

To access the Agenda and Backup Materials electronically, go to www.gjcity.org



Parks and Recreation Advisory Board Agenda

Lincoln Park Barn

May 5, 2022

12:00 PM

Call to Order

Approval of Minutes

Approve minutes of April 7, 2022 Meeting

Regular Agenda Topics

Community Recreation Center Survey Results

Meeting Schedule Change

Orchard Mesa Pool Renovation

Fireworks Special Event

Dos Rios Playground

For the Good of the Community

Future Agenda Topics

Adjournment

Next Meeting Date

Parks and Recreation Advisory Board Minutes

Regular Meeting – April 7, 2022

Meeting Location: Barn – Lincoln Park

Roll Call

Board Members Present: William Findlay
Kyle Gardner
Cindy Enos-Martinez
Phil Pe'a
Gary Schroen
Austin Solko
Nancy Strippel
Michele Vion
Lisa Whalin
Byron Wiehe

Board Members Absent:

City Staff Present: Ken Sherbenou, Director of Parks and Recreation
Rob Davis, Parks Supervisor Forestry and Open Space
Allison Little, Administrative Specialist

Meeting called to order by William Findlay at 12:05 p.m.

Approve Minutes from the March 3, 2022 Parks and Recreation Advisory Board Meeting

Lisa Whalin made a motion to approve the minutes from the March meeting. The motion was seconded by Kyle Gardner and carried unanimously.

Motion by the Parks and Recreation Advisory Board: Yes 9 No 0

Parks Supervisor Presentation – Rob Davis

Rob Davis talked with the Board about his area of supervision. Recently Rob worked with a company to do a tree canopy assessment. This assessment shows \$30M in annual savings based on stormwater runoff reduction, air quality improvement and 166,000 tons of carbon sequestered. Rob showed the board the tree canopy website. In general there is 11% canopy cover in Grand Junction and the recommendation is 25% canopy cover. (For comparison, Phoenix has a 25% canopy cover.) The website further breaks down the canopy cover by land use, which shows where canopy is low or decreasing. The website will also calculate what is required to raise canopy coverage. For example, raising schools coverage from 5% to 10% would take 750 trees. Tools such as this help staff make data driven recommendations. Board members wondered what specific forestry goals are in place. Rob explained that part of the PROS master plan recommendations include creating an urban forestry master plan which will be a great vehicle for formalizing department forestry goals. There are nearly 250,000 trees in Grand Junction which are worth nearly \$1.1B. 75% of those trees are on private property leaving about 58,000 trees on public property. City Forestry Crews work through a seasonal rotation of winter removals, spring plantings, summer pruning, followed by fall plantings and share some numbers for trees pruned, planted and removed. Currently staff is removing more trees than are being planted. Rob

shared that Forestry would like the opposite to be true, however a large number of removals are required due to lack of water. Rob showed the board a number of forestry quick links which are available on the City website. Board members wondered why tree care companies are required to be licensed when operating in the City of Grand Junction. Rob advised the board that tree care work is one of the most dangerous professions. City licensing ensures that tree care companies are holding the proper insurance and have demonstrated that they meet the industry standard for professional knowledge around tree care and tree work.

Rob talked with the Board about the City's private ash treatment program. 23% of the inventory is ash trees. There are over 3,000 public ash trees which the City began treating last summer. The ash program is designed to have a vendor (T4 trees) treat private trees with the cost being shared 50/50 between citizen and the City of Grand Junction. The City portion will be a maximum of \$500 per address. This treatment program should protect trees for 2 – 3 years. If trees do not qualify for treatment, rebates are available for citizens wanting to replace ash trees with another variety (up to \$100 per rebate, three rebates per household).

Rob talked with the board about plant health care, staff have treated 3.3 million square feet of land with a pre-emergent product that should help keep weeds down in the summer. This will be followed up with a fall application which helps keep down spring weeds. Public Works has taken over weed management in rights of way. Additionally, open space staff are taking care of Kindred Reserve and doing work on Watson Island working to return that to more native space. Staff also take care of the Riverfront Trail system and looking for future opportunities for trail connections and public open space.

For the Good of the Community

Board members wondered about results from the Community Recreation Center survey. Ken Sherbenou advised the board that those results are being shared with Council in an upcoming workshop and will be brought to the May meeting.

Ken Sherbenou gave the board updates on a number of other projects. Staff is pursuing additional design on the Dos Rios splash pad. Responses for the Dos Rios playground are due next Friday. The multi-purpose building that was planned for the south end of Stocker Stadium near the Lincoln Park Barn is on hold. Additionally, staff is pursuing discussions with the companies that expressed interest but did not submit bids on the Pickleball/Tennis project at Lincoln Park.

Board members inquired about the timeline of the zipline installation. Bonsai anticipates completion in mid-summer.

Board members wondered why there is no seating around the pump track at Dos Rios. It's a great place for parents to take their kids, but there is no place to sit and watch.

Adjourn

The board adjourned by acclimation at 1:08pm to a tour of the Stadium construction site.

Respectfully Submitted,
Allison Little
Administrative Specialist



The City of Grand Junction Community Recreation Center Survey Results

Prepared for: The City of Grand Junction
Prepared by: The Social Research Center of Colorado Mesa University and the
Center for Opinion Research at Franklin & Marshall College

Justin Gollob, PhD

Director of the Social Research Center
Professor of Political Science
Colorado Mesa University

Eliot Jennings, PhD

Associate Professor of Political Science
Colorado Mesa University

Clay King, PhD

Assistant Professor of Statistics
Colorado Mesa University



Table of Contents

I. Executive Summary.....	1
Key Findings.....	2
A. Constructing an Indoor Community Recreation Center	2
Chart 1: Question CC1	2
Table 1: Question CC2 (Support).....	3
Table 2: Question CC2 (Oppose).....	4
B. Funding an Indoor Community Recreation Center	4
Chart 2: Question CC4	5
Chart 3: Question CC7	6
Chart 4: Question CC8	7
C. Location of an Indoor Community Recreation Center	7
Chart 5: Question CC5	8
Chart 6: Question CC6	9
D. Conclusion	9
II. Methodology.....	10
III. Attachments.....	11
A1: Question CC1.....	11
A2: Question CC4.....	13
A3: Question CC7.....	17
A4: Marginal Frequency Report.....	19

I. Executive Summary

The City of Grand Junction engaged professors from Colorado Mesa University to conduct a survey measuring citizen attitudes towards a potential indoor Community Recreation Survey. CMU’s Social Research Center partnered with the Center for Opinion Research at Franklin & Marshall College to design and implement the Grand Junction Community Recreation Center Survey in February of 2022. The purpose of this survey was to facilitate an understanding of opinions and needs related to a potential indoor Community Recreation Center in Grand Junction.

The survey was designed to obtain statistically valid responses from registered voters in the City of Grand Junction. The design team worked with the Grand Junction City Council to finalize the survey instrument which was mailed to 8,040 randomly selected registered voters living in the City of Grand Junction. The survey was completed by 1,286 registered voters. Statistically, the survey provides a margin of error of +/- 4.0 at a 95% confidence level that the findings are representative of the opinions of registered voters in the City of Grand Junction.

The findings show that while 76% of respondents rate the current Grand Junction Parks and Recreation system as excellent or good, only 20% rate the current indoor recreational facilities in Grand Junction as excellent or good. When asked if they thought Grand Junction should build an indoor Community Recreation Center, 59% of respondents answered “Yes, definitely” with 24% answering “Yes, probably”. Only 15% of respondents thought that Grand Junction should “probably not” or “definitely not” build an indoor Community Recreation Center. Support for building an indoor Community Recreation Center was further validated by 83% of respondents believing that the construction of an indoor Community Recreation Center would be a good use of city resources, with 16% believing it would not be a good use of city resources.

When considering how the Community Recreation Center would be funded, 49% preferred a 15% tax on nicotine products followed by 18% preferring a 0.15% sales tax increase followed by 7% preferring a 3-millage rate property tax increase. There were 20% of respondents that preferred not to build a Community Recreation Center since it would require additional taxes. However, responses to question CC4 also indicate that a majority of residents are likely (very and somewhat) to support building a Community Recreation Center regardless of the funding mechanism used (sales tax = 67% support; property tax = 69% support; nicotine tax = 79% support). The survey also sought the opinion of respondents on the type and location of a Community Recreation Center with 54% favoring a large facility while 29% preferred multiple smaller facilities in different locations. When asked where a large facility should be located, 50% preferred Matchett Park while 33% favored Lincoln Park.

Additional details are presented below.

Key Findings


Results from the City of Grand Junction Community Recreation Center Survey shows that registered voters living in Grand Junction support building an indoor Community Recreation Center (CRC). Question CC1 in the survey asked respondents whether they “...think Grand Junction should build an indoor Community Recreation Center for Grand Junction residents, or not?”. This question was asked very early in the survey to all participants, and it was asked before any funding questions were presented so as not to conflate the two separate issues of (1) building a CRC and (2) funding a CRC.

A. Constructing an Indoor Community Recreation Center

Results for question CC1, are presented in Chart 1, below. A majority of respondents (59%) selected the highest level of support (yes, definitely) with 8% selecting the lowest level of support (no, definitely not). By combining the “yes, definitely” and the “yes, probably” responses into a single category, results show that 83% of respondents support building a CRC. By combining “no, probably not” and “no, definitely not”, 15% of respondents oppose the idea of building a CRC. The small percentage (2%) of “do not know” responses could indicate that the public holds relatively distinct opinions on this issue. It is important to remember that CC1 is a raw measure of support considering it was asked before any discussion of funding mechanisms.

Chart 1: Question CC1

(“There have been on-going discussions about whether the City of Grand Junction should build an indoor Community Recreation Center for its residents. Based on what you know, do you think Grand Junction should build an indoor Community Recreation Center for Grand Junction residents, or not?)



There are some conclusions that can be drawn from demographic differences exhibited in Attachment A1: Question CC1 (pg 11). The first conclusion is that there is overall support (yes, definitely and yes, probably) among each demographic group presented in the table. The highest level of support is among respondents under 35 years of age (94%) followed by respondents with children living in the household (93%). The lowest level of overall support is among respondents 55 years of age and older (71%). It should be noted that the 55+ category was overrepresented in the survey and that the weighting mechanism decreased overall levels of support for this group.

A second conclusion is that participants potentially hold strong opinions on this issue. This is exhibited by the fact that a majority of respondents selected “yes, definitely” across almost every single demographic group. Those groups where “yes, definitely” was a plurality, rather than a majority, include Republicans, participants with a family income of \$25,000 to \$35,000, and respondents who are age 55 and over.

Participants were also asked an open-ended question about why they support/oppose building a CRC. Responses by those supporting a CRC were coded into one of 20 response categories by professional staff at the Center for Opinion Research (COR). Results are presented in Table 1.

Table 1: Question CC2 (Support)

(What is the main reason you support building an indoor Community Recreation Center?)

	<i>n=1063</i>
Promotes/encourages health and wellness (exercise, fitness)	21%
Opportunities/programs for youth, kids	18%
Weather or season: any mention of weather-related reason	18%
Social interaction, get together, bring together, build community	16%
Need for recreation center - in general, no specific reason	15%
Good for community, good the city, asset for city	11%
Will get a lot of use, will be used - in general	10%
Opportunities/programs for families (all ages)	9%
Affordable recreation	8%
Pools, swimming specially mentioned, indoor or in general	7%
Safe environment, safety	7%
Current lack of or Provides additional recreation opportunities: indoor, specifically named, or in general	6%
Size of city, City is growing, promote growth (attract people)	6%
Opportunities/programs for seniors, elderly	5%
Will or plan to use it personally (family)	5%
Location: Centrally located, easily accessible, convenient	3%
Meeting rooms, meeting space	3%

Other	1%
Do not know	3%

The most common response given by supporters of building a CRC (N=1063) is that it promotes health and wellness (21%). Other frequently cited responses include youth programs/opportunities (18%), weather related reasons (18%), and opportunities for social interactions (16%). The top reasons for supporting building a CRC point to health, convenience, and recreation opportunities.

For those who oppose building a CRC (N=191), reasons were coded into one of ten response categories by COR Staff. Table 2 provides a summary of responses given by those who oppose building a CRC.

Table 2: Question CC2 (Oppose)

(What is the main reason you oppose building an indoor Community Recreation Center?)

	<i>n=191</i>
Cost	23%
Taxes: Does not want tax increase	20%
Other gyms available	14%
Not needed, unnecessary	13%
Competes with private businesses, takes away from businesses	10%
Funds should be used for other purposes	8%
Will not use it (personally)	3%
Will not get used, generally	2%
Other	7%
Do not know	1%

The most common responses include the cost of a CRC (23%) and not wanting a tax increase (20%). This is followed by responses that include other gyms available (14%), not needed (13%), and competes with private businesses (10%). The two most common reasons opposing a CRC are related to fiscal concerns.

B. Funding an Indoor Community Recreation Center

Participants were asked two separate questions measuring support of funding mechanisms for a CRC. The specific funding mechanisms were provided to the researchers by the City of Grand Junction and include: (1) a 0.15% sales tax increase, (2) a 3-millage rate property tax increase, (3) a 15% tax on nicotine products. It is important to note that these three funding mechanisms do not change across the two separate questions measuring funding preferences.

The first question (CC4) measures each funding mechanism in isolation from the others. This is accomplished by randomly assigning one of the three funding mechanisms to participants and then


asking their level of support for building a CRC using the tax they were randomly assigned. This approach minimizes the impact alternative funding mechanisms could have on participants' answers.

A total of 434 respondents were presented with the 0.15% sales tax increase mechanism, 430 were given the 3-millage rate property tax increase mechanism, and 423 received the 15% tax on nicotine products mechanism. Prior to weighting the data, there are no statistically significant differences among demographic variables with respect to which funding mechanism respondents were assigned. These demographic variables include: age, gender, employment status, Hispanic or Latino, education attainment, income level, and marital status.

Results in Chart 2 show that participants were "very likely" to support the construction of a CRC regardless of the funding mechanism they were presented. Very likely is the plurality response for the sales (42%) and property (41%) tax increases and it is the majority response for the nicotine tax (62%). Combining the "very likely" and "somewhat likely" response options produces majority support across all three funding mechanisms (sales = 67%; property = 69%; nicotine = 79%). Comparatively, the "not at all likely" response is the third most popular response, but constitutes a minority of all responses for each funding mechanism (sales = 23%; property = 21%; nicotine = 13%).

Chart 2: Question CC4

(Although voters in Grand Junction legalized the sale, cultivation, and taxation of cannabis in city limits to fund parks and recreation projects in April 2021, this tax is not projected to be sufficient to build a Community Recreation Center. As such, the city would require additional revenues to fully fund the construction of an indoor Community recreation Center that is funded by [Random Fund Option]? Are you very likely, somewhat likely, somewhat unlikely, or not at all likely to support this proposal for an indoor Community Recreation Center?)




Random Fund Options: (1) the new cannabis tax revenue already devoted to parks and recreation and a 0.15% sales tax increase ending when the building is paid off; (2) the new cannabis tax revenue already devoted to parks and recreation and a 3 millage rate property tax increase ending when the building is paid off; (3) the new cannabis tax revenue already devoted to parks and recreation and a 15% tax on nicotine products including but not limited to cigarettes, chewing tobacco and vaping e-liquid.

Results are presented by demographic groupings in Attachment A2. These results show that some demographic groups exhibit lower levels of support (e.g.: Republican and age 55+), for sales and property tax funding sources, but these differences shrink when examining the nicotine tax funding source.

Asked later in the survey, question CC7 allows participants an opportunity to select which of the three funding mechanisms they prefer, if any. The order in which the mechanisms were presented were rotated between participants to control for order effects. Results are presented in Chart 3.

Chart 3: Question CC7

(In addition to using the new cannabis tax, how would you prefer to fund an indoor Community Recreation Center?)




*Response Options: Pursue a 0.15% sales tax increase to build a Community Recreation Center;
 Pursue a 3-millage rate property tax increase to build a Community Recreation Center;
 Pursue a 15% tax on nicotine products including but not limited to cigarettes, chewing tobacco and vaping e-liquid;
 Prefer not to build a Community recreation Center since it requires additional taxes;
 Do not know.*

Participants demonstrate a preference for the 15% tax on nicotine products with close to 50% selecting that option. This was followed in order by “prefer not to build a CRC (20%), a 0.15% sales tax increase (18%), and a 3-millage rate property tax increase (7%). While results from question CC4 illustrate the public’s support of building a CRC regardless of the funding mechanism presented to them, results from this question demonstrates a preference for funding a CRC through a 15% tax on nicotine products.

To measure opinions on the City’s stewardship of resources, especially as it relates to building a CRC, participants were also asked to agree or disagree with the following statement: the construction of an indoor Community Recreation Center would be a good use of Grand Junction city resources. The results are presented in Chart 6.

Chart 4: Question CC8

(Do you agree or disagree with the following statement: the construction of an indoor Community Recreation Center would be a good use of Grand Junction city resources.)



The data shows that a majority of respondents strongly agree (58%) with the statement, while a minority (10%) strongly disagree. By collapsing the agree responses into a single category, 83% of respondents agree with the statement while 16% disagree. By comparison, 2% of respondents indicated they do not know if the construction of an indoor CRC would be a good use of city resources.


C. Location of an Indoor Community Recreation Center

Participants were asked what type of facility they would prefer if a CRC was built: one large CRC in a single location, or multiple smaller CRCs in different locations. The results demonstrate a clear preference for a

single CRC in a single location. A majority (54%) prefer a single large facility compared to 29% who prefer smaller facilities in different locations. Comparatively, 12% do not support building a CRC. See Chart 4.

Chart 5: Question CC5

(If the necessary funding to build a Community Recreation Center was secured, which option would you prefer:)



Response Options: Option A: Build a large Community Recreation Center in a single location including such components as: a large warm leisure pool, large lap pool, outdoor pool, therapy pool, large fitness/weight area, large walk/jog track and a large 4-7 court gymnasium, among other amenities.


Option B: Build multiple small Community Recreation Centers in different locations each with components such as a small warm water leisure OR lap pool, small fitness/weights area, small walk/jog track and a small 1-2 court gymnasium, among other amenities.

Option C: I do not support pursuit of a Community Recreation Center/s.

Respondents also expressed a preference for building the facility in Matchett Park, with 50% selecting that location. By comparison, Lincoln Park – Moyer Outdoor Pool received 33% of the vote with the remaining 18% selecting do not know. See Chart 5. This question was answered by all participants, even those who do not support building a CRC. This could help explain the large percentage of respondents who selected “do not know”.

Chart 6: Question CC6

(Regardless of your answer to the last question, if a large indoor Community Recreation Center was build including both indoor and outdoor pools, would you prefer that it be built on the footprint of the existing Lincoln Park-Moyer Outdoor Pool (the rest of the park and the golf course would be unaffected) or in Matchett Park at the center of the undeveloped site?)



In terms of amenities, respondents were “very likely” or “somewhat likely” to use a indoor warm water leisure pool (78%), an indoor walk/jog track (76%), a fitness and weight center (76%), and a multi-use gymnasium(s) for basketball, pickleball, volleyball and fitness (70%). More details are included in Question CC10 in Attachment A3.

D. Conclusion

In conclusion, the results of this survey show strong support among registered Grand Junction voters for building a CRC. Results indicate that they prefer a large, single facility located at Matchett Park. The results also show that the preferred method of funding a CRC is a 15% tax on nicotine products, however, it should be noted that support for building a CRC is strong across all three possible funding mechanisms (sales, property, nicotine).

For a full list of questions and corresponding responses, see attachment A3.

II. Methodology

The findings presented in this summary are based on the results of interviews conducted February 2 - 21, 2022. The interviews were conducted at the Center for Opinion Research at Franklin & Marshall College. The data included in this release represent the responses of 1,286 registered Grand Junction, Colorado voters. The sample of voters was obtained from Marketing Systems Group. All sampled respondents were notified by mail about the survey. Interviews were completed over the phone and online depending on each respondent's preference. Survey results were weighted (age, gender, race, participation in the 2019 municipal election, and party registration) using an iterative weighting algorithm to reflect the known distribution of those characteristics.

The sample error for this survey is +/- 4.0 percentage points when the design effects from weighting are considered. In addition to sampling error, this poll is also subject to other sources of non-sampling error. Generally speaking, two sources of error concern researchers most. Non-response bias is created when selected participants either choose not to participate in the survey or are unavailable for interviewing. Response errors are the product of the question and answer process. Surveys that rely on self-reported behaviors and attitudes are susceptible to biases related to the way respondents process and respond to survey questions.

III. Attachments

A1: Question CC1 (“There have been on-going discussions about whether the City of Grand Junction should build an indoor Community Recreation Center for its residents. Based on what you know, do you think Grand Junction should build an indoor Community Recreation Center for Grand Junction residents, or not?”)

Should Grand Junction Build an Indoor Community Recreation Center?						
	Yes, definitely	Yes, probably	No, probably not	No, definitely not	Do not know	
Gender						
Female	65%	21%	6%	6%	2%	
Male	53%	27%	8%	9%	3%	
Political Party						
Republican	48%	28%	9%	12%	3%	
Democrat	72%	18%	6%	4%	0%	
Other	62%	23%	7%	6%	2%	
Annual Family Income						
Under \$25,000	59%	27%	9%	3%	2%	
\$25,000 - \$35,000	43%	34%	12%	8%	3%	
\$35,000 - \$50,000	54%	33%	4%	6%	3%	
\$50,000 - \$75,000	65%	21%	6%	6%	2%	
\$75,000 - \$100,000	73%	12%	6%	9%	0%	
Over \$100,000	73%	14%	5%	7%	1%	
Age						
Under 35	78%	16%	4%	2%	0%	
35 - 54	75%	16%	2%	5%	2%	
55 and over	38%	33%	13%	13%	3%	
Education Level						
High School or Less	57%	29%	5%	6%	3%	
Some College	57%	22%	9%	9%	3%	
College Degree	62%	22%	7%	6%	3%	
Race						
White	59%	24%	7%	7%	3%	
Nonwhite	61%	18%	8%	11%	2%	
Marital Status						

Single, Never Married	71%	21%	3%	3%	2%
Married	60%	22%	8%	8%	2%
Not Currently Married	50%	29%	8%	9%	4%
Children Living in Household					
No	52%	28%	10%	8%	2%
Yes	79%	14%	2%	5%	0%

A2: Question CC4 (Although voters in Grand Junction legalized the sale, cultivation, and taxation of cannabis in city limits to fund parks and recreation projects in April 2021, this tax is not projected to be sufficient to build a Community Recreation Center. As such, the city would require additional revenues to fully fund the construction of a Community Recreation Center.

How likely are you to support construction of an indoor Community Recreation Center that is funded by [RANDOM FUND OPTION]? Are you very likely, somewhat likely, somewhat unlikely, or not at all likely to support this proposal for an indoor Community Recreation Center?)

Likelihood of Support for CRC Construction with 0.15% Sales Tax Increase

	Very likely	Somewhat likely	Somewhat unlikely	Not at all likely	Do not know
Gender					
Female	44%	25%	11%	16%	4%
Male	38%	25%	7%	29%	1%
Political Party					
Republican	23%	32%	10%	30%	5%
Democrat	56%	22%	7%	15%	0%
Other	49%	20%	10%	20%	1%
Annual Family Income					
Under \$25,000	29%	34%	0%	37%	0%
\$25,000 - \$35,000	32%	14%	14%	32%	8%
\$35,000 - \$50,000	55%	18%	7%	20%	%
\$50,000 - \$75,000	40%	35%	12%	12%	1%
\$75,000 - \$100,000	66%	12%	5%	17%	0%
Over \$100,000	54%	19%	10%	16%	1%
Age					
Under 35	67%	17%	5%	11%	0%
35 - 54	57%	28%	4%	10%	1%
55 and over	23%	25%	14%	35%	3%
Education Level					
High School or Less	27%	31%	10%	27%	5%
Some College	36%	26%	9%	28%	1%
College Degree	50%	22%	8%	17%	3%
Race					

White	41%	25%	10%	22%	2%
Nonwhite	42%	20%	5%	27%	6%
Marital Status					
Single, Never Married	61%	20%	3%	16%	0%
Married	42%	25%	11%	20%	2%
Not Currently Married	37%	24%	7%	28%	4%
Children Living in Household					
No	39%	23%	10%	26%	2%
Yes	57%	25%	7%	11%	0%

Likelihood of Support for CRC Construction with 3 Mill Property Tax Increase

	Very likely	Somewhat likely	Somewhat unlikely	Not at all likely	Do not know
Gender					
Female	41%	32%	8%	18%	1%
Male	42%	23%	9%	25%	1%
Political Party					
Republican	16%	31%	13%	37%	3%
Democrat	63%	24%	7%	6%	0%
Other	49%	27%	6%	18%	0%
Annual Family Income					
Under \$25,000	23%	40%	7%	30%	0%
\$25,000 - \$35,000	28%	48%	7%	17%	0%
\$35,000 - \$50,000	54%	27%	5%	14%	0%
\$50,000 - \$75,000	35%	39%	10%	14%	2%
\$75,000 - \$100,000	46%	28%	12%	14%	0%
Over \$100,000	65%	9%	7%	19%	0%
Age					
Under 35	56%	33%	7%	4%	0%
35 - 54	51%	25%	8%	16%	0%
55 and over	26%	27%	10%	36%	1%
Education Level					
High School or Less	24%	43%	4%	28%	1%
Some College	29%	35%	8%	28%	0%
College Degree	51%	22%	10%	16%	1%
Race					
White	41%	31%	8%	19%	1%
Nonwhite	42%	6%	12%	37%	3%
Marital Status					
Single, Never Married	49%	35%	7%	9%	0%
Married	42%	24%	11%	23%	0%
Not Currently Married	33%	34%	4%	26%	3%
Children Living in Household					
No	30%	32%	11%	27%	0%
Yes	70%	19%	4%	5%	2%

Likelihood of Support for CRC Construction with 15% Nicotine Tax

	Very likely	Somewhat likely	Somewhat unlikely	Not at all likely	Do not know
Gender					
Female	65%	14%	4%	13%	4%
Male	57%	21%	8%	14%	0%
Political Party					
Republican	60%	18%	5%	14%	3%
Democrat	70%	9%	8%	13%	0%
Other	58%	20%	6%	13%	3%
Annual Family Income					
Under \$25,000	71%	18%	7%	4%	0%
\$25,000 - \$35,000	43%	38%	0%	14%	5%
\$35,000 - \$50,000	47%	21%	13%	19%	0%
\$50,000 - \$75,000	65%	14%	11%	7%	3%
\$75,000 - \$100,000	69%	9%	0%	22%	0%
Over \$100,000	72%	11%	2%	13%	2%
Age					
Under 35	81%	15%	4%	0%	0%
35 - 54	63%	17%	4%	12%	4%
55 and over	48%	18%	9%	23%	2%
Education Level					
High School or Less	67%	15%	0%	13%	5%
Some College	63%	9%	6%	21%	1%
College Degree	60%	20%	7%	10%	3%
Race					
White	62%	16%	6%	14%	2%
Nonwhite	59%	22%	5%	12%	2%
Marital Status					
Single, Never Married	60%	19%	9%	8%	4%
Married	68%	14%	3%	13%	2%
Not Currently Married	53%	16%	8%	18%	5%
Children Living in Household					
No	56%	19%	7%	16%	2%
Yes	72%	13%	5%	9%	1%

A3: Question CC7 (In addition to using the new cannabis tax, how would you prefer to fund an indoor Community Recreation Center? Would you prefer to...)

Funding Preference						
	15% tax on nicotine products	0.15% sales tax increase	3 millage rate property tax increase	Prefer not to build a CRC	Do not know	
Gender						
Female	51%	17%	8%	16%	8%	
Male	48%	18%	6%	25%	3%	
Political Party						
Republican	45%	15%	7%	28%	5%	
Democrat	52%	21%	11%	11%	5%	
Other	52%	18%	5%	18%	7%	
Annual Family Income						
Under \$25,000	43%	26%	10%	17%	4%	
\$25,000 - \$35,000	43%	13%	5%	30%	9%	
\$35,000 - \$50,000	40%	25%	10%	17%	8%	
\$50,000 - \$75,000	60%	17%	2%	15%	6%	
\$75,000 - \$100,000	49%	21%	8%	18%	4%	
Over \$100,000	54%	20%	9%	14%	3%	
Age						
Under 35	61%	16%	7%	10%	6%	
35 - 54	54%	20%	8%	11%	7%	
55 and over	40%	16%	6%	32%	6%	
Education Level						
High School or Less	50%	17%	6%	21%	6%	
Some College	47%	16%	6%	27%	4%	
College Degree	51%	19%	7%	16%	7%	
Race						
White	50%	17%	7%	19%	7%	
Nonwhite	46%	18%	7%	25%	4%	
Marital Status						
Single, Never Married	53%	18%	7%	15%	7%	
Married	52%	16%	7%	20%	5%	
Not Currently Married	44%	21%	7%	23%	5%	

Children Living in Household

No	46%	18%	8%	23%	5%
Yes	58%	19%	5%	11%	7%

*Response Options: Pursue a 0.15% sales tax increase to build a Community Recreation Center;
Pursue a 3-millage rate property tax increase to build a Community Recreation Center;
Pursue a 15% tax on nicotine products including but not limited to cigarettes, chewing tobacco and vaping e-liquid;
Prefer not to build a Community recreation Center since it requires additional taxes;
Do not know.*

A4: Marginal Frequency Report
 (may not total 100% due to rounding)

RESYR. How many years have you lived in the City of Grand Junction?

n	Mean	Std. Dev.
1267*	20.65	17.45

*n value represents responses excluding "Do not know" and "Prefer not to answer"

QoL. How would you rate Grand Junction as a place to live?

Excellent	34%
Good	52%
Fair	13%
Poor	1%

MIP_GJ. What do you think is the most important problem facing Grand Junction today?

Infrastructure, roads, traffic	11%
Growth, growing too fast, overpopulation	10%
Crime, drugs, violence, guns	9%
Homelessness	9%
Lack of Recreation opportunities (Recreation Center, pools, etc.)	9%
Housing: Affordable housing	7%
Government, politicians	4%
Jobs: Available Jobs, quality jobs, adequately paying, low paying	4%
Divisiveness, Political divide	3%
Education, schools	3%
Lack of community resources	2%
Economic Development: Attracting/retaining businesses or industry	2%
Cost of living	2%
COVID-19	2%
Water issues, drought	2%
Lack of diversity	1%
Taxes	1%
Healthcare	1%
Economy, in general	1%
Budget, spending, funding concerns	1%
Mental health concerns	1%
Lack of vision, planning, resistant to change	1%

Environmental concerns: air quality, pollution, climate change	1%
Racism	1%
Social inequality	1%
Other	2%
Do not know	12%

PARK1. How would you rate the current overall parks and recreation system in Grand Junction?

Excellent	17%
Good	59%
Fair	18%
Poor	4%
Do not know	2%

PARK2. How would you rate the current indoor recreation facilities in Grand Junction?

Excellent	3%
Good	17%
Fair	27%
Poor	33%
Do not know	20%

CC1. There have been on-going discussions about whether the City of Grand Junction should build an indoor Community Recreation Center for its residents. Based on what you know, do you think Grand Junction should build an indoor Community Recreation Center for Grand Junction residents, or not?

Yes, definitely	59%
Yes, probably	24%
No, probably not	7%
No, definitely not	8%
Do not know	2%

CC2Y. What is the main reason you **support** building an indoor Community Recreation Center?

n=1063

Promotes/encourages health and wellness (exercise, fitness)	21%
Opportunities/programs for youth, kids	18%
Weather or season: any mention of weather related reason	18%
Social interaction, get together, bring together, build community	16%
Need for recreation center - in general, no specific reason	15%
Good for community, good for the city, asset for city	11%

Will get a lot of use, will be used - in general	10%
Opportunities/programs for families (all ages)	9%
Affordable recreation	8%
Pools, swimming specially mentioned, indoor or in general	7%
Safe environment, safety	7%
Current lack of or Provides additional recreation opportunities: indoor, specifically named, or in general	6%
Size of city, City is growing, promote growth (attract people)	6%
Opportunities/programs for seniors, elderly	5%
Will or plan to use it personally (family)	5%
Location: Centrally located, easily accessible, convenient	3%
Meeting rooms, meeting space	3%
Other	1%
Do not know	3%

**n value represents number of respondents who answered "Yes, definitely" and "Yes, probably" in CC1. Total may exceed 100% because multiple responses were accepted.*

CC2N. What is the main reason you **oppose** building an indoor Community Recreation Center?

	<i>n=191</i>
Cost	23%
Taxes: Does not want tax increase	20%
Other gyms available	14%
Not needed, unnecessary	13%
Competes with private businesses, takes away from businesses	10%
Funds should be used for other purposes	8%
Will not use it (personally)	3%
Will not get used, generally	2%
Other	7%
Do not know	1%

**n value represents # respondents answering "No, probably not" and "No, definitely not" in CC1.*

CC3. How much have you read, seen, or heard about the possible development of a Community Recreation Center by the City of Grand Junction?

A great deal	10%
A fair amount	34%
Not much	38%
Nothing at all	19%

Funding Option Testing

CC4. Although voters in Grand Junction legalized the sale, cultivation, and taxation of cannabis in city limits to fund parks and recreation projects in April 2021, this tax is not projected to be sufficient to build a Community Recreation Center. As such, the city would require additional revenues to fully fund the construction of a Community Recreation Center.

How likely are you to support construction of an indoor Community Recreation Center that is funded by the new cannabis tax revenue already devoted to parks and recreation and a [RANDOM FUND OPTION]? Are you very likely, somewhat likely, somewhat unlikely, or not at all likely to support this proposal for an indoor Community Recreation Center?

	Very likely	Somewhat likely	Somewhat unlikely	Not at all likely	Do not know
0.15% sales tax increase ending when the building is paid off (n=434)	42%	25%	9%	23%	2%
3 millage rate property tax increase ending when the building is paid off (n=430)	41%	28%	9%	21%	1%
15% tax on nicotine products including but not limited to cigarettes, chewing tobacco and vaping e-liquid (n=423)	62%	17%	6%	13%	2%

**Question wording was randomized; n values represent number of respondents who were asked each option.*

CC5. If the necessary funding to build a Community Recreation Center was secured, which option would you prefer:

Build a large Community Recreation Center in a single location including such components as: large warm water leisure pool, large lap pool, outdoor pool, therapy pool, large fitness/weight area, large walk/jog track and a large 4-6 court gymnasium, among other amenities.	54%
Build multiple small Community Recreation Centers in different locations each with components such as a small warm water leisure OR lap pool, small fitness/weights area, small walk/jog track and a small 1-2 court gymnasium, among other amenities.	29%
Or, do you not support pursuit of a Community Recreation Center.	12%
Do not know	5%

CC6. Regardless of your answer to the last question, if a large indoor Community Recreation Center was built including both indoor and outdoor pools, would you prefer that it be built on the footprint of the existing Lincoln Park-Moyer Outdoor Pool (the rest of the park and the golf course would be unaffected) or in Matchett Park at the center of the undeveloped site?

Footprint of the existing Lincoln Park-Moyer Outdoor Pool	33%
Matchett Park	50%
Do not know	18%

CC7. In addition to using the new cannabis tax, how would you prefer to fund an indoor Community Recreation Center? Would you prefer to...

Pursue a 0.15% sales tax increase to build a Community Recreation Center	18%
Pursue a 3 millage rate property tax to build a Community Recreation Center	7%
Pursue a 15% tax on nicotine products including but not limited to cigarettes, chewing tobacco and vaping e-liquid	49%
Or, would you prefer not to build a Community Recreation Center since it requires additional taxes?	20%
Do not know	6%

CC8. Do you agree or disagree with the following statement: the construction of an indoor Community Recreation Center would be a good use of Grand Junction city resources.

Strongly agree	58%
Somewhat agree	25%
Somewhat disagree	6%
Strongly disagree	10%
Do not know	2%

Note: respondents who answered “No, probably not” or “No, definitely not” to CC1, and “prefer not to build a community recreation center” to CC7, and “Somewhat disagree” or “Strongly disagree” to CC8, skipped to CC11.

CC9. How often would you use the Community Recreation Center [RANDOM PRICE OPTION]: frequently, sometimes, seldom or never?

	Frequently	Sometimes	Seldom	Never	Do not know
If there was no daily admission fee for adults (<i>n</i> =312)	48%	32%	15%	5%	0%
If the adult daily admission fee was \$4 (<i>n</i> =270)	41%	38%	12%	6%	2%
If the adult daily admission fee was \$8 (<i>n</i> =286)	24%	35%	28%	8%	5%
If the adult daily admission fee was \$12 (<i>n</i> =246)	9%	43%	24%	21%	2%

**Question wording was randomized; n values represent number of respondents who were asked each option.*

CC10. In addition to daily admission, Community Recreation Center users could also purchase punch passes (\$4-\$8 per punch depending on age) or annual passes (\$20-\$40 per month depending on age) to reduce the daily rate. How likely are you or members of your family to become a punch pass or annual pass holder: very likely, somewhat likely, somewhat unlikely, or not at all likely?

	<i>n=1113</i>
Very likely	42%
Somewhat likely	34%
Somewhat unlikely	10%
Not at all likely	10%
Do not know	3%

Would you and your family be very likely, somewhat likely, not very likely, or not at all likely to use each of the following indoor recreation amenities?

<i>n=1113</i>	Very likely	Somewhat likely	Somewhat unlikely	Not at all likely	Do not know
Child watch (child care while guardian is using the facility)	16%	11%	11%	59%	3%
Indoor playground	20%	17%	13%	48%	2%
Teen space	17%	17%	9%	52%	5%
Indoor warm water leisure pool: lazy river, zero-depth entry, slides	55%	23%	9%	12%	1%
Climbing wall(s) and bouldering features	30%	26%	11%	30%	3%
Racquetball courts	17%	26%	19%	36%	2%
Therapy space and therapy pool	35%	31%	16%	15%	3%
Fitness and weight center	44%	32%	9%	12%	2%
Game area	23%	32%	11%	27%	8%
Indoor walk/jog track	44%	32%	9%	14%	1%
Indoor multi-use gymnasium(s) for basketball, pickleball, volleyball and fitness	38%	32%	11%	17%	2%
Indoor cool water lap pool	33%	34%	12%	19%	2%

Community spaces (rental for parties and meetings)	19%	36%	17%	26%	2%
Aerobics studio/group fitness	29%	38%	12%	18%	2%

CC11. In April 2019, Grand Junction residents voted on a ballot proposal that would have funded the development of an indoor Community Recreation Center. The proposal placed the Community Recreation Center at Matchett Park and would have increased sales taxes by 0.39%. Did you vote on this ballot proposal, or not?

Yes	40%
No	32%
Do not know	28%

CC11b. Did you vote for or against the proposal?

n=491

For	51%
Against	43%
Do not know	6%

**n value represents number of respondents who answered "Yes" in CC11.*

CC11c_F. What is the main reason you voted **for** the indoor Community Recreation Center?

n=242

Need for recreation center - in general, no specific reason	33%
Good for community, good the city, asset for city	23%
Promotes/encourages health and wellness (exercise, fitness)	14%
Opportunities/programs for youth, kids	13%
Social interaction, get together, bring together, build community	8%
Will get a lot of use, will be used - in general	6%
Will or plan to use it personally (family)	6%
Size of city, City is growing, promote growth (attract people)	5%
Opportunities/programs for families (all ages)	5%
Pools, swimming specially mentioned, indoor or in general	5%
Meeting rooms, meeting space	4%
Affordable recreation	3%
Location: Centrally located, easily accessible, convenient	3%
Current lack of or Provides additional recreation opportunities: indoor, specifically named, or in general	3%
Weather or season: any mention of weather-related reason	2%
Safe environment, safety	2%

Opportunities/programs for seniors, elderly	1%
Other	4%
Do not know	1%

**n value represents number of respondents who answered "For" in CC11b. Total may exceed 100% because multiple responses were accepted*

CC11c_A. What is the main reason you voted **against** the indoor Community Recreation Center?

n=203

Taxes: Did not want tax increase	48%
Cost	12%
Location	10%
Funds should be used for other purposes	10%
Competes with private businesses, takes away from businesses	6%
Not needed, unnecessary	4%
Will not use it (personally)	2%
Other gyms available	1%
Will not get used, generally	1%
Other	5%
Do not know	1%

**n value represents number of respondents who answered "Against" in CC11b.*

AGE. What was your age on your last birthday?

18-24	4%
25-34	17%
35-44	18%
45-54	16%
55-64	11%
65 and over	34%

EDUC. What was the highest level of schooling you have completed?

High school graduate or less	12%
Some college	29%
College degree	59%

MAR. What is your current marital status? Are you single, married, separated, divorced, or a widow or widower?

Married	55%
Single, Never Married	20%
Widow or widower	11%
Divorced	13%
Separated	1%

NumC. How many children LESS than 18 years of age live in your household?

None	70%
1-2	23%
3-4	6%
5 or more	1%

NumA. Including yourself, how many adults 18 years of age or older currently live in this household?

1-2	90%
3-4	10%

HCM. Do you and/or members of your household belong to any health clubs or fitness facilities?

Yes	50%
No	50%

Hisp. Are you Hispanic or Latino, or not?

Yes	4%
No	95%

RACE_A. Which of the following categories best describes your racial background? White, Black or African American, Asian, Native Hawaiian or Other Pacific Islander, or American Indian, Alaska Native?

White	87%
Non-white	13%

WORK. Which best describes your current employment status? Are you working full-time, part-time, unemployed (looking for work), retired, disabled, going to school, or something else?

Full-time	52%
Retired	32%
Part-time	7%
Something else	3%
Going to school	3%
Disabled	1%
Unemployed	1%

INCOME. And, just for statistical purposes, is your total family income...

Under \$25,000	11%
\$25-\$35,000	8%
\$35-50,000	14%
\$50-75,000	20%
\$75-100,000	17%
Over \$100,000	28%
Don't know	1%

FinToday. We are interested in how people are getting along financially these days. Would you say that you and your family are better off, worse off, or about the same financially as you were a year ago?

Better off	21%
Worse off	24%
About the same	54%
Don't know	1%

FinFut. Now looking ahead, do you think that a year from now, you and your family will be better off financially than you are now, worse off, or about the same as you are now?

Better off	26%
Worse off	14%
About the same	53%
Don't know	7%

DONE. How do you describe yourself?

Male	47%
Female	53%



coloradomesa.edu/src

1100 North Avenue
Grand Junction, CO 81501-3122

© 2022 COLORADO MESA UNIVERSITY

