SIoux Falls Parks and Recreation Board Meeting
Wednesday, January 29, 2020
4:00 p.m. Regular Board Meeting
City Center, 231 N. Dakota Ave., Room 110

ORDER OF BUSINESS

1. Roll call and determination of quorum

2. Approval of minutes from December 18, 2019 meeting

3. Public Comment

4. Report of standing committees
   a. Marketing and Public Needs
   b. Park System Planning and Development
   c. Partnerships and Recreation

5. Unfinished business

6. New business
   a. Comprehensive Parks and Recreation System Plan – Leon Younger, Pros Consulting
   b. Ordinance 95 Amendments – Levitt Shell Facility Use Fees (non-Levitt events) – Jackie Nelson
   c. Landscapes Management Company – Contract Amendment – Don Kearney

7. Report of Director of Parks and Recreation
   a. Community Center report – December
   b. Ice Rink report – December
   c. Aquatics report – December
   d. Golf Course Report – November

8. Items added after the agenda deadline
   a. The Parks and Recreation Board may include other such business as may come before this body.

9. Reading of communications to the Board

10. Open board discussion

11. Adjournment

Upcoming events: No news conferences or ribbon cuttings are scheduled

Persons requiring special accommodation for participation in any programs or activities sponsored by Sioux Falls Parks and Recreation should call 367-8222 during regular business hours at least 48 hours prior to the event. Special needs will be accommodated whenever reasonably possible.
Unofficial minutes to be approved at the January 29, 2020 meeting

December 18, 2019

A REGULAR MEETING OF THE SIOUX FALLS PARKS AND RECREATION BOARD
was held on Wednesday, December 18, 2019, at 4 p.m., at the Oyate Community
Center.

Roll Call and Determination of Quorum
Members present: Lorrae Lindquist, Jim Stavenger, Ann Nachtigal, Todd Sundleaf, Mike
Begeman, Mick Conlin, and Rick Weber.

Members absent: none

Parks and Recreation staff present: Don Kearney, Director of Parks and Recreation; Sky
Smothers, Recreation Manager; Jackie Nelson, Administrative Manager; Kelby Mieras,
Park Operations Manager; Tory Miedema, Park Development Specialist; Mike Patten,
Park Development Specialist; and Rita Meyer, Administrative Assistant.

Others present: Karen Leonard, City Attorney’s Office; Brandon Huether, City of Sioux
Falls Communications Office; Brian Vognild, Veterans’ Park Board President; Dan
Grider, Great Bear Recreation Park; Elizabeth Whealy, Great Plains Zoo & Delbridge
Museum of Natural History; Diane Gildemaster and Sue Aguilar, Mary Jo Wegner
Arboretum.

Approval of Minutes (November 20, 2019)
A motion to approve the minutes was made by Begeman and seconded by
Stavenger. Motion passed unanimously with all present Board members voting
yes.

Public Input
No public input.

Report of Standing Committees
The Marketing and Public Needs Committee met and discussed all items on the
agenda. The Park System Planning and Development Committee did not meet.
The Partnerships and Recreation Committee met and discussed all items on the
agenda, as well as some potential fee ordinance changes.

Unfinished Business
No unfinished business.

Under New Business
Great Bear Chalet Rental Fee: Dan Grider shared a request from Great Bear to
raise their Chalet rental fee from $700 to $1,000. After some discussion, a motion
to approve the increase was made by Weber and seconded by Nachtigal. Motion
passed unanimously with all present Board members voting yes.

Zoo Annual Report Presentation: Elizabeth Whealy presented the 2018 Zoo
annual report to the Park Board.
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**Wegner Arboretum Society Conditional Gifting Agreement:** Patten shared details of a gifting agreement for a tract of land adjacent to the Arboretum. A motion to recommend approval of the agreement was made by Nachtigal and seconded by Begeman. Motion passed unanimously with all present Board members voting yes.

**Scott-Connelly Nature Area Naming Application:** Patten shared details of the naming application of the nature area, which pertains to the tract of land named in the Wegner Arboretum Society Conditional Gifting Agreement. A motion to recommend approval was made by Stavenger and seconded by Weber. Motion passed unanimously with all present Board members voting yes.

**Veterans’ Memorial Park Advisory Board “Decommissioning”:** Patten and Brian Vognild, President of the Veterans’ Memorial Park Advisory Board shared details of the history of the Board, noting that their mission was to advise in design, construction, and operation of the Veterans’ Memorial Park. Now that the park is fully developed and operational, the Board feels that they have fulfilled their mission and have voted to recommend that the Board be decommissioned. A motion to recommend approval to decommission the Board was made by Conlin and seconded by Sundleaf. Motion passed unanimously with all present Board members voting yes.

**Veterans’ Park Donation:** Mieras shared details of a recent monetary donation received for the Veterans’ Memorial Park. A motion to recommend approval of the donation was made by Begeman and seconded by Nachtigal. Motion passed unanimously with all present Board members voting yes.

**Election of Park and Recreation Board Officers:** Park Board President Lindquist presented the slate of Park Board Officers for 2020. Stavenger will serve as the new Board President, Nachtigal will serve as Vice President, and Begeman will serve as Secretary. A motion to approve the Park Board Officers was made by Weber and seconded by Conlin. Motion passed unanimously with all present Board members voting yes.

**Approval of Standing Committees:** Park Board President Lindquist presented the Board with the proposed 2020 Standing Committees. A motion to approve the Standing Committees was made by Nachtigal and seconded by Sundleaf. Motion passed unanimously with all present Board members voting yes.

**Report of Director of Parks and Recreation**
Kearney shared that Great Bear Recreation Park and all outdoor City ice rinks will open for the season on Friday, December 20. He shared that a fee structure ordinance pertaining to non-Levitt events is being developed and will be presented at an upcoming Board meeting. He also shared that attendance at the Midco® Aquatic Center is on track to exceed 200,000 visitors for the third year in
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a row. Kearney acknowledged Miedema and Patten’s contributions to the success of the Veterans’ Park Advisory Board. Patten shared that the Sherman Park Buffalo Wall will be essentially complete in the next two weeks, with only the site restoration being completed in the spring.

**Items Added After the Agenda Deadline**
None.

There being no further business, Begeman made a motion to adjourn. Meeting adjourned.

________________________________________________________________________
Secretary

Approved by:

________________________________________________________________________
President
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CHAPTER ONE — EXECUTIVE SUMMARY

1.1 INTRODUCTION

Sioux Falls is the largest city in South Dakota located in the heart of America. Regionally positioned, Sioux Falls is a community that offers a welcoming atmosphere, vibrant Downtown, big-city entertainment, and small-City hospitality. The City of Sioux Falls also provides a comprehensive parks and recreation system that greatly contributes to the quality of life in Sioux Falls and surrounding areas. Sioux Falls Parks and Recreation (“SFPR”) is responsible for maintaining public open spaces, for providing a quality system of parks and recreation facilities, as well as creating positive leisure opportunities available to all persons in the community. SFPR has a legacy of providing high-quality parks and services to the community.

The SFPR system consists of over 3100-acres of parkland, made up of 80 parks, 11 undeveloped sites, 5 community centers, 4 enlarged gymnasiums, 3 support sites, 3 golf courses, 6 ice rinks, 5 outdoor pools, one indoor aquatic center, Downtown River Greenway, and more than 30 miles of paved, off-street recreational trails. Additionally, SFPR partners with third parties to manage the following: The Great Plains Zoo & Delbridge Museum of Natural History, Great Bear Recreation Park, Mary Jo Wegner Arboretum & East Sioux Falls Historic Site, and Falls Overlook Café. Also, SFPR recently added a Levitt Performance Venue, which is 1 of only 8 in the United States. The system is very-well maintained and provides excellent service area throughout the City.

Since 2010, SFPR was accredited by the Commission for Accreditation of Parks and Recreation Agencies (CAPRA), which recognizes park and recreation agencies for excellence in operation and service. CAPRA is the only national accreditation of park and recreation agencies and is a valuable measure of an agency’s overall quality of operation, management, and service to the community. Being CAPRA Accredited demonstrates the SFPR’s commitment to keeping Sioux Falls a great place to live by holding the Department accountable to the public. SFPR is 1 out of 172 CAPRA Accredited agencies out of over 8,000 park systems in the United States, which demonstrates compliance with national best practices in over 150 measured practices.

This System Plan sought community input to identify their visions and expectations for the future of the Sioux Falls park and recreation system. Community input was received via focus groups, key stakeholder interviews, public forums, a statistically-valid needs analysis survey, a community online open survey, and a crowd-sourcing website www.plansfparks.org. The information gathered from the community engagement process was combined with technical research to produce the final plan.
1.2 SYSTEM PLAN GOALS

The purpose of the Sioux Falls Comprehensive Parks and Recreation System Plan is to offer strategies and operational policies that provide guidance in order to meet the needs of current and future Sioux Falls residents. A consistent theme throughout the development of this plan is SFPR’s commitment to a quality parks and recreation system that delivers high-quality parks, trails and recreation programs, facilities, and events for all residents, while contributing to the quality of life of the City of Sioux Falls. The goals of the plan were to:

- **Engage the community, leadership and stakeholders** through innovative public input means to build a shared vision for parks, recreation, aquatics, open space and trails for the next five to ten years.

- **Utilize a wide variety of data sources and best practices**, including a statistically-valid survey, to predict trends and patterns of use and how to address unmet needs and gaps in the service area.

- **Determine unique Level of Service Standards** to develop appropriate actions regarding parks, recreation, aquatics, open space, and trails that reflects the City of Sioux Falls’ strong commitment to provide high quality recreational activities.

- **Shape financial and operational preparedness** through innovative and “next” practices to achieve the strategic objectives and recommended actions with achievable strategies.

- **Develop a dynamic and realistic strategic action plan** that creates a road map to ensure long-term success and financial sustainability for the City of Sioux Falls parks, recreation programs, aquatics, and open spaces, as well as action steps to support the family-oriented community and businesses that calls Sioux Falls home.
1.3 ACCOMPLISHMENTS SINCE LAST MASTER PLAN

The Department has made great strides in the past 5 years working towards achieving a number of the objectives set forth in the 2015 Comprehensive Master Plan. The two largest impacts to the park system were long-awaited visionary projects that finally came to fruition. The Midco® Aquatic Center was completed and opened in 2016, making it the first public indoor aquatic center in Sioux Falls. This facility has proven very popular since opening, making great strides in increasing year-round recreation activities for the city and region. The Levitt Shell of Sioux Falls was completed and open in 2019, making it 1 of only 8 Levitt performance venues in the United States. This facility addressed the need for another special event venue in the city and was a major improvement to the City’s namesake Falls Park.

The Trail System in Sioux Falls was considered one of the most important and popular amenities in the park system in the 2015 Comprehensive Plan, and a main objective of the plan was to expand the trail system and connectivity. SFPR went to work on this objective by completing preliminary alignments and profiles on the Cherry Creek and Big Sioux River trail corridors to identify land needs and start negotiations with land owners. SFPR was able to acquire key pieces of land along both of these corridors to eventually build out the trails. In addition to planning work, SFPR was also able to construct the segment of trail from Marion Road to the Country Club of Sioux Falls, the highest priority segment of trail identified in the Bicycle Master Plan. Other notable trail construction projects completed were the Elmwood Park trail connection, the reconstruction and widening of the Beadle Greenway trail segment, and the addition of trail counters in various locations along the main trail loop.

Other important objectives set forth in the previous plan were to maintain existing levels of service and to improve and upgrade existing facilities. During this time, the Department was able to develop two new parks in growth areas in the south and east parts of the city and purchase land for two additional parks in new developments. In addition to providing new parks, SFPR also continued to focus on maintaining and improving parks and amenities. To that end, SFPR made improvements in 45 different parks in the system. The improvements ranged from entire park renovations, replacement of playgrounds/play courts/picnic shelters, ballfield renovations, to the addition of new facilities. SFPR also made great strides in making the parks more ADA accessible. The Department performed an accessibility audit in 2016 and updated the ADA Transition Plan in 2017 as a result. In addition to removing accessibility barriers during the improvement projects listed earlier, SFPR also completed a project that brought 13 parks into compliance with ADA guidelines.

Another goal of the plan was to increase financial opportunities for the Department. One example of doing this was securing a $2.2M title naming right agreement for the Midco® Aquatic Center, as well as 3 additional minor sponsorships. SFPR has also been very successful in pursuing philanthropic opportunities, as evidenced by the recent $600,000 gift to build a downtown dog park.
1.4 PROJECT PROCESS

The System Plan followed a process of data collection, public input, on-the-ground study, assessment of existing conditions, market research, and open dialogue with local leadership and key stakeholders. The project process followed a planning path, as illustrated below:

Where Are We Today?

- Site & facility assessments
- Park classification and level of service standards
- Related plans review

Where Are We Going Tomorrow?

- Statistically-valid survey
- Online survey
- Demographics and trends analysis
- Benchmark analysis
- Stakeholder interviews and focus groups

How Do We Get There?

- Needs prioritization
- Service classification review
- Marketing assessment
- Financial review
- Capital improvement planning
- Funding and revenue planning
- Strategic action plan

1.5 SFPR VISION & MISSION

1.5.1 VISION

The following vision presents how Sioux Falls Parks and Recreation desires to be viewed in the future:

“To provide a comprehensive mix of high-quality parks and recreation programs, facilities, and services that contribute to a quality of life that is unparalleled in the region.”

1.5.2 MISSION

The following is the mission for how Sioux Falls Parks and Recreation will implement the vision:

“To enhance the quality of life by providing safe and enjoyable experiences through people, programs, places, and partnerships.”
1.6 THEMES OF THE PLAN

1.6.1 ONE SIOUX FALLS
The Parks & Recreation System Plan is organized under the guidance of the One Sioux Falls framework that the City administration and employees use to guide their work to provide excellent quality of life in Sioux Falls. Each of the four focus areas fall under the umbrella of innovation and investments in foundational growth for the community.

- **Safety and Health:** Provide a safe community in which the health and well-being of our citizens is above the national average.
- **Accessible Housing:** Foster the availability of housing options at all income levels, throughout the city.
- **Workforce:** Continue to develop a community with a quality of life that will attract and retain the best employee base in the United States.
- **Engaging People:** Engage, collaborate and partner with the community to solve our challenges and seize our opportunities.

1.6.2 SYSTEM MASTER PLAN THEMES
Themes emerged from the SFPR System Plan that are based on feedback from the community, technical assessments, and review of best practices, which in turn fall under the umbrella of One Sioux Falls. The four overarching themes include:

- Equitable Access to Parks & Facilities
- Maintaining & Growing Infrastructure
- Year-Round Programming
- Financing a Parks System of Excellence
1.7 RECOMMENDATIONS

Based on community feedback, stakeholder input, technical analysis, and the priority rankings outlined within this Plan, the following key recommendations were developed to enhance the park and recreation system and position SFPR to best serve the current and future needs of the community.

While SFPR should strive to achieve all recommendations outlined within this System Plan, the following represents the top four themes for the next five years. Achievement of these will require the sustained effort and support of the community, elected officials, Park Board members, and SFPR. Successfully implementing these objectives will ensure SFPR remains responsive to the identified needs of the community and positions itself to remain one of the best managed park and recreation systems in the country.

The following outlines the key recommendations based on the four key themes:

1.7.1 EQUITABLE ACCESS TO PARKS

- Update existing neighborhood parks where needed and develop new neighborhood parks in underserved areas of the City to achieve an equitable level of service for neighborhood parks across the City.
  - Develop new neighborhood parks in areas of the city not currently served by a park, in any classification, within one half of a mile. Use the equity mapping to identify best location.
  - In areas not served by a neighborhood park, but served by a park of a different classification, ensure neighborhood park experiences are provided. If lacking, add amenities to provide those experiences at the existing park.
- Continue the initiative of a half mile strategy connecting residents to parks and trails.
  - Work towards establishing trail connections to parks through bike trails, sidepaths, bike boulevards, bike routes, and bike lanes, where appropriate.
  - Work with developers to establish agreements for parks and trail development and connectivity along their development project.
1.7.2 MAINTAINING & GROWING INFRASTRUCTURE

- Implement a strategy for aquatics that manages costs and refreshes aging facilities with current uses combined with new trends in aquatic design.
  - Replace Frank Olson Pool, Kuehn Pool, and McKennan Wading Pool with facilities of similar size in the existing parks with updated facilities that meet current ADA and industry standards.
  - Renovate and update the Terrace Park Family Aquatic Center and Laurel Oak Family Aquatic Center sites with a refreshed look with trending aquatic play features that has wide age segment appeal to extend their useful life.
  - Develop a business plan for all aquatic centers to achieve a cost recovery goal consistent with community values.
- Analyze the current indoor recreation space offerings to determine if there is a more efficient strategy to address the indoor recreation space needs identified in the community survey.
  - Assess the current community center model to determine if these centers meet community needs. Based on the statistically-valid survey, the community desires additional indoor programming space, which may not be met based on the current model.
1.7.3 Year-Round Programming

- Develop a new approach to providing ice rinks with additional winter recreation enhancement, regionally, for citizens to enjoy more consistently during the winter season.
  - Provide more operational days and better, more consistent ice by transitioning to refrigerated ice rinks. Determine the optimal existing ice rink to convert to a refrigerated rink based on infrastructure condition and location.

- Provide core-based programs and events that meet the needs of the community while improving program standards and delivery of service.
  - Implement program management principles ensuring consistent delivery of quality programs.
  - Align program offerings with community needs and priorities identified through public input. Retire and replace declining programs.
  - Add six (6) new core programs over the next six years - one a year in Active Adults (Senior Services), Outdoor Adventure, Special Events, Youth Sports not covered by associations, People with Disabilities and Family programs.

- Develop management standards and amend policies to provide direction to staff on service delivery consistency. Provide training on how to implement new policies and procedures developed.
  - Develop program standards and performance measures to enhance the quality of services and define the outcomes for staff to manage towards.
  - Continue to build out a true cost of service model for both programs and operations that has been initiated through the work order system to communicate true costs of service.
  - Update the pricing policy to reflect cost recovery goals for core program areas and how to appropriately price programs and services.

1.7.4 Financing a Parks System of Excellence

- Ensure capital funding is balanced between Capital Reinvestment (60%), New/Upgraded Investments (20%), and Visionary Projects (20%).

- Develop additional funding methods to support the system and the Department.
  - Establish an independent Parks & Recreation Foundation to explore external funding opportunities working in concert with the Parks and Recreation Board and the Mayor’s Office.

- Develop a full cost of service assessment for the Department to determine unit costs in parks and recreation services and set cost recovery level goals in recreation programs and facilities.
  - Dedicate one person to business plan development, performance measures, and costing models for each City facility and Core Program Area.
  - Create a new business model for the Department that directs the staff to manage forward with earned income best practices.
1.8 CONCLUSION

SFPR is widely respected as a best-practice agency for maintaining a consistent standard of excellence in maintenance and level of service equity for residents of Sioux Falls and visitors to the City. This System Plan is designed to support SFPR in continuing to provide innovative and well-balanced facilities and programs in the community as the City grows and evolves over the next five years.

The Sioux Falls community takes pride in SFPR, as evident in the table below that is based on the statistically-valid needs assessment survey results with comparison to national benchmarks.

The quality of park maintenance was a key theme during the public engagement, as well as accessibility to an abundance of different park experiences ranging from Falls Park to the Bike Trail. The special use facilities such as The Great Plains Zoo & Delbridge Museum of Natural History, Great Bear Recreation Park, Mary Jo Wegner Arboretum and East Sioux Fall Historic Site, the Falls Overlook Café, and the recently added Levitt Performance Venue are tremendous assets to the community. SFPR also provides a wealth of programs that reach a multitude of age segments and diverse interests represented in the community.

Moving forward, additional actions are required to retain the high-quality system SFPR operates, which is to stay ahead of the park infrastructure and asset needs that SFPR owns and manages. It is paramount that SFPR keeps up with improvements to existing park and recreation amenities and trails, as well as maintaining equity across the park system, which are important actions desired by residents. SFPR should consider adding new amenities to meet community needs such as year-round programming. Also, additional funding sources are needed to support financing a park system of excellence, such as an independent Parks Foundation.

SFPR is well-positioned to build upon its legacy over the next five years of providing a comprehensive mix of high-quality parks and recreation programs, facilities, and services that contribute to a high quality of life in the City of Sioux Falls that is unparalleled in the region.
CHAPTER TWO — COMMUNITY PROFILE

A key component of the Parks and Recreation System Plan is a Demographics and Recreational Trends Analysis, as this provides a thorough understanding of the demographic makeup of residents within the City of Sioux Falls, while also identifying national, regional, and local recreational trends.

2.1 DEMOGRAPHIC ANALYSIS

The Demographic Analysis describes the population within the City of Sioux Falls’ boundary. This assessment is reflective of the City’s total population and its key characteristics such as age segments, race, ethnicity, 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.

2.1.1 SIOUX FALLS DEMOGRAPHIC OVERVIEW

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>2018 Total Population</th>
<th>2018 Total Households</th>
<th>2018 Median Age</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>181,739</td>
<td>72,692</td>
<td>35.5</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>2018 Median Household Income</th>
<th>2018 Race</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>$56,857</td>
<td>81% White Alone</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
2.1.2 METHODOLOGY
Demographic data used for the analysis was obtained from U.S. Census Bureau and from 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 January 2019 and reflects actual numbers as reported in the 2010 Census as well as estimates for 2018 and 2023 as obtained by ESRI. Straight line linear regression was utilized for 2028 and 2033 projections. The City boundaries shown below were utilized for the demographic analysis (Figure 1).

Figure 1: City Boundaries
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 as 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.

- 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 — 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 — 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.
2.1.3 SIOUX FALLS POPULATION

POPULATION

The City’s population experienced a significant growing trend in recent years, increasing 18.09% from 2010 to 2018 (2.26% per year). This is more than double the national annual growth rate of 0.86% (from 2010-2018). Similar to the population, the total number of households also experienced a substantial increase in recent years (17.80% since 2010).

Currently, the population is estimated at 181,739 individuals living within 72,692 households. Projecting ahead, the total population and total number of households are both expected to continue growing rapidly over the next 15 years. Based on 2033 predictions, the City is expected to have 236,780 residents living within 94,528 households (Figures 2 & 3).
AGE SEGMENT

Evaluating the City by age segments, Sioux Falls has a rather young population, with roughly half of its residents (49%) being 34-years old or younger. The City has a median age of 35.5-years old which is lower than the U.S. median age of 38.3-years. Assessing the population as a whole, Sioux Falls is projected to continue its current aging trend. Over the next 15 years, the 55+ population is expected to grow to represent 28% of the City's total population. This is largely due to the increased life expectancies and the remainder of the Baby Boomer generation shifting into the senior age groups (Figure 4).

Due to the continued growth of the older age segments, it is useful to further segment the “Senior” population beyond the traditional 55+ designation. Within the field of parks and recreation, there are two commonly used ways to partition this age segment. One is to simply segment by age: 55-64, 65-74, and 75+. However, as these age segments are engaged in programming, the variability of health and wellness can be a more relevant factor. For example, a 55-year-old may be struggling with rheumatoid arthritis and need different recreational opportunities than a healthy 65-year old who is running marathons once a year. Therefore, it may be more useful to divide this age segment into “Active,” “Low-Impact,” and/or “Social” Seniors.

![Population by Age Segment](image)

Figure 4: Population by Age Segments
RACE
Analyzing race, Sioux Falls’ current population is predominantly White Alone. The 2018 estimate shows that 81% of the population falls into the White Alone category, while Black Alone (7%) represents the largest minority. The predictions for 2033 expect the City’s population to continue diversifying, with the White Alone population projected to decrease to 75%, while all other races are expected to experience moderate growth (Figure 5).

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Year</th>
<th>White Alone</th>
<th>Black Alone</th>
<th>American Indian</th>
<th>Asian</th>
<th>Pacific Islander</th>
<th>Some Other Race</th>
<th>Two or More Races</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2010</td>
<td>87%</td>
<td>4%</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2018</td>
<td>81%</td>
<td>7%</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2023</td>
<td>80%</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2028</td>
<td>77%</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2033</td>
<td>75%</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Figure 5: Population by Race

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 of the racial categories from above. Based on the 2010 Census, those of Hispanic/Latino origin represent just below 6% of Sioux Falls’ current population, which is roughly one-third of the national average (18% Hispanic/Latino). The Hispanic/Latino population is expected to experience minimal growth over the next 15 years, increasing to 7% of the City’s total population by 2033 (Figure 6).

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Year</th>
<th>All Others</th>
<th>Hispanic / Latino Origin (any race)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2010</td>
<td>96%</td>
<td>4%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2018</td>
<td>94.3%</td>
<td>6%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2033</td>
<td>93%</td>
<td>7%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Figure 6: Population by Ethnicity
HOUSEHOLD INCOME
As seen in Figure 7, the City’s per capita income ($31,172) and median household income ($56,857) are both above the current state averages ($28,844 & $54,091) but slightly below the current national averages ($31,950 & $58,100).
### 2.1.4 Sioux Falls Demographic Comparative Summary

The table below is a summary of the City's demographic figures. These figures are then compared to the state and U.S. populations. This type of analysis allows Sioux Falls to see how their population compares on a local and national scale. The highlighted cells represent key takeaways from the comparison between the City and the national population.

- Green = Significantly higher than the National Average
- Red = Significantly lower than the National Average

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>2018 Demographic Comparison</th>
<th>Sioux Falls</th>
<th>South Dakota</th>
<th>U.S.A.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Population</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Annual Growth Rate (2010-2018)</td>
<td>2.26%</td>
<td>1.16%</td>
<td>0.86%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Projected Annual Growth Rate (2018-2033)</td>
<td>2.02%</td>
<td>1.14%</td>
<td>0.88%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Households</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Annual Growth Rate (2010-2018)</td>
<td>2.22%</td>
<td>1.18%</td>
<td>0.79%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Average Household Size</td>
<td>2.42</td>
<td>2.43</td>
<td>2.59</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Age Segment Distribution</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ages 0-17</td>
<td>24%</td>
<td>24%</td>
<td>22%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ages 18-34</td>
<td>25%</td>
<td>23%</td>
<td>24%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ages 35-54</td>
<td>26%</td>
<td>23%</td>
<td>25%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ages 55-74</td>
<td>19%</td>
<td>23%</td>
<td>22%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ages 75+</td>
<td>6%</td>
<td>7%</td>
<td>7%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Race Distribution</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>White Alone</td>
<td>81.1%</td>
<td>83.4%</td>
<td>69.9%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Black Alone</td>
<td>6.9%</td>
<td>2.2%</td>
<td>12.9%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>American Indian</td>
<td>2.7%</td>
<td>8.7%</td>
<td>1.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Asian</td>
<td>3.6%</td>
<td>1.6%</td>
<td>5.7%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pacific Islander</td>
<td>0.1%</td>
<td>0.1%</td>
<td>0.2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Some other Race</td>
<td>2.4%</td>
<td>1.3%</td>
<td>6.9%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Two or More Races</td>
<td>3.1%</td>
<td>2.7%</td>
<td>3.4%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hispanic / Latino Population Origin (any race)</td>
<td>5.7%</td>
<td>4.1%</td>
<td>18.3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>All Others</td>
<td>94.3%</td>
<td>95.9%</td>
<td>81.7%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Income Characteristics</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Per Capita Income</td>
<td>$31,172</td>
<td>$28,844</td>
<td>$31,950</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Median Household Income</td>
<td>$56,857</td>
<td>$54,091</td>
<td>$58,100</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Figure 8: Demographic Comparative Summary Table
DEMOGRAPHIC SUMMARY

- The City’s population annual growth rate (2.26%) is significantly higher than both South Dakota’s (1.16%) and the U.S.’s (0.86%) growth rates.
- Sioux Falls’ household annual growth rate (2.22%) is also notably higher than both state (1.18%) and national (0.79%) averages.
- When assessing age segments, the service area has a slightly younger population than the national age segment distribution.
- The City’s racial distribution has a greater White Alone population, and smaller Black Alone and Some Other Race populations when compared to national percentage distribution.
- Sioux Falls’ percentage of Hispanic/Latino population (5.7%) is approximately one-third of the national average (18.3%).
- The City’s per capita income ($31,172) and median house income ($56,857) are both higher when compared to South Dakota’s income characteristics ($28,844 & $54,091) but slightly lower than the U.S.’s income characteristics ($31,950 & $58,100).
2.2 RECREATION TRENDS ANALYSIS

The Trends Analysis provides an understanding of national, regional, and local recreational trends. This analysis examines participation trends, activity levels, and programming trends. It is important to note that all trends are based on current and/or historical patterns and participation rates.

2.2.1 NATIONAL TRENDS IN RECREATION

METHODOLOGY

The Sports & Fitness Industry Association’s (SFIA) Sports, Fitness & Recreational Activities Topline Participation Report 2018 was utilized in evaluating the following trends:

- National Trends in Sport and Fitness Participation
- Core vs. Casual Participation
- Activity by Generation

The study is based on findings from surveys carried out in 2017 and the beginning of 2018 by the Physical Activity Council, resulting in a total of 30,999 online interviews (individual and household surveys). A sample size of 30,999 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 +/- 0.27 percentage points at a 95% confidence interval. Using a weighting technique, survey results are applied to the total U.S. population figure of 298,325,103 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.

CORE VS. CASUAL PARTICIPATION

In addition to overall participation rates, SFIA further categorizes active participants as either core or casual participants based on frequency. 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 and recreational activities more than 50 times per year, while for sports, the threshold for core participation is typically 13 times per year. In a given 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 casual 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.

In recent years, the percent of core participants has decreased in nearly every sport/activity as casual participation continues to become more common among today’s generation. This is expected to be a result of several factors including time restraints, financial barriers, and the introduction of new activities. All of these factors are contributing to participants trying out new activities and casually participating in a wide variety of sports and recreation endeavors versus the former trend of dedicating all of one’s time and finance to one (or two) activities.

INACTIVITY RATES / ACTIVITY LEVEL TRENDS

SFIA also categorizes participation rates by intensity, dividing activity levels into five categories based on the caloric implication (i.e., high caloric burning, low/med caloric burning, or inactive) and the frequency of participation (i.e., 1-50 times, 50-150 times, or above) for a given activity. Participation rates are expressed as ‘super active’ or ‘active to a healthy level’ (high caloric burning, 151+ times), ‘active’ (high caloric burning, 50-150 times), ‘casual’ (high caloric burning, 1-50 times), ‘low/med caloric burning’, and ‘inactive’. These participation rates are then assessed based on the total population trend over the last five years, as well as breaking down these rates by generation.
NATIONAL SPORT AND FITNESS PARTICIPATORY TRENDS

NATIONAL TRENDS IN GENERAL SPORTS

The sports most heavily participated in the United States were Golf (23.8 million in 2016) and Basketball (23.4 million), which have participation figures well in excess of the other activities within the general sports category. The popularity of Golf and Basketball can be attributed to the ability to compete with relatively small number of participants. Even though Golf has experienced a recent decrease in participation, it still continues to benefit from its wide age segment appeal and is considered a life-long sport. Basketball’s success can 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 the majority of American dwellings as a driveway pickup game.

Since 2012, Rugby and other niche sports, like Boxing, Lacrosse, and Roller Hockey have seen strong growth. Rugby has emerged as the overall fastest growing sport, as it has seen participation levels rise by 82.8% over the last five years. Based on the five-year trend, Boxing for Competition (42.6%), Lacrosse (35.1%), and Roller Hockey (34.2%) have also experienced significant growth. In the most recent year, the fastest growing sports were Boxing for Competition (13.1%) and Pickleball (11.3%).

During the last five years, the sports that are most rapidly declining include Ultimate Frisbee (-39.1%), Touch Football (-22.8%), Tackle Football (-16.0%), and Racquetball (-13.4%). For the most recent year, Ultimate Frisbee (-14.9%), Badminton (-12.6%), Gymnastics (-10.7%), and Volleyball-Sand/Beach (-9.9%) experienced the largest declines.

In general, the most recent year shares a similar pattern with the five-year trends. This suggests that the increasing participation rates in certain activities have yet to peak in sports like Rugby, Lacrosse, Field Hockey, and Competitive Boxing. However, some sports that increased rapidly over the past five years have experienced recent decreases in participation, including Squash, Ice Hockey, Roller Hockey and Volleyball-Sand/Beach. The reversal of the five-year trends in these sports may be due to a relatively low user base (ranging from 1-5 million) and could suggest that participation in these activities may have peaked.

CORE VS. CASUAL TRENDS IN GENERAL SPORTS

The most popular sports, such as Basketball and Baseball, have a larger core participant base (engaged 13+ times annually) than casual participant base (engaged at least 1 time annually). Less mainstream, less organized sports such as Ultimate Frisbee, Roller Hockey, Squash, and Boxing for Competition have larger casual participation. Although these sports increased in participation over the last five years, the newcomers were mostly casual participants that may be more inclined to switch to other sports or fitness activities, resulting in the declining one-year trends. See Appendix A for a complete listing of general sports broken down by core vs. casual users. (Source: SFIA)
### National Participatory Trends - General Sports

<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>2012</td>
<td>2016</td>
<td>2017</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Golf * (2011, 2015, and 2016 data)</td>
<td>25,682</td>
<td>24,120</td>
<td>23,815</td>
<td>-7.3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Basketball</td>
<td>23,708</td>
<td>22,343</td>
<td>23,401</td>
<td>-1.3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tennis</td>
<td>17,020</td>
<td>18,079</td>
<td>17,683</td>
<td>3.9%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Baseball</td>
<td>12,976</td>
<td>14,760</td>
<td>15,642</td>
<td>20.5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Soccer (Outdoor)</td>
<td>12,944</td>
<td>11,932</td>
<td>11,924</td>
<td>-7.9%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Softball (Slow Pitch)</td>
<td>7,411</td>
<td>7,690</td>
<td>7,283</td>
<td>-1.7%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Football, Flag</td>
<td>5,865</td>
<td>6,173</td>
<td>6,551</td>
<td>11.7%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Badminton</td>
<td>7,278</td>
<td>7,354</td>
<td>6,430</td>
<td>-11.7%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Volleyball (Court)</td>
<td>6,384</td>
<td>6,216</td>
<td>6,317</td>
<td>-1.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Football, Touch</td>
<td>7,295</td>
<td>5,686</td>
<td>5,629</td>
<td>-22.8%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Soccer (Indoor)</td>
<td>4,617</td>
<td>5,117</td>
<td>5,399</td>
<td>16.9%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Football, Tackle</td>
<td>6,220</td>
<td>5,481</td>
<td>5,224</td>
<td>-16.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Volleyball (Sand/Beach)</td>
<td>4,505</td>
<td>5,489</td>
<td>4,947</td>
<td>9.8%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gymnastics</td>
<td>5,115</td>
<td>5,381</td>
<td>4,805</td>
<td>-6.1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Track and Field</td>
<td>4,257</td>
<td>4,116</td>
<td>4,161</td>
<td>-2.3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cheerleading</td>
<td>3,244</td>
<td>4,029</td>
<td>3,816</td>
<td>17.6%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Racquetball</td>
<td>4,070</td>
<td>3,579</td>
<td>3,526</td>
<td>-13.4%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pickleball</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>2,815</td>
<td>3,132</td>
<td>N/A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ultimate Frisbee</td>
<td>5,131</td>
<td>3,673</td>
<td>3,126</td>
<td>-39.1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ice Hockey</td>
<td>2,363</td>
<td>2,697</td>
<td>2,544</td>
<td>7.7%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Softball (Fast Pitch)</td>
<td>2,624</td>
<td>2,467</td>
<td>2,309</td>
<td>-12.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lacrosse</td>
<td>1,607</td>
<td>2,090</td>
<td>2,171</td>
<td>35.1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wrestling</td>
<td>1,922</td>
<td>1,922</td>
<td>1,896</td>
<td>-1.4%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Roller Hockey</td>
<td>1,367</td>
<td>1,929</td>
<td>1,834</td>
<td>34.2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rugby</td>
<td>887</td>
<td>1,550</td>
<td>1,621</td>
<td>82.8%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Field Hockey</td>
<td>1,237</td>
<td>1,512</td>
<td>1,596</td>
<td>29.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Squash</td>
<td>1,290</td>
<td>1,549</td>
<td>1,492</td>
<td>15.7%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Boxing for Competition</td>
<td>959</td>
<td>1,210</td>
<td>1,368</td>
<td>42.6%</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%)
NATIONAL TRENDS IN GENERAL FITNESS
Overall, national participatory trends in fitness have experienced strong 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. These activities also have very few barriers to entry, which provides a variety of options that are relatively inexpensive to participate in and can be performed by most individuals.

The most popular fitness activity, by far, is Fitness Walking, which had about 110.8 million participants in 2017, increasing 2.7% from the previous year. Other leading fitness activities based on total number of participants include Treadmill (52.9 million), Free Weights (52.2 million), Running/Jogging (50.7 million), Weight/Resistance Machines (36.2 million), and Stationary Cycling (36.0 million).

Over the last five years, the activities growing most rapidly are Non-Traditional / Off-Road Triathlons (74.7%), Trail Running (57.6%), and Aerobics (32.7%). Over the same time frame, the activities that have undergone the most decline include: Boot Camps Style Cross Training (-11.3%), Stretching (-7.5%), and Weight/Resistance Machines (-6.9%).

In the last year, activities with the largest gains in participation were Triathlon Non-Traditional/Off Road (10.1%), Running/Jogging (7.1%), and Trail Running (6.6%). From 2016-2017, the activities that had the most decline in participation were Traditional/Road Triathlon (-8.9%), Cardio Kickboxing (-3.0%), and Calisthenics/Bodyweight Exercise (-2.6%).

CORE VS. CASUAL TRENDS IN GENERAL FITNESS
It should be noted that many of the activities that are rapidly growing have a relatively low user base, which allows for more drastic shifts in terms of percentage, especially for five-year trends. Increasing casual participants may also explain the rapid growth in some activities. For instance, core/casual participation trends showed that over the last five years, casual participants increased drastically in Non-Traditional/ Off Road (119.6%) and Tai Chi (26.9%), while the core participant base of both activities experienced significantly less growth. See Appendix A for a complete listing of general fitness activities broken down by core vs. casual users. (Source: SFIA)
### National Participatory Trends - General Fitness

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Activity</th>
<th>Participation Levels</th>
<th>% Change</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>2012</td>
<td>2016</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fitness Walking</td>
<td>114,029</td>
<td>107,895</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Treadmill</td>
<td>50,839</td>
<td>51,872</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Free Weights (Dumbbells/Hand Weights)</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>51,513</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Running/Jogging</td>
<td>51,450</td>
<td>47,384</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Weight/Resistant Machines</td>
<td>38,999</td>
<td>35,768</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Stationary Cycling (Recumbent/Upright)</td>
<td>35,987</td>
<td>36,118</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Stretching</td>
<td>35,873</td>
<td>33,771</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Elliptical Motion Trainer*</td>
<td>28,560</td>
<td>32,218</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Free Weights (Barbells)</td>
<td>26,688</td>
<td>26,473</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Yoga</td>
<td>23,253</td>
<td>26,268</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Calisthenics/Bodyweight Exercise</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>25,110</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Choreographed Exercise</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>21,839</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Aerobics (High Impact)</td>
<td>16,178</td>
<td>21,390</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Stair Climbing Machine</td>
<td>12,979</td>
<td>15,079</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cross-Training Style Workout</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>12,914</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Stationary Cycling (Group)</td>
<td>8,477</td>
<td>8,937</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Trail Running</td>
<td>5,806</td>
<td>8,582</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pilates Training</td>
<td>8,519</td>
<td>8,893</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cardio Kickboxing</td>
<td>6,725</td>
<td>6,899</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Boot Camp Style Cross-Training</td>
<td>7,496</td>
<td>6,583</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Martial Arts</td>
<td>5,075</td>
<td>5,745</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Boxing for Fitness</td>
<td>4,831</td>
<td>5,175</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tai Chi</td>
<td>3,203</td>
<td>3,706</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Barre</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>3,329</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Triathlon (Traditional/Road)</td>
<td>1,789</td>
<td>2,374</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Triathlon (Non-Traditional/Off Road)</td>
<td>1,075</td>
<td>1,705</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%)

*Cardio Cross Trainer is merged to Elliptical Motion Trainer*
NATIONAL TRENDS IN OUTDOOR RECREATION

Results from the SFIA report demonstrate a contrast of growth and decline in participation regarding outdoor / adventure recreation activities. Much like the general fitness activities, these activities encourage an active lifestyle, can be performed individually or within a group, and are not as limited by time constraints.

In 2017, the most popular activities, in terms of total participants, from the outdoor / adventure recreation category include: Day Hiking (44.9 million), Road Bicycling (38.8 million), Freshwater Fishing (38.3 million), and Camping within ¼ mile of Vehicle/Home (26.2 million).

From 2012-2017, BMX Bicycling (83.4%), Adventure Racing (56.3%), Backpacking Overnight (38.3%), and Day Hiking (30.1%) have undergone the largest increases in participation. Similarly, in the last year, activities growing most rapidly include: BMX Bicycling (10.0%), Backpacking Overnight (8.1%), and Day Hiking (6.6%).

The five-year trend shows activities declining most rapidly were In-Line Roller Skating (-20.7%), Camping within ¼ mile of Home/Vehicle (-16.5%), and Birdwatching (-9.2%). More recently, activities experiencing the largest declines were Adventure Racing (-15.7%), Traditional Climbing (-9.4%), and In-Line Roller Skating (-2.1%).

CORE VS. CASUAL TRENDS IN OUTDOOR RECREATION

National participation trends for outdoor activities is on the rise; however, In-Line Roller Skating and Freshwater Fishing only experienced increases in casual participation over the last five years. Any decline in participation over the last five years was mainly ascribed to decreases in core participants for activities such as In-Line Roller Skating (-32.6%), Skateboarding (-10.7%), Road Bicycling (-10.4%), Camping Recreational Vehicle (-10.0%), and Archery (-3.2%). See Appendix A for a complete listing of outdoor/adventure activities broken down by core vs. casual users. (Source: SFIA)
### 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>2012</td>
<td>2016</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hiking (Day)</td>
<td>34,519</td>
<td>42,128</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bicycling (Road)</td>
<td>39,790</td>
<td>38,365</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fishing (Freshwater)</td>
<td>39,002</td>
<td>38,121</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Camping (&lt;1/4 Mile of Vehicle/Home)</td>
<td>31,454</td>
<td>26,467</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Camping (Recreational Vehicle)</td>
<td>15,903</td>
<td>15,855</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fishing (Saltwater)</td>
<td>12,000</td>
<td>12,266</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Birdwatching (&gt;1/4 mile of Vehicle/Home)</td>
<td>13,535</td>
<td>11,589</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Backpacking Overnight</td>
<td>7,933</td>
<td>10,151</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bicycling (Mountain)</td>
<td>7,265</td>
<td>8,615</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Archery</td>
<td>7,173</td>
<td>7,903</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fishing (Fly)</td>
<td>5,848</td>
<td>6,456</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Skateboarding</td>
<td>6,227</td>
<td>6,442</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Roller Skating, In-Line</td>
<td>6,647</td>
<td>5,381</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bicycling (BMX)</td>
<td>1,861</td>
<td>3,104</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Adventure Racing</td>
<td>1,618</td>
<td>2,999</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Climbing (Traditional/Ice/Mountaineering)</td>
<td>2,189</td>
<td>2,790</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

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

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

---

**Figure 11:** Outdoor / Adventure Recreation Participatory Trends
NATIONAL TRENDS IN AQUATIC ACTIVITY

Swimming is unquestionably a lifetime sport, which is most likely why it has experienced such strong participation growth among the American population. In 2017, Fitness Swimming is the absolute leader in overall participation (27.1 million) for aquatic activities, due in large part to its broad, multigenerational appeal. In the most recent year, Fitness Swimming reported the strongest growth (2.0%) among aquatic activities, while Aquatic Exercise and Competitive Swimming experienced decreases in participation.

Aquatic Exercise has had a strong participation base of 10.4 million, however it also has recently experienced a slight decrease in participants (-1.1%). Based on previous trends, this activity could rebound in terms of participation due largely to ongoing research that demonstrates the activity’s great therapeutic benefit coupled with increased life expectancies and a booming senior population. Aquatic Exercise has paved the way as a less stressful form of physical activity, while allowing similar benefits as land-based exercises, such as aerobic fitness, resistance training, flexibility, and balance. Doctors are still recommending Aquatic Exercise for injury rehabilitation, mature patients, and patients with bone or joint problems. Compared to a standard workout, Aquatic Exercise can significantly reduce stress placed on weight-bearing joints, bones, and muscles, while also reducing swelling.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Activity</th>
<th>Participation Levels</th>
<th>% Change</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>2012</td>
<td>2016</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Swimming (Fitness)</td>
<td>23,216</td>
<td>26,601</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Aquatic Exercise</td>
<td>9,177</td>
<td>10,575</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Swimming (Competition)</td>
<td>2,502</td>
<td>3,369</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%)

CORE VS. CASUAL TRENDS IN AQUATIC ACTIVITY

While all activities have undergone increases in participation over the last five years, most recently, casual participation (1-49 times) is increasing much more rapidly than core participation (50+ times). For the five-year timeframe, casual participants of Competition Swimming increased by 56.2%, Aquatic Exercise by 24.8%, and Fitness Swimming by 21.0%. However, core participants of Competition Swimming decreased by -6.5% and Aquatic Exercise declined by -4.6% (from 2012 to 2017). See Appendix A for a complete listing of aquatic activities broken down by core vs. casual users. (Source: SFIA)
National Trends in Water Sports / Activities

The most popular water sports / activities based on total participants in 2017 were Recreational Kayaking (10.5 million), Canoeing (9.2 million), and Snorkeling (8.3 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 long winter seasons 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 greatly influence water activity participation.

Over the last five years, Stand-Up Paddling (138.9%) was by far the fastest growing water activity, followed by White Water Kayaking (33.1%), Recreational Kayaking (28.7%), and Sea/Tour Kayaking (20.8%). Although the five-year trends show water sport activities are getting more popular, the most recent year shows a different trend. From 2016-2017 Stand-Up Paddling Recreational Kayaking reflect much slower increases in participation (3.3% and 5.2%), while White Water Kayaking (-2.0%), Sea/Tour Kayaking (-5.4%) both show decreases in participation numbers.

From 2012-2017, activities declining most rapidly were Jet Skiing (-22.6%), Water Skiing (-19.4%), and Wakeboarding (-10.8%). In the most recent year, activities experiencing the greatest declines in participation included: Boardsailing/Windsurfing (-9.4%), Canoeing (-8.2%), and Scuba Diving (-7.6%).

<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>Kayaking (Recreational)</td>
<td>8,187 10,017 10,533</td>
<td></td>
<td>28.7%</td>
<td>5.2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Canoeing</td>
<td>9,813 10,046 9,220</td>
<td>-6.0%</td>
<td>-8.2%</td>
<td>-3.8%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Snorkeling</td>
<td>8,664 8,717 8,384</td>
<td>-3.2%</td>
<td>-3.8%</td>
<td>-3.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jet Skiing</td>
<td>6,996 5,783 5,418</td>
<td>-22.6%</td>
<td>-6.3%</td>
<td>-6.3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sailing</td>
<td>3,841 4,096 3,974</td>
<td>3.5%</td>
<td>-3.0%</td>
<td>-3.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Water Skiing</td>
<td>4,434 3,700 3,572</td>
<td>-19.4%</td>
<td>-3.5%</td>
<td>-3.5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rafting</td>
<td>3,756 3,428 3,479</td>
<td>-7.4%</td>
<td>1.5%</td>
<td>-4.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Stand-Up Paddling</td>
<td>1,392 3,220 3,325</td>
<td>138.9%</td>
<td>3.3%</td>
<td>-10.8%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wakeboarding</td>
<td>3,368 2,912 3,005</td>
<td>-10.8%</td>
<td>3.2%</td>
<td>-4.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kayaking (Sea/Touring)</td>
<td>2,446 3,124 2,955</td>
<td>20.8%</td>
<td>-5.4%</td>
<td>-5.4%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Scuba Diving</td>
<td>2,781 3,111 2,874</td>
<td>3.3%</td>
<td>-7.6%</td>
<td>-7.6%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Surfing</td>
<td>2,545 2,793 2,680</td>
<td>5.3%</td>
<td>-4.0%</td>
<td>-4.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kayaking (White Water)</td>
<td>1,878 2,552 2,500</td>
<td>33.1%</td>
<td>-2.0%</td>
<td>-2.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Boardsailing/Windsurfing</td>
<td>1,372 1,737 1,573</td>
<td>14.7%</td>
<td>-9.4%</td>
<td>-9.4%</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: Water Sports / Activities Participatory Trends

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 more casual participants than core participants, since frequencies of activities may be constrained by uncontrollable factors. See Appendix for a complete listing of water sports and activities broken down by core vs. casual users.
ACTIVITY BY GENERATION

Analyzing participation by age for recreational activities reveals that fitness and outdoor sports were the most common activities across all generations. Breaking down activity level by generation shows a converse correlation between age and healthy activity rates.

**Generation Z (born 2000+)** were the most active, with only 17.6% identifying as inactive. Approximately 65% of individuals within this generation where active in 2017; with 26.3% being active to a healthy level, 18.5% being active & high calorie, and 20.1% being casual active & low/med calorie.

Almost half (46.7%) of **millennials (born 1980-1999)** were active to a healthy level (35.4%) or active & high calorie (11.3%), while 24.0% claimed they were inactive. Even though this inactive rate is much higher than Generation Z’s (17.6%), it is still below the national inactive rate (28%).

**Generation X (born 1965-1979)** has the second highest active to a healthy level rate (35.0%) among all generations, only being 0.4% less than Millennials. At the same time, they also have the second highest inactive rate, with 28.1% not active at all.

**The Boomers (born 1945-1964)** were the least active generation, with an inactive rate of 33.3%. This age group tends to participate in less intensive activities. Approximately 34% claimed to engage in casual & low/med calorie (4.3%) or low/med calorie (29.6%) burning activities.

### 2017 PARTICIPATION RATES BY GENERATION

![Pie charts showing activity levels by generation](image)

*Times per year: Casual (1-50), Active (51-150), Active to Healthy Level (151+)
NATIONAL AND REGIONAL PROGRAMMING TRENDS

PROGRAMS OFFERED BY PARK AND RECREATION AGENCIES (MIDWEST REGION)

NRPA’s Agency Performance Review 2018 summarize key findings from NRPA Park Metrics, which is a benchmark tool that compares the management and planning of operating resources and capital facilities of park and recreation agencies. The report contains data from 1,069 park and recreation agencies across the U.S. as reported between 2015 and 2017.

The report shows that the typical agencies (i.e., those at the median values) offer 161 programs annually, with roughly 60% of those programs being fee-based activities/events.

According to the information reported to the NRPA, the top five programming activities most frequently offered by park and recreation agencies, both in the U.S. and regionally, are described in the table below (Figure 14). A complete comparison of regional and national programs offered by agencies can be found in Figure 15.

When comparing Midwest agencies to the U.S. average, team sports, themed special events, fitness enhancement classes, and health and wellness education were all identified as top five most commonly provided program areas offered regionally and nationally. Additionally, aquatics (84%) programs were also popular amongst Midwest agencies.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Top 5 Most Offered Core Program Areas (Offered by Parks and Recreation Agencies)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>U.S. (% of agencies offering)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Team sports (86%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Themed special events (84%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Social recreation events (81%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fitness enhancement classes (78%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Health and wellness education (78%)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Figure 14: Top 5 Core Program Areas
In general, Midwest park and recreation agencies offered programs at a slightly lesser rate than the national average. However, based on a discrepancy threshold of 5% or more, Midwest agencies are offering programs such as fitness enhancement classes, aquatics, racquet sports, and golf, at a higher rate than the national average. Contradictory, the Midwest is trailing the national average in regards to themed special events, trips and tours, martial arts, performing arts, cultural crafts, and visual arts.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Core Program Areas Offered by Parks and Recreation Agencies</th>
<th>U.S.</th>
<th>Midwest</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Team sports</td>
<td>86%</td>
<td>88%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Themed special events</td>
<td>79%</td>
<td>84%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Social recreation events</td>
<td>77%</td>
<td>81%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fitness enhancement classes</td>
<td>78%</td>
<td>84%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Health and wellness education</td>
<td>78%</td>
<td>81%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Safety training</td>
<td>70%</td>
<td>74%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Aquatics</td>
<td>69%</td>
<td>88%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Individual sports</td>
<td>68%</td>
<td>67%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Trips and tours</td>
<td>56%</td>
<td>64%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Racquet sports</td>
<td>62%</td>
<td>67%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Martial arts</td>
<td>53%</td>
<td>61%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Performing arts</td>
<td>53%</td>
<td>61%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cultural crafts</td>
<td>51%</td>
<td>58%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Visual arts</td>
<td>49%</td>
<td>56%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Natural and cultural history activities</td>
<td>53%</td>
<td>49%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Golf</td>
<td>47%</td>
<td>53%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
TARGETED PROGRAMS FOR CHILDREN, SENIORS, AND PEOPLE WITH DISABILITIES

For better understanding of targeted programs by age segment, the NRPA also tracks program offerings that cater specifically to children, seniors, and people with disabilities, on a national and regional basis. This allows for further analysis of these commonly targeted populations. According to the 2018 NRPA Agency Performance Review, approximately 79% of agencies offer dedicated senior programming, while 62% of park and recreation agencies provide adaptive programming for individuals with disabilities.

Based on information reported to the NRPA, the top three activities that target children, seniors, and/or people with disabilities most frequently offered by park and recreation agencies are described in the table below (Figure 16). A complete comparison of regional and national programs offered by agencies can be found in Figure 17.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>U.S. (% of agencies offering)</th>
<th>Midwest Region (% of agencies offering)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>• Summer camp (84%)</td>
<td>• Senior programs (78%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Senior programs (79%)</td>
<td>• Summer camp (69%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Teen programs (63%)</td>
<td>• Programs for people with disabilities (61%)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Figure 16: Top 3 Core Target Program Areas

Agencies in the Midwest tend to offer targeted programs at a lesser rate than the national average. Midwest agencies are offering a significantly lower rate of programs in terms of summer camps and preschool programs, while full day care is the only targeted program in which Midwest agencies are exceeding the national rate.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Core Program Areas Targeting Children, Seniors, and/or People with Disabilities (Percent of Agencies)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>U.S.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Midwest</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Summer camp</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Specific senior programs</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Specific teen programs</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Programs for people with disabilities</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>After school programs</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Preschool</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Before school programs</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Full daycare</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Figure 17: Targeted Programs for Children, Seniors, and People with Disabilities
2.2.2 LOCAL SPORT AND LEISURE MARKET POTENTIAL

MARKET POTENTIAL INDEX (MPI)

The following charts show sport and leisure market potential data for Sioux Falls, as provided by ESRI. A Market Potential Index (MPI) measures the probable demand for a product or service within the City. The MPI shows the likelihood that an adult resident living within the target area 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.

Overall, the City demonstrates slight above average market potential index (MPI) numbers, this is particularly noticeable when analyzing the fitness and commercial recreation market potential charts. All except one activity from both of these charts has an MPI score $\geq 100$. Analyzing the general sports and outdoor activity MPI charts, a majority of these activities still scored above the national average, with only tennis, volleyball, ice skating, and horseback riding scoring below 100.

These overall high MPI scores show that Sioux Falls’ residents have a rather strong participation presence when it comes to recreational activities. This becomes significant when the City considers starting up new programs or building new facilities, giving them a strong tool to estimate resident attendance and participation.

As seen in the charts below, the following sport and leisure trends are most prevalent for residents within the City. The activities are listed in descending order, from highest to lowest MPI score. High index numbers (100+) are significant because they demonstrate that there is a greater potential that residents within the service area will actively participate in offerings provided by SFPRI.

GENERAL SPORTS MARKET POTENTIAL

When analyzing the general sports MPI chart, basketball (113 MPI), football (111 MPI), and golf (110 MPI) are the most popular sports amongst City residents when compared to the national average.
FITNESS MARKET POTENTIAL

The fitness MPI chart shows aerobics (108 MPI), jogging/running (107 MPI), and yoga (106 MPI) as the most popular activities amongst Sioux Falls residents when compared to the national average.

![Fitness MPI Chart](image)

Figure 19: Fitness Participation Trends

OUTDOOR ACTIVITY MARKET POTENTIAL

When analyzing the outdoor activity MPI chart, rock climbing (120 MPI), mountain biking (106 MPI), and hiking (104 MPI) are the most popular activities amongst City residents when compared to the national average.

![Outdoor Activity MPI Chart](image)

Figure 20: Outdoor Activity Participation Trends
COMMERCIAL RECREATION MARKET POTENTIAL

The commercial recreation MPI chart shows visited a zoo (116 MPI), visited a theme park 5+ times (113 MPI), and played a board game (110 MPI) as the most popular activities amongst Sioux Falls residents when compared to the national average.
EXPECTED LOCAL PARTICIPATION
The following chart shows the expected percentage of resident participants within the City in regards to recreational activities. These percentages are correlated to MPI scores previously introduced, serving as an additional tool for programmatic decision-making that allows SFPR to quantify the expected participants by activity.

![Sioux Falls Expected Participation Percentage Chart]

Figure 22: Expected Participation Percentage
2.3 BENCHMARK ANALYSIS

2.3.1 METHODOLOGY

The City of Sioux Falls Parks and Recreation (SFPR) identified operating metrics to benchmark against comparable parks and recreation agencies. The goal of the analysis is to evaluate how SFPR is positioned among peer agencies, as it applies to efficiency and effectiveness practices. The benchmark assessment is organized into specific categories based on peer agency responses to targeted questions that lend an encompassing view of each system’s operating metrics as compared to the SFPR.

Information used in this analysis was obtained directly from each participating benchmark agency. Agency selections included departments with CAPRA accreditation and selected peers from SFPR staff. Due to differences in how each system collects, maintains, and reports data, variances may exist. These variations can impact the per capita and percentage allocations, and the overall comparison must be viewed with this in mind. The benchmark data collection for all systems was complete as of July 2019, and it is possible that information may have changed since the original collection date. The information sought was a combination of operating metrics that factor budgets, staffing levels, and inventories. In some instances, the information was not tracked or not available. A good example of this is the Outdoor Ice Rinks with only Sioux Falls, Saint Paul, and Des Moines managing ice rinks that the other agencies do not. These types of instances have an impact on the overall expenses of these agencies taking considerably more resources to provide these services.

The table below lists each benchmark agency in the study, arranged by total population served, and reveals key characteristics of each jurisdiction. Peer agencies represent broad geographical coverage from coast to coast, and those selected have demographic and organizational characteristics similar to SFPR. For all agencies examined, Sioux Falls represents a lower population (183,200) when compared to the other selected agencies. SFPR has a lower population density (2,321 residents per sq. mi.) with an almost similar jurisdiction size (78.94 sq. mi.) as Boise (79.36 sq. mi.), Des Moines (80.87 sq. mi.), and Grand Prairie (81.00 sq. mi.).

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Agency</th>
<th>State</th>
<th>Population</th>
<th>Jurisdiction Size (Sq. Mi.)</th>
<th>Population per Sq. Mi.</th>
<th>CAPRA (Year)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Boise</td>
<td>ID</td>
<td>246,000</td>
<td>79.36</td>
<td>3,100</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Des Moines</td>
<td>IA</td>
<td>216,853</td>
<td>80.87</td>
<td>2,682</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Grand Prairie</td>
<td>TX</td>
<td>189,430</td>
<td>81.00</td>
<td>2,339</td>
<td>Yes (2017)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sioux Falls</td>
<td>SD</td>
<td>183,200</td>
<td>78.94</td>
<td>2,321</td>
<td>Yes (2010)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Shawnee County</td>
<td>KS</td>
<td>178,725</td>
<td>556.00</td>
<td>321</td>
<td>Yes (2018)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### 2.3.2 Benchmark Comparison

#### Park Acres

The following table provides a general overview of each system’s park acreage and expresses the key performance metric of total acres per 1,000 residents. SFPR ranks near the middle of the benchmark for total park sites (80). Even though SFPR is near the bottom on total acres owned or managed (3,349) among its peers, they rank near the top for developed acres (2,985). Assessing the total acres per 1,000 residents, SFPR is also near the median of the benchmark with 18.28 acres which is greater than NRPA medians of 10.1 acres of parkland per 1,000 residents.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Agency</th>
<th>Population</th>
<th>Total Sites</th>
<th>Total Acres Owned or Managed</th>
<th>Developed Acres</th>
<th>Developed Acres as % of Total</th>
<th>Total Acres per 1,000 Residents</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Boise</td>
<td>246,000</td>
<td>101</td>
<td>7,450</td>
<td>1,756.0</td>
<td>24%</td>
<td>30.28</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Grand Prairie</td>
<td>189,430</td>
<td>56</td>
<td>5,002</td>
<td>4,435.0</td>
<td>88%</td>
<td>26.41</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Des Moines</td>
<td>216,853</td>
<td>75</td>
<td>4,031</td>
<td>1,500.0</td>
<td>37%</td>
<td>18.59</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sioux Falls</td>
<td>183,200</td>
<td>80</td>
<td>3,349</td>
<td>2,985.0</td>
<td>89%</td>
<td>18.28</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Shawnee County</td>
<td>178,725</td>
<td>109</td>
<td>2,685</td>
<td>n/a</td>
<td>n/a</td>
<td>15.02</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Saint Paul</td>
<td>306,621</td>
<td>180</td>
<td>4,123</td>
<td>n/a</td>
<td>n/a</td>
<td>13.45</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*NRPA Median 2016-2018 = 10.1 Acres per 1,000 Residents*

#### Full-Time Equivalent (FTES)

This section compares levels of staffing for each system by comparing full-time equivalents (FTEs) to total population. Total FTEs per 10,000 residents is a key performance metric that assesses how well each agency is equipped, in terms of human resources, to serve its jurisdiction. Among peer agencies, SFPR ranks second to last in staffing relative to the population served, with 12.28 FTEs per 10,000 residents. The national median for similar-sized agencies is 8.3 FTEs per 10,000, which is well below the current staffing level for SFPR.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Agency</th>
<th>Population</th>
<th>Total FTEs</th>
<th>FTEs per 10,000 Residents</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Boise</td>
<td>246,000</td>
<td>765</td>
<td>31.10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Shawnee County</td>
<td>178,725</td>
<td>420</td>
<td>23.50</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Saint Paul</td>
<td>306,621</td>
<td>564</td>
<td>18.39</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Grand Prairie</td>
<td>189,430</td>
<td>237</td>
<td>12.51</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sioux Falls</td>
<td>183,200</td>
<td>225</td>
<td>12.28</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Des Moines</td>
<td>216,853</td>
<td>113</td>
<td>5.23</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*NRPA Median 2016-2018 = 8.3 FTEs per 10,000 Residents*
OPERATING EXPENSE PER CAPITA

Agencies participating in the benchmark study are spending on parks and recreation operations. Dividing the annual operational budget by each service area’s population allows for a comparison of how much each agency is spending on a per resident basis. SFPR ranks third among peer agencies for both total operating expense ($17,197,750) and expense per resident ($93.87), which is above the NRPA median of $78.69 per resident.

<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>Saint Paul</td>
<td>306,621</td>
<td>$ 60,807,671</td>
<td>$ 198.32</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Boise</td>
<td>246,000</td>
<td>$ 33,013,298</td>
<td>$ 134.20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sioux Falls</td>
<td>183,200</td>
<td>$ 17,197,750</td>
<td>$ 93.87</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Shawnee County</td>
<td>178,725</td>
<td>$ 13,704,416</td>
<td>$ 76.68</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Grand Prairie</td>
<td>189,430</td>
<td>$ 14,085,502</td>
<td>$ 74.36</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Des Moines</td>
<td>216,853</td>
<td>$ 12,087,123</td>
<td>$ 55.74</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

NRPA Median 2016-2018 = $78.69 Operating Expense per Resident

NON-TAX REVENUE

By comparing each agency’s annual non-tax revenue to the population, the annual revenue generated on a per resident basis can be determined. As seen below, there is a variation in revenue-generating capabilities among benchmark agencies, with SFPR representing the middle of the study for earned income generated per resident ($21.15). Placing SFPR near NRPA’s median ($20.11) revenue per resident.

<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>Saint Paul</td>
<td>306,621</td>
<td>$ 16,903,976</td>
<td>$ 55.13</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Boise</td>
<td>246,000</td>
<td>$ 10,534,092</td>
<td>$ 42.82</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Des Moines</td>
<td>216,853</td>
<td>$ 4,593,223</td>
<td>$ 21.18</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sioux Falls</td>
<td>183,200</td>
<td>$ 3,875,011</td>
<td>$ 21.15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Grand Prairie</td>
<td>189,430</td>
<td>$ 3,657,082</td>
<td>$ 19.31</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Shawnee County</td>
<td>178,725</td>
<td>$ 2,349,630</td>
<td>$ 13.15</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

NRPA Median 2016-2018 = $20.11 Revenue per Resident
COST RECOVERY

Operational cost recovery is a key performance indicator, arrived at by dividing total non-tax revenue by total operating expense, which measures how well each Departments’ revenue generation covers the total cost of operations. The current 23% cost recovery for SFPR ranks near the bottom among benchmark peers and is below the national median of 27% cost recovery for similar agencies. This is performance measure that should be tracked overtime and expected to improve as revenue generation for the Department strengthens and operational efficiencies are achieved.

<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>Des Moines</td>
<td>$ 4,593,223</td>
<td>$ 12,087,123</td>
<td>38%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Boise</td>
<td>$ 10,534,092</td>
<td>$ 33,013,298</td>
<td>32%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Saint Paul</td>
<td>$ 16,903,976</td>
<td>$ 60,807,671</td>
<td>28%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Grand Prairie</td>
<td>$ 3,657,082</td>
<td>$ 14,085,502</td>
<td>26%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sioux Falls</td>
<td>$ 3,875,011</td>
<td>$ 17,197,750</td>
<td>23%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Shawnee County</td>
<td>$ 2,349,630</td>
<td>$ 13,704,416</td>
<td>17%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

NRPA Median 2016-2018 = 27% Cost Recovery

CAPITAL INVESTMENT

The table below reveals the actual capital investment in the most recent year and compares it to each jurisdiction’s population. Each agency has also provided their budget capital improvement plan for 2019. SFPR invests around $8 million 2018 in capital improvements, which is above the benchmark median. NRPA median for agencies with 1,501 to 2,500 population per square mile for a five-year capital budget spending is $5,371,748.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Boise</td>
<td>246,000</td>
<td>$ 22,084,779</td>
<td>$ 89.78</td>
<td>$ 42,690,587</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sioux Falls</td>
<td>183,200</td>
<td>$ 8,276,300</td>
<td>$ 45.18</td>
<td>$ 9,918,178</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Saint Paul</td>
<td>306,621</td>
<td>$ 9,510,785</td>
<td>$ 31.02</td>
<td>n/a</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Grand Prairie</td>
<td>189,430</td>
<td>$ 4,567,187</td>
<td>$ 24.11</td>
<td>$ 4,177,791</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Des Moines</td>
<td>216,853</td>
<td>$ 4,515,489</td>
<td>$ 20.82</td>
<td>$ 15,394,255</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Shawnee County</td>
<td>178,725</td>
<td>$ -</td>
<td>$ -</td>
<td>$ -</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
MARKETING SPENDING

Marketing spending for parks and recreation agencies are typically less than the private sector, but the industry is beginning to realize the value of investing in marketing and the potential return on investment (ROI) that can be achieved. Compared to peers reporting figures, SFPR ranks near the bottom for total marketing expense ($27,368), marketing spending per resident ($.15). SFPR increased the marketing budget $61,732 which will be about ($.49) per resident in 2019. Best practice peer agency is Grand Prairie with $1.27 per resident. The overall marketing budget for Grand Prairie ($280,880) is 1.9% of their total operating budget.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Grand Prairie</td>
<td>189,430</td>
<td>$240,868</td>
<td>$1.27</td>
<td>$280,880</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Boise</td>
<td>246,000</td>
<td>$271,191</td>
<td>$1.10</td>
<td>$326,519</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Shawnee County</td>
<td>178,725</td>
<td>$144,238</td>
<td>$0.81</td>
<td>$169,890</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Des Moines</td>
<td>216,853</td>
<td>$174,158</td>
<td>$0.80</td>
<td>$203,944</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sioux Falls</td>
<td>183,200</td>
<td>$27,368</td>
<td>$0.15</td>
<td>$89,100</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Saint Paul</td>
<td>306,621</td>
<td>n/a</td>
<td>n/a</td>
<td>n/a</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### 2.3.3 Level of Service Comparison

The table below provides the raw data of inventory levels from the benchmark systems, as well as a side-by-side comparison of the level of service for each amenity type population of jurisdiction served. Inventory data for each of the benchmark agencies were directly obtained from each agency.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Agency</th>
<th>Sioux Falls</th>
<th>Boise</th>
<th>Des Moines</th>
<th>Grand Prairie</th>
<th>Saint Paul</th>
<th>Shawnee County</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Current Service Level based upon population</td>
<td>Current Service Level based upon population</td>
<td>Current Service Level based upon population</td>
<td>Current Service Level based upon population</td>
<td>Current Service Level based upon population</td>
<td>Current Service Level based upon population</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>PARK ACRES</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total Developed Acres</td>
<td>16.29</td>
<td>9.14</td>
<td>9.92</td>
<td>23.41</td>
<td>n/a</td>
<td>15.92</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Undeveloped Acres/Land Bank</td>
<td>1.96</td>
<td>0.92</td>
<td>1.46</td>
<td>0.96</td>
<td>n/a</td>
<td>1.96</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total Park Acres</td>
<td>18.26</td>
<td>10.06</td>
<td>11.38</td>
<td>24.37</td>
<td>n/a</td>
<td>17.88</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>INDOOR / OUTDOOR FACILITIES</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Recreation / Community Centers</td>
<td>1.00</td>
<td>0.19</td>
<td>0.17</td>
<td>1.38</td>
<td>n/a</td>
<td>0.80</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Outdoor Aquatic Centers</td>
<td>0.33</td>
<td>0.16</td>
<td>0.20</td>
<td>0.49</td>
<td>n/a</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pool Surface Only</td>
<td>0.33</td>
<td>0.16</td>
<td>0.20</td>
<td>0.49</td>
<td>n/a</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Splash Pools / Spraygrounds</td>
<td>0.04</td>
<td>0.07</td>
<td>0.08</td>
<td>0.08</td>
<td>n/a</td>
<td>0.04</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Indoor Ice Rinks</td>
<td>1.00</td>
<td>0.50</td>
<td>0.50</td>
<td>2.06</td>
<td>n/a</td>
<td>1.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ice Rinks Refrigerated</td>
<td>1.00</td>
<td>0.50</td>
<td>0.50</td>
<td>2.06</td>
<td>n/a</td>
<td>1.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ice Rinks Unrefrigerated</td>
<td>1.24</td>
<td>0.23</td>
<td>0.23</td>
<td>0.90</td>
<td>n/a</td>
<td>1.24</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Note:** The table above provides raw data of inventory levels from the benchmark systems, as well as a side-by-side comparison of the level of service for each amenity type population of jurisdiction served. Inventory data for each of the benchmark agencies were directly obtained from each agency.
2.3.4 INVENTORY COMPARISON

The table below provides a snapshot of inventory for benchmark systems. To assist with the comparison, the last column is the average of the data provided by each benchmark agencies.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Agency:</th>
<th>Sioux Falls</th>
<th>Boise</th>
<th>Des Moines</th>
<th>Grand Prairie</th>
<th>Saint Paul</th>
<th>Shawnee County</th>
<th>Average</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>PARK ACRES:</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total Developed Acres</td>
<td>acres per</td>
<td>2,985.00</td>
<td>1,756.00</td>
<td>1,500.00</td>
<td>4,435.00</td>
<td>n/a</td>
<td>n/a</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Undeveloped Acres/Land Bank</td>
<td>acres per</td>
<td>364.00</td>
<td>5,694.00</td>
<td>2,531.00</td>
<td>567.00</td>
<td>n/a</td>
<td>n/a</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total Park Acres</td>
<td>acres per</td>
<td>3,349.00</td>
<td>7,450.00</td>
<td>4,031.00</td>
<td>5,002.00</td>
<td>4,123.00</td>
<td>2,684.86</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>OUTDOOR BALLFIELDS:</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Multi-Purpose Fields (Soccer, Football, Cricket, Lacrosse, Other)</td>
<td>field per</td>
<td>73</td>
<td>46</td>
<td>45</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>83</td>
<td>250</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ball Diamonds (Baseball, Softball)</td>
<td>field per</td>
<td>106</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>37</td>
<td>147</td>
<td>41</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total Ballfields</td>
<td>field per</td>
<td>179</td>
<td>96</td>
<td>61</td>
<td>60</td>
<td>210</td>
<td>291</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>OUTDOOR SPORT COURTS:</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Basketball Courts</td>
<td>court per</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>36</td>
<td>27</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pickleball Courts</td>
<td>court per</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>18</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sand Volleyball Courts</td>
<td>court per</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tennis Courts</td>
<td>court per</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>81</td>
<td>55</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>77</td>
<td>42</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total Sport Courts</td>
<td>court per</td>
<td>73</td>
<td>121</td>
<td>91</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>163</td>
<td>76</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PLAYGROUNDS:</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Traditional Play</td>
<td>playground per</td>
<td>73</td>
<td>76</td>
<td>57</td>
<td>31</td>
<td>77</td>
<td>352</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Inclusive Play</td>
<td>playground per</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nature Play</td>
<td>playground per</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Indoor Play</td>
<td>playground per</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total Playgrounds</td>
<td>playground per</td>
<td>73</td>
<td>121</td>
<td>58</td>
<td>32</td>
<td>77</td>
<td>352</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>INDOOR / OUTDOOR FACILITIES:</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Recreation / Community Centers</td>
<td>site per</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>32</td>
<td>9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Indoor Aquatic Centers</td>
<td>site per</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Outdoor Aquatic Centers / Pools</td>
<td>site per</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Splash Pads / Spraygrounds</td>
<td>site per</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Outdoor Ice Rinks</td>
<td>site per</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Indoor Ice Rinks</td>
<td>site per</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Amphitheaters / Band Shells</td>
<td>site per</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>INDOOR / OUTDOOR FACILITY SPACE (SQUARE FEET):</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Recreation / Community Centers</td>
<td>SF per</td>
<td>182,686</td>
<td>44,552</td>
<td>40,250</td>
<td>260,628</td>
<td>n/a</td>
<td>143,577</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Indoor Aquatic Centers</td>
<td>SF per</td>
<td>60,000</td>
<td>39,683</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>93,634</td>
<td>n/a</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Outdoor Aquatic Centers (Pool Surface Only)</td>
<td>SF per</td>
<td>55,914</td>
<td>33,370</td>
<td>56,703</td>
<td>10,640</td>
<td>n/a</td>
<td>79,806</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Splash Pads / Spraygrounds</td>
<td>SF per</td>
<td>7,500</td>
<td>2,500</td>
<td>14,500</td>
<td>12,000</td>
<td>n/a</td>
<td>6,649</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ice Rinks Refrigerated</td>
<td>SF per</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>34,000</td>
<td>7,200</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>n/a</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ice Rinks Unrefrigerated</td>
<td>SF per</td>
<td>227,300</td>
<td>56,524</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>n/a</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

LEVEL OF SERVICE COMPARISON

SFPR represents above average to benchmark agencies in the areas of developed acres (2,985), number of ball diamonds (106), Sand Volleyball Courts (16), outdoor aquatic centers (6) and square feet of recreation/community center (182,686). SFPR represents the higher standards of services from the peer agencies in unrefrigerated ice rink (227,300 Square Ft). Areas where SFPR falls below the average are undeveloped land (364 acres), multipurpose fields (73), pickleball courts (6), and recreation centers (5).
2.3.5 SUMMARY OF BENCHMARK FINDINGS

Compared to benchmark peers, SFPR represents a lower population, with a lower population density, and similar jurisdiction sizes. Ranking near the top in developed acres over 80 park sites, SFPR has fewer acres than the benchmarked peers. The department has placed value on improving land they already maintain. Based on the data presented in the benchmark analysis, SFPR is positioned around the benchmark average to slightly below the benchmark average. Some factors that may be impacting this are the City represents a lower than average population, a lower population density, and a lower average jurisdiction size. When compared to its peers, Sioux Falls still excels in developed acres and total acres per 1,000 (18.28) is well above the NRPA Median of 10.1 acres per 1,000. The commitment to a strong quality of life is present with the consistent investment in capital improvements.

Operation expense ($93.87) per resident plus capital improvement ($45.18) per resident equals $139.05 per resident to maintain and improve operations of the SFPR. SFPR manages six ice rinks, which may affect budget comparisons. Earned income per resident in non-tax revenue recovers 23% of the operation costs. SFPR had the lowest representation in marketing at $0.15 per resident which is also well below what is considered best practice in the industry (3-4% of the overall expenses). However, they have plans of a significant budgeted increased for 2019. This budgeted increase may help the non-tax revenue and increase the cost recovery for the department.

Sioux Falls is also spending at a high rate per resident in its operational budget ($93.87) and earning ($21.15) per resident which is slightly above the NRPA Median of $21.11. This is the result of providing essential services to neighborhoods at little to no cost as a philosophical approach to changes earlier in the City’s jurisdictional growth. The need to reach these areas with services was a priority during these sprawling growth periods.

Benchmarks data is used by many agencies in the industry to identify key performance indicators where improvement will have the greatest impact overall on the system. Setting a tangible goal based in part on the NRPA Metrics medians or average of peer communities is an approach that allows the Department to benchmark regularly a trusted resource for the parks and recreation industry.
CHAPTER THREE — COMMUNITY ENGAGEMENT

SFPR Launched the System Plan in January 2019, which included a robust public engagement process to inventory the current conditions of the system and to help determine the needs and priorities for the future. The planning process incorporated a variety of input from the community. This included a series of key stakeholder interviews and focus group discussions, as well as three public forums, a statistically valid survey, a crowd-sourcing project website, and an online community survey. The following sections in this chapter summarize and highlight the key findings from each stage of the community engagement process.

3.1 KEY LEADERSHIP AND FOCUS GROUP INTERVIEWS

In January of 2019, on-site focus groups were completed over two days and included approximately 54 individuals. These interviews included City leaders and elected officials, current and potential partners, event sponsors, local businesses, the Parks and Recreation Board, local education leaders, similar program providers and partners, health care organizations, and representatives from the State and various departments within the City. Based on feedback from these stakeholder interviews and focus groups, the following key themes regarding the SFPR emerged.

People value the parks and recreation services in Sioux Falls, especially the access to a variety of experiences within the system along with partnerships in the community to make it all happen. Many agree the connectivity through bike and pedestrian paths, increase in parks, sports fields, programs, and events are great assets to the Sioux Falls residents. Interviewees commended the importance that the Department puts on maintenance and recognized there are aging facilities and amenities within the system that are aging to the point of renovation or replacement. There is also a recognition of the efforts with new development to bring the City together in public gathering spaces building community.

Equity is important to the future of Sioux Falls Parks and Recreation services. People interviewed and in focus groups commented on the equitable distribution of parks as a strength that makes Sioux Falls such a great place to live. However, equity in distribution of parks in recently developed areas is not to the standard set by the City. Participant’s perception is that the development of new parks has not kept pace with the new developed areas of the City. It will be important in the level of service planning work to verify whether the City is keeping pace or not. Distribution of sports fields and facilities into these areas was also mentioned. People appreciate the social equity within the City for facility use and would like to see programming distributed more equitably across the city and closer to their homes.

The overarching strength of the Sioux Falls Parks and Recreation system is the Department’s management in providing quality parks, recreation and facilities. Several Industries highlight the parks and recreation system and all it offers when attracting potential employees. Sound planning has provided great opportunities that are beneficial to residents and visitors including the many facility partnerships, enhancements to walkability in the City, Falls Park and the events. Well maintained parks and facilities allow assets to reach their full life providing many years of enjoyment for residents.

The general perception of the parks and recreation system is a quality system with areas that need improvement. Interviewees are genuinely concerned about funding the quality parks and recreation system in an equitable manner across the City, as it pertains to new park development, facility renovations, and new or replacement amenities. Other areas where improvements are needed most is capital assets which included neighborhood parks, facilities, sports fields, aging pools, playgrounds, restrooms, shelters, parking, improved safety in parks, and the ice rinks length of season. Strategies to address aging facilities and amenities need to be prioritized, funded and communicated so residents know when to expect renovation or replacement.

The overarching challenge of the Sioux Falls Parks and Recreation Department is funding to address all of the needs. The needs include renovation or replacement of aging facilities and amenities that have reached their useful life and begin to require major repairs that may be cost prohibitive to continue maintaining. The interviewees also believe the staff and system needs to grow commensurate with the City and include parks, facilities, and amenities in newly developed areas and planned future development. Environmental challenges exist in the system as well and include three most mentioned, the Emerald Ash Borer, the water quality
of the Big Sioux River, and the levee at Family Park. The strategies to alleviate these environmental issues needs to include partnerships and appropriate levels of funding.

The Department could improve marketing and communication to tell the story and increase awareness of the system and services, as well as improving social media engagement and special event approval process. Many of those interviewed appreciate the system and City investments however, for it to be truly appreciated by partners and users, streamlining communications and processes is extremely important. As a positive realization from the interview process, many also expressed they appreciate the opportunity to be a part of the process and providing feedback. They look forward to more community engagement in the Comprehensive System Plan process and future development in the system.

The key outcome desired from the Parks and Recreation Comprehensive System Plan is a unified vision involving residents, leaders, and staff for the system to better meet the needs of residents. The interviewees believe the vision should include strategies for addressing the greatest needs through a prioritized action plan including better long-range planning, management, streamlined processes, improved communications, and funding to achieve the outcomes. Assets and activities that were mentioned multiple times were also captured from participant’s responses. These include; the water quality of Big Sioux River, development of outdoor adventure in and around the City, better partnerships with surrounding municipalities and service providers to avoid duplication and stretch resources, neighborhood parks and amenities to distribute services more equitably increasing access, pedestrian and bike safety, marketing and communication improvement, and most importantly a funding strategy.

Specific program, facility, amenity and service needs most frequently identified by interviewees included:

- Walking/biking trails and connectivity
- Aquatics Centers/pools
- Recreation center and pool combinations (indoor/outdoor pools)
- Adequate parking
- Restrooms
- More river access points and enhanced access points
- Bocce Courts for Special Olympics
- Indoor archery facility
- Playground downtown Sioux Falls
- Synthetic turf fields
- New rugby field could be enhanced with additional fields for lacrosse
- Single track, mountain bike trails
- Parks in outlying areas of the City newly developed
- More extreme sports and warrior races
- SDGFP has funds available for archery, gun safety, and outdoor adventure
- Keep programs affordable and create more social equity by offering them closer to my neighborhood
- Field space/green space for pick-up games.
- Other similar providers impact the park and recreation system by getting the word out attracting people and there needs to be better promotion and awareness of Sioux Falls Parks and Recreation
- Blue ways/ paddle trails
- Senior activities
- More downtown events. New diamond for canaries
- Need more urban fisheries, another lake or pond to sustain fish and allow use
- Water recreation area (dam up a creek) that would allow for this type of environment to be created.
- Bring back the paddleboats — Covell Lake in Terrace Park
- Summer Recreation needs promoted more and staff levels should be higher and quality activities
3.2 PUBLIC FORUMS

In tandem with the stakeholder and focus group interviews, three public forums were hosted designed to further engage residents of the community. The public forum was an open call to the public to share the Comprehensive Parks & Recreation System Plan process, as well as an opportunity for residents to offer feedback on the parks and recreation system through live polling devices. Approximately 28 participants, representing a variety of interests, were present at the public forums.

3.2.1 LIVE POLLING

One key approach for soliciting feedback from attendees of the public forum was through live polling of the audience. Following the initial process presentation, each attendee used a polling device (i.e. 'clicker') to answer a series of questions related to usage and satisfaction levels of parks, trails, facilities, and programs. The following charts share the survey results from the live polling portion of the public forum meeting.

Q.1 AGE GROUP

Almost one-third (32%) of respondents are ages 26-35, while 29 percent are ages 36-45 and ages 18-26 are represented at four percent.
Q.2 GENDER
The respondents represent 68 percent male and 32 percent female.

Q.3 USE OF SIOUX FALLS PARKS OR TRAIL SYSTEM
The majority of respondents use the parks or trail system at least weekly (39%), while 32 percent are using the systems at least monthly.
Q.4 OVERALL QUALITY OF SFPR PARKS AND TRAILS
The vast majority of respondents rate the quality of the parks and trail system as excellent (61%) and good (32%), while seven percent (7%) rate the quality as fair. No responses were received for poor and not applicable.

Q.5 PARTICIPATION IN PARKS AND RECREATION PROGRAMS
Almost one/third of respondents participate in programs at least six times per year (32%) and almost one/third participate two to five times per year, while 18 percent participate one time per year or less.
Q.6 OVERALL QUALITY OF SFPR PROGRAMS AND SPECIAL EVENTS
Eighty-six percent (86%) of respondents rate the overall quality of programs and special events as good to great, while four percent rate the quality as fair.

Q.7 LEARN ABOUT THE SFPR PROGRAMS AND EVENTS
Thirty-eight percent (38%) of respondents learn of programs and events from word of mouth and social media. These are typically connected as people learn in the social media feeds and share when in conversation with friends and family. The activity guide is valuable at 16%, while City website is 14% of responses. Eight percent (8%) identified learning through P&R newsletter, when at facilities, and via email.
Q.8 PREFERRED METHOD OF COMMUNICATION
Social media is the most preferred way respondents want to learn of programs and events (22%), while 16% want to learn from the activity guide. The City website and word of mouth, both have fourteen percent (14%) that responded these are their preferred ways to learn of programs and events followed by 10% through the P&R newsletter.

Q.9 PROGRAMS/SERVICES MOST INTERESTED IN
The most interest is with special events (30%), while adult programs and athletics follows it with 14% of responses. Family programs and nature/environment are 12%, while youth programs follow with 11% of responses.
**Q.10 SUPPORT DEVELOPING NEW OUTDOOR POOLS**
The greatest responses are 32% neutral on the support for developing new outdoor pools, somewhat supportive are 29%, very supportive 21%, while a total of 18% are somewhat to very unsupportive.

**Q.11 SUPPORT DEVELOPING NEW INDOOR POOLS**
The greatest responses are 36% neutral on the support for developing new indoor pools, very supportive are 25%, somewhat supportive 18%, while a total of 21% are somewhat to very unsupportive.
**Q.12 SUPPORT FOR FURTHER DEVELOPING FALLS PARK**

Very supportive of further developing Falls Park are 64%, while 18% are somewhat supportive, neutral towards further development are 14% and 4% somewhat unsupportive.

**Q.13 TOP TWO PRIORITIES FOR PARKS**

Continue expanding trails has the most responses (21%), with 18% desiring more access to the Big Sioux River, neighborhood parks at 16%, new parks in newly developed areas of the City are 14%, and further develop Falls Park and improve security are at 9%.
Q.14 TOP TWO PRIORITIES FOR RECREATION FACILITIES
Develop additional trails tops the list with 24%, followed up by develop indoor fields, and indoor playground to round out the top three responses. More sports field is fourth with 12% of respondents, while recreation center, renovate aging pools, and additional playgrounds follow with 10% each.

Q.15 IMPROVEMENT OF ONE THING IN SFPR
Improve the equity of parks received 32% of the responses, while preserve natural/green spaces received 25%. Following the top two are improve safety/security (14%), update playgrounds (11%) and increase signage (7%).
3.3 STATISTIcALLY-VaLiD SURVEY

ETC Institute administered a parks and recreation survey for the Sioux Falls Parks and Recreation Department during the Spring of 2019. The survey will aid the Sioux Falls Parks and Recreation Department in taking a resident-driven approach to making decisions that will enrich the future of the City and positively affect the lives of residents.

3.3.1 METHODOLOGY

ETC Institute mailed a survey packet to a random sample of households in Sioux Falls. Each survey packet contained a cover letter, a copy of the survey, and a postage-paid return envelope. Residents who received the survey were given the option of returning the survey by mail or completing it on-line at www.SiouxFallsParksSurvey.org.

Ten days after the surveys were mailed, ETC Institute sent emails and placed phone calls to the households that received the survey to encourage participation. The emails contained a link to the on-line version of the survey to make it easy for residents to complete the survey. To prevent people who were not residents of Sioux Falls from participating, everyone who completed the survey on-line was required to enter their home address prior to submitting the survey. ETC Institute then matched the addresses that were entered on-line with the addresses that were originally selected for the random sample. If the address from a survey completed on-line did not match one of the addresses selected for the sample, the on-line survey was not counted.

A total of 493 residents completed the survey, which was mailed to 3,000 households. The overall results for the sample of 493 households have a precision of at least +/-4.4% at the 95% level of confidence.

The major findings of the survey are summarized on the following pages.
3.3.2 PARK AND FACILITY NEEDS AND PRIORITIES

Facility Needs: Respondents were asked to identify if their household had a need for 31 parks and recreation facilities and rate how well their needs for each were currently being met. Based on this analysis, ETC Institute was able to estimate the number of households in the community that had the greatest “unmet” need for various parks and facilities.

The six parks and recreation facilities with the highest percentage of households that have an unmet need were:

1. Walking/hiking trails - 16,752 households (or 23%)
2. Natural areas and wildlife habitats - 16,568 households (or 23%)
3. Indoor playground - 14,402 households (or 20%)
4. Indoor running/walking track - 13,973 households (or 19%)
5. Indoor fitness and exercise facilities - 13,706 households (or 19%)
6. Small neighborhood parks - 13,471 households (or 18%)

The estimated number of households that have unmet needs for each of the 31 parks and facilities that were assessed is shown in the chart below.

Q8-3. Estimated Number of Households Whose Needs for Parks and Facilities Are Being Met 50% or Less

by number of households based on an estimated 73,214 households in the City of Sioux Falls

Source: ETC Institute (2019)
Facility Importance: In addition to assessing the needs for each park and facility, ETC Institute also assessed the importance that residents placed on each park and facility. Based on the sum of respondents’ top four choices, the three most important parks and facilities to residents were:

1. Small neighborhood parks (37%)
2. Paved bike trails (34%)
3. Walking/hiking trails (32%)

The percentage of residents who selected each facility as one of their top four choices is shown in the chart below.
Priorities for Facility Investments: The Priority Investment Rating (PIR) was developed by ETC Institute to provide organizations with an objective tool for evaluating the priority that should be placed on recreation and parks investments. The Priority Investment Rating (PIR) equally weights (1) the importance that residents place on facilities and (2) how many residents have unmet needs for the facility.

Based on the Priority Investment Rating (PIR), the following 10 parks and facilities were rated as high priorities for investment:

- Walking/hiking trails (PIR=186)
- Small neighborhood parks (PIR=180)
- Natural areas and wildlife habitats (PIR=155)
- Paved bike trails (PIR=131)
- Outdoor swimming pools/water parks (PIR=121)
- Indoor swimming pools/leisure pool (PIR=115)
- Off-leash dog parks (PIR=113)
- Large community parks (PIR=112)
- Indoor playground (PIR=104)
- Indoor fitness and exercise facilities (PIR=102)

The chart below shows the Priority Investment Rating for each of the 31 facilities/amenities that were assessed on the survey.
3.3.3 PROGRAMMING NEEDS AND PRIORITIES

Programming Needs. Respondents were also asked to identify if their household had a need for 24 recreation programs and rate how well their needs for each program were currently being met. Based on this analysis, ETC Institute was able to estimate the number of households in the community that had “unmet” needs for each program.

The three recreation programs with the highest percentage of households that have an unmet need were:

1. Outdoor adventure (camping, backpacking, etc.)—17,429 households (or 24%)
2. Adult fitness and wellness programs—17,396 households (or 24%)
3. Nature programs — 15,570 households (or 21%)

The estimated number of households that have unmet needs for each of the 24 programs that were assessed is shown in the chart below.

Q10-3. Estimated Number of Households Whose Needs for Programs Are Being Met 50% or Less

by number of households based on an estimated 73,214 households in the City of Sioux Falls

Source: ETC Institute (2019)
Program Importance. In addition to assessing the needs for each program, ETC Institute also assessed the importance that residents place on each program. Based on the sum of respondents' top four choices, the three most important programs to residents were:

1. Adult fitness and wellness programs (23%)
2. Outdoor adventure (camping, backpacking, etc.) (18%)
3. Youth Learn to Swim programs (18%)

The percentage of residents who selected each program as one of their top four choices is shown in the chart below.

**Q11. Programs That Are Most Important to Households**

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

- Adult fitness & wellness programs: 23%
- Outdoor adventure (camping, backpacking, etc.): 18%
- Youth Learn to Swim programs: 18%
- Nature programs: 15%
- Canoeing & kayaking: 13%
- Special events: 12%
- Travel & tourism (day trips): 12%
- Youth sports programs: 12%
- Water fitness programs: 12%
- Senior programs: 11%
- Before & after school programs: 10%
- Pre-school programs: 9%
- Youth summer camp programs: 9%
- Fishing programs: 8%
- Golf programs: 8%
- Youth & adult arts & crafts programs: 7%
- Youth fitness & wellness programs: 6%
- Programs for disabled: 5%
- Tennis lessons & leagues: 5%
- Youth gymnastics & cheerleading: 5%
- Youth & adult drama/performing arts programs: 4%
- Martial arts programs: 4%
- E-sport gaming programs: 3%
- Other: 2%

Source: ETC Institute (2019)
Priorities for Programming Investments. Based on the priority investment rating (PIR), the following eight programs were rated as “high priorities” for investment:

- Adult fitness and wellness programs (PIR=200)
- Outdoor adventure (camping, backpacking, etc.) (PIR=177)
- Nature programs (PIR=154)
- Canoeing and kayaking (PIR=137)
- Travel and tourism (day trips) (PIR=133)
- Youth Learn to Swim programs (PIR=130)
- Water fitness programs (PIR=122)
- Special events (PIR=107)

The chart below shows the Priority Investment Rating (PIR) for each of the 24 programs that were rated.
3.3.4 TAX VERSUS USER FEE SUPPORT FOR PROGRAMS

Respondents were informed that several programs offered by Sioux Falls Parks and Recreation require a fee to offset the full cost of providing the program. From a list of 12 programs and services, respondents were asked to indicate what they believe is the appropriate mix of support from taxes versus user fees. Most respondents indicated that the programs for special populations/disabled and programs for low income residents should be supported by taxes or an even mix of taxes and user fees. The chart below shows the distribution of responses.

Q6. Tax Versus User Fee Support for Programs

by percentage of respondents

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Program</th>
<th>0%</th>
<th>10%</th>
<th>20%</th>
<th>30%</th>
<th>40%</th>
<th>50%</th>
<th>60%</th>
<th>70%</th>
<th>80%</th>
<th>90%</th>
<th>100%</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Programs for special populations/disabled</td>
<td>46%</td>
<td>26%</td>
<td>15%</td>
<td>7%</td>
<td>5%</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Programs for low income residents</td>
<td>33%</td>
<td>30%</td>
<td>22%</td>
<td>8%</td>
<td>6%</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Learn to swim programs</td>
<td>28%</td>
<td>21%</td>
<td>29%</td>
<td>12%</td>
<td>10%</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Youth sports programs</td>
<td>20%</td>
<td>22%</td>
<td>31%</td>
<td>13%</td>
<td>14%</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Youth classes (arts, dance, etc.)</td>
<td>17%</td>
<td>23%</td>
<td>28%</td>
<td>19%</td>
<td>13%</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Youth camps</td>
<td>13%</td>
<td>25%</td>
<td>32%</td>
<td>18%</td>
<td>13%</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Senior adults classes</td>
<td>13%</td>
<td>19%</td>
<td>32%</td>
<td>18%</td>
<td>18%</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Special events &amp; festivals</td>
<td>12%</td>
<td>13%</td>
<td>33%</td>
<td>18%</td>
<td>25%</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Field rentals for youth sports tournaments</td>
<td>10%</td>
<td>13%</td>
<td>30%</td>
<td>20%</td>
<td>27%</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Adult sports programs</td>
<td>4%</td>
<td>8%</td>
<td>22%</td>
<td>28%</td>
<td>38%</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Adult classes (exercise, arts, dance, etc.)</td>
<td>5%</td>
<td>7%</td>
<td>22%</td>
<td>27%</td>
<td>40%</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Field rentals for adult sports tournaments</td>
<td>4%</td>
<td>6%</td>
<td>23%</td>
<td>25%</td>
<td>42%</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
3.3.5 PARK USAGE
Ninety-five percent (95%) of respondents indicated someone in their household used a park or facility offered by the Sioux Falls Parks and Recreation Department. This figure is 15% higher than the national average of 80%.

3.3.6 QUALITY OF PARKS
Of the ninety-five percent (95%) of respondents that used a park or facility offered by the Sioux Falls Parks and Recreation Department, ninety-six (96%) of respondents rated the quality as “excellent” or “good”.

Q1b. How would you rate the overall quality of parks or facilities that you and members of your household have used?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Rating</th>
<th>Percentage</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Excellent</td>
<td>42%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Good</td>
<td>54%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fair</td>
<td>4%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Poor</td>
<td>0%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: ETC Institute (2019)
3.3.7 PROGRAM PARTICIPATION
Forty-three percent (43%) of respondents indicated someone in their household participated in SFPR recreation programs. This figure is 10% higher than the national average of 33%.

Q2. Have you or other members of your household participated in any recreation programs offered by the Sioux Falls Parks and Recreation Department?

by percentage of respondents

Source: ETC Institute (2019)

3.3.8 QUALITY OF PROGRAMS
Ninety-two percent (92%) of respondents rated the overall quality programs offered by The Sioux Falls Parks and Recreation Department as “excellent” or “good”.

Q2b. How would you rate the overall quality of programs that you and members of your household have participated in?

by percentage of respondents

Source: ETC Institute (2019)
3.3.9 OTHER ORGANIZATIONS USED
Forty-nine (49%) of respondents have used Sioux Falls Parks and Recreation for indoor and outdoor recreation activities followed by Churches (37%), South Dakota State Recreation Areas (35%), and School Districts (35%).

3.3.10 INFORMATION SOURCES
Respondents were asked to indicate which information sources they most prefer to use to learn about the Sioux Falls Parks and Recreation Department programs and activities. Fifty-two percent (52%) of respondents indicated they prefer the website, 46% indicated they prefer from friends and neighbors, 45% indicated they prefer department program guide, and 36% indicated they prefer at parks and facilities.
3.3.11 SATISFACTION WITH PARKS AND RECREATION SERVICES

The highest levels of satisfaction with parks and recreation services, based upon the combined percentage of “very satisfied” and “somewhat satisfied” responses, were: the maintenance of parks (88%), the number of parks (83%), the number of walking/biking trails (80%), the amount of open spaces (75%). Twenty-two percent (22%) of respondents were “somewhat dissatisfied” or “very dissatisfied” with the availability of information about programs and facilities.

3.3.12 POTENTIAL IMPROVEMENTS TO THE PARK SYSTEM

The potential actions that received the highest levels of support, based upon the combined percentage of “very supportive” and “somewhat supportive” responses, were: improving existing small neighborhood parks (86%), improving existing paved walking and biking trails (82%), improving existing large community parks (81%) improving existing nature preserves (80%).
Based on the sum of respondents' top three choices, the potential action that respondents would be most willing to support was the improvement of existing small neighborhood parks.

**Q14. Potential actions indicated in Q13. respondents would be most willing to support.**

3.3.13 FUNDING SUPPORT

The potential funding mechanisms that received the highest levels of support, based upon the combined percentage of “very supportive” and “somewhat supportive” responses, were: Grants from state (82%), federal, and private sources (82%), corporate sponsorship and donations (80%) and Existing sales tax revenue (70%).

**Q15. Level of Support for potential funding mechanisms that could be used to pay for actions indicated in Question 14**

Source: ETC Institute (2019)
3.3.14 CONCLUSIONS

When asked to rate the overall value their household receives from Sioux Falls Parks and Recreation Department 84% of respondents indicated they are either “very satisfied” or “somewhat satisfied”. Additionally, 96% of respondents rated the overall quality of Sioux Falls parks or facilities as “excellent” or “good”. Lastly, 92% of respondents rated the overall quality programs offered by The Sioux Falls Parks and Recreation Department as “excellent” or “good”. To ensure the District continues to meet the needs and expectations of the community, ETC Institute recommends that they sustain and/or improve the performance in areas that were identified as “high priorities” by the Priority Investment Rating (PIR). The facilities and programs with the highest PIR ratings are listed below.

**Park and Facility Priorities**

- Walking/hiking trails (PIR=186)
- Small neighborhood parks (PIR=180)
- Natural areas and wildlife habitats (PIR=155)
- Paved bike trails (PIR=131)
- Outdoor swimming pools/water parks (PIR=121)
- Indoor swimming pools/leisure pool (PIR=115)
- Off-leash dog parks (PIR=113)
- Large community parks (PIR=112)
- Indoor playground (PIR=104)
- Indoor fitness and exercise facilities (PIR=102)

**Programming Priorities**

- Adult fitness and wellness programs (PIR=200)
- Outdoor adventure (camping, backpacking, etc.) (PIR=177)
- Nature programs (PIR=154)
- Canoeing and kayaking (PIR=137)
- Travel and tourism (day trips) (PIR=133)
- Youth Learn to Swim programs (PIR=130)
- Water fitness programs (PIR=122)
- Special events (PIR=107)
3.4 Community Online Survey

An online survey was deployed to gain a better understanding of the characteristics, preferences, and satisfaction levels of Sioux Falls park and recreation users. The survey was available from May 20th for six weeks and was closed on June 28th. A total of 436 responses were received.

The on-line survey emulated the statistically-valid survey questions distributed by ETC which allowed residents not randomly selected for the ETC survey the opportunity to be part of the community input process.

3.4.1 Findings

Have you or other members of your household used any parks or facilities offered by the Sioux Falls Parks and Recreation Department?

The online survey reflects that 99% of the survey takers use the parks or facilities in Sioux Falls Parks and Recreation Department.
HOW WOULD YOU RATE THE OVERALL QUALITY OF PARKS OR FACILITIES THAT YOU AND MEMBERS OF YOUR HOUSEHOLD HAVE USED?
Thirty-nine percent (39%) of survey respondents believes that the parks and facilities are in excellent condition with 56% believing the quality is good. Only 5% reported less than fair quality when they experienced parks or facilities within the Sioux Falls Parks and Recreation Department.

HAVE YOU OR OTHER MEMBERS OF YOUR HOUSEHOLD PARTICIPATED IN ANY RECREATION PROGRAMS OFFERED BY THE SIoux FALLS PARKS AND RECREATION DEPARTMENT?
Fifty-eight percent (58%) of the survey respondents participate in programs offered by the Sioux Falls Parks and Recreation Department.
HOW WOULD YOU RATE THE OVERALL QUALITY OF PROGRAMS THAT YOU AND MEMBERS OF YOUR HOUSEHOLD HAVE PARTICIPATED IN?

Program quality was rated excellent by 34% respondents and 58% stating that the quality was good. Eight percent (8%) of survey respondents rated the quality of Sioux Falls Parks and Recreation programs fair or poor.

![Pie chart showing the percentage of respondents rating the overall quality of programs as excellent (34%), good (58%), fair (7%), and poor (1%).]

FROM THE FOLLOWING LIST, PLEASE CHECK ALL THE ORGANIZATIONS THAT YOU AND MEMBERS OF YOUR HOUSEHOLD HAVE USED FOR INDOOR AND OUTDOOR RECREATION ACTIVITIES DURING THE PAST 12 MONTHS.

The chart below reveals the top organizations respondents use for indoor and outdoor recreation. Respondents use Sioux Falls Parks and Recreation Department as their top organization used for recreation (21%), followed by South Dakota State Recreation Area (14%) and the School Districts (12%).

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Organizations Respondents Use for Recreation</th>
<th>%</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Sioux Falls Parks and Recreation Department</td>
<td>21%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>South Dakota State Recreation Areas</td>
<td>14%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>School Districts</td>
<td>12%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Churches</td>
<td>11%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Private clubs (tennis, fitness &amp; dance)</td>
<td>10%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Youth sports associations</td>
<td>7%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Neighboring communities</td>
<td>6%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Community Colleges/Universities</td>
<td>5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>YMCA</td>
<td>3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>None; do not use any organizations</td>
<td>3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Homeowners associations/apartment complex</td>
<td>3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Travel sports teams</td>
<td>3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Boys and Girls Club</td>
<td>1%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
PLEASE CHECK ALL THE WAYS YOU LEARN ABOUT SIOUX FALLS PARKS AND RECREATION PROGRAMS AND SERVICES.

Survey respondents (18%) use the website and Facebook to gather information about Sioux Falls Parks and Recreation. Respondents also rely on friends and neighbor (14%) as well as the department guide (13%) as a resource to gather information about Sioux Falls Parks and Recreation programs and services.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Communication Methods</th>
<th>Frequency</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Website</td>
<td>272</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Facebook</td>
<td>255</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Department Program Guide</td>
<td>169</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>At Parks and Facilities</td>
<td>95</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Newspaper articles</td>
<td>45</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>School flyers/newsletters</td>
<td>43</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Radio</td>
<td>41</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cable access television</td>
<td>37</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Twitter</td>
<td>19</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Monthly e-newsletter</td>
<td>14</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Department staff</td>
<td>12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

WHAT ARE YOUR PREFERRED WAYS TO LEARN ABOUT PROGRAMS AND SERVICES?

By combining survey respondents’ top three choices, top preferred ways of communication are:

- Facebook — 272 respondents
- Website — 255 respondents
- Department Program Guide — 169 respondents
THE COSTS TO PROVIDE RECREATION PROGRAMS ARE FUNDED THROUGH A COMBINATION OF PARTICIPANT FEES AND GENERAL TAX REVENUES. THE FOLLOWING ARE CATEGORIES OF PROGRAMS OFFERED BY SIOUX FALLS PARKS AND RECREATION. FOR EACH CATEGORY PLEASE INDICATE WHAT PERCENT OF THE PROGRAM COSTS WOULD BE PAID BY TAXES AND WHAT PERCENT BY USER FEES.

The majority of respondents indicated that there should be an even mix of tax support and user fees for each of the program/service listed. Bolded percentages are the highest percent responses for each of the programs. A third or more of respondents indicated users should pay more for the following:

- Field rentals for adult sports tournaments — 41%
- Adult classes (exercise, arts, dance, etc.) — 34%
- Adult sports programs — 33%

A third or more of respondents indicated taxes should pay for the following:

- Programs for special populations/disabled — 43%
- Programs for low income residents — 33%

Two programs stand out for respondents interested in 100% tax-based fees:

- Programs for special populations/disabled-43%
- Programs for low income residents-33%

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Programs</th>
<th>100% taxes, 0% Fees</th>
<th>75% taxes, 25% Fees</th>
<th>50% taxes, 50% Fees</th>
<th>25% taxes, 75% Fees</th>
<th>0% taxes, 100% Fees</th>
<th>Don’t Know</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Youth Sports Program</td>
<td>13%</td>
<td>26%</td>
<td><strong>32%</strong></td>
<td>10%</td>
<td>9%</td>
<td>9%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Adult Sports Program</td>
<td>4%</td>
<td>7%</td>
<td><strong>20%</strong></td>
<td><strong>28%</strong></td>
<td><strong>33%</strong></td>
<td>8%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Youth Camps</td>
<td>9%</td>
<td>25%</td>
<td><strong>32%</strong></td>
<td>16%</td>
<td>10%</td>
<td>8%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Adult classes (exercise, arts, dance, etc.)</td>
<td>4%</td>
<td>7%</td>
<td><strong>20%</strong></td>
<td>28%</td>
<td><strong>34%</strong></td>
<td>7%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Youth classes (arts, dance, etc.)</td>
<td>13%</td>
<td>26%</td>
<td><strong>29%</strong></td>
<td>14%</td>
<td>10%</td>
<td>9%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Learn to Swim Programs</td>
<td>24%</td>
<td>23%</td>
<td><strong>27%</strong></td>
<td>12%</td>
<td>8%</td>
<td>7%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Senior Adult Classes</td>
<td>11%</td>
<td>20%</td>
<td><strong>27%</strong></td>
<td>18%</td>
<td>14%</td>
<td>9%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Special events and festivals</td>
<td>17%</td>
<td>12%</td>
<td><strong>28%</strong></td>
<td>18%</td>
<td>16%</td>
<td>10%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Programs for low income residents</td>
<td><strong>33%</strong></td>
<td>30%</td>
<td>17%</td>
<td>7%</td>
<td>5%</td>
<td>8%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Programs for special populations/disabled</td>
<td><strong>43%</strong></td>
<td>26%</td>
<td>15%</td>
<td>4%</td>
<td>3%</td>
<td>9%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Field rentals for youth sports tournaments</td>
<td>7%</td>
<td>13%</td>
<td><strong>28%</strong></td>
<td>16%</td>
<td>26%</td>
<td>10%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Field rentals for adult sports tournaments</td>
<td>3%</td>
<td>5%</td>
<td>19%</td>
<td>23%</td>
<td><strong>41%</strong></td>
<td>10%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
PLEASE CHECK ALL THE REASONS THAT DEFER YOU OR OTHER MEMBERS OF YOUR HOUSEHOLD FROM USING PARKS, RECREATION FACILITIES OR PROGRAMS OF SIOUX FALLS PARKS AND RECREATION.

The top three reasons respondents do not use parks, recreation facilities or programs are they do not know what is being offered (34%), too busy (28%) and the programs they are interested in are not offered at convenient times (26%).

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Reasons for not Participating</th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>I do not know what is being offered</td>
<td>34%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>We are too busy</td>
<td>28%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Program times are not convenient</td>
<td>26%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Too far from our residence</td>
<td>21%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nothing deters me from participating</td>
<td>19%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fees are too high</td>
<td>17%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Program or facility not offered</td>
<td>17%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Facilities are not well maintained</td>
<td>13%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Class full</td>
<td>13%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I do not know locations of facilities</td>
<td>8%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Facilities don’t have the right equipment</td>
<td>7%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Registration for programs is difficult</td>
<td>6%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lack of parking</td>
<td>6%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Facility operating hours not convenient</td>
<td>6%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Security is insufficient</td>
<td>5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lack of quality programs</td>
<td>4%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Use services of other agencies</td>
<td>4%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Use facilities in other communities</td>
<td>3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Poor customer service by staff</td>
<td>2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lack of accessibility</td>
<td>2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>None. I do not use facilities</td>
<td>1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Language barriers are difficult</td>
<td>0%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

74
PLEASE SELECT EACH OF THE FOLLOWING PARKS AND RECREATION FACILITIES THAT YOU OR ANY MEMBER OF YOUR HOUSEHOLD HAS A NEED FOR.

Top amenities respondents have a need for are walking/hiking trails (70%), paved bike trails (69%) and small neighborhood parks (63%).

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Amenities Respondents Have A Need For</th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Walking/hiking trails</td>
<td>70%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Paved bike trails</td>
<td>69%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Small neighborhood parks</td>
<td>63%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Natural areas and wildlife habitats</td>
<td>58%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Large community parks</td>
<td>57%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Outdoor swimming pools/water parks</td>
<td>56%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Playground equipment</td>
<td>46%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Picnic areas and shelters</td>
<td>46%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Indoor swimming pools/leisure pool</td>
<td>40%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Off-leash dog parks</td>
<td>33%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Indoor playground</td>
<td>32%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Indoor running/walking track</td>
<td>31%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Community gardens</td>
<td>30%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Indoor fitness and exercise facilities</td>
<td>29%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mountain biking/single track</td>
<td>29%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Boating and fishing areas</td>
<td>26%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Outdoor ice-skating rinks</td>
<td>21%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Youth soccer fields</td>
<td>19%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Outdoor tennis courts</td>
<td>19%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Golf courses</td>
<td>19%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Youth baseball and softball fields</td>
<td>19%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pickleball courts</td>
<td>17%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Outdoor basketball courts</td>
<td>17%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Indoor sports fields (football, soccer, etc.)</td>
<td>15%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Indoor basketball/volleyball courts</td>
<td>13%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Skate parks</td>
<td>10%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Adult softball fields</td>
<td>10%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Youth football fields</td>
<td>9%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Regional multigenerational community center</td>
<td>9%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Adult soccer fields</td>
<td>5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other</td>
<td>4%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
WHICH FOUR OF THE PARKS/FACILITIES FROM THE LIST IN QUESTION 8 ARE MOST IMPORTANT TO YOUR HOUSEHOLD?

By combining survey respondents’ four choices, most important parks and facilities are:

- Paved bike trails — 203 respondents
- Walking/hiking trails — 172 respondents
- Small neighborhood parks — 166 respondents
- Natural areas and wildlife habitats — 99 respondents
PLEASE SELECT EACH OF THE FOLLOWING RECREATION PROGRAMS THAT YOU OR ANY MEMBER OF YOUR HOUSEHOLD HAS A NEED FOR.

Popular programs respondents have a need for are adult fitness and wellness programs (42%), outdoor adventure opportunities such as camping and backpacking (36%) as well as canoeing and kayaking (35%).

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Programs Respondents Have A Need For</th>
<th>%</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Adult fitness and wellness programs</td>
<td>42%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Outdoor Adventure (camping, backpacking, etc.)</td>
<td>36%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Canoeing and kayaking</td>
<td>35%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nature programs</td>
<td>34%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Youth Learn to Swim programs</td>
<td>33%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Youth sports programs</td>
<td>28%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Youth summer camp programs</td>
<td>25%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Youth and adult arts and crafts programs</td>
<td>23%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Special events</td>
<td>23%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Travel and tourism (day trips)</td>
<td>22%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Before and after school programs</td>
<td>20%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Youth fitness and wellness programs</td>
<td>19%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Water fitness programs</td>
<td>18%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fishing programs</td>
<td>15%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pre-school programs</td>
<td>14%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Golf programs</td>
<td>13%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Youth and adult drama/performing arts programs</td>
<td>12%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tennis lessons and leagues</td>
<td>11%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Youth gymnastics and cheerleading</td>
<td>10%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Senior programs</td>
<td>8%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Martial arts programs</td>
<td>7%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other</td>
<td>6%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>E-sport gaming programs</td>
<td>6%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Programs for Disabled</td>
<td>5%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
WHICH FOUR OF THE PROGRAMS FROM THE LIST IN QUESTION 10 ARE MOST IMPORTANT TO YOUR HOUSEHOLD?

By combining respondents’ four choices, the most important programs are:

- Youth learn to swim programs — 110 respondents
- Outdoor adventure (camping, backpacking, etc.) — 102 respondents
- Adult fitness and wellness programs — 101 respondents
- Nature programs — 91 respondents
Preferred times for Sioux Fall Parks and Recreation users are Weekday Evenings between 6pm-8pm (67%), Saturday Morning between 8am-noon (65%) and Saturday Afternoons noon-3pm (55%). The least preferred time is Sunday morning before 8am (16%), weekday afternoons noon-3pm (16%), weekday morning before 8am (17%), and Sunday evenings after 8pm (17%).

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Preferred Times</th>
<th>Percentage</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Weekday Evenings (6pm-8pm)</td>
<td>67%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Saturday Mornings (8am-noon)</td>
<td>65%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Saturday Afternoons (noon-3pm)</td>
<td>55%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sunday Afternoons (3pm-5pm)</td>
<td>51%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Saturday Afternoons (3pm-5pm)</td>
<td>51%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sunday Afternoons (noon-3pm)</td>
<td>49%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Saturday Evenings (5pm-8pm)</td>
<td>44%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Weekday Evenings (5pm-6pm)</td>
<td>42%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sunday Evenings (5pm-8pm)</td>
<td>37%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sunday Mornings (8am-noon)</td>
<td>36%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Weekday Mornings (8am-noon)</td>
<td>26%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Weekday Evenings (after 8pm)</td>
<td>25%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Saturday Evenings (after 8pm)</td>
<td>24%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Weekday Afternoons (3pm-5pm)</td>
<td>23%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Saturday Mornings (before 8am)</td>
<td>18%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sunday Evenings (after 8pm)</td>
<td>17%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Weekday Mornings (before 8am)</td>
<td>17%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Weekday Afternoons (noon-3pm)</td>
<td>16%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sunday Mornings (before 8am)</td>
<td>16%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Please rate how supportive you would be of each of the following potential actions Sioux Falls Parks could take to improve the parks and recreation systems.

Top potential actions survey respondents would be very supportive are developing new trails (78%), improving existing paths for walking and biking (74%), improve the existing nature preserve (68%), and acquire parkland (67%).

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Potential Actions</th>
<th>Very Supportive</th>
<th>Somewhat Supportive</th>
<th>Not Supportive</th>
<th>Not Sure</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Develop new trails that connect to existing trails</td>
<td>78%</td>
<td>19%</td>
<td>2%</td>
<td>2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Improve existing paved walking and biking trails</td>
<td>74%</td>
<td>23%</td>
<td>2%</td>
<td>1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Improve existing nature preserves</td>
<td>68%</td>
<td>26%</td>
<td>2%</td>
<td>3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Acquire new park land</td>
<td>67%</td>
<td>23%</td>
<td>4%</td>
<td>7%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Improve existing small neighborhood parks</td>
<td>66%</td>
<td>29%</td>
<td>2%</td>
<td>3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other</td>
<td>62%</td>
<td>6%</td>
<td>8%</td>
<td>24%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Improve existing large community parks</td>
<td>58%</td>
<td>35%</td>
<td>4%</td>
<td>3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Improve existing adult sports fields</td>
<td>56%</td>
<td>37%</td>
<td>3%</td>
<td>5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Improve existing nature centers</td>
<td>56%</td>
<td>37%</td>
<td>3%</td>
<td>5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Develop new indoor recreation centers</td>
<td>51%</td>
<td>30%</td>
<td>11%</td>
<td>8%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Replace aging outdoor swimming pools</td>
<td>49%</td>
<td>35%</td>
<td>10%</td>
<td>6%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Improve existing swimming pools</td>
<td>48%</td>
<td>38%</td>
<td>9%</td>
<td>5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Develop new outdoor swimming pools</td>
<td>41%</td>
<td>33%</td>
<td>18%</td>
<td>7%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Develop new splash parks</td>
<td>41%</td>
<td>32%</td>
<td>20%</td>
<td>7%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Develop new dog parks</td>
<td>35%</td>
<td>33%</td>
<td>25%</td>
<td>7%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Improve existing community centers</td>
<td>35%</td>
<td>49%</td>
<td>9%</td>
<td>7%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Improve existing youth sports fields</td>
<td>28%</td>
<td>49%</td>
<td>17%</td>
<td>6%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Develop new youth sports fields</td>
<td>27%</td>
<td>43%</td>
<td>20%</td>
<td>10%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Develop outdoor refrigerated ice rinks</td>
<td>20%</td>
<td>36%</td>
<td>31%</td>
<td>12%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Improve existing tennis court facilities</td>
<td>15%</td>
<td>36%</td>
<td>35%</td>
<td>14%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Improve existing golf courses</td>
<td>12%</td>
<td>30%</td>
<td>47%</td>
<td>11%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
WHICH THREE PARKS AND RECREATION SERVICES LISTED IN QUESTION 13 ARE MOST IMPORTANT TO YOU AND YOUR HOUSEHOLD?

By combing survey respondents’ three choices, the most important services are to:

- Develop new trails that connect to existing trails — 175 respondents
- Improve existing paved walking and biking trails — 154 respondents
- Improve existing small neighborhood parks — 145 respondents
PLEASE RATE HOW SUPPORTIVE YOU WOULD BE OF EACH OF THE FOLLOWING POTENTIAL FUNDING MECHANISMS THAT COULD BE USED TO PAY FOR THE ACTIONS YOU INDICATED YOU MOST SUPPORT IN QUESTION 14.

Funding the priorities in question 14 should first attempt to be funded through grants (86%), sponsorships/donations (81%), and enterprise opportunities (60%). However, 54% of the survey respondents are willing to use the existing sales tax revenue and 41% willing to use existing property tax revenue.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Potential Funding Mechanisms</th>
<th>Very Supportive</th>
<th>Somewhat Supportive</th>
<th>Not Supportive</th>
<th>Not Sure</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Grants from state, federal, &amp; private sources</td>
<td>86%</td>
<td>10%</td>
<td>1%</td>
<td>2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Corporate sponsorship and donations</td>
<td>81%</td>
<td>15%</td>
<td>1%</td>
<td>3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Enterprise operations (concession stands, gift shops, etc.)</td>
<td>60%</td>
<td>30%</td>
<td>6%</td>
<td>4%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Existing sales tax revenue</td>
<td>54%</td>
<td>34%</td>
<td>6%</td>
<td>7%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Existing property tax revenues</td>
<td>41%</td>
<td>38%</td>
<td>14%</td>
<td>7%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bond issue approved by voters</td>
<td>38%</td>
<td>41%</td>
<td>10%</td>
<td>11%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Program user fees for recreational programs</td>
<td>37%</td>
<td>52%</td>
<td>11%</td>
<td>1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dedicated tax for park improvements</td>
<td>32%</td>
<td>35%</td>
<td>22%</td>
<td>11%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Impact/Development Fees</td>
<td>28%</td>
<td>42%</td>
<td>9%</td>
<td>22%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other</td>
<td>16%</td>
<td>11%</td>
<td>5%</td>
<td>68%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

WHICH THREE FUNDING MECHANISMS LISTED IN QUESTION 15 DO YOU AND YOUR HOUSEHOLD MOST SUPPORT?

By combing survey respondents’ three choices, the most important funding mechanism is:

- Corporate sponsorships and donations — 243 respondents
- Grants from state, federal, and private sources — 241 respondents
- Existing sales tax revenue — 168 respondents
Please rate your satisfaction with the following parks and recreation services provided by Sioux Falls:

Of the services listed below, survey participants were very satisfied with maintenance of parks (44%), number of parks (40%), and amount of open space (30%). Areas where survey participants were somewhat or very dissatisfied include quality/number of indoor amenities/features (27%) and availability of information about programs and facilities (23%).

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Satisfaction Level of Services Provided</th>
<th>Very Satisfied</th>
<th>Somewhat Satisfied</th>
<th>Neutral</th>
<th>Somewhat Dissatisfied</th>
<th>Very Dissatisfied</th>
<th>Don't Know</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Maintenance of parks</td>
<td>44%</td>
<td>47%</td>
<td>6%</td>
<td>3%</td>
<td>1%</td>
<td>0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Number of parks</td>
<td>40%</td>
<td>41%</td>
<td>9%</td>
<td>8%</td>
<td>2%</td>
<td>0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Amount of open spaces</td>
<td>30%</td>
<td>44%</td>
<td>15%</td>
<td>8%</td>
<td>2%</td>
<td>1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Number of walking/biking trails</td>
<td>27%</td>
<td>45%</td>
<td>12%</td>
<td>12%</td>
<td>4%</td>
<td>0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Quality/number of outdoor amenities/features</td>
<td>22%</td>
<td>46%</td>
<td>19%</td>
<td>11%</td>
<td>2%</td>
<td>1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Customer assistance by staff in person</td>
<td>21%</td>
<td>20%</td>
<td>23%</td>
<td>4%</td>
<td>1%</td>
<td>32%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Park accessibility (ADA compliant access)</td>
<td>19%</td>
<td>20%</td>
<td>24%</td>
<td>4%</td>
<td>2%</td>
<td>30%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Customer assistance by staff over the phone</td>
<td>17%</td>
<td>16%</td>
<td>23%</td>
<td>3%</td>
<td>2%</td>
<td>39%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Park staff hours/availability in facilities</td>
<td>17%</td>
<td>31%</td>
<td>23%</td>
<td>7%</td>
<td>2%</td>
<td>19%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Community special events</td>
<td>17%</td>
<td>36%</td>
<td>28%</td>
<td>8%</td>
<td>2%</td>
<td>9%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ease of registering for programs</td>
<td>16%</td>
<td>24%</td>
<td>28%</td>
<td>10%</td>
<td>4%</td>
<td>18%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fees charged for recreation programs</td>
<td>16%</td>
<td>28%</td>
<td>32%</td>
<td>8%</td>
<td>3%</td>
<td>13%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Availability of information about programs and facilities</td>
<td>14%</td>
<td>36%</td>
<td>24%</td>
<td>18%</td>
<td>5%</td>
<td>2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rentals of shelters, gyms, or meeting rooms</td>
<td>14%</td>
<td>26%</td>
<td>28%</td>
<td>5%</td>
<td>2%</td>
<td>25%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Park/facility rule awareness and enforcement</td>
<td>14%</td>
<td>28%</td>
<td>32%</td>
<td>9%</td>
<td>3%</td>
<td>14%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>User friendliness of website</td>
<td>13%</td>
<td>35%</td>
<td>26%</td>
<td>8%</td>
<td>5%</td>
<td>14%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Customer assistance by staff via email</td>
<td>13%</td>
<td>16%</td>
<td>23%</td>
<td>1%</td>
<td>2%</td>
<td>45%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Quality/number of indoor amenities/features</td>
<td>11%</td>
<td>32%</td>
<td>23%</td>
<td>19%</td>
<td>8%</td>
<td>6%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
PLEASE RATE YOUR SATISFACTION WITH THE OVERALL VALUE YOUR HOUSEHOLD RECEIVES FROM THE SIOUX FALLS PARK AND RECREATION DEPARTMENT.

Thirty-seven percent (37%) of survey respondents are very satisfied with the overall value they receive from the Sioux Falls Park and Recreation department while just over half (52%) of respondents are somewhat satisfied with the overall value. Only 4% of respondents are somewhat or very dissatisfied with their overall value the receive from the department.
3.4.21.2.19 DEMOGRAPHICS

### GENDER

- Male: 37%
- Female: 63%

### RACE

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Race Description</th>
<th>Percentage</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>American Indian</td>
<td>0.5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Asian Indian, Chinese, Filipino, Japanese, Korean, Vietnamese, Other Asian</td>
<td>0.7%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Black/African American</td>
<td>0.9%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hispanic, Latino, or Spanish Origin</td>
<td>0.5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pacific Islander</td>
<td>0.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>White/Caucasian</td>
<td>94.3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other</td>
<td>1.2%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
3.5 STATISTICALLY VALID VS ONLINE COMMUNITY SURVEY COMPARISONS

An online survey was deployed to gain a better understanding of the characteristics, preferences, and satisfaction levels of Sioux Falls park and recreation users. The survey was available from May 20th for six weeks and was closed on June 28th. A total of 436 responses were received.

The online survey emulated the statistically-valid survey questions distributed by ETC, which received 493 responses. This allowed other residents another opportunity to provide input even if they did not receive the statistically-valid survey. Overall, the findings from the online community survey are rather similar to the statistically-valid survey results. In many instances, the results mirror each other. Below are some of the key takeaways from both the surveys.

3.5.1 KEY SURVEY SIMILARITIES

**PARK AND FACILITY USAGE**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Question 1</th>
<th>2019 Statistically-Valid</th>
<th>2019 Electronic Survey</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>95%</td>
<td>99%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**QUALITY OF PARKS**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Question 1a</th>
<th>2019 Statistically-Valid</th>
<th>2019 Electronic Survey</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Excellent</td>
<td>42%</td>
<td>39%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Good</td>
<td>54%</td>
<td>56%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fair</td>
<td>4%</td>
<td>5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Poor</td>
<td>1%</td>
<td>0%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**PARTICIPATION IN RECREATION PROGRAMS**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Question 2</th>
<th>2019 Statistically-Valid</th>
<th>2019 Electronic Survey</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>43%</td>
<td>58%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**QUALITY OF PROGRAMS**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Question 2a</th>
<th>2019 Statistically-Valid</th>
<th>2019 Electronic Survey</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Excellent</td>
<td>34%</td>
<td>38%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Good</td>
<td>58%</td>
<td>54%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fair</td>
<td>7%</td>
<td>8%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Poor</td>
<td>1%</td>
<td>0%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
**OTHER ORGANIZATIONS USED**
The top five organizations used are the same as the statistically-valid survey with only two areas reversed. The top organizations used were:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Statistically-Valid Survey</th>
<th>Electronic Survey</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2. Churches</td>
<td>2. South Dakota State Recreation Areas</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5. Private Clubs</td>
<td>5. Private Clubs</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**SOURCES OF INFORMATION**
The top five sources of information used are the same as the statistically-valid survey. The top sources of information used were:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Statistically-Valid Survey</th>
<th>Electronic Survey</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. Website</td>
<td>1. Website</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. From Friends &amp; Neighbors</td>
<td>2. Facebook</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. Department Program Guide</td>
<td>3. From Friends &amp; Neighbors</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5. Facebook</td>
<td>5. At Parks and Facilities</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**PREFERRED COMMUNICATION METHODS**
The top five sources of information used are the same as the statistically-valid survey. The top sources of information used were:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Statistically-Valid Survey</th>
<th>Electronic Survey</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. Website</td>
<td>1. Facebook</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. Department Program Guide</td>
<td>2. Website</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. Facebook</td>
<td>3. Department Program Guide</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5. From Friends &amp; Neighbors</td>
<td>5. At Parks and Facilities</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**PARKS/FACILITIES MOST IMPORTANT**
The top six most “important” facilities/amenities were the same as the statistically-valid survey:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Statistically-Valid Survey</th>
<th>Electronic Survey</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. Small Neighborhood Parks</td>
<td>1. Paved Bike Trails</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. Paved Bike Trails</td>
<td>2. Walking/Hiking Trails</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. Large Community Parks</td>
<td>4. Natural Areas and Wildlife Habitats</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5. Natural Areas &amp; Wildlife Habitats</td>
<td>5. Outdoor Swimming Pools/Waterparks</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
The top six most “important” programs were the same as the statistically-valid survey:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Statistically-Valid Survey</th>
<th>Electronic Survey</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. Adult Fitness &amp; Wellness Programs</td>
<td>1. Youth Learn to Swim Programs</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. Outdoor Adventure</td>
<td>2. Outdoor Adventure</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. Youth Learn to Swim Programs</td>
<td>3. Adult Fitness &amp; Wellness Programs</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5. Canoeing &amp; Kayaking</td>
<td>5. Special Events</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6. Special Events</td>
<td>6. Canoeing &amp; Kayaking</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Both surveys indicate very similar perceptions to the degree of tax subsidy provided for various program areas.

Both surveys indicate a high willingness to fund the same three amenities/facilities with tax dollars:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Statistically-Valid Survey</th>
<th>Electronic Survey</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. Improve Existing Small Neighborhood Parks</td>
<td>1. Develop New Trails that Connect to Existing Trails</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. Improve Existing Paved Walking &amp; Biking Trails</td>
<td>2. Improve Existing Paved Walking &amp; Biking Trails</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. Develop New Trails that Connect to Existing Trails</td>
<td>3. Improve Existing Small Neighborhood Parks</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Statistically-Valid Survey</th>
<th>Electronic Survey</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. Maintenance of Parks</td>
<td>1. Maintenance of Parks</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. Number of Parks</td>
<td>2. Number of Parks</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. Number of Walking/Biking Trails</td>
<td>3. Amount of Open Spaces</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. Amount of Open Spaces</td>
<td>4. Number of Walking/Biking Trails</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

After analyzing the data collected from the public engagement process, there are several public priorities that rose to the surface:

- The community understands there is a need for tax subsidy and user fees to help sustain the system; additionally, there is commonality among the type of services that should be more user fee-based and those that should be funded more with tax dollars.
- Small neighborhood parks, Paved bike trails, and Walking/hiking trails are important facility needs.
- There is a willingness to financially support improving the existing system.
- Community is very satisfied with the maintenance of parks.
- Focusing on the City’s website will be an important communication method.
CHAPTER FOUR — PARKS, TRAILS, FACILITIES AND PROGRAM ANALYSIS

4.1 PARK CLASSIFICATIONS

In developing design principles for parks, it is important that each park be programmed, planned, and designed to meet the needs of its service area and classification within the overall park and recreation system. Every park, regardless of type, needs to have an established set of outcomes. Park planners/designers design to those outcomes, including operational and maintenance costs associated with the design outcomes.

Each park classification category serves a specific purpose, and the features and facilities in the park must be designed for the number of age segments the park is intended to serve, the desired length of stay deemed appropriate, and the uses it has been assigned. Recreation needs and services require different design standards based on the age segments that make up the community that will be using the park. A varying number of age segments will be accommodated with the park program depending on the classification of the park. The age segments used for this purpose are broken into the following sets and subsets:

- Ages 0-17
  - Ages 0-5
  - Ages 6-12
  - Ages 13-17
- Ages 18-34
  - Ages 18-24
  - Ages 25-34
- Ages 35-54
  - Ages 35-44
  - Ages 45-54
- Ages 55-74
  - Ages 55-64
  - Ages 65-74
- Ages 76+

4.1.1 DEFINITIONS

**Land Usage:** The percentage of space identified for active or passive use within a park. A park master plan should follow land usage guidelines.

**Active Use:** An area that requires more intensive development to support the desired recreation activities. Spaces are designed specifically to encourage people to congregate and interact with each other. Active areas include built amenities, such as playgrounds, splash pads, sports courts or fields, community centers, program pavilions, swimming pools, rentable shelters, and similar amenities. Active may also be used in reference to a program or activity that requires a more vigorous physical effort to participate, such as playing sports, swimming, working out, skating, etc.

**Passive Use:** An area that has minimal to no development, usually for the purpose of providing non-programmed open space and/or preserving or restoring natural habitat. Areas that are developed are designed to promote casual and frequently self-directed activities, such as hiking, fishing, bird watching, wildlife viewing, picnicking, kite-flying, Frisbee, or similar generally unstructured activities. Built amenities may include trails, boardwalks, fishing piers, benches, picnic tables, grass meadows, etc. Passive may also be used in reference to a program or activity that requires minimal physical exertion to participate, such as attending an arts and crafts class, continuing education program, etc.

**Park/Facility Classifications:** Includes Urban Plaza, Neighborhood Park, Community Park, Regional Park, Special Use Park/Facility, School Grounds, Greenways/Trails, and Nature Preserves/Open Space.
**Signature Facility/Amenity:** This is an enhanced facility or amenity which is viewed by community as deserving of special recognition due to its design, location, function, natural resources, etc. A signature facility/amenity is frequently synonymous with the park from the general public’s perspective. A signature facility/amenity may also be a revenue facility. Examples include a standalone sports complex, community center, waterpark, destination playground, amenities or natural features.

**Site Features:** The specific types of facilities and amenities included within a park. Site features include such elements as a community center, playground, splashpads, picnic shelters, restrooms, game courts, trails, open meadows, nature preserves, etc. These types of amenities are categorized as lead or support amenities. Community demographics and needs should be considered when identifying site features for a park.

**Revenue Facilities:** These include facilities that charge a fee to use in the form of an admission fee, player fee, team fee, or permit fee. These could include pools, golf courses, tennis courts, recreation centers, sport field complexes, concession facilities, hospitality centers, reservable shelters, outdoor or indoor theatre space, and special event spaces.

**User Experiences:** The type of intentional recreation experiences a user has available to them when visiting a park. A park master plan should incorporate user experience recommendations based on the following types of experiences:

**Leader-Directed Experience:** An experience received from a facility, amenity or service where participant involvement is directed by a leader and supervision is required for participation. These experiences, usually provided through an organized class, often promote skill development or learning, but may be for recreational purposes only. Leader-directed experiences typically require advance registration and include a user fee to participate. Examples include day camps, learn-to-swim programs, environmental education classes, sports leagues, etc. Certain types of special events, such as concerts, 5K fun runs/walks, or similar events that rely on the performance or significant coordination of someone to occur are also considered leader-directed experiences.

**Self-Directed Experience:** An experience received from a facility, amenity or service that provides opportunities for individuals or groups to participate independently and at their own pace. Supervision, when provided, is primarily to promote safety or regulate attendance. A user fee may or may not be charged, depending on the setting. Advance registration is often not required. Examples include playground or splashpad usage, picnicking, disc golf, nature walks, walking a dog, etc. General use of a community center, such as using fitness equipment, using the gym or indoor aquatic during open times or walking the track, are also considered self-directed experiences.

### 4.1.2 PARK CLASSIFICATIONS DEFINITIONS

**URBAN PLAZAS**

An urban plaza is a small outdoor space, usually less than 0.5 acres, but may be up to 8 acres, and most often located in an urban area surrounded by commercial buildings or higher-density housing. Urban plazas are small, urban open spaces that serve a variety of functions, such as: small event space, play areas for children, spaces for relaxing and socializing, taking lunch breaks, etc.

Successful urban plazas have four key qualities: they are accessible, allow people to engage in activities, are comfortable spaces that are inviting, and are sociable places. In general, pocket parks offer minimal amenities on site and are not designed to support organized recreation services. The service area for urban plazas is usually less than a quarter-mile and they are intended for users within close walking distance of the park.

This type of park is not commonly found in a public park system, and is normally designed, constructed and maintained as a common’s area within a downtown corridor. The City of Sioux Falls inventory includes Fawick Park, Fort Sod, Philips Avenue Plaza, Pioneer Plaza, and Van Eps Park.

Urban plazas are not designed to accommodate more than very limited recreation services. They are typically able to provide recreation services for one user group such as a playground, splashpad, benches for walkers, landscape and trails for enjoyment of the natural environment or display of public artwork.
• Size of park: Urban plazas are usually under one acre in size. Anything larger would typically be considered a neighborhood park.
• Service radius: Several city blocks or less than 1/4 mile in a residential setting.
• Site selection: Servicing a specific recreation need, ease of access from the surrounding area, and linkage to the community pathway system are key concerns when selecting a site. Ideally, it will have adjacency to other park system components, most notably greenways, and the trail system. Location is determined by the needs of the neighborhood, partnership opportunities and the availability and accessibility of land.
• Length of stay: One-hour experience or less.
• Site features: Community input through the public meeting process needs to be the primary determinant of the development program for this type of park. Urban Plazas are not designed to accommodate more than very limited recreation use. They are typically able to provide recreation use for one user group such as a playground or splash pad for youth, benches for walkers, landscape and trails for enjoyment of the natural environment or display of artwork for the local neighborhood. Amenities are ADA compliant. Although demographics and population density play a role in location, the justification for an Urban Plaza lies more in servicing a specific recreation need or taking advantage of a unique opportunity. Given the potential variety of Urban Plaza activities and locations, services can vary.
• Landscape design: Appropriate design to enhance the park theme/use/experience.
• Revenue facilities: None.
• Land usage: 90% active/10% passive. The character may be one of intensive use or aesthetic enjoyment. Area businesses and residents should be encouraged to assist in policing and the day-to-day maintenance of this type of park, as they are located in downtown areas. The primary function of such a park is to provide recreation space to those areas of the City where population densities limit the available open space.
• User experiences: Predominately self-directed, but a signature amenity may be included which provides opportunities for leader-directed programs. Depending on the size and location, special events could be activated.
• Maintenance standards: Dependent on-site features, landscape design, and park visitation.
• Signage: Directional signage and facility/amenity regulations to enhance user experience.
• Parking: Parking is typically not required.
• Lighting: Site lighting is typically used for security and safety.
• Naming: Consistent with the agency’s naming policy for naming of parks, such as being named after a prominent or historic person, event, or natural landmark.

NEIGHBORHOOD PARK
A neighborhood park is typically 3-10 acres in size; however, some neighborhood parks are determined by use and facilities offered and not by size alone. The service radius for a neighborhood park is one half mile or six blocks. Neighborhood parks should have safe pedestrian access for surrounding residents; parking may or may not be included but if included accounts for less than ten cars and provides for ADA access. Neighborhood parks serve the recreational and social focus of the adjoining neighborhoods and contribute to a distinct neighborhood identity. Currently, the Department has many neighborhood parks within its inventory such as Glenview Park, Emerson Park, Marion Park, Leaders Park, Town One Park to name a few.

• Size of park: 3 to 10 acres (usable area measured). Preferred size is eight acres.
• Service radius: 0.5-mile radius.
• Site selection: On a local or collector street. If near an arterial street, provide natural or artificial barrier from traffic. Where possible, next to a school. Encourage location to link subdivisions and linked by trails to other parks.
• Length of stay: One-hour experience or less.
• Site features: One signature amenity (e.g., playground, splashpad, sport court, gazebo); no restrooms unless necessary for a signature amenity; may include one non-programmed sports field; playgrounds for ages 2-5 and 5-12 with some shaded elements; typically, no reservable shelters; loop trails; one type of sport court; no non-producing/unused amenities; benches, small picnic shelter(s) next to play areas. Amenities are ADA compliant.
• Landscape design: Appropriate design to enhance the park theme/use/experience. Customized to demographics of neighborhood; safety design meets established Crime Prevention Through Environmental Design (CPTED) standards; integrated color scheme throughout.
• Revenue facilities: None.
• Land usage: 85% active/15% passive.
• User experiences: Typically, self-directed, but a signature amenity may be included which provides opportunities for leader-directed programs.
• Maintenance standards: Dependent on-site features, landscape design, and park visitation.
• Signage: Directional signage to the park, as well as within the park, and facility/amenity regulations to enhance user experience.
• Parking: Design should include widened on-street parking area adjacent to park, when feasible. Goal is to maximize usable park space. As necessary, provide 5-10 spaces within park including accessible parking spaces. Traffic calming devices encouraged next to park.
• Lighting: Security only. Lighting on all night for security.
• Naming: Consistent with the agency’s naming policy for naming of parks, such as being named after a prominent or historic person, event, donor, or natural landmark.

COMMUNITY PARK

Community parks provide diverse recreation opportunities to serve the residents of Sioux Falls. These include active and passive recreation, as well as self-directed and organized recreation opportunities for individuals, families and small groups. Community Parks often include facilities that promote outdoor recreation and activities such as walking and biking, picnicking, playing sports, playing on playgrounds, and fishing. These sites also include natural areas, emphasizing public access to important natural features. Since community parks may attract people from a wide geographic area, support facilities are required, such as parking and restrooms. Self-directed recreation activities such as meditation, quiet reflection, and wildlife watching also take place at community parks.

Community parks generally range from 10 to 100 acres depending on the surrounding community. Community parks serve a larger area — radius of one to three miles — and contain more recreation amenities than a neighborhood park. Currently, the City of Sioux Falls has many Community Parks that include Rotary Park, Memorial Park, Spencer Park, and Laurel Oak Park to name a few.

• Size of park: 10 to 100 acres, but ideally 20 to 40 acres.
• Service radius: One to three-mile radius.
• Site selection: On two collector streets minimum and preferably one arterial street. If near arterial street, provide natural or artificial barrier from traffic. Minimal number of residences abutting site. Preference for adjacent or nearby proximity with school or other municipal use. Encourage trail linkage to other parks.
• Length of stay: Two to three hours experience.
• Site features: Four signature amenities at a minimum: (e.g., trails, sports fields, large shelters/pavilions, community playground for ages 2-5 and 5-12 with some shaded elements, recreation center, pool or family aquatic center, sports courts, water feature); public restrooms with drinking fountains, ample parking, and security lighting. Amenities are ADA compliant. Multi-purpose fields are appropriate in this type of park.
• Landscape design: Appropriate design to enhance the park theme/use/experience. Enhanced landscaping at park entrances and throughout park.
• Revenue facilities: One or more (e.g. picnic shelters, program pavilion, dog park).
• Land usage: 65% active and 35% passive.
• User experiences: Mostly self-directed experiences, but may have opportunities for leader-directed programs based on available site features and community demand.
• Maintenance standards: Dependent on-site features, landscape design, and park visitation.
• Signage: Directional signage to the park, as well as within the park, and facility/amenity regulations to enhance user experience. May include kiosks in easily identified areas of the facility.
• Parking: Sufficient to support the amenities; occupies no more than 10% of the park. Design should include widened on-street parking area adjacent to park. Goal is to maximize usable park space. Traffic calming devices encouraged within and next to the park.
• Lighting: Security lighting and lighting appropriate for signature amenities.
• Naming: Consistent with the agency’s naming policy for naming of parks, such as being named after a prominent or historic person, event, donor, or natural landmark.
• Other: Strong appeal to surrounding neighborhoods; integrated color scheme throughout the park; partnerships developed with support groups, schools and other organizations; loop trail connectivity; linked to trail or recreation facility; safety design meets established CPTED standards.

REGIONAL PARK

Regional parks provide access to unique recreation features, natural areas, and facilities that attract visitors from the entire community and beyond. Regional parks often accommodate small and large group activities and have infrastructure to support group picnics. As community attractions, Regional parks can enhance the economic vitality and identity of the entire region. These parks may include significant natural areas and wetlands, trails and pathways, gardens and arboretums, ponds, and other water features. They add unique facilities, such as destination or thematic playgrounds, community centers, aquatic centers, sledding hills, viewing knolls, skateparks, and other interesting elements.

Regional parks can and should promote tourism and economic development. Regional parks can enhance the economic vitality and identity of the entire region. Regional parks are typically 100 or more acres in size. Currently, the City of Sioux Falls has Falls Park and Sherman Park to name a few that fall under the regional park designation.

• Size of park: 100+ acres.
• Service radius: Three miles or greater radius.
• Site selection: Prefer location which can preserve natural resources on-site such as wetlands, streams, and other geographic features or sites with significant cultural or historic features. Significantly large parcel of land. Access from public roads capable of handling anticipated traffic.
• Length of stay: 4-8-hour experience.
• Site features: 10 to 12 amenities to create a signature facility (e.g., community center, waterpark, lake, destination playground, 3+ reservable picnic shelters, outdoor adventure amenities, arboretum, trails, and specialty facilities); public restrooms with drinking fountains, concessions, restaurant, ample parking, special event site.
• Landscape design: Appropriate design to enhance the park theme/use/experience. Enhanced landscaping at park entrances and throughout park.
• Revenue facilities: More than two; park designed to produce revenue to help offset operational costs.
• Land usage: Up to 50% active/50% passive.
• User experiences: Significant mix of leader-directed and self-directed experiences. More than four recreation experiences per age segment with at least four core programs provided.
• Maintenance standards: Dependent on-site features, landscape design, and park visitation.
• Signage: Directional signage to the park, as well as within the park, and facility/amenity regulations to enhance user experience. May include kiosks in easily identified areas of the facility.
• Parking: Sufficient for all amenities. Traffic calming devices encouraged within and next to park.
• Lighting: Security lighting and lighting appropriate for signature amenities.
• Naming: Consistent with the agency’s naming policy for naming of parks, such as being named after a prominent or historic person, event, donor, or natural landmark.
• Other: Safety design may meet CPTED safety standards; integrated color scheme throughout the park; linked to major trails systems, public transportation available, concessions, food and retail sales available, dedicated site managers on duty.

SPECIAL USE PARK

Special use parks are those spaces that do not fall within a typical park classification. A major difference between a special use park and other parks is that they usually serve a single purpose whereas other park classifications are designed to offer multiple recreation opportunities. It is possible for a special use facility to be located inside another park.

Special use parks generally contain one facility or amenity that falls into the following categories:

• **Historic/Cultural/Social Sites** — Unique local resources offering historical, educational, and cultural opportunities. Examples include arboretums, memorials, historic downtown areas, commercial zones, arboretums, display gardens, and amphitheaters. Frequently these are located in community or regional parks.

• **Golf Courses** — 9- and 18-hole complexes with ancillary facilities such as club houses, driving ranges, program space and learning centers. These facilities are highly maintained and support a wide age level of males and females. Programs are targeted for daily use play, tournaments, leagues, clinics and special events. Operational costs come from daily play, season pass holders, concessions, driving range fees, earned income opportunities, and sale of pro shop items.

• **Indoor Recreation Facilities** — specialized or single purpose facilities. Examples include community centers, senior centers, performing arts facilities, and community theaters. Frequently these are located in community or regional parks.

• **Outdoor Recreation Facilities** — Examples include aquatic parks, disk golf, skateboard, BMX, and dog parks, ski area, standalone sports complex, which may be located in a park.

The City of Sioux Falls has many different special use facilities within its current inventory, such as Great Bear Recreation Park, Yankton Trail Park Soccer Fields, Sanford Sports Complex, among others.

• Size of park: Depends upon facilities and activities included. The diverse character of these parks makes it difficult to apply acreage standards.

• Service radius: Depends upon facilities and activities included. Typically serves special user groups while a few serve the entire population.

• Site selection: Given the variety of potential uses, no specific standards are defined for site selection. As with all park types, the site itself should be located where it is appropriate for its use.

• Length of stay: Varies by facility.

• Site Features: Varies by facility.

• Revenue facilities: Due to nature of certain facilities, revenue may be required for construction and/or annual maintenance. This should be determined at a policy level before the facility is planned and constructed.

• Land usage: Varies by facility.

• User experiences: Varies by facility.

• Maintenance standards: Dependent on-site features, landscape design, and park visitation.

• Signage: Directional signage to the park, as well as within the park, and facility/amenity regulations to enhance user experience. May include kiosks in easily identified areas of the facility.

• Parking: On-street or off-street parking is provided as appropriate for facility.

• Lighting: Security lighting and lighting appropriate for facility.

• Landscape design: Appropriate design to enhance the park theme/use/experience.

• Naming: Consistent with the agency’s naming policy for naming of parks, such as being named after a prominent or historic person, event, donor, or natural landmark.

• Other: Integrated color scheme throughout the park; safety design meets established CPTED standards.
SCHOOL GROUNDS

By combining the resources of two public agencies, such as the City of Sioux Falls the Sioux Falls School District, as well as adjacent school districts, the school grounds classification allows for expanding the recreation, social, and educational opportunities available to the community in an efficient and cost-effective manner. Through a partnership agreement, the City uses schools for after school programming.

Facilities may include one to three meeting rooms, a kitchen, a game room, a computer lab, and a gym with either three volleyball courts or two basketball courts. The important outcome in the joint-use relationship is that both the school district and the park system benefit from shared use of facilities and land area.

Depending on circumstances, school grounds often complement other community open lands. As an example, an elementary school can serve as neighborhood park providing a playground and open space to the surrounding community during non-school hours. Similarly, a middle school or high school may serve in a number of capacities that could include indoor sport courts, athletic fields, tennis courts, etc.

- Size: Variable as it depends on function.
- Location: Determined by location of school district property.
- Site features: May include playgrounds, tennis courts, basketball courts, athletic fields, and trails.
- Signage: Directional signage to the park, as well as within the park, and facility/amenity regulations to enhance user experience. May include kiosks in easily identified areas of the School Grounds for public use.
- Recreation services: Mainly self-directed recreation activities. Where feasible, if athletic fields are developed on school grounds, they are oriented to youth programming. Establishing a joint-use agreement is recommended to making school ground designations work for both agencies. This is particularly important to maintenance, liability, use, and programming of the facilities.

NATURE PRESERVES/OPEN SPACE

Nature preserves/open space are undeveloped but may include natural or paved trails. Grasslands under power line corridors are one example and creek areas another. Nature preserves/open space contain natural resources that can be managed for recreation and natural resource conservation values such as a desire to protect wildlife habitat, water quality, and endangered species. Nature preserves/open space also can provide opportunities for nature-based, self-directed, low-impact recreational opportunities such as walking and nature viewing. These lands consist of:

- Individual sites exhibiting natural resources.
- Lands that are unsuitable for development but offer natural resource potential.
- Parcels with steep slopes and natural vegetation, drainage ways and ravines, surface water management areas (man-made ponding areas), and utility easements.
- Protected lands, such as wetlands/lowlands and shorelines along waterways, lakes, and ponds.

The intent of nature preserves/open space is to enhance the livability and character of a community by preserving as many of its natural amenities as possible. Integration of the human element with that of the natural environment that surrounds them enhances the overall experience. The City of Sioux Falls offers many unique nature preserves/open space parks that include Perry Nature Area, Legacy Park, and Arrowhead Park to name a few.

- Amenities: May include paved or natural trails, wildlife viewing areas, mountain biking, disc golf, nature interpretation, and education facilities.
- Maintenance standards: Demand-based maintenance with available funding. Biological management practices observed.
- Lighting: None.
- Signage: Directional signage to the park, as well as within the park, and facility/amenity regulations to enhance user experience. May include kiosks in easily identified areas of the facility.
• Landscape design: Generally, none. Some areas may include landscaping, such as entryways or around buildings. In these situations, sustainable design is appropriate.

GREENWAYS/TRAILS
Greenways/trails include natural and built corridors that typically support trail-oriented activities, such as walking, jogging, biking, skating, etc. Greenways/trails function as linear parks by linking features together and providing green buffers. Greenways/trails may be located along abandoned railroad lines, transportation or utility rights-of-way, riparian corridors, or elongated natural areas. Greenways/trails and linear parks may be of various lengths and widths, and these corridors typically support facilities such as viewing areas, benches, and trailheads. Greenways/trails between key destinations can help create more tightly-knit communities, provide opportunities for non-motorized transportation, and link to the regional trail system. The Main Bike Loop Trail, Norlin Greenway, Downtown River Greenway, and Veteran Parkway Trail to name a few are examples of greenways/trails.

• Size: Typically, unencumbered land at least 30-feet wide. It may include a trail to support walk, bike, run, and sometimes equestrian type activities. Usually, an urban trail is at minimum 10-feet wide to support pedestrian and bicycle uses. Trails incorporate signage to designate where a user is located and where the trails connect in the community.
• Site selection: Located consistent with approved a community’s comprehensive plan and/or alternative transportation plan as appropriate.
• Amenities: Parking and restrooms at major trailheads. May include station points, which include a bench, drink fountain, trail map, and bike repair station, pocket parks/public plazas along the trail.
• Maintenance standards: Dependent on-site features, landscape design, and park visitation.
• Lighting: Security lighting at trailheads is preferred. Lighting in urbanized areas or entertainment districts as appropriate.
• Signage: Mileage markers at half mile intervals. Interpretive kiosks as deemed appropriate.
• Landscape design: Coordinated planting scheme in urban areas. Limited or no landscape planting in open space areas with a preference for maintaining natural areas as a buffer to neighbors.
• Other: Connectivity to parks or other community attractions and facilities is desirable.
4.2 PARKS AND RECREATION FACILITIES ASSESSMENT

4.2.1 INTRODUCTION
The consulting team conducted an in-person site assessment of each existing park over a six-week period in the fall of 2018. The purpose of this assessment was to inventory the park system’s existing amenities, evaluate the condition and identify opportunities for improvement. The assessment will be utilized with other technical research reports to assist with ‘Level of Service’ analysis and the final Park and Recreation System Plan including recommendations and action strategies.

4.2.2 PARK ASSESSMENT BY CLASSIFICATION

NEIGHBORHOOD PARKS
Neighborhood Parks in Sioux Falls consistently provide the following amenities:

- Park shelter
- Playground
- Sport court, generally basketball (predominantly half court)
- Flex field lawn area with backstop
- Drinking fountain
- Limited site lighting
- Accessible walkways between amenities
- Park identification signage

Size: Varies from 0.33 acres (Ronnning Park) to 26.5 acres (Thelin Park) with a median size of 5 acres and an average of 6.5 acres.

Existing Neighborhood Parks:

- Burnside Park
- Emerson Park
- Hayward Park
- Thelin Park
- Baker Park
- Campus Park
- Dan Dugan Park
- Galway Park
- Glenview Park
- Jefferson Park
- Lewis Park
- Marion Park
- Menlo Park
- Platinum Valley Park*
- Prairie Hills West Park
- Prairie Meadows Park*
- Prairie Trail Park
- Southern Vistas Park*
- Beadle Greenway
- Bryant Park
- Granite Valley Park
- Heritage Park
- Lacey park
- Linwood Park
• Lyon Park
• Mansor Pioneer Park
• Meldrum Park
• Ronning Park
• Tower Park
• Whittier Park*
• Fred Dawley Park
• Town One Park
• Whispering Woods South
• Willow Ridge Park

Known Future Neighborhood Parks:
• NW School Site *
• Judee Estates
• Wild Meadows
• SE Brandon School Site

Typical park shelter at Fred Dawley Park
Typical neighborhood Park sign
Evaluation & Opportunities:

- Well maintained play structures to serve the 5-12 age segment
- A large passive recreation space for yard games, picnicking, and walking
- Shelters consistently provide shade and protection from rain
- Drinking fountains are readily available
- Aging drinking fountains are rusting at several parks. Create a replacement program and upgrade the material to stainless steel
- Many newer neighborhood parks in community growth areas have been created in conjunction with elementary school sites/playgrounds. At school sites the basketball court is provided as part of the school playground and is typically an asphalt surface
- The very consistent palette of experiences and amenities is used in all neighborhood parks lacks excitement and diversity. Consider creating a menu of 7-8 different amenities that are appropriate for use in neighborhood parks. Incorporate 3-4 of these amenities in each park to increase diversity throughout the system
  - Playground (2-5-year-old, 6-8, 9-12) play equipment or a combination of these amenities; nature play
  - Picnic shelter (25 person or less in size), grill
- Fitness equipment
- Spray ground
- Walking loop trail
- Sport court(s) (no more than 2) for basketball, tennis, pickleball, sand volleyball
- Bag court or Horseshoe court
- Bocce Ball court
- Sports field for practice (combination of space for soccer, softball or youth baseball) or pick-up games
- Small dog park with synthetic turf
- Small skate park
- Small fishing pond
- Community gardens
- Art/sculpture pieces/fountains
- Small gathering plaza area for neighborhood gathering for picnics, movie nights, small music events
- Flower gardens/benches/ security lighting with a gazebo or courtyard
- Small sled hill for neighborhood kids to gather at

**COMMUNITY PARKS**

While community parks in Sioux Falls often contain many of the amenities found in a neighborhood park, they also contain larger amenities used by the entire community. Examples include aquatics, athletic facilities and dog parks.

**Size:** Varies from 9.65 acres (McCart Fields) to 85 acres (Dunham Park) with a median size of 26 acres and an average of 31 acres.

**Community Parks:**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Park</th>
<th>Community Amenities</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Dunham Park</td>
<td>Baseball/Softball</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Elmwood Park</td>
<td>Baseball</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>McCart Fields</td>
<td>Softball</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kuehn Park*</td>
<td>Softball, Skate Park, Golf, Tennis, Aquatics</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>McKennan Park</td>
<td>Tennis, Ice Skating, Wading Pool, Bandshell, Gardens</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Memorial Park</td>
<td>Ice Skating, Soccer</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Spellerberg Park</td>
<td>Indoor Aquatics Center, Tennis, Sledding Hill</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Spencer Park</td>
<td>Dog Park, Soccer, Disc Golf, Trailhead</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tomar Park</td>
<td>Soccer, Tennis, Disc Golf, Trailhead</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cherry Rock Park</td>
<td>Volleyball, Baseball, Trailhead</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kenny Anderson Park*</td>
<td>Community Center, Softball</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Leaders Park</td>
<td>Singletrack</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nelson Park</td>
<td>Aquatics, Skate Park</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Frank Olson Park</td>
<td>Softball, Aquatics</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Laurel Oak Park</td>
<td>Aquatics, Tennis</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lion’s Centennial Park</td>
<td>Soccer</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Morningside Park*</td>
<td>Community Center, Softball</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pasley Park</td>
<td>Baseball, Nature Area</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Riverdale Park</td>
<td>Multi-use Fields, Pickleball, Sand Volleyball</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rotary Park</td>
<td>Canoe Access, Trailhead</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Denotes School Park Sites
Dunham Park Ball Fields
McKenna Park
Midco® Aquatic Center at Spellerberg Park
Tennis Courts at Kuehn Park
Nelson Park Skate Park
Cherry Rock Park Sand Volleyball Courts
Evaluation & Opportunities

- Opportunities for additional experiences at Community Parks may include:
  - Larger regional playgrounds for 2-5, 6-8 and 9-12 play spaces and could include adult play space
  - Nature Play spaces
  - Regional Spray Ground with four or five water play spaces
  - Usually two to three picnic reservable shelters
  - Multi-field sports complex for baseball, softball, soccer that have scheduled activities
  - Cricket field
  - Large Skatepark
  - Multi-court facility for basketball, Sand Volleyball, Pickleball, Tennis. 4 courts or more at a minimum
  - Outdoor Pool or Water Park
  - Multigenerational Community Center- 50,000 square feet minimum up to 100,000 square feet
  - Indoor Pool and or a family aquatic center
  - Exercise trail
  - Small Amphitheater
  - Loop walking trail for walking, running
  - Concession facilities
  - Indoor Hospitality Space
  - Wedding Garden
  - Fishing pond or small lake
  - Stadium for football, soccer, baseball
  - Track for running
  - Sculpture garden
  - Nature trails
  - Bag Courts
  - Dog Park
  - Restrooms with parking
  - Large Community Garden
  - Rose Garden and landscape gardens
  - Small special event site that can host up to 500-100 people
  - Gazebo
  - Program Center only for afterschool programs, senior programs and summer day camps
  - Nature Center
  - Natural areas to walk in
  - Adventure Water Play Practice areas for canoeing, kayaking, Paddle Boarding, Ziplining,
  - Covered Exercise Facility outside
  - Wildlife viewing area
  - Nature art displays
  - Off leash dog park area
  - BMX Track facility
  - Small mountain bike course
  - Driving range
  - Miniature Golf Course
  - Nine-hole golf course
  - Connected to a spine trail that connects to a regional trail
Natural waterfall area
River park access
Archery range
Sled Hill
Destination restaurant
Family camping area
Beach camping area
Fairground space for 4-H fairs
Historic site spaces
Natural historic features
Rehab Center for Wildlife
Outdoor Ice Skate Facility with restrooms a concession space
Farmers market space
Viewing Tower
Small Arboretum collection
Large Indoor Playground
Indoor Ice Rink Complex
Outdoor ice rink

REGIONAL PARKS

Historic regional parks include Terrace Park Sherman Park and Tuthill Park. These parks function as very large community parks but due to size or special purpose, such as the Japanese Gardens, Great Plain Zoo, or sledding hill they have a regional draw. The newer regional parks within Sioux Falls generally have a highly specialized purpose such as athletics, memorials, winter sports or nature activities that often draw visitors to participate in a special event or activity.

Size: Varies from 21 acres (Veteran’s Memorial Park) to 277 acres (Great Bear Recreation Park) with a median size of 94 acres and an average of 111 acres.

Existing Regional Parks:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Regional Amenities</th>
<th>Sanford Sports Complex</th>
<th>Sherman Park</th>
<th>Terrace Park</th>
<th>Veterans’ Memorial Park</th>
<th>Sertoma Park</th>
<th>Tuthill Park</th>
<th>Yankton Trail Park</th>
<th>Falls Park</th>
<th>Great Bear</th>
<th>Hamodon Park</th>
<th>Mary Jo Wegner Arboretum</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Multi-use Fields</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Softball, Zoo, Historical Significance, Memorial</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Baseball, Aquatics, Gardens, Lake, History, Bandshell</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Memorial</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nature Area</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Singletrack, Disc Golf, Ice Skating, Sledding Hill, Gardens</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Soccer, Trailhead</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Historical Significance, Farmers Market, Trailhead, Levitt</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Winter Sports, Nature Area</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Baseball/Softball</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gardens, Historical Significance, Nature Area</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Veterans' Memorial Park

Terrace Park; typical park restroom

Sanford Sports Complex

Harmodon Park

Falls Park

Sherman Park Concessions
Evaluation & Opportunities

- Besides the multi-use fields at Sanford Sports Complex, the greater facility also includes the Sanford Fieldhouse, which is an indoor synthetic turf practice facility; basketball and volleyball at the Pentagon; Huether Family Match Pointe indoor tennis; Scheels Ice Plex; Power and Grace Gymnastics; and Sanford Great Shots golf.
- Historic stone stairs and walkways at Terrace Park have created a challenge when balancing accessibility requirements with historic preservation.
- Falls Park has been very successful and as a result the facilities are no longer adequate. The pedestrian bridge and walkways are too narrow, parking is in short supply. The Saturday Farmers Market is extremely popular.
- An updated master plan for the Mary Jo Wegner Arboretum & East Sioux Falls Historic Site is nearing completion. The MJW Board would like to further develop formal gardens and increase the reach of their horticultural educational mission.
- Opportunities for additional experiences at Regional Parks may include:
  - Regional lake for boating, jet skiing, kayaking, sailing, fishing, canoeing
  - Regional Playground for all ages
  - Regional Picnic Shelters to host groups of 100-250 people in one setting (5-10 shelters)
  - Regional Beach with concessions and restrooms
  - Rowing Course as well as canoe and kayak course for sporting events
  - Restaurant and concession facilities
  - Regional Campground for RV, Tent, Tree Houses, Glamping and cabins
  - Sledding hill
  - Small outdoor ski center and outdoor cross-country site
  - Regional Bike Trail through the property
  - Combination of hard surface trails and soft surface trails
  - Regional Restaurant
  - Historic Sites facilities or historic park
  - Wedding Venue and hospitality center
  - 18 hole or 36-hole golf course with clubhouse and driving range
  - Vineyard site for education and entertainment
  - Farm park site for demonstrations, for animals, crops, gardens, and program events
  - Community Gardens
  - Multisport Field House Indoors for basketball, volleyball, soccer, field hockey
  - Multi-generational Community Center 100,000 square ft or more
  - Large water park with slides, moving water, flat water, zero depth entry, concessions, shade
  - Indoor Aquatic Center
  - Ice Rink Complex indoors 2 or 3 sheets of ice
  - Sports center for large scale indoor events, concerts
  - Multisport Outdoor Sports Complex for soccer, football, baseball, softball. 8,12,16,20 fields in one setting
  - Tennis Center with 20+ courts
  - Large Amphitheatre site that can seat 10-12,000 people
  - Special event space
  - Horsepark site and riding center
  - Fairground site
  - Polo Fields
  - Regional Nature Center
  - Quarry Park Site for Outdoor Adventure
- Shooting range
- Zoo Site
- Wildlife Animal Enclosure
- Marina site with slips and moorings
- Regional Dog Park site and off leash site
- Arboretum Site
- Large Driving Range
- Radio Control Site
- Regional Archery and Shooting Range
- Regional Skateboard Complex
- Mountain bike course
- BMX Course
- Fairgrounds
- Destination Playground
- Museum site for various type of historical and art experiences
- Art Sculpture site
- Go cart racing site
- Velodrome Site

**URBAN PLAZAS**

Urban plazas in Sioux Falls are exclusively located within the downtown area and are small in size.

**Size:** Varies from .12 acres (Phillips Avenue Plaza) to 7.86 acres (Fawick Park) with a median of .45 acres and an average of 1.92 acres.

**Existing Urban Plazas:**

- **Fawick park**
  - Amenities: Performance lawn, sculpture
- **Fort Sod**
  - Amenities: Sculpture
- **Phillips Avenue Plaza**
  - Amenities: Fountain, seating area
- **Pioneer Plaza**
  - Amenities: Fountain
- **VanEps Park**
  - Amenities: Small performance lawn, sculpture
Evaluation & Opportunities

- Fawick Park is situated on the west bank of the Big Sioux River and is set up as a performance space with lawn seating area. The Park could be utilized more frequently for performances. Potential connection and terminus of the Downtown River Greenway.

- Fort Sod has been underutilized in the past, but plans are in the works for conversion to a downtown dog park in 2020.

- Phillips Avenue Plaza is an urban renewal plaza located adjacent to the Phillips Avenue Diner on S. Phillips Avenue between 9th and 10th Streets.

- Pioneer Plaza is a narrow parcel located at the SE corner of N Phillips Avenue and E Eighth Street. Steep topography limits the use as a plaza but the space is intended to be a primary access point to the Downtown River Greenway.

- VanEps Park has recently been renovated with a small shelter and an event lawn space that has yet to be used to its fullest potential. Besides the immediately adjacent City Center, remaining adjacencies include busy Minnesota Avenue and Minnehaha County surface parking lots.
GREENWAYS

Existing Greenways

- Elmen Trailhead
- Farm Field Park
- Downtown River Greenway
- Lien Park
- River Boulevard
- Norlin Greenway
- North Greenway Extension

Evaluation & Opportunities

- Downtown River Greenway is planned to extend from Falls Park to Fawick Park on both the east and west sides of the Big Sioux River. Construction has been publicly funded but implementation has been a coordinated effort with private development such as Cherapa Place, Lumber Exchange, Hilton Garden Inn, and the pending Sioux Steel Redevelopment project.
Besides a greenway, Farm Field Park also includes canoe/kayak access to the Big Sioux River and is the location of a multi-use field. In conjunction with the Diamond Creek Trail underpass at 57th Street and the historic Yankton Trail Bridge, Farm Field Park provides safe access to the trail system for residents of southern Sioux Falls.

Elmen Trailhead is a respite along the western portion of the bike loop that follows the Big Sioux River levee system. Amenities include parking, restrooms, shelters, vending and access to drinking water.

**NATURE PRESERVES**

**Size:** Varies from 24 acres (Helen Pasley Nature Area) to 134.84 acres (Arrowhead Park) with a median of 41.84 acres and an average of 59.55 acres.

**Existing Nature Preserves:**

- Family Park
- Legacy Park
- Oxbow Greenway
- Perry Nature Area
- Helen Pasley Nature Area
- Arrowhead Park

![Arrowhead Park](image1.jpg)

![Legacy Park](image2.jpg)

![Family Park](image3.jpg)

![Oxbow Park](image4.jpg)
Evaluation & Opportunities

- Family Park was created from a former gravel quarry donated to the City of Sioux Falls for development as a nature park. Lakes are stocked with fish by the SD Game Fish & Parks Department. Family Park also includes both a fenced dog park and an off-leash dog park popular for training hunting dogs.

- Perry Nature Area is owned by Minnehaha County but operated by Sioux Falls Parks & Recreation. Property is contiguous with the Mary Jo Wegner Arboretum & East Sioux Falls Historic Site. Arrowhead Park is currently separated from Perry Nature Area by Highway 42 but is planned to be connected by a pedestrian underpass with a future highway reconstruction project.

4.2.3 ASSESSMENT BY AMENITY

AQUATICS

Existing aquatics facilities continue to age. Replacement pools have been constructed at Drake Springs and Spellerberg Park but an additional pool has not been constructed in Sioux Falls since 1994 when the population was 109,500; current population is over 180,000.

- Frank Olson Park
- Spellerberg Park
- Laurel Oak Park
- Terrace Park
- Kuehn Park
- McKennan Park
- Drake Springs (Nelson Park)
WINTER SPORTS & OUTDOOR ICE
Outdoor ice skating is currently provided at six locations throughout the park system.

- Memorial Park
- Campus Park
- Sherman Park
- McKennan Park
- Frank Olson Park
- Tuthill Park

Evaluation & Opportunities

- Post-tension concrete slab with hockey boards have been constructed at Memorial Park (2010) and Sherman Park (2011).
- Creating natural ice making by flooding ice rinks without refrigeration has been a challenge for over a decade with inconsistent weather conditions.
- Warming houses at Campus Park, Sherman Park, McKennan Park and Tuthill Park are outdated and need significant investment or replacement.
- Downtown Sioux Falls (DTSF) and private development groups have expressed demand for a downtown skating rink.
- Downhill skiing and tubing are popular winter activities at Great Bear. Snowmaking equipment extends the season, especially on the north-facing ski hill. Sledding is also popular at Spellerberg and Tuthill Parks.
PARK SHELTERS

Many park shelters are wood framed with asphalt shingles, 20’x20’ or 20’x40’ in dimension and have been constructed within the past 20 years. Additional upkeep can be expected as they continue to age.

Custom shelters constructed of more durable materials can be found at McKennan Park and Falls Park. A large pavilion at Sertoma Park is available for reservation and is a popular place to hold events. Constructed of laminated wood, it is beginning to show its age. A large open-air structure at Falls Park North is home to a Farmer’s Market on Saturdays in the summer but receives little use during the week.
SPORT COURTS | BASKETBALL
The current design standard for outdoor basketball courts is post-tensioned concrete. Both half and full courts can be found throughout the park system, dependent upon location and need. Most courts are new and in excellent condition due to a recent replacement initiative. Courts in poor condition are limited to Emerson Park, Terrace park, Menlo Park, Prairie Trail Park, Meldrum Park and Town One Park.
SPORT COURTS | TENNIS

Similar to basketball, the current design standard for outdoor tennis courts is post-tensioned concrete. Primary outdoor tennis complexes are McKennan Park (8), Laurel Oak Park (10), and Kuehn Park (8). McKennan and Laurel Oak are in very good condition, but Kuehn Park will require surface repairs in the near future. Tennis courts are also found at Frank Olson Park (3), Spellerberg Park (2), Tomar Park (2) and Lewis Park (2). Courts at Nusier Salem Park (2) and Menlo Park (2) don’t appear to receive much use and could be evaluated for repurposing. Older concrete on a single court at Mansor Pioneer Park is in good condition but the tennis surfacing is nearly gone; this may also be an opportunity for a new purpose.
SPORT COURTS | PICKLEBALL
Tennis courts at Riverdale Park have recently been converted to six pickleball courts. Additional lesser used tennis courts may be candidates for conversion to additional pickleball courts.

FLEX FIELDS
Yankton Trail Park is the premier soccer complex in Sioux Falls with 21 fields. Improvements are needed to restrooms and vehicular circulation and parking.
Sanford Sports Complex has 10 fields that are used for youth football but can also accommodate soccer during city-wide tournaments.
Tomar Park, Lion’s Centennial Park and Spencer Park are also sites with fields for recreational soccer or football. Memorial Park, Riverdale Park, Sherman Park and Kenny Anderson Park also have smaller amounts of flex field space.
All fields are natural turf, there are no synthetic turf outdoor flex fields in the Sioux Falls Park system.

BASEBALL/SOFTBALL
Baseball and softball fields are generally in excellent shape throughout the community. Renovations have recently been completed at Burnside Park, Cherry Rock Park and Terrace Park. Dunham Park is the exception and needs field upgrades. Harmodon Park is located on the far east side of town and is the premier baseball facility for upper age groups. The local youth baseball group has been leading a charge to upgrade baseball fields at Harmodon Park to improve drainage and add synthetic infield turf. Currently all baseball fields in Sioux Falls are natural turf.
SKATEPARKS
Skateparks at Kuehn Park and Nelson Park consist of unimaginative slabs of concrete with ramps and jumps placed on top. Future skatepark projects should consider sculpted terrain that is integrated into a cohesive design.

COMMUNITY CENTERS
Four community centers were constructed in partnership with the Sioux Falls School District at elementary schools: the most recent in 2003. The identity and purpose of Community Centers is unclear. Is the current method of operation the best use of limited resources and is there a better way these facilities could serve the public?

- Maricar
- Kuehn
- Kenny Anderson
- Morningside

4.2.4 SYSTEM SUMMARY
Facilities/amenities throughout the park system are generally in good to excellent condition and feature only minor maintenance problems. Generally, most maintenance issues with these facilities appear to be the result of age and/or heavy use.

Strengths:
- There is a very good park distribution and service coverage within the system
- Quality facilities are dispersed evenly throughout the community
- Parks are extremely well-maintained
- Excellent multi-use trail system
- The park system has several signature park spaces including:
  - Falls Park
  - McKennan Park
  - Terrace Park
  - Sherman Park
  - Veterans’ Memorial Park
  - Sertoma Park
  - Great Bear
  - Arrowhead Park/MJW Arboretum & Historic Site/Perry Nature Area
• Maintenance staff is dedicated and well-trained
• Cyclical maintenance programs are in place for play equipment and park roads
• Despite tight funding, partnerships with school systems has allowed continued development of neighborhood parks on new school sites

Weaknesses:
• The replacement cycle for play equipment is falling behind; currently the required service life of equipment is over 20 years
• It becomes increasingly difficult to keep up with maintenance and needed renovations as the community has grown and the park system has expanded

Threats:
• Emerald Ash Borer will result in a significant loss of tree canopy within the parks, and community as a whole, over the next decade.

Recommendations:
• Increase cyclical replacement projects for play equipment
• Continue to stay on top of maintenance items such as crack sealing, parking lot striping and roofing. Increase staff if required and use in-house labor wherever possible. Reserve the design/bid/build process for larger projects or those requiring specialization.
4.3 LEVEL OF SERVICE

4.3.1 OVERVIEW
Level of Service (LOS) standards are guidelines that define service areas based on population that support investment decisions related to parks, facilities, and amenities. LOS standards are updated over time as industry trends and community demographics change.

The consulting team evaluated park facility standards using a combination of resources. These resources included market trends, demographic data, community and stakeholder input, the statistically-valid community survey, and general observations. The existing level of service was based on analysis of the City of Sioux Falls inventory. This information allowed standards to be customized to Sioux Falls.

It is important to note that these LOS standards should be viewed as a guide. The standards are to be coupled with conventional wisdom and judgment related to the particular situation and needs of the community. By applying these standards to the population of Sioux Falls, gaps or surpluses in park and facility types are revealed.

4.3.2 PER CAPITA “GAPS”
According to the LOS, the City is performing well in meeting the Sioux Falls needs to properly serve the Sioux Falls community today and in the future. The existing level of service meets and exceeds best practices and recommended service levels for many items; however, there are several areas that do not meet recommended standards. Although Sioux Falls meets the standards for total park acres, there is a deficit for neighborhood parks (80 acres), as well total miles of trails. Also, there is a need for additional special use and greenway park types.

For outdoor amenities, Sioux Falls shows a shortage of large shelters (3), as well as playgrounds (1), dog parks (1), skate board park (1), and splashpads (3).

In regards to indoor recreation space, there is a shortage of 89,923 square feet. For aquatic facilities, SFPR exceeds standards.

The standards that follow are based upon population figures for 2018 and 2023, the latest estimates available at the time of analysis.

4.3.3 HALF MILE STRATEGY
Level of service was also completed using SFPR’s half-mile strategy to trails and parks combined. SFPR is doing an excellent job in access to parks and trails.
The Level of Service Standard helps to determine community unmet needs based on the Community Survey, NRPA National Standards, best practices in area communities of similar size and nature.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Inventory:</th>
<th>Sioux Falls</th>
<th>Total Inventory</th>
<th>Current Service Level based upon population</th>
<th>Recommended Service Levels</th>
<th>Meas Standard/Need Exists</th>
<th>Additional Facilities/Amendments Needed</th>
<th>Project</th>
<th>Total 2020-2024</th>
<th>Meas Standard/Need Exists</th>
<th>Additional Facilities/Amendments Needed</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>PAKES</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Urban Plaza</td>
<td>9.58</td>
<td>9.58</td>
<td>0.05 acres per 1,000</td>
<td>0.09 acres per 1,000</td>
<td>Meets Standard -</td>
<td>Acro(s)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Meets Standard -</td>
<td>Acro(s)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Neighborhood Parks</td>
<td>147.55</td>
<td>147.55</td>
<td>0.81 acres per 1,000</td>
<td>1.25 acres per 1,000</td>
<td>Need Exists</td>
<td>60 Acro(s)</td>
<td>Brandon NE Golden Gateway - 7 acres</td>
<td>7.00</td>
<td>Need Exists</td>
<td>94 Acro(s)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Community Parks</td>
<td>486.93</td>
<td>486.93</td>
<td>2.75 acres per 1,000</td>
<td>2.50 acres per 1,000</td>
<td>Meets Standard -</td>
<td>Acro(s)</td>
<td>Meets Standard - Acro(s)</td>
<td></td>
<td>Meets Standard -</td>
<td>Acro(s)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Regional Parks</td>
<td>1,246.92</td>
<td>1,246.92</td>
<td>6.86 acres per 1,000</td>
<td>6.50 acres per 1,000</td>
<td>Meets Standard -</td>
<td>Acro(s)</td>
<td>Falls Park Expansion - 7.74 acres</td>
<td>17.79</td>
<td>Need Exists</td>
<td>27 Acro(s)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Special Use</td>
<td>470.45</td>
<td>470.45</td>
<td>2.69 acres per 1,000</td>
<td>2.60 acres per 1,000</td>
<td>Need Exists</td>
<td>2 Acro(s)</td>
<td>Meets Standard - Acro(s)</td>
<td></td>
<td>Meets Standard -</td>
<td>Acro(s)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>School Parks</td>
<td>193.16</td>
<td>193.16</td>
<td>1.06 acres per 1,000</td>
<td>1.00 acres per 1,000</td>
<td>Meets Standard -</td>
<td>Acro(s)</td>
<td>Meets Standard - Acro(s)</td>
<td></td>
<td>Meets Standard -</td>
<td>Acro(s)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nature Preserve/Open Space</td>
<td>303.13</td>
<td>303.13</td>
<td>1.63 acres per 1,000</td>
<td>1.60 acres per 1,000</td>
<td>Meets Standard -</td>
<td>Acro(s)</td>
<td>Family Park Expansion - 142 acres</td>
<td>142.00</td>
<td>Meets Standard - Acro(s)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Greenways</td>
<td>71.13</td>
<td>71.13</td>
<td>0.39 acres per 1,000</td>
<td>0.40 acres per 1,000</td>
<td>Need Exists</td>
<td>2 Acro(s)</td>
<td>Cherry Creek Trail Corridor - 99.76 acres</td>
<td>120.99</td>
<td>Meets Standard - Acro(s)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Total Developed Park Acres**

2,970.85

16.35 acres per 1,000

16.09 acres per 1,000

Meets Standard - Acro(s)

287.74

Meets Standard - Acro(s)

**TRAILS:**

Paved Trails | 36.87 | 36.87 | 0.20 miles per 1,000                      | 0.25 miles per 1,000     | Need Exists                | 9 Miles(s)                               | Meets Standard - Miles(s) |                  | Need Exists       | 13 Miles(s)                              |

Hilly/Nature Trails | 23.37 | 23.37 | 0.13 miles per 1,000                      | 0.15 miles per 1,000     | Need Exists                | 4 Miles(s)                               | Meets Standard - Miles(s) |                  | Need Exists       | 8 Miles(s)                               |

Single Track | 5.59 | 5.59 | 0.03 miles per 1,000                      | 0.05 miles per 1,000     | Need Exists                | 3 Miles(s)                               | Meets Standard - Miles(s) |                  | Need Exists       | 4 Miles(s)                               |

**OUTDOOR AMENITIES:**

Small Shelters | 29.00 | 29.00 | 1.00 site per 1,000                      | 1.00 site per 10,000     | Meets Standard -           | Site(s)                                  | Meets Standard - Site(s) |                  | Meets Standard -           | Site(s)                                  |

Medium Shelters | 42.00 | 42.00 | 1.00 site per 1,000                      | 1.00 site per 15,000     | Meets Standard -           | Site(s)                                  | Meets Standard - Site(s) |                  | Meets Standard -           | Site(s)                                  |

Large Shelters | 2.00 | 2.00 | 1.00 site per 1,000                      | 90.87 acres per 1,000    | Meets Standard -           | 3 Site(s)                                | Meets Standard - Site(s) |                  | Meets Standard -           | Site(s)                                  |

Elliptical Fields | 44.00 | 44.00 | 1.00 field per 1,000                     | 1.00 field per 4,500     | Meets Standard -           | Field(s)                                 | Meets Standard - Field(s) |                  | Meets Standard -           | Field(s)                                  |

Softball Fields | 61.00 | 61.00 | 1.00 field per 1,000                     | 2.87 acres per 1,000     | Meets Standard -           | Field(s)                                 | Meets Standard - Field(s) |                  | Meets Standard -           | Field(s)                                  |

Multi-Use Field (Soccer/Lacrosse/Football/Rugby) | 74.00 | 74.00 | 1.00 site per 1,000                      | 1.00 site per 4,000     | Meets Standard -           | Field(s)                                 | Meets Standard - Field(s) |                  | Meets Standard -           | Field(s)                                  |

Outdoor Basketball Courts | 42.00 | 42.00 | 1.00 court per 1,000                     | 4.32 acres per 1,000     | Meets Standard -           | Court(s)                                 | Meets Standard - Court(s) |                  | Meets Standard -           | Court(s)                                  |

Tennis Courts | 40.00 | 40.00 | 1.00 court per 1,000                     | 4.54 acres per 1,000     | Meets Standard -           | Court(s)                                 | Meets Standard - Court(s) |                  | Meets Standard -           | Court(s)                                  |

Pickleball Courts | 6.00 | 6.00 | 1.00 court per 1,000                     | 30.29 acres per 1,000    | Meets Standard -           | 1 Court(s)                              | Meets Standard - Court(s) |                  | Meets Standard -           | Court(s)                                  |

Playgrounds (Youth & Tod) | 75.00 | 75.00 | 1.00 site per 1,000                      | 2.42 acres per 1,000     | Meets Standard -           | Site(s)                                  | Meets Standard - Site(s) |                  | Meets Standard -           | Site(s)                                  |

Dog Park | 4.00 | 4.00 | 1.00 site per 1,000                      | 4.53 acres per 1,000     | Meets Standard -           | Site(s)                                  | Meets Standard - Site(s) |                  | Meets Standard -           | Site(s)                                  |

Sand Volleyball | 18.00 | 18.00 | 1.00 site per 1,000                      | 10.08 acres per 1,000    | Meets Standard -           | Site(s)                                  | Meets Standard - Site(s) |                  | Meets Standard -           | Site(s)                                  |

Skate Board Park | 2.00 | 2.00 | 1.00 site per 1,000                      | 90.87 acres per 1,000    | Meets Standard -           | Site(s)                                  | Meets Standard - Site(s) |                  | Meets Standard -           | Site(s)                                  |

**RECREATION SPACE:**

Indoor Recreation Space | 182,686.00 | 182,686.00 | 1.01 SF per person | 1.00 SF per person | Need Exists | 88,823 Square Feet | - | Need Exists | 115,292 Square Feet | - |

**AQUATIC FACILITIES:**

Outdoor Water | 55,914.00 | 55,914.00 | 307.66 SF per 1,000 | 1,000 SF per 1,000 | Meets Standard - | Square Feet | - | Meets Standard - | Square Feet | - |

Indoor Water | 22,711.00 | 22,711.00 | 124.96 SF per 1,000 | 1,000 SF per 1,000 | Meets Standard - | Square Feet | - | Meets Standard - | Square Feet | - |

Training Water | 27,946.00 | 31,240.00 | 171.89 SF per 1,000 | 1,000 SF per 1,000 | Meets Standard - | Square Feet | - | Meets Standard - | Square Feet | - |

Recreational Water | 47,385.00 | 47,385.00 | 260.73 SF per 1,000 | 1,000 SF per 1,000 | Meets Standard - | Square Feet | - | Meets Standard - | Square Feet | - |

**Notes:**

School Parks inventory only includes school facilities that have partnerships between the City and School District to provide additional land and/or play equipment.

Aquatic Facilities are broken out by outdoor vs indoor in the total inventory and training vs recreational is the total inventory. These are just two different ways to look at the definition of a pool from USA Swimming and NRPA standpoints.
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Sioux Falls has historically used a half-mile strategy to parks and trails, which is depicted graphically in the map below. The City has excellent distribution for parks and trails combined.
4.4 EQUITY MAPPING

4.4.1 SERVICE AREA MAPS
Service area maps and standards assist SFPR in assessing where services are offered, how equitable the service distribution and delivery is across the Sioux Falls service area, and how effective the service is as it compares to the demographic densities. In addition, looking at guidelines with reference to population enables Sioux Falls to assess gaps in services, where facilities are needed, or where an area is over saturated. This allows the SFPR management to make appropriate capital improvement decisions based upon need for a system as a whole and the ramifications those decisions may have on a specific area.

The maps contain several circles, which represent the recommended per capita LOS found on the previous page. The circles’ size varies dependent upon the quantity of a given amenity (or acre type) located at one site and the surrounding population density. The bigger the circle, the more people a given amenity or park acre serves and vice versa. Additionally, some circles are shaded a different color which represents the “park classification” of that particular type. There is a legend in the bottom left-hand corner of each map depicting the various park type or amenity in the equity mapping process. The areas of overlapping circles represent adequate service, or duplicated service, and the areas with no shading represents the areas not served by a given amenity or park acre type. Service area maps were created for all parks and amenities, but for the purposes of the master plan, the following were deemed important in explaining the recommendations:

- All Parks
- All Parks Map with Service Area
- Neighborhood and School Service Area
- Neighborhood, Community, Regional, and Schools Service Area
- Paved Trails Service Area
- Indoor Recreation Space Service Area
- Outdoor Water Service Area
- Indoor Water Service Area
- Dog Park Service Area
- Skate Board Park Service Area
ALL PARKS MAP
The map below details the location of all parks managed by SFPR, as well as their park classification.
ALL PARKS MAP WITH SERVICE AREA

The map below details all park classifications with each service area. It shows that there is excellent coverage of parkland in the City while taking into account all park classifications.
NEIGHBORHOOD AND SCHOOL PARKS MAP

The map below details the service area coverage of neighborhood and school park classifications, as these two park classifications have similar user experiences and amenities. Neighborhood Parks was one of the most desired park/facility types based on community input.
NEIGHBORHOOD, SCHOOL, REGIONAL AND COMMUNITY PARK SERVICE AREA MAP

The map below details the service area equity of Neighborhood, Community, Regional and School Parks. It is recommended that with the community’s desire for neighborhood park amenities that SFPR consider adding similar amenities in other park classifications such as Community Parks and Regional Parks to meet demand.
PAVED TRAILS

The map below shows the coverage of paved trails in the City. The Main Bike Loop provides a continuous paved trail around the City, along with many trail spurs connecting to parks. Trail are highly desired by the community based on all feedback received during the master plan.
INDOOR RECREATION SPACE

The map below details the service area for indoor recreation space. The community desires additional year-round programming opportunities and the map show that there are gaps in coverage based on the level of service standards.
OUTDOOR WATER
The map below shows the service area for outdoor water. The six outdoor facilities, including McKennan wading pool, are distributed across the city and offers a well-balanced outdoor system.
INDOOR WATER
Currently, the only indoor pool operated by the City of Sioux Falls is the Midco® Aquatic Center. Due to the size and location of the facility, the service area covers the entire market.
**DOG PARK SERVICE AREA MAP**

The map below shows the location of the City's four dog parks. Based on the level of service standards, it is recommended that the City add one additional dog park.
The map below shows the location of the City’s two skate board parks. Based on the level of service standards, it is recommended that the City add one additional skate board park.
4.5 PROGRAM ASSESSMENT

As part of the Comprehensive Parks and Recreation System Plan process, a Recreation Program Assessment of the programs and services offered by Sioux Falls Parks and Recreation (SFPR) was completed. The assessment offers an in-depth perspective of program and service offerings and helps identify strengths, weaknesses, and opportunities regarding programming. The assessment also assists in identifying core programs, program gaps within the community, key system-wide issues, areas of improvement, and future programs and services for residents.

The findings and comments are based from a review of information provided by SFPR’s staff including program descriptions, financial data, partnership agreements, promotion methods, etc. This report addresses the program offerings from a systems perspective for the entire portfolio of programs, as well as individual program information.

4.5.1 PROGRAM ASSESSMENT OVERVIEW

SFPR offers a wide gamut of programs ranging from Aquatics to Cultural Arts to Health & Wellness. The following section is a brief overview of all program offerings provided by the SFPR and more detailed analysis can be found in the specific sections of each key performance indicator.

Below are some overall observations that stood out when analyzing the program assessment sheets:

Overall the program descriptions effectively communicate the key benefits and goals of each Core Program Area.

Age segment distribution is strong with approximately 76% of the City’s population falling between the ages of 18-75+ years old, it is fitting that the ‘Adult’ segments are highly catered to. Programming Youth (12 & under) is appropriate considering similar provider services. SFPR needs to ensure segments such as Teens (13-17) aren’t being underserved. The Age Segment distribution should be annually monitored to ensure program distribution aligns with community demographics and resources.

Program lifecycles: 46% of the current program offers are in the Decline and Saturation stages, which shows concern that underperforming programs are likely being sustained for too long. There are 37 out of 57 programs that are considered legacy. For the 20 programs that are not legacy programs, they should be retired and new programs identified in the recreation trends and community survey priority investment should be developed to keep a fresh supply of programming to meet resident’s needs. A complete description of Lifecycle Stages can be found in Section 4.5.5.

The City uses a streamlined volunteer program which allows residents and organizations to get involved easily to give back to the community which could be improved by identifying opportunities that are ongoing and specific seasonal tasks. Providing information on various volunteer opportunities, special events, and programs on the website in advance would assist in a more proactive approach. The website should also include online registration for volunteers that is an icon and easily visible to be easy and convenient. This best practice should be continued and augmented as needed to ensure a volunteer force that adequately fills the need of the City.

From a marketing and promotions standpoint, the staff utilizes a variety of marketing methods when promoting their programs including: online program guides, the City’s website, brochures and flyers, email blasts, PSA’s, paid advertisements, newsletters, special events, in-facility promotions/ signage, social media and digital marketing (introduced in 2019) as a part of the marketing mix.

- SFPR would benefit from identifying marketing Return on Investment (ROI) for all marketing initiatives
- Opportunity to increase the number of cross-promotions such as Live Well SF, The Library, Transit, and other public and nonprofit service providers. This will increase the reach and should be reciprocated to organizations that partner on this effort.

Currently, the collection of customer feedback is rather robust, as identified in section 4.5.10 of this report. Moving forward, it is highly recommended that the SFPR continues utilizing several platforms to obtain public input. Furthermore, lost customer and on-site surveys are additional tools that the Department may want to consider using in the future to track customer feedback.
Pricing strategies are rather limited. Currently, the only used approaches include: age and ability to pay. Some additional pricing tactics the Department should consider utilizing in the future include cost recovery rates, residency rates, competition (market) rates, and group discounts. In order to successfully implement cost recovery rates, it is essential to understand current cost of service in order to determine ideal cost recovery goals.

Financial performance measures such as cost recovery goals aren’t currently being utilized by the Department. Moving forward, it is recommended for staff to begin tracking cost recovery for all program areas. When doing so, the staff should factor in all direct and indirect costs pertaining to programming. A focus on developing consistent earned income opportunities would be beneficial to the SFPR’s overall quest for greater fiscal sustainability.

4.5.2 EXISTING CORE PROGRAM AREAS

Public recreation is challenged by the premise of being all things to all people. To help achieve the 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. The philosophy of the Core Program Area assists staff, policy makers, and the public focus on what is most important. Program areas are considered as Core if they meet a majority of the following categories:

- 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.
- SFPR controls a significant percentage (20% or more) of the local market.

In consultation with SFPR staff, the planning team identified the following Core Program Areas currently being offered:

1. Aquatics
2. Cultural Arts
3. Enrichment
4. Health & Wellness
5. Outdoor Recreation
6. Youth & Adult Sports

AQUATICS

The Aquatics Core Program Area provides a lifelong safety skill while also offering fitness opportunities such as strength and coordination. Additionally, Aquatics can provide confidence in the water and motivation to improve skill proficiencies. The goal is to provide a safe and enjoyable aquatic experience for all persons. Examples of Aquatic Programs include:

- Outdoor Swim Lessons
- Open Swim
- Aquatic Fitness Classes
- Flick & Float
- Water Walking
- Lap Swimming
CULTURAL ARTS
The Cultural Arts Core Program Area promotes a sense of social connectivity within the City. These programs are designed to be accessible to the novice event goer as well as entertaining for those who frequent cultural arts programs. The goal is to introduce the community to cultural programs in a way that is accessible to a wide population of the City. Examples of Cultural Arts Programs include:

• Storyland Children’s Theatre
• Theatre Camps
• Music Classes
• Book Walks
• Theatre in the Parks

ENRICHMENT
The Enrichment Core Program Area provides opportunities for lifelong hobbies and interests through numerous classes and special events. The goal is to continue to develop and enhance the hobbies and interests of community members. Examples of Enrichment Programs include:

• Frosty Frolics
• Science Education
• Youth Hobbies & Interests
• Senior Education
• Sensory Classes

HEALTH & WELLNESS
The Health & Wellness Core Program Area provides opportunities for lifelong health and wellbeing through indoors and outdoors fitness and wellness classes. The goal of this Core Program Area is to increase the physical and nutritional wellbeing of Sioux Falls’ residents. Examples of Health & Wellness Programs include:

• 5K Events Fun Run/Walks
• Fun & Fit
• Yoga in the Park
• Land Fitness
• Cooking and Nutrition
• Youth Cross Country Meets
• Outdoor Road Races
OUTDOOR RECREATION
The Outdoor Recreation Core Program Area provides numerous programs and activities that introduce or enhance the citizens understanding, appreciation, and general interest in nature pursuits. The goal of Outdoor Recreation is to develop an understanding, appreciation, and general interest in nature pursuits throughout the Sioux Falls Area. Examples of Outdoor Recreation Programs include:

- Fishing
- Recreational Hikes
- Ecology Camp
- Nature Arts
- Archery

YOUTH & ADULT SPORTS
The Youth & Adult Sports Core Program Area provides facilities for and assists with implementation of recreational activities for all ages. The goal of this Core Program Area is to provide a wide variety of recreational activities for youth and adults resulting in a lifelong active lifestyle. The community and tournament visitors appreciate the field availability and level of maintenance. Tournaments include local leagues, regional tournaments and national tournaments. Examples of Youth & Adult Sports include:

- Volleyball Tournaments
- Adult Basketball
- Youth Sports/Camps
- Adult Kickball
- Senior Games
- Youth Triathlon

4.5.3 DEMOGRAPHICS AND TRENDS

DEMOGRAPHICS
Based on population data from the Environmental Systems Research Institute (ESRI) and analysis of the data, the City’s population has recently experienced a significant growing trend, and is currently estimated at 181,739 individuals. Based on predictions through 2033, the City is expected to have 236,780 residents living within 94,528 households.

The population of the City is predominately White Alone. The 2018 estimates show that 81% of Sioux Falls’ population is classified as White Alone, while the Black Alone population (7%) represents the largest minority. Future projections show that by 2033 the overall composition of population will become slightly more diverse. Forecasts of the target area through 2033 project a decrease in the White Alone population (to 75%), coinciding with increases amongst all other race segments.

The per capita income ($31,172) and median household income ($56,857) for the City are both above the state averages and slightly below the national averages. The overall composition of the population is relatively young with half (49%) of the total population falling below 35-years old. Projecting ahead, the City’s population is expected to experience a minor aging trend. The 55+ age segment is projected to increase an additional 3% by 2033.
NATIONAL RECREATION TRENDS

Information released by Sports & Fitness Industry Association’s (SFIA) 2018 Study of Sports, Fitness, and Leisure Activities Topline Participation Report reveals that the most popular sport and recreational activities include:

- Fitness walking
- Treadmill
- Free weights
- Running/jogging
- Hiking
- Yoga
- Paddleboard

From a traditional team sport standpoint, basketball ranks highest among all sports, with approximately 23.4 million people reportedly participating in 2017. Golf and Tennis round out the top three. Sports that have experienced significant growth in participation over the past five years are:

- Rugby
- Boxing
- Lacrosse
- Roller hockey
- Field Hockey

According to the Physical Activity Council, an “inactive” is defined as an individual that doesn’t take part in any physical activity. Over the last 5-years the rate of inactivity has remained flat, but due to the population increase there were 2.0 million more inactive people in 2017 than in 2012.

EXPECTED LOCAL PARTICIPATION

The following chart shows the expected percentage of resident participants for the City in regards to recreational activities. These percentages are correlated to MPI scores and can serve as another tool for programmatic decision-making that allows SFPR to quantify the expected participants by activity.
RECOMMENDATIONS

The Core Program Areas listed in Section 4.5.2 provide a generally well-rounded and diverse array of programs, currently well-suited to address the programmatic needs of the existing population.

The City should be mindful of higher than average income levels when pricing programs and services, while considering lower income residents who fall outside the averages. This is most valuable for programs and services developed after the initial plan recommendations as direction for the staff. With the Department evolving to be more focused on revenue generation, understanding the market value, target market, and classification of the program or service will help price appropriately for revenue or for community good.

- Based on best practices and demographic and recreations trends information, the City staff should evaluate Core Program Areas and individual programs, ideally on an annual basis to ensure offerings are relevant to evolving demographics in an aging community.
- Develop new high priority investment programs identified by residents from the community survey within the Core Program Areas of Aquatics, Cultural Arts, Enrichment, Health & Wellness, and Outdoor Recreation. See the Core Program Areas with high and medium priorities in the Appendix.

4.5.4 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.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Core Program Area</th>
<th>Preschool</th>
<th>Elementary (Grades K-5)</th>
<th>Middle School (Grades 6-12)</th>
<th>High School (Grades 13+)</th>
<th>Young Adult (Ages 16-24)</th>
<th>Adults (Ages 25-44)</th>
<th>Middle-age Adults (Ages 45-64)</th>
<th>Senior Adults (Ages 65+)</th>
<th>Families</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Aquatics</td>
<td>P</td>
<td>P</td>
<td>P</td>
<td>S</td>
<td>S</td>
<td>S</td>
<td>P</td>
<td>P</td>
<td>P</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cultural Arts</td>
<td>P</td>
<td>P</td>
<td>S</td>
<td>S</td>
<td>P</td>
<td>P</td>
<td>P</td>
<td>P</td>
<td>P</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Enrichment</td>
<td>P</td>
<td>P</td>
<td>P</td>
<td>P</td>
<td>P</td>
<td>P</td>
<td>P</td>
<td>P</td>
<td>P</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Health &amp; Wellness</td>
<td>S</td>
<td>S</td>
<td>S</td>
<td>S</td>
<td>S</td>
<td>P</td>
<td>P</td>
<td>S</td>
<td>P</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Outdoor Recreation</td>
<td>P</td>
<td>P</td>
<td>S</td>
<td>S</td>
<td>P</td>
<td>P</td>
<td>P</td>
<td>P</td>
<td>S</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Youth &amp; Adult Sports</td>
<td>S</td>
<td>P</td>
<td>P</td>
<td>P</td>
<td>P</td>
<td>P</td>
<td>P</td>
<td>P</td>
<td>P</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

This type of analysis exhibits an over-arching view of the age segments served by different program areas, while 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. Based on the age demographics noted previously in this report, current programs seem to be fairly well-aligned with the community’s age profile. With approximately 76% of the City’s population falling between the ages of 18-75+ years old, it is fitting that the ‘Adult’ segments are highly catered. Furthermore, there are many similar providers for youth services within the City that help to provide opportunities for the various segments of youth. The staff are conscious of areas where services can be duplicated and areas where services are adequately provided by similar providers. There is no need to duplicate services in these areas and dilute the impact so instead, the City has several partnerships with these organizations to limit the duplication and increase resources.
However, there may be opportunities to create programming for specific age segments that would have specific messages and marketing to attract a specific age segment to participate. The City already has specific age segments targeted and could do the same with some special events. In addition, special events and fitness programs for youth such as kids adventure expo, conditioning for adventure, and life skills are opportunities where programming could be introduced to address the need of outdoor adventure identified as a top priority for investment identified from the 2019 Needs Assessment Survey results. It could also be useful for the staff to perform an age segment analysis of current participants by individual program, in order to gain a more detailed perspective of the data. This could open up opportunities for expanding program participation in the current age segment or expand the reach into other age segments and demographics.

It would be best practice to establish a plan including what age segment to target, establish the message, identify which marketing methods to use, create social media campaigns for new programming, and determine what to measure for success before allocating resources towards a particular effort. An example of this would be a youth fair. This would have youth focused activities, a specific message geared towards youth and their most involved parent to entice participation.

4.5.5 PROGRAM LIFECYCLE ANALYSIS

A Program Lifecycle Analysis involves reviewing each program offered by the SFPR to determine the stage of growth or decline for each. This provides a way of informing 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 program areas. The following table shows the percentage distribution of the various lifecycle categories of SFPR’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 Stage</th>
<th>Description</th>
<th>Actual Program Distribution</th>
<th>Recommended Distribution</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Introduction</td>
<td>New program; modest participation</td>
<td>4%</td>
<td>26% total</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Take-Off</td>
<td>Rapid participation growth</td>
<td>5%</td>
<td>50-60% total</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Growth</td>
<td>Moderate, but consistent participation growth</td>
<td>17%</td>
<td>40%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mature</td>
<td>Slow participation growth</td>
<td>28%</td>
<td>46% total</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Saturation</td>
<td>Minimal to no participation growth; extreme competition</td>
<td>37%</td>
<td>0-10% total</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Decline</td>
<td>Declining participation</td>
<td>9%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Only 26% of all programs fall within the beginning stages (Introduction, Take-Off, & Growth). This is well-below the recommended 50%-60%. Furthermore, approximately 46% of the current program offers are in the Decline and Saturation stages, which appears to be much higher than the recommended program distribution. This is attributed to the majority of programs (37/57) being Legacy Programs. If a program is in Saturation stage, it may not necessarily need to be retired — it could be that it is a legacy program that is beloved by the community or are capped due to lack of resources to expand. Eventually Legacy Programs are retired as trends change. The underperforming programs need to be retired and spin-off programs developed where appropriate. This will help to capture the current participation and retain these customers. When this occurs, it is absolutely necessary to conduct surveys of remaining participation to help develop services that will help retain these customers. When this is not possible, staff should develop a similar provider list with services that could be recommended to existing participants. This should include messaging of the Department’s caring brand for residents to continue their quality of life with another organization.
It is useful to look at attendance trends — do you have fewer participants over the last few offerings? If so, the community may be looking for a different type of program. While there are exceptions, most programs in the Saturation and Decline stages are ready to retire, including the Legacy Programs as identified above.

Staff should complete a Program Lifecycle Analysis on an annual basis and ensure that the percentage distribution closely aligns with desired performance. Furthermore, SFPR 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.

4.5.6 PROGRAM CLASSIFICATION

Conducting a classification of services informs how each program serves the overall organization mission, the goals, and objectives of each Core Program Area. Additionally, it also assists with how programs should be funded with regard to 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. A public benefit can be described as everyone receiving the same level of benefit with equal access, whereas a private benefit can be described as the user receiving exclusive benefit above what a general taxpayer receives for their personal benefit.

This plan proposes a classification method based on three indicators: Essential, Important, and Value-Added. 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, as well as access by participants. The infographic to the right describes each of the three program classifications.
Another way to describe these three classifications is to analyze the degree to which the program provides a community versus an individual benefit.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Program Classification Metrics</th>
<th>ESSENTIAL Programs</th>
<th>IMPORTANT Programs</th>
<th>VALUE-ADDED Programs</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Benefits (i.e., health, safety, protection of assets)</td>
<td>• Substantial public benefit (negative consequence if not provided)</td>
<td>• Public and individual benefit</td>
<td>• Primarily individual benefit</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Access</td>
<td>• Open access by all</td>
<td>• Open access</td>
<td>• Limited access to specific users</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Financial Sustainability</td>
<td>• Free, nominal or fee tailored to public needs</td>
<td>• Fees cover some direct costs</td>
<td>• Fees cover most direct and indirect costs</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Public interest; Legal Mandate; Mission Alignment</td>
<td>• Requires public funding</td>
<td>• Requires a balance of public funding and a cost recovery target</td>
<td>• Some public funding as appropriate</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Competition in the Market</td>
<td>• Limited or no alternative providers</td>
<td>• Alternative providers unable to meet demand or need</td>
<td>• Alternative providers readily available</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
With assistance from SFPR staff, a classification of programs and services was conducted for all of the recreation programs currently being offered. The results are presented in the chart below.

Approximately 22% of programs were deemed Essential by SFPR staff, with 28.8% considered to be Important, and the remaining 49.2% being Value-Added. This distribution breakdown is used to identify the current distribution and make recommendations that help the agency achieve a balance that helps achieve cost recovery goals.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>ESSENTIAL Programs</th>
<th>IMPORTANT Programs</th>
<th>VALUE-ADDED Programs</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>• Indoor Swim Lessons</td>
<td>• Certification &amp; Training Classes</td>
<td>• Flick &amp; Float</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Outdoor Swim Lessons</td>
<td>• Aquatic Fitness Classes</td>
<td>• Wibit Events</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Open Swim</td>
<td>• Lap Swim</td>
<td>• Reindeer Games</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Mondays at McKennan</td>
<td>• Water Walking</td>
<td>• Cardboard Boat Race</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Storyland Children’s Theatre</td>
<td>• Paws in the Park</td>
<td>• Youth Triathlon</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Theatre in the Parks</td>
<td>• Defrightful Family Fun</td>
<td>• Lazy 5K</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Municipal Band</td>
<td>• 5K Events</td>
<td>• Theatre Camps</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Kids Nite</td>
<td>• Fun &amp; Fit</td>
<td>• Music Classes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Touch a Truck</td>
<td>• Yoga in the Park</td>
<td>• Book Walks</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Independence Day Celebration</td>
<td>• Land Fitness</td>
<td>• Sensory Classes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Frosty Frolics</td>
<td>• Paddling Fair</td>
<td>• Senior Education</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Playground Program</td>
<td>• Fishing</td>
<td>• Adult Hobbies &amp; Interests</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Open Skate</td>
<td>• Toddler/Preschool Sports</td>
<td>• Youth Hobbies &amp; Interests</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Youth Sports/Camps</td>
<td>• Developmental Track Meets</td>
<td>• Cooking and Nutrition</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Road Races</td>
<td>• Senior Games</td>
<td>• Recreational Hikes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Senior Games</td>
<td></td>
<td>• Snowshoeing</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>• Archery</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>• Nature Arts</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>• Ecology Camp</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>• VB Tournaments</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>• Adult Basketball</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>• Adult Indoor Volleyball</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>• Adult Sand Volleyball</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>• Adult Kickball</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>• Drop - In Pickleball</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

22% 28.8% 49.2%

It is recommended that the Department continues operating with its current distribution, where Important and Value-added percentages are higher than essential programs. This will help the City with operational revenues while still ensuring the City’s lower income residents have ample opportunities to participate.
4.5.7 COST OF SERVICE & COST RECOVERY

Currently, SFPR does not have cost recovery goals. Moving forward, it is recommended that cost recovery targets be identified for each Core Program Area, at minimum, and for specific programs or events where possible. The previously identified Core Program Areas would serve as an effective breakdown for tracking cost recovery metrics, which would theoretically group programs with similar cost recovery and subsidy goals.

Determining cost recovery performance and using it to inform 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 City policy, for each program or program type based on the outcomes of the previous two steps, and adjust program prices accordingly.

The following provides more detail on steps 2 & 3.

UNDERSTANDING THE FULL COST OF SERVICE

To develop specific cost recovery targets, full cost of accounting needs to be created on each class or program that accurately calculates direct and indirect costs. Cost recovery goals are established once these numbers are in place, and 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 provides information that can be used to price programs based upon accurate delivery costs. The figure below illustrates the common types of costs that must be accounted for in a Cost of Service Analysis.
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 Analyses 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 provided by SFPR between one another. Cost recovery goals are established once Cost of Service totals have been calculated. Program staff should be trained on the process of conducting a Cost of Service Analysis, and the process should be undertaken on a regular basis.

**CURRENT COST RECOVERY**

With regard to SFPR programs, services, and events, methods to measure and track cost recovery have not been developed up to this point. It is best practice to have cost recovery goals at the core program area level, and over time, evolve into implementing cost recovery goals at the individual program level as well. The below table shows cost recovery best practices for those core program areas identified. Setting, tracking, and reaching cost recovery goals for every core program area will help the Department justify program expense and make a case for additional offerings in the future.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Core Program Area</th>
<th>Best Practice in Cost Recovery</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Aquatics</td>
<td>50-100%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cultural Arts</td>
<td>40-60%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Enrichment</td>
<td>50-75%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Health &amp; Wellness</td>
<td>50-100%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Outdoor Recreation</td>
<td>25-75%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Youth &amp; Adult Sports</td>
<td>50-100%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

As shown in the table above, cost recovery targets can vary based on the core program area, and even at the program level within a core program area. Several variables can influence the cost recovery target, including lifecycle stage, demographic served, and perhaps most important, program classification. These are best practices for core program areas. Programs within each core program area will vary in price and subsidy level. The program mix within each core program area will determine the cost recovery capabilities. The department should determine the current cost recovery of each core program area to begin establishing goals. With an approved cost recovery goal, annual tracking, and quality assurance cost recovery goals will improve. Use this key performance indicator in Figure 9 and update it annually to include the actual cost recovery achieved. Each core program area can be benchmarked against itself on an annual basis.
PRICING

The pricing of programs should be established based on the Cost of Service Analysis, overlaid onto program areas or specific events, and strategically adjusted according to market factors and/or policy goals.

Overall, the degree to which SFPR utilizes pricing strategies is somewhat limited. Current pricing tactics include age and ability to pay. The pricing strategies not currently used in the program portfolio are family/household status, residency, weekday/weekend rates, prime/non-prime time, group discounts, location, market rate, and cost recovery. These strategies are useful to help stabilize usage patterns and help with cost recovery for higher quality amenities and services.

Staff should continue to monitor the effectiveness of the various pricing strategies they employ and adjust as necessary within the policy frameworks that guide the overall pricing philosophies. A Recreation Programming Plan has been established to provide direction to staff during program development. It is important to continue monitoring and benchmarking against competitors and other service providers in the local market, on an annual basis and update pricing and pricing strategies. The table below details pricing methods currently in place by each core program area.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Types of Pricing Strategies</th>
<th>Description</th>
<th>Currently Used</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Age Segment</td>
<td>Different prices offered for different ages</td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Family/ Household Status</td>
<td>Different prices offered for family / household groups</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Residency</td>
<td>Different prices for resident vs non-resident</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Weekday/ Weekend</td>
<td>Different prices for different days of the week</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Prime/Non-Prime Time</td>
<td>Different prices for different times of the day</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Group Discounts</td>
<td>Different prices for groups</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>By Location</td>
<td>Different prices at different locations</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>By Competition (Market Rate)</td>
<td>Competitors’ prices influence your price</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>By Cost Recovery Goals</td>
<td>Dept. cost recovery goals influence your price</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>By Customer’s Ability to Pay</td>
<td>Scholarships, subsidies, discounted rates offered for low-income</td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
4.5.8 SPONSORS / PARTNERS AND VOLUNTEERS

SPONSORS / PARTNERS

Currently, SFPR has several partnerships with various organizations such as Sioux Falls School District, Sioux Falls YMCA, Fellowship of Christian Athletes, Sioux Falls Youth Hockey, South Dakota Senior Games, etc. These organizations have either verbal or written agreements with the City to assist with providing volunteers, sponsoring events, running programs, providing spaces for programs and events, etc.

In order to truly sell the potential benefits of partnering with the system, there is a need to develop a focused sponsorship campaign and a proposal for tiered sponsorship levels. However, there is no information on the website about becoming a sponsor of the Department. This information should be highlighted front and center on the website describing how to become a sponsor/partner and the benefits of becoming a partner.

Additionally, to help garner sponsorship dollars the Department provides detailed listing of each event, the participation numbers, and user demographics which help potential sponsors to identify how well the program/event participants align with the sponsor’s target market to assist in choosing the right fit for them.

These metrics can also help SFPR evaluate its return on investment (ROI) for sponsorships / partnerships for various events.
Other recommendations for Sponsorships include:

**Sponsor Recognition**
Recognizing all existing or past sponsors for their support would strengthen working relationships with sponsors. Create a sponsorship brochure that highlights programs and events that need sponsors. The City should consider adding a page in the brochure thanking all of their current partners.

**Tiered Sponsorship Levels**
It is essential to create tiered levels of sponsorship in order to allow all potential sponsors the ability to choose the level of support they wish to exhibit.

**Package Offerings**
Agencies who package sponsorship opportunities tend to have a higher likelihood of selling sponsorships. Packaging sponsorship opportunities for Events as well as Signature Parks and Facilities could be a viable option to provide additional sponsor value as well. Providing sample packaging options that tie in some signature special events with some of the smaller events would ensure that the staff up-sells events that may not be sold otherwise, while the partners receive more bang for their buck.

**VOLUNTEERS**

**VOLUNTEER PROGRAM**
The City currently receives help from thousands of volunteers, on an annual basis, offering assistance to clean up trails and parks to assisting with recreational programming. The City currently uses The Helpline Center’s Volunteer Connection Program https://www.helplinecenter.org/volunteer-connections/ for civic organizations, businesses and other groups and individuals to sign up for opportunities. This service provides a way for people to connect with what matters to them and to give back to the community.

A key part of maintaining the desirability of volunteerism in the City 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 SFPR functions.

Other best practices that the City should be aware of in managing volunteers include:

- Identify volunteer opportunities system-wide, develop job descriptions and acceptance conditions for volunteers (such as background checks).
- Develop documented volunteer recruitment, retention, and recognition systems.
- Involve volunteers in cross-training to expose them to various departmental functions and increase their skill. This can also increase their utility, allowing for more flexibility in making work assignments, and can increase their appreciation and understanding of the City.
- Add steps to formally document resignation or termination of volunteers. Also, include ways to monitor and track reasons for resignation/termination.
4.5.9 MARKETING PLATFORMS

MARKETING
This section reviews SFPR’s marketing and promotions as gleaned from the program worksheets. The number and types of mediums used are certainly varied through the system. Developing a true branding plan to create and propagate a message that resonates will be important to maximize the effectiveness of the marketing mediums listed below.

As stated in the program assessment worksheets provided by staff, most programs are promoted in the online program guides, the City’s website, brochures and flyers, email blasts, PSA’s, newsletters, in-facility promotions/signage, special events, and social media. There are also some instances of paid advertisements, such as digital marketing. Additional marketing methods that could be considered moving forward include direct mail, marquee signs, SMS marketing, and QR codes.

Given the limited marketing dollars available, it would be helpful for SFPR to undertake a marketing return on investment (ROI) assessment to evaluate the effectiveness of the marketing mediums undertaken and tailor future marketing spending to focus on the most effective mediums. This could be done by ensuring every registrant and as many on-site users as possible are asked ‘How did you hear about us?’. Currently, the City is asking this question in program surveys and recruitment process. Tying the participant responses to marketing mediums would allow for a better understanding of marketing spending and enable greater effectiveness of existing ones while eliminating non-effective mediums.

Continue to maximize cross-promoting at special events. It is imperative that the SFPR take advantage of the presence of high numbers of relative captive audience in the special event environment to promote its other offerings, programs, facilities, and rentals. Similar cross-promoting programs targeted towards the same age group audiences are highly encouraged. An example would be cross-promoting Family Movie Nights and Flick & Float events, and vice versa.
4.5.10 CUSTOMER SERVICE AND FEEDBACK

Customer service is at the root of the success of any organization. A true community-service organization prides itself on identifying its customers’ preferences and acting in accordance to help fulfill their needs. In order to do this, an ongoing and system-wide feedback mechanism is of vital importance and the Department’s willingness to undertake an extensive customer service training initiative for its staff is a big step in the right direction.

Regarding customer input, the Department currently utilizes several user feedback tools including: pre/post program evaluations, user surveys/comment cards, focus groups, statically-valid surveys, SFPR website, and online survey platforms. Moving forward, it is also recommended that SFPR begins incorporating lost customer surveys as part of their user feedback in order to help identify and address customer issues as well as enhancing the user experience.

COMMUNITY SURVEY RESULTS RELATED TO PROGRAMMING

A statistically-valid community survey was conducted with a random sample to obtain public input. These questions were developed based on information provided as part of the focus groups, key leadership interviews, staff focus groups and the public forums. The importance of this type of community engagement approach is that it captures users and non-users of the parks and recreation system. The following graphs represent the community's needs as it relates to programs and services.

PRIORITIES FOR RECREATION PROGRAM INVESTMENTS

The Priority Investment Rating (PIR) was developed by ETC Institute to provide organizations with an objective tool for evaluating the priority that should be placed on recreation and parks investments. The Priority Investment Rating (PIR) equally weights (1) the importance that residents place on recreation programs and (2) how many residents have unmet needs for the type of recreation program. The following eight programs were rated as “high priorities” for investment:

- Adult fitness and wellness programs (PIR=200)
- Outdoor adventure (camping, backpacking, etc.) (PIR=177)
- Nature programs (PIR=154)
- Canoeing and kayaking (PIR=137)
- Travel and tourism (day trips) (PIR=133)
- Youth Learn to Swim programs (PIR=130)
- Water fitness programs (PIR=122)
- Special events (PIR=107)

The Department should invest in the programs areas and integrate them into the current Core Program Areas. A detailed analysis of high priority programming and the potential opportunity to integrate into each Core Program Area can be found in the Appendix 2.1. The chart shows the Priority Investment Rating (PIR) for each of the 24 programs that were rated.
ORGANIZATIONS RESIDENTS USE FOR RECREATION

The organization used the most for indoor and outdoor recreation activities is the City of Sioux Falls Parks and Recreation. This is most likely due to the wide segment appeal of parks, facilities, and programs. The top four are rounded out by churches, the South Dakota State Recreation Areas and the School Districts.

PREFERRED WAYS TO LEARN ABOUT PROGRAMS AND SERVICES

Respondents were asked to identify their preferred method to learn of programs and services. The top three preferred methods are the City’s website, the Department’s program guide, and the Department’s Facebook page. This helps the department to know where to invest in marketing.
TAX DOLLARS VERSUS USER FEE SUPPORT FOR PROGRAMS

Respondents were informed that several programs offered by Sioux Falls Parks and Recreation require a fee to offset the full cost of providing the program. From a list of 12 programs and services, respondents were asked to indicate what they believe is the appropriate mix of support from taxes versus user fees. Most respondents indicated that the programs for special populations/disabled and programs for low income residents should be supported by taxes or an even mix of taxes and user fees. The chart below shows the distribution of responses.
BEST TIMES TO OFFER RECREATION PROGRAMS

Respondents were asked to identify the day and times interested in participating in programs. The top tier for preferred days and times are Weekday evenings (6pm-8pm) and Saturday mornings (8am-Noon). The second tier of preferred days and times are Sunday afternoons (3pm-5pm), Saturday afternoons (Noon-3pm), Saturday afternoons (3pm-5pm), and Sunday afternoons (Noon-3pm). These are followed closely by Saturday evening (5pm-8pm) and Weekday evenings (5pm-6pm).

The Department should overlay this information with the cross tabs by age segment to determine the best time to offer programs based on the target market. This information will increase the potential that the program will fit within the schedule of the target market increasing participation potential.
4.5.11 CONCLUSIONS

RECREATION PROGRAM ASSESSMENT

As SFPR and its offerings continue to grow, it will be crucial for staff to review the Recreational Program Assessment to ensure key metrics are being tracked and monitored on an annual basis. Below are some overall significant takeaways that were identified throughout the Program Assessment Analysis:

Recreation Program Plan should be updated and provide direction to staff from the Parks and Recreation System Plan. Include in this plan the program standards, key performance indicators and defined outcomes for success.

SFPR has identified the following as Core Program Areas:

- Aquatics
- Cultural Arts
- Enrichment
- Health & Wellness
- Outdoor Recreation
- Youth & Adult Sports

Core Program Areas will need to be added to better align with the community needs over the next five to six years. The Core Program Areas that should be added are:

- Active Adults (senior services)
- Outdoor Adventure
- Special Events
- Youth Sports (not covered by youth sport organizations)
- Adaptive Recreation (for people with disabilities)
- Family Programs

Age segment distribution is strong with approximately 76% of the City’s population falling between the ages of 18-75+ years old, it is fitting that the ‘Adult’ segments are highly catered to. Programming Youth (12 & under) is appropriate considering similar provider services. The SFPR needs to ensure segments such as Teens (13-17) are not being underserved. The Age Segment distribution should be annually monitored to ensure program distribution aligns with community demographics and resources.

Program lifecycles: 46% of the current program offers are in the Decline and Saturation stages, which shows concern that underperforming programs are likely being sustained for too long. There are 37 out of 57 programs that are considered legacy. For the 20 programs that are not legacy programs, they should be retired and new programs identified in the recreation trends and community survey priority investment should be developed to keep a fresh supply of programming to meet resident’s needs. A complete description of Lifecycle Stages can be found in Section 1.5.

The City uses a more streamlined volunteer program which allows residents and organizations to get involved easily to give back to the community which could be improved by identifying opportunities that are ongoing and specific seasonal tasks. Providing information on various volunteer opportunities, special events, and programs on the website in advance would assist in a more proactive approach. The website should also include online registration for volunteers that is an icon and easily visible to be easy and convenient. This best practice should be continued and augmented as needed to ensure a volunteer force that adequately fills the need of the City. From a marketing and promotions standpoint, the staff utilizes a variety of marketing methods when promoting
their programs including: online program guides, the City’s website, brochures and flyers, email blasts, PSA’s, paid advertisements, digital marketing, newsletters, special events, in-facility promotions/ signage, and social media as a part of the marketing mix.

- SFPR would benefit from identifying marketing Return on Investment (ROI) for all marketing initiatives
- Opportunity to increase the number of cross-promotions

- Currently, the collection of customer feedback is rather robust. Moving forward, it is highly recommended that the SFPR continues utilizing several platforms to obtain public input. Furthermore, lost customer and on-site surveys are additional tools that the Department may want to consider using in the future to track customer feedback

- Pricing strategies are rather limited. Currently, the only used approaches include: age and ability to pay. Some additional pricing tactics the Department should consider utilizing in the future include cost recovery rates, residency rates, competition (market) rates, and group discounts. In order to successfully implement cost recovery rates, it is essential to understand current cost of service in order to determine ideal cost recovery goals.

- Financial performance measures such as cost recovery goals aren’t currently being utilized by the Department. Moving forward, it is recommended for staff to begin tracking cost recovery for all program areas. When doing so, the staff should factor in all direct and indirect costs pertaining to programming. A focus on developing consistent earned income opportunities would be beneficial to the SFPR’s overall quest for greater fiscal sustainability.
4.6 AQUATICS MASTER PLAN

4.6.1 INTRODUCTION
The Updated Aquatics Master Plan is included in the Appendix as a supplemental document. The following recommends the current facilities, needs summary, and recommendations.

There are two standards to consider when reviewing the aquatic system. One is the National Recreation and Parks Associations (NRPA) recommendation for outdoor community recreation purposes and the other is the USA Swimming recommendation for year-round training lanes within a community. The NRPA standard recommends communities provide a four to six lane lap pool for every 25,000 people in a community. The USA Swimming standard recommends 20 short course training lanes per 100,000 people in a community. A well-rounded aquatic system will have a balance of recreation and training water as well as indoor and outdoor aquatic facilities. Both standards should be met to achieve this goal. These standards can be translated into square feet of water space needed per every 1,000 residents. The NRPA standard recommends 110 sq. ft. of outdoor recreation water for every 1,000 people. The USA Swimming standard recommends 110 sq. ft. of indoor training space for every 1,000 people.

With the current system, Sioux Falls operates 307 SF per 1,000 of outdoor water and 124 SF per 1,000 of indoor water. Both meeting the recommended standards. Similarly, the city operates 172 SF per 1,000 people of training water and 260 SF per 1,000 people of recreation water. Both of which also meet the standards. However, as the population grows, there will be a need for more indoor training water and indoor warm instructional water in the future. Additionally, the existing outdoor recreational pools are aging and will need major investments to be replaced or continue operating for the remaining life cycle.

4.6.2 BENCHMARK SUMMARY
Included in the Comprehensive Parks System Plan is a Benchmark Analysis for various operating metrics, including aquatic facility offerings, across five peer communities: Grand Prairie, TX, Boise, ID, Shawnee County, KS, Des Moines, IA, Saint Paul, MN. Currently, the City offers one outdoor aquatic center or pool for every 30,533 residents. This is the second highest among the peer group. In addition to number of locations, Sioux Falls also offers second highest square feet per person for aquatics at 0.31 square feet per person.

4.6.3 CURRENT FACILITIES REVIEW
The City of Sioux Falls currently operates eight aquatic facilities that include:

- **Midco® Aquatic Center**
  - Opened in 2016
  - 4 years old
  - Indoor 50-meter lap pool, indoor multi-purpose leisure pool, indoor warm water instructional pool, outdoor spray ground

- **Drake Springs Family Aquatic Center**
  - Re-built in 2009
  - 11 years old
  - Outdoor Family Aquatic Center

- **Laurel Oak Family Aquatic Center**
  - Opened in 1993
  - 27 years old
  - Outdoor Family Aquatic Center
- Terrace Park Family Aquatic Center
  - Opened in 1993
  - 27 years old
  - Outdoor Family Aquatic Center

- Kuehn Park Pool
  - Opened in 1981
  - 39 years old
  - Outdoor 25-yard lap pool

- Frank Olson Pool
  - Opened in 1972
  - 44 years old
  - Outdoor 50-meter pool with small wading pool

- McKennan Wading Pool
  - Opened in 1971
  - 49 years old
  - Outdoor stand-alone wading pool

- Pioneer Spray Park
  - Opened in 2009
  - 11 years old
  - Outdoor spray ground

The following chart shows the historical attendance levels for each aquatic facility:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Spellerberg</td>
<td>16,977</td>
<td>14,220</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Midco® Aquatic Center</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>44,164</td>
<td>219,055</td>
<td>209,218</td>
<td></td>
<td>*200,00+</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Drake Springs FAC</td>
<td>58,633</td>
<td>55,971</td>
<td>68,032</td>
<td>62,852</td>
<td>48,289</td>
<td>45,910</td>
<td>47,898</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Frank Olson Pool</td>
<td>23,807</td>
<td>19,021</td>
<td>21,727</td>
<td>23,319</td>
<td>13,278</td>
<td>14,827</td>
<td>16,627</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kuehn Pool</td>
<td>32,699</td>
<td>26,439</td>
<td>38,366</td>
<td>31,926</td>
<td>26,668</td>
<td>37,553</td>
<td>25,942</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Laurel Oak FAC</td>
<td>53,257</td>
<td>38,797</td>
<td>58,905</td>
<td>49,041</td>
<td>36,528</td>
<td>38,510</td>
<td>36,723</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>McKennan Wading Pool</td>
<td>20,067</td>
<td>18,259</td>
<td>21,529</td>
<td>25,196</td>
<td>18,001</td>
<td>19,509</td>
<td>14,223</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Terrace Park FAC</td>
<td>52,670</td>
<td>53,738</td>
<td>57,174</td>
<td>62,846</td>
<td>43,167</td>
<td>43,668</td>
<td>40,654</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Midco® Aquatic Center numbers have not been finalized at time of printing.
Aside from the Pioneer Spray Park and McKennan Wading Pool facilities, which are free, each facility uses the following pay structure.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Category</th>
<th>Daily Admission</th>
<th>Summer Pass</th>
<th>Fall/Winter/Spring</th>
<th>Annual Pass</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Under 2</td>
<td>Free</td>
<td>Free</td>
<td>Free</td>
<td>Free</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ages 2-17</td>
<td>$5</td>
<td>$30</td>
<td>$70</td>
<td>$80</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ages 18-54</td>
<td>$6</td>
<td>$70</td>
<td>$170</td>
<td>$190</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ages 55+</td>
<td>$5</td>
<td>$40</td>
<td>$95</td>
<td>$110</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Veteran</td>
<td>Standard Rates Apply</td>
<td>$40</td>
<td>$95</td>
<td>$110</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Family</td>
<td>Not Available</td>
<td>$100</td>
<td>$240</td>
<td>$300</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Reduced-Income Adult</td>
<td>$1 (fall/winter/spring only)</td>
<td>$40</td>
<td>$95</td>
<td>$110</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Reduced-Income Family</td>
<td>$1 (fall/winter/spring only)</td>
<td>$50</td>
<td>$120</td>
<td>$155</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Free Family/Adult/Senior Citizen Pass</td>
<td>Not Available</td>
<td>Free</td>
<td>Not Available</td>
<td>Not Available</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

4.6.4 NEEDS SUMMARY & RECOMMENDATIONS

Based on the information obtained from the stakeholder group discussions, community comments, site assessments, and demographic information, the following summarizes the aquatic needs for Sioux Falls.

**DRAKE SPRINGS FAMILY AQUATIC CENTER**

Drake Springs Family Aquatic Center was renovated in 2009 to become a modern family aquatic center and is currently the most popular outdoor pool. As the City’s newest outdoor aquatic center this facility has a significant amount of useful life remaining and should continue to operate as-is with basic maintenance.

**NEEDS**

- Capital replacement plan and budget for aging equipment
- Improved operations business plan to reduce on-going cost

**RECOMMENDATION**

The recommendation is to provide the needed maintenance to sustain the facility for the next 10-15 years.

**FRANK OLSON POOL**

Frank Olson Pool opened in 1972 and is the city’s only outdoor, 50-meter pool.

**NEEDS**

- More shallow water
- More recreational value

**RECOMMENDATION**

Frank Olson has reached the end of its useful life and should be replaced with a facility of similar size and offer more shallow recreational water for the local neighborhood. Estimated Cost: $10-12 Million
COMPREHENSIVE PARKS & RECREATION SYSTEM PLAN

LAUREL OAK FAMILY AQUATIC CENTER
Laurel Oak opened in 1993, at the start of the family aquatic center trend.

NEEDS
- More shade
- Expanded concessions
- Family changing areas
- Replacement for sand play area

RECOMMENDATION
Laurel Oak is a well-used facility and is starting to show signs of its age. The recommendation is to provide the needed capital repairs to sustain the facility for the next 10-15 years and invest additional funds to meet current industry trends. Estimated Cost: $3,000,000

MCKENNAN WADING POOL
McKennan Wading Pool opened in 1971 and is a local, neighborhood pool with shallow wading water.

NEEDS
- Improved mechanical systems
- Modern support spaces

RECOMMENDATION
McKennan has reached the end of its useful life and should be replaced with a facility of similar size. Estimated Cost: $2-3 Million.

KUEHN PARK POOL
Overview
Kuehn Park Pool opened in 1981. It is a traditional outdoor community pool, built before the family aquatic center trend.

NEEDS
- More shaded areas
- More distance from adjacent properties

RECOMMENDATION
Kuehn Park Pool has reached the end of its useful life and should be replaced with a facility of similar size. Estimated Cost: $7-10 Million.

TERRACE PARK FAMILY AQUATIC CENTER
Terrace Park Family Aquatic Center opened in 1993, at the start of the family aquatic center trend.

NEEDS
- More storage space for equipment
- The slides were resurfaced in 2019, but are reaching the end of their life and will need to be replaced

RECOMMENDATION
Terrace Park Family Aquatic Center is a well-used facility and is starting to show signs of its age. The recommendation is to provide the needed capital repairs to sustain the facility for the next 10-15 years and invest additional funds to meet current industry trends. Estimated Cost: $3,000,000
4.6.5 COST SUMMARY
The following table summarizes the capital cost estimates from each site listed above.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Facility</th>
<th>Estimated Cost</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Drake Springs Family Aquatic Center</td>
<td>N/A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Frank Olson</td>
<td>$10-12 Million</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Laurel Oak</td>
<td>$3 Million</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>McKennan Wading Pool</td>
<td>$2-3 Million</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Terrace Park Family Aquatic Center</td>
<td>$3 Million</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kuehn Park</td>
<td>$7-10 Million</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>$25-31 Million</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

4.6.6 IMPLEMENTATION PLAN
The following strategies outline the proposed plan to maintain the historic level of aquatic service within the City of Sioux Falls and to ultimately fulfill Goal 4 as outlined in the Comprehensive Parks System Plan.

GOAL
Implement a strategy for aquatics that manages costs and refreshes aging facilities with current uses combined with new trends in aquatic design.

REPLACE AGING POOLS
This strategy will include updated park site Master Plan to maximize the use of aging pools.

1. Replace Frank Olson Pool, Kuehn Pool, and McKennan Wading Pool with facilities of similar size in the existing parks with updated facilities that meet current ADA and industry standards.
   • Develop a new park Master Plan for each of these parks to maximize use of space already owned by department
   • Determine the cost and funding options to finance the development of the park and pool.
   • Develop a business plan for the pool and park to maximize the operational efficiency.
   • Develop an updated program plan for the pool to maximize its usage to all residents of the city.

RENOVATIONS AND REPAIRS TO MAINTAIN OUTDOOR AQUATIC SYSTEM
This strategy ensures that the current Family Aquatic Center’s meet the expectations of Sioux Falls residents.

2. Renovate and update the Terrace Park Family Aquatic Center and Laurel Oak Family Aquatic Center sites with a refreshed look with trending aquatic play features that has wide age segment appeal to extend their useful life.
   • Determine capital improvement needs for each of the other existing pools in order of magnitude as well as meeting aquatic safety requirements.
   • Follow the aquatic plan recommendations in the System Plan with a capital improvement funding plan.
   • Coordinate all improvements for each specific pool outlined in the aquatics plan with staff, user groups and special events.
DEVELOP A BUSINESS PLAN FOR FACILITIES TO ACHIEVE HIGHER COST RECOVERY

This strategy focuses on enhanced cost recovery at existing facilities.

3. Develop a business plan for all aquatic centers to achieve a cost recovery goal consistent with community values.
   - Hire an outside consultant to work with staff to develop a business plan for the Midco® Aquatic Center to maximize the use, value, earned income options to achieve at least a 70% cost recovery.
   - Find additional partners or programs to beef up the revenue in the facilities.
   - Develop a cost of service assessment for each program in the facility to determine if it is priced accurately based on level of exclusive use.
4.7 RECREATIONAL FACILITY ANALYSIS

This chapter analyzes the Community Centers and Ice Rinks as recreational facilities to better understand the utilization and drop-in programming approach.

4.7.1 COMMUNITY CENTERS

In the early 1970’s the City of Sioux Falls and the Sioux Falls School District began a partnership that exists currently. This partnership was to provide services to neighborhoods within the City and the youth that attend the School District. It began with Whittier Middle School and the Department’s shared use of the facility for parks and recreation activities. Due to the success of providing services and the challenges associated with a growing community, the discussions evolved to the City developing enlarged gyms to assist in providing parks and recreation programs and activities. This approach would begin with John Harris elementary and an enlarged gym.

Due to the success of the John Harris enlarged gym an opportunity presented itself to develop the first school/community center concept with Anne Sullivan Elementary School. This is where the Kenny Anderson Community Center was constructed. This partnership on facility development and providing services would help the City solve some challenges including:

- Growing league play and the need for additional gym space
- The emergence of the Golden Age (senior) programming
- The need to diversify and provide services throughout the City and to reach the wider population

Following the success of Kenny Anderson Community Center, more community centers were built (Oyate, Kuehn, and MariCar) during the renovations of Garfield, Oscar Howe, and Hayward Elementary Schools. Then in 2003 the fifth and final community center, Morningside, was constructed alongside Harvey Dunn Elementary School. This was under the same model of Kenny Anderson Community Center. It was during this time that concerns began to arise regarding the sustainability. The community center model, due to the operational and capital expense, began to have questions of practicality of being asked to check the viability of continuing with the model. It was determined to no longer be equitable to provide community centers across the city. As a result, no additional community centers have been constructed and currently there are no new centers proposed under the existing model. The Department has continued to partner with new schools to enlarge their gyms to accommodate three volleyball courts and two full sized basketball courts. The last enlarged gym was at Fred Assam Elementary. In addition, the Department discontinued use of John Harris in 2017.

This model has helped the City serve community very well closer to home over the years. Changes in community needs, changes in neighborhood demographics, changing recreational trends, changing City priorities, growing School District needs, and limited resources are impacting the use and effectiveness of these community centers in meeting the changing needs of Sioux Falls. The City has augmented its operations in the summer to open three of the community centers while two are closed. Also impacting the use and effectiveness of the community centers are closure times from early May through late May and mid-August through late September.

In addition, the drop-in model of recreation programming is no longer as effective as well-developed recreational experiences. Drop-in opportunities are sometimes seen as low value programming perceived by the price (free). The majority of citizens see value through prices and individual perception of quality. Nationally, citizens see and experience the value of parks and recreation, so they are more inclined to pay for these services. Quality programs and services that are current recreational trends that provide participants with unique experiences are being sought out more with younger adults and families as they provide participants with shareable experiences through their preferred social media platforms. Incorporating unique activities within programs and pointing out these opportunities to post and share will encourage participants to help build the brand of the Department. The key here is unique quality activities.
They will pay for services as long as the services are:

- Convenient by location and time
- A certain level of quality
- Of a particular interest
- Meets an existing need

**POSITIVE IMPACTS OF CURRENT COMMUNITY CENTERS MODEL**

It is important to identify what currently works well with the community center model that the City has developed. The following positive impacts were identified:

- Drop-in services help provide a location for youth to participate in a structured activity rather than unstructured and unsupervised.
- Provide a controlled and safe environment for programming
- Dedicated indoor space for department programming
- Distributed around the city in core neighborhoods at the time of development.
- These facilities enhance the quality of life for surrounding neighborhoods
- Gathering spaces for the community
- Enlarged gyms provide extended outreach for weekend open gym
- Shared expenses with SF School District is a cost-effective approach for residents
  - Custodians, HVAC, repairs, maintenance, improvements
- Opportunities available for court rentals (basketball and volleyball)
- Free, no participation costs
- Positive relationships with the School District
- Provide a great environment for staff development (Seasonal and Fulltime)

**CHALLENGES OF CURRENT COMMUNITY CENTERS MODEL**

The following challenges have been identified through planning team observations, document review, facility tours, and staff focus groups.

- There is a strong perception of a ‘free daycare’
- Lack of emergency contact information is gathered from patrons under the current program model
- Lack of operational technology - Currently no check-in system or tracking of who is in the community centers
- Resources required to operate community centers
  - The cost of year-round operations that include weekday hours in five locations and weekend and weekday hours in eight locations
  - Staff research, plan, and implement (seasonal and annual) recreational programs in inadequate spaces which is impacting participation
- Difficulty with recruiting, hiring, and retaining seasonal employees to augment fulltime staff in the community centers and enlarged gyms
- Hours of Operation
  - Operational dates during the school year are late September through early May
  - Operation dates during the summer are early June through early August,
    - 3 of the 5 Community Centers are open during this time.
    - 2 of the 5 Community Centers closed all summer unless a program is held
  - All community centers being ‘closed’ several weeks in May & August/September
  - Inconsistent weeknight open gym operations schedule.
• Weeknight open gym held after league operations is confusing for the public and staff, which leads to low attendance.
  o Lack of revenue to offset expenses has had a substantial impact on hours of operation decisions and staffing levels
• Community center amenities are antiquated
  o Updates have not occurred up to this point.
  o Facilities have not kept up with trends and spaces within the buildings are not adequate for emerging recreational trends
• Fee structure
  o No participant fees for open gym
  o Majority of meeting room rentals are considered ‘non-profit’ which is a free rental. This includes: scout meetings, birthday parties, bridal/baby showers, family gatherings, etc.
• Programming schedules based on Recreation Program Specialist’s area of programming responsibility.
  o Each Recreation Program Specialist focuses on one area of programming (Outdoor Recreation, Athletics, Health and Wellness) which leads to equity concerns.
• The School District promotes other after school opportunities from their website, but not the Department’s drop in program.
• Community center overall attendance has dropped 29 percent since 2016.
• Hours of operation have been reduced

CHALLENGES IMPACTING BOTH THE SCHOOL DISTRICT AND DEPARTMENT
The facility spaces and management approach also impact programming. The following challenges have been identified as impacting both partners:

• The School District and attached community centers offer Out of School Time (OST) programming at same locations. This creates confusion for the parents. And the public in general
• School District offers programming classes through Community Education in direct competition with the Sioux Falls Parks and Recreation Department
• Community center entrances are often confused for school entrances as most are shared
• Frustration from the public that the community centers begin operations several weeks after school starts and end operations several weeks before school ends. This may be influenced by the community centers being seen as a ‘free daycare’ more than anything else
• Community center operation dates are different from the attached elementary school operation dates
• Shared space can lead to programming limitations
  o School in session limits daytime gymnasium usage
  o Gymnasium space limitations for weekday open gym operations due to Kid’s Inc. having rights to half of the gym at each facility
  o School gym space needs create conflicts for league operations. School needs supersede Department use of the gym for an event. Leagues take longer for these reasons and it impacts participation
4.7.2 COMMUNITY CENTER PROGRAMMING ANALYSIS

SFPR has a variety of “Drop-In” programs which are offered at all of their community centers as well as at some enlarged school gymnasiums.

The locations where Drop-in programming is offered include:

**Community Centers**
- Kenny Anderson
- Kuehn
- MariCar
- Morningside
- Oyate

**Enlarged Gym**
- Fred Assam
- Laura Wilder
- Terry Redlin

**COMMUNITY CENTER DROP-IN**
The Community Center Drop-In Program Area offers a variety of programming options including weekday drop-in & open gym programs, weekend drop-in & open gym programs, computer lab use for the public, walking program, playgroup program, senior programming, and other classes and programs for free or limited fee recreation opportunities throughout the calendar year. Additionally, Community Center Drop-In programs provide a controlled and safe environment for the community, while also improving the quality of life for residents. Examples of Community Center Drop-In Programs include:

- Family Night Out
- Senior Cards
- Open Gym
- Walking Club
- Playgroup
- Family Movie Nights

**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.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Core Program Area</th>
<th>Preschool</th>
<th>Elementary (Grades K-3)</th>
<th>Middle School (Grades 4-8)</th>
<th>High School (Grades 9-12)</th>
<th>Young Adults (Ages 13-18)</th>
<th>Adults (Ages 19-44)</th>
<th>Middle-age Adults (Ages 45-64)</th>
<th>Senior Adults (Ages 65+)</th>
<th>Families</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Community Center Drop-In</td>
<td>P</td>
<td>P</td>
<td>P</td>
<td>P</td>
<td>P</td>
<td>P</td>
<td>P</td>
<td>P</td>
<td>P</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Table 1: Age Segment Analysis for Drop-In Programs*
This analysis of Community Center Drop-in programs shows the broad reach of the age segments served by this program area. As it pertains to the Drop-in programs, a check-in system where the Department could track who was taking advantage of the service could identify which age segments are actually being served most. Doing this would then help to better identify which of the age segments are truly primary and which are secondary. Additionally, this data could also help identify peak times and areas with the potential to save costs on operations.

**PROGRAM CLASSIFICATION**

With assistance from SFPRD staff, a classification of the Drop-in programs and events was conducted for all of the community centers. The results are presented in the chart below.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>ESSENTIAL Programs</th>
<th>IMPORTANT Programs</th>
<th>VALUE-ADDED Programs</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Kenny Anderson Weekday Open Gym</td>
<td>Playgroup</td>
<td>Family Movie Nights</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kenny Anderson Weeknight Open Gym</td>
<td>Family Night Out</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kenny Anderson Weekend Open Gym</td>
<td>Walking Club</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kenny Anderson Weekday Drop In</td>
<td>Computer Lab</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kenny Anderson Weeknight Drop In</td>
<td>Senior Cards</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kenny Anderson Weekend Drop In</td>
<td>Laura Wilder Enlarged Gym — League</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Morningside Weekday Open Gym</td>
<td>Laura Wilder Enlarged Gym - Open Gym</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Morningside Weeknight Open Gym</td>
<td>Fred Assam Enlarged Gym — League</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Morningside Weekend Open Gym</td>
<td>Fred Assam Enlarged Gym - Open Gym</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Morningside Weekday Drop In</td>
<td>Terry Redlin – League</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Morningside Weeknight Drop In</td>
<td>Terry Redlin - Open Gym</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Morningside Weekend Drop In</td>
<td>John Harris Enlarged Gym — Leagues</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Oyate Weekday Open Gym</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Oyate Weeknight Open Gym</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Oyate Weekend Open Gym</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Oyate Weekday Drop In</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Oyate Weeknight Drop In</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Oyate Weekend Drop In</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kuehn Weekday Open Gym</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kuehn Weeknight Open Gym</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kuehn Weekend Open Gym</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kuehn Weekday Drop In</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kuehn Weeknight Drop In</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kuehn Weekend Drop In</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MariCar Weekday Open Gym</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MariCar Weeknight Open Gym</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MariCar Weekend Open Gym</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MariCar Weekday Drop In</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MariCar Weeknight Drop In</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MariCar Weekend Drop In</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

| 70% | 28% | 2% |

Table 2: Community Center Drop-In Program Classification
Approximately 70% of programs were deemed Essential by SFPRD staff, with 28% considered to be Important, and the remaining 2% being Value-Added. This distribution breakdown is in line with the original philosophy on access, programming and fees. The essential programming means a greater level of community benefit and subsidy for these services. The important programming means less of a community benefit and greater level of fees and charges to support the programming. Value-added means greater level of individual benefit and greater level of fees and charges.

**DROP-IN PROGRAM ATTENDANCE ANALYSIS**

The Drop-in Program attendance is tracked by the Department for Walking Club, Playgroup, Weekdays, Weekends, and Weeknights. The Department has experienced decreasing attendance in all drop-in services from 2014 to 2018. In 2019 Open Gym on weekends increased to the highest levels during the six-year analysis period. The largest decreases in attendance are Playgroup (43%), Enlarged Gyms (29%) and Walking Club (19%). The smallest decrease is the Open Gym Weeknight (12%). Attendance rebounded across the drop-in programs, except Enlarged Gyms, during 2016 and 2017. The Department should discuss the cause of this effect on attendance to see if there are any Department initiatives or services that directly impacted the attendance during these years. Overall attendance has dropped 11% from 2014 to 2019.

**Total Drop-in Attendance**

Currently all Drop-In programs are decreasing in total attendance as seen in Figure 7. Drop-in programs can be one of the most challenging when attracting participants unless the service meets a need. Best practices are to create a database of programming/services of activities that can be interchanged as part of a curriculum. The staff have already found success in structured games during the drop-in program. Documenting these successes will help the Department respond better to dips in attendance.
COMMUNITY CENTER ROOM RENTALS

Community Center Room Rentals was provided by the Department and is only available from 2017 to 2019. The rentals have increased from 2017 to 2019 at Kuehn Community Center (56%) and Oyate Community Center (17%). Adversely, rentals have decreased at Kenny Anderson Community Center (-18%), MariCar Community Center (-45%) and Morningside Community Center (-32%). While the rentals have decreased, the attendance has increased in all Community Centers except MariCar. Overall rentals have decreased by 17 percent and overall attendance has increased by 45 percent.

To help identify best uses in rentals, the Department should track the type of rental by category and specifically market these spaces for the appropriate uses.

---

**Community Center Rentals & Attendance**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Room Rental</th>
<th>2017</th>
<th>2018</th>
<th>2019</th>
<th>% Change</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Kenny Anderson Community Center</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rentals</td>
<td>193</td>
<td>166</td>
<td>159</td>
<td>-18%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Attendance</td>
<td>5,721</td>
<td>10,161</td>
<td>6,139</td>
<td>7%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Kuehn Community Center</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rentals</td>
<td>93</td>
<td>89</td>
<td>145</td>
<td>56%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Attendance</td>
<td>3,602</td>
<td>4,106</td>
<td>4,527</td>
<td>26%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>MariCar Community Center</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rentals</td>
<td>210</td>
<td>156</td>
<td>116</td>
<td>-45%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Attendance</td>
<td>5,536</td>
<td>8,211</td>
<td>5,234</td>
<td>-5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Morningside Community Center</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rentals</td>
<td>424</td>
<td>363</td>
<td>289</td>
<td>-32%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Attendance</td>
<td>10,899</td>
<td>15,263</td>
<td>18,393</td>
<td>69%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Oyate Community Center</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rentals</td>
<td>167</td>
<td>174</td>
<td>196</td>
<td>17%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Attendance</td>
<td>3,927</td>
<td>7,432</td>
<td>8,746</td>
<td>123%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total Rentals:</strong></td>
<td>1,087</td>
<td>948</td>
<td>905</td>
<td>-17%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total Attendance:</strong></td>
<td>29,685</td>
<td>45,173</td>
<td>43,039</td>
<td>45%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Figure 25 - Community Center Rentals & Attendance
4.7.3 CONCLUSIONS
As the City continues to grow and spread out, it is important for the Department to analyze the effectiveness of services, service location and the operational philosophy of the Community Centers. This includes assessing the efficiency and effectiveness of programming facilitated by Sioux Falls Parks and Recreation at these locations. Key performance indicators from this analysis should be tracked and monitored on an annual basis. Below are some overall takeaways that were identified throughout the Community Centers Analysis:

- The Community Centers are serving all age segments with the Drop-in Programs, events and rentals. Tracking who is in the facility will help better understand which age segments are being served most and least. This will assist staff in defining target markets for future programming and services.
- Program Classifications: The majority of Community Centers programs are identified as essential. This is in line with the approach to fees and charges.
- Drop-in Program Attendance has been consistently decreasing except in Weekend Open Gym, where in 2019 an increase was observed. A check-in system would provide valuable data on specific day and times where Drop-in programs are most successful and allow for continuing these so there are still opportunities to Drop-in.
- Community Center Rentals are decreasing with the attendance increasing. The decrease in number and increase in attendance means that the cost to operate the centers is increasing and revenue to offset expenses is decreasing making the current fee structure unsustainable over time.
- Overall there is a need to conduct a full assessment of the current community center model. The decrease in attendance at programs and decrease in rentals have created an overall downward trend that impacts efficiency and effectiveness. The City should monitor this on an annual basis to determine if these centers meet community needs considering the current cost recovery levels. Based on the statistically-valid survey, the community desires additional indoor programming space, which may not be met based on the current model.
4.8 SIOUX FALLS ICE RINKS

In addition to the Community Centers, the planning team analyzed the outdoor ice rinks and their performance since the 2013-2014 outdoor ice rink season. The data collected and used for this was provided by the Department and consists of the process used to create the ice rinks, the attendance tracked, and the operational days of each season in the analysis.

Over the years, the Sioux Falls Parks and Recreation Department has developed outdoor ice rinks in six parks across the City. These outdoor ice rinks are created each year by flooding areas within the parks. Fulltime Staff are involved in the creation of these ice rinks during overnight hours and on days when the temperature is adequate (below freezing). The cold temperature is needed for the process to work best and create a skateable surface. To develop the ice, staff apply layers of water that freeze and then they repeat this process many times over. This is a time-consuming process and in recent years has been an even greater challenge with warmer winters. Part-time seasonal staff are hired for the skate rentals and concessions.

Sioux Falls has invested in creating two Hockey Rinks. The rinks have composite fiberglass dasher boards and concrete floors for year-round use along with outdoor lighting to extend play beyond sundown. The rinks are 200’ x 85’ which is regulation-sized for amateur play. In the warmer months, the rinks can be used for roller hockey and roller skating. These hockey rinks are also in addition to the recreational ice rinks created in these parks. Both sheets of ice are supported by one warming house at these two parks.

Currently, the six outdoor ice rinks that are frozen annually are in the following parks.

- Campus Park Ice Rink
- Frank Olson Park Ice Rink
- McKennan Park Ice Rink
- Memorial Park Ice Rink & Hockey Rink
- Sherman Park Ice Rink & Hockey Rink
- Tuthill Park Ice Rink

The seasonal hours of operation, typically begin after the new year. When cold enough, the rinks are open Monday through Friday, 4 to 8 p.m.; Saturday and Sunday, 1 to 8 p.m. Ice skates are available for rent at all rinks. People with their own skates are welcome to skate any time during normal park hours.

Each ice rink has a warming house, limited concessions, vending, and skate rental. Skate rentals: youth ages 17 and younger, $1; adults ages 18 to 54, $3; and seniors ages 55 and older, $2. Skate rentals are free during Frosty Frolics.
4.8.1 OUTDOOR ICE RINKS LOCATIONS
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4.8.2 ICE RINK ATTENDANCE
The Ice Rink days open and attendance are tracked during open hours of operation when skate rental is available. The days open for Ice Rinks fluctuated during the analysis period and is dependent upon weather, temperatures, and the condition of the ice. When looking at the days open from the 2013-2014 season and the 2018-2019 season the ice rinks were open less days (6%), yet the decrease in attendance was between 11% and 47%. The Department has experienced decreasing attendance at all Ice Rinks. The largest decreases in attendance are above 35 percent and include Memorial Park (47%), Campus Park (43%), Frank Olson Park (37%) and Sherman Park (35%). The least decrease in attendance is at Tuthill Park (39%) and McKennan Park (11%). Overall attendance has dropped 33 percent from 2013-2014 season to the 2018-2019 season.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Campus Park</td>
<td>1,502</td>
<td>826</td>
<td>281</td>
<td>870</td>
<td>1,070</td>
<td>849</td>
<td>-43%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Frank Olson Park</td>
<td>1,004</td>
<td>837</td>
<td>408</td>
<td>883</td>
<td>1,047</td>
<td>632</td>
<td>-37%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>McKennan Park</td>
<td>1,394</td>
<td>696</td>
<td>705</td>
<td>1,346</td>
<td>1,507</td>
<td>1,238</td>
<td>-11%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Memorial Park</td>
<td>3,781</td>
<td>1,595</td>
<td>1,743</td>
<td>3,473</td>
<td>4,520</td>
<td>2,010</td>
<td>-47%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sherman Park</td>
<td>1,966</td>
<td>530</td>
<td>712</td>
<td>1,279</td>
<td>1,629</td>
<td>1,269</td>
<td>-35%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tuthill Park</td>
<td>2,052</td>
<td>1,106</td>
<td>1,776</td>
<td>3,000</td>
<td>3,100</td>
<td>2,299</td>
<td>-13%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Figure 26 - Outdoor Ice Rink Days Open and Attendance

4.8.3 TOTAL OUTDOOR ICE RINK ATTENDANCE
The Total attendance dropped significantly in the 2014-2015 and 2015-2016 seasons. Attendance the rebounded across all Ice Rinks during 2016 and 2017. The Department should discuss the cause of this effect on attendance to see if there are any Department initiatives or services that directly impacted the attendance. If not, then most likely during these years weather was a positive impact. Typically, almost 50% of the Ice Rink attendance for each season occurs in the month of January. This is due to this month having the most favorable weather for maintaining the ice.
4.8.4 OUTDOOR ICE RINK COMMUNITY COMPARISON

Sioux Falls has a higher than average per capita outdoor ice compared to communities to the south but much lower than average per capita outdoor ice than communities to the north with strong hockey heritage.

Edina, Minnesota was the only community found to rely on outdoor unrefrigerated outdoor ice for hockey programming. The following case studies were researched for outdoor ice rinks:

- Outdoor refrigerated ice and event space — Des Moines, IA
- Temporary outdoor refrigerated ice — St. Paul, MN
- Permanent outdoor refrigerated rink — Cambridge, MN
- Semi-permanent outdoor refrigerated rink - Brandon, SD
- Outdoor covered refrigerated rink — St. Louis Park, MN
- Refrigerated recreational loop — Maple Grove, MN
- Naturally cooled outdoor ice — Edina, MN
- Synthetic ice - Omaha, NE

Figure 28: Communities within 100 Mile Radius and Regional

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>CITY</th>
<th>POPULATION</th>
<th>OUTDOOR TOTAL</th>
<th>OUTDOOR REFRIGERATED TOTAL</th>
<th>OUTDOOR PER CAPITA</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>EDINA, MN</td>
<td>51,350</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>4,279</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>WINONA, MN</td>
<td>27,139</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>5,427</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FARGO/MOORHEAD</td>
<td>238,124</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>8,819</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BISMARK, ND</td>
<td>72,417</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>12,069</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ROCHESTER, MN</td>
<td>114,011</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>2**</td>
<td>12,667</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MINNEAPOLIS, MN</td>
<td>413,651</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>17,235</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SIOUX FALLS, SD</td>
<td>174,360</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>29,060</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>OMAHA, NE</td>
<td>251,854</td>
<td>4*</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>62,963</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>RAPID CITY, SD</td>
<td>74,048</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>74,048</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DES MOINES, IA</td>
<td>215,472</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>215,472</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

* One of the four outdoor ice rinks is synthetic ice
** Project in planning phase, waiting on funding to implement

Figure 29: Community Ice Rink Comparison Per Capita
4.8.5 POTENTIAL SOLUTIONS TO QUALITY ICE

- Outdoor refrigerated rinks can extend the ice season from late November to early March and maintain ice quality during warm spells. Cost varies with type of system used but savings are realized when a chiller is shared with an indoor ice rink or a second outdoor rink.
- Portable cooling equipment is extremely expensive and maintenance intensive. Portable cooling mats have a short 5-year useful life span.
- Shade structures reduce daytime melting from sun glare and eliminate the need to remove snow from the ice.
- Synthetic (plastic) ice is an option to consider but must be shaded, or removed, in the summer.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Permanent Outdoor Refrigerated Hockey</th>
<th>Permanent Outdoor Recreational Ice (10,000 SF)</th>
<th>Permanent Outdoor Recreational Ice Loop (12,000 SF)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>$750,000 - $1,500,000</td>
<td>$1,000,000 - $1,250,000</td>
<td>$1,500,000 - $2,000,000</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Integrate Refrigerated Mats and Chiller into Existing Rink</th>
<th>Synthetic Ice</th>
<th>Rink Cover (30,000 SF)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>±$750,000 / 5 YEARS</td>
<td>$180,000 - $240,000</td>
<td>$750,000 - $1,250,000</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
4.8.6 CONCLUSIONS

As the neighborhoods around the parks with ice rinks evolve and demographics change, so will the interests of these residents. The Department should analyze the effectiveness of services, service location and the operational philosophy of the ice rinks. This includes assessing the efficiency and effectiveness of at each of the ice rink locations. Key performance indicators from this analysis should continue to be tracked and monitored on an annual basis. Below are some conclusions from the analysis:

- Providing a consistent sheet of ice that can be relied upon by citizens with programming will increase usage by at least seventy-five percent. More operational days and quality ice in key locations is more consistent with the existing facilities and services the Department currently provides for other recreational interest of the residents.
- Interstate 90 appears to be the southern limit of where outdoor ice can successfully be maintained for a full 8-week outdoor ice season. Except for Edina, Minnesota, all communities interviewed report challenges constructing and maintaining consistent outdoor ice and rely on indoor facilities for athletic programming.
- Regionally, outdoor ice is generally reserved for recreational use. Investments in unrefrigerated outdoor ice are being scaled back. For example, Fargo and Winona continue to make outdoor ice but have cut back or eliminated warming house availability.
- Trends seen in Maple Grove, Des Moines, Chicago, Omaha and Rapid City show outdoor recreational ice consolidated between a few high-quality refrigerated rinks. Fargo is considering an outdoor refrigerated recreation rink in their downtown area.
- Except for Brandon, communities within a 30-mile radius of Sioux Falls rely on Sioux Falls for indoor and outdoor ice facilities.
- Consider developing a new approach to providing ice rinks with additional winter recreation enhancement, regionally, for citizens to enjoy more consistently during the winter season.
4.9 MARKETING ANALYSIS

A Marketing Analysis was completed as part of the plan and the full report can be found in the Appendix. The following outlines the key findings and recommendations.

4.9.1 INTRODUCTION

The Planning Team worked with staff to understand operations and responsibilities, policies, practices, outcomes and to review existing documents and reports that guide the marketing and communications. The process analyzed the current conditions and the following areas of marketing and communications.

- Marketing and Communications Assessment
  - Brand Assessment
  - Website Assessment
  - Program Brochure and Other Marketing Collateral
  - Social Media

4.9.2 CURRENT RESPONSIBILITIES

There are many best practices in place that help the Department reach residents with services and events. These best practices contribute to the efficiency and effectiveness of communications. However, there are instances where current responsibilities exceed capacity throughout the year and some marketing efforts do not reach the intended targets without ample time to expand the reach.

Current best practices for marketing are online program guides, the City’s website, brochures and flyers, email blasts, PSA’s, paid advertisements, newsletters, special events, in-facility promotions/ signage, social media and digital marketing (introduced in 2019) as a part of the marketing mix.

The approach to cost recovery does not necessitate that all efforts reach the intended targets and convert into participation. To achieve greater cost recovery and sustainability, ensuring the resources for increased capacity in marketing and communication is an important first step. Parks and Recreation departments are the only one within a municipality where people choose to spend their disposable income. It is important that cost recovery minded departments work towards the three percent (3%) best practices for marketing and communication investment. This includes personnel, supplies and contracted services.

MARKETING AND COMMUNICATIONS

The Department Marketing, special events and outreach staff are part of the City’s communication team and also coordinate the Special Event Committee for outside requests to utilize City property for larger community events. The City oversees communications and have developed a process for brand and quality assurance before communication is sent out. This process is a best practice in marketing to ensure a brand voice is consistent and achieves outcomes.

The Department makes great use of free to low cost marketing methods. Staff create program content calendars, special events master calendar, develop website and social media content, e-Newsletter, and sprout social, which is a city-wide social media scheduling software. Additional responsibilities include:

- Social media
- Press release content writing
- Copy editing
- Data analysis
- Email marketing
- Graphic design
- Event/Initiative campaign management
- Web content management
- City wide (non-city sponsored) event logistics
- Press conferences
• Ground breaking
• Ribbon cuttings
• Public Meetings
• Associated administrative tasks
• Permit management
• Staff recruitment
• Community outreach
• Community engagement and response (See Click Fix, CRMs, Social Media) etc.

SPECIAL EVENTS
Staff serve as liaison between the organization and the City. The magnitude of communication is intentionally increased to manage expectations and outcomes. The City team is comprised of representatives from departments including, but not limited to; Health, Police, Parks and Recreation, Fire and Rescue, Environmental, and Public Works. Having SFPR staff serve on the special event committee helps the City ensure a thorough approach to the overall special event process and minimize inconveniences. The number of public events can reach up to 100 annually depending upon events, achievements, projects, and outreach initiatives scheduled.

The first priority is to ensure the success of an event held on city property. This includes City requirements such as the application process, logistics and permitting for compliance. The software used to manage reservations is RecTrac for collecting fees along with application fees, and Energov is used for issuing the permits and fees.

The City has a strong operations team where ideas and discussions lead to a high level of implementation. The City teamwork on special events helps provide a necessary service to the citizens and organizers ensuring the standard is met for the community. That standard includes a clean and safe approach to a large range of events lead by consistent and clear messaging from the beginning to after the event feedback. Staff remain responsive and engaged throughout the process to ensure the most enjoyable and convenient experience for all.

4.9.3 MARKETING ANALYSIS CONCLUSIONS
SFPR is very intentional with marketing and communications. This culture of continuous enhancement to increase reach and awareness will be achieved as key metrics are being tracked and monitored on a monthly basis. Below are some key takeaways that were identified throughout the Marketing Analysis:

• Current Responsibilities are being met with periodic gaps due to workload. Staff have responsibilities and roles defined for efficiency and effectiveness. Capacity will need to be increased if the philosophical approach to cost recovery increases focus on revenue generation in order to maximize brand recognition and demonstrate value of experiences.

• Market Potential is driven by consumer spending patterns overlaid with the community needs from the statistically-valid survey (Primary Target Market). Department position within the primary Target Market is strong with high satisfactory levels for operations and facilities. Using collateral from the data collected will help the Department reinforce the brand, tell the Department’s story, introducing new services to meet needs, and reinforce the benefits of being a customer.

• Target Markets for the Department are in two categories; Primary and Secondary. The Primary Target Market is the residents of Sioux Falls, SD. These are the segments that have the greater use of services and largely fund operations and maintenance of the system. The Secondary Target Market is the visitors to Sioux Falls, SD (approximately one-hour radius). This includes audiences with specific interests that are much more difficult to reach without partnerships. Secondary Target Market services are typically driven by outside organizations in partnership with the City for overall enjoyment.

• The Brand Assessment shows the City and Department do an outstanding job in brand management and quality assurance through communication efforts. The use of hashtags, taglines and headlines are effective in application and help the Primary Target Market instantly recognize the brand, determine the purpose of messaging, and its relevance to their
interests. Continued use of local participation photos with intent capture the value and make human connections strengthening the brand.

- The Website Assessment uncovered a better approach to a government website for ease of use in navigation and locating information. There are website layout enhancements that should be explored for increased participation. Having the layout familiar to consumers of e-commerce will enhance ease of use. Having a mechanism in place to establish a conversion rate, track it over time, and benchmark against past performance would enhance the marketing efficiency and effectiveness to a greater level. Social media, specifically Facebook is a significant preferred method of learning about services and should have social media profiles and ways to connect on the website.

- The Fun Guide is online publishing only at this time. Fliers for core program areas are being printed and distributed. The Department should closely monitor this approach for participation levels and make adjustments as needed. The Department’s print materials are visually appealing and they go through a thorough copyedit process to ensure consistent brand identity and quality content. Content is appropriate and digestible with direction to acquire additional information. Titles are creative and descriptive where readers can identify the activity. Introductory sentences are inconsistent. They either creatively identify the benefits or they are basic and some go right into the logistics for the activity. Content development should include the features, advantages, and benefits (FAB) of facilities, parks, programs, projects and events within the first sentence to entice participation. Logistical details are better for the second or third sentence or towards the end of the description.

- The Department Website and Fun Guide: These two methods were identified by household survey responses as the number one and number two ways the residents would like to hear of programs and services. It is important that these two methods complement each other especially since the Fun Guide is no longer printed. When a new seasonal Fun Guide is released it should have a prominent location and attractive to the eye for easy download and review. Fewer clicks to this important marketing tool will be better to participation as is the case for the online registration icon. In addition, having the Fun Guide link to RecTrak registration pages for specific programs will enhance the experience and ease of use.

- Currently, SFPR has social media presence on Facebook and Twitter and limited presence on YouTube. The Department’s approach to content is informative, brand reinforcing, promotes a call to action and makes human connections.
  - The City is well versed in the analytics of their social media presence and have built capacity through the use of technology that the Department is obtaining as well. Analysis of current summary reports shows that the Department has great success in building capacity with a 16% to 22.7% increase in impressions during the analysis period. Currently the Department has over 5,400 Twitter Followers and over 11,500 Facebook Followers. To continue this growth the Department should run more campaigns and contests. Continued analysis of social media is important to ensure the Department is allocating resources efficiently and for the greatest effectiveness.
  - Instagram Account should be established for brand assurance purposes and sharing engaging content. Through searches, it was identified that there is a Sioux Falls Instagram Account that people are posting to. The site has many photos from the people using the Sioux Falls Parks and Facilities. The Department should reach out to the platform and claim the page to begin controlling the content in the Department’s name.
  - The Department could engage followers and increase followership on social media through more brand reinforcing content and images. Behind the scenes brand reinforcement demonstrating the Department’s culture will enhance the brand. Engage the community with thought provoking questions and responses that use data collateral created from the Comprehensive System Plan process.
4.10 PRIORITY RANKINGS

The purpose of the Facility/Amenity and Program Priority Rankings is to provide a prioritized list of facility/amenity and program needs for the community served by SFPR. Quantitative data was used from the statistically-valid community survey, which asked residents to list unmet needs and rank their importance. A weighted scoring system is used to determine the priorities for SFPR facilities/amenities and programs:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Data Source</th>
<th>Component</th>
<th>Weighting</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Quantitative Data</td>
<td>Unmet Needs Reported by the Community Survey</td>
<td>50%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>— This is used as a factor from the total number of households stating whether they have a need for a facility/amenity and the extent to which their need for facilities/amenities has been met. Survey participants were asked to identify this for 30 different facilities/amenities and 23 program areas.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Importance Rankings Reported by the Community Survey</td>
<td>50%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>— This is used as a factor from the importance allocated to a facility/amenity by the community. Each respondent was asked to identify the top four most important 30 facilities/amenities and 23 program areas.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

From this analysis, the Citywide priorities were compared to the following areas of the City:

- Southeast
- Central
- Northeast
- Northwest
- Southwest
4.10.1 FACILITY PRIORITY RANKINGS

Based on the Priority Investment Rating (PIR), the following 10 parks and facilities were rated as high priorities for investment:

- Walking/hiking trails
- Small neighborhood parks
- Natural areas and wildlife habitats
- Paved bike trails
- Outdoor swimming pools/water parks
- Indoor swimming pools/leisure pool
- Off-leash dog parks
- Large community parks
- Indoor playground
- Indoor fitness and exercise facilities

The following “heat map” depicts facility/amenity priority overall for the 30 facility/amenities, as well as by each geographic area of the City.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Facility/Amenity</th>
<th>City Wide</th>
<th>Southeast</th>
<th>Central</th>
<th>Northeast</th>
<th>Northwest</th>
<th>Southwest</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Walking/hiking trails</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Small neighborhood parks</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Natural areas &amp; wildlife habitats</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Paved bike trails</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Outdoor swimming pools/water parks</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Indoor swimming pools/leisure pool</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Off-leash dog parks</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Large community parks</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Indoor playground</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Indoor fitness &amp; exercise facilities</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>13</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Indoor running/walking track</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Boating &amp; fishing areas</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Picnic areas &amp; shelters</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Community gardens</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>14</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Playground equipment</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mountain biking/single track</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>16</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Outdoor ice-skating rinks</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>18</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Outdoor basketball courts</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>21</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Youth baseball &amp; softball fields</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>24</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Skate parks</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>27</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Golf courses</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>25</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Indoor sports fields (football, soccer, etc.)</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>17</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Regional multigenerational community center</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>26</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Indoor basketball/volleyball courts</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>19</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Outdoor tennis courts</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pickleball courts</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>29</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>23</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Youth soccer fields</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>22</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Youth football fields</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>29</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>29</td>
<td>28</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Adult softball fields</td>
<td>29</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>30</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Adult soccer fields</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>29</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>29</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
4.10.2 PROGRAM PRIORITY RANKINGS

Based on the priority investment rating (PIR), the following eight programs were rated as “high priorities” for investment:

- Adult fitness and wellness programs
- Outdoor adventure (camping, backpacking, etc.)
- Nature programs
- Canoeing and kayaking
- Travel and tourism (day trips)
- Youth Learn to Swim programs
- Water fitness programs
- Special events

The following “heat map” depicts program priority overall for the 23 programs, as well as by each geographic area of the City.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Program</th>
<th>City Wide</th>
<th>Southeast</th>
<th>Central</th>
<th>Northeast</th>
<th>Northwest</th>
<th>Southwest</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Adult fitness &amp; wellness programs</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Outdoor adventure (camping, backpacking, etc.)</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nature programs</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Canoeing &amp; kayaking</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Travel &amp; tourism (day trips)</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Youth Learn to Swim programs</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Water fitness programs</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Special events</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Senior programs</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Youth &amp; adult arts &amp; crafts programs</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>14</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fishing programs</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Youth summer camp programs</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Before &amp; after school programs</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>13</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Youth sports programs</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pre-school programs</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Youth fitness &amp; wellness programs</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>16</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Youth &amp; adult drama/performing arts programs</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Golf programs</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>17</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tennis lessons &amp; leagues</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>18</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Programs for disabled</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>22</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Youth gymnastics &amp; cheerleading</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>19</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Martial arts programs</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>21</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>E-sport gaming programs</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>23</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
CHAPTER FIVE — FINANCIAL, FUNDING AND CAPITAL IMPROVEMENT PLAN

5.1 SERVICE DELIVERY ANALYSIS

As part of the Comprehensive System Plan development process, the consulting team performed a Service Delivery Analysis of Sioux Falls Parks and Recreation Department. The analysis is an opportunity to look at major services and functions that drive operations and the perceived brand of the Department. The purpose of classification is to establish a deeper understanding of the existing services/functions helping in determining priority, who benefits, what is the benefit, and for what cost. The information can be used during times when resources are limited to keep focus, achieve identified outcomes and/or determine to discontinue the service or function. Conversely, when a new service and/or function are created, it can help facilitate the thought process of determining the purpose of service, where does this fit within existing services, which service area has capacity to implement, are partners needed, should the Department lead or support the service delivery, or pass on the opportunity.

5.1.1 PROCESS

The Consulting team conducted a working session with key management staff on establishing major services and functions within the current Departmental structure. These have been established based on observations, interviews, focus groups, and operating practices. All services and functions of the Department have been classified as (a) Core, (b) important, or (c) Value-Added based on definitions and criteria. In addition, broad performance standards have been identified resulting in a summary of services and functions by classification.

5.1.2 SERVICE CLASSIFICATION CRITERIA

Classifying services is an important process for the Department to follow to remain aligned with the community’s interests and needs, the mission of the organization, and to sustainably operate within the bounds of the financial resources that support it.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Type of Program</th>
<th>Who Benefits?</th>
<th>Who Pays?</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Essential Service</td>
<td>All the People in Community</td>
<td>The community through the tax system, no user charges</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Important Service</td>
<td>Individuals who Participate Benefit but all members of community benefit somehow</td>
<td>Individual users pay partial costs</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Value-Added Service</td>
<td>Individual who participates</td>
<td>Individual users pay full costs</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
The following core service and function criteria are defined for the purpose of determining what are the core essential, important, and value-added services that SFPR provides in operations.

5.1.3 **CORE “ESSENTIAL” SERVICES**
- **Definition of Core “Essential” Services**
  - Core “Essential” services are those programs, services and facilities SFPR must provide and/or are essential in order to capably govern the parks and recreation system. The failure to provide a core service at an adequate level would result in a significant negative consequence relative to the overall City health & safety and economic vitality of the community.
  - **Criteria**
    - The Department is mandated by law, by the Charter or is contractually obligated by agreement to provide the service.
    - The service is essential to protecting and supporting the public’s health and safety.
    - The service protects and maintains valuable SFPR assets and Infrastructure.
    - The City’s residents, businesses customers and partners would generally and reasonably expect and support SFPR in providing the service, and that service is one that cannot or should not be provided by the private sector, and provides a sound investment of public funds.

5.1.4 **“IMPORTANT” SERVICES**
- **Definition of “Important” Services**
  - “Important” services are those programs, services and facilities SFPR should provide, and are important to governing the parks and recreation operations and effectively serving the residents, businesses, customers and partners. Providing Important services expands or enhances our ability to provide and sustain SFPR core services, health & safety, and economic vitality.
  - **Criteria**
    - Service provides, expands, enhances or supports identified core essential services.
    - Services are broadly supported and utilized by the community, and are considered an appropriate, important, and valuable public good. Public support may be conditional upon the manner by which the service is paid for or funded.
    - Service generates income or revenue that offsets some or all of its operating cost and/or is deemed to provide an economic, social or environmental outcome or result within the community.

5.1.5 **VALUE-ADDED” SERVICES**
- **Definition of “Value-added” Services**
  - “Value-added” services are discretionary programs, services and facilities that SFPR may provide when additional funding or revenue exists to offset the cost of providing those services. Value-added services provide added value to our residents, businesses, customers and partners above and beyond what is required or expected of a parks and recreation department.
  - **Criteria**
    - Service expands, enhances or supports Core Essential Services and Important Services, and the quality of life of the community.
Services are supported and well utilized by the community, and provide an appropriate and valuable public benefit.

Service generates income or funding from sponsorships, grants, user fees or other sources that offsets some or all of its cost and/or provides a meaningful economic, social or environmental benefit to the community.

5.1.6 CORE SERVICE/FUNCTION AREAS

SFPR staff helped to define major services and functions in operations. The following have been determined to be their core “essential, important and value-added services”. The core function analysis can be used by SFPR to manage workloads within the Departments. If determined necessary by SFPR, the next steps could be for the staff to develop a strategy for each core service and how staff will manage these services differently for the future. Each major service or function is also identified as a lead or support function, which helps to determine how to deliver the service in the most cost-effective manner. An early review of current classification when implementing the Comprehensive System Plan will identify if the delivery of a service is in fact a lead or support responsibilities. The Department should amend the classification of services/functions when changes to operations are implemented in removing or adding services to the Department’s responsibilities. The following are the SFPR core functions and analysis. A full detailed list of functions can be found in the Appendix.
DEPARTMENT ADMINISTRATION CORE SERVICE/FUNCTION ANALYSIS

The Administration Core Functions are categorized into six areas of focus including Finance, Stakeholders, Operations, Planning, Communications, and Administrative.

DEPARTMENT ADMINISTRATION FUNCTION DISTRIBUTION

The Function Distribution within SFPR Administration is 97 percent Essential and three percent Important, with no functions classified as value-added. This current distribution is common for administration as it serves core essential functions to overall operations and also serves as a resource and/or in an oversight capacity to all divisions of the Department.

DEPARTMENT ADMINISTRATION FUNCTION CLASSIFICATION (LEAD/SUPPORT)

The total number of functions within the Administration Department is 35. Currently, the Essential functions of Administration are predominantly a Lead function and the only Important function is in a support capacity. There are not any Value-added support functions of Administration. This distribution demonstrates the Administration is leading the Department to achieve overarching outcomes.

DEPARTMENT ADMINISTRATION SUMMARY

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Overarching Classification</th>
<th>Overarching Function</th>
<th>Who Benefits</th>
<th>Who Pays</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Essential (97%)</td>
<td>Lead (85%)</td>
<td>Community</td>
<td>Community (Tax Base)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
PARK ADMINISTRATION CORE SERVICE/FUNCTION ANALYSIS

The Park - Administration Core Functions are categorized into two areas of focus including Communications and Special Events.

PARK - ADMINISTRATION FUNCTION DISTRIBUTION

The Function Distribution within SFPR Park - Administration is 93 percent Essential, three percent Important, and four percent value-added. Given the responsibilities for overall community awareness and enjoyment, this current distribution is indicative of what is seen in agencies with the responsibility of communicating the Department brand and assisting outside organizations implement special events.

PARK - ADMINISTRATION FUNCTION CLASSIFICATION (LEAD/SUPPORT)

The total number of functions within Park - Administration is 27. These are broad functions and have many specific tasks within them. Currently, 23 out of 26 Essential functions are Lead and one supported Important function. The Value-added function (above) is not a Lead or Support Function so it does not show up in this graph.

PARK - ADMINISTRATION SUMMARY

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Overarching Classification</th>
<th>Overarching Function</th>
<th>Who Benefits</th>
<th>Who Pays</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Essential (93%)</td>
<td>Lead (85%)</td>
<td>Community</td>
<td>Community (Tax Base)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
PARK OPERATIONS CORE SERVICE/FUNCTION ANALYSIS
The Park Operations Core Functions are categorized into two areas of focus including Financial and Risk Management.

PARK OPERATIONS FUNCTION DISTRIBUTION
The Function Distribution within SFPR Park Operations is 68 percent Essential, 27 percent Important, and five percent value-added. This current distribution is representative of the park operations of SFPR maintaining the assets of the system being essential and the logistical support for outside events is not essential to the Department but it is important to the community’s vitality and enjoyment of living in Sioux Falls.

PARK OPERATIONS FUNCTION CLASSIFICATION (LEAD/SUPPORT)
The total number of functions identified within the Park Operations is 43. Currently, 29 out of 30 Essential functions of Park Operations are Lead and 10 out of 13 are supported Important functions. The Value-added function are a Support role.

PARK - OPERATIONS SUMMARY

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Overarching Classification</th>
<th>Overarching Function</th>
<th>Who Benefits</th>
<th>Who Pays</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Essential (68%)</td>
<td>Lead (70%)</td>
<td>Community, Individual User</td>
<td>Community (Tax base) Individual users - partial</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
PARK DEVELOPMENT CORE SERVICE/FUNCTION ANALYSIS
The Park Development Core Functions are categorized into areas of focus including Design & Land Acquisition, Facilities & Infrastructure, and Site Construction.

PARK DEVELOPMENT FUNCTION DISTRIBUTION
The Function Distribution within SFPR Park Development is 100 percent Essential with no important or value-added functions currently. This current distribution can be attributed to the potential for planning and development to drive up operational costs. The staff must anticipate challenges when planning for the future. This is an important best practice for cost containment.

PARK DEVELOPMENT FUNCTION CLASSIFICATION (LEAD/SUPPORT)
The total number of functions identified within the Park Development Department is 21. Currently, 15 out of 21 Essential functions are Lead and five are supported essential functions. The support functions are mostly inspection and tracking functions. This is expected as in many City structures each department serves the City in its respective area for inspection and tracking.

PARK - DEVELOPMENT SUMMARY

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Overarching Classification</th>
<th>Overarching Function</th>
<th>Who Benefits</th>
<th>Who Pays</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Essential (100%)</td>
<td>Lead (76%)</td>
<td>Community</td>
<td>Community (Tax base)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
COMPREHENSIVE PARKS & RECREATION SYSTEM PLAN

RECREATION PROGRAMS CORE SERVICE/FUNCTIONS ANALYSIS
The Recreation Programs Core Functions are categorized into core program areas; Aquatics, Outdoor Recreation, Health & Wellness, Cultural Arts, Enrichment, and Youth & Adult Sports.

RECREATION PROGRAMS FUNCTION DISTRIBUTION
The Function Distribution within SFPR Recreation Programs is 29 percent Essential, 35 percent Important, and 36 percent value-added functions. This current distribution is not uncommon in Recreation Programs considering the variety of programming provided by the Department. This distribution is indicative of a department with a higher cost recovery than the SFPR.

RECREATION PROGRAMS FUNCTION CLASSIFICATION (LEAD/SUPPORT)
The total number of functions identified within the Recreation Programs is 59. Currently, all functions are a Lead of the Division. There are 17 Essential, 21 Important and 21 Value-added functions. It is not uncommon for recreation services to be mostly led by staff. The Division should look at partnerships to ensure there is a balance of lead and support in providing services that are collaborated in the delivery. In order to increase capacity, the Department should retire declining programs to replace with new and look to partner where service need expanded so SFPR can be in the support role.

RECREATION PROGRAMS SUMMARY

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Overarching Classification</th>
<th>Overarching Function</th>
<th>Who Benefits</th>
<th>Who Pays</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Evenly Distributed (Essential, Important, Value-added)</td>
<td>Lead (100%)</td>
<td>Community, Individual / Community, Individual User</td>
<td>Community (Tax base), Individual user - partial, Individual user - full</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
RECREATION COMMUNITY CENTERS CORE SERVICE/FUNCTION ANALYSIS

The Recreation Community Centers Core Functions are categorized into two areas of focus including Community Center Management and Community Center Programs. This approach to oversee both aspects of these types of indoor recreation spaces is best practice for maximizing efficiency in operations.

RECREATION COMMUNITY CENTERS FUNCTION DISTRIBUTION

The Function Distribution within SFPR Recreation Community Centers is 77 percent Essential, 21 percent Important, and 2 percent Value-added functions. Recreation Community Centers functions are very detailed and therefore the majority of functions are essential due to the management of the space and the activities that are implemented within the community centers. The philosophy of low to no cost for activities and use of these centers from their opening drives the overarching classification being essential.

RECREATION COMMUNITY CENTERS FUNCTION CLASSIFICATION (LEAD/SUPPORT)

The total number of functions identified within the Recreation Community Centers is 56. Currently, 43 Essential functions are Lead and 12 functions are Lead Important functions. Currently, Recreation Community Centers has one Value-added functions in a Lead role. All functions are Lead in Recreation Community Centers.

RECREATION COMMUNITY CENTERS SUMMARY

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Overarching Classification</th>
<th>Overarching Function</th>
<th>Who Benefits</th>
<th>Who Pays</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Essential (77%)</td>
<td>Lead (100%)</td>
<td>Community, Individual / Community</td>
<td>Community (Tax base), Individual user - partial</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
RECREATION AQUATICS CORE SERVICE/FUNCTION ANALYSIS
The Recreation – Aquatics Core Functions are categorized in one category and that is Facility Management. The fact that water activities are potentially fatal activities, facility safety through management is the priority. Programming is still managed from a facility safety approach.

RECREATION – AQUATICS FUNCTION DISTRIBUTION
The Function Distribution within SFPR Recreation – Aquatics is 92 percent Essential, 8 percent value-added functions. This is not uncommon for aquatics to have an overarching classification of essential. The amount of preparation goes into the facility and operations for aquatics is driven by risk management. Any Important or Value-added functions support revenue generation to offset operational costs.

RECREATION – AQUATICS FUNCTION CLASSIFICATION (LEAD/SUPPORT)
The total number of functions identified within the Recreation – Aquatics is 12. Currently, five out of 12 Essential functions are Lead/Support and six Essential functions are Lead. The almost even split between Lead/Support and Lead functions can only be described as the level of importance has appropriate levels of cross training to ensure the Essential functions get completed in a timely fashion. The workload can fluctuate by the hour in aquatic facilities and staff typically in the Support role may need to assume the Lead depending upon immediate needs.

RECREATION AQUATICS SUMMARY

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Overarching Classification</th>
<th>Overarching Function</th>
<th>Who Benefits</th>
<th>Who Pays</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Essential (92%)</td>
<td>Lead (58%)</td>
<td>Community, Individual / Community</td>
<td>Community (Tax base), Individual user - partial</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
SPECIAL USE FACILITIES CORE SERVICE/FUNCTION ANALYSIS
The Special Use Facilities Core Functions are categorized into five type facilities including Golf Facilities, Great Plains Zoo, Great Bear Ski Valley, Mary Jo Wagoner Arboretum, and Overlook Café. In the major functions of the Special Use Facilities are to oversee operational contracts and to plan and coordinate capital projects for the City.

SPECIAL USE FACILITIES FUNCTION DISTRIBUTION
The Function Distribution within SFPR Special Use Facilities is 100 percent Essential with no Important or Value-added functions. These signature facilities have City-wide outcomes that can be a challenge for parks and recreation departments to manage with shifting financial priorities.

SPECIAL USE FACILITIES FUNCTION CLASSIFICATION (LEAD/SUPPORT)
The total number of functions identified within the Special Use Facilities is 13. Currently, five out of 13 Essential functions are Lead and eight Essential functions are Support. This approach to management is best practice when needing to balance capacity with services.

SPECIAL USE FACILITIES SUMMARY

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Overarching Classification</th>
<th>Overarching Function</th>
<th>Who Benefits</th>
<th>Who Pays</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Essential (100%)</td>
<td>Support (61%)</td>
<td>Community, Individual / Community</td>
<td>Community (Tax base), Individual user - partial, Private fundraising</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
5.1.7 STANDARDS FOR SERVICES/FUNCTIONS
When the Department has achieved CARPA Accreditation, it demonstrates standards are in place. These standards are meant to enhance existing standards defined by the City specific to parks and recreation services. The following standards are applicable to all Divisions within the Department. The standards should be in place to promote a high-quality delivery of services and functions that continue to build the brand keep capacity manageable and applied to areas of future growth for the Department to keep consistency:

- Employee and Contractor qualifications are consistent with in-the-field experience in the specialty they are responsible for delivering.
- The appropriate resources are provided to deliver the service/function
- The service/function is delivered in the appropriate timeframe, either indoor or outdoor, is safe and documented process.
- When documenting and tracking the number of annual hours it takes to complete the service/function, define the frequency of the service/function.
- Equipment or supplies that are used are of high-quality, safe and appropriate maintained as part of the preventative maintenance plan.
- The Department must have the capacity to manage the Essential service/function.
- Appropriate support staff or volunteers are in place to help guide the service/function.
- Staff is trained on policies, procedures, plans and outcomes.
- Staff and volunteers are trained in customer service and diversity training to make all interactions welcoming.
- Funding for services is appropriate to create a sustainable approach to service delivery.
- New staff, volunteers, and contract employees working with children will have background checks.
- Performance measures are tracked and shared with staff.
- All regulatory requirements for service/functions are completed on time and filed according to guidelines
- Appropriate required licenses and certifications set by law will be reviewed and filed for compliance.

5.1.8 CONCLUSION & RECOMMENDATIONS
Sioux Falls has taken incredible steps to structure operations in a manner that continues providing quality parks and recreation services including the addition of staff in recent years. While these positions have been added, the current FTEs (12.28 FTE) of the Department is below the average of 17.17 per 10,000 population. Contributing to the need for additional staff is the percentage of the park system that is developed and the type of amenities requiring expertise to properly manage and maintain the system. Examples would be the Midco Aquatic Center, competition athletic fields, community centers, etc.

Sioux Falls has 89% of the acres developed requiring a higher level of maintenance. The Department should set a goal to increase FTEs over the next five years to properly maintain the system in a sustainable manner. This is especially important as the Department continues to add trails, programs, and assets to park properties. Properly maintained staffing levels where key functions add sustainability to the system is important to bring all assets to their full lifecycle.

Additional functions will be added as the Department focuses more on cost recovery to develop a sustainable system moving forward. This will impact the capacity of the department and should be accounted for in the tracking and monitoring of the workload. The Department should use the framework of this analysis in updating annually the service delivery analysis.

After reviewing the public input, survey results, staff input, function classifications, the following recommendations will develop the Department’s capacity through training, strategic management, workload management, technology, and additional staff.

- Use the cost of service model to help determine the appropriate staffing level to ensure the capacity to manage operations and preserve assets as the system grows and adds new amenities, parks, service areas, and facilities.
- Develop business plans for all facilities to help manage to determined outcomes.
- Teach and train staff in business principles, policies, procedures, standards, and outcomes. Train all staff on new organizational functions as they are added to the system.
• Track hours spent in each classification of service performed to ensure a balanced workload.
• Develop customer service training and conduct annual refresher training that is specific to parks and recreation services.
• Use function classifications and roles (lead/support) in managing workloads and new opportunities to ensure proper alignment.
• Examine, at least annually, the functionality of the organizational structure. Amend as necessary.
5.2 FINANCIAL ASSESSMENT

The financial assessment of the SFPR was completed, as a part of the System Plan process. As a key element of the Plan, was a review of the available information to assess the financial situation of the SFPR. The revenues, expenditures and capital funds were analyzed to identify trends and assess the Department’s financial integrity. The cost recovery for facilities, programs and services at major functional levels has been analyzed to assess the cost of service recovery.

5.2.1 DATA REVIEWED

A review of the detailed cost and activity information prepared by the Department staff was completed. Following is a list of the cost and activity data reviewed:

- Actual Revenue and Expenditure Summary Reports for 2015 through 2018
- Budgeted Revenue and Expenditure Summary Reports for 2019
- Comprehensive Annual Financial Report for 2018
- Mayor’s Capital Program 2020-2024

5.2.2 FINANCIAL ANALYSIS

The revenues and expenditures for fiscal years ending 2015 through 2019 are shown in Figure 30.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>2015</th>
<th>2016</th>
<th>2017</th>
<th>2018</th>
<th>2019</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Actual</td>
<td>Actual</td>
<td>Actual</td>
<td>Actual</td>
<td>Original Budget</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Revenues</td>
<td>$1,155,230</td>
<td>$1,567,828</td>
<td>$2,139,802</td>
<td>$2,114,806</td>
<td>$2,289,941</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Expenditures</td>
<td>$15,635,862</td>
<td>$16,966,026</td>
<td>$17,969,194</td>
<td>$17,197,750</td>
<td>$19,539,085</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Revenues Over (Under) Expenditures</td>
<td>$(14,480,632)</td>
<td>$(15,398,198)</td>
<td>$(15,829,392)</td>
<td>$(15,082,944)</td>
<td>$(17,249,144)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cost Recovery</td>
<td>7.39%</td>
<td>9.24%</td>
<td>11.91%</td>
<td>12.30%</td>
<td>11.72%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The total cost recovery is between 7.39% and 12.30% for the study period. The cost recovery has increased over the analysis period.

Best practice cost recovery for park and recreation programs is between 40% to 60%. The actual recovery for Sioux Falls Parks and Recreation is less than anticipated. Most parks and recreation agencies are mandated to have a certain cost recovery to balance the funding sources to their specific level of financial sustainability. These are based on the needs of a community and the revenue capabilities of designed facilities. The fees are set by the City Council and have been reviewed and updated with minimally price increases for increased costs. SFPR is unique in that it is mostly a facility provider for youth and adult athletics as the Department does not offer youth baseball, youth football, youth basketball, Adults softball etc. This has an effect on the Department’s ability to recover costs as the City was not focused on revenue generation in earlier years of developing the park system.
The functional programs are analyzed in the following sections.

**CENTRALIZED FACILITIES**

The Central Facilities revenues and expenditures for fiscal years ending 2013 through 2019 are shown in Figure 31.

Centralized Facilities are not anticipated to recover costs of operations. The expenditures increased significantly in 2018 to accommodate repair and maintenance needs. Increases in repair and maintenance are considered a positive to maintain the quality and useful life of the facilities and equipment.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Revenues</th>
<th>2015 Actual</th>
<th>2016 Actual</th>
<th>2017 Actual</th>
<th>2018 Actual</th>
<th>2019 Original Budget</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>32 - Licenses and Permits</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>34 - Charges</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>35 - Fines</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>37 - Contributions</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>38 - Miscellaneous</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Expenditures</th>
<th>2015</th>
<th>2016</th>
<th>2017</th>
<th>2018</th>
<th>2019</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>40 - Wages &amp; Benefits</td>
<td>1,052</td>
<td>2,731</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>43 - Repair &amp; Maintenance</td>
<td>7,665</td>
<td>15,826</td>
<td>17,930</td>
<td>107,633</td>
<td>198,813</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>44 - Supplies &amp; Materials</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>311</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>46 - Utilities</td>
<td>260</td>
<td>12,645</td>
<td>8,259</td>
<td>13,922</td>
<td>8,780</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>0</td>
<td>(8,977)</td>
<td>(31,202)</td>
<td>(26,500)</td>
<td>(121,555)</td>
<td>(207,593)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

| Cost Recovery | 0.00% | 0.00% | 0.00% | 0.00% | 0.00% |

Figure 31 - Centralized Facilities Revenues, Expenditures and Cost Recovery
AQUATICS

The Aquatics revenues and expenditures for fiscal years ending 2015 through 2019 are shown in Figure 32.

The cost recovery is between 27.16% and 45.98% for the study period. Best practice cost recovery for aquatics activities is approximately 40%. The cost recovery for aquatics is similar to other agencies. Good cost recovery supports facility maintenance and allows for quality programming to be provided. Cost recovery for aquatics programs is generally 40% to 80%, while cost recovery for water parks is usually 100% or more.

The increase in revenue and cost recovery beginning in 2016 is related to the fee ordinance update and opening of the indoor aquatic center. To ensure the aquatics cost recovery remains consistent or improves, the Department should continue to monitor increasing expenditures, continue cost containment measures, and review annually. As industry mandates and expenses increase due to consumables and repair and maintenance, the Department should recommend amending fees to achieve cost recovery goals as needed.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Revenues</td>
<td>484,685</td>
<td>928,591</td>
<td>1,485,272</td>
<td>1,472,621</td>
<td>1,645,005</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>32 - Licenses and Permits</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>100</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>34 - Charges</td>
<td>480,991</td>
<td>928,591</td>
<td>1,479,545</td>
<td>1,472,621</td>
<td>1,644,905</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>35 - Fines</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>37 - Contributions</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>5,727</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>38 - Miscellaneous</td>
<td>3,694</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Expenditures</th>
<th>1,784,405</th>
<th>2,295,335</th>
<th>3,230,323</th>
<th>3,502,368</th>
<th>3,750,000</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>40 - Wages &amp; Benefits</td>
<td>1,349,573</td>
<td>1,717,146</td>
<td>2,202,747</td>
<td>2,267,275</td>
<td>2,441,630</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>41 - Professional Services</td>
<td>20,495</td>
<td>57,575</td>
<td>83,344</td>
<td>77,098</td>
<td>146,041</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>42 - Rentals</td>
<td>18,105</td>
<td>31,798</td>
<td>35,799</td>
<td>36,321</td>
<td>49,864</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>43 - Repair &amp; Maintenance</td>
<td>200,231</td>
<td>168,036</td>
<td>105,745</td>
<td>322,914</td>
<td>109,179</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>44 - Supplies &amp; Materials</td>
<td>129,021</td>
<td>210,870</td>
<td>186,235</td>
<td>218,845</td>
<td>260,225</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>45 - Training</td>
<td>6,855</td>
<td>5,740</td>
<td>3,263</td>
<td>4,605</td>
<td>865</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>46 - Utilities</td>
<td>60,125</td>
<td>104,170</td>
<td>613,190</td>
<td>575,310</td>
<td>742,196</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>63 - Miscellaneous</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Revenues Over (Under) Expenditures</th>
<th>(1,299,720)</th>
<th>(1,366,744)</th>
<th>(1,745,051)</th>
<th>(2,029,747)</th>
<th>(2,104,995)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Cost Recovery</td>
<td>27.16%</td>
<td>40.46%</td>
<td>45.98%</td>
<td>42.05%</td>
<td>43.87%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
OUTDOOR SPORTS

The Outdoor Sports program revenues and expenditures for fiscal years ending 2015 through 2019 are shown in Figure 33.

The cost recovery is between 5.50% and 12.15% for the study period. Best practice cost recovery for outdoor sporting activities is between 60% to 100%. Departments typically build and provide use of the sport facilities to the leagues. The sport leagues that use the facilities help offset the maintenance expenditures by the city through user fees they collect based on a set hourly rate for each field or by a set per player fee for park maintenance. These arrangements typically include the leagues being allowed exclusive use of these facilities. The cost recovery for Outdoor Sports is significantly less than anticipated. The current cost recovery is related to the focus being on providing facilities for local sport leagues as a priority. The revenue comes from user fees and charges.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Revenues</td>
<td>303,204</td>
<td>229,326</td>
<td>194,197</td>
<td>170,185</td>
<td>262,237</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>32 - Licenses and Permits</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>2,450</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>34 - Charges</td>
<td>236,803</td>
<td>215,867</td>
<td>184,379</td>
<td>158,697</td>
<td>249,787</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>37 - Contributions</td>
<td>10,000</td>
<td>10,196</td>
<td>650</td>
<td>1,121</td>
<td>10,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>38 - Miscellaneous</td>
<td>56,401</td>
<td>3,263</td>
<td>9,168</td>
<td>10,367</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Expenditures</td>
<td>2,494,717</td>
<td>3,441,555</td>
<td>3,531,123</td>
<td>2,459,699</td>
<td>3,102,312</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>40 - Wages &amp; Benefits</td>
<td>1,960,349</td>
<td>2,147,133</td>
<td>2,097,561</td>
<td>1,842,100</td>
<td>2,141,629</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>41 - Professional Services</td>
<td>792</td>
<td>34,397</td>
<td>17,017</td>
<td>5,892</td>
<td>300</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>42 - Rentals</td>
<td>1,701</td>
<td>2,204</td>
<td>9,396</td>
<td>10,677</td>
<td>2,330</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>43 - Repair &amp; Maintenance</td>
<td>313,585</td>
<td>253,979</td>
<td>363,462</td>
<td>309,098</td>
<td>326,773</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>44 - Supplies &amp; Materials</td>
<td>72,891</td>
<td>78,964</td>
<td>137,343</td>
<td>96,065</td>
<td>30,410</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>45 - Training</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>46 - Utilities</td>
<td>145,399</td>
<td>149,878</td>
<td>142,613</td>
<td>140,552</td>
<td>500,870</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>63 - Miscellaneous</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>775,000</td>
<td>763,731</td>
<td>55,315</td>
<td>100,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Revenues Over (Under) Expenditures</td>
<td>(2,191,513)</td>
<td>(3,212,229)</td>
<td>(3,336,926)</td>
<td>(2,289,514)</td>
<td>(2,840,075)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cost Recovery</td>
<td>12.15%</td>
<td>6.66%</td>
<td>5.50%</td>
<td>6.92%</td>
<td>8.45%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Figure 33 - Outdoor Sports Revenues, Expenditures and Cost Recovery
COMMUNITY CENTERS

The Community Centers revenues and expenditures for fiscal years ending 2015 through 2019 are shown in Figure 34.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>062 - Community Centers</th>
<th>2015 Actual</th>
<th>2016 Actual</th>
<th>2017 Actual</th>
<th>2018 Actual</th>
<th>2019 Original Budget</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Revenues</td>
<td>36,376</td>
<td>99,513</td>
<td>99,048</td>
<td>84,077</td>
<td>34,164</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>32 - Licenses and Permits</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>34 - Charges</td>
<td>23,464</td>
<td>97,680</td>
<td>89,842</td>
<td>76,151</td>
<td>19,164</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>37 - Contributions</td>
<td>4,000</td>
<td>8,000</td>
<td>8,500</td>
<td>15,000</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>38 - Miscellaneous</td>
<td>8,912</td>
<td>833</td>
<td>1,206</td>
<td>(574)</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Expenditures</td>
<td>1,199,004</td>
<td>1,329,372</td>
<td>1,329,673</td>
<td>1,277,928</td>
<td>1,542,249</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>40 - Wages &amp; Benefits</td>
<td>652,732</td>
<td>725,050</td>
<td>710,251</td>
<td>734,145</td>
<td>919,789</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>41 - Professional Services</td>
<td>378,800</td>
<td>19,045</td>
<td>12,209</td>
<td>13,996</td>
<td>35,750</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>42 - Rentals</td>
<td>64,683</td>
<td>58,906</td>
<td>55,275</td>
<td>53,570</td>
<td>57,291</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>43 - Repair &amp; Maintenance</td>
<td>9,857</td>
<td>324,694</td>
<td>388,082</td>
<td>326,552</td>
<td>358,938</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>44 - Supplies &amp; Materials</td>
<td>84,978</td>
<td>131,823</td>
<td>89,727</td>
<td>75,190</td>
<td>91,400</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>45 - Training</td>
<td>5,033</td>
<td>1,717</td>
<td>1,227</td>
<td>865</td>
<td>865</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>46 - Utilities</td>
<td>2,921</td>
<td>68,137</td>
<td>72,902</td>
<td>73,610</td>
<td>78,216</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Revenues Over (Under) Expenditures</td>
<td>(1,162,628)</td>
<td>(1,230,859)</td>
<td>(1,230,625)</td>
<td>(1,193,851)</td>
<td>(1,508,085)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cost Recovery</td>
<td>3.03%</td>
<td>7.41%</td>
<td>7.45%</td>
<td>6.58%</td>
<td>2.22%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The cost recovery is between 2.22% and 7.45% for the study period. Best practice cost recovery for community centers is between 40% to 80%. The cost recovery for the Community Centers is less than similar agencies. Best practice facilities are typical multigenerational spaces that are designed for multi-program use including recent recreational trends. The Department is operating facilities that were appropriately designed to address the needs of the neighborhoods they were developed in. These needs include community group meetings and youth after-school time. These facilities have space limitations to provide the current trends in recreation outside the gymnasium. It should be noted that these facilities are attached to schools and therefore are shared use. This shared use also has limited use due to school safety and needs throughout a calendar year. These facilities are typically open 40 hours a week whereas multigenerational centers are open 100-110 hours a week and support multiple uses in one setting.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Active Gen, VOA, YMCA</th>
<th>2015 Actual</th>
<th>2016 Actual</th>
<th>2017 Actual</th>
<th>2018 Actual</th>
<th>2019 Original Budget</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Expenditures</td>
<td>306,920</td>
<td>306,920</td>
<td>306,920</td>
<td>306,920</td>
<td>306,920</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

In addition, the professional services agreements with similar providers for the amount of $306,920 annually has been removed from the community centers to make the analysis only on the community centers revenue and expenditure performance.
MUSIC & THEATER VENUES

The Music & Theater Venues revenues and expenditures for fiscal years ending 2015 through 2019 are shown in Figure 36.

Music & Theater Venues are anticipated to recover 100% or more of costs of professional presentations. Recreational music and theater programs are anticipated to recover 50% to 100% of costs. The actual Music & Theater Venues cost recovery is 0.91% to 2.71% during the study period. The 2019 budgeted cost recovery is 3.30%. The cost recovery is impacted by the performances being free to attend. Examples of this are Mondays at McKennan, Municipal Band, Theatre in the Park, Storyland Theater, etc.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>收入</td>
<td>9,029</td>
<td>3,866</td>
<td>2,553</td>
<td>2,749</td>
<td>8,555</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>许可证和许可</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>费用</td>
<td>7,811</td>
<td>2,619</td>
<td>1,291</td>
<td>1,449</td>
<td>5,555</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>贡献</td>
<td>1,218</td>
<td>1,247</td>
<td>1,262</td>
<td>1,300</td>
<td>3,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>支出</td>
<td>332,641</td>
<td>360,678</td>
<td>280,124</td>
<td>236,158</td>
<td>259,200</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>工资及福利</td>
<td>221,207</td>
<td>244,660</td>
<td>198,229</td>
<td>165,302</td>
<td>178,416</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>专业服务</td>
<td>73,791</td>
<td>91,905</td>
<td>66,792</td>
<td>66,802</td>
<td>66,784</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>租赁</td>
<td>5,944</td>
<td>7,524</td>
<td>429</td>
<td>516</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>维修及维护</td>
<td>352</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>169</td>
<td>76</td>
<td>4,200</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>公路及材料</td>
<td>30,524</td>
<td>15,763</td>
<td>13,446</td>
<td>2,588</td>
<td>11,525</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>培训</td>
<td>275</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>275</td>
<td>275</td>
<td>275</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>能源</td>
<td>548</td>
<td>726</td>
<td>784</td>
<td>599</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>收入超过（低于）支出</td>
<td>(323,612)</td>
<td>(356,812)</td>
<td>(277,571)</td>
<td>(233,409)</td>
<td>(250,645)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>成本恢复</td>
<td>2.71%</td>
<td>1.07%</td>
<td>0.91%</td>
<td>1.16%</td>
<td>3.30%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Figure 36 - Music & Theater Venues Revenues, Expenditures and Cost Recovery
PARKS AND PLAYGROUNDS

The Parks and Playgrounds revenues and expenditures for fiscal years ending 2015 through 2019 are shown in Figure 37.

Parks and Playgrounds operations are anticipated to have low cost recovery. The Repair & Maintenance expenditures increased significantly in the 2019 Budget. Increases in repair and maintenance are considered a positive to maintain the quality and useful life of the facilities and equipment.

Parks and Playgrounds cost recovery is 2.09% to 2.63% during the study period.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>069 - Parks &amp; Playgrounds</th>
<th>2015 Actual</th>
<th>2016 Actual</th>
<th>2017 Actual</th>
<th>2018 Actual</th>
<th>2019 Original Budget</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Revenues</td>
<td>156,721</td>
<td>120,373</td>
<td>151,316</td>
<td>129,134</td>
<td>149,250</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>32 - Licenses and Permits</td>
<td>15,518</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>33 - Government Shared</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>10,000</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>34 - Charges</td>
<td>87,882</td>
<td>99,429</td>
<td>86,137</td>
<td>93,486</td>
<td>94,255</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>36 - Investment Income</td>
<td>2,177</td>
<td>(141)</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>37 - Contributions</td>
<td>24,980</td>
<td>10,879</td>
<td>42,046</td>
<td>21,617</td>
<td>45,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>38 - Miscellaneous</td>
<td>26,164</td>
<td>10,206</td>
<td>13,126</td>
<td>14,013</td>
<td>9,995</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Expenditures</td>
<td>6,359,686</td>
<td>5,746,240</td>
<td>5,743,935</td>
<td>5,868,511</td>
<td>5,828,968</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>40 - Wages &amp; Benefits</td>
<td>3,019,495</td>
<td>3,133,134</td>
<td>3,221,183</td>
<td>3,098,784</td>
<td>3,318,923</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>41 - Professional Services</td>
<td>198,452</td>
<td>156,386</td>
<td>141,691</td>
<td>280,602</td>
<td>158,688</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>42 - Rentals</td>
<td>129,351</td>
<td>177,846</td>
<td>168,275</td>
<td>158,922</td>
<td>228,614</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>43 - Repair &amp; Maintenance</td>
<td>844,644</td>
<td>885,256</td>
<td>1,006,215</td>
<td>1,159,005</td>
<td>1,121,096</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>44 - Supplies &amp; Materials</td>
<td>443,607</td>
<td>348,355</td>
<td>325,207</td>
<td>377,308</td>
<td>444,075</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>45 - Training</td>
<td>14,028</td>
<td>9,627</td>
<td>10,013</td>
<td>20,899</td>
<td>7,390</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>46 - Utilities</td>
<td>865,501</td>
<td>936,767</td>
<td>748,302</td>
<td>677,412</td>
<td>450,182</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>61 - Benefit Payments</td>
<td>61,935</td>
<td>98,869</td>
<td>123,049</td>
<td>95,579</td>
<td>100,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>63 - Miscellaneous</td>
<td>782,672</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cost Recovery</td>
<td>2.46%</td>
<td>2.09%</td>
<td>2.63%</td>
<td>2.20%</td>
<td>2.56%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Figure 37 - Parks and Playgrounds Revenues, Expenditures and Cost Recovery
EXTERNAL PROPERTY MAINTENANCE

The External Property Maintenance revenues and expenditures for fiscal years ending 2015 through 2019 are shown in **Figure 38**.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Revenues</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>31 - Taxes</td>
<td>3,528</td>
<td>3,338</td>
<td>3,385</td>
<td>3,268</td>
<td>3,650</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>32 - Licenses and Permits</td>
<td>875</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>34 - Charges</td>
<td>148,456</td>
<td>149,400</td>
<td>182,234</td>
<td>214,665</td>
<td>156,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>38 - Miscellaneous</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>(327)</td>
<td>(122)</td>
<td>9,821</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Expenditures</strong></td>
<td>585,478</td>
<td>613,143</td>
<td>568,465</td>
<td>672,896</td>
<td>1,713,889</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>40 - Wages &amp; Benefits</td>
<td>510,941</td>
<td>647,366</td>
<td>683,503</td>
<td>731,723</td>
<td>712,092</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>41 - Professional Services</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>42 - Rentals</td>
<td>2,790</td>
<td>984</td>
<td>600</td>
<td>659</td>
<td>3,724</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>43 - Repair &amp; Maintenance</td>
<td>58,516</td>
<td>71,687</td>
<td>121,190</td>
<td>96,133</td>
<td>123,173</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>44 - Supplies &amp; Materials</td>
<td>18,635</td>
<td>14,837</td>
<td>13,085</td>
<td>18,272</td>
<td>20,365</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>46 - Utilities</td>
<td>1,715</td>
<td>1,582</td>
<td>1,585</td>
<td>1,658</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Revenues Over (Under) Expenditures</strong></td>
<td>(439,738)</td>
<td>(584,045)</td>
<td>(634,466)</td>
<td>(620,691)</td>
<td>(699,704)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cost Recovery</td>
<td>25.79%</td>
<td>20.70%</td>
<td>22.62%</td>
<td>26.84%</td>
<td>18.58%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The cost recovery is between 18.58% and 26.84% for the study period. The cost recovery has significantly decreased over the study period.

FORESTRY

The Forestry revenues and expenditures for fiscal years ending 2015 through 2019 are shown in **Figure 39**.

Forestry operations are not anticipated to recover costs of operations. The Forestry cost recovery is 0.11% to 0.52% over the study period.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>074 - Forestry</th>
<th>2015 Actual</th>
<th>2016 Actual</th>
<th>2017 Actual</th>
<th>2018 Actual</th>
<th>2019 Original Budget</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Revenues</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>31 - Taxes</td>
<td>3,528</td>
<td>3,338</td>
<td>3,385</td>
<td>3,268</td>
<td>3,650</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>32 - Licenses and Permits</td>
<td>875</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>34 - Charges</td>
<td>148,456</td>
<td>149,400</td>
<td>182,234</td>
<td>214,665</td>
<td>156,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>38 - Miscellaneous</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>(327)</td>
<td>(122)</td>
<td>9,821</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Expenditures</strong></td>
<td>585,478</td>
<td>613,143</td>
<td>568,465</td>
<td>672,896</td>
<td>1,713,889</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>40 - Wages &amp; Benefits</td>
<td>510,941</td>
<td>647,366</td>
<td>683,503</td>
<td>731,723</td>
<td>712,092</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>41 - Professional Services</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>42 - Rentals</td>
<td>2,790</td>
<td>984</td>
<td>600</td>
<td>659</td>
<td>3,724</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>43 - Repair &amp; Maintenance</td>
<td>58,516</td>
<td>71,687</td>
<td>121,190</td>
<td>96,133</td>
<td>123,173</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>44 - Supplies &amp; Materials</td>
<td>18,635</td>
<td>14,837</td>
<td>13,085</td>
<td>18,272</td>
<td>20,365</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>46 - Utilities</td>
<td>1,715</td>
<td>1,582</td>
<td>1,585</td>
<td>1,658</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Revenues Over (Under) Expenditures</strong></td>
<td>(584,045)</td>
<td>(611,848)</td>
<td>(567,782)</td>
<td>(669,421)</td>
<td>(1,709,059)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cost Recovery</td>
<td>0.11%</td>
<td>0.21%</td>
<td>0.12%</td>
<td>0.52%</td>
<td>0.28%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Figure 38 - External Property Maintenance Revenues, Expenditures and Cost Recovery

Figure 39 - Forestry Revenues, Expenditures and Cost Recovery
**ZOO**

The Zoo revenues and expenditures for fiscal years ending 2015 through 2019 are shown in Figure 40. Zoo operations has no revenue sources. Zoo cost recovery is anticipated to be 40% to 80%. These figures do not include the Zoological Society’s revenue and expenses.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>075 - Zoo</th>
<th>2015 Actual</th>
<th>2016 Actual</th>
<th>2017 Actual</th>
<th>2018 Actual</th>
<th>2019 Original Budget</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Revenues</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>32 - Licenses and Permits</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>33 - Government Shared</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>34 - Charges</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Expenditures</td>
<td>1,754,033</td>
<td>1,800,857</td>
<td>1,808,281</td>
<td>1,571,296</td>
<td>1,625,387</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>40 - Wages &amp; Benefits</td>
<td>260,937</td>
<td>308,161</td>
<td>305,839</td>
<td>295,413</td>
<td>312,948</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>41 - Professional Services</td>
<td>1,445,680</td>
<td>1,457,680</td>
<td>1,457,462</td>
<td>1,227,173</td>
<td>1,262,053</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>42 - Rentals</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>981</td>
<td>1,131</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>43 - Repair &amp; Maintenance</td>
<td>31,647</td>
<td>22,420</td>
<td>33,621</td>
<td>37,233</td>
<td>33,111</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>44 - Supplies &amp; Materials</td>
<td>12,380</td>
<td>9,714</td>
<td>7,481</td>
<td>7,805</td>
<td>14,090</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>45 - Training</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>46 - Utilities</td>
<td>3,389</td>
<td>2,882</td>
<td>2,897</td>
<td>2,541</td>
<td>3,185</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Revenues Over (Under) Expenditures</td>
<td>(1,754,033)</td>
<td>(1,800,857)</td>
<td>(1,808,281)</td>
<td>(1,571,296)</td>
<td>(1,625,387)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cost Recovery</td>
<td>0.00%</td>
<td>0.00%</td>
<td>0.00%</td>
<td>0.00%</td>
<td>0.00%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Figure 40 - Zoo Revenues, Expenditures and Cost Recovery*

**EXTERNAL SPECIAL EVENTS**

The External Special Events revenues and expenditures for fiscal years ending 2015 through 2019 are shown in Figure 41.

External Special Events operations has no revenue sources. External Special Events cost recovery is anticipated to be 40% to 80%.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>080 - External Special Events</th>
<th>2015 Actual</th>
<th>2016 Actual</th>
<th>2017 Actual</th>
<th>2018 Actual</th>
<th>2019 Original Budget</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Revenues</td>
<td>11,740</td>
<td>33,473</td>
<td>21,236</td>
<td>24,811</td>
<td>26,250</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>32 - Licenses and Permits</td>
<td>3,125</td>
<td>20,350</td>
<td>16,800</td>
<td>16,900</td>
<td>16,250</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>34 - Charges</td>
<td>8,015</td>
<td>13,123</td>
<td>4,436</td>
<td>7,911</td>
<td>10,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>37 - Contributions</td>
<td>600</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>38 - Miscellaneous</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Expenditures</td>
<td>217,630</td>
<td>304,270</td>
<td>323,887</td>
<td>331,971</td>
<td>343,214</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>40 - Wages &amp; Benefits</td>
<td>214,617</td>
<td>299,428</td>
<td>318,901</td>
<td>328,301</td>
<td>336,514</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>41 - Professional Services</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>42 - Rentals</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>515</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>43 - Repair &amp; Maintenance</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>623</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>44 - Supplies &amp; Materials</td>
<td>1,921</td>
<td>3,147</td>
<td>2,274</td>
<td>2,192</td>
<td>2,500</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>46 - Utilities</td>
<td>1,065</td>
<td>1,033</td>
<td>2,699</td>
<td>963</td>
<td>4,200</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Revenues Over (Under) Expenditures</td>
<td>(205,890)</td>
<td>(270,797)</td>
<td>(302,651)</td>
<td>(307,160)</td>
<td>(316,964)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cost Recovery</td>
<td>5.39%</td>
<td>11.00%</td>
<td>6.56%</td>
<td>7.47%</td>
<td>7.65%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Figure 41 - External Special Events Revenues, Expenditures and Cost Recovery*

The City has a special event committee that reviews outside organization events for logistics and safety to minimize the impact to the City during these events. This cost center is the committee’s expenses to review and communicate particulars about the events. This proactive approach by the City, along with tracking the expenditures are considered best practices in municipal parks and recreation.
5.2.3 STAFFING
Staffing, shown in Figure 42, demonstrates consistent strength to operate and maintain facilities. The staffing has increased 20% over the study period.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Staffing</th>
<th>Actual</th>
<th>Actual</th>
<th>Actual</th>
<th>Actual</th>
<th>Actual</th>
<th>Budget</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Year-end Fulltime Positions</td>
<td>71</td>
<td>72</td>
<td>76</td>
<td>74</td>
<td>75</td>
<td>77</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Part-time FTE’s</td>
<td>116</td>
<td>109</td>
<td>121</td>
<td>133</td>
<td>132</td>
<td>147</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total FTE’s</td>
<td>187</td>
<td>181</td>
<td>197</td>
<td>207</td>
<td>207</td>
<td>224</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Nationally, municipal park operations have experienced a significant decrease in personnel due to economic conditions. Many departments are finally increasing capacity to properly maintain the system now that economic conditions have improved. The Sioux Falls Parks and Recreation Department has been regaining capacity as well. The Department is heavily reliant upon part-time and seasonal staff.

Additional context can be provided by looking at the benchmark on FTEs per 10,000 residents. In the Benchmark chapter, the Department has 12.28 FTEs per 10,000 which is below the average of 17.17 FTEs per 10,000 from the peer departments. The Department should set a goal to increase FTEs over the next five years to properly maintain the system in a sustainable manner. This is especially important as the Department continues to add trails, programs, and assets to park properties. Properly maintained staffing levels where key functions add sustainability to the system is important to bring all assets to their full lifecycle.

5.2.4 AMENITIES
Amenities, shown in Figure 43, demonstrates a growth in facilities and acres maintained.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Amenities</th>
<th>2014</th>
<th>2015</th>
<th>2016</th>
<th>2017</th>
<th>2018</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Park Acres Maintained</td>
<td>2,458</td>
<td>2,470</td>
<td>2,470</td>
<td>2,470</td>
<td>2,470</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Outdoor Aquatic Facilities</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Indoor Aquatic Facilities</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Community Centers</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Nationally, municipal park systems are having difficulty funding the existing amenities. The City and the Department demonstrate a commitment to parks increasing amenities.
5.2.5 CAPITAL IMPROVEMENT PLANNING

The City has demonstrated a commitment to the Department’s facilities and infrastructure through substantial investments in the Parks and Recreation system as shown in Figure 44. More recently the City has amended the Capital Improvement Plan to have a greater focus on infrastructure throughout the City.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Land</td>
<td>$296,070</td>
<td>$314,228</td>
<td>$203,131</td>
<td>$355,048</td>
<td>$200,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Buildings</td>
<td>8,543,663</td>
<td>13,670,207</td>
<td>1,466,659</td>
<td>147,430</td>
<td>438,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Improvements Other Than</td>
<td>4,652,504</td>
<td>4,239,756</td>
<td>4,093,412</td>
<td>6,226,140</td>
<td>4,707,500</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Buildings</td>
<td>1,434,430</td>
<td>909,683</td>
<td>632,388</td>
<td>1,547,681</td>
<td>694,300</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total Capital Expenditures</td>
<td>$14,926,667</td>
<td>$19,133,874</td>
<td>$6,395,590</td>
<td>$8,276,300</td>
<td>$6,039,800</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Anticipated capital expenditures are shown in Figure 45. The City proposes to fund the capital plan from Sales and Use Taxes.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Capital Program</th>
<th>2019</th>
<th>2020</th>
<th>2021</th>
<th>2022</th>
<th>2023</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Capital Improvements Program</td>
<td>$5,345,500</td>
<td>$4,053,500</td>
<td>$4,149,000</td>
<td>$3,714,000</td>
<td>$5,920,000</td>
<td>$23,182,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other Capital Equipment Program</td>
<td>694,300</td>
<td>1,025,000</td>
<td>911,700</td>
<td>1,139,000</td>
<td>1,542,836</td>
<td>5,312,836</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total Capital Program</td>
<td>$6,039,800</td>
<td>$5,078,500</td>
<td>$5,060,700</td>
<td>$4,853,000</td>
<td>$7,462,836</td>
<td>$28,494,836</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

5.2.6 FINANCIAL ASSESSMENT SUMMARY

The Department’s cost recovery is significantly less than similar agencies based on the Benchmark of peer departments. In the Benchmark Chapter, it shows the Department at 23% which is below the average of 27% of all benchmarked departments. This is due in part to SFPR managing the services under a philosophy of minimal fees and charges.

It is recommended that the Department consider the establishment of Department financial policies and specific overall cost recovery goals for each facility and core program area.

FINANCIAL POLICIES

The Department should consider adopting financial policies including:

- Cost Recovery Goals that are attainable including criteria for setting future goals
- Donation Policy: Donations, Promotions, Gifts and Bequests that outline City guidelines and emphasize Department priorities
- Grant Policy with review of requirements
- Establish a Fees and Charges Policy that provides guidelines on pricing philosophy and direction on determining future fees and charges that empower the staff to analyze and recommend fees based on the cost of service for the City Council to approve
COST RECOVERY POLICIES
Cost Recovery Policies will enhance the City Financial Policies for programs and services that are not set at full cost recovery by City Financial Policies. Fees and Charges policies define the process for setting fees and charges based on criteria related to public and private benefits. The policy may also establish non-resident and member pricing structures.

The Cost Recovery guidelines provide priorities for price setting and general categories for cost recovery.

DONATION POLICY
A Donation Policy provides the Department with a framework for making donations from the Department. The policy provides guidelines for the promotion of the facilities. General guidelines include framework for gifts and bequests, passes and certificates, exchange for services or goods to the Department.

GRANT POLICY
A Grant Policy provides the Department with a framework review of requirements, application and implementation of grants.

PARTNERSHIP AND SPONSORSHIP POLICY
A Partnership and Sponsorship Policy establishes criteria for participation and the process for implementing partnerships and sponsorships.
5.3 FUNDING AND REVENUE STRATEGIES

The City has established a diversified approach to funding the system development and operations. This means the City has established dedicated funding sources and temporary (one-time) funding sources for the Department. The funding strategy analysis looked at following funding sources in two categories. **Section 5.3.1** identifies funding sources the City either currently implements or has implemented, as needed. **Section 5.3.2** identifies funding sources the City should consider in supporting the recommendations outlined in the Sioux Falls Comprehensive Parks and Recreation System Plan. This list is intended to serve as a resource to fit a variety of projects, operational needs, or partner-specific initiatives as well as provide inspiration in considering other strategies beyond these suggestions.

### 5.3.1 CURRENTLY IMPLEMENTING / AS NEEDED

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>External Funding Sources</th>
<th>Uses</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Corporate Sponsorship</td>
<td>Corporations invest in the development or enhancement of new or existing facilities. Sponsorships are also highly used for programs and events.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Partnerships</td>
<td>Joint development funding sources or operational funding sources between two separate agencies, such as two government entities, a non-profit and a governmental entity, or a private business and a governmental entity.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Conservancies</td>
<td>These are organized fund raising and operational groups who raise money for individual signature parks and or attractions such as zoo’s or regional parks.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Friends Groups</td>
<td>Raise money typically for a single focus purpose that could include a park facility or program that will better the community as a whole and their special interest.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Volunteerism</td>
<td>This revenue source is an indirect revenue source in that persons donate time to assist the organization in providing a product or service on an hourly basis.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Private Donations</td>
<td>Private Donations may also be received in the form of funds, land, facilities, recreation equipment, art or in-kind services.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Irrevocable Remainder Trusts</td>
<td>These trusts are set up with individuals who typically leave a portion of their wealth to the City in a trust fund that allows the fund to grow over a period of time and then is available for the City to use.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Special Fundraisers</td>
<td>Many park and recreation agencies have special fundraisers on an annual basis to help cover specific programs and capital projects.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### User Fees

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Fees and Charges</th>
<th>Uses</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Fees and Charges</td>
<td>This could include daily fees for access to public owned facilities and parks.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Permits (Special Use Permits)</td>
<td>These special permits allow individuals to use specific park property for financial gain.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Reservations</td>
<td>This revenue source comes from the right to reserve specific public property for a set amount of time.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Equipment Rentals</td>
<td>The revenue source is available on the rental of equipment such as mobile stage, bleachers, tables, chairs, tents, stages, bicycles, roller blades, kayaks, boats etc. that are used for recreation purposes.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Admissions / Ticket Sales</td>
<td>This revenue source is on accessing facilities for self-directed activities such as pools, ice skating rinks, ballparks and entertainment facilities.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Grants

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Grants</th>
<th>Uses</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Land &amp; Water Conservation Fund</td>
<td>The funds come from the Federal Government that is received for drilling rights off the cost of the United States. Up to 50 percent reimbursement for outdoor recreation projects.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Recreational Trails Program</td>
<td>For development of urban trail linkages, trail head and trailside facilities.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NRPA Grant &amp; Funding Resources</td>
<td>The National Recreation and Park Association (NRPA) periodically posts information about grant and fundraising opportunities that are available for park and recreation agencies.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Local Nonprofit Foundation Grants</td>
<td>These nonprofit foundations raise money through community foundations for parks and help support local park foundations on a local and regional level.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Land Trust</td>
<td>Fund the cost for acquiring land that needs to be preserved and protected for greenway purposes.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Taxes

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Taxes</th>
<th>Uses</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Property Tax</td>
<td>Property tax is paid to the State and the redistributed to the City.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Special Improvement District</td>
<td>Taxing districts established to provide funds for certain types of improvements that benefit a specific group of affected properties.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sales Tax</td>
<td>This tax is very popular in high traffic tourism type cities and with county and state parks.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Food &amp; Beverage Tax</td>
<td>The City currently implements this funding strategy for entertainment type venues.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Public Improvement District</td>
<td>This taxing district provides funds especially for the operation and maintenance of public amenities such as parks and major boulevards.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Franchises &amp; Licenses</td>
<td>Uses</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-------------------------------</td>
<td>----------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pouring Rights</td>
<td>Private soft drink companies that execute agreements with organizations for exclusive pouring rights within facilities.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Concession Management</td>
<td>City either contracts for the service or receives a set amount of the gross percentage or the full revenue dollars that incorporates a profit after expenses.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Private Concessionaires</td>
<td>Contract with a private business to provide and operate desirable recreational activities financed, constructed and operated by the private sector.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Greenway Utility</td>
<td>Greenway utilities are used to finance acquisition of greenways and development of the greenways by selling the development rights underground for the fiber optic types of businesses.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Naming Rights</td>
<td>Selling the naming rights for new buildings or renovation of existing buildings and parks for the development cost associated with the improvement.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Easements</td>
<td>City allows utility companies, businesses or individuals to develop some type of an improvement above ground or below ground on their property for a set period of time and a set dollar amount to be received by the City on an annual basis.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Land Leases</td>
<td>Leased space from City-owned land through a subordinate lease that pays out a set dollar amount plus a percentage of gross dollars for recreation enhancements.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Advertising Sales</td>
<td>Sale of tasteful and appropriate advertising on park and recreation related items such as in an organization’s print materials, on scoreboards, dasher boards and other visible products or services.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Inter-Local Agreements</td>
<td>Contractual relationships entered into between two or more local units of government and/or between a local unit of government and a non-profit organization for the joint usage/development.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### 5.3.2 Explore Feasibility

#### City to Explore Feasibility

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>External Funding Sources</th>
<th>Uses</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Foundation / Gifts</td>
<td>They offer a variety of means to fund capital projects, including capital campaigns, gifts catalogs, fundraisers, endowments, sales of items, etc. The City does not have a park foundation.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Capital Funding Sources</th>
<th>Uses</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Capital Fees</td>
<td>Capital fees are added to the cost of revenue producing facilities such as golf courses, pools, recreation centers, hospitality centers and sports complexes and are lifted off after the improvement is paid off.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Impact Fees / Retail Impact Fees</th>
<th>Uses</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>These fees are on top of the set user rate for accessing facilities such as golf courses, recreation centers and pool facilities to support capital improvements that benefit the user of the facility. Retail Impact fees are based on retail development like hotels on parks system land.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Development / Redevelopment Fees</th>
<th>Uses</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>These fees are assessed for the development of residential properties with the proceeds to be used for parks and recreation purposes, such as open space acquisitions, community park site development, neighborhood park development, regional park acquisition and development, etc.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>User Fees</th>
<th>Uses</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Recreation Service Fees</td>
<td>This is a dedicated user fee, which can be established by a local ordinance or other government procedures for the purpose of constructing and maintaining recreation facilities.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Grants</th>
<th>Uses</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Deadwood Funding Grant</td>
<td>Funded by a portion of the gambling revenue generated in Deadwood, South Dakota. Grants ranging from $1,000 to $25,000 given to projects that retain, restore, or rehabilitate historic buildings, structures, and archaeology sites in South Dakota for commercial, residential, or public purposes.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Partnership Enhancement Monetary Grant Program</th>
<th>Uses</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Funds are available for projects which promote public awareness in support of tree planting, maintenance, management, protection and cultivation of trees in rural, community and urban settings.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Franchises &amp; Licenses</th>
<th>Uses</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Catering Permits &amp; Services</td>
<td>This is a license to allow caterers to work in the park system on a permit basis with a set fee or a percentage of food sales returning to the City.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
5.4 PRICING POLICY

Sioux Falls is one of 172 CAPRA Accredited Departments in the Nation and the only one in the State of South Dakota. This defines each department as one who embraces best practices with documented plans, policies and procedures. It also supports a culture of “next practices,” meaning they do not wait for direction, they set the direction to continue building in sustainability and operations.

Sioux Falls Parks and Recreation (SFPR) should consider an updated pricing policy in order to allow its facilities and programs to continue to grow and remain financially sustainable in the future. The policy allows staff to recommend fees and charges and set cost recovery targets guided by the policy to help benefit the residents of Sioux Falls. The recommended amendments to fees and charges will require Parks and Recreation Board and City Council approval before adoption. The following are driving the recommendation for pricing services:

- To achieve better earned income, consistency in financial management, and accountability with the use of Parks and Recreation Department dollars and user fees.
- To establish a basis of fees and rationale for the pricing structure.
- To ensure both Sioux Falls citizens and staff are aware of all associated costs and how the pricing structure is set.
- To demonstrate consistency, structure, and uniformity throughout the parks system.
- To promote transparency when setting prices and delivery services.
- To provide justification for future price increases.
- To become more efficient in managing parks, facilities, and programs that can provide better services and remain sustainable.
- To implement a methodology to serve SFPR in meeting cost recovery goals for program services.

5.4.1 PROCESS USED TO DEVELOP THE SIOUX FALLS PARKS AND RECREATION COST RECOVERY MODEL AND DEPARTMENT ACTIONS MOVING FORWARD

- A Classification of Service prepared with Parks and Recreation Staff on what is considered core essential, important, and value-added programs provided was included in the Master Plan for the Parks and Recreation system.
- SFPR budget data was used as the initial basis for the cost of service and pricing model.
- Community input including statistically significant community survey analysis.
- Anticipated City needs for the near future and the impact to funding for parks and recreation priorities.
- SFPR staff will assign cost recovery percentages in each of the Pricing Tiers based on true cost of services once established.
- SFPR staff placed each program and service within a tier based on the cost to provide the service and the level of benefit the user received above a general taxpayer.
- Each program and service provided will be assigned a total cost to operate based on actual costs provided by a cost recovery software system established for the Department.
  - Examples of cost recovery software include: custom excel workbook, ePrep Solutions Pass™Lite App, Amilia Cost Recovery Tool, etc.
- Contractor percentage for teaching programs will be adjusted to achieve the cost recovery goal desired and will vary based on that goal.

Historically, SFPR has been in the forefront of equitable access with affordable facilities and programs. Minimal increases in pricing have happened over the years, but by in large the numbers have remained mostly unchanged despite the fact that operational costs
have increased annually. The Department has a cost recovery of twenty-six percent (26%) at its highest. The challenge is that low
to no fees and charges for programming and facilities impacts perceived value and participation rates begin to decline, decreasing
the services impact.

SFPR has a priority list of infrastructure needs and has identified greater earned income will be required to continue meeting the
needs of the community and sustain the level of service moving forward. Looking at the challenge as an opportunity, the planning
team developed questions to understand the public’s perspective on the use of taxes versus user fee support for programs and
services as part of the statistically valid sample survey. The survey results have been factored into the analysis of the current
pricing structure and demonstrate the community’s mix of support, as described below:

5.4.2 COMMUNITY SURVEY RESULTS (TAXES VS. FEES) INTO COST RECOVERY
From the survey results, the following direct cost recovery was identified by households that responded to the statistically valid
survey. Cost recovery is what respondents to the survey believe should be covered through fees and charges.

- Programs for special populations/disabled: 0-30% of the direct costs
- Programs for low income residents: 0-35% of the direct costs
- Learn to swim programs: 10-50% of the direct costs
- Youth sports programs: 40-60% of the direct costs
- Youth classes (art, dance, etc.): 40-60% of the direct costs
- Youth camps: 50-70% of the direct costs
- Senior adult classes: 50-70% of the direct costs
- Special Events & festivals: 60-80% of direct costs
- Field rentals for youth sports tournaments: 60-80% of the total costs
- Adult sports programs: 70-90% of total costs
- Adult classes (exercise, arts, dance, etc.): 70-90% of direct costs
- Field rentals for adult sports tournaments: 80-100% of total costs
5.4.3 BRIEF HISTORY OF PRICING IN SIoux FALLS

The City has a fee ordinance that has to be updated in order for the Department to increase pricing. A more detailed analysis of amendments can be found in the Appendix. The brief history of the amended ordinance follows:

- **1996** — In ordinance 29-96 the City amended the fees with Aquatics, ice skate rental, league/tournament fees (City sponsored), maintenance fees (baseball), Downtown Recreation Center rental rates, Kenny Anderson Community Center rental rates, and miscellaneous recreation program fees (tennis, senior games, summer youth band, and concession permits).
- **1996** — In ordinance 61-96 the City revised the park fees of section 27-41 to include a maintenance fee for softball teams and added weekend field fees.
- **1997** — In ordinance 27-97 The City amended section 24-71 to include aquatic fees. These fees also included reduced-income fees to allow access to those who may need assistance in order to participate in use of aquatic facilities. Fees included; Daily admission at $2 for youth and seniors and $3 for adults, season passes for youth and senior $20, season passes for adults $30, season passes for families at $70, swim lessons for ages 3-6 at $12, and swim lessons for ages six and over at $20.
- **1999** — In ordinance 45-99 the City set the summer youth chorus fee at $25.
- **2000** — In ordinance 16-00 the City revised fees for aquatics to include Terrace and Laurel Oak Aquatic Centers, decreased child admission at all other pools to $1, decreased seasonal passes for certain levels (Child $10, Family $50, Reduced-income Family $25), and decreased swim lesson prices to ages three to six $10 and ages six and over $15.
- **2001** — In ordinance 105-01 the City amended to include pricing for City sponsored leagues/tournaments at specific facilities, non-City sponsored leagues/tournaments, free aquatics passes for families with a Dakota EBT card, and other miscellaneous recreation program fees minimally.
- **2007** — In ordinance 26-07 the City revised the fees to include infants being free at aquatic centers, adult kickball, youth/high school 3-on-3 basketball league, athletics/camps at community centers, defined games and practice field rentals, and added sports photography permits. No other fees were amended.
- **2010** — In ordinance 24-10 the City defined aquatic centers, pools, wading pools and spray park and made admission free to wading pools and spray parks and added a dodgeball league fee.
- **2010** — In ordinance 57-10 the City increased fees by one dollar on senior and adult aquatic daily admission, increased season passes (Child $5, Senior $10, Adult $15, Family $20), and added picnic shelter reservations at $25 each.
- **2011** — In ordinance 43-11 the City amended fees to include Child daily admissions to pools and aquatic centers, increased youth band and chorus by $5, increased reduced-income pricing, increased swim lessons by $5, increased adult volleyball tournament by $10, increased meeting rooms by $5, added wedding location reservation and bandstand reservations for Terrace and McKennan.
- **2014** — In ordinance 52-14 the City added Sioux Falls Ice & Rec Center pricing of $160 /hour for ice rental, child/senior open skate $4, adult open skate $6, rental skates $3.
- **2015** — In ordinance 98-15 the City invested time into restructuring the fees and charges including any increases for 2016, 2017, and 2018. In addition, definitions to the language were updated. This was due to Midco® being added to the system. Other changes included adding Midco® operations costs and developing seasonal and year-round aquatics passes with fees. Seasonal swim passes increased from $5-$30 dollars over the three-year period the ordinance addressed. These were the most significant increases since 1995.
5.4.4 PROGRAM PRICING MODEL

This model is made of six tiers tied to the classification of services by who benefits from the City providing the service. Lower cost recovery levels are for programs and services where the community benefits or benefits most (Essential Services Classification). In the middle is a mix of benefit between the community and the individual (Important Services Classification) and higher cost recovery is where the individual benefits most (Value-Added Services Classification).

5.4.5 PRICING POLICY RECOMMENDATIONS

- SFPR should consider a set variable rates for resident and non-residents rates as appropriate.
- SFPR should consider the establishment of a true cost of service that determines direct and indirect costs that then is used for setting the value of each price of service to achieve the cost recovery goal.
- As part of the policy, the department should include the option to raise prices automatically without Parks and Recreation Board and City Council approval 3-5% annually based on inflation factors associated with each program such as staff costs, maintenance costs, utility costs, supply costs, instructor costs, rental fees for other facilities the department uses to provide programs in on a seasonal basis.
5.5 CAPITAL IMPROVEMENT PLAN

5.5.1 INTRODUCTION

The Capital Improvement Plan (CIP) is a five-year projection of planned physical improvements to the park system. The current 2020 to 2024 CIP provides revenue projections and a “blueprint” for spending priorities to support the desired outcomes of the City of Sioux Falls Comprehensive Parks & Recreation System Plan.

One of the core functions of the Parks and Recreation Board and the SFPR administration team is to preserve and protect existing park system assets. The CIP strives to provide necessary funding through the annual budget process for the ongoing capital maintenance or replacement of existing assets before allocating funds for new parks and recreation facilities.

Public input is integral to the success of SFPR. The public has ongoing opportunities for input on capital improvements through the planning process for this Master Plan, park-specific site plans prepared before renovation or development occurs, with public input at monthly park board meetings, and annual budget approvals by the City Council.

The CIP should be viewed as a working document, updated annually to reflect projected revenue collections, refined cost projections, potential changes in community or park system needs, shifts in overall City priorities and other unique opportunities. Opportunities for new revenue sources and/or partnerships to help share costs will need to be explored in order to support new capital and visionary development.

BEST PRACTICES FOR CAPITAL PLANNING

Best Practice #1 — 3% to 4% of Total Assets Invested Annually in Projects

As of 2019, the total Sioux Falls Park System Asset Valuation (less land & equipment) is approximately $240,000,000. Best Practice guidelines are that 3-4% of total assets should be annually budgeted in capital investment projects. A $240,000,000 asset valuation would equate to a yearly investments budget of approximately $7,200,000 to $9,600,000 annually.

Best Practice #2 — 60/20/20 Funding Levels

Over a 5 to 10-year CIP planning period, the following recommendations for proposed improvements should be used as a guide for allocating CIP funding. The following percentages may vary during specific funding year(s) and are based on a fixed system that is not experiencing significant growth. The 60/20/20 metric serves as a good reference marker, but a growing community like Sioux Falls will see more volatility of the funding percentages over the life of the CIP as new growth of the community is accounted for.

- 60% of total funding - Capital Reinvestment Projects (±$4,320,000 to $5,760,000 annually).
- 20% of total funding - New Investment Projects (±$1,440,000 to $1,920,000 annually).
- 20% of total funding - Visionary Projects (±$1,440,000 to $1,920,000 annually).
- 100% Best Practice 60/20/20 funding over a 1 Year CIP Budget: ±$7,200,000 to $9,600,000.
- 100% Best Practice 60/20/20 funding over a 10 Year CIP Budget: ±$72,000,000 to $96,000,000.

5.5.2 CAPITAL IMPROVEMENTS

For the purpose of this CIP, capital improvements are defined as projects that have a monetary value of at least $7,500 and have an estimated life of greater than one year to serve the park and recreation needs of our community. Examples of capital improvements include construction, major remodeling, equipment replacements, purchase of parkland, park fixtures and buildings. Planning efforts associated with capital improvements, including architectural, engineering, and legal services, are also considered capital expenditures and incorporated within the CIP.
It is important to note that the CIP needs to be examined over multiple years to analyze consistency to suggested best practices because overall City of Sioux Falls priorities across departments can shift the use of sales tax revenues.

Proposed capital improvements within this CIP are divided within three classifications:

**A. Capital Reinvestment:** The improvement or replacement of existing park assets and any related planning efforts. Capital Reinvestment is required to preserve the usefulness and extend the life of existing park assets and may be the result of capital replacement plans or unexpected, emergency needs. Capital Reinvestment for the current 2020 to 2024, 5-year planning period are projected at $13.4 million in sales tax dollars.

**B. New Investment:** The purchase and/or development of new parks, recreation facilities, and/or equipment. New Investments are typically identified and designed through an extensive planning process with input from many stakeholders, including the community, user groups, elected officials, other governmental entities, partners, staff, and the Parks & Recreation Board. There is a projected need for $7.2 million in sales tax dollars in New Investments during the 5-year planning period.

**C. Visionary Investment:** The purchase and/or development of “visionary” new community parks, recreation facilities, and/or equipment. Recent examples include Midco® Aquatic Center and Downtown River Greenway projects. There is a Visionary Project planned in the 5-year CIP planning window for the Downtown River Greenway. A visionary project may only occur once every 5 to 10 years.

**PRIORITIZATION OF CAPITAL IMPROVEMENTS**

Continued investment in the park system is critical to providing quality parks and recreation experiences for the residents of Sioux Falls. Since funding for capital improvements is finite, projects are prioritized based on the following best practices, criteria and subject to the permitted uses of available funding.

**All Improvements:** All capital improvements support the goals, objectives and community needs of the most current Parks and Recreation System Plan as approved or amended by the Parks and Recreation Board and City Council.

**Priority 1 – “Capital Reinvestment Projects”**

Capital Reinvestment needs of existing parks and recreation facilities or equipment. Residents and community leaders consistently place a high priority on maintaining existing assets. This was validated by the 2019 Community Interest and Opinion Survey, in which 77% to 87% of respondents supported improvements to existing neighborhood parks, trails, improvements to existing community parks and improvements to existing nature preserves. Typically, Capital Reinvestment projects are paid for by sales tax funding sources.

**Priority 2 – “New Investment Projects”**

New Investments in park assets as the community grows is also important to the public. Projects such as the development of new trails that connect to existing ones, new program features within existing parks and acquiring new parkland was supported by over 70% of the public.

**Priority 3 – “Visionary Projects”**

Projects such as the Downtown River Greenway and the Midco Aquatic Center that help enhance the community’s quality of life and add new recreation experiences also remain strong in public polling with over 50% support.
HISTORICAL FUNDING SUMMARY FOR CAPITAL IMPROVEMENTS (2010-2019)

Funding in this 2010-2019 summary consists of sales tax, private contributions and bond proceeds. Parks and recreation investment compared to asset value during this period ranged from 1.8% to 7.6%. The average annual spending compared to asset value over the 10-year period is 3.6% or $8,500,000.

**Level One “Capital Reinvestment Projects”** over the 2010-2019 CIP period the department has invested $36.4 Million on renovation and upgrades to existing facilities including zoo renovations, ballfield reconstruction, trail reconstruction and cyclical playground replacement.

**Level Two “New Investment Projects”** over the 2010-2019 CIP period the department has invested $23.3 Million on new parks, trails, zoo exhibits and land acquisition.

**Level Three “Visionary Investment Projects”** over the 2010-2019 CIP period the department has invested $30 Million on new visionary community projects such as the Midco® Aquatics Center, Downtown River Greenway and the Levitt Shell.

The chart below breaks out the percentage of capital improvements by level from 2010-2019.
The chart below details the capital improvements broken out by capital reinvestment, new investment, and visionary for each year from 2010-2019.

### 5.5.3 FUNDING SOURCES FOR CAPITAL IMPROVEMENTS

The following is a summary of current and historical funding sources used by or available to Sioux Falls Parks & Recreation to pay for capital improvements within the park system.

#### SALES TAX

The largest revenue source for capital investment is the second penny sales and use tax, there is an anticipated $284 Million to invest in city-wide capital assets after debt service for the 2020-2024 CIP. This program anticipates sales and use tax growth rate of 4% in 2020 and 5% in subsequent years. As in past years, the City will adjust these figures in future years as needed, based on economic changes. From 2010 to 2019, Sioux Falls Parks & Recreation received 9% to 11% of the total CIP each year, resulting in $4 to $7 Million. Sales tax funding is allocated towards improvements, equipment and debt service on past bonds.

Allocation of 2020-2024 CIP sales tax funding breaks out as follows:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Investment Type</th>
<th>2020-2024 CIP Summary (Sales Tax Only)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Level One - Capital Reinvestment</td>
<td>$13,392,500.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Level Two - New Investments</td>
<td>$7,222,000.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Level Three - Visionary Projects</td>
<td>$0.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total Five Year Investment:</td>
<td>$20,614,500.00</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
BONDING
While much of the park system has been built by the City on a "pay as you go" basis using existing cash on hand to fund capital improvements, the City has periodically issued bonds that directly impact the park system. In these instances, the City used bond proceeds to fund capital improvements such as the Sanford Sports Complex, Drake Springs Aquatic Center and Harmodon Park to name a few.

PARKS FOUNDATION
A Parks Foundation has the potential to be a significant source of revenue for capital improvements in the future, helping complement other funding sources and providing additional avenues for securing bequests, donations, grants, naming rights and similar alternative funding mechanisms. Establishment of a Park Foundation should be a top priority for the department to help offset the cost of larger visionary projects. Examples of regional Park Foundations include the Rapid City Parks Foundation, Fargo Parks Foundation and Omaha Parks Foundation.

GIFTS, DONATIONS, SPONSORSHIPS, & GRANTS
While there is not a Sioux Falls Parks Foundation, the Sioux Falls Community Foundation is a growing organization funded by gifts, donations, sponsorships, and grants received from individuals or organizations. The person or entity providing the funds often restricts its use for specific projects or purposes. Many visionary park projects have benefited from these gifts, including the Downtown River Greenway, MJW Arboretum, Zoo Master Plan Improvements and the planned Kirby Dog Park at Fort Sod.

The Sioux Falls community has been very generous in the past and finding support to build a new project is often the easiest part. Securing additional dollars for repair, maintenance and eventual rehabilitation is more difficult. In years when funding for park capital projects is tight, the City has focused on maintaining existing assets rather than funding new construction.
5.5.4 HOW THE MASTER PLAN KEY PLAN FINDINGS ARE BEING ADDRESSED BY THE CURRENT 2020 TO 2024 CIP

**Equitable Access to Parks & Facilities**
Equitable access to parks and facilities over the 2020 to 2024 CIP will have over $5.7 Million budgeted for improvements that include cyclical play court and playground replacements, trail access/reconstruction projects and park land acquisition.

**Maintaining & Growing Infrastructure**
Maintaining and growing park infrastructure over the 2020 to 2024 CIP will have over $10.9 Million budgeted for improvements that include new restrooms, ballfield repairs, roads and parking lots, irrigation repairs and park maintenance facilities.

**Year-Round Programming**
Year-round park infrastructure improvements over the 2020 to 2024 CIP will have over $12.4 Million budgeted for improvements that include new paved bike trails, greenway development and internal trail reconstruction projects.

The chart below details how the 2020-2024 capital improvements address each of the plan’s themes.
5.5.5 CIP PLANNING RECOMMENDATIONS THAT SHOULD BE CONSIDERED

These recommendations are not currently in the 5-year CIP. The proposed recommendations should be prioritized and spread throughout the CIP accordingly.

1. **Equitable Access to Parks & Facilities:**
   a. Neighborhood Parks (#1 for public support) - Neighborhood Park Improvements.
   b. Neighborhood Parks (#1 for public support) - Continue land acquisition for new park and trail development.

2. **Maintaining & Growing Infrastructure:**
   a. Community Park Improvements (#4 & #7 for public support) - Frank Olson Pool Replacement.
   b. Neighborhood Parks (#1 for public support) - Look to program additional elements in community parks that also serve neighborhood functions.

3. **Year-Round Programming:**
   a. Community Park Improvements (#4 & #8 for public support) — Indoor Recreation Space Feasibility Planning.
   b. Community Park Improvements (#16 for public support) — Ice Rink Replacement Planning.

4. **Financing A Parks System of Excellence:**
   a. Advancing development of a Sioux Falls Parks Foundation.

**SUMMARY OF POTENTIAL ACTIONS FOR PUBLIC SUPPORT**

Q14. Potential actions indicated in Q13. respondents would be most willing to support.

(by percentage of respondents who selected the items as one of their top four choices)

- Improve existing small neighborhood parks: 35%
- Improve existing paved walking & biking trails: 26%
- Improve existing large community parks: 16%
- Improve existing nature preserves: 16%
- Acquire new park land: 13%
- Improve existing swimming pools: 12%
- Develop new indoor recreation centers: 12%
- Develop new dog parks: 11%
- Improve existing nature centers: 10%
- Improve existing youth sports fields: 8%
- Develop new splash parks: 8%
- Replace aging outdoor swimming pools: 6%
- Develop new outdoor swimming pools: 5%
- Improve existing golf courses: 4%
- Develop outdoor refrigerated ice rinks: 4%
- Improve existing community centers: 3%
- Improve existing adult sports fields: 2%
- Develop new youth sports fields: 2%
- Improve existing tennis court facilities: 1%
- Other: 4%

- 1st Choice
- 2nd Choice
- 3rd Choice
5.5.6 CIP CONCLUSION

SFPR has historically done a great job of maintaining its assets as well as adding visionary projects to the system that are desired by residents. SFPR will need to continue to invest in the system to take into account the growth of the City, while also maintaining current assets. As there are some deferred capital reinvestment projects, SFPR will need take all appropriate measures to extend the life of existing assets in an effort to mitigate the impact as the assets reach their useful lifecycle.

Some critical funding decisions will need to be made by community leaders that will have a significant impact on both the current planning period and long-term future of the park system. While the capital funding sources anticipated during the current 5-year planning period remain significant, there are identified projects in this plan expected to be unfunded. New funding options, such as the creation of a Parks Foundation, must be considered and implemented during this planning period to avoid a capital funding deficit in the future.
CHAPTER SIX — ACTION PLAN

Based on community feedback, stakeholder input, technical analysis, and the priority rankings outlined within this System Plan, the following key recommendations were developed to enhance the park and recreation system and position it to best serve the current and future needs of the community. The full Action Plan can be found in the Appendix.

6.1 VISION

The following vision presents how Sioux Falls Parks and Recreation desires to be viewed in the future:

“To provide a comprehensive mix of high-quality parks and recreation programs, facilities, and services that contribute to a quality of life that is unparalleled in the region.”

6.2 MISSION

The following is the mission for how Sioux Falls Parks and Recreation will implement the vision:

“To enhance the quality of life by providing safe and enjoyable experiences through people, programs, places, and partnerships.”

6.3 RECOMMENDATIONS

6.3.1 PARK LAND

The direction for park land is to achieve a half-mile access strategy to equitably distribute parks and update with trending amenities that meet the needs of the community.

GOAL 1

Update existing neighborhood parks where needed and develop new neighborhood parks in underserved areas of the City to achieve an equitable level of service for neighborhood parks across the City.

STRATEGIES & TACTICS

- Develop new neighborhood parks in areas of the City not currently served by a park, in any classification, within one half of a mile. Use the equity mapping to identify best location.
  - Determine where a neighborhood park is lacking based on access and density maps used as part of the System Plan process and prioritize where the next park gets developed.
  - Consider creating and tracking the development cost and operational cost of a neighborhood park to support a future developer impact fee ordinance for new parks as part of planned new developments as part of a growth plan for the City.
  - Determine what new parks amenities cost to buy and construct and update every three years.
- In areas not served by a neighborhood park, but served by a park of a different classification, ensure neighborhood park experiences are provided. If lacking, add amenities to provide those experiences at the existing park.
  - Evaluate the existing amenities at the parks serving as neighborhood parks and ensure experiences are being provided equitably. If neighborhood park experiences are lacking, add amenities at the existing park to efficiently meet the need.
GOAL 2
Continue the initiative of a half of a mile strategy connecting citizens to parks or trails.

STRATEGIES & TACTICS

• Work towards establishing trail connections to parks through bike trails, sidewalks, bike boulevards, bike routes, and bike lanes, where appropriate.
  o Evaluate existing bike lanes, sidewalks and right-a-ways in the City that are in place now that can serve as a trail or bike lane as part of the Bicycle plan.
  o Develop criteria where the highest area of population receives priority for connections to spine trails.
  o Determine design standards for bike trails, bike lanes, and sidewalks that youth would be comfortable on as well as parents of youth.

• Work with developers to establish agreements for parks and trail development and connectivity along their development project.
  o Meet with developers to discuss trail connections out of their developments consistent with the City’s Bicycle Plan, their design standards and guidelines desired and the City’s priorities for additions.
  o Determine if the City can provide credits back to the developer for adding trails from their development to a spine trail.
  o Ensure minimum standard details exist to strengthen negotiations with developers on quality of life infrastructure for parks and trails.
  o Discuss the option with commercial developers to TIF trail development and their support for it where appropriate.
6.3.2 PARK AND FACILITY MANAGEMENT
The direction for park and facility management is to maintain the variety of recreation facilities that provide equity in distribution and adequate spaces for current recreational needs and as the community continues to grow.

GOAL 3
Analyze the current indoor recreation space offerings to determine if there is a more efficient strategy to address the indoor recreation space needs identified in the community survey.

STRATEGIES & TACTICS
- Assess the current community center model to determine if these centers meet community needs. Based on the statistically-valid survey, the community desires additional indoor programming space, which may not be met based on the current model.
  - Meet with school officials to determine the highest and best use of these centers. This may include a hybrid solution between the schools, parks and recreation and non-profit organizations.
  - Evaluate the school sites to determine if the current facilities could meet wider age segment needs based on what the community desires in indoor space.
  - Launch a strategic planning process to assess the current community center model to determine the best model moving forward considering the current subsidy and benefit to the community. Plan should address wider age segment and current time constraints as expressed by the community in the survey results.
GOAL 4
Implement a strategy for aquatics that manages costs and refreshes aging facilities with current uses combined with new trends in aquatic design.

STRATEGIES & TACTICS

• Replace Frank Olson Pool, Kuehn Pool, and McKennan Wading Pool with facilities of similar size in the existing parks with updated facilities that meet current ADA and industry standards.
  o Develop a new park Master Plan for each of these parks to maximize use of space already owned by department.
  o Determine the cost and funding options to finance the development of the park and pool.
  o Develop a business plan for the pool and park to maximize the operational efficiency.
  o Develop an updated program plan for the pool to maximize its usage to all residents of the city.

• Renovate and update the Terrace Park Family Aquatic Center and Laurel Oak Family Aquatic Center sites with a refreshed look with trending aquatic play features that has wide age segment appeal to extend their useful life.
  o Determine capital improvement needs for each of the other existing pools in order of magnitude as well as meeting aquatic safety requirements.
  o Follow the aquatic plan recommendations in the System Plan with a capital improvement funding plan.
  o Coordinate all improvements for each specific pool outlined in the aquatics plan with staff, user groups and special events.

• Develop a business plan for all aquatic centers to achieve a cost recovery goal consistent with community values.
  o Hire an outside consultant to work with staff to develop a business plan for the Midco® Aquatic Center to maximize the use, value, earned income options to achieve at least a 70% cost recovery.
  o Find additional partners or programs to beef up the revenue in the facilities.
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- Develop a cost of service assessment for each program in the facility to determine if it is priced accurately based on level of exclusive use.

GOAL 5
Develop a new approach to providing ice rinks with additional winter recreation enhancement, regionally, for citizens to enjoy more consistently during the winter season.

STRATEGIES & TACTICS
- Provide more operational days and better, more consistent ice by transitioning to refrigerated ice rinks. Determine the optimal existing ice rink to convert to a refrigerated rink based on infrastructure condition and location.
  - Update park sites where ice rinks are taken out. Determine new amenities that provide a wider age segment appeal than the ice rink for the park.
  - Establish the optimal existing location for the first converted refrigerated ice rink and provide the proper amenities to go with them to entice more users and a wider age segment of people. Theme the sites to make them more attractive to users.
  - Program the refrigerated site versus setting them up for open skate to broaden their appeal with broomball games, skate lessons, skate parties for neighborhoods and youth organizations.
  - Provide concessions, warming fires, music and ways to improve the ambiance of the site.
  - Develop a business plan for the site to maximize its use, value and revenue it can support for a quality experience.
GOAL 6
Develop additional funding methods to support the system and the Department.

STRATEGIES & TACTICS
• Establish an independent Parks & Recreation Foundation to explore external funding opportunities working in concert with the Parks and Recreation Board and the Mayor’s Office.
  o Explore private donations for parks facilities and programs working with the parks and recreation foundation.
  o Continue to identify capital improvement projects for outside funding.
  o Train the park foundation members to foster an understanding of park projects to approach donors and receive gifting to the foundation for park specific projects.
  o Explore private donations for parks facilities and programs working with the parks and recreation foundation.
  o Continue to identify capital improvement projects for outside funding.
  o Train the park foundation members to foster an understanding of park projects to approach donors and receive gifting to the foundation for park specific projects.

6.3.3 PROGRAMS AND SERVICES
The direction for programs and services is to establish a set of policies and standards that empower staff through best practices to deliver existing recreation services in the most efficient and effective manner continuing to allow staff to be responsive to the needs of the community as it continues to grow.

GOAL 7
Provide core-based programs and events that meet the needs of the community while improving program standards and delivery of service.

STRATEGIES & TACTICS
• Implement program management principles ensuring consistent delivery of quality programs.
  o Continue developing GIS system to identify districts to offer all core programs demonstrating equity.
  o Document the program development process applying the key performance indicators to each program/event and incorporate into the Recreation Program Plan.
  o Annually update similar provider list to limit duplication of services and identify markets where the City can thrive.
  o Continue to monitor demographics of the City as it grows to ensure that needs of the community are being met.
  o Annually track the lifecycle of all programs to ensure they start to align with the recommended distribution in the Program Assessment.
  o Continue to track “No Go” programs and the amount of resources allocated, and circumstances that may have impacted reasons behind cancellation.
  o Capitalize on responses from the System Plan survey on why people participate in City programs and how they learn of them to develop messaging and determine best marketing method to use.
  o Continue to track the use of volunteers and update the database annually.
  o Develop pricing strategies for core program areas, update annually with any new strategies created, and incorporate into the Recreation Program Plan.
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- Track, analyze and update the age segments analysis and those served annually.
- Classify all new programs/events developed to incorporate into the annual tracking, analyzing and updating of the program classifications distribution chart.

- Align program offerings with community needs and priorities identified through public input. Retire and replace declining programs.
  - Develop new programming with the System Plan survey results focusing on the high priority areas of interest within each Planning Area for better equity.
  - Conduct interest surveys to further define specific programs within each interest area of each Planning Area.
  - Develop new partnerships agreements to share the operating costs for all programs identified where capacity and resources are not adequate to provide fully by the Department.
  - Identify Legacy Programs and develop language that describes why programs are legacy to include in descriptions.
  - Retire programs in decline that are not defined as a Legacy Program and prepare for retiring programs in saturated with new programming to replace it.

- Add six (6) new core programs over the next six years: one a year in Active Adults (Senior Services), Outdoor Adventure, Special Events, Youth Sports not covered by associations, People with Disabilities and Family programs.
  - Conduct a survey to understand the specific interest of the community and target markets.
  - Apply each new Core Program Area to the key performance indicators from the Program Assessment.
  - Define the goals/outcomes of each new Core Program Area that describes for what purpose is the program being offered, for what benefit, for what cost to achieve what outcome.
  - Develop descriptions for each new core program area that can be used in messaging to target markets. Descriptions need to focus on features of the program, advantages for taking the program with the City and the benefits they will receive by taking the program for themselves or their family. Use creative titles to draw potential users’ attention.
  - Track, analyze and update key performance indicators for each program within each Core Program Area when implemented. Track the direct and indirect costs for each program to determine true cost to provide the service based on a unity cost of cost per experience, cost per league, cost per hour, and cost per class hour.

GOAL 8
Develop management standards and amend policies to provide direction to staff on service delivery consistency. Provide training on how to implement new policies and procedures developed.

STRATEGIES & TACTICS
- Develop program standards and performance measures to enhance the quality of services and define the outcomes for staff to manage towards.
  - Maintain and enhance the quality of service delivery and develop program standards for each.
  - Document and incorporate program standards into the Recreation Program Plan that enhances the quality and consistency of service delivery.
  - Define customer service performance measures for service delivery and train staff to focus on measurable outcomes.
- Identify key performance indicators unique to each Core Program Area or services that should be used to develop goals for the program each time it is provided.

- Continue to build out a true cost of service model for both programs and operations that has been initiated through the work order system to communicate true costs of service.
  - Conduct a cost of service study to determine the expenses associated with programs, facilities and services.
  - Develop miniature business plans of two to three pages for each core program area that focuses on the market, who else is providing a similar service in the area, price point, cost, age segments served, quality of the facility the programs are provided in and how it is delivered. Key Performance Indicators and results expected.
  - Understand and document the costs of managing programs into a cost recovery policy and the program development process.
  - Identify important unit costs and track for each park classification to determine cost per experience and duplicate/utilize on other similar classified park and amenity.
  - Establish cost recovery goals through best practice ranges (i.e. 25-50%) for each core program area using the current cost recovery actuals as a baseline.

- Update the pricing policy to reflect cost recovery goals for core program areas and how to appropriately price programs and services.
  - Update the pricing guidelines within the Program Services Plan to include the cost of facility use into the cost of programs.
  - Identify the specific cost recovery goals annually within the best practices range identified for each Core Program Area.
  - Update current program budget spreadsheets to a centralized approach which includes the costs that should be incorporated into program development to achieve goals.
  - Track and analyze of cost recovery goals and outcomes annually and update policies and documents as needed.
GOAL 9
Enhance engagement, marketing, and promotions of services that will help increase awareness, participation, and operational
revenues.

STRATEGIES & TACTICS

• Consistently market programs and services by highlighting the “FAB” Features, Advantages, and Benefits to entice readers
to action.
  o Develop content with Features, Advantages, and Benefits of programs and services through digital and printed
    materials.
  o Develop campaigns and initiatives to create increased reach and awareness of Department Mission
    implementation and draw attention to the human story and connections.
  o Seek developing stories in operations from each division of the Department to share with residents that
    reinforce the mission and brand awareness.
  o Highlight overarching features, advantages and benefits of parks and recreation for the City’s health and vitality
    including a quarterly or monthly spotlight in messaging.
  o Annually review collateral developed to ensure a best practices approach to marketing and to avoid becoming
    institutional in messages and materials.

• Additional staff is needed to increase capacity to be more revenue driven and transition to cost recovery goals.
  o Develop a Return on Investment Model for three to five marketing methods for tracking free method costs, paid
    method costs and participation rate.
  o Develop positions to cover gaps in Marketing & Communications, defining roles and responsibilities and
    incorporate into a brief personnel plan.
  o Seek additional staff through City approved internships partnering with local and regional colleges.
  o Update the Delivery of Service Analysis spreadsheet and key performance indicators to account for changes in
    functions/services and ensure capacity is not lost.

• Regularly update the Department Marketing Plan.
  o Include the Market Potential Index, Target Market, Tapestry & LifeModes Segmentation, and Return on
    Investment sections of the System Plan Marketing Analysis to the Marketing Plan.
  o Specifically reference and Cite sections of the Marketing Plan that tie to, and help accomplish outcomes from,
    City approved plans, policies, and procedures.
  o Regularly review market potential data to ensure services are not moving away from reaching the primary
    target markets and identified needs.
  o Seek customer feedback regularly to identify the most efficient and effective approach to marketing services
    and meeting the primary target market where they are consuming information.

• Implement additional best practices in the marketing and communications of the Department.
  o Update the website to be more revenue driven with familiar layouts from private industry retail services.
  o Train all staff on the marketing plan and how to implement it efficiently and effectively.
  o The Fun Guide should link to RecTrak registration pages for specific programs and facility reservations.
New seasonal Fun Guides should have a prominent location on the website and be attractive to the eye for easy download and review.

Include quick click links in digital marketing where readers can easily follow the Department on social media.

Regularly evaluate the online publishing of the Fun Guide to monitor impacts to participation rates and satisfaction. Adjust strategy to include printing for specific demographics of the target markets.

Continue to capture photos of residents using the park system and programs for promotional purposes and making human connections.

Develop a list of examples in operations that can help the Department tell their story.

Develop training on taking photos and identifying the opportunities including what to do with the photos.

Implement training across the board to fulltime staff and seek assistance in obtaining photos.

Designate people in charge of obtaining photos at park programs, facilities, and events.

GOAL 10
Increase social media engagement, reach and presence to communicate with the community on services, facilities, and development.

STRATEGIES & TACTICS

- Regularly monitor the Department name and brand on existing and newly developed social media platforms.

  Department should continue to monitor existing social media and new platforms created to ensure that content is appropriate to the mission vision and core values.

  When newly developed social platforms become available, assess the level of benefit to the Department from engagement before developing a page. It may be more beneficial to have an account and manage it lightly to avoid having one created by someone else, impacting the brand.

  Annually review social media content and approach to ensure outcomes are achieved and still align with the overall direction.

  Establish an Instagram account to manage brand identity on the platform.

- Continue the use of data analytics to ensure efficiency and effectiveness remain a major focus for the Department as marketing and communications evolves.

  Use Department data and credible source data to help assess efforts and report on outcomes and goals achieved from the marketing plan.

  Analyze customer feedback and customer retention on social media platforms to make adjustments for improvement.

  Develop a marketing annual report for the Department that analyzes the data and identifies the results and any adjustments to resident’s consumption of information.

  Use analysis to develop a deeper understanding of the market and target markets within the City.

- Increase the engagement with residents and followers on social media.

  Develop content around the features, advantages and benefits of the subject matter identifying the human connections.

  Develop regular messaging meetings where upcoming tasks, projects, and programs are discussed seeking opportunities to tell your story through language and pictures that reinforce the Department brand.
Post thought provoking questions to social media platforms that engage followers through nature, heritage, and recreation that build awareness and recognition of value.

Continue to implement contests for social media followers to participate in and increase followers and reach.

Increase video content and consider developing Facebook live events that allow the community to follow or engage in Department happenings.

Extend the length of the topic and capturing reader’s attention with creative activities.

6.3.4 OPERATIONS AND FINANCIAL MANAGEMENT

The direction for Operations and Financial Management is to incorporate a business approach to operations that focuses on meeting an expected unit cost and cost recovery levels to increase sustainability in providing services to the community.

GOAL 11

Develop a full cost of service assessment for the Department to determine unit costs in parks and recreation services and set cost recovery level goals in recreation programs and facilities.

STRATEGIES & TACTICS

• Dedicate one person to business plan development, performance measures, and costing models for each City facility and Core Program Area.

  o Develop job responsibilities to include earned income, revenue development, tracking, analyzing, and developing performance measures.

  o Identify revenue capabilities within signature parks, Core Program Areas, community centers, and aquatic facilities.

  o Classify specific services within business plans and identify cost recovery targets within the range.

  o Identify target markets for each business plan through demographic analysis and character traits (tapestries).

  o Work with division leaders and managers to develop outcomes and training.

  o Develop processes, key performance indicators, and reporting for business plan accountability.

• Create a new business model for the Department that directs the staff to manage forward with earned income best practices.

  o Develop a cost of service for all services including asset preservation and routine maintenance.

  o Identify both internal and external factors that increase costs and monitor these to inject countermeasures when needed.

  o Establish regular meetings to review progress, analyze the data, and inject course corrections, if needed.

  o Develop social equity into the business model for all services as demonstrated with aquatics passes.

GOAL 12

Develop the Department’s capacity through training, strategic management, workload management, technology, and additional staff.

STRATEGIES & TACTICS

• Continue to seek out professional development opportunities for staff.

  o Develop training on the business principals and conduct feedback of participants through a survey.

  o Develop training on policies, procedures, standards and outcomes and implement as part of CAPRA standards.
- Develop customer service training and conduct annual refresher training that is specific to parks and recreation services.

- Develop capacity within the Department to enhance sustainability.
  - Using the Classification of Services, establish weekly tally of hours spent on functions/service by each employee to manage workloads.
  - Continue to seek opportunities for professional development to build skills and capacity.
  - Continue to manage capacity by determining if functions/services should be done inhouse or contracted.
  - Define roles and workload for new functions/services to determine if these can be absorbed or if additional resources are needed before final determination.
  - Continue to research and identify updates in technology and software where automation increases capacity.
  - Determine the appropriate staffing level to ensure the capacity to manage operations and preserve assets as the system grows and adds new amenities, parks, service areas, and facilities.
CHAPTER SEVEN — CONCLUSION

SFPR is widely respected as a best-practice agency for maintaining a consistent standard of excellence in maintenance and level of service equity for residents of Sioux Falls and visitors to the City. This System Plan is designed to support SFPR in continuing to provide innovative and well-balanced facilities and programs in the community as the City grows and evolves over the next five years.

The Sioux Falls community takes pride in SFPR, as evident in the table below that is based on the statistically-valid needs assessment survey results with comparison to national benchmarks.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Satisfaction with Quality of Parks &amp; Facilities</th>
<th>Satisfaction with Quality of Programs &amp; Activities</th>
<th>Satisfaction with Overall Value Received</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>SFPR</td>
<td>United States</td>
<td>SFPR</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>96%</td>
<td>92%</td>
<td>84%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>85%</td>
<td>89%</td>
<td>61%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The quality of park maintenance was a key theme during the public engagement, as well as accessibility to an abundance of different park experiences ranging from Falls Park to the Bike Trail. The special use facilities such as The Great Plains Zoo & Delbridge Museum of Natural History, Great Bear Recreation Park, Mary Jo Wegner Arboretum and East Sioux Fall Historic Site, the Falls Overlook Café, and the recently added Levitt Performance Venue are tremendous assets to the community. SFPR also provides a wealth of programs that reach a multitude of age segments and diverse interests represented in the community.

Moving forward, additional actions are required to retain the high-quality system SFPR operates, which is to stay ahead of the park infrastructure and asset needs that SFPR owns and manages. It is paramount that SFPR keeps up with improvements to existing park and recreation amenities and trails, as well as maintaining equity across the park system, which are important actions desired by residents. SFPR should consider adding new amenities to meet community needs such as year-round programming. Also, additional funding sources are needed to support financing a park system of excellence, such as an independent Parks Foundation.

SFPR is well-positioned to build upon its legacy over the next five years of providing a comprehensive mix of high-quality parks and recreation programs, facilities, and services that contribute to a high quality of life in the City of Sioux Falls that is unparalleled in the region.
AN ORDINANCE OF THE CITY OF SIOUX FALLS, SD, AMENDING THE CODE OF
ORDINANCES OF THE CITY BY REVISING SECTION 95.071 RECREATION ACTIVITY AND
FACILITY FEES OF CHAPTER 95: PARKS AND RECREATION.

BE IT ORDAINED BY THE CITY OF SIOUX FALLS, SD:

Section 1. That Section 95.071 of the Code of Ordinances of Sioux Falls, SD, is hereby amended to read:

§ 95.071 RECREATION ACTIVITY AND FACILITY FEES.

The following fees, inclusive of all applicable taxes, shall be charged for city recreation activities and use of park and recreation facilities:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Activity</th>
<th>2016</th>
<th>2017</th>
<th>2018</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><em>(a)</em> Aquatic Fees</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Outdoor wading pools and outdoor spray parks</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Daily admission infant, child, adult, and senior citizen</td>
<td>Free</td>
<td>Free</td>
<td>Free</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Summer Aquatic Season Fee Schedule</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Daily admission infant</td>
<td>Free</td>
<td>Free</td>
<td>Free</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Daily admission child</td>
<td>$3</td>
<td>$4</td>
<td>$5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Daily admission adult</td>
<td>$4</td>
<td>$5</td>
<td>$6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Daily admission senior citizen</td>
<td>$3</td>
<td>$4</td>
<td>$5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Splash pass</td>
<td>Sold in increments of no less than $50 at a 10% reduction of the face value of the pass purchased.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Season pass child</td>
<td>$20</td>
<td>$25</td>
<td>$30</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Season pass adult</td>
<td>$50</td>
<td>$60</td>
<td>$70</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Veteran, senior citizen, and reduced-income adult season pass</td>
<td>$30</td>
<td>$35</td>
<td>$40</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Season pass family</td>
<td>$80</td>
<td>$90</td>
<td>$100</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Reduced-income family season pass</td>
<td>$40</td>
<td>$45</td>
<td>$50</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Free season pass</td>
<td>Free</td>
<td>Free</td>
<td>Free</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### Fall, Winter, and Spring Aquatic Season Fee Schedule

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Service Description</th>
<th>Fall</th>
<th>Winter</th>
<th>Spring</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Fall, Winter, and Spring reduced-income daily admission</td>
<td>$4</td>
<td>$4</td>
<td>$1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Daily admission infant</td>
<td>Free</td>
<td>Free</td>
<td>Free</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Daily admission child</td>
<td>$3</td>
<td>$4</td>
<td>$5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Daily admission adult</td>
<td>$4</td>
<td>$5</td>
<td>$6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Daily admission senior citizen</td>
<td>$3</td>
<td>$4</td>
<td>$5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Splash pass</td>
<td>Sold in increments of no less than $50 at a 10% reduction of the face value of the pass purchased.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Child season pass</td>
<td>$50</td>
<td>$60</td>
<td>$70</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Adult season pass</td>
<td>$120</td>
<td>$145</td>
<td>$170</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Family season pass</td>
<td>$190</td>
<td>$215</td>
<td>$240</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fall, Winter, and Spring reduced-income family season pass</td>
<td>$100</td>
<td>$110</td>
<td>$120</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Veteran, senior citizen, and Fall, Winter, and Spring reduced-income adult season pass</td>
<td>$70</td>
<td>$85</td>
<td>$95</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Annual Aquatic Season Fee Schedule

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Service Description</th>
<th>Fall</th>
<th>Winter</th>
<th>Spring</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Child annual pass</td>
<td>$60</td>
<td>$70</td>
<td>$80</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Adult annual pass</td>
<td>$150</td>
<td>$170</td>
<td>$190</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Family annual pass</td>
<td>$250</td>
<td>$275</td>
<td>$300</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Reduced-income family annual pass</td>
<td>$125</td>
<td>$140</td>
<td>$155</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Veteran, senior citizen, and reduced-income individual adult annual pass</td>
<td>$90</td>
<td>$100</td>
<td>$110</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Other Fees

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Service Description</th>
<th>Fall</th>
<th>Winter</th>
<th>Spring</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Lane rental—50-meter pool (25-yard/meter course per lane/per hour)</td>
<td>$5</td>
<td>$5</td>
<td>$5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lane rental—50-meter pool (50-yard/meter course per lane/per hour)</td>
<td>$10</td>
<td>$10</td>
<td>$10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Swim lessons adult with infant, toddler, preschool at outdoor aquatic centers and outdoor swimming pools</td>
<td>$15</td>
<td>$15</td>
<td>$15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Swim lessons Level I-VI at outdoor aquatic centers and outdoor swimming pools</td>
<td>$20</td>
<td>$20</td>
<td>$20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Swim lessons adult (4 classes) at outdoor aquatic centers and outdoor swimming pools</td>
<td>$20</td>
<td>$20</td>
<td>$20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Swim lessons at Mideo Aquatic Center</td>
<td>$45</td>
<td>$45</td>
<td>$45</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>League fees (per team)</td>
<td>$90</td>
<td>$90</td>
<td>$90</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lifeguard recertification course</td>
<td>$125</td>
<td>$125</td>
<td>$125</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lifeguard certification course</td>
<td>$185</td>
<td>$185</td>
<td>$185</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Water safety instructor course</strong></td>
<td>$255</td>
<td>$255</td>
<td>$255</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Indoor meeting space rental (per hour)</strong></td>
<td>$50</td>
<td>$50</td>
<td>$50</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Miscellaneous</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pool locker</td>
<td>$0.25</td>
<td>$0.25</td>
<td>$0.25</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Indoor and outdoor swim meets (per pool/per participant/per event)</td>
<td>$10</td>
<td>$10</td>
<td>$10</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

(b) **Ice rink fees**

**Outdoor rinks**

- Ice skate rental adult | $3 |
- Ice skate rental children | $1 |
- Ice skate rental senior citizen | $2 |

_Sioux Falls Lee & Ree Center (The below fees shall not exceed the following:)_

- Ice rental | $160/hour |
- Children/Seniors open skate admission | $4/person |
- Adult open skate admission | $6/person |
- Open skate rental | $3/pair |

(c) **League/Tournament fees—City-sponsored**

**Team fee**

**Athletic camps**

- Athletic or other camps (per participant) | $25 |

**Basketball**

- Adult basketball tournament | $200 |
- Men's adult basketball league | $400 |
- Over-40 basketball league | $200 |
- Women's adult basketball league | $200 |
- Youth basketball tournament | $50 |
- Youth/high school 3-on-3 basketball league | $20 |

**Dodgeball**

- Adult dodgeball league | $50 |

**Kickball**

- Adult kickball league | $75 |

**Volleyball**

- Adult volleyball league | $120 |
- Adult volleyball tournament | $60 |
- Summer sand volleyball league | $75 |
### (d) Scheduled Practices and Tournaments Fees (Non-City-Sponsored)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Activity</th>
<th>Fee</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Facility fee per field/court per day—adult</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Baseball games</td>
<td>$80</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Baseball practices</td>
<td>$40</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rugby games</td>
<td>$25</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Soccer games</td>
<td>$45</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Soccer practices</td>
<td>$22</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Softball games</td>
<td>$65</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Softball practices</td>
<td>$32</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tennis match/dual, per location</td>
<td>$100</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tennis practices</td>
<td>$6 per court</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Fee per field per invitational tournament (adult/youth)**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Location</th>
<th>Fee</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Dunham, Burnside, McCart, Cherry Rock, Frank Olson, Covell, and Elmwood</td>
<td>$25</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Harmodon/Nelson grass infields</td>
<td>$80</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>McKennan/Kuehn tennis</td>
<td>$100</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sherman, Kenny Anderson, Harmodon, and Pasley</td>
<td>$65</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sports camp/clinics (per event)</td>
<td>$20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tomar, Yankton Trail, and Spencer</td>
<td>$45</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**League fee per team (adult)**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>League</th>
<th>Fee</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Adult fall softball league, Sherman, and Harmodon</td>
<td>$50</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Adult softball league, Burnside, and Kuehn</td>
<td>$50</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Adult softball league, Sherman, Kenny Anderson, and Harmodon</td>
<td>$170</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Coed softball league, Kenny Anderson, Harmodon, and Sherman</td>
<td>$120</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### (e) Rental Fee

**Community/Recreation centers**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Facility</th>
<th>Fee</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Court rental, per hour</td>
<td>$25</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Meeting room, per room, per hour excluding nonprofit organizations</td>
<td>$25</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Picnic shelter reservation fee</td>
<td>$25</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Portable bleacher, reservation fee</td>
<td>$150</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Showmobile, reservation fee</td>
<td>$275</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Terrace or McKennan Band Shell reservation fee</td>
<td>$75</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tuthill House, per hour</td>
<td>$25</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wedding location reservation fee</td>
<td>$75</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Levitt Shell Facility Use Fee (by anticipated attendance)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>----------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1 to 499</td>
<td>$600 per day</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>500 to 999</td>
<td>$875 per day</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1,000 to 2,499</td>
<td>$1,000 per day</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2,500 to 3,999</td>
<td>$2,500 per day</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4,000 or more</td>
<td>$3,500 per day</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

| Lighting of the Falls                                      | $200 per day |

(f) **Participant Fees**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Activity</th>
<th>Fee</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Adult classes single session</td>
<td>$8 per contact hour</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Adult tennis league, per participant</td>
<td>$7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Classes all ages multiple session</td>
<td>$5 per contact hour</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Golden Age, per dancee-fee</td>
<td>$4.50</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Golden Age, yearly dues per participant</td>
<td>$2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Senior games, per participant</td>
<td>$10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Summer youth band, per participant</td>
<td>$30</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Summer youth singers, per participant</td>
<td>$30</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Youth classes through age 17 single session</td>
<td>$5 per contact hour</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

(g) **Concession Fees**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Activity</th>
<th>Fee</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Concession permits, per vendor, per event</td>
<td>$50</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Concession permits, seasonal, per vendor</td>
<td>10% of gross sales less sales tax</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sports photography fee (per location, per calendar year)</td>
<td>$100</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

(h) The director of parks and recreation may establish definitions for terms used in this section, and may, upon a showing of good cause, adjust these rates to provide discounts, bonuses, incentives, and promotions to enhance park and recreation activities and facilities usage, as well as penalties, late fees, deposits, and pro rata fee policies.

Date adopted: _________________.

__________________________
Paul TenHaken, Mayor

ATTEST:

__________________________
Thomas Greco, City Clerk
ORDINANCE NO. _______

AN ORDINANCE OF THE CITY OF SIOUX FALLS, SD, AMENDING THE CODE OF ORDINANCES OF THE CITY BY REVISING SECTION 95.071 RECREATION ACTIVITY AND FACILITY FEES OF CHAPTER 95: PARKS AND RECREATION.

BE IT ORDAINED BY THE CITY OF SIOUX FALLS, SD:

Section 1. That Section 95.071 of the Code of Ordinances of Sioux Falls, SD, is hereby amended to read:

§ 95.071 RECREATION ACTIVITY AND FACILITY FEES.

The following fees, inclusive of all applicable taxes, shall be charged for city recreation activities and use of park and recreation facilities:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Activity</th>
<th>Fee</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Aquatic Fees</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Outdoor wading pools and outdoor spray parks</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Daily admission infant, child, adult, and senior citizen</td>
<td>Free</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Summer Aquatic Season Fee Schedule</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Daily admission infant</td>
<td>Free</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Daily admission child</td>
<td>$5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Daily admission adult</td>
<td>$6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Daily admission senior citizen</td>
<td>$5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Splash pass</td>
<td>Sold in increments of no less than $50 at a 10% reduction of the face value of the pass purchased.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Season pass child</td>
<td>$30</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Season pass adult</td>
<td>$70</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Veteran, senior citizen, and reduced-income adult season pass</td>
<td>$40</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Season pass family</td>
<td>$100</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Reduced-income family season pass</td>
<td>$50</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Free season pass</td>
<td>Free</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fall, Winter, and Spring Aquatic Season Fee Schedule</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---------------------------------------------------</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fall, winter, and spring reduced-income daily admission</td>
<td>$1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Daily admission infant</td>
<td>Free</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Daily admission child</td>
<td>$5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Daily admission adult</td>
<td>$6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Daily admission senior citizen</td>
<td>$5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Splash pass</td>
<td>Sold in increments of no less than $50 at a 10% reduction of the face value of the pass purchased.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Child season pass</td>
<td>$70</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Adult season pass</td>
<td>$170</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Family season pass</td>
<td>$240</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fall, winter, and spring reduced-income family season pass</td>
<td>$120</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Veteran, senior citizen, and fall, winter, and spring reduced-income adult season pass</td>
<td>$95</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Annual Aquatic Season Fee Schedule</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Child annual pass</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Adult annual pass</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Family annual pass</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Reduced-income family annual pass</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Veteran, senior citizen, and reduced-income individual adult annual pass</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Other Fees</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Lane rental—50-meter pool (25-yard/meter course per lane/per hour)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lane rental—50-meter pool (50-yard/meter course per lane/per hour)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Swim lessons adult with infant, toddler, preschool at outdoor aquatic centers and outdoor swimming pools</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Swim lessons Level I-VI at outdoor aquatic centers and outdoor swimming pools</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Swim lessons adult (4 classes) at outdoor aquatic centers and outdoor swimming pools</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Swim lessons at Mideo Aquatic Center</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>League fees (per team)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lifeguard recertification course</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lifeguard certification course</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Service</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---------------------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Water safety instructor course</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Indoor meeting space rental (per hour)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Miscellaneous**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Service</th>
<th>Fee</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Pool locker</td>
<td>$0.25</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Indoor and outdoor swim meets (per pool/per participant/per event)</td>
<td>$10</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**(b) Ice Rink Fees**

**Outdoor rinks**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Service</th>
<th>Fee</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Ice skate rental adult</td>
<td>$3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ice skate rental children</td>
<td>$1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ice skate rental senior citizen</td>
<td>$2</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**(c) League/Tournament Fees—City-Sponsored**

**Team Fee**

**Athletic camps**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Service</th>
<th>Fee</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Athletic or other camps (per participant)</td>
<td>$25</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Basketball**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Service</th>
<th>Fee</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Adult basketball tournament</td>
<td>$200</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Men's adult basketball league</td>
<td>$400</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Over-40 basketball league</td>
<td>$200</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Women's adult basketball league</td>
<td>$200</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Youth basketball tournament</td>
<td>$50</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Youth/high school 3-on-3 basketball league</td>
<td>$20</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Dodgeball**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Service</th>
<th>Fee</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Adult dodgeball league</td>
<td>$50</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Kickball**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Service</th>
<th>Fee</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Adult kickball league</td>
<td>$75</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Volleyball**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Service</th>
<th>Fee</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Adult volleyball league</td>
<td>$120</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Adult volleyball tournament</td>
<td>$60</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Summer sand volleyball league</td>
<td>$75</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**(d) Scheduled Games/Practices and Tournaments Fees (Non-City-Sponsored)**

**Facility fee per field/court per day—adult**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Service</th>
<th>Fee</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Baseball games</td>
<td>$80</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Baseball practices</td>
<td>$40</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rugby games</td>
<td>$25</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Soccer games</td>
<td>$45</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Soccer practices</td>
<td>$22</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Service</td>
<td>Fee</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---------------------------------------------</td>
<td>------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Softball games</td>
<td>$65</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Softball practices</td>
<td>$32</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tennis match/dual, per location</td>
<td>$100</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tennis practices</td>
<td>$6 per court</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Fee per field per invitational tournament (adult/youth)</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dunham, Burnside, McCart, Cherry Rock, Frank Olson, Covell, and Elmwood</td>
<td>$25</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Harmodon/Nelson grass infields</td>
<td>$80</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>McKennan/Kuehn tennis</td>
<td>$100</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sherman, Kenny Anderson, Harmodon, and Pasley</td>
<td>$65</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sports camp/clinics (per event)</td>
<td>$20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tomar, Yankton Trail, and Spencer</td>
<td>$45</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>League fee per team (adult)</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Adult fall softball league, Sherman and Harmodon</td>
<td>$50</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Adult softball league, Burnside and Kuehn</td>
<td>$50</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Adult softball league, Sherman, Kenny Anderson, and Harmodon</td>
<td>$170</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Coed softball league, Kenny Anderson, Harmodon, and Sherman</td>
<td>$120</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(e) <strong>Rental Fee</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Community/Recreation centers</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Court rental, per hour</td>
<td>$25</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Meeting room, per room, per hour excluding nonprofit organizations</td>
<td>$25</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Picnic shelter reservation fee</td>
<td>$25</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Portable bleacher reservation fee</td>
<td>$150</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Showmobile reservation fee</td>
<td>$275</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Terrace or McKennan Band Shell reservation fee</td>
<td>$75</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tuthill House, per hour</td>
<td>$25</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wedding location reservation fee</td>
<td>$75</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Levitt Shell Facility Use Fee (by anticipated attendance)</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1 to 499</td>
<td>$600 per day</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>500 to 999</td>
<td>$875 per day</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1,000 to 2,499</td>
<td>$1,000 per day</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2,500 to 3,999</td>
<td>$2,500 per day</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4,000 or more</td>
<td>$3,500 per day</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Lighting of the Falls</strong></td>
<td>$200 per day</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
(f) **Participant Fees**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Service</th>
<th>Fee</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Adult classes single session</td>
<td>$8 per contact hour</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Adult tennis league, per participant</td>
<td>$7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Classes all ages multiple session</td>
<td>$5 per contact hour</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Senior games, per participant</td>
<td>$10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Youth classes through age 17 single session</td>
<td>$5 per contact hour</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

(g) **Concession Fees**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Service</th>
<th>Fee</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Concession permits, per vendor, per event</td>
<td>$50</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Concession permits, seasonal, per vendor</td>
<td>10% of gross sales less sales tax</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sports photography fee (per location, per calendar year)</td>
<td>$100</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

(h) The director of parks and recreation may establish definitions for terms used in this section, and may, upon a showing of good cause, adjust these rates to provide discounts, bonuses, incentives, and promotions to enhance park and recreation activities and facilities usage, as well as penalties, late fees, deposits, and pro rata fee policies.

Date adopted: ____________________.

______________________________
Paul TenHaken, Mayor

ATTEST:

______________________________
Thomas Greco, City Clerk
Notice of Hearing: ____________
Date of Hearing: ____________
Date Adopted: ____________
Date Published: ____________
Date Effective: ____________

RESOLUTION NO. ____________

A RESOLUTION AUTHORIZING THE MAYOR TO ENTER INTO AMENDMENT ONE TO GOLF FACILITIES MANAGEMENT AGREEMENT BETWEEN THE CITY OF SIOUX FALLS AND LANDSCAPES MANAGEMENT COMPANY, LLC.

WHEREAS, Landscapes Management Company, LLC ("LMC") and the City of Sioux Falls, SD, are parties to a Golf Facilities Management Agreement dated January 19, 2018, and filed as City Agreement No. 17-0102 (the "Agreement"); and

WHEREAS, the parties desire to enter into Amendment One to modify the noncompetition clause under the Agreement;

NOW, THEREFORE, BE IT RESOLVED BY THE CITY OF SIOUX FALLS, SD:

Section 1. The document attached hereto and made a part of this resolution entitled "Amendment One to Golf Facilities Management Agreement between the City of Sioux Falls and LMC" is hereby approved.

Section 2. The Mayor is authorized to sign the Amendment One to Agreement after it is ratified and executed by LMC.

Section 3. The City shall publish the resolution, without attachment, after its passage. The attachment is on file and available for inspection in the office of the City Clerk.

Date adopted: ________________

______________________________
Paul TenHaken, Mayor

ATTEST:

______________________________
Thomas Greco, City Clerk
AMENDMENT ONE TO GOLF FACILITIES MANAGEMENT AGREEMENT
BETWEEN THE CITY OF SIOUX FALLS AND LMC

Agreement made February 1, 2020, between the City of Sioux Falls, South Dakota, a home rule chartered municipality, organized and existing under South Dakota law (the "City" or "Owner"), and Landscapes Management Company, LLC, a Nebraska limited liability company ("LMC" or "Manager").

The parties agree to amend the agreement dated January 19, 2018, and filed as City Agreement No. 17-0102 by amending Section 2.6(a) to read as follows:

2.6 Non-Competition

a) With the exception of the city of Brandon, during the Management Term, LMC agrees it will not, directly or indirectly manage or provide management services to similar types of public daily fee golf facilities located with a 20-mile radius of Golf Facilities which compete with the Golf Facilities for events as a principal, partner, joint venture, officers, director, member, employee, consultant, agent, independent contractor of any business entity. LMC further agrees to employ different LMC personnel for the management of the city of Brandon golf facilities and LMC will not hire personnel from the Golf Facilities without first obtaining the City's written consent.

IN WITNESS WHEREOF, the parties have executed this agreement the day and year first above written.

CITY OF SIOUX FALLS

BY: ________________________________
PRINTED NAME: ________________________________
TITLE: ________________________________

LANDSCAPES MANAGEMENT COMPANY, LLC

BY: ________________________________
PRINTED NAME: ________________________________
TITLE: ________________________________
FEDERAL TAX ID NO. ________________________________

ATTEST:

CITY CLERK
PRINTED NAME: ________________________________
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1.8.2020.docx
## Sioux Falls Parks & Recreation
### 2019 Community Center Dashboard

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Event Type</th>
<th>January</th>
<th>February</th>
<th>March</th>
<th>April</th>
<th>May</th>
<th>June</th>
<th>July</th>
<th>August</th>
<th>September</th>
<th>October</th>
<th>November</th>
<th>December</th>
<th>2019 Totals</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Community Center Attendance</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Weekday Open Gym</td>
<td>8,908</td>
<td>8,427</td>
<td>10,032</td>
<td>8,011</td>
<td>1,510</td>
<td>1,886</td>
<td>1,733</td>
<td>602</td>
<td>2,579</td>
<td>10,256</td>
<td>8,331</td>
<td>6,126</td>
<td>68,401</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Weeknight Open Gym</td>
<td>99</td>
<td>111</td>
<td>135</td>
<td>242</td>
<td>79</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>304</td>
<td>947</td>
<td>118</td>
<td>47</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Weekend Open Gym</td>
<td>2,881</td>
<td>2,580</td>
<td>3,000</td>
<td>1,487</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>487</td>
<td>2,076</td>
<td>3,030</td>
<td>2,757</td>
<td>18,297</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Walking Club</td>
<td>328</td>
<td>232</td>
<td>304</td>
<td>236</td>
<td>33</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>43</td>
<td>253</td>
<td>269</td>
<td>288</td>
<td>1,986</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Playgroup</td>
<td>514</td>
<td>343</td>
<td>446</td>
<td>364</td>
<td>69</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>93</td>
<td>617</td>
<td>450</td>
<td>449</td>
<td>3,335</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SFPR Events</td>
<td>84</td>
<td>237</td>
<td>163</td>
<td>438</td>
<td>73</td>
<td>461</td>
<td>217</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>82</td>
<td>554</td>
<td>529</td>
<td>87</td>
<td>2,954</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total Attendance</strong></td>
<td>12,814</td>
<td>11,930</td>
<td>14,080</td>
<td>10,768</td>
<td>1,764</td>
<td>2,347</td>
<td>1,960</td>
<td>631</td>
<td>3,588</td>
<td>14,702</td>
<td>12,727</td>
<td>9,754</td>
<td>97,055</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Operational Days</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>31</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>251</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Average Daily Attendance</td>
<td>458</td>
<td>459</td>
<td>503</td>
<td>385</td>
<td>588</td>
<td>117</td>
<td>89</td>
<td>90</td>
<td>598</td>
<td>474</td>
<td>455</td>
<td>406</td>
<td>387</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Computer Lab Attendance</td>
<td>2,435</td>
<td>2,221</td>
<td>2,580</td>
<td>2,440</td>
<td>246</td>
<td>323</td>
<td>268</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>805</td>
<td>2,707</td>
<td>2,546</td>
<td>1,693</td>
<td>18,267</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Court Rentals Attendance</td>
<td>285</td>
<td>248</td>
<td>80</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>200</td>
<td>190</td>
<td>1,041</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Athletic Events Attendance</td>
<td>11,566</td>
<td>7,808</td>
<td>4,052</td>
<td>831</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>946</td>
<td>5,453</td>
<td>3,805</td>
<td>34,476</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Meeting Room Rentals</td>
<td>96</td>
<td>102</td>
<td>110</td>
<td>105</td>
<td>34</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>34</td>
<td>140</td>
<td>133</td>
<td>115</td>
<td>905</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Meeting Room Attendance</td>
<td>2,292</td>
<td>3,866</td>
<td>6,777</td>
<td>6,190</td>
<td>1,848</td>
<td>354</td>
<td>518</td>
<td>515</td>
<td>3,260</td>
<td>5,392</td>
<td>6,321</td>
<td>5,706</td>
<td>43,039</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kid's Inc Attendance</td>
<td>2,346</td>
<td>2,268</td>
<td>2,267</td>
<td>2,152</td>
<td>1,261</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>637</td>
<td>2,659</td>
<td>1,910</td>
<td>1,517</td>
<td>17,017</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>TOTAL CC VISITS</strong></td>
<td>29,303</td>
<td>26,120</td>
<td>27,256</td>
<td>19,941</td>
<td>4,888</td>
<td>2,701</td>
<td>2,468</td>
<td>1,146</td>
<td>7,500</td>
<td>23,722</td>
<td>26,611</td>
<td>20,972</td>
<td>192,628</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Computer lab attendance isn't included in total as they are accounted for in CC attendance.*
# 2019-2020
## Ice Rinks

### Statistics

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>December 2019</th>
<th>January 2020</th>
<th>February 2020</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Attendance</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Campus</td>
<td>229</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Frank Olson</td>
<td>344</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>McKennan</td>
<td>642</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Memorial</td>
<td>1,349</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sherman</td>
<td>470</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tuthill</td>
<td>738</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total Attendance</strong></td>
<td><strong>3,772</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Average Daily Attendance</strong></td>
<td><strong>314.33</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Ice Skate Rentals</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Campus</td>
<td>180</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Frank Olson</td>
<td>237</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>McKennan</td>
<td>397</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Memorial</td>
<td>973</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sherman</td>
<td>241</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tuthill</td>
<td>810</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total Ice Skate Rentals</strong></td>
<td><strong>2,838</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Revenue

#### Net Skate

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Location</th>
<th>Revenue</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Campus</td>
<td>$299</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Frank Olson</td>
<td>$332</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>McKennan</td>
<td>$653</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Memorial</td>
<td>$730</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sherman</td>
<td>$362</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tuthill</td>
<td>$1,101</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total Ice Skate Revenue</strong></td>
<td><strong>$3,477</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

#### Net Concessions

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Location</th>
<th>Revenue</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Campus</td>
<td>$14.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Frank Olson</td>
<td>$19.50</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>McKennan</td>
<td>$64.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Memorial</td>
<td>$181.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sherman</td>
<td>$27.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tuthill</td>
<td>$89.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total Concession Revenue</strong></td>
<td><strong>$394.50</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Total Revenue** $3,871.50

### City of Sioux Falls Golf Courses
#### Income Statement
**November 30, 2019**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Prairie Green</th>
<th>Elmwood</th>
<th>Kuehn Park</th>
<th>Consolidated</th>
<th>Budget</th>
<th>Prior Year</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Rounds Played</strong></td>
<td>24,406</td>
<td>37,750</td>
<td>17,449</td>
<td>79,605</td>
<td>76,579</td>
<td>75,846</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Revenues</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Greens Fees</td>
<td>309,445</td>
<td>396,290</td>
<td>133,934</td>
<td>839,669</td>
<td>881,511</td>
<td>831,123</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pro Shop</td>
<td>137,941</td>
<td>116,423</td>
<td>14,698</td>
<td>265,062</td>
<td>245,868</td>
<td>221,417</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Driving Range</td>
<td>62,993</td>
<td>55,878</td>
<td>35,794</td>
<td>154,665</td>
<td>185,898</td>
<td>121,279</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Carts</td>
<td>287,848</td>
<td>299,307</td>
<td>72,530</td>
<td>659,685</td>
<td>823,223</td>
<td>471,159</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Food &amp; Beverage</td>
<td>176,563</td>
<td>179,027</td>
<td>31,231</td>
<td>386,820</td>
<td>460,675</td>
<td>350,172</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Annual Passes</td>
<td>193,540</td>
<td>198,820</td>
<td>39,616</td>
<td>382,976</td>
<td>340,893</td>
<td>340,128</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total Revenues</strong></td>
<td>1,166,330</td>
<td>1,196,745</td>
<td>327,802</td>
<td>2,692,878</td>
<td>2,938,078</td>
<td>2,350,278</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Cost of Goods Sold</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Merchandise</td>
<td>68,694</td>
<td>75,595</td>
<td>5,404</td>
<td>149,693</td>
<td>137,785</td>
<td>125,210</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Food &amp; Beverage</td>
<td>72,713</td>
<td>70,617</td>
<td>10,425</td>
<td>153,755</td>
<td>159,199</td>
<td>127,388</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Cost of Goods Sold</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total Operating Expenses</td>
<td>141,397</td>
<td>146,622</td>
<td>15,829</td>
<td>303,486</td>
<td>292,894</td>
<td>252,598</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Gross Profit</strong></td>
<td>1,025,923</td>
<td>1,050,532</td>
<td>313,973</td>
<td>2,389,428</td>
<td>2,645,094</td>
<td>2,105,680</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Operating Expenses</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pro Shop</td>
<td>141,466</td>
<td>130,951</td>
<td>50,800</td>
<td>323,217</td>
<td>336,982</td>
<td>302,921</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Driving Range</td>
<td>5,319</td>
<td>3,551</td>
<td>7,075</td>
<td>15,445</td>
<td>15,000</td>
<td>10,563</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Carts</td>
<td>118,732</td>
<td>119,885</td>
<td>3,111</td>
<td>241,724</td>
<td>244,965</td>
<td>216,618</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Course Maintenance</td>
<td>327,678</td>
<td>426,179</td>
<td>74,907</td>
<td>828,764</td>
<td>944,033</td>
<td>803,230</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Food &amp; Beverage</td>
<td>95,089</td>
<td>78,795</td>
<td>357</td>
<td>164,242</td>
<td>181,788</td>
<td>150,120</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>General &amp; Administration</td>
<td>266,404</td>
<td>248,318</td>
<td>81,843</td>
<td>596,556</td>
<td>534,452</td>
<td>476,356</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Membership</td>
<td>1,990</td>
<td>1,816</td>
<td>520</td>
<td>3,306</td>
<td>3,046</td>
<td>2,196</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total Operating Expenses</strong></td>
<td>946,669</td>
<td>1,007,599</td>
<td>218,741</td>
<td>2,173,008</td>
<td>2,252,220</td>
<td>1,987,004</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Other Income (Expense)</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Property Taxes - Equipment</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total Other Income (Expense)</strong></td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>EBITDA</strong></td>
<td>80,254</td>
<td>42,937</td>
<td>93,230</td>
<td>216,420</td>
<td>392,874</td>
<td>118,745</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>City Purchased Assets</td>
<td></td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>620,341</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hotel Lease Income</td>
<td></td>
<td>-</td>
<td>34,868</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>34,868</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Depreciation</td>
<td>(51,875)</td>
<td>(81,069)</td>
<td>(14,069)</td>
<td>(147,003)</td>
<td>(156,397)</td>
<td>(90,738)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Interest Expense</td>
<td>(2,638)</td>
<td>(8,203)</td>
<td>(307)</td>
<td>(21,097)</td>
<td>(5,308)</td>
<td>(3,545)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gain/Loss on Sale of Asset</td>
<td>1,284</td>
<td>(1,482)</td>
<td>(1,213)</td>
<td>(1,380)</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other Income/Expense</td>
<td>600</td>
<td>135,660</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>136,260</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Net Income</strong></td>
<td>27,725</td>
<td>122,651</td>
<td>77,092</td>
<td>227,467</td>
<td>265,095</td>
<td>662,838</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>