



Downtown Improvement Board
Special Parades Meeting Tuesday
September 29th, 2026, 9:00 A.M.
AGENDA

- I. Call to Order
 - a. Remarks from Chairman
- II. Recurring Agenda
 - a. Meeting was properly noticed.
 - b. *Approval of the proposed meeting agenda for September 29th, 2026
 - c. *Approval of the minutes from the regular meeting of the DIB September 15th, 2026
- III. New Business
 - a. Presentation of Findings from Pensacola Mardi Gras
 - b. *Parade Recommendation to send to City of Pensacola
- VIII. Public Comment
- IX. Adjournment

Next Regular Meeting – October 13th

(*) Items to be voted on



Downtown Improvement Board

Regular Monthly Meeting

Tuesday September 15th, 2026,

7:30 AGENDA

Attendance: Chris McKean, Chairman, Nathan Holler, William Merrill, Mike Kohler, Gregg Harding, Walker Wilson, Executive Director, Cailin Feagles, Director of Operations & Events

- I. Call to Order
 - a. The meeting is called to order at 7:32 AM
- II. Recurring Agenda
 - a. Mr. Walker Wilson confirmed the meeting was properly noticed.
 - b. The proposed meeting agenda for September 15th, 2026 is motioned by Nathan Holler, seconded by William Merrill, and unanimously approved.
 - c. The minutes of the regular meeting agenda held on August 10th, 2026 are motioned, seconded, and unanimously approved.
 - d. The August Financials were motioned, seconded, and unanimously approved.
- III. On-Going Business
 - a. PPD Report - Sergeant Ghigliotty
 - Sergeant Ghigliotty met with Walker to discuss schedule overtime shifts for weekends for the next fiscal year.
 - b. Spotless Report - Labarian Turner
 - Two new spotless employees have joined the team.
 - Walker discusses the potential of a Clean & Safe App.
 - c. Marketing Report - Caron Sjoberg
 - Some of the projects from last month included Summer Shop-a-palooza, Palafox Market Summer Pop-Up, First Friday Art Walk, Holiday Downtown All I Want Campaign, Harvest Sip and Shop, and the Palafox Market Halloween Market on October 31st.
 - d. Palafox Market - Cailin Feagles
 - Florida Downtowns visited the market last week.
 - An email went out to collect interest from vendors for Holiday Market/Holiday Haul.
- IV. Old Business
- V. New Business
 - a. Schedule Major Parades Meeting for September 28th, 29th, or 30
 - The meeting will be held on Tuesday, September 29th, 2026 at 9 AM
 - b. *First Friday Art Walk
 - There is a motion to continue to fund half of the trolley for the

remainder of the year, and one time print of the materials. Motioned, seconded, and unanimously approved.

- c. *Harvest Sip & Shop Review and Holiday Haul 11/04/26
 - Motion to approve up to \$2,500 for Holiday Haul 2026. Motion is seconded, and unanimously approved.
- d. * Schedule Overtime PPD Officers for FY 2026/2027
 - FY27 PPD overtime \$56,000 for all Friday/Saturday coverage and Thanksgiving Eve; Dec. 23–24; MLK weekend; Presidents’ Day weekend; Memorial Day weekend; March 13 additional shift; June 17; July 1; and Labor Day weekend. *Remaining Balance \$14,000 (28 shifts)*
 - Motioned, seconded, and unanimously approved.
- e. *Executive Director Annual Review – up to \$5,000
 - Motion to approve \$5,000. Motion is seconded and unanimously approved.
- f. *Executive Director Contract Extension
 - Motioned, seconded, and unanimously approved.

VIII. Public Comment

IX. Adjournment- Meeting is adjourned at 8:59 AM

Next Special Meeting – September 28th, 29th, or 30th

Next Regular Meeting – October 13th

(*) Items to be voted on

Downtown Pensacola Parade Route and Operations Survey Results

Downtown Improvement Board Survey report September 24 2026

The survey received 91 submissions from downtown stakeholders between September 9 and September 21, 2026. Most respondents preferred the traditional Garden and Palafox route for major parades. They also favored a strong on-site safety presence while asking for less disruptive closures, clearer access to workplaces and parking, and better advance communication.

Findings at a glance

75 of 91 respondents (82.4%) selected the traditional Palafox route; 8 (8.8%) selected Jefferson, and 8 selected another or undecided option. In the separate 1-to-5 route question, 77 chose the strongest Palafox preference, 9 leaned toward Jefferson, and 5 chose the midpoint.

The sample is concentrated on Palafox: 70 respondents (76.9%) identified a location directly on that street. Among them, 65 favored Palafox and 1 favored Jefferson. The 11 respondents located directly on Jefferson split 5 for each route, with 1 supporting either. Among the 54 who identified as a business or property owner, 38 chose Palafox and 8 Jefferson.

67 respondents (73.6%) described the overall effect of major downtown parades on their business or property as positive; 11 (12.1%) described it as negative. More respondents supported enhanced police presence and emergency access than additional street closures. A proposed pre-parade street party drew 55 supporters (60.4%), although the question did not offer a “somewhat oppose” option.

These are submissions, not one vote per establishment or a representative poll of all downtown businesses. The survey does not test float clearance, route engineering, traffic capacity, emergency access, or the views of parade krewes or the general public.

Who responded

Respondents could select multiple roles. Fifty-three selected business owner, 19 property owner, 23 business manager, 29 employee, and 13 resident; 54 selected business owner or property owner. Two responses included another role description. Role totals therefore exceed 91.

Location relative to parade route	Count	Share
Directly on Palafox	70	76.9%
Directly on Jefferson	11	12.1%
Directly on Garden	3	3.3%
Within approximately one block	6	6.6%
Elsewhere downtown	1	1.1%

The most common reported business type was restaurant or bar (44), followed by retail (16), professional or office (13), entertainment or attraction (4), hotel or hospitality (3), residential property (2), commercial property or landlord (1), nonprofit or institution (1), and seven other write-ins.

Route preference

Response	Count	Share
Garden and Palafox traditional route	75	82.4%
Garden and South Jefferson construction route	8	8.8%
Either route	3	3.3%
Different routes for different parades	2	2.2%
Another route or configuration	2	2.2%
Unsure or need more information	1	1.1%

The second route question used a 1-to-5 scale, with 1 labeled strongly prefer Palafox, 3 no preference, and 5 strongly prefer Jefferson. Responses were: 1, 77; 2, 0; 3, 5; 4, 1; and 5, 8. This question measures intensity separately from the more flexible first question.

Respondent group	Total	Palafox	Jefferson	Other
Directly on Palafox	70	65	1	4
Directly on Jefferson	11	5	5	1
All other locations	10	5	2	3
Business or property owners	54	38	8	8

Groups overlap: owner responses are also included in the street-location rows. “Other” includes either route, different routes, another configuration, or unsure. Because Jefferson frontage has 11 responses, its 5-to-5 division should not be generalized to all Jefferson businesses.

How respondents compared the routes

Every comparison row was answered by 91 respondents. Counts below are perceptions of the routes, not independent engineering or safety findings.

Measure	Palafox	Jefferson	Same	Unsure
Public safety	57	8	14	12
Emergency vehicle access	47	11	15	18
Pedestrian movement	66	10	8	7
Vehicle circulation around downtown	63	8	13	7
Customer access to downtown businesses	70	9	9	3
Employee access	64	10	13	4
Parking access	62	9	16	4

Measure	Palafox	Jefferson	Same	Unsure
Deliveries / vendor access	52	11	17	11
Crowd distribution	66	12	8	5
Business visibility and exposure	74	8	7	2
Economic benefit to downtown businesses	73	7	7	4
Overall spectator experience	74	11	5	1
Overall parade experience	72	10	6	3

The largest Palafox leads were in visibility and exposure (74 versus 8), spectator experience (74 versus 11), economic benefit (73 versus 7), and customer access (70 versus 9). The narrowest comparative Palafox lead was emergency vehicle access (47 versus 11, with 33 answering same or unsure).

Business impacts and operating practices

Overall effect of parades

Response	Count	Share
Very positive	54	59.3%
Somewhat positive	13	14.3%
Neither positive nor negative	10	11.0%
Somewhat negative	6	6.6%
Very negative	5	5.5%
Not applicable or unsure	3	3.3%

Fifty-three respondents reported some kind of balcony, rooftop, window, patio, or other viewing space. Of these, 32 described it primarily as space for customers or business guests; 5 as residential or tenant use; 4 as private or ticketed use; 2 as mixed commercial and residential; 2 as short-term or vacation-rental use; 4 said the space was not generally used for viewing; and 4 supplied other descriptions. Thirty-five said no, and 3 were unsure or not applicable.

Business operating hours

Response	Count	Share
Remain open during normal hours	44	48.4%
Open earlier or stay open later	23	25.3%
Decision varies by parade or route	13	14.3%
Special or limited parade hours	4	4.4%

Response	Count	Share
Close during the parade	2	2.2%
Open only for a private or ticketed event	1	1.1%
Not applicable	4	4.4%

On the multi-select question about impacts, parking (46), customer access (43), employee access (38), and closure timing (38) were the most frequently selected. Twenty-nine selected increased sales or business and 9 selected lost sales or business. Those are reported impacts, not measured revenue changes. Full counts appear below.

Reported advantages and disadvantages of Jefferson

Sixty-three selected “no significant advantages” for Jefferson. The most frequently selected advantages were added activity on Jefferson (18), crowd distribution (12), pedestrian movement (11), viewing (11), and less disruption to Palafox businesses (11).

Sixty-four selected reduced activity or exposure for Palafox businesses as a disadvantage. Other frequent choices were a less desirable atmosphere (43), parking issues (36), reduced economic benefit (36), customer access (33), and employee access (29). Fourteen selected no significant disadvantages. Five submissions selected both “no significant advantages” and an advantage; one selected both “no significant disadvantages” and a disadvantage. All checked choices are tabulated as submitted.

Security and access

Security measure	Support	Neutral	Oppose	Unsure
Expanded security perimeter around the parade route	51	24	14	2
Closing additional streets to vehicle traffic	23	26	37	5
Restricting vehicle access before and during parades	39	30	19	3
Removing / towing vehicles left within restricted areas	52	26	8	5
Maintaining dedicated access for police, fire, and emergency vehicles	74	12	2	3
Increased law-enforcement / security presence	77	9	4	1

The greatest support was for increased police or security presence (77 of 91) and dedicated emergency access (74). Additional street closures drew 23 supporters, 37 opponents, 26 neutral responses, and 5 unsure responses. An expanded security perimeter drew 51 supporters and 14 opponents. Restricting vehicle access drew 39 supporters and 19 opponents.

Whether respondents feel safer

Response	Count	Share
Significantly safer	21	23.1%

Response	Count	Share
Somewhat safer	36	39.6%
No meaningful difference	26	28.6%
Somewhat less safe	0	0.0%
Significantly less safe	1	1.1%
Unsure	7	7.7%

Safety and business access balance

Response	Count	Share
Yes very well	17	18.7%
Mostly yes	31	34.1%
Neutral	21	23.1%
Mostly no	13	14.3%
No	5	5.5%
Unsure	4	4.4%

Overall, 57 of 91 (62.6%) said additional security measures made them feel safer, while 26 reported no meaningful difference. Forty-eight answered yes or mostly yes when asked if safety and business access were appropriately balanced; 18 said no or mostly no, 21 were neutral, and 4 were unsure.

The 32 written security responses most often raised closure footprint and timing, garage and employee access, clearer maps and signage, and visible police on foot or in parking garages. Some asked that additional officers remain after parades end. Several supported stronger on-route policing while objecting to wider vehicle restrictions.

Future operations and event ideas

The most selected improvements were designated employee access points (39), temporary parking (28), pre-parade activity that generates business (28), more public restrooms (27), better closure and detour maps (24), promotion of downtown businesses (22), and parking shuttles (22). Each person could select multiple priorities; all improvement counts appear below.

Different routes by parade size

Response	Count	Share
Definitely yes	16	17.6%
Probably yes	28	30.8%

Response	Count	Share
No preference	7	7.7%
Probably no	16	17.6%
Definitely no	24	26.4%

Using different routes depending on parade size or type has no clear majority: 44 (48.4%) definitely or probably support it, 40 (44.0%) probably or definitely oppose it, and 7 (7.7%) have no preference.

Pre-parade street party

Response	Count	Share
Strongly support	37	40.7%
Somewhat support	18	19.8%
Neither support nor oppose	19	20.9%
Strongly oppose	6	6.6%
Unsure or need more information	11	12.1%

The street-party question specified a party before the Saturday parade on whichever of Palafox or Jefferson was not used as the route. It drew 55 supporters, 6 strong opponents, 19 neutral, and 11 unsure. No “somewhat oppose” answer was offered, so the strength of opposition cannot be measured fully.

What respondents wrote

Among 61 answers about making parades more beneficial and 65 one-recommendation answers, many asked to restore Palafox for major events. They cited spectators and business visibility, the established atmosphere, and easier use of Jefferson Street parking when Jefferson is not the parade street. Some wanted smaller parades to use a shorter or different route.

Respondents who favored Jefferson or another configuration cited space for crowds and floats, potential safety concerns on a narrower Palafox, the ability to spread activity across downtown, and less interruption for businesses not serving parade spectators. Jefferson-frontage respondents were divided; one described access difficulty from being enclosed by closures on both sides of the business.

A recurring operational request was to keep parking lots and garages available longer, open controlled employee and customer crossings before the parade, and publish one clear closure and access map well in advance. Other suggestions included temporary staff parking, shuttle or trolley options, toilets, trash collection, post-parade policing, family areas, and more direct promotion of downtown establishments.

One respondent proposed a revised route using Jefferson for staging and Palafox for a portion of the parade. Another suggested concentrating the parade on Garden and North Palafox. Those are individual suggestions, not tested alternatives. The survey did not ask respondents to assess costs, speed-table clearance, or emergency-service feasibility.

Interest in a future stakeholder discussion

Response	Count	Share
----------	-------	-------

Response	Count	Share
Yes	43	47.3%
Maybe	27	29.7%
No	21	23.1%

Seventy respondents expressed at least possible interest in a future stakeholder discussion (43 yes and 27 maybe). Contact information is not included in this board summary.

Points for Board review

- Treat the Palafox result as a clear preference among the 91 respondents, especially Palafox-frontage stakeholders, while recognizing that this voluntary sample is not a referendum of every downtown establishment.
- Review Palafox and Jefferson against police, fire, accessibility, crowd-management, and float-clearance findings before making a route recommendation. The survey records perceived safety, not a technical determination.
- Consider a separate access plan for garages, employee parking, deliveries, hotel guests, and crossing points, with a published map and closure schedule for whichever route is selected.
- If considering a street party or separate routes by parade size, define the event footprint, security staffing, business participation, and access rules. The party has majority support; route variation has a nearly even split.

Method and limits

Counts reflect all 91 submissions in the supplied Google Forms CSV export; no responses were removed or weighted. All single-select questions and grid rows shown here were answered by all 91. Percentages are counts divided by 91 and rounded to one decimal. Multi-select questions allow more than one selection, so their percentages add to more than 100%.

The export lists a business or property name on each submission, but names repeat and the form did not enforce one response per establishment. About 77% of respondents identified a Palafox location, and role categories overlap. This limits how far the results can be generalized to all downtown businesses or compared as independent business votes. Written themes summarize responses without counting them as independently coded votes.

Detailed counts for multi-select questions

For each option below, the percentage is the share of all 91 respondents who selected it. Other write-ins are grouped rather than reproducing identifying or free-form text.

Reported impacts on business or property

Option selected	Count	Share
Parking	46	50.5%
Customer access	43	47.3%
Employee access	38	41.8%
Timing of street closures	38	41.8%
Increased sales or business	29	31.9%
Length of street closures	24	26.4%
Public restrooms	19	20.9%
Trash and litter	10	11.0%
Public safety / security	10	11.0%
Lost sales or business	9	9.9%
Traffic congestion	8	8.8%
Post-parade cleanup	8	8.8%
Advance notification of closures	7	7.7%
Deliveries	6	6.6%
Public intoxication / behavior	6	6.6%
Maps and detour information	6	6.6%
Crowd control	4	4.4%
Rideshare / taxi access	3	3.3%
ADA accessibility	2	2.2%
Noise	2	2.2%
Property damage	1	1.1%
Other write-ins	5	5.5%

Perceived advantages of Jefferson

Option selected	Count	Share
I did not observe any significant advantages	63	69.2%
Created additional activity on Jefferson Street	18	19.8%
Better crowd distribution	12	13.2%
Better pedestrian movement	11	12.1%
Better parade viewing	11	12.1%
Less disruption to Palafox Street businesses	11	12.1%
Better emergency access	10	11.0%
Better access to businesses during the parade	8	8.8%
Better traffic circulation	5	5.5%
Easier to secure / manage	5	5.5%
Other write-ins	5	5.5%

Perceived disadvantages of Jefferson

Option selected	Count	Share
Reduced activity or exposure for Palafox businesses	64	70.3%
Less desirable parade atmosphere	43	47.3%
Parking issues	36	39.6%
Reduced economic benefit to downtown	36	39.6%
Customer access issues	33	36.3%
Employee access issues	29	31.9%
Jefferson Street was less suitable for large crowds	26	28.6%
I did not observe any significant disadvantages	14	15.4%
Delivery / vendor access issues	14	15.4%
Pedestrian congestion	13	14.3%
Traffic circulation problems	13	14.3%

Option selected	Count	Share
Safety concerns	10	11.0%
Other write-ins	4	4.4%

Suggested improvements

Option selected	Count	Share
Designated employee access points	39	42.9%
Additional temporary parking	28	30.8%
Pre-parade activities that generate business	28	30.8%
More public restrooms	27	29.7%
Better maps of closures and detours	24	26.4%
More promotion encouraging parade attendees to visit downtown businesses	22	24.2%
Parking shuttles	22	24.2%
More consistent parade routes	19	20.9%
Additional trash / recycling containers	18	19.8%
Additional police / security	18	19.8%
Post-parade activities encouraging visitors to remain downtown	17	18.7%
Earlier notification of road closures	16	17.6%
Better communication directly with downtown businesses	16	17.6%
Better rideshare pickup / drop-off locations	14	15.4%
Designated customer access areas	14	15.4%
Designated delivery / vendor access periods	12	13.2%
Better directional and wayfinding signage	11	12.1%
Family-friendly viewing areas	10	11.0%
Faster post-parade cleanup	7	7.7%
Improved emergency access	3	3.3%
Better lighting	2	2.2%
Better crowd-control barriers	2	2.2%

Option selected	Count	Share
ADA-accessible viewing areas	1	1.1%
Other write-ins	5	5.5%

Full security response distribution

Measure	Strongly support	Support	Neutral	Oppose	Strongly oppose	Unsure
Expanded security perimeter around the parade route	33	18	24	10	4	2
Closing additional streets to vehicle traffic	8	15	26	22	15	5
Restricting vehicle access before and during parades	13	26	30	12	7	3
Removing / towing vehicles left within restricted areas	26	26	26	6	2	5
Maintaining dedicated access for police, fire, and emergency vehicles	57	17	12	2	0	3
Increased law-enforcement / security presence	62	15	9	2	2	1

Full importance response distribution

Scores are counts for each response on a scale from 1, not important, to 5, extremely important. All 91 respondents answered each row.

The most “extremely important” ratings went to business impact (64), public safety (60), emergency response access (59), economic activity (49), and pedestrian safety (46).

Route criterion	1	2	3	4	5	4 or 5
Public safety	2	0	15	14	60	74
Emergency response access	0	2	12	18	59	77
Impact on downtown businesses	1	3	13	10	64	74
Customer access	1	1	25	20	44	64
Employee access	1	1	27	22	40	62
Traffic circulation	2	5	31	30	23	53
Parking	3	7	25	20	36	56
Economic activity	1	3	13	25	49	74
Spectator experience	1	2	20	27	41	68
Crowd capacity	1	2	29	32	27	59
Pedestrian safety	1	2	17	25	46	71
ADA accessibility	2	4	26	24	35	59
Ease of securing the route	2	13	23	29	24	53
Impact on downtown residents	7	11	29	20	24	44
Ability for the rest of downtown to operate normally	7	9	25	17	33	50

Downtown Pensacola Public Parade Survey Results

Downtown Improvement Board Survey report September 24 2026

The public survey received 623 submissions between September 16 and September 23, 2026. It asked about future routes, what matters when selecting a route, perceived safety, a pre-parade street party, and possible improvements. The traditional Palafox route led overall and among respondents who said they had experienced both routes. The survey also drew a particularly large share of Krewe and parade participants.

Findings at a glance

421 of 623 submissions (67.6%) favored the traditional Garden and South Palafox route for major parades; 108 (17.3%) favored Garden and South Jefferson. Fifty-eight (9.3%) supported either route, and the other 36 chose different routes by parade, another configuration, or unsure.

401 (64.4%) selected parade participant or Krewe member as their connection to downtown, while 483 (77.5%) said they attend almost every parade. Among the 431 who reported experiencing both routes, 276 (64.0%) preferred Palafox and 81 (18.8%) preferred Jefferson.

Parade viewing and atmosphere was the most selected route criterion (440, 70.6%), followed by public safety (285, 45.7%) and business access or economic activity (225, 36.1%). Additional security measures made 384 (61.6%) feel safer. A proposed pre-parade street party drew 383 supporters (61.5%), 64 opponents (10.3%), 109 neutral responses, and 67 unsure responses.

These are voluntary survey submissions, not a representative poll of all Pensacola residents or a verified count of distinct people. The high share of Krewe members and frequent parade attendees is essential context for Board use.

Who responded

Connection to downtown	Count	Share
Parade participant or Krewe member	401	64.4%
Regular downtown visitor	110	17.7%
Downtown employee	35	5.6%
Downtown resident	30	4.8%
Occasional downtown visitor	21	3.4%
Downtown business or property owner	16	2.6%
Other write-ins	10	1.6%

The form asked for one best-fitting connection. Several of the ten other write-ins described more than one connection, including Krewe involvement, but are reported as write-ins rather than reassigned to a fixed category.

How often respondents attend

Response	Count	Share
Almost every parade	483	77.5%
Most parades	100	16.1%

Response	Count	Share
Some parades	38	6.1%
Rarely	1	0.2%
I have not attended a downtown parade	1	0.2%

The 583 who attend almost every or most parades account for 93.6% of submissions. This survey principally reflects engaged parade participants and regular attendees rather than people who seldom attend.

Routes respondents have experienced

Response	Count	Share
Both Palafox and Jefferson routes	431	69.2%
Traditional Palafox route only	154	24.7%
Jefferson construction route only	33	5.3%
Neither or unsure	5	0.8%

Sixty-nine percent had experienced both configurations. The 154 who reported experiencing only Palafox and 33 only Jefferson have different bases for comparison, so the both-routes subgroup is shown separately below.

Route preference

Response	Count	Share
Garden and South Palafox traditional route	421	67.6%
Garden and South Jefferson construction route	108	17.3%
Either route	58	9.3%
Different routes for different parades	23	3.7%
Another route or configuration	8	1.3%
Unsure or need more information	5	0.8%

Respondent group	Total	Palafox	Jefferson	Other
Selected participant or Krewe category	401	279 (69.6%)	60 (15.0%)	62
Selected another category or wrote Other	222	142 (64.0%)	48 (21.6%)	32
Experienced both routes	431	276 (64.0%)	81 (18.8%)	74
Experienced Palafox route only	154	137 (89.0%)	6 (3.9%)	11
Experienced Jefferson route only	33	7 (21.2%)	20 (60.6%)	6

Role groups and experience groups overlap; the rows should not be added together. "Other" includes either route, different routes, another route, and unsure. Only 33 reported experiencing Jefferson without Palafox, so that row should be treated cautiously.

What matters in route selection

Respondents could select up to three factors. The counts below show selections, not ranked priorities. A lower count does not mean respondents oppose a factor.

Factor selected	Count	Share
Parade viewing and overall atmosphere	440	70.6%
Public safety	285	45.7%
Access to downtown businesses and economic activity	225	36.1%
Pedestrian movement and safety	192	30.8%
Family-friendly experience	140	22.5%
Traffic circulation and parking	102	16.4%
Emergency vehicle access	101	16.2%
ADA accessibility	28	4.5%
Minimizing disruption to residents and downtown operations	17	2.7%
Other write-ins	29	4.7%

The 29 other priorities often focused on float maneuverability, speed tables on the rebuilt Palafox route, safety walkers, staging, and access. Those are suggestions, not measured engineering findings.

Perceived effect of increased security measures

Response	Count	Share
Significantly safer	225	36.1%
Somewhat safer	159	25.5%
No meaningful difference	203	32.6%
Somewhat less safe	3	0.5%
Significantly less safe	2	0.3%
Unsure	31	5.0%

The survey asked how the overall measures make respondents feel. It did not ask whether they support each particular perimeter, closure, towing, or police staffing decision. Written answers included both praise for increased safety and concern about how far and how early streets are closed.

Pre-parade street party

Response	Count	Share
Strongly support	274	44.0%
Somewhat support	109	17.5%
Neither support nor oppose	109	17.5%
Somewhat oppose	33	5.3%

Response	Count	Share
Strongly oppose	31	5.0%
Unsure or need more information	67	10.8%

The question said a Saturday pre-parade party could add activity and might involve additional street closures and security. The result records support for the idea; it does not establish support for a specific site, footprint, timing, or access plan.

What respondents wrote

The optional final question received 340 filled responses. Some were short entries such as “N/A” or “no change,” and individual answers sometimes raised several issues. The themes below describe recurring ideas without assigning coded vote counts to them.

Route atmosphere and room to move

Many asked to return to Palafox, citing the familiar atmosphere, tradition, parade viewing, and visits to downtown businesses. Respondents who preferred Jefferson described more room for floats, safety walkers, and spectators, as well as the possibility of keeping Palafox open for pedestrian access to businesses. Others proposed extending the route or using different configurations for different parade sizes.

Parking and parade staging

Parking was a frequent request: free or less expensive spaces for attendees, designated parking near float lineups for Krewe members, and easier loading of heavy supplies. Several asked for clearer staging assignments, float storage or return access, safer rider drop-off near parked vehicles, shuttle service, and more predictable parking access after the parade.

Street design and security operations

Some respondents worried that new Palafox speed tables could affect float clearance or rider safety. Others worried about narrow points, turns, or inconsistent barricade placement on Jefferson. These comments express concerns rather than test results. People also requested shorter or smaller closure areas, later parking cutoff times, clearer detour information, and quicker reopening after parades. Several praised the existing safety effort or asked for stronger police presence and barrier enforcement.

Visitor experience and parade execution

Respondents called for visible signs and barriers at the beginning of the route where parade participants may not throw items, particularly near Spring Street and Garden Street. Other ideas included more restrooms and trash cans, family viewing space, better tree trimming, more bands, longer or more continuous parade movement, and better communication among organizers, the City, and Krewes. Some liked the street-party idea; others worried it might complicate participant access or duplicate activity already occurring at lineup.

Comparison with the downtown stakeholder survey

Survey	Total	Palafox	Jefferson	Other
Public parade survey	623	421 (67.6%)	108 (17.3%)	94 (15.1%)
Downtown stakeholder survey	91	75 (82.4%)	8 (8.8%)	8 (8.8%)

Both surveys favored Palafox. Their percentages should be reported separately: 70 of 91 downtown stakeholder submissions identified a Palafox location, while 401 of 623 public submissions selected parade participant or Krewe member. Recruitment was voluntary, one person may have answered both surveys, and their question sets differ. The two sets of submissions should not be pooled as a single vote.

Points for Board review

- Treat the Palafox lead as a clear preference among these public survey submissions, including the group that has experienced both routes, while recognizing the sample is heavily engaged in parades.
- Compare both route options with police, fire, accessibility, crowd management, and documented float and speed-table clearance findings. Survey perceptions do not determine physical feasibility or safety.
- Ask for an operating plan covering Krewe parking and loading, float staging and return, public parking, closure timing, crossing points, and signs around no-throw areas, whichever route is chosen.
- If pursuing a pre-parade street party, define its street footprint, access hours, security, and relationship to float lineup before treating broad support for the idea as approval of a particular plan.

Method and limits

Counts reflect all 623 submissions in the supplied Google Forms CSV export; no responses were removed or weighted. Every respondent answered each closed question, including the select-up-to-three question. Percentages use 623 as the denominator unless a subgroup denominator is shown; rounding may prevent displayed percentages from summing exactly to 100%. The factor percentages sum to more than 100% because respondents could select multiple factors.

The export does not establish unique respondents, coverage of Pensacola residents, or the population to which results could be generalized. The role question asked for one connection, though some write-ins named multiple roles. The 340 written answers were reviewed for recurring themes, not coded as independently measured votes. Security responses record perceived feeling of safety, and route comments do not replace float-clearance tests or technical review.