

How the Survey Was Conducted

The Public Information Corporation of Littleton, Colorado, conducted a 603-interview telephone survey for the Boulder County Board of Commissioners in May, 2006. The interviews were conducted between April 27 and May 13. The survey resulted in a representative sampling of active registered voters listed in the Boulder County Elections Office's file.

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

The survey instrument included general questions about issues that face Boulder County today, perceptions of the County government, and matters that will or might be referred to the County voters at the General Election on November 7.

Confidence factor in a 603-interview sampling is 4 percent, plus or minus, in 95 out of 100 cases.

The project results are presented in two sections. Volume I, which follows, is a detailed analysis of survey results. Volume II 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 four geographical zones. They consist of (1) the City of Boulder; (2) the city of Longmont; (3) Southeast Cities, including Louisville, Lafayette, Erie and Superior; and (4) Unincorporated areas, which also include several small towns.

In several cases we provide additional tables that track responses where identical or very similar questions were asked in surveys conducted in 2003, 2004 and 2005 as well as in 2006.

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

“Demographic anomalies” are instances in which individual grouping responses to particular questions in the current survey 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 603-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 analyst.

Another caveat is that occasionally anomalies reach 7 percent or so but aren't mentioned in the analysis 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 the “somewhat” response anomalies adds to the quality of the analysis, but usually it does 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 convenience each time anomalies are listed we show the actual percentage given by all respondents, e.g. (603=62%) followed by +10% if the anomalous response was 72% and -12% if it was 50%.

If the all-respondent number is less than 603, it means that some persons were not asked that question because of skip instructions.

All demographic anomalies mentioned in this study pertain only to 2006 and not to previous surveys that are used in trend studies.

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

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%	20%	17%	17%	27%
Traffic jams/congestion	5	7	3	7	3
Wider highways/streets	1 } 9%	3 } 14%	0 } 5%	2 } 11%	0 } 6%
Repair roads/streets	1	1	1	0	3
More/better mass transit	2	3	1	2	0
Public school issues	8	5	12	10	9
Economy concerns	7	9	4	10	5
More/maintain open space better	6	6	5	7	4
More affordable/low rent housing	6	8	3	4	7
Illegal immigrants (negative)*	6	2	15	4	4
Public safety (police & fire issues)	4	2	9	2	3
Local government issues	4	4	3	2	4
Taxes too high/don't raise taxes	3	3	4	3	1
High auto or home fuel prices	3	2	3	1	3
Social issues and concerns	3	3	4	5	0
Control/get rid of prairie dogs	3	3	2	4	3

**Note: We also kept track of positive comments about undocumented immigrants, and those totaled 1%*

Discussion

While the table above uses the format that is standard in this project, most of our comments will attend the multiple-year version that follows our discussion of demographic anomalies.

Three new response categories – topics that were not observed in most of the County's previous and comparable surveys -- turned up here. They were: negative comments about illegal immigrants, at 6 percent; spiraling automotive and/or home fuel prices, at 3 percent; and calls to control or eliminate prairie dogs, also at 3 percent.

Categories that we established early in the editing phase but which weren't mentioned often are not included on the table.

Most Important Boulder County Issues – 2002 - 2006

	<u>7/02</u>	<u>2/03</u>	<u>6/04</u>	<u>4/05</u>	<u>5/06</u>
Manage/stop growth	9%	15%	20%	20%	20%
Highways/transit	18	6	13	9	9
Public schools issues	9	16	13	8	8
Economy concerns	4	20	20	8	7
More/maintain open space	4	2	4	7	6
Affordable housing	7	4	3	6	6
Illegal immigrants (negative)	--	--	--	--	6
Local governance issues	8	3	4	3	3
Water supply/drought	6	16	8	1	2

Discussion

Expressions about stopping or managing growth is in its third year as the single most important issue facing Boulder County, at a steady 20%. However, looking back beyond this table to 2000 we note that it was even higher, at 39%.

Highway and transit issues remained the second-most mentioned concern at 9 percent. We consider 6 percent or greater to be a major issue with wide-scope open-ended questions such as this in which multiple responses are not accepted.

Public schools concerns, which include fiscal, curriculum and administrative issues, continue to be in the top three, this year at 8 percent.

One of the most interesting trends has to do with mentions of the economy as the most important issue facing Boulder County. It jumped from 4 percent in the 1998 through 2002 surveys to 20 percent in 2003 and 2004. Then it settled to 8 percent in 2005 and remains virtually unchanged in 2006.

Two of the line items graphically show the impact that top-headline current events have on the public psyche in Boulder County. The issue of illegal immigrants was most dramatic, coming literally from nowhere in 2002 through 2005, and then attaining major issue status this year at 6 percent. The other was worries over water supply and the drought, which suddenly peaked in 2003 as dropping supplies and restrictions became everyday front-page news, followed by two years of reports of excellent snowpacks in the Metro Denver watersheds

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%	9%	29%
Highways/transit	9	11	20
Public schools issues	8	11	19
Economy concerns	7	5	12
More/maintain open space	6	7	14
Affordable housing	6	5	11
Illegal immigrants (negative)	6	4	10
Local governance issues	4	3	7
Social issues	3	6	9
Control prairie dogs	3	3	6
Water supply/drought	2	3	5
Environment issues	2	3	5
Taxes too high/cut taxes	3	2	2

Discussion

We do not consider rankings of next-most important issues, nor resulting demographic anomalies, to be particularly enlightening in isolation. However, as the table above shows, when the results are combined with those of question 1 it's a bit different.

Mostly, the totals of the line items in the two questions confirmed what was evident with question 1, with the “highways and transit,” “public education” and “open space” emergent categories slightly more enhanced in the combined results than others.

Question 3 – Satisfaction with Boulder 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?

	<u>TOTAL</u>	<u>Boulder</u>	<u>Longmont</u>	<u>SE Cities</u>	<u>Unincorp.</u>
Very satisfied	15%	19%	8%	14%	17%
Somewhat satisfied	64	64	63	67	63
Somewhat dissatisfied	12	9	17	10	13
Very dissatisfied	6	4	7	6	7
No response	3	4	4	3	0

Discussion

Active voters are predominantly satisfied with County government's performance in the many things that are its responsibility, with 79 percent giving "satisfied" ratings versus 18 percent who indicated dissatisfaction.

Another way to gauge how the County is doing is a comparison of the extreme response categories, and again the balance is decidedly positive, with 15 percent of all respondents indicating that they are "very satisfied" and only 6 percent indicating that they're "very dissatisfied."

Satisfaction With Boulder County Government – 2002-2006				
	<u>6/02</u>	<u>6/04</u>	<u>4/05</u>	<u>5/06</u>
Very satisfied	11%	13%	14%	15%
Somewhat satisfied	60	65	64	64
Somewhat dissatisfied	18	13	14	12
Very dissatisfied	7	5	5	6
No response	4	4	2	3

Discussion

Over the past four years the active voters' perceptions of the performance of Boulder County government have changed very little, but still the small changes have been consistently positive.

Question 4 – Perceptions of County Levels of Taxation

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	22%	18%	25%	25%	24%
High but acceptable	35	36	37	34	33
About right	36	38	34	33	37
Lower than would expect	4	5	2	6	2
No response	3	3	3	2	3

Discussion

While 57 percent of active registered voters feel that Boulder County government's taxes are on the high side, at the same time 75 percent believe that the taxation level is acceptable.

Sometimes we consider a comparison of the extremes on the response scale to be useful, but only if the choices are symmetrical – approximately of equal intensity on both sides of a centerline. In this case only one of the four choices could be construed as negative, and the other three are degrees of positive.

Perceptions of County Taxation – 2002 - 2006					
	<u>6/02</u>	<u>2/03</u>	<u>6/04</u>	<u>4/05</u>	<u>5/06</u>
Too high	27%	20%	22%	25%	22%
High but acceptable	32	32	31	31	35
About right	34	39	40	37	36
Lower than would expect	3	3	4	3	4
No response	4	5	3	4	3

Discussion

This table is unusual in that the changes of active registered voters' perceptions were minimal. If the July, 2002, survey – which was conducted by this firm for a different client -- is set aside, the largest swing across each of the response categories is only 5 percent.

Question 5 – County Growth and Development Policies

Would you say that the County allows too much growth and development in unincorporated areas, not enough growth and development in unincorporated areas, or do you feel the current policies are about right?

	<u>TOTAL</u>	<u>Boulder</u>	<u>Longmont</u>	<u>SE Cities</u>	<u>Unincorp.</u>
Too much growth	38%	34%	43%	43%	31%
Not enough growth	12	9	12	14	12
Policies are about right	44	47	36	40	53
No response	7	9	8	3	3

Discussion

While the perception that growth and development policies are about right is at 44 percent among active registered voters, the feeling that the County allows too much growth and development isn't far behind at 38 percent. Only 12 percent feel that the County doesn't allow enough growth and development in unincorporated areas.

We checked responses to the same question in the 2005 survey and found that they were virtually identical to those of 2006.

Questions 6- 8 – Statements Re: Large Houses in Unincorporated Areas

Question 6 asked whether respondents agree or disagree that County regulations should allow landowners themselves to decide how large their houses should be.

Question 7 dealt with whether respondents agree or disagree that if a house would be larger than, say, 4,000 to 5,000 square feet the county should require mitigation to the land such as buying open land and leaving it open, using energy-efficient construction and using alternative energy sources such as solar or wind.

Question 8 asked whether the county should require the size of a house to be reduced to minimize impacts on neighbors, views, or the environment.

	<u>Q.6</u>	<u>Q.7</u>	<u>Q.8</u>
Agree strongly	27%	49%	39%
Agree mildly	27	24	27
Disagree mildly	25	12	18
Disagree strongly	20	12	14
No response	2	3	2

Discussion

While more respondents agree with the three statements than disagree, only the idea of letting homeowners themselves decide how large their house should be received relatively weak support, with 54 percent agreeing and 45 percent disagreeing.

Requiring the mitigation of the impact on the land of houses larger than 4,000 to 5,000 square feet received the strongest support, with virtually half of respondents agreeing strongly with the statement and another 24 percent agreeing mildly – 73 percent in all.

County regulations requiring the size of a house to be reduced to minimize impacts on neighbors, views or the environment was less popular, but still 69 percent agreed either strongly or mildly.

We feel that the demographic anomalies results are particularly interesting in terms of underlining the substantial philosophical and geographical differences among zones. There are, however, few surprises for seasoned Boulder vs. Longmont-watchers.

Questions 9 and 10 – Sales Tax Increase for Bus Transit Plan

Two demographically-equal panels were asked nearly-identical questions about how strongly they would support or oppose a ballot question next November proposing a sales and use tax increase. It would provide enhanced bus transit services to and from employment and retail centers in the County, as well as more regional trails and bike paths. However, question 9 asked about a two-tenths of a cent increase, and with question 10 it was one-tenth of a cent. The table below shows how each panel responded to the two tax increase levels, as well as the results of a similar question from our 2005 Boulder County survey positing one-tenth of a cent.

(Separate tables for question 9 and for question 10, with geographical zone breakouts, as well as demographic anomalies, follow on subsequent pages.)

	Q.9 5/06 <u>(.2)</u>	Q.10 5/06 <u>(.1)</u>	4/05 <u>(.1)</u>
Support it strongly	51%	49%	52%
Support it mildly	20	26	25
Oppose it mildly	15	8	10
Oppose it strongly	11	14	11
No response	3	3	2

Discussion

There was very little difference in the reaction of the two 400-respondent panels whether the sales and use tax increase ballot question would ask for two-tenths or one-tenth of a cent. Further, the public receptivity has remained essentially unchanged subsequent to April, 2005.

While 76 percent of the question 10 panel in this year's survey supported the proposal either strongly or mildly compared with 71 percent for the question 9 panel, in another respect question 9 was a bit stronger. We refer to a comparison of the "support it strongly" versus the "oppose it strongly" responses. With the two-tenths of a cent it was 51-to-11 percent, but with one-tenth of a cent it was 49-to-14 percent.

In any case we believe that either of the two levels of tax increase would have been approved had the election taken place in May, 2006, or for that matter in April, 2005.

(The tables that follow present the results of questions 9 and 10 separately and with geographical zone breakouts. In most cases, in the text, we highlight only demographic anomalies that may be observed in the "support it strongly" and "oppose it strongly" response categories because the "mildly" occurrences aren't instructive, in our view).

Results of Q.9 (two-tenths of a cent tax increase)

	<u>TOTAL</u>	<u>Boulder</u>	<u>Longmont</u>	<u>SE Cities</u>	<u>Unincorp.</u>
Support it strongly	51%	51%	46%	57%	51%
Support it mildly	20	19	16	20	25
Oppose it mildly	15	18	16	8	14
Oppose it strongly	11	10	16	14	4
No response	3	2	6	2	6

Demographic Anomalies

Only two instances of anomalies – which we define as being 7 percent or more above or below the countywide total – are in evidence on the chart above, and neither is important to the analysis. However, it’s noteworthy that the Southeast cities, which include Lafayette, Louisville, Erie and Superior, are the most supportive of the two-tenths of a cent sales tax, and Longmont is the least supportive.

Results of Q.10 (one-tenth of a cent tax increase)

	<u>TOTAL</u>	<u>Boulder</u>	<u>Longmont</u>	<u>SE Cities</u>	<u>Unincorp.</u>
Support it strongly	49%	63%	43%	39%	45%
Support it mildly	26	17	34	32	23
Oppose it mildly	8	5	10	6	13
Oppose it strongly	14	10	10	18	19
No response	3	4	3	5	0

Demographic Anomalies

The most striking feature of responses to the tenth of a cent version of the proposed bus transit plan question has to do with City of Boulder active voters. Whereas the panel presented with the two-tenths of a cent version had nearly mirrored the countywide result, the other panel, when asked about one tenth of a cent, favored it by 14 percent greater than the countywide result. The other three zones fell below the 49 percent countywide, but did not reach anomaly proportions.

We also point out a paradox having to do with the unincorporated and small towns zone. With question 9 this zone was one of the two anomalies that we mentioned in passing, with only 4 percent opposing it strongly compared with 11 percent countywide. However, with question 10 the zone’s respondents opposed it strongly by 19 percent compared with 14 percent countywide.

Questions 11 and 12 – Effects of Caveats on the Two Sales Tax Questions

Question 11 asks if the tax increase questions for enhanced transit services did not include funding for more regional trails and bike paths as previously stated, would respondents be more likely or less likely to support them?

Question 12 asks if those tax increase questions were to specify that renewable fuels such as hydrogen and biodiesel, and new clean technologies such as hybrid electric, would be used, would respondents be more likely or less likely to support them?

The following table compares whether respondents would be more likely or less likely to support the proposed enhanced transit services ballot question if the two caveats were to be added to the ballot questions:

	<u>Q.11.</u>	<u>Q.12</u>
More likely to support	17%	68%
Less likely to support	38%	3
Makes no difference	44	28
No response	1	1

Discussion

It doesn't require special insights to see that removing regional trails and bike paths from the wording of questions 9 and 10 would reduce their appeal to the prospective voters substantially. In retrospect had it been feasible to further split the sampling to provide four demographically-balanced panels (to probe reactions not only to the size of the tax increase but also with and without the caveats) rather than two we could have quantified the loss. However, to have done that with reasonable confidence would have required at least 1,000 interviews, in our opinion.

On the other hand adding requirements for special fuels would have very little downside insofar as appealing to more voters is concerned. Of course the question 12 result would have been different, in our opinion, had increased capital and operating costs been mentioned in our wording of question 12.

Question 13 – Precinct Voting Places vs. Voting Centers

Boulder County voters currently vote in polling places in neighborhood precincts. An alternative would be to create new voting centers that would be fewer in number but would allow citizens to go to any of them to cast their votes. How do you feel about having voting centers instead of precinct polling places?

	<u>TOTAL</u>	<u>Boulder</u>	<u>Longmont</u>	<u>SE Cities</u>	<u>Unincorp.</u>
Strongly support	18%	19%	21%	17%	14%
Mildly support	24	28	22	20	24
Mildly oppose	25	23	25	28	26
Strongly oppose	23	18	22	29	26
Other (mostly need more info.)	3	4	3	2	3
No response	7	9	7	3	6

Discussion

Voting centers are not a popular alternative to voting in precinct places, but it's close enough that an effective public information program could make it acceptable to most citizens, in our opinion. We feel that way because all four responses read by interviewers received close to the same level of support.

In nearly all of our past public opinion research projects there has been at least one question we wished retrospectively that we could have asked, and here is an example: It would have been useful to add an open-ended question probing why respondents opposed the idea. Concern about the distance to voting centers? Concern that there might be longer lines? Just tradition? We don't know.

Demographic Anomalies

With Strongly Support (603=18%) – There were no anomalies, per se, but there was a gender divergence, with 22 percent of women strongly supporting voting centers compared with 14 percent of men.

Questions 14 –17 – Improving Mobility, Reducing Congestion

Four suggestions that have been made by citizens for improving mobility or decreasing traffic congestion in Boulder County were read, and respondents were asked how effective they believed each would be.

Question 14 asked about improving bus services, such as BOLT, DASH and JUMP, that primarily run between and within County communities.

Question 15 asked about improving bicycle and pedestrian trails and connections.

Question 16 dealt with providing free or discounted transit passes such as the EcoPass.

Question 17 asked about improving intersections with enhancements such as more turning lanes.

Comparative Results of Questions 14-17

	<u>Very effect.</u>	<u>Some- what effect.</u>	<u>Not very effect.</u>	<u>Not at all effect.</u>	<u>No resp.</u>
Q.14 Improving bus services	35%	42%	13%	4%	6%
Q.15 Improving trails and connections	27	39	21	12	2
Q.16 Free/discounted transit passes	47	36	8	4	4
Q.17 Improving intersections	33	41	14	7	4

Discussion

Free or discounted transit passes was rated the most effective program to improve mobility or decreasing traffic congestion, with 47 percent indicating that it would be very effective. It also led the four questions when “very effective” and “somewhat effective” were collapsed, totaling 83 percent of all respondents who felt that way.

Improving bus services came in second with 35 percent indicating that it would be very effective, and 77 percent when the two “effective” categories were collapsed. Improving intersections was close behind, with 33 percent considering it to be very effective, and a combined total in the collapse of 74 percent.

Improving trails and connections was well behind the others, with only 27 percent considering it to be the most effective program to improve mobility or decrease traffic congestion. The collapse of the two “effective” categories resulted in a total of 66 percent.

Questions 18-22 – Five Possible Expanded County Programs Rated

Respondents were told that, “with limited resources, governments at all levels cannot be all things to all people, so public needs and desires for services and facilities constantly need to be assessed. Boulder County officials are looking at a variety of citizens’ suggestions that might, or might not, be examined for future ballot issues.” Then, respondents rated each on a scale with values of 5 down to 1, with 5 being the most important and 1 being the least important. We calculated the average response for each, using frequencies rather than percentages. A perfect cumulative score for the 603 respondents would have been 5.0, and the minimum possible score would have been 1.0. The following table compares the scores, and the questions are arrayed in the order of their scores, highest to lowest.

	<u>Score</u>
Q.18. Offering incentives for renewable energy alternatives	3.84
Q.21. Providing more affordable housing	3.48
Q.22. Acquiring more open space, building more trails	3.27
Q.20. Enhancing infant and parenting program	3.19
Q.19. Countywide library tax to enhance services	2.82

Discussion

The table speaks for itself and needs no elaboration because a frequency-based scoring system does not lend itself to our method of spotlighting demographic anomalies.

However, the computer tabulations present us not only with frequencies but also with the percentages of how many respondents chose each point on the 5-down-to-1 scale, broken out by demographic groupings. Thus, we can present what we believe are useful demographic anomalies using only the “5” (most important) and “1” (least important) response lines. They follow, in highest-to-lowest score order:

Question 23 – Requiring Energy and Water Efficiency Measures

Respondents were informed that developers of new residential, commercial and industrial properties in Boulder County currently are required to install certain energy and water efficiency features. It has been proposed that owners of existing residential properties in Boulder County be required to phase in the installation of energy and water efficiency measures such as more structural insulation and low flow toilets. They were asked to indicate the degree to which they would support or oppose such requirements. The results are presented in this table:

	<u>TOTAL</u>	<u>Boulder</u>	<u>Longmont</u>	<u>SE Cities</u>	<u>Unincorp.</u>
Strongly support	21%	27%	19%	13%	19%
Mildly support	32	34	27	36	31
Mildly oppose	19	14	22	22	23
Strongly oppose	25	21	30	27	24
No response	2	3	2	2	3

Discussion

While supporters of the proposal to require retrofitting of energy and water efficiency measures in existing residential properties outnumber opponents by a margin of 53 to 45 percent, those who strongly oppose have a 4 percent edge over those who strongly support the mandatory installations. All things considered it's pretty much a toss-up.

Question 24 – Approval or Disapproval of Open Space Program

To what extent do you approve or disapprove of the Boulder County open space program?

	<u>TOTAL</u>	<u>Boulder</u>	<u>Longmont</u>	<u>SE Cities</u>	<u>Unincorp.</u>
Approve strongly	49%	64%	26%	52%	46%
Approve mildly	33	23	48	31	34
Disapprove mildly	9	6	10	10	12
Disapprove strongly	6	4	10	5	5
No response	4	3	7	2	3

Discussion

Boulder County's open space program, with an overall 82 percent approval rating, remains very popular. Although there are some substantial anomalies --a couple are visible in the geographical breakouts above – none of the 20 demographic groupings that are included in our breakouts gave an approval rating of less than 60 percent.

Two of them broke 90 percent in the collapsed approval lines – Democrats, at 94 percent, and persons 18 to 24, at 96 percent.

Question 25 – How Often Visit County Web Site?

How often do you visit the Boulder County government web site? Frequently, infrequently, never, or do you not have access to the internet at all?

	<u>TOTAL</u>	<u>Boulder</u>	<u>Longmont</u>	<u>SE Cities</u>	<u>Unincorp.</u>
Frequently	11%	10%	10%	11%	15%
Infrequently	42	45	41	40	42
Never	38	38	38	40	37
No access to internet	8	7	11	9	7
No response	0	0	0	0	0

Discussion

Use of the Boulder County government's web site is very good, as the table above shows.

Geographically speaking, visits to the site are spread uniformly across the County. Unincorporated areas are a bit more likely to access the site than other areas, but the difference doesn't reach anomalous proportions.

It's very different with other demographic breakouts. As the following numbers show, the most likely to visit are 25 to 34 years of age and have lived in the County between 5 and 9 years. Least likely are persons who are 65 and older, of whom 74 percent either never visit or don't have access to the internet at all.

Frequency of Web Site Visits – 2005-2006 Comparison

	<u>5/06</u>	<u>4/05</u>
Frequently	11%	7%
Infrequently	42	40
Never	38	53
No access to internet . . .	8	n/a*
No response	0	0

**In the 2005 survey it had been determined previously that 12 percent of respondents did not have access to the internet and they were skipped.*

Discussion

The gain in County web site visitors in 2006 was a bit greater than the numbers in the above table show. If we omit the 8 percent who said that they have no access to the internet at all, thus leveling the playing field with 2005, the percentage of persons who access the site either frequently or infrequently rises to 58%.

#