

Plan Priorities Scoring

Results from Plan Priorities Workshop

May 3, 2007, Sandpoint Community Hall, 6:00 – 8:00 pm



Sandpoint
Comprehensive
Plan

Introduction: The following pages provide group scoring and individual comments developed by participants in the May 3, 2007 Plan Priorities Workshop. At that meeting, attendees were split into small groups of between two and four persons, and given a worksheet listing draft vision “snippets” for consideration, review and scoring. All concepts presented for scoring was developed from collated responses submitted by participants at the April 5 Vision Workshop. Six topic areas were represented on the worksheets as reflected below, and all groups were asked to rate each snippet, by group consensus, from “strongly agree” to “strongly disagree”, or “don’t care.” Space was provided below each vision snippet for respondents to explain their ratings. Results were tabulated from all groups during a break, and were included in a slide-show and discussion session with the exception of items 5.2-5.4.* Responses from all topics are included in this summary, though results from 5.2-5.4 have been marked with an asterisk (*) due to a printing error in the original exercise form.

Participant Instructions: All worksheets featured first-page instructions as copied here:

“In order to focus Sandpoint’s energies where they’ll be most effective, it’s important to understand community priorities. The following exercise lists many of the thoughts and ideas participants submitted in the April 5 workshop, ordered by major topic. With other members of your group, please discuss, and as a group, rate each of the concepts from “strongly agree” to “strongly disagree” to “don’t care.” We’ll tally the results during this evening’s break and allow everyone to see how everyone rated things. Have comments or qualifiers related to an issue? Feel free to jot them down in the margins or below each item. We won’t be able to include them in tonight’s presentation, but we’ll transcribe and review everything included on each worksheet. Thanks!”

** During the process, it was discovered that text related to the subject headings 5.2, 5.3, and 5.4 were unrelated to those headings; due to this, facilitators went table to table, explaining the subject headers and asking participants to disregard the printed text following these three headings. This document includes the corrected vision text, as verbally described to participants.*

Topic 1: Parks & Open Space

		1 - Strongly Agree	2 - Agree	3 - Don't Know	4 - Disagree	5 - Strongly Disagree	6 - Don't Care	Total Answers
		Percent						
1.1	Trail Town: Sandpoint cares deeply about maintaining and improving its trail network for the sake of local transportation, connectivity between existing City and County parks, and between urban and non-urban areas. All types are envisioned: biking, walking, Nordic ski trails, and more and better shoreline trails.	84.0	12.0	4.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	25
	1.1 Comments:							
	<i>"Concern about heavy traffic – big truck."</i>							
	<i>"Add horse trails."</i>							
	<i>"High priority (shoreline trails)."</i>							
	<i>"(Nordic ski trails) with warming huts with espresso."</i>							
	<i>"Partnerships with county and neighboring towns create 'network.'"</i>							
	<i>"Agree but not priority."</i>							
	<i>"Already existing trails. Connectivity is the challenge. Cost is unknown (securing right of ways)."</i>							
	<i>"Connectivity."</i>							
1.2	Active Waterways: Sandpoint needs to improve access and scenic/recreational activities along waterways, including Sand Creek and Lake Pend Oreille. In addition to shoreline trails, things like public boat slips should be considered for Sand Creek, and land should be acquired for more continuous shoreline greenbelts.	68.0	28.0	4.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	25
	1.2 Comments:							
	<i>"Milfoil is a major concern."</i>							
	<i>"No more boat slips in Sand Creek."</i>							
	<i>"Greenbelts more than boat slips."</i>							
	<i>"No public boat slips in Sand Creek."</i>							
	<i>"Public access important, don't develop everything."</i>							
	<i>"With consideration of water quality and private property."</i>							
	<i>"(improve) non-motorized (access)."</i>							
	<i>"Seasons needs to have waterfront open to public – a walkway at least."</i>							
	<i>"Need to break this down."</i>							
	<i>"Protect in its natural state."</i>							

Topic 1: Parks & Open Space

		1 - Strongly Agree	2 - Agree	3 - Don't Know	4 - Disagree	5 - Strongly Disagree	6 - Don't Care	Total Answers
		Percent						
1.3	<p>A Countywide Perspective: Sandpoint needs to work on collaborative City and County parks planning, to take better advantage of existing resources and to more effectively acquire and improve new facilities. Views and open spaces appreciated today need to be formally identified and protected.</p> <p>1.3 Comments: <i>"Needs to keep pace with growth."</i> <i>"Emphasis and cooperation with the county."</i> <i>"Maintain and improve existing facilities."</i> <i>"This planning process shouldn't just involve the city, but also the county."</i> <i>"County parks?"</i> <i>"Emphasis on natural areas."</i> <i>"Both inside the city and in the county."</i> <i>"Have collaboration between city and county!"</i></p>	92.0	8.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	25
1.4	<p>A City of Parks: Sandpoint is a recreational town, but there's more to Sandpoint's future than Lake Pend Oreille and the Schweitzer ski area. The community should begin planning today to become a city of parks, with a greater range of facilities scattered strategically among the town's neighborhoods. The goal? Have neighborhood or pocket parks within walking distance of each home.</p> <p>1.4 Comments: <i>"Stronger zoning laws for required green space in new developments."</i> <i>"Cost is a concern. Ratio of parks should be based on growth and in new areas."</i> <i>"Dog friendly too!"</i> <i>"Require open spaces to be included in developments."</i> <i>"A mix of passive and active parks."</i> <i>"Will LP property become a box store with acres of asphalt or a mixed neighborhood with green areas. Strongly prefer latter."</i> <i>"Provide incentives to developers who create pocket parks/not make minimum requirement. How to define walking distance?"</i> <i>"Want protected 'natural' parks, not necessarily a developed park."</i></p>	60.0	28.0	8.0	4.0	0.0	0.0	25

Topic 1: Parks & Open Space

		1 - Strongly Agree	2 - Agree	3 - Don't Know	4 - Disagree	5 - Strongly Disagree	6 - Don't Care	Total Answers
		Percent						
1.5	Diverse Offerings: Sandpoint envisions a future with much greater diversity in its parks offerings. Things to be considered include dog parks, municipal golf courses, ice-skating, an indoor sports complex, youth-oriented features such as a BMX track, and neighborhood gardens.	34.8	43.5	17.4	4.3	0.0	0.0	23
	1.5 Comments:							
	<i>"Need an ice rink – more winter facilities."</i>							
	<i>"International Frisbee golf course."</i>							
	<i>"Divided regarding indoor sports complex. Want affordable golf available. Make things affordable to locals. Make activities available (scholarships/discounts/sliding scale) to families with no disposable income."</i>							
	<i>"Strongly agree (with "dog parks"). For others: encourage private funding and development, not the city's role."</i>							
	<i>"Disc golf."</i>							
	<i>"Agree with some; not all. E.g. BMX. Sports complex has to pay for itself."</i>							
	<i>"We need more baseball and softball fields. Indoor complex with swimming pool and emphasis on youth activities."</i>							
	<i>"Perhaps a bit less exclusive as afar as context (i.e. golf course)."</i>							
	<i>"Strongly if golf courses would not take up so much land."</i>							
	<i>"Need to be studied."</i>							
	<i>"A number of these could be done privately or public."</i>							
	<i>"Specialized features not financially appropriate."</i>							
	<i>"In particular, youth-oriented and neighborhood gardens. No to crossed out items (municipal golf courses, BMX track)."</i>							
	<i>"Base planning on comprehensive demographic study – i.e. where are the kids and how to fund?"</i>							
	<i>"More consideration to low-cost, no cost recreational areas."</i>							
	<i>"Yes, but with creative funding that doesn't always tax residents."</i>							

Topic 2: Streets and Transportation

		1 - Strongly Agree	2 - Agree	3 - Don't Know	4 - Disagree	5 - Strongly Disagree	6 - Don't Care	Total Answers
		Percent						
2.1	<p>Flow and Go: Sandpoint needs to improve its traffic flow – but with an eye to the fact that “improved” means different things in different areas. For instance, traffic downtown needs to move at a pedestrian and business-friendly pace - not snarled, but not moving at highway speeds, either. Neighborhoods need improvements to keep speeds down without impeding local use, and the community needs to consider ways to direct through-town traffic away from its Main Street.</p> <p>2.1 Comments: <i>“Need a bypass.”</i> <i>“Include more four-way stops and lights, traffic circles, speed bumps.”</i> <i>“Need solutions!”</i> <i>“Traffic calmers with bump out.”</i> <i>“Get the through traffic out of First Avenue.”</i> <i>“Bypass.”</i> <i>“Very well stated.”</i> <i>“Need to find an alternative to the highway in the creek – consider tunnel under Superior, roundabouts, and other alternatives.”</i> <i>“It is a serious problem!”</i></p>	88.0	12.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	25
2.2	<p>Transportation Synergy: The City of Sandpoint needs to consider ways to make all means of transportation viable and safe, including bicycling, walking, and automobile transportation. Park and Rides should be considered, especially if they support walking or cycling into the city core. In Sandpoint, no one means of transportation should overwhelm the others.</p> <p>2.2 Comments: <i>“It’s okay if walkers and cyclists overwhelm the cars.”</i> <i>“Horse carriage, buses w/ bike racks, Disney type shuttle, outlying park and rides.”</i> <i>“Is this realistic?”</i> <i>“Identify where the city core is.”</i> <i>“We wish there was a category higher than ‘strongly agree!’”</i></p>	92.0	8.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	25

Topic 2: Streets and Transportation

		1 - Strongly Agree	2 - Agree	3 - Don't Know	4 - Disagree	5 - Strongly Disagree	6 - Don't Care	Total Answers
		Percent						
2.3	<p>A Walkable Town: Residents appreciate Sandpoint’s claim to be a walkable town, but think the City could do a lot more to make the claim credible. More and better sidewalks, lighting, street trees, awnings, benches, crosswalks, slower-paced traffic, and “ped-sheds” – areas that have neighborhood centers within a five-minute walk – are desired.</p> <p>2.3 Comments: <i>“Get Sandpoint on mountain time – that gives us an hour of daylight.”</i> <i>“Avoid light pollution. Have major concerns. List of pedestrian improvements concerns us. Don’t like requiring people to install sidewalks. What is this (neighborhood centers)?”</i> <i>“Get through traffic out of town.”</i> <i>“(Neighborhood centers) unrealistic.”</i> <i>“Yes, keep the city core alive.”</i> <i>“Close off some downtown streets to only pedestrians.”</i> <i>“More realistic density of neighborhood centers. What about 15 minutes?”</i> <i>“Emphasis on crosswalks and slower paced traffic. Do a better job of snow-removal for pedestrian access at all intersections.”</i> <i>“Kid and elder-friendly.”</i> <i>“How do you pay for it?”</i> <i>“Don’t understand (“ped-sheds”).”</i> <i>“Big cause is increased traffic and aggressive drivers. Using high-technology for enforcement – some type of public transport would alleviate core traffic.”</i> <i>“Use technology (flash speed checks) to enforce existing laws and speeds. Look at source of problem – light rail, transportation – better traffic flow.”</i> <i>“City council should formally resolve ‘walking town.’”</i></p>	88.0	8.0	4.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	25

Topic 2: Streets and Transportation

	1 - Strongly Agree	2 - Agree	3 - Don't Know	4 - Disagree	5 - Strongly Disagree	6 - Don't Care	Total Answers
	Percent						
<p>2.4 Planning Partnership: Residents don't agree on the proposed byway along Sand Creek, but do think the City and its priorities should be well-represented in ITD discussions. Balancing transportation needs may require channeling transportation according to use and intensity, but Sandpoint's identity, economy and vision need strong representation.</p> <p>2.4 Comments: <i>"Need to make sure vision is represented."</i> <i>"Get the byway built!"</i> <i>"ITD doesn't allow city parties a turn."</i> <i>"Bonner County needs a voice in this."</i> <i>"ITD, specifically Boise officials, should not define the character of this town."</i> <i>"Alternatives to the S.C. Byway need to be explored and considered."</i> <i>"This is an unclear 'feel good' statement."</i> <i>"Trust professionals – urban land institute."</i> <i>"Need much more and firmer with ITD."</i></p>	84.0	8.0	8.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	25
<p>2.5 Great Design: Sandpoint's entire street network should support the character of the community – including things like boulevard/median green-spaces, good lighting, pedestrian-oriented features, landscaping and great public art.</p> <p>2.5 Comments: <i>"Sounds like pie in the sky."</i> <i>"Financial concerns."</i> <i>"Diverse opinion on topic."</i> <i>"(Boulevard/median green-spaces) too expensive to build and maintain."</i> <i>"No (boulevard/median green-spaces); yes (good lighting); yes (pedestrian-oriented features); yes (landscaping); at what cost (great public art)?"</i> <i>"Just don't turn Sandpoint into Disneyland."</i> <i>"5th Street meridian wanted."</i> <i>"Medians help pedestrians cross streets."</i> <i>"Lack of public support and input resulted in a sterile public square not utilized as much as it could be. Design plans should include public input."</i></p>	40.0	40.0	4.0	16.0	0.0	0.0	25

Topic 2: Streets and Transportation

1 - Strongly Agree

2 - Agree

3 - Don't Know

4 - Disagree

5 - Strongly Disagree

6 - Don't Care

Total Answers

Percent

"(Good lighting) Careful – good urban low lighting."

"Narrowing streets a possibility sometimes."

"How to pay for it?"

"Real concern about snow removal. Art is subjective. Why not explore other themes for town 'style' – Western? 1950s motif? Timber heritage?"

"Great idea – need diversity and objectivity."

"Cost is a huge factor here."

"Needs further discussion on details."

Topic 3: Housing and Neighborhoods

		1 - Strongly Agree	2 - Agree	3 - Don't Know	4 - Disagree	5 - Strongly Disagree	6 - Don't Care	Total Answers
		Percent						
3.1	Affordable Sandpoint: Sandpoint residents are very concerned about rising housing costs, and support a more proactive role for the City in maintaining or developing affordable housing types within the community. Residents don't want the cost of living in Sandpoint to grow faster than wages earned working in Sandpoint.	82.6	13.0	0.0	4.3	0.0	0.0	23
	3.1 Comments:							
	<i>"Sandpoint needs more affordable senior housing."</i>							
	<i>"A lot more to it than this."</i>							
	<i>"Creative and attractive housing."</i>							
	<i>"Keep development rules easy – do not make it too expensive to develop property. Allow incentives to developers to build low income house."</i>							
	<i>"No role for city here."</i>							
	<i>"That is integrated into the community."</i>							
	<i>"Strike a balance between healthy housing and cost."</i>							
	<i>"Mixed neighborhoods, not housing projects."</i>							
	<i>"The other tragedy would be loss of close knit community. #1 risk factor for forcing 'Aspenization' – must be headed off at all costs. Look at models of towns that made good choices."</i>							
	<i>"Look at transportation and other models."</i>							
3.2	Housing Diversity: Residents envision Sandpoint's future including a wide variety of lot sizes, accommodating a mix of housing sizes. Beyond the capacity of such development to improve affordability, residents believe diverse lot sizing is more compatible with Sandpoint's small-town character, and helps foster a better sense of community.	60.9	26.1	4.3	4.3	4.3	0.0	23
	3.2 Comments:							
	<i>"With reservations on how it is implemented."</i>							
	<i>"Badly written: please identify zoning intents."</i>							
	<i>"Encourage small attractive homes."</i>							
	<i>"If the standards support 3.1."</i>							
	<i>"Lots of small houses can be as bad as lots of large houses."</i>							
	<i>"Lot sizes part of it – diverse building types is important."</i>							
	<i>"Mixed use density must be raised."</i>							

Topic 3: Housing and Neighborhoods

1 - Strongly Agree
 2 - Agree
 3 - Don't Know
 4 - Disagree
 5 - Strongly Disagree
 6 - Don't Care
 Total Answers

Percent

- "Need to work out nuts and bolts is important."*
- "House sizes need to be appropriate (but not too big for) lot sizes."*
- "Gated communities don't allow a diverse residential area. Housing should be compatible with the size of the lots."*
- "Lot sizes should be consistent within a subdivision, but varied throughout town."*

3.3	Mixed Use is Good: Sandpoint residents envision their downtown including more residential uses in the mix to better utilize available space and infrastructure. Outside of downtown, the plan should promote the creation of small-scale, walkable commercial centers offering things like hair care, groceries and coffee shops, dispersed throughout the City.	60.0	24.0	12.0	4.0	0.0	0.0	25
-----	---	------	------	------	-----	-----	-----	----

3.3 Comments:

- "Depends on implementation."*
- "Concept seems good but is not feasible to businesses, not yet."*
- "Be careful with businesses in a residential area. Don't block the views."*
- "Mixed use downtown is good! No strip malls, we already have Ponderay."*
- "We agree with the first sentence but don't think the town is large enough for the second, all around."*
- "Not economically feasible; clusters okay."*
- "Approved design."*
- "Seems difficult to accomplish due to viability and changing the character of the neighborhoods."*
- "Need commercial that promotes neighborhood sociability."*
- "With strictly compatible neighborhood businesses."*
- "Question volume to support."*
- "With design review to fit neighborhoods."*

Topic 3: Housing and Neighborhoods

		1 - Strongly Agree	2 - Agree	3 - Don't Know	4 - Disagree	5 - Strongly Disagree	6 - Don't Care	Total Answers
		Percent						
3.4	Beauty and Character: Sandpoint loves its natural setting, but also appreciates its built environment. The City needs to improve its building standards, possibly establishing a design review process in order to help ensure things built today are still useful and important in the future. Attention to detail can help Sandpoint retain its small-town character, and helps contribute to the long-term success of the city.	60.9	21.7	8.7	4.3	4.3	0.0	23
	3.4 Comments:							
	<i>"Concerned about bureaucracy involved."</i>							
	<i>"Divided."</i>							
	<i>"Concerned particularly about this (design review process). Housing deserves more attention."</i>							
	<i>"Land costs dictate a quality architecture by themselves. Don't saddle developers with 'design Nazis' who push the current fads."</i>							
	<i>"Limited application."</i>							
	<i>"Design standards should be scaleable to what exists."</i>							
	<i>"Develop a green building code."</i>							
	<i>"Developments such as the one of Pine Street, across from Alpine Vista, are an eyesore and not in keeping with the character of Sandpoint."</i>							
	<i>"Definitely need to establish a design review process so that new construction is compatible with Sandpoint's beauty and character."</i>							
	<i>"Sooner the better."</i>							
	<i>"Concerned that process be carefully designed."</i>							
	<i>"Analogous to CC&R's – somewhat governed by town theme design. Two separate concerns: structural soundness (objective) and design (subjective – some type of standard established). Examine outside professionals and town models."</i>							
	<i>"Building standards – trust outside professionals."</i>							

Topic 4: Jobs and the Regional Economy

		1 - Strongly Agree	2 - Agree	3 - Don't Know	4 - Disagree	5 - Strongly Disagree	6 - Don't Care	Total Answers
		Percent						
4.1	Grow Local, Support Local: Sandpoint should take a larger role in supporting locally-owned businesses, both new and existing. This would dovetail with having Sandpoint develop a more “place-based” economy, tapping local resources and opportunities to develop a strong, durable, well-paying job base.	56.0	20.0	20.0	4.0	0.0	0.0	25
	4.1 Comments:							
	<i>“How would it be implemented?”</i>							
	<i>“Concept is good, but the land is not there.”</i>							
	<i>“Too gray.”</i>							
	<i>“How does the city do this?”</i>							
	<i>“Micro-lending.”</i>							
	<i>“Year-round local craft and farmer’s markets. Need more access to high-speed internet for clean jobs!”</i>							
	<i>“Contributes to Sandpoint’s greenness.”</i>							
	<i>“BCEDC should focus on helping local businesses.”</i>							
	<i>“Any industry would have to be environmentally friendly.”</i>							
	<i>“With more discussion.”</i>							
4.2	Recreation = Success: The fact that Sandpoint has a strong recreational focus is seen as an economic asset, too. By actively developing, enhancing, and improving the community’s many recreational strengths, the City can benefit its residents today while helping to attract job providers that hire innovative, “creative class” workers who consider recreation as essential to their lives.	56.5	30.4	13.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	23
	4.2 Comments:							
	<i>“Add motherhood.”</i>							
	<i>“Equal access for all.”</i>							
	<i>“Weird wording. Needs to be written clearly.”</i>							
	<i>“Driven by needs of folks here now.”</i>							
	<i>“Sandpoint has already been doing this fairly well.”</i>							
	<i>“Attract other industries.”</i>							
	<i>“Can’t endorse promotion of Sandpoint to encourage second homes and high end gated communities.”</i>							
	<i>“Would love to break this down.”</i>							

Topic 4: Jobs and the Regional Economy

1 - Strongly Agree
2 - Agree
3 - Don't Know
4 - Disagree
5 - Strongly Disagree
6 - Don't Care
Total Answers

Percent

"Okay as long as economy is more diverse and not dependent on recreation, tourism, etc. Need better paying jobs."
"Study demographics of existing and incoming population."
"Question needs refinement."

4.3 A Regional Approach: Sandpoint should tailor its economic strategy to promote Sandpoint business "synergy" with regional economic players, dovetailing local talents with regional strengths and needs. **36.0 32.0 16.0 16.0 0.0 0.0 25**

4.3 Comments:

"Depends on implementation."
"Write it clearly."
"Chamber duty, not city issue."
"Region = Bonner County."
"BCEDC is doing this."
"Need more clarity, sounds too vague."
"The county needs to limit alcohol/or monitor accessibility."
"We don't want to subsidize fringes of town."
"Needs more discussion."
"We could like to be self contained. Be almost isolationist to prevent crime prevalent in other areas."
"Become the player – lead the way."
"Question needs refinement."

4.4 Better Education, Better Jobs: Residents worry about the rising costs of living in Sandpoint, and want the City to work on promoting and supporting local and regional educational opportunities, recognizing that a better educated workforce is a better paid workforce. **87.0 4.3 0.0 4.3 4.3 0.0 23**

4.4 Comments:

"We need a college campus."
"More technical and craftsman education: trades."
"Better education (does not equal) better wages in this area. The employers need to be educated to this!"
"Emphasis on broadly educated community rather than just job training."
"College is coming. We need to bring up the wages of those paid at the lower end."
"Need world class schools! Extremely high."

Topic 4: Jobs and the Regional Economy

1 - Strongly Agree

2 - Agree

3 - Don't Know

4 - Disagree

5 - Strongly Disagree

6 - Don't Care

Total Answers

Percent

"Highest priority."

"Also vocational training."

"Problem with too many levies."

Topic 5: Public Facilities and Services

		1 - Strongly Agree	2 - Agree	3 - Don't Know	4 - Disagree	5 - Strongly Disagree	6 - Don't Care	Total Answers
		Percent						
5.1	<p>A "Green" Community: Sandpoint should become much more environmentally sustainable. The City should consider implementing "green" building codes, improving recycling services, developing locally-produced energy, and encouraging innovative approaches to water quality and wastewater treatment. The idea of "green" should carry into green space, too: setting aside watershed greenbelts can bring aesthetic, wildlife and water quality benefits.</p> <p>5.1 Comments: <i>"Too much: three topics in one long sentence."</i> <i>"Agree but make affordable."</i> <i>"Should encourage, not mandate ('green' building codes). Like 'green,' but concerned about cost."</i> <i>"Need to be sure it makes good sense."</i> <i>"Very bad ('green' building codes). Not more rules and regulations. Developers are doing this already. The economic climate dictates this already."</i> <i>"What is this more important than? Priority?"</i> <i>"Recycling #3 through #7 plastics. Ban open burning! We need city council to approve mayor's signing of climate protection act to help implement 'green' activities."</i> <i>"Supporting ('green' building codes)."</i> <i>"Couldn't agree more!"</i> <i>"Balance with affordability – question needs narrower focus."</i> <i>"Balance in a plan with dollars and priority."</i> <i>"Not requirements but incentives and encouragement."</i></p>	75.0	16.7	4.2	0.0	4.2	0.0	24
5.2 *	<p>Grow as You Go: Sandpoint's full range of services is carefully monitored to ensure that they grow at the same pace as the community. Costs for new services including water, wastewater, parks and recreation facilities, healthcare services, solid waste disposal, libraries and transportation infrastructure are shared equitably, according to long and short-term benefit.</p>	91.7	8.3	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	24

Topic 5: Public Facilities and Services

		1 - Strongly Agree	2 - Agree	3 - Don't Know	4 - Disagree	5 - Strongly Disagree	6 - Don't Care	Total Answers
		Percent						
5.2 Comments: <i>"Tax on developers to pay for infrastructure."</i> <i>"Repeat vision."</i> <i>"Couldn't agree more!"</i>								
5.3 *	Education and Youth Activities: Sandpoint residents are strongly committed to improving educational opportunities in their town and region, including those that work to address local needs and enhance local economic opportunities. Sandpoint's future depends on the quality of its education, and the community supports a broad range of youth-oriented activities to compliment that education.	94.7	5.3	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	19
5.3 Comments: <i>"Available and affordable for all."</i> <i>"Don't overlight, etc."</i> <i>"Must improve crosswalk safety (European blinking crosswalks?)."</i> <i>"Fewer cars."</i> <i>"Skateboards too."</i>								
5.4 *	Safe, by Design: In concert with Sandpoint's walkable nature, the community encourages planning and growth patterns that improve the abilities and efficiencies of police and fire services. Compact growth in Sandpoint is recognized as benefiting fire response times, as well as supporting a more neighborhood-friendly, personal approach to police protection.	8.0	13.3	6.7	0.0	0.0	0.0	15
5.4 Comments: <i>"Too round about: Do we want the by-way or not? (Respondents made their own boxes and checked "strongly agree" with 3 points, "agree" with 1 point, and "strongly disagree" with 1 point)."</i> <i>"Squirrel crosswalks, circles."</i>								

Topic 6: Shopping and Commerce

	1 - Strongly Agree	2 - Agree	3 - Don't Know	4 - Disagree	5 - Strongly Disagree	6 - Don't Care	Total Answers
	Percent						
<p>6.1 A Beautiful Downtown: Residents want Sandpoint to improve the overall appearance of downtown, through renovation/restoration, greater occupation of available space, improved pedestrian facilities and streetscape, and better connections to Sandpoint's shoreline areas.</p> <p>6.1 Comments: <i>"Responsibility of businesses."</i> <i>"Give incentives to developers to do this – don't make more restrictive rules."</i> <i>"No tourist oriented Disneyland. (Occupation of available space) for locals."</i> <i>"Need a park instead of a highway along Sand Creek."</i> <i>"More downtown residential."</i></p>	81.8	13.6	4.5	0.0	0.0	0.0	22
<p>6.2 Local Needs, Local Services: Residents feel Sandpoint's planning ought to support the provision of goods and services residents need for day-to-day life – without such a focus, many believe, the community will become a place focused more on tourists and visitors than locals.</p> <p>6.2 Comments: <i>"Unclear about implementation."</i> <i>"Tourism comes for this reason."</i> <i>"Tourism is the 'life blood.' It should be the first priority. This statement is a good second."</i> <i>"Perhaps, but question what the city's role would be."</i> <i>"Make local ownership a priority. Keep out corporate chains that kill local business."</i> <i>"Keep it a real downtown."</i> <i>"Most residents don't shop in downtown – real estate office and tourist dominated – need plan for change and diversification."</i></p>	81.0	9.5	9.5	0.0	0.0	0.0	21
<p>6.3 Keep Downtown Real: Sandpoint need to do more strategic thinking about downtown in order to make it "real" – downtown should define itself in terms of limits and content, and consider how it could encourage or discourage business types to stay diverse (avoiding too many real-estate offices, for instance). Sandpoint's downtown ought to be "Local, non-corporate, and culturally-rich."</p>	73.1	11.5	7.7	3.8	3.8	0.0	26

Topic 6: Shopping and Commerce

		1 - Strongly Agree	2 - Agree	3 - Don't Know	4 - Disagree	5 - Strongly Disagree	6 - Don't Care	Total Answers
		Percent						
6.3 Comments:								
<i>"Parking is an issue. How would it be implemented?"</i>								
<i>"How do we control this (too many real estate offices)? City shouldn't."</i>								
<i>"Keep the Starbucks down."</i>								
<i>"Real estate offices not on ground floor. 1st floor = retail/food, etc..."</i>								
<i>"Move real estate out some."</i>								
<i>"Yes (avoiding too many real-estate offices)."</i>								
<i>"We need Ben Franklin, Radio Shack, Safeway ..."</i>								
<i>"Needs discussion. Market reality vs. controls etc..."</i>								
6.4	Ample Parking: Improved parking conditions are recognized as key to the community's success. The town is committed to applying creative, cost-effective methods to address public parking needs, including structural investments as needed and creating incentives for business collaboration. Whether downtown or elsewhere, lack of parking shouldn't hobble Sandpoint's future.	50.0	20.0	15.0	10.0	5.0	0.0	20
6.4 Comments:								
<i>"We like (incentives for business collaboration)."</i>								
<i>"Educate about perception."</i>								
<i>"Disagree (the town is committed to). Agree (lack of parking shouldn't hobble Sandpoint's future)."</i>								
<i>"No structures above ground. Parking should define development, not the other way around."</i>								
<i>"No parking garage either."</i>								
<i>"Outlying park and rides would decrease need for downtown parking."</i>								
<i>"Is there a parking problem or just perception."</i>								
<i>"But not the current government."</i>								
<i>"Need more specific information as to what the city can do."</i>								
<i>"Needs further philosophical discussion re:"</i>								
6.5	Future Features: Residents have long-range hopes for their City, and hope for new or expanded features such as a convention center, future mass transit, a new or improved commercial airport, and a year-round farmer's market.	25.0	20.0	20.0	0.0	30.0	5.0	20

Topic 6: Shopping and Commerce

1 - Strongly Agree
 2 - Agree
 3 - Don't Know
 4 - Disagree
 5 - Strongly Disagree
 6 - Don't Care
 Total Answers

Percent

6.5 Comments:

"Hotels."

"Year-round market."

"(Year-round farmers market) Yes!"

"No! (Convention center, future mass transit, a new or improved commercial airport) Yes! (A year-round farmer's market)."

"Utilize fairgrounds year-round. No large-scale assembly of people."

"This mix is unacceptable."

"Strongly disagree with all but mass transit, which is direly needed."

"(Future mass transit) need now."

"Listed things might be outside city."

"Mass transit but no big city mass transit. Convention center? Not huge but we do need meeting space. The year-round market suits Sandpoint."

"Sounds too much like a big city; Farmer's market is very good."

"Too diverse detail. Need to not throw together e.g. airports and farmer's market."