ELGIN PARKS & RECREATION
MASTER PLAN UPDATE

JUNE 2023
Dear Elgin Residents:

Thank you for taking the time to review the 2023 Parks and Recreation Department Master Plan. A master plan is a document that guides direction for future growth that is comprehensive and long range in scope and identifies goals and objectives the department wants to achieve over the next five to ten years. This plan is a living document that complements the department’s mission and vision statements.

Parks, recreation, and open space improve the lives of millions of people each and every day. Public parks, trails, and indoor and outdoor recreation facilities promote better physical and mental health, serve as places for family and friends to meet, and are often where people can connect with nature. Recognizing the importance and value of parks and recreation in the community, the City of Elgin strives to be responsive to residents while balancing the diverse recreational interests of a large community. This is accomplished through the creation and implementation of a master plan that provides an in-depth view of the city’s resources, programs, and services. The Master Plan provides essential guidance in long term decision making while establishing goals and priorities based on current amenities and offerings.

No matter how you choose to recreate, there is no shortage of ways to enjoy all that the City of Elgin has to offer.

Sincerely,

Maria Cumpata
Parks and Recreation Director
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EXECUTIVE SUMMARY

The earliest documented planning in the City of Elgin dates as far back as the 1917 Plan of Elgin by E.W. Bennett. More than a century of planning has guided Elgin’s development, its sense of place, and provided residents the opportunity to shape their community. Planning specifically for parks and outdoor recreation within the community has been a focus for the last 45 years. In that time, four parks and recreation master plans have been developed, with the latest plan developed in 2011. The following report is an update to the 2011 plan to holistically study the community to identify opportunities within the parks system for improvements.

The team studied scales both large and small; from a city-wide, community lens, to neighborhoods and city districts, down to a park specific scale to identify individual park improvements as well as enhancements that can be broadcast across all parks in Elgin. The report looks at demographic data and population trends, including analysis regarding programs offered by the city, gaps in offerings, and recommendations for improvements for future programs and services for residents. Additionally, the team prepared a comprehensive maintenance plan to establish an initial visual impression of park sites and facilities. The plan also looks at service area mapping and standards, as well as a benchmark analysis, to determine the appropriate levels of access, amenities, parkland, and open space systems available to the community compared to other peer benchmark agencies.

Finally, park specific feasibility studies were developed to assess opportunities within specific parks. The team was given nine individual focus-parks to perform an on-site analysis and to provide specific park inventory and future recommendations. The nine focus parks are:

- Drake Field
- Elgin Shores
- Festival Park
- Lords Park
- Mulberry Grove Park
- Walton Island
- Wing Park
- Sports Complex
- Summerhill Park

In tandem with the master plan, a series of public input and focus group meetings were held to gather feedback from the community regarding park usage and needs, to better refine the master plan recommendations. There were three public input meetings and six focus group sessions. The public input meetings focused specifically on providing the community opportunities to share their ideas about the types of facilities they’d like to see in the parks system, validate where expected growth and new park development is needed, identify the parks they use and how they access parks, and comment on the feasibility studies developed for each of the nine focus-parks.

A separate meeting was held to focus on community interests and desires for the Lords Park Pool. The meeting addressed balancing staffing concerns with community expectations.

Together with community feedback and the comprehensive demographic and service area analysis, the team developed a series of recommendations for the city to focus on over the next 10-15 years until the next community master plan. These goals focus on acres of parkland needed, types of amenities needed based on age groupings, and opportunities for improvement in mobility to and from parks through walking, public transportation, and biking. Other recommendations included in this plan are related to overall system-based improvements, such as park signage and wayfinding, general access and connectivity, infrastructure and maintenance, and vegetation and sustainability.

The City of Elgin and its parks department have done a wonderful job to date bringing rich park and open space experiences to the community, while preserving the city's history and culture that intertwine with its existing parks system. However, the next decade represents an important phase in the city’s bright future. Elgin is growing slower than the national average and saw a decrease in population from 2020 to 2022. The population is forecasted to increase only slightly over the next ten years, with persons over 55 expected to account for 28% of the population by 2037. This plan aims to guide the city in future decision making to better cater to its current and forecast demographics, while keeping focused on growth and tactical improvements aimed to attract new families and increase revenue.
SECTION 1.0
INTRODUCTION
1.0 INTRODUCTION

1.1 PROJECT OVERVIEW

After 12 years, Elgin Parks and Recreation (EPR) called for an update to the 2011 Elgin Parks and Recreation Master Plan (EPRMP). This update will ensure that future growth and development of parkland and park facilities within the city align with the community and its needs. The community recreational and open space needs have evolved reflecting changes in culture, technology, and population demographics. This update seeks to meet Elgin in this moment of time while leaving space for the community to grow and adapt.

The city has made tremendous strides increasing park space and updating its parks and public facilities to fit the changing needs of its population. Seventy two percent of residents live within a 10-minute walk to a park and the city is meeting its Level of Service goal of 15 acres of parkland for every 1,000 residents. While these metrics should be celebrated, it is not a time to rest on past success; as the city changes and grows annually, so too do the needs of the community.

The 2023 Master Plan Update (MPU) is intended to assist future decision making by establishing priority zones and offering long-term recommendations for the next 10 years and beyond. Recommendations were developed through community input and feedback, coordination with the EPR staff and departments, GIS and Census data collection and analysis, a comprehensive market study, as well as an on-site evaluation of nine focus-parks in the Elgin parks system selected for review by EPR. What emerged from these studies was a series of trends that helped guide the recommendations at a regional, community, and park level. The vision of the EPR is to, “...create community through people, parks, and programs...” and serves as the guiding principle in the creation of this update.

1.2 PROJECT AREA

Elgin, IL is a western suburb of Chicago located along the Fox River. The river splits the city into two parts allowing for a robust park and open space system along the riverfront. Elgin has a population of approximately 115,000 people as of the 2020 Census. The population is predominantly white, with a rapidly growing diverse, ethnic population. It has a rich history, particularly in its parks system, which contains numerous culturally significant resources and unique park features. Lords Park and Wing Park are two historic, flagship parks featuring mature tree canopies, rolling lawns, and a variety of well cherished public amenities.

The 2011 EPRMP recognized the significant geographical growth of Elgin over the prior decade and developed five multi-neighborhood planning districts: West, North Central, Northeast, South Central, and Southeast (Figure 2 on page 3). This update will rely on those districts for trend analysis and recommendations.

The team was also given nine individual focus-parks to perform an on-site analysis and to provide specific park inventory and future recommendations. These parks are highlighted above in Figure 1 and listed below:
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Figure 2: Map of Elgin parks system and districts

ELGIN PARKS INVENTORY 2022

- Parks
- NEW: Newsome Park
- Kiwanis Park
- Fowler River Park
- Princeton Wood Park
- Randall Ridge Park
- Ryerson Park
- St. Francis Park
- Sutters Park
- Slate Avenue Park
- Summerhill Park
- The Highlands Golf Course
- Trinity Terrace
- Truss Park
- Walton Island Park
- Willow Bay Park
- Wing Park
- Wing Street Park
- Wright Avenue Park
- Cornerstone Park
- Mayer Park
- Shadow Hill Park
- Copper Springs Park
- Waterford Entry Park
- Wing Park Battlefield
- Veteran’s Memorial Park
- Bowes Creek Country Club
- Unity Park
- Shamrock Park
- Longcommon Park
- Heritage Park
- Freedom Run Dog Park
- Trillium Park
- Windrow Park
- Channing Gardens
- Douglas/Ann Park
- PACE Bus Route
- Bike Path
- Playground
1.4 UPDATED GOALS AND VISION

The 2011 EPRMP made recommendations related to park and recreation facility development and land acquisition. The specific goals were as follows:

- Create a supporting document to use when applying for local, state, and federal grants.
- Establish priorities and recommendations for existing and future park and facilities developments.
- Identify potential costs related to park and recreation facility development and land acquisition.
- Identify potential resources and create a funding plan to finance the costs related to park and recreation facility development and land acquisition.

The 2011 EPRMP also highlighted the city’s mission to enhance the quality of life for residents of every Elgin neighborhood by protecting unique resources, enhancing cultural treasures, and protecting the historic identity of the city. It also sought to preserve access to an integrated community and regional system of parks and recreation facilities, services, and programs with an eye on the future, while preserving the past.

The 2023 MPU looks to build off the previous plan’s mission and goals and categorize them into eight drivers grouped into three themes:

- **Access**
  - Ensure parks and services are physically accessible to all.
  - Increase accessible features within parks.
  - Maintain and increase multi-modal transportation.
  - Add additional parkland to underserved demographics and districts.

- **Experience**
  - Provide new sports and program offerings.
  - Meet the unmet needs of current and future communities of Elgin.

- **Resources**
  - Protect historically significant parkland.
  - Promote and preserve culturally meaningful resources.
  - Strengthen and preserve natural systems.

1.5 PUBLIC ENGAGEMENT

The MPU was refined through a robust public engagement process. Two public meetings, held at the Centre, focused specifically on providing the community opportunities to share their ideas about the types of facilities they would like to see in the parks system, validate where expected growth and new park development is needed, identify the parks they use and how they access parks, and comment on the feasibility studies developed for each of the nine focus-parks.

A separate meeting was held to focus specifically on community interests and desires for the Lords Park Family Aquatic Center. The pool closed in response to safety protocols during the COVID-19 pandemic and has not reopened. The meeting addressed balancing staffing concerns with community expectations. This meeting was held at Lords Park Elementary School.

The following summarizes the public input meetings held during the MPU.

PUBLIC ENGAGEMENT

The first public meeting introduced the public to the update process, project expectations and asked attendees to identify desirable design themes and priorities for park planning. In addition, participants were asked to share information about their relationship with the parks system, where they lived, the parks they used, the planning district from which they accessed the parks, and how often they did so.

An online survey was developed and released in conjunction with the in-person public input meeting. The online survey sought to recreate, as closely as possible, the questions and input provided at the in-person meeting. Participants who could not attend the meeting were encouraged to participate online. A unique feature of Public Input Meeting 1 was the collection of ‘Park Stories’. During the public open comment period, participants were encouraged to share personal stories and experiences they have had in Elgin parks.

PUBLIC INPUT MEETING 1

PUBLIC INPUT MEETING 2

PUBLIC INPUT MEETING 3

PUBLIC MEETING 4

Figure 4: Diagram of design drivers and themes

Figure 3: Diagram of design drivers and themes

Figure 4: Diagram of the project arc

*Photos courtesy of the Daily Herald
Figure 5: Summary analysis of public input meeting 1

- **Figure 5**: Summary analysis of public input meeting 1

- **Design Priorities...**
  - When visiting the park, survey respondents design priorities.
  - 14% gathering space
  - 10% community spirit
  - 20% social experiences
  - 26% active recreation
  - 9% connection
  - 13% passive recreation

- **Average Age of Respondents**
  - 17 - 28: 7.5%
  - 29 - 42: 32.3%
  - 43 - 62: 39.6%
  - 63 - 76: 16.0%
  - 77+: 4.1%

- **How do you typically travel to and from an Elgin Park?**
  - Drive: 273
  - Walk: 111
  - Bike: 78
  - Bus: 1
  - Other: 1
  - Don't go to parks: 1

- **What experiences would you like to try at Elgin Parks?**
  - 17% new to Elgin Park
  - 11% a couple times a year
  - 12% never used

- **What do you do when you visit an Elgin Park?**
  - Trails
  - Enjoy the park
  - Picnic/greenspace
  - Playgrounds/splash pads
  - Sports fields
  - Other

- **Who are you Elgin Parks visitor/user?**
  - Male: 3%
  - Female: 97%

- **Total Number of Participants**: 450

---

**Legend**

- Trails
- Special Events/Festivals
- Bike Trails
The stories were recorded using podcasting equipment and software and the recordings were then edited and shared with EPR. The recordings represent a unique collection of the communities' personal experiences in the parks from a range of population groups.

In total, over 450 participants provided input in-person or through the online survey. The majority of participants (117) indicated they lived in the West District, however when asked which district participants used most, the North Central district collected the majority of responses (128), followed by the Southeast (120) and the West district (94). This indicated to the team that while a majority of respondents lived on the periphery of the city and in the suburbs, the center of the city remained most frequently used for their park and recreation needs. Notable parks in these most visited districts include Festival Park, Lords Park, and Wing Park.

PLANNING THEMES AND VISION AND VALUES TESTING

The public input survey used to collect community preferences at the first Public Input Meeting included feedback on preferred planning themes, as well as Vision Testing and Values. The top planning theme was Active Recreation (189 Votes) defined as, “highly developed recreational experiences such as baseball, basketball, playgrounds, or aquatic facilities”, followed by Social Experiences (147 Votes) and Passive Recreation (134 Votes). Based on other in-person feedback from open ended questions and the ‘Park Stories’ sessions, the message heard was a desire for additional group recreational experiences, in particular pickleball, aquatic play and playgrounds for small groups, families and associations to enjoy together, as well as additional public spaces for special events or festivals. Additional values testing indicated a desire for new and improved trails and connections, suggesting a need to connect these recreational experiences together with non-motorized methods.

Content and results from Public Input Meeting 1 can be found in Appendix A.

PUBLIC INPUT MEETING 2

Public Input Meeting 2 was held in-person with community members attending to provide feedback. Findings from the first round of public engagement were presented along with initial feasibility studies based on an analysis of park access, demographics, and character. In addition, feasibility studies developed for the nine focus-parks were presented.

Participants were encouraged to ask questions following the presentation, provide feedback regarding initial feasibility studies and identify what they liked or wanted to see changed in the feasibility studies.

An overwhelming majority of respondents agreed with the addition of more court space, while others pointed out the need for all-season activities such as ice rinks, cross country trails, and even air domes for multi-sport activities. Respondents were excited to see more trail connections and opportunities for paved loop trails throughout the parks and also expressed a desire to preserve and highlight Elgin's natural vegetation.

Content and results from Public Input Meeting 2 can be found in Appendix B.

LORDS PARK PUBLIC INPUT MEETING

The third public meeting focused on the Lords Park Pool and asked the public to provide feedback related to their use, experiences, and desires for aquatic recreation within the Elgin Parks system. The ultimate goal was to determine whether or not to keep the existing pool, or construct a different type of aquatic facility in its place. The meeting was held in-person and also utilized an online survey where over 1,600 people provided their opinions.

While results from resident feedback was mixed in favor of keeping the existing pool versus developing a new outdoor aquatic facility, 98% of respondents indicated that aquatic facilities and programs are important to the quality of life in Elgin. Re-opening the Lords Park Family Aquatic Center was the preferred response, with 62% voting they were in favor of the existing pool, versus 38% indicating they would prefer a reimagined aquatic experience at Lords Park.

STAKEHOLDER MEETINGS

In addition to the public input meetings described above, six focus group meetings were held with stakeholders organized by subject matter. The focus groups included representatives from Operations (parks department operators and managers), Safety (representatives from fire, police, and safety organizations), Youth Sports, Business Community, Officials and Community (representatives of the City of Elgin government and counsel), and Leisure (representatives from sports leagues, tournament coordinators, and friends groups). Focus group participants were presented initial feedback and findings from the first public input meeting as well as a summary of existing park services. Then each Focus Group was led through a Strengths, Weaknesses, Opportunities, and Threats (SWOT) analysis of the parks system.

Comments from the SWOT analysis were captured dynamically during the meeting so participants could see their responses in ‘real time’ on the screen. Among all participants there was a general consensus that Elgin has a strong parks system and offers programming and services that meet a lot of the needs of the community. Unique features of the parks system, the riverfront access; the golf course; museum; and zoo were highlighted in all the meetings. Identified opportunities and needs were focused on specifics such as improving marketing and awareness of the parks system and its offerings, specific maintenance issues or concerns, changing community demographics and interest, and insufficient funding or staffing.

Figure 6: Photos during the public engagement process
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2.0 REGIONAL ANALYSIS AND TRENDS

The following section provides a regional analysis of the City of Elgin’s demographic data and forecasted 5-15 year trends. Projections are made using historical patterns and straight-line linear regression. Data was gathered from a variety of sources such as the U.S. Census Bureau and the Environmental Systems Research Institute, Inc (ESRI).

The full demographic and trend analysis can be found in Appendix F & G.

2.1 DEMOGRAPHICS AND TRENDS

POPULATION

Elgin is a moderate size city and the population has remained relatively stable over the past decade. The population increased from 110,251 to 114,423 with an average increase of 0.32% per year (well below the national average of 0.74%). The population decreased from 2020 to 2022 but is expected to slightly increase over the next 15 years, reaching 115,824 residents by 2037 with a projected average annual growth rate of .08% over the time period of 2022 to 2037 (Figure 7). The total number of households has increased at a similar rate, growing from 35,672 in 2010 to 38,714 by 2022. By 2037, it is expected that there will be 40,860 households within the city, and that number will likely continue to expand.

POPULATION AGE SEGMENTATION

The largest age segments of the city’s population are 18–34 (23%) and 35–54 (26%). There is a slight aging trend with people over the age of 55 making up 28% of the population by 2037 which is a minor increase from previous years. All age segments over 55 (55-64, 64-74, and 75+) are expected to increase by 1-2% each from 2022 to 2037. Elgin has a median age of 34.8, younger than the median age of Illinois (38.3) and the United States (38.1). Overall, the population is expected to age over time, as younger populations decrease and existing age classes become older.

Figures 8 and 9 display 2022 median age population density and 2027 projected median age population density. It shows younger segments occupying the majority of downtown and along the Fox River, while older segments of the population live in the suburbs of the city. This trend is projected to continue over the next 5 years.
While the city has become increasingly more diverse since 2010, the current population is predominantly "White Alone". The 2022 population estimate shows that 44% of the population falls into the White Alone category, with "Some Other Race" (24%) and "Two or More Races" (7%) representing the second and third largest categories. Predictions for the 2037 population estimate continue to become much more diverse, with a major decrease in the White Alone population, and minor increases to all other race categories. Within this change, the Two or More Races category will increase the most from 17% to 29%. Overall, Elgin is much more diverse than Illinois and the United States (Figure 10).

The city’s population was also assessed based on Hispanic/Latino ethnicity, which by the Census Bureau definition is viewed independently from race. It is important to note that individuals who are Hispanic/Latino in ethnicity can also identify with any racial categories identified above. Based on the current 2022 estimate, people of Hispanic/Latino origin represent 47% of the city’s population, which is well above the national average (19% Hispanic/Latino). In future projections, the Hispanic/Latino population is expected to continue steadily growing to 53% of the city’s total population by 2037 (Figure 11).

Per capita income is earned by an individual while median household income is based on the total income of everyone over the age of sixteen living within the same household. Elgin’s per capita income ($35,994) is roughly the same as the state and national averages ($37,306 and $35,672 respectively). On the other hand, the city’s median household income ($80,620) is significantly higher than the state ($68,428) and national averages ($65,712) (Figures 12 and 13). These income characteristics should be taken into consideration when the Department is pricing out programs and calculating cost recovery goals.
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2.2 SERVICE AREA MAPPING

The following sections summarize various service area data points to provide insight into the community’s needs related to park access, amount of park space available, and the programs and services offered at each park. The metrics evaluated were:

- Level of Service Standards
- Program Assessment
- Accessibility
  - Walkability
  - Non-motorized transit
  - Public transportation
- Available Amenities
  - 17 and younger
  - 65 and older

2.2.1 LEVEL OF SERVICE STANDARDS

Level of Service (LOS) is an important consideration when assessing the availability and quantity of park space within a community. It measures the number of acres of parkland per 1,000 residents. The 2011 EPRMP established a desired level of service (LOS) standard of 15 acres of parkland for every 1,000 residents during the master plan process. With an estimated 2022 population of 114,423, Elgin’s 1,770 acres of total parkland equates to an LOS of 15.5 acres per 1,000 residents, meaning the city is meeting its desired objective.

2.2.2 PROGRAM ASSESSMENT

In addition to LOS, a program assessment was performed by PROS Consulting which provides an in-depth perspective of programs and services offered by the EPR to identify strengths, challenges, and opportunities regarding their programming. The assessment also assists in identifying core programs, program gaps, key system-wide issues, areas for improvement, and future programs and services desired by residents and visitors.

2.2.3 ACCESSIBILITY

Accessibility is another important metric to track when looking broadly at a parks system and the ability for residents of all abilities and demographics to enjoy their favorite park. Typically, this is measured by the number of people living within a 5- or 10-minute walk or bike ride to a trail, a park, or a bus stop, assuming the average individual walks \( \frac{1}{4} \) mile in 5 minutes, and \( \frac{1}{2} \) mile in 10 minutes. The goal is for all of the accessibility metrics to work in tandem, so that residents can safely and reasonably walk or bike to a park or walk to a bus stop that will take them to a park.

**WALKABILITY**

The first and easiest accessibility metric to track is walkability, which is defined by how many residents live within a 10-minute walk or less of a park. This metric is tracked through gap analysis mapping as shown in Figure 15. The light shade of green shows areas where residents are less than 10 minutes from a park. This boundary, created with data from the Trust for Public Land (TPL), is overlaid on current population density mapping from ESRI Community Analyst and CMAP Time Series to determine areas of need or ‘gaps’. Based on the analysis prepared for this MPU, 59% of residents live within a 5-minute walk of a park, while 72% of residents live within a 10-minute walk. The walkability of Elgin’s residents is significantly higher than the national average (55%) for a 10-minute walk, however, comparable and slightly larger communities such as Joliet and Naperville, IL have TPL walk scores of 80% and 89% respectively. Good progress has been made, but it is important for Elgin to commit to continued accessibility to parks.

![Figure 14: Residents enjoy Summer Concerts in the Park](image1)

![Figure 15: Map of 2022 population density and 10-minute walk service area](image2)

Credit: www.cityofelgin.org
NON-MOTORIZED TRANSIT

Non-motorized accessibility mapping (Figure 16) shows a good concentration of trail facilities across the city, primarily around downtown and in the southern portion of the West District. The Fox River Trail (FRT) is a great asset for the city because it provides widespread pedestrian trail access to the riverfront, spanning the entirety of the city north to south. However, currently only 13% of parks are directly connected to the community by an existing bike facility. While it is recommended to construct and connect additional routes throughout the city to parks where possible, it can be difficult to develop links in existing neighborhoods and in areas with limited right of way (ROW). One strategy would be to use the existing FRT as the primary north/route, and strategically link east/west neighborhood routes into the FRT to better connect the non-motorized trail system. Doing so will also require more crossings over the Fox River, where today there is only one dedicated off-street trail crossing, making accessing the FRT from the West side of the city difficult.

PUBLIC TRANSPORTATION

Public transportation (Figure 17) was the last accessibility metric analyzed for the MPU. This metric is measured by finding the percentage of residents that live within a 5- to 10-minute walk of a bus stop and the percentage of existing parks within a 5- to 10-minute walk of a bus stop. As of 2020, 68% of residents live within a 5-minute walk of a bus stop, and 84% of residents live within a 10-minute walk. While these ratios are a step in the right direction, according to national agencies and planning documents, 90% of residents should live within a 5-minute walk of a transit stop. From an open space perspective, the percentage of parks accessible by bus is an important metric. Today, 67% of parks have a bus stop within a 5-minute walk, while 75% have a stop within a 10-minute walk. Additional components to consider with public transportation are wait times, ease of transferring between buses, and percentage of the city that is serviced by bus.

*Assuming the average individual walks ¼ mile in 5 minutes, ½ mile in 10 minutes
**AAMENTS**

The following gap analysis further evaluates level of service needs based on age cohorts and access to specific park types within a 10-minute walk. While each age group should be considered, the team found 17 and under, and 65 and older to be of particular note due to shrinking younger populations and growing elderly populations.

**17 AND UNDER**

This analysis (Figure 18) studied the 10-minute walk radius to amenities and divided it into categories based on Active, Passive, Open Space, Play, and Destination type for age cohorts under 17 years old. Because this group’s population is declining and further projected to decline, the city should attempt to provide adequate amenities to attract younger people and their families in order to continue growing the city.

**65 AND OLDER**

Figure 18 analyzed the 10-minute walk radius to amenities and divided it into categories based on Active, Passive, Open Space, Play, and Destination type for age cohorts 65 years and older. Because this group’s population is growing and further projected to grow, the City should continue providing adequate amenities to keep this contingent represented with appropriate programming.
2.4 EVALUATION OF FOCUS-PARKS

As part of the MPU, the planning team evaluated nine focus-parks selected by EPR. The parks included:

- Drake Field
- Elgin Shores
- Festival Park
- Lords Park
- Summerhill Park
- Mulfrey Park
- Walton Island
- Wing Park
- Sports Complex

Each of the nine parks were evaluated in person and on-site. Evaluation criteria included the following characteristics: internal circulation, accessible routes and equipment, site furnishings, overall condition of on-site facilities, overall ecological health, identification of significant park landmarks, viewsheds, and overall maintenance.

Observations were collected with field notes, photographs and through a table-based conditions survey. The condition survey enabled the site evaluator to grade the park using a 1-through-5 scoring system.

The on-site analysis was performed over a two-day period in September 2022. Members of the planning team walked each of the nine focus-parks to collect the site inventory data. After the on-site visits, the team compiled all notes, data, and photography, and provided EPR with a summary of observations, including a list of general recommendations to consider for the overall system of parks. These general recommendations were categorized into four categories: Park Signage and Wayfinding, Access and Connectivity, Infrastructure and Maintenance, and Vegetation and Sustainability.

2.5 ARCHITECTURAL EVALUATION OF KEY PARK FACILITIES

In conjunction with the overall site inventory and analysis performed, an additional architectural evaluation was performed to evaluate key park structures and facilities at Lords Park, Drake Field, and Wing Park. These evaluations were performed on October 13, 2022. The full summary and analysis can be found in Appendix E.
SECTION 3.0
SITE ANALYSIS AND RECOMMENDATIONS
3.0 SITE ANALYSIS AND RECOMMENDATIONS

The following outlines the site analysis and recommendations for improvements to the Elgin Parks System. Recommendations are presented in four parts:

- Regional Recommendations,
- General Overall Parks and Recreation System Recommendations
- Golf Course Recommendations
- Focus-Park Feasibility Studies

The feasibility studies are based on the evaluation of the nine focus-parks and the architectural evaluations of key park facilities. This represents a high-level, city-wide approach to improving the parks and recreation system, while also acknowledging the specific needs of the nine focus-parks.

3.1 REGIONAL RECOMMENDATIONS

The upcoming recommendations compare the existing demographic and spatial analysis described previously with key 10-year goals for the city. Also, ERP can reference when applying for grants or establishing plans with various municipal groups when planning for future upgrades and studies related to the regional park and transportation system.

LEVEL OF SERVICE STANDARDS

In the 2011 ERMP, Elgin targeted 15 acres of parkland per 1,000 residents. Currently, Elgin is meeting its goal, providing 15.5 acres of parkland for every 1,000 residents. Because Elgin’s population is not expected to increase significantly over the next 10 years, it is not recommended the city target a new parkland/residential goal, but continue to monitor its population and adjust for change. To maintain its goal of 15 acres of park space per 1,000 residents, the city will need to add an additional 70 acres of park space per 5,000 new residents. If no new parkland is provided, the ratio will fall below 15 acres per 1,000 people with just a 4,000 person increase from the 2020 population. Without an increase in total population over the next 10 years however, this report recommends strategically adding park space where necessary in existing neighborhoods to improve the access of existing residents to parks space, and increase the walk score for park access, or where demographics show a need for specific park types. Additionally, we recommend investing resources in improving and adding amenities in existing parks.

PARK ADDITIONS - 10-YEAR GOAL

This report recommends breaking up park additions into two priorities: high priority and moderate priority. High priority areas are those where population density is greater than 4,000 people per square mile located within service area gaps and within the city center (Figure 24). As property becomes available, the city should target these areas first. Moderate priority areas are those where population density is less than 4,000 people per square mile located within service area gaps and outside of the city center. As funding becomes available, the city should strategically consider adding additional parks in these high priority and moderate priority areas.

Figure 22: Movies in the Park at Festival Park

Figure 23: Example of a new regional waterfront park, Riverside Park - Detroit, MI

Figure 24: 10-year goal for additional parks

Credit: www.cityofelgin.org
**Amenity Additions - 10-Year Goal**

Opportunities for new parks based on amenity classifications should also be broken down in two priorities, high priority and moderate priority (Figure 27). These additions should be aligned with service area gaps overlaid with specific demographic population densities. The two growing and most underserved groups observed are under 17 years of age and over 65. Based on the needs of these communities, the city should target high priority areas first, followed by moderate priority areas as funding and land become available.

**Walkability - 10-Year Goal**

Over the next 10 years, the city should aim to increase the number of residents within a 5-minute walk of a park from 59% today, to 70% by 2033, and from 91% of residents within a 10-minute walk, to 98% (Figure 27). The team also recommends increasing the length of trail per resident from 3 miles of trail per 1,000 residents to 3.5 miles of trail per 1,000 residents by the year 2033 (Figure 28).
Bike Facilities - 10-Year Goal

The 10-year goal for bike facilities aims to increase the number of residents directly connected to a park by an existing bike facility from 13% to 80% (Figure 30). In order to achieve this, the city should prioritize connecting Special Use and Community Parks such as Lords Park, Wing Park, and the Sports Complex, etc.

Figure 29: Example of protected on-street bike lanes with safety striping and planted medians - Ann Arbor, MI

Transit - 10-Year Goal

The 10-year goal for transit upgrades looks to increase the number of parks within a 5-minute walk from a bus stop from 67% today to 80% by 2033 (Figure 32). It also looks to increase the number of parks east of Randall Rd within a 10-minute walk from a bus stop from 75% today to 90% by 2033. In order to achieve this, the city should prioritize connecting Special Use and Community Parks such as Lords Park, Wing Park, and the Sports Complex, etc. Additionally, all Community and Special Use parks should have a bus stop adjacent or within the park.

Figure 30: 10-year bike facility goal

Figure 31: Example bus stop bumpout with connected bike lane - Detroit, MI

Figure 32: 10-year transit goal
3.2 GENERAL OVERALL RECOMMENDATIONS

The following outlines recommendations for improvements to the general overall parks and recreation system. These recommendations can be applied across all parks and are broken down into four categories:

- Park Signage and Wayfinding
- Access and Connectivity
- Infrastructure and Maintenance
- Vegetation and Sustainability

**PARK SIGNAGE AND WAYFINDING**

- Develop and adopt a signage family, consistent in style and appearance across all parks. Park signage should reflect the EPR brand, color, font and logo. Park signs should include:
  - Standard monument/entry signs at major park entrances.
  - Special feature signs for key destinations within existing parks (golf courses, pools or aquatic facilities, Museum, Zoo, etc.).
  - Wayfinding signage for visitor orientation within parks.
- Wayfinding kiosk signage with ‘you are here’ mapping directional signage with distances to key features of the park.
  - Distances should be measured in a consistent, user-friendly unit (minutes or miles).
  - Consider the inclusion of Bluetooth or QR code content for visitor device interface particularly at significant locations or use areas within a park.

- Conduct a city-wide signage and wayfinding study to identify the ease of navigation or orientation to parks using city roads. This study should evaluate ease of orientation along major transportation routes and visitor identification to all Special Use and Community Parks, (i.e. Wing, Lords, Festival, Sports Complex, Jack Cook etc.). The study should evaluate wayfinding from the edge of the city to key locations and provide recommendations for improved vehicular navigation and orientation to park spaces. This study is especially important for the proposed future growth of the Sports Complex as a tournament destination.

**ACCESS AND CONNECTIVITY**

- Conduct an updated ADA assessment at all parks.
- Develop a consistent paved pedestrian connection to special use areas within parks. This includes a consistent paved connection within the park and at major entry points.
- Provide sufficient bike parking adjacent to major programmatic experiences.
- Add or modify city bus stops and routes to provide pick-up and drop off to 90% of Community and Special Use Parks east of Randall Road (Festival Park, Lords Park, Sports Complex, Trout Park, and Wing Park will all have a bus stop inside the park).
- Conduct a pedestrian and bicycle safety analysis at all Special Use and Community Parks (Wing, Lords, Festival, Sports Complex, Jack Cook).

**ACCESS AND CONNECTIVITY**

- Conduct an updated ADA assessment at all parks.
- Develop a consistent paved pedestrian connection to special use areas within parks. This includes a consistent paved connection within the park and at major entry points.
- Provide sufficient bike parking adjacent to major programmatic experiences.
- Add or modify city bus stops and routes to provide pick-up and drop off to 90% of Community and Special Use Parks east of Randall Road (Festival Park, Lords Park, Sports Complex, Trout Park, and Wing Park will all have a bus stop inside the park).
- Conduct a pedestrian and bicycle safety analysis at all Special Use and Community Parks (Wing, Lords, Festival, Sports Complex, Jack Cook).
3.0 Site Analysis and Recommendations

INFRASTRUCTURE AND MAINTENANCE

- Conduct a seating study for the Special Use and Community Parks to determine if sufficient seating is provided in appropriate quantities and adjacencies.
- Provide additional trash and recycling receptacles at main gathering places in all parks and at major use areas within parks.
- Conduct a receptacle audit for all major Special Use and Community Parks to ensure sufficient access and quantity for the typical number of users.
- Identify and adopt a consistent site furnishing standard across all parks.
- Review and/or update detailed/targeted maintenance plans for each park.
  - A standard may also be developed according to park type, i.e., Special Use, Community, Neighborhood, and Pocket parks.
- Conduct a quality review of parking lot surfacing in all parks.
- Review all park lighting to determine where new fixtures are necessary and where replacements are needed.
  - Where possible, convert lighting to LED standards.
  - Where possible, convert lighting to auto dimming at scheduled times with activation triggers for maintenance, safety, and emergency vehicles.
- Evaluate opportunities for incorporating additional seasonal and all-season programming such as ice rinks, air domes, sledding, ice sculptures, and winter trails for snowshoeing, cross country skiing, and ice skating.

VEGETATION AND SUSTAINABILITY

- Continue to assess the health of existing trees in the parks and provide recommendations for disease mitigation and succession planting.
- Protect and promote Elgin’s old growth tree canopy.
- Develop an invasive species inventory and removal plan for park properties and adjacent ROWs.
- Prepare a sustainability audit for the Special Use and Community parks.
  - Develop a plan for best practices related to sustainable design and development. This study should include opportunities for green infrastructure, stormwater capture and management, solar energy capture, electric vehicle charging stations, and green building techniques for existing and future facilities.
3.3 GOLF COURSE RECOMMENDATIONS

The City of Elgin currently owns and operates three different golf courses. They are Wing Park Golf Course, The Highlands of Elgin, and Bowes Creek Country Club. These three golf courses give the residents of Elgin a wide variety of golf options and value propositions to play the game. The two feature courses (The Highlands of Elgin and Bowes Creek) have proven to be excellent economic engines to bring patrons to Elgin to spend their disposable income.

Wing Park golf course opened in 1908 and is the oldest nine-hole municipally operated facility in Illinois. This course is a regulation length nine-hole golf course. It is located at the entrance of one of the city’s busiest historic parks; Wing Park. This course, with its traditional design, targets the junior, senior and intermediate players. Youth participation in this sport has increased sixty percent over the past few years and this is a great course to develop their techniques and learn the game. A big trend in the industry currently is building urban compact courses to attract families, younger players, and higher handicappers. This course, however, is at a disadvantage to draw business without reasonable clubhouse facilities. In addition, golfers must cross the main park access road to get to the course. To improve the course amenities, the professional staff has recommended a remodel of the clubhouse and improved access to the park to keep the golfers safe. This clubhouse would be updated to represent the local neighborhood style and accommodate an improved golf practice facility. The addition of golf simulators would allow for an improved amenity for the golfer to practice and receive instruction. This issue should be considered as part of a future, golf specific master plan.

The Highlands of Elgin is the city’s flagship golf course and is currently ranked #2 by Golf Digest as one of the top public courses to play in Illinois. The facility became fully operational in July 2010. It replaced the former Spartan Meadows golf course. It was designed to offer a superior golf experience for the public golfer. The course has a Scottish influence with rolling hills and dramatic vistas. The Prairie Style Clubhouse with its restaurant, The Grumpy Goat Tavern, has wonderful accommodations for golfers and those that just need a meeting space. The facility has restaurant space for nearly 200 patrons, private rooms, as well as a retail golf shop and golf simulator for instruction and practice off season. The Highlands of Elgin is located adjacent to the city’s Sports Complex, east of McLean Boulevard and south of Illinois Route 20.

In the fall of 2009, the City of Elgin opened Bowes Creek Country Club, an 18-hole golf course integrated within Bowes Creek. Bowes Creek is a 616-acre community developed by luxury home builder, Toll Brothers. This development and partnership allowed the golf course to be owned and operated by the City of Elgin. The 18-hole premium golf course offers a private golf experience to the public golfer. It offers full memberships for unlimited golf and a unique, Member for a Day, daily rate that has proven to be very successful in marketing the facility. The course was designed by locally grown but internationally recognized architect, Rich Jacobsen. The course features wooded and wetland areas, lakes, mature trees and was created from rolling farmland on the west end of town. The restaurant, Johnny’s Supper Club, has a unique style with an Italian flair. The Bowes Creek Practice Facility and its Golf Academy is very active and offers a great environment to practice. It is the intention of the golf staff to expand the opportunities of the facility by expanding the range facility. To model the business from a seasonal facility to a year-round facility; it is important to build the amenities to support full season practice. This would involve expanded hitting areas, virtual golf simulators for winter practice and expanded instruction, as well as the possibility of golf-specific training areas. The large insurgence of golfers into the sport is causing many simulators and off-season facilities to open. This concept would allow the city to take advantage of this growing business. This proposal would once again be a part of a future, golf-specific master plan.
3.4 TOP 5 OVERALL RECOMMENDATIONS

1. TRAIL SYSTEM
   - Increase miles of park trail per resident from 0.11 miles of trail per 1,000 residents to 0.40 miles of trail.
   - Ensure park trails connect with city sidewalks and other non-motorized bike routes in Elgin.

2. ACCESS TO PARKS
   - Provide internal park bus stops at Festival Park, Lords Park, Wing Park, Sports Complex, and Trout Park.
   - Ensure non-motorized trails and bike routes connect to all Community and Special Use Parks.

3. ACCESSIBILITY
   - Conduct an updated ADA and pedestrian and bicycle safety assessment at all parks.
   - Prioritize improvement projects at Festival Park, Lords Park, Wing Park, Sports Complex, and Jack Cook Park.

4. SIGNAGE AND WAYFINDING
   - Conduct a city-wide signage and wayfinding study.
   - Develop and adopt a signage family, consistent in style and appearance across all parks.

5. VEGETATION
   - Prepare a sustainability audit for all Community and Special Use parks.
   - Develop an invasive species inventory and removal plan.
   - Protect Elgin’s old growth tree canopy.

Figure 42: Diagram of Top 5 overall recommendations
SECTION 3.5
PARK SPECIFIC ANALYSIS & FEASIBILITY STUDIES
DRAKE FIELD

LOCATION
701 Hastings St, Elgin IL 60120

PARK INTRODUCTION
Founded in 1967, Drake Field is a community park adjacent to Huff Elementary School. The park is equipped with two football playing fields, restrooms, a concessions building, a small playground, and a medium sized picnic shelter. It’s also the home to the Elgin Youth Football program.

EXISTING CONDITIONS AND ANALYSIS

- A. Replace signage
- B. Pavement in poor condition
- C. Minimal tree canopy throughout site
- D. Accessible path to playground
- E. Minimal vegetation screening road
- F. Field goals in need of repair
- G. Vehicular circulation is a safety concern
- H. Nice large tree screening

NARRATIVE
Drake Field is primarily used for youth football, with a concession building, bleachers, storage, and a small shelter. There is also a small playground in poor condition. The vehicular circulation and parking are of particular concern because of the lack of stalls and the safety issues created during large events. The entry and exit sequence are unsafe, as the one-way drive lane curves around the east field and exits behind an adjacent off-site building. The Drake Field sign was down during our visit and needs to be replaced to be consistent with an overall signage update proposed throughout the parks and recreation system. There is also minimal vegetation along the street, and an overall lack of tree canopy throughout the site.

Figure 43: Drake Field | Existing Conditions
**DRAKE FIELD**

**FEASIBILITY STUDY**

1. New court play space
2. New small playground; 3-5 play elements (varied ages)
3. Flexible lawn
4. Relocated concessions & bathrooms with new outdoor gathering space
5. Mounded and swaled topography
6. Oak savanna restoration with mown trails
7. Future expanded court play
8. Improved parking lot

**PARKING**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>EXISTING</th>
<th>PROPOSED</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>STALLS</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>36</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ADA</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**NARRATIVE**

The feasibility study at Drake Field assumes that the football component would be relocated where additional parking and access is available. The main goal with the study is to provide an opportunity for play court facilities (1) and to improve pedestrian and vehicular circulation and safety. The parking lot is now two-way, with simplified entry and exit sequences (8). A pedestrian path system adjoins the parking lot and connects the neighborhood, while also linking the major site elements with an accessible route. Much of the lawn is converted to native oak savanna with mown trails (6), while enough lawn exists for flexible events and future expansion of the courts (3&7). Berms and swales are created in the terrain to provide visual interest, stormwater capture, and as an additional amenity for exploration (5). The concession building is relocated closer to the activity, with added bathrooms for easier access (4).

* Football component at Drake Field would be relocated where additional parking and access is available.
ELGIN SHORES

LOCATION
601 S. State St, Elgin, IL 60123

PARK INTRODUCTION
Located on the Fox River and accessible from S. State St, Elgin Shores is a 21-acre park tucked in along the river's west bank. Owned by the Kane County Forest Preserve, but managed by Elgin Parks and Recreation, it includes a ballpark complex, restroom and concession facilities, boat and kayak launch, parking, and playground.

EXISTING CONDITIONS AND ANALYSIS

A. Overgrown vegetation obscures entrance
B. Outdated entry signage
C. Overall lack of maintenance
D. No water fountains
E. One shade structure | Minimal shade throughout site
F. Batting cages no longer function
G. Field layout and circulation not well-defined
H. Kayak launch is warped
I. Underutilized shoreline
J. Pavement in need of repair or resurfacing
K. Nice planting in parking islands but is overgrown and spilling into roadway
L. Spectator seating could be better maintained and more established

NARRATIVE
Elgin Shores is a unique park because of its discreetness and proximity to the Fox River. New visitors did however have a hard time locating the park off S State St. because of a lack of prominent entry signage and entry features. The native plantings in the parking lot islands are a welcome aspect, however many of the edges are overgrown into to the drive lanes, creating an uncomfortable feeling when circulating. Certain park elements are no longer being used, and a general confusing circulation system made wayfinding difficult. The team noticed an opportunity along the Fox River to restore native vegetation, provide better views to the river, and add additional trails for more recreational opportunities.
**NARRATIVE**

The feasibility study at Elgin Shores looks to rearrange the play fields to create a central plaza and dropoff area. This provides a central hub of activity, with an improved playground (5), flexible lawn space (5), and upgraded concessions (6). Several small shade structures are placed for gatherings, or simply to drop gear off as visitors arrive. An axial promenade (4) and overlook (8) is suggested to provide visitors a chance to connect and access the waterfront before, during, and after games. Parking and circulation are improved for safety and wayfinding (2&3). The team also recommends clearing and restoring the vegetation along the river to open views of the water and allow for an informal trail loop. With community endorsement, space for a small skate park is possible as well (12).
FESTIVAL PARK

LOCATION
132 S Grove Ave, Elgin IL 60120

PARK INTRODUCTION
Located in downtown Elgin, Festival Park is a linear park running along the Fox River. Joining the trail system along the riverside, the park features a large playground and works as a green entertainment venue.

EXISTING CONDITIONS AND ANALYSIS

- A: In need of park marker signage from trail connection
- B: Major signage at intersection
- C: No changing rooms
- D: Painted play-spheres flaking
- E: Additional bike racks needed
- F: Playground surfacing lifting
- G: Bilingual signage invites multicultural play
- H: Large event lawn
- I: Connection to waterfront an amenity
- J: Trees lack appropriate soil depth and are beginning to girdle
- K: Single curb cut for venue loading & unloading
- L: Park lacks distinct presence along the street frontage

NARRATIVE
Festival Park is one of the more established parks the team visited. It has well defined circulation, varied public amenities for active and passive recreation, and is situated along the waterfront, providing moments to enjoy views of the Fox River while at the park. It is broken up into three zones by the circulation, with perimeter sidewalks enclosing the park on all sides. Water and play are in the north zone near the main entrance, while the southern zones provide flexible lawn space for informal recreation, relaxation, and larger events. The park needs light maintenance and upkeep, along with additional site furnishings and bike parking/facilities. The lawns could also benefit from an open plaza space with seating and lighting to allow for additional gathering opportunities.
NARRATIVE

The upgrades to Festival Park center around the two open lawn spaces. A permanent gathering space was studied along S Grove Ave with shade trees, ornamental lighting, and art/signage (2). A central plaza walkway provides an improved central axis which would allow for better separation of the lawn for smaller events (12), as well as opportunities for vendors and food trucks during larger events. The walkway extends out over the Fox River, providing an additional overlook and establishing an axis of activity through the center of the park (10). A permanent stage would allow the city to provide upgraded facilities for larger, more varied events (5). Additionally, the large spheres in the splash pad should be removed to allow room for a 60-person seasonal ice rink (6).
LORDS PARK

LOCATION
325 Hiawatha Dr, Elgin, IL 60120

PARK INTRODUCTION
Lords Park was established in 1893 by the Lord family and later donated to be used as a city park. It is one of Elgin's most historic and unique parks. At 108-acres, it has several destination features such as the Lords Park Zoo, Elgin Public Museum, a historic pavilion, as well as the Lords Park Aquatic Center. It has picturesque rolling terrain with open lawn and old growth canopy trees.

EXISTING CONDITIONS AND ANALYSIS

A Wayfinding signage is limited throughout the park
B Asphalt pavement in need of repair/replacement
C Accessible parking needs to be better connected to most amenities
D Lack of site furnishing standards, some damaged and not accessible
E Insufficient bike racks
F Need accessible routes to amenities
G Mature trees create picturesque parkland
H Damaged or dying trees to be evaluated for removal
I Sparse planting around amenities
J Basketball court striping fading
K Accessible playground with accessible elements
L Habitat for animals should be improved
M Stagnant water with algae
N Pond walkway failing in some locations
O Entrance to pool is hidden and unwelcoming

Figure 49: Lords Park | Existing Conditions

NARRATIVE
Lords Park is a stunning community park similar to Wing Park with open lawns and beautiful old grown trees. There is slightly more cultural and historic significance because of the zoo, the ponds, and the museum which make it a truly unique park experience. The team noticed similar constraints with circulation, including a lack of off-street pedestrian trails and adequate ADA access to most amenities. The playground is ADA accessible which was welcomed to see. The team noticed areas in need of repair/replacement, including asphalt paving and sidewalks along the ponds. Vegetation management is another concern, as several old oaks are showing signs of stress, and the two ponds have small algae blooms in a few locations.
LORDS PARK

FEASIBILITY STUDY – OVERALL

1. Pool Area - See Enlargements
2. Extend PACE bus route into park with stop at pool
3. Stormwater wetland with paved trail & interpretive boardwalk
4. Road connection - consider movable barriers
5. Develop an immersive zoo experience with elevated boardwalks
6. Dredge pond and naturalize pond edges
7. Park gateway sign
8. New loop trail network

NARRATIVE

The feasibility study at Lords Park looks at holistic improvements centered on mobility throughout the park while enhancing existing park features and amenities. Upgrades include an immersive zoo experience with elevated boardwalks and continuous open space for animals (5), naturalizing the edge conditions of the ponds as well as dredging the bottom to remove sediment and restore the aquatic ecosystem (6), and leveraging the lowland northeast lawn area to incorporate a stormwater wetland with interpretive boardwalk experience (3). There are also several locations where paved trail connections to and from the park are recommended, as well as a potential alteration to the PACE bus route to loop into the park and provide access to the pool area. Finally, the study looked at two different scenarios around the pool area which are featured on the following pages.
LORDS PARK ENLARGEMENT A

FEASIBILITY STUDY

1. Proposed new splash pad (10-15 features, 3,600 sf)
2. Shade structure
3. Improved parking lot configuration, option 1
4. Meadow planting
5. Park gateway sign
6. Feature sign
7. Wayfinding kiosk
8. Dropoff
9. New pool entry
10. Path connection to the neighborhood
11. Connect museum to splash pad
12. New court play space
13. Immersive zoo experience

PARKING

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>SPACES</th>
<th>ADA</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>EXISTING 27*</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PROPOSED 40*</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Dedicated stalls

NARRATIVE

Enlargement A studied removing the pool and replacing it with a new 3,600 square feet splash pad or similar outdoor aquatic facility (1), while improving the parking and vehicular/pedestrian circulation around the pool area. Enlargement A keeps the existing western road edge adjacent to the pool, while creating a two-way parking lot in the existing pavement footprint (3). A new vehicular dropoff was studied for easier access and to provide a more prominent entry point (8). The study also looked at better connecting the museum with the pool area utilizing a paved sidewalk along the parking as the linkage (11). Improved signage at main park entries and at the pool would help enhance the wayfinding experience (5, 6, & 7).
The second feasibility study around the Lords Park pool area looks at keeping the existing pool (1) while increasing and improving the adjacent parking lot and access road. The team recommends this study over replacing the pool with a splash pad or other outdoor aquatic facility after careful analysis of the Level of Service standards related to outdoor pools and the city’s current needs related to population figures. This study also separates the roadway from the parking but realigns the road into the park to provide a larger two-way parking area and improved 4-way intersection at the west end (5 & 7). Improved signage, a new dropoff at the pool, and a connection to the museum are all part of enlargement B as well.
**MULBERRY GROVE PARK**

**LOCATION**
1769 Newbridge Cir, Elgin, IL 60123

**PARK INTRODUCTION**
A 5-acre neighborhood park, Mulberry Grove Park has a large open lawn with a winding path, several small shelters, a playground, tennis & basketball courts, and a small skateboard track.

**EXISTING CONDITIONS AND ANALYSIS**

- **A** No dedicated ADA parking
- **B** One ADA entrance
- **C** Minimal site furnishings: Trash bins, bike racks, dog waste, water fountain, benches
- **D** Playground needs to be redone
- **E** Opportunity for overlook
- **F** Tennis courts need resurfacing
- **G** Striping needed on half courts
- **H** Underutilized skate track

**NARRATIVE**
Mulberry Grove Park is a nice, quiet neighborhood park surrounded by single-family homes. It has an out-and-back paved trail, large open lawn, and site amenities compressed to the east. Throughout the park, the team noticed there were no benches or site furnishings near any of the recreational areas or along the path. Several of the amenities need attention as well; the playground is in poor condition, the tennis courts need resurfacing, the basketball courts need striping, and the skate track appeared underutilized. ADA access from the neighborhood to the park is also lacking and could be expanded.
MULBERRY GROVE PARK

FEASIBILITY STUDY

1. New court play space
2. Re-surfaced tennis courts & add futsal/pickleball striping
3. Re-painted basketball courts
4. Enhanced skate plaza
5. New playground equipment & surfacing
6. Loop trail connection
7. Flexible lawn space
8. Oak savanna restoration with mown trail
9. Perimeter buffer planting
10. New 10’ X 10’ shelter
11. Overlook

NARRATIVE

The improvements at Mulberry Grove Park focus on updating all existing amenities and play areas, while expanding the offerings for court games and adding multi-sport striping to the tennis courts for more flexibility (1, 2, 3, 4, & 5). Much of the open lawn is converted to an oak savanna condition to reduce maintenance costs and provide additional benefits to stormwater capture and pollinator habitats, while still allowing sufficient space for soccer games or other small events (7 & 8). The team proposes connecting the paved and accessible trail to make it a loop around the park, as well as creating several informal mown trails through the prairie for opportunities to connect with nature (6 & 8).

Figure 54: Mulberry Grove Park | Feasibility Study
3.0 Site Analysis and Recommendations

SPORTS COMPLEX

LOCATION
709 Sports Way, Elgin, IL 60123

PARK INTRODUCTION
Elgin Sports Complex is a 107-acre sports-focused park. The entrance is located three blocks south of the McLean Blvd exit off of US HWY 20. It features softball, baseball, and soccer fields, volleyball courts, a playground, and a BMX track. The park is used for tournaments as well as sport leagues and large events.

EXISTING CONDITIONS AND ANALYSIS
A. Lack of consistent wayfinding
B. Asphalt pavement in need of repair/replacement
C. Faded parking/roadway striping
D. Lacks accessible route
E. Insufficient bike racks
F. Car centric circulation
G. Lack of site furnishing standards, some damaged and not accessible
H. Erosion seen throughout pump track
I. Minimal trees | Large uninterrupted pavement
J. Sports fields in very good shape

NARRATIVE
Overall, the Elgin Sports Complex is in fantastic shape. The fields are holding up very well and the facilities are all still in very good condition. The most notable observations were the lack of consistent wayfinding, adequate ADA standards for access and circulation, and the condition of the asphalt pavement in many of the parking lots and drive lanes. The team also observed a need for a more complete inter-connected pedestrian circulation system. A few paths exist, primarily the main paved path from S McLean Blvd, but there’s a lack of a consistent secondary path system that connects the rest of the programming to the overall circulation, and consistent safety standards with regards to road crossings and vehicular/pedestrian interfaces. There was also a lack of trees in the parking lots causing an urban heat island effect.
3.0 Site Analysis and Recommendations

SPORTS COMPLEX

FEASIBILITY STUDY

1. Painted pedestrian crossing
2. Perimeter sidewalk
3. Curbed island with trees
4. Vehicular dropoff
5. Improved pedestrian entry

PARKING

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Stalls</th>
<th>ADA</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>EXISTING</td>
<td>335*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PROPOSED</td>
<td>310</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*South of Sports Way

NARRATIVE

With an additional Sports Complex Master Plan happening in conjunction with this report, the team focused its study area to the main baseball field parking lot, which can also be applied to the rest of the other parking areas. The team suggests breaking up large uninterrupted asphalt with planted parking lot islands (3) to help slow down traffic, increase visual interest, and provide shade to counteract the heat island effect in warmer months. Additionally, a painted pedestrian path (1) is applied through the center spine, as well as a perimeter sidewalk (2) for safer pedestrian movement, especially on busy game days. Currently, visitors must walk in-between cars and diagonally across drive lanes to get to the entry plaza. Finally, asphalt roads/parking need resurfacing, and an ADA access plan should be developed to ensure adequate access and safety requirements are being met throughout the park.

Figure 56: Sports Complex | Feasibility Study
SUMMERHILL PARK

LOCATION
1375 Concord Dr, Elgin, IL 60120

PARK INTRODUCTION
Summerhill park is a 4.5-acre neighborhood park in the Parkwood Farms neighborhood. It has a playground, small shelter, large open lawn, and dedicated street parking.

EXISTING CONDITIONS AND ANALYSIS

A. Major roadway visible from park
B. No ADA ramp from on street parking
C. Playground equipment needs replacement
D. Worn out playground surfacing
E. No accessible play equipment
F. Large underutilized lawn
G. Dedicated street parking
H. Large drainage channel cutting through the bottom of the park
I. Evergreen trees create safety issues

NARRATIVE
Summerhill Park is a neighborhood park with a large open lawn and a playground with a suboptimal location near the road. The site is unique because of a large hill and drainage structure that occupies a quarter of the site. The noise from Hwy 20 is very noticeable as there is a lack of shrub screening and trees to provide a buffer around the park. There is dedicated on-street parking which is unique for this type of park, but no ADA ramp or striping which is not code compliant.
**SUMMERHILL PARK**

**FEASIBILITY STUDY**

1. New playground  
2. Re-configured entry plaza  
3. Shade structure & plaza  
4. Flexible lawn space  
5. Restored savanna & perimeter buffer  
6. Paved perimeter loop trail  
7. Preserve existing trees

---

**NARRATIVE**

The suggested improvements at Summerhill Park focus on developing more of an activity hub adjacent to Concord Dr. A new playground (1), plaza (3), and shelter (3) are suggested to allow for additional community gatherings and events. An entry plaza connects these amenities to the street and creates a sense of arrival (2). The lawn area is reduced and restored with native oak savanna to limit maintenance costs and add a visual/sound buffer from the highway (6). The lawn space still accommodates a variety of soccer games (4), and a paved loop trail wraps the perimeter of the lawn to give visitors an opportunity to walk the whole park and return (6). Existing trees around the existing playground are preserved where possible (7).

---

*Figure 58: Summerhill Park | Feasibility Study*
WALTON ISLAND

LOCATION
1 Walton Island, Elgin, IL 60120

PARK INTRODUCTION
Walton Island is a unique, 4.5-acre Elgin park located on the Fox River. It was created through the WPA program in the 1930s and dedicated to the city by Izaak Walton League. There are winding paths, fishing and water access, a gazebo, and many unique seating opportunities for enjoying the Fox River and its inspiring scenery.

EXISTING CONDITIONS AND ANALYSIS

- A. No entry signage
- B. Damaged trash bins
- C. Damaged trees
- D. Concrete failing along designed basin
- E. Revetment in need of selective repair
- F. North island appears better maintained
- G. South island appears less maintained, more overgrown
- H. Sculpture in need of new paint

NARRATIVE
Walton Island is a unique park in the Elgin Parks system as it sits on two islands on the Fox River. However, it appears over-designed and over-programmed for the harsh environment it is located in. Each island is distinct; the north island is simple and well maintained, while the south island is slightly more dynamic, programmed, and less maintained. Both islands need repair to the reinforced shoreline revetment and removal of dead or damaged trees. The south island feels a little unsettling in areas due to the overgrown vegetation, and some site features are failing or unused. The bridges that connect the island to the Fox River Trail also lack significant park signage to help visitors understand they’ve arrived at the park. The adjoining entry spaces also feel uncelebrated and could benefit from seating or a change in materials to highlight the entry point.
WALTON ISLAND

FEASIBILITY STUDY

1. Selective revetment replacement & naturalized edge condition
2. Park gateway sign
3. Remove water access
4. Simplified water access
5. Simplify existing site seating and rain garden, replace with native planting

NARRATIVE

The Feasibility Study at Walton Island focuses on reducing the amount of site features and programming to allow for easier maintenance and less vulnerable infrastructure (5), along with a safer, more naturalized island experience. Park gateway signs create a better sense of arrival (2), while additional lawn space and native plantings help alleviate maintenance. With programming being removed or simplified, water access points should be considered for removal to help limit the areas of activity at the water/island interface and concentrate gathering into 1-2 main areas of each island (3 & 4). Revetment replacement/repair is also needed in select locations on each island to fortify the shoreline (1).

Figure 60: Walton Island | Feasibility Study
WING PARK

LOCATION
1010 Wing St, Elgin, IL 60123

PARK INTRODUCTION
At 121-acres, Wing Park and its accompanying golf course is one of the largest public parks maintained by the City of Elgin. The park opened in 1903, providing residents with a variety of programming and sweeping open space. It features shelters, a public pool, playground, tennis courts, a historic bandshell, volleyball, and a small baseball complex.

EXISTING CONDITIONS AND ANALYSIS

- Inconsistent signage types across park
- Entry signage faded and hard to see
- Asphalt pavement in need of repair
- Accessible parking needs connection to most amenities
- Tennis courts used for pickleball
- Signage on tennis courts outdated
- Bocce ball and horseshoes appear worn out
- Lack of site furnishing standards, some damaged and not accessible
- Insufficient bike parking
- Need a pedestrian loop path throughout the park
- Accessible route missing near some amenities
- Bandshell an incredible asset | seating in need of replacement
- Mature trees create picturesque parkland
- Large number of invasive species near pool
- Bridge boards need to be replaced
- Lack of multi-modal access
- Pedestrian path hard to find if accessing the park from the east
- Some playground equipment in need of replacement

NARRATIVE
Wing Park is a stunning community park with open lawns and beautiful old grown trees. The biggest need arises from circulation and wayfinding. The main entrance was easy to miss from the road, and once parked, it was difficult to find a paved pedestrian path to navigate through the park. There are a series of paved paths that pass north/south through the park, but to get to most amenities, users need to cross the lawns, walk in the roads, or occasionally find a desire path/gravel path to lead them to a site feature. Many of these pedestrian path conflicts or discontinuity are also concerns regarding ADA standards. The team heard from a group of people at the park that there’s a need for dedicated pickleball courts, or at the very least, pickleball striping at most tennis courts.
WING PARK

FEASIBILITY STUDY

1. Park gateway sign
2. Feature sign
3. Wayfinding kiosk
4. Loop trail connection
5. Additional pedestrian path connection to Wing St

6. Upgrade bandshell facilities (bathrooms, A/V, wifi, etc.)
7. New bandshell theater seating
8. Pool expansion study
9. Recommended trail connection

NARRATIVE

The feasibility study at Wing Park includes an improved, more prominent entry sign (1), updated wayfinding signage throughout the park (3), as well as additional paved trails to connect, and loop, the existing trail system to the adjacent neighborhood (4 & 5). Controlling invasive species is another concern, especially along Tyler Creek and near the Wing Park Pool as there is a very large patch of phragmites in front of the pool. The bandshell is an incredible amenity, and the surrounding vegetation and open space make for a one-of-a-kind experience, however, a new electrical system, A/V equipment, along with updated restrooms and permanent seating would allow for more varied event types into the future (6 & 7).
APPENDIX A | PUBLIC INPUT MEETING 1 SUMMARY

A document with the public input meeting 1 summary presentation.
Which park district do participants live in?

Total Park Area: 1705 Acre

Which park district do participants use the most?

Total Park Area: 1705 Acre

Total Participants: 85 (In-person)
365 (Online)
MOST USED PARKS - NORTH CENTRAL DISTRICT

KEYMAP

TOTAL PARK AREA:

253 Acre

MOST USED PARKS - SOUTHEAST DISTRICT

KEYMAP

TOTAL PARK AREA:

315 Acre
## SOUTH CENTRAL DISTRICT

![Map of South Central District]

### PARKS SYSTEM SERVICES

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Facilities</th>
<th>Total facilities / Total parks</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Basketball</td>
<td>8/76</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Basketball (1/2)</td>
<td>32/76</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fields - Baseball</td>
<td>23/76</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fields - Softball</td>
<td>10/76</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fields - Football</td>
<td>2/76</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fields - Practice</td>
<td>48.8 Acre</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fields - Small practice</td>
<td>5.4 Acre</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fields - Soccer</td>
<td>12/76</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sand Volleyball</td>
<td>6/76</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Golf Course</td>
<td>3/76</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tennis Court</td>
<td>10/76</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Playground</td>
<td>43/76</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dog Park</td>
<td>1/76</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Swimming</td>
<td>2/76</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Skate Park</td>
<td>3/76</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BMX Track</td>
<td>1/76</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Boat Launch</td>
<td>3/76</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fishing Area</td>
<td>8/76</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Additional Facilities

- Pavilion: 1/76
- Shelter: 35/76
- Bandshell: 1/76
- Washroom: 9/76
- Spray Fountain: 2/76
- Hard Path: 6.3 mile
- Zoo: 1/76
- Museum: 2/76
- Nature Center: 1/76
- Nature Preserve: 3/76
- Nature Multi-Use Trail: 5.2 mile

---

**APPENDIX A**

**SMITHGROUP**
WHAT DO YOU LIKE ABOUT THESE PARKS?

WHAT COULD THESE PARKS DO BETTER?
PUBLIC INPUT MEETING 1 – PLANNING THEMES

PASSIVE RECREATION
Recreación pasiva
Informal recreational experiences that require minimal facility development such as walking, hiking, running trails, picnic areas, and nature experiences.

ACTIVE RECREATION
Recreación activa
Highly developed recreational experiences such as baseball, basketball, playgrounds, or aquatic facilities.

GATHERING SPACE
Espacio de reunión
Provides gathering areas for residents and helps to enhance the beauty and culture of neighborhoods.

SOCIAL EXPERIENCES
Experiencias sociales
Increase social events and venues that support daily life and special moments.

COMMUNITY SPIRIT
Espíritu comunitario
Nurturing the bond and experiences that make a community stronger and more connected.

CONNECTION
Conexión
Reflect and strengthen the identity of Elgin, the adjacent neighborhoods and parks, to create meaningful community connections.

PUBLIC INPUT MEETING 1 – ACTIVE RECREATION

ACTIVE RECREATION
Recreación activa
Highly developed recreational experiences such as baseball, basketball, playgrounds, or aquatic facilities.

197 VOTES
Votaciones
Aquatic facilities
Facilities and aquatic activities such as swimming and boating.

346 VOTES
Votaciones
Playground
Structures, equipment, and unsafe features opportunities.

145 VOTES
Votaciones
Exercise
Playground fitness equipment and safe trails.

135 VOTES
Votaciones
Sports courts/fields
Versatile facilities for multiple activities such as soccer, basketball, tennis, or other sports.

35 VOTES
Votaciones
Tournament fields & facilities
Tournament facilities for soccer, cricket, baseball, and lacrosse.

SMITHGROUP
ELGIN PARKS AND RECREATION
PUBLIC INPUT MEETING 1 – SOCIAL EXPERIENCES

SOCIAL EXPERIENCES

EXPERIENCIAS COMUNITARIAS

Increase social events and venues that support daily life and special moments.

AUSSEREN die Veranstaltungsstätte und rechtzeitige Aktivitäten und spezielle Momente.

241 VOTES

SPECIAL EVENTS OR FESTIVALS

Organize gatherings to engage the whole community such as events with food vendors, artists, or vendors.

FESTIVAL EN EL CAMPO

80 VOTES

WEEKLY EVENTS

Furnish neighborhood events hosted by members or local community groups.

SOMETHING ELSE?

64 VOTES

DAY CAMPS & EVENTS

Special opportunities for groups like scout and family.

SOMETHING ELSE?

124 VOTES

EVENING & NIGHT PROGRAMS

Organize events like concerts and other programs with food, music, or entertainment.

SOMETHING ELSE?

APPENDIX A

PUBLIC INPUT MEETING 1 – PASSIVE RECREATION

PASSIVE RECREATION

RECREACIÓN PASIVA

Informal recreational experiences that require minimal facility development such as walking, hiking, running trails, picnicking areas, and nature experiences.

EXPERIENCIAS recreativas informales que requieren una intervención menor de infraestructura como caminatas, bicicletas, senderismo, áreas para pícnic y experiencias al aire libre.

225 VOTES

TRAILS

Trails and connections that support facility and outdoor activity and meaningful interaction.

225 VOTES

SOMETHING ELSE?

66 VOTES

CELEBRATE HISTORY

Features, museum, and other facilities linked to a specific history or heritage.

SOMETHING ELSE?

64 VOTES

LEARNING

Schools, community centers, or other facilities linked to learning or development.

SOMETHING ELSE?

167 VOTES

NATURE EXPERIENCES

Informal recreation and language experiences linked to nature.

SOMETHING ELSE?

APPENDIX A
PUBLIC INPUT MEETING 1 – GATHERING SPACE

GATHERING SPACE
ESPACIO DE REUNIÓN

Provides gathering areas for residents and helps to enhance the beauty and culture of neighborhoods.

Presta espacios de reunión para residentes y ayuda a mejorar la belleza y cultura de las comunidades.

PUBLIC INPUT MEETING 1 – COMMUNITY SPIRIT

COMMUNITY SPIRIT
ESPIRITU COMUNITARIO

Nurturing the bond and experiences that make a community stronger.

Fortalece el vínculo y experiencias que hacen que una comunidad sea más fuerte.

APPENDIX A

APPENDIX A

SMITHGROUP

SMITHGROUP
PUBLIC INPUT MEETING 1 – CONNECTION

Reflect and strengthen the identity of Elgin, the adjacent neighborhood, and parks, to create meaningful community connection.

PUBLIC INPUT MEETING 1 – DEMOGRAPHICS

What experiences would you like to try at Elgin Parks?

WHAT WE HEARD... SUMMARY

Total number of participants: 460

1. Am you currently a resident of Elgin, IL?

2. How do you typically travel to and from an Elgin Park?

3. When visiting Elgin Parks, what are your design priorities?

4. What are the most popular parks in Elgin?

5. How often do you visit an Elgin Park?

6. What do you do when you visit an Elgin Park?

7. Would you recommend an Elgin Park to a friend?

8. Something we missed?

9. Is there anything else you would like to share?

93%
APPENDIX B | PUBLIC INPUT MEETING 2 SUMMARY

A document with the public input meeting 2 summary presentation and images of feedback received.
PRESENTATION & OPEN HOUSE FORMAT

TOTAL PARTICIPANTS
73 (IN-PERSON ONLY)

GENERAL RECOMMENDATIONS
WHAT WE HEARD...

- All season activities (snowshoeing, cross country skiing, ice skating, etc.)
- Increase native restoration
- Additional multi-modal connections to parks
- More walking trails in the parks
- Dog parks
- Indoor multi-sport court space
- Disc golf
LORDS PARK
WHAT WE HEARD...

- No mow grass areas
- More parking near the museum
- Some support for a splash pad but keeping the pool was the majority response heard
- Ice rink
- Additional basketball/ soccer space
- Walking paths
- Disc golf
- Dredge the lagoons

LORDS PARK – ENLARGEMENTS
WHAT WE HEARD...

- Consider pickleball near tennis
- Need better parking around pool
- Can there be a splash pad and a pool?
- Nighttime programming
- Concerns about ticks more natural areas
LORDS PARK – ENLARGEMENTS
WHAT WE HEARD…

- Consider pickleball near tennis
- Need better parking around pool
- Can there be a splash pad and a pool?
- Nighttime programming
- Concerns about ticks more natural areas

ELGIN SHORES
WHAT WE HEARD…

- Convert fields to turf
- Safety a concern, need more lighting around parking lots
- Habitat restoration
- Water sport rentals/boathouse
- Pedestrian access to the park from S State St (Hwy 31)
- Liked the new playground & central plaza
WALTON ISLAND
WHAT WE HEARD...

- Sculpture needs repainting
- More native plants
- Engage the park from the west
- Keep water access
- Park gateway sign
- Better maintenance

FESTIVAL PARK
WHAT WE HEARD...

- Permanent staging
- More lighting
- Ice rink
- Liked central food truck plaza and center spine
- Pedestrian oriented streetscape
- In need of focal point from afar
SUMMERHILL PARK
WHAT WE HEARD...

- Would like to see community garden space
- Native restoration
- Preserve existing trees
- Perimeter loop trail
- Liked new playground, entry plaza with shelter
- Consider earthen berms for sound reduction
- Leash mandates for dogs

MULBERRY GROVE PARK
WHAT WE HEARD...

- Like pickleball courts but not here, noise level and need for bathrooms a concern
- Full court basketball
- Outdoor eating/gathering space
- Loop trail
- Native restoration
- Need to consider people of all abilities
SPORTS COMPLEX
WHAT WE HEARD...

- More programming: disc golf, ice rink, dog park, archery, airdome
- Pickleball
- Need pedestrian/bike connection over route 20
- Better public transportation service to the park

DRAKE FIELD PARK
WHAT WE HEARD...

- Don’t get rid of youth football
- Parking a major concern, need more, safer parking
- Like the pickleball courts but not here
- Yes to greenspace and new playground
ELGIN PARKS AND RECREATION

APPENDIX B

ELGIN PARKS AND RECREATION

Location
150 S Grove Ave, Elgin, IL 60123

Park Introduction
Located in downtown Elgin, Festival Park is a linear park running along the Fox River. Joining the Fox River Trail system along the levee, the park features a large playground, splashpad, meadow, and a large open space ideal for City functions and large events.

Key Map

Existing Conditions
- Need to park entrance sign and trail connection
- Major signage at intersection
- No shade structures
- Painted play spaces taking
- Additional site tasks needed
- Repaved and easy walking
- Bilingual signage at entrance and in playground
- Large event lawn
- Connection to adjacent parks
- Areas are attractions and events are becoming a given
- Single park trail with visual and logical signage
- Lots of programming and street events

Labels
- Pathway prominent with feature placement
- Central trail with planter with seating, gateway, and lighting
- Great park sign at center place
- Gateway sign
- Permanent stage
- Permanent signs
- Public art
- Public seating
- Public catwalk
- Sidewalk
- Splash pad
- Maintenance signs
- Entrance gate
- Portable stage
- Permanent stage
- Central park signage
- Painted play spaces
- Splash pad
- Playground
- Gateway
- Sidewalk
- Signage
- Lighting

Let's Do Permaculture
Dedicated Education & Learning
Permanent Staging
Temporary Dome
Ice Rink
Pool Center
Ice Rink
Ice Rink
I want my ice now!
APPENDIX B

ELGIN PARKS AND RECREATION

LOCATION
1 Walton Island, Elgin, 60120

PARK INTRODUCTION
Walton Island is another unique Elgin park, a small park on the Fox River. It was created through the appreciation of the River and dedicated to the City by Ivan Walton, bankers, fishing and water subjects gazebo, and the opportunities for enjoying the Fox River and its beauty.

EXISTING CONDITIONS
- No entry signage
- Damaged trash bins
- Damaged trees
- Concrete facing along Fox River issues
- Repaint in need of conscious repair
- North Island appears better maintained, more even green
- South Island appears less maintained, more overgrown
- Sculpture in need of new paint

REVISED PLAN
- Remove water access
- Add accessible pathways
- Improved maintenance

APPENDIX B

WALTON ISLAND

Place a GREEN dot on the text label or the recommendations plan drawing that you feel represents the condition or conditions you'd like to see in this park.

Please feel free to provide additional comments using a sticky note or writing directly on the board.

THAT SCULPTURE IS GONNA NEED A VISIT.
ELGIN PARKS AND RECREATION

LOCATION
301 Kendall Ave, Elgin, IL 60120

PARK INTRODUCTION
A 1-acre neighborhood park, Mulberry Grove Park, has a large open lawn with a walking path, several small shelters, a playground, tennis & basketball courts, and a small undeveloped track.

EXISTING CONDITIONS
1. No dedicated ADA parking
2. Too many benches
3. Missing sign to entrance. Trash bins, bike racks, GG waste, water fountains, benches
4. Playground needs to be resized
5. Inactivity for overflow
6. Tennis courts need resurfacing
7. Sprinkler needs on half courts
8. Undeveloped area track

LABELS
1. Existing pickleball courts
2. Resurfaced tennis courts & new backboards
3. New pickleball court
4. Tennis court
5. New playground equipment
6. Loop trail connection
7. Flexible tennis courts
8. Flat tennis surfaces with drainage
9. Pedestrian buffer pavers
10. New light or shade
11. Overhead

APPENDIX B
APPENDIX C | STAKEHOLDER FEEDBACK

A document with summary feedback from six focus group meetings held with stakeholders from various groups and organizations. Representatives included Operations, Safety, Youth Sports, Business Community, Officials and Community, and Leisure.
SWOT ANALYSIS

STRENGTHS
1. Amount of coverage, you don’t have to go far to find a park near your home
2. Golf, lots of communities don’t have courses
3. Splash pads, very popular
4. Ability to support sports teams and tournaments
5. Greater ability for rentals than other communities
6. Being on the river and the Fox River Trail, access and proximity to the trail
7. One outdoor pool, and one indoor (before COVID three pools, 2 out; 1 in)
8. The zoo (needs better communication to the westside) and its free and year-round.
9. The pavilion and bridge at Lords Park
10. Accessibility of shelters
11. Walton island
12. Festival park
13. Well-maintained and safe
14. Staff and team
15. The community is diverse

WEAKNESSES
1. Insufficient staff size, not enough for the number of parks
2. Understaffed compared to other communities
3. River, not used as well as it could/should be
4. Festival park could be used more efficiently, better programmed differently
   1. Permanent concert or other venue
5. Because they are understaffed, they can’t be as creative with open space as they would like
6. Big miss not to have a canoe/kayak rental
7. Under budget
8. Marketing
9. Signing/Wayfinding
10. A lot of the parks don’t have power, or if they do it doesn’t function as desired
11. Sports complex is the only facility with wifi (WiFi doesn’t work at the pools, but its there)
12. Creative planning when parks are planned/designed; using the parks staff team and others in to help guide the planning
13. Many of the parks come from developers gifting to parks.
SWOT ANALYSIS

OPPORTUNITIES

1. WiFi
2. Jack Cook undeveloped; this should be a regional park
3. Expansion of the sports complex
4. No bathrooms or maintenance facility at SC (move to weaknesses)
5. Room to grow on the west side
6. Park activities/programming throughout the year (drops off after camps)
7. Cross promotion throughout the parks (people aren’t aware of the amenities in other parks)
8. Pickleball complex/courts (needs bathrooms and parking)
   1. Is it a lot of people that play pickleball? (percent of population)
   2. Is it big in Elgin?
9. Could use more soccer fields; Could use artificial surfacing for soccer
10. Make Elgin stand out; make Elgin special

THREATS

1. The people that use Lords pool don’t speak up
2. Need to find a way to connect with communities and people we don’t hear from
3. As amenities are lost, might not be able to get them back
4. It is easier to stop something than it is to start it again
5. As other communities develop sports complexes the Elgin complex will be less used; biggest benefit is there are 10 fields next to each other
6. Trying to catch up with trends instead of being ahead of trends; right now they are reactive, not a leader
7. Make Elgin stand out instead of competing with other communities and trends
8. Maximize on the things they are already great at and make them better
9. River brings trash, floods, it requires constant upkeep that they don’t have staff for, the fluctuations impact landscaping or other existing features/amenities
10. There is still a stigma with coming downtown or being around the river
11. There was never really a development for engaging the river or riverwalk experience
12. Not maximizing the existing resources
13. Need better process for design to better understand use and maintenance
14. The public works team is at breaking point because of staffing and budget
SWOT ANALYSIS

STRENGTHS

1. Amount of opportunities for all age classes for recreation through the program offerings
2. Huge amount of outdoor space, 2K+ acres of outdoor property and green space
3. Parks are pretty well spread out and accessible
4. Individual special things like zoo and museums
5. Diversity of offerings, easy to do something different everyday/weekend
6. Extremely accommodating; will work users to meet their needs/desires
7. Strong relationship between parks dept and sport leagues/clubs
8. City provides a youth organizations/sporting groups/clubs financial assistance
9. All the facilities: golf courses, outdoor pools, community/rec center
10. Safety access is good
11. Lighting is good from a safety standpoint
12. Park night closures work well
SWOT ANALYSIS

WEAKNESSES
1. Over accommodating; somethings for some people don’t represent the interests of the community
2. Special interests get more attention than the community as a whole
3. Fads can block other opportunities
4. Staffing levels
5. (What are youth participation levels?) Parks in general are seeing a huge use uptick
6. Replacement of aged facilities; facilities aren’t replaced as soon as they should; replacement follows public outcry or safety concerns
7. Juggling special interests v. community needs
8. Too much clinging to older programs; need to evaluate efficacy and ROI of some existing programming
9. Everyone on staff is stretched thin
10. There is nothing that ties the parks together, no trail, bike access, bus route, etc.

OPPORTUNITIES
1. There is an extensive camera system in the city as new parks are developed providing camera systems is important
2. WiFi
3. Bluetooth pucks or other types of notification systems
4. Safety notification
5. Signage/Wayfinding
6. Summer camping is max’d out (swimming lessons fill up)
SWOT ANALYSIS

THREATS

1. Weather events
2. PA Systems/Notification systems in larger parks
3. Perception of crime and safety, in some parks
4. Public, overuse, overloving
5. Not staying relevant and current, not up to date
6. Parks is playing catch up but isn’t on the front side of the bell curve
7. Parks is reactive, in general (pre pandemic)
8. Programming is still below pre pandemic
9. Fitness memberships are threatened by the big box pricing competition
10. Is there enough staff for the programming and programming expansion
11. Hiring market is very difficult
SWOT ANALYSIS

STRENGTHS

1. There are a lot of parks, and they are close; you don’t have to go very far to get to a park.
2. Amenities
3. Very well kept/maintained (Lords, Wing, Meier)
4. Two really good golf courses, very popular. For the quality of the course; they are good bang for the buck
5. Prior to COVID some schools took field trips to Museums or Nature Center
6. The zoo is a great opportunity for the library to run programming
7. Some parks are better suited for young children
8. Swimming is a favorite field trip for BGC
9. Lord’s park was a Friday field trip for BGC
SWOT ANALYSIS

WEAKNESSES

1. Some parks don’t have appropriate-sized equipment for young children. Festival park doesn’t really have more than about 2 things for a little kid to do. (Little kid, is 5 and under).
2. For Central, awareness of opportunities within the parks, what do they have available. Improved marketing.
3. Wing park baseball fields is not maintained as well as other parks, not well lit at night and the bathrooms are not as nice as in other parks.
4. At Lords Park, more wayfinding signage is needed to better orient visitors/users (especially for families or new residents)
5. Unsure of winter-time activity options

OPPORTUNITIES

1. Court space for use with local academic teams (ex tennis teams)
2. Utilization of spaces for events like Cross Country
3. Elgin is experiencing great growth, particularly on the west side
4. As the community grows need to provide a variety of spaces that can have multiple season use and/or are flexible
5. Open space that can be used by the school districts
6. Look at collaborative field development and ensure parking is designed for bus access/drop off/parking
7. What educational opportunities are there for the youth that already exist
8. Ditto #7 for picnic tables and covered structures – is there sufficient space for students to lunch under cover
9. Sledding hill
10. More dog parks
11. Organized events in the summer and winter for kids
12. Exercise/fitness station tracks/loops
13. ADA based equipment in the playgrounds
14. Some opportunity at every park for children with special needs, not just at designated parks
15. Multi-use artificial turf fields - accessible fields regardless of season - high use
16. Destination parks, should have destination programming
17. Develop something to the west of town that might be a destination/regional park if the ROI made sense or resource availability
18. Balance opportunities with resources
19. At every park there should be something that spotlights every park – maybe QR code based
SWOT ANALYSIS

THREATS

1. Funding and limited resources
2. Will new residents on the west side travel to existing parks or will they want more neighborhood-based experiences.
3. The connectivity from park to park isn’t developed yet.
4. Some schools have agreements with some parks outside of Elgin bc of proximity
5. Most people in the west Elgin corridor are not joining the parks fitness facilities (hard to get them east of Randall).
SWOT ANALYSIS

STRENGTHS

1. The number of parks and the variety of services delivered in the park.
2. On a per capita perspective Elgin is ahead of other communities – this speaks to a high quality of life
3. Downtown parks are an attraction (Walton Island; Festival Park and FP splashpad).
4. Downtown parks for business uses (ex photos for weddings)
5. Photo ops extend to Lord’s Park and Walton Island as well as other parks (Prom)
6. Built in event spaces
7. Diverse offerings/amenities and lots of parks
8. Many of the amenities are unique to Elgin; the size and volume of parks are an attraction and unique compared to the neighboring communities
9. Golfing and golf courses, a very unique opportunity
10. The parks are safe
SWOT ANALYSIS

WEAKNESSES
1. Age of the playgrounds
2. Too many parks that lack accessibility (ADA)
3. Infrastructure needs at Festival Park; there are some specific needs that could make FP more competitive. Ex. fencing; On-going maintenance of the fountain and concerns when the fountain goes off (fountain seems to be better operated this year)
4. Marketing of the parks and all that is available (attributes of the parks); is the word getting out?
5. Getting the word out about the specific programs offered and highlight the ease of process for renting facilities or participating in park-based programs
6. Need more regional quality facilities, multi-use parks – these directly drive hotel use
7. It would be nice to have an entertainment district immediately adjacent to the sports complex.
8. Tournaments in the parks have a direct impact on hotel use
9. Festival park could drive the entertainment district
10. Bathrooms in the parks, comes up from time to time
11. Enable vendors to lease park space/venue for amenities/program offerings
12. Ice skating experience
13. Winter-time experiences (sledding, XX skiing, snowshoeing, etc) or designated areas
14. Are flexible lawn/practice fields still available, are there enough?
15. Ornamental gardens and/or more floristic display areas (Refresh the plantings more often).
16. Marketing/awareness

OPPORTUNITIES
1. The strategic plan (MP update) is a great opportunity
2. More residents live in housing products that don’t have outdoor space; provide more dog stations and or another dog park (adjacent to high-density apartment areas)
3. Fund raising and funding providers (private, grants, honoring in parks, donor programs)
4. Increase fitness opportunities within the community – build on the existing success of the park’s fitness programming
5. Smaller events spread out, throughout the community; the more events, the more community engagement
6. Let the residents know the park resources are available to them and there is a variety of park experiences in Elgin
7. Improved awareness across the community
8. Are older folks (active seniors) a niche that hasn’t been addressed in parks
9. Are there more opportunities, like the Halloween event that could be more family driven (scarecrow fest)
10. COVID changes lives and set the stage to try new events or other new things
11. Tech use in the parks (WiFi in the parks; geocaching; live-stream regional events) (what kind of electrical/charging opportunities exist in parks, lighting)
12. Showcase park programs and experiences with realtors
13. Reconnect across the community
14. 20th Anniversary Celebration is big opportunity
15. Are there new partnerships that could/should be formed? Are there enough partnerships/relationships?
16. Make partnering easier
SWOT ANALYSIS

THREATS
1. Not pivoting towards the trends (pickleball, watersports, fitness facility changes, remote working, etc.)
2. Inadequate funding
3. Insufficient staffing
4. Decline in involvement/participation in traditional sports – where are the spending their time, can we capture that experience?
5. Cost impediments for families to participate
6. Time restrictions for families to participate – are programs offered at the right time for the intended users?
7. Weather (flooding or other weather-based impacts) restricting use and potential revenue or other opportunities
8. Real grass at the SC can become unusable because of storm experiences
9. Ensuring parks have adequate infrastructure based on type of park and planned use
10. Technology is hard to keep up with
11. Public safety during an event or large gathering and emergency management/response plan
12. Ensure partners and event organizers that public safety has been thought through
SWOT ANALYSIS

STRENGTHS

1. The diversity that the large parks have, there are a number of different activities (tennis, swimming, basketball, etc); great playgrounds, picnic areas, and large flexible spaces – especially true of Lords Park
2. Diversity of experiences at a large park enable users to occupy the site longer
3. Smaller parks offer a little more safety to parents and to younger users and closer to home – allows users to easily access a park from home
4. Smaller parks are an outreach/decompression area for stressed teens
5. The amount of programming benefits families
6. Summer programming is a great asset
7. Programs and services provide 1st-job opportunities for many younger residents – promotes job responsibility and community engagement/civic responsibility
8. The parks are very clean and well maintained
9. The shelters are always being used and are in high demand
10. There is a little something for everyone in the parks (ex the golf courses offer experience scales)
11. Community partnerships are very strong and allow for p&r to reach more people in the community
12. We have a zoo, and it is well attended
13. Early childhood opportunities, there aren’t enough preschool slots and p&r backstops this need
14. Parks offers experiences for all-ages
15. Connectivity; inner city parks are easy to get to
16. Destination parks are easy to find if you are from the area
17. Economic impact parks have on the community (Sports Complex and the programming there)
18. Museum in Lords Park enhances the park and there are community friends groups (an organization) that support the parks
19. Neighborhoods have adopted and take care of the parks within their neighborhoods – it changes park pride for the neighborhood parks
20. Bike trails are heavily used
SWOT ANALYSIS

WEAKNESSES
1. Connectivity
2. Destination parks are harder to get to if you aren’t a local
3. Many may not know there is a zoo
4. Signage
5. Better marketing of the museum in Lords Park
6. Not much focus on the river – the river is a big part of (physically) of the city
7. Continental Park (Elgin Shores Forest Preserve) could improve boater access, access to the river – generally
8. Walton Island is underutilized, had some safety/care issues
9. Trout park for water access
10. The number park in district 4 is Lords park which isn’t in dist 4; going to a school playground is sometimes easier to go to

OPPORTUNITIES
1. Need to hold larger tournaments and more of them at the Sports Complex
2. Need for more flexible; multi-use fields
3. Increase community/friends group programming and experiences
4. access and engaging the river more (boating, fishing, etc)
5. Review what S Elgin has done by their dam as precedent for river access/engagement
6. More dog parks – agility equipment for dogs
7. Improvements to Festival park & Walton Island could enhance the commercial opportunities and partnerships
SWOT ANALYSIS

THREATS

1. South Elgin river access
2. Dog parks in other communities
3. Need a solid plan to improve parks and maintain parks
4. All-inclusive (fully-accessible) playground/park (destination type space)
SWOT ANALYSIS

STRENGTHS

1. Major sports complex and a large recreation center; larger fields (usually well-maintained) that can be used for a variety of events
2. The 10-fields is big bonus
3. Management at Wing Park and Elgin pools has been fantastic
4. Youth sports participation numbers remain high
SWOT ANALYSIS

WEAKNESSES
1. Facilities are a little outdated (synthetic tur fields and sufficient lighting)
2. Fields can be impacted by weather (rain)
3. BMX maintains their own facility (track and building); parks mows the lawn
4. A publicly accessible track maintained by volunteers wears on the volunteers
5. The BMX facility doesn’t have protection from illicit use and robberies/break-ins – security generally is a big concern – facility needs to be fenced off – problems with vandalism and misuse – need more park support
6. Some of the proposed maintenance hasn’t been completed for several decades there is a lot of catch up to bring facilities up to contemporary expectations
7. Maintenance recently has been very good at Sports Complex
8. Pool maintenance is expensive and membership/use fees don’t cover costs
9. Pools are starting to show their age
10. Day camp pool users aren’t able to use as much of the pool b/c they lack swimming skills

OPPORTUNITIES
1. Synthetic turf would improve versatility of the fields
2. ST increases the offerings within specific sports (softball/baseball) increasing the age classes that can use the same field
3. New concessions and washroom is needed at the Sports complex
4. How can P&R take advantage of extending the seasons at the existing pools
5. Is there an opportunity to look to a corporate or private sponsor for keeping the pools open later into Aug?
6. Is there a way to provide improved swimming training for day camp users? (Maybe through a sponsor/donor)
7. Turf fields are more desired for tournaments (at least for the infield) to ensure the games can be held
A document with a summary of notes and analysis from SmithGroups on-site tours of the nine focus parks including, Lords Park, Wing Park, Walton Island, Elgin Shores, Sports Complex, Festival Park, Mulberry Grove Park, and Summerhill Park.

*Note: Drake Field Park was not part of the project scope until after the teams site visits were completed.*
OVERALL, THE PROGRAMMING/FACILITIES ARE IN GOOD SHAPE, WITH THE EXCEPTION OF A FEW ISOLATED OPPORTUNITIES FOR IMPROVEMENT.

- MANY AMENITIES ARE NOT ACCESSIBLE. THERE WAS ONLY A FEW ADA COMPLIANT PLAYGROUNDS IN THE 8 PARKS WE VISITED.

- THE LARGE ESTATE PARKS DO NOT HAVE AMPLE ACCESSIBLE PATHS, VERY LOW AMOUNT OF ACCESSIBLE TABLES, AND EVEN LACK OF ACCESSIBLE BENCHES.

- LACK OF BIKE FACILITIES, I.E., BIKE RACKS, FIXIT STATIONS, SAFE ROUTES/PATHS

- THE SIGNAGE AND WAYFINDING AT MOST PARKS NEEDS IMPROVEMENT. THERE WERE EXCEPTIONS, BUT OVERALL THERE WERE SEVERAL TIMES WE ENDED UP AT PARKS THROUGH ENTRANCES THAT DID NOT HAVE A GATEWAY EXPERIENCE OR APPROPRIATE WAYFINDING THEREAFTER.

- PLANTING FINER TEXTURED PLANTS AROUND AMENITIES WOULD ALSO SERVE AS WAYFINDING AND BRING A HUMAN SCALE TO THE PARK AMENITIES.

- UPDATE FURNITURE ACROSS THE PARKS AND PERHAPS ESTABLISH A CONSISTENT FAMILY OF SITE FURNISHINGS.

- RECOMMEND HIRING A FORESTER TO ASSESS THE CONDITION OF OLD GROWTH TREE CANOPY COVER IN THE PARKS. WE NOTICED CONCERNING DROPOFF OCCURRING IN SEVERAL PARKS, INCLUDING WING AND LORDS PARK.

- MAINTENANCE IMPRESSIVE IN MANY PLACES, NEEDS ATTENTION/PLAN IN OTHERS

OVERALL PARK SYSTEM
POOL FACILITY IN GOOD CONDITION, NEED TO LOOK INTO POOL CODE FOR ADDITIONAL SLIDE OPPORTUNITIES. SPACE IN THE EAST LAWN FOR ANOTHER SLIDE BUT WOULD BE SEPARATE FROM THE MAIN POOL.

ACCESSIBLE PARKING BUT NO WHERE TO GO OTHER THAN STREET.

LARGE PICKLEBALL TURN OUT ON BOTH DAYS. A DEFINITE NEED TO FIND AN ADEQUATE HOME THAT WILL ENCOURAGE THE GROUP TO USE ON A REGULAR BASIS.

TENNIS SIGN NEEDS UPDATING TO ALLOW PICKLEBALL. WING PARK ENTRY SIGN MISSING SOUTH FACING SIDE.

FURNISHING NEEDS UPDATES

CAN YOU EASILY LOOP AROUND AS A PEDESTRIAN? CONSIDER A FEW ADDITIONAL PATHS TO ALLOW FOR A LOOPED PED EXPERIENCE.

MINIMAL BIKE PARKING

REALLY GOOD PARK FOR CARS BUT NOT FOR PEOPLE

- LACKS PEDESTRIAN PATHS
- LACKS MULTIMODAL ACCESS

WING PARK
WING PARK

ADA compliance an issue

Removal of old/failing equipment.

Large amount of invasive species near pool

Consistant signage/wayfinding needed

Could this be used for a pedestrian loop?

Consistant signage/wayfinding needed

Incredible asset, need new seating

Picturesque spaces

Picturesque spaces

Could consider pool expansion here

Paths not accessible

Removal of old/failing equipment.
ADA PARKING FAR AWAY FROM AMENITIES, BUT THEY DID HAVE ADA PICNIC TABLES.

OLD BIKE RAILS

BASKETBALL COURTS NEEDS STRIPING

ANIMALS WERE AS HAPPY AS THEY COULD BE.

HABITATS COULD USE A REFRESH

ONE OF THE FEW ACCESSIBLE PLAYGROUNDS AND SHELTERS

PLANT UP AROUND AMENITIES. SINGULAR HEDGES CAN LOOK UNINVITING AND UNKEPT

REBAR SHOWING CONCRETE LEANING INTO LAKE PROBABLY NEEDS REPLACING. COULD BRING PEOPLE CLOSER TO WATER THROUGH TERRACING THIS WAY.

STAGNANT WATER ALGAE BEGINING TO GROW ALONG BANKS
Lord's Park

- Algae beginning to form in stagnant water
- Pool has very hidden entrance, open up this fence
- One of the only accessible play systems
- Shelters seemed to be well used
- Succession planting needed
- Damaged planting
- Pavement and parking could use updating
- Museum an important asset - link programming
- Picturesque spaces
- Habitats could be expanded and better
Sports Complex

Car circulation works well, need for improved pedestrian circulation.

No bike racks even if you came in by bike.

10/10 restrooms centrally located in this area.

Potential space for pickleball.

Update picnic table.

Needs maint. to keep up with erosion.

Potential field.

Accessible, but where are you going without struggling?

Parking needs new striping and resurfacing.

All parking lots need trees or something. Again, really good for cars, but too much pavement.

Picnic table needs maint.

To keep up with erosion.

Guns shots can be heard from the shooting range across the street. Consider buffering.

Erosion.

Parking needs new striping and resurfacing.

Elgin Parks and Recreation
SPORTS COMPLEX

Baseball fields in excellent shape

Nice central plaza space

Impressive pump track with a few maintenance needs

Erosion along pump track a concern

Parking lots will need resurfacing soon

Need to look at arrive and ped circulation

Need for ADA accessible paths to fields

Another potential pickleball location

Centrally located bathroom/concession works well

Impressive field quality

Could accommodate pickleball?
Saw a person bike out of the woods, is there a path?

No signage. Overgrown and hidden entrance.

You can hear gunshots from this park as well.

Does not feel welcoming.

Restroom locked. No water fountain.

Parking lot very overgrown, needs maintenance.

No shade at all at the playground.

What is this turf area?

Could consider alternative field layout to create more of a central space.

Boat launch works but in need of clearing and pedestrian space.

Restroom locked. No water fountain.

GPS led us here.

You can hear gunshots from this park as well.

Does not feel welcoming.

Restroom locked. No water fountain.

Parking lot very overgrown, needs maintenance.

No shade at all at the playground.

What is this turf area?

Could consider alternative field layout to create more of a central space.

Boat launch works but in need of clearing and pedestrian space.

Restroom locked. No water fountain.

GPS led us here.

You can hear gunshots from this park as well.

Does not feel welcoming.

Restroom locked. No water fountain.

Parking lot very overgrown, needs maintenance.

No shade at all at the playground.

What is this turf area?

Could consider alternative field layout to create more of a central space.

Boat launch works but in need of clearing and pedestrian space.

Restroom locked. No water fountain.

GPS led us here.

You can hear gunshots from this park as well.

Does not feel welcoming.

Restroom locked. No water fountain.

Parking lot very overgrown, needs maintenance.

No shade at all at the playground.

What is this turf area?

Could consider alternative field layout to create more of a central space.

Boat launch works but in need of clearing and pedestrian space.

Restroom locked. No water fountain.
ELGIN SHORES

- Overgrown planting, consider mowing edges of pavement
- Pavement will need resurfacing: Weeds need maint.
- Shoreline could become a site asset
- Kayak launch becoming warped also possible asset
- Trees could be planted to shade seating areas
- Playground in adequate shape
- Lack of trees can deter families from enjoying playgrounds
- Unclear what the use is here
- Field layout feels disconnected, circulation not well defined
- Fan areas could be more established
- Pavement will need resurfacing. Weeds need maint.
- Overgrown planting, consider mowing edges of pavement
- Pavement will need resurfacing: Weeds need maint.
- Shoreline could become a site asset
- Kayak launch becoming warped also possible asset
- Trees could be planted to shade seating areas
- Playground in adequate shape
- Lack of trees can deter families from enjoying playgrounds
- Unclear what the use is here
- Field layout feels disconnected, circulation not well defined
- Fan areas could be more established
- Pavement will need resurfacing. Weeds need maint.
No Entry Signage. Could potentially invite new people to it.

Trash cans at this park really need to be replaced with something that is stronger.

Highly maintained.

Unintentional low water area for ducks very nice.

Conc falling into central part. Lowly maintained.

Replace trees and increase plant maint. It is only time until they lose the trees.

Unless you build up a lot it is going to flood. Maybe lean into it similar to the Netherlands floodable parks.
WALTON ISLAND PARK

- Shelter in excellent shape
- Duck habitat
- Trash bins all have damage along railings
- Overgrown southern island, lots of potential passive space
- Concrete sinking towards center
- Many people came to feed geese
- No visible park sign
- Sculpture could use maintenance
- Trees have trunk damage; succession trees needed
- Revetment needs replacement in some locations
- Revetment needs replacement in some locations
- Well maintained north island
- Need for succession trees

APPENDIX D
MULBERRY GROVE

- Needs maintenance.
- There is no seating in this park.
- Desperately needs new surfacing, cracking.
- No trash along trails, no bikeracks, no dog waste, no water.
- New striping needed at basketball courts.
- Skate track a nice asset, but could be livened up with trees, planting, seating, and additional skate elements.
- Single light?
- Potential ADA street parking?

Opportunity for small overlook or seating node at pond edge.
**MULBERRY GROVE**

- Lots of invasives along park boundary and shrub areas
- Shade structure but no seating
- Single ADA ramp
- If removed could parking be installed in this area
- Skate park a nice amenity but could be enhanced
- In need of new basketball striping
- Tennis surfacing needs replacement
- Large multiuse field
- Could be used as potential amenity instead
- Winding loop path is nice
- Winding loop path is nice
- A
- B
- C
- D
- E
- F
- G
- H
- I
- J
- K

*Elgin Parks and Recreation*
1. Paint flaking on spheres; consider painting perhaps Elgin Blue.
2. Surfacings lifting & becoming potential hazard.
3. Trees lack appropriate soil depth beginning to girdle.
4. Could utility hookups be screened or painted?
5. Connection to waterfront trail is a unique amenity.
6. Bathrooms in good condition but no changing rooms.
7. Lack of bike racks for space.
8. Consider an updated gateway entry for trail connection.
9. Bathrooms in good condition but no changing rooms.
10. Trees lack appropriate soil depth beginning to girdle.
11. Could utility hookups be screened or painted?
12. Connection to waterfront trail is a unique amenity.
13. Paint flaking on spheres; consider painting perhaps Elgin Blue.
15. Could use additional curb cut for increased access.
16. 10/10 concrete pad.
FESTIVAL PARK

Paint lifting from spheres

Beautiful shaded and planted green spaces

Bilingual signage that encourages children to play

Surfacing lifting

Incredible play equipment but again no accessible play

Large event lawn

Lack of soil depth could begin to harm the promenade trees

Updated signage/gateway from trail

Utility hookups

Major entry signage at intersection
SUMMERHILL PARK

- Off Street Parallel Parking Available No Connecting Ramp
- Has an Accessible Picnic Table Though
- In Need of New Playground Equipment
- Large Lawn Area with Potential for Other Amenities
- Very Well Maintained Drainage Area
- It is a Lot of Lawn to Maintain for a Hidden Area

Note: The park is a lot of lawn to maintain for a hidden area.
Opportunity to naturalize drainage or convert into usable space

In need of ADA parking and ramp

Large fields are potential amenity spaces

No accessible play

Noise from the major road spills in

Wooden play structures are in need of replacement

Continuous Entry Signage

Need to maintain surfacing
APPENDIX E | FACILITY CONDITION REPORT

A document containing on site inspections of key park facilities and structures at Lords Park, Drake Field, and Wing Park.
October 13, 2022

City of Elgin
Lords Park Aquatic Center
Drake Field
Wing Park Band Shell

RE: site field visit memorandum

1.0 lords park aquatic center
Address: 325 Hiawatha Dr, Elgin, IL 60123
Contact: Mike Adams
       (847) 264-0068
       adams_m@cityofelgin.org

A. General
The Lords Park Aquatic Center is located within Lords Park, a 108-acre regional park established in 1893, approx. 1.5 miles northwest of downtown Elgin, IL. The facility, constructed in 2000 and opened to the public in 2001, consists of a large swimming pool, check-in and locker facility, pump house, concessions/outdoor areas for eating, and sand volleyball courts. The pool closed to the public after the 2019 summer season and has sat vacant since.

B. Conditions summary
The pool and associated structures are in overall excellent condition, especially considering that the facility has not been in use for 3 years now. Very little upgrades are needed to reopen the facility. Per Mike, the pool equipment/systems were operating smoothly when the pool was open and were seemingly “over-built” for the facility. The biggest item requiring attention right now are the pool slides.

C. Structure 1: Entry/ Locker Building and Concessions

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Year Built:</th>
<th>2000</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Type of Structure and Defining Features:</td>
<td>1 story building w/ CMU walls, concrete slab on grade, gable roof. The exterior is defined by painted CMU, siding, and an asphalt shingle roof. There is large overhand of the gable roof at the entrance, supported by painted concrete columns.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Condition: The Entry/Locker building is in good condition. The concrete floors which have been coated in a non-slip surface are in generally good condition. There are cracks present, typically at threshold locations, likely a result of very few expansions or control joints throughout the floor. Painted CMU walls are in good condition, note there is some paint peeling in the shower locations. The wood plant ceiling is in good condition. On the exterior, the</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Painted wood fascia is peeling. The concrete at one of the column bases is cracked. The building could benefit from a light cleaning. The Concessions is also attached to the Entry/Locker building with concrete floors in generally good condition. There are cracks present, typically at threshold locations, likely a result of very few expansions or control joints throughout the floor. Painted CMU walls are in good condition. The ceiling is FRP panels. The counters are stainless steel and there are pass through windows with secured overhead door.</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Additions/Alterations:** None identified.

**Primary Use(s):** Entry/check-in for pool guests. Restroom and locker room facilities. Concessions for reheated food (no fryer) and outdoor seating area to eat.

**Building openings/Windows and Doors:** Windows are vinyl and appear to be in good condition. Skylights are present throughout the building and appear to be in good condition. No leaks were present.

Doors are painted hollow metal throughout the building. There is rusting at hinges. Rusting is also showing through the painted screens over the louvers at the lower portion of some doors – these tend to be the shower rooms and wetter areas of the building.

**Mechanical:** No heating or cooling exists for the building. There are louvers at exterior walls and in doors throughout the building provide ventilation. Exhaust fans are in the locker/shower rooms and can be seen from the exterior of the building on the roof.

**Electrical:** Light fixtures appear sufficient throughout the space but were off at the time of visit. Electrified exit signs were present throughout the building. A security system is present consisting of an AI phone at the entry and security cameras at the exterior of the building.

Condition: Electrical fixtures are in overall good condition.

**Plumbing:** Plumbing gets disconnected and drained on a yearly basis to prevent freezing pipes during winter months. Gas fired hot water heaters (1 for each of the locker rooms, 76-gal. each) and 1 electric water heater supplying the concession kitchen.

Condition: Fixtures and systems are in overall good condition. Water heaters for the locker rooms are likely original to the building, past their useful life, and would likely need replacement soon. Additionally, they are exhibiting rust at the top and bottom of the tank and have sat unused for 3 years. The water heater for the kitchen sits directly on the concrete floor which is usually not the recommended installation.

**Other:**

**Accessibility:** The building’s floor is at level with grade on the exterior and no ADA issues were immediately apparent in terms of floor surface.

According to Mike Adams, there was an ADA assessment performed recently and upgrades were made at that time to the restroom facilities.
The counter at the entrance does not provide a lower portion or option for wheelchair users.

The back doors do not have an ADA paddle but are held open when the facility is in use.

Immediately outside the Concessions portion of the building, the slope of the sidewalk/primary path from the Pool to the Concessions is noticeably steep.
D. Structure 2: Pump House

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Year Built:</th>
<th>2000</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Type of Structure and Defining Features:</td>
<td>The building matches the style and construction type of the entry/locker building. With concrete slab on grade, painted CMU walls, and a wood frame roof structure. The ceilings are gyp. board, mudded but unpainted. These ceilings were installed in 2019 along with heating for the facility and insulation. Condition: The building is in overall good condition. There is cracking at the unfinished concrete floor due to the lack of expansion and control joints in the floor. There was some water seeping into the walls at the base of the west wall, however minimal. There are no windows, only louvers which have been covered over on the inside with rigid insulation. The door to the acid room shows rusting and the handle corroding due to the fumes off the contents of the room.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Additions/Alterations:</td>
<td>None identified.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Primary Use(s):</td>
<td>Entry/check-in for pool guests. Restroom and locker room facilities. Concessions/kitchen for outdoor seating area.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mechanical/Electrical/Plumbing:</td>
<td>Pool equipment is in good condition during the last open season in 2019. No reported issues.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

E. Site

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Pool:</th>
<th>According to signage, the pool’s capacity is 943 persons. The pool was recently repainted and new heaters were installed in 2019, the last year the pool was open. Condition: The pool is in overall good condition. However, there is standing water at the base of the deep end of the pool. Some vertical wall surfaces within the pool have paint peeling where walls have been exposed to the most standing water.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

---
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The pool features several slides which are in poor condition. They have never been refinished since the pool’s opening and require stripping and refinishing in order to be safe for use.

Some linear drains that are to be flush with the concrete around the pool are displaced and a tripping hazard. These should be fixed into the ground. Some pool drain grates around the pool are missing.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Parking:</th>
<th>Parking is available for the facility.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Condition:</td>
<td>Asphalt surface is in generally good condition. Striping is worn down and could be improved, particularly for the ADA stalls. See notes in the Accessibility portion below.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Accessibility:</th>
<th>Accessible parking stalls are available. Signs are not permanent and set into place when the facility is open. The ADA symbol on the asphalt is worn down and should be repainted for visibility.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>The level of the parking lot surface to the adjacent sidewalk/path of entry to the facility is greater than ½”. Therefore, the path of entry/egress is non-compliant.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The concrete path from the pool area to the eating/concessions area appears to be greater than allowable max. slopes per ADA. This should be reviewed.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Navigable paths:</th>
<th>Asphalt and concrete surfaces are in generally good condition, with just a few cracks present. There is a particularly bad crack in the eating/concessions area.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>See accessibility notes for some non-compliance issues.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

| Landscaping:     | Landscaping is in good condition and appears to have been maintained even though the facility has been closed. |

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Misc. Site Features:</th>
<th>There is a fenced-in sand volleyball court on the premise.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Fencing around the pool and buildings is a coated metal chain link fence and appears to be in good condition. Some areas near the bottom of the fence require repair – repositioning the chain link back into place. There is one particularly open hole at the volleyball court.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Decorative fencing around the pool consists of wood posts and rope. There is one portion at the west side of the pool that requires repair/replacement of the rope.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
2.0 drake field
Address: 701 Hastings St, Elgin, IL 60120
Contact: Greg Hulke
(847) 812-6993
hulke_g@cityofelgin.org

A. General
This 7-acre park was established in 1967 and is home to the Elgin Youth Football program. It is immediately adjacent to Huff Elementary School. The complex consists of two football playing fields, a playground, a concession building, storage building, arts building, and a picnic shelter.

B. Conditions Summary
The park’s facilities and grounds are in overall fair to poor condition, exhibiting years of use and wear. We were unable to enter any of the structures at the time of survey, except for a portion of the storage facility.

C. Structure 1: Performing Arts Building

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Year Built:</th>
<th>Unknown, likely original to the park.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Type of Structure and Defining Features:</td>
<td>The structure consists of decorative brick masonry exterior walls on a concrete foundation. There is a wooden hip roof structure with asphalt shingles. Condition: The condition, as observed from the exterior, is overall fair to poor. Brick is in good condition but there is some cracking evident with various campaigns of re-pointing. There is also some cracking at the concrete at grade. The metal doors exhibit rusting. The wood frame windows are filled in with painted plywood. A portion of the roof overhang appears to be collapsing near the main entry door.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Additions/Alterations:</td>
<td>Painted wood vestibule at main entrance.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Primary Use(s):</td>
<td>The building was formerly used by a performing arts group but is not currently in use.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mechanical/Electrical/Plumbing:</td>
<td>There is an electrical feed present to the building. Mechanical and plumbing systems are unknown.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Accessibility:</td>
<td>There is no hard path leading to the building from the parking lot. The sidewalk at the main entrance does not extend past the building.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

D. Structure 2: Storage Facility

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Year Built:</th>
<th>Unknown</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Type of Structure and Defining Features:</td>
<td>The rectangular painted wooden structure sits atop a concrete foundation, likely slab on grade. There is a wooden hip roof structure with asphalt shingles.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### E. Structure 3: Scoreboard Tower

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Year Built:</th>
<th>Unknown, likely original to the park.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Type of Structure and Defining Features:</td>
<td>Painted concrete masonry unit tower with a fair footprint, approximately 2-stories in height.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Condition: The tower appears to be in overall fair condition. Some paint is peeling around the tower and some of the concrete block surface, spalled. The door exhibits rust. The wood windows at the top of the tower were not fixed in place and flapping open in the wind.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Additions/Alterations:</td>
<td>None identified.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Primary Use(s):</td>
<td>The building was formerly used by a performing arts group but is not currently in use.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mechanical/Electrical/Plumbing:</td>
<td>There is an electrical feed present to the building. Mechanical and plumbing systems are unknown and likely non-existent.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Accessibility:</td>
<td>The tower is not ADA accessible; stair are required to reach the upper portion.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### F. Structure 4: Concessions Building

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Year Built:</th>
<th>Unknown</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Type of Structure and Defining Features:</td>
<td>The building consists of painted brick and CMU exterior walls on a concrete foundation. There are asphalt shingles on the gable roof structure. A brick chimney extends out from the roof. Some window openings have been blocked in with masonry units, others have painted metal grates at the exterior of the windows. The building’s interior was inaccessible at the time of surveying.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Condition: The building’s exterior is in overall good condition, although there were some cracks in the brick on the eastern side which appear to have been recently repaired with mortar. Vinyl at the underside of the eave is falling</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Condition: The structure appears to be in fair condition on the exterior. However, in the storage portion that was accessed, significant roof leaks are present throughout, damaging the ceiling boards which are falling down and display significant staining.

Additions/Alterations: None identified.

Primary Use(s): The eastern half of the building is reserved for the youth football league’s storage and was inaccessible during the survey. The central portion of the building is Elgin park’s storage. The western-most portion of the building was inaccessible during the survey.

Mechanical/Electrical/Plumbing: There is an electrical feed present to the building. Mechanical and plumbing systems are unknown as bathrooms were not accessible at the time of survey.

Accessibility: There is no hard path leading to the building from the parking lot. The bathrooms do not comply with ADA requirements.
## G. Structure 5: Picnic Shelter

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Year Built:</th>
<th>Unknown</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Type of Structure and Defining Features:</td>
<td>The wooden gable roof structure is supported by painted steel posts on a concrete slab on grade. Condition: The structure is in overall good condition. There is some graffiti on the posts. The concrete floor surface is level and in good condition, with one large crack near the middle. The picnic tables are in poor conditions but are reportedly getting replaced soon.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Additions/Alterations:</td>
<td>None identified.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Primary Use(s):</td>
<td>Picnic pavilion.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mechanical/Electrical/Plumbing:</td>
<td>N/A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Accessibility:</td>
<td>The pavilion is accessible, however, the sidewalks and path leading to the structure were under construction.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

## H. Site

| Parking: | Parking is very minimum on the site. The asphalt areas assigned for parking are in poor condition. There are no ADA stalls. Striping is faded. There is a clear need for more parking on this site. Youth football games draw large crowds and the excessive traffic and cars parked on the residential streets adjacent to the field is a point of contention for the residents in the neighborhood. |
### Accessibility:

Most of the site would not be considered accessible as hard surfaces/paths do not exist to most structures and areas of bleacher seating.

The asphalt path in the area around the concessions building is in poor condition, with excessive cracking and portions that appear to exceed maximum slope requirements.

Portions of sidewalk at the northern edge of the park was under construction as part of a major street construction project occurring at the time of the survey.

### Navigable paths:

Formal paths consist of both asphalt and concrete paved areas. There are no paths leading to bleacher seating.

### Misc. Site Features:

The playground structures are in good condition, with some signs of weathering.

There are permanent bleachers/benches for spectators at the central field. The aluminum bleacher seating sit atop concrete pads. Concrete has cracking, steel from former bleacher seating is embedded in the concrete.

On the fields, flood lighting is temporary, wheeled out and work off generator power. There are goal posts – painting is peeling off in some areas. There is an electronic scoreboard at the south end of the central field on the site.

There are 3 flag poles at the north end of the central field.

There are 3 porta-johns on the asphalt near the concessions/picnic shelter area. They do not appear to be maintained and the doors flapping opened in the wind.
3.0 wing park band shell

Address: 1010 Wing St, Elgin, IL 60123
Contact: Steve Whalen
   (847) 774-6779
   s.whalen23@gmail.com

A. General
The bandshell sits in Wing Park, a 121-acre regional park opened formally in 1903 and is active with many musical performances in the summer months. The structure is also rentable.

B. Conditions summary
The structure is in overall good condition. However, seating and amenities for the bandshell have vast room for improvement. ADA access for the facility is lacking.

C. Structure 1: Bandshell

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Year Built:</th>
<th>1962</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Type of Structure and Defining Features:</td>
<td>The bandshell is constructed of painted CMU walls with a painted steel structure supporting the overhang over the main stage. The surface of the stage is flat concrete. A concrete sidewalk joins the main stage and flanking storage buildings. The small 1-story storage buildings flank either side of the main stage. These are matching CMU with flat metal decking roof structures supported on exposed flat trusses. Condition: The bandshell and storage buildings are in good condition. Graffiti is often found on the walls and painting is blotchy in some areas where there have been attempts to cover over the graffiti.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Additions/Alterations:</td>
<td>None identified.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Primary Use(s):</td>
<td>Performance bandshell.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Building openings/Windows and Doors:</td>
<td>The bandshell is exposed to the elements. The storage rooms have painted metal doors, no windows.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mechanical:</td>
<td>There is an exhaust fan installed in the southern storage building to exhaust fumes from the gasoline powered equipment stored there.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Electrical:</td>
<td>Light fixtures at the underside of the pavilion are reportedly new, now LED. The northern storage building houses the electrical feed, disconnect switch, and panel. The panel reads that there are 100amps for the site. The facility lacks receptacles throughout, with just 2 quads in the north storage room, and 1 quad on the exterior of that building that does not appear to be exterior rated.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Plumbing:</td>
<td>N/A</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### D. Site

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Accessibility:</th>
<th>Seating for the bandshell are wooden benches atop mulch. There is no hard surface path of travel leading from the parking lot to the seating area. Reportedly, some wheelchair users who arrive by van sometimes will sit atop the hill and view performances from afar as they can not roll onto the grassy surface in the main seating area.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>General:</th>
<th>The site is tucked away in Wing park and the seating area is sunken in from the rolling hills of the park so that the seating area slopes down towards the bandshell’s stage.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Parking:</th>
<th>Parking is available for the facility. Condition: Asphalt surface is in generally good condition. It appears that an adequate number of ADA stalls are provided and striping is in good condition.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Accessibility:</th>
<th>See previous notes. Seating is largely inaccessible.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Navigable paths:</th>
<th>Asphalt and concrete surfaces are in generally good condition but there is only a paved path leading to the bandshell itself.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

| Landscaping: | Landscaping is in good condition and is maintained. |
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DEMOGRAPHIC AND RECREATIONAL TRENDS ANALYSIS

A document summarizing recreation market trends with analysis of the types of parks, facilities, and services used by the residents of Elgin.
DEMOGRAPHIC & RECREATION TRENDS ANALYSIS

1.1 INTRODUCTION

Included in the Parks and Recreation Master Plan update, (“Plan”) is a Demographic & Recreation Trends Analysis. The purpose of this analysis is to help the Parks and Recreation Department (“Department”) and the population they serve identify recreation market trends. The analysis also helps quantify the market in and around the City of Elgin, Illinois (“City”) and assists in providing a better understanding of the types of parks, facilities, and services used by residents.

This analysis is two-fold; it aims to answer the who and the what. First, it assesses the demographic characteristics and population projections of City residents to understand who the Department serves. Secondly, recreational trends are examined on a national and local level to understand what the population wants to do and what activities they trend toward. Findings from this analysis establish a fundamental understanding that provide a basis for prioritizing the community need for parks, trails, facilities, and recreation programs.

DEMOGRAPHIC ANALYSIS

The Demographic Analysis describes the population within the City of Elgin, Illinois. This assessment is reflective of the City’s total population and its key characteristics such as age, race, and income levels. It is important to note that future projections are based on historical patterns and unforeseen circumstances during or after the time of the analysis could have a significant bearing on the validity of the projected figures. Figure 1 provides an overview of the City’s populace based on current estimates of the 2022 population. A further analysis of each of these demographic characteristics (population, age, race, ethnicity, and income) can be found in Section 1.1.3.

DEMOGRAPHIC OVERVIEW

**POPULATION:**
- 2022 Population: 114,423
- Annual Growth Rate: .08%
- Total Households: 38,714

**AGE:**
- Median age: 34.8
- Largest age segments: 18-34, 35-54
- Continued growth of 55+ pop. through 2037

**RACE/ETHNICITY:**
- 44% White Alone
- 6% Black Alone
- 6% Asian Alone
- 47% Hispanic/Latino

**INCOME:**
- Median household income: $80,620
- Per capita income: $35,994

*Figure 1: Demographic Overview of Elgin, IL*
1.1.2 METHODOLOGY
Demographic data used for the analysis was obtained from U.S. Census Bureau and from the Environmental Systems Research Institute, Inc. (ESRI), the largest research and development organization dedicated to Geographical Information Systems (GIS) and specializing in population projections and market trends. All data was acquired in May 2022 and reflects actual numbers as reported in the 2010 Census. ESRI then estimates the current population (2022) as well as a 5-year projection (2027). PROS utilized a straight-line linear regression to forecast demographic characteristics for 10 and 15-year projections (2032 and 2037). (Note: We are using 2010 Census data; The 2020 Census Demographics and Housing Characteristics data was not available at the time this report was written).

DEMOGRAPHIC ANALYSIS BOUNDARY
The City boundaries shown below were utilized for the demographic analysis. (See Figure 2)
1.1.3 CITY POPULACE

POPULATION

The City of Elgin is a moderate size city and the population has remained relatively stable over the past decade. The population increased from 110,251 to 114,423 with an average increase of 0.32% per year (well below the national average of 0.74%). The population decreased from 2020 to 2022 but is expected to slightly increase over the next 15 years, reaching 115,824 residents by 2037 with a projected average annual growth rate of 0.08% over the time period of 2022 to 2037. *(See Figure 3)* The total number of households has increased at a similar rate, growing from 35,672 in 2010 to 38,714 by 2022. By 2037, it is expected that there will be 40,860 households within the City, and that number will likely continue to expand. *(See Figure 4)*

*Figure 3: City’s Total Population and Annual Growth Rate*

*Figure 4: City’s Total Households and Annual Growth Rate*
AGE SEGMENTATION

The largest age segments of the City’s population are 18–34 (23%) and 35–54 (26%). There is a slight aging trend with people over the age of 55 making up 28% of the population by 2037 which is a minor increase from previous years. (See Figure 5) All age segments over 55 (55-64, 64-74, and 75+) are expected to increase by 1-2% each from 2022 to 2037. Elgin has a median age of 34.8, younger than the median age of Illinois (38.3) and the United States (38.1). Overall, the population is expected to age over time, as younger populations decrease and existing age classes become older.

Figure 5: City’s Population by Age Segments
RACE AND ETHNICITY DEFINITIONS
The minimum categories for data on race and ethnicity for Federal statistics, program administrative reporting, and civil rights compliance reporting are defined below. The Census 2010 data on race are not directly comparable with data from the 2000 Census and earlier censuses; therefore, caution must be used when interpreting changes in the racial composition of the US population over time. The latest (Census 2010) definitions and nomenclature are used within this analysis. (Note: We are using 2010 Census data as the 2020 Census Demographics and Housing Characteristics File has not yet been made available).

- **American Indian** – This includes a person having origins in any of the original peoples of North and South America (including Central America), and who maintains tribal affiliation or community attachment.

- **Asian** – This includes a person having origins in any of the original peoples of the Far East, Southeast Asia, or the Indian subcontinent including, for example, Cambodia, China, India, Japan, Korea, Malaysia, Pakistan, the Philippine Islands, Thailand, and Vietnam.

- **Black Alone** – This includes a person having origins in any of the Black racial groups of Africa.

- **Native Hawaiian or Other Pacific Islander** – This includes a person having origins in any of the original peoples of Hawaii, Guam, Samoa, or other Pacific Islands.

- **White Alone** – This includes a person having origins in any of the original peoples of Europe, the Middle East, or North Africa.

- **Hispanic or Latino** – This is an ethnic distinction, a subset of a race as defined by the Federal Government; this includes a person of Mexican, Puerto Rican, Cuban, South or Central American, or other Spanish culture or origin, regardless of race.

Please Note: The Census Bureau defines Race as a person’s self-identification with one or more of the following social groups: White, Black, or African American, Asian, American Indian, and Alaska Native, Native Hawaiian and Other Pacific Islander, some other race, or a combination of these. While Ethnicity is defined as whether a person is of Hispanic / Latino origin or not. For this reason, the Hispanic / Latino ethnicity is viewed separate from race throughout this demographic analysis.
RACE
Analyzing race, the City’s current population is predominantly White Alone, though it has become increasingly more diverse since 2010. The 2022 estimate shows that 44% of the population falls into the White Alone category, with Some Other Race (24%) and Two or More Races (17%) representing the second and third largest categories. Predictions for 2037 expect the population to continue to become much more diverse, with a major decrease in the White Alone population, and minor increases to all other race categories. Within this change, the Two or More Races category will increase the most from 17% to 29%. Overall, Elgin is much more diverse than Illinois and the United States. (See Figure 6)

ETHNICITY
The City’s population was also assessed based on Hispanic/Latino ethnicity, which by the Census Bureau definition is viewed independently from race. It is important to note that individuals who are Hispanic/Latino in ethnicity can also identify with any racial categories identified above.

Based on the current 2022 estimate, people of Hispanic/Latino origin represent 47% of the City’s population, which is well above the national average (19% Hispanic/Latino). In future projections, the Hispanic/Latino population is expected to continue steadily growing to 53% of the City’s total population by 2037. (See Figure 7)
HOUSEHOLD INCOME
Per capita income is that earned by an individual while median household income is based on the total income of everyone over the age of sixteen living within the same household. The Elgin’s per capita income ($35,994) is roughly the same as the state and national averages ($37,306 and $35,672 respectively). On the other hand, the City’s median household income ($80,620) is significantly higher than the state ($68,428) and national averages ($65,712). (See Figures 8 and 9) These income characteristics should be taken into consideration when the Department is pricing out programs and calculating cost recovery goals.

![Figure 8: Income Characteristics of Elgin, IL](image1)

![Figure 9: Comparative Income Characteristics of Elgin, IL](image2)
1.1.4 DEMOGRAPHIC IMPLICATIONS

While it is important not to generalize recreation needs and priorities based solely on demographics, the analysis suggests some potential implications for the City:

- Though the population is trending towards an older age, Elgin is still home to a fairly large segment of young people. Where large populations of youth are present in a community there is a need to focus on young adults, family spaces and recreational programming. Adding more athletic fields or family orientated parks could be beneficial for attracting other young families to settle in Elgin. However, it is important to plan improvements for an older population as well, as Elgin’s population ages there is expected to be an increasing desire for “Active Adult” recreational activities.

- The City’s above average household income characteristics suggest potential disposable income at the family level. Though the per capita income characteristics are a bit lower for Elgin, the Parks and Recreation Department should be mindful of resident wealth when pricing programs and events.

- In comparison to the United States average (.74%), Elgin had a significantly lower annual growth rate from 2020 to 2022 (-.16%). However, because the population total remained roughly the same over time, the Department will likely be able to focus on maintaining the current amenities it has rather than creating new ones.

- Finally, the Department should ensure its diversifying population is reflected in its offerings, marketing/communications, and public outreach. Because Elgin’s population is more diverse than the state and national averages, it will be important to ensure that Department program offerings represent the diversity of its population.
RECREATIONAL TRENDS ANALYSIS

The Recreational Trends Analysis provides an understanding of national and local recreational trends. Trends data used for this analysis was obtained from Sports & Fitness Industry Association’s (SFIA), National Recreation and Park Association (NRPA), and Environmental Systems Research Institute, Inc. (ESRI). All trend data is based on current and/or historical participation rates, statistically valid survey results, or NRPA Park Metrics.

1.2.1 NATIONAL TRENDS IN RECREATION

METHODOLOGY

The Sports & Fitness Industry Association’s (SFIA) Sports, Fitness & Leisure Activities Topline Participation Report 2022 was utilized in evaluating the following trends:

- National Recreation Participatory Trends
- Core vs. Casual Participation Trends

The study is based on findings from surveys conducted in 2021 by the Physical Activity Council (PAC), resulting in a total of 18,000 online interviews. Surveys were administered to all genders, ages, income levels, regions, and ethnicities to allow for statistical accuracy of the national population. A sample size of 18,000 completed interviews is considered by SFIA to result in a high degree of statistical accuracy. A sport with a participation rate of five percent has a confidence interval of plus or minus 0.32 percentage points at a 95 percent confidence level. Using a weighting technique, survey results are applied to the total U.S. population figure of 304,745,039 people (ages six and older).

The purpose of the report is to establish levels of activity and identify key participatory trends in recreation across the U.S. This study looked at 118 different sports/activities and subdivided them into various categories including: sports, fitness, outdoor activities, aquatics, and others.

CORE VS. CASUAL PARTICIPATION

In addition to overall participation rates, SFIA further categorizes active participants as either core or casual participants based on the frequency of participation. Core participants have higher participatory frequency than casual participants. The thresholds that define casual versus core participation may vary based on the nature of each individual activity. For instance, core participants engage in most fitness activities more than 50-times per year, while for sports, the threshold for core participation is typically 13-times per year.

In each activity, core participants are more committed and tend to be less likely to switch to other activities or become inactive (engage in no physical activity) than causal participants. This may also explain why activities with more core participants tend to experience less pattern shifts in participation rates than those with larger groups of casual participants.
1.2.2 IMPACT OF COVID-19

Approximately 232.6 million people ages 6 and over reported being active in 2021, which is a 1.3% increase from 2020 and the greatest number of active Americans in the last 5 years. There were more things to do as outdoor activities thrived, fitness at home became more popular, and team sports started back up after the COVID-19 hiatus.

Americans continued to practice yoga, attend Pilates training, and workout with kettlebells. They were drawn to the ease of pickleball and the competitiveness of tennis. Many started with indoor climbing, while others took to the hiking trail. The waterways traffic had an increase of stand-up paddlers, kayaks, and jet skis. Gymnastics, swimming on a team, court volleyball, and fast-pitch softball benefited from the participation boom created from the Olympics.

Water sports had the largest gain in participation rates. Activities such as kayaking, stand-up paddling, and boardsailing/windsurfing all contributed to the 2.0 percent increase. Outdoor sports continued to grow with 53.9 percent of the U.S. population participating. This rate remains higher than pre-pandemic levels, having a 6.2 percent gain over 50.7 percent participation rate in 2019. The largest contributor to this gain was trail running with a 5.6 percent increase in one year and 13.9 percent from 2019. Generationally, fitness sports continue to be the go-to means of exercise for Boomers, Gen X, and Millennials. Over half of the Gen X, Millennials, and Gen Z generation participated in one type of outdoor activity. Team sports were heavily dominated by generation Gen Z.
1.2.3 NATIONAL TRENDS IN RECREATION

PARTICIPATION LEVELS

The top sports where participation was the highest in the United States were Basketball (27.1 million), Golf (25.1 million), and Tennis (22.6 million) which have participation figures higher than the other activities within the general sports category. Baseball (15.5 million) and Outdoor Soccer (12.5 million) round out the top five.

The popularity of Basketball, Golf, and Tennis can be attributed to the ability to compete with a small number of participants. This, coupled with an ability to be played outdoors and/or properly distanced, helps explain their popularity during the COVID-19 pandemic. Basketball’s overall success can also be attributed to the limited amount of equipment needed to participate and the limited space requirements necessary, which make basketball the only traditional sport that can be played at most American dwellings as a drive-way pickup game. Golf continues to benefit from its wide age segment appeal and is considered a life-long sport. In addition, target type game venues or golf entertainment venues have increased drastically (72.3%) over the past 5-years, using golf entertainment (e.g., Top Golf) as a new alternative to breathe life back into the game of Golf.

FIVE-YEAR TREND

Since 2016, Pickleball (71.2%), Golf-Entertainment Venues (51.3%), and Tennis (25.1%) have shown the largest increase in participation. Similarly, Basketball (21.4%) and Boxing for Competition (20.7%) have also experienced significant growth. Based on the five-year trend from 2016-2021, the sports that are most rapidly declining in participation include Ultimate Frisbee (-40.4%), Roller Hockey (-26.1%), Beach/Sand Volleyball (-23.8%), Squash (-23.5%), Slow Pitch Softball (-21.9%), and Gymnastics (-20.7%).

ONE-YEAR TREND

The most recent year shares some similarities with the five-year trends, with Pickleball (14.8%) and Boxing for Competition (7.3%) experiencing some of the greatest increases in participation this past year. Fast Pitch Softball had the greatest one-year increase (15.3%), while, Gymnastics (10.9%), and Court Volleyball (8.1%). Basketball (-2.2%), Flag Football (-1.6%), Indoor Soccer (-0.6%) and Baseball (-0.5%) have shown a five-year increase, but a one-year decrease. This is a direct result of coming out of the COVID-19 pandemic. Similarly, other team sports such as Ultimate Frisbee (-5.8%), Slow Pitch Softball (-5.4%), Roller Hockey (-5%), Racquetball (-4.8%) and Beach/Sand Volleyball (-3.1%), also had significant decreases in participation over the last year.
CORE VS. CASUAL TRENDS IN GENERAL SPORTS

Sports with high participation rates, such as Basketball, Baseball, and Slow Pitch Softball have a larger core participant base (participation rates as high as 13+ times per year) than the participation base of casual sports participation rates of casual sports (1-12 times per year). Due to the COVID-19 Pandemic, most activities showed a decrease in their percentage of core participants. However, there were significant increases in the percentage of casual participation for Court Volleyball, Pickleball, Fast Pitch Softball, Gymnastics and Lacrosse in the past year. *(See Figure 10)*  

Please see Appendix A for full Core vs. Casual Participation breakdown.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Activity</th>
<th>2016</th>
<th>2020</th>
<th>2021</th>
<th>5-Year Trend</th>
<th>1-Year Trend</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Basketball</td>
<td>22,343</td>
<td>27,753</td>
<td>27,135</td>
<td>21.4%</td>
<td>-2.2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Golf (9 or 18-Hole Course)</td>
<td>23,815</td>
<td>24,804</td>
<td>25,111</td>
<td>5.4%</td>
<td>1.2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tennis</td>
<td>18,079</td>
<td>21,642</td>
<td>22,817</td>
<td>25.1%</td>
<td>4.5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Baseball</td>
<td>14,760</td>
<td>15,731</td>
<td>15,587</td>
<td>5.6%</td>
<td>-0.9%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Soccer (Outdoor)</td>
<td>11,932</td>
<td>12,444</td>
<td>12,556</td>
<td>5.2%</td>
<td>0.9%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Golf (Entertainment Venue)</td>
<td>8,173</td>
<td>12,057</td>
<td>12,362</td>
<td>51.3%</td>
<td>2.5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Softball (Slow Pitch)</td>
<td>7,690</td>
<td>6,349</td>
<td>6,008</td>
<td>-21.9%</td>
<td>-5.4%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Football (Flag)</td>
<td>6,173</td>
<td>7,001</td>
<td>6,889</td>
<td>11.6%</td>
<td>-1.6%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Volleyball (Court)</td>
<td>6,216</td>
<td>5,410</td>
<td>5,849</td>
<td>-5.9%</td>
<td>8.1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Badminton</td>
<td>7,354</td>
<td>5,862</td>
<td>6,061</td>
<td>-17.6%</td>
<td>3.4%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Soccer (Indoor)</td>
<td>5,117</td>
<td>5,440</td>
<td>5,408</td>
<td>5.7%</td>
<td>-0.6%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Football (Touch)</td>
<td>5,686</td>
<td>4,846</td>
<td>4,884</td>
<td>-14.1%</td>
<td>0.8%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Football (Tackle)</td>
<td>5,481</td>
<td>5,054</td>
<td>5,228</td>
<td>-4.5%</td>
<td>3.4%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gymnastics</td>
<td>5,381</td>
<td>3,848</td>
<td>4,268</td>
<td>-20.7%</td>
<td>10.9%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Volleyball (Sand/Beach)</td>
<td>5,489</td>
<td>4,320</td>
<td>4,184</td>
<td>-23.8%</td>
<td>-3.1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Track and Field</td>
<td>4,116</td>
<td>3,636</td>
<td>3,587</td>
<td>-12.9%</td>
<td>-1.3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cheerleading</td>
<td>4,029</td>
<td>3,308</td>
<td>3,465</td>
<td>-14.0%</td>
<td>4.7%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pickleball</td>
<td>2,815</td>
<td>4,199</td>
<td>4,819</td>
<td>71.2%</td>
<td>14.8%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Racquetball</td>
<td>3,579</td>
<td>3,426</td>
<td>3,260</td>
<td>-8.0%</td>
<td>-4.8%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ice Hockey</td>
<td>2,697</td>
<td>2,270</td>
<td>2,306</td>
<td>-14.5%</td>
<td>1.6%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ultimate Frisbee</td>
<td>3,673</td>
<td>2,325</td>
<td>2,190</td>
<td>-40.4%</td>
<td>-5.8%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Softball (Fast Pitch)</td>
<td>2,467</td>
<td>1,811</td>
<td>2,088</td>
<td>-15.4%</td>
<td>15.3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lacrosse</td>
<td>2,090</td>
<td>1,884</td>
<td>1,892</td>
<td>-9.5%</td>
<td>0.4%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wrestling</td>
<td>1,922</td>
<td>1,931</td>
<td>1,937</td>
<td>0.8%</td>
<td>0.3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Roller Hockey</td>
<td>1,929</td>
<td>1,500</td>
<td>1,425</td>
<td>-26.1%</td>
<td>-5.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Boxing for Competition</td>
<td>1,210</td>
<td>1,361</td>
<td>1,460</td>
<td>20.7%</td>
<td>7.3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rugby</td>
<td>1,550</td>
<td>1,242</td>
<td>1,238</td>
<td>-20.1%</td>
<td>-0.3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Squash</td>
<td>1,549</td>
<td>1,163</td>
<td>1,185</td>
<td>-23.5%</td>
<td>1.9%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*NOTE: Participation figures are in 000’s for the US population ages 6 and over.*

*Figure 10: General Sports National Participatory Trends*
1.2.4 NATIONAL TRENDS IN GENERAL FITNESS

PARTICIPATION LEVELS

Overall, national participatory trends in fitness have experienced rapid growth in recent years. Many of these activities have become popular due to an increased interest among Americans to improve their health and enhance quality of life by engaging in an active lifestyle. The most popular general fitness activities in 2021 also were those that could be done at home or in a virtual class environment. The activities with the most participation are Fitness Walking (115.8 million), Treadmill (53.6 million), Free Weights (52.6 million), Running/Jogging (48.9 million) and Stationary Cycling (32.4 million).

FIVE-YEAR TREND

Over the last five years (2016-2021), the activities growing at the highest rate are Trail Running (45.9%), Yoga (30.8%), Dance, Step & Choreographed Exercise (13.3%), and Pilates Training (9.6%). Over the same period, the activities that have undergone the biggest decline include Group Stationary Cycling (-33.5%), Traditional Triathlon (26.4%), Cardio Kickboxing (-26.1%), Cross-Training Style Workout (-24.4%) and Non-Traditional Triathlons (-23.5%).

ONE-YEAR TREND

In the last year, activities with the largest gains in participation were those that can be done alone at home or socially distanced outdoors. The top increases were in Treadmill (7.6%), Cross-Training Style Workouts (6.4%) Trail Running (5.6%), Yoga (4.7%) and Stair Climbing (4.7%). In the same span, the activities that had the largest decline in participation were those that would take more time and investment. The greatest drops were seen in Traditional Triathlon (-5.3%), Aerobics (-5.1%), Non-Traditional Triathlons (-4.3%), and Cardio Kickboxing (-3.7%).

CORE VS. CASUAL TRENDS IN GENERAL FITNESS

The most participated in fitness activities all had increases in their casual users’ base (participating 1-49 times per year) over the last year. These fitness activities include Fitness Walking, Free Weights, Running/Jogging, Treadmills, Yoga, and Recumbent/Upright Stationary Cycling. Please see Appendix A for full Core vs. Casual Participation breakdown.
## National Participatory Trends - General Fitness

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Activity</th>
<th>Participation Levels</th>
<th>% Change</th>
<th>5-Year Trend</th>
<th>1-Year Trend</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>2016</td>
<td>2020</td>
<td>2021</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fitness Walking</td>
<td>107,895</td>
<td>114,044</td>
<td>115,814</td>
<td>7.3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Treadmill</td>
<td>51,872</td>
<td>49,832</td>
<td>53,627</td>
<td>3.4%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Free Weights (Dumbbells/Hand Weights)</td>
<td>51,513</td>
<td>53,256</td>
<td>52,636</td>
<td>2.2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Running/Jogging</td>
<td>47,384</td>
<td>50,652</td>
<td>48,977</td>
<td>3.4%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Stationary Cycling (Recumbent/Upright)</td>
<td>36,118</td>
<td>31,287</td>
<td>32,453</td>
<td>-10.1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Weight/Resistant Machines</td>
<td>35,768</td>
<td>30,651</td>
<td>30,577</td>
<td>-14.5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Elliptical Motion Trainer</td>
<td>32,218</td>
<td>27,920</td>
<td>27,618</td>
<td>-14.3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Yoga</td>
<td>26,268</td>
<td>32,808</td>
<td>34,347</td>
<td>30.8%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Free Weights (Barbells)</td>
<td>26,473</td>
<td>28,790</td>
<td>28,243</td>
<td>6.7%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dance, Step, &amp; Choreographed Exercise</td>
<td>21,839</td>
<td>25,160</td>
<td>24,752</td>
<td>13.3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bodyweight Exercise</td>
<td>25,110</td>
<td>22,845</td>
<td>22,629</td>
<td>-9.9%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Aerobics (High Impact/Intensity Training Hill)</td>
<td>10,575</td>
<td>10,954</td>
<td>10,400</td>
<td>-1.7%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Stair Climbing Machine</td>
<td>15,079</td>
<td>11,261</td>
<td>11,786</td>
<td>-21.8%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cross-Training Style Workout</td>
<td>12,914</td>
<td>9,179</td>
<td>9,764</td>
<td>-24.4%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Trail Running</td>
<td>8,582</td>
<td>11,854</td>
<td>12,520</td>
<td>45.9%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Stationary Cycling (Group)</td>
<td>8,937</td>
<td>6,054</td>
<td>5,939</td>
<td>-33.5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pilates Training</td>
<td>8,893</td>
<td>9,805</td>
<td>9,745</td>
<td>9.6%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cardio Kickboxing</td>
<td>6,899</td>
<td>5,295</td>
<td>5,099</td>
<td>-26.1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Boot Camp Style Cross-Training</td>
<td>6,583</td>
<td>4,969</td>
<td>5,169</td>
<td>-21.5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Martial Arts</td>
<td>5,745</td>
<td>6,064</td>
<td>6,186</td>
<td>7.7%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Boxing for Fitness</td>
<td>5,175</td>
<td>5,230</td>
<td>5,237</td>
<td>1.2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tai Chi</td>
<td>3,706</td>
<td>3,300</td>
<td>3,393</td>
<td>-8.4%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Barre</td>
<td>3,329</td>
<td>3,579</td>
<td>3,659</td>
<td>9.9%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Triathlon (Traditional/Road)</td>
<td>2,374</td>
<td>1,846</td>
<td>1,748</td>
<td>-26.4%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Triathlon (Non-Traditional/Off Road)</td>
<td>1,705</td>
<td>1,363</td>
<td>1,304</td>
<td>-23.5%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**NOTE:** Participation figures are in 000’s for the US population ages 6 and over

**Legend:**
- **Large Increase:** greater than 2%
- **Moderate Increase:** 0% to 25%
- **Moderate Decrease:** 0% to -25%
- **Large Decrease:** less than -25%

*Figure 11: General Fitness National Participatory Trends*
1.2.5 NATIONAL TRENDS IN OUTDOOR RECREATION

PARTICIPATION LEVELS

Results from the SFIA report demonstrate rapid growth in participation regarding outdoor/adventure recreation activities. Much like the general fitness activities, these activities encourage an active lifestyle, can be performed individually or with proper social distancing in a group, and are not as limited by time constraints. In 2021, the most popular activities, in terms of total participants, from the outdoor/adventure recreation category include: Day Hiking (57.8 million), Road Bicycling (44.5 million), Freshwater Fishing (42.6 million), Camping within ¼ mile of Vehicle/Home (36.1 million), and Recreational Vehicle Camping (17.8 million).

FIVE-YEAR TREND

From 2016-2021, Day Hiking (55.3%), BMX Bicycling (44.2%), Skateboarding (37.8%), Camping within ¼ mile of Vehicle/Home (30.1%), and Fly Fishing (27.3%) have undergone the largest increases in participation. The five-year trend also shows activities such as Adventure Racing (-31.4%), In-Line Roller Skating (-18.8%), Archery (-13.5%), and Traditional Climbing (-4.5%) to be the only activities with decreases in participation.

ONE-YEAR TREND

The one-year trend shows all activities growing in participation from the previous year. The most rapid growth is Skateboarding (34.2%), Camping within ¼ mile of Vehicle/Home (28.0%), Birdwatching (18.8%), and Day Hiking (16.3%). Over the last year, the only activities that underwent decreases in participation were Adventure Racing (-8.3%) and Archery (-2.7%).

CORE VS. CASUAL TRENDS IN OUTDOOR RECREATION

Most outdoor activities have experienced participation growth in the last five years. Although this is a positive trend, it should be noted that all outdoor activities participation, besides adventure racing, consist primarily of casual users. Please see Appendix A for full Core vs. Casual Participation breakdown.
## National Participatory Trends - Outdoor / Adventure Recreation

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Activity</th>
<th>Participation Levels</th>
<th>% Change</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>2016</td>
<td>2020</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hiking (Day)</td>
<td>42,128</td>
<td>57,808</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bicycling (Road)</td>
<td>38,365</td>
<td>44,471</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fishing (Freshwater)</td>
<td>38,121</td>
<td>42,556</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Camping (&lt; 1/4 Mile of Vehicle/Home)</td>
<td>26,467</td>
<td>36,082</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Camping (Recreational Vehicle)</td>
<td>15,855</td>
<td>17,825</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fishing (Saltwater)</td>
<td>12,266</td>
<td>14,527</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Birdwatching (&gt;1/4 mile of Vehicle/Home)</td>
<td>11,589</td>
<td>15,228</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Backpacking Overnight</td>
<td>10,151</td>
<td>10,746</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bicycling (Mountain)</td>
<td>8,615</td>
<td>8,998</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Archery</td>
<td>7,903</td>
<td>7,249</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fishing (Fly)</td>
<td>6,456</td>
<td>7,753</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Skateboarding</td>
<td>6,442</td>
<td>8,872</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Climbing (Indoor)</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>5,535</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Roller Skating, In-Line</td>
<td>5,381</td>
<td>4,892</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bicycling (BMX)</td>
<td>3,104</td>
<td>3,880</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Climbing (Traditional/Ice/Mountaineering)</td>
<td>2,790</td>
<td>2,456</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Climbing (Sport/Boulder)</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>2,290</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Adventure Racing</td>
<td>2,999</td>
<td>1,966</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

NOTE: Participation figures are in 000’s for the US population ages 6 and over

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Legend:</th>
<th>Large Increase (greater than 35%)</th>
<th>Moderate Increase (0% to 35%)</th>
<th>Moderate Decrease (0% to -25%)</th>
<th>Large Decrease (less than -25%)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Figure 12: Outdoor/Adventure Recreation National Participatory Trends*
1.2.6 NATIONAL TRENDS IN AQUATICS

PARTICIPATION LEVELS
Swimming is deemed a lifetime activity, which is why it continues to have such strong participation. In 2021, Fitness Swimming remained the overall leader in participation (25.6 million) amongst aquatic activities, even though most, if not all, aquatic facilities were forced to close at some point due to the COVID-19 pandemic.

FIVE-YEAR TREND
Assessing the five-year trend, no activity has experienced an increase from 2016-2021, due to the accessibility of facilities during Covid-19. While Fitness Swimming and Aquatic Exercise underwent a slight decline, dropping -3.7% and -1.7% respectively, Competitive Swimming suffered a -16.2% decline in participation.

ONE-YEAR TREND
The impact of the COVID-19 pandemic is seen here as most aquatic facilities were forced to shut down for some part of the year. This caused decreases to Aquatic Exercise (-5.1%) as the largest decline, followed by Fitness Swimming (-0.2%). However, despite the general decline over the past 5-years, participation in Competitive swimming increased by 8% over the previous year.

CORE VS. CASUAL TRENDS IN AQUATICS
Only Aquatic Exercise has undergone an increase in casual participation (1-49 times per year) over the last five years, however, they have all seen a decrease in core participation (50+ times per year) in the same time period. This decline happened before the COVID-19 pandemic, and the large decreases in all participation over the last year have furthered this trend. Please see Appendix A for full Core vs. Casual Participation breakdown.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Activity</th>
<th>Participation Levels</th>
<th>% Change</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>2016</td>
<td>2020</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Swimming (Fitness)</td>
<td>26,601</td>
<td>25,666</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Aquatic Exercise</td>
<td>10,575</td>
<td>10,954</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Swimming (Competition)</td>
<td>3,369</td>
<td>2,615</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

NOTE: Participation figures are in 000’s for the US population ages 6 and over

Legend:
- Large Increase (greater than 25%)
- Moderate Increase (0% to 25%)
- Moderate Decrease (0% to -25%)
- Large Decrease (less than -25%)

Figure 13: Aquatics National Participatory Trends
1.2.7 National Trends in Water Sports / Activities

Participation Level

The most popular water sports / activities based on total participants in 2021 were Recreational Kayaking (13.3 million), Canoeing (9.2 million), and Snorkeling (7.3 million). It should be noted that water activity participation tends to vary based on regional, seasonal, and environmental factors. A region with more water access and a warmer climate is more likely to have a higher participation rate in water activities than a region that has a long winter season or limited water access. Therefore, when assessing trends in water sports and activities, it is important to understand that fluctuations may be the result of environmental barriers which can influence water activity participation.

Five-Year Trend

Over the last five years, Recreational Kayaking (33.3%), Surfing (24%), and Stand-Up Paddling (16.1%) were the fastest growing water activities. White Water Kayaking (1.4%) was the only other activity with an increase in participation. From 2016-2021, activities declining in participation most rapidly were Boardsailing/Windsurfing (-25.3%), Scuba Diving (-20.4%), Water Skiing (-17.4%), Sea Kayaking (-17.2%) Snorkeling (-16.1%), and Sailing (-15.4%).

One-Year Trend

Recreational Kayaking (2.7%) and Stand-Up Paddling (1.7%) were the activities to grow both over 5 years and in the last year. Activities which experienced the largest decreases in participation in the most recent year include Surfing (-8.9%), Snorkeling (-5.3%), Scuba Diving (-4.3%), and Canoeing (-4.1%).

Core vs. Casual Trends in Water Sports/Activities

As mentioned previously, regional, seasonal, and environmental limiting factors may influence the participation rate of water sport and activities. These factors may also explain why all water-based activities have drastically more casual participants than core participants, since frequencies of activities may be constrained by uncontrollable factors. These high casual user numbers are likely why most water sports/activities have experienced decreases in participation in recent years. Please see Appendix A for full Core vs. Casual Participation breakdown.
### National Participatory Trends - Water Sports / Activities

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Activity</th>
<th>Participation Levels</th>
<th>% Change</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>2016</td>
<td>2020</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kayaking (Recreational)</td>
<td>10,017</td>
<td>13,002</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Canoeing</td>
<td>10,046</td>
<td>9,595</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Snorkeling</td>
<td>8,717</td>
<td>7,729</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jet Skiing</td>
<td>5,783</td>
<td>4,900</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sailing</td>
<td>4,095</td>
<td>3,486</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Stand-Up Paddling</td>
<td>3,220</td>
<td>3,675</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rafting</td>
<td>3,428</td>
<td>3,474</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Water Skiing</td>
<td>3,700</td>
<td>3,050</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Surfing</td>
<td>2,793</td>
<td>3,800</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wakeboarding</td>
<td>2,912</td>
<td>2,754</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Scuba Diving</td>
<td>3,111</td>
<td>2,588</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kayaking (Sea/Touring)</td>
<td>3,124</td>
<td>2,508</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kayaking (White Water)</td>
<td>2,552</td>
<td>2,605</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Boardsailing/Windsurfing</td>
<td>1,737</td>
<td>1,268</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

NOTE: Participation figures are in 000’s for the US population ages 6 and over.

Legend:

- Large Increase (greater than 35%)
- Moderate Increase (10% to 35%)
- Moderate Decrease (0% to -25%)
- Large Decrease (less than -25%)

*Figure 14: Water Sports/Activities National Participatory Trends*
1.2.8 LOCAL SPORT AND LEISURE MARKET POTENTIAL

LOCAL SPORT AND LEISURE MARKET POTENTIAL

The following charts show sport and leisure market potential data for Elgin residents, as provided by ESRI. The Market Potential Index (MPI) measures the probable demand for a product or service within the defined service areas. The MPI shows the likelihood that an adult resident will participate in certain activities when compared to the U.S. national average. The national average is 100; therefore, numbers below 100 would represent lower than average participation rates, and numbers above 100 would represent higher than average participation rates. The service area is compared to the national average in four (4) categories – general sports, fitness, outdoor activity, and commercial recreation.

It should be noted that MPI metrics are only one data point used to help determine community trends; thus, programmatic decisions should not be based solely on MPI metrics.

Overall, when analyzing Elgin’s MPIs, the data demonstrates above average market potential index (MPI) numbers. When the market potential is assessed by category most activities scored close to the national average (100). These MPI scores show that Elgin has a strong participation presence for certain recreational offerings, such as Soccer or basketball. This becomes significant when the Department considers starting programs or building new facilities and gives the Department a strong tool to estimate resident attendance and participation.

Figures 15 through 18 illustrate MPI scores for 47 recreational and leisure activities in Elgin compared to the national average. The activities are categorized by activity type and listed in descending order, from highest to lowest MPI score. High index numbers (100+) are significant because they demonstrate a greater likelihood that Elgin’s residents will actively participate in the activities if/when offered by the Department.

GENERAL SPORTS MARKET POTENTIAL

The General Sports chart projects that MPI scores in Elgin exceed the national average for all sports, except golf. The highest scores belong to Soccer (137), Basketball (118), and Volleyball (116). Elgin’s General Sports scores are relatively high. (See Figure 15)

![General Sports MPI Chart](image_url)
**FITNESS MARKET POTENTIAL**
Assessing MPI scores for the Fitness Activity category reveals that fitness activities in the City rank a bit lower than the General Sports. Several activities are below the national average, however, the Fitness MPI for Elgin averages out with four activities at or above the national average. The most popular activities are Zumba (116), Aerobics (110), and Weight Lifting (104). *(See Figure 16)*

![Fitness MPI Chart](image)

**OUTDOOR ACTIVITY MARKET POTENTIAL**
Overall, the Outdoor Activity MPI chart reflects that the City is mostly below the national average in all activities recorded except Mountain Biking (109) and Rock Climbing (103). Certain outdoor activities like freshwater fishing, archery, and canoeing/kayaking may be as low because of access, seasonal variation, and/or insufficient facilities to attract participants. *(See Figure 17)*

![Outdoor Activity MPI Chart](image)

*Figure 16: Fitness MPI for Elgin, IL*

*Figure 17: Outdoor Activity MPI for Elgin, IL*
COMMERCIAL RECREATION MARKET POTENTIAL

The Commercial Recreation category reveals that only a few of the recorded activities are above the national average. The most popular activity in the service area was Visited a theme park at 125, with a significant drop off compared to the next highest activity. Overall, the type of activities that are popular in Elgin are diverse; some artistic activities have MPI scores similar to those seen from in the active, sports-like activities have MPI scores signal a potential target area for new facilities, funding, or programs. The lowest MPI score in Elgin was found to be, "Spent $250 on sports/rec equipment" (89), signaling the community may not prefer to spend much on their sports activities or hobbies. (See Figure 18)

![Commercial Recreation MPI](chart)

Figure 18: Commercial Recreation MPI for Elgin, IL
### APPENDIX A - CORE VS. CASUAL PARTICIPATION TRENDS

#### GENERAL SPORTS

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Activity</th>
<th>National Core vs Casual Participatory Trends - General Sports</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Participation Levels</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>2016</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Basketball</td>
<td>22,343</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Casual (1-12 times)</td>
<td>7,466</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Core (13+ times)</td>
<td>14,877</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Golf (9 or 18-Hole Course)</td>
<td>23,815</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tennis</td>
<td>18,079</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Baseball</td>
<td>14,760</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Casual (1-12 times)</td>
<td>5,675</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Core (13+ times)</td>
<td>9,085</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Soccer (Outdoor)</td>
<td>11,952</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Casual (1-25 times)</td>
<td>6,342</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Core (26+ times)</td>
<td>5,590</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Softball (SlowPitch)</td>
<td>7,619</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Casual (1-12 times)</td>
<td>3,377</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Core (13+ times)</td>
<td>4,314</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Football (Flag)</td>
<td>6,173</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Casual (1-12 times)</td>
<td>3,299</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Core (13+ times)</td>
<td>2,974</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Core Age 6 to 17 (13+ times)</td>
<td>1,401</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Volleyball (Court)</td>
<td>6,216</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Casual (1-12 times)</td>
<td>2,852</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Core (13+ times)</td>
<td>3,364</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Badminton</td>
<td>7,354</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Casual (1-12 times)</td>
<td>5,285</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Core (13+ times)</td>
<td>2,099</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Football (Touch)</td>
<td>5,686</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Casual (1-12 times)</td>
<td>3,804</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Core (13+ times)</td>
<td>2,383</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Soccer (Indoor)</td>
<td>5,117</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Casual (1-12 times)</td>
<td>2,347</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Core (13+ times)</td>
<td>2,770</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Football (Tackle)</td>
<td>5,481</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Casual (1-25 times)</td>
<td>2,242</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Core (26+ times)</td>
<td>3,240</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Core Age 6 to 17 (26+ times)</td>
<td>2,543</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gymnastics</td>
<td>5,881</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Casual (1-49 times)</td>
<td>3,580</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Core (50+ times)</td>
<td>1,800</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Volleyball (Sand/Beach)</td>
<td>5,489</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Casual (1-12 times)</td>
<td>3,988</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Core (13+ times)</td>
<td>1,500</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Track and Field</td>
<td>4,116</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Casual (1-25 times)</td>
<td>1,981</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Core (26+ times)</td>
<td>2,135</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**NOTE:** Participation figures are in thousands for the US population ages 6 and over.

#### Participation Growth/Decline

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Participation Growth/Decline</th>
<th>Large Increase greater than 20%</th>
<th>Moderate Increase (6% to 20%)</th>
<th>Moderate Decline (6% to 35%)</th>
<th>Large Decline (greater than -35%)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Core vs Casual Distribution</td>
<td>Mostly Core Participation greater than 75%</td>
<td>Mostly Casual Participation greater than 75%</td>
<td>More Core Participants (56-74%)</td>
<td>More Casual Participants (56-74%)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

---

**Source:** Elgin Parks and Recreation
### General Sports (Continued)

#### National Core vs Casual Participatory Trends - General Sports

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Activity</th>
<th>Participation Levels</th>
<th>2016</th>
<th>2020</th>
<th>2021</th>
<th>2025</th>
<th>2030</th>
<th>% Change</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>#</td>
<td>%</td>
<td>#</td>
<td>%</td>
<td>#</td>
<td>%</td>
<td>5-Year Trend</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cheerleading</td>
<td>4,029</td>
<td>100%</td>
<td>3,308</td>
<td>100%</td>
<td>3,465</td>
<td>100%</td>
<td>-14.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Casual (1-25 times)</td>
<td>2,365</td>
<td>59%</td>
<td>1,911</td>
<td>58%</td>
<td>2,030</td>
<td>59%</td>
<td>-14.2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Core (30+ times)</td>
<td>1,664</td>
<td>41%</td>
<td>1,377</td>
<td>42%</td>
<td>1,435</td>
<td>41%</td>
<td>-18.8%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pickleball</td>
<td>2,815</td>
<td>100%</td>
<td>4,199</td>
<td>100%</td>
<td>4,819</td>
<td>100%</td>
<td>71.2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Casual (1-12 times)</td>
<td>1,710</td>
<td>61%</td>
<td>2,855</td>
<td>63%</td>
<td>3,158</td>
<td>72%</td>
<td>102.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Core (13+ times)</td>
<td>1,106</td>
<td>39%</td>
<td>1,364</td>
<td>32%</td>
<td>1,365</td>
<td>28%</td>
<td>23.4%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Racquetball</td>
<td>3,579</td>
<td>100%</td>
<td>3,426</td>
<td>100%</td>
<td>3,260</td>
<td>100%</td>
<td>-8.9%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Casual (1-12 times)</td>
<td>2,488</td>
<td>70%</td>
<td>2,476</td>
<td>72%</td>
<td>2,270</td>
<td>70%</td>
<td>-8.8%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Core (13+ times)</td>
<td>1,092</td>
<td>31%</td>
<td>950</td>
<td>28%</td>
<td>990</td>
<td>30%</td>
<td>-9.3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ice Hockey</td>
<td>2,687</td>
<td>100%</td>
<td>2,270</td>
<td>100%</td>
<td>2,305</td>
<td>100%</td>
<td>-14.5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Casual (1-12 times)</td>
<td>1,533</td>
<td>50%</td>
<td>1,185</td>
<td>51%</td>
<td>1,208</td>
<td>52%</td>
<td>-10.9%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Core (13+ times)</td>
<td>1,144</td>
<td>50%</td>
<td>1,105</td>
<td>49%</td>
<td>1,010</td>
<td>48%</td>
<td>-18.1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ultimate Frisbee</td>
<td>3,673</td>
<td>100%</td>
<td>2,325</td>
<td>100%</td>
<td>2,190</td>
<td>100%</td>
<td>-90.4%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Casual (1-12 times)</td>
<td>2,746</td>
<td>75%</td>
<td>1,476</td>
<td>63%</td>
<td>1,441</td>
<td>65%</td>
<td>-97.8%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Core (13+ times)</td>
<td>927</td>
<td>25%</td>
<td>849</td>
<td>37%</td>
<td>749</td>
<td>34%</td>
<td>-19.2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Softball (Fast Pitch)</td>
<td>2,467</td>
<td>100%</td>
<td>1,811</td>
<td>100%</td>
<td>2,088</td>
<td>100%</td>
<td>-15.4%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Casual (1-25 times)</td>
<td>1,198</td>
<td>49%</td>
<td>650</td>
<td>36%</td>
<td>934</td>
<td>45%</td>
<td>-22.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Core (26+ times)</td>
<td>1,269</td>
<td>51%</td>
<td>1,182</td>
<td>64%</td>
<td>1,154</td>
<td>55%</td>
<td>-9.1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lacrosse</td>
<td>2,960</td>
<td>100%</td>
<td>1,884</td>
<td>100%</td>
<td>1,892</td>
<td>100%</td>
<td>-9.5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Casual (1-12 times)</td>
<td>1,153</td>
<td>55%</td>
<td>902</td>
<td>48%</td>
<td>1,009</td>
<td>58%</td>
<td>-12.5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Core (13+ times)</td>
<td>938</td>
<td>45%</td>
<td>982</td>
<td>52%</td>
<td>883</td>
<td>47%</td>
<td>-5.9%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wrestling</td>
<td>1,922</td>
<td>100%</td>
<td>1,931</td>
<td>100%</td>
<td>1,957</td>
<td>100%</td>
<td>0.8%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Casual (1-25 times)</td>
<td>1,139</td>
<td>59%</td>
<td>1,229</td>
<td>64%</td>
<td>1,290</td>
<td>67%</td>
<td>-13.8%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Core (26+ times)</td>
<td>782</td>
<td>41%</td>
<td>692</td>
<td>36%</td>
<td>643</td>
<td>33%</td>
<td>-17.3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Roller Hockey</td>
<td>1,929</td>
<td>100%</td>
<td>1,500</td>
<td>100%</td>
<td>1,425</td>
<td>100%</td>
<td>-26.1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Casual (1-12 times)</td>
<td>1,458</td>
<td>75%</td>
<td>1,129</td>
<td>75%</td>
<td>1,088</td>
<td>76%</td>
<td>-24.3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Core (13+ times)</td>
<td>491</td>
<td>25%</td>
<td>371</td>
<td>25%</td>
<td>337</td>
<td>24%</td>
<td>-51.4%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Boxing for Competition</td>
<td>1,210</td>
<td>100%</td>
<td>1,361</td>
<td>100%</td>
<td>1,460</td>
<td>100%</td>
<td>20.7%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Casual (1-12 times)</td>
<td>1,035</td>
<td>86%</td>
<td>1,214</td>
<td>85%</td>
<td>1,262</td>
<td>86%</td>
<td>21.9%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Core (13+ times)</td>
<td>176</td>
<td>15%</td>
<td>147</td>
<td>11%</td>
<td>199</td>
<td>14%</td>
<td>-13.1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rugby</td>
<td>1,950</td>
<td>100%</td>
<td>1,242</td>
<td>100%</td>
<td>1,238</td>
<td>100%</td>
<td>-20.1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Casual (1-7 times)</td>
<td>1,090</td>
<td>70%</td>
<td>807</td>
<td>65%</td>
<td>778</td>
<td>63%</td>
<td>-28.6%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Core (8+ times)</td>
<td>460</td>
<td>30%</td>
<td>435</td>
<td>35%</td>
<td>460</td>
<td>37%</td>
<td>0.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Squash</td>
<td>1,949</td>
<td>100%</td>
<td>1,163</td>
<td>100%</td>
<td>1,185</td>
<td>100%</td>
<td>-25.5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Casual (1-7 times)</td>
<td>1,111</td>
<td>72%</td>
<td>669</td>
<td>58%</td>
<td>720</td>
<td>61%</td>
<td>-35.2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Core (8+ times)</td>
<td>437</td>
<td>28%</td>
<td>495</td>
<td>43%</td>
<td>466</td>
<td>39%</td>
<td>6.6%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Golf (Entertainment Venue)</td>
<td>8,173</td>
<td>100%</td>
<td>12,057</td>
<td>100%</td>
<td>12,362</td>
<td>100%</td>
<td>-51.3%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**NOTE:** Participation figures are in 000's for the US population ages 6 and over.

#### Participation Growth/Decline

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Participation Growth/Decline</th>
<th>Large Increase (greater than 20%)</th>
<th>Moderate Increase (0% to 20%)</th>
<th>Moderate Decrease (0% to -20%)</th>
<th>Flat/Decrease (less than -20%)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Core vs Casual Distribution</td>
<td>Mostly Core Participants (greater than 75%)</td>
<td>Mostly Casual Participants (50-74%)</td>
<td>Evens Divided (45-50% Core and Casual)</td>
<td>Mostly Casual Participants (less than 25%)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### General Fitness

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Activity</th>
<th>Participation Levels</th>
<th>% Change</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>2016</td>
<td>2020</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fitness Walking</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Casual (1-49 times)</td>
<td>107,895</td>
<td>114,044</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Core (50+ times)</td>
<td>34,535</td>
<td>34,742</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Treadmill</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Casual (1-49 times)</td>
<td>51,872</td>
<td>49,833</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Core (50+ times)</td>
<td>23,490</td>
<td>19,549</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Free Weights (Dumbbells/Hand Weights)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Casual (1-49 times)</td>
<td>51,513</td>
<td>53,256</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Core (50+ times)</td>
<td>38,245</td>
<td>20,070</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Running/Jogging</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Casual (1-49 times)</td>
<td>47,384</td>
<td>30,652</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Core (50+ times)</td>
<td>21,754</td>
<td>24,938</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Stationary Cycling (Recumbent/Upright)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Casual (1-49 times)</td>
<td>36,118</td>
<td>31,287</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Core (50+ times)</td>
<td>28,249</td>
<td>19,249</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Weight/Resistant Machines</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Casual (1-49 times)</td>
<td>35,768</td>
<td>30,651</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Core (50+ times)</td>
<td>14,346</td>
<td>10,940</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Elliptical Motion/Cross Trainer</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Casual (1-49 times)</td>
<td>37,218</td>
<td>27,920</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Core (50+ times)</td>
<td>15,667</td>
<td>14,403</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Yoga</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Casual (1-49 times)</td>
<td>26,258</td>
<td>32,808</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Core (50+ times)</td>
<td>15,468</td>
<td>19,953</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Free Weights (Barbells)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Casual (1-49 times)</td>
<td>20,792</td>
<td>15,471</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Core (50+ times)</td>
<td>10,344</td>
<td>13,428</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dance, Step, Choreographed Exercise</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Casual (1-49 times)</td>
<td>21,839</td>
<td>25,180</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Core (50+ times)</td>
<td>14,158</td>
<td>16,652</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bodyweight Exercise</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Casual (1-49 times)</td>
<td>7,081</td>
<td>8,507</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Core (50+ times)</td>
<td>2,119</td>
<td>22,845</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Aerobics (High Impact/Intensely Training)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Casual (1-49 times)</td>
<td>10,575</td>
<td>10,954</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Core (50+ times)</td>
<td>7,135</td>
<td>8,351</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Stair Climbing Machine</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Casual (1-49 times)</td>
<td>6,490</td>
<td>2,623</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Core (50+ times)</td>
<td>5,747</td>
<td>4,922</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cross-Training Style Workout</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Casual (1-49 times)</td>
<td>12,914</td>
<td>9,129</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Core (50+ times)</td>
<td>6,450</td>
<td>3,476</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**NOTE:** Participation figures are in 000s for the US population ages and over.
## GENERAL FITNESS (CONTINUED)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Activity</th>
<th>Participation Levels - General Fitness</th>
<th>% Change</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>2016</td>
<td>2020</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Trail Running</td>
<td>8,582</td>
<td>11,854</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Stationary Cycling (Group)</td>
<td>8,937</td>
<td>10,654</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Casual (1-49 times)</td>
<td>5,751</td>
<td>5,134</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Core (50+ times)</td>
<td>3,186</td>
<td>5,802</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Plates Training</td>
<td>8,893</td>
<td>9,995</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Casual (1-49 times)</td>
<td>5,575</td>
<td>6,648</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Core (50+ times)</td>
<td>3,317</td>
<td>3,347</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cardio Kickboxing</td>
<td>6,899</td>
<td>5,295</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Casual (1-49 times)</td>
<td>4,780</td>
<td>5,638</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Core (50+ times)</td>
<td>2,119</td>
<td>1,657</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Boot Camp Style Training</td>
<td>6,583</td>
<td>4,963</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Casual (1-49 times)</td>
<td>4,685</td>
<td>3,204</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Core (50+ times)</td>
<td>2,099</td>
<td>1,765</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Martial Arts</td>
<td>5,785</td>
<td>6,664</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Casual (1-12 times)</td>
<td>1,964</td>
<td>2,579</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Core (13+ times)</td>
<td>3,780</td>
<td>3,885</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Boxing for Fitness</td>
<td>5,175</td>
<td>5,230</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Casual (1-12 times)</td>
<td>2,679</td>
<td>2,962</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Core (13+ times)</td>
<td>2,496</td>
<td>2,268</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tai Chi</td>
<td>3,706</td>
<td>3,300</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Casual (1-49 times)</td>
<td>2,245</td>
<td>1,858</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Core (50+ times)</td>
<td>1,461</td>
<td>1,442</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Barre</td>
<td>3,329</td>
<td>3,579</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Casual (1-49 times)</td>
<td>2,630</td>
<td>2,721</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Core (50+ times)</td>
<td>695</td>
<td>858</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Triathlon (Traditional/Road)</td>
<td>2,574</td>
<td>1,846</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Triathlon (Non-Traditional/Off Road)</td>
<td>1,705</td>
<td>1,363</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**NOTE**: Participation figures are in DDF for the US population ages 6 and over.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Participation Growth/Decline</th>
<th>Growth (less than 25%)</th>
<th>Moderate Increase (25% to 50%)</th>
<th>Moderate Decline (51% to 75%)</th>
<th>Large Decline (76% or more)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Core vs Casual Distribution</td>
<td>Mostly Core Participants (growth 25% or more)</td>
<td>Mostly Core Participants (growth 25% to 50%)</td>
<td>Mostly Core Participants (growth 50% to 75%)</td>
<td>Mostly Casual Participants (growth 75% or more)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### OUTDOOR/ADVENTURE RECREATION

#### National Core vs Casual Participatory Trends - Outdoor / Adventure Recreation

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Activity</th>
<th>2016</th>
<th>2020</th>
<th>2021</th>
<th>Participation Levels</th>
<th>% Change</th>
<th>5-Year Trend</th>
<th>1-Year Trend</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>#</td>
<td>%</td>
<td>#</td>
<td>%</td>
<td>#</td>
<td>%</td>
<td>%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hiking (Day)</td>
<td>42,128</td>
<td>100%</td>
<td>57,808</td>
<td>100%</td>
<td>58,697</td>
<td>100%</td>
<td>19.3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bicycling (Road)</td>
<td>38,265</td>
<td>100%</td>
<td>44,471</td>
<td>100%</td>
<td>42,775</td>
<td>100%</td>
<td>11.5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Casual (1-25 times)</td>
<td>19,744</td>
<td>50%</td>
<td>23,730</td>
<td>53%</td>
<td>22,280</td>
<td>54%</td>
<td>15.8%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Core (25+ times)</td>
<td>19,121</td>
<td>50%</td>
<td>20,751</td>
<td>47%</td>
<td>20,495</td>
<td>48%</td>
<td>7.2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fishing (Freshwater)</td>
<td>38,121</td>
<td>100%</td>
<td>42,556</td>
<td>100%</td>
<td>40,853</td>
<td>100%</td>
<td>7.2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Casual (1-7 times)</td>
<td>20,308</td>
<td>53%</td>
<td>24,309</td>
<td>57%</td>
<td>22,451</td>
<td>55%</td>
<td>10.6%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Core (8+ times)</td>
<td>17,813</td>
<td>47%</td>
<td>18,247</td>
<td>43%</td>
<td>18,403</td>
<td>45%</td>
<td>5.3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Camping (&lt; 1/4 Mile of Vehicle/Home)</td>
<td>26,467</td>
<td>100%</td>
<td>30,682</td>
<td>100%</td>
<td>35,985</td>
<td>100%</td>
<td>30.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Casual (1-7 times)</td>
<td>8,719</td>
<td>55%</td>
<td>11,281</td>
<td>68%</td>
<td>9,888</td>
<td>59%</td>
<td>11.1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Core (8+ times)</td>
<td>7,158</td>
<td>45%</td>
<td>6,544</td>
<td>37%</td>
<td>6,838</td>
<td>41%</td>
<td>8.5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fishing (Saltwater)</td>
<td>12,266</td>
<td>100%</td>
<td>14,527</td>
<td>100%</td>
<td>13,790</td>
<td>100%</td>
<td>12.4%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Casual (1-7 times)</td>
<td>7,188</td>
<td>59%</td>
<td>9,109</td>
<td>63%</td>
<td>8,543</td>
<td>62%</td>
<td>18.7%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Core (8+ times)</td>
<td>5,078</td>
<td>41%</td>
<td>5,418</td>
<td>37%</td>
<td>5,246</td>
<td>38%</td>
<td>9.5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Birdwatching (&gt; 1/4 mile of Vehicle/Home)</td>
<td>11,589</td>
<td>100%</td>
<td>15,228</td>
<td>100%</td>
<td>14,815</td>
<td>100%</td>
<td>27.8%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Backpacking Overnight</td>
<td>10,151</td>
<td>100%</td>
<td>10,716</td>
<td>100%</td>
<td>10,306</td>
<td>100%</td>
<td>1.5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bicycling (Mountain)</td>
<td>8,915</td>
<td>100%</td>
<td>8,998</td>
<td>100%</td>
<td>8,693</td>
<td>100%</td>
<td>0.9%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Casual (1-12 times)</td>
<td>4,273</td>
<td>50%</td>
<td>4,838</td>
<td>53%</td>
<td>4,517</td>
<td>52%</td>
<td>9.7%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Core (13+ times)</td>
<td>4,642</td>
<td>50%</td>
<td>4,144</td>
<td>47%</td>
<td>4,175</td>
<td>48%</td>
<td>-3.8%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Archery</td>
<td>7,003</td>
<td>100%</td>
<td>7,249</td>
<td>100%</td>
<td>7,342</td>
<td>100%</td>
<td>-7.1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Casual (1-25 times)</td>
<td>6,850</td>
<td>84%</td>
<td>6,102</td>
<td>84%</td>
<td>6,056</td>
<td>82%</td>
<td>-9.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Core (25+ times)</td>
<td>1,153</td>
<td>16%</td>
<td>1,147</td>
<td>16%</td>
<td>1,288</td>
<td>18%</td>
<td>2.8%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fishing (Fly)</td>
<td>6,456</td>
<td>100%</td>
<td>7,753</td>
<td>100%</td>
<td>7,458</td>
<td>100%</td>
<td>15.5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Casual (1-7 times)</td>
<td>4,183</td>
<td>65%</td>
<td>5,200</td>
<td>65%</td>
<td>4,762</td>
<td>64%</td>
<td>15.9%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Core (8+ times)</td>
<td>2,273</td>
<td>35%</td>
<td>2,733</td>
<td>35%</td>
<td>2,696</td>
<td>36%</td>
<td>18.6%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Skateboarding</td>
<td>6,942</td>
<td>100%</td>
<td>8,872</td>
<td>100%</td>
<td>8,747</td>
<td>100%</td>
<td>25.8%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Casual (1-25 times)</td>
<td>3,955</td>
<td>61%</td>
<td>6,315</td>
<td>71%</td>
<td>6,181</td>
<td>71%</td>
<td>15.9%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Core (25+ times)</td>
<td>2,487</td>
<td>39%</td>
<td>2,557</td>
<td>29%</td>
<td>2,566</td>
<td>29%</td>
<td>3.2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Climbing (Indoor)</td>
<td>n/a</td>
<td>n/a</td>
<td>5,535</td>
<td>100%</td>
<td>5,684</td>
<td>100%</td>
<td>n/a</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Roller Skating (In-Line)</td>
<td>5,381</td>
<td>100%</td>
<td>4,892</td>
<td>100%</td>
<td>4,940</td>
<td>100%</td>
<td>-8.2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Casual (1-12 times)</td>
<td>3,891</td>
<td>72%</td>
<td>3,186</td>
<td>71%</td>
<td>3,525</td>
<td>71%</td>
<td>-8.7%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Core (13+ times)</td>
<td>1,520</td>
<td>28%</td>
<td>1,425</td>
<td>29%</td>
<td>1,415</td>
<td>29%</td>
<td>-0.9%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bicycling (BMX)</td>
<td>3,104</td>
<td>100%</td>
<td>3,880</td>
<td>100%</td>
<td>3,861</td>
<td>100%</td>
<td>24.4%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Casual (1-12 times)</td>
<td>1,760</td>
<td>57%</td>
<td>2,532</td>
<td>65%</td>
<td>2,466</td>
<td>64%</td>
<td>40.1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Core (13+ times)</td>
<td>1,344</td>
<td>43%</td>
<td>1,348</td>
<td>35%</td>
<td>1,396</td>
<td>36%</td>
<td>3.9%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Climbing (Traditional/Ice/Mountaineering)</td>
<td>2,290</td>
<td>100%</td>
<td>2,156</td>
<td>100%</td>
<td>2,379</td>
<td>100%</td>
<td>-14.9%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Climbing (Sport/Bouldering)</td>
<td>n/a</td>
<td>n/a</td>
<td>2,290</td>
<td>100%</td>
<td>2,301</td>
<td>100%</td>
<td>n/a</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Adventure Racing</td>
<td>2,799</td>
<td>100%</td>
<td>1,866</td>
<td>100%</td>
<td>1,826</td>
<td>100%</td>
<td>-19.1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Casual (1 times)</td>
<td>1,081</td>
<td>36%</td>
<td>328</td>
<td>17%</td>
<td>312</td>
<td>17%</td>
<td>-31.6%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Core (2+ times)</td>
<td>1,918</td>
<td>64%</td>
<td>1,538</td>
<td>83%</td>
<td>1,514</td>
<td>83%</td>
<td>-2.1%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**NOTE:** Participation figures are in 000’s for the US population ages 6 and over.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Participation Growth/Decline</th>
<th>Large Increase (greater than 5%)</th>
<th>Moderate Increase (9% to 3%)</th>
<th>Moderate Decline (9% to 3%)</th>
<th>Large Decline (greater than 5%)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Core vs Casual Distribution</td>
<td>Mostly Core Participants (greater than 75%)</td>
<td>More Casual Participants (45-74%)</td>
<td>Equally Divided (65-10% Core and Casual)</td>
<td>Mostly Casual Participants (65-79%)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

ELGIN PARKS AND RECREATION
## AQUATICS

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Activity</th>
<th>2016</th>
<th>2020</th>
<th>2021</th>
<th>5-Year Trend</th>
<th>1-Year Trend</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Swimming (Fitness)</td>
<td>26,601</td>
<td>100%</td>
<td>25,666</td>
<td>100%</td>
<td>-3.7%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Casual (1-49 times)</td>
<td>17,781</td>
<td>67%</td>
<td>17,987</td>
<td>70%</td>
<td>-1.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Core (50+ times)</td>
<td>8,820</td>
<td>33%</td>
<td>7,660</td>
<td>30%</td>
<td>-9.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Aquatic Exercise</td>
<td>10,575</td>
<td>100%</td>
<td>10,954</td>
<td>100%</td>
<td>-1.7%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Casual (1-49 times)</td>
<td>7,135</td>
<td>67%</td>
<td>8,381</td>
<td>76%</td>
<td>17.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Core (50+ times)</td>
<td>3,440</td>
<td>33%</td>
<td>2,583</td>
<td>24%</td>
<td>-30.8%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Swimming (Competition)</td>
<td>5,369</td>
<td>100%</td>
<td>2,615</td>
<td>100%</td>
<td>-16.2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Casual (1-49 times)</td>
<td>1,881</td>
<td>56%</td>
<td>1,524</td>
<td>58%</td>
<td>-9.2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Core (50+ times)</td>
<td>1,488</td>
<td>44%</td>
<td>1,081</td>
<td>42%</td>
<td>-25.0%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**NOTE:** Participation figures are in 000's for the US population ages 6 and over.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Participation Growth/Decline</th>
<th>Large Increase (greater than 25%)</th>
<th>Moderate Increase (9% to 25%)</th>
<th>Moderate Decrease (-9% to -25%)</th>
<th>Large Decrease (less than -25%)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Core vs Casual Distribution</td>
<td>Mostly Core Participants (65-79%)</td>
<td>More Casual Participants (50-64%)</td>
<td>Evenly Divided (45-55% Core and Casual)</td>
<td>Mostly Casual Participants (greater than 70%)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
# WATER SPORTS/ACTIVITIES

## National Core vs Casual Participatory Trends - Water Sports / Activities

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Activity</th>
<th>Participation Levels</th>
<th>% Change</th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>2016</td>
<td>2020</td>
<td>2021</td>
<td>#</td>
<td>%</td>
<td>#</td>
<td>%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kayaking (Recreational)</td>
<td>10,017</td>
<td>100%</td>
<td>13,002</td>
<td>100%</td>
<td>13,351</td>
<td>100%</td>
<td>33.3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Canoeing</td>
<td>10,046</td>
<td>100%</td>
<td>9,595</td>
<td>100%</td>
<td>9,199</td>
<td>100%</td>
<td>-4.4%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Snorkeling</td>
<td>8,717</td>
<td>100%</td>
<td>7,293</td>
<td>100%</td>
<td>7,316</td>
<td>100%</td>
<td>-16.1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Casual (1-7 times)</strong></td>
<td>6,984</td>
<td>80%</td>
<td>6,374</td>
<td>82%</td>
<td>5,989</td>
<td>82%</td>
<td>-6.9%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Core (8+ times)</strong></td>
<td>1,773</td>
<td>20%</td>
<td>1,355</td>
<td>18%</td>
<td>1,326</td>
<td>18%</td>
<td>-25.2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jet Skiing</td>
<td>5,783</td>
<td>100%</td>
<td>4,900</td>
<td>100%</td>
<td>5,062</td>
<td>100%</td>
<td>-12.5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Casual (1-7 times)</strong></td>
<td>4,134</td>
<td>72%</td>
<td>3,873</td>
<td>77%</td>
<td>3,780</td>
<td>75%</td>
<td>-8.8%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Core (8+ times)</strong></td>
<td>1,640</td>
<td>28%</td>
<td>1,116</td>
<td>23%</td>
<td>1,281</td>
<td>25%</td>
<td>-21.9%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sailing</td>
<td>4,095</td>
<td>100%</td>
<td>3,486</td>
<td>100%</td>
<td>3,463</td>
<td>100%</td>
<td>-15.4%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Casual (1-7 times)</strong></td>
<td>2,833</td>
<td>69%</td>
<td>2,395</td>
<td>69%</td>
<td>2,418</td>
<td>70%</td>
<td>-14.6%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Core (8+ times)</strong></td>
<td>1,262</td>
<td>31%</td>
<td>1,091</td>
<td>31%</td>
<td>1,045</td>
<td>30%</td>
<td>-17.2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Stand-Up Paddling</td>
<td>3,220</td>
<td>100%</td>
<td>3,675</td>
<td>100%</td>
<td>3,739</td>
<td>100%</td>
<td>16.1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rafting</td>
<td>3,428</td>
<td>100%</td>
<td>3,474</td>
<td>100%</td>
<td>3,383</td>
<td>100%</td>
<td>-1.3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Water Skiing</td>
<td>3,700</td>
<td>100%</td>
<td>3,050</td>
<td>100%</td>
<td>3,058</td>
<td>100%</td>
<td>-17.4%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Casual (1-7 times)</strong></td>
<td>2,667</td>
<td>72%</td>
<td>2,189</td>
<td>72%</td>
<td>2,209</td>
<td>72%</td>
<td>-17.2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Core (8+ times)</strong></td>
<td>1,033</td>
<td>28%</td>
<td>861</td>
<td>28%</td>
<td>849</td>
<td>28%</td>
<td>-17.8%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Surfing</td>
<td>2,783</td>
<td>100%</td>
<td>3,800</td>
<td>100%</td>
<td>3,463</td>
<td>100%</td>
<td>24.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Casual (1-7 times)</strong></td>
<td>1,768</td>
<td>63%</td>
<td>2,507</td>
<td>66%</td>
<td>2,158</td>
<td>62%</td>
<td>22.1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Core (8+ times)</strong></td>
<td>1,024</td>
<td>37%</td>
<td>1,293</td>
<td>34%</td>
<td>1,305</td>
<td>38%</td>
<td>-27.4%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wakeboarding</td>
<td>2,912</td>
<td>100%</td>
<td>2,754</td>
<td>100%</td>
<td>2,674</td>
<td>100%</td>
<td>-3.2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Casual (1-7 times)</strong></td>
<td>2,017</td>
<td>69%</td>
<td>2,007</td>
<td>73%</td>
<td>1,902</td>
<td>71%</td>
<td>-5.7%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Core (8+ times)</strong></td>
<td>895</td>
<td>31%</td>
<td>747</td>
<td>27%</td>
<td>772</td>
<td>29%</td>
<td>-13.2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Scuba Diving</td>
<td>3,111</td>
<td>100%</td>
<td>2,588</td>
<td>100%</td>
<td>2,476</td>
<td>100%</td>
<td>-20.4%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Casual (1-7 times)</strong></td>
<td>2,952</td>
<td>74%</td>
<td>1,860</td>
<td>73%</td>
<td>1,795</td>
<td>72%</td>
<td>-21.7%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Core (8+ times)</strong></td>
<td>819</td>
<td>26%</td>
<td>708</td>
<td>27%</td>
<td>680</td>
<td>27%</td>
<td>-17.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kayaking (Sea/Touring)</td>
<td>3,124</td>
<td>100%</td>
<td>2,508</td>
<td>100%</td>
<td>2,587</td>
<td>100%</td>
<td>-17.2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kayaking (White Water)</td>
<td>2,552</td>
<td>100%</td>
<td>2,605</td>
<td>100%</td>
<td>2,587</td>
<td>100%</td>
<td>1.4%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Boardsailing/Windsurfing</td>
<td>1,737</td>
<td>100%</td>
<td>1,268</td>
<td>100%</td>
<td>1,297</td>
<td>100%</td>
<td>-25.3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Casual (1-7 times)</strong></td>
<td>1,449</td>
<td>83%</td>
<td>1,015</td>
<td>80%</td>
<td>1,002</td>
<td>77%</td>
<td>-10.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Core (8+ times)</strong></td>
<td>288</td>
<td>17%</td>
<td>253</td>
<td>20%</td>
<td>295</td>
<td>23%</td>
<td>2.4%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**NOTE:** Participation figures are in 000's for the US population ages 6 and over.

## Participation Growth/Decline

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Participation Growth/Decline</th>
<th>Large Increase (greater than 25%)</th>
<th>Moderate Increase (6% to 25%)</th>
<th>Moderate Decrease (0% to 25%)</th>
<th>Large Decrease (less than 25%)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

## Core vs Casual Distribution

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Core vs Casual Distribution</th>
<th>Mostly Core Participants (greater than 75%)</th>
<th>Mostly Casual Participants (56-74%)</th>
<th>Nearly Balanced (55-59%, Core and Casual)</th>
<th>Mostly Casual Participants (56-74%)</th>
<th>Mostly Casual Participants (greater than 75%)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

---

**APPENDIX F**

---
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RECREATION PROGRAM ASSESSMENT

A document assessing the recreational services
offered by the Elgin Parks and Recreation Department
while offering opportunities for future programs and
improvements.
CHAPTER ONE – RECREATION PROGRAM ASSESSMENT

1.1 OVERVIEW

1.1.1 INTRODUCTION

As part of the City of Elgin Parks and Recreation Master Plan, the consulting team conducted a Recreation Program Assessment of the recreational services offered by the City’s Parks and Recreation Department (“Department”). The assessment offers an in-depth perspective of programs and services offered by the Department to identify strengths, challenges, and opportunities regarding their programming. The assessment also assists in identifying core programs, program gaps that exist, key system-wide issues, areas for improvement, and future programs and services residents and visitors would like.

The consulting team based these program findings and comments from a review of information provided by the Department including program descriptions, financial data, website content, and discussions with staff. This report addresses the program offerings from a systems perspective from the entire portfolio of programs.

1.1.2 FRAMEWORK

The Department provides a broad range of recreation and leisure programming for all ages. These program offerings are supported with dedicated spaces which include: neighborhood parks, community parks, regional parks, and special use facilities such as the Edward Schock Centre, Lords and Wing Park Family Aquatic Centers, Bowes Creek Country Club, the Highlands and Wing Park Golf Courses, Hawthorne Hill Nature Center, Eastside Recreation Center, Elgin Sports Complex, and Lord’s Park Pavilion. See the Level of Service Analysis for a complete inventory of all recreational facilities.

1.1.1 PROGRAM ASSESSMENT OVERVIEW

Overall observations include:

- The Core Program Areas are well-rounded and meet many community needs.
- Program descriptions/goals effectively communicate the key benefits and desired outcomes of each Core Program Area.
- Current programs seem to be aligned with the community’s age profile. The Department serves every age segment as a primary audience with some form of programming.
- The Lifecycle Analysis depicts a generally healthy program distribution that approaches the best practice recommendation, with a slight favor towards programs that are in the mature, saturation, or decline lifecycle stages.
- Cost recovery is tracked for most Core Program Areas, and cost recovery rates generally exceed departmental goals.
- Several different pricing strategies are used, with some Core Program Areas utilizing many different strategies. Opportunities may exist to broaden the use of these strategies across all Core Program Areas.
- A broad array of marketing and communication methods are used. Some additional resources may be available at the City level (e.g., direct mail, YouTube).
- Currently the Department uses multiple survey-based methods for gathering public input and
feedback in terms of recreation programs. There is an opportunity to broaden this, however the Department appears to do a good job of volunteer tracking. This should be continued across all Core Program areas.

- Management of partnerships is generally strong, but some variation exists across Core Program Areas. The identification and documentation of outcomes could be improved for consistency and memorialized in partnership policies agreements throughout the agency.

1.2 CORE PROGRAM AREAS

To help achieve the Department’s mission, it is important to identify Core Program Areas based on current and future needs to create a sense of focus around specific program areas of greatest importance to the community. Public recreation is challenged by the premise of being all things to all people. The philosophy of the Core Program Area is to assist staff, policy makers, and the public to focus on what is most important to the community. Program areas are considered as Core if they meet a majority of the following criteria:

- The program area has been provided for a long period of time (over 4-5 years) and/or is expected by the community.
- The program area consumes a relatively large portion (5% or more) of the agency’s overall budget.
- The program area is offered 3-4 seasons per year.
- The program area has wide demographic appeal.
- There is a tiered level of skill development available within the program area’s offerings.
- There is full-time staff responsible for the program area.
- There are facilities designed specifically to support the program area.
- The agency controls a significant percentage (20% or more) of the local market.

### 1.2.1 EXISTING CORE PROGRAM AREAS

In discussions with the Department staff, seven Core Program Areas were identified that are currently being offered.

**Figure 1: Core Program Areas**
### 1.2.2 CORE PROGRAM AREA DESCRIPTIONS, GOALS, & EXAMPLE PROGRAMS

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Core Program Area</th>
<th>Description</th>
<th>Goals</th>
<th>Example Programs</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| Aquatics                  | Exercise, fitness, wellness activities and education to promote healthy lifestyles for all ages. | Provide programs and facilities for all age segments to have a measurable positive impact on physical and mental health for the community. | • Swimming Lessons  
• Water Aerobics  
• Lifeguard classes  
• Swim Team |
| Athletics                  | Participants learn skills and drills of sports promoting active lifestyle and healthy relationship to athletics with low competitive attitude and focus on teamwork. Young children learn hand-eye coordination with fun games that assist with physical development. Participants can utilize skills into adulthood in our leagues. | Provide introduction of athletics to youth and adults in a positive environment. Encourage participation in active programming to future the mission of offering activities to residents that promote health and wellness. | • Pickleball  
• Youth Soccer  
• Martial Arts  
• Tee Ball |
| Community Recreation      | Program opportunities in arts, creativity, nature, and education allowing the community to explore new hobbies and learn new skills. | Provide experiences and community gathering opportunities around shared interests at low or no cost to the participant. These options facilitate building community and fostering wellness so that people served by the city can find a recreational option suitable and accessible to them. | • Special Events  
• Nature  
• Cultural Arts  
• Drop-In Playgrounds |
| Early Childhood Programs  | Early childhood programs designed for ages 6 months to 6 years, to encourage early learning and socialization. | Provide introduction of athletics to youth and adults in a positive environment. Encourage participation in active programming to further the mission of offering activities to residents that promote health and wellness. | • Early Childhood Classes  
• Discovery Camps |
| Facility Rentals | Provide space for our community for events, tournaments, and parties | Provide experiences and community gathering opportunities around shared interests at low or no cost to the participant. These options facilitate building community and fostering wellness so that all people served by the city can find a recreational option suitable and accessible to them. | - Hawthorne Hill Nature Center  
- Pavilion at Lords Park  
- Heritage Ballroom  
- Elgin Sports Complex  
- Adventure Island  
- Wing Park Family Aquatic Center  
- Edward Schock Centre of Elgin Meeting Rooms |
| Health & Wellness | Exercise, fitness, and wellness activities as well as educational programs to promote healthy lifestyles for all ages. | Enhance the quality of life in the communities served by providing high quality fitness facilities, programs & products that instill the value of health and wellness. | - Group Fitness  
- Memberships |
| School Age Programs | Youth programs designed for ages 6 to 12 years, encourage, and promote competency-building, social, and life skills, academic improvement, motivation, and overall community involvement | To serve residents by offering innovative programming, premier camps, and create an innovative path for leadership development within the community. | - Homeschool Gym and Swim  
- Dance  
- Before and After School programs  
- Kids Day Off  
- Winter and Spring Break |
1.3 PROGRAM STRATEGY ANALYSIS

### 1.3.1 AGE SEGMENT ANALYSIS

The table below depicts each Core Program Area and the most prominent age segments they serve. Recognizing that many Core Program Areas serve multiple age segments, Primary (noted with a ‘P’) and Secondary (noted with an ‘S’) markets are identified. Areas that serve age segments in both a Primary and Secondary way are noted with ‘P/S.’

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Core Program Area</th>
<th>Preschool (5 &amp; under)</th>
<th>Elementary (6-12)</th>
<th>Teens (13-17)</th>
<th>Adult (18+)</th>
<th>Senior (55+)</th>
<th>All Ages Programs</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Aquatics</td>
<td>P</td>
<td>P</td>
<td>P</td>
<td>S</td>
<td>P/S</td>
<td>P</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Athletics</td>
<td>S</td>
<td>P</td>
<td>P</td>
<td>P</td>
<td>P/S</td>
<td>P/S</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Community Recreation</td>
<td>S</td>
<td>P/S</td>
<td>S</td>
<td>P/S</td>
<td>S</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Early Childhood</td>
<td>P</td>
<td>S</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>S</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Facility Rentals</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>P</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Health &amp; Wellness</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>S</td>
<td>P</td>
<td>P</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>School Age</td>
<td>S</td>
<td>P</td>
<td>S</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Figure 1: Program Priority by Age Segment

For this report, an Age Segment Analysis was completed by Core Program Areas, exhibiting an overarching view of the age segments served by different program areas, and displaying any gaps in segments served. It is also useful to perform an Age Segment Analysis by individual programs, in order to gain a more nuanced view of the data.

The Department serves every age segment as a primary audience with some form of programming and every age segment is served by multiple core program areas.

The staff should continue to monitor demographic shifts and program offerings to ensure that the needs of each age group are being met. It would be best practice to establish a plan including what age segment to target, establish the message, which marketing method(s) to use, create the social media campaign, and determine what to measure for success before allocating resources towards a particular effort.
1.3.2 PROGRAM LIFECYCLE

A Program Lifecycle Analysis involves reviewing each program offered by the Department to determine the stage of growth or decline for each. This provides a way of making strategic decisions about the overall mix of programs managed by the agency to ensure that an appropriate number of programs are “fresh” and that relatively few programs, if any, need to be discontinued. This analysis is not based on strict quantitative data, but rather, is based on staff members’ knowledge of their programs. The following table shows the percentage distribution of the various lifecycle categories of the City’s programs. These percentages were obtained by comparing the number of programs in each individual stage with the total number of programs listed by staff members.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Lifecycle</th>
<th>Description</th>
<th>Actual Programs Distribution</th>
<th>Recommended Distribution</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Introduction</td>
<td>New Programs; modest participation</td>
<td>16%</td>
<td>47%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Take-Off</td>
<td>Rapid participation growth</td>
<td>4%</td>
<td>50%-60% Total</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Growth</td>
<td>Moderate, but consistent participation growth</td>
<td>27%</td>
<td>41%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mature</td>
<td>Slow participation growth</td>
<td>41%</td>
<td>40%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Saturation</td>
<td>Minimal to no participation growth; extreme competition</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>12%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Decline</td>
<td>Declining participation</td>
<td>12%</td>
<td>0-10% Total</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The Lifecycle Analysis depicts a generally healthy program distribution that approaches the best practice recommendation. Approximately 47% of all programs fall within the beginning stages (Introduction, Take-Off, & Growth). It is recommended to have 50-60% of all programs within these beginning stages because it provides the Department with an avenue to energize its programmatic offerings. These stages ensure the pipeline for new programs is there prior to programs transitioning into the Mature Stage.

According to staff, 41% of all program offerings fall into the Mature Stage. This stage anchors a program portfolio and it is recommended to have 40% of programs within the Mature category in order to achieve a stable foundation.

Additionally, 12% of programs are identified as Saturated or Declining. It is a natural progression for programs to eventually evolve into saturation and decline stages. However, if programs reach these stages rapidly, it could be an indication that the quality of the programs does not meet expectations, or there is not as much of a demand for the programs. As programs enter into the Decline Stage, they must be closely reviewed and evaluated for repositioning or elimination. When this occurs, the Department should modify these programs to begin a new lifecycle within the Introductory Stage or replace the existing programs with new programs based upon community needs and trends.

The staff should complete a Program Lifecycle Analysis on an annual basis and ensure that the percentage distribution closely aligns with desired performance. Furthermore, the Department could include annual performance measures for each Core Program Area to track participation growth, customer retention, and percentage of new programs as an incentive for innovation and alignment with community trends.
1.3.3 PROGRAM CLASSIFICATION

Conducting a classification of services analysis informs how each program serves the overall organization mission, the goals and objectives of each Core Program Area, and how the program should be funded regarding tax dollars and/or user fees and charges. How a program is classified can help to determine the most appropriate management, funding, and marketing strategies.

Program classifications are based on the degree to which the program provides a public benefit versus a private benefit. Public benefit can be described as everyone receiving the same level of benefit with equal access, whereas private benefit can be described as the user receiving exclusive benefit above what a general taxpayer receives for their personal benefit.

For this exercise, the Department used a classification method based on three categories: Essential Services, Important Services, and Value-Added Services. Where a program or service is classified depends upon alignment with the organizational mission, how the public perceives a program, legal mandates, financial sustainability, personal benefit, competition in the marketplace, and access by participants.

**Value Added Services**

*Could Provide:* With additional resources, they add value to the community. They support essential and important services to the community, generate income and have individual benefits. They can be supported by user fees, enhance the community, and require little to no subsidy.

**Important Services**

*Should Provide:* They expand and enhance core services, are broadly supported and used, and have conditional public support. They have an economic / social / environmental outcome for the community, have community importance, and need moderate subsidy.

**Essential Services**

*Must Provide:* They protect assets and infrastructure, are expected and supported, have a sound investment of public funds, and have a broad public benefit. There is a negative impact if they are not provided, are a part of the mission, and need significant assistance or complete subsidy support. If they cannot otherwise be subsidized by traditional revenues, other forms of subsidies (e.g., scholarships) may be used.
The following graphic describes the proportion of each type of service.

**Program Classification Distribution**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Essential</th>
<th>Important</th>
<th>Value-Added</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>30%</td>
<td>41%</td>
<td>30%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Figure 3: Program Classifications Distribution

With assistance from staff, a classification of programs and services was conducted for all of the recreation programs offered by the Department. The results presented in the following table represent the current classification distribution of recreation program services. Programs should be assigned cost recovery goal ranges within those overall categories. A full program list organized by Core Program Areas can be found in **APPENDIX A**.

As the Department continues to evolve and better meet the community’s needs, there could be an added benefit to managing the services if they all were classified according to the Cost Recovery Model for Sustainable Services as depicted below in **Figure 5**.

---

**Individual Benefit**: exclusive benefit received by individuals and not the general public; individual pays at least 80% of the cost of service

- 100%+

**Considerable Individual Benefit**: nearly all benefit received by individuals, benefit to community in a narrow sense

- 70%-100%

**Balanced Community & Individual Benefit**: benefits accrued to both individual and general public interests, but to a significant individual advantage

- 50%-70%

**Considerable Community Benefit**: Recreation services benefits accrued to both the general public and individual interests, but to a significant community advantage

- 20%-50%

**Community Benefit**: Recreation services to be accessible and of benefit to all, supported wholly or significantly by tax dollars

- 0%+
Given the broad range of cost recovery goals, it would be helpful to further distribute programs internally within sub-ranges of cost recovery as depicted in the previous Figure 5. This will allow for programs to fall within an overall service classification tier while still demonstrating a difference in expected/desired cost recovery goals based on a greater understanding of the program’s goals (e.g., Pure Community services versus Mostly Community Services or Community and Individual Mix versus Mostly Individual Mix).

### 1.3.4 COST-OF-SERVICE & COST RECOVERY

Cost recovery targets should at least be identified for each Core Program Area at a minimum, and for specific programs or events when realistic. The previously identified Core Program Areas would serve as an effective breakdown for tracking cost recovery metrics including administrative costs. Theoretically, staff should review how programs are grouped for similar cost recovery and subsidy goals to determine if current practices still meet management outcomes.

Determining cost recovery performance and using it to make informed pricing decisions involves a three-step process:

1. Classify all programs and services based on the public or private benefit they provide (as completed in the previous section).
2. Conduct a Cost-of-Service Analysis to calculate the full cost of each program.
3. Establish a cost recovery percentage, through Department policy, for each program or program type based on the outcomes of the previous two steps and adjust program prices accordingly.

The following section provides more details on steps 2 & 3.

**UNDERSTANDING THE FULL COST-OF-SERVICE**

To develop specific cost recovery targets, full cost of accounting needs to be created for each class or program that accurately calculates direct and indirect costs. Cost recovery goals are established once these numbers are in place, and the Department’s program staff should be trained on this process. A Cost-of-Service Analysis should be conducted on each program, or program type, that accurately calculates direct (i.e., program-specific) and indirect (i.e., comprehensive, including administrative overhead) costs. Completing a Cost-of-Service Analysis not only helps determine the true and full cost of offering a program, but it also provides information that can be used to price programs based upon accurate delivery costs. **Figure 6** illustrates the common types of costs that must be accounted for in a Cost-of-Service Analysis.

![Figure 6: Cost-of-Service Analysis](image)
The methodology for determining the total Cost-of-Service involves calculating the total cost for the activity, program, or service, then calculating the total revenue earned for that activity. Costs (and revenue) can also be derived on a per unit basis. Program or activity units may include:

- Number of participants
- Number of tasks performed
- Number of consumable units
- Number of service calls
- Number of events
- Required time for offering program/service

Agencies use Cost-of-Service Analysis to determine what financial resources are required to provide specific programs at specific levels of service. Results are used to determine and track cost recovery as well as to benchmark different programs against one another. Cost recovery goals are established once Cost-of-Service totals have been calculated. The Program staff should be trained in the process of conducting a Cost-of-Service Analysis and it should be completed on a regular basis.

CURRENT COST RECOVERY

The Department currently tracks cost recovery on a per program basis for most of their recreational offerings. This is a best practice and should continue to be calculated and tracked annually to help ensure goals are being met. Figure 7 provides the actual cost recovery ranges for each Core Program Area.

Overall, the Department has a cost recovery goal of 120%. Actual cost recovery averages 135% above the Department’s goal.

The Core Program Area with the greatest average cost recovery is Facility Rentals (167%). The Area with the lowest average is Health & Wellness (85%).

It is recommended that the Department not only track actual cost recovery but set cost recovery goals at the start of each year. This will allow the Department to benchmark itself against its goal year over year.

As shown in the table, actual cost recovery can vary based on the Core Program Area. Several variables can influence the cost recovery target, including lifecycle stage, demographic served, and perhaps most important, program classification.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Core Program Area</th>
<th>Cost Recovery Goal</th>
<th>Actual Cost Recovery</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Aquatics</td>
<td>120%</td>
<td>Min: 0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Max: 193%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Avg: 120%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Athletics</td>
<td>120%</td>
<td>Min: 130%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Max: 180%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Avg: 157%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Community Recreation</td>
<td>120%</td>
<td>Min: 49%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Max: 134%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Avg: 103%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Early Childhood</td>
<td>120%</td>
<td>Min: 0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Max: 164%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Avg: 116%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Facility Rentals</td>
<td>120%</td>
<td>Min: 120%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Max: 200%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Avg: 167%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Health &amp; Wellness</td>
<td>120%</td>
<td>Min: 0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Max: 135%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Avg: 85%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>School Age</td>
<td>120%</td>
<td>Min: 113%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Max: 157%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Avg: 137%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>OVERALL</td>
<td>120%</td>
<td>Avg: 135%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Figure 7: Cost Recovery by Core Program Area
COST RECOVERY BEST PRACTICES

Cost recovery targets should reflect the degree to which a program provides a public versus individual good. Programs providing public benefits (i.e., Essential programs) should be subsidized more by the Department; programs providing individual benefits (e.g., Value-Added programs) should seek to recover costs and/or generate revenue for other services. To help plan and implement cost recovery policies, the consulting team has developed the following definitions to help classify specific programs within program areas.

- **Essential** programs category is critical to achieving the organizational mission and providing community-wide benefits and therefore, generally receive priority for tax-dollar subsidization.
- **Important or Value-Added** program classifications generally represent programs that receive lower priority for subsidization.
  - Important programs contribute to the organizational mission but are not essential to it; therefore, cost recovery for these programs should be high (i.e., at least 80% overall).
  - Value-Added programs are not critical to the mission and should be prevented from drawing upon limited public funding, so overall cost recovery for these programs should be near or in excess of 100%.

1.3.5 PRICING

Pricing strategies are one mechanism agencies can use to influence cost recovery. As shown in Figure 8, a variety of pricing strategies are used across Core Program Areas.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Core Program Area</th>
<th>Age Segment</th>
<th>Family/ Household Status</th>
<th>Residency</th>
<th>Weekday/ Weekend</th>
<th>Prime / Non-Prime Time</th>
<th>Group Discounts</th>
<th>By Location</th>
<th>By Competition (Market Rate)</th>
<th>By Cost Recovery Goals</th>
<th>By Customer’s Ability to Pay</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Aquatics</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Athletics</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Community Rec</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Early Childhood</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Facility Rentals</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Health &amp; Wellness</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>School Age</td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Figure 8: Cost Recovery by Core Program Area
Of the ten pricing strategies assessed, Aquatics uses the most (7) and Athletics uses the least (4). Moving forward, the Department should consider implementing some additional strategies, when deemed appropriate. Additionally, applying weekday/weekend rates and prime/non-prime time rates should be evaluated. These under-utilized pricing strategies may help stabilize usage patterns and help with cost recovery for higher quality amenities and services.

The staff should continue monitoring the effectiveness of the various pricing strategies they employ and adjust as needed. It is also important to continue monitoring for yearly competitor and other service providers (e.g., similar providers).

1.3.6 PROGRAM STRATEGY RECOMMENDATIONS
In general, the Department program staff should continue the cycle of evaluating programs on both individual merit as well as the program mix as a whole. This can be completed at one time on an annual basis, or in segments at key seasonal points of the year as long as each program is checked once per year. The following tools and strategies can help facilitate this evaluation process.

MINI BUSINESS PLANS
The consulting team recommends that Mini Business Plans (2-3 pages) for each Core Program Area be updated on a yearly basis. These plans should evaluate the Core Program Area based on meeting the outcomes desired for participants, cost recovery, percentage of the market and business controls, Cost-of-Service, pricing strategy for the next year, and marketing strategies that are to be implemented. If developed regularly and consistently, they can be effective tools for budget construction and the justification processes in addition to use as marketing and communication tools.

PROGRAM DEVELOPMENT & DECISION-MAKING MATRIX
When developing program plans and strategies, it is useful to consider all of the Core Program Areas and individual program analysis discussed in this Program Assessment. Lifecycle, Age Segment, Classification, and Cost Recovery Goals should all be tracked, and this information along with the latest demographic trends and community input should be factors that lead to program decision-making. Community input can help the staff focus on specific program areas to develop new opportunities in what group of citizens to target, including the best marketing methods to use.

A simple and easy-to-use tool similar to Figure 9 below will help compare programs and prioritize resources by using multiple data points, rather than relying solely on cost recovery. In addition, this analysis will help staff make an informed and objective case to the public when a program is in decline, enjoyed by a

---

![Figure 9: Mini Business Plan Examples](image-url)
few, yet it is retired.

If the program/service is determined to have strong priority, appropriate cost recovery, good age segment appeal, good partnership potential, and strong market conditions, the next step is to determine the marketing methods by completing a similar exercise similar to the one below.

**PROGRAM EVALUATION CYCLE (WITH LIFECYCLE STAGES)**

Using the Age Segment and Lifecycle analysis and other established criteria, the program staff should evaluate programs on an annual basis to determine the program mix. This can be incorporated into the Program Operating/Business Plan process. A diagram of the program evaluation cycle and program lifecycle is found in **Figure 10**. During the introductory stages, the program staff should establish program goals, design program scenarios and components, and develop the program operating/business plan. Regular program evaluations will help determine the future of a program.

If participation levels are still growing, continue to provide the program. When participation growth is slowing (or non-existent) or competition increases, staff should look at modifying and re-energize the program to encourage the customers to participate. When program participation is consistently declining, staff should terminate the program and replace it with a new program based on the public’s priority ranking and/or the activity areas that are trending nationally/regionally/locally while taking into consideration the anticipated local participation percentage.

![Figure 40: Evaluation Cycle with Program Lifecycle Logic Matrix](image-url)
1.4 MARKETING, VOLUNTEERS, AND PARTNERSHIPS

1.4.1 CURRENT RECREATION MARKETING AND COMMUNICATIONS
The Department’s current marketing efforts utilize several communication methods to connect with residents including:

- Printed Program Guides
- Online Program Guides,
- Website
- Mobile-Friendly Website
- Mobile App
- Flyers/ Brochures
- Direct Mail
- Email Blasts and/ or Listserv
- Public Service Announcements (PSAs)
- Road signs/ marquees
- Paid Advertisements
- Radio Advertisements
- Online Newsletters
- In-Facility Signage
- Facebook
- Instagram
- Twitter

Effective communication strategies require striking an appropriate balance between the content and the volume of messaging, while utilizing the “right” methods of delivery. The Department has a broad distribution of delivery methods for promoting programs. It is imperative to continue updating the Department’s marketing strategy annually to provide information for community needs, demographics, and recreation trends.

An effective marketing plan must be an ongoing process and integrated with supporting plans and directly coordinate with the organization’s priorities. The plan should also provide specific guidance about how the Department’s identity and brand is to be consistently portrayed across the multiple methods and means of communication.
1.4.2 WEBSITE
The Department’s website ([https://www.cityofelgin.org/83/Parks-Recreation](https://www.cityofelgin.org/83/Parks-Recreation)) has several features making it easy to navigate and user friendly. There are several clickable icons located on the homepage with facility and program information for users to navigate and find frequently sought information. Additionally, further down the homepage users can find additional resources, updates, and organizational information, along with social media accounts. These are all good tools that can help increase program/event awareness and enhance users experience when utilizing the website.
1.4.3 PUBLIC INPUT AND FEEDBACK
Currently the Department uses a variety of methods for gathering public input and feedback for recreation program offerings, the quality, and availability. Methods used across Core Program Areas are primarily survey-based and include post-program surveys, recurring user surveys, and statistically valid surveys. Consider implementing the following additional methods, especially for programs early in their lifecycle:

- Pre-program surveys
- Lost customer/user surveys
- Non-customer/non-user surveys
- Focus groups
- In-facility or on-site surveys
- Crowdsourcing tools (e.g., MindMixer, Peak Democracy)

1.4.4 MARKETING AND COMMUNICATIONS RECOMMENDATIONS

- Ensure the marketing plan includes the components and strategies identified in this section.
- Establish priority segments to target in terms of new program/service development and communication tactics (e.g., Teens, Seniors, and other ages and groups).
- Establish and review regularly the performance measures for marketing. These measures can be tracked through customer surveys as well as some web-based metrics.
- Leverage relationships with partners to enhance marketing efforts through cross-promotion that include defined measurable outcomes.
- Explore additional marketing mediums to maximize exposure to the target markets you identify.

1.4.5 VOLUNTEER AND PARTNERSHIP MANAGEMENT
Today’s expectations require most public parks and recreation departments to seek productive and meaningful partnerships with both community organizations and individuals to deliver quality and seamless services to their residents. These relationships should be mutually beneficial to each party to better meet overall community needs and expand the positive impact of the agency’s mission. Effective partnerships and meaningful volunteerism are key strategy areas for the Department to strive for with the community in the years to come.

When managed with respect and used strategically, volunteers can serve as the primary advocates for the City and its offerings. Across all Core Program Areas, the Department systematically tracks volunteers. This is a practice that should be continued and will help with consistency and ensure volunteers are being utilized to their full potential. Key performance indicators such as the number of volunteers, volunteer hours, type of volunteers (e.g., community service, special events, interns, and other classifications of volunteers) should all be tracked across each Core Program Area. Tracking volunteer hours can also be used in budget discussions, showing how well the Department is able to leverage limited resources. A complete list of volunteer recommendations and best practices can be found in Appendix B.
1.4.6 RECREATION PROGRAM PARTNERSHIPS

The Department currently works with several partnering agencies, organizations, and corporations throughout the community. These partnerships support facilitation of programs and sponsorships of community events. Management of partnerships is generally strong, but some variation exists across Core Program Areas.

As with the tracking of volunteers, tracking partnerships demonstrates to the leadership how well the staff can allocate resources. In many instances, partnerships are inequitable to the public agency and do not produce reasonable shared benefits between parties. It is not suggested that the Department’s existing partnerships are inequitable, rather in general many parks and recreation agencies’ partnerships tend to be one-sided.

The following recommended policies will promote fairness and equity within existing and future partnerships while helping staff to manage potential internal and external conflicts. Certain partnership principles must be adopted by the Department and implemented across the agency for existing and future partnerships to work effectively. These partnership principles are as follows:

- **All partnerships require a working agreement** with measurable outcomes and will be evaluated on a regular basis. This should include reports to the agency on the performance and outcomes of the partnership including an annual review to determine renewal potential.
- **All partnerships should track costs** associated with the partnership investment to demonstrate the shared level of equity.
- **All partnerships should maintain a culture** that focuses on collaborative planning on a regular basis, regular communications, and annual reporting on performance and outcomes to determine renewal potential and opportunities to strengthen the partnership.

Additional partnerships can be pursued and developed with other public entities such as neighboring towns/cities, colleges, state or federal agencies, non-for-profit organizations, as well as with private or for-profit organizations. There are recommended standard policies and practices that will apply to any partnership, and others that are unique to relationships with private, for-profit entities.

1.4.7 VOLUNTEER AND PARTNERSHIP RECOMMENDATIONS

- Identify measurable outcomes for partnerships across the Department, and to the extent possible, formalize them in written agreements.
- Enhance tracking of volunteer and partnership metrics.
- Review best practices provided in Appendix B and implement them accordingly.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Core Program Area</th>
<th>Program</th>
<th>Essential</th>
<th>Important</th>
<th>Value-Added</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Aquatics</strong></td>
<td>Swimming Lessons</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Swim Team</td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Water Aerobics</td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>HydroTherapy</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Open Swim (Adventure Island)</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Outside User Groups</td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Masters Swim Team</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Lifeguard Classes</td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Open Swim (Wing Park)</td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Open Swim (Lord’s Park)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Athletics</strong></td>
<td>Youth Basketball</td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Tee Ball</td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Gymnastics</td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Taekwondo</td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Youth Soccer</td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Adult Softball</td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Community Rec</strong></td>
<td>CPR</td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Ceramics</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Art/ Painting/ Drawing</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Nature/ Outdoor Education</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Early Childhood</strong></td>
<td>Preschool</td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Preschool Explorers</td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Kidz World</td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Toddler Drop In Gym</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>General Early Childhood Classes</td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Preschool Discovery Camps</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Facility Rentals</strong></td>
<td>Centre - Heritage Ballroom</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Centre - Meeting Rooms/ Studios</td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Pavilion at Lords Park</td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Park Shelters</td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Walton Island Gazebo</td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Wing Park Bandshell</td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Centre - Adventure Island</td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Lord's Park Aquatic Center</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Wing Park Aquatic Center</td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Hawthorne Hill Nature Center</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Centre Fieldhouse</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Sports Complex Softball Fields</td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Sports Complex Soccer Fields</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Wing Park/ Trout Baseball Fields</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Health &amp; Wellness</strong></td>
<td>Memberships</td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Personal Training</td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Group Fitness</td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Massage</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Nutrition</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>School Age</strong></td>
<td>Summer Camp</td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Afterschool Program</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Homeschool Gym and Swim</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Young Rembrandts</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Kids Day Off Program</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>BASE - Before/ After School</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Dance</td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Birthday Parties</td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Magic</td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Snapology</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
1.6 APPENDIX B: VOLUNTEER/PARTNERSHIP BEST PRACTICES & RECOMMENDATIONS

BEST PRACTICES IN VOLUNTEER MANAGEMENT

In developing a volunteer policy (Volunteer Manual), some best practices that the Department should be aware of include:

- Involve volunteers in cross-training to expose them to various organizational functions and increase their skills. This can also increase their utility, allowing for more flexibility in making work assignments, and can increase their appreciation and understanding of the Department.

- Ensure a Volunteer Coordinator (a designated program staff member with volunteer management responsibility) and associated staff stay fully informed about the strategic direction of the agency overall, including strategic initiatives for all divisions. Periodically identify, evaluate, or revise specific tactics the volunteer services program should undertake to support the larger organizational mission.

- A key part of maintaining the desirability of volunteerism in the agency is developing a good reward and recognition system. The consultant team recommends using tactics similar to those found in frequent flier programs, wherein volunteers can use their volunteer hours to obtain early registration at programs, or discounted pricing at certain programs, rentals or events, or any other Town function. Identify and summarize volunteer recognition policies in a Volunteer Policy document.

- Regularly update volunteer position descriptions. Include an overview of the volunteer position lifecycle in the Volunteer Manual, including the procedure for creating a new position.

- Add end-of-lifecycle process steps to the Volunteer Manual to ensure that there is formal documentation of resignation or termination of volunteers. Also include ways to monitor and track reasons for resignation/termination and perform exit interviews with outgoing volunteers when possible.

In addition to number of volunteers and volunteer hours, categorization and tracking volunteerism by type and extent of work, it is important to consider the type of volunteers you will have assist the Department.

- **Regular Volunteers:** Those volunteers whose work is continuous, provided their work performance is satisfactory and there is a continuing need for their services.

- **Special Event Volunteers:** Volunteers who help with a particular event with no expectation that they will return after the event is complete.

- **Episodic Volunteers:** Volunteers who help with a particular project type on a recurring or irregular basis with no expectation that they will return for other duties.

- **Volunteer Interns:** Volunteers who have committed to work for the agency to fulfill a specific higher-level educational learning requirement.

- **Community Service Volunteers:** Volunteers who are volunteering over a specified period to fulfill a community service requirement.

Encourage employees to volunteer in the community. Exposure of staff to the community in different roles (including those not related to parks and recreation) will raise awareness of the agency and its volunteer program. It also helps staff understand the role and expectations of a volunteer if they can experience it for themselves.
BEST PRACTICE FOR ALL PARTNERSHIPS

All partnerships should adhere to common policy requirements. These include:

- Each partner will meet with or report to the Department staff on a regular basis to plan and share activity-based costs and equity invested.
- Partners will establish measurable outcomes and work through key issues of focus for the coming year to meet the desired outcomes.
- Each partner will focus on meeting a balance of equity agreed to and track investment costs accordingly.
- Measurable outcomes will be reviewed quarterly and shared with each partner, with adjustments made as needed.
- A working partnership agreement will be developed and monitored together on a quarterly or as-needed basis.
- Each partner will assign a liaison to serve each partnership agency for communication and planning purposes.

POLICY RECOMMENDATIONS FOR PUBLIC/PRIVATE PARTNERSHIPS

The recommended policies and practices for public/private partnerships may include businesses, private groups, private associations, or individuals who desire to make a profit from use of the Department’s facilities or programs are detailed below. These can also apply to partnerships where a private party wishes to develop a facility on park property, provide a service on publicly owned property, or have a contract with the agency to provide a task or service on the agency’s behalf at public facilities. These unique partnership principles are as follows:

- Upon entering into an agreement with a private business, group, association or individual, the Department’s staff and political leadership must recognize they must allow the private entity to meet their financial objectives within reasonable parameters that protect the mission, goals and integrity of the Department.
- As an outcome of the partnership, the Department must receive a designated fee that may include a percentage of gross revenue dollars less sales tax on a regular basis, as outlined in the contract agreement.
- The working agreement of the partnership must establish a set of measurable outcomes to be achieved, as well as the tracking method of how those outcomes will be monitored by the agency. The outcomes will include standards of quality, financial reports, customer satisfaction, payments to the agency, and overall coordination with the Department for the services rendered.
- Depending on the level of investment made by the private contractor, the partnership agreement can be limited to months, a year or multiple years.
- If applicable, the private contractor will provide a working management plan annually that they will follow to ensure the outcomes desired by the Department. Monitoring the management plan will be the responsibility of both partners and the plan can be negotiated if necessary. The agency must allow the contractor to operate freely in their best interest, as long as the outcomes are achieved and adhered to in the terms of the partnership agreement.
- The private contractor cannot lobby agencies’ advisory or governing boards for renewal of a contract and any such action will be a cause for termination. All negotiations must be with the Department Director or their assignee.
• The agency has the right to advertise for private contracted partnership services or negotiate on an individual basis with a bid process based on the professional level of the service to be provided.

• If conflicts arise between both partners, the highest-ranking officers from both sides will try to resolve the issue before going to each partner’s legal counsel. If none can be achieved, the partnership shall be dissolved.

PARTNERSHIP OPPORTUNITIES

The following recommendations are both an overview of common partnership opportunities as well as suggested approaches to organizing partnership searches. This is not an exhaustive list of all potential partnerships that can be developed, but this list can be used as a reference tool for an agency to develop its own priorities in partnership development. The following five areas of focus are recommended:

1. **Operational Partners:** Other entities and organizations that can support the efforts of the Department to maintain facilities and assets, promote amenities and park usage, support site needs, provide programs and events, and/or maintain the integrity of natural/cultural resources through in-kind labor, equipment, or materials.

2. **Vendor Partners:** Service providers and/or contractors that can gain brand association and notoriety as a preferred vendor or supporter of the city or Department in exchange for reduced rates, services, or some other agreed upon benefit.

3. **Service Partners:** Nonprofit organizations and/or friends’ groups that support the efforts of the agency to provide programs and events, and/or serve specific constituents in the community collaboratively.

4. **Co-Branding Partners:** Private, for-profit organizations that can gain brand association and notoriety as a supporter of the Department in exchange for sponsorship or co-branded programs, events, marketing and promotional campaigns, and/or advertising opportunities.

5. **Resource Development Partners:** A private, nonprofit organization with the primary purpose to leverage private sector resources, grants, public funding opportunities, and resources from individuals and groups within the community to support the goals and objectives of the agency on mutually agreed strategic initiatives.
MAINTENANCE MANAGEMENT PLAN

A document containing initial visual impressions of park sites and facilities, and recommended goals for maintenance management.
CHAPTER ONE – MAINTENANCE MANAGEMENT PLAN

1.1 MAINTENANCE FIELD VISITS

PROS Consulting toured the Elgin Parks and Recreation system with the Park Superintendent to establish an initial visual impression of park sites and facilities. This provided the Consulting Team a better understanding of how the parks are managed and maintained by the park staff and the issues they face in meeting the public’s expectations for well-maintained parks and park amenities.

1.1.1 GENERAL OBSERVATIONS

From the field observation review the maintenance of parks appears to fall into a Level 2 to a level three level of maintenance care. (See definitions of all three Maintenance Care Levels outlined starting on page 4)

The park observation tour had limited stops and walk around evaluations due to weather. PROS was able to see most of the sports fields maintained by the department, trails, downtown parks, neighborhood parks and community parks, natural areas and various amenities in the parks.

The downtown park areas observed were maintained at a Level 2 of care for downtown parks in the city. Neighborhood parks and community parks were also maintained at a Level 2. Walkways, playgrounds, and sports fields for the most part were maintained as well at a Level 2 of maintenance care.

Drainage of the sports fields seem to be an issue for the fields observed. It was at the end of the fall season so there was a considerable amount of wear and tear which will require overseeding, aeration, fertilizing and general care for the next spring season on the soccer and football fields. The lighting on the football fields needs to be adjusted to provide more accurate illumination for all areas of the fields. The lights on each field must be checked for proper lumens / brightness and those that are not working should be replaced.

The play equipment in the parks varies in age and condition and have a variety of experiences that appeal to children.

Some buildings in the parks need repainting and updating. The closed aquatic center pool needs a reopening strategy, permanent closure strategy or a removal plan so that the public is aware about its definitive future use.

Visiting facilities during the tour, the interior of buildings used for group rentals and programs are in good condition and are maintained very well.

Hard surface trails appeared to be in good condition and the care is above adequate within maintenance standards listed in this document. Soft surface trails were not within maintenance levels for standards of care and need improvement to make them more viable for use by park visitors.

There are parks need an to be redesigned so they will better meet the future needs of residents, especially some of the sport fields and specific areas in community parks. Color schemes and signage is inconsistent throughout the system and themes for identification and location of amenities, facilities and park information is not present in the parks. Insufficient parking is an issue in several parks causing people to park in residential neighborhoods during games and especially on weekends. Residents of these neighborhoods become upset with the city about these ongoing situations.

There is a farm zoo in the system that operates out of the main zoo during the summer season. During the park visit, a minimal number of animals were present. However, it was later learned that a local farmer provides a significant number and variety of animals, making the zoo a popular place to visit. Volunteers operate the zoo and despite the small number of animals present during the visit, only minor aesthetics in the facility need attention. Signage is present with facts and educational information about the animals and their role in agriculture.
Park maintenance shops are small and some equipment is left outside when not in use and is uncovered in the winter. Indoor storage from the weather is needed to extend the useful life of the equipment and also prevent vandalism to machinery left outside and unattended. A maintenance building strategy needs to be considered for a larger size shop with sufficient storage and security.

1.2 STAFF MAINTENANCE WORKSHOP

The consulting team developed an outline for a maintenance workshop with the maintenance staff. The staff was interviewed virtually during the workshop and asked a series of questions about the functionality of the maintenance department, how internal operations may or may not affect their ability to deliver on desired park maintenance standards and the role maintenance duties play in the overall care and upkeep of parks, trails, sport fields, natural areas and key site amenities. Consistent monitoring and record keeping of equipment lifecycle replacement will indicate maximum effective use of equipment and reduce repair times that interrupt routine duties.

The information garnered from the interviews and site assessments will help clarify key recommendations the consulting team will be including in the Master Plan that the maintenance department will need to address on a year-round basis. The recommendations should be used as the backdrop for them to implement set maintenance standards and key performance indicators for all maintenance operations and to monitor performance.

This Maintenance Management Plan will address hours of operation, staffing levels needed, technology requirements and customer service obligations based on established and agreed upon outcomes. After the interview workshop and discussion with the staff, this key information should assist in building a solid maintenance management plan and support the department in other areas where future questions or concerns arise.

The maintenance staff realized the need for an evaluation of how their department operates within the park system in order to engage methods to perform their tasks more effectively. Comparing the department to other agencies defined in the Benchmark Analysis segment of the Master Plan will reveal how other agencies’ maintenance staff accomplish everyday tasks, how they maintain their equipment and manage their budget when seeking funds from their cities. Learning about the budget is important for the Department to realize how funding is acquired and why their current efforts to obtain funds are not as successful as they need them to be to tell their story and justify their needs to maintain the department efficiently.

Staff members recognize they lack a significant amount of information regarding the department’s individual budget and they would also like to understand how the department is included in the overall budget of the City. In addition to learning about the budget, they feel it would be helpful to see how their expense budget contributes to the financial position of their department. The total budget for operating expenses is $17,500.00. Parks Maintenance Budget is $4,209,884 and the Sports Complex budget is $1,013,430, for a total of $5,223,314 (28.2% of the total operating expense) The Department’s capital expenses are built into their budget which varies from year to year. Typical capital budgets for life cycle maintenance of parks and recreation departments like Elgin are 3-5% of the value of their assets less land value to take care of what they already own. However, this does not allow them to seek additional funding for new projects or equipment beyond amounts already allotted to their department. The minimal amount the staff knows about budget process creates frustration when they don’t receive additional funding and they aren’t aware of why they were denied. The golf course is the only enterprise fund within the
department while all other park and recreation facilities are not operated in that way. The staff would like to know more about how an enterprise fund works within the park system. Understanding how finances affect their Department would help them understand why they operate in a deficit every year. Operating more effectively may eliminate the transfer of funds during the year to support the department, see how funds are properly used to maintain the system and also how the staff’s pay scale is established for new hires and dedicated employees.

The off-road equipment the department has needs to be updated and a lifecycle schedule would be instrumental to improving the longevity of their equipment and this would help assure the right equipment is purchased for the job of which it will be used for to achieve the maximum efficiency. The staff wants to implement new maintenance policies and procedures, as well as improve maintenance standards and operating procedures for the department. However, they will need additional support by the City to make that become a reality.

Currently there is no formal maintenance standards for maintaining park amenities, facilities, or park lands. Reviewing the Department’s work tasks and any records they currently use will:

- be instrumental to the development of Key Performance Indicators (KPIs) to managing forward successfully
- help them to be more proactive than reactive
- improve their understanding of work expectations
- assist in the development of records for work that is complete

These processes will assist the staff in addressing deficiencies and seek solutions.

These standards will provide information about how to best utilize FTEs, part-time and seasonal staff to focus on the right person with the right skill set to achieve the right task for the right pay. Establishing maintenance standards, understanding how to monitor them, learning more about proper staff numbers for their department and aligning skill sets with staff members would help the department operate as effectively as possible with the limited staff in the department.

The Department has an ongoing recruitment program in place that currently collaborates with the Human Resources Department of the City. Hiring for the system has been difficult in the past two years with low employment levels and the quantity of applicants has been distinctively insufficient. Outreach to a junior college in the City is one method they use and results there have not been encouraging.

Full-time maintenance positions in the department are currently filled, but obtaining part-time help is an ongoing problem. The full-time Community Resource Coordinator in the Land Management Division manages the volunteer program for the department. He organizes work days for volunteers to help in the parks and also manages a restitution program that provides maintenance labor throughout the parks as needed and without cost.

Staff members willingly perform most maintenance tasks in a “jack of all trades” approach because they are not certified tradesman. When asked by the City or the administration to perform additional work, the staff has not been in a position to say no graciously and provide an answer that will help tell their story. The City needs to know more about how they operate and what their workload capacity is beyond the existing capacity of their staff. The department wants to know how to maintain new properties and fit additional maintenance tasks into their current workload with existing staff.

The homeless problem is present in Elgin as in other cities and the staff struggles with finding better methods to prevent this presence in the parks, especially in the outlying park areas. This issue is becoming more prevalent and understanding how to implement and enforce a “no encampment policy” would be a significant step toward a solution. The homeless situation will not only continue but increase as well in the new park areas as properties are
acquired by the City and the park system continues to grow. The proper signage in the parks is up to date and signs were found to be in good shape. Adding a policy for appropriate signage to the plan would be good for the system in new areas and amenities in the future. Development of a formal sign policy would be a proactive way to ensure signs are in good condition, properly placed and have appropriate information indicating park rules that will be enforced. The program would certainly help provide guidance for new structures being built and also for new amenities as the system grows.

Color schemes for branding the system should be a priority in many areas. However, accomplishing this is difficult without a marketing person on staff to develop and implement the signage program. The City released a branding kit for the system to use and assure marketing is consistent throughout the parks for signs and on facilities which should portray an appropriate identity of the parks. The staff knows this will make the system be more user friendly for visitors to use the system and make parks more visible to the City.

The staff recognizes the program, Crime Prevention Through Environmental Design (CPTED) and would like to learn more about implementing it. This program would be extremely helpful to assist in crime prevention and managing certain areas and buildings/facilities that already exist. There are no preventive standards in place now to deal with crime in the parks through design standards, so designing a CPTED program to fit the system is truly needed.

Questions about the maintenance plan for specific areas were addressed. The staff is anxious to learn about developing standards, interpreting financials and ways of operating the system that can improve their department. Specifically, they would like information about creating no mow areas, how to initiate a volunteers’ program as well as the process of benchmarking with other agencies that can provide a point of reference when looking inward at their system. They are open to learning about solutions to other issues they have that are common in other park systems.

### 1.3 MAINTENANCE STANDARDS

The following maintenance standards are outlined to provide the staff with a starting point for working hours based on full-time, part-time, and seasonal staff. These generalized standards are to be used as a guide and will need to be customized for the department based on available staffing and the operational budget available.

**Maintenance Standards:** Three maintenance levels are generally defined. The difference between levels is the frequency of maintenance as determined by employee ability. Maintenance Standards have these general characteristics:

- **Level 1 Maintenance** – High profile areas where the entire area is visible to foot traffic such as entrances to community centers, signature facilities, and areas where funding permits a higher level of maintenance. Examples of maintenance work include: Mowing and edging twice per week, 95 percent turf coverage at start of season with 5 percent weeds and 0 percent bare areas, edging once per week, tree pruning cycle once annually and litter pickup twice per week.

- **Level 2 Maintenance** – Moderate to heavy use is typical in most parks. Examples of Level 2 maintenance tasks include: Mowing and edging once per week, 88 percent turf coverage at the start of season with 8 percent weeds and 4 percent bare area, tree pruning cycle every seven years and litter pickup once per week.

- **Level 3 Maintenance** – Typical for low usage parks or when funding is limited. Examples of maintenance duties include mowing and edging every 10 days, 80 percent turf coverage at start of season with 20 percent weeds, edging once per week or every 2 weeks in off-season, tree pruning cycle every 10 years and litter pickup every other week.
In areas where turf does not impact quality of experience (i.e., dog parks or non-landscaped open space areas) demand-based maintenance is provided according to funding availability.

Maintenance standards are organized by three Levels of Service. Maintenance standards can change by season and month depending on the type of park area level of use. Standards shall be calculated by time and equipment proposed for all parks in the system.

This format provides guidance in terms of understanding the required work activities and elements in a descriptive manner that then can be quantified numerically. The following are descriptions of the levels of service and both qualitative and quantitative maintenance standards as proposed for all parks in the system.

### 1.3.1 LEVEL ONE MAINTENANCE STANDARDS FOR PARKS

- **Turf Maintenance** – high profile areas (small areas, entire area visible to foot traffic)
  - Mowing will occur 2 times/week
  - Mowing heights
    - 2 ½” during warm season (daytime highs consistently above 75 degrees)
  - Edging of all turf perimeters will occur 1 time/week
  - 95% turf coverage
  - 3% weed infestation for existing areas (all efforts should be made to keep new areas 100% weed free)
  - 2% bare area
  - Remove grass clippings if visible
  - Aerate 1 time/year (additionally if needed)
  - Inspect thatch layer regularly and remove as needed
  - Test soil and water annually
    - Additional testing will occur if deemed necessary
  - Soil moisture will be consistent
    - No wet areas
    - No dry areas
    - Firm enough for foot and mower traffic
    - Apply wetting agents to assist in uniform soil moisture
    - Hand water as needed
  - Inspect daily for insects, disease, stress and respond to outbreaks within 24 hours
  - Fertilize (3) times per year
  - Top dress/over seed once a year
- **Tree and Shrub Maintenance**
  - Prune/trim trees and shrubs as dictated by specie twice annually during spring and fall
  - Remove sucker growth annually
  - Test soil annually to ensure application of appropriate nutrients as needed
  - Apply fertilizer to plant species according to their optimum requirements as needed or yearly
  - Inspect regularly for insects and diseases. Respond to outbreaks within 48 hours
  - Place 2” of organic mulch around each tree within a minimum 18” ring
  - Place 2” of organic mulch around shrub beds to minimize weed growth
  - Remove hazardous limbs and plants immediately upon discovery
  - Remove dead trees and plant material immediately unless located within an environmental area
• Remove or treat invasive plants within 5 days of discovery
• Flower bed maintenance done yearly
• Fertilize once a year
• Pond maintenance completed yearly and inspect weekly
• Water features maintained weekly
• Invasive plant removal annually

• Storm Cleanup
  • Inspect drain covers at least twice monthly, before rain and immediately after flooding
  • Remove debris and organic materials from drain covers immediately
  • Maintain water inlet height at 100% of design standard

• Irrigation Systems
  • Inspect irrigation systems at least once per month or as necessary
  • Initiate repairs to non-functioning systems within 24 hours of discovery
  • Back flow testing done annually

• Litter Control
  • Pick up litter and empty containers at least once daily or as needed
  • Remove leaves and organic debris once a week or as necessary

• Playground Maintenance
  • Audit each playground to ensure compliance with the current version of ASTM Performance Standard F1487 and the Consumer Product Safety Commission “Handbook for Public Playground Safety”
  • Complete low-frequency playground inspections at least bi-monthly or as required. All low-frequency inspections are to be completed by a Certified Playground Safety Inspector (CPSI). Complete safety-related repairs immediately, and initiate other repairs within 48 hours of discovery
  • Complete high-frequency inspections at least weekly
  • Grooming surface three times weekly, nine months a year

• Hard Surface Maintenance
  • Remove debris and broken glass immediately upon discovery
  • Remove sand, dirt, and organic debris from walks and hard-court surfaces weekly
  • Remove trip hazards from pedestrian areas immediately upon discovery
  • Paint fading or indistinct instructional/directional signs annually
  • After mowing, blow grass clippings off of hard surfaces
  • Remove grass growing in cracks as needed

• Outdoor Court Maintenance
  • Inspect tennis, pickleball and basketball courts at least once a month. Complete all repairs within 48 hours of discovery
  • Repaint lines at least once each year
  • Replace basketball nets when frayed, broken, or missing
  • Maintain basketball goal posts, backboards, rims, tennis net posts, fencing, and hardware to original design specifications

• Trail Maintenance
  • Inspect hard and soft surface trails at least once monthly
  • Remove dirt, sand and organic debris from hard surfaces at least once weekly
Remove organic debris from soft surfaces at least once weekly
Maintain a uniform 3”-4” depth of compacted material on soft surface trails at all times
Remove graffiti weekly
Remove overhanging branches within 84” of the trail surface at least twice annually
Mechanically or chemically control growth 24” on either side of the trails
Inspect signs, benches, and other site amenities at least once a month. Complete repairs within 10 days of discovery
Inspect and make necessary repairs to lighting systems at least once monthly
Repair/replace bulbs to maintain lighting levels to design specifications at all times.

• Site Amenity Maintenance
  Inspect benches, trash containers, picnic tables, grills, bicycle racks, flag poles, drinking fountains after mowing and other site amenities at least monthly. Complete repairs within 24 hours of discovery
  Clean, scrub, and power wash amenities twice yearly
  Inspect daily for insects, disease and stress and respond to outbreaks within 24 hours

• Athletic fields grounds maintenance (Baseball, Soccer, Softball, Lacrosse and Rugby)
  Fields that are dedicated to softball, baseball, soccer, Lacrosse and rugby only
  Use a mower capable of "striping" the turf
  Mow twice weekly
  Mowing heights
    • 2” during cool season (daytime highs consistently below 75 degrees)
  Edge field perimeters twice monthly
  95% turf coverage at the start of every season
  80% turf coverage after play begins
  5% weed infestation
  0% bare area at the start of every season
  15% bare and weak areas will be acceptable after play begins
  Apply pre-germinated seed to heavily worn areas after every tournament
  Remove grass clippings if visible
  Aerate 3 times annually
  Aerate thin and high use areas as needed
  Inspect thatch layer regularly and remove as needed
  Test soil and water annually
    • Additional testing will occur if deemed necessary
  Soil moisture will be consistent
    • No wet areas
    • No dry areas
    • Firm enough for foot and mower traffic
    • Apply wetting agents to assist in uniform soil moisture
    • Hand water as needed
  Inspect daily for insects, disease and stress. Respond to outbreaks within 24 hours
  Fertilize monthly
  Aerate and over seed yearly

• Fence and Gate Maintenance
  Inspect fences, gates and bollards at least twice annually. Complete safety-related repairs immediately. Complete other repairs within 48 hours of discovery
• Annually free debris from fence
• Sign Maintenance
  o Inspect sign lettering, surfaces and posts at least once monthly
  o Repair/replace signs to maintain design and safety standards within 24 hours of discovery
  o Clean signs twice a year
  o Cut back plant material annually or sooner if needed
• Pest Control
  o If the city has an Integrated Pest Management Program (IPM) policy, address problem areas and inspect monthly. Remedy immediately upon discovery
• Vandalism and Graffiti Removal
  o Initiate repairs immediately upon discovery. Document and photograph damage as necessary
• Picnic Shelters
  o Clean reserved units and remove litter prior to and after each reservation
  o Minor repairs are to be made immediately upon discovery
  o Non-reserved units are cleaned weekly by power washing, or as necessary
• Lighting Security/Areas
  o Foot-candle levels will be maintained to preserve original specification
  o Inspect lighting fixtures once monthly
  o Repairs/bulb replacement will be completed within 24 hours of discovery
• Aquatic Center Standards
  o Vacuum pool weekly
  o Manually check water chemistry every two hours of operation
  o Check water electronically on a continuous basis
  o Water checked for temperature, chlorine, and pH
  o Check flow rates every 2 hours of operation
  o Water checked for clarity on a continuous basis
  o Clean concrete areas daily
  o Repaint pool tank every two years
  o Pressure wash concrete areas weekly
  o Clean restrooms two times daily
  o Inspect facility and associated equipment daily
  o Maintain all equipment per manufacturers suggestions
  o Inspect sand filter annually
• Broken Equipment Standard
  o Broken equipment shall be repaired immediately, as staff is capable and parts are available when noticed or reported
  o If staff is not able to repair, the broken equipment will be signed and roped off with emergency tape indicating that the amenity is broken, not to be used, and if and when it will be repaired
• Lifecycle Replacement
  o The city should developed a lifecycle replacement program that must be built into the Capital Improvement Program that is based on contractor and product specifications
• Concession Standards (outdoor) if developed in the future
  o Concession operating permits secured before opening
  o Concession facilities cleaned, wiped down, and sanitized before opening
• Electrical appliances checked for compliance and repaired if damaged
• Lights checked and repaired as needed
• Appliances cleaned thoroughly before opening
• Prices for concessions will be posted
• Cash registers tested to ensure they work properly
• Circuit breakers tested prior to opening
• Cleaning and sanitation supplies on hand before opening
• Pick up debris daily

- Closing Concession Standards (outdoor)
  • Equipment cleaned thoroughly
  • Supplies removed and discarded
  • Electricity should be turned off
  • Refrigerators turned off and sealed
  • Facility floors, sinks, and counters cleaned thoroughly
  • Hoses cleaned and drained
  • Kitchen cleaned thoroughly
  • Inspections of standards will occur monthly

- Restrooms
  • Restrooms cleaned twice per day unless contracted
  • Restrooms inspected hourly
  • Restrooms locked/unlocked daily
  • Replace waterless urinal cartridges monthly
  • Leaks dealt with immediately and repaired within 24 hours of discovery

- Open Space Standard
  • Maintain natural appearance to open space areas
  • Remove trees and branches that pose a hazard to the users of the area
  • Respond to disease and insect outbreaks within 24 hours of identification
  • Inspect areas monthly
  • Remove and clean dump sites within 48 hours of identification
  • Post and maintain appropriate signage for each individual area
  • Implement strategies to assist in reducing the stand of non-native invasive plants by 5% annually
  • No large branches or debris will be allowed in parks and along perimeters

1.3.2 LEVEL TWO MAINTENANCE STANDARDS FOR PARKS

Maintenance standards can change by season and month depending on the park and level of use. Standards will be calculated by time and equipment needed to develop the required operation budgets. The difference between Level 1 and Level 2 standards is the frequency rate.

- Turf Maintenance
  • Mowing will occur once weekly
  • Mowing heights
    - 2½” during cool season (day time highs consistently below 75 degrees)
  • Edging of all turf perimeters will occur weekly during season and every 2 weeks in off-season
  • 88% turf coverage
8% weed infestation
4% bare area will be acceptable after play begins
Remove grass clippings if visible
Aerate once annually in low use areas
Aerate twice annually in high use areas (additional if needed)
Inspect thatch layer regularly and remove as needed
Test soil and water annually
  - Additional testing will occur if deemed necessary
Soil moisture will be consistent
  - No wet areas
  - No dry areas
  - Firm enough for foot and mower traffic
  - Apply wetting agents to assist in uniform soil moisture
  - Hand water as needed
Inspect weekly for insects, disease, and stress, and respond to outbreaks within 24 hours
Fertilize twice yearly

• Tree and Shrub Maintenance
  Prune/trim trees and shrubs as dictated by specie at least once annually
  Apply fertilizer to plant species only if plant health dictates
  Remove sucker growth as needed
  Inspect regularly for insects and diseases. Respond to outbreaks within 48 hours
  Place 2” of organic mulch around each tree within a minimum 18” ring
  Place 2” of organic mulch around shrub beds to minimize weed growth
  Remove hazardous limbs and plants immediately upon discovery
  Remove dead trees and plant material within 30 days of discovery
  Remove or treat invasive plants yearly

• Storm Cleanup
  Inspect drain covers at least once monthly and immediately after flooding occurs
  Remove debris and organic materials from drain covers within every other month
  Inspect and clean drains before forecasted storms begin
  Maintain water inlet height at 100% of design standard
  Invasive plant removal once a year or as needed
  Drain system maintenance done once a year

• Irrigation Systems
  Inspect irrigation systems a minimum of once per month and as necessary
  Initiate repairs to non-functioning systems within 48 hours of discovery
  Annual back flow inspection done yearly

• Litter Control
  Pick up litter and empty containers at least every other day or as needed
  Remove leaves and organic debris once a week

• Playground Maintenance
  Audit each playground to ensure compliance with the current version of ASTM Performance Standard F1487 and the Consumer Product Safety Commission “Handbook for Public Playground Safety”
Complete low-frequency playground inspections at least bi-monthly or as required. All low-frequency inspections are to be completed by a Certified Playground Safety Inspector (CPSI). Complete safety-related repairs immediately and initiate other repairs within 48 hours of discovery. Complete high-frequency inspections at least weekly. Grooming surface two times weekly.

**Hard Surface Maintenance**
- Remove debris and broken glass immediately upon discovery
- Remove sand, dirt, and organic debris from walks, lots, and hard surfaces every 30 days
- Remove trip hazards from pedestrian areas immediately upon discovery
- Paint fading or indistinct instructional/directional signs every other year
- Remove grass in the cracks monthly

**Outdoor Court Maintenance**
- Inspect basketball courts at least once monthly. Complete repairs within 10 days of discovery
- Repaint lines at least once every 2 years
- Replace basketball nets within 10 days when frayed, broken, or missing
- Maintain basketball goal posts, backboards, rims, fencing, and hardware to original design specifications. Complete repairs within 10 days of discovery

**Trail Maintenance**
- Inspect hard and soft surface trails at least once monthly
- Remove dirt, sand, and organic debris from hard surfaces at least once monthly
- Remove organic debris from soft surfaces at least once monthly
- Maintain a uniform 2-4” depth of compacted material on soft surface trails
- Mechanically or chemically control growth 24” on either side of the trails
- Remove overhanging branches within 84” of the trail surface at least once annually
- Inspect signs, benches, and other site amenities at least once a month. Complete repairs within 10 days of discovery

**Site Amenity Maintenance**
- Inspect benches, trash containers, picnic tables, grills, bicycle racks, drinking fountains and other site amenities at least monthly. Complete repairs within 5 days of discovery
- Cleaning and washing annually
- Inspect daily for insects, disease and stress and respond to outbreaks within 24 hours

**Athletic Field Grounds Maintenance (baseball, soccer, softball, Lacrosse, and rugby)**
- Fields that are dedicated to soccer, baseball, softball, and rugby only
- Mowing will occur twice weekly
- Mowing heights
  - 2 ½ “during cool season (daytime highs consistently below 75 degrees)
  - 3” during warm season (daytime highs consistently above 75 degrees)
- Edging of all field perimeters will occur once monthly
- 80% turf coverage at the start of every season
- 65% turf coverage after play begins
- 20% weed infestation
- 5% bare area at the start of every season
- 15% bare and weak areas will be acceptable after play begins
- Remove grass clippings if visible
Aerate once annually
- Inspect thatch layer regularly and remove as needed
- Test soil and water annually
- Additional testing will occur if deemed necessary
- Soil moisture will be consistent
- No wet areas
- No dry areas
- Firm enough for foot and mower traffic
- Inspect weekly for insects, disease, and stress, and respond to outbreaks within 24 hours

- Fence and Gate Maintenance
  - Inspect fences, gates, and bollards at least once annually. Complete safety-related repairs immediately, and complete other repairs within 5 days of discovery
  - Clean debris annually

- Sign Maintenance
  - Inspect sign lettering, surfaces, and posts at least once every 3 months
  - Repair/replace signs to maintain design and safety standards within 5 days of discovery
  - Clean signs once a year

- Pest Control
  - In accordance with the Department’s Integrated Pest Management Program (IPM), inspect problem areas monthly and remedy immediately upon discovery

- Vandalism and Graffiti Removal
  - Initiate repairs immediately upon discovery. Document and photograph damage as necessary

- Picnic Shelters
  - Reserved units cleaned and litter removed prior to and after each reservation
  - Minor repairs are made immediately upon discovery
  - Non-reserved units are cleaned bi-weekly, or as necessary

- Lighting Security/Area
  - Inspect quarterly
  - Repairs/bulb replacement will be completed within 72 hours of discovery

- Restrooms
  - Restrooms cleaned daily unless contracted
  - Restrooms inspected every three hours
  - Restrooms locked/unlocked daily
  - Replace waterless urinal cartridges monthly
  - Leaks dealt with immediately and repaired within 24 hours of discovery

### 1.3.3 LEVEL THREE MAINTENANCE STANDARDS FOR PARKS

Maintenance Standards can change by season and month depending on the type of park and level of use. Standards will be calculated by time and equipment needed to develop required operation budgets.

- Turf Maintenance (dog parks)
  - Mowing will occur once every 10 days
  - Mowing heights
    - 2½” during cool season (daytime highs consistently below 75 degrees)
  - 50% turf coverage
1.3.4 MAINTENANCE STANDARDS FOR FACILITIES/AMENITIES

**MAINTENANCE STANDARDS FOR GOLF COURSE**

- **Golf - Bunker (Level 1 Maintenance)**
  - Goal: To provide a quality obstacle to enhance the golf experience
  - Rake 7x/week
  - Supplement sand 1x/annually
  - Remove water and check drains As needed
  - Cut edges 1x/month and as needed

- **Golf - Bunker (Level 2 Maintenance)**
  - Goal: To provide a quality obstacle to enhance the golf experience
  - Rake 3 - 5x/week and as needed
  - Supplement sand 1x/annually
  - Remove water and check drains As needed
  - Cut edges 1 - 2x/year and as needed

- **Golf - Fairways (Level 1 Maintenance)**
  - Goal: To provide a quality surface to hit the golf ball
  - Mow, blow trimmings 3 or 4x/week
  - Repair holes and divots 7x/week
  - Aerate 1x/year
  - Overseed 1x/year
  - Fertilizer 3x/year
  - Apply Pre-emergent, fungicide 1x/month
  - Apply pesticide 1x/year
  - Adjust flags/signs 1x/week
  - Inspect markers 1x/week
  - Paint Tee markers 1x/year
  - Water: As required for green, smooth playing surface 1”/week
  - Manage leaves 2x/year and as needed

- **Golf - Greens (Level 1 Maintenance)**
  - Goal: To provide a quality putting surface for golfers to enjoy
  - Mow, blow as necessary 7x/week
  - Collars mowed 3x/week
  - Aerate up to 3x/year
  - Lightly Top-dressed 1x/2 weeks or as needed
  - Overseed 3x/year
  - Fertilizer 1x/2 weeks
  - Water As required for green playing surface
  - Manage leaves/debris 2x/year and as needed
  - Verticut 3x/year
  - Roll As required for green playing surface
MAINTENANCE MANAGEMENT PLAN

- Change cups 7x/week
- Apply pesticide 1x/week or as needed

- Golf – natural areas (Level 3 Maintenance)
  - Goal: Eliminate invasive species and enjoy a weed-free surface
    - Mow 1x/year
    - Apply herbicide 1x/year or as needed
    - Sign 1x/year

- Golf - Roughs (Level 2 Maintenance)
  - Goal: To provide a semi-level hitting surface for golfing playability
    - Mow 2x/week
    - Overseed As needed
    - Trim Trees 1x/year and as needed
    - Apply herbicide/pesticide 1x/year
    - Fertilizer 1x/year
    - Manage leaves 2x/year and as needed
    - Vegetation Control 3x/year

- Golf - Tees (Level 1 Maintenance)
  - Goal: To provide a quality hitting surface for golfers to tee off
    - Pick up tees 3x/week and daily by rangers
    - Mow 3x/week
    - Replace divots with grass and sand 7x/week
    - Blow 7x/week
    - Move markers 7x/week
    - Inspect signs 7x/week
    - Repair signs As needed
    - Check and replenish ball washer fluids 7x/week
    - Empty trash cans 7x/week
    - Aerate 5x/year
    - Overseed 2x/year and as needed
    - Fertilizer 1x/month
    - Pre-emergence 1x/year
    - Water 7x/week
    - Manage leaves 2x/year and as needed

DOG PARKS MAINTENANCE
- Mow parks at least once a week at 3 inches
- Pick up trash daily in parking lots
- Clean restrooms at least once a week
- Inspect signage on how to use the park properly
- Move dog areas every two weeks to keep areas from getting beat down
- Grade parking lot monthly or as needed
- Inspect fencing on a weekly basis
- Inspect safety lighting on a weekly basis.
SAND VOLLEYBALL COURTS
- Rake sand volleyball courts three times a week if in a park
- Replace the appropriate beach volleyball sand to the level of side blocks or ropes twice a year.
- Nets inspected every week and replaced as needed. Nets placed at the appropriate height.
- Trash picked up around courts daily and cans emptied as needed.
- Signs inspected and noted weekly.

SKATE PARK
- Inspected daily for litter and concrete cracks
- No water standing in bowls
- Lights working at full capacity
- Fencing in good repair
- Graffiti is removed weekly if present
- Security camera system is in place, working properly and checked daily
- Signs are in place with no graffiti on them
- Litter picked up on a daily basis

SPASH PAD
- Inspected daily to ensure all spray fountains are properly working
- Recirculation pumps are operating correctly, and chemicals properly applied
- All timers are working properly and inspected daily
- All lighting is working properly and inspected daily during the season
- All benches sturdy and inspected daily during the season
- Repairs are made immediately when discovered
- Vandalism repaired immediately when discovered
- All security cameras are working properly and checked daily during the season

LAWN GAMES PLAZA
- Bag courts, horseshoes pits and bocce ball courts inspected daily and repaired when damage is discovered.
- Litter and dirt swept daily during the season.
- Repairs made to surface areas of any court done when discovered.
- Seating areas inspected daily.
- Lighting inspected daily.
- Trash is picked up daily.
- Restrooms inspected and cleaned daily.
- Shade areas inspected daily and repaired immediately.

DISC GOLF COURSE
- Disc golf course inspected weekly including baskets and repairs made when damage is discovered
- Golf course mowed weekly
- Hole signs inspected weekly while mowing
- Trash cans placed at every other hole and emptied every three days
- Tee boxes inspected and leveled as needed
- Parking lots picked up every other day and stripped every four years
- Hole flags replaced as needed
NON-GARDEN MAINTENANCE STANDARDS

- Picnic Tables
  - Tables shall be clean and free of debris and graffiti
  - All boards for seats and tops will be in place without broken or missing pieces. There will be a smooth surface without protrusions, exposed sharp edges or pointed corners
  - All hardware must be tight and intact
  - All vegetation under tables in turf areas must be mowed and/or trimmed
- Grills
  - Picnic tables are adjacent to grills
  - Grills are operational
  - If racks are present, they are operational and attached to the main body
  - Vegetation, low hanging limbs, and debris are cleared away from grills
  - Grills are properly anchored.
- Parking Lots and Roadways
  - Surfaces are free of litter and debris
  - Asphalt surfaces are free of vegetation
  - Pavement markings are clear and visible
  - Bumper block pins are flush to top surface
  - Roadway and parking lot corridors will be maintained at a 10’ height. No limbs or branches will be within 2’ft of pavement edges
- Trash Cans/Recycling Containers
  - Lids are present and in fit the containers properly
  - Exterior of receptacles are clean and painted.
  - The area around cans is clean and free of debris.
- Bike Racks
  - Hardware is intact.
  - Vegetation around racks is trimmed.
- Fences
  - All post and rails are intact, secure, and upright and level
  - Vegetation under fences in developed areas is kept trimmed or is sprayed
- Signage
  - Park signage is properly installed in a visible location
  - Signs are clean, painted, and not bent
  - Signposts are upright and level
  - Signs must have current park system logo
- Gates
  - Open and close easily. Lock securely
  - Gate alignment allows for safe opening and closing
  - All hardware and cross members are present and secure
  - Anchor posts will be present
- Benches
  - Slats are smooth and structurally sound
  - Hardware is intact
  - Nails, bolts, and screws are flush with surface
Vegetation under the seating area is kept trimmed
- The structures are clean and graffiti free
- Kiosks
  - Brochure boxes will be stocked with current printed material
  - No non-park material will be present
  - Plexi-glass cover is clean
  - No graffiti or vandalism is present
  - No insect nests are on or in kiosks
  - Structure is intact and in good repair
- Water Fountains/Hydrants
  - Fountains and hydrants are accessible and operational
  - Fountain bowls are free of debris and rust deposits
  - Fountains and hydrants are not leaking or dripping
- Bridges/Boardwalks/Steps/Piers/Overlooks
  - All surfaces are graffiti free
  - All hardware is present and flush with surface
  - No lumber is missing or broken
  - Surfaces are free of debris
  - Surfaces are free of trip hazards
- Restrooms
  - Restrooms are clean and properly stocked with paper and soap products
  - Lighting and ventilation systems if present are operational
  - Toilets, faucets, doors, and hand dryers are operational
  - Restrooms are free of graffiti
  - Trash receptacles are clean
  - Doors are properly marked according to gender
  - Doors and locks are operational
  - If ADA accessible they are to be compliant with the requirements of the Americans with Disabilities Act
  - Structure will be free of insect nests, spider webs, and debris
- Irrigation Areas
  - The irrigation system is fully operational
  - The system is free of leaks
  - System is properly adjusted to minimize runoff
  - Winterize before temperatures are below freezing or when appropriate
- Trails
  - Trails will be free of litter and debris
  - Signage will be in place and visible
  - Trail corridor will be free of overhanging vegetation
  - Fallen trees across trails will be removed as soon as possible with minimal impact to surrounding area
- Turf around Picnic Areas
  - Turf will be free of litter and debris
  - The turf is mowed to no more than 4” in height
1.4 RECOMMENDATIONS

Based on the observations and interviews of the system are preliminary recommendations to be discussed with the Management Team of Elgin Parks and Recreation for further refinement.

- The Maintenance Division staff needs to be managed per hour to accomplish tasks as they apply to full-time, part-time, seasonal and contracted staff for all levels in the specific types of parks and amenities.
- Maintenance standards need to be established and Staff trained to achieve these standards for each type of park or facility.
- The operating budget for park maintenance should be developed based on maintenance standards and available Staff.
- Maintenance management software should be acquired to track work orders, costs, staffing requirements and outcomes should be a priority.
- A lifecycle assessment of existing amenities should be developed to demonstrate to key decision makers where the park system is in its lifecycle for replacement (less land cost) to keep the system in a good position to present the parks and the city to the community and to visitors in a positive manner for the future.
- Staff needs to be more involved in the budget process to present their needs in a proactive way instead of a reactive manner.
- Volunteers need to be recruited and trained properly with the mindset of adding value to what the park maintenance staff can provide, especially with park cleanups.
- Sports field maintenance needs an improved strategy to make the park systems fields as playable as possible and attractive to host local, regional, state and national tournaments in all sports.
- Maintenance costs are normally 40 to 45% of the total operational budget of a department the size of Elgin.
- Cost per acre of maintained parks is typically $6,500 to $7,000 an acre of maintained parks in the upper Midwest of the United States.
- Maintenance shops need to be evaluated for the level of productivity they provide to the staff and storage to support the lifecycle maintenance and security of the parks’ equipment.
- The recreation program and park maintenance staff needs to create a strategy regarding the fields that need the most improvements in order of priority.
- Landscape design and care needs to be enhanced in downtown parks.
- Managing the homeless population in parks needs to be addressed in a proactive manner versus a reactive manner.
- The total asset value of the park system needs to be assessed as well as how many capital funds are spent each year to protect those assets that are needed to keep the park system in an attractive and well-kept state to residents and park visitors.
- A dedicated funding source for the downtown park maintenance, such as a BID District should be considered and established.
BENCHMARK ANALYSIS

A document identifying operating metrics to benchmark against comparable parks and recreation agencies. This document evaluates Elgin park and open space system compared to peer, benchmark agencies.
**BENCHMARK ANALYSIS**

**Methodology**

PROS Consulting with assistance from the Elgin Parks and Recreation Department (“Department”) identified operating metrics to benchmark against comparable parks and recreation agencies. The goal of the analysis is to evaluate how the Department compares with peer, benchmark agencies. The benchmark assessment is organized into specific categories based on peer park district responses to targeted questions that lend an encompassing view of operational metrics for peer park district. The metrics used were identified by the Department as reference points important to the operations and performance of their park system. National or regional best practice key performance indicators were not used for this analysis. A comparison of the Department against national and regional best practices is included in the Recreational Program Assessment and the Maintenance and Management Plan. This report is for information purposes only, and since unknown variables exist regarding how data is calculated by the peer park districts, no specific information from this report will be used to arrive at recommendations made in the Master Plan Report. General reference points regarding all park districts will be used throughout the Master Plan.

Information used in this analysis was obtained directly from each participating benchmark agency. PROS recognizes that the benchmark agencies are park districts versus cities which operate in a different funding model. Due to differences in how park districts operate versus city park departments, such as how they collect, maintain, and report data, variances may exist. These variations can impact the per capita and percentage allocations. Because of this the overall comparison must be viewed with this in mind. The benchmark data collection for all park districts was complete as of May 2023, and it is possible that information in this report may have changed since the original collection. The information sought was a combination of operating metrics that factor budgets, staffing levels, and inventories. In some instances, information was not tracked or not available from the participating agencies. Where there are blank cells in the tables of this report, the participating agency did not provide their information. The Park Districts listed below were selected with the Department to be benchmarked because they represent communities of comparable size and socioeconomic characteristics to that of Elgin and are leading park and recreation agencies in Illinois.

The benchmarked agencies selected by the city staff are:

- Arlington Heights, IL Park District
- Bartlett, IL Park District
- Fox Valley, IL Park District
- Hoffman Estates, IL Park District
- Rockford, IL Park District
- Schaumburg, IL Park District
The table below (Figure 1.) lists each benchmark park district in the study, arranged by total population served. Peer park districts represent geographical coverage within the state of Illinois. For all park districts examined, Elgin represents the third largest population and the third highest number of parks.

### Benchmark Comparison

#### Park Acres

The following table (Figure 2.) provides a general overview of each park district’s park acreage and charted in three ways: Acres not Managed / Total Developed Acres / Total Acres Owned and Managed. Assessing the level of service for park acres, Elgin ranks near the middle in number of total acres owned / managed and also total developed acres. For acres not developed, Elgin Parks and Recreation has the second highest number of acres (200 acres) and the third highest in total acres and third highest in total developed acres per 1,000 residents.
Park Acres per 1,000 Residents (Total Acres and Developed Acres)

Total Acres indicate the size of the entire park district, and the ratio of the total acres per 1,000 residents, it does not account for the park land or open space residents can access within a community (such as lands owned by other governmental bodies). (Figure 3.) The right-hand column of this chart shows the total number of developed acres that a park district utilizes for parks, recreation facilities, trails, program areas, green spaces, and other park amenities available to park users. All park districts including the Department are relatively close (within 5.3 acres) in their developed acres per 1,000 residents. Elgin Parks and Recreation has 13.99 acres per 1,000 residents and this number is within the range of the benchmark districts. In the 2010 master plan Elgin set a goal of 15 acres of parkland per 1,000, and although their ration of developed acres of parkland per resident is low compared to their peers, their total acres exceeds their parkland to resident goal.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Agency</th>
<th>Population</th>
<th>Total Acres per 1,000 Residents</th>
<th>Total Developed Acres per 1,000 Residents</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Rockford Park District</td>
<td>199,355</td>
<td>24.67</td>
<td>17.15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hoffman Estates Park District</td>
<td>52,530</td>
<td>17.76</td>
<td>16.24</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Schaumburg Park District</td>
<td>78,000</td>
<td>14.83</td>
<td>14.05</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Elgin Parks and Recreation</td>
<td>115,000</td>
<td>15.73</td>
<td>13.99</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fox Valley Park District</td>
<td>233,000</td>
<td>14.25</td>
<td>11.88</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bartlett Park District</td>
<td>42,100</td>
<td>10.23</td>
<td>11.84</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Arlington Heights Park District</td>
<td>73,692</td>
<td>9.69</td>
<td>9.34</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Figure 3. Park Acres per 1,000 Residents

Trail Miles

The information in Figure 4. reveals the service levels for dedicated trail miles within each park district. Viewing the total trial miles in descending order, Elgin has the least number of trail miles in their system (13.0).

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Agency</th>
<th>Population</th>
<th>Total Trail Miles</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Rockford Park District</td>
<td>199,355</td>
<td>75.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fox Valley Park District</td>
<td>233,000</td>
<td>48.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bartlett Park District</td>
<td>42,100</td>
<td>17.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Arlington Heights Park District</td>
<td>73,692</td>
<td>16.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Schaumburg Park District</td>
<td>78,000</td>
<td>15.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hoffman Estates Park District</td>
<td>52,530</td>
<td>14.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Elgin Parks and Recreation</td>
<td>115,000</td>
<td>13.0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Figure 4. Trails

The national level provided by NRPA (National Recreation and Parks Association) for total trails miles is 31.5 miles.
**Trail Miles Per 1,000 Residents**

Comparing total trails miles as a ratio per 1,000 residents the Department provides almost half as many miles as its closest peer. *(Figure 5.)*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Agency</th>
<th>Trail Miles per 1,000 Residents</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Bartlett Park District</td>
<td>0.40</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rockford Park District</td>
<td>0.38</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hoffman Estates Park District</td>
<td>0.27</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Arlington Heights Park District</td>
<td>0.22</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fox Valley Park District</td>
<td>0.21</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Schaumburg Park District</td>
<td>0.20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Elgin Parks and Recreation</strong></td>
<td><strong>0.11</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Figure 5. Trail Miles per 1,000 Residents*

**Facilities**

The peer Park Districts provide a variety of facilities *(Figure 6.)* in their districts dependent on the type of programs offered and how the facilities are used. Key metrics are shown as the number of facilities (blue bar) and the number of facilities where the district does their programming (orange bar). This chart only reflects the number of facilities operated and where programming is provided by an agency or the Department. Elgin has nine facilities (the same as two other districts) and six of them are used for programming. Of all benchmark districts, Elgin uses approximately two thirds of their total facilities for programming. All others use at least half or more of their facilities for programming.

*Figure 6. Facilities*
Square Footage of Facilities

The total square footage of all facilities in each district are as follows. The facilities are ranked by most square footage to least number of square footage in descending order. Fox Valley Park District has the largest number of total square feet in all of their buildings.

**Total square footage of all facilities in each district:**

- Elgin Parks and Recreation 185,000 sq. ft.
- Fox Valley Park District 225,000 sq. ft.
- Schaumburg Park District 152,000 sq. ft.
- Bartlett Park District 130,000 sq ft.
- Arlington Heights Park District 113,000 sq ft.
- Hoffman Estates Park District 100,000 sq ft.

Staffing

This section (Figure 7.) compares staffing levels as documented in Full Time Employees (FTE’s) *.

For reference, FTEs are calculated by adding the total hours of service for which the employer pays wages to employees during the year (but not more than 2,080 hours for any employee) and divide that amount by 2,080.

In general, park districts participating in the benchmark study exhibited their full-time staffing levels (Schaumburg with 274 FTEs) to the least number of FTEs on staff (Rockford with 130 FTEs).

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Agency</th>
<th>Population</th>
<th>Total FTEs</th>
<th>Total FTEs in Parks, Open Spaces and Trails</th>
<th>Total FTEs in Department Administration</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Schaumburg</td>
<td>78,000</td>
<td>274</td>
<td>Full-time: 26 Part-time: 18</td>
<td>Full-time: 21 Part-time: 8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fox Valley Park District</td>
<td>233,000</td>
<td>269</td>
<td>Full-time: 47 Part-time: 38</td>
<td>Full-time: 66 Part-time: 118</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Arlington Heights Park District</td>
<td>73,692</td>
<td>181</td>
<td>Full-time: 38 Part-time: 30</td>
<td>Full-time: 19 Part-time: 2 Rec Dept FT 34 PT 1,074</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Elgin Parks and Recreation</td>
<td>115,000</td>
<td>179</td>
<td>Full-time: 27 Part-time: 43</td>
<td>Full-time: 37 Part-time: 552</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hoffman Estates Park District</td>
<td>52,530</td>
<td>158</td>
<td>Full-time: 25 Part-time: 29</td>
<td>Full-time: 48 Part-time 552</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rockford Park District</td>
<td>199,355</td>
<td>130</td>
<td>Full-time: 35 Part-time: 24</td>
<td>Full-time: 66 Part-time 5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bartlett Park District</td>
<td>42,100</td>
<td></td>
<td>Full-time: 15 Part-time: 8 - 10</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Figure 7. Staffing
Contractors

Figure 8. compares the use of outside contractors for work or services. Elgin uses 10 contractors for programming in their system and they are directly in the middle of the benchmark districts, and they spend $235,000 for contractors, annually. Contractors vary by service provided.

The table also lists the types of programs that contractors provide in each district.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Agency</th>
<th>Contractors used for programming</th>
<th>Programming</th>
<th>Actual Dollars Spent on Contractors</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Rockford Park District</td>
<td>10 to 20</td>
<td>Soccer, Pickleball, Volleyball, Swimming lessons, art, figure skating, buddy gymnastics</td>
<td>$6,547,976</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hoffman Estates Park District</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>Officials, Martial Arts, Racquetball, Music, Gymnastics, Soccer, Basketball, STEM, Art</td>
<td>$129,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Elgin Parks and Recreation</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>Group Fitness, Officials, Dance and Cultural Arts, Martial Arts, Early Education</td>
<td>$235,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Schaumburg Park District</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>Tennis, Officials, Karate, Dog Training, Athletics, Fitness, Arts</td>
<td>Parks: $92,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Arlington Heights Park District</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>Officials, Martial Arts, Diving, Youth Sports, General, and Athletic Classes</td>
<td>$327,200</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fox Valley Park District</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>Personal trainers, Specialty fitness, Adult league officials, Animal care, Karate, Canvas painting, Robotics, Coding</td>
<td>$500,000</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
**Amenities**

Benchmark agencies were asked to provide a list of visitor amenities. Twenty-six amenities are shown in the chart below (Figure 9.). Of the amenities listed, synthetic fields and ice rinks are the least well represented in the park districts. All other amenities are spread somewhat evenly across the benchmark districts. Playgrounds are the most popular amenity, in addition each district offers an amenity unique to their system. Below the chart is some specific data about the amenities in the park districts.

### AMENITIES

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Amenity</th>
<th>Elgin Parks and Recreation</th>
<th>Hoffman Estates Park District</th>
<th>Fox Valley Park District</th>
<th>Schaumburg Park District</th>
<th>Bartlett Park District</th>
<th>Arlington Heights Park District</th>
<th>Rockford Park District</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Multi-Purpose Fields</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>75</td>
<td>41</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>102</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ball Diamonds</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>55</td>
<td>62</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>43</td>
<td>68</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Synthetic Fields</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>36</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lighted Fields</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>34</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Basketball Courts</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>19 full court</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>13 full court</td>
<td>31</td>
<td>49 full court</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tennis Courts</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>38</td>
<td>35</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>60</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pickleball Courts</td>
<td>12 outdoor</td>
<td>10 indoor</td>
<td>14 indoor</td>
<td>35 indoor</td>
<td>2 indoor</td>
<td>12 outdoor</td>
<td>12 outdoor</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sand Volleyball Courts</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Traditional Playgrounds</td>
<td>46</td>
<td>46</td>
<td>96</td>
<td>60</td>
<td>44</td>
<td>47</td>
<td>60</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Inclusive Playgrounds</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Recreation / Community Center</td>
<td>1 - 185.00 sq. ft.</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>4 - total 574,000 sq. ft.</td>
<td>1 - 130,00 sq. ft.</td>
<td>6 - 188,524 sq. ft.</td>
<td>3 - 18,567 sq. ft.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Indoor Aquatic Center / Pools</td>
<td>5 - 10,252 sq. ft.</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1 - 40,000 sq. ft.</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1 - 8,968 sq. ft.</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Outdoor Aquatic Center / Pools</td>
<td>2 Centers</td>
<td>22, 653 sq. ft.</td>
<td>14,142 sq. ft.</td>
<td>2 - 17,000 sq. ft.</td>
<td>3 centers</td>
<td>Total 38,100 sq. ft.</td>
<td>3 Centers</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>5 - 6,300 sq. ft.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>3 centers</td>
<td>5 - 51,559 sq. ft.</td>
<td>4,603 sq. ft.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>4,556 sq. ft.</td>
<td>4,220 sq. ft.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Splash Pads / Spray Grounds</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>5 - 8,600 sq. ft.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>5</td>
<td>2 total 4,000 sq. ft.</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Golf Courses</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>18 holes: 1</td>
<td>18 holes: 1</td>
<td>27 holes: 1</td>
<td>18 holes: 1</td>
<td>18 holes: 1</td>
<td>18 holes: 1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Golf Courses</td>
<td>18 holes: 1</td>
<td>18 holes: 1</td>
<td>18 holes: 1</td>
<td>27 holes: 1</td>
<td>18 holes: 1</td>
<td>18 holes: 1</td>
<td>18 holes: 1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Disc Golf Courses</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>18 holes: 1</td>
<td>18 holes: 1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>18 holes: 4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Disc Golf Courses</td>
<td>18 holes: 1</td>
<td>18 holes: 1</td>
<td>18 holes: 1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>9 holes: 1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Skate Parks</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bike Parks</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Picnic Shelters</td>
<td>37</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>71</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>22</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dog Parks</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nature Center</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Teen Center</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Unique Amenity</td>
<td>Rock Wall</td>
<td>Climbing Wall</td>
<td>TopTracer Golf Facility</td>
<td>Blackberry Farm (historic amusement) Garden Pits</td>
<td>10 meter diving board</td>
<td>Sailing, Snowboarding, and Tubing Hills</td>
<td>Lake Arlington</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ice Rink</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Among all benchmark park districts:

- Playgrounds are the most common amenity in the benchmark districts.
- Multi-purpose fields are the second most common.
- Basketball courts are the third most common amenity.
- All districts have at least seven lighted fields.
- All districts have at least one, nine-hole golf course.
- Picnic shelters range from 6 to 71 shelters.
- Two districts offer a Teen Center.
- All-inclusive playgrounds are offered in 6 of the 7 districts.
Fitness Memberships

Fitness Centers are a popular amenity in most park systems and districts. Four of the benchmark agencies have fitness centers with significant numbers of memberships, ranging from 3,000 to 15,000 members. Fitness membership by agency are listed from left to right, most to least (Figure 10).

The cost and number of memberships along with the type of fitness equipment, the size of the fitness center space and programs offered at fitness centers can create significant revenue for a park system. Using memberships fees as the common denominator, against the amount of revenue:

In descending order for revenue per membership:
- Hoffman Estates Park District: $494.34
- Arlington Heights Park District: $365.22
- Elgin Parks and Recreation $262.86
- Fox Valley Park District: $261.76
- Schaumburg Park District: $70.67

Program Participations*

Total program participation can include multiple participations from the same resident, which allows communities to see the overall impact and usage of their programs. (Figure 11.) *Participations are the number of experiences; participants are the number of individuals. One participant can have multiple participations.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Program Participation</th>
<th>Total Program Participations</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Rockford Park District</td>
<td>300,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fox Valley Park District</td>
<td>145,418</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hoffman Estates Park District</td>
<td>79,153</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Arlington Heights Park District</td>
<td>57,518</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Elgin Parks and Recreation</td>
<td>48,560</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Schaumburg Park District</td>
<td>40,491</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bartlett Park District</td>
<td>24,818</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Core programs are typically broader programs with strategic initiatives that have other supporting programs underneath them. Hoffman Estates Park District was the leader in the number of core programs provided with 72. An example of a core program would be Aquatics, with Learn to Swim as a sub program.
Operating Budget

The operating budget reflects the annual operational expenses for each park district and the budget sources. Every agency assessed utilized their General Fund for over half of their operating budgets, as well as dedicated levies for other significant portions of their expenses. (Figure 12.) This table shows the sources that are most popular among the benchmark districts.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Agency</th>
<th>Total Budgeted Operating Expenses (Current Year)</th>
<th>General Fund Tax Support</th>
<th>Dedicated Levies</th>
<th>Earned / Generated Revenue</th>
<th>Other Dedicated Taxes</th>
<th>Sponsorships</th>
<th>Grants</th>
<th>Other Dedicated Taxes</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Fox Valley Park District</td>
<td>$43,672,836</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>30%</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>27%</td>
<td>13%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rockford Park District</td>
<td>$37,320,162</td>
<td>54%</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>25%</td>
<td>9%</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>6%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Schaumburg Park District</td>
<td>$28,670,000</td>
<td>51%</td>
<td>2%</td>
<td>47%</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Arlington Heights Park District</td>
<td>$26,982,640</td>
<td>47%</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>37%</td>
<td>2%</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>1%</td>
<td>13%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Elgin Parks and Recreation</td>
<td>$18,500,000</td>
<td>51%</td>
<td>5%</td>
<td>44%</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hoffman Estates Park District</td>
<td>$16,539,313</td>
<td>31%</td>
<td>13%</td>
<td>53%</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bartlett Park District</td>
<td>$15,500,000</td>
<td>52%</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>42%</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>6%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

(Figure 12. Operating Budget)

Revenue Per Capita Earned

By examining each park district’s annual non-tax revenue, the benchmark districts with the largest earned income revenue is Schaumburg with $13,727,000. (Figure 13.) Using the resident per revenue ratio, Schaumburg has $175.99 of revenue per resident earned. Elgin Parks and Recreation reported $8,300,000 as their total non-tax earned revenue.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Agency</th>
<th>Population</th>
<th>Total Non-Tax Revenue</th>
<th>Revenue per Resident</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Schaumburg Park District</td>
<td>78,000</td>
<td>$13,727,000</td>
<td>$175.99</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Arlington Heights Park District</td>
<td>73,692</td>
<td>$12,495,090</td>
<td>$169.56</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fox Valley Park District</td>
<td>233,000</td>
<td>$11,880,000</td>
<td>$50.99</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hoffman Estates Park District</td>
<td>52,530</td>
<td>$9,647,600</td>
<td>$183.66</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rockford Park District</td>
<td>199,355</td>
<td>$9,361,945</td>
<td>$46.96</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Elgin Parks and Recreation</td>
<td>115,000</td>
<td>$8,300,000</td>
<td>$72.17</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bartlett Park District</td>
<td>42,100</td>
<td>$6,530,000</td>
<td>$155.11</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

(Figure 13. Revenue per Capita)
Revenue Sources

This table (Figure 14.) shows nine sources where parks districts generate revenue. Programs/classes are the most prevalent sources of revenue followed by entry fees and memberships. The percentages presented in the “other” sources column indicate that districts utilize several revenue streams to provide income. Facilities rank third as a revenue source behind fees for programs, and classes and entry and memberships.

### Revenue Sources

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Agency</th>
<th>Facility Entry Fees/ Memberships</th>
<th>Programs/ Class Fees and Charges</th>
<th>Facility Rentals</th>
<th>Facility, property, or ROW leases</th>
<th>Concessions/ resale items</th>
<th>Donations/ In-Kind</th>
<th>Grants</th>
<th>Sponsorships</th>
<th>Other</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Hoffman Estates Park District</td>
<td>26%</td>
<td>51%</td>
<td>12%</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>8%</td>
<td>1%</td>
<td>1%</td>
<td>1%</td>
<td>1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bartlett Park District</td>
<td>25%</td>
<td>46%</td>
<td>6%</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>15%</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>3%</td>
<td>1%</td>
<td>4%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Schaumburg Park District</td>
<td>13%</td>
<td>46%</td>
<td>17%</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>3%</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>5%</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>17%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Arlington Heights Park District</td>
<td>39%</td>
<td>41%</td>
<td>2%</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>3.5%</td>
<td>1.9%</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>16%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fox Valley Park District</td>
<td>34%</td>
<td>30%</td>
<td>10%</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>1%</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>25%</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Elgin Parks and Recreation</td>
<td>13%</td>
<td>25%</td>
<td>5%</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>2%</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>4%</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>51%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rockford Park District</td>
<td>38%</td>
<td>14%</td>
<td>16%</td>
<td>6%</td>
<td>18%</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>0%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Figure 14. Revenue Sources**

### Funding Sources

Including earned/generated revenue, this table (Figure 15.) lists seven sources where peer agencies obtain funding. Taxes are used to support their general fund. Elgin is no exception with 51% of their general fund supported by taxes. This percentage is within the realm of the other benchmark park districts. The second most reliable funding source is from earned/generated revenue, outlined in the previous table.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Agency</th>
<th>Total Budgeted Operating Expenses (Current Year)</th>
<th>General Fund Tax Support</th>
<th>Dedicated Levies</th>
<th>Earned / Generated Revenue</th>
<th>Other Dedicated Taxes</th>
<th>Sponsorships</th>
<th>Grants</th>
<th>Other</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Rockford Park District</td>
<td>$37,320,162</td>
<td>54%</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>25%</td>
<td>9%</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>6%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bartlett Park District</td>
<td>$15,500,000</td>
<td>52%</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>42%</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>6%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Schaumburg Park District</td>
<td>$28,670,000</td>
<td>51%</td>
<td>2%</td>
<td>47%</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Elgin Parks and Recreation</td>
<td>$18,500,000</td>
<td>51%</td>
<td>5%</td>
<td>44%</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Arlington Heights Park District</td>
<td>$26,982,640</td>
<td>31%</td>
<td>13%</td>
<td>53%</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hoffman Estates Park District</td>
<td>$16,539,313</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>30%</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>27%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fox Valley Park District</td>
<td>$43,672,836</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>30%</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>27%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Figure 15. Funding Sources**

### Operating Expense Per Capita

Dividing the annual operational budget by each service area’s population allows for a comparison of how much each park district is spending per resident. (Figure 16.)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Agency</th>
<th>Population</th>
<th>Total Operating Expense</th>
<th>Operating Expense per Resident</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Bartlett Park District</td>
<td>42,100</td>
<td>$15,500,000</td>
<td>$368.17</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Schaumburg Park District</td>
<td>78,000</td>
<td>$28,670,000</td>
<td>$367.56</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Arlington Heights Park District</td>
<td>73,692</td>
<td>$26,982,640</td>
<td>$366.15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hoffman Estates Park District</td>
<td>52,530</td>
<td>$16,539,313</td>
<td>$314.85</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fox Valley Park District</td>
<td>233,000</td>
<td>$43,672,836</td>
<td>$187.44</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rockford Park District</td>
<td>199,355</td>
<td>$37,320,162</td>
<td>$187.20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Elgin Parks and Recreation</td>
<td>115,000</td>
<td>$18,500,000</td>
<td>$160.87</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Figure 16. Operating Expense per Capita**
Operating Expenses Per Acre and Per FTE

Other lens for evaluating operating expenses in a park district is by total acres of parks and open space, as well as by FTE (Figures 17. and 18.). These metrics compare the operational resource level of an agency against the acreage of lands managed, based on staffing.

Per Acre

Elgin is similar to other benchmark communities in operating expense per FTE at $10,227 per FTE. Elgin also ranked second to the lowest among assessed agencies for total operating expense per acre. (Figure 17.)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Agency</th>
<th>Total Acres</th>
<th>Total Operating Expense</th>
<th>Operating Expense per Acre</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Arlington Heights Park District</td>
<td>714</td>
<td>$21,870,375</td>
<td>$30,632</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bartlett Park District</td>
<td>600</td>
<td>$15,500,000</td>
<td>$25,833</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Schaumburg Park District</td>
<td>1,157</td>
<td>$28,670,000</td>
<td>$24,780</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fox Valley Park District</td>
<td>2,383</td>
<td>$43,672,836</td>
<td>$18,327</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hoffman Estates Park District</td>
<td>933</td>
<td>$16,539,313</td>
<td>$17,727</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Elgin Parks and Recreation</td>
<td>1,809</td>
<td>$18,500,000</td>
<td>$10,227</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rockford Park District</td>
<td>4,919</td>
<td>$37,320,162</td>
<td>$7,587</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Figure 17. Operating Expense per Acre

Operating Expense Per FTE

Operating expense per FTE is created by dividing the total FTEs by the total operating budget (Figure 18).

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Agency</th>
<th>Total FTEs</th>
<th>Total Operating Expense</th>
<th>Operating Expense per FTE</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Rockford Park District</td>
<td>130</td>
<td>$37,320,162</td>
<td>$287,078</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Arlington Heights Park District</td>
<td>181</td>
<td>$35,603,300</td>
<td>$196,703</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fox Valley Park District</td>
<td>269</td>
<td>$43,672,836</td>
<td>$162,353</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hoffman Estates Park District</td>
<td>158</td>
<td>$16,539,313</td>
<td>$104,679</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Schaumburg Park District</td>
<td>274</td>
<td>$28,670,000</td>
<td>$104,635</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Elgin Parks and Recreation</td>
<td>179</td>
<td>$18,500,000</td>
<td>$103,352</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bartlett Park District</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>$15,500,000</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Figure 18. Operating Expense per FTE
Operational Cost Recovery
Operational cost recovery is a key performance indicator which measures how well an agency’s revenue covers their cost of operations. (Figure 19.) Overall, agencies participating in the benchmark study have a high-cost recovery. Elgin features an operational cost recovery of 45%, which is comparable to the majority of park districts involved in the benchmark study.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Agency</th>
<th>Total Non-Tax Revenue</th>
<th>Total Operating Expense</th>
<th>Operational Cost Recovery</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Hoffman Estates Park District</td>
<td>$9,647,600</td>
<td>$16,539,313</td>
<td>58%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Schaumburg Park District</td>
<td>$13,727,000</td>
<td>$28,670,000</td>
<td>48%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Arlington Heights Park District</td>
<td>$12,495,090</td>
<td>$26,982,640</td>
<td>46%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Elgin Parks and Recreation</td>
<td>$8,300,000</td>
<td>$18,500,000</td>
<td>45%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bartlett Park District</td>
<td>$6,530,000</td>
<td>$15,500,000</td>
<td>42%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fox Valley Park District</td>
<td>$11,880,000</td>
<td>$43,672,836</td>
<td>27%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rockford Park District</td>
<td>$9,361,945</td>
<td>$37,320,162</td>
<td>25%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Figure 19. Operational Cost Recovery

Capital Improvement Plan
Due to the volatility of Capital Improvement Plan (CIP) budgets and availability of funding from year to year, the table below (Figure 20.) reveals the last three years of actual investment from 2019 through 2021. These figures were then utilized to show the average annual capital investment for each agency.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Agency</th>
<th>CIP Budget 2019</th>
<th>CIP Budget 2020</th>
<th>CIP Budget 2021</th>
<th>Avg. Annual CIP</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Rockford Park District</td>
<td>$16,143,867</td>
<td>$25,240,364</td>
<td>$29,303,417</td>
<td>$23,562,549</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fox Valley Park District</td>
<td>$23,573,393</td>
<td>$3,358,065</td>
<td>$9,218,856</td>
<td>$12,050,105</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Schaumburg Park District</td>
<td>$10,500,000</td>
<td>$10,500,000</td>
<td>$11,000,000</td>
<td>$10,666,667</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Arlington Heights Park District</td>
<td>$1,775,996</td>
<td>$3,944,980</td>
<td>$5,525,560</td>
<td>$3,748,845</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hoffman Estates Park District</td>
<td>$2,093,152</td>
<td>$114,847</td>
<td>$2,485,501</td>
<td>$1,564,500</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bartlett Park District</td>
<td>$1,522,000</td>
<td>$1,258,000</td>
<td>$1,523,000</td>
<td>$1,434,333</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Elgin Parks and Recreation</td>
<td>$745,000</td>
<td>$925,000</td>
<td>$685,000</td>
<td>$785,000</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Figure 20. Capital Improvement Plan
Scholarships:

Scholarships are an excellent way for park districts to give back to the community and all of the benchmark agencies provide scholarships supported by a park foundation. (Figure 21.) Elgin provides a mid-range number of scholarships (350) at $125 per participant, their annual scholarship awards total $38,750.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Agency</th>
<th>Do you have a Foundation?</th>
<th>If so, how many events are held annually</th>
<th>Do you award scholarships or subsidies?</th>
<th>What is the maximum amount provided per participant?</th>
<th>If so, what is the number of participants that receive yearly subsidy on average?</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Rockford Park District</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Several</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>$67.61</td>
<td>786</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hoffman Estates Park District</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>$1,500</td>
<td>350</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Elgin Parks and Recreation</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>$125</td>
<td>300</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Arlington Heights Park District</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Varies</td>
<td>302</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Schaumburg Park District</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>$250</td>
<td>60 to 80</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fox Valley Park District</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>$1,450</td>
<td>63</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bartlett Park District</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>$200</td>
<td>25</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Figure 21. Scholarships

Summary of Benchmark Analysis Findings

The benchmark agencies provide a good comparison for Elgin. Specific areas where peer agencies perform at a very high level include total park acreage per resident, staffing, operational cost recovery, and revenue per capita. The data provided by all peer agencies exceeded the national statistics of NRPA.

The benchmark evaluation validated the strong performance of Elgin in many areas, such as staffing, operating expense per acre, and operational cost recovery. These strengths speak to the investment in the park system, as well as the ability of the staff to offer high quality parks and services for the community. Although Elgin’s revenue generated from facility and entry fees, and programs and classes is slightly lower than the peer agencies, they are able to rely on funding support from taxes not available to peer agencies. And despite their program and class fees being lower than other park districts, their earned generated income is in line with other park districts.

Areas where the Department could grow and improve were related to lower spending compared to the peer agencies. The Department was found to be below the peer agencies in categories such as operating budget, operating expense per FTE, and CIP spending.

Increased departmental spending could obtain higher program participation, improve earned revenue generation, increase outreach, and the capability to better serve residents. Though some comparisons may have the Department on the lower end comparatively, Elgin is firmly in the middle of the pack or better in several metrics.

Overall, as a point of reference Elgin is a strong park and recreation department This Benchmark Analysis should be used to identify operational changes, or capital improvements that will bring the Department closer in line with its peers.
APPENDIX G  | GIS SUMMARY PRESENTATION

A document with the summary GIS presentation related to demographics and trend analysis.
COMMUNITY CONTEXT

LAND USE
2022 (NO DATA FROM 2011)
ZONING
2022

Utilities

INFRAsTRUCuRE & TRANSPORTATION
2022 (NO DATA FROM 2011)

Utilities
Number of additions to existing facilities within the center city since 2008.

Additional routes needed for more regional connections, direct connections to parks.
TRANSPORT & FREIGHT

No changes to rail lines since 2011 (based on city data)

84% of residents are within a 10-minute walk of a bus stop

68% of parks are within a 5-minute walk from a bus stop

*Assuming the average individual walks 1/2 mile in 5 minutes, 1/4 mile in 10 minutes

ENVIRONMENTAL CONDITIONS

2022 (NO DATA FROM 2011)
ENVIRONMENTAL CONDITIONS
2016 (NO DATA FROM 2011)

Source: CMAP

ENVIRONMENTAL CHANGES – LAND COVER

2011 – LAND COVER

Source: CMAP
POLITICAL & JURISDICTIONAL
COUNTY BOUNDARIES 2022
No changes

POLITICAL & JURISDICTIONAL
CITY BOUNDARY 2011-2022
Parcel annexations to the north
NEIGHBORHOOD GROUPS

2022

SCHOOLS

NO DATA FROM 2011
From 2000-2020, Elgin's total population increased by 22% (6% from 2010-2020). Total household population to increase by 20% from 2010-2030. Total households to increase by 28% from 2010-2030.
Keeping with trends since 2010, the diversity index will increase by 1% from 2022-2027.
Median household income increased 7% from 2010-2020, and is projected to increase by 7% from 2022-2027.

Total employment to increase by 13% from 2010-2030.

Source: ESRI Community Analyst, CMAP Time Series
SERVICE AREA MAPPING

PARK LEVEL OF SERVICE STANDARDS

The City of Elgin’s Parks and Recreation Master Plan establishes a desired level of service (LOS) standard of 15 acres of parkland for every 1,000 residents. With an estimated 2022 population of 114,423, Elgin’s 1,770 acres of total parkland equates to an LOS of 15.5 acres per 1,000 residents, meaning the City is meeting its desired objective.
59% of residents are within a 5-minute walk of a park

91% of residents are within a 10-minute walk of a park

*Assuming the average individual walks ¼ mile in 5 minutes, ½ mile in 10 minutes.

Data Source: CMAP LAZ HH Pop

We've classified parks that were left "unidentified" based on 2011 plan parameters for Special, Neighborhood, Community and Regional parks. Are we missing the mark anywhere?

NEW/UNCLASSIFIED PARKS

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>NAME</th>
<th>Class</th>
<th>Amenity</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>FESTIVAL PARK</td>
<td>Special</td>
<td>Play</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DILL CREEK PARK</td>
<td>Special</td>
<td>Play</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PARKWAY PARK</td>
<td>Special</td>
<td>Play</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>WOODVIEW PARK</td>
<td>neighborhood</td>
<td>Play</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TRILLIUM PARK</td>
<td>Special</td>
<td>Passive</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SHAMROCK PARK</td>
<td>Neighborhood</td>
<td>Active</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LONGCORN MOORE PARK</td>
<td>Neighborhood</td>
<td>Active</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>HERITAGE PARK</td>
<td>Neighborhood</td>
<td>Active</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TOURNAMENT DR PARK</td>
<td>Special</td>
<td>Passive</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DRUMMOND MEMORIAL</td>
<td>neighborhood</td>
<td>Open Space</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>WILLOW CREEK PARK</td>
<td>Neighborhood</td>
<td>Open Space</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>JACK E. COOK PARK</td>
<td>Special</td>
<td>Open Space</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

2009 Total Household Population

- 0 - 100
- 101 - 500
- 501 - 1,000
- 1,001 - 2,000
- 2,001 - 5,000

Data Source: Community, Neighborhood, Regional, Special Use
ACCESS TO AMENITIES

AGE COHORTS UNDER 17

AMENITIES

AGE COHORTS UNDER 17: 10-MINUTE WALK RADIUS (1/2 MI)
**AMENITIES**

**AGE COHORTS UNDER 17: 10-MINUTE WALK RADIUS (1/2 MI)**

Gap in access to parks for ages 0-17 on northwest & southwest sides.

---

**AMENITIES**

**AGE COHORTS OVER 65**
AMENITIES

AGE COHORTS OVER 65: 10-MINUTE WALK RADIUS (1/2 MI)

Gap in access to parks for ages 65+ on northwest & southwest sides
**GAP ANALYSIS**

**NEXT STEPS**

- Obtain 2011 P/R plan district shapefile from the city if accessible
- Do Level of Service Standard (LOS) analysis for each district to understand gaps in acreage per person, and compare to city-wide LOS
- Look at LOS for 0-17yr old and 65+ age groups

---

**OTHER PARK ACCESSIBILITY DATA POINTS**

**SOURCE: TPL**

- Percentage of residents within a 10-minute walk of a park by age:
  - Children (0-19): 74%
  - Adults (20-64): 72%
  - Seniors (65+): 67%

- Percentage of residents within a 10-minute walk of a park by income:
  - High Income: 67%
  - Middle Income: 72%
  - Low Income: 74%

- Percentage of residents within a 10-minute walk of a park by race/ethnicity:
  - American Indian*: 67%
  - Asian*: 66%
  - Black*: 70%
  - Hispanic*: 76%
  - Pacific Islander*: 71%
  - White*: 65%
  - 2 or More Races*: 72%
  - Other*: 73%

---

*Excludes those that report Hispanic origin (which is captured separately from race by the U.S. Census).

6% of Elgin’s city land is used for parks and recreation.
Analysis Parameters:

All populated areas in a city that fall outside of a 10-minute walk of a park are assigned a level of priority, based on a comprehensive index of six equally weighted demographic and environmental metrics. These areas are census block groups from which unpopulated areas and 10-minute walk service areas were removed. The metrics below are calculated for each block group, normalized relative to each city, and averaged to create the park priority.

- Population density*
- Density of low income households*—which are defined as households with income less than 75% of the urban area median household income
- Density of people of color*
- Community health—a combined index based on the rate of poor mental health and low physical activity from the 2020 CDC PLACES census tract dataset
- Urban heat islands—surface temperature at least 1.25 degrees greater than city mean surface temperature from Trust for Public Land, based on 2021 Landsat 8 satellite imagery
- Pollution burden—Air toxics respiratory hazard index from 2020 EPA EJScreen

*Based on 2021 US Census Block Groups provided by Esri

https://www.tpl.org/parkserve/about
ESRI LOCAL MARKET POTENTIAL
PULLED MARKET REPORTS FROM ESRI: ESRI REPORTS

Source: ESRI Sport & Leisure Market Potential

- 29% Participated in walking for exercise in last 12 months
- 16% Participated in hiking in last 12 months
- 14% Participated in swimming in last 12 months
- 13% Participated in weightlifting in last 12 months
OPEN SPACE, GREENWAYS, TRAILS & CONNECTIVITY

ACCESSIBILITY
Looking at access to employment centers, retail nodes, institutional destinations, schools, parks, existing greenways
82% of residents are within a 10-min walk of a bike facility

13% of parks are directly connected to the community by an existing bike facility

76% of parks are within a 5-min walk of a bike facility

Bike facility refers to bike paths, lanes & routes

*Assuming the average individual walks 1/4 mile in 5 minutes, 1/2 mile in 10 minutes

Lords Park, Eagle/Burridge Park, Wing Park, Sports Complex - opportunities existing for improved direct connections
APPENDIX H | ORDER OF MAGNITUDE COST

A document containing unit cost estimates for each of the nine focus parks.
## DRAKE FIELD

**Order of Magnitude Cost**  
Figures in 2023 U.S. Dollars

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Item</th>
<th>Item Description</th>
<th>Quantity</th>
<th>Unit</th>
<th>Unit Cost</th>
<th>Item Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>Site preparation &amp; demolition</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>LS</td>
<td>$250,000.00</td>
<td>$250,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>Native restoration</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>AC</td>
<td>$7,000.00</td>
<td>$18,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>Asphalt pavement</td>
<td>20,000</td>
<td>SF</td>
<td>$10.00</td>
<td>$200,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>Concrete sidewalk</td>
<td>9,600</td>
<td>SF</td>
<td>$12.00</td>
<td>$115,200</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>Renovation/relocation of existing concessions</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>LS</td>
<td>$150,000.00</td>
<td>$150,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>New court play</td>
<td>13,000</td>
<td>SF</td>
<td>$25.00</td>
<td>$325,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>New playground</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>LS</td>
<td>$200,000.00</td>
<td>$200,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td>Monument signage</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>EA</td>
<td>$65,000.00</td>
<td>$65,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9</td>
<td>Lawn seed</td>
<td>5,250</td>
<td>SY</td>
<td>$2.00</td>
<td>$10,500</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10</td>
<td>Bioretention basin</td>
<td>19,000</td>
<td>SF</td>
<td>$28.00</td>
<td>$532,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11</td>
<td>Landscaping</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>LS</td>
<td>$10,000.00</td>
<td>$10,000</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Subtotal**  
$1,875,900 $2,813,850  50% contingency

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Item</th>
<th>Item Description</th>
<th>Quantity</th>
<th>Unit</th>
<th>Unit Cost</th>
<th>Item Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

**Construction Subtotal**  
$1,875,900 $2,813,850

- Design/Engineering/Permits | 15% | $281,400 | $422,100 |
- Design Contingency & Remaining Elements | 30% | $562,800 | $844,200 |

**Project Total**  
$2,720,100 $4,080,150

$2,720,000 $4,080,000
### Order of Magnitude Cost
Figures in 2023 U.S. Dollars

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Item</th>
<th>Elgin Shores Park</th>
<th>Quantity</th>
<th>Unit</th>
<th>Unit Cost</th>
<th>Item Total</th>
<th>Remarks</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>Site preparation &amp; demolition</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>LS</td>
<td>$100,000.00</td>
<td>$100,000</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>Native restoration</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>AC</td>
<td>$7,000.00</td>
<td>$35,000</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>Concrete sidewalk</td>
<td>113,400</td>
<td>SF</td>
<td>$12.00</td>
<td>$1,360,800</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>Asphalt pavement</td>
<td>110,000</td>
<td>SF</td>
<td>$10.00</td>
<td>$1,100,000</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>Curb &amp; Gutter</td>
<td>3,850</td>
<td>LF</td>
<td>$30.00</td>
<td>$115,500</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>Overlook</td>
<td>3,000</td>
<td>SF</td>
<td>$85.00</td>
<td>$255,000</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>Boat/Kayak launch</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>LS</td>
<td>$100,000.00</td>
<td>$100,000</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td>Skate park</td>
<td>16,000</td>
<td>SF</td>
<td>$25.00</td>
<td>$400,000</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9</td>
<td>Playground and event lawn</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>LS</td>
<td>$300,000.00</td>
<td>$300,000</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10</td>
<td>Renovation of existing concessions</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>LS</td>
<td>$120,000.00</td>
<td>$120,000</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11</td>
<td>Small open-air shelter</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>EA</td>
<td>$50,000.00</td>
<td>$100,000</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12</td>
<td>Lighting</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>LS</td>
<td>$750,000.00</td>
<td>$750,000</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13</td>
<td>Relocated/restored little league baseball fields</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>EA</td>
<td>$50,000.00</td>
<td>$100,000</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14</td>
<td>Restored adult baseball fields</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>EA</td>
<td>$25,000.00</td>
<td>$50,000</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15</td>
<td>Monument signage</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>EA</td>
<td>$65,000.00</td>
<td>$65,000</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16</td>
<td>Bioretention basin</td>
<td>9,600</td>
<td>SF</td>
<td>$28.00</td>
<td>$268,800</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17</td>
<td>Trees</td>
<td>92</td>
<td>EA</td>
<td>$600.00</td>
<td>$55,200</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>18</td>
<td>Landscaping</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>LS</td>
<td>$20,000.00</td>
<td>$20,000</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Subtotal**  
$5,295,300  
$7,942,950  
50% contingency

**Construction Subtotal**  
$5,295,300  
$7,942,950

- Design/Engineering/Permits 15%  
  $794,300  
  $1,191,400
- Design Contingency & Remaining Elements 30%  
  $1,588,600  
  $2,382,900

**Project Total**  
$7,678,200  
$11,517,250

$7,678,000  
$11,517,000
### Festival Park

**Client:** Elgin Parks and Recreation  
**Project #:** 13988  
**Detail Order of Magnitude Cost (Figures in 2023 U.S. Dollars)**  
**Date:** 5/19/2023  
**Phase:** Master Plan Update

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Item</th>
<th>Item Description</th>
<th>Quantity</th>
<th>Unit</th>
<th>Unit Cost</th>
<th>Item Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>Site preparation &amp; demolition</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>LS</td>
<td>$50,000.00</td>
<td>$50,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>Concrete sidewalk - Feature</td>
<td>19,000</td>
<td>SF</td>
<td>$18.00</td>
<td>$342,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>Overlook</td>
<td>1,000</td>
<td>SF</td>
<td>$85.00</td>
<td>$85,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>Seasonal Ice Rink</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>LS</td>
<td>$600,000.00</td>
<td>$600,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>New stage</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>LS</td>
<td>$1,500,000.00</td>
<td>$1,500,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>Lighting</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>LS</td>
<td>$100,000.00</td>
<td>$100,000.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>Restored playground surfacing</td>
<td>5,500</td>
<td>SF</td>
<td>$25.00</td>
<td>$137,500</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td>New sylva cell system*</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9</td>
<td>Kiosk</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>EA</td>
<td>$10,000.00</td>
<td>$20,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10</td>
<td>Small park sign</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>EA</td>
<td>$8,000.00</td>
<td>$16,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11</td>
<td>Trees</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>EA</td>
<td>$600.00</td>
<td>$9,600</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12</td>
<td>Landscaping</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>LS</td>
<td>$20,000.00</td>
<td>$20,000</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Subtotal**  
$2,880,100  
$4,320,150  
50% contingency

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Item</th>
<th>Item Description</th>
<th>Quantity</th>
<th>Unit</th>
<th>Unit Cost</th>
<th>Item Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Construction Subtotal**  
$2,880,100  
$4,320,150

- Design/Engineering/Permits  
  15%  
  $432,000  
  $648,000

- Design Contingency & Remaining Elements  
  30%  
  $864,000  
  $1,296,000

**Project Total**  
$4,176,100  
$6,264,150

*New sylva cell system not included in Order of Magnitude Cost.
# Lords Park A

**Order of Magnitude Cost**

*Figures in 2023 U.S. Dollars*

---

**Client:** Elgin Parks and Recreation  
**Project #:** 13988  
**Detail:** Order of Magnitude Cost (Figures in 2023 U.S. Dollars)  
**Date:** 5/19/2023  
**Phase:** Master Plan Update

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Item</th>
<th>Item Description</th>
<th>Quantity</th>
<th>Unit</th>
<th>Unit Cost</th>
<th>Item Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>Site preparation &amp; demolition</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>LS</td>
<td>$500,000.00</td>
<td>$500,000.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>Native restoration</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>AC</td>
<td>$7,000.00</td>
<td>$7,000.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>Asphalt pavement</td>
<td>38,000</td>
<td>SF</td>
<td>$10.00</td>
<td>$380,000.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>Curb &amp; gutter</td>
<td>2,000</td>
<td>LF</td>
<td>$30.00</td>
<td>$60,000.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>Asphalt path</td>
<td>50,000</td>
<td>SF</td>
<td>$5.00</td>
<td>$250,000.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>Concrete sidewalk</td>
<td>3,600</td>
<td>SF</td>
<td>$12.00</td>
<td>$43,200.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>Concrete sidewalk - decorative</td>
<td>15,000</td>
<td>SF</td>
<td>$18.00</td>
<td>$270,000.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td>New court play</td>
<td>13,000</td>
<td>SF</td>
<td>$25.00</td>
<td>$325,000.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9</td>
<td>Monument signage</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>EA</td>
<td>$65,000.00</td>
<td>$260,000.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10</td>
<td>Feature Sign</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>EA</td>
<td>$30,000.00</td>
<td>$60,000.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11</td>
<td>Kiosk</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>EA</td>
<td>$10,000.00</td>
<td>$10,000.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12</td>
<td>Stormwater Pond</td>
<td>65,000</td>
<td>SF</td>
<td>$5.00</td>
<td>$325,000.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13</td>
<td>Interpretive Boardwalk</td>
<td>1,900</td>
<td>SF</td>
<td>$125.00</td>
<td>$237,500.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14</td>
<td>Pond dredge &amp; Restoration</td>
<td>77,000</td>
<td>SF</td>
<td>$5.00</td>
<td>$385,000.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15</td>
<td>Pond dredge &amp; Restoration</td>
<td>95,000</td>
<td>SF</td>
<td>$5.00</td>
<td>$475,000.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16</td>
<td>Pond dredge &amp; Restoration</td>
<td>63,000</td>
<td>SF</td>
<td>$5.00</td>
<td>$315,000.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17</td>
<td>Splash Pad</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>LS</td>
<td>$750,000.00</td>
<td>$750,000.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>18</td>
<td>Zoo expansion</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>LS</td>
<td>$2,000,000.00</td>
<td>$2,000,000.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>19</td>
<td>Landscaping</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>LS</td>
<td>$15,000.00</td>
<td>$15,000.00</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Subtotal**  
$6,665,950  
$9,998,925  
50% contingency

<p>| | | | | | |</p>
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Construction Subtotal</strong></td>
<td>$6,665,950</td>
<td>$9,998,925</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Design/Engineering/Permits</td>
<td>15%</td>
<td>$999,900</td>
<td>$1,499,800</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Design Contingency &amp; Remaining Elements</td>
<td>30%</td>
<td>$1,999,800</td>
<td>$2,999,700</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<p>| | | | | | |</p>
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Project Total</strong></td>
<td>$9,666,000</td>
<td>$14,498,000</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

---
## Order of Magnitude Cost

Figures in 2023 U.S. Dollars

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Item</th>
<th>Item</th>
<th>Quantity</th>
<th>Unit</th>
<th>Unit Cost</th>
<th>Item Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>Site preparation &amp; demolition</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>LS</td>
<td>$100,000.00</td>
<td>$100,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>Native restoration</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>AC</td>
<td>$7,000.00</td>
<td>$7,250</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>Asphalt pavement</td>
<td>53,000</td>
<td>SF</td>
<td>$10.00</td>
<td>$530,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>Curb &amp; gutter</td>
<td>3,700</td>
<td>LF</td>
<td>$30.00</td>
<td>$111,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>Asphalt path</td>
<td>50,000</td>
<td>SF</td>
<td>$5.00</td>
<td>$250,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>Concrete sidewalk</td>
<td>4,000</td>
<td>SF</td>
<td>$12.00</td>
<td>$48,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>Concrete sidewalk - decorative</td>
<td>3,300</td>
<td>SF</td>
<td>$18.00</td>
<td>$59,400</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td>Monument signage</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>EA</td>
<td>$65,000.00</td>
<td>$260,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9</td>
<td>Feature Sign</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>EA</td>
<td>$30,000.00</td>
<td>$30,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10</td>
<td>Kiosk</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>EA</td>
<td>$10,000.00</td>
<td>$10,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11</td>
<td>Stormwater Pond</td>
<td>65,000</td>
<td>SF</td>
<td>$5.00</td>
<td>$325,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12</td>
<td>Interpretive Boardwalk</td>
<td>1,900</td>
<td>SF</td>
<td>$125.00</td>
<td>$237,500</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13</td>
<td>Pond dredge &amp; Restoration</td>
<td>77,000</td>
<td>SF</td>
<td>$5.00</td>
<td>$385,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14</td>
<td>Pond dredge &amp; Restoration</td>
<td>95,000</td>
<td>SF</td>
<td>$5.00</td>
<td>$475,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15</td>
<td>Pond dredge &amp; Restoration</td>
<td>63,000</td>
<td>SF</td>
<td>$5.00</td>
<td>$315,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16</td>
<td>Zoo expansion</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>LS</td>
<td>$2,000,000.00</td>
<td>$2,000,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17</td>
<td>Landscaping</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>LS</td>
<td>$15,000.00</td>
<td>$15,000</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Subtotal $5,156,150 $7,734,225 50% contingency

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Item</th>
<th>Item</th>
<th>Quantity</th>
<th>Unit</th>
<th>Unit Cost</th>
<th>Item Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Construction Subtotal $5,156,150 $7,734,225

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Item</th>
<th>Item</th>
<th>Quantity</th>
<th>Unit</th>
<th>Unit Cost</th>
<th>Item Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>15%</td>
<td>Design/Engineering/Permits</td>
<td>15%</td>
<td></td>
<td>$773,400</td>
<td>$1,160,100</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>30%</td>
<td>Design Contingency &amp; Remaining Elements</td>
<td>30%</td>
<td></td>
<td>$1,546,800</td>
<td>$2,320,300</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Project Total $7,476,350 $11,214,625

$7,476,000 $11,215,000
## Order of Magnitude Cost

**Figures in 2023 U.S. Dollars**

**Client:** Elgin Parks and Recreation  
**Project #:** 13988  
**Detail Order of Magnitude Cost (Figures in 2023 U.S. Dollars)**  
**Date:** 5/19/2023  
**Phase:** Master Plan Update

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Item</th>
<th>Item Description</th>
<th>Quantity</th>
<th>Unit</th>
<th>Unit Cost</th>
<th>Item Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>Site preparation &amp; demolition</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>LS</td>
<td>$50,000.00</td>
<td>$50,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>Native restoration</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>AC</td>
<td>$7,000.00</td>
<td>$14,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>Asphalt path</td>
<td>6,400</td>
<td>SF</td>
<td>$5.00</td>
<td>$32,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>New court play</td>
<td>13,000</td>
<td>SF</td>
<td>$25.00</td>
<td>$325,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>Court resurfacing</td>
<td>14,500</td>
<td>SF</td>
<td>$15.00</td>
<td>$217,500</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>New playground equipment and surfacing</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>LS</td>
<td>$250,000.00</td>
<td>$250,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>Small open-air shelter</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>EA</td>
<td>$25,000.00</td>
<td>$25,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td>Overlook</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>EA</td>
<td>$20,000.00</td>
<td>$20,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9</td>
<td>Skate park renovation</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>LS</td>
<td>$50,000.00</td>
<td>$50,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10</td>
<td>Landscaping</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>LS</td>
<td>$10,000.00</td>
<td>$10,000</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Subtotal**  
$993,500  
$1,490,250  
50% contingency

### Construction Subtotal

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Item Description</th>
<th>Percentage</th>
<th>Amount</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Design/Engineering/Permits</td>
<td>15%</td>
<td>$149,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Design Contingency &amp; Remaining Elements</td>
<td>30%</td>
<td>$298,100</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Project Total**  
$1,440,600  
$2,160,850  
$1,441,000  
$2,161,000
## Order of Magnitude Cost

**Figures in 2023 U.S. Dollars**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Item</th>
<th>Item Description</th>
<th>Quantity</th>
<th>Unit</th>
<th>Unit Cost</th>
<th>Item Total</th>
<th>Remarks</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>Site preparation &amp; demolition</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>LS</td>
<td>$25,000.00</td>
<td>$25,000</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>Asphalt path</td>
<td>7,200</td>
<td>SF</td>
<td>$5.00</td>
<td>$36,000</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>Pavement safety striping</td>
<td>350</td>
<td>LF</td>
<td>$50.00</td>
<td>$17,500</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>Parking island</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>EA</td>
<td>$5,000.00</td>
<td>$100,000</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>Trees</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>EA</td>
<td>$600.00</td>
<td>$24,000</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>Landscaping</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>LS</td>
<td>$10,000.00</td>
<td>$10,000</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Subtotal**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Item Total</th>
<th>50% contingency</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>$212,500</td>
<td>$318,750</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Construction Subtotal**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Item Description</th>
<th>Percentage</th>
<th>Item Total</th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Design/Engineering/Permits</td>
<td>15%</td>
<td>$31,900</td>
<td>$47,800</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Design Contingency &amp; Remaining Elements</td>
<td>30%</td>
<td>$63,800</td>
<td>$95,600</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Project Total**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Item Total</th>
<th>Item Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>$308,200</td>
<td>$462,150</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

---

**Elgin Parks and Recreation**

APPENDIX H
### Order of Magnitude Cost

**Figures in 2023 U.S. Dollars**

**SUMMERHILL PARK**

**Elgin Parks and Recreation**

**Project #** 13988

**Detail**

**Date** 5/19/2023

**Phase** Master Plan Update

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Item</th>
<th>Quantity</th>
<th>Unit</th>
<th>Unit Cost</th>
<th>Item Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Summerhill Park</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1 Site preparation &amp; demolition</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>LS</td>
<td>$75,000.00</td>
<td>$75,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2 Native restoration</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>AC</td>
<td>$7,000.00</td>
<td>$14,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3 Asphalt path</td>
<td>9,400</td>
<td>SF</td>
<td>$5.00</td>
<td>$47,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4 Concrete sidewalk</td>
<td>7,700</td>
<td>SF</td>
<td>$12.00</td>
<td>$92,400</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5 New playground</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>LS</td>
<td>$200,000.00</td>
<td>$200,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6 Monument sign</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>EA</td>
<td>$65,000.00</td>
<td>$65,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7 Large shade structure</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>EA</td>
<td>$75,000.00</td>
<td>$75,000.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8 Trees</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>EA</td>
<td>$600.00</td>
<td>$6,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8 Landscaping</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>LS</td>
<td>$10,000.00</td>
<td>$10,000</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Subtotal** $584,400 $876,600 50% contingency

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Item</th>
<th>Quantity</th>
<th>Unit</th>
<th>Unit Cost</th>
<th>Item Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Construction Subtotal</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Design/Engineering/Permits</td>
<td>15%</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>$87,700</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Design Contingency &amp; Remaining Elements</td>
<td>30%</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>$175,300</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Project Total** $847,400 $1,271,100

50% contingency
### Order of Magnitude Cost
Figures in 2023 U.S. Dollars

**Client:** Elgin Parks and Recreation  
**Project #:** 13988  
**Detail:** Order of Magnitude Cost (Figures in 2023 U.S. Dollars)  
**Date:** 5/19/2023  
**Phase:** Master Plan Update

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Item</th>
<th>Item Description</th>
<th>Quantity</th>
<th>Unit</th>
<th>Unit Cost</th>
<th>Item Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>Site preparation &amp; demolition</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>LS</td>
<td>$250,000.00</td>
<td>$250,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>Native restoration</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>AC</td>
<td>$7,000.00</td>
<td>$98,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>Stone revetment replacement</td>
<td>2,550</td>
<td>LF</td>
<td>$1,200.00</td>
<td>$3,060,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>Monument signage</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>EA</td>
<td>$65,000.00</td>
<td>$130,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>Landscaping</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>LS</td>
<td>$10,000.00</td>
<td>$10,000</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Subtotal**  
$3,548,000  
50% contingency  
$5,322,000

**Construction Subtotal**  
$3,548,000  
15% Design/Engineering/Permits  
$532,200  
30% Design Contingency & Remaining Elements  
$1,064,400

**Project Total**  
$5,144,600  
$5,145,000  
$7,716,900  
$7,717,000
## Wing Park

### Order of Magnitude Cost

**Figures in 2023 U.S. Dollars**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Item</th>
<th>Quantity</th>
<th>Unit</th>
<th>Unit Cost</th>
<th>Item Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Site preparation &amp; demolition</strong></td>
<td>1</td>
<td>LS</td>
<td>$25,000</td>
<td>$25,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Asphalt path</strong></td>
<td>14,350</td>
<td>SF</td>
<td>$5.00</td>
<td>$71,750</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Feature Sign</strong></td>
<td>2</td>
<td>EA</td>
<td>$30,000.00</td>
<td>$60,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Park monument sign</strong></td>
<td>2</td>
<td>EA</td>
<td>$65,000.00</td>
<td>$130,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Kiosk</strong></td>
<td>3</td>
<td>EA</td>
<td>$10,000.00</td>
<td>$30,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Upgrade bandshell</strong></td>
<td>1</td>
<td>LS</td>
<td>$750,000.00</td>
<td>$750,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Trees</strong></td>
<td>40</td>
<td>EA</td>
<td>$600.00</td>
<td>$24,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Landscaping</strong></td>
<td>1</td>
<td>LS</td>
<td>$20,000.00</td>
<td>$20,000</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Subtotal** $1,110,750 $1,666,125 50% contingency

**Construction Subtotal** $1,110,750 $1,666,125

- Design/Engineering/Permits 15% $166,600 $249,900
- Design Contingency & Remaining Elements 30% $333,200 $499,800

**Project Total** $1,610,550 $2,415,825

$1,611,000 $2,416,000
APPENDIX I | RECOMMENDATION TASK LIST

A document containing a task list of each master plan update recommendation and goal categorized by recommendation type.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Goal</th>
<th>Completed (y/n)</th>
<th>Date Completed</th>
<th>Notes</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Level of Service Standards</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Add 70 acres of park space per 5,000 new residents</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Park Additions</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Add park space in areas designated High Priority</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Add park space in areas designated Moderate Priority</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Amenity Additions</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Add or modify specific park types in areas designated High Priority</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Add or modify specific park types in areas designated Moderate Priority</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Walkability</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>70% of residents live within a 5-minute walk of a park</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>98% of residents live within a 10-minute walk of a park</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Provide 0.4 miles of trail per 1,200 residents</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Bike Facilities</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>80% of Special Use and Community Parks are directly connected to a bike facility</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Public Transportation</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>80% of parks are within a 3-minute walk from a bus stop</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>90% of Special Use and Community Parks east of Randall Rd are within a 10-minute walk from a bus stop</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Festival Park, Lords Park, Sports Complex, and Wing Park have bus stops in the park</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Park Signage and Wayfinding</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Develop and adopt a signage family</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Develop standard Monument/entry signs at major park entrances</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Develop special feature signs for key destinations within existing parks</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Develop wayfinding signage for visitor orientation within parks</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Consider the inclusion of Bluetooth or QR code content within parks</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Conduct a city-wide signage and wayfinding study</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Access and Connectivity</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Conduct an updated ADA assessment at all parks</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Develop a consistent paved pedestrian connection to special use areas within parks</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Provide sufficient bike parking adjacent to major programmatic experiences</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Conduct a pedestrian and bicycle safety analysis at all Special Use and Community Parks</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Infrastructure and Maintenance</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Conduct a seating study for the Special Use and Community Parks</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Provide additional trash and recycling receptacles at main gathering places in all parks</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Conduct a receptacle audit for all major Special Use and Community Parks</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Identify and adopt a consistent site furnishing standard across all parks</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Review and/or update detailed/targeted maintenance plans for each park</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Review all park lighting to determine where new fixtures are necessary, and where replacements are needed</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Evaluate opportunities for incorporating additional seasonal and all-season programming</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Vegetation and Sustainability</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Assess the health of existing trees in the parks</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Protect and promote Elgin’s old growth tree canopy</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Develop an invasive species inventory and removal plan for park properties and adjacent R.O.W.s</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Prepare a sustainability audit for the Special Use and Community Parks</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Develop a plan for best practices related to sustainable design and development</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Festival Park</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pedestrian promenade with feature pavement</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Central food truck plaza with seating, gateway sign, and ornamental lighting</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Small park sign at corner plaza</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>New gateway sign at NE corner</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Permanent stage</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Remove giant spheres to establish seasonal ice rink</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Replace standard curb at stage area with full length mountable curb</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Repair or replace surfacing in the playground</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Uplight street trees</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Observation point at Fox River</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Replace promenade trees with Silva cell system or equal to provide more space for root growth</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Central plaza walkway between event lawns</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Wing Park</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Add park gateway sign</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Add Feature signs</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Add wayfinding kiosks</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Loop trail connection along Tyler Creek</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Additional pedestrian path connection from main visitor parking to Wing St</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Upgrade bandshell facilities (bathrooms, A/V, wifi, etc.)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>New bandshell theater seating</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
## Elgin Park Master Plan Update - List of Recommendations

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Goal</th>
<th>Completed (y/n)</th>
<th>Date Completed</th>
<th>Notes</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Drake Field Park</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>- New court play space</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>- New small playground; 3-5 play elements</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>- Flexible lawn</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>- Relocated concessions &amp; bathrooms with new outdoor gathering space</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>- Mounded and swaled topography</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>- Oak savanna restoration with mown trails</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>- Future expanded court play</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>- New parking lot</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Walton Island</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>- Selective revetment replacement &amp; naturalized edge condition</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>- Park gateway sign at both entrances</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>- Remove &amp; simplify water access</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>- Simplify existing site seating and rain garden, replace with native planting</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mulberry Grove Park</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>- New court play space</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>- Re-surfaced tennis courts &amp; add futsal/pickleball striping</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>- Re-painted basketball courts</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>- New playground equipment</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>- Loop trail connection</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>- Flexible lawn</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>- Oak savanna restoration with mown trail</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>- Perimeter buffer planting</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>- New 10' X 10' shelter</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>- Overlook at the west detention pond</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Summerhill Park</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>- New playground</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>- Re-configured entry plaza</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>- Shade structure &amp; plaza</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>- Flexible lawn</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>- Restored savanna &amp; perimeter buffer</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>- Paved perimeter loop trail</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>- Preserve existing trees around playground</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Elgin Shores</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>- Entry gateway signage with improved visibility</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>- New eastern parking area with dropoff</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>- Central plaza connection from fields to river</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>- New playground; 3-4 play elements, flex lawn, and small shelter</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>- Remodel and update existing concessions and restrooms</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>- Lowland marsh and oak savanna restoration with mown trail</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>- Waterfront overlook with fishing access</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>- New little league baseball fields</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>- New high school/adult baseball fields</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>- Improved kayak and boat launch</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>- Small skate park (16,000sf)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Vejle Logo</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>- New 10' X 10' shelter</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>- Overlook at the west detention pond</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>- Improved pedestrian entry</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>- Curbed island with trees</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>- Perimeter sidewalks</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>- Park gateway sign at major entrances</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>- Naturalize pond edges</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>- Develop an immersive zoo experience with elevated boardwalks</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>- Park gateway sign at major entrances</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>- New loop trail network</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sports Complex</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>- Painted pedestrian crossing through center spine</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>- Perimeter sidewalks</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>- Curbed island with trees</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>- Improved pedestrian entry</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>- Vehicular dropoffs</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Notes</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1. As property becomes available</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>2. Ensure sufficient access and quantity for the typical number of users</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>3. Where possible convert lighting to LED standards.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Where possible convert lighting to auto dimming at certain times with activation triggers for maintenance, safety, and emergency vehicles</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>4. Provide recommendations for disease mitigation and succession planting</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>5. Replace failing revetment and where water access is removed. As funding becomes available, replace additional sections</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

---

APPENDIX I

Elgin Parks and Recreation