



■ *The Relevance of Parks*

- 
- *A survey conducted by Ca.State Parks & the Ca. State Parks Foundation*
 - *Included both a qualitative & quantitative phase*
 - *To explore positioning & image themes and advocacy & relevance issues*
 - *What people think about parks and what motivates them to action*



■ *Key Findings*

Parks are Narrowly Defined



- *Parks are seen as green, green grass, trees, open space, picnics, kids, fun*
- *Little recognition that places such as beaches or cultural sites are also parks*

No Differentiation



- *People can't distinguish between a local, state, county/district or federal park*
- *Little brand recognition*

Parks Taken for Granted



- *Parks are seen much like roads*
- *Parks are placed in the same “importance” category as roads*
- *Like roads, people feel their taxes already pay for parks*
- *Not seen as threatened or in jeopardy
- little perceived need for activism*
- *Role in education not widely known*

Assets & Liabilities



■ *Assets:*

- *Fun, family, relaxation, escape, open space*
- *Inexpensive or free.*

■ *Liabilities:*

- *Unsafe (especially in L.A.)*
- *Restrooms, litter, homeless*
- *Crowds*

Insights & Opportunities



- *The appeal of parks is emotional and spiritual, not rational*
- *Childhood memories nearly universal*
- *“It’s a safe place for kids to play, to learn about nature, to teach values”*
- *Strong agreement “without parks, our finest resources, ecological & wildlife diversity would be in great danger.”*

Insights & Opportunities



- *Economic benefits of parks not understood*
- *During good times, people skeptical that parks need help*
- *With evidence that parks are threatened with closure, most are moved to action - particularly local parks*