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## Community Survey Method

- Questionnaire developed by Granada Community Services District (GCSD)
- Input from San Mateo County Parks Dept.
- In English and Spanish
- Mailed to 2,283 residences in district on 2/20/15
- 2,235 were delivered
- Slightly different survey version on County website
- Data coded, entered by SFSU \& local typist
- Raw data available in Excel and SPSS formats
- Data error checked and verified by Dr. Tierney
- Data analysis by Dr. Tierney, using IBM SPSS


## Preliminary Results

- Results are preliminary, subject to review
- Combined paper \& online surveys, removed unusable surveys
- Total of 609 completed and usable surveys in database
- Response rate 609/2335=27.2\%
- 542 mail responses and 67 online surveys

| Survey Type |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  |  |  |
| Mail | Frequency | Valid Percent |
| Online | 642 | 89.0 |
| Total | 609 | 11.0 |
|  |  | 100.0 |

## Age of Respondent Household Residents

Age of Household Residents


## Number of Persons By Age, Responding Households

| Age | Frequency | Percent |
| :--- | ---: | ---: |
| $0-1$ | 26 | $1.9 \%$ |
| $2-5$ | 61 | $4.5 \%$ |
| $6-11$ | 96 | $7.1 \%$ |
| $12-14$ | 41 | $3.0 \%$ |
| $15-18$ | 57 | $4.2 \%$ |
| $19-24$ | 65 | $4.8 \%$ |
| $25-39$ | 181 | $13.3 \%$ |
| $40-55$ | 356 | $26.2 \%$ |
| $56-74$ | 413 | $30.4 \%$ |
| $75+$ | 61 | $4.5 \%$ |
| T otal | 1357 | $100.0 \%$ |

## Responding Households With Children Under 18 Years

Households With Children Under 18

|  | Frequency | Percent |
| :--- | :--- | :--- |
| With Children Under 18 | 183 | 30.0 |
| Total Respondents | 609 | 100.0 |

## Where Do Respondents Live

What Neighborhood Do You Live In

|  |  | Frequency | Valid Percent |
| :--- | :--- | ---: | ---: |
| Valid | Clipper Ridge | 69 | 11.8 |
|  | El Granada | 441 | 75.3 |
|  | Miramar(unincorporated) | 68 | 11.6 |
|  | Princeton | 8 | 1.4 |
|  | Total | 586 | 100.0 |
| Missing | System | 23 |  |
| Total |  | 609 |  |

# Cell Location Of Household On Grid Overlay Of District 



## How Long Have They Lived Here

How Long Have You Lived Here

|  |  | Frequency | Valid Percent |
| :--- | :--- | ---: | ---: |
| Valid | Less than 1 year | 24 | 4.1 |
|  | 1-5 years | 109 | 18.5 |
|  | 6-10 years | 77 | 13.1 |
|  | 11-15 years | 100 | 16.9 |
|  | 16+ years | 280 | 47.5 |
|  | Total | 590 | 100.0 |
| Missing | System | 19 |  |
| Total |  | 609 |  |

## Visited Local Parks In Last 12

 MonthsVisited Local Parks In Last 12 Months; Percent Yes Visited

| Park | Percent |
| :--- | :--- |
| Coastal Trail | 94.9 |
| Mirada Surf West | 83.3 |
| Quarry Park | 81.1 |
| Clipper Ridge Park | 41.8 |

## Visited Clipper Ridge Park By Neighborhood



## Frequency of Visiting Local Parks

Frequency of Visiting Local Parks; Percent Reporting Frequently or Often Visit

| Park | Percent |
| :--- | :--- |
| Coastal Trail | 57.4 |
| Mirada Surf West | 51.1 |
| Quarry Park | 40.6 |
| Clipper Ridge Park | 36.6 |

## Do Local Parks Need Improvement?



## Do Local Parks Need Improvement

Do Local Parks Need Improvement

|  |  |  |
| :--- | ---: | ---: |
|  |  | Frequency | Valid Percent | Mes |
| :--- |
|  |

## Do Local Parks Need Improvement By Neighborhood

What Neighborhood Do You Live In * Do Local Parks Need Improvement Cross Tabulation


# There Are Sufficient Park Areas In Walking Distance 



## Sufficient Park Areas Within Walking Distance of Residence By Children In HH

There Are Sufficient Park Areas In Walking Distance * Children In Household

|  |  |  | Walking Distance |  |  | Total |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  |  |  | Yes | Somewhat | No |  |
| Children In Household | Yes | Count | 101 | 46 | 26 | 173 |
|  |  | $\%$ within <br> Children In Household | 58.4\% | 26.6\% | 15.0\% | 100.0\% |
|  | No | Count | 288 | 80 | 44 | 412 |
|  |  | \% within Children In Household | 69.9\% | 19.4\% | 10.7\% | 100.0\% |
| Total |  | Count | 389 | 126 | 70 | 585 |
|  |  | \% within Children In Household | 66.5\% | 21.5\% | 12.0\% | 100.0\% |

Chi Square Probability $=0.026$

# Sufficient Park Areas In Walking Distance By Where You Live 

| There Are Sufficient Park Areas In Walking Distance * What Neighborhood Do You Live In |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  |  |  | In Walking Distance |  |  | Total |
|  |  |  | Yes | Somewhat | No |  |
| What Neighborhood Do You Live In | Clipper Ridge |  | 53 | 10 | 3 | 66 |
|  |  | \% within What Neighborhood Do You Live In | 80.3\% | 15.2\% | 4.5\% | 100.0\% |
|  | El Granada | Count | 279 | 92 | 57 | 428 |
|  |  | \% within What Neighborhood Do You Live In | 65.2\% | 21.5\% | 13.3\% | 100.0\% |
|  | Miramar (unincorporated) | Count | 44 | 13 | 7 | 64 |
|  |  | $\%$ within What Neighborhood Do You Live In | 68.8\% | 20.3\% | 10.9\% | 100.0\% |
|  | Princeton | Count | 3 | 4 | 1 | 8 |
|  |  | \% within What Neighborhood مn Youliveln | 37.5\% | 50.0\% | 12.5\% | 100.0\% |
| Total |  | Count | 379 | 119 | 68 | 566 |
|  |  | \% within What Neighborhood | 67.0\% | 21.0\% | 12.0\% | 100.0\% |

[^0]
## Need For Small Neighborhood Parks In Your Area

Need For Small Neighborhood Parks In Your Area

|  |  | Frequency | Valid Percent |
| :--- | :--- | ---: | ---: |
| Valid | Substantial | 159 | 26.9 |
|  | Moderate | 204 | 34.5 |
|  | Little | 111 | 18.8 |
|  | None | 81 | 13.7 |
|  | Unsure | 37 | 6.3 |
|  | Total | 592 | 100.0 |
| Total |  | 609 |  |

# Need For Small Neighborhood Parks By Children In Household 

Children In Household * Need For Small Neighborhood Parks In Your Area Crosstabulation


Chi Square Probability = $=.000$

## Travel Outside of Local Area For Recreation Not Provided Locally

Travel Outside Local Area For Recreation Not Provided Locally

|  |  | Frequency | Valid Percent |
| :--- | :--- | ---: | ---: |
| Valid | Frequently | 72 | 11.9 |
|  | Otten | 108 | 17.9 |
|  | Occasionally | 235 | 38.8 |
|  | Seldom | 143 | 23.6 |
|  | Never | 45 | 7.4 |
|  | Other | 2 | .3 |
|  | Total | 605 | 100.0 |
| Missing | System | 4 |  |
| Total |  | 609 |  |

Your Interest Level in Recreational Activities, By HH Ages; Percent Responding High Interest Level

| Activity | Total Percent | Age 15-18 Percent | Age 25-39 Percent | Age 56-74 Percent |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Hiking | 68.8 | 67.4 | 76.2 | 63.6 |
| Nature Walks | 64.1 | 55.8 | 65.7 | 58.8 |
| Dog Walking | 54.2 | 61.9 | 60.7 | 48.2 |
| Cycling | 47.4 | 57.1 | 42.2 | 40.6 |
| Swimming | 37.9 | 46.3 | 44.4 | 27.3 |
| Picnics/BBQ | 34.8 | 35.1 | 45.5 | 24.4 |
| Running | 30.4 | 29.3 | 44.1 | 17.5 |
| Playground Play | 28.7 | 20.1 | 46.1 | 19.3 |
| Tennis | 17.9 | 23.1 | 21.2 | 12.1 |
| Basketball | 15.9 | 26.8 | 19.8 | 9.5 |
| Soccer | 15.2 | 23.7 | 18.6 | 8.9 |
| Golf/Disc Golf | 14.5 | 17.9 | 15.2 | 8.6 |
| Skateboarding | 14.2 | 23.7 | 19.4 | 10.4 |
| Baseball | 12.9 | 23.7 | 13.8 | 9.2 |
| Volleyball | 9.3 | 29.7 | 9.5 | 7.4 |
| Bocce Ball | 9.1 | 10.3 | 7.4 | 4.7 |
| Roller Skating | 8.1 | 10.5 | 5.2 | 5.1 |
| Football | 6.7 | 10.8 | 8.2 | 4.8 |
| Hockey | 3.6 | 2.6 | 4.2 | 1.1 |
| Handball | 3.2 | 2.6 | 2.2 | 4.3 |
| Horseshoes | 5.1 | 0 | 5.2 | 3.1 |
| Surfing (Other) | 2.7 | na | na | na |
| Fishing (Other) | 1.6 | na | na | na |
| Horseback Ride (Other) | 1.2 | na | na | na |
| Kayaking (Other) | 1.2 | na | na | na |

## Would Participate In More Activities Listed If Available Locally

Would Participate More In Activities Listed If Available Locally

|  |  | Frequency | Valid Percent |
| :--- | :--- | ---: | ---: |
| Valid | Yes | 368 | 65.0 |
|  | No | 82 | 14.5 |
|  | Maybe | 116 | 20.5 |
|  | Total | 566 | 100.0 |
| Missing | System | 43 |  |
| Total |  | 609 |  |

## Would Participate More Activitis If Available Locally By Children In HH

Children In Household * Would Participate More In Activities Listed If Available Locally Crosstabulation

|  |  |  | Would Participate More In Activities Listed If Available Locally |  |  | Total |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  |  |  | Yes | No | Maybe |  |
| Children In Household | Yes | Count | $\begin{array}{r} 145 \\ 84.3 \% \end{array}$ | 8$4.7 \%$ | $\begin{array}{r} 19 \\ 11.0 \% \end{array}$ | $\begin{array}{r} 172 \\ 100.0 \% \end{array}$ |
|  |  | \% within Children In Household |  |  |  |  |
|  | No | Count | $\begin{array}{r} 223 \\ 56.6 \% \end{array}$ | $\begin{array}{r} 74 \\ 18.8 \% \end{array}$ | $\begin{array}{r} 97 \\ 24.6 \% \end{array}$ | $\begin{array}{r} 394 \\ 100.0 \% \end{array}$ |
|  |  | \% within Children In Household |  |  |  |  |
| Total |  | Count | 368 | 82 | 116 | 566 |
|  |  | \% within Children In Household | 65.0\% | 14.5\% | 20.5\% | 100.0\% |

## Important To Have Community Center

Important To Have Community Center

|  |  | Frequency | Valid Percent |
| :--- | :--- | ---: | ---: |
| Valid | Very | 154 | 26.6 |
|  | Moderate | 228 | 39.4 |
|  | Not Very | 128 | 22.1 |
|  | Not Needed | 68 | 11.8 |
|  | Total | 578 | 100.0 |
| Missing | System | 31 |  |
| Total |  | 609 |  |

- No Significant differences by Where They Lived
- Substantially, but not significantly, more Important by Children in HH


# Important To Have Community Center By Age In Household 

Important To Have Community Center

|  |  | Frequency | Total Percent | HH With Age 15-18 | HH With Age 25-39 | HH With Age 56-74 |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Valid | Very | 154 | 26.6 | 53.3 | 19.4 | 24.8 |
|  | Moderate | 228 | 39.4 | 26.7 | 41.7 | 41.9 |
|  | Not Very | 128 | 22.1 | 13.3 | 16.7 | 20.7 |
|  | Not Needed | 68 | 11.8 | 6.7 | 22.2 | 12.6 |
|  | Total | 578 | 100.0 | 100.0 | 100.0 | 100.0 |
| Missing | System | 31 |  |  |  |  |
| Total |  | 609 |  |  |  |  |

## Should Median Strips In El Granada Be Improved

Should Median Strips in El Granada Be Improved

|  |  | Frequency | Valid Percent |
| :--- | :--- | ---: | ---: |
| Valid | Yes | 327 | 57.3 |
|  | No | 106 | 18.6 |
|  | Maybe | 138 | 24.2 |
|  | Total | 571 | 100.0 |
|  | 38 |  |  |
| Missing | System | 609 |  |
| Total |  |  |  |

# Should Median Strips Be Improved By Where You Live 

What Neighborhood Do You Live In ${ }^{*}$ Should Median Strips in EI Granada Be Improved Crosstabulation

|  |  |  | Should Median Strips in El Granada Be Improved |  |  | Total |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  |  |  | Yes | No | Maybe |  |
| What Neighborhood Do You Live In | Clipper Ridge |  | 27 | 10 | 29 | 66 |
|  |  | \% within What <br> Neighborhood Do You Live In | 40.9\% | 15.2\% | 43.9\% | 100.0\% |
|  | El Granada | Count | 270 | 76 | 80 | 426 |
|  |  | \% within What <br> Neighborhood Do You Live In | 63.4\% | 17.8\% | 18.8\% | 100.0\% |
|  | Miramar (unincorporated) | Count | 25 | 16 | 24 | 65 |
|  |  | \% within What <br> Neighborhood Do You Live In | 38.5\% | 24.6\% | 36.9\% | 100.0\% |
|  | Princeton | Count | 3 | 1 | 4 | 8 |
|  |  | \% within What <br> Neighborhood Do You Live In | 37.5\% | 12.5\% | 50.0\% | 100.0\% |
| Total |  | Count | 325 | 103 | 137 | 565 |
|  |  | \% within What <br> Neighborhood Do You Live In | 57.5\% | 18.2\% | 24.2\% | 100.0\% |

Chi Square Probability $=0.000$

## Median Strips Most Likely To Use

Median Strip Areas Most Likely To Use, Percent

| Median Strip Area | Percent |
| :--- | ---: |
| Balboa | 27.4 |
| Cabrillo | 15.8 |
| Granada | 19.9 |
| Portola | 22.7 |
| The Alameda | 31.5 |
| All | 21.3 |
| None | 16.6 |

Importance of Park and Recreation Facilities to You and Your Household; By HH Ages, Percent Responding High Level

| Activity | Total Percent | Age 15-18 Percent | Age 25-39 Percent | Age 56-74 Percent |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Bike Trails | 64.2 | 73.8 | 66.1 | 56.2 |
| Unpaved Paths/Trails | 62.6 | 60.1 | 61.1 | 59.6 |
| Unimproved Open Space | 62.2 | 49.9 | 58.4 | 61.8 |
| Public Restrooms | 56.2 | 46.2 | 57.2 | 56.1 |
| Paved Paths/Trails | 55.1 | 51.3 | 56.7 | 50.7 |
| Pet Waste Stations | 52.5 | 44.7 | 61.8 | 46.4 |
| Benches/Seating | 45.3 | 33.3 | 44.2 | 47.4 |
| Passive Parks <br> (Unstructured Use) | 44.7 | 37.1 | 44.1 | 40.2 |
| Dog Parks | 44.2 | 42.9 | 44.1 | 38.5 |
| Swimming Pool | 42.6 | 56.8 | 50.1 | 31.7 |
| Public Parking | 41.3 | 37.8 | 33.3 | 43.5 |
| Sm Neighborhood Parks | 40.2 | 30.8 | 45.6 | 37.2 |

Importance of Park and Recreation Facilities to You and Your Household;
By HH h Ages, Percent Responding High Level, Continued

| Children's <br> Playground | 33.8 | 23.3 | 46.7 | 25.6 |
| :--- | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: |
| Community <br> Gardens | 26.1 | 22.2 | 30.4 | 19.8 |
| Ball Fields | 24.1 | 46.2 | 27.5 | 19.3 |
| Recreation <br> Programs | 23.2 | 33.3 | 23.8 | 17.2 |
| Boys and Girls Club | 21.1 | 27.9 | 20.8 | 14.7 |
| Skating Parks | 17.4 | 16.7 | 19.1 | 11.1 |
| Tennis Courts | 16.8 | 16.2 | 22.4 | 11.2 |
| Historic Centers | 14.3 | 5.1 | 12.2 | 13.3 |
| Golf Par Course | 14.3 | 23.8 | 9.9 | 11.9 |
| Bocce Ball Area | 11.6 | 23.3 | 11.1 | 7.6 |
| Volleyball Courts | 10.1 | 19.4 | 11.3 | 6.1 |
| Horseshoe Pits | 5.2 | 2.4 | 6.1 | 3.9 |
| Hand Ball Courts | 4.1 | 7.3 | 3.2 | 2.1 |

## Park Planning Process

The Standard Process for Park Planning Includes:

1. Inventory of Existing Park Facilities and Programs

- In-House Assessment
- MidCoast Community Council- Recreation documents/plans

2. Needs Assessment

- Community Survey
- Comparison with Standards/Local Communities

3. Recommendations - Facilities and Programs

- Parks Advisory Committee
- Public Hearings

4. Prioritization
5. Implementation

[^0]:    Chi Square Probability $=0.086$

