

**SURVEY OF PUBLIC OPINION
ABOUT OTTAWA COUNTY**

Report Submitted to Ottawa County Planning and Grants Department

October 2002

Prepared by:

Dr. Charles K. Atkin

Communication Research Institute

COMMUNICATION RESEARCH INSTITUTE
311 Kensington Road
East Lansing, MI 48823

SURVEY OF PUBLIC OPINION ABOUT OTTAWA COUNTY

Dr. Charles Atkin, Communication Research Institute

A telephone survey was conducted to measure the opinions of Ottawa County citizens relating to county government and life in Ottawa County. A total of N=400 individuals were interviewed between September 19 - 30, 2002. The survey was performed by Dr. Charles Atkin of the Communication Research Institute, using a telephone interviewing facility on the Michigan State University campus.

The basic sample frame is a representative cross-section of all Ottawa County adults. Interviewers called a list of countywide telephone numbers supplied by Survey Sampling Inc. of Fairfield, Connecticut. Both listed and unlisted numbers were called. The opening portion of the interview sought to secure cooperation, briefly identify the subject matter, and screen to ensure that respondents are adult county residents; each interview began with following introduction:

Hello, this is _____ calling from the Communication Research Institute in East Lansing. We're conducting a research study to measure citizen's opinions about county government in Ottawa County. Do you reside in Ottawa County? Are you age 18 or older?

IF HESITANT: The survey takes just ten minutes... your number was selected at random and answers are confidential... and we're not selling anything.

Interviewers calling from a centralized phone bank facility contacted a total of N = 638 households with qualifying individuals; of these, N=400 agreed to be interviewed, a success rate of 64%. On the other hand, 35% declined to be interviewed and 1% discontinued the lengthy interview partway through the questions. This is a slightly higher completion rate than current telephone survey standards.

Based on the sample size of N=400, the figures in this report can be extrapolated to the overall county population within a sampling error range of approximately 4 percentage points above or below the true percentage. For example, consider the finding that 68% of this sample feel that housing costs are affordable; this can be projected to an actual population figure ranging between 64% to 72% (with a 95% level of confidence that the projected percentage is accurate). Indeed, it is probable that the error is much smaller than plus or minus 4 points; the odds are two-to-one that it falls within two percentage points... in this case, between 66% and 70%.

The respondents in the sample can be profiled in terms of six demographic characteristics: the median age is 46 years old; the median level of educational attainment is 14 years of schooling; the median length of residency in Ottawa County is 16 years; 93% are Caucasian; 52% are female; 57% live in the West Corridor (largest proportions in Georgetown Township, Holland Township, and Holland city).

The survey was composed primarily of close-end items, with two open-end questions. This report presents the wording of each item and the set of responses, usually in percentage terms.

The report also presents cross-tabulation results comparing the responses of the following demographic and geographic subgroups: males vs. females, older vs. younger, higher vs. lower education, shorter vs. long-term residents, and residents of the West corridor vs. East vs. Rural areas of the county:

West Corridor: Grand Haven, Grand Haven Twp, Holland, Holland Twp, Ferrysburg, Park Twp, Port Sheldon Twp, Spring Lake Twp, Spring Lake Village, Zeeland, Zeeland Twp

East: Georgetown Twp, Hudsonville, Jamestown Twp, Tallmidge Twp

Rural: Chester Twp, Wright Twp, Polkton Twp, Coopersville, Allendale Twp, Blendon Twp, Crockery Twp, Robinson Twp, Olive Twp

The findings will be presented in six sections, describing responses to the questions in the order covered in the questionnaire. The appendices present cross-tabulations and open-end comments. These are major topical sections of the report:

- (1) Opinions about Life in Ottawa County
- (2) Ottawa County Strengths and Issues
- (3) Contact and Satisfaction with County Employees
- (4) Preferences for Expenditures on Services
- (5) Opinions about Tax Increases
- (6) Demographic Profile of Sample

(1) Opinions about Life in Ottawa County

Early in the interview, the respondents were asked a series of nine items dealing with basic opinions about living in Ottawa County. The interviewer read nine statements, and the residents indicated agreement or disagreement with each one (those with no opinion or mixed viewers are classified in the “neutral” category).

Please tell me if you agree or disagree with the following statements about Ottawa County:

Ottawa County is a safe place to live

93% AGREE
5% NEUTRAL
2% DISAGREE

Housing costs are affordable

68% AGREE
15% NEUTRAL
17% DISAGREE

Employment opportunities are good

62% AGREE
20% NEUTRAL
18% DISAGREE

Recycling services are sufficient

63% AGREE
13% NEUTRAL
24% DISAGREE

The county park system provides a satisfactory range of recreational opportunities

86% AGREE
10% NEUTRAL
4% DISAGREE

County employees are helpful

61% AGREE
33% NEUTRAL
6% DISAGREE

Ottawa County communicates effectively with its residents

63% AGREE
21% NEUTRAL
16% DISAGREE

Overall, Ottawa County is a good place to live

95% AGREE
3% NEUTRAL
2% DISAGREE

Overall, residents are consistently positive in their assessments of Ottawa County. The proportions agreeing on the eight dimensions range from 61% to 95%. Those with neutral responses vary from item to item, so the satisfaction rates are somewhat higher on several dimensions when this category is excluded (for example, 62% of all respondents say employment opportunities are good, while 18% disagree; the rate of agreement rises to 77% when only those expressing an opinion are analyzed). Here is the rank order of adjusted agreement on each item: 98% good place to live, 98% safe place to live, 96% recreational opportunities satisfactory, 91% employees helpful, 80% housing affordable, 77% employment opportunities good, 75% county communicates effectively, and 72% recycling services sufficient.

(2) Ottawa County Strengths and Issues

There were two open-ended items posed to the sample. The first asked about the strengths of the county, and the other question asked people to identify issues facing the county.

What are the greatest strengths of Ottawa County? (OPEN END)

The open-end comments can be categorized into the following groupings and subgroupings, which encompass the categories where at least 1% of the sample cited the specific strength:

- 46% Physical environment
 - 13% Attractive location
 - 12% Lakes and beaches
 - 12% Parks and recreation
 - 5% Peaceful and comfortable
 - 3% Rural countryside
 - 1% Uncrowded
- 25% People and communities
 - 9% Nice people, family-oriented
 - 7% Communities friendly, close-knit
 - 4% Religious and moral people
 - 2% Work ethic
 - 2% Diversity of people
 - 1% Quality of life
- 14% Safe, low-crime
- 8% Schools
- 7% Economy and job opportunities
- 4% Clean
- 2% Roads
- 1% Low taxes
- 1% Culture and entertainment
- 1% Positive leadership
- 1% Affordable

Fully 90% of all respondents identified at least one strength; about one-third cited two or more. The attractive physical environment is the most widely-cited strength of Ottawa County, as many people mention the lakes, beaches, and parks. The quality of the people in towns and neighborhoods is cited by one-quarter of the sample, including the general friendliness and the specific religiousness (moral, work ethic). Safety is another major strength, along with cleanliness. The schools and the economy also receive some comments. Relatively few mention the low taxes or cost of living. There are several dozen additional strengths mentioned by only one or two persons.

What is the most important issue facing Ottawa County? (OPEN END)

The open-ended comments were summarized by the interviewer and coded into the following categories, with the percentage of residents mentioning each issue:

- 16% Population growth
- 16% Road construction/repair (including 5% mentioning bypass)
- 9% Economic development and jobs
- 9% Environment (see below)
- 7% Schools
- 4% Taxes
- 3% Traffic congestion
- 3% Crime increase, gangs
- 2% Affordable housing
- 1% Discrimination, diversity
- 1% Safety
- 1% Healthcare cost
- 1% Drug/alcohol problems

Slightly more than three-fourths of the county residents mentioned an issue of concern, while 23% could not think of a particular issue that they considered important. The two largest categories encompass population growth and road problems (the 3% citing traffic congestion could be added to either category). The need for new employment opportunities and attracting business is tied for third, along with environmental issues (including water quality, land preservation, offshore drilling, and recycling). The quality and cost of schools ranks fifth, followed by taxes. No other topic area is mentioned by more than 3% of the residents. Only three people commented specifically about county government (“Board is cheap”, “unprofessionalism of county officials”, and “disputes in county departments”). There are scattered mentions of other problems by one or two individuals in the sample, but no other area of concern totals 1% of the sample.

(3) Contact and Satisfaction with County Employees

The interviewers next asked whether or not the residents have had contact with each of 12 departments of Ottawa County. In cases where there had been contact, a follow-up question was posed to determine satisfaction with the quality of services provided. In the presentation of findings below, the percent reporting contact is displayed to the right of the name of the department; for the subset of respondents who had contact, the percentages of satisfied vs. neutral vs. dissatisfied are displayed below each department name.

We want to ask whether you’ve had contact with employees of the following county departments:

IF HAD CONTACT: Were you satisfied or dissatisfied with the quality of services provided?

Register of Deeds (26% HAD CONTACT)

92% SATISFIED
4% NEUTRAL
4% DISSATISFIED

County Clerk (36% HAD CONTACT)

92% SATISFIED
4% NEUTRAL
4% DISSATISFIED

Treasurer (20% HAD CONTACT)

99% SATISFIED
0% NEUTRAL
1% DISSATISFIED

Parks and Recreation Office (26% HAD CONTACT)

90% SATISFIED
6% NEUTRAL
4% DISSATISFIED

Drain Commissioners Office (12% HAD CONTACT)

72% SATISFIED
5% NEUTRAL
23% DISSATISFIED

Michigan Works Agency (12% HAD CONTACT)

81% SATISFIED
13% NEUTRAL
6% DISSATISFIED

Public Health (37% HAD CONTACT)

93% SATISFIED
3% NEUTRAL
4% DISSATISFIED

Mental Health (15% HAD CONTACT)

81% SATISFIED
5% NEUTRAL
14% DISSATISFIED

Courts (29% HAD CONTACT)

70% SATISFIED
13% NEUTRAL
17% DISSATISFIED

Friend of the Court (13% HAD CONTACT)

53% SATISFIED
10% NEUTRAL
37% DISSATISFIED

Sheriff (32% HAD CONTACT)

82% SATISFIED
6% NEUTRAL
12% DISSATISFIED

Community Action Agency (6% HAD CONTACT)

79% SATISFIED
0% NEUTRAL
21% DISSATISFIED

The highest percentage of residents have had contact with the Public Health department (37%) and the County Clerk (36%), followed by the Sheriff (32%) and Courts (29%). The next tier includes Register of Deeds (26%) and Parks and Recreation office (26%), followed by the Treasurer (20%). Next are the Mental Health department (15%), Friend of the Court (13%), Drain Commissioner office (12%) and Michigan Works Agency (12%); the least-used unit is the Community Action Agency (6%).

Satisfaction is above 90% for five units: Treasurer, Public Health, County Clerk, Register of Deeds, and Parks and Recreation. Satisfaction is below 80% for Community Action Agency, Drain Commissioner, Courts, and Friend of the Court.

(4) Preferences for County Expenditures on Services

In the other major section of the survey, interviewers read a list of 12 county services in the order presented below, and asked the residents to indicate if they favored increased or decreased expenditures (or continuation of the current amount of spending):

Ottawa County spends funds on many services. For each one that I list, tell me if you think the county should be spending more money or less money... or the same amount as now.

Parks and recreation
28% MORE
68% SAME
4% LESS

Environmental protection

48% MORE

48% SAME

4% LESS

Law enforcement

44% MORE

52% SAME

4% LESS

Mass transit

29% MORE

59% SAME

12% LESS

Drug prevention and treatment

41% MORE

54% SAME

5% LESS

Mental health

24% MORE

71% SAME

5% LESS

Public health services

29% MORE

67% SAME

4% LESS

Social services

28% MORE

67% SAME

5% LESS

Senior services

39% MORE

58% SAME

3% LESS

Bringing in new businesses

52% MORE
43% SAME
5% LESS

Purchasing open green space

29% MORE
59% SAME
12% LESS

Making county services available by computer

34% MORE
58% SAME
8% LESS

For all 12 services, a larger proportion favored more spending rather than less spending; in most cases, slightly more than half of the residents want to maintain current levels of expenditures. The services can be rank-ordered according to the net preference for increased rather than decreased spending (the % “more” minus the % “less”): +47% new business, +44% environmental protection, +40% law enforcement, +36% drugs, +36% seniors, +26% computer services, +25% public health, +24% parks, +23% social services, +19% mental health, +17% mass transit, and +17% green space.

(5) Opinions about Tax Increases

Near the end of the survey, three final items dealt with the millage proposals and the trade-off between taxes vs. services:

Would you favor or oppose a special millage tax increase to fund bike paths in the county?

42% FAVOR
16% NEUTRAL
42% OPPOSE

Would you favor or oppose a special millage tax increase to fund farm land preservation?

46% FAVOR
17% NEUTRAL
37% OPPOSE

If the county budget is not sufficient to cover all current services, would you prefer cutting back on services or increasing taxes?

- 45% CUT SERVICES
- 29% INCREASE TAX
- 7% BOTH CUT AND INCREASE
- 6% NEITHER
- 13% DON'T KNOW

There is an even split in preference on bike path tax, with 42% favoring and 42% opposing. Farm land preservation is favored by a 46% to 37% margin. In each case, about one-sixth of the sample is neutral or undecided. On the question about dealing with budget constraints, fully 52% favor cutting services while 35% favor increasing taxes (7% of these people favor both).

(6) Demographic Profile of Sample

At the end of the survey, interviewers asked the respondents to describe their characteristics in terms of gender, age, education, ethnicity, length of residence, and geographical locale.

Gender:

- 48% MALE
- 52% FEMALE

Age:

- 15% AGE 18-29
- 17% THIRTIES
- 25% FORTIES
- 17% FIFTIES
- 13% SIXTIES
- 13% OLDER

Education:

- 31% 12TH GRADE OR LESS
- 28% SOME COLLEGE/TECH SCHOOL
- 41% FOUR-YEAR COLLEGE GRAD OR MORE

Ethnic background:

- 93% CAUCASIAN
- 1% AFRICAN-AMERICAN
- 2% ASIAN-AMERICAN
- 4% HISPANIC

Years lived in Ottawa County:

- 13% ONE -THREE YEARS
- 9% FOUR-FIVE YEARS
- 12% SIX-TEN YEARS
- 13% ELEVEN-FIFTEEN YEARS
- 12% SIXTEEN-TWENTY YEARS
- 41% LONGER

Locale:

- 5% ALLENDALE Twp
- 2% BLENDON Twp
- 1% CHESTER Twp
- 2% COOPERSVILLE
- 1% CROCKERY Twp
- 1% FERRYSBURG
- 18% GEORGETOWN Twp
- 6% GRAND HAVEN
- 6% GRAND HAVEN Twp
- 11% HOLLAND
- 11% HOLLAND Twp
- 3% HUDSONVILLE
- 3% JAMESTOWN Twp
- 1% OLIVE Twp
- 7% PARK Twp
- 1% POLKTON Twp
- 2% PORT SHELDON Twp
- 2% ROBINSON Twp
- 5% SPRING LAKE Twp
- 3% SPRING LAKE Village
- 3% TALLMIDGE Twp
- 1% WRIGHT Twp
- 2% ZEELAND
- 3% ZEELAND Twp

After each respondent identified their township, village, or city, the interviewer asked if they could identify the name of the commissioner representing their area. This is an open end question, with no aided-recall to help trigger recognition. Of the 400 respondents, 376 could not name their county commissioner

Which County Commissioner represents the area where you live? *OPEN-END*

1 BURGHORST
1 HAVEMAN
2 KORTMAN
0 KUYERS
3 MOHR
5 RINCK
1 RUITER
2 RYCENGA
0 SCHROTENBOER
3 SWARTOUT
1 VANDERKAMP
4 VANDERLAAN
1 VISSCHER
376 DON'T KNOW

Appendix A: CROSS-TABULATION ANALYSES

The overall sample was sub-divided based on five demographic variables, in order to examine differences on a subset of important questions measured in the survey. This portion of the report will present the percent of each subgroup who gave the key answer on these items. The following subgroups are compared:

- Gender (male vs. female)
- Age level (age 18-39 vs. 40-59 vs. age 60 or older)
- Length of residence (up to 15 years vs. 16 years or longer)
- Locale (west vs. east vs. rural/other)
- Education level (high school vs. some college vs. college grad)

These charts are organized as follows: (a) the question from the survey is paraphrased, (b) the key response category, such as AGREE or YES, is identified, (c) the percentage giving that answer for the full sample is presented at the top of each table (this is the same figure reported in the text), and (d) the percentages giving that particular answer within each subgroup are presented (e. g., percent of the younger respondents who say YES vs. percent of the older respondents who say YES). Results are summarized after each section of related questions.

Ottawa is safe place to live (% AGREE)

93% Overall sample

90% Male	92% Shorter residency	
94% Female	93% Longer residency	
94% Under 40	93% West	93% High school
91% 40's/50's	94% East	91% Some college
93% Over 60	88% Rural/other	93% College grad

Housing costs affordable (% AGREE)

68% Overall sample

67% Male	67% Shorter residency	
69% Female	69% Longer residency	
63% Under 40	64% West	71% High school
67% 40's/50's	76% East	58% Some college
73% Over 60	70% Rural/other	72% College grad

Employment opportunities good (% AGREE)

62% Overall sample

64% Male	55% Shorter residency	
61% Female	69% Longer residency	
65% Under 40	61% West	68% High school
60% 40's/50's	66% East	60% Some college
63% Over 60	63% Rural/other	60% College grad

Recycling services sufficient (% AGREE)

63% Overall sample

62% Male	57% Shorter residency	
64% Female	69% Longer residency	
66% Under 40	68% West	76% High school
58% 40's/50's	58% East	56% Some college
68% Over 60	55% Rural/other	58% College grad

Recreation opportunities satisfactory (% AGREE)

86% Overall sample

82% Male	83% Shorter residency	
90% Female	89% Longer residency	
90% Under 40	90% West	90% High school
84% 40's/50's	82% East	78% Some college
85% Over 60	80% Rural/other	89% College grad

County employees helpful (% AGREE)

61% Overall sample

59% Male	54% Shorter residency	
63% Female	67% Longer residency	
60% Under 40	59% West	74% High school
61% 40's/50's	57% East	51% Some college
62% Over 60	73% Rural/other	58% College grad

County communicates effectively (% AGREE)

63% Overall sample

56% Male	54% Shorter residency	
69% Female	70% Longer residency	
60% Under 40	64% West	73% High school
59% 40's/50's	64% East	60% Some college
73% Over 60	57% Rural/other	57% College grad

County is a good place to live (% AGREE)

95% Overall sample

92% Male	95% Shorter residency	
98% Female	96% Longer residency	
95% Under 40	95% West	95% High school
95% 40's/50's	95% East	94% Some college
96% Over 60	95% Rural/other	96% College grad

Employee contact: Register of Deeds (% YES)

26% Overall sample

25% Male	25% Shorter residency	
26% Female	27% Longer residency	
25% Under 40	24% West	22% High school
23% 40's/50's	24% East	25% Some college
30% Over 60	33% Rural/other	29% College grad

Employee contact: County Clerk (% YES)

36% Overall sample

36% Male	30% Shorter residency	
36% Female	41% Longer residency	
35% Under 40	39% West	31% High school
38% 40's/50's	30% East	35% Some college
34% Over 60	34% Rural/other	40% College grad

Employee contact: Treasurer (% YES)

20% Overall sample

21% Male	17% Shorter residency	
19% Female	22% Longer residency	
15% Under 40	22% West	18% High school
23% 40's/50's	16% East	20% Some college
20% Over 60	20% Rural/other	21% College grad

Employee contact: Parks and Recreation Office (% YES)

27% Overall sample

26% Male	29% Shorter residency	
28% Female	24% Longer residency	
26% Under 40	28% West	21% High school
30% 40's/50's	24% East	28% Some college
21% Over 60	25% Rural/other	30% College grad

Employee contact: Drain Commissioners Office (% YES)

12% Overall sample

17% Male	11% Shorter residency	
8% Female	13% Longer residency	
8% Under 40	12% West	10% High school
12% 40's/50's	12% East	14% Some college
15% Over 60	11% Rural/other	12% College grad

Employee contact: Michigan Works Agency (% YES)

12% Overall sample

13% Male	11% Shorter residency	
10% Female	13% Longer residency	
15% Under 40	14% West	11% High school
14% 40's/50's	9% East	17% Some college
5% Over 60	8% Rural/other	9% College grad

Employee contact: Public Health (% YES)

37% Overall sample

34% Male	39% Shorter residency	
40% Female	35% Longer residency	
33% Under 40	35% West	32% High school
36% 40's/50's	40% East	39% Some college
43% Over 60	39% Rural/other	40% College grad

Employee contact: Mental Health (% YES)

15% Overall sample

11% Male	14% Shorter residency	
19% Female	15% Longer residency	
15% Under 40	17% West	17% High school
13% 40's/50's	8% East	17% Some college
17% Over 60	17% Rural/other	12% College grad

Employee contact: Courts (% YES)

29% Overall sample

31% Male	27% Shorter residency	
26% Female	30% Longer residency	
27% Under 40	33% West	25% High school
31% 40's/50's	21% East	37% Some college
25% Over 60	27% Rural/other	26% College grad

Employee contact: Friend of the Court (% YES)

13% Overall sample

13% Male	12% Shorter residency	
12% Female	14% Longer residency	
12% Under 40	16% West	12% High school
15% 40's/50's	6% East	20% Some college
11% Over 60	13% Rural/other	9% College grad

Employee contact: Sheriff (% YES)

32% Overall sample

36% Male	35% Shorter residency	
28% Female	29% Longer residency	
35% Under 40	33% West	29% High school
36% 40's/50's	31% East	34% Some college
22% Over 60	30% Rural/other	33% College grad

Employee contact: Community Action Agency (% YES)

6% Overall sample

8% Male	6% Shorter residency	
4% Female	6% Longer residency	
5% Under 40	8% West	8% High school
6% 40's/50's	4% East	6% Some college
7% Over 60	2% Rural/other	5% College grad

Satisfied with services: Register of Deeds (% SATISFIED)

92% Overall sample

89% Male	87% Shorter residency	
95% Female	97% Longer residency	
90% Under 40	93% West	89% High school
93% 40's/50's	96% East	100% Some college
94% Over 60	86% Rural/other	90% College grad

Satisfied with services: County Clerk (% SATISFIED)

92% Overall sample

91% Male	95% Shorter residency	
92% Female	90% Longer residency	
86% Under 40	90% West	90% High school
92% 40's/50's	94% East	92% Some college
97% Over 60	96% Rural/other	92% College grad

Satisfied with services: Treasurer (% SATISFIED)

99% Overall sample

97% Male	97% Shorter residency	
100% Female	100% Longer residency	
100% Under 40	100% West	100% High school
98% 40's/50's	100% East	96% Some college
100% Over 60	92% Rural/other	100% College grad

Satisfied with services: Parks and Recreation Office (% SATISFIED)

90% Overall sample

90% Male	85% Shorter residency	
90% Female	94% Longer residency	
91% Under 40	89% West	92% High school
89% 40's/50's	92% East	84% Some college
91% Over 60	88% Rural/other	92% College grad

Satisfied with services: Drain Commissioners Office (% SATISFIED)

72% Overall sample

77% Male	80% Shorter residency	
63% Female	67% Longer residency	
70% Under 40	67% West	75% High school
76% 40's/50's	85% East	80% Some college
69% Over 60	71% Rural/other	63% College grad

Satisfied with services: Michigan Works Agency (% SATISFIED)

81% Overall sample

80% Male	75% Shorter residency	
82% Female	85% Longer residency	
83% Under 40	91% West	100% High school
75% 40's/50's	40% East	74% Some college
100% Over 60	100% Rural/other	71% College grad

Satisfied with services: Public Health (% SATISFIED)

93% Overall sample

91% Male	97% Shorter residency	
95% Female	90% Longer residency	
95% Under 40	93% West	93% High school
92% 40's/50's	93% East	93% Some college
93% Over 60	96% Rural/other	94% College grad

Satisfied with services: Mental Health (% SATISFIED)

81% Overall sample

75% Male	81% Shorter residency	
85% Female	82% Longer residency	
72% Under 40	85% West	95% High school
87% 40's/50's	67% East	68% Some college
83% Over 60	82% Rural/other	79% College grad

Satisfied with services: Courts (% SATISFIED)

69% Overall sample

71% Male	70% Shorter residency	
67% Female	69% Longer residency	
71% Under 40	73% West	61% High school
67% 40's/50's	61% East	68% Some college
73% Over 60	65% Rural/other	77% College grad

Satisfied with services: Friend of the Court (% SATISFIED)

53% Overall sample

52% Male	59% Shorter residency	
54% Female	48% Longer residency	
53% Under 40	57% West	60% High school
52% 40's/50's	33% East	41% Some college
55% Over 60	50% Rural/other	64% College grad

Satisfied with services: Sheriff (% SATISFIED)

82% Overall sample

79% Male	80% Shorter residency	
85% Female	84% Longer residency	
79% Under 40	83% West	75% High school
87% 40's/50's	85% East	78% Some college
74% Over 60	74% Rural/other	89% College grad

Satisfied with services: Community Action Agency (% SATISFIED)

79% Overall sample

73% Male	64% Shorter residency	
89% Female	92% Longer residency	
67% Under 40	74% West	80% High school
82% 40's/50's	100% East	83% Some college
86% Over 60	100% Rural/other	75% College grad

Spending on: Parks and recreation (% MORE)

28% Overall sample

32% Male	33% Shorter residency	
25% Female	24% Longer residency	
26% Under 40	26% West	21% High school
34% 40's/50's	31% East	30% Some college
20% Over 60	30% Rural/other	32% College grad

Spending on: Environmental protection (% MORE)

48% Overall sample

52% Male	51% Shorter residency	
44% Female	45% Longer residency	
46% Under 40	50% West	41% High school
57% 40's/50's	42% East	56% Some college
36% Over 60	49% Rural/other	48% College grad

Spending on: Law enforcement (% MORE)

44% Overall sample

40% Male	46% Shorter residency	
48% Female	43% Longer residency	
43% Under 40	43% West	44% High school
50% 40's/50's	48% East	40% Some college
7% Over 60	40% Rural/other	47% College grad

Spending on: Mass transit (% MORE)

30% Overall sample

31% Male	30% Shorter residency	
29% Female	29% Longer residency	
29% Under 40	34% West	21% High school
35% 40's/50's	19% East	37% Some college
22% Over 60	30% Rural/other	32% College grad

Spending on: Drug prevention and treatment (% MORE)

41% Overall sample

39% Male	37% Shorter residency	
43% Female	44% Longer residency	
46% Under 40	42% West	44% High school
42% 40's/50's	43% East	44% Some college
34% Over 60	35% Rural/other	37% College grad

Spending on: Mental health (% MORE)

24% Overall sample

22% Male	23% Shorter residency	
27% Female	26% Longer residency	
25% Under 40	25% West	23% High school
25% 40's/50's	19% East	26% Some college
22% Over 60	29% Rural/other	24% College grad

Spending on: Public health services (% MORE)

29% Overall sample

31% Male	34% Shorter residency	
28% Female	26% Longer residency	
33% Under 40	29% West	25% High school
29% 40's/50's	31% East	34% Some college
26% Over 60	29% Rural/other	31% College grad

Spending on: Social services (% MORE)

29% Overall sample

28% Male	28% Shorter residency	
29% Female	29% Longer residency	
33% Under 40	29% West	28% High school
30% 40's/50's	25% East	29% Some college
21% Over 60	32% Rural/other	29% College grad

Spending on: Senior services (% MORE)

39% Overall sample

39% Male	35% Shorter residency	
39% Female	42% Longer residency	
37% Under 40	41% West	43% High school
44% 40's/50's	35% East	46% Some college
33% Over 60	35% Rural/other	31% College grad

Spending on: Bringing in new businesses (% MORE)

52% Overall sample

56% Male	55% Shorter residency	
49% Female	49% Longer residency	
59% Under 40	54% West	51% High school
55% 40's/50's	43% East	56% Some college
38% Over 60	59% Rural/other	50% College grad

Spending on: Purchasing open green space (% MORE)

30% Overall sample

32% Male	30% Shorter residency	
28% Female	29% Longer residency	
27% Under 40	35% West	23% High school
37% 40's/50's	22% East	32% Some college
20% Over 60	22% Rural/other	34% College grad

Spending on: Making county services available by computer (% MORE)

34% Overall sample

37% Male	38% Shorter residency	
32% Female	32% Longer residency	
40% Under 40	39% West	30% High school
38% 40's/50's	28% East	40% Some college
21% Over 60	29% Rural/other	34% College grad

Special millage to fund bike paths (% FAVOR)

42% Overall sample

36% Male	44% Shorter residency	
47% Female	40% Longer residency	
49% Under 40	43% West	35% High school
42% 40's/50's	42% East	46% Some college
34% Over 60	38% Rural/other	45% College grad

Special millage to fund farmland preservation (% FAVOR)

46% Overall sample

37% Male	45% Shorter residency	
53% Female	47% Longer residency	
47% Under 40	48% West	45% High school
49% 40's/50's	41% East	40% Some college
38% Over 60	46% Rural/other	50% College grad

Prefer cutting services or increasing taxes (% CUT SERVICE)

46% Overall sample

55% Male

44% Shorter residency

37% Female

47% Longer residency

49% Under 40

48% West

56% High school

41% 40's/50's

41% East

42% Some college

48% Over 60

44% Rural/other

40% College grad