

EXECUTIVE SUMMARY

Raymond Turco & Associates was retained by the McKinney Community Development Corporation (MCDC) to assist in assessing future quality of life needs in the community. The firm was charged with the task of conducting a Quality of Life Assessment Survey, a scientifically accurate telephone poll to examine the attitudes of residents throughout the city relative to potential improvements, especially a potential aquatic facility and multi-sports youth complex. A similar survey was also conducted as an online survey for those who wished to participate, but this summary focuses principally on the telephone survey results. Questions focused on current quality of life ratings, as well as unprompted suggestions for facilities and programs and prompted support for others to enhance the excellence within the community. A significant portion of the survey questions focused on the need for a potential aquatic facility. Queries tested current pool use as well as potential types of facilities, and both indoor and outdoor features in which to incorporate. The information gathered in this report will allow MCDC members, elected and appointed officials of the City of McKinney and citizens alike to better understand how residents in the McKinney view potential quality of life improvements, especially when it comes to aquatics. It will also provide citizen input to the council relative to their ongoing discussions.

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. So that all residents are equally represented, the telephone universe was divided into three geographic sectors, with each area assigned a quota proportional to the number of households with available telephone numbers. Anyone could participate in the online survey and geographic segmentations were not included in the line of questioning.

The telephone survey included the responses of 401 individuals, which equates to an error rate of +/- 5%, at a 95% confidence level. The online survey captured the opinions of 522 individuals.

Below are listed the highlights from our analysis of the project:

GENERAL ATTITUDES ABOUT QUALITY OF LIFE IN MCKINNEY AND POSSIBLE IMPROVEMENTS

- *Nearly everyone taking the telephone survey was either satisfied (34%) or very satisfied (63%) with the quality of life in their community. By comparison, criticisms were just two percent, split between general and intense dissatisfaction. Only one individual had no opinion. Thus, the ratio of positive to negative comments was nearly 49 to one, indicating the number of people who would speak positively about quality of life before a negative comment occurred. People who responded to the online survey were also extremely satisfied, at 92%, but were less passionate in terms of very satisfied remarks (36%). In addition, this group was more critical, although just 9%, with 2% very dissatisfied. Also note that the ratio of intense ratings among telephone respondents was even higher (63%-1%, 63.0:1) showing residents to be more passionate in their quality of life rating than the general consensus. The intensity ratio among online survey participants was 18.1:1 (36%-2%). Although satisfaction ratings among the telephone sample were similar throughout the city (97%-98%-92%), there was a definite lack of passion or enthusiasm in Area III (45%), the zone east of U.S. 75 when compared with the other two subsectors (67% and 65%). Quality of life ratings did not appear to be influenced based on length of residence in the city (93% of 0-6, to 98% of 6-20, to 94% of 20+ years), the age of the respondent (98% of under 45, to 97% of 45-65, to 97% of 65+ years), and the age of one's children (97% of nonparents, to 97% of children under 6, 98% of 7-12, to 96% of 13-18). For comparison purposes, combined (96%-97%), but especially, intense (55%-63%) satisfaction ratings were higher this year than in 2010 when the same question was presented in the City Attitudinal Survey. (See Question #1 of the Survey and Table #3 of the Tabulation Report.)*

- *Better than two of every three individuals participating in the telephone survey graded McKinney as having improved (68%) rather than stayed the same (25%) or gotten worse (6%) in the past five years. Note that the ratio of improved to worse marks was better than ten to one. Individuals who participated in the online survey were also more inclined to grade the community improved (56%), but at a lower rate than telephone respondents. However, they were only two points higher in worse marks, (8%), as more considered the community the same (36%). The ratio of improved to worse among this subset was better than six to one.*

Improved perceptions among telephone respondents were similar throughout the city (69%-67%-65%), but Area III was less likely to grade the community as having stayed the same (27%-26%-15%), instead believing it had gotten worse (3%-6%-15%). The less important one felt it was to build an aquatic facility in the city, the less inclined he or she was to consider the community improved (77%-73%-49%), instead tending to label it the same (19%-21%-36%) or worse (4%-4%-13%). The longer one lived in the city, the more likely he or she was say quality had improved (56%-71%-73%). (See Question #3 of the Survey and Table #5 of the Tabulation Report.)

- **It was most important for the MCDC to provide financing for projects related to recreational or community facilities, like recreation centers, aquatic centers, or a community center (89%-8%, 11.1:1), based on this item attaining the highest ratio of important to unimportant ratings from survey respondents. Of the other four amenities tested, graded important for MCDC to provide financing were public park and open space improvements (89%-9%, 8.6:1) and professional and amateur sports and athletic facilities, including baseball stadiums to youth sports (81%-16%, 5.1:1). Of less importance, but still more so than unimportance, was the other two amenities, entertainment, tourist, and convention facilities (69%-25%, 2.8:1) and hike and bike trails in each section of the city (76%-20%, 2.8:1). Online respondents reversed the order of the top two, placing greater importance on public park and open space improvements (94%-6%, 15.7:1) and then projects related to recreational or community facilities (92%-9%, 10.2:1). Ratios for the other projects were 4.6:1 (82%-18% for hike and bike trails in each section of the city), 4.0:1 (80%-20% for professional and amateur sports and athletic facilities), and 3.8:1 (79%-21% for entertainment, tourist, and convention facilities). Intensity ratings showed telephone respondents most committed to the top three amenities, with very important percentages of 37%, 33%, and 30%. The subsector results show the top item in Area I to be recreational or community facilities, compared with public Park and open space improvements in both Areas II and III. Area III assigned lower importance ratings to all five amenities, although the variance between their score and the high rating was never more than nine percent. Recreational or community related facilities lost importance as people aged (95%-90%-85%), although still graded extremely important. Also declining was interest in hike and bike trails (76%-82%-67%). Young and middle-aged respondents identified recreational or community facilities as most important to be financed, compared to seniors focusing on public Park and open space improvements. (See Question #4 of the Survey and Tables #6 - #10 of the Tabulation Report. Also see Tables #2 - #4 of the Summary Report, page)**

- **Retail/economic development/malls (17%), trails (12%), and pool/aquatic/water park/natatorium and park (both 10%) were the top unprompted responses of survey participants for what they would prefer located or provided in McKinney that would improve their family's quality of life, if money were no object. Rounding out the top five was public transit/rail, with 8% mention. A total of 16 suggestions were listed. In a follow-up question, the facilities respondents thought would best enhance the city's quality of life if constructed and based on money being no object, were aquatic center/pool/water park/natatorium (18%), recreation/community center/gymnasium (14%), mall/shopping center/retail/restaurants (11%), convention/events center (10%), and performing arts center/live theater/entertainment center (9%). In total, 14 facility suggestions were made that survey participants felt would enhance the city's quality of life. People participating in the online survey focused more attention on the pool/aquatic/water park/natatorium (24%), then retail/economic development/malls (12%), and public transit/rail (8%), trails (7%), and parks/green space/open space (6%) as items that would improve their quality of life, if money was no object. Therefore, although the order of preference was different between the two survey groups, the top five items were similar. In their follow-up question, aquatic center/pools/water park/natatorium was also the top facility mentioned, at 28%. After that, online respondents were prefer recreation/community center/gymnasium (14%), auditorium/concert hall (9%), a convention/events center (8%), and mall/shopping center/retail/restaurants constructed to enhance quality of life. The telephone responses showed retail/economic development/malls (20%-16%-13%) and public transit/rail (12%-5%-3%) to be more popular in Area I than elsewhere, the only responses to show that level of percentage deviation. Relative to only facilities, variances were evident in terms of the aquatic center/pool/water park/natatorium (16%-24%-13%), recreation/community center/gymnasium (17%-6%-22%), performing arts center/live theater/entertainment center (15%-5%-0%), and senior center (4%-13%-13%). (See Questions #5 and #6 of the Survey, Tables #11 and #12 of the Tabulation Report, and Supporting Tables #5 and #6 of the Summary Report.)**

- **An indoor/outdoor aquatic facility (77%-17%, 4.5:1), additional parking in downtown McKinney (77%-18%, 4.3:1), and a community recreation center (76%-20%, 3.8:1) were the projects most popularly supported in terms of being in the city, based on them attaining the highest ratios of support to opposition among survey respondents. All eight items tested were popularly supported for being in McKinney, but survey participants focused less attention on an outdoor water park (61%-33%, 1.8:1), retail development (64%-30%, 2.1:1), and expansion of the hike and bike trail**

system (71%-23%, 3.1:1). Online survey participants assigned its highest support ratios to the indoor/outdoor aquatic facility (84%-16%, 5.3:1) like telephone respondents, but also graded similar support to expansion of the hike and bike trail system (84%-16%, 5.3:1). After those two were additional parking in downtown McKinney (83%-18%, 4.6:1) and the community recreation center (80%-20%, 4.0:1). Comparatively, not as popular among this group was the outdoor water park (74%-26%, 2.8:1) and children's museum (75%-25%, 3.0:1). In comparing the two survey groups, online respondents placed the higher ranking for expanding hike and bike trails (2nd, to 6th) and retail development (5th, to 7th), while telephone participants voiced more support for the children's museum (4th, to 7th). Other items were within one position, regardless of the survey group. Residents participating in the telephone survey were most passionate about having additional parking in downtown (34%), more so than the indoor/outdoor aquatic facility (23%), children's museum (21%), or retail development (20%). The only item to exhibit percentage variances of more than ten percent was for the indoor multi-use athletic facility, a less popular facility to individuals in Area III (73%-72%-61%). The older the respondent, the greater the level of support for additional parking in downtown McKinney (70%-76%-82%). Support varied most based on age for the outdoor water park (76%-59%-53%). (See Question #7 of the Survey, Tables #13 - #20 of the Tabulation Report, and Supporting Tables #7 - #9 of the Summary Report.)

- **Recreation (62%) and exercise (50%) were the most popular reasons for why people swam. One in four (22%) said they did not swim and 11% used to swim. The telephone survey showed that relatively few people swim for rehabilitation (15%), injury/disease management (9%) or competition (3%). Additionally, in a follow-up question, 5% acknowledged that they or their children swam on a youth or adult swim club. Online respondents also swam most often for recreation (68%) and exercise (48%), not for competition (9%) or rehabilitation (8%). In addition, fewer noted they did not swim (12%) and a higher rate said they or their children swam on a youth or adult swim team (13%). The further east the telephone sample, the more likely people were to say they did not swim (18%-20%-44%), thus, the areas west of I-75 were more inclined to say they swam for recreation (69%-65%-32%) and for exercise (49%-59%-34%). The older the individual, the less likely he or she was to swim for recreation (76%-70%-42%) or for exercise (52%-59%-38%). When compared by children, those with youth under age 18 more often swam for recreation purposes (75%-75%-71%) than nonparents (55%). However, when it came to swimming for exercise, parent and nonparent levels were similar (47%-47%-49%, to 48%). (See Questions #8 and #9 of the Survey and Tables #21 and #22 of the Tabulation Report.)**

- **Slightly better than seven of every ten residents sampled rated it important (43%) or very important (28%) for the city to develop an aquatics facility in McKinney. By comparison, 25% considered the development either unimportant (20%) or very unimportant (5%). An additional 3% gave a no opinion response, creating a ratio of 2.8 to one important versus unimportant marks. The ratio among the online sample was similar, at 2.5 to one. Also similar was the percentage of very important (41%), important (31%), and combined unimportance (29%) percentages. Overall importance within the telephone subset was ten percent higher in Areas I and II than in III (71%-73%-63%), where a higher percentage considered the development unimportant (27%-21%-31%). Note the more satisfied with quality of life, the more important facility development became (41%-65%-75%). The age tabulations showed that the older the individual, the less likely he or she was to consider development important (80%-74%-62%), although all ages considered it important to the city developing such a facility. (See Question #10 of the Survey and Table #23 of the Tabulation Report.)**

- **One in three (33%) acknowledged having visited an indoor or outdoor aquatic facility in the past 12 months, according to respondents. Allen (55%) was the chief beneficiary of the visits, as that was the city visited most frequently. Other popular cities or areas included Frisco (13%), Plano (11%), and out of state and out of metroplex (both 5%). Asked what they liked most about the facility they visited, the most popular comments were that it was indoor (16%), had a kids play area/water features/variety (14%), it was convenient/accessible/open year-round (10%), and was modern/clean (9%). A total of 14 unprompted positive aspects of various indoor/outdoor aquatic facilities were collected by way of the query. Online survey participants were 16 points more likely to have visited an indoor or outdoor aquatic facility (49%) and Allen (55%), Frisco (20%), and Plano (10%) were the most popular destinations. As with telephone respondents, what online visitors liked most was the fact that the facility was indoor (16%), had a kids play area/water features/variety (13%), and large/spacious/modern (11%). There was a ten percent variance among telephone survey participants when it came to visiting Allen, as Area II residents were more likely to list this municipality (53%-60%-50%). Younger respondents preferred their facility being indoor (25%-11%-5%), while older individuals more often said kids play area/water features (16%-11%-20%) and fun/family/friendly/safe (6%-14%-15%) were positives of the facility. (See Questions #11 - #13 of the Survey, #24 - #26 of the Tabulation Report, and Supporting Tables #10 and #11 of the Summary Report.)**

DEFINING A POTENTIAL AQUATIC FACILITY

- *A large family aquatic facility, which would include both pools and a children's play area (75%-20%, 3.8:1) was the most popularly supported aquatic facility option, of the six tested, based on it receiving the highest ratio of support to opposition from survey participants. The second most popular facility option was for it to be an indoor aquatic facility as part of a fitness and recreation center (73%-23%, 3.2:1), with the third choice being a facility that includes an indoor pool or pools as well as outdoor aquatic features (70%-26%, 2.7:1). Less popular to survey participants, although each generated majority support, were a stand-alone indoor aquatic facility (59%-32%, 1.8:1) or a single outdoor aquatic facility, which could include multiple water features (65%-30%, 2.2:1). The least popular aquatic option was not constructing any further aquatic facilities, a suggestion that was more frequently opposed than supported (26%-66%, 0.4:1), although note that one in four citywide agreed with this statement. Online respondents were slightly different in their prioritization, as they expressed more support for the facility that included an indoor pool or pools as well as outdoor aquatic features (80%-21%, 3.8:1) then the large family aquatic facility, which would include both pools and children's play area (76%-23%, 3.3:1) and indoor aquatic facility as part of a fitness and recreation center (74%-26%, 2.8:1). Therefore, the top three facility types were similar, although prioritized differently by the two survey groups. The single outdoor aquatic facility which could include multiple water features and stand-alone indoor aquatic facility achieved identical support ratios of 1.4:1 (both 59%-41%) and as with telephone respondents, were the least popular options. Also, a similar ratio (0.4:1) disputed the statement about not constructing any further aquatic facilities in the city. Although not significant, no opinion ratings among telephone respondents were highest regarding the stand-alone indoor aquatic facility (8%), indicating less awareness of this possibility. Intensity ratings were nominal, at 23% for the facility that included an indoor pool or pools as well as outdoor aquatics, 22% for the large family aquatic facility, and 21% for the indoor aquatic facility. Several options were much less popular in Area III, specifically the single outdoor aquatic facility (69%-64%-52%), the indoor aquatic facility, as part of a fitness and recreation center (74%-75%-61%), and the stand-alone indoor aquatic facility (61%-63%-49%). It was Area III that most often supported the option of not constructing any further aquatic facilities in the city (26%-25%-34%). Age and support varied most relative to supporting a facility that included an indoor pool as well as outdoor features (84%-73%-59%) and the indoor aquatic facility, as part of a fitness and recreation center (85%-73%-65%). (See Question #14 of the Survey,*

#27 - #32 of the Tabulation Report, and Supporting Tables #12 - #14 of the Summary Report.)

- **Asked to choose their number one preferred facility from the six previous options, residents did not indicate a clear choice, as 26% wanted the facility with indoor and outdoor pools, 23%, the family aquatic facility, and 22%, the indoor aquatic facility as part of a recreation center. Very few preferred the outdoor aquatic facility or indoor aquatic facility only (both 5%) and 15% preferred that nothing be constructed. Online respondents were more definite, as a facility with indoor and outdoor pools was clearly preferred (32%) over the indoor aquatic facility as part of a recreation center (20%) or family aquatic facility (19%). Therefore, both groups chose the facility with indoor and outdoor pools as their top choice, although online respondents were more focused on this item. Most popular in Area I were the family aquatic facility and the facility with indoor and outdoor pools (both 26%). The family aquatic facility was also tops to people in Area III (29%), although their second choice was to construct nothing (24%). Area II was basically split between the facility with indoor and outdoor pools and indoor aquatic facility as part of a recreation center (29% and 28%). The indoor aquatic facility as part of a recreation center generated only 8% in Area III, a significant variance between the other subsectors. Those who considered it important to construct an aquatic facility in McKinney identified the facility with indoor and outdoor pools as their preferred choice (36%-34%-6%). The choice of young people was either the facility with indoor and outdoor pools (31%) or the family aquatic facility (29%), while middle-aged individuals preferred the indoor aquatic facility as part of a recreation center (27%) slightly ahead of the facility with indoor and outdoor pools (26%) and seniors, the family aquatic facility (25%) over the facility with indoor and outdoor pools (23%), although 22% preferred that nothing be constructed. Parents with young children wanted the family aquatic facility (42%-35%-19%, to 21%), while those with pre-teens and teenagers preferred the facility with indoor and outdoor pools (25%-36%-36%, to 23%). (See Question #15 of the Survey and Table #33 of the Tabulation Report.)**

- **If an aquatic facility was constructed, residents focused more on recreational pools, as a fitness/lap lane pool (75%-21%, 3.6:1), children's wading pool (73%-23%, 3.2:1), and shallow depth pool (64%-28%, 2.3:1) were the most popular pool options to include. A majority of those surveyed also supported the aquatic facility including a pool that would be used for recreational purposes only (56%-39%, 1.4:1), a 25-yard by 50 meter, competition, or Olympic-sized pool (62%-32%, 1.9:1), or a 25-yard by 25 meter competition pool (62%-31%, 2.0:1), but the other three were more popular. The fitness/lap lane pool was also number one on the list**

for online survey participants (78%-22%, 3.5:1), although they voiced more support for the shallow depth pool (73%-27%, 2.7:1) than telephone respondents. After that, the online participants preferred the children's wading pool (71%-30%, 2.4:1) and 25-yard by 50 meter, competition or Olympic-sized pool (70%-30%, 2.3:1) over the 25-yard by 25 meter competition pool (64%-36%, 1.8:1) or pool that would be used for recreation purposes only (60%-41%, 1.5:1). Both groups, therefore, ranked the fitness/lap lane pool first and the recreation pool last, with the other four one ranking position differently. In terms of enthusiasm or passion, telephone respondents were split between three pools – a fitness/lap lane pool, a children's wading pool, and a 25-yard by 50 meter, competition or Olympic-sized pool – as each generated 20% strong support ratings. Area III was much less supportive of an aquatic facility including a fitness/lap lane pool (76%-81%-56%), shallow depth pool (65%-69%-51%), or both competition pools (62%-69%-51% for 25-yard by 25 meter and 60%-70%-50% for 25-yard by 50 meter). A children's wading pool was popular citywide (75%-71%-73%). Seniors were more apt to oppose a facility including a pool that would be used for recreational purposes only (43%-50%) and were generally less supportive of including the various options than young or middle-aged respondents. (See Question #16 of the Survey, Tables #34 - #39 of the Tabulation Report, and Supporting Tables #15 - #17 of the Summary Report.)

- **If plans called for multiple pools in an aquatic facility, the top two choices to people participating in the telephone survey were a children's wading pool (34%) and a 25-yard by 50 meter, competition, or Olympic-sized pool (33%). However, at 31% were two other pool types, a recreation pool and a fitness/lap lane pool. People were less likely to choose for inclusion in an aquatic facility a shallow depth pool (17%) or a 25-yard by 25 meter competition pool (15%). An additional 14% were opposed to constructing any pools. Online survey respondents prioritized the elements differently, as they felt what should be included in a facility were a recreation pool (53%) and a fitness/lap lane pool (38%), which ranked third and fourth to telephone respondents. The top two choices to people participating in the telephone survey, the children's wading pool and 25-yard by 50 meter pool ranked fourth and third, respectively, with percentages of 26% and 29%. Then people looked toward the shallow depth (13%) or 25-yard by 25 meter (6%) pools. Identical to telephone respondents, 14% were also opposed to pools in general. The further east the telephone sample, the greater the interest in a children's wading pool (30%-36%-44%), in contrast to a reduced importance for including a 25-yard by 50 meter (40%-29%-19%) and to a lesser extent, a recreation pool (34%-29%-27%). The top two in each area were: 25-yard by 50 meter and recreation pool (34%) in Area I; children's wading pool and fitness/lap lane pool (both 36%) in Area II**

and; children's wading pool and recreation pool (27%) in Area III. People who graded it very important for the city to build an aquatic facility were 45% likely to prefer a 25-yard by 50 meter pool, declining if the facility was only important (36%) or unimportant (18%), the most significant decline in preference when comparing various questions. The only one similar was those grading it unimportant more likely to say they opposed pools (4%-4%-41%). The youngest were most excited about the children's wading pool (45%-31%-32%) and recreation pool (46%-27%-27%). Middle-aged individuals preferred including the fitness/lap lane pool (29%-39%-23%). The age of one's child impacted pool type preference. For example, those with young children preferred the children's wading pool (58%-40%-36%, to 32%) and recreation pool (50%-36%-25%, to 30%), while those with older children leaned toward the fitness/lap lane pool (25%-28%-53%, to 27%) and 25-yard by 50 meter (14%-35%-45%, to 31%). (See Question #17 of the Survey and Table #40 of the Tabulation Report.)

- **A family changing area (78%-19%, 4.1:1), shade features (77%-19%, 4.1:1), children's play features/water play areas (72%-25%, 2.9:1), water play area (70%-26%, 2.7:1), fitness/lap lane pool (69%-28%, 2.5:1), and picnic area/gazebo (67%-29%, 2.3:1) stood out in terms of importance ratios from the 17 items tested for possible inclusion in the facility design of either an indoor or outdoor aquatic facility, according to telephone respondents. Conversely, what was not as important to include in a design were indoor enhancements such as waterfalls (35%-59%, 0.6:1), sand volleyball (47%-49%, 1.0:1), a diving area (52%-44%, 1.2:1), zero-depth/beach entry pool (50%-41%, 1.2:1), party areas (53%-43%, 1.2:1), and lazy river or current channel (52%-40%, 1.2:1). Online participants also felt what was most important to include were family changing rooms (85%-15%, 5.7:1) and shade features (85%-15%, 5.7:1) and at a higher ratio. After that were children's play features/water play areas (80%-20%, 4.0:1), a water play area (80%-21%, 3.8:1), and fitness/lap lane pool (75%-25%, 3.0:1). Therefore, both groups assigned identical rankings to the top five aquatic features. At the bottom of the ranking list were sand volleyball (37%-62%, 0.6:1), dry playground area (46%-64%, 0.9:1), indoor enhancements such as water falls (49%-51%, 1.0:1), bleachers for competition (55%-45%, 1.2:1), and a diving area (56%-34%, 1.3:1). Intensity ratings showed people participating in the telephone survey most enthusiastic about including a water play area (23%), family changing area (22%), shade features (20%), children's play features/water play areas (18%), and fitness/lap lane pool and lazy river or current channel (both 14%). A lack of information caused higher no opinion responses relative to the importance of including a zero-depth/beach entry pool (9%) or lazy river or current channel (8%). Family changing areas (83%-76%-71%), water slides (63%-65%-52%), and a fitness/lap lane pool (71%-75%-54%) were some of the elements graded**

much less important by individuals in Area III than elsewhere. However, those respondents were much more pro water spray ground (52%-52%-66%) and dry playground area (54%-54%-71%). The older the individual, the less likely he or she was to grade the individual elements important. The variances were most dramatic relative to the importance of a water play area (83%-75%-58%), zero-depth/beach entry pool (63%-51%-39%), water slides (80%-61%-53%), lazy river or current channel (68%-53%-40%), party areas (66%-57%-41%), shade features (91%-78%-69%), or a water spray ground (71%-53%-45%) being included in the eventual design. (See Question #18 of the Survey, Tables #41 - #57 of the Tabulation Report, and Supporting Tables #18 - #20 of the Summary Report.)

- **Approximately one of every three persons interviewed over the telephone (29%) acknowledged having visited one of the city's recreation centers on either a monthly (12%), weekly (13%), or daily (4%) basis. An additional 26% said they visited a recreation center rarely, with the remaining 43% saying they had never visited a city recreation center. Similarly, 31% of online survey respondents went to the centers monthly (8%), weekly (18%), or daily (5%). A lower percentage of people participating in the online survey, 33%, said they had never visited one of the facilities. Area III residents from the telephone survey least often frequented a recreation center, as only 19% visited it monthly, weekly, or daily. That compared with percentages of 31% in both Areas I and II. People who rated an aquatic facility very important were 44% apt to frequent the facilities monthly through daily, compared with declining attendance for those grading the potential facility only important (30%) or unimportant (11%). People newer to the city were more frequent recreation center utilizers (31%-30%-20%), as too were younger respondents rather than older (44%-26%-24%) survey participants. Parents in general, but especially those with younger children, were also more inclined to have visited the recreation centers (56%-41%-37%), with nonparent visitation at just 22%. (See Question #19 of the Survey and Table #58 of the Tabulation Report.)**
- **Family locker rooms (76%-20%, 3.8:1), group exercise/aerobics room (71%-25%, 2.8:1), basketball courts (67%-27%, 2.5:1), weight/cardiovascular/equipment room (67%-29%, 2.3:1), food concession area (65%-30%, 2.2:1), drop-in babysitting/nursery (64%-30%, 2.1:1), and indoor jogging track (63%-32%, 2.0:1) were the top seven amenities that telephone survey participants were most supportive of including as part of an aquatic facility if indoor fitness and recreation opportunities were included. Of the 14 items tested, respondents were least supportive of the facility including a kitchen/cooking classrooms (44%-52%, 0.8:1), sauna/steam rooms (44%-50%, 0.9:1), gymnastics room (46%-47%, 1.0:1), and three other amenities that captured support ratios of**

1.1:1 – game room with pool tables, table tennis, etc. (50%-45%), arts and craft room (49%-45%), and a rock climbing wall (49%-46%). Family locker rooms (86%-13%, 6.6:1), group exercise/aerobics room (84%-16%, 5.3:1), weight/cardiovascular equipment room (83%-17%, 4.9:1), indoor jogging track (79%-21%, 3.8:1), a concession area (74%-26%, 2.8:1), a multi-purpose rooms for meetings or party rentals (72%-28%, 2.6:1), and drop-in babysitting/nursery (70%-29%, 2.4:1) were top seven according to online survey participants. Therefore, six of the top seven ranked items were similar, with basketball courts being replaced by meeting or party rooms for the last item. What was not important to online survey participants, were sauna/steam rooms (57%-43%, 1.3:1), an arts and craft room (57%-43%, 1.3:1), gymnastics room (59%-41%, 1.4:1), kitchen/cooking classroom (58%-41%, 1.4:1), and game room (61%-39%, 1.6:1). Based on only intensity (strong support) ratings, the amenities telephone respondents would choose to include would be weight/cardiovascular/equipment room (23%), drop-in babysitting/nursery (18%), an indoor jogging track (15%), and basketball courts, group exercise/aerobics room, and family locker rooms (each 14%). What they were not inclined to support were a game room, with pool tables, table tennis, etc. and an arts and craft room (both 6%), sauna/steam room (8%), and multi-purpose rooms for meetings or party rentals and gymnastics room (both 9%). Respondents from Area III were less desirous of including basketball courts (69%-67%-58%), weight/cardiovascular/equipment room (68%-69%-54%), and drop-in babysitting/nursery (66%-65%-55%), but they were most supportive of including a gymnastics room (42%-47%-53%) and kitchen/cooking classroom (46%-34%-56%) and to a lesser extent, an arts and craft room (51%-45%-55%). The age tabulations showed younger respondents more supportive of the various elements than older individuals. This was especially true relative to basketball courts (83%-71%-53%), a sauna/steam rooms (61%-48%-30%), weight/cardiovascular/equipment room (82%-69%-52%), family locker rooms (90%-78%-54%), and a rock climbing wall (76%-48%-40%). (See Question #20 of the Survey, Tables #59 - #72 of the Tabulation Report, and Supporting Tables #21 - #23 of the Summary Report.)

- **Asked to identify the indoor competitive or recreational sports programs in which their children participated, the most popular programs among telephone respondents were basketball (10%), soccer (7%), baseball (6%), and volleyball (4%). The vast majority, 80%, said they did not have any children who participated in the various programs. Other responses were 3% for softball and flag football, 2% for cheer, and 1% for Lacrosse. In a follow-up question, children were currently taken to Plano related/recreation center/sports associations (14%), a church (13%),**

McKinney Recreation/Community Center (12%), or Allen related/Community Center/ASA and school (both 11%) to participate in the various programs. Parents also took their children to the YMCA (9%), Lifetime Fitness/LA Fitness (8%), and the Dr. Pepper Stars Center and North Star (both 7%). The online query was posed slightly differently, but overall, 71% acknowledged either not having children (35%) or having children who did not participate (36%), slightly lower than the 80% of telephone respondents who did not have children participate. Among the 29% who did have children participate, the most popular programs in which they participated was basketball (39%), soccer (37%), volleyball (22%), or baseball (21%). Also, 49% said they participated in other programs not listed. Therefore, the top two programs in which children participated, regardless of the sample, were basketball and soccer. And in terms of destinations, online respondents most often took their children to Plano-related venues (14%), Frisco-related venues (11%), church (7%), or the YMCA, Allen-related venues, or Blue Sky (each 6%). Telephone survey participants without children or participating children were most often located in Area III (79%-77%-89%). It should be noted that in terms of participation, percentages generally varied by less than five percent throughout the city. At five percent were the top two sports of basketball (11%-9%-6%) and soccer (8%-8%-3%), both more popular in Areas I and II than in Area III. People who considered the building of an aquatic facility in McKinney to be very important had the highest percentage of children participate in basketball (18%-7%-7%), soccer (11%-8%-4%), and baseball (10%-4%-7%) when compared with people who graded the facility less than very important to construct. Nearly half of the parents sampled did not have children who participated in indoor or recreational competitive sports programs (49%-36%-45%). Parents of teenagers participated in basketball (27%), more so than soccer or baseball (both 15%), those with pre-teen children in basketball (40%), soccer (26%), and baseball (22%), and those whose children were under age six, basketball (23%) and baseball (20%) before soccer (17%). As to where parents took their children, people in Area III most often said Plano related/recreation center/sports associations (12%-15%-25%), Allen related/Community Center/ASA (10%-7%-25%), and Blue Sky (5%-0%-11%), while it was Area I parents who took their children to church (20%-7%-0%) for indoor sports, as well as the Dr. Pepper Stars Center (12%-0%-0%). (See Questions #21 and #22 of the Survey, Tables #73 and #74 of the Tabulation Report, and Supporting Table #24 of the Summary Report.)

- Locker or changing rooms (76%-20%, 3.9:1), courts for volleyball or basketball (69%-26%, 2.7:1), and area for performance or fitness training (63%-31%, 2.0:1) were the features deemed by survey participants to be most important for inclusion if an indoor multi-sport facility was

constructed. Of less importance, but still generating plurality importance, were meeting rooms (49%-45%, 1.1:1), indoor turf arena for sports like indoor soccer, lacrosse, or flag football (51%-43%, 1.2:1), or a food and beverage court (62%-32%, 1.9:1). The priority for including features in an indoor multi-sport facility, according to online survey participants, were similar, although they assigned higher importance ratios to the locker or changing rooms (88%-12%, 7.3:1), volleyball or basketball courts (79%-21%, 3.8:1), and areas for performance or fitness training (76%-24%, 3.2:1). This subset next ranked food and beverage court (67%-34%, 2.0:1), indoor turf arena (57%-42%, 1.4:1), and meeting rooms (52%-48%, 1.1:1) important, just not to the same degree as the top three items. Note that the ranking for both groups was identical. From an intensity standpoint, the most important features to include to those responding to the telephone survey were courts for volleyball or basketball (19%), locker or changing rooms (17%), and indoor turf arena (14%). Meeting rooms (5%) and the food and beverage court (8%) failed to reach double-digits in terms of very important marks. Area III was not inclined to rate several elements as important, especially when compared with other parts of the city. Those were courts for volleyball or basketball (71%-71%-56%) and areas for performance or fitness training (66%-62%-50%). However, consensus-like importance was assigned to including an indoor turf area (50%-53%-48%), locker or changing rooms (79%-79%-70%) or meeting rooms (50%-48%-45%). Forty-two percent separated the importance ratings between young and old when it came to commenting on the importance of having an indoor turf arena if an indoor multi-sport facility was constructed. There was at least a 25-point gap between groups relative to courts for volleyball or basketball (82%-75%-54%) and locker or changing rooms (93%-80%-66%). (See Question #23 of the Survey, Tables #75 - #80 of the Tabulation Report, and Supporting Tables #25 - #27 of the Summary Report.)

- **Better than seven of ten survey participants supported (47%) or strongly supported (24%) the city constructing a youth indoor multi-sport facility, compared to 21% who either opposed (13%) or strongly opposed (8%) the facility. No opinion ratings totaled 6%, creating a support ratio of 3.4 to one. The intensity ratio was similar (24%-8%, 3.0:1). Online survey respondents were nine points more supportive, at 80%, with 21% against, for a ratio of 3.8:1). Also, those participating in the online survey were more passionate about the project, with 35% strong support, creating a higher intensity ratio was similar (35%-9%, 3.9) to that of telephone participants. Support ratings declined the further east the telephone survey subsectors (75%-69%-68%), but only minimally. Also, this item did not appear to be influenced based on quality of life perceptions, as percentages were similar (73%-70%-67%) regardless of how complimentary**

or critical one was with the community. Survey participants rating the aquatic facility very important to build were also highly supportive of the youth indoor multi-sport facility (86%-77%-49%), and also much more passionate about it (43%-22%-10%). The longer one lived in the city, the least supportive he or she was about the potential facility (74%-72%-61%); with the same trend evident from the standpoint of age (83%-72%-64%). Parents were also more likely to endorse the initiative (78%-79%-79%) than nonparents (68%), although all four subsets were supportive at no less than two of every three in terms of constructing the facility. (See Question #24 of the Survey and Table #81 of the Tabulation Report.)

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 401 respondents from the City of McKinney. Respondents were selected at random. The sample was drawn using a geographical segmentation scheme that divided the study region into three subsectors, mirroring the zones done in previous city surveys, most notably the 2010 City Attitudinal Survey. Each area was assigned a quota proportional to the number of voting households with available telephone numbers. A survey with a random sample size of 401 is accurate to within 5% at the 95% confidence level. 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) The sample for the self-administered online survey was composed of 521 individuals who chose to access the site from the MCDC web site, as well as the City's and school district's web sites. Anyone who accessed the site was eligible to participate. There were no subsector designations, so there were no quotas established for the individual surveys. A survey with a random sample size of 521 could be accurate to within nearly 4% at the 95% confidence level, although online surveys, because of inherent differences, cannot be statistically proven in a similar manner. Just know that there could be one chance in twenty that the online results may vary by as much as plus or minus approximately 4% from the results that would be obtained by polling the entire population.

(3) 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 15 minutes. Over 32,000 phone attempts were made to complete the project. The online survey went "live," or online, on May 20th and closed June 9th. Therefore, potential participants had approximately three weeks to take the survey.

(4) Only complete surveys were accepted as part of the sample for the telephone survey, and interviewers were required to confirm the respondents' name and telephone number. All online surveys were accepted as part of the sample, regardless of how many questions were answered. Therefore, when reviewing the computer tabulation report, you will note the number of respondents for each question is different.

(5) All questions in the telephone survey allowed 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. This was not the case with the online survey, except in a few instances. For the most part, online participants were told to not answer the question if that had no opinion.

(6) Telephone interviewing began on April 25, 2013. The 401 interviews were completed by May 17. The survey was thus in the field for 23 days, a short enough time period to make this an accurate reading during the time period the study was being implemented.

(7) 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: TELEPHONE RESPONDENT

RESPONDENT GROUP	SUBGROUP	SURVEY SAMPLE	(N=)
FULL SAMPLE		100%	401
AREA	Area I (West city limits to Lake Forest Blvd)	52%	210
	Area II (Lake Forest Blvd east to U.S. 75)	32%	129
	Area III (East of U.S. 75)	15%	62
GENDER	Male	53%	212
	Female	47%	189
LENGTH OF RESIDENCE	Under one year	1%	5
	1 - 3 Years	6%	24
	4 - 6 Years	15%	62
	7 - 10 Years	29%	115
	11 - 20 Years	36%	144
	More than 20 Years	13%	51
AGE OF RESPONDENT	Less than 25 Years	1%	5
	26 - 35 Years	2%	10
	36 - 45 Years	18%	74
	46 - 55 Years	25%	102
	56 - 65 Years	18%	74
	Over 65 Years	33%	133
AGE RANGES OF CHILDREN CURRENTLY LIVING AT HOME	No Children	59%	269
	Under 6 Years of Age	8%	36
	7-12 Years of Age	16%	72
	13-18 Years of Age	17%	75

RESPONDENT GROUP	SUBGROUP	SURVEY SAMPLE	(N=)
FULL SAMPLE		100%	401
FREQUENCY OF VOTING IN LOCAL ELECTIONS	Always	43%	171
	Often	31%	124
	Seldom	17%	68
	Never	9%	36
	Refuse to Answer	0%	2
ASSOCIATION WITH YOUTH OR ADULT SWIM TEAM	Yes	5%	20
	No	95%	381

RESPONDENT PROFILE: TELEPHONE RESPONDENT

RESPONDENT GROUP	SUBGROUP	SURVEY SAMPLE	(N=)
FULL SAMPLE		100%	521
LENGTH OF RESIDENCE	Under one year	4%	20
	1 – 3 Years	14%	71
	4 – 6 Years	18%	94
	7 – 10 Years	25%	131
	11 – 20 Years	25%	129
	More than 20 Years	13%	66
AGE OF RESPONDENT	Less than 25 Years	1%	5
	26 – 35 Years	15%	64
	36 – 45 Years	27%	115
	46 – 55 Years	31%	130
	56 – 65 Years	14%	58
	Over 65 Years	8%	35
AGE RANGES OF CHILDREN CURRENTLY LIVING AT HOME	No Children	34%	172
	Under 6 Years of Age	17%	87
	6–12 Years of Age	23%	115
	13-18 Years of Age	22%	111
	Refuse to answer	5%	25
FREQUENCY OF VOTING IN LOCAL ELECTIONS	Always	37%	156
	Often	39%	165
	Seldom	16%	66
	Never	8%	32
ASSOCIATION WITH YOUTH OR ADULT SWIM TEAM	Yes	13%	58
	No	87%	396

CONTACT PROFILE

The sample contact universe was composed of households in zip codes in the city of McKinney with an available telephone number. The list was purchased from Experian, a nationally recognized list management firm. It was then divided into the three geographic regions, with each subsector given a quota based on their percentage of telephone numbers compared to the full universe. This was done to produce statistically valid results and not allow one part of the city to be either over-represented or under-represented.

The following table summarizes the effectiveness of telephone contact.

TYPE OF CONTACT	%	(N=)
TOTAL UNIVERSE OF RANDOM NUMBERS	100%	11,414
TOTAL CONTACTS MADE	100%	32,444
COMPLETED	1%	401
ANSWERING MACHINE	55%	17,644
REFUSE TO ANSWER	5%	1,517
NO ANSWER	26%	8,544
WRONG NUMBER (21% of full sample)		2,344
CALL BACK	6%	1,850
LANGUAGE BARRIER	0%	62
DISCONTINUED INTERVIEW	0%	42

APPENDIX: SUPPORTING TABLES

TABLE #2: OVERALL IMPORTANCE FOR THE MCDC TO PROVIDE FINANCING FOR VARIOUS QUALITY OF LIFE AMENITIES

AMENITY	VERY IMPORTANT	IMPORTANT	UN IMPORTANT	VERY UNIMPORTANT	NO OPINION	RATIO
Projects related to recreational or community facilities, like recreation centers, aquatic centers, or a community center	37%	52%	6%	2%	2%	11.1:1
Professional and amateur sports and athletic facilities, including children's sports, from baseball stadiums to youth sports	30%	51%	14%	2%	3%	5.1:1
Entertainment, tourist, and convention facilities	21%	48%	23%	2%	7%	2.8:1
Public park and open space improvements	33%	56%	8%	1%	0%	8.6:1
Hike and bike trails in each section of the city	26%	50%	18%	2%	4%	2.8:1

TABLE #3: IMPORTANCE FOR THE MCDC TO PROVIDE FINANCING FOR VARIOUS QUALITY OF LIFE AMENITIES BY SUBSECTOR

AMENITY	AREA I		AREA II		AREA III	
	IMPORTANT	UN IMPORTANT	IMPORTANT	UN IMPORTANT	IMPORTANT	UN IMPORTANT
Projects related to recreational or community facilities, like recreation centers, aquatic centers, or a community center	91%	7%	89%	9%	82%	13%
Professional and amateur sports and athletic facilities, including children's sports, from baseball stadiums to youth sports	81%	17%	83%	15%	76%	17%
Entertainment, tourist, and convention facilities	70%	25%	67%	23%	66%	28%
Public park and open space improvements	89%	9%	90%	8%	87%	10%
Hike and bike trails in each section of the city	76%	18%	77%	21%	68%	24%

TABLE #4: IMPORTANCE FOR THE MCDC TO PROVIDE FINANCING FOR VARIOUS QUALITY OF LIFE AMENITIES BY AGE OF RESPONDENT

AMENITY	UNDER 45		45 - 65 YEARS		65+ YEARS	
	IMPORTANT	UN IMPORTANT	IMPORTANT	UN IMPORTANT	IMPORTANT	UN IMPORTANT
Projects related to recreational or community facilities, like recreation centers, aquatic centers, or a community center	95%	4%	90%	8%	85%	13%
Professional and amateur sports and athletic facilities, including children's sports from baseball stadiums to youth sports	85%	13%	79%	19%	82%	15%
Entertainment, tourist, and convention facilities	72%	22%	76%	27%	69%	24%
Public park and open space improvements	89%	9%	89%	9%	91%	7%
Hike and bike trails in each section of the city	76%	21%	82%	14%	67%	27%

TABLE #5: ITEMS DESIRED FOR BEING LOCATED OR PROVIDED IN MCKINNEY THAT WOULD IMPROVE QUALITY OF LIFE BY SUBSECTOR, GENDER AND AGE OF RESPONDENT

RESPONSE	OVER ALL	SUBSECTOR			GENDER		AGE OF RESPONDENT		
		AREA I	AREA II	AREA III	MALE	FEMALE	UUNDER 45 YEAR	45-64 YEARS	65+ YEARS
Retail/economic development/malls	17%	20%	16%	13%	20%	15%	12%	17%	21%
Trails	12%	10%	15%	11%	17%	6%	15%	11%	11%
Pool/aquatic center/water park/natatorium	10%	9%	14%	5%	6%	15%	15%	9%	8%
Miscellaneous	10%	9%	6%	21%	11%	8%	7%	9%	13%
Park	10%	8%	11%	11%	8%	11%	5%	13%	7%
Public transit/rail	8%	12%	5%	3%	7%	10%	10%	6%	11%
Community/recreation center/gym	7%	7%	7%	8%	6%	9%	12%	7%	4%
Outdoor recreation/sports fields/tennis courts	4%	3%	6%	5%	4%	4%	8%	3%	3%
Restaurants	4%	3%	6%	3%	3%	5%	3%	3%	5%
Senior facility/living/recreational	3%	0%	7%	5%	1%	5%	2%	2%	5%
Alleviate traffic/finish road construction	3%	3%	3%	3%	3%	3%	0%	6%	1%
Convention center/events center	2%	3%	1%	3%	4%	1%	2%	2%	4%
Performing arts/music	2%	4%	0%	0%	1%	3%	2%	4%	0%
Amusement park/entertainment center	2%	2%	1%	5%	3%	2%	3%	2%	3%
School/education-related	2%	1%	2%	3%	1%	3%	3%	2%	1%
Jobs/work/training skills	2%	2%	0%	3%	3%	0%	0%	2%	1%
Library	2%	2%	1%	0%	2%	1%	0%	2%	3%

TABLE #6: PREFERRED FACILITY THAT WOULD BEST ENHANCE QUALITY OF LIFE IF CONSTRUCTED BY SUBSECTOR, GENDER AND AGE OF RESPONDENT

RESPONSE	OVER ALL	SUBSECTOR			GENDER		AGE OF RESPONDENT		
		AREA I	AREA II	AREA III	MALE	FEMALE	UNDER 45 YRS	45-64 YEARS	65+ YEARS
Aquatic center/pool/water park/natatorium	18%	16%	24%	13%	9%	26%	19%	22%	10%
Recreation/community center/gymnasium	14%	17%	6%	22%	13%	15%	17%	16%	9%
Mail/shopping center/retail/restaurants	11%	9%	13%	13%	14%	8%	9%	10%	14%
Convention/event center	10%	10%	10%	13%	13%	8%	8%	9%	16%
Performing arts center/live theater/entertainment center	9%	15%	5%	0%	11%	8%	9%	8%	12%
Senior center	8%	4%	13%	13%	6%	10%	0%	9%	14%
Miscellaneous	4%	4%	5%	6%	6%	3%	8%	4%	2%
Sports complex	4%	4%	5%	6%	4%	5%	9%	2%	3%
Library/museum/schools	4%	5%	5%	3%	5%	4%	6%	4%	3%
Stadium/minor or otherwise/arena	3%	3%	6%	0%	3%	4%	6%	2%	3%
Recreation related/community garden/skate park/tennis courts/golf course	3%	5%	0%	6%	4%	3%	2%	3%	5%
Indoor water facility/natatorium	3%	3%	5%	0%	2%	4%	4%	4%	0%
Park	2%	3%	2%	3%	3%	2%	0%	3%	3%
Auditorium	2%	3%	2%	0%	2%	2%	2%	1%	3%
Medical facility	1%	1%	2%	3%	2%	1%	2%	1%	2%

TABLE #7: OVERALL SUPPORT TO VARIOUS POTENTIAL PROJECTS BEING IN MCKINNEY

PROJECT	STRONGLY SUPPORT	SUPPORT	OPPOSE	STRONGLY OPPOSE	NO OPINION	RATIO
An indoor multi-use athletic facility	14%	57%	19%	3%	6%	3.2:1
A children's museum	21%	52%	19%	2%	5%	3.5:1
An indoor/outdoor aquatic facility	23%	54%	16%	1%	5%	4.5:1
Expansion of the hike and bike trail system	18%	53%	21%	2%	5%	3.1:1
A community recreation center	17%	59%	19%	1%	4%	3.8:1
An outdoor water park	17%	44%	31%	2%	6%	1.8:1
Retail development	20%	44%	26%	4%	5%	2.1:1
Additional parking in downtown McKinney	34%	43%	16%	2%	4%	4.3:1

TABLE #8: SUPPORT FOR VARIOUS POTENTIAL PROJECTS BEING IN MCKINNEY BY SUBSECTOR

PROJECT	AREA I		AREA II		AREA III	
	SUPPORT	OPPOSE	SUPPORT	OPPOSE	SUPPORT	OPPOSE
An indoor multi-use athletic facility	73%	20%	72%	24%	61%	30%
A children's museum	73%	20%	72%	24%	76%	23%
An indoor/outdoor aquatic facility	77%	19%	78%	15%	75%	19%
Expansion of the hike and bike trail system	72%	23%	73%	23%	66%	26%
A community recreation center	75%	21%	77%	19%	78%	19%
An outdoor water park	62%	32%	59%	34%	57%	36%
Retail development	67%	28%	63%	33%	59%	32%
Additional parking in downtown McKinney	75%	18%	80%	14%	76%	21%

TABLE #9: SUPPORT FOR VARIOUS POTENTIAL PROJECTS BEING IN MCKINNEY BY AGE OF RESPONDENT

PROJECT	UNDER 45		45 - 65 YEARS		65+ YEARS	
	SUPPORT	OPPOSE	SUPPORT	OPPOSE	SUPPORT	OPPOSE
An indoor multi-use athletic facility	69%	22%	71%	25%	72%	21%
A children's museum	88%	8%	67%	27%	72%	25%
An indoor/outdoor aquatic facility	87%	9%	77%	18%	69%	25%
Expansion of the hike and bike trail system	76%	20%	78%	17%	61%	33%
A community recreation center	83%	13%	75%	20%	73%	25%
An outdoor water park	76%	15%	59%	35%	53%	40%
Retail development	70%	24%	61%	36%	67%	27%
Additional parking in downtown McKinney	70%	26%	76%	16%	82%	13%

TABLE #10: CITY IN WHICH INDOOR OR AQUATIC FACILITY WAS LOCATED AND VISITED BY RESPONDENTS IN PAST 12 MONTHS (N=133) BY SUBSECTOR, GENDER, AND AGE OF RESPONDENT

RESPONSE	OVER ALL	SUBSECTOR			GENDER		AGE OF RESPONDENT		
		AREA I	AREA II	AREA III	MALE	FEMALE	+ YEAR	45-64 YEARS	65
Allen	55%	53%	60%	50%	47%	62%	60%	53%	50%
Frisco	13%	14%	11%	14%	15%	11%	13%	10%	18%
Plano	11%	9%	13%	14%	13%	10%	6%	17%	9%
Out of state	5%	7%	0%	14%	10%	1%	6%	5%	5%
Outside of metroplex	5%	3%	9%	0%	5%	4%	6%	3%	5%
Grapevine/North Richland Hills/Keller	4%	7%	0%	0%	5%	3%	8%	2%	0%
Carrollton	2%	1%	2%	0%	2%	1%	0%	2%	5%
The Colony	2%	1%	2%	0%	2%	1%	0%	2%	5%
Dallas	2%	1%	0%	7%	2%	1%	2%	2%	0%
Flower Mound	2%	3%	0%	0%	0%	3%	0%	2%	5%
Addison	1%	1%	0%	0%	2%	0%	0%	2%	0%
Cedar Hill	1%	0%	2%	0%	0	1%	0%	2%	0%

TABLE #11: ITEM MOST LIKED ABOUT INDOOR OR OUTDOOR AQUATIC FACILITY VISITED BY SUBSET (N=133) BY SUBSECTOR, GENDER AND AGE OF RESPONDENT

RESPONSE	OVER ALL	SUBSECTOR			GENDER		AGE OF RESPONDENT		
		AREA I	AREA II	AREA III	MALE	FEMALE	+ YEAR	45-64 YEARS	65
Indoor	16%	20%	11%	14%	10%	22%	25%	11%	5%
Kids play area/water features/variety	14%	14%	20%	0%	18%	11%	16%	11%	20%
Miscellaneous	12%	17%	4%	14%	13%	11%	8%	13%	20%
Convenient/accessible/open year round	10%	8%	18%	0%	12%	9%	8%	15%	5%
Modern/clean	9%	6%	11%	14%	12%	6%	4%	13%	10%
Fun/family/friendly/safe	6%	5%	9%	7%	5%	8%	6%	14%	15%
Inexpensive	5%	6%	2%	7%	2%	8%	6%	6%	0%
Different pools for adults and youth	5%	6%	4%	0%	2%	8%	6%	2%	10%
Large/spacious	5%	2%	7%	14%	7%	3%	6%	4%	5%
Olympic sized pool	4%	6%	0%	7%	3%	5%	2%	6%	5%
Wading pools	4%	3%	7%	0%	5%	3%	2%	7%	0%
Lazy river	3%	3%	2%	7%	5%	2%	4%	2%	5%
Lap lanes	2%	3%	2%	0%	2%	3%	4%	2%	0%
Recreation area also	2%	3%	0%	7%	3%	2%	2%	4%	0%
Heated pool	2%	0%	2%	7%	2%	2%	2%	2%	0%

TABLE #12: OVERALL SUPPORT TO VARIOUS AQUATIC FACILITY OPTIONS

OPTION	STRONGLY SUPPORT	SUPPORT	OPPOSE	STRONGLY OPPOSE	NO OPINION	RATIO
A single outdoor aquatic facility, which could include multiple water features	12%	53%	25%	5%	6%	2.2:1
A large family aquatic facility, which would include both pools and children's play area	22%	53%	17%	3%	4%	3.8:1
A stand-alone indoor aquatic facility	13%	46%	29%	3%	8%	1.8:1
An indoor aquatic facility, as part of a fitness and recreation center	21%	52%	20%	3%	4%	3.2:1
A facility that included an indoor pool or pools as well as outdoor aquatic features	23%	47%	23%	3%	3%	2.7:1
Not constructing any further aquatic facilities in the city	8%	18%	50%	16%	7%	0.4:1

TABLE #13: SUPPORT TO VARIOUS AQUATIC FACILITY OPTIONS BY SUBSECTOR

OPTION	AREA I		AREA II		AREA III	
	SUPPORT	OPPOSE	SUPPORT	OPPOSE	SUPPORT	OPPOSE
A single outdoor aquatic facility, which could include multiple water features	69%	26%	64%	30%	52%	38%
A large family aquatic facility, which would include both pools and children's play area	76%	20%	77%	19%	69%	28%
A stand-alone indoor aquatic facility	61%	33%	63%	25%	49%	49%
An indoor aquatic facility, as part of a fitness and recreation center	74%	22%	75%	22%	61%	32%
A facility that included an indoor pool or pools as well as outdoor aquatic features	67%	29%	79%	18%	61%	34%
Not constructing any further aquatic facilities in the city	26%	68%	25%	66%	34%	54%

TABLE #14: SUPPORT TO VARIOUS AQUATIC FACILITY OPTIONS BY AGE OF RESPONDENT

PROJECT	UNDER 45		45 - 65 YEARS		65+ YEARS	
	SUPPORT	OPPOSE	SUPPORT	OPPOSE	SUPPORT	OPPOSE
A single outdoor aquatic facility, which could include multiple water features	73%	19%	69%	26%	56%	40%
A large family aquatic facility, which would include both pools and children's play area	82%	16%	75%	22%	72%	24%
A stand-alone indoor aquatic facility	71%	21%	60%	31%	52%	42%
An indoor aquatic facility, as part of a fitness and recreation center	85%	12%	73%	25%	65%	30%
A facility that included an indoor pool or pools as well as outdoor aquatic features	84%	13%	73%	26%	59%	36%
Not constructing any further aquatic facilities in the city	19%	68%	29%	67%	31%	61%

TABLE #15: OVERALL SUPPORT TO VARIOUS POOL OPTIONS BEING INCLUDED IN AN AQUATIC FACILITY

POOL TYPE	STRONGLY SUPPORT	SUPPORT	OPPOSE	STRONGLY OPPOSE	NO OPINION	RATIO
Fitness/lap lane pool	20%	55%	17%	4%	4%	3.6:1
A shallow depth pool	10%	54%	25%	3%	8%	2.3:1
A 25-yard by 25 meter competition pool	15%	47%	29%	2%	6%	2.0:1
A pool that would be used for recreation purposes only	10%	46%	37%	2%	5%	1.4:1
A children's wading pool	20%	53%	21%	2%	4%	3.2:1
A 25-yard by 50 meter, competition, or Olympic-sized pool	20%	42%	28%	4%	6%	1.9:1

TABLE #16: SUPPORT TO VARIOUS POOL OPTIONS BEING INCLUDED IN AN AQUATIC FACILITY BY SUBSECTOR

POOL TYPE	AREA I		AREA II		AREA III	
	SUPPORT	OPPOSE	SUPPORT	OPPOSE	SUPPORT	OPPOSE
Fitness/lap lane pool	76%	20%	81%	16%	56%	37%
A shallow depth pool	65%	26%	69%	26%	52%	38%
A 25-yard by 25 meter competition pool	62%	33%	69%	25%	51%	42%
A pool that would be used for recreation purposes only	56%	38%	61%	37%	48%	47%
A children's wading pool	75%	20%	71%	20%	73%	26%
A 25-yard by 50 meter, competition, or Olympic-sized pool	60%	33%	70%	26%	50%	42%

TABLE #17: SUPPORT TO VARIOUS POOL OPTIONS BEING INCLUDED IN AN AQUATIC FACILITY BY AGE OF RESPONDENT

POOL TYPE	UNDER 45		45 - 65 YEARS		65+ YEARS	
	SUPPORT	OPPOSE	SUPPORT	OPPOSE	SUPPORT	OPPOSE
Fitness/lap lane pool	85%	11%	78%	19%	65%	31%
A shallow depth pool	75%	18%	66%	26%	53%	39%
A 25-yard by 25 meter competition pool	70%	28%	66%	29%	54%	38%
A pool that would be used for recreation purposes only	70%	26%	60%	38%	43%	50%
A children's wading pool	85%	8%	74%	24%	64%	31%
A 25-yard by 50 meter, competition, or Olympic-sized pool	69%	26%	66%	28%	54%	41%

TABLE #18: OVERALL IMPORTANCE FOR INCLUDING VARIOUS INDOOR OR OUTDOOR AQUATIC FEATURES IN FACILITY DESIGN

ELEMENT	VERY IMPORTANT	IMPORTANT	UNIMPORTANT	VERY UNIMPORTANT	NO OPINION	RATIO
Water play area	23%	47%	21%	5%	3%	2.7:1
Diving area	12%	40%	40%	4%	4%	1.2:1
Zero-depth/beach entry pool	8%	42%	36%	5%	9%	1.2:1
Family changing area	22%	56%	16%	3%	2%	4.1:1
Water slides	12%	50%	31%	3%	4%	1.8:1
Fitness/lap lane pool	14%	55%	24%	4%	3%	2.5:1
Lazy river or current channel	14%	38%	35%	5%	8%	1.3:1
Children's play features/water play areas	18%	54%	21%	4%	3%	2.9:1
Party areas	10%	43%	39%	4%	4%	1.2:1
Indoor enhancements such as waterfalls	5%	30%	53%	6%	5%	0.6:1
Bleachers for competition	9%	52%	29%	4%	4%	1.8:1
Wading pool	6%	55%	31%	4%	4%	1.7:1
Shade features	20%	57%	16%	3%	3%	4.1:1
Water spray ground	7%	47%	36%	4%	6%	1.4:1
Sand volleyball	6%	41%	44%	5%	4%	1.0:1
Picnic area/gazebo	12%	55%	25%	4%	4%	2.3:1
Dry playground area	7%	49%	35%	5%	4%	1.4:1

TABLE #19: IMPORTANCE FOR INCLUDING VARIOUS INDOOR OR OUTDOOR AQUATIC FEATURES IN FACILITY DESIGN BY SUBSECTOR

ELEMENT	AREA I		AREA II		AREA III	
	IMPORT	UN IMPORT	IMPORT	UN IMPORT	IMPORT	UN IMPORT
Water play area	71%	26%	71%	27%	66%	29%
Diving area	49%	46%	57%	40%	53%	45%
Zero-depth/beach entry pool	48%	41%	53%	41%	50%	42%
Family changing area	83%	15%	76%	22%	71%	27%
Water slides	63%	33%	65%	32%	52%	44%
Fitness/lap lane pool	71%	27%	75%	22%	54%	40%
Lazy river or current channel	52%	40%	55%	38%	47%	45%
Children's play features/water play areas	72%	24%	70%	26%	72%	24%
Party areas	55%	40%	53%	44%	47%	51%
Indoor enhancements such as waterfalls	36%	58%	37%	59%	30%	66%
Bleachers for competition	63%	32%	65%	31%	53%	43%
Wading pool	60%	35%	62%	32%	58%	40%
Shade features	79%	16%	76%	21%	71%	29%
Water spray ground	52%	41%	52%	43%	66%	31%
Sand volleyball	48%	46%	44%	53%	50%	48%
Picnic area/gazebo	71%	25%	61%	34%	68%	29%
Dry playground area	54%	42%	54%	43%	71%	27%

TABLE #20: IMPORTANCE FOR INCLUDING VARIOUS INDOOR OR OUTDOOR AQUATIC FEATURES IN FACILITY DESIGN BY AGE OF RESPONDENT

ELEMENT	UNDER 45		45 - 65 YEARS		65+ YEARS	
	IMPORT	UN IMPORT	IMPORT	UN IMPORT	IMPORT	UN IMPORT
Water play area	83%	15%	75%	23%	58%	38%
Diving area	64%	31%	52%	44%	45%	51%
Zero-depth/beach entry pool	63%	30%	51%	39%	39%	49%
Family changing area	95%	4%	77%	21%	71%	24%
Water slides	80%	19%	61%	36%	53%	41%
Fitness/lap lane pool	78%	19%	74%	24%	58%	37%
Lazy river or current channel	68%	28%	53%	41%	40%	46%
Children's play features/water play areas	87%	11%	71%	28%	65%	29%
Party areas	66%	30%	57%	41%	41%	53%
Indoor enhancements such as waterfalls	48%	48%	34%	63%	30%	62%
Bleachers for competition	68%	30%	66%	28%	53%	42%
Wading pool	66%	30%	59%	38%	60%	33%
Shade features	91%	8%	78%	19%	69%	27%
Water spray ground	71%	27%	53%	41%	45%	46%
Sand volleyball	57%	40%	45%	52%	44%	51%
Picnic area/gazebo	77%	20%	71%	26%	58%	37%
Dry playground area	62%	37%	57%	40%	52%	43%

TABLE #21: OVERALL SUPPORT FOR VARIOUS AMENITIES IF INDOOR FITNESS AND RECREATION OPPORTUNITIES INCLUDED AS PART OF AQUATIC FACILITY

AMENITY	STRONGLY SUPPORT	SUPPORT	OPPOSE	STRONGLY OPPOSE	NO OPINION	RATIO
Basketball courts	14%	53%	23%	4%	5%	2.5:1
Sauna/steam rooms	8%	36%	45%	5%	5%	0.9:1
Weight/cardiovascular /equipment room	23%	44%	25%	4%	5%	2.3:1
Multi-purpose rooms for meetings or party rentals	9%	52%	31%	2%	6%	1.8:1
Group exercise/aerobics room	14%	57%	23%	2%	4%	2.8:1
Indoor jogging track	15%	48%	29%	3%	4%	2.0:1
Drop-in babysitting/nursery	18%	46%	27%	3%	5%	2.1:1
Game room, with pool tables, table tennis, etc.	6%	44%	41%	4%	5%	1.1:1
Family locker rooms	14%	62%	17%	3%	4%	3.8:1
Gymnastics room	9%	37%	44%	3%	7%	1.0:1
Arts and craft room	6%	43%	41%	4%	5%	1.1:1
Rock climbing wall	10%	39%	42%	4%	4%	1.1:1
Food concession area	10%	55%	26%	4%	4%	2.2:1
Kitchen/cooking classroom	10%	34%	47%	5%	5%	0.8:1

TABLE #22: SUPPORT FOR VARIOUS AMENITIES IF INDOOR FITNESS AND RECREATION OPPORTUNITIES INCLUDED AS PART OF AQUATIC FACILITY BY SUBSECTOR

AMENITY	AREA I		AREA II		AREA III	
	SUPPORT	OPPOOSE	SUPPORT	OPPOSE	SUPPORT	OPPOSE
Basketball courts	69%	25%	67%	26%	58%	39%
Sauna/steam rooms	43%	51%	48%	47%	45%	50%
Weight/cardiovascular /equipment room	68%	28%	69%	25%	54%	40%
Multi-purpose rooms for meetings or party rentals	58%	35%	63%	31%	63%	34%
Group exercise/aerobics room	70%	26%	73%	23%	67%	29%
Indoor jogging track	64%	32%	64%	32%	61%	34%
Drop-in babysitting/nursery	66%	28%	65%	30%	55%	40%
Game room, with pool tables, table tennis, etc.	49%	45%	52%	44%	50%	47%
Family locker rooms	76%	20%	77%	16%	67%	30%
Gymnastics room	42%	49%	47%	46%	53%	45%
Arts and craft room	51%	45%	45%	47%	55%	44%
Rock climbing wall	49%	45%	53%	43%	42%	54%
Food concession area	68%	28%	61%	33%	64%	32%
Kitchen/cooking classroom	46%	49%	34%	60%	56%	44%

TABLE #23: SUPPORT FOR VARIOUS AMENITIES IF INDOOR FITNESS AND RECREATION OPPORTUNITIES INCLUDED AS PART OF AQUATIC FACILITY BY AGE OF RESPONDENT

ELEMENT	UNDER 45		45 - 65 YEARS		65+ YEARS	
	SUPPORT	OPPOSE	SUPPORT	OPPOSE	SUPPORT	OPPOSE
Basketball courts	83%	13%	71%	24%	53%	42%
Sauna/steam rooms	61%	33%	48%	47%	30%	64%
Weight/cardiovascular /equipment room	82%	15%	69%	27%	52%	42%
Multi-purpose rooms for meetings or party rentals	77%	18%	55%	39%	58%	38%
Group exercise/aerobics room	82%	15%	72%	25%	61%	35%
Indoor jogging track	80%	19%	64%	31%	53%	43%
Drop-in babysitting/nursery	75%	21%	67%	28%	55%	39%
Game room, with pool tables, table tennis, etc.	61%	36%	53%	44%	40%	53%
Family locker rooms	90%	6%	78%	18%	54%	32%
Gymnastics room	61%	34%	42%	50%	41%	52%
Arts and craft room	61%	36%	48%	46%	44%	50%
Rock climbing wall	76%	22%	48%	47%	40%	60%
Food concession area	85%	12%	62%	34%	57%	36%
Kitchen/cooking classroom	57%	40%	41%	54%	38%	56%

TABLE #24: FACILITY OR FACILITIES CHILDREN TAKEN TO FOR INDOOR YOUTH SPORTS BY SUBSECTOR, GENDER AND AGE OF RESPONDENT

RESPONSE	OVER ALL	SUBSECTOR			GENDER		AGE OF RESPONDENT		
		AREA I	AREA II	AREA III	MALE	FEMALE	UNDER 45	45-64 YEARS	65+
Plano related/recreation center/sports associations	14%	12%	15%	25%	13%	16%	5%	27%	0%
Church	13%	20%	7%	0%	15%	11%	11%	18%	0%
McKinney Recreation/Community center	12%	12%	11%	13%	13%	11%	14%	9%	17%
Allen related/Community center/ASA	11%	10%	7%	25%	3%	19%	11%	6%	33%
School	11%	12%	7%	13%	5%	16%	11%	12%	0%
YMCA	9%	10%	7%	13%	8%	8%	8%	9%	17%
Lifetime Fitness/LA Fitness	8%	5%	11%	13%	13%	3%	11%	3%	17%
Dr. Pepper Stars Center	7%	12%	0%	0%	5%	8%	5%	3%	33%
North Star	7%	7%	4%	13%	10%	3%	8%	6%	0%
Miscellaneous	5%	7%	4%	0%	10%	0%	5%	6%	0%
Frisco related facilities/field house	5%	7%	4%	0%	5%	5%	11%	0%	0%
Blue Sky	5%	0%	11%	13%	5%	5%	3%	9%	0%
Boys & Girls Club	5%	5%	0%	25%	8%	3%	5%	3%	17%
Texas Best Gymnastics	4%	5%	4%	0%	3%	5%	8%	0%	0%
Private facility	4%	5%	4%	0%	5%	3%	5%	3%	0%
The Colony	3%	5%	0%	0%	3%	3%	3%	3%	0%
Craig Ranch	3%	2%	4%	0%	3%	0%	0%	6%	0%
Cooper Institute	1%	2%	0%	0%	3%	0%	0%	3%	0%
Mouzon basketball	1%	2%	0%	0%	3%	0%	0%	3%	0%
Big Red Center	1%	0%	4%	0%	0%	3%	3%	0%	0%
McKinney Gymnastics Center	1%	0%	4%	0%	3%	0%	3%	0%	0%
Little Gym	1%	2%	0%	0%	3%	0%	3%	0%	0%
Stonebridge	1%	2%	0%	0%	0%	3%	0%	3%	0%

TABLE #25: OVERALL IMPORTANCE FOR INCLUDING VARIOUS FEATURES IF INDOOR MULTI-SPORT FACILITY WAS CONSTRUCTED

FEATURE	VERY IMPORTANT	IMPORTANT	UNIMPORTANT	VERY UNIMPORTANT	NO OPINION	RATIO
Courts for volleyball or basketball	19%	50%	22%	4%	5%	2.7:1
Indoor turf arena for sports like indoor soccer, lacrosse, or flag football	14%	37%	39%	4%	6%	1.2:1
Areas for performance or fitness training	10%	53%	28%	3%	6%	2.0:1
Food and beverage court	8%	54%	28%	4%	6%	1.9:1
Locker or changing rooms	17%	60%	17%	3%	2%	3.9:1
Meeting rooms	5%	44%	41%	4%	6%	1.1:1

TABLE #26: IMPORTANCE FOR INCLUDING VARIOUS FEATURES IF INDOOR MULTI-SPORT FACILITY WAS CONSTRUCTED BY SUBSECTOR

ELEMENT	AREA I		AREA II		AREA III	
	IMPORT	UN IMPORT	IMPORT	UN IMPORT	IMPORT	UN IMPORT
Courts for volleyball or basketball	71%	23%	71%	23%	56%	40%
Indoor turf arena for sports like indoor soccer, lacrosse, or flag football	50%	44%	53%	40%	48%	48%
Areas for performance or fitness training	66%	28%	65%	29%	53%	44%
Food and beverage court	66%	29%	62%	32%	50%	42%
Locker or changing rooms	79%	18%	79%	18%	70%	29%
Meeting rooms	50%	43%	48%	45%	45%	53%

TABLE #27: IMPORTANCE FOR INCLUDING VARIOUS FEATURES IF INDOOR MULTI-SPORT FACILITY WAS CONSTRUCTED BY AGE OF RESPONDENT

ELEMENT	UNDER 45		45 - 65 YEARS		65+ YEARS	
	IMPORT	UN IMPORT	IMPORT	UN IMPORT	IMPORT	UN IMPORT
Courts for volleyball or basketball	82%	14%	75%	20%	54%	40%
Indoor turf arena for sports like indoor soccer, lacrosse, or flag football	74%	23%	54%	42%	32%	59%
Areas for performance or fitness training	75%	22%	68%	28%	50%	41%
Food and beverage court	75%	21%	63%	33%	54%	38%
Locker or changing rooms	93%	7%	80%	20%	66%	29%
Meeting rooms	59%	38%	48%	46%	44%	48%