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CHAPTER ONE

Executive Summary

1.1 INTRODUCTION
The Olathe Parks and Recreation Department provides a comprehensive approach in the delivery of parks, recreation facilities, historic sites, and program services to the citizens of Olathe that greatly contributes to the quality of life for residents of the City. In order for the Parks and Recreation Department to continue to be viable, it must have a solid planning document to guide the City’s efforts, which is outlined in this Olathe Parks and Recreation Master Plan.

The master plan process took nine months to develop and involved all representative departments with an extensive and robust public input process. The master plan provides a framework to respond to citizens’ needs and expectations, as well as identifies priorities for the staff to work toward successful implementation.

1.2 PURPOSE OF THE MASTER PLAN
The purpose of the Olathe Parks and Recreation Master Plan is to serve as a planning document to guide the City leaders and staff for the next 5 to 10 years. The results of which will aid the City with guidance toward where and how to deliver parks, recreation facilities, historic sites, and programs to meet public expectations and needs. It is a document that clearly states key issues that need to be addressed along with key recommendations on how to address those issues.

The Department has had great success over the last 10 years when using the 1/8 cent sales tax to support park improvement and new development, recreation facility improvement and new development, and to energize community program services in the most productive manner. The results of this study will support the importance of success with the next park and recreation voter initiative scheduled for 2014. There is more to be accomplished toward further improvement of the park and recreation system in the City.

Throughout the planning process, residents have supported the efforts of the City to build the new Community Center scheduled to open in July 2014. The community has also supported City administrators as they continue to project further improvements to the park and recreation system with the desire to brand the City of Olathe as the city of choice when living in Johnson County, Kansas.
1.2.1 ELEMENTS OF THE MASTER PLAN

The master plan consists of the following sections:

- Executive Summary
- Community Needs Assessment
- Demographic and Trends
- Facility and Program Assessment
- Operational and Financial Analysis
- Vision, Mission, Recommendations and Implementation Plan

1.3 PROJECT PROCESS

The foundation of the Master Plan was the use of a creative and comprehensive public participation process. It was important to engage community members who enjoy participating in the planning process and encourage participation among those members that typically do not contribute. The public input process engaged residents through a variety of community input processes that included stakeholder interviews, focus group meetings, public forums, and a citywide citizen survey. The information received from these community input processes was applied to the overall planning process. This is critical when articulating accurately the true unmet needs, addressing key issues, providing recommendations for change, and strategizing to move the Department forward for optimum results. The process of developing the Olathe Parks and Recreation Master Plan followed a logical planning path as described below:

The Community Values Model™ was utilized as the foundation of the Olathe Parks and Recreation Master Plan. The Community Values Model™ is an innovative process to utilize comprehensive public input and insight in a meaningful way. Input, guidance, and values from key community leaders, stakeholders, and the general public are used to create overall guiding principles and values of the community related to the delivery of parks, recreation facilities, and program services. The Community Values Model™ is then used as the basis for developing or reaffirming the vision, mission, and strategic objectives for the master plan. The strategic objectives address six unique areas of parks and recreation planning including:

- Principles of Community
- Mandatory Elements for Facilities, Programs & Services
- Land and Open Space
- Facilities
- Programs
- Maintenance
- Levels of Service Delivery
- Core Services
- Role in Delivery vs. Other Service Providers
- Funding Mechanisms to Support Operations & Capital
- Public / Public
- Public / Not-for-Profit
- Public / Private
- Design / Align Organization to Support Vision and Values to Community
1.4 VISION & MISSION STATEMENTS

Based on results of the community input process generated through the use of the Community Values Model, the following Vision was developed. The Vision communicates how the Department wishes to be viewed and known with key leaders of the City and the residents of the community.

“Our vision is to enhance Olathe’s economic development, healthy initiatives, and quality of life throughout the community. The Parks and Recreation Department will create a community of choice to live, work and play now and for future generations through the development of quality parks, recreation facilities, trails, historic sites and program services.”

The following is the Mission for how the City of Olathe Parks and Recreation Department will implement the Vision:

“To maximize all available resources in providing beautiful parks, recreation activities, trails, historic sites, and facilities to the Olathe community that enhances the residents’ health and safety, promotes economic vitality, celebrates community heritage and creates civic pride in living in Olathe.”

1.5 COMMUNITY VISIONS, GOALS AND KEY RECOMMENDATIONS

1.5.1 COMMUNITY VISION AND GOAL FOR PARK LAND

“Our vision for all parks in Olathe is to make them a sense of civic pride through quality design principles and maintenance standards that allows them to be managed in the most productive and efficient manner.”

GOAL

Meet the desired goals per acre in the following park categories: neighborhood parks at 2 acres per 1,000 people; community parks at 6 acres per 1,000 people; regional park of 10.49 acres per 1,000 people; and trail miles equal to .5 tenths of a mile per 1,000 people.

STRATEGIES FOR PARK LAND

- Redevelop Cedar Lake and Lake Olathe as signature parks in the City.
- Update the identified existing neighborhood parks outlined in the master plan to support neighborhood revitalization and generate a higher level of productivity in participation.
- Update and refresh community parks in the City as it applies to Prairie Center Park, Lone Elm, Black Bob, Two Trails, and Olathe Girls Softball Park.
- Continue to develop hard surface trails with Johnson County Parks throughout the City.
- Update the Cemetery Master Plan for the City to include adding more burial property.
- Create a Master Plan for cultural and historic sites/parks including Mahaffie Stagecoach Stop & Farm Historic Site/Heritage Center and Ensor Park & Museum.
- Establish a tree canopy goal for the City and decrease the mortality rate of trees for the first three years after planting.
- Replace outdated landscapes in the City.
- Enhance community gardens program in the City working with KSU, Churches, and Olathe Med Center, among others.
- Develop master plan for public art in the City.
1.5.2 COMMUNITY VISION AND GOAL FOR RECREATION FACILITIES

“Our vision for recreation facilities in Olathe is to create destination facilities that support neighborhood and community needs while meeting a cost recovery goal to keep the facilities productive and financially sustainable.”

GOAL
Seek to make all City-owned recreation facilities, at minimum, 60% productive during prime and nonprime times based on providing quality programs, creating effective partnerships, and adding quality amenities at each site.

STRATEGIES FOR RECREATION FACILITIES

• Update Prairie Center and Black Bob Park recreation facilities and amenities to make the community parks as productive and financially sustainable as possible.
• Update and complete all phases of Lone Elm Park recreation facilities and amenities to ensure the community park is financially sustainable and successful in its sports tourism attractions.
• Update neighborhood pools in the City.
• Based on the approval results of the new Olathe Community Center, consider the development of a new community center / field house to balance indoor recreation availability across the City.
• Develop Park Master Plans for Lake Olathe and Cedar Lake, taking advantage of the two park assets and making them more viable to the park system.
• Update year-round use of current facilities.
1.5.3 COMMUNITY VISION AND GOAL FOR PROGRAMMING

“Our vision for programming is to create the widest level of age segment appeal that engages all residents to experience programs services provided by the City that improves their quality of life.”

GOAL

Achieve a goal of 35% of all Olathe residents experiencing an organized recreation program through the Department by 2015.

STRATEGIES FOR PROGRAMMING

• Provide comprehensive, quality recreation and educational programming aimed at satisfying the needs of varying age levels, physical abilities, and special interests in these core services: youth and adult sports, special populations, health and wellness, enrichment, aquatic facilities, aquatic programming, historic sites, and special events.
• Provide efficient and effective leadership for delivery of quality services for the community.
• Promote public involvement and actively seek input in the planning, operation, and participation of the programs provided by the Department.
• Improve effective performance measures used throughout the Department to judge the performance of staff, programs, and recreation facilities.
• Continue to foster a strong volunteer program targeting 15% of the total work force hours being provided by volunteers.
• Update partnership policies for program services as it applies to operational partners, vendor partners, service partners, co-branding partners, resource development partners, and internal City partners.
• Strive to keep 40-50% of all recreation programs in the Introductory, Takeoff, or Growth lifecycle stages in order to align with trends and help meet the evolving needs of the community.
• Classify programs as core essential, important or value added based on public and private benefits of the program.
• Incorporate programming standards for all services provided across the system.
• Continue to find new earned income opportunities to support programs such as the summer concert series, recreation facilities, and specialty programs in the City.
• Promote community health and wellness through programming that addresses physical, mental, environmental, economical, and social wellbeing.
1.5.4 COMMUNITY VISION AND GOAL FOR OPERATIONS AND STAFFING

“Our vision for operations and staffing is to provide quality programs, facilities, historic sites, parks and trails that deliver on the community’s expectations for a safe and enjoyable experience while keeping the infrastructure of the system in a quality state.”

GOAL
Invest 3% of total asset value in park-related infrastructure improvements on an annual basis to keep the City parks, facilities, and amenities in a respectable level of care.

STRATEGIES FOR OPERATIONS AND STAFFING

• Benchmark staff levels of the Department against other similar size cities with similar size parks, trails, historic sites, and facilities to determine how well Olathe is managing its system.
• Develop a maintenance management plan for the park system to help meet visitor and elected officials expectations for quality parks, trails, historic sites, and facilities.
• Develop an updated signage plan for the Department in all parks and facilities that provide good way-finding in the parks in both English and Spanish.
• Develop an updated urban forestry plan for the City.
• Determine the cost of City-owned facilities and the cost to provide the service that the Parks Department maintains, identifying funding strategies that do not detract from other park needs.

1.5.5 COMMUNITY VISION AND GOAL FOR FINANCING

“Our vision for financing the Department is guided by the community and the elected officials expectations financially for quality parks, trails, historic sites, recreation facilities and amenities and program services that provide an acceptable level of funding to deliver on these expected outcomes within a sustainable system.”

GOAL
Seek voter renewal of the 1/8 sales tax to maintain parks, trails, recreation facilities, and programs in 2014.

STRATEGIES FOR FINANCING

• Establish a Sales Tax Committee to promote the renewal of the parks 1/8 cents tax to preserve and protect the parks and recreation system in Olathe.
• Update the developer impact fee ordinance.
• Determine the cost of street medians and bike lanes in the City. Seek additional funding sources to support the existing 35 miles of median maintenance. Plan for additional growth of median miles, maintenance expectations, and requirements in the future.
• All new programmatic ideas developed for the City such as a Arts Master Plan need to have a funding source identified to support the cost of development and ongoing maintenance.
• Develop an earned income plan for the Department that identifies all available funding sources that could be considered for the Department to help offset operational and capital cost.
• Consider dam care at the lakes.
1.5.6 OTHER KEY RECOMMENDATIONS

The following are key recommendations that were developed from the data evaluated, on-site evaluations of parks and recreation facilities, citizen input, and discussions with key members of City Council, the Mayor, and City staff.

PROGRAM PORTFOLIO MANAGEMENT

- Consider expanding core program offerings to meet the desires expressed by the public, include the provision of programs that engage minorities, seniors, and residents with disabilities. This also aligns with the projected demographic trend of an aging and more diversified population in Olathe.
- Continue to provide a strong portfolio of programs that cater to families. Affordable family-oriented programs are particularly desired and valued by the community.
- Acknowledge and celebrate the history and heritage of Olathe through on-going programming and special events.
- Consider expanding special events and creating an annual event that the Department can call “its own.” The community desires this.
- Classify core program areas as essential, important, and value added. Develop strategic cost recovery goals for each type of service that match public good with private good. Promote community involvement and actively seek input in the planning, operation, and participation of the Olathe Parks and Recreation Department.
- Effectively coordinate the Parks and Recreation Department with other City departments, organizations, schools, and other community partners to improve the overall service to citizens.
- Offer comprehensive, quality recreation, and educational programming aimed at satisfying the needs of varying age levels, physical abilities, and special interests.
- Provide efficient and effective leadership and coordination for delivery of quality services for the community.
- Ensure community diversity and inclusion.
PROGRAM LIFECYCLE MANAGEMENT

- Strive to keep about 40-50% of all recreation programs in the Introductory, Take-Off, or Growth lifecycle stages in order to align with trends and to help meet the evolving needs of the community.
- Strive to keep about 40% of programs in the Mature stage to provide stability to the overall program portfolio.
- Programs falling into the Saturated or Decline stage need to be reprogrammed or retired to create new programs for the introductory stage.

COST RECOVERY, PRICING, AND FINANCIAL MANAGEMENT

- Use programmatic areas as a basis for cost recovery goals. The core programs identified in the recreation program assessment need to serve as an effective breakdown. Staff currently groups programs with similar cost recovery goals in this format.
- Cost recovery targets are to be identified for each program area and for specific programs or events. Currently, individual programs have no clear cost recovery target.
- Classify programs as core essential, important, and value-added, and apply true cost of service pricing to each program area before applying additional cost recovery goals.
- Use the spectrum of public-to-private benefit to inform cost recovery targets and pricing strategies. Programs providing higher level of public benefits need to be subsidized more by the Department.
- Non-core programs, which are less critical to provide and further away from the agency mission, need to aim to yield a higher cost recovery rate to sustain them, leaving the limited tax-based appropriations to fund core programs.
- Full cost of accounting that accurately calculates direct and indirect costs are to be used to develop fees and cost recovery goals. Department staff must be trained on this process.
- Programs, and their associated fees, provided by competitors and other providers must be benchmarked annually to monitor changes they are making and how they compare with the Department’s programs.
- Brief business plans are to be developed for each core program area. This will help monitor the success of achieving desired outcomes, help control cost recovery, guide operational adjustments, and serve as budget development tools.
PERFORMANCE MANAGEMENT

- Implement consistent system-wide recreation program standards.
- Conduct an annual review process so that staff and leadership can review policies, operations, issues, and plans for the future.
- Begin documenting the program development process to formalize and coordinate program lifecycles in a strategic way.
- Develop an instructor/contractor tool kit or resource package with critical information including strategic program frameworks, Department and City goals, mission, and vision.
- Create ongoing connections with part-time and seasonal staff to integrate them to the Department and to help manage satisfaction and performance.
- Identify customer requirements for core program areas (at minimum) and use them for performance management.
- Conduct an environmental scan of best practices every few years to inspire innovation and help make corrections to program operations.
- Continue to implement a system-wide and centralized approach for collecting customer feedback.
- Develop and implement quality control mechanisms for instructors and contractors to ensure effectiveness and to build credibility.

VOLUNTEER MANAGEMENT

- Consider adding additional volunteer opportunities, particularly for corporations, seniors and students.
- Foster a system-wide approach to volunteer recruitment and management, including coordinated and standardized position descriptions and application/acceptance requirements.
- Develop a tracking system to quantify the number of volunteer hours according to program area and specific function, and document cost savings in more detailed ways.
- Develop documented volunteer recruitment, retention, and recognition systems.
- Involve volunteers in cross training to expose them to various departmental functions and increase their skill. This practice can also increase their utility, allowing for more flexibility in making work assignments, and can increase their appreciation and understanding of the Department.

PARTNERSHIP MANAGEMENT

- Formalize and continually maintain an overall partnership philosophy supported by a policy framework.
- Consider additional partnerships with schools, libraries, and nonprofits, particularly to provide expanded educational programming.
- Require all partnerships to have a working agreement with measurable outcomes evaluated on a regular basis.
- Require all partnerships to track costs to demonstrate the shared level of equity and investment made by partners involved with the City.
- Maintain a culture of collaborative planning for all partnerships. Focus on regular communications and annual reporting.
MARKETING AND PROMOTION

- Develop a strategic marketing plan that focuses the brand and identity of the Department, as well as increase communication about programs and services, especially to minorities or underserved members of the community.
- Tie the marketing plan directly to the Department’s mission and vision.
- Provide specific guidance as to how the Department’s identity and brand will be consistently portrayed across the multiple forms of media, organizations, and to diverse audiences.
- Use community input to inform marketing efforts.
- Build volunteerism in the marketing and communication efforts, and recruit new volunteers with new skills as the marketing program grows.
- Establish performance measures for marketing efforts and review them regularly.
- Enhance relationships with partners that can leverage marketing efforts through cross-promotion.

1.6 CONCLUSION

The City of Olathe Parks and Recreation Department has done a very good job over the last 15 years developing parks and recreation facilities across the City. The voter approved 1/8-cent sales tax ten years ago provided the Department the opportunity to improve the system and develop additional recreation facilities. Once again, voters need to approve renewal of the 1/8-cent sales tax to keep the system relevant and effective for the residents. Currently, the park and recreation system is well used and appreciated by the community. Moving forward, additional actions are required to retain a quality system and stay ahead of the park infrastructure and asset needs that the Department owns and manages. Improving the existing recreation amenities and trails, as well as continuing to add new amenities that the community desires will ensure the City of Olathe is a community of choice for residents of Johnson County.

The master plan outlines many recommendations for each element of the system, which will require support from the Mayor and City Council, key leadership in the City Manager’s office, and Department staff to implement the recommendations. The recommendations address community unmet needs and expectations, as well as support the economic and health related goals of the City Council and Mayor’s office.

The opening of the new community center in July 2014 will provide the Department its first true indoor space that staff has the ability to take ownership of and program. The facility will be another goal achieved from guidance derived from the previous master plan’s recommendations.

This master plan is a planning tool that allows the Department to manage forward. The City has acted well on implementing the recommendations from previous plans. The success from implementing the previous plan is evidence that the process works. Continuation of carrying out the recommendations is critical, as the Department has become a major service provider to the community and an integral “quality of life” expectation of people living and working in Olathe. Community support follows great vision, so let the advancement begin!
CHAPTER TWO
COMMUNITY NEEDS ASSESSMENT

2.1 COMMUNITY INPUT SUMMARY

An initial step when developing a master plan for the Olathe Parks and Recreation Department, ten focus groups were organized and conducted with various residents, stakeholders, the Department foundation, and staff members from Olathe. In addition, two public forums were offered at local schools to collect information from the general public. This interaction with residents and other community representatives helps to establish priorities for the future improvement and strategic planning for the Olathe Parks and Recreation Department. Focus group and stakeholder questions enable the Department to learn what users of the system value, and establish the needs and concerns that the Department could address in the future.

2.1.1 STRENGTHS OF THE PARKS AND RECREATION DEPARTMENT

Overall, focus group and public forum participants were highly favorable of the park and recreation system in Olathe and expressed a generally high level of satisfaction with the Department and its staff. Among the most cited strengths was the number and diversity of programs, which has grown in proportion to Olathe’s population increases. The Department’s ability to partner with other organizations and institutions, particularly Olathe Public Schools (OPS) and the joint-use of their facilities for recreation programs, was referenced as part of this success.

Participants also included the quality and diversity of the park system as a strength. The variety is valued, from large open spaces found at sites like Lake Olathe and Cedar Lake to small neighborhood parks. Efforts made by staff in recent years to engage neighborhood residents about the management of the parks they live near have been especially appreciated. Trails are highly valued and every focus group included discussion about the quality of the trail system, and a desire for more. Recent improvements to park sites, streetscapes, and recreation facilities Black Bob Park, Black Bob Bay, and the Heritage Center at Mahaffie received recurring positive feedback; plus, there is a lot of anticipation and excitement surrounding the opening of the new Olathe Community Center in 2014.

Again and again, participants made reference to the idea that the high quality of the parks and recreation system in Olathe directly contributes to the community’s quality of life. Many individuals said that the Department does an exceptional job of providing an array of facilities and programs for both individuals and families, and similarly, many stated that the family-friendly nature of park and recreation services has been a major factor in their decisions to move to Olathe or continue living in the community.
2.1.2 KEY OUTCOMES OVER THE NEXT FIVE YEARS

Many participants commented that, above all, they would like to see the master plan help the Department continue its positive trend of success. However, several recurring themes emerged regarding specific outcomes:

- Care, maintenance, cleanliness, and improvement of existing facilities and parks.
- Development of new recreation facilities – but only those that are appropriate based on growth and demand projections or those that could attract regional tournaments/events and become a destination facility for particular recreation activities.
- Reinvigoration of underutilized areas such as Lake Olathe, Cedar Lake, downtown, and historical/cultural sites.
- Acknowledgement and celebration of the history and heritage of Olathe through its existing sites and the potential for more special events related to those themes.
- A plan to strategically identify open space for acquisition according to City growth patterns.
- A plan to keep the Department financially sustainable, especially in light of the opening of the community center and the need to continue to expand programs and facilities to meet the growth of the City.
- A more connected community in terms of trails, public transportation, and bike lanes. Connections need to be made with other trail/transportation systems, and connecting downtown Olathe can be a particular focus.
- A fully engaged community, particularly engagement with minority, low-income, and special populations.
- Additional volunteer opportunities, especially for students and seniors.
- Continual improvements to the Department’s efforts to communicate with the public, including the promotion of programs and events as well as conveying the important role that parks and recreation plays in the community.
- Additional special events in general, with some recurring suggestions for events at the community center, holiday/winter festivals, and additional musical performances or concerts. Many participants emphasized that there could be more special events for youth and families.
- Guidance on prioritizing use of facilities that are in high demand, like athletic fields, among all of the groups that compete to use them for both scheduled games/practices and informal pick-up games.
- Clarification of roles with partners, especially Olathe District Schools and the Johnson County Park and Recreation District (JCPRD), and expansion of partnerships as appropriate to meet emerging needs.
2.1.3 CHANGES, ADDITIONS AND IMPROVEMENTS FOR THE SYSTEM

Many focus group and public forum participants brought up the need for better amenities at existing parks throughout the system, especially at those parks that are aging. Specific sites mentioned during the discussion included Lake Olathe, Two Trails Park, Frontier Park, Lone Elm, and Cedar Lake. Improvements are desired to restrooms, drinking fountains, benches, and shelters. Several individuals mentioned that improvements were needed to enhance their feeling of safety, to make facilities more family-friendly (particularly in terms of restrooms), make them more physically accessible, and to make these parks more attractive to more residents overall.

Trails are highly valued by the community according to the participants, and the Department needs to continue efforts to expand and connect the trail system. Developing additional trails in existing parks was suggested, as well as connecting with other trail systems like Johnson County Park and Recreation District. It was also important to many residents that downtown Olathe be connected to the trail system, as this would help with transportation issues, facilitate more visitation downtown, and tie into the trail-based history of the City.

The need for better athletic facilities was discussed frequently. Many individuals desire a sport/athletic complex that will attract use not only among City residents, but also people from nearby communities. Indoor soccer, basketball courts, baseball/softball diamonds, and tennis courts were mentioned as facilities that are needed, along with improved areas for spectators and concessions. There was recognition that the new community center might provide some of these needs, and there was also discussion that Olathe District Schools would likely build a new tennis center, but many residents felt that additional facilities would likely be needed.

Some residents said that additional open space for informal recreation and sports would be beneficial, like simple rectangular fields to be used for pick-up games of soccer or football and also for emerging sports like lacrosse and cricket. It was also mentioned that more areas are needed to cater to the recreation interests of minority or low-income populations, and that informal fields like these could help accomplish that desire. Part of this conversation also included requests to make reservation rules of areas like this more straightforward, especially when it comes to communicating which fields are available on a first-come first-served basis, and which ones must be reserved.

Many focus group participants wanted to ensure that there were adequate facilities and programs for everyone in the community. All neighborhoods in the City should receive equitable levels of service from the Department. Several groups cited that the west side of the City as an area that may need additional facilities or services. While Olathe has a reputation of being a younger family-oriented City, it was often mentioned that the Department needs to make sure that it provides services and amenities for everyone, including seniors, individuals with disabilities, teens, tweens, ethnic minorities, low-income populations, and singles. Suggestions included offering well-rounded programs that involve not just physical activity, but also arts, culture, history, and continuing education. Many people also mentioned that they would like to see diverse programs like that at the new community center.

Affordability and access issues came up frequently during the focus groups, and several participants wanted to see improvements to the scholarship program. They hope that lower-income residents would not be priced out of the new community center, and that the scholarship program would be continually evaluated to ensure it provides opportunities for these populations to participate. The notion of tiered eligibility came up, along with continually revising eligibility criteria to match the local economic conditions in Olathe.

Leveraging the City’s history was also a priority for many residents. The Department could take advantage of existing facilities like the Ensor Farm and Memorial Cemetery through better signage, programs, connections with trails, or partnerships. Other historic sites and buildings could be used by the Department (via partnerships) to offer more programs and special events. Several participants that have affiliation with organizations related to the area history expressed eagerness to partner with the Department to explore new uses and funding sources to open up these historic and cultural resources to the public in new ways.
2.1.4 MARKETING AND COMMUNICATIONS

The Activity Guide received consistent praise from participants as one of the best resources to stay aware and up-to-date of all of the programs and facilities provided by the Department. There was no clear preference for the electronic version compared to the print version – a significant number of people use each based upon their personal preferences. The ability to opt-out of receiving print copies was appreciated by many, however.

Several focus group members were not aware they could receive email notifications from the Department, suggesting that staff needs to continue to promote this as a means of communication. It was suggested by some individuals that emails be more targeted depending upon topic, demographic, or geography. This was also suggested in regard to social media. Some residents suggested that there be different Twitter feeds for different services or events (i.e., one specific to the community center construction, one for teen programming, one for trail notifications, etc.).

Using additional City resources for marketing and promotion was suggested. The Department could share more news in the City/Mayor’s newsletter. Also, some participants want to see more signs around town promoting programs, parks, and events. This could include banners across Santa Fe, temporary road signs, and additional use of billboards. Having bulletin boards at park and recreation facilities (or other City facilities) would help with this and could be used to increase general awareness of news around town. Cross-promoting other City services was suggested, and some specific ideas included having recycling centers or library book drop-offs at parks and recreation facilities. Joint efforts with non-City entities were also suggested, such as partnering with the Chamber of Commerce, Olathe District Schools, JCP RD, the Freedom’s Frontier National Heritage Area, the Mayor’s Latino Coalition, and other organizations for marketing efforts (although, it was also acknowledged that the Department is already working with several of these groups for this purpose).

A few suggestions were received for particular messages that the Department needs to communicate. One is that the Department must emphasize that the parks and recreation system is available for all residents, and that there is something for everyone. This can be done by highlighting certain programs or amenities that might interest nontraditional users. It was also suggested that the Department be sure to communicate more about the new community center, including a description of the range of amenities and describing the value and benefit of purchasing an admission or membership. Participants also thought the Department could do more for new residents by giving them a welcoming message to the community and providing a welcome packet of information.

2.1.5 MAINTENANCE, OPERATIONS AND VALUE RECEIVED OF THE SYSTEM

Virtually every participant agreed that the Department does a good job with the funding they receive and that City residents get a good value for their tax dollars. It was acknowledged that much of the Department’s success was due to their strong partnerships, especially with Olathe District Schools, and that it is important to continue to foster the growth of partnerships. Many participants said that they are willing to continue to pay for programs that charge fees. This question also prompted additional discussion about scholarships for recreation programs and the need to keep some programs and facilities accessible to those with low incomes. A few participants said the Department needs to consider revising some of their fees because Olathe charges more than other nearby cities for comparable services.
2.1.6 FUNDING PARKS AND RECREATION TO MATCH THE GROWTH OF THE CITY

There was broad consensus that the Department has multiple sources of income and avoids becoming dependent on too few sources. A prevailing thought was that the City place a priority on taking care of existing facilities, meaning that there be enough funding for ongoing maintenance and operations. However, the focus groups also acknowledged the need for additional facilities and programs to be developed as the City grows, but that the growth of the system needs to be planned carefully and with consideration of the long-term financial implications of the additional operational demands they will put in place. Some participants brought up the Excise Tax and Sales Tax. Both were strongly supported among virtually all focus group participants.

Some participants wanted to see more efforts to recover costs or generate additional revenue. It was suggested that concessions and equipment rental be expanded if that would create more of a funding source. Another idea mentioned multiple times was that if the City developed a high-quality sports complex, it could generate revenue through user fees from teams, admission fees (such as at the Blue Valley sports complex), and through concessions.

It was important to several participants that the Department does not give up on Federal Grant funding opportunities (or other grants) despite the decline or elimination of those sources in recent years. Through cooperation with other departments or organizations, it was suggested that other funding sources (i.e., storm water) could be used for park improvements or beautification projects.
2.1.7 IMPROVING CEDAR LAKE AND LAKE OLATHE AS SIGNATURE PARKS

Nearly every participant in the focus groups and public forums supported the idea of improving both Lake Olathe and Cedar Lake, but Lake Olathe received more discussion and enthusiasm. Residents cited safety concerns and lack of aesthetic appeal as major reasons for improvement, but also many of the participants simply felt that the areas are under-utilized and hold outstanding potential to become a signature/destination park for the community. When asked about specific enhancements they would like to see, ideas mentioned included (re-)opening a swimming beach, developing a marina with small boat/paddleboat rentals, creating an outdoor amphitheater, developing more trails and connecting it to the broader trail system, and making improvements to shelter houses, restrooms, and roads. A number of participants encouraged the Department to look at ways to connect the two parks with a greenway.

Shawnee Mission Park was referenced multiple times as a model to use for Lake Olathe. Focus group participants liked the idea of conducting improvements that would bring family-friendly activities and special events to the park. Developing campgrounds and rental cabins was also mentioned and linked back to the idea of creating additional revenue sources for the Department. Some participants said that they would like to see features at Lake Olathe or Cedar Lake that would help make Olathe unique or would help draw visitors from other communities in the Kansas City area or from the region. Ideas included an adventure sports area, an archery range, a shooting range, an ice rink, a skating rink, mountain bike trails, a petting zoo, climbing wall, or performing arts programming. It can be noted that participants sometimes mentioned adding these amenities anywhere in the Olathe parks and recreation system, not just at Lake Olathe or Cedar Lake. Other parks mentioned as having desirable features that Lake Olathe / Cedar Lake could be modeled after were Shawnee Mission Park, Kill Creek Parks, Timber Ridge, the outdoor theater in Leawood, Wyandotte Park, Deanna Rose Children’s Farmstead, and Eugene Mahoney State Park in Nebraska.

2.1.8 MISSING RECREATION FACILITIES OR AMENITIES

Responses to this question varied greatly from general ideas to highly specific requests for improvements. There was recognition that the new community center was going to fill a major gap for indoor recreation, particularly in terms of aquatics, fitness facilities, and meeting rooms; but there was also a lack of certainty among the participants about what specifically the community center would offer. There was hope expressed that the pool and water features would be adequate, although some individuals said they knew it would not include a competition-sized pool, which they felt is needed. Others felt that the community center posed a threat to affordability and access, and wanted the Department to ensure that ample scholarships or reduced rates were offered to residents that needed them.

Having some kind of signature destination within Olathe was important to many participants. A premier “crown-jewel” sports complex also came up several times as something the City needs. Several parents mentioned they often have to drive to other communities to take their children to youth athletic events, and that given how busy these other facilities are, coupled with the growing population and demand for athletics across all age groups, that Olathe could invest in a similar facility. Participants also warned that while a new facility may indeed be needed, the Department needs to be careful to guard against duplicating facilities and services that are provided by other communities or the public school system.

Better connectivity was frequently mentioned as something the City needs. Residents requested both on-street and off-street trails connected to other parks and other communities. More alternative transportation nodes were discussed, such as the idea of using the community center or popular parks as places where trails meet with public transportation access.

Several residents expressed that the City needs to do more to celebrate and promote its history and heritage. Ensor Farm, and the Mahaffie Stagecoach Stop & Farm/Heritage Center were cited as strong assets to the system, but many individuals thought more could be done with those sites, or that new sites altogether could be opened or improved, especially in the downtown area.
Residents also talked about the need for Olathe to have its “own” special event. Wild West Days and other festivals were talked about as good events, but were offered by Johnson County or other organizations. When this idea was brought up, there seemed to be strong support for tying the event to local Olathe history. It was suggested that a permanent shelter somewhere near downtown, or in a park like Lake Olathe, might help facilitate a new special event – or it could be used to improve existing events like the farmers’ market.

Other specific amenities, facilities, and services suggested for creation or expansion were:

- Dog parks, for all breeds and with some natural areas
- Community gardens throughout the City
- Swimming beaches
- Outdoor racquetball courts
- Pickleball courts
- Roller skating rink
- Ice skating rink
- Neighborhood playgrounds for a broader age range of children, particularly older children
- Large “destination” playground with innovative features to attract people from nearby communities
- Places for bird watching and viewing other wildlife
2.1.9 EXPECTATIONS OF THE MASTER PLAN

Responses to this question were also diverse, and reflect the wide array of interests and ideas expressed by the diversity of participants:

- Recognition of the history of Olathe, and ideas for programs and facilities that help celebrate the community’s heritage.
- Ways to improve the trail system for both on-road and off-road trails, including better signage and better connectivity with adjacent trail systems.
- A plan for green space that takes into account future development and the growing population.
- A plan for the financial sustainability of the Department, particularly recognizing the ongoing maintenance and operational needs of facilities and programs over their full lifecycle.
- Maintenance standards for parks and recreation facilities.
- More accessible and/or affordable programs for these populations:
  - Families with children
  - Seniors
  - Low-income
  - Ethnic minorities, especially the Latino community
  - Individuals with disabilities
- Improving the scholarship program and overall affordability of programs and facilities.
- Connections with the public transportation system.
- A plan for the community center, in terms of financial viability and in terms of meeting the needs for all residents.
- An analysis of the need for a new/expanded/improved sports complex or field house.
- Playgrounds for all ages and abilities.
- A plan to maximize partnerships and reduce duplication of services with other providers.
- Recognition of technology and what it can do for the Department.
- Ways to restore older and under-utilized parks.
- A plan for Lake Olathe to turn it into a signature park.
- Ways to create more special events.
- Recognition of growth patterns of the City, and recommendations for providing the right mix of programs and facilities to match that growth.
- Ways to keep the park system safe and family friendly.
- A plan for the continued wise use of tax dollars.
- Alignment with the City Comprehensive Plan and other related planning documents.
2.2 COMMUNITY SURVEY

2.2.1 OVERVIEW OF THE METHODOLOGY

ETC Institute conducted a Comprehensive Community Needs Assessment Survey January of 2014 to help establish use and satisfaction for current parks and recreation facilities, and to determine priorities for the future development of parks and recreation facilities, programs and services within the City of Olathe Parks and Recreation Department. The survey was designed to obtain statistically valid results from households throughout the City of Olathe. The survey was administered by mail and by web.

ETC Institute worked extensively with City of Olathe officials and PROS Consulting in the development of the survey questionnaire. This work allowed the survey to be tailored to issues of strategic importance to effectively plan the future system and engage community involvement.

The six-page survey was mailed to a random sample of 1,600 households within the City of Olathe Parks and Recreation boundaries. Approximately three days after the surveys were mailed, each household that received a survey also received an automated voice message encouraging them to complete the survey.

The goal was to obtain a total of at least 400 completed surveys. ETC Institute reached that goal with a total of 417 surveys completed. The results of the random sample of 417 households have a 95% level of confidence with a precision rate of at least +/-4.7%.

The following pages summarize major survey findings.
HAVE YOU OR MEMBERS OF YOUR HOUSEHOLD VISITED ANY OF THE CITY OF OLATHE PARKS AND RECREATION DEPARTMENT PARKS DURING THE PAST YEAR?
Eighth-four percent (84%) of respondents have visited the City of Olathe Parks and Recreation Department parks over the past year. Fourteen percent (14%) of respondents have not visited City of Olathe parks over the past year and (2%) of respondents stated that they didn’t know if they had visited City of Olathe park or not over the past year.

CITY OF OLATHE PARKS AND RECREATION FACILITIES RESPONDENT HOUSEHOLDS HAVE USED OR VISITED OVER THE PAST 12 MONTHS
Seventy-six percent (76%) of respondents have used walking, hiking and biking trails over the past 12 months. Other City of Olathe Parks and Recreation Department facilities households have used over the past 12 months include small neighborhood parks (70%), large community parks (49%), playgrounds (48%), lakes (47%), nature areas and trails (44%), and outdoor swimming pools (44%).
HOW RESPONDENTS RATE THE OVERALL PHYSICAL CONDITION OF ALL THE PARKS, TRAILS, AND RECREATION FACILITIES IN THE CITY OF OLATHE THEY HAVE VISITED
Sixty-four percent (64%) of respondents rate the overall physical condition of all the City of Olathe parks, trails and recreation facilities they have visited as “good.” Thirty-one percent (31%) of respondents rate the overall condition of parks, trials and facilities as “excellent” and (5%) rate the overall condition as “fair.”

HAVE RESPONDENT HOUSEHOLDS PARTICIPATED IN ANY RECREATION PROGRAMS OFFERED BY THE CITY OF OLATHE PARKS AND RECREATION DEPARTMENT DURING THE PAST 12 MONTHS
Twenty-five percent (25%) of respondents have participated in programs offered by the City of Olathe Parks and Recreation Department over the past 12 months. Seventy-two percent (72%) of respondents have not participated in programs and (3%) of respondent don’t know whether or not they have participated in programs offered by the City of Olathe in the past 12 months.
HOW MANY DIFFERENT RECREATION PROGRAM OFFERED BY THE CITY OF OLATHE PARKS AND RECREATION DEPARTMENT HAVE RESPONDENT HOUSEHOLDS PARTICIPATED IN OVER THE PAST 12 MONTHS?

Based on the percentage of respondents who participated in programs, forty-four percent (44%) of respondents participated in 2 to 3 programs offered by the City of Olathe Parks and Recreation Department over the past 12 months. Other amounts of programs respondents participated in over the past 12 months include: 1 program (33%), 4 to 6 programs (18%), 7 to 10 programs (1%), 11 or more programs (2%) and don’t know (2%).

RESPONDENTS TOP THREE PRIMARY REASONS WHY THEIR HOUSEHOLD HAS PARTICIPATED IN OLATHE PARKS AND RECREATION DEPARTMENT RECREATION PROGRAMS

Fifty-eight percent (58%) of respondents’ primary reasons why their household participated in Olathe Parks and Recreation programs was the location of the facility. Other primary reasons why respondent households have participated in parks and recreation programs offered by the City of Olathe include: Economical fees (51%), friends participate (36%) and dates offered (32%).
HOW RESPONDENTS RATE THE OVERALL QUALITY OF THE CITY OF OLATHE PARKS AND RECREATION PROGRAMS THEY HAVE PARTICIPATED IN OVER THE PAST 12 MONTHS

Sixty-two percent (62%) of respondents rated the overall quality of programs they have participated in as “good.” Other ratings of the overall quality of the City of Olathe Parks and Recreation Department programs respondent households have participated in over the past 12 months include: “Excellent” (23%), “fair” (8%), “poor” (5%) and “don’t know” (2%).

ORGANIZATIONS RESPONDENT HOUSEHOLDS HAVE USED FOR INDOOR AND OUTDOOR RECREATION ACTIVITIES DURING THE PAST 12 MONTHS

Forty-six percent (46%) of respondent have used Johnson County Parks for their indoor and outdoor recreation activities over the past 12 months. Other organizations that respondent households have used for their indoor and outdoor recreation activities over the past 12 months include: City of Olathe Parks and Recreation Department (43%), Olathe School District (42%), and parks & facilities in neighboring cities (34%).
ORGANIZATIONS RESPONDENT HOUSEHOLDS HAVE USED THE MOST AGES 0-11 YEARS
Ten percent (10%) of respondents have used the Olathe School District the most for parks and recreation programs and services over the past 12 months. Other organizations children ages 0-11 years have used the most for parks and recreation programs and services include: City of Olathe Park and Recreation Department (7%) and churches (6%).

![Graph showing percentages of respondents using different organizations for parks and recreation programs and services for ages 0-11 years.]

ORGANIZATIONS RESPONDENT HOUSEHOLDS HAVE USED THE MOST AGES 12-17 YEARS
Six percent (6%) of respondents have used the Olathe School District the most for parks and recreation programs and services over the past 12 months. Other organizations children ages 12-17 years have used the most for parks and recreation programs and services include: Private clubs (4%). City of Olathe Parks and Recreation Department (4%).

![Graph showing percentages of respondents using different organizations for parks and recreation programs and services for ages 12-17 years.]
ORGANIZATIONS RESPONDENT HOUSEHOLDS HAVE USED THE MOST AGES 18-61 YEARS
Seventeen percent (17%) of respondents use the Olathe School District the most for parks and recreation programs and services. Other organizations respondents’ ages 18-61 years have used the most for parks and recreation programs and services include: Homeowners Associations (13%), Churches (10%) and City of Olathe Parks and Recreation Department (9%).

ORGANIZATIONS RESPONDENT HOUSEHOLDS HAVE USED THE MOST AGES 62 YEARS AND OLDER
Five percent (5%) of respondents use Homeowners Associations the most for parks and recreation programs and services. Other organizations respondents use the most for parks and recreation programs and services include: Olathe School District (3%) and Johnson County Parks (2%).
WAYS RESPONDENTS LEARN ABOUT CITY OF OLATHE PARKS AND RECREATION DEPARTMENT PROGRAMS AND ACTIVITIES

Seventy-two (72%) percent of respondents use the *Activity Guide* to learn about information regarding programs and activities provided by the City of Olathe. Other ways respondents learn about programs and activities provided by the City of Olathe Parks and Recreation Department include: City/Mayor’s newsletter (46%) and parks and recreation website (39%).

IMPROVEMENTS RESPONDENT HOUSEHOLDS WOULD USE IF THEY WERE MADE AT EITHER/OR BOTH LAKE OLATHE AND CEDAR LAKE

Forty-seven percent (47%) of respondents would use *improvement to restrooms* if they were made at either or both Lake Olathe and Cedar Lake. Other improvement that respondent households would use if they were made at either or both Lake Olathe or Cedar Lake include: More trails within the park (41%), trails connecting to other parks (40%), swimming beach (39%), large destination playground (31%), outdoor amphitheater (30%) and Marina with small boat rentals (30%).
THE TOP THREE FACILITIES AND IMPROVEMENT THAT RESPONDENT HOUSEHOLDS WOULD USE THE MOST IF THEY WERE DEVELOPED AT EITHER LAKE OLATHE OR CEDAR LAKE

Based on the sum of respondent top three choices, (30%) of respondents would use the more trails within the park the most. Other improvement or facilities that respondent households would use the most if they were developed at either Lake Olathe or Cedar Lake include: Swimming beach (29%), trails connecting to other parks (24%), improvements to restrooms (24%), and marina with small boat rentals (23%).

CITY OF OLATHE PARKS AND RECREATION DEPARTMENT FACILITIES RESPONDENT HOUSEHOLDS HAVE A NEED FOR

Seventy-six percent (76%) of respondents have a need for walking, hiking and biking trails. Other City of Olathe Parks and Recreation Department facilities that respondent households have a need for include: Small neighborhood parks (68%), large community parks (67%), outdoor swimming pools and water parks (62%), picnic areas and shelters (55%), indoor fitness and exercise facilities (50%), indoor swimming pools and leisure pools (47%), playground equipment (46%) and historic sites and Living History Farm (41%).
THE TOP FOUR CITY OF OLATHE PARKS AND RECREATION FACILITIES THAT ARE THE MOST IMPORTANT TO RESPONDENT HOUSEHOLDS

Based on the sum of respondents top four choices, (48%) of respondents stated that the most important City of Olathe Parks and Recreation Department facility is walking, hiking and biking trails. Other most important City of Olathe Parks and Recreation Facilities that are the most important to households include: Outdoor swimming pools and water parks (36%), small neighborhood parks (31%), large community parks (24%) and indoor fitness and exercise facilities (21%).

CITY OF OLATHE PARKS AND RECREATION PROGRAMS THAT RESPONDENT HOUSEHOLDS HAVE A NEED FOR:

Based on the percentage of respondents who have a need for facilities, forty-four percent (44%) of respondents have a need for adult fitness and wellness programs. Other parks and recreation programs that respondent households have a need for include: Youth sports programs (33%), community special events (28%), nature programs (28%), and water fitness programs (28%).
THE TOP FOUR CITY OF OLATHE PARKS AND RECREATION PROGRAMS THAT ARE THE MOST IMPORTANT TO RESPONDENT HOUSEHOLDS

Based on the sum of respondents top four choices, (32%) of respondents state that the City of Olathe parks and recreation program that is the most important to their household is adult fitness and wellness programs. Other programs that are the most important to respondent households include: Youth sports programs (23%), youth learn to swim programs (19%), community special events (16%), water fitness programs (15%) and nature programs (14%).

![Chart showing the top four programs according to importance.]

**Q13. The top FOUR City of Olathe programs that are MOST IMPORTANT to respondent households**

Source: ETC Institute City of Olathe Parks and Recreation Department (2016)

THE TOP FOUR CITY OF OLATHE PARKS AND RECREATION PROGRAMS THAT RESPONDENT HOUSEHOLDS CURRENTLY PARTICIPATE IN THE MOST OFTEN

Based on the sum of respondent top four choices, (17%) of respondents currently participate in youth sports programs the most often. Other City of Olathe parks and recreation programs that respondent households currently participate in the most often include: Community special events (14%), youth Learn to Swim programs (11%), adult fitness and wellness programs (11%) and youth summer camp programs (10%).

![Chart showing the top four programs according to current participation.]

**Q14. The top FOUR programs that respondent households currently participate in the MOST OFTEN**

Source: ETC Institute City of Olathe Parks and Recreation Department (2016)
REASONS THAT PREVENT RESPONDENT HOUSEHOLDS FROM USING PARKS, RECREATION FACILITIES, OR PROGRAMS OF THE CITY OF OLATHE PARKS AND RECREATION DEPARTMENT MORE OFTEN

Twenty-six percent (25%) of respondents are prevented from using parks, recreation facilities or programs of the City of Olathe Parks and Recreation Department more often because they do not know what is being offered. Other reasons that prevent respondent households from using parks, recreation facilities or programs of the City of Olathe Parks and Recreation Department more often include: Fees are too high (21%), program times are not convenient (19%), use services of other agencies (19%), program or facility not offered (18%) and I do not know locations of facilities (17%).

Q15. Reasons that prevent respondent households from using parks, recreation facilities, or programs of the Olathe Parks and Recreation Department more often

(by percentage of respondents excluding ‘none chosen’)

- I do not know what is being offered: 26%
- Fees are too high: 21%
- Program times are not convenient: 19%
- Use services of other agencies: 19%
- Program or facility not offered: 18%
- I do not know locations of facilities: 17%
- Too far from our residence: 15%
- Use facilities in other communities: 14%
- Lack of quality programs: 10%
- Lack of accessibility: 10%
- Security is insufficient: 8%
- Facilities are not well maintained: 7%
- Facility operating hours not convenient: 7%
- Facilities don’t have the right equipment: 5%
- Class full: 3%
- Registration for programs is difficult: 3%
- Lack of parking: 3%
- Poor customer service by staff: 1%

Source: ETC Institute City of Olathe Parks and Recreation Department (2014)
LEVEL OF SUPPORT RESPONDENTS GIVE TO THE CITY OF OLATHE TAKING ACTIONS TO IMPROVE AND EXPAND PARKS AND RECREATION FACILITIES

Ninety-one percent (91%) of respondents are either “very supportive” or “somewhat supportive” of the City of Olathe to take action to maintain and upgrade existing trails and maintain and upgrade existing neighborhood parks. Other similar levels of support for the City of Olathe to take action to improve and expand parks and recreation facilities include: Maintain and upgrade existing swimming pools (85%), maintain and upgrade existing sports fields (84%), acquire open space for trails, playgrounds, etc. (81%) and maintain and upgrade Lake Olathe (78%).

Q16. Level of support respondent households give to the City of Olathe taking actions to improve and expand parks and recreation facilities

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>by percentage of respondents</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Maintain and upgrade existing trails</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Maintain and upgrade existing neighborhood parks</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Maintain and upgrade existing swimming pools</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Maintain and upgrade existing sports fields</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Acquire open space for trails, playgrounds, etc.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Maintain and upgrade Lake Olathe</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Develop longer trail by connecting trails in Olathe to other trail systems throughout Johnson County</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Maintain and upgrade Cedar Lake</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Maintain and upgrade the Mashed Stagpaw Adventure Park and Farmer's Grove</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: IF Institute City of Olathe Parks and Recreation Department (2016)

Q16. Level of support respondent households give to the City of Olathe taking actions to improve and expand parks and recreation facilities

Cont.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>by percentage of respondents</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Acquire open space for youth and adult sports fields</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Connect downtown Olathe to walking and biking trails</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Develop trail connecting Lake Olathe and Cedar Lake parks</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Develop an outdoor family aquatic center on east side of Olathe</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Develop an indoor community center on east side of Olathe</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Develop a new outdoor sports complex for Olathe youth and tournaments</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Develop a new indoor sports complex for Olathe youth and tournaments</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Maintain and upgrade Eisor Park and Museum</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: IF Institute City of Olathe Parks and Recreation Department (2016)
THE TOP THREE CITY OF OLATHE PARKS AND RECREATION EXPANSIONS OR IMPROVEMENTS RESPONDENTS ARE THE MOST WILLING TO FUND WITH THEIR TAX DOLLARS

Based on the sum of respondents’ top three choices, twenty-eight percent (28%) of respondents are the most willing to fund with their tax dollars the City to maintain and upgrade existing neighborhood parks. Other expansions or improvement respondents are the most willing to fund with their tax dollars include: Maintain and upgrade existing trails (24%) and maintain and upgrade existing swimming pools (20%).

Source: ETC Institute City of Olathe Parks and Recreation Department (2014)
IF AN ADDITIONAL $100 WERE AVAILABLE FOR CITY OF OLATHE PARKS, TRAILS, SPORTS, RECREATION AND HISTORIC FACILITIES, HOW WOULD RESPONDENTS ALLOCATE THE FUNDS?

Respondents would allocate ($51) toward the improvement and maintenance of existing parks and recreation facilities. Respondents would allocate ($29) toward the development of new indoor and outdoor facilities. Respondents would allocate ($18) toward the acquisition of new park and land open space and ($2) toward other means.

RESPONDENT LEVEL OF SATISFACTION WITH THE OVERALL VALUE THEIR HOUSEHOLD RECEIVES FROM THE CITY OF OLATHE PARKS AND RECREATION DEPARTMENT

Forty percent (40%) of respondents are “somewhat satisfied” with the overall value their household receives from the City of Olathe Parks and Recreation Department. Other levels of satisfaction with the overall value respondent households receives from the City of Olathe Parks and Recreation Department include: “Very satisfied” (33%), “neutral” (19%), “don’t know” (7%), “somewhat dissatisfied” (2%) and “very dissatisfied” (0%).
Q20. Demographics: Ages of people in household

by percentage of respondents

- Ages 20-24: 8%
- Ages 25-34: 9%
- Ages 35-44: 13%
- Ages 45-54: 11%
- Ages 55-64: 11%
- Ages 65+: 10%
- Ages 75+: 3%
- Under age 5: 7%
- Ages 15-19: 10%
- Ages 16-14: 10%

Source: BTC Institute City of Olathe Parks and Recreation Department (2014)

Q21. Demographics: Respondent age

by percentage of respondents

- 35 to 44: 23%
- 45 to 64: 24%
- 65+: 13%
- 65 to 64: 17%
- 55 to 64: 11%
- 45 to 64: 11%
- Under 35: 17%
- Not Provided: 6%

Source: BTC Institute City of Olathe Parks and Recreation Department (2014)
Q22. Demographics: Household income

by percentage of respondents

- $50,000 - $74,999: 20%
- $25,000 - $49,999: 9%
- $75,000 - $99,999: 19%
- Under $25,000: 7%
- $100,000 - $149,999: 23%
- $150,000 or more: 12%
- Not provided: 10%

Source: ETC Institute City of Olathe Parks and Recreation Department (2016)
CHAPTER THREE

COMMUNITY PROFILE

3.1 DEMOGRAPHIC ANALYSIS

The Demographic Analysis provides an understanding of the population within the City of Olathe, Kansas. In order to provide a more in-depth analysis, the City of Olathe was divided into two areas for evaluation, East Olathe and West Olathe. This analysis is reflective of the total population, and its key characteristics such as age segments, income levels, race, and ethnicity.

It is important to note that future projections are all based on historical patterns and unforeseen circumstances during or after the time of the projections could have a significant bearing on the validity of the final projections.

3.1.1 DEMOGRAPHIC OVERVIEW

The total population of East and West Olathe each had a substantial increase of approximately 26% from 2000 to 2010. The population of East Olathe grew from 52,985 in 2000 to 71,792 in 2010, while West Olathe went from 40,169 in 2000 to 54,070 in 2010. The current estimated population for East Olathe in 2012 is 73,143, and it is projected to grow to 76,742 in 2017, and reach 93,769 by 2027. West Olathe will experience similar growth with an estimated 55,886 in 2012, and the total population will rise to 60,132 in 2017 and 73,295 by 2027.

According to the U.S. Census reports, the total number of households in East Olathe grew by a sizeable 29.5%, from 17,825 in 2000 to 25,296 in 2010. West Olathe also experienced significant growth in total households of 24.2%, from 14,549 in 2000 to 19,206 in 2010. Both areas are expected to continue to grow in total number of households. East Olathe is estimated to have 25,774 households in 2012, and is expected to grow to 33,856 households by 2027. West Olathe has an estimated 19,832 households in 2012, and is expected to reach 25,870 by 2027.

As a whole, Olathe’s median household income and per capita income are above both state and national averages, but East Olathe’s income characteristics show it is much wealthier than its counterpart to the west. Based on 2012 estimates, East Olathe has a median household income of $76,007 and per capita income of $31,016, while West Olathe has a median household income of $58,922 and per capita income of 27,170.
Based on the 2010 Census, the population of the City of Olathe is much younger (approximately 33 years) than the median age of the U.S. (37.2 years). Both East and West Olathe have experienced an aging trend. From 2000 to 2010, the 55+ segment grew more than any other age group, as East Olathe increased from 8.5% to 15.6% and West Olathe went from 13.5% to 18.2%. Projections through 2027 show a continuation of the aging trend, with the 55+ group growing in both of the selected areas, while all other age segments slowly decrease to create a nearly balanced age distribution in both East and West Olathe.

The City of Olathe is limited in diversity, as the majority of the population falls into the White Alone category. Based on 2012 estimates, both East (83.8% White Alone) and West (80.33% White Alone) Olathe are predominately White Alone. The most prominent minorities in 2012 for East Olathe are the Black Alone (5.66%) and Asian (5%) groups, and West Olathe’s largest minorities include Some Other Race (6.65%) and Black Alone (6.09%). By 2027, East and West Olathe will slowly become more diverse. East Olathe will remain predominately White Alone (78.97%), while the Black Alone (7.98%) and Asian (6.23%) will continue to slowly grow through 2027. West Olathe will follow a similar trend, and by 2027 will be mostly White Alone (76.04%), with small growth among Some Other Race (8.12%) and Black Alone (8.07%). Both sides of the City have a significant representation of people of Hispanic/Latino Origin. East Olathe saw its Hispanic/Latino population jump from 1.89% in 2000 to 7.01% by 2010, and is expected to grow to 10.59% by 2027. West Olathe has an even larger Hispanic/Latino population that nearly doubled from 7.97% in 2000 to 14.3% in 2010, and is projected to grow to 18.46% in 2027.
3.1.2 METHODOLOGY

Demographic data used for the analysis was obtained from U.S. Census Bureau and from Environmental Systems Research Institute, Inc. (ESRI), the largest research and development organization dedicated to Geographical Information Systems (GIS) and specializing in population projections and market trends. All data was acquired in August 2013 and reflects actual numbers as reported in the 2000 and 2010 Censuses, and estimates for 2012 and 2017 as obtained by ESRI. Straight-line linear regression was utilized for projected 2022 and 2027 demographics. The geographic boundary of East and West Olathe, Kansas, was utilized as the demographic analysis boundary shown below.

Figure 1 - Geographic Boundaries of East and West Olathe
RACE AND ETHNICITY DEFINITIONS
The minimum categories for data on race and ethnicity for Federal statistics, program administrative reporting, and civil rights compliance reporting are defined as below. The Census 2010 data on race are not directly comparable with data from the 2000 Census and earlier censuses; caution must be used when interpreting changes in the racial composition of the U.S. population over time. The latest (Census 2010) definitions and nomenclature are used within this analysis.

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

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

**Black:** This includes a person having origins in any of the black racial groups of Africa.

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

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

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

POPULATION

The City of Olathe’s population has grown rapidly in recent years. From 2000 to 2010, each of the target area’s total population experienced a substantial increase, with East Olathe growing by 26.2% and West Olathe increasing by 25.7%. Both areas are well above national growth averages, which were just over 1% annually. Projecting ahead, the City is expected to continue to grow over the next 15 years, but at a reduced rate. Based on predictions through 2027, East Olathe is expected to have approximately 93,769 residents living within 33,856 households, and West Olathe is projected to have 73,295 residents in 25,870 households. See Figure 2 and Figure 3.

Figure 2 - Total Population of East Olathe

Figure 3- Total Population of West Olathe
AGE SEGMENT
Evaluating by age segments, the City of Olathe has a somewhat balanced distribution between youth, young adult, family, and senior populations. East and West Olathe have a similar age distribution, and growth trends have mirrored each other. In 2010, the highest segment by population for East Olathe was the 35 to 54 age group representing 30.9%, and the largest segment in West Olathe was the <18 group at 29.2%. In both East and West Olathe, the lowest age segment was the 55+ group, which constitutes 15.6% (East) and 18.2% (West) of their respective populations.

Over time, the overall composition of the population for the City of Olathe is projected to slowly age. In East Olathe, the Census results from 2000 and 2010 show decreases in the <18 (from 32.3% to 30.4%), 18 to 34 (from 26.7% to 23.1%), and the 35 to 54 (from 32.5% to 30.9%), populations. From 2000 to 2010, West Olathe saw a slight increase in the <18 segment (from 28.9% to 29.2%), while the 18 to 34 (from 27.4% to 23.9%) and 35 to 54 (from 30.2% to 28.7%) groups experienced small decreases. In the 10-year period between censuses, the largest shift for both of the target areas was in the 55+ age segment, which grew in the East (from 8.5% to 15.6%) and the West (from 13.5% to 18.2%). Future projections through 2027 show the City of Olathe will continue to age, and both of the target areas will move toward a more balanced age distribution. For each of the target areas, 2027 predictions expect the three youngest age segments to all gradually decrease, while the 55+ group will grow to represent 20.8% in the East and 24.3% in the West. The target area’s age distribution is characteristic of general national trends where the 55+ age group has been growing as a result of increased life expectancies and the baby boomer population. See Figure 4 and Figure 5.

Figure 4 - Population by Age Segment for East Olathe

Figure 5 - Population by Age Segment for West Olathe
RACE AND ETHNICITY

In analyzing race and ethnicity, the City of Olathe has a landscape that is limited in diversity. As a whole, the City is predominately White Alone, with no strong representation by any minority. Overtime, the target area is expected to slowly diversify, but will remain mostly Caucasian, which will represent nearly 80% of the total population based on projections through 2027. East and West Olathe have very similar racial compositions, with slight variations in minority representation.

Based on 2012 estimates, East Olathe is largely White Alone, with approximately 83.8% of the total population. The Black Alone (5.66%) and Asian (5%) groups represent the largest of the minorities in 2012. From 2000 to 2010, East Olathe witnessed the White Alone drop from 90.45% to 84.6%, while the Black Alone (from 3.32% to 5.11%) and Asian (from 2.95% to 4.98%) races underwent the most significant increases. In the years between censuses, the ethnic distinction of Hispanic/Latino Origin grew rapidly from 1.89% to 7.01%. Projections through 2027 expect East Olathe to remain mostly White Alone (78.97%), as the Black Alone (7.98%), Asian (6.23%), and Hispanic (10.59%) populations continue to slowly rise.

West Olathe is slightly more diverse than its neighbor to the East. In 2012, the total population of the area is estimated to be 80.33% White Alone, with a small minority presence led by the Some Other Race (6.65%) and Black Alone (6.09%) groups, and a strong representation among the Hispanic/Latino (14.46%) ethnicity. From 2000 to 2010, the White Alone decreased from 86.27% to 81.09%, with small increases in the Some Other Race (from 4.35% to 6.59%) and Black Alone (from 4.16% to 5.59%) populations. In the same 10-year period, the most significant growth came from the Hispanic/Latino ethnicity, which nearly doubled from 7.97% to 14.3% of the total population. Predictions through 2027 depict a small decline in the White Alone (76.04%) category, while the Some Other Race (8.12%), Black Alone (8.07%), and Hispanic/Latino (18.46%) groups are all projected to undergo some minor growth.
City of Olathe Parks and Recreation Master Plan

Figure 8 - Hispanic/Latino Population for East Olathe

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Year</th>
<th>All Others</th>
<th>Hispanic / Latino Origin (any race)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2000</td>
<td>1.89%</td>
<td>88.11%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2010</td>
<td>7.01%</td>
<td>92.99%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2027</td>
<td>10.59%</td>
<td>89.41%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Figure 9 - Hispanic Latino Population for West Olathe

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Year</th>
<th>All Others</th>
<th>Hispanic / Latino Origin (any race)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2000</td>
<td>7.97%</td>
<td>92.03%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2010</td>
<td>14.30%</td>
<td>85.70%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2027</td>
<td>18.46%</td>
<td>81.54%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
HOUSEHOLDS AND INCOME
Overall, the City of Olathe’s income characteristics demonstrate steady growth trends. East Olathe is the wealthier of the two areas, and has much higher levels of income for all categories. The median household income represents the earnings of all persons age 15 years or older living together in a housing unit. Per capita income is the average income in the past 12 months for each individual age 15 or older in a geographic area.

East Olathe’s median household income was $67,363 in 2000 and $76,007 in 2012. It is projected to grow to $91,271 by 2027. The area’s per capita income is also projected to increase from $25,745 in 2000 and $31,016 in 2012, to $39,299 by 2027.

Median household income for West Olathe increased from $51,878 in 2000 to $58,992 in 2012. It is expected to grow to $78,356 based on 2027 predictions. Per capita income for the region also increased from $22,727 in 2000 to $27,170 in 2012, and is projected to reach $35,610 by 2027.
East Olathe’s median household income ($76,007) is significantly higher than the state ($48,964) and national ($52,762) averages. The target area’s per capita income ($31,016) is also much higher than state ($25,438) and national ($27,915) averages. East Olathe’s income characteristics indicate a strong presence of disposable income and greater price elasticity.

Although to a lesser degree than the East, income characteristics for West Olathe are also considered favorable, with a median household income ($58,992) that is well above state and national averages. West Olathe’s per capita income ($27,170) is greater than the Kansas state average, but falls just shy of the national average.

Figure 12 - Comparative Income Characteristics for East Olathe

Figure 13 - Comparative Income Characteristics for West Olathe
3.2 TRENDS ANALYSIS

Information released by Sports & Fitness Industry Association’s (SFIA) 2013 Study of Sports, Fitness, and Leisure Participation reveals that the most popular sport and recreational activities include fitness walking, treadmill, running/jogging, free weights and bicycling. Most of these activities appeal to both young and old alike, can be done in most environments, are enjoyed regardless of level of skill, and have minimal economic barriers to entry. These popular activities also have appeal because of the social aspect. For example, although fitness activities are mainly self-directed, people enjoy walking and biking with other individuals because it can offer a degree of camaraderie.

Fitness walking has remained the most popular activity of the past decade by a large margin. Walking participation during the last year data was available (2012), reported over 114 million Americans had walked for fitness at least once.

From a traditional team sport standpoint, basketball ranks highest among all sports, with nearly 24 million people reportedly participating in 2012. Team sports that have experienced significant growth in participation are lacrosse, rugby, ice hockey, ultimate Frisbee, gymnastics, beach volleyball, and fast pitch softball, all of which have experienced double-digit growth over the last five years. Most recently, ice hockey, roller hockey, and fast pitch softball underwent the most rapid growth among team sports from 2011 to 2012.

In the past year, there has been a slight 1.9% increase of “inactives” in America, from 78.9 million in 2011 to 80.4 million in 2012. According to the Physical Activity Council, an “inactive” is defined as an individual that doesn’t take part in any “active” sport. On the bright side, there is evidence that the rate of increase in inactivity is slowing down. Even more encouraging is that an estimated 33% of Americans above the age of 6 are active to a healthy level, taking part in a high calorie burning activity three or more times per week.

The Sports & Fitness Industry Association (SFIA) Sports, Fitness & Recreational Activities Topline Participation Report 2013 was utilized to evaluate national sport and fitness participatory trends. SFIA is the number one source for sport and fitness research. The study is based on online interviews carried out in January and February of 2013 from more than 38,000 individuals and households.

NOTE: In 2012, the Sports & Fitness Industry Association (SFIA) came into existence after a two-year strategic review and planning process with a refined mission statement: “To Promote Sports and Fitness Participation and Industry Vitality.” The SFIA was formerly known as the Sporting Goods Manufacturers Association (SGMA).
Basketball, a game originating in the U.S., is actually the most participated sport among the traditional “bat and ball” sports with almost 24 million estimated participants. This popularity can be attributed to the ability to compete with relatively small number of participants, the limited amount of equipment needed to participate, and the limited space requirements necessary – the last of which make basketball the only traditional sport that can be played at the majority of American dwellings as a drive-way pickup game.

As seen in Figure 14, since 2007, squash and other niche sports like lacrosse and rugby have seen strong growth. Squash has emerged as the overall fastest growing sport, as it has seen participation levels rise by over 110% over the last five years. Based on survey findings from 2007-2012, lacrosse and rugby have experienced significant growth, increasing by 51.9% and 43.8% respectively. Other sports with notable growth in participation over the last five years were ice hockey (28.4%), ultimate Frisbee (27.1%), gymnastics (25.8%), and beach volleyball (16.2%). From 2011 to 2012, the fastest growing general sports were squash (16%), ice hockey (10.9%), roller hockey (10.5%), and fast pitch softball (9.3%).

In terms of total participants, the most popular activities in the general sports category in 2012 include basketball (23.7 million), tennis (17 million), baseball (13 million), outdoor soccer (12.9 million), and slow pitch softball (7.4 million). All five of these sports have been declining in recent years; however, the sheer number of participants demands the continued support of these sports.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Activity</th>
<th>Participation Levels</th>
<th>% Change</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>2007</td>
<td>2008</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Basketball</td>
<td>15,058</td>
<td>15,539</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Basketball</td>
<td>25,958</td>
<td>25,108</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cheerleading</td>
<td>3,775</td>
<td>3,192</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Field Hockey</td>
<td>1,127</td>
<td>1,122</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Football, Flag</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>7,310</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Football, Tackle</td>
<td>7,339</td>
<td>7,816</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gymnastics</td>
<td>4,066</td>
<td>3,975</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ice Hockey</td>
<td>1,940</td>
<td>1,971</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lacrosse</td>
<td>1,058</td>
<td>1,092</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Racquetball</td>
<td>4,425</td>
<td>4,511</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Roller Hockey</td>
<td>1,681</td>
<td>1,569</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rugby</td>
<td>817</td>
<td>654</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Soccer (Indoor)</td>
<td>4,237</td>
<td>4,487</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Soccer (Outdoor)</td>
<td>13,708</td>
<td>13,595</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Softball (Fast Pitch)</td>
<td>2,345</td>
<td>2,331</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Softball (Slow Pitch)</td>
<td>9,185</td>
<td>9,560</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Squash</td>
<td>612</td>
<td>659</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tennis</td>
<td>10,940</td>
<td>17,749</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Track and Field</td>
<td>4,891</td>
<td>4,504</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ultimate Frisbee</td>
<td>4,058</td>
<td>4,459</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Volleyball (Court)</td>
<td>6,986</td>
<td>7,588</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Volleyball (Sand/Beach)</td>
<td>3,878</td>
<td>4,025</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wrestling</td>
<td>3,313</td>
<td>3,335</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Figure 14 - General Sports Participatory Trends**

**Legend:**
- **Large Increase** (greater than 25%)
- **Moderate Increase** (0% to 25%)
- **Moderate Decrease** (0% to 25%)
- **Large Decrease** (less than -25%)
3.2.2 NATIONAL TRENDS IN AQUATIC ACTIVITY

Swimming is unquestionably a lifetime sport. Swimming activities have remained very popular among Americans, and all three categories have seen an increase in participation recently. Fitness swimming is the absolute leader in multigenerational appeal with over 23 million reported participants in 2012, a 7.9% increase from the previous year (Figure 15). NOTE: In 2011, recreational swimming was broken into competition and fitness categories in order to better identify key trends.

Aquatic exercise has a strong participation base, and has reversed a downward trend in the last few years. Aquatic exercise has paved the way for a less stressful form of physical activity, allowing similar gains and benefits to land based exercise, including aerobic fitness, resistance training, flexibility, and better balance. Doctors have begun recommending aquatic exercise for injury rehabilitation, mature patients, and patients with bone or joint problems due to the significant reduction of stress placed on weight-bearing joints, bones, muscles, and also the affect that the pressure of the water assists in reducing swelling of injuries.

```
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Activity</th>
<th>Participation Levels</th>
<th>% Change</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>2007</td>
<td>2008</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Aquatic Exercise</td>
<td>9,757</td>
<td>9,512</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Swimming (Competition)</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>N/A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Swimming (Fitness)</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>N/A</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

NOTE: Participation figures are in 000's for the US population ages 8 and over.

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

Figure 15 - Aquatic Participatory Trends
3.2.3 NATIONAL TRENDS IN GENERAL FITNESS

National participatory trends in general fitness have experienced strong growth in recent years. Many of these activities have become popular due to an increased interest among people to improve their health by engaging in an active lifestyle. Many of these activities have very few barriers to entry, which provides a variety of activities that are relatively inexpensive to participate in and can be performed by nearly anyone with no time restrictions. The most popular fitness activity by far is fitness walking, which had over 114 million participants in 2012. Other leading fitness activities based on number of participants include running/jogging (over 51 million participants), treadmill (nearly 51 million participants), and hand free weights (46.6 million participants). Over the last five years, the activities that are growing most rapidly are high impact aerobics (up 43.3%), cardio kickboxing (up 39.8%), group stationary cycling (up 34.3%), and running/jogging (up 25.3%). From 2011-2012, the largest gains in participation were in Tai Chi (up 7.7%), Calisthenics (up 6.5%), and Yoga (up 5.2%). See Figure 16.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Activity</th>
<th>Participation Levels</th>
<th>% Change</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>2007</td>
<td>2008</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Aerobics (High Impact)</td>
<td>11,237</td>
<td>11,770</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Aerobics (Low Impact)</td>
<td>22,397</td>
<td>23,283</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Aerobics (Step)</td>
<td>8,528</td>
<td>9,427</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Boxing for Fitness</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>N/A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Calisthenics</td>
<td>8,620</td>
<td>8,888</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cross-Training</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>N/A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cardio Kickboxing</td>
<td>4,812</td>
<td>4,905</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Elliptical Motion Trainer</td>
<td>23,586</td>
<td>24,435</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fitness Walking</td>
<td>103,741</td>
<td>110,204</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Free Weights (Barbells)</td>
<td>25,499</td>
<td>25,821</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Free Weights (Dumbbells)</td>
<td>32,371</td>
<td>33,381</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Free Weights (Hand Weights)</td>
<td>43,821</td>
<td>43,409</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Martial Arts</td>
<td>6,885</td>
<td>6,718</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pilates Training</td>
<td>9,192</td>
<td>9,059</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Running/jogging</td>
<td>41,064</td>
<td>41,097</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Stair Climbing Machine</td>
<td>13,521</td>
<td>13,863</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Stationary Cycling (Group)</td>
<td>6,334</td>
<td>6,504</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Stationary Cycling (Recumbent)</td>
<td>10,818</td>
<td>11,104</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Stationary Cycling (Upright)</td>
<td>24,351</td>
<td>24,918</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Stretching</td>
<td>36,181</td>
<td>35,235</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tai Chi</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>3,424</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Treadmill</td>
<td>50,073</td>
<td>49,722</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Weight/Resistant Machines</td>
<td>39,230</td>
<td>38,844</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Yoga</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>17,758</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

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

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

Figure 16 - General Fitness Participatory Trends
3.2.4 NATIONAL TRENDS IN GENERAL RECREATION

Results from the SFIA’s Topline Participation Report demonstrate increased popularity among Americans in numerous general recreation activities. Much like the general fitness activities, these activities encourage an active lifestyle, can be performed individually or with a group, and is not limited by time restraints. In 2012, the most popular activities in the general recreation category included road bicycling (nearly 40 million participants), freshwater fishing (over 39 million participants), and day hiking (over 34.5 million participants). From 2007-2012, general recreation activities that have undergone very rapid growth are adventure racing (up 131.8%), traditional/road triathlons (up 124.2%), nontraditional/off-road triathlons (up 122.6%), and trail running (up 37.7%). Inline roller skating, horseback riding, and skateboarding have all seen a substantial drop in participation, decreasing by 38.5%, 30.4%, and 26.1% respectively over the last five years. See Figure 17.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Activity</th>
<th>Participation Levels</th>
<th>% Change</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>2007</td>
<td>2008</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Adventure Racing</td>
<td>698</td>
<td>829</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Archery</td>
<td>5,950</td>
<td>6,180</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bicycling (Mountain)</td>
<td>6,849</td>
<td>7,242</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bicycling (Road)</td>
<td>38,940</td>
<td>38,527</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bicycling BMX</td>
<td>1,287</td>
<td>1,298</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Climbing (Sport/Indoor/Boulder)</td>
<td>4,514</td>
<td>4,642</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Climbing (Traditional/Rock/Mountaineering)</td>
<td>2,002</td>
<td>2,275</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fishing (Fly)</td>
<td>5,755</td>
<td>5,095</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fishing (Freshwater)</td>
<td>70,659</td>
<td>42,095</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fishing (Saltwater)</td>
<td>14,437</td>
<td>14,121</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hiking (Day)</td>
<td>20,665</td>
<td>21,228</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Horseback Riding</td>
<td>12,048</td>
<td>11,457</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Roller Skating, In-Line</td>
<td>10,814</td>
<td>10,211</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Skateboarding</td>
<td>8,423</td>
<td>8,118</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Trail Running</td>
<td>4,215</td>
<td>4,523</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Triathlon (Non-Traditional/Off Road)</td>
<td>4,183</td>
<td>3,545</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Triathlon (Traditional/Road)</td>
<td>758</td>
<td>845</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

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

Legend:
- Large increase (greater than 25%)
- Moderate increase (0% to 25%)
- Moderate decrease (0% to -25%)
- Large decrease (less than -25%)

Figure 17 - General Recreation Participatory Trends
3.2.5 LOCAL SPORT AND MARKET POTENTIAL

The following charts show sport and leisure market potential data from ESRI. A Market Potential Data (MPI) measures the probable demand for a product or service in the City of Olathe. The MPI shows the likelihood that an adult resident of Olathe will participate in certain activities when compared to the U.S. national average. The national average is 100, therefore, numbers below 100 would represent a lower than average participation rate, and numbers above 100 would represent higher than average participation rate. East and West Olathe are compared to the national average in four (4) categories: general sports by activity, fitness by activity, outdoor activity, and money spent on miscellaneous recreation. Both East and West Olathe show high market potential index numbers for all categories.

As seen in the tables below, the following sport and leisure trends are most prevalent for residents within East and West Olathe. Cells highlighted in yellow indicate the top three scoring activities based on the purchasing preferences of residents.

### GENERAL SPORTS MARKET POTENTIAL

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Participatory Trends; by Activity - General Sports</th>
<th>East Olathe (MPI)</th>
<th>West Olathe (MPI)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Participated in Baseball</td>
<td>125</td>
<td>106</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Participated in Basketball</td>
<td>128</td>
<td>115</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Participated in Football</td>
<td>122</td>
<td>113</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Participated in Golf</td>
<td>144</td>
<td>128</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Participated in Soccer</td>
<td>135</td>
<td>114</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Participated in Softball</td>
<td>127</td>
<td>109</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Participated in Tennis</td>
<td>141</td>
<td>122</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Participated in Volleyball</td>
<td>123</td>
<td>113</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### FITNESS MARKET POTENTIAL

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Participatory Trends; by Activity - Fitness</th>
<th>East Olathe (MPI)</th>
<th>West Olathe (MPI)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Participated in Aerobics</td>
<td>140</td>
<td>127</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jogging/ Running</td>
<td>149</td>
<td>133</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Participated in Pilates</td>
<td>134</td>
<td>119</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Participated in Swimming</td>
<td>124</td>
<td>118</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Participated in Walking for Exercise</td>
<td>116</td>
<td>112</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Participated in Weight Lifting</td>
<td>144</td>
<td>128</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Participated in Yoga</td>
<td>131</td>
<td>121</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### OUTDOOR ACTIVITY MARKET POTENTIAL

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Participatory Trends; by Activity - Outdoor Activity</th>
<th>East Olathe (MPI)</th>
<th>West Olathe (MPI)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Participated in Archery</td>
<td>88</td>
<td>90</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Participated in Backpacking/Hiking</td>
<td>126</td>
<td>115</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Participated in Bicycling (mountain)</td>
<td>133</td>
<td>117</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Participated in Bicycling (road)</td>
<td>132</td>
<td>120</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Participated in Fishing (fresh water)</td>
<td>102</td>
<td>99</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Participated in Fishing (salt water)</td>
<td>111</td>
<td>106</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Participated in Horseback Riding</td>
<td>108</td>
<td>108</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### City of Olathe Parks and Recreation Master Plan

**MONEY SPENT ON MISCELLANEOUS RECREATION**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Participatory Trends; by Activity - Money Spent on Miscellaneous Recreation</th>
<th>East Olathe (MPI)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Spent on High End Sports/Recreation Equipment &lt;$250</td>
<td>119</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Spent on High End Sports/Recreation Equipment &gt;$250</td>
<td>138</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Attend sports event: baseball game</td>
<td>131</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Attend sports event: basketball game (college)</td>
<td>126</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Attend sports event: basketball game (pro)</td>
<td>134</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Attend sports event: football game (college)</td>
<td>135</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Attend sports event: football-Monday night game (pro)</td>
<td>126</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Attend sports event: football-weekend game (pro)</td>
<td>141</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Attend sports event: golf tournament</td>
<td>131</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Attend sports event: ice hockey game</td>
<td>132</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Attend sports event: soccer game</td>
<td>131</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Visited a theme park in last 12 months</td>
<td>135</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Visited Disney World (FL)/12 mo: Magic Kingdom</td>
<td>139</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Visited any Sea World in last 12 months</td>
<td>160</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Visited any Six Flags in last 12 months</td>
<td>131</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Went to zoo in last 12 months</td>
<td>141</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Participatory Trends; by Activity - Money Spent on Miscellaneous Recreation</th>
<th>West Olathe (MPI)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Spent on High End Sports/Recreation Equipment &lt;$250</td>
<td>113</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Spent on High End Sports/Recreation Equipment &gt;$250</td>
<td>121</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Attend sports event: baseball game</td>
<td>121</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Attend sports event: basketball game (college)</td>
<td>123</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Attend sports event: basketball game (pro)</td>
<td>126</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Attend sports event: football game (college)</td>
<td>132</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Attend sports event: football-Monday night game (pro)</td>
<td>122</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Attend sports event: football-weekend game (pro)</td>
<td>128</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Attend sports event: golf tournament</td>
<td>124</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Attend sports event: ice hockey game</td>
<td>123</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Attend sports event: soccer game</td>
<td>122</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Visited a theme park in last 12 months</td>
<td>130</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Visited Disney World (FL)/12 mo: Magic Kingdom</td>
<td>131</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Visited any Sea World in last 12 months</td>
<td>154</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Visited any Six Flags in last 12 months</td>
<td>121</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Went to zoo in last 12 months</td>
<td>134</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
3.3 BENCHMARK ANALYSIS

3.3.1 OVERVIEW

As part of the master plan, a benchmark analysis was completed that identified operating metrics to be benchmarked to comparable industry leading park and recreation systems nationwide that have high cost recovery, are NRPA Gold Medal winners, and/or Commission for Accreditation of Park and Recreation Agencies (CAPRA) agency. The complexity in this analysis was ensuring direct comparison through a methodology of statistics and ratios in order to provide comparable information, as best as possible. The challenge was ensuring that the agencies would turn around the information in a short timeframe.

It must be noted that the benchmark analysis is only an indicator based on the information provided. However, every effort was made, in working directly with the benchmark agencies, to obtain the most credible information and organize the data in a consistent and comparable format. The information sought was a combination of operating metrics with budgets, staffing, supporting plans, and acreages. In some instances, the information was not tracked or not available. The attributes considered in this benchmark study included:

- Population/ Demographics
- Size of System (square miles)
- Leading System Nationwide

Careful attention was paid to incorporate a mix of systems that are comparable industry leaders and they include:

- Carmel Clay Parks and Recreation, Indiana
- Roseville Parks and Recreation, California
- Frisco Parks and Recreation, Texas
- Overland Park Parks and Recreation Department, Kansas
- Blue Valley Recreation Commission, Kansas

Due to differences in how each system collects, maintains, and reports data, variances exist. These variations have an impact on the per capita and percentage allocations within the budget, and hence, the overall comparison must be viewed with this in mind. Also, despite repeated attempts to obtain missing information, there may be some portions where the data provided by the benchmarked systems was incomplete.

The benchmark data collection for all systems was done as of April 2014. While it is possible that there may have been changes or updates in the data provided, in order to ensure consistency in data collection, the original figures obtained at that time have been used in the benchmark.

The goal was to evaluate where Olathe Parks and Recreation is positioned among peer agencies as it applies to efficiency and effectiveness practices. The survey is organized into specific categories and questions to obtain data that offers an encompassing view of each system’s operating metrics in comparison to Olathe Parks and Recreation.
AGENCY DESCRIPTIONS

Olathe Parks and Recreation
The City of Olathe has a population of 130,045, and the Parks and Recreation Department oversees 35 parks and greenways spread out over nearly 2,000 acres of land. The system also provides over 36 total miles of trails to local residents. The Department is set to open a new 72,000 square foot Olathe Community Center and Stagecoach Park in July 2014, which will provide much needed spaces for recreation, fitness, and community outreach programs. The parks and recreation Department also is in charge of four outdoor pools, a skate park, Olathe Memorial Cemetery, Ensor Park & Museum, and the Mahaffie Stagecoach Stop & Farm/Heritage Center. Program opportunities offered by the Department include aquatics, youth/adult sports, enrichment camps, tournaments, farmers’ market, special populations, and special events.

Carmel Clay Parks and Recreation
The Carmel Clay Parks and Recreation Department serves the 83,565 individuals within the City of Carmel. The system offers 15 total parks and greenways on over 500 acres of developed land, along with 16 miles of trails. The Monon Community Center is a 146,000 square foot gem within the system, featuring a fitness center, indoor aquatics, gym, track, meeting rooms, and a water park. Over 5,000 programs and classes for all ages are hosted by the Department with activities such as adaptive programs, arts and culture, extended school enrichment, health and fitness, social and community events, sports, camps, and swimming lessons.

Roseville Parks and Recreation
The City of Roseville has 124,519 residents, and the parks and recreation Department manages 68 total parks and greenways and over 400 acres of land. The Maidu Regional Park gives the community a variety of options, complete with a community center, batting cages, skate park, soccer arena, and museum/historic site. The Roseville Sports Center is the combination of a community center and a fitness center that offers a cardio room, weight room, full gymnasium, climbing wall, childcare, and rentals. The Department also boasts a state-of-the-art football/soccer stadium, three aquatic facilities, the Utility Exploration Center, and the Roseville Public Library. The City of Roseville Parks and Recreation Department offers a wide range of programming for all ages, including sports, day camps, aquatics, fitness, special interests/hobbies, cultural arts, trips/tours, and adaptive programs.
Frisco Parks and Recreation
The Frisco Parks and Recreation Department serves a local population of 128,176 people. The Department has 36 parks and greenways plus over 55 miles of trails on over 1,500 acres of land. The highlight of the system is the Frisco Athletic Center, a 100,000 square foot facility full of recreational spaces and complete with indoor and outdoor aquatic centers. The Department also operates a 17,000 square foot senior center and a variety of outdoor facilities. Recreation programming opportunities include art, athletics, aquatics, dance, education, fitness, recreation, personal enrichment, music, special events, and seniors.

Overland Park Parks and Recreation
The parks and recreation Department for the City of Overland Park provides over 80 parks and greenways and over 90 miles of trails for the local population that is approaching 180,000 people. The Department features two recreation centers and the Deanna Rose Children’s Farmstead that attracts over 450,000 visitors each year. The system also operates a variety of traditional and nontraditional facilities within the city, including the Arboretum and Botanical Gardens, farmers’ market, two golf courses, indoor and outdoor pools, and a nationally recognized soccer complex. Programming opportunities hosted by the Department include health and wellness, athletics, sports leagues, swimming, social activities and events, arts, and natural resource preservation.
3.3.2 BENCHMARK COMPARISON

GENERAL COMPARATIVE OF SYSTEMS

This section provides size and population figures for the city or jurisdiction containing each system. It also presents information on each system’s parks and greenways, including acreage statistics and total trail miles. The chart below breaks down total acreage into a per-1,000 population basis, as well as a percentage of total acres maintained by each parks department.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>System</th>
<th>City Area (Sq. Miles)</th>
<th>Current Population of City/Jurisdiction</th>
<th>Population Per Square Mile</th>
<th>Total Number of Parks and Greenways</th>
<th>Total Acres Owned or Managed by System</th>
<th>Total Developed Acres</th>
<th>% Acres Maintained to Total Park Acres</th>
<th>Total Park Acres Per 1,000 Pop.</th>
<th>Total Trail Miles</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Olathe Parks and Recreation</td>
<td>60.4</td>
<td>130,045</td>
<td>2,152</td>
<td>35</td>
<td>1,936.4</td>
<td>1,552.3</td>
<td>98%</td>
<td>15.37</td>
<td>30.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Carmel Clay Parks and Recreation</td>
<td>48.1</td>
<td>83,565</td>
<td>1,761</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>505.0</td>
<td>505</td>
<td>100%</td>
<td>6.04</td>
<td>16.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Roseville Parks and Recreation</td>
<td>36.2</td>
<td>124,519</td>
<td>3,440</td>
<td>68</td>
<td>406.6</td>
<td>263</td>
<td>62%</td>
<td>2.28</td>
<td>2.28</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Frisco Parks and Recreation</td>
<td>52.4</td>
<td>128,176</td>
<td>2,404</td>
<td>35</td>
<td>1,205.0</td>
<td>671</td>
<td>44%</td>
<td>11.77</td>
<td>55.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Overland Park Parks and Recreation</td>
<td>76.4</td>
<td>178,919</td>
<td>2,374</td>
<td>83</td>
<td>2,940.2</td>
<td>2,618</td>
<td>89%</td>
<td>18.45</td>
<td>90.1</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Overland Park Parks and Recreation has the largest population (178,919) and second largest population density (2,374 people per square mile) among all systems analyzed in the benchmark comparison. Carmel Clay Parks and Recreation ranks last in area (49.1 square miles) and population (83,565), and has the lowest population per square mile (1,761 per square mile). Comparatively, Olathe Parks and Recreation is in the middle in terms of area (60.4 square miles), ranks second in population (130,045), and has a population density of 2,152 people per square mile.

Roseville Parks and Recreation, CA (408.5 acres in 68 parks), is one of the highest in total number of parks but is the lowest in total park acres. Overland Park Parks and Recreation boasts a total acreage of 2,940 and has the most total number of parks (83). In comparison, Olathe Parks and Recreation has the second highest total acreage (1,998) and has 35 parks and greenways.

In terms of percentages, Carmel Clay Parks and Recreation maintains 100% of its total park acres and is the leader in that category, but it is next to last in total parks per 1,000 people, with only 6.04 park acres per 1,000 people. Olathe Parks and Recreation comes in a close second to Carmel Clay in percentage of park acres maintained (98%), and it also has the second highest total park acres per 1,000 people (15.37).
ANNUAL OPERATING BUDGET AND COST RECOVERY

This section covers two parts, the total budget and cost recovery. For the total budget, it was based off of the operational expenses and the capital budget. Adding those two together is the amount of the total budget. Total cost recovery is found by taking total earned income revenue and dividing it by the total budget.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>System</th>
<th>Total Population</th>
<th>Total Revenues</th>
<th>Total Operating Expenses</th>
<th>Capital Budget</th>
<th>Total Budget</th>
<th>Operating Expenses Per Capita</th>
<th>Total Cost Recovery</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Olathe Parks and Recreation</td>
<td>130,045</td>
<td>$1,096,794</td>
<td>$10,055,068</td>
<td>$150,000</td>
<td>$10,205,060</td>
<td>$77.33</td>
<td>20%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Carmel Clay Parks and Recreation</td>
<td>83,665</td>
<td>$15,402,367</td>
<td>$9,663,335</td>
<td>$230,794</td>
<td>$13,234,126</td>
<td>$119.11</td>
<td>117%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Roseville Parks and Recreation</td>
<td>124,179</td>
<td>$16,441,533</td>
<td>$21,640,000</td>
<td>$3,000,000</td>
<td>$24,640,000</td>
<td>$173.79</td>
<td>67%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Frisco Parks and Recreation</td>
<td>126,178</td>
<td>$4,474,081</td>
<td>$9,933,056</td>
<td>$5,200,000</td>
<td>$15,133,056</td>
<td>$76.72</td>
<td>30%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Overland Park Parks and Recreation</td>
<td>178,109</td>
<td>$5,001,565</td>
<td>$18,644,475</td>
<td>$290,000</td>
<td>$18,934,475</td>
<td>$104.21</td>
<td>26%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Roseville Parks and Recreation Department currently has the highest total budget with $24,640,000 and operating at 67% cost recovery. Carmel Clay Parks and Recreation has by far the highest total cost recovery at 117% with a total budget of $13,234,126. Overland Park Parks and Recreation has the second highest budget ($18,934,475), but has the second lowest total cost recovery at 26%. Olathe Parks and Recreation has the lowest cost recovery (20%) with a total budget of $10,205,960.

Roseville Parks and Recreation has the highest operating expenses per capita ($173.79) followed by Carmel Clay Parks and Recreation ($119.11). Frisco Parks and Recreation has the lowest operating expense per capita at $76.72 followed by Olathe Parks and Recreation with $77.33.

COST PER MAINTAIN ACRE

This category assesses the cost to maintain each park system. This figure is obtained by taking the operating expenses and dividing it by the total developed acres. This does not take into account the total amount of acres a park has.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>System</th>
<th>Total Operating Expenses</th>
<th>Total Developed Acres</th>
<th>Cost per Maintained Acre</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Olathe Parks and Recreation</td>
<td>$10,055,060</td>
<td>1,953</td>
<td>$5,149.64</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Carmel Clay Parks and Recreation</td>
<td>$9,953,335</td>
<td>505</td>
<td>$19,709.57</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Roseville Parks and Recreation</td>
<td>$21,640,000</td>
<td>253</td>
<td>$85,533.60</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Frisco Parks and Recreation</td>
<td>$9,833,066</td>
<td>671</td>
<td>$14,654.33</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Overland Park Parks and Recreation</td>
<td>$18,644,475</td>
<td>2,618</td>
<td>$7,122.74</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Roseville Parks and Recreation system operates, by far, the highest cost per maintained acre ($85,534), but with the lowest total developed acres (253), followed by Carmel Clay Parks and Recreation ($19,710) who also has the second lowest total operating expenses ($9,953,335). Olathe Parks and Recreation operates with the lowest cost per maintained acre at $5,150 with 1,953 developed acres. Overland Park and Recreation operates with the second lowest cost per maintained acre at $7,123 with 2,618 developed acres with the second highest total operating expenses ($18,644,475).
**COST RECOVERY GOALS**
This category shows the cost recovery goals each system wishes to achieve.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>System</th>
<th>Cost Recovery Goals</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Olathe Parks and Recreation</td>
<td>Aquatics 95%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Special Populations Programs 100%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Programs for each Age Segment Targeted 100%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Mahaffie Special Events 78%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Carmel Clay Parks and Recreation</td>
<td>Parks &amp; Recreation Department 85%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Monon Community Center 100%+</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Roseville Parks and Recreation</td>
<td>Parks &amp; Recreation Department 58%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>General Fund Only 31%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Recreation &amp; Facilities 69%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Administration, Development, Parks &amp; Open Space 7.8%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Frisco Parks and Recreation</td>
<td>Parks &amp; Recreation Department 40%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Frisco Athletic Center 100%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Overland Park Parks and Recreation</td>
<td>Fitness Programs 120%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Adult Sports Leagues 130%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Community Center Classes 115%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Farmstead 100%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Golf 100%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Aquatics 62%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Soccer Rentals 20-40%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Soccer Concessions 107%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### FULL TIME EQUIVALENTS IN SYSTEM

This section shows the amount of FTE’s (Full Time Equivalents) in each system, total FTE’s per 1,000 population and per developed acre. As seen below, information on FTE’s was unavailable for the Park District of Highland Park, and the system should not be used for comparison in this portion of the benchmark analysis.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>System</th>
<th>Total FTE</th>
<th>Population</th>
<th>Developed Acres</th>
<th>Total FTE per 1,000 Pop.</th>
<th>Total FTE per Developed Acre</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Olathe Parks and Recreation</td>
<td>79.75</td>
<td>130,045</td>
<td>1,962.8</td>
<td>0.61</td>
<td>0.04</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Carmel Clay Parks and Recreation</td>
<td>199.70</td>
<td>83,565</td>
<td>605</td>
<td>2.39</td>
<td>0.40</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Roseville Parks and Recreation</td>
<td>221.00</td>
<td>124,519</td>
<td>253</td>
<td>1.77</td>
<td>0.87</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Frisco Parks and Recreation</td>
<td>153.75</td>
<td>128,176</td>
<td>671</td>
<td>1.20</td>
<td>0.23</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Overland Park Parks and Recreation</td>
<td>197.33</td>
<td>178,019</td>
<td>2,619</td>
<td>1.10</td>
<td>0.08</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Based on information on FTE’s, the Carmel Clay Parks and Recreation system is the leader in comparisons of Full Time Equivalents to current population figures, with 2.39 FTE’s per 1,000 people. The next closest systems in total FTE’s per 1,000 population are Roseville Parks and Recreation and Frisco Parks and Recreation, with 1.77 and 1.20 FTE’s per 1,000 people, respectively. Olathe Parks and Recreation has the lowest total FTE’s per 1,000 population with 0.61.

On a per developed acre basis, Olathe Parks and Recreation has the lowest total FTE’s per developed acre (0.04) followed closely by Overland Park Parks and Recreation (0.08). Both of the systems have, by far, the highest developed acres. Roseville Parks and Recreation has the highest FTE’s per developed acre and also has the lowest developed acres (253).
### OPERATING SOURCES

The following chart depicts the sources of operating funds for each system.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>System</th>
<th>Source of Operating Funds</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Olathe Parks and Recreation</strong></td>
<td>General Fund, Recreation Fund, Special Parks and Recreation Fund, Park Sales Tax</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Carmel Clay Parks and Recreation</strong></td>
<td>Taxes - City of Carmel &amp; Clay Township, Impact Fees, Earned Income, Interest &amp; Other Revenue</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Roseville Parks and Recreation</strong></td>
<td>General Fund, User Fees, Special Revenue Fund, Special Districts</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Frisco Parks and Recreation</strong></td>
<td>General Fund, Community Development Corporation, Parks Development Fund, Grants, General Obligation Bonds</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Overland Park Parks and Recreation</strong></td>
<td>General Fund, Stormwater Utility Fund, Golf Course Fund, Soccer Operations Fund, Business Improvement District, Special Parks and Recreation Fund, General Obligation Bonds, Pay As You Go Fund, Private Contributions, Debt Financing</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
4.1 FACILITY ASSESSMENT

In October 2013, the PROS team assessed a representative cross section of parks at each level of service for Olathe Parks & Recreation (OPR). Through the analysis process, the assessments provide an understanding of existing offerings of the system and a clear understanding of existing conditions, along with size, age, and maintenance levels provided throughout the system.

Based on these inventories, comprehensive recommendations for classifications based on National Recreation and Parks Association (NRPA) guidelines can be developed. Using these classifications, a standard for level of service to the residents of Olathe can be addressed and allows for the formulation of capital improvement recommendations for future improvements and expansion opportunities for the full system.

4.1.1 METHODOLOGY

Inventory and assessment of each park visited included evaluation of the conditions exhibited on the site of various program elements and site features. Park program elements and site feature conditions were rated using a differential scale of +/0/-. The definition for each of these condition ratings is as follows.

**RATING SYSTEM:**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Assessment Rating</th>
<th>Definition</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>+</td>
<td>Program elements or site features are in excellent condition, with no apparent immediate maintenance needed.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0</td>
<td>Program elements or site features are in good working condition with little or no immediate maintenance required.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-</td>
<td>Program elements or site features are in need of improvement requiring significant immediate maintenance, removal or replacement.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Program elements and site features contained within individual assessments indicate various constructed elements or activities supported on site. Specific examples of program elements and features include picnic areas, playgrounds, shelters or pavilions, ball fields, sport courts, etc.
ASSESSSED FACILITIES:
The thirty-five (35) City of Olathe Parks and Recreation sites that were inventoried and assessed included the following:

- Arapaho Park
- Manor Park
- Arrowhead Park
- Mill Creek Park
- Blackbob Park
- North Walnut Park
- Brougham Park
- Olathe Girls Softball Complex
- Calamity Line Park
- Olathe Memorial Cemetery
- Cedar Lake Park
- Oregon Trail Park
- Ensor Farms
- Pellet Park (formerly Pine & Elm Park)
- Fairview Park
- Prairie Center Park
- Frisco Lake Park
- Quailwood Park
- Frontier Park
- Raven Ridge Park
- Frontier Park Pool
- Scarborough Park
- Hampton Park
- Southdowns Park
- Haven Park
- Southglen Park
- Heatherstone Park
- Stagecoach Park
- Lake Olathe Park
- Two Trails Park
- Lone Elm Park
- Waterworks Park
- Mahaffie Pond Park
- Woodbrook Park
- Mahaffie Stagecoach Stop & Farm/Heritage Center

Each park visited was inventoried and assessed in regards to park offerings, locations, conditions, accessibility, and future opportunities for improvements and expansion. Additional information was gathered pertaining to sizes, maintenance, and activity levels. A detailed selection of images was taken for each facility reviewed and included to support reviewer findings. The inventory and assessments from each park are included on the following pages.
4.1.2 SUMMARY OF SYSTEM FACILITIES

STRENGTHS

- The City of Olathe is well served by its Sub-Regional and Community Parks, with only a small portion of the northwest corner of the City being un-served by City park facilities. Additional neighborhood level parks are needed throughout the various service areas. The City is fully serviced by regional park facilities controlled by the Johnson County Parks and Recreation.
- Residents have a variety of programming options to choose from and have the ability to take advantage of unique programs that are not found in many park systems.
- The parks and streetscape areas are well maintained with regular mowing and tree trimming schedules.
- Parks were clean and free of debris and graffiti. Older parks have been renovated to keep a consistent level of service throughout the park system.
- Park facilities included interior loop trails and updated playground and shelters throughout the community.
- Additional opportunities, including large aquatic centers and community centers, have been recently added to the Olathe Parks and Recreation services providing new amenities to draw residents to use.

OPPORTUNITIES

- Develop a schedule for updating existing facilities to meet current ADA guidelines for playgrounds, boat facilities, etc.
- Consider a playground and surfacing life cycle replacement of 10 to 12 years.
- Establish trail standards for interior loop trails of an 8’ width / 10-12’ on all linear trails throughout the community.
- Create signage guidelines to address all park facilities including landscape and irrigation standards around those signs.
- Incorporate way-finding signage on all larger (community/sub-regional) park facilities.
- Incorporate landscape around the base of shelters to reduce access points and reduce erosion around foundation areas.
- Establish a lifecycle standard for parking lot surfaces including maintenance schedules for chip n’ seal, etc.
- Consider installations of splash pads in neighborhood parks to ease the need for additional aquatic centers.
- Incorporate way-finding signage on all trails.
- Provide a greenway trail network connection between major County and City parks with a regional draw (including Ernie Miller, Lake Olathe, Prairie Center, and Cedar Lake Parks).
- Provide loop trails connecting various elements/activities within Cedar Lake and Lake Olathe Parks.
- Obtain additional neighborhood parkland through developer allocations to provide a more equal distribution of parks throughout Olathe.
- Develop master plans for Lake Olathe and Cedar Lake Park to provide major draw to outside groups, including new amenities not seen within current City of Olathe holdings. Developing the master plans should incorporate feasibility studies to address more opportunities to bring in additional funds with usage fees to support Olathe’s parks system.
- Evaluate the feasibility of a community center/field house east of I-35 similar to the new Stagecoach Park facility.
- Evaluate the feasibility of an outdoor family aquatic facility to complement Black Bob Bay in the western service area.
4.1.3 PARK CLASSIFICATIONS

This inventory identifies the various City of Olathe Parks and Recreation facilities and establishes a classification framework based on facility size using standards adopted and recognized by the National Recreation and Park Association Guidelines, 1996. Additional information relating to general descriptions of each service level, typical program, site size standards and area required per 1,000 residents is further outlined based upon the NRPA Guidelines. The categories for this classification system include sub-regional parks, community parks, neighborhood parks, historic sites, and aquatic centers.

4.2 RECREATION PROGRAM ASSESSMENT

As part of the Master Plan, a Recreation Program Assessment was performed of the programs and services offered by the Olathe Parks and Recreation Department. The assessment offers an in-depth perspective of the recreation program offerings and helps identify strengths, weaknesses, opportunities, and threats in programming. The assessment also assists in identifying core programs, program gaps within the community, key system-wide issues, and areas of improvement in determining future recreation programs and services for residents.

The program findings and comments were based on a review of information provided by the Department including program descriptions, participation statistics, financial data, website content, focus groups, stakeholder interviews, and discussions with parks and recreation staff. This assessment addresses the program offerings from a systems perspective for the entire portfolio of programs, as well as individual program information. It identifies key issues and presents recommendations for these issues, summarized at the end of this section.

4.2.1 RECREATION PROGRAM OVERVIEW

The Recreation Division, led by the Recreation Superintendent, oversees the management and administration of recreation programming, special community-wide events, and the operation of recreation facilities. Staff in the division is engaged year-round in planning, implementing, conducting, and evaluating programs and events.

All functions within the division combine to provide nearly 100 separate programs that served over 13,000 participants in 2012. The recreation division also operates four public pools, provides special population services, organizes the Olathe Farmers’ Market, and offers a wide variety of special events, including a Fishing Derby, Campout at the Bay, Daddy Daughter Ball, Mom/Son Date Night, Home Improvement Workshops, Touch-a-Truck, Winter Fest, Fourth of July Fireworks, Rock School, and free Summer Concert Series. In July 2014, a new 72,000 square foot community center is slated to open to the public. This facility, along with the development of the adjacent Stagecoach Park, will provide expanded recreation, aquatic, fitness, and community programming spaces to the City.

In addition to the provision of services provided directly by the Department at City facilities, partnerships with other organizations and school districts are utilized throughout the service area through cooperative relationships, programs are offered at facilities provided by Olathe Public Schools and the Kansas School for the Deaf. Programming support is also provided by private businesses such as Dick’s Sporting Goods and Hy-Vee.

Additional and more specific information regarding departmental core priorities, program lifecycles, program finances, standards, volunteerism, and marketing are discussed in this chapter.
4.2.2 FOCUS GROUP FINDINGS

As part of the process for developing a master plan for the Olathe Parks and Recreation Department, ten focus groups were conducted representing the various residents, stakeholders, foundation, and staff members from Olathe. In addition, the two public forums were completed at local schools to collect information from the general public. Participants provided the following insights about recreation programs and services provided by the Department (a full report of public input findings can be found earlier in this master plan):

- The quality and diversity of programs, particularly those that cater to youth and families, stood out as factors that add to residents’ satisfaction of the Department. Many stated that the family-friendly nature of park and recreation services was a major factor in decisions to move to Olathe or continue living in this community.
- The Department’s ability to partner with other organizations and institutions, particularly Olathe Public Schools (OPS) and the joint-use of their facilities for recreation programs, was appreciated and referenced as part of the Department’s success.
- There is widespread anticipation and excitement surrounding the opening of the new community center in July 2014.
- Many participants believe there should be more acknowledgement and celebration of the history and heritage of Olathe through programming and special events.
- Frequently mentioned was that additional special events are needed. According to some, there should be more special events for youth and families. Others felt like there should be more events in general. Some residents also talked about the need for Olathe to have its “own” special event.
- A common theme during focus groups was that the Department might do more to engage minority, low-income, and special populations in program offerings and programming decisions.
- Some focus group participants desire additional volunteer opportunities, especially opportunities for seniors and students.
- The Activity Guide received consistent praise from participants as one of the best resources to stay aware and up-to-date of all of the programs and facilities provided by the Department.
- Despite the popularity of the Activity Guide, there should be continuous improvements to the Department’s efforts to communicate with the public, including the promotion of programs and events as well as conveying the important role that parks and recreation plays in the community.
- Affordability and access issues came up during the meetings, and several participants wanted to see improvements to the scholarship program.

4.2.3 RECREATION TRENDS

Research was conducted regarding demographic, industry, and consumer trends that may affect the outlook of Olathe Parks and Recreation. A full report on the findings is provided earlier in this master plan, but in this chapter it is important to summarize critical points from those findings that have an impact on recreation programming.
DEMOGRAPHIC TRENDS

- The total population of East and West Olathe each had a substantial increase of approximately 26% from 2000 to 2010. East Olathe is projected to grow to 76,742 by 2017, and West Olathe is projected to reach 60,132 by the same year.
- On average, the population of Olathe is younger (33.0 years) than the median age of the U.S. (37.2 years). However, from 2000 to 2010, the 55+ segment grew more than any other age group. Projections show the aging trend to continue to and beyond the year 2027.
- Current demographic estimates indicate Olathe is a family-oriented area. The total number of households in East Olathe grew by a sizeable 29.5%, from 17,825 in 2000 to 25,296 in 2010. West Olathe also experienced significant growth in total households of 24.2%, from 14,549 in 2000 to 19,206 in 2010.
- The City of Olathe is limited in race diversity, as the majority of the population falls into the White Alone category. Based on 2012 estimates, both East (83.8% White Alone) and West (80.33% White Alone) Olathe are predominately White Alone. Future projections show the population will undergo relatively little change and will continue to be somewhat limited in race diversity.
- The City has seen significant diversification in ethnic diversity (i.e., representation of people of Hispanic/Latino origin). East Olathe saw the Hispanic/Latino population jump from 1.9% in 2000 to 7.0% by 2010, and is expected to grow to 10.6% by 2027. West Olathe has an even larger Hispanic/Latino population that increased from 8.0% in 2000 to 14.3% in 2010, and is projected to grow to 18.5% in 2027.

RECREATION PARTICIPATION

- According to recreation industry trends, the top recreation activities for females are currently walking, aerobics, general exercising, biking, jogging, basketball, weight lifting, golf, swimming, and tennis.
- The top recreation activities for males are golf, basketball, walking, jogging, biking, weight lifting, football, hiking, fishing, and hunting.
- Team sports have slowly declined over the past decade throughout the U.S., but several have seen a positive growth since 2010. In particular, lacrosse and tennis have seen significant growth over the past decade.
- Basketball ranks as the most popular team sport.
- The growth in youth team sports is now being driven by 13 and 14 year olds; these are the peak ages of sports participation for children. Nearly 70% of children (age 6 to 17) in the U.S. are playing team sports.
- The greatest growth of participation in recreation activities has occurred in activities that have low barriers to entry, can be undertaken within close proximity to home, and can be completed in a limited amount of time.
- Swimming has proven multigenerational appeal and is one of the few recreation activities pursued across the lifespan. Participation rates have remained relatively steady in recent years.

LOCAL MARKET POTENTIAL

- Sports with the most market potential in Olathe as measured by the Market Potential Index (MPI) are golf, tennis, soccer, and basketball.
- Fitness activities with the most market potential in Olathe include jogging, running, aerobics, and weightlifting.
- Outdoor activities with the most market potential in Olathe include road cycling, mountain biking, hiking, and backpacking.
- Activities or pursuits in Olathe with the most potential for spending money are attending football games, visiting theme parks, and going to the zoo.
4.2.4 DEPARTMENT PRIORITIES AND CORE PROGRAMS

The mission of the Olathe Parks and Recreation Department is to “care for the spaces, places, and active lifestyles that define Olathe’s community identity and quality of life for all to enjoy.” To help achieve this mission, the Department identified a number of organizational priorities in their 2013 Business Plan regarding communication, partnerships, physical assets, staff, and financial resources. Of those, several key priorities should be given particular attention in this recreation program assessment to frame recommendations and to ultimately help the Department achieve their long-term goals. They include:

- Promote community involvement and actively seek input in the planning, operation, and participation of the Olathe Parks and Recreation Department.
- Effectively coordinate the Parks and Recreation Department with other City departments, organizations, schools, and other community partners to improve the overall service to our citizens.
- Offer comprehensive, quality recreation, and educational programming aimed at satisfying the needs of varying age levels, physical abilities, and special interests.
- Provide efficient and effective leadership and coordination for delivery of quality services for the community.
- Ensure diversity and inclusion in our community is embraced by all.

It is important to identify core programs based on current and future needs to create a sense of focus around specific program areas of greatest importance to the community. Public recreation is challenged by the premise of being all things to all people, especially in a community such as Olathe. The core program philosophy assists staff in being able to focus on what is most important. Programs are categorized as core programs if they meet a majority of the following categories:

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

Based upon input from Department staff, the following core program areas were identified:

- Youth and Adult Sports
- Youth Sports and Enrichment
- Aquatics Facilities
- Aquatics Programming
- Special Events

It is important to recognize that limits on the Department’s staffing, resources, and availability of space may hinder some of the efforts to maintain or expand core programs; therefore, it is essential that staff commit to a concerted effort towards managing and prioritizing these core program areas in the coming years when new facilities come on line.
4.2.5 LIFECYCLE ANALYSIS

A lifecycle analysis involves reviewing every program identified by Olathe Parks and Recreation staff to determine the stage of growth or decline for each as a way of informing strategic decisions about the overall recreation program portfolio managed by the Department. This analysis is not based on strict quantitative data, but rather is based on staff members’ knowledge of their program areas. Figure 18 shows the percentage distribution of the various lifecycle categories of the Department’s recreation programs. These percentages were obtained by comparing the number of programs in each individual stage with the total number of programs listed by staff.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Lifecycle Stage</th>
<th>Description</th>
<th>Actual Program Distribution</th>
<th>Recommended Distribution</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Introduction</td>
<td>New program; modest participation</td>
<td>16%</td>
<td>50-60%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Take-Off</td>
<td>Rapid participation growth</td>
<td>6%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Growth</td>
<td>Moderate, but consistent population growth</td>
<td>32%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mature</td>
<td>Slow participation growth</td>
<td>29%</td>
<td>40%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Saturation</td>
<td>Minimal to no participation growth; extreme competition</td>
<td>16%</td>
<td>0-10%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Decline</td>
<td>Declining participation</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Figure 18 - Recreation Program Lifecycle Analysis - Current Distribution and Recommendations

Overall, the lifecycle analysis results indicate a fair balance of all recreation programs across the lifecycle. A combined total of 55% of programs fall into the Introduction, Take-Off, and Growth stages. It is recommended that this total be between 50-60%, therefore, Olathe Parks and Recreation appears to be doing well at providing enough new or emerging programs to align with trends and help meet the evolving needs of the community. Additionally, many of these programs are also good candidates for revenue generation due to their novelty, popularity, and/or growth.

It is also important to have a stable core segment of programs that are in the Mature stage. Currently, Olathe Parks and Recreation has about 29% of their programs in this category. It is recommended that this be about 40% so as to provide stability to the overall program portfolio, but without dominating the portfolio with programs that are advancing to the later stages of the lifecycle. Programs in the Mature stage should be tracked for signs that they are entering the Saturation or Decline stages. According to staff, there is an ongoing process to evaluate program participation and trends to ensure that program offerings continue to meet the community’s needs.

A total of about 16% of programs are saturated, and none are reported to be declining. Programs in the Decline stage must be closely reviewed to evaluate repositioning them or eliminating them. It is recommended to modify these programs to begin a new lifecycle with the Introductory stage as well as to continue to add new programs based upon community needs and trends. Staff should complete a lifecycle review on an annual basis and ensure that the percentage distribution closely aligns with desired performance. Furthermore, the Department could include a performance measure of percentage of total number of new programs offered annually as an incentive for more innovation.

From a strategic perspective, based on continuous increases in programs, the Department needs to identify ways to increase capacity for recreation programs through increased facility use with new or expanded facilities (i.e., the new community center) and partnerships / leases or agreements with similar providers to carve out distinct market niches for the future that can be moved into a future recreation facility.
4.2.6 RECREATION PROGRAM FINANCIAL ASSESSMENT

Finding ways to enhance revenue year-on-year and improve service pricing strategies are priorities for Olathe Parks and Recreation. To that end, a review of recreation program cost recovery and pricing strategies was conducted based upon information provided by Department staff.

COST RECOVERY STRATEGIES

According to information provided, cost recovery performance is currently tracked at an overall level. The Department aims to recover 30% of costs for all programs offered directly by the department or through one of their contract providers. When certain Departmental facilities are used, cost recovery goals are occasionally set higher (to approximately 50%).

In addition to tracking cost recovery at the Department level, it is recommended to use program areas as an additional basis for categorization. Cost recovery targets should be identified for each program area, at least, and for specific programs or events if necessary. The previously identified core programs would serve as an effective breakdown for tracking cost recovery metrics, which would theoretically group programs with similar cost recovery and subsidy goals.

Targets need to reflect the degree to which the program area provides a public versus private good. Programs providing public benefits should be more subsidized by the Department; programs providing private benefits should seek to recover costs and/or generate revenue for other services. Generally, non-core programs, which are less critical to the organizational mission, should aim to yield a higher cost recovery rate to sustain them, leaving the limited tax-based appropriations to fund core programs.

Figure 19 presents cost recovery benchmarks based upon common program areas. National median cost recovery percentages are presented for comparison using data provided by the 2012 National Benchmarking Survey of Fee Policies and Program Costs Recovery published by Leisure Vision, which included a sample of 139 park and recreation agencies across the country. Cost recovery in that report is defined as the percentage of direct costs recouped through program fees; no values over 100% are depicted. The survey of agencies asked only for cost recovery ranges, therefore, precise averages cannot be reported.
### City of Olathe Parks and Recreation Master Plan

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>ADULT PROGRAMS (overall)</th>
<th>100%</th>
<th>YOUTH PROGRAMS (overall)</th>
<th>76-99%</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Swimming lessons</td>
<td>100%</td>
<td>Preschool programs</td>
<td>76-99%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tennis classes</td>
<td>100%</td>
<td>Youth tennis classes</td>
<td>100%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Arts and crafts classes</td>
<td>100%</td>
<td>Arts and crafts classes</td>
<td>76-99%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Trips</td>
<td>100%</td>
<td>Performing arts classes</td>
<td>100%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dance classes</td>
<td>100%</td>
<td>Fitness classes</td>
<td>76-99%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Aerobics/Fitness classes</td>
<td>100%</td>
<td>Golf classes</td>
<td>100%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Martial arts classes</td>
<td>100%</td>
<td>Swimming lessons</td>
<td>76-99%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Water aerobics classes</td>
<td>76-99%</td>
<td>After school programs</td>
<td>76-99%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ADULT SPORTS (overall)</td>
<td>76-99%</td>
<td>YOUTH SPORTS (overall)</td>
<td>76-99%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Adult men’s softball</td>
<td>76-99%</td>
<td>Youth softball</td>
<td>76-99%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Adult women’s softball</td>
<td>76-99%</td>
<td>Youth baseball</td>
<td>76-99%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Coed softball</td>
<td>76-99%</td>
<td>Youth volleyball</td>
<td>76-99%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Adult soccer</td>
<td>76-99%</td>
<td>Youth football</td>
<td>76-99%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Men’s basketball</td>
<td>100%</td>
<td>Youth baseball</td>
<td>76-99%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Women’s basketball</td>
<td>76-99%</td>
<td>Youth lacrosse</td>
<td>76-99%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Coed basketball</td>
<td>100%</td>
<td>Youth basketball</td>
<td>76-99%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3 on 3 basketball</td>
<td>100%</td>
<td>Youth soccer</td>
<td>76-99%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Adult lacrosse</td>
<td>100%</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Adult volleyball</td>
<td>100%</td>
<td>YOUTH CAMPS (overall)</td>
<td>76-99%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Adult baseball</td>
<td>76-99%</td>
<td>Youth day camps</td>
<td>76-99%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Evening camps</td>
<td>76-99%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PROGRAMS FOR PEOPLE W/ DISABILITIES (overall)</td>
<td>76-99%</td>
<td>Performing arts camps</td>
<td>76-99%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Preschool programs</td>
<td>76-99%</td>
<td>Sports camps</td>
<td>100%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tennis classes</td>
<td>76-99%</td>
<td>Arts and crafts camps</td>
<td>76-99%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Arts and crafts classes</td>
<td>76-99%</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Performing arts classes</td>
<td>76-99%</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fitness classes</td>
<td>76-99%</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Basketball leagues</td>
<td>76-99%</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dance classes</td>
<td>76-99%</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Golf classes</td>
<td>76-99%</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Swimming lessons</td>
<td>76-99%</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>After school programs</td>
<td>76-99%</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Martial arts classes</td>
<td>76-99%</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Baseball/softball leagues</td>
<td>76-99%</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Social clubs</td>
<td>51-75%</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

* Among those agencies that charge fees in each program area

Figure 19 - National Median Cost Recovery Rates
To further assist plan and implement cost recovery policies, the following definitions were developed and presented in Figure 20 to help classify specific programs within program areas.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Category</th>
<th>Description</th>
<th>Cost Recovery</th>
<th>Subsidy</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Core-Essential</td>
<td>• Part of the organizational mission</td>
<td>None to moderate</td>
<td>High</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Serves a majority of the community</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• “We must offer this program.”</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Important</td>
<td>• Important to the community</td>
<td>Moderate</td>
<td>Moderate</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Serves large portions of the community</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• “We should offer this program.”</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Value-Added</td>
<td>• Enhanced community offerings</td>
<td>High to complete</td>
<td>Little to none</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Serves niche groups</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• “It would be nice to offer this program.”</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Figure 20 - Cost Recovery and Subsidy Program Categories

Programs falling into the Important or Value-Added classifications generally represent programs that receive lower priority for subsidization. Important programs contribute to the organizational mission but are not essential to it; therefore, cost recovery for these programs should be high (i.e., at least 80% overall). Value-added programs are not critical to the mission and should be prevented from drawing upon limited public funding, so overall cost recovery for these programs should be near to or in excess of 100%.

To develop specific cost recovery targets, full cost of accounting should be created on each class or program that accurately calculates direct and indirect costs. Cost recovery goals are established once these numbers are in place, and Department staff should be trained on this process.

PRICING STRATEGIES

The pricing of services is established based on the cost of services and overlaid into program areas or specific program events. Currently Olathe Parks and Recreation uses pricing strategies based on age segment, residency, comparability to competition, and group discounts. However, the use of pricing strategies could be used more, particularly family/household status, prime/nonprime time, weekday/weekend, and location. An effort to price services in comparability to competition is especially important, and while currently conducted by staff, could be done more. Yearly competitor and other service providers should be benchmarked, shopped, and evaluated, to monitor changes they are making and how they compare with the Department’s programs.

It is recommended that mini-business plans (2 to 3 pages) be created for each core program service area on a yearly basis. They will evaluate the program area based on meeting the outcomes desired for participants, cost recovery, percentage of the market and business controls, cost of service, pricing strategy for the next year, and marketing strategies that are to be implemented. If developed regularly and consistently, they can be effective tools for budget construction and justification processes. Furthermore, these plans can address other financial and operational needs such as cash collection standards and refund process standards that need to be incorporated.
4.2.7 PROGRAM STANDARDS AND PERFORMANCE MANAGEMENT

The relationship between meeting the needs of the community, achieving the Departmental mission, and executing service delivery is of critical importance. With an understanding of this important dynamic, the following section provides an analysis of the service system and includes building on the service foundation that already exists in the Department. As observed from the discussions with data from the staff, the community does seem to exhibit a relatively high level of satisfaction with the offerings provided by Olathe Parks and Recreation. Based on observations, the Department’s operations and program offerings are above average based on nationwide trends, but enhancements to performance management practices would yield overall improvements to the services provided to the community. This section is intended to move the Department to a higher level of sophistication in quality management and move it into the realm of state- and national-level best practices.

RECREATION PROGRAM STANDARDS

The practice of using recreation program standards is essential for agencies desiring to perform at high levels and that aspire to be community and industry leaders. One of the most significant issues in managing a recreation program system includes the challenges faced with the complexity associated with thousands of service transactions, in-person and online, from multiple staff members dealing with a diverse audience at a variety of facilities within the system. Furthermore, the heavy reliance on part-time and seasonal staff in the service delivery process creates even greater challenges. These dynamics result in significant program and service quality variation.

When reviewing the program assessment information, there are limited numbers of performance measures used throughout the Olathe Parks and Recreation system to gauge performance. Recreation programs must have standard measures in place. Some examples include:

- Customer retention
- Customer satisfaction toward the registration system
- Specific cleanliness ratings
- Cost recovery rates
- Household percentage of program participation
- Percent of programs in introduction and growth stage
- Market penetration by age group
- Program distribution by age group
QUALITY MANAGEMENT
Recommended ways to build a culture of quality management in recreation program delivery for Olathe Parks and Recreation include the following:

- **Annual Review Process:** Staff presents their yearly goals for program areas to senior leadership and/or an advisory board. This would include policy reviews, financial and registration performance, customer issues, and plans for the future. This process helps to ensure good communication and cooperation for supporting divisions, such as parks, administration, and technology as well.

- **Documented Program Development Process:** This is required in order to reduce service variation and assist in training new staff. A common approach is to use a process map that provides guidance to staff for consistently developing new programs. It can help to diminish the learning curve for new staff and reinforce program development as a core competency. This is created in a flowchart format showing the steps in the process for program development, including writing class descriptions, process steps, hiring staff, using contractual employees, and the list of standards.

- **Instructor/Contractor Tool Kit:** Kits need to be created by the staff that outline information about the Department, including mission, vision, values, goals, organizational structure, roster of users, program guides, program standards, evaluation forms, registration forms, important phone numbers, name tags, thank you cards, and program learning objectives.

- **On-going Connections with Part-time and Seasonal Staff:** There needs to be on-going processes and events to connect part-time and seasonal programming staff, as well as some contractors, with full-time Department personnel through meetings, email, newsletters, staff recognition, and random visits by management. This also assists with determining and managing job satisfaction of these employees.

- **Identification of Customer Requirements:** Staff identify customer requirements for core program areas. This is important to emphasize with staff that directly interface with customers. Requirements relate to those service attributes that are most important to a customer, and requirements should be developed with customer input. Each core program area should include a listing of approximately five key customer requirements. For example, in a youth gymnastics program, key requirements could include overall safety of the program, instructional quality, convenience and ease of registration, cost of the program, and skill development.

- **Environmental Scan of Best Practices:** Staff identify key competitors or similar providers, both locally and nationally, of core program areas. Every one or two years, staff should develop a matrix of information to compare services in areas that have the greatest importance to customers. Benchmarking other nationally renowned agencies also can provide a process to continuously improve programming.

CUSTOMER FEEDBACK
Customer service is at the root of the success of any organization. A true community-service organization prides itself on identifying its customers’ preferences and acting in accordance to help fulfill their needs. In order to do this, an ongoing and system-wide feedback mechanism is of vital importance.

Currently, the Department does not have a system-wide approach for gathering customer feedback. Feedback is collected, but it is inconsistent from program-to-program. Maximizing the use of the Department’s website, utilizing online survey tools, and incorporating both pre-and post-program feedback systems across the agency are recommended tactics for the Department to implement. Surveys to lost customers or non-users would also be a useful addition to identify causes of attrition, dwindling popularity, or barriers to participation.

At the beginning of each year or season, the Department needs to conduct targeted ‘Open Houses’ to provide potential users an opportunity to preview the full spectrum of upcoming program offerings. This forum can also be used to gather feedback on the types of programs and services the public would be most interested in. This concept provides a constant input mechanism for programming ideas and ensures that offerings are based on observed need, rather than staff opinion or assumption. Additionally, users are more likely to participate in programs that they have had a chance to provide input on.
It is important that the Department continue to capture the customer feedback data and develop a database that can be used over the years to track trends and changes. The feedback obtained must be communicated with senior leadership, advisory boards, and future staff so as to ensure an open and transparent process and one that looks at improving as a team without focusing on individual blame.

Also, it is imperative to continue implementing quality control mechanisms for instructors and contractors to ensure effectiveness and build credibility. Except for some programs that conduct post-program customer feedback, the Department does not appear to undertake any mechanism of evaluating overall customer feedback pertaining to instructor quality. Having an ongoing instructor quality check certainly helps elevate the quality level and accountability of program offerings, which in turn enables the Department to provide and price programs according to their true value.

4.2.8 VOLUNTEERS AND PARTNERSHIPS

Today’s economic climate and political realities require most public park and recreation departments to seek productive and meaningful partnerships with both community organizations and individuals to deliver quality and seamless services to their residents. These relationships should be mutually beneficial to each party to better meet overall community needs and expand the positive impact of the Department’s mission. Because of the constraints facing Olathe Parks and Recreation due to economic challenges, effective partnerships and meaningful volunteerism are a key strategy area for the Department to meet the needs of the community in the years to come.

RECREATION PROGRAM VOLUNTEERS

Compared to many other similar Departments, Olathe Parks and Recreation boasts a strong volunteer program. Staff estimates that their volunteers provided 42,822 hours of service in 2011, equating to approximately $790,000 in labor. The Department is encouraged to continue to foster a system-wide approach to volunteer recruitment and management. It can be difficult to guard against the significant variation in the ways that volunteers are managed. Ensuring streamlined procedures and standardized guidelines for volunteer management are critical to making volunteers an effective complement to paid personnel and a valuable asset in reducing operational costs. When managed with respect and used strategically, volunteers can also serve as the primary advocates for the Department and its offerings.

A key part of maintaining the desirability of volunteerism in the Department is developing a good reward and recognition system. Using tactics similar to those found in frequent flier programs is recommended, wherein volunteers can use their volunteer hours to obtain early registration at programs, or discounted pricing at certain programs, rentals or events, or any other Department function.

Other best practices that the Department should be aware of in managing volunteers includes:

- Allocating a portion of an employee’s time in order to continually manage a system-wide volunteer program, beyond the recreation division, as well as to oversee it or have a committee of employees involved in oversight.
- Identify volunteer opportunities system-wide, develop job descriptions, and acceptance of conditions for volunteers (such as background checks).
- Develop a tracking system to quantify the number of volunteer hours according to program area and specific function, and document cost savings in more detailed ways.
- Develop documented volunteer recruitment, retention, and recognition systems.
- Involve volunteers in cross training to expose them to various Departmental functions and increase their skill. This can also increase their utility, allowing for more flexibility in making work assignments, and can also increase their appreciation and understanding of the Department.
PARTNERSHIPS

Olathe Parks and Recreation has a burgeoning partnership network that shows strong signs of further growth. Current partners include school districts, private businesses, media, nonprofit organizations, and foundations. The Olathe Parks and Recreation Foundation, besides serving as a partner, serves as a valuable mechanism for developing and facilitating other partnerships in the area with an overarching goal of supporting the construction, reconstruction, and improvement of public parks and recreational facilities, including the acquisition of land for park purposes, the acquisition of major recreational equipment and facilities, and the institution of new programs in the recreation system.

A community and organizational goal for Olathe Parks and Recreation is to further expand partnerships for the Department. The initial step in developing multiple partnerships in the community that expand upon existing relationships is to have an overall partnership philosophy that is supported by a policy framework for managing these relationships. Many times partnerships are inequitable to the public agency and do not produce reasonable shared benefits between parties. The recommended policies will promote fairness and equity within the existing and future partnerships while helping staff to manage against potential internal and external conflicts. Certain partnership principles must be adopted by the Department for existing and future partnerships to work effectively. These partnership principles are as follows:

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

Partnerships can be pursued and developed with other public entities such as neighboring cities, schools, colleges, state or federal agencies; nonprofit organizations; as well as with private for-profit organizations. There are recommended standard policies and practices that will apply to any partnership, and those that are unique to relationships with private for-profit entities.

Policy Recommendations for All Partnerships

All partnerships developed and maintained by Olathe Parks and Recreation should adhere to common policy requirements. These include:

- Each partner will meet with or report to Olathe Parks and Recreation staff on a regular basis to plan and share activity-based costs and equity invested.
- Partners will establish measurable outcomes and work through key issues to focus on the coming year to meet the desired outcomes.
- Each partner will focus on meeting a balance of equity agreed to and track investment costs accordingly.
- Measurable outcomes will be reviewed quarterly and shared with each partner, with adjustments made as needed.
- A working partnership agreement will be developed and monitored together on a quarterly or as-needed basis.
- Each partner will assign a liaison to serve each partnership agency for communication and planning purposes.
- If conflicts arise between partners, the Director of Olathe Parks and Recreation, along with the other partner’s highest ranking officer assigned to the agreement, will meet to resolve the issue(s) in a timely manner. Any exchange of money or traded resources will be made based on the terms of the partnership agreement.
- Each partner will meet with the other partner’s respective board or managing representatives annually to share updates and outcomes of the partnership agreement.
Policy Recommendations for public/private partnerships

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

• Upon entering into an agreement with a private business, group, association, or individual, the Olathe Parks and Recreation Department staff and political leadership must recognize that they must allow the private entity to meet their financial objectives within reasonable parameters that protect the mission, goals, and integrity of the City.

• As an outcome of the partnership, Olathe Parks and Recreation must receive a designated fee that may include a percentage of gross revenue dollars less sales tax on a regular basis, as outlined in the contract agreement.

• The working agreement of the partnership must establish a set of measurable outcomes to be achieved, as well as the tracking method of how those outcomes will be monitored by the Department. The outcomes will include standards of quality, financial reports, customer satisfaction, payments to the Department, and overall coordination with the Department for the services rendered.

• Depending on the level of investment made by the private contractor, the partnership agreement can be limited to months, a year, or multiple years.

• If applicable, the private contractor will provide a working management plan annually that they will follow to ensure the outcomes desired by Olathe Parks and Recreation. The management plan can and will be negotiated, if necessary. Monitoring of the management plan will be the responsibility of both partners. The Department must allow the contractor to operate freely in their best interest, as long as the outcomes are achieved and the terms of the partnership agreement are adhered to.

• The private contractor cannot lobby city advisory or governing boards for renewal of a contract. Any such action will be cause for termination. All negotiations must be with the Olathe Parks and Recreation Department Director or their designee.

• The agency has the right to advertise for private contracted partnership services, or negotiate on an individual basis with a bid process based on the professional level of the service to be provided.

• If conflicts arise between both partners, the highest-ranking officers from both sides will try to resolve the issue before going to each partner’s legal counsels. If none can be achieved, the partnership shall be dissolved.
PARTNERSHIP OPPORTUNITIES
These recommendations are an overview of existing partnership opportunities available to Olathe Parks and Recreation, as well as a suggested approach to organizing partnership pursuits. This is not an exhaustive list of all potential partnerships that can be developed, but can be used as a tool of reference for the agency to develop its own priorities in partnership development. The following five areas of focus are recommended:

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

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

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

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

5. **Resource Development Partner**: A private nonprofit organization with the primary purpose to leverage private sector resources, grants, other public funding opportunities, and resources from individuals and groups within the community to support the goals and objectives of the Department on mutually agreed strategic initiatives.
4.2.9 MARKETING AND PROMOTION

Recreation division staff is engaged in marketing and promotion to varying degrees. The Department recently created and filled has a full-time Marketing Coordinator position that facilitates the production of an Activities Guide, news releases, program information, media requests, and other communication and promotion tasks.

Despite these successes, it is a stated priority of the Department to enhance communication and establish a marketing campaign to increase public awareness of Department programs and services among all residents of the community, particularly minority groups. These goals were also articulated by focus groups, and are prevalent throughout the organization.

Effective communication strategies require striking an appropriate balance between the content of messaging with the volume of the messaging while utilizing the “right” methods of delivery. The Department has multiple subjects and areas of focus that should be addressed in communications and will need to rely upon multiple types of media to deliver those messages. Similarly, the community must perceive the interconnectedness of this whole messaging process so that it is not received as fragmented and overwhelming. A strategic marketing plan is recommended that addresses the following:

- Target audiences/markets identification
- Key messages for each target market
- Communication channels/media for each target market
- Graphic identity and use protocols
- Style handbook for all marketing material
- Social media strategies and tactics
- Communication schedule
- Marketing roles and responsibilities

The marketing plan must build upon and integrate with supporting plans, such as this master plan, and directly coordinate with organizational priorities. The plan also needs to provide specific guidance as to how the Department’s identity and brand is to be consistently portrayed across the multiple methods to multiple and potentially very diverse audiences. Other recommendations for marketing and promotion include:

- Use community input from survey results, focus group meetings, program assessments, on-site surveys, etc., to inform marketing efforts.
- Build volunteerism in the marketing and communication efforts, and recruit new volunteers with new skills as the marketing program grows.
- Establish performance measures for marketing efforts and review them regularly.
- Enhance relationships with partners that can leverage marketing efforts through cross-promotion.
4.3 SUMMARY OF RECOMMENDATIONS

4.3.1 PROGRAM PORTFOLIO MANAGEMENT

- Consider expanding program offerings to meet the desires expressed by the public, including providing programs that engage minorities, seniors, and those with disabilities. This also aligns with the demographic trend of an aging and diversifying population in Olathe.
- Continue to provide a strong portfolio of programs that cater to families. Affordable family-oriented programs are particularly valued.
- Acknowledge and celebrate the history and heritage of Olathe through programming and special events.
- Consider expanding special events and creating an annual event that Olathe can call its “own.”
- Designate core program areas, as specified earlier in this assessment.

4.3.2 PROGRAM LIFECYCLE MANAGEMENT

- Strive to keep about 40-50% of all recreation programs in the Introductory, Take-Off, or Growth lifecycle stages in order to align with trends and to help meet the evolving needs of the community.
- Strive to keep about 40% of programs in the Mature stage to provide stability to the overall program portfolio.
- Programs falling into the Saturated or Decline stage should be reprogrammed or retired to create new programs for the Introductory stage.

4.3.3 COST RECOVERY, PRICING, AND FINANCIAL MANAGEMENT

- Use programmatic areas as a basis for cost recovery goals. The core programs identified in this recreation program assessment should serve as an effective breakdown, because they group programs with similar cost recovery goals.
- Cost recovery targets should be identified for each program area, at the least, and for specific programs or events at the most. Currently, individual programs have no clear target.
- Classify programs as core essential, important, and value-added, and apply true cost of service pricing to each program area before applying additional cost recovery goals.
- Use the spectrum of public-to-private benefit to inform cost recovery targets and pricing strategies. Programs providing public benefits should be more subsidized by the Department.
- Non-core programs, which are less critical or further away from the agency mission, should aim to yield a higher cost recovery rate to sustain them, leaving the limited tax-based appropriations to fund core programs.
- Full cost of accounting that accurately calculates direct and indirect costs should be used to develop prices and cost recovery goals. Department staff need to be trained on this process.
- Programs, and their associated prices, provided by competitors and other providers should be benchmarked annually to monitor changes they are making and how they compare with the Department’s programs.
- Very brief business plans need to be developed for each program area, particularly the core program areas. They will help monitor the success of achieving outcomes, help control cost recovery, guide operational adjustments, and serve as budget development tools.
4.3.4 PERFORMANCE MANAGEMENT
- Implement consistent system-wide recreation program standards.
- Conduct an annual review process so that staff and leadership can review policies, operations, issues, and plans for the future.
- Begin documenting the program development process to formalize and coordinate program lifecycles in a strategic way.
- Develop an instructor/contractor tool kit or resource package with critical information and information on strategic frameworks.
- Create ongoing connections with part-time and seasonal staff to integrate them to the Department and to help manage satisfaction and performance.
- Identify customer requirements for core program areas (at least) and use them for performance management.
- Conduct an environmental scan of best practices every few years to inspire innovation and help make corrections to program operations.
- Implement a system-side and centralized approach for collecting customer feedback.
- Develop and implement quality control mechanisms for instructors and contractors to ensure effectiveness and build credibility.

4.3.5 VOLUNTEER MANAGEMENT
- Consider adding additional volunteer opportunities, particularly for seniors and students.
- Foster a system-wide approach to volunteer recruitment and management, including coordinated and standardized position descriptions and application/acceptance requirements.
- Develop a tracking system to quantify the number of volunteer hours according to program area and specific function and document cost savings in more detailed ways.
- Develop documented volunteer recruitment, retention, and recognition systems.
- Involve volunteers in cross training to expose them to various Departmental functions and increase their skill. This can also increase their utility, allowing for more flexibility in making work assignments, and can also increase their appreciation and understanding of the Department.

4.3.6 PARTNERSHIP MANAGEMENT
- Formalize and continually maintain an overall partnership philosophy supported by a policy framework.
- Consider additional partnerships with schools, libraries, and nonprofits, particularly to provide expanded educational programming.
- Require all partnerships to have a working agreement with measurable outcomes evaluated on a regular basis.
- Require all partnerships to track costs to demonstrate the shared level of equity and investment.
- Maintain a culture of collaborative planning for all partnerships, focusing on regular communications and annual reporting.
4.3.7 MARKETING AND PROMOTION

- Develop a strategic marketing plan that focuses the brand and identity of the Department as well as increases communication about programs and services, especially to minorities or underserved members of the community.
- Tie the marketing plan directly to the Department’s mission and vision.
- Provide specific guidance as to how the Department’s identity and brand should be consistently portrayed across the multiple methods and to diverse audiences.
- Use community input to inform marketing efforts.
- Build volunteerism in the marketing and communication efforts, and recruit new volunteers with new skills as the marketing program grows.
- Establish performance measures for marketing efforts and review them regularly.
- Enhance relationships with partners that can leverage marketing efforts through cross-promotion.

4.4 LEVEL OF SERVICE STANDARDS

Level of Service Standards is guidelines that define service areas based on population that support investment decisions related to parks, facilities, and amenities. Level of Service Standards can and will change over time as the program lifecycles change and demographics of a community change.

PROS evaluated park facility standards using a combination of resources. These resources included National Recreation and Park Association (NRPA) guidelines, recreation activity participation rates reported by the Sports & Fitness Industry Association as it applies to activities that occur in the U.S. and the City area, community and stakeholder input, findings from the community-wide survey and general observations. This information allowed standards to be customized to the City of Olathe (Figure1).

These standards need to be viewed as a guide. The standards are to be coupled with conventional wisdom and judgment related to the particular situation and needs of the community. By applying these facility standards to the population of Olathe, gaps and surpluses in park and facility/amenity types are revealed. As one can see there are many needs to be met in Olathe to meet the needs of the community now and in the future. The standards outlined are not aggressive, but are conservative.
### Olathe Park Facility Standards

#### 2012 Inventory - Developed Facilities

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Park Type</th>
<th>Olathe Park Inventory</th>
<th>Schools</th>
<th>Johnson County Facilities</th>
<th>VMSA Facility</th>
<th>Total Inventory</th>
<th>Current Service Level based upon population</th>
<th>Recommended Service Levels: Meets Standard</th>
<th>Meets Standard/Need Exists</th>
<th>Additional Facilities/ Amenities Needed</th>
<th>Inventory</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Rectangular Sports Fields</td>
<td>acres/acre</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1.25 acres per mile</td>
<td>1.000</td>
<td>3.00</td>
<td>acres per 1,000</td>
<td>0.36</td>
<td>acres per 1,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Softball Field Adult (Soccer/Football)</td>
<td>7.00 acres</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1.50 acres per mile</td>
<td>0.82</td>
<td>6.80</td>
<td>acres per 1,000</td>
<td>0.43</td>
<td>acres per 1,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rectangular Sports Fields</td>
<td>acres/acre</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1.00 acres per mile</td>
<td>1.000</td>
<td>6.00</td>
<td>acres per 1,000</td>
<td>0.50</td>
<td>acres per 1,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Softball Field Youth (250 ft.)</td>
<td>acres/acre</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>0.50 acres per mile</td>
<td>1.000</td>
<td>2.00</td>
<td>acres per 1,000</td>
<td>0.37</td>
<td>acres per 1,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Baseball Field Adult (90 ft.)</td>
<td>acres/acre</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>0.25 acres per mile</td>
<td>2.000</td>
<td>3.00</td>
<td>acres per 1,000</td>
<td>0.47</td>
<td>acres per 1,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Softball Field Youth (60 ft.)</td>
<td>acres/acre</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>0.25 acres per mile</td>
<td>4.000</td>
<td>6.00</td>
<td>acres per 1,000</td>
<td>0.67</td>
<td>acres per 1,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Skate Park</td>
<td>acres/acre</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>0.25 acres per mile</td>
<td>1.000</td>
<td>4.00</td>
<td>acres per 1,000</td>
<td>0.41</td>
<td>acres per 1,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Off-Leash Area</td>
<td>acres/acre</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>0.25 acres per mile</td>
<td>2.000</td>
<td>8.00</td>
<td>acres per 1,000</td>
<td>1.33</td>
<td>acres per 1,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Playground</td>
<td>acres/acre</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>0.25 acres per mile</td>
<td>2.000</td>
<td>8.00</td>
<td>acres per 1,000</td>
<td>1.33</td>
<td>acres per 1,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Disc Golf Course</td>
<td>acres/acre</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>0.25 acres per mile</td>
<td>1.000</td>
<td>4.00</td>
<td>acres per 1,000</td>
<td>0.41</td>
<td>acres per 1,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Picnic Shelter Medium (50-100)</td>
<td>acres/acre</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>0.25 acres per mile</td>
<td>2.000</td>
<td>8.00</td>
<td>acres per 1,000</td>
<td>1.33</td>
<td>acres per 1,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Outdoor Family Aquatic</td>
<td>acres/acre</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>0.25 acres per mile</td>
<td>1.000</td>
<td>4.00</td>
<td>acres per 1,000</td>
<td>0.41</td>
<td>acres per 1,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Outdoor Flat Water</td>
<td>acres/acre</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>0.25 acres per mile</td>
<td>1.000</td>
<td>4.00</td>
<td>acres per 1,000</td>
<td>0.41</td>
<td>acres per 1,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>City/School Multi-Use Courts</td>
<td>acres/acre</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>0.25 acres per mile</td>
<td>1.000</td>
<td>4.00</td>
<td>acres per 1,000</td>
<td>0.41</td>
<td>acres per 1,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tennis Courts</td>
<td>acres/acre</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>0.25 acres per mile</td>
<td>1.000</td>
<td>4.00</td>
<td>acres per 1,000</td>
<td>0.41</td>
<td>acres per 1,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Community Parks</td>
<td>731.44 acres</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>5.67 acres per 1,000</td>
<td>6.00</td>
<td>acres per 1,000</td>
<td>0.10</td>
<td>acres per 1,000</td>
<td>1.000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Historic Cemetery Sites</td>
<td>acres/acre</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>0.25 acres per mile</td>
<td>1.000</td>
<td>4.00</td>
<td>acres per 1,000</td>
<td>0.41</td>
<td>acres per 1,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Regional Parks</td>
<td>acres/acre</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>0.25 acres per mile</td>
<td>1.000</td>
<td>4.00</td>
<td>acres per 1,000</td>
<td>0.41</td>
<td>acres per 1,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Community Parks</td>
<td>acres/acre</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>0.25 acres per mile</td>
<td>1.000</td>
<td>4.00</td>
<td>acres per 1,000</td>
<td>0.41</td>
<td>acres per 1,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Neighborhood Parks</td>
<td>acres/acre</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>0.25 acres per mile</td>
<td>1.000</td>
<td>4.00</td>
<td>acres per 1,000</td>
<td>0.41</td>
<td>acres per 1,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Recreation Parks</td>
<td>acres/acre</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>0.25 acres per mile</td>
<td>1.000</td>
<td>4.00</td>
<td>acres per 1,000</td>
<td>0.41</td>
<td>acres per 1,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other Maintained Areas</td>
<td>acres/acre</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>0.25 acres per mile</td>
<td>1.000</td>
<td>4.00</td>
<td>acres per 1,000</td>
<td>0.41</td>
<td>acres per 1,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total Park Acres</td>
<td>acres/acre</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>3.58 acres per 1,000</td>
<td>3.58</td>
<td>acres per 1,000</td>
<td>0.80</td>
<td>acres per 1,000</td>
<td>1.000</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

#### Anticipated Future Park Development 2012 - 2017

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Park Type</th>
<th>Meets Standard/Need Exists</th>
<th>Additional Facilities/ Amenities Needed</th>
<th>Inventory</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Additional Facilities/ Amenities Needed</td>
<td>Additional Facilities/ Amenities Needed</td>
<td>Inventory</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>----------------------------------</td>
<td>----------------------------</td>
<td>----------------------------------------</td>
<td>------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Meet Standard</td>
<td>90.00 (Acres)</td>
<td>Meets Standard</td>
<td>90.00 (Acres)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Need Exists</td>
<td>3.96 (Acres)</td>
<td>Meets Standard</td>
<td>3.96 (Acres)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Additional Facilities/ Amenities Needed</td>
<td>Additional Facilities/ Amenities Needed</td>
<td>Inventory</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>----------------------------------</td>
<td>----------------------------</td>
<td>----------------------------------------</td>
<td>------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Meet Standard</td>
<td>90.00 (Acres)</td>
<td>Meets Standard</td>
<td>90.00 (Acres)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Need Exists</td>
<td>3.96 (Acres)</td>
<td>Meets Standard</td>
<td>3.96 (Acres)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

#### 2012 Estimated Population

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Estimated Population</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>126,000</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

#### 2017 Estimated Population

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Estimated Population</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>129,574</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Notes: Other Maintained Areas include cemeteries, medians, city buildings, tight-of-way, and miscellaneous tracts. Recreation Parks includes soccer, lacrosse, field hockey and rugby fields. Johnson County Facilities include Heritage Park, Ernie Miller Nature Center, and Cedar Niles Property. The development of Cedar Niles Property is subject to fund availability and board approval. Total amount of public school space available for public use is 31% for gyms and 25% for pools of a total 146,000 s.f. gym space and 72,000 s.f. of pools. Public School Square Footage Available for Daily Public Use is listed in the needs of public rec facilities. Community Gardens include Old Town, Farmhouse Garden, and Spacek Street Garden.
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4.5 SERVICE AREA MAPS

Levels of service were determined by classifications of each individual City facility using the standards described above. The assessment of service levels generated in this study replaces the previous standard now considered outdated by NRPA of 10 acres of parks per 1,000 residents. Based on the old standard of 10 acres/1,000, the 1,998.41 acres maintained by Olathe Parks and Recreation are more than sufficient for the estimated 129,029 residents in 2012. Within new guideline recommendations provided by NRPA, levels of service for individual program elements or activities should be handled on a case by case basis in order to tailor the system to the most appropriate age range, quantity, and quality of recreation facilities within fiscal limits of the individual system. A detailed assessment of the parks and open space available to Olathe residents provides an understanding of the opportunities that might be available within the community for development of other recreation amenities by the OPR. The detailed assessment can be found in Appendix B of the report. Throughout this analysis, the focus has been to analyze the service and the long-term opportunities and benefits to the community. This method assists in creating a framework to evaluate future park and open space development initiatives for the City.

To support the current analysis of facilities standards charts, the Level of Service maps included in this document highlight a service radius of .5 miles for neighborhood parks, 3 miles for community parks, 6 miles for sub-regional parks and 10 miles for regional facilities. The facilities outlined and broken down into the two “service areas” (east and west of I-35) along with the composite map showing the full City boundaries allow service area “gaps” to be identified so that these areas can be filled strategically to create a more uniform service level throughout the City.
4.5.1 OLATHE SERVICE AREA
4.5.2 EAST OLATHE SERVICE AREA
4.5.3 WEST OLATHE SERVICE AREA
4.6 PRIORITIZED FACILITY AND PROGRAM NEEDS ASSESSMENT

The purpose of the Facility and Program Priority Rankings is to provide a prioritized list of facility/amenity needs and recreation program needs for the community served by the City of Olathe Parks and Recreation Department.

This rankings model evaluated both quantitative and qualitative data. Quantitative data includes the statistically valid Community Survey, which asked residents of Westerville to list unmet needs and rank their importance. Qualitative data includes resident feedback obtained in community input and demographics and trends.

A weighted scoring system was used to determine the priorities for parks and recreation facilities/amenities and recreation programs. For instance as noted below, a weighted value of 3 for the Unmet Desires means that out of a total of 100%, unmet needs make up 30% of the total score. Similarly, importance-ranking also makes up 30%, while Consultant Evaluation makes up 40% of the total score, thus totaling 100%.

This scoring system considers the following:

- **Community Survey**
  - Unmet needs for facilities and recreation programs – This is used as a factor from the total number of households mentioning whether they have a need for a facility/program and the extent to which their need for facilities and recreation programs has been met. Survey participants were asked to identify this for 26 different facilities/amenities and 20 recreation programs.
  - Importance ranking for facilities and recreation programs – This is used as a factor from the importance allocated to a facility or program by the community. Each respondent was asked to identify the top four most important facilities and recreation programs.

- **Consultant Evaluation**
  - Factor derived from the consultant’s evaluation of program and facility priority based on survey results, demographics, trends and overall community input.

The weighted scores were as follows:

- 60% from the statistically valid community survey results.
- 40% from consultant evaluation using demographic and trends data, community focus groups and public meetings and levels of service.

These weighted scores were then summed to provide an overall score and priority ranking for the system as a whole. The results of the priority ranking were tabulated into three categories: High Priority (top third), Medium Priority (middle third) and Low Priority (bottom third).

The combined total of the weighted scores for Community Unmet Needs, Community Importance, and Consultant Evaluation is the total score based on which the Facility/Amenity and Program Priority is determined.
4.6.1 FACILITY / AMENITY PRIORITY RANKINGS
As seen below, Walking, hiking and biking trails, Indoor Swimming pools / leisure pools, indoor fitness / exercise facilities, outdoor swimming pools / water parks and Small Neighborhood Parks are the top five highest facility / amenity priorities in Olathe.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Facility/Amenity Needs Assessment</th>
<th>Overall Ranking</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Walking, hiking and biking trails</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Indoor swimming pools/leisure pools</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Indoor fitness/exercise facilities</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Outdoor swimming pools/water parks</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Small neighborhood parks</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Large community parks</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Boating and fishing areas</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ice skating rink</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Large destination playground</td>
<td>9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Indoor gyms for basketball/volleyball</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Picnic areas and shelters</td>
<td>11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Playground equipment</td>
<td>12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Youth baseball fields</td>
<td>13</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Youth soccer fields</td>
<td>14</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Special events parks</td>
<td>15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Community gardens</td>
<td>16</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Outdoor tennis courts</td>
<td>17</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Historic sites/Living History Farm</td>
<td>18</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Outdoor sand volleyball courts</td>
<td>19</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Outdoor basketball courts</td>
<td>20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Skate parks</td>
<td>21</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Girls softball fields</td>
<td>22</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Adult softball fields</td>
<td>23</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Youth football fields</td>
<td>24</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Youth lacrosse fields</td>
<td>25</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pickleball courts</td>
<td>26</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### 4.6.2 PROGRAM PRIORITY RANKINGS

As seen below, Adult fitness and wellness programs, water fitness programs, youth sports programs, youth learn to swim programs and Community special events are the top five highest program priorities in Olathe.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Olathe Program Needs Assessment</th>
<th>Overall Ranking</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Adult fitness and wellness programs</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Water fitness programs</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Youth sports programs</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Youth Learn to Swim programs</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Community special events</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Adult sports programs</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Adult arts and crafts programs</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Youth summer camp programs</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Youth fitness and wellness programs</td>
<td>9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nature programs</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Youth arts and crafts programs</td>
<td>11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Before and after school programs</td>
<td>12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pre-school programs</td>
<td>13</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tennis lessons and leagues</td>
<td>14</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Martial arts programs</td>
<td>15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Adult drama/performing arts programs</td>
<td>16</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Youth gymnastics and cheerleading</td>
<td>17</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Programs for Disabled</td>
<td>18</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Olathe community heritage programs</td>
<td>19</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Youth drama/performing arts programs</td>
<td>20</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
5.1 PARKS CAPITAL IMPROVEMENT PLAN

The 2015-2024 Parks Capital Improvement Plan (PCIP) is a ten-year projection of planned physical improvements to the park system. The CIP provides revenue projections and a “blueprint” for spending priorities to support the desired outcomes of the Parks and Recreation Master Plan. No actual expenditures are made until they are included in the Cities 5 year CIP and/or reviewed and approved by City Council.

One of the core functions of the Department’s management is to preserve and protect existing park system assets. The 2013 Community Survey, conducted as part of the Parks and Recreation Master Plan, found that residents expect the park system to be well maintained. In essence, the public directed the Department to “take care of what you already have.” With this mandate in mind, the PCIP provides necessary funding for the ongoing deferred capital maintenance or replacement of existing assets before allocating funds for new parks and recreation facilities which is to begin in the year 2018 and 2019 budget years. Additionally, capital improvements with the ability to contribute to cost recovery has higher levels of priority to help support the Department’s structural budget.

The PCIP should be viewed as a working document, updated at least annually to reflect actual revenue collections, refined cost projections, and potential changes in community or park system needs. The total cost of capital improvements outlined in this PCIP far exceed the revenue projections from current funding streams. Opportunities for new revenue sources and/or partnerships to help share costs will need to be explored to accelerate new capital development during this ten-year planning period. It is imperative that the City Council support the renewal of the 1/8 cent park sales tax to take care of the existing system for the future and support new funding sources outlined in the plan. In the Appendix the PCIP is outlined by park and priority.
5.1.1 TYPES OF PARKS CAPITAL IMPROVEMENTS

For the purpose of this PCIP, capital improvements are defined as projects that have a monetary value of at least $1,000, a useful life of at least three years, and result in the creation or renovation of a fixed asset that allows the Department to serve the park and recreation needs of the Olathe community. Examples of capital improvements include construction, remodeling, equipment replacements, or purchase of parkland, park fixtures, buildings, vehicles, and equipment. Planning efforts associated with capital improvements, including architectural, engineering, and legal services, are also considered capital expenditures and incorporated within the PCIP.

Capital improvements within this PCIP are divided within two classifications:

- Capital Maintenance:
  - The improvement or replacement of existing park assets and any related planning efforts. Capital Maintenance is required to preserve the usefulness and extend the life of existing park assets and may be the result of capital replacement plans or unexpected, emergency needs.

- New Project:
  - The purchase and/or development of new parks, recreation facilities, and/or equipment. “Soft costs” associated with the planning and design of the park system or specific parks are also classified as a New Project. Most New Projects are identified and designed through an extensive planning process with input from many stakeholders, including the community, user groups, elected officials, Parks & Recreation Foundation, other governmental entities, partners, staff, and the City Council.

5.1.2 PRIORITIZATION OF CAPITAL IMPROVEMENTS

Continued investment in the park system is critical to providing quality parks and recreation experiences for the residents of Olathe. Since funding for capital improvements is finite, projects are prioritized based on the following criteria:

- All Improvements: All parks capital improvements must support the goals and objectives of the 2015-2019 Parks and Recreation Master Plan as approved or amended by City Council.

- Priority 1: Capital Maintenance needs of revenue generating facilities mandated to be self-sufficient. Since the condition of these facilities has a direct impact on operational costs and revenue generation, capital maintenance needs of revenue facilities receive the highest priority. Currently this includes capital maintenance for the sports complexes, water parks and pools, and new facilities that can help offset operational costs.

- Priority 2: Capital Maintenance needs of existing parks, recreation facilities, and equipment. The 2013 Community Survey asked residents what parks and recreation services should receive the most attention. Nearly 40% of respondents identified the maintenance and cleanliness of parks and trails as their first, second, or third choice - ranking their highest priority for the park system.

- Priority 3: New Projects enhancing existing parkland or community assets with consideration given for revenue generation and operational expenses.

- Priority 4: New Projects requiring the purchase of new parkland with consideration given for revenue generation and operational expenses.
5.2 FUNDING AND REVENUE STRATEGIES

Park and recreation systems across the U.S. today have learned to develop a clear understanding of how to manage revenue options to support parks and recreation services in a municipality based on the limited availability of tax dollars. Park and recreation systems no longer rely on taxes as their sole revenue option, but have developed new sources of revenue options to help support capital and operational needs.

A growing number of municipalities have developed policies on pricing of services, cost recovery rates, and partnership agreements for programs and facilities provided to the community. They also have developed strong partnerships that are fair and equitable in the delivery of services based on who receives the service, for what purpose, for what benefit, and for what costs. In addition, agencies have learned to use parks and recreation facilities, amenities, programs and events to create economic development as it applies to keeping property values high around parks and along trails through increased maintenance, adding sports facilities and events to drive tournaments into the region that create hotel room nights and increase expenditures in restaurants and retail areas. They have learned to recognize that people will drive into their community for good recreation facilities such as sports complexes, pools, and for special events if presented correctly and are well managed.

In the City of Olathe, some of these policies and management practices are not in place and should be considered for the future. PROS has outlined several options for the City to consider. In any event, PROS feels that some, if not all, of these sources should be considered as an option to support the future capital and operational needs of the City as outlined in the master plan.

5.2.1 FUNDING SOURCES FOR PARKS CAPITAL IMPROVEMENT DOLLARS AND OPERATIONS

The following financial options outline opportunities for the City to consider in supporting the recommended parks capital improvements outlined in the master plan as well as operational costs associated with managing the system for the future. Many of these funding sources may not be allowed for first class cities in Kansas, or have never been used by first class cities, but should be pursued through legislative means should the city see the value in pursuing these funding sources.

**General Obligation Bond:** A general obligation bond is a municipal bond secured by a taxing authority such as the City of Olathe to improve public assets that benefits the municipal agency involved that oversee the parks and recreation facilities. The City of Olathe has done a General Obligation Bond for parks and recreation facilities for the new community center and other opportunities should be considered for the future to promote economic sustainability and livability in Olathe.

General Obligation Bonds should be considered for the park and recreation facility projects, such as, a future recreation center, updates to neighborhood parks and community parks or an existing sports complex. Improvements to parks such as Lake Olathe or Cedar Lake should also be covered by this funding source and let the operational revenue come from the site amenities developed in the park. These parks help frame the City’s image and will benefit a wide age segment of users. Updating these parks will benefit the community as a whole and stabilize neighborhoods. Over the last 10 years across the U.S. over 90% of park and recreation bond issues have passed in cities when offered to the community to vote to support the community needs for parks and recreation. This is according to Trust for Public Lands research.
Governmental Funding Programs: A variety of funding sources are available from federal and state government for park-related projects. For example, the Land and Water Conservation Fund program has been reinstated for 2014, and levels at 150 million and can provide capital funds to state and local governments to acquire, develop, and improve outdoor recreation areas. Federal Community Development Block Grant (CDBG) funds are used to support open space related improvements, including redevelopment and new development of parks and recreation facilities. Transportation Enhancement Funds available through TE, the current federal transportation bill, can be used for trail and related green space development, AmeriCorps Grants can be used to fund support for park maintenance.

TE Funds as well as Safe Routes To School Funds should be pursued for the trail improvements outlined in the plan. TE monies require a 20% match by the city and Safe Routes to School Funds require no match by the City.

CDBG (Community Development Block Grants) funds are used by many cities to enhance parks. These funds should be used to support the redevelopment of major facilities based on its location in the City and what it will do to enhance the neighborhood and schools surrounding the park, which is the purpose for CDBG monies.

AmeriCorps Grants should be pursued by the parks division to support park maintenance and cleanup of drainage areas, where trails and small neighborhood parks are located in the City.

Federal Housing Grants can also help support parks near federal housing areas and should be pursued if appropriate.

If applying for these grants is an issue, the City staff should seek out a grant writer to write the application.

Park Impact Fees: The City has implemented park impact fees, but they should be updated. The current deficiencies in parkland and trail standards need to be addressed and the park impact fee can again support these park improvements. This will allow for use of funds collected from 2014 to 2019.

Internal Park Improvement Fund: This funding source is created from a percentage of the overall park admissions to attractions such as sport complexes or special events in the park and would allow a percentage usually in the 3-5% of gross revenues as dedicated to the park for existing and future capital improvements. This funding source is used for sports complexes, aquatic parks, campgrounds, and fee based parks. This type of user fee does not require voter approval, but is set up in a dedicated fund to support the existing attraction for future maintenance and improvements.

Tax Allocation or Tax Increment District: Commonly used for financing redevelopment projects. A Tax Allocation District (TAD) involves the issuance of tax-exempt bonds to pay front-end infrastructure and eligible development costs in partnership with private developers. As redevelopment occurs in the City, the “tax increment” resulting from redevelopment projects is used to retire the debt issued to fund the eligible redevelopment costs. The public portion of the redevelopment project funds itself using the additional taxes generated by the project. TADs can be used to fund park improvements and development as an essential infrastructure cost. These funds would work well in the downtown redevelopment and in trail development the City has proposed. The City of Valparaiso, Indiana, has used this funding source extensively for their redevelopment of the downtown area and has made a huge impact on the image and impact to parks and business in the downtown area as well as the development of trails in the City.

Developer Cash-in-Lieu of meeting the Open Space Requirement: Ordinances requiring the dedication of open space within developments to meet the park and recreation needs of the new residents often have provisions allowing cash contribution to substitute for the land requirement.
**Facility Authority:** Sometimes used by park and recreation agencies to improve a specific park or develop a specific improvement such as a stadium, large recreation center, large aquatic center, or sports venue for competitive events. Repayment of bonds to fund the project usually comes from a sales tax in the form of food and beverage. A Facility Authority could oversee improvements for the large facilities, such as another aquatic center and sports field complex. The City could seek out a private developer to design build the facility with the City paying back these costs over a 20-year period. The Facility Authority could include representation from the schools, the City, and private developers.

**Utility Lease Fee:** Utility lease fees have been used to support parks in the form of utility companies supporting a park from utility easements, storm water runoff, and paying for development rights below the ground. This funding source is derived from fees on property owners based on measures, such as the amount of impervious surfacing as well as fees from utility companies having access through the park. It is used by many cities to acquire and develop greenways and other open space resources that provide improvements in the park or development of trails. Improvements can include trails, drainage areas, and retention ponds that serve multiple purposes such as recreation, environmental protection, and storm water management. This could be a source for the utilities to make a contribution to support the parks and trails in the future.

**Transient Occupancy Tax:** This funding source is used by many cities to fund improvements to parks from hotels that benefit from the parks and Transient Occupancy Taxes that are typically set at 5-8% on the value of a hotel room with a 1% sales tax that can be dedicated for park and recreation improvement purposes. Because of the value that parks could provide in the way of special events, sports tournaments, entertainment and cultural events, hotels in the area that benefit could be set up with a portion of their occupancy funds going to support park and recreation related improvements that directly benefit them. This funding source should be implemented progressively as the City increases the number of events it sponsors. Tracking the economic value back to the hotels is important to build trust with the hotel business community.

**Food and Beverage Tax:** The City has a 1/8-cent sales tax now in Olathe. Some cities have used a 1-cent sales tax from food and beverage, as well, because many visitors to the City help to pay for a bond to finance future parks and recreation related improvements. Food and Beverage Taxes are very well accepted in most Midwest communities.

**Parks Capital Improvement Fee:** A parks capital improvement fee can be added to an admission fee to a recreation facility or park attraction to help pay back the cost of developing the facility or attraction. This fee is usually applied to golf courses, aquatic facilities, recreation centers, stadiums, amphitheaters, and special use facilities such as sports complexes. The funds generated can be used either to pay back the cost of the capital improvement on a revenue bond that was used to develop the facility. Capital improvement fees normally are $5 per person for playing on the improved site or can be collected as a parking fee.

**Lease Back:** Lease backs are a source of capital funding in which a private sector entity such as a development company buys the land or leases the parkland and develops a facility such as a park, restaurant, recreation attraction, recreation center, pool, or sports complex, and leases the facility back to the municipality to pay off the capital costs over a 20 to 25 year period. This approach takes advantage of the efficiencies of private sector development while relieving the burden on the municipality to raise upfront capital funds. This funding source is typically used for recreation and aquatic type facilities, stadiums, civic buildings, and fire stations.
5.2.2 FUNDING SOURCES FOR OPERATIONAL DOLLARS

**Land Leases/Concessions:** Land leases and concessions are public/private partnerships in which the municipality provides land or space for private commercial operations that enhance the park and recreation experience in exchange for payments to help reduce operating costs. They can range from restaurants to cell towers to full management of recreation attractions.

**Admission to the Park:** Many park and recreation systems in the U.S. have admission fees on a per car, per bike, and per person basis to access a signature park that can be used to help support operational costs. Car costs range from $3 to $5 a car and $2 dollars a bicycle or $2 dollars per person. This may not be appropriate for Olathe at the present time, but may be considered in the future especially if Lake Olathe or Cedar Lake get redeveloped. This fee may be useful for large events and festivals that have the capability to be set up as a fee-based park at least on weekends.

**Parking Fee:** Many parks that do not charge an admission fee will charge a parking fee. Parking rates range from $3 to $4 dollars a day. This funding source could work for helping to support special events, festivals, and tournaments.

**User Fees:** User fees are fees paid by a user of recreation facilities or programs to offset the costs of services provided by the Department in operating a park, a recreation facility, or in delivering programs and services. In Olathe, prior to 2008, residents highly undervalued recreation programs. A perception of “value” has been instilled in the community by Olathe parks staff for what benefits the City is providing to the user. As the Department continues to develop new programs, all future fees will be charged based on cost recovery goals in the Pricing Policy. The fees for the parks and/or core recreation services are based on the level of exclusivity the user receives compared to the general taxpayer.

**Corporate Naming Rights:** In this arrangement, corporations invest in the right to name an event, facility, or product within a park in exchange for an annual fee, typically over a ten-year period. The cost of the naming right is based on the impression points the facility or event will receive from the newspapers, TV, websites, and visitors or users to the park. Naming rights for park and recreation facilities are typically attached to sports complexes, amphitheaters, recreation centers, aquatic facilities, stadiums, and events. Naming rights are a good use of outside revenue for parks, recreation facilities, or special attractions in the City.

**Corporate Sponsorships:** Corporations can also underwrite a portion or all of the cost of an event, program, or activity based on their name being associated with the service. Sponsorships typically are title sponsors, presenting sponsors, associate sponsors, product sponsors, or in-kind sponsors. Many agencies seek corporate support for these types of activities.

Advertising sales on sports complexes, scoreboards, gym floors, trashcans, playgrounds, in locker rooms, at dog parks, along trails, flower pots, and as part of special events held in the City to help support operational costs have been an acceptable practice in parks and recreation systems for a long time and should be considered for the City to support operational costs.

**Maintenance Endowment Fund:** This is a fund dedicated exclusively for a park’s maintenance, funded by a percentage of user fees from programs, events, and rentals.

**Park Revolving Fund:** This is a dedicated fund to be used for park purposes only that is replenished on an ongoing basis from various funding sources such as grants, sponsorships, advertising, program user fees and rental fees within the park. The City has established a revolving fund supported by all of the funding sources identified in this section and it should continue.
Permit Fees: This fee is incorporated for exclusive reservations of picnic shelters, sports fields, special events provided by the City, and competition tournaments held in the City by other organizations. Permit fees include a base fee for all direct and indirect costs for the City to provide the space on an exclusive basis plus a percentage of the gross for major special events and tournaments held on City-owned permitted facilities. The City has established the use of permit fees supported by all of the funding sources identified in this section. These dollars could be applied to the Park Revolving Fund to help support park improvements.

5.2.3 PRIVATE FUNDING SOURCES

Business/Citizen Donations: Individual donations from corporations and citizens can be sought to support specific improvements and amenities. The City might consider trying to raise the money privately for the development of major facilities in the future.

Private Foundation Funds: Nonprofit community foundations can be strong sources of support for the Department and should be pursued for specific park and recreation amenities. The Department does have a parks foundation and it should consider developing strategies to support park-related programs and improvements for the future.

Nonprofit Organizations: Nonprofit organizations can provide support for green space and parks in various ways. Examples include:

- Conservancy or Friends Organization: This type of nonprofit is devoted to supporting a specific park. These Park Conservancy’s or Friends Groups are a major funding source for parks in the United States and should be considered for Olathe parks and recreation facilities. This could apply to Lake Olathe or Cedar Lake regional parks.
- Greenway Foundations: Greenway foundations focus on developing and maintaining trails and green corridors on a citywide basis. The City could seek land leases along their trails as a funding source, in addition to selling miles of trails to community corporations and nonprofits in Olathe. The development rights along the trails can also be sold to local utilities for water, sewer, fiber optic, and cable lines on a per-mile basis to support development and management of these corridors.

5.2.4 VOLUNTEER SOURCES

Adopt-an-Area of a Park: In this approach, local neighborhood groups or businesses make a volunteer commitment to maintaining a specific area of a park. Adopt-an-Area of a Park arrangements are particularly well-suited for the Department.

Adopt-a-Trail: This is similar to Adopt-a-Park but involves sponsorship of a segment of a trail (i.e., one mile) for maintenance purposes.

Community Service Workers: Community service workers are assigned by the court to pay off some of their sentence through maintenance activities in parks, such as picking up litter, removing graffiti, and assisting in painting or fix-up activities. Most workers are assigned 30 to 60 hours of work. This would seem to be a good opportunity for the parks to work with the police or sheriff’s Department on using community service workers in parks.
In developing a master plan it is important to establish a vision and mission for the Department to guide its efforts for the future. Vision says what the Department wants to be known for and Mission indicates how we get there. The following vision and mission have been updated from the 2008 Master Plan.

6.1 VISION
“Our vision is to enhance Olathe’s economic development, healthy initiatives, and quality of life throughout the community. The Parks and Recreation Department will create a community of choice to live, work and play now and for future generations through the development of quality parks, recreation facilities, trails, historic sites, and program services.”

6.2 MISSION STATEMENT
“To maximize all available resources in providing beautiful parks, recreation activities, trails, historic sites, and facilities to the Olathe community that enhances the residents’ health and safety, promotes economic vitality, celebrates community heritage and creates civic pride in living in Olathe.”

6.2.1 KEY GUIDING PRINCIPLES
- Customer service
- Enrichment
- Innovation
- Environmental sustainability

The following section outlines the Goals and Specific Strategies for five key areas of the Olathe Parks and Recreation. These are broad strategies while the detailed tactics to fulfill them are provided in the appendix of the master plan. The recommendations are meant to serve as a guide and should be flexible to adapt to changing trends and needs over time. This will ensure that the master plan truly serves as a living document, which is dynamic and proactively meeting community needs and vision over time.

The key areas for recommendations include:
- Parkland
- Facilities
- Programming
- Operations and staffing
- Financing
6.3 COMMUNITY VISION AND GOAL FOR PARK LAND

“Our vision for all parks in the City is to make them a sense of civic pride through quality design principles and maintenance standards that allows them to be managed in the most productive and efficient manner.”

6.3.1 GOAL

Meet the desired goals per acre in the following park categories: neighborhood parks at 2 acres per 1,000 people; community parks at 6 acres per 1,000 people; regional park of 10.49 acres per 1,000 people; and trail miles equal to .5 tenths of a mile per 1,000 people.

6.3.2 STRATEGIES FOR PARK LAND

- Redevelop Cedar Lake and Lake Olathe as signature parks in the City.
- Update the identified existing neighborhood parks outlined in the master plan to support neighborhood revitalization and generate a higher level of productivity in participation.
- Update and refresh community parks in the City as it applies to Prairie Center Park, Lone Elm, Black Bob, Two Trails, and Olathe Girls Softball Park.
- Continue to develop hard surface trails with Johnson County Parks throughout the City.
- Update the Cemetery Master Plan for the City to include adding more burial property.
- Create Master Plan for cultural and historic sites/parks including Mahaffie Stagecoach Stop & Farm Historic Site/Heritage Center and Ensor Park & Museum.
- Establish a tree canopy goal for the City and decrease the mortality rate of trees for the first three years.
- Replace outdated landscapes in the City.
- Enhance community gardens program in the City working with KSU, Churches, and Olathe Med Center.
- Develop master plan for public art in the City.

6.4 COMMUNITY VISION AND GOAL FOR RECREATION FACILITIES

“Our vision for recreation facilities in Olathe is to create destination facilities that support neighborhood and community needs while meeting a cost recovery goal to keep the facilities productive and financially sustainable.”

6.4.1 GOAL

Seek to make all City-owned recreation facilities, at minimum, 60% productive during prime and nonprime times based on providing quality programs, creating effective partnerships, and adding quality amenities at each site.

6.4.2 STRATEGIES FOR RECREATION FACILITIES

- Update Prairie Center and Black Bob Park recreation facilities and amenities to make the community park as productive and financially sustainable as possible.
- Update neighborhood pools in the City.
- Based on the approval results of the new Olathe Community Center, consider the development of a new community center / field house to balance availability across the City.
- Update the Swim Beach at Lake Olathe as a destination facility and combine it with a concession and rental marina operation along with an adventure sports program (Develop a Lake Olathe Master Plan and include these tactics).
- Update year-round use of current facilities.
6.5 COMMUNITY VISION AND GOAL FOR PROGRAMMING

“Our vision for programming is to create the widest level of age segment appeal that engages all residents to experience programs services provided by the City that improves their quality of life.”

6.5.1 GOAL

Achieve a goal of 35% of all Olathe residents experiencing an organized recreation program through the Department by 2015.

6.5.2 STRATEGIES FOR PROGRAMMING

• Provide comprehensive, quality recreation and educational programming aimed at satisfying the needs of varying age levels, physical abilities, and special interests in these core services: youth and adult sports, special populations, enrichment, aquatic facilities, aquatic programming, historic sites, and special events.
• Provide efficient and effective leadership for delivery of quality services for the community.
• Promote public involvement and actively seek input in the planning, operation, and participation of the programs provided by the Department.
• Improve effective performance measures used throughout the Department to judge the performance of staff, programs, and recreation facilities.
• Continue to foster a strong volunteer program targeting 15% of the total work force hours being provided by volunteers.
• Update partnership policies for program services as it applies to operational partners, vendor partners, service partners, co-branding partners, resource development partners, and internal City partners.
• Strive to keep 40-50% of all recreation programs in the Introductory, Takeoff, or Growth lifecycle stages in order to align with trends and help meet the evolving needs of the community.
• Classify programs as core essential, important or value added based on public and private benefits of the program.
• Incorporate programming standards for all services provided across the system.
• Continue to find new earned income opportunities to support programs such as the summer concert series, recreation facilities, and specialty programs in the City.
• Promote community health and wellness through programming that addresses physical, mental, environmental, economical, and social wellbeing.
6.6 COMMUNITY VISION AND GOAL FOR OPERATIONS AND STAFFING

“Our vision for operations and staffing is to provide quality programs, facilities, historic sites, parks and trails that deliver on the community’s expectations for a safe and enjoyable experience while keeping the infrastructure of the system in a quality state.”

6.6.1 GOAL

Invest 3% of total asset value in park-related infrastructure improvements on an annual basis to keep the City parks, facilities, and amenities in a respectable level of care.

6.6.2 STRATEGIES FOR OPERATIONS AND STAFFING

- Benchmark staff levels of the Department against other similar size cities with similar size parks, trails, historic sites, and facilities to determine how well Olathe is managing its system.
- Develop a maintenance management plan for the park system to help meet visitor and elected officials expectations for quality parks, trails, historic sites, and facilities.
- Develop an updated signage plan for the Department in all parks and facilities that provide good way-finding in the parks in both English and Spanish.
- Develop an updated urban forestry plan for the City.
- Determine the cost of City-owned facilities and the cost to provide the service that the Parks Department maintains and ways to fund it outside of taking resources away from park needs.

6.7 COMMUNITY VISION AND GOAL FOR FINANCING

“Our vision for financing the Department is to determine what is expected by the community and the elected officials for quality parks, trails, historic sites, recreation facilities and amenities and program services that provide an acceptable level of funding to deliver on these expected outcomes to create a sustainable system.”

6.7.1 GOAL

Seek voter renewal of the 1/8 sales tax to maintain parks, trails, and recreation facilities in 2014.

6.7.2 STRATEGIES FOR FINANCING

- Establish a Sales Tax Committee to promote the renewal of the parks 1/8 cents tax to preserve and protect the parks and recreation system in Olathe.
- Update the developer impact fee ordinance.
- Determine the cost of street medians and bike lanes in the City. Seek additional funding sources to support the existing 35 miles of median maintenance. Plan for additional growth of median miles, maintenance expectations, and requirements in the future.
- All new programmatic ideas developed for the City such as a Arts Master Plan need to have a funding source identified to support the cost of development and ongoing maintenance.
- Develop an earned income plan for the Department that identifies all available funding sources that could be considered for the Department to help offset operational and capital cost.
- Consider dam care at the lakes.
CHAPTER SEVEN

CONCLUSION

The City of Olathe Parks and Recreation Department has done a very good job over the last 15 years developing parks and recreation facilities across the City. The voter approved 1/8-cent sales tax 15 years ago provided the Department the opportunity to improve the system and develop additional recreation facilities. Once again, voters need to approve the 1/8-cent sales tax to keep the system relevant and effective for the residents. Currently, the park and recreation system is well used and appreciated by the community. Moving forward, additional actions are required to retain a quality system and stay ahead of the park infrastructure and asset needs that the Department owns and manages. Improving the existing recreation amenities and trails, as well as continuing to add new amenities that the community desires will ensure the City of Olathe is a community of choice for residents of Johnson County.

The master plan outlines many recommendations for each element of the system, which will require support from the Mayor and City Council, key leadership in the City Manager’s office, and Department staff to implement the recommendations. The recommendations address community unmet needs and expectations, as well as support the economic and health related goals of the City Council and Mayor’s office.

The opening of the new community center in July 2014 will provide the Department its first true indoor space that staff has the ability to take ownership of and program. The facility will be another goal achieved from guidance derived from the previous master plan’s recommendations.

This master plan is a planning tool that allows the Department to manage forward. The City has acted well on implementing the recommendations from previous plans. The success from implementing the previous plan is evidence that the process works. Continuation of carrying out the recommendations is critical, as the Department has become a major service provider to the community and an integral “quality of life” expectation of people living and working in Olathe. Community support follows great vision, so let the advancement begin!