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Why do this?
What’s involved?
4 Stages of Public Engagement

1. Information Gathering
   - Needs Assessment
     - Staff
     - Stakeholders
     - Public Meetings
     - Focus groups
     - Interviews
     - Surveys
     - Online engagement
   - Inventory
     - All Assets
     - All Program Locations
     - Other Providers
   - Level of Service Analysis
     - GIS component-based mapping
     - Quality, Quantity, Functionality
   - Community Profile
     - Historical & Planning Context
     - Demographics
     - Trends

2. Findings & Visioning
   - Presentation/Feedback Sessions
     - Staff
     - Stakeholders
     - Decision Makers
   - What We Have Discovered
     - Key Issues Matrix
     - Key Ideas and Themes for Improvement
   - Analysis
     - Programming
     - Operations
     - Maintenance
     - Marketing & Communications
     - Financial Resources

3. Draft Recommendations
   - Summary Findings
   - Strategies
     - Long-Term Vision
     - Short-Term Action
   - Implications
     - Financial
     - Operational
     - Maintenance
   - Recommendations
   - Action Plan
     - Tasks
     - Timing
     - Costs
   - Review & Revisions

4. Final Plan
   - Review
     - Staff
     - Public
     - Decision Maker
   - Distribute/Post

Implementation
   - Action Plan
   - Annual Review

Typically our Strategic/Master Plans include a 5-year focus on operations, a 10-year focus on capital, and a 20-year strategic vision. Other elements and tools are added as needed for a community-specific plan.
And..The Survey Says
Methodology

Primary methods:
1 = Statistically Valid (Invitation Survey)
Mailed postcard and survey with an option to complete online through password protected website

2 = Open Link Survey
Online survey available to all residents of the City of Tulsa

7,606 Postcards & 4,000 Surveys Delivered
- 1st mailing: 4,000 residents received a postcard, followed by a mailed survey
- 2nd mailing: 3,606 residents received a postcard

990 - Invitation Surveys Completed
+/- 3.1% Margin of Error

693 - Open Link Surveys Completed

1,683 Total Completed Surveys
NEEDS MET FACILITIES

In terms of facilities meeting the needs of the community:

• Respondents feel that golf courses and playgrounds are meeting the needs the best.

• Fitness/weight rooms and equestrian trails/facilities rated lowest at 2.9, followed by aquatic facilities at 3.0.

• All current facilities rated generally “average” with scores between 2.9 and 3.5.

IMPORTANCE FACILITIES

On a scale of 1 to 5, with 5 being very important:

• Resident households rated the following as most important to their household:
  • Trails and pathways (4.5)
  • Neighborhood parks (4.5)
  • Amenities at City parks (4.4)
  • Playgrounds (4.0)

• These are the same across all subareas; playgrounds and aquatic facilities rate higher in the North area than elsewhere in Tulsa.
Key Findings

INCREASE USE

• Top two items to address to increase use:
  • Better conditions/maintenance of parks or facilities
  • Better lighting in parks

• East and South sides of Tulsa put the most emphasis on more lighting in parks.

• North and West had an emphasis on WiFi Connectivity.

FUTURE PROGRAMS AT NEARBY PARKS

• More than 65% of respondents would probably or definitely participate in their favorite programs at a nearby park as opposed to going to a community or recreation center.

• Only 5% of respondents indicate that they probably or definitely would not.

• Nearly half of respondents in the West side of Tulsa indicate that they would “definitely” participate in programs at their nearby park.
Key Findings

FUTURE NEEDS

- Respondents feel the most important items to focus on for facilities and amenities in the future:
  - Maintenance of existing facilities (4.3)
  - Additional trails and connections (4.2)
  - Acquiring land for new parks in underserved areas (4.1)

- Respondents feel the most important items to focus on for programs and services in the future:
  - Youth educational programs (3.9)
  - More youth fitness/sports/healthy lifestyle programs (3.8)
  - Providing resources to connect with community services (3.8).

FUNDING SOURCES

More than half of respondents indicate that they would probably or definitely support the following funding sources:

- Offering naming/sponsorship opportunities in parks (75% support)
- An additional quarter-cent sales tax dedicated to parks and trails maintenance (62% support)
- Development fees on new homes or businesses to fund parks in growing areas (58%)
- Pay $30 more a year in property taxes on average $150,000 home to fund parks maintenance (54%)
- Increased user fees was only option that did not received support, showing that an increase in user fees would somewhat limit participation for 36% of invite respondents and significantly limit participation for another 18%.
Inventory and Level of Service
Walkability

While nearly 87% can walk to something only 38% live in an area considered to meet the target score.
# Addressing low scoring parks and components

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Classification</th>
<th>Subarea</th>
<th>Location</th>
<th>Overall Park GRASP® Score</th>
<th>Design &amp; Ambiance</th>
<th>Drinking Fountains</th>
<th>Seating</th>
<th>BBQ Grills</th>
<th>Dog Stations</th>
<th>Security Lighting</th>
<th>Bike Racks</th>
<th>Restrooms</th>
<th>Shade</th>
<th>Connection to trails</th>
<th>Park Access</th>
<th>Parking</th>
<th>Seasonal Plantings</th>
<th>Ornamental Plantings</th>
<th>Picnic Tables</th>
<th>Observations / Comments</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Developed Parks</td>
<td>East Tulsa</td>
<td>Aaronson</td>
<td>30.8</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>NA</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>NA</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>NA</td>
<td>NA</td>
<td>NA</td>
<td>NA</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>NA</td>
<td>NA</td>
<td>NA</td>
<td>NA</td>
<td>Address low scoring courts and consider adding additional component(s)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Cowan</td>
<td>28.8</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>NA</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>NA</td>
<td>NA</td>
<td>NA</td>
<td>NA</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>NA</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>NA</td>
<td>Consider adding additional component(s) or partnering with adjacent school</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>East Park Tract</td>
<td>13.2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>NA</td>
<td>NA</td>
<td>NA</td>
<td>NA</td>
<td>NA</td>
<td>NA</td>
<td>NA</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>NA</td>
<td>NA</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>NA</td>
<td>Consider park refresh or improvements to improve overall park design and ambiance. Improve neighborhood access to existing elements and add additional component(s)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Hill</td>
<td>33.6</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>NA</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>NA</td>
<td>NA</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>NA</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>NA</td>
<td>NA</td>
<td>NA</td>
<td>NA</td>
<td>NA</td>
<td>Address low scoring courts</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>McCullough</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>NA</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>NA</td>
<td>NA</td>
<td>NA</td>
<td>NA</td>
<td>NA</td>
<td>NA</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>NA</td>
<td>NA</td>
<td>NA</td>
<td>NA</td>
<td>Consider park refresh or improvements to improve overall park design and ambiance. Consider additional component(s) and improving existing diamond fields</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Plaza</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>NA</td>
<td>NA</td>
<td>NA</td>
<td>NA</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>NA</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>NA</td>
<td>NA</td>
<td>NA</td>
<td>NA</td>
<td>NA</td>
<td>Isolated park with limited population within walking distance but could add component(s)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Rose Dew</td>
<td>28.8</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>NA</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>NA</td>
<td>NA</td>
<td>NA</td>
<td>NA</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>NA</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>NA</td>
<td>NA</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>NA</td>
<td>Consider adding additional component(s) to serve the isolated neighborhood</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Shannon II</td>
<td>19.8</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>NA</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>NA</td>
<td>NA</td>
<td>NA</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>NA</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>NA</td>
<td>NA</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>NA</td>
<td>Consider adding additional component(s)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Skelly</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>NA</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>NA</td>
<td>NA</td>
<td>NA</td>
<td>NA</td>
<td>NA</td>
<td>NA</td>
<td>NA</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>NA</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>NA</td>
<td>Consider park refresh or improvements to improve overall park design and ambiance. Address low scoring courts</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Wright</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>NA</td>
<td>NA</td>
<td>NA</td>
<td>NA</td>
<td>NA</td>
<td>NA</td>
<td>NA</td>
<td>NA</td>
<td>NA</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>NA</td>
<td>NA</td>
<td>NA</td>
<td>Isolated park with limited population within walking distance but could add component(s). Consider park refresh or improvements to improve overall park design and ambiance</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Darlington</td>
<td>33.6</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>NA</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>NA</td>
<td>NA</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>NA</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>NA</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>NA</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>NA</td>
<td>Consider additional component(s) for example a shelter or loop walk</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Gary</td>
<td>6.6</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>NA</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>NA</td>
<td>NA</td>
<td>NA</td>
<td>NA</td>
<td>NA</td>
<td>NA</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>NA</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>NA</td>
<td>Consider park refresh or improvements to improve overall park design and ambiance. Small isolated park but could maybe add a small shelter or other component</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Financial Analysis
To meet the typical Operating Expenditure TPR would need to increase its per capita spending by approximately $17 dollars. This increase would necessitate a budget increase of $6.8 million.
The National Park and Recreation Association suggests that a typical agency with a similar population to Tulsa would need 210 FTE.

TPR has 124 Total FTE.

NRPA standard 210 FTE + Tulsa Parks 124 FTE = 86 FTE Shortfall.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Function</th>
<th>TPR FTEs</th>
<th>Percentage Distribution</th>
<th>National Median FTEs</th>
<th>Percentage Distribution</th>
<th>FTE Variance</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Parks and Facilities</td>
<td>56.3</td>
<td>45%</td>
<td>94.5</td>
<td>45%</td>
<td>-38.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Recreation Services</td>
<td>57.3</td>
<td>46%</td>
<td>65.1</td>
<td>31%</td>
<td>-7.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Administration</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>7%</td>
<td>37.8</td>
<td>18%</td>
<td>-29.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Capital Development</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>6.3</td>
<td>3%</td>
<td>-6.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2%</td>
<td>6.3</td>
<td>3%</td>
<td>-3.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td><strong>124.6</strong></td>
<td><strong>100%</strong></td>
<td><strong>210</strong></td>
<td><strong>100%</strong></td>
<td><strong>-85.4</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Tulsa Parks staffing investment, compared nationally by function.
Key Issues and Recommendations
Overview
The Strategic Implementation Plan is organized into the same seven key issue categories:

- Organizational Effectiveness
- Financial Opportunities
- Park and Facility Improvements
- Managing Level of Service
- Programs and Service Delivery Enhancements
- Reducing Gaps and Disparities
- Community Health

There are xx action items within the Strategic Implementation Plan; each has been developed specifically to correspond and address or advance one or multiple identified key issues. Each action item has been evaluated and prioritized using the following implementation timeframes:

- **S** short-term (1-3 years)
- **M** mid-term (4-6 years)
- **L** long-term (7-10 years)
- ∞ Ongoing

Timeframe to complete is designated with the appropriate timeframe to begin the project.
Organizational Effectiveness
Key Issues
• Tulsa Parks is significantly understaffed and needs 60 – 90 more employee positions to meet the current and future needs of a city this size.

• The current recreation software system and/or configuration does not meet the current and future needs of Tulsa Parks, including features and functionality to provide more accurate reporting, allow for a streamlined registration and reservation process, and communication with and customers and instructors.

• Tulsa Parks needs a defined policy, process and tracking resources to adequately develop and manage partnership, donation and volunteer opportunities throughout the department.
## Recommendations Overview

### Sample Implementation Plan

#### Focus Area One: Organizational Effectiveness

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Objective 1.1: Address Organizational Effectiveness Issues</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Actions</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>----------------------------------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1.1.a Hire additional department staff to close staffing gaps in each division team.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1.1.b Hire additional staff and increase marketing budget to acquire and develop resources and tools that will allow expanded marketing and communication channels, campaigns, and collateral.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Financial Opportunities
Key Issues
• Tulsa Parks’ budget is underfunded by $6.8 million to adequately meet the current needs of a community this size and number of park acres and facilities to maintain, and additional capital will need to be secured for future improvements or expansion of services.

• In general, Tulsa Parks lacks the appropriate staffing and budget to adequately maintain current park grounds and amenities, and facilities.
Park and Facility Improvements
Key Issues
• Access to aquatic park features and facilities is inconsistent across the community.

• Types, quality and condition of playgrounds are inconsistent across the community.

• Current use of park asset management software and inventory is limited and inconsistent.

• The current park inventory has gaps and inconsistencies in categorization and tracking of various park feature components, such as open green space, loop trails, etc.

• Tulsa Parks does not currently have an asset inventory of indoor recreation facilities and components.

• The quality and condition of athletic courts (tennis, basketball, etc.) is inconsistent across the community. Use and resident satisfaction of current type of athletic courts also varies across the community.
Managing Level of Service
Key Issues
• Tulsa currently needs more safe, walkable routes to parks and recreation opportunities across the community, and residents’ feedback shows this need as a top priority and barrier to use.

• There’s limited access to trails within different subareas of the city and little trail connectivity, especially within residential areas.
Program Delivery and Service Enhancements
Key Issues
• Increasing physical activity, as identified in the Healthy Communities section of the report, is a prioritized goal for Tulsa Parks.

• Community centers need to engage with surrounding neighborhoods to increase resident participation in recreation programs and events at nearby parks.

• Tulsa residents show a desire to expand access to nature play opportunities and STEM programing.

• Some Tulsa Parks programs, services and processes are duplicative of what is provided by other organizations, but with lower outcomes and return on investment.
Reducing Gaps and Disparities
Key Issues
• Gaps and disparities exist throughout Tulsa to access park and recreation opportunities from both neighborhood and other walkable service areas.

• There are lower levels of park use and recreation participation in North, East and West Tulsa.
Community Health
Key Issues
• Tulsa Parks prioritizes the need to increase activities and events in parks to promote active lifestyle community wide.

• Tulsa residents show an increased concern for their own and family’s safety at parks throughout the city.

• Public and partnership opportunities exist to improve transportation and walkable access to/from parks and recreation facilities and to expand their programs and services to meet preventative community health needs.

• Tulsa community needs assessments indicate Tulsa Parks should increase opportunities to access healthy food/drinks as well as education about good nutrition’s health benefits.
Next Steps

August 2021
• Update draft/recommendations
• Review updates/final edits

September /October 2021
• Present final plan
• Adoption
Thank you for your time!