

LA VISTA PARK AND RECREATION MASTER PLAN

4. NEEDS ASSESSMENT

WHAT DO WE WANT?

For the *La Vista Park and Recreation Master Plan* to respond to community needs and desires, it was essential to involve La Vista residents throughout the process. To best evaluate diverse park and recreation needs, public input from La Vista's park users and citizens was gathered in two primary ways: (1) public input meetings, forums, and presentations and (2) surveys. Different approaches were employed to ensure an accurate picture of public attitudes about the City's park and recreation system from park users, stakeholders, and citizens.

It is important to note that the input gained during the public input meetings, forums, and presentations and through the surveys is not scientifically valid. The results presented in this report are qualitative, not quantitative. The information provides input from community members who were interested enough in the park and recreation system to attend a meeting or forum and complete a survey.

To assure compatibility and efficiency in the overall process, a Steering Committee was developed. This committee assisted in not only the public input opportunities and surveys, but also provided in-depth information and assistance during the development of the *La Vista Park and Recreation Master Plan*.

PUBLIC INPUT MEETINGS, FORUMS, AND PRESENTATIONS

A variety of meetings, forums, and presentations were conducted with the residents of La Vista, park and trail enthusiasts, stakeholders, City Council members, Park and Recreation Advisory Board members, and City staff.

Focus Meetings

The goals of the Focus Meetings were to solicit input about La Vista's park, trail, open space, and recreation needs and to give residents an opportunity to comment, ask questions, and express concerns about the project. The first Focus Meeting involved the Steering Committee members. The next three meetings were held for various Stakeholders of the project. Stakeholders were encouraged to attend the meeting specifically aimed at the group or organizations they were representing. The fifth and final Focus Meeting was open to the public. The five meetings were conducted on the following dates, with the targeted group listed below:

- **Focus Meeting #1** - January 17, 2002 - La Vista City Hall
Targeted: Steering Committee
- **Focus Meeting #2** - March 6, 5:30 p.m. - La Vista Community Center
Targeted: Community Interest Groups and Organizations
- **Focus Meeting #3** - March 6, 7:30 p.m. - La Vista Community Center
Targeted: Recreation and Athletic Groups and Organizations

- **Focus Meeting #4** - March 13, 5:30 p.m. - La Vista Community Center
Targeted: Government Officials and Agencies
- **Focus Meeting #5** - March 13, 7:30 p.m. - La Vista Community Center
Targeted: Community, Residents, Public



Focus Meeting with the Steering Committee

At the five Focus Meetings, there were a total of 72 participants. There were 8 participants at the first meeting, 12 at the second, 14 at the third, 30 at the fourth, and 8 at the fifth. (See *Appendix 4A* for a list of participants at each meeting.) Some participants attended more than one meeting; therefore a total of 53 different people attended the meetings. As previously mentioned, the first Focus Meeting involved the Steering Committee members. The Steering Committee members were invited to attend any or all of the remaining meetings. While

many did attend one of these other meetings, they did not participate in the activities because their input had already been received during the first Focus Meeting.

Those attending the meetings represented a variety of groups, interests, and neighborhoods from throughout La Vista and the surrounding area. The results from these meetings are not scientifically valid, but do provide qualitative information regarding the La Vista park and recreation system.

The key findings from the Focus Meetings are below.

Strengths of the park and recreation system

- Future for Growth and Development
- Generous Community Support
- Quality and Number of Existing Facilities
- Variety in Programs and Facilities
- Well-Organized Leadership and Operations

Weaknesses of the park and recreation system

- Demand on Programming
- Facility Shortages
- Limitations of Support
- Meeting Current Needs
- Meeting Future Needs

Recommendations for the proposed park and trail system

- Mini-Parks – located within neighborhoods, throughout the community
- Neighborhood Parks – located within neighborhoods, throughout the community
- Community Parks – located within floodplain areas and large open spaces
- Greenways and Trails – located along floodplains and railroads, connect neighborhoods and parks

Each Focus Meeting began with a brief introduction to the project and a description of the scheduled activities and exercises. (See *Appendix 4-B* for the meeting agenda.) The planning process, including the goals, opportunities, issues, and stakeholders that were determined by the Steering Committee, was discussed. Participants had the opportunity to comment on these items.

Participants were then organized into work groups to begin the focus group activities.



Focus Meeting

Three different exercises took place at each of the Focus Meetings. The first exercise was identifying the park and recreation system

strengths and weaknesses. The second activity was a park system mapping exercise, where participants created their ideal plan for the future park and recreation system. The final exercise for the participants was to complete two surveys, the Park User Survey and the Community Scan. (Detailed information regarding these two surveys is discussed below.)

Strengths and Weaknesses. This exercise was designed to gather participant views about strengths and weaknesses of the La Vista park and recreation system. Meeting participants identified a variety of strengths and weaknesses. After the individual participants compiled their list of strengths and weaknesses, they were discussed as a group. (See *Appendix 4-C* for individual participant responses from each meeting, transcribed and organized according to the meeting attended.)

A summary of park and recreation system strengths is as follows:

Future for Growth and Development

- Available land is utilized as open space
- City and staff are open to new activities and ideas
- Goals look ahead to the future
- Growth to west - new park and recreation facilities
- Master planning underway
- Park additions are included in new housing developments
- Parks are accessible from neighborhoods

Generous Community Support

- City and other City departments are supportive
- Community is supportive
- Core group of volunteers exists
- High response to programs
- Recreation department has good relationship with neighboring communities
- User groups give back to improve facilities

Quality and Number of Existing Facilities

- Community Center
- Facilities receive high usage

- Many well-distributed parks for a community of its size
- Number and quality of recreational fields
- Park equipment
- Senior Center

Variety in Programs and Facilities

- Distribution of parks and facilities
- Program variety reaches children, youth, adults, and seniors
- Variety of passive and active recreation

Well-Organized Leadership and Operations

- Costs for consumed services are reasonable
- Good leadership on all programs
- Parks and facilities are well maintained
- Recreation department works well with outside organizations
- Recreation staff is knowledgeable, friendly, and helpful

A summary of park and recreation system weaknesses is as follows:

Demand on Programming

- Competitive recreation programming
- Expanding the variety of programming available - Educational, outdoor, historical, etc.
- Increasing cooperation and participation by outside agencies
- Keeping pace with changing recreation needs
- Longer Community Center hours - Increased accessibility
- Underutilized and over-utilized facilities

Facility Shortages

- Additional indoor facilities - Track, swimming pool, meeting spaces, etc.
- Aging swimming pool with limited amenities - Only one pool in town
- Community Center is undersized
- Competitive recreation fields
- Improvements to existing facilities - Lighting, parking, equipment, number of fields, etc.
- Lack of recreational trail system through community and to other communities
- Large open space - Use for La Vista Days
- More natural features - Lakes, trees, wildlife areas, etc.
- Recreational fields not centrally located - Growth is to west
- Skate park
- Winter outdoor sports areas

Limitations of Support

- Community support limited to core group
- Lack of volunteers for programs

Meeting Current Needs

- Available funding for programs and facilities is limited
- Flooding hazards
- Need a fully equipped staff to meet all the recreational needs of the community
- Some programs and facilities have more available funds than others

Meeting Future Needs

- Communicating community needs to developers
- Creating a regional attraction
- Limited new facilities in western growth area
- Need a long-range vision for growth and development of the park and recreation system
- No long-term budget for park improvements and expansion is in place

Mapping Exercise. Following the strengths and weaknesses activity, participants began the park system mapping exercise. Each group was given a map of La Vista, which showed the current City limits, the extra-territorial jurisdiction, and the future growth and development area. The map also showed existing and proposed trails; existing La Vista parks, recreation areas, and open areas; existing La Vista public facilities; other existing public and semi-public parks and open spaces; public schools; and the floodplain. *Future Land Use Map* from the *La Vista Unified Development Ordinance: Comprehensive Development Plan 1997, Future Land Use Plan Update 2001, Zoning Regulations 2001, and Subdivision Regulations 2002* was displayed for participants to reference during this exercise. Participants were asked to locate new mini-parks, neighborhood parks, community parks, greenbelts, and trails using a series of park indicators, including sticker dots and markers. Participants were then given several different on-site park facility icons (including paved multi-use area, organized sports field, natural area, playground, tennis court, swimming pool, multi-use path, community center, restroom, open play field, parking, maintenance, and picnic shelter) and asked to place the icons where they felt these facilities were needed in both proposed and existing parks. Participants were also encouraged to make additional comments or recommendations by writing them directly on the map. (See *Figure 4-1* and *Figure 4-2*.)

Figure 4-1: Discussing the mapping exercise.



Figure 4-2: Participating in the mapping exercise.



After locating parks, drawing linkages, and defining on-site facilities, participants prioritized potential parks and facilities. Participants were given dollar icon stickers to prioritize the parks and facilities in order to show their preference in allocating park system dollars. (See *Figure 4-3*, *Figure 4-4*, and *Figure 4-5*.)

Figure 4-3: Creating their park system.



Figure 4-4: Discussing proposed facilities.



Figure 4-5: Discussing the proposed trails and greenways.



Comments from all individuals and groups participating in the mapping exercise have been combined to create the following summary.

Greenbelts and Trails

- East/west corridors starting at Keystone Trail, traveling along the creek/drainage ditch through Mayor's Park and near Park View Boulevard, continuing west along streets and greenways to the Papillion Creek floodplain area, continuing along the floodplain to Chalco Hills Recreation Area and 168th Street.
- North/south corridors along thoroughfares, including 72nd Street, 84th Street, 96th Street, 132nd Street, and 144th Street.
- Connecting parks, neighborhoods, and schools.
- Connecting to neighboring communities.
- Throughout floodplain areas.

Mini-Parks, Neighborhood Parks, and Community Parks

- Mini-Parks were primarily located within neighborhoods throughout the community.
- Neighborhood Parks were primarily located within neighborhoods throughout the community.
- Community Parks were primarily located in floodplain areas and in large open spaces.
- Large parks, including Community Parks or Sports Complexes, were proposed near the Big Papillion Creek floodplain, the Papillion Creek floodplain, and Chalco Hills Recreation Area.

Park Facilities

- Facilities identified at Mini-Parks included:
 - Multi-Use Court
 - Picnic Shelter
 - Play Ground
 - Restroom
- Facilities identified at Neighborhood Parks included:
 - Community Center
 - Maintenance
 - Natural Areas
 - Open Play Field
 - Organized Sports Field
 - Parking
 - Picnic Shelter
 - Play Ground
 - Restroom
 - Swimming Pool
 - Youth Baseball Complex
- Facilities identified at Community Parks included:
 - Community Center
 - Maintenance
 - Multi-Use Court
 - Natural Areas
 - Open Play Field
 - Organized Sports Field
 - Parking
 - Path
 - Picnic Shelter
 - Play Ground
 - Restroom
 - Shelter
 - Skate Park
 - Swimming Pool
 - Tennis Courts
 - Trees
 - Youth Baseball Complex

- Facilities identified in the Papillion Creek floodplain area included:
 - Baseball Complex
 - Community Center
 - Flying Field
 - Maintenance
 - Multi-Use Court
 - Natural Areas
 - Open Air Amphitheater
 - Open Play Field
 - Organized Sports Field
 - Parking
 - Path
 - Picnic Shelter
 - Play Ground
 - Restroom
 - Swimming Pool
 - Tennis Courts
 - Trees
- Facilities identified in the Chalco Hills Recreation Area included:
 - 18-Hole Golf Course
 - 3-Hole Golf Practice Facility
 - Amphitheater
 - Bike Trail
 - Driving Range
 - Fishing
 - Kites
 - Major Sports Complex
 - Model Air Flying
 - Natural Areas
 - Picnic Shelter
 - Play Ground
 - Skateboard Area
 - Softball Park
 - Volleyball Park
- Facilities identified in the Big Papillion Creek floodplain/La Vista Soccer Complex Area included:
 - Model Flying Field (Paved Runway 500'x40' N-S, ½mile x ½mile)
 - Multi-Use Court
 - Natural Areas
 - Open Play Field
 - Parking
 - Path
 - Picnic Shelter
 - Play Ground
 - Restroom

Money Allocation/Funding Priority

- HIGH (most important) – Big Papillion Creek floodplain area by the La Vista Soccer Complex, the central floodplain area along the Papillion Creek and Union Pacific Railroad, Chalco Hills Recreation Area, and trails throughout the community.
- MEDIUM (second most important) – La Vista Fall Golf Course, Recreation Center, and Municipal Pool.
- LOW (third most important) – City Park and various open spaces and parks throughout the community.

Figure 4-6 graphically portrays the results from the Focus Meeting mapping exercise. The mapping exercise revealed some interesting ideas and themes from the various individuals and groups participating in the exercise.

Insert Figure 4-6: Composite Map (use one with verbage - -Attachment D page 2 of 2 of old report)

Stakeholder Forum and First Citywide Forum

The Stakeholder Forum was held on March 27, 2002 at 7:00pm at the La Vista City Hall. The First Citywide Forum was held on April 9, 2002, also at 7:00pm at the La Vista City Hall. The goals of the forum were:

- To present the current status of the project, including all information and mapping collected to date
- To have participants discuss issues and policy questions that will be used to create the framework for the Master Plan



Forum Participants

Twenty-eight stakeholders registered at the Stakeholder Forum. Fifteen people registered at the Citywide Forum. (See *Appendix 4-D* for a list of participants at each forum and an outline of the presentation.) Each forum generally followed the same format, including a presentation of the progress and information gathered to date and a discussion regarding policy issues.

Presentation. The forums began with a description of the scheduled activities. The agenda for both forums was as follows:

- **Introductions**
- **What Do We Know?** This covered the existing conditions, including the demographic profile, inventory, and condition and capacity reports.
- **What Do We Want?** This covered the needs assessment portion of the project, addressing the results from the Park User Survey, Community Scan, and Focus Meetings.
- **What Should We Do?** This covered the policy issues based on five questions: Where should parks be built?, What do you want to do in the parks?, How do you want to get to the parks?, How should parks be maintained and patrolled?, and How should we pay for it? At the Stakeholder Forum, participants were asked to complete worksheets addressing each of these questions. Individual participant responses were compiled and transcribed. (See *Appendix 4-E*.) At the Citywide Forum, the responses gathered at the Stakeholder Forum were presented and discussed.
- **Upcoming Events.** At the end of each forum, upcoming events were discussed. This included the Multi-Media Presentation to the Park and Recreation Advisory Board on April 23, Tuesday, 7:00pm at City Hall and to the City Council on May 7, Tuesday, 7:00pm at City Hall.
- **Questions and Comments.** There was also an opportunity for questions and comments regarding the information presented at the forum or any items the participants wished to address.

Second Citywide Forum

The Second Citywide Forum was held midway through the development of the draft plan in order to obtain general public input on policy, action items, and recommendations. The forum began as an open house with stations where interested parties could gather information and comment on portions or all plan elements of interest. A brief formal presentation and group discussion followed.

Multi-Media Presentations

The first set of Multi-Media Presentations generally followed the same format as the First Citywide Forum by defining the comprehensive “state of the parks system” and outlining the upcoming process for decision-making. The presentation was first presented to the Park and Recreation Advisory Board on April 23, Tuesday, 7:00pm at City Hall. The presentation was then presented to the City Council on May 7, Tuesday, 7:00pm at City Hall. This set of Multi-Media Presentations reviewed what had been completed to date and discussed what the next steps would be in developing the *La Vista Park and Recreation Master Plan*.

Following completion of the draft action plan, a second set of Multi-Media Presentations were conducted with the Park and Recreation Advisory Board and the City Council. These presentations provided an opportunity to hear about the *Park and Recreation Master Plan* in its entirety. It also provided an opportunity for final input into the plan.

The third set of Multi-Media Presentations covered the entire process, findings, and recommendations for the *La Vista Park and Recreation Master Plan*.

The Multi-Media Presentations allowed the Park and Recreation Advisory Board and City Council members to stay informed of the *La Vista Park and Recreation Master Plan*. These meetings were open to the public.

SURVEYS

The survey portion for this project contained three elements, including the Park User Survey, Community Scan, and Swimming Pool Survey. The Park User Surveys and Community Scans were conducted at the Focus Meetings on January 17, 2002, March 6, 2002, and March 13, 2002. Steering Committee members attended the first Focus Meeting held on January 17th. The two meetings on March 6th and the first meeting on March 13th involved Stakeholder representatives from government agencies, recreation/athletic organizations, and community interest groups. Stakeholders were encouraged to attend one of these meetings. The community was invited to attend the final Focus Meeting held on March 13th, which was open to the public. A total of thirty-three Park User Surveys and Community Scans were completed. The results from the surveys are not scientifically valid, but they did provide an opportunity for the community to provide input on their park and recreation system.

The Swimming Pool Survey of the La Vista Municipal Pool users was taken on a hot, sunny July 31st, 2002 between 10:30 am and 3:30 pm. The purpose of the survey was to determine attitudes toward the current pool and to ask about any changes pool users would like to see. The survey is not a scientific sampling. An interviewer asked people on the pool deck if they would be willing to answer a few questions about the pool. Sixty people agreed to do so; no one refused. The interviewer attempted to get a cross-section of people on the pool deck without interrupting their swimming activities. Because most of the children and

teenagers were in the pool most of the time, more adults than children were interviewed. Young children were not questioned without a parent or guardian present.

Park User Survey

Generally, respondents of the Park User Survey were satisfied with the La Vista park and recreation facilities. The key findings from the Park User Survey are described below.

- 84% stated they were satisfied with the *number* of park and recreation facilities in La Vista.
- 81% stated they were satisfied with the *quality* of park and recreation facilities in La Vista.
- 81% stated they were satisfied with the *maintenance* of the park and recreation facilities in La Vista.
- 84% stated they were satisfied with the *number and variety* of park and recreation programs in La Vista.
- 78% stated they were satisfied with the *quality* of park and recreation programs in La Vista.
- 52% stated La Vista did *not have enough parks*, 48% stated *just the right amount of park space*, and 3% stated *too many parks*.
- The one aspect participants liked the most about the park and recreation system in La Vista varied, some common responses included *programs and activities; Community/Recreation Center; cleanliness and maintenance of parks; and the location, number, and size of parks*.
- The one aspect participants liked the least about the park and recreation system in La Vista varied, some common responses included *limited space and parking at the Community/Recreation Center, no trail system, and not enough staff/management for proper supervision and monitoring of parks*.

Detailed results from the La Vista Park User Survey regarding the park and recreation system follow. See *Appendix 4-F* for a blank copy of the Park User Survey and *Appendix 4-G* for a complete breakdown of responses for the Park User Survey. (Note: Due to rounding, numbers may not add to 100%.)

Park User Survey participants were asked how satisfied they are with the number of park and recreation facilities in La Vista, using a scale of 1 to 5, where 1 means very dissatisfied and 5 means very satisfied. Of the participants surveyed, 87% stated they were satisfied to very satisfied with the number of park and recreation facilities in La Vista. Below is a breakdown of the results: (Note: Number of respondents is in parentheses.)

9%	5 = Very Satisfied (3)
45%	4 = Moderately Satisfied (14)
33%	3 = Satisfied (11)
3%	2 = Moderately Dissatisfied (1)
9%	1 = Very Dissatisfied (3)
3%	No Answer (1)

Survey participants were asked how satisfied they are with the quality of the park and recreation facilities in La Vista, using a scale of 1 to 5, where 1 means very dissatisfied and 5 means very satisfied. Of those surveyed, 81% stated they were satisfied to very satisfied with the quality of park and recreation facilities in La Vista. Below is a breakdown of the results: (Note: Number of respondents is in parentheses.)

18%	5 = Very Satisfied (6)
42%	4 = Moderately Satisfied (14)
21%	3 = Satisfied (7)
9%	2 = Moderately Dissatisfied (3)
6%	1 = Very Dissatisfied (2)
3%	No Answer (1)

Survey participants were asked how satisfied they are with the maintenance of the park and recreation facilities in La Vista, using a scale of 1 to 5, where 1 means very dissatisfied and 5 means very satisfied. Of those surveyed, 81% stated they were satisfied to very satisfied with the maintenance of park and recreation facilities in La Vista. Below is a breakdown of the results: (Note: Number of respondents is in parentheses.)

30%	5 = Very Satisfied (10)
30%	4 = Moderately Satisfied (10)
21%	3 = Satisfied (7)
12%	2 = Moderately Dissatisfied (4)
3%	1 = Very Dissatisfied (1)
3%	No Answer (1)

Survey participants were asked how satisfied they are with the number and variety of the park and recreation programs in La Vista, using a scale of 1 to 5, where 1 means very dissatisfied and 5 means very satisfied. Of those surveyed, 84% stated they were satisfied to very satisfied with the number and variety of park and recreation programs in La Vista. Below is a breakdown of the results: (Note: Number of respondents is in parentheses.)

12%	5 = Very Satisfied (4)
45%	4 = Moderately Satisfied (15)
27%	3 = Satisfied (9)
9%	2 = Moderately Dissatisfied (3)
3%	1 = Very Dissatisfied (1)
3%	No Answer (1)

Survey participants were asked how satisfied they are with the quality of the park and recreation programs in La Vista, using a scale of 1 to 5, where 1 means very dissatisfied and 5 means very satisfied. Of those surveyed, 78% stated they were satisfied to very satisfied with the quality of park and recreation programs in La Vista. Below is a breakdown of the results: (Note: Number of respondents is in parentheses.)

12%	5 = Very Satisfied (4)
36%	4 = Moderately Satisfied (12)
30%	3 = Satisfied (10)

12%	2 = Moderately Dissatisfied (4)
6%	1 = Very Dissatisfied (2)
3%	No Answer (1)

Participants were asked how many times he/she has visited or used any park or park facility in the last twelve months. Of those surveyed, 60% visited any park or park facility at least once a month. Below is a breakdown of the results: (Note: Number of respondents is in parentheses.)

30%	50+ times (every week or more) (10)
15%	25 - 49 times (5)
15%	12 - 24 times (once or twice a month) (5)
30%	2 - 11 times (10)
6%	1 time (2)
3%	Don't know/Don't have an answer (1)

Survey participants were asked if La Vista has 'too many parks,' 'not enough parks,' or 'just the right amount' of park space. Below is the breakdown: (Note: Number of respondents is in parentheses.) Approximately 3%, or one respondent, did not answer this question.

3%	Too many parks (1)
52%	Not enough parks (17)
42%	Just the right amount of park space (14)

Survey participants were asked which park or park facility they most frequently visit. The parks most frequently visited by the survey respondents included Central Park (26%), La Vista Sports Complex (24%), and the Soccer Complex (17%). The breakdown of results is below: (Note: Some respondents answered more than one park. Percentages reflect the total number of responses, not total number of questionnaires. Number of respondents is in parentheses.)

0%	Apollo Park (0)
7%	Ardmore Park (3)
0%	Camenzind Park (0)
26%	Central Park (12)
0%	Champion Park (0)
2%	City Park (1)
0%	Eberle/Walden Park (0)
0%	Hollis Park (0)
4%	Jaycee/Harvest Hills Park (2)
7%	Kelly Park (3)
2%	La Vista Falls Municipal Golf Course (1)
0%	La Vista Memorial Park (0)
24%	La Vista Sports Complex (11)
0%	Mayor's Park (0)
2%	Municipal Pool (1)
17%	Soccer Complex (8)
4%	Other (Community/Recreation Center) (2)

- 2% Other (91st and Giles) (1)
- 2% No Answer (1)

A series of open-ended questions were asked. Following is a summary of the results; complete responses can be found in *Appendix 4-G*.

Survey participants were asked “Why do you visit this park? What do you specifically do here?” This question is the second part of the previous question, “What park do you most frequently visit?” The responses from the surveys are categorized below: (Note: Some respondents answered with more than one response. Percentages reflect the total number of responses, not total number of questionnaires. Number of respondents is in parentheses.)

- 27% Athletic Activities – participating, coaching, and/or watching baseball, softball, soccer, basketball, volleyball, tennis, football, and golf (15)
- 15% Walking/Jogging (8)
- 11% Close to Home/Size of Park (6)
- 9% Special Community Events – La Vista Days and July 4th (5)
- 9% Playground Activities – playing and watching (5)
- 7% Model Aircraft Activities – flying, instructing, and events (4)
- 5% Enjoying the Outdoors/Bird Watching/Mental Break (3)
- 5% Community/Recreation Center Activities – fitness programs, AIKIDO, martial arts, and racquetball (3)
- 4% Picnic (2)

Survey participants were asked, “What is the one aspect (facility, activity, program, thing) that you MOST like about the park and recreation system in La Vista?” The responses are categorized as follows: (Note: Some respondents answered with more than one response. Percentages reflect the total number of responses, not total number of questionnaires.)

- 21% Programs and Activities – for youth, variety, diversity, available opportunities, events, and equipment (9)
- 17% Community/Recreation Center (7)
- 17% Other (no answer) (7)
- 14% Cleanliness and Maintenance of Parks (6)
- 10% Location, Number, and Size of Park (4)
- 7% Staff – open minded, cooperative, and helpful (3)
- 7% Overall Great Facilities (3)
- 5% Golf Course (2)
- 2% Sports Complex (1)

Participants were asked, “What is the one aspect (facility, activity, program, thing) that you LEAST like about the park and recreation system in La Vista?” The responses are categorized below: (Note: Some respondents answered with more than one response. Percentages reflect the total number of responses, not total number of questionnaires. Number of respondents is in parentheses.)

- 31% Other (no answer) (11)
- 20% Limited Space and Parking at the Community/Recreation Center (7)

- 14% No Trail System (5)
- 14% Staffing/Management – not enough/lack of supervision, no monitoring of parks, too much time and money spent on Sports Complex (5)
- 11% Need More Open Areas – green areas, obstruction free, at new housing (4)
- 6% Lack of Maintenance – no irrigation, too few trees, dog feces (2)
- 3% Youth Participate in Other Cities’ Sports Programs (1)

A series of demographic questions were asked to the survey participants. The answers to these questions reveal the closest public school to the participants’ house, age category of the participant, number of children under the age of 18 living in the participants’ house, and gender of the participant. Below shows the breakdown of demographic characteristics of the survey participants.

Of all the respondents, approximately 58% live within the City limits of La Vista.

Closest public school to the participants’ house: (Note: Number of respondents is in parentheses.)

- 27% G. Stanley Hall (9)
- 27% Parkview Heights (9)
- 15% La Vista Junior High School (5)
- 12% Don’t Know (4)
- 9% No Answer (3)
- 6% La Vista-Papillion High School (2)
- 3% Hickory Hill (1)
- 0% La Vista West (0)

Age categories of participants: (Note: Number of respondents is in parentheses.)

- 0% 14 - 17 years old (0)
- 0% 18 - 24 years old (0)
- 18% 25 - 34 years old (6)
- 30% 35 - 44 years old (10)
- 27% 45 - 54 years old (9)
- 6% 55 - 64 years old (2)
- 15% 65 - 79 years old (5)
- 0% 80 years old or older (0)
- 3% No Answer (1)

Number of children under the age of 18 living in participants’ house: (Note: Number of respondents is in parentheses.)

- 70% Have no children under the age of 18 living in their house (23)
- 6% Have 1 child under the age of 18 living in their house (2)
- 18% Have 2 children under the age of 18 living in their house (6)
- 0% Have 3 children under the age of 18 living in their house (0)
- 3% Have 4 children under the age of 18 living in their house (1)
- 3% No Answer (1)

Gender of participants: (Note: Number of respondents is in parentheses.)

64% Male (21)
33% Female (11)
3% No Answer (1)

Community Scan

The Community Scan asked participants their opinion regarding a variety of activities. The key findings from the Community Scan are described below.

- Of the listed activities, baseball (programmed/organized play), soccer (programmed/organized play), and aerobics/fitness/exercise rated the highest. Bicycling (connection to metro trails), bicycling (trails in City), and concerts rated the lowest. Swimming (open, indoor) was identified as the most popular activity that is needed but not currently provided.
- Brochures sent to the home was rated as the best method to notify family about activities available in the community.
- Grants were rated as the financing mechanism most supported to provide additional facilities and activities.
- If resources are not available in the community to meet the desires and needs of all residents, additional open space and parkland was ranked as the most popular priority.

Detailed results from the La Vista Community Scan follow. See *Appendix 4-H* for a blank copy of the Community Scan and *Appendix 4-I* for a complete breakdown of responses for the Community Scan.

The majority of respondents rated the following activities as excellent (starting with the highest ranked activity for this category):

- Baseball - Programmed/Organized Play
- Soccer - Programmed/Organized Play
- Aerobics/Fitness/Exercise
- Basketball - Programmed/Organized Play
- Football - Programmed/Organized Play
- Golf - Course Play
- Teen Activities - Open Facility
- Open Gym Time
- Holiday Theme Events
- Senior Citizen Programs
- Weightlifting/Weight Training
- After School Programs
- Wrestling
- Family Recreation Programs
- Picnicking
- Karate/Self Defense (tied with average and poor)
- Swimming - Lessons

- Handball - Casual Play (tied with poor)
- Summer Sports Camp (tied with poor)
- Full-Day Trips (Senior Citizens) (tied with poor)
- Other (Radio Control Model Airplane)

The majority of respondents rated the following activities as average (starting with the highest ranked activity for this category):

- Basketball - Casual Play/Pick-up Games
- Crafts/Hobbies
- Pottery/Ceramics Classes
- Soccer - Casual Play/Pick-up Games
- Softball - Casual Play/Pick-up Games
- Volleyball - Indoors
- Baseball - Casual Play/Pick-up Games
- Football - Casual/Pick-up Games
- Swimming - Open - Outdoor
- Dance Lessons (tied with poor)
- Karate/Self Defense (tied with excellent and poor)
- Teen Activities - Programmed/Organized
- Gymnastics

The majority of respondents rated the following activities as poor (starting with the lowest ranked activity for this category):

- Bicycling - Connection to Metro Trails
- Bicycling - Trails in City
- Concerts
- Nature/Outdoor Awareness
- Cultural Arts Programs
- Golf - Driving Range
- Skateboarding
- Art Fairs
- Cross Country Skiing
- Horse Shoes
- Movies
- Swimming - Open - Indoor
- Volleyball - Outdoors
- Frisbee - Programmed/Organized Play
- Hiking/Walking/Jogging
- Preschool Programs
- Tennis - Programmed/Organized
- Drawing/Sketching Classes
- Full-Day Trips (Adults)
- Gardening Club
- Overnight Trips
- Photography Club

- Racquetball - Programmed/Organized Play
- Sledding/Tobogganing
- Summer Day Camp
- Dance Lessons (tied with average)
- Full-Day Trips (Youth)
- Handball - Organized Play
- Hockey - Programmed/Organized Play
- Ice Skating
- Karate/Self Defense (tied with excellent and average)
- Tennis - Casual Play/Pick-up Games
- Water Exercise
- Hockey - Casual Play/Pick-up Games
- Painting Classes
- Racquet/Squash - Casual Play/Pick-up Games
- Shuffleboard
- Table Tennis
- Tennis - Lessons
- Handball - Casual Play (tied with excellent)
- Summer Sports Camp (tied with excellent)
- Full-Day Trips (Senior Citizens) (tied with excellent)

The following list identifies the activities that respondents rated as a needed activity that isn't currently provided. These are listed from the most to least needed.

- 30% Swimming - Open - Indoor
- 24% Movies
- 24% Sledding/Tobogganing
- 21% Nature/Outdoor Awareness
- 21% Skateboarding
- 21% Water Exercise
- 18% Bicycling - Trails in City
- 18% Frisbee - Programmed/Organized Play
- 15% Ice Skating
- 12% Bicycling - Connection to Metro Trails
- 12% Concerts
- 12% Cross Country Skiing
- 12% Gardening Club
- 12% Hockey - Casual Play/Pick-up Games
- 12% Hockey - Programmed/Organized Play
- 9% Cultural Arts Programs
- 9% Drawing/Sketching Classes
- 9% Golf - Driving Range
- 9% Photography Club
- 9% Teen Activities - Programmed/Organized
- 9% Tennis - Lessons
- 6% Art Fairs
- 6% Football - Casual/Pick-up Games

6%	Horse Shoes
6%	Overnight Trips
6%	Painting Classes
6%	Preschool Programs
6%	Racquet/Squash - Casual Play/Pick-up Games
6%	Racquetball - Programmed/Organized Play
6%	Shuffleboard
6%	Soccer - Casual Play/Pick-up Games
6%	Tennis - Casual Play/Pick-up Games
6%	Tennis - Programmed/Organized
6%	Volleyball - Outdoors
3%	Crafts/Hobbies
3%	Family Recreation Programs
3%	Full-Day Trips (Adults)
3%	Full-Day Trips (Senior Citizens)
3%	Full-Day Trips (Youth)
3%	Gymnastics
3%	Handball - Casual Play
3%	Handball - Organized Play
3%	Holiday Theme Events
3%	Open Gym Time
3%	Picnicking
3%	Pottery/Ceramics Classes
3%	Soccer - Programmed/Organized Play
3%	Softball - Casual Play/Pick-up Games
3%	Softball - Programmed/Organized Play
3%	Summer Day Camp
3%	Summer Sports Camp
3%	Swimming - Lessons
3%	Swimming - Open - Outdoor
3%	Table Tennis
3%	Teen Activities - Open Facility
3%	Volleyball - Indoors
3%	Weightlifting/Weight Training

The following list identifies the activities that respondents were unable to answer (rated O – Don't Know). These are categorized in groups (under 25%, between 25% and 50%, between 51% and 75%, and over 75%) and are in order from low to high.

Under 25%

12%	Bicycling - Connection to Metro Trails
12%	Open Gym Time
15%	Aerobics/Fitness/Exercise
15%	Golf - Course Play
18%	Bicycling - Trails in City
18%	Weightlifting/Weight Training
21%	Family Recreation Programs

22% Holiday Theme Events
 24% After School Programs
 24% Crafts/Hobbies
 24% Hiking/Walking/Jogging

Between 25% and 50%

27% Baseball - Programmed/Organized Play
 27% Basketball - Programmed/Organized Play
 27% Karate/Self Defense
 27% Softball - Casual Play/Pick-up Games
 27% Softball - Programmed/Organized Play
 27% Swimming - Open - Outdoor
 30% Nature/Outdoor Awareness
 30% Picnicking
 30% Soccer - Casual Play/Pick-up Games
 30% Soccer - Programmed/Organized Play
 30% Swimming - Open - Indoor
 31% Senior Citizen Programs
 33% Baseball - Casual Play/Pick-up Games
 33% Basketball - Casual Play/Pick-up Games
 33% Teen Activities - Open Facility
 36% Concerts
 36% Football - Casual/Pick-up Games
 36% Football - Programmed/Organized Play
 36% Golf - Driving Range
 36% Movies
 36% Pottery/Ceramics Classes
 36% Teen Activities - Programmed/Organized
 36% Volleyball - Indoors
 36% Wrestling
 38% Art Fairs
 39% Dance Lessons
 39% Skateboarding
 42% Swimming - Lessons
 45% Horse Shoes
 45% Racquet/Squash - Casual Play/Pick-up Games
 45% Sledding/Tobogganing
 45% Summer Day Camp
 45% Summer Sports Camp
 45% Table Tennis
 45% Tennis - Casual Play/Pick-up Games
 48% Handball - Casual Play
 48% Volleyball - Outdoors
 48% Water Exercise
 48% Frisbee - Programmed/Organized Play

Between 51% and 75%

52%	Cultural Arts Programs
52%	Gymnastics
52%	Handball - Organized Play
52%	Racquetball - Programmed/Organized Play
52%	Tennis - Lessons
53%	Shuffleboard
53%	Tennis - Programmed/Organized
55%	Cross Country Skiing
55%	Full-Day Trips (Senior Citizens)
55%	Ice Skating
58%	Drawing/Sketching Classes
58%	Gardening Club
58%	Preschool Programs
61%	Overnight Trips
61%	Painting Classes
61%	Photography Club
64%	Full-Day Trips (Youth)
64%	Full-Day Trips (Adults)
64%	Hockey - Programmed/Organized Play
67%	Hockey - Casual Play/Pick-up Games/Pick-up Games

Over 75%

No activities were identified in this category

Survey participants were asked what the most effective method was to notify their family about activities and which activities are available in the community. Participants were asked to rank the different notification methods on a scale of most effective to least effective. The most effective methods of notification included brochures sent to the home and the City newsletter. Below is a summary of the results. (Note: Percentage represents those respondents who gave the particular method a rating. Percentage does not include those respondents who did not answer the question or left it blank. Number of respondents is in parentheses.)

Brochures sent to the home (29 respondents)

86%	Most Effective (25)
10%	Effective (3)
3%	Least Effective (1)

Brochures available in public outlets (30 respondents)

37%	Most Effective (11)
27%	Effective (8)
37%	Least Effective (11)

Information through schools (28 respondents)

46% Most Effective (13)
13% Effective (4)
39% Least Effective (11)

Newspaper (29 respondents)

41% Most Effective (12)
31% Effective (9)
28% Least Effective (8)

Notices in libraries, community centers (29 respondents)

31% Most Effective (9)
34% Effective (10)
34% Least Effective (10)

Recreation newsletter (29 respondents)

62% Most Effective (18)
28% Effective (8)
10% Least Effective (3)

City newsletter (30 respondents)

73% Most Effective (22)
13% Effective (4)
13% Least Effective (4)

Radio announcements (28 respondents)

21% Most Effective (6)
21% Effective (6)
57% Least Effective (16)

TV announcements/Triad TV (28 respondents)

25% Most Effective (7)
29% Effective (8)
46% Least Effective (13)

Bulletin board in businesses, churches, etc. (27 respondents)

11% Most Effective (3)
15% Effective (4)
74% Least Effective (20)

Other (3 respondents suggested other modes of notification)

Website (2)
Assistance from School District (1)

Survey participants were asked “How would you rate existing parks, recreational facilities, and activities in La Vista?” using a scale from excellent to poor. Maintenance of facilities and cost (reasonableness) were rated the highest. (Note: Percentage represents those

respondents who gave the particular facility or activity a rating. Percentage does not include those respondents who did not answer the question or left it blank. Number of respondents is in parentheses.)

Adequacy of facilities available (30 respondents)

53% Excellent (16)
43% Average (13)
3% Poor (1)

Maintenance of facilities (30 respondents)

80% Excellent (24)
17% Average (5)
3% Poor (1)

Availability (hours) (30 respondents)

73% Excellent (22)
27% Average (8)
0% Poor (0)

Cost (reasonableness) (29 respondents)

76% Excellent (22)
17% Average (5)
7% Poor (2)

Accessibility (ease/availability to all) (30 respondents)

70% Excellent (21)
20% Average (6)
10% Poor (3)

Security (30 respondents)

60% Excellent (18)
33% Average (10)
7% Poor (2)

Promotion (making residents aware) (29 respondents)

34% Excellent (10)
41% Average (12)
24% Poor (7)

Overall quality of parks (29 respondents)

69% Excellent (20)
28% Average (8)
3% Poor (1)

Parks and open space (30 respondents)

57% Excellent (17)
20% Average (6)
23% Poor (7)

Playgrounds (30 respondents)

57% Excellent (17)
43% Average (13)
0% Poor (0)

Recreation facilities and fields (30 respondents)

73% Excellent (22)
27% Average (8)
0% Poor (0)

Recreation programs (30 respondents)

73% Excellent (22)
27% Average (8)
0% Poor (0)

Cultural programs (29 respondents)

7% Excellent (2)
38% Average (11)
55% Poor (16)

Special activities (24 respondents)

21% Excellent (5)
46% Average (11)
33% Poor (8)

Survey participants were asked “Which of the following financing mechanisms would your family be willing to support in order to provide additional facilities and activities, if necessary?” The financing mechanisms were to be rated by the participants using a scale from not supportive to supportive. The mechanisms with the most support were grants and special fund raising campaigns. (Note: Percentage represents those respondents who gave the particular mechanism a rating. Percentage does not include those respondents who did not answer the question or left it blank. Number of respondents is in parentheses.)

Tax Increase (24 respondents)

17% Support (4)
25% Somewhat Support (6)
58% Not Support (14)

Bond Issue (25 respondents)

44% Support (11)
12% Somewhat Support (3)
44% Not Support (11)

Special fund raising campaigns (26 respondents)

81% Support (21)
12% Somewhat Support (3)
8% Not Support (2)

User fees, for specific activities (28 respondents)

71% Support (20)
21% Somewhat Support (6)
7% Not Support (2)

Grants (28 respondents)

89% Support (25)
7% Somewhat Support (2)
4% Not Support (1)

Other (4 other financing mechanisms were suggested)

Government/Private Partnerships (1)
Development Fees (1)
Gambling Profits (1)
Keno Revenue (2)

Survey participants were asked “If resources are not available in the community to meet the desires and needs of all residents how would you rank the following as a priority for your family?” Participants ranked the areas of need on a scale of high to low. The highest priority was for additional open space and parkland. (Note: Percentage represents those respondents who gave the particular item a rating. Percentage does not include those respondents who did not answer the question or left it blank. Number of respondents is in parentheses.)

Additional open space and parkland (29 respondents)

72% High (21)
21% Medium (6)
7% Low (2)

Additional recreational facilities (fields, special use facilities) (29 respondents)

45% High (13)
34% Medium (10)
21% Low (6)

Additional recreational programs (29 respondents)

21% High (6)
52% Medium (15)
28% Low (8)

Maintenance of existing facilities/programs (29 respondents)

- 66% High (19)
- 24% Medium (7)
- 10% Low (3)

Other (3 respondents offered other suggestions)

- Trails (1)
- Gym space (1)
- Open Space (1)

A series of demographic questions was asked to the survey participants. The answers to these questions reveal the total number of persons living in their home, ages of all individuals living at home, whether their home is located within the City limits or outside the City limits, how long they have lived in La Vista (if applicable), and the gross household income in 2001 (optional). Below shows the breakdown of demographic characteristics of the survey participants. (Note: Percentage represents those respondents who responded to the particular question. Percentage does not include those respondents who did not answer the question or left it blank. Number of respondents is in parentheses.)

Number of persons currently living in your home (30 respondents)

- 57% 1 to 2 persons (17)
- 40% 3 to 4 persons (12)
- 3% 5 to 8 persons (1)

Ages of all individuals identified in previous question

- 26% Under the age of 18 (19)
- 7% Between 19 and 25 (5)
- 25% Between 26 and 40 (18)
- 32% Between 41 and 60 (23)
- 10% Over 61 (7)

Is your home located within the City limits or outside the City limits? (30 respondents)

- 60% Within the City limits (18)
- 40% Outside the City limits (12)

Of those living within La Vista, 19.2 years was the average number of years living here.

What was your gross household income in 2001? (optional) (23 respondents)

- 4% Less than \$15,000
- 0% \$15,000 to \$24,999
- 4% \$25,000 to \$34,999
- 22% \$35,000 to \$49,999
- 30% \$50,000 to \$74,999
- 39% More than \$75,000

Survey participants were also given an opportunity to list other comments or concerns regarding the La Vista park and recreation activities and programs. Comments and concerns are as follows:

- I feel that a degreed/full time position with a high level of experience is needed for the position of La Vista Park Superintendent is going to be needed.
- Need more funds allocated to maintaining golf course, pools, and parks.
- Additional space for programs
- I don't believe our City planners are considering enough green space and natural areas that would incorporate walking/biking trails. Additionally, I've been disappointed with the management of the indoor v-ball leagues. Nights available, not limiting size of leagues, fees increasing with no apparent benefit to teams, no standings provided. Would prefer coed leagues at time other than Sunday afternoon, Sunday evening or a weeknight. We need open space connecting neighborhoods. Use of existing creek ways, don't cover them as open space and nature areas.
- Concentrate on doing a better job with the existing programs/facilities. Management of programs/facilities needs to be upgraded. Extended hours of the full-time staff to 7:00 or 8:00 at night to help with question and problems. Better cooperation with school district and surrounding recreation programs.
- Need more community involvement in City on a whole, i.e. community advisory boards, youth volunteers
- New pool should be indoor. Need more open gym time. Fees for programs and activities should be comparable to surrounding communities.

Swimming Pool Survey

According to survey results, a typical pool user is a female between 26 and 40 years old who lives in La Vista, uses the pool daily or four to six times a week, stays two to four hours or longer, and likes its location.

Reasons people like the pool include the good staff and operations, pool size, and pool depth. They like the pool and site amenities, including the volleyball courts and shady area, chairs, and ample parking available. They think it is a nice, safe place to come that is clean and well maintained and conveniently located in La Vista. The diving board is especially popular with youngsters. Some mentioned the admission cost as being reasonable and appreciate the swimming lessons and baby pool.

Things people would like to see changed about the pool include a bigger, deeper, pool with more activities such as a water slide, more diving boards, and more toys (fountains and jets) in the water. They would like to have a concession stand or vending machines available, as well as more shady areas and chairs. They would like to see improvements to the baby pool, bathhouse, and locker rooms. Some mentioned additional, year-round swimming facilities; a longer season; adult aerobics; and various site improvements.

All but five of the sixty people surveyed like the pool's location for reasons including its close proximity to their homes, and its convenient, central location. A few feel it is secluded and out-of-the-way, even though it is next to busy 84th Street. The heavy traffic on 84th Street that makes it difficult to get to the pool was cited as the reason three people didn't like the pool's location. Some people gave more than one reason for liking or disliking the pool's location. Two people did not answer the question.

The following is a summary of the Swimming Pool Survey responses. Along with the compiled responses, a blank survey can be found in *Appendix 4-J*.

What is your age?

Under 10: 4	16 to 18: 4	41 to 55: 6	76 & up: 0
10 to 12: 9	19 to 25: 6	56 to 65: 2	No answer: 0
13 to 15: 6	26 to 40: 21	66 to 75: 2	

Gender

Male: 24 Female: 36

Do you live in La Vista? If not, what City or county do you live in?

La Vista: 41	Papillion: 4	Fairview Heights: 1	Ralston: 1
Omaha: 9	Bellevue: 3	District 66: 1	

How often do you use the La Vista Municipal Pool?

Daily: 14	Average of once a week: 8
4-6 times a week: 13	1-5 times a season: 11
1-3 times a week: 8	6-10 times a season: 6

How long do you usually stay at the pool?

More than 4 hours: 22 2-4 hours: 26 Less than 2 hours: 12

What are three things you like best about the La Vista Municipal Pool?

Good Staff and Operations: 30	Diving Board: 16
Pool Size and Depth: 26	Location in La Vista: 14
Nice, Safe Place to Come: 25	Admission Cost: 6
Clean and Well-Maintained: 24	Swimming Lessons: 3
Pool and Site Amenities: 21	Baby Pool: 3

Please identify three things about the pool you think should be changed.

Bigger, Deeper Pool: 29	Additional Swimming Facilities: 6
More Water Activities: 21	Management and Operations: 6
More Diving Boards: 19	Bath House Improvements: 5
Water Slide: 18	Longer Season: 5
Baby Pool Improvements: 8	More Chairs: 5
Shade Areas: 12	Programs: 4
Facility and Site Improvements: 10	Difficult Location: 3
Concession Area/Vending Machines: 14	

Do you like the location of the pool?

Yes: 55 No: 3 No response: 2

Yes – Close to home:	28
Yes – Convenient Location:	10
Yes – Centrally Located in La Vista:	6
Yes – Secluded Location:	6
Yes – Other:	5
No – Hard to get to from east of 84th St.:	3
No – Other:	2

STEERING COMMITTEE

The Steering Committee was formed to help define and develop the *La Vista Park and Recreation Master Plan*. The roles of the Steering Committee included:

- Guiding the process and product on behalf of the community.
- Attending Steering Committee Workshops.
- Providing input and reaction to the inventory, needs assessment, policy issues, and plans.
- Assisting in policy issue review and policy recommendations.
- Providing support and representation at presentations to the Park and Recreation Advisory Board, City Council, and other public meetings.

The Steering Committee members included:

- Doug Kindig (City Council)
- Nancy Schultz (Park and Recreation Advisory Board)
- Brenda Sedlacek (Assistant City Administrator)
- David Potter (City Staff – Community Planner)
- Joe Soucie (City Staff – Public Works Director)
- Scott Stopak (City Staff - Recreation Director)
- Brian Lukasiewicz (City Park Foreman)
- Greg Johnson (Citizens)

Workshops

Numerous Steering Committee Workshops were held. The objectives at each workshop varied. During the first workshop, the Steering Committee identified goals, opportunities, issues, and stakeholders.

During the second workshop, the Steering Committee reviewed the results from the first workshop; discussed the surveys, demographic profile, and inventory forms; and took part in the Focus Meeting activities. The Steering Committee identified the strengths and weaknesses of the existing park and recreation system and developed a proposed park and recreation plan. (See the Focus Meeting portion of this section for complete details.)

During the third and fourth workshops, the Steering Committee determined the Mission Statement and discussed policy statements and development. (See Section 5 in this report regarding policy development.)



Steering Committee Workshop

During the fifth workshop, the Steering Committee discussed the outline for the draft report, specifically addressing the policy statements, park facilities analysis, Swimming Pool Survey, recreation facilities and programs, and the tree plan.

During the remaining workshops, the Steering Committee discussed the recommendations and action plan.

Workshop Results

The Steering Committee identified the goals, opportunities, issues, stakeholders, and mission statement for the *La Vista Park and Recreation Master Plan*.

Goals. The goals, as determined by the Steering Committee, are as follows:

Ensure adequate planning has taken place

- Establish a plan that addresses the City's growth and provides general direction for the City to work towards
- Identify and recommend needs of newly annexed areas
- Provide framework for future staffing needs and programming needs
- Guidance in designating and utilizing open space within City and two-mile extraterritorial jurisdiction
- Fit park and recreation plan into Comprehensive Plan
- Designate land for green space and parks
- Acquiring land - new park and recreation areas

Conduct thorough needs assessment and meet needs and wants of community

- Conduct assessment of current practices, policies, programs, facilities, parks
- Develop an understanding of the community's current and future needs, wants, and expectations related to park and recreation - are they being met?
- Identify non-existent activities (skate parks, BMX tracks, Frisbee golf)
- Determine the need for new/additional facilities (sports complex, fields, pool, etc.)
- Identify new or better uses for "under utilized" areas La Vista currently has
- Set aside more green space for future sports complexes or just to be left open
- Identify how La Vista matches up and/or compares to surrounding communities
- Enhance, don't duplicate, efforts of surrounding communities

Provide desired facilities and amenities

- Decide what type of pool will be needed (new, additional pool, water complex)
- Identify a Tree Plan that will reflect the needs outlined in the City code and Tree City USA (ensure proper selection, care, and possible grant monies)
- Develop a City-wide trail system (link various elements within the City, ETJ, NRD)
- Expansion of the current community center (possibly by building another facility to the west)
- Provide effective affordable recreational activity areas for the growing population of La Vista
- Improve our existing facilities making them the best they can be

Provide a park and recreation system that is supported by the City and community

- Provide a useable and guiding document for City staff and City Council (Inform of current and future needs)
- Have community-wide support
- Identify community needs and expectations
- Take into account citizen concerns in developing and improving our facilities

Ensure funding needs and sources have been identified

- Determine budget for future staffing
- Identify future financial commitments
- Identify funding opportunities
- Identify future capital improvements
- Recommend funding for new projects and/or rehabilitation of older parks and facilities

Opportunities. The opportunities, as determined by the Steering Committee, are as follows:

Involvement and support from the community

- Enable the public to help shape new and existing park and recreation facilities
- Get more people interested and involved
- New people coming to town bring new ideas and new recreation needs
- Small town atmosphere in urban area - citizens willing to work and help
- City and citizens have time and patience
- Growing/progressive community with civic backing for projects - commitment and good leadership
- City staff, departments, and council work well together to achieve goals
- Cooperative effort with the county, other cities, and school district

Enhance the quality of life

- Opportunity to establish a long-range plan to provide future direction
- Provide park facilities in every neighborhood
- City staff, departments, and council have high goals to do what is right
- Good things currently happening - have leadership to keep progressing
- Grow in an orderly fashion - concise with needs of the community
- Moving forward and open to new ideas - not stagnant
- Unlimited growth creates new needs
- Family oriented community
- Facilities and points of interests are within walking distance (without using major streets)
- New pool facility (traditional or water park)
- Successful past and bright future

Comprehensive park system and recreational opportunities

- Plan that identifies where the City is at and what needs to be done for years in the future
- Creating new park facilities
- Being able to approve developments, which can assist in building parks
- Linear corporate limits provide unique opportunities (trail potential)
- Quality of current facilities
- Programs for all ages (pre-school through senior citizens)
- Recreational complex - development of regional components
- Areas available (open space in ETJ, sod farm, Papio Creek)
- Proximity to surrounding communities

Financial assistance and funding opportunities

- Large corporations are potential funding sources
- People willing to pay - if properly planned
- Expanding population and future income - tax base
- Keno-Revenue

Issues. The issues, as determined by the Steering Committee, are as follows:

Community involvement, support, and approval

- Cooperation between citizens, City staff, other communities, school districts, YMCA, and athletic associations
- Dealing with differing public opinions and perceptions
- Public participation - getting people interested, involved, and supporting the project
- Satisfying citizens
- Realizing we can't please all the people all the time
- Getting "buy-in" from City officials, citizens, and developers (may be challenging, but this is not insurmountable)
- Determining what is needed and/or wanted (trails, pool, etc.)
- Determining special interest needs (skate park, pool, indoor pool, sports fields, etc.)

Developing a comprehensive park and recreation plan

- Developing a tree plan
- Trail development and link to existing trails
- Matching parks growth with City growth
- Utilization of current and future facilities
- "Adopt-a-park" program
- Needs assessment - creating, sustaining and/or improving needed park and recreational facilities and programs
- Connecting the two sides of the interstate
- Go beyond just maintenance issues - be able to make additional improvements
- Existing La Vista vs. New (West) La Vista - growth

Addressing project development issues - Planning for current and future needs

- Accurately accessing westward expansion and annexation developments
- Addressing needs in ETJ and future growth area
- Fast rate of growth
- Expanding staff needs
- Growth and development patterns - industry vs. residents vs. parks
- Linear corporate limits and development
- Population - current vs. future
- Do we build facilities or parks with ideas of serving non-residents?
- Recreational opportunities to adjacent communities - joint facilities

Financing and funding the project

- Funding of projects
- Money - sources
- Acquisition of land
- Prioritizing projects according to needs and wants
- Match staffing needs with improvements
- Staff can just keep up now- would like to do more

Stakeholders. The stakeholders, as determined by the Steering Committee, are as follows:

Government officials and agencies

- Mayor
- City Council
- City Administrator
- City Attorney
- City Engineer (Acting Engineer)
- City Staff (Parks, Recreation, Public Works, Utilities, Planning)
- Department Heads
- Park and Recreation Advisory Board
- Planning Commission
- School Board/District
- School Groups (athletics, P.E. groups, classroom field trips)
- County Board
- Surrounding Cities and Counties (Officials and Boards)
- NRD

Recreation and athletic groups and organizations

- BMX Riders
- Football Club
- Frisbee Golf Players
- Hobby Clubs (Model Airplane Groups)
- Skate Boarders
- Soccer Club/Players
- Softball Players
- Wrestling Club
- Athletic Association

- Sports Teams/Clubs (City sponsored, Local and visiting)
- Coaches

Community Interest Groups and Organizations

- Churches
- Civic/Community Groups (Jaycees, etc.)
- Special Interest Groups
- YMCA
- Volunteer Groups
- Individual Neighborhoods
- Corporations and Businesses

Individuals

- Adjoining Property Owners
- Current Citizens
- New Citizens of the Community
- Volunteers
- Youth
- Senior Citizens
- Developers
- Subdivisions
- Owner of Sod Farm

Mission Statement. The mission statement, as determined by the Steering Committee, is as follows:

The La Vista park and recreation system shall provide life long opportunities for recreational programs and park facilities that enhance the quality of life for La Vista residents.

SUMMARY

Input from the community helped point out La Vista residents' views regarding the park and recreation programs and facilities. This input was an essential part of the development and implementation of the *La Vista Park and Recreation Master Plan*. By continually involving the public throughout this process, the *La Vista Park and Recreation Master Plan* responds to the needs of the public and is supported by the residents.