

August 5, 2002

To: John Fregonese
Fregonese Calthorpe & Associates

From: Adam Davis
Davis, Hibbitts & McCaig, Inc.

Re: Central Texas Telephone Survey Results

I. Introduction and Research Methodology

Davis, Hibbitts & McCaig, Inc. (DHM) is pleased to present the results of a telephone survey of five central Texas counties conducted during July 2002 to assist in evaluating opinions about issues related to future growth in the region.

In May, DHM conducted a pair of small group discussions to solicit opinions on this topic and assist in developing the survey.

This survey used a stratified sample of 750. Respondents were randomly drawn from the general population age 18 and over. One hundred fifty respondents in each of the five counties – Bastrop, Caldwell, Hays, Travis, and Williamson – were interviewed. The data for the counties are reported based on the actual sample in each county. The data reported for all of the other cross tab banners in the tables are population proportionate; that is the data were weighted to reflect the proportional percentage of population that each of the counties represents.

This memo highlights key findings, notes significant subgroup variations for gender, age, location of residence, ethnicity, and other factors, and compares some results with findings from the May focus group research. The final section on observations combines findings from both research projects. For additional information on survey results please see the accompanying set of Tables.

The five-county survey collected the following demographic characteristics:

- 46% of respondents were male and 54% female.
- 68% identified themselves as white, 20% as Hispanic, 6% African American, and 2% Asian.
- 13% were 18-24 years old, 22% 25-34, 27% 35-54, and 23% were over 55.
- 12% of respondents had less than a high school education and 23% were high school graduates; 22% had some college, 27% were college graduates and 16% had some post-college experience.
- 12% had lived in the Central Texas region for less than two years, 13% between two and five, 17% 6-10 years, 23% 11-20 years, and 35% more than 20 years.
- 27% of respondents reported household incomes of \$30,000 or less, 11% reported \$30-40,000, 10% \$40-50,000, 14% \$50-75,000 and another 17% over \$75,000.

- Asked to describe where they lived, 38% selected suburban, 23% urban, 18% rural changing to suburban, and 17% rural.
- Two-thirds of respondents reported voting in the November 2001 general election.

Questionnaire. A copy of the annotated questionnaire is attached as an Appendix. The substantive areas of questioning included problems in the Central Texas region, planning for growth, land use preferences, transportation funding, and public communications. Each is discussed in a separate section below.

Statement of Limitations. In gathering the responses, DHM employed quality control measures, including questionnaire pretesting, callbacks, and verification.

Any sampling of opinions or attitudes is subject to a margin of error, which represents the difference between a sample of a given population and the total population (here, the five county region's general population age 18 plus). For a sample size of 750 the overall margin of error is +/- 2.1% to 3.6%. Findings from individual counties (with sample size of 150) have a margin of error of +/-4.8% to 8.0%.

These plus-minus error margins represent differences between the sample and total population at a confidence interval, or probability, calculated to be 95%. This means there is a 95% probability that the sample taken for this study would fall within the stated margins of error if compared with the results achieved from surveying the entire target population.

II. The Central Texas Region's Biggest Problems

Respondents were first asked what they thought were the "biggest problems" in the Central Texas region that local or regional government officials should do something about (Q1). Transportation issues led the list, with "traffic" (40% of responses) and "roads/highways/bridges" (18%) as the top concerns. These were followed by "education/schools" (11%), "jobs/unemployment" (9%), and "health care/health insurance/medical" (9%). A broader category of "transportation" was also noted by 7% of responses. In total, two of every three responses (65%) identified an iteration of transportation as one of the biggest problems in the region.

Responses were generally consistent across demographic groups, with some exceptions: Hispanic respondents were less likely to be concerned with traffic and more concerned with health care (22% of Hispanic responses vs. 5% for whites) and the cost of living (19% vs. 2%); and respondents with college experience were more likely to note education as a problem.

Participants in the earlier focus group research (May 2002) also quickly noted traffic congestion as a key characteristic of what they *did not* like about where they lived.

III. Planning for Growth – Generally

Respondents were read two statements about planning for growth generally. To the statement, **“Planning for growth is necessary if we are to keep our livability”** (Q2a), 86% said they agreed, with 53% in strong agreement. This high agreement rating held true across major demographic categories and in every county (county support for this statement ranged from 81% to 87% of respondents).

A second statement about planning for growth, **“My local government ought to try to slow growth down”** (Q2f), enjoyed agreement by less than two of five respondents (38%). At least a plurality, if not a majority, of every major demographic group disagreed with the notion that government should try to slow growth. Hispanic respondents and those with less education and lower or moderate incomes were most likely to agree with a government role (43% of Hispanics, 45% without high-school education and 40% with a high-school degree, and 40-41% with household incomes less than \$50,000).

In the focus groups, most saw growth as inevitable. Although there were concerns about the consequences and pace of growth, many saw it as positive for the region.

IV. Land Use Preferences

Respondents also were read some agree-disagree statements about their preferences for a variety of land use options. The support for planning generally (Q2a) noted above was validated by the statement receiving the least agreement from respondents: that there was **“plenty of room for growth in the region and (we) shouldn’t worry about the cities spreading out as they grow”** (Q2d, 35%). At least a plurality in every demographic group disagreed with this statement, with the strongest opposition from voters (62%), those willing to pay more to improve the transportation system in the region (61%), and middle-aged, more educated and affluent residents (76% age 45-54, 60-62% of those with a college degree or more and 65-66% of those making \$50,000 or more annually disagreed with the statement). These results are consistent with findings from the focus groups, which noted support for some land use planning.

The option of **redeveloping blighted areas in existing neighborhoods and business districts** (Q2b) registered 70% agreement with survey respondents. The highest agreement among respondents for this strategy was with those who said they were willing to pay more to improve the transportation system in the region¹ (78% versus 61% of those saying they were unwilling to pay more).

There was also strong support for **higher density development in new neighborhoods** (Q2c). Nearly three-fourths of respondents (73%) expressed agreement with this statement if the development were carefully designed and with open space provided. Support was consistent across demographic groups, with the strongest agreement from those with less than a high-school education (90%), households making \$50-75,000 annually (81%), and those living in the region 6-10 years (80%).

Respondents’ **willingness to have more people in their own neighborhood to limit development of open space outside city limits** (Q2h) fared less well, with only 38% in agreement. All five counties had at least a plurality of respondents disagreeing with the statement, with the strongest

¹ See Section V for the results on the question of willingness to pay more to improve transportation.

disagreement in Hays County (54%). Respondents identifying themselves as living in suburban areas actually had a plurality agreeing with the statement (43%). Other significant sub-groups that were split or had plurality agreement include women, 18-24 year olds, residents of less than 20 years, high-school graduates, and people with post-college experience.

The survey then presented two growth related scenarios and respondents were asked to choose, on a 1 to 7 scale, how they personally felt about the issues involved with each (Q4 and 5):

A. Growth in Developed or Undeveloped Areas

Some people believe to provide public services and transit efficiently and cost effectively, maintain environmental quality, and protect open space, that new growth and development (including in-fill and redevelopment) should occur within existing neighborhoods and business districts even if it means more people living closer together. Others believe that focusing growth in existing areas will be expensive, even disruptive, and that new growth should occur on vacant land, moving out from the fringes of the existing developed area onto open space.

After this description was read, respondents were asked to choose which came closest to their personal feelings, where 1=growth primarily in developed areas, 4=both equal, and 7=growth in undeveloped areas. The mean was 4.1, reflecting a near equal preference for growth in both existing and undeveloped areas. The frequency distribution reflected this split opinion: 36% selected growth in developed areas, 23% both equal, and 39% growth in undeveloped areas.

This split opinion held true across demographic groups, although there was slightly more support for focusing on developed areas from residents of Bastrop County (3.8 mean score) and in undeveloped areas among Hispanics (4.7).

When asked a similar question in the focus groups, two-thirds of participants expressed a stronger preference for growth primarily in undeveloped areas, although some comments indicated confusion about their rating. The average rating was 5.0, with no participants neutral (a 4 rating) on this question. Participants were ambivalent about Austin, with some favoring redevelopment before moving from the city core and others concerned that it would change the character of Austin.

B. Residential/Commercial Mix

Some people feel that in the future, development should be planned so that residential and small scale commercial areas are mixed together and designed so that it is easy to walk or bicycle to shopping for everyday needs like groceries and the cleaners. Others feel that there should be a separation between residential and shopping areas to avoid any negative impacts on housing like noise and traffic and that people will almost always use their cars for shopping trips.

A second scenario presented mixed-use (residential and commercial) development options (ratings 1 to 3) versus residential and shopping separation (ratings 5 to 7). The mean was 3.9, another nearly equally split opinion. This scenario elicited the most polarized response pattern with 45% selecting mixed-use centers (and 22% selecting a 1 score on the issue), 41% separation of residential and shopping areas, and 12% saying both options were equal. Bastrop and Travis County respondents were slightly more supportive of mixed use (3.8 mean scores) and rural residents and Hispanics exhibited more support for separated development (4.6 and 4.3 respectively).

In a similar question posed to the focus groups nearly two-thirds of participants favored mixed-use development (combined average of 3.2). For some, their support for mixed-use was contingent on “adequate safeguards.”

V. Transportation Planning and Funding

The survey also assessed transportation planning and funding. The notion of **widening congested freeways and building new ones** (Q2g) received substantial agreement from respondents, with 70% in agreement (and 39% registering strong agreement). This support was consistent across all counties and demographic groups, with highest support among rural residents (82%), non-voters (78%), Hispanics (80%), and households making \$50-75,000 annually (80%).

Respondents were less enthusiastic about **light rail as part of the solution to the area’s traffic congestion** (Q2e). A bare majority (51%) agreed, with 26% agreeing strongly. Overall, support for this statement was narrow, with strongest agreement from young people (two-thirds of 18-24 years olds), lower-income households (63% of those under \$30,000), two-thirds of Hispanics, and those living in the area 5 years or less (60%). The strongest opposition to this statement was with older, more affluent people (41% of people over 45 and 42% of people making over \$75,000).

Just over one-half of respondents agreed that **more sidewalks and bike paths were part of the solution to traffic congestion** (Q2i). Support was generally strongest among women (66%), urban and Travis County residents (71% and 63% respectively), and lower income and less educated respondents (69% of those with incomes under \$30,000 and 72% of those with less than a high school education).

Respondents were then asked if they “**could specify exactly how money would be spent**” whether **they were willing to pay more in taxes to improve the region’s transportation system** (Q3). Just over half of respondents (54%) said yes. Support was strongest among urban residents (62%), 18-24 year olds (67%), people with college experience (64-71%), and households making more than \$50,000 annually (61-70%).

Groups registering the greatest opposition to paying more were residents of Caldwell County (47% said no), non-voters (50%), residents of rural communities changing to suburban (49%), and those with a high-school degree or less (56-60% no).

Respondents who said they were not well informed on growth and environmental issues² in the region were split on their willingness to pay for such improvements (46% yes, 44% no).

Survey respondents were then read a scenario about addressing traffic congestion in the region (Q6):

Traffic congestion has increased as the Central Texas region has grown. Some people believe that public funds should be used to improve existing roads and build new ones to preserve the convenience and freedom of driving a car. Others believe future transportation problems are best resolved by greater investment in public transit and other modes of transportation.

Respondents were presented with a 7-point tradeoff scenario – roads for cars (ratings 1-3) versus public transit and other modes (ratings 5-7). The mean was 4.0, favoring both options equally. The

² See Section VI for results on the question of how well informed respondents felt on growth and environmental issues.

distribution of opinion also reflected this balance: 42% on the roads for cars side, 39% favoring mass transit, and 19% selecting both equal. Respondents willing to pay more for transportation improvements, college graduates, and African Americans and Asians were more supportive of the public transit and other modes option. There is also some indication that respondents with more education leaned more toward a public transit model.

A majority of focus group participants favored investments in roads for cars. Support in these groups for public transit was generally soft, weighted with concerns that people were not willing to get out of their cars.

VI. Public Involvement and Communications

Finally, survey respondents were asked a series of questions about understanding of and involvement in growth, land use, transportation, and environmental issues in the Central Texas region. Nearly 7 in 10 respondents (69%) said they were somewhat or very well informed and 31% that they were not too well or not at all informed on these issues (Q7).

There was a strong positive relationship between feeling informed and age, education, income, and length of residence. That is, as people age, get more education, make more money and live longer in the area, their level of knowledge about these issues increased. Those who said they are not well informed were more likely to be rural, non-voters, and unwilling to pay more for regional transportation improvements.

About one-third of respondents also reported that they had participated in the following activities as a result of their concern about growth, land use, transportation, and environmental issues (Q8):

- Donated money/volunteered time to candidate or issue 38%
- Contacted an elected official by phone/letter/fax/email 35%
- Volunteered/joined an association or other group 35%
- Attended a public meeting 33%
- Participated in neighborhood/regional clean-up activities 30%

About one in 10 respondents said they had called a radio talk show (12%) or wrote a letter to their local paper (10%).

Most respondents reported they received their information about these issues (Q9) from television (60%). Almost one-half of responses (46%) noted the *Austin-American Statesman* and another one-third of responses mentioned radio (32%). Nineteen percent (19%) also said that friends and neighbors were sources of information for them.

Both those respondents identified as more willing to pay for transportation improvements and those saying they were not well informed relied more on television than on other sources for their information. Higher income and better educated respondents were more likely to mention radio and newspaper sources than they were television.

VII. Observations

- ❖ **Growth and Planning.** There was support for planning and worry about cities spreading out, yet there was no significant agreement about slowing growth – only 38% said government should take a role in slowing growth. It is not totally clear if respondents meant they felt government had no role, or if they did not agree that growth should be slowed. If focus group participant comments are any guide, most emphasized government needing to be “ahead of the curve” in planning for growth. Many viewed growth as positive, but they also were ambivalent about the consequences of growth and felt the pace was too fast.
- ❖ **Transportation Issues.** Traffic is a central concern for the region’s residents. Forty percent of responses noted traffic as one of the biggest problems about which local and regional governments should do something. An additional 18% identified highways and bridges as a big problem. However, there appears to be a presumption against public transit. As a focus group participant noted, “We Texans are an independent bunch; we don’t want someone taking away our freedom to have cars.”

The survey results affirm this: seven in ten supported widening or building more freeways, barely one-half saw light rail as part of the solution to the traffic problem, and they were split when asked to choose a preference between more roads and public transit. Traffic and congestion is a pressing issue; building more roads is the presumptive solution to fixing it.

- ❖ **Balance.** Slightly more than one-half (54%) of respondents expressed a willingness to pay more taxes to improve the region’s transportation system. More of these “yes” votes were willing to spend money on light rail (59% agreeing that light rail is part of the solution vs. 45% of those unwilling to pay more) and less on widening and building freeways than those unwilling to pay more (68% vs. 75%). Both sides were split on building more sidewalks and bike paths as part of the solution (60% and 59%) to traffic congestion.

The degree of support for multiple options likely means that any strategic funding initiative focusing on a single solution is not likely to be broadly supported. This is consistent with the focus group participants’ support for balanced solutions to land use and transportation issues.

- ❖ **Ambivalence.** Opinions were nearly evenly divided on the specific growth scenarios (additional growth in developed or undeveloped areas, mixed-use options, and car and transit alternatives). The split decisions on each of these scenarios reflects further ambivalence about how to deal with the population growth that focus group participants found inevitable.
- ❖ **Agreement.** There was strong agreement, however, regarding the general notions of developing existing “blighted” areas and higher density in *new* neighborhoods. However, when presented with a personal impact (“more people in *my* neighborhood”) agreement dropped.
- ❖ **Area of Residence.** Travis County, the most populated in the region, exhibited the most support for paying more for regional transportation improvements and were most supportive of planning for growth generally, mixed-use developments, and adding more sidewalks and bike pathways.

Davis, Hibbitts & McCaig, Inc.
Central Texas Regional Visioning Project
Baseline Survey
July 2002; N=750; RDD
(n=150 each in Bastrop, Caldwell Hays, Travis, and Williamson,)
 statistical weighting used for regional analysis and reporting

INTERVIEWER _____ STA# _____

TOTAL TIME: _____ Respondent (M/F) M _____ F _____

[INTERVIEWER: SPECIAL INSTRUCTIONS TO YOU, WILL APPEAR IN BRACKETED BOLD TEXT, SUCH AS THIS INSTRUCTION. DO NOT READ TEXT WHICH APPEARS WITHIN THESE BRACKETS, UNLESS INSTRUCTED TO DO SO BY THE TEXT]

Hello, this is _____ calling from DHM. We're conducting a poll about important issues in the Central Texas region, which is the area within approximately 50 miles of Austin. May I please speak to someone 18 or older? **[IF NO ONE AVAILABLE, TERMINATE]**

1. What are the biggest problems in the Central Texas region that you would like to see your local and regional government officials do something about? (OPEN/ACCEPT UP TO THREE)

Traffic-----	40%
Roads/Highways/Bridges -----	18%
Education/Schools (General) -----	11%
Jobs/Unemployment -----	9%
Health Care / Health Insurance / Medical-----	9%
Transportation (General)-----	7%
Crime -----	7%
Cost of Living -----	6%
Taxes-----	6%
Nothing -----	2%
Don't know/No answer/Refused -----	6%
All others -----	<5%

2. I'm now going to read to you some statements. For each one, please tell me if you disagree strongly, disagree somewhat, agree somewhat, or agree strongly. If you feel neutral about it or don't know, just say so.

<u>ROTATE</u>	<u>Strgly</u> <u>Disagr.</u>	<u>Smwt</u> <u>Disagr.</u>	<u>Neut.</u>	<u>Smwt</u> <u>Agree</u>	<u>Strgly</u> <u>Agree</u>	<u>Dk/</u> <u>Na</u>
a. Planning for growth is necessary if we are to keep our livability. -----	5%	4%	4%	33%	53%	1%
b. Blighted areas in existing neighborhoods and business districts should be redeveloped instead of using up open space for new development. -----	5%	12%	10%	30%	40%	2%

ROTATE

	<u>Strgly</u> <u>Disagr.</u>	<u>Smwt</u> <u>Disagr.</u>	<u>Neut.</u>	<u>Smwt</u> <u>Agree</u>	<u>Strgly</u> <u>Agree</u>	<u>Dk/</u> <u>Na</u>
c. New neighborhoods with higher density development are OK if they are carefully designed and provide open space. -----	8%	9%	8%	42%	31%	3%
d. We have plenty of room for growth in the Central Texas region and shouldn't worry about the cities spreading out as they grow. -----	27%	29%	7%	21%	14%	3%
e. Light rail is part of the solution to the Austin area's traffic congestion problem. -----	21%	13%	10%	25%	26%	4%
f. My local government ought to try to slow growth down. -----	23%	25%	12%	22%	16%	2%
g. We should widen congested freeways and build new ones. -----	11%	10%	7%	31%	39%	2%
h. I am willing to have more people live in my neighborhood so that less open space outside existing city boundaries will have to be developed. -----	20%	23%	16%	25%	13%	3%
i. Building more sidewalks and bicycle paths is part of the solution to the traffic congestion problem. -----	14%	19%	7%	28%	31%	1%

3. If you could specify exactly how the money would be spent, would you be willing to pay anything more in taxes to improve the transportation system in the Central Texas region?

Yes -----	54%
No -----	39%
[DO NOT READ] Don't know / Na/ Ref-----	7%

Next, I'd like to ask you some questions which will have you choose a number on a 1 to 7 scale that comes closest to the way you personally feel about the issues involved.

4. Some people believe to provide public services and transit efficiently and cost effectively, maintain environmental quality, and protect open space, that new growth and development (including in-fill and redevelopment) should occur within existing neighborhoods and business districts even if it means more people living closer together. Others believe that focusing growth in existing areas will be expensive, even disruptive, and that new growth should occur on vacant land, moving out from the fringes of the existing developed area onto open space. Using a 7-point scale, where 1 is growth primarily in developed areas and 7 is growth in undeveloped areas, which number comes closest to the way you personally feel? You can choose any number from 1 to 7.

1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8
10%	11%	15%	23%	18%	7%	14%	3%
PRIMARILY IN DEVELOPED AREAS			BOTH EQUAL	GROWTH IN UNDEVELOPED AREAS			DK/NA

Mean = 4.1

5. Some people feel that in the future, development should be planned so that residential and small scale commercial areas are mixed together and designed so that it is easy to walk or bicycle to shopping for everyday needs like groceries and the cleaners. Others feel that there should be a separation between residential and shopping areas to avoid any negative impacts on housing like noise and traffic and that people will almost always use their cars for shopping trips. Again, using a 7 point scale, where 1 is mixed use centers and 7 is residential-shopping separation, which number comes closest to the way you personally feel about how areas should be planned in the future. You can choose any number from 1 to 7.

1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8
22%	11%	12%	12%	11%	13%	17%	2%
MIXED USE CENTERS ONLY			BOTH EQUAL	RESIDENTIAL SHOPPING SEPARATION			DK/NA

Mean = 3.9

6. **Traffic congestion has increased as the Central Texas region has grown. Some people believe that public funds should be used to improve existing roads and build new ones to preserve the convenience and freedom of driving a car. Others believe future transportation problems are best resolved by greater investment in public transit and other modes of transportation. Again, using the same 7 point scale where 1 is investment in roads for cars and 7 is investment in public transit and alternative modes, which number comes closest to the way you personally feel? Again, you can choose any number from 1 to 7.**

1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8
17%	9%	16%	19%	11%	12%	16%	2%
ROADS FOR			BOTH		PUBLIC TRANSIT		DK/NA
CARS			EQUAL		AND ALTERNATIVE MODES		

Mean = 4.0

7. **Would you say that you feel not at all informed, not too well informed, somewhat well informed, or very well informed about growth, land use, transportation, and environmental issues in the Central Texas region?**

Not at all informed -----	9%
Not too well informed -----	22%
Somewhat well informed-----	50%
Very well informed -----	19%
[DO NOT READ] Don't know / Na/ Ref-----	0%

8. **In the last three years, please tell me if you have been involved in any of the following civic activities as a result of your concern about growth, land use, transportation, and environmental issues:**

<u>[ROTATE]</u>	<u>Yes</u>	<u>No</u>
A. Participated in neighborhood or regional clean-up activities. -----	30%	70%
B. Attended a public meeting. -----	33%	67%
C. Donated money or volunteered time to a political candidate or issue. -----	38%	63%
D. Contacted an elected official by phone, letter, fax or email. -----	35%	65%
E. Volunteered with or joined a community group, neighborhood groups, business association or advocacy group. -----	35%	65%
F. Wrote a letter to your local paper-----	10%	89%
G. Called a radio talk show. -----	12%	87%
DON'T KNOW/NO ANSWER/REFUSED -----	30%	0%

9. **Where do you get your information about issues like population growth in the Central Texas region and what is being done to plan for it? (RECORD ALL RESPONSES.)**

Local television news-----	60%
----------------------------	-----

Radio-----	32%
The Austin American-Statesman-----	46%
Other daily newspaper [Specify]-----	12%
Friends/neighbors -----	19%
Other (Specify and code: _____)-	13%
[DO NOT READ] Don't know / Na/ Ref-----	5%

These last questions are for demographic purposes only.

10. What county do you live in? [n=150 each county]

Weighting factors:

Bastrop-----	4%
Caldwell -----	2%
Hays-----	7%
Travis -----	68%
Williamson-----	19%
[DO NOT READ] Don't know / Na/ Ref-----	0%

11. How would you describe where you live: urban, suburban, rural changing to suburban, or rural?

Urban -----	23%
Suburban -----	38%
Rural changing to suburban-----	18%
Rural -----	17%
[DO NOT READ] Refused -----	4%

12. How long have you lived in the Central Texas region?

less than 2 years -----	12%
2-5 years -----	13%
6-10 years -----	17%
11-20 years -----	23%
more than 20 years -----	35%
[DO NOT READ] Refused -----	0%

13. Please stop me when I've read a category that best describes your present age:
[READ LIST]

18-24-----	13%
25-34-----	22%
35-44-----	27%
45-54-----	15%
55-64-----	12%
65+ -----	11%
[DO NOT READ] Refused -----	0%

14. Do you have any children under the age of 18 living in your household?

Yes -----	43%
No -----	56%
[DO NOT READ] Refused -----	0%

15. Which of the following categories best describes your total annual household income last year before taxes? Remember to include everyone in your household. [READ LIST]

less than \$15,000 -----	10%
\$15,001-30,000 -----	17%
\$30,001-40,000 -----	11%
\$40,001-50,000 -----	10%
\$50,001-75,000 -----	14%
\$75,001 – 100,000 -----	9%
\$100,001 - \$150,000 -----	6%
\$150,001+ -----	2%
[DO NOT READ] Refused -----	19%

16. What was the last level of school you completed?

less than high school -----	12%
high school degree -----	23%
some college -----	22%
college degree -----	27%
graduate school or degree -----	16%
[DO NOT READ] Refused -----	1%

17. Did you vote in the last general election in November of 2001?

Yes -----	65%
No -----	35%
[DO NOT READ] Refused -----	0%

18. With which racial or ethnic group do you identify yourself?

White -----	68%
African American -----	6%
Hispanic -----	20%
Asian -----	2%
Other (Specify: _____) -----	1%
[DO NOT READ] Refused -----	2%

Thank you very much for your time.

19. Gender **[BY OBSERVATION]**

Male----- 46%
Female----- 54%

Respondent Name: _____ Telephone: _____

Cluster: _____ Page: _____ Supervisor: _____ Verified by: _____
