

How the Survey Was Conducted

The Public Information Corporation of Littleton, Colorado, conducted a 604-interview telephone survey for the Boulder County Board of Commissioners in late June and early July, 2007. The survey resulted in a representative sampling of active registered voters listed in the Boulder County Elections Office's file.

The sampling is balanced within 2 percent, plus or minus, of the actual demographic profile of the total file, as to gender, age, years lived in Boulder County, party registration and which of four geographical zones lived in. The zones consisted of (1) the City of Boulder, (2) the City of Longmont, (3) Southeast Cities (Louisville, Lafayette, Superior and Erie), and (4) unincorporated areas plus small towns.

A vendor extracted the calling lists from the total file according to our randomization and format specifications. All other aspects, including interviewing, coding and data processing, took place at our office.

The survey instrument included general questions about issues that face Boulder County today, transportation improvement projects, term limits, open space program priorities, and referendum questions that might or might not be included on the November, 2007, general election ballot.

Confidence factor in a 604-interview sampling is 4 percent, plus or minus, in 95 out of 100 cases.

The project results are presented in two sections. Volume 1, which follows, is a detailed analysis of the survey results. Volume 2 contains all of the computer tabulations and cross-tabulations that we worked with.

About the Survey Analysis Format

This Analysis volume presents the results of the survey in text and tables form. The results of related series of questions are presented in consolidated tables for comparison purposes. Otherwise the tables show not only the countywide results but also in the four geographical zones.

In several cases we provide additional tables that track responses where identical or very similar questions were asked in previous and comparable surveys.

Following is an explanation of some of the terms that are used in the analysis:

“Emergent Categories” refers to semantically similar verbatim responses that are clustered into categories during the editing of open-ended questions. Each distinct category then is assigned a unique one- or two-digit number for data entry.

We start with few assumptions as to what the noteworthy opinions and issues will be, although we make certain that categories which likely will be compared with results from earlier years are established in advance. New categories reflecting changing times emerge almost on their own as the early interviews are being conducted, and hence the term “emergent categories.”

“Demographic anomalies” are instances in which individual groupings (e.g., “Boulder,” “Longmont,” etc. responses to particular questions deviate from the countywide results by 7 percent or more and may be useful in understanding trends in the County. Deviations of less than 7 percent generally are not enlightening in a 604-interview sampling. However, with the reciprocal response cells (columns) involving men vs. women there might be only 4 percent differences from the countywide result and yet the 8-point spread between the genders certainly can be of significance to the analysis.

Another caveat is that occasionally anomalies reach 7 percent or so but aren’t mentioned in the analyses because we felt that spotlighting them would not be useful. This is particularly true where four-level multiple choice responses are used, e.g. “very satisfied, somewhat satisfied, somewhat dissatisfied or very dissatisfied.” Occasionally pointing out “somewhat” response anomalies adds to the quality of the analysis, but usually they do not.

Demographic anomalies are expressed in brief paragraphs in terms of how many percentage points they are higher or lower than the result for all persons who were asked a particular question, e.g. +10% or –12%. For the reader’s convenience each time anomalies are listed we show the actual percentage given by the total number of respondents (e.g. (604=62%) followed by +10% if the anomalous response was 72% or –12% if the response was 50%.

If the all-respondent “total” number is less than 604 it means that some persons were not asked that particular question because of skip instructions.

All demographic anomalies mentioned in this study pertain only to the current project and not to those of previous surveys that are used in trend studies tables.

“**Collapse**” refers to instances in which related open-ended categories are combined in tables if we feel that it will provide a better focus. Collapses are described by text or, if they are used in tables, the more narrow response categories that are collapsed are bracketed.

Double dashes (--) indicate instances in tables where responses were less than one-half of one percent but not zero. Responses of 0.5 to 0.9 are rounded up to 1 by our statistical software.

Question 1 – Single Most Important Issue

In general, what do you consider to be the single most important issue facing Boulder County today? (Open end).

	<u>TOTAL</u>	<u>Boulder</u>	<u>Longmont</u>	<u>SE Cities</u>	<u>Unincorp.</u>
Manage/stop growth	20%	19%	14%	23%	23%
Traffic jams/congestion	8	8	9	11	12
More/better public transit	3 13	5 14	3 15	1 14	2 17
Better roads/streets	1	0	2	1	2
Repair roads/streets	1	1	1	1	1
Public school issues	7	6	9	12	5
Affordable housing/high costs	7	8	7	10	5
Illegal immigrants (negative)*	6	1	15	6	2
Local governance concerns	5	6	5	2	8
Open space issues	4	5	3	6	3
Economy concerns/jobs	4	7	4	2	3
Taxation issues	4	4	3	4	7
Environment concerns	3	5	0	4	4
Water supply issues/drought	3	3	3	2	2
Social concerns	3	5	3	2	2

** Note: We also tracked positive comments about undocumented immigrants; they totaled less than 1%*

Discussion

This table speaks for itself, and as a consolidated table on the following page shows, control/stop growth consistently has been the most-volunteered response category in surveys conducted over the past five years. Transportation issues have been second most-mentioned for four of the five years.

Interestingly, illegal immigrants concerns, which turned up as a substantial emergent category for the first time – at 6 percent – in the 2006 survey again emerged at 6 percent.

Note: categories that we established early in the editing process but which weren't mentioned by more than 1 percent of respondents in the 604-interview tabulation aren't always included on the table.

Demographic Anomalies

With “illegal immigrants (604=6%) – Anomalously high were: Longmont residents, +9%.

Most Important Boulder County Issues – 2003-2007

	<u>7/07</u>	<u>5/06</u>	<u>4/05</u>	<u>6/04</u>	<u>2/03</u>
Manage/stop growth	20%	20%	20%	20%	15%
Transportation issues	13	9	9	13	6
Public schools issues	7	8	8	13	13
Affordable housing/costs	7	6	6	3	4
Illegal immigrants (negative)	6	6	--	0	0
Local governance issues	4	3	3	4	3
More/maintain open space	4	6	7	4	2
Economy concerns	4	7	8	20	20
Water supply/drought	3	2	1	8	16

Discussion

In addition to issues dealing with managing or stopping growth, transportation and public schools issues have emerged among the top three categories in each of the past three years.

Expressions of a need for more affordable housing has risen rather steadily as an important issue during the five surveys and, as previously mentioned, concerns about undocumented/illegal immigrants has reached that status in just two years.

On the other hand, concerns about the economy, including calls for more employment, has dropped from being the top issue in 2003 to just 4 percent this time.

Question 2 – Next Most Important Issue

And what would be the next most important issue facing Boulder County today?
(Open end.)

	<u>Q.1</u>	<u>Q.2</u>	<u>Combined</u>
Manage/stop growth	20%	7%	27%
Transportation issues	13	15	28
Public schools issues	7	9	16
Affordable housing/high costs	7	6	13
Illegal immigrants (negative)	6	2	8
Local government concerns	5	4	9
Open space issues	4	5	9
Economy concerns/jobs	4	4	8
Taxation issues	4	3	7
Environment concerns	3	4	7
Water supply issues/drought	3	4	7
Social concerns	3	3	6

Discussion

We do not present a table showing the rankings of question 2 response categories because in this survey, as in the past, it hasn't been useful. However, combined with the same categories in question 1 they are of interest to the analysis, we believe. Here, transportation issues rise to the top of the list of emergent categories.

Also, we don't present demographic anomalies for question 2 for two reasons:

First, we didn't believe that they would have been of much value.

Second, there weren't any.

Question 3 – Satisfaction With County Government

Please think for a moment about the many things that are the responsibility of Boulder County government. Would you say that you are very satisfied, somewhat satisfied, somewhat dissatisfied or very dissatisfied with the job being done?

	<u>TOTAL</u>	<u>Boulder</u>	<u>Longmont</u>	<u>SE Cities</u>	<u>Unincorp.</u>
Very satisfied	13%	18%	10%	14%	8%
Somewhat satisfied	65	62	68	68	62
Somewhat dissatisfied	13	12	13	10	15
Very dissatisfied	6	5	6	5	11
No response	3	3	3	3	4

Discussion

Boulder County’s government received positive marks from 78 percent of the active registered voters, with 18 percent indicating some level of dissatisfaction. Another way to look at voter sentiment is to compare “very satisfied” with “very dissatisfied” responses, and the result was positive by better than 2-to-1.

There were no demographic anomalies in the “very satisfied” and “very dissatisfied” response categories.

Satisfaction with Boulder County Government – 2002-2007					
	<u>7/07</u>	<u>5/06</u>	<u>4/05</u>	<u>6/04</u>	<u>6/02</u>
Very satisfied	13%	15%	14%	13%	11%
Somewhat satisfied	65	64	64	65	60
Somewhat dissatisfied	13	12	14	13	18
Very dissatisfied	6	6	5	5	7
No response	3	3	2	4	4

(Note: This question was not included in the 2/03 survey.)

Question 4 – Acceptability of County Taxation Levels

Generally speaking, would you say that the taxes you pay to Boulder County government are too high, high but acceptable, about right, or would you say that they are lower than you would expect for the services County government provides?

	<u>TOTAL</u>	<u>Boulder</u>	<u>Longmont</u>	<u>SE Cities</u>	<u>Unincorp.</u>
Too high	24%	13%	33%	29%	26%
High but acceptable	28	32	25	30	24
About right	41	45	39	32	45
Lower than would expect	4	6	2	4	3
No response	3	5	1	6	2

Discussion

Three-quarters of respondents felt that Boulder County's taxes are acceptable for the services that are provided, and one-quarter said they are too high.

A number of demographic anomalies will be pointed out later with this question, but the most important ones – in our view – are apparent in the geographical zones breakout presented in the table above. The contrast in perceptions of people from Boulder and Longmont is particularly interesting, and it's a pattern that is repeated a number of times in this survey (and in ones in past years).

Demographic Anomalies

With “too high” (604=24%) – Anomalously high are: Longmont residents, +9%; and persons 35 to 44, +9%. Anomalously low are: Boulder residents, -11%; persons 18 to 24, -18%; persons 25 to 44, -8%; and in county 10 to 19 years, -8%.

With “high but acceptable” (604=28%) – Anomalously high are: persons 35 to 44, +13%. Anomalously low are: persons 65 or older, -7%.

With “about right” (604=41%) – Anomalously high are: persons 18 to 34, +14%; Anomalously low are: Southeast Cities residents, -9%; and persons 45 to 54, -10%.

Perceptions of Boulder County Taxation – 2003-2007

	<u>7/07</u>	<u>5/06</u>	<u>4/05</u>	<u>6/04</u>	<u>2/03</u>
Too high	24%	22%	25%	22%	20%
High but acceptable	28	35	31	31	32
About right	41	36	37	40	39
Lower than would expect	4	4	3	4	3
No response	3	3	4	3	5

Discussion

Over the years perceptions of Boulder County taxation by active registered voters haven't changed much. In comparing the results of the February, 2003, survey with those of July, 2007, we note that the differences in all four response categories are at or lower than the 4 percent, plus or minus, the confidence factor for a 604-interview sampling.

Question 5 – Extension of 0.1% Transportation Tax (1)

The purposes of a sales and use tax for improvements to the transportation system in Boulder County that was approved by the voters in 2001 were described, and then the following open-ended question was asked:

If a question were to be on this November's ballot to extend the current tenth of one percent sales and use tax for the same kinds of transportation and alternative transportation improvements for 10 years, do you think you would support it strongly, support it mildly, oppose it mildly or oppose it strongly?

	<u>TOTAL</u>	<u>Boulder</u>	<u>Longmont</u>	<u>SE Cities</u>	<u>Unincorp.</u>
Support it strongly	47%	61%	34%	48%	42%
Support it mildly	30	26	35	29	32
Oppose it mildly	9	6	13	10	11
Oppose it strongly	10	6	15	10	12
No response	3	2	3	3	3

Discussion

Support for a possible ballot question for extension of the transportation sales and use tax for 10 years is solid, with 77 percent indicating support at some level versus 19 percent in opposition. Another way of looking at strength or weakness is to compare the extreme response categories, “support it strongly” versus “oppose it strongly” and in this case it’s 47-to-10 percent, also solid.

Even in Longmont, which is the least supportive of the four geographical zones, the support-oppose ratio is 69-to-28 percent.

(Note: This question was repeated, virtually unchanged, as question 22, which as at the end of the issue questions. This was to determine whether feelings about a vote on extending this tax would change due to the asking of a large number of previous questions, some of which dealt with other kinds of taxes. A table comparing the results of the two questions is shown at the conclusion of question 22 discussion).

Demographic Anomalies

With “strongly support” (604=47% -- Anomalously high were: Boulder residents, +14%; persons 18 to 24, +20%; persons 25 to 44, +10%; and in county 4 years or less, +18%. Anomalously low were: Longmont residents, -13%; persons 65 or older, -9%; and in county 20 years or more, -10%.

With “strongly oppose” (604=10%) – Anomalously high were: in county 20 years or more, +7%. Anomalously low were: persons 18 to 24, -10%; and in county 10 to 19 years, -7%.

Question 6 – One Reason to Support/Oppose Tax Extension

What one reason mostly caused you to _____ the proposed extension of the current tenth of one percent sales and use tax for transportation improvements for 10 years? (The response in question 5 was repeated)

	<u>TOTAL</u>	<u>Boulder</u>	<u>Longmont</u>	<u>SE Cities</u>	<u>Unincorp.</u>
<i><u>Reasons for positive responses</u></i>					
Traffic is getting worse	23%	28%	26%	21%	16%
The improvements badly needed	16	17	10	18	17
Because of transit/alternatives	12	16	7	9	15
Need more bike, walking trails	5	7	6	5	2
We need to complete projects	4	4	5	3	4
Roads, highways need work	2	2	1	5	1
Will improve the environment	2	2	1	1	4
<i><u>Reasons support "mildly," not "strongly"</u></i>					
Not the highest priority	4	2	3	3	6
I need more information	2	2	1	1	3
Previous work was too slow	2	1	1	4	2
Against more bike, hiking paths	2	2	2	1	2
<i><u>Reasons for negative responses</u></i>					
Concerns about past spending	8	3	13	11	7
Too many taxes/oppose all taxes	5	5	6	6	4
<i>Note: Responses with frequency of 1 percent or less are not shown)</i>					

Discussion

Three positive response categories that emerged account for half of all responses to this question.

The perception that traffic keeps getting worse leads the list at 23%, with the more general feeling that the improvements mentioned with question 5 are badly needed next at 16%. Third, at 12%, were comments about needs for public transit and alternative transportation enhancements.

Only two negative response categories emerged, with 8 percent indicating feelings that their tax money hadn't been wisely spent in the past, and 5 percent indicating that they oppose more taxes regardless of the purpose.

We noticed in the questionnaire editing process that a significant number of persons who responded “mildly support” to question 5 then gave negative reasons for it, and we realized that they were explaining why they hadn’t said “strongly support.” That’s why we set up a special group of emergent categories to address that seeming paradox. They are shown in the middle of the table above.

Demographic Anomalies

With “traffic is getting worse” (588=23%) -- Anomalously high were: persons 18 to 24, +12%. Anomalously low were: unincorporated area residents, -7%. Also, there was a gender divergence, with 27 percent of women making this response versus 20 percent of men.

Questions 7 Through 11

Respondents were told: “Setting aside how you responded to the previous (transportation-related) questions, please tell me how important you feel several kinds of transportation improvement projects will be in the next decade or two – very important, somewhat important, not very important or not important at all.”

	<u>Very Impt.</u>	<u>Some- what Impt.</u>	<u>Not very Impt.</u>	<u>Not at all Impt.</u>	<u>No Resp.</u>
Q.9. What about better maintenance of paved and gravel roads?	42%	41%	13%	3%	1%
Q.7. What about widening road shoulders to increase safety and provide additional room for bikes?	47	33	10	9	1
Q.11. What about transportation demand management efforts such as increasing availability of EcoPasses and other bus service improvements?	44	33	11	7	5
Q.8. What about intersection improvements?	33	42	17	4	4
Q.10. What about improving bus transit over and beyond what will be provided by RTD?	38	31	18	8	4

(Note: The questions are arrayed in order of the combined “very important” and “somewhat important” responses.)

Discussion

Initially we laid out the boxed questions in descending order of “very important” responses, which would be one logical way to do it, but finally decided that combining “very important” and “somewhat important” would be a more valid way to display the results of the question series.

The result was that highway improvements rose to the top of the list, although none of the described transportation improvements lagged badly.

Demographic Anomalies

Question 7 anomalies (re: widening road shoulders)

With “very important” (604=47%) – Anomalously high were: persons 35 to 44, +7%. Anomalously low were: persons 65 or older, -13%.

Also, there was a gender divergence, with 51 percent of the women believing that widening of road shoulders was very important versus 42 percent of men feeling that way.

With “not at all important” (604=9%) – Anomalously high were: persons 65 or older, +8%.

Question 8 anomalies (re: intersection improvements)

With “very important” (604=33%) – Anomalously high were: persons 65 or older, +7%. Anomalously low were: persons 18 to 24, -12%.

Question 9 anomalies (re: road maintenance)

With “very important” (604=42%) – Anomalously high were: persons 55 or older, -10%; and in county 20 years or more, +8%. Anomalously low were: Boulder residents, -7% persons 18 to 44, -12%; and in county 4 years or less, -7%.

Question 10 anomalies (re: improving bus transit)

With “very important” (604=38%) – Anomalously high were: Boulder residents, +7%; and persons 18 to 44, +8%. Anomalously low were: unincorporated area residents, -9%; persons 45 to 54, -7%; and persons 65 or older, -14%.

Question 11 anomalies (re: transportation demand management)

With “very important” (604=44%) – Anomalously high were: Boulder residents, +12%; persons 18 to 24, +9%; persons 25 to 34, +22%; and in county 4 years or less, +16%. Anomalously low were: Longmont residents, -11%; unincorporated area residents, -8%; persons 65 or older, -14%; and in county 20 years or more, -10%.

Questions 12 – Term Limit Raise for District Attorney

Respondents were asked whether the term limit for the office of District Attorney, should be raised from the current 8 years to 12 years. They were asked to indicate whether they would support such a question on the November ballot strongly or mildly, or oppose it mildly or strongly.

	<u>TOTAL</u>	<u>Boulder</u>	<u>Longmont</u>	<u>SE Cities</u>	<u>Unincorp.</u>
Support it strongly	10%	14%	9	5	12%
Support it mildly	27	31	27	28	21
Oppose it mildly	26	18	30	33	26
Oppose it strongly	30	28	29	30	33
No response	7	9	5	4	9

Discussion

With 56 percent of respondents in opposition and 37 percent supportive, a ballot question asking if the term limit for District Attorney should be raised to 12 years would have faced defeat had the election been held in early July. There was a 3-to-1 ratio of “oppose it strongly” versus “support it strongly.”

None of the geographical zones showed more support than opposition, although it was virtually tied in the City of Boulder. However, a comparison of the extreme response categories there showed a ratio of 2-to-1 “oppose strongly” versus “support strongly.”

Demographic Anomalies

With “oppose it strongly” (604=10%) – Anomalously low were: persons 18 to 24, -10%; and persons 35 to 44, -7%.

Questions 13 – Term Limit Raise for County Commissioners

Respondents then were asked whether the term limit for the offices of the three County Commissioners should be raised from the current 8 years to 12 years. They were asked to indicate whether they would support such a question on the November ballot strongly or mildly, or oppose it mildly or strongly.

	<u>TOTAL</u>	<u>Boulder</u>	<u>Longmont</u>	<u>SE Cities</u>	<u>Unincorp.</u>
Support it strongly	8%	10%	5	7	12%
Support it mildly	23	28	23	25	14
Oppose it mildly	31	27	36	33	29
Oppose it strongly	32	25	33	31	40
No response	6	10	3	4	5

Discussion

The results here resemble those of the District Attorney question, although the ratio between “oppose strongly” and “support strongly” is greater – 4-to-1.

Demographic Anomalies

With “oppose it strongly” (604=30% -- Anomalously low were: persons 18 to 45, -7%.

	<u>District Attorney</u>	<u>Commis- sioners</u>
Support strongly	10%	8%
Support mildly	27	23
Oppose mildly	26	31
Oppose strongly	30	32
No response	7	6

Discussion

There is no large difference in the comparative results of questions 12 and 13. Every response category difference fell within one percent or less of the confidence factor of a 604-interview survey.

We believe that much of the difference can be attributed to an order bias that is due to the fact that no rotation instruction was included on the questionnaire. That was no oversight, however, because we believed that, should both questions be included on the November ballot, they would appear in the same order that we used in all precincts.

Questions 14 through 18 – Open Space Program Priorities

The following introductory statement was made: *“With limited resources, the priorities of the Boulder County open space program constantly need to be assessed. On a sliding scale of 5 down to 1, with 5 being of the highest priority and 1 being of the lowest, how would you rate the purchase of land for each of the following different responses if you were in charge of the program?”*

(Note: We calculated the average rating on the 5-point scale per respondent, and then ranked the five purposes that were read by interviewers. The result is shown in this consolidated table. The questions are arrayed in descending rank.)

Q.15. To preserve wildlife habitat	4.12
Q.18. To keep agricultural land intact with the county leasing it to farming	3.82
Q.14. To create buffers in or between communities	3.74
Q.16. To provide connections between existing trails	3.51
Q.17. To preserve historical properties	3.50

Discussion and Demographic Anomalies

While we believe that the format of the table above best illustrates the collective feelings of Boulder County active voters about Open Space Program priorities, we concluded that returning to the frequencies of responses to the extreme ratings, (5) -- highest” and “(1) -- lowest,” is most useful in identifying demographic anomalies.

We are particularly interested in the anomalies that turned up with question 18, which shows that the older the respondent, the higher the priority for keeping agricultural land intact. The same thing happened with how long respondents have lived in the county – the longer, the higher. Also, women were much more likely to give the highest rating to keeping agricultural land intact than were men – 49% versus 34%.

Question 15 anomalies (re: wildlife habitat)

With “highest” (604=54%) – Anomalously high were: persons 18 to 24, +15%; and in county 4 years or less, +9%. Anomalously low were: persons 65 or older, -11%. Also there was a gender divergence, with 58% of women giving “preserve wildlife habitat” the highest priority versus 51% of men.

Question 18 anomalies (re: agricultural land intact)

With “highest” (604=42%)-- Anomalously high were: persons 55 or older, +8%. Anomalously low were: persons 18 to 24, -21%; persons 35 to 44, -9%; and in county 4 years or less, -7%. Also, there was a gender divergence, with 49% of women giving question 18 the highest priority versus 34% of men.

Question 14 anomalies (re: create buffers)

With “highest” (604=41%) – Anomalously low were: persons 18 to 24, -14%.

Question 16 anomalies (re: trail connections)

With “highest” (604=30%) – Anomalously low were: persons 18 to 34, -9%.

Question 17: (re: preserve historical properties)

With “highest” (604=27%) – Anomalously high were: persons 55 or older, +7%. Anomalously low were: persons 18 to 24, -21%; persons 35 to 44, -9%; and in county 4 years or less, -7%. Also, there was a gender divergence with 49 percent of the women giving “preserve historical properties” the highest rating versus 34 percent of the men.

Questions 19 and 20 – Extension of Open Space Tax

These were alternative questions, in which half of respondents were asked how strongly they would support or oppose a question on the November ballot to extend the current tenth of one percent sales and use tax for the county’s open space an additional 15 years, and the other half were asked about making the tax permanent. The following table compares the results.

	<u>Q.19</u> <u>15 yrs.</u>	<u>Q.20</u> <u>Perm.</u>
Strongly support	58%	50%
Mildly support	21	28
Mildly oppose	8	7
Strongly oppose	12	12
No response	1	3

Discussion

We believe that either version of a ballot question proposing extension of the open space sales and use tax would have a good chance of passage, given a reasonable level of proponent effort and news media support. Not only is there a virtual 80-to-20 percent support vs. oppose ratio with both the “15 years” and “permanent” questions, but a comparison of the extreme responses, “strongly support” versus “strongly oppose” is very favorable.

There are a number of demographic anomalies, which will be presented, but we would like to spotlight one of them here. There is some falloff on the “strongly support” line with three of the four geographical zones where “permanent” is concerned, but in the City of Boulder it’s a substantial 18%. In the Southeast Cities “permanent” actually runs a bit stronger than “15 years.”

Question 19 Table (Extend 15 Years)

	<u>TOTAL</u>	<u>Boulder</u>	<u>Longmont</u>	<u>SE Cities</u>	<u>Unincorp.</u>
Support it strongly	58%	70%	50	54	55%
Support it mildly	21	10	26	25	26
Oppose it mildly	8	7	10	10	6
Oppose it strongly	12	11	13	11	12
No response	1	1	1	0	0

Question 20 Table (Extend Permanently)

	<u>TOTAL</u>	<u>Boulder</u>	<u>Longmont</u>	<u>SE Cities</u>	<u>Unincorp.</u>
Support it strongly	50%	52%	43	57	48%
Support it mildly	28	30	29	31	20
Oppose it mildly	7	6	9	6	8
Oppose it strongly	12	8	16	4	22
No response	3	4	3	1	3

Demographic Anomalies

Question 19 anomalies (re: extend 15 years)

With “strongly support” (604=58%) – Anomalously high were: Boulder residents, +12%; persons 25 to 44, +11%; and in county 5 to 9 years, +19%. Anomalously low were: Longmont residents, -8%.

With “strongly oppose” (604=12%) – Anomalously low were: persons 25 to 34, -10%; and in county 4 years or less, -8%.

Question 20 anomalies (re: extend permanently)

With “strongly support” (604=50%) – Anomalously high were: Southeast Cities residents, +7%; persons 18 to 24, +8%; persons 35 to 44, +18%; in county 4 years or less, +8%; and in county 10 to 19 years, +12%. Anomalously low were: Longmont residents, -7%; persons 55 or older, -12%; and in county 20 years or more, -11%.

With “strongly oppose (604=12%) – Anomalously high were: Unincorporated areas residents, +10%. Anomalously low were: Southeast Cities residents, -8%; and persons 25 to 34, -9%.

Question 21 – Open Space Spending Priorities

Because open space funds may be spent both for land acquisition and for maintenance of open space areas, goals must be set for how much of the money should go to each purpose. If you were in charge of the program would you prefer that it would be 75 percent for land acquisition and 25 percent for maintenance, a 50-50 split, or 25 percent for land acquisition and 75 percent for maintenance of open space areas?

<i>75% acquisition, 25% maintenance</i>	<i>29%</i>
<i>50% acquisition, 50% maintenance</i>	<i>42</i>
<i>25% acquisition, 75% maintenance</i>	<i>19</i>
<i>Other*</i>	<i>3</i>
<i>No response</i>	<i>7</i>

*"Other" responses included: 60% acquisition, 40% maintenance; 100% acquisition, 0% maintenance; 0% acquisition and 100% maintenance; and don't spend anything on open space.

Discussion

While the 50-50 split response category received the most support from respondents, the table shows an obvious bias on the side of acquisition.

Demographic Anomalies

With "75% acquisition, 25% maintenance" (604=29%) – Anomalously high were: persons 25 to 34, +8%. Anomalously low were: Longmont residents, -7%; persons 18 to 24, -13%; and persons 65 or older, -12%.

With "50-50 split" (604=42%) – Anomalously high were: Southeast Cities residents, +10%; and persons 18 to 24, +15%.

Question 22 – Extension of 0.1% Transportation Tax (2)

Now, I'm going to ask a question somewhat like the one that you answered earlier in the interview. Please bear with me. (Then, the question, which was nearly identical to question 5, was read).

	<u>TOTAL</u>	<u>Boulder</u>	<u>Longmont</u>	<u>SE Cities</u>	<u>Unincorp.</u>
Support it strongly	42%	54%	33%	41%	37%
Support it mildly	36	31	39	38	38
Oppose it mildly	11	7	16	12	11
Oppose it strongly	9	7	9	6	14
No response	2	2	2	2	1

Discussion

The same strong support for extension of the transportation tax that was evident with question 5 is repeated here. While some of the support dropped from “strongly” to “mildly,” the opposition numbers were virtually unchanged. The comparative numbers may be seen on this consolidated table:

	<u>Q.5</u>	<u>Q.22</u>
Strongly support	47%	42%
Mildly support	30	36
Mildly oppose	9	11
Strongly oppose.	10	9
No response	3	2

Demographic anomalies were almost identical in the two questions.

#