



St. Francis, Minnesota
**Park System
Plan**

ADOPTED BY CITY COUNCIL, JULY 18, 2022





TABLE OF CONTENTS

01	INTRODUCTION	1
	Plan Purpose.....	1
	Previous Plans & Background Documents.....	2
02	EXISTING CONDITIONS	7
	Existing Conditions Overview.....	7
	Demographic Analysis and Projections.....	8
	Programming & Events.....	10
	Existing Parks & Features.....	12
03	NEEDS ASSESSMENT	17
	Needs Overview.....	17
	Trends in Recreation.....	17
	Peer Comparison.....	21
	NRPA Park Metrics.....	22
	Staffing and Budget Analysis.....	24
	Level of Service Analysis.....	24
	Park Classification.....	26
	Engagement Input.....	28
	Summary of Needs Assessment.....	32
04	DEVELOPMENT RECOMMENDATIONS	33
	Vision, Values, and Goals.....	33
	Organization of Recommendations.....	34
	Recommendations Framework.....	35
	Specific Recommendations & Initiatives.....	44
	Park Concept Plans.....	48
05	IMPLEMENTATION	55
	Implementation Overview.....	55
	Budgeting for Plan Recommendations.....	56
	Funding Overview and Sources.....	59
	Park Policies.....	60
06	APPENDIX	65



ACKNOWLEDGMENTS

CITY COUNCIL

Steve Feldman, Mayor
Joe Muehlbauer, Council member
Kevin Robinson, Council member
Robert Bauer, Council member
Sarah Udvig, Council member

CITY STAFF

Kate Thunstrom, City Administrator
Joe Kohlmann, Former City Administrator
Jeremy Shook, Streets/Parks Supervisor
Paul Carpenter, Public Works Director

CONSULTANT

HKGi

Thank you to all the St. Francis residents, visitors, and stakeholders who provided valuable input to the development of this plan!

“

Input from the community-wide survey included: “Would love more parks and recreation areas outside neighborhoods. Would love more hiking/walking trails.”

”





INTRODUCTION



PLAN PURPOSE

This Park System Plan document is a follow up plan to the City's 2040 Comprehensive Plan in support of the City's evolution of its growing parks, recreation, and trails system. This Plan references previous work and planning that has been completed as part of the following documents: *St. Francis Forward*, the *Bridge St. Design Guidelines*, the *City's 2040 Comprehensive Plan*, neighborhood park designs, Anoka County park and trail planning, and others.

This document includes individual park concepts plans, implementation recommendations related to capital projects, operations, maintenance, and planning projects, and strategic planning to support potential grant funding for future development of the parks, trails, and recreation system.

Community engagement input and input from elected officials is reflected in this plan to ensure that the recommendations represent the interests of the city's residents, recreation partners, business owners, students, and workers.

PLAN ORGANIZATION

Chap. 1: Introduction

Purpose and background information

Chapter 2: Existing Conditions

City Context, existing parks and facilities

Chapter 3: Needs Assessment

Evaluation and assessment of the parks and recreation system compared to local and national metrics, community input, and gaps in service

Chapter 4: Development Recommendations

Vision, long-term recommendations, and near-term projects identified to improve and maintain the system

Chapter 5: Implementation & Policies


Budgeting, funding, and policies used to implement the recommendations

PREVIOUS PLANS & BACKGROUND DOCUMENTS

St. Francis 2040 Comprehensive Plan



VISION STATEMENT FOR THE CITY OF ST. FRANCIS:

The vision for St. Francis is an active town on the Rum River, enjoying a high quality of life that meets the day to day needs of residents, workers, and visitors. Rural areas are a mix of working lands, open space, and homes, all celebrating the natural environment. Neighborhoods are safe and strengthen a sense of community. The city has vibrant and bustling commercial districts, and businesses are growing. Visitors and those passing through make it a point to stop in St. Francis on their way. While the community's proximity to Minneapolis and St. Paul provides residents with access to a diversity of jobs and activities within the region, residents of St. Francis have options for a variety of jobs locally. A full range of households enjoy living in St. Francis. Families, empty nesters, and senior citizens can gather, learn, celebrate, move safely and conveniently around town, and obtain the services they need.



City of St. Francis Comprehensive Plan (2020)

The park system helps the City achieve its vision and guiding principles: celebrating the natural environment, creating community spaces and recreation opportunities, improving the identity of St. Francis and enhancing the natural character of the City.




Comprehensive Plan Maps: 'Planned Trails' and 'Park Search Areas'


City of St. Francis Park and Trail Plan (2013)

Park and Trail Issues listed in the 2013 park system plan that are still relevant today:

- The City is lacking in active recreational facilities/programs and relies heavily on adjacent communities for such opportunities.
- Community promotion of park and trail facility use is important in establishing a community identity.
- Development of additional picnic and playground facilities, tennis courts, hockey rinks, skate parks, and soccer fields are all seen as important to St. Francis residents.
- Development of a trail system to connect neighborhoods to recreational areas and commercial centers is seen as a priority for the City.
- Cooperation with Anoka County and surrounding jurisdictions in regard to park and trail planning is considered beneficial.
- The Park and Recreation Commission, Planning Commission, and City Council must maintain an active working relationship.
- Recommended 10 acres of parkland per 1,000 people




City of St. Francis Park and Trail Plan (2013)



City of St. Francis Bridge Street Design Guidelines (2019)





St. Francis Bridge Street Design Guidelines



Bridge Street Parcel Concepts

St. Francis Forward: (re) Development Plans for the city of St. Francis (2017)



- Develops a vision for redevelopment of the city through public and private investments
- Provides a master plan to guide redevelopment efforts
- Establishes a set of project ideas to catalyze redevelopment



Development Master Plan

St. Francis Parks Mapping and Brochure (2018)


- An overview of all city parks and facilities within each park is included.
- The brochure is accessible on the city's website for residents and visitors to plan their park visits.
- The maps and brochure identify several trail loops within the city that range from 0.4 to 2 miles in length.




Created through a grant with Anoka County

Northern Anoka County River Crossing Study (2012)

- Potential impacts to future downtown campus and Woodbury Park are identified in the plan for bridge improvements
- As this plan is implemented, the city should consider connections to Rum River County Park from Community Park and Woodbury Park



Intersection Concept



Anoka County Regional Trail Master Plans

SUGAR HILLS REGIONAL TRAIL MASTER PLAN (2016)

The proposed Sugar Hills Regional Trail corridor is approximately 14 miles long and connects the Anoka County regional trail system with the Cities of Oak Grove, St. Francis and Nowthen. The trail is proposed to connect Rum River North County Park and the Rum River and North Anoka County Regional Trails along with numerous city parks and trails along its route. Approximately two miles of the trail currently exist. Additional proposed segments in St. Francis run along Ambassador Blvd and County Rd 70 West of the Rum River.


RUM RIVER REGIONAL TRAIL MASTER PLAN (2019)

The Rum River Regional Trail follows the Rum River from the City of Anoka to the Anoka/Isanti County border. The trail is made up of segments connecting different local and regional parks. The plan for this trail is to be 20 miles long when complete and stretch North to South across the county.

Recent changes to the trail plan in St. Francis include a trail underpass at Bridge Street located just south of the Bridge Street bridge, immediately adjacent to the Rum River on the east side. There is also a proposed trail realignment located north of Rum River North County Park adjacent to the east side of the Rum River.



“ St. Francis is an active town on the Rum River ”





EXISTING CONDITIONS



EXISTING CONDITIONS OVERVIEW

The St. Francis park system is made up of several neighborhood parks, community parks, natural parks and open spaces that provide residents and visitors with spaces to get outside, play, and gather. The school district, Anoka County, and the State of Minnesota provide additional recreation facilities and open spaces such as athletic fields, playgrounds, nature trails, water access, fishing, and open space preservation, that complement the city's system.

Community Park is the central community park that provides outdoor space for hosting community events and space for family gathering. Anoka County's Rum River North County Park provides miles of paved and natural surface trails, fishing and boating access, and picnic and play areas.

This chapter include information about the city's demographics and projections for future growth, a summary of city programming and events, maps of existing parks and open space, a list of parks by classification, and a map and list of park facilities and amenities.



Woodbury Park



Community Park

DEMOGRAPHIC ANALYSIS AND PROJECTIONS


The city of St. Francis is a rural community that bridges Anoka and Isanti counties. The vast majority of the city’s area and population is within Anoka County, but a small northeastern spur crosses the county boundary and falls in Isanti County.

BREAKDOWN OF POPULATION BY AGE GROUP


	ST. FRANCIS	ANOKA AND ISANTI COUNTIES	MINNESOTA
YOUNG CHILDREN (UNDER 5)	10.4%	11.0%	6.2%
SCHOOL AGE (5-19)	21.7%	23.7%	19.5%
YOUNG ADULTS (OVER 20, UNDER 40)	28.7%	29.1%	26.5%
MIDDLE AGED (40-65 YEARS)	30.6%	28.2%	31.5%
RETIREMENT AGE (65+)	8.6%	7.9%	16.3%

Who lives in Saint Francis?

The population make up of St. Francis closely follows the age patterns of the two counties that encompass the city. Anoka and Isanti counties however have a higher proportion of children under 5 and school aged children, and a lower proportion of middle aged and older adults. Around one third of households have children under 18 living at home, and half of households are composed of married couples. The city is split fairly evenly with regard to gender, the population breakdown is 49.5% female and 50.5% male. A majority of the population is white (90%) and the remaining population is composed of primarily people who identify as two or more races (4%), Hispanic or Latino (4%), and Black or African American (1%).



ST. FRANCIS RACIAL BREAKDOWN



ST. FRANCIS AGE BREAKDOWN

How are things changing?

The City is projected to see substantial growth in the next twenty years, up 65% from current population levels. Anoka County is expected to see growth as well but it is projected to be more moderate, around 25% according to the state demographer. This expected growth will likely have a tremendous impact on the use of the parks system as incoming residents take advantage of the city's parks and trails.

POPULATION PROJECTIONS FOR THE CITY

	2010	2017	2020	2030	2040
ST FRANCIS	7,218	7,624	8,200	10,400	12,600

POPULATION PROJECTIONS BY COUNTY

	2013	2018	2023	2028	2033	2038	2043
ANOKA	339,099	353,813	367,861	381,158	392,988	403,116	411,712
ISANTI	38,058	39,966	40,678	41,652	42,420	42,960	43,297

What does all this mean for the parks system?


Parks, trails, and recreation facilities serve as important community hubs that connect neighbors of all ages with each other and community opportunities. Creating social connections among and across generations is an overarching piece of community wellness both for younger and older generations. For the community in and around St. Francis who utilize the parks system these park spaces serve a vital role.

The City of St. Francis has a fairly substantial number of households with school aged children and younger and these households tend to be more frequent park users. In families with younger children parents often visit parks to supervise their children, walk around trails, and relax. Children use parks in many ways as well, playing on playground equipment, exploring natural spaces, and participating in youth sports or other programming.

The community currently has a smaller community of older adults than Minnesota as a whole, but an increasing and aging population indicate that this will shift in the near future. Older adults are often regular park users, especially those who are retired and have more free time. Much of the park use by older adults is on walking paths and trails, and opportunities for casual or organized socialization, including trending sports like pickleball.

Because a majority of city residents (9 out of 10) leave the city for work it is important that the city maintains amenities like parks that make the choice of staying and living in the community worthwhile. Parks and other city services may be influential factors when people are deciding where to call home and where to look for enjoyment. Conversely, many people who work in the city do not live in St. Francis.

Four out of five employees in St. Francis are living elsewhere and only 322 residents both live and work in the city.



ST. FRANCIS POPULATION PROJECTIONS



Woodbury Park

PROGRAMMING & EVENTS

Community Park

The large open space, concessions and restroom building, trails, parking lots, and playground at Community Park provide an ideal setting for hosting community-wide events. The city facilitates rental of the ballfield and picnic shelter at Community Park through the Facility Use Permit process. The school program utilizes the ballfield as well as church organizations and other groups.

Spaces available for rent at Community Park include:

- Concessions building
- Picnic Shelter
- Warming house/hockey building
- Baseball diamond

Community Park has been used to host community-wide events by the St. Francis Chamber of Commerce. Annual events include National Night to Unite in August, and St. Francis Pioneer Days in May and June.



Community Park event

Hidden Ponds Park

The ballfields and soccer fields at Hidden Ponds Park are available for families, athletic organizations, and youth groups to rent out. They are used by local sports organizations and use is facilitated by the city.

Woodbury Park

A gazebo and gardens at Woodbury Park are available for rental for weddings and other gatherings. The park provides a picturesque location close to downtown and the Rum River.

Community Room

A Community Room at the St. Francis City Hall is available for meetings and other small gatherings. The Senior group uses the room regularly.



Community Park event




Community Park event

Existing City-wide Parks, Trails, and Open Spaces Map

Existing developed parks and trails are concentrated in the central, developed part of St. Francis. As the city continues to develop new housing areas to the north, east, and west of downtown, additional parks and trails will be constructed to serve new residents. Two state Wildlife Management Areas (WMAs) are located in the undeveloped west and east parts of the city. Anoka County operates two county parks that serve St. Francis residents: Rum River North County Park is located on the west side of the Rum River, centrally located in the city, while Lake George Regional Park is located just south of the city in Oak Grove. Most of the trails in the city are county trails, with two regional trail corridors planned within the city: the Sugar Hills Regional Trail and the Rum River Regional Trail.

- County Trails
- County Park
- Community Park
- Neighborhood Park
- Passive Park or Open Space
- Wildlife Management Area
- New Existing Trails
- Possible Trails
- City Limits
- Open Water
- Wetland



EXISTING PARKS & FEATURES


The City of St. Francis has nine (9) developed parks, including two community parks, one special use park, and six neighborhood parks. These parks provide facilities and amenities, such as play equipment, shelters, athletic fields, courts, and trails. The city operates another nine natural parks and several other undeveloped open spaces that provide valuable passive recreation space and wildlife habitat areas, some of which have walking trails.

Non-city parks and open spaces include County, State, School District, and private facilities that support the city’s system with additional recreation opportunities.

PARK TYPE	QTY	PARK NAMES
CITY PARKS		
Community Park	2	Community Park, Hidden Ponds Park
Special Use Park	1	Woodbury Park
Neighborhood Park	7	Durigan Locher Park, Degardner Park, Rum River Woods Park, Highland Woods Park, Seelye Brook Park, Deer Creek 2nd Park, Siwek Park
Natural Parks	9	Creekview Estates, Wickstrom Forest Park, Sunrise Hills, Degardner Nature Park, Edgewild Park, Dellwood River Park, Smith Lake Park, Stonehouse Park, Deer Creek 1st Park
Undeveloped Open Space		Several areas exist throughout the city
NON-CITY PARKS AND OPEN SPACE		
County or Regional Park	1	Rum River North County Park
Wildlife Management Area (MN DNR)	2	Bethel WMA, Carl E. Bonnell WMA
School Facilities	4	St. Francis Elementary, St. Francis Middle School, St. Francis High School, St. Francis Learning Center
Private Recreation	2	Minnetonka Game and Fish Club, The Ponds Golf Course



Existing Developed Area Parks, Trails, and Open Spaces Map



Existing park sign, Degardner Park




Existing parking area



Existing park wayfinding



Existing open space, Deer Creek 2nd Park



Existing Park Features Map



Existing ballfield, Community Park



Existing restroom facilities, Community Park
















Existing picnic shelter and grills, Deer Creek 2nd Park



Existing playground, Durigan Locher Park



Existing Park Features by Park

Park Name	Classification	            												
		Baseball/ Softball Field	Basketball Court	Canoe/Kayaking	Fishing Access	Ice Rink	Playground	Rentable Space	Restroom	Shelter	Sledding Hill	Soccer Field	Trails	Volleyball Court
Community Park	Community Park	X				X	X	X	X	X		X	X	
Deer Creek 1st Park	Passive or Open Space													
Deer Creek 2nd Park	Neighborhood Park					X			X			X		
Degardner Nature Park	Passive or Open Space													
Degardner Park	Neighborhood Park		X									X		
Dellwood River Park	Passive or Open Space											X		
Durigan Locher Park	Neighborhood Park					X						X		
Edgewild Park	Passive or Open Space													
Hidden Ponds Park	Community Park	X				X					X	X		
Highland Woods Park	Neighborhood Park					X						X		
Rum River Woods Park	Neighborhood Park					X						X		
Seelye Brook Park	Neighborhood Park					X				X		X		
Siwek Park	Neighborhood Park		X			X			X					
Smith Lake Park	Passive or Open Space													
Stonehouse Park	Passive or Open Space													
Wickstrom Forest Park	Passive or Open Space													
Woodbury Park	Special Use Park						X		X			X		
St. Francis Community Room	Special Facility						X	X						
totals		2	2	-	-	1	8	3	2	4	1	1	1	

Non-City Parks and Open Space													
Lake George Regional Park	Anoka County Park (Oak Grove)			X	X		X	X	X	X			
Rum River North County Park	Anoka County Park			X	X		X	X	X	X		X	
Bethel WMA	Minnesota DNR WMA												
Carl E. Bonnell WMA	Minnesota DNR WMA												
St. Francis High School	School	X									X		
St. Francis Elem & Middle Schools	School	X	X				X				X		
St Francis Learning Center	School	X					X				X		
totals		3	1	2	2	-	4	2	2	2	-	3	1



“ Rum River North and the Community Parks are the parks most frequently visited by survey respondents ”





NEEDS ASSESSMENT



NEEDS OVERVIEW

This chapter includes a summary of several analysis methods that were used to identify needs for the park system:

- A review of recreation trends
- Peer Community Comparison
- NRPA Metrics
- Staffing and Budget Analysis
- Level of Service
- Park Classifications and Guidelines
- Engagement Input

TRENDS IN RECREATION

Park and recreation trends are constantly changing and evolving, but often they can be tied to more broad societal changes and shared values. Park trends are often connected to topics of sustainability and climate resilience, promoting health in communities, and increasing accessibility and equity in the system in addition to creating opportunities for engaging unique experiences. It is important for park and recreation systems to adapt accordingly to ensure that they continue to provide relevant facilities, programs and options that serve communities as they evolve and shift.



Splash Pad



Pollinator Garden



Environmental Benefits of Parks, Trails, and Open Spaces

Parks and recreation spaces make up a substantial portion of open spaces in many communities and can carry significant potential for contributing to a community's sustainability and resiliency goals.

- Parks can provide valuable **pollinator habitat**; fragmented edges and marginal areas are becoming increasingly important in this regard. Parks can be used as a location for restoring "natural" landscapes and encouraging habitat friendly plantings. Trends around pollinator habitat restoration in parks include reducing turf and/or conversion to pollinator lawns, and transitioning maintenance from mowing to weeding/spraying/burning.
- **Green infrastructure** can also be integrated into parkland areas to maximize the positive impact of the space for the community. This infrastructure can include rain gardens, below ground water storage, detention ponds, artificial wetlands, etc.
- Embracing the functionality of parks and trails as a vital part of a community's **transportation system** is another potential contribution. Parks and trails provide alternative methods of getting people where they need to go without using a vehicle. New trends in this area include creating parks without borders, coordinating with public transit services and other transportation options, and coordinating parks and trails as means to accessing important destinations.
- Recognizing the role of parks beyond recreation is not new, but is being explored in new ways. Parks can be viewed as part of the local **food system** providing a place to grow, harvest, and prepare food. By providing grills, picnic shelters, and community gardens or foraging areas, or hosting farmers markets, and CSA pickups etc. parks can help to fill in gaps in the food system.



Park Access & Equity

The distribution of park resources and the communities and uses being served or not served by a parks system all reflect on the equity of the parks system. There are many ways that barriers to park use and access can be reduced and that park systems can become more equitable:

- **Access:** Parks should be evenly distributed throughout the city where people are living
- **Cost:** Endeavor to keep park programming affordable or free so it can be accessed as widely as possible
- **Language/Literacy:** Develop park signage and materials in multiple languages and use symbols rather than words when possible
- **Age and ability:** Build flexible use recreation spaces that can be enjoyed by people of many ability levels (children, older adults, people with disabilities etc.)
- **Amenities:** Provide amenities that make it more comfortable and manageable for all people to use parks, bathrooms, spaces for prayer or nursing, benches etc.
- **Programming:** Offer programming that is culturally relevant to various groups within the community





Healthy Communities

Promoting health and wellness through interaction with nature and recreation activities is a vital role of a park system. Parks can provide a convenient location for many different forms of exercise. According to the Parks & Trails Council of Minnesota, communities that offer parks & trails with outreach can increase the number of people who exercise at least 3 times per week by 25%. In addition to the physical benefits, parks and recreation access can also impact mental wellbeing. Access to natural spaces is associated with numerous social emotional benefits, lower rates of stress and depression, higher levels of focus, and a greater overall sense of well-being (APHA's Improving Health and Wellness through Access to Nature). Park trends that help to promote healthy communities include:

- Offer fitness programs in parks
- Hold special fitness focused events like races and triathlons
- Provide spaces with flexible programming
- Create well connected and maintained walking, running, and biking trails
- Partner with schools to offer free summer meals
- Increase interest in local food through garden access, hosting farmers markets, and serving as pick up sites for CSAs
- Preserve and provide access to natural areas
- Offer educational and interpretive programs
- Incorporate app-based exploration options to move screen time outdoors

Programming

Programming is a key method of engaging the community that can drive the use of park and recreation facilities. Key programming activities offered by many communities include themed special events, team sports, social recreation events, fitness enhancement classes, and health and wellness education. According to the NRPA, agencies serving less than 20,000 residents hold on average 32 fee-based programs per year. The top three types of programming offered by towns are: Social recreation events (94%), themed special events (92%), and Fitness enhancement classes (88%). According to the NRPA 83% of agencies offer some type of summer camp for their communities' younger residents.

The type of programming provided by parks has shifted in the last two years, virtual social events and grab-and-go activities caught on as a means of continuing recreation programming offerings during the uncertainty of the COVID-19 pandemic. New types of programs were designed to allow participants to maintain a safe distance or participate from their home in new and different ways. Virtual competitions and team events also became a more common option. Esports which was already on the rise as a new trend gained even more traction due to the lack of in person contact required.

Team-based sports are a great means of developing social skills, a sense of camaraderie and healthy levels of competition, for children and adults, however, there is also a shift toward more passive and individual sports, which foster life-long exercise and individually motivated activity, which is equally important to promote. Activities such as walking, biking, hiking, paddling, fishing, skating and skiing are more adaptable to people as their bodies age and can no longer handle higher-impact or competitive sports. These solo or small-group hobbies have also seen the greatest uptick in numbers since the onset of COVID-19.





New Facilities and Changing Preferences

Some of the evolution of parks trends are less tied to a specific goal and are more so a cultural shifting of taste and preference. New forms of nature-based recreation like geocaching, biocaching, archery, dog parks and non-traditional sports like lacrosse, pickleball, ultimate frisbee, and disc golf are all emerging as newly popularized ways to make use of the park system.

- Interest in free, flexible water play, such as splash pads instead of pools
- Declining adult league participation due to competition from other more flexible fitness options
- More competitive youth athletics require higher quality fields (artificial turf soccer fields, ball diamonds with lights and dugouts)
- Increased interest in multi-purpose, flexible field space
- All season trail use by hikers, bikers (mountain, fat tire, commuting), skiing
- Adventure focused experiences (climbing, BMX biking, races)
- Rise in different types of water sports such as stand-up paddle boarding, kayaking, and windsurfing
- Nature play which can engage kids for longer, in more complex activities, and more frequently than traditional playgrounds
- Desire for additional amenities, such as permanent restrooms, in all parks

Summary

Trends should not dictate the entire direction of a park system; but monitoring the direction and type of trends, and incorporating these themes into decision making processes will help to move the parks system forward. Not every park system has the capacity or need to offer every new thing. Care should be taken to assess what options will serve the St. Francis community best based on who is in the community, what their desires are, what the community already has, and what is available from other sources. It should also be noted that while some trends address specific goals and will always be important (such as access to neighborhood parks), others might be more short lived (such as Pokémon Go or other virtual reality apps).

Things to consider when making parks planning decisions:



Does this decision help to advance equitable outcomes?



Does this decision promote a healthy and well community?



Does this decision have a positive impact on the natural environment?



Does this decision move towards achieving the goals of the park system?


PEER COMPARISON

Understanding where St. Francis stands in relation to peer communities is one way to address how the park system is doing overall. The peer communities chosen were the Cities of Andover, Anoka, East Bethel, Ham Lake, Oak Grove, Otsego, and Ramsey. These cities were identified based on a combination of factors including proximity, physical size, and population. The National Recreation and Park Association’s benchmarks based on other communities around the country are also considered. Assessing how St. Francis’ park system compares to these other communities is one of several tools that can be used to determine areas where the community could make improvements or areas in which the park system is already thriving.

St. Francis is smaller in physical space and population than most of the peer cities, and on the low end for the NRPA’s less than 20,000 residents category with 7,652 residents. It is also below average in terms of population density compared to these peer cities. These factors should be kept in mind when assessing how St. Francis stacks up.

General Metrics Compared to Peer Cities:

Not all communities track all of the measures, and it is likely that for those who are tracking specific metrics their methods or categorizations differ slightly. For example, Oak Grove lists in their comprehensive plan that they have 50 parks, however many of these parks fit into the category of open space and would not necessarily be counted as parks by other communities. Data is also skewed slightly high by the larger communities of Andover and Ramsey. This is especially important to note when considering the ranges of the peer comparison data. The ratio of parkland to the overall city area in St. Francis is lower than the peer cities’ average; however, Anoka and East Bethel have exceptionally high ratios which push up the average.



Peer Communities in geographic relation to St. Francis

SUMMARY OF PEER COMMUNITY COMPARISON DATA

	ST. FRANCIS	RANGE OF PEERS	AVERAGE OF PEERS
CITY AREA IN SQUARE MILES	24	7—48	31.6
TOTAL POPULATION	8,142	7,000—33,000	18,660
POPULATION DENSITY	339	247—2,437	824.4
TOTAL PARKS	19	15—67	35.3
COMMUNITY & SPECIAL USE PARKS	3	0—6	3
SPORTS COMPLEXES	-	0—11	6.3
NEIGHBORHOOD PARKS	7	5—16	10.6
PASSIVE PARKS/OPEN SPACE	9	2—40	13.8
TOTAL CITY PARKLAND ACREAGE	82	82—1,334	607
TOTAL PARKLAND AND OPEN SPACE ACREAGE	842	842—5372	1,840
PERCENTAGE OF CITY AREA DEDICATED TO PARKS AND OPEN SPACE	8%	4%—18%	9%
TOTAL TRAIL MILES	12	0—61	47.9

Facility Offerings:

Compared to peer communities, St. Francis generally has fewer recreation facilities, which aligns with its smaller population size and lower density compared to peers. There are no tennis or basketball courts publicly available in the community and only one multi-use field which is slightly surprising given the average amount in the peer communities. However, school facilities do provide space for athletics in St. Francis. This does present a potential opportunity for improvement through adding additional low maintenance offerings to parks that would add value and increase overall utilization of the space. The provision of these amenities by surrounding communities also indicates that there are locations in a reasonable proximity for St. Francis residents to access these resources.

	ST. FRANCIS	RANGE	AVERAGE
PLAYGROUNDS	8	8—42	20.8
TENNIS COURTS	0	0—14	7.6
OUTDOOR BASKETBALL COURTS	0	0—14	6.7
OUTDOOR ICE RINKS	1	1—12	6.2
BALL FIELDS	2	2—27	16.6
MULTI-USE FIELDS (SOCCER/LACROSSE/FOOTBALL)	1	2—29	9.6
SHELTERS	4	4—19	13.8
PERMANENT BATHROOM FACILITIES	2	0—17	5.6

NATIONAL RECREATION & PARK ASSOCIATION (NRPA) PARK METRICS

Benchmarks

(Based on metrics from cities with less than 20,000 residents)

	NRPA	AVERAGE	ST. FRANCIS
TOTAL TRAIL MILES	3	47.9	12
PARKS PER 1,000 RESIDENTS	0.81	2.2	2.48
ACRES OF TOTAL PARKLAND PER 1,000 RESIDENTS*	12.4	125.8*	10.7 acres (city parkland) 110*
ANNUAL BUDGET PER CAPITA	\$117	\$19.74	\$43.29
ANNUAL BUDGET PER ACRE OF PARK AND NON-PARK SITES	\$7,959	\$1,033.52	\$393.41

*Includes county and state park land

The city's 12 total miles of trail is lower than the peer cities average but well above the 3-miles benchmark for the NRPA. St. Francis is above in regards to number of parks per capita, surpassing both the NRPA bench mark of 0.81 per 1,000 residents and the peer community average of 2.2 per 1,000 residents. It is also above the benchmark, though still below the peer average on acres of total parkland per 1,000 residents (when factoring in County and State land). If considering only city parkland, St. Francis is below the NRPA median of parkland acreage per resident.

The NRPA benchmarks also track frequency of provision of certain amenities and services in park systems. St. Francis doesn't have a dog park or indoor ice rink but fewer than half of cities (43.6%) its size have dog parks and only 6% have indoor ice rinks. Most NRPA communities (75%) have youth ball facilities, and on average St. Francis' peer communities have more ball fields than St. Francis. St. Francis has one playfield, more than half of NRPA communities have a multipurpose play field (soccer/lacrosse/football) and among peer communities the average is 10 playfields. St. Francis does not have a recreation center which about half of communities its size do. The Ponds golf course is an important asset to St. Francis and is exceptional since only about a quarter of communities its size has a golf course.

For communities below 20,000 the parks budget benchmark is an expenditure of \$114.62 on parks per capita, and \$7,959 per acre of park and non-park sites. St. Francis falls well below this with a \$43.29 per capita, \$393.41 per acre of park and open space land.

Opportunities for other community-desired facilities that are not currently provided in St. Francis:

FARMER'S MARKETS

- Nowthen Farmers Market (10 miles)
- Elk River Farmers Market (15 miles)
- Isanti Family Farmers Market (10 miles)


SKATE PARKS

- Oak Grove Skate Park (5 miles)
- Isanti Skate Park (15 miles)
- Andover Skate Park (15 miles)
- Ramsey Skate Park (15 miles)

NATURE PLAY AREAS

- Anoka has a playground with play elements modelled to look like natural wood (15 miles)

Recreation offerings in Surrounding Communities



STAFFING AND BUDGET ANALYSIS

Existing Department Structure, Staffing, and Comparison Data

PARKS STAFFING COMPARISON


Compared to peer communities in the surrounding area, St. Francis has fewer parks and recreation FTE staff. According to the NRPA metrics, the average breakdown of park and recreation staff by responsibility is 42% operations/maintenance, 27% programmers, 19% administration, 3% capital development, and 4% support staff. According to peer communities and NRPA medians, St. Francis should consider adding between one and eight FTE dedicated to parks and recreation as the community continues to grow. Seasonal employees could be utilized to provide services that may be filled by FTEs.

	PEER COMMUNITIES	NRPA METRIC MEDIAN	ST. FRANCIS
<i>Parks and Recreation Staffing FTE (for a population of Less than 20,000)</i>	Range 0-8 FTE Range of 0-25 seasonal employees	11.8 FTE	3 FTE* *shared with Streets
<i>Operations/Maintenance staff (42%)</i>	-	4.9 FTE	3
<i>Programmers (27%)</i>	-	3.2 FTE	0
<i>Administration staff (22%)</i>	-	2.6 FTE	0
<i>Capital development staff (5%)</i>	-	0.6 FTE	0
<i>Support staff (5%)</i>	-	0.6 FTE	0

Budget Comparison Data

The low end of the peer communities' annual parks budget is \$75,000/year, and the high end is \$900,000/year. The City of St. Francis' annual parks budget typically falls somewhere in the middle of this range.

The NRPA identifies a median Annual Operating Expenditure amount of \$1,200,000 for jurisdictions of Less than 20,000 residents. This breaks down to a median amount of \$117 per capita.




ST. FRANCIS PARKS STAFFING STRUCTURE

LEVEL OF SERVICE

The City of St. Francis provides a high level of service to residents in terms of access to parks and open space. Neighborhood and community parks in St. Francis are geographically located to provide almost every resident with access to a park within a 10-minute (half mile) walking distance.

A few small gaps in access to neighborhood parks exist in the north and southeast parts of the city. See the map on the following page: Map of Access to Neighborhood Parks. The red circles highlight a few small areas of residential neighborhoods in the city where residents are more than a half mile from a park. With future park development and continued trail development, some of these residents will have improved trail access. It is also important to note the value of access visually to natural resources, such as the Rum River corridor that many residents have, as well as the benefits of nearby school district and private open space land.

Map of Access to Neighborhood Parks



PARK CLASSIFICATIONS AND GUIDELINES

Parks and open spaces are classified according to their use, size, purpose, and typical features. Cities and municipalities typically provide neighborhood and community parks that offer close to home recreation and playgrounds as the foundation of their park system. The City of St. Francis also provides many passive natural area parks that support the city's vision of environmental stewardship and preservation. Non-city parks offer additional recreation opportunities for residents, such as large-scale County and State natural area parks, and specific use features, such as golf courses. The following table identifies the types of parks in St. Francis along with the number of parks in the city, the use and facilities in the park, and guidelines for the service area, population service, size range and goal for number of acres per population.

PARK TYPE	QTY	PARK NAMES	USE & FACILITIES	SERVICE AREA	POPULATION SERVED	SIZE RANGE	ACRES PER POPULATION
CITY PARKS							
Athletic / Sports Complex	0	None	Larger in scale and serving broader community recreational needs. The primary objective is to meet wide-ranging and clearly defined community recreation, athletics and social needs. Generally four to sixteen fields or sports courts in one setting; public restrooms, ample parking, field lighting	Entire community	All ages	20 acres (minimum recommended)	
Community Park	2	Community Park, Hidden Ponds Park	Facilities serving the entire community with access to natural and programmed areas. These parks may also serve regional visitors, although not as the primary function. Provides space for community events. Gathering space, picnic shelters, athletic fields, other large format recreation (disc golf, community gardens, etc)	Entire community	All ages, toddler to retiree, entire community	20-60 acres	10 acres / 1,000 residents
Special Use Park	1	Woodbury Park	Parks or facilities serving a single use activity such as athletics (solely), historic interpretation, exercise, education, etc. Special Use Parks and Facilities are focused on providing services at a community wide level, and may attract outside visitors as well.	Entire community		Varies	
Neighborhood Park	7	Durigan Locher Park, Degardner Park, Rum River Woods Park, Highland Woods Park, Seelye Brook Park, Deer Creek 2nd Park, Siwek Park	The primary recreation facility to meet the day-to-day needs of neighborhoods. Provide active recreation and gathering space for families or groups of neighbors. Includes Playgrounds, Open field space, Basketball hoops	Large neighborhood sizes of up to 5,000 persons within ¼ or ½ mile radius	Focus upon ages 5 through 39 with emphasis upon ages 5 through 18	1-10 acres	2.0 acres / 1,000 residents
Natural Parks	9	Creekview Estates, Sunrise Hills, Wickstrom Forest Park, Degardner Nature Park, Edgewild Park, Dellwood River Park, Smith Lake Park, Stonehouse Park, Deer Creek 1st Park	Areas focused on the provision of natural environments, passive recreation, and ecological education.	No applicable standard, scattered among City parks of all sizes	All ages	Sufficient to protect the resource and accommodate recreational uses	Variable
Undeveloped Open Space		The City of St. Francis also retains pieces of land that have been dedicated as parkland, but not developed. In instances where parks are not accessible, or the community would benefit from connections, these should be developed as parks and trails.					
NON-CITY PARKS AND OPEN SPACE							
County or Regional Park	1	Rum River North County Park	High Quality natural resource areas and trail corridors in natural settings; Administered by Anoka County Include Picnic facilities, restrooms, water access, trails, site specific amenities				
Wildlife Management Area (MN DNR)	2	Bethel WMA, Carl E. Bonnell WMA	WMAs are lands designated for wildlife protection, and public hunting, trapping, fishing, and other compatible uses; Administered by the State of Minnesota				
School Facilities	4	St. Francis Elementary, St. Francis Middle School, St. Francis High School, St. Francis Learning Center	While not operated or maintained by the City, residents benefit from the playgrounds, courts, and fields available at schools in St. Francis; Administered by the school district				
Private Recreation	2	Minnetonka Game and Fish Club, The Ponds Golf Course	Recreational offerings provided through non-profit or for profit entities. Typically a specific use such as golf, shooting, or camps. May or may not be available to all members of the public.				



WHAT WE HEARD

- Mothers with children were the most frequent responders to this survey:
 - Over twice as many women completed the survey as men
 - 74% of respondents have children 17 or under living in their household
 - Over half are between 35 and 44 years of age
- A majority of people learn about parks and recreation through Facebook and other forms of social media
- Of those surveyed 60% reported that they visit the parks in Saint Francis at least weekly
- Rum River North and the Community Parks are the parks most frequently visited by respondents
- Very few respondents (less than 5%) felt that the current parks and recreation communication system was "not good"
- Elements of the parks system most in need of improvement include: recreation programs for seniors and youth, community center/ senior center, and comfort amenities
- Highest interest in new features or facilities: farmers market, splash pad, more paved trails, and an indoor community center

ENGAGEMENT INPUT


The City of St. Francis conducted a survey on-line and at in person events to give park users an opportunity to provide input on what they want to see in the future in the St. Francis park system.

The survey was made available to those in St. Francis and surrounding communities between August and September of 2021. Postcards directing people to the survey were mailed to residents and distributed at parks and events. A hard copy of the survey was made available to attendees at the National Night Out event on August 3, 2021. Over all the survey was completed by 194 individuals. The survey covered demographics of respondents, their feelings on the park system currently, and ways they would like to see the park system grow and evolve over the coming years.


Demographics of Respondents

- **89% Residents of St. Francis**
- **9% Visitors**
- **2% Other**


Based on 193 responses



Based on 125 responses



Based on 70 responses



How do people learn about parks and recreation opportunities in St. Francis?

Facebook/Social Media	64%
City Website	30%
City Newsletter	27%
Other	18%


Based on 194 responses

"National Night Out"

"I don't! Never get any info"

"Exploring, maps, word of mouth."

How often do you visit parks and facilities in St. Francis?




Based on 192 responses

Overall, how satisfied are you with elements of the St. Francis parks & recreation system?

	Very satisfied (Keep investing in this)	Somewhat satisfied	Somewhat dissatisfied	Very dissatisfied (This needs improvements)	Neutral / don't use
Walking or hiking trails	33%	44%	11%	5%	7%
Playground equipment	32%	42%	7%	5%	13%
Picnic facilities	26%	49%	9%	4%	13%
Protection of natural resources	25%	46%	11%	4%	15%
Wayfinding signage	25%	39%	9%	5%	21%
Roadway trails	21%	32%	15%	9%	23%
Ice rink / warming house	20%	19%	11%	8%	42%
Comfort amenities (restrooms, parking, benches, etc.)	19%	44%	19%	11%	8%
Sports facilities (baseball, softball, soccer, hockey rink, basketball, etc.)	18%	24%	13%	10%	35%
Recreation programs for youth	18%	23%	15%	17%	27%
Community center / senior center	15%	11%	7%	12%	54%
ADA accessibility	11%	15%	6%	4%	64%

Based on 188 responses

How effective is the current parks and recreation communication system?



Based on 189 responses

Along roadways, which type of trail facility do you prefer?


Off-street paved multi-use trails, 64%

Sidewalks, 33%

On-street trails, 3%

Based on 124 responses


Which new or expanded parks and recreation facilities would you be interested in using in St. Francis?



Based on 188 responses

Have you visited any of the following parks and/or facilities in the City of St. Francis?

Based on 127 responses



PRIORITIES FOR THE ST. FRANCIS PARK SYSTEM BASED ON SURVEY RESPONSES:

- Effort should be concentrated on development of a community center, splash pad, and youth sports
- Some areas are high use but not a high priority as they are already meeting the needs of the community. Maintain these should be a priority: sports facilities and playgrounds
- Pave off-road trails that would encourage more residents to make use of existing infrastructure
- Based on responses an ice rink/ warming house is a low priority for the community at this time

SAMPLE OF COMMENTS ON NEW OR EXPANDED PARKS AND RECREATION FACILITIES RESPONDENTS WOULD BE INTERESTED IN

"Indoor or outdoor pool for swimming lessons, youth swimming and rec use for the community"

"Stuff for the youth, like a community center"

"Pickleball Courts!"

"Would love more parks and recreation areas outside neighborhoods. Would love more hiking/walking trails."

"Disc golf course"

"Tubing, canoeing, kayak rental facility on the Rum with a shuttle."

"Large playground/activity park for kids with water "

"Inclusive park for people of all abilities"

"More interconnected trails"

"Pave the ice rink so it can be used in summer for roller rink or roller hockey"

"Dog park"



SUMMARY OF NEEDS ASSESSMENT

Themes and topics that emerged as needs for the St. Francis parks and recreation system are listed in the table below along with the source where the need was identified.

Need	Needs Assessment Data Source						
	Community Input Survey	Parks tour & Staff input	Gaps based on Peer Comparison	NRPA Metrics data	Gaps based on Service Areas/ Proximity Analysis	St. Francis 2040 Comp Plan & Parks Plan	Trends Analysis
Community Center	●			●	●		
Splash Pad	●						●
Youth programming	●			●	●		
Farmers market	●						
Paved Trails throughout the community	●						●
Build partnerships, improve relationships and communication with other agencies and organizations		●	●			●	
Enhance and Promote use of the Rum River	●	●					●
Address recreation needs for older youth / young teens	●						
Evaluate Park Dedication		●					
Hire parks staff			●	●			

DEVELOPMENT RECOMMENDATIONS



VISION, VALUES, AND GOALS

The following statements represent the vision of the future parks and recreation system in St. Francis based on the needs and desires of residents and previous planning completed by the city.

The Rum River is an important identifying feature of the city. Connections to and use of the river is provided for all residents.

The city's high quality of life is maintained with access to nature and recreation opportunities.

Existing neighborhood and community parks are maintained for all to enjoy.

The natural environment is celebrated.

Parks, trails, and open spaces contribute to safe neighborhoods and a strong sense of community.

Parks and community events contribute to vibrant commercial and downtown areas.

Trails offer opportunities for residents and visitors to move about town by walking or bicycling.

Partnerships and coordination are key to recreation opportunities for youth, seniors, and active adults.

Parks and recreation that is offered by schools or other organizations is not duplicated by the city.



ORGANIZATION OF RECOMMENDATIONS

The recommendations in this chapter are organized as follows:

RECOMMENDATIONS FRAMEWORK provides overarching goals and long-term recommendations

Overview

Neighborhood Parks

Community & Special Use Parks

Community Facilities

Natural Areas & Open Spaces

Trails

Programming

Long-term Considerations

SPECIFIC RECOMMENDATIONS & INITIATIVES identifies short-term projects and priorities based on community input

Develop a farmers market in St. Francis

Develop a splash pad at Community Park

Develop paved trail network in the city for walking, running, and biking

Develop an indoor community center

Consider development of an off-leash dog park

Develop new neighborhood parks and playgrounds

Develop Rum River access

Other considerations

PARK CONCEPT PLANS recommend specific improvements to four park sites in the city

Woodbury Park

Community Park

Hidden Ponds Park


NW 40-acre parcel/open space


Overview

In order to achieve the vision for parks and recreation in the city of St. Francis, incremental steps are needed to improve and update what exists today, add features to the system, and plan for the long-term sustainability of the system.

- Continue to maintain what exists today.
- Make improvements to Community Park and other improvements as facilities are in need of replacement.
- Build new neighborhood parks as development occurs.
- Invest in partnerships.
- Continue to connect trails. Avoid dead-end trails.

Park System Recommendations Overview Diagram






Siwek Park Concept Plan



Neighborhood Parks

- The goal is for neighborhood parks to be located to provide 1/2-mile service area from most residents
- Continue to build Neighborhood Parks as new developments are added
- Create “minimum standard” list of features for future Neighborhood Parks (i.e. design a park that is unique to the site, include play equipment and trail connections/loop trail, benches)

Neighborhood Park Search Areas



Area	Notes
1	West of Hwy 47 - May be part of a larger expansion or project related to Hidden Ponds Park with neighborhood and community-wide amenities
2	Between Hwy 47 and the Rum River - Area is anticipated for highest density in growth areas - Will require typical neighborhood facilities, and has the potential to tie nicely with the Rum River
3	North section of new development between Rum River Boulevard and the Rum River - Likely a neighborhood focus, should capitalize on natural features
4	Siwek Park is under development to provide a park within this search area
5	Future development east of Rum River Boulevard - Neighborhood focus, connect with trail network and natural features



Community & Special Use Parks

1	Make updates to Hidden Ponds Park, including irrigation, new basketball court, a new shelter, and new play equipment.
2	Develop a Feasibility Study for the NW 40-acre parcel across from Hidden Ponds Park, based on the development concept.
3	Make updates to Woodbury Park to facilitate a Farmers Market
4	<p>Make improvements to Community Park to make it a premier park for residents on a daily basis and for hosting programs and events. See the Community Park Feasibility Study. Identified improvements include: Replace the existing concessions and restroom building</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Add a splash pad - Replace the playground with a nature-themed adventure playground - Add two new picnic shelters - Add a loop trail - Add a dog park in the southeast corner of the park





Basketball court



Splash pad

Community & Special Use Park Locations



Trail connections



Concessions building



Flexible meeting space



Senior fitness space




Potluck gathering space



Community Facilities

- Consider partnership facilities where possible in order to avoid duplication of services.
- Strengthen relationship/partnership with School District and Athletic organizations to provide joint services and programming.
- In partnership with new city hall, consider a community center that with limited programming (flexible meeting space, rental rooms) with outdoor picnic facilities.



Community Campus planning images from the 2017 Saint Francis Forward Plan




Natural Areas + Open Spaces

- Consider opportunities to preserve open space within the community.
- Highlight the importance of green spaces that provide conservation of open space, wildlife habitat, ecosystem services, etc.
- Recognize that not every park in the city needs to include a playground and trail. There is great value in open space, natural areas, and trails for the benefit of mental and physical health.
- Invest in natural areas as opportunities arise, such as Rum River shoreline restoration with Anoka County.
- Invest in acquisition of natural areas as opportunities arise.



Natural Features

This map from the *St. Francis Forward Plan* identifies several natural features that are representative of the city's identity, including the Rum River, wetlands, floodplain, and parkland.






Trails

- Work with Anoka County to build paved trails along county roads in the community.
- Align trail projects with road construction projects. Build trails along roads as opportunities arise with road construction.
- Develop a long-term vision plan for a connected network of trails and green corridors.

Trails Diagram



Anoka County Regional Trail Master Plans

SUGAR HILLS REGIONAL TRAIL





FIGURE 4

RUM RIVER REGIONAL TRAIL



Figure A


RUM RIVER REGIONAL TRAIL COUNTY CONTEXT





Programming

- Encourage athletic groups and associations to offer programming. The city should provide fields and facilities and facilitate rental of those spaces.
- Focus on partnerships and non-profit groups to organize a farmers market and other programs.
- Consider partnering with Anoka County and outdoor groups to provide outdoor-focused programs (fishing, hiking, nature exploration, paddling, etc.)






Long Term Considerations

- In the future, most St. Francis residents will live within a close proximity to a high-quality neighborhood park, as well as have nearby access to trails, natural areas and open space.
- Neighborhood park amenities and facilities will require significant re-investment in the next 15-20 years as items will need repair or replacement
- The city should consider land acquisition to conserve open space and for key trail corridors as opportunities arise.

- The city should hire staff in order to meet the needs of daily parks maintenance and future facilities.
- Collaboration and coordination between the city and Anoka County is key to implementation of future regional parks and trails that will benefit city residents.



SPECIFIC RECOMMENDATIONS & INITIATIVES

These recommendations are priorities to focus on for the next 5-10 years. These recommendations emerged from community, staff, and City Council input.

Develop a Farmers Market in St. Francis

STEPS/CONSIDERATIONS:

- Develop a committee to envision and operate the market
- Utilize Butterfield Dr NW adjacent to Woodbury Park

RESPONSIBILITIES / PARTNERS / COSTS

- Work with partner and local organizations and volunteers to lead and operate the market
- City staff time will be needed to permit and manage the market schedule
- The city should make street improvements (~\$100K) to facilitate market vendors and promotion, such as street surfacing improvements, a banner sign on the north side of the street.



Proposed Farmers Market adjacent to Woodbury Park



Splash Pad within the Community Park concept plan

Develop a Splash Pad at Community Park

Implement the splash pad as one of the priority projects of the larger Community Park concept plan.

STEPS/CONSIDERATIONS:

- Utilize the Community Park Feasibility Study to implement improvements to Community Park, including a splash pad
- Consider further community engagement as the splash pad is designed

RESPONSIBILITIES / PARTNERS / COSTS

- City staff time needed to manage the process
- Hire a contractor/vendor to design and install the splash pad
- Cost ranges from \$400K to \$900K for the splash pad, associated amenities, and design costs



St. Francis Trail Loops Map


Develop paved trail network in the city for walking, running, and biking

STEPS/CONSIDERATIONS:

- Identify all existing and planned trails in the city
- Utilize County trails as part of the network
- Prioritize loop trails (1-mile, 3-mile, 5-mile)
- Prioritize making connections between trails that currently dead end
- Coordinate new trails with road improvements (Anoka County and MNDOT)—consider setting up a regular partner meeting

RESPONSIBILITIES / PARTNERS / COSTS

- City staff to encourage and urge County to build trails
- Costs will vary based on context and cost-share



Redevelopment concept from St. Francis Forward Plan

Develop Indoor Community Center

STEPS/CONSIDERATIONS:


- Refer to *Saint Francis Forward Plan*
- Coordinate with downtown city planning for future city hall/fire station/meeting room/recreation
- Consider current and potential future users: senior groups, youth groups, volunteer committees and steering groups, city staff, rental groups, fitness classes

RESPONSIBILITIES / PARTNERS / COSTS

- Work with the school district, local athletic organizations, youth groups, and senior groups to identify the needs and desires for the community center



Off-leash dog park location within the NW 40-acre parcel concept plan



Off-leash dog park location within the Community Park concept plan

Consider development of an off-leash dog park


An off-leash dog park was identified as a desired facility in the community engagement process.

CONSIDERATIONS:

- Two locations within the park system have been identified as potential spots for a future dog park.
- The Community Park Concept Plan includes space for an off-leash dog park in the southeast corner of the park--this would be a wooded, fenced in site. This site is approximately 2.5 acres.
- A concept for the NW 40-acre parcel across from Hidden Ponds Park identifies a dog park that would include trails and wetlands. This site is almost 9 acres.

RESPONSIBILITIES / PARTNERS / COSTS

- The City Public Works Department would construct, operate, and manage the dog park
- City pet license fees or off-leash dog park access fees could help provide revenue for the dog parks
- Costs would include fencing, signage, brush and tree clearing, trash receptacles, and wood chips or mulch as needed.



St. Francis 2040 Comprehensive Plan: New Park Search Areas Map

Develop New Neighborhood Parks and Playgrounds

STEPS/CONSIDERATIONS:

- Build parks as development occurs
- Consider concept plans for improvements to existing parks in the city
- Establish a minimum list of features and standards for new neighborhood parks: play equipment, picnic tables, benches, park sign, trail loop, small shelter, trash and recycling receptacles, trees/shade

RESPONSIBILITIES / PARTNERS / COSTS

- Utilize and update Park Dedication Policy
- Work with developers to identify accessible and desirable land for future parks


Develop Rum River Access

STEPS/CONSIDERATIONS:

- Consider locations for canoe/kayak landings and fishing piers
- Identify overlook locations
- Consider potential DNR restrictions
- Promote the outdoors/connection to nature and forests in St. Francis

RESPONSIBILITIES / PARTNERS / COSTS

- The city should work with and urge Anoka County to add / improve access at Rum River Park, including future regional trail improvements and connections



Rum River North County Park Map (Source: Anoka County)


Other Considerations

STEPS/CONSIDERATIONS:


- Host winter events—skiing or ice skating
- Consider adding a disc golf course
- Provide space for food trucks and events (Community Park and Woodbury Park)
- Promote parks and events with social media
- Partner with the Chamber to develop food halls and food hubs, food festivals and celebrations
- Consider pop up parks—work with local businesses and community members
- Show the benefits of parks to the community; gain public and business support for investments
- Consider a skate park
- Consider athletic fields / tournament complex at the Northwest 40-acre property
- Build on the success of Pioneer Days

RESPONSIBILITIES / PARTNERS / COSTS

- Many of these ideas will need to be led by community groups, local businesses, and volunteers
- Consider partnerships with churches/schools/ Chamber of Commerce to provide programs and events
- City staff can help with promotion




Skate park



Disc golf



Pop up park



Winter event -- ice skating



Pop up park




Food trucks

PARK CONCEPT PLANS

Concept plans for parks identify long-term visions for improvements and new development.

- 1) Woodbury Park
- 2) Community Park
- 3) Hidden Ponds Park
- 4) NW 40-acre parcel / open space



Woodbury Park Concept

Improvements for Woodbury Park identify spaces that will facilitate a farmers market on Butterfield Drive, fountain and landscaping enhancements, and trail connections as part of the Anoka County Sugar Hills Regional Trail and Bridge Street improvements.



PRECEDENT IMAGES



Community Park Concept

The concept plan for Community Park includes a new splash pad, a nature-inspired playground, a new concessions building, added trails, a small off-leash dog park, parking enhancement, and trail connections surrounding the park. See the Community Park Feasibility Study for more detail.



LOCATION MAP:



PRECEDENT IMAGES



Trail connections



Picnic shelter



Park wayfinding system



Playground improvements

Hidden Ponds Park Concept

Improvements identified for Hidden Ponds Park include a new picnic shelter, a new playground, a basketball court, and Irrigation throughout the ballfields area.



PRECEDENT IMAGES



Northwest 40-acre Parcel/Potential Athletic Park

The northwest 40 acre open space is an undeveloped space that is to the east and across the Roanoke St NW, from Hidden Ponds Park.

Potential park development opportunities for this open space include:

- Athletic fields: 4 rectangular multi-use fields, and 3 diamond fields
- A 9 acre off-leash dog area
- A half-mile walking trail loop
- Supporting facilities, including shelters, parking lot, and restrooms
- A potential future community recreation building could be built on the NW part of the property


PRECEDENT IMAGES



Soccer on multi-use rectangular fields



Picnic Shelter with restrooms



Off-leash dog area (Image source: Three Rivers Park District)

NW 40-Acre Parcel / Potential Athletic Park Concept



PARK CONCEPT OVERVIEW AND ALTERNATIVES

The future park should be developed to provide for flexible future development. For instance, the northwest corner of the park would be a good location for a potential future community recreation building. The multi-use fields in that location should be built so as not to impede future building access and development.



PRECEDENT IMAGES



Multi-use fields with lighting



Ballfields

“Parks and playgrounds
are the soul of a city”

- Marty Rubin





IMPLEMENTATION & PARK POLICIES



IMPLEMENTATION OVERVIEW

This chapter organizes specific projects into tables according to project type and provides high level planning budgets for consideration. Funding sources and options give an overview of considerations for aligning potential funding with projects.

A list of park policies includes policies that have been developed as part of previous park and trail system planning and the recent 2040 Comprehensive Plan. These policies are listed here as a reference for new park projects as well as continued operations and maintenance of the system.



BUDGETING FOR PLAN RECOMMENDATIONS


The following tables identify major projects and plans for the city to undertake in the next 5 to 10+ years. Budget numbers are typically included as high level planning numbers that would include planning, design, engineering, installation, and contingency costs. Many of the projects are conceptual and need further design and engineering to determine detailed costs.

The projects are organized into three broad categories:

- *Capital Projects* are physical development projects, such as park and trail improvements
- *Planning and Operations projects* involve staffing, administration time, and marketing tasks
- *Ongoing Coordination and Planning projects* are partnerships, meetings, and coordination items

CAPITAL PROJECTS	SHORT TERM (5-YEAR)	LONG TERM (5-10 YEARS)
Improve Woodbury Park and Butterfield Drive to facilitate markets and events	\$100K - \$250K	
Improve Community Park with splash pad – Phase 1 improvements (see Community Park Feasibility Study for full project list, phasing, and cost estimate)	\$500K - \$1M	
Community Park Phase 2 and 3 improvements		\$2M - \$4M
Rum River shoreline improvements	2022 - Using Legacy grant; \$35,000 (city)	
Hidden Ponds Park improvements: basketball court, irrigation	\$500K	
Hidden Ponds Park: Phase 2 improvements: playground, shelter, trails		\$500K - \$1M
NW open space / 40-acre parcel park improvements: dog park, trails, ballfields, multi-use rectangular fields, parking, Feasibility Study (short term), longer term design and engineering	\$30K (Feasibility Study)	\$5M - \$10M
Trail improvements should be incorporated into new subdivisions as opportunities arise	Developer-paid, city-paid, and county-paid	
Consider trail improvements with city road reconstruction projects as opportunities arise	TBD	
Trail improvements – on County roads	County coordination and support	
As opportunities arise, potentially start building a trails fund / annual allowance	\$50k - \$100K annually	
New neighborhood parks and playgrounds (with development)	primarily developer and Park Dedication	
Indoor community center—keep in this mind as other developments are ongoing		TBD (bonding will be needed)
Allowance for conservation easements and land acquisition as opportunities arise	Primary developer funded	
Hwy 47 and Ambassador development park – potential trails and disc golf	\$50K - \$200K	

PLANNING AND OPERATIONS PROJECTS	SHORT TERM (5-YEAR)	LONG TERM (5-10 YEARS)
Evaluate Park Dedication policy	\$8K	
Grant writing for park improvements -- as needs arise	TBD / per project	
Work to hire an additional 1.0-2.0 FTE to manage and operate parks, recreation, and facilities	\$200K+ / annually	
Identify loop trails—continue to update existing trails map and brochure, consider expanding marketing of trail opportunities in the community	staff time	
ONGOING COORDINATION AND PLANNING		
Initiate an ongoing biannual partnership meeting for programming (School District reps, athletic association reps)	Staff time	
Work with Chamber of Commerce to assemble a Farmers Market steering group to develop plans and coordinate a future farmers market Steering Group could also coordinate existing and future programs and events	Staff time	
Consider setting up a regular coordination meeting with Anoka County and MNDOT to review multimodal transportation needs and projects	Staff time	
Send high priority trail projects to Anoka County for including in their planning	Staff time	
Consider reinstating Park Commission in order to provide advisory role on parks and recreation	Staff time	
DNR coordination—communication related to conservation easements and Rum River as needs arise	Staff time	
Work with Anoka County SWCD to advance conservation goals and apply for cost share funding and partnerships on natural resource projects – as needs arise	Staff time	

Parks Action Items			
	DESCRIPTION	RESPONSIBLE ENTITIES	TIMING
	Update the City's park dedication requirements as part of the zoning and subdivision ordinance updates	City of St. Francis	Short
	Update the City's park and trail system plan	City of St. Francis	Short
	Update the City's CIP	City of St. Francis	Short
	Develop a park inventory and official policy regarding the replacement of park features	City of St. Francis	Short
	Installation of the stoplight at Pederson Drive and Hwy 47	City of St. Francis, MNDOT	Short
	Replace playgrounds that have been removed in neighborhoods where no alternative exists	City of St. Francis	Short/Med
	Explore strategies to provide event-based and program-based activities (athletic, cultural, or entertainment) throughout the City that will benefit the economic development of the City and provide sought-after amenities for residents.	City of St. Francis	Short/Med
	Develop trails along the Rum River	City of St. Francis	Med/Long
	Develop parks as neighborhoods develop in the north part of St. Francis	City of St. Francis	Med/Long

Parks Action Items from the *City of St. Francis 2040 Comprehensive Plan*

Programs to Address Needs

There are a number of tools the City can use to address the identified parks and trails needs in the community. This table identifies specific implementation actions and tools that can be utilized by the City, County, and various stakeholders to meet those needs.

TABLE 6.31 PARK & TRAIL IMPLEMENTATION TOOLS

Park/Trail Tool	Circumstances & Sequence of Use	City Approach	Natural Resources	School Coordination	Trail Network	Access	Search Areas	Maintenance
Park and Trail Dedication	Park dedication is intended to collect funds or property from development projects to pay for or supply land to meet the increased demand for parks and trails by new residents.	Active/Ongoing			X	X	X	
General Fund	General funds can be used to fund the development and maintenance of parks and trails. The City utilizes the general fund for these purposes.	Active/Ongoing	X	X	X	X	X	X
Capital Improvement Planning	Keeping track of lifecycle and upcoming expenses helps the park system retain a stable understanding of budget needs	Active/Ongoing		X	X	X	X	
Safe Routes to School	Safe Routes to School grants are funded at state and federal levels. Funding can go towards infrastructure and activities.	Open to consideration		X	X	X		
Volunteerism	Volunteers can provide resources for park development and maintenance. This labor can also be used as a "match" for many grants that require them.	Project by project basis	X	X				X
Donations/ Sponsorships	These may be financial donations from individuals or area corporations, or donations of labor from recreation clubs or use agreements. Programs such as "adopt-a-trail" or "adopt-a-park" by an organization, business, or individuals have been used in many communities to help with maintenance tasks and raise awareness.	Open to consideration	X	X	X			X
Regional Park and Trail Funding	Funding for regional parks and trails can be secured through the Metropolitan Council. The local agency for regional parks is Anoka County. The City supports these projects.	Project by project basis	X		X		X	
State of Minnesota	The State of Minnesota provides funds through the DNR for park and trail related amenities. MNDOT provides much of the funding for trail projects, especially in conjunction with roads	Project by project basis	X		X	X		
Federal Funding	Federal Programs such as BUILD (formerly TIGER) provide funding for road reconstructions, and trail components can be incorporated into the projects. The City will support sponsoring agencies (MNDOT, Anoka County).	Project by project basis			X	X		
Dedicated Tax Levy	A City can hold a referendum for a dedicated tax levy with proceeds directed specifically for parks and recreation. This levy can be used for capital projects as well as operations and maintenance. The proceeds may be in place of general funds or be supplemented by general funds.	Open to consideration	X	X	X	X	X	X

Funding programs and Tools list from the *City of St. Francis 2040 Comprehensive Plan*

FUNDING OPTIONS AND SOURCES

INCREASE CITY FUNDING

Increase Parks and Recreation's share of the City's general fund.

Increase funding from the General Fund for maintenance work.

Establish a Maintenance and Replacement Fund to cover major capital repairs and replacements.

EXPLORE NEW CITY FUNDS

Explore the use of a franchise fee to fund maintenance or specific programs.

Explore a bond referendum for a specific package of capital improvements.

Dedicated tax levy specifically for parks and recreation/trails

Consider a Local Option Sales Tax – needs legislative approval

PURSUE GRANTS

Continue to strategically pursue grants focused on those whose funding amounts are sufficient to outweigh administrative requirements.

Regional Solicitation

SPONSORS & PARTNERS

Evaluate the potential value of sponsorship for all assets, programs, and events in the system based on user demographics and participation/visitation. Use the data to create an enhanced sponsorship catalog to target local and regional sponsors and corporate partnerships.

Continue to build and enhance partnerships with community education departments, schools, athletic organizations, fraternal organizations/nonprofits, and others.

Explore collaboration funding opportunities in areas like public health, public art, programming, and sustainability.

Pilot use of a crowdfunding tool for small, targeted project (kickstarter.org, razoo.com or NRPA Fund Your Park).

PARK POLICIES

The following policies were developed as part *City of St. Francis Park and Trail Plan* developed in 2005, and updated in 2013.

GENERAL

1. Create and maintain an attractive, diverse, and interesting system of parks and trails.
2. Establish park and trail facilities that provide recreational as well as functional uses.
3. Maintain all trails in good repair and ensure that designated trail segments are kept open and clear of snow throughout the year unless designated as winter use trails.
4. Provide for the efficient maintenance and operation of clean, orderly, controlled, safe, and attractive parks and trails. Park maintenance and operation shall safeguard the physical condition of trails from deterioration or damage due to weather, vandalism, or other natural or human causes.
5. Consideration shall be given to safety, visibility, and emergency access into parks when acquiring land or planning for development.

ENVIRONMENTAL

1. It is the policy of the City to manage, preserve, and protect its natural environment in order to enhance the residential quality of life in the community.
2. Maintain scenic river district and continue to work with DNR to protect the Rum River's rural scenic and urban scenic areas.
3. Consider crediting for dedication of park and trail land only those parcels that are not within delineated wetlands or that include slopes of no more than twelve percent (12%).

ENHANCE/EXPAND SYSTEM

1. Maintain and enhance City's existing parks
2. Acquire park and trail facilities to satisfy the recreational and transportation needs of the residents on both a neighborhood and community-wide basis.
3. Expand the park and multi-modal trail system with connections to the town center and neighborhoods.
4. Provide for an adequate amount of open space throughout new developments, which serve both aesthetic and recreational functions and also serve as buffers and boundaries between incompatible land uses.
5. Consider existing physical site amenities (natural or man-made) and encourage the establishment of new site amenities when planning and developing park areas.

WORK WITH OTHERS

1. Promote citizen interest and involvement in the planning and enjoyment in the City's park and trail system.
2. Promote integration with other city activities, services, and facilities.
3. Promote working relationships within Independent School District #15, the surrounding communities, the County, School Districts, private and/or non-profit organizations in developing joint ventures for shared use of recreational parks, open spaces, facilities and the citywide trail system.

PARK DESIGN

1. Park and playground buildings should be compatible with surrounding activities with regard to scale, design, color, setbacks, and materials.
2. Park and trail development should minimize impacts on adjacent properties through design provisions including, but not limited to:
 - Adequate off-street parking
 - Appropriate orientation and location of buildings and activity areas
 - Screening, buffering and landscaping
 - Adequate setbacks and physical separation
3. Provide support facilities in conjunction with trail development.
4. Design and construct trails according to development recommendations established by the National Park and Recreation Association, the Minnesota Department of Transportation, and the Minnesota Department of Natural Resources.
5. Develop new residential areas as pedestrian-oriented neighborhoods with a mix of housing types, open and recreational spaces, trail linkages, trees, adequate buffering from incompatible land uses, and traffic calming measures.

CONSTRUCTION

1. Encourage the private sector to provide recreational opportunities/facilities.

Comprehensive Plan Policies

The following policies were developed as part of *St. Francis 2040: Comprehensive Plan for the City of St. Francis*.

1. *Policy 1.1:* Promote the development of high quality neighborhood parks that can be walked to by new residents as new neighborhoods develop.
2. *Policy 1.2:* Ensure all parks, park buildings, and trails are safe, convenient, and accessible for all residents.
3. *Policy 1.3:* Require new parkland to be located with at least one full side of frontage to a public road
4. *Policy 1.4:* Replace key features (such as playgrounds) at parks that have had them removed and there is not a suitable alternative for the neighborhood
5. *Policy 1.5:* Ensure there is a plan and resources to pay for the maintenance and long term replacement costs of new parks
6. *Policy 1.6:* Develop a funding mechanism to pay for the upkeep of existing parks
7. *Policy 2.1:* Reconstruct sidewalks and trails that are in disrepair and install new sidewalks and trails to eliminate gaps in the system and better connect to parks. Conduct these efforts in combination with road reconstruction/repair projects when possible.
8. *Policy 2.2:* Within the developed areas of St. Francis, work to provide parks and school facilities that are accessible to all residents without having to cross high speed/high traffic streets. If major roads must be crossed, provide safe crossings.
9. *Policy 2.3:* Support Anoka County in the development of the proposed Sugar Hills Regional Trail
10. *Policy 3.1:* Reconnect the Rum River to the City as an important recreational amenity without degrading habitat or water quality.
11. *Policy 3.2:* Incorporate natural features and areas into the parks system when possible and applicable.
12. *Policy 3.3:* Coordinate with the School District to encourage environmental learning



“

Look forward for a century, to the time when the city has a population of a million, and think what will be their wants. They will have wealth enough to purchase all that money can buy, but all their wealth cannot purchase a lost opportunity, or restore natural features of grandeur and beauty, which would then possess priceless value, and which you can preserve for them if you will...

”

— H.W.S. Cleveland, 1883



APPENDIX

Contents of the Appendix include:

1. Estimate of lengths of future/proposed trails in the city
2. Community Park Feasibility Study
3. Polco Park System Survey Summary, October 2021

Estimate of Lengths of Future / Proposed Trails in St. Francis

These trails are shown in the Plan maps as "Possible Trails."

Jurisdiction	Trail Description	Approximate Length	Notes
County	Anoka Co. Sugar Hills Regional Trail Corridor	8.71 miles	Sugarbush Rd NW to Rum River
County	Anoka Co. Rum River Regional Trail Corridor	3.67 miles	Bridge St/Rum River Blvd to northern border, includes trail through Rum River Regional Park as this would likely need to be rebuilt to regional trail standards
City	Rum River Woods Park trail	3,070 ft	Loop along the river
City	dead end trails connection	1,330 ft	Deer Creek 1st Park
City	River Dr NW/Rum River Blvd NW to northern border	3.75 miles	West side of Rum River
City	Hwy 28/47 to northern border; west side of Hwy 47	1.16 miles	
City	Network of possible trails west of Hwy 24, from southern border to 23rd Ave NW	4.32 miles	Trails along County Drainage Ditch Number 18
City	229th Ave NW to 237th Ave NW, south of Bethel WMA	1.44 miles	
City	Segment between Hwy 72 and northern border	1,350 ft	Along Crocus St NW
City	Siwek Park to 241st Ave NW	4,300 ft	East of Rum River; east of proposed County Rum River Regional Trail
City	Deer Creek 1st Park, across 81, through DeGardner 2nd Park, across 28, to northern border	2.25 miles	
City	From Seelye Brook Park, west to Hwy 71 along the creek	1.8 miles	Along Seelye Brook
City	West of Hwy 71, from southern border to Magnesium St NW, along creek	1.1 miles	



COMMUNITY PARK CONCEPT MASTER PLAN FEASIBILITY STUDY


JULY 2022



STUDY BACKGROUND & PURPOSE

Located in the heart of St. Francis just minutes from the Rum River, Community Park is a 20-acre community scale park designed to provide more specialized services and recreational programming than in a neighborhood park. While the park contains a variety of unique park amenities including a concessions building, restrooms, and the City's only ice rink warming house, it has the opportunity to add new and updated community scale facilities.

As part of the city-wide park system planning process conducted in 2021-2022, a conceptual park master plan was developed for Community Park which identifies a number of improvements to bring the park up to the level of service desired by the community. The conceptual master plan is the basis from which the recommended improvements in this feasibility study area taken, with additional refinements based on site characteristics, expected costs, the conditions of existing park features, and input from the community and its leaders. This document will then outline an approach for the completion of park improvements, organizing them into logical phases in order to minimize the disruption of park use and provides implementation flexibility based on available funding and other factors.



Park Location within Saint Francis

OUTDOOR COMMUNITY EVENT VENUE

Community Park hosts Pioneer Days, the City's premier community event, with carnival rides, petting zoo, live entertainment, fireworks, a softball tournament, and other activities over multiple days. The Park also hosts other community events including National Night Out and Movies in the Park, a weekly summer event open to the public. The park is the City's primary outdoor community event space and requires adequate facilities to properly host these important community events as the City continues to grow.



Pioneer Days, Saint Francis



Existing Hockey Rink

SITE INVENTORY AND ASSESSMENT

A site visit was conducted in May of 2022 to assess and inventory the park's existing amenities and natural features. This process, in combination with information from the Park System Plan, identifies in greater detail the gaps and opportunities in current park programming and amenities which need to be addressed over the next decade within the park.

Hockey Rink and Warming House

The existing rink boards and posts are decaying throughout the rink and warrant a full replacement in order to mitigate safety and maintenance concerns. Eight light poles which light the rink are in good condition, but the older inefficient light fixtures will benefit from upgrading in order to provide more reliable and efficient illumination. The rink's interior is currently turf and is used by the community as a defacto dog run during the summer. Turf typically presents additional challenges when establishing and maintaining quality skating ice during the early and late parts of winter.

The existing warming house is in good condition, though there are opportunities for interior and exterior enhancements which could be explored further as funding allows, but which are not a part of this report's recommendations.



Existing Warming House

Ball Field

The existing diamond field bleachers are in good condition and should be salvaged for re-use within the park. The infield ag-lime, outfield turf, fencing, foul poles, dugouts, and spectator areas are all reaching the end of their typical lifespans and as such are candidates for replacement or enhancement.

Concessions and Restroom Structure

The concession and restrooms building show signs of structural issues with areas of the CMU walls failing. It should be replaced with a new building which meets the concession and restroom demands of the expanded park programming indicated in the Park System Plan and this report.



Existing Concessions and Restroom Structure



Existing Baseball Field

Digital Park Sign / Other Park Signage

The digital park sign is in good structural condition, but the dynamic signage panel is nearing end of life and no longer meets the informational needs of the community. This feature should be redesigned and replaced.

Playground

The playground structure at Community Park is in fair condition and likely nearing a typical 15-20 year life span. Immediate improvements should include replenishment of engineered wood fiber to appropriate fall height depths with a mid-term target for complete equipment replacement as funding allows.

Shelter/ Rental Space


The existing picnic shelter and grills are in fair condition. Its current location at the end of the central lawn space is however in conflict with other priority park improvements and as such it should be replaced and relocated to a location more conducive to its intended primary use.



Existing Community Park Baseball Field and Sign



Community Park Entrance Sign



Locations of Existing Site Features



Existing Playground



Existing Shelter and Rental Space



Existing Volleyball Court

Volleyball Court

The Park's sand volleyball court is the only one of its kind in the city and is in serviceable condition. The court's location and orientation however are not optimal. Its location is isolated towards the back of the park which disconnects it from many of the important support amenities such as water, rest rooms, and picnic facilities. It's recommended that the court be reoriented north to south and that support facilities be added nearby.

Site Furnishings

Trash and Recycling Receptacles

The existing rolling receptacles are in good condition and should be salvaged and reused based on the proposed new park layout.

Picnic Tables

There are multiple styles of existing picnic tables at the park of varying conditions. The newer more modern style tables should be salvaged and reused within the park, other older style tables can be salvaged, refitted, and reused in the City's other parks. Any new tables purchased as part of the recommended improvements should closely match the style of the newer tables in order to provide a more cohesive environment in the park.



Existing Bench Types to Repurpose in other Parks

Lighting


Trail lighting is generally adequate in coverage, but the poles and lights should be upgraded to modern LED fixtures that match the character of new core park amenities.



Existing Bench Types to Salvage



Existing Trail Lighting



Locations of Existing Site Features

Trails and Trail Loops

Community Park's trail loop is one of five loop trails identified in the Park System Plan, and connects Saint Francis Elementary School and Trinity Lutheran Church and School in a 1 mile circuit. Much of the Park's existing sidewalk and trail pavement is in serviceable condition. Though the existing system connects well to most of the park amenities, it does not connect effectively to the surrounding area. Additionally, there is no existing loop network within the park and many of the recommended improvements, including enhancements to the recently purchased southeast property will require additional connections in order to provide access.



Existing Bituminous Trail

Parking Lots

Warming House Parking Lot

The parking lot surface is in serviceable condition, but curbing in some areas is cracking, broken, or settling. When pavement reaches its end-of-life the parking lot configuration should be redesigned to accommodate a double loaded parking island in the center of the lot. This improvement is not a part of this report's recommendations.



Existing Main West Parking Lot

West Parking Lot

Surfacing and concrete parking wheel-stops are in good condition. When pavement reaches its end-of-life the parking lot should be redesigned with curb and gutter to enhance water quality and provide ADA curb cuts for access to the park's trail network. Additionally, a turn around at the north end of the lot should be added to facilitate drop-offs and circulation for event and programmed uses.



Existing East Parking Lot

East Parking Lot

Surfacing and concrete parking wheel-stops are in good condition. When pavement reaches its end-of-life the parking lot should be redesigned with curb and gutter to enhance water quality and provide ADA curb cuts for access to the park's trail network.

New Park Land


The wooded land in the southeast section of the park, formerly two residential properties, has recently been acquired as an addition to the park and has had all structures and pavement removed and been cleared of brush and under-story vegetation in preparation for future park use.



Vacant Land Acquired for Park Expansion

PLANNING FOR FUTURE RECREATIONAL NEEDS

The City currently has a smaller community of older adults than Minnesota as a whole, but an increasing and aging population indicate a coming shift in park use. Older adults are often regular park users, especially retirees with additional free time. Typical recreation activities for this group are geared towards staying active, both physically and socially. Providing facilities such as trails, pickleball courts, and other venues for casual or organized socialization are geared toward senior use.



The age 45-60 population in Saint Francis is approaching retirement age and the predictable shifts in recreational needs that typically accompany that major life transition.

Demographic Trends (Above) and Community Outreach Comments (Right) from the Saint Francis Park System Plan

SUMMARY OF COMMUNITY INPUT

What We Heard From Community Park Users

Community Park is one of the most frequently visited parks in the City's system. Those responding to the Park System Plan's community engagement process felt that recreation for seniors and youth and comfort amenities were among the highest priority improvements to existing park facilities. Top on the list of new facility desires was a new splash pad and more paved trails.

Community Park is also uniquely positioned in the City's overall park system to provide additional information via both dynamic and traditional bulletin signage, to better engage and inform users about upcoming recreational opportunities in the wider park system.

Overall the recommendations of this feasibility study will address community interest in providing a splash pad, paved trails, dog park, new playgrounds, and water quality facilities as part of the wider framework of improvements recommended in the park.

Directly Addressing Community Priorities

Below is a selection of comments made by community members during the engagement process, with highlighted items being part of the proposed improvements in Community Park over the next decade.



CONCEPT PLAN



Summary of Park Facilities and Amenities

A typical community scale park provides amenities that serve the community at multiple scales. More specialized and unique facilities like a splash pad or performance pavilion will draw users from throughout the community, while more common features like trails and picnic facilities serve the everyday recreation needs of neighborhood residents.

Community Facilities:

- Splash Pad
- Performance Stage / Picnic Pavilion
- Concession Building with Picnic Shelter and Restrooms
- Large and Small Breed Dog Park
- Multi-age Playground with Nature Play
- Diamond Field with Shaded Spectator Areas
- Ice Rink with Warming House
- Pickleball Courts

Neighborhood Facilities:

- Basketball Court
- Sand Volleyball Court
- Lit Paved Walking Trail Loops
- Picnic Shelter with Grills and Picnic Tables
- Open Lawn Space



Priority Project Locations within Community Park



PROPOSED PRIORITY PROJECTS

Hockey Upgrades, New Courts and Dog Park

ESTIMATED COST: \$800,000

While not a priority project from a community input perspective, the condition of the rink's boards make this a priority project. Replacing the boards and lighting will substantially reduce maintenance inputs and improve user experience and safety. Paving the rink will extend ice longevity on both sides of the season, making for easier ice establishment in early winter and reducing ice loss in the spring. Paving the rink also provides a surface for summer season use as a location for basketball and roller hockey.

This project would shift the existing summer rink use (as a dog run) to the newly acquired property to the southeast, by creating a fenced dog park with separate areas for large and small breed dogs. These recommended improvements better utilize existing parking on the east side, utilize shaded open areas conducive to a typical dog park program, and isolate dog activity from other park uses.



Detail Plans of Community Park Priority Projects

This phase also programs the under-utilized east lawn area with an expanded courts program, including a re-oriented sand volleyball pit and new pair of pickleball courts. There is additional space for future expansion of the pickleball program should it gain popularity as the 45-60 age cohort enters retirement over the next 15 years.

Core improvements include:

- Replacement of rink boards and fence and retrofitting existing rink light poles with LED fixtures
- New rink concrete pavement, basketball hoops, and striping
- New small and large breed dog park
- New pickleball courts (two)
- Reorient and rebuild existing sand volleyball pit in new location
- New portable toilet enclosure for dog park and courts users



Example of Potential Multi-Breed Dog Park



Example of Potential Pickleball Court



Example of Potential Multi-Sport Rink




Priority Project Locations within Community Park

Performance Pavilion and Splash Pad

ESTIMATED COST: \$1,700,000

Community Park's large scale outdoor events make it an optimum location for facilities supporting outdoor performances. A new elevated open-air pavilion combined with the large adjacent open lawn space can host major community events. This improvement also provides a secondary use as shaded splash pad seating and rent-able picnicking space when not scheduled for events.

The park system plan also identified a splash pad as a priority future improvement. A 1,500 square foot splash pad will provide ground level and some above ground play features along with seating, and landscaping to buffer the use and provide additional shade. The splash pad will be centrally located to leverage supporting facilities such as restrooms, shaded seating / picnicking, playgrounds, food/concessions, and large amounts of parking.



Detail Plan of Community Park Priority Project

Core improvements include:

- Elevated open-air performance pavilion / picnic shelter with lighting and electrical service
- Splash pad with ground level and above ground elements
- Shaded seating and picnic areas
- Addition of a turn-around/drop off and curb and gutter to existing west parking lot
- Loop trail system (park wide)
- Dynamic signage, trail wayfinding, and park entry signs



Example of Potential Performance Pavilion / Picnic Shelter



Example of Potential Splash Pad Amenities




Priority Project Locations within Community Park

Diamond Field Upgrades & New Concession/Restrooms

ESTIMATED COST: \$1,425,000

Upgrading the diamond field facilities will improve game playability and safety and enhance the spectator experience. Player experience will benefit from improvements to the infield and outfield surfaces, taller foul poles and fencing, and enhanced dugouts. Spectator experience will be improved by additional shade, expanded seating options, improved viewing angles, and a more transparent and protective backstop system.

The existing concession building will be replaced with a new structure that provides updated restroom and concession facilities along with a new covered picnic area. This facility will match the architectural character of the performance pavilion and picnic shelter. Its central location will support the shaded picnic and spectator areas and will also provide support facilities critical to the adjacent playground and splash pad areas.




Detail Plan of Community Park Priority Project

Core improvements include:

- New field fencing with safety rail and 20' foul poles
- New 24' backstop tension netting system
- Infield and outfield rehabilitation
- Enhanced dugouts
- Expanded spectator areas with additional shade
- Concession building with covered spectator picnic area and restrooms



Example of Potential Fence and Dugout Improvements



Example of Potential Concession Restroom Building



Example of Potential Diamond Field Improvements



Priority Project Locations within Community Park

Playground, Nature Play, and Picnic Shelter

ESTIMATED COST: \$1,000,000

The park's existing playground scale and condition do not meet the needs identified in the park system plan and do not match the park's other community scale improvements. The new playground design will capitalize on the existing playground's central location, connecting it to adjacent restrooms, shaded picnic/seating areas, and capitalize on good visibility and access from the main parking area while keeping a safe distance.

The playground will be redesigned to fit the scale and scope of the park's community function with an emphasis on accessibility and nature play. Playground features and design will create areas for both structured and unstructured play, providing a wider range of experiences and opportunities to create, learn, experiment, and imagine for children with a broader range of ages and abilities.



Detail Plan of Community Park Priority Project

This phase will also include a second picnic shelter nestled among the mature trees south of the playground area. This shelter will look out to the Park's central open water feature and forested southern edge. Proximity to the splash pad and playground and access to restrooms will make this another desirable rental option for private events and will further support community scale programming during Pioneer Days, Movies in the Park, and other community scale programs.

Core improvements include:

- Expand and reorganize the playground program:
 - New 2-5 and 5-12 age play containers with separate sand play area
 - New nature play area and structured and unstructured play features
 - New accessible safety surfacing
- Picnic shelter and picnicking area



Example of Potential Picnic Shelter



Example of Potential Nature Play Features



Example of Potential Shaded Picnic Area



Example of Potential Traditional Play Features with a Natural Theme

PROPOSED COMMUNITY PARK RENDERS



Picnic shelter facing North.



Path connecting picnic shelter to splash pad and bandshell.



Facing proposed splash pad and bandshell.



ADA ramp into bandshell.

PROPOSED COMMUNITY PARK RENDERS



Facing splash pad from the East.



Looking West along 1st base fence line at proposed bathroom facility.



Looking East along 1st base fencing at picnic area.



Facing East behind baseball field backstop.



PROPOSED COMMUNITY PARK RENDERS



Facing East off of parking lot turn around towards proposed bathroom facility and playground.



Looking North at proposed 5-12 year playground and balance play area.

CORE PARK DESIGN CONSIDERATIONS



Trash Receptacles Should be Located on Concrete Pads in High Use Areas at a Distance Appropriate to Mitigate Odors and Insect Nuisances



ADA Accessible Parking Should Be Provided in All Parking Lots



An ADA Accessible Paved Trail System Will Connect Park Amenities and Provide an Internal Bike/Walk Loop Network



Where Needed Portable Toilets Should be Conveniently Located Near High Use Areas and Screened from View

- General park-wide considerations:
 - All programming should be visible from an adjacent roadway where practical
 - Paved trails should be lit where practical
 - All paved surfaces, roofs, dog park areas, and other impervious surfaces should be infiltrated where possible or drain to water quality features before they enter the City's stormwater system.
- Buildings should have complementary design characteristics including:
 - Similar roof pitches
 - Matching roofing materials
 - Cladding/siding of similar material and color
 - Masonry/Stone accents at ground level to balance out the mass of roof lines and break of the uniformity of building facades from ground to roof
 - Windows on at least two facades
- Areas with youth or elder programming should have:
 - Areas with ample shade, either via structure (shelter) or vegetation
 - Adjacent trash and toilet facilities
 - Be easily accessible via both trail and parking lot


ESTIMATE OF PROBABLE COSTS

Below is an estimate of the expected hard and soft project costs in 2022 dollars. Costs should be adjusted to align with current construction bidding environment and inflation as phases are implemented.

ITEM DESCRIPTIONS	EST QTY	UNIT	UNIT COST(LOW)	COST	NOTES
HOCKEY UPGRADES, NEW COURTS AND DOG PARK					
VOLLEYBALL - PLAY SAND	75	CY	60.00	\$ 4,500	
VOLLEYBALL - EDGER	200	LF	20.00	\$ 4,000	
VOLLEYBALL - NETTING / POSTS	1	LS	4,000.00	\$ 4,000	
VOLLEYBALL - REF STAND	1	LS	2,500.00	\$ 2,500	
PICKLEBALL - NET AND POSTS	2	EA	3,500.00	\$ 7,000	
PICKLEBALL - 4' WINDSCREEN	284	LF	15.00	\$ 4,260	
PICKLEBALL - 4' CHAINLINK W/ GATE	284	LF	45.00	\$ 12,780	
PICKLEBALL - SURFACE AND STRIPING	4,000	SF	16.00	\$ 64,000	
PICKLEBALL - 16" CONC. EDGER	194	LF	15.00	\$ 2,910	
DOG PARK - 4' BLACK VINYL CHAINLINK FENCE	900	LF	45.00	\$ 40,500	
DOG PARK - DOUBLE ENTRANCE WITH CONC, PADS AND GATES	1	LS	7,500.00	\$ 7,500	
DOG PARK - SIGNAGE	1	LS	2,000.00	\$ 2,000	
DOG PARK - SITE CLEARING AND WOOD MULCH INSTALL	2,889	SY	15.00	\$ 43,333	
TOILET ENCLOSURE WITH PAD	1	LS	5,000.00	\$ 5,000	
RINK - LIGHTING	8	EA	7,500.00	\$ 60,000	ASSUMES ADEQUATE ELEC SERVICE, REUSE OF POLES
RINK - BOARDS AND 6' FENCING	1	LS	145,000.00	\$ 145,000	6' chainlink atop rink board
TRASH /RECYCLING RECEPTACLE COMBO	3	EA	0.00	\$ -	REUSE EX ROLLING CANS
8' BITUMINOUS TRAIL	2,650	SF	5.00	\$ 13,250	
BASKETBALL - HOOPS	4	EA	4,500.00	\$ 18,000	
CONCRETE SURFACE WITH STRIPING	16,500	SF	6.50	\$ 107,250	
SITE RESTORATION / EROSION CONTROL / TREE PROTECTION	1	LS	25,000.00	\$ 25,000	
STORMWATER IMPROVEMENTS	1	LS	25,000.00	\$ 25,000	ALLOWANCE
SUBTOTAL				\$ 597,783	
PERFORMANCE PAVILION AND SPLASH PAD					
SPLASH PAD	1,500	SF	200.00	\$ 320,000	TURN KEY INCL EQUIP., INSTALL, CONC., PERMITS, SEWER CONNECT
BAND SHELL / PICNIC SHELTER	1	LS	200,000.00	\$ 200,000	INCL. INSTALL
5" CONC. SIDEWALK	4,000	SF	8.00	\$ 32,000	
8' BITUMINOUS TRAIL	42,750	SF	5.00	\$ 213,750	
TRAIL LIGHT REPLACEMENT	15	EA	6,500.00	\$ 97,500	Assumes reuse of existing light foundations and electrical service
DYNAMIC PARK SIGNAGE	1	LS	60,000.00	\$ 60,000	
WAYFINDING AND INFORMATION SIGNAGE	1	LS	50,000.00	\$ 50,000	
LANDSCAPING	1	LS	10,000.00	\$ 10,000	
2" DECIDUOUS TREE	17	EA	600.00	\$ 10,200	
CONC. STAIR	126	LF	240.00	\$ 30,240	
ADA RAMPS W/ WALL	100	LF	100.00	\$ 10,000	INCL \$8/SF FOR CONC WALK AND \$60 PER LF FOR WALL
PICNIC TABLES	12	EA	2,000.00	\$ 24,000	MATCH EXISTING MODERN TABLES
TRASH /RECYCLING RECEPTACLE COMBO	3	EA	0.00	\$ -	REUSE EX ROLLING CANS
6' BENCH	5	EA	3,000.00	\$ 15,000	W/ CONC PAD
SITE RESTORATION / EROSION CONTROL / TREE PROTECTION	1	LS	25,000.00	\$ 25,000	
PARKING LOT - PAVEMENT AND CURB DEMO	27,500	SF	0.80	\$ 22,000	REMOVE C&G AT NE CORNER, REALIGN ACCESS DRIVE, PROVIDE DROP-OFF
PARKING LOT - BITUMINOUS PAVEMENT	3,200	SY	20.00	\$ 64,000	REPAVE
PARKING LOT - CURB AND GUTTER	1,400	LF	25.00	\$ 35,000	NEW CURB AT ENTRANCE AND NE CORNER
STORMWATER IMPROVEMENTS	1	LS	50,000.00	\$ 50,000	ALLOWANCE
SUBTOTAL				\$ 1,268,690	

ITEM DESCRIPTIONS	EST QTY	UNIT	UNIT COST(LOW)	COST	NOTES
DIAMOND FIELD UPGRADES					
6" CHAINLINK W/ CONC. MAINTENANCE STRIP AND TOPPER	950	LF	125.00	\$ 118,750	
24' BACKSTOP NETTING SYSTEM	1	LS	50,000.00	\$ 50,000	
5' CONCRETE WALK	3,000	SF	8.00	\$ 24,000	SPECTATOR / DUGOUTS / CONCESSIONS AREAS
BLEACHER	2	EA		\$ -	ASSUMES REUSE OF 2 EXISTING
SCOREBOARD	1	LS	25,000.00	\$ 25,000	
20' FOUL POLES	2	EA	3,000.00	\$ 6,000	
AG LIME STRIP, STOCKPILE & REPLACE	278	CY	25.00	\$ 6,944	ASSUMES 6" DEPTH
30' CHAINLINK DUGOUT W/ ROOF	2	EA	42,000.00	\$ 84,000	
2" DECIDUOUS TREE	14	EA	600.00	\$ 8,400	
REGRADE AND RESEED OUTFIELD	1	LS	20,000.00	\$ 20,000	
PICNIC TABLES	7	EA	2,000.00	\$ 14,000	MATCH EXISTING MODERN TABLES
GRILL	2	EA	500.00	\$ 1,000	REUSE EXISTING GRILLS
TRASH /RECYCLING RECEPTACLE COMBO	3	EA	0.00	\$ -	REUSE EX ROLLING CANS
CONCESSION BLDG W/ RESTROOMS AND OPEN-AIR PICNIC	1	LS	650,000.00	\$ 650,000	PRE-ENGINEERED INCL UTILITY CONNECTIONS AND INSTALL
SITE RESTORATION / EROSION CONTROL / TREE PROTECTION	1	LS	25,000.00	\$ 25,000	
STORMWATER IMPROVEMENTS	1	LS	25,000.00	\$ 25,000	ALLOWANCE
			SUBTOTAL	\$ 1,058,094	
PLAYGROUND, NATURE PLAY, AND PICNIC SHELTER					
TRADITIONAL PLAYGROUND	1	LS	350,000.00	\$ 350,000	INCL. INSTALL
5" CONC. SIDEWALK	4,500	SF	8.00	\$ 36,000	
NATURE PLAY FEATURES	1	LS	75,000.00	\$ 75,000	INCL. INSTALL
6' BENCH	8	EA	2,500.00	\$ 20,000	W/ CONC PAD
TRASH /RECYCLING RECEPTACLE COMBO	3	EA	0.00	\$ -	REUSE EX ROLLING CANS
ENGINEERED WOOD FIBER	7,500	SF	2.00	\$ 15,000	ASSUME 75% PLAY SURFACE
POURED IN PLACE SAFETY SURFACE	1,625	SF	25.00	\$ 40,625	ASSUME 25% TRADITIONAL PLAY SURFACE
THICKENED CONC SIDEWALK PLAY CONTAINER EDGER	500	LF	40.00	\$ 20,000	
36'X24' PICNIC SHELTER	1	LS	120,000.00	\$ 120,000	INCL. INSTALL
5" CONC. PICNIC SHELTER PAD AND SIDEWALK	2,000	SF	8.00	\$ 16,000	
TOILET ENCLOSURE WITH PAD	1	LS	5,000.00	\$ 5,000	
LANDSCAPING	1	LS	5,000.00	\$ 5,000	
2" DECIDUOUS TREE	2	EA	800.00	\$ 1,600	
PICNIC TABLES	12	EA	500.00	\$ 6,000	REUSE AND REFURBISH EXISTING
GRILL	4	EA	1,500.00	\$ 6,000	NEW
TRASH /RECYCLING RECEPTACLE COMBO	2	EA	0.00	\$ -	REUSE EX ROLLING CANS
SITE RESTORATION / EROSION CONTROL / TREE PROTECTION	1	LS	25,000.00	\$ 25,000	
STORMWATER IMPROVEMENTS	1	LS	50,000.00	\$ 50,000	ALLOWANCE
			SUBTOTAL	\$ 741,225	
			Hard Cost Subtotal	\$ 3,665,793	
			<i>Design, Engineering, Survey, Permitting (15%)</i>	<i>\$ 549,869</i>	
			<i>Mobilization (5%)</i>	<i>\$ 183,290</i>	
			CONSTRUCTION TOTAL	\$ 4,398,951	
			<i>Construction and Design Contingency 15%</i>	<i>\$ 549,869</i>	
ESTIMATE OF PROBABLE CONSTRUCTION COST				\$ 4,948,820	






City of St. Francis Park
System Plan Survey

Survey Results
FINAL

10/04/2021

How often do you visit parks and facilities in St. Francis?

Overview




Breakdowns


Gender

Responses broken down by the gender of the respondent. Currently, most public data only supports male, female, and unknown.


Female



Male




Unknown




Age Range







Responses broken down by age of the respondent. Respondents for whom age are unknown are not included in these breakdowns.

18-24















25-34



35-44**45-54****55-64****65-74****75 years or older****Unknown****Precinct**


The geographic area in which the respondent lives. This is determined by the location of the reported household.

ANDOVER P-05**EAST BETHEL P-1**

EAST BETHEL P-2**ISANTI TWP****MINNEAPOLIS W-12 P-12****OAK GROVE P-1****OAK GROVE P-3****OAK GROVE P-4****SAINT FRANCIS P-1****SAINT FRANCIS P-2****STANFORD TWP****Unknown**

Have you visited any of the following parks and/or facilities in the City of St. Francis?

Overview




Breakdowns


Gender

Responses broken down by the gender of the respondent. Currently, most public data only supports male, female, and unknown.

Female



Male



Unknown

Any City trails 55% (31)




Community Parks (Woodbury Park, Hidden Ponds, St. Francis Community Park) 80% (45)



Neighborhood Parks (e.g. Deer Creek 2nd Park, Highland Woods, Rum River Woods) 50% (28)



Natural Parks (e.g. Creekview Estates, DeGardner Park 2, Dellwood River) 18% (10)




School Facilities (St. Francis elementary, middle school, high school, learning center) 59% (33)



Rum River North County Park 82% (46)



State Recreation Facilities (Carl E Bonnell WMA, Bethel WMA) 20% (11)



Private Recreation (Minnetonka Game and Fish Club, The Ponds golf course) 27% (15)




Age Range

Responses broken down by age of the respondent. Respondents for whom age are unknown are not included in these breakdowns.

18-24


Any City trails 0% (0)




Community Parks (Woodbury Park, Hidden Ponds, St. Francis Community Park) 100% (1)




Neighborhood Parks (e.g. Deer Creek 2nd Park, Highland Woods, Rum River Woods) 0% (0)



Natural Parks (e.g. Creekview Estates, DeGardner Park 2, Dellwood River) 0% (0)




School Facilities (St. Francis elementary, middle school, high school, learning center) 0% (0)




Rum River North County Park 100% (1)



State Recreation Facilities (Carl E Bonnell WMA, Bethel WMA) 0% (0)



Private Recreation (Minnetonka Game and Fish Club, The Ponds golf course) 0% (0)

**25-34**

Any City trails 56% (5)




Community Parks (Woodbury Park, Hidden Ponds, St. Francis Community Park) 78% (7)



Neighborhood Parks (e.g. Deer Creek 2nd Park, Highland Woods, Rum River Woods) 67% (6)



Natural Parks (e.g. Creekview Estates, DeGardner Park 2, Dellwood River) 33% (3)




School Facilities (St. Francis elementary, middle school, high school, learning center) 67% (6)




Rum River North County Park 89% (8)



State Recreation Facilities (Carl E Bonnell WMA, Bethel WMA) 0% (0)



Private Recreation (Minnetonka Game and Fish Club, The Ponds golf course) 22% (2)



35-44

Any City trails 76% (22)



Community Parks (Woodbury Park, Hidden Ponds, St. Francis Community Park) 72% (21)



Neighborhood Parks (e.g. Deer Creek 2nd Park, Highland Woods, Rum River Woods) 76% (22)



Natural Parks (e.g. Creekview Estates, DeGardner Park 2, Dellwood River) 17% (5)




School Facilities (St. Francis elementary, middle school, high school, learning center) 55% (16)




Rum River North County Park 72% (21)




State Recreation Facilities (Carl E Bonnell WMA, Bethel WMA) 17% (5)



Private Recreation (Minnetonka Game and Fish Club, The Ponds golf course) 17% (5)

**45-54**

Any City trails 31% (5)



Community Parks (Woodbury Park, Hidden Ponds, St. Francis Community Park) 88% (14)



Neighborhood Parks (e.g. Deer Creek 2nd Park, Highland Woods, Rum River Woods) 25% (4)



Natural Parks (e.g. Creekview Estates, DeGardner Park 2, Dellwood River) 0% (0)




School Facilities (St. Francis elementary, middle school, high school, learning center) 75% (12)




Rum River North County Park 88% (14)




State Recreation Facilities (Carl E Bonnell WMA, Bethel WMA) 13% (2)




Private Recreation (Minnetonka Game and Fish Club, The Ponds golf course) 19% (3)





55-64



65-74



75 years or older**Unknown****Precinct**

The geographic area in which the respondent lives. This is determined by the location of the reported household.

ANDOVER P-05

Any City trails 100% (1)



Community Parks (Woodbury Park, Hidden Ponds, St. Francis Community Park) 100% (1)



Neighborhood Parks (e.g. Deer Creek 2nd Park, Highland Woods, Rum River Woods) 100% (1)



Natural Parks (e.g. Creekview Estates, DeGardner Park 2, Dellwood River) 0% (0)




School Facilities (St. Francis elementary, middle school, high school, learning center) 100% (1)




Rum River North County Park 100% (1)



State Recreation Facilities (Carl E Bonnell WMA, Bethel WMA) 0% (0)



Private Recreation (Minnetonka Game and Fish Club, The Ponds golf course) 0% (0)



EAST BETHEL P-1

Any City trails 0% (0)



Community Parks (Woodbury Park, Hidden Ponds, St. Francis Community Park) 100% (2)



Neighborhood Parks (e.g. Deer Creek 2nd Park, Highland Woods, Rum River Woods) 0% (0)



Natural Parks (e.g. Creekview Estates, DeGardner Park 2, Dellwood River) 0% (0)




School Facilities (St. Francis elementary, middle school, high school, learning center) 50% (1)




Rum River North County Park 50% (1)



State Recreation Facilities (Carl E Bonnell WMA, Bethel WMA) 0% (0)




Private Recreation (Minnetonka Game and Fish Club, The Ponds golf course) 0% (0)




EAST BETHEL P-2


Any City trails 0% (0)




Community Parks (Woodbury Park, Hidden Ponds, St. Francis Community Park) 0% (0)



Neighborhood Parks (e.g. Deer Creek 2nd Park, Highland Woods, Rum River Woods) 0% (0)



Natural Parks (e.g. Creekview Estates, DeGardner Park 2, Dellwood River) 0% (0)




School Facilities (St. Francis elementary, middle school, high school, learning center) 100% (1)



Rum River North County Park 100% (1)



State Recreation Facilities (Carl E Bonnell WMA, Bethel WMA) 0% (0)



Private Recreation (Minnetonka Game and Fish Club, The Ponds golf course) 100% (1)



ISANTI TWP


Any City trails 100% (1)




Community Parks (Woodbury Park, Hidden Ponds, St. Francis Community Park) 100% (1)




Neighborhood Parks (e.g. Deer Creek 2nd Park, Highland Woods, Rum River Woods) 0% (0)



Natural Parks (e.g. Creekview Estates, DeGardner Park 2, Dellwood River) 0% (0)




School Facilities (St. Francis elementary, middle school, high school, learning center) 0% (0)




Rum River North County Park 100% (1)



State Recreation Facilities (Carl E Bonnell WMA, Bethel WMA) 0% (0)



Private Recreation (Minnetonka Game and Fish Club, The Ponds golf course) 0% (0)



MINNEAPOLIS W-12 P-12

Any City trails 100% (1)



Community Parks (Woodbury Park, Hidden Ponds, St. Francis Community Park) 100% (1)




Neighborhood Parks (e.g. Deer Creek 2nd Park, Highland Woods, Rum River Woods) 100% (1)



Natural Parks (e.g. Creekview Estates, DeGardner Park 2, Dellwood River) 100% (1)




School Facilities (St. Francis elementary, middle school, high school, learning center) 0% (0)




Rum River North County Park 100% (1)



State Recreation Facilities (Carl E Bonnell WMA, Bethel WMA) 0% (0)



Private Recreation (Minnetonka Game and Fish Club, The Ponds golf course) 0% (0)



OAK GROVE P-1

Any City trails 67% (2)




Community Parks (Woodbury Park, Hidden Ponds, St. Francis Community Park) 100% (3)



Neighborhood Parks (e.g. Deer Creek 2nd Park, Highland Woods, Rum River Woods) 67% (2)



Natural Parks (e.g. Creekview Estates, DeGardner Park 2, Dellwood River) 33% (1)




School Facilities (St. Francis elementary, middle school, high school, learning center) 67% (2)




Rum River North County Park 100% (3)



State Recreation Facilities (Carl E Bonnell WMA, Bethel WMA) 0% (0)




Private Recreation (Minnetonka Game and Fish Club, The Ponds golf course) 33% (1)




OAK GROVE P-3

Any City trails 0% (0)



Community Parks (Woodbury Park, Hidden Ponds, St. Francis Community Park) 0% (0)



Neighborhood Parks (e.g. Deer Creek 2nd Park, Highland Woods, Rum River Woods) 0% (0)



Natural Parks (e.g. Creekview Estates, DeGardner Park 2, Dellwood River) 0% (0)



School Facilities (St. Francis elementary, middle school, high school, learning center) 100% (1)



Rum River North County Park 100% (1)



State Recreation Facilities (Carl E Bonnell WMA, Bethel WMA) 100% (1)



Private Recreation (Minnetonka Game and Fish Club, The Ponds golf course) 100% (1)



OAK GROVE P-4

Any City trails 50% (1)




Community Parks (Woodbury Park, Hidden Ponds, St. Francis Community Park) 100% (2)



Neighborhood Parks (e.g. Deer Creek 2nd Park, Highland Woods, Rum River Woods) 0% (0)



Natural Parks (e.g. Creekview Estates, DeGardner Park 2, Dellwood River) 0% (0)



School Facilities (St. Francis elementary, middle school, high school, learning center) 100% (2)




Rum River North County Park 50% (1)



State Recreation Facilities (Carl E Bonnell WMA, Bethel WMA) 50% (1)



Private Recreation (Minnetonka Game and Fish Club, The Ponds golf course) 0% (0)



SAINT FRANCIS P-1

Any City trails 61% (19)



Community Parks (Woodbury Park, Hidden Ponds, St. Francis Community Park) 71% (22)



Neighborhood Parks (e.g. Deer Creek 2nd Park, Highland Woods, Rum River Woods) 55% (17)



Natural Parks (e.g. Creekview Estates, DeGardner Park 2, Dellwood River) 23% (7)



School Facilities (St. Francis elementary, middle school, high school, learning center) 58% (18)




Rum River North County Park 71% (22)



State Recreation Facilities (Carl E Bonnell WMA, Bethel WMA) 6% (2)



Private Recreation (Minnetonka Game and Fish Club, The Ponds golf course) 16% (5)



SAINT FRANCIS P-2

Any City trails 50% (13)



Community Parks (Woodbury Park, Hidden Ponds, St. Francis Community Park) 77% (20)



Neighborhood Parks (e.g. Deer Creek 2nd Park, Highland Woods, Rum River Woods) 65% (17)



Natural Parks (e.g. Creekview Estates, DeGardner Park 2, Dellwood River) 12% (3)




School Facilities (St. Francis elementary, middle school, high school, learning center) 58% (15)



Rum River North County Park 85% (22)











State Recreation Facilities (Carl E Bonnell WMA, Bethel WMA) 12% (3)











Private Recreation (Minnetonka Game and Fish Club, The Ponds golf course) 27% (7)



STANFORD TWP

Any City trails	0% (0)	
Community Parks (Woodbury Park, Hidden Ponds, St. Francis Community Park)	100% (1)	
Neighborhood Parks (e.g. Deer Creek 2nd Park, Highland Woods, Rum River Woods)	0% (0)	
Natural Parks (e.g. Creekview Estates, DeGardner Park 2, Dellwood River)	0% (0)	
School Facilities (St. Francis elementary, middle school, high school, learning center)	100% (1)	
Rum River North County Park	100% (1)	
State Recreation Facilities (Carl E Bonnell WMA, Bethel WMA)	0% (0)	
Private Recreation (Minnetonka Game and Fish Club, The Ponds golf course)	0% (0)	

Unknown

Any City trails	55% (31)	
Community Parks (Woodbury Park, Hidden Ponds, St. Francis Community Park)	80% (45)	
Neighborhood Parks (e.g. Deer Creek 2nd Park, Highland Woods, Rum River Woods)	50% (28)	
Natural Parks (e.g. Creekview Estates, DeGardner Park 2, Dellwood River)	18% (10)	
School Facilities (St. Francis elementary, middle school, high school, learning center)	59% (33)	
Rum River North County Park	82% (46)	
State Recreation Facilities (Carl E Bonnell WMA, Bethel WMA)	20% (11)	
Private Recreation (Minnetonka Game and Fish Club, The Ponds golf course)	27% (15)	

Overall, how satisfied are you with elements of the St. Francis parks and recreation system?


Overview

Question	Very Satisfied (keep investing)	Somewhat Satisfied	Somewhat Dissatisfied	Very dissatisfied (needs improvement)	Neutral/don't use
Playground equipment	24%	43%	10%	6%	16%
Picnic facilities	20%	48%	11%	6%	15%
Walking or hiking trails	32%	38%	13%	7%	10%
Roadway trails	19%	29%	13%	11%	28%
Sports facilities (baseball, softball, soccer, hockey rink, basketball, etc.)	11%	22%	12%	15%	40%
Ice rink/Warming house	11%	21%	8%	11%	48%
Comfort amenities (benches, restrooms, parking, etc.)	15%	43%	21%	14%	8%
Wayfinding signage	20%	40%	8%	7%	25%
Community center/Senior center	10%	10%	6%	12%	62%
ADA accessibility	5%	14%	3%	5%	73%
Protection of natural resources	21%	48%	13%	6%	13%
Recreation programs for youth	12%	19%	18%	19%	31%
Recreation programs for seniors	5%	8%	6%	9%	72%
Other	6%	12%	1%	13%	67%


[Expand all](#) / [Collapse all](#)




Playground equipment




Picnic facilities




Walking or hiking trails




Roadway trails



Sports facilities (baseball, softball, soccer, hockey rink, basketball, etc.)




Ice rink/Warming house



Comfort amenities (benches, restrooms, parking, etc.)



Wayfinding signage




Community center/Senior center




ADA accessibility



Protection of natural resources



Recreation programs for youth



Recreation programs for seniors



Other




Breakdowns for: Playground equipment


Gender

Responses broken down by the gender of the respondent. Currently, most public data only supports male, female, and unknown.


Female



Male











Unknown







Age Range

Responses broken down by age of the respondent. Respondents for whom age are unknown are not included in these breakdowns.


18-24**25-34****35-44****45-54****55-64****65-74**

75 years or older**Unknown****Precinct**


The geographic area in which the respondent lives. This is determined by the location of the reported household.

ANDOVER P-05**EAST BETHEL P-1****EAST BETHEL P-2****ISANTI TWP**


MINNEAPOLIS W-12 P-12




OAK GROVE P-1




OAK GROVE P-3




OAK GROVE P-4





SAINT FRANCIS P-1






SAINT FRANCIS P-2



STANFORD TWP**Unknown****Breakdowns for: Picnic facilities****Gender**

Responses broken down by the gender of the respondent. Currently, most public data only supports male, female, and unknown.

Female**Male****Unknown****Age Range**

Responses broken down by age of the respondent. Respondents for whom age are unknown are not included in these breakdowns.

18-24

Very Satisfied (keep investing) 0% (0)

Somewhat Satisfied 100% (1)

Somewhat Dissatisfied 0% (0)

Very dissatisfied (needs improvement) 0% (0)

Neutral/don't use 0% (0)

25-34

Very Satisfied (keep investing) 22% (2)

Somewhat Satisfied 44% (4)

Somewhat Dissatisfied 11% (1)

Very dissatisfied (needs improvement) 0% (0)

Neutral/don't use 22% (2)

35-44

Very Satisfied (keep investing) 11% (3)

Somewhat Satisfied 46% (13)

Somewhat Dissatisfied 11% (3)

Very dissatisfied (needs improvement) 14% (4)

Neutral/don't use 18% (5)

45-54

Very Satisfied (keep investing) 13% (2)

Somewhat Satisfied 40% (6)

Somewhat Dissatisfied 13% (2)

Very dissatisfied (needs improvement) 13% (2)

Neutral/don't use 20% (3)

55-64

Very Satisfied (keep investing) 13% (1)

Somewhat Satisfied 38% (3)

Somewhat Dissatisfied 13% (1)

Very dissatisfied (needs improvement) 13% (1)

Neutral/don't use 25% (2)

65-74

Very Satisfied (keep investing) 75% (3)


Somewhat Satisfied 0% (0)

Somewhat Dissatisfied 0% (0)


Very dissatisfied (needs improvement) 0% (0)

Neutral/don't use 25% (1)

75 years or older




Unknown




Precinct

The geographic area in which the respondent lives. This is determined by the location of the reported household.


ANDOVER P-05




EAST BETHEL P-1











EAST BETHEL P-2






ISANTI TWP



MINNEAPOLIS W-12 P-12**OAK GROVE P-1****OAK GROVE P-3****OAK GROVE P-4****SAINT FRANCIS P-1****SAINT FRANCIS P-2**

STANFORD TWP**Unknown****Breakdowns for: Walking or hiking trails****Gender**

Responses broken down by the gender of the respondent. Currently, most public data only supports male, female, and unknown.

Female**Male****Unknown****Age Range**

Responses broken down by age of the respondent. Respondents for whom age are unknown are not included in these breakdowns.

18-24

Very Satisfied (keep investing) 100% (1)

Somewhat Satisfied 0% (0)

Somewhat Dissatisfied 0% (0)

Very dissatisfied (needs improvement) 0% (0)

Neutral/don't use 0% (0)

25-34

Very Satisfied (keep investing) 33% (3)

Somewhat Satisfied 33% (3)

Somewhat Dissatisfied 11% (1)

Very dissatisfied (needs improvement) 11% (1)

Neutral/don't use 11% (1)

35-44

Very Satisfied (keep investing) 34% (10)

Somewhat Satisfied 28% (8)

Somewhat Dissatisfied 21% (6)

Very dissatisfied (needs improvement) 10% (3)

Neutral/don't use 7% (2)

45-54

Very Satisfied (keep investing) 19% (3)

Somewhat Satisfied 38% (6)

Somewhat Dissatisfied 19% (3)

Very dissatisfied (needs improvement) 0% (0)

Neutral/don't use 25% (4)

55-64

Very Satisfied (keep investing) 57% (4)

Somewhat Satisfied 29% (2)

Somewhat Dissatisfied 0% (0)

Very dissatisfied (needs improvement) 14% (1)

Neutral/don't use 0% (0)

65-74

Very Satisfied (keep investing) 20% (1)


Somewhat Satisfied 40% (2)

Somewhat Dissatisfied 0% (0)


Very dissatisfied (needs improvement) 20% (1)

Neutral/don't use 20% (1)

75 years or older




Unknown




Precinct

The geographic area in which the respondent lives. This is determined by the location of the reported household.


ANDOVER P-05




EAST BETHEL P-1




EAST BETHEL P-2




ISANTI TWP




MINNEAPOLIS W-12 P-12




OAK GROVE P-1




OAK GROVE P-3




OAK GROVE P-4





SAINT FRANCIS P-1






SAINT FRANCIS P-2



STANFORD TWP**Unknown****Breakdowns for: Roadway trails****Gender**

Responses broken down by the gender of the respondent. Currently, most public data only supports male, female, and unknown.

Female**Male****Unknown****Age Range**

Responses broken down by age of the respondent. Respondents for whom age are unknown are not included in these breakdowns.

18-24

Very Satisfied (keep investing) 100% (1)

Somewhat Satisfied 0% (0)

Somewhat Dissatisfied 0% (0)

Very dissatisfied (needs improvement) 0% (0)

Neutral/don't use 0% (0)

25-34

Very Satisfied (keep investing) 11% (1)

Somewhat Satisfied 33% (3)

Somewhat Dissatisfied 11% (1)

Very dissatisfied (needs improvement) 0% (0)

Neutral/don't use 44% (4)

35-44

Very Satisfied (keep investing) 21% (6)

Somewhat Satisfied 14% (4)

Somewhat Dissatisfied 28% (8)

Very dissatisfied (needs improvement) 17% (5)

Neutral/don't use 21% (6)

45-54

Very Satisfied (keep investing) 19% (3)

Somewhat Satisfied 38% (6)

Somewhat Dissatisfied 13% (2)

Very dissatisfied (needs improvement) 13% (2)

Neutral/don't use 19% (3)

55-64

Very Satisfied (keep investing) 25% (2)

Somewhat Satisfied 13% (1)

Somewhat Dissatisfied 13% (1)

Very dissatisfied (needs improvement) 25% (2)

Neutral/don't use 25% (2)

65-74



Very Satisfied (keep investing) 25% (1)

Somewhat Satisfied 25% (1)





Somewhat Dissatisfied 0% (0)







Very dissatisfied (needs improvement) 25% (1)



Neutral/don't use 25% (1)

75 years or older**Unknown****Precinct**




The geographic area in which the respondent lives. This is determined by the location of the reported household.

ANDOVER P-05**EAST BETHEL P-1****EAST BETHEL P-2****ISANTI TWP**

MINNEAPOLIS W-12 P-12**OAK GROVE P-1****OAK GROVE P-3****OAK GROVE P-4****SAINT FRANCIS P-1****SAINT FRANCIS P-2**

STANFORD TWP**Unknown****Breakdowns for: Sports facilities (baseball, softball, soccer, hockey rink, basketball, etc.)****Gender**

Responses broken down by the gender of the respondent. Currently, most public data only supports male, female, and unknown.

Female**Male****Unknown****Age Range**

Responses broken down by age of the respondent. Respondents for whom age are unknown are not included in these breakdowns.

18-24

Very Satisfied (keep investing) 100% (1)

Somewhat Satisfied 0% (0)

Somewhat Dissatisfied 0% (0)

Very dissatisfied (needs improvement) 0% (0)

Neutral/don't use 0% (0)

25-34

Very Satisfied (keep investing) 0% (0)

Somewhat Satisfied 38% (3)

Somewhat Dissatisfied 0% (0)

Very dissatisfied (needs improvement) 13% (1)

Neutral/don't use 50% (4)

35-44

Very Satisfied (keep investing) 3% (1)

Somewhat Satisfied 24% (7)

Somewhat Dissatisfied 14% (4)

Very dissatisfied (needs improvement) 21% (6)

Neutral/don't use 38% (11)

45-54

Very Satisfied (keep investing) 25% (4)

Somewhat Satisfied 25% (4)

Somewhat Dissatisfied 0% (0)

Very dissatisfied (needs improvement) 13% (2)

Neutral/don't use 38% (6)

55-64

Very Satisfied (keep investing) 0% (0)

Somewhat Satisfied 14% (1)

Somewhat Dissatisfied 0% (0)

Very dissatisfied (needs improvement) 14% (1)

Neutral/don't use 71% (5)

65-74



Very Satisfied (keep investing) 25% (1)

Somewhat Satisfied 50% (2)





Somewhat Dissatisfied 0% (0)

Very dissatisfied (needs improvement) 0% (0)


Neutral/don't use 25% (1)

75 years or older**Unknown****Precinct**


The geographic area in which the respondent lives. This is determined by the location of the reported household.

ANDOVER P-05**EAST BETHEL P-1****EAST BETHEL P-2****ISANTI TWP**


MINNEAPOLIS W-12 P-12




OAK GROVE P-1




OAK GROVE P-3




OAK GROVE P-4




SAINT FRANCIS P-1




SAINT FRANCIS P-2



STANFORD TWP



Unknown




Breakdowns for: Ice rink/Warming house


Gender

Responses broken down by the gender of the respondent. Currently, most public data only supports male, female, and unknown.


Female



Male



Unknown



Age Range

Responses broken down by age of the respondent. Respondents for whom age are unknown are not included in these breakdowns.

18-24

Very Satisfied (keep investing) 0% (0)

Somewhat Satisfied 0% (0)

Somewhat Dissatisfied 0% (0)

Very dissatisfied (needs improvement) 0% (0)

Neutral/don't use 100% (1)

25-34

Very Satisfied (keep investing) 11% (1)

Somewhat Satisfied 33% (3)

Somewhat Dissatisfied 0% (0)

Very dissatisfied (needs improvement) 0% (0)

Neutral/don't use 56% (5)

35-44

Very Satisfied (keep investing) 4% (1)

Somewhat Satisfied 19% (5)

Somewhat Dissatisfied 4% (1)

Very dissatisfied (needs improvement) 11% (3)

Neutral/don't use 63% (17)

45-54

Very Satisfied (keep investing) 33% (5)

Somewhat Satisfied 7% (1)

Somewhat Dissatisfied 0% (0)

Very dissatisfied (needs improvement) 13% (2)

Neutral/don't use 47% (7)

55-64

Very Satisfied (keep investing) 13% (1)

Somewhat Satisfied 25% (2)

Somewhat Dissatisfied 0% (0)

Very dissatisfied (needs improvement) 25% (2)

Neutral/don't use 38% (3)

65-74

Very Satisfied (keep investing) 0% (0)


Somewhat Satisfied 20% (1)

Somewhat Dissatisfied 20% (1)


Very dissatisfied (needs improvement) 0% (0)

Neutral/don't use 60% (3)

75 years or older




Unknown




Precinct

The geographic area in which the respondent lives. This is determined by the location of the reported household.


ANDOVER P-05




EAST BETHEL P-1




EAST BETHEL P-2




ISANTI TWP




MINNEAPOLIS W-12 P-12




OAK GROVE P-1




OAK GROVE P-3




OAK GROVE P-4




SAINT FRANCIS P-1




SAINT FRANCIS P-2



STANFORD TWP



Unknown




Breakdowns for: Comfort amenities (benches, restrooms, parking, etc.)


Gender

Responses broken down by the gender of the respondent. Currently, most public data only supports male, female, and unknown.


Female



Male



Unknown



Age Range

Responses broken down by age of the respondent. Respondents for whom age are unknown are not included in these breakdowns.

18-24

Very Satisfied (keep investing) 0% (0)

Somewhat Satisfied 100% (1)

Somewhat Dissatisfied 0% (0)

Very dissatisfied (needs improvement) 0% (0)

Neutral/don't use 0% (0)

25-34

Very Satisfied (keep investing) 22% (2)

Somewhat Satisfied 22% (2)

Somewhat Dissatisfied 22% (2)

Very dissatisfied (needs improvement) 11% (1)

Neutral/don't use 22% (2)

35-44

Very Satisfied (keep investing) 0% (0)

Somewhat Satisfied 41% (12)

Somewhat Dissatisfied 34% (10)

Very dissatisfied (needs improvement) 10% (3)

Neutral/don't use 14% (4)

45-54

Very Satisfied (keep investing) 25% (4)

Somewhat Satisfied 38% (6)

Somewhat Dissatisfied 25% (4)

Very dissatisfied (needs improvement) 13% (2)

Neutral/don't use 0% (0)

55-64

Very Satisfied (keep investing) 25% (2)

Somewhat Satisfied 50% (4)

Somewhat Dissatisfied 0% (0)

Very dissatisfied (needs improvement) 25% (2)

Neutral/don't use 0% (0)

65-74

Very Satisfied (keep investing) 25% (1)


Somewhat Satisfied 50% (2)

Somewhat Dissatisfied 25% (1)


Very dissatisfied (needs improvement) 0% (0)

Neutral/don't use 0% (0)

75 years or older




Unknown




Precinct

The geographic area in which the respondent lives. This is determined by the location of the reported household.


ANDOVER P-05




EAST BETHEL P-1




EAST BETHEL P-2




ISANTI TWP




MINNEAPOLIS W-12 P-12




OAK GROVE P-1




OAK GROVE P-3




OAK GROVE P-4




SAINT FRANCIS P-1




SAINT FRANCIS P-2



STANFORD TWP



Unknown




Breakdowns for: Wayfinding signage


Gender

Responses broken down by the gender of the respondent. Currently, most public data only supports male, female, and unknown.


Female



Male



Unknown



Age Range

Responses broken down by age of the respondent. Respondents for whom age are unknown are not included in these breakdowns.

18-24

Very Satisfied (keep investing) 100% (1)

Somewhat Satisfied 0% (0)

Somewhat Dissatisfied 0% (0)

Very dissatisfied (needs improvement) 0% (0)

Neutral/don't use 0% (0)

25-34

Very Satisfied (keep investing) 33% (3)

Somewhat Satisfied 11% (1)

Somewhat Dissatisfied 11% (1)

Very dissatisfied (needs improvement) 11% (1)

Neutral/don't use 33% (3)

35-44

Very Satisfied (keep investing) 14% (4)

Somewhat Satisfied 38% (11)

Somewhat Dissatisfied 7% (2)

Very dissatisfied (needs improvement) 7% (2)

Neutral/don't use 34% (10)

45-54

Very Satisfied (keep investing) 27% (4)

Somewhat Satisfied 33% (5)

Somewhat Dissatisfied 7% (1)

Very dissatisfied (needs improvement) 13% (2)

Neutral/don't use 20% (3)

55-64

Very Satisfied (keep investing) 29% (2)

Somewhat Satisfied 29% (2)

Somewhat Dissatisfied 14% (1)

Very dissatisfied (needs improvement) 14% (1)

Neutral/don't use 14% (1)

65-74

Very Satisfied (keep investing) 0% (0)


Somewhat Satisfied 40% (2)

Somewhat Dissatisfied 20% (1)


Very dissatisfied (needs improvement) 20% (1)

Neutral/don't use 20% (1)

75 years or older




Unknown




Precinct

The geographic area in which the respondent lives. This is determined by the location of the reported household.


ANDOVER P-05




EAST BETHEL P-1




EAST BETHEL P-2




ISANTI TWP




MINNEAPOLIS W-12 P-12




OAK GROVE P-1




OAK GROVE P-3




OAK GROVE P-4





SAINT FRANCIS P-1






SAINT FRANCIS P-2




STANFORD TWP**Unknown****Breakdowns for: Community center/Senior center****Gender**


Responses broken down by the gender of the respondent. Currently, most public data only supports male, female, and unknown.


Female**Male****Unknown****Age Range**


Responses broken down by age of the respondent. Respondents for whom age are unknown are not included in these breakdowns.


18-24

Very Satisfied (keep investing) 100% (1)



Somewhat Satisfied 0% (0)



Somewhat Dissatisfied 0% (0)



Very dissatisfied (needs improvement) 0% (0)



Neutral/don't use 0% (0)


25-34

Very Satisfied (keep investing) 0% (0)



Somewhat Satisfied 33% (3)


Somewhat Dissatisfied 0% (0)



Very dissatisfied (needs improvement) 0% (0)



Neutral/don't use 67% (6)


35-44

Very Satisfied (keep investing) 7% (2)



Somewhat Satisfied 0% (0)


Somewhat Dissatisfied 7% (2)



Very dissatisfied (needs improvement) 14% (4)



Neutral/don't use 71% (20)


45-54

Very Satisfied (keep investing) 13% (2)



Somewhat Satisfied 13% (2)


Somewhat Dissatisfied 7% (1)



Very dissatisfied (needs improvement) 7% (1)



Neutral/don't use 60% (9)


55-64

Very Satisfied (keep investing) 17% (1)



Somewhat Satisfied 0% (0)


Somewhat Dissatisfied 17% (1)



Very dissatisfied (needs improvement) 0% (0)



Neutral/don't use 67% (4)


65-74

Very Satisfied (keep investing) 0% (0)



Somewhat Satisfied 20% (1)


Somewhat Dissatisfied 0% (0)



Very dissatisfied (needs improvement) 20% (1)


Neutral/don't use 60% (3)


75 years or older




Unknown




Precinct

The geographic area in which the respondent lives. This is determined by the location of the reported household.


ANDOVER P-05




EAST BETHEL P-1




EAST BETHEL P-2




ISANTI TWP




MINNEAPOLIS W-12 P-12




OAK GROVE P-1




OAK GROVE P-3




SAINT FRANCIS P-1




SAINT FRANCIS P-2



STANFORD TWP



Unknown




Breakdowns for: ADA accessibility


Gender

Responses broken down by the gender of the respondent. Currently, most public data only supports male, female, and unknown.


Female



Male



Unknown



Age Range

Responses broken down by age of the respondent. Respondents for whom age are unknown are not included in these breakdowns.

18-24

Very Satisfied (keep investing) 0% (0)

Somewhat Satisfied 0% (0)

Somewhat Dissatisfied 0% (0)

Very dissatisfied (needs improvement) 0% (0)

Neutral/don't use 100% (1)

25-34

Very Satisfied (keep investing) 0% (0)

Somewhat Satisfied 11% (1)

Somewhat Dissatisfied 0% (0)

Very dissatisfied (needs improvement) 11% (1)

Neutral/don't use 78% (7)

35-44

Very Satisfied (keep investing) 0% (0)

Somewhat Satisfied 4% (1)

Somewhat Dissatisfied 8% (2)

Very dissatisfied (needs improvement) 4% (1)

Neutral/don't use 85% (22)

45-54

Very Satisfied (keep investing) 7% (1)

Somewhat Satisfied 13% (2)

Somewhat Dissatisfied 7% (1)

Very dissatisfied (needs improvement) 0% (0)

Neutral/don't use 73% (11)

55-64

Very Satisfied (keep investing) 0% (0)

Somewhat Satisfied 14% (1)

Somewhat Dissatisfied 0% (0)

Very dissatisfied (needs improvement) 14% (1)

Neutral/don't use 71% (5)

65-74

Very Satisfied (keep investing) 0% (0)


Somewhat Satisfied 20% (1)

Somewhat Dissatisfied 0% (0)


Very dissatisfied (needs improvement) 20% (1)

Neutral/don't use 60% (3)

75 years or older




Unknown




Precinct

The geographic area in which the respondent lives. This is determined by the location of the reported household.


ANDOVER P-05




EAST BETHEL P-1




EAST BETHEL P-2




ISANTI TWP




MINNEAPOLIS W-12 P-12




OAK GROVE P-1




OAK GROVE P-3




SAINT FRANCIS P-1




SAINT FRANCIS P-2



STANFORD TWP



Unknown




Breakdowns for: Protection of natural resources


Gender

Responses broken down by the gender of the respondent. Currently, most public data only supports male, female, and unknown.


Female



Male



Unknown



Age Range

Responses broken down by age of the respondent. Respondents for whom age are unknown are not included in these breakdowns.

18-24

Very Satisfied (keep investing) 100% (1)

Somewhat Satisfied 0% (0)

Somewhat Dissatisfied 0% (0)

Very dissatisfied (needs improvement) 0% (0)

Neutral/don't use 0% (0)

25-34

Very Satisfied (keep investing) 22% (2)

Somewhat Satisfied 33% (3)

Somewhat Dissatisfied 11% (1)

Very dissatisfied (needs improvement) 22% (2)

Neutral/don't use 11% (1)

35-44

Very Satisfied (keep investing) 12% (3)

Somewhat Satisfied 52% (13)

Somewhat Dissatisfied 8% (2)

Very dissatisfied (needs improvement) 12% (3)

Neutral/don't use 16% (4)

45-54

Very Satisfied (keep investing) 25% (4)

Somewhat Satisfied 44% (7)

Somewhat Dissatisfied 13% (2)

Very dissatisfied (needs improvement) 13% (2)

Neutral/don't use 6% (1)

55-64

Very Satisfied (keep investing) 43% (3)

Somewhat Satisfied 43% (3)

Somewhat Dissatisfied 14% (1)

Very dissatisfied (needs improvement) 0% (0)

Neutral/don't use 0% (0)

65-74



Very Satisfied (keep investing) 20% (1)

Somewhat Satisfied 20% (1)





Somewhat Dissatisfied 40% (2)







Very dissatisfied (needs improvement) 0% (0)



Neutral/don't use 20% (1)

75 years or older**Unknown****Precinct**




The geographic area in which the respondent lives. This is determined by the location of the reported household.

ANDOVER P-05**EAST BETHEL P-1****EAST BETHEL P-2****ISANTI TWP**

MINNEAPOLIS W-12 P-12**OAK GROVE P-1****OAK GROVE P-3****OAK GROVE P-4****SAINT FRANCIS P-1****SAINT FRANCIS P-2**

STANFORD TWP**Unknown****Breakdowns for: Recreation programs for youth****Gender**

Responses broken down by the gender of the respondent. Currently, most public data only supports male, female, and unknown.

Female**Male****Unknown****Age Range**

Responses broken down by age of the respondent. Respondents for whom age are unknown are not included in these breakdowns.

18-24

Very Satisfied (keep investing) 100% (1)

Somewhat Satisfied 0% (0)

Somewhat Dissatisfied 0% (0)

Very dissatisfied (needs improvement) 0% (0)

Neutral/don't use 0% (0)

25-34

Very Satisfied (keep investing) 11% (1)

Somewhat Satisfied 33% (3)

Somewhat Dissatisfied 0% (0)

Very dissatisfied (needs improvement) 33% (3)

Neutral/don't use 22% (2)

35-44

Very Satisfied (keep investing) 10% (3)

Somewhat Satisfied 14% (4)

Somewhat Dissatisfied 21% (6)

Very dissatisfied (needs improvement) 24% (7)

Neutral/don't use 31% (9)

45-54

Very Satisfied (keep investing) 20% (3)

Somewhat Satisfied 27% (4)

Somewhat Dissatisfied 13% (2)

Very dissatisfied (needs improvement) 7% (1)

Neutral/don't use 33% (5)

55-64

Very Satisfied (keep investing) 0% (0)

Somewhat Satisfied 14% (1)

Somewhat Dissatisfied 14% (1)

Very dissatisfied (needs improvement) 14% (1)

Neutral/don't use 57% (4)

65-74

Very Satisfied (keep investing) 0% (0)


Somewhat Satisfied 40% (2)

Somewhat Dissatisfied 0% (0)


Very dissatisfied (needs improvement) 20% (1)

Neutral/don't use 40% (2)

75 years or older




Unknown




Precinct

The geographic area in which the respondent lives. This is determined by the location of the reported household.


ANDOVER P-05




EAST BETHEL P-1




EAST BETHEL P-2




ISANTI TWP




MINNEAPOLIS W-12 P-12




OAK GROVE P-1




OAK GROVE P-3




OAK GROVE P-4





SAINT FRANCIS P-1






SAINT FRANCIS P-2




STANFORD TWP**Unknown****Breakdowns for: Recreation programs for seniors****Gender**


Responses broken down by the gender of the respondent. Currently, most public data only supports male, female, and unknown.


Female**Male****Unknown****Age Range**


Responses broken down by age of the respondent. Respondents for whom age are unknown are not included in these breakdowns.


18-24

Very Satisfied (keep investing) 100% (1)



Somewhat Satisfied 0% (0)



Somewhat Dissatisfied 0% (0)



Very dissatisfied (needs improvement) 0% (0)



Neutral/don't use 0% (0)


25-34

Very Satisfied (keep investing) 0% (0)



Somewhat Satisfied 11% (1)



Somewhat Dissatisfied 0% (0)



Very dissatisfied (needs improvement) 11% (1)



Neutral/don't use 78% (7)


35-44

Very Satisfied (keep investing) 0% (0)



Somewhat Satisfied 0% (0)



Somewhat Dissatisfied 8% (2)



Very dissatisfied (needs improvement) 0% (0)



Neutral/don't use 92% (24)


45-54

Very Satisfied (keep investing) 0% (0)



Somewhat Satisfied 0% (0)



Somewhat Dissatisfied 14% (2)



Very dissatisfied (needs improvement) 7% (1)



Neutral/don't use 79% (11)


55-64

Very Satisfied (keep investing) 0% (0)



Somewhat Satisfied 14% (1)



Somewhat Dissatisfied 14% (1)



Very dissatisfied (needs improvement) 14% (1)



Neutral/don't use 57% (4)


65-74



Very Satisfied (keep investing) 0% (0)


Somewhat Satisfied 40% (2)






Somewhat Dissatisfied 0% (0)


Very dissatisfied (needs improvement) 40% (2)



Neutral/don't use 20% (1)


75 years or older**Unknown****Precinct**


The geographic area in which the respondent lives. This is determined by the location of the reported household.

ANDOVER P-05**EAST BETHEL P-1****EAST BETHEL P-2****ISANTI TWP**


MINNEAPOLIS W-12 P-12




OAK GROVE P-1




OAK GROVE P-3




OAK GROVE P-4





SAINT FRANCIS P-1






SAINT FRANCIS P-2



STANFORD TWP**Unknown****Breakdowns for: Other****Gender**


Responses broken down by the gender of the respondent. Currently, most public data only supports male, female, and unknown.

Female**Male****Unknown****Age Range**

Responses broken down by age of the respondent. Respondents for whom age are unknown are not included in these breakdowns.

18-24

Very Satisfied (keep investing) 0% (0)



Somewhat Satisfied 0% (0)


Somewhat Dissatisfied 0% (0)

Very dissatisfied (needs improvement) 0% (0)

Neutral/don't use 100% (1)

25-34

Very Satisfied (keep investing) 0% (0)



Somewhat Satisfied 20% (1)


Somewhat Dissatisfied 0% (0)

Very dissatisfied (needs improvement) 60% (3)

Neutral/don't use 20% (1)

35-44

Very Satisfied (keep investing) 0% (0)



Somewhat Satisfied 0% (0)


Somewhat Dissatisfied 0% (0)

Very dissatisfied (needs improvement) 7% (1)

Neutral/don't use 93% (14)

45-54

Very Satisfied (keep investing) 0% (0)



Somewhat Satisfied 22% (2)


Somewhat Dissatisfied 0% (0)

Very dissatisfied (needs improvement) 11% (1)

Neutral/don't use 67% (6)

55-64

Very Satisfied (keep investing) 0% (0)



Somewhat Satisfied 0% (0)


Somewhat Dissatisfied 0% (0)

Very dissatisfied (needs improvement) 40% (2)

Neutral/don't use 60% (3)

65-74

Very Satisfied (keep investing) 0% (0)





Somewhat Satisfied 50% (1)





Somewhat Dissatisfied 0% (0)

Very dissatisfied (needs improvement) 50% (1)


Neutral/don't use 0% (0)

75 years or older**Unknown****Precinct**


The geographic area in which the respondent lives. This is determined by the location of the reported household.

ANDOVER P-05**EAST BETHEL P-1****MINNEAPOLIS W-12 P-12****OAK GROVE P-1**


OAK GROVE P-3




SAINT FRANCIS P-1



SAINT FRANCIS P-2




Unknown



Which new or expanded parks and recreation facilities would you be interested in using in St. Francis?

Overview




Breakdowns


Gender



Responses broken down by the gender of the respondent. Currently, most public data only supports male, female, and unknown.

Female



Male





Unknown

Indoor community center
(senior center, indoor track,
classrooms, fitness
equipment) 67% (38)



Improved tournament athletic
complex (softball/baseball) 28% (16)



New neighborhood parks and
playgrounds (in
neighborhoods where parks
don't exist today) 49% (28)




More paved trails for walking,
running, and bicycling 65% (37)




Mountain bike trails 21% (12)




Basketball courts 16% (9)




Tennis courts 14% (8)




Pickleball courts 16% (9)




Skate park 26% (15)



Ice rink/warming house 23% (13)




More
soccer/football/lacrosse
fields 11% (6)




Splash pads 68% (39)




Disc golf 25% (14)




River access (canoe landing,
fishing pier) 30% (17)



Water quality improvements
to the Rum River 23% (13)




Community gardens 25% (14)



Farmer's market 67% (38)




Cross country ski trails and
winter facilities 25% (14)



Groomed winter trails for fat
tire biking 11% (6)





Age Range



Responses broken down by age of the respondent. Respondents for whom age are unknown are not included in these breakdowns.

18-24


Indoor community center (senior center, indoor track, classrooms, fitness equipment)	100% (1)
Improved tournament athletic complex (softball/baseball)	0% (0)
New neighborhood parks and playgrounds (in neighborhoods where parks don't exist today)	0% (0)
More paved trails for walking, running, and bicycling	100% (1)
Mountain bike trails	0% (0)
Basketball courts	0% (0)
Tennis courts	100% (1)
Pickleball courts	0% (0)
Skate park	0% (0)
Ice rink/warming house	100% (1)
More soccer/football/lacrosse fields	0% (0)
Splash pads	100% (1)
Disc golf	0% (0)
River access (canoe landing, fishing pier)	100% (1)
Water quality improvements to the Rum River	0% (0)
Community gardens	100% (1)
Farmer's market	100% (1)
Cross country ski trails and winter facilities	0% (0)
Groomed winter trails for fat tire biking	0% (0)

25-34


Indoor community center (senior center, indoor track, classrooms, fitness equipment)	67% (6)
Improved tournament athletic complex (softball/baseball)	0% (0)
New neighborhood parks and playgrounds (in neighborhoods where parks don't exist today)	33% (3)
More paved trails for walking, running, and bicycling	33% (3)
Mountain bike trails	22% (2)
Basketball courts	11% (1)
Tennis courts	0% (0)
Pickleball courts	0% (0)
Skate park	0% (0)
Ice rink/warming house	11% (1)
More soccer/football/lacrosse fields	0% (0)
Splash pads	56% (5)
Disc golf	0% (0)
River access (canoe landing, fishing pier)	22% (2)
Water quality improvements to the Rum River	44% (4)
Community gardens	11% (1)
Farmer's market	33% (3)
Cross country ski trails and winter facilities	11% (1)
Groomed winter trails for fat tire biking	11% (1)




35-44



45-54







55-64

Indoor community center (senior center, indoor track, classrooms, fitness equipment)	75% (6)
Improved tournament athletic complex (softball/baseball)	13% (1)
New neighborhood parks and playgrounds (in neighborhoods where parks don't exist today)	38% (3)
More paved trails for walking, running, and bicycling	88% (7)
Mountain bike trails	13% (1)
Basketball courts	13% (1)
Tennis courts	13% (1)
Pickleball courts	25% (2)
Skate park	13% (1)
Ice rink/warming house	13% (1)
More soccer/football/lacrosse fields	13% (1)
Splash pads	75% (6)
Disc golf	13% (1)
River access (canoe landing, fishing pier)	38% (3)
Water quality improvements to the Rum River	38% (3)
Community gardens	50% (4)
Farmer's market	88% (7)
Cross country ski trails and winter facilities	38% (3)
Groomed winter trails for fat tire biking	0% (0)

65-74

Indoor community center (senior center, indoor track, classrooms, fitness equipment)	100% (5)
Improved tournament athletic complex (softball/baseball)	20% (1)
New neighborhood parks and playgrounds (in neighborhoods where parks don't exist today)	20% (1)
More paved trails for walking, running, and bicycling	40% (2)
Mountain bike trails	0% (0)
Basketball courts	0% (0)
Tennis courts	0% (0)
Pickleball courts	20% (1)
Skate park	20% (1)
Ice rink/warming house	0% (0)
More soccer/football/lacrosse fields	0% (0)
Splash pads	40% (2)
Disc golf	20% (1)
River access (canoe landing, fishing pier)	20% (1)
Water quality improvements to the Rum River	40% (2)
Community gardens	0% (0)
Farmer's market	100% (5)
Cross country ski trails and winter facilities	20% (1)
Groomed winter trails for fat tire biking	0% (0)




75 years or older

Indoor community center (senior center, indoor track, classrooms, fitness equipment)	50% (1)
Improved tournament athletic complex (softball/baseball)	0% (0)
New neighborhood parks and playgrounds (in neighborhoods where parks don't exist today)	0% (0)
More paved trails for walking, running, and bicycling	0% (0)
Mountain bike trails	50% (1)
Basketball courts	0% (0)
Tennis courts	0% (0)
Pickleball courts	50% (1)
Skate park	0% (0)
Ice rink/warming house	0% (0)
More soccer/football/lacrosse fields	0% (0)
Splash pads	50% (1)
Disc golf	50% (1)
River access (canoe landing, fishing pier)	0% (0)
Water quality improvements to the Rum River	0% (0)
Community gardens	0% (0)
Farmer's market	100% (2)
Cross country ski trails and winter facilities	0% (0)
Groomed winter trails for fat tire biking	0% (0)

Unknown

Indoor community center (senior center, indoor track, classrooms, fitness equipment)	67% (38)
Improved tournament athletic complex (softball/baseball)	28% (16)
New neighborhood parks and playgrounds (in neighborhoods where parks don't exist today)	49% (28)
More paved trails for walking, running, and bicycling	65% (37)
Mountain bike trails	21% (12)
Basketball courts	16% (9)
Tennis courts	14% (8)
Pickleball courts	16% (9)
Skate park	26% (15)
Ice rink/warming house	23% (13)
More soccer/football/lacrosse fields	11% (6)
Splash pads	68% (39)
Disc golf	25% (14)
River access (canoe landing, fishing pier)	30% (17)
Water quality improvements to the Rum River	23% (13)
Community gardens	25% (14)
Farmer's market	67% (38)
Cross country ski trails and winter facilities	25% (14)
Groomed winter trails for fat tire biking	11% (6)



Precinct

The geographic area in which the respondent lives. This is determined by the location of the reported household.

ANDOVER P-05

Indoor community center (senior center, indoor track, classrooms, fitness equipment)	100% (1)	<div style="width: 100%; height: 10px; background-color: #4a4a9a;"></div>
Improved tournament athletic complex (softball/baseball)	0% (0)	<div style="width: 0%; height: 10px; background-color: #d9d9d9;"></div>
New neighborhood parks and playgrounds (in neighborhoods where parks don't exist today)	0% (0)	<div style="width: 0%; height: 10px; background-color: #d9d9d9;"></div>
More paved trails for walking, running, and bicycling	100% (1)	<div style="width: 100%; height: 10px; background-color: #4a4a9a;"></div>
Mountain bike trails	100% (1)	<div style="width: 100%; height: 10px; background-color: #4a4a9a;"></div>
Basketball courts	0% (0)	<div style="width: 0%; height: 10px; background-color: #d9d9d9;"></div>
Tennis courts	0% (0)	<div style="width: 0%; height: 10px; background-color: #d9d9d9;"></div>
Pickleball courts	100% (1)	<div style="width: 100%; height: 10px; background-color: #4a4a9a;"></div>
Skate park	0% (0)	<div style="width: 0%; height: 10px; background-color: #d9d9d9;"></div>
Ice rink/warming house	100% (1)	<div style="width: 100%; height: 10px; background-color: #4a4a9a;"></div>
More soccer/football/lacrosse fields	0% (0)	<div style="width: 0%; height: 10px; background-color: #d9d9d9;"></div>
Splash pads	0% (0)	<div style="width: 0%; height: 10px; background-color: #d9d9d9;"></div>
Disc golf	100% (1)	<div style="width: 100%; height: 10px; background-color: #4a4a9a;"></div>
River access (canoe landing, fishing pier)	100% (1)	<div style="width: 100%; height: 10px; background-color: #4a4a9a;"></div>
Water quality improvements to the Rum River	0% (0)	<div style="width: 0%; height: 10px; background-color: #d9d9d9;"></div>
Community gardens	0% (0)	<div style="width: 0%; height: 10px; background-color: #d9d9d9;"></div>
Farmer's market	100% (1)	<div style="width: 100%; height: 10px; background-color: #4a4a9a;"></div>
Cross country ski trails and winter facilities	100% (1)	<div style="width: 100%; height: 10px; background-color: #4a4a9a;"></div>
Groomed winter trails for fat tire biking	100% (1)	<div style="width: 100%; height: 10px; background-color: #4a4a9a;"></div>

EAST BETHEL P-1

Indoor community center (senior center, indoor track, classrooms, fitness equipment)	100% (2)	<div style="width: 100%; height: 10px; background-color: #4a4a9a;"></div>
Improved tournament athletic complex (softball/baseball)	100% (2)	<div style="width: 100%; height: 10px; background-color: #4a4a9a;"></div>
New neighborhood parks and playgrounds (in neighborhoods where parks don't exist today)	50% (1)	<div style="width: 50%; height: 10px; background-color: #4a4a9a;"></div>
More paved trails for walking, running, and bicycling	50% (1)	<div style="width: 50%; height: 10px; background-color: #4a4a9a;"></div>
Mountain bike trails	50% (1)	<div style="width: 50%; height: 10px; background-color: #4a4a9a;"></div>
Basketball courts	50% (1)	<div style="width: 50%; height: 10px; background-color: #4a4a9a;"></div>
Tennis courts	50% (1)	<div style="width: 50%; height: 10px; background-color: #4a4a9a;"></div>
Pickleball courts	50% (1)	<div style="width: 50%; height: 10px; background-color: #4a4a9a;"></div>
Skate park	0% (0)	<div style="width: 0%; height: 10px; background-color: #d9d9d9;"></div>
Ice rink/warming house	0% (0)	<div style="width: 0%; height: 10px; background-color: #d9d9d9;"></div>
More soccer/football/lacrosse fields	50% (1)	<div style="width: 50%; height: 10px; background-color: #4a4a9a;"></div>
Splash pads	100% (2)	<div style="width: 100%; height: 10px; background-color: #4a4a9a;"></div>
Disc golf	0% (0)	<div style="width: 0%; height: 10px; background-color: #d9d9d9;"></div>
River access (canoe landing, fishing pier)	100% (2)	<div style="width: 100%; height: 10px; background-color: #4a4a9a;"></div>
Water quality improvements to the Rum River	50% (1)	<div style="width: 50%; height: 10px; background-color: #4a4a9a;"></div>
Community gardens	0% (0)	<div style="width: 0%; height: 10px; background-color: #d9d9d9;"></div>
Farmer's market	0% (0)	<div style="width: 0%; height: 10px; background-color: #d9d9d9;"></div>
Cross country ski trails and winter facilities	50% (1)	<div style="width: 50%; height: 10px; background-color: #4a4a9a;"></div>
Groomed winter trails for fat tire biking	50% (1)	<div style="width: 50%; height: 10px; background-color: #4a4a9a;"></div>

Dog park	0% (0)
Other	100% (1)


Dog park	0% (0)
Other	0% (0)

EAST BETHEL P-2


Indoor community center
(senior center, indoor track,
classrooms, fitness equipment) 100% (1)




Improved tournament athletic
complex (softball/baseball) 0% (0)




New neighborhood parks and
playgrounds (in neighborhoods
where parks don't exist today) 0% (0)




More paved trails for walking,
running, and bicycling 0% (0)




Mountain bike trails 0% (0)




Basketball courts 0% (0)




Tennis courts 0% (0)




Pickleball courts 0% (0)




Skate park 0% (0)




Ice rink/warming house 0% (0)




More
soccer/football/lacrosse
fields 0% (0)




Splash pads 0% (0)




Disc golf 0% (0)




River access (canoe landing,
fishing pier) 0% (0)



Water quality improvements
to the Rum River 0% (0)




Community gardens 0% (0)




Farmer's market 100% (1)



Cross country ski trails and
winter facilities 0% (0)



Groomed winter trails for fat
tire biking 0% (0)



ISANTI TWP


Indoor community center
(senior center, indoor track,
classrooms, fitness equipment) 100% (1)



Improved tournament athletic
complex (softball/baseball) 0% (0)




New neighborhood parks and
playgrounds (in neighborhoods
where parks don't exist today) 0% (0)




More paved trails for walking,
running, and bicycling 100% (1)




Mountain bike trails 0% (0)




Basketball courts 0% (0)




Tennis courts 0% (0)




Pickleball courts 0% (0)




Skate park 0% (0)



Ice rink/warming house 0% (0)



More
soccer/football/lacrosse
fields 0% (0)



Splash pads 100% (1)



Disc golf 100% (1)



River access (canoe landing,
fishing pier) 100% (1)



Water quality improvements
to the Rum River 100% (1)



Community gardens 100% (1)




Farmer's market 100% (1)




Cross country ski trails and
winter facilities 100% (1)




Groomed winter trails for fat
tire biking 0% (0)



Dog park 0% (0)




Other 0% (0)



Dog park 100% (1)



Other 0% (0)





MINNEAPOLIS W-12 P-12

Indoor community center (senior center, indoor track, classrooms, fitness equipment)	0% (0)
Improved tournament athletic complex (softball/baseball)	0% (0)
New neighborhood parks and playgrounds (in neighborhoods where parks don't exist today)	0% (0)
More paved trails for walking, running, and bicycling	0% (0)
Mountain bike trails	0% (0)
Basketball courts	0% (0)
Tennis courts	0% (0)
Pickleball courts	0% (0)
Skate park	0% (0)
Ice rink/warming house	0% (0)
More soccer/football/lacrosse fields	0% (0)
Splash pads	100% (1)
Disc golf	100% (1)
River access (canoe landing, fishing pier)	0% (0)
Water quality improvements to the Rum River	0% (0)
Community gardens	0% (0)
Farmer's market	100% (1)
Cross country ski trails and winter facilities	0% (0)
Groomed winter trails for fat tire biking	0% (0)

OAK GROVE P-1

Indoor community center (senior center, indoor track, classrooms, fitness equipment)	100% (3)
Improved tournament athletic complex (softball/baseball)	67% (2)
New neighborhood parks and playgrounds (in neighborhoods where parks don't exist today)	67% (2)
More paved trails for walking, running, and bicycling	100% (3)
Mountain bike trails	67% (2)
Basketball courts	33% (1)
Tennis courts	33% (1)
Pickleball courts	33% (1)
Skate park	0% (0)
Ice rink/warming house	33% (1)
More soccer/football/lacrosse fields	33% (1)
Splash pads	33% (1)
Disc golf	67% (2)
River access (canoe landing, fishing pier)	100% (3)
Water quality improvements to the Rum River	33% (1)
Community gardens	33% (1)
Farmer's market	100% (3)
Cross country ski trails and winter facilities	67% (2)
Groomed winter trails for fat tire biking	0% (0)





OAK GROVE P-3


Indoor community center (senior center, indoor track, classrooms, fitness equipment)	0% (0)
Improved tournament athletic complex (softball/baseball)	0% (0)
New neighborhood parks and playgrounds (in neighborhoods where parks don't exist today)	100% (1)
More paved trails for walking, running, and bicycling	100% (1)
Mountain bike trails	100% (1)
Basketball courts	0% (0)
Tennis courts	0% (0)
Pickleball courts	0% (0)
Skate park	100% (1)
Ice rink/warming house	0% (0)
More soccer/football/lacrosse fields	0% (0)
Splash pads	100% (1)
Disc golf	0% (0)
River access (canoe landing, fishing pier)	100% (1)
Water quality improvements to the Rum River	100% (1)
Community gardens	0% (0)
Farmer's market	100% (1)
Cross country ski trails and winter facilities	100% (1)
Groomed winter trails for fat tire biking	100% (1)

OAK GROVE P-4


Indoor community center (senior center, indoor track, classrooms, fitness equipment)	100% (2)
Improved tournament athletic complex (softball/baseball)	50% (1)
New neighborhood parks and playgrounds (in neighborhoods where parks don't exist today)	0% (0)
More paved trails for walking, running, and bicycling	50% (1)
Mountain bike trails	50% (1)
Basketball courts	0% (0)
Tennis courts	0% (0)
Pickleball courts	50% (1)
Skate park	0% (0)
Ice rink/warming house	0% (0)
More soccer/football/lacrosse fields	50% (1)
Splash pads	50% (1)
Disc golf	0% (0)
River access (canoe landing, fishing pier)	0% (0)
Water quality improvements to the Rum River	0% (0)
Community gardens	0% (0)
Farmer's market	50% (1)
Cross country ski trails and winter facilities	0% (0)
Groomed winter trails for fat tire biking	0% (0)





SAINT FRANCIS P-1



SAINT FRANCIS P-2






STANFORD TWP

Indoor community center (senior center, indoor track, classrooms, fitness equipment)	100% (1)	<div style="width: 100%; height: 10px; background-color: #4a4a9a;"></div>
Improved tournament athletic complex (softball/baseball)	0% (0)	<div style="width: 0%; height: 10px; background-color: #4a4a9a;"></div>
New neighborhood parks and playgrounds (in neighborhoods where parks don't exist today)	0% (0)	<div style="width: 0%; height: 10px; background-color: #4a4a9a;"></div>
More paved trails for walking, running, and bicycling	100% (1)	<div style="width: 100%; height: 10px; background-color: #4a4a9a;"></div>
Mountain bike trails	0% (0)	<div style="width: 0%; height: 10px; background-color: #4a4a9a;"></div>
Basketball courts	0% (0)	<div style="width: 0%; height: 10px; background-color: #4a4a9a;"></div>
Tennis courts	0% (0)	<div style="width: 0%; height: 10px; background-color: #4a4a9a;"></div>
Pickleball courts	0% (0)	<div style="width: 0%; height: 10px; background-color: #4a4a9a;"></div>
Skate park	0% (0)	<div style="width: 0%; height: 10px; background-color: #4a4a9a;"></div>
Ice rink/warming house	0% (0)	<div style="width: 0%; height: 10px; background-color: #4a4a9a;"></div>
More soccer/football/lacrosse fields	0% (0)	<div style="width: 0%; height: 10px; background-color: #4a4a9a;"></div>
Splash pads	100% (1)	<div style="width: 100%; height: 10px; background-color: #4a4a9a;"></div>
Disc golf	0% (0)	<div style="width: 0%; height: 10px; background-color: #4a4a9a;"></div>
River access (canoe landing, fishing pier)	0% (0)	<div style="width: 0%; height: 10px; background-color: #4a4a9a;"></div>
Water quality improvements to the Rum River	100% (1)	<div style="width: 100%; height: 10px; background-color: #4a4a9a;"></div>
Community gardens	0% (0)	<div style="width: 0%; height: 10px; background-color: #4a4a9a;"></div>
Farmer's market	100% (1)	<div style="width: 100%; height: 10px; background-color: #4a4a9a;"></div>
Cross country ski trails and winter facilities	0% (0)	<div style="width: 0%; height: 10px; background-color: #4a4a9a;"></div>
Groomed winter trails for fat tire biking	0% (0)	<div style="width: 0%; height: 10px; background-color: #4a4a9a;"></div>

Unknown

Indoor community center (senior center, indoor track, classrooms, fitness equipment)	67% (38)	<div style="width: 67%; height: 10px; background-color: #4a4a9a;"></div>
Improved tournament athletic complex (softball/baseball)	28% (16)	<div style="width: 28%; height: 10px; background-color: #4a4a9a;"></div>
New neighborhood parks and playgrounds (in neighborhoods where parks don't exist today)	49% (28)	<div style="width: 49%; height: 10px; background-color: #4a4a9a;"></div>
More paved trails for walking, running, and bicycling	65% (37)	<div style="width: 65%; height: 10px; background-color: #4a4a9a;"></div>
Mountain bike trails	21% (12)	<div style="width: 21%; height: 10px; background-color: #4a4a9a;"></div>
Basketball courts	16% (9)	<div style="width: 16%; height: 10px; background-color: #4a4a9a;"></div>
Tennis courts	14% (8)	<div style="width: 14%; height: 10px; background-color: #4a4a9a;"></div>
Pickleball courts	16% (9)	<div style="width: 16%; height: 10px; background-color: #4a4a9a;"></div>
Skate park	26% (15)	<div style="width: 26%; height: 10px; background-color: #4a4a9a;"></div>
Ice rink/warming house	23% (13)	<div style="width: 23%; height: 10px; background-color: #4a4a9a;"></div>
More soccer/football/lacrosse fields	11% (6)	<div style="width: 11%; height: 10px; background-color: #4a4a9a;"></div>
Splash pads	68% (39)	<div style="width: 68%; height: 10px; background-color: #4a4a9a;"></div>
Disc golf	25% (14)	<div style="width: 25%; height: 10px; background-color: #4a4a9a;"></div>
River access (canoe landing, fishing pier)	30% (17)	<div style="width: 30%; height: 10px; background-color: #4a4a9a;"></div>
Water quality improvements to the Rum River	23% (13)	<div style="width: 23%; height: 10px; background-color: #4a4a9a;"></div>
Community gardens	25% (14)	<div style="width: 25%; height: 10px; background-color: #4a4a9a;"></div>
Farmer's market	67% (38)	<div style="width: 67%; height: 10px; background-color: #4a4a9a;"></div>
Cross country ski trails and winter facilities	25% (14)	<div style="width: 25%; height: 10px; background-color: #4a4a9a;"></div>
Groomed winter trails for fat tire biking	11% (6)	<div style="width: 11%; height: 10px; background-color: #4a4a9a;"></div>

Dog park	100% (1)
Other	100% (1)



If you selected "other" please indicate which new or expanded parks and recreation facilities would you be interested in using in St. Francis:

Responses

Inclusive park for people of all abilities

steps or rope on Seelye sledding hill

Monorail

Disc golf course

Would be great to get a path around Lake George (like Lake Nokomis for example). Even if it needs to stray away from the lake at points. I would use this often and would imagine others would as well.

Dog park

Large playground/activity park for kids with water

Rum river woods is a joke, so little is there and it over 25 years old

Pave the ice rink so it can be used in summer for roller rink or roller hockey

Yoga classes

We moved into our neighborhood in 2012 and one of the things that excited us was the degardner circle park. They removed the playground and the picnic area. It is now a sand/cat box that the kids can't play in. The pond is completely dried up and full of garbage. Very sad sight. There are a lot of children in these combining neighborhoods that would benefit from a new playground and picnic area.

Swimming pool

Trails for horseback riding

Would love more parks and recreation areas outside neighborhoods. Would love more hiking/walking trails.

Indoor or outdoor pool for swimming lessons, youth swimming and rec use for the community

Stuff for the youth, like a community center.

Degardner Circle has no playground equipment. There are a lot of children that live in both neighborhoods and the apartment buildings. Children need a safe place to play. Some drivers going to the apartment buildings speed down the street making an unsafe area for children to play.

Waterpark like the Anoka Aquatic Center - revenue generating as well

Community pool. Add swings to the nearby neighborhood park. Vintage st and 226th

Park on the west side of town in the A-1 / A-2 district

Community pool

From question # 3, Where is the Community Center / Senior Center located? Also from question #3, what Recreation Programs for Youth does the city offer? I'm familiar with programs offered through the school district via Community Education, but I'm not familiar with any city sponsored programs.

Pickleball "Courts"!!

Highland woods park has plenty of room for basketball court if sand area is removed after swings (hardly used by anyone) we are there frequently. This would be an awesome location as multiple middle school age and above in the neighborhood, who are otherwise getting into other stuff.

Waterpark or out door pool for older kids

Smith Lake Wildlife Estates

pool/swimming

Tubing, canoeing, kayak rental facility on the Rum with a shuttle. Rental stand to offer wi sandwiches, soft drinks, coffee and ice cream available for purchase


Indoors or outdoor pool

More interconnect trails

Would love a bike path going out past the Ponds down nightingale and back around to the high school

Along roadways, which type of trail facility do you prefer?

Overview




Breakdowns


Gender

Responses broken down by the gender of the respondent. Currently, most public data only supports male, female, and unknown.


Female



Male




Unknown




Age Range







Responses broken down by age of the respondent. Respondents for whom age are unknown are not included in these breakdowns.

18-24







25-34




35-44**45-54****55-64****65-74****75 years or older****Unknown****Precinct**


The geographic area in which the respondent lives. This is determined by the location of the reported household.

ANDOVER P-05**EAST BETHEL P-1****EAST BETHEL P-2****ISANTI TWP**


MINNEAPOLIS W-12 P-12




OAK GROVE P-1




OAK GROVE P-3




OAK GROVE P-4




SAINT FRANCIS P-1




SAINT FRANCIS P-2



STANFORD TWP




Unknown



How do you learn about parks and recreation opportunities in St. Francis?

Overview




Breakdowns


Gender

Responses broken down by the gender of the respondent. Currently, most public data only supports male, female, and unknown.


Female



Male











Unknown













Age Range

Responses broken down by age of the respondent. Respondents for whom age are unknown are not included in these breakdowns.

18-24**25-34****35-44****45-54****55-64****65-74****75 years or older****Unknown****Precinct**

The geographic area in which the respondent lives. This is determined by the location of the reported household.

ANDOVER P-05**EAST BETHEL P-1****EAST BETHEL P-2****ISANTI TWP****MINNEAPOLIS W-12 P-12****OAK GROVE P-1****OAK GROVE P-3****OAK GROVE P-4****SAINT FRANCIS P-1****SAINT FRANCIS P-2**

STANFORD TWP


City website 0% (0)




City newsletter 0% (0)



Facebook/Social media 100% (1)



Other 0% (0)



Unknown


City website 27% (15)




City newsletter 20% (11)



Facebook/Social media 69% (38)



Other 15% (8)



If you selected "other" please indicate how you learn about parks and recreation opportunities in St. Francis:

Responses

Friends

Referral

In passing

National night out

National night out

Drive by

Word of mouth

I don't! Never get any info

Word of mouth

Exploring, maps, word of mouth.

I live here

Word of mouth, lived here a long time

Google

Going outside

Word of mouth and signs posted in the community, flyers in mailbox or community Ed brochure from ISD 15

Word of mouth

I seem to have signed up for email notification

Community Facebook groups

Word of mouth

On my own, by moving about in the city and seeing what is available.

1st time in 4 years hearing about it.


Going there

Internet. Mapping apps and programs.

Google maps

How effective is the current parks and recreation communication system?

Overview




Breakdowns


Gender

Responses broken down by the gender of the respondent. Currently, most public data only supports male, female, and unknown.


Female



Male



Unknown



Age Range

Responses broken down by age of the respondent. Respondents for whom age are unknown are not included in these breakdowns.

18-24

Great! – I can find information easily 100% (1)

Moderately effective – I can find some of what I'm looking for 0% (0)

Not good – it is difficult to find information 0% (0)

N/A 0% (0)

25-34

Great! – I can find information easily 22% (2)

Moderately effective – I can find some of what I'm looking for 33% (3)

Not good – it is difficult to find information 22% (2)

N/A 22% (2)

35-44

Great! – I can find information easily 7% (2)

Moderately effective – I can find some of what I'm looking for 72% (21)

Not good – it is difficult to find information 14% (4)

N/A 7% (2)

45-54

Great! – I can find information easily 6% (1)

Moderately effective – I can find some of what I'm looking for 38% (6)

Not good – it is difficult to find information 38% (6)

N/A 19% (3)

55-64

Great! – I can find information easily 13% (1)

Moderately effective – I can find some of what I'm looking for 50% (4)

Not good – it is difficult to find information 25% (2)

N/A 13% (1)

65-74

Great! – I can find information easily 0% (0)

Moderately effective – I can find some of what I'm looking for 60% (3)

Not good – it is difficult to find information 20% (1)

N/A 20% (1)

75 years or older

Great! – I can find information easily 50% (1)

Moderately effective – I can find some of what I’m looking for 50% (1)

Not good – it is difficult to find information 0% (0)

N/A 0% (0)

Unknown

Great! – I can find information easily 7% (4)

Moderately effective – I can find some of what I’m looking for 70% (38)

Not good – it is difficult to find information 22% (12)

N/A 0% (0)

Precinct

The geographic area in which the respondent lives. This is determined by the location of the reported household.

ANDOVER P-05

Great! – I can find information easily 0% (0)

Moderately effective – I can find some of what I’m looking for 100% (1)

Not good – it is difficult to find information 0% (0)

N/A 0% (0)

EAST BETHEL P-1

Great! – I can find information easily 0% (0)

Moderately effective – I can find some of what I’m looking for 50% (1)

Not good – it is difficult to find information 50% (1)

N/A 0% (0)

EAST BETHEL P-2

Great! – I can find information easily 0% (0)

Moderately effective – I can find some of what I’m looking for 100% (1)

Not good – it is difficult to find information 0% (0)

N/A 0% (0)

ISANTI TWP


Great! – I can find information easily 0% (0)


Moderately effective – I can find some of what I’m looking for 100% (1)


Not good – it is difficult to find information 0% (0)


N/A 0% (0)

MINNEAPOLIS W-12 P-12


Great! – I can find information easily 100% (1)



Moderately effective – I can find some of what I’m looking for 0% (0)



Not good – it is difficult to find information 0% (0)



N/A 0% (0)


OAK GROVE P-1


Great! – I can find information easily 0% (0)



Moderately effective – I can find some of what I’m looking for 67% (2)



Not good – it is difficult to find information 33% (1)


N/A 0% (0)


OAK GROVE P-3


Great! – I can find information easily 0% (0)



Moderately effective – I can find some of what I’m looking for 0% (0)



Not good – it is difficult to find information 0% (0)


N/A 100% (1)


OAK GROVE P-4


Great! – I can find information easily 0% (0)



Moderately effective – I can find some of what I’m looking for 0% (0)



Not good – it is difficult to find information 50% (1)


N/A 50% (1)


SAINT FRANCIS P-1


Great! – I can find information easily 16% (5)



Moderately effective – I can find some of what I’m looking for 48% (15)



Not good – it is difficult to find information 19% (6)


N/A 16% (5)


SAINT FRANCIS P-2

Great! – I can find information easily 8% (2)



Moderately effective – I can find some of what I’m looking for 62% (16)


Not good – it is difficult to find information 23% (6)



N/A 8% (2)


STANFORD TWP


Great! – I can find information easily 0% (0)




Moderately effective – I can find some of what I’m looking for 100% (1)



Not good – it is difficult to find information 0% (0)




N/A 0% (0)




Unknown


Great! – I can find information easily 7% (4)




Moderately effective – I can find some of what I’m looking for 70% (38)



Not good – it is difficult to find information 22% (12)




N/A 0% (0)



Are you a St. Francis resident or visitor?

Overview




Breakdowns


Gender

Responses broken down by the gender of the respondent. Currently, most public data only supports male, female, and unknown.


Female



Male




Unknown




Age Range

Responses broken down by age of the respondent. Respondents for whom age are unknown are not included in these breakdowns.


18-24




25-34







35-44











45-54




55-64**65-74****75 years or older****Unknown****Precinct**


The geographic area in which the respondent lives. This is determined by the location of the reported household.

ANDOVER P-05**EAST BETHEL P-1****EAST BETHEL P-2****ISANTI TWP****MINNEAPOLIS W-12 P-12****OAK GROVE P-1****OAK GROVE P-3****OAK GROVE P-4**

SAINT FRANCIS P-1


Resident 100% (31)



Visitor 0% (0)


Other 0% (0)


SAINT FRANCIS P-2


Resident 100% (26)



Visitor 0% (0)


Other 0% (0)


STANFORD TWP


Resident 100% (1)



Visitor 0% (0)


Other 0% (0)


Unknown

Resident 88% (49)


Visitor 11% (6)


Other 2% (1)


If you are a visitor, please tell us where you are from:

Responses

East Bethel

Andover

East Bethel

East Bethel

Nowthen

Oak grove

Oak Grove

Cambridge

Just moved from SF to Oak Grove

Oak Grove

Cambridge

Oak Grove

If you selected "other" please indicate where you are from:


Responses

My daughter attends the high school

Saint Francis

In which category is your age?

Overview




Breakdowns


Gender

Responses broken down by the gender of the respondent. Currently, most public data only supports male, female, and unknown.


Female



Male




Unknown




Age Range







Responses broken down by age of the respondent. Respondents for whom age are unknown are not included in these breakdowns.

18-24



25-34



35-44**45-54****55-64****65-74****75 years or older****Unknown****Precinct**

The geographic area in which the respondent lives. This is determined by the location of the reported household.

ANDOVER P-05

18-24 years	0% (0)
25-34 years	0% (0)
35-44 years	0% (0)
45-54 years	0% (0)
55-64 years	100% (1)
65-74 years	0% (0)
75 years or older	0% (0)

EAST BETHEL P-1

18-24 years	0% (0)
25-34 years	0% (0)
35-44 years	100% (2)
45-54 years	0% (0)
55-64 years	0% (0)
65-74 years	0% (0)
75 years or older	0% (0)

EAST BETHEL P-2

18-24 years	0% (0)
25-34 years	0% (0)
35-44 years	0% (0)
45-54 years	0% (0)
55-64 years	0% (0)
65-74 years	100% (1)
75 years or older	0% (0)

ISANTI TWP

18-24 years	0% (0)
25-34 years	0% (0)
35-44 years	0% (0)
45-54 years	100% (1)
55-64 years	0% (0)
65-74 years	0% (0)
75 years or older	0% (0)


MINNEAPOLIS W-12 P-12

18-24 years	0% (0)
25-34 years	100% (1)
35-44 years	0% (0)
45-54 years	0% (0)
55-64 years	0% (0)
65-74 years	0% (0)
75 years or older	0% (0)


OAK GROVE P-1

18-24 years	0% (0)
25-34 years	0% (0)
35-44 years	33% (1)
45-54 years	67% (2)
55-64 years	0% (0)
65-74 years	0% (0)
75 years or older	0% (0)


OAK GROVE P-3




OAK GROVE P-4




SAINT FRANCIS P-1




SAINT FRANCIS P-2



STANFORD TWP




Unknown



Do any children 17 or under live in your household?

Overview



Breakdowns

Gender

Responses broken down by the gender of the respondent. Currently, most public data only supports male, female, and unknown.

Female



Male




Unknown



Age Range

Responses broken down by age of the respondent. Respondents for whom age are unknown are not included in these breakdowns.


18-24



25-34




35-44




45-54




55-64




65-74



75 years or older




Unknown




Precinct

The geographic area in which the respondent lives. This is determined by the location of the reported household.


ANDOVER P-05




EAST BETHEL P-1



EAST BETHEL P-2



ISANTI TWP



MINNEAPOLIS W-12 P-12



OAK GROVE P-1




OAK GROVE P-3




OAK GROVE P-4




SAINT FRANCIS P-1




SAINT FRANCIS P-2



STANFORD TWP




Unknown



Looking at the map above, what area of the city do you live in?

Overview




Breakdowns


Gender

Responses broken down by the gender of the respondent. Currently, most public data only supports male, female, and unknown.


Female



Male




Unknown




Age Range







Responses broken down by age of the respondent. Respondents for whom age are unknown are not included in these breakdowns.

18-24





25-34




35-44**45-54****55-64****65-74****75 years or older****Unknown****Precinct**


The geographic area in which the respondent lives. This is determined by the location of the reported household.

ANDOVER P-05**EAST BETHEL P-1**


EAST BETHEL P-2




MINNEAPOLIS W-12 P-12




OAK GROVE P-1




OAK GROVE P-4




SAINT FRANCIS P-1



SAINT FRANCIS P-2



STANFORD TWP



Unknown

