RAYMOND TURCO & ASSOCIATES

EXECUTIVE SUMMARY

Raymond Turco & Associates was retained by The Pool At Morro Bay and The Los Osos Community Pool Association, two swim club organizations, to assist in assessing future aquatic needs in the Estero Bay region, defined during this process as an area on the coast, with its boundaries being the cities of San Simeon and San Luis Obispo. Specifically, the firm was charged with the task of conducting an Aquatic Needs Assessment Survey, a scientifically accurate telephone poll, to examine the attitudes of residents throughout the region relative to aquatics and whether or not they would support and utilize one or more aquatic facilities if constructed. Questions focused on current pool use as well as potential locations, possible features to incorporate and programming opportunities to include in an aquatic facility. The information gathered in this report will allow club members and concerned individuals in the community to better understand how residents in the Estero Bay region view aquatic needs, as well as potential utilization. It will also provide citizen input into the ongoing assessment process currently being undertaken.

Recall that a survey is an attitudinal "snap-shot" of the community during the time of survey implementation and has not been influenced by either positive or negative publicity. The telephone survey included the responses of 403 individuals which equates to an overall error rate of +/- 5%, at a 95% confidence level. It should be noted that the survey was artificially "influenced" by including a larger percentage of respondents from the cities of Los Osos and Morro Bay, where the proposed facility might be constructed. That means that some areas were underpresented relative to their opinions. The decision was made that rather than be statistically valid for the whole survey universe, those impacted most would have a larger say. Below are listed the highlights from our analysis of the project:

GENERAL ATTITUDES ABOUT AQUATICS IN ESTERO BAY

- ***As many people were pleased (43%) as critical (43%) with the quality of aquatics in their community. Also similar were the levels of intense positive and negative opinions (10%-14%), although critical comment was more common. The remaining 14% had no opinion regarding the quality of aquatics. The ratio of satisfaction to dissatisfaction was one to one, indicating that people were split as to their opinion about aquatic quality.***

  Regarding intense opinions, residents most critical of aquatic quality resided in either Cambria (20%) or Morro Bay (24%). Elsewhere the percentage of intense negativity was 15% (Los Osos), 3% (San Luis Obispo), and 2% (Cayucos). Overall dissatisfaction exceeded the median score of 43% in Cambria (48%) and Morro Bay (59%), the only subsector in which negative opinions exceeded 50%. Note intense negative remarks were greater than similar positive beliefs in Cambria (20%-3%), Morro Bay 15%-7%), and Los Osos (17%-7%), but not Cayucos (2%-11%) or San Luis Obispo (3%-18%). Citizens in San Luis Obispo were also more complimentary in terms of excellent ratings (18%), followed by survey participants from Cayucos (11%), Morro Bay (8%), Los Osos (7%), and Cambria (6%). Two subsectors were better than 50% positive – San Luis Obispo (70%) and Cayucos (65%). Way under the 50 percentile for satisfaction were individuals from the cities of Cambria (36%), Los Osos (35%), and Morro Bay (27%). The ratios of satisfaction to dissatisfaction were very different based on where people lived. For example, above the median ratio of 1.0:1 were people in Cayucos (65%-13%, 5.0:1) and San Luis Obispo (70%-20%, 3.5:1). That compared with much lower levels in Morro Bay (27%-59%, 0.5:1), Los Osos (35%-53%, 0.7:1), and Cambria (36%-48%, 0.8:1).

  People who were either members of a swim club or else knew someone who was, 12% of the full sample, were less enthusiastic (4%-11%) and positive overall (39%-44%), instead being more negative (58%-41%) and dissatisfied (58%-41%). Interestingly, members were very aware of the quality of aquatics, as only 2% had no opinion, a much lower rate than nonmembers (16%). Those opposed to the year-round aquatic center in the Estero Bay region were most satisfied with the quality of aquatics (58%), compared to 45% who would support and 34% strongly support the project.

  Satisfaction ratings fluctuated based on how long one had lived in the region (47% of under 4, to 34% of 5-10, and 43% of over 10 years), although those newest to their respective community were most pleased. As

people aged, what increased were the very satisfied (4% of under 45, to 10% of 46-65, to 12% of over 65) remarks, but also the no opinion comments (7%-10%-24%). What varied little based on age was the percentage of positive comments (44%-40%-43%). People without children or whose children were over the age of 18, described in this report as "nonparents," were more positive than some parental groups, at 43%, but more negative than others, *as percentages were 40% (under 6),* 49% (age 6-12), and 37% (age 13-18). The ethnic tabulations showed Caucasians and Others similarly satisfied (43%-39%), although Others had a higher level of no opinion responses (22%-13%). (See Table #1 of the Tabulation Report and Question #1 of the Survey.)

- ***Exercise (62%) and recreation (61%) were the two statements respondents felt best described their primary uses with rgards to swimming. The next most popular response was rehabilitation, at 23%. Fewer still said they swam for injury/disease management (14%) or competition (4%). In addition, approximately one in three said they don't swim (16%) or used to swim (15%).***

  In Cambria (75%-65%) and San Luis Obispo (72%-63%), recreational swimming was preferred over exercise in terms of why people swam. That was not the case in Cayucos (63%-54%), Morro Bay (64%-60%), or Los Osos (58%-57%). Los Osos had the highest percentage of people who said they did not swim (21%, to 13% in Morro Bay and San Luis Obispo). Another significant variance was the low percentage of people in Cayucos who said they swam for injury/disease management (2%, to 20% in Cambria). Women were more likely to say they swam for exercise (68%-56%), rehabilitation (28%-17%), and injury/disease management (18%-11%). Respondents associated with a swim club swam more in general, whether it be for exercise (83%-59%), recreation (77%-60%), rehabilitation (35%-21%), or injury/disease management (31%-12%).

  People newest to their community used swimming to recreate more so than to exercise (72%-64%). This was not the case for mid-term (68%-71%) or long-term (55%-57%) community members, who were slightly more inclined to exercise when they swam. The older the respondent, the more apt he or she was to say they did not swim (7%-15%-22%) or used to swim (6%-11%-25%). Therefore, nearly one-half the people over 65 either don't swim currently or never swam. Both the young (85%-73%) and middle-aged (69%-65%) acknowledged recreational swimming over exercise. Comparatively, seniors swam more for exercise than recreation (40%-51%). Seniors were also more likely to swim for rehabilitation (14%-23%-26%). Parents of all three age subsets swam for recreation (91%-84%-79%) rather than exercise (80%-76%-63%). Nonparents, on the other hand, said

exercise was a more frequent reason to swim than recreation (59%-54%). Nonparents were also the subset with the highest combined don't swim/used to swim levels (36%, to 12%-14%-17%). The ethnic tabulations showed Others to prefer recreational swimming over exercise (69%-63%), while Caucasians said exercise over recreation, although just barely (62%-60%). Also note that Caucasians had higher don't swim/used to swim ratings (32%-26%). (See Table #3 of the Tabulation Report and Question #3 of the Survey.)

- ***Forty percent of survey participant's acknowled that in the past year, they or their family traveled within a 25-mile radius to utilize an aquatic facility where they had to pay a fee. By comparison, 60% said they did not.***

  Yes responses were highest in Los Osos, at 49%, followed by 46% in Morro Bay. At the median rate were individuals in the San Luis Obispo community (40%). Levels at these three cities were all significantly higher than in Cambria (28%) or Cayucos (20%), where only one in five replied affirmatively to travelling to utilize an aquatic facility. Those most critical of the aquatic quality were over 50% apt to travel to utilize an aquatic facility (41%-37%-51%). Also more likely to utilize an out-of-town facility were people associated with a swim club (69%-37%) rather than nonmembers. Also note that the subgroup most likely to say they did not travel to utilize an aquatic facility were those opposed to a year-round aquatic center in the Estero Bay region (42% strong support, to 62% support, to 86% oppose). There was not a significant variance in aquatic facility utilization based on tenure in the community (38%-46%-39%), although there was when examining the findings by age (59%-43%-28%), as people over the age of 65 chose not to travel to utilize a facility. Parents were more than twice as likely as nonparents to travel to an aquatic facility and pay a fee (71%-69%-71%, to 31%). Also note that the age of one's children did not appear to impact visitation. There was also no significant difference in visitation when comparing results based on ethnicity (41%-39%), as both similarly visited an aquatic facility. (See Question #4 of the Tabulation Report and Question #4 of the Survey.)

- ***Better than four of five respondents sampled (82%) would either strongly support (42%) or support (40%) a year-round aquatic facility being built in the Estero Bay area, on the coast somewhere between San Simeon and San Luis Obispo. Conversely, opposition was less than one in ten (9%), with the remaining 8% having no opinion on the matter. Note that the ratio of support to opposition was better than nine to one (9.1:1), an early indication of general support. In addition, note that the intense support response was the most popular position (42%-40%). Also, the ratio of intense support to opposition was 21 to one, higher than the general ratio***

and an indication that there was a constituency very passionate about the potential project. This was the "pre-test" query, as no other information about this idea was discussed prior to posing the question.

Based on strong support ratings, the facility should be constructed in Morro Bay, as strong support ratings were higher there (55%) than anywhere else. The community of Cambria had the second highest strong support, at 48%, with Los Osos in third place with a 44%. Residents in Cayucos were 34% likely to strongly support the facility. However, in San Luis Obispo, only 18% were intensely supportive. The support ratio was as follows: tops in Morro Bay, at 17.8:1 (89%-5%), but followed closely by a 17.6:1 (88%-5%) in Los Osos. At much lower levels were residents of San Luis Obispo (66%-12%, 5.5:1), Cambria (81%-16%, 5.1:1), and Cayucos (70%-23%, 3.0:1). The more critical people were of the quality of aquatics, the more likely they were to strongly support (28%-29%-62%) and support in general (77%-78%-92%) the year-round venue. Those with no opinion about aquatic quality were more in line with satisfied rather than dissatisfied respondents, with a 65% support rating. Also more likely to both strongly support (67%-39%) and support in general (90%-81%) the proposed facility were people associated with a swim club.

When this question is compared with a similar query presented at the end of the survey, we note strong supporters have retained 65% of strong support, although more than a third shifted to general support (31%) and 4% to opposition. General support, 40% of the preliminary findings, also retained 61% of general support, with 19% shifting to intense advocacy and 13% to opposition. Of the 7% opposed, 83% continued to oppose the project in the post-test query, as too, 50% of the strong opponents, although they were only 2% of the full sample. Finally, of the 8% who had no opinion on this question more shifted to opposition than support (44%-41%) between the pre-test and post-test questions.

The longer one had lived in the Estero Bay area, the less likely he or she was to support the facility being built (90%-84%-78%), although the lowest rating was still better than three of every four. The age tabulations showed strong support dropping more than 25% based on one's age (59%-43%-33%), although general support by only eight points (86%-83%-78%). Parents were nearly twice as likely to strongly support the potential facility as nonparents (63%-65%-60%, to 36%), although general support was fairly consistent regardless of whether respondents had children under 18 or not (83%-87%-89%, to 81%). Also note no difference of opinion based on ethnicity relative to the potential project (81%-84%). (See Table #5 of the Tabulation Report and Question #5 of the Survey.)

- ***Survey participants said that if a pool or aquatic facility was located in Morro Bay (68%-32%, 2.1:1), they would be more likely to travel there to utilize it with some degree of regularity than if it was located in Los Osos (63%-38%, 1.7:1). Compartively, respondents were unlikely to visit a pool or aquatic facility with some regularity if it was located in Cambria or San Simeon (17%-83%, 0.2:1), San Luis Obispo (43%-57%, 0.8:1), or Cayucos (48%-52%, 0.9:1).*** In addition to its higher likely ratio, intensity ratings were higher for traveling to Morro Bay than Los Osos (38%-30%). Very likely ratings dropped to 23% for Cayucos, to 17% for San Luis Obispo, and 6% for Cambria or San Simeon. Also note that very unlikely ratings matched or were higher than very likely levels in both San Luis Obispo (17%-17%) and Cambria or San Simeon (6%-26%).

  Morro Bay generated majority likely ratings in four of the five cities. That compared with three for Cayucos, two for Los Osos, and one for Cambria or San Simeon. No city voiced majority likely ratings if the facility was located in San Luis Obispo, not even the sector community. The four communities voicing majority likely ratings for Morro Bay were Morro Bay (89%), Los Osos (73%), Cayucos (64%), and Cambria (53%). For Cayucos, the cities were Morro Bay (78%), Cayucos (64%), and Cambria (55%). The other majority marks were Los Osos (86%) and Morro Bay (78%) for locating a facility in Los Osos and Cambria (78%) in Cambria. Residents in Cambria chose Cambria (78%) over their second choice, either Cayucos (55%) or Morro Bay (53%). Interestingly, people from Cayucos were split between Morro Bay and Cayucos (65%-64%), whereas in both Morro Bay (89%) and Los Osos (86%), their own city received the highest likely ratings.

  Nonparents would likely travel to either Los Osos (68%) or Morro Bay (64%), with the latter a slightly less popular location. With parents, Morro Bay (88%-84%-77%) was a more popular choice than Los Osos (63%-72%-71%), although note that as children aged, the gap between the two choices narrowed. Overall, a majority of parents would likely travel to San Luis Obispo (65%-70%-54%), with Cayucos attaining majority ratings from two of the three parental subsets (57%-55%-48%). Neither parents nor nonparents would likely travel to Cambria or San Simeon to utilize an aquatic facility. (See Tables #6 - #10 of the Tabulation Report, Question #6 of the Survey, and Supporting Tables #2 - #4 of the Summary Report.)

- ***Morro Bay was preferred over Los Osos (37%-27%) as the choice of survey participants as the area where they would like to see an aquatic facility constructed. Much less popular choices were the cities of San Luis Obispo (13%), Cayucos (6%), and Cambria and San Simeon (both 8%). One percent said a city other than the five primary choices, with the remaining 7% having no opinion on the matter.***

Eighty-eight percent of residents in Morro Bay would prefer the facility built in their city. That was a higher individual rate than the 74% of Los Osos residents who wanted the venue in their city, 73% of Cambria inhabitants who chose their community, and 68% of San Luis Obispo residents who preferred the aquatic facility in their city. It should be noted that Morro Bay as a preferred location captured more area wide support than the others. For example, of the 37% who listed this city, two-thirds came from Morro Bay with one-third coming from other areas. Comparatively, of the 27% who listed Los Osos, 92% came from that city. Thirteen percent chose San Luis Obispo as their preferred location, with 77% coming from that city. The other two communities were at 83% (Cayucos) and 91% (Cambria and San Simeon).

Individuals' critical of aquatic quality chose Morro Bay over Los Osos (46%-31%) as their preferred destination. Morro Bay was also the choice of people both satisfied (32%-24%) and very satisfied (26%-23%), but the variance was more narrow. Also note that both swim club members (42%-31%) and nonmembers (36%-26%) chose Morro Bay over Los Osos as their location of choice. The 18% who opposed a year-round aquatic center in the Estero Bay region similarly listed the three top choices of Morro Bay, Los Osos, and San Luis Obispo (21%-20%-17%). Comparatively, general supporters were split between Morro Bay and Los Osos (31%-31%). Where Morro Bay stood out were with those most intense of their support, as strong supporters were twice as likely to pick Morro Bay over Los Osos (55%-25%).

Long-term community residents similarly preferred Morro Bay or Los Osos (32%-31%) for locating an aquatic facility. However, newer (46%-22%) and mid-term (44%-22%) inhabitants were clearly more inclined to prefer Morro Bay. The age tabulations showed the youngest portion of the sample more attuned to locating a facility in Morro Bay (54%-36%-31%), while it was those most senior who listed Los Osos (23%-26%-32%) as their preferred location. Note that seniors were split, while the others clearly preferred Morro Bay. Morro Bay was also the clear choice of parents (54%-17%, to 49%-18%, to 46%-31%), regardless of their children's age. Nonparents were also more inclined to select Morro Bay (34%-28%), but the difference in percentages was much closer. (See Table #11 of the Tabulation Report and Question #7 of the Survey.)

- ***If a facility was constructed in Morro Bay or Los Osos, a majority of survey participants would prefer the facility be a combination (indoor and outdoor) (55%) rather than either an indoor (25%) or outdoor (12%) aquatic venue. Only 5% would rather see nothing constructed, with the remaining 4% having no opnion on the matter.***

The combination of indoor and outdoor aquatics was the preferred choice, regardless of the city in which one resided. However, percentages varied by twelve percentage points. Exceeding the majority mark were residents in Los Osos (59%), Morro Bay (57%), and San Luis Obispo (53%). The other combination marks were 46% in Cayucos and 45% in Cambria. Those two regions were the areas most apt to want nothing constructed (10% and 11%, to 1% in Los Osos). Although not a lot of people chose an outdoor only facility, the highest rating came from Morro Bay (17%, to 5% in San Luis Obispo). The combination facility was preferred whether one was positive about aquatic quality or critical (54%-55%-59%). Interestingly, the 14% with no opinion about quality were equally split between the combination facility and the indoor facility (41%-40%) and their support for the indoor facility was nearly twice the other three subsets (23%-21%-23%). Respondents with no affiliation with a swim club preferred an indoor facility (27%-13%), while members focused more interest on an outdoor facility (23%-10%). Both groups, however, preferred the combination facility (58%-54%) over the other two.

People strongly and generally supportive of a year-round aquatic center focused on the combination facility (58% and 60%) rather than the indoor center (23% and 27%) as their preferred choice. Comparatively, opponents voiced a slight preference with the combination over the indoor facility (27%). An additional 24% would prefer that nothing is constructed.

Support for the combination facility was consistent regardless of age (58%-55%-54%) or length of residence (58%-50%-55%). The same could also be true for the second most popular choice, the indoor facility. Parents of young children were most enthusiastic about wanting the combination facility (71%-59%-65%), but both they and nonparents (52%) were likely to endorse the preferred choice. Note that nonparents were nearly the most supportive subset when it came to preferring the indoor facility (26%, to 17%-27%-21%). (See Table #12 of the Tabulation Report and Question #8 of the Survey.)

DEFINING A POTENTIAL AQUATIC FACILITY

- ***Family changing rooms (87%-9%, 9.7:1), fitness/lap lane pool (85%-11%, 7.7:1), a therapeutic pool (84%-12%, 7.0:1), water play area (76%-15%, 5.1:1), and a children's wading pool (81%-16%, 5.1:1) were the top rated elements area respondents would prefer to see included if an aquatic center was constructed, based on support to opposition ratios. Out of the***

22 items tested, the top ten also included a recreational diving area (76%-16%, 4.8:1), pool for competitions (77%-18%, 4.3:1), zero depth pool entry (69%-16%, 4.3:1), children's play features such as spray areas (70%-24%, 2.9:1), and bleachers for competition viewing (69%-26%, 2.7:1). Comparatively, what were not preferred were areas for tanning (27%-66%, 0.4:1), waterfalls (29%-65%, 0.4:1), and a current channel, or lazy river (31%-49%, 0.6:1). In addition, a significant percentage of respondents had concerns when it came to including water slides (50%-44%, 1.1:1), a wave pool (48%-42%, 1.1:1), sand volleyball area (50%-45%, 1.1:1), indoor enhancements such as waterfalls (49%-42%, 1.2:1), and a steam room or sauna (51%-44%, 1.2:1).

Survey participants were most passionate (strongly support) about including a fitness/lap lane pool (22%), family changing rooms (21%), water play area (20%), a therapeutic pool (18%), and a pool for competitions (15%). Conversely, what they were not enthusiastic about including were areas for tanning (3%), waterfalls (4%), indoor enhancements such as waterfalls (5%), and party areas and a wave pool (both 6%). When comparing how intensity ratings ranked compared to support ratios, we note strong support most prevalent for water slides (11th, to 16th), while the community was more pro party areas (13th, to 18th), indoor enhancements such as waterfalls (15th, to 20th), and bleachers for competition viewing (10th, to 17th). Those with the higher support ratios had community support but lacked people who felt similarly passionate about that particular element. The slide possessed that constituency, but lacked the same level of community commitment.

When comparing people from the cities of Morro Bay and Los Osos, we note that seven of the top ten items were similar, although prioritized slightly differently. Those elements most popular were family changing rooms (1st and 3rd), a therapeutic pool (2nd and 2nd), fitness/lap lane pool (3rd and 1st), children's wading pool (4th and 4th), pool for competitions (5th and 7th), recreational diving area (6th and 5th), and a water play area (7th and 6th). And when comparing all five cities, only a few elements of the top ten were prioritized differently. For example, the compeititve diving area failed to make the top ten in Cambria and Cayucos, but did in the other three cities. A zero depth entry pool was top ten in Cambria, Cayucos, and Los Osos, but not elsewhere, while Los Osos residents did not place bleachers for competition viewing in their top ten, something that residents in the other cities did. Also, the whirlpool ranked 6th to people in San Luis Obispo, but was not in the top ten in the other four sectors. Residents in the San Luis Obispo subsector assigned the highest ratings to more items being included (15), followed by four in Los Osos and three in Morro Bay. When examining the five subsectors, the variances in

support ratings were most dramatic relative to including areas for tanning (38% in San Luis Obispo, to 10% in Cambria), indoor enhancements such as waterfalls (65% in San Luis Obispo, to 38% in Cambria), dry playground area (60% in San Luis Obispo, to 39% in Cayucos), a whirlpool (80% in San Luis Obispo, to 55% in Cambria), and zero depth pool entry (76% in Los Osos, to 56% in Cambria).

As children aged, support increased for a pool for competitions (80%-90%-91%), zero depth pool entry (66%-70%-77%), dry playground area (63%-65%-70%), and a therapeutic pool (86%-87%-92%). At the same time, interest waned for a water play area (100%-94%-83%), children's play features (82%-80%-73%), and a wave pool (64%-49%-48%). What nonparents wanted most to see at a new facility were family changing rooms (84%), fitness/lap lane pool (83%), therapeutic pool (82%), children's wading pool (79%), and pool for competitions (74%). However, what they did not want to see were areas for tanning (23%), water falls (24%), a current channel, or lazy river (26%), a wave pool (36%), and indoor enhancements (43%). (See Tables #13 - #34 of the Tabulation Report, Question #9 of the Survey, and Supporting Table #5 - #7 of the Summary Report.)

- ***Asked to identify the most important aquatic feature or amenity to be included in the planning of an aquatic center, respondents prioritized a fitness/lap lane pool (29%), therapeutic pool (18%), and a pool for competitions (13%) as being most important. After that was a children's wading pool (7%), water play area and zero-depth pool entry (both 5%). Of the 22 items tested, 20 were considered to be most important to construct by at least one respondent. The elements registered least often were party areas, waterfalls, and dry playground area (each 0%-1 respondent).***

  The top three items in each area were as follows: in Morro Bay, fitness/lap lane pool (32%), therapeutic pool (20%), and pool for competitions (13%); in Los Osos, the same three responses, at levels of 29%, 21%, and 11%; in San Luis Obispo, 29%, 21%, and 11%; in Cayucos, 21%, 17%, 13%; and in Cambria, fitness/lap lane pool (46%), pool for competitions (17%), and therapeutic pool (9%). How strongly people prioritized their particular choices varied. More than ten percent differentiated the high and low rates for fitness/lap lane pool (46% in Cambria, to 21% in Cayucos), therapeutic pool (21% in San Luis Obispo, to 9% in Cambria), chidren's wading pool (13% in Cayucos, to 3% in Cambria), and competitive diving area (10% in Cayucos, to 0% in Cambria). Women were more likely to say the new aquatic venue needed a therapeutic pool (24%-12%), while men felt it was most important for the facility to have a pool for competitions

(19%-7%). The more critical people were about aquatic quality, the more frequently they said that the facility should have a fitness/lap lane pool (21%-26%-35%), although those same individuals were less demanding of a therapeutic pool (21%-19%-16%). Not surprisingly, people affiliated with a swim club were more demanding of a pool for competitions (26%-11%), although it still ranked third among nonmembers.

Those who would prefer a combination indoor/outdoor aquatic facility being constructed prioritized the top three items at rates of 30% (fitness/lap lane pool), 19% (therapeutic pool), and 12% (pool for competitions). By comparison, indoor facility advocates prioritized those same three elements at levels of 24%, 21%, and 16%, as well as 11% who wanted zero-depth pool entry. Although only 13% of the full sample preferred an outdoor facility, 42% prioritized the fitness/lap lane pool, far more than any of the other subsets. After that was the therapeutic pool and competition pool, both at 13%, along with 10% for a children's wading pool.

When reviewing the findings by age, certain groups focused on specific elements more than others. Middle-aged people most preferred the fitness/lap lane pool (21%-34%-25%), while seniors more often considered the therapeutic pool (4%-18%-27%) most important. It was the youngest portion of the sample that assigned the highest rates for both competition (19%-13%-9%) and children's wading (13%-5%-6%) pools. Long-term residents were the group most likely to prioritize a therapeutic pool (12%-13%-23%) as being most important for inclusion, whereas the competition pool (24%-10%-11%) was of most interest to people newer to the area. The fitness/lap lane pool was most important to people who had lived in their city for 5-10 years (16%-38%-30%).

Nonparents were the driving force for including a therapeutic pool in planning the aquatic facility (23%, to 0%-2%-10%). They were also the subset most interested in the fitness/lap lane pool (31%, to 21%-20%-25%). Comparatively, parents appeared to be most interested in including the competition pool (9%-18%-21%, to 11%), children's wading pool (15%-10%-10%, to 5%), and water play area (15%-10%-4%, to 4%). The ethnic tabulations showed Caucasians/Whites most interested in the fitness/lap lane pool (31%-19%), while Others were focused on the chidren's wading pool (13%-6%). (See Table #35 of the Tabulation Report, Question #10 of the Survey and Table #27 of the Tabulation Report, and supporting Table #8 of the Summary Report.)

- ***Open recreation swimming (80%-19%, 4.2:1), lap/fitness swimming (75%-24%, 3.1:1), water aerobics/aqua jogging (69%-29%, 2.4:1), therapeutic***

recreation (69%-30%, 2.3:1), and water safety/Red Cross certification (62%-36%, 1.7:1) were the aquatic programming opportunities most likely to generate participation from residents, based on these achieving the highest ratios of likely to unlikely comments. Of the 16 programs tested, more than half (10) did not generate majority likely ratings, with respondents saying they would least likely participate in synchronized swimming (20%-78%, 0.3:1), infant and toddler instruction (30%-69%, 0.4:1), water polo (31%-67%, 0.5:1), springboard diving (35%-64%, 0.5:1), and competitive swimming (35%-64%, 0.5:1). People were nearly as likely to participate as not in special interest programs (37%-40%, 0.9:1), although 22% had no opinon on this type of programming.

From the perspective of very likely ratings, survey participants voiced the most interest in lap/fitness swimming (23%), open recreation swimming (22%), water aerobics/aqua jogging (20%), therapeutic recreation (16%), and age-specific group swimming lessons (15%). There was practically no excitement in terms of people being interested in synchronized swimming (3%), special interest programs (4%), springboard diving (5%), scuba certification classes (6%), and water games, such as water volleyball and water polo (both 8%). There was some constituent support for infant and toddler instruction (10th in intensity, to 15th in ratio), but this was lacking relative to scuba certification classes (9th in ratio, to 13th in intensity), special interest programs (6th, to 15th), and water games, such as water volleyball (7th, to 11th).

The five programs that generated overall majority participation did so throughout the study area. Lap/fitness swimming was most popular in Cayucos (75%) and Morro Bay (79%), compared to open recreation swimming in Cambria (75%), Los Osos (83%), and San Luis Obispo (74%). The second most popular program in Morro Bay was water aerobics/aqua jogging (74%), while lap/fitness swimming garnered the second most interest in Cambria (73%), Los Osos (75%), and San Luis Obispo (71%). Residents from Cayucos placed open recreation swimming second, with 75%. The third most popular aquatic program in terms of likely participation was water aerobics/aqua jogging in Cambria (63%) compared with infant and therapeutic recreation everywhere else (73% in Morro Bay and Los Osos, to 61% in San Luis Obispo). In addition to the five programs that attained majority likely ratings, water games drew majority ratings in Morro Bay and Los Osos (both 51%) but not anywhere else. When reviewing the likely ratings, only one program did not display at least a ten point variance in percentages and that was lap/fitness swimming (79% in Morro Bay, to 71% in San Luis Obispo). Likely ratings varied dramatically, as the average difference by subsector was nearly 20% (19.4%). The most significant variances revolved around age-specific

group swimming lessons drawing much more interest in Cayucos than Cambria (49%-21%), as too lessons for disabled or special need persons (45%-21%), infant and toddler instruction (37%-13%), and synchronized swimming (34%-10%). In addition, water games appeared to draw a lot more interest in Morro Bay and Los Osos (both 51%, to 28% in Cambria) and water polo generated a higher likely rating in Morro Bay (38%, to 15% in Cambria). Note that for 11 of the 16 programs, the lowest likely rating came from people in Cambria. Comparatively, the highest likely ratings came from Cayucos and Morro Bay (both 6), as well as Los Osos (5).

A majority of parents, regardless of the age of their children, would likely participate in age-specific group swimming lessons (83%-84%-65%), therapeutic recreation (57%-55%-71%), water aerobics/aqua jogging (55%-55%-67%), water safety/Red Cross certification (80%-79%-84%), lap/fitness swimming (86%-86%-87%), open recreation swimming (100%-96%-94%), water games, such as water polo (74%-69%-64%), springboard diving (52%-57%-54%), and water polo (54%-51%-52%). Conversely, those that generated the most interest from nonparents were open recreation swimming (76%), water aerobics/aqua jogging and lap/fitness swimming (both 72%), and water safety/Red Cross certification (56%). Not surprisingly, infant or toddler instruction generated significant interest from parents of young children (63%-32%-31%), but fell off as children aged (63%-32%-31%). Also note that interest in scuba certification classes increased as children aged (43%-47%-58%), as, too, synchronized swimming (3%-14%-29%), although interest never grew to be higher than one of every three. (See Tables #36 - #51 of the Tabulation Report, Question #11 of the Survey, and Supporting Tables #9 - #11 of the Survey Summary Report.)

- ***Recreational swimming (84%-4%, 21.0:1), along with lap swimming (78%-7%, 11.1:1), playing in the water slide (77%-10%, 7.7:1) were the programs in which parents would most likely allow their children to participate, based on these having the highest ratios of likely to unlikely percentages. Parents would allow their children involvement in all eight programs tested, although the ratios showed some hesitancy in terms of water polo (58%-28%, 2.1:1), diving lessons (67%-34%, 3.4:1), playing with water equipment (65%-19%, 3.4:1), and competitive swimming (67%-19%, 3.5:1).***

  Very likely ratings showed the most excitement in terms of parents allowing children to participate in recreational swimming (43%), swimming lessons (42%), lap swimming (40%), and playing on the water slide (32%). Conversely, intensity levels were lowest relative to competitive swimming (18%), water polo (23%), diving lessons (24%), and playing with water equipment (25%). No opinion ratings for the various activities ranged from

13%-16%, indicating a significant percentage lacked information to make a decision.

Residency had a significant impact on whether or not there was interest in children participating in the various programming opportunitities. For example, likely ratings for all eight programs varied on average 28%. As in previous queries, the low rating was almost always in the City of Cambria, while the higher levels came from residents of Cayucos (6) or Morro Bay (2). The disparity in likely ratings was greatest for allowing children to participate in swimming lessons (86% in Cayucos, to 50% in Cambria), water polo (71% in Cayucos and Morro Bay, to 41% in San Luis Obispo), competitive swimming (78% in Cayucos, to 50% in Cambria), and diving lessons (85% in Cayucos, to 58% in Los Osos). The difference was smallest for recreational swimming, but that was still 18 points (93% in Cayucos, to 75% in Cambria). When comparing the two primary areas of Morro Bay and Los Osos, note that Morro Bay parents were more likely to allow their children to participate in the various programs, at rates that varied between 10 (88%-78% for recreational swimming) and 20 (71%-51% for water polo) points.

Nine of every ten survey participants, regardless of the age of children, would likely allow them to participate playing on a water slide (92%-94%-95%) and recreational swimming (97%-96%-97%). Ninety percent of parents would also likely allow children to participate in swimming lessons (97%-98%-72%), at least until they reached the age of 13, at which point likely ratings declined. The only other programs which saw likely ratings vary were playing with water equipment (86% of 6-12, to 74% of under 6) and water polo (71% of under 6 and 13-18, to 60% of 6-12). (See Tables #52 - #59 of the Tabulation Report, Question #12 of the Survey, and Supporting Tables #12 - #14 of the Summary Report.)

- ***"I would support the community of Los Osos and the city of Morro Bay working together to construct one aquatic center that meets everyone's needs rather than each constructing one" (90%-8%, 11.0:1) was far and away the aquatic facility location statement that generated the highest ratio of agreement to disagreement. In terms of locating a facility in a specific city, affirmation was similar for the statements, "I would prefer any aquatic facility beign constructed in Morro Bay" (73%-21%, 2.5:1) and "I would prefer any aquatic facility being constructed in Los Osos" (65%-30%, 2.2:1). Of the six statements dealing with facility location, those most likely to be disputed were "I don't believe residents in my community would support the construction of an aquatic facility" (28%-57%, 0.5:1) and "I would prefer an aquatic facility being constructed in Morro Bay and in Los Osos" (40%-54%, 0.7:1). The final statement, "I probably would***

not utilize an aquatic facility if it was not constructed in the community in which I live" (50%-47%, 1.1:1) generated as much agreement as disagreement. These statements indicate that residents are most in favor of Los Osos and Morro Bay working together to build one aquatic facility that respondents have a very slight preference for locating the venue in Morro Bay and that constructing a facility in each city was not favored by survey participants. Also, most believe that residents would support the construction of an aquatic facility, although some concerns were raised that some residents might hesitate to visit facilities not located in their city.

Although the ratios showed similar interest in locating an aquatic facility in either Los Osos or Morro Bay, the intensity ratings showed much more enthusiasm for locating it in Morro Bay, based on that statement generating significantly higher intensity ratings (35%-23%). In fact, there was more intensity for locating a facility in Morro Bay than the communities working together to construct one that meets everyone's needs rather than one in each community (33%). Also note that only 3% strongly affirmed that they did not believe residents would support the construction of an aquatic facility and 8% would not utilize an aquatic facility if not constructed in the community in which they lived.

There was more agreement in Morro Bay for preferring any aquatic facility being constructed in Morro Bay (95%) than in Los Osos for constructing one in their city (87%). However, there was also more support among Morro Bay residents for preferring a facility in Los Osos than in Los Osos for an aquatic center in Morro Bay (77%-70%). Respondents from both Cayucos (79%-19%) and Cambria (56%-31%) voiced majority agreement for preferring a facility being constructed in Morro Bay (79%-19%). They were not at all similar in agreement for an aquatic center being constructed in Los Osos (38%-60% and 35%-56%). San Luis Obispo residents were similar in preferring an aquatic facility in either city (46%-42%), although the higher rate was for Morro Bay. And disagreement ratings were higher for locating the facility in Los Osos (46%-42%). In both Cambria (63%-36%) and San Luis Obispo (67%-30%), a majority affirmed that they would probably not utilize an aquatic facility if not constructed in their communities. In both Morro Bay (48%-49%) and Los Osos (47%-49%), opinions were split, while in Cayucos (30%-64%), residents did not appear to be concerned where the facility was located. Majority agreement was not reached in any of the five cities for locating aquatic facilities in both Morro Bay and Los Osos, with the high ratings being 40% and 42% in the named communities. Conversely, 93% of both subsectors agreed that both communities should work to together to construct one aquatic center. The highest rate for not believing residents in their

community would not support construction was 43% in Cambria, compared to a low of 19% in San Luis Obispo.

Parents were more likely to prefer any aquatic facility being built in Morro Bay (89%-86%-83%) than in Los Osos (74%-74%-77%), based on the former generating agreement ratings 15 percent higher in general. Nonparents also more often agreed with the Morro Bay statement (69%-62%), although the variance was not as dramatic. Parents were also more likely to affirm the cooperation statement (92%-94%-92%, to 88%). As children aged, parents appeared to be more concerned with location, as agreement increased for not utilizing an aquatic facility if not constructed in the community in which they live (26%-43%-56%). And parents voiced majority agreement, at 51%. Additionally, nonparents were the leading advocates in not believing their community would support the construction of an aquatic facility (33%, to 11%-16%-15%). (See Tables #60 - #65 of the Tabulation Report, Question 13 of the Survey, and Supporting Tables #15 - #17 of the Summary Report.)

- ***One-half (51%) of respondents surveyed said that they or their family would utilize a combination indoor and outdoor aquatic facility either 2-3 times per week (35%) or more than three times per week (16%). Nearly the same percentage voiced similar utilization rates if an indoor facility was constructed (37%+13%=50%). Both rates were higher than if what was constructed was an outdoor aquatic facility (29%+12%=41%). However, never/no opinion ratings were similar whether what was constructed was an indoor (12%), outdoor (17%), or combination (15%) facility.***

  If the combination facility was constructed, residents from Morro Bay indicated being willing to utilize it most frequently, as their combined 2-3 times and more than 3 times per week rating was 63%. The only other majority mark was a 54% in Los Osos. Elsewhere, combined percentages were 45% (Cayucos), 43% (Cambria), and 35% (San Luis Obispo). Frequency ratings for indoor utilization, which was very similar in terms of overall percentages, was also highest in Morro Bay (64%), followed by 57% in Los Osos, 43% in Cayucos, 40% in Cambria, and 27% in San Luis Obispo. Frequent usage of an outdoor aquatic facility was higher in Morro Bay (51%) than anywhere else (44% in Los Osos, to 30% in San Luis Obispo). People associated with a swim club would be very frequent users of a combination facility (73%), but would also regularly visit the indoor aquatic facility (71%) and the outdoor facility (61%). Frequency rates among nonmembers were 49%, 48%, and 40%.

  The more supportive residents were of a year-round aquatic center in the Estero Bay area, the more frequently they acknowledged using it, be it a

combination (76%-48%-18%), indoor (77%-46%-16%), or outdoor (62%-39%-14%) aquatic facility.

The combination venue drew more potential utilization from people who were younger (65%-51%-44%), but note that tenure in the community did not significantly impact usage. The variance of usage based on age was not as dramatic when reviewing potential usage of the indoor aquatic facility (58%-50%-48%), as a higher rate of younger individuals were more likely to be drawn to the combination facility. Note that how long one lived in the community had no more impact regarding usage of the indoor facility (50%-51%-51%) as the combination facility. Only people under the age of 45 voiced majority usage if the facility was outdoors (56%-41%-35%). Frequent utilization of a combination aquatic venue was driven by parents of young children (74%-58%-59%, to 47%), but that was also the case for the indoor facility (66%-57%-53%, to 49%) and outdoor (57%-51%-52%, to 38%) center. (See Tables #66 - #68 of the Tabulation Report and Question #14 of the Survey.)

- ***A bond election generated the most support (68%), including intense advocacy (15%), and least opposition (27%), thus was the financing method of choice for construction of a new aquatic facility, if additional funding was required. The resulting ratio of support to opposition was nearly three to one (2.6:1), although it should be noted that the survey universe was all residents and not merely voters, so this may not represent the opinions of those most likely to vote in a bond election. The other three financing methods did not generate majority support: increased property taxes (26%-68%, 0.4:1), a sales tax increase (40%-57%, 0.7:1); or an assessment district (32%-45%, 0.7:1). Note that a large percentage were unfamiliar with an assessment district, as 23% chose no opinon, compared to no more than 5% for the other three options.***

  As stated, intense support was highest in terms of strongly supporting the bond election, although the 15% was not a significant level of passion or enthusiasm from survey participants. However, it was twice the level of the next closest scored option, the sales tax increase (7%). And the 15% was nearly four times as high as the other two items, as only 4% strongly supported the property tax increase and assessment district. Also note that for the sales tax increase (7%-18%), property tax increase (4%-22%), and assessment district (4%-15%), intense opposition was significantly higher.

  Regardless of where people lived in the study area, a majority endorsed the bond election as the preferred means of financing construction of the proposed facility. However, that said, support varied dramatically, from a

high of 80% in Morro Bay, to a low of 54% in San Luis Obispo, for a disparity of nearly thirty points. The percentages elsewhere were 72% (Los Osos) and 58% and 57% (Cambria and Cayucos). Respondents in Morro Bay and Los Osos were similarly supportive of the sales tax increase (both 47%), with ratings elsewhere no higher than the 30% in San Luis Obispo. Percentages also varied for the other two, the increased property taxes (35% in Los Osos, to 17% in San Luis Obispo) and the assessment district (37% in Los Osos, to 23% in San Luis Obispo).

Nonparents, the subgroup other surveys have shown to be the most frequent voters, were least positive, but still 62% likely to support the bond election. The three parental groups, from young to old, were 78%, 80%, and 88% likely advocates. The sales tax increase was also supported by a majority of the three parental subsets (57%-59%-57%) but not nonparents (34%). Of the other two options, increased property taxes (31%-40%-46%) saw support increase as children aged (31%-40%-46%), but never reached the majority mark. Nonparents, on the other hand, were only 23% likely to support this method. And not one of the parental subsets supported the assessment district as a means to finance construction (31%-41%-27%, to 32%), although nonparents were the only subset to express majority opposition (50%, to 26%-32%-35%). Also, parents of young and pre-teen children did express plurality support. (See Tables #69 - #72 of the Tabulation Report, Question #15 of the Survey, and Supporting Tables #18 - #20 of the Summary Report.)

- ***$2.00-$4.00 was the lowest amount a majority (54%) acknowledged being willing to pay for daily use of an aquatic facility. As the amount grew, the percentages declined: 25% at $4.01-$6.00; 2% at $6.01-$8.00; 4% at $8.01-$10.00; and 1% at more than $10.00. Also note that 15% would expect the lowest amount to be less than $2.00. In a follow-up query, the most popular response for the highest amount respondents would be willing to pay was $4.01-$6.00, with 34%. Other percentages were 11% (less than $2.00), 23% ($2.00-$4.00), 8% ($6.01-$8.00), 15% ($8.01-$10.00), and 9% (more than $10.00). By combining percentages and making the assumption that somebody who would pay more would also be willing to pay less, 86% would rate $2.00-$4.00 as the least they would pay, declining to 32% at $4.01-$6.00, making between these two amounts the low threshold. Using a similar methodology, the high threshold was between $2.00-$4.00 (89%) and $6.01-$8.00 (32%). Based on an exact amount response, the lowest average amount was $3.00 and the highest average amount for daily use, $5.00.***

  As has been stated, the lowest amount would be $2.00-$4.00, with percentages ranging from 78% in Cambria to 88% in Morro Bay and Los

Osos. At the next level, the variance was more significant, as people from Los Osos were more open to pay $4.01-$6.00 (41%) than anywhere else and especially Morro Bay (21%), although the actual low rating was 17% in Cayucos. At the threshold level ($4.01-$6.00), the other percentages were 39% (San Luis Obispo) and 34% (Cayucos). When compared with one's preferred facility, those favoring the combination facility had a higher threshold, as the 89% at $2.00-$4.00 declined to 36% at $4.01-$6.00. By comparison, those who wanted the indoor facility were at 82% and 27%, with outdoor facility advocates at 97% at $2.00-$4.00 but only 24% at $4.01-$6.00. As opposition to a year-round aquatic facility in Estero Bay grew, so too did the percentage who felt that less than $2.00 was the lowest amount to pay (6%-14%-31%).

At the $4.01-$6.00 low amount threshold, newer residents voiced the highest percentages (37%-29%-31%), as too middle-aged survey participants (24%-41%-24%) and parents of older children and nonparents (24%-32%-39%, to 31%). Note that long-term inhabitants (10%-6%-20%), people over 65 (7%-8%-26%), and nonparents (17%, to 8%-6%-6%) were the groups most apt to establish less than $2.00 as the lowest amount.

In terms of the highest amount threshold, combined percentages were 73% (Cambria), 72% (San Luis Obispo), 68% (Los Osos), 61% (Cayucos), and 58% (Morro Bay) at the $4.01-$6.00 level, declining to 39% (San Luis Obispo), 38% (Los Osos), 32% (Cambria), 24% (Morro Bay), and 23% (Cayucos) at the $6.01-$8.00 range. Therefore, the areas open to a slightly higher fee appeared to be the Los Osos and San Luis Obispo communities. Respondents affiliated with a swim club were more likely to say the highest amount was $2.00-$4.00 (39%-20%), thus assigning a lower $4.01-$6.00 (51%-67%) and $6.01-$8.00 (18%-33%) threshold percentage, indicating nonmembers to be more open to a higher amount, albeit still at the $6.01-$8.00 level.

Combination facility advocates showed their threshold to be between $4.01-$6.00 (67%) and $6.01-$8.00 (34%). These two ranges were similar if the preferred facility was an indoor aquatic center (68%-32%). Individuals who preferred the outdoor facility were less open to both the $4.01-$6.00 (58%) and $6.01-$8.00 (23%) range. Part of the reason for this is that many accepted $2.00-$4.00 (40%) as the highest amount they would pay for daily use.

The longer one lived in the sample universe, the less likely they were to establish $6.01-$8.00 as their highest amount threshold (41%-30%-29%). Note that at the $4.01-$6.00 level, percentages were nearly identical (66%-65%-65%). The age tabulations also showed a decline, with the

oldest portion of the sample assigning the lowest $6.01-$8.00 rate (37%-37%-22%). The percentages at the $4.01-$6.00 showed more acceptance among the middle-aged (63%-74%-55%). As children aged, parents appeared to be more open to the $6.01-$8.00 highest amount threshold (24%-36%-40%), although at no point were a majority open to that amount. (See Table #73 and #74 of the Tabulation Report and Question #16 of the Survey.)

- ***Less than $300 per year was both the lowest amount (68%) and the highest amount (54%) that people said they were willing to pay for use of an aquatic facility on an annual pass. Very few assigned an amount higher than $300: 10% at $300-$400 per year and 2% for both $401-$500 and $501-$600. Additionally, 17% had no opnion. Other highest amount percentages were 14% ($300-$400), 7% ($401-$500), 3% ($501-$600), 2% ($601-$700), and 19% (no opinion). By combining percentages, 82% would say that less than $300 was the lowest amount they would pay,l declining to 14% at $300-$400, while the highest amount was also less than $300 (54%) and then $300-$400 (26%). Based on the exact amount responses, the lowest average amount for an annual pass was $139.00 and the highest average amount, $235.00.***

  Residents in Los Osos (73%) and San Luis Obispo (71%) voiced the highest less than $300 lowest amount ratings. Comparatively, the lowest percentage came from people in Cambria, at 55%. The percentages elsewhere were 64% (Cayucos) and 67% (Morro Bay). The next level percentages varied from 23% in Cambria down to 12% in San Luis Obispo. Nonswim club members were more definitive in saying less than $300 was the lowest amount they would pay (69%-60%), with percentages dropping to 18% and 14% at $300-$400.

  When compared with one's preferred facility, there was not a significant difference in terms of less than $300 per year threshold, as percentages were 72% for the combination facility, 71% for the outdoor facility, and 65% for the indoor aquatic venue. Also note that whether one strongly supported (64%), generally supported (78%), or even opposed (50%) a year round aquatic facility in the Estero Bay area rating, a majority felt that the lowest amount they would pay was less than $300.00.

  A majority of respondents rated the less than $300 per year the lowest amount they would pay. This was consistent based on tenure in the community (76%-76%-62%), age of respondent (82%-71%-56%), and the age of one's children (77%-76%-83%, to 64%). People over 65 voiced a lower less than $300 per year rating, but that was because their no opnion response was significantly higher than others (13%-11%-28%).

Having noted that the highest amount a majority of residents would expect to pay was still less than $300 per year, it should be noted that responses were similar in the cities of Los Osos and San Luis Obispo (both 58%), Cayucos (57%), and Morro Bay (54%), but not in Cambria, where only 34% chose that amount. That part of the study area was more open to a larger amount, but that was not more than $300-$400 per year (36%, to 20% in Cayucos). Cambria was also the region most open to paying $501-$600 per year (13%, to 1% in Los Osos), although that rate was neglible. People affiliated with a swim club were 48% likely to grade the less than $300 per year the most they would expect to pay, which was slightly lower than the nonaffiliated respondents would select (55%). The threshold at the $300-$400 per year was slightly more likely to favor the swim club members (20%-14%).

It appeared that people who preferred the combination aquatic facility were more hesitant to pay higher amounts, as they were 60% likely to say that less than $300 was the highest amount they would expect to pay. That compared with 51% who preferred the indoor facility and 47% who listed the outdoor facility as their preference. Respondents intense in their support for a year-round aquatic center in the Estero Bay area appeared to have a slightly higher threshold, as their less than $300 per year rating was lower (48%) than general supporters (65%) and, to that extent, opponents, although their 41% was tempered by higher no opinion responses (15%-14%-36%), whereas intense supporters were open to higher amounts (37% at $300-$400 per year, to 18% and 22%).

Except for people who had lived in their community for over ten years, 63% chose less than $300 per year as their threshold (63%-63%-48%) and when compared by age, middle-aged respondents were more open to a higher amount than younger individuals when comparing less than $300 per year ratings (65%-56%-47%). Threshold ratings varied when compared by the age of one's child (66%-55%-63%, to 52%), but all groups were hesitant to say more than $300 was the highest amount they would be willing to pay. (See Table #75 and #76 of the Tabulation Report and Question #17 of the Survey.)

- ***Under $600 per year was both the lowest (64%) and the highest (58%) amount people said they would be willing to pay for a family pass to use an aquatic facility. Other lowest amount categories generated minimal levels of 4% ($601-$700), 0% ($701-$800 and $901-$1,000), 1% ($801-$900), and 1% (more than $1,000). Approximately one in three (29%) gave a no opinion response, indicating a reluctance to acknowledge a level without additional information. In addressing the highest amount threshold, responses were 5% ($601-$700), 3% ($701-$800), 0% (both $801-$900 and***

$901-$1000), and 3% (more than $1,000). An additional 29% lacked information to make a decision and thus gave a no opinion response. By combining percentages, 70% would say that less than under $600 was the lowest amount they would pay for a family pass, declining to 6% at $601-$700, while the highest amount was also under $600 (58%) and then $601-$700 (11%). Even though the threshold response was under $600, the true amount was lower, as based on the exact amount of survey participants the average lowest amount for an annual pass was $206.00 and the highest average amount, $322.00.

Looking at only the under $600 yearly fee, the high percentage was a 73% in the Los Osos area. After that were percentages of 67% (San Luis Obispo), 63% (Morro Bay), 55% (Cayucos), and 45% (Cambria). Also, no opinion responses were much higher in Cambria (45%) than they were anywhere else (45%, to 23% in Los Osos and San Luis Obispo). When compared with satisfaction or dissatisfaction with aquatic quality, levels were similar, at 69% (dissatisfied), 60% (satisfied), and 64% (very satisfied). Additionally, there was no difference in threshold ratings between people affiliated with a swim club and nonmembers (63%-64%).

Whether one preferred a combination aquatic facility (69%), an indoor aquatic venue (60%), or an outdoor facility (63%), the threshold was still under $600. Respondents supportive and strongly supportive of a year-round aquatic center were 66% and 69% likely to consider under $600 as the threshold, a much higher level than opponents (51%), although part of the reason for the disparity was the higher rate of no opinion responses (25%-25%-41%).

Under $600 dollars per year ratings declined the longer persons one lived in their community (79%-65%-59%), with the discrepancy brought about by higher no opinion ratings among older inhabitants (17%-26%-34%). The same trend was evident when reviewing the threshold ratings by age – the older the individual, the lower the under $600 ratings (86%-69%-47%) and higher the no opinion response (7%-24%-46%). Also more likely to assign the higher threshold ratings were parents (89%-82%-81%, to 57%), whereas nonparents more often had no opinion (35%, to 6%-8%-15%). Clearly people who were newer to the area, younger, and had children, were more definitive in their establishment of their payment threshold, whereas the others might be open to more, based on additional information.

As noted, the lowest amount threshold was also the highest amount people were willing to pay. Percentages were highest in Los Osos (67%) and San Luis Obispo (65%), but also above the majority in both Morro Bay

(56%) and Cayucos (50%). Only in Cambria was the threshold below majority (38%), as more had no opinion (40%, to 24% in Los Osos). Men assigned the highest threshold rating (65%-51%), as men appeared to be more cautious. Women just more often had no opinion (34%-24%).

As has been noted, there was not a significant difference in threshold percentages whether respondents preferred a combination facility (62%), an indoor venue (56%), or an outdoor center (54%). General supporters assigned a slightly higher rate (65%) than intense supporters (58%) or opponents (45%). Of course, opponents were more prone to have no opinion (27%-25%-39%).

And as with the low threshold, the higher percentages came from newer residents (71%-58%-54%), in contrast to older inhabitants having higher no opinion remarks (17%-26%-35%). This trend was also true based on age, lower threshold levels (80%-63%-41%) and higher no opinion marks (8%-24%-47%), young to old. Parents were a minimum 22 points higher in threshold marks than nonparents (83%-73%-81%, to 51%), with nonparents 22 percent more inclined to have no opinion (36%, to 6%-8%-13%). (See Table #77 and #78 of the Tabulation Report and Question #18 of the Survey.)

- ***Seventy-seven percent of survey participants sampled would either strongly support (36%) or support (41%) a year-round aquatic facility being built in the Estero Bay area, on the coast somewhere between San Simeon and San Luis Obispo. Comparatively, the year-round aquatic facility was opposed by 17%, with 6% of them intensely opposed. The remaining 5% had no opinion on this issue. This is the second time this question was posed, presented after interviewers gave participants information that might influence one positively or negatively on this issue. When compared to the pre-test query, support declined five percent, from 82% to 77%, opposition increased from 9% to its current 17%, and no opinion responses moved from 8% to 5%. Therefore, while support was still significant, the information provided caused the support ratio to move from 9.1:1 to 4.5:1, based on declining support and increased opposition.***

  As with the pre-test, intense support continued to be most prevalent in the Morro Bay area (54%), one percent lower than expressed during the initial part of the survey. The only place in which strong support increased was in San Luis Obispo (18%-22%). Declining enthusiasm was most evident in the city of Cambria (48%-25%), although people in Cayucos (34%-25%) and Los Osos (44%-36%) were both less likely to support the project. Overall support in Morro Bay went from 89% to 84%. Support also declined in Los Osos (88%-82%), San Luis Obispo (66%-64%), and Cambria (81%-78%),

although from a statistical perspective, there was no change because the declines were minimal. And in Cayucos (70%-70%), there was no change in support percentages. The support ratio declined throughout: in Morro Bay, from 17.8:1 to 8.4:1. Ratios were also diminished in Los Osos (17.6:1-6.3:1), San Luis Obispo (5.5:1-2.1:1), Cambria (5.1:1-4.3:1), and Cayucos (3.0:1-2.5:1). So therefore, even though all groups were no less than twice as likely to support the construction then oppose it, the findings show that residents were less supportive of a year-round aquatic facility being built in the Estero Bay area when they were provided information about it than when they had heard nothing about the idea. Overall support continued to be stronger among people affiliated with a swim club rather than nonmembers (87%-77%), but both rates were down from the pre-test (90%-81%), although only slightly.

Strong support was higher among the small subgroup that preferred an outdoor facility being constructed (48%), with combination facility advocates ranked second (38%) and indoor venue supporters third (33%). However, overall support was highest among both combination and outdoor facility proponents (both 83%), followed closely by indoor facility supporters (78%).

Strong support did not vary when compared by tenure in the community (38%-38%-35%), although it did when reviewed by age of respondent (55%-38%-25%). Interestingly, in the pre-test, support dropped 12 percent when compared by length of residence (90%-84%-78%), while the post-test showed only a minimal difference in support (80%-79%-77%), although note that most of the diminished ratings came from those most supportive in the first place, people newest to the community. General support declined eight percent (86%-83%-78%) in the pre-test, compared with a more than twenty percent drop in the post-test (89%-82%-67%). The age tabulations show the eldest subset was the group to lose the most support. Parents continued to be more strongly supportive of the aquatic facility than nonparents (57%-57%-50%, to 30%), but all levels were lower than previously (63%-65%-60%, to 36%). However, although a portion of the enthusiasm was lost to parents, general support (91%-92%-92%) was in fact higher than the pre-test (83%-87%-89%), meaning that while they were less passionate, general support grew. Nonparents were less supportive this time than before (81%-72%). (See Table #79 of the Tabulation Report and Question #19 of the Survey.)

- ***Two of every three (66%) were against two aquatic facilities being built, one in Los Osos and the other in Morro Bay, with 23% of that total intensely opposed. Only 30% supported the two facilities and only 10% were passionate toward the project. The ratio of support to opposition was***

negative (30%-66%, 0.5:1), as, too, strong support to strong opposition (10%-23%, 0.4:1). Five percent chose the no opinion response.

Double-digit intense support was evident in three of the five cities: Los Osos (13%); Morro Bay (12%); and Cayucos (11%). In Cambria, only 5% were passionate toward the dual facilities, while in San Luis Obispo, nobody voiced intense support. Conversely, there was a wide range of intense anti-opinions, varying from a high of 32% in Cayucos to 19% in Morro Bay. The most support was in Los Osos (35%) and the least, San Luis Obispo (18%). Support did grow based on how dissatisfied one was with aquatic quality (21%-30%-37%), but failed to even reach 40% support. People associated with a swim club were more likely to advocate the project than nonmembers (38%-29%), but also fell short of even 40%, or two out of five advocates.

The forty percent support barrier was broken by respondents who strongly supported a year-round aquatic center in the Estero Bay area (43%), but just barely. And support dropped for people who would support the center (27%) as well as oppose it (11%).

Support for the dual facilities was no higher than 30% when compared by both length of residence (29%-30%-28%) and age of respondent (38%-29%-24%), except for people under the age of 45. Parents of teenagers were nearly 50% supportive (34%-32%-48%), with others less so. And nonparents were only 25% positive, much lower than parents. There was also only a minimal variance when compared by ethnicity (29%-30%), although Others did more frequently voice intense opposition to the plan (33%-22%). (See Question #80 of the Tabulation Report and Question #20 of the Survey.)

METHODOLOGY

The techniques used in this survey adhere to statistical standards used in the survey industry. The points to keep in mind when evaluating this report are:

(1) The sample for the telephone survey was composed of 403 respondents from the five primary cities that comprise the Estero Bay region. Respondents were selected at random. The sample was drawn using a geographical segmentation scheme that divided the study region into five subsectors, each representing one of the five cities. Each sector was then assigned a quota that "skewed" the results to where the two primary cities, Los Osos and Morro Bay, would have a greater representation when compared with a standard quota, which would be proportional to the number of households with available telephone numbers. Thus, certain parts of the study area are overrepresented and others underrepresented. A survey with a random sample size of 400 is accurate to within 5% at the 95% confidence level, given the constraints of the new quotas. This means there is one chance in twenty that the survey results may vary by as much as plus or minus 5% from the results that would be obtained by polling the entire population of the study area.

(2) All telephone interviews were conducted by professional interviewers under close professional supervision by Raymond Turco & Associates from our Grand Prairie, Texas telephone call center. Interviews were recorded under controlled situations to minimize measurement error. The length of interviews varied with the average survey lasting approximately 16 minutes. Approximately 15,000 phone attempts were made to complete the project.

(3) Only complete surveys were accepted as part of the sample for the telephone survey, and interviewers were required to confirm the respondent's name and telephone number.

(4) Certain questions were written to permit the respondent to answer "no opinion." This was done so as to avoid the artificial creation of attitudes on issues where the interviewee may not have had an opinion.

(5) Telephone interviewing began on February 15, 2010. The 403 interviews were completed by February 26. The survey was thus in the field for 12 days, a short enough time period to make this an accurate reading during the time period the study was being implemented.

(6) Completed questionnaires were checked for compliance with interviewing and sampling specifications. All editing and validation of interviews, coding of open-ended responses, data processing and computer analysis were

performed by Raymond Turco & Associates of Arlington, Texas. The survey analysis was prepared by Ray Turco, President.

SURVEY ACCURACY

Contrary to what may appear to be common sense, the accuracy of a telephone survey is not greatly influenced by the proportion of the total population that is interviewed. Instead, within a controlled environment, survey accuracy is directly related to the number of individuals interviewed. That is, a survey of 500 people out of a total population of 1,000 will yield results that are as accurate as a survey of 500 taken from a total population of 10,000.

For all practical purposes, the accuracy of "large" surveys (those involving more than 100 interviews) is approximately one divided by the square root of the number of interviews. For example, the error percentage or survey accuracy of a survey of 100 people is approximately plus or minus 10 percent (1 divided by 10). A survey of 600 people will have an error level of approximately 4 percent (1 divided by 25).

But these error rates or accuracy levels must be applied and interpreted with three important caveats in mind. First, these are the 95 percent confidence limits. This means that given a sample of 600 people, 95 times out of 100 the "true" result will lie within plus or minus 4% of the observed answer.

Secondly, this error percentage applies solely to binary (yes/no, agree/disagree) questions. For example, if 55 percent of a sample of 600 voters said they would vote for candidate A, then you can be 95% sure that candidate A's "true" support lies between 51% and 59%.

Finally, the error percentage calculated as 1 divided by the square root of the number of responses is the "worst case" error. That is, it is based on the initial assumption that the percentage that is being estimated via the survey is 50 percent. If, from some other source, it is known or assumed that the "true" percentage differs from 50 percent, the actual survey error is less than that based on a 50% "true" percentage value.

Considering this information, a survey with a random sample size of 600 respondents is accurate to within approximately 4% at the 95% confidence interval. This means there is only one chance in twenty that the survey results may vary by as much as plus or minus 4% from the results that would be obtained by polling the entire population of the full study area.

As previously discussed, the statistical error decreases as the proportion answering the question in a given way moves away from 50% and as the number of persons responding to a given question increases. The sampling error

confidence interval for various proportions responding in a given way and for various numbers in the full sample responding is given in the following table:

TABLE #1: SAMPLING ERROR AT 95% CONFIDENCE LEVEL

	Number responding to question				
PERCENTAGE GIVING ANSWER	**50**	**100**	**250**	**500**	**600**
50%	14.1%	10.0%	6.3%	4.5%	4.1%
40% or 60%	13.9%	9.8%	6.2%	4.4%	4.0%
30% or 70%	13.0%	9.2%	5.8%	4.1%	3.7%
20% or 80%	10%	8%	5%	4%	3%
10% or 90%	9%	6%	4%	3%	2%

In actual practice, survey results are frequently somewhat better than is indicated by the 95% confidence level sampling error estimate.

RESPONDENT PROFILE

RESPONDENT GROUP	SUBGROUP	SURVEY SAMPLE	(N=)
FULL SAMPLE		100%	402
AREA (CITY AND ZIP CODE)	**Cambria (93428)**	10%	40
	Cayucos (93430)	14%	56
	Morro Bay (93442)	28%	112
	Los Osos (93402)	33%	135
	San Luis Obispo (93405)	15%	60
GENDER	**Male**	49%	199
	Female	51%	204
LENGTH OF RESIDENCE	**Under one year**	5%	22
	2 – 4 Years	12%	***50***
	5 – 7 Years	12%	47
	8 – 10 Years	12%	49
	Over 10 Years	58%	234
AGE OF RESPONDENT	**Less than 25 Years**	1%	5
	26 – 35 Years	4%	18
	36 – 45 Years	12%	48
	46 – 55 Years	24%	97
	56 – 65 Years	23%	94
	Over 65 Years	34%	138
AGE RANGES OF CHILDREN CURRENTTLY LIVING AT HOME	**No Children**	74%	300
	Under 6 Years of Age	9%	***35***
	6–12 Years of Age	12%	49
	13-18 Years of Age	13%	52

RESPONDENT GROUP	SUBGROUP	SURVEY SAMPLE	(N=)
FULL SAMPLE		100%	402
ETHNIC GROUPING	**Caucasian/Anglo**	88%	354
	Hispanic	3%	11
	Asian	1%	4
	Pacific Islander	0%	1
	Other	5%	20
	Refuse to Answer	3%	13
FREQUENCY OF VOTING IN LOCAL ELECTIONS	**Always**	83%	***333***
	Often	11%	46
	Seldom	3%	11
	Never	2%	9
	Refuse to Answer	1%	4
ASSOCIATED WITH SWIM CLUB IN ESTERO BAY AREA	**Member**	3%	11
	Know Someone	9%	37
	No	87%	349
	Refuse to Answer	1%	6

CONTACT PROFILE

The sample contact universe was composed of households in specific zip codes in the Estero Bay region with an available telephone number. The list was purchased from Experian, a nationally recognized list management firm. It was then divided into the five primary cities, with each city given a quota based on potential participation in a facility.

The following table summarizes the effectiveness of telephone contact.

TYPE OF CONTACT	%	(N=)
TOTAL UNIVERSE OF RANDOM NUMBERS	100%	8,903
TOTAL CONTACTS MADE	100%	14,029
COMPLETED	2%	403
ANSWERING MACHINE	47%	6,635
REFUSE TO ANSWER	13%	1,824
NO ANSWER	23%	3,162
WRONG NUMBER (7% of full sample)		665
CALL BACK	9%	1,265
LANGUAGE BARRIER	0%	59
DISCONTINUED INTERVIEW	0%	16

APPENDIX: SUPPORTING TABLES

TABLE #2: OVERALL LIKELIHOOD OF TRAVELLING TO VARIOUS CITIES TO UTILIZE A POOL OR AQUATIC FACILITY WITH SOME DEGREE OF REGULARITY

CITY	VERY LIKELY	LIKELY	UNLIKELY	VERY UNLIKELY	NO OPINION	RATIO
San Luis Obispo	17%	26%	40%	17%	1%	0.8:1
Los Osos	30%	33%	24%	14%	1%	1.7:1
Morro Bay	38%	30%	22%	10%	1%	2.1:1
Cayucos	23%	25%	39%	13%	0%	0.9:1
Cambria and San Simeon	6%	11%	57%	26%	0%	0.2:1

TABLE #3: LIKELIHOOD OF TRAVELLING TO VARIOUS CITIES TO UTILIZE A POOL OR AQUATIC FACILITY WITH SOME DEGREE OF REGULARITY BY SUBSECTOR

CITY	CAMBRIA		CAYUCOS		MORRO BAY		LOS OSOS		SAN LUIS OBISPO	
	LIKELY	UNLIKELY	LIKELY	UNLIKELY	LIKELY	UNLIKELY	LIKELY	UNLIKELY	LIKELY	UNLIKELY
San Luis Obispo	10%	91%	23%	77%	44%	55%	48%	52%	33%	31%
Los Osos	20%	80%	34%	66%	78%	21%	86%	14%	31%	64%
Morro Bay	53%	48%	65%	36%	89%	10%	73%	28%	30%	67%
Cayucos	55%	46%	64%	36%	78%	22%	32%	67%	9%	90%
Cambria and San Simeon	78%	23%	22%	79%	15%	86%	5%	93%	3%	95%

TABLE #4: LIKELIHOOD OF TRAVELLING TO VARIOUS CITIES TO UTILIZE A POOL OR AQUATIC FACILITY WITH SOME DEGREE OF REGULARITY BY AGE OF RESPONDENT'S CHILDREN

CITY	NO CHILD		UNDERr 6		AGES 6-12		AGES 13-18	
	LIKELY	UNLIKELY	LIKELY	UNLIKELY	LIKELY	UNLIKELY	LIKELY	UNLIKELY
San Luis Obispo	36%	62%	65%	34%	70%	30%	54%	46%
Los Osos	68%	32%	63%	33%	72%	26%	71%	27%
Morro Bay	64%	36%	88%	9%	84%	14%	77%	21%
Cayucos	47%	52%	57%	43%	55%	45%	48%	52%
Cambria and San Simeon	17%	82%	20%	80%	14%	85%	14%	85%

Table #5: OVERALL SUPPORT FOR VARIOUS ELEMENTS BEING INCLUDED IN AN AQUATIC CENTER

ELEMENT	STRONGLY SUPPORT	SUPPORT	OPPOSE	STRONGLY OPPOSE	NO OPINION	RATIO
Water play area	20%	56%	13%	2%	10%	5.1:1
Recreational diving area	12%	64%	14%	2%	7%	4.8:1
Competitive diving area	9%	54%	26%	3%	8%	2.2:1
Pool for competitions	15%	62%	16%	2%	5%	4.3:1
Family changing rooms	21%	66%	7%	2%	4%	9.7:1
Water slides	10%	40%	38%	6%	5%	1.1:1
Current channel, or lazy river	7%	24%	43%	6%	20%	0.6:1
Children's play features such as spray areas	11%	59%	21%	3%	5%	2.9:1
Zero depth pool entry	14%	55%	15%	1%	14%	4.3:1
Party areas	6%	42%	37%	5%	9%	1.5:1
Wave pool	6%	42%	37%	5%	9%	0.7:1
Waterfalls	4%	25%	59%	6%	5%	0.4:1
Sand volleyball area	7%	43%	40%	5%	5%	1.1:1
Dry playground area	7%	48%	36%	4%	5%	1.4:1
Whirlpool	11%	52%	27%	3%	6%	2.1:1
Children's wading pool	12%	69%	13%	3%	3%	5.1:1
Fitness/lap lane pool	22%	63%	9%	2%	4%	7.7:1
A therapeutic pool	18%	66%	10%	2%	4%	7.0:1
Areas for tanning	3%	24%	57%	9%	6%	0.4:1
Indoor enhancements such as waterfalls	5%	44%	37%	5%	9%	1.2:1
Bleachers for competition viewing	7%	62%	23%	3%	5%	2.7:1
Steam room or sauna	9%	42%	38%	6%	5%	1.2:1

TABLE #6: SUPPORT FOR VARIOUS ELEMENTS BEING INCLUDED IN AN AQUATIC CENTER BY SUBSECTOR

ELEMENT	CAMBRIA		CAYUCOS		MORRO BAY		LOS OSOS		SAN LUIS OBISPO	
	SUPPT	OPPOS	SUPPT	OPPOS	SUPPT	OPPOS	SUPPT	OPPOS	SUPPT	OPPOS
Water play area	73%	20%	74%	22%	75%	17%	77%	10%	79%	8%
Recreational diving area	65%	25%	68%	27%	76%	16%	82%	14%	78%	12%
Competitive diving area	55%	38%	57%	36%	67%	26%	65%	28%	62%	22%
Pool for competitions	75%	16%	74%	25%	79%	19%	76%	19%	82%	12%
Family changing rooms	83%	15%	86%	13%	91%	7%	86%	9%	85%	7%
Water slides	45%	48%	50%	47%	51%	44%	48%	46%	5%	35%
Current channel, or lazy river	26%	50%	32%	52%	34%	47%	30%	50%	33%	45%
Children's play features such as spray areas	61%	33%	70%	29%	70%	26%	70%	23%	76%	15%
Zero depth pool entry	56%	28%	68%	18%	65%	23%	76%	13%	74%	8%
Party areas	43%	51%	45%	50%	45%	42%	49%	44%	55%	30%
Wave pool	36%	60%	39%	57%	40%	54%	40%	56%	45%	45%
Waterfalls	31%	65%	25%	70%	27%	69%	27%	69%	43%	48%
Sand volleyball area	43%	50%	39%	59%	51%	46%	53%	41%	57%	33%
Dry playground area	55%	38%	39%	57%	50%	46%	59%	36%	68%	25%
Whirlpool	55%	40%	59%	39%	58%	2%	65%	29%	80%	14%
Children's wading pool	66%	28%	83%	16%	82%	18%	85%	11%	81%	10%
Fitness/lap lane pool	73%	26%	84%	14%	86%	11%	88%	8%	90%	5%
A therapeutic pool	70%	31%	79%	18%	87%	10%	88%	9%	85%	7%
Areas for tanning	10%	78%	29%	68%	27%	67%	26%	69%	38%	53%
Indoor enhancements such as waterfalls	38%	48%	48%	48%	44%	49%	50%	42%	65%	20%
Bleachers for competition viewing	63%	28%	72%	25%	75%	23%	63%	30%	75%	20%
Steam room or sauna	45%	43%	47%	52%	56%	42%	45%	50%	64%	28%

TABLE #7: OVERALL SUPPORT FOR VARIOUS ELEMENTS BEING INCLUDED IN AN AQUATIC CENTER BY AGE OF RESPONDENT'S CHILDREN

ELEMENT	NO CHILD		UNDER 6		AGES 6-12		AGES 13-18	
	SUPPT	OPPOS	SUPPT	OPPOS	SUPPT	OPPOS	SUPPT	OPPOS
Water play area	**71%**	**17%**	**100%**	**0%**	**94%**	**2%**	**83%**	**10%**
Recreational diving area	72%	19%	89%	12%	90%	8%	87%	8%
Competitive diving area	61%	22%	71%	20%	79%	14%	69%	19%
Pool for competitions	74%	21%	80%	15%	90%	8%	91%	6%
Family changing rooms	84%	11%	92%	6%	98%	2%	98%	0%
Water slides	45%	51%	66%	26%	65%	27%	71%	27%
Current channel, or lazy river	26%	52%	51%	43%	53%	41%	44%	40%
Children's play features such as spray areas	68%	25%	82%	17%	80%	20%	73%	25%
Zero depth pool entry	67%	18%	66%	20%	70%	20%	77%	13%
Party areas	43%	48%	60%	23%	69%	20%	61%	29%
Wave pool	36%	57%	64%	43%	49%	47%	48%	44%
Waterfalls	24%	70%	43%	49%	49%	47%	37%	64%
Sand volleyball area	47%	47%	54%	37%	57%	39%	60%	35%
Dry playground area	51%	42%	63%	37%	65%	31%	70%	25%
Whirlpool	61%	32%	69%	26%	75%	22%	71%	25%
Children's wading pool	79%	17%	95%	6%	85%	8%	86%	10%
Fitness/lap lane pool	83%	13%	94%	6%	94%	4%	92%	6%
A therapeutic pool	82%	13%	86%	14%	87%	10%	92%	4%
Areas for tanning	23%	71%	40%	52%	45%	49%	35%	56%
Indoor enhancements such as waterfalls	43%	48%	66%	29%	67%	26%	64%	23%
Bleachers for competition viewing	65%	28%	74%	23%	87%	12%	78%	19%
Steam room or sauna	48%	47%	45%	46%	63%	29%	63%	33%

TABLE #8: PREFERRED AQUATICE ELEMENTS DEEMED MOST IMPORTANT TO INCLUDE IN THE CONSTRUCTION OF AN AQUATIC FACILITY BY OVERALL, SUBSECTOR, AND GENDER

ELEMENT	OVERALL	CAMBRIA	CAYUCOS	MORRO BAY	LOS OSOS	SAN LUIS OBISPO	MALE	FEMALE
Fitness – lap lane pool	29%	46%	21%	32%	29%	22%	27%	31%
A therapeutic pool	18%	9%	17%	20%	21%	17%	12%	24%
Pool for competitions	13%	17%	13%	13%	11%	13%	19%	7%
Children's wading pool	7%	3%	13%	6%	5%	9%	7%	7%
Water play area	5%	6%	2%	4%	8%	4%	5%	5%
Zero-depth pool entry	5%	9%	8%	3%	4%	6%	3%	6%
Competitive diving area	4%	0%	10%	5%	4%	2%	5%	3%
Children's play features such as spray areas	3%	0%	2%	2%	4%	9%	3%	4%
Recreational diving area	2%	0%	2%	2%	4%	2%	3%	2%
Family changing rooms	2%	3%	0%	3%	2%	6%	2%	3%
Water slides	2%	3%	2%	2%	2%	4%	3%	2%
Current channel, or lazy river	2%	0%	4%	3%	0%	2%	1%	2%
Wave pool	2%	0%	2%	1%	3%	0%	3%	1%
Steam room or sauna	2%	0%	0%	3%	2%	2%	1%	2%
Whirlpool	1%	3%	2%	1%	2%	0%	2%	1%
Sand volleyball area	1%	3%	2%	0%	0%	0%	1%	0%
Areas for tanning	1%	0%	0%	0%	1%	2%	1%	1%
Party areas	0%	0%	0%	1%	0%	0%	1%	0%
Waterfalls	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%	2%	1%	0%
Dray playground area	0%	0%	0%	0%	1%	0%	1%	0%

TABLE #9: OVERALL LIKELIHOOD TO PARTICIPATE IN VARIOUS AQUATIC PROGRAMMING

PROGRAM	VERY LIKELY	LIKELY	UNLIKELY	VERY UNLIKELY	NO OPINION	RATIO
Age-specific group swimming lessons	15%	27%	39%	18%	1%	0.7:1
Lessons for disabled or special need persons	9%	26%	50%	13%	0%	0.6:1
Infant and toddler instruction	8%	22%	53%	16%	0%	0.4:1
Therapeutic recreation	16%	53%	22%	8%	1%	2.3:1
Scuba certification classes	6%	33%	49%	10%	2%	0.7:1
Water aerobics/aqua jogging	20%	49%	23%	6%	1%	2.4:1
Water safety/Red Cross certification	12%	50%	29%	7%	1%	1.7:1
Special interest programs	4%	33%	33%	7%	22%	0.9:1
Lap/fitness swimming	23%	52%	19%	5%	0%	3.1:1
Masters swimming	9%	28%	42%	8%	13%	0.7:1
Open recreation swimming	22%	58%	14%	5%	0%	4.2:1
Water games, such as water volleyball	8%	38%	43%	9%	2%	0.9:1
Competitive swimming	9%	26%	52%	12%	2%	0.5:1
Springboard diving	5%	30%	51%	13%	1%	0.5:1
Water polo	8%	23%	55%	12%	1%	0.5:1
Synchronized swimming	3%	17%	61%	17%	2%	0.3:1

TABLE #10: LIKELIHOOD TO PARTICIPATE IN VARIOUS AQUATIC PROGRAMMING BY SUBSECTOR

PROGRAM	CAMBRIA		CAYUCOS		MORRO BAY		LOS OSOS		SAN LUIS OBISPO	
	LIKELY	UN LIKELY	LIKELY	UN LIKELY	LIKELY	UN LIKELY	LIKELY	UN LIKELY	LIKELY	UN LIKELY
Age-specific group swimming lessons	21%	80%	49%	52%	44%	55%	42%	57%	45%	54%
Lessons for disabled or special need persons	21%	81%	45%	55%	38%	62%	42%	59%	22%	77%
Infant and toddler instruction	13%	88%	37%	63%	31%	70%	36%	64%	25%	74%
Therapeutic recreation	55%	46%	66%	34%	73%	27%	73%	25%	61%	35%
Scuba certification classes	38%	63%	41%	59%	46%	51%	38%	60%	29%	66%
Water aerobics/aqua jogging	63%	38%	66%	32%	74%	25%	71%	27%	61%	33%
Water safety/Red Cross certification	53%	48%	61%	39%	71%	29%	64%	36%	55%	41%
Special interest programs	30%	53%	40%	44%	45%	35%	34%	41%	35%	36%
Lap/fitness swimming	73%	28%	75%	25%	79%	22%	75%	25%	71%	27%
Masters swimming	23%	60%	34%	48%	33%	47%	40%	46%	33%	60%
Open recreation swimming	75%	25%	75%	25%	63%	17%	83%	15%	74%	25%
Water games, such as water volleyball	28%	73%	38%	63%	51%	46%	51%	46%	44%	54%
Competitive swimming	28%	73%	36%	63%	37%	61%	40%	58%	23%	75%
Springboard diving	25%	76%	40%	60%	36%	60%	36%	64%	28%	68%
Water polo	15%	86%	32%	68%	38%	62%	35%	63%	23%	72%
Synchronized swimming	10%	90%	34%	64%	19%	79%	23%	74%	14%	85%

TABLE #11: LIKELIHOOD TO PARTICIPATE IN VARIOUS AQUATIC PROGRAMMING BY AGE OF RESPONDENT'S CHILDREN

PROGRAM	NO CHILD		UNDER 6		AGES 6-12		AGES 13-18	
	LIKELY	UN LIKELY	LIKELY	UN LIKELY	LIKELY	UN LIKELY	LIKELY	UN LIKELY
Age-specific group swimming lessons	32%	67%	83%	17%	84%	16%	65%	35%
Lessons for disabled or special need persons	41%	58%	22%	77%	30%	79%	23%	78%
Infant and toddler instruction	28%	71%	63%	38%	32%	67%	31%	69%
Therapeutic recreation	71%	28%	57%	43%	55%	43%	71%	27%
Scuba certification classes	35%	62%	43%	55%	47%	53%	58%	42%
Water aerobics/aqua jogging	72%	27%	55%	43%	55%	41%	67%	29%
Water safety/Red Cross certification	56%	42%	80%	20%	79%	20%	84%	17%
Special interest programs	36%	42%	37%	35%	45%	37%	48%	35%
Lap/fitness swimming	72%	28%	86%	15%	86%	14%	87%	13%
Masters swimming	34%	54%	54%	32%	47%	45%	42%	44%
Open recreation swimming	76%	24%	100%	0%	96%	4%	94%	6%
Water games, such as water volleyball	38%	61%	74%	17%	69%	24%	67%	33%
Competitive swimming	31%	68%	45%	49%	53%	43%	48%	52%
Springboard diving	29%	71%	52%	40%	57%	39%	54%	46%
Water polo	24%	74%	54%	45%	51%	49%	52%	46%
Synchronized swimming	22%	77%	3%	94%	14%	85%	29%	69%

TABLE #12: OVERALL LIKELIHOOD TO ALLOW CHILDREN TO PARTICIPATE IN VARIOUS AQUATIC PROGRAMMING

PROGRAM	VERY LIKELY	LIKELY	UNLIKELY	VERY UNLIKELY	NO OPINION	RATIO
Lap swimming	40%	38%	6%	1%	14%	11.1:1
Playing in the water slide	32%	45%	9%	1%	13%	7.7:1
Swimming lessons	42%	30%	13%	1%	13%	5.1:1
Diving lessons	24%	43%	16%	4%	13%	3.4:1
Recreational swimming	43%	41%	3%	1%	13%	21.0:1
Playing with water equipment	25%	40%	17%	2%	16%	3.4:1
Competitive swimming	18%	49%	18%	1%	14%	3.5:1
Water polo	23%	35%	25%	3%	15%	2.1:1

TABLE #13: LIKELIHOOD TO ALLOW CHILDREN TO PARTICIPATE IN VARIOUS AQUATIC PROGRAMMING BY SUB SECTOR

PROGRAM	CAMBRIA		CAYUCOS		MORRO BAY		LOS OSOS		SAN LUIS OBISPO	
	LIKELY	UN LIKELY	LIKELY	UN LIKELY	LIKELY	UN LIKELY	LIKELY	UN LIKELY	LIKELY	UN LIKELY
Lap swimming	67%	25%	86%	7%	88%	0%	75%	2%	72%	23%
Playing in the water slide	66%	33%	93%	0%	86%	3%	68%	11%	82%	14%
Swimming lessons	50%	41%	86%	7%	80%	9%	66%	13%	77%	18%
Diving lessons	67%	33%	85%	7%	77%	9%	58%	21%	59%	36%
Recreational swimming	75%	2%	93%	0%	88%	0%	78%	2%	90%	5%
Playing with water equipment	50%	50%	72%	14%	75%	14%	58%	19%	68%	14%
Competitive swimming	50%	41%	78%	14%	77%	11%	64%	15%	59%	33%
Water polo	58%	25%	71%	21%	71%	14%	51%	29%	41%	55%

TABLE #14: LIKELIHOOD TO ALLOW CHILDREN TO PARTICIPATE IN VARIOUS AQUATIC PROGRAMMING BY AGE OF RESPONDENT'S CHILDREN

PROGRAM	NO CHILD		UNDER 6		AGES 6-12		AGES 13-18	
	LIKELY	UN LIKELY	LIKELY	UN LIKELY	LIKELY	UN LIKELY	LIKELY	UN LIKELY
Lap swimming	49%	8%	88%	9%	92%	4%	91%	9%
Playing in the water slide	36%	20%	92%	9%	94%	4%	95%	4%
Swimming lessons	41%	16%	97%	3%	98%	2%	72%	26%
Diving lessons	36%	21%	77%	20%	82%	18%	77%	22%
Recreational swimming	51%	6%	97%	3%	96%	4%	97%	2%
Playing with water equipment	31%	26%	74%	17%	86%	10%	78%	18%
Competitive swimming	38%	18%	80%	20%	77%	20%	80%	18%
Water polo	34%	23%	71%	26%	60%	39%	71%	26%

TABLE #15: OVERALL AGREEMENT WITH VARIOUS AQUATIC FACILITY LOCATION STATEMENTS

STATEMENT	STRONGLY AGREE	AGREE	DISAGREE	STRONGLY DISAGREE	NO OPINION	RATIO
I would prefer any aquatic facility being constructed in Los Oso	23%	42%	23%	7%	4%	2.2:1
I would prefer any aquatic facility being constructed in Morro Bay	35%	38%	18%	3%	6%	2.5:1
I would prefer any aquatic facility being constructed in Morro Bay and in Los Oso	11%	29%	46%	8%	7%	0.7:1
I probably would not utilize an aquatic facility if it was not constructed in the community in which I live	8%	42%	41%	6%	3%	1.1:1
I would support the community of Los Osos and the City of Morro Bay working together to construct one aquatic center that meets everyone's needs rather than each constructing one	33%	55%	6%	2%	3%	11:1
I don't believe residents in my community would support the construction of an aquatic facility	3%	25%	49%	8%	14%	0.5:1

TABLE #16: AGREEMENT WITH VARIOUS AQUATIC FACILITY LOCATION STATEMENTS BY SUBSECTOR

STATEMENT	CAMBRIA		CAYUCOS		MORRO BAY		LOS OSOS		SAN LUIS OBISPO	
	AGREE	DIS AGREE	AGREE	DIS AGREE	AGREE	DIS AGREE	AGREE	DIS AGREE	AGREE	DIS AGREE
I would prefer any aquatic facility being constructed in Los Oso	35%	56%	38%	60%	77%	20%	87%	12%	42%	46%
I would prefer any aquatic facility being constructed in Morro Bay	56%	31%	79%	19%	95%	6%	70%	23%	46%	42%
I would prefer any aquatic facility being constructed in Morro Bay and in Los Oso	28%	58%	30%	64%	40%	57%	42%	44%	29%	59%
I probably would not utilize an aquatic facility if it was not constructed in the community in which I live	63%	36%	34%	62%	48%	49%	47%	49%	67%	30%
I would support the community of Los Osos and the City of Morro Bay working together to construct one aquatic center that meets everyone's needs rather than each constructing one	73%	10%	86%	14%	93%	6%	93%	5%	83%	12%
I don't believe residents in my community would support the construction of an aquatic facility	43%	48%	36%	56%	20%	66%	33%	55%	19%	57%

TABLE #17: AGREEMENT WITH VARIOUS AQUATIC FACILITY LOCATION STATEMENTS BY AGE OF RESPONDENT'S CHILDREN

STATEMENT	NO CHILD		UNDER 6		AGES 6-12		AGES 13-18	
	AGREE	DIS AGREE	AGREE	DIS AGREE	AGREE	DIS AGREE	AGREE	DIS AGREE
I would prefer any aquatic facility being constructed in Los Oso	62%	33%	74%	23%	74%	24%	77%	21%
I would prefer any aquatic facility being constructed in Morro Bay	69%	24%	89%	9%	86%	8%	83%	14%
I would prefer any aquatic facility being constructed in Morro Bay and in Los Oso	37%	56%	49%	48%	41%	49%	54%	41%
I probably would not utilize an aquatic facility if it was not constructed in the community in which I live	51%	47%	26%	68%	43%	55%	56%	35%
I would support the community of Los Osos and the City of Morro Bay working together to construct one aquatic center that meets everyone's needs rather than each constructing one	88%	9%	94%	3%	92%	4%	94%	4%
I don't believe residents in my community would support the construction of an aquatic facility	33%	54%	11%	82%	16%	71%	15%	64%

TABLE #18: OVERALL SUPPORT FOR VARIOUS FINANCING METHODS FOR CONSTRUCTION OF NEW AQUATIC FACILITY

FINANCING METHOD	STRONGLY SUPPORT	SUPPORT	OPPOSE	STRONGLY OPPOSE	NO OPINION	RATIO
A bond election	15%	53%	17%	10%	5%	2.6:1
Sales tax increase	7%	33%	39%	18%	3%	0.7:1
Increased property taxes	4%	22%	46%	22%	5%	0.4:1
Assessment district	4%	28%	30%	15%	23%	0.7:1

TABLE #19: SUPPORT FOR VARIOUS FINANCING METHODS FOR CONSTRUCTION OF NEW AQUATIC FACILITY BY SUBSECTOR

FINANCING METHOD	CAMBRIA		CAYUCOS		MORRO BAY		LOS OSOS		SAN LUIS OBISPO	
	SUPPT	OPPOS	SUPPT	OPPOS	SUPPT	OPPOS	SUPPT	OPPOS	SUPPT	OPPOS
A bond election	58%	31%	57%	43%	80%	17%	72%	23%	54%	40%
Sales tax increase	28%	68%	29%	71%	47%	51%	47%	51%	30%	64%
Increased property taxes	23%	71%	19%	80%	27%	69%	35%	60%	17%	72%
Assessment district	36%	38%	34%	55%	27%	43%	37%	44%	23%	55%

TABLE #20: SUPPORT FOR VARIOUS FINANCING METHODS FOR CONSTRUCTION OF NEW AQUATIC FACILITY BY AGE OF RESPONDENT'S CHILDREN

FINANCING METHOD	NO CHILD		UNDER 6		AGES 6-12		AGES 13-18	
	SUPPT	OPPOS	SUPPT	OPPOS	SUPPT	OPPOS	SUPPT	OPPOS
A bond election	62%	32%	78%	12%	80%	12%	88%	12%
Sales tax increase	34%	63%	57%	43%	59%	41%	57%	40%
Increased property taxes	23%	74%	31%	60%	40%	49%	46%	46%
Assessment district	32%	50%	31%	26%	41%	32%	27%	35%