# 2004 REDEVELOPMENT SURVEY

Prepared For:

Public Communications & Marketing
City of Clearwater

Prepared By:

Bordner Research, Inc.
4709 Brayton Terrace North
Palm Harbor, Fl. 34685
727-797-6552

June 2004

BORDNER research, inc.

# TABLE OF CONTENTS


| | Page |
|---|---|
| BACKGROUND AND METHOD | 1 |
| FINDINGS | 1 |
| General Attitudes Toward Downtown Redevelopment | 1 |
| Charter Amendment #2 Vote | 3 |
| Specific Improvements Support | 4 |
| Factors in Redevelopment Voting Decisions | 5 |
| Redevelopment Information Sources | 6 |
| OVERALL CONCLUSION | 8 |
| APPENDIX: SELECTED VERBATIMS | 10 |
| APPENDIX: DATA TABLES | 21 |

# BACKGROUND AND METHOD

Recognizing that citizen input is important and affords the best opportunity to reach strategic objectives, the City of Clearwater commissioned Bordner Research to conduct a study of residents having the following primary objectives:

- To determine citizen attitudes toward redevelopment of downtown and the downtown waterfront, in general;
- To determine the bases of citizen attitudes toward the narrowly defeated March 9 Charter amendment #2 question which addressed changes to the downtown waterfront;
- To determine factors that are important to citizens when making voting decisions on redevelopment issues.

To meet these objectives, Bordner Research surveyed via telephone 400 randomly selected regular voters of Clearwater. A regular voter was defined as a citizen who has proven civic involvement by voting in at least three of the last five municipal elections. Data collection took place May 12 - May 28. Sampling error was plus or minus 5.0 percent at 95% confidence.

Complete data tables with subgroup breakouts by gender, age, major political party and Charter Amendment #2 vote (where appropriate) are presented in the Appendix. Tables with an asterisk (*) beside the table number indicate questions that permitted multiple answers and consequently column percentages may not total 100 percent. Also included in the Appendix are selected verbatims on key questions which provide more in-depth flavor to the objective survey results reported herein.

# FINDINGS

## General Attitudes Toward Downtown Redevelopment

- Approximately four in five regular voters believe all redevelopment plans should be put to public vote (83%), redevelopment of Clearwater's downtown is important (80%) and something needs to be done to attract more people and business downtown (79%). With respect to the latter two issues, those who voted for Charter amendment #2 were more likely to agree than those who voted against it. Those who voted against Charter amendment #2 were more likely to agree that all redevelopment plans should be put to public vote. (See Summary Table 1 on the next page.)

- Good majorities of regular voters agreed that Coachman Park is an ideal place for concerts and festivals (71%), redevelopment of downtown will benefit the whole community (65%) and enhancements to and/or expansion of Coachman Park will benefit the downtown area (63%). Those who voted for Charter amendment #2

were more likely than those who did not to agree with all of these issues. Only four in ten of those who voted against Charter amendment #2 agreed with the latter two issues while a slight majority agreed with the first issue.

- Less that one-half of regular voters indicated trust in local government to carry out redevelopment plans in an efficient and cost effective manner (46%) and to make redevelopment plans that are in the best interests of the community (43%). Those who voted against Charter amendment #2 were most likely to express mistrust of local government.

**SUMMARY TABLE 1***
**DOWNTOWN REDEVELOPMENT ATTITUDES (%)**

| | Agree | Disagree | No Opinion |
|---|---|---|---|
| Redevelopment of Clearwater's downtown area is important | 80 | 20 | 0 |
| Something needs to be done to attract more people and business downtown | 79 | 20 | 1 |
| Coachman Park is an ideal place for concerts and festivals | 71 | 28 | 1 |
| Enhancements to and/or expansion of Coachman Park will benefit the downtown area | 63 | 35 | 2 |
| I believe all redevelopment plans should be put to public vote | 83 | 16 | 1 |
| Redevelopment of downtown will benefit the whole community | 65 | 34 | 1 |
| I trust local government to make redevelopment plans that are in the best interests of the community | 43 | 56 | 1 |
| I trust local government to carry out redevelopment efforts in an efficient and cost effective manner | 46 | 53 | 1 |

- For more detail see Tables 4-11 in the Appendix.

- Despite the fact that eighty percent (80%) of regular voters believe redevelopment of Clearwater's downtown area is important, only six in ten (60%) expressed overall support for the city's efforts to redevelop the downtown area. Almost one-fourth (24%) indicated they do not support such efforts overall and sixteen percent (16%) did not take a stand on the issue. Those who voted for Charter amendment #2 were significantly more likely than those who voted against it to support downtown redevelopment efforts overall, 88% to 36% respectively.

- Major reasons offered by those supporting downtown redevelopment overall were

great need/downtown dying (42%), need to attract people downtown (29%), area blighted/needs a face lift (27%), economic/tax base improvement (20%), need for more things to do downtown (18%) and need to attract businesses downtown (16%). (For a complete list see Table 2 in the Appendix.)

- Major reasons mentioned by those not supporting downtown redevelopment overall were fear overdevelopment (25%), not benefit whole community (23%), downtown is irrelevant (23%), waste of money (23%), never go downtown (20%), lack confidence in city's ability to do correctly (18%), area already too congested (18%) and other areas of the city need attention first (16%). (For a complete list see Table 3 in the Appendix.)

**Charter Amendment #2 Vote**

- Of the regular voters surveyed, 39% said they voted for Charter amendment #2, 44% voted against it, 10% declined to indicate how they voted and 7% stated they did not vote. Those voters 75 years of age or older were less likely than those of other ages to indicate they voted for the amendment.

- When those who voted for the amendment were asked their reasons, the following responses were given.

| | % | | % |
|---|---|---|---|
| Improvements needed | 38 | Provide needed parking | 10 |
| Good for city | 28 | Attract business to area | 9 |
| Attract people to area | 22 | Beautification plans | 8 |
| Like the place (general) | 20 | Park expansion | 7 |
| Help the city economy | 19 | Marina | 7 |
| Benefit the whole community | 14 | Provide things to do | 7 |

- Those who voted against the amendment also offered a myriad of reasons for their decision.

| | % | | % |
|---|---|---|---|
| Not benefit all citizens | 18 | Concerts should be in stadium | 8 |
| Dislike marina | 18 | View obstruction | 7 |
| Too many unanswered questions | 16 | Dislike garage on waterfront | 6 |
| Like waterfront as is | 15 | Plans too grandiose | 6 |
| Plan increase traffic congestion | 11 | Fear overdevelopment | 5 |
| Lack confidence can do right | 11 | Against community wishes | 5 |
| Need spend money elsewhere | 11 | Language unclear | 3 |
| Too many parts to amendment | 11 | Lack of citizen input | 3 |
| Waste of money/cost | 11 | No commercialization limits | 2 |
| Downtown is irrelevant | 8 | No fountains in drought | 2 |

- Only 10 of those who voted on Charter amendment #2 in the March 9 election said that since the election they have received information that would have led them to vote differently. Five indicated they would switch to a yes vote and five stated they would switch to a no vote.

- Of the 30 citizens surveyed who did not vote in the March 9 election, 11 (37%) said they support Charter amendment #2, 5 (17%) oppose it and 14 (46%) expressed no opinion. Among those supporting the amendment major reasons offered were good for the city and improvements are needed. The major reason offered by those opposing the amendment was waste of money. (See Tables 23 & 24 in the Appendix for complete lists.)

- Seven in ten (70%) of the regular voters surveyed stated they received enough information about the proposed improvements to the downtown waterfront and Coachman Park prior to the election to make an informed decision. Those who voted against the amendment were more likely than those who voted for it to indicate they did not receive enough information prior to the election.

- Among those who felt they needed more information prior to the election, major information needs mentioned were more plan detail (38%), more advance notice/publicity (21%), cost information (17%), financing/funding source (13%), more understandable language (13%) and information on the benefits of the plan (10%). (See Table 26 in the Appendix for a complete list.)

**Specific Improvements Support**

- When regular voters were questioned about the proposed city-owned improvements they would support if they were brought to voters in separate referendums, six in ten (61%) said they support general improvements/ beautification (such as interactive fountains, children's play area and a waterside promenade).

**SUMMARY TABLE 2***
**IMPROVEMENTS SUPPORT (%)**

| | Yes | No | Unsure |
|---|---|---|---|
| General improvements/beautification | 61 | 29 | 10 |
| Expanding Coachman Park | 52 | 31 | 17 |
| Multi-level parking garage | 51 | 33 | 16 |
| "Marina" | 44 | 41 | 15 |
| Relocation of bandshell | 43 | 34 | 23 |

* For more detail see Tables 34-39 in Appendix

- A slight majority supported expanding Coachman Park green space by replacing or relocating existing Harborview Center parking currently on the waterfront (52%) and construction of a multi-level parking facility adjacent to the Memorial Causeway Bridge to replace Harborview Center parking (51%).

- Less than one-half (44%) indicated support for boat slips, docks and a dock master's office on the waterfront adjacent to the new bridge, with the provision that other uses like fuel docks, boat ramps and commercial uses are prohibited.

- Also less than a majority (43%) indicated support for relocation of the bandshell nearer to Drew Street below the library.

- Those who voted for Charter amendment #2 were more likely to support each element of the proposed city-owned improvements to the downtown waterfront than those who voted against the amendment.

- Among those who voted against the amendment some support was indicated for each of the various elements of the proposed improvements.

| | % |
|---|---|
| General improvements/beautification | 40 |
| Expanding Coachman Park | 33 |
| Multi-level parking garage | 30 |
| Relocation of bandshell | 21 |
| "Marina" | 14 |

- In general, those 75 years of age or older were the least likely to indicate support for each element of the plan and the most likely not to express an opinion.

- When treated as separate referendums, only one-fourth (25%) of regular voters did not support at least one of the improvement elements about which they were queried. Of these 101 cases, 59% did not support any improvement item, 19% did not express an opinion on any item and the remainder (22%) either did not support at least one item or were unsure of their support on at least one item.

- Overall, one in five regular voters (22%) expressed support for all five proposed improvement elements.

**Factors in Redevelopment Voting Decisions**

- Regular voters were queried about the importance of various factors in making decisions on redevelopment issues. With the exception of two items at least nine in ten said each factor was important. (See Summary Table 3 on the next page.)

**SUMMARY TABLE 3***
**DECISION FACTORS (%)**

| | Very Important | Somewhat Important | Total Important |
|---|---|---|---|
| Specific funding information | 74 | 23 | 97 |
| Specific info on what plan includes and does not include | 66 | 29 | 95 |
| Specific detailed plans | 69 | 25 | 94 |
| Specific info on benefits of improvements | 56 | 35 | 91 |
| Info on how downtown improvements fit in with city's overall vision & mission | 53 | 38 | 91 |
| Separate referendum questions for each element | 47 | 26 | 73 |
| Thorough public participation in design process | 34 | 36 | 70 |

*For more detail see Table 27-33 in the Appendix

- Of extreme importance to at least two-thirds of regular voters are specific funding information (74%), specific detailed plans (69%) and specific information on not only what the plan includes but also on what it doesn't include (66%).

- Seven in ten regular voters said separate referendum questions on each element of the improvement plan (73%) and thorough public participation in the design process (70%) were important.

- Those who voted against Charter amendment #2 were more likely than those who voted for it to think separate referendum questions on each element of the plan is important in their decision making, 82% to 63% respectively.

**Redevelopment Information Sources**

- In making voting decisions with respect to redevelopment issues, over eighty percent (82%) of regular voters said information provided by the City was important to them, with slightly over one-third (35%) saying it was very important. Interestingly, compared to other information sources the City was mentioned as the most important source of information on redevelopment issues by both those voting for and against Charter amendment #2. (See Summary Table 4 on the next page.)

**SUMMARY TABLE 4***
**INFORMATION SOURCES (%)**

| | Very Important | Somewhat Important | Total Important |
|---|---|---|---|
| City (C-View, mailers, E-mail, website and ads) | 35 | 47 | 82 |
| Local TV and radio stations | 27 | 49 | 76 |
| *St. Petersburg Times* | 31 | 43 | 74 |
| Political action groups (e.g., Chamber, Save the Bayfront) | 19 | 43 | 62 |
| Friends/colleagues | 16 | 42 | 58 |
| Small local newspapers (e.g., *Gazette*, *Citizen*) | 17 | 35 | 52 |

* For more detail see Tables 12-17 in the Appendix

- Approximately three-fourths of those surveyed said local TV/radio stations and the *St. Petersburg Times* were important sources of information when making voting decisions on redevelopment issues. Democrats were more likely than Republicans to state these sources were important to them.

- Approximately three in five regular voters said political action groups (62%) and friends/colleagues (58%) were important information sources. A slight majority (52%) said small local newspapers were important.

# OVERALL CONCLUSIONS

Clearwater regular voters do hold positive overall attitudes regarding the redevelopment of downtown. Eight in ten believe redevelopment of downtown is important and that something needs to be done to attract more people and businesses downtown. Good majorities believe the expansion of Coachman Park would benefit the downtown area and that the redevelopment of downtown would benefit the whole community. A majority support the city's efforts to redevelop downtown. Many perceive the need for, and importance to the economy of, redeveloping and revitalizing the downtown area.

Despite these positive attitudes the March 9 Charter amendment #2 which addressed city-owned improvements to Coachman Park and the downtown waterfront failed. The data suggest many possible reasons for this failure including, but not limited to, the following:

1. negative perceptions/misconceptions
   - proposed improvements not benefit whole community but rather only a few
   - downtown is irrelevant (has nothing to offer that can't get elsewhere, nobody goes there, owned by Scientologists)
   - waste of money that needed elsewhere
   - passage would give City carte blanche to do what it wants without proper checks and balances

2. fear of overdevelopment and commercialization of the waterfront
   - increase traffic congestion
   - ruin peaceful atmosphere
   - obstruction of view
   - plan too grandiose for city of this size

3. single referendum with multiple improvement elements (all or nothing package)

4. lack of specific information on plan details, costs, time frames, financing/funding, size of garage, etc.

5. lack of sufficient advance notice/publicity prior to the election to permit careful consideration of the impact and pro/cons of the proposed improvements

6. referendum wording too legal and unclear

7. lack of full understanding of the <u>benefits</u> of each proposed improvement as well as the plan as a whole (e.g., what is benefit of bandshell relocation, how does expansion of Coachman Park benefit downtown business and the City economy, etc.)

8. skepticism about the City's ability to carry out improvement efforts in a cost effective and efficient manner given problems with Harborview Center, the roundabout and the new causeway bridge.

In order to increase the likelihood of passage of any future improvement referendums, the City needs to develop and implement proactive strategies to counteract the reasons for failure of Charter amendment #2.

Recognize that in the consumer mind the most important source of information about redevelopment improvement plans is the City itself. Develop a communication strategy which delineates the impact of any proposed improvements and stresses the economic, cultural and quality of life benefits to the whole community.

Take care in your communications to avoid the use of words that imply more than the improvements you are proposing. For example, avoid the word "amphitheater" which implies permanent seating; avoid the word "marina" which implies fuel stations and boat ramps.

The data further suggest that changes in the voting process itself may enhance the likelihood of referendum approval. Publicize redevelopment/improvement plans well in advance of the election in which they are put to vote. Confine referendum questions to single improvements or improvements that are contingent upon each other rather than treating all proposed improvements as "one package".

# APPENDIX: SELECTED VERBATIMS

Q. 1B. Reasons support City's efforts to redevelop downtown

Without redevelopment downtown will continue its decline . . . and that is bad for the city and its people.

We need redevelopment of downtown badly or we're gonna die out down there. Redevelopment would be good for Clearwater.

I've lived here for 30 years. In that time nothing has been done to improve downtown. It just keeps dying. I've looked at other cities and what they have done. I feel we could do something too. The waterfront plan seemed like a real good start. I was sorry it was voted down.

Downtown is deplorable . . . it's like a poverty zone for the homeless. Redevelopment is important for the economy. It would attract people to come in . . . not drive them away like now.

It breaks my heart to see downtown go downward. Once the new bridge is open I feel downtown Clearwater will be forgotten and die . . . unless something is done to draw people there.

Downtown is in desperate need of clean up and beautification.

Downtown is a blighted area that desperately needs improvements.

It is already a blighted area. Downtown will die if something isn't done soon.

Downtown is old and needs a "face lift". It needs more business to boost the economy and more opportunities for public enjoyment.

Downtown is an eye sore as it is right now. It needs to be more attractive for people to go spend time there.

The economic health of downtown goes a long way to determine the overall health of the city and therefore the quality of life of the citizens.

The tax base is being eroded by the Scientologists. This needs to stop. New businesses and activities need to occur in downtown.

Redevelopment is important to attract people downtown. It would be good for the economy and the people (both visitors and residents).

The empty businesses in downtown are depressing. There is very little to do there except the library. There is no parking. Something needs to be done before it's too late.

The City needs to totally change downtown if they want people to go back as shoppers

and visitors.

Downtown is the heart of the City. Something has to be done to attract more people to the area and the only way to do it is by totally redeveloping it.

Our downtown area is in desperate need. It doesn't offer anything.

There is nothing downtown to attract residents except the new library and Coachman Park events. Something needs to be done.

The area needs to be a place people want to go . . . more nice restaurants, shopping and unique events. The way it is now no one has any reason to go there.

Something needs to be done to attract more visitors and residents downtown. The way it is now with closed storefronts, traffic jams, etc., . . . who would voluntarily go there?

Downtown needs some spark. We need a vibrant downtown.

Downtown needs to come alive with businesses, restaurants and culture. It needs to be redeveloped for all citizens to enjoy. I trust my elected officials to take us forward.

This is a wonderful community and the more attractive it is the more it benefits the area and the quality of life.

Clearwater needs to revamp downtown and bring it into the 21st century . . . it is long overdue.

Q. 1 B. Reasons do not support City's efforts to redevelop downtown

The downtown is never going to come back so why waste the money.

It's a waste of money. The Scientologists have bought up everything and they own downtown. It's just too late for downtown.

It's not worth it. There is no parking downtown and who wants to see a bunch of Scientologists marching around.

With the bridge bypassing downtown, redevelopment is a moot point.

Downtown is not important because nobody wants to go there. Other areas around town need more attention.

Redevelopment of downtown is useless . . . it is almost entirely Scientology owned.

Nobody goes downtown anymore . . . so why bother.

Redevelopment of downtown would only benefit the Scientologists and maybe tourists. It wouldn't do a thing for the residents. Besides, no one working for the city knows what they're doing anyway.

I think downtown is just a campus for Scientology. Redevelopment wouldn't benefit anybody but them . . . and they don't pay taxes.

It would be spending money on a project that does not help citizens.

I never go there. They only people it would benefit are the Scientologists.

I don't see how redeveloping downtown helps Clearwater as a whole.

Downtown is a Scientology community. It is no longer the hub of Clearwater. They should put the limited resources in other areas.

They always screw up and waste money every time they try to do something. They don't need anything done downtown because people have all kinds of alternative places to shop and have fun.

The City can't do it right. They've done a horrible job in the past . . . that is, the roundabout, the bridge falling down, confusing signs on the causeway. I just think it would end up costing money with nothing good coming out of it.

I'm against downtown redevelopment because the City of Clearwater has wasted so much money in the past on things that don't work, like the roundabout and the new bridge.

I like how it is. I don't want it overdeveloped.

I don't want Clearwater to grow so much that it becomes another Miami.

I'd like downtown to stay serene and lovely. I don't want it overdeveloped.

I want them to leave the waterfront alone. I'm afraid they are going to ruin it. They've messed up everything else.

I don't want the bluff or green space touched because it is beautiful as it is.

Downtown is already too crowded and congested. Why try to draw more people there?

Q. 4(1) Reasons vote for Charter amendment #2.

Downtown needs a drastic overhaul. Any change would be an improvement.

Downtown needs to be redeveloped with more attractions and things to do. I was very disappointed when the plan did not pass the vote.

We have a desperate need downtown. I felt this plan could work. We need to act on something before it is too late.

In order to compete for tourist business, the downtown waterfront has to be made more attractive.

We desperately need something to improve downtown . . . to lift it up from the ghost town it is becoming. The Save the Bayfront people just don't get it. They are not offering any remedies . . . only a continuation of what is.

Downtown needs to be modernized and renewed in order to attract businesses and people. This was a really good start.

A strong and attractive downtown helps the City's economy and improves the quality of life of all citizens.

Changing the appearance of downtown and the waterfront will attract more visitors and residents to the area. This in turn will bring in more businesses which will lead to a greater tax base for Clearwater. This is a needed and good thing.

The plan has key elements that would turn downtown around.

We have a wonderful asset in the waterfront. The plan would bring the waterfront up to its potential.

The City's economy cannot survive without a strong and thriving downtown. I think this plan would help that.

Downtown's economic health affects the City as a whole.

It only enhances the area. I can see why they put all that into one package. It will take all of it to entice some growth there.

The plan would put activities in the waterfront area for the entire city to enjoy.

The changes would be nice for everyone in Clearwater. I want to support the City moving forward.

I think it is a good idea to stay current and up with the times.

I thought it was a really good idea overall. I really didn't understand all the legal words so I called a City official and was happy with what I heard.

I listened to all the City officials and feel it is a wonderful plan. The City did make modifications to the plan after listening to citizens. Too bad the ballot question was not specific enough . . . if it was, it might have passed.

The plan would improve the community and be an asset to all its citizens.

It will take something unique to bring downtown back. I thought that might do it.

I voted for it because I'm for beauty, culture, art and uplifting things for the people. I don't want it commercialized too much.

I thought the plans were wonderful. I really like the expansion of the park and the marina.

A parking facility will help alleviate the lack of parking downtown. Not only would the whole waterfront be more beautiful that it already is, but people would be attracted back to the area.

Although I'm not sure about the benefits of the amphitheater and parking garage, I thought the marina was an especially good idea.

Q. 4(2) Reason vote against Charter amendment #2

This would not benefit the entire community . . . only tourists and a select few residents.

I'm against making improvements that only the Scientologists are going to benefit from.

It's a boondoggle. It won't benefit anyone except the Scientologists. It'll just cost the tax payers for nothing.

Traffic congestion would be even worse than it is now with this plan. Also, the biggest beneficiaries would be the Scientologists and I'm not for that.

It is not necessary to spend money on downtown. Downtowns are a thing of the past. People want to get out of town today.

Once the bridge is complete downtown will be by-passed. No one will go there. It's a waste of money. We have voted it down twice now. They need to give it up.

Put your concerts somewhere else . . . we are not Ft. Lauderdale. The government only wants to develop the few spare miles of the beach and Coachman area. Clearwater is much bigger than that. Money needs to be spent elsewhere.

The City has already spent too much time and money trying to revive downtown. The amendment represents throwing good money after bad. It is useless to continue trying.

Redevelopment of downtown without a built-in solution to traffic congestion would be worse than the current situation.

The proposal did not adequately address the traffic congestion that redevelopment would attract.

Increased traffic problems, benefit only Scientologists and more people at events will not result in more business patrons . . . these are the main reasons I did not vote for it.

I'm not in favor of bigger entertainment that would cause huge crowds. It's better to keep it small. The Bluff is not a good place to erect a parking garage.

I like it the way it is and I don't want to see a bunch of cement going up all over.

Building a larger park and marina will not help the small downtown business owners or attract residents to the downtown shops. We don't need more fountains when we can't even water our lawns.

It's not needed really. The new stadium should be used for concerts and functions because I wouldn't like to see functions and crowds getting too big. They should keep the waterfront the way it is now with some beautification to the park.

I didn't have enough specific information to justify voting for it.

I didn't have enough info and I don't fully trust the ability of our City planners. I just wasn't sure this was in the best interest of all citizens.

The plan was unclear and gave the city too much leeway to spend taxpayer money. Make the plans more specific and you have my vote.

The new stadium should have the concerts. Not enough information was put out soon enough. We don't need another marina. I'm not sure the improvements would benefit the tax paying public.

Save the Bayfront info raised questions in my mind and the City did not have time to counter the objections until after the election. I voted no but now I would vote yes.

It was not clear enough to know exactly what they were proposing because all the legal language was hard to understand.

There were too many loopholes in the proposal. The plans were set without completely revealing information. A large parking area shouldn't be right on the waterfront . . . that's a misuse of the land. I don't see how expanding the park would help downtown businesses. How many times does this have to be voted down before they realize it is not what the public wants.

I have no confidence in them doing anything correctly due to their past track record.

They have already spent a lot of money foolishly and I thought this would give them carte blanche to squander more money on things that don't work . . . like the roundabout and the new shabby bridge that has to be redone.

I have no confidence in the City's ability to carry out such major projects effectively.

The proposed project was too large for a city of our size.

It was an all or nothing deal. It should be cut up into separate pieces because there were parts I agreed with. The City did not do a good job of explaining everything.

There were too many parts to it. It should have been broken up into separate referendums.

There were just too many things together. I approve of some things but not the entire proposal. I had to vote no.

It was presented as a total package . . . some of it was good and some of it was not. I'm against the marina because the city spent 7 million extra dollars to raise the height of the bridge to accommodate only 3 sailboats in the area. They spend money too loosely.

All the proposals were lumped together. Some things I agreed with but I had to vote no because I did not agree with all of it. Besides, I think it gave open season to City officials to spend our tax dollars.

The marina would detract from the beauty of the area and block the view of the water.

We don't need a marina down there. It would be unsightly on our beautiful waterfront.

Boat slips would commercialize it. I don't want to lose the peacefulness of the area.

We have a marina on Clearwater Beach already. The proposed marina would be a public eyesore.

I do not want the marina. I don't want Clearwater to be like Miami.

The marina and all the diesel fuel will ruin our waterfront. The park needs to be left open and free of charge to all our citizens.

Waterfront property should not be used for parking.

I don't want an "amphitheater". It would bring too many people and overrun our park with seating. It's pretty like it is.

I can't believe they are planning waterfalls and fountains when we have droughts and water restrictions. There were too many parts to it and things I disagreed with.

Q. 7 Information helpful in making informed voting decisions.

The plans need to be laid out more specifically.

Specifics, specifics, specifics. Details, details, details . . . for example, how many boat slips, how many levels on garage, what is reason for moving bandshell, how big will the park be, etc.?

I want exact details on the proposal . . . like how big the marina would be, how many seats at the amphitheater, etc.

More details should be sent to people's homes rather than just things in the paper and on TV. There should be information about the cost and how long it will take to finish.

More information and better details should have been made available a lot sooner . . . at least sooner than one week before the vote.

More details on each improvement including the benefits of each. Also would like to know costs and time frames.

Specifics on financing and long term maintenance costs. If it would eat up the City budget, it's not worth it.

Do concerts make the City money? Will a larger park and blocking the view help?

The City could have been more specific on how this would effect Clearwater residents. I would like more on the proposed benefits of the improvements to the community.

How this will help the entire community.

More information on the features and benefits of the improvements/changes.

People need to see why you are trying to do things there . . . what the benefits to the city and the people are.

Information was not put out timely enough to give people time to make a good decision. The first time I heard about it was one week prior to the elections.

The information was not presented to voters early enough to make a better choice. It seemed like the City was trying to push the vote through and that scared me.

I got two flyers . . . one said to vote yes and the other said vote no. There wasn't enough advance information and it wasn't explained well enough. Therefore, I didn't vote on the amendment.

The City needs to do a better job in putting out information about the improvements for people to compare with that put out by its opponents.

I had no info at all. It was a "bolt out of the blue" for me.

There was more anti-literature than anything else. I would have liked more information from the City's perspective. I didn't feel I had both sides of the issue.

If I relied solely on the literature sent in the mail I would not have had enough information to vote wisely. I did get some information from watching C-View, but still didn't feel like I was fully informed. I just went with my gut.

I would like more balanced information. It seemed like it came up out of the blue. There should be more time for discussions and the opportunity to get answers to questions you may have.

It needs to be in more understandable terms so the average person can understand just what they are proposing.

The legal jargon was not easy to understand and I had no time to research the issue myself. I would like the pros and cons on one paper instead of all the legal mumbo jumbo that no one can decipher. When in doubt, vote no . . . and that's what I did.

What they were proposing was hazy to me . . . I needed more info but there wasn't time to get it. I voted no.

The info was too fuzzy. I didn't understand what the limits on spending were, if any.

Other comments

Our mayor has said he would like another vote in June of next year. That's wrong . . . way too many of our residents have gone North for the summer by then. Major referendums should be done at a time when most residents are around to vote.

I'm really concerned that the "nay-sayers" are determined to keep anything constructive from happening in this community.

Please don't turn Coachman Park into "Coney Island".

Harborview Center has not lived up to expectations. It should be torn down and something else added there.

Get rid of that damn roundabout.

I would like to see an "extreme sport" park under the bridge.

Why don't the Scientologists donate a building for the parking garage?

# APPENDIX: DATA TABLES

* Tables with an asterisk beside the table number indicate questions that permitted multiple answers. Consequently, column percentages may not total 100%.