## NOTICE OF MEETING

## REGULAR MEETING AGENDA

1. CALL TO ORDER
2. AGENDA APPROVAL
3. PUBLIC COMMENT UPON MATTERS ALREADY ON THE AGENDA (Three minute time limit)
A. Public Comments Received regarding Beach Policy Review, Bishops Beach Page 3 and Similar Areas in Homer
4. VISITORS (Visitors normally have 10 minutes for their presentation.) A. Homer High School Students

Page 9
A Presentation by Students Regarding the Issues and Proposed Recommendations on Bishop's Beach

## 5. RECONSIDERATION

6. ADOPTION OF CONSENT AGENDA All items on the consent agenda are considered routine and non-controversial by the Parks \& Recreation Commission and are approved in one motion. There will be no separate discussion of these items unless requested by a Parks \& Recreation Commissioner or someone from the public, in which case the item will be moved to the regular agenda and considered in normal sequence.
A. Minutes for the Special Meeting on April 2, 2015

Page 11
5. STAFF \& COUNCIL REPORTS/COMMITTEE REPORTS/BOROUGH REPORT
A. Recommendation Recap - Julie Engebretsen/Renee Krause

Page 21
B. Parks \& Recreation Trails Symposium Status Update - Deb Lowney/Mike Illg Page 25
C. Community Recreation Report - Mike Illg
D. Parks Report - Angie Otteson
6. PUBLIC HEARING(there are no items scheduled)
7. PENDING BUSINESS
A. Map Depicting the Existing Areas and Proposed Areas

Page 27

1. Recommendations to Define a Pedestrian Only Area
2. Recommendations Regarding Motorized and Non-Motorized Traffic Areas
3. Recommendation to Establish a Limited Permitting System
4. Recommendation to Designate a New Area
a. Boundaries
b. Allowable Activities
B. Placement of a Barrier at Bishop's Beach Access A Motion postponed from the February 19, 2015 regular meeting to place a barrier to prohibit vehicles from turning immediately right upon the beach to deter crossing private property and extend said barrier to medium tide line.
5. NEW BUSINESS
A. Trespass - A Discussion Page 33
B. Scheduling the Spring Park Walk Through Page 43
C. Draft Parks Arts Culture Needs Assessment Page 45
6. Telephone Survey Results Page 125
7. INFORMATIONAL MATERIALS
A. Commission Annual Calendar 2015
Page 167
B. Commissioner Attendance at City Council Meetings 2015
Page 169
8. COMMENTS OF THE AUDIENCE
9. COMMENTS OF THE COUNCILMEMBER (If one has been assigned)
10. COMMENTS OF STAFF MEMBERS
11. COMMENTS OF THE COMMISSION
12. COMMENTS OF THE CHAIR
13. ADJOURNMENT THERE WILL BE A REGULAR MEETING ON THURSDAY, MAY 21, 2015. THE NEXT SPECIAL MEETING AND TENTATIVE PUBLIC HEARING IS SCHEDULED FOR MONDAY MAY 4, 2015 at 5:30pm in the City Hall Cowles Council Chambers located at 491 E. Pioneer Avenue, Homer Alaska

| From: | Jo Johnson |
| :--- | :--- |
| Sent: | Thursday, April 09, 2015 8:01 AM |
| To: | Renee Krause |
| Subject: | FW: Zone 7 Photo with tide for that day--Use this one |

Jo Johnson

From: Nina Faust [mailto:aknina51@gmail.com]
Sent: Thursday, April 09, 2015 7:25 AM
To: Jo Johnson
Subject: Zone 7 Photo with tide for that day--Use this one
Taken at 2:40 pm April 8. Low tide was at 11:38 a.m. a - 0.6 ft tide. High tide was at 6:03 pm/ 16.4 ft .
Here is a photo of Zone 7 that helps see the layout. Please add to the packet of the Parks and Rec Commission. Nina Faust


## Greeting Park and Rec Commissioners,

I fully support creating the area around the slough side of Bishops beach called Zone 7 that is designated for safe pedestrian use only. This area within our city limits warrants closure to vehicles.

Segregating users is a very common approach to accommodate multiple uses that may not be compatible. To create this area for safe pedestrian use only will bring many benefits to the city of Homer

- to prevent erosion in this sensitive area,
- avoid compaction for macro invertebrates used by bird and mammal species for food
- Create a natural beach botanical garden for residents and guests to behold the unique natural vegetation.
- provides habitat along with the driftwood for nesting birds
- accommodate the quiet walking majority of our citizen pedestrians
- accommodate our resident and visitor wildlife and bird viewers as well as the many birds and wildlife .

Protecting natural accessible areas is good for our local and city economy and the relaxation and recreation of our residents and visitors.

We need to allow the natural vegetation and underlying soils and sand to perform their ecosystem services provided for free if given the opportunity. Presently this area is very damaged. We can assist in the rehabilitation of zone 7 by setting up natural barriers to allow the sparse plant material to grow back and by carefully transplanting locally growing starts from intact areas.
Beach Wildrye (Lemus mollis) Planting Guide _http://plants.alaska.gov/pdf/ACRECG_2011_sec06-beach-wildrye.pdf

## Wildlife Viewing

The May 2014 ADFG report The Economic Importance of Alaska's Wildlife in 2011 summary:
http://www.adfg.alaska.gov/static/home/news/ongoingissues/pdfs/the-economic-importance-of-alaskas-wildlife-in-2011-summary-report.pdf

This report portrays the huge economic engine wildlife viewers are to Alaska. This has been a growing constituency to be recognized by cities and states.

- 199,000 resident wildlife watchers
- 669,000 traveling visitor wildlife watchers
- $\$ 2.7$ Billion dollars in spending in Alaska Billion
- $\$ 231$ million dollars in local city and state tax revenue
- creates 18,800 jobs.
- $\$ 976$ million dollars in labor income almost 1 Billion dollars

And in the U.S. Nearly a third of all Americans 16 years of age and older, or 72 million, participated in wildlife watching in 2011
http://digitalmedia.fws.gov/cdm/ref/collection/document/id/1906
Expenditures on Wildlife-watching in the U.S. totaled more than twice that spent on all spectator sports such as all football, baseball in 2011.
http://digitalmedia.fws.gov/cdm/ref/collection/document/id/1906

- Wildlife Watchers 71,776,000
- Total Expenditures(1) $\$ 54,890,272,000$ Billion
- Total Industrial Output(2) $\$ 142,147,057,177$ Billion
- Jobs 1,379,282
- Salaries and Wages \$53,036,586,430 Billion
- State and Local Tax Revenues $\$ 10,277,128,026$ Billion
- Federal Tax Revenues $\$ 10,818,805,399$ Billion


## Birding

http://www.fws.gov/southeast/economicImpact/pdf/2011-BirdingReport--FINAL.pdf

- 512,000 birders in Alaska ( $31 \%$ resident $69 \%$ visitors)
- 47 million birders in the US
- 18 million birders who travel away from home
- Total Expenditures $\$ 40,942,680,000$ Billion

Total Output \$106,977,730,000 Billion
Jobs 666,000
Employment Income \$31,391,977,000 Billion
State Tax Revenues \$6,000,203,000 Billion
Federal Tax Revenues $\$ 7,089,387,000$ Billion

## Education

Homer has a living laboratory with a bounty of educational and research facilities to partner with

- Kachemak Bay Estuarine Research Reserve
- Alaska Maritime Wildlife Refuge
- Center for Alaskan Coastal Studies
- Pratt Museum
- Kachemak Bay State Park and Wilderness Park
- Friends of Kachemak Bay State Park
- Bay Excursions
- Western Hemisphere Shorebird Reserve Network
- Kachemak Bay Birders
- National Water Trail Committee
- K-Bay CHA Board
- K-Bay Conservation Society
- Kachemak Crane Watch

What better more appropriate place to accommodate this live classroom than Bishops Beach. With the boardwalk along the slough we could nurture the walking birding pastime by encouraging the habitat in this prime area where vehicles do not tread.

Vehicles on a sensitive beach and slough ecosystem that has the potential of hosting so many birds and macro-invertebrates gives the wrong message to our students, visitors and residents. It does not provide wise education. It promotes a style of recreation that is not compatible and damaging. It is not the place for vehicular wheeled traffic.

The city of Homer has the great opportunity to educate. To present to students, visitors and residents that we are very bird and wildlife friendly and that we understand the importance of safe walking areas and ecological services that are given to us free of charge when cared for properly.

Thank-you for your consideration
With Kind Regards,
Nancy Hillstrand
P.O. Box 7

Homer, Alaska 99603
907-235-9772


## Memorandum

TO:
PARKS AND RECREATION ADVISORY COMMISSION
FROM: RENEE KRAUSE, CMC, DEPUTY CITY CLERK
DATE: APRIL 9,2015
SUBJECT: PRESENTATION BY STUDENTS OF HOMER HIGH SCHOOL AND WEST HOMER ELEMENTARY

The students presenting and participating in the collaboration of the presentation tonight are as follows:

Alicia Steiner, 15, Sophomore
Paloma Ramires, 15, Sophomore
Taylor Davis, 18, Senior
Nolan Bunting
Landon Bunting
Jay Davis
and
Parker Lowney, 12, $6^{\text {th }}$ Grade, West Homer Elementary

I will try to have a paper copy of their presentation available for the meeting. It was not received in time for inclusion in the packet.

Session 15-06 a Special Meeting of the Parks and Recreation Advisory Commission was called to order on April 2, 2015 at 5:35 pm by Chair Matt Steffy at the Cowles Council Chambers City Hall located at 491 E. Pioneer Avenue, Homer, Alaska.

PRESENT: COMMISSIONERS LOWNEY, MACCAMPBELL, STEFFY, ARCHIBALD, BRANN, ROEDL AND LILLIBRIDGE

STAFF: JULIE ENGEBRETSEN, DEPUTY CITY PLANNER RENEE KRAUSE, CMC, DEPUTY CITY CLERK

Commissioner Lillibridge arrived at 7:24 p.m.

## APPROVAL OF THE AGENDA

Chair Steffy requested a motion to approve the agenda.
MACCAMPBELL/LOWNEY - MOVED TO APROVE THE AGENDA
There was no discussion.
The agenda was approved by consensus of the Commission.

## PUBLIC COMMENT ON ITEMS ALREADY ON THE AGENDA

Chair Steffy invited the public to comment and requested them to please sign in they will have 3 minutes.

Nolan Buntins, non-resident, President, Homer Youth Birding Group, another group of Homer High School Students, commented on the importance of the habitat to the birds, advocated for the closure of the beach in front of Beluga Slough to motorized vehicles and that all dogs remain on leash. He further stated that all recommendations should be for and inconsideration of Beluga Slough. This will better protect the Slough for the future.

Louise Ashmun, commented on waiting to submit written comment since she was a new resident; personally would advocate for no vehicles on the beaches but in deference to the overall general public she recommended that the commission use strong ordinance language for no vehicles in area 7, seasonal closures, dogs on leash, increased enforcement and improved signage and removal of old signage. Ms. Ashmun recommended the Commission follow the recommendations of Jack Wiles. She did not make any specific recommendations regarding the other issues of great concern.

Lani Raymond, city resident, commented on "ifs" - regarding vehicles in Area 7 on the beach. If the commission is to implement seasonal closures in the winter they should consider the impact of climate change since the berm would not be frozen to any suitable depth to offer protection needed from vehicles driving upon them; and, this may not be a long term solution but if they allow seasonal driving then they must ban all motorized traffic from the berms. The second if, if they are going to close area 7 to vehicular traffic all year long with some access through a permit system and one of the goals is to restore the outer berms to better protect the slough and upper wetlands from storm surges and sea level rising in the future be careful that your final plan does not result in damage and degradation to the berm area and defeat this goal. For example under a permit system allowing vehicle use in the winter on the beach there should be an iron clad restriction to prohibit any type of vehicle use on the berm. There would need to be an ordinance specifically identifying the berm as off limits with a physical barrier and the support for enforcement provided.

Beverly Macy, city resident, commented on developing a volunteer program to enforce rules on the beach relating to similar actions conducted as a resident of Hope, Alaska for Fire Restrictions/Enforcement. She described how the residents were given the authority, vests and hard hats and how the program worked. Ms. Macy commented on the enormity of dog feces on the Beluga Slough beach area.

Andy Haas, city resident, civil defense lawyer, commented on the rampant drug usage destroying the community and should be a number one priority of the commission. He believed that the number one deterrent would be prohibiting vehicles on the beach. He stated that if the only prohibition to result was dogs on leashes that would be a crime.

## VISITORS

There were no visitors scheduled.

## RECONSIDERATION

There were no items for reconsideration.

## ADOPTION OF THE CONSENT AGENDA

A. Minutes for the regular meeting of March 19, 2015

Chair Steffy requested any comments, questions or corrections regarding the items on the consent agenda. Hearing none he requested a motion for adoption of the consent agenda.

BRANN/LOWNEY - MOVED TO ADOPT THE CONSENT AGENDA.
There was no discussion.
VOTE. YES. NON-OBJECTION. UNANIMOUS CONSENT.
Motion carried.

## STAFF \& COUNCIL REPORTS/COMMITTEE REPORTS/BOROUGH REPORTS

## A. Staff Report Julie Engebretsen, Deputy City Planner

Ms. Engebretsen reported on the following:

- The telephone survey has been completed and she hopes to have a full report at the regular meeting April $16^{\text {th }}$
- the survey results are on the city website and included in the packet under informational materials
- she encouraged the commission to wrap up the discussion about Bishop's Beach area and Area 8A/B in the next two meetings as she would really like to invite the old town neighborhood and land owners affected by recommendations in area 8 before the tourist season is upon us and before any public hearings.

Ms. Engebretsen then reviewed the recommendations made to date:

1. City of Homer to purchase 500 Doggie Bag Dispensers
2. City to place Stationary dog waste dispensers at public buildings, trails and parks and encourage other agencies and businesses to do the same
3. City to partner with other organizations to provide education and materials on responsible pet ownership.
4. Following areas to be designated as Leashed Only Areas: Area 2, Area 5, within Mariner Park, within Bishop's Beach Park, and Area 7
5. Moved to change Area 8 to Area 8A Beach Access west to Crittenden and Area 8B will be Crittenden West

- Install 3 fire pits on city owned parcels Bishops Beach Park, near the end of Main Street \& Ohlson Lane and at the end of Crittenden
- Consider 3 options for closing the beach to vehicles
a. No vehicles Bishop's Beach to the Slough mouth
b. No vehicles between Bishop's Beach and Mariner Park April $1^{\text {st }}$ - September 30th
c. No vehicles east of Bishop's Beach to the end of the spit April 1st - September $30^{\text {th }}$
- Place a Permanent, Natural materials Barrier to keep vehicles out of the area between Bishop's Beach and the mouth of the slough
- Add Bishop's Beach and Beluga Slough to the existing Western Hemisphere Shorebird Reserve Network (WHSRN)
- Hire two seasonal beach patrol employees
- Draft and Ordinance to define and ban reckless driving as it would apply to all of City of Homer beaches
- Improve Signage

The following has been postponed: Place a natural barrier to the right from beach access to deter vehicles traffic from crossing private property and extend to medium tide line

Other recommendations or solutions:

- Increase dog waste education
- Additional Trash receptacles at Crittenden and Main Street/Ohlson locations
- Community outreach and education on beach rules
- Education on beach resources
- Delineate private property in the Bishop's Beach Access area
- Placement of rocks to prevent or mark where vehicles should drive east of Bishop's Beach
- placement of a Park Host, Chief Robl stated that this person would also be required to testify in court on beach enforcement issues.


## PUBLIC HEARING

There were no items scheduled for this meeting.

## PENDING BUSINESS

A. Land Allocation Plan 2015 Recommendations

Chair Steffy read the title into the record. He asked Commissioner Lowney to start with her recommendations.

LOWNEY/ BRANN - MOVED TO MAKE LOTS 9A \& 10A Page A-2 DEDICATED PARKING FOR BUSINESS AND PUBLIC ON THE SPIT.

There was a brief discussion.
VOTE. YES. NON-OBJECTION. UNANIMOUS CONSENT.
Motion carried.
LOWNEY/BRANN - MOVED TO SUBMIT A REQUEST TO COUNCIL FOR \$5000 TO DEVELOP A PUBLIC ACCESS/PEDESTRIAN TRAIL (PAGE C-6) TO THE BEACH AND PLACEMENT OF A FIRE PIT AND REFUSE CONTAINER.

Commissioner Lowney provided her reasons for requesting funds to develop the parcel. Further discussion on the public using the private access and needing additional time to study this proposal since the location is extremely steep and would need a staircase. Plus there may be grants to use with this type of project and the difficulty in maintaining refuse can on the beach, parking is already limited in the Old Town area. Staff recommended that the Commission submit a recommendation that Council designates this parcel as a park and then they can discuss the recommendation to budget funding at a later meeting.

The commission agreed by consensus to postponed this recommendation until the June 18, 2015.
LOWNEY/ROEDL - MOVED TO RECOMMEND LOT PAGE 75 (C6) AND PAGE 78 (C9) BE DESIGNATED AS PARK LAND.

Discussion on the retention of the property off of Ocean Drive Loop and the previous request to designate as open space view shed or green space, concerns expressed regarding safety. Staff also recommended they address the details at a different meeting. The property is not appraisable and it is difficult sell land that is basically not usable. There are costs related to the property in the form of assessments.

VOTE. YES. NON-OBJECTION. UNANIMOUS CONSENT.

Motion carried.
LOWNEY/MACCAMPBELL - MOVED TO SUBMIT A RECOMMENDATION TO THE PORT \& HARBOR THAT THEY DESIGNATE THE PARKING AREA (D21) AS SHORT TERM PARKING INSTEAD OF 7 DAY PARKING.

Discussion ensued on submitting this recommendation to the Port \& Harbor Commission to make the changes to the parking from long term to short term since the issue of parking is so prevalent on the spit.

VOTE. YES. NON-OBJECTION. UNANIMOUS CONSENT.
Motion carried.
LOWNEY/BRANN - MOVED TO DESIGNATE THE MOST SOUTHEASTERLY LOT OF THE DEVELOPMENT BE DESIGNATED AS A PARK AND THAT THE CITY WORK ON ESTABLISHING A TRAIL EASEMENT THROUGH THE UNDEVELOPED ADJOINING LOT OFF OF SITKA ROSE CIRCLE FOR THE PURPOSE OF ESTABLISHING AN ALTERNATIVE ROUTE TO WEST HOMER ELEMENTARY FROM WEST HILL.

There was a brief discussion on an easement and there are plans for the construction of a house there this summer and staff is doubtful that the owner will grant an easement. Staff explained that it is likely that this land will be re-platted as it does not fall within established subdivision guidelines. It is too early in the process since there will likely be several changes to this property. Commissioner MacCampbell wanted to urge that whenever large neighborhoods like this are being considered that greenbelts or greenspace be maintained at an optimum.

Commissioner Lowney withdrew her motion.
LOWNEY/BRANN - MOVED TO DESIGNATE MARINER PARK (E24) AS A PARK.
There was a brief discussion regarding determination of ownership and staff confirmed that the city owns the property however a title search was not done.

VOTE. YES. NON-OBJECTION. UNANIMOUS CONSENT.
Motion carried.
There was a brief discussion on the current clearing underway on the property behind the Cleaners off of Main Street. Staff was unaware of the work being done on FAA property. They explained the efforts to clear out the Poopdeck Trail and surrounding land.

Commissioner Lowney also mentioned the clearing and trails at Mullikin and Along Fairview Ave at Karen Hornaday Park.

## MACCAMPBELL/BRANN - MOVED TO DESIGNATE THE CONTIGUOUS LOTS (C10) SOUTHEAST OF MARINER PARK AS PARK LAND.

There was a brief discussion on the recommendation.
VOTE. YES. NON-OBJECTION. UNANIMOUS CONSENT.

## Motion carried.

A brief discussion ensued regarding the changes to the land at the corner of Homer Spit Road and Freightdock Road regarding the placement of new restrooms and a sculpture of a large fish hook.

The next discussion was entertained on the area next to the Chip Pad on A4 would be a great place for the Barge Haul out Area. No recommendation was made.

There was a brief discussion on designating the additional land to Woodard Park. No recommendation at this time.

There were no further recommendations from the commission.
B. Parks, Recreation and Trail Symposium - Homer...On the Move!

Commissioner Lowney provided the commission with the progress of the steering committee on the organization and planning of the first symposium. Commissioner Lowney provided the following:

- Currently they have the following organizations confirmed
- State Parks, City of Homer, ReCreate Rec, Cook Inletkeeper, Coastal Studies, Walkability Group, Homer Area Trails and the Woodard Creek Coalition
- There was interest from Howl, Bicycle Club, Running Club, and Ski Club but haven't received confirmation
- It has been advertised on Facebook, Please Share it!
- They need to discuss advertising on the radio or paper

Commissioner MacCampbell asked about the time to set up on the $18^{\text {th }}$. Commissioner Lowney stated that there is not much to set up so she figured if people could be there about 10:30, the event starts at noon.

Commissioner Archibald agreed that they needed to advertise and inquired about the cost. Staff advised that it may be approximately $\$ 350$ for two business card sized advertisements. Chair Steffy inquired from Mr. Armstrong about advertising the Homer News and he advised them of the alternative means to advertise the event that are free but to contact the Newspaper for Advertising.

Commissioner Lowney will draft the ad and meet with staff next week to finalize. Staff will provide her with the contact information for the radio station.

Commissioner Lowney appreciated the positive reaction from the groups that are participating in this event and it has the potential to be very beneficial.

ARCHIBALD/ROEDL - MOVED TO ALLOCATE UP TO $\$ 600$ FROM THE PARKS AND RECREATION FUND TO PROMOTE THE PARKS AND TRAIL SYMPOSIUM.

There was a discussion on advertising venues, distributing flyers, and providing light refreshments.
VOTE. YES. NON-OBJECTION. UNANIMOUS CONSENT.
Motion carried.

Chair Steffy called for a 5 minute recess at $6: 45 \mathrm{p} . \mathrm{m}$. The meeting was called back to order at 7:53 p.m.
C. Dogs, Birds and Habitat Oh My!

1. Recommendations to Protect Birds and Habitat

Chair Steffy read the title into the record and opened the floor for discussion. It was noted that this was to finish the discussion on Birds and Habitat and for the commissioners to recommend any additional changes. He reviewed the previous recommendations made by the commission.

ARCHIBALD/BRANN - MOVED TO DESIGNATE THE UPPER VEGETATED BERM AREA IN AREA 7 AS DOGS ON LEASH ONLY.

## Commissioner MacCampbell offered a friendly amendment to include All Domesticated animals.

There was a brief discussion that all animals should be banned from that area used as habitat for wildlife including but not limited to dogs, cats and horses.
The amendment was accepted.
ARCHIBALD/BRANN - MOVED TO PROHIBIT DOMESTICATED ANIMALS IN THE VEGETATED BERM AREA IN AREA 7.

There was brief discussion on the reason for no animals in that area.
VOTE.YES. NON-OBJECTION. UNANIMOUS CONSENT.
Motion carried.
Commissioner Lowney requested clarification for dogs on leash in parking areas. Chair Steffy stated that they have made a motion regarding that and noted the page in the packet for reference.

Chair Steffy asked for additional motions regarding dogs and habitat.
ROBERT/LOWNEY - MOVED TO DESIGNATE AREA 8A, BISHOP'S BEACH ACCESS WEST TO CRITTENDEN ACCESS, AS DOGS ON LEASH ONLY.

Discussion ensued on the issue of most congested and used and that beach actually being private property above the tide line and if dogs are there off leash in the sandy berm then it is more of an issue of trespass. It was noted that this could be part of the education process.

LOWNEY/BRANN - MOVED TO AMEND THE MOTION TO READ DOGS OFF LEASH ONLY WEST OF CRITTENDEN AND BELOW MEAN HIGH TIDE LINE.

Discussion on there being no jurisdiction on private property. The city owns below mean high tide and the commission is giving owner's permission to run their dogs west of Crittenden and below mean high tide. Clarification on the established rule of dogs under voice control was offered.

VOTE. (Amendment) YES. NON-OBJECTION. UNANIMOUS CONSENT.
Motion carried.
ROBERT/ROEDL - MOVED TO DESIGNATE AREA 6 AS DOGS ON LEASH ONLY DURING THE SEASONAL MIGRATION AND NESTING PERIOD ANNUALLY, NORMALLY MARCH - OCTOBER.

Discussion centered delineating the area without including all the area from Crittenden West to Mariner Park. Discussion covered splitting Area 4 in two parts. Staff recommended making it Area 4 -Rip Rap South, towards to end of the Spit, an off leash area and Rip Rap West would be on leash.

LOWNEY/ - MOVED TO MAKE AREA 4 FROM THE RIP RAP SOUTH TO THE END OF THE SPIT OFF LEASH AND RIP RAP NORTH AS ON LEASH.

Chair Steffy voiced recommendation that dogs are on leash in Mariner Park. There was a determination that there was confusion on establishing leashed and no leashed areas in Area 6 and 4.

Commissioner Lowney decided to withdraw her motion.
Staff recommended making motions specific to the area. If they present a combined recommendation to Council and they do not approve it then they lose all but if it is by specific area then Council may approve the recommendation for one area but not the other.

The Commission agreed with the staff recommendation.
Chair Steffy read the motion made by Commissioner Archibald currently on the floor.
Commissioner MacCampbell stated that he would support the option if it was seasonal during the migration and nesting seasons as it is the only area that is not used much by pedestrians or dog owners. Further comments noting that the area is not heavily used and could support off leash use. Commissioner Archibald agreed to amend his motion to reflect the seasonal closure. Commissioner Roedl questioned the early March closure since birds usually arrive in April. It was noted that the seasonal closure was established by Mr. Matz. Commissioner Lowney called for the vote. Commissioner Roedl accepted the amendment.

Ms. Krause read the amended motion into the record.
VOTE. YES. NON-OBJECTION. UNANIMOUS CONSENT.
Motion carried.
LOWNEY/ROEDL - MOVED TO DESIGNATE AREA 4, MOUTH OF THE MARINER PARK LAGOON TO THE CITY OF HOMER CAMPGROUND AT THE FISHING HOLE, AS DOGS ON LEASH ANNUALLY.

Discussion on the area being recommended as on leash only ensued. They discussed redrawing area section lines and the purpose is to control dogs in the more congested areas. There was a preference to keep or have more control while in parking areas and parks and if they have it different in all areas it will be hard to control or follow.
Staff recommended not changing the lines of areas since there are other items that still need to be addressed. It was also noted that Mariner Park cover this area and is dogs on leash.

Commissioner Lowney withdrew her motion at this time.
Commissioner Lowney explained that it addresses habitat but wanted to discuss access and fire pit installation at Crittenden. It was noted that there was a public access installed at least a year ago. They received permission and agreement with the property owner and everything was a done deal.

Chair Steffy asked for additional recommendations.
LOWNEY/BRANN - MOVED TO RECOMMEND CREATION OF A PUBLIC ACCESS TRAIL TO THE BEACH FROM OHLSON LANE AND ANCILLARY PARKING.

There was no discussion.
VOTE. YES. NON-OBJECTION. UNANIMOUS CONSENT.
Motion carried.
Commissioner Lillibridge arrived at 7:36 p.m.

Commissioner Archibald requested reading of the motions passed so far this meeting. Staff read the motions made and passed. There were four.

## LOWNEY/LILLIBRIDGE - MOVED TO LIMIT MOTORIZED TRAFFIC BY PERMIT ONLY IN AREA 8 and 8A

Discussion on the use of this prohibition to deter drug dealing, private property rights, that this action would be punishing the majority if the good users, but by permit would allow those users that require the access, enacting this recommendation would add to the parking problem at the beach already and where will those additional people park.
Additional comments against total closure from the majority of the commission were offered and that they need more enforcement down there and if they had to take it to a vote of the community it would not pass.
Commissioner Lowney advocated that they consider the science of what they are doing, and the fact that they may be challenged but they need to make that recommendation. They can designate areas for parking and if it is full then there are other areas to park and view the water, she gets that Bishops Beach is convenient. She questioned whether they still need to drive on the beach and that with more and more people coming to the area they need to be aware of the issues driving on the beach causes.

VOTE. YES. LOWNEY, LILLIBRIDGE.
VOTE. NO. MACCAMPBELL, STEFFY, ARCHIBALD, BRANN, ROEDL
Motion failed.

## STEFFY/BRANN - MOVED TO POSTPONE ITEMS D AND E AT THE APRIL $16{ }^{\text {TH }}$ MEETING.

Staff explained that as long as the discussion is wrapped up at the April $16^{\text {th }}$ meeting they will have an extra week between that meeting and the May $4^{\text {th }}$ Special meeting that they can invite the Old Town property owners to comment on the recommendations. Staff also noted that the same packet materials will be used for the postponed items.

VOTE. YES. NON-OBJECTION. UNANIMOUS CONSENT.
Motion carried.
D. Map Depicting the Existing Zones and Proposed Zones

1. Recommendations to Define a Pedestrian Only Zone
2. Recommendations regarding Motorized and Non-Motorized Traffic Zones
3. Recommendation to Establish a Limited Permitting System
4. Recommendation to Designate a New Zone
a. Boundaries
b. Allowable Activities
E. Placement of a Barrier at Bishop's Beach Access

A Motion postponed from the February 19, 2015 regular meeting to place a barrier to prohibit vehicles from turning immediately right upon the beach to deter crossing private property and extend said barrier to medium tide line.

## NEW BUSINESS

There were no new business items on the agenda.

## INFORMATIONAL MATERIALS

A. Commission Annual Calendar 2015
B. Commissioner Attendance at City Council Meetings 2015
C. Needs Assessment Survey Results
D. Safe Kids Fair - Vendor Application

Chair Steffy read through the informational items.

## COMMENTS OF THE AUDIENCE

There were no comments from the audience.

## COMMENTS OF THE CITY STAFF

Ms. Engebretsen commented that they did a great job on the coffee table yesterday and they will keep plugging along.

Ms. Krause commented had no comments.

## COMMENTS OF THE COUNCILMEMBER (If one is present)

There were no council members present.

## COMMENTS OF THE COMMISSION

Commissioner Lillibridge apologized for being late, she was working with patients. She really likes the process, and believes that they are meeting enough along with the history; she will make an effort to catch up this week. It was a good meeting.

Commissioner Roedl will be missing the next meeting and agrees that they have gotten a lot done but still have a lot to do, he knows he will be missing out on something so please don't hesitate to talk to him to catch him up.

Commissioner Brann will be here for the next meeting but will be gone after that, he agreed that they got a lot done but wanted to caution the commissioners not to get mired down in the details as they move forward so that they don't lose the general public or get lost themselves in discussion. Specific rules are required for some things but they do not need to micromanage everything. Good radio discussion yesterday. Good work guys.

Commissioner Archibald was not sure that they covered the discussion on the dogs on or off leash from the Rip Rap south. He is sorry to have lead them astray talking about two things at once.

Commissioner MacCampbell thanked everyone he may not be here also on the $16^{\text {th }}$ but if he can call in that is permissible as long as there is a quorum present also.

Commissioner Lowney good meeting they did cover a lot but she was also hoping that they make good decisions based on facts and try to keep emotion out of the equation. She will be working on the flyers for the symposium and would appreciate everyone approaching the other organizations to participate.

## COMMENTS OF THE CHAIR

Chair Steffy appreciated the lively back and forth; he confirmed that they did resolve the motion on Area 4 by Commissioner Lowney withdrawing her motion for Commissioner Archibald. He commented on the hiring Jeff Scarsi as the new schoolyard Habitat Coordinator who will start in May. They extended the grant for additional year. He requested status update in the donation of the equipment. He confirmed the date of the symposium for April $18^{\text {th }}$ and he thanked the press for being in attendance and getting the word out to the public.

## ADJOURNMENT

There being no further business to come before the Commission, Chair Steffy adjourned the meeting at 8:15 p.m. The next SPECIAL MEETING IS SCHEDULED FOR THURSDAY, APRIL 16, 2015 at 5:30 p.m. at City Hall Cowles Council Chambers 491 E. Pioneer Avenue, Homer, Alaska.

Renee Krause, CMC, Deputy City Clerk I
Approved:


## Memorandum

TO: PARKS AND RECREATION ADVISORY COMMISSION
FROM: RENEE KRAUSE, CMC, DEPUTY CITY CLERK
DATE: APRIL 9,2015
SUBJECT: RECOMMENDATION RECAP
From the April 2, 2015 Special Meeting the following motions were made:

- MOVED TO PROHIBIT DOMESTICATED ANIMALS IN THE VEGETATED BERM AREA IN AREA 7.
-MOVED TO DESIGNATE AREA 8A, BISHOP'S BEACH ACCESS WEST TO CRITTENDEN ACCESS, AS DOGS ON LEASH ONLY AND DOGS OFF LEASH ONLY WEST OF CRITTENDEN AND BELOW MEAN HIGH TIDE LINE.
- MOVED TO DESIGNATE AREA 6 AS DOGS ON LEASH ONLY DURING THE SEASONAL MIGRATION AND NESTING PERIOD ANNUALLY, NORMALLY MARCH - OCTOBER
- MOVED TO RECOMMEND CREATION OF A PUBLIC ACCESS TRAIL TO THE BEACH FROM OHLSON LANE AND ANCILLARY PARKING

To: Parks and Recreation Advisory Commission
From: Julie Engebretsen, Deputy City Planner
Date: March 25,2015
Subject: April 2 ${ }^{\text {nd }}$ Staff Report

## PARC Needs Assessment Update

The telephone survey went well and has been completed. I hope to have an update at the meeting about the project, and a draft at the April $16^{\text {th }}$ meeting. If you have not seen them, the community survey results are available on the City Website, and included in this packet.

## Beach Policy neighborhood invite

I'd like to encourage the Commission to wrap up discussion of the Bishop's beach area/area 8A and 8 B , in the next two meetings. I would really like to invite the old town neighborhood and area 8 land owners to come to a commission meeting, before the tourism season is upon us, and well before a public hearing.

## RECAP of beach policy motions to date:

~CITY OF HOMER PURCHASE 500 DOGGIE BAG DISPENSERS.
~THE CITY PLACE STATIONARY DOG WASTE DISPENSERS AT PUBLIC BUILDINGS, TRAILS AND PARKS AND ENCOURAGES OTHER AGENCIES AND BUSINESSES TO DO THE SAME.
~THE CITY PARTNER WITH OTHER ORGANIZATIONS TO PROVIDE EDUCATION AND MATERIALS ON RESPONSIBLE PET OWNERSHIP.
~THE FOLLOWING AREAS BE DESIGNATED AS LEASHED ONLY: AREA 2, AREA 5, WITHIN MARINER PARK, WITHIN BISHOPS BEACH PARK, AND AREA 7.
~MOVED TO CHANGE AREA 8 TO AREA 8A BEACH ACCESS TO CRITTENDEN AND 8B WILL BE CRITTENDEN WEST
~ Install fire pits at these three locations: Bishop's Beach Park, City parcel near the end of Main Street/Ohlson Lane, and at the End of Crittenden.

## ~Consider 3 options for closing the beach to vehicles:

1. No vehicles east from Bishop's Beach to the slough
2. No vehicles between Bishop's Beach and Mariner Park. (Seasonal, closed in summer)
3. No vehicles east of Bishop's Beach, all the way to the end of the Spit. (Seasonal)
~Place a permanent natural barrier to keep vehicles out of area 7 (Bishops beach Park the mouth of the slough) (Feb 19 mtg )
$\sim$ Add Bishop's Beach and Beluga Slough to the existing Western Hemisphere Shorebird Reserve Network. (WHSRN)
$\sim$ Hire two seasonal beach patrol employees
~Draft an ordinance to define and ban reckless driving as it would be applies to all of City of Homer beaches
$\sim$ Signage is inadequate and needs to be improved at Bishop's Beach.

Motions on the floor but postponed at Feb 19 meeting: Place a natural barrier to the right from the beach access to deter vehicle traffic from crossing private property and extend to medium tide line.

## Other Solutions:

- Increase dog waste education
- Trash cans at Main/Ohlson and Crittenden. (Make it easier to toss trash and doggie baggies)
- Educate locals on beach rules. Community outreach: primary user groups, schools
- Education on beach resources (why we have the rules and how they protect what we have)
- Delineate private property at Bishop's Beach Access
- Place rocks to prevent or mark where vehicles shouldn't go, east at Bishop's Beach
- Consider a park host. Chief Robl recommends they be willing to be a witness to testify in court on beach enforcement actions.


## TRAILS SYMPOSIUM

## Homer...ON THE MOVE!

## Saturday, <br> April 18th at 12-4PM

Held at Homer High Commons


The purpose of this symposium is to connect community members, user groups and organizations for an afternoon dedicated to networking, sharing, promoting, planning and advocating for safe, accessible trails, sidewalks, and roadways.

## ~All are welcome and encouraged to attend!~

For more information \& questions contact Deb at 299-0344 or Mike at 235-6090

Planning

To: $\quad$ Parks and Recreation Advisory Commission
From: Julie Engebretsen, Deputy City Planner
Date: $\quad$ March 11, 2015
Subject: Beach Zones

## Introduction

The Commission requested several items on the agenda. They have been categorized here for organization.

Map Depicting the Existing Zones and Proposed Zones

1. Recommendations to Define a Pedestrian Only Zone
2. Recommendations regarding Motorized and Non-Motorized Traffic Zones
3. Recommendation to Establish a Limited Permitting System
4. Recommendation to Designate a New Zone
a. Boundaries
b. Allowable Activities

## 1. Request to Define a Pedestrian Only Zone.

Staff recommendation: Drop the term "Pedestrian Priority" from the Beach Policy. If the goal is to close the beach to vehicles, its much more clear to say that.


## 2. Recommendations regarding Motorized and Non-Motorized Traffic Zones

Currently, the commission has adopted a recommendation to close area 7 to vehicles year round, and to seasonally close the area from Beluga Slough, east through Mariner Park out the Spit. If the Commission wants any other new areas closed to vehicles, please make a motion to do so. Otherwise, this is the proposal that is going to public hearing.

## 3. Recommendation to Establish a Limited Permitting System

If the Commission wants to have a permit system, please make a motion describing who can get a permit and why. Don't get too bogged down in the details; right now we need to know who gets permission, what area of the beach this applies to, and why permission would be granted.

## 4. Recommendation to Designate a New Zone

## a. Boundaries

b. Allowable Activities

At the last meeting, Chief Robl suggested creating an additional zone directly west of Bishop's Beach Park, that is more restrictive due to the increased usage, but allows kids to go further west. I was not at the last meeting, but I understand there was some conversation on a slower speed limit through this area.

## Boundaries:

Suggested Motion: Create a new area from Bishop's Beach Park, west to $\qquad$ (Crittenden?) Staff suggests calling this "Bishop's Beach Area" to keep it simple for now.

## Allowable activities:

How will beach behavior be different in this area, than other places where people can drive on the beach?
$\sim$ the Commission has already recommended designated fire pit areas along this portion of the beach
~Parks maintenance will try to find ways to increase the number of trash cans in the area, probably along the roads where trash can be picked up.
~Would building stairs at the end of Main Street or working with the landowner who has the private trail in that area help pedestrian access?
$\sim$ Staff recommends a short brainstorming session on what the Commission envisions in this area.

## Attachments

1. Small Beach Area Map
2. Larger beach map of Mariner Park to Crittenden



# Memorandum 

TO: PARKS AND RECREATION ADVISORY COMMISSION
FROM: RENEE KRAUSE, CMC, DEPUTY CITY CLERK
DATE: APRIL 9,2015
SUBJECT: TRESPASS
Commissioner Brann requested this item on the agenda for discussion.

Following are Alaska State Statutes as it relates to Trespass, there are currently no City regulations regarding Trespass so the state laws would be applicable barring any other outstanding covenants, easements or permissions.

# State By State Guide to No Trespassing Laws \& Signage 



Two of the biggest fears of both business and landowners is liability and the risk of trespassing that comes with owning private property. While we've written previously on dog signage and liability (http://www.signs.com/blog/beware-of-dog-signs-protecting-you-your-dogs-and-your-visitors/), in every state signage plays a slightly different role in legal issues surrounding private property and criminal trespassing.

In addition to preventing trespassing, the reasons for using this type of signage can include a desire for privacy, vandalism and theft prevention, preventing hunting, fishing and trapping, and the obvious liability prevention. After all, private property rights are outlined in the Constitution and, for many, evoke some extremely strong emotions. So from no trespassing to restricted access to private property signs, find your state in the map below to see what types of no trespassing signage will give you legal recourse and help protect your property from ignorant or malicious intruders.

## What is Criminal Trespassing?

In most cases criminal trespassing is defined as entering or remaining on a premises or property in which one does not have the authorization, license or privilege to do so. Usually notice against entering or remaining can either be delivered in oral or written fashion by the
property owner or an authorized agent. Laws vary slightly from state to state with some being very basic and others having very detailed requirements for providing proper notice.

## Trespassing Consequences - Misdemeanor or Felony?

In most states criminal trespassing is punishable by a misdemeanor though in some it is considered a felony. Almost without fail the distinction is based on the situation and intent of the trespasser. Along with being charged with a misdemeanor or felony, trespassing usually comes with some kind of fine and/or imprisonment. In almost all cases property owners have greater legal recourse when they've met the state's definition for proper verbal or written notice.

## No Trespassing Signage \& Templates

For each state we've included examples of the types of signage property owners need to have in place to improve their legal recourse. All of the no trespassing sign templates can be clicked on to customize to your state's needs. Once clicked on we'd recommend choosing our . 040 Aluminum (http://www.signs.com/aluminum/) material as an affordable yet durable exterior option but rigid plastic (http://www.signs.com/rigid-plastic/) and dibond (http://www.signs.com /dibond/) are other good options. As per the note below it is still the responsibility of the buyer to verify that the signage requirement we've outlined meets state laws.

## Legal Disclaimer

We've done our best to find state laws applicable to criminal trespassing on private property. Some states have trespassing laws specific to the type of property. Where possible we've noted these differences. Notwithstanding, we are not lawyers and will not be held responsible for information found on this page. Where possible we've included a link to state laws or resources that to the best of our knowledge is current state law. Nonetheless, readers are responsible for ascertaining both the law and source are correct before acting on this advice in any way, including the customization of templates and purchase of signs.

Click on the any template below to customize it or find them in our no trespassing templates page (http://www.signs.com/templates/safety/no-trespassing/).

## Alaska

Alaska state laws for no trespassing are laid out in Alaska Statute Title 11 Chapter 46 Section 350, or AS 11.46.350 (http://www.touchngo.com/Iglentr/akstats/Statutes/Title11/Chapter46 /Section350.htm).

In layman's terms the statute states that assuming the person that has entered and/or remains on land that is neither fenced nor designed to exclude intruders and has no intent to commit a crime can remain on the land unless the following is in place:

- Notice is given to the person by the owner or by an authorized person that there is no trespassing.
- Notice is given to the person in a reasonably visible way based on the circumstances.

This notice is sufficient if it meets the following requirements:

- Legible in English
- It is at least 144 square inches in size
- Contains name and address of both the person whose authority is posting the sign and the one that can grant permission to enter
- Is placed at all known access points to the property
- If an island, posted at each cardinal point of the island
- States specific prohibitions such as no digging, hunting, fishing, trespassing, etc.


```
Alaska Statutes.
Title 11. Criminal Law
Chapter 46. Offenses Against Property
Section 320. Criminal Trespass in the First Degree.
previous: Section 315. Possession of Burglary Tools.
next: Section 330. Criminal Trespass in the Second Degree.
```


## AS 11.46.320. Criminal Trespass in the First Degree.

```
(a) A person commits the crime of criminal trespass in the first degree if the person enters or remains unlawfully
(1) on land with intent to commit a crime on the land; or
(2) in a dwelling.
(b) Criminal trespass in the first degree is a class A misdemeanor.
```

All content © 2008 by Touch N' Go/Bright Solutions, Inc.

## Note to HTML Version:

This version of the Alaska Statutes is current through December, 2007. The Alaska Statutes were automatically converted to HTML from a plain text format. Every effort has been made to ensure their accuracy, but this can not be guaranteed. If it is critical that the precise terms of the Alaska Statutes be known, it is recommended that more formal sources be consulted. For statutes adopted after the effective date of these statutes, see, Alaska State Legislature If any errors are found, please e-mail Touch $N^{\prime}$ Go systems at E-mail. We hope you find this information useful.

This page has been updated: 08/26/2011 16:35:19

Alaska Statutes.
Title 11. Criminal Law
Chapter 46. Offenses Against Property
Section 330. Criminal Trespass in the Second Degree.
previous: Section 320. Criminal Trespass in the First Degree. next: Section 340. Defense: Emergency Use of Premises.

## AS 11.46.330. Criminal Trespass in the Second Degree.

(a) A person commits the crime of criminal trespass in the second degree if the person enters or remains unlawfully
(1) in or upon premises; or
(2) in a propelled vehicle.
(b) Criminal trespass in the second degree is a class B misdemeanor.

All content © 2008 by Touch N' Go/Bright Solutions, Inc.

## Note to HTML Version:

This version of the Alaska Statutes is current through December, 2007. The Alaska Statutes were automatically converted to HTML from a plain text format. Every effort has been made to ensure their accuracy, but this can not be guaranteed. If it is critical that the precise terms of the Alaska Statutes be known, it is recommended that more formal sources be consulted. For statutes adopted after the effective date of these statutes, see, Alaska State Legislature If any errors are found, please e-mail Touch $\mathrm{N}^{\prime}$ Go systems at E-mail. We hope you find this information useful.

This page has been updated: 08/26/2011 16:35:20

Alaska Statutes.
Title 11. Criminal Law
Chapter 46. Offenses Against Property
Section 350. Definition; privilege to enter or remain on unimproved land.
previous: Section 340. Defense: Emergency Use of Premises.
next: Section 360. Vehicle Theft in the First Degree.

## AS 11.46.350. Definition; privilege to enter or remain on unimproved land.

(a) As used in AS 11.46.300-11.46.350, unless the context requires otherwise, "enter or remain unlawfully" means to
(1) enter or remain in or upon premises or in a propelled vehicle when the premises or propelled vehicle, at the time of the entry or remaining, is not open to the public and when the defendant is not otherwise privileged to do so;
(2) fail to leave premises or a propelled vehicle that is open to the public after being lawfully directed to do so personally by the person in charge; or (3) enter or remain upon premises or in a propelled vehicle in violation of a provision in an order issued or filed under AS 18.66.100-18.66.180 or issued under former AS 25.35.010 (b) or 25.35.020.
(b) For purposes of this section, a person who, without intent to commit a crime on the land, enters or remains upon unimproved and apparently unused land, which is neither fenced nor otherwise enclosed in a manner designed to exclude intruders, is privileged to do so unless
(1) notice against trespass is personally communicated to that person by the owner of the land or some other authorized person; or
(2) notice against trespass is given by posting in a reasonably conspicuous manner under the circumstances.
(c) [Repealed, Sec. 1 ch 48 SLA 2014].

All content (c) 2008 by Touch $N^{\prime}$ Go/Bright Solutions, Inc.

## Note to HTML Version:

This version of the Alaska Statutes is current through December, 2007. The Alaska Statutes were automatically converted to HTML from a plain text format. Every effort has been made to ensure their accuracy, but this can not be guaranteed. If it is critical that the precise terms of the Alaska Statutes be known, it is recommended that more formal sources be consulted. For statutes adopted after the effective date of these statutes, see, Alaska State Legislature If any errors are found, please e-mail Touch N' Go systems at E-mail. We hope you find this information useful.
This page has been updated: 03/09/2015 12:33:10


## Memorandum

TO: PARKS AND RECREATION ADVISORY COMMISSION
FROM: RENEE KRAUSE, CMC, DEPUTY CITY CLERK
DATE: APRIL 9, 2015
SUBJECT: SCHEDULING A SPRING PARK WALK THROUGH
This exercise is conducted annually by the commission to inspect the conditions at the city recreational facilities - parks, beaches, trails.

Please entertain discussion on when or if the Commission would like to schedule a worksession on a separate date or prior to an already scheduled meeting.

Please remember that we will need two weeks or more to schedule a worksession even if a meeting is already scheduled for that date.

Recommendation
Review calendars to determine the best and convenient date for the majority of Commissioners and staff.

PARKS, ARTS, RECREATION AND CULTURE (RECREATION AND CULTURE) NEEDS ASSESSMENT

Prepared for the City of Homer, Alaska by Agnew::Beck Consulting
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## EXECUTIVE SUMMARY

## HOMER RECREATION AND CULTURE NEEDS ASSESSMENT

The PARC Needs Assessment is intended to determine the resources and prioritize the needs for the community concerning parks, arts, recreation and culture (PARC) facilities and programs. To accomplish this, the project involved:

- Assessing community values, wants and needs related to PARC resources, based on feedback from a broad range of organizations, individuals, and businesses;
- Identifying gaps between identified needs and existing facilities and programs; and
- Investigating strategies for meeting priority needs, recognizing the realities of finite resources and the size of the greater Homer community. Strategies include better use of existing facilities, while investigating options for new resources to support future PARC improvements.

The results reflect the reality that many residents, businesses, organizations of and visitors to the greater Homer area deeply value PARC resources for their social, health and quality of life benefits, for the economic opportunities they provide, and because they make greater Homer the community and the place in which they choose to live. The greater Homer area has attracted a community of people with great vision and capacity to make things happen: community members dedicate a remarkable number of volunteer hours, have started and maintained numerous nonprofits, hosted community events, and donated materials and funding toward various community resources.

## AMBITIOUS, REALISTIC AND STRATEGIC

With all this community effort, greater Homer already has a wealth of PARC resources. The needs assessment reveals a desire for even more: a broad and ambitious list of ways to further expand and fill PARC gaps. At the same time, it is clear that there are limits in the community's ability to meet all expressed wishes, and that there is a desire to be realistic about how much the community is able to take on and sustain over time. To satisfy these goals, this summary of identified needs is presented within the context of an overall set of strategies:

- Maximize the use of existing public resources.
- Look for and take advantage of opportunities for the private sector to fill gaps.
- Explore new ways to improve the efficiency and coordination of providing PARC resources and related information sharing.
- Maintain existing facilities while developing funding strategies for highest priority future expansion or renewal projects.


## SUMMARY OF IDENTIFIED PRIORITY NEEDS

A full list of identified needs is included in the attached Identified Needs Inventory. This list was generated from a review of previous relevant plans and studies, an online community survey, an online provider questionnaire, community workshop and focus group discussions, and key informant interviews. From this inventory, a set of priorities was determined by filtering the identified needs based on whether they had:

- Broad support from multiple user groups and the general public and therefore would directly serve the largest portion of the community, or
- High level of support from one or more organized user group(s) and therefore already has a project champion, although it may directly serve a smaller subset of the community.
The identified needs were also filtered through a set of specific criteria developed by the community as the basis for prioritization; these criteria determined that priorities should:
- Contribute to the economic vitality of the community.
- Bring together multiple organizations and user groups (such as seniors and youth).
- Support the capacity and mission of existing organizations.
- Be affordable to users.
- Be able to be staffed and maintained.
- Have a user group.
- Be physically accessible to community members, in a central location, and complement adjacent land uses (if applicable).
- Include both passive and active recreation together.

The priorities that emerged through this filtering process focus on the need for indoor facilities/activities and improvements to PARC resource coordination, and also included a number of more modest of outdoor facilities and programming needs.

## INDOOR FACILITIES

Of the priorities that filtered to the top, the most significant was space for indoor activities. The most pressing needs are for a general-purpose gymnasium and a multi-purpose space for dance, martial arts, performing arts (rehearsals, performances), and community events. It will be difficult for the community to meet these types of programming needs until adequate space is created. Specific identified needs include:

- Active recreation space: large multi-purpose gymnasium, indoor walking track, affordable weight room, martial arts gym, indoor (and outdoor) racket sports:
- Space for the arts: centralized location for music activities (including practice studio, recording studio and/or programing), more spaces for making art, 200-300 seat performance space, and
- Spaces for youth: toddler and family spaces, ${ }^{1}$ teen space while school is not in session.
- Space that can support varied community events and gatherings.

Depending on specific designs, many or even all of these needs might be met in a single facility. A multi-purpose community center was the most frequently identified need across providers, user groups, existing plans and the general public. Although frequently mentioned, a new multipurpose facility would be costly. Considering the other identified needs, this project might best be deferred to a medium or long-term status, giving time to raise the necessary funding as well as time for the area's population, industry and tax base to grow. The next step for the community will be to determine how best to meet priority indoor space needs through existing facilities, new discrete facilities or grouped within a single multi-use project. Investigating options will include consideration of: the availability of existing spaces and their ability to adequately meet the identified needs; potential project providers (who will own and operate the space, who will run the activities), their responsibilities, level of commitment and ability to sustain use/participation; potential funding mechanisms and willingness to pay; and which uses will compatible or incompatible in a multi-use facility. While these decisions are being made, the City should investigate ways to keep the HERC open (e.g., for another 10 years) to help meet indoor space needs.

Another priority that came up repeatedly during the needs assessment is the need to stabilize the financial future of the Kevin Bell Ice Arena. Though the City is not responsible for this facility, thousands of people use the facility (up to 800 in a week). The facility supports local users and also attracts teams from outside the community who spend time (and money) in Homer. Aside from the debt of the building and land, the rink's revenue has supported its yearly operations since it opened in 2005. Current debt totals $\$ 2.74$ million, and it will require $\$ 60,000$ per year to repay. The rink has become an institution in Homer, providing healthy lifestyle choices and also important winter revenue with the annual tournaments and games, bringing visitors from other cities. The Needs Assessment is not the forum in which to work out the specific near term strategies on this timesensitive issue. The community can continue to seek opportunities to meet existing user needs at the hockey arena (e.g., indoor walking, climbing) as well as investigate longer term revenue sources that could help sustain the facility. The idea was raised to consider dedicating some amount of City funds to cover a portion of the $\$ 60,000$ annual debt payment.

[^0]
## OUTDOOR FACILITIES

Priority outdoor facilities include: upgrading the softball fields, car-free ice skating at Beluga Lake, a warming hut on the spit, an outdoor amphitheater, and multi-use trail connections. These outdoor improvements, while important, present a much lower threshold of cost and complexity than the possible need for some form of new, multipurpose indoor facility(ies).

## ACTIVITIES, EVENTS, PROGRAMING

A number of programming needs were identified, listed below. Exploring options to meet these identified needs is important, but must be considered in the context of the management and/or addition of indoor facilities, which is closely tied to many of these identified needs.

- Indoor, winter event space and programing, activities (e.g. laser tag, bumper cars, go cart track, child play area), and longer hours for programs or facilities (e.g. late night and/or early morning).
- Multi-generational activities, for parents and toddlers, for mentally and physical disabled older people, for seniors in general.
- Activities at McNeil Canyon School and in Anchor Point, specifically.
- Short courses/workshops (one day or less), with smaller time and financial commitment.
- Specific activities/classes: folk school, healthy cooking, lifelong learning programs, Zumba, wildfoods safety, marine safety, adult indoor soccer.


## MANAGEMENT AND COMMUNICATION

Outreach results make clear that participants recognize the need for new strategies to meet these priorities and identified the following solutions:

- Make better use of what already is available:
- Centralized community calendar and information sharing (e.g., via mobile phone app).
- Transportation improvements to get people to activities/events (e.g., affordable cross-bay transportation, rides for youth and seniors who do not drive).
- Continued coordination and access to school district resources, particularly the high school.
- Improve the delivery of PARC resources:
- Centralized meeting room list/scheduler.
- Consolidated community PARC leadership to reduce the number of volunteer boards and enable better coordination among providers (e.g., calendaring, networking, partnerships on projects, joint fundraising or grant applications, reciprocal membership agreements).
- Consider a centralized City Parks and Recreation Department with additional City of Homer recreation staff (existing staff are currently at capacity, and the City could potentially leverage increased community involvement toward providing services and completing park improvement projects with additional staff.).
- Consider ways to maintain the PARC Committee and continued City involvement in PARC resource management.
- Investigate new funding options (e.g., service area); consistent capital funding is needed, whether for the HERC, ballfields, or park improvements.


## OPPORTUNITIES TO USE EXISTING FACILITIES

The community felt strongly that Homer's many existing resources should be used to meet existing needs before any new facilities were built or programs started. The Needs Assessment included an analysis of the extent to which priority needs could be met with existing resources, based on the needs and existing resources inventories generated through the needs assessment process. Many identified needs could potentially be met through existing or new resources, depending on the will of the community.

## NEXT STEPS AND IMPLEMENTATION RESOURCES

Recreation and culture are important enough to area residents that a majority support some degree of increased public funding for recreation and culture facilities and services through various means. In the near term, recreation and culture leaders could continue to focus on the operational and organizational priority needs to better coordinate and consolidate existing resources in terms of space, funding and fundraising efforts, information sharing, and planning for longer-term priorities, such as a new multi-purpose facility or addressing the future ownership of the Kevin Bell Ice Arena.

The statistically valid survey indicates a level of support and willingness to dedicate City funds toward these two large capital projects. Just over half of the statistically-valid telephone survey respondents ( 56.8 percent) said that a new multi-purpose community center should be a City priority within the next 10 years and indicated a willingness to contribute some amount of property taxes to its development. Similarly, just over half of the statistically-valid telephone survey respondents (53.6 percent) indicated that the City should provide approximately $\$ 10,000-\$ 15,000$ per year in new funding to help cover a portion of the loan payment on the hockey arena, and look to the Homer Hockey Association to find the remaining funding for the Kevin Bell Ice Arena. Another 20.1 percent of survey respondents indicated a willingness to dedicate city funding to pay the entire $\$ 60,000$ annual mortgage payment on the ice arena.

The statistically valid survey also indicates a level of support for different potential funding mechanisms. The most frequently indicated choice of municipal funding mechanism for new recreation and culture services was to reallocate existing funding from other municipal sources (25
percent). Support for taxes (property, sales, other) as the preferred funding mechanism ranged from approximately 12-18 percent, while survey results also indicate that over 55 percent of area residents would to some degree favor the creation of a service area in the Homer area to fund new recreation and culture services. The most likely and robust strategy for funding existing and new recreation and culture facilities and services is to leverage funding from a variety of sources, including city tax funding, user fees, grants and continued volunteer support.

## INTRODUCTION

For a long time, the Homer area has had a rich offering of recreation and culture amenities. Community parks and beaches, indoor and outdoor sports, visual and performing arts, cultural events and festivals are all part of the local quality of life for residents of all ages. This is part of what makes the area what it is, part of what brings new friends and family to live in the area, and part of what keeps residents healthy and engaged in community life.

While the Greater Homer community is abundant in recreation and culture resources, the City and a number of community organizations face tight budgets, overcommitted or inadequate physical facilities, and other limitations to their ability to sustain programing and facilities. The Recreation and Culture Needs Assessment is intended to help the greater community to get creatively organized about how make the most of what the greater Homer area has already, to build on that foundation to provide new amenities, or to move existing programs and facilities in new directions. The needs assessment also provides greater clarity about the value of recreation and culture activities to the greater Homer community and identifies potential resources and strategies to sustain and grow the amenities that make the greater Homer area the place where residents want to live. The needs assessment does all of this by:

- Assessing community values, wants and needs related to PARC resources, based on feedback from a broad range of organizations, individuals, and businesses;
- Identifying gaps between identified needs and existing facilities and programs; and
- Investigating strategies for meeting priority needs, recognizing the realities of finite resources and the size of the greater Homer community. Strategies include better use of existing facilities, while investigating options for new resources to support future recreation and culture improvements.

The results of the needs assessment reflect the reality that many residents, businesses, organizations of and visitors to the greater Homer area deeply value recreation and culture resources for their social, health and quality of life benefits, for the economic opportunities they provide, and because they make greater Homer the community and the place in which they choose to live. The greater Homer area has attracted a community of people with great vision and capacity to make things happen: community members dedicate a remarkable number of volunteer hours, have started and maintained numerous nonprofits, hosted community events, and donated materials and funding toward various community resources.

With all this community effort, greater Homer already has a wealth of recreation and culture resources. The needs assessment reveals a desire for even more: a broad and ambitious list of ways to further expand and fill recreation and culture gaps. At the same time, it is clear that there are limits in the community's ability to meet all expressed wishes, and that there is a desire to be realistic
about how much the community is able to take on and sustain over time. To satisfy these goals, identified needs are presented within the context of an overall set of strategies:

- Maximize the use of existing public resources.
- Look for and take advantage of opportunities for the private sector to fill gaps.
- Explore new ways to improve the efficiency and coordination of providing recreation and culture resources and related information sharing.
- Maintain existing facilities while developing funding strategies for highest priority future expansion or renewal projects.


## METHODOLOGY

A full list of identified needs was generated from a review of previous relevant plans and studies, an online community survey ( 989 responses, representing approximately 1,700 people), an online provider questionnaire ( 21 responses), community workshop ( $\sim 40$ participants) and focus group discussions ( $\sim 55$ participants), and key informant interviews. From this inventory, a set of priorities was determined by filtering the identified needs based on whether they had:

- Broad support from multiple user groups and the general public and therefore would directly serve the largest portion of the community, or
- High level of support from one or more organized user group(s) and therefore already has a project champion, although it would directly serve a smaller subset of the community.

The identified needs were also filtered through a set of specific criteria developed by the community as the basis for prioritization; these criteria determined that priorities should:

- Contribute to the economic vitality of the community.
- Bring together multiple organizations and user groups (such as seniors and youth).
- Support the capacity and mission of existing organizations.
- Be affordable to users.
- Be able to be staffed and maintained.
- Have a user group.
- Be physically accessible to community members, in a central location, and complement adjacent land uses (if applicable).
- Include both passive and active recreation together.

A gap analysis of recreation and culture needs was performed with the priorities that emerged through this filtering process. The City of Homer oversaw the process, with guidance from the Recreation and Culture Advisory Committee, which represented perspectives from the Homer

Council on the Arts (HCOA), Parks and Recreation Commission, Homer Hockey, MAPP of the Southern Kenai Peninsula, Kenai Peninsula Borough Assembly, ReCreate Rec, Bunnell Arts Center, City of Homer Community Recreation, Homer Voice for Business, and motorized sports groups (e.g., Snomads).

A statistically valid telephone survey was conducted by Ivan Moore Research, primarily to assess the community's willingness to pay for identified recreation and culture needs. Survey results indicated that recreation and culture are important to the majority of area residents and that there is some support for increasing public funding for recreation and culture facilities and services through various means.

## RECREATION AND CULTURE IN GREATER HOMER

## THE GREATER HOMER COMMUNITY

Residents, businesses, organizations of and visitors to the greater Homer area deeply value recreation and culture resources for their social, health and quality of life benefits, for the economic opportunities they provide, and because they make greater Homer the community and the place in which they choose to live. The greater Homer area has attracted a community of people with great vision and capacity to make things happen: community members dedicate a remarkable number of volunteer hours, have started and maintained numerous nonprofits, hosted community events, and donated materials and funding toward various community resources.

## POPULATION TRENDS

Research and Analysis Section; and U.S. Census Bureau


Sources: Alaska Department of Labor and Workforce Development,


The Homer Recreation and Culture Needs Assessment focuses on the City of Homer and four neighboring census tracts: Anchor Point, Fritz Creek, Diamond Ridge and Kachemak City. The population of this area totaled 10,842 in 2013. ${ }^{2}$ Changing age distribution in this area between 2000 and 2010 suggests that it will see greater recreation and culture participation by seniors and stable or decreased participation by other age groups. The population of people age 55 to 74 nearly doubled during that time, while the population age 35-44 decreased by almost 500 .

[^1] Bureau

Figure 2: Age of Population in Greater Homer, 2000 and 2010


Sources: 2000 Census, 2008-2012 American Community Survey 5-year estimate; Greater Homer area includes Homer city, Kachemak city, Diamond Ridge, Fritz Creek, and Anchor Point.

The population over 65 is projected to almost double in the next forty years. This trend suggests that the greater Homer area is likely to see more recreation and culture participation by seniors; this increase could include more potential volunteers among active seniors.

Figure 3: Projected senior population 2012-2042

|  | 2012 | 2017 | 2022 | 2032 | 2042 | annual <br> increase <br> total <br> increase |  |  |
| :--- | ---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Homer Population | 10,783 | 11,217 | 11,628 | 12,183 | 12,434 | $1 \%$ | $15 \%$ |  |
| Homer Population 65+ | 1,733 | 2,150 | 2,789 | 3,325 | 3,094 | $3 \%$ | $78 \%$ |  |
| 65+ percent of total <br> population | $16 \%$ | $19 \%$ | $24 \%$ | $27 \%$ | $25 \%$ |  |  |  |

[^2]Youth population trends are less clear, suggesting that recreation and culture resources should remain flexible to accommodate changing youth populations. While the number of the young people under age 19 living in greater Homer decreased dramatically between 2000 and 2010, the population under five years old has decreased by a significantly smaller amount than the older youth population, indicating that the decrease in youth population may be slowing. Anecdotal evidence suggests that the number of young people is (or will soon be) increasing because of the number of infants that have been born within the last two to three years. The Kenai Peninsula Borough is projected to have an overall increase in young people.

Figure 4: Population Change in the Greater Homer Area, Age 19 and Under, 2000-2010

| Age | 2000 | 2010 | Change |
| :--- | ---: | ---: | ---: |
| Under 5 years | 598 | 583 | $-3 \%$ |
| 5 to 9 years | 716 | 567 | $-21 \%$ |
| 10 to 14 years | 879 | 659 | $-25 \%$ |
| 15 to 19 years | 789 | 664 | $-16 \%$ |
| All age 19 and under | $\mathbf{2 , 9 8 2}$ | $\mathbf{2 , 4 7 3}$ | $\mathbf{- 1 7 \%}$ |

Source: 2010, Census, 2008-2012 American Community Survey 5-year estimate; Alaska Population Estimates by Borough, Census Area, City, and Census Designated Place (CDP), 2010-2013

Figure 5: Kenai Peninsula Borough population projections 2012-2042

| 2012 |  | 2022 | 2032 | 2042 | \% increase |
| :--- | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: |
| Kenai Peninsula Borough | 56,718 | 61,391 | 64,321 | 65,647 | $16 \%$ |
| 19 and under | 14,423 | 15,483 | 16,865 | 17,403 | $21 \%$ |

Source: State of Alaska Population Projections 2012-42

## THE VALUE OF RECREATION AND CULTURE

Results from both an online (non-statistically valid) survey and a telephone (statistically-valid) survey indicate that recreation and culture activities are important to Homer community members. More than 75 percent of online community survey respondents (self-selected) said recreation activities were important or very important to them and their immediate family, while arts activities were important or very important to 65 percent of respondents. Just over 59 percent of statistically-valid telephone survey respondents indicated that recreation and culture activities are important or very important to them and their immediate family and friends.

Figure 6: How important are recreation activities to you and your immediate family and friends?


Figure 7: How important are arts activities to you and your immediate family and friends?


Source: 2014 Recreation and Culture Needs Assessment Online Community Survey
Figure 8: Importance of Recreation and Culture Activities
How important are the availability of recreation and culture activities to you and your immediate family and friends?

| Response | Percent | Number |
| :--- | :---: | :---: |
| Very important | $43.6 \%$ | 113 |
| Important | $15.7 \%$ | 41 |
| Somewhat important | $24.3 \%$ | 63 |
| Not very important | $7.1 \%$ | 18 |
| Not at all important | $8.7 \%$ | 23 |
| Not sure. | $0.6 \%$ | 2 |

Source: 2014 Recreation and Culture Needs Assessment Public Opinion Survey, Ivan Moore Research. Raw survey results are weighted according to the following: 1) Responses apportioned by zip code according to the adult population in each; 2) Marital status balanced by gender in both zip codes (i.e., the percentage of married men equals that of married women and the percentage of single men equals that of single women); 3) The age distribution is weighted to match the census distribution of head of household; 4) Cellphone-only responses were appropriately weighted against landline responses.

Survey results also suggest that recreation and culture are an important part of residents' daily life. Around 75 percent of online community survey respondents participate in a recreation and culture activity three or more times per week.

Figure 9: How often do you participate in activities?


Source: 2014 Recreation and Culture Needs Assessment Online Community Survey

## COMMUNITY BENEFITS

Fun is the number one reason Homer residents participate in recreation and culture activities. Ninety percent of the nearly 1,000 survey respondents said fun was one reason they participated in recreation and culture activities. Recreation and culture activities provide utilitarian benefits as well: nearly 85 percent of respondents said they participated for exercise and

Recreation is a quality of life priority for my family and I value youth activity opportunities above almost all else. health benefits. Respondents said that recreation and culture activities help with stress management, spiritual health and quality of life during the winter months.

Figure 10: Why do you participate in recreation and culture activities?


Source: 2014 Recreation and Culture Needs Assessment Online Community Survey

Community workshop participants identified these intangible benefits of recreation and culture to the Homer community:

- Health benefits \| Community safety; mental and physical health.
- Family and social wellbeing \| Networking, role modeling, having places for people to interact, as an extended family, especially when many people have family far away.
- Education | Opportunities for young people to spend free time and/or to develop their vocations; contributes to a great school system.
- Natural resource conservation | Opportunities to learn about and experience the natural environment, fosters conservation.
- Economic wellbeing | Generates business opportunities and is a visitor destination.


## ECONOMIC BENEFITS

Recreation and culture amenities also provide direct and indirect economic benefits. Respondents to the Recreation and Culture Needs Assessment Provider Survey reported that recreation and culture resources provide about 175 full-time, part-time, or contracted jobs in the Homer community. The Alaska Department of Labor and Workforce Development estimates that around 300 people have experience in this job category.

Figure II: Number of Workers with Experience in PARC Industries, 2009-2013

| Place | Arts, entertainment, recreation employment <br> experience by place of residence |
| :--- | :---: |
| Homer city | 181 |
| Anchor Point | 28 |
| Diamond Ridge | 27 |
| Fritz Creek | $\mathbf{2}$ |
| Kachemak city | 50 |
| All | $\mathbf{3 0 1}$ |

Source: Number of Workers with Experience in Industry 2009-2013, Alaska Department of Labor and Workforce Development, Research and Analysis Section. Last updated on August 26, 2014.

Indirect economic benefits come mainly through the visitor industry. The average visitor to Homer spends $\$ 257$ per trip, including $\$ 87$ on tours, activities and entertainment; 16 percent of Homer workers are employed in leisure and hospitality. ${ }^{3}$ The Provider Survey also indicated that recreation and culture resources do attract visitors who support the Homer economy, drawing anywhere from 500-600 attendees to recreation and culture events, with the average event drawing about 115 people in addition to the people producing, performing or competing in the event. Other providers indicate that:

- Nearly 90 percent of campground users come from outside of Homer (City of Homer Parks Maintenance).
- About 10 percent of the Kachemak Wooden Boat Society festival attendees come from out of town.
- Every Saturday visiting Little League teams from the Kenai Peninsula or Anchorage visit Homer to play ball, eat lunch and dinner. Many spend the night and plan a fishing trip (Homer Little League).

[^3]
## BARRIERS TO PARTICIPATION

Through the online community survey (self-selected), the needs assessment identified a number of barriers to participation in recreation and culture activities, as well as common themes for overcoming these barriers. A number of survey respondents also indicated that they are fully satisfied with recreation and culture offerings in the Homer area and believed that no changes are needed.

Figure 12: What prevents you from participating in recreation and culture activities more often?


Source: 2014 Recreation and Culture Needs Assessment Online Community Survey

The assessment identified several common themes for overcoming these barriers to participation:

- Time \| Lack of time or scheduling conflicts prevent people from participating in what is available. Sometimes there are too many things happening at the same time.
- Space | Some spaces (e.g., open gym, publicly-accessible workshop) are unavailable when people want to use them; some are not available at all.
- Communication | People don't always know what is available to them, and/or don't know where to find out about events, classes, and other resources that might interest them.
- Location/Transportation | Some people indicated that they live too far away, or have no transportation to get to the programs and facilities they want to use. Several
also mentioned a lack of safe pedestrian and bicyclist routes in town, where most of Homer's recreation and culture opportunities exist.
- Money | Some don't have the money needed to participate in all the activities they are interested in. For some, rising land values and a lack of the right job opportunities have made it difficult to afford to even live in Homer, particularly for young families.
- Youth and Childcare | Some people said they need more childcare options or supervised activities for children; some young people said they need more places to go outside of school hours.
- Volunteers | Some said more volunteers are needed, there too many opportunities and people are getting burned out, others said they need to volunteer less in order to have more time available for PARC activities.

Youth and seniors echoed many of these common themes. Among youth, the most common barriers to participating in more recreation and culture activities include transportation, money and weather. Seniors mentioned the need for more ways for new arrivals to Homer to connect with recreation and culture activities and groups. Caregivers for less active seniors pointed out that because it takes extra time and energy to help these less independent elders out of the house, planned activities and events are better for outings, while short unstructured activities are easier at home or in places like the Senior Center.

> We visit Homer at least twice a year so more festivals would be nice so we can plan a little getaway from Anchorage. As for arts, they are pretty expensive, because it is worth it.

## EXISTING RECREATION AND CULTURE

The Homer has many existing recreation and culture resources. The Recreation and Culture Needs Assessment indicated a few common overarching themes:

- A number of space constraints were identified for indoor activities.
- Outdoor facilities are well used.
- A large number and wide variety of activities, events and programming are available; there appears to be more participation in outdoor than indoor activities.
- There is a desire for more consolidation and leveraging resources to more effectively manage and advertise recreation and culture facilities, activities, events and programming.

An inventory of recreation and culture resources is included in Appendix A.

## SUMMARY OF EXISTING RECREATION AND CULTURE RESOURCES

## INDOOR FACILITIES

The Needs Assessment confirms that Homer currently has a number of different indoor recreation and culture spaces, yet there are also space constraints, scheduling conflicts and a lack of certain types of indoor facilities. These space constraints exist in part because some existing facilities, such as the HERC and the High School, are already used to their current capacity. The gap analysis provides more information about the capacity of different spaces to meet identified needs.

Existing large indoor multi-purpose spaces include the Homer High School gym, the HERC building and middle and elementary school multipurpose rooms. The Mariner Theater hosts large performances; Pier 1 puts on productions in the summer; and smaller winter season shows use spaces like the Bunnell Street Arts Center, the Homer Council on the Arts (HCOA) Gallery, the Homer Theater and bars/restaurants. Smaller indoor recreation spaces for dance and yoga include the Bay Club, the High School, private yoga studios, and the HERC building. There are spaces for specific activities, like pottery or woodworking, throughout Homer, but the most accessible studio spaces are at the High School and have experienced a number of scheduling conflicts. Homer also has a number of flexible spaces, which offer the potential to be temporarily or permanently reconceived to meet the demand for additional specialized spaces that are currently unavailable. For example, Kachemak Bay Campus and Homer Council on the Arts already host multiple types of events. See Appendix A, Indoor Flexible Spaces, for an additional list of spaces that can meet the needs of a variety of events and uses.

## OUTDOOR FACILITIES

The Needs Assessment confirmed that the area's existing parks, trails and other outdoor spaces are well-used and that a number of projects have benefitted from the coordination of various public and outdoor interest groups to plan and raise funding for improvements.

The City provides 17 dedicated parks and seven park areas for recreational purposes. The Kenai Peninsula School District maintains outdoor fields and tennis courts at the High School. The Homer area also has a number of yearround multi-use trails. Outdoor facilities also include:

- Homer Ski Club rope tow
- Kachemak Bay Equestrian

Figure 13: Participation in Outdoor Activities

| Outdoor Activity | Responses <br> (Percent) | Responses <br> (Raw number) |
| :--- | :---: | :---: |
| Walking | $71 \%$ | 646 |
| Recreational Fishing | $58 \%$ | 531 |
| Camping | $58 \%$ | 530 |
| Bicycling | $56 \%$ | 510 |
| Recreational Boating | $48 \%$ | 435 |
| Cross Country Skiing | $46 \%$ | 416 |
| Gardening | $45 \%$ | 405 |
| Wildfood Harvesting | $41 \%$ | 377 |
| Festivals | $38 \%$ | 342 |
| Photography | $37 \%$ | 339 |

Source: 2014 Recreation and Culture Needs Assessment Online
Community Survey Association Cottonwood Horse Park

- Outdoor basketball courts at the HERC and High School
- Softball, baseball, football, and soccer fields
- Multiuse trails (for mountain biking, cross country skiing, hiking, and other activities)
- Disc golf course
- Street art
- Outdoor space at the (old) Pratt Museum (10 acres)
- Outdoor amphitheaters at the library, Pratt Museum, and Islands and Ocean Center.


## ACTIVITIES, EVENTS, PROGRAMMING

The Needs Assessment confirmed that the greater Homer community offers a relatively large number and variety of recreation and culture activities, events and programming. Residents and visitors are very involved in recreation and culture activities, as participants or users, as providers and as volunteers. The activities and events that draw the most frequent and steady participation tend to change over time as new activities are introduced and others fade in popularity. Some

Figure 14: Participation in Indoor Activities

| Indoor Activity | Responses <br> (Percent) | Responses <br> (Raw <br> number) |
| :--- | :---: | :---: |
| Swimming | $43 \%$ | 365 |
| Performance Art | $40 \%$ | 344 |
| Gym | $38 \%$ | 321 |
| Lifelong Learning | $33 \%$ | 280 |
| Hockey/Ice Sports | $28 \%$ | 242 |
| Yoga/tai chi/meditation | $28 \%$ | 237 |
| Cooking | $25 \%$ | 216 |
| Visual Arts | $23 \%$ | 193 |
| Basketball | $20 \%$ | 168 |
| Card and board games | $18 \%$ | 155 |

Source: 2014 Recreation and Culture Needs Assessment Online Community Survey
activities/events have seen a decline in participation, but many providers reported steady or growing participation. For example, Concert on the Lawn will be discontinued in 2015 because of decreased attendance, while Colors of Homer is thriving as a shared community arts event that includes music.

Providers and users emphasize that these activities and events bring new people to visit or even live in the Homer area. Some providers indicated the desire to expand their programming, but have encountered space constraints.

Community survey results ${ }^{4}$ suggest that more people participate in outdoor activities and use outdoor spaces. Outdoor activities could be more popular in general. They may also be more accessible: often there is no membership or user fee involved for outdoor activities, and there may be fewer scheduling constraints because people can usually participate in outdoor activities at any time of day. Greater participation in outdoor activities may also be an indication of the shortage of indoor facilities reported by the community.

## MANAGEMENT AND COMMUNICATION

A desire for consolidation and simplification was the overall theme that emerged from the Needs Assessment about the state of provider management of and communication about recreation and culture resources in the Homer area. Although Homer has a robust volunteer base and a community culture that supports volunteerism, some providers have been challenged to find volunteer staff and
board members, and expressed a desire for consolidation. The community also recognizes that pooling efforts and resources may allow providers to leverage even more resources. For instance, some providers suggested the benefits of working together to pursue funding for joint projects.

[^4]Existing City staff managing parks and City recreation programs are at or above capacity to meet local demand for these programs, and could benefit from partnerships with providers.

While participation in specific events and activities naturally ebbs and flows, most of Homer's recreation and culture providers indicated that interest in their programs has been strong. Yet Homer has so much recreation and culture that residents and visitors are not always aware of what is available to them. Some of the most frequently identified needs are not for new programs and facilities, but for more centralized and internet-based communication about what is happening and available.

Providers | In addition to the Homer area's stunning natural landscape, provider organizations are the engine of arts and recreation opportunities. For the purposes of this needs assessment, the Recreation and Culture Committee defined recreation and culture providers as a business or organization that provides classes or puts on performances or events. Activity user groups (e.g., Snomads) were also considered recreation and culture providers. Churches and civic groups are also recognized as providing valuable recreation and culture opportunities for adults and young people alike. Additionally, sole proprietor artists, co-ops, and galleries add to making Homer the rich recreation and culture community that it is.

Twenty one providers responded to the provider questionnaire. Most providers are stable or growing. Figure 14 shows that less than half of the providers surveyed were operating at a capacity that fit their organization. Nine said they had more demand for services than they could provide and four said they had less demand than they could provide. Providers highlighted the importance of their volunteers, the difficulty of finding heated indoor space, and the difficulty of finding funding.

Figure 15: How would you characterize your organization's capacity?


Source: 2014 Recreation and Culture Needs Assessment Provider Survey

Figure 16: How would you characterize trends in participation or use?


Source: 2014 Recreation and Culture Needs Assessment Provider Survey

The City of Homer and Community Recreation | Recreation services are supported by two departments and three divisions of the City of Homer. The Community Recreation program, under the direction of the Department of Administration, provides programing and facility access in two main non-municipal locations and one city-owned property, the HERC building. The Division of Parks in the Public Works Department maintains recreation facilities, primarily parks, trails and campgrounds. Some stakeholders advocated consolidating these functions under a single Parks and Recreation Department to provide better services. Figure 16 shows that of the 25 largest cities in Alaska in 2010, approximately 76 percent had local parks and recreation departments and 76 percent had a community or recreation center in 2010. Only three of communities (Homer, Dillingham and Houston) had neither a Parks and Recreation Department nor a Borough to provide coordinated park and recreation services. Homer is one of three of Alaska's 25 largest cities that uses local schools as a recreation center.

Figure 17: Recreation and Culture Services in Alaska's 25 Largest Cities

| City | Population | Parks and Recreation Department | Borough provides? | Community/ Recreation Center |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Anchorage | 291,826 | Yes | No | Yes |
| Fairbanks | 31,535 | No | Yes | Yes |
| Juneau | 31,275 | Yes | Combined city/borough | Yes |
| Sitka | 8,881 | Yes | Combined city/borough | No |
| Ketchikan | 8,050 | No | No | Yes |
| Wasilla | 7,831 | Yes | Yes | Yes |
| Kenai | 7,100 | Yes | No | No |
| Kodiak | 6,130 | Yes | Combined city/borough | No (schools) |
| Bethel | 6,080 | Yes | No | Yes |
| Palmer | 5,937 | Yes | Yes | Yes |
| Homer | 5,003 | No | No | No (schools) |
| Unalaska | 4,376 | Yes | No | Yes |
| Barrow | 4,212 | Yes | No | Yes |
| Soldotna | 4,163 | Yes | No | Yes |
| Valdez | 3,976 | Yes | No | Yes |
| Nome | 3,598 | Yes | No | Yes |
| Kotzebue | 3,201 | Yes | No | Yes |
| Petersburg | 2,948 | Yes | Combined city/borough | Yes |
| Seward | 2,693 | Yes | No | Yes |
| Wrangell | 2,369 | Yes | Combined city/borough | Yes |
| Dillingham | 2,329 | No | No | No |
| Cordova | 2,239 | Yes | No | Yes |
| North Pole | 2,117 | No | Yes | No |
| Houston | 1,912 | No | No | No (schools) |
| Craig | 1,201 | Yes | No | Yes |

Source: City of Homer Community Recreation, 2010 Census.

Other Recreation and Culture Coordinators | In addition to the City, several organizations coordinate and facilitate multiple types of recreation and culture opportunities and bring user groups and spectators together across activities. These coordinators include:

- MAPP of Homer
- Homer Arts and Culture Alliance
- Homer Council on the Arts, including Artist Registry
- Kenai Peninsula School District
- Homer Chamber of Commerce

Information and Advertising | Getting the word out about recreation and culture facilities and programs is just as important as having the resources to begin with. Participation might be low for some programing because people are unaware of what is available, especially for visitors and new residents who are just learning about the community and what it has to offer. Providers, users and the general public repeatedly mentioned the need for a centralized community calendar. MAPP of Homer is currently working on an integrated web based calendar that providers can use, so meeting the need for more coordinated information sharing might be close. Existing community calendars and information sources include:

- Homer News
- City of Homer
- Individual arts, recreation, civic organizations
- Homer Council on the Arts website, arts calendar and e-news and artist registry
- Homer Public Radio AM 890
- Pop411.org
- KBBI calendar

Volunteers | Providers and community members highlighted the importance of volunteers in sustaining recreation and culture activities and amenities in Homer. Recreation and culture provider survey respondents totaled:

- 52,742 volunteers hours per year, or 144 hours per day (not including the organization that approximated "literally thousands" of volunteer hours annually).
- At least 85 board member positions.
- At least 133 formal volunteer positions.
- Recreation and culture providers rely on at least 796 informal or event specific volunteer positions.

Community respondents also reported volunteering. Fifteen percent volunteer once per week or more, and 65 percent rarely or never volunteer. Working age survey respondents reported volunteering more frequently than youth or seniors.

Figure I8: On average, how often do you volunteer at recreation and culture programs and activities?


Source: 2014 Recreation and Culture Needs Assessment Online Community Survey

## GAP ANALYSIS OF RECREATION AND CULTURE NEEDS

To be realistic about how much the greater Homer community is able to take on and sustain over time, identified needs are presented within the context of an overall set of strategies:

- Maximize the use of existing public resources.
- Look for and take advantage of opportunities for the private sector to fill gaps.
- Explore new ways to improve the efficiency and coordination of providing recreation and culture resources and related information sharing.
- Maintain existing facilities while developing funding strategies for highest priority future expansion or renewal projects.


## SUMMARY OF IDENTIFIED PRIORITY NEEDS

Identified priority needs focus on the need for indoor facilities/activities and improvements to recreation and culture resource coordination, and also included a number of more modest of outdoor facilities and programming needs.

Figure 19: Provider Space Needs

| Facility need | Providers | Percent |
| :--- | ---: | ---: |
| We need more heated indoor space | 11 | $52 \%$ |
| We need more outdoor space | 9 | $53 \%$ |
| We need specialized space | 12 | $57 \%$ |
| We currently do not have any space needs. | 2 | $10 \%$ |
| Other [1] | 9 | $53 \%$ |

[1] Includes: Access at high priority times (e.g., right after school); ADA accessible space; Access to calendar and coordinating for space that is available; Headquarters/space that different user groups can overlap and interact in; Childcare space.
Source: 2014 Recreation and Culture Needs Assessment Provider Survey

## INDOOR FACILITIES

Of the priorities that filtered to the top, the most significant was space for indoor activities. The most pressing needs are for a general-purpose gymnasium and a multi-purpose space for dance, martial arts, and performing arts rehearsals. The City will be unable to expand these types of programming until adequate space is created. Specific identified needs include:

- Active recreation space: large multi-purpose gymnasium, indoor walking track, affordable weight room, martial arts gym, indoor (and outdoor) racket sports.
- Space for the arts: centralized location for music activities (including practice studio, recording studio and/or programing), more spaces for making art, 200-300 seat performance space, and
- Spaces for youth: toddler and family spaces, ${ }^{5}$ teen space while school is not in session.

Depending on specific designs, many or even all of these needs might be met in a single facility. A multi-purpose community center was the most frequently identified need across providers, user groups, existing plans and the general public. Although frequently mentioned, a new

> Looking forward to retirement and would really
> like to see a community facility with many activities available under one roof and a park facility for multipurpose outdoor activities multipurpose facility would be costly. Considering the other identified needs, this project should be deferred to a medium or long-term status, giving the area population, industry and tax base time to grow. In the near term, the next step for the community will be to determine whether to meet priority indoor space needs through existing facilities, new discrete facilities or grouped within a single multi-use project. This discussion will involve consideration of: the availability of existing spaces and their ability to adequately meet the identified needs; potential project providers (who will own and operate the space, who will run the activities), their responsibilities, level of commitment and ability to sustain use/participation; potential funding mechanisms and willingness to pay; and which uses will compatible or incompatible in a multi-use facility. While these decisions are being made, the City should investigate ways to keep the HERC open (e.g., for another 10 years) to help meet indoor space needs.

Another priority that came up repeatedly during the needs assessment is the need to stabilize the financial future of the Kevin Bell Ice Arena. Though the City is not responsible for this facility, thousands of people use the facility (up to 800 in a week). The facility supports local users and also attracts teams from outside the community who spend time (and money) in Homer. Aside from the debt of the building and land, the rink's revenue has supported its yearly operations since it opened in 2005. Current debt totals $\$ 2.74$ million, and it will require $\$ 60,000$ per year to repay. The rink has become an institution in Homer, providing healthy lifestyle choices and also important winter revenue with the annual tournaments and games, bringing visitors from other cities. The Needs Assessment is not the forum in which to work out the specific near term strategies on this timesensitive issue. The community can continue to seek opportunities to match existing user needs to the arena (e.g., indoor walking, climbing) as well as investigate longer term revenue sources that

[^5]could help sustain the facility. Consider expanding City funding to cover a portion of the $\$ 60,000$ annual debt payment.

## OUTDOOR FACILITIES

Priority outdoor facilities include: upgrading the softball fields, car-free ice skating at Beluga Lake, a warming hut on the spit, an outdoor amphitheater, and multi-use trail connections. These outdoor improvements, while important, present a much lower threshold of cost and complexity than the possible need for some form of new, multipurpose indoor facility(ies).

ACTIVITIES, EVENTS, PROGRAMING
A number of programming needs were identified, listed below. Exploring options to meet these identified needs is important, but must be considered in the context of the management and/or addition of indoor facilities, which is closely tied to many of these identified needs.

- Indoor, winter event space and programing, activities (e.g. laser tag, bumper cars, go cart track, child play area), and longer hours for programs or facilities (e.g. late night and/or early morning).
- Multi-generational activities, for parents and toddlers, for mentally and physical disabled older people, for seniors in general.
- Activities at McNeil Canyon School and in Anchor Point, specifically.
- Short courses/workshops (one day or less), with smaller time and financial commitment.
- Specific activities/classes: folk school, healthy cooking, lifelong learning programs, Zumba, wildfoods safety, marine safety, adult indoor soccer.


## MANAGEMENT AND COMMUNICATION

Outreach results make clear that participants recognize the need for new strategies to meet these priorities and identified the following solutions:

- Make better use of what already is available:
- Centralized community calendar and information sharing (e.g., via mobile phone app).
- Transportation improvements to get people to activities/events (e.g., affordable cross-bay transportation, rides for youth and seniors who do not drive).
- Continued coordination and access to school district resources, particularly the high school.
- Improve the delivery of recreation and culture resources:
- Centralized meeting room list/scheduler.
- Consolidated community recreation and culture leadership to reduce the number of volunteer boards and enable better coordination among providers (e.g., calendaring, networking, partnerships on projects, joint fundraising or grant applications, reciprocal membership agreements).
- Consider a centralized City Parks and Recreation Department with additional City of Homer recreation staff (existing staff are currently at capacity, and the City could potentially leverage increased community involvement toward providing services and completing park improvement projects with additional staff.).
- Consider ways to maintain the Recreation and Culture Committee and continued City involvement in recreation and culture resource management.
- Investigate new funding options (e.g., service area); consistent capital funding is needed, whether for the HERC, ballfields, or park improvements.

> If we had another gym, we could fill that with more school activities, let alone more community rec activities. There are a lot of groups that would like to be in there, just don't have time or space for them. - Douglas Waclawski, Principal, Homer High School

Figure 20: Priority Identified Needs


| Project |  |  |  | Outreach Source |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| $\begin{aligned} & \text { त } \\ & \frac{2}{0} \\ & \frac{0}{2} \end{aligned}$ | Project | Category |  |  |  | त 0 $\vdots$ $\vdots$ $\vdots$ $\vdots$ 0 0 0 0 0 | - |
| - | Space and/or programs for music (e.g. open jam, mentoring/volunteer taught lessons, community band, practice spaces) | Central space/ headquarters (Indoor) | O | $\square$ | $\square$ | $\square$ |  |
| - | Maintained, car free ice skating at Beluga Lake | Outdoor |  |  | $\square$ |  |  |
| - | Outdoor stage/amphitheater | Outdoor | 0 | $\square$ |  | $\square$ | $\square$ |
| - | Warming hut on spit for water sports | Outdoor |  | $\square$ | $\square$ |  |  |
| - | Adequate parking at some facilities (e.g., Karen Hornaday Park, Jack Gist Park). | Outdoor |  | $\square$ |  | $\square$ | $\square$ |
| - | Upgrade softball fields | Outdoor |  | $\square$ | $\square$ | $\square$ | $\square$ |
| $\bigcirc$ | Construct more non-motorized trails; bike and walking trails throughout the city and on main roads and neighborhoods; enhanced trail connections | Trails |  | $\square$ | $\square$ | $\square$ | $\square$ |
| $\bullet$ | Provide more ski trails in Anchor Point | Trails |  | $\square$ | $\square$ |  | $\square$ |
| - | Improved maintenance for trails | Trails |  | $\square$ | ■ |  |  |
| - | Move toward multi-use trails in future | Trails |  | $\square$ | $\square$ | $\square$ |  |
| $\bullet$ | Multi-generational activities | Programing |  | $\square$ |  |  |  |
| $\bigcirc$ | Longer hours for programs or facilities (e.g. late night and/or early morning) | Programing |  | $\square$ | ■ |  |  |
| $\bigcirc$ | More indoor activities (e.g. laser tag, bumper cars, go cart track, child play area) | Programing |  | $\square$ |  | $\square$ | $\square$ |
| $\bigcirc$ | More for mentally and physical disabled older people, and for seniors in general | Programing | $\bigcirc$ | $\square$ |  |  | $\square$ |
| - | Marine safety programing | Programing |  | $\square$ | ■ |  |  |
| $\bigcirc$ | More activities at McNeil Canyon School | Programing |  |  | ■ |  |  |


| Project |  |  |  | Outreach Source |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| 交 | Project | Category |  |  |  |  |  |
| - | More activities in Anchor Point | Programing |  | ■ | $\square$ |  |  |
| - | Parent-toddler classes | Programing |  |  | $\square$ |  |  |
| - | Folk school classes | Programing |  |  | $\square$ |  |  |
| - | Healthy cooking classes | Programing |  | ■ | $\square$ |  |  |
| - | Indoor soccer (adults only) | Programing |  |  | $\square$ |  |  |
| - | More short courses/workshops (I day or less) with smaller time and financial commitment (e.g. at the University) | Programing |  | ■ | $\square$ |  |  |
| - | Vocational-technical classes and apprenticeship programs | Programing |  | ■ |  | $\square$ | ■ |
| - | Wildfoods safety class | Programing |  |  | ■ |  |  |
| - | Zumba | Programing |  |  | $\square$ |  |  |
| $\bullet$ | Improved, central community calendar (flyers, website, email updates, social media) | Coordination + Information |  | ■ | $\square$ |  | $\square$ |
| $\bullet$ | Continue to work with school district to enable off hours and off season use to the extent possible; Elementary, Middle and/or High School open to public for community schools or evening programs, as possible | Coordination + Information |  | ■ | ■ | $\square$ | ■ |
| $\bullet$ | Centralized Parks and Recreation Department | Coordination + Information |  | $\square$ |  | $\square$ | $\square$ |
| $\bigcirc$ | Expand capacity to maintain facilities and offer programs | Coordination + Information |  | $\square$ |  | $\square$ | ■ |
| $\bullet$ | Consolidate recreation and culture leadership. Reduce the number of volunteer boards; more coordination among providers (e.g., calendaring, networking, partnerships on projects, joint fundraising or grant applications, reciprocal membership agreements) | Coordination + Information |  | ■ | $\square$ | $\square$ | ■ |
| - | More recreation and culture employees to provide project coordination and fundraising support, particularly grantwriting; could be shared by various providers. | Coordination + Information |  | $\square$ |  | ■ | $\square$ |
| - | Meeting room List | Coordination + Information |  | $\square$ |  | ■ |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| - | Park endowment fund | Funding |  | ■ |  |  | $\square$ |


| Project |  |  |  | Outreach Source |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| $\begin{aligned} & \text { 入 } \\ & \frac{2}{2} \\ & \frac{0}{2} \end{aligned}$ | Project | Category |  |  | $\begin{aligned} & \lambda \\ & \vdots \\ & \vdots \\ & \vdots \\ & \lambda \\ & \\ & \vdots \\ & \vdots \\ & \varepsilon \\ & 0 \\ & 0 \end{aligned}$ | Provider Survey |  |
| $\bullet$ | Park, Arts, Recreation and Culture, and Trails Foundation | Funding |  | $\square$ |  |  |  |
| $\bigcirc$ | Sliding payment scale for participation in sporting activities and equipment, lower gym fees, including teen discount | Funding |  | ■ | $\square$ | $\square$ | ■ |
| - | Recreation Service District | Funding |  | $\square$ |  |  |  |
| - | Revaluate senior property tax exemption | Funding |  | $\square$ |  |  |  |
| - | Charge people who live outside of the city more to use city facilities and programs | Funding |  |  | $\square$ |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| $\bullet$ | Transportation improvements, especially for those who don't drive (e.g. carpooling/ridesharing, improvements to trails and sidewalks, bike lanes, road crossings, better signage, connecting trails and paths through town, make places for people to park and walk) | Supporting |  | $\square$ | $\square$ | $\square$ | $\square$ |
| - | Affordable transport across the bay | Programing |  | $\square$ | ■ |  | ■ |
| - | Town center/square/plaza | Supporting | O | $\square$ |  |  | ■ |

## OPPORTUNITIES TO USE EXISTING FACILITIES

The community felt strongly that Homer's many existing resources should be used to meet existing needs before any new facilities were built or programs started. Agnew::Beck analyzed the extent to which priority needs could be met with existing resources, based on the needs and existing resources inventories generated through the needs assessment process. The results are summarized in the table below. Many identified needs could potentially be met through existing or new resources, depending on the will of the community.

Figure 21: Opportunities to Use Existing Resources to Meet Priority Recreation and Culture Needs

|  | Improve <br> Coordination, <br> Calendaring and | Space |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Identified Need |  |  |  |
| Communication | Dependent |  |  | | New Facility |
| :---: | Existing Resource(s)


| Community Center |  |  |  | Yes |
| :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- |
| Multi-purpose facility <br> with gymnasium | Yes | Yes | HERC, High School, Middle <br> School |  |
| Centrally located <br> convention center | No | Yes | Yes <br> (for larger events <br> that require a <br> central location) | Land's End, Bidarka Hotel, <br> Islands and Ocean, Kevin Bell <br> Ice Arena (with flooring) |
| 200-300 seat <br> performance venue | No | Yes | Yes | Mariner Theater, Pier One, <br> Homer Theater, Homer <br> Council on the Arts |
| Martial arts <br> gymnasium/mat <br> room7 | Yes | Yes | Yes | High School, private <br> businesses |
| Toddler-family <br> spaces | Yes | Yes | Maybe <br> (depends on <br> specific activities) | Senior Center, Library, Islands <br> and Ocean, Homer Council <br> on the Arts, Pratt Museum, <br> Kevin Bell Arena, Pool, <br> Schools, private businesses. |
| Teen space | Yes | Yes | Yes | High School, others (e.g., rec <br> room) |

6 200-300 seat performance venue could be integrated with a main multi-purpose space, with green room (backstage warm-up/dressing room/rehearsal space for performers) as auxiliary space or additional black box (flexible space that is less constrained for other uses than the typical raised stage, permanent seating of a traditional theater).

7 A martial arts gymnasium/mat room could be designed to also serve as the green room noted above.

| Identified Need | Improve <br> Coordination, Calendaring and Communication |  | New Facility | Existing Resource(s) |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Music hub | Yes | Yes | Yes | High School, private businesses (e.g., Lindianne's Music Garden) |
| Art studios and art classroom space | Yes | Yes | Yes | Schools, Kachemak Bay Campus, Homer Council on the Arts? |
| Affordable weight room | Yes | Yes | Maybe | High School |
| Indoor walking track | Yes | Yes | Yes | High School, Kevin Bell, Elementary Schools |
| Outdoor amphitheater | Yes | Yes | Maybe | Pratt Museum, Library, Islands and Ocean |
| Other Projects |  |  |  |  |
| Community calendar <br> MAPP Calendar | Yes | No | No | Homer News, City of Homer, Individual arts, recreation, civic organizations, Homer Council on the Arts, Homer Public Radio AM 890, Pop411.org, KBBI calendar |
| Address scheduling conflicts with Kenai Peninsula Borough District Resources. ${ }^{8}$ | Yes | Yes | Maybe | High School (has scheduling application), other schools, Community Recreation, others |
| Consolidated community recreation and culture leadership | Yes | No | No | Recreation and Culture Committee |
| Centralized City Park and Recreation Department ${ }^{9}$ | Yes | No | No | City of Homer Park <br> Maintenance, Community <br> Recreation |

[^6]|  | Improve <br> Coordination, <br> Calendaring and <br> Communication | Space <br> Dependent | New Facility |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |$\quad$| Existing Resource(s) |
| :---: |


| Programming |  |  | Yes | Yes |
| :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- |
| Indoor soccer (adults <br> only) | Yes | Community Recreation |  |  |
| More indoor <br> activities (e.g. laser <br> tag, bumper cars, go <br> cart track, child play <br> area) | Yes | Yes | Yes <br> (at a large scale) | At a limited scale, opportunity <br> for future offerings by new or <br> existing providers. Community <br> Recreation |
| Winter event space <br> and programing | Yes | Yes | Maybe <br> (depends on <br> specific activities) | Community Recreation, <br> Schools, Kachemak Bay <br> Campus, Bunnell St. Art, <br> Homer Council on the Art <br> Center, Islands and Ocean |
| More for mentally <br> and physical disabled <br> older people, and for <br> seniors in general | Yes | Yes | Maybe <br> (depends on <br> specific activities) | Community Recreation, <br> Independent Living Center <br> TRAILS Program |
| More activities in <br> Anchor Point ${ }^{10}$ | Yes | Yes | Maybe <br> (depends on <br> specific activities) | Anchor Point library, senior <br> center |
| Longer hours for <br> programs or facilities <br> (e.g. late night and/or <br> early morning) | Yes | Yes | Maybe | Private businesses and various <br> providers |
| Multi-generational <br> activities | Yes | No | Maybe <br> (depends on <br> specific activities) | Community Recreation, <br> Senior center, non-profits, <br> library |
| Marine safety <br> programing11 | Yes | No | High School (pool), Kachemak <br> Bay Campus, boat harbor <br> (working boats and boat yard <br> businesses) |  |

10 Specifically: general and summer-specific activities, swimming at the Anchor Point pond, bike route to Anchor Point, trails in Anchor Point.
11 The high school and college are already working to increase marine-industry related curricula and secure appropriate space(s).

| Identified Need | Improve Coordination, Calendaring and Communication | Space Dependent | New Facility | Existing Resource(s) |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| More activities at McNeil Canyon School | Yes | Yes | No | McNeil Canyon School |
| Parent-toddler classes | Yes | No | Maybe (depends on specific activities) | Community Recreation, SPROUT, Pratt Museum, Harbor School of Music and Dance, Homer Soccer Assoc., other providers |
| Folk school classes | Yes | No | Maybe (depends on specific activities) | North Pacific Folk School, Kachemak Bay Campus, High School classrooms |
| Healthy cooking classes | Yes | No | No | SVT Health and Wellness, South Peninsula Hospital, local churches |
| Short courses/ workshops (1 day or less) with smaller time and financial commitment | Yes | Maybe | No | Kachemak Bay Campus, various providers |
| Vocational-technical classes and apprenticeship programs | Yes | Maybe | Maybe ${ }^{12}$ | Kachemak Bay Campus, High School |
| Wildfoods safety class | Yes | No | No |  |
| Zumba | Yes | No | No | Community Recreation, Bay Club, Senior Center |

12 The college and High School work together to fulfill their space needs.

## IMPLEMENTATION RESOURCES

Fulfilling priority identified needs will involve some smaller, more easily-implemented improvements (low-hanging fruit) and larger projects that require significant planning, coordination and financial investment. The Needs Assessment was also used as an opportunity to learn more about how the greater Homer community could and would be willing to support these larger recreation and culture projects in the future. The bulk of this chapter focuses on financing for larger, mostly capital projects, or ongoing coordinated service and facility provision (e.g., an area-wide Parks and Recreation department).

## COMMUNITY SUPPORT

The Homer area has seen a growing interest in community parks, indoor and outdoor sports, visual and performing arts, cultural events and festivals, which are all part of the local quality of life for residents of all ages. Community organizations and municipalities face financial and space limitations to sustain programming and facilities. Maintaining and improving these resources requires funding and other forms of support.

Results from both an online (self-selected) survey and a telephone (statistically-valid) survey revealed that recreation and culture are important to the majority of area residents, and that there is community support for exploring options to fund new recreation and culture services and facilities.

Figure 22: Support for New Funding Strategies
Maintaining and/or improving recreation and culture opportunities requires funding and other forms of support. Do you support exploring new strategies to maintain and/or expand recreation and culture opportunities in the greater Homer area?

| Response | Percent | Number |
| :--- | :---: | :---: |
| Yes, it is important to explore new resources and strategies | $69 \%$ | 604 |
| Maybe, depends on what the options are. | $21 \%$ | 187 |
| No, I think what is spent today is adequate or more than adequate. | $4 \%$ | 34 |
| Not sure, need to learn more about current resources, and future options. | $6 \%$ | 51 |

Source: 2014 Recreation and Culture Needs Assessment Online Community Survey

## SUPPORT FOR SPECIFIC PROJECTS

The statistically-valid telephone survey was used to better understand the level of community support for funding two projects in particular: the creation of a new multi-purpose community center that could fulfill a number of the space needs identified during the Needs Assessment, and the willingness to dedicate public funding to assist with mortgage payments on the Kevin Bell Ice Hockey Arena.

Multi-purpose community center | One proposal is to build a multi-purpose community center in Homer to provide a year-round facility for indoor activities like recreation, performing arts, community gatherings, education and specialty activities. Such a facility will cost at least 18 million dollars to build. Funding for construction would come from several sources but would certainly require area residents to contribute, on average, several hundred dollars a year per household through both user fees and increased taxes.

Figure 23: Support for City Funding New Multi-purpose Community Center

| Response | Percent | Number |
| :--- | :---: | :---: |
| This is a desirable facility; it should be a priority within the next 5 <br> years; and I would be willing to contribute to support its development. | $30.1 \%$ | 78 |
| This is a desirable facility; it should be a priority $\mathbf{5 - 1 0}$ years from now, <br> providing time for the community to grow and increase the tax base. | $26.7 \%$ | 69 |
| This facility should not be a priority, and I would not be willing to <br> contribute any amount of additional taxes to support its development. | $39.2 \%$ | 101 |
| Not sure. | $3.9 \%$ | 10 |

Source: 2014 Recreation and Culture Needs Assessment Public Opinion Survey, Ivan Moore Research. Raw survey results have been weighted according to the following: 1) Responses apportioned by zip code according to the adult population in each; 2) Marital status balanced by gender in both zip codes (i.e., the percentage of married men equals that of married women and the percentage of single men equals that of single women); 3) The age distribution is weighted to match the census distribution of head of household; 4) Cellphone-only responses were appropriately weighted against landline responses.

Kevin Bell Ice Hockey Arena | The Kevin Bell Ice Hockey Arena is well used, with programs serving 800 people each week. The loan to pay for the building is now due, requiring mortgage payments of approximately $\$ 60,000$ per year for the next 20 years. User fees can cover operations costs, but won't cover the building loan payments.

Figure 24: Support for City Funding Kevin Bell Ice Hockey Arena

| Response | Percent | Number |
| :--- | :---: | :---: |
| The City of Homer should not put any funding into the building, <br> even if this means the facility will close. | $20.4 \%$ | 52 |
| The City should provide approximately $\mathbf{\$ 1 0 , 0 0 0} \mathbf{- \$ 1 5 , 0 0 0}$ per year in <br> new funding to help cover a portion of the loan payment, and look to <br> the Homer Hockey Association to find the remaining funding. | $53.6 \%$ | 136 |
| The City should pay the full $\mathbf{\$ 6 0 , 0 0 0}$ per year loan payment, and fund <br> this expenditure with tax revenues. | $20.1 \%$ | 51 |
| Not sure. | $5.9 \%$ | 15 |

Source: 2014 Recreation and Culture Needs Assessment Public Opinion Survey, Ivan Moore Research. Raw survey results have been weighted according to the following: 1) Responses apportioned by zip code according to the adult population in each; 2) Marital status balanced by gender in both zip codes (i.e., the percentage of married men equals that of married women and the percentage of single men equals that of single women); 3) The age distribution is weighted to match the census distribution of head of household; 4) Cellphone-only responses were appropriately weighted against landline responses.

## FINANCING LOCAL RECREATION AND CULTURE

A variety of financing tools could be used for large capital projects, to help support ongoing operations, and for helping to subsidize activities for those who would not otherwise have the financial means to participate. A few examples of ideas brought up during the Needs Assessment are explained in this chapter. Residents and local business owners also emphasized the importance of growing the area population and economy through new industry and job opportunities in order to build a solid base of participation and tax base for recreation and culture facilities and programs.

## Existing Financial Support |

 The provider survey indicated that Homer's existing recreation and culture programming and facilities are supported by a number of sources. In general, that support is stable or growing more often than it is in decline. These findings suggest that providers are effectively managing their day-to-day operations.Figure 25: How are existing programs and facilities funded?


Source: 2014 Recreation and Culture Needs Assessment Provider Survey

Support for Future Funding Mechanisms | Telephone (statistically-valid) survey results indicate that area residents would prefer to see a variety of taxes used to fund new recreation and culture services funded. Only 18 percent of survey respondents indicated that they would prefer that the City not fund new recreation and culture services at all.

Figure 26: How would you characterize your current funding/support resources?


Source: 2014 Recreation and Culture Needs Assessment Provider Survey

Figure 27: Support for Specific Funding Sources
Which funding source would you most prefer to see used to fund new recreation and culture services in the Homer area?

| Response | Percent | Number |
| :--- | :---: | :---: |
| Property taxes | $12.2 \%$ | 31 |
| Sales tax | $17.2 \%$ | 44 |
| Other taxes | $18.3 \%$ | 47 |
| Reallocate existing funding from other municipal sources | $25.0 \%$ | 64 |
| Don't fund new recreation and culture services at all | $18.0 \%$ | 46 |
| Not sure | $9.3 \%$ | 24 |

Source: 2014 Recreation and Culture Needs Assessment Public Opinion Survey, Ivan Moore Research. Raw survey results weighted according to: 1) Responses apportioned by zip code according to the adult population in each; 2) Marital status balanced by gender in both zip codes; 3) The age distribution is weighted to match the census distribution of head of household; 4) Cellphone-only responses weighted against landline responses.

## DEDICATED SERVICE AREA

One funding option used in the Kenai Peninsula Borough to pay for a desired service is the creation of a service area. Nikiski and Seldovia, for example, both have recreational service areas that pay for services provided in their communities. Residents within the service area would vote to approve property taxes to pay for recreation and culture services (i.e., facilities, programs, staff) to be provided in that area. These taxes would be collected and spent from their own separate fund. They would only be used to pay for allowable recreation and culture services or facilities provided within the service area. For instance, property taxes could be used to pay for a community center that would serve the entire service area.

Property taxes are collected in the form of a mill levy (or tax rate). The property tax amount due each year is based on adding together the mill levy for each service area in which the property lies. To calculate the property tax, the taxing authority multiplies the assessed value of the property by the mill rate and then divides by 1,000 . For example, a property with an assessed value of $\$ 50,000$ located in a municipality with a mill rate of 20 mills would have a property tax bill of $\$ 1,000$ per year. If the City had a dedicated recreation and culture service area, a mill levy would be set for the service area, and would be added to any other mill levies collected by the City, then multiplied by the property's assessed value and divided by 1,000 to arrive at the overall property tax.

Current taxes | "The property tax rate in Homer totals 11.3 mills (4.5 City of Homer, 4.5 Kenai Peninsula Borough, and 2.3 South Peninsula Hospital). This translates to a tax levy of $\$ 1,130$ for every $\$ 100,000$ in assessed valuation. However, the first $\$ 20,000$ in valuation is tax exempt for most residents who request the exemption. In addition, senior citizens (age 65 and older) benefit from an exemption on the first $\$ 150,000$ in valuation for the City of Homer portion and on the first $\$ 300,000$ in valuation for the Kenai Peninsula Borough portion. The KPB exemption applies to service area tax assessments as well; for example, the one which supports South Peninsula Hospital." (2014 City of Homer Budget, p25)

Who pays | A dedicated service area would allow the City to collect taxes for recreation and culture services directly from property owners.

Statistically-valid telephone survey results indicate that over 55 percent of area residents would to some degree favor the creation of a service area in the Homer area to fund new recreation and culture services.

Figure 28: Support for Recreation and Culture Service Area

| Response | Percent | Number |
| :--- | :---: | :---: |
| Strongly favor | $27.5 \%$ | 71 |
| Mildly favor | $27.8 \%$ | 72 |
| Neutral | $3.7 \%$ | 9 |
| Mildly oppose | $17.7 \%$ | 45 |
| Strongly oppose | $18.9 \%$ | 49 |
| Not sure | $4.4 \%$ | 11 |

Source: 2014 Recreation and Culture Needs Assessment Public Opinion Survey, Ivan Moore Research. Raw survey results weighted according to: 1) Responses apportioned by zip code according to the adult population in each; 2) Marital status balanced by gender in both zip codes; 3) Age distribution matches head of household census distribution; 4) Cellphoneonly responses against landline responses.

## REALLOCATE EXISTING FUNDING

The City of Homer receives funding from taxes and other funding mechanisms. These revenues are allocated to the City's the General Fund and to special funds dedicated for specific services or capital improvements (facilities). With voter approval, some of these existing funds could be appropriately reallocated specifically to fund new recreation and culture services. Statistically-valid telephone survey results indicate that 25 percent of area residents would most prefer to see new recreation and culture services in the Homer area funded through reallocation of existing funding from other municipal sources.

One example of a dedicated fund that might be reallocated (with voter approval) is known as the HART Fund. Voters within the City of Homer approved to dedicate three-quarters of one percent (or 0.0075 percent) of all sales tax for the Homer Accelerated Roads and Trails (HART) Program. The HART Program calls for 90 percent of the revenue to be allocated towards road improvements and 10 percent of the annual revenue to be spent on trails and sidewalk projects. The HART Program only pays for capital projects (facilities); the funding does not pay for ongoing operating costs, such as utilities or salaries for trail planning and maintenance staff (City residents would have to vote to allow the HART Fund pay for operating costs for any facilities).

The City uses these funds to leverage grants, to cost share with land owners on road projects, and has considered using the funds to match state road funding for local roads through legislative appropriations on City of Homer roads. The funds may be used to make bond payments (check this about the bond payments).

Figure 29: Current HART Fund Allocation

|  | $\begin{gathered} \text { Roads } \\ (.0075 \% .9=.00675) \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} \text { Trails } \\ (.0075 \%, 1=.00075) \end{gathered}$ | $\frac{\text { Total }}{(.0075 \%)}$ |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| 2012: | \$1,059,830 | \$102,007 | \$1,161,837 |
| 2013: | \$1,222,088 | \$123,172 | \$1,345,260 |
| 2014: | (projected) \$1, I 3,701 | (projected) \$125,193 | (projected) \$ $1,238,894$ |
| Current balance: | \$6,902,873 | \$439,787 | \$7,342,660 |

The existing HART fund could be re-allocated so that a portion of it was also dedicated to Recreation capital (facility) improvements. For example, if 66 percent (two-thirds) of the .075 percent HART Fund was allocated to Roads and Trails ( 90 percent of which was still allocated to roads, and 10 percent of which was still allocated to trails), and 33 percent (one-third) of the HART Fund was re-allocated to Recreation, the funding distribution would look like this:

Figure 30: Hypothetical HART Fund Reallocation to Include Recreation

|  | $\begin{gathered} \text { Roads } \\ (.0075 * .66 * .9= \\ .0045 \%) \end{gathered}$ | Trails $\begin{gathered} (.0075 \% .66 \% .1= \\ .0005 \%) \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} \text { Recreation } \\ (.0075 * .33= \\ .0025 \%) \end{gathered}$ | $\frac{\text { Total }}{(.0075 \%)}$ |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| 2012: | \$690,131 | \$76,681 | \$383,406 | \$1,161,837 |
| 2013: | \$812,537 | \$88,787 | \$443,936 | \$1,345,260 |
| 2014: | \$735,903 | \$81,767 | \$408,835 | \$1,238,894 |
| Balance: | \$4,36 1,540 | \$484,615 | \$2,423,078 | \$7,342,660 |

These funds could be used for capital improvements only, but much of the deferred maintenance to Homer's public parks could be quickly addressed if the City dedicated $\$ 100,000$ each year in capital funds for recreation facilities, particularly if the City followed an endowment model and awarded matching grants to community organizations to complete projects in city parks. Re-allocating the funding in this way would also require a bond measure (a majority of voters would have to vote in favor of the change). (check this with JE) $\qquad$

## DEDICATED SALES TAX

The City could also establish a dedicated sales tax specifically for recreation and culture services. This tax would be collected at the point of sale on retail goods and services by the retailer and passed on to the municipality. It would be charged as a percentage of the cost of goods and services sold, e.g., $1 \%$ recreation and culture tax. This would be in addition to any other sales tax the City collects. Statistically-valid telephone survey results indicate that 17.2 percent of area residents would most prefer to see new recreation and culture services in the Homer area funded through a sales tax.

Current taxes |"The sales tax in Homer is 7.5\% (4.5\% City of Homer and 3\% Kenai Peninsula Borough). Non-prepared foods are exempt from sales tax from September through May." (2014 City of Homer Budget, p25)

Who pays \| A dedicated sales tax would allow the City to collect revenue for recreation and culture services from Homer residents and non-residents who patronize businesses in the City of Homer. The sales tax is one of the few financing mechanisms described here that would draw funding from visitors to Homer. Though visitation numbers fluctuate from year to year, visitors to Alaska are expected to increase in 2015 because of improvements in the national economy and lower fuel prices. In the near term, Homer may see a rise in sales tax receipts from increased visitor traffic, which could be invested into recreation and culture resources that would continue to draw visitors to the area.

## USER FEES

Providers of recreation and culture programs and facilities may charge fees to users, such as facility rental fees, class tuition and fees, membership fees (e.g., gym membership fees), or ticket sales to events. For facility-based events (e.g., sport stadium, theater) the organization operating the facility might also sell concessions (food, drink, other merchandise, gift shop) as a way of increasing revenue for facility operations. State and national parks may also charge fees for licensing activities like guiding, fishing and hunting; these license fees also help to manage the number of people doing a particular activity within the park during a given time period.

As one recreation and culture provider, the City of Homer could consider adjusting or instituting new user fees for recreation and culture facilities and services (e.g., higher community recreation fees for non-city residents). Other recreation and culture providers could also consider changes to their user fees to support their facilities and programs.

Current fees | There are too many recreation and culture providers in Homer to list all of the fees, but as an example, The City of Homer charges fees to individuals who sign up for community recreation programs. The fees are set for each individual class or program, and include monthly fees, punch-cards, and per-class fees.

Who pays | Users of the facility or program would pay. Fees could be tiered based on resident/non-resident status, age, income or other characteristic. The Needs Assessment revealed a desire for free or low cost programs, events, and facility access, particularly for those with low income, families (e.g., discounted family rate), and youth. Community members also suggested offering annual membership fees for facilities such as the hockey arena and the pool.

## GRANTS AND LOCAL PHILANTHROPY

The Homer Foundation currently supports a number of community members, non-profits and initiatives through scholarships and small grants toward things like education, healthcare, the library, food security, animal welfare, recreation and the arts. The foundation responds to the applications that come in, so the distribution of awards changes from year to year. According to last year's annual report, approximately 42 percent of the Homer Foundation's awards went toward recreation and culture (14 percent to sports and recreation, eight percent to arts and culture, 20 percent to youth). These funds help pay for youth to participate in programs and contribute to local non-profits.

- The Homer Foundation also raised $\$ 50,000$ locally in order to leverage larger funding commitments from donors like the Rasmuson Foundation for the Homer library project. Because Homer has a relatively small base of potential funders and tax base, this model is unlikely to be duplicated anytime soon.
- The Homer Foundation could be a fiscal agent, or pass-through for grant funding toward recreation and culture programs and facilities.

The Homer Foundation is not set up to take on managing facilities or programs. However these other community foundation examples provide some inspiration for how different entities within the Homer area could work together in new ways to provide programs and facilities.

- Juneau built a field house through a community foundation, then created an oversight administrative organization to manage the facility. Homer could adopt a similar arrangement to build a new facility, with the City or a quasi-nonprofit entity to manage the facility once built.
- The Anchorage Park Foundation goes beyond funding through grants and scholarships to leverage support for parks, trails and recreation opportunities through several programs, including Challenge Grants (in which community members apply for grants from the APF to match their own fundraising efforts for park and trail improvement projects), Youth Employment in Parks (in which teens are hired to complete park improvement projects, including trail building, forestry, waterway restoration, and urban park improvements) and neighborhood park fix-its (in which the APF selects park improvement projects based on community input and coordinates community volunteers to carry them out). Other organizations in Homer could consider similar programs to sustain and maintain facilities.

Through the Needs Assessment outreach process, community members identified other related ideas, such as collaboration among providers to apply for grants, helping people find volunteer opportunities, and monthly fundraisers to benefit folks who want to participate, but can't necessarily afford it. The senior focus group referenced a program a real estate agent ran, which gave new property owners a free one-year membership to a community organization in Homer. The program was paid for through the property sale commission. Reviving this program could be a way to invite new residents into the community and establish a pattern of supporting recreation and arts organizations through private giving.

## PUBLIC PRIVATE PARTNERSHIPS

Homer could also engage in public-private partnerships to provide desired recreation and culture facilities and programs. For example, a community recreation center could be planned to be linked to a hotel that could subsidize the recreation center costs and attract more non-resident users able and willing to pay a user fee for the facility. In Anchorage, the Dimond Center followed a similar model, building a hotel into a shopping mall plan. In Togiak, a Family Resource Center included a few rooms of lodging that provide an operating subsidy that, along with other sources of building revenue (e.g., rents from non-profit service providers), more than covers the building's operating costs (which include staffing).

## NEW PATHWAYS

Rasmuson Foundation, EmcArts, the Foraker Group, and the Alaska State Council on the Arts offer a program for and with Alaska's arts and cultural organizations, called New Pathways Alaska. The
program is designed to help participant organizations better sustain themselves organizationally and financially through workshops and participant forums, coaching, project facilitation, capital grants and online learning tools.

## APPENDIX A. EXISTING RESOURCES INVENTORY

```
INDOOR FACILITIES
Large Indoor Multi-Purpose
HERC Building
Homer High School Gym
Paul Banks Elementary School Gym
Homer Middle School Gym
West Homer Elementary School Gym
Anchor Point Gym
Fritz Creek Multi-Purpose Room
```


## Performance/Presentation

```
Islands and Oceans (60-person capacity?)
Mariner Theater at Homer High ( 400 -person capacity)
Pier One Theater (100-person capacity)
Homer Theater (250-person capacity?)
Homer Council on the Arts (70-person capacity)
Bars and Coffeehouses (Alice's, Kbay, Alibi)
Pratt Museum Amphitheater
Islands and Oceans Amphitheater
Karen Hornaday Park
Farmer's Market
```


## Small Indoor Recreation

```
Many Rivers
Art Barn
HERC Building
Bay Club
Private dance studio(s)
Flexible Spaces (meeting, classroom, event, office)
Homer Council on the Arts gallery and back room
Bunnell Gallery
Library
Yurt Village
Kachemak Ski Club Lodge
Kachemak Bay Equestrian Association cabins (20)
The Commons (Kachemak Bay Campus)
Bayview and Pioneer Halls (Kachemak Bay Campus, I00-person capacity, each)
Additional classrooms at Kachemak Bay Campus
Elementary, Middle, High School classrooms
HERC Building classrooms
City Council
Pratt Museum
Churches
```


## Specialized Spaces

```
Weight room (Homer High School, Bay Club)
Wrestling room (Homer High School)
Gymnastics room (Homer High School)
Kevin Bell Hockey Arena
```

Comment [MH7]: PARC committee to review capacity

```
Racquetball (Bay Club)
Pools (Homer High School, Bay Club)
Auto shop (Homer High School)
Welding shop (Homer High School)
Wood working shop (Homer High School)
Pottery room (Homer High School)
Art classrooms (Homer High School, Paul Banks Elementary School, West Homer Elementary School, Homer
Middle School)
Art studio (Kachemak Bay Campus)
Individual art or music studios? (Homer High Elementary School)
Practice Rooms (Homer High Elementary School)
Kitchen (HERC building)
Computer Room (HERC, Kachemak Bay Campus)
```


## Youth Oriented Indoor Spaces

## Schools

Rec room

## Senior Oriented Indoor Spaces

Homer Senior Center

## OUTDOOR FACILITIES

## KPB School District

Artificial Turf at Homer High School
Four tennis courts at Homer High School

## City of Homer

Campgrounds (4)
Trails (5.41 mi on 6 trails)
Other area trails (3)
17 dedicated parks and 7 park areas for recreational purposes:

| Baycrest | Jeffrey |
| :--- | :--- |
| Bayview | Karen Hornaday |
| Ben Walters | Louie's Lagoon |
| Bishops Beach | Mariner Park |
| Coal Point | Skatepark |
| Diamond Creek Recreation Area | Triangle |
| End of the Road | W.R. Bell |
| Fishing Lagoon | WKFL |
| Jack Gist | Woodside |

## Other

Homer Ski Club Rope Tow
Kachemak Bay Equestrian Association Cottonwood Horse Park
Outdoor Basketball Court (HERC, schools)
Softball, baseball, football, soccer fields
Trails: mountain bike, cross country, multiuse
Disc Golf Course
Street Art
Pratt Museum 10 acres outdoor space

ACTIVITIES, EVENTS, PROGRAMING

| Event/Festival |  |
| :---: | :---: |
| Homer Yacht Club races | Wrestling Tournament |
| Burning basket | Safe Kids Fair/Bike Rodeo |
| Kachemak Bay Wooden Boat Festival | Spit Run |
| Homer Highland Games | Ski Swap |
| Kachemak Bay shorebird festival | Hunter Safety |
| Homer Gardener's weekend | Telluride Film Fest |
| Homer Epic 100 | Nutcracker |
| Homer Jackpot halibut derby | Farmer's Market |
| Homer farmer's market | Writer Conference |
| Seldovia summer solstice music festival | Winter Bike Fest |
| Kenai Pen. Orchestra summer music festival |  |
| Formal programs (youth, adult, mixed age) |  |
| Artquest | Fencing |
| TheatreShakes | Weight Room |
| Musical Theatre | Adult Karate |
| Blues in the Schools | Pick Up Basketball |
| ArtShops | Volleyball |
| Jubilee | Ping Pong |
| Summer Music Camps | Tango Dance |
| Summer Circus Arts Camp | Soccer |
| Creative Communities and Cart | Pickleball |
| Adult Performing Arts Show | Pickleball |
| ArtShops | Ping Pong |
| Classes | Basketball |
| Youth and Teen | Soccer |
| PlayGroup | Volleyball |
| Popeye Wrestling | Ball Room Dance |
| Youth Wrestling | Bellydance |
| Bruin Youth Basketball | Climbing |
| Girls' Basketball | Fencing |
| Youth Basketball | Dodgeball |
| Youth BB Camp | BB Sponsorship |
| Youth Karate | BB League |
| Tumbling | Tai Chi |
| Equipment | Pilates |
| Youth Soccer | Lost Wax Casting |
| Zumba | Silversmith |
| Gymnastics | Hunter Ed |
| Gymn. Equipment | Refurbish Class |
| Youth Kayaking | Spanish |
| Mixed Ages | Online classes |


| Users groups/activities |  |
| :---: | :---: |
| Open gym | Gardening |
| Dog training | Museum |
| Community dancing and drumming | Watch wildlife |
| Racquetball | Geocaching |
| Disc sports | Backcountry skiing |
| Alaska training room | Kayaking |
| Writing | Surfing |
| Indoor soccer | Bird monitoring |
| Water aerobics | Motorcycle riding |
| Wood carving | Snowshoeing |
| Ham Radio Club | Skateboarding |
| Fish feeding | Dog mushing |
| Exhibits and art shows | Tree climbing |
| Hockey | Downhill skiing |
| Figure Skating | Go carts |
| Martial arts | Camping |
| Swimming | Slacklining |
| Indoor climbing | Wake boarding |
| Cooking | Hiking |
| Boat building | Bonfires on the beach |
| Lifelong learning | Beach walking |
| Card and board games | Parkour |
| Video games | Shooting |
| Indoor walking | Playground |
| Fiber arts | Subsistence fishing |
| Visual arts | Recreational fishing |
| Literary arts | Recreational boating |
| Functional arts | Cross country skiing |
| Native arts and crafts | Wildfood harvesting |
| Contra dancing | Festival attendance |
| Video streaming | Photography |
| Community fundraising | Running |
| Bowling | Picknicking |
| Boy Scouts | Outdoor education |
| Weaving | Sledding |
| Youth group worship | Recreational hunting |
| Music Production | Outdoor ice skating, hockey |
| PE Class | Four wheeling |
| Legos | Birding |
| Movies | Public Art |
| Attend performing arts | Baseball |
| Strong Homer Women | Softball |
| Welding | Snowboarding |
| Pony Club | Frisbee disc golf |
| Sit around | Football |
| Lacrosse |  |
| Remote control cars/airplanes |  |

## MANAGEMENT AND COMMUNICATION

## Coordinators

MAPP of Homer
City of Homer Community Recreation
Homer Arts and Culture Alliance
Homer Council on the Arts, Artist Registry
Kenai Peninsula School District
Chamber of Commerce

## Community Calendars

Homer News
City of Homer
Individual arts, recreation, civic organizations
Homer Council on the Arts website, arts calendar and e-news and artist registry
Homer Public Radio AM 890
Pop4II.org
KBBI calendar

## Nonprofit Providers

Bruins Basketball Kachemak Bay Wooden Boat Society
Bunnell Street Arts Center Kachemak Nordic Ski Club
City of Homer Parks Maintenance
Community Recreation (City of Homer)
Homer Council on the Arts
Homer Cycling Club
Homer Hockey Association
Homer Little League
Homer Softball Association
Homer Yacht Club
Kachemak Bay Campus
Kachemak Bay Equestrian Association
Kachemak Bay Running Club
Kachemak Swim Club
Kenai Peninsula Orchestra, Inc.
Kenai Peninsula School District
North Pacific Folk School
Patrons of the Pratt Museum, Pratt Museum
Popeye Wrestling
Snomads Inc.
Soccer Association of Homer
Homer Yacht Club
Kachemak Ski Club
Homer Tennis Association

## Businesses

Halibut Cove Live/Quiet Place Lodge
Numerous restaurants offering live entertainment
Norman Lowell Art Studio
Art shop gallery
Bunnell street arts center
halibut cove experience fine art gallery
Jars of clay pottery
Latitude 59 LLP digital photo artists
Lindianne's music garden
Hands of Alaska
Picture Alaska Gallery and Boutique
Ptarmigan arts cooperative gallery
Rare Bird Pottery - Ahna Iredale
Sea Lion Fine Arts Gallery
The Cove Gallery
$106$

## APPENDIX B: IDENTIFIED NEEDS

## PRIORITY IDENTIFIED NEEDS

## INDOOR FACILITIES

Multi-purpose community center | A multi-purpose community center facility was the most frequently identified need across providers, user groups, existing plans and the general public. The current demand for multi-purpose space for activities like soccer, basketball, pickleball and wrestling make community access to a large gym a very high priority. The uncertain future of the HERC building leaves users worried that if it closes, many activities will be left without a space. Providers and the business community expressed the desire to generate new economic development opportunities through a community center that could also serve as a convention center or attract visitors to attend sports and other events. The City commissioned a convention center feasibility study in 2005, which concluded that (at the time) Homer possessed a number of facilities that could host various events, but that a number of issues constrained their ability to effectively accommodate traditional meetings and conferences, and that a more traditional convention center would likely be utilized comparable to similar facilities in Sitka, Ketchikan and Valdez. The facility could possibly contain these auxiliary spaces: performance or theater space, including a backstage rehearsal space, weight room, studio space for art, music, woodworking, etc., and incubator or headquarter space for various recreation and culture program providers. A multi-purpose community center in a central downtown location could also respond to community desire to create a town center.

Indoor walking track | Walking is one of the most outdoor activities, and most desired indoor and outdoor activities. Indoor walking serves all ages, and in particular, seniors who desire an ice free location for exercise in the winter. Schools offer uninterrupted, flat surfaces for walking. However, access to schools is limited during school hours. The Kevin Bell Arena might have a large enough space for a seasonal walking loop. A calendar that identifies locations and times for walking indoors could help leverage existing resources to meet this need.

Kevin Bell Hockey Arena | There is an acute need to address the financial future of the Kevin Bell Hockey Arena. While the City is not responsible for this project directly, thousands of people use the facility, and it provides a public recreational benefit. The location makes it less appealing as a location for uses that would drive economic development in a more central location, such as a convention center. But there may be opportunities for the arena to host some identified needs, such as an indoor walking area.

Toddler and family spaces | There is anecdotal evidence of growth in the number of young families in Homer. The Needs Assessment findings reveal significant demand for play spaces and programs for young families. Ideally, a children's play space is easily accessible and integrated with
parent routines. Existing providers, such as the Senior Center, Kachemak Bay Campus, Library, Islands and Oceans, Homer Council on the Arts, Pratt Museum, Schools, may have spaces that could be creatively reinterpreted as a mixed-age learning and play experience. ${ }^{13}$

Teen space while school is out of session | Teenagers often do not have their own transportation and are limited to accessing recreation and culture resources outside of school. Creating an interesting, safe place for teens to linger between town outings is beneficial for teens, parents, and community members. There may be opportunities for flexible and underused spaces to be adapted for this use.

Centralized music studio | The Needs Assessment revealed a desire for co-location of music instruction, practice studio space, recording studio and related programing. Many people, especially teens, identified a recording studio as one component of a needed community music space. This space could meet at least some of the need for teen space outside of school and provide the mentors and mixed-age interaction that the community desires. The provider questionnaire indicated that a local business may expand to meet some or all of this identified need.

Art workshop or studio space | Providers and users expressed interest for more art classrooms and studios for individuals and to offer classes for youth and children. Art classrooms currently exist in the schools and at Kachemak Bay College, although scheduling constraints may prevent them from meeting this identified need. The Kachemak Wholesale Building was also identified as a potential space for art classrooms.

Performance space with capacity for 200-300 people | This need could be met in a number of ways, such as a simple "black box" theater for 250 people with wings, theater lighting, a backstage rehearsal area, and bathrooms. Spaces exist in Homer that could somewhat meet this identified need, but they lack some of the specific amenities or access needs that potential users desire. For example, the Mariner Theater is too large for most events, Pier One is used seasonally in summer only, the Homer Theater has film programing during evening hours, private restaurants or bars may not be family-friendly, and although the Homer Council on the Arts has a portable stage, it has none of the audience and backstage amenities. There may be existing spaces in the area that could be improved or retrofitted to accommodate the desired performance space, or it could be designed as part of a new facility.

Affordable weight room | Ready access to a low-cost weight room was a frequently identified need. The Homer Community Recreation program offers limited access to weightlifting facilities at the Homer High School for a relatively low fee, but the hours are limited by the school's scheduling constraints. The Bay Club currently offers weightlifting facilities for a monthly membership fee,

13 The Imaginarium at Anchorage Museum is one model for mixed-age learning and play experience.
which may be higher than some community members are able or willing to pay. Private business owners have opened lower-cost fitness facilities in the past, and may be able to do so in the future.

Martial arts gymnasium/practice space | Martial arts are enjoyed by multiple ages and have sustained steady participation as after-school programming, so would fulfill some of the identified broad programming needs. A martial arts practice space could also be used by Popeye Wrestling to host out of town teams. This identified need may also be met through private business: a martial arts program for youth has been privately operated out of the Kachemak Wholesale building.

Courts for racket sport | Racket sports, including tennis, pickleball and other sports, are popular activities for many area residents. The HERC building and Bay Club currently offer the only indoor facilities for racket sports, and Homer also has a number of outdoor tennis courts at the high school. Additional indoor and/or outdoor facilities could be included in plans for new recreational facilities. There may also be plans to complete construction of additional courts from the past.

## OUTDOOR FACILITIES

Upgrade softball fields | This identified need reflects a desire to complete improvements to existing facilities. The costs to improve and maintain the softball fields would be somewhat balanced by the benefits of additional games and events that would bring out-of-town visitors to Homer.

Car free ice skating at Beluga Lake | Outdoor ice skating is a low-cost, health-promoting community activity that was identified in the survey several times. Limiting car access to Beluga Lake would be primarily a policy change that would require some enforcement but few capital costs.

Outdoor amphitheater | This identified need could reflect a lack of communication about existing resources. Outdoor amphitheaters currently exist at the (old) Pratt Museum, the Homer Library, and Islands and Ocean Center; similar facilities exist at the Homer Farmer's Market and Karen Hornaday park.

Multi-use trails | Trails were frequently identified as recreation needs, and reflected the popularity of outdoor trail-based activities as well as the desire for more pedestrian and non-motorized transportation routes in order to attend recreation and culture events and programs. The community online survey results indicated that walking, bicycling and cross country skiing were among the most popular outdoor activities in Homer: 71 percent of survey respondents indicated that they walk for recreational purposes, 56 percent ride a bicycle and 46 percent cross country ski. Biking, walking and cross country skiing were also among the most-frequently identified activities that survey respondents wanted to do more often. Related identified needs include: the desire for shared multiuse trailheads, streamlined trail easements and acquisition, and single track trails on Diamond Ridge (which could also serve as an economic driver given the growth of bike-packing and snow biking in recent years). Because trails are addressed specifically in the Homer Non-Motorized Transportation

Plan, the Recreation and Culture Needs Assessment focuses on other types of recreation and culture facilities.

## ACTIVITIES, EVENTS, PROGRAMING

The specific programs offered in Homer will fluctuate with need and popularity. Decisions about which programs to offer will balance a number of different factors: the desire for new programs, to expand already popular activities, possibly discontinue programs that are challenged to bring in enough participants to sustain themselves, availability of appropriate space, and availability of appropriate staff (teachers, coaches, administrators, etc.), among others. The identified needs included a variety of desired programing, some of which is already provided in Homer. Existing providers could better meet some of these needs by improving their coordination and information sharing efforts, discussed in the following section.

## MANAGEMENT AND COMMUNICATION

Improved community calendar and information sharing | The Needs Assessment revealed that community members do not always know which activities and events are available to them, or that there is too much going on and overlapping events lower participation from what it would otherwise be. A centralized community calendar would help users, providers and visitors better coordinate existing recreation and culture programing. Potential visitors could also use a centralized calendar to plan visits to Homer around recreation and culture activities. MAPP is already working on a centralized calendar that could be used for this purpose, and the Homer Tribune maintains a community calendar. Community members also suggested a weekly subscription-based email that would advertise local programming.

A mobile phone application could also solve the need for "one stop" access to information about recreation and culture resources. An app could provide different levels of access for providers and users, including a calendar to promote better scheduling and learn about existing activities. There could be a social media component to facilitate space sharing. The app could also be integrated with a visitor website and be used to help orient visitors to resources in and around Homer. The app could be financed through advertising or user/subscription fees. ${ }^{14}$

Transportation improvements | Additional options for non-motorized, public or shared transportation would increase access to existing facilities and resources, particularly for those who do not drive. This identified need could be met through a local bus system, expanding the taxi voucher program, an improved in-town ride share.

14 A number of other cities in the U.S. and Canada have created similar apps:
http://www.activenetwork.com/blog/city-and-recreation-mobile-apps/

Continued coordination and access to school district resources | Area schools can provide a popular and relatively low-cost location for community programs and activities, particularly the Homer High School. The high school is a well-loved community resource that was built and bonded with the intention of serving as a community school. It is possible that the High School has reached its use capacity, especially for spaces such as the gymnasium, weight room, art studios and performing arts rehearsal spaces. All facilities must be closed for maintenance periodically, and the more often the facilities are used, the more maintenance they require, which drives up the facility operating costs. The Needs Assessment identified continued interest in the Homer High School, Anchor Point and McNeil Canyon schools as venues for community programming. To the extent that scheduling conflicts, cost or liability concerns prevent these schools from being used for community events, alternatives will have to be considered.

Centralized system for booking facilities $\|$ Spaces for different events and programs are offered by a variety of public and private providers in the Homer area. A centralized booking system could connect recreation and culture providers with rentable spaces, helping to reduce the number of under-used spaces and relieve pressure on popular facilities.

Consolidated PARC leadership | Providers and community members expressed a desire to reduce the number of volunteer boards, consolidate and coordinate among existing providers to offer more programming with less administration (e.g., calendaring, networking, partnerships on projects, joint fundraising or grant applications, reciprocal membership agreements). Some form of consolidated or more coordinated leadership would allow providers to avoid duplication among organizations, share administrative staff, and better leverage existing resources. Community members stressed the importance of having a coalition effort for any large new facility project. Meeting this identified need could take several different forms, such as:

- The Recreation and Culture Committee that formed to guide this Needs Assessment could be formalized and continue to work closely with the City to manage recreation and culture resources.
- A more centralized City Parks and Recreation Department could work with other provider organizations to support coordination efforts.
- MAPP's existing efforts to coordinate among various community service organizations could be expanded to act as a hub for recreation and culture organizations.
- An umbrella organization could be designated or created to stabilize some of the smaller non-profit initiatives, acting as a fiscal agent and charging an indirect rate in exchange for a package of support mechanisms, including space and administrative support.

Centralized City Parks and Recreation Department | Recreation management at the City of Homer is dispersed across two departments in three physical locations. A centralized department could facilitate partnerships with other providers for obtaining funding, constructing new facilities or upgrading existing facilities, and providing services.

More PARC employees | Existing City of Homer recreation staff are currently at capacity. With additional staff, the City could potentially leverage increased community involvement toward providing services and completing park improvement projects. Provider organizations also identified a desire to share the costs of employing grantwriters to help them access new sources of funding.

## NON-PRIORITY IDENTIFIED NEEDS

## Multi-purpose Indoor

Basketball court
Dance hall with wooden floor
Provide gym in Anchor Point
Specialized Indoor
Arcade
Community bike shop
Community kitchen
Community wood working shop
Curling
Futsal court (indoor soccer)
Indoor climbing facility
Indoor skate park
Maker space
Robotics/auto shop
Water park

## Central space/ headquarters (Indoor)

Circumpolar educational center with sailing classes
Folk School headquarters
HQ for recreation and culture provider organizations
Incubator space for new businesses
Wooden Boat Society headquarters (library and meeting space, shop, boat and equipment storage)

## Outdoor

Paintball/airsoft course
Another disc golf course at Hornaday Park or Bishop's Beach
Buy land for parks (e.g. at the bottom of West Hill)
Community garden (greenhouse, high tunnels, rented to people for growing their own food)
Covered Park and Ride for bikes
Covered, unheated shelter near athletic fields
Flag football
More sports fields
Motocross track
Playground on the spit
Public outdoor swimming (e.g. an Anchor Point pond, Lampert Lake)
RC flying field/track
Shooting range
Sledding hill
ATV programs or facilities
Helicopter access to backcountry (e.g., for heli-skiing)
Improve the boat ramp ("speed divots" between every concrete log)
Jet skiing programs or facilities
Expand outdoor activities/facilities across the bay
Warming hut on spit (There is a plan and seed money in place for this project as of 2015. No action required from City.)

## Trails

Develop a non-motorized path/trail adjacent to Kachemak Drive connecting the Homer Spit Trail to the EER pathway.
Light ski trails at McNeil
Mountain bike single track trails (Diamond Ridge)
More multi-use access at Ohlson Mt Road

## Programing

3-D Printer
Classes for adults
Affordable art classes
Basket weaving
Boxing
Circus arts
Dodgeball
Field Hockey
Film school
Food preservation
Game library
Golf lessons
Indoor shooting
Industrial art classes
Jewelry class
Lacrosse
Mini golf
Rentals on the spit (kayaks, boats)
Sailing
Childcare while adult recreation activities are happening
Community stitching/knitting
Tennis lessons
Tournaments (e.g. pickle ball, tennis, ping pong, martial arts)
Video gaming club
Weaving
Wildflower identification
Ski loan program

## Coordination + Information

## Consolidated advertising

Cultivate recreation and culture leadership
More volunteer and service organization coordination (e.g., adopt a park)
Bathrooms at the base of the spit

## THE POTENTIAL OF A MULTI-PURPOSE COMMUNITY CENTER

Many of the recreation and cultural needs identified as part of this process could be met through existing resources or in a single multi-purpose center. Figure 26 indicates identified needs that could most likely benefit from co-location in a multi-purpose center, though not all of these uses are expected to be accommodated by a single new facility.

Figure 3I: Identified needs that could be met by a multi-purpose community center

| Possible primary uses in new multi-purpose facility |
| :--- | :--- | :--- |


| $\begin{aligned} & \text { त } \\ & \frac{0}{0} \\ & \frac{0}{2} \\ & \hline \end{aligned}$ | Identified Need | Notes |
| :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | Indoor climbing facility |  |
|  | Maker space |  |
|  | Incubator space for recreation and culture providers and/or small businesses |  |
|  | Community garden |  |
|  | Healthy cooking classes |  |
|  | Short courses/workshops |  |

The center could be designed to fulfill the need for additional gymnasium space, a performance venue, and smaller flexible spaces that could meet the needs for a variety of specific programing needs like music recording, art studios and/or PARC headquarters and businesses. A smaller auxiliary space could serve as a mat room for wrestling, martial arts, and yoga, with a removable floor and a "back stage" to the main space for performances.


These images illustrate examples of multi-purpose gymnasium and performance spaces. The image on the far left seats 300 people; the image on the far right seats 100 people.
An indoor walking track could be included in the design of the main gymnasium space or around the entire building envelope. Outdoor projects, such as an outdoor amphitheater and additional community gardens could also be integrated into the design. The following diagram illustrates how spaces can be combined in a multi-use facility to meet several needs at once.


## APPENDIX C: COMMUNITY OUTREACH

## COMMUNITY OUTREACH PROCESS

The Homer Recreation and Culture Needs Assessment is a thoughtful look forward over the next 10 to 15 years to understand the big picture of our existing recreation and culture activities and resources, what is missing, and which changes the community would like to see. For this endeavor
to be meaningful, it was important that the variety of activities and viewpoints of the greater community were included. Outreach to providers, users, the general public and other stakeholders informed much of the study, and with key informant interviews, focus groups, a community workshop, several planning documents, and almost 1,000 survey responses, there was no shortage of information. The City of Homer oversaw the process, with guidance from the Recreation and Culture Advisory Committee. The involved three target populations: recreation and culture providers, recreation and culture users, and the general public. The Needs Assessment included a special focus to reach out to young people and seniors in the study area. The outreach activities described below were used to understand the particular needs and potential resources of these target populations.

## RECREATION AND CULTURE ADVISORY COMMITTEE

The Recreation and Culture Advisory Committee included: Gail Edgerly (Homer Council on the Arts, HCOA), Matt Steffy (Parks and Recreation Commission), Jan Rumble (Homer Hockey), Megan Murphy (MAPP of the Southern Kenai Peninsula), Kate Crowley (ReCreate Rec), Asia Freeman (Bunnell Arts Center), Mike Illg (City of Homer Community Recreation Coordinator), Corbin Arno (Homer Voice for Business, Motorized Sports), Karen Marks (Art Shop Gallery, Homer Voice for Business, volunteer), and Kelly Cooper (Kenai Peninsula Borough Assembly, Homer Voice for Business, volunteer).

The Recreation and Culture Advisory Committee provided context for overarching issues to be addressed through the Needs Assessment process, as well as guidance for how the Needs Assessment can be a useful tool to meet the goals of the City, Homer community and recreation and culture providers. The group also guided the statistically valid survey, informed the gap analysis of identified needs, and helped to identify initial funding and implementation strategies for meeting priority needs.

## ONLINE COMMUNITY SURVEY

For this Needs Assessment, an online community survey gathered the input of 989 respondents, representing approximately 1,700 people. ${ }^{15}$ The City publicized the survey in newspapers and community events. The Recreation an
d Culture Committee also facilitated the online community survey at Homer Middle School and Homer High School during Physical Education classes to better understand the youth perspective on Homer's recreation and culture needs.

## PROVIDER QUESTIONNAIRE

Twenty one recreation and culture providers filled out an online questionnaire to inform how they use volunteers and paid staff, what they anticipated their needs to be and identify potential resources they could contribute toward meeting community recreation and culture needs. The survey also helped to understand the potential secondary economic impacts of recreation and culture in Homer. Providers included: City of Homer Community Recreation, Bruins Basketball, Homer Council on the Arts, Homer Softball Association, Kachemak Bay Wooden Boat Society, Lindianne's Music Garden, Homer Little

Figure 32: Where do you live?


Figure 33: How old are you?


Source: 2014 Recreation and Culture Needs Assessment Online Community Survey League, Kachemak Ski Club, Soccer Association of Homer, Kachemak Bay Campus, Kachemak Swim Club, North Pacific Folk School, Popeye Wrestling, Homer Cycling Club, Homer Hockey Association, Many Rivers Yoga (with Healing Transformations, The Floating Leaf Sangha, Homer Center for Spiritual Living, and The Artful Eddy), Kachemak Bay Equestrian Association, Bunnell Street Arts Center, Pratt Museum, Snomads Inc., and City of Homer Parks Maintenance.

15 Respondents were able to respond for themselves or household, and then indicate their household size.

## NOVEMBER I2-I4, 2014 SITE VISIT

Ski Swap Outreach | 6-8 p.m., Wednesday, November 12, 2014. This activity allowed the project team to connect with recreation and culture users who might not otherwise come to a public meeting or fill out survey. A poster display shared the results of the Needs Assessment to date, including a list of identified needs categorized by facility, program or management strategy. Participants were invited to indicate whether identified needs were best met using existing resources or whether a new facility was truly needed. Participants commonly noted the need for a new affordable gym space, more opportunities for toddlers and parents to recreate together, and transportation improvements. Participants also indicated the desire to improve the coordination of existing organizational structures, such as calendars, funding opportunities and nonprofit boards to improve access and availability of recreation and culture resources.

Business Community Focus Group | 12-1 p.m. Thursday, November 13, 2014. The Business Focus Group discussed a number of strategies for recreation and culture resources:

- Improve information sharing: include education; consolidate advertising and promotion; use web-based communication tools.
- For both organizations and businesses: cultivate leadership; coordinate among silos; identify who has responsibility for implementing projects (building new or improving existing facilities, starting new or changing existing programs, etc.).
- For facilities: make better use of existing facilities if possible; for proposed new facilities, assess the financial feasibility of projects and ensure there is the means to cover costs.

The group emphasized that these strategies all work toward the goal of strengthening the local economy and growing the population, particularly younger people and families.

High School Focus Groups | $1-4 \mathrm{pm}$ Thursday, November 14. The Planning Team conducted two focus groups. The first group was with the Homer High Symphonic Band. About 40 students worked together to create a list of their top recreation and culture activities

Figure 34: Where do Homer High students participate in recreation and culture activities?


## (playing music, drawing and sketching, playing video

games, creative writing and poetry, skiing, hiking, walking the dog) and map where they do them. Then the students worked together to answer three questions: What do we need or want more of? What are barriers to meeting those needs? What are possible solutions to overcome the barriers? After presenting and discussing their work, the students asked the facilitators to
describe how arts and recreation are currently funded. Recreation and Culture Committee members Mike Illg and Asia Freeman reviewed the funding mechanisms for the organizations they represented. The second focus group helped to review the previous group's list of identified needs and synthesize the findings into three highest-priority needs, which included:

1) A multi-use, mixed-age space including the following amenities:

- Publicly-accessible music recording studio
- Practice rooms
- Games/game library
- Pottery
- 3-D printer
- Maker space

2) A performance space, for activities like Color of Homer
3) Maintaining the trails

Teens listed transportation, time, money and weather as barriers to participation. They indicated that a multi-use space would provide a place to be if they did not want to go in and out of town. The taxi voucher program was offered as a model for solving the transportation barrier.

Community Workshop | 5:30-8:15.p.m, Thursday, November 14. Around 40 people, five Parks and Recreation Commissioners and five Recreation and Culture Committee members attended the workshop. The workshop began with an open house where people could review research and work to date. The planning team presented the results of the demographic and survey analyses with small group breakout to discuss guiding questions. Discussion focused on identifying high priority projects and the characteristics that they would need to move forward. Participants also expressed a desire to focus recreation and culture resources around a walkable downtown and to pursue sport and tourism events. The idea of a town center or plaza anchored by multi-purpose recreation and culture space or convention center emerged as a popular desire. Participants also discussed
implementation strategies such as public-private partnerships and coordinating with a private foundation to help leverage funding and volunteer efforts to develop a new multi-purpose facility. Other identified needs highlighted in workshop discussions included:

- A Medium-sized theater for 250 people with wings, black box, lighting, bathrooms, heat, beer and alcohol permits, accessible, maintained
- In and outdoor racket sports
- Maker space; communal art studio space for 15-20 studios
- A dance hall with a wooden floor
- A community kitchen

Community Workshop


- A meeting room list
- A centralized calendar
- Area for walking indoors
- A couple more recreation and culture employees (city)
- Non-motorized routes for walking and skiing through town, sidewalks to public buildings; trail network that isn't tied to the road system
- Bathrooms at the base of the spit

Senior Focus Group | 10-11 a.m. Friday, November 15. Seniors are a diverse group, including people who have raised families and now are aging in Homer, retirees from other parts of the state, and less able individuals and their caregivers who use services like the Friendship Center adult day program and assisted living. The focus group attendees all agreed that the growing population of this diverse group will have an impact on the Homer community in the coming years.

The focus group highlighted the importance of a centralized calendar to share activities with new retirees to town. The multitude of events each weekend is a draw for retirees. One person said she could easily come up with 12 people who were visitors in town for pickleball alone. The group referenced a program a real estate agent ran that gave new property owners a free one-year membership to a community organization in Homer (paid for through the property sale commission). Reviving this program could be a way to invite new residents into the community and establish a pattern of supporting recreation and arts organizations through private giving. There was also discussion of the senior tax exemption. Both seniors and non-seniors expressed discomfort that because of the exemption, some seniors are not contributing as much as they would like to city and borough services.

The senior focus group also liked the idea of an intergenerational space with mixed programing, and remarked on the popularity of the paved multi-use trails for walking. They noted that people become tired of "fighting the snow" in winter, though the City has been good about keeping the trails clear. An indoor space for walking would be used frequently by active seniors and provide a
place for assisted living, adult day providers and caregivers to bring less mobile seniors out in the winter, either for a safe walk, or to be around other people in an unstructured environment. However, they also maintained that scheduled activities work well for less independent individuals, as caretakers must plan extra time to get less mobile residents to an activity.

## Recreation and Culture Committee

## Community Workshop



Work Session | 12 noon - 2 p.m. Friday, November 15. The Recreation and Culture Committee decided to invite more representatives from the business community to bring their expertise in economic development and private-sector project financing to discussions about the direction of the Needs Assessment and any large-scale priority projects that might come out of it. The Committee discussed previous successful projects in which the City was a partner, and how lessons learned from those projects (e.g., the animal shelter, library, Old Town) could be applied to the Needs Assessment project. Past successful efforts had a lead organization with goals, plans, volunteers and seed money; the City was better able to contribute as a partner with an outside lead organization (for instance, the City provided land for the library).

## INTERVIEWS

The planning team conducted key informant interviews with all members of the Recreation and Culture Committee as well as a few key providers including, Carol Swartz (Kachemak Bay Campus), Douglas Waclawski (Homer High School Principal), Joy Steward (Homer Foundations), and Rick Malley (Independent Living Center).

## STATISTICALLY VALID SURVEY

A statistically valid telephone survey was conducted by Ivan Moore Research, primarily to assess the community's willingness to pay for identified recreation and culture needs. Survey results indicated that recreation and culture are important to the majority of area residents and that there is some support for increasing public funding for recreation and culture facilities and services through various means.

## APPENDIX D: SOURCES

2008 City of Homer Comprehensive Plan. City of Homer. 2008.
Homer Non-Motorized Transportation and Trails Plan. City of Homer. 2004.
2012-2042 Population Projections. State of Alaska Department of Labor and Workforce Development. 2014.

Annual Report. City of Homer. 2013.
Needs Assessment Report: Homer Prevention Project. SPF/SIG/Homer Prevention Project. 2012.
Community Information DCRA. DCRA. 1940-2013; 2014 published.
Alaska Population Estimates by Census Designated Place (2010-2013). DOLWD. 2013 published.
City of Homer Adopted Budget Jan 1- Dec 31 2014. City of Homer. 2014.
HERC Building Engineering Report. Klauder \& Company Architects/City of Homer Public Works. 2012.

Community Health Needs Assessment. MaPP of SKP. March 2014.
Community Health Improvement Plan. MaPP of SKP. 2011.
Community Health Campus Survey.
City of Homer Community Recreation Report. City of Homer, Community Recreation Coordinator. 18 June 2014.

Arts, Entertainment and Recreation. Neal Fried, Alaska Economic Trends. September 2014.

IVAN MOORE<br>RESEARCH

## HOMER PUBLIC OPINION SURVEY MARCH 2015

Hi, my name is $\qquad$ and I'm calling for Ivan Moore Research, an Alaska public opinion research firm. We are conducting a public opinion survey today in the Homer area about some issues that are important to the community. The survey should take no more than five minutes.

S1. What is the zip code where you live?


IF OTHER ZIP OR UNSURE, THEN SAY "Do you live in the Homer/Anchor Point area?" IF NO, TERMINATE.

IF CELLPHONE RESPONDENT... We'd like to get your input to the survey as a cellphone respondent. We've deliberately called you (on the weekend/after $7 \mathrm{pm}) *$ so that we're not using up your minutes, and we'd like to ask if you can safely respond to the survey where you are right now. IF YES, CONTINUE...

IF LANDLINE RESPONDENT... Is this a residential telephone?
IF YES, CONTINUE...
If they are available, I'd like to speak with the youngest male aged 18 or older in your household.

IF AVAILABLE, SWITCH AND REPEAT INTRO.
IF NOT AVAILABLE... How about the youngest female aged 18 or older?
IF AVAILABLE, SWITCH AND REPEAT INTRO.
IF NOT AVAILABLE, CONTINUE WITH RESPONDENT.
All phone numbers used for this survey were randomly generated. We don't know your name, but your opinions are important to us, and we'd appreciate your participation if that's OK with you. Of course, your responses will be completely confidential.

1. First of all, how long have you lived in the Homer area?


Mean $=21.1$ years

The Homer area has seen a growing interest in community parks, indoor and outdoor sports, visual and performing arts, cultural events and festivals, which are all part of the local quality of life for residents of all ages.

While we have parks, recreation and cultural resources, community organizations and municipalities face financial and space limitations to sustain programming and facilities.
2. First of all, how important are the availability of recreation and culture activities to you and your immediate family and friends, very important, important, somewhat important, not very important or not at all important?


We'd now like to know what you think about certain proposals that currently exist to develop, sustain and/or improve certain recreation and culture facilities in Homer.
3. One proposal is to build a multi-purpose community center in Homer to provide a year-round facility for indoor activities like recreation, performing arts, community gatherings, education and specialty activities. Such a facility will cost at least 18 million dollars to build. Funding for construction would come from several sources but would certainly require area residents to contribute, on average, several hundred dollars a year per household through both user fees and increased taxes. Which of the following statements best matches your views?

A: This is a desirable facility, it should be a priority within the next 5 years, and $I$ would be willing to contribute to support its development.

B: This is a desirable facility, but it should be a priority 5-10 years from now, providing time for the community to grow and increase the tax base.

C: This facility should not be a priority, and I would not be willing to contribute any amount of additional taxes to support its development.

4. The Kevin Bell Ice Hockey Arena is well used, with programs serving 800 people each week. The loan to pay for the building is now due, requiring mortgage payments of approximately $\$ 60,000$ per year for the next 20 years. User fees can cover operations costs, but won't cover the building loan payments. Which of the following statements below best matches your views?

A: The City of Homer should not put any funding into the building, even if this means the facility will close.

B: The City should provide approximately $\$ 10,000-\$ 15,000$ per year in new funding to help cover a portion of the loan payment, and look to the Homer Hockey Association to find the remaining funding.

C: The City should pay the full $\$ 60,000$ per year loan payment, and fund this expenditure with tax revenues.


5A. Which funding source would you most prefer to see used to fund new recreation and culture services in the Homer area? Would you like to see them funded with new property taxes, funded with new sales taxes, funded other kinds of taxes, funded with existing money reappropriated from other municipal sources, or not funded at all?


5B. One funding option used in the Kenai Peninsula Borough to pay for a desired service is the creation of a service area. Nikiski and Seldovia, for example, both have recreational service areas that pay for services provided in their communities. These service areas use property taxes to pay for local services like, for example, a community center. Generally speaking, do you strongly favor, mildly favor, mildly oppose or strongly oppose the creation of a service area in the Homer area to fund potential recreation and culture services?


The following questions are for statistical purposes only.
6A. (IF LANDLINE, THEN ASK...) Do you use a cellphone?
6B. (IF CELLPHONE, THEN ASK...) Do you have a landine telephone in your home?

6C. (IF YES TO EITHER 6A OR 6B, THEN ASK...) On which line do you conduct most of your day-to-day telephone communication, your landline or your cellphone?

7. What is your registered party affiliation? Are you a Democrat, a Republican, are you registered with another party, or are you no party?

| \| | PARTY AFFILIATION: |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: |
| \| | Count | \% |
| \| Democrat | 30 | 11.9\% |
| \| Republican | 55 | 22.0\% |
| \|Other party | 20 | 8.2\% |
| \| No party | 144 | 58.0\% |

8. In what year were you born?

| \| | AGE OF RESPONDENT: |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: |
| I | Count | \% |
| \| 18-24 | 9 | 3.6\% |
| \| 25-34 | 31 | 12.4\% |
| \| 35-44 | 36 | $14.7 \%$ |
| \| 45-54 | 56 | 22.6\% |
| \| 55-64 | 67 | 27.4\% |
| \| 65 + | 47 | 19.3\% |

Mean $=51.8$ years
9. Of the people currently living in your household, how many are children or adolescents aged 18 or under?

10. Are you married or single?

11. In which of the following broad categories does your household income fall?


[^7]12. Do you own or rent the home you live in?

13. GENDER...

| \| | GENDER OF RESPONDENT: |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: |
| \| | Count | \% |
| \| Male | 132 | 51.0\% |
| \| Female | 127 | 49.0\% |

That completes the survey. I have a telephone number for Ivan Moore Research that you can call with any comments, compliments or complaints. Would you like the number?

Thank you very much for your help. Goodbye.

THE FOLLOWING VARIABLE WAS CALCULATED USING MEASURED DATA:

| \| | \| MARITAL STATUS BY GENDER:| |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: |
| \| | Count | \% |
| \| Married males | 78 | 31.3\% |
| \|Married females | 74 | 29.7\% |
| \|Single males | 49 | 19.7\% |
| \|Single females | 48 | 19.3\% |

# CROSSTABULATION TABLES <br> Zip Code <br> Column Percents 

| \| | ZIPCODE: |  | Total |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| \| | 99556 | 99603 | Col \% |
| \| | Col \% | Col \% |  |
| \|YEARS OF HOMER RESIDENCY: |  |  |  |
| \|Less than 15 years | $60.6 \%$ | $34.4 \%$ | 39.7\% |
| \| 15-25 years | 9.3\% | $32.2 \%$ | 27.5\% |
| \| More than 25 years | $30.0 \%$ | $33.4 \%$ | $32.7 \%$ |
| \| |  |  |  |
| \| IMPORTANCE OF RECREATION |  |  |  |
| \| AND CULTURE ACTIVITIES: |  |  |  |
| \|Very important | 19.6\% | $50.2 \%$ | $43.8 \%$ |
| \| Important | 22.1\% | $14.0 \%$ | 15.7\% |
| \|Somewhat important | 25.6\% | $23.3 \%$ | $23.8 \%$ |
| \| Not very important | 13.3\% | $5.6 \%$ | $7.2 \%$ |
| \| Not at all important | $17.6 \%$ | 6.6\% | 8.9\% |
| \| Not sure | 1.8\% | . $3 \%$ | . $6 \%$ |
| \| |  |  |  |
| \|OPINION OF COMMUNITY |  |  |  |
| CENTER: |  |  |  |
| \|Priority in next 5 years | 10.1\% | 35.1 \% | 29.9\% |
| \|Priority later | $38.6 \%$ | 23.1 \% | $26.3 \%$ |
| \| Not a priority | 48.2\% | $37.7 \%$ | $39.8 \%$ |
| \| Not sure | 3.1\% | 4.2\% | 4.0\% |
| I |  |  |  |
| \|OPINION OF FUNDING OF ICE |  |  |  |
| \| ARENA: |  |  |  |
| \| No funding | 10.5\% | 23.2\% | 20.5\% |
| \| Pay \$10-15k partial | $47.7 \%$ | $54.8 \%$ | $53.3 \%$ |
| \|Pay full \$60k | 25.3\% | $18.9 \%$ | 20.2\% |
| \| Not sure | 16.5\% | 3.2\% | $6.0 \%$ |
| \| |  |  |  |
| \|PREFERRED FUNDING SOURCE: |  |  |  |
| \|Property taxes | 8.4\% | 13.2\% | 12.2\% |
| \|Sales tax | 10.1\% | 19.2\% | 17.3\% |
| \|Other taxes | 17.8\% | $18.5 \%$ | 18.3\% |
| \| Reappropriate | 31.2\% | $22.7 \%$ | $24.5 \%$ |
| \| Don't fund | 21.9\% | 17.3\% | 18.2\% |
| \| Not sure | 10.6\% | 9.1\% | 9.5\% |
|  |  |  |  |
| \|FAVOR OR OPPOSE SERVICE |  |  |  |
| AREA? |  |  |  |
| \|Strongly favor | 23.9\% | 29.1\% | 28.0\% |
| \|Mildly favor | 20.5\% | 28.9\% | 27.1\% |
| \| Neutral | . $7 \%$ | 4.5\% | $3.7 \%$ |
| \| Mildly oppose | 24.5\% | $15.6 \%$ | $17.4 \%$ |
| \|Strongly oppose | $22.5 \%$ | 18.3\% | 19.2\% |
| \| Not sure | 8.0\% | $3.6 \%$ | 4.5\% |
| \| |  |  |  |
| \| Total | 20.9\% | 79.1\% | 100.0\% |


| \| | ZIPCODE: |  | Total |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| \| | 99556 | 99603 | Col \% |
| \| |  |  |  |
| \| | Col \% | Col \% |  |
| \| LANDLINE/CELL STATUS: |  |  |  |
| \| Land only | 3.0\% | 4.9\% | 4.5\% |
| \| Both - land dominant | 6.5\% | 10.6\% | 9.7\% |
| \|Both - cell dominant | 29.4\% | $34.9 \%$ | 33.8\% |
| \|Cell only | $61.1 \%$ | 49.6\% | $52.0 \%$ |
|  |  |  |  |
| \| PARTY AFFILIATION: |  |  |  |
| \| Democrat | 5.3\% | 14.0\% | 12.1\% |
| \| Republican | 28.6\% | $20.7 \%$ | 22.4\% |
| \|Other party | 13.4\% | $6.8 \%$ | 8. 2 \% |
| \| No party | 52.6\% | 58.5\% | $57.2 \%$ |
| \| |  |  |  |
| \|AGE OF RESPONDENT: |  |  |  |
| \| 18-34 | 15.4\% | 16.6\% | 16.3\% |
| \| 35-44 | $26.0 \%$ | 11.9\% | $14.9 \%$ |
| \| 45-54 | 24.4\% | $22.6 \%$ | $23.0 \%$ |
| \| 55 + | 34.2\% | 48.9\% | 45.8\% |
| \| |  |  |  |
| \| CHILDREN IN HOUSEHOLD: |  |  |  |
| \| None | 48.7\% | 68.5\% | $64.3 \%$ |
| \| One or more | 51.3\% | 31.5\% | $35.7 \%$ |
| \| |  |  |  |
| \| MARITAL STATUS: |  |  |  |
| \| Married | $76.6 \%$ | $56.4 \%$ | $60.7 \%$ |
| \|Single | 23.4\% | $43.6 \%$ | 39.3\% |
| \| |  |  |  |
| \| HOUSEHOLD INCOME: |  |  |  |
| \| \$0-40, 000 | 30.5\% | $32.7 \%$ | 32.3\% |
| \| \$ 40, 000-80, 000 | 24.9\% | 29.1\% | 28.2\% |
| \| \$80,000-120,000 | 31.1\% | $23.2 \%$ | $24.8 \%$ |
| \|\$120, 000 + | 7.8\% | 11.2\% | $10.5 \%$ |
| \| Not sure | 5.8\% | 3. $8 \%$ | 4.2\% |
| \| |  |  |  |
| I OWN OR RENT HOME? |  |  |  |
| \| Own | 96.3\% | $83.3 \%$ | 86.1 \% |
| \| Rent | $3.7 \%$ | $16.7 \%$ | 13.9\% |
| \| |  |  |  |
| \| GENDER OF RESPONDENT: |  |  |  |
| \| Male | 48.9\% | $50.4 \%$ | 50.1\% |
| \| Female | 51.1\% | 49.6\% | 49.9\% |
|  |  |  |  |
| \|MARITAL STATUS BY GENDER: |  |  |  |
| \| Married males | $38.3 \%$ | 28.2\% | 30.4\% |
| \|Married females | 38.3\% | 28.2\% | $30.3 \%$ |
| \|Single males | 11.7\% | $21.8 \%$ | 19.7\% |
| \|Single females | $11.7 \%$ | $21.8 \%$ | 19.7\% |
| \| |  |  |  |
| \| Total | 21.2\% | 78.8\% | 100.0\% |

# CROSSTABULATION TABLES 

Years of Homer Residency<br>Column Percents




# CROSSTABULATION TABLES Party Affiliation Column Percents 

$140$

| \| | PARTY AFFILIATION: |  |  |  | Total |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| 1 | Democrat | $\begin{aligned} & \text { Republica } \\ & \text { n } \end{aligned}$ | Other party | No party | Col \% |
| \| | Col \% | Col \% | Col \% | Col \% |  |
| \| YEARS OF HOMER RESIDENCY: |  |  |  |  |  |
| \|Less than 15 years | 20.2\% | $36.3 \%$ | 59.0\% | $42.6 \%$ | 39.7 \% |
| \| 15-25 years | 41.0\% | $32.4 \%$ | 22.8\% | $25.0 \%$ | 28.4\% |
| \|More than 25 years | 38.8\% | $31.3 \%$ | 18.1\% | 32.4\% | 31.9\% |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |
| \| IMPORTANCE OF RECREATION | |  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |
| \| Very important | $69.6 \%$ | 29.5\% | 44.9 \% | 43.4\% | 43.5\% |
| \| Important | 16.1\% | 7.4\% | 17.1\% | 17.3\% | $14.9 \%$ |
| \|Somewhat important | 11.4\% | $42.7 \%$ | $10.6 \%$ | $23.3 \%$ | 25.1\% |
| \| Not very important |  | $5.4 \%$ | 1.3\% | 9.5\% | $6.8 \%$ |
| \| Not at all important | $3.0 \%$ | 15.0\% | 21.4\% | 6. 2 \% | 9.0\% |
| \| Not sure |  |  | 4.7\% | . $4 \%$ | . $6 \%$ |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |
| \|OPINION OF COMMUNITY |  |  |  |  |  |
| CENTER: |  |  |  |  |  |
| \|Priority in next 5 years | $46.3 \%$ | 13.1\% | $42.9 \%$ | $31.7 \%$ | 30.2\% |
| \|Priority later | $28.7 \%$ | $28.9 \%$ \| | 2.9\% | 28.8\% | $26.7 \%$ |
| \| Not a priority | 18.7\% | $58.0 \%$ | $42.3 \%$ | $36.6 \%$ | $39.7 \%$ |
| \| Not sure | 6.4\% |  | 11.8\% | 2.9\% | 3.4\% |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |
| \|OPINION OF FUNDING OF ICE |  |  |  |  |  |
| \| ARENA: |  |  |  |  |  |
| \| No funding | 17.4\% | 27.9\% | 7.1\% | 19.0\% | 19.9\% |
| \| Pay \$10-15k partial | 69.4\% | $55.6 \%$ \| | 39.9\% | 51.9\% | $53.8 \%$ |
| \|Pay full \$60k | 13.2\% | $6.7 \%$ \| | 49.2\% | 22.9\% | 20.2\% |
| \| Not sure |  | 9.8\% | 3.8\% | 6.2\% | $6.1 \%$ |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |
| \|PREFERRED FUNDING SOURCE: |  |  |  |  |  |
| \|Property taxes | $22.9 \%$ | 7. $7 \%$ | $11.6 \%$ | 12.3\% | $12.5 \%$ |
| \|Sales tax | 15.2\% | 7.2\% | 12.7\% | $22.4 \%$ | 17.4\% |
| \|Other taxes | $23.0 \%$ | 21.8\% \| | 20.9\% | 15.4\% | 18.2\% |
| \| Reappropriate | 27.5\% | $32.3 \%$ \| | 12.3\% | 23.5\% | $25.0 \%$ |
| \| Don't fund | 4.1\% | 29.3\% \| | $33.2 \%$ | $14.5 \%$ | 18.0\% |
| \| Not sure | 7.4\% | 1.6\% | 9.3\% | 11.9\% | 8.9\% |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |
| \| FAVOR OR OPPOSE SERVICE |  |  |  |  |  |
| \| AREA? |  |  |  |  |  |
| \|Strongly favor | 44.3 \% | 17.8\% \| | $40.3 \%$ | 26.3\% | 27.7\% |
| \|Mildly favor | 28.2\% | 23.8\% \| | 7.1\% | $32.4 \%$ | $27.9 \%$ |
| \| Neutral | 2.2\% | . $5 \%$ | 1.7\% | 5.5\% | $3.7 \%$ |
| \|Mildly oppose | $11.8 \%$ | 29.1\% | 7.6\% | $16.2 \%$ | $17.8 \%$ |
| \|Strongly oppose | $2.6 \%$ | 25.2\% \| | $34.9 \%$ | 17.2\% | $18.7 \%$ |
| \| Not sure | 11.0\% | 3.7\% \| | 8.3\% | 2.5\% | 4.2\% |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |
| \| Total | 11.9\% | 22.0\% \| | 8. 2 \% | $58.0 \%$ | 100.0\% |



# CROSSTABULATION TABLES 

Age of Respondent
Column Percents
$144$

| 1 | AGE OF RESPONDENT: |  |  |  | Total |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | 18-34 | 35-44 | 45-54 | $55+$ | Col \% |
|  | Col \% | Col \% | Col \% | Col \% |  |
| \|YEARS OF HOMER RESIDENCY: | | | | | | | | | | | | |  |  |  |  |  |
| \|Less than 15 years | 25.3\% | $66.3 \%$ | $54.8 \%$ | 27.6\% | 39.1\% |
| \| 15-25 years | 49.5\% | $23.6 \%$ | $25.0 \%$ | $24.9 \%$ | $28.8 \%$ |
| \| More than 25 years | 25.2\% | 10.2\% | 20.1\% | 47.5\% | $32.1 \%$ |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |
| \| IMPORTANCE OF RECREATION | AND CULTURE ACTIVITIES: |  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |
| \|Very important | $57.3 \%$ | $37.5 \%$ | $44.5 \%$ | $41.7 \%$ | 44.2 \% |
| \| Important | 9.7\% | 18.0\% | 19.5\% | 14.2\% | 15.2\% |
| \| Somewhat important | $32.2 \%$ | $33.2 \%$ | $16.3 \%$ | 23.1 \% | $24.5 \%$ |
| \| Not very important |  |  | 11.1\% | 8.8\% | $6.6 \%$ |
| \| Not at all important |  | 11.2\% | 8.6\% | $11.1 \%$ | 8. 8 \% |
| \| Not sure | . $8 \%$ |  |  | 1.1\% | . $6 \%$ |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |
| \|OPINION OF COMMUNITY |  |  |  |  |  |
| CENTER: |  |  |  |  |  |
| \|Priority in next 5 years | $22.2 \%$ | 34.1 \% | 38.2\% | 30.1\% | $31.3 \%$ |
| \|Priority later | $34.3 \%$ | $22.1 \%$ | $26.6 \%$ | $27.0 \%$ | $27.4 \%$ |
| \| Not a priority | $38.3 \%$ | 41.3\% | $33.8 \%$ | $40.3 \%$ | $38.7 \%$ |
| \| Not sure | 5.2\% | 2.6\% | 1.4\% | $2.6 \%$ | 2.7\% |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |
| \|OPINION OF FUNDING OF ICE |  |  |  |  |  |
| \| ARENA: |  |  |  |  |  |
| \| No funding | $21.7 \%$ | $22.9 \%$ | $10.5 \%$ | $21.5 \%$ | 19.4\% |
| \| Pay \$10-15k partial | $52.9 \%$ | $46.0 \%$ | $63.0 \%$ | $52.2 \%$ | $53.7 \%$ |
| \|Pay full \$60k | $21.1 \%$ | $30.3 \%$ | $15.8 \%$ | $20.6 \%$ | $21.1 \%$ |
| \| Not sure | 4.4\% | . $8 \%$ | $10.8 \%$ | 5.6\% | 5.8\% |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |
| \|PREFERRED FUNDING SOURCE: |  |  |  |  |  |
| \| Property taxes | 9.6\% | $6.6 \%$ | 9.4\% | 17.5\% | $12.7 \%$ |
| \|Sales tax | $14.2 \%$ | $6.2 \%$ | $25.9 \%$ | $19.5 \%$ | $18.1 \%$ |
| \|Other taxes | $30.2 \%$ | 25.3\% | 18.3\% | $11.8 \%$ | 18.2\% |
| \| Reappropriate | $31.0 \%$ | $45.7 \%$ | $18.4 \%$ | 19.4\% | $24.9 \%$ |
| \| Don't fund | 2.5\% | 12.1\% | $17.8 \%$ | 23.2\% | $17.0 \%$ |
| \| Not sure | 12.4\% | 4.2\% | 10.2\% | $8.7 \%$ | 9.0\% |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |
| \| FAVOR OR OPPOSE SERVICE |  |  |  |  |  |
| 1 AREA? |  |  |  |  |  |
| \| Strongly favor | 8.9\% | $40.5 \%$ | $40.9 \%$ | 23.4\% | $27.6 \%$ |
| \| Mildly favor | 44.1 \% | $14.9 \%$ | $16.9 \%$ | $34.4 \%$ | 29.1 \% |
| \| Neutral | 11.6\% |  |  | 3.9\% | 3. 7\% |
| \|Mildly oppose | $18.1 \%$ | 18.5\% | $21.0 \%$ | $14.6 \%$ | 17.2\% |
| \|Strongly oppose | $6.0 \%$ | 19.9\% | 21.2\% | 20.5\% | 18.2\% |
| \| Not sure | 11.3\% | 6. 2 \% |  | 3. $2 \%$ | 4.2\% |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |
| \|Total | 16.1\% | 14.7\% | 22.6\% | $46.7 \%$ | 100.0\% |


| 1 | AGE OF RESPONDENT: |  |  |  | Total |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | 18-34 | 35-44 | 45-54 | $55+$ | Col \% |
|  | Col \% | Col \% | Col \% | Col \% |  |
| \| LANDLINE/CELL STATUS: |  |  |  |  |  |
| \| Land only |  |  |  | 9.4\% | 4.4\% |
| \|Both - land dominant | 6.6\% | 4.8\% | 7. $2 \%$ | 12.2\% | 9.1\% |
| \| Both - cell dominant | 32.1 \% | $23.0 \%$ | 32.9\% | $36.0 \%$ | $32.8 \%$ |
| \|Cell only | $61.2 \%$ | $72.2 \%$ | 59.9\% | 42.4\% | $53.8 \%$ |
| \| |  |  |  |  |  |
| \| PARTY AFFILIATION: |  |  |  |  |  |
| \| Democrat | 14.8\% | 7.2\% | 15.5\% | 10.1\% | 11.7\% |
| \| Republican | 31.9\% | 18.1\% | $22.6 \%$ | 18.5\% | $21.6 \%$ |
| \|Other party |  | $14.9 \%$ | 4.0\% | $10.9 \%$ | 8.1\% |
| \| No party | 53.3\% | $59.8 \%$ | $57.9 \%$ | $60.5 \%$ | 58.6\% |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |
| \| CHILDREN IN HOUSEHOLD: |  |  |  |  |  |
| \| None | $40.3 \%$ | 30.5\% | 48.8\% | 92.1\% | $64.9 \%$ |
| IOne or more | 59.7\% | 69.5\% | $51.2 \%$ | 7.9\% | $35.1 \%$ |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |
| \| MARITAL STATUS: |  |  |  |  |  |
| \| Married | 47.7\% | $56.8 \%$ | $66.5 \%$ | 63.4\% | $60.6 \%$ |
| \|Single | 52.3\% | 43.2\% | 33.5\% | $36.6 \%$ | $39.4 \%$ |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |
| \| HOUSEHOLD INCOME: |  |  |  |  |  |
| \| \$0-40, 000 | 44.9 \% | 29.2\% | 20.0\% | $33.8 \%$ | $32.1 \%$ |
| \| \$40,000-80,000 | 29.8\% | $30.6 \%$ | $30.6 \%$ | 25.8\% | 28.2\% |
| \| \$80,000-120,000 | 23.6\% | $30.7 \%$ | $37.7 \%$ | 19.9\% | 25.9\% |
| \| \$120, 000 + |  | 9.5\% | 11.7\% | $14.2 \%$ | $10.5 \%$ |
| \| Not sure | 1.6\% |  |  | $6.3 \%$ | 3. $2 \%$ |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |
| \| OWN OR RENT HOME? |  |  |  |  |  |
| \| Own | 72.1 \% | 90.9\% | 81.8\% | 92.1\% | 86.3\% |
| \| Rent | 27.9\% | 9.1\% | 18.2\% | 7.9\% | $13.7 \%$ |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |
| \| GENDER OF RESPONDENT: |  |  |  |  |  |
| \| Male | 52.0\% | $50.3 \%$ | $61.0 \%$ | 45.3\% | $50.7 \%$ |
| \| Female | 48.0\% | 49.7\% | $39.0 \%$ | $54.7 \%$ | 49.3\% |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |
| \| MARITAL STATUS BY GENDER: |  |  |  |  |  |
| \| Married males | $26.5 \%$ | 29.9\% | 41.3\% | 29.1\% | 31.5\% |
| \|Married females | 21.2\% | $26.9 \%$ | 25.3\% | $34.3 \%$ | 29.1\% |
| \|Single males | $25.5 \%$ | $21.5 \%$ | 20.8\% | $16.7 \%$ | 19.8\% |
| \|Single females | 26.8\% | $21.7 \%$ | 12.6\% | 19.9\% | 19.6\% |
| \| ZIPCODE: |  |  |  |  |  |
| 199556 | 20.1\% | $37.4 \%$ | 22.7\% | 16.0\% | 21.4\% |
| 199603 | 79.9\% | 62.6\% | 77.3\% | $84.0 \%$ | 78.6\% |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |
| \| Total | 16.3\% | 14.9\% | 23.0\% | 45.8\% | 100.0\% |

# CROSSTABULATION TABLES 

Children in Household
Column Percents
$148$

| \| | CHILDREN INHOUSEHOLD: |  | Total |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| \| |  |  |  |
| , | None | One or | Col \% |
| \| |  | more |  |
| \| |  |  |  |
| \| | Col \% | Col \% |  |
| \|YEARS OF HOMER RESIDENCY: |  |  |  |
| \|Less than 15 years | $33.0 \%$ | 49.5\% | $38.8 \%$ |
| \| 15-25 years | $26.5 \%$ | $32.2 \%$ | 28.5\% |
| \|More than 25 years | $40.5 \%$ | 18.3\% | $32.7 \%$ |
| $1$ |  |  |  |
| \|IMPORTANCE OF RECREATION | |  |  |  |
| \| AND CULTURE ACTIVITIES:| |  |  |  |
| \|Very important | $39.7 \%$ | $53.5 \%$ | $44.6 \%$ |
| \| Important | $14.7 \%$ | 15.1\% | $14.8 \%$ |
| \| Somewhat important | 29.2\% | 15.1\% | $24.2 \%$ |
| \| Not very important | 4.8\% | 10.4\% | $6.8 \%$ |
| \| Not at all important | 10.8\% | 5.6\% | 9.0\% |
| \| Not sure | . $8 \%$ | . $4 \%$ | . $6 \%$ |
| \| |  |  |  |
| \|OPINION OF COMMUNITY |  |  |  |
| CENTER: |  |  |  |
| \|Priority in next 5 years | $27.8 \%$ | $35.9 \%$ | $30.6 \%$ |
| \|Priority later | 25.3\% | $30.3 \%$ | 27.0\% |
| \| Not a priority | $42.2 \%$ | $32.8 \%$ | $38.9 \%$ |
| \| Not sure | 4.8\% | 1.1\% | $3.5 \%$ |
|  |  |  |  |
| \|OPINION OF FUNDING OF ICE |  |  |  |
| \| ARENA: |  |  |  |
| \| No funding | 16.7\% | $26.5 \%$ | 20.2\% |
| \| Pay \$10-15k partial | $53.2 \%$ | $53.9 \%$ | $53.5 \%$ |
| \|Pay full \$60k | 24.4\% | $12.8 \%$ | 20.3\% |
| \| Not sure | 5.6\% | $6.8 \%$ | $6.0 \%$ |
| \| |  |  |  |
| \|PREFERRED FUNDING SOURCE: |  |  |  |
| \| Property taxes | 15.9\% | 5.3\% | 12.1\% |
| \|Sales tax | 18.0\% | 17.4\% | 17.8\% |
| \|Other taxes | $14.0 \%$ | $26.8 \%$ | $18.5 \%$ |
| \|Reappropriate | $24.0 \%$ | 25.4\% | $24.5 \%$ |
| \| Don't fund | 20.2\% | 14.7\% | 18.3\% |
| \| Not sure | 7.9\% | 10.4\% | 8.8\% |
|  |  |  |  |
| \|FAVOR OR OPPOSE SERVICE |  |  |  |
| \| AREA? |  |  |  |
| \|Strongly favor | $24.8 \%$ | 30.9\% | 27.0\% |
| \| Mildly favor | $30.3 \%$ | 25.4\% | $28.6 \%$ |
| \| Neutral | 4.3\% | 2.8\% | $3.8 \%$ |
| \|Mildly oppose | 16.4\% | 18.6\% | 17.2\% |
| \|Strongly oppose | 21.2\% | 15.1\% | 19.0\% |
| \| Not sure | 2.9\% | 7.2\% | 4.4\% |
| \| |  |  |  |
| \| Total | 65.0\% | 35.0\% | 100.0\% |


| \| | CHILDREN IN HOUSEHOLD: |  | Total |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| \| |  |  |  |
| \| | None | One or | Col \% |
| \| |  | more |  |
| \| | -- |  |  |
| \| | Col \% | Col \% |  |
| \| LANDLINE/CELL STATUS: |  |  |  |
| \| Land only | $6.3 \%$ | . $7 \%$ | 4.3\% |
| \| Both - land dominant | 9.1\% | 10.2\% | 9.5\% |
| \|Both - cell dominant | $32.7 \%$ | $34.8 \%$ | $33.4 \%$ |
| \|Cell only | 51.9\% | $54.3 \%$ | 52.8\% |
| \| |  |  |  |
| \| PARTY AFFILIATION: |  |  |  |
| \| Democrat | 12.1\% | 12.1\% | 12.1\% |
| \| Republican | 17.2\% | 29.3\% | 21.5\% |
| \|Other party | 9.7\% | 5.1\% | 8.1\% |
| \| No party | $61.0 \%$ | 53.4\% | 58.3\% |
| \| |  |  |  |
| \|AGE OF RESPONDENT: |  |  |  |
| \| 18-34 | 10.0\% | 27.5\% | 16.2\% |
| \| 35-44 | $6.9 \%$ | 29.3\% | $14.8 \%$ |
| \| 45-54 | $16.8 \%$ | $32.7 \%$ | 22.4\% |
| \| 55 + | $66.2 \%$ | 10.5\% | $46.7 \%$ |
| \| |  |  |  |
| \| MARITAL STATUS: |  |  |  |
| \| Married | 56.1 \% | $71.3 \%$ | 61.4\% |
| \|Single | $43.9 \%$ | 28.7\% | $38.6 \%$ |
| \| |  |  |  |
| \| HOUSEHOLD INCOME: |  |  |  |
| \| \$0-40,000 | $31.6 \%$ | 30.9\% | 31.4\% |
| \| \$ 40, 000-80,000 | $26.9 \%$ | $32.7 \%$ | 28.8\% |
| \| \$80,000-120,000 | $24.3 \%$ | 28.8\% | 25.8\% |
| \|\$120,000+ | 12.3\% | $6.7 \%$ | 10.4\% |
| \| Not sure | 4.8\% | . $9 \%$ | 3.5\% |
| \| |  |  |  |
| IOWN OR RENT HOME? |  |  |  |
| \| Own | 85.0\% | 89.4\% | $86.5 \%$ |
| \| Rent | 15.0\% | 10.6\% | 13.5\% |
| \| |  |  |  |
| \| GENDER OF RESPONDENT: |  |  |  |
| \| Male | 50.1 \% | $51.6 \%$ | $50.6 \%$ |
| \| Female | 49.9\% | 48.4\% | 49.4\% |
|  |  |  |  |
| \| MARITAL STATUS BY GENDER: |  |  |  |
| \| Married males | 26.4\% | 41.0\% | $31.5 \%$ |
| \|Married females | 29.7\% | $30.3 \%$ | 29.9\% |
| \|Single males | $24.0 \%$ | 11.1\% | 19.4\% |
| \|Single females | 19.9\% | 17.6\% | 19.1\% |
| \| |  |  |  |
| \| ZIPCODE: |  |  |  |
| 199556 | 16.2\% | $30.6 \%$ | 21.3\% |
| 199603 | 83.8\% | 69.4\% | 78.7\% |
| \| |  |  |  |
| \| Total | $64.3 \%$ | $35.7 \%$ | 100.0\% |

# CROSSTABULATION TABLES 

Marital Status
Column Percents
$152$


| 1 | MARITAL STATUS: |  | Total |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  |  |  | Col \% |
|  | Married \| Single |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |
|  | Col \% | Col \% |  |
| \| LANDLINE/CELL STATUS: |  |  |  |
| \| Land only | 4.4\% | 4.9\% | 4.6\% |
| \| Both - land dominant | 10.2\% | 8.1\% | 9.4\% |
| \|Both - cell dominant | 38.3\% | $24.3 \%$ | $32.9 \%$ |
| \|Cell only | 47.1\% | 62.6\% | $53.1 \%$ |
| \|PARTY AFFILIATION: |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |
| \| Democrat | 14.2\% | 9.1\% | 12.2\% |
| \| Republican | 21.6\% | 21.7\% | $21.7 \%$ |
| \|Other party | $6.5 \%$ | 10.4\% | 8.1\% |
| \| No party | $57.7 \%$ | $58.8 \%$ | 58.1 \% |
|  |  |  |  |
| \| AGE OF RESPONDENT: |  |  |  |
| \| 18-34 | 12.8\% | $21.6 \%$ | $16.3 \%$ |
| 135-44 | $13.6 \%$ | 15.9\% | $14.5 \%$ |
| \| 45-54 | $24.7 \%$ | 19.1\% | 22.5\% |
| \| 55+ | 48.9\% | 43.4\% | $46.7 \%$ |
|  |  |  |  |
| \|CHILDREN IN HOUSEHOLD: |  |  |  |
| \| None | 59.2\% | $73.9 \%$ | $64.9 \%$ |
| IOne or more | 40.8\% | $26.1 \%$ | $35.1 \%$ |
|  |  |  |  |
| \| HOUSEHOLD INCOME: |  |  |  |
| \| \$0-40, 000 | $21.8 \%$ | $46.9 \%$ | $31.8 \%$ |
| 1 \$ 40, 000-80,000 | $28.5 \%$ | $28.9 \%$ | $28.6 \%$ |
| \| \$80,000-120,000 | $32.9 \%$ | 15.4\% | $25.9 \%$ |
| \| \$120, 000 + | 12.7\% | $6.3 \%$ | 10.1\% |
| \| Not sure | 4.2\% | 2.6\% | 3.5\% |
|  |  |  |  |
| I OWN OR RENT HOME? |  |  |  |
| \| Own | 97.4\% | 68.4\% | 86.1\% |
| \| Rent | 2.6\% | $31.6 \%$ | 13.9\% |
|  |  |  |  |
| \| GENDER OF RESPONDENT: |  |  |  |
| \| Male | 51.3\% | $50.5 \%$ | $51.0 \%$ |
| \|Female | 48.7\% | 49.5\% | 49.0\% |
|  |  |  |  |
| \| MARITAL STATUS BY GENDER: |  |  |  |
| \| Married males | 51.3\% |  | 31.3\% |
| \|Married females | 48.7\% |  | $29.7 \%$ |
| \|Single males |  | $50.5 \%$ | 19.7\% |
| \|Single females |  | 49.5\% | 19.3\% |
|  |  |  |  |
| \| ZIPCODE: |  |  |  |
| 199556 | 26.7 \% | 12.6\% | $21.2 \%$ |
| 199603 | 73.3\% | 87.4\% | $78.8 \%$ |
|  |  |  |  |
| \| Total | $60.7 \%$ | 39.3\% | 100.0\% |

# CROSSTABULATION TABLES 

 Household IncomeColumn Percents



# CROSSTABULATION TABLES <br> Own or Rent Home? <br> Column Percents 

| \| | OWN OR RENT HOME? |  | Total |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  |  |  |  |
|  | Own | Rent | Col \% |
|  |  |  |  |
|  | Col \% | Col \% |  |
| \|YEARS OF HOMER RESIDENCY: |  |  |  |
| \|Less than 15 years | $34.4 \%$ | $61.1 \%$ | 38.1 \% |
| \| 15-25 years | 28.1\% | 35.4\% | 29.1\% |
| \| More than 25 years | $37.6 \%$ | $3.4 \%$ | $32.8 \%$ |
| $1$ |  |  |  |
| IIMPORTANCE OF RECREATION \| |  |  |  |
| \| AND CULTURE ACTIVITIES: |  |  |  |
| \|Very important | 40.6\% | $67.9 \%$ | 44.4\% |
| \| Important | 15.2\% | 18.8\% | 15.7\% |
| \| Somewhat important | 27.8\% | $3.4 \%$ | $24.4 \%$ |
| \| Not very important | 7.9\% |  | $6.8 \%$ |
| \| Not at all important | 7.9\% | 9.1\% | 8.1\% |
| \| Not sure | . $6 \%$ | . $8 \%$ | . $6 \%$ |
| I |  |  |  |
| \|OPINION OF COMMUNITY |  |  |  |
| CENTER: |  |  |  |
| \|Priority in next 5 years | 28.6\% | 42.9\% | 30.6\% |
| \|Priority later | 30.1 \% | 11.6\% | $27.6 \%$ |
| \| Not a priority | 38.2\% | 39.4\% | $38.4 \%$ |
| \| Not sure | 3.1\% | $6.0 \%$ | 3.5\% |
|  |  |  |  |
| \|OPINION OF FUNDING OF ICE |  |  |  |
| \| ARENA: |  |  |  |
| \| No funding | 20.8\% | 15.3\% | 20.1\% |
| \| Pay \$10-15k partial | $53.3 \%$ | $57.7 \%$ | $53.8 \%$ |
| \|Pay full \$60k | 20.1\% | 27.1\% | 20.9\% |
| \| Not sure | 5.8\% |  | 5.1\% |
| i |  |  |  |
| \|PREFERRED FUNDING SOURCE: |  |  |  |
| \| Property taxes | 10.2\% | 27.4\% | $12.5 \%$ |
| \|Sales tax | 18.0\% | 11.8\% | 17.1\% |
| \|Other taxes | 18.7\% | 19.6\% | 18.8\% |
| \| Reappropriate | 24.9\% | 22.9\% | $24.6 \%$ |
| \| Don't fund | 18.6\% | 11.9\% | 17.7\% |
| \| Not sure | 9.6\% | $6.3 \%$ | 9.2\% |
| \| |  |  |  |
| \|FAVOR OR OPPOSE SERVICE |  |  |  |
| AREA? |  |  |  |
| \|Strongly favor | $26.6 \%$ | 33.2\% | 27.5\% |
| \|Mildly favor | 29.7\% | 18.3\% | 28.2\% |
| \| Neutral | 2.2\% | 13.5\% | 3.8\% |
| \| Mildly oppose | $17.6 \%$ | 15.7\% | 17.3\% |
| \|Strongly oppose | 18.9\% | 19.3\% | 18.9\% |
| \| Not sure | 5.0\% |  | $4.3 \%$ |
|  |  |  |  |
| \| Total | $86.3 \%$ | 13.7\% | 100.0\% |



# CROSSTABULATION TABLES 

## Gender of Respondent <br> Column Percents

| \| | GENDER OF RESPONDENT: |  | Total |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| \| |  |  |  |
| \| | Male | Female | Col \% |
| \| |  |  |  |
| \| | Col \% | Col \% |  |
| \|YEARS OF HOMER RESIDENCY: |  |  |  |
| \|Less than 15 years | $44.7 \%$ | 33.5\% | 39.2\% |
| \|15-25 years | 29.4\% | 27.2\% | 28.3\% |
| \| More than 25 years | 25.9\% | 39.3\% | $32.5 \%$ |
| I |  |  |  |
| \| IMPORTANCE OF RECREATION |  |  |  |
| AND CULTURE ACTIVITIES: |  |  |  |
| \|Very important | 40.1 \% | 47.1\% | $43.6 \%$ |
| \| Important | 17.0\% | 14.3\% | 15.7\% |
| \| Somewhat important | 21.1\% | 27.7\% | 24.3\% |
| \| Not very important | 10.2\% | 3.9\% | 7.1\% |
| \| Not at all important | 11.1\% | 6.2\% | 8.7\% |
| \| Not sure | . $5 \%$ | . $8 \%$ | . $6 \%$ |
| I |  |  |  |
| \|OPINION OF COMMUNITY |  |  |  |
| CENTER: |  |  |  |
| \|Priority in next 5 years | $32.4 \%$ | 27.8\% | 30.1 \% |
| \|Priority later | $22.8 \%$ | $30.8 \%$ | $26.7 \%$ |
| \| Not a priority | 41.1\% | $37.3 \%$ | $39.2 \%$ |
| \| Not sure | $3.8 \%$ | 4.0\% | 3.9\% |
|  |  |  |  |
| \|OPINION OF FUNDING OF ICE |  |  |  |
| \| ARENA: |  |  |  |
| \| No funding | 22.1\% | 18.8\% | 20.4\% |
| \| Pay \$10-15k partial | $47.9 \%$ | $59.3 \%$ | $53.6 \%$ |
| \|Pay full \$60k | 22.1\% | 18.1\% | 20.1\% |
| \| Not sure | 7.8\% | 3.9\% | 5.9\% |
|  |  |  |  |
| \|PREFERRED FUNDING SOURCE: |  |  |  |
| \|Property taxes | $12.8 \%$ | $11.7 \%$ | 12.2\% |
| \|Sales tax | 15.9\% | 18.6\% | 17.2\% |
| \|Other taxes | 20.4\% | $16.1 \%$ | 18.3\% |
| \| Reappropriate | $23.9 \%$ | 26.1 \% | 25.0\% |
| \| Don't fund | 20.5\% | 15.4\% | 18.0\% |
| \| Not sure | $6.6 \%$ | 12.1\% | 9.3\% |
|  |  |  |  |
| \|FAVOR OR OPPOSE SERVICE |  |  |  |
| \| AREA? |  |  |  |
| \|Strongly favor | 30.8\% | 24.1 \% | 27.5\% |
| \|Mildly favor | $15.9 \%$ | 40.1\% | 27.8\% |
| \| Neutral | 4.1\% | 3.2\% | $3.7 \%$ |
| \| Mildly oppose | $17.6 \%$ | $17.7 \%$ | $17.7 \%$ |
| \|Strongly oppose | $28.6 \%$ | 8.9\% | 18.9\% |
| \| Not sure | 2.9\% | 6.1\% | 4.4\% |
| \| |  |  |  |
| \| Total | $50.8 \%$ | 49.2\% | 100.0\% |


| \| | GENDER OF RESPONDENT: |  | Total |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| \| |  |  |  |
| । | Male | Female | Col \% |
| \| | ----- |  |  |
| \| | Col \% | Col \% |  |
| \| LANDLINE/CELL STATUS: |  |  |  |
| \| Land only | $3.1 \%$ | 5.8\% | $4.4 \%$ |
| \|Both - land dominant | 7.8\% | $11.5 \%$ | 9.6\% |
| \| Both - cell dominant | 29.1\% | 39.0\% | $34.0 \%$ |
| \|Cell only | $60.0 \%$ | $43.6 \%$ | $52.0 \%$ |
| + |  |  |  |
| \| PARTY AFFILIATION: |  |  |  |
| \| Democrat | 8.1\% | 15.9\% | 11.9\% |
| \|Republican | 27.8\% | 15.8\% | 22.0\% |
| \|Other party | 11.6\% | 4.5\% | $8.2 \%$ |
| \| No party | 52.4\% | $63.8 \%$ | $58.0 \%$ |
| $1$ |  |  |  |
| \|AGE OF RESPONDENT: |  |  |  |
| \| 18-34 | 16.5\% | 15.6\% | 16.1\% |
| \| 35-44 | $14.6 \%$ | 14.8\% | 14.7\% |
| \| 45-54 | 27.2\% | 17.9\% | $22.6 \%$ |
| \| 55 + | 41.7\% | $51.7 \%$ | $46.7 \%$ |
| \| |  |  |  |
| \| CHILDREN IN HOUSEHOLD: |  |  |  |
| \| None | $64.3 \%$ | $65.7 \%$ | $65.0 \%$ |
| \| One or more | $35.7 \%$ | $34.3 \%$ | $35.0 \%$ |
| $1$ |  |  |  |
| \| MARITAL STATUS: |  |  |  |
| \| Married | $61.5 \%$ | $60.7 \%$ | $61.1 \%$ |
| \|Single | 38.5\% | 39.3\% | $38.9 \%$ |
| , |  |  |  |
| \| HOUSEHOLD INCOME: |  |  |  |
| \| \$0-40,000 | 30.2\% | 33.10 | $31.6 \%$ |
| \| \$ 40, 000-80,000 | 21.3\% | $36.0 \%$ | 28.3\% |
| \| \$80,000-120,000 | 28.6\% | 21.9\% | 25.4\% |
| \| \$120,000+ | $14.0 \%$ | 6.2\% | 10.3\% |
| \| Not sure | 5.9\% | 2.8\% | 4.4\% |
| \| |  |  |  |
| IOWN OR RENT HOME? |  |  |  |
| \| Own | 82.4\% | 90.3\% | 86.3\% |
| \| Rent | 17.6\% | 9.7\% | 13.7\% |
| \| |  |  |  |
| \|MARITAL STATUS BY GENDER: |  |  |  |
| \| Married males | $61.5 \%$ |  | 31.3\% |
| \|Married females |  | $60.7 \%$ | 29.7\% |
| \|Single males | 38.5\% |  | 19.7\% |
| \|Single females |  | 39.3\% | 19.3\% |
|  |  |  |  |
| \| ZIPCODE: |  |  |  |
| 199556 | 20.3\% | 21.3\% | 20.8\% |
| 199603 | 79.7\% | $78.7 \%$ | $79.2 \%$ |
| \| |  |  |  |
| \| Total | $50.1 \%$ | 49.9\% | 100.0\% |

## 2015 HOMER CITY COUNCIL MEETINGS PARKS AND RECREATION ADVISORY COMMISSION ATTENDANCE

It is the goal of the Commission to have a member speak regularly to the City Council at council meetings. There is a special place on the council's agenda specifically for this. After Council approves the consent agenda and any scheduled visitors it is then time for staff reports, commission reports and borough reports. That is when you would stand and be recognized by the Mayor to approach and give a brief report on what the Commission is currently addressing, projects, events, etc. A commissioner is scheduled to speak and has a choice at which council meeting they will attend. It is only required to attend one meeting during the month that you are assigned. However, if your schedule permits please feel free to attend both meetings. Remember you cannot be heard if you do not speak.

The following Meeting Dates for City Council for 2015 is as follows:

January 12, 262015 Commissioner Archibald
February 9, 232015 Commissioner Archibald, Commissioner Steffy
March 9, 232015
Commissioner Brann, Commissioner Steffy

Commissioner Lowney, Commissioner Lillibridge

May 11, 26 (Tues)

June 8, 222015

July 202015
Commissioner Roedl

August 10, 242015

September 14, 282015

October 12, 262015

November 23, 2015

December 14, 2015

Please review and if you will be unable to make the meeting you are tentatively scheduled for please discuss.

PLEASE NOTE: When additional commissioners are appointed the proposed schedule above will reflect those added commissioners.

MEETING DATE $\qquad$ SCHEDULED EVENTS OR AGENDA ITEM

| $\square$ MARCH 19, 2015 | LAND ALLOCATION PLAN REVIEW \& RECOMMENDATIONS TO COUNCIL <br> UPDATE ON PARK \& RECREATION SYMPOSIUM hOMER...ON THE MOVE |
| :---: | :---: |
| $\square$ APRIL 16, 2015 | SELECT SPRING PARK \&/ OR BEACH WALK THROUGH FINAL REPORT ON PARK \& RECREATION SYMPOSIUM HOMER...ON THE MOVE |
| MAY 4, 2015 SPECIAL | TENTATIVE PUBLIC HEARING ON DRAFT RECOMMENDATIONS TO UPDATE BEACH POLICY |
| $\square \mathrm{MAY} 21,2015$ | WORKSESSION SPRING PARK AND/OR BEACHES WALK THROUGH <br> FINAL REVIEW, PUBLIC HEARING AND RECOMMENDATION TO COUNCIL ON PROPOSED CHANGES TO THE BEACH POLICY |
| $\square$ IUNE 18, 2015 | INITIAL BUDGET REVIEW - WHAT DOES THE COMMISSION WANT FOR 2016? <br> THANK YOU ADVERTISEMENT FOR THE FIRST HALF OF THE YEAR REVIEW CAPITAL IMPROVEMENT PLAN |
| $\square$ JULY 16, 2015 | NO MEETING SCHEDULED |
| $\square$ AUGUST 20, 2015 | BUDGET REVIEW \& RECOMMENDATIONS STRATEGIC PLANNING |
| $\square$ SEPTEMBER 17, 2015 | FALL PARK WALK THROUGH AND BEACH WALK; ELECTIONS; SELECT KHP CLEAN UP DAY BUDGET DISCUSSION |
| ■OCTOBER 15, 2015 | KAREN HORNADAY PARK CLEAN-UP <br> REVIEW AND APPROVE THE 2016 MEETING SCHEDULE <br> THANK YOU ADVERTISEMENT FOR $2{ }^{\text {ND }}$ HALF OF THE YEAR |
| $\square$ NOVEMBER 19, 2015 | STRATEGIC PLAN REVIEW \& PLANNING |
| DECEMBER 2015 | NO MEETING SCHEDULED HAPPY HOLIDAYS! |

## PARKS AND RECREATION ADVISORY COMMISSION ANNUAL CALENDAR

 FOR THE 2015 MEETING SCHEDULE
[^0]:    ${ }^{1}$ Some of these space needs may be fulfilled by better communication about existing toddler-friendly spaces and activities; many programs are already offered and new activities starting.

[^1]:    2 Sources: Alaska Department of Labor and Workforce Development, Research and Analysis Section; and U.S. Census

[^2]:    This projection method assumes the Homer population will remain the same size relative to the Kenai Peninsula
    Borough (19 percent of total population) and applies the 65 and older population annual increase in the Kenai Peninsula Borough ( KPB ) to the Homer population.
    Source: 2010, Census, 2008-2012 American Community Survey 5-year estimate; Alaska Population Estimates by Borough, Census Area, City, and Census Designated Place (CDP), 2010-2013; State of Alaska Population Projections 2012-42

[^3]:    ${ }^{3}$ Source: Alaska Economic Trends, June 2013, AKDOLWD; Alaska Visitor Statistics Program VI: Summer 2011, McDowell Group.

[^4]:    42014 Recreation and Culture Needs Assessment Online Community Survey.

[^5]:    5 Some of these space needs may be fulfilled by better communication about existing toddler-friendly spaces and activities; many programs are already offered and new activities starting.

[^6]:    8 Schools may already be used to capacity. The high school is used for school, Kachemak Bay Campus, Community Recreation activities and other community events. All space availability is dependent on scheduling and budgets for the associated operations and maintenance costs.
    9 A centralized City Park and Recreation Department would be a new City department; it would require additional staff members, who could potentially leverage additional community involvement/coordination.

[^7]:    Median $=\$ 62,900$

