



# 2015 PARK REPORT CARD



**PARK DISTRICT**  
of OAK PARK

218 Madison Street  
Oak Park, Illinois 60302  
(708) 725-2000  
[www.pdop.org](http://www.pdop.org)

**Project Manager**  
Bobbi Nance, Senior Manager of Strategy & Innovation

**Park Surveyors**  
Bobbi Nance, Senior Manager of Strategy & Innovation  
Andrew Gerow, Intern

# WHY GRADE OUR PARKS?

Although our programs and facilities are highly valued and important parts of our service offerings, park lands will always be the most popular and most visible attributes to the Oak Park community. In the 2014 Oak Park Community Attitude & Interest Survey, 93.9% of respondents indicated that they or a member of their household had visited a park during the past year, which is much higher than the Illinois average of under 80%.

This Park Report Card is an effort to objectively and quantitatively measure the quality of park infrastructure and maintenance in order to ensure the highest level of service possible for the residents of Oak Park. As with other Park District performance measurement initiatives, the Park Report Card allows the Park District of Oak Park to:

- communicate priorities internally among employees, as well as externally to the Board of Commissioners, citizen committees, and the public,
- learn how the Park District's present state compares to past performance and future goals,
- measure the impact of park infrastructure investments and park maintenance efforts,
- demonstrate progress towards meeting our mission, goals, and objectives,
- provide direction for allocation of funds, staff, and other resources, and
- offer transparency and accountability to the public.



The park system in Oak Park may be small in size compared to national averages, but is vital to the community and environment.

## Using The Information in this Report


The Park Report Card is intended to help the Park District of Oak Park advance its strategic initiative, "Maintaining and Improving our Infrastructure." The overall system grade is included as key metric in the Park District's performance measurement program. Additionally, the information contained in this report should help guide, along with other Park District plans and research and community feedback, the following:

- Capital Improvement Plans,
- Park Master Plans, and
- Park maintenance standards and procedures

# FINDINGS

## Overall Results

In the second year of this report, again Park District parks generally fared well, with the majority of parks (84%) receiving a rating of “Good” or higher and an overall system score of a “B” at 85 out of 100. This overall system score is an increase of 2 points from the prior year. Three parks received a score of “Fair.” Ridgeland Common Recreation Complex received the highest score with a 94 and Maple Park and Stevenson Park received the lowest scores with 78 each, a difference of 16 points. This variance from the highest-rated to lowest-rated park shrank by 5 points from 2014. Appendix A lists the overall scores for each individual park.




The majority of parks received a B (Good). One parks received an A (Excellent) and 3 parks were given a C (Fair). No parks received a Poor or Failing score in 2015.

## Geographical Analysis

Geographically-speaking, the quality of the parks seems fairly distributed throughout the community. Each quadrant of the community has one of the Top 4 highest-rated parks and all four quadrants and likewise the four lowest-rated parks are spread out between the four quadrants as well. In fact, the highest rated park (Ridgeland Common), is only blocks away from one of the lowest rated parks (Stevenson Park) which demonstrates that all sections of the community receive a fair amount of capital improvement dollars and maintenance and operations attention. Appendix B displays park grades by location.

## Park Feature Analysis

As the overall park scores would indicate, the majority of individual park features also scored well on average throughout the community. Seven of the eight areas received a “B” (Good) rating. The one area that experienced a decline from the prior year was Paths & Sidewalks, which is the park feature that Oak Park residents value most. This is was due to continued issues with bare spots and weeds near sidewalks (thought to be due to damage during snow removal) and a noticeable increase in garbage near cans waiting for pick-up.




Overall, most areas scored well, including Paths & Sidewalks and Passive Greenspaces, two areas important to Oak Park residents. Each area scored the same or higher in 2015 as it did in 2014, except for Paths & Sidewalks, which experienced a slight dip, but still received an overall “Good” score.

# FINDINGS

The areas that saw the largest increase were Parking Lots and Athletic Spaces. The Parking Lot score benefitted from the addition of the new Ridgeland Common parking lot in the overall scores. Continued improvements to athletic field maintenance as well as the installation of new fencing and other features at athletic fields in several of the parks in late 2014 resulted in an increase in this area of 12 points overall. More information about how each Park Feature was rated is included later in this report.

## Issues Observed

When issues were found at any park feature, the surveyor was asked to document the extent or impact of the problem. In most cases, minimal issues were found, including in the area of cleanliness and safety and lighting which received excellent scores. Additionally, overall, park amenities were generally found to be open and available to the public as scheduled. The most common issue found was with landscaping (plant beds, trees, etc.) and park surfaces.



Very few issues were found with availability of amenities or with cleanliness or safety issues. The most common issues observed were related to fencing and landscaping in

## Conclusions

Overall, again this year the Park District and the residents of Oak Park should be proud of the progress made in its parks in recent years. The majority of parks were rated as “Good,” which demonstrated that while they are being used and experiencing some wear and tear, the capital improvements and park maintenance invested have resulted in an overall quality park system.

With an increase of 2 points over last year, the overall park system score met the desired goal of 85/100. In order to maintain this score, Park District staff should review the information in this report to make improvements to the infrastructure and maintenance of parks receiving a “C” as well as continued efforts towards improving landscaping, including plant beds and tree maintenance. Additionally, with the heavy use that the parks receive, it is important to continue to review and address surface issues. A more specific list of recommendations based on park evaluation results is included later in the report.

It should be noted that maintaining all parks at the “A” level may require significant capital investments (those parks receiving the highest scores were generally those which have also were most recently renovated) and on-going maintenance to bring them up to and keep them at this level. In a community where approximately 80 acres of parkland is expected to serve over 50,000 residents, this may not be practical.

# PATHS & SIDEWALKS

All walking and biking paths and sidewalks in and immediately around a park, as well as adjacent fencing, seating, lighting, and landscaping

# B-

Overall, Park District paths and sidewalks received a score of “Good,” although the score dipped slightly from the prior year. Structurally, the paths and sidewalks were in good shape, although in some parks, concrete steps and ramps were deteriorating. In most cases, an appropriate number of bike racks, benches, and trash receptacles were present, although it was very apparent that trash removal operations had changed from the prior year which had a negative impact. Other common issues found were usually related to the amenities adjacent to the paths or the landscaping. Additionally, surface issues were observed, including sand, mud, and dirt that had migrated onto the paths, as well as frequent damage to the turf next to paths from winter snow removal which have now led to a very noticeable amount of weeds.



Overall, Park District walkways were in “Good” condition. (Euclid Square Park)

## Paths Scores

Andersen Park	79
Austin Gardens	80
Barrie Park	80
Carroll Park	80
Cheney Mansion	89
Euclid Square	83
Field Park	86
Fox Park	87
Lindberg Park	83
Longfellow Park	80
Maple Park	77
Mills Park	88
Randolph Park	87
Rehm Park	72
Ridgeland Common	88
Scoville Park	85
Stevenson Park	67
Taylor Park	81
Wenonah Park	N/A
<b>System Average</b>	<b>82</b>




Although improvements to landscaping overall were found, some landscaped areas near walkways still suffered from a lack of maintenance. (Rehm Park)



Damage from the snow removal process continues to be an issue with paths & sidewalks. (Lindberg Park)

## Observations



# PASSIVE GREENSPACE

# B-

All passive green spaces in a park and accompanying fencing, seating, lighting, landscaping, and other equipment

Overall, Park District passive green spaces received a score of “Good.” In most cases, an appropriate number of bike racks, benches, and trash receptacles were present and few issues with deterioration with those items were found. Few litter or safety problems were observed. Green spaces in parks dedicated solely to passive activities generally fared better than smaller passive spaces in multi-use parks adjacent to high-traffic areas. The most common issues found in these parks included worn-out grass with bare spots and some weed issues, as well as landscaping issues caused by poor maintenance or the high volume of use.



Overall, Park District green spaces were in “Good” condition. (Maple Park)

## Park Scores

Andersen Park	N/A
Austin Gardens	85
Barrie Park	N/A
Carroll Park	80
Cheney Mansion	90
Euclid Square	86
Field Park	70
Fox Park	N/A
Lindberg Park	79
Longfellow Park	100
Maple Park	81
Mills Park	81
Randolph Park	N/A
Rehm Park	93
Ridgeland Common	N/A
Scoville Park	87
Stevenson Park	72
Taylor Park	78
Wenonah Park	N/A
<b>System Average</b>	<b>82</b>




Cheney Mansion grounds were added to the Park Report Card this year and received high marks for greenspaces.



Green space scores were slightly affected by on-going tree maintenance needs at some locations. (Taylor Park)

## Observations



# BATHROOMS

# B+

All public restrooms open to park visitors on a daily basis and accompanying equipment


Overall, Park District park bathrooms received a score of “Good.” Structurally, most bathrooms were in good condition, and were free of any cleanliness or safety problems. Bathrooms, which are opened and closed daily by Park District staff, were found open as expected 100% of the time. At parks where the bathrooms were attached to community center, the bathrooms were in generally good condition (having been most recently updated), but those at parks with stand-alone comfort stations are showing wear. The most common issues at the bathrooms were missing supplies and minor equipment.



Overall, Park District bathrooms were in “Good” condition. Generally, bathrooms attached to community centers were in better condition than stand-alone facilities. For the 2nd year in a row, Andersen Park’s bathroom received a perfect score.

## Park Scores

Andersen Park	100
Austin Gardens	N/A
Barrie Park	N/A
Carroll Park	99
Cheney Mansion	N/A
Euclid Square	N/A
Field Park	96
Fox Park	94
Lindberg Park	85
Longfellow Park	93
Maple Park	64
Mills Park	N/A
Randolph Park	N/A
Rehm Park	N/A
Ridgeland Common	96
Scoville Park	87
Stevenson Park	91
Taylor Park	79
Wenonah Park	N/A
<b>System Average</b>	<b>88</b>




Except for a few exceptions, restrooms were generally clean, but some were showing wear & tear and missing supplies including soap dispensers and mirrors. (Maple Park)



Puddles of water were often found in comfort stations, sometimes from leaks and sometimes from cleaning (Taylor Park)

## Observations





# PLAYGROUNDS

All playgrounds and splash pads in a park and accompanying fencing, seating, lighting, landscaping, and other play equipment

# B-

Overall, Park District playgrounds received a score of “Good.” Rarely was any playground equipment missing and in almost all cases, everything was functioning properly. Most playgrounds are showing slight signs of deterioration from use including chipped or peeling paint and some rust. Weeds were a common issue near many playgrounds as was surface issues, including low levels of sand and/or woodchip and frequent worn or bare spots in nearby turf. Migrated sand from sand play areas continues to be an issue, but this was found less often than in the prior year.



Overall, Park District playgrounds were in “Good” condition. (Field Park)



Poured in place surfaces at several playgrounds are starting to show wear. (Scoville Park)




Issues were found with maintaining landscaping and turf near playgrounds. (Wenonah Park)

## Park Scores

Andersen Park	80
Austin Gardens	N/A
Barrie Park	80
Carroll Park	82
Cheney Mansion	N/A
Euclid Square	82
Field Park	85
Fox Park	91
Lindberg Park	98
Longfellow Park	79
Maple Park	71
Mills Park	N/A
Randolph Park	77
Rehm Park	85
Ridgeland Common	N/A
Scoville Park	74
Stevenson Park	75
Taylor Park	88
Wenonah Park	90
<b>System Average</b>	<b>82</b>

## Observations

Area Availability	MINIMAL
Area Equipment Missing	MINIMAL
Area Equipment Not Functioning Properly	MINIMAL
Area Infrastructure/Equipment Deterioration	NOTICEABLE
Area Seating Issues	NOTICEABLE
Area Fencing Issues	NOTICEABLE
Area Lighting Issues	MINIMAL
Area Landscaping Issues	PREVALENT
Area Surface Issues	PREVALENT
Area Cleanliness & Safety	MINIMAL



# SITTING AREAS

# B

All designated sitting areas in a park and accompanying fencing, seating, lighting, landscaping, and other equipment

Overall, Park District sitting areas received a score of “Good.” No equipment was missing except for a trash receptacle at one site and all equipment was functioning properly. Sitting areas with shelters were in generally good condition and the only equipment problems were the grills at the Taylor Park patio. Some minor deterioration was found with some of the picnic tables, although many of the notable issues at the Taylor Park patio were addressed from the previous year. Issues with noticeable weeds and bare spots lowered landscaping and surface scores. Cleanliness was affected slightly by heavier amounts of leaves and dirt and some minor litter issues. No safety issues were discovered.



Overall, Park District sitting areas were in “Good” condition. (Field Park)

## Park Scores

Andersen Park	87
Austin Gardens	N/A
Barrie Park	N/A
Carroll Park	N/A
Cheney Mansion	N/A
Euclid Square	N/A
Field Park	90
Fox Park	78
Lindberg Park	95
Longfellow Park	N/A
Maple Park	N/A
Mills Park	N/A
Randolph Park	85
Rehm Park	N/A
Ridgeland Common	N/A
Scoville Park	N/A
Stevenson Park	N/A
Taylor Park	82
Wenonah Park	N/A
<b>System Average</b>	<b>87</b>




Most tables and benches were in good condition with minor wear and tear. (Randolph Park)



Fox Park’s patio scored the lowest of all of the seating areas with a score of “Fair.”

## Observations

- Area Availability
- Area Equipment Missing
- Area Equipment Not Functioning Properly
- Area Infrastructure/Equipment Deterioration
- Area Seating Issues
- Area Fencing Issues
- Area Lighting Issues
- Area Landscaping Issues
- Area Surface Issues
- Area Cleanliness & Safety



# DRINKING FOUNTAINS

All individual drinking fountains in a park

# A-

Overall, Park District drinking fountains were rated “Excellent” and received the highest area score in the park system for the second year in a row. When issues were found, they were usually related to functionality of the fountains, including leaks and water pressure either being too high or too low to use easily. Another issue was clogged basins, often by sand and other debris from nearby playgrounds. It should be noted that these issues were found much less often than the prior year.



Overall, Park District drinking fountains were in “Excellent” condition which is a large improvement over the prior year’s score. (Ridgeland Common Recreation Complex)

Park Scores	
Andersen Park	97
Austin Gardens	N/A
Barrie Park	90
Carroll Park	80
Cheney Mansion	N/A
Euclid Square	100
Field Park	95
Fox Park	79
Lindberg Park	97
Longfellow Park	95
Maple Park	96
Mills Park	82
Randolph Park	93
Rehm Park	70
Ridgeland Common	100
Scoville Park	89
Stevenson Park	89
Taylor Park	94
Wenonah Park	96
<b>System Average</b>	<b>92</b>



Issues with clogged fountains improved from last year, but were still an issue at some parks. (Barrie Park)



Most drinking fountains functioned as expected, but did show signs of leaking at the base of the fountain. (Longfellow Park)

## Observations

	MINIMAL	NOTICEABLE	PREVALENT
Area Availability	1	0	0
Area Equipment Missing	1	0	0
Area Equipment Not Functioning Properly	0	1	0
Area Infrastructure/Equipment Deterioration	0	1	0
Area Seating Issues	0	0	0
Area Fencing Issues	0	0	0
Area Lighting Issues	0	0	0
Area Landscaping Issues	0	0	0
Area Surface Issues	0	1	0
Area Cleanliness & Safety	1	0	0

# ATHLETIC SPACES

All athletic courts and fields in a park and accompanying fencing and backstops, player and spectator seating, lighting, and landscaping

# B

Park District athletic spaces saw a tremendous increase in quality from the previous year's rating of "Fair" to the current year's rating of "Good." Increased efforts towards athletic field maintenance paid off and the capital improvements to replace the baseball diamond fencing, bleachers, etc. at several parks resulted in noticeable improvements. Equipment, including nets, was rarely missing. Some functionality issues discovered with court nets and poles, but otherwise most equipment operated as expected, although were often showing signs of deterioration. Despite the capital improvements mentioned above, the largest issues found were with fencing and surfaces again this year.



Overall, Park District athletic spaces were in "Good" condition. (Fox Park)

## Park Scores

Andersen Park	72
Austin Gardens	N/A
Barrie Park	87
Carroll Park	97
Cheney Mansion	N/A
Euclid Square	72
Field Park	79
Fox Park	91
Lindberg Park	89
Longfellow Park	87
Maple Park	83
Mills Park	N/A
Randolph Park	N/A
Rehm Park	80
Ridgeland Common	95
Scoville Park	93
Stevenson Park	77
Taylor Park	80
Wenonah Park	N/A
<b>System Average</b>	<b>85</b>




Although some bare patches still remain, overall turf surface quality improved from the prior year. (Rehm Park)



Despite turf and diamond surface improvements, other surface issues still exist, including migrating infield materials and deteriorating court surfaces. (Field Park)

## Observations

- Area Availability
- Area Equipment Missing
- Area Equipment Not Functioning Properly
- Area Infrastructure/Equipment Deterioration
- Area Seating Issues
- Area Fencing Issues
- Area Lighting Issues
- Area Landscaping Issues
- Area Surface Issues
- Area Cleanliness & Safety



# PARKING LOTS

# B

All designated parking lots in a park and accompanying equipment, fencing, lighting, and landscaping

Overall, Park District athletic courts and fields received a score of “Good.” Although parking lots play a minor role in a visit to a park, for users they can be both the first and last impression a park receives. Ridgeland Common Recreation Complex’s parking lot is still quite new with few issues. Rhem Park parking lot had several issues with bumper stops, which included many missing and deteriorating bumpers, which lowered parking lot scores, as did missing signs and issues with weeds and empty tree pits/tree rings.




Overall, Park District parking lots were in “Good” condition. (Ridgeland Common Recreation Complex)

Park Scores	
Andersen Park	N/A
Austin Gardens	N/A
Barrie Park	N/A
Carroll Park	N/A
Cheney Mansion	N/A
Euclid Square	N/A
Field Park	N/A
Fox Park	N/A
Lindberg Park	N/A
Longfellow Park	N/A
Maple Park	N/A
Mills Park	N/A
Randolph Park	N/A
Rhem Park	77
Ridgeland Common	91
Scoville Park	N/A
Stevenson Park	N/A
Taylor Park	N/A
Wenonah Park	N/A
<b>System Average</b>	<b>84</b>



Bumpers were often broken and were missing from many parking spots. (Rhem Park)

Some signage was missing, although the poles were still in place. (Rhem Park)



# RECOMMENDATIONS

Based on the data collected, the following improvements will have the greatest impact on improving future park scores. Although it will not be possible or practical to incorporate all of these improvements immediately, they should be reviewed when setting maintenance standards and reviewing capital improvement plans. However, it's important that any improvements chosen are incorporated with current maintenance and capital improvement efforts without eliminating others, otherwise the Park District may see improved scores in one area while allowing a decline in another.

- Evaluate future capital improvement plans for the Maple, Rehm, and Stevenson Parks which all received a score of "Fair" to ensure that improvements address the issues covered in this report where possible.
- Continue to address landscaping & weed issues. Frequent problems were observed in many parks with weeds, untrimmed bushes, and empty tree pits and tree rings, and empty plant beds.
- Re-evaluate the location of plant beds and shrubs adjacent to high-traffic areas, especially playgrounds and athletic fields. Both the plants and turf were often in poor condition.
- Investigate ways to mitigate the frequent damage done to turf alongside sidewalks during snow removal and repair previous damage. Sidewalk edges continued to be muddy, uneven, and unsightly in many areas, and while less of this was found than in previous years, this was only because weeds had sprung up in the adjacent bare patches, which lead to similar poor surface scores (and aesthetics).
- The remaining asphalt walkways in the park system often have cracks and uneven surfaces, which should be addressed in future capital improvements.
- Complete an inventory of equipment in the bathrooms located in comfort stations to ensure that all locations have a soap dispenser, paper towel dispenser/hand dryer, trash can, and mirror.
- Re-evaluate the changes to trash pick-up from the previous year's operations. It was evident that trash was not being picked up on as frequent of a basis and the gap from when a can was emptied to when the trash was removed from the park was noticeable and caused issues.
- Increase efforts to mitigate the impact of the sand play areas on the cleanliness of playgrounds and functionality of nearby drinking fountains through more frequent clean-up of playground surfaces, public education, and/or re-evaluating whether or not to include them in future master plans due to the continued issues they caused.
- Paint, repair, and/or replace athletic fields and courts fencing and/or backstops at several locations. At the locations where this work was completed after last year's Report Card, the impact of the improvements was noticeable. The parks receiving the lowest scores in this area include Andersen Park, Euclid Square, Ridgeland Common, and Maple Park.



A new issue that was found this year was with trash removal. Often, trash can lids were found flipped over at trash cans waiting for pick-up and sat empty for long enough that they often accumulated water from rain and/or garbage from park users.

# METHODOLOGY

## Parks Included

Park Report Card results include all Park District of Oak Park owned and leased park properties and features contained within them with the following exceptions:

- 1) Park properties that have not been developed for public use,
- 2) Parks and/or features closed for capital improvements throughout the survey period,
- 3) Facilities on a park site, except for public bathrooms available to park users, and
- 4) Unique or limited access park features, such as dog parks, Rehm trains, seasonal ice rinks, etc.

## Features Types

Eight park feature types were chosen to represent features commonly found in Park District of Oak Park parks., including:

- 1) Athletic Fields & Courts
- 2) Playgrounds
- 3) Paths & Sidewalks
- 4) Passive Green Spaces
- 5) Seating Areas
- 6) Bathrooms
- 7) Drinking Fountains
- 8) Parking Lots

## Survey Tool

A custom survey tool was developed to rate each park feature in the following evaluation areas:

- 1) Availability to Public
- 2) Functionality & Maintenance
- 3) Surface Quality
- 4) Cleanliness & Safety

The tool was developed for a tablet which allowed surveyors to collect and store the results and photos electronically and eliminated the need for paper compilation.

## Data Collection

Survey work for this report card took place between May and August 2015, Tuesday-Friday. In the field, surveyors completed evaluations for each feature contained within a given park on two separate visits (except as noted earlier in the criteria for “Parks Included”) whenever defined boundaries could be determined. For example, if a park had two water fountains, two feature evaluations were completed each visit. Likewise, a separate feature evaluation was completed for each men’s and women’s bathrooms. However, some exceptions included:

- 1) Generally, baseball diamonds were evaluated based only the infield, fencing, and bleachers as the outfield usually overlapped with a designated soccer field.
- 2) Groups of athletic courts, playgrounds or other features that shared fencing, benches, or other amenities were evaluated together as one feature.

## Scoring Methods

The evaluation tool produces an overall score on a scale of 0 to 100 for each individual feature on each visit using relative weights assigned for each evaluation area. For example, a safety issue discovered would negatively impact an individual park feature score more heavily than a minor maintenance issue, such as chipped paint.

Individual features that were unavailable to the public without explanation, i.e. a locked bathroom or athletic court or a water fountain that was not turned on, were automatically given a “0” for that visit. All individual park feature scores for all visits throughout the surveying period are then averaged together with other park features of the same feature type to give a specific park an average feature type score. For example, if a park contains a baseball diamond,

# METHODOLOGY

soccer field, and a tennis court, the scores for each of those individual athletic spaces are averaged together to create an overall park athletic spaces score.

These overall feature type scores are then combined, using a second set of relative weights, to give the overall park itself a score and final grade.

<u>Scores</u>	<u>Grade</u>	<u>Condition</u>
100-97	A+	Excellent
96-93	A	Excellent
92-90	A-	Excellent
89-87	B+	Good
86-83	B	Good
82-80	B-	Good
79-77	C+	Fair
76-73	C	Fair
72-70	C-	Fair
69-67	D+	Poor
66-63	D	Poor
62-60	D-	Poor
59 & below	F	Failing

Scores are calculated to ensure that no individual feature area or park is penalized because it lacked any given feature such as seating or functional equipment.

Both evaluation area weights and park feature type weights were created based on feedback collected from a survey of community members to determine what was most important to park user satisfaction. These weights

ensure that the score is a true and accurate reflection of how an Oak Park user would rate a park based on what is most important to them.

These weights were verified through initial testing of the survey tool, where evaluators were asked to review a park and provide their own estimate of the letter grade based on findings prior to learning the score assigned to an area through the survey tool.



# APPENDIX A

AVERAGE  
PARK SCORE


**B**

## OVERALL PARK SCORES

Rank	Park	Overall Score	Paths & Sidewalks	Passive Greenspace	Bathrooms	Playgrounds	Sitting Areas	Drinking Fountains	Athletic Spaces	Parking Lots
1	Ridgeland Common	94	88	N/A	96	N/A	N/A	100	95	91
2	Cheney Mansion	89	89	90	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A
2	Longfellow Park	89	80	100	93	79	N/A	95	87	N/A
2	Wenonah Park	89	N/A	N/A	N/A	82	N/A	96	N/A	N/A
5	Lindberg Park	88	83	79	85	98	95	97	89	N/A
6	Randolph Park	87	93	N/A	N/A	77	85	93	N/A	N/A
6	Fox Park	87	87	N/A	94	91	78	79	91	N/A
8	Field Park	86	86	70	96	85	90	95	79	N/A
8	Carroll Park	86	80	80	99	82	N/A	80	97	N/A
8	Andersen Park	86	79	N/A	100	80	87	97	72	N/A
11	Scoville Park	85	85	87	87	74	N/A	89	93	N/A
12	Mills Park	84	88	81	N/A	N/A	N/A	82	N/A	N/A
12	Euclid Square	84	83	86	N/A	82	N/A	100	72	N/A
12	Barrie Park	84	80	N/A	N/A	80	N/A	90	87	N/A
15	Taylor Park	83	81	78	79	88	82	94	80	N/A
15	Austin Gardens	83	80	85	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A
17	Maple Park	78	77	81	64	71	N/A	96	83	N/A
17	Rehm Park	78	72	93	N/A	73	N/A	70	80	77
17	Stevenson Park	78	67	72	91	75	N/A	89	77	N/A
Average Score		85								

# APPENDIX B

## PARK GRADES BY LOCATION



### Parks

1. Ridgeland Common Recreation Complex
2. Cheney Mansion
3. Longfellow Park
4. Wenonah Park
5. Lindberg Park
6. Randolph Park
7. Fox Park
8. Field Park
9. Carroll Park
10. Andersen Park
11. Scoville Park
12. Mills Park
13. Euclid Square Park
14. Barrie Park
15. Taylor Park
16. Austin Gardens
17. Maple Park
18. Rehm Park
19. Stevenson Park

