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Tonight’s topics:

• Overview/background
• Implementing agencies workshops/MPOSC
• Visitor satisfaction and most popular activities
• Demographics of park visitation
• New visitors and information seeking

Implementing agency staff joined five scheduled lunch conversations to dive into operations implications of survey results.
Background and Implementing Agency Workshops
Visitor Study Purpose

• Help inform planning, policy, and management
• Evaluate and strengthen equitable usage of regional parks and trails in accordance with the 2040 Regional Parks Policy Plan
• Update data in funding formulas to help determine where funding goes for parks and trails
2021 Visitor Survey

- Surveys administered in the field by Wilder Research
- Over 5,400 surveys, over 50% response rate. Survey quotas proportionate to visitation.
- At least 393 surveys per implementing agency. One unit in each implementing agency was “oversampled” to have data at the unit level.
- Data were reviewed and analyzed by Council staff.
- Report to be published this fall; currently workshopping data with implementing agencies.
2021 Visitor Survey Process

Data collection & preparation
Summer/Fall 2021

Funding inputs calculated, preliminary data analysis
Winter/Spring 2022

Data workshops with Imp. Agencies & MPOSC
Summer & Fall 2022

Publication of findings, including workshop insights
Fall 2022
Data workshops summer 2022

Data partners: why & how

- Extensive data; workshops and conversations offer areas of focus.
- Five topics: Visitor satisfaction; activities; race & age equity; gender & disability equity; new visitors and information seeking.
- Conversations look at management and policy implications.
- Fall 2022: Publication of final report.

Implementing agency staff joined five scheduled lunch conversations to dive into operations implications of survey results.
Visitor satisfaction and popular activities
Visitor satisfaction & suggestions

Study details/ visitor satisfaction

• 88% reported facilities very good or excellent
• Higher satisfaction in suburbs; slightly lower in systems with older facilities (MPRB, St Paul)

Visitor Suggestions

• Top parks suggestion: everything’s good
• Top for trails: Better trail maintenance
• Bathrooms, water, signage, shade are important
## Popular activities & social characteristics

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Most popular activity</th>
<th>Hiking/walking is the most popular activity for all groups</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>2nd most popular activity</strong></td>
<td>Relax/do nothing: Age 12-44; Black, Latino, Asian American, multiple race visitors; gender nonbinary</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>3rd most popular activity</strong></td>
<td>Biking: Women, gender nonbinary; ages 12-44; Black, Latino, multiple races visitors</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Table 1: Most popular activities, disaggregated by social characteristics. Source: Metropolitan Council 2021 Visitor Study*
Visitor demographics
Visitation less racially/ethnically diverse than regional population overall.

Communities of color are underrepresented among park, trail visitors relative to the population.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Regional population</th>
<th>Park visitation</th>
<th>Trail visitation</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Asian American</td>
<td>4.1% 2.3%</td>
<td>8.2%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Black</td>
<td>3.8% 1.7%</td>
<td>10.3%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Latino</td>
<td>3.6% 2.4%</td>
<td>7.2%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>White</td>
<td>84.3% 90.7%</td>
<td>68.8%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Figure 1: Comparing survey demographics with the regional population for race/ethnicity. Source: Metropolitan Council 2021 Parks & Trails Visitor Study.
Fewer young people visit compared with their proportion in population.

Young people are underrepresented among park, trail visitors. Disparities are greater on trails.

Figure 2: Comparing survey demographics with the regional population for age. Source: Metropolitan Council 2021 Parks & Trails Visitor Study
Higher racial/ethnic diversity among younger visitors.

Younger visitors are more racially/ethnically diverse.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Age Group</th>
<th>BIPOC</th>
<th>White</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>age 12-24</td>
<td>35.8%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>age 25-44</td>
<td>19.1%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>age 45-64</td>
<td>11.5%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>age 65+</td>
<td>4.0%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Figure 3: Percent visitors who are BIPOC and white, by age group. Source: Metropolitan Council 2021 Parks & Trails Visitor Study.
Gender gap in trail visitation.

Men and women equally visit parks. Trail visitation shows a gender gap.

Figure 4: Gender of surveyed visitors for parks, trails compared with the seven-county regional population (percent). Source: Metropolitan Council 2021 Parks & Trails Visitor Study
New Visitors and Information Seeking
Information seeking: Where and who

New visitors, park visitors, were the most likely to seek information prior to visiting.

Figure 5: Information seeking by new, return visitors compared by park, trail (unweighted data, percent). Source: Metropolitan Council 2021 Visitor Survey

NEW VISITORS are:

- 84% of information seekers
- Wanting to know about park hours, parking, and rules
- 3 times greater a presence at parks than trails
New visitors more likely to be non-white, seek information, visit parks.

New/infrequent visitors are more racially/ethnically diverse than return visitors.

NEW VISITORS are:

- 84% of information seekers
- Wanting to know about park hours, parking, and rules
- 3 times greater a presence at parks than trails

“There is a misconception that we only need to build the system and invest in growing the system. But good communication is what attracts people. We need to push this priority, and the Council can support this through grant opportunities. Directors can support it through reviewing this data.”

Figure 6: Comparison by implementing agency of proportion of BIPOC visitors, new vs return visitors (percent). Source: Metropolitan Council 2021 Parks & Trails Visitor Study
Review of implementing agency insights
Survey data says:
88% reported facilities very good or excellent; higher satisfaction in suburbs; slightly lower in systems with older facilities.

“We can zoom in on what to do better, but it’s notable that people are generally happy, highly positive.”
• The public values well-maintained and high-quality facilities. This needs funding. [KEY MESSAGE]
• Trail maintenance concerns are important [KEY MESSAGE].

Top desired improvements were better trail conditions; improved maintenance; bathroom availability/quality; water access.

[KEY MESSAGE]: “Resources are biggest thing. The operations funding is chronically underfunded. Statute says we could add up to 40%, and the legislature only adds up to 8-9%...Knowing about maintenance problems informs the conversation about sustainable funding.”

All social groups had hiking/walking as top activity, but family events, family/friend meetups, playing sports, and fishing were more popular among underserved racial ethnic groups.

• [KEY MESSAGE] Continue/expand efforts to understand and meet diverse users’ needs.
• Open and flexible space are key to offering equitable opportunities.
• Support spaces for “doing nothing” and getting into hiking/walking.
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