Purpose of this Study

In November 2014, the Glen Ellyn Park District placed a $13.5 million referendum on the ballot which the Park District submitted for voter approval in order to add an indoor aquatic center to the Ackerman Sports and Fitness Center. A total of 12,513 people voted out of a total electorate of 24,878 registered voters, a fairly strong turnout in a non-presidential general election, with the outcome of 39.8% in favor and 60.1% against. By staging the referendum in a general election, the Park District did accomplish the goal of having it take place in a larger turnout.

As considerable time, effort and planning was extended towards the potential indoor pool project, this study has been designed to identify voter sentiments within the electorate as to the outcome of the November 2014 referendum and what influenced their decision in the choice they made.

Polls such as this serve dual useful purposes. In part, they become short community needs assessment surveys that provide information about recreational use patterns and preferences and as well as polls that provide roadmaps as to what direction to move forward in for residents who are voters. As the questionnaire presented in the Appendix of this study shows, everyone’s opinion is significant be they a supporter or not.
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Methodology of this Study

Just as it is neither practical nor reasonably possible to ask everyone in the community for their opinions about parks and recreation services, it is not practical or affordable to ask all voters how they voted in the November 2014 election. For this reason, political pollsters, such as Public Research Group (PRG) rely on samples that are representative of the population, within a margin of error that is determined by the sample size and construction.

PRG is experienced in creating samples that are representative of voter populations. The process typically begins with the creation of a sample from a database from county voting records. Such a sample needs to be randomly selected to minimize sampling error and needs to be of a substantial enough size to be within a 3.5% margin of error that pollsters can be 95% confident that it is representative of the entire population of those who have voted.

In this study, PRG secured the voter sample from DuPage County voting records. The sample drawn from those records were approximately 500 voting households, with 211 responding to the questionnaire in the Appendix of this study. Responses were collected using telephone polling, administered by trained and local interviewers.

Responses were entered into an SPSS statistical program and were tabulated and compared. Demographic information was collected as part of this study to make comparisons as well. The end result is a report that is part needs assessment and part political poll, using tables, graphs and charts to help understand the importance of the findings.
Demographics

While PRG’s telephone pollsters did not specifically ask respondents their genders, interviewers were able to identify the gender of respondents from their voices. The genders of respondents were recorded at the beginning of the interview. Nearly all of the genders of respondents were identified in this study.

At the end of the questionnaire, in Question 11, respondents were asked to provide their ages as well as the ages of everyone else in the household. Considering the responses to question 12, it is possible to create variables of which respondents had children in the household as well as their ages, in order to provide analysis about whether this may have correlated with their household’s usage of recreation facilities or their vote in favor or against the November 2014 referendum.

The data shows that of the 208 respondents where interviewers were able to discern their genders, 54.3% were females and 45.7% were males. This compares favorably with 2010 Census estimates where 51.2% were females and 48.8% were males, well within the margin of 3.5%.

In Question 11, respondents were asked to provide their ages. The following table shows the average age of those who provided that information.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Average Age</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Respondents</td>
<td>58.03</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Census data estimated that the median age of residents of the Village of Glen Ellyn was 37 years old. But Census data takes into consideration all residents within the village. This study only takes into consideration residents of voting age of 18 years and over.
Since no one under 18 years of age was interviewed in this study, it is reasonable to say that the average age of respondents in this study is nearly equivalent to 55 years of age \((37 + 18)\), the sum of the median age and the minimum voting age, very close to the 58.03 years of age from the census data.

Creating a variable from Question 11 that identified what percentage of responding households had children was a relatively easy task. Considering the percentages of households that had children, the following chart makes that comparison.

### Children in the Household

- **Children**, 33.8%
- **No Children**, 66.2%

The chart shows that 33.8% of responding households contained children, very close to Census estimates that 36.7% of households in the Village of Glen Ellyn contained children under the age of 18. Households with senior citizens aged 65 and older was somewhat different by comparison.

### Have Seniors in the Household

- **Seniors**, 40.0%
- **No Seniors**, 60.0%
Forty percent of responding households contained senior citizens compared to 21.8% by Census estimates, well outside the margin of error which requires an explanation of the difference. The difference can be explained by the fact that the database of registered voters is different from that of the general population.

Overall, political pollsters find that seniors are registered and vote in higher percentages than non-seniors, which also tends to raise the average age of the electorate. As this applies to the Glen Ellyn Park District, the age of the electorate is an important consideration when a referendum is required to finance capital projects.

Older voters need to see the importance of the project if it is expected that they would support it. For that reason, for some questions, this study will compare households with senior responses to those of household without seniors. Likewise, households with and without children will be compared as will male and female responses.
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Support or Opposition to the Referendum

Question 2 asked whether those interviewed in this study voted in favor of the Glen Ellyn Park District’s $13.5 million referendum to add an indoor aquatic center to the Ackerman Sports and Fitness Center.

Voted Yes or No

There was only one person out of 211 that didn’t divulge how he or she had voted. Of the 210 that did, 60% voted no and 40% voted yes, nearly identical to the actual 60.1% who voted against it and 39.1% who voted in favor, suggesting that the sample is very representative of the voting public.

Demographically, whether voters were men or women mattered little. 39% of men voted yes as did 41% of women, well within the margin of error.
Having a senior in the household made a difference as did having children in the household. Of households with seniors, 32% said they voted yes compared to 44% of households without seniors.

**Voting by Age**

- No Seniors:
  - No: 56.0%
  - Yes: 44.0%
- Seniors:
  - No: 68.0%
  - Yes: 32.0%

Having children in the household also made a difference. Forty-four percent of households with children said they voted for the referendum compared to 36% of households without children.

**Voting with Children**

- No Children:
  - No: 64.0%
  - Yes: 36.0%
- Children:
  - No: 56.0%
  - Yes: 44.0%

The implication that demographics make a difference suggests that certain demographic groups can be identified for information. However, with this knowledge in hand, the Park District should also seek to educate the entire community as to the benefits of the proposed referendum with useful and accurate information.
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Support for the Park District

The first question asked respondents to rate the Glen Ellyn Park District in terms of it being excellent, good, average, fair, or poor. The question was asked to see if the perception of how voters feel about the Park District made a difference in support for or against the referendum.

The data shows that 84% of those responding rated the Park District as excellent or good. Only 5% rated it as fair or poor, suggesting that the Park District is highly regarded by the electorate and very likely by the public in general.

Overall, PRG can dismiss the notion that the image of the Glen Ellyn Park District was a significant factor for the loss of the referendum. With such high approval ratings, it is unlikely that the image of the Park District is the reason voters didn’t support the November 2014 referendum.
Opposition Reasoning

Question 3 provided respondents with 16 reasons that they might have opposed the referendum to build an indoor aquatic center at the Ackerman Sports and Fitness Center. Respondents were provided the opportunity to say that they strongly agreed with the reason, that they agreed, or that the reason provided did not factor into their decision. The following tables show how voters responded to each question individually.

**Didn't Agree with the Plan**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Percentage</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Strongly Agree</td>
<td>6.3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Agree</td>
<td>3.9%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Did not Factor</td>
<td>89.8%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

In response to the choice that they didn’t agree with the facility plan for the indoor aquatic center, 84 respondents did not answer that question, presumably because they voted in favor of the referendum.

Of those who voted against it, 89.8% said that the plan did not factor into their vote, and 10.2% said they either agreed or strongly agreed that the plan was the reason they voted against the referendum. The findings suggest that not agreeing with the plan for the new indoor aquatic center was not a very important reason to vote against it.

**Too Much Money**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Percentage</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Strongly Agree</td>
<td>64.1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Agree</td>
<td>14.1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Did not Factor</td>
<td>21.9%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Considering the choice that the indoor aquatic center project would cost too much money, 21.9% of those who voted against the referendum said that this reason did not factor into their decisions, but 78.2% said that the cost was a factor. The data suggests the cost was a significant reason to vote against the initiative.
The payback of the bonds being too long as a reason to vote against the referendum was not an important factor to 71.4% of those voting against it but was a factor to 28.6%. This could be interpreted to mean that the payback being too long was marginally important.

That the project didn’t contain the amenities that voters wanted was only a factor to 10.1% of respondents. Nearly 90% of those voting against the referendum said it was not a factor.
Those voting against the referendum were somewhat split about whether there was a need for the project. About 31.5% of those voting against it said it was not a factor and 68.4% said it was, suggesting that the need for the indoor aquatic center was not solidly established in the minds of those voting against it.

That it was not the right time for the project was less of a factor to those voting against the referendum. Sixty-eight percent said it was not a factor with about 32% responding that they agreed or strongly agreed that it was a factor in their vote against the referendum.
That someone else told them to oppose the referendum was almost universally not the reason people voted against it, where 96.7% said it did not factor into their decisions, suggesting that voters were not guided by the opinions of others.

The idea that no one would use the indoor aquatic center was not a particularly compelling reason to vote against the referendum either, although 33.9% thought it was. Similarly, that the new facility would have been a drain on the Park District’s resources was a factor to 39.2% of those voting against it.
One of the choices was that those voting against the referendum were generally opposed to tax increases of any kind. Respondents were fairly evenly split in that response, with 49.6% saying it did not factor into their decisions and 50.4% saying it did.

In the way of additional analysis, with only 7.1% and 22.7% of all respondents, including those who voted for the referendum, agreeing and strongly agreeing that they were always opposed to tax increases, that left 70.2% of the electorate that would be open to tax increases.
One of the choices in Question 3 was that voters voted against the referendum because they didn’t trust the Glen Ellyn Park District. Based on the responses to the Question 1, where respondents were asked how they rated the Glen Ellyn Park District, it was a little surprising that 32.3% of those voting against it said they didn’t trust the Park District. On the other hand, of all voters, not just those voting against the referendum, only 19.4% of all voters said that they felt that way.

A choice in Question was that the Park District shouldn’t compete with private enterprises. That choice was a factor to 26.8% of those voting against the referendum but not a factor to 73.2%.

That there were too many unknowns about how the project would cover its operating and maintenance costs once it was built was a factor to 63.5% of those voting against the project.
Those voting against the project were evenly split on whether the indoor aquatic facility would benefit the entire community. Nearly half said it was and half said it wasn’t a factor.
The last choice provided in Question 3 was whether those voting against the referendum felt that the referendum itself should have included other projects. With 86.9% of those who voted against it saying that not including other projects was a significant factor, this choice was one of the least relevant.

Question 3 also provided respondents with an open-ended opportunity to provide their own reasons for voting against the referendum. The list of their un-edited responses is contained in the Appendix of this study. Only six people provided their own answers and most of these responses were similar to the choices they were provided in the question.

To summarize the findings from Question 3, the most important reasons that those voting against the referendum were that the need for the indoor aquatic facility was not clearly established with them, the benefits were not always apparent, and the unknowns about how operating and maintenance costs would be provided were not clarified.

Far less important to those voting against the project were that other projects should have been included, that the Park District shouldn’t compete with privately owned facilities, that no one would use the indoor aquatic facility, or that they didn’t trust the Glen Ellyn Park District.
Education about the Project

Question 4 asked all voters, regardless of if they voted for or against the referendum, how they learned about the project or educated them about the referendum. Respondents were provided the choices of saying received information from the Glen Ellyn Park District website, from local newspapers, from Glen Ellyn Aquatic Initiative material, from neighbors or friends, from park district education sessions, or that they really didn’t know about it.

How Did You Learn/ Educate Yourself

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Source</th>
<th>Percentage</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Didn’t know much about it</td>
<td>1.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Education sessions</td>
<td>4.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Group opposing</td>
<td>4.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Glen Ellyn P.D. website</td>
<td>34.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Initiative material</td>
<td>43.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Neighbor/ friend</td>
<td>48.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Local newspapers</td>
<td>81.0%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The data shows that 81% of those responding said they received their information from local newspapers, by far the highest percentage of any choices. Forty-eight percent said they received their information from neighbors or friends, presumably by word of mouth, 43% said from initiative material, and 34% said from the Glen Ellyn Park District website. Only 1% said they didn’t know much about it, with education sessions at 4%.

The findings suggest that newspaper coverage is critical to disseminating information to the public. How the public responded to that information is compared in the next table, which compares how those who voted for and against the referendum (Question 2) received their information.
Whether the medium of information affected voters positively or negatively is not clear, because there is not necessarily causality in respondents’ answers. However, there is correlation.

Starting with the smallest percentages first, those who didn’t know much about the referendum all voted against it as did those who were part of a group opposing the referendum, but the percentages were small.

Neighborhood friends correlated more positively than negatively, as did initiative material and education sessions. Newspaper publicity tended to correlate with voters negatively, as did the Glen Ellyn Park District website, with differences within the margin of error in most cases. But the findings suggest that media does make a difference.
Question 5 asked voters if they felt like they understood how the Glen Ellyn Park District was going to pay for the pool. The data shows that 71% of voters said they did understand how the Park District was going to pay for the pool.

The correlation with voting for or against the referendum is important. The following table shows that 78% of those who understood how the Park District was going to pay for the aquatic facility voted for it compared to 67% of those who didn’t understand.

The findings are outside the margin of error and suggest that understanding how the park district was going to pay for the pool did make a difference.
Hypothetical Questions

Question 6 asked what respondents' response would be to the statement that the pool referendum would not have resulted in a tax increase.

Most voters, 51%, disagreed that the pool referendum would not have resulted in a tax increase. Twenty-seven percent agreed and 22% were not sure.

The comparison shows that higher percentages of voters supported the referendum with their votes if they agreed with the statement that the pool referendum would not have resulted in a tax increase or were not sure. There a big difference in the percentages of people who voted for the referendum if they believed the pool referendum would in fact result in a tax increase.
Question 6a was tailored for respondents who were not sure. It asked, if they know the Park District was simply extending an existing tax levy and not increasing taxes, how would they have voted for the referendum?

Of the 60 voters who responded in Question 6 that they were not sure if the referendum would have resulted in a tax increase, 50% would have favored the referendum and 50% would have opposed it. This suggests that if it were clearer that the referendum would not have raised taxes to those who were not sure, half of them would have voted for it.
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Awareness of Issues

Question 7 asked all voters whether they were aware that the Glen Ellyn Park District has one of the lowest Park District tax levies in DuPage County, that the GEPD has a balanced budget, that Lake Ellyn Park improvements are scheduled for the Spring of 2015, that the GEPD was recently awarded over $500,000 in grant funding, or that the GEPD broadcasts all of its board meetings live.

Low Tax Levies

- Aware, 14.4%
- Not Aware, 85.6%

Balanced Budget

- Aware, 34.8%
- Not Aware, 65.2%
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The charts show various levels of awareness about the issues presented in Question 7, ranging from a low of 14.4% to a high of 54.8%. Analysis of these findings is in order so that the data can become more meaningful.

For instance, when only 14.4% of voters are aware that the Glen Ellyn Park District has one of the lowest tax levies in DuPage County, there might be the suspicion that this could have contributed to the loss of the November 2014 referendum. If awareness that taxes are low is a factor, there might be a difference in the levels of awareness between those who voted for the referendum and those who voted against it.

The data shows that there is a difference of awareness between those who voted for and against the referendum. Of those who voted for the referendum, 17% were aware that the Glen Ellyn Park District had one of the lowest Park District tax levies in DuPage County. Of those who voted against it, only 11% were aware of that fact.

Since overall awareness of the low Park District tax levy is low, it may be important to focus on educating the public about that situation in order to help people understand that the Glen Ellyn Park District has been prudent in allocating their financial resources.

Helping the public understand that the Park District has secured $500,000 in grants might be another area of education, since only 22.7% of voters seem to be aware of that fact. That the Park District has a balanced budget is a message that has not been totally understood either. Referenda are financial decisions made by the public. The Glen Ellyn seems to be making good ones, perhaps lost on voters at this time.
Capital Projects

Question 8 asked respondents the level at which they support a future referendum for a list of capital projects that included maintaining current parks & facilities, upgrading existing parks, land acquisition, connecting current trails and creating new ones, making athletic field improvements, or any other project of which they could think.
The open-ended responses are in the Appendix, and are not very informative. But the data in the graph shows there is support for all of choices in Question 8 except land acquisition. As is usually the case in studies like this, the greatest support is for maintaining and improving existing facilities. There is also support for connecting existing and creating new trails, but less support for acquiring more land for parks and natural areas.

In terms of priorities, Question 9 asked which of the projects listed were the most important to respondents’ households.

The table shows that fewer respondents answered the question for each subsequent choice. In terms of totals, the graph shows frequencies for each choice and the totals. Percentages are not meaningful so are not shown.
Future Referenda

Question 10 asked voters what amount they would support for a future referendum. Three referenda amounts were provided: $3 million, $5 million and $7 million. Respondents were permitted to select only one of the choices.

Interestingly, the highest percentage of voters said they would support a $7 million referendum, the second highest a $3 million referendum and the lowest a $5 million referendum. The other remaining 53% of respondents didn’t select any of the amounts, presumably because weren’t in favor of any of them.

Recalling that the margin of error on this small sample of 211 voters has a plus or minus margin of error of 3.5%, the findings that 47% of the voters in favor of a referendum of $7 million or less is still not a majority.

On the other hand, as the other data from this poll suggests, with more education of the electorate about the already low tax rate of the Glen Ellyn Park District and with the information that the new bond issue would replace an existing one without raising the overall rate, those percentages could change.
Comments

Question 12 asked voters to make any comments that they thought would be helpful. PRG has been careful to present those comments in their un-edited form so as not to change their meaning. The open-ended comments are contained in the Appendix of this report.

Many of the comments were expressing support or their lack of support for the referendum, but few provided very definitive reasons why. Some voters said the project was needed while others said that it would be too expensive or that they didn’t understand how the Park District would pay for it.

PRG's interpretation of the open-ended comments is that very few were adamant or angry. The consensus was overall support for the Park District.
Appendix
Q2. Did you vote in favor of the Glen Ellyn Park District's $13.5 million referendum?
Glen Ellyn Park District

Q3. Not need for a new pool in Glen Ellyn as there are plenty of other indoor pools nearby.

Legend

- Strongly Agree
- Agree
- Did not Factor

Roads - Interstate
Roads - State Routes

Roads

- 0-10%
- 11-20%
- 21-30%
- 31-40%
- 41-50%
- 51-60%
- 61-70%
- 71-80%
- 81-90%
- 91-100%
Q3. Too many unknowns about how the project will cover operating and maintenance costs once built.
Glen Ellyn Park District

Q5. Do you feel like you understood how the Park District was going to pay for the pool?
### Glen Ellyn Park District

**Q9. Which of the projects are most important to your household?**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Region</th>
<th>Maintain Current Facilities</th>
<th>Upgrade Existing Parks</th>
<th>Land Acquisition</th>
<th>Connect Existing Trails</th>
<th>Athletic Field Improvements</th>
<th>Other</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Northeast</strong></td>
<td>54.05%</td>
<td>22.52%</td>
<td>4.5%</td>
<td>8.11%</td>
<td>10.81%</td>
<td>0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Northwest</strong></td>
<td>29.68%</td>
<td>19.35%</td>
<td>7.74%</td>
<td>16.77%</td>
<td>18.06%</td>
<td>8.39%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>South</strong></td>
<td>40.79%</td>
<td>25%</td>
<td>5.26%</td>
<td>11.84%</td>
<td>11.84%</td>
<td>5.26%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Legend:
- Maintaining Current Facilities
- Upgrading Existing Parks
- Land acquisition
- Connecting Existing Trails & Create New Ones
- Athletic Field Improvements
- Other
- Roads - Interstate
- Roads - State Routes
- Roads

**Northeast**

- Maintain Current Facilities: 54.05%
- Upgrade Existing Parks: 22.52%
- Land Acquisition: 4.5%
- Connect Existing Trails: 8.11%
- Athletic Field Improvements: 10.81%
- Other: 0%

**Northwest**

- Maintain Current Facilities: 29.68%
- Upgrade Existing Parks: 19.35%
- Land Acquisition: 7.74%
- Connect Existing Trails: 16.77%
- Athletic Field Improvements: 18.06%
- Other: 8.39%

**South**

- Maintain Current Facilities: 40.79%
- Upgrade Existing Parks: 25%
- Land Acquisition: 5.26%
- Connect Existing Trails: 11.84%
- Athletic Field Improvements: 11.84%
- Other: 5.26%
Glen Ellyn Park District Telephone Poll Script

Good evening. My name is (first only) and I'm calling on behalf of the Glen Ellyn Park District. We are not selling anything or asking for donations. We are doing an exit poll to identify community opinions regarding the referendum that was on the ballot last month. We have 12 questions to ask and this should take approximately 5 minutes.

(When the person is on the line) Will you take just a few minutes with us tonight to discuss the Park District’s recent referendum for an indoor pool?

____ Yes                      ____ No

If no, apologize for bothering them and terminate the poll. If yes, proceed.

INTERVIEWER SHOULD NOTE READING WHETHER THE PERSON IS:

1. A MAN         2. A WOMAN

Before we begin let me assure you that all of your responses are confidential. This is important data that will aid the Park District with future planning and programming.

1. Overall, how would you rate the Glen Ellyn Park District?

___ Excellent _ __Good   ____Average          ____Fair          ___ Poor

2. Did you vote in favor of the Glen Ellyn Park District’s $13.5 million referendum to add an indoor aquatic center to the Ackerman Sports and Fitness Center?

___ Yes (If selected, skip to Question #4)       ___ No (If selected, go to Question #3)

3. How strongly do you agree with the following reasons why you opposed the referendum to build an indoor aquatic center at the Ackerman Sports and Fitness Center? (3 = Strongly agree; 2 = Agree; 1 = Did not factor into my decision)

_____ I didn’t agree with the facility plan for the indoor aquatic center that includes issues with parking and loss of green space at Ackerman
_____ The total amount for the project was too much money
_____ A ten year bond payback schedule is too long
_____ It didn’t contain the amenities I wanted
_____ No need for a new pool in Glen Ellyn as there are plenty of other indoor pools nearby
_____ It’s not the right time for it
_____ Someone else told me to oppose it
No one in our household would use an indoor aquatic center

It would have been a drain on the Park District’s resources

I oppose tax increases of any kind

I don’t have trust and confidence in the Park District

The Park District should not be competing with private enterprises for indoor aquatics

Too many unknowns about how the project will cover operating and maintenance costs once built

The indoor aquatic facility is not a benefit for the entire community

The referendum should have included other projects

Other

4. How did you learn/educate yourself about the referendum question?

Glen Ellyn Park District website

Local newspapers

Glen Ellyn Aquatic Initiative material

Neighbor/friend

Group opposing the referendum

Park District education session(s)

Didn’t really know much about it

5. Do you feel like you understood how the Park District was going to pay for the pool?

Yes

No

6. What is your response to the statement that the pool referendum would not have resulted in a tax increase?

Agree

Disagree

Not Sure (If selected, ask Question 6a)

6a: If you knew the Park District was simply extending an existing tax levy and NOT increasing taxes, how would you have voted for the pool referendum?

In Favor

Opposed
7. How aware are you of the following? (2 = Aware; 1 = Not Aware)

- The Glen Ellyn Park District has one of the lowest Park District tax levies in DuPage County
- The Park District has a balanced budget
- Lake Ellyn Park improvements are scheduled to begin in spring 2015
- The Park District was recently awarded over $500,000 in grant funding
- The Park District broadcasts all of its board meetings live

8. At what level would you support a future referendum for any of these capital projects for the Park District? (3 = Strong Support; 2 = Support; 1 = No support)

- a. Maintaining Current Park District Facilities & Parks
- b. Upgrading Existing Neighborhood & Community Parks
- c. Land acquisition
- d. Connecting Existing Trails & Creating New Ones
- e. Athletic field improvements
- f. Other
- g. None (If selected, ask Question #11)

9. Which of the projects listed above are most important to your household?

1st:____  2nd:____  3rd:____

10. What amount would you support for a future referendum for any of these projects?

- $3 million
- $5 million
- $7 million
- Other

11. Beginning with yourself, what are the ages of those living in your household?

- ___  ___  ___  ___  ___  ___  ___

12. Please make any comments that you think would be helpful.

___________________________________________________________________________

Thank you for your time. Have a good evening.
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Question 3- Other reasons

- Water is extremely expensive. Water bills are extremely high
- Money could be better spent in other areas
- No more tax cost
- Other things felt needed priority
- Renewing almost expired
- Voted against project

Question 8- Other projects

- Activities & programs for seniors
- Bring pool issue back to referendum
- Landscaping around Sunset Park & park
- maintaining natural areas
- No confidence in Village PD to project of that magnitude
- platform & tennis
- Would like to see pool come up to referendum again
- Would like to see pool to referendum again
- More small parks for children
- Another pool referendum
- Another pool referendum
- Board needs to listen to the people
- Depends on specifics
- Doesn’t know
- Doesn’t know about athletic field improvements
- Doesn’t know without specific information
- Don’t spend taxes on these things
- Downtown needs help spend time on that
- Future indoor pool referendum
- Improve projects they have going
- Indoor pool
- Indoor pool at Ackerman
- Lake Ellyn improvements
- Look at other community amenities, towns
- Modernized playgrounds
- New athletic fields
- Village links is very poorly
- Where are the grants from
Q12- Comments

- Thinks PD is not completely forthright about stating its need for the facility
- Would not disclose age
- 13.5 million dollars seems like it’s too large
- Additional community info would be useful
- Against tax increases of any kind. Feels building an indoor aquatic center would ultimately result in a tax increase
- Although resident voted the indoor pool
- Are too aggressive & spent too much spent
- Athletic fields should not be built on or near retention
- Because residents strongly disapprove of Lake Ellyn’s future park improvement that they lack confidence
- Because the resident lives south of Roosevelt feels that many GEPD projects don’t benefit this south area of GE
- Better planning
- Big issue for resident is that there be no tax increase for anything by PD
- Chose not to answer any more questions
- Community made it very clear that they did not want the pool
- Could have done a much better job in convincing people to vote for it
- Could make a lot more money at Village Links Could be managed a lot better
- District figure out its not a bottomless pit. No taxes
- Doesn’t feel the PD should be spending any money on this type of project
- Doesn’t think a project of this is needed at this point in time
- Don’t try to compete with the YMCA
- Encourage additional programs for refugees and immigrants to make community a better place
- Essentially $500 per $500,000 (they are spending already)
- Everything with PD does not have to be the biggest & the best
- Feels GE PD doesn't need to build an indoor facility (pool) as there are many indoor pools in GE
- Feels the GE PD would benefit by collaborating with surrounding suburbs such as Wheaton
- Feels the pool would greatly benefit the community and would generate revenue for the community down the road
- GE PD needs to conduct better residents
- Hard to get direct contact with those who run the park district to make themselves heard
- Have grandchildren. Voted for it on their behalf
- How are you getting word out about all things
- I don’t trust them
- If there is new land
- Invest in projects that support community as a whole
- Keep public better informed on PD issues, projects, activities
- Land taking away from soccer fields for parking if it had passed
- Live across from a park inordinate amount of waste electricity - water fuel
- Look into south side of GE Construct Outdoor pool
- Maintain, nothing new
- Maintaining what we have
- More info on PD subjects important & vital
- More senior programs in park district
• Most PD are over budget. A project of this type would cost a lot more money.
• Needs more definitive info before deciding & voting on any future projects.
• No need for a PD indoor pool in Glen Ellyn.
• Not necessary - spending of money.
• On fence-for the vote No more taxes.
• Original project at Ackerman was a fiasco years ago. Projected costs went way over budget.
• Parking at Glen Ellyn park - make parking easier for seniors.
• PD could better spend money in other areas than a pool.
• PD is a great resource.
• Please listen to the residents voices.
• Pool appreciate the need for pool. Lot of spending for a few.
• Poor planning with pool issue. Resident feels pool sharing have been proposed.
• Problem - money going out taxes are out the door.
• Provide additional & stronger unbiased info to community.
• Pushing this pool issue down everyone's throat.
• Regarding the pool - Other pools got funding ahead.
• Renewing almost expired bonds was upsetting to resident.
• Resident Ackerman would be better designed for athletic pursuits.
• Resident does not believe the pool construction would not resulting in a tax increase.
• Resident feels GE PD and GE village need to `look at ways to decrease property taxes for residents.
• Resident feels indoor pool should have been built & included in Ackerman Fitness Center plans years ago.
• Resident feels there is a gross fiscal problem with the GE PD.
• Resident is against the GE PD spending money on a survey of this type.
• Resident states GEPD spends more money than the Village of GE.
• Resistant to any PD projects.
• Resident unaware of most statements.
• Respect the vote the Village voters put forward.
• Should have built indoor pool when they built Ackerman in first place.
• Sorry pool referendum did not pass.
• Spend money in areas of importance.
• The whole concept of selling a referendum that will not increases hides the fact that without referendum taxes would decrease.
• There should not be any tax increase to be incurred by GE residents at all.
• They do a pretty good job- would like to see more activities for seniors.
• Thinks an indoor pool would be great enhancement.
• Thinks pool is really important for community.
• Thinks the GEPD could spend the money on more important PD related projects.
• Thinks the PD needed to conduct more research on pool issue.
• Thinks the people of GE should be more aware the park district does have a balanced budget.
• Thought pool would have been good.
• Try again for the pool.
• Aquatic center.
• Understand pool would be funded with bonds.
• Useful project for community at large.
• Very few Sr. programs with the park district.
• Wants to know GEPD’s long range planning. Wants to know PD vision.
• Watch carefully how money is appropriated and spent.
• We voted for the pool because it would be good for the community
• What do we get for the enormous taxes
• When Ackerman was built they should have gone all out from the beginning
• Will not comment on age Not giving that info
• Wish pool referendum would have passed. Good for community
• Wishes people understood pool issue better
• Won’t comment on ages
• Wonderful job keep it up
• Would not like to say age
• Would like to see an indoor pool & aquatic center built in GE
• Would like to see an indoor pool in GE
• Would like to see better publicity for community on project information in the form of public educational sessions before electing
• Would like to see better publicity on PD project proposals
• Would like to see both sides of the pool issue presented
• Would like to see more senior PD day trips and PD sponsored weekly vacation trips for seniors
• Would like to see pool come up for another referendum
• Would like to see the PD educate the public & inform the public of upcoming possible projects far in advance
• Would need more information before supporting anything
• Would not divulge ages of adults
• Would strongly support pool if it came back to referendum