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Executive Summary

Background

Student evaluation team, M.A.R.S. Consulting Group (M.A.R.S.), conducted an evaluation of the Clark County Wetlands Park (CCWP) Volunteer Program from April 2014 through August 2014. The pre-assessment consisted of a qualitative analysis of the organization’s educational programs, tremendous growth in and establishment of facilities throughout 2013 and 2014, staff responsibilities, and volunteer programs. As a result of this pre-assessment, M.A.R.S. determined that an evaluation of the current volunteer program would have the most impact on the organization.

Purpose

The primary purpose of this evaluation is to provide Wetlands Park staff with suggestions and recommendations based on the identified needs of the current volunteer program.

Methodology

Qualitative information about the program was collected via interviews with CCWP staff members. Qualitative and qualitative data was collected via a benchmark study in reference to three comparable local volunteer programs. M.A.R.S. also collected quantitative data via surveys developed and distributed to current volunteers as well as Park visitors.

Major Findings

Volunteer survey and visitor survey respondents provided insight into wants, needs and likes, as well as constructive feedback regarding perceived issues (survey data and comments are available throughout the evaluation report and in the Appendix).
Volunteer Survey

The majority of respondents:

- Expressed a desire for more in-depth communication with CCWP staff.
- Indicated that additional training, specifically technical training, was most desired.
- Expressed a desire for additional opportunities to socialize with peers.
- Indicated that volunteer uniforms were uncomfortable, and of average quality.
- Expressed a desire for the opportunity to spend more time outdoors, including hosting additional guided tours of the Park.
- Expressed a desire for a vendor in the Café space, and/or a gift shop

Visitor Survey

The majority of respondents:

- Indicated their primary reason for visiting the Park was to Walk/Run on Trails and visit the Nature Center.
- Felt CCWP facilities were adequately staffed.
- Expressed an interest in seeing additional guided tours of the Park.
- Expressed a desire for a vendor in the Café space, and/or a gift shop
- Indicated that they would return to Wetlands Park.

Cost Benefit Analysis

- The volunteer appreciation program currently costs approximately $4,050.00 annually for a volunteer base of 75 volunteers.
- The utilization of volunteers to run the Park produced a net benefit of $159,441.30 in FY13-14.
- Should the Park reach its’ goal of expansion of the volunteer program to 150 volunteers, the Cost-Benefit ratio would be 60.33, meaning for every dollar spent on the volunteer program, the Park would receive a benefit of $60.33.
Recommendations

The results of the evaluation determined that the goal to expand the CCWP volunteer program could be accommodated within the current budget with the following adjustments:

- **Actionable Items (three to twelve months)**
  - Cost Minimization Efforts on Current Volunteer Program Operation
    - Decrease the number of volunteer appreciation potlucks
    - Decrease the number of appreciation gifts
    - Modify the units in which volunteer commitment/contribution is measured and tracked
    - Increase the minimum volunteer requirement from eight to 16 hours each month

- **Increase communication between CCWP staff and volunteers**
  - Offer additional training opportunities
  - Peer-to-peer training program
  - Additional forums for communication with volunteers and visitors

- **Short-Term Goals (One to Three Years)**
  - Alternative uniform possibilities
  - Volunteer handbook
  - Additional guided group tours

- **Long-Term Goals (Three to Ten Years)**
  - Café and/or Gift Shop
  - Volunteer management software
  - Addition of a nonprofit arm, the Friends of Wetlands
For the purposes of this evaluation report, “CCWP” and “The Park” will be used interchangeably to reference Clark County Wetlands Park. “M.A.R.S.” and “the evaluation team” will be used interchangeably to reference the M.A.R.S. student evaluation group.
**Introduction**

Clark County Wetlands Park (CCWP) is a nature preserve located in the southeast area of the Las Vegas Valley. The Park, which operates within the Clark County Parks & Recreation (CCPR) department, includes 2,900 acres of water, trails, and trees along the Las Vegas Wash. Wetlands Park offers designated walking and biking trails as well as opportunities for wildlife viewing, photography, and simply escaping to a unique natural environment.

The nature preserve surrounding Wetlands Park is extremely important to the life cycle of water in the Valley. The preserve actually slows water, helping to minimize erosion. The unique habitat also helps to cleanse the water before it makes its way into Lake Mead.

Wetlands Park originated as a small, collaborative project – a partnership between Clark County Parks & Recreation and the Las Vegas Water Reclamation District. The project was founded with consideration of three basic principles: recreation, education and stewardship. In 1990, the Wetlands project started very small with only one trailer utilized as an information center for visitors. In March of 1991, the first constructed recreation trails were opened to the public.

In 1995, Wetlands Park embarked on the development of a master plan, facilitated by Clark County Parks & Recreation. Wetlands Park staff spearheaded the project, leading the planning process and construction while continuing to offer programs to the public as the master plan was being developed. Five primary organizational goals were created within the Park’s master plan:
• Develop recreational and tourism opportunities, based on public needs, which are compatible with the conservation and restoration of the Wash.

• Create social benefits for the Valley by providing opportunities for area residents to gain a sense of community pride and ownership of this park.

• Create educational opportunities to convey the importance and significance of the Wash through various media.

• Conserve and restore natural resources by protecting and enhancing the ecological resources of the Las Vegas Wash.

• Complete a master plan that will guide the design and development of the Park’s recreational facilities and support infrastructure.

One of the Park’s primary goals developed in the master plan focused on providing opportunities for community involvement and activism. Wetlands Park has developed a direct way for the community to be involved with the Park through the volunteer program.

The Wetlands Park project continued to develop, and in 2004, CCPR received funding from the Southern Nevada Public Lands Management Act (SNPLMA) to construct the modern facilities now located in the Nature Preserve. Construction was completed in 2012, and all Wetlands Park operations are now in the same facility.
One of the largest facilities recently constructed is the Nature Center and Exhibit Hall. The facility offers interactive exhibits, geographical and topographical maps of the Wash, habitat and wildlife exhibits, information about the Wash’s role in the Valley’s water cycle, the Park’s collaborative efforts with the Las Vegas Strip, and much more. The Nature Center also provides activities for all ages. The Park also offers a variety of programs, including art, recreation and fitness, nature walks, educational field trips and special events.

The Wetlands Nature Center also features an auditorium, which continuously shows an introductory 12–minute film showcasing the wildlife, amazing habitats, trails and the river-like Las Vegas Wash. Visitors can also access the Nature Center’s viewing decks, which showcase panoramic views of the beautiful Las Vegas Valley.

**Organizational Structure**

Wetlands Park has been under the direction of the Clark County Parks and Recreation department since 1995. There are several layers within the organizational structure. For the complete organizational chart, please see Appendix. A.1.

Don Burnette is the Clark County Manager, Randy Tarr is Assistant Clark County Manager and overseas eight County departments including Parks & Recreation (CCPR). Jane Pike is the current Director of CCPR, and Steve Corry is the Assistant Director. Brandon Barrow is the Wetlands Park Coordinator, Allison Brady is the Recreation Programs Supervisor and Christie Leavitt is the Curator of Education. The park has a dedicated and passionate group of staff (3 full time, 12 part time) and 75 dedicated volunteers.
Volunteer Program Overview

The CCWP volunteer program began in the summer of 1998. CCWP staff conducted initial volunteer trainings to prepare and educate Information Hosts who would staff the temporary Wetlands Park Information Center, which opened October 10, 1998. In all, 37 volunteers contributed 3,494.5 service hours in the first fiscal year (July 1998-June 1999). The volunteer program has continued to grow, and as of April 22, 2014 the CCWP volunteer program has 75 volunteers. In the most current fiscal year (June 30, 2013 through July 31, 2014), those volunteers contributed a total of 8,596 service hours.

Figure E: Volunteer Activity FY99 - FY14

CCWP currently has one full time staff member, Christine Leavitt - Curator of Education, who oversees the program. Christie has been involved with Wetlands Park since its inception and has seen the volunteer program grow over the last sixteen years. Christie is not only responsible for coordinating CCWP’s volunteers, but she also oversees educational programming, including school field trips, museum, and outdoor education.
Because CCWP offers several different programs to the public, the volunteer program is extensive, offering diverse opportunities for individuals to donate their time. Current volunteer positions are:

- Education Facilitators
- Exhibit Facilitators
- Information Hosts
- Trail Keepers
- WHO (Wetlands Hands On) Team Leaders

Each individual interested in volunteering for CCWP goes through a detailed application, interview and orientation process. Volunteers are screened and processed just as any Clark County employee would be. CCWP completes a background check on each volunteer applicant, and grants him/her a Clark County Parks & Recreation badge. Volunteer applicants are placed in a volunteer position based on his/her experience, interests and availability. Each volunteer is then given a uniform to keep. This uniform is to be worn during all shifts.

CCWP has also created an extensive volunteer appreciation program. Volunteers are rewarded with annual dinners, appreciation gifts, birthday and anniversary cards, and pins which designate the number of years an individual has been volunteering with CCWP.

**Purpose of Evaluation**

The primary purpose of this evaluation is to provide Wetlands Park staff with suggestions and recommendations based on the identified needs of the current volunteer program. Secondly, it may be helpful for Wetlands Park staff to utilize the collected data to further develop and build upon their volunteer program, and, in turn, continue to grow and mature as one of Southern Nevada’s treasured facilities.
This evaluation was designed to provide suggestions and recommendations to improve the current CCWP volunteer program based on the data acquired. Expected outcomes will include:

- Better understanding of volunteer program Strengths, Weaknesses, Opportunities & Challenges
- Knowledge of current best practices used within comparable program models
- Knowledge of the monetary cost of the volunteer program versus the benefit it provides
- Understanding of current volunteers’ attitudes towards both the volunteer and appreciation programs
- Understanding of visitor awareness and perception of volunteer program.

**Evaluation Process**

Qualitative and quantitative data for this evaluation was collected in many ways including personal interviews and interactions with Wetlands Park staff members Allison Brody – Recreation Program Supervisor, Christie Leavitt – Curator of Education, and Brandon Barrow – Wetlands Park Coordinator, a survey distributed to current volunteers, a survey distributed to Park visitors, a benchmark study of similar organizations and/or volunteer programs, a SWOC Analysis, and field observations.

**Staff Interviews**

Two Wetlands Park staff members were interviewed in order to collect detailed information regarding the Park’s volunteer program. Allison Brody, primary contact for the duration of this evaluation project, first met with the evaluation team to provide general information regarding the Park, its programs, needs, and potential project focuses. During discussion about the Park’s volunteer program, Allison explained how much the Park has grown in recent years, and how the volunteer program has had to quickly expand in order to support the new programs. Ms. Brody expressed a want for additional training opportunities for volunteers that cover more content and genres, as well as a desire to re-structure current volunteer job descriptions.
As a result of this discussion, the evaluation team decided to focus on evaluating the current Wetlands Park Volunteer Program. Allison suggested that the consultants meet with Christie Leavitt, CCWP’s current volunteer coordinator, to discuss the volunteer program in further detail.

M.A.R.S. consultants met with Chris to learn more about how the current volunteer program operates. From this meeting, the evaluation team was able to gather additional information in regards to the long-established volunteer program, and begin to construct an evaluation plan. During the meeting with Christie, she noted that the Park would like to continue to grow and provide additional programs, however, Clark County Parks & Recreation does not have the budgetary room for additional salaried employees at this time. Christie informed M.A.R.S. that the Park would like to offset the need for additional staff members by utilizing additional volunteers, and that it is the goal of the CCWP staff to operate a program of 180 volunteers.

Field Observations

The evaluation team first visited the Wetlands Park on Saturday, March 29, 2014 prior to our initial scheduled meeting with Allison. No members of the evaluation team had visited the Wetlands Park in recent years, and therefore were all unaware of any programs or offerings provided, with the exception of information acquired during preemptive research on the Park’s website and social media pages. Upon first visiting the Wetlands Park, the evaluation team was thrilled to explore the Park’s new facilities including an information center, café, auditorium, administrative buildings, and educational center.

The evaluation team interacted with Wetlands Park volunteers at the educational center, and explored the trails nearest the Visitor’s Center and surrounding buildings. The consultants noted the high quality exhibits, displays and facilities, as well as the enthusiastic and welcoming nature of the volunteers.
The evaluation team also noted that the Park’s facilities seemed understaffed, considering the volume of visitors on a pleasant Saturday afternoon. The information center, café, auditorium, and front desk inside the administrative building were all unstaffed. The evaluation team noted these locations with intent to further inquire about staffing needs in meetings with Wetlands Park staff.

**Evaluation Focus**

Following the initial interviews with Recreational Programs Supervisor and Curator of Education, the evaluation team decided to pursue and focus on the evaluation of the efficiency of Wetlands Park’s current volunteer program.

CCWP staff indicated a desire to expand the volunteer program from 75 to approximately 150 individuals. M.A.R.S. will also focus on providing recommendations for growth in order to meet those goals.

**SWOC Analysis of CCWP Volunteer Program**

Employees of the Park were interviewed to collect information for the SWOC (Strengths, Weaknesses, Opportunities, and Challenges) Analysis. The evaluation team conducted an open interview with Christie Leavitt, Curator of Education and part-time Volunteer Coordinator, to obtain detailed information regarding the Park’s volunteer program.

**Strengths**

- Documented volunteer job descriptions, policies, and procedures.
- Passionate, active volunteers, staff members and management
- Volunteer appreciation program

**Weaknesses:**

- Lack of adequate funding and/or sources of funding to support new programs and needed staff members
Lack of employees to staff the Park in its entirety (i.e. full-time Volunteer Coordinator).

Volunteer base has not grown to meet the demands of the new facilities (number of volunteers/volunteer hours), and therefore volunteer needs are not being met.

Rely heavily on volunteers to staff facilities, educational tours and field trips, and trails.

Significant costs associated with extensive volunteer appreciation program

Limited “extended training” for volunteers in the areas of natural history, teaching/facilitating skills, group management skills, and customer service skills.

Volunteer training program does not allow for follow-up training or emphasis on coaching and feedback

Opportunities:

- Increased marketing efforts/increased visibility of park
  - Field trips, facility rentals, etc.
- Expansion of current educational programs
- Full utilization of special facilities
  - Café, auditorium, etc.

Challenges:

- Aging volunteer base
- Park distance from Valley residents
- Lack of funding and support from Clark County Parks & Recreation (CCPR).
- Lack of in-depth training for volunteers in key areas
Research Question

After conducting a SWOC analysis, the evaluation team developed several additional questions to narrow the focus the proposed evaluation. The research question for this evaluation is:

Is the Wetlands Park volunteer program as efficient as it could be?

Additionally, the evaluation group asked the following sub-questions:

- Does the current volunteer program adequately staff the facility?
- Does the current volunteer program contribute to the Park’s overall goals and vision?
- What are the benefits of utilizing volunteer staff versus paid staff?
- Could the volunteer appreciation program be restructured to provide the same level of acknowledgement at a lesser cost?

Evaluation Plan

M.A.R.S. Group developed a plan to evaluate the volunteer program through a series of personnel interviews, the distribution of surveys and data analysis of those survey results, as well as feedback from Wetlands Park representatives.

Surveys

Two surveys were developed in order to collect pertinent information about Wetlands Park, as well as the volunteer program. Survey questions were developed by the evaluation team in collaboration with the Recreation Program Supervisor. The evaluation team developed one survey, named Visitor Survey, designed to measure visitors’ satisfaction with the Park, programs and services offered, and effectiveness of staff and volunteers. The second survey developed, named Volunteer Survey, was designed to measure current volunteers’ level of satisfaction among many factors of the volunteer program, including the current appreciation program, training, and program needs.
Benchmark Study
The evaluation team conducted a benchmark study of three local organizations comparable to Wetlands Park in regard to organizational focus, size, volunteer programs and several additional criteria. The three organizations studied were the Mob Museum, Clark County Museum, and the Springs Preserve. The evaluation team developed a series of ten standard questions asked of each organization’s representative. These questions were developed according to M.A.R.S.’s knowledge of Wetlands Park, as well as its needs and goals. Volunteer coordinators at each organization were interviewed via phone.

Table 1: Benchmark Study Comparison

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Topics</th>
<th>CCWNP</th>
<th>Springs Preserve</th>
<th>Clark County Museum</th>
<th>Mob Museum</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. Total volunteer programs</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. Total volunteers</td>
<td>75</td>
<td>300</td>
<td>35</td>
<td>50</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. Is there an appreciation program? Is it based on hours or years?</td>
<td>Yes-Years</td>
<td>Yes-Hours</td>
<td>No-Unable to Fund</td>
<td>Yes-Hours</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5. Are uniforms given? What is the cost of this uniform?</td>
<td>$40.00 (A vest, hat and name tag are given to take home)</td>
<td>$30.00 (A vest that is washed and handed out each day. Stays in house).</td>
<td>No-Dress Code Enforced</td>
<td>$25.00 (Black Polo given to each volunteer to take home).</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6. Hours of each shift? Hours needed to stay active each month?</td>
<td>4/8</td>
<td>4/16</td>
<td>4/16</td>
<td>4/16</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7. What are the age requirements to be a volunteer? What is their average age?</td>
<td>45-65</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>60% are 21 and younger.</td>
<td>21</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8. What scheduling program/method do you use to schedule volunteers?</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>Scheduling coordinator takes phone calls and handles emails</td>
<td>Calendar of hours available is emailed out to staff and the guest desk schedules the hours</td>
<td>Volgistics</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9. What do you give out for the appreciation program? Do you provide an annual dinner/lunch?</td>
<td>3 Years-Pin and Bar Dinner ceremony - 3 times a year. Appreciation gifts.</td>
<td>1,000 hours – Certificate/Bronze Display Pin 2,000 hours-Silver Display Pin 3,000 hours-Gold Display Pin 5,000 hours-Platinum Display Pin *Lunch award ceremony every April. Give a ways and donations are raffled out.</td>
<td>None-Unable to Fund</td>
<td>1,000 hours – Certificate/Bronze Display Pin 2,000 hours-Silver Display Pin 3,000 hours-Gold Display Pin 5,000 hours-Platinum Display Pin *Dinner award ceremony. Currently being developed where the dinner will be held in April.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10. What is required in order to be a volunteer?</td>
<td>Application, Interview, Background, Orientation</td>
<td>Application, Interview, Background, Orientation</td>
<td>Application, Interview, Background, Orientation</td>
<td>Application, Interview, Background, Orientation</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

An evaluation of each organization’s responses shows clear similarities between the organizations’ volunteer programs when compared to Wetlands Park. However, one organization seemed to compare best to Wetlands Park. For several reasons discussed below, M.A.R.S. chose to focus on the Springs Preserve’s volunteer program for the purposes of comparison.
Wetlands Park currently has seventy-five volunteers with the goal of recruiting an additional 75 for a full volunteer base of 150. The Springs Preserve currently operates with the help of 300 volunteers – the largest volunteer base of any organization researched. At the Wetlands Park, while Christie Leavitt is a full-time employee, volunteer management is just one of her responsibilities. The Springs Preserve has one full-time employee solely dedicated to volunteer management.

Each volunteer shift at the Springs Preserve is a minimum of four hours, and the rules regarding minimum time commitments are strongly enforced. The Wetlands Park volunteer program guidelines state that each volunteer is required to commit to a minimum of eight hours of volunteer service each month. However, these guidelines are not as strictly enforced.

While Wetlands Park reported that retirees are the primary age demographic of their volunteers, the Springs Preserve relies heavily on volunteers age 21 and younger. During summer, the Springs Preserve increases its programming and utilizes the younger demographic to assist in running the programs. There is usually a waiting list for individuals to volunteer in the summer, and according to Christina Lopez, Human Resources Analyst at the Springs Preserve, the summer programs really help introduce young people to a positive work environment and work ethic.

Both programs have a volunteer appreciation program in place that rewards the organization’s volunteers for their hard work and commitment. The Springs Preserve offers one meal-centered awards ceremony, whereas Wetlands Park offers three potluck award ceremonies. Each program provides appreciation gifts for their volunteers.

The Springs Preserve utilizes a scheduling system that allows anyone to assist with scheduling the volunteers. Volunteers can call the main customer service desk to schedule or cancel a volunteer shift. These volunteer management programs are usually somewhat costly, but costs and monthly fees vary depending on what software program is needed.
According to Christina Lopez at the Springs Preserve, these volunteer management programs are typically cost prohibitive for many organizations. Wetlands Park currently utilizes a scheduling process, accessible internally by staff.

Because Wetlands Park has set a goal to operate with and manage a large group of volunteers, the evaluation group researched the most comparable volunteer program model in order to gain some additional insight on the management of a substantially larger volunteer base. This information may be helpful as the CCWP volunteer program grows.

**Evaluation Methodology**

In order to support the overall goal of expanding the volunteer program from 75 to 150 volunteers, as well as answer the previously stated research questions, the evaluation team decided to create and analyze survey data, as well as an in-depth Cost Benefit analysis.

**Surveys**

The evaluation team created both an online and paper version of each survey for ease of fulfillment by respondents. Group members also created and introductory letter, survey instructions, and marketing collateral for dissemination and use at Wetlands Park to help CCWP staff and volunteers explain the purpose of the survey and need for respondents.

The evaluation group and CCWP staff collected survey responses from June 22, 2014 through July 1, 2014. Responses completed in person (i.e. paper surveys) were collected at Wetlands Park. The data was inputted into the online survey service, and all responses were included in data analysis.

The surveys were developed by M.A.R.S. with regard to conversations with CCWP staff members. The information provided by Wetlands Park helped M.A.R.S. develop the main set of questions, which were submitted to CCWP, specifically Allison Brody, for approval. The evaluation group received suggested changes to each survey, and the survey questions were
edited accordingly. When all components of the surveys were finalized, they were distributed to visitors and volunteers, respectively, and the survey collection period began.

**Visitor Survey**

The visitor survey consisted of 13 main questions and 8 demographic questions. The survey questions were designed to evaluate the visitor’s level of engagement with the park, frequency of visitation, reason for visiting, level of interaction with staff and volunteers, and their satisfaction with the customer service of staff and volunteers. Visitors were also asked about their opinion regarding staffing levels of the park, their awareness of the volunteer program and whether or not they would like to volunteer.

Demographic questions collected information regarding the visitor’s age, sex, income, education, employment status, residency at zip code level, marital status and whether or not they had children. It was thought that information about the parental status of the visitors could inform recruitment efforts for the parks youth education programs. In addition, the place of residence was considered an important variable to determine how far visitors were willing to travel to visit the park and whether or not they were mainly coming from the nearby area.

The evaluation team utilized Survey Monkey to collect the online survey responses. The link was distributed on the Wetlands Park Facebook page and website. The paper forms were distributed and collected by the staff members and volunteers at the Park. M.A.R.S. received 78 visitor survey responses during the collection period.

**Volunteer Surveys**

The volunteer survey consisted of 18 survey questions and 8 demographic questions. The main purpose of the survey was to evaluate the volunteers’ satisfaction with their scheduling, training and appreciation gifts. Volunteers were also asked to express an opinion regarding the overall operation of the Park and potential areas for improvement. The demographic portion of the survey collected information regarding the volunteer’s age, sex, income, education,
employment status, residency at zip code level, marital status and whether or not the volunteer has minor children in his/her care. A full copy of the Volunteer Survey Questions and related materials are available in the Appendix, A.2 through A.5.

Data Collection

At the beginning of the survey period, instructions were given in the form of a memo to Wetlands park volunteers and staff. The instructions stated that the surveys could be filled out online (preferred) or in person by request. The CCWP staff was provided with a flyer regarding the survey, a letter explaining the reason for the survey, instructions for collecting responses, the link to the electronic survey, and a printable version of the survey for those who wished to complete it in person. In case of questions, the staff and volunteers were provided with a contact for the evaluation team during the survey period. At no point during the survey period were the researchers contacted for questions.

Visitor surveys were promoted on the Wetlands Park Facebook Page, through the Wetlands Park e-mail list of 400 subscribers, and at the Park’s information desk. At the time the survey was posted to the CCWP Facebook page, the page had 1,593 “Likes” and 365 individuals saw the survey announcement. During the survey period, the Nature Center received an average of 48 visitors per day. Park staff members were instructed to provide a flyer explaining the survey to all visitors that they interacted with and to explain how to access the survey online at the Park’s Facebook page. Staff reported, “We posted the survey flyer in the Exhibit Hall and Information Kiosk; we also had volunteers verbally tell visitors about the survey.” If the visitor wished to fill out the survey in person, they were provided with a paper form to fill out that was then collected by the staff member. At the end of the survey period, 36 electronic surveys were collected and 42 paper surveys were collected.

Volunteer surveys were primarily promoted through an e-mail announcement with an electronic link to the survey and instructions on how to fill out the survey in person if desired.
The e-mail was sent to all but two volunteers by a Wetlands Park staff person. The two remaining volunteers did not have e-mail, so they were mailed a paper version of the survey. Wetlands Park staff members were instructed to encourage all volunteers to take the survey and reported that they reached out to approximately 30 volunteers about the survey in person. M.A.R.S. received 41 total responses, approximately 55% of the total volunteer workforce at the time of the survey. At the end of the survey period, 35 electronic surveys were collected and six paper surveys were collected.

Data Analysis – Volunteer Survey Results

Volunteer survey responses were collected by M.A.R.S., producing viable data to be analyzed. The analysis presented includes visual representations, quantitative and qualitative data derived from demographic and general interest questions.

Demographics

The majority of survey respondents were female (62.9%, 22), with 12 males responding to the survey and one heterosexual couple who completed the survey jointly.
The majority of respondents (57.14%) indicated that they were 65 years of age or older. The remainder of the respondents indicated they were between 30 and 64 years of age, except for one individual who indicated he/she was less than 18 years of age, and seven individuals who did not indicate an age group.

What is the highest level of education you have completed?

Answered: 35  Skipped: 6
The majority of respondents (80%) indicated they had completed some college, 60% had completed an undergraduate degree or higher. No respondents selected the other available options.

22 Approximately what is your household income?
Answered: 33 Skipped: 8

Ten respondents (30.3%) described their household income as less than $40,000 per year, 7 respondents (21.2%) made $40,000 to $79,999 per year, and 7 respondents (21.2%) made more than $80,000 per year. Nine respondents (27.7%) preferred not to answer the question.

25 Which of the following best describes your current employment status?
Answered: 35 Skipped: 6

Retired 60.0% (21)
Employed part time 11.4% (4)
Employed full time 20.0% (7)
Student 5.7% (2)
Unemployed 2.9% (1)
The majority of respondents (60%) indicated that they were retired followed by Employed Full Time (20%), Employed Part Time (11.43%), Student (5.71%) and Unemployed (2.86%).

What is your marital status?

The majority of respondents (65.5%) indicated that they were Married or Living with Partner, followed by Never Married (24.1%), Divorced (6.9%) and Widowed (3.4%).

Are you the parent or guardian of any minor children?

No 97.1% (34)
Only one respondent indicated that they were the parent or guardian of a minor child. The rest, 34 respondents (97.14%), indicated that there was no minor child in their care.

**Results**

The survey found that the majority of respondents (60%) have volunteered at the Park for less than 5 years, 17.5% of respondents have volunteered for 5 to 10 years, and 20.0% of respondents have volunteered at the park for more than 10 years. One respondent indicated that he/she had volunteered for “$ Months,” and therefore was listed as “Uncategorized” at 2.50% of respondents. The volunteers contributed between 1 and 40 service hours per month at the Park, with a mode of 12 hours per month.

The majority of respondents (87.5%) indicated that they are currently volunteering as much as they would like to. The remainder (5 respondents) indicated that they would like to volunteer more. There were no respondents who indicated that they would like to volunteer fewer hours. Of the volunteers who indicated that they would like to volunteer more, a range of 7 to 30 additional hours was desired.
Volunteers who completed the survey served in a variety of volunteer roles at the Park. The majority of respondents (48.6%) indicated that they served as an Exhibit Facilitator, followed by Information Host, Education Facilitator, Trailkeeper, “Other” and WHO Team Leader. Responses that were categorized as “Other” included special events, walking meeting walkers, really try to make people think about their impact on the environment, non-school groups wanting tours, and exhibit.

When asked about the effectiveness of initial orientation training, the vast majority of respondents (97.06%) indicated that their volunteer position and responsibilities were either “Fully Explained” or “Explained” to them. Only one respondent indicated that their responsibilities were “Partially Explained” to them during initial orientation. As a result of attending orientation training, 85.29% of respondents felt “Very Prepared” or “Adequately Prepared” to meet the responsibilities of their position, 11.76% felt “Somewhat Prepared” and 2.94% felt “Not Prepared at All.”
When asked about ongoing training sessions, 100% of respondents indicated that their volunteer position and responsibilities were either “Fully Explained” or “Explained” to them. In addition, most respondents felt prepared to meet the responsibilities as a result of attending training, 93.55% respondents felt “Very Prepared” or “Adequately Prepared” to meet the responsibilities of their position and 6.45% felt “Somewhat Prepared.” There were no respondents who felt “Not Prepared at All” after attending ongoing training sessions.

The survey results indicated that current volunteers desire additional, more effective training. “Technical training (information about plants, animals; teaching skills) was the most desired, followed by “General Park Information.” Although CCWP staff thought that the volunteers may need customer service training, only two survey respondents indicated interest in this area. The “Other” category also received two responses: “Additions/changes to park policies and procedures;” and “I’m from the east coast and many of these things are new to me, the plants, birds etc.”

Which of the following types of training would help you be more effective as a volunteer (Check all that apply):
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Wetlands Park staff wanted to know if volunteers felt supported by staff. All of the volunteers (100.0%) who responded to the survey indicated that they felt adequately supported by the staff in accomplishing volunteer duties. All but one volunteer indicated that they believed that the staff thought the work they did was useful and important. All but one indicated that they believed that the park visitors thought that the work they did was useful and important.

How would you rate the QUALITY of the following volunteer benefits?

![Bar Chart]

The survey looked at the volunteers’ perception of the quality and importance of volunteer benefits such as appreciation gifts, potlucks/dinners and uniforms. In regards to the quality of these appreciation gifts, the majority of individuals indicated that the volunteer benefits were “Excellent” or “Above Average.” Potlucks/Dinners were rated “Excellent” quality by 80% of respondents followed by Appreciation Gifts (74.2%) and then Uniforms (61.3%). Some respondents (22.6%) indicated that they felt that the uniforms were of just average quality.
With regard to the importance of the volunteer benefits, uniforms were considered the most important, followed by Potlucks/Dinners and then Appreciation Gifts. About half (46.7%) of respondents felt that appreciation gifts were “Important” and 40% felt that appreciation gifts were “Moderately Important.” Three respondents felt that appreciation gifts were “Of Little Importance” and one respondent felt that appreciation gifts were “Unimportant.”

When asked if they had noticed any need for additional services or gap in service at the Park, 28.1% indicated a “Yes” response. An open-ended comment section revealed the following needs:

- Understaffing in Exhibit Hall and information kiosk
- Litter patrol on trails
- Volunteers walking the trails to answer questions during visitor hours
- Need more presence and enforcement of the rules before/after business hours
- More tours of the park in the daytime and at night
- At least 2 people per shift
- Supply visitors with interesting information about the plants, animals and importance of wetlands
When asked if they had a professional skill, expertise or training that has never put to use within their volunteer position at the Park, 30.0% indicated a yes response. An open-ended comment section revealed the following skills held by volunteers, noting that they would be happy to share these talents and skill sets.

- GIS mapping
- Non-profits / Business Administration
- Arts and crafts for children and adults
- Industrial engineering
- Medical training (paramedic, nurse)
- Commercial artist (willing to provide original drawings or artwork)
- Information Technology
- Off-road equipment operation / safety certification

In response to staffing of the facilities, the majority of respondents felt that the park was adequately staffed by both paid staff and by volunteers.

Volunteers indicated that they enjoyed a variety of aspects about volunteering at the Park. Most notably, volunteers enjoyed being outdoors, interacting with visitors and doing good in the community. Respondents were permitted to choose more than one answer and indicate a response that was not already on the list. Responses from the “Other” category included:

- Learning about plants and animals/ learning new things (4)
Team/family-like culture (2)
Educating the public/children/newcomers to the park (3)
Giving back
Interacting with nature

The following comments were also submitted:

Figure F: Comments from Volunteer Survey

“The staff do a great job of preparing, assisting, and working with the volunteers. I’ve worked other places where volunteers weren’t treated with trust or as part of the overall team, but the feeling here is completely opposite.”

“You don’t feel like just a name on a badge. It’s almost like family.”

What do you enjoy most about volunteering at Wetlands Park? (Check all that apply)
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The majority of volunteers surveyed indicated that they planned to continue as a CCWP Volunteer.
When asked what would make their volunteer experience even more enjoyable, respondents indicated the following:

- **Uniforms**
  - A spare shirt
  - More comfortable uniforms

- **Communication**
  - Additional access to staff
  - Being informed about changes and improvements to the Park
  - Additional progressive communication
  - More information as things change in upper echelon
  - The opportunity to have volunteer experiences noted in changes
  - Kept up to date and respected for our life knowledge which would help our Park
  - Group debriefing

- **Training**
  - Formal training when you first start
  - More orientation
  - Training on park history and nature
  - Knowledge to produce growth and understanding
  - Learning about the eco-system, nature, the park
  - More information about plants animals and birds than what is in the brochure handed out to visitors
  - More group learning and interaction
  - One on one time with staff to identify plants and animals to become more knowledgeable about the things that visitors see and ask questions about
  - More educational courses
  - Flora/fauna identification outings
• Being Outdoors
  o More nature walks with staff and volunteers
  o Seeing how nature cares for itself
  o With more staffing, I could leave the welcome desk to walk the trails a little more frequently

• Interacting with Other Volunteers
  o More opportunities to interact with other volunteers from different positions
  o Regular meetings and contact with other volunteers
  o Social debriefs (beer/food) after project completions

• Job Duties
  o Planning events
  o Providing education to visitors
  o Transportation while on the trails
  o Buddying up with another tour leader

• Amenities:
  o All exhibits in the Nature Center Working
  o Open the auditorium to the public
  o Gift shop available for visitors
  o Open a gift, book and accessories shop
  o Cafeteria opened with vendor
  o Vending machines in cafeteria

• Other
  o Better park security during after-hours events
  o Feeling more involved
  o Doing something good for the community
  o Educational handout for school tours
  o Get paid
  o All good
  o It is already very enjoyable, I love volunteering here
  o More visitors

The following comments were also submitted:

Figure G: Additional Comments from Volunteer Survey

“I definitely would have benefited from more time "buddying up" with another tour leader and I was told I could do that but I did not feel really comfortable as everyone else seemed to be so much more advanced than I was.”

“One on one time in the preserve with staff to identify plants and animals so I am more knowledgeable about the common things that people see and ask questions about.”
Data Analysis - Visitor Survey Results

Visitor survey responses were collected by M.A.R.S., producing viable data to be analyzed.

The analysis presented includes visual representations, quantitative and qualitative data derived from demographic and general interest questions.

Demographics

The data shows that the visitors were 65.71% or 46 are female and 34.29% or 24 are male.

What is your age?

The data shows that the visitors were 65.71% or 46 are female and 34.29% or 24 are male.
Of the respondents, none were “under the age of 18”, 12.68% or nine were “18 – 29 years old”, 18.31% or 13 were “30 - 39 years old”, 25.35% or 18 were “40 – 49 years old”, 25.35% or 18 were “50 – 59 years old,” and 18.31% or 13 were “65 years and over”. The data shows that approximately half of respondents (50.70%) were in the age range of 30 – 49 years old. It also shows that only 12.68% were under the age of 29.

The data for this question shows that there is not a single dominant income group among respondents. The data shows that there is almost an even distribution between all answerable options.

The next question presented was, “What is the zip code of your primary residence.” This question had 70 responses and was skipped by eight respondents. A map of the zip codes can be found in the Appendix, A.6.
The data shows that a significant amount of the respondents (77.46%) had a college degree or higher. The data shows no responses for “some high school”, 8.45% or six responses for “high school graduates”, 11.27% or eight responses for “some college”, 2.82% or two responses for “Trade/technical/vocational training”, 29.58% or 21 were “college graduate”, 14.08 or 10 responses for “some postgraduate work”, and 33.80 or 24 responses for “post graduate degree.”
The data shows that over half have full time employment and 69.56% are employed. The responses show 56.52% or 39 were “employed full time”, 13.04% or nine were “employed part time”, 5.80% or four were “unemployed”, 18.84% or 13 were “retired”, 1.45% or one respondent identified as “student”, and 4.35% or three selected “rather not say”.

What is your marital status?
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The data shows that the majority of the visitors are currently married or living with a partner. The responses show 67.65% or 23 were “married or living with a partner”, none were “widowed”, 11.76% or four were “divorced”, 2.94% or one respondent was “separated”, 11.76% or four were “never married”, and 5.88% or two selected “rather not say”.

August 15, 2014
The responses show 42.03% or 29 selected “yes” and 57.97% or 40 selected “no.” The data shows that over half of the visitors to the Park do not have children or guardianship of a child. The respondents that selected “no” were finished with the survey. Respondent who selected “yes” to this question were routed to the following sub question:

**If yes, how old are they? (check all that apply)**

Of the respondents that do have children 51.72% or 15 have a “0 – 5 years old”, 34.48% or 10 have a “6 – 10 years old”, 24.14% or seven have a “11 - 14 years old”, and 24.14% or seven have a “15 – 18 years old” child. This question allowed for the respondents to select multiple answers. A large majority (86.20%) of the respondents have children at the age of 10 or under.
Results

The data shows that a majority of respondents visit the Wetlands Park less than once a month which is about 69.23%. 55.13% or 43 responded to “More than once a year but less than once a month”, 14.1% or 11 responded to “Once a year”, 14.1% or 11 responded to “Once a month”, 10.26% or 8 responded to “One a week”, 6.41% or 5 responded to “Daily”, and there were no responses for “Never”.

The data shows that 77.33% of respondents had visited the Wetlands Park in the past year where 22.67% had never been to the park before. 22.67% or 17 responded to “None”, 60% or
45 responded to “1-10”, 6.67% or 5 responded to “11-20”, 1.33% or 1 responded to “21-30”,
9.33% or 7 responded to “Greater than 30”, and there were no responses for “Never”.

The respondents were able to select multiple answers for this question. Of the responses
65.79% or 50 selected “Walk/Run trails, 3.95% or 3 selected “Bike trails”, 52.63% or 40 selected
“Visit Nature Center”, 3.95% or 3 selected “School field trip”, 28.95% or 22 selected “Education
program/class/event”, 5.26% selected “Volunteer”, and 10.53% or 8 selected “Other”. There
were 8 responses to the “Other” section. The data shows that the walk/run trails is the most
popular choice with 65.79% of respondents selecting this answer with “Visit Nature Center” the
next most popular choice with 52.63% of respondents selecting this answer.
Who did you visit the Park with?
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- No one, I enjoy the Park alone: 10.67% (8)
- My Spouse: 21.33% (16)
- My child (1): 8.00% (6)
- My children (2 or more): 22.67% (17)
- A group of friends, colleagues, or other associates: 37.33% (28)

This question was answered by 75 respondents and skipped by three respondents. 10.67% or 8 selected “No one, I enjoy the Park alone”, 21.33% selected “My Spouse”, 8% or 6 selected “My child (1)”, 22.67% or 17 selected “My children (2 or more)”, and 37.33% or 28 selected “a group of friends, colleagues, or other associates”. The data shows that 52% of visitors bring a child or spouse to the park and 89.33% bring another individual with them to visit the park.

During your most recent visit, did you interact with a representative of the Wetlands Park?
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- Yes: 77.63%
- No: 22.37%

The data shows that a majority of the visitors interact with someone associated with the Wetlands Park. 77.63% or 59 responded “Yes” and 22.37% responded “No”. The answer to this
question would lead the respondent to one of two different questions based on if they selected “Yes” or “No”.

The respondents that answered “Yes” in question five were routed to Sub Question 1, which asks, “If yes, was it a volunteer or staff member?” was routed to this sub question. 55.93% or 33 selected “Volunteer”, 30.51% or 18 selected “Staff member”, and 13.56% or 8 selected “Unsure”. The data shows that over half of survey respondents interacted with a volunteer and only 13.56% didn’t know if the person they interacted with was a volunteer or staff member.

The respondents that answered “No” on question 5 were routed to Sub-Question two.

93.75% or 15 selected “I didn’t require assistance”, 6.25% or 1 selected “no one was around”,
and there were no responses to “someone was around but seemed preoccupied”. The data shows that the majority of people (93.75%) who didn’t receive help did not need assistance.

This was a matrix based questions where the respondents would rate their satisfaction on four different areas on a Likert scale\(^1\). The scale for all the area ranged from “Very Satisfied”, “Satisfied”, “Neutral”, “Unsatisfied”, “Very Unsatisfied”, and “N/A”. The first area of this matrix was Attitude. 74.67% or 56 selected “Very Satisfied”, 16% or 12 selected “Satisfied”, and 9.33% selected “N/A”. The next area was Knowledge, 72% or 54 selected “Very Satisfied”, 16 or 12 selected “Satisfied”, and 9 selected “N/A”. The third area was Overall Helpfulness, 73.33% or 55 selected “Very Satisfied”, 17.33% or 13 selected “Satisfied”, and 9.33% or 7 selected “N/A”. The last area was “Ability to answer all of your questions,” 68% or 51 selected “Very Satisfied”, 14.67% or 11 selected “Satisfied”, 2.67% or two selected “Neutral”, and 14.67% or 11 selected “N/A”. There were 12 additional comments to this question which can be found in the Appendix, A.10. The data shows that vast majority of respondents were very satisfied or satisfied in all four areas.
The data for this shows that most of the visitors felt the park is adequately staffed but there were some who felt the park was understaffed. 13.89% or 10 selected “Understaffed”, 86.11% or 62 selected “Adequately staffed”, and there were no responses of “Overstaffed”.

The data shows a vast majority planned on returning to the Wetlands Park in the future. 92.11% or 70 selected “Yes”, 1.32% or 1 selected “No”, and 6.58% or 5 selected “Unsure.”
The data shows that a little less than half of the respondents have not heard of the volunteer program at the Wetlands Park. 59.21% or 45 selected “Yes” and 40.79% or 31 selected “No”.

The data shows that 27.63% or 21 selected “Yes”, 39.47% or 30 selected “No”, and 32.89% or 25 selected “Unsure”. The data shows an almost even response across the three answerable options, but 30 respondents were interested in volunteering at the Park. This is significant given that there are currently 75 active volunteers in the program.
The last question presented to survey respondents was “Do you have any additional comments about your visit to the Wetlands Park?” This question was used to collect additional information and qualitative data from the respondents. The question received 33 comments; 9 of those comments were suggestions for improvements, two were negative comments, and 25 were testimonials indicating how much the respondent enjoys the Park. The comments from this question can be found in the Appendix, A.11.

**Comparisons**

**What was the purpose of your most recent visit to Wetlands Park? (Check all that apply)**

![Bar chart showing percentages of responses to the question about the purpose of the visit.]

These results show a comparison between the purposes of the visit and if the respondent is a parent or a guardian of a child. The data shows that there is an increase in the “Education program/class/event” compared to the results from both parents and non-parents.

**Cost-Benefit Analysis**

CCWP staff members informed M.A.R.S. that it plans to expand the current volunteer program from 75 to 150 consistent volunteers. After becoming familiarized with the Park’s facilities and goals, M.A.R.S. created a cost benefit analysis to show the costs and benefits of expanding the volunteer program. The ideal staffing plan was developed based on interviews.
with CCWP staff members and M.A.R.S.’s observations of the staffing at the Park. Using the information collected, M.A.R.S. developed a plan to demonstrate how CCWP could potentially staff all positions and responsibilities with additional volunteers. After creating the ideal staffing plan, the student evaluation group sent the plan to CCWP staff for review and approval. Upon finalization and approval of the plan, the first course of action was to develop an ideal plan of staffing to determine if the increase in volunteers would in fact be utilized, or if additional positions would need to be created. The ideal staffing plan was broken down by job title, then by the number of positions needed to support daily operations. The job titles, including the number of positions needed, are listed below:

- Exhibit hall (floaters to explain and answer questions) = 2
- Exhibit hall front desk = 2
- Information Desk = 1
- Wetland Watcher = 4
- Education facilitator (8 guides per walk Available Tues/Thurs) = 8
- Wetlands: Hands On! (WHO) Team Leads = 10 (once per month)

The total number of staff needed for weekly operation is as follows:

- Monday, Wednesday, Friday, Saturday, and Sunday = 9
- Tuesday and Thursday = 17
- One Saturday per month (WHO Team Leads) = 10

CCWP facilities are open every day from 9:00am until 3:00pm which is 6 hours a day. The total number of operating hours per week is 42, and the total number of operating hours per year is 2,190. Based on the ideal staffing plan, the facility would have to cover 27,768 hours per year in order to fill all positions throughout the year. All of these positions are to be filled by volunteers, not paid staff members.

Currently, volunteers are required to contribute a minimum of eight hours each month. Assuming that all 75 volunteers contribute an average of eight hours per month, the current number of volunteers only contribute 7,200 hours per year. This total is far below the projected
total hours indicated by the ideal staffing plan - 27,768 hours per year. If the Park determined it did not want expand the volunteer workforce, the current 75 volunteers would have to provide on average 31 hours per month to cover the total hours needed as indicated in the ideal staffing plan. Clearly, expecting volunteers to contribute over 30 hours each month is unrealistic.

Because CCWP staff members plan to expand the current volunteer base from 75 to 150 volunteers, the volunteer force would double. At the current minimum of eight hours per month, 150 volunteers would only provide 14,400 volunteer hours per year. Again, this is below the 27,768 needed as indicated in the ideal staffing plan. A volunteer workforce of 150 volunteers would need to be required to provide 16 hours per month in order to staff all 27,768 hours indicated in the ideal staffing plan. Table 2 illustrates the total number of hours provided by the current volunteer workforce dependent on the minimum number of volunteer hours required per month. Table 3 illustrates the total number of hours provided by the expanded volunteer workforce dependent on the minimum number of volunteer hours required per month.

Table 2 Minimum Number of Volunteer Hours Contributed per Month by Current Volunteer Workforce

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Required hours Per month</th>
<th>Total hours per year</th>
<th>Number of Current Volunteers</th>
<th>Total Hours Provided for 75</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td>96</td>
<td>75</td>
<td>7200</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10</td>
<td>120</td>
<td>75</td>
<td>9000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12</td>
<td>144</td>
<td>75</td>
<td>10800</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14</td>
<td>168</td>
<td>75</td>
<td>12600</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16</td>
<td>192</td>
<td>75</td>
<td>14400</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20</td>
<td>240</td>
<td>75</td>
<td>18000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>25</td>
<td>300</td>
<td>75</td>
<td>22500</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>30</td>
<td>360</td>
<td>75</td>
<td>27000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>31</td>
<td>372</td>
<td>75</td>
<td>27900</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Table 3: Minimum Number of Volunteer Hours Contributed per Month by Expanded Volunteer Workforce

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Required hours Per month</th>
<th>Total hours per year</th>
<th>Projected Total Volunteers</th>
<th>Total Hours Provided for 150</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td>96</td>
<td>150</td>
<td>14400</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10</td>
<td>120</td>
<td>150</td>
<td>18000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12</td>
<td>144</td>
<td>150</td>
<td>21600</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14</td>
<td>168</td>
<td>150</td>
<td>25200</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16</td>
<td>192</td>
<td>150</td>
<td>28800</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Costs of the volunteer program and volunteer appreciation program were provided by the CCWP staff. These costs included the appreciation program, training, and uniforms. The cost of the volunteer appreciation program and training was broken down into a current cost per volunteer. The Table 4 below shows the costs per volunteer:

Table 4: Cost of Volunteer Appreciation Program per Volunteer

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Cost of Volunteer Appreciation Program</th>
<th>Cost per year ($)</th>
<th>Number of Volunteers</th>
<th>Cost Per Volunteer ($)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>I Appreciation dinners (3 each year)</td>
<td>900.00</td>
<td>75</td>
<td>12.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Training – contract teacher (1 each year)</td>
<td>100.00</td>
<td>75</td>
<td>1.33</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Training – food (4 times each year)</td>
<td>600.00</td>
<td>75</td>
<td>8.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5 year pin (approx. 3 each year)</td>
<td>75.00</td>
<td>75</td>
<td>1.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5 year bar (approx. 20 each year)</td>
<td>200.00</td>
<td>75</td>
<td>2.67</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Appreciation gifts and Cards</td>
<td>2,175.00</td>
<td>75</td>
<td>29.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total cost per year per Volunteer</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>54.00</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The total cost of the volunteer appreciation program and training for the current 75 volunteers is $4,050.00. For the expanded volunteer base of 150 the cost would be $8,100.00.

The average salary for a full time Volunteer Coordinator in the Las Vegas job market is $38,000.00 per year. The costs of a full time Volunteer Coordinator would be an annual reoccurring expense.
The average cost of uniform is currently $35.00 per volunteer. Based on the current 75 volunteers, uniform costs would be $2,625.00. Uniform costs would double to $5,250.00 for a volunteer base of 150. If the Park decided to change the uniforms but the costs remained the same then it would cost around $5,250.00 to replace all of the uniforms for the existing and new volunteers. The replacement costs would be figured into the costs of the program. Figuring a replacement figure of 10%, Wetlands Park would need to replace 15 uniforms per year which would cost roughly $525.00.

Currently Wetlands Park has 75 core volunteers which for the fiscal year of 2013/2014 contributed 8,596 hours to Wetlands Park. This is an average of 9.55 hours per month per volunteer. The approximate cost for the volunteers and volunteer appreciation program for the fiscal year 2013/2014 was $9,147. This shows a cost benefit ratio for $16.90, which means for every one dollar spent the park received $16.90 worth of benefit from every volunteer hour contributed. The cost benefit ratio is calculated by taking the number of hours the volunteers provided multiplied by $19.05\textsuperscript{2} per hour.

The CCWP staff members’ planned expansion of their volunteer force would lead to a gross benefit of $528,980.40 per year, assuming the volunteer workforce is expanded to 150 volunteers that contributed the ideal 27,768 hours per year. The total costs of the expanded volunteer base to 150 and the addition of a Volunteer Coordinator would consist of a total cost of $46,625 per year. Without a Volunteer Coordinator the cost to run the program would be $8,625. The net benefits for a year would be a total of $520,355.40 (see full Cost-Benefit table in Appendix, A.12 and A.13). The cost benefit ratio would be $60.33. The $60.33 cost benefit ratio means that for every one dollar spent on the Volunteer program, the Park would receive $60.33 dollars in benefit; this benefit does not include staffing costs.

If the costs and benefits remained the same over the next 10 years, the Park would receive a net total of $5,205,804.40 in benefits. If the Park was to replace the volunteers with paid part
time staff, the costs of operating the Park would be significantly higher than utilizing the volunteer base. To staff the Park with enough staff members to operate at the level indicated in the ideal staffing plan, CCWP would need to hire 26.7 part-time employees (working 20 hours per week at minimum wage. At the current minimum wage of $8.25, it would cost the Park $229,086 in additional staffing costs to cover all of the ideal staffing plan hours of 27,768. The figure below compares the cost of using paid employees and volunteers per year.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Type of Staff</th>
<th>Cost ($)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Min. Wage employee</td>
<td>$229,086.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Volunteers (Vol. Coord. Not Included)</td>
<td>$8,625.00</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Comparing the costs of using paid staff ($229,086.00) and the costs of the Volunteer program ($8,625) the difference of cost per year is vast. Using paid staff provides the same amount of benefit but at a much higher cost to the Park.

**Recommendations**

When M.A.R.S. began this evaluation project, CCWP staff expressed their desire for the evaluation team to conduct an evaluation project in several different operational areas of the Park. However, the evaluation team discovered that there is an underlying “issue” connecting all of these areas. Given the very recent construction of the Visitor Center and expansion of the Park, it is the goal of CCWP staff to expand programming and events, but additional staff members are needed in order to expand and develop in this way.

Due to financial restrictions of the Clark County Parks & Recreation budget, the evaluation team learned that the addition of CCWP staff members is not likely. Therefore, CCWP staff set a goal to expand the current volunteer program from 75 to a total of 150 volunteers. M.A.R.S. conducted an evaluation of the current CCWP volunteer program in order to provide suggestions that might assist in the expansion of its volunteer program.
After completing the data analysis, M.A.R.S. developed several recommendations that may help to grow and improve upon the current volunteer program. The relative substance of these recommendations has been taken into account, and therefore they have been listed within three categories: Actionable items (three months to twelve months), short-term goals (one year to three years), and long-term goals (three years to 10 years). All recommendations were developed with the ultimate goal of volunteer program expansion in mind.

**Actionable Items (Three to Twelve Months)**

- **Cost Minimization Efforts on Current Volunteer Program Operation**

  1. **Volunteer Appreciation Dinners**

     Reducing the number of volunteer appreciation dinners from three to only one dinner each year would produce an annual savings of 66% based on the number of current volunteers. This reduction would help fund the expansion of the volunteer program. Currently the cost for the three appreciation dinners is approximately $12 per volunteer, bringing the total cost of three dinners to approximately $900. The expansion of the volunteer program to the goal of 150 volunteers would literally double the cost for an approximate total of $1800. If CCWP was to reduce the number of volunteer appreciation dinners to one annual dinner, the cost would be approximately $4 per volunteer, bringing the cost of an annual appreciation dinner down to $300 for the current volunteer base and $600 for the expanded base of 150 volunteers.

     While decreasing the number of volunteer appreciation dinners would provide savings that, in turn, could fund the expansion of the volunteer program, the survey data collected indicates that the vast majority of volunteer survey respondents believe the potlucks and dinners are “important” or “moderately important.” In addition, some volunteers called for “more interaction with other volunteers” and more social gatherings as indicated by comments in the survey responses:
• More opportunities to interact with other volunteers from different positions
• Regular meetings and contact with other volunteers
• Social debriefs (beer/food) after project completions

In order to save costs on appreciation dinners and potlucks while increasing the social aspect of volunteering that so many respondents cite as a primary reason they volunteer, M.A.R.S. recommends that CCWP hosts one potluck-type volunteer appreciation dinner and supplement with other regular volunteer meetings at the Park, and/or scheduled social events outside the Park.

Scheduling occasional volunteer meetings would give CCWP volunteers the opportunity for further interaction with one another, as well as access to staff. These meetings could potentially provide the venue for further volunteer training and team building activities, satisfying volunteers’ need to further interact with one another as well as connect further with the Park.

2. Volunteer Appreciation Gifts

Currently CCWP provides volunteers two appreciation gifts per year, as well as various letters and cards for special occasions (birthdays, anniversaries, etc.). The total costs of these gifts are $29.00 per volunteer per year. The gifts are given during the mid-winter and spring - approximately $15.00 and $7.00, respectively. By simply reducing the amount of appreciation gifts given per year, the cost of the volunteer program would decrease. The savings could then be applied to the CCWP volunteer program to help cover costs of expansion and accommodate the incorporation of incoming volunteers. For example, by eliminating the spring-time gift of $7 would reduce the per-volunteer cost of the program by $7 per year - a savings of $525 per year at the current volunteer levels. By expanding the program to 150 volunteers, appreciation gifts will cost $4350 per year at the current level of expenditure. By reducing the amount of appreciation gifts to one annual gift, CCWP would save $1050 per year to provide an appreciation gift to 150 volunteers. Because many of the volunteers surveyed indicated that
appreciation gifts were important to their volunteer experience (47.7%), simply reducing the number of gifts given annually will still please the volunteers, but allow for the savings needed to accommodate incoming volunteer recruits.

3. **Modify the Units in Which Volunteer Commitment is Measured**

CCWP currently awards service pins to all the volunteers who have volunteered at the Park for at least 5 years. In the current model, volunteers receive a bar pin for each additional year of service. Because CCWP volunteers are so committed to serving the Park, the cost of these service pins and bars is expensive.

The survey data collected from volunteers indicates that volunteers contributed between one and 40 service hours per month to the Park, with the majority of volunteers contributing 12 hours per month. Though the pin system is meant to showcase the dedication of a volunteer, the system is not necessarily an accurate visual representation of a volunteer’s contribution to the Park. For example, Volunteer A has contributed the minimum requirement of eight hours each month for the last six years. He has been awarded a pin and a bar, indicating he has been a CCWP volunteer for six years. However, Volunteer B has contributed sixteen hours of volunteer service each month for the past three years. Volunteer B has contributed the exact same amount of service hours, but she has only been awarded a pin. This comparison is visualized in the Figure 14 below:
By simply changing the award system to reflect the amount of hours contributed instead of the number of years, CCWP could reduce the number of pins distributed each year greatly reducing the cost of this portion of the appreciation program, while still showing appreciation for volunteers’ hard work and dedication.

4. Cost Benefits of Volunteer Program Expansion

The CCWP staff’s ultimate goal is to expand the volunteer base from 75 to 150 volunteers. The cost benefit analysis shows that the expansion of the volunteer program vastly outweighs the costs of hiring traditional staff. Although the cost to run the volunteer program with the additional volunteers increases the benefit to the Park, it also still outweighs the costs of adding traditional staff members.

Nearly one quarter of survey respondents indicated that they felt that the park was understaffed by both paid staff and volunteers. In particular, volunteer respondents felt that Exhibit Hall and Information Kiosk are understaffed, and could potentially benefit from at least two scheduled individuals per shift. Volunteer respondents also indicated a need for litter patrol
on trails, CCWP representatives walking the trails, and additional guided group tours. Some volunteer respondents felt that additional staffing would allow them to be outdoors and walk the trails more often, an area noted of particular interest in the survey comments. Based on these results, it is in the best interest of CCWP to expand its volunteer base and diversify volunteer duties.

5. **Increase of Minimum Hourly Volunteer Commitment**

Currently, CCWP volunteers are required to commit to a minimum of eight volunteer hours per month. During the most recent FY 2013-2014, CCWP volunteers contributed 8,596 service hours to the Park, and the cost for the program (excluding staffing costs) was approximately $4500.00. This means that the Park took on a cost of approximately $0.54 per volunteer hour contributed.

The volunteer survey indicates that 23.8% of volunteers are contributing less than the minimum requirement of eight volunteer hours per month. The volunteer survey also indicates that 59.5% are contributing between eight and 16 volunteer hours per month, and 16.6% are contributing between 17 and 40 hours per month. Because hourly volunteer contributions reportedly vary, volunteers may be able to contribute fewer than the required eight hours each month without incident.

Increasing the minimum contribution of volunteer hours to 16 hours per month would cover all of the hours of operation outlined in the Cost Benefit Analysis and Ideal Staffing Plan (see Appendix, A.14). If the current base of 75 volunteers contributed 16 service hours per month, they would provide 14,400 volunteer hours for the exact same cost to the Park. Increasing the minimum hourly requirement for volunteers would not reduce the cost of the volunteer program, but it would increase the efficiency of the program by approximately 69% compared to the current program requirements.

- **Increased Communication Between Staff and Volunteers**
1. **Additional Training Opportunities**

Volunteer Survey respondents indicated a high level of interest in additional technical and general training opportunities. A handful of volunteers indicated that learning new things was one of the things they liked most about volunteering. Technical training, particularly about the Park’s animals, plants, geography, etc., was of most interest to volunteers, followed by general training and information regarding the Park’s history and development. While Wetlands Park staff expressed the desire to provide customer service training to volunteers, only two survey respondents showed interest in that type of training.

2. **Develop a More Specific Peer-to-Peer Training Program**

As indicated by respondents of the volunteer survey, current CCWP volunteers would value the social interaction that group or "buddy" training could provide. With the high interest indicated in additional training, CCWP staff should consider initially training team leaders, possibly the W.H.O team leaders, on Park specifics then arranging for group mentoring or training. This initial training should be in-depth enough that current volunteers feel comfortable participating in a buddy training program.

Given the time frame that may be required to develop such a program, the peer-to-peer or "buddy" training program, CCWP staff members, should they choose to adopt the idea, may consider placing the development of this program in the Short-term Goals section to be implemented at a later date.

3. **Establish Additional Forums for Volunteer Communication**

While 100% of volunteer survey respondents indicated that they felt supported by CCWP staff to accomplish their duties, several called for increased communication with staff regarding Park operations and more opportunity to provide input as a volunteer. Volunteers would like to be informed about the Park’s development and changes to policies and procedures. In addition they called for “group debriefings.”
Establishing a tradition of training meetings or team building activities as previously mentioned would potentially provide volunteers the opportunity to share feedback regarding volunteer experiences, and provide suggestions for further development. Also, CCWP should consider a volunteer-only newsletter, or announcements board centrally located in the Visitor Center.

4. **Establish Additional Forums for Visitor Communication**

Comments collected from visitor survey respondents indicated concerns over the signage on the trails. The concerns outlined were that it was easy to get lost on the trails and trail signage and additional maps would be helpful in trying to determine where visitors are on the trails.

The evaluation team understands that general signage, including trail signage, is currently being developed for Wetlands Park and CCWP staff anticipate the installation of that signage within the next year. However, CCWP staff could consider developing a location in or around the Visitor Center for an announcement board. Developmental information, such as trail signage, can be displayed and accessible to visitors, and keep them updated on the Park’s continual progress. CCWP staff should also consider posting this information on the Park’s website.

- **Short-Term Goals (One to Three Years)**

1. **Expansion of Hours of Operation**

   Comments from the visitor survey indicate a desire for the Visitor Center to be open for a longer period of time on the weekend as well as during the week. In addition, one volunteer survey respondent expressed that "more visitors" would make their volunteer experience more enjoyable.

   Perhaps if the Visitor Center hours of operation were increased, more visitors would be able to take advantage of CCWP facilities and visit the Park following their work day or after their children are home from school. M.A.R.S. understands that the expansion of operating hours
would affect staffing costs and likely require additional staff or key volunteers, and therefore is a goal not immediately achieved.

2. **Additional Guided Group Tours**

   While the Park currently offers guided tours, comments collected from visitor survey respondents indicate an interest for additional guided group tours throughout the Park.

   In addition, volunteer survey respondents expressed a strong desire to be outdoors and on the trails. Volunteer respondents specifically rated being outdoors as one of the main things they like about volunteering at the Park. They also expressed interest in adding group tours and more volunteers out on the trails. Expanding the opportunity for guided tours would potentially help increase the number of visitors to the Park, while simultaneously providing volunteers the opportunity to participate in an outdoor activity.

3. **Alternative Uniform Solutions**

   The Cost Benefit Analysis shows that the current CCWP volunteer uniforms can be quite costly, and sometimes create confusion in regard to whether a visitor is interacting with a CCWP volunteer or staff member.

   Volunteer survey respondents indicate that uniforms were ranked as the most important benefit of the volunteer program when ranked against dinners and appreciation gifts. However, nearly one quarter of volunteers rated the quality of the current uniform as just "average." In addition, one volunteer commented that they would like more comfortable uniforms.

   The Benchmark Study conducted by the evaluation team provided an opportunity to view samples of different uniforms used by organizations in the Valley. These uniforms range from a simple dress code to reusable items which were “checked out” by volunteers for shifts. In viewing the varied uniforms utilized by other organizations, M.A.R.S. would suggest one of three alternative uniform options:
- A general dress code enforced by Park staff.
  - This could be something as simple as requiring volunteers to wear jeans or khaki shorts/pants, and a black polo shirt. The presence of a volunteer badge would indicate the volunteer’s status with the Park.

- CCWP polo shirt or t-shirt purchased by the volunteer.
  - CCWP could design and order the shirts, but recover the cost of the uniform by requiring the volunteer to purchase his/her shirt, much like the CCPR requires part-time employees to purchase CCPR logoed shirts.

- CCWP vests to be worn over a volunteer’s clothing.
  - Vests would be purchased by the Park in bulk, and checked out to volunteers at the beginning of their shift. Vests would be returned at the end of the shift to be laundered.
  - It is important to note that one of the organizations interviewed during the Benchmark Study, the Springs Preserve, was able to establish a system for laundering volunteer vests through their relationship with the Las Vegas Valley Water District. Vests are picked-up by LVVWD, laundered, and returned.

Each of the options outlined above cost the respective organization less than CCWP spends on each volunteer uniform. Reducing the costs of the current uniforms would be ideal to save costs with the expansion of the volunteer workforce.

M.A.R.S. understands that altering the physical uniform and/or the way it is distributed to volunteers may be undesirable. In the event that CCWP staff opts to keep providing the current
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uniform, the evaluation team suggests bidding out the cost of uniform pieces to alternate companies, as permitted, in order to determine potential savings.


Given volunteers’ interest in learning more about the Park and the natural habitat, CCWP staff might consider developing a volunteer handbook and/or training manual to be distributed to new volunteers. Additional training courses and/or a “buddy” training program may already be in place before a volunteer manual is developed, but volunteers would still be able to reference the manual should they need to answer a visitor’s question prior to completing their training.

Providing an updated volunteer manual annually would also ensure volunteers are all aware of and acknowledge any changes to policies or procedures.

- Long-Term Goals (Three to Ten Years)

1. Addition of a Park Café and Gift Shop

Many volunteer survey respondents commented that they would like to see the Café space open with a vendor or vending machines. They also expressed desire for a gift, book and accessories shop. The addition of a Café and/or Gift Shop would bring one, or several, new revenue streams to the Park, which could potentially help offset costs of the volunteer program.

In early discussions, CCWP staff members indicated that the establishment a nonprofit “arm” of the Park is in the approval process. Much like other CCPR-associated nonprofit organizations, such as the Friends of Winchester Park, the hypothetical “Friends of Wetlands Park” could potentially operate a Gift Shop, allowing proceeds from purchases to benefit Park programs. The nonprofit arm could also develop partnerships with local nonprofits, such as Opportunity Village’s food services for example, to operate the Café.

2. Purchase of Volunteer Management Software
As the CCWP volunteer program continues to grow and develop, the management of volunteers will become more time consuming for staff members. Given that the addition of a full-time staff member solely dedicated to volunteer management is not likely to come to fruition, CCWP staff might consider purchasing volunteer management software.

Based on information collected in the Benchmark Study, the evaluation team discovered that one southern Nevada nonprofit organization (comparable to CCWP) is able to manage over 150 active volunteers using volunteer management software and a part-time volunteer coordinator, rather than a full-time volunteer coordinator.

Depending on the program selected, volunteer management software can be surprisingly affordable. Software programs also tend to be customizable for the organization, and costs can be minimized by selecting the program parts most effective for managing a specific volunteer program. If CCWP staff discovers that managing 150 or more volunteers within the current internal systems becomes difficult or too time consuming, volunteer management software should be considered in lieu of a full-time volunteer coordinator.

**Conclusion**

Overall, the CCWP volunteer program provides many benefits to the Park. However, upon closer evaluation, M.A.R.S. was able to determine that some areas of focus, with some adjustment, could potentially become more efficient and effective. In order to expand the volunteer program to the desired 150 volunteers within the current budget, M.A.R.S. recommends that CCWP staff:

- Minimize the cost of the current volunteer program
  - Decrease the number of volunteer appreciation potlucks
  - Decrease the number of appreciation gifts
Modify the units in which volunteer commitment/contribution is measured and tracked

Increase the minimum volunteer requirement from eight to 16 hours each month

- Increase communication between CCWP staff and volunteers
  - Offer additional training opportunities and team building activities
  - Volunteer handbook
- Explore alternative uniform possibilities
- Add more guided group tours
- Consider operating a Café and/or Gift Shop
- Pursue the purchase of volunteer management software

Limitations

During the evaluation process, M.A.R.S. encountered limitations that should be considered when reviewing this report.

M.A.R.S. attempted to conduct an extremely thorough evaluation of the Wetlands Park volunteer program. Some of the information and data requested by M.A.R.S. was not released by Wetlands staff. While all data provided was included in evaluation analyses, the evaluation team was slightly limited by the amount of detailed information CCWP was able or willing to provide. Given that M.A.R.S. is an independent, student evaluation group, this limitation was expected.

Upon receipt of the collected paper version of the Visitor Survey, M.A.R.S. learned that the survey was not completely randomly distributed to Park visitors. CCWP staff members reported distributing the survey to a concentrated group of Park visitors who were attending a class at the Visitor Center. M.A.R.S. determined that the distribution of the visitor survey to a focused
concentration of visitors could have caused a skewed data sample, and therefore produced data that misrepresents the average group of visitors to the Park.

**Time Constraints**

Due to the limited amount of time permitted for the completion of this evaluation project, M.A.R.S. was unable to complete the type of in-depth analysis originally planned. It is our hope that a future student evaluation team might have the opportunity to further assist the Park by choosing to evaluate any of the following areas of interest.

As a result of an extended period of edits and revisions during survey development, the time allotted for survey collection was condensed to just fifteen days. Given the short time frame, M.A.R.S. and CCWP staff and volunteers collected an impressive amount of evaluations. However, M.A.R.S. believes that the response rate of the surveys, respectively, would have been higher if the surveys had been open for response for a longer period of time. Additional survey responses would have provided additional or alternative data, potentially changing the survey analysis.

In reference to the benchmark study conducted by M.A.R.S. for informational purposes, M.A.R.S. team members were encouraged to conduct more extensive research for purposes of comparison. M.A.R.S. team members hoped to distribute the same visitor and volunteer surveys distributed to CCWP patrons to patrons of the Springs Preserve, with the intent to compare data collected from both organizations. Unfortunately, Springs Preserve did not have the resources to accommodate our survey request within the very short time frame proposed. It is M.A.R.S.’s hope that a future student evaluation group might have the opportunity to conduct this research as an addition to the original benchmark data.

M.A.R.S. had hoped to conduct a time study of Wetlands Park employees to evaluate and analyze the allocation of time and responsibilities. Because Christie’s time is split between so many different areas of the Park, M.A.R.S. had hoped the time study would contribute to the
long-term goal of acquiring a full-time Volunteer Coordinator. Again, it is M.A.R.S.’s hope that a future evaluation group has the opportunity to conduct this study.
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**End Notes**

1. A Likert scale is defined as a method of ascribing quantitative value to qualitative data, to make it amenable to statistical analysis. A numerical value is assigned to each potential choice and a mean figure for all the responses is computed at the end of the evaluation or survey.

2. In their most recent report released for 2013, Independentsector.org estimates the value of volunteer time to be $19.05 per hour.
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A.2 Survey Instructions

Memorandum

To: CCWP Staff and Volunteers
CC: Allison Brody
From: M.A.R.S. Consulting Group, UNLV Student Evaluation Team
Date: 6/24/2014
Re: Volunteer and Visitor Survey Instructions

Background
The Clark County Wetlands Park has recently partnered with students in UNLV’s Greenspun College of Urban Affairs to conduct an evaluation of certain aspects of the Wetlands Park programs. This opportunity will allow students to gain practical experience in program evaluation, while also providing feedback to Wetlands Park staff. A student evaluation group will be distributing two brief surveys beginning June 24, 2014 and ending July 8, 2014. There are two surveys - one for volunteers and one for visitors.

The surveys are designed to evaluate volunteer and visitor satisfaction and experiences. Surveys may be filled out electronically or through a paper form. In addition, the survey will be distributed via e-mail to volunteers, and posted on social media for visitors.

Instructions
Surveys may be filled out online (preferred) or in person by request (visitors and volunteers may ask the information desk for a paper copy of the surveys). Please keep paper visitor and volunteer surveys in separate piles. Again, these surveys will be available from June 24 – July 8.

For visitor surveys: Please provide the survey flyer to all visitors that you interact with. Explain that the survey can be accessed online by visiting the Wetlands Park Facebook page. If the visitor wishes to fill out the form in person, please provide them with a paper survey.

For volunteer surveys: Volunteer surveys will be distributed via e-mail to all volunteers by a Wetlands Park staff person. Please encourage all volunteers to check their e-mail for the survey and fill it out. Some individuals may need to be called to be notified or reminded to take the survey.
**A.3 Volunteer Survey Introductory Letter**

---

**UNLV School of Environmental and Public Affairs**

University of Nevada Las Vegas
Greenspun College of Urban Affairs
4505 S. Maryland Pkwy.
Las Vegas, NV 89154

June 24, 2014

Dear Volunteers,

The Clark County Wetlands Park (CCWP) recently agreed to partner with UNLV’s School of Environmental & Public Affairs to allow students in the Masters in Public Administration (MPA) program the opportunity to assess and evaluate the Wetlands Park Volunteer Program. In an effort to gain additional information regarding the Wetlands Park volunteer program, our student evaluation group, M.A.R.S. Consulting Group, will be distributing a brief survey to current CCWP volunteers beginning June 24, 2014 and ending July 8, 2014.

The survey is designed to evaluate volunteers’ satisfaction and experiences with CCWP’s volunteer program. Surveys will be available in both an online and hardcopy format. You may access the online survey link via the Wetlands Park Facebook page, or request a hardcopy survey inside the Exhibit Gallery. Should you choose to complete a hardcopy of the survey, please return your completed survey to the information desk in the Exhibit Gallery. The results of the survey will provide the CCWP staff members with detailed feedback regarding various aspects of the program, and allow the student evaluation group to compile an in depth assessment of the current volunteer program.

Should you have questions regarding the survey, please contact Stephanie Holguin via phone (702-250-5427) or email (HolguinS@unlv.nevada.edu).

We would sincerely appreciate your participation in this survey. Thank you in advance for your support and participation.

Sincerely,

M.A.R.S. Consulting Group, MPA Students

Greenspun College of Urban Affairs
Greenspun College of Urban Affairs
University of Nevada, Las Vegas

---

Greenspun College of Urban Affairs
Box 454030 • 4505 S. Maryland Parkway • Las Vegas, NV 89154-4030 • Main: 702-895-4400 • Fax: 702-895-4436
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A.4 Volunteer Survey Email Introduction

Email introduction was sent to current CCWP volunteers by Allison Brody and Chris Leavitt on behalf of M.A.R.S.

Hello, Wetlands Gang!

Students from the UNLV Greenspun School of Public Affairs, MPA Program approached us at Wetlands about the possibility of taking on a real-life project. They have experience with evaluating various Volunteer programs, and were very much interested in doing an evaluation of our Volunteer Program.

We love information, and like the idea of giving you all a chance to tell us about your experiences in the Wetlands Volunteer Program. This information will help us make this Volunteer Program the best it can be. Tell us what you think! Your responses will be anonymous. Anyway, just follow this link to complete the survey: https://www.surveymonkey.com/s/WLPVolunteerSurvey

We also have hard copies if you prefer filling it out by hand (drop by the office) – and please call if you have any questions or issues.

As always, thanks for your time and all that you do!

Chris and Allison
A.5 Volunteer Survey (four pages)

VOLUNTEER SURVEY

(Please handwrite or circle your answers)

1. How long have you been volunteering at Wetlands Park? ________

2. Approximately how many hours do you volunteer per month? ________

3. Are you currently volunteering as much as you would like to? (Place an X next to your answer)
   __ Yes
   __ No – I would like to volunteer more
   __ No – I would like to volunteer less

4. If you would like to volunteer more, how many additional hours per month would you be willing to volunteer? ________

5. If you would like to volunteer less, how many hours would you like to subtract per month? ________

6. Which of the following describes your role as a volunteer? (Check all that apply)
   __ Education Facilitator
   __ Exhibit Facilitator
   __ Information Host
   __ Trailkeeper (Wetlands Watcher)
   __ WHO Team Leader
   __ Other ________

7. How well were your volunteer position and responsibilities explained to you in the following situations: (Place an X in the box with your answer)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Fully Explained</th>
<th>Explained</th>
<th>Partially Explained</th>
<th>Not Explained</th>
<th>Not Applicable</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>During your initial orientation:</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>During ongoing training sessions:</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

8. As a result of attending training, how prepared did you feel to meet the responsibilities of your position? (Place an X in the box with your answer)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Very Prepared</th>
<th>Adequately Prepared</th>
<th>Somewhat Prepared</th>
<th>Not Prepared at All</th>
<th>Not Applicable</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>After your initial orientation:</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>After ongoing training sessions:</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

9. Which of the following types of training would help you be more effective as a volunteer (Check all that apply):
   __ Customer service
   __ General park information
   __ Technical training (information about plants, animals; teaching skills)
   __ Other ________
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10. To what extent do you agree with the following statements:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Statement</th>
<th>Strongly Agree</th>
<th>Agree</th>
<th>Undecided</th>
<th>Disagree</th>
<th>Strongly Disagree</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>I feel supported by the staff to accomplish my volunteer duties:</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The staff thinks the work I do is useful and important:</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The visitors think the work I do is useful and important:</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

11. How would you rate the QUALITY of the following volunteer benefits?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Benefit</th>
<th>Excellent</th>
<th>Above Average</th>
<th>Average</th>
<th>Below Average</th>
<th>Extremely Poor</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Appreciation Gifts:</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Potlucks/ Dinners:</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Uniforms:</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

12. How would you rate the IMPORTANCE of the following volunteer benefits?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Benefit</th>
<th>Very Important</th>
<th>Important</th>
<th>Moderately Important</th>
<th>Of Little Importance</th>
<th>Unimportant</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Appreciation Gifts:</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Potlucks/ Dinners:</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Uniforms:</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

13. Is there any need or gap in service you have noticed that might have potential for additional volunteer work (not necessarily by you)?
   ___ Yes
   ___ No
   ___ If yes, please specify: ____________________________________________

14. Do you have a professional skill, expertise or training that has never been put to use in your volunteer work at Wetlands Park (but you would be happy to share)?
   ___ Yes
   ___ No
   ___ If yes, please specify: ____________________________________________

15. Do you feel the facilities are adequately staffed (by paid staff)?
   ___ Understaffed
   ___ Adequately
   ___ Overstaffed

Additional comments:
________________________________________________________________________________________
________________________________________________________________________________________
________________________________________________________________________________________
16. What do you enjoy most about volunteering at Wetlands Park? (Check all that apply)
   ___ Interacting with visitors
   ___ Interacting with other volunteers
   ___ Interacting with staff
   ___ Being outdoors
   ___ Doing good in the community
   ___ Feeling appreciated
   ___ Other (please specify):

17. What are 3 things that would make your volunteer experience even more enjoyable?
   1. _____________________________________________
   2. _____________________________________________
   3. _____________________________________________

18. I plan to continue as a Wetlands Park Volunteer.
   ___ Strongly Agree
   ___ Agree
   ___ Somewhat Agree
   ___ Somewhat Disagree
   ___ Disagree
   ___ Strongly Disagree

Demographic Questions (Circle the appropriate answer)

1. Gender
   Male
   Female
   Other

2. What is your age?
   Under 18 years old
   18 – 29 years old
   30 – 39 years old
   40-49 years old
   50-64 years old
   65 years and over
   Rather not say

3. Approximately what is your household income?
   $0 - $9,999
   $10,000 - $19,999
   $20,000 - $29,999
   $30,000 - $39,999
   $40,000 - $49,999
   Answers continued on next page-----------------
$50,000 - $59,999
$60,000 - $69,999
$70,000 - $79,999
$80,000 - $89,999
$90,000 - $99,999
$100,000 - $149,999
$150,000 or more
Rather not say

4. What is the Zip Code of your primary residence? ________________________

5. What is the highest level of education you have completed?
   Some high school
   High school graduate
   Some college
   Trade/technical/vocational training
   College graduate
   Some postgraduate work
   Post graduate degree

6. Which of the following best describes your current employment status?
   Employed full time
   Employed part time
   Unemployed
   Retired
   Student
   Rather not say

7. Are you the parent or guardian of any minor children?
   Yes
   No

8. If yes, how old are they? (check all that apply)
   0-5 years old
   6-10 years old
   11-14 years old
   15-18 years old

Thank you for completing the survey!
A.6 Zip Code Map

Visitors (top ten zip codes)

Volunteers (All zip codes)
A.7 Visitor Survey Promotional Flyer

tell us
about your visit!

We want to know about your experiences at Wetlands Park!

Help us further develop our programs and facilities by completing a brief survey.**

Stop by the information desk for a copy of the survey today!

**Survey conducted by UNLV MPA (Masters in Public Administration) student evaluation group in partnership with Clark County Wetlands Park.

Survey results will provide Wetlands Park staff with detailed feedback regarding various aspects of the Park, and allow the student evaluation group to compile an in-depth assessment of the visitors’ satisfaction with Wetlands Park programs, staff and facilities.
Visitor Survey Introductory Letter

University of Nevada Las Vegas
Greenspun College of Urban Affairs
4505 S. Maryland Pkwy.
Las Vegas, NV 89154

June 24, 2014

Dear Wetlands Park visitors,

The Clark County Wetlands Park recently agreed to partner with UNLV’s School of Environmental & Public Affairs to allow students in the Masters in Public Administration (MPA) program the opportunity to assess and evaluate local organizations and programs. In an effort to gain additional information regarding the Wetlands Park volunteer program, our student evaluation group, M.A.R.S. Consulting Group, will be distributing a brief survey to current Park visitors beginning June 24, 2014 and ending July 8, 2014.

The survey is designed to evaluate visitors’ satisfaction and experiences with the Park. Surveys will be available in both an online and hardcopy format. You may access the online survey link via the Wetlands Park Facebook page, or request a hardcopy survey inside the Exhibit Gallery. Should you choose to complete a hardcopy of the survey, please return your completed survey to the information desk in the Exhibit Gallery. The results of the survey will provide the Park staff with detailed feedback regarding various aspects of the Park, and allow the student evaluation group to compile an in depth assessment of the visitors’ satisfaction with Wetlands Park programs, staff and facilities.

Should you have questions regarding the survey, please contact Stephanie Holguin via phone (702-250-5427) or email (Holguins@unlv.nevada.edu).

We would sincerely appreciate your participation in this survey. Thank you in advance for your support and participation.

Sincerely,

M.A.R.S. Consulting Group, MPA Students

School of Environmental & Public Affairs
Greenspun College of Urban Affairs
University of Nevada, Las Vegas

Greenspun College of Urban Affairs
Box 454030 • 4505 S. Maryland Parkway • Las Vegas, NV 89154-4030 • Main: 702-895-4440 • Fax: 702-895-4436
VISITOR SURVEY

(please handwrite or circle your answers)

1. How often do you visit Wetlands Park?
   - Daily
   - Once a week
   - Once a month
   - Once a year
   - More than once a year but less than once a month
   - Never

2. During the last year, how many times did you visit Wetlands Park?
   - None
   - 1-10
   - 11-20
   - 21-30
   - Greater than 30

3. What was the purpose of your most recent visit to Wetlands Park? (Check all that apply)
   - Walk/run trails
   - Bike trails
   - Visit Nature Center
   - School Field Trip
   - Education program/class/event
   - Volunteer
   - Other, Please Specify

4. Who did you visit the Park with?
   - No one, I enjoy the Park alone
   - My Spouse
   - My child (1)
   - My children (2 or more)
   - A group of friends, colleagues, or other associates

5. During your most recent visit, did you interact with a representative of the Wetlands Park?
   - Yes
   - No

6. If yes, was it a volunteer or staff member?
   - Volunteer
   - Staff member
   - Unsure
7. If no, why weren’t you assisted?
   No one was around
   Someone was around but seemed preoccupied
   I didn’t require assistance

8. How would you rate your satisfaction with the following aspects of the representatives service:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Very Satisfied</th>
<th>Satisfied</th>
<th>Neutral</th>
<th>Unsatisfied</th>
<th>Very Unsatisfied</th>
<th>Not Applicable</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Attitude:</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Knowledge:</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Overall helpfulness:</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ability to answer all of your questions:</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Additional Comments:

_____________________________________________________________________________
_____________________________________________________________________________
_____________________________________________________________________________

9. How would you rate the staffing levels of the facilities?
   Understaffed
   Adequately Staffed
   Overstaffed

10. Do you plan on returning to the Wetlands Park in the future?
    Yes
    No
    Unsure

11. Have you heard about the Wetlands Park volunteer program?
    Yes
    No

12. Would you be interested in volunteering at the Wetlands Park?
    Yes
    No
    Unsure

13. Do you have any additional comments about your visit to the Wetlands Park?
    ___________________________________________________________________________
    ___________________________________________________________________________
    ___________________________________________________________________________
    ___________________________________________________________________________
Demographic Questions (Circle the appropriate answer)

1. **Gender**
   - Male
   - Female
   - Other

2. **What is your age?**
   - Under 18 years old
   - 18 – 29 years old
   - 30 – 39 years old
   - 40-49 years old
   - 50-64 years old
   - 65 years and over
   - Rather not say

3. **Approximately what is your household income?**
   - $0 - $9,999
   - $10,000 - $19,999
   - $20,000 - $29,999
   - $30,000 - $39,999
   - $40,000 - $49,999
   - $50,000 - $59,999
   - $60,000 - $69,999
   - $70,000 - $79,999
   - $80,000 - $89,999
   - $90,000 - $99,999
   - $100,000 - $149,999
   - $150,000 or more
   - Rather not say

4. **What is the Zip Code of your primary residence?** ____________________________

5. **What is the highest level of education you have completed?**
   - Some high school
   - High school graduate
   - Some college
   - Trade/technical/vocational training
   - College graduate
   - Some postgraduate work
   - Post graduate degree
7. Which of the following best describes your current employment status?
   Employed full time
   Employed part time
   Unemployed
   Retired
   Student
   Rather not say

8. Are you the parent or guardian of any minor children?
   Yes
   No

9. If yes, how old are they? (check all that apply)
   0-5 years old
   6-10 years old
   11-14 years old
   15-18 years old

Thank you for completing the survey!

A.10 Visitor Comments for the Survey Question: “How would you rate your satisfaction with the representatives?”

- Many new questions, deeper understanding
- Helpful and encouraging about hummingbird miles.
- Great facility
- The staff has always been helpful and welcoming. The Nature Tykes teachers are fabulous.
- Great staff
- After looking over the exhibits and the class, I will change my way of teaching to move interactive hands on lessons.
- Instructor from Park District very informative.
- Great people here
- The volunteer, named Pam, showed us some of the exhibits and directed us to a nature walk.
- I have on walks run into park staff and volunteers and they are always seem more than willing to answer questions.
- When we've had questions, the representatives have always been helpful and patient. However, we visit often, so we don't need assistance each time.
- Your staff/volunteers that run the programs for the kids are awesome!
## A.11 Additional Visitor Survey Comments

### UNLV Grad-Wetlands Park Visitor Survey

**Q13 Do you have any additional comments about your visit to the Wetlands Park?**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>#</th>
<th>Responses</th>
<th>Date</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td><strong>Suggestions</strong> Fabulous opportunity need more teaching</td>
<td>7/10/2014 12:43 PM</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td><strong>Positive feedback</strong> Excellent place to bring visitors - did early morning bird watching program</td>
<td>7/10/2014 12:41 PM</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td><strong>Positive feedback</strong> My grandson said &quot;Way Cool&quot;. I came last time right before your opening - I've taken daughter and grandson on the trails. Nice, nice, nice!</td>
<td>7/10/2014 12:36 PM</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td><strong>Suggestions</strong> Trail names and signs would be helpful</td>
<td>7/10/2014 12:33 PM</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td><strong>Positive feedback</strong> Nature center- perfect stop with my kids on a hot summer day!</td>
<td>7/10/2014 12:31 PM</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td><strong>Positive feedback</strong> Excellent education for my grand nieces and nephew</td>
<td>7/10/2014 12:26 PM</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td><strong>Positive feedback</strong> The refrigerated drinking fountains and air conditioning in the visitors center were a joy.</td>
<td>7/10/2014 12:22 PM</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td><strong>Positive feedback</strong> Love it here!</td>
<td>7/10/2014 12:20 PM</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9</td>
<td><strong>Suggestions</strong> Better marking of trails</td>
<td>7/10/2014 12:12 PM</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10</td>
<td><strong>Positive feedback</strong> I was very impressed with the layout of the park and the opportunities it offered to observe nature. Paths are beautiful, trails seem endless, and observation points are well placed.</td>
<td>7/10/2014 12:10 PM</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11</td>
<td><strong>Positive feedback</strong> A little oasis in the desert. I was unaware of. I'm glad I discovered it through the educational training program. Now I can voice my new learned knowledge in the classroom and with family and friends.</td>
<td>7/10/2014 12:06 PM</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12</td>
<td><strong>Positive feedback</strong> Lots of improvement</td>
<td>7/10/2014 12:03 PM</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13</td>
<td><strong>Positive feedback</strong> I loved it! Never had the opportunity to come before, but I'd love to come back!</td>
<td>7/10/2014 11:58 AM</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14</td>
<td><strong>Positive feedback</strong> Wonderful opportunity to get close and appreciate nature and will ensure to bring students and family in the future!</td>
<td>7/10/2014 11:53 AM</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15</td>
<td><strong>Positive feedback</strong> I loved visiting such a beautiful and tranquil environment.</td>
<td>7/10/2014 11:50 AM</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16</td>
<td><strong>Suggestions</strong> Allow dogs</td>
<td>7/10/2014 11:32 AM</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17</td>
<td><strong>Positive feedback</strong> The video was very good. Visitor nature center was well done and kept us interested.</td>
<td>7/10/2014 11:30 AM</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>18</td>
<td><strong>Positive feedback</strong> We have always loved the wetlands park. It just keeps getting better! We tell all our friends about it!</td>
<td>7/10/2014 11:21 AM</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>19</td>
<td><strong>Positive feedback</strong> Beautiful facility</td>
<td>7/10/2014 11:17 AM</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20</td>
<td><strong>Suggestions</strong> Spanish guided tours for seniors would be greatly appreciated!</td>
<td>7/3/2014 12:42 AM</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>21</td>
<td><strong>Positive feedback</strong> <strong>Suggestions</strong> Loved the park. Wish they had more programs oriented to the 6-10 age group.</td>
<td>7/2/2014 3:24 PM</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>22</td>
<td><strong>Positive feedback</strong> This was our first visit, and we plan to return.</td>
<td>7/2/2014 12:32 PM</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>23</td>
<td><strong>Suggestions</strong> I prefer dogs over bicycles</td>
<td>7/2/2014 11:08 AM</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>24</td>
<td><strong>Positive feedback</strong> I enjoy having a great nature park in the city. Very restful and a good place to take bird photos.</td>
<td>7/2/2014 10:48 AM</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>25</td>
<td><strong>Positive feedback</strong> We were passing thru and saw it. Very nice place to visit</td>
<td>7/2/2014 10:47 AM</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>26</td>
<td><strong>Positive feedback</strong> I love the outdoor areas at the park as they are different than other parks. Las Vegas's water! I also was happy to see new development going on. The last time I was there, I will soon be teaching in CCSD and hope to use some of the resources at the visitors center.</td>
<td>7/2/2014 10:08 AM</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### UNLV Grad-Wetlands Park Visitor Survey

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>ID</th>
<th>Feedback Type</th>
<th>Feedback</th>
<th>Date/Time</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>27</td>
<td>Positive</td>
<td>Although I am not interested in volunteering at this time, I would be in the future. I consider the Wetlands Park to be more enjoyable and educational than the Springs Preserve.</td>
<td>7/2/2014 9:44 AM</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>28</td>
<td>Negative</td>
<td>I think this is a great place! Many don't know it even exists. Which I love for myself because the anonymity of it keeps it quiet for me and my children. But I do know that without enough business programs such as this cannot go on. My kids love going here and so do I. Sadly the homeless patrons have tried using it for a place to camp out/live which I feel for them and can't blame them. However I do know that it can deter visitors. However I still recommend it to a lot of people to visit.</td>
<td>7/2/2014 9:38 AM</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>29</td>
<td>Neutral</td>
<td>Easy to get lost on the trails, even with map. Could there be more &quot;You are here&quot; signs showing how to get back to the Centre.</td>
<td>7/2/2014 9:36 AM</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>30</td>
<td>Positive</td>
<td>Just enjoy it every time I visit. It is also 10 minutes from my house.</td>
<td>6/25/2014 9:30 PM</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>31</td>
<td>Positive</td>
<td>Because it is closer to us, we most often visit the Duck Creek trails part of the park. We loved our visits to the main park and Nature Center, however!</td>
<td>6/25/2014 11:42 AM</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>32</td>
<td>Positive</td>
<td>We always have a great time here! The paths are great and we almost never take the same path twice. We like to pack a lunch and eat during the near the big bridge. We love seeing the progress that has been made in this park over the last 4 years. Great park! Thank you!!</td>
<td>6/25/2014 11:01 AM</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>33</td>
<td>Suggestions</td>
<td>Cub/Boy Scouts partnerships. Summer activities moved to earlier in the day?</td>
<td>6/25/2014 10:57 AM</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### A.12 Cost Benefit Analysis: Without a Full-Time Volunteer Coordinator Position

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Wetlands Park Cost Benefit Analysis Table</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Cost/Benefit</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-------------------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Without Vol. Coord.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Vol. App. 1 Year (150)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Uniforms</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total Projected Net Costs</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cumulative Total Projected Net Costs</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Vol. Benefit</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total Projected Net Benefits</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cumulative Total Projected Net Benefits</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### A.13 Cost Benefit Analysis: With a Full-Time Volunteer Coordinator Position

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Wetlands Park Cost Benefit Analysis Table</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Cost/Benefit</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-------------------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>With Vol. Coord.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Vol. App. 1 Year (150)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Uniforms</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total Projected Net Costs</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cumulative Total Projected Net Costs</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Vol. Benefit</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total Projected Net Benefits</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cumulative Total Projected Net Benefits</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
A.14 Ideal Staffing Plan

CCWP Ideal Staffing Plan

Wetlands Park hours of operation: Monday – Sunday 9am-3pm

Total hours open per week = 42

Total hours open per year = \( (6 \times 365) = 2190 \)

**Ideal Staffing:**

- Exhibit hall (floaters to explain and answer questions) = 2
- Exhibit hall front desk = 2
- Information Desk = 1
- Wetland Watcher = 4
- Education facilitator (8 guides per walk Available Tues/Thurs) = 8
- Wetlands: Hands On! Team Leads = 10 (once per month)

**Total staff needed per day:**

- Monday, Wednesday, Friday, Saturday, and Sunday = 9
- Tuesday and Thursday = 17
- One Saturday per month (Wetlands: Hands On! Team Leads) = 10