

## Fall 2022 Aquatic Center Survey Summary Report

January 6, 2023

An online community survey was conducted in the late Fall 2022 (Nov-Dec) to collect input on the August 2022 proposition details, bond measure communication preferences and guidance for future planning.

Seven of the 12 questions were open ended responses proving ample opportunity for feedback. Total of 482 responses were received.

Overall, the results confirm that the proposal is in-line with what the community is looking for, but more detailed information about the project and costs to taxpayers are needed to clarify misinformation that continues to circulate in the community. Majority of the survey respondents are supportive of the project and looking for more campaign style communication, which is not something that the District can directly participate in.

Review of the concerns listed indicates that additional voter education is needed in areas of project funding, the status of current Si View Pool, and the proposed facility details with images where possible. Detailed explanation of the logic for constructing a recreation pool first, before the competition pool, may also be helpful, and how recreation pool features support learn to swim programs and fitness programs in the same space.

There is interest in including other recreation amenities with the aquatic center proposal, however, respondents stated strongly the aquatic center should be the primary focus, and adding amenities is not recommended if it reduces project support due to increased costs.

### Review of questions:

- 420 (87%) of the respondents were District residents, 42 reside out of District, and 19 were unsure.
- 94% of the respondents were either somewhat familiar or very familiar with the August 2022 proposal.
- Respondents ranked the top 3 aquatic center features as:
  - Recreation pool for lessons, fitness and therapeutic programs
  - Parking area
  - 25-yard lap lanes

The features that received the least amount of interest included:

- Dry classroom space
- Zero depth accessible entry
- Community gathering spaces
- In an open-ended question, respondents listed very few items as missing from the 2022 proposal. Nearly half of the respondents (45%) did not feel that anything was missing. Overall cost and desire for more lap lanes/competition pool were identified as the greatest needs for changes in a future proposal. 14% of the respondents indicated there was not enough information about the proposal to know that vote was taking place or to decide.

Competition pool	35	10%
Cost	53	16%
Dry amenities	5	1%
Location	11	3%
Good as is	154	45%
Not enough info	48	14%
Other features	11	3%
Uncategorized	23	7%
Total responses	340	

Note that individual responses have been grouped to categories with similar responses:

- Competition Pool: includes comments for more lap lanes, more deep water, and large competition pool
- Cost: include comments for concerns of cost, sharing cost with other agencies, seeking other funding sources
- Dry amenities: includes requests for fitness center, sport courts etc.
- Location: includes comments with concerns of traffic and not enough parking on proposed site
- No: indicates responses that stated nothing is missing from the proposal as is
- Not enough info: includes responses that called for more advertising, campaigning, citizen education, and comments that indicated respondents had not received enough details about the proposal
- Other features: includes request for aquatic features such as splash pad, outdoor pool, steam room etc.
- Uncategorized: responses that did not fit in to the above categories
- In an open-ended question, respondents were asked if they had any remaining unanswered questions about the 2022 proposal. Majority 79% did not have questions. The uncategorized grouping includes responses related water use, timeline, future of old pool, and information why residents did not vote for the proposal.

Questions about cost	24	8%
Explain need for facility	3	1%
Questions about facility details	9	3%
No questions	228	79%
Uncategorized	19	7%
Questions about location	7	2%
Total responses		290

- General comments about the 2022 proposal echoed similar comments to earlier questions: concerns with cost to taxpayer and District residents paying for a facility that serves the entire Valley, as well as requests for changes to project scope – to either include competition pool first or to scale back the project. Timing of proposal was also thought to be poor, near the time when property assessments arrived.

Campaign needed	39	12%
Cost to taxpayers	53	16%
Disappointed	79	24%
Project scope/site	28	8%
Scale back plans	13	4%
Timing of proposal	16	5%
Uncategorized responses	23	7%
no comments	81	24%
Total responses		332

- When asked how voters learned about the proposal, majority saw it on the ballot (52%); Si View website (41%) and Si View mailer or activity guide (38%) were also common sources. Of the 93 “other” responses, 43% stated word of mouth, 42% social media, and the rest either other news sources or at the pool.

- In an open ended question, participants were asked about what the District could do better with community outreach, recognizing campaign law limitations. Responses were grouped to categories of marketing ideas (social media, specifically NextDoor, signage and flyers), outreach ideas (schools, preschools, clubs, businesses, organizations), ideas for voter education topics, community meeting ideas, and campaigning ideas.

Campaign ideas	24	8%
community meeting	16	5%
Voter education ideas	27	9%
Marketing ideas	90	29%
Outreach ideas/groups	46	15%
Unrelated comments	32	10%
No suggestions	78	25%
Total responses		313

- In an open ended format, participants were asked for input on considerations for a future proposal. Nearly half (47%) indicated the proposal should run again as is. Of others it was fairly even split between adding more features (competition pool and splashpad) or scaling back the proposal. Other recommendations included a wide array of topics such as seeking partners/external funding, finding a different location, educating voters about proposal in more detail.

Run as is	148	47%
Drop proposal	4	1%
Add dry amenities	5	2%
Educate voters	17	5%
Funding considerations	23	7%
Scale back plan	41	13%
Change location	15	5%
Add more (comp. pool)	54	17%
Renovate Si View	4	1%
Timing of proposal	3	1%
Uncategorized	2	1%
Total responses		316

- This question asked if non-aquatic recreation amenities for areas throughout the District, such as pickleball courts and trails, were included in a proposal with the aquatic center, would voters be inclined to support the measure.

Yes            53%

No 27%

Unsure 20%

- In specifying non-aquatic recreation amenities, an open-ended question offered space to provide ideas for such features. Half of the responses said not to include other amenities even if they were supportive of the idea. The list of ideas is extensive, sports courts include: tennis, pickleball, racquetball, basketball, and badminton. Several responses included multiple amenities.

Climbing wall	4	1%
Fields & lights	2	1%
Fitness/weight room	46	13%
Gym	4	1%
Indoor playground	3	1%
Indoor track	2	1%
No other amenities	175	50%
Outdoor fitness	1	0%
Sauna	2	1%
Shelters	19	5%
Splashpad	4	1%
Sports courts	50	14%
Teen center	1	0%
Trails	9	3%
Yoga/dance studio	26	7%
Total responses	348	

The final question of the survey asked for any final comments and voluntary contact information from individuals who had questions and wished to be contacted. This information is not included in this report.