

**APPENDIX B**

**RECREATION SURVEY AND  
PUBLIC WORKSHOP RESULTS**

# Appendix B

## RECREATION SURVEY AND PUBLIC WORKSHOP RESULTS

### INTRODUCTION

This appendix includes all of the data from the survey as well as the public workshop. This information is summarized in Section IV of the document. The first part of Appendix B includes the complete answers from all 380 respondents to the survey, as well as analysis of these responses. Some questions are cross-tabbed by geographical area, or age group to get more insight into what the community sees as a necessary component in a park and recreation system for Klamath Falls.

The second section includes information from the community workshop that was held in Klamath Falls in March. A summary of this information is also included in Section IV of the document.

### RECREATION SURVEY RESULTS

The results of the survey questions are compiled on the following pages.

## QUESTIONS FOR ALL AGES 10 AND OVER

**QUESTION 1.**  
**My age is:**

This question is used to determine and accurate demographic profile of the respondents to the survey, and also is beneficial in being able to cross-tab responses to other questions by age category or age group.

**Table B-1**  
**Age Distribution of Responses**

Age Bracket	Number of Responses	Percentage of Sample
10-14	38	9.4%
15-17	27	6.7%
18-24	23	5.7%
25-34	37	9.1%
35-44	85	21.0%
45-54	82	20.2%
55-64	65	16.0%
65+	48	11.9%

**QUESTION 2.**  
**How would you rate the general upkeep and maintenance of the existing park system in Klamath Falls?**

Respondents were asked to rate the upkeep and maintenance of existing parks. They were given four choices, from excellent to poor.

**Table B-2**  
**General Upkeep and Maintenance of Park System**

Rating	Number of Responses	Percentage of Sample	Medford Survey (for comparison)
Good	202	51.0%	65.5%
Fair	154	38.9%	8.4%
Excellent	29	7.3%	26.0%
Poor	11	2.8%	0.0%

The responses to this questions were for the most part centralized, with few people choosing either 'excellent' or 'poor'. Half of the respondents considered the upkeep and maintenance of parks 'good'. The comparison with the same question asked to Medford residents shows a dramatic difference in how the maintenance of the parks is perceived by the community. The majority (91.5%) of Medford respondents considered the parks maintenance excellent or good, compared to 58.3% for Klamath Falls. This question was broken down into survey areas, to see how the geographical location affected the perception of the upkeep and maintenance of parks in Klamath Falls.

**Table B-3**  
**General Upkeep and Maintenance by Geographical Location**

Rating	Lakefront Neighborhood	Pacific Terrace	Central Area	Mills Neighborhood	South Suburban
Good	54.1%	52.9%	44.8%	37.5%	61.3%
Fair	37.8%	36.3%	44.8%	50.0%	29.3%
Excellent	6.8%	5.9%	7.6%	10.0%	8.0%
Poor	1.4%	4.9%	2.9%	2.5%	1.3%

When the question is analyzed based on geographic location, the results are similar. The South Suburban area had the most percentage of responses for 'Good', while Mills Neighborhood had the highest number of responses for 'Fair' and 'Excellent'. Pacific Terrace garnered the most 'Poor' responses, although it was still low in comparison to other responses.

**QUESTION 3.**  
**What do you feel are the 3 most important park facilities or recreation activities needed in Klamath Falls?**

This was an open-ended question in which the respondents were asked to identify what the most needed facility or activity is. The most common responses are listed below.

**Table B-4**  
**Most Important Park Facilities or**  
**Recreation Activities Needed**

<b>Response</b>	<b>Number of Responses</b>
Playgrounds	47
Nature hiking/walking trails	43
Ice skating/hockey rink	41
Pools (no type specified)	36
Picnic/barbecue Areas	35
Bike trails	34
Skateboard park	29
Sports fields (no type specified)	28
Recreation activities for youth	26
Basketball courts	26
Indoor Pool	20
Soccer fields	20
Tennis courts	19
Multi-use indoor recreation facility	17
Baseball fields	16
Fun park (mini-golf, waterslide, etc.)	15
Add/improve restrooms	13
Trails (no type specified)	12
Teen Center	12
Large open space areas	11
Sports programs	10
Pet areas	10
Snowboard/ski park	9
BMX track	8
Boating	7
Better park maintenance	6
Wildlife/bird watching	6
More neighborhood parks	5
Water Park	5
Archery Range	5
Softball fields	4
Parking in parks	4
Outdoor pool	4
Water sports	4

<b>Fishing</b>	<b>4</b>
<b>Indoor soccer</b>	<b>4</b>
<b>Volleyball courts</b>	<b>4</b>

Additional responses included: football fields (3), more benches (3), summer activities and programs (3), wetlands (3), outdoor stage / entertainment area (3), shooting / rifle range (2), zoo (2), public golf course (2), community gardens (2), track & field (2), handicapped accessible equipment (2), community activities (2), batting cages (2), more park security (2), snack facilities (2), quiet places (2), hot springs, large community park, adult volleyball league, sports for handicapped kids, rowing club, day camp, equestrian trails, x-country ski trails, handball courts, horseshoes, dog supervision, wild animal control, safer facilities, indoor track, weight training/exercise center, senior center, historical sites, motor sports park.

The results showed that the most important facility needed was playgrounds, followed by hiking/walking trails, and an ice skating/hockey rink. Sports fields were ranked ninth in the list. This table contains all of the responses as they appeared on the surveys, thus the large number of different responses to the questions, alluding to the diversity of interests in the community.

In Table B-5 below, we rank the responses according to the general category that they are pertaining to. For example, all sports fields will be categorized under one heading, rather than broken down into the individual types of sports fields. This provides an overall picture of which type of general facility the respondents to the survey are most interested in.

**Table B-5  
Most Important Park Facilities or  
Recreation Activities Needed**

<b>Response (all types included)</b>	<b>Number of Responses</b>
<b>Trails</b>	<b>91</b>
<b>Sports fields</b>	<b>75</b>
<b>Swimming</b>	<b>60</b>
<b>Sport courts</b>	<b>50</b>
<b>Playgrounds</b>	<b>47</b>
<b>Ice skating/hockey rink</b>	<b>41</b>
<b>Picnic/barbecue areas</b>	<b>35</b>
<b>Skateboard park</b>	<b>29</b>
<b>Recreation activities for youth</b>	<b>26</b>
<b>Multi-use indoor recreation facility</b>	<b>17</b>
<b>Fun park (mini-golf, waterslide, etc.)</b>	<b>15</b>

The results of this differs from Table B-5 in that the combination of all types of facilities makes trails the number one answer, followed by sports fields, pools, and sports courts. Playgrounds still ranks high on this list also, meaning it is an important facility that the community feels is needed.

**QUESTION 4.**  
**How often have you visited the following parks or facilities in the last 12 months?**

In this question, respondents were asked to identify their visitation pattern for a pre-determined list of recreation areas. The intent of the question was to measure facility usage and frequency of visitation.

**Table B-6**  
**Facility Usage for 12 Month Period**

Park or Facility	Not at all	1-5 Times	6-10 Times	11+ Times
Moore Park	9.7%	41.7%	23.6%	25.1%
Veteran's Park	26.1%	51.6%	13.6%	8.7%
Wiard Park	43.7%	44.2%	8.4%	3.7%
Conger Park	65.4%	21.1%	5.7%	7.7%
Kit Carson Park	68.7%	21.6%	3.5%	6.2%
Kiger Stadium	72.7%	21.6%	3.2%	2.5%
Mills-Kiwanis Park	84.6%	12.7%	2.2%	0.5%
Krause Park	97.5%	1.5%	0.2%	0.7%

Of the eight recreation areas listed above, Moore Park receives the most use. It is important to note that nearly a quarter of the users visit this park more than 11 times per year. Krause Park had the highest response of people who do not use the park.

When visitation is analyzed on a per capita basis, the following is the result.

**Table B-7**  
**Per Capita Facility Usage in a 12 Month Period**

Park or Facility	Per Capita Visitation
Moore Park	6.9
Veteran's Park	3.0
Wiard Park	2.6
Conger Park	2.2
Kit Carson Park	1.9
Kiger Stadium	1.0
Mills-Kiwanis Park	0.6
Krause Park	0.2

The per capita facility usage shows the dramatic difference in residents who use Moore Park as compared to other parks in the area.

**QUESTION 5.**  
**If there are parks you do not use, please name the park and reason for not using it.**

This was an open-ended question in which the respondents were asked to name parks they do not use, and then list reasons for why they did not use the park. The most common answers are listed below.

**Table B-8**  
**Parks Not Used and**  
**Reasons for Not Using**

<b>Reason</b>	<b>Number of Responses</b>
<b>Mills-Kiwanis Park</b>	<b>73</b>
too far/not near my neighborhood	31
don't feel safe	10
no facilities I use	9
in a bad neighborhood	8
run down/needs improvements	6
drug activity	3
too many teens hanging out	2
gang activity	2
not familiar with park/location	1
bad tennis courts	1
<b>Krause Park</b>	<b>73</b>
not familiar with park/location	59
too far/not near my neighborhood	12
no facilities I use	2
<b>Kit Carson Park</b>	<b>53</b>
too far/not near my neighborhood	29
not familiar with park/location	8
no facilities I use	7
needs improvements	4
not enough time	3
no children's facilities	1
ground on fields not level	1
<b>Wiard Park</b>	<b>35</b>

too far/not near my neighborhood	27
don't feel safe	3
equipment is poor	2
not familiar with park/location	1
not enough time	1
drug activity	1

Table B-8 (continued)

Reason	Number of Responses
<b>Kiger Stadium</b>	<b>33</b>
not interested in sports/baseball	15
too far/not near my neighborhood	9
not familiar with facility	7
not enough time	1
no family events	1
<b>Conger Park</b>	<b>21</b>
too far/not near my neighborhood	17
no facilities I use	2
not familiar with park/location	1
not enough time	1
<b>Veteran's Memorial Park</b>	<b>16</b>
don't feel safe	5
homeless people	3
crime	2
dirty/full of trash	2
too far/not near my neighborhood	1
too loud	1
equipment is poor	1
no children's equipment	1
<b>Moore Park</b>	<b>3</b>
no facilities I use	2
too far/not near my neighborhood	1
<b>Fairview Park</b>	<b>1</b>
unsafe play equipment	1

<b>Stukel Park</b>	<b>1</b>
<b>gang activity</b>	<b>1</b>
<b>Richmond Park</b>	<b>1</b>
<b>run down/needs improvements</b>	<b>1</b>

The two parks receiving the most comments were Mills-Kiwanis Park and Krause Park. Both had 73 responses, although for vastly different reasons. Most people responded that Mills-Kiwanis Park was too far from their neighborhood, although a number of responses indicated that people were wary of the neighborhood or didn't feel safe, citing examples of gang and drug activity. Krause Park received the most comments related to not knowing about the park or its location.

**QUESTION 6.**  
**How often have you used the following trails in a 12 month period?**

Similar to question 4, respondents were asked to identify their visitation pattern for a pre-determined list of trails in the Klamath Falls Area. The intent of the question was to measure trail usage and frequency of use.

**Table B-9**  
**Trail Usage for 12 Month Period**

<b>Trail</b>	<b>Not at all</b>	<b>1-5 Times</b>	<b>6-10 Times</b>	<b>11+ Times</b>
<b>Bike Path</b>	<b>41.3%</b>	<b>29.5%</b>	<b>12.1%</b>	<b>17.1%</b>
<b>Upper Loop at Moore Park</b>	<b>47.3%</b>	<b>35.6%</b>	<b>6.6%</b>	<b>10.4%</b>
<b>Link River Trail</b>	<b>41.2%</b>	<b>38.1%</b>	<b>11.9%</b>	<b>8.8%</b>
<b>Rails to Trails/OC&amp;E</b>	<b>74.1%</b>	<b>17.0%</b>	<b>3.0%</b>	<b>5.9%</b>
<b>Exercise Path at Moore Park Marina</b>	<b>60.3%</b>	<b>29.8%</b>	<b>6.0%</b>	<b>3.9%</b>
<b>Wing Watcher Trail</b>	<b>82.6%</b>	<b>12.6%</b>	<b>2.4%</b>	<b>2.4%</b>

Of the trails listed, the Bike Path receives the most amount of use, with approximately 30% of respondents using it over six times in a 12 month period. The Wing Watcher Trail had the most responses of not being used, probably due to its specialized use, and lack of connections to other trails.

When trail use is analyzed on a per capita basis, the following, Table B-10 below lists the results.

**Table B-10**  
**Per Capita Trail Usage in a 12 Month Period**

Trail	Per Capita Visitation
Bike Path	4.4
Upper Loop at Moore Park	3.2
Link River Trail	2.8
Exercise Path at Moore Park Marina	2.0
Rails to Trails/OC&E	1.6
Wing Watcher Trail	0.9

As shown in Table B-10, the Bike Path is still the most heavily used trail in the Klamath Falls Area. The results are similar to Table B-9, again showing the lack of visitation of the Wing Watcher Trail. The reason for this found in Table B-11, an analysis of an alternate answer, where respondents could choose that they were not familiar with the trail. The results are shown in Table B-11 are listed on the following page.

**Table B-11  
Respondents Not Familiar with  
Area Trails**

Trail	Not Familiar with Trail
Wing Watcher Trail	15.4%
Rails to Trails/OC&E	8.0%
Exercise Path at Moore Park Marina	4.7%
Link River Trail	4.0%
Bike Path	3.7%
Upper Loop at Moore Park	2.2%

As seen from the response to this question, use of the trails is in direct relation to people's awareness of them. The Upper Loop at Moore Park having more familiarity but less use than the Bike Path is probably due to its location in Moore Park and community awareness of that park and its facilities.

**QUESTION 7.  
What emphasis should be placed on the use of Moore Park?**

This question asked the respondents to choose from a fixed list of choices about how Moore Park should be used. There were two distinctly different options, and a third specifying a combination of these two. The responses are found below in Table B-12.

**Table B-12**

Use of Moore Park

Response	Number of Responses	Percentage of Sample
Natural Open Space and Passive Uses	50	13.3%
Sports Fields and Other Active Uses	24	6.4%
Combination of the Above	303	80.4%

The most common response was to use Moore Park as both passive use natural open space and for sports fields and other active uses. For those respondents that specified a particular choice over the other, natural open space and passive use was selected twice as much as sports fields and other active uses.

**QUESTION 8.**  
**What improvements are needed at Moore Park? (you may answer more than once)**

This question expanded on Question 7, asking for specific improvements that are needed at Moore Park. There were five options to choose from, and an 'Other' category for additional answers.

Table B-13  
 Improvements to Moore Park

Response	Number of Responses	Percentage of Sample
Upgrade and add restrooms	279	32.1%
Provide more parking	182	20.9%
Develop more unpaved trails	165	19.0%
Develop more paved trails	96	11.0%
Upgrade tennis courts	80	9.2%
Other (list)	68	7.8%

Responses listed in the 'Other' category include: Add/improve playground equipment (10), upgrade picnic areas (7), add basketball courts (6), re-open upper loop to cars (4), improve maintenance (4), add swimming facilities (4), open wading pool (4), expand developed area (3), allow leased pet access (3), keep existing trees healthy (3), archery range (3), add snack bar (3), locate restrooms closer to facilities (3), more security (3), handicapped accessibility (2), clean up garbage (2), more landscaping (2), more pavilions (2), amphitheater (2), petting zoo (2), bug control (2), enhance wildlife habitat (2), add pet run areas, batting cages, volleyball courts, equipment for elderly, baseball field, improve horseshoe pits, have facilities open year round, add lodge/restaurant, improve trail access, better pet supervision, more community events, skateboard park, improve

soccer fields, football field, encourage less auto traffic, remove tennis courts, improve gingerbread house, improve RV dump station, more advertisement.

From the responses, a large majority of people wanted additional restrooms or upgrading of the existing facilities. Not surprisingly, the second rated answer was to provide more parking, a major deficiency identified with the park. Additional answers with high response rates included improvements and additional playground equipment, and also upgrading of picnic areas.

**QUESTION 9.  
How would you rate the overall appearance of Klamath Falls?**

In this question, respondents were asked to rate the overall appearance of the City. The question stated four possible responses. These responses are listed on the following page in Table B-14.

**Table B-14  
Appearance of Klamath Falls**

Rating	Number of Responses	Percentage of Sample
Excellent	10	2.5%
Good	219	55.3%
Poor	149	37.6%
No Opinion	18	4.5%

The most common response was 'Good', garnering over half of all responses. 'Poor' was the next most popular answer. A very small number of respondents consider the overall appearance of Klamath Falls to be 'Excellent'.

This question was then cross-tabbed by survey areas, to determine if there was any variation in perception based on geographic location.

**Table B-15  
Appearance of Klamath Falls  
(by geographic location)**

Rating	Lakefront Neighborhood	Pacific Terrace	Central Area	Mills Neighborhood	South Suburban
Excellent	2.7%	3.9%	1.0%	2.5%	2.6%
Good	50.7%	48.5%	59.2%	65.0%	58.4%
Poor	48.3%	45.6%	32.0%	30.0%	32.5%
No Opinion	2.7%	1.9%	7.8%	2.5%	6.5%

While the Pacific Terrace Area had the highest number of respondents that considered the appearance of Klamath Falls 'Excellent', the Mills Neighborhood had the highest percentage of people that considered the city's appearance 'Good', and the lowest number of responses for 'Poor'.

**QUESTION 10.**  
**Recognizing that there would be an added cost associated with new development, do you feel that additional park and recreation facilities are needed in Klamath Falls?**

**Table B-16**  
**Additional Park and Recreation Facilities Needed**

Response	Number of Responses	Percentage of Sample
Yes	267	69.5%
No	117	30.5%

Over two-thirds of respondents feel that additional park and recreation facilities are needed, even taking into account the fact that the development will entail an associated cost.

The responses were cross-tabbed by age-group, to determine which portion of the population feels more strongly about additional park and recreation facilities.

**Table B-17**  
**Additional Park and Recreation Facilities (by age group)**

Response	10-14	15-17	18-24	25-34	35-44	45-54	55-64	65+
Yes	91.9%	88.9%	59.1%	67.6%	76.8%	74.1%	52.5%	45.0%
No	8.1%	11.1%	40.9%	32.4%	23.2%	25.9%	47.5%	55.0%

The responses, when analyzed by age-group are not surprising, showing the numbers in favor steadily declining with age. This is due to the fact that the younger respondents are not financially responsible for paying for the facilities, but will probably get a large amount of use from them. The older respondents are, on the whole, less willing to pay for additional facilities, and will probably use them less.

**QUESTION 11.**  
**Do you feel that a multi-purpose indoor recreation center offering a wide variety of facilities is needed in the Klamath Falls area?**

This question asked respondents whether or not the City needs a multi-use indoor recreation facility. They could answer yes or no. The next question, #12, is a follow up to this question. The summary of responses is located in Table B-18 below.

**Table B-18  
Multi-Purpose Indoor Recreation Center**

Response	Number of Responses	Percentage of Sample
Yes	309	80.3%
No	76	19.7%

Over 80% if respondents feel that a multi-purpose indoor recreation facility is needed. This result is slightly higher than Medford and Roseburg, each of which had 74% of respondents answer 'yes' to a similar question.

**QUESTION 12.**  
If you feel that an indoor recreation center is needed, what facilities would you most like to see? (you may answer more than once)

**Table B-19  
Facilities for Indoor Recreation Center**

Response	Number of Responses	Percentage of Sample
Space for teen activities	233	17.7%
Indoor swimming pool	228	17.3%
Multi-use gymnasium	217	16.5%
Weightroom/Fitness room	141	10.7%
Room for aerobics and exercise	134	10.2%
Large multi-purpose/reception room	127	9.7%
Racquetball courts	100	7.6%
Indoor soccer fields	73	5.5%
Other (list)	63	4.8%

Responses listed in the 'Other' category include: ice skating (20), skateboarding (10), rollerblading / skating (4), children's play areas (3), basketball (3), hockey (2), climbing wall (2), billiards (2), batting cages (2), track (2), wrestling mats (3), baby-sitting/childcare (2), volleyball, Boys & Girls Club, indoor softball, tutoring/education, arena football, sauna/hot tub, badminton, boxing, tennis courts, snack bar, pre-school, dance hall, archery lanes, arts & crafts, BMX track, ping-pong tables.

The responses to this question are similar to other questions in the survey, highlighting a lack of adequate facilities for teens, the need for a public indoor swimming pool, and other indoor facilities (Table B-4).

**QUESTION 13.**  
**In 1991 the City stopped offering recreation programs due to lack of funding. Do you feel that the City should again offer recreation programs?**

**Table B-20**  
**Provide Recreation Programs**

Response	Number of Responses	Percentage of Sample
Yes	326	84.5%
No	60	15.5%

An overwhelming majority of respondents support the City again providing recreation programs. The problem, of course, is funding the programs, but should funding become available, this would be a necessary element to add to the City's operations.

**QUESTION 14.**  
**If you answered "yes" to the above question, what programs do you feel the City should provide? (please mark all that apply)**

This is the follow-up question to #14, where respondents were asked if the City should provide recreation programs. This question expands on that idea, asking residents which programs should be offered. Five options are available, with an option of listing other ideas.

**Table B-21**  
**Programs That Should Be Provided**

Response	Number of Responses	Percentage of Sample
Teen activities	269	27.2%
Youth sport programs	262	26.5%
Children's playground activities	185	18.7%
Special interest classes	135	13.7%
Adult sports programs	117	11.8%
Other (list)	21	2.1%

Responses listed in the 'Other' category include: concerts/entertainment (3), skateboarding (3), swimming lessons (2), teen activities (2), biking (2); handicapped activities, water sports, boating, fishing, archery, shooting, theater groups, baby-sitting, senior activities, family activities, Pee-Wee football, Get Active America.

As in earlier questions, a large number of respondents stated that an important aspect of the community should be related to youth activities. Almost three quarters of the responses were for teen activities, youth

sports programs, and children's playground activities. This is similar to trends in both Medford and Roseburg, where youth activities far outweighed adult oriented programs.

**QUESTION 15.**  
**Do you feel the City should offer special programs or provide facilities for the teen-age youth?**

**Table B-22**  
**Special Programs or Facilities for Youth**

Response	Number of Responses	Percentage of Sample
Yes	329	86.1%
No	53	13.9%

The respondents to this question again show overwhelming support for programs and facilities directed towards the community's teen-age youth.

**QUESTION 16.**  
**If you feel that special programs are needed for the teen-age youth, what types of programs or facilities should be offered? Please select your top three (3) choices.**

A follow-up question to #15, respondents were asked to specify what types of programs or facilities would be needed for teen-age youth. A list of seven choices were offered, and respondents were directed to select their top three answers. Answers are categorized below.

**Table B-23**  
**Facilities or Programs for Teen-Age Youth**

Response	Number of Responses	Percentage of Sample
Fun park (mini-golf, go-karts, etc.)	198	17.4%
Organized sports	197	17.3%
Spaces for teens to gather or "hang out"	168	14.8%
Dances/social events	162	14.2%
Job training/career placement programs	144	12.7%
Game room (billiards, video games, etc.)	126	11.1%
Health education programs (alcohol, drugs, AIDS, etc.)	115	10.1%
Other (list)	28	2.5%

Responses listed in the 'Other' category include: skatepark (9), environmental education (2), ice-skating (2), basketball (2), batting cages (2), clean-up/restoration projects (2), club/intramural sports (2), all-night gym, counseling, programs for teen mothers, Get Active America, Wake Up Klamath Falls, family activities, biking club, motorcycle/auto racing club, shooting range, computer access.

The most popular answer was for a fun park, consisting of mini-golf, go-kart racing, and waterslide. Also receiving a number of responses was organized sports. The most common 'Other' answer was a skatepark.

Table B-24 below breaks down the responses by age groups youth (10-17), adult (18-24), and senior (55 and over).

**Table B-24  
Facilities or Programs for Teen-Age Youth  
(by age group)**

Response	10-17	18-54	55+
Fun park (mini-golf, go-karts, etc.)	23.9%	17.6%	11.9%
Organized sports	15.7%	17.8%	17.2%
Spaces for teens to gather or "hang out"	13.7%	15.3%	14.2%
Dances/social events	13.7%	14.0%	15.3%
Job training/career placement programs	6.1%	11.9%	19.5%
Game room (billiards, video games, etc.)	19.3%	10.9%	5.4%
Health education programs (alcohol, drugs, AIDS, etc.)	5.1%	9.9%	14.6%
Other (list)	2.5%	2.6%	1.9%

The results divide out dramatically between the age groups. Respondents ages 10-17 favored a fun-park and game room as the top choices for teen activities. Adult respondents chose organized sports and spaces for teens to hang out as most needed. Seniors, ages 55 and over, favored dances/social events, as well as educational programs and job training.

**QUESTION 17.**

**Which of the following projects do you feel are most needed in Klamath Falls? Please prioritize the entire list by writing a #1 for your first preference, a #2 for your second preference, a #3 for your third preference, etc.**

Respondents to this question were asked to prioritize this entire list. On the following page is Table B-25, which shows the number of times a project was picked as the number one response.

**Table B-25  
Projects Most Needed in Klamath Falls**

<b>Response</b>	<b>Number of First Responses</b>	<b>Percentage of Sample</b>
Upgrade existing parks	126	36.3%
Construct an indoor recreation center	73	21.0%
Develop a sports field complex	50	14.4%
Construct an indoor swimming pool	40	11.5%
Acquire natural open space	26	7.5%
Acquire land for future parks	15	4.3%
Construct paved and unpaved trails	11	3.2%
Construct new parks	6	1.8%

Many respondents chose 'Other' for their first response. The responses listed in this category include: ice skating rink (13), fun park/mini-golf (6), skateboard park (4), teen spaces (3), fix roads and sidewalks (3), city beautification (2), wildlife habitat, landscaping, outdoor swimming pool, more activities/programs, turn Modoc land into park, water activities, hot springs, shooting range, Discovery Zone for kids 10 & under, archery range, BMX track, basketball courts, remove drug dealers from parks, make parks safer.

Based on the results, approximately 36% of respondents felt that the City should prioritize its efforts to 'upgrade existing parks'. There was additional support for construction of new facilities, including the indoor recreation center, sports field complex, and indoor swimming pool. A small number of answers favored acquisition of natural open space, and there was very little support for construction of new parks and trails.

The following table shows the total score of each response after giving the responses a weighted value. Responses were ranked according to priority, with a first choice response assigned a score of "9", a second choice assigned a score of "8", and so on.

**Table B-26  
Most Needed Projects**

(weighted totals)

Response	Weighted Total
Upgrade existing parks	2325
Construct an indoor recreation center	1889
Develop a sports field complex	1450
Construct an indoor swimming pool	1427
Construct paved and unpaved trails	1267
Acquire natural open space	1104
Acquire land for future parks	1048
Construct new parks	860

While the majority of responses were similar, there was a difference between the two methods of analysis. The choice of 'construct paved and unpaved trails' rose slightly as a weighted response.

**QUESTION 18.**  
**If the City were to obtain land for natural open space, which types would be most important to you? You may select up to three (3) choices.**

Table B-27  
 Types of Natural Open Space Needed

Response	Number of Responses	Percentage of Sample
Scenic areas for quiet enjoyment	253	31.4%
Stream or creek corridors	211	26.2%
Wetlands	125	15.5%
Significant vegetation areas	91	11.3%
City should not acquire open space	66	8.2%
Steep hillsides	46	5.7%
Other (list)	13	1.6%

Responses listed in the 'Other' category include: Lake Ewauna waterfront (4), obtain Conger Heights, manage Moore Park open space, outdoor areas for teens, waterfalls, wildlife park.

While scenic areas for quiet enjoyment was the top choice, preservation of major water features was also an important consideration. Approximately 26% chose stream or creek corridors, as well as the top answer in the 'Other' category being acquisition of Lake Ewauna waterfront. Only 8% stated that the City should not acquire open space.

**QUESTION 19.**  
**How do you feel new trail development should occur in the City of Klamath Falls?**

Trail usage was discussed earlier, and this question asked respondents to choose what direction the future development of trails in the city should occur. Five choices were offered, and the results are compiled below in Table B-28.

**Table B-28**  
**New Trail Development**

Response	Number of Responses	Percentage of Sample
Link existing trails (OC&E Trail, Canal Trail, etc.) together to form longer trail routes	90	32.6%
Construct unpaved trails in the surrounding hills and other open space areas	59	21.4%
Do not feel trail development is important	51	18.5%
Develop bike trails along existing streets	47	17.0%
Construct shorter segments throughout the community	29	10.5%

The most common response was to link existing trails together to form longer trail segments. There was little support for construction of shorter, neighborhood segments. Approximately 19% of respondents felt new trail development was not important.

**QUESTIONS FOR AGES 18 AND OVER**

**QUESTION 20.**  
**The City owns a number of very small mini-parks that are undeveloped or contain old and outdated playground equipment. What should be done with these sites?**

**Table B-29**  
**Mini-Park Options**

Response	Number of Responses	Percentage of Sample

Upgrade and improve the park sites	178	57.6%
Sell the sites and use the money to upgrade nearby parks	70	22.7%
Leave sites as they are and ask the neighborhoods to maintain them	53	17.2%
Other (list)	8	2.6%

Responses listed in the 'Other' category include: improve most used and sell the rest (4), maintain existing (3), upgrade then ask neighborhoods to maintain (2), add more similar parks (2), find organization sponsors for parks (2), provide organization to neighborhoods to maintain parks, improve old playground equipment or remove it.

A majority of respondents consider upgrading and improving the existing mini-parks to be the best course of action. A number of the responses in the 'Other' category provided useful insight. A good suggestion was to organize and develop a maintenance plan with the neighborhoods before turning them over, thus assuring there is a plan in which the neighborhood can adhere to in future maintenance of the parks.

**QUESTION 21.**  
**In general, the cost of developing and maintaining larger parks is less per acre than smaller parks. Larger community parks offer more facilities and activities although they are usually located farther apart. Which type of park do you feel is most needed in Klamath Falls?**

This question is used to determine which type of park system the community would want most. Short descriptions of each park system were given, and respondents were asked to pick which one they feel is most needed. The summary of answers is found in Table B-30 on the following page.

**Table B-30**  
**Type of Park System**

Response	Number of Responses	Percentage of Sample
Neighborhood parks, approximately 5 acres in size, located within a half mile of most residents. They would provide all of the facilities of a mini-park plus picnic areas, basketball court, play field, etc.	147	49.0%
Large multi-use community parks approximately 15-25 acres in size and designed to serve the entire area. (Moore Park is an example)	109	36.3%
Small mini-parks, less than one acre in size and located within most subdivisions. They would	25	8.3%

provide a children's playground and small grass area only.		
Open space that is left primarily in its natural condition. Maximum development would be a trail system.	19	6.3%

Almost half of those responding to the survey chose a neighborhood park system, which is the best balance between facilities and cost of development and maintenance. There is a large distinction between respondents who prefer neighborhood and community parks (approximately 85%) to those favoring mini-parks and open space.

**QUESTION 22.**  
**How important is it that commercial property owners be required to landscape or beautify their property?**

This question asked respondents to rate, by level of importance, commercial property beautification. Three responses were available to choose from: very important, somewhat important, and not important. The responses are summarized below in Table B-31

**Table B-31**  
**Beautification of Property**

Rating	Number of Responses	Percentage of Sample
Very Important	217	66.2%
Somewhat Important	99	30.2%
Not Important	12	3.7%

**QUESTION 23.**  
**Some cities budget money for beautification projects such as street landscaping, downtown plantings, entrance features, flower plantings, etc.? Do you feel the City of Klamath Falls should budget money for city beautification?**

This question is a corollary the above question on beautification of commercial property. This question expands the concept to include all city beautification projects, and ask if the residents believe that the City should spend money on these types of projects.

**Table B-32**  
**Budget Money for City Beautification**

Response	Number of Responses	Percentage of Sample
Yes	265	83.1%

No	54	16.9%
----	----	-------

**QUESTION 24.**  
**If you answered "yes" to the previous question, what types of beautification projects should be implemented? (Please check all that apply)**

This is a follow-up to Question 23, asking respondents to choose which types of beautification projects they would like to see. The responses are shown below.

**Table B-33**  
**Types of Beautification Projects**

Response	Number of Responses	Percentage of Sample
Street tree planting	198	17.3%
Planting of annual flowers	173	15.1%
Street landscaping	170	14.9%
City entrance features	155	13.6%
Downtown plaza/courtyards	139	12.2%
Water fountains and other features	116	10.2%
Banners and hanging baskets	86	7.5%
Murals and wall paintings	85	7.4%
Other (list)	20	1.8%

Responses listed in the 'Other' category include: keep litter picked up (2), enforce rules on clean yards/junk (2), assist property owners in maintenance/improvements (2), building clean-up/renovations (2), prevent vandalism (2), historical plaques, memorial statues, pave streets, benches, make Vet's park safer, plant vegetation on hillsides, remove ugly juniper bushes on Alameda, plant more trees on Alameda, create a Riverwalk, more sidewalks, drought tolerant plantings, maintain waterfall better, create historical district, plant perennials, use proper pruning techniques, make signs smaller.

The majority of responses were more favored towards landscaping and the use of vegetation to beautify the city, as opposed to more construction-oriented projects like plazas and fountains. A number of suggestions were offered in the 'Other' category, most commonly relating to clean-up and maintenance.

**QUESTION 25.**  
**Would you be willing to finance a park and recreation acquisition and development program through some type of special assessment on property, such as a general obligation bond?**

**Table B-34**  
**Finance a Recreation Acquisition and Development Program**

Rating	Number of Responses	Percentage of Sample	Roseburg Survey (for comparison)
Yes	202	65.6%	55.9%
No	106	34.4%	44.1%

While not a large majority, over two-thirds of respondents would support a recreation development program through a special assessment on property. The results of the Roseburg Survey were used as a comparison, and Klamath Falls has a slightly higher percentage of residents willing to financially support park acquisition and development.

The results of the following table are cross-tabbed by survey areas.

**Table B-35  
Financing of Park Development/Acquisition  
by Geographical Location**

Rating	Lakefront Neighborhood	Pacific Terrace	Central Area	Mills Neighborhood	South Suburban
Yes	49.1%	79.3%	64.4%	60.0%	66.7%
No	50.9%	20.7%	35.6%	40.0%	33.3%

The results when based on geographic location are very interesting. While the Central Area, Mills, and South Suburban areas are similar to the overall percentages, the Lakefront and Pacific Terrace areas vary dramatically. Lakefront Neighborhood respondents were against the financing of park development and acquisition, with less than 50% answering 'yes'. On the other hand, the Pacific Terrace area was largely in favor of financing, with almost 80% of respondents answering 'yes'.

**QUESTION 26.  
If you answered "yes", how much would you be willing to support?**

65% of respondents who are willing to financially support a special assessment, This question asked respondents how much they would be willing to pay for this. The responses are categorized in dollar increments from \$10 to \$100 annually. The responses are listed below in Table B-36.

**Table B-36  
Amount of Annual Financial Support**

Response	Number of Responses	Percentage of Sample
Up to \$20 annually	73	34.6%
Up to \$10 annually	58	27.5%

Up to \$50 annually	48	22.7%
Up to \$100 annually	32	15.2%

The results were then cross-tabbed by geographical location.

**Table B-37**  
Amount of Annual Financial Support  
by Geographical Location

Rating	Lakefront Neighborhood	Pacific Terrace	Central Area	Mills Neighborhood	South Suburban
Up to \$10 annually	30.8%	19.7%	23.1%	30.4%	40.9%
Up to \$20 annually	34.6%	23.1%	28.8%	42.3%	38.6%
Up to \$50 annually	30.8%	24.2%	26.9%	13.0%	15.9%
Up to \$100 annually	15.4%	27.3%	7.7%	17.4%	4.5%

Breaking the results down into survey areas illuminates a couple of points. Again Pacific Terrace shows great support, with over 27% of respondents willing to pay \$100 or more. Mills Neighborhood and South Suburban area, while showing good support for a special assessment, are on the whole only willing to pay a smaller amounts in the \$10-20 range annually. Lakefront Neighborhood, having the smallest amount of support for the special assessment overall, makes up for this somewhat with a number of respondents willing to pay in the \$50 range annually.

**QUESTION 27.**  
A youth sports complex is being proposed on Foothills Boulevard. What level of participation should the City of Klamath Falls assume in the development and operation of this facility?

This question was used to gauge respondents views on how involved the City should be in the proposed Klamath Sports Complex. Responses offered ranged from complete involvement in construction and maintenance of the facility to not being involved at all.

**Table B-38**  
City Involvement in Sports Complex

Response	Number of Responses	Percentage of Sample
Provide a portion of the money to develop the facility	84	30.7%
All of the above including management of the facility	77	28.1%
Not be involved	74	27.0%
Provide maintenance services	21	7.7%
Construct the entire facility with money from a tax-supported bond measure	18	6.6%

The results do not show a strong majority favoring any one option. The least favored options were to construct the entire facility through a bond measure, and to only provide maintenance services.

**QUESTION 28.**  
**What do you feel could be done to improve the annual Snowflake Festival?**

This open-ended question attempts to determine improvements, if any, that residents feel would make the annual Snowflake Festival a more successful community event. Overall, the question received a large number of responses. They are listed in Table B-39 below.

**Table B-39**  
**Improvements to the Snowflake Festival**

<b>Response</b>	<b>Number of Responses</b>
Nothing; so far it's great	36
No opinion	17
Cancel it/not needed	12
Improve quality of floats	10
More food/hot drink vendors	10
Never seen it	8
More bands/play longer	6
Better TV coverage/announcers	5
Hold it on a weekend	5
Combine w/ a winter sports festival	5
Haven't attended in recent years	4
More room for people to participate	4
Incentives for businesses involvement	4
Make downtown look better	3
Make route longer	3

**Table B-39 (continued)**

<b>Response</b>	<b>Number of Responses</b>
More places to sit	3
More activities for kids	3
Have businesses stay open longer	3
Let people watch from inside shops	3
Provide more restrooms	3
More advertisement	3

<b>More floats</b>	<b>3</b>
<b>Better organization</b>	<b>2</b>
<b>Turn over to private organization</b>	<b>2</b>
<b>Hold annual 'snowflake ball' formal</b>	<b>2</b>
<b>Make route shorter</b>	<b>2</b>
<b>Less floats</b>	<b>2</b>
<b>Hold it during the day</b>	<b>2</b>
<b>Discourage log trucks</b>	<b>2</b>
<b>More interest activities</b>	<b>2</b>

Other responses included: have more events through weekend, have gathering/party after parade, provide more security, involve schools more, try to attract statewide interest, easier access to staging area, awards for floats/lighting, not demand all same color lights, charge for people sitting in bleachers, wind breaks, transportation to parade for elderly and disabled, have crafts booths, hold it on south 6th street, make it less commercial, slow down parade, add ice/snow sculpting contest, keep parade area cleaner, let people throw candy.

As seen from the table, the most popular response was to do nothing, because respondents felt the Snowflake Festival was good as it is. A few respondents responded with suggestions to cancel the event, but did not give reasons for such action. Overall the responses involved three categories. One is to improve the quality of the event but having better floats, cleaner downtown, etc. Another is to make participants more comfortable by providing hot drinks, wind breaks, letting people view from indoors, etc. Last was a call for more community participation, in various forms.

**CURRENT RECREATION PARTICIPATION LEVELS**

Recreation demand is difficult to quantify because of the many factors that influence recreation participation and interests. There have been many approaches tried for identifying this demand, ranging from the use of national surveys and standards to measuring actual participant hours. Recognizing this problem, JCD began accumulating recreation participation information on communities throughout the northwest. Presently, JCD has data on over 30 communities, representing a combined population of nearly two million people.

The average participation rate in a given 30-day period for the last fifteen communities surveyed is called the NORTHWEST AVERAGE. By comparing participation rates for Klamath Falls with the

NORTHWEST AVERAGE, we can determine where the city is different from the norm. This information assists us in developing meaningful park and facility standards that reflect use patterns in Klamath Falls. At the same time it must be kept in mind that many factors will influence local participation levels, such as:

- **Lack of facilities**
- **Climate**
- **Poor quality of facilities and programs**
- **Present recreation trends**
- **Fad or trend activities**
- **Cost of using facilities and programs**
- **Present economic conditions**
- **Economic profile of the community**

On the next page are participation rates for both indoor and outdoor activities. The per capita occasions for a 30-day period refers to the average amount of participation per person in 30 days, when the activity is in season. These activities are ranked so that the most popular activities in the Klamath Falls area appear first. The survey questionnaire listed 44 activities, and a space for other activities.

For a comparison, we have included the NORTHWEST AVERAGE and participation rates for the City of Medford, Oregon and the City of Roseburg, Oregon. Medford was chosen for comparison due to its close proximity to Klamath Falls. Roseburg was chosen for comparison due to similar size, climate and characteristics. The Medford survey was conducted in 1995 and the Roseburg survey was conducted in 1996.

The top answers are located on the following page in Table B-40.

**Table B-40**  
**Top 44 Recreation Participation Activities**  
**Klamath Falls, Oregon**

Rank	Activity	Per Capita Occasions per 30 Days			
		City of Klamath Falls	NW Average	City of Roseburg	City of Medford
1.	Music Listening	3.2	7.0	7.5	--
2.	Walking for Pleasure	2.8	5.4	7.4	4.8
3.	Gardening	2.7	4.1	4.3	--
4.	Family Activities	2.3	3.6	3.9	3.6
5.	Fishing - Freshwater	2.3	2.5	3.2	2.2
6.	Bicycling - Pleasure	2.2	3.3	3.9	3.3
7.	Nature Walks	2.2	2.6	3.5	1.9
8.	Wildlife Watching	2.2	2.5	2.6	2.3
9.	Exercise/Aerobics	2.0	3.3	--	3.4
10.	Picnicking	2.0	2.6	3.6	2.1
11.	Bird Watching	1.9	1.8	1.4	2.1
12.	Hiking/Backpacking	1.9	1.8	--	1.5
13.	Playground - Visit/Use	1.9	2.8	2.6	2.7
14.	Swimming - Outdoor	1.8	2.9	3.3	1.6
15.	Basketball	1.7	2.3	3.0	1.7
16.	Concerts (attending)	1.7	1.9	3.1	2.0
17.	Golf - Playing	1.7	1.6	2.0	2.2
18.	Jogging/Running	1.7	2.1	2.4	1.7
19.	Sledding	1.7	1.6	--	--
20.	Swimming - Indoor	1.7	2.1	2.1	1.4
21.	Baseball - Youth	1.5	2.0	2.6	1.4
22.	Boating - Power	1.5	1.8	2.2	--
23.	Golf - Driving Range	1.5	1.2	1.3	1.5
24.	Roller Skating/Blading	1.5	1.3	1.9	1.2
25.	Bicycling - Unpaved	1.4	1.4	1.2	1.2
26.	Football	1.4	1.4	2.0	1.3
27.	Kite Flying	1.4	1.1	--	--
28.	Soccer	1.4	1.6	1.9	1.3
29.	Softball	1.4	1.7	2.4	1.2
30.	Water Skiing	1.4	0.8	--	--
31.	Canoe/Kayaking	1.3	0.6	--	--
32.	River Rafting	1.3	0.9	0.5	--
33.	Skiing - X-Country	1.3	0.7	--	--

34.	Tennis	1.3	1.1	0.7	1.5
35.	Track & Field	1.3	1.3	--	--

Table B-40 (continued)

Rank	Activity	Per Capita Occasions per 30 Days			
		City of Klamath Falls	NW Average	City of Roseburg	City of Medford
36.	Volleyball - Outdoor	1.3	0.9	0.8	0.8
37.	Archery	1.2	0.8	--	--
38.	Bicycling - Touring	1.2	1.2	0.7	--
39.	Ice Skating - Indoor	1.2	1.0	--	--
40.	Boating - Sailing	1.1	0.7	--	--
41.	Ice Hockey	1.1	1.1	--	--
42.	Skateboarding	1.1	0.6	0.6	0.7
43.	Wind Surfing	1.1	0.3	0.2	--
44.	Rowing/Sculling	1.0	--	--	--

**Observations of Table B-40:**

- 20 of the 44 categories have a higher participation than the NORTHWEST AVERAGE, and 4 categories had equal participation. The remainder of responses fell below average, with one category having no average to use as a comparison.
- The first competitive sport to appear on the list is basketball at #15. Youth Baseball is #21 on the list, football appears at #26, soccer shows up at #28, and softball is #29.
- While half of the categories in Klamath Falls have higher participation than the NORTHWEST AVERAGE, the majority of these are found in the bottom half of the table. This shows that the activities with higher participation are on the whole more specialized and regional in nature. None of the top ten activities are above the NW AVERAGE.
- Other additional activities people stated were: shooting (3), walking dogs (2), hunting (2), snowboarding (2), native plant society, racquetball, yoga, downhill skiing, mini-golf.

The following tables highlight the Top 10 Recreation Activities based on age groups. Table B-41 shows the Top 10 youth activities (ages 10-17). Table B-42 displays the Top 10 for seniors 55 and over.

**Table B-41  
Top Ten Recreation Activities  
10 - 17 Age Group**

Ranking	Activity	Per Capita Occasions		
		Age 10-17	All Age Groups	Ranking All Ages
1.	Sledding	3.1	1.7	19

2.	Bicycling - Pleasure	2.9	2.2	6
3.	Basketball	2.8	1.7	15
4.	Swimming - Outdoor	2.8	1.8	14
5.	Swimming - Indoor	2.4	1.7	20

Table B-41 (continued)

		Per Capita Occasions		
6.	Playground -Visit/Use	2.3	1.9	13
7.	Roller Skating/Blading	2.3	1.5	24
8.	Family Activities	2.2	2.3	4
9.	Jogging/Running	2.2	1.7	18
10.	Nature Walks	2.1	2.2	7

**Observations of Table B-41:**

- Three of the top ten activities for this age group are also among the top ten activities for the population as a whole.
- Most of the activities listed here have higher participation rates for this age group than the population as a whole. The participation rates for sledding is almost double the participation rate for this age group compared to the population as a whole.
- Participation rates for the top ten youth activities are about 35% higher than for the same activities for the population as a whole.

**Table B-42  
Top Ten Recreation Activities  
Senior Population Group (Age 55 and Above)**

Ranking	Activity	Per Capita Occasions		
		Age 55+	All Age Groups	Ranking All Ages
1.	Bird Watching	2.2	1.9	11
2.	Family Activities	1.8	2.3	4
3.	Fishing - Freshwater	1.9	2.0	5
4.	Gardening	2.8	2.7	3
5.	Golf - Play	1.7	1.7	17
6.	Music Listening	2.5	3.2	1
7.	Nature Walks	2.0	2.2	7
8.	Picnicking	1.8	2.0	10
9.	Walking for Pleasure	2.6	2.8	2
10.	Wildlife Watching	2.2	2.2	8

**Observations of Table B-42:**

- Eight of the top ten senior activities are also in the top ten for the population as a whole.
- The overall level of participation for the top ten senior activities is roughly 7% lower than for all age groups.

**Table B-43  
Participation Rates for Non-Motorized  
Trail-Related Activities  
All Age Groups**

Activity	City of Klamath Falls	NW Average	City Ratio to NW Avg.
Roller-Skate/Rollerblade	1.5	1.3	+15.4%
Hiking/Backpacking	1.9	1.8	+5.5%
Bicycling - Unpaved	1.4	1.4	0.0%
Bicycling - Touring	1.2	1.2	0.0%
Nature Walks	2.2	2.6	-15.4%
Jogging/Running	1.7	2.1	-19.0%
Bicycling - Pleasure	2.2	3.3	-33.3%
Walking, for pleasure	2.8	5.4	-48.1%

**Observations of Table B-43:**

- Roller Skating/Blading, and Hiking/Backpacking are higher than the NORTHWEST AVERAGE. Walking for Pleasure and Bicycling for Pleasure, while both in the Top 10 in overall recreation activities in Klamath Falls, are well below the NW AVERAGE.
- In general, participation in trail-related activities is slightly lower in Klamath Falls than the same activities for the NORTHWEST AVERAGE.

**Table B-44  
Participation Rates for Water Related Activities  
All Age Groups**

Activity	City of Klamath Falls	NW Average	City Ratio to NW Avg.
Wind Surfing	1.1	0.3	+266.7%
Canoe/Kayaking	1.3	0.6	+116.7%
Water Skiing	1.4	0.8	+75.0%
Boating - Sailing	1.1	0.7	+57.1%
River Rafting	1.3	0.9	+44.4%
Boating - Power	1.5	1.8	-16.7%
Fishing - Freshwater	2.0	2.5	-20.0%
Swimming - Outdoor	1.8	2.9	-37.9%
Rowing/Sculling	1.0	--	--

**Observations of Table B-44 :**

- Wind Surfing and Canoe/Kayaking are significantly higher than the NORTHWEST AVERAGE. Outdoor swimming is lower, probably due to a lack of facilities.
- In general, participation in water-related activities is significantly higher in Klamath Falls than the same activities for the NORTHWEST AVERAGE. This is due to the high number and variety of lake and river activities in close proximity to the area.

**Table B-45  
Participation Rates for Competitive Sports  
All Age Groups**

Activity	City of Klamath Falls	NW Average	City Ratio to NW Avg.
Volleyball - Outdoor	1.3	0.9	+44.4%
Tennis	1.3	1.1	+18.2%
Football	1.4	1.4	0.0%
Soccer	1.4	1.6	-12.5%
Softball	1.4	1.7	-17.6%
Baseball - Youth	1.5	2.0	-25.0%
Basketball	1.7	2.3	-26.1%
	10.00	11.00	

**Observations of Table B-45:**

- Outdoor Volleyball and Tennis have participation rates higher than the NORTHWEST AVERAGE. This is surprising due to the shortage and existing quality of facilities.
- Overall, Klamath Falls sports participation is about 10% lower than the NORTHWEST AVERAGE, probably due to shortages of facilities and programs.

**PREFERRED RECREATION ACTIVITIES**

Respondents were also asked to rank their top nine preferred recreation activities, if facilities were available. The activity rankings were then scored with a weighted value, by giving a first choice a value of nine, a second choice a value of eight, etc. The total weighted score was then added up for each activity. The 25 highest-ranking activities are shown on the following page in Table B-46. The weighted score is shown only for ranking purposes.

The last column lists the current participation ranking from Table B-40. While not directly comparable to the ranking of preferred activities, it does help to give an idea of activities showing strong differences between desired participation and current participation. This difference between what people are currently doing and what they would like to be doing is called *latent demand*.

**Table B-46  
Top 25 Preferred Recreation Activities  
All Age Groups**

Ranking	Activity	Weighted Score	Participation Ranking
1.	Walking for Pleasure	705	2
2.	Nature Walks	455	7
3.	Bicycling - Pleasure	426	6
4.	Music Listening	426	1
5.	Concerts - Attending	419	16
6.	Family Activities	399	4
7.	Picnicking	393	10
8.	Swimming - Indoor	374	20
9.	Gardening	340	3
10.	Wildlife Watching	338	8
11.	Fishing - Freshwater	331	5
12.	Golf - Play	299	17
13.	Ice Skating - Indoor	288	39
14.	Hiking/Backpacking	262	12
15.	Swimming - Outdoor	256	14
16.	Exercising/Aerobics	199	9
17.	Jogging/Running	188	18
18.	Bicycling - Unpaved	184	25
19.	Birdwatching/Feeding	172	11
20.	Playground - Visit/Use	171	13
21.	Boating - Power	167	22
22.	Sledding	163	19
23.	Basketball	154	15
24.	Canoe/Kayaking	149	31
25.	Skiing - X-Country	144	33

**Observations of Table B-46:**

- The activities highlighted in dark gray were ranked significantly higher in preferred activities than in current participation. The activities highlighted in light gray ranked significantly lower between preference and current participation.

- There are three activities listed here that do not appear in the top twenty-five of the current participation list: ice skating - indoor, canoe/kayaking, and x-country skiing. This indicates that people would participate in these activities more often if facilities were more readily available.
- Indoor ice-skating, indoor swimming, and attending concerts all have a significant latent demand. This finding correlates with other data taken from the survey concerning ice skating facilities, and also swimming facilities. Attending concerts wasn't addressed in earlier questions, thus has no other data to back up this conclusion.

**COMMUNITY WORKSHOP RESULTS**

**Introduction**

One public workshop meeting was held in the Klamath Falls Area in February of 1998. The participants represented a mixture of City staff and local citizens.

A group discussion format was used for this workshop. Participants were divided into groups averaging about 5-6 people per group. Then, the five questions which were the focus of the meeting were presented and participants were given a brief description of the intent behind each one.

At this point each group was left to pursue ideas and suggestions at their own pace. Each group wrote down their thoughts on large sheets which were hung on the wall at the end of the discussion period. A representative of each group was asked to summarize its findings for the rest of the participants. In the summary which follows, the "number of tables" refers to the number of groups who mentioned a particular item.

**Result Summaries**

The questions asked were summarized below. Also included was a question on prioritization of City park service.

**1. What park and recreation facilities are most needed in the City of Klamath Falls?**

**Table B-47  
Park and Recreation Facilities Needed  
(workshop results)**

<b>Response</b>	<b>Number of Group Responses</b>
Skateboard Park	3
Amphitheater/Concert Area	2
Improved Playground Equipment	2
Better Maintenance	1
Guide to City Parks	1
Indoor Sports Complex	1
Open Space Areas	1
Outdoor Ice Rink	1

Outdoor Swimming Pool	1
Paved Trails	1
Picnic Areas	1
Restrooms	1
Sand Volleyball Courts	1
Soccer Fields	1
Sports Facilities	1
Toddler Play Areas	1
Trails (no type specified)	1
Water park	1
Youth Facilities/Activities	1

In general, a wide spectrum of facilities were requested. The results are similar to those taken from the community survey question of a similar nature. Three of the four workshop groups mentioned a skateboard park as a necessary element.

**2a. What emphasis should be placed on the use of Moore Park?**

**Table B-48  
Emphasis on Use of Moore Park  
(workshop results)**

Response	Number of Group Responses
Combination of the Above	4
Natural Open Space and Passive Use	0
Sports Fields and Other Active Use	0

All four groups consider the best course of action for future use of Moore Park to be a combination of natural open space and passive use with sports fields and other active uses.

Other comments included: need to evaluate the tennis courts in the park, allow for future development of the park based on needs - more tennis courts, etc.

**2b. What improvements are needed at Moore Park?**

**Table B-49  
Improvements to Moore Park  
(workshop results)**

Response	Number of Group Responses

Add/Improve Parking	5
Add/Improve Restrooms	4
Add/Improve Tennis Courts	4
Better and Safer Play Equipment	2
Develop Upper Loop	2
Incorporate Moore Hills (104 acre parcel)	2
Add More Trails/Link Trails	1
Awareness of Gingerbread House	1
Bug Control	1
Improve Archery Area	1
Maintenance of Gingerbread House	1
Naturescape Interpretive Trails	1
Outdoor Pool	1

The majority of responses concerned improvements to existing facilities such as parking, restrooms, and tennis courts. Suggestions for parking included expanding into the Pacific Power property and utilizing that for parking. Specific suggestions for restrooms included adding more facilities closer to the fields and playground equipment.

**3. How should new parks be located and developed?**

**Table B-50  
Type of Park System in Klamath Falls  
(workshop results)**

Response	Number of Group Responses
Neighborhood Parks	3
Community Parks	1
Open Space	1
Mini-Parks	0

A neighborhood park system was the most popular choice, with responses from three of the four groups. There ended up being five answers, because one group specified both community and neighborhood parks as the most popular. One group specified that one more community park would be needed, then the rest could be developed as neighborhood parks.

Other comments and suggestions included: don't sell mini-parks but leave them as open-space, preserve shoreline, have new subdivisions required to have park space, require developer responsibility for construction and maintenance of parks, add bike trail connections.

**4. What responsibilities should the City have in Parks and Recreation?**

**Table B-51  
Responsibilities of City in Parks & Recreation  
(workshop results)**

<b>Response</b>	<b>Number of Group Responses</b>
Park Development & Maintenance	4
Youth Sports Programs	2
Arts & Crafts Programs	2
Adult Sports Programs	1
Acquire Open Space	1
Enforce Park Rules	1
Encourage Participation from Neighborhoods	1

The most common response was for Park Development and Maintenance. This is similar to the existing situation of the Parks Department. When totaled together, programs and activities becomes the most popular response with five responses, from youth sports, arts & crafts, and adult sports programs.

**5. How should major park and recreation facility improvements be funded?**

**Table B-52  
Funding of Park and Recreation Improvements  
(workshop results)**

<b>Response</b>	<b>Number of Group Responses</b>
City General Fund	1
Corporate Funding	1
Day-Use Fees	1
Grants	1
Impact Fees/City Funds	1
Bond Measure	0
Serial Levy	0

The majority of responses were in favor of funding through exterior sources (not directly from residents). In addition to those answers provided, workshop participants included day-use fees, corporate funding, and grants as a way of providing additional park and recreation resources without directly taxing City residents.

**6. Prioritization Question**

Finally, workshop participants were asked to prioritize which projects are most needed in the Klamath Falls area. Each participant was given four choices, with the results summarized in Table B-53 below.

**Table B-53**  
**Prioritization of Parks Projects**  
**(workshop results)**

<b>Response</b>	<b>Number of Group Responses</b>
<b>Indoor Recreation Complex</b>	<b>15</b>
<b>Natural Open Space</b>	<b>15</b>
<b>Sports Field Complex</b>	<b>13</b>
<b>Trails</b>	<b>11</b>
<b>Development of New Parks</b>	<b>8</b>
<b>Public Meeting/Activity Space</b>	<b>8</b>
<b>Acquire More Park Land</b>	<b>3</b>
<b>Other</b>	<b>3</b>