

C

**BENCHMARK
COMPARISON**



BENCHMARK ANALYSIS

1.1 METHODOLOGY

PROS Consulting and the Davenport Parks and Recreation Department (“Department”) identified operating metrics to benchmark against comparable parks and recreation agencies. The goal of the analysis is to evaluate how the Department is positioned among peer agencies, as it applies to efficiency and effectiveness practices. The benchmark assessment is organized into specific categories based on peer responses to targeted questions that lend an encompassing view of each system’s operating metrics in comparison to the Department. The information sought allows for a comparison of key performance factors such as inventory of assets, budgets, staffing levels, programming, capital investment, marketing, maintenance, and operational philosophies.

Information used in this analysis was obtained directly from each participating benchmark agency, where possible, and supplemental data was collected from agency websites, Comprehensive Annual Financial Reports (CAFR), and the National Recreation and Park Association’s (NRPA) Park Metrics Database. *Due to differences in how each system collects, maintains, and reports data, variances may exist. These variations can impact the per capita and percentage allocations, and the overall comparison must be viewed with this in mind.* The benchmark data collection for all systems was complete as of December 2020. It is possible that information in this report may have changed since the original collection date, and in some instances, the information was not tracked or not available. The data was collected for and of fiscal year FY2019 or FY2019/20, depending upon each organization’s fiscal year.

The table below lists each benchmark agency in the study and reveals key characteristics, including location, jurisdiction type, population size, land area, density, and whether peers have won the NRPA Gold Medal Award and/or achieved CAPRA Accreditation. Peer agencies selected are located in Iowa, Kansas and Indiana. Davenport, Cedar Rapids and Olathe are managed as a Local Government Agency or City. Carmel Clay and Overland are managed as special park districts. This study also includes a wide range of populations served from 95,797 residents in Carmel Clay to 200,000 in Overland. The City of Davenport’s population (102,085) is the second smallest population and it is in the middle on jurisdiction size (29.68 sq. mi.), which results in a much lower population density (1,548 residents per sq. mi.) relative to its peers.

| Agency | State | Jurisdiction Type | Population | Jurisdiction Size (Sq. Mi.) | Population per Sq. Mi. | NRPA Gold Medal Winner (Year) | CAPRA Accredited (Origin Year) |
|----------------------------------|-------|-------------------|------------|-----------------------------|------------------------|-------------------------------|--------------------------------|
| Davenport Parks & Recreation | IA | City Department | 102,085 | 65.94 | 1,548 | No | Yes |
| Carmel Clay Parks & Recreation | IN | Special District | 95,797 | 47.46 | 2,018 | Winner (2014, 2020) | Yes (2014) |
| Cedar Rapids Parks & Recreation | IA | City Department | 133,562 | 72.07 | 1,853 | No | No |
| Olathe Parks & Recreation | KS | City Department | 139,605 | 62.38 | 2,238 | No | No |
| Overland Park Parks & Recreation | KS | Park District | 200,000 | 76.00 | 2,632 | No | No |

1.2 BENCHMARK COMPARISON

1.2.1 PARK ACRES

The following table provides a general overview of each system’s park acreage and reveals the key performance metric of total acres per 1,000 residents. The Department is just below the benchmark median for total park sites (41), but has the second highest total acres owned or managed (3,647). Further dissecting park acreage, the majority of the Department’s inventory is developed acreage (97%), which is the second highest percentage of developed parkland in the study. Assessing the key performance indicator (KPI) of level of service for park acres, the Department is the best in class of the benchmark with 35.73 acres of parkland for every 1,000 residents. The Department is also well above the NRPA median for park systems serving 100K-250K residents (8.9 acres of parkland per 1,000 residents).

| Agency | Population | Total Park Sites | Total Acres Owned or Managed | Total Developed Acres | Developed Acres as % of Total | Total Acres per 1,000 Residents |
|---|------------|------------------|------------------------------|-----------------------|-------------------------------|---------------------------------|
| Davenport Parks & Recreation | 102,085 | 41 | 3,647 | 3,541 | 97% | 35.73 |
| Cedar Rapids Parks & Recreation | 133,562 | 97 | 4,171 | 774 | 19% | 31.23 |
| Overland Park Parks & Recreation | 200,000 | 90 | 2,400 | 1,534 | 64% | 12.00 |
| Olathe Parks & Recreation | 139,605 | 46 | 1,444 | 1,408 | 98% | 10.34 |
| Carmel Clay Parks & Recreation | 95,797 | 19 | 574 | 105 | 18% | 5.99 |
| <i>NRPA Median for Agencies Serving less than 100K-250K Residents = 8.9 Acres per 1,000 Residents</i> | | | | | | |

1.2.2 TRAIL MILES

The information below shows the service levels for trails within each system and delineates mileage by type of trail. By dividing total trail mileage by the population of each service area, the level of service provided to the community can be determined as trail miles for every 1,000 residents. The Department is in the middle of the list with total miles of trail (32.5) in the benchmark study, but it could provide a better balance between soft (9.0 miles) and paved trails (23.5). The Department is in the top three for trail mileage per capita among benchmark agencies, with 0.32 miles per 1,000 residents. This level of service for trail mileage also falls below the best practice range of 0.50-1.0 of trail miles per 1,000 residents.

| Agency | Population | Soft Trail Miles | Paved Trail Miles | Total Trail Miles | Trail Miles per 1,000 Residents |
|---|------------|------------------|-------------------|-------------------|---------------------------------|
| Overland Park Parks & Recreation | 200,000 | 4.0 | 87.0 | 91.0 | 0.46 |
| Davenport Parks & Recreation | 102,085 | 9.0 | 23.5 | 32.5 | 0.32 |
| Cedar Rapids Parks & Recreation | 133,562 | 7.8 | 34.5 | 42.3 | 0.32 |
| Carmel Clay Parks & Recreation | 95,797 | 4.7 | 21.7 | 26.4 | 0.28 |
| Olathe Parks & Recreation | 139,605 | - | 20.0 | 20.0 | 0.14 |
| <i>Best practice is 0.5-1.0 trail miles per 1,000 residents</i> | | | | | |



1.2.3 STAFFING

This section compares levels of staffing for each system by comparing full-time equivalents (FTEs) to the total population served. Total FTEs per 10,000 residents is a key performance metric that assesses how well each system is equipped, in terms of human resources, to provide recreational services. The Department ranks second among agencies reporting data with 10.96 FTEs per 10,000 residents. This is also above the NRPA median for similar-sized systems (8.0 FTEs per 10,000 residents). Davenport has the largest acres per 1,000 residents yet is well below Carmel in the full-time equivalents. Davenport even has several special use facilities that are maintained for the public, which typically increases the number of staff due to special skill sets that are needed.

| Agency | Population | Total FTEs | FTEs per 10,000 Residents |
|---|------------|------------|---------------------------|
| Carmel Clay Parks & Recreation | 95,797 | 180 | 18.84 |
| Davenport Parks & Recreation | 102,085 | 112 | 10.96 |
| Cedar Rapids Parks & Recreation | 133,562 | 124 | 9.25 |
| Overland Park Parks & Recreation | 200,000 | 160 | 8.00 |
| Olathe Parks & Recreation | 139,605 | 82 | 5.87 |
| <i>NRPA Median for Agencies Serving less than 100K-250K Residents = 8.0 FTEs per 10,000 Residents</i> | | | |

1.2.4 VOLUNTEERS

Volunteers are critical for a sustainable park and recreation system because they help supplement the workforce and significantly reduce operating costs. The table below measures the total bodies and hours contributed by volunteers, then provides the average hours worked per volunteer and equates volunteer hours to Full-Time Equivalents (FTEs). The Department leads the list in the benchmark for volunteer engagement, in terms of average hours contributed per volunteer (91.7) and second in volunteer FTEs (26.44), while the Department is just above the median with the second largest volunteer pool (600) among peer agencies.

| Agency | Total Volunteers | Total Hours Contributed | Avg Hours Contributed per Volunteer | Volunteer Hours Converted to FTEs |
|----------------------------------|------------------|-------------------------|-------------------------------------|-----------------------------------|
| Overland Park Parks & Recreation | n/a | 75,000 | n/a | 36.06 |
| Davenport Parks & Recreation | 600 | 55,000 | 91.7 | 26.44 |
| Cedar Rapids Parks & Recreation | 883 | 17,953 | 20.3 | 8.63 |
| Olathe Parks & Recreation | 81 | 4,767 | 58.9 | 2.29 |
| Carmel Clay Parks & Recreation | 378 | 2,703 | 7.2 | 1.30 |

1.2.5 OPERATING EXPENSE PER CAPITA

The table below expresses total operating expenditures for each agency and compares it to the population served. Dividing the annual operational budget by each service area’s population allows for a comparison of how much each agency is spending per resident. The Department ranks fourth for total operating expenditures (\$6.99 million), and with \$68.50 spent on operations per resident. This level of spending is below the NRPA median for agencies serving 100K-250K residents (\$74.87 operating expense per resident). Davenport has been able to keep its operational costs well below that of peer communities. The Department should ensure that the operating expenditures are sufficient to properly maintain all assets to their full lifecycle before replacement. When assets are not reaching the full lifecycle, it is usually due to lack of funding or staff to properly maintain all under the Department’s purview.

| Agency | Population | Total Operating Expense | Operating Expense per Resident |
|--|----------------|-------------------------|--------------------------------|
| Carmel Clay Parks & Recreation | 95,797 | \$ 12,522,928 | \$ 130.72 |
| Overland Park Parks & Recreation | 200,000 | \$ 19,341,250 | \$ 96.71 |
| Cedar Rapids Parks & Recreation | 133,562 | \$ 10,666,582 | \$ 79.86 |
| Davenport Parks & Recreation | 102,085 | \$ 6,992,551 | \$ 68.50 |
| Olathe Parks & Recreation | 139,605 | \$ 4,532,725 | \$ 32.47 |
| <i>NRPA Median for Agencies Serving less than 100K-250K Residents = \$74.87 Operating Expense per Resident</i> | | | |

1.2.6 DISTRIBUTION OF EXPENDITURES

Diving deeper into the operating budget, the benchmark study also analyzed the designation of operating expenses. This includes allocation of funds towards personnel, operations, capital expenses not included in CIP, and other expenses. As shown below, the Department is higher in operations than benchmark peers in how it allocates expenditures and its distribution is lower in personnel among peers with the national average set forth by the NRPA. Best practice for the personnel expenditure percentage in the service industries is 55-60% of the overall budget. The correlation between acreage per 1,000 residents, operating budget and the percentage personnel is from the overall budget, points to the Department being understaffed. Subsequently, assets will deteriorate more rapidly costing more in the long-term than they would otherwise. What is also a factor is the Department’s reliance on part-time staff. Part-time staff are transient in nature and difficult to achieve the same level of service from and buy-in to achieve efficient and effective operations.

| Agency | Personnel | Operations | Capital Expense not in CIP | Other |
|--|------------|------------|----------------------------|-----------|
| Davenport Parks & Recreation | 45% | 51% | 3% | 0% |
| Carmel Clay Parks & Recreation | 60% | 38% | 2% | 0% |
| Cedar Rapids Parks & Recreation | 0% | 38% | 0% | 0% |
| Olathe Parks & Recreation | 64% | 46% | 0% | 0% |
| Overland Park Parks & Recreation | 51% | 46% | 3% | 0% |
| <i>NRPA agencies serving less than 100K-250K residents</i> | <i>56%</i> | <i>37%</i> | <i>3%</i> | <i>4%</i> |



1.2.7 REVENUE PER CAPITA

By comparing each agency’s annual non-tax revenue to the population, the annual revenue generated on a per resident basis can be determined. There is a dichotomy among peer agencies where the top benchmark agencies are generating significant levels of revenue, while the Department is just above the average revenue per resident. Compared to the population served, the Department is below the benchmark median with revenue per resident of \$18.63. This rate of revenue generation is just over three dollars more than the national median for agencies serving 100K-250K residents (\$15.44 per resident).

| Agency | Population | Total Non-Tax Revenue | Revenue per Resident |
|---|----------------|-----------------------|----------------------|
| Overland Park Parks & Recreation | 200,000 | \$ 13,724,500 | \$ 68.62 |
| Carmel Clay Parks & Recreation | 95,797 | \$ 6,129,625 | \$ 63.99 |
| Olathe Parks & Recreation | 139,605 | \$ 5,500,000 | \$ 39.40 |
| Davenport Parks & Recreation | 102,085 | \$ 1,902,084 | \$ 18.63 |
| Cedar Rapids Parks & Recreation | 133,562 | \$ 1,347,882 | \$ 10.09 |

NRPA Median for Agencies Serving less than 100K-250K Residents = \$15.44 Revenue per Resident

1.2.8 OPERATIONAL COST RECOVERY

Operational cost recovery is a key performance indicator, arrived at by dividing total non-tax revenue by total operating expense. This measures how well each agency’s revenue generation covers the total cost of operations. Overall, agencies participating in the benchmark study exhibit very strong cost recovery rates, as all, but one, peers are achieving better than the NRPA median and multiple agencies are exceeding industry best practice for operational cost recovery (~50%). Although the Department has the second lowest cost recovery rate among peer agencies, the Department’s 27% operational cost recovery is above the NRPA median for agencies serving 100K-250K residents (19.6%).

| Agency | Total Non-Tax Revenue | Total Operating Expense | Operational Cost Recovery |
|---|-----------------------|-------------------------|---------------------------|
| Olathe Parks & Recreation | \$ 5,500,000 | \$ 4,532,725 | 121% |
| Overland Park Parks & Recreation | \$ 13,724,500 | \$ 19,341,250 | 71% |
| Carmel Clay Parks & Recreation | \$ 6,129,625 | \$ 12,522,928 | 49% |
| Davenport Parks & Recreation | \$ 1,902,084 | \$ 6,992,551 | 27% |
| Cedar Rapids Parks & Recreation | \$ 1,347,882 | \$ 10,666,582 | 13% |

NRPA Median for Agencies Serving less than 100K-250K Residents = 19.6% Cost Recovery

1.2.9 CIP SUMMARY

Due to the volatility of Capital Improvement Plan (CIP) budgets and availability of funding from year to year, the table below reveals the last four years of actual investment and the budgeted CIP for 2021. These figures are then utilized to show the average annual capital investment for each agency. Compared to peer agencies, the Department ranks last for average CIP, with around \$1.3 million of investment annually. The current average for the Department is approximately one-tenth of the national median for CIP investment among agencies serving 100K-250K residents (\$13.6 million).

| Agency | CIP Expense 2017 | CIP Expense 2018 | CIP Expense 2019 | CIP Expense 2020 | CIP Budget 2021 | Avg Annual CIP |
|----------------------------------|------------------|------------------|------------------|------------------|-----------------|----------------|
| Overland Park Parks & Recreation | n/a | n/a | n/a | \$ 17,470,000 | \$ 5,290,000 | \$ 11,380,000 |
| Olathe Parks & Recreation | \$ 4,062,000 | \$ 25,857,000 | \$ 3,235,000 | \$ 2,825,000 | \$ 2,600,000 | \$ 7,715,800 |
| Carmel Clay Parks & Recreation | \$ 3,846,733 | \$ 9,285,449 | \$ 5,306,785 | \$ 9,640,423 | \$ 5,000,000 | \$ 6,615,878 |
| Davenport Parks & Recreation | \$ 1,475,000 | \$ 2,522,500 | \$ 690,000 | \$ 1,360,000 | \$ 565,000 | \$ 1,322,500 |

NRPA Median for Agencies Serving less than 100K-250K Residents = \$13.6M CIP Budget

Note: Figures for Cedar Rapids were not available at time of study.

1.2.10 CIP USE

The table below describes the designated uses for capital investments among benchmark agencies. Only three agencies reported figures, but most that did are more balanced on investing in renovation and development. The Department is fairly high on investing in renovation (90%) and low on development (10%). In comparison to the investment targets based on NRPA data for agencies serving 100K-250K residents, the Department is above average on renovation while below the national levels for development, acquisition, and other.

| Agency | Renovation | Development | Acquisition | Other |
|---|------------|-------------|-------------|-------|
| Davenport Parks & Recreation | 90% | 10% | 0% | 0% |
| Carmel Clay Parks & Recreation | 30% | 65% | 5% | 0% |
| Olathe Parks & Recreation | 52% | 32% | 16% | 0% |
| NRPA agencies serving less than 100K-250K residents | 53% | 34% | 8% | 4% |

Note: Figures for Cedar Rapids and Overland Park were not available at time of study.



1.2.11 MARKETING SPEND PER RESIDENT

Marketing budgets for parks and recreation agencies are typically much less than the private sector, but the industry is beginning to realize the value of investing in marketing and the potential return on investment that can be achieved. The table below compares the current marketing budgets for each agency. Then the current budget is divided by the total population served to arrive at the anticipated marketing spend per resident. The Department’s current marketing budget (\$142,800) is below the benchmark median. Relative to the population served, the Department ranks second among benchmark peers for anticipated marketing spend per resident (\$1.40).

| Agency | Population | Current Marketing Budget (2020) | Marketing Spend per Resident (2020) |
|---------------------------------|------------|---------------------------------|-------------------------------------|
| Carmel Clay Parks & Recreation | 95,797 | \$ 593,000 | \$ 6.19 |
| Davenport Parks & Recreation | 102,085 | \$ 142,800 | \$ 1.40 |
| Olathe Parks & Recreation | 139,605 | \$ 75,000 | \$ 0.54 |
| Cedar Rapids Parks & Recreation | 133,562 | \$ 19,342 | \$ 0.14 |

Note: Figures for Overland Park were not available at time of study.

1.2.12 MARKETING AS PERCENTAGE OF OPERATIONS

The table below shows the marketing expense incurred by each agency in the most recent fiscal year, then compares it to total expenditures to show what percentage of the operating expenses are dedicated to marketing. Compared to peer agencies, the Department has the second lowest marketing expense (\$19,693) and marketing percentage of operations (0.3%).

| Agency | Marketing Expense | Operational Expense | Marketing as % of Operations |
|---------------------------------|-------------------|---------------------|------------------------------|
| Carmel Clay Parks & Recreation | \$ 500,000 | \$ 12,522,928 | 4.0% |
| Olathe Parks & Recreation | \$ 77,000 | \$ 4,532,725 | 1.7% |
| Davenport Parks & Recreation | \$ 19,693 | \$ 6,992,551 | 0.3% |
| Cedar Rapids Parks & Recreation | \$ 2,745 | \$ 10,666,582 | 0.0% |

Note: Figures for Overland Park were not available.

1.2.13 SOCIAL MEDIA

Social media has increasingly become an integral part of marketing for parks and recreation agencies. The table below reveals the total staff hours that are dedicated to social media each year and provides a snapshot of how many followers / subscribers each agency has across multiple platforms. The Department ranks second highest for staff hours contributed to social media, while its follower / subscriber counts are lower across most platforms.

| Agency | Annual Staff Hours Managing Social Media | Followers/Subscribers by Social Media Platform | | | | |
|----------------------------------|--|--|---------|-----------|---------|----------|
| | | Facebook | Twitter | Instagram | YouTube | LinkedIn |
| Carmel Clay Parks & Recreation | 1300 | 17,086 | 5,621 | 4,053 | 297 | 646 |
| Olathe Parks & Recreation | 780 | 10,708 | 2,933 | 1,390 | 0 | 0 |
| Cedar Rapids Parks & Recreation | n/a | 10,596 | 11,900 | 3,313 | 141 | 0 |
| Davenport Parks & Recreation | 936 | 7,826 | 0 | 1,157 | 226 | 0 |
| Overland Park Parks & Recreation | 200 | 5,252 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |

1.2.14 PROGRAM PARTICIPATION

This portion assesses program participation for each agency by comparing total registered program participations to the population of each service area to determine the average participation rate per resident. Program activity is measured in participations (versus participants), which accounts for each time a resident participates in a program and allows for multiple participations per individual. The Department is second lowest in engaging the community in programs and participation rate (0.12 per resident) among peer agencies.

| Agency | Population | Total Program Participations | Participations per Resident |
|----------------------------------|------------|------------------------------|-----------------------------|
| Olathe Parks & Recreation | 139,605 | 381,303 | 2.73 |
| Cedar Rapids Parks & Recreation | 133,562 | 91,599 | 0.69 |
| Overland Park Parks & Recreation | 200,000 | 40,000 | 0.20 |
| Davenport Parks & Recreation | 102,085 | 12,318 | 0.12 |
| Carmel Clay Parks & Recreation | 95,797 | 6,428 | 0.07 |



1.2.15 PROGRAM REVENUES

As an additional indicator of revenue-generating capabilities of benchmark agencies, the program revenue of each department was compared to total residents within each jurisdiction. Davenport ranks in the middle among benchmark agencies and earnings from programming with an average of \$6.40 in program revenue per resident.

| Agency | Population | Total Program Revenue | Program Revenue per Resident |
|----------------------------------|------------|-----------------------|------------------------------|
| Olathe Parks & Recreation | 139,605 | \$ 5,500,000 | \$ 39.40 |
| Cedar Rapids Parks & Recreation | 133,562 | \$ 1,916,176 | \$ 14.35 |
| Davenport Parks & Recreation | 102,085 | \$ 653,543 | \$ 6.40 |
| Carmel Clay Parks & Recreation | 95,797 | \$ 200,000 | \$ 2.09 |
| Overland Park Parks & Recreation | 200,000 | \$ 55,000 | \$ 0.28 |

1.2.16 PROGRAM COST RECOVERY

Similar to the overall cost recovery, each agency's recovery levels for programs were assessed by dividing total program revenues by the direct cost to provide them. The Department recovers 47% of direct program expenses via revenue from programs, which positions the Department in the middle, among peer agencies.

| Agency | Total Program Revenue | Total Operating Expense for Programs | Cost Recovery for Programs |
|----------------------------------|-----------------------|--------------------------------------|----------------------------|
| Olathe Parks & Recreation | \$ 5,500,000 | \$ 5,300,000 | 104% |
| Cedar Rapids Parks & Recreation | \$ 1,916,176 | \$ 3,691,594 | 52% |
| Davenport Parks & Recreation | \$ 653,543 | \$ 1,389,626 | 47% |
| Carmel Clay Parks & Recreation | \$ 200,000 | \$ 450,000 | 44% |
| Overland Park Parks & Recreation | \$ 55,000 | \$ 200,000 | 28% |

1.2.17 INDOOR RECREATION SPACE

By dividing the existing square footage by the total population, the average indoor space available per resident can be determined. Assessing the available indoor recreation space among benchmark agencies, Davenport ranks second among peers with 1.26 sf per resident; however, this is lower than the national best practice of 1.5-2.0 sq. ft. of indoor space per resident.

| Agency | Population | Total Indoor Recreation Facilities | Total Sq. Ft. Indoor Rec Facilities | Sq. Ft. per Resident |
|--|------------|------------------------------------|-------------------------------------|----------------------|
| Carmel Clay Parks & Recreation | 95,797 | 3 | 157,225 | 1.64 |
| Davenport Parks & Recreation | 102,085 | 3 | 128,900 | 1.26 |
| Overland Park Parks & Recreation | 200,000 | 3 | 140,000 | 0.70 |
| Olathe Parks & Recreation | 139,605 | 1 | 71,712 | 0.51 |
| Cedar Rapids Parks & Recreation | 133,562 | 2 | 26,559 | 0.20 |
| <i>National Best Practice = 1.5-2.0 Square Feet of Indoor Space per Resident</i> | | | | |



1.3 SUMMARY OF BENCHMARK FINDINGS

The Benchmark Analysis included top performing agencies from Iowa, Kansas and Indiana. Continuing to benchmark against peer agencies is beneficial for the Department to better understand how its performance stacks up to industry best practices. The following is a summary of the key findings from the benchmark comparison.

- The Department has the second highest parkland inventory relative to peer agencies and national best practices. Based on the current level of service, the Department has well above the NRPA median for park acres per 1,000 residents and below NRPA median trail miles per 1,000 residents.
- From a human resources standpoint, the Department is above the NRPA median for similar sized agencies. The Department helps supplement staff and keep operating costs lower by maximizing the volunteer program, as the Department ranks second among peers for average hours per volunteer and the highest for volunteers converted to FTEs.
- The majority of benchmark peers are spending more on operations than the national median. The Department has the second lowest spending per resident among all benchmark agencies and is below the NRPA median for operating expense per resident. The Department is higher in operations than benchmark peers in how it allocates expenditures and its distribution is lower in personnel among peers with the national average set forth by the NRPA.
- Similar to operating expenses, many peer agencies generate significant revenue on a per resident basis. The Department ranks second to last among peer agencies and is generating revenue slightly above the NRPA median rate.
- Assessing operational cost recovery (i.e., what level non-tax revenues recoup operational costs), benchmark agencies are performing at a high level, as only one agency has a cost recovery level falls below the national median for similar-sized agencies. Although the Department is ranked next to last among benchmark peers, with 27% of operations supported by earned income, its cost recovery level is still above the national median set forth by NRPA.
- The marketing efforts of the Department are second best compared to peer agencies. The percentage of operations dedicated to marketing and the marketing spend per resident are both below benchmark averages. The Department ranks near the top for staff time dedicated to managing social media and total followers / subscribers tend to be lower than peers for most platforms.
- Comparing metrics related to programming, the Department ranks near the bottom among its peers for program participation and in the middle for program revenue generation per resident (\$6.40). This positions the Department cost recovery in the middle of peer agencies (47%) of its direct program costs through program revenues and should look to improve its cost recovery level for programs in the future.
- Based on level of service for indoor recreation space, the Department ranks in the top (three-way tie) among peers for total number of facilities (3) and second in square feet per resident of indoor space (1.26 sq. ft.). However, the current service level is below the recommended best practice level, which may signal a need for additional indoor space to meet unmet community needs.