

The April 2013 GP RedLine Survey addressed the installation of "shade" in communities, particularly as it relates to parks, recreation and public health. The survey resulted in 213 completed surveys obtained from practitioners (primarily professionals in parks and recreation) from around the country. This survey is one of a series of surveys conducted by GPRED on topics of interest in the fields of recreation, health and planning.

Does your agency have a formal written policy concerning shade? Most respondents indicated that their agency, department or organization does not have a formal written policy recommending or requiring the installation of "shade" in outdoor facilities. Only 13\% of survey respondents reported they had such policies.

Does your agency, department or organization have a formal, written policy recommending or requiring the installation of "shade" in outdoor facilities?


Perhaps not surprising is the finding that the existence of such policies varies extensively by geography. Shade considerations are especially likely to be considered in warm sunny locations such as Florida and less so in communities that have heavy tree cover in place. Results of the entire survey are broken out by state of respondents and the findings show some regional differences in shade-oriented programs, although geography does not fully explain the likelihood

Is shade addressed in your local planning process? The low levels of policy, requirement or action related to providing shade are further confirmed by the lack of attention or study of shade that occurs in the planning process. When asked, "Does you jurisdiction conduct shade or solar studies to determine the best placement of shade as a part of community planning?" only $16 \%$ of respondents indicated that their community was involved in this type of analysis. While
$70 \%$ said their community did not address shade, $13 \%$ responded that they "did not know," perhaps an indication of low awareness of the issue overall.

In communities where money is available for installing shade features it is obtained from multiple sources. As illustrated below, parks and recreation budgets are most identified (80\%), followed by grants, private developers, and to a lesser extent, tree replacement funds. The survey provided respondents the opportunity to identify "other" sources of money for shade improvements and responses indicated that donations and memorials, capital funds, and partnerships were sources that are being used in various settings.

If money is available for installing shade features, is it from: (check all that apply)


What are the most important factors in determining why shade is not being addressed? Survey responses suggest that "cost" (66\%) is the single most identified reason why agencies don't recommend or require shade in outdoor areas, followed by "cost of maintenance" (32\%). Interestingly, "lack of awareness about UV overexposure as a cause of skin cancer" was cited by $19 \%$ of respondents.

If your agency, department or organization does not specifically recommend or require shade in outdoor areas, what are the two most important factors that you feel account for shade not being specifically addressed in your local plans? (check two)


Open ended comments concerning this question provide additional input concerning prevailing thoughts among practitioners. A number of respondents took time to remark that shade is a part of their thinking and planning but these considerations don't necessarily require codification. A sampling of verbatim survey comments included the following:
"In your community what agencies, departments or organizations have taken a lead or active role in promoting attention or policies concerning shade?"

- We do structure our parks to allow for shaded areas. Is it necessary to have an ordinance about every common sensical aspect of design?
- We do a good job of planning for shade so we don't necessarily need a written policy at this time
- We take providing shade seriously and do think about it when designing facilities. We just do not have policy specifically requiring it.
- Irvine residents are demanding shade as a mandatory park feature in all new construction and rehabs.
- Just because we don't require it, doesn't mean we don't value shade. We have shade structures in many areas.

A final survey question requested information on the types of efforts that are occurring so that results could be shared. Examples of findings from the following question included:
"Please share any information on polices, code provisions or press releases concerning shade-related topics in your community including trends, innovations or best practices. Send copies to info@gpred.org or include any links or citations in the spaces below:"

- 30 ft spacing on ROW
- Cooling facilties press release
- Currently looking to revive our street tree program.
- DC tree canopy goal
- For policies, check Queensland, Australia
- Included in the Parks and Recreation Element of the City's General Plan
- Local Ordances/Development Codes
- Million trees from Denver has been a supporter
- None - we are in the upper midwest with short summers
- Occasional handouts
- Park standards
- Planning Ordinance
- Please carefully review answer to question 5
- Trees Planting Requires per Lot
- We try to put shade covers over as many playgrounds and bleachers as possible.
- Worked with local High School Building Trades class to build shade for dugouts for ball fields.
- http://library.municode.com/HTML/14864/level2/DIVIVREDE_CH4LAIRTRPR.htmI\#TOPTITLE
- http://www.americanforests.org/magazine/article/keep-austin-green/
- http://www.na.fs.fed.us/urban/index.shtm
- na
- none
- none I am aware of
- unknown
- www.dcop.dc.gov
- The only policy we have on this subject is in our day camp manual, caring for children and ensuring they use sunscreen and have adequate shelter.
- http://sustainablecities.asu.edu/2013/03/04/trees-for-people-developing-a-tree-shade-plan-for-yourcommunity/
- No formal policy, but over the past 5 years our department has installed shade canopies over 95\% of our existing playgrounds
- http://library.municode.com/HTML/10101/level3/COOR_CH26DEZO_S26-19DEIMST.htmI\#COOR_CH26DEZO_S26-9DEIMST_S26-19-5LAREGU
- considering adding shade to iron horse trail seemed to be one of teh \#*desires in community surveys
- Aquatic pamplets on UV \& cancer
- Arbor day has been an incentive
- For policies, check South Africa
- No policies for trees in parks.
- Shade structures at Playgrounds
- Tress Planting Requires per Frontage Road
- http://www.cityoflafayette.com/index.aspx?NID=667
- https://www.facebook.com/ShuntheSun
- park specs
- www.ddot.dc.gov
- http://www.americanforests.org/our-programs/urbanforests/10-best-cities-for-urban-forests/10-best-cities-for-urbanforests-austin/
- Looking for resources on tree policies.
- Shade structures over seating areas at Athletic Complexes
- http://www.cityoflafayette.com/documentcenter/view/1078
- www.ddoe.dc.gov


22 May 13
Source:RRC Associates - Boulder, CO

|  |  | OVERALL | U.S. CENSUS REGION / WORLD REGION |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  |  |  | Colorado Front Range (12 county Weld to Elbert to Pueblo) | Other Colorado | Northeast US <br> Census <br> Region | Midwest US <br> Census <br> Region | Southern US Census Region | Western US <br> Census Region (excl. <br> Colorado) | Europe | CA | CO | FL | MN | TX | IL | MO | VA | ALL OTHER STATES / COUNTRIES |
| Does your jurisdiction conduct shade or solar studies to determine the best placement of shade? | Yes | 16\% | 11\% | 10\% |  | 15\% | 17\% | 18\% | 50\% | 13\% | 11\% | 8\% | 9\% | 33\% | 13\% | 13\% |  | 12\% |
|  | No | 71\% | 72\% | 90\% | 86\% | 73\% | 66\% | 69\% | 50\% | 72\% | 79\% | 77\% | 91\% | 33\% | 63\% | 75\% | 86\% | 73\% |
|  | Don't Know | 13\% | 17\% |  | 14\% | 13\% | 17\% | 13\% |  | 15\% | 11\% | 15\% |  | 33\% | 25\% | 13\% | 14\% | 15\% |
| TOTAL |  | 100\% | 100\% | 100\% | 100\% | 100\% | 100\% | 100\% | 100\% | 100\% | 100\% | 100\% | 100\% | 100\% | 100\% | 100\% | 100\% | 100\% |
|  | $\mathrm{n}=$ | 216 | 18 | 10 | 7 | 55 | 53 | 71 | 2 | 39 | 28 | 13 | 11 | 9 | 8 | 8 | 7 | 123 |

22 May 13
Source:RRC Associates - Boulder, CO

|  |  | OVERALL | U.S. CENSUS REGION / WORLD REGION |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  |  | Colorado Front Range (12 county Weld to Elbert to Pueblo) | Other <br> Colorado | Northeast US Census Region | Midwest US <br> Census <br> Region | Southern US <br> Census <br> Region | Western US <br> Census Region (excl. <br> Colorado) | Europe | CA | CO | FL | MN | TX | IL | MO | VA | ALL OTHER STATES/ COUNTRIES |
| If money is available for installing shade features, it is from: | Tree replacement funds |  | 38\% | 47\% | 50\% | 29\% | 46\% | 35\% | 31\% | 50\% | 33\% | 48\% | 38\% | 64\% | 67\% | 43\% | 50\% |  | 42\% |
|  | Parks and recreation budgets | 80\% | 94\% | 100\% | 57\% | 85\% | 78\% | 73\% | 100\% | 74\% | 96\% | 85\% | 91\% | 100\% | 71\% | 100\% | 67\% | 85\% |
|  | Private developers at time of new construction | 42\% | 53\% | 50\% | 29\% | 31\% | 37\% | 51\% |  | 62\% | 52\% | 31\% | 45\% | 56\% | 29\% | 50\% | 17\% | 49\% |
|  | Grants | 53\% | 59\% | 50\% | 71\% | 46\% | 45\% | 60\% | 50\% | 59\% | 56\% | 46\% | 45\% | 89\% | 71\% | 25\% | 17\% | 54\% |
|  | Other sources | 18\% | 24\% |  | 14\% | 20\% | 16\% | 19\% |  | 15\% | 16\% |  | 18\% | 11\% | 14\% | 13\% | 33\% | 14\% |
| TOTAL |  | 230\% | 276\% | 250\% | 200\% | 230\% | 210\% | 234\% | 200\% | 244\% | 268\% | 200\% | 264\% | 322\% | 229\% | 238\% | 133\% | 245\% |
|  | $\mathrm{n}=$ | 207 | 17 | 8 | 7 | 54 | 49 | 70 | 2 | 39 | 25 | 13 | 11 | 9 | 7 | 8 | 6 | 118 |

22 May 13
Source:RRC Associates - Boulder, CO

|  |  | OVERALL | U.S. CENSUS REGION / WORLD REGION |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  |  | Colorado Front Range (12 county Weld to Elbert to Pueblo) | Other Colorado | Northeast US Census Region | Midwest US Census Region | Southern US <br> Census <br> Region | Western US Census Region (excl. <br> Colorado) | Europe | CA | CO | FL | MN | TX | IL | MO | VA | ALL OTHER STATES / COUNTRIES |
| Most important factors that account for shade not being addressed in local plans | Lack of awareness about UV overexposure as a cause of skin cancer |  | 21\% | 13\% | 33\% | 29\% | 27\% | 20\% | 17\% |  | 14\% | 21\% | 18\% | 20\% | 17\% |  | 13\% | 29\% | 17\% |
|  | Cost of installation | 66\% | 47\% | 56\% | 71\% | 67\% | 75\% | 65\% | 100\% | 77\% | 50\% | 82\% | 50\% | 100\% | 60\% | 75\% | 86\% | 70\% |
|  | Cost of maintenance | 31\% | 40\% | 11\% | 43\% | 27\% | 20\% | 41\% | 100\% | 49\% | 29\% | 18\% |  |  | 20\% | 50\% | 29\% | 31\% |
|  | Shade is not a priority | 23\% | 7\% | 33\% | 43\% | 31\% | 27\% | 14\% |  | 3\% | 17\% | 27\% | 50\% | 17\% |  | 38\% | 29\% | 18\% |
|  | Our climate is not very sunny | 7\% |  |  |  | 6\% |  | 16\% |  | 6\% |  |  | 20\% |  |  |  |  | 4\% |
|  | Other | 24\% | 53\% | 56\% |  | 20\% | 25\% | 19\% |  | 17\% | 54\% | 27\% | 20\% | 17\% | 60\% | 13\% | 14\% | 28\% |
| TOTAL |  | 173\% | 160\% | 189\% | 186\% | 178\% | 168\% | 173\% | 200\% | 166\% | 171\% | 173\% | 160\% | 150\% | 140\% | 188\% | 186\% | 168\% |
|  | $n=$ | 188 | 15 | 9 | 7 | 49 | 44 | 63 | 1 | 35 | 24 | 11 | 10 | 6 | 5 | 8 | 7 | 106 |
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