UCLA CENTER FOR HEALTH POLICY RESEARCH

HEALTH ECONOMICS AND EVALUATION RESEARCH

Appendix A: Parks After Dark Evaluation Methods



Appendix A: Parks After Dark Evaluation Methods

Survey Data Analyses Methods

Summer, winter, and spring 2023 PAD attendee surveys were based on a convenience sampling method. See Exhibit 1 for an example of the PAD survey instrument. PAD attendees completed the surveys in English or Spanish when participating in PAD events or activities, whenever possible. Some completed more than one survey if they attended more than one PAD event or multiple nights of PAD. Most attendee surveys were completed electronically (via Survey Monkey) using DPR-provided iPads or attendees' smart phones (scanned using available QR code). Where reliable internet was not available, surveys were completed on paper, entered manually into Survey Monkey, and checked by a Los Angeles DPR staff member for accuracy and completeness. Upon receiving the datasets for winter, spring, and summer seasons from DPR, UCLA cleaned the data, addressed duplicate entries, and analyzed the data using the statistical software STATA 14.

To address duplicate entries in surveys, a unique identifier was created using responses from three survey questions (day of the month you were born, first two letters of the street you live on, and how many siblings do you have). The unique identifier was matched against other unique identifiers in the dataset to determine 1) if there were any duplicate entries and 2) how many times the duplicate entries came up. Duplicate entries were dropped from the dataset so that survey analysis was performed on de-duplicated data. The most recent survey completed was used for duplicate entries.

Frequency tables were created to highlight the distribution of quantitatively measured responses. Attendee survey results are presented by individual park and by PAD Group in Appendix B. Survey results are not reported when fewer than five attendees responded, due to lack of reliability and the inability to generalize the results.

Qualitative theming was conducted for open-ended survey questions. Responses were categorized and select illustrative quotes are provided throughout the report as they relate to PAD goals.

Exhibit 1: Summer 2023 Parks After Dark Participant Survey



Park Name:											
						FIRST 2 letters set you live on:		How many siblings do you have?			
	My ID:						L	Ш			
Pleas	Please answer the following questions about your activity and your community:										
1.	What zip code o	do you live in?	<u> </u>	\perp							
2.	How often do you visit this park (outside of PAD)?										
	□ Daily	y 🗆 Weekly 🗆 Monthly 🗆 1-2 times a Year 🗆 First time									
3.	How many days	low many days per week do you currently exercise (walking, biking, gardening, jogging, playing sports)?									
	□ None	□ 1 day	☐ 2 days	□3	days	☐ 4 days	☐ 5 days	□ 6	days	☐ 7 days	
	3a. On average, about how much time do you spend doing these physical activities/exercises each day?										
	☐ 15 minutes or less ☐ about 30 minutes ☐ about 1 hour ☐ more than 1 hour										
4.	How safe do you feel in your neighborhood?										
	☐ Very safe		☐ Somewh	at safe		☐ Somew	hat unsafe	□ No	□ Not at all safe		
5.	Please tell us ho items:	ow STRONGLY	YOU AGREE (DR DISAGI	REE with	the following	Strongly Agree ©	Agree	Disagree	Strongly Disagree ⁽²⁾	
	I live in a clos	e-knit or unifi	ed neighborho	od.							
	If there is a cr	isis, I have otl	hers I can talk 1	to.							
	PAD is import	ant for my co	mmunity								
Pleas	Please answer the following questions about your experience at PARKS AFTER DARK:										
6.	How did you fin										
	☐ Live in the area/walking by ☐ Flyer ☐ Internet (e.g., website, Facebook, Twitter)										
	□ Somebody told me □ Attended last year □ Other:										
7.	Did you attend	PARKS AFTER	DARK with you	ung childre	en or teer	ns? (check al	l that apply)				
	☐ Children ag	e 0-5	☐ Childre	n age 6-12	2	□ Chil	dren age 13-18		None		
8.	About how ofte	n do you plan	to attend PAR	RKS AFTER	DARK <u>th</u> i	s summer?					
	☐ Once or twice	e	☐ Once a we	ek	□мо	re than onc	e a week	□IW	ill not atter	nd again	
9.	What kinds of physical activity/ exercise did you participate in at PARKS AFTER DARK this summer? (check all that apply)						t apply)				
	☐ Team sports		□ Walking du	b		Exercise of	lass	☐ Swi	mming		
	□ Other □ Did not participate										
	9a. How often do you plan to participate in these activities during PARKS AFTER DARK?										
☐ Once or twice this summer ☐ Once a week ☐ More than once a week											
10. How safe do you feel attending PARKS AFTER DARK? ☐ Not at all safe											
	□ Very safe □ somewhat safe □ somewhat unsafe										
	PLEASE TURN OVER – MORE QUESTIONS (i)										

11.	What made you feel <u>safe</u> at PARKS AFTER DARK? (check all that apply)									
	☐ Deputy Sheriffs ☐ Park staff ☐ People arou				e aroun	nd Positive atmosphere				
	□ Nothing / did not feel safe □ Community Intervention Worker				orker	□ Other	r:			
12.	What do you think	about the numbe	er of Deputy Sherif	fs at PARKS AFT	ER DAR	к?				
	☐ Too mai	_	t right	☐ Not enough		_	not see the	m		
13										
	3. Please tell us how STRONGLY YOU AGREE OR DISAGREE with the following items:							Channels		
	At PARKS AFTER DARK					Strongly Agree	Agree	Disagree	Strongly Disagree •	
		y neighbors better.								
		belonging in my co								
		ariety of resources	s available to me a	ind/or my famil	y (i.e.,					
	health, social ser	rvices). e positively with co	mmunity mamba							
		in activities I can't					 	H	ä	
		ve family atmosph		-			-			
		ety of activities tha				-	 	 	-	
		,								
14.	What years did yo	u go to PARKS AFT	ER DARK at this pa	ark or another p	oark? (ch	neck all that a	pply)			
	2010 2011 2012 2013				2014	2022				
	2015	2016	2017	2018		2019	2023			
15.	What was your <u>fav</u>	vorite PARKS AFTE	R DARK event or a	ctivity? (check o	only one	·)				
	■ Movies ■ Concerts ■ Sports ■ Education ■ Exercise class ■ Arts & cul						culture			
	☐ Swimming ☐ Jumper / games ☐ Other:									
				_						
	i. Would you participate in PARKS AFTER DARK again?									
17.	. Would you recommend PARKS AFTER DARK to others?									
18.	Additional comments or									
	suggestions:									
19.	What is the most i	mportant								
	thing PAD could in	nprove?								
Please de	escribe yourself. All	responses are co	mpletely confiden	ntial.						
20.	What is your age?	-								
	□ 10-15 □ 16-25 □ 26-39 □ 40-59					☐ 60+ ☐ Prefer not to answer			o answer	
21.	. What is your race/ethnicity? (check all that apply)									
	□ Black or African American □ American Indian or Alaskan Native □ Asian									
	☐ Hispanic, Latino or Spanish origin ☐ Native Hawaiian or other Pacific Islander ☐ White									
						refer not to answer				
	■ Some other race.									
22.	What is the prima	ry language you sp	eak at home?	□ Eng	lish	☐ Spanish	□P	refer not to	answer	
				□ oth	ier					
23	8. What was your sex designated or Male Female Non-Binary or X Prefer not to answer									
23.	listed at birth? (check only one):									
	□ Other:									

Crime Data Analyses Methods

To test the impact of PAD on crime rates, comparison parks in Los Angeles County were identified for each PAD Group (Exhibit 2). Comparison parks were selected from a pool of Los Angeles County and City parks with facilities suitable for hosting PAD programming. Comparison parks were matched to PAD parks based on demographics, including race and ethnicity, household income, and crime rates in the communities living near the parks during the year prior to PAD implementation. Communities near the parks were defined as Census Tracts that were within a one-mile radius of the park. When a Census Tract was within one mile of multiple parks, it was attributed to the park with the shortest distance between the center of the park and center of the Census Tract.

Exhibit 2: PAD Comparison Parks, 2023

Match by Cohort (Year Joined PAD)	Comparison Parks				
PAD Group One (2010)	Manzanita Park				
	Hollenbeck Park (City of Los Angeles)				
	Adolfo Medina Memorial Park				
PAD Group Two (2012)	Louise Park				
	Banning Park and Museum				
	Two Strike County Park				
PAD Group Three (2015)	Las Palmas Park				
	Paramount Park (City of Paramount)				
	Lugo Park				
PAD Group Four (2016)	Golden Park				
	Louise Park				
	Lincoln Park (City of Los Angeles)				
	Veterans Memorial Park				
	Scott Park				
	York Field				
	Richie Valens Park				
	Bristow Park				
	Rio Vista Park (City of Pico Rivera)				
	Manzanita Heights				
	Adolfo Medina Memorial Park				
	Maywood Riverfront Park				
PAD Group Five (2017)	Clara Park Expansion				
	Lakeview Park				
PAD Group Six (2018)	John Zimmerman Park				
	Lynwood Park				
	Carriage Crest Park				

Match by Cohort (Year Joined PAD)	Comparison Parks
	Gingrich Park
	Westmont Park
	Dexter Park
	Chet Holified Park
	Deputy Pierre W. Bain Park
	Joshua Hills Park
	Avenue Park
PAD Group Seven (2022)	Spane Park

Part I and Part II daily crime rates were created by calculating the ratio of number of crimes during the summer PAD period to the total population in the associated Census Tracts using LASD/LAPD and Census population data. The PAD period was specific to the timeframe for start of the PAD program in all parks for a given year. UCLA calculated a daily crime rate during the PAD program per year to increase comparability of rates across parks and over time. This method addressed variations in park specific timelines, as: 1) PAD operation is concentrated during summer months and for a short period of time (3 days a week, 6-9 weeks) and 2) the number of days of PAD varies from year to year; therefore, using a daily rate makes crime comparable over time.

UCLA conducted additional analysis to attribute changes in crime rates over time to PAD implementation using difference-in-difference, or DD methodology. This analysis included examination of crime trends in PAD parks to similar comparison parks before and after PAD implementation using regression models. Comparison of the change between regression-based predicted rates for PAD and comparison parks is a more robust analyses method than comparing actual rates between these groups.

Note that the data presented on changes in crime rates in this report are not directly comparable to previous evaluation reports due to due to multiple methodological differences including selection of comparison parks and Census tracts.

Methods for Calculating Cost of Crime Savings

The literature cites a significant amount of uncertainty in estimating the cost of crime. UCLA estimated the cost of crime by taking the average for specific Part II crime categories based on an extensive literature review; these estimates give value to intangible social costs of crime, in addition to the costs to law enforcement. Cost estimates were inflated to 2023 dollars using the Bureau of Labor Statistics Consumer Price Index calculator.

The cumulative Part I crime reduction, since PAD's inception, was estimated at 74 Part I crimes avoided during PAD operation from 2009-2023. The proportion of the most common Part I crimes were calculated looking at the total number of each crime type in PAD operation months from 2009-2023 in PAD assigned Census Tracts. The proportion of Part I crime type was multiplied by the estimated reduction of Part I crimes attributable to PAD to estimate the reduction by type. Cost savings were then calculated by crime type avoided.

Reliable estimates were not available for all categories of Part II crime and were therefore not included in the analysis.

Key Informant Survey and Interview Methods

Key informants from agencies involved with PAD administration, planning, and implementation were sent a survey by email. Contacts were identified by DPR and DPH PAD program leads; contacts from LASD were identified by the scheduling Sergeant at LASD, Parks Bureau. The open window for the survey was approximately three weeks in November 2023, but was extended until the end of January 2024 to collect additional responses. Key topics of the survey included: PAD affiliation and background, perception of PAD impact as it related to each of the seven PAD goals, implementation challenges and successes, general recommendations, and utilization of PAD participant survey data. The survey had 40 questions with a mixture of multiple choice, Likert scale perception ratings, and free response prompts for additional qualitative narrative. A total of 24 key informants participated in the survey, with the majority from DPR (71%).

Follow-up group interviews were conducted with select and representative key informants (n=17 interviews with n=55 key informants). Key informants were from DPR (42), DPH (5), DMH (4), LASD (2), and DEO (2). Seventeen total interviews were conducted with the majority from DPR (71%). A protocol was followed for each interview, and participants were also given the opportunity to provide feedback and reflect on their individual experience with PAD.

Integrated Transport and Health Impacts Model (ITHIM) Methods

PAD participant surveys were used to estimate routine (baseline) levels of physical activity and physical activity attributable to PAD. PAD program schedules provided by DPR were used to estimate the average activity time for broad categories of physical activity offered through PAD (e.g., team sport, aquatics, walking club, exercise class, etc.). ITHIM was adapted to incorporate routine and PAD physical activity levels. The activity calculation was an aggregate measure considering both the 1) length (measured by hours/week) and 2) intensity of physical activity (measured by metabolic equivalents of task, METs). The physical activity METs calculations were aggregated across all responses and quintiles (10%, 30%, 50%, 70%, and 90%) of routine and PAD physical activity METs were calculated based on gender and age. The age categories from the PAD participant survey did not perfectly match those used by ITHIM; similar age categories were combined where necessary to more closely match the model. The model's impact was standardized to the size of the PAD population using the estimated number of person activity visits at PAD and accounting for those individuals who attended PAD at least once a week and participated in physical activity.

Specific assumptions used for the model include:

- ITHIM is designed to assess the impact of physical activity levels annually, while PAD programming was only available to participants for eight weeks during the summer months. Therefore, the level of activity in the models was assumed to be for an entire year (i.e., PAD participants continue at their "PAD level" year-round).
- PAD participants were assumed to engage in a given physical activity program for the total length of time the activity was scheduled.
- The survey did not identify what type of physical activity the individual participated in for the baseline estimate, therefore METs for general gym exercise were used (5.5 METs).