

Book of Crosstabs

Tax Feasibility Study...

**Testing Voter Support for
Multiple Funding Measures**

A Scientific Survey of Clayton's Local Electorate

Commissioned by ...



March 2022

Conducted by...

Strategy Research Institute
Research and Consulting for Strategic Planning
www.sri-consulting.org



Table of Contents

Table 1-1,2,3,4	Q1.0 I would like to ask whether you <u>agree</u> or <u>disagree</u> with the following statement: Clayton is a great community ; I am <u>happy to be a resident</u> .
Table 2-1,2,3,4	Q2.0 Is there a Local Issue you are especially concerned about today?
Table 3-1,2,3,4	Q3.1 How satisfied are you with the <u>park and recreation amenities</u> presently available to local residents, including playgrounds, picnic tables, and-the-like at Clayton Community Park, The Grove Park, including the Gazebo, and North Valley Park?
Table 4-1,2,3,4	Q3.2 How satisfied are you with the level of <u>police services</u> presently being provided in Clayton?
Table 5-1,2,3,4	Q3.3 How satisfied are you with community development (including code enforcement, planning and zoning)?
Table 6-1,2,3,4	Q3.4 How satisfied are you with the <u>County Library</u> located in Clayton?
Table 7-1,2,3,4	Q4.0 Prior to the present survey, were you aware of the fact that the City of Clayton is facing huge fiscal challenges?
Table 8-1,2,3,4	Q4.1 Whether or not you were previously aware of the fiscal challenges that City officials will soon be facing, if you learned about these challenges through a trusted source, would that make you highly concerned, somewhat concerned, or not at all concerned about how this set of challenges will impact the well-being of you and your family members?
Table 9-1,2,3,4	Q5.0 At the present time, Clayton officials are considering several ways of dealing with this difficult situation. I would like to ask you about your preferences regarding two of these. Would you prefer: <u>Maintaining City services</u> at their current level and increasing local taxes only enough to pay for the same level of programs and services that are presently being provided to local residents? Or, do you prefer... <u>Cutting back the current level of City services and programs</u> , thereby, creating NO new taxes at the local level of government ...even if this means forcing City officials into making significant cutbacks in the level of services presently being provided to Clayton residents, such as reducing the number of sworn police officers; cutting back expenses in maintaining City parks; or reducing the number of hours City Hall is open to the public; among other services?
Table 10-1,2,3,4	Q6.0 The first option is to ask Clayton voters to authorize an increase the amount of their property tax by \$400, per year, per parcel of property owned, which amounts to approximately \$33 per month . This would provide unrestricted funds to balance the City's annual budget; plus, address unmet needs for additional public safety, park maintenance, sustainability and staff support. The specific funding mechanism would be a PARCEL TAX , which is a <u>flat tax</u> on each parcel of property owned as opposed to a tax based upon the <u>assessed value</u> of each parcel of property owned. If you were asked to vote today on such a funding measure, would you vote YES or NO?

Table 11-1,2,3,4	Q6.1 Since you're not willing to pay \$400 per year (or about \$33 per month) to allow City officials to balance the City's annual budget and address unmet needs, would you be willing to authorize an annual increase of \$300 (or \$25 per month) per parcel of property owned, in order for the City to balance the City's annual budget and avoid having to make significant cutbacks in the level services presently being provided to Clayton residents?
Table 12-1,2,3,4	Q6.2 Since you're not willing to pay \$300 per year (which is approximately \$25 per month) to allow City officials to balance the City's annual budget, would you be willing to authorize an annual increase of \$200 (or \$17per month) per parcel of property owned, in order for the City to avoid having to make significant cutbacks in the level of services presently being provided to Clayton residents?
Table 13-1,2,3,4	Q7.0 If you were asked to vote today on a measure to create a UTILITY USE TAX of 6% of your utility bills, would you definitely vote YES , probably vote YES , probably vote NO ; or definitely vote NO on such a measure?
Table 14-1,2,3,4	Q8.0 Should the City place a <u>one-cent</u> Sales Tax (in the form of a TUT) on the local ballot to avoid having to make significant cutbacks in the level of services presently being provided to local residents and making it possible to address some of the City's unmet needs, would you vote YES or NO ?
Table 15-1,2,3,4	Q8.1 Should the City place a <u>half-cent</u> Sales Tax (in the form of a TUT) on the local ballot to avoid having to make significant cutbacks in the level of services presently being provided to local residents, would you vote YES or NO ?
Table 16-1,2,3,4	Q9.1 Without these funds, the City will be forced to lay off at least one police officer; thus, reducing response times and negatively impacting the level of Public Safety in Clayton in numerous other ways. Would hearing this argument from someone you trust make you more likely to SUPPORT or OPPOSE the proposed funding Measure; OR would it have NO IMPACT on how you would vote; OR is it NOT BELIEVABLE?
Table 17-1,2,3,4	Q9.2 The streetlight assessment currently in place in Clayton does not fully cover the cost of operations; in fact, the rate has not been increased for the past 24 years. Furthermore, it does not include a CPI to control for normal inflation. Therefore, without additional funds, the City may be forced to turn off a portion of street lights in certain neighborhoods of the City; thus, negatively impacting public safety. Would hearing this argument from someone you trust make you more likely to SUPPORT or OPPOSE the proposed funding Measure; OR would it have NO IMPACT on how you would vote; OR is it NOT BELIEVABLE?
Table 18-1,2,3,4	Q9.3 Without these funds, the City will be forced to cut back on the level of services presently being provided to Clayton residents, citywide; thus, negatively impacting the <i>quality of life</i> for all Clayton residents. Would hearing this argument from someone you trust make you more likely to SUPPORT or OPPOSE the proposed funding Measure; OR would it have NO IMPACT on how you would vote; OR is it NOT BELIEVABLE?
Table 19-1,2,3,4	Q9.4 Taxes are simply <u>too high</u> . Clayton residents need tax relief . Would hearing this argument from someone you trust make you more likely to SUPPORT or OPPOSE the proposed funding Measure; OR would it have NO IMPACT on how you would vote; OR is it NOT BELIEVABLE?
Table 20-1,2,3,4	Q9.5 Without the revenues from the proposed funding Measure, the City will be forced into "deficit spending", which means that the City will have to take money out of its reserves to cover operating costs, instead of using these monies as intended for other needs. Would hearing this argument from someone you trust make you more likely to SUPPORT or OPPOSE the proposed funding Measure; OR would it have NO IMPACT on how you would vote; OR is it NOT BELIEVABLE?
Table 21-1,2,3,4	Q9.6 Without additional funding, the City could be forced into bankruptcy; or even be taken over by Contra Costa County. Would hearing this argument from someone you trust make you more likely to SUPPORT

or OPPOSE the proposed funding Measure; OR would it have NO IMPACT on how you would vote; OR is it NOT BELIEVABLE?

Table 22-1,2,3,4	Q10.0 Now that you have heard several arguments in SUPPORT of, and in OPPOSITION to, the notion of authorizing an increase in the local tax base in order to avoid having to make serious cutbacks in services presently being provided to Clayton residents, and assuming the amount of increase does NOT exceed your THRESHOLD of <i>willingness to pay</i> ; would you vote YES or NO on such a funding Measure?
Table 23-1,2,3,4	Q11.0 Because the need for City services and the City's operating costs will continue into the foreseeable future, would you recommend making the proposed increase in the local tax base, if authorized by Clayton voters, PERMANENT; or, would you want the increase to 'Sunset' (meaning <u>terminate</u>) in a specific number of years OR be brought back to local voters to be RENEWED?
Table 24-1,2,3,4	Q11.1 Since you're not willing to support keeping this increase in the local tax base in place PERMANENTLY, would you be willing to keep it in place for 20 years ; then have it terminate OR be brought back to local voters for renewal?
Table 25-1,2,3,4	Q11.2 Since you're not willing to support keeping increase in the local tax base for 20 years, would you be willing to keep it in place for 10 years ; then have it terminate OR be brought back to local voters for renewal?
Table 26-1,2,3,4	Q12.1 In order to control for normal inflation, would you support authorizing a modest annual increase in the local tax base that is based upon a CPI (not to exceed 5%), in order to KEEP PACE with the increased cost of providing City services to Clayton residents from year-to-year.
Table 27-1,2,3,4	Q13.0 Do you AGREE or DISAGREE with the following statement, "Clayton's elected officials are completely trustworthy "?

NOTE: The percentages in the Book of Crosstabs will not match exactly with the percentages reported on the questionnaire and in the final report. SRI uses valid percentages in reporting the findings in the report (meaning respondents who did not answer the question are not included in the percentages reported), however, the Crosstabs program reports findings based on the full number of respondents, even those who choose not respond to certain question.

City of Clayton Funding Feasibility Survey
 Table 1-1

/

/

Q1.0 I would like to ask whether you agree or disagree with the following statement: Clayton is a **great community**; I am happy to be a resident.

	Gender			Age					Ethnicity						
	Total	Male	Fem	18-30	31-40	41-50	51-65	Over 66	Cauc	Hisp	Black	Nat Am	Mid East	Asian	Other
Total	307 100%	160 100%	147 100%	33 100%	58 100%	51 100%	87 100%	99 100%	220 100%	12 100%	12 100%	6 100%	3 100%	18 100%	21 100%
Extremely satisfied	102 33.2%	45 28.1%	57 38.8%	3 100%	18 31.0%	12 23.5%	27 31.0%	42 42.4%	72 32.7%	3 25.0%	3 25.0%	-	-	9 50.0%	9 42.8%
Very satisfied	57 51.1%	97 60.6%	60 40.8%	-	34 58.6%	27 52.9%	42 48.3%	48 48.5%	112 50.9%	9 75.0%	6 50.0%	3 50.0%	3 100%	9 50.0%	9 42.8%
Only slightly satisfied	30 9.8%	9 5.6%	21 14.3%	-	-	3 5.9%	15 17.2%	9 9.1%	24 10.9%	-	-	3 50.0%	-	-	3 14.4%
Neutral/unsure	15 4.9%	9 5.6%	6 4.1%	-	6 10.3%	9 17.6%	-	-	9 4.1%	-	3 25.0%	-	-	-	-
Extremely dissatisfied	3 1.0%	-	3 2.0%	-	-	-	3 3.4%	-	3 1.4%	-	-	-	-	-	-

City of Clayton Funding Feasibility Survey
 Table 1-2

/

Q1.0 I would like to ask whether you agree or disagree with the following statement: Clayton is a **great community**; I am happy to be a resident.

/

	Education						Income					Length of residency			
	Total	Less High	High Scho	Some Coll	Coll Grad	Grad Scho	Under \$25K	\$25-\$50K	\$50-\$75K	\$75-\$100K	Over \$100K	0-5 yrs	6-10 yrs	11-25 yrs	Over 25 yrs
Total	307 100%	3 100%	17 100%	72 100%	119 100%	90 100%	-	21 100%	36 100%	36 100%	178 100%	73 100%	48 100%	84 100%	102 100%
Strongly agree	102 33.2%	3 100%	9 52.9%	36 50.0%	36 30.3%	15 16.7%	-	6 28.6%	18 50.0%	15 41.7%	54 30.3%	18 24.7%	9 18.8%	30 35.7%	45 44.1%
Somewhat agree	157 51.1%	-	5 29.4%	30 41.7%	71 59.7%	51 56.7%	-	8 42.9%	18 50.0%	9 25.0%	97 54.5%	43 58.9%	33 68.8%	42 50.0%	39 38.2%
Not agree or disagree	30 9.8%	-	-	6 8.3%	9 7.6%	12 13.3%	-	3 14.3%	-	9 25.0%	15 8.4%	6 8.2%	3 6.3%	12 14.3%	9 8.1%
Somewhat disagree	15 4.9%	-	3 17.6%	-	3 2.5%	9 10.0%	-	-	-	3 8.3%	12 6.7%	6 8.2%	3 6.3%	-	6 5.9%
Strongly disagree	3 1.0%	-	-	-	-	3 3.3%	-	3 14.3%	-	-	-	-	-	-	3 2.9%

City of Clayton Funding Feasibility Survey

Table 1-3

/
/

Q1.0 I would like to ask whether you agree or disagree with the following statement: Clayton is a **great community**; I am happy to be a resident.

/
/
/
/

	# Children					Home Ownership		Ideology			
	Total	None	One	Two	Three or more	Own	Rent	Lib	Prog	Mod	Con
Total	307 100%	207 100%	32 100%	59 100%	6 100%	289 100%	15 100%	81 100%	96 100%	26 100%	78 100%
Strongly agree	102 33.2%	84 40.6%	9 28.1%	9 15.3%	-	90 31.1%	9 60.0%	24 29.6%	39 40.6%	6 23.1%	27 34.6%
Somewhat agree	57 51.1%	90 43.5%	17 53.1%	44 74.6%	6 100%	154 53.3%	3 55.6%	45 55.6%	36 37.5%	17 65.4%	42 53.8%
Not agree or disagree	30 9.8%	27 13.0%	-	-	-	30 10.4%	-	9 11.1%	15 15.6%	-	6 7.7%
Somewhat disagree	15 4.9%	3 1.4%	6 18.8%	6 10.2%	-	12 4.2%	3 20.0%	3 3.7%	3 3.1%	3 11.5%	3 3.8%
Strongly disagree	3 1.0%	3 1.4%	- 8.1%	-	-	3 1.0%	-	-	3 3.1%	-	-

City of Clayton Funding Feasibility Survey

Table 1-4

/

/

Q1.0 I would like to ask whether you agree or disagree with the following statement: Clayton is a **great community**; I am happy to be a resident.

/

	Area of Residence					
	Total	North Clay	Central Clay	Town Cent	South Clay	Other
Total	307 100%	86 100%	36 100%	74 100%	39 100%	54 100%
Strongly agree	102 33.2%	27 31.4%	6 16.7%	30 40.5%	9 23.1%	27 50.0%
Somewhat agree	157 51.1%	50 358.1%	15 41.7%	32 43.2%	27 69.2%	21 38.8%
Not agree or disagree	30 9.8%	3 3.5%	9 25.0%	12 16.2%	-	6 11.1%
Somewhat disagree	15 4.9%	6 7.0%	3 8.3%	-	3 7.7%	-
Strongly disagree	3 1.0%	-	3 5.3%	-	-	-

City of Clayton Funding Feasibility Survey
 Table 2-1

/
 /
 Q2.0 Is there a **Local Issue** you are especially concerned about today?

	Gender			Age					Ethnicity						
	Total	Male	Fem	18-30	31-40	41-50	51-65	Over 66	Cauc	Hisp	Black	Nat Am	Mid East	Asian	Other
Total	307 100%	160 100%	147 100%	3 100%	58 100%	51 100%	87 100%	99 100%	220 100%	12 100%	12 100%	6 100%	3 100%	18 100%	21 100%
Yes	142 46.3%	64 40.0%	78 53.1%	3 100%	19 32.8%	24 47.1%	42 48.3%	42 51.7%	115 52.3%	3 25.0%	3 25.0%	6 100%	-	3 16.6%	6 28.6%
No	159 51.8%	93 58.1%	66 44.9%	-	39 67.2%	24 47.1%	45 51.7%	48 48.5%	99 52.3%	9 75.0%	9 75.0%	-	3 100%	15 83.4%	15 71.4%

City of Clayton Funding Feasibility Survey
 Table 2-2

/

/

Q2.0 Is there a **Local Issue** you are especially concerned about today?

/

/

	Education						Income					Length of residency			
	Total	Less High	High Scho	Some Coll	Coll Grad	Grad Scho	Under \$25K	\$25-\$50K	\$50-\$75K	\$75-\$100K	Over \$100K	0-5 yrs	6-10 yrs	11-25 yrs	Over 25 yrs
Total	307 100%	3 100%	17 100%	72 100%	119 100%	90 100%	-	21 100%	36 100%	178 100%	36 100%	73 100%	48 100%	84 100%	102 100%
Yes	142 46.3%	-	8 47.1%	36 50.0%	62 52.1%	33 36.7%	-	9 42.9%	15 41.7%	21 58.3%	70 39.3%	28 38.4%	21 43.8%	33 39.3%	60 58.8%
No	159 51.8%	3 100%	9 52.9%	30 41.7%	57 47.9%	57 63.3%	-	12 57.1%	18 50.0%	15 41.7%	105 59.0%	45 61.6%	27 56.3%	45 53.6%	42 41.2%

City of Clayton Funding Feasibility Survey

Table 2-3

/

/

Q2.0 Is there a **Local Issue** you are especially concerned about today?

/

/

/

/

	# Children					Home Ownership			Ideology			
	Total	None	One	Two	Three or more	Own	Rent	Lib	Prog	Mod	Con	
	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	
Total	307	207	32	59	6	289	15	81	96	26	78	
	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	
Yes	142	102	11	26	-	142	12	42	45	8	36	
	46.3%	49.3%	65.6%	44.1%		49.1%	80.0%	51.9%	50.0%	30.8%	46.2%	
No	159	99	21	33	6	144	-	39	45	18	42	
	51.8%	47.8%	34.4%	55.9%	100%	49.8%		48.1%	50.0%	69.2%	57.7%	

City of Clayton Funding Feasibility Survey

Table 2-4

/

/

Q2.0 Is there a **Local Issue** you are especially concerned about today?

/

	Area of Residence					
	Total	North Clay	Central Clay	Town Cent	South Clay	Other
Total	307 100%	86 100%	36 100%	374 100%	39 100%	51 100%
Yes	142 46.3%	44 51.2%	15 41.7%	26 35.1%	18 46.2%	24 47.1%
No	159 51.8%	39 45.3%	21 58.3%	45 60.8%	21 53.8%	27 52.9%

City of Clayton Funding Feasibility Survey
 Table 3-1

/

/

Q3.1 How satisfied are you with the park and recreation amenities presently available to local residents, including playgrounds, picnic tables, and-the-like at Clayton Community Park, The Grove Park, including the Gazebo, and North Valley Park?

	Gender			Age					Ethnicity						
	Total	Male	Fem	18-30	31-40	41-50	51-65	Over 66	Cauc	Hisp	Black	Nat Am	Mid East	Asian	Other
Total	307 100%	160 100%	147 100%	3 100%	58 100%	51 100%	87 100%	99 100%	220 100%	12 100%	12 100%	6 100%	3 100%	18 100%	21 100%
Extremely satisfied	168 54.7%	93 58.1%	75 51.0%	- 100%	33 56.9%	30 58.8%	51 58.6%	48 48.5%	114 51.8%	12 100%	- 100%	3 50.0%	3 100%	12 66.6%	21 100%
Somewhat satisfied	101 32.9%	53 33.1%	48 32.7%	3 100%	20 34.5%	18 35.3%	27 31.0%	33 33.3%	77 35.0%	- 100%	12 100%	3 50.0%	- 100%	3 16.7%	- 100%
Neutral/unsure	20 6.5%	8 5.0%	12 8.2%	- 100%	2 3.4%	- 100%	6 6.9%	9 9.1%	14 6.4%	- 100%	- 100%	- 100%	- 100%	- 100%	- 100%
Somewhat dissatisfied	9 2.9%	3 1.9%	6 4.1%	- 100%	3 5.2%	- 100%	- 100%	6 6.1%	9 4.1%	- 100%	- 100%	- 100%	- 100%	- 100%	- 100%
Extremely dissatisfied	6 2.0%	3 1.9%	3 2.0%	- 100%	- 100%	3 5.9%	3 3.4%	- 100%	3 1.4%	- 100%	- 100%	- 100%	- 100%	3 16.7%	- 100%

City of Clayton Funding Feasibility Survey
 Table 3-2

/

Q3.1 How satisfied are you with the park and recreation amenities presently available to local residents, including playgrounds, picnic tables, and-the-like at Clayton Community Park, The Grove Park, including the Gazebo, and North Valley Park?

/

	Education						Income					Length of residency			
	Total	Less High	High Scho	Some Coll	Coll Grad	Grad Scho	Under \$25K	\$25-\$50K	\$50-\$75K	\$75-\$100K	Over \$100K	0-5 yrs	6-10 yrs	11-25 yrs	Over 25 yrs
Total	307 100%	3 100%	17 100%	72 100%	119 100%	90 100%	-	21 100%	36 100%	36 100%	178 100%	73 100%	48 100%	84 100%	102 100%
Extremely satisfied	102 33.2%	3 100%	12 70.6%	39 54.2%	69 58.0%	42 46.7%	-	15 71.4%	21 58.3%	15 41.7%	99 55.6%	36 49.3%	21 43.8%	48 57.1%	63 61.8%
Somewhat satisfied	157 51.1%	-	3 17.6%	18 25.0%	41 34.5%	39 43.3%	-	6 28.6%	6 16.7%	15 41.7%	65 36.5%	35 47.9%	18 37.5%	24 28.6%	24 23.5%
Neutral/unsure	30 9.8%	-	2 11.8%	9 12.5%	6 5.0%	3 3.3%	-	-	6 16.7%	3 8.3%	5 2.8%	2 2.7%	-	6 7.1%	12 11.8%
Somewhat dissatisfied	15 4.9%	-	-	6 8.3%	-	-	-	-	-	3 8.3%	3 1.7%	-	3 6.3%	6 7.1%	-
Extremely dissatisfied	3 1.0%	-	-	-	3 2.5%	3 2.5%	-	-	-	-	6 3.4%	-	3 6.3%	-	3 2.9%

City of Clayton Funding Feasibility Survey
 Table 3-3

/

/

Q3.1 How satisfied are you with the park and recreation amenities presently available to local residents, including playgrounds, picnic tables, and-the-like at Clayton Community Park, The Grove Park, including the Gazebo, and North Valley Park?

/

/

/

/

	# Children					Home Ownership			Ideology			
	Total	None	One	Two	Three or more	Own	Rent	Lib	Prog	Mod	Con	
Total	307 100%	207 100%	32 100%	59 100%	6 100%	289 100%	15 100%	81 100%	96 100%	26 100%	78 100%	
Extremely satisfied	168 54.7%	111 53.6%	21 65.6%	30 50.8%	3 50.0%	159 55.0%	6 40.0%	48 59.3%	48 50.0%	9 34.6%	45 57.7%	
Somewhat satisfied	101 32.9%	66 31.9%	11 34.4%	21 35.6%	3 50.0%	98 33.9%	3 20.0%	15 18.5%	39 40.6%	14 53.8%	27 34.6%	
Neutral/unsure	20 6.5%	18 8.7%	-	2 3.4%	-	20 6.9%	-	3 3.7%	9 9.4%	3 11.5%	3 3.8%	
Somewhat dissatisfied	9 2.9%	6 2.9%	-	3 5.1%	-	6 2.1%	3 20.0%	9 11.1%	-	-	-	
Extremely dissatisfied	6 2.0%	3 1.4%	-	3 5.1%	-	6 2.1%	-	6 7.4%	-	-	-	

City of Clayton Funding Feasibility Survey
 Table 3-4

/

Q3.1 How satisfied are you with the park and recreation amenities presently available to local residents, including playgrounds, picnic tables, and-the-like at Clayton Community Park, The Grove Park, including the Gazebo, and North Valley Park?

/

	Area of Residence					
	Total	North Clay	Central Clay	Town Cent	South Clay	Other
Total	307 100%	86 100%	36 100%	74 100%	39 100%	51 100%
Extremely satisfied	168 54.7%	57 66.3%	21 58.3%	36 48.6%	12 30.8%	30 58.8%
Somewhat satisfied	101 32.9%	26 38.2%	6 16.7%	24 32.4%	24 61.5%	15 29.4%
Neutral/unsure	20 6.5%	3 3.5%	3 8.3%	5 6.8%	3 7.7%	6 11.8%
Somewhat dissatisfied	9 4.9%	-	-	6 8.1%	-	-
Extremely dissatisfied	6 2.0%	-	6 16.7%	-	-	-

City of Clayton Funding Feasibility Survey
 Table 4-1

/

/

Q3.2 How satisfied are you with the level of police services presently being provided in Clayton?

	Gender			Age					Ethnicity						
	Total	Male	Fem	18-30	31-40	41-50	51-65	Over 66	Cauc	Hisp	Black	Nat Am	Mid East	Asian	Other
Total	307 100%	160 100%	147 100%	3 100%	58 100%	51 100%	87 100%	99 100%	220 100%	12 100%	12 100%	6 100%	3 100%	18 100%	12 100%
Extremely satisfied	179 58.3%	98 61.3%	81 55.1%	3 100%	38 65.5%	33 64.7%	60 69.0%	39 39.4%	128 58.2%	9 75.0%	6 100%	-	3 100%	9 50.5%	6 50.0%
Somewhat satisfied	104 33.9%	56 35.0%	48 32.7%	-	20 34.5%	15 29.4%	24 27.6%	42 42.4%	77 35.0%	3 25.0%	-	3 100%	-	6 33.3%	6 50.0%
Neutral/unsure	15 4.9%	6 3.8%	9 6.1%	-	-	-	3 3.4%	12 12.1%	12 5.5%	-	-	-	-	-	-
Somewhat dissatisfied	6 2.0%	-	6 4.1%	-	-	3 5.9%	-	3 3.0%	3 1.4%	-	-	-	-	3 16.7%	-
Extremely dissatisfied	3 1.0%	-	3 2.0%	-	-	-	-	3 3.0%	-	-	-	-	-	-	-

City of Clayton Funding Feasibility Survey
 Table 4-2

/

/

Q3.2 How satisfied are you with the level of police services presently being provided in Clayton?

/

/

	Education						Income					Length of residency			
	Total	Less High	High Scho	Some Coll	Coll Grad	Grad Scho	Under \$25K	\$25-\$50K	\$50-\$75K	\$75-\$100K	Over \$100K	0-5 yrs	6-10 yrs	11-25 yrs	Over 25 yrs
Total	307 100%	3 100%	17 100%	72 100%	119 100%	90 100%	-	21 100%	36 100%	36 100%	178 100%	73 100%	48 100%	84 100%	102 100%
Extremely satisfied	179 58.3%	3 100%	11 64.7%	33 45.8%	63 52.9%	66 73.3%	-	15 71.4%	21 58.3%	15 41.7%	110 61.8%	35 47.9%	33 68.8%	48 57.1%	63 61.8%
Somewhat satisfied	104 33.9%	-	6 35.3%	30 41.7%	50 42.0%	15 16.7%	-	6 28.6%	9 25.0%	15 41.7%	59 33.1%	32 43.8%	12 25.0%	30 35.7%	30 29.4%
Neutral/unsure	15 4.9%	-	-	9 12.5%	-	6 6.7%	-	-	3 8.3%	6 16.7%	6 3.4%	3 4.1%	-	6 7.1%	6 5.9%
Somewhat dissatisfied	6 2.0%	-	-	-	3 2.5%	3 3.3%	-	-	-	-	3 1.7%	-	3 6.3%	-	3 2.9%
Extremely dissatisfied	3 1.0%	-	-	-	3 2.5%	-	-	-	3 8.3%	-	-	3 4.1%	-	-	-

City of Clayton Funding Feasibility Survey
 Table 4-3

/

/

Q3.2 How satisfied are you with the level of police services presently being provided in Clayton?

/

/

/

/

	# Children					Home Ownership			Ideology			
	Total	None	One	Two	Three or more	Own	Rent	Lib	Prog	Mod	Con	
Total	307 100%	207 100%	32 100%	59 100%	6 100%	289 100%	15 100%	81 100%	96 100%	26 100%	78 100%	
Extremely satisfied	179 58.3%	114 55.1%	24 75.0%	38 64.4%	-	167 57.8%	9 60.0%	45 55.6%	66 68.8%	12 46.2%	42 53.8%	
Somewhat satisfied	104 33.9%	72 34.8%	8 25.0%	18 30.5%	6 100%	98 33.9%	6 40.0%	30 37.0%	21 21.9%	14 53.8%	30 35.8%	
Neutral/unsure	15 4.9%	15 7.2%	-	-	-	15 5.2%	-	-	9 9.4%	-	6 7.7%	
Somewhat dissatisfied	6 2.0%	3 1.4%	-	3 5.1%	-	6 2.1%	-	6 7.4%	-	-	-	
Extremely dissatisfied	3 1.0%	3 1.4%	-	-	-	3 1.0%	-	-	-	-	-	

City of Clayton Funding Feasibility Survey

Table 4-4

/

/

Q3.2 How satisfied are you with the level of police services presently being provided in Clayton?

	Area of Residence					
	Total	North Clay	Central Clay	Town Cent	South Clay	Other
Total	307 100%	86 100%	36 100%	74 100%	39 100%	51 100%
Extremely satisfied	179 58.3%	48 55.8%	21 58.3%	35 47.3%	24 61.5%	36 70.6%
Somewhat satisfied	104 33.9%	35 40.7%	9 25.0%	33 44.6%	12 30.8%	9 17.6%
Neutral/unsure	15 4.9%	3 3.5%	3 8.3%	3 4.1%	3 7.7%	3 5.9%
Somewhat dissatisfied	6 2.0%	-	3 8.3%	-	-	3 5.9%
Extremely dissatisfied	3 1.0%	-	-	3 4.1%	-	-

City of Clayton Funding Feasibility Survey
 Table 5-1

/

/

Q3.3 How satisfied are you with community development (including code enforcement, planning and zoning)?

	Gender			Age					Ethnicity						
	Total	Male	Fem	18-30	31-40	41-50	51-65	Over 66	Cauc	Hisp	Black	Nat Am	Mid East	Asian	Other
Total	307 100%	160 100%	147 100%	3 100%	58 100%	51 100%	87 100%	99 100%	220 100%	12 100%	12 100%	6 100%	3 100%	18 100%	21 100%
Extremely satisfied	51 16.6%	27 16.9%	24 16.3%	-	18 31.0%	3 5.9%	15 17.2%	15 15.2%	45 20.5%	3 25.0%	-	-	-	9 50.5%	-
Somewhat satisfied	116 37.8%	65 40.6%	51 34.7%	-	26 44.8%	24 47.1%	21 24.1%	42 42.4%	80 36.4%	3 25.0%	6 50.0%	3 100%	-	6 33.3%	3 14.3%
Neutral/unsure	54 17.6%	24 15.0%	30 20.4%	3 100%	12 20.7%	6 11.8%	12 13.8%	18 18.2%	36 16.4%	-	3 25.0%	-	3 50.0%	-	9 42.8%
Somewhat dissatisfied	48 15.6%	24 15.0%	24 16.3%	-	-	12 23.5%	21 24.1%	12 12.1%	36 16.4%	-	3 25.0%	-	3 50.0%	3 16.7%	3 14.3%
Extremely dissatisfied	29 9.4%	17 10.6%	12 8.2%	-	2 3.4%	3 5.9%	18 20.7%	6 6.1%	20 9.1%	3 25.0%	-	-	-	-	6 28.6%

City of Clayton Funding Feasibility Survey
 Table 5-2

/

Q3.3 How satisfied are you with community development (including code enforcement, planning and zoning)?

/

	Education						Income					Length of residency			
	Total	Less High	High Scho	Some Coll	Coll Grad	Grad Scho	Under \$25K	\$25-\$50K	\$50-\$75K	\$75-\$100K	Over \$100K	0-5 yrs	6-10 yrs	11-25 yrs	Over 25 yrs
Total	307 100%	3 100%	17 100%	72 100%	119 100%	90 100%	-	21 100%	36 100%	36 100%	178 100%	73 100%	48 100%	84 100%	102 100%
Extremely satisfied	51 16.6%	3 100%	6 35.3%	6 8.3%	27 22.7%	9 10.0%	-	6 28.6%	9 25.0%	-	33 18.5%	15 20.5%	9 18.8%	9 10.7%	18 17.6%
Somewhat satisfied	116 37.8%	-	3 17.6%	36 50.0%	50 42.0%	27 30.0%	-	9 42.9%	18 50.0%	15 41.7%	65 36.5%	292 39.7%	27 56.3%	30 35.7%	30 29.4%
Neutral/unsure	54 17.6%	-	3 17.6%	9 12.5%	15 12.6%	24 26.7%	-	-	3 8.3%	6 16.7%	39 21.9%	15 20.5%	9 18.8%	21 25.0%	9 8.8%
Somewhat dissatisfied	48 15.6%	-	3 17.6%	9 12.5%	18 15.1%	15 16.7%	-	3 14.3%	3 8.3%	9 25.0%	21 11.8%	12 16.4%	-	14.3%	24 23.5%
Extremely dissatisfied	29 9.4%	-	2 11.8%	9 12.5%	6 5.0%	12 13.3%	-	3 14.3%	3 8.3%	6 16.7%	11 6.2%	2 2.7%	-	9 10.7%	18 17.6%

City of Clayton Funding Feasibility Survey
 Table 5-3

/
 /
 Q3.3 How satisfied are you with community development (including code enforcement, planning and zoning)?

/
 /
 /
 /

	# Children					Home Ownership			Ideology			
	Total	None	One	Two	Three or more	Own	Rent	Lib	Prog	Mod	Con	
Total	307 100%	207 100%	32 100%	59 100%	6 100%	289 100%	15 100%	81 100%	96 100%	26 100%	78 100%	
Extremely satisfied	51 16.6%	36 55.1%	9 28.1%	6 10.2%	- 100%	48 16.6%	- 60.0%	15 22.2%	15 37.5%	- 64.5%	18 42.3%	
Somewhat satisfied	116 37.8%	75 36.2%	14 43.8%	24 40.7%	3 100%	107 37.0%	9 60.0%	18 22.2%	36 37.5%	17 64.5%	33 42.3%	
Neutral/unsure	54 17.6%	36 17.4%	9 28.1%	9 15.3%	- 100%	48 16.6%	6 40.0%	9 11.1%	24 25.0%	9 34.6%	9 11.5%	
Somewhat dissatisfied	48 15.6%	36 17.4%	- 43.8%	9 15.3%	- 100%	48 16.6%	- 60.0%	21 25.9%	18 37.5%	- 64.5%	9 42.3%	
Extremely dissatisfied	29 9.4%	21 10.1%	- 43.8%	8 13.6%	- 100%	29 10.0%	- 60.0%	12 14.8%	3 3.1%	- 64.5%	6 7.7%	

City of Clayton Funding Feasibility Survey

Table 5-4

/

/

Q3.3 How satisfied are you with community development (including code enforcement, planning and zoning)?

	Area of Residence					
	Total	North Clay	Central Clay	Town Cent	South Clay	Other
Total	307 100%	86 100%	36 100%	74 100%	39 100%	51 100%
Extremely satisfied	51 16.6%	30 34.9%	-	12 16.2%	3 7.7%	3 5.9%
Somewhat satisfied	116 37.8%	26 30.2%	9 25.0%	39 52.7%	18 46.2%	21 41.2%
Neutral/unsure	54 17.6%	15 17.4%	6 16.7%	9 12.2%	6 15.4%	15 29.4%
Somewhat dissatisfied	48 15.6%	9 10.5%	9 25.0%	6 8.1%	9 23.1%	9 17.6%
Extremely dissatisfied	29 19.4%	-	9 25.0%	8 10.8%	3 7.7%	3 5.9%

City of Clayton Funding Feasibility Survey
 Table 6-1

/

/

Q3.4 How satisfied are you with the County Library located in Clayton?

	Gender			Age					Ethnicity						
	Total	Male	Fem	18-30	31-40	41-50	51-65	Over 66	Cauc	Hisp	Black	Nat Am	Mid East	Asian	Other
Total	307 100%	160 100%	147 100%	3 100%	58 100%	51 100%	87 100%	99 100%	220 100%	12 100%	12 100%	6 100%	3 100%	18 100%	21 100%
Extremely satisfied	159 51.8%	72 45.0%	87 59.2%	-	30 51.7%	24 47.1%	45 51.7%	57 57.6%	120 54.5%	-	12 100%	3 50.0%	3 100%	6 33.4%	12 57.1%
Somewhat satisfied	73 23.8%	43 26.9%	30 20.4%	-	19 32.8%	12 23.5%	18 20.73%	18 18.2%	49 22.3%	12 100%	-	-	-	6 33.3%	-
Neutral/unsure	66 21.5%	42 26.3%	24 16.3%	3 100%	9 15.5%	12 23.5%	24 27.6%	18 18.2%	45 20.5%	-	-	3 50.0%	-	6 33.3%	9 42.9%
Somewhat dissatisfied	6 2.0%	3 1.9%	3 2.0%	-	-	3 5.9%	-	3 3.0%	3 1.4%	-	-	-	-	-	-
Extremely dissatisfied	3 1.0%	-	3 2.0%	-	-	-	-	3 3.0%	3 1.4%	-	-	-	-	-	-

City of Clayton Funding Feasibility Survey
 Table 6-2

/

/

Q3.4 How satisfied are you with the County Library located in Clayton?

/

/

	Education						Income					Length of residency			
	Total	Less High	High Scho	Some Coll	Coll Grad	Grad Scho	Under \$25K	\$25-\$50K	\$50-\$75K	\$75-\$100K	Over \$100K	0-5 yrs	6-10 yrs	11-25 yrs	Over 25 yrs
Total	307 100%	3 100%	17 100%	72 100%	119 100%	90 100%	-	21 100%	36 100%	36 100%	178 100%	73 100%	48 100%	84 100%	102 100%
Extremely satisfied	159 51.8%	3 100%	9 52.9%	36 50.0%	63 52.9%	45 50.0%	-	12 57.1%	21 58.3%	18 50.0%	90 61.8%	30 41.1%	18 37.5%	42 50.0%	69 67.6%
Somewhat satisfied	73 23.8%	-	8 47.1%	15 20.8%	32 26.9%	18 20.0%	-	3 14.3%	12 33.3%	9 25.0%	37 33.1%	16 21.9%	18 37.5%	24 28.6%	15 14.7%
Neutral/unsure	66 21.5%	-	-	18 25.0%	21 17.6%	24 26.7%	-	3 14.3%	3 8.3%	6 16.7%	51 3.4%	24 32.9%	12 25.0%	15 17.9%	15 14.7%
Somewhat dissatisfied	6 2.0%	-	-	3 4.2%	-	3 3.3%	-	3 14.3%	-	3 8.3%	-	3 4.1%	-	3 3.6%	-
Extremely dissatisfied	3 1.0%	-	-	-	3 2.5%	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	3 2.9%

City of Clayton Funding Feasibility Survey

Table 6-3

/

/

Q3.4 How satisfied are you with the County Library located in Clayton?

	# Children					Home Ownership			Ideology			
	Total	None	One	Two	Three or more	Own	Rent	Lib	Prog	Mod	Con	
Total	307 100%	207 100%	32 100%	59 100%	6 100%	289 100%	15 100%	81 100%	96 100%	26 100%	78 100%	
Extremely satisfied	159 51.8%	105 50.7%	18 56.3%	33 55.9%	-	150 51.9%	6 40.0%	39 48.1%	45 46.9%	12 46.2%	51 65.4%	
Somewhat satisfied	73 23.8%	42 20.3%	8 25.0%	17 28.8%	6 100%	73 25.3%	-	27 33.3%	12 12.5%	8 30.8%	12 15.4%	
Neutral/unsure	66 21.5%	51 24.6%	6 18.8%	9 15.3%	-	57 19.7%	9 60.0%	12 14.8%	33 34.4%	6 23.1%	15 19.2%	
Somewhat dissatisfied	6 2.0%	6 2.9%	-	-	-	6 2.1%	-	-	6 6.3%	-	-	
Extremely dissatisfied	3 1.0%	3 1.4%	-	-	-	3 1.0%	-	3 3.7%	-	-	-	

City of Clayton Funding Feasibility Survey

Table 6-4

/

/

Q3.4 How satisfied are you with the County Library located in Clayton?

	Area of Res					
	Total	North Clay	Central Clay	Town Cent	South Clay	Other
Total	307 100%	86 100%	36 100%	74 100%	39 100%	51 100%
Extremely satisfied	159 51.8%	51 59.3%	18 50.0%	30 40.5%	24 61.5%	15 29.4%
Somewhat satisfied	73 23.8%	26 30.2%	9 20.0%	23 31.1%	6 15.4%	9 17.6%
Neutral/unsure	66 21.5%	9 10.5%	9 25.0%	15 20.3%	9 23.1%	24 47.1%
Somewhat dissatisfied	6 2.0%	-	-	6 8.1%	-	-
Extremely dissatisfied	3 1.0%	-	-	-	-	3 5.9%

City of Clayton Funding Feasibility Survey
 Table 7-1

/

Q4.0 Prior to the present survey, were you aware of the fact that the **City of Clayton** is facing huge fiscal challenges?

/

	Gender			Age					Ethnicity						
	Total	Male	Fem	18-30	31-40	41-50	51-65	Over 66	Cauc	Hisp	Black	Nat Am	Mid East	Asian	Other
Total	307 100%	160 100%	147 100%	3 100%	58 100%	51 100%	87 100%	99 100%	220 100%	12 100%	12 100%	6 100%	3 100%	18 100%	18 100%
Extremely aware	53 17.3%	35 21.9%	18 12.2%	-	11 19.0%	9 17.6%	21 24.1%	9 9.1%	35 15.9%	3 25.0%	-	6 100%	-	-	9 50.0%
Somewhat aware	111 36.2%	54 33.8%	57 38.8%	-	6 10.3%	21 41.2%	27 30.0%	51 51.5%	87 39.5%	3 25.0%	-	-	-	3 16.7%	6 33.3%
Not at all aware	137 44.6%	65 40.6%	72 49.0%	3 100%	38 65.5%	18 35.3%	39 44.8%	39 39.4%	95 43.2%	6 50.0%	9 75.0%	-	3 100%	15 83.3%	3 16.7%
DK/Unsure/Refused	6 2.0%	6 3.8%	-	-	3 5.2%	3 5.9%	-	-	3 1.4%	-	3 25.0%	-	-	-	-

City of Clayton Funding Feasibility Survey
 Table 7-2

/

Q4.0 Prior to the present survey, were you aware of the fact that the **City of Clayton** is facing huge fiscal challenges?

/

	Education						Income					Length of residency			
	Total	Less High	High Scho	Some Coll	Coll Grad	Grad Scho	Under \$25K	\$25-\$50K	\$50-\$75K	\$75-\$100K	Over \$100K	0-5 yrs	6-10 yrs	11-25 yrs	Over 25 yrs
Total	307 100%	3 100%	17 100%	72 100%	119 100%	90 100%	-	21 100%	36 100%	36 100%	178 100%	73 100%	48 100%	84 100%	102 100%
Extremely aware	53 17.3%	3 100%	2 11.8%	3 4.2%	24 20.2%	18 20.0%	-	3 14.3%	-	-	44 24.7%	17 23.3%	12 25.0%	9 10.7%	15 14.7%
Somewhat aware	111 36.2%	-	6 35.3%	30 41.7%	39 32.6%	36 40.0%	-	9 42.9%	9 25.0%	21 58.3%	54 30.3%	12 16.4%	15 31.3%	36 42.9%	48 47.1%
Not at all aware	137 44.6%	-	9 52.9%	36 50.0%	56 47.1%	33 36.7%	-	9 42.9%	27 75.0%	15 41.7%	74 41.6%	41 56.2%	18 37.5%	39 46.4%	39 38.2%
DK/Unsure/Refused	6 2.0%	-	-	3 4.2%	-	3 3.3%	-	-	-	-	3 3.4%	3 4.1%	3 6.3%	-	-

City of Clayton Funding Feasibility Survey

Table 7-3

/

/

Q4.0 Prior to the present survey, were you aware of the fact that the **City of Clayton** is facing huge fiscal challenges?

/

/

/

	# Children					Home Ownership		Ideology			
	Total	None	One	Two	Three or more	Own	Rent	Lib	Prog	Mod	Con
Total	307 100%	207 100%	32 100%	59 100%	6 100%	289 100%	15 100%	81 100%	96 100%	26 100%	78 100%
Extremely aware	53 17.3%	24 50.7%	3 9.4%	23 39.0%	-	15 18.3%	-	12 14.8%	21 21.9%	-	15 19.2%
Somewhat aware	111 36.2%	90 20.3%	9 28.1%	9 15.3%	3 50.0%	108 37.4%	3 20.0%	42 51.9%	30 31.3%	3 11.5%	27 34.6%
Not at all aware	137 44.6%	93 24.6%	20 62.5%	24 40.7%	-	122 42.2%	12 80.0%	27 33.3%	45 46.9%	20 76.9%	33 46.2%
DK/Unsure/Refused	6 2.0%	-	-	3 5.1%	3 50.0%	6 2.1%	-	-	-	3 11.5%	3 3.8%

City of Clayton Funding Feasibility Survey

Table 7-4

/

/

Q4.0 Prior to the present survey, were you aware of the fact that the **City of Clayton** is facing huge fiscal challenges?

	Area of Res					
	Total	North Clay	Central Clay	Town Cent	South Clay	Other
Total	307 100%	86 100%	36 100%	74 100%	39 100%	51 100%
Extremely aware	53 17.3%	15 17.4%	15 41.7%	5 6.8%	6 15.4%	6 11.8%
Somewhat aware	111 36.2%	30 34.9%	6 16.7%	36 48.6%	15 38.5%	15 29.4%
Not at all aware	137 44.6%	38 44.2%	12 33.3%	33 44.6%	18 46.2%	30 58.8%
DK/Unsure/Refused	6 2.0%	3 3.5%	3 8.3%	-	-	

City of Clayton Funding Feasibility Survey
 Table 8-1

/

/

Q4.1 Whether or not you were previously aware of the fiscal challenges that City officials will soon be facing, if you learned about these challenges through a trusted source, would that make you highly concerned, somewhat concerned, or not at all concerned about how this set of challenges will impact the well-being of you and your family members?

/

/

	Gender			Age					Ethnicity						
	Total	Male	Fem	18-30	31-40	41-50	51-65	Over 66	Cauc	Hisp	Black	Nat Am	Mid East	Asian	Other
Total	307	160	147	3	58	51	87	99	220	12	12	6	3	18	21
	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%
Highly concerned	93	39	54	-	24	9	24	33	66	3	12	3	3	6	3
	30.3%	24.4%	36.7%		41.4%	17.6%	27.6%	33.3%	30.0%	25.0%	100%	50.0%	50.0%	33.3%	14.3%
Somewhat concerned	152	80	72	-	26	30	48	45	107	9	-	3	3	9	12
	49.5%	50.0%	49.0%		44.8%	58.8%	55.2%	45.5%	48.6%	75.0%		50.0%	50.0%	50.0%	57.1%
Not at all concerned	44	26	18	3	5	6	12	15	29	-	-	-	-	3	6
	14.3%	16.3%	12.2%	100%	8.6%	11.8%	13.8%	15.2%	13.2%					16.7%	28.6%
DK/Unsure/Refused	18	15	3	3	3	6	3	6	18	-	-	-	-	-	-
	5.9%	9.4%	2.0%		5.2%	11.8%	3.4%	6.1%	8.2%						

City of Clayton Funding Feasibility Survey
 Table 8-2

/

Q4.1 Whether or not you were previously aware of the fiscal challenges that City officials will soon be facing, if you learned about these challenges through a trusted source, would that make you highly concerned, somewhat concerned, or not at all concerned about how this set of challenges will impact the well-being of you and your family members?

/

	Education						Income					Length of residency			
	Total	Less High	High Scho	Some Coll	Coll Grad	Grad Scho	Under \$25K	\$25-\$50K	\$50-\$75K	\$75-\$100K	Over \$100K	0-5 yrs	6-10 yrs	11-25 yrs	Over 25 yrs
Total	307 100%	3 100%	17 100%	72 100%	119 100%	90 100%	-	21 100%	36 100%	36 100%	178 100%	73 100%	48 100%	84 100%	102 100%
Highly concerned	93 30.3%	-	12 70.6%	24 33.3%	33 27.7%	21 23.3%	-	9 42.9%	15 41.7%	15 41.7%	45 25.3%	24 32.9%	12 25.0%	24 28.6%	33 32.4%
Somewhat concerned	152 49.5%	-	3 17.6%	36 50.0%	65 54.6%	48 53.3%	-	9 42.9%	12 33.3%	12 33.3%	101 56.7%	32 43.8%	30 62.5%	45 53.6%	45 44.1%
Not at all concerned	44 14.3%	3 100%	2 11.8%	-	21 17.6%	15 16.7%	-	3 14.3%	3 8.3%	9 25.0%	23 12.9%	8 11.0%	6 12.5%	12 14.3%	18 17.6%
DK/Unsure/Refused	18 5.9%	-	-	12 16.7%	-	6 6.7%	-	-	6 16.7%	-	9 5.1%	9 12.3%	-	3 3.6%	6 5.9%

City of Clayton Funding Feasibility Survey
 Table 8-3

Q4.1 Whether or not you were previously aware of the fiscal challenges that City officials will soon be facing, if you learned about these challenges through a trusted source, would that make you highly concerned, somewhat concerned, or not at all concerned about how this set of challenges will impact the well-being of you and your family members?

	# Children					Home Ownership		Ideology			
	Total	None	One	Two	Three or more	Own	Rent	Lib	Prog	Mod	Con
Total	307	207	32	59	6	289	15	81	96	26	78
	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%
Highly concerned	93	66	9	15	-	87	6	24	24	6	27
	30.3%	31.9%	28.1%	25.4%		30.1%	40.0%	29.6%	25.0%	23.1%	34.6%
Somewhat concerned	152	90	23	33	8	152	-	42	54	11	36
	49.5%	43.5%	71.9%	55.9%	100%	52.6%		51.9%	56.3%	42.3%	46.2%
Not at all concerned	44	36	-	8	-	38	3	12	12	3	12
	14.3%	17.4%		13.6%		13.1%	20.0%	14.8%	12.5%	11.5%	15.4%
DK/Unsure/Refused	18	15	-	3	-	12	6	3	6	6	3
	5.9%	7.2%		5.1%		4.2%	40.0%	3.7%	6.3%	23.1%	3.8%

City of Clayton Funding Feasibility Survey

Table 8-4

/

/

Q4.1 Whether or not you were previously aware of the fiscal challenges that City officials will soon be facing, if you learned about these challenges through a trusted source, would that make you highly concerned, somewhat concerned, or not at all concerned about how this set of challenges will impact the well-being of you and your family members?

	Area of Res					Other
	Total	North Clay	Central Clay	Town Cent	South Clay	
Total	307 100%	86 100%	36 100%	74 100%	39 100%	51 100%
Highly concerned	93 30.3%	24 27.9%	15 41.7%	21 28.4%	6 15.4%	9 17.6%
Somewhat concerned	152 49.5%	44 51.2%	15 41.7%	39 52.7%	30 76.9%	24 47.1%
Not at all concerned	44 14.3%	18 20.9%	6 16.7%	8 10.8%	-	12 23.5%
DK/Unsure/Refused	18 5.9%	-	-	6 8.1%	3 7.7%	6 11.8%

City of Clayton Funding Feasibility Survey
 Table 9-1

/

Q5.0 At the present time, Clayton officials are considering several ways of dealing with this difficult situation. I would like to ask you about your preferences regarding two of these. Would you prefer: Maintaining City services at their current level and increasing local taxes only enough to pay for the same level of programs and services that are presently being provided to local residents? Or, do you prefer... Cutting back the current level of City services and programs, thereby, creating NO new taxes at the local level of government...even if this means forcing City officials into making significant cutbacks in the level of services presently being provided to Clayton residents, such as reducing the number of sworn police officers; cutting back expenses in maintaining City parks; or reducing the number of hours City Hall is open to the public; among other services?

/

	Gender			Age					Ethnicity						
	Total	Male	Fem	18-30	31-40	41-50	51-65	Over 66	Cauc	Hisp	Black	Nat Am	Mid East	Asian	Other
Total	307	160	147	3	58	51	87	99	220	12	12	6	3	18	21
	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%
Maintain services/ Increase taxes	107	56	51	-	14	30	27	36	80	3	-	6	-	3	15
	34.9%	35.0%	34.7%		24.1%	58.8%	31.0%	36.4%	36.45%	25.0%		100%		16.7%	71.4%
Cut back services/ NO new taxes	126	72	54	3	24	15	36	39	75	9	9	-	3	12	3
	41.0%	45.0%	36.7%	100%	41.4%	29.4%	41.4%	39.4%	34.1%	75.0%	75.0%		100%	66.6%	14.3%
Depends on amount	45	12	33	-	6	3	18	18	39	-	-	-	-	3	3
	14.7%	7.5%	22.4%		10.3%	5.9%	20.7%	18.2%	17.7%					16.7%	14.3%
Refused	29	20	9	-	14	3	6	6	26	-	3	-	-	-	-
	9.4%	12.5%	6.1%		24.1%	5.9%	6.9%	6.1%	11.8%		25.0%				

City of Clayton Funding Feasibility Survey
 Table 9-2

/

/

Q5.0 At the present time, Clayton officials are considering several ways of dealing with this difficult situation. I would like to ask you about your preferences regarding two of these. Would you prefer: Maintaining City services at their current level and increasing local taxes only enough to pay for the same level of programs and services that are presently being provided to local residents? Or, do you prefer... Cutting back the current level of City services and programs, thereby, creating NO new taxes at the local level of government...even if this means forcing City officials into making significant cutbacks in the level of services presently being provided to Clayton residents, such as reducing the number of sworn police officers; cutting back expenses in maintaining City parks; or reducing the number of hours City Hall is open to the public; among other services?

/

/

	Education						Income					Length of residency			
	Total	Less High	High Scho	Some Coll	Coll Grad	Grad Scho	Under \$25K	\$25-\$50K	\$50-\$75K	\$75-\$100K	Over \$100K	0-5 yrs	6-10 yrs	11-25 yrs	Over 25 yrs
Total	307 100%	3 100%	17 100%	72 100%	119 100%	90 100%	-	21 100%	36 100%	36 100%	178 100%	73 100%	48 100%	84 100%	102 100%
Maintain services/ Increase taxes	107 34.9%	3 100%	3 17.6%	18 25.0%	32 26.9%	51 56.7%	-	9 42.9%	12 33.3%	6 16.7%	74 41.6%	32 43.8%	21 43.8%	24 28.6%	30 29.4%
Cut back services/ NO new taxes	126 41.0%	-	9 52.9%	30 41.7%	363 52.9%	121 23.3%	-	12 57.1%	9 25.0%	21 58.3%	63 35.4%	24 32.9%	18 37.5%	36 42.9%	48 47.1%
Depends on amount	45 14.7%	-	3 17.6%	18 25.0%	18 15.1%	6 6.7%	-	-	12 33.3%	6 16.7%	24 13.5%	3 4.1%	6 12.5%	18 21.4%	18 17.6%
DK/Unsure/Refused	29 9.4%	-	2 11.8%	6 8.3%	6 5.0%	12 13.3%	-	-	3 8.3%	3 8.3%	17 9.6%	14 19.2%	3 6.3%	6 7.1%	6 5.9%

City of Clayton Funding Feasibility Survey
 Table 9-3

/

Q5.0 At the present time, Clayton officials are considering several ways of dealing with this difficult situation. I would like to ask you about your preferences regarding two of these. Would you prefer: Maintaining City services at their current level and increasing local taxes only enough to pay for the same level of programs and services that are presently being provided to local residents? Or, do you prefer... Cutting back the current level of City services and programs, thereby, creating NO new taxes at the local level of government...even if this means forcing City officials into making significant cutbacks in the level of services presently being provided to Clayton residents, such as reducing the number of sworn police officers; cutting back expenses in maintaining City parks; or reducing the number of hours City Hall is open to the public; among other services?

/

	# Children					Home Ownership			Ideology			
	Total	None	One	Two	Three or more	Own	Rent	Lib	Prog	Mod	Con	
Total	307	207	32	59	6	289	15	81	96	26	78	
	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	
Maintain services/ Increase taxes	107	69	14	24	-	104	3	24	24	11	45	
	34.9%	33.3%	43.8%	40.7%		36.0%	20.0%	29.6%	25.0%	42.3%	57.7%	
Cut back services/ NO new taxes	126	84	9	24	6	117	6	39	45	9	18	
	41.0%	40.6%	28.1%	40.7%	100%	40.53%	40.0%	48.1%	46.9%	34.6%	23.1%	
Depends on amount	45	36	6	3	-	45	-	9	21	6	6	
	14.7%	17.4%	18.8%	5.1%		15.6%		11.1%	21.9%	23.1%	7.7%	
Refused	29	18	3	8	-	23	6	9	6	-	9	
	9.4%	8.7%	9.4%	13.6%		8.0%	40.0%	11.1%	6.3%		11.5%	

City of Clayton Funding Feasibility Survey
 Table 9-4

/

Q5.0 At the present time, Clayton officials are considering several ways of dealing with this difficult situation. I would like to ask you about your preferences regarding two of these. Would you prefer: Maintaining City services at their current level and increasing local taxes only enough to pay for the same level of programs and services that are presently being provided to local residents? Or, do you prefer... Cutting back the current level of City services and programs, thereby, creating NO new taxes at the local level of government...even if this means forcing City officials into making significant cutbacks in the level of services presently being provided to Clayton residents, such as reducing the number of sworn police officers; cutting back expenses in maintaining City parks; or reducing the number of hours City Hall is open to the public; among other services?

	Area of Res					Other
	Total	North Clay	Central Clay	Town Cent	South Clay	
	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----
Total	307	86	36	74	39	51
	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%
Maintain services/ Increase taxes	107	32	6	24	21	21
	34.9%	37.2%	16.7%	32.4%	53.8%	41.2%
Cut back services/ NO new taxes	126	36	30	30	6	18
	41.0%	41.9%	83.3%	40.5%	15.4%	35.2%
Depends on amount	45	12	-	15	9	6
	14.7%	14.0%		20.3%	23.1%	11.8%
Refused	29	6	-	5	3	6
	9.4%	7.0%		6.8%	7.7%	11.8%

City of Clayton Funding Feasibility Survey
 Table 10-1

/

Q6.0 The first option is to ask Clayton voters to authorize an increase the amount of their **property tax** by \$400, per year, per parcel of property owned, which amounts to approximately \$33 per month . This would provide unrestricted funds to balance the City's annual budget; plus, address unmet needs for additional public safety, park maintenance, sustainability and staff support. The specific funding mechanism would be a **PARCEL TAX**, which is a flat tax on each parcel of property owned as opposed to a tax based upon the assessed value of each parcel of property owned. If you were asked to vote today on such a funding measure, would you vote YES or NO?

/

	Gender			Age					Ethnicity						
	Total	Male	Fem	18-30	31-40	41-50	51-65	Over 66	Cauc	Hisp	Black	Nat Am	Mid East	Asian	Other
Total	307	160	147	3	58	51	87	99	220	12	12	6	3	18	21
	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%
Definitely YES	114	69	45	3	15	9	45	36	81	6	9	6	3	-	3
	37.1%	43.1%	30.6%	100%	25.9%	17.6%	51.7%	36.4%	36.8%	50.0%	75.0%	100%	100%	-	14.3%
Probably YES	54	30	24	-	12	12	18	9	36	3	-	-	-	9	3
	17.6%	18.8%	16.3%	-	20.7%	23.5%	20.7%	9.1%	16.4%	25.0%	-	-	-	50.0%	14.3%
Neutral/unsure	27	9	18	-	9	6	3	9	18	3	-	-	-	-	6
	8.8%	5.6%	12.2%	-	15.5%	11.8%	3.4%	9.1%	8.2%	25.0%	-	-	-	-	28.6%
Probably NO	74	29	45	-	14	15	12	33	59	-	3	-	-	9	3
	24.1%	18.1%	30.6%	-	24.1%	29.4%	13.8%	33.3%	26.8%	-	25.0%	-	-	50.0%	14.3%
Definitely NO	36	21	15	-	6	9	9	12	24	-	-	-	-	-	6
	11.7%	13.1%	10.2%	-	10.3%	17.6%	10.3%	12.1%	10.9%	-	-	-	-	-	28.6%

City of Clayton Funding Feasibility Survey
 Table 10-2

/

Q6.0 The first option is to ask Clayton voters to authorize an increase the amount of their **property tax** by \$400, per year, per parcel of property owned, which amounts to approximately \$33 per month . This would provide unrestricted funds to balance the City's annual budget; plus, address unmet needs for additional public safety, park maintenance, sustainability and staff support. The specific funding mechanism would be a **PARCEL TAX**, which is a flat tax on each parcel of property owned as opposed to a tax based upon the assessed value of each parcel of property owned. If you were asked to vote today on such a funding measure, would you vote YES or NO?

/

	Education						Income					Length of residency			
	Total	Less High	High Scho	Some Coll	Coll Grad	Grad Scho	Under \$25K	\$25-\$50K	\$50-\$75K	\$75-\$100K	Over \$100K	0-5 yrs	6-10 yrs	11-25 yrs	Over 25 yrs
Total	307 100%	3 100%	17 100%	72 100%	119 100%	90 100%	-	21 100%	36 100%	36 100%	178 100%	73 100%	48 100%	84 100%	102 100%
Definitely YES	114 37.1%	-	9 52.9%	27 37.5%	48 40.3%	27 30.0%	-	6 28.6%	12 33.3%	21 58.3%	60 33.7%	15 20.5%	18 37.5%	42 50.0%	39 38.2%
Probably YES	54 17.6%	-	3 17.6%	18 25.0%	18 15.1%	15 16.7%	-	3 14.3%	12 33.3%	6 41.7%	30 16.9%	12 16.4%	9 18.8%	21 25.0%	12 11.8%
Neutral/unsure	27 8.8%	-	-	15 20.8%	9 7.6%	3 3.3%	-	-	3 8.3%	6 16.7%	15 8.4%	6 8.2%	6 12.5%	3 3.6%	12 11.8%
Probably NO	74 24.1%	-	3 17.6%	3 4.2%	38 31.9%	27 30.0%	-	9 42.9%	9 25.0%	3 25.0%	38 21.3%	23 31.5%	9 18.8%	12 14.3%	30 29.4%
Definitely NO	36 11.7%	3 100%	-	9 12.5%	6 5.0%	18 20.0%	-	3 14.3%	-	-	33 18.5%	15 20.5%	6 12.5%	6 7.1%	9 8.8%

City of Clayton Funding Feasibility Survey
 Table 10-3

/

/

Q6.0 The first option is to ask Clayton voters to authorize an increase the amount of their **property tax** by \$400, per year, per parcel of property owned, which amounts to approximately \$33 per month . This would provide unrestricted funds to balance the City's annual budget; plus, address unmet needs for additional public safety, park maintenance, sustainability and staff support. The specific funding mechanism would be a **PARCEL TAX**, which is a flat tax on each parcel of property owned as opposed to a tax based upon the assessed value of each parcel of property owned. If you were asked to vote today on such a funding measure, would you vote YES or NO?

/

/

/

	# Children					Home Ownership		Ideology			
	Total	None	One	Two	Three or more	Own	Rent	Lib	Prog	Mod	Con
Total	307	207	32	59	6	289	15	81	96	26	78
	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%
Definitely YES	114	78	9	21	3	111	3	42	39	3	18
	37.1%	37.7%	28.1%	35.6%	50.0%	38.4%	20.0%	51.9%	40.6%	11.5%	23.1%
Probably YES	54	33	6	12	3	51	3	15	18	3	12
	17.6%	15.9%	18.8%	20.3%	50.0%	17.6%	20.0%	18.5%	18.8%	11.5%	15.4%
Neutral/unsure	27	18	3	6	-	24	3	3	6	6	6
	8.8%	8.7%	9.4%	10.2%	-	8.3%	20.0%	3.7%	6.3%	23.1%	7.7%
Definitely NO	74	54	11	9	-	65	6	15	21	11	27
	24.1%	26.1%	34.4%	15.3%	-	22.5%	40.0%	18.5%	21.9%	42.3%	34.6%
Probably NO	36	24	3	9	-	36	-	12	12	3	15
	11.7%	11.6%	9.4%	15.3%	-	12.5%	-	7.4%	12.5%	11.5%	19.2%

City of Clayton Funding Feasibility Survey
 Table 10-4

/

Q6.0 The first option is to ask Clayton voters to authorize an increase the amount of their **property tax** by \$400, per year, per parcel of property owned, which amounts to approximately \$33 per month . This would provide unrestricted funds to balance the City's annual budget; plus, address unmet needs for additional public safety, park maintenance, sustainability and staff support. The specific funding mechanism would be a **PARCEL TAX**, which is a flat tax on each parcel of property owned as opposed to a tax based upon the assessed value of each parcel of property owned. If you were asked to vote today on such a funding measure, would you vote YES or NO?

	Area of Residence					
	Total	North Clay	Central Clay	Town Cent	South Clay	Other
Total	307 100%	86 100%	36 100%	74 100%	39 100%	48 100%
Definitely YES	114 37.1%	33 38.4%	21 58.3%	18 24.3%	15 38.5%	12 25.0%
Probably YES	54 17.6%	15 17.4%	6 16.7%	21 28.4%	3 7.7%	9 18.8%
Neutral/unsure	27 8.8%	3 3.5%	-	6 8.1%	3 7.7%	12 25.0%
Probably NO	74 24.1%	26 30.2%	3 8.3%	18 24.3%	12 30.8%	12 25.0%
Definitely NO	36 11.7%	9 10.5%	6 16.7%	9 12.2%	6 15.4%	3 6.2%

City of Clayton Funding Feasibility Survey
 Table 11-1

/

/

Q6.1 Since you're not willing to pay \$400 per year (or about \$33 per month) to allow City officials to balance the City's annual budget and address unmet needs, would you be willing to authorize an annual increase of \$300 (or \$25 per month) per parcel of property owned, in order for the City to balance the City's annual budget and avoid having to make significant cutbacks in the level services presently being provided to Clayton residents?

/

/

	Gender			Age					Ethnicity						
	Total	Male	Fem	18-30	31-40	41-50	51-65	Over 66	Cauc	Hisp	Black	Nat Am	Mid East	Asian	Other
Total	307	160	147	3	50	42	78	87	194	12	9	6	3	18	15
	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%
Definitely YES	111	63	48	3	12	9	39	39	75	9	6	6	3	-	3
	41.3%	46.0%	36.4%	100%	24.0%	21.4%	50.0%	44.8%	38.7%	75.0%	66.7%	100%	100%	-	20.0%
Probably YES	51	39	12	-	21	9	18	3	30	-	3	-	-	12	6
	19.0%	28.5%	9.1%	-	42.0%	21.4%	23.1%	3.4%	15.5%	-	33.3%	-	-	66.7%	40.0%
Neutral/unsure	27	9	18	-	6	6	3	12	24	3	-	-	-	-	-
	10.0%	6.6%	13.6%	-	12.0%	14.3%	3.8%	13.8%	12.4%	25.0%	-	-	-	-	-
Probably NO	51	21	30	-	3	18	6	24	42	-	-	-	-	3	3
	19.0%	15.3%	22.7%	-	6.0%	42.9%	7.7%	27.6%	21.6%	-	-	-	-	16.7%	20.0%
Definitely NO	29	5	24	-	8	-	12	9	23	-	-	-	-	3	3
	10.8%	3.6%	18.2%	-	16.0%	-	15.4%	10.3%	11.9%	-	-	-	-	16.7%	20.0%

City of Clayton Funding Feasibility Survey
 Table 11-2

/

/

Q6.1 Since you're not willing to pay \$400 per year (or about \$33 per month) to allow City officials to balance the City's annual budget and address unmet needs, would you be willing to authorize an annual increase of \$300 (or \$25 per month) per parcel of property owned, in order for the City to balance the City's annual budget and avoid having to make significant cutbacks in the level services presently being provided to Clayton residents?

	Education						Income					Length of residency			
	Total	Less High	High Scho	Some Coll	Coll Grad	Grad Scho	Under \$25K	\$25-\$50K	\$50-\$75K	\$75-\$100K	Over \$100K	0-5 yrs	6-10 yrs	11-25 yrs	Over 25 yrs
Total	269 100%	-	15 100%	63 100%	113 100%	72 100%	-	18 100%	36 100%	36 100%	143 100%	56 100%	42 100%	78 100%	93 100%
Definitely YES	111 41.3%	-	6 40.0%	27 42.9%	51 45.1%	24 33.3%	-	3 28.6%	15 41.7%	21 58.3%	54 37.8%	15 26.8%	18 42.9%	39 50.0%	39 41.9%
Probably YES	51 19.0%	-	6 40.0%	15 23.8%	18 15.9%	12 16.7%	-	6 42.9%	3 8.3%	6 41.7%	36 25.2%	15 26.8%	12 28.6%	18 23.1%	6 6.5%
Neutral/unsure	27 10.0%	-	-	18 28.6%	6 5.3%	3 4.2%	-	-	6 16.7%	6 16.7%	12 8.4%	3 5.4%	6 14.3%	3 3.8%	15 16.1%
Probably NO	51 19.0%	-	3 20.0%	3 4.8%	15 13.3%	27 37.5%	-	-	9 25.0%	3 25.0%	30 21.0%	15 26.8%	6 14.3%	12 15.4%	18 19.4%
Definitely NO	29 10.9%	-	-	-	23 20.4%	6 8.3%	-	9 14.3%	3 8.3%	-	11 7.7%	8 14.3%	-	6 7.7%	15 16.1%

City of Clayton Funding Feasibility Survey
 Table 11-3

/

/

Q6.1 Since you're not willing to pay \$400 per year (or about \$33 per month) to allow City officials to balance the City's annual budget and address unmet needs, would you be willing to authorize an annual increase of \$300 (or \$25 per month) per parcel of property owned, in order for the City to balance the City's annual budget and avoid having to make significant cutbacks in the level services presently being provided to Clayton residents?

/

/

/

	# Children					Home Ownership			Ideology			
	Total	None	One	Two	Three or more	Own	Rent	Lib	Prog	Mod	Con	
Total	269	183	29	48	3	251	15	75	84	23	63	
	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	
Definitely YES	111	81	15	3	3	111	-	42	36	3	18	
	41.3%	44.3%	31.1%	10.2%	100%	44.2%		56.0%	42.9%	13.0%	28.6%	
Probably YES	51	24	18	3	-	45	6	18	18	-	9	
	19.0%	13.1%	37.5%	40.7%		17.9%	40.0%	24.0%	21.4%		14.3%	
Neutral/unsure	27	21	3	-	-	24	3	-	9	3	9	
	10.0%	11.5%	6.3%			9.6%	20.0%		10.7%	13.0%	14.3%	
Definitely NO	51	36	12	-	-	45	6	15	9	9	18	
	19.0%	19.7%	25.0%			17.9%	40.0%	20.0%	10.7%	39.1%	28.6%	
Probably NO	29	21	-	-	-	26	-	-	12	8	9	
	10.8%	11.5%				10.4%			14.3%	34.8%	14.3%	

City of Clayton Funding Feasibility Survey
 Table 11-4

/

Q6.1 Since you're not willing to pay \$400 per year (or about \$33 per month) to allow City officials to balance the City's annual budget and address unmet needs, would you be willing to authorize an annual increase of \$300 (or \$25 per month) per parcel of property owned, in order for the City to balance the City's annual budget and avoid having to make significant cutbacks in the level services presently being provided to Clayton residents?

	Area of Residence					Other
	Total	North Clay	Central Clay	Town Cent	South Clay	
Total	269 100%	77 100%	30 100%	63 100%	33 100%	48 100%
Definitely YES	111 41.3%	33 42.9%	21 70.0%	21 33.3%	9 27.3%	15 31.2%
Probably YES	51 19.0%	15 19.5%	3 10.0%	18 28.6%	9 27.3%	6 12.5%
Neutral/unsure	27 10.0%	6 7.8%	-	6 9.5%	3 9.1%	9 18.8%
Probably NO	51 19.0%	12 15.6%	-	15 23.8%	6 18.2%	18 37.5%
Definitely NO	29 10.8%	11 14.3%	6 20.0%	3 4.8%	6 18.2%	-

City of Clayton Funding Feasibility Survey
 Table 12-1

/

/

Q6.2 Since you're not willing to pay \$300 per year (which is approximately \$25 per month) to allow City officials to balance the City's annual budget, would you be willing to authorize an annual increase of \$200 (or \$17per month) per parcel of property owned, in order for the City to avoid having to make significant cutbacks in the level of services presently being provided to Clayton residents?

/

/

	Gender			Age					Ethnicity						
	Total	Male	Fem	18-30	31-40	41-50	51-65	Over 66	Cauc	Hisp	Black	Nat Am	Mid East	Asian	Other
Total	240 100%	132 100%	108 100%	3 100%	42 100%	42 100%	66 100%	78 100%	171 100%	12 100%	6 100%	6 100%	3 100%	15 100%	12 100%
Definitely YES	87 36.3%	48 36.4%	39 36.1%	3 100%	9 21.4%	6 14.3%	33 50.0%	27 34.6%	57 33.3%	6 50.0%	6 66.7%	6 100%	3 100%	-	-
Probably YES	42 17.5%	30 22.7%	12 11.1%	-	12 28.6%	9 21.4%	15 22.7%	6 7.7%	33 19.3%	-	-	-	-	3 20.0%	6 50.0%
Neutral/unsure	21 8.8%	9 6.8%	12 11.1%	-	6 14.3%	6 14.3%	3 4.5%	6 7.7%	15 8.8%	3 25.0%	-	-	-	-	3 25.0%
Probably NO	63 26.3%	33 25.0%	30 27.8%	-	15 35.7%	12 28.6%	9 13.6%	27 34.6%	42 24.6%	3 25.0%	3 33.3%	-	-	12 80.0%	-
Definitely NO	27 11.3%	12 9.1%	15 13.9%	-	-	9 21.4%	6 9.1%	12 15.4%	24 14.0%	-	-	-	-	-	3 25.0%

City of Clayton Funding Feasibility Survey
 Table 12-2

/

/

Q6.2 Since you're not willing to pay \$300 per year (which is approximately \$25 per month) to allow City officials to balance the City's annual budget, would you be willing to authorize an annual increase of \$200 (or \$17per month) per parcel of property owned, in order for the City to avoid having to make significant cutbacks in the level of services presently being provided to Clayton residents?

	Education						Income					Length of residency			
	Total	Less High	High Scho	Some Coll	Coll Grad	Grad Scho	Under \$25K	\$25-\$50K	\$50-\$75K	\$75-\$100K	Over \$100K	0-5 yrs	6-10 yrs	11-25 yrs	Over 25 yrs
Total	240 100%	-	15 100%	63 100%	90 100%	66 100%	-	9 100%	33 100%	36 100%	132 100%	48 100%	42 100%	72 100%	78 100%
Definitely YES	87 36.3%	-	6 40.0%	18 28.6%	39 43.3%	21 31.8%	-	3 33.3%	9 27.3%	15 41.7%	42 31.8%	9 18.8%	12 28.6%	36 50.0%	30 38.5%
Probably YES	42 17.5%	-	3 20.0%	9 14.3%	15 16.7%	15 22.7%	-	-	6 18.2%	9 25.0%	27 20.5%	9 18.8%	15 35.7%	12 16.7%	6 7.7%
Neutral/unsure	21 8.8%	-	-	15 23.8%	3 3.3%	3 4.5%	-	-	3 9.1%	6 16.7%	9 6.8%	3 6.3%	6 14.3%	3 4.2%	9 11.5%
Probably NO	63 26.3%	-	3 20.0%	18 28.6%	24 26.7%	15 22.7%	-	3 33.3%	9 27.3%	3 8.3%	42 31.8%	24 50.0%	9 21.4%	9 12.5%	21 26.9%
Definitely NO	27 11.3%	-	3 20.0%	3 4.8%	9 10.0%	12 18.2%	-	3 33.3%	6 18.2%	3 8.3%	12 9.1%	3 6.3%	-	12 16.7%	12 15.4%

City of Clayton Funding Feasibility Survey
 Table 12-3

/

/

Q6.2 Since you're not willing to pay \$300 per year (which is approximately \$25 per month) to allow City officials to balance the City's annual budget, would you be willing to authorize an annual increase of \$200 (or \$17per month) per parcel of property owned, in order for the City to avoid having to make significant cutbacks in the level of services presently being provided to Clayton residents?

	# Children					Home Ownership		Ideology			
	Total	None	One	Two	Three or more	Own	Rent	Lib	Prog	Mod	Con
Total	240 100%	162 100%	21 100%	48 100%	6 100%	225 100%	15 100%	75 100%	72 100%	15 100%	54 100%
Definitely YES	87 36.3%	63 38.9%	6 28.6%	12 25.0%	3 50.0%	87 38.7%	-	30 40.0%	27 37.5%	3 20.0%	18 33.3%
Probably YES	42 17.5%	24 14.8%	6 28.6%	12 25.0%	-	136 16.0%	6 40.0%	15 20.0%	18 25.0%	-	9 16.7%
Neutral/unsure	21 8.8%	15 9.3%	3 14.3%	3 6.3%	-	18 8.0%	3 20.0%	3 4.0%	3 4.2%	-	9 16.7%
Definitely NO	63 26.3%	42 25.9%	3 14.3%	15 31.3%	3 50.0%	57 25.3%	6 40.0%	12 16.0%	21 29.2%	6 40.0%	15 27.8%
Probably NO	27 11.3%	18 11.1%	3 14.3%	6 12.5%	-	27 12.0%	-	15 20.0%	3 4.2%	6 40.0%	3 5.6%

City of Clayton Funding Feasibility Survey
 Table 12-4

/

Q6.2 Since you're not willing to pay \$300 per year (which is approximately \$25 per month) to allow City officials to balance the City's annual budget, would you be willing to authorize an annual increase of \$200 (or \$17per month) per parcel of property owned, in order for the City to avoid having to make significant cutbacks in the level of services presently being provided to Clayton residents?

	Area of Residence					
	Total	North Clay	Central Clay	Town Cent	South Clay	Other
Total	240 100%	66 100%	24 100%	60 100%	27 100%	48 100%
Definitely YES	87 36.3%	27 40.9%	15 62.5%	15 25.0%	3 11.1%	15 31.2%
Probably YES	42 17.5%	9 13.6%	9 37.5%	12 20.0%	6 22.2%	6 12.5%
Neutral/unsure	21 8.8%	6 9.1%	-	3 5.0%	6 22.2%	3 6.3%
Probably NO	63 26.3%	15 22.7%	-	21 35.0%	12 44.4%	15 31.2%
Definitely NO	27 11.3%	9 13.6%	-	9 15.0%	-	9 18.8%

City of Clayton Funding Feasibility Survey
 Table 13-1

/

/

Q7.0 If you were asked to vote today on a measure to create a **UTILITY USE TAX** of **6%** of your utility bills, would you **definitely vote YES**, **probably vote YES**, **probably vote NO**; or **definitely vote NO** on such a measure?

	Gender			Age					Ethnicity						
	Total	Male	Fem	18-30	31-40	41-50	51-65	Over 66	Cauc	Hisp	Black	Nat Am	Mid East	Asian	Other
Total	307 100%	160 100%	147 100%	3 100%	58 100%	51 100%	87 100%	99 100%	220 100%	12 100%	12 100%	6 100%	3 100%	18 100%	21 100%
Definitely YES	179 58.3%	89 55.6%	90 61.2%	3 100%	32 55.2%	33 64.7%	48 55.2%	54 54.5%	122 55.5%	6 50.0%	12 100%	6 100%	3 100%	9 50.0%	12 57.1%
Probably YES	36 11.7%	24 15.0%	12 8.2%	-	9 15.5%	3 5.9%	6 6.9%	18 18.2%	27 12.3%	3 25.0%	-	-	-	3 16.7%	3 14.3%
Neutral/unsure	6 2.0%	3 1.9%	3 2.0%	-	3 5.2%	-	3 3.4%	-	6 2.7%	-	-	-	-	-	-
Probably NO	57 18.6%	33 20.6%	24 16.3%	-	3 5.2%	9 17.6%	18 20.7%	27 27.3%	42 19.1%	3 25.0%	-	-	-	3 16.7%	3 14.3%
Definitely NO	29 9.4%	11 6.9%	18 12.2%	-	11 19.0%	6 11.8	12 13.8%	-	23 10.5%	-	-	-	-	3 16.7%	3 14.3%

City of Clayton Funding Feasibility Survey
 Table 13-2

/

/

Q7.0 If you were asked to vote today on a measure to create a **UTILITY USE TAX** of **6%** of your utility bills, would you **definitely vote YES**, **probably vote YES**, **probably vote NO**; or **definitely vote NO** on such a measure?

	Education						Income					Length of residency			
	Total	Less High	High Scho	Some Coll	Coll Grad	Grad Scho	Under \$25K	\$25-\$50K	\$50-\$75K	\$75-\$100K	Over \$100K	0-5 yrs	6-10 yrs	11-25 yrs	Over 25 yrs
Total	307 100%	3 100%	17 100%	72 100%	119 100%	90 100%	-	21 100%	36 100%	36 100%	178 100%	73 100%	48 100%	84 100%	102 100%
Definitely YES	51 16.6%	-	17 100%	33 45.8%	75 63.0%	48 53.3%	-	12 57.1%	18 50.0%	27 75.0%	101 56.7%	32 43.8%	33 68.8%	63 75.0%	51 50.0%
Probably YES	116 37.8%	-	-	15 20.8%	15 12.6%	6 6.7%	-	-	6 16.7%	6 16.7%	21 11.8%	12 16.4%	-	6 7.1%	18 17.6%
Neutral/unsure	54 17.6%	-	-	3 4.2%	3 2.5%	-	-	-	-	-	3 1.7%	3 4.1%	-	-	3 2.9%
Probably NO	48 15.6%	3 100%	-	18 25.0%	12 10.1%	24 26.7%	-	6 28.6%	9 25.0%	3 8.3%	30 16.9%	12 16.4%	12 25.0%	9 10.7%	24 23.5%
Definitely NO	29 9.4%	-	-	3 4.2%	14 11.8%	12 13.3%	-	3 14.3%	3 8.3%	-	23 12.9%	14 19.2%	3 6.3%	6 7.1%	6 5.9%

City of Clayton Funding Feasibility Survey
 Table 13-3

/

/

Q7.0 If you were asked to vote today on a measure to create a **UTILITY USE TAX** of **6%** of your utility bills, would you **definitely vote YES**, **probably vote YES**, **probably vote NO**; or **definitely vote NO** on such a measure?

/

/

/

	# Children					Home Ownership			Ideology			
	Total	None	One	Two	Three or more	Own	Rent	Lib	Prog	Mod	Con	
Total	307	207	32	59	6	289	15	81	96	26	78	
	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	
Definitely YES	51	111	24	35	6	170	9	60	63	9	30	
	16.6%	53.6%	75.0%	59.3%	100%	58.8%	60.0%	74.1%	65.6%	34.6%	38.5%	
Probably YES	116	27	3	6	-	33	3	15	9	3	6	
	37.8%	13.0%	9.4%	10.2%	-	11.4%	20.0%	18.5%	9.4%	11.5%	7.7%	
Neutral/unsure	54	3	-	3	-	6	-	-	-	-	3	
	17.6%	1.4%	-	5.1%	-	2.1%	-	-	-	-	3.8%	
Definitely NO	48	48	-	9	-	54	3	6	15	6	27	
	15.6%	23.2%	-	15.3%	-	18.7%	20.0%	7.4%	15.6%	23.1%	34.6%	
Probably NO	29	18	5	6	-	26	-	-	9	8	12	
	9.4%	8.7%	15.6%	10.2%	-	9.0%	-	-	9.4%	30.8%	15.4%	

City of Clayton Funding Feasibility Survey
 Table 13-4

/

Q7.0 If you were asked to vote today on a measure to create a **UTILITY USE TAX** of **6%** of your utility bills, would you **definitely** vote YES, **probably** vote YES, **probably** vote NO; or **definitely** vote NO on such a measure?

	Area of Residence					
	Total	North Clay	Central Clay	Town Cent	South Clay	Other
Total	307 100%	86 100%	36 100%	74 100%	39 100%	51 100%
Definitely YES	51 16.6%	45 52.3%	33 91.7%	44 59.5%	18 46.2%	27 52.9%
Probably YES	116 37.8%	15 17.4%	-	9 12.2%	3 7.7%	9 17.6%
Neutral/unsure	54 17.6%	3 3.5%	-	-	-	3 5.98%
Probably NO	48 15.6%	12 14.0%	3 8.3%	21 28.4%	9 23.1%	9 17.6%
Definitely NO	29 19.4%	11 12.8%	-	-	9 23.1%	3 5.9%

City of Clayton Funding Feasibility Survey
 Table 14-1

/

Q8.0 Should the City place a one-cent Sales Tax (in the form of a TUT) on the local ballot to avoid having to make significant cutbacks in the level of services presently being provided to local residents and making it possible to address some of the City's unmet needs, would you vote **YES** or **NO**?

/

	Gender			Age					Ethnicity						
	Total	Male	Fem	18-30	31-40	41-50	51-65	Over 66	Cauc	Hisp	Black	Nat Am	Mid East	Asian	Other
Total	307	160	147	3	58	51	87	99	220	12	12	6	3	18	21
	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%
Definitely YES	96	39	57	3	9	18	33	24	72	6	-	6	3	-	-
	31.3%	24.4%	38.8%	100%	15.5%	35.3%	37.9%	24.2%	32.7%	50.0%		100%	100%		
Probably YES	54	36	18	-	3	15	9	27	45	-	-	-	-	3	3
	17.6%	22.5%	12.2%		5.2%	29.4%	10.3%	27.3%	20.5%					14.3%	14.3%
Neutral/unsure	14	8	6	-	2	-	3	9	8	-	-	-	-	-	6
	4.6%	5.0%	4.1%		3.4%		3.4%	9.1%	3.6%						28.6%
Probably NO	78	39	39	-	24	15	21	18	54	3	3	-	-	9	9
	25.4%	24.4%	26.5%		41.4%	29.4%	24.1%	18.2%	24.5%	25.0%	25.0%			42.9%	42.9%
Definitely NO	65	38	27	-	20	3	21	21	1	3	9	-	-	6	3
	21.2%	23.8%	18.4%		34.5%	5.9%	24.1%	21.2%	18.6%	25.0%	75.0%			28.6%	14.3%
28.6%															

City of Clayton Funding Feasibility Survey
 Table 14-2

/

Q8.0 Should the City place a one-cent Sales Tax (in the form of a TUT) on the local ballot to avoid having to make significant cutbacks in the level of services presently being provided to local residents and making it possible to address some of the City's unmet needs, would you vote **YES** or **NO**?

/

	Education						Income					Length of residency			
	Total	Less High	High Scho	Some Coll	Coll Grad	Grad Scho	Under \$25K	\$25-\$50K	\$50-\$75K	\$75-\$100K	Over \$100K	0-5 yrs	6-10 yrs	11-25 yrs	Over 25 yrs
Total	307 100%	3 100%	17 100%	72 100%	119 100%	90 100%	-	21 100%	36 100%	36 100%	178 100%	73 100%	48 100%	84 100%	102 100%
Definitely YES	96 31.3%	-	3 17.6%	9 12.5%	51 42.9%	27 30.0%	-	3 14.3%	6 16.7%	18 50.0%	51 28.7%	6 8.2%	18 37.5%	45 53.6%	27 26.5%
Probably YES	54 17.6%	-	6 35.3%	12 16.7%	21 17.6%	15 16.7%	-	6 28.6%	6 16.7%	6 16.7%	27 15.2%	12 16.4%	6 12.5%	15 17.9%	21 20.6%
Neutral/unsure	14 4.6%	-	2 11.8%	3 4.2%	3 2.5%	3 6.7%	-	-	9 25.0%	-	5 2.8%	5 6.8%	-	3 3.6%	6 5.9%
Probably NO	78 25.4%	-	6 35.3%	24 33.3%	27 22.7%	27 23.3%	-	9 42.9%	12 33.3%	6 16.7%	45 25.3%	24 32.9%	15 31.3%	15 17.9%	24 23.5%
Definitely NO	65 21.2%	3 100%	-	24 33.3%	17 14.3%	21 23.3%	-	3 14.3%	3 8.3%	6 16.7%	50 28.1%	26 35.6%	9 18.8%	6 7.1%	24 23.5%

City of Clayton Funding Feasibility Survey
 Table 14-3

/

Q8.0 Should the City place a one-cent Sales Tax (in the form of a TUT) on the local ballot to avoid having to make significant cutbacks in the level of services presently being provided to local residents and making it possible to address some of the City's unmet needs, would you vote **YES** or **NO**?

/

	# Children					Home Ownership		Ideology			
	Total	None	One	Two	Three or more	Own	Rent	Lib	Prog	Mod	Con
Total	307	207	32	59	6	289	15	81	96	26	78
	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%
Definitely YES	51	66	9	15	3	93	3	36	27	6	18
	16.6%	31.9%	28.1%	25.4%	50.0%	32.2%	20.0%	44.4%	28.1%	23.1%	23.1%
Probably YES	116	33	6	12	3	54	-	18	18	-	18
	37.8%	15.9%	18.8%	20.3%	50.0%	18.7%		22.2%	18.8%		23.1%
Neutral/unsure	54	12	-	2	-	14	-	6	3	3	-
	17.6%	5.8%		3.4%		4.8%		7.4%	3.1%	11.5%	
Definitely NO	48	45	9	24	-	63	12	9	24	9	27
	15.6%	21.7%	28.1%	40.7%		21.8%	80.0%	11.1%	25.0%	34.6%	34.6%
Probably NO	29	51	8	6	-	65	-	12	24	8	15
	9.4%	24.6%	28.1%	10.2%		22.5%		14.8%	25.0%	30.8%	19.2%

City of Clayton Funding Feasibility Survey
 Table 14-4

/

Q8.0 Should the City place a one-cent Sales Tax (in the form of a TUT) on the local ballot to avoid having to make significant cutbacks in the level of services presently being provided to local residents and making it possible to address some of the City's unmet needs, would you vote **YES** or **NO**?

	Area of Residence					
	Total	North Clay	Central Clay	Town Cent	South Clay	Other
Total	307 100%	86 100%	36 100%	74 100%	39 100%	51 100%
Definitely YES	51 16.6%	30 34.9%	15 41.7%	21 28.4%	15 38.5%	9 17.6%
Probably YES	116 37.8%	18 20.9%	6 16.7%	15 20.3%	-	15 29.4%
Neutral/unsure	54 17.6%	-	-	2 2.7%	3 7.7%	3 5.9%
Probably NO	48 15.6%	15 17.4%	6 16.7%	24 32.4%	15 38.5%	15 29.4%
Definitely NO	29 19.4%	23	9 25.0%	12 16.2%	6 15.4%	9 17.6%

City of Clayton Funding Feasibility Survey
 Table 15-1

/

Q8.1 Should the City place a half-cent Sales Tax (in the form of a TUT) on the local ballot to avoid having to make significant cutbacks in the level of services presently being provided to local residents, would you vote **YES** or **NO**?

/

	Gender			Age					Ethnicity						
	Total	Male	Fem	18-30	31-40	41-50	51-65	Over 66	Cauc	Hisp	Black	Nat Am	Mid East	Asian	Other
Total	242 100%	122 100%	120 100%	3 100%	38 100%	48 100%	66 100%	78 100%	179 100%	9 100%	3 100%	6 100%	3 100%	12 100%	21 100%
Definitely YES	81 33.5%	22 27.0%	48 40.0%	3 100%	9 23.7%	12 25.0%	21 31.8%	27 34.6%	57 31.8%	6 66.7%	- 100%	6 100%	3 100%	3 25.0%	-
Probably YES	63 26.0%	39 32.0%	24 20.0%	-	6 15.8%	18 37.5%	12 18.2%	27 34.6%	54 30.2%	-	-	-	-	-	3 16.7%
Neutral/unsure	8 3.3%	2 1.6%	6 5.0%	-	2 5.3%	-	3 4.5%	3 3.8%	5 2.8%	-	-	-	-	-	3 16.7%
Probably NO	60 24.8%	30 24.6%	30 25.0%	-	9 23.7%	12 25.0%	24 36.4%	15 19.2%	45 25.1%	3 33.3%	3 100%	-	-	6 50.0%	3 16.7%
Definitely NO	30 12.4%	18 4.8%	12 10.0%	-	12 31.6%	6 12.5%	6 69.1%	6 7.7%	18 10.1%	-	-	-	-	3 25.0%	9 50.0%

City of Clayton Funding Feasibility Survey
 Table 15-2

/

Q8.1 Should the City place a half-cent Sales Tax (in the form of a TUT) on the local ballot to avoid having to make significant cutbacks in the level of services presently being provided to local residents, would you vote **YES** or **NO**?

/

	Education						Income					Length of residency			
	Total	Less High	High Scho	Some Coll	Coll Grad	Grad Scho	Under \$25K	\$25-\$50K	\$50-\$75K	\$75-\$100K	Over \$100K	0-5 yrs	6-10 yrs	11-25 yrs	Over 25 yrs
Total	242 100%	-	17 100%	48 100%	102 100%	69 100%	-	18 100%	33 100%	30 100%	128 100%	47 100%	39 100%	78 100%	78 100%
Definitely YES	52 33.5%	-	3 17.6%	9 18.8%	45 44.1%	18 26.1%	-	3 16.7%	6 18.2%	15 50.0%	36 28.1%	-	12 30.8%	39 50.0%	30 38.5%
Probably YES	63 26.0%	-	9 52.9%	12 25.0%	21 20.6%	21 30.4%	-	9 50.0%	9 27.3%	9 30.0%	30 23.4%	15 31.9%	9 23.1%	18 23.1%	21 26.9%
Neutral/unsure	8 3.3%	-	2 11.8%	-	3 2.9%	3 4.3%	-	-	3 9.1%	-	5 3.9%	2 4.3%	-	3 3.8%	3 3.8%
Probably NO	60 24.8%	-	3 17.6%	18 37.5%	21 20.6%	18 26.1%	-	6 33.3%	6 18.2%	6 20.0%	36 28.1%	21 44.7%	6 15.4%	15 19.2%	18 23.1%
Definitely NO	30 12.4%	-	-	9 18.8%	12 11.8%	9 13.0%	-	-	9 27.3%	-	21 16.4%	9 19.1%	12 30.8%	3 3.8%	6 7.7%

City of Clayton Funding Feasibility Survey
 Table 15-3

/

Q8.1 Should the City place a half-cent Sales Tax (in the form of a TUT) on the local ballot to avoid having to make significant cutbacks in the level of services presently being provided to local residents, would you vote **YES** or **NO**?

/

	# Children					Home Ownership		Ideology			
	Total	None	One	Two	Three or more	Own	Rent	Lib	Prog	Mod	Con
Total	242	156	24	53	6	224	15	69	72	18	63
	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%
Definitely YES	81	57	3	15	3	75	3	33	21	-	18
	33.5%	6.5%	12.5%	28.3%	50.0%	33.5%	20.0%	47.8%	29.2%		28.6%
Probably YES	63	42	9	9	3	63	-	18	24	3	18
	26.0%	26.9%	37.5%	17.0%	50.0%	28.1%		26.1%	33.3%	16.7%	28.6%
Neutral/unsure	8	6	-	2	-	8	-	-	3	3	-
	3.3%	3.8%		3.8%		3.6%			4.2%	16.7%	
Definitely NO	60	39	6	15	-	51	9	9	15	9	18
	24.8%	25.0%	25.0%	28.3%		22.8%	60.0%	13.0%	20.8%	50.0%	28.6%
Probably NO	30	12	6	12	-	27	3	9	9	3	9
	12.4%	7.7%	25.0%	22.6%		12.1%	20.0%	13.0%	12.5%	16.7%	14.3%

City of Clayton Funding Feasibility Survey
 Table 15-4

/

Q8.1 Should the City place a half-cent Sales Tax (in the form of a TUT) on the local ballot to avoid having to make significant cutbacks in the level of services presently being provided to local residents, would you vote **YES** or **NO**?

	Area of Residence					
	Total	North Clay	Central Clay	Town Cent	South Clay	Other
	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----
Total	242 100%	63 100%	27 100%	62 100%	33 100%	36 100%
Definitely YES	81 33.5%	27 42.9%	12 44.4%	21 33.9%	6 18.2%	9 25.0%
Probably YES	63 26.0%	21 33.3%	6 22.2%	12 19.4%	9 27.3%	15 41.7%
Neutral/unsure	8 3.3%	-	-	2 3.2%	-	3 8.3%
Probably NO	60 24.8%	9 14.3%	6 22.2%	18 29.0%	12 36.4%	3 8.3%
Definitely NO	30 12.4%	6 9.5%	3 11.1%	9 14.5%	6 18.2%	6 16.7%

City of Clayton Funding Feasibility Survey
 Table 16-1

/

Q9.1 Without these funds, the City will be forced to lay off at least one police officer; thus, reducing response times and negatively impacting the level of Public Safety in Clayton in numerous other ways. Would hearing this argument from someone you trust make you more likely to SUPPORT or OPPOSE the proposed funding Measure; OR would it have NO IMPACT on how you would vote; OR is it NOT BELIEVABLE?

	Gender			Age					Ethnicity						
	Total	Male	Fem	18-30	31-40	41-50	51-65	Over 66	Cauc	Hisp	Black	Nat Am	Mid East	Asian	Other
Total	307	160	147	3	58	51	87	99	220	12	12	6	3	18	18
	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%
Much more Support	18	6	12	-	-	3	12	3	9	3	-	-	-	9	3
	5.9%	3.8%	8.2%			5.9%	13.8%	3.0%	4.1%	25.0%				42.8%	16.7%
Somewhat more Support	32	11	21	-	5	6	15	-	26	-	-	3	-	9	-
	10.4%	6.9%	14.3%		8.6%	11.8%	17.2%		11.8%			50.0%		50.0%	
No effect	42	27	15	-	12	3	6	21	30	-	6	-	3	-	3
	13.7%	16.9%	10.2%		20.7%	5.9%	6.9%	21.2%	13.6%		50.0%		100%		16.7%
Somewhat more Oppose	81	51	30	3	12	21	15	27	60	3	3	-	-	-	3
	26.4%	31.9%	20.4%	100%	20.7%	41.2%	17.2%	27.3%	27.3%	25.0%	25.0%				16.7%
Much more Oppose	72	42	30	-	18	12	24	18	51	-	3	3	-	-	6
	23.5%	26.3%	20.4%		31.0%	23.5%	27.6%	18.2%	23.2%		25.0%	50.0%			33.3%
NOT believable	56	17	39	-	11	6	15	24	38	6	-	-	-	-	3
	18.2%	10.6%	26.5%		19.0%	11.8%	17.2%	24.2%	17.3%	50.0%					16.7%
Unsure/Refused	6	6	-	-	-	-	-	6	6	-	-	-	-	-	-
	2.0%	3.8%						6.1%	2.7%						

City of Clayton Funding Feasibility Survey
 Table 16-2

/

Q9.1 Without these funds, the City will be forced to lay off at least one police officer; thus, reducing response times and negatively impacting the level of Public Safety in Clayton in numerous other ways. Would hearing this argument from someone you trust make you more likely to SUPPORT or OPPOSE the proposed funding Measure; OR would it have NO IMPACT on how you would vote; OR is it NOT BELIEVABLE?

/

	Education						Income					Length of residency			
	Total	Less High	High Scho	Some Coll	Coll Grad	Grad Scho	Under \$25K	\$25-\$50K	\$50-\$75K	\$75-\$100K	Over \$100K	0-5 yrs	6-10 yrs	11-25 yrs	Over 25 yrs
Total	307	3	17	72	119	90	-	21	36	36	178	73	48	84	102
	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%		100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%
Much more Support	102	3	9	36	36	15	-	6	18	15	54	18	9	30	45
	33.2%	100%	52.9%	50.0%	30.3%	16.7%		28.6%	50.0%	41.7%	30.3%	24.7%	18.8%	35.7%	44.1%
Somewhat more Support	157	-	5	30	71	51	-	8	18	9	97	43	33	42	39
	51.1%		29.4%	41.7%	59.7%	56.7%		42.9%	50.0%	25.0%	54.5%	58.9%	68.8%	50.0%	38.2%
No effect	30	-	-	6	9	12	-	3	-	9	15	6	3	12	9
	9.8%			8.3%	7.6%	13.3%		14.3%		25.0%	8.4%	8.2%	6.3%	14.3%	8.1%
Somewhat more Oppose	15	-	3	-	3	9	-	-	-	3	12	6	3	-	6
	4.9%		17.6%		2.5%	10.0%				8.3%	6.7%	8.2%	6.3%		5.9%
Much more Oppose	3	-	-	-	-	3	-	3	-	-	-	-	-	-	3
	1.0%					3.3%		14.3%							2.9%
NOT believable	15	-	3	-	3	9	-	-	-	3	12	6	3	-	6
	4.9%		17.6%		2.5%	10.0%				8.3%	6.7%	8.2%	6.3%		5.9%
Unsure/refused	3	-	-	-	-	3	-	3	-	-	-	-	-	-	3
	1.0%					3.3%		14.3%							2.9%

City of Clayton Funding Feasibility Survey
 Table 16-3

/

Q9.1 Without these funds, the City will be forced to lay off at least one police officer; thus, reducing response times and negatively impacting the level of Public Safety in Clayton in numerous other ways. Would hearing this argument from someone you trust make you more likely to SUPPORT or OPPOSE the proposed funding Measure; OR would it have NO IMPACT on how you would vote; OR is it NOT BELIEVABLE?

/

	# Children				Home Ownership		Ideology				
	Total	None	One	Two	Three or more	Own	Rent	Lib	Prog	Mod	Con
Total	307	207	32	59	6	289	15	81	96	26	78
	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%
Much more Support	102	84	9	9	-	90	9	24	39	6	27
	33.2%	40.6%	28.1%	15.3%		31.1%	60.0%	29.6%	40.6%	23.1%	34.6%
Somewhat more Support	57	90	17	44	6	154	3	45	36	17	42
	51.1%	43.5%	53.1%	74.6%	100%	53.3%	55.6%	55.6%	37.5%	65.4%	53.8%
No effect	30	27	-	-	-	30	-	9	15	-	6
	9.8%	13.0%				10.4%		11.1%	15.6%		7.7%
Somewhat more Oppose	15	3	6	6	-	12	3	3	3	3	3
	4.9%	1.4%	18.8%	10.2%		4.2%	20.0%	3.7%	3.1%	11.5%	3.8%
Much more Oppose	3	3	-	-	-	3	-	-	3	-	-
	1.0%	1.4%	8.1%			1.0%			3.1%		
NOT believable	15	-	3	-	3	9	-	-	-	3	12
	4.9%		17.6%		2.5%	10.0%				8.3%	6.7%
Unsure/refused	3	-	-	-	-	3	-	3	-	-	-
	1.0%					3.3%		14.3%			

Clayton Funding Feasibility Survey

Table 16-4

/

/

Q9.1 Without these funds, the City will be forced to lay off at least one police officer; thus, reducing response times and negatively impacting the level of Public Safety in Clayton in numerous other ways. Would hearing this argument from someone you trust make you more likely to SUPPORT or OPPOSE the proposed funding Measure; OR would it have NO IMPACT on how you would vote; OR is it NOT BELIEVABLE?

	Area of Residence					Total
	North Clay	Central Clay	Town Cent	South Clay	Other	
Total	86	36	74	39	54	307
	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%
Much more Support	27	6	30	9	27	102
	31.4%	16.7%	40.5%	23.1%	50.0%	33.2%
Somewhat more Support	50	15	32	27	21	157
	58.1%	41.7%	43.2%	69.2%	38.8%	51.1%
No effect	3	9	12	-	6	30
	3.5%	25.0%	16.2%	-	11.1%	9.8%
Somewhat more Oppose	6	3	-	3	-	15
	7.0%	8.3%	-	7.7%	-	4.9%
Much more Oppose	-	3	-	-	-	3
	-	5.3%	-	-	-	1.0%
NOT believable	-	3	-	3	9	15
	-	17.6%	-	2.5%	10.0%	4.9%
Unsure/refused	-	-	-	-	3	3
	-	-	-	-	3.3%	1.0%

City of Clayton Funding Feasibility Survey
 Table 17-1

/

/

Q9.2 The streetlight assessment currently in place in Clayton does not fully cover the cost of operations; in fact, the rate has not been increased for the past 24 years. Furthermore, it does not include a CPI to control for normal inflation. Therefore, without additional funds, the City may be forced to turn off a portion of street lights in certain neighborhoods of the City; thus, negatively impacting public safety. Would hearing this argument from someone you trust make you more likely to SUPPORT or OPPOSE the proposed funding Measure; OR would it have NO IMPACT on how you would vote; OR is it NOT BELIEVABLE?

	Gender			Age					Ethnicity						
	Total	Male	Fem	18-30	31-40	41-50	51-65	Over 66	Cauc	Hisp	Black	Nat Am	Mid East	Asian	Other
Total	307	160	147	3	58	51	87	99	220	12	12	6	3	18	18
	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%
Much more Support	22	16	6	-	10	-	6	3	19	-	-	3	-	-	-
	7.2%	10.0%	4.1%		17.2%		6.9%	3.0%	8.6%			50.0%			
Somewhat more Support	36	18	18	-	6	3	12	12	24	3	3	3	-	-	-
	11.7%	11.3%	12.2%		10.3%	5.9%	13.8%	12.1%	10.9%	25.0%	25.0%	50.0%			
No effect	24	15	9	-	3	6	12	3	12	-	3	-	-	-	9
	7.8%	9.4%	6.1%		5.2%	11.8%	13.8%	3.0%	5.5%		25.0%				50.0%
Somewhat more Oppose	90	51	39	3	18	21	9	36	72	6	3	-	-	-	-
	29.3%	31.9%	26.5%	100%	31.0%	41.2%	10.3%	36.4%	32.7%	50.0%	25.0%				
Much more Oppose	72	39	33	-	9	12	27	24	48	3	-	-	3	9	3
	23.5%	24.4%	22.4%		15.5%	23.5%	31.0%	24.2%	21.8%	25.0%			100%	50.0%	16.7%
NOT believable	60	21	39	-	12	6	21	21	45	-	3	-	-	6	33.3%
	19.6%	13.1%	26.5%		20.7%	11.8%	24.1%	21.2%	20.5%		25.0%			33.3%	
Unsure/Refused	3	-	3	-	-	3	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	3	-
	1.0%		2.0%			5.9%								16.7%	

City of Clayton Funding Feasibility Survey
 Table 17-2

/

/

Q9.2 The streetlight assessment currently in place in Clayton does not fully cover the cost of operations; in fact, the rate has not been increased for the past 24 years. Furthermore, it does not include a CPI to control for normal inflation. Therefore, without additional funds, the City may be forced to turn off a portion of street lights in certain neighborhoods of the City; thus, negatively impacting public safety. Would hearing this argument from someone you trust make you more likely to SUPPORT or OPPOSE the proposed funding Measure; OR would it have NO IMPACT on how you would vote; OR is it NOT BELIEVABLE?

	Education						Income					Length of residency			
	Total	Less High	High Scho	Some Coll	Coll Grad	Grad Scho	Under \$25K	\$25-\$50K	\$50-\$75K	\$75-\$100K	Over \$100K	0-5 yrs	6-10 yrs	11-25 yrs	Over 25 yrs
Total	307 100%	3 100%	17 100%	72 100%	119 100%	90 100%	-	21 100%	36 100%	36 100%	178 100%	73 100%	48 100%	84 100%	102 100%
Much more Support	22 7.2%	-	2 11.8%	3 4.2%	14 11.8%	-	-	-	-	3 8.3%	16 9.0%	10 13.7%	-	6 7.1%	6 5.9%
Somewhat more Support	36 11.7%	-	9 52.9%	6 8.3%	18 15.1%	3 3.3%	-	6 28.6%	3 8.3%	3 8.3%	21 11.8%	3 4.1%	3 6.3%	18 21.4%	12 11.8%
No effect	24 7.8%	-	-	3 4.2%	3 2.5%	18 20.0%	-	3 14.3%	-	-	15 8.4%	6 8.2%	-	6 7.1%	12 11.8%
Somewhat more Oppose	90 29.3%	-	3 17.6%	18 25.0%	36 30.3%	30 33.3%	-	3 14.3%	12 33.3%	18 50.0%	45 25.3%	27 37.0%	12 25.0%	24 28.6%	27 26.5%
Much more Oppose	72 23.5%	-	3 17.6%	24 33.3%	24 20.2%	21 23.3%	-	3 14.3%	15 41.7%	9 25.0%	39 21.9%	18 24.7%	18 37.5%	18 21.4%	18 17.6%
NOT believable	60 19.5%	3 100%	-	18 25.0%	24 20.2%	15 16.7%	-	6 28.6%	6 16.7%	3 8.3%	39 21.9%	9 12.3%	12 25.0%	12 14.3%	27 26.5%
Unsure/refused	3 1.0%	-	-	-	-	3 3.3%	-	-	-	-	3 1.7%	-	3 6.3%	-	-

City of Clayton Funding Feasibility Survey
 Table 17-3

/

/

Q9.2 The streetlight assessment currently in place in Clayton does not fully cover the cost of operations; in fact, the rate has not been increased for the past 24 years. Furthermore, it does not include a CPI to control for normal inflation. Therefore, without additional funds, the City may be forced to turn off a portion of street lights in certain neighborhoods of the City; thus, negatively impacting public safety. Would hearing this argument from someone you trust make you more likely to SUPPORT or OPPOSE the proposed funding Measure; OR would it have NO IMPACT on how you would vote; OR is it NOT BELIEVABLE?

/

/

/

/

	# Children				Home Ownership		Ideology				
	Total	None	One	Two	Three or more	Own	Rent	Lib	Prog	Mod	Con
Total	307 100%	207 100%	32 100%	59 100%	6 100%	289 100%	15 100%	81 100%	96 100%	26 100%	78 100%
Much more Support	22 7.2%	9 4.3%	8 25.0%	2 3.4%	-	22 7.6%	-	9 11.1%	3 3.1%	5 19.2%	3 3.8%
Somewhat more Support	36 11.7%	15 7.2%	6 18.8%	15 25.4%	-	33 11.4%	3 20.0%	9 11.1%	9 9.4%	-	9 11.5%
No effect	24 7.8%	15 7.2%	3 9.4%	6 10.2%	-	24 8.3%	-	3 3.7%	6 6.3%	9 34.6%	6 7.7%
Somewhat more Oppose	90 29.3%	69 33.3%	3 9.4%	15 25.4%	3 50.0%	81 28.0%	9 60.0%	30 37.0%	27 28.1%	6 23.1%	24 30.8%
Much more Oppose	72 23.5%	54 26.1%	6 18.8%	9 15.3%	3 50.0%	69 23.9%	3 20.0%	12 14.8%	30 31.3%	-	24 30.8%
NOT believable	60 19.5%	45 21.7%	6 18.8%	9 15.3%	-	57 19.7%	-	15 18.5%	21 21.9%	6 23.1%	12 15.4%
Unsure/refused	3 1.0%	-	-	3 5.1%	-	3 1.0%	-	3 3.7%	-	-	-

Clayton Funding Feasibility Survey

Table 17-4

/

/

Q9.2 The streetlight assessment currently in place in Clayton does not fully cover the cost of operations; in fact, the rate has not been increased for the past 24 years. Furthermore, it does not include a CPI to control for normal inflation. Therefore, without additional funds, the City may be forced to turn off a portion of street lights in certain neighborhoods of the City; thus, negatively impacting public safety. Would hearing this argument from someone you trust make you more likely to SUPPORT or OPPOSE the proposed funding Measure; OR would it have NO IMPACT on how you would vote; OR is it NOT BELIEVABLE?

	Area of Residence					Other
	Total	North Clay	Central Clay	Town Cent	South Clay	
Total	307 100%	86 100%	36 100%	74 100%	39 100%	51 100%
Much more Support	22 7.2%	8 9.3%	3 8.3%	5 6.8%	3 7.7%	-
Somewhat more Support	36 11.7%	18 20.9%	9 25.0%	3 4.1%	6 15.4%	-
No effect	24 7.8%	3 3.5%	6 16.7%	6 8.1%	-	9 7.6%
Somewhat more Oppose	90 29.3%	24 27.9%	-	21 28.4%	6 15.4%	33 64.7%
Much more Oppose	72 23.5%	24 27.9%	6 16.7%	15 20.3%	15 38.5%	3 5.9%
NOT believable	60 19.5%	9 10.5%	9 25.0%	24 32.4%	9 23.1%	6 11.8%
Unsure/refused	3 1.0%	-	3 8.3%	-	-	-

City of Clayton Funding Feasibility Survey
 Table 18-1

/

Q9.3 Without these funds, the City will be forced to **cut back on the level of services** presently being provided to Clayton residents, citywide; thus, negatively impacting the *quality of life* for all Clayton residents. Would hearing this argument from someone you trust make you more likely to SUPPORT or OPPOSE ?

	Gender			Age					Ethnicity						
	Total	Male	Fem	18-30	31-40	41-50	51-65	Over 66	Cauc	Hisp	Black	Nat Am	Mid East	Asian	Other
Total	307	160	147	3	58	51	87	99	220	12	12	6	3	18	18
	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%
Much more Support	14	14	-	-	2	-	9	3	8	3	-	-	-	-	3
	4.6%	8.8%			3.4%		10.3%	3.0%	3.6%	25.0%					16.7%
Somewhat more Support	21	3	18	-	3	3	6	3	15	-	-	-	-	-	-
	6.8%	1.9%	12.2%		5.2%	5.9%	6.9%	3.0%	6.8%						
No effect	39	27	12	-	9	6	9	12	27	-	3	6	-	-	-
	12.7%	16.9%	8.2%		15.5%	11.8%	10.3%	12.1%	12.3%		25.0%	100%			
Somewhat more Oppose	108	66	42	3	27	24	21	33	78	6	3	-	3	6	3
	35.2%	41.3%	28.6%	100%	46.6%	47.1%	24.1%	33.3%	35.5%	50.0%	25.0%		100%	33.3%	16.7%
Much more Oppose	66	27	39	-	9	9	24	24	45	-	6	-	-	9	9
	21.5%	16.9%	26.5%		15.5%	17.6%	27.6%	24.2%	20.5%		50.0%			50.0%	50.0%
NOT believable	53	20	33	-	8	9	15	21	41	3	-	-	-	3	3
	17.3%	12.5%	22.4%		13.8%	17.6%	17.2%	21.2%	18.6%	25.0%				16.7%	16.7%
Unsure/Refused	6	3	3	-	-	-	3	3	6	-	-	-	-	-	-
	2.0%	1.9%	2.0%				3.4%	3.0%	2.7%						

City of Clayton Funding Feasibility Survey
 Table 18-2

/

Q9.3 Without these funds, the City will be forced to **cut back on the level of services** presently being provided to Clayton residents, citywide; thus, negatively impacting the *quality of life* for all Clayton residents. Would hearing this argument from someone you trust make you more likely to SUPPORT or OPPOSE ?

/

	Education						Income					Length of residency			
	Total	Less High	High Scho	Some Coll	Coll Grad	Grad Scho	Under \$25K	\$25-\$50K	\$50-\$75K	\$75-\$100K	Over \$100K	0-5 yrs	6-10 yrs	11-25 yrs	Over 25 yrs
Total	307 100%	3 100%	17 100%	72 100%	119 100%	90 100%	-	21 100%	36 100%	36 100%	178 100%	73 100%	48 100%	84 100%	102 100%
Much more Support	14 4.6%	-	2 11.8%	-	3 2.5%	9 10.0%	-	-	18 50.0%	-	11 6.2%	5 6.8%	-	3 3.6%	6 5.9%
Somewhat more Support	21 6.2%	-	3 17.6%	3 4.2%	12 10.1%	3 3.3%	-	3 14.3%	18 50.0%	6 16.7%	3 1.7%	-	3 6.3%	18	-
No effect	39 12.7%	-	3 17.6%	9 12.5%	15 12.6%	9 10.0%	-	3 14.3%	-	6 16.7%	27 15.2%	9 12.3%	6 12.5%	15 17.9%	9 8.8%
Somewhat more Oppose	108 35.2%	-	6 33.3%	18 25.0%	48 40.3%	33 36.7%	-	9 42.9%	-	15 41.7%	60 33.7%	30 41.1%	18 37.5%	33 39.3%	27 26.5%
Much more Oppose	66 21.5%	-	3 17.6%	21 29.2%	18 15.1%	24 26.7%	-	3 14.3%	-	3 8.3%	39 21.9%	12 16.4%	15 31.3%	6 7.1%	33 32.4%
2.9%															
NOT believable	53 17.3%	3 100%	-	18 25.0%	20 16.8%	12 13.3%	-	3 14.3%	-	6 16.7%	35 19.7%	17 23.3%	6 12.5%	9 10.7%	21 20.6%
Unsure/refused	6 2.0%	-	-	3 4.2%	3 2.5%	-	-	-	-	-	3 1.7%	-	-	-	6 5.9%

City of Clayton Funding Feasibility Survey
 Table 18-3

/

Q9.3 Without these funds, the City will be forced to **cut back on the level of services** presently being provided to Clayton residents, citywide; thus, negatively impacting the *quality of life* for all Clayton residents. Would hearing this argument from someone you trust make you more likely to SUPPORT or OPPOSE ?

/

	# Children					Home Ownership		Ideology			
	Total	None	One	Two	Three or more	Own	Rent	Lib	Prog	Mod	Con
Total	307 100%	207 100%	32 100%	59 100%	6 100%	289 100%	15 100%	81 100%	96 100%	26 100%	78 100%
Much more Support	14 4.6%	9 4.3%	-	5 8.5%	-	14 4.8%	-	6 7.4%	-	-	3 3.8%
Somewhat more Support	21 6.8%	12 5.8%	3 9.4%	6 10.2%	-	21 7.3%	-	9 11.1%	-	-	9 11.5%
No effect	39 12.7%	18 8.7%	9 28.1%	6 10.2%	3 50.0%	36 12.5%	3 20.0%	12 14.8%	15 15.6%	3 11.5%	6 7.7%
Somewhat more Oppose	108 35.2%	78 37.7%	9 28.1%	18 30.5%	3 50.0%	96 21.8%	9 20.0%	30 37.0%	39 40.6%	6 23.1%	27 34.6%
Much more Oppose	66 21.5%	48 23.2%	3 9.4%	15 25.4%	-	63 21.8%	3 20.0%	15 18.5%	18 18.8%	9 34.6%	21 26.9%
NOT believable	53 17.3%	36 17.4%	8 25.0%	9 15.3%	-	53 18.3%	-	6 7.4%	21 21.9%	8 30.8%	12 15.4%
Unsure/refused	6 2.0%	6 2.9%	-	-	-	6 2.1%	-	3 3.7%	3 3.1%	-	-

Clayton Funding Feasibility Survey
 Table 18-4

/

Q9.3 Without these funds, the City will be forced to **cut back on the level of services** presently being provided to Clayton residents, citywide; thus, negatively impacting the *quality of life* for all Clayton residents. Would hearing this argument from someone you trust make you more likely to SUPPORT or OPPOSE ?

	Area of Residence					
	Total	North Clay	Central Clay	Town Cent	South Clay	Other
	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----
Total	307 100%	86 100%	36 100%	74 100%	39 100%	51 100%
Much more Support	14 4.6%	-	6 16.7%	5 6.8%	-	-
Somewhat more Support	21 6.8%	6 7.0%	-	12 16.2%	-	-
No effect	39 12.7%	12 14.0%	6 16.7%	3 4.1%	12 30.8%	3 5.9%
Somewhat more Oppose	108 35.2%	33 38.4%	3 8.3%	30 40.5%	9 23.1%	30 58.9%
Much more Oppose	66 21.5%	15 17.4%	15 41.7%	12 16.2%	12 30.8%	6 11.8%
NOT believable	53 17.3%	17 19.6%	6 16.7%	12 16.2%	6 15.4%	9 17.6%
Unsure/refused	6 2.0%	3 3.5%	-	-	-	3 5.9%

City of Clayton Funding Feasibility Survey
 Table 19-1

/

/

Q9.4 Taxes are simply too high. Clayton residents **need tax relief**. Would hearing this argument from someone you trust make you more likely to SUPPORT or OPPOSE the proposed funding Measure; OR would it have NO IMPACT on how you would vote; OR is it NOT BELIEVABLE?

	Gender			Age					Ethnicity						
	Total	Male	Fem	18-30	31-40	41-50	51-65	Over 66	Cauc	Hisp	Black	Nat Am	Mid East	Asian	Other
Total	307 100%	160 100%	147 100%	33 100%	58 100%	51 100%	87 100%	99 100%	220 100%	12 100%	12 100%	6 100%	3 100%	18 100%	18 100%
Much more Support	15 4.9%	9 5.6%	6 4.1%	-	-	3 3.9%	9 10.3%	3 3.0%	12 5.5%	-	-	-	-	-	3 14.3%
Somewhat more Support	30 9.8%	15 9.4%	15 10.2%	-	6 10.3%	3 5.9%	12 13.8%	3 3.0%	21 9.5%	-	-	3 50.0%	-	-	-
No effect	42 13.7%	21 13.1%	21 14.3%	-	3 5.2%	9 17.6%	18 20.7%	12 12.1%	30 13.6%	3 25.0%	-	-	3 100%	-	6 28.6%
Somewhat more Oppose	121 39.4%	70 7.5%	51 34.7%	3 100%	31 53.4%	24 47.1%	24 27.6%	36 36.4%	91 41.4%	3 25.0%	3 25.0%	-	-	9 50.0%	6 28.6%
Much more Oppose	36 11.7%	12 7.5%	24 16.30%	-	6 10.3%	12 23.5%	6 6.9%	12 12.1%	18 8.2%	6 50.0%	3 25.0%	-	-	6 33.3%	3 14.3%
NOT believable	42 13.7%	21 13.1%	21 14.3%	-	12 20.7%	-	12 13.8%	18 18.2%	30 13.6%	-	6 50.0%	3 50.0%	-	3 16.7%	
Unsure/Refused	21 6.8%	12 7.5%	9 6.1%	-	-	-	6 6.9%	15 15.2%	18 8.2%	-	-	-	-	-	3 14.3%

City of Clayton Funding Feasibility Survey
 Table 19-2

/

/

Q9.4 Taxes are simply too high. Clayton residents **need tax relief**. Would hearing this argument from someone you trust make you more likely to SUPPORT or OPPOSE the proposed funding Measure; OR would it have NO IMPACT on how you would vote; OR is it NOT BELIEVABLE?

/

/

	Education						Income					Length of residency			
	Total	Less High	High Scho	Some Coll	Coll Grad	Grad Scho	Under \$25K	\$25-\$50K	\$50-\$75K	\$75-\$100K	Over \$100K	0-5 yrs	6-10 yrs	11-25 yrs	Over 25 yrs
Total	307	3	17	72	119	90	-	21	36	36	178	73	48	84	102
	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%		100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%
Much more Support	15	-	3	-	6	3	-	-	6	-	6	-	-	12	3
	4.9%		17.6%		5.0%	3.3%			16.7%		3.4%			14.3%	2.9%
Somewhat more Support	30	3	-	12	6	6	-	-	-	3	18	9	9	6	6
	9.8%	100%		16.7%	5.0%	6.7%				8.3%	10.1%	12.3%	18.8%	7.1%	5.9%
No effect	42	-	3	6	12	21	-	6	6	3	18	-	-	18	24
	13.7%		17.6%	8.3%	10.1%	23.3%		28.6%	16.7%	8.3%	10.1%			21.4%	23.5%
Somewhat more Oppose	121	-	8	21	50	42	-	9	6	21	79	40	27	30	24
	39.4%		47.1%	29.2%	42.0%	46.7%		42.9%	16.7%	58.3%	44.4%	54.8%	56.3%	35.7%	23.5%
Much more Oppose	11.76	-	3	12	12	9	-	-	9	6	18	9	9	6	12
	14.3%		17.6%	16.7%	10.1%	10.0%			25.0%	16.7%	10.1%	12.3%	18.8%	7.1%	11.8%
NOT believable	2	-	-	9	27	6	-	6	-	-	33	12	3	12	15
	13.7%			12.5%	22.7%	6.7%		28.6%			18.5%	16.4%	6.3%	14.3%	14.7%
Unsure/refused	21	-	-	12	6	3	-	-	9	3	6	3	-	-	18
	6.8%			16.7%	5.0%	3.3%			25.0%	8.3%	3.4%	4.1%			17.6%

City of Clayton Funding Feasibility Survey
 Table 19-3

/

/

Q9.4 Taxes are simply too high. Clayton residents **need tax relief**. Would hearing this argument from someone you trust make you more likely to SUPPORT or OPPOSE the proposed funding Measure; OR would it have NO IMPACT on how you would vote; OR is it NOT BELIEVABLE?

/

/

/

	# Children					Home Ownership		Ideology			
	Total	None	One	Two	Three or more	Own	Rent	Lib	Prog	Mod	Con
Total	307 100%	207 100%	32 100%	59 100%	6 100%	289 100%	15 100%	81 100%	96 100%	26 100%	78 100%
Much more Support	15 4.9%	15 7.2%	-	-	-	12 4.2%	3 20.0%	9 11.1%	3 3.1%	-	3 3.8%
Somewhat more Support	30 9.8%	18 8.7%	-	9 15.3%	-	127 9.3%	3 20.0%	6 7.4%	9 9.4%	-	12 15.4%
No effect	42 13.7%	27 13.0%	-	15 25.4%	-	42 14.5%	-	9 11.1%	15 15.6%	3 11.5%	9 11.5%
Somewhat more Oppose	121 39.4%	78 37.7%	17 53.1%	23 39.0%	3 50.0%	112 38.8%	6 40.0%	27 33.3%	42 43.8%	17 65.4%	33 42.3%
Much more Oppose	36 11.7%	24 11.6%	-	9 15.3%	3 50.0%	33 11.4%	3 20.0%	9 11.1%	9 9.4%	-	6 7.7%
NOT believable	42 13.7%	24 11.6%	15 46.9%	3 5.1%	-	42 14.5%	-	9 11.1%	15 15.6%	6 23.1%	12 15.4%
Unsure/refused	21 6.8%	21 10.1%	-	-	-	21 7.3%	-	12 14.8%	3 3.1%	-	3 3.8%

Clayton Funding Feasibility Survey

Table 19-4

/

/

Q9.4 Taxes are simply too high. Clayton residents need tax relief. Would hearing this argument from someone you trust make you more likely to SUPPORT or OPPOSE the proposed funding Measure; OR would it have NO IMPACT on how you would vote; OR is it NOT BELIEVABLE?

	Area of Residence					
	Total	North Clay	Central Clay	Town Cent	South Clay	Other
Total	307 100%	86 100%	36 100%	74 100%	39 100%	54 100%
Much more Support	15 4.9%	-	3 8.3%	6 8.1%	3 7.7%	3 7.7%
Somewhat more Support	30 9.8%	9 10.5%	-	9 12.2%	3 7.7%	3 7.7%
No effect	42 13.7%	9 10.5%	12 33.3%	9 12.2%	3 7.7%	6 12.6%
Somewhat more Oppose	121 39.4%	32 37.2%	9 25.0%	26 35.1%	18 46.2%	30 62.5%
Much more Oppose	36 11.7%	9 10.5%	6 16.7%	12 16.2%	3 7.7%	6 12.6%
NOT believable	42 13.7%	21 24.4%	6 16.7%	9 12.2%	6 15.4%	-
Unsure/refused	21 6.8%	6 7.0%	-	3 4.1%	3 7.7%	-

City of Clayton Funding Feasibility Survey
 Table 20-1

/

Q9.5 Without the revenues from the proposed funding Measure, the City will be forced into "deficit spending", which means that the City will have to take money out of its reserves to cover operating costs, instead of using these monies as intended for other needs. Would hearing this argument from someone you trust make you more likely to SUPPORT or OPPOSE the proposed funding Measure; OR would it have NO IMPACT on how you would vote; OR is it NOT BELIEVABLE?

/

	Gender			Age					Ethnicity						
	Total	Male	Fem	18-30	31-40	41-50	51-65	Over 66	Cauc	Hisp	Black	Nat Am	Mid East	Asian	Other
Total	307	160	147	33	58	51	87	99	220	12	12	6	3	18	21
	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%
Much more Support	9	6	3	-	-	3	3	3	9	-	-	-	-	-	-
	2.9%	3.8%	2.0%			5.9%	3.4%	3.0%	4.1%						
Somewhat more Support	30	18	12	-	6	-	9	12	21	3	-	3	-	-	-
	9.8%	11.3%	8.2%		10.3%		10.3%	12.1%	9.5%	25.0%		50.0%			
No effect	60	18	42	-	3	12	12	30	42	3	3	3	-	3	6
	19.5%	11.3%	28.6%		5.2%	23.5%	13.8%	17.2%	19.1%	25.0%	25.0%	50.0%		16.7%	28.6%
14.4%															
Somewhat more Oppose	113	71	42	3	29	24	24	30	83	3	3	-	3	6	3
	36.8%	44.4%	28.6%	100%	50.0%	47.1%	27.6%	30.3%	37.7%	25.0%	25.0%		100%	33.3%	14.3%
Much more Oppose	57	27	30	-	18	9	24	6	30	3	6	-	-	9	9
	18.6%	16.9%	20.4%		31.0%	17.6%	27.6%	6.1%	13.6%	25.0%	50.0%			50.0%	42.9%
NOT believable	24	9	15	-	-	-	12	12	24	-	-	-	-	-	-
	7.8%	5.6%	10.2%				13.8%	12.1%	10.9%						
Unsure/Refused	14	11	3	-	2	3	3	6	11	-	-	-	-	-	3
	4.6%	6.9%	2.0%		3.4%	5.9%	3.4%	6.1%	5.0%						14.3%

City of Clayton Funding Feasibility Survey
 Table 20-2

/

Q9.5 Without the revenues from the proposed funding Measure, the City will be forced into "deficit spending", which means that the City will have to take money out of its reserves to cover operating costs, instead of using these monies as intended for other needs. Would hearing this argument from someone you trust make you more likely to SUPPORT or OPPOSE the proposed funding Measure; OR would it have NO IMPACT on how you would vote; OR is it NOT BELIEVABLE?

/

	Education						Income					Length of residency			
	Total	Less High	High Scho	Some Coll	Coll Grad	Grad Scho	Under \$25K	\$25-\$50K	\$50-\$75K	\$75-\$100K	Over \$100K	0-5 yrs	6-10 yrs	11-25 yrs	Over 25 yrs
Total	307 100%	3 100%	17 100%	72 100%	119 100%	90 100%	-	21 100%	36 100%	36 100%	178 100%	73 100%	48 100%	84 100%	102 100%
Much more Support	9 2.9%	-	3 17.6%	-	3 2.5%	-	-	-	3 8.3%	-	3 8.3%	-	-	6 7.1%	3 2.9%
Somewhat more Support	30 9.8%	-	3 17.6%	12 16.7%	9 7.6%	6 6.7%	-	3 28.6%	-	3 8.3%	21 11.8%	6 8.2%	3 6.3%	15 17.9%	6 5.9%
No effect	60 19.5%	-	-	15 20.8%	30 25.2%	12 13.3%	-	6 14.3%	6 16.7%	12 33.3%	30 16.9%	15 20.5%	9 18.8%	12 14.3%	24 23.5%
Somewhat more Oppose	113 36.8%	-	3 17.6%	24 33.3%	53 44.5%	33 36.7%	-	6 14.3%	9 25.0%	15 41.7%	68 38.2%	32 43.8%	18 37.5%	27 32.1%	36 35.3%
Much more Oppose	57 18.6%	-	3 17.6%	6 8.3%	18 15.1%	30 33.3%	-	6 28.6%	6 16.7%	3 8.3%	39 21.9%	15 20.5%	15 31.3%	18 21.4%	9 8.8%
NOT believable	24 7.8%	3 100%	3 17.6%	6 8.3%	6 5.0%	6 6.7%	-	-	6 16.7%	3 8.3%	15 8.4%	3 4.1%	3 6.3%	6 7.1%	12 11.8%
Unsure/refused	14 4.6%	-	2 11.8%	9 12.5%	-	3 3.3%	-	-	6 16.7%	-	2 1.1%	2 2.7%	-	-	12 11.8%

5.9%

City of Clayton Funding Feasibility Survey
 Table 20-3

/

/

Q9.5 Without the revenues from the proposed funding Measure, the City will be forced into "deficit spending", which means that the City will have to take money out of its reserves to cover operating costs, instead of using these monies as intended for other needs. Would hearing this argument from someone you trust make you more likely to SUPPORT or OPPOSE the proposed funding Measure; OR would it have NO IMPACT on how you would vote; OR is it NOT BELIEVABLE?

/

/

/

/

	# Children				Home Ownership		Ideology				
	Total	None	One	Two	Three or more	Own	Rent	Lib	Prog	Mod	Con
Total	307 100%	207 100%	32 100%	59 100%	6 100%	289 100%	15 100%	81 100%	96 100%	26 100%	78 100%
Much more Support	9 2.9%	9 4.3%	-	-	-	6 2.1%	3 20.0%	9 11.1%	-	-	-
Somewhat more Support	30 9.8%	18 8.7%	3 9.4%	9 15.3%	-	30 10.4%	-	12 14.8%	6 6.3%	-	6 7.7%
No effect	60 19.5%	42 20.3%	6 18.8%	6 10.2%	3 50.0%	60 20.8%	-	6 7.4%	27 28.1%	3 11.5%	18 23.1%
Somewhat more Oppose	113 36.8%	75 36.2%	14 43.8%	21 35.6%	3 50.0%	104 36.0%	6 40.0%	33 40.7%	36 37.5%	11 42.3%	30 38.5%
Much more Oppose	57 18.6%	30 14.5%	9 28.1%	18 30.5%	-	51 17.6%	6 40.0%	9 11.1%	18 18.8%	12 46.2%	12 15.4%
NOT believable	24 7.8%	24 11.6%	-	-	-	24 8.3%	-	6 7.4%	6 6.3%	-	12 15.4%
5 Unsure/refused	14 4.6%	9 4.3%	-	5 8.5%	-	14 4.8%	-	6 7.4%	3 3.1%	-	-

Clayton Funding Feasibility Survey
 Table 20-4

/
 Q9.5 Without the revenues from the proposed funding Measure, the City will be forced into "deficit spending", which means that the City will have to take money out of its reserves to cover operating costs, instead of using these monies as intended for other needs. Would hearing this argument from someone you trust make you more likely to SUPPORT or OPPOSE the proposed funding Measure; OR would it have NO IMPACT on how you would vote; OR is it NOT BELIEVABLE?

	Area of Residence					
	Total	North Clay	Central Clay	Town Cent	South Clay	Other
	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----
Total	307 100%	86 100%	36 100%	74 100%	39 100%	51 100%
Much more Support	9 2.9%	-	3 8.3%	3 4.1%	-	3 5.9%
Somewhat more Support	30 9.8%	15 17.4%	6 16.7%	3 4.1%	-	-
No effect	60 19.5%	9 10.5%	18 50.0%	15 20.3%	12 30.8%	3 5.9%
Somewhat more Oppose	113 36.8%	41 47.7%	3 8.3%	18 24.3%	15 38.5%	30 58.9%
Much more Oppose	57 18.6%	6 7.0%	6 16.7%	24 32.4%	9 23.1%	9 17.6%
NOT believable	24 7.8%	15 17.4%	-	9 12.2%	-	-
Unsure/refused	14 4.6%	-	-	2 2.7%	3 7.7%	6 1.8%

City of Clayton Funding Feasibility Survey
 Table 21-1

/

/

Q9.6 Without additional funding, the City could be forced into bankruptcy; or even be taken over by Contra Costa County. Would hearing this argument from someone you trust make you more likely to SUPPORT or OPPOSE the proposed funding Measure; OR would it have NO IMPACT on how you would vote; OR is it NOT BELIEVABLE?

	Gender			Age					Ethnicity						
	Total	Male	Fem	18-30	31-40	41-50	51-65	Over 66	Cauc	Hisp	Black	Nat Am	Mid East	Asian	Other
Total	307	160	147	33	58	51	87	99	220	12	12	6	3	18	21
	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%
Much more Support	77	41	36	3	20	6	24	21	59	3	-	3	-	9	3
	25.1%	25.6%	24.5%	100%	34.5%	11.8%	27.6%	21.2%	26.8%	25.0%		50.0%		50.0%	16.7%
Somewhat more Support	39	24	15	-	12	3	12	9	24	-	3	3	-	3	3
	12.7%	15.0%	10.2%		20.7%	5.9%	13.8%	9.1%	10.9%		25.0%	50.0%		16.7%	16.7%
No effect	21	15	6	-	3	6	6	6	15	-	-	-	3	-	3
	6.8%	9.4%	4.1%		5.2%	11.8%	6.9%	6.1%	6.8%				100%		16.7%
Somewhat more Oppose	62	41	21	-	8	21	12	18	38	3	3	-	-	6	-
	20.2%	25.6%	14.3%		13.8%	41.2%	13.8%	18.2%	17.3%	25.0%	25.0%			33.3%	
Much more Oppose	39	21	18	-	6	3	24	6	36	-	3	-	-	-	-
	12.7%	13.1	12.2%		10.3%	5.9%	27.6%	6.1%	16.4%		25.0%				
NOT believable	54	12	42	-	6	12	6	30	39	6	3	-	-	-	6
	17.6%	7.5%	28.6%		10.3%	23.5%	6.9%	30.3%	17.7%	50.0%	25.0%				33.3%
Unsure/Refused	15	6	9	-	3	-	3	9	9	-	-	-	-	-	3
	4.9%	3.8%	6.1%		5.2%		3.4%	9.1%	4.1%						16.7%

City of Clayton Funding Feasibility Survey
 Table 21-2

/

/

Q9.6 Without additional funding, the City could be forced into bankruptcy; or even be taken over by Contra Costa County. Would hearing this argument from someone you trust make you more likely to SUPPORT or OPPOSE the proposed funding Measure; OR would it have NO IMPACT on how you would vote; OR is it NOT BELIEVABLE?

	Education						Income					Length of residency			
	Total	Less High	High Scho	Some Coll	Coll Grad	Grad Scho	Under \$25K	\$25-\$50K	\$50-\$75K	\$75-\$100K	Over \$100K	0-5 yrs	6-10 yrs	11-25 yrs	Over 25 yrs
Total	307 100%	3 100%	17 100%	72 100%	119 100%	90 100%	-	21 100%	36 100%	36 100%	178 100%	73 100%	48 100%	84 100%	102 100%
Much more Support	24 26.7%	-	-	15 20.8%	32 36.9%	24 26.7%	-	3 14.3%	6 16.7%	12 33.3%	44 24.7%	14 19.2%	18 37.5%	18 21.4%	27 26.5%
Somewhat more Support	15 16.7%	-	3 17.6%	3 4.2%	18 15.1%	15 16.7%	-	6 28.6%	-	3 8.3%	24 13.5%	6 8.2%	6 12.5%	9 10.7%	18 17.6%
No effect	6 6.7%	-	-	9 12.5%	6 5.0%	6 6.7%	-	-	3 8.3%	-	18 10.1%	3 4.1%	6 12.5%	12 14.3%	-
Somewhat more Oppose	21 23.3%	-	8 47.1%	9 12.5%	24 20.2%	21 23.3%	-	9 42.9%	3 8.3%	12 33.3%	29 16.3%	20 27.4%	3 6.3%	24 28.6%	15 14.7%
Much more Oppose	9 10.0%	-	3 17.6%	15 20.8%	12 10.1%	9 10.0%	-	-	3 8.3%	3 8.3%	24 13.5%	12 16.4%	3 6.3%	9 10.7%	15 14.7%
NOT believable	12 13.3%	3 100%	3 17.6%	15 20.8%	21 17.6%	12 13.3%	-	3 14.3%	15 41.7%	3 8.3%	33 18.5%	15 20.5%	12 25.0%	9 10.7%	18 17.6%
Unsure/refused	3 3.3%	-	-	6 8.3%	6 5.0%	3 3.3%	-	-	6 16.7%	3 8.3%	6 3.4%	3 4.1%	-	3 3.6%	9 8.8%

City of Clayton Funding Feasibility Survey
 Table 21-3

/

/

Q9.6 Without additional funding, the City could be forced into bankruptcy; or even be taken over by Contra Costa County. Would hearing this argument from someone you trust make you more likely to SUPPORT or OPPOSE the proposed funding Measure; OR would it have NO IMPACT on how you would vote; OR is it NOT BELIEVABLE?

/

/

/

/

	# Children					Home Ownership		Ideology			
	Total	None	One	Two	Three or more	Own	Rent	Lib	Prog	Mod	Con
Total	307	207	32	59	6	289	15	81	96	26	78
	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%
Much more Support	77	51	11	12	-	70	6	30	27	5	12
	25.1%	24.6%	34.4%	20.3%		24.6%	40.0%	37.0%	28.1%	19.2%	15.4%
Somewhat more Support	39	21	6	12	-	39	-	15	6	3	9
	12.7%	10.1%	18.8%	20.3%		13.5%		18.5%	6.3%	11.5%	11.5%
No effect	21	9	6	3	3	21	-	3	6	3	6
	6.8%	4.3%	18.8%	5.1%	50.0%	7.3%		3.7%	6.3%	11.5%	7.7%
Somewhat more Oppose	62	48	6	5	3	56	3	18	18	3	21
	20.2%	23.20%	18.8%	8.5%	50.0%	19.4%	20.0%	22.2%	18.8%	11.5%	26.9%
Much more Oppose	39	24	-	15	-	36	3	6	15	3	9
	12.7%	11.6%		25.4%		12.5%	20.0%	7.4%	15.6%	11.5%	11.5%
NOT believable	54	42	3	9	-	51	3	6	21	6	15
	17.6%	20.3%	9.4%	15.3%		17.6%	20.0%	7.4%	21.9%	23.1%	19.2%
Unsure/refused	15	12	-	3	-	15	-	3	3	3	6
	4.9%	5.8%		5.1%		5.2%		3.7%	3.1%	11.5%	7.7%

Clayton Funding Feasibility Survey

Table 21-4

/

/

Q9.6 Without additional funding, the City could be forced into bankruptcy; or even be taken over by Contra Costa County. Would hearing this argument from someone you trust make you more likely to SUPPORT or OPPOSE the proposed funding Measure; OR would it have NO IMPACT on how you would vote; OR is it NOT BELIEVABLE?

	Area of Residence					Other
	Total	North Clay	Central Clay	Town Cent	South Clay	
Total	307 100%	86 100%	36 100%	74 100%	39 100%	51 100%
Much more Support	77 25.1%	17 19.8%	12 33.3%	21 28.4%	6 15.4%	12 23.5%
Somewhat more Support	39 12.7%	18 20.9%	6 16.7%	6 8.1%	3 7.7%	6 11.8%
No effect	21 6.8%	9 10.5%	-	6 8.1%	3 7.7%	3 5.9%
Somewhat more Oppose	62 20.2%	24 27.9%	-	17 23.0%	6 15.4%	12 23.5%
Much more Oppose	39 12.7%	3 3.5%	6 16.7%	6 8.1%	12 30.8%	6 11.8%
NOT believable	54 17.6%	12 14.0%	12 33.3%	18 24.3%	3 7.7%	9 17.6%
Unsure/refused	15 4.9%	3 3.5%	-	-	6 15.4%	3 5.9%

City of Clayton Funding Feasibility Survey
 Table 22-1

/

Q10.0 Now that you have heard several arguments in SUPPORT of, and in OPPOSITION to, the notion of authorizing an increase in the local tax base in order to avoid having to make serious cutbacks in services presently being provided to Clayton residents, and assuming the amount of increase does NOT exceed your THRESHOLD of *willingness to pay*; would you **vote YES** or **NO** on such a funding Measure?

/

	Gender			Age					Ethnicity						
	Total	Male	Fem	18-30	31-40	41-50	51-65	Over 66	Cauc	Hisp	Black	Nat Am	Mid East	Asian	Other
Total	307 100%	160 100%	147 100%	3 100%	58 100%	51 100%	87 100%	99 100%	220 100%	12 100%	12 100%	6 100%	3 100%	18 100%	21 100%
Definitely YES	75 24.4%	36 22.5%	39 26.5%	3 100%	9 15.5%	3 5.9%	24 27.6%	27 27.3%	48 21.8%	6 50.0%	6 50.0%	6 100%	-	-	-
Probably YES	48 15.6%	30 18.8%	18 12.2%	-	6 10.3%	15 29.4%	15 17.2%	12 12.1%	36 16.4%	-	-	-	-	3 16.7%	3 14.3%
Neutral/unsure	14 4.6%	11 6.9%	3 2.0%	-	8 13.8%	3 5.9%	-	3 3.0%	11 5.0%	-	-	-	-	-	3 14.3%
Probably NO	114 37.1%	66 30.0%	45 44.9%	-	15 25.9%	15 29.4%	39 44.8%	45 45.5%	87 39.5%	3 25.0%	6 50.0%	-	3 100%	12 66.7%	6 28.6%
Definitely NO	53 17.3%	21 20.0%	15 14.3%	-	20 34.5%	12 23.5%	9 10.3%	12 12.1%	35 15.9%	3 25.0%	-	-	-	3 16.7%	9 42.9%

City of Clayton Funding Feasibility Survey
 Table 22-2

/

Q10.0 Now that you have heard several arguments in SUPPORT of, and in OPPOSITION to, the notion of authorizing an increase in the local tax base in order to avoid having to make serious cutbacks in services presently being provided to Clayton residents, and assuming the amount of increase does NOT exceed your THRESHOLD of *willingness to pay*; would you **vote YES** or **NO** on such a funding Measure?

/

	Education						Income					Length of residency			
	Total	Less High	High Scho	Some Coll	Coll Grad	Grad Scho	Under \$25K	\$25-\$50K	\$50-\$75K	\$75-\$100K	Over \$100K	0-5 yrs	6-10 yrs	11-25 yrs	Over 25 yrs
Total	90 100%	3 100%	17 100%	72 100%	119 100%	90 100%	-	21 100%	36 100%	36 100%	178 100%	73 100%	48 100%	84 100%	102 100%
Definitely YES	24 26.7%	-	6 35.3%	8 12.5%	33 27.7%	24 26.7%	-	3 14.3%	6 16.7%	9 25.0%	39 21.9%	6 8.2%	9 18.8%	27 32.1%	33 32.4%
Probably YES	18 20.0%	-	3 17.6%	15 20.8%	12 10.1%	18 20.0%	-	6 28.6%	6 16.7%	6 16.7%	27 15.2%	9 12.3%	9 18.8%	18 21.4%	12 11.8%
Neutral/unsure	3 3.3%	-	2 11.8%	6 8.3%	3 2.5%	3 3.3%	-	-	3 8.3%	-	11 6.2%	5 6.8%	6 12.5%	-	3 2.9%
Probably NO	33 36.7%	-	6 35.3%	27 37.5%	45 37.8%	33 36.7%	-	12 57.1%	15 41.7%	15 41.7%	57 32.0%	27 37.0%	9 18.8%	27 32.1%	51 50.0%
Definitely NO	12 13.3%	3 100%	-	15 20.8%	23 19.3%	12 13.3%	-	-	6 16.7%	3 8.3%	44 24.7%	26 35.6%	15 31.3%	9 10.7%	3 2.9%

City of Clayton Funding Feasibility Survey
 Table 22-3

/

/

Q10.0 Now that you have heard several arguments in SUPPORT of, and in OPPOSITION to, the notion of authorizing an increase in the local tax base in order to avoid having to make serious cutbacks in services presently being provided to Clayton residents, and assuming the amount of increase does NOT exceed your THRESHOLD of *willingness to pay*; would you **vote YES** or **NO** on such a funding Measure?

/

/

/

	# Children					Home Ownership		Ideology			
	Total	None	One	Two	Three or more	Own	Rent	Lib	Prog	Mod	Con
Total	307 100%	207 100%	32 100%	59 100%	6 100%	289 100%	15 100%	81 100%	96 100%	26 100%	78 100%
Definitely YES	75 24.4%	60 299.0%	3 9.4%	6 10.2%	3 50.0%	75 26.0%	-	33 40.7%	24 25.0%	-	12 15.4%
Probably YES	48 15.6%	33 15.9%	9 28.1%	6 10.2%	-	42 14.5%	6 40.0%	6 7.4%	24 25.0%	6 23.1%	12 15.4%
Neutral/unsure	14 4.6%	3 1.4%	3 9.4%	8 13.6%	-	14 4.8%	-	6 7.4%	-	-	6 7.7%
Definitely NO	114 37.1%	84 40.6%	3 9.4%	27 45.8%	-	102 35.3%	9 460.0	27 33.3%	27 28.1%	12 46.2%	33 42.3%
Probably NO	53 17.3%	24 11.6%	14 43.8%	12 20.3%	3 50.0%	53 18.3%	-	9 11.1%	21 21.9%	8 30.8%	12 15.4%

City of Clayton Funding Feasibility Survey
 Table 22-4

/

Q10.0 Now that you have heard several arguments in SUPPORT of, and in OPPOSITION to, the notion of authorizing an increase in the local tax base in order to avoid having to make serious cutbacks in services presently being provided to Clayton residents, and assuming the amount of increase does NOT exceed your THRESHOLD of *willingness to pay*; would you **vote YES** or **NO** on such a funding Measure?

	Area of Residence					Other
	Total	North Clay	Central Clay	Town Cent	South Clay	
Total	307 100%	86 100%	36 100%	74 100%	39 100%	48 100%
Definitely YES	75 24.4%	30 34.9%	15 41.7%	9 12.2%	-	9 18.8%
Probably YES	48 15.6%	6 7.0%	6 16.7%	18 24.3%	6 15.4%	12 25.0%
Neutral/unsure	14 4.6%	6 7.0%	-	5 6.8%	3 7.7%	-
Probably NO	114 37.1%	24 27.9%	12 33.3%	39 52.7%	21 53.8%	15 32.2%
Definitely NO	53 17.3%	20 23.3%	3 8.3%	3 4.1%	9 23.1%	12 25.0%

City of Clayton Funding Feasibility Survey
 Table 23-1

/

Q11.0 Because the need for City services and the City's operating costs will continue into the foreseeable future, would you recommend making the proposed increase in the local tax base, if authorized by Clayton voters, PERMANENT; or, would you want the increase to 'Sunset' (meaning terminate) in a specific number of years OR be brought back to local voters to be RENEWED?

	Gender			Age					Ethnicity						
	Total	Male	Fem	18-30	31-40	41-50	51-65	Over 66	Cauc	Hisp	Black	Nat Am	Mid East	Asian	Other
Total	307	160	147	3	58	51	87	99	220	12	12	6	3	18	21
	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%
Permanent	53	32	21	3	11	18	12	12	38	-	-	3	-	9	12
	17.3%	20.0%	14.3%	100%	19.0%	35.3%	13.8%	12.1%	17.3%			50.0%		16.7%	57.1%
Sunset	227	107	120	-	41	33	66	78	170	9	9	-	3	15	6
	73.9%	66.9%	81.6%		70.7%	64.7%	75.9%	78.8%	77.3%	75.0%	75.0%		100%	83.3%	28.6%
Unsure	15	9	5	-	3	-	3	6	6	-	3	3	-	-	3
	4.9%	5.6%	4.1%		5.2%		3.4%	6.1%	2.7%		25.0%	50.0%			14.3%

City of Clayton Funding Feasibility Survey
 Table 23-2

/

Q11.0 Because the need for City services and the City's operating costs will continue into the foreseeable future, would you recommend making the proposed increase in the local tax base, if authorized by Clayton voters, PERMANENT; or, would you want the increase to 'Sunset' (meaning terminate) in a specific number of years OR be brought back to local voters to be RENEWED?

/

	Education						Income					Length of residency			
	Total	Less High	High Scho	Some Coll	Coll Grad	Grad Scho	Under \$25K	\$25-\$50K	\$50-\$75K	\$75-\$100K	Over \$100K	0-5 yrs	6-10 yrs	11-25 yrs	Over 25 yrs
Total	307 100%	3 100%	17 100%	72 100%	119 100%	90 100%	-	21 100%	36 100%	36 100%	178 100%	73 100%	48 100%	84 100%	102 100%
Permanent	32 17.3%	3 100%	-	9 12.5%	17 14.3%	24 26.7%	-	6 28.6%	6 16.7%	-	41 23.0%	32 43.8%	6 12.5%	15 17.9%	-
Sunset	227 73.9%	-	14 82.4%	60 83.3%	90 75.6%	57 63.3%	-	15 71.4%	27 75.0%	36 100%	116 65.2%	35 47.9%	39 81.3%	60 10.7%	93 91.2%
Unsure	15 4.9%	-	-	3 4.2%	6 5.0%	6 6.7%	-	-	3 8.3%	-	9 5.1%	6 8.2%	-	6 7.1%	3 2.9%

City of Clayton Funding Feasibility Survey
 Table 23-3

/

Q11.0 Because the need for City services and the City's operating costs will continue into the foreseeable future, would you recommend making the proposed increase in the local tax base, if authorized by Clayton voters, PERMANENT; or, would you want the increase to 'Sunset' (meaning terminate) in a specific number of years OR be brought back to local voters to be RENEWED?

/

	# Children					Home Ownership		Ideology			
	=====					=====		=====			
	Total	None	One	Two	Three or more	Own	Rent	Lib	Prog	Mod	Con
	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----
Total	307 100%	207 100%	32 100%	59 100%	6 100%	289 100%	15 100%	81 100%	96 100%	26 100%	78 100%
Permanent	53 17.3%	30 14.5%	14 43.8%	9 15.3%	- 100%	53 18.3%	3 20.0%	9 11.1%	21 21.9%	8 30.8%	15 19.2%
Sunset	227 73.9%	159 76.8%	18 56.3%	41 69.5%	6 100%	212 73.4%	- -	63 77.8%	72 75.0%	18 69.2%	54 69.2%
Unsure	15 4.9%	12 5.8%	- -	3 5.1%	- -	12 4.2%	- -	33 3.7%	- -	- -	9 11.5%

Clayton Funding Feasibility Survey

Table 23-4

/

/

Q11.0 Because the need for City services and the City's operating costs will continue into the foreseeable future, would you recommend making the proposed increase in the local tax base, if authorized by Clayton voters, PERMANENT; or, would you want the increase to 'Sunset' (meaning terminate) in a specific number of years OR be brought back to local voters to be RENEWED?

	Area of Residence					
	Total	North Clay	Central Clay	Town Cent	South Clay	Other
	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----
Total	307 100%	86 100%	36 100%	74 100%	39 100%	51 100%
Permanent	53 17.3%	17 19.8%	3 8.3%	9 12.2%	12 30.8%	6 11.8%
Sunset	227 73.9%	63 73.3%	24 66.7%	59 79.7%	27 69.0%	42 82.4%
Unsure	15 4.9%	3 3.5%	3 8.3%	3 4.1%	-	3 5.9%

City of Clayton Funding Feasibility Survey
 Table 24-1

/

Q11.1 Since you're not willing to support keeping this increase in the local tax base in place PERMANENTLY, would you be willing to keep it in place for **20 years**; then have it terminate OR be brought back to local voters for renewal?

	Gender			Age					Ethnicity						
	Total	Male	Fem	18-30	31-40	41-50	51-65	Over 66	Cauc	Hisp	Black	Nat Am	Mid East	Asian	Other
Total	242 100%	116 100%	126 100%	3 100%	44 100%	33 100%	69 100%	84 100%	176 100%	9 100%	12 100%	3 100%	3 100%	15 100%	9 100%
YES 20 year	42 17.4%	18 15.5%	24 19.0%	- 0%	9 20.5%	- 0%	18 26.1%	15 17.9%	36 20.5%	- 0%	9 75.0%	- 0%	- 0%	12 80.0%	3 33.3%
NO 20 year	182 75.2%	89 76.7%	93 73.8%	3 100%	32 72.7%	33 100%	48 69.6%	57 67.9%	131 74.4%	9 100%	- 0%	3 100%	3 100%	3 20.0%	6 66.7%
Unsure	15 6.2%	9 7.8%	6 4.8%	- 0%	3 6.8%	- 0%	3 4.3%	9 10.7%	6 3.4%	- 0%	3 25.0%	- 0%	- 0%	- 0%	- 0%

City of Clayton Funding Feasibility Survey
 Table 24-2

/

Q11.1 Since you're not willing to support keeping this increase in the local tax base in place PERMANENTLY, would you be willing to keep it in place for **20 years**; then have it terminate OR be brought back to local voters for renewal?

/

	Education						Income					Length of residency			
	Total	Less High	High Scho	Some Coll	Coll Grad	Grad Scho	Under \$25K	\$25-\$50K	\$50-\$75K	\$75-\$100K	Over \$100K	0-5 yrs	6-10 yrs	11-25 yrs	Over 25 yrs
Total	242 100%	-	14 100%	63 100%	96 100%	63 100%	-	15 100%	30 100%	36 100%	125 100%	41 100%	39 100%	66 100%	96 100%
YES 20 year	42 17.4%	-	-	6 9.5%	18 18.8%	18 28.6%	-	9 60.0%	6 20.0%	3 8.3%	21 16.8%	6 14.6%	6 15.4%	9 13.6%	21 21.9%
NO 20 year	182 75.2%	-	14 100%	48 76.2%	69 71.9%	45 71.4%	-	6 40.0%	21 70.0%	27 75.0%	95 76.0%	35 85.4%	30 76.9%	54 81.8%	63 65.6%
Unsure	15 6.2%	-	-	6 9.5%	9 9.4%	-	-	-	3 10.0%	6 16.7%	6 4.8%	-	3 7.7%	3 4.5%	9 9.4%

City of Clayton Funding Feasibility Survey
 Table 24-3

/

Q11.1 Since you're not willing to support keeping this increase in the local tax base in place PERMANENTLY, would you be willing to keep it in place for **20 years**; then have it terminate OR be brought back to local voters for renewal?

/

	# Children					Home Ownership		Ideology			
	Total	None	One	Two	Three or more	Own	Rent	Lib	Prog	Mod	Con
Total	242 100%	171 100%	18 100%	44 100%	6 100%	224 100%	15 100%	66 100%	72 100%	48 100%	63 100%
YES 20 year	42 5.9%	33 19.3%	3 16.7%	6 13.6%	6 100%	36 16.1%	3 20.0%	3 4.5%	12 16.7%	3 16.7%	24 38.1%
NO 20 year	182 10.4%	123 71.9%	15 83.3%	35 79.5%	-	170 75.9%	12 80.0%	54 81.8%	60 83.3%	15 83.3%	30 47.6%
Unsure	15 20.%	12 7.0%	-	3 6.8%	-	15 6.7%	-	9 13.6%	-	-	6 9.5%

Clayton Funding Feasibility Survey

Table 24-4

/

Q11.1 Since you're not willing to support keeping this increase in the local tax base in place PERMANENTLY, would you be willing to keep it in place for **20 years**; then have it terminate OR be brought back to local voters for renewal?

	Area of Residence					
	Total	North Clay	Central Clay	Town Cent	South Clay	Other
	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----
Total	242 100%	66 100%	27 100%	62 100%	27 100%	42 100%
YES 20 year	42 17.4%	18 27.3%	9 33.3%	6 9.7%	6 9.7%	-
NO 20 year	182 75.2%	45 68.2%	15 55.6%	53 85.5%	53 85.5%	42 100%
Unsure	15 6.2%	3 4.5%	3 11.1%	-	-	-

City of Clayton Funding Feasibility Survey
 Table 25-1

/

Q11.2 Since you're not willing to support keeping increase in the local tax base for 20 years, would you be willing to keep it in place for **10 years**; then have it terminate OR be brought back to local voters for renewal?

	Gender			Age					Ethnicity						
	Total	Male	Fem	18-30	31-40	41-50	51-65	Over 66	Cauc	Hisp	Black	Nat Am	Mid East	Asian	Other
Total	197	98	99	3	35	33	51	66	137	9	12	3	3	12	6
	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%
YES 10 year	84	36	48	-	12	15	12	45	66	3	3	-	-	-	-
	42.6%	36.7%	48.5%		34.3%	45.5%	23.5%	68.2%	48.2%	33.3%	25.0%				
NO 10 year	107	56	51	3	23	18	33	21	65	6	9	3	3	12	6
	54.3%	57.1%	51.5%	100%	65.7%	54.5%	64.7%	31.8%	47.4%	66.7%	75.0%	100%	100%	100%	100%
Unsure	6	6	-	-	-	-	6	-	6	-	-	-	-	-	-
	3.0%	6.1%					11.8%		4.4%						

City of Clayton Funding Feasibility Survey
 Table 25-2

/

Q11.2 Since you're not willing to support keeping increase in the local tax base for 20 years, would you be willing to keep it in place for **10 years**; then have it terminate OR be brought back to local voters for renewal?

/

	Education						Income					Length of residency			
	Total	Less High	High Scho	Some Coll	Coll Grad	Grad Scho	Under \$25K	\$25-\$50K	\$50-\$75K	\$75-\$100K	Over \$100K	0-5 yrs	6-10 yrs	11-25 yrs	Over 25 yrs
Total	197 100%	-	14 100%	54 100%	78 100%	45 100%	-	6 100%	24 100%	33 100%	101 100%	35 100%	33 100%	57 100%	72 100%
YES 10 year	84 42.6%	-	6 42.9%	30 55.6%	33 42.3%	15 33.3%	-	6 100%	15 62.5%	15 50.0%	39 38.6%	12 34.3%	12 36.4%	24 42.1%	36 50.0%
NO 10 year	107 54.3%	-	8 57.1%	24 44.4%	42 53.8%	27 60.0%	-	-	9 37.5%	15 50.0%	59 58.4%	23 65.7%	18 54.5%	30 52.6%	36 50.0%
Unsure	6 3.0%	-	-	-	3 3.8%	3 6.7%	-	-	-	-	3 3.0%	-	3 9.1%	3 5.3%	-

City of Clayton Funding Feasibility Survey
 Table 25-3

/

Q11.2 Since you're not willing to support keeping increase in the local tax base for 20 years, would you be willing to keep it in place for **10 years**; then have it terminate OR be brought back to local voters for renewal?

/

	# Children					Home Ownership		Ideology			
	Total	None	One	Two	Three or more	Own	Rent	Lib	Prog	Mod	Con
Total	197 100%	135 100%	15 100%	38 100%	6 100%	185 100%	15 100%	63 100%	60 100%	15 100%	36 100%
YES 10 year	84 42.6%	63 46.7%	9 60.0%	9 23.7%	3 50.0%	81 43.8%	3 25.0%	21 33.3%	24 40.0%	9 60.0%	24 66.7%
NO 10 year	107 54.3%	66 48.9%	6 40.0%	29 76.3%	3 50.0%	98 53.0%	9 75.0%	39 61.9%	33 55.0%	6 140.0	12 33.3%
Unsure	6 3.0%	6 4.4%	-	-	-	6 3.2%	-	3 4.8%	3 5.0%	-	-

Clayton Funding Feasibility Survey

Table 25-4

/

/

Q11.2 Since you're not willing to support keeping increase in the local tax base for 20 years, would you be willing to keep it in place for **10 years**; then have it terminate OR be brought back to local voters for renewal?

	Area of Residence					Other
	Total	North Clay	Central Clay	Town Cent	South Clay	
Total	197 100%	48 100%	18 100%	53 100%	18 100%	45 100%
YES 10 year	84 42.6%	24 50.0%	3 16.7%	21 39.6%	9 50.0%	18 640.0
NO 10 year	107 54.2%	21 43.8%	15 83.3%	29 54.7%	9 50.0%	27 60.0%
Unsure	6 3.0%	3 6.3%	-	3 5.7%	-	

City of Clayton Funding Feasibility Survey
 Table 26-1

/

Q12.1 In order to control for normal inflation, would you support authorizing a modest annual increase in the local tax base that is based upon a CPI (not to exceed 5%), in order to KEEP PACE with the increased cost of providing City services to Clayton residents from year-to-year.

/

	Gender			Age					Ethnicity						
	Total	Male	Fem	18-30	31-40	41-50	51-65	Over 66	Cauc	Hisp	Black	Nat Am	Mid East	Asian	Other
Total	307 100%	160 100%	147 100%	3 100%	58 100%	51 100%	87 100%	99 100%	220 100%	12 100%	12 100%	6 100%	3 100%	18 100%	21 100%
Definitely YES	65 21.2%	44 27.5%	21 14.3%	3 100%	17 29.3%	6 11.8%	27 31.0%	15 15.2%	50 22.7%	-	3 25.0%	-	-	6 33.3%	3 14.3%
Probably YES	48 15.6%	18 11.3%	30 20.4%	-	12 20.7%	15 29.4%	-	21 21.2%	33 15.0%	6 50.0%	-	-	-	3 16.7%	6 28.6%
Neutral/unsure	29 9.4%	17 10.6%	12 8.2%	-	8 13.8%	6 11.8%	3 3.4%	12 12.1%	20 9.1%	-	-	-	-	3 16.7%	6 28.6%
Probably NO	63 20.5%	36 22.5%	27 18.4%	-	6 10.3%	12 23.5%	24 27.6%	21 21.2%	54 24.5%	-	3 25.0%	-	-	-	-
Definitely NO	96 31.3%	42 26.3%	54 36.7%	-	15 25.9%	12 23.5%	33 37.9%	24 24.2%	57 25.9%	6 50.0%	6 50.0%	6 100%	3 100%	6 33.3%	6 28.6%

28.6%

City of Clayton Funding Feasibility Survey
 Table 26-2

/

/

Q12.1 In order to control for normal inflation, would you support authorizing a modest annual increase in the local tax base that is based upon a CPI (not to exceed 5%), in order to KEEP PACE with the increased cost of providing City services to Clayton residents from year-to-year.

/

/

	Education						Income					Length of residency			
	Total	Less High	High Scho	Some Coll	Coll Grad	Grad Scho	Under \$25K	\$25-\$50K	\$50-\$75K	\$75-\$100K	Over \$100K	0-5 yrs	6-10 yrs	11-25 yrs	Over 25 yrs
Total	307 100%	3 100%	17 100%	72 100%	119 100%	90 100%	-	21 100%	36 100%	36 100%	178 100%	73 100%	48 100%	84 100%	102 100%
Definitely YES	65 21.2%	3 100%	-	15 20.8%	20 16.8%	27 30.0%	-	6 28.6%	3 8.3%	3 8.3%	50 28.1%	23 31.5%	12 25.0%	9 10.7%	21 20.6%
Probably YES	48 15.6%	-	3 17.6%	3 4.2%	27 22.7%	15 16.7%	-	6 28.6%	15 41.7%	9 25.0%	18 10.1%	15 20.5%	9 18.8%	3 3.6%	21 20.6%
Neutral/unsure	29 9.4%	-	2 11.8%	12 16.7%	12 10.1%	3 3.3%	-	-	6 16.7%	-	14 7.9%	5 6.8%	6 12.5%	6 7.1%	12 11.8%
Probably NO	63 20.5%	-	3 17.6%	18 25.0%	21 17.6%	18 20.0%	-	6 28.6%	3 8.3%	9 25.0%	36 20.2%	18 24.7%	6 12.5%	21 25.0%	18 17.6%
Definitely NO	96 31.3%	-	9 52.9%	21 29.2%	39 32.8%	24 26.7%	-	3 14.3%	6 16.7%	15 41.7%	57 32.0%	9 12.3%	15 31.3%	45 53.6%	27 26.5%

City of Clayton Funding Feasibility Survey
 Table 26-3

/

/

Q12.1 In order to control for normal inflation, would you support authorizing a modest annual increase in the local tax base that is based upon a CPI (not to exceed 5%), in order to KEEP PACE with the increased cost of providing City services to Clayton residents from year-to-year.

/

/

	# Children					Home Ownership		Ideology			
	=====					=====		=====			
	Total	None	One	Two	Three or more	Own	Rent	Lib	Prog	Mod	Con
	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----
Total	307	207	32	59	6	289	15	81	96	26	78
	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%
Definitely YES	66	45	8	12	-	65	-	15	21	8	21
	21.2%	21.7%	25.0%	200.3%		22.5%		18.5%	21.9%	30.8%	36.9%
Probably YES	48	33	6	9	-	52	3	9	9	6	18
	15.6%	15.9%	18.8%	15.3%		14.5%	20.0%	11.1%	9.4%	23.1%	23.1%
Neutral/unsure	29	15	3	8	3	29	-	9	9	-	6
	9.4%	7.2%	9.4%	13.6%	50.0%	10.0%		11.1%	9.4%		7.7%
Definitely NO	63	48	6	9	-	54	9	9	33	12	6
	20.5%	23.2%	18.8%	15.3%		18.7%	60.0%	11.1%	34.4%	46.2%	7.7%
Probably NO	96	60	9	21	3	93	3	36	24	-	24
	31.3%	29.0%	28.1%	35.6%	50.0%	32.2%	20.0%	44.4%	25.0%		30.8%

City of Clayton Funding Feasibility Survey
 Table 26-4

/

Q12.1 In order to control for normal inflation, would you support authorizing a modest annual increase in the local tax base that is based upon a CPI (not to exceed 5%), in order to KEEP PACE with the increased cost of providing City services to Clayton residents from year-to-year.

	Area of Residence					Other
	Total	North Clay	Central Clay	Town Cent	South Clay	
Total	307 100%	86 100%	36 100%	74 100%	39 100%	51 100%
Definitely YES	65 21.2%	23 26.7%	3 8.3%	12 16.2%	15 38.5%	9 17.6%
Probably YES	48 15.6%	21 24.4%	9 25.0%	9 12.2%	-	9 17.6%
Neutral/unsure	29 9.4%	12 14.0%	-	5 5.8%	3 7.7%	6 11.8%
Probably NO	63 20.5%	6 7.0%	6 16.7%	18 24.3%	21 30.8%	12 23.5%
Definitely NO	96 31.3%	24 27.9%	18 50.0%	27 36.5%	-	15 29.4%

City of Clayton Funding Feasibility Survey
 Table 27-1

/
 /
 Q13.0 Do you AGREE or DISAGREE with the following statement, "Clayton's elected officials are **completely trustworthy**"?

	Gender			Age					Ethnicity						
	Total	Male	Fem	18-30	31-40	41-50	51-65	Over 66	Cauc	Hisp	Black	Nat Am	Mid East	Asian	Other
Total	307 100%	160 100%	147 100%	3 100%	58 100%	51 100%	87 100%	99 100%	220 100%	12 100%	12 100%	6 100%	3 100%	18 100%	21 100%
Strongly agree	21 6.8%	12 7.5%	9 6.1%	-	3 5.2%	6 11.8%	3 3.4%	9 9.1%	15 6.8%	3 25.0%	-	-	-	-	3 14.3%
Somewhat agree	93 30.3%	51 31.9%	42 28.6%	3 100%	24 41.4%	18 35.3%	21 24.1%	24 24.2%	57 25.9%	3 5.0%	6 50.0%	-	-	15 83.3%	6 28.6%
Neutral/unsure	47 15.3%	20 12.5%	27 18.4%	-	8 13.8%	6 11.8%	15 17.2%	18 18.2%	41 18.6%	-	-	3 50.0%	-	-	3 14.3%
Somewhat disagree	78 25.4%	42 26.3%	36 24.5%	-	6 10.3%	21 42.2%	27 31.0%	24 24.2%	57 25.9%	3 25.0%	3 25.0%	-	3 100%	3 16.7%	3 14.3%
Strongly disagree	56 18.2%	26 16.3%	30 20.4%	-	24.1%	-	18 20.7%	18 18.2%	44 20.0%	-	-	3 50.0%	-	-	6 28.6%

City of Clayton Funding Feasibility Survey
 Table 27-2

/

/

Q13.0 Do you AGREE or DISAGREE with the following statement, "Clayton's elected officials are **completely trustworthy**"?

/

/

	Education						Income					Length of residency			
	Total	Less High	High Scho	Some Coll	Coll Grad	Grad Scho	Under \$25K	\$25-\$50K	\$50-\$75K	\$75-\$100K	Over \$100K	0-5 yrs	6-10 yrs	11-25 yrs	Over 25 yrs
Total	307 100%	3 100%	17 100%	72 100%	119 100%	90 100%	-	21 100%	36 100%	36 100%	178 100%	73 100%	48 100%	84 100%	102 100%
Strongly agree	21 6.8%	3 100%	-	6 8.3%	3 2.5%	9 10.0%	-	-	6 16.7%	3 8.3%	12 6.7%	3 4.1%	12 25.0%	6 7.1%	-
Somewhat agree	93 30.3%	-	3 17.6%	21 29.2%	42 35.3%	27 30.0%	-	9 42.9%	9 25.0%	15 41.7%	51 28.7%	27 37.0%	12 25.0%	21 25.0%	33 32.4%
Neutral/unsure	47 15.3%	-	3 17.6%	12 16.7%	20 16.8%	12 13.3%	-	-	6 16.7%	3 8.3%	32 18.0%	11 15.1%	6 12.5%	15 17.9%	15 14.7%
Somewhat disagree	78 25.4%	-	9 52.9%	18 25.0%	30 25.2%	21 23.3%	-	9 42.9%	9 25.0%	9 25.0%	42 23.6%	15 20.5%	6 12.5%	24 28.6%	33 32.4%
Strongly disagree	56 18.2%	-	11.8%	12 16.7%	21 17.6%	15 16.7%	-	3 14.3%	6 16.7%	6 16.7%	29 16.3%	8 11.0%	12 25.0%	15 17.9%	3 20.6%

City of Clayton Funding Feasibility Survey
 Table 27-3

/

/

Q13.0 Do you AGREE or DISAGREE with the following statement, "Clayton's elected officials are **completely trustworthy**"?

/

/

/

/

	# Children					Home Ownership		Ideology			
	Total	None	One	Two	Three or more	Own	Rent	Lib	Prog	Mod	Con
Total	307 100%	207 100%	32 100%	59 100%	6 100%	289 100%	15 100%	81 100%	96 100%	26 100%	78 100%
Strongly agree	21 6.8%	18 8.7%	-	-	3 50.0%	18 .2%	3 20.0%	3 3.7%	9 9.4%	-	6 7.7%
Somewhat agree	93 30.3%	60 39.0%	15 46.9%	18 30.5%	-	90 31.1%	-	15 18.5%	24 25.0%	9 34.6%	36 46.2%
Neutral/unsure	47 15.3%	30 14.5%	8 25.0%	9 15.3%	-	47 16.3%	-	6 7.4%	15 15.6%	14 53.8%	12 15.4%
Somewhat disagree	78 25.4%	54 26.1%	6 18.8%	18 30.5%	-	72 24.9%	6 40.0%	21 25.9%	30 21.3%	3 11.5%	15 19.2%
Strongly disagree	56 18.2%	39 18.8%	3 9.4%	11 18.6%	-	53 18.3%	3 20.0%	30 37.0%	18 18.8%	-	3 3.8%

City of Clayton Funding Feasibility Survey
 Table 27-4

/

/

Q13.0 Do you AGREE or DISAGREE with the following statement, "Clayton's elected officials are **completely trustworthy**"?

/

	Area of Residence					
	Total	North Clay	Central Clay	Town Cent	South Clay	Other
	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----
Total	307 100%	86 100%	36 100%	74 100%	39 100%	45 100%
Strongly agree	21 54.7%	6 7.0%	-	9 12.2%	-	6 13.3%
Somewhat agree	93 32.9%	24 27.9%	9 25.0%	24 32.4%	12 30.8%	18 40.0%
Neutral/unsure	47 6.5%	17 19.8%	-	5 8.1%	12 30.8%	6 13.3%
Somewhat disagree	78 4.9%	24 27.9%	12 33.3%	21 28.4%	12 30.8%	9 20.0%
Strongly disagree	56 2.0%	9 10.5%	15 41.7%	14 18.9%	3 7.7%	6 13.3%

