

Parks, Public Greenspace, and Smarter Growth: *Opportunities for Linking Land and People*

*This second edition Translation Paper was commissioned by the Fundations' Network for Smart Growth and Livable Communities. * It was first written in 2000 and updated in 2007 by the collaborating author, Kathleen Blaha, formerly of The Trust for Public Land. It is the third updated second edition in a series of Translation Papers sponsored by the Fundations' Network to illustrate the ways that making better decisions about growth and development can improve individual lives, the civic life of communities, and our built and natural environments. The full series is available at www.fundersnetwork.org.*

Abstract

Electeds officials, community leaders, and voters in North America's cities and towns increasingly recognize how much there is to gain from rehabilitating existing parks and creating new parks and new public greenspace. Between 1988 and 2006, voters in cities and counties across the United States approved nearly \$40 billion in new funding for parks and public greenspace. These measures demonstrate the public's strong interest in protecting open space, providing recreational opportunities, improving the vitality of cities, and making good decisions about growth and land use.

Yet too often, the provision of parks and greenspace remains reactive and piecemeal, resulting in separate development of parks, housing, and retail with little strategic overlap. Instead, when local governments use park assets as part of a comprehensive

approach to growth and development, they bring life back into cities, leverage new economic development, and lead to important measures of improved health, youth development, water quality and habitat protection, and neighborhood revitalization.



New strategies that intentionally link parks and greenspace with community development, public health, social justice, and access and opportunity, are leading to better decisions about how and where communities grow and change. Park development and planning represent

exceptional opportunities for public agencies and private foundations to provide leadership to improve communities. Park and public greenspace development is properly understood as a land use planning tool that is non-prescriptive, market-based, and enthusiastically-supported by the public.

** The Fundations' Network works to inspire, strengthen, and expand philanthropic leadership and fundations' abilities to support organizations working to improve communities through better development decisions and growth policies. For more information, visit www.fundersnetwork.org.*

Parks and Community Development

Public enthusiasm and support for parks and public greenspace is evident in hundreds of localities and expresses itself in many ways. Over the last ten years, many city and metropolitan area public park bond authorizations have linked city and county park funding programs with investments of hundreds of million dollars. Examples include Los Angeles County, Seattle/King County, Portland/Portland Metro, Miami/Dade County, and Phoenix. Significantly, in all these measures voters provided funding for both central city and suburban public land acquisition and park redevelopment. Since 1988, voters around the country have approved 76 percent of 1,990 conservation finance measures, creating some \$40 billion for preserving important lands and creating park space, according to The Trust for Public Land's Land Vote database, which tracks state and local conservation finance measures.

Individually, tens of thousands of Americans have joined local parks conservancies and friends groups, giving millions of dollars and donating hundreds of thousands of hours of time and work. Hundreds of park advocacy organizations now exist around the country at the city and neighborhood level. Beyond the funds generated, these public-private partnerships honor and make use of the public's enthusiasm for these special places and are bringing strength and creativity to the design, development, and management of public parks. In several instances, management of specific parks has been all but turned over to entrepreneurial citizen groups.

Many of these citizen groups and public agencies extend their efforts far beyond the aesthetics and physical maintenance of

parks. They are engaged in real community outreach, with the parks a component of community development. The more a community combines a park with other uses (housing, public streets and sidewalks, transit, schools), the more the park enlivens the neighborhood. Parks stimulate real estate stability and are deeply valued by the people who use them, based on their link to real community development needs.

In East Boston, after active citizens succeeded in acquiring an abandoned Conrail track for the East Boston Greenway, developers immediately began expressing interest in building housing near and alongside the new amenity. Across the country in Seattle, community leaders seeking to raise millions of dollars to buy an old Unocal oil storage tank farm for conversion into a sculpture garden found receptivity not only from a group of philanthropists, but also from future residents of several high-rise buildings under construction near the site who were thrilled to exchange a neighboring brownfield for a garden—and to invest to make it happen. In Cleveland, a major park investment by Metroparks spurred a private developer to start a new housing project on a brownfield along long-ignored Mill Creek. As the experience of these and other communities shows, the partnering of parks and neighborhoods enhances and stabilizes a community.

Park rehabilitation alone can bring new people and new vitality into urban neighborhoods. But creation of new greenspace can do even more. Several of America's oldest, densest cities have undertaken breathtaking center-city park creation and park rejuvenation activities that have pumped new vitality into the cities themselves. This dramatically belies the misconception that older cities are "all built up" and that any new growth can only

Since 1988, voters around the country have approved 76 percent of 1,990 conservation finance measures, creating some \$40 billion for preserving important lands and creating park space.

take place in “greenfields” on the urban fringe. Boston, for instance, rejected federal highway money in favor of transit funding. They put a major rail line underground and constructed a greenway park trail on the surface. Today, the skinny, five-mile Southwest Corridor Park—which includes playing courts, community gardens, walking paths, and a commuter bicycle trail—is one of the anchors of South Boston’s revitalization. Based on the success of Southwest Park, and later, the transformation of a parking garage into the city’s magnificent Post Office Square park, the city of Boston is now placing a major interstate highway underground and covering it with open space and a park-like boulevard, using the resultant private development to ultimately recoup the increased costs of building underground.

Many cities are moving forward with redevelopment plans that use parks and greenspace to leverage mixed-use development. Chicago is converting a mile-square abandoned USX steel plant on the south shore into a new community with housing, shops, jobs, and 123 acres of new parkland (in a city which has one of the lowest park acres-per-capita ratios in the country). Baltimore is creating a 14-mile trail along the long-neglected Gwynns Falls stream as it winds through moderate- and low-income neighborhoods on its way to the Harbor.

Surveys consistently show that people want to live close to greenspace and not in the “ecological black holes” that our cities often resemble. And park efforts over the last century have proved this idea, from the conversion of Chicago’s tannery district to its magnificent lakefront park, to the revitalizing engine of the cleaned-up Tennessee Riverfront in Chattanooga.

Boston’s Mayor Tom Menino says parks are an economic development tool. Chicago’s Mayor Richard Daley is committing millions to vacant lot recycling, restoration of the Chicago River, the new Millennium Park, and rooftop gardens. And in Detroit, more

than \$250 million in public and private money is being used for a greenway along the Detroit River. These mayors understand the link between parks and economic development. They see that their public investments are attracting millions of new dollars in private investment for their cities.

Parks and Health

While the aesthetic and recreational role of these spaces is a vital part of their importance, public health researchers are also finding that there are correlations between an individual’s access to parks and increased physical activity. The creation and/or enhancement of parks and playgrounds is proving to be an effective strategy for increasing physical activity and improving health. Studies find that people who live close to parks are more physically active. For example, a Rand Corporation study found that adolescent girls who live close to parks engage in more physical activity than their counterparts who do not.¹ Another Rand study showed that in Los Angeles, people living close to parks exercise more and visit parks more frequently than those living further away.²

The importance of physical activity as a contributor to overall good health makes parks a vital strategy, along with good nutrition, in the national effort to combat and reduce epidemic levels of obesity, diabetes, and heart disease. Living near safe and well-equipped parks and public open spaces is more than an amenity: it is a vital component in improving the health of children and adults alike.

Living near safe and well-equipped parks and public open spaces is more than an amenity: it is a vital component in improving the health of children and adults alike.

Parks and Social Justice

According to the International City/County Management Association

(ICMA), recent research demonstrates a significant association between race, ethnicity, socioeconomic status, and access to physical activity settings including parks, bike trails, and public pools, etc.³ A 2004 study by the Health Research and Policy Centers at the University of Chicago finds that communities with lower incomes, higher poverty rates, and higher proportions of racial/ethnic minorities—statistically the most at risk to be sedentary and overweight—also have the fewest opportunities for community-level physical activity.⁴

This unfair and unequal distribution of safe, accessible parks has a direct and negative impact on the health and life expectancy of the most disadvantaged populations. Communities of color and low-income individuals, without places for recreation or safe, walkable neighborhoods, are significantly less likely than whites and the more affluent to engage in the regular physical activity that is crucial to preventing obesity and related health problems. Among white adults in the United States, 33 percent engage in regular physical activity, compared to only 23.7 percent of African American adults and 22 percent of Latino adults.⁵ And adults with incomes below the poverty level are three times as likely as high-income individuals to be physically inactive.⁶

These are issues of major concern to communities of color and low-income individuals. A 2002 survey by the Public Policy Institute of California found that 72 percent of Latinos (and 60 percent of European Americans) believe that low-income and minority neighborhoods do not get a fair share of well-maintained parks and recreational facilities compared to other neighborhoods.⁷ A 2003 public opinion poll by the Field Research Corporation on childhood obesity in California found that 51 percent of African

Americans and 49 percent of Latinos rate their neighborhood as being fair to very poor in providing opportunities for children to be physically active. Among European Americans, almost one in three respondents rate their neighborhood as fair to very poor in this regard.

Los Angeles County offers one example of severe park inequity. More than 1.5 million children in Los Angeles County do not live within walking distance of a public park. The existing park space is disproportionately concentrated in the region's wealthy neighborhoods. As a result, data show that Latino, African American, and Asian American/Pacific Islander youth are less likely than their European American counterparts to enjoy access to parks, playgrounds, and other exercise facilities.⁸ Fitness reports among California schoolchildren in the Los Angeles Unified School District show nearly one-third of the 605 schools reporting that less than 10 percent of students met basic fitness levels, and 40 schools did not have a single physically fit-student.⁹

It should be no surprise that people of color and low-income individuals overwhelmingly support land conservation and parks. A national poll conducted by The Trust for Public Land and The Nature Conservancy in 2004 found particularly strong support for conservation among Latino voters, with 77 percent willing to support new conservation-funding measures, compared with 65 percent of all voters. In 2002, Californians passed the largest resource bond in U.S. history, Proposition 40, which included \$2.6 billion for parks, clean water, and clean air. Statewide exit polls showed support from 77 percent of African American, 74 percent of Latino, 60 percent of Asian American/Pacific Islander, and 56 percent of European American voters. Seventy-five (75) percent of voters making under \$20,000 per year and 61 percent with a high school diploma or less also supported the proposition.¹⁰

The unfair and unequal distribution of safe, accessible parks has a direct and negative impact on the health and life expectancy of the most disadvantaged populations.

In fact, of the 263 county ballot measures tracked since 1996 by the LandVote database, less affluent communities have shown the highest levels of support for parks. By and large, these measures were considered in counties where the majority of the population is white, more affluent, and better educated—more than twice as many of these measures have been on the ballot in communities with above average incomes (189) than those with below average incomes (74). Yet, the rate of approval in the more affluent communities, while very high, is slightly lower than in less affluent communities (76 percent compared to 79 percent).

Significant barriers exist which contribute to lower levels of public finance activity for parks and open space in urban jurisdictions with large populations of low-income communities of color. There are competing concerns such as education, crime, and jobs as well as limited activity by mainstream conservation organizations in inner-city environments. Opposition by taxpayer associations and high voter approval thresholds for public finance measures pose additional barriers to conservation finance measures in some states. Yet these barriers have been successfully overcome with the right mix of strategy, resources, and community support.

Philanthropic Leadership

National Leadership

Funders in their own cities, such as The George Gund Foundation in Cleveland, Gates Family Fund in Denver, and The San Francisco Foundation, have long supported city park investment. But in 1994, the Wallace Reader's Digest Funds raised the bar by first, thinking nationally, and second, working to link residents directly to their sometimes faltering parks through advocating stronger partnerships and better park programming.

The Wallace program for “big-city parks” was the first national effort to show the value of the Olmsted Legacy (“parks for people”) with an investment in both parks and in local park organizations (many of which were quite fledgling). Moreover, an important goal of the program was the linkage of parks and neighborhoods—an approach that was bolstered by the requirement that each community come up with matching funds for the Wallace money. The results have been impressive: millions of dollars of new funding, a new generation of leadership, an increase in community control and input, and a revitalized vision of the role of parks.

Atlanta

The Arthur M. Blank Family Foundation is working to develop a system of “Great Parks” in Atlanta, tied to the larger vision of how public space connects the entire community. By providing support, the Foundation's goal is to help create parks and ensure that they are high quality, well-maintained, and protected. The Foundation decided in 2001 to make parks and greenspace inside Atlanta's I-285 beltway a major priority, pledging between \$20 million and \$30 million for land acquisition and maintenance. The Foundation's Environmental Initiative has already helped to preserve more than 1,100 acres of land in metropolitan Atlanta, simultaneously achieving environmental, public access, social capital, and urban development objectives.

The Blank Foundation is assisting the city of Atlanta in implementing its vision for the “Beltline,” a 22-mile green ribbon around the city that will create new parks, transit stops, and housing options. The Beltline project is expected to cost over \$2 billion and take close to 25 years. The Foundation kicked off its investment in the project with a \$2.5 million grant to The Trust for Public Land to invest in building the public parkway by acquiring right-of-way for the project.



Detroit

In 2003, the Kresge Foundation announced a \$50 million grant to fund and maintain a three-mile RiverWalk pathway through downtown Detroit along the Detroit River. The scope of the riverfront vision is vast. It includes a new state park with a harbor; a new port facility for cruise ships and sightseeing vessels; and a plaza, promenade, and retail development near General Motors' Renaissance Center headquarters. Eventually, hundreds of new housing units are expected to surround the public spaces along the Detroit River.

The RiverWalk—for walking, cycling, and skating—links all elements of the riverfront vision together, positioning the Kresge gift a linchpin for the project. The Foundation is paying \$50 million in a series of five grants over five years that, “creates a reward for

accomplishing one part and keeps the carrot out in front so the process keeps moving,”

according to John Marshall III, former president of the Foundation. In 2005, the Ford Foundation and W.K. Kellogg Foundation made substantial gifts to the Riverfront Project—funding community-based planning, site development, and long-term sustainability. The

Detroit Riverfront Conservancy, Inc., created to lead the effort, expects that the \$250 million public and private investment in the Detroit RiverWalk will spur more than \$1 billion in economic development. “When we started this, we said we didn't just want to create public space on the riverfront; it was always done in the context of creating economic development,” says Matthew Cullen, co-chair of the conservancy and general manager of economic development and enterprise services at General Motors Corp.

Camden, N.J.

After a relentless 50-year decline, the city of Camden, N.J., is now the focus of a state

Economic Recovery Board, proposed investment by area developers, and a new greenway. The Cooper River greenway, a 24-mile corridor—but for the city's nine-acre section—spans most of Camden County. This extension of the trail into the city of Camden has issues similar to many urban trails being built around the country, such as the challenge of assembling parcels along roads through heavily developed public and private properties and near old industrial sites. The trail project, supported by the Ford Foundation, will benefit multiple neighborhoods, passing through school property, city parks, and taking users to the shoreline of the Delaware River for a view of Philadelphia. But the trail is also envisioned as a regional project, symbolically and actually, linking the city to existing trails throughout the county and being a key segment of the proposed “River-to-Bay” greenway that will run across the state.

Opportunities for Funders

The funding community has begun to play a significant role in urban park renovation but there is much more that needs to be done. Following is a list of eight types of strategies that funders may consider in order to support the role that parks and greenspace play in building communities.

Support the development of standards for urban park creation, development, and management. Standards are needed to guide public investment. The Trust for Public Land has undertaken an initial round of such research that resulted in its book, *Inside City Parks*, which looks at the center cities of the 60 largest metropolitan areas. But no comparable work exists for smaller cities, suburban communities, or counties. For many years there have been theoretical standards of minimum acres-per-1,000 of neighborhood and regional parks and other facilities. But these are gross calibrations and do not take into account

The Detroit Riverfront Conservancy, Inc. expects that the \$250 million public and private investment in the Detroit RiverWalk will spur more than \$1 billion in economic development.

population density or the many different purposes of parks and open space. Instead of merely counting inputs of land and dollars, community decisions should be based on an analysis of measurable outcomes—benefits received by actual urban dwellers in terms of recreation, conservation, livability, and property value enhancement. No system of measuring outcomes has been devised.

Support demonstration projects that advance the strategic use of parks and open space. Just as with transit stations, it makes fiscal sense for urban parks to be located near densely-populated urban neighborhoods. A public investment in parks should serve larger numbers of people. Conversely, crowded neighborhoods have particular need for patches of open space. Funders can encourage park design and redesign as part of a broad strategy for improving urban environments.

Integrate parks into the redevelopment of low-income neighborhoods that have large numbers of tax-foreclosed vacant lots. In cities such as Baltimore, Detroit, Newark, N.J., and Chicago, community development corporations are actively constructing new housing units. But too often the housing is being planned with little or no regard for public parks and greenspace, failing to do the one thing guaranteed to increase neighborhood's desirability. Many communities have found that uniting to fix parks, clean-up vacant lots, and build community gardens has been the first step to collaboration on other more contentious issues—parks can serve as the leading vehicle for growing stronger community relations. Supporters of Chicago's Garfield Park have broadened their interests to work side-by-side with the New Bethel community development corporation not only on park improvements, but also on new inner-city housing and better public transit.

Recognize the relationship between parks and environmental sustainability. With growing populations, more and more

metropolitan areas are grappling with problems of water supply and purity and many are considering using parks and open space as buffers to protect streams, canals, rivers, and lakes. Voters in Charlotte/Mecklenburg County, N.C., deemed their drinking water source, Mountain Island Lake, worthy of a \$20 million investment. From Charlotte in the water-rich southeast to Cincinnati along the flood-prone Ohio River to Chicago's Calumet Lakes cleanup to Phoenix in the Arizona desert, hydrologists and park planners are beginning to work together to design systems that meet multiple objectives of water management, water quality improvement, and recreation. Among the numerous challenges are designing flood-resistant facilities, establishing artificial wetlands that are open to public use, and controlling run-off from parking lots.

Cities and inner-ring suburbs are also grappling with the challenge of abandoned brownfields. Some of these are problematic building sites, but can be cleaned-up and reclaimed as parks and open space. Denver converted an old rail yard into a new downtown Commons, a new focal point for the city that is stimulating new housing and retail development. San Francisco's abandoned Mission Bay rail yard is being readied for something similar. Chicago will convert a mile-square shuttered steel mill property to parkland, a museum, a parkway and housing. Pittsburgh is reclaiming a huge slagheap into a greenway that will run from Frick Park to the Monongahela River (with support from the Heinz Endowments). Virginia Beach, Va., transformed an old landfill into Mt. Trashmore Park (the highest point in the city), and New York City turned the 3,000-acre Fresh Kills landfill into the largest park in that city.

Investigate the use of developer impact fees for park creation and open space preservation. Many suburban counties and cities, including Chicago, Atlanta, and all cities in California, require developers to



donate land or make a commensurate payment in order to preserve greenspace as part of new construction. Other cities have no such requirement. Supporters laud the mechanism for saving land and keeping taxes from climbing; opponents claim that it raises the cost of new housing and drives developers away to other jurisdictions. No one has fully analyzed its real impact on urban open space preservation.

Promote integrated funding programs.

Public expenditures and bond referenda at all levels of government need to be promoted as collaborative tools and incentives that can provide more resources for local parks. Bringing federal and state governments into the picture is important not only for the resources they have but also for the structural requirement they bring—*planning*. (It is notable that now, while the importance of neighborhood planning is becoming more widely recognized, most cities' park agencies are still operating either on an outmoded plan or on no plan at all.) The combination of a planning obligation with some federal and state matching funds could do for city parks what a comparable program—transportation—did for city highways in the 1970s and 1980s.

Undertake research to provide a credible analysis of the fiscal impact of parks.

Perhaps the single greatest long-term

research need is providing economic “proof” of the value of urban parks. Parks, of course, will always be revered for their many other benefits, but their support will increase further if it can be demonstrated that they have economic clout that can match or surpass the clout of their localized “competitors”—housing, retail, and employment nodes. In order to have maximum participation in future policy discussions, parks advocates need a carefully-designed study that measures and quantifies the economic impact of different kinds of urban parks.

Leverage additional public and private funding.

Public funding for parks is extremely limited. City parks are the least likely neighborhood benefit to find public funding. No federal or state programs exist to support them. No revenues are generated from park projects that might attract private developers. City parks must be creatively developed and marketed to leverage and attract funding—and private philanthropic funding can be just the catalyst to doing so. These can be complex projects; from site acquisition and potential elimination of contamination to community-based design to construction and ongoing management, they require extensive partnerships and dedication. It takes vision, commitment, and some risk-taking to kick them off—which means it takes leadership.



Where It's Working — Innovative Partnerships

Los Angeles—Small Parks, New Partnerships

Over 25 city and state agencies, community-based organizations and businesses are working on a Parks for People initiative in Los Angeles. The partnership has proposed adding 25 new parks to the city by 2010. Extensive geographic information system (GIS) analysis has pinpointed the neighborhoods most in need, including the Central City area, South L.A., portions of Southwest and Southeast L.A. County (including Wilmington and San Pedro), East L.A., and the Pacoima/San Fernando area.

Parks for People-LA (P4P-LA) serves as a catalyst for park development and a forum for discussion about healthy communities. The partnership with local neighborhood organizations and stakeholders drives community empowerment, aids neighborhood revitalization, and contributes to the development of healthy neighborhoods.

Parks for People-LA is a model of innovation, taking a different approach to solving a traditional problem by acting as an “incubator” and resource venture fund for park development. Aided by the GIS tool, *Greenprinting*, P4P-LA works with local government agencies and community organizations, as well as their leaders and constituents, to “ground truth” the planning maps and identify prospective park sites, engage natural partners and stakeholders, and secure public and private funds for land acquisition and construction. Underserved communities often have insufficient local financial resources and no access to private and public funding. This innovative program specifically assists those neighborhoods with the greatest needs.

Community organizing is critical. Parks for People-LA provides direct and indirect assistance to rally communities around projects, attending and hosting meetings to facilitate dialogue and create local ownership. This includes a community design and planning process. As plans are developed, P4P-LA identifies resources (public and private) for acquisition, design, construction, and stewardship.

Project management during and throughout construction is often facilitated by P4P-LA and culminates with the transfer of the park and/or improvements at completion. Stewardship planning, training, and programming are also provided.

A park project by itself cannot revitalize neighborhoods facing economic challenges, crime, violence, and other obstacles. Yet the process of engaging residents serves as a catalyst for creating neighborhood empowerment and a deeper sense of commitment. The participatory process educates residents in organizing and vocalizing their concerns and builds crucial skills for long-term community renewal. Recognizing that long-term stewardship is vital to the success and longevity of parks, P4P-LA invests heavily in building community stewardship programs.

Philadelphia Green and City Parks¹¹

Philadelphia is blessed with 150 neighborhood parks, from tiny Bardascino Park in South Philadelphia to 44-acre Wissinoming Park in the Northeast. Each park is different, reflecting the history, culture, and rich mosaic of its surroundings.

When neighbors come together to reclaim a park, they begin to reclaim their neighborhood. In 1993, the Pennsylvania Horticultural Society's Philadelphia Green launched its “Parks Revitalization Project” to help community groups take charge of their parks. Begun as a modest initiative involving just three parks, the project now involves nearly 60 throughout Philadelphia. Through the collaborative efforts of Philadelphia

Green, the city's Department of Recreation, the Fairmount Park Commission, and community groups, the project has had a dramatic impact, greatly improving the appearance of many parks and making them an integral part of urban life once again.

Supported by the William Penn Foundation and beginning with Vernon Park, Norris Square in North Philadelphia, and Wharton Square in South Philadelphia, Philadelphia Green organized volunteers into independent "friends" groups to serve as park stewards. At the same time, it offered training and technical support to Department of Recreation staff and volunteers. A three-way partnership was born as Philadelphia Green staff, city workers, and volunteer groups worked together.

Philadelphia Green helped park groups to organize, plan projects, and recruit volunteers. It also channeled funding to the groups for small enhancement projects. The Department of Recreation responded to the groundswell of community support with stepped-up mowing, trash collection, and infrastructure repair. The cycle of decline in city parks soon slowed and eventually stopped and the system of neighborhood parks began a steady climb back toward vitality.

"Government found ways to redirect existing resources and the community found ways to contribute to park maintenance," said Joan Reilly, director of partnership development for Philadelphia Green. "We found ways to support both in the process, acting as a catalyst for change." Volunteers say the three-way alliance created easier access to resources and contacts. Tom Fox, deputy commissioner for the Department of Recreation, says the strong commitment on the part of everyone involved helped leverage more funds from the city, enabling the department to slowly rebuild its staff and budget from a low-point in the early 1990s.

New York City and a Schools Partnership

The need for playgrounds and parks is acute in New York City's low-income neighborhoods. Fully 16 of the city's 18 lowest-income Community Board Districts fail to meet the accepted standard of 2.5 acres of open space per thousand residents, leaving families in these communities with few recreational alternatives. Further, fewer than half of New York City's elementary schools have playgrounds and most of those are little more than cracked asphalt lots.

In 1996, The Trust for Public Land (TPL) launched its City Spaces Playground Program and created 13 playgrounds by 2005. City Spaces involves extensive community outreach, participatory design, environmental education, and stewardship training processes. The process allows children, parents, teachers, administrators, and other community members to participate and contribute to all aspects of a site's conception, construction, eventual programming, and long-term management.

Through a five-year partnership with the New York City Department of Education that was announced in 2004, the City Spaces program will create 25 new community playgrounds at a cost of \$1 million each. Foundations such as MetLife Foundation, The J.M. Kaplan Fund, and the Horace W. Goldsmith Foundation are contributing to the \$25 million public-private partnership, one-third of which will be raised through private fund-raising efforts.

Part of what makes City Spaces work is the close working relationship with schools and community groups to design, build, program, and then manage the playgrounds. Further, community outreach works to provide playgrounds that serve the community as a whole. City Spaces launches extensive outreach to the community at large, together with the school and the local partner, with the aim of involving as many people as possible to create community connections with the new park.

Conclusion

The debate over how communities grow and change did not start with parks, but these discussions are allowing residents to revisit Frederick Law Olmsted's views about the social promise of parks and greenspace. Nineteenth century park advocates were the first to see the public health, civic, and social benefits to public open space, and Olmsted's Central Park was the first to demonstrate the economic benefits that parks can leverage through increased property values. For many years these powerful concepts guided city building and then for many more years afterward they were lost. Now, fortunately, the pendulum is swinging back.

There is a role for funders in supporting the creation of standards that can create community scorecards and common expectations for identifying needs and policies to address them. And there is a need to create a common language and a vision that captures the physical and social needs that a community—residents, environmentalists, and community developers alike—all have for creating parks and greenspace in and around where people live and work.

Endnotes

- ¹ Cohen, D. [et al]. *Proximity of Parks and Schools is Associated with Physical Activity in Adolescent Girls*. Active Living Research Conference, San Diego, February 2005.
- ² Telephone conversation with Dr. Deborah Cohen, MD, MPH, Rand Corp., March 21, 2005.
- ³ *Active Living and Social Equity—Creating Healthy Communities for All Residents: A Guide for Local Governments*. Washington, DC: International City/County Management Association, January 2005.
- ⁴ Powell, Lisa M [et al]. “The relationship between community physical activity settings and race, ethnicity and socioeconomic status.” *Evidence-Based Preventive Medicine*, 2004, 1(2), p. 143.
- ⁵ Early Release of Selected Estimates Based on Data from the 2002 National Health Interview Survey, Centers for Disease Control and Prevention, National Center for Health Statistics, June 29, 2005.
- ⁶ Barnes, Patricia M. and Schoenborn, Charlotte. *Physical Activity Among Adults: United States, 2000*. Advance Data from Vital and Health Statistics, Centers for Disease Control and Prevention, National Center for Health Statistics, May 14, 2003, p. 6.
- ⁷ Baldassare, Mark. *PPIC Statewide Survey: Special Survey on Californians and the Environment*. San Francisco: Public Policy Institute of California, June 2002.
- ⁸ Pincetl, Stephanie [et al]. *Toward a Sustainable Los Angeles: A 'Nature's Services' Approach*, Center for Sustainable Cities. Los Angeles: University of Southern California, March 2003, p. 36.
- ⁹ 2003-2004 California Physical Fitness Report data, as cited in Garcia, Robert and Flores Baltodano, Erica. “Healthy Children, Healthy Communities, and Legal Services.” *Journal of Poverty Law and Policy*, May-June 2005, 39(1), p. 57.
- ¹⁰ Garcia, Robert [et al]. *Dreams of Fields: Soccer, Community and Equal Justice*. Report on Sports in Urban Parks to the California Department of Parks and Recreation. Los Angeles: Center for Law in the Public Interest, December 2002.
- ¹¹ Drawn extensively from the Wharton School case study of the Pennsylvania Horticulture's city parks program: http://www.pennsylvaniahorticulturalsociety.org/phlgreen/revitalizing_phila_parks.htm.

Translation Papers

The Funders' Network's series of translation papers are designed to assist funders and other interested parties to better understand the connection between sprawling patterns of development and urban disinvestment and specific issue areas and to articulate opportunities for progress that would be created by smarter growth policies and practices. Four updated second editions of the first papers in the series, including this one, have been published to date. Sixteen topics were covered by first editions in the series. Visit www.fundersnetwork.org to download electronic copies or request printed versions.

2nd Editions

- #4 *Civic Participation and Smarter Growth: Improving How Communities and Places Grow and Change.*
- #3 *Parks, Public Greenspace, and Smarter Growth: Opportunities for Linking Land and People*
- #2 *Workforce Development and Smart Growth: Opportunities for Linking Movements.*
- #1 *Regional Equity and Smart Growth: Opportunities for Advancing Social and Economic Justice in America.*

1st Editions

- #16 *Air Quality and Smart Growth: Planning for Cleaner Air.*
- #15 *Energy and Smart Growth: It's About How and Where We Build.*
- #14 *Water and Smart Growth: The Impacts of Sprawl on Aquatic Ecosystems.*
- #13 *Community Development and Smart Growth: Stopping Sprawl at its Source.*
Jointly commissioned by the Funders' Network and the Local Initiatives Support Corporation (LISC).
- #12 *The Arts and Smart Growth: The Role of Arts in Placemaking.* Jointly commissioned by the Funders' Network and Grantmakers in the Arts.
- #11 *Health and Smart Growth: Building Health, Promoting Active Communities.*
- #10 *Biodiversity and Smart Growth: Sprawl Threatens Our Natural Heritage.*
- #9 *Children, Youth and Families and Smart Growth: Building Family Friendly Communities.*
- #8 *Education and Smart Growth: Reversing School Sprawl for Better Schools and Communities.*
- #7 *Aging and Smart Growth: Building Aging-Sensitive Communities.*
- #6 *Transportation Reform and Smart Growth: A Nation at the Tipping Point.*
- #5 *Agricultural Sustainability and Smart Growth: Saving Urban Influenced Farmland.*
- #4 *Civic Participation and Smart Growth: Transforming Sprawl into a Broader Sense of Citizenship.*
- #3 *Opportunities for Smarter Growth: Parks, Greenspace and Land Conservation.*
- #2 *Opportunities for Linking Movements: Workforce Development and Smart Growth.*
- #1 *Opportunities for Smarter Growth: Social Equity and the Smart Growth Movement.*



1500 San Remo Avenue, Suite 249
Coral Gables, FL 33146
(305) 667-6350 phone
(305) 667-6355 fax
info@fundersnetwork.org
www.fundersnetwork.org