

CHAPTER 3

DEMOGRAPHICS AND TRENDS

Demographics

To be effective, the Park District must be responsive to the current needs of residents. The public input meeting conducted as a part of the Comprehensive Park Master Plan plays a critical part in determining needs. Another essential part is to evaluate the current and projected characteristics of the population served by Park District programs and facilities. For example, if the population is growing rapidly, there will be an increased demand for park space. If the population is aging, there may be a need to shift the emphasis of recreation programs from small children to older adults. The following summarizes key demographic trends affecting the provision of parks and recreation facilities in the Hampshire Township Park District.

NATIONAL DEMOGRAPHIC TRENDS

- The “baby boomlet” is over. The so-called baby boomlet, the increase in U.S. child-births caused when members of the post-World War II generation had their own children, peaked in about 1990, and has been on the decline since then. However, Hampshire’s population is projected to grow at substantial rates over the next twenty years due to a number of large new housing developments.
- In a 1990 study, people in the U.S. age 16 and older were asked to identify the major motivation for leisure activities. The study revealed that most Americans are recuperators in their spare time, preferring to relax instead of achieve. The study also revealed that we are still creatures of habit, tending to gravitate toward familiar activities.
Source: American Demographics, May 1992, pp. 26-33
- Up to the 1990 census, persons per household continue to decline. This decline often means fewer children living at home. However, results of the 2000 census indicate that this has reversed, and persons per household have increased nationally.
- The American population is getting older. In addition to the birth rate trends that support this statement, people are living longer due to enhanced medical technology.

Local Demographic Trends

The U.S. Census provides reliable and relevant information on the overall population and trends. The tables that follow provide an overview of the demographic make-up of the Hampshire Township Park District. Some of

these tables provide U.S., state, county, and local townships data, which provides a framework for how the Hampshire Township Park District compares with other governmental units.

In addition, the school district serving Hampshire residents maintains population data on the number of school children enrolled each year, plus projections for future years. This information from the school district is useful in understanding one of the primary markets for the Park District services ~ pre-school, primary and secondary age children.

U.S. Census

Hampshire Township Park District’s population increased moderately between 1990 and 2000. The 2000 census established the population of Hampshire Township at 4,793, an increase of 1,395 people, or 41.1%. The Northeastern Illinois Planning Commission (NIPC) projects the population of Hampshire Township at 20,771 by the year 2030, a substantial growth of 333%.

	1990	2000	Estimated 2005 Census	Projected 2030*
Hampshire Township	3,398	4,793	6,500	20,771
Change from Previous Census		41.1%	36.0%	333.0%

* projected populations from Northern Illinois Planning Commission

Table 3-1: Hampshire Township Park District Population

The estimated population for 2005 in Table 3-1 is based upon census figures for the Village. In 2000 the census for the Village was 2,900, or 1,893 less than the Township. In 2003, the Village had a special census completed which established the population at 3,805, an increase

of 905 or 31%. Assuming that the population is growing at a rate of 10% per year, the population of the Village would be approximately 4,600 for 2005. With the difference of 1,900 between the Village and the Township, and assuming that almost all of the growth is occurring within the Village boundary, the population for the Park District (Township) would equal approximately 6,500, or an increase of 36% since 2000.

A comparison of 1990 and 2000 census data in Table 3-2 provides some insight into the characteristics and needs of the 4,793 residents served by the Park District. Between 1990 and 2000, all age groups increased, except for the 20-24 (-8.1%) and the 25-34 (-1.1%). The greatest increase was in the 45-59 age groups, with 83%.

The next highest increases were in the 10-14 age group by 66.6% and the 35-44 age group by 62.9%. The population over 65 increased by 35.7% and the population 19 and under increased by 44.4%. The above changes in age groups between 1990 and 2000 indicate that the population is aging, which conforms to national trends. However, with the growth projected and based upon school enrollment projections, a younger population is anticipated over the next 10-20 years. It is also anticipated that the 25-34 age group with children will increase substantially.

The changes in age groups tend to indicate that the Park District needs to provide a diversity of programs and facilities to serve all age groups.

Table 3-3 compares Hampshire’s demographic profile with the national, state, county, and the

Age Groups	1990		2000		1990-2000	
	People	%	People	%	Numeric Change	% Change
0-4	245	7.2%	311	6.5%	66	26.9%
5-9	282	8.3%	375	7.8%	93	32.9%
10-14	264	7.8%	440	9.2%	176	66.6%
15-19	254	7.5%	383	9.0%	129	50.8%
20-24	222	6.5%	204	4.3%	-18	-8.1%
25-34	539	15.9%	533	11.1%	-6	-1.1%
35-44	552	16.2%	899	18.8%	347	62.9%
45-59	541	15.9%	990	20.7%	449	83.0%
60-64	144	4.2%	176	3.7%	32	22.2%
65-74	192	5.7%	278	5.8%	86	44.8%
75-84	121	3.6%	155	3.2%	34	28.1%
85+	42	1.2%	49	1.0%	7	16.7%
Under 19	1,045	30.8%	1,509	31.5%	464	44.4%
Median Age			36.8			
Family Size	3.32		3.28		-0.04	-1.2%
Population	3,398		4,793		1,395	41.1%

Table 3-2: Hampshire Township Park District Population by Age Group

surrounding communities of Belvidere Township, Burlington Township, Genoa Township, and the Village of Huntley. In comparison with the national profile, Hampshire's under 19 and 35-59 age groups are slightly higher. The 65 and over and 20-34 age groups are lower than the national profile.

In comparison to the State of Illinois demographic profiles, essentially the same differences exist as with the national profiles for Hampshire.

In comparison to Kane County demographic profiles, Hampshire has a lower under 19 age group profile. The most significant difference is the 35-49 age groups, where Hampshire's is higher than the County's, and the 20-34 where the age group profiles are lower.

When compared to the surrounding communities, Hampshire's population is slightly older than Belvidere and Genoa Townships, but younger than Burlington Township and the Village of Huntley. Hampshire has the highest average family size, except for Kane County.

Table 3-4 identifies the level of education attained by residents in Hampshire compared to federal, state, county and nearby communities.

Attainment of high school education for Hampshire's residents is higher when compared to national, state and county levels, but lower when compared to nearby communities. When comparing high school attainment levels, Hampshire ranks lower than national, state, and county, but higher when compared to nearby communities. The differences are not

Age Groups	Hampshire Township Park District	U. S.	Illinois	Kane County	Belvidere Township Boone County	Burlington Township Kane County	Village of Huntley	Genoa Township DeKalb County
0-4	6.5%	6.8%	7.1%	8.7%	7.6%	6.1%	8.5%	8.8%
5-9	7.8%	7.3%	7.5%	8.7%	8.7%	6.7%	7.1%	9.2%
10-14	9.2%	7.3%	7.3%	8.0%	8.7%	8.0%	5.3%	7.6%
15-19	9.0%	7.2%	6.2%	7.5%	7.5%	8.8%	4.3%	6.9%
20-24	4.3%	6.7%	6.9%	6.3%	5.6%	4.8%	4.6%	5.3%
25-34	11.1%	14.2%	14.6%	15.9%	13.7%	8.8%	17.6%	16.0%
35-44	18.8%	16.0%	16.0%	16.8%	16.1%	18.3%	14.2%	18.9%
45-59	20.7%	18.2%	17.8%	17.4%	17.6%	22.5%	15.1%	15.2%
60-64	3.7%	3.4%	3.7%	3.0%	3.7%	5.2%	7.2%	3.2%
65-74	5.8%	6.5%	6.2%	4.4%	5.7%	5.1%	12.2%	5.2%
75-84	3.2%	4.4%	4.3%	2.9%	3.9%	3.7%	4.8%	3.6%
85+	1.0%	1.5%	1.5%	1.1%	1.5%	1.3%	1.0%	1.9%
Under 19	31.5%	28.6%	28.0%	33.0%	32.4%	29.6%	14.3%	32.6%
Median Age	36.8	35.3	34.7	32.2	35.1	39.5	39.1	32.9
Average Family Size	3.28	3.14	3.23	3.43	3.25	3.15	2.97	3.21
Population	4,793				25,212	1,834	5,619	5,342

Table 3-3: Census Population Comparisons to National, State, Regional and Surrounding Communities (2000 Census)

Level of Education	Hampshire Township Park District	U. S.	Illinois	Kane County	Belvidere Township	Burlington Township	Village of Huntley	Genoa Township
Less than 9 th Grade	3.1%	5.9%	5.9%	6.2%	5.7%	2.4%	1.4%	5.8%
9 th to 12 th Grade, no Diploma	7.3%	10.5%	9.1%	8.5%	12.9%	7.2%	9.0%	12.5%
High School Grad	33.8%	29.5%	29.2%	25.6%	38.0%	40.7%	34.6%	37.4%
Some College, no Degree	28.3%	21.5%	21.8%	22.2%	21.7%	28.7%	27.2%	24.2%
Associate Degree	6.4%	6.5%	6.2%	6.8%	6.3%	7.6%	6.2%	8.4%
Bachelor Degree	16.1%	16.6%	17.7%	20.7%	10.4%	9.7%	15.4%	8.4%
Graduate or Professional Degree	5.0%	9.5%	10.1%	10.0%	5.9%	9.2%	6.0%	3.3%

Table 3-4: Comparison of Educational Attainment - % of Population over 25 (2000 Census)

significant in both cases, and generally suggests a well educated population.

Of the five communities compared in Table 3-5, Hampshire has one of the highest family median incomes, ranking slightly less than Burlington Township. When compared to national and state income levels, Hampshire is significantly higher, and slightly more than Kane County.

Based on the demographic data and the projected growth for the Hampshire Township Park District, the following implications for recreation facilities program planning include:

- Due to the level of new residential development, all major age groups are expected to increase in size over the next decade.

Income Ranges	Hampshire Township Park District	U. S.	Illinois	Kane County	Belvidere Township	Burlington Township	Village of Huntley	Genoa Township
Less than \$10,000	1.3%	5.8%	5.0%	2.7%	3.6%	0.4%	1.3%	0.0%
\$10,000 – 14,999	1.0%	4.3%	3.4%	2.0%	3.0%	0.6%	1.1%	1.3%
\$15,000 – 319,999	2.5%	5.0%	4.0%	2.6%	3.5%	1.0%	1.2%	5.2%
\$20,000 – 25,999	2.4%	5.7%	4.8%	3.7%	5.4%	2.8%	3.2%	3.3%
\$25,000 – 29,999	5.2%	5.9%	5.2%	3.7%	4.6%	3.0%	2.2%	3.9%
\$30,000 – 34,999	3.5%	6.1%	5.5%	4.1%	5.6%	0.2%	5.0%	6.1%
\$35,000 -39,999	2.9%	5.9%	5.4%	4.5%	5.4%	5.1%	5.8%	7.9%
\$40,000 – 44,999	3.8%	5.8%	5.5%	4.6%	6.4%	2.9%	4.5%	9.3%
\$45,000 -49,999	4.5%	5.4%	5.2%	4.9%	4.7%	2.0%	5.1%	6.5%
\$50,000 – 59,999	11.4%	10.1%	10.3%	10.5%	11.4%	10.8%	10.4%	12.4%
\$60,000 -74,999	15.2%	12.2%	13.3%	14.5%	16.3%	20.5%	25.6%	19.6%
\$75,000 -99,999	23.2%	12.5%	14.3%	17.6%	14.8%	18.7%	17.9%	16.0%
\$100,000 -124,999	10.8%	6.5%	7.7%	10.6%	5.7%	14.8%	8.0%	4.6%
\$125,000 -149,999	3.3%	3.1%	3.7%	5.0%	2.4%	8.7%	4.3%	2.9%
\$150,000 -199,999	4.4%	2.7%	3.3%	4.7%	3.7%	2.6%	1.7%	1.0%
\$200,000 or more	4.9%	2.9%	3.6%	4.2%	3.2%	4.3%	2.6%	0.0%
Median Income	\$68,875	\$50,046	\$55,545	\$66,588	\$56,707	\$70,179	\$64,786	\$54,107

Table 3-5: Comparison of Family Income Characteristics - % of Population (2000 Census)

- Older (45-64) working age population groups are likely to experience the greatest growth.
- Younger adults, pre-school and school age children are projected to increase at more moderate rates.
- The high school age population will begin to increase at a faster rate than younger children.
- While continuing to increase modestly, the senior population will represent a decreasing proportion of total population.
- With a somewhat higher than average income level, and increasing working age population, the Hampshire Township Park District residents might support programs such as aerobics, health and fitness, handball, etc.

In summary, due to sustained population growth over the next decade, fueled by new residential development, all major population age groups served by the Park District are expected to increase. For general resource allocation and program planning purposes, the older working adult and high school age populations are likely to impact facilities planning considerations to the greatest degree. Growth among younger adults, pre-school and school age children is projected to be more modest. The senior population will continue to increase, but will represent a stable or decreasing percentage of the District's total population.

School District Enrollments

Tables 3-6 and 3-7 identify the enrollments in School District #300 for the past 12 years, and projections for the next 10 years. The School District recently developed two enrollment projection scenarios – high and low. The projections in Table 3-6 represent the low scenario and Table 3-7 represents the high scenario. Both scenarios identify the enrollment totals for each of the three existing schools located

School District #300 Schools within Hampshire Township				
Year	Hampshire High School	Hampshire Middle School	Hampshire Elementary School	Total within Township
1992-93	342	222	460	1,024
1993-94	358	234	472	1,064
1994-95	377	230	506	1,113
1995-96	368	268	510	1,146
1996-97	380	281	493	1,154
1997-98	393	319	503	1,215
1998-99	392	319	504	1,215
1998-99	421	310	527	1,258
2000-01	449	281	532	1,262
2001-02	439	278	539	1,256
2002-03	472	344	582	1,398
2003-04	496	399	631	1,526
2004-05	538	450	598	1,586
2005-06	602	509	615	1,726
2006-07	710	548	650	1,908
2007-08	823	575	679	2,077
2008-09	914	604	711	2,229
2009-10	1,025	626	733	2,384
2010-11	1,093	652	744	2,489
2011-12	1,130	698	747	2,575
2012-13	1,198	722	757	2,677
2013-14	1,248	747	757	2,752
2014-15	1,306	758	760	2,824

**Source: Community Unit School District #300 Enrollment Study with Projections, by Ehlers & Associates, February 2005*

Table 3-6: Community Unit School District No. 300 Enrollments (Scenario I Projections)

in the Township and the totals for all three schools.

- Since 1992-93, the total enrollment (1,024) has grown to 1,586, an increase of 54.9%, or an average of slightly less than 5% per year.

- Since 1992-93, the number of students at Hampshire High School increased by 57.3%, the Middle School increased by 102%, and the Elementary School increased by 30%.

For the next ten years, Scenario I (low) projects a growth of 142% or 768 students for the High School, 68% or 288 students for the Middle School, and 27% or 163 students for the Elementary School. The total enrollment increase is projected at 78% or 1,238 students.

Scenario II (high) for the same period projects a growth 730% or 3,931 for the High School, 530% or 2,385 students for the Middle School, and 254% or 1,521 students for the Elementary School. The total enrollment increase is projected at 494% or 7,837 students.

The difference in projected enrollment increases between Scenario I and II will be dependent upon the development of new residential subdivisions. As discussed later in this Plan, there are a number of developments now under construction as well as in the planning stages. The rate at which these developments are approved and constructed over the next ten years will determine the level of school enrollment increases.

Whether enrollment increases meet projections of either Scenario I or II or somewhere in between, the growth will have a major impact on facilities and programs offered by the Park District. In either Scenario, the enrollment increases are the greatest in the high school and middle school, which suggests more facilities and programs to meet the needs of these age groups

School District #300 Schools within Hampshire Township				
Year	Hampshire High School	Hampshire Middle School	Hampshire Elementary School	Total within Township
1992-93	342	222	460	1,024
1993-94	358	234	472	1,064
1994-95	377	230	506	1,113
1995-96	368	268	510	1,146
1996-97	380	281	493	1,154
1997-98	393	319	503	1,215
1998-99	392	319	504	1,215
1998-99	421	310	527	1,258
2000-01	449	281	532	1,262
2001-02	439	278	539	1,256
2002-03	472	344	582	1,398
2003-04	496	399	631	1,526
2004-05	538	450	598	1,586
2005-06	635	525	647	1,807
2006-07	840	627	843	2,310
2007-08	1,125	810	1,157	3,092
2008-09	1,454	1,095	1,562	4,111
2009-10	1,843	1,433	1,949	5,225
2010-11	2,220	1,867	2,217	6,304
2011-12	2,692	2,201	2,311	7,204
2012-13	3,279	2,507	2,320	8,106
2013-14	3,920	2,781	2,272	8,973
2014-15	4,469	2,835	2,119	9,423

*Source: Community Unit School District #300 Enrollment Study with Projections, by Ehlers & Associates, February 2005

Table 3-7: Community Unit School District No. 300 Enrollments (Scenario II Projections)

Trends in Recreation

Assessing trends in recreation is an important element in the development of a Comprehensive Park Master Plan. In order to accommodate future needs of the District, it is essential

to understand what has taken place and what is being envisioned to continue or change in the area of recreation that will affect District programs and facilities. One method is to assess demographic data over a period of time – ten to twenty years – to determine demographic profile trends, such as changes in median age, size of family, income, and ages. Similarly, trends in recreation – what people have done with their leisure time, what they are now doing, and what can be expected - have been documented. These trends, along with other factors such as demographics, economics, etc., provide the means to rationally determine future needs for Park District programs and facilities. Understanding and planning for medium to long term trends is important, versus short term trends which maybe “fads.”

A literature search provided a number of publications and studies addressing recreation trends. Information and conclusions from these documents are summarized in the following subsections.

NATIONAL SURVEY ON RECREATION AND THE ENVIRONMENT (NSRE)

The NSRE is the latest in the continuing series of National Recreation Surveys conducted by the federal government since 1960 (Cordell, 1995). This chapter *OUTDOOR RECREATION PARTICIPATION TRENDS* : by H. Ken Cordell; Barbara L. McDonald; R. Jeff Teasley; John C. Bergstrom; Jack Martin; Jim Bason; Vernon R. Leeworthy; was prepared as the final national summary report on findings from the NSRE looking at participation patterns and levels of participation across activities and segments of our society. Excerpts from this chapter are discussed below.

General Types of Participation

Thirteen basic types of outdoor recreation participation were surveyed (see Table 3-8). An estimated 94.5% of the population reported that during the 12 months prior to their interview for the NSRE in 1994-95, they participated in one or more of the activities included in the survey activity list. This percentage, referred to as “global” participation, amounts to over 189 million people age 16 or older.

Type of Outdoor Activity	Percent of Population 16 or older	Number in Millions
Participated in any type of activity	94.5%	189.3
Trail/street/road activities	68.3%	136.9
Individual sports	22.0%	44.1
Team sports	26.4%	53.0
Spectator activities	58.7%	117.6
Viewing/learning activities	76.2%	152.6
Snow and ice activities	18.1%	36.3
Camping (all overnight)	26.3%	52.8
Hunting	9.3%	18.6
Fishing	28.9%	57.9
Boating/floating	29.0%	58.1
Swimming	54.2%	108.6
Outdoor adventure activities	36.8%	73.6
Social activities	67.8%	135.9

Source: 1994-95 National Survey on Recreation and the Environment, USDA Forest Service and the University of Georgia, Athens, Georgia. The NSRE is the most recent of the series of National Recreation Surveys begun nationally in 1960.

Table 3-8: Percent and Number of People 16 Years and Older in the U.S. Participating in 13 Types of Outdoor Recreation Activities, 1994-95

Across all of the 13 types of participation, the four most popular single activities were:

- Walking: 66.7 percent
- Viewing a beach or waterside: 62.1 percent

- Family gatherings outdoors: 61.8 percent
- Sightseeing: 56.6 percent

Most of these types of activities remain popular among Americans past the age of 60.

Land-Based Activities

Activities that occur primarily on land, rather than on water, snow or ice, constitute the largest single category of outdoor recreation participation in the country. These activities include:

Individual and Team Sports, including baseball, football, and soccer, are participated in at least once annually by 53 million people. Both individual and team sports typically require some sort of specially designed site for participation, such as tennis courts or baseball fields. Most of these facilities are provided by local government and/or the private sector.

Trail, Street, and Road Activities: By far the single most popular activity in the United States is walking outdoors. Biking is the next most popular trail, street, and road activity, while running and jogging is the third most popular activity.

Viewing and Learning Activities: Visiting sites of interest and viewing wildlife are rapidly growing types of land-based outdoor recreation. Over 75% of people over the age 15 participate in some form of viewing or learning activities. Nature centers, visitor centers, and other outdoor-oriented education facilities are popular, many of which are local facilities in communities. Appreciation of wildlife is one of the most rapidly growing forms of outdoor recreation. Water related viewing or learning is an important part of this pursuit and studying nature near water is equally as popular.

Viewing and learning activities, such as visiting historic sites, wildlife viewing, and sightseeing, are among the nation’s highest participation activities in terms of total number of trips taken for enjoyment.

Outdoor Adventure: Among outdoor adventure types of activities, hiking is the most popular in terms of number of participants on an annual basis. Almost 24% of the population 16 years and older (about 48 million people) went hiking once or more during the 1994-95 survey period. Hiking is one of the principal uses of the extensive system of trails in the United States.

Social Activities: Nearly half of the 200 million people 16 years or older in the U.S. participate in picnicking and family gatherings. This experience can be as casual as a single person taking lunch in the nearby local park, or as elaborate as a full gourmet spread of food among friends. Often associated with picnicking are family outdoor gatherings. Throughout this country, group shelters and multiple family picnic sites have been developed to facilitate this very popular activity.

Water-Based Activities:

Water based activities include the following:

Boating: By far the most popular boating activity is motor boating with wind-powered boating less popular. Both require large expanses of water. Muscle-powered boating and floating activities include canoeing, kayaking, rowing, and floating or rafting which is growing in popularity.

Fishing: Fishing remains popular throughout the country. Among those who fish in fresh water, most fish in warm water, a category of water bodies that includes most lakes, reservoirs, large rivers, and ponds. Bass, crappie,

and other species are the most familiar and sought after. Many people fish by the catch and release method which regulates both species and size.

Swimming: Of the estimated 109 million people who swim out-of-doors, over 80% are estimated to do at least some portion of their swimming in pools.

Snow and Ice-Based Activities:

Skiing, skating, and snow-mobiling are the three types of snow and ice activities presented in Table 3-9. Cross-country skiing occurs on or off trails and can be on either groomed or un-groomed trails. Overall, 6.5 million people ski cross country, most of them in a variety of venues. An estimated 3.7 million ski cross country in backcountry areas (self-defined), 5.7 million ski on un-groomed trails, and 5.4 million ski on groomed trails. Some 10.5 million people ice skate and over 7 million snowmobile.

Type of Outdoor Activity	Percent of Population 16 or Older	Number in Millions
Downhill Skiing		
Snowboarding	2.3%	4.5
Sledding	10.2%	20.5
Downhill skiing	8.4%	16.8
Cross Country Skiing		
On groomed trails	2.7%	5.4
On un-groomed trails	2.8%	5.7
Back country	1.9%	3.7
All forms	3.3%	6.5
Ice skating	5.2%	10.5
Snowmobiling	3.6%	7.1

Source: 1994-95 National Survey on Recreation and the Environment, USDA Forest Service and the University of Georgia, Athens, Georgia. The NSRE is the most recent of the series of National Recreation Surveys begun nationally in 1960.

Table 3-9: Percent and Number of People 16 Years and Older in the U.S. Participating in Snow and Ice-Based Outdoor Activities, 1994-95

Summary

Over the years and still today, the greatest demand are places for casual activities such as walking; family gatherings; sightseeing; visiting beaches and historic sites: and other sites of interest. These activities appeal to a wide spectrum of people from the inner cities, the suburbs, and rural areas. Entertainment, fun, learning, and seeing are often motivations for these activities. Viewing and learning, socially oriented outdoors activities, and swimming are the most popular forms of participation where natural and historical settings are significant components of the expectations of the user.

Both long-term and short-term past trends point to continued growth in outdoor recreation across all segments of the population, with some more than others. Growth seems particularly strong in viewing and learning activities. If these trends continue, pressures for more places to participate and for recreation infrastructure to support recreation seekers will continue to build. There is evidence, particularly of growing pressures on the public lands and the recreation opportunities those lands represent. Growing pressure is likely to take many forms and will require a variety of management responses. Static to decreasing public funding for outdoor recreation access, service, facility development, and maintenance will present major challenges in the near future as well as long-term. These growing pressures and the challenges they represent will likely include the more popular beaches, forest sites, parks, and special attractions, which will experience greater congestion during peak times.

PUBLIC PARK AND RECREATION TRENDS: A STATUS REPORT

In a paper entitled *Public Park and Recreation Trends: A Status Report* prepared by Ruth V. Russell of the Department of Recreation and Park Administration at Indiana University, the author stated "...the need for a rational understanding of the future is important". The challenges of political, social, economic and technological change have left the public recreation and park field at somewhat loose ends. Unrelenting financial problems, more federal and state requirements, enhanced demands for services to an aging population, program requirements catering to greater diversity of lifestyles, a shrinking and ethnically changing work force, stiffer competition for tax dollars, increasing violent crimes in parks, a movement toward privatization of operations, computerization, shrinking public images of the profession, and lack of citizen involvement are among the challenges now faced by public recreation and park agencies.

Recreation and park administrators, planners and educators in 13 states were asked to identify issues that they expected would have the greatest impact on their organization's and/or clientele's near future. In order of frequency of choice, those issues identified were:

1. economy/consumerism: ~ the need to better define economic impact of recreation opportunity;
2. business management: ~ increasing costs and decreasing resources;
3. technology and science: ~ genetic engineering/life prolonging technology;
4. family/social relationships: ~ growth of nontraditional families;
5. politics/government/legislation: ~ need for federal and state funding support;

6. fitness/sports: ~ motivating the non-participant (youth, disabled, aged);
7. medicine/health/wellness: ~ growth of employee wellness services;
8. education, learning, and training: ~ prevalent illiteracy;
9. environment/ecology: ~ management of increased demand for open space/resources;
10. workplace/employment: ~ decline of the power of labor unions;
11. demographics: ~ an aging population; and
12. travel/tourism: ~ keeping pace with new demands such as eco-tourism.

Studying the programs of the National Recreation and Park Association Congresses over the past 10 years, the most frequently discussed topics were

- constituents
- fiscal resources
- space resources.
- needs and characteristics of constituents.
- the impact of the Americans with Disabilities Act
- urban youth
- cultural diversity
- aging
- drug abuse.
- financial concerns
- preventative maintenance
- land acquisition strategies

The most comprehensive study was that completed by Whyte (1992) that focused on trends and issues in local government recreation and parks administration. Whyte compiled and ranked trends (see Table 3-10) and issues (see Table 3-11) according to impact for local government recreation and park service systems.

EXTREME IMPACT	
1.	Deteriorating park and recreation infrastructure
2.	Increasing crime (violence, drug use, vandalism, gangs) in communities and parks
3.	Declining park and recreation budgets relative to costs
4.	Increasing competition for shrinking federal, state, and local tax resources
5.	Massive public sector debt
GREAT IMPACT	
1.	Neglect of children
2.	Greater cultural diversity (growing and more influential minority populations)
3.	Greater difficulty in providing equal opportunity for leisure to all people
4.	Declining quality of life and livability of urban areas (insufficient open space, deteriorating city)
5.	Greater division between "haves" and "have-nots"
6.	Increased public demand for participation, accountability and productivity in government

Table 3-10: Top Ranked Trends

Further, Whyte’s study identified and discussed a number of trends related to recreation. The most significant ones are as follows:

1. Trends focused on the community:

Although there is virtually no research addressing the relationship between concepts of community and recreation services, the conceptual basis exists for suggesting that recreation and park services contribute to one's perception of a good community. Neighborhood identity can be developed through a park and neighborhood identity can be lost through a park

2. Trends focused on people:

- a. Special needs populations.

Without a doubt, recreation and park professionals nationwide feel the impact of the Americans with Disabilities Act will significantly increase in the future. In terms of older adult constituents, a shift is occurring toward

EXTREME IMPACT	
1.	How to ensure adequate finance for capital development (land/open space, facilities)
2.	What spending priorities should be set in the face of budget cuts or when services are stretched too thin
3.	How to make parks safe places (from crime, vandalism, gangs, substance abuse) while maintaining visitor enjoyment
4.	How public parks and recreation can strengthen its political position and shape the future through affecting state and national policy
5.	How to compete successfully for funding against other community services (education, health, police)
GREAT IMPACT	
1.	Should park and recreation services be managed more like a business
2.	How to build on the wellness movement to promote alternative programs to drug abuse, anti-social behavior, etc.
3.	How to make services more accessible to low income groups, single parents, and homeless people
4.	How to increase local tax support
5.	How to build public trust and satisfy demands for accountability
6.	How to ensure investment in infrastructure maintenance and improvement (community pride)
7.	How to foster coalition building and cooperation between other service providers and related disciplines (community networks, resource sharing, service consolidation)
8.	How to develop public recognition that parks and recreation contributes to the health and well being of society and counteracts the effects of disabilities

Table 3-11: Top Ranked Issues

- b. Youth.
Youth have become of prime focus to public recreation and park agencies. Unlike two decades ago when those

over the age of 65 years represented the poorest sector of the population, today children have that distinction. Children are the most "at risk" age group in society. The following statistics from the U.S. House Select Committee on Children, Youth and Families support this trend: one in four children is poor, one in six has no health insurance, one in seven will drop out of school, one in five will become a teenage parent, and one in four will spend time on welfare. The United States ranks seventh in life expectancy, tenth in educational expenditure per student, tenth in public health expenditures, and seventeenth in infant mortality. Children appear to be less physically fit than were their predecessors, they are frequently abused, and millions are "latch-key" children.

c. Demographics.

In the United States the median age, about 33 in 1990, is almost 36 in 2000. Between 1990 and 2000, the number of people between 35 and 44 jumped by almost 16%, and those between the ages of 45 and 54 increased by 46%, compared with an overall population growth of 7.1%. Secondly, not only are older people becoming a larger segment of the population, but they are enjoying better health and longer life, and wielding greater economic and political power. By 2020, when baby boomers reach 65, old people will be 20% of the U.S. population.

3. Trends focused on natural resources.

a. Linking parks.

Much of the new park land acquisition that is desired today appears to be developing linear green spaces designed

to link people using foot and bicycle transportation to parks, shopping, and other neighborhoods. As part of this trend is another, the recycling of no longer used or underutilized built environments as linear parks, for example, railroad beds, abandoned roads, utility pole rights of way, the underneath of highway overpasses, etc.

b. Land stewardship.

In a report from the President's *Commission: Americans Outdoors*, the protection of natural resources and open space is the first priority for the future. Public recreation is positioned to lead in land stewardship because collectively they are often one of the largest land managers in a community. Because public recreation professionals tend to be activity services oriented and because they have not formulated an environmental ethic to guide decision making, anti-land stewardship dilemmas result.

c. Safety.

The 1990s has been the age of the expert witness as society and the legal system demand new and higher standards of safety in park and recreation programs and facilities. Of increasing need for public agencies is safety consultants and risk management plans. A primary ingredient for park safety is public support. The park and recreation community must reclaim its rightful place as a leading provider of safe and healthful recreation services. This means for many communities the development of security prevention strategies. For example, the consideration of a night "total darkness policy", the design of parking lots that discourage through-traffic cruising, publicized

incentive programs to combat vandalism, and recreation program delivery partnerships with law enforcement agencies should be considered.

d. Specialized facilities.

The specialization of participation in many forms of leisure activity represents the reversal of a trend of increased mass production of recreation activities which occurred over the last few decades. The advent of increased specialization in recreation interests will mean that the amount of knowledge about specific forms of leisure behavior will have to increase for those in the planning process. More important, it will mean that planning of such recreation environments will have to be done with the continual and direct participation of those who are specialists in the leisure behavior in question. Design of specialized facilities, in effect, will have to be done much more specifically for those who will use that particular environment. This follows not only from trends in specialized recreation behavior but also from consumer expectations for customized, specialized products.

4. Trends focused on management.

a. Market driven.

There is an increasing trend toward market segmentation in service delivery. For example, the poor and the frail are not viable markets for many recreation programs. Meanwhile, the high end segments are usually well-supplied; they have learned to use their affluence to purchase access to the best environments and the most attractive opportunities. Thus the markets with the highest "sales" potential are found

among the new "discretionaires". This is a new class of people; they are the first generation in their families with college degrees and special skills that are at a premium in the labor markets. They have developed wider interests and new talents in their educational histories. But those in the earlier phases of their careers cannot afford the same recreation costs as the wealthy. They will spend time and money on leisure, but will remain price conscious.

b. Privatization.

Privatization in government service delivery is currently prevalent and enthusiastic across the country. However, those public recreation and park agencies that are successfully utilizing privatization are those which have completely re-envisioned and re-invented government.

Privatization in terms of property acquisition and development has been able to revitalize unused or underutilized areas at minimal public cost. In many cases, new recreation facilities have been developed through the use of private operators who expanded and rebuilt publicly-owned areas under a continuing rental arrangement with long-range contract with the municipality.

Other examples of privatization have been in subcontract park maintenance, security services, and golf course starter operations. Garbage collection, building maintenance, and tree trimming have also been carried out by private concerns, sometimes resulting in substantial savings. In spite of these and other examples of privatization, the

importance of accurately defining the work to be done with a contract that clearly specifies the quantity, quality, and price of the work can not be ignored.

c. Alternative funding sources.

Park and recreation agencies, as producers, are aggressively seeking strategies to concurrently generate revenue and expand service levels to broader segments of society. One recent trend is selling services at discount prices. Those agencies utilizing this approach feel they can maximize facility use and generate varying levels of revenue from multiple sources. Discounting provides an incentive to target markets already familiar with shopping sales. Another trend is price fencing. Price fencing allows customers to logically and rationally segment themselves into rate categories based on their needs, behaviors, and willingness to pay, and allows park and recreation agencies to develop better rationale for user fee rates. A third trend is price bundling ~ marketing two or more services into a single "package" at a special price.

5. Trends focused on services.

a. Customer communication.

Citizens are increasingly participating in public processes to plan programs and formulate policies. Even private institutions are being increasingly required to make available more information on products and plans. Public parks and recreation must remain customer oriented. The high cost of losing a customer means: (a) the average wronged customer will tell 8 - 16 others, (b) 92% of unhappy customers

never purchase the service/goods again, and (c) it costs five times as much to recruit a new customer than to retain an old customer. Recreation and park agencies must be able to trust citizens, try new programs, improve the quality of current programs, develop strategies to quickly remedy the complaints of unhappy customers, stand behind what they say, and establish "no questions asked" customer policies in order to remain viable.

Conclusion

Public recreation and park agencies must do more with less still accurate. Efficiency without sacrificing effectiveness is the future challenge. Key concepts within this message include greater attention to public and community relations, innovative fiscal management, better mastery of information systems, and greater sophistication in sales and marketing. Yet, the supreme task is the development of a broader and more sensitive definition of what the park and recreation profession is, without forfeiting the essential ingredients of enjoyment and personal well-being.

RECREATION CENTER TRENDS:

A survey of recreation centers by Danial R. Atilano of Burnidge Cassell and Associates "Making a Profit in Non-Profit Recreation Centers" IPRA1/2001, indicated that "bigger is not always better". However, this is in direct contrast to another Special Focus IPAR article by Lori J. Miller of Williams Architects regarding "town center" concepts for community-driven recreation centers serving diverse needs and users that concluded "Give us more, do it better, and do it now".

The truth as usual, may be represented by both viewpoints. The key to a successful recreation center is the ability to understand user's interests, develop a center that has flexibility in use and expansion, and develop creative methods to finance the facility. Interesting facts from these articles include:

- Sizes can range from 900 to Elgin's 206,550 square foot mega-center;
- Indoor pool facilities are often less cost effective to operate than outdoor facilities based on revenues;
- It is not necessary to be a mega-facility to have a successful recreation center; and
- Recreation Centers need to be responsive to trends in recreation and avoid responding to fads

Americans have numerous choices for their leisure time activities. Often, recreation centers are designed for basic services, but, they have the ability to adapt facilities to respond to changes in community needs and demographic profiles.

There are two schools of thought regarding size and a full service facility versus numerous buildings throughout the community. The full service center has the advantage of being a one-stop facility where families can make one trip and serve the entire family's needs. Children can attend an activity while parents participate in another activity. Partners such as municipalities, school districts, hospitals, and corporations can be involved in the mega-centers and can share space and costs with park districts.

Key to a successful recreation center is to be responsive to the needs of its service population, make it adaptable as recreation trends change and the service population grows, secure partners to maximize programs, and

develop the facility in context with other public and private facilities in the same service area.

SWIMMING POOLS AND THEME WATER PARKS

Water theme parks, with wave pools, water-slides and support facilities, are a relatively recent trend in new recreation facilities. While these facilities have traditionally been developed by private businesses, many park districts in the Chicago region have constructed water theme parks in the past 10 years. Wheeling, Niles, Hoffman Estates, and Schaumburg are examples of park districts that have opened such facilities. The Schaumburg water-park is an indoor facility for year-round use. These facilities generally are very popular when first opened. It is still too early to tell, however, whether they can maintain their appeal and attendance levels over time.

In contrast, there is a trend toward neighborhood pools in lieu of developing large theme water park facilities with multiple amenities. Arlington Heights and Mount Prospect Park Districts made a shift from a theme water-park to developing neighborhood pools in response to local resident's interest in neighborhood based facilities. These local pools are smaller than theme parks and attract residents from a specific community or subdivision avoiding congestion and noise often associated with the larger complexes. ("Back To Basics", by Jennifer Stimac IPRA 1/2001)

Outdoor swimming pools and theme water parks are very expensive to construct and maintain, and their financial success is dependent upon good attendance during only a three month period. The past two or three years with relatively cool and wet springs and lower than average temperature summer days, public pools have not fared well. Attendance figures

have been lower than projected, and many park districts have experienced losses in revenues.

GOLF COURSES AND LEARNING CENTERS

Golf is another sport, which has gained popularity in recent years. It is a sport that is playable by an aging population. Many park districts have acquired existing courses and renovated them. They have historically been excellent revenue sources when combined with complimentary uses, such as a driving range, restaurant with liquor license (the only use that a park district can operate with such a license), pro-shops, and large club houses offering rental facilities. This trend was expected to continue well into next ten to twenty years. However, over the past couple of years, golf courses have experienced a drop in rounds and revenues. This unexpected drop has been credited to two factors, climate and overbuilding. Like with swimming pools, golf can be affected by weather, and the last several years the length of the season and number of annual rounds has been shortened by lower average temperatures and inclement conditions. Golf course association sources state that there are approximately 350 golf courses in the Chicago region, with less than 100 courses constructed in the past ten years. Whether the recent decline will reverse itself is difficult to predict.

However, one trend in golf that appears very positive is the development of 9-hole par 3 golf courses and golf learning centers. With the popularity that Tiger Woods has created in the golf community over the past five years, a younger and less affluent population has taken up the game. Par-3 golf courses have provided a good source for learning the game and practicing. Also, golf learning centers have become a very popular facility. They usually contain a lighted driving range, which is an excellent

revenue producer and affected less by unfavorable climate; chip and putting practice area; miniature golf course, club house with food services; and sometimes three to nine par-3 golf holes. These facilities are being developed by both the private and public sectors.

Workshop and Public Meeting

As part of the development of the Comprehensive Park Master Plan, a workshop with the District Board and Long-Range Planning Committee and a public meeting were conducted to gain input and suggestions. The following is a summary of the workshop and meeting held and issues discussed.

PARK BOARD OF COMMISSIONERS AND LONG RANGE PLANNING COMMITTEE

On January 5, 2005, a workshop was held with Park District Board Commissioners and members of the Long-Range Planning Committee. The following is a summary of the issues and comments from the discussion and questionnaire at the workshop.

Board and Committee members were asked to list three responses to five questions. The following is a summary of the responses to each question. Each participant was then asked to vote on three responses in order to establish priorities (numbers in parentheses represent the number of votes).

**1. List Park District Systems/
Facilities/Programs Liked Best**

- a. Little people playtime – preschool (90-100 kids AM/PM 5 days/week) (6)
- b. Size of parks (existing) aesthetics – Ream and Seyller Parks social “small town character” (6)
- c. Cooperation between park district and school district (programming/facilities and staff) (5)
- d. Potential for new facilities and programs (2)
- e. Recreation supervisor and staff (1)
- f. Existing/potential pedestrian amenities for all parks
- g. Program structured/organized consistency
- h. Number of volunteers (coaches; building projects, etc.) “small town” atmosphere
- i. Variety of programs for youth to 12 years (50% to 75% participation)
- j. Proactive nature of Park District Board – such as working on Long Range Master Plan

**2. List Park District Systems/
Facilities/Programs Liked Least**

- a. Lack of indoor programming space (6)
- b. Budget constraints, lack of funds, small tax base (5)
- c. Major sports facilities not well organized – not enough space/overlap between baseball and soccer fields (4)
- d. Lack of parking spaces at Seyller Park and Bruce Memorial Ream Park (2)
- e. Lack of teen programs (2)
- f. Lack of maintenance people (existing part time) full time and weekends (2)
- g. Communication between Park District and coaches (schedules, etc.)

**3. List New Recreation
Facilities to Include**

- a. Indoor facilities – basketball gym/classrooms/etc. – large Recreation Building which is self-funding (6)
- b. Revenue producing facilities (objective is to, at a minimum, break even on costs) (5)
- c. Open spaces and sports facilities in new parks (4)
- d. Link parks together with trails (3)
- e. Add classroom space to increase preschool programs (2)
- f. Skateboard park (2)
- g. Improve playing fields to reduce rain water, maintenance (1)
- h. Bruce Ream Park – accommodate non-recreation community uses – festival parking
- i. Upgrade/modernize playgrounds especially at Bruce Ream Memorial Park – ADA etc.

**4. List Most Important Objectives
for Plan to Address**

- a. Create better working relationship with Village through Comprehensive Plan Process and encourage school park agreements (8)
- b. Serve all age groups (6)
- c. Open space to link all parks (5)
- d. Open space and new recreational programs (2)
- e. Revenue producer – at least break even on costs, work with school district
- f. Village cooperation in impact fees and new parks in new developments
- g. Use NPRA standard’s with developers
- h. Expand opportunities for Park District to use school facilities (i.e. gyms) and mutual use of Park District by schools
- i. Parks public owned and meets Park District standards for size and facilities

- j. Retention ponds – all wet bottom, detention ponds by county - look at multi-use of pond for parking, etc.
- k. Tree preservation ordinance – Village is enforcing with developers, impact fees to reforest Village

5. What Is Greatest Challenge to Park District Development

- a. Have a plan that grows with population and simultaneously increases revenues to meet costs and demands
- b. Optimize land and cash donations that matches maintenance, development, life cycle replacement costs
- c. Lack of financial resources
- d. Money - increase funding sources
- e. Work/cooperation with Village to increase impact fees
- f. Increasing community support through community relation efforts
- g. Park, trails, open space maintenance cooperatives between Village and Park District
- h. Village holds, maintains open space until Park District is ready to take it over
- i. Continue to improve relationship between Park Board and Village Board

PUBLIC LISTENING SESSION

On February 15, 2005, a public listening sessions was held to gain input and comments. A total of 20 residents attended the meeting. The following is a summary of comments base upon a questionnaire:

Participants were asked to list three responses to five questions. The following is a summary of the responses to each question. Each participate was then asked to vote on three responses in order to establish priorities (num-

ber in parentheses represent the number of votes).

1. What Do You Like Best About the Park District?

- a. Preschool program (9)
- b. All soccer fields in one park (5)
- c. Walking path in Seyller Park (4)
- d. Seyller Park playground (4)
- e. Special programs/events - - holidays at Seyller Park (4)
- f. Shelters and cooking grills (cooking) (3)
- g. The combined Basketball Courts/Tennis Courts at Seyller park (3)
- h. Reasonable prices for programs (2)
- i. Sledding hill at Seyller Park (2)
- j. Director of Recreation (2)
- k. Likes the parks (1)
- l. Baseball fields at Bruce Ream (1)
- m. Clean Parks – the grass is cut (1)
- n. After school programs

2. What Do You Like Least about the Park District?

- a. Size of Recreation Center (not enough room for programs i.e. birthday parties) (14)
- b. Lack of variety of programs for teens, skate park wanted (8)
- c. Need major sports complex to centralize sports play activities (7)
- d. Overall maintenance of soccer fields and baseball fields at Seyller Park due to limited personnel – most of the Ream Park is in the floodplain (6)
- e. Lack of pool facility (6)
- f. Limited parking at Recreation Center (5)
- g. Bruce Ream Memorial Park - lack of children’s play area at west end (2)

- h. Bathroom facilities- locked Saturday morning at Bruce Ream Memorial Park (2)
- i. Poor Lighting (inadequate) in parks and fields
- j. Not enough children’s and adult programs
- k. Basketball / Tennis courts need repair at Seyller Park

- c. Men’s open basketball (no longer offered)
- d. Playgrounds / preschool / path system
- e. Baseball fields – adult and youth
- f. Softball, soccer
- g. Sledding hill
- h. Basketball (youth)

3. What Recreation Facility Improvements should be Included in the Park District?

- a. Combined Comments about the Recreation Center included: (14)
 - Recreation center (like Elgin) with indoor basketball / pool and party rooms, multi-purpose activity rooms
 - Consider expandable Recreation Center, develop in phases
 - Adult programs lack day care facility
 - Senior center with programs and activities
- b. Need skate board park (8)
- c. Sports complex- soccer fields, sport courts (6)
- d. Fishing pond with nature area (6)
- e. Golf course driving range (5)
- f. Separate preschool building or facility with its own parking, playground, security (2)
- g. Batting cages (1)
- h. Go-cart track (1)
- i. Outdoor ice-skating rink (1)
- j. Frisbee golf

4. What Park Facilities do You and Your Household Use?

- a. Preschool / sports fields / Seyller Park Football
- b. Walking paths – open space

Other Comments

1. Hampshire Township Park District - create preserve for natural area and educational programs
2. Something unique to Hampshire Township Park District that people will drive to use
3. Something like Busse Woods Nature Trail
4. Something revenue producing

Summary of Workshop and Public Meeting

A number of major and common themes surfaced from the Board workshop and public meeting. When asked “what do you like best about the Park District,” the preschool programs ranked the highest. Size of parks, the small town character, quality and variety of recreation programs, and the cooperation between the Park District and School District ranked high. Comments about recreation facilities included all soccer fields in one park, walking paths in Seyller Park, the combined tennis and basketball courts at Seyller Park, and the baseball fields as Bruce Ream Memorial Park.

In terms of “what do you like least about the Park District,” the most prevalent comments revolved around the need for a new Recreation Center. Other most commonly mentioned issues were financial restraints, lack of programs for teens, need for a major sports complex, maintenance of fields due to lack of full-time personnel, and limited parking at Recreation Building.

When asked about new facilities, the need for a new Recreational Center with adequate space for programs and indoor recreational facilities was overwhelmingly stated. Other facilities mentioned included a skateboard park, trails linking parks and other community facilities, and additional sports fields.

