- **Main Branch/Loop:** Recommendations specific to the downtown sections of the corridor included increasing the safety of walkway areas, increasing the continuity of the riverwalk, and developing more cafes and restaurants that can be reached on foot and by boat. The proposal to develop a riverboat gambling facility near the downtown area was a major topic of discussion, and opinions were mixed on what the city should do:

  [Chris]…I think it would probably improve the quality of our building, as far as we could get more out of our condo and things like that. It would improve our value because I think if it would be done, they would have to make sure they did it right and it would beautify the area instead of degrading the area, and they would have to be responsible for that branch of the river, too.

  [Chuck] I say if it does come, I say put it on a boat instead of Navy Pier.

  [Gene] I think it's ridiculous to put it on a boat when you've got all this undeveloped land. We're talking about 30,000 jobs. What is the point in having it, what Daley is talking about now is a moat, a moat boat, that's basically it. That's ridiculous, why not just build it on the ground? People come to Chicago, the rest of the state lives off Chicago. Definitely put it on land. We're talking about two billion dollars worth of development.

  [Chris] It doesn't matter to me.

  [Bradley] I don't like it. I don't like organized crime, period.

  [Mary Anne] I think we're still lucky to have such a wonderful resource like the Chicago River and the whole lakefront, and anything that gives people more access to that, I think it should be utilized. There is a certain charm and sense of freedom that you get on a boat that goes along with recreation, gambling, or being in a nightclub atmosphere. I think it's a lot of fun.

- **South Branch/Chinatown:** Recommendations by Chinatown participants for their stretch of the river were to increase river cleanup efforts, and develop park space and a riverwalk along the South Branch. Some participants were concerned that while increased river development might be good for the local economy, shoreline restaurants, recreational boating operations, and the like would not meet the needs of Chinatown residents:

  [Facilitator] Is there potential in your neighborhood for this kind of development?

  [Brian1] None that I see.

  [Ken] No, not in my neighborhood…you know, you have to consider if people can afford that type of thing.

- **Cal-Sag Channel/Palos:** Recommendations included cleanup of the river, restrictions on further industrial development, some limited commercial-recreational development including the construction of a marina (already proposed), and enhancement of recreational opportunities with path development along the shore of the canal. Palos participants were highly concerned that further development should respect and enhance the natural qualities that now exist:

  [Jim] I'd just really like to see them continue with their efforts to clean it up. As far as developing along it, try to preserve as much of the wildness as you can. Keep it clean, keep it simple…

  [Ann]…I think there is great potential there and I would just love to see that developed as they have talked about through the years, and having some little areas where there are restaurants or recreational facilities so that you could stop to watch the ducks or whatever.

  [Ed] Maintain its current natural setting, don't really upheave the whole thing to make it professional looking. Let it be the natural look. And make it accessible to people so that they don't have any fear about walking through it, either.

  [Helen] I want it kept pretty much the way it is. I like the way it is.

  [Marie] I pretty much feel the same way, I'd like to clean it up, not a lot of building and things but I would like a marina where you could stop in and walk. Of course, the path sounds great.

- **Calumet River/Pullman-Blue Island:** Participants would like to see their river enhanced for recreational and business opportunities. But before any development can happen, they overwhelmingly stressed the need to clean up the river and adjacent landfill:

  [Regina] If they cleaned up Mount Trashmore that would be a big help. A lot of the pollution coming into the Cal-Sag is coming from Indiana and they are not stopping it because it's Indiana's so it's coming over the border and polluting everything. If they cleaned up the river, even if they got 30 percent of it out of there, it would make the area a little bit nicer. You know, it would bring some of the summer boating in and some of the people back, and maybe rebuild the area around there.

  [Jennifer] I think what she said about Mount Trashmore is holding up a lot. I think the water should be cleaned up—it's a living thing, it needs to breathe basically. I think it needs to be cleaned somehow, just to bring the life back to it—it's like a big sludge puddle.

PART IV CONCLUSIONS

This study provided some insights into how an important constituent group, nearby neighborhood residents, perceive and use the Chicago River corridor. Although many specific thoughts and ideas were generated from the different focus group exercises and discussions, these findings can be condensed into three general themes to guide future planning efforts: the issues of central importance, the dynamics of the corridor, and the means to successful implementation of planning goals and objectives. We conclude this chapter with a brief discussion of each theme.

- **The Issues: Water Quality, Naturalness, Aesthetics, Maintenance, Safety, Access:** These six issues emerged time and again during the focus group discussions—from initial discussions of ideal settings for recreation, to perceptions of the river in participants' neighborhoods, to preferred features of river scenes, to suggestions for future development. Although these issues helped define what was important to the study participants, the various ways in which the issues were talked about revealed the specifics of what participants felt they had, didn't have, and wanted to have. With water quality taking the lead, a comprehensive understanding of these issues will help ensure the success of planning, management, and programs for the Chicago River and other urban river corridors being considered for improvement. This study has provided the basis for such an understanding, and it has shown not only the importance of these issues, but also their complex, multidimensional nature.

- **The Dynamics: Change, Variability, Diversity, Context, Appropriateness:** Although the six issues mentioned above might be thought of as required considerations for urban river corridor enhancements, another underlying but important theme conveyed frequently in this report signals caution to those wishing to apply any wholesale solutions to corridor planning, management, and programs. This theme refers to the dynamics of the corridor, dynamics that have temporal, spatial, social, and personal components to them. The corridor is diverse, both geographically and socially, and this diversity is reflected in the varied ways in which focus group participants talked about the present and desired condition of the river in their neighborhood. Solutions to river corridor problems must therefore be appropriate to their context. Even within a neighborhood or reach there will be multiple values and attitudes toward a given issue, and thus solutions need to accommodate differences or work toward consensus. Finally, it must be recognized that perceptions and uses of the river corridor will continue to change as more and more improvements are made. As is generally the case with environmental quality improvements, as people come to recognize the value of the resource they demand more of it. For the Chicago River corridor, demands for recreation development will no doubt increase as the environment of the corridor improves; corridor planners and managers should begin now to think about what this could mean, not just in the near future, but 30 to 50 years from now as well. In some cases, this will mean capitalizing on opportunities for land protection and enhancement in areas that currently do not receive much use or attention, while in other cases it will dictate stronger actions toward ensuring the continued balance of river uses for industry and commerce along with recreation. Either way, research such as this can help identify policy directions to help guide long-range decisionmaking.

- **The Means to Success: Awareness, Knowledge, Use, Experience, Concern, Action:** The final theme expressed in study findings is a critical one to keep in mind for planning, management, and program implementation. The success of future efforts in the corridor will depend largely on the receptivity of the corridor constituents, a receptivity that begins with awareness and knowledge, which in turn can lead to use and experience of the resource, and might ultimately result in concern and positive actions to protect and enhance the resource. This study showed the difficulty of realizing such a turn of events, for the awareness and knowledge of river and river improvement activities tend to be very localized and can drop off dramatically the further away people live from a given stretch of river. To the extent that the public can be informed about the river and improvement activities through news stories and features and through on-site information such as signs and facility tours, perceptions can be formed or improved. Sincerity is the key to any informational program, for misleading claims could work against the best intentioned of efforts.

  Use and experience are the essential counterparts to information for establishing an appreciation and concern for the corridor. Land and water trails can be ideal for bringing people into direct contact with the resource; and in many cases can become educational as well as recreational experiences for participants. Guided tours, an important way to reach and target particular audiences, can "initiate" those unfamiliar with the resource and who might not otherwise seek it out on their own.

  Public participation in resource management activities is one increasingly popular and successful way to accomplish environmental improvement goals; it has been used successfully by the Friends of the Chicago River and other environmental groups in Chicago and elsewhere. River restoration programs include river cleanup, ecological restoration of vegetative communities, and water quality monitoring. The direct interaction with the environment the activities offer participants is more than a recreational or social experience, and many who become involved in restoration find it provides them with deep aesthetic, symbolic, and spiritual values (Jordan, 1993).

In conclusion, this chapter offers some ideas for how we might better plan for river improvement by understanding the perceptions and preferences of one important user and interest group: nearby neighborhood residents. Knowing the issues and their dynamics is the important first step to action, but engaging the public to assist in action will surely be the key to success.

APPENDIX 2.1
FOCUS GROUP MODERATOR GUIDE

I. Introduction (5 minutes)

A. Written Exercise—Worksheet 1: Have participants complete background questionnaire including demographic questions.

II. Free Associations, Ratings and Imagery (15 minutes)

A. Written Exercises—Worksheets 2 & 3: Have participants free associate and rate on a 0 degree (cold/negative) to 100 degree (warm/positive) scale a list of general and area-specific landmarks and/or outdoor recreational developments, including "The Chicago River in Your Neighborhood."

B. Imagery Exercise—Worksheet 4: Pass out boxes of crayons and have participants draw a picture of "The Chicago River in My Neighborhood." When finished, have them turn the sheet over and complete the sentence: "I am the Chicago River in your neighborhood. I am…"

III. Outdoor Recreation Behavior and Attitudes (15 minutes)

A. Activities

1. Discussion: What outdoor recreation activities have you done in your neighborhood during the last 12 months? What about other members of your household?

B. Motivations

1. Written Exercise—Worksheet 5: Have participants list words and phrases that would describe their ideal setting for outdoor recreation activities in their neighborhood.

2. Discussion: People want to get outside to recreate in their neighborhood for different reasons. What do you want out of your outdoor recreation activities? Why do you do the things you do? Where in your neighborhood do you go? Why do you choose a particular site or setting over another one? Specific probes: importance of adjacent land use, water quality, environmental quality, feeling of wildness, aesthetics, access, facility development, safety, and congestion.

IV. Chicago River Imagery (35 minutes)

A. Discussion: Results of Free Association Exercise—Worksheet 2. Probe for specific reasons for associations to "The Chicago River in Your Neighborhood."

B. Discussion: Results of Rating Exercise—Worksheet 3. Probe for specific reasons for ratings of "The Chicago River in Your Neighborhood."

C. Discussion: Results of Imagery Exercise—Worksheet 4. Have people discuss their drawings and descriptions of the river in their neighborhood; probe for features or feelings included in their imagery.

D. Discussion: Specific Probes—Thinking about the Chicago River in your neighborhood, how do you feel about adjacent land use? Water quality? Environmental quality? Feelings of wildness? Aesthetics? Access? Facility development? Safety? Congestion? Why?

V. Chicago River Corridor Development (20 minutes)

A. Development Scenarios

1. Written Exercise—Worksheet 6: Show participants pictures of river corridor development exhibiting different aesthetic, land use, and recreational opportunity options. Have them rate and record their comments about each picture.

2. Discussion: Reasons for your ratings? Which pictures show the kind of development you'd like to see for the Chicago River corridor? Should there be different kinds of development along the river? Are there specific places that should have a certain kind of development?

B. Attitudes and Suggestions for River Improvement

1. Discussion: What principles should guide development of the Chicago River in your neighborhood? What would you like to see done and not done? What final message would you give to river corridor planners and managers for improving the river corridor, in your neighborhood or elsewhere?

APPENDIX 2.2
FOCUS GROUP CODING PROCESS

CODING PROCESS

To begin the coding process, we first thoroughly familiarized ourselves with the tapes and transcripts. Upon each iteration (up to 9 iterations per focus group), codes were formulated and revised until a system was developed for accurately and reliably coding participants' responses. Using a combination of statistical software packages including the Text Analysis Package (TAP) Version 1.0 (Drass, 1986) and SYSTAT for Windows Version 5 (SYSTAT Inc., 1992), we coded each response made by a person to identify:

1) The ***response*** itself—the unique number of the response, the individual who made it, and the group he or she was in;
2) The ***context*** in which the response was made—whether or not the response dealt with the river, whether it dealt with current perceptions and uses or future prospects and alternatives;
3) The pertinent ***issues*** conveyed in the response—general issue of concern (e.g., safety) and specific issue of concern (e.g., falling in the water).

In practice, each response received three response codes, one of five context codes, and up to three issue codes. The TAP program was used to code the context and issue codes; however, because TAP is limited to a maximum of 4 codes per response, some of the more lengthy and complex responses were split to adequately capture the number of issues they addressed. The box shown here gives a typical example of a how a respondent's comment was coded from the transcript.

EXAMPLE

In response to the facilitator's lead question, the respondent answers with three activities he and his family often engage in close to home:

1 2 nr1 h110 h150 h170 *[Mark] Walking, bicycling, rollerblading.*

Response Coding: The first two columns identify the respondent's focus group number and the unique number assigned to this comment. The text itself includes the respondent's name in brackets.

Context Coding: The third column identifies the context code, indicating the comment referred to the one (in bold italics) of five context codes below that described activities in general, not specifically associated with the Chicago River.

- yr References to activities, places and perceptions related to the Chicago River
  - yr1 Current conditions, perceptions, and uses of the river
  - yr2 River development prospects & alternatives—including activities they would like to do
  - yr3 Response to photographs of river development—Use photo numbers yr31 to yr37
- nr References to activities and places not on the Chicago River
  - ***nr1 Activities currently engaged in, generally or in other places but not on the river***
  - nr2 Ideal settings for recreation

Issue Coding: Columns 4-6 include codes for each of the activities mentioned by the respondent. The issue codes provide information of a hierarchical nature, from general to specific. At the most general level, the 3 activities each fell into letter "h" of "k" general categories:

a. River place names and locations
b. History and river facts
c. Characteristics of the river landscape
d. Current condition and maintenance
e. Reputation of the river
f. Current and future development
g. Access issues
h. Recreation activities
i. Safety issues
j. Crowding, conflict, other social issues
k Demographics

Although each of the issue codes can be accessed on this general level, actual responses were assigned codes of a much more specific nature. Within the "Recreation activities" general category, codes 100-900 were used to assign the activities to a more specific activity category:

h100	***Linear and solo active activities***	h400	Water activities	h700	Winter sports
h200	Passive activities	h500	Active group sports	h800	"Urban" activities
h300	Children's activities	h600	Nature and arts activities	h900	Community-based activities

Finally, at the most specific level (for this issue), codes 10-70 were used to identify the specific activities mentioned:

h110	***Walking***	h140	Walking pets	***h170***	***Biking***
h120	Running, jogging	***h150***	***Rollerblading, skating***		
h130	Exercising	h160	Skateboarding		

CODEBOOK

Context Codes (use "p" extension to indicate specific place names on or off the river)

yr References to activities, places, and perceptions related to the Chicago River
- yr1 Current conditions, perceptions, and uses of the river
- yr2 River development prospects & alternatives—including activities respondents would like to do
- yr3 Response to photographs of river development—Use photo numbers yr31 to yr37

nr Reference to activities and places not on the Chicago River
- nr1 Activities that respondents currently engage in generally or in other places but not on the river
- nr2 Ideal settings for recreation

ISSUE CODES

A River place names and locations
- A101 Problems in identification of river name
- A102 The river system and branches; connectivity of the system
- A103 Colloquial names for the river—ditch, canal, channel, etc.
- A104 West Fork of North Branch
- A105 Middle Fork of North Branch
- A106 East Fork of North Branch/Skokie River, Skokie Lagoons
- A107 North Branch
- A108 North Shore Channel
- A109 The Chicago River downtown
- A110 South Branch
- A111 Sanitary and Ship Canal
- A112 Cal-Sag Channel
- A113 Calumet River
- A114 Little Calumet River
- A115 Other rivers not in the system
- A116 Specific places along river

B History and river facts, perceptions, and misperceptions
- B100 Exploration, settlement, and establishment of Chicago
- B200 Reversing the flow
- B300 Digging the channels
- B400 Early landscape of Chicago—marsh and prairie lands

C Characteristics of the river and landscape
- C100 Physical characteristics of the river proper
  - C110 Wide
  - C120 Narrow
  - C130 Straight
  - C140 Bends, curves
  - C150 Deep
  - C160 Shallow
  - C170 Pond, lake
  - C180 Walled shore
  - C190 Natural shore
- C200 Physical characteristics/features of the built environment
  - C210 Architecture—buildings/skyline
    - Bridges (use F489)
    - Boats (use H430 - H440)
- C300 Physical characteristics/features of the natural environment
  - C310 Vegetation—plants and landscapes
    - C311 Trees
      - C311a Mature trees
      - C311b Trees too small
    - C312 Bushes
    - C313 Grass
    - C314 Flowers
    - C315 Prairie; wildflowers and grasses
    - C316 Wetland, floodplain
    - C317 Forest, woods (see also F430 for references to forest preserves)
    - C318 Native, historic, or indigenous landscape; natural environment; rare or endangered natural landscape
    - C319 Wild brush, pioneer vegetation
    - C31a Green
  - C320 Wildlife
    - C321 Deer
    - C322 Birds
    - C323 Small animals; foxes and coyotes
    - C324 Mosquitos, bugs
    - C325 Rats
    - C326 Shorebirds and waterfowl
    - C327 Other water wildlife (e.g., frogs and turtles)
  - C330 Sun, shade
  - C340 Hills and topography
- C400 Evaluative characteristics
  - C410 Aesthetic and affective attributes—general statements "like" and "love" the river, landscape
    - C411 General views, sightseeing
    - C412 Beauty, scenic, attractive, awesome
    - C413 Peace, solitude, quiet, relaxing, uncrowded, secluded
    - C414 Pleasant, nice feeling, appealing
    - C415 Freedom
    - C416 Fresh air, clean air
    - C417 Clean (place)
    - C418 Escape, refuge
    - C419 Contrast of nature with the city/green-built, etc.
    - C41a Naturalness, lack of development
    - C41b Boring, dull, no feeling for it
    - C41c Gray, drab
    - C41d Cold, sterile
    - C41e Uninviting, not "people friendly"
    - C41f Just don't like it
  - C420 Functional attributes of the river—generally
    - C421 For drainage, prevents or controls flooding
    - C422 For recreation
    - C423 For transportation
    - C424 For sewage disposal
  - C430 Economic attributes
    - C431 Riverboat gambling
    - C432 Industry and commercial activity will create jobs

D Condition and maintenance of the river landscape
- D100 General statements about cleaning, care, and maintaining the river environment (water, shore)
  - D110 Manicured
  - D120 Messy, untended
  - D130 Stewardship, respect for nature, personal responsibility
  - D140 Condition is good considering its urban nature (context)
- D200 Improvement plans, information about improvement efforts
  - D2A00 Water quality condition
    - D2A10 Clean water
    - D2A20 Pollution—general statements of "dirty," "filthy," "gross," etc.

D2A30 Smell
D2A40 Toxics
D2A40 Color
D2A41 Dyeing the river green on St Patrick's Day
D2A50 Turbidity, etc.
D2A60 Natural debris—floating, sunken, etc.
D2A70 Dumping and littering of stuff in the river (not naturally caused)
D2A80 Fish—as indicators of/referents to water quality; restocking efforts
D2A81 Presence of fish, types of fish that live in the river
D2A82 Eating the fish
D2A90 Flooding
D2B00 Water quality maintenance: pollution control
D2B10 General statements of making the water clean or cleaner
D2B20 Water aeration/filtration
D2B21 Waterfalls
D2B22 Devon aeration facility
D2B23 Centennial fountain
D2B30 Water garbage pickup efforts
D2B31 Downtown skimmer boats
D2B32 Condition and maintenance along shore (non-water, non-vegetative)
D2B40 Dredging/cleanup
D2B50 Deep Tunnel
D400 Landscape and facility condition and maintenance—shoreline, land, & facilities
D410 General statement on care, maintenance
D411 Good care
D412 Poor care
D420 Land based cleanup efforts (not community based)
D430 Eroded
D440 Litter
D450 Dog litter
D460 Graffiti
D470 Vandalism
D480 Landfill
D500 Vegetation condition and maintenance
D510 Unmaintained vegetation, generally
D520 Overhanging trees, overgrown and in need of trimming
D530 "Manicured," formal
D540 Plant more trees and flowers, more landscaping needed
D550 Loss of native vegetation
D560 Barren, lack of landscaping
D570 Plant wildflowers

E Reputation of the river
E100 Change in environmental (water/land) quality over time
E110 Has improved
E120 Has stayed the same
E130 Has gotten worse
E200 Change in environmental quality as a function of location
E300 Comparisons with Lake Michigan
E400 Prospects for environmental quality improvement
E410 Good
E420 Poor

F River recreation use and development
F100 Prospects of river development
F110 Development shouldn't proceed until water is cleaned up
F120 Development can go ahead even if water isn't clean
F140 Balance of recreation with "working river"
F150 Low prospects for development/improvement
F200 Development mix
F210 All natural, preserve wildness
F220 Mostly natural
F230 Mix of natural and developed
F240 Mostly developed
F300 Compatibility/context of development
F310 Compatible, appropriate for this setting
F320 Too artificial, urban, or overdeveloped
F330 Too wild
F340 Keep it like it is
F350 More recreational development needed
F400 Open space development
F410 Recreation facilities in general
F420 Parks and plaza areas
F430 Forest and nature preserves
F440 Golf courses
F450 Private clubs
F460 Playgrounds
F470 Fishing and boating
F471 Ramps
F472 Marinas, boatyards, and rental places
F473 Fishing docks, piers
F480 Facility development
F481 Trails and paths
F481A Blacktopped
F481B Unpaved
F482 Benches
F483 Lights
F484 Attractive paving
F485 Fencing (see also Access-fencing and Safety-fencing)
F486 Restrooms
F487 Fountains and statuary
F488 Buildings—fieldhouses and pavilions
F489 Bridges
F48a Athletic facilities—playing courts, etc.
F48b Swimming facilities
F490 Open space protection activities
F491 Acquisition
F492 Easement
F493 Regulation of land use
F494 Regulation of users
F495 Enforcement of pollution control
F496 Leasing
F500 Development types
F510 Residential
F511 Property values—gain or loss
F520 Commercial—restaurants, cafes, bars, and shops
F530 Industrial
F540 Transportation
F550 Boating-oriented development
F600 Development spectrum
F610 Urban
F620 Suburban
F630 Rural—country
F640 Wild

G Access
G100 In general
G110 Visual access
G200 Convenience, proximity

- G300 Public vs. private land
- G400 Adequacy of public open space and parks
- G500 Adequacy of space for development
- G600 Fencing and access (see also fencing and safety)
- G700 On foot
  - G710 To get right down to the river
  - G720 Continuity of riverwalk
  - G730 Upper and lower levels by downtown
- G800 By car
  - G810 Parking
- G900 Equity in distribution of space and facilities, programs
  - G910 Cost of access to places and programs

H Activities—in general, varied activities
- H100 Linear and solo active activities
  - H110 Walking
  - H120 Running, jogging
  - H130 Exercising
  - H140 Walking pets
  - H150 Rollerblading, skating
  - H160 Skateboarding
  - H170 Biking
- H200 Passive activities
  - H210 Picnicking and BBQing
  - H220 Sitting, relaxing, getting some sun
  - H230 Looking at area (e.g., from home)
- H300 Children's activities
  - H310 Walking children
  - H320 Free play
  - H330 Playground activities
  - H340 Kid's park programs
- H400 Water activities
  - H410 Fishing
  - H420 Swimming, beach
  - H430 Boating:
    - H431 Canoeing, kayaking
    - H432 Motorboating
    - H433 Sailing
    - H43a Paddleboats
    - H434 Tour boats, tours, and river excursions
    - H435 Crewing/rowing
  - H440 Watching river activities, boats, its flow, and the general landscape
  - H450 Playing by or in the river
- H500 Active group sports
  - H510 Baseball
  - H520 Basketball
  - H530 Football
  - H540 Golf
  - H550 Soccer
  - H560 Tennis
  - H570 Volleyball
- H600 Nature and arts activities
  - H601 Nature study
  - H610 Watching, feeding wildlife interaction
  - H620 Art—painting, drawing
  - H630 Film and photography
  - H640 Gardening, lawn maintenance
  - H650 Plant collecting
  - H660 Zoo
  - H670 Cutting wood
- H700 Winter sports
  - H710 Skiing
  - H720 Skating
  - H730 Hockey
  - H740 Snowmobiling
  - H750 Tobogganing
- H800 "Urban" activities
  - H810 Tourism
  - H820 Shopping
  - H840 Festivals
- H900 Community-based activities
  - H910 River cleanup, land cleanup efforts
  - H920 Neighborhood watch/park watch programs
  - H930 Community policing
  - H940 Socializing

I Safety
- I100 General—physical safety
- I200 Falling in the water
  - I210 Fencing or lack thereof
  - I220 Body contact with water
- I300 General—personal safety, safe from crime, security
- I400 Vegetation
  - I410 Dense vegetation, foliage as hiding places for criminals and perverts, openness (antonym)
  - I420 Children getting lost in the woods
- I500 Criminal activity, gang activity, selling drugs
  - I510 Perverts, child molesters
- I600 Homeless, panhandlers
- I700 People drinking and/or doing drugs
- I800 Rowdies, yahoos
- I900 Patrols
- IA100 Lighting
- IA200 Visibility
- IA300 People/activity as a deterrent to crime

J Crowding, conflicts, and other social issues
- J100 People
- J200 Car traffic
- J300 Boat traffic and speed
- J400 Noise
- J500 Pets
- J600 Inappropriate behavior
- J700 Management conflicts

K Demographics—references to "all groups"
- K100 Age—reference to "all ages"
  - K110 Young children
  - K120 Teens
  - K130 Middle age
  - K140 Older adults
- K200 Gender
  - K210 Males
  - K220 Females
- K300 Social group composition
  - K310 Singles
  - K320 Couples
  - K330 Families
- K400 Occupation
  - K410 Blue collar
  - K420 Professionals
  - K430 Students
  - K440 Homemakers
  - K450 Retirees
- K500 Ethnicity—references to "all ethnic groups"
  - K510 African American
  - K520 Anglo American
  - K530 Hispanic American
  - K540 Asian American
    - K541 Chinese American

APPENDIX 2.3 STATISTICAL OVERVIEW OF FINDINGS

TABLE 2.3.1
Percentage of context and general issue codes for focus group transcript statements by group

	STUDY AREAS											
	Middle Fork Lake Forest	Skokie Lagoons Glencoe	N. Shore Ch. Evanston-Skokie	N. Branch Ravenswood-Albany Park	North Branch Lathrop	Main Stem Loop	South Branch Chinatown	Cal-Sag Palos	Calumet Pullman-Blue Island	Metro East	Metro West	All Groups
CONTEXT CODES												
Refs. to Chicago River	**76.7**	**86.1**	**82.0**	**80.7**	**79.0**	**94.1**	**69.2**	**89.7**	**90.0**	**84.0**	**60.4**	**81.5**
Current perceptions, conditions, activities	35.7	53.6	51.9	37.6	27.8	50.7	23.1	41.2	61.4	54.3	31.5	42.5
Devt. prospects & alternatives	19.4	9.6	9.8	8.6	15.8	12.5	9.9	36.0	22.9	29.6	7.2	16.1
Responses to photos	21.7	22.9	20.3	34.4	35.3	30.9	36.3	12.5	5.7	0 .0	21.6	21.6
Refs. to other places	**23.3**	**13.9**	**18.1**	**19.4**	**21.1**	**5.9**	**30.8**	**10.3**	**10.0**	**16.1**	**39.6**	**18.5**
Current perceptions, conditions, activities	16.3	6.0	6.0	7.5	10.5	5.2	20.9	2.9	2.9	16.1	27.9	10.6
Ideal settings	7.0	7.8	12.0	11.8	10.5	0.7	9.9	7.4	7.1	0.0	11.7	7.9
Total (%)	**100.0**	**100.0**	**100.0**	**100.0**	**100.0**	**100.0**	**100.0**	**100.0**	**100.0**	**100.0**	**100.0**	**100.0**
Context Codes (n)	**129**	**166**	**133**	**93**	**133**	**136**	**91**	**136**	**70**	**81**	**111**	**1279**
GENERAL ISSUES CODES												
River names	7.5	2.4	12.4	4.6	1.3	0.0	0.8	1.4	0.7	0.6	2.6	3.4
River history & facts	0.0	0.4	1.3	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	1.4	0.0	2.5	3.7	0.9
River characteristics	22.1	23.5	8.9	15.3	17.3	25.2	26.0	14.0	11.7	18.6	25.0	18.9
Condition & maint.	15.6	26.3	14.7	23.9	40.4	7.9	12.2	19.2	54.0	24.2	23.4	22.7
Reputation	.0	2.8	3.1	0.0	1.9	3.7	0.0	2.8	5.1	12.4	7.8	3.6
River development	28.1	21.9	20.0	14.8	16.0	22.0	21.4	40.2	17.5	16.8	18.8	22.1
River access	4.5	2.4	2.7	4.0	4.5	6.5	7.6	2.3	0.0	1.9	0.5	3.3
Activities	15.1	17.5	16.0	15.9	14.1	19.6	21.4	7.9	6.6	17.4	17.2	15.4
Safety	5.5	.8	19.1	20.5	4.5	14.0	4.6	8.9	2.9	4.4	0.5	8.1
Crowding, etc.	1.5	1.6	1.8	1.1	0.0	0.0	1.5	1.9	1.5	0.6	0.5	1.1
Demographic	0.0	0.4	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.9	4.6	0.0	0.0	0.6	0.0	0.5
Total (%)	**100.0**	**100.0**	**100.0**	**100.0**	**100.0**	**100.0**	**100.0**	**100.0**	**100.0**	**100.0**	**100.0**	**100.0**
Issue Codes (n)	**199**	**251**	**225**	**176**	**156**	**214**	**131**	**214**	**137**	**161**	**192**	**2056**

TABLE 2.3.2
Current perceptions of the river—percentage of general issue codes for transcript statements by group

	STUDY AREAS											
	Middle Fork Lake Forest	Skokie Lagoons Glencoe	N. Shore Ch. Evanston-Skokie	N. Branch Ravenswood-Albany Park	North Branch Lathrop	Main Branch Loop	South Branch Chinatown	Cal-Sag Palos	Calumet Pullman-Blue Island	Metro East	Metro West	All Groups
River names	19.5	4.3	22.1	10.5	3.9	0.0	3.1	3.6	1.3	0.0	7.9	7.5
River history & facts	0.0	.7	2.4	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	1.2	0.0	5.1	7.9	1.5
River characteristics	28.6	29.1	8.7	4.0	11.8	21.0	37.5	19.3	11.5	22.8	20.6	19.0
Condition & maint.	24.7	27.0	18.9	27.6	49.0	9.2	31.3	30.1	60.3	25.3	25.4	27.7
Reputation	0.0	5.0	4.7	0.0	2.0	6.7	0.0	2.4	3.9	19.0	14.3	5.5
River development	11.7	12.1	11.0	19.7	7.8	13.5	12.5	16.9	10.3	11.4	11.1	12.6
River access	2.6	0.0	0.8	6.6	9.8	5.0	3.1	0.0	0.0	1.3	0.0	2.3
Activities	9.1	19.2	15.0	10.5	5.9	24.4	12.5	13.3	7.7	13.9	11.1	14.3
Safety	3.9	.7	14.2	21.1	9.8	18.5	0.0	12.1	2.6	1.3	0.0	8.4
Crowding, etc.	0.0	2.1	2.4	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	1.2	2.6	0.0	1.6	1.1
Demographic	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	1.7	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.2
Total (%)	**100.0**	**100.0**	**100.0**	**100.0**	**100.0**	**100.0**	**100.0**	**100.0**	**100.0**	**100.0**	**100.0**	**100.0**
Issue Codes (n)	**77**	**141**	**127**	**76**	**51**	**119**	**32**	**83**	**78**	**79**	**63**	**926**

TABLE 2.3.3
Current perceptions of the river—percentage of specific issue codes related to river characteristics by group

	STUDY AREAS											
	Middle Fork Lake Forest	Skokie Lagoons Glencoe	N. Shore Ch. Evanston-Skokie	N. Branch Ravenswood-Albany Park	North Branch Lathrop	Main Branch Loop	South Branch Chinatown	Cal-Sag Palos	Calumet Pullman-Blue Island	Metro East	Metro West	All Groups
Characteristics of the river proper	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	12.0	8.3	0.0	11.1	11.1	15.4	5.1
Characteristics of the built environment	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	8.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	5.6	23.1	3.4
Characteristics of the natural environment	90.9	68.3	45.5	33.3	33.3	12.0	0.0	62.5	33.3	22.2	0.0	43.2
Vegetation	50.0	4.9	36.4	0.0	16.7	12.0	0.0	18.8	22.2	5.6	0.0	15.3
Wildlife	40.9	58.5	9.1	33.3	16.7	0.0	0.0	43.8	11.1	16.7	0.0	26.7
Other	0.0	4.9	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	1.1
Evaluative characteristics	9.1	31.7	54.6	66.7	66.7	68.0	91.7	37.5	55.6	61.1	61.5	48.3
Aesthetic benefits	4.6	29.3	27.3	66.7	16.7	68.0	50.0	18.8	33.3	55.6	53.9	36.9
Functional benefits	4.6	2.4	27.3	0.0	33.3	0.0	25.0	18.8	22.2	5.6	7.7	9.7
Economic benefits	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	16.7	0.0	16.67	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	1.7
Total (%)	**100.0**	**100.0**	**100.0**	**100.0**	**100.0**	**100.0**	**100.0**	**100.0**	**100.0**	**100.0**	**100.0**	**100.0**
Issue Codes (n)	**22**	**41**	**11**	**3**	**6**	**25**	**12**	**16**	**9**	**18**	**13**	**176**

TABLE 2.3.4
Current perceptions of the river—percentage of key specific issue codes related to condition and maintenance of the river landscape by group

	STUDY AREAS											
	Middle Fork Lake Forest	Skokie Lagoons Glencoe	N. Shore Ch. Evanston-Skokie	N. Branch Ravenswood-Albany Park	North Branch Lathrop	Main Branch Loop	South Branch Chinatown	Cal-Sag Palos	Calumet Pullman-Blue Island	Metro East	Metro West	All Groups
General statements about condition and maintenance	15.8	7.9	0.0	14.3	12.0	0.0	10.0	12.0	4.3	10.0	0.0	7.9
Water quality condition and maintenance	79.0	55.3	91.7	75.8	84.0	90.9	90.0	88.0	89.4	85.0	100.0	82.5
Condition: Key Issues	79.0	39.5	58.3	71.4	72.0	63.6	80.0	52.0	59.6	70.0	93.8	63.3
Pollution (gen.)	*	*	*	*	*	*	*	*	*	*	*	
Smell			*		*				*	*		*
Toxics							*					
Color											*	
Turbidity					*							
Natural Debris	*											
Dumping/litter				*	*	*	*			*		
Fish		*		*	*			*				
Flooding	*		*									
Maintenance: Key Issues	0.0	15.8	33.3	4.8	12.0	27.3	10.0	36.0	29.8	15.0	6.3	19.1
Cleanup (gen.)					*		*		*			
Aeration/filtration						*		*	*			
Garbage pickup						*						
Dredging		*										
Deep tunnel			*									
Landscape/facility condition and maintenance	5.3	31.6	8.3	9.5	4.0	9.1	0.0	0.0	4.3	0.0	0.0	8.2
Vegetation condition and maintenance	0.0	5.3	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	2.1	5.0	0.0	1.6
Total (%)	**100.0**	**100.0**	**100.0**	**100.0**	**100.0**	**100.0**	**100.0**	**100.0**	**100.0**	**100.0**	**100.0**	**100.0**
Issues Codes (n)	**19**	**38**	**24**	**21**	**25**	**11**	**10**	**25**	**47**	**20**	**16**	**256**

*Identified as an issue by around 10% of the group or higher.

TABLE 2.3.5
Ideal settings—percentage of key general and specific issue codes by group

	STUDY AREAS									
	Middle Fork Lake Forest	Skokie Lagoons Glencoe	N. Shore Ch. Evanston-Skokie	North Branch Ravenswood-Albany Park	North Branch Lathrop	South Branch Chinatown	Cal-Sag Palos	Calumet R. Pullman-Blue Island	Metro West	All Groups[1]
Characteristics	25.0	25.0	3.6	7.1	0.0	13.3	52.9	40.0	41.2	21.6
Natural environment	*						*			
Aesthetic surroundings	*	*				*	*	*	*	*
Condition & maintenance	10.0	14.3	0.0	21.4	50.0	6.7	0.0	10.0	11.8	13.2
Clean water								*		
Well-maintained landscape	*			*	*					
Development	0.0	32.1	50.0	14.3	38.9	26.7	11.8	20.0	17.7	25.7
Open space development		*	*	*	*	*	*	*	*	
Access	10.0	10.2	17.9	0.0	0.0	33.3	17.7	0.0	5.9	11.4
Convenience, proximity	*						*			
Activities	20.0	10.2	10.7	7.1	0.0	6.7	11.8	20.0	17.7	11.4
Linear activities	*					*				
Active group sports								*	*	
Safety	20.0	0.0	17.9	42.9	0.0	0.0	0.0	10.0	5.9	10.2
All other issues	15.0	7.1	0.0	7.1	11.1	13.3	5.9	0.0	0.0	6.6
Total (%)	**100.0**	**100.0**	**100.0**	**100.0**	**100.0**	**100.0**	**100.0**	**100.0**	**100.0**	**100.0**
Issue Codes (n)	**20**	**28**	**28**	**14**	**18**	**15**	**17**	**10**	**17**	**169**

*Identified as an issue by around 10% of the group or higher.

[1]This question was not discussed in the Loop or Metro East groups.

TABLE 2.3.6
Photo ratings—percentage of key general and specific issue codes by photo

	PHOTOS							
	Photo 1 Landfill & Boat Landing	Photo 2 Downtown Plaza	Photo 3 Downtown Riverwalk	Photo 4 Industrial Land use	Photo 5 Natural Trail	Photo 6 Natural Bridge	Photo 7 Aeration Facility	All Photos[1]
Characteristics	58.3	22.5	35.1	39.4	36.1	28.2	41.3	34.8
Natural environment			*		*			
Aesthetic surroundings	*	*	*	*	*	*	*	*
Condition & maintenance	16.7	6.1	13.5	12.1	17.4	48.7	21.7	18.6
Water condition & maintenance			*			*	*	
Vegetation and landscape condition & maintenance	*			*	*	*		
Development	0.0	49.0	33.8	42.4	29.1	12.8	30.4	31.6
Development mix					*			
Context of development		*	*	*			*	*
Open space development		*		*	*		*	*
Access	0.0	0.0	4.1	6.1	2.3	5.1	0.0	3.8
Activities	25.0	2.0	6.8	0.0	2.3	5.1	0.0	3.8
Safety	0.0	10.2	6.8	0.0	12.8	5.1	4.4	7.4
All other issues	0.0	10.2	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	1.5
Total (%)	**100.0**	**100.0**	**100.0**	**100.0**	**100.0**	**100.0**	**100.0**	**100.0**
Issue Codes (n)	**12**	**49**	**74**	**33**	**86**	**39**	**46**	**339**

*Identified as an issue by around 10% of the group or higher.

[1]This question was not discussed in the Metro East group.

TABLE 2.3.7
Future potential—percentage of key general and specific issue codes by group

	STUDY AREAS											
	Middle Fork Lake Forest	Skokie Lagoons Glencoe	N. Shore Ch. Evanston-Skokie	N. Branch Ravenswood-Albany Park	North Branch Lathrop	Main Branch Loop	South Branch Chinatown	Cal-Sag Palos	Calumet Pullman-Blue Island	Metro East	Metro West	All Groups
River characteristics	9.1	8.0	11.1	22.2	7.4	40.7	0.0	4.0	2.5	22.6	35.0	12.7
Natural environment				*								
Aesthetics			*			*					*	*
Condition and maintenance	13.6	60.0	14.8	27.8	48.2	7.4	7.7	15.2	60.0	34.0	40.0	28.2
Water condition and maintenance		*		*	*			*	*	*	*	*
Vegetation and landscape condition and maintenance	*	*		*	*				*			
Reputation	0.0	0.0	3.7	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	4.0	10.0	7.6	10.0	3.8
River development	61.4	20.0	11.1	0.0	25.9	37.0	69.2	61.6	25.0	26.4	15.0	37.9
Prospects of river development							*				*	
Development mix	*	*						*				
Context of development	*	*						*				
Open space development	*				*	*	*	*	*	*		*
River access	2.3	4.0	0.0	0.0	3.7	11.1	7.7	2.0	0.0	1.9	0.0	2.5
Activities	4.6	4.0	7.4	27.8	11.1	3.7	15.4	2.0	2.5	0.0	0.0	4.8
Safety	9.1	4.0	48.2	22.2	3.7	0.0	0.0	8.1	0.0	3.8	0.0	8.4
Other issues	0.0	0.0	3.7	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	1.0	0.0	3.8	0.0	1.5
Total (%)	**100.0**	**100.0**	**100.0**	**100.0**	**100.0**	**100.0**	**100.0**	**100.0**	**100.0**	**100.0**	**100.0**	**100.0**
Issue Codes (n)	**44**	**25**	**27**	**18**	**27**	**27**	**13**	**99**	**40**	**53**	**20**	**393**

*Identified as an issue by around 10% of the group or higher.

LITERATURE CITED

Drass, K. A. (1986). *TAP: Text Analysis Program Version 1.0.*

Dwyer, J. F., and Gobster, P. H. (1992). Black/white outdoor recreation preferences and participation: Illinois State Parks. In *Proceedings of the 1991 Northeastern Recreation Research Symposium.* (Gen. Tech. Rep. NE-160, pp. 20-24). Radnor, PA: USDA Forest Service, Northeastern Forest Experiment Station.

Fern, E. F. (1983). Why do focus groups work: A review and integration of small group process theories. In Mitchell, Andrew (Ed.), *Advances in Consumer Research.* Ann Arbor, MI: University of Michigan.

Fielding, N. G., and Lee, R. M. (1992). *Using Computers in Qualitative Research.* Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage Publications, Inc.

Furuseth, O. J., and Altman, R. E. (1991). Who's on the greenway: socioeconomic, demographic, and locational characteristics of greenway users. *Environmental Management,* 15(3): 329-336.

Gobster, P. H. (1995). Perception and use of a metropolitan greenway system for recreation. *Landscape and Urban Planning,* 33: 401-413.

Goldman, A. E., and McDonald, S. S. (1987). *The Group Depth Interview—Principles and Practice.* New York: Prentice-Hall, Inc.

Jordan III, W. (1993). "Sunflower forest": Ecological restoration as the basis for a new environmental paradigm. In Baldwin, A. D., Jr., de Luce, J., and Pletsch C. (Eds.), *Beyond Preservation: Restoring and Inventing Landscapes* (pp. 17-34). Minneapolis: University of Minnesota Press.

Kaplan, R. (1977). Down by the riverside: Informational factors in waterscape preference. *Proceedings: River Recreation Management and Research Symposium* (Gen. Tech. Rep. NC-28, pp. 285-289). St. Paul, MN: USDA Forest Service, North Central Forest Experiment Station.

Kaplan, R., and Talbot, J. F. (1988). Ethnicity and preference for natural settings: A review and recent findings. *Landscape and Urban Planning,* 15: 107-117.

Krueger, R. L. (1994). *Focus Groups: A Practical Guide for Applied Research* (2nd ed.). Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage Publications, Inc.

Moore, R. L., Graefe, A. R., Gitelson, R. J., and Porter, E. (1992). *The Impacts of Rail-Trails: A Study of Users and Nearby Property Owners from Three Trails.* Washington, DC: U.S. Department of Interior, National Park Service, Rivers, Trails, and Conservation Assistance Program.

Schroeder, H. W. (1983). Variations in the perception of urban forest recreation sites. *Leisure Sciences,* 5(3): 221-230.

Silverman, D. (1993). *Interpreting Qualitative Data: Methods for Analysing Talk, Text, and Interaction.* Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage Publications, Inc.

SYSTAT, Inc. (1992). *SYSTAT for Windows, Version 5.* Evanston, IL: SYSTAT, Inc.

Wolcott, H. F. (1994). *Transforming Qualitative Data: Description, Analysis, and Interpretation.* Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage Publications, Inc.

Young, R. A., and Flowers, M. L. (1982). *Users of an Urban Natural Area: Their Characteristics, Use Patterns, Satisfactions, and Recommendations* (For. Res. Rep. 82-84, 5 p.). Urbana, IL: University of Illinois, Agricultural Experiment Station.

NOTES

This project was designed and implemented by the author and by the co-principal investigator Lynne Westphal. The focus groups were arranged and conducted by Adam Davis, Decision Sciences, Inc., Portland, Oregon. This chapter benefited from the helpful comments of Dale Blahna, Department of Forest Resources, Utah State University; Christine Vogt, Department of Recreation and Tourism Management, Arizona State University; Joanne Vining, Institute for Environmental Studies, University of Illinois at Urbana-Champaign; and John Dwyer, Susan Stewart, and Lynne Westphal of the USDA Forest Service.