

# BETTENDORF PARKS & RECREATION

## PROGRAMMING STRATEGIC PLAN

### 2024-2026

#### TABLE OF CONTENTS

- PLANNING OVERVIEW
- ENVIRONMENTAL SCAN OVERVIEW
- STRATEGIC GOALS & OBJECTIVES
- PLANNING TEAM



## PLANNING OVERVIEW

The City of Bettendorf Parks & Recreation Department has undergone significant change over the past 5 years. Among those changes include, closing the Life Fitness Center, construction of new Aquatic and Ice Rink facilities, changes in department leadership and structure, forming a new Parks Advisory Board and moving staff and programming to the Community Center.

Having not engaged in a strategic plan for programming, staff felt there was a lack of a common cohesive mission and vision for the department. In March of 2023, Wastyn & Associates began the planning process with staff interviews, Advisory Board Interviews, Parks Foundation interviews, community focus groups and an electronic survey. The information was then formulated and evaluated into an environmental scan. A planning committee was formed to use these results to form a new mission, vision, and strategic goals for the Recreation Department.

This strategic planning process has been a positive undertaking for staff, the Parks Advisory Board, City Council, City Staff, and community stakeholders. The plan is designed to have clear strategic goals, objectives, action plans, and measures of success to guide the Recreation Department in future decision making. With this plan, staff is committed to providing accessible, diverse, and inclusive experiences that enhance the quality of life and create a sense of place and community for all.



Kim Kidwell

Director of Culture & Recreation



## Parks & Recreation Strategic Plan Overview

### Process

In the Spring of 2023, the City of Bettendorf Parks and Recreation Department contracted Wastyn & Associates to facilitate the organization's formal strategic planning process. This process began with engaging eight focus groups throughout the month of April 2023. These focus groups were attended by 35 members of the community and the data collected was used to determine current perceptions and future desires for the organization. The focus group data formed the foundation for the 34-question survey which was available on the City's website, sent via email distribution list, as well as paper copies available at the Community Center. 2,469 people completed the survey to validate or alter the perceptions gleaned from the focus group participants.

Once the data was collected a strategic planning team composed of Parks and Recreation staff, elected city officials, city administrators and members of the park advisory board met on three different occasions to develop the plan.

### Key Findings from Survey

- Residents are satisfied/very satisfied with almost all aspects of the city's parks. Areas cited that could be improved were restroom facilities, followed by safety, lighting, and maintenance.
- Residents largely enjoy the city facilities. Palmer Hills Golf Course rated of the highest quality, followed by Frozen Landing, and the Bettendorf Community Center, although with only a difference of 0.1 between each, the differences likely emerged from chance rather than any real difference in quality rating.
- With respect to programs, actives and events, respondents were very satisfied. Of the listed Bettendorf Parks and Recreation events, most



respondents attended the Bettendorf Fourth of July Festival followed by the Bettendorf Park Band Summer Concert Series and Movies in the Park. The St. Patrick's Day Special Population Dance and Yoga in the Park received the least number of selections.

- When asked to rate the quality of the amenities of the parks, trails and park maintenance had the highest weighted averages; basketball courts and restrooms had the lowest weighted averages. However, there were minimal differences among even these responses.
- Residents would like to see the city provide more funding and support to Parks and Recreation and to provide more adequate access to parks and recreational facilities to all parts of the city.

### Planning Sessions

The planning sessions used the environmental scan as one point of data. Through discussion the group identified the various strengths, weaknesses, opportunities and threats to the Parks and Recreation department. A discussion of aspirations concluded that providing a premiere experience for residents should be attained.

Three strategic initiatives emerged to provide this premiere experience.

### ***Strategic Initiative #1: Create Processes and Expectations for Continual Improvement***

Bettendorf Parks & Recreation needs a formalized process for continual growth. The purpose of this initiative is to prepare the department to better manage themselves and to think strategically.

### ***Strategic Initiative #2: Accredited Parks and Rec Department***

An aspirational goal is required for a department to achieve peak effectiveness. Pursuing accreditation provides an external benchmark of performance and should bring the department together in pursuit of this goal.



### **Strategic Initiative #3: Explore Value of External Partnerships**

With declining resources both financially and physically, the exploration of community partners allows the department to better understand possibilities for collaborative programming and space.

Finally, the staff spent some time reflecting on mission and vision and agreed to the following new mission and vision to provide direction and purpose for the department.

#### **MISSION**

*The mission of Bettendorf Parks & Recreation is to provide accessible, diverse, and inclusive experiences that enhance the quality of life and create a sense of place and community for all.*

#### **VISION**

*Bettendorf Parks & Recreation is recognized as a champion for community and personal growth through lifelong recreational experiences.*



# Bettendorf Parks and Recreation Strategic Plan 2024-2026

---

## **MISSION**

The mission of Bettendorf Parks & Recreation is to provide accessible, diverse, and inclusive experiences that enhance the quality of life and create a sense of place and community for all.

## **VISION**

Bettendorf Parks & Recreation is recognized as a champion for community and personal growth through lifelong recreational experiences.

### ***Strategic Initiative #1: Create Processes and Expectations for Continual Improvement***

**Commentary:** Bettendorf Parks & Recreation is in a formalized process for continual growth. The purpose of this initiative is to prepare the department to better manage themselves and to think strategically.

Objective	Action Plans	Measures of Success	Person Responsible	Budget	Timeline
Establish Sense of Purpose	1. Finalize Mission and Vision	Mission adopted	Kim, Liz, Nathan	0	Q1 2024
	2. Establish Agenda Driven Monthly Meetings	Trust and teamwork	Kim, Liz, Nathan	\$75/month	ongoing
	3. Offer more team building opportunities	Trust and teamwork, Morale	Kim, Liz	0	
	4. Establish specific tasks and procedures	Staff cohesiveness	Kim, Liz, Nathan	0	Q1 2024
	5. Regularly discuss performance objectives and Goals	Goals analyzed	Kim, Liz, Nathan	0	Quarterly
Establish Rec Business Plan for Department (in context of accreditation)	1. Benchmark Other Agencies Practices (see Accreditation)	In line or exceeding other communities of the same size	Liz, Nathan	0	Q2 2024
	2. Incorporate Community Feedback and Needs (Gap Analysis)	Successful neighborhood collaboration	Jason, Liz, Nathan, Kim	\$200	Ongoing
	3. Formalize Program Analysis and assessment	Programs are better and geared toward the mission and vision	Liz, Nathan, Kim R	0	Q1 2024
	4. Program review process created to evaluate program success and offerings.	Program evaluation allows better decision making	Liz, Nathan, Kim R, Isaac, Meredith	0	On-going

Objective	Action Plans	Measures of Success	Person Responsible	Budget	Timeline
	5. Form department goals for Community Center space utilization	Better allocation of resources	Liz, Nathan Isaac, Meredith	0	Q3 2024
	6. Staff receives Business Training	Better decisions	Kim	0	Q2 2024
Develop better understanding of city budgets and goals	1. Budget Education for Decision Making	Decisions informed by budget expectations	Kim	0	Q1 2024
	2. More Pro-active cost actions	Better use of resources	Kim	0	On going
	3. New software implementation	Trainings and regular usage	Finance/IT/Kim	0	Q1 2024
	4. More awareness of City Council Goal Setting	Accomplishing tasks that are top priority with the City.	Kim	0	On going
Collaborative dialogue with City Decision Makers	1. Have meeting with decision makers prior to goal setting	Meeting happens	Kim	0	Q3 2024
		More transparency			Q3 2024
	2. Monthly reports to Council	More informed decision makers	Kim	0	monthly
Create process for consistent reporting of information	1. Determine what information needs to be reported and to whom, time frame and purpose	Information reported to decision makers	Kim	0	Q1 2024
	2. Information should be streamlined and reported quarterly in one format	Reports are created and are consistent	Liz, Nathan, Isaac, Meredith, Jason	0	Q1 2024
	3. Team understands data tracked	Team better informed			
Study organizational structure	1. Review park operations and structure for efficiency and effectiveness	Implement needed to change structure	Kim, Jason, Brian S	0	Q1 - ongoing



Objective	Action Plans	Measures of Success	Person Responsible	Budget	Timeline
	2. Clarify internal job responsibilities/roles in Parks and Rec department	Individual staff responsibilities are clear	Kim, Liz, Nathan	0	Q2 2024
Create staff development plans (1)	1. Staff receives needed business training	Staff works better	Kim	TBD	Q
	2. Staff is reviewed and creates professional development needs	Open communication	Kim	TBD	On-going
	3. Staff attends appropriate professional development opportunities	Better motivated staff	Kim	TBD	On-going
Create additional team cohesion	1. Agenda driven monthly meetings	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Staff informed</li> <li>• Better staff morale</li> <li>• Teamwork</li> <li>• Open communication</li> </ul>	Kim	0	On-going
	2. Monthly team building activities		All	0	

### **Strategic Initiative #2: Accredited Parks and Rec Department**

**Commentary:** An aspirational goal is required for a department to achieve peak effectiveness. Pursuing accreditation provides an external benchmark of performance and should bring the department together in pursuit of this goal.

Objective	Action Plans	Measures of Success	Person Responsible	Budget	Timeline
Standards for Accreditation are understood and disseminated (1)	1. Research Standards of NRPA (CAPRA)	Staff understands standards	Nathan	0	On-going
	2. Communicate standards to staff		Nathan	0	Q2 2025
Establish expectations and create support for accreditation initiative (2)	1. Meeting with key department heads	Department heads are supportive of accreditation initiative	Kim and Nathan	0	Q2 2025
Appoint Core accreditation team (3)	1. Accreditation Manger selected	Manager is appointed	Kim	0	Q3 2025
	2. Internal and external people appointed to accreditation team	Team is created	Kim	0	Q3 2025
Keep Decision Makers informed of progress (4)	1. Establish communication process for informing key people	Process is established	Kim	0	Q3 2025
	2. Determine which Dept. Heads and Council Members need to be kept informed	Information is shared during COW, Informational Meetings	Kim	0	Q3 2025
Officially Apply for accreditation (5)	1. Application is prepared	Application is Complete	Kim and team	\$2,000	Q4 2026

### ***Strategic Initiative #3: Explore Value of External Partnerships***

**Commentary:** With declining resources both financially and physically the exploration of community partners allows the department to better understand possibilities for collaborative programming and space.

Objective	Action Plans	Measures of Success	Person Responsible	Budget	Timeline
Define Expectations	1. What are our needs?	Facility Sharing	Kim	TBD	Q1 2024
	2. What can we offer?	Program sharing	Kim	TBD	
	3. Compromise	Expand Community access		TBD	
High Level Meetings with Potential Partners	1. Meet with Bett/PV Superintendents	Goals/action plan established	Kim/Jeff/Decker	0	Q2 2024
	2. Meet with TBK	Goals/action plan established	Kim/Jeff/Liz	0	Q2 2024
	3. Meet with YMCA	Goals/action plan established	Kim/Liz	0	Q2 2024
	4. Meet with Rivermont	Goals/action plan established	Kim/Liz	0	Q2 2024

# Environmental Scan Results

July 20, 2023

---

## Executive Summary

In Spring 2023, the City of Bettendorf contracted with Wastyn & Associates to facilitate the organization's formal strategic planning process. This process began with 8 focus groups throughout the month of April 2023, attended by 35 people to determine current perceptions and future desires for the organization. Focus group data formed the foundation for the 34-question survey that 2,469 people completed to validate or alter the perceptions gleaned from the focus group participants. This report summarizes the data and findings from the survey, adding focus group insights as relevant to support or provide context for survey findings.

When we compare the demographics of the respondents and of the City of Bettendorf, we conclude that **the survey captured the perceptions of between 5% and 26% of all Bettendorf residents**, a response rate that provides confidence in the representativeness of the responses received. When we look at household size and composition, we can also conclude that we captured the opinion of **31% of all Bettendorf children** through their parents and **37% of all seniors**. The survey under-represented the opinions of lower income people – those with incomes of less than \$75,000 – and over-represented people with incomes of higher than \$150,000.

The prototypical survey respondent lives in North Bettendorf, has four people living in their household, between the age of 25 and 55, 2 children or 2 seniors, White, own their home, and have a dog.

Nearly all (97.5%) of respondents had used a Bettendorf Park or facility in the last 12 months, with a much higher percentage of 25- 55-year-olds using the parks or facilities than young adults (18-25) or older adults (older than 65), with older adults least likely to have used a park or facility in the last year, although 93.2% did. Significantly fewer Black or Hispanic residents attended a park or facility compared to White residents. A lower percentage of African American residents visited Devils Glen Park than any other racial or ethnic group. A significantly higher percentage of North Bettendorf residents and people with annual incomes of more than \$50,000 than the other groups studied.

In the last 12 months, nearly one-third of respondents had visited Crow Creek Park, Devils Glen Park, Middle Park or Veterans Memorial Park; 10% or fewer had visited McLamarrah Park or the Jack and Pat Bush Scenic Overlook. Parks used varied based on income, race, and where the respondent lives. Most people visited the parks slightly less than monthly, leading us to conclude that they generally had enough experience with them to draw informed conclusions and impressions.

When we rate the quality of parks, nearly all had room for improvement with Crow Creek Park, Forest Grove Park, and Veterans Memorial Park receiving the highest quality ratings and Edgewood Park, Sunny Crest Park, Pidgeon Creek Park and the Pat and Jack Bush Scenic Overlook scoring the lowest but not significantly lower. A clear age division in ratings of quality emerged between people younger than 55 and those older than 55, presumably because of the presence of children in the household and the

different needs of youth for recreational and sports activities. When asked to rate their most important parks, the same findings emerged.

When asked to rate the quality of the amenities of the parks, trails and park maintenance had the highest weighted averages; basketball courts and restrooms had the lowest weighted averages. Again, with minimal differences between the ratings of all the amenities studied. Respondents rated safety, maintenance, playground, and restrooms as most important to them and tennis courts and pickleball courts as least important. A clear difference in perceptions existed between people older and younger than 55.

When we compare perceptions of quality with perceptions of importance, **respondents saw a large need to improve restroom facilities, followed by safety, lighting, and maintenance.**

About one-third of respondents each had used the Community Center, Frozen Landing, and Palmer Hills Golf Course with 18% having not used any of these amenities in the last 12 months. People typically used these facilities monthly to semi-annually when in season. Palmer Hills Golf Course rated of the highest quality, followed by Frozen Landing, and the Bettendorf Community Center, although with only a difference of 0.1 between each, the differences likely emerged from chance rather than any real difference in quality rating. When rating the importance of each, the Community Center rated the highest followed by Palmer Hills Golf Course, and Frozen Landing, although with minimal differences between the ratings. When we compare ratings on importance with quality, we see **a potential need to improve the quality of the Community Center.**

Seventy percent of respondents had used a Bettendorf Parks and Recreation program, indicating sufficient knowledge to have valid perceptions. The likelihood of participating in programs decreased with age, with 18–25-year-olds most likely to participate and people older than 65 least likely. When asked to select in which programs they have participated, the largest percentage of respondents attended soccer games followed by day camps, playground programs, and Coach Pitch baseball leagues. Rugby Fit Clinic and Rookie Rugby League fell to the bottom of the list. A clear split in attendance at Parks and Recreation Programs exists between individuals younger than 55 and older than 55.

Golf lessons, playgrounds program, adult basketball league, adult's kickball league, summer sports and games, and soccer rated the highest on quality of programs. Santa's Day Out, Skiing and snowboarding lessons, and female self-defense classes scored the lowest but not by a large margin. When asked to rate some desired quality of these programs, "meets the needs of a wide variety of ages" rated highest, followed by "accessible," "affordable," and "high quality." "Unique" rated lowest, but still at a respectable score. When asked to rate the same attributes on importance, "affordable," "meets the needs of a wide variety of ages," and "accessible" emerged as the most important aspects of Bettendorf programs. "Unique" and "collaborative" fell to the bottom as least important. When we compare the quality and the importance of these aspects of Bettendorf programs, we find a desire and opportunity to make these programs more affordable, better staffed, and more accessible.

Of the listed Bettendorf Parks and Recreation events, most respondents attended the Bettendorf Fourth of July Festival followed by the Bettendorf Park Band Summer Concert Series and Movies in the Park. The St. Patrick's Day Special Population Dance and Yoga in the Park received the least number of

selections. When asked to rate the quality of each event, the Bettendorf Park Band Summer Concert Series and Bettendorf Park and Recreation Night rated the highest; the Country Hoe Down Special Population Dance rated the lowest. Similar results emerged when asked to rate the importance of these events with the Bettendorf Fourth of July Festival receiving the highest rating followed by the Bettendorf Park Band Summer Concert Series and Movies in the Park. The County Hoe Down Special Population Dance and Frosty Four Run fell to the bottom as least important. When we compare ratings of importance with those of quality, we find that every event has the appropriate investment based on the difference between quality and importance.

The final section of the survey asked respondents' opinions about Bettendorf Parks and Recreation's relationships with the City of Bettendorf and other partners and recommendations for the department's future. Among a list of statements about the department, "Parks and Recreation provide an important amenity for attracting Bettendorf residents" rated had the highest level of agreement among respondents, followed "I am proud of Bettendorf's parks," "I am proud of Bettendorf's recreational programs," and "Parks and Recreation provides a place for residents to gather to build community." That the city provides adequate funding for Parks and Recreation and Parks and Recreation partners sufficiently with the TBK Sports Complex falling to the bottom of the list.

When asked to rate the importance of each statement, respondents rated "City adequately supports the Parks and Recreation department" and "City provides adequate funding for Parks and Recreation" as the most important, "Parks and Recreation partners sufficiently with TBK" and "Parks and Recreation partners sufficiently with the YMCA" received the lowest rating on their importance. When we compare the ratings on quality with those of importance, we find that **respondents would like to see the city provide more funding and support to Parks and Recreation and to provide more adequate access to parks and recreational facilities to all parts of the city.**

The final closed-ended question asked respondents to prioritize 12 possible future projects or activities. "More park activities for older kids (e.g., 10–15-year-olds)" and "Upgrade indoor facilities" rated as the highest priorities; "Add dog parks" rated as the lowest priority by a wide margin.

To further prioritize this list and remove the temptation to rate them all as a high priority, the last question asked participants to choose **one project** from the same list of 12 for Bettendorf Parks and Recreation to undertake. "Create a community center for recreational programs and community use" overwhelmingly received the most responses, followed by "more park activities for older kids," and "better connect the trails." "Acquire new land or open spaces" and "provide more information about parks programming" received the fewest responses as the highest priority.

## Study Process

In Spring 2023, the City of Bettendorf contracted with Wastyn & Associates to facilitate a formal strategic planning process for the Parks and Recreation Department.

The process began by collecting data on community needs and perceptions. Eight focus groups – attended by 35 people – provided one picture of the community's needs, perceptions, and priorities. Focus groups lasted an average of an hour. All focus groups used the script included in Appendix A as a

guide to gather broad input, although focus groups determined the direction of the conversation rather than strictly sticking to the script.

Transcripts of audio recordings of the focus group conversations provided the basis for the 34-question community survey that sought to confirm, alter, or enhance the perceptions that emerged from the focus groups. A combination of closed-ended and open-ended questions elicited community members' perceptions of and priorities for Bettendorf Parks and Recreation as they plan their future. See Appendix B for a copy of the survey.

SurveyMonkey emailed the survey to the 18,568 people on their mailing list using Wastyn & Associates' SurveyMonkey account. 1,695 of those emails bounced. 753 individuals responded to their email invitation to take the survey for a completion rate of 4%.

A weblink shared the survey through Zen City with other community members who do not appear on their mailing list. An additional 1,711 individuals took the survey through this circulated link. Three other people completed a hard copy of the survey, distributed through the Parks and Recreation offices to walk-in traffic. In total, **responses from 2,469 individuals** provide the data to inform the conclusions drawn in this report.

Best practice in survey research considers a response rate of more than 5% as representative of the sample as a whole, in this case, Bettendorf residents. We cannot determine an exact response due to the offering of a weblink. We can look at demographics of the respondents and compare them to city of Bettendorf to determine the representativeness of the responses. Those data appear in the next section and show that, based on the number of people who completed the survey and the reported sizes of their households, we can conclude that **the survey captured the perceptions of between 5% and 26% of all Bettendorf residents**. Overall, this response rate and the demographics provides confidence in the representativeness of the responses received.

### Demographics of Survey Respondents

We ask questions about survey respondents' demographics for two reasons. First, these data provide an indicator of the representativeness of the results for the population. That is, the over-representation of a certain demographic or an under-representation of another may partially explain an outcome, suggest further data that might merit collection, or warrant caution interpreting the results.

Second, when we have subgroups with more than 30 members, we can compare perceptions based on demographic characteristics to see where statistically significant differences emerge. That is, do individuals of a certain age or geographic location have different perceptions and priorities than individuals of another age or geographic location? This report shares subgroup differences when Survey Monkey identifies them as statistically significant at  $p > 0.05$ , meaning that the difference would likely emerge by chance less than 5% of the time. Said another way, we can say with 95% certainty that a true difference between the subgroups exists.

Where Respondents Live: Just under 38% of survey respondents said they live in North Bettendorf. 18.8% said they live in East Bettendorf, while just under 14% said they live in Downtown Bettendorf or

West Bettendorf. 10.4% of respondents reported living outside of Bettendorf in Iowa, while 4.8% said they live outside of Bettendorf in Illinois.

Where do you live?		
Answer Choices	Responses	
North Bettendorf	37.99%	905
East Bettendorf	18.85%	449
Downtown Bettendorf	13.98%	333
West Bettendorf	13.94%	332
Outside of Bettendorf in Iowa	10.41%	248
Outside of Bettendorf in Illinois	4.83%	115

Based on these data, **2,019 Bettendorf residents completed the survey**. According to population estimates from the 2022 U.S. Census, Bettendorf has a population of 39,548. Assuming that each survey represents only one resident – which we know it does not based on the responses from the next question, we have a **survey response rate of just over 5% of all Bettendorf residents** which provides good confidence that the results represent the population as a whole.

When we compare other demographic characteristics with where they live, we find differences based on race, age, and income.

Variable	Location					
	North	East	Downtown	West	Iowa	Illinois
Age	25-55	older than 55	18-25			
Race	White, Hispanic	Asian, Pacific Islanders	American Indian, Alaskan Native, Asian, Pacific Islander, Black	Hispanic		

Household Size: The next question asked respondents how many people live in their household. 43.5% replied four, 18.7% replied three, 14.3% said five, and 11.7% reported two. 8.7% have more than five people living in their household, and just 3.1% reported being the sole person living in their home.

How many people live in your household, including you?		
Answer Choices	Responses	
*1	3.09%	74
*2	11.65%	279
*3	18.71%	448
*4	43.51%	1042
*5	14.32%	343
More than 5	8.73%	209



Assuming that only one person in each household completed the survey – which we cannot verify, these responses provide information on the perceptions held by 9,113 Bettendorf residents, or 23% of the population. **Conservatively estimating that half of these households had more than one member complete the survey, we have captured the opinions of approximately 11.5% of Bettendorf residents.**

Again, the number of household members differed depending on age, race, location and income, with an interaction between variables likely at play. To summarize these findings, with only statistically significant difference reported:

Variable	Household Size					
	1 person	2 people	3 people	4 people	5 people	5 people +
Age	Older than 65	18-25	18-25	25-55		Younger than 55
Race		Asian, Pacific Island, Black	Asian, Pacific Island, Black	White	Hispanic	American Indian or Alaskan Natives
Location				North Bettendorf		
Income	Less than \$49,999	Less than \$49,999	\$75,000 - \$99,999	\$50,000 and \$74,999; more than \$150,000	More than \$75,000	

Age: The survey also asked participants to select their age from a set of provided ranges. More than 81% reported their age as between 25-55 years old. An additional 7.7% reported their age as between 18 and 25. 5.6% of respondents said they were 55 to 65 years of age, and 5.0% selected 65+. Fewer than 10 respondents (less than 0.05%) reported their age as younger than 18 years old.

What is your age?		
Answer Choices	Responses	
Younger than 18 years old	0.42%	10
18-25 years old	7.71%	184
25-55 years old	81.20%	1939
55-65 years old	5.61%	134
Older than 65	5.07%	121

When we compare these data to the age breakdown reported through the US Census Bureau, we see an under-representation of children younger than 18 – not surprisingly given that their parents likely completed the survey – and of adults older than 65.

Age Group	Survey Respondents	US Census Data
Younger than 18	0.42%	26.0%
18-65	94.51%	57%

Older than 65	5.07%	17.0%
---------------	-------	-------

A larger percentage of Black residents fall between 18 and 25 than of any other racial or ethnic group other than American Indian or Alaskan Native. Significantly fewer Black residents fall between 25 and 55 compared to the other racial groups; no American Indian or Alaskan Native between 55 and 65 years old responded to the survey.

Number of Children in the Household: However, when we asked respondents how many children live in their household, we see a greater representation of children in the responses, assuming that the parent who completed the survey looked at some of the questions through the lens of their children. The findings below and the comments suggest that they did. 41.8% reported having two children in the home, 34% reported having one, and just under 13% reported having zero children living in the household. 7.3% said they have three children in the home, while 4% said they have more than three children living with them.

How many children in your household?		
Answer Choices	Responses	
0	12.95%	310
1	34.00%	814
2	41.77%	1000
3	7.27%	174
More than 3	4.01%	96

Taken together, **these data represent the experiences of 3,720 Bettendorf children.** If we assume that the number of children from respondents who live in Bettendorf mirrors those who live outside of the city, that is 14.7% of survey respondents do not live in Bettendorf, we conclude that the survey reflects the experiences of 3,173 Bettendorf minors or **31% of all children who live in the city.** Even if both parents completed the survey, we still captured the experiences of 15.5% of all Bettendorf children, a percentage that gives us great confidence in the representativeness of the results.

Again, we see differences between other demographics and the number of children. People younger than 55 more likely have children in the household at all numbers than people older than 55 with people 55-65 more likely to have 1 or 2 children in the household than people older than 65 do. Only 5% of people older than 65 have a child in their household.

Variable	Number of Kids				
	0	1	2	3	3+
Race			Asian, Pacific Islanders	Hispanic	
Location		Downtown Bettendorf, Illinois	North Bettendorf		East and West Bettendorf, Iowa
Income	Less than \$50,000	\$75,000 and \$99,999	\$50,000 and \$74,999	More than \$150,000	

**Number of Seniors in the Household:** The survey also asked respondents how many seniors live in their household. Approximately 35% reported having two seniors (35.31%) or zero seniors (34.39%) in the home, while 28.8% said they have one senior in the home. Only 1.5% reported having more than two seniors living in the household.

How many seniors in your household?		
Answer Choices	Responses	
0	34.39%	822
1	28.79%	688
2	35.31%	844
More than 2	1.51%	36

Using similar logic with the children, assuming that only one person in each of these households completed the survey, we captured the opinions of **approximately 2,484 Bettendorf seniors or 37% of all of the seniors who live in Bettendorf**. Even if both members of the household completed the survey, we still have captured the views of 18.5% of Bettendorf seniors, a percentage that gives us great confidence in the representativeness of the results.

Not surprisingly, a higher percentage of people older than 65 have 2 seniors in their household than any other age group, with 71.7% of respondents older than 65 reporting 2 seniors in the household and 27.5% reporting only 1.

Variable	Number of Seniors			
	0	1	2	2+
Race	Hispanic	Black	American Indian, Alaskan Native, Black, and White	
Location	East and West Bettendorf, Iowa	Downtown Bettendorf, Illinois	North Bettendorf	
Income	More than \$150,000	\$75,000 - \$99,999	\$50,000 - \$74,999	less than \$50,000

**Race and Ethnicity:** The next question asked about respondents' race and ethnicity. Of the 2,469 total respondents, **86.5% reported their race as White/Caucasian**. Just over 3% of participants answered Asian/Pacific Islander, as well as American Indian or Alaskan Native and Black or African American. 2.5% reported their race/ethnicity as Hispanic, and less than 1% (0.76%) reported identifying as more than one ethnicity.

Which race/ethnicity best describes you? (Please choose only one.)		
Answer Choices	Responses	
American Indian or Alaskan Native	3.32%	79
Asian / Pacific Islander	3.62%	86
Black or African American	3.24%	77
Hispanic	2.53%	60
White / Caucasian	86.53%	2056
Multiple ethnicity / Other (please specify)	0.76%	18

Of the 18 who chose “other,” they described their race in a way that matches one of the previous categories.

When we compare the race and ethnicity of the survey respondents to the population of Bettendorf, we find that **representation of people of color nearly matches city**. Within the population of people of color, however, we have a slight overrepresentation of Asian and Pacific Islanders, Hispanic, and American Indians and an underrepresentation of Black or African Americans. However, given the relatively small numbers in each of these groups, that should not have a significant influence on the data or its interpretation.

Race/Ethnicity	Survey Respondents	US Census Data
White	86.53%	86.2%
Asian/Pacific Islander	3.62%	6.4%
American Indian/Alaskan Native	3.32%	0.1%
Black or African American	3.24%	1.9%
Hispanic	2.53%	4.6%
Multiple/Other	0.76%	5.1%

Home ownership: The survey then asked respondents if they own their place of residents. Of the 2,469 respondents, 95.2% said they own their home, while just under 5% said they do not.

Do you own your place of residence?		
Answer Choices	Responses	
Yes	95.22%	2273
No	4.78%	114

The US Census Bureau reports that 75.2% of Bettendorf residents own their home, making these data over representative of homeowners compared to renters in the city. A higher percentage of people between the ages of 18 and 25 rent than people older than 25. Hispanic residents less likely own their home compared to White residents. A higher percentage of people in North Bettendorf own their home than respondents from any other geographic area. A higher percentage of people with incomes less than \$50,000 rent rather than own their home.

Dog Owners: Two-thirds of residents own a dog. We asked this question less for representativeness and more to help interpret the question that asks about the value of the city’s dog parks which appears later in this report.

Do you own a dog?		
Answer Choices	Responses	
Yes	66.07%	1575
No	33.93%	809

A higher percentage of people younger than 55 own a dog compared to people older than 55 with people older than 65 the least likely to own a dog. A higher percentage of Black and White families own a dog compared to the other racial and ethnic groups studied. 79.5% of residents in North Bettendorf own a dog, higher than any other geographic area. A higher percentage of people from the other Bettendorf geographic areas own a dog compared to the non-Bettendorf respondents. A higher percentage of people with incomes between \$50,000 and \$74,999 own a dog than any other income group.

Household Income: Finally, the survey asked respondents for their annual household income range. 37.8% reported an income range of between \$50,000 and \$74,999. Approximately 22% each reported an income range of between \$100,000 and \$150,000 (22.59%) and between \$75,000 and \$99,999 (22.0%). Nearly 13% reported an annual household income of more than \$150,000, and just under 5% reported a household income of less than \$49,999.

What is your annual household income?		
Answer Choices	Responses	
Less than \$49,999	4.69%	110
Between \$50,000 and \$74,999	37.77%	886
Between \$75,000 and \$99,999	22.04%	517
Between \$100,000 and \$150,0	22.59%	530
More than \$150,000	12.92%	303

When we compare the annual household income for survey respondents and the City of Bettendorf, using data pulled from the 2021 ACS 5-Year Estimates Detailed Tables, we find that the survey under-represented lower income people – those with incomes of less than \$75,000 – and over-represented people with incomes of higher than \$150,000.

	Survey	City
Less than \$49,999	4.69%	27.29%
\$50,000 - \$74,999	37.77%	14.24%
\$75,000 - \$99,999	22.04%	15.02%
\$100,000 - \$150,000	22.59%	18.57%
More than \$150,000	12.92%	24.76%

Like other demographic characteristics, income varied based on the age of recipient, race, and neighborhood where they live.

Variable	Household Income				
	Less than \$50K	\$50K-\$75K	\$75K-\$100K	\$100K-\$150K	More than \$150K
Age		Younger than 55	18-25	older than 65	55-65
Race	American Indian, Alaskan Native, Asian, Pacific Islander, Black	White	Black	Hispanic	Hispanic, White
Location	Downtown Bettendorf	North Bettendorf	Downtown Bettendorf, Illinois	East and West Bettendorf, Iowa	East Bettendorf

These interactions between demographic variables become important as we interpret the perceptions noted throughout this report because the data analysis does not allow us to separate out which variable causes a given effect. For example, we see a strong correlation between age and income and age and number of children. We also see similar patterns of responses from people who live in East Bettendorf, West Bettendorf, and non-Bettendorf residents who live in Iowa and between Downtown Bettendorf residents and those who live in Illinois. We cannot know with certainty if geography drives their perceptions or their location because, for example, downtown Bettendorf also has a higher concentration of lower income and younger residents. We point this out as a caution when drawing absolute conclusions based on these data.

#### Survey Respondents' Relationship to Bettendorf Parks and Facilities

The survey asked respondents whether they have attended a Bettendorf Park or facility in the last 12 months. 97.5% responded yes, and 1.9% responded no. 0.7% could not recall.

Have you attended a Bettendorf Park or facility in the last 12 months?		
Answer Choices	Responses	
Yes	97.48%	2360
No	1.86%	45
Not sure	0.66%	16

People between the ages of 25 and 55 much more likely said they used the parks than young adults (ages 18-25) or older adults (older than 65) did, with older adults least likely to use the parks (6.72% did not use the parks compared to 1.34% of people 25-55).

Significantly fewer Black or African American and Hispanic attended a park or facility compared to White residents. A lower percentage of African American residents visited Devils Glen Park than any other racial or ethnic group.

A significantly higher percentage of North Bettendorf residents have attended a Bettendorf Park or facility in the last 12 months than downtown Bettendorf residents or people who live outside of Bettendorf who took the survey. A significantly lower percentage of residents with incomes of less than \$49,999 attended a Bettendorf Park or facility in the last 12 months compared to residents with higher incomes.

The survey then asked respondents six questions about their experience with Bettendorf parks.

First, respondents were asked to select all the Bettendorf parks they have visited in the last 12 months. Only 1.9% of respondents said they have not visited any of the listed parks in the past 12 months. Of the rest, nearly one-third each had visited Crow Creek Park (37.8%), Devils Glen Park (36.2%), Middle Park (33.6%) or Veterans Memorial Park (31.3%). Approximately 10% or fewer had visited McLamarrah Park (10.3%) or the Jack and Pat Bush Scenic Overlook (9.3%). The ability to select more than one explains the nonadditive nature of the results.

<b>Which of the following Bettendorf Parks have you visited in the last 12 months? Check all that apply</b>		
Answer Choices	Responses	
Crow Creek Park	37.77%	914
Devils Glen Park	36.24%	877
Middle Park	33.60%	813
Veterans Memorial Park	31.28%	757
McManus Park (Rocket Park)	26.53%	642
Forest Grove Park	20.91%	506
Edgewood Park	20.08%	486
Kiwanis Park	16.12%	390
Hoover Park	16.07%	389
Hollowview Park	15.54%	376
Lincoln Park Splash Pad	15.25%	369
Friendship Park	14.42%	349
Ed Scheck Park	14.26%	345
Leach Park & Boat Launch	14.21%	344
Sunny Crest Park	14.13%	342
Meier Park	14.01%	339
Field Sike Park	13.43%	325
Parkway Drive	13.06%	316
Eagle's Landing Park and Boat Launch	11.82%	286
Pigeon Creek Park	11.40%	276
McLamarrah Park	10.29%	249
Pat & Jack Bush Scenic Overlook	9.26%	224
None	1.94%	47

Park usage varied depending on the age of the respondent. Because of a small number of people younger than 18 who completed the survey, we exclude their data from the analysis and find the following differences:

- People older than 65 more likely **did not use any** of the listed parks compared to every other age group
- People older than 55 more likely used **Devils Glen Park, Middle Park, Crow Creek Park, Veterans Memorial Park and Leach Park and Boat Launch** compared to people younger than 55, although **Crow Creek Park** attracts more people between the ages of 25 and 55 than between 18 and 25 and **Veterans Memorial Park** attracts more people older than 25 than between the ages of 18 and 25.
- People between the ages of 18 and 25 or 55 to 65 more likely used **McManus Park** than people 25 to 55 or older than 65, although people between the ages of 25 and 55 more likely used this park than people older than 65
- People between the ages of 18 and 25 more likely used **Edgewood Park** than people of any other age, with a significant difference between 18- and 25-year-olds and people older than 65 and a steady decline in usage as the age brackets increased
- People between the ages of 18 and 25 more likely used **Sunny Crest Park** than people of any other age; likelihood to use the park decreased with age. No one older than 65 said they used this park.
- People younger than 55 more likely used **Meier Park, Parkway Drive, Hoover Park, McLamarrah Park, Friendship Park, Lincoln Park Splash Pad** than people older than 65, although people between the ages of 18 and 25 use Lincoln Park Splash Pad less often than people between the ages of 25 and 55.
- People between the ages of 55 and 65 more likely use **Kiwanis Park** than any other age group
- People between the ages of 25 and 55 more likely used **Ed Scheck Park** and the **Pat and Jack Bush Scenic Overlook** than people older than 65 did; fewer people in the 18-25 age group used the Pat and Jack Bush Scenic Overlook than people between the ages of 25 and 55
- People between the ages of 25 and 65 more likely use **Field Sike Park** than people older than 65.

Park usage also varied by race and ethnicity.

White	American Indian, Alaskan Native	Asian or Pacific Islander	Black	Hispanic
Edgewood Park, Leach Park and Boat Launch, Parkway Drive, Veterans Memorial Park, Crow Creek Park, Kiwanis Park	Sunny Crest Park, McManus Park	Sunny Crest Park, McManus Park	McManus Park	Middle Park, Forest Grove Park, Veterans Memorial Park, McManus Park, Crow Creek Park, Kiwanis Park



A higher percentage of North Bettendorf residents did not visit any park than those who live in any other section of town or outside of Bettendorf in Iowa.

North	Downtown	East	West	Iowa	Illinois
Ed Scheck, Field Sike, Forest Grove	McManus, Edgewood, Sunny Crest	Devils Glen, Middle, Crow Creek, Veterans Memorial, McManus, Edgewood, Friendship, Forest Grove	Devils Glen, Middle, Crow Creek, Veterans Memorial, McManus, Edgewood, Hoover, Kiwanis, Forest Grove	Devils Glen, Middle, Crow Creek, Veterans Memorial	Sunny Crest, McLamarrah, Friendship

Income also determined which park people visited. A lower percentage of people with incomes between \$50,000 and \$74,999 visited **Devils Glen Park** than people of other incomes with the highest percentage of people with incomes of more than \$150,000. **McManus Park** also draws a smaller percentage of people with incomes between \$50,000 and \$74,999 than any other income level. The chart below shows which park people with different income levels more often frequented.

Less than \$50,000	\$50K-\$75K	\$75K-\$100K	\$100K-\$150K	More than \$150K
		Sunny Crest Park and Pidgeon Creek, Lincoln Park Splash Pad	Kiwanis, Hollowview, Lincoln Park Splash Pad	Middle, Crow Creek, Ed Scheck, Friendship, Field Sike, Veterans Memorial, and Forest Grove, Kiwanis Park and Hollowview, Lincoln Park Splash Pad, Devils Glen

The survey then used a 5-point Likert Scale to ask respondents how often they typically visit each park in a year. SurveyMonkey converts respondents' qualitative responses into numbers to create a weighted average with "Daily" = 5, "Weekly" = 4, "Monthly" = 3, "Quarterly" = 2, and "Less than 3 times a year" = 1. Respondents also had the option to choose "N/A or No Opinion" which got assigned no points and did not figure into the final average. To analyze these data, we look at the final weighted average to see, on average, how often people visit these different parks.

These data show that most people visit the parks slightly less often than monthly with Crow Creek Park, Sunny Crest Park, Parkway Drive, and McLamarrah Park receiving the highest weighted average scores at 2.9 each, indicating that respondents visited those nearly once a month (which would have resulted in a 3.0 score). Leach Park and Boat Launch, McManus Park (Rocket Park), and Middle Park received the lowest scores at 2.7, although still closer to monthly than quarterly visits to these parks. Overall, survey

respondents visit these parks frequently, leading us to conclude that, on average, **they have enough experience with them to draw informed conclusions based on more than just a single impression.**

How often do you typically visit each park in a year?	
	Weighted Average
Crow Creek Park	2.92
Sunny Crest Park	2.89
Parkway Drive	2.88
McLamarrah Park	2.87
Meier Park	2.85
Pat & Jack Bush Scenic Overlook	2.85
Hoover Park	2.84
Hollowview Park	2.84
Edgewood Park	2.83
Ed Scheck Park	2.83
Kiwanis Park	2.81
Friendship Park	2.81
Pigeon Creek Park	2.8
Eagle's Landing Park and Boat Launch	2.8
Field Sike Park	2.79
Devils Glen Park	2.75
Lincoln Park Splash Pad	2.75
Forest Grove Park	2.74
Veterans Memorial Park	2.73
Leach Park & Boat Launch	2.69
McManus Park (Rocket Park)	2.68
Middle Park	2.66

### Current Perceptions

The survey then shifted its focus to respondents' perceptions of Bettendorf Parks and Recreation's parks, programs, and events.

Perceptions of Parks: The first question used a 4-point Likert Scale to ask respondents to rate the quality of each Bettendorf park. SurveyMonkey converts respondents' qualitative responses into numbers to create a weighted average with "Excellent" = 4, "Good" = 3, "Fair" = 2, and "Poor" = 1. Respondents also had the option to choose "N/A or No Opinion," which got no points and did not figure into the final average.

To analyze these data, we look at the final weighted average, considering anything above a 3.0 as positive since it received more "excellent" and "good" ratings than "fair" or "poor." Anything below a 3.0 deserves discussion as an area for possible improvement.

None of the listed parks received a score of 3.0 or higher on this question, indicating areas for improvement for all parks. As typically occurs in surveys like this, the scores tend to bunch, in this case between 2.7 and 2.9 making it hard to discern between the quality of different parks. That also means that not one park stands out as stellar or sub-par.

That said, Crow Creek Park, Forest Grove Park, and Veterans Memorial Park received the highest quality ratings with weighted averages of 2.9, very near the 3.0 score for a positive rating. Edgewood Park, Sunny Crest Park, Pidgeon Creek Park and the Pat and Jack Bush Scenic Overlook scored the lowest at 2.7.

How would you rate the quality of each of these parks?	
	Weighted Average
Crow Creek Park	2.91
Forest Grove Park	2.91
Veterans Memorial Park	2.9
Devils Glen Park	2.88
McManus Park (Rocket Park)	2.84
Middle Park	2.83
Kiwanis Park	2.78
Meier Park	2.77
Hollowview Park	2.77
Friendship Park	2.77
Parkway Drive	2.75
Field Sike Park	2.75
Hoover Park	2.74
McLamarrah Park	2.73
Leach Park & Boat Launch	2.73
Lincoln Park	2.73
Eagle's Landing Park and Boat Launch	2.73
Ed Scheck Park	2.72
Edgewood Park	2.71
Sunny Crest Park	2.71
Pigeon Creek Park	2.7
Pat & Jack Bush Scenic Overlook	2.7

A clear division on ratings of quality emerged between people older than 55 and those younger than 55, presumably because of the presence of children and the specific needs for their children. For example, people older than 55 rated the quality of **Devils Glen Park, Sunny Crest Park, and Crow Creek Park**, higher than those younger than 55 did. People younger than 55 rated the quality of **Edgewood Park, Meier Park, Parkway Drive, Hoover Park, McLamarrah Park, Kiwanis Park, Hollowview Park, Ed Scheck Park, Pigeon Creek Park, Friendship Park, Lincoln Park, Eagle's Landing Park and Boat Launch, Field Sike Park, Forest Grove Park, and the Pat and Jack Bush Scenic Overlook** higher than people older than 55 did. More people older than 55 rated these as "N/A or no opinion" than people at younger ages.

Two exceptions to this general tendency emerged. People older than 65 rated **Middle Park** higher in quality than any other age group did and people older than 25 rated **Veterans Memorial Park** higher than people between the ages of 18 and 25 did

Racial differences also emerged, many of which mirror the parks that different racial or ethnic groups tend to use. Black residents rated **Devils Glen Park** and **Veterans Memorial Park** lower in quality than White residents did. American Indian and Alaskan Natives rated **Sunny Crest Park** higher in quality than any other racial group or ethnicity did. White and Hispanic residents rated **Crow Creek Park** higher in quality than Black residents did. Black and American Indian or Alaska Native residents rated **McLamarrah Park** higher in quality than White or Hispanic residents did. American Indian, Alaska Native, Asian, Pacific Islanders and Black residents rated **Pidgeon Creek Park, Forest Grove Park, and Eagle's Landing Park and Boat Launch** higher in quality than White or Hispanic residents did. Asian and Pacific Islander residents rated **Friendship Park** higher in quality than Hispanic or White residents did.

Finally, people who live in downtown Bettendorf rated **Crow Creek Park** of lower quality than people who live elsewhere.

The survey then asked participants select the parks that they rate as most important to them to differentiate between all the different parks they may visit in a year. Nearly a third rated Crow Creek Park as their most important, followed by Veterans Memorial Park (24.3%), Devils Glen Park (24.1%), and Middle Park (23.9%). Pigeon Creek Park and Pat & Jack Bush Scenic Overlook received the lowest percentage of responses at 9.9% and 8.8%, respectively, indicating participants view them as less important. The ability to select more than one park explains the nonadditive nature of the responses.

<b>Which park is most important to you? Check all that apply</b>		
Answer Choices	Responses	
Crow Creek Park	31.53%	759
Veterans Memorial Park	24.26%	584
Devils Glen Park	24.14%	581
Middle Park	23.85%	574
McManus Park	19.32%	465
Edgewood Park	16.29%	392
Forest Grove Park	15.87%	382
Sunny Crest Park	14.37%	346
Hoover Park	14.25%	343
Kiwanis Park	13.63%	328
Meier Park	13.59%	327
Hollowview Park	13.09%	315
Lincoln Park	13.09%	315
Ed Scheck Park	12.26%	295
Field Sike Park	12.09%	291
Leach Park & Boat Launch	12.05%	290
Parkway Drive	11.47%	276
Friendship Park	11.38%	274
McLamarrah Park	11.18%	269
Eagle's Landing Park and Boat Launch	10.51%	253
Pigeon Creek Park	9.89%	238
Pat & Jack Bush Scenic Overlook	8.81%	212
None	1.66%	40

Again, statistically significant differences emerged on the park they rated as most important based on age, race, income, and location.

Park	Age	Race	Income	Location
Crow Creek	Older than 55	Hispanic, White	Higher than \$150,000	East, West, Iowa
Devils Glen	Older than 55	Hispanic, American Indian, Alaska Native	\$100,000-\$150,000	East, West, Iowa
Eagle Landing	Younger than 65		\$25,000-\$49,999	
Ed Scheck	Younger than 55			North, West
Edgewood	Younger than 55		Less than \$150,000	Downtown, West
Field Sike	Younger than 65		\$25,000-\$49,999	North, West
Forest Grove			Higher than \$150,000	North, East
Friendship	25-55			
Hollowview		Black, White	\$50,000-\$150,000	

Park	Age	Race	Income	Location
Hoover			\$50,000-\$150,000	
Kiwanis			\$50,000-\$150,000	
Leach	Older than 25		\$50,000-\$150,000	
Lincoln	Younger than 65		Less than \$150,000	
McLamarrah	Younger than 55		\$25,000-\$49,999	
McManus	Younger than 65	Hispanic, American Indian, Alaska Native	Less than \$150,000	Downtown, East Bettendorf
Meier	Younger than 65		Less than \$150,000	Downtown, West Bettendorf
Middle	Older than 55	Hispanic	Less than \$25,000	North, Illinois
Parkway Drive	Younger than 55			
Pat & Jack Bush			\$25,000-\$49,999	North, Iowa, Illinois
Pidgeon Creek	25-55			North, West
Sunny Crest	Younger than 55	Black, Asian		Downtown
Veterans Memorial	Older than 55	Hispanic, White	Higher than \$75,000	East, West, Iowa

Amenities of Bettendorf Parks: The next question asked participants to rate the quality of a list of amenities of Bettendorf's parks, again offering the same 4-point Likert Scale with the option to select "N/A or no opinion." Again, a weighted average above 3.0 indicates more ratings of good or excellent for an overall positive impression.

Trails and park maintenance had the highest weighted averages at 2.8 each. Basketball courts and restrooms had the lowest weighted averages at 2.6 and 2.5, respectively. Again, none of the amenities rated a 3.0 or higher, suggesting areas of improvement for all the aspects about which the survey asked.

How would you rate the quality of each of these aspects of Bettendorf's parks?	
	Weighted Average
Trails	2.82
Maintenance of the parks	2.8
Dog friendly	2.77
Playgrounds	2.77
Parking	2.76
Safety	2.74
Soft surfaces (e.g., grass, landscaping)	2.73
Soccer fields	2.72
Hard surfaces (e.g., parking lots, basketball courts)	2.71
Shelters	2.7
Pickleball courts	2.7
Ball diamonds	2.69
Tennis courts	2.67
Lighting	2.67
Benches and picnic tables	2.65
Basketball courts	2.59
Restrooms	2.51

People older than 55 rated the quality of the trails, park maintenance, shelters, benches and picnic tables, parking, ball diamonds, and soft surfaces higher than people younger than 55 did. Most people older than 55 had no opinion about the soccer fields, pickleball courts, tennis courts, or basketball courts, suggesting that they do not use these amenities.

People between the ages of 55 and 65 rated the quality of the playgrounds higher than any other age group did.

Interesting, ratings of park safety increased as respondents got older with people older than 55 rating it safer than people under 55 did.

Asian and Pacific Islanders rated the quality of parking higher than American Indian, Alaska Natives, Asian, Pacific Islanders or White residents did, followed by Hispanic and Black residents. Asian and Pacific Islanders rated the quality of the playgrounds higher than American Indian, Black, or White residents did; Hispanic residents rated the quality of the playgrounds higher than Black residents did. American Indian and Alaska Natives rated the pickleball courts of higher quality than the White residents did. Hispanic residents rated the safety of the parks higher than the Asian, Pacific Islanders, Black or White residents did.

People from North Bettendorf rated parks maintenance and quality of the hard surfaces (e.g., parking lots, basketball courts) and soft surfaces (grass, landscaping) lower than people from other areas of the city and beyond. People in East and West Bettendorf rated the dog friendliness of the parks and restrooms lower than people from North Bettendorf or downtown.

A higher percentage of people with incomes between \$50,000 and \$74,999 rated the maintenance of the parks, lighting, safety, hard surfaces (parking lots, basketball courts), soft surfaces (grass and

landscaping) and dog friendliness as lower quality than people of other income levels did. A higher percentage of people with incomes higher than \$150,000 rated the restrooms of lower quality and parking of higher quality than people at lower income levels did.

Respondents then rated the same list of aspects in terms of their importance, again using the 4-point Likert scale. For this question, “Very Important” = 4, “Important” = 3, “Not Important” = 2, and “Not Important at All” = 1. Respondents again had the option to choose “N/A or No Opinion” which got no points and did not figure into the final average.

We ask these parallel questions for two reasons. First, we want to assess the relative importance of different aspects of amenities to understand people’s perceptions of them. Second, we compare perceptions of quality with perceptions of importance to see where they diverge. Items with a large discrepancy in these ratings become areas where respondents felt that Bettendorf Parks and Recreation either places too much emphasis or invested too many resources (negative number) compared to its perceived importance or too little (positive number).

Safety, maintenance of the parks, playgrounds, and restrooms all received weighted averages above 3.0, indicating that respondents see each of those features as “essential” or “important.” Basketball courts, dog friendly, tennis courts, and pickleball courts received the lowest ratings of around 2.7, and below the threshold that might suggest discussions about how to improve their quality are not as important to residents.

<b>How would you rate the IMPORTANCE of each of these aspects of Bettendorf’s parks?</b>	
	Weighted Average
Safety	3.13
Maintenance of the parks	3.11
Playgrounds	3.03
Restrooms	3.02
Lighting	2.99
Benches and picnic tables	2.94
Trails	2.93
Parking	2.93
Hard surfaces (e.g., parking lots, basketball courts)	2.92
Shelters	2.91
Soft surfaces (e.g., grass, landscaping)	2.91
Ball diamonds	2.77
Soccer fields	2.74
Basketball courts	2.72
Dog friendly	2.71
Tennis courts	2.7
Pickleball courts	2.69

People older than 55 rated the trails, maintenance of the parks, restrooms, shelters, benches and picnic tables, parking, playgrounds, ball diamonds, soccer fields, pickleball courts, basketball courts, lighting, safety, hard surfaces, and soft surfaces as much more important than people younger than 55 did. The



percentage of people older than 55 who had no opinion on this question ranged between 25% and 33% for the soccer fields, basketball courts, tennis courts, and pickleball courts.

Asian and Pacific Islanders, Hispanic, and White residents rated the importance of the restrooms higher than the other ethnic or minority groups did. Hispanic residents rated the importance of the safety, shelters, and playgrounds higher than Asian, Pacific Islanders, Black or White residents did and rated the importance of hard surfaces as more important than Black or White residents did. White residents rated safety as more important than Black, Asian, Pacific Islander, American Indian or Alaskan Native did, but lower in importance than Hispanics did. Among the ethnic groups studied, Black residents rated shelters as least important. White and Hispanic residents rated the importance of the benches and picnic tables, lighting, and parking higher than American Indian or Alaskan Natives did. Hispanic residents rated the importance of basketball courts higher than White residents did. Asian, Pacific Islander, and Black residents rated the importance of the soft surfaces (grass and landscaping) lower than the other groups did.

People from North and downtown Bettendorf rated the importance of dog friendliness of parks and tennis courts lower than people from East or West Bettendorf did.

A higher percentage of people with incomes higher than \$75,000 considered the ball diamonds more important and tennis courts less important than people with incomes less than \$75,000 did.

When we compare perceptions of quality with perceptions of importance, some interesting conclusions emerge. Respondents saw a large need to improve restroom facilities, followed by safety, lighting, and maintenance. They felt that the Parks and Recreation Departments makes an appropriate investment in ball diamonds, tennis courts, soccer fields, pickleball courts, and making parks dog friendly.

	Quality	Importance	Difference
Restrooms	2.51	3.02	0.51
Safety	2.74	3.13	0.39
Lighting	2.67	2.99	0.32
Maintenance of the parks	2.8	3.11	0.31
Benches and picnic tables	2.65	2.94	0.29
Playgrounds	2.77	3.03	0.26
Shelters	2.7	2.91	0.21
Hard surfaces (e.g., parking lots, basketball courts)	2.71	2.92	0.21
Soft surfaces (e.g., grass, landscaping)	2.73	2.91	0.18
Parking	2.76	2.93	0.17
Basketball courts	2.59	2.72	0.13
Trails	2.82	2.93	0.11
Ball diamonds	2.69	2.77	0.08
Tennis courts	2.67	2.7	0.03
Soccer fields	2.72	2.74	0.02
Pickleball courts	2.7	2.69	-0.01
Dog friendly	2.77	2.71	-0.06

Perceptions of Parks and Recreation Facilities: The survey then asked participants four questions about existing Bettendorf facilities.

The first question asked participants to select all the facilities they have used in the last 12 months. The Bettendorf Community Center received the highest percentage of responses at 36.8%, followed by Frozen Landing at 34.1% and Palmer Hills Golf Course at 31.3%. 18% of respondents said they used none of the facilities in the last 12 months.

<b>Which of the following Bettendorf Parks facilities have you used in the last 12 months? Check all that apply</b>		
Answer Choices	Responses	
Community Center	36.82%	886
Frozen Landing	34.08%	820
Palmer Hills Golf Course	31.26%	752
None	17.96%	432

Usage again varied based on age, location, and race. No statistically significant differences emerged based on income.

Facility	Age	Race	Location
Community Center		American Indian, Alaskan Natives	Downtown
Frozen Landing		Black	Downtown, East, West
Palmer Hills		White, American Indian, Alaskan Natives	
None	Older than 55	Hispanic, White	North, Iowa

The survey then asked participants how often they typically visit each of the Bettendorf facilities with the options of “weekly (in season),” “monthly (in season),” “semiannually,” “annually,” “less than once a year,” and “never.” SurveyMonkey converts these answers to numbers to compute a weighted average with 5 = “weekly (in season),” 4 = “monthly (in season),” 3 = “semiannually,” 2 = “annually,” 1 = “less than once a year,” and 0 = “never.” The three facilities all earned a score greater than 3.0, indicating that respondents visit those facilities monthly to semi-annually when in season.

<b>How often do you typically visit each of the following Bettendorf facilities?</b>	
	Weighted Average
Palmer Hills Golf Course	3.4
Frozen Landing	3.39
Community Center	3.38

A higher percentage of people younger than 55 used the Community Center or Frozen Landing weekly, monthly or semi-annually than people older than 55 did. The frequency of use of Palmer Hills Golf Course did not vary significantly based on age.

The next question asked participants to rate the quality of each Bettendorf facility using the same 4-point Likert Scale as the previous questions, with options of “excellent,” “good,” “fair,” or “poor.” Palmer Hills Golf Course received the highest weighted average at 2.9, followed by Frozen Landing at 2.8 and the Bettendorf Community Center at 2.7, all very positive though below the 3.0 threshold that would indicate more “excellent” and “good” responses than “fair” or “poor.”

<b>How would you rate the QUALITY of the following Bettendorf facilities?</b>	
	Weighted Average
Palmer Hills Golf Course	2.94
Frozen Landing	2.81
Community Center	2.7

People older than 55 rated the quality of the Community Center and Frozen Landing lower or had no opinion compared to people younger than 55 did. Perceptions of Palmer Hills Golf Course did not vary based on age.

People in East and West Bettendorf and from Iowa rated the Community Center lower in quality than people from North or downtown Bettendorf or Illinois. A higher percentage of people with incomes less than \$75,000 rated the quality of the Community Center higher than people with incomes greater than \$75,000. A higher percentage of people with incomes between \$50,000 and \$74,999 or higher than \$100,000 rated the quality of Palmer Hills Golf Course higher than people at other income levels.

The final question regarding Bettendorf facilities asked participants to rate the importance of each facility for the quality of life in the city using a 4-point Likert Scale using the options “critically important,” “important,” “not important,” and “not important at all.” Respondents also had the option to choose “N/A or No Opinion,” which got no points and did not figure into the final average.

None of the options received a score of 3.0 or higher. The Community Center received the highest weighted average at 2.93, followed by Palmer Hills Golf Course at 2.89, and Frozen Landing at 2.8.

<b>How would you rate the IMPORTANCE of the following Bettendorf facilities for the quality of life in the city?</b>	
	Weighted Average
Community Center	2.93
Palmer Hills Golf Course	2.89
Frozen Landing	2.8

People older than 55 rated Frozen Landing and Palmer Hills Golf Course as more important than people younger than 55 did. American Indian and Alaskan Natives rated the importance of the Community Center higher than Asian and Pacific Islanders did. American Indian, Alaskan Natives and White residents rated the importance of Frozen Landing higher than Asian and Pacific Islanders did.

When we compare the ratings on importance with the ratings on quality, we see a potential need to improve the quality of the Community Center.

Facility	Quality	Importance	Difference
Community Center	2.7	2.93	.23
Palmer Hills Golf Course	2.94	2.89	.05
Frozen Landing	2.81	2.8	.01

Perceptions of Parks and Recreation Programs: The survey then asked participants six questions about Bettendorf Parks and Recreation programs.

The first question in this section asked participants if they or their family members attend programs offered by Bettendorf Parks and Recreation. 71.7% of respondents said yes, while 24.4% answered no. Just under 4% chose “not sure.”

Do you or family members attend programs offered by Bettendorf Parks and Recreation?		
Answer Choices	Responses	
Yes	71.70%	1381
No	24.35%	469
Not sure	3.95%	76

Age	Yes	No	Not Sure
18-25	88.0%	9.8%	2.2%
25-55	72.5%	24.7%	2.8%
55-65	62.6%	28.2%	9.2%
Older than 65	51.3%	37.0%	11.8%

More people under the age of 55 attend Parks and Recreation programs than people older 55 do. American Indian, Alaskan Natives, and Black residents more likely attend Parks and Recreation programs than the other racial or ethnic groups do. People from downtown Bettendorf most likely attend Parks and Recreation Programs; people from outside of Bettendorf most likely do not. A higher percentage of people with incomes between \$75,000 and \$99,999 or higher than \$150,000 attend programs compared to people with incomes between \$50,000 and \$74,999.

The next question provided participants with a list of 45 Bettendorf Parks and Recreation programs and asked them to select all the programs that they have attended in the last 2 years. The largest percentage of respondents have attended soccer games (17.1%) followed by day camps (14.1%), playground programs (14.0%), and Coach Pitch baseball leagues (13.8%). Rugby Fit Clinic and Rookie Rugby League fell to the bottom with about 5-6% of respondents having attended these.

Which of the following Bettendorf Parks and Recreation programs have you attended in the last 2 years? Please check all that apply		
Answer Choices	Responses	
Soccer	17.08%	372
Day Camp	14.14%	308
Playgrounds Program	13.96%	304
Coach Pitch Baseball League	13.82%	301
Adult Softball Leagues	13.73%	299
Babysitting for Success Classes	13.50%	294
Adult Kickball League	12.44%	271
Cooking - Junior Chef Classes	12.30%	268
Cake Decorating Classes	12.12%	264
Golf Lessons	11.29%	246
Adult Basketball League	11.02%	240
Creative Community: Paint & Plant Activity Kit	10.74%	234
Sports & Games	10.24%	223
Outdoor Pickleball	10.15%	221
Tennis Camps	10.10%	220
Cooking - Parent/Child Classes	9.92%	216
Creative Community: Paint Parties	9.92%	216
Summer Sports and Games	9.60%	209
Coach Pitch Softball League	9.32%	203
Tumbling Classes	9.32%	203
Little All Stars Basketball League	9.18%	200
Golden Fit Senior Fitness Class	9.04%	197
Little Poms Cheerleading Clinic	8.54%	186
Flag Football League	8.40%	183
Female Self-Defense Classes	8.26%	180
Indoor Soccer Clinics	8.26%	180
Tennis Lessons	8.22%	179
Magician's Academy	7.85%	171
Little All Stars Basketball Clinic	7.67%	167
Indoor Pickleball	7.62%	166
Winter Break Survival Activity Kit	7.53%	164
Winter Sports and Games	7.53%	164
Legend Baseball Clinic	7.39%	161
Little Hitters Baseball Clinic	7.30%	159
Little Spikers Volleyball Clinic	7.25%	158
Skiing & Snowboarding Lessons	7.25%	158
Tot Lot	7.25%	158
Music Therapy Classes	7.12%	155
Teen Vehicle Maintenance 101 Workshop	6.98%	152
Safely Home Alone Classes	6.89%	150
Wine: Discover & Learn Class	6.70%	146
Ultimate Frisbee Camp	6.24%	136
Little Hitters Softball Clinic	6.11%	133
Rugby Fit Clinic	6.01%	131
Rookie Rugby Clinic	5.51%	120
Other (please specify)	4.68%	102

A clear split in attendance at Parks and Recreation Programs exists between individuals younger than 55 and older than 55.

18-25	25-55	55-65	Older than 65
Junior Chef Classes, Little Poms Cheerleading Clinic, indoor pickleball	Playground programs	Outdoor pickleball, tennis lessons	Outdoor pickleball, indoor pickleball

No age difference exists for coach pitch baseball, day camp, Golden Fit Senior Classes, golf lessons, sports and games, summer sports and games, tennis camps, and tot lot. People younger than 65 more likely attended female self-defense classes, legend baseball clinic and flag football league than people older than 65.

The adult basketball league attracts more American Indian and Alaskan Native residents than any other race or ethnicity except Asian and Pacific Islanders. Far fewer White or Hispanic residents attend adult kickball league or adult softball leagues; the latter tends to attract more Black residents as does the coach pitch baseball league and Little Poms Cheerleading Clinic. White residents also have a lower likelihood to attend the cake decorating class or coach pitch softball league than the other racial or ethnic groups listed. Soccer, tennis camp and tot lot attracted a larger percentage of Hispanic residents than from other racial or ethnic groups.

The adult basketball league, adult softball leagues, adult kickball, cake decorating, paint and plant activity kit, little hitters baseball clinic, sports and games, and Wine: Discover and Learn classes attract a larger percentage of downtown Bettendorf residents than from elsewhere within or outside of the city. Downtown and West Bettendorf attract a higher percentage of residents for Babysitting for Success classes. Downtown, East, and West Bettendorf and the Iowa Quad Cities attract a higher percentage of people for soccer than from downtown Bettendorf or Illinois.

Income also influences the classes they take.

Less than \$50K	\$50K-\$75K	\$75K-\$100K	\$100K-\$150K	More than \$150K
Teen Vehicle Maintenance 101 Workshop	Teen Vehicle Maintenance 101 Workshop	Adult Basketball League, Adult Kickball League, Adult Softball Leagues, Teen Vehicle Maintenance 101 Workshop		Day Camp, Golf Lessons, Outdoor Pickleball, Playground Programs, Soccer, Tennis Camp and Lessons

A lower percentage of people with incomes greater than \$150,000 attend cake decorating classes, coach pitch softball league, Creative Community: Paint and Plant Activity Kit, Golden Fit senior fitness class, legends baseball clinic, rugby clinics, skiing and snowboarding lessons, ultimate frisbee camp, and Wine: Discover and Learn Class.

Respondents also had the option to select “other.” Those verbatim responses appear in Appendix C and fall into the following categories:

- Pickleball
- Swim Lessons
- Dog Swim
- Music Events
- Summer Concerts
- Bettendorf Park Band
- Veterans Events
- Yoga
- Self Defense
- Dance
- Senior golf cart tour
- Corporate Games
- Dek Hockey
- Walking on bike paths
- Board Game Nights
- Library Concerts
- Kayaking
- Ninja Class
- Volleyball

The survey then asked participants to rate the quality of the programs they have attended using the same 4-point Likert scale as above, with the options “excellent,” “good,” “fair,” “poor,” and “N/A or no opinion.” None of the programs received a weighted average of 3.0 or higher, indicating opportunities for future analysis and discussion. Golf lessons, playgrounds program, adult basketball league, adult’s kickball league, summer sports and games, and soccer had the highest weighted averages at 2.81 or higher.

Of the programs you have attended, please rate the quality of these programs	
	Weighted Average
Golf Lessons	2.85
Playgrounds Program	2.84
Adult Basketball League	2.83
Adult Kickball League	2.83
Summer Sports & Games	2.83
Soccer	2.81
Adult Softball Leagues	2.79
Cake Decorating Classes	2.78
Tennis Lessons	2.78
Wine: Discover & Learn Class	2.78
Coach Pitch Baseball League	2.77
Flag Football League	2.77
Indoor Soccer Clinics	2.77
Magician's Academy	2.77
Sports & Games	2.77
Cooking - Junior Chef Classes	2.76
Creative Community: Paint & Plant Activity Kit	2.76
Day Camp	2.76
Little All Stars Basketball Clinic	2.76
Little Hitters Softball Clinic	2.76
Music Therapy Classes	2.76
Special Population Spring Formal	2.76
Tennis Camps	2.76
Tot Lot	2.76
Tumbling Classes	2.76
Ultimate Frisbee Camp	2.76
Winter Sports & Games	2.76
Babysitting for Success Classes	2.75
Coach Pitch Softball League	2.75
Golden Fit Senior Fitness Class	2.75
Little Spikers Volleyball Clinic	2.75
Rookie Rugby Clinic	2.75
Safely Home Alone Classes	2.75
Cooking - Parent/Child Classes	2.74
Creative Community: Paint Parties	2.74
Little Hitters Baseball Clinic	2.74
Indoor Pickleball	2.74
Rugby Fit Clinic	2.74
Legend Baseball Clinic	2.73
Little All Stars Basketball League	2.73
Little Poms Cheerleading Clinic	2.73
Outdoor Pickleball	2.73
Teen Vehicle Maintenance 101 Workshop	2.73
Winter Break Survival Activity Kit	2.73
Santa's Day Out	2.72
Skiing & Snowboarding Lessons	2.72
Female Self-Defense Classes	2.7



A majority of people older than 55 selected “N/A or no opinion.”

The next question asked participants to rate the quality of nine aspects of Bettendorf programs using the same 4-point Likert Scale to create a weighted average using “excellent,” “good,” “fair,” “poor,” and “N/A or no opinion.” “Meets the needs of a wide variety of ages” received the highest weighted average at nearly 3.0, followed by “accessible,” “affordable,” and “high quality” at 2.9 each. “Unique” had the lowest weighted average at 2.82, but still a respectable score.

<b>Please rate the quality of the following aspects of Bettendorf Programs</b>	
	<b>Weighted Average</b>
Meets the needs of a wide variety of ages	2.99
Accessible	2.92
Affordable	2.9
High quality	2.89
Quality coaching and program leaders	2.86
Collaborative	2.86
Well staffed	2.85
Quality of facility	2.84
Unique	2.82

People between the ages of 55 and 65 rated the programs lower on affordability than people between the ages of 25 and 55 or older than 65 did. People younger than 55 rated the quality of coaching and program leaders higher than people older than 55 did.

Hispanic and White respondents rated “meets the needs of a wide variety of ages” higher on quality than American Indian, Alaskan Native, or Asian/Pacific Islanders did. Black residents rated programs lowest on accessibility. Black, American Indian, and Alaskan Native residents rated the quality of the programs lower than Hispanic and White residents did.

North Bettendorf residents rated the quality of staffing higher than people from other neighborhoods did.

The survey then asked participants to rate the importance of those nine aspects of Bettendorf Programs using the 4-point Likert Scale with options “critically important,” “important,” “not important,” “not important at all,” and “N/A or no opinion.” “Affordable,” “meets the needs of a wide variety of ages,” and “accessible” had the highest weighted averages at 3.1 each, indicating that respondents see those aspects as the most important aspects of Bettendorf programs. “Unique” and “collaborative” fell to the bottom.

Please rate the <b>IMPORTANCE</b> of the following aspects of Bettendorf Programs	
	Weighted Average
Affordable	3.11
Meets the needs of a wide variety of ages	3.09
Accessible	3.09
Well staffed	3.04
Quality coaching and program leaders	3.02
High quality	3.01
Quality of facility	2.98
Collaborative	2.88
Unique	2.8

People older than 55 rated meeting the needs of a variety of ages, affordability, accessibility, high quality, uniqueness, and quality of the facilities as more important than people younger than 55 did. People younger than 55 rated the quality of coaching and program leaders as more important than people older than 55 did.

Black residents rated the importance of meeting the needs of a wide variety of ages as more important than people from other racial or ethnic groups did. Hispanic and White residents rated affordability, accessibility, and the quality of coaching and program leaders as more important than the other groups did. White residents rated the importance of quality higher than Black residents did. Black, American Indian, and Alaskan Natives rated “well-staffed” as more important than the other racial or ethnic groups did. Hispanic residents rated the quality of the facilities as more important than the other racial or ethnic groups did.

People living in downtown Bettendorf rated “accessibility” and “high quality” as less important than people from other parts of the city.

A higher percentage of people with incomes greater than \$100,000 rated “affordability” as important compared to people with incomes of less than \$100,000.

When we compare the quality and the importance of these aspects of Bettendorf programs, we find a desire and opportunity to make these **programs more affordable, better staffed, and more accessible.**

	Quality	Importance	Difference
Affordable	2.9	3.11	0.21
Well staffed	2.85	3.04	0.19
Accessible	2.92	3.09	0.17
Quality coaching and program leaders	2.86	3.02	0.16
Quality of facility	2.84	2.98	0.14
High quality	2.89	3.01	0.12
Meets the needs of a wide variety of ages	2.99	3.09	0.1
Collaborative	2.86	2.88	0.02
Unique	2.82	2.8	-0.02

The final question about Bettendorf Parks and Recreation programs asked participants how they learn about the programs. Most respondents said they learn about programs via email (53.5%), followed by social media (42%), and word of mouth (40.3%). This becomes important information for communicating future opportunities.

<b>How do you learn about Bettendorf Parks and Recreation Programs? Check all that apply</b>		
Answer Choices	Responses	
Email	53.51%	1264
Social Media	41.62%	983
Word of mouth	40.30%	952
Newsletter	31.50%	744
Parks Brochure/Catalogue	31.50%	744
Other (please specify)	1.78%	42

Again, statistically significant differences emerged based on age, race, location, and income in how people learn about Bettendorf Parks and Recreation programs.

	Age	Race	Location	Income
Email	Older than 55			More than \$100,000
Social Media	Younger than 65	Hispanic	West Bettendorf	
Word of Mouth	25-55		Iowa	
Newsletter	Younger than 55	Black, American Indian, Alaskan Natives	North Bettendorf	\$50,000-\$74,999
Brochure	25-55	White, American Indian, Alaskan Natives	North Bettendorf	Less than \$50,000

The question also allowed respondents to select “other” and asked them to specify that event. 42 people selected the “other (please specify)” option. Their verbatim responses appear in Appendix C, and fall into the following categories:

- Grew up in Bettendorf and know about the events
- Website
- Friends and Family
- Flyers at Library or around the City
- Direct passing card
- Text
- City Youtube page
- Co-worker
- Google
- Museum
- Facebook
- Quad City Times announcement
- Neighbors
- Schools

Perceptions of Parks and Recreation Events: The survey then asked participants three questions about Bettendorf Parks and Recreation events.

The first question provided respondents with a list of 15 Bettendorf Parks and Recreation events and asked them to select all the events they have attended. Of the 15 event answer choices, the Bettendorf Fourth of July Festival received the most responses at 44.6%, followed by the Bettendorf Park Band Summer Concert Series at 30.4% and Movies in the Park at 26%. The St. Patrick's Day Special Population Dance and Yoga in the Park received the least number of selections at 14.5% and 14.1%, respectively, and 1.5% of respondents selected "other."

Which of the following events have you attended? Please check all that apply.			
Answer Choices		Responses	
Bettendorf Fourth of July Festival	44.57%	10	
Bettendorf Park Band Summer Concert Series	30.39%	686	
Movies in the Park	26.05%	588	
Bettendorf Park & Rec Night	22.46%	507	
Dogtoberfest	19.18%	433	
Winter Carnival	17.72%	400	
Country Hoe Down Special Population Dance	17.46%	394	
Get Out And Trail	17.37%	392	
Frosty Four Fun Run	17.06%	385	
Jamie Hill Memorial Golf Tournament	16.48%	372	
Healthiest State Walk	16.39%	370	
Senior Golf Cart Tour	15.86%	358	
Swim Bash Special Population Pool Party	15.73%	355	
St. Patrick's Day Special Population Dance	14.53%	328	
Yoga in the Park	14.09%	318	
Other (please specify)	1.51%	34	

34 people selected the "other (please specify)" option. Their verbatim responses appear in Appendix C, and fall into the following categories:

- Senior 55 exercise class
- Dog swim
- Live music at Fayer
- Mayor's birthday Bash
- Cars and Coffee
- Board Game Nights
- Memorial Day/Veteran's Day
- Public Works Day
- Glass Hunt
- Halloween Parade

Event	Age	Race	Location	Income
Band Concerts	Older than 55	Black, Hispanic	Downtown, East, West	Less than \$49,999
Dogtoberfest		Black		

Fourth of July	Older than 55	White, Hispanic	East, West	More than \$150,000
----------------	---------------	-----------------	------------	---------------------

Event	Age	Race	Location	Income
Frosty Four	Younger than 55	American Indian, Alaskan Native, Black		Less than \$150,000
Healthiest State	Younger than 55			
Hoe Down	Younger than 55	Black	Downtown	Less than \$150,000
Jamie Hill Golf	Older than 65		Illinois	\$50,000-\$74,999
Movie in Park	Younger than 65	Hispanic		More than \$75,000
Parks & Rec Night	Younger than 55	Asian, Pacific Islanders, Black	Downtown	Less than \$150,000
Senior Golf Cart	Older than 65			\$50,000-\$74,999
St. Patrick Dance	Younger than 55		Illinois	\$50,000-\$74,999
Swim Bash	Younger than 55			\$50,000-\$74,999
Winter Carnival	Younger than 55		Illinois	\$50,000 - \$150,000
Yoga in Park	Younger than 55		Illinois	

The next question asked participants to rate the quality of each of the 15 events using the same 4-point Likert Scale. Only the Bettendorf Fourth of July Festival rated a 3.0 or higher (3.04), indicating that respondents view that event as “good” to “excellent.” The Bettendorf Park Band Summer Concert Series and Bettendorf Park & Rec Night rated the next highest at 2.9. The Country Hoe Down Special Population Dance rated the lowest with a score of 2.73.

How would you rate the QUALITY of the following Bettendorf Parks and Recreation events?	
	Weighted Average
Bettendorf Fourth of July Festival	3.04
Bettendorf Park Band Summer Concert Series	2.89
Bettendorf Park & Rec Night	2.86
Movies in the Park	2.84
Dogtoberfest	2.83
Winter Carnival	2.82
Frosty Four Run	2.78
Get Out And Trail	2.78
Healthiest State Walk	2.78
Senior Golf Cart Tour	2.78
Swim Bash Special Population Pool Party	2.77
St. Patrick's Day Special Population Dance	2.76
Jamie Hill Memorial Golf Tournament	2.75
Yoga in the Park	2.75
Country Hoe Down Special Population Dance	2.73

The majority of people older than 55 had no opinion.

The final question about Bettendorf Parks and Recreation events asked participants to rate the importance of each of the 15 events using the same 4-point Likert Scale with the options “critically important,” “important,” “not important,” and “not important at all”, along with the option of “N/A or no opinion.” Similar to the last question, the Bettendorf Fourth of July Festival received the highest weighted average score at 3.05, the only event to score above a 3.0. The Bettendorf Park Band Summer Concert Series and Movies in the Park received the next highest scores at 2.9 each. The County Hoe Down Special Population Dance and Frosty Four Run fell to the bottom as least importance, but still a very respectable 2.8.

<b>How would you rate the IMPORTANCE of the following Bettendorf Parks and Recreation events?</b>	
	Weighted Average
Bettendorf Fourth of July Festival	3.05
Bettendorf Park Band Summer Concert Series	2.89
Movies in the Park	2.85
Bettendorf Park & Rec Night	2.84
Get Out And Trail	2.83
Healthiest State Walk	2.82
Swim Bash Special Population Pool Party	2.82
Winter Carnival	2.82
St. Patrick's Day Special Population Dance	2.8
Dogtoberfest	2.79
Senior Golf Cart Tour	2.79
Jamie Hill Memorial Golf Tournament	2.78
Yoga in the Park	2.78
Country Hoe Down Special Population Dance	2.76
Frosty Four Run	2.75

White and Hispanic residents rated the Fourth of July Festival as more important than Black residents did. People in North Bettendorf rated the Healthiest State Walk and Jamie Hill Memorial Golf Tournament as more important than people from other geographies did. People in North Bettendorf and Illinois rated Yoga in the Park as more important than people from other geographies did.

A higher percentage of people with incomes between \$50,000 and \$74,999 rated the Bettendorf Parks and Recreation Night, Healthiest State Walk, and Get Out and Trail as critically important compared to people at other income levels.

When we compare ratings of importance with those of quality, we find that every event has the appropriate investment based on the difference between quality and importance.

Event	Quality	Importance	Difference
Get Out And Trail	2.78	2.83	0.05
Swim Bash Special Population Pool Party	2.77	2.82	0.05
Healthiest State Walk	2.78	2.82	0.04
St. Patrick's Day Special Population Dance	2.76	2.8	0.04
Country Hoe Down Special Population Dance	2.73	2.76	0.03
Jamie Hill Memorial Golf Tournament	2.75	2.78	0.03
Yoga in the Park	2.75	2.78	0.03
Movies in the Park	2.84	2.85	0.01
Senior Golf Cart Tour	2.78	2.79	0.01
Bettendorf Fourth of July Festival	3.04	3.05	0.01
Bettendorf Park Band Summer Concert Series	2.89	2.89	0
Winter Carnival	2.82	2.82	0
Bettendorf Park & Rec Night	2.86	2.84	-0.02
Frosty Four Run	2.78	2.75	-0.03
Dogtoberfest	2.83	2.79	-0.04

#### Desired Future for Bettendorf Parks and Recreation

The survey then focused on participants' opinions about Bettendorf Parks and Recreation's relationships with the City of Bettendorf and other partners and recommendations for the Parks and Recreation department's future.

The first question asked participants to indicate their level of agreement with 10 statements regarding Bettendorf Parks and Recreation, its relationship with the City of Bettendorf, and its other partnerships. The question again used a 4-point Likert Scale with options "totally agree" = 4, "agree" = 3, "disagree" = 2, and "totally disagree" = 1. Respondents again had the option to choose "N/A or No Opinions" which did not figure into the final average.

Only the statement "Parks and Recreation provide an important amenity for attracting Bettendorf residents" received a score of 3.0 or higher (3.0). Other statements that received scores just under 3.0 include "I am proud of Bettendorf's parks," "I am proud of Bettendorf's recreational programs," and "Parks and Recreation provides a place for residents to gather to build community" each received scores of 2.98. That the city provides adequate funding for Parks and Recreation and Parks and Recreation partners sufficiently with the TBK Sports Complex falling to the bottom of the list at a respectable 2.85.

Please indicate your level of agreement with the following statements	
	Weighted Average
Parks and recreation provide an important amenity for attracting Bettendorf residents	3
I am proud of Bettendorf's parks	2.98
I am proud of Bettendorf's recreational programs	2.98
Parks and Recreation provides a place for resident to gather to build community	2.98
City adequately supports the Parks and Recreation department	2.94
Parks and Recreation partners sufficiently with the YMCA	2.88
Parks and Recreation partners sufficiently with the Bettendorf school district	2.86
All parts of the city have adequate access to parks and recreational facilities	2.86
City provides adequate funding for Parks and Recreation	2.85
Parks and Recreation partners sufficiently with TBK Sports Complex	2.85

The next question asked participants to rank the same eight statements based on their importance using the same 4-point Likert scale as the others in the survey: "critically important" = 4, "important" = 3, "not important" = 2 or "not important at all" = 1 with a "N/A or no opinion" option that received no points.

Respondents rated "City adequately supports the Parks and Recreation department" and "City provides adequate funding for Parks and Recreation" as the most important, with scores of 3.14 and 3.13, respectively. The statements "Parks and Recreation partners sufficiently with TBK" and "Parks and Recreation partners sufficiently with the YMCA" received the lowest weighted average scores at 2.83 each, indicating respondents do not view those partnerships as important as the other statements.

How important do you rank each of the following?	
	Weighted Average
City adequately supports the Parks and Recreation department	3.14
City provides adequate funding for Parks and Recreation	3.13
All parts of the city have adequate access to parks and recreational facilities	3.06
Parks and recreation provide an important amenity for attracting Bettendorf residents	3.04
Parks and Recreation provides a place for resident to gather to build community	2.99
Parks and Recreation partners sufficiently with the Bettendorf school district	2.93
Parks and Recreation partners sufficiently with TBK	2.83
Parks and Recreation partners sufficiently with the YMCA	2.83

American Indian, Alaskan Native, and Black residents rated adequate city support as more important than the other racial or ethnic groups did, while Black residents rated the city providing adequate funding as less important than the other racial or ethnic groups did. White and Hispanic residents rated sufficient partnerships with the YMCA and Bettendorf School District as more important than the others did. Hispanic residents also rated providing all parts of the city with adequate access to parks and recreational facilities, using parks and recreation as an amenity to attract Bettendorf residents, and providing an important place for residents to gather to build community as more important than other groups did, with White rating that as second most important among the racial groups reviewed.

A higher percentage of people with incomes between \$50,000 and \$74,999 totally agreed with the statement that "Parks and Recreation partners sufficiently with the Bettendorf School District" than people at other income levels did. A higher percentage of people with incomes greater than \$150,000



indicated that they have pride in Bettendorf's recreational programs compared to people at lower income levels.

When we compare the ratings on quality with those of importance, we find that respondents would like to see the city provide more funding and support to Parks and Recreation and to provide more adequate access to parks and recreational facilities to all parts of the city.

	Quality	Importance	Difference
City provides adequate funding for Parks and Recreation	2.85	3.13	0.28
City adequately supports the Parks and Recreation department	2.94	3.14	0.2
All parts of the city have adequate access to parks and recreational facilities	2.86	3.06	0.2
Parks and Recreation partners sufficiently with the Bettendorf school district	2.86	2.93	0.07
Parks and recreation provide an important amenity for attracting Bettendorf residents	3	3.04	0.04
Parks and Recreation provides a place for resident to gather to build community	2.98	2.99	0.01
Parks and Recreation partners sufficiently with TBK Sports Complex	2.85	2.83	-0.02
Parks and Recreation partners sufficiently with the YMCA	2.88	2.83	-0.05

Finally, the survey asked participants to prioritize 12 possible projects or activities on which Bettendorf Parks and Recreation could focus over the next 10 years. The 4-point Likert Scale used the options "top priority" = 4, "priority" = 3, "not a priority" = 2 and "should not consider" =1, with the option to select "N/A or no opinion." Again, we evaluate these both based on their overall rating with anything above a 3.0 considered a priority among respondents and anything below a 3.0 as less of a priority with anything close to 1.0 as something they do not prioritize at all. We also look at their comparative scores to see how they rank in relation to each other.

Of these options, "More park activities for older kids (e.g., 10–15-year-olds)" and "Upgrade indoor facilities" received the highest weighted average scores of 2.91 each. "Add dog parks" received the lowest weighted average score by far at 2.54, indicating that respondents do not feel the city should prioritize that project as much as the others, an interesting finding given that nearly two-thirds of respondents own a dog.

<b>Bettendorf Parks and Recreation must prioritize limited funding to address systems needs over the next 10 years. For each of the following, how would you prioritize the following possible projects or activities?</b>	
	Weighted Average
More park activities for older kids (e.g., 10-15 year olds)	2.91
Upgrade indoor facilities	2.91
Improve recreational programs	2.88
Improve parks maintenance	2.88
Better connect the trails	2.88
Create a community center for recreational programs and community use	2.87
Add new recreational programs	2.79
Provide more information about parks programming	2.79
Build more neighborhood or pocket parks	2.77
Develop Forest Grove Park	2.76
Acquire new land or open spaces	2.71
Add dog parks	2.54

Hispanic and Asian or Pacific Island residents rated “Improve recreational facilities” as a higher priority than American Indian or Alaskan Natives did. Hispanic residents rated upgraded indoor facilities as a higher priority than Black residents did. White residents rated acquiring new land or open spaces as a higher priority than Black residents did.

Residents of North Bettendorf rated “acquire new land or open spaces,” “develop Forest Grove Park,” “better connect trails,” and “build more neighborhood or pocket parks” as higher priorities than people from other geographies did.

A higher percentage of people with incomes between \$50,000 and \$74,999 rated “add new recreation programs,” “develop Forest Grove Park,” and “acquire new land or open spaces” as a top priority than any other income group did. A lower percentage of people with incomes between \$75,000 and \$99,999 rated “upgrade indoor facilities” as a top priority than people at other income levels did.

To further prioritize this list and remove the temptation to rate them all as a high priority, the last question asked participants to choose **one project** from the same list of 12 for Bettendorf Parks and Recreation to undertake.

“Create a community center for recreational programs and community use” overwhelmingly received the most responses at 30.7%, followed by “more park activities for older kids” (10.9%), and then “better connect the trails” (7.9%). “Acquire new land or open spaces” and “provide more information about parks programming” received less than 5% of responses at 4.3% and 4.0%, respectively.

If you had to choose ONE project for Bettendorf Parks and Recreation to undertake, what would you choose?		
Answer Choices	Responses	
Create a community center for recreational programs and community use	30.73%	724
More park activities for older kids (e.g., 10-15 year olds)	10.87%	256
Better connect the trails	7.85%	185
Improve parks maintenance	7.34%	173
Upgrade indoor facilities	7.22%	170
Add new recreational programs	6.07%	143
Improve recreational programs	5.73%	135
Build more neighborhood or pocket parks	5.35%	126
Develop Forest Grove Park	5.26%	124
Add dog parks	5.22%	123
Acquire new land or open spaces	4.33%	102
Provide more information about parks programming	4.03%	95

Significantly more Hispanic residents chose “more activities for older kids” than White residents did. More American Indian, Alaskan Native, Asian, Pacific Islander, and Black residents selected “Improve recreational programs” compared to White residents. More White residents chose “create a community center” than the other racial or ethnic groups did, followed by Hispanic residents.

An overwhelmingly more significant percentage of North Bettendorf residents (59.3%) chose “create a community center” as their top priority. West Bettendorf residents would prefer better connected trails as would Iowans.

#### Other Comments about Bettendorf Parks and Recreation

The survey ended with an open-ended question that asked respondents to share, “*What have we not asked about Bettendorf Parks and Recreation that we should know as we plan the organization's future?*” The 1110 verbatim responses received appear in Appendix C, excluding “NA,” “none,” “I don’t know,” “You covered it,” or the equivalents of these sentiments.

Although there is some commonality among the open-ended answers, they mostly duplicate the findings of the survey: *Most of the programs and parks are good with*

DRAFT



Parks & Recreation Strategic Planning Committee

Kim Kidwell- Director of Culture & Recreation  
Liz Solis-Willis- Recreation Manager  
Nathan Pittman- Recreation Manager  
Meredith Fabrizius- Recreation Coordinator  
Isaac Jacobs- Recreation Coordinator  
Kim Radcliff- Parks & Recreation Administrative Assistant  
Jason Manfull- Parks Maintenance Supervisor  
Decker Ploehn- City Administrator  
Jeff Reiter- Assistant City Administrator  
Cathy Duda- Parks Advisory Board  
Betsy Flaherty- Parks Advisory Board  
Bob Sartor- Parks Advisory Board  
Frank Baden- City Council  
Lisa Brown- City Council  
Laura Wittnebel- Friends of Bettendorf Parks Foundation  
Mark Hunt- Community Development Director  
Taylor Beswick- Senior City Planner