



SECTION 4: PUBLIC INVOLVEMENT

Public involvement was, and continues to be, an important aspect of preparing this plan and developing goals to best serve the parks and recreation needs of our community. Several methods were used to obtain public comment.

Public Survey:

The District conducted a Community Attitude and Interest Survey during May and June of 2005 to help establish priorities for the future development of parks and recreation facilities, programs and services within the community. This survey was designed to obtain statistically valid results from households throughout the District. The survey was administered by Leisure Vision, Inc. using both mail and phone surveys.

Leisure Vision worked extensively with District officials in the development of the survey questionnaire. These efforts resulted in the survey being tailored to address issues of strategic importance in order to better plan for the future of the District.

In May of 2005, surveys were mailed to a random sample of 2,003 households in the Si View Metropolitan Park District. Approximately three days after the surveys were mailed, each household that received a survey received an electronic voice message encouraging them to complete the survey. Additionally, about two weeks after the surveys were mailed, Leisure Vision began contacting households by phone, either to encourage completion of the mailed survey or to administer the survey by phone.

The goal was to obtain a total of 400 completed surveys. This goal was accomplished, with 407 surveys having been completed. The results of the random sample of 407 households have a 95% level of confidence with an accuracy of +/-4.8%.

The survey results include benchmarking data, which allows the District to compare results against the Leisure Vision national database of over 100 communities. The benchmarking comparisons are provided in each of the key finding categories.

Key Findings:

A complete copy of the executive summary is included in Appendix B. The following represents key findings from the survey:

- ***Frequency of Use of District Parks and Facilities***
Each of the three District facilities (Si View Community Center, Si View Pool and Si View Park) had between 52% and 58% of respondents indicate that they had visited the facilities at least once during the past year. It should also be noted that each of the three facilities had between 15% and 18% of respondents indicate they had visited them at least monthly during the past year.



- ***Quality of Si View Parks District Parks and Facilities***

Respondents were asked to rate the quality of the parks and facilities (Si View Community Center, Si View Pool and Si View Park) that they and members of their household had visited during the past year.

Rating	District	National Average
Excellent	9%	29%
Good	63%	53%
Fair	26%	13%
Poor	2%	2%
Don't Know	0%	3%

- ***Participation in District Programs***

Respondents were asked if they or other members of their household had participated in any recreation programs offered by the District during the past 12 months.

Response	District	National Average
Yes	34%	29%
No	66%	71%

- ***Quality of District Programs***

Respondent households that had participated in programs offered by the District during the past 12 months were asked to rate the quality of the programs they participated in.

Rating	District	National Average
Excellent	32%	32%
Good	56%	54%
Fair	11%	10%
Poor	1%	2%
Don't Know	0%	2%

- ***Way Respondents Learned About Programs and Activities***

From a list of seven options, respondents were asked to indicate all of the ways they learn about District programs and activities. A benchmarking comparison is not available for this question.

Rating	Response
Recreation Program Guide	60%
Word of Mouth	46%
Newspaper	44%
Program Fliers at School	26%
At Community Center/Pool	21%
District Website	12%
District Office	5%



- ***Most Important Parks and Recreation Facilities***

From a list of 24 parks and recreational facilities, respondents were asked to select the four that are most important to them and members of their household.

Category	District	National Average
Walking and Biking Trails	41%	40%
Indoor Swimming Pools	38%	17%
Natural Areas	25%	21%
Indoor Fitness Facilities	22%	19%
Large Community Parks	21%	19%
Indoor/Outdoor Pool	18%	N/A
Youth Soccer Fields	17%	8%
Small Neighborhood Parks	17%	31%
Playgrounds	15%	23%
Outdoor Pools	15%	17%
Picnic Shelters	14%	12%
Indoor Recreation Centers	13%	20%
Senior Recreation Center	9%	9%
Youth Baseball Fields	8%	10%
Gym Space/Indoor	8%	8%
Indoor Ice-Rink	7%	6%
Outdoor Tennis Courts	6%	7%
Skateboard Parks	4%	4%
Pea Patch/Gardens	4%	N/A
Youth Softball Fields	3%	4%
Outdoor Basketball Courts	3%	6%
In-Line Hockey Rink	2%	4%
Football Fields	1%	3%
Adult Softball/Baseball Fields	1%	6%



- ***Most Important Functions for the District***

From a list of 12 functions performed by the District, respondents were asked to select the three they think are most important for the District to provide. A benchmarking comparison is not available for this question.

Category	Importance
Operate Parks/Facilities that are Well Maintained	45%
Operate Si View Community Center and Pool	38%
Provide places for Indoor Recreation	34%
Provide Places for Outdoor Sports	32%
Provide Activities for Teens	28%
Provide Activities for Toddlers and Youth	22%
Preserve the Environment and Open Space	18%
Provide Special Events for All Ages	18%
Provide Trails that Connect Neighborhoods	11%
Provide Activities for People with Disabilities	9%
Coordinate with other Recreation Service Providers	7%

- ***Support for Actions to Improve Parks and Recreation Needs***

From a list of 10 actions the District could take to improve parks and recreation needs in the community, respondents were asked to indicate their level of support for each one. A benchmarking comparison is not available for this question.

Action	Importance
Renovate Si View Pool	50%
Renovate Si View Park	43%
Develop Walking and Biking Trails	43%
Develop New Indoor/Outdoor Aquatic Center	40%
Obtain Land for Undeveloped Natural Areas	40%
Renovate Si View Community Center	39%
Obtain Land to Develop for Passive Use	39%
Develop Athletic Fields	36%
Obtain Land to Develop for Active Sports Uses	27%
Develop and Indoor Ice-Skating Facility	18%



- ***Actions Respondents Are Most Willing to Fund***

From the list of 10 actions the District could take to improve parks and recreation needs in the community, respondents were asked to select the four they are most willing to fund with their tax dollars.

Action	Funding Priority
Renovate Si View Pool	46%
Renovate Si View Park	37%
Develop Walking and Biking Trails	36%
Develop New Indoor/Outdoor Aquatic Center	35%
Renovate Si View Community Center	33%
Obtain Land to Develop for Passive Use	29%
Obtain Land for Undeveloped Natural Areas	29%
Develop Athletic Fields	28%
Obtain Land to Develop for Active Sports Uses	19%
Develop and Indoor Ice-Skating Facility	12%

Si View Neighborhood Meetings:

The Board of Commissioners holds an annual neighborhood meeting for residents living in the Si View Neighborhood. Participants are invited to share feedback on a number of issues including parking and traffic challenges, field and park usage, program development and management of large events such as the Festival at Mt. Si. The minutes from past meetings are included in Appendix C.

Community Meeting:

Prior to preparation of this comprehensive plan, the Board of Commissioners held a meeting to obtain input from the community on present and future parks and recreation services in the Snoqualmie Valley. Numerous user groups were invited including Snoqualmie Valley Little League, the Snoqualmie Valley Youth Soccer Association, the Meadowbrook Farm Preservation Association, Indoor Playground, the Mt. Si Senior Center, the North Bend Educational and Cultural Association (Festival at Mt. Si.), the Chamber of Commerce, Encompass, HUB, and staff and officials from the City of North Bend, the City of Snoqualmie and the Snoqualmie Valley School District. Notices were posted at various locations in the community and personal invitations were sent to the previously identified groups. The meeting minutes for the Community Meeting are included in Appendix C.

Joint Park Board Meetings:

The District actively participates in Joint Park Board Meetings with the Cities of North Bend and Snoqualmie in addition to the Snoqualmie Valley School District. The goal of this group is to establish opportunities for partnerships in seeking grant funding, developing facilities and managing programs and services. This group meets a minimum of three times per year and all meetings are open to the public.



Board of Commissioners Annual Retreat:

The Board of Commissioners holds an annual retreat to review goals and to establish a work plan for the upcoming 12-24 months. Previous retreats have included invited guests from neighbor agencies including the City of Issaquah.

Public Hearing:

Upon completing the first draft of this plan, the Board of Commissioners held a Public Hearing to receive testimony on the plan. Feedback from the hearing in addition to Board recommended changes were included in the final draft of this plan.

Ongoing Feedback:

The District receives input from the general public on an ongoing basis. The five-member Board of Commissioners holds three public meetings each month for the purpose of conducting the business of the District. The meetings are open to the public and comments and feedback on District operations are always welcome.

District Staff and Commissioners:

The District staff have contact with parks and recreation patrons on a daily basis via e-mail, the website, in-person conversations and written correspondence. The Board of Commissioners are also very accessible and receive numerous comments and suggestions from community members. This contact provides a forum for staff to receive advice, comments, feedback, assessment and praise. This feedback from the public is held in high regard and is used to improve daily operations and to help shape the development of long-range plans.

City of North Bend Park Plan:

The City of North Bend conducted numerous public hearings and meetings in the development of their 2002 Park Plan and subsequent updates. Their Park Plan, in addition to the feedback received via their public process contributed to the development of the District's Comprehensive Plan.