

ILLINOIS LAND AT RISK

A Statewide Assessment of Public Park and Green Space Needs



SPONSORS

The Trust for Public Land
Illinois Association of Park Districts



The TRUST FOR PUBLIC LAND conserves land for people to improve the quality of life in our communities and to preserve our natural and historic resources for future generations.

www.tpl.org



Through service, research, and education, IAPD's mission is to advance park districts, forest preserve districts, conservation and recreation agencies in their ability to preserve natural resources and improve the quality of life for all people in Illinois.

www.ilparks.org

DEAR FRIENDS,

Open space in Illinois is vanishing at an alarming rate. This is especially evident in the congested, rapidly developing northeastern portion of the state. But even in Illinois' central and southern reaches, the loss of farmland combined with higher per capita development is taking a toll on the amount of publicly accessible lands available for recreation.

The Illinois Department of Natural Resources, local park districts, forest preserves, and conservation agencies are the custodians of Illinois' publicly accessible recreational spaces. In 2002, the Trust for Public Land (TPL) and the Illinois Association of Park Districts (IAPD) conducted a survey of these agencies' three- to five-year capital needs for land purchases and renovation and construction of new park and recreation facilities. The needs are staggering.

Two current programs, the Open Lands Trust (OLT) and the Open Space Land Acquisition and Development (OSLAD), have enabled agencies to acquire and improve thousands of acres of recreational land. But the need for land conservation and improvement funding in Illinois far outpaces the amount of money provided through these programs.

Our need appears even greater in light of the low state ranking regarding Illinois' recreational land holdings — 48th out of 50 states in a 1990 Texas study, and last in a 2000 Wisconsin survey of Midwestern states regarding publicly accessible, state-owned acres per thousand of population.

In light of the high needs detailed in the following survey coupled with recent budget cuts to OLT and OSLAD, there is urgency to do more to conserve land before it is too late. Recommendations on how we can dedicate more land to publicly accessible parks are included at the end of the report. We encourage you to join communities across the state in taking steps to ensure the quality of life for Illinois residents both now and in the future.

Sincerely,



Dr. Ted Flickinger
Director

Illinois Association of Park Districts



Chris Slattery
Director

Trust for Public Land, Chicago Office

ILLINOIS LAND AT RISK

A Statewide Assessment of Public Park and Green Space Needs

Why Study Public Park and Green Space Needs in Illinois?

Illinois has a proud heritage as a prairie state graced with areas of natural beauty and historic importance. But recent decades have made it clear that the state's vast woodlands, prairie, and farmland are being fragmented and lost to urban sprawl at an alarming rate.

As a national land conservation organization, the Trust for Public Land (TPL) tracks voter support for open space funding. There have been many recent ballot victories for local conservation measures in Illinois. The Illinois Association of Park Districts (IAPD) completed a comprehensive survey of public opinion in April of this year and found that residents in the northeastern portion of the state were very concerned about the rate of development in their area and were the most supportive of preserving what open space remains. This survey also found that these respondents were also willing to pay higher taxes to

protect publicly accessible open space. Both organizations have observed an increased commitment in funding for open space at the state level in Illinois since 1999. But in the spring of 2002, the financial support for open space acquisition and park improvements has been severely cut due to the State's fiscal crisis. TPL, IAPD, and others in Illinois believe that something must be done to secure dedicated state funding for parks and open space for future generations.

Survey Methodology

In 2001, TPL and IAPD conducted an assessment of the three- to five-year capital needs of the Illinois Department of Natural Resources (IDNR), and Illinois' park, forest preserve, and conservation districts. This assessment included:

- ♦additional acres planned for purchase
- ♦cost for acquiring those acres
- ♦cost for renovation or restoration of currently held acres and facilities
- ♦cost for new recreational facilities

Surveys were mailed to the 354 agencies that make up the IAPD membership and to the Illinois Department of Natural Resources. A total of 217 responses were received yielding a 62.4 percent rate. Surveys were analyzed and appear in the appendix of this report.

BELOW: *Teens canoeing near Collinsville.*



IAPD

Key Findings

Analysis of the surveys revealed the following:

- ♦ In order to meet public demand for parks and open space, local and state agencies would need to acquire over 83,000 acres over the next five years
- ♦ Cost to acquire these 83,000 acres is projected to be nearly \$1.2 billion in current dollars
- ♦ The Illinois Department of Natural Resources plans to acquire 40,000 additional acres for the state park system over the next five years
- ♦ The Chicago Park District plans acquisition of 250 additional acres at a projected cost of \$550 million
- ♦ Renovation and/or restoration funding needs for existing parks and recreation facilities in Illinois are estimated in excess of \$600 million
- ♦ Funding for new construction of public recreation facilities approaches \$1.2 billion
- ♦ Total funding needs for all responding agencies over the next five years exceed \$2.9 billion



IAPD

Background: State Land Conservation in Illinois

TOP RIGHT:
Rockford Park District

It would be unfair to compare Illinois to states with vast mountain or shoreline reaches and extensive national parks, forests, and wildlife refuges. Illinois is a prairie state with a strong agricultural heritage. Chicago, the largest city in the Midwest, has long been a national transportation and trade center, known more for its brawn and broad shoulders than its natural beauty. Nonetheless, there is a proud history of investment in Illinois parks and there is still a very real need to acquire important unprotected lands worth saving for the future.

Illinois was at the forefront of the state park movement when the General Assembly created the Illinois Park Commission in 1909 to identify lands for future state parks. Two years later the General Assembly expanded the authority of the Park Commission and appropriated funds for the acquisition of Starved Rock, the first major state park in Illinois. Although the initial expansion of the state park system beyond this first purchase was slow, the system was growing at a rapid pace by the 1930s. Much of the

current state park system originated with the Park Commission and its evaluation of potential future sites. The Park Commission eventually evolved into the existing Illinois Department of Natural Resources.

Today, Illinois is a diverse state with far-ranging recreation and open space needs. The Chicago metropolitan area encompasses the vast majority of the state's population and is characterized by ever-expanding development. The remainder of the state outside of the Chicago area, although largely agricultural, has more than half a dozen larger population centers which are also experiencing sprawl. Continued expansion and diversification of the state's population is expected well into the current century. This continued expansion is changing the character of Illinois forever, particularly in terms of the consumption of farmland for development in northeastern Illinois. A salient feature of this population growth, particularly in the six-county Chicago metropolitan area, is that land consumption has significantly outpaced it. For example, between 1950 and 1995, the population of the Chicago metropolitan area grew by 48 percent, but land coverage increased by a staggering 165 percent.¹

land consumed by development increased and farmland was reduced by 44 percent.² Though farmland and rural culture have been among the most visible casualties of urban sprawl, the availability of adequate parks, recreation areas, and open space has not kept up with population growth, and valuable plant and animal habitat has been lost. For instance, the Illinois Department of Natural Resources maintains an inventory of privately held high-quality natural areas within the state. There remains nearly 60,000 acres of property on this inventory that are not protected from development.³

Current State Funding Sources and Demand in Illinois

Illinois has two primary state funding programs—the Open Lands Trust (OLT) and the Open Space Lands Acquisition and Development (OSLAD) programs—both administered by the Illinois DNR. Modest federal Land and Water Conservation Fund (LWCF) monies are also administered with the OSLAD funds and share similar guidelines. All programs require 50 percent matching funds, with maximum grant awards of \$2 million for OLT funds and \$750,000 for OSLAD/LWCF funds; nonacquisition development projects can be funded up to \$400,000. Exceptions are made in OLT for local governments serving disadvantaged populations, which are

eligible for 90 percent matching funds. Under OSLAD/LWCF guidelines, Cook County is eligible for up to \$1.15 million in funds and the City of Chicago

BELOW: *Senka Park, Chicago, Illinois*

In Cook County alone, the population declined during the 1970s and 80s, while



and Chicago Park District a combined \$2.3 million.

Funding authorization for the OLT is due to expire in 2003. OLT has been funded at \$40 million per year since its inception in 1999 and approximately one quarter of that amount has been available to eligible local governments with the remainder going for state park acquisitions.

Additional smaller funding programs include the Natural Areas Acquisition Fund (NAAF) and the C2000 program. The NAAF has been used to fund the acquisition and stewardship of sensitive natural areas by the Illinois Department of Natural Resources. The C2000 program is a broad, multi-jurisdictional program created to protect and enhance natural resources within Illinois. Most of this funding has been spent on planning and management activities, but a portion of the funds has been utilized for acquisition purposes.

Since 1986, OSLAD/LWCF grants have made the acquisition of 8,900 acres

Illinois Growth Task Force

In response to concern over the consumption of prime farmland for development, the Illinois General Assembly created the Illinois Growth Task Force to study growth issues. Among the issues addressed in the Task Force's report to the legislature, completed in February 2002, was open space preservation. The report noted, "poorly coordinated growth and development often threaten natural areas and open space throughout the state." The report also stated that there are insufficient funds to meet demand and that public support for open space preservation is strong, as evidenced by recent voter approval of local park and open space acquisition measures.

As one of its recommendations to the Illinois General Assembly, the Task Force recommended that the Open Lands Trust program be reauthorized and that a permanent source of funding be provided.

CONSERVATION AND RECREATION ACRES OWNED BY MIDWESTERN STATES

	Population	Total Acres	State-Owned Recreation Acres	% State-Owned	Acres per 1000 Population
Michigan	9,938,444	36,453,760	4,472,175	12.3%	450
Minnesota	4,919,479	50,910,720	6,018,000	11.8	1,223
Wisconsin	5,363,675	34,831,360	1,317,525	3.8	246
Ohio	11,353,140	26,242,560	478,876	1.8	42
Indiana	6,080,485	23,017,600	339,068	1.5	56
Illinois	12,419,293	35,613,440	306,187	0.9	25
Iowa	2,926,324	35,817,600	302,552	0.8	103

Source: Wisconsin Joint Legislative Audit Committee "An Evaluation: Warren Knowles-Gaylord Nelson Stewardship Program" Report 00-10. October 2000. Appendix

National Trends

Land conservation to preserve parks, open space, farmland, and working landscapes has been a cornerstone issue in other states as well as Illinois. The Knowles-Nelson Stewardship Local Assistance Programs in Wisconsin are similar to the Illinois OSLAD and OLT programs, providing matching grants to local units of governments and non-profit conservation groups for land acquisition and park development projects. When the Wisconsin Stewardship program expired in 2000, the Wisconsin legislature, with support from the governor, extended the program for another ten years with bonding authority to fund it at \$600 million.

The phenomenon of local governments creating dedicated funds for conservation is not unique to Illinois. During the past three years, voters across the country have approved more than 400 land conservation measures, raising \$11 billion. Notable examples include the November 2000 approval by voters in St. Louis area counties of new sales taxes which will raise \$400 million over twenty years. Voters in Houston and Harris County, home of Houston, approved bonds totaling \$140 million combined for parks and open space in November 2001.

possible. As of midyear 2001, the OLT program had resulted in the acquisition of 17,700 acres: 14,300 by the state and 6,400 acres by units of local government.⁴ The OLT program has been funded by appropriations approved by the General Assembly, and the OSLAD had been funded by a dedicated 35% of the real estate transfer tax until the recent state fiscal crisis. That percentage has now been reduced by \$9 million to 20%, while the 2002-2003 OLT program annual appropriation was reduced by \$4 million, or 10%. The Natural Areas Acquisition Fund (NAAF) had been funded by 15% of the real estate transfer tax and that has been reduced by \$6 million to 5%. The C2000 program had been funded by general revenues and it was reduced from funding level of \$12 million to \$4 million.

From 1986 to 2001 the OSLAD program has provided approximately \$129.1 million in state funds to assist 884 local outdoor recreation and resource preservation projects. Competition for these funds has been very high with more than \$280.7 million requested by local agencies during this period. A relatively new program, OLT has already granted \$46.5 million for 47 projects to local governments leveraging a similar amount at that level.



ABOVE: Soccer match
Carbondale Park District

IAPD



Jill Metcoff

LEFT: *Ping Tom Memorial Park, Chicago, Illinois*

How Illinois Compares to Other Midwestern States

Recent studies of state recreation areas reveal that Illinois does not compare favorably with other states on a national or regional basis. Illinois ranks toward the bottom when comparing state-owned recreation areas to a total percent of state area. A 1990 study conducted by the Texas Parks and Wildlife Department found that Illinois ranked 48th out of the 50 states in the amount of acres of state recreation lands per 1,000 residents and currently ranks last when compared to other Midwestern states. In a 2000 analysis by the Wisconsin Joint Legislative Audit Committee of seven Midwestern states, Illinois ranked sixth in terms of a percentage of state-owned recreation lands. When population is considered, Illinois falls to last place.

State Best Practices

The Trust for Public Land has identified several land conservation principles and strategies that contribute to effective state land conservation program. These state "best practices"—and how Illinois measures up—are described below.

Substantial State Investment

An effective land conservation program is built upon the foundation of a strong and unwavering fiscal commitment through a stable revenue source. This commitment is critical in allowing state and local governments to establish long-term conservation visions and commitments. Ideally, states will have a dedicated revenue source, although there are some that support conservation through substantial annual appropriations (Washington) or periodic large bond issues (California, Rhode Island). Among the most common dedicated revenue streams are: sales tax (Missouri, New Jersey); lottery income (Colorado, Minnesota); and real estate transfer tax/deed recording fees (Florida, Massachusetts).

State Investment In Illinois

In 1999, the governor and General Assembly began to address funding for Illinois' conservation and recreation land acquisition needs with adoption of the Open Lands Trust (OLT) program, to augment the existing OSLAD program. OLT provides \$160 million over a four-year period; approximately half of this goes to matching grants for local governments and the remainder goes to the

Illinois DNR to acquire open space and parklands at the state level. Funding for the OLT program expires at the end of the State's fiscal year June 30, 2003. As this report iterates, need and demand for state land conservation funding in Illinois far outstrip the amount of funding provided through OLT and OSLAD.

Enable Local Financing

In order for local governments to achieve their conservation goals, they need local financing options. In most instances, this local funding option will be the core revenue source with other sources — state, federal, and private — serving as incentives or supplements. There are three predominant local financing options: property tax, sales tax, and general obligation bonds.

Local Financing in Illinois. All three of these options are available to and have been used by local governments for land conservation in Illinois. The most common dedicated local funding option has been through voter approval of general obligation

bond measures. In recent years, voters in a number of park districts and forest preserve districts have passed such measures, including DuPage, Kane, Lake, McHenry, and Will.



Tom Evers

RIGHT:
*Fishing in Lincoln Park,
Chicago Park District*

Voters in St. Clair and Madison counties, near St. Louis, approved sales tax increases to pay for parkland acquisition. Many of these local tax increases for land conservation have been overwhelmingly approved by Illinois voters, demonstrating strong citizen support for land conservation.

State Incentives for Local Conservation

State incentives are the most significant reasons for the extensive land conservation partnerships that exist between state and local governments. These incentives often take the form of matching grants and low-interest loans, encouraging local governments to create financing mechanisms — often dedicated — which leverage state funds.

Conservation Tax Credits

To increase donations and bargain sales of land with conservation value by private landowners and corporations, a number of states allow for income or other tax credits. When coupled with federal tax incentives, conservation can become more attractive than development. Tax incentive programs can be a strong supplement to other open space funding programs by encouraging private, voluntary land conservation. Although popular since they do not require creation of a new revenue source, tax credits alone are not sufficient as a method of land acquisition as it is unrealistic to rely solely on land donations.

Tax Credits In Illinois: There is currently no tax credit provision in Illinois for the donation of land or interests in land, nor are there bargain sales to local governments or nonprofit organizations for conservation purposes.

Conclusion

Illinois will continue to face the challenges of growth, particularly in the Chicago metropolitan area, during the remainder of this decade. Over the last twenty years, the demographics of this growth have been characterized by the consumption of land at an alarming rate that far exceeds the increase in population. Additionally, Illinois' growing population has increasingly diverse recreation needs. Therefore, it is not surprising that the state and local governments identify a continuing need to acquire additional lands for conservation and recreation, as well as large funding needs for the development and rehabilitation of recreation facilities. Illinois officials had the foresight to respond to this challenge in the past by creating the Open Space Land Acquisition and Development and the Open Lands Trust programs. These programs have enabled the Illinois DNR, park, forest preserve, and conservation districts to acquire thousands of acres of recreation lands and to make necessary improvements to those parklands — but Illinois can and should do more.

Recommendations for Illinois

1) Reauthorize Permanent Funding of the Open Lands Trust Program: In 2003 the Open Lands Trust program will expire unless the Illinois General Assembly reauthorizes the program and continues to provide funding. This program has been an important source of funding for open space acquisition by the Illinois DNR, park, forest preserve, and conservation districts. Reauthorization

and continued funding of the OLT program is also a recommendation of the Illinois Growth Task Force. For Illinois to meet current needs and those of an expanding population in the future, continuation of this program with increased levels of funding is critical.



TOP: Gompers Park, Chicago Park District

TPL/ Tom Evers

2) Restore Funding to the Open Space Land Acquisition and Development and Natural Areas Acquisition Funds:

The recent state fiscal crisis has led to dramatic reductions in funding for open space acquisition and improvement funding. The real estate transfer tax had been earmarked to provide a dedicated source of revenue for these two programs with 35% for the OSLAD program and 15% to the NAAF program. OSLAD in particular has had a strong track record of success and accountability. Funding for these programs should be restored to these levels by the General Assembly at the earliest opportunity.

3) Provide Greater Local Incentives and Increase Flexibility in the use of Open Lands Trust Funds:

Currently, OLT requires a 50 percent match for all grants. While this level of match gives local governments incentive to provide funding to receive grants, this state funding source could be used to leverage additional local funding. For example, state land conservation programs in other

states require not only a local match, but also give higher priority to projects from local governments that have established a dedicated source of local funding, beyond one-time appropriations of existing local government revenues. Further, some state programs require that proposed projects be consistent with local government land use plans, or they give additional consideration to projects that are part of a comprehensive local government plan for open space protection. Increased flexibility in the use of the funds, for example allowing money to be used toward the acquisition of sites that increase recreation, might also provide more incentives for local park districts. The General Assembly should reauthorize the OLT program and also consider amending the program to provide greater incentives for local government participation and consider expanding participation to land trusts and other non-governmental organizations.

4) Establish a State Tax Credit for Land Conservation: The General Assembly should consider enacting a state land conservation tax credit against the individual and corporate income tax in Illinois. For example, North Carolina's conservation tax credit, enacted in 1983, offers a 25 percent state income tax credit on the value of land or easements donated to public or private nonprofit conservation entities, up to \$250,000 for individuals and \$500,000 for corporations. There is a five-year carryover if credits exceed tax liability in any one year. Approximately 68,000 acres have been protected under the tax credit program in North Carolina.

End Notes:

1. Losing Ground: Land Consumption in the Chicago Region, 1900-1998. Page 8. Report by Openlands Project, 1998.
2. Losing Ground: Land Consumption in the Chicago Region, 1900-1998. Page 8. Report by Openlands Project, 1998.
3. Under Pressure: Land Consumption in the Chicago Region, 1998-2020. Report by Openlands Project, January, 1999.
4. Information provided by the Illinois Department of Natural Resources.

SUMMARY OF 3-5 YEAR PARK AND NATURAL AREA CAPITAL NEEDS

City/County Park and Rec Name	Population Estimated	Land Needs (Acres)	Land Needs (Dollars)	Restoration Renovation (Dollars)	New Facility Needs (Dollars)
Alsip Park District	24,000	N/A	\$500,000	\$685,000	\$350,000
Addison Park District	37,000	0	\$15,000,000	\$10,000,000	\$15,000,000
Albion Park District	1,800	0	\$0	\$15,000	\$0
Allin Township Park District	1,400	0	\$0	\$2,000	\$0
Arlington Heights Park District	77,000	60	\$21,000,000	\$6,000,000	\$15,000,000
Armington Community Park District	1,000	0	\$0	\$0	\$0
Bailey Park District	1,300	0	\$0	\$0	\$0
Barrington Park District	10,000	55-100	\$6,500,000	\$2,000,000	\$2,500,000
Barrington Countryside Park District	10,000	55	\$7,500,000	\$1,500,000	\$3,000,000
Bartlett Park District	38,000	12	\$0	\$0	\$500,000
Batavia Park District	24,000	84.5	\$0	\$0	\$0
Beardstown Community Park District	8,000	0	\$0	\$80,000	\$80,000
Bedford Park District	1,500	0		\$250,000	\$2,000,000
Belvidere Park District	30,000	90	\$2,970,000	\$2,592,775	\$7,185,890
Bensenville Park District	23,000	8	\$161,000	\$1,000,000	\$2,000,000
Benton Community Park District	0	15-20			
Berwyn Park District	26,000	Very little		\$425,000	\$3,000,000
Big Rock Park District	2,200	0	\$0	\$0	\$600,000
Bloomington Park District	25,000	30	\$6,000,000	\$4,000,000	\$12,000,000
Bloomington Parks & Recreation Dept.	65,000	200	\$7,650,000	\$5,000,000	\$6,000,000
Bolingbrook Park District	60,000	200 +	\$12,000,000	\$6,000,000	\$12,000,000
Bourbonnais Township Park District	32,000	50	\$200,000	\$250,000	\$15,000,000
Braidwood Park District	7,500	5	\$110,000	\$0	\$45,000
Bridgeview Park District	16,000	No plans			
Buffalo Grove Park District	44,000	72	\$12,000,000	\$8,500,000	\$23,000,000
Burbank Park District	28,000	0		\$5,500,000	\$18,000,000
Burr Ridge Park District	7,400	0	\$0	\$2,500,000	\$3,000,000
Byron Forest Preserve District	Ogle	100	\$2,500,000	\$1,500,000	
Byron Park District	10,000	30-50	\$600,000	\$80,000	\$650,000
Calumet Memorial Park District	40,000	10 to 50		\$4,000,000	\$2,000,000
Canton Park District	15,000	0	\$0	\$300,000	\$2,500,000
Carlinville Park District	8,000	0	\$0	\$45,000	\$0
Carol Stream Park District	44,000	60-80	\$4,500,000	\$4,750,000	\$9,000,000
Cary Park District	20,000	10-15	\$1,200,000	\$2,000,000	\$50,000,000
Champaign County Forest Preserve District	720,000	600	\$1,500,000	\$1,000,000	\$1,000,000
Champaign Park District	63,000	20-30	\$500,000	\$2,000,000	\$5,000,000
Channahon Park District	11,500	25	\$0	\$0	\$4,500,000
Charleston Park District	22,000	350	\$400,000	\$3,000,000	\$4,000,000
Chicago Park District	2,783,000	250	\$50,000,000		
Chicago Ridge Park District	14,000	No plans		\$2,500,000	
Clarendon Hills Park District	7,400	5	\$0	\$1,846,000	\$143,000
Clark County Park District	13,500	0	\$0	\$300,000	\$0
Clyde Park District (Cicero)	70,000	0		500,000 per park	
Collinsville Area Recreation District	30,000	100	\$1,100,000	\$750,000	\$6,500,000
Coloma Township Park District	13,000		\$100,000	\$350,000	\$200,000

City/County Park and Rec Name	Population Estimated	Land Needs (Acres)	Land Needs (Dollars)	Restoration Renovation (Dollars)	New Facility Needs (Dollars)
Colona Park District	8,000	15	\$0	\$0	\$440,000
Cook Co. Forest Preserve Dist.	5,377,000	7000*	\$300,000,000	\$31,000,000	
Country Club Hills Park District	19,000	9		\$138,000	\$475,000
Crete Park District	7,400	0	\$0	\$140,000	\$80,000
Crystal Lake Park District	55,000	150-200	\$4,000,000	\$250,000	\$0
Darien Park District	25,000	12	\$3,300,000	\$3,500,000	\$6,500,000
Decatur Park District	120,000	0	\$0	\$1,600,000	\$2,900,000
De Kalb Park District	39,000	50	\$12,500,000	\$4,600,000	\$2,900,000
Deerfield Park District	18,000	10	\$3,000,000	\$3,000,000	\$6,500,000
DeKalb County Forest Preserve District	86,000	300+		\$100,000	\$100,000
Des Plaines Park District	45,000	25	\$3,750,000	\$2,000,000	\$2,000,000
Dixon Park District	15,000	160	\$900,000	\$0	\$0
Downers Grove Park District	50,000		\$36,000,000	\$6,000,000	\$21,000,000
Dundee Township Park District	53,000	150	\$0	\$500,000	\$14,000,000
East St. Louis Park District	60,000	0	\$0	\$4,000,000	\$2,000,000
Edwardsville Parks & Recreation Department	22,000	50	\$1,000,000	\$250,000	\$3,000,000
Effingham Park District	12,000	10	\$500,000	\$200,000	\$1,000,000
Elba Salem Park District	2,000	0	\$0	\$15,000	\$0
Elgin Parks and Recreation Department	95,000		\$4,000,000	\$2,000,000	\$23,000,000
Elk Grove Park District	35,000	80	\$16,000,000	\$8,000,000	\$11,000,000
Elmhurst Park District	42,000	8	\$4,000,000	\$7,200,000	\$14,200,000
Elmwood Park, Village of	24,000	N/A		\$500,000	
Ridgeville Park District (Evanston)	74,000	0		\$10,500,000	
Fairfield Park District	5,200	10	\$25,000	\$60,000	\$40,000
Flagg-Rochelle Community Park District	13,500	6	\$120,000	\$2,000,000	\$5,000,000
Foss Park District	45,000	40	\$100,000	\$200,000	\$14,000,000
Fox Valley Park District	170,000	50-100	\$3,500,000	\$8,000,000	\$28,000,000
Fox Valley Special Recreation Association	220,000	0	\$0	\$0	\$0
Frankfort Community Park District	8,000	0	\$0	\$0	\$1,000,000
Frankfort Park District	11,000	75-100		\$300,000	\$0
Freeport Park District	30,000	300	\$1,800,000	\$4,500,000	\$1,000,000
Geneseo Community Park District	10,000	0	\$0	\$500,000	\$500,000
Geneva Park District	23,000	60-70	\$7,200,000	\$350,000	\$6,500,000
Genoa Township Park District	7,000	60	\$150,000	\$250,000	\$2,000,000
Glen Ellyn Park District	35,000	10-15	\$6,000,000	\$3,000,000	\$1,300,000
Glencoe Park District	8,000	10	\$15,000,000	\$8,000,000	
Glenview Park District	50,000	75	\$15,000,000	\$9,000,000	\$9,000,000
Godfrey Parks and Recreation Department	16,000	80	\$800,000	\$100,000	\$1,000,000
Godley Park District	500	0	\$0	\$150,000	\$1,900,000
Granite City Park District	32,000	0	\$0	\$4,000,000	\$6,000,000
Grant Memorial Park District	1,500	0		\$5,000	\$50,000
Grayslake Park District	20,000	100	\$5,000,000	\$1,000,000	\$6,000,000
Gurnee Park District	30,000	50-100	\$5,000,000	\$250,000	\$15,000,000
Hanover Park Park District	31,000	0	\$0	\$1,000,000	\$4,000,000
Harrisburg Township Park District	11,000	0	\$0	\$17,500,000	\$0
Hawthorne Park District(Cicero)	15,000	Land locked		\$200,000	\$800,000
Hazel Crest Park District	14,000	None			\$2,500,000

City/County Park and Rec Name	Population Estimated	Land Needs (Acres)	Land Needs (Dollars)	Restoration Renovation (Dollars)	New Facility Needs (Dollars)
Hickory Hills Park District	16,000	0		\$300,000	\$325,000
Highland Park, Park District of	31,000	10	\$0	\$800,000	\$3,500,000
Highland, City of	8,500	0	\$0	\$0	\$0
Hinsdale Park and Recreation Department	17,500	0	\$0	\$0	\$0
Hoffman Estates Park District	48,000	25-30 acres	\$4,000,000	\$7,000,000	\$6,200,000
Hollis Park District	1,500	0	\$0	\$500,000	\$200,000
Homewood-Flossmoor Park District	30,000	140	25,000/acre	\$3,000,000	\$5,000,000
Illinois Department of Natural Resources	12,419,293	40,000	\$85,000,000	\$65,300,000	\$173,200,000
Inverness Park District	5,000	2 to 5	80,000/acre	\$644,460	\$250,000
Joliet Park District	100,000	200	\$8,000,000	\$10,000,000	\$17,500,000
Kane Co. Forest Preserve Commission	410,000	2,000	\$45,000,000	\$3,000,000	\$1,000,000
Kankakee Valley Park District	34,000	0	\$0	\$2,500,000	\$6,400,000
Kewanee Park District	13,000	0	\$0	\$350,000	\$0
Kingsbury Park District	8,000	25-50	\$275,000	\$3,000,000	\$500,000
Kingston Township Park District	2,500	5	\$37,500	\$5,000	\$25,000
LaGrange Park District	15,000	10	300-450,000/acre	\$1,700,000	\$12,000,000
Lake Bluff Park District	7,500	0	\$1,000,000	\$1,000,000	\$1,700,000
Lake County Forest Preserve District	644,000	5,000	\$200,000,000	\$45,000,000	\$50,000,000
Lake Forest Recreation Department	20,000	30	\$3,000,000	\$3,000,000	\$5,000,000
Lake in the Hills, Village of	23,000	85	\$2,100,000	\$1,155,000	\$8,600,000
Lan-Oak Park District	30,000	250	\$3,000,000	\$10,500,000	\$9,000,000
Le Roy Community Park District	4,000	0	\$0	\$0	\$2,400,000
Libertyville Park and Recreation Department	20,000	0	\$0	\$500,000	\$0
Lincolnway Special Recreation Association	66,000	0	\$0	\$0	\$0
Lindenhurst Park District	12,500	10	\$650,000	\$1,000,000	\$2,200,000
Lisle Park District	25,000	8	\$630,000	\$6,500,000	\$7,500,000
Litchfield Park District	7,000	0	\$0	\$0	\$5,000,000
Lockport Township Park District	55,000	400-500	\$1,300,000	\$1,000,000	\$5,500,000
Lombard Park District	42,000	0	\$0	\$2,100,000	\$3,800,000
Long Grove Park District	6,000	20	\$2,000,000	\$100,000	\$100,000
Macon County Conservation District	114,000	0	\$0	\$385,000	\$0
Manhattan Park District	9,000	56.25	\$300,000	\$800,000	\$500,000
McHenry County Conservation District	260,000	5,600	\$56,000,000	\$7,000,000	
McHenry Parks & Recreation Department	53,000	75-100	\$750,000	\$2,500,000	\$3,000,000
Medinah Park District	9,000	55	\$1,045,000	\$100,000	\$1,900,000
Memorial Park District(Hillside)	40,000	0	\$0	\$1,500,000	\$5,000,000
Mokena Park District	20,000	20-30	\$350,000	\$260,000	\$4,000,000 rec center; \$3,000,000-4,000,000 Open space
Moline Park and Recreation Department	43,000	210	\$525,000	\$600,000	\$12,000,000
Morrison, City of	4,500	20	\$100,000	\$150,000	\$800,000
Morton Grove Park District	22,000	Very little opportunity	\$600,000/acre	\$1,600,000	
Mount Prospect Park District	57,000	Unknown		\$13,000,000	\$7,000,000
Mount Sterling Park District	2,500	0	\$0	\$80,000	\$30,000
Mundelein Park District	32,000	20	\$1,700,000	\$150,000	\$10,000,000
Naperville Park District	130,000	167	\$0	\$7,000,000	
Niantic Park District	800	40	\$160,000	\$0	\$200,000
Northbrook Park District	38,000	Less than 100 acres	\$25,000,000	\$10,400,000	\$12,000,000

City/County Park and Rec Name	Population Estimated	Land Needs (Acres)	Land Needs (Dollars)	Restoration Renovation (Dollars)	New Facility Needs (Dollars)
Northeast DuPage Special Recreation Assoc.		0	\$0	\$135,600	\$0
Northfield Park District	4,000	4.5	\$1,116,000	\$240,000	
Oak Brook Park District	8,800	Unknown			
Oak Forest Park District	28,000	No plans			
Oak Lawn Park District	56,000	Interested		\$550,000	
Oak Park Park District	54,000	None		\$1,650,000	
Oakbrook Terrace Park District	10,000	15-25	\$300,000	\$0	\$0
Olympia Fields Park District	5,000	40	\$1,600,000	\$850,000	\$2,000,000
Oregon Park District	7,200	0		\$500,000	\$200,000
Orland Park Rec. & Parks Dept.	50,000	300	\$20,000,000	\$620,000	\$15,000,000
Oswegoland Park District	32,000	200	\$10,000,000	\$35,000	\$25,000,000
Ottawa Recreation Department	18,000	75	\$350,000	\$250,000	\$100,000
Palatine Park District	80,000	28	\$2,800,000	\$4,500,000	\$10,000,000
Park Ridge Park District	37,000	0	\$0		
Paxton Park District	5,400	0	\$0	\$300,000	\$150,000
Peoria Park District	129,000	200	\$3,000,000	\$3,047,020	\$5,000,000
Peotone Park District	3,000	3	\$0	\$25,000	\$20,000
Plainfield Township Park District	80,000	600	\$15,000,000	\$2,000,000	\$30,000,000
Pontiac Parks & Recreation	9,500	0	\$0	\$50,000	\$20,000
Princeton Park District	7,200	0	\$0	\$0	\$0
Quincy Park District	42,000	10-20	\$45,000	\$2,000,000	\$3,000,000
Richton Park P & R Dept.	12,000	None			\$1,470,000
River Trails Park District(Prospect Heights)	16,000	Land locked		\$100,000	300,000-400,000
Riverside Playground & Rec. Dept.	9,000	0	\$0	\$622,890	\$306,000
Rock Island County Forest Preserve District	148,700	0	\$0	\$0	\$0
Rock Island Park and Recreation Department	40,000	50	\$300,000	\$2,000,000	\$6,000,000
Rockford Park District	198,000	1507	\$2,500,000	\$32,428,925	\$9,000,000
Rolling Meadows Park District	20,000	None		\$1,550,000	\$3,000,000
Romeoville, Village of	25,000	100	\$5,000,000	\$3,000,000	\$2,000,000
Roselle Park District	19,000	0	\$0	\$250,000	\$2,500,000
Rosemont Park District	4,000	None		\$250,000	\$0
Roseville Recreation Department	1,000	0	\$0	\$5,000	\$15,000
Saint Jacob Township Park District	1,200	40-50	\$200,000	\$125,000	\$36,000 per building
Salt Creek Rural Park District(Palatine)	9,000	0		\$1,500,000	\$7,000,000
Sandwich Park District	6,000	0	\$0	\$100,000	\$500,000
Schaumburg Park District	76,000	None		\$7,500,000	\$10,000,000
Skokie Park District	59,000	None anticipated		\$8,000,000	\$20,000,000
South Barrington Park District	3,000	35			
South Holland P & R Dept.	23,000	0	\$0	\$500,000	\$0
Springfield Park District	115,000	75	\$375,000	\$915,000	\$5,450,000
St. Charles Park District	40,000	430	\$11,000,000	\$10,000,000	\$28,500,000
Sterling Park District	12,000	0		\$500,000	\$3,000,000
Stonington Park District	1,100			\$30,000	
Streamwood Park District	35,000	11 to 20	84,000/acre	\$750,000	\$1,500,000
Sugar Grove Township Park District	9,600	0	\$0	\$0	\$0
Summit Park District	10,000	None			\$2,586,000
Taylorville Comm. Pleasure Driveway & Park Dist.	24,500	30	\$300,000	\$300,000	\$500,000

City/County Park and Rec Name	Population Estimated	Land Needs (Acres)	Land Needs (Dollars)	Restoration Renovation (Dollars)	New Facility Needs (Dollars)
Tinley Park Park District	48,000	100 to 150	65,000/acre	\$700,000	\$15,400,000
Tolono Park District	3,000	0	\$0	\$0	\$35,000
Tremont Area Park District	4,800	0	\$0	\$50,000	\$25,000
Tri-Township Park District	14,000		\$20,000	\$34,000	\$700,000
University Park Parks & Recreation	7,000	0	\$0	\$500,000	\$4,000,000
Urbana Park District	36,000	200	\$2,600,000	\$2,500,000	\$6,000,000
Vandalia Park District	5,000	0	\$0	\$0	\$0
Vermilion County Conservation District	82,000	80	\$2,000,000	\$300,000	\$1,500,000
Vernon Hills Park District	20,000	0		\$1,000,000	\$8,000,000
Villa Park Park and Recreation Department	22,000	0	\$0	\$300,000	\$1,400,000
Walnut Park District	2,500	0	\$0	\$30,000	\$10,000
Washington Park District	20,000			\$300,000	\$100,000
Watseka Park District	5,700	40	\$160,000	\$0	\$0
Wauconda Park District	8,700	30	\$0	\$50,000	\$125,000
Waukegan Park District	87,900	139	\$10,265,000	\$11,070,900	\$21,000,000
West Chicago Park District	29,000	0	\$0	\$1,900,000	\$23,500,000
Westchester Park District	18,000	3 to 4		\$0	\$400,000
Western Du Page Special Recreation Association	270,000	3	\$0	\$0	\$4,000,000
Western Springs Park District	12,000	0	\$0	\$0	\$180,000
Westmont Park District	25,000	10	\$6,000,000-8,000,000	\$1,000,000	\$6,000,000
Wheaton Park District	54,000	10	\$1,500,000	\$6,500,000	\$8,000,000
Wildwood Park District	6,000	0	\$0	\$0	\$0
Will County, Forest Preserve District of	502,000	6,000	\$902,000	\$5,255,000	\$18,100,000
Wilmette Park District	27,000	No plans	\$1,250,000	\$4,000,000	\$10,000,000
Winnebago County Forest Preserve District	275,000	7,000-9,000	\$25,000,000	\$29,500,000	\$15,000,000
Winnebago Park District	2,900	0	\$0	\$0	\$0
Winnetka Park District	14,000	No plans		\$8,000,000	\$1,800,000
Woodridge Park District	35,000	0		\$2,500,000	\$5,000,000
Woodstock Recreation and Parks Department	20,000	0	\$0	\$2,080,000	\$985,000
Worth Park District	12,000	None			
York Center Park District	4,000	10-20	\$0	\$800,000	\$0
Zion Park District	21,000	0	\$0	\$1,000,000	\$500,000
TOTAL		83,374.25	\$1,182,388,000	\$609,157,570	\$1,173,681,890
TOTAL DOLLAR NEEDS					\$2,965,227,460

THE TRUST FOR PUBLIC LAND

The Trust for Public Land (TPL) is a national nonprofit land conservation organization founded to protect land for public enjoyment. TPL believes that connecting people to land through parks, recreation areas, greenways, working lands, and natural open spaces is key to livable communities and a healthier environment.

TPL was founded in 1972 as a new kind of land-saving organization: entrepreneurial, business oriented, and able to move quickly in the marketplace.

TPL's experts in law, finance, real estate, fundraising, government, and public relations work nationwide to help citizens and government agencies identify lands they wish to see protected and then help them accomplish their land-saving goals. TPL has completed well over a thousand projects providing more than 1.4 million acres of land for people nationwide.

THE ILLINOIS ASSOCIATION OF PARK DISTRICTS

The Illinois Association of Park Districts (IAPD) is a nonprofit service, research and education organization that represents park districts, forest preserves, conservation and recreation agencies. IAPD's mission is to advance these agencies in their ability to provide outstanding park and recreation opportunities, preserve our natural resources, and improve the quality of life for all people in Illinois.

As a public-interest membership organization, the IAPD is dedicated to the wise use of leisure, conservation of our natural and human resources, and beautification of the total Illinois environment. The Association recognizes that excellent park, recreation and conservation services affect the quality of life for all citizens and significantly contribute to attracting new business development in the State.

For more information about the Trust for Public Land or the Illinois Association of Park Districts contact:

The Trust for Public Land
Chicago Office
53 W. Jackson Blvd., Suite 632
Chicago, IL 60604
(312) 427-1979
www.tpl.org

The Trust for Public Land
St. Louis Office
2100 Locust Suite #2N
St. Louis, MO 63103
(314) 436-7255

Illinois Association of Park Districts
211 E. Monroe Street
Springfield, IL 62701-1186
(217) 523-4554
www.ilparks.org



This report was produced with generous support from the Mason Foundation, Inc.