

AGENDA
GIG HARBOR PARKS COMMISSION MEETING
Wednesday, June 7, 2023 – 5:30 p.m.
Community Rooms

Optional Virtual Meeting Link: <https://us06web.zoom.us/j/92140715051>
Call-in: (253) 215-8782 Meeting ID: 921 4071 5051

- I. CALL TO ORDER / ROLL CALL**
- II. APPROVAL OF MINUTES:** May 3, 2023
- III. PUBLIC COMMENT**
- IV. DISCUSSION ITEMS**
 - A. Crescent Creek Park Master Plan Update
 - B. Sports Complex Phase 2 & 3 Feasibility project update
 - Selection of Park Commissioner Representative to Stakeholder Group
 - C. Parks Funding Survey
- V. STAFF REPORTS**
 - A. Parks Division Update – Parks Manager Jennifer Haro
 - B. City Administration Update – City Clerk Josh Stecker
- VI. COMMISSIONER REPORTS & COMMENTS**
- VII. ADJOURN**

Next Regular Meeting: August 2, 2023 (July meeting cancelled)

MINUTES
GIG HARBOR PARKS COMMISSION MEETING
Wednesday, May 3, 2023 – 5:30 p.m.
Community Rooms

CALL TO ORDER / ROLL CALL: Chair Ben Coronado called the meeting to order. Commissioners Les McCallum, Louise Tieman, Justin Teerlinck and Stephanie Lile were present. Stace Gordon and Doug Smith were excused.

APPROVAL OF MINUTES: The minutes of the April 5, 2023, Parks Commission meeting were unanimously approved.

DISCUSSION ITEMS:

Skansie Brothers Park Rotary Paver Proposal – Parks Manager Jennifer Haro introduced a proposal to replace existing pavers at Skansie Brothers Park with pavers honoring past Rotary members. The commission supported the proposal

North Creek Conservation Properties Naming Proposals – The commission reviewed name proposals for the recently acquired conservation properties. The commission unanimously recommended two naming options for the city council to consider – “txʷaalqəł Conservation Area” and “Donkey Creek Reserve.”

STAFF REPORTS:

- 1. Parks Division Update** – Jennifer Haro provided a recap of Parks Appreciation Day and other Parks activities.
- 2. City Administration Update** – City Clerk Josh Stecker reported on a recent survey on trees and other upcoming surveys.

ADJOURN: The meeting adjourned at 6:46 p.m.

Joshua Stecker, CMC
City Clerk



MEMORANDUM

DATE: June 6, 2023

TO: Gig Harbor Parks Commission

FROM: Josh Stecker, City Clerk

SUBJECT: FlashVote Parks Funding Survey Results

Survey results on parks funding were released on May 25. The full results are available here: <https://www.flashvote.com/gig-harbor-wa/surveys/park-funding-05-23>. The results have filters so you can view the responses by age, property owners, residency status, etc.

First, a few notes on our FlashVote survey pool since this is our first survey with real, useable data. 187 Gig Harbor city residents (people of voting age inside city limits) took the survey. Demographically-speaking, we got a very accurate sample of likely voters represented in the pool.

Gig Harbor “likely” voters are people who voted in either the 2022 November general election or the 2023 February special election (or both). There are approximately 7,500 likely voters based on this data.

- 52% of likely voters are age 61 or older
- 28% are age 46-60
- 20% are age 31-45
- 10% are age 18-30

Our survey responses break down like this:

- 59% of responders were age 61 or older
- 24% were age 46-60
- 15% were age 31-45
- 1% were age 18-30 (this age group is notoriously difficult to represent in surveys and we’ll be working with FlashVote to try to increase this number)

As you can see, the survey results are in the same ballpark as the likely voter results. The survey opinions of voters over 60 are slightly over-emphasized with other voters' opinions being deemphasized the younger they get.

The survey pool size of 187 participants is considered to be a statistically reliable pool with a margin of error around 7%.

What this shows us is that FlashVote is a very useful tool for hearing what voters think, which is great for this survey because we want to hear from voters.

In other types of surveys where we want to hear from *residents* or the *community*, we may need to do a little deeper diving. We know from the 2020 census that 25% of Gig Harbor's population is age 65 or older. We also know that 25% of the population is age 18 or under. The older resident population is doubly represented in the surveys while 25% of the population is virtually unrepresented. Its something to keep in mind when we ask questions about parks usage in the future.

.....

Since we have established that the survey is a solid representation of likely voters, **what did we learn in this survey?**

- 1. 73% of respondents would support a new 20-year tax levy to replace the expiring \$3.5 million bond.** Only 10% preferred to not have a parks levy going forward. Coincidentally (or not) the February 2023 School District levies and the August 2022 Fire District levy were also approved by Gig Harbor voters at around 73%--roughly 7-8 points higher than the overall district approval ratings.

Roughly half of respondents would support an \$8 million bond. Because a 60% majority is needed to pass the bond, an \$8 million levy may be beyond the support of the community without increased messaging about projects and need.

- 2. Support for funding parks projects by levy is varied.** Only one project (a trail connecting the Cushman Trail to downtown) received a majority of support from the survey respondents.

• Cushman Trail connector	62% supported
• Senior Center/Community Center	42%*
• Sports Complex Phase 2	41%
• Skate Park Playground	39%
• Maritime Pier	35%
• Cushman Trail Phase 5	28%
• Sports Complex Phase 3	24%
• Commercial Fisherman's Homeport	21%
• Wilkinson Barn	17%

*Senior Center/Community Center support may be under-represented, as we had a few comments in the survey that implied that responders may have thought that constructing the center would require removal of trees in the forest.

.....

It's also important to identify **what the survey *didn't* tell us**. This survey only asked responders what they would be willing to pay additional property taxes to fund. If we asked the question "*what parks projects do you support?*" it is almost certain that the support numbers would rise for every project.

These survey results should not be interpreted to mean that the community does not support a given project just because support for additional taxes was low. This list *might* provide a general ranking of project priorities. Some lower support numbers *might* be an indicator that the projects are not widely supported by the community. But these are not the questions asked by this survey.