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Executive Summary

Background

A mail survey of Summit County residents was conducted during the spring of 2015 to assess citizens’ views about local quality of life conditions, growth and growth management, the performance of County government, priority issues for government services and programs, transportation conditions and services, and economic development conditions and priorities. The survey was designed as a follow-up to similar countywide surveys conducted in 2011 and 2013, with some repeat questions incorporated in order to allow for assessment of possible changes over time in citizens’ views about selected issues addressed across all of the survey years. The 2015 survey was also designed to allow for comparison of the views expressed by residents living in western, northern, and southern portions of Summit County. By providing accurate and representative data regarding citizens’ views about a broad range of conditions and issues, the results of this survey are intended to enhance the ability of county officials to understand and respond to residents’ needs, concerns and priorities.

Methodology

To insure a high level of accuracy in estimating the response tendencies of residents living in all parts of Summit County, initial samples of 1,000 residential mailing addresses were selected at random from zip code areas corresponding to western, northern, and southern portions of the county. Following deletion of addresses determined to be invalid or vacant, requests for survey participation were mailed to 903 randomly-selected residential addresses in the west-county area, 958 addresses in the north-county area, and 912 addresses in the south-county area. Completed questionnaires were returned by 349 west-county residents (38.6% response rate), 404 north-county residents (42.2% response rate), and 332 south-county residents (36.4% response rate). The overall survey response rate (39.1%) was slightly lower than that obtained in 2011 or 2013. The statistical margin of error for response percentages associated with the combined countywide sample is approximately +/- 3%. Margins of error for data based on responses from each of the three designated portions of the county are approximately +/- 5.2% for the west-county area, +/- 4.7% for the north-county area, and +/- 5.3% for the south-county area.

Overall Quality of Life

A majority of survey participants living in each of the three designated areas indicated that they consider overall quality of life in Summit County to be above average. For the county as a whole, the data indicate that 90% of residents consider quality of life to be either above average or excellent. West-county residents were considerably more likely than either north-county or south-county residents to rate quality of life as “excellent.” In all three areas residents placed considerable emphasis on the importance of outdoor recreation opportunities, clean environment, and the rural and agricultural character of some portions of the county as factors that contribute in important ways to local quality of life. When asked to rate the importance of various factors for the future of the county, respondents placed greatest emphasis on protecting and preserving agricultural land and open space,
limiting the expansion of new residential development, limiting future land development through enforcement of density and parcel size requirements, and developing strategies to reduce traffic congestion. Overall, survey participants were slightly more likely to believe that in recent years the county has become less desirable as a place to live than to believe it has become more desirable. Among those who indicated that county conditions had become less desirable, the most frequently-noted explanations for such beliefs involved concerns about the effects of growth and development and about traffic congestion.

Growth and Growth Management

Residents throughout Summit County expressed considerable concern about the consequences of growth and development. A substantial majority of residents countywide agreed that rapid growth is causing a loss of important and valued characteristics of the area, and most agreed policies are needed to manage future growth and development. Not surprisingly, residents of the more heavily-developed west-county area were generally most supportive of growth management policies, while residents of the largely rural north-county area were somewhat less concerned about growth and development issues and most likely to express ambivalence about policies that might impose limits on private property rights in order to manage growth. On most questions pertaining to growth and growth management residents of the southern area of Summit County, which is in many ways transitioning from a more-rural to a more-developed character, expressed views that fell between those expressed by north-county and west-county residents.

Rating the Performance of Summit County Government

For the county as a whole the data indicate that 92% of residents considered the quality of county-provided services to be average, above average, or excellent. The combined percentage of residents rating county services as above average or excellent was considerably higher in 2015 (48.5%) than had been the case in 2013 (40%) or in 2011 (35.6%). Responses indicating a belief that county services are above average or excellent were most common among west-county residents (about 56% of responses), less common among those living in the south-county area (about 35%), and lowest among north-county residents (about 25%).

Similarly, for Summit County as a whole the data indicate that a large majority (85%) of residents considered the value of county services they receive relative to the amount of taxes and fees they pay to be at least “average” or better than average. The combined percentage of residents rating the value of services relative to taxes/fees as above average or excellent was higher in 2015 (46.1%) than was the case in either 2013 (40.9%) or 2011 (33.7%). This suggests a generally positive reaction to efforts by county government to increase the efficiency of county programs and services. West-county residents were more likely to rate the value received in government services as better than average (a combined 55.5%) than was the case among either south-county (28.5%) or north-county (18.1%) residents. At the same time, the percentage of respondents rating the value of services in relation to taxes and fees paid as “very poor” was quite low across all three areas (3.9% in the west-county area, 8.4% in the north-county area, and 4.7% in the south-county area).

Ratings of the performance of Summit County government with respect to the availability of information about services, facilities and programs were also positive overall. For the county as a whole the percentage of ratings in the above average or excellent categories was considerably higher in 2015 (42%) than in either 2013 (32%) or 2011 (27%). Once again, the percentage of responses falling
into the above average or excellent categories was higher among west-county residents (49.5%) than among either north-county (22%) or south-county (26.3%) residents. Very similar patterns were observed for another question that asked citizens to rate the efforts of Summit County government to keep them informed about local issues and events. For the county as a whole the data indicate that in 2015 approximately 36% of residents would rate this aspect of county government performance as above average or excellent, a notably higher percentage than what was reported in either 2011 or 2013 (27% in both years).

Responses to a question that asked about the responsiveness of the Summit County Council to citizen input revealed somewhat mixed reactions, with considerable differences across the three areas of the county. West-county residents were considerably more likely to rate the responsiveness of the Council as above average or excellent (a combined 28.5%) than were either north-county (10.8%) or south-county (15.4%) residents.

About one out of three survey respondents reported they had contacted at least one Summit County government office during the past year. Among those who did report such contact, a majority indicated that they were either somewhat satisfied or very satisfied with various aspects of that experience. Among those who expressed dissatisfaction with how effectively county offices had responded to their needs and concerns, the offices responsible for planning and building matters were most frequently identified as the source of their dissatisfaction.

**Funding Priorities for County Programs and Services**

When asked to consider whether allocations of county funds for various programs and services should increase, decrease, or remain at current levels, a majority of residents in each of the three county areas generally expressed a preference for retention of current funding levels, with little evidence of support for funding reductions. Among west-county residents, expressions of support for increased funding allocations exceeded 20% of responses for questions focusing on provision of public library services, public health clinics, emergency response services, hiking and biking trails, senior citizen centers and services, fire protection, public bus transportation services, planning and zoning enforcement, solid waste recycling, air and water quality monitoring, maintenance of county roadways, and the purchase of private lands for open space protection and public recreation uses. Twenty percent or more of north-county residents supported increased funding for public health clinics, the Sheriff’s department, senior citizen centers and services, fire protection, maintenance of county roadways, and purchase of private lands for open space protection and public recreation. Among south-county residents, 20% or more of respondents expressed support for increased funding of public library services, public health clinics, the Sheriff’s department, emergency response services, hiking and biking trails, senior citizen centers and services, fire protection, public bus transportation services, solid waste recycling, air and water quality monitoring, annual maintenance of county roads, and purchase of private lands for open space and recreation uses.

**Transportation Conditions and Priorities**

Survey participants generally considered it important that Summit County develop strategies to reduce traffic congestion problems experienced in more heavily-developed portions of the county. Countywide about 85% of residents indicated that they consider such efforts to be either moderately or very important, with residents of western portions of the county considerably more likely to consider
this “very important” (70%) than those living in the north-county (34%) or south-county (44%) areas. In all areas relatively few residents indicated frequent use of alternative forms of transportation for activities such as shopping, keeping appointments, or commuting to work. When asked whether they would be likely to begin to use alternative transportation options if traffic congestion in parts of the county continues to worsen, residents living in the west-county area were considerably more likely to say they probably or definitely would do so (a combined 41%) than were residents of the north-county (14%) or south-county (22%) areas. Still, when asked about possible expansion of the public bus system that currently serves only west-county areas, residents throughout the county were generally supportive of service expansion to other areas -- especially if the rider fees would be charged to cover the costs of doing so.

Economic Development Conditions and Priorities

On the whole residents of Summit County appear to be ambivalent about efforts by county government to promote economic development. When asked about the allocation of county funds for economic development and business recruitment efforts, residents from all areas of the county were considerably more likely to indicate a preference for reduced rather than increased funding of such programs. Also, when asked whether efforts to encourage economic development and the creation of new job opportunities should be a priority for county government, residents in all three areas tended to consider this no more than a “medium” priority issue; for the county as a whole only about 14% of residents would rate such efforts as a high priority. When asked to indicate what they consider to be the most important and appropriate indicators of successful economic development in their communities, residents across the county tended most often to highlight improvement in residents’ educational assets and skills, and improvements to amenities and services that would make the community more attractive to businesses. Local characteristics identified most often as “competitive strengths” that provide advantages in attracting new economic development opportunities included the quality of the natural environment of the area and community lifestyle characteristics. Characteristics identified most often as “competitive weaknesses” that may restrict economic development included limited availability of high-quality, high-wage jobs and limited availability of affordable housing.
INTRODUCTION

This report presents an overview of findings from a 2015 survey of adult residents of Summit County, Utah. Commissioned by the Summit County Manager’s office and the County Council as a part of broader strategic planning activities, the study was designed to assess citizens’ views about local quality of life conditions and trends, growth and growth management concerns, satisfaction with government services, transportation conditions, and economic development priorities. The project was conducted by Dr. Richard Krannich, professor of Sociology at Utah State University. The information presented here outlines study procedures, summarizes survey results, and highlights key findings.

STUDY APPROACH

A self-completion survey questionnaire was developed to measure residents’ views about selected conditions and issues in Summit County. The survey instrument was designed to include a number of questions that had been asked in similar county-wide surveys conducted by Dr. Krannich for the county in 2011 and 2013, so that possible changes in citizens’ views could be assessed. At the same time, a number of new questions were incorporated to address several topics not considered in those earlier studies. Input regarding key issues and themes to be addressed in the survey was obtained through discussions with county administrators and staff that began in late January, 2015 and continued during the months of February and March. A late February meeting involving all members of the County Council provided additional guidance regarding survey content. Several drafts of the questionnaire were developed, and in turn reviewed by the county manager, assistant county manager and professional staff from several county offices. Their comments, questions and suggestions were taken into account in developing a final version of the survey questionnaire.
In designing the survey implementation process, it was important to take into account the fact that levels of development and population concentration in Summit County differ substantially between the more heavily-populated area centered around Park City and much more sparsely populated northern and southern portions of the county. Estimates provided by the County Planner’s office indicate that in 2015 approximately 68% of county residents and 70% of households were located in a geographically small portion of the county (designated here as the “west-county” area) which includes Park City and the adjoining Snyderville Basin (zip code areas 84060, 84068 and 84098). About 21% of residents and 20% of households were located in the “south county” area, which includes Paea, Oakley, Marion, Kamas, Francis, Woodland, and surrounding areas (zip codes areas 84036, 84055 and 84061). The “north county” area, which includes the county seat of Coalville along with smaller communities such as Hoytsville, Wanship, Echo, Henefer, and more sparsely populated areas extending to the north and east north toward the Wyoming border (zip code areas 84017, 84024 and 84033), contained just over 11% of the county population and slightly fewer than 11% of households. To insure adequate representation of residents from these three distinct parts of the county and sufficient numbers of observations from each area to allow for statistically accurate comparisons, a stratified probability sampling procedure was used to select potential survey participants. Separate random samples of residential mailing addresses located within the grouped zip code areas corresponding to the western, northern, and southern portions of the county were obtained through Marketing Systems Group, a national commercial service that provides samples drawn from up-to-date U.S. Postal Service delivery sequence files. The initial sampling procedure produced lists of 1,000 residential mailing addresses for each of the three county segments. A map indicating the locations of cities and towns included in the three county areas described above appears on the next page.

1 The 2011 survey involved a separation of the county into two areas for sampling and analysis purposes – western portions of the county, and eastern portions of the county. In combination the northern and southern portions of the county as designated in the 2013 and 2015 surveys correspond to what was classified as the eastern portion of the county in the 2011 study.
Survey administration involved a multi-wave, mixed-mode strategy based on the “tailored design” principles outlined by Dillman, Smyth and Christian (2009). Potential participants were presented with the option of responding via either a traditional printed questionnaire or an on-line (SurveyMonkey) system. Sampled households received up to five separate mailings soliciting participation in the survey process. A pre-notification post card was sent via first-class mail on March 23, 2015 to sampled households announcing the survey and indicating that a questionnaire would be mailed soon. A full survey packet containing the printed questionnaire booklet, explanatory cover letter, and postage-paid return envelope was sent to all sampled households on April 6th, following deletion of addresses for which pre-notification cards were
returned as undeliverable. The cover letter and questionnaire instructions requested that the survey be completed and returned by the adult household member whose birthday had occurred most recently, an effective and straightforward method for randomizing selection of individual respondents within sampled households. In addition, the letter provided recipients with information on how those selected for participation could access a dedicated website in order to complete the questionnaire on-line, if they preferred that option over a traditional printed survey format. This first questionnaire mailing was followed several days later by a postcard reminder requesting that recipients complete and return the questionnaire if they had not already done so. A follow-up mailing of full survey packets to non-responding households was sent on April 24th. On May 15th a final follow-up mailing of survey packets was sent to all households that had still not responded by that date.

Deletion of mailing address listings for which survey materials were returned as undeliverable (primarily vacant households) produced final samples of 903 residential addresses in the western portion of Summit County, 958 addresses in the northern portion of the county, and 912 in the southern portion of the county. At the time of the June 30th cut-off date for processing returns, completed questionnaires had been returned by 349 west-county residents, 404 north-county residents, and 332 south-county residents. Of the 1085 total survey responses, only 53 were provided via the on-line survey option. Survey response rates (39.1% countywide; 38.6% for western Summit County, 42.2% for northern areas of the county, and 36.4% for southern areas of the county), while slightly lower than those obtained from the 2011 and 2013 citizen surveys, are reasonably high given recent trends of declining response rates for mail as well as other types of surveys in the U.S. (see Dillman, Smyth and Christian 2009; Lozar et al. 2008). For the county as a whole, the statistical margin of error associated with the combined countywide sample is approximately +/- 3%. The margins of error for data based on survey responses from the three designated portions of the county are
approximately +/- 5.2% for western areas of the county, +/- 4.7% for north-county areas, and +/- 5.3% for south-county areas.  

In this report the response patterns for individual survey questions are presented separately for the western, northern, and southern portions of Summit County, and also for the county as a whole. Because the proportions of households included in the samples for western, northern and southern portions of the county are not identical, it is important to recognize that survey response patterns for the county as a whole cannot be derived from a simple averaging of responses across those three areas. In order to produce accurate countywide estimates the survey data were statistically weighted prior to analysis, to adjust for variations in numbers of residents, differing sampling proportions, and differing numbers of responses for the three county segments. As a result, all data charts representing county-wide response patterns are based on data that have been adjusted using this statistical weighting procedure. Where questions included in the 2015 survey are identical to those asked in 2011 and/or 2013, the countywide response patterns for 2015 are compared to those obtained in earlier years.

---

2 Theoretical margins of error are calculated based on an assumed even distribution of responses across response categories to a given question. The actual margin of error is smaller when response distributions are uneven and higher proportions of response fall into one category rather than another.
SURVEY RESULTS

Quality of Life in Summit County

Overall quality of life rating. The first survey question asked respondents to rate the “overall quality of life in Summit County.” As indicated in Figure 1a, very few respondents in any part of the county considered quality of life to be either “very poor” or “below average.” In all three areas approximately one-half of respondents rated quality of life in the county as “above average.” At the same time, west-county residents were far more likely to rate quality of life in the county as “excellent” (47.6%) than those living in either north-county (18.6%) or south-county (23.9%) areas. Figure 1b presents statistically weighted countywide response patterns to this quality of life question for the 2011, 2013 and 2015 surveys of Summit County residents. Response patterns across these years are generally quite similar, with approximately 85% to 90% of respondents indicating that they considered quality of life in the county to be either above average or excellent. At the same time, there is evidence of a slight trend toward more positive ratings over time, with the percentage of residents rating local quality of life as “excellent” higher in 2015 (39.8%) than in either 2013 (37.4%) or 2011 (35.4%).

Factors contributing to quality of life. Respondents were next asked to indicate the extent to which several factors do or do not contribute in positive ways to the quality of life they experience in Summit County. Responses to an item focusing on “outdoor recreation opportunities” (Figure 2a) revealed that while residents of all three portions of the county consider this to be important, those living in the west-county area were considerably more likely to consider outdoor recreation opportunities “very important” to their quality of life (84.5%) than were either north-county (46.4%) or south-county (60.9%) residents. Countywide response distributions derived from the 2011, 2013 and 2015 surveys (Figure 2b) indicate a slight increase over time in the percentage of residents who consider outdoor recreation opportunities as a very important element of the quality of life they experience in Summit County.
Figure 1a. Citizens’ ratings of the overall quality of life in Summit County

Figure 1b. Citizens’ ratings of the overall quality of life in Summit County (countywide results for 2011, 2013 and 2015)
Figure 2a. Citizens' ratings of the importance of outdoor recreation opportunities to quality of life in Summit County

Figure 2b. Citizens' ratings of the importance of outdoor recreation opportunities to quality of life in Summit County (countywide results for 2011, 2013 and 2015)
Similarly, responses to an item addressing the importance of the “clean environment of the area” as a contributor to quality of life (Figure 3a) were concentrated in the “very important” category across all three portions of the county. However, the percentage of residents highlighting this as “very important” to their quality of life was higher in the west-county area (90.4%) than was the case in either the north-county (73.8%) or south-county (85%) areas. Countywide response patterns for this question were very similar in 2011, 2013 and 2015 (Figure 3b), with nearly identical percentages of responses falling into the “very important” category in each of these years (88.1% in 2011, and 87.5% in both 2013 and 2015).

A majority of respondents throughout Summit County indicated that they consider “the rural and agricultural character” of portions of the county as an important and positive contributor to quality of life. Response distributions summarized in Figure 4a reveal that those living in the more rural north-county and south-county areas were considerably more likely to consider this “very important” (69.6% and 75.3%, respectively) than were those living in western Summit County (52.4%). A comparison of countywide responses from the 2011, 2013 and 2015 surveys (Figure 4b) reveals that a higher percentage of county residents viewed the rural/agricultural character of some county areas as “very important” in 2013 (60.3%) than was the case in 2011 (47.8%) or in 2015 (58.8%).

In contrast, residents of the three county areas were generally similar in their evaluations of the importance of the “local availability of retail shopping and commercial services” as a quality of life factor (Figure 5a). In all areas the most common response (37.4% for the north-county area, 40.5% for the south-county area, and 39.7% for the west-county area) was that this is a “moderately important” contributor to local quality of life. When considering the county as a whole, overall response patterns from the 2015 survey are very similar to those obtained in 2011 and 2013(Figure 5b), with approximately 60% of respondents in each of these years considering the availability of shopping/commercial facilities to be either moderately or very important to local quality of life.
Figure 3a. Citizens' ratings of the importance of the clean environment of the area to quality of life in Summit County

Figure 3b. Citizens' ratings of the importance of the clean environment of the area to quality of life in Summit County (countywide results for 2011, 2013 and 2015)
Figure 4a. Citizens’ ratings of the importance of the rural and agricultural character of some parts of the county to quality of life in Summit County.

Figure 4b. Citizens’ ratings of the importance of the rural and agricultural character of some parts of the county to quality of life (countywide results for 2011, 2013 and 2015).
Figure 5a. Citizens’ ratings of the importance of the local availability of retail shopping and commercial services to quality of life in Summit County

Figure 5b. Citizens’ ratings of the importance of the local availability of retail shopping and commercial services to quality of life in Summit County (countywide results for 2011, 2013 and 2015)
Preferences for the future of Summit County. The next series of survey questions asked respondents to indicate how important a variety of factors might be to their vision about what they would prefer to see happen in Summit County over the next ten years or so.

When asked about the importance of “protecting and preserving agricultural land and open space,” the most common response was “very important” among north-county (71.8%), south-county (77.5%) and west-county (75.1%) residents (Figure 6a). The statistically weighted countywide response distributions derived from the 2011, 2013 and 2015 surveys are nearly identical, with three-fourths of responses in each of these years falling into the “very important” category (Figure 6b).

By comparison, relatively few respondents felt that it is very important to “increase the number of commercial shopping facilities” in the county (Figure 7a). Not surprisingly, a higher proportion of respondents in the more heavily developed western portion of the county with far more commercial development and relatively easy access to the Salt Lake City area considered this “not at all important” (61.9%) than was the case among residents of more rural north-county (43.1%) and south-county (41.9%) areas. The statistically weighted countywide response patterns from the 2015 survey are very similar to those obtained in 2011 and 2013, with just over half of residents in each of these survey years considering an increase in the number of commercial shopping facilities to be “not at all important” to the future of Summit County (Figure 7b).
Figure 6a. Citizens' ratings of the importance of protecting and preserving agricultural land and open space in Summit County

Figure 6b. Citizens' ratings of the importance of protecting and preserving agricultural land and open space in Summit County (countywide results for 2011, 2013 and 2015)
Figure 7a. Citizens' ratings of the importance of increasing the number of commercial shopping facilities in Summit County

- North: Not at all Important 61.9%, Slightly Important 43.1%, Moderately Important 19.3%, Very Important 6.3%
- South: Not at all Important 41.9%, Slightly Important 31.2%, Moderately Important 26.7%, Very Important 9.4%
- West: Not at all Important 33.7%, Slightly Important 31.2%, Moderately Important 14.9%, Very Important 6.3%

Figure 7b. Citizens' ratings of the importance of increasing the number of commercial shopping facilities in Summit County (countywide results for 2011, 2013 and 2015)

- 2011: Not at all Important 53.2%, Slightly Important 52.4%, Moderately Important 13.4%, Very Important 4.6%
- 2013: Not at all Important 55.9%, Slightly Important 29.2%, Moderately Important 11.1%, Very Important 5.0%
- 2015: Not at all Important 28.5%, Slightly Important 28.6%, Moderately Important 13.7%, Very Important 4.4%
Broad-based concerns about the effects of ongoing residential growth and development in Summit County are revealed by responses to an item that asked survey participants to indicate the importance of “limiting the expansion of new residential development.” As indicated in Figure 8a, most respondents from all three portions of the county considered this either moderately or very important to the future of the county. Not surprisingly, such concerns were most prevalent in the more heavily developed west-county area, where nearly half of survey respondents (47.1%) said that limiting residential expansion is “very important.” In contrast, only three out of ten respondents (20.1%) living in north-county areas and just over four out of ten (42.1%) of those in south-county areas selected the “very important” response category. Comparison of results from the 2011, 2013 and 2015 surveys (Figure 8b) reveals generally similar overall response tendencies across these three points in time, with 44-46% of residents countywide considering limitations on new residential development to be “very important.”

A similar pattern is evident in responses to a question asking about the importance of “placing limits on future land development through enforcement of ordinances involving housing density and parcel size requirements” (Figure 9a). A substantial majority of responses were in the “moderately important” or “very important” categories (a combined 68.8% for north-county residents, 83.2% for south-county residents, and 88% for west-county residents). At the same time, it is important to note that west-county residents were more likely to consider this “very important” (66.5%) than were those living in either the northern (32.4%) or southern (57%) portions of Summit County. Overall countywide response patterns for 2011, 2013 and 2015 were highly similar (Figure 9b), with about six out of ten county residents in each of these years considering it very important to place limits on future land development.
Figure 8a. Citizens' ratings of the importance of limiting the expansion of new residential development in Summit County

Figure 8b. Citizens' ratings of the importance of limiting the expansion of new residential development in Summit County (countywide results for 2011, 2013 and 2015)
Figure 9a. Citizens’ ratings of the importance of placing limits on future land development in Summit County through enforcement of ordinances involving housing density and parcel size requirements

Figure 9b. Citizens’ ratings of the importance of placing limits on future land development in Summit County through enforcement of ordinances involving housing density and parcel size requirements (countywide results for 2011, 2013 and 2015)
When asked about the importance of “increasing job opportunities in clean, high-tech industries, health services, and other professional service occupations” (Figure 10a), a majority of respondents in all three portions of the county said this is either moderately or very important to the future of Summit County. Response distributions were similar across the all three areas of the county, with between 64% and 69% of responses falling into the moderately or very important categories. The statistically weighted countywide response patterns derived from the 2011, 2013 and 2015 surveys reveal a slight decline over time in the percentage of county residents saying they believe it is “very important” for the future of Summit County that such job opportunities be increased. (Figure 10b).

Respondents were also asked to consider the importance of “developing strategies to reduce traffic congestion in more heavily-developed portions of Summit County.” As indicated in Figure 11a, respondents living in the west-county area were far more likely to rate this as “very important” (70.2%) than were those living in either the north-county (33.7%) or south-county (44.1%) areas. Results based on the statistically-weighted countywide totals for 2015 (Figure 11b) indicate that overall approximately six out of ten county residents considered reducing traffic congestion to be “very important” to the future of the county (a similar question was not included in the 2011 or 2013 surveys).
Figure 10a. Citizens’ ratings of the importance of increasing job opportunities in Summit County in clean, high-tech industries, health services, and other professional service occupations.

Figure 10b. Citizens’ ratings of the importance of increasing job opportunities in Summit County in clean, high-tech industries, health services & & and other professional service occupations (countywide results for 2011, 2013 and 2015).
Figure 11a. Citizens' ratings of the importance of developing strategies to reduce traffic congestion in more heavily-developed portions of Summit County

Figure 11b. Citizens' ratings of the importance of developing strategies to reduce traffic congestion in more heavily-developed portions of Summit County (countywide results for 2015)
Changes in the desirability of Summit County. The next question in this portion of the questionnaire asked respondents to indicate whether over the past 4-5 years Summit County had become “more or less desirable as a place to live.” Across all three portions of the county relatively few residents expressed a view that local living conditions had become either “much more desirable” or “much less desirable” (Figure 12a). At the same time, the combined percentage of respondents indicating that the county had become either somewhat or much less desirable as a place to live was higher among those living in west-county areas (46.1%) than was the case for either north-county (36.3%) or south-county (33.3%) residents. For the county as a whole (Figure 12b), statistically weighted results reveal that in 2015 a slightly smaller percentage of residents believed the county had become somewhat or much more desirable (combined 28.1%) than was the case in either 2011 (30.1%) or 2013 (34.9%).

Survey participants were also asked to explain in their own words why they thought the county had become more or less desirable over the past 4-5 years. West-county residents who thought conditions had become less desirable and who also provided an explanation as to why they felt that way commented most often on the effects of widespread population growth and general “overdevelopment” (41% of volunteered comments), excessive traffic and congestion (38% of responses), and excessive commercial development (6%). North-county residents who thought conditions had become less desirable most frequently commented on population growth and general overdevelopment (48% of volunteered comments), excessive county government control on property use or other private matters (11%), increased traffic levels and traffic congestion (7%), and inequities in the distribution of political power and resource allocations across different portions of the county (7%). Among south-county residents who felt conditions had become less desirable, the most common explanations included population growth and general overdevelopment (57% of volunteered comments) and excessive traffic and congestion (16%).
Figure 12a. Over the past 4 to 5 years has Summit County become MORE or LESS desirable as a place to live?

- Much more desirable: North 5.4%, South 11.7%, West 16.8%
- Somewhat more desirable: North 18.8%, South 18.8%, West 16.8%
- Stayed about the same: North 41.5%, South 36.1%, West 25.6%
- Somewhat less desirable: North 28.5%, South 28.4%, West 28.4%
- Much less desirable: North 7.8%, South 6.8%, West 7.8%

Figure 12b. Over the past 4 to 5 years has Summit County become MORE or LESS desirable as a place to live? (countywide results for 2011, 2013 and 2015)

- Much more desirable: 2011 10.1%, 2013 12.1%, 2015 9.5%
- Somewhat more desirable: 2011 22.8%, 2013 18.6%, 2015 18.6%
- Stayed about the same: 2011 35.5%, 2013 32.2%, 2015 29.4%
- Somewhat less desirable: 2011 29.4%, 2013 28.8%, 2015 28.8%
- Much less desirable: 2011 5.6%, 2013 4.2%, 2015 6.6%
Similarly, some of those who believed conditions in Summit County had become more desirable over the past 4-5 years also provided comments to explain their viewpoints. Among west-county residents, the specific reasons provided for such positive views about trends in the county included outdoor recreation opportunities and areas (38% of volunteered responses), expanded availability and convenience of shopping and other commercial facilities (14%), and improved or expanded public infrastructure and services (14%). Explanations for positive views about changes provided by north-county residents focused most frequently on expansion of shopping and other commercial facilities and services (23% of volunteered responses) the high quality of environmental conditions in the area (16%), improved or expanded public services and infrastructure (7%), and the availability of outdoor recreation opportunities and areas (7%). Among south-county residents who perceived positive change patterns, the most frequently-volunteered explanations included the high quality of the environment (21% of comments) and expanded availability and convenience of shopping and other commercial facilities (19%).
Growth and Growth Management

The next theme addressed in the survey involved issues related to growth and development experiences and growth management strategies. The first in this series of questions asked survey participants to indicate their agreement or disagreement that “growth and development in Summit County is causing a loss of important and valued characteristics that have traditionally been associated with the area.” As indicated in Figure 13a, a majority of residents in all three portions of the county expressed agreement with this statement, and few disagreed. One-third (33.6%) of north-county residents, four out of ten (40.5%) south-county residents, and 45% of west-county residents said they “strongly agree” that growth and development are causing a loss of valued county characteristics. In each area about three out of ten respondents said they “somewhat agree” with the statement. The statistically weighted countywide response pattern (Figure 13b) reveals that in 2015 a higher proportion of county residents (42.8%) believed growth and development effects are causing a loss of valued county characteristics than was the case when survey participants were asked to consider a similarly-worded question in 2011 (36.4%) and in 2013 (34.3%).

Given concerns expressed by many residents over the impacts of growth and development, it is not surprising to find that most survey participants believe “proper planning policies to manage growth and development are needed to control the rate and locations of development in Summit County.” In all three portions of the county a majority of survey participants expressed some level of agreement with this statement, and relatively few disagreed (see Figure 14a). It is noteworthy that the percentage of respondents saying they “strongly agree” with the need for growth management policies is considerably higher among those living in the more populous and more heavily developed western portion of the county (69.9%) than among those who live in the north-county (41.3%) or south-county (56.3%) areas. Statistically-weighted estimates of overall county-wide response distributions (Figure 14b) suggest that in 2015 there was a stronger tendency for county residents to agree that growth management policies are needed (64.2%) than was the case when a similarly-worded question was posed in the 2011 and 2013 citizen surveys.
Figure 13a. Levels of agreement that growth and development are causing a loss of important and valued characteristics

Figure 13b. Levels of agreement that growth and development are causing a loss of important and valued characteristics (countywide results for 2011, 2013 and 2015)
Figure 14a. Levels of agreement that proper planning policies to manage growth and development are needed to control the rate and locations of development in Summit County

Figure 14b. Levels of agreement that proper planning policies to manage growth and development are needed to control the rate and locations of development in Summit County (countywide results for 2011, 2013 and 2015)
Distinctions between the orientations of residents living in different areas of Summit County become especially apparent when we turn attention to questions that examine growth management issues in the context of private property rights concerns. For example, when presented with a statement that “it is not acceptable to restrict private property rights in order to protect the environment or preserve open space,” expressions of agreement were considerably more widespread among those living in the northern portion of the county, and to a lesser extent among those living in the southern portion of the county, than was the case among west-county residents (Figure 15a). More than six out of ten west-county residents indicated that they either somewhat or strongly disagreed with this pro-private property rights statement (a combined 62.8% of responses). In contrast, only 40.6% of south-county residents and just 29.9% of north-county residents expressed disagreement. Expressions of agreement that private property rights should not be restricted were most common among north-county residents (29.6% said they “strongly agree” and 25.8% “somewhat agree”). For the county as a whole, response patterns from the 2015 survey are similar to those observed in both 2011 and 2013. In all three years county residents were more likely overall to disagree than to agree with the notion that it is not acceptable to restrict private property rights in order to protect the environment or preserve open space (Figure 15b).

Similarly, over three-fourths (76.4%) of west-county residents expressed some level of disagreement with a statement that “uses of private land should be based on what the owner wants, without being restricted by regulations or land use ordinances,” while only 44.9% of south-county residents and just 29.3% of north-county residents expressed disagreement (Figure 16a). Agreement that private property owners should be able to use their lands as they wish was far higher among north-county residents (a combined 60.9% of responses) than was the case for either of the other county areas. The statistically weighted countywide response distributions produced by this question were very similar in 2015 to those observed in 2011 and 2013 (Figure 16b).
Figure 15a. Levels of agreement that it is not acceptable to restrict private property rights to protect the environment or preserve open space
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Figure 15b. Levels of agreement that it is not acceptable to restrict private property rights to protect the environment or preserve open space (countywide results for 2011, 2013 and 2015)
Figure 16a. Levels of agreement that uses of private land should be based on what the owner wants, without being restricted by regulations or land use ordinances.

Figure 16b. Levels of agreement that uses of private land should be based on what the owner wants, without being restricted by regulations or land use ordinances (countywide results for 2011, 2013 and 2015).
Respondents from the northern portion of the county were somewhat more likely than those living in south-county and west-county areas to agree with a statement that “future growth and development should occur throughout Summit County, so that people who live in less-developed areas of the county will have more access to the economic opportunities and services that accompany such growth.” As indicated in Figure 17a, nearly half of north-county residents (a combined 46.5%) indicated that they either “strongly agree” or “somewhat agree” with this idea. Statistically-weighted countywide response patterns (Figure 17b) indicate that overall levels of agreement with this notion of more evenly-distributed patterns of development throughout the county were lower in 2015 than had been the case when survey participants were asked to consider a similarly-worded question at the time of the 2011 and 2015 citizen surveys.
Figure 17a. Levels of agreement that future growth and development should occur throughout Summit County, so people living in less-developed areas of the county will have more access to the economic opportunities and services.

Figure 17b. Levels of agreement that future growth and development should occur throughout Summit County, so people living in less-developed areas of the county will have more access to economic opportunities and services. (Countywide results for 2011, 2013, 2015)
The final item in this series asked respondents to indicate their agreement or disagreement with a statement that “Summit County should require most new housing developments to be built at higher densities with smaller lots.” The combined percentage of respondents indicating that they strongly agree or somewhat agree with the idea of requiring higher-density housing development was slightly larger among those living in west-county areas (23%) than was the case among either north-county (19.4%) or south-county (18.8%) residents (Figure 18a). However, across all three areas of the county respondents were considerably more likely to indicate disagreement as opposed to agreement with the statement. The weighted countywide response distribution for 2015 (Figure 18b) indicates that approximately 4 out of 10 residents (39.1%) would express strong disagreement with requirements involving higher density/smaller lot housing development. The countywide response patterns also suggest that expressions of disagreement regarding such policies were more widespread in 2015 than had been the case when survey participants were asked to consider a similar question in the 2011 and 2013 surveys. That difference may be attributable in part to a change in question wording, since in earlier surveys the issue of higher density/smaller lot requirements was linked to preservation of open space.
Figure 18a. Levels of agreement that Summit County should require most new housing developments to be built at higher density with smaller lots

Figure 18b. Levels of agreement that Summit County should require most new housing developments to be built at higher density with smaller lots (countywide results for 2011, 2013 and 2015)
Rating the Performance of Summit County Government

The next major section of the survey questionnaire included a number of questions asking respondents to provide input regarding their experiences and satisfaction with Summit County government offices and services.

**Ratings of county government performance.** Respondents were asked first to provide their assessment of the “overall quality of services provided by county government.” As indicated in Figure 19a, only 15.4% of north-county residents, 9.7% of south-county residents, and 6.2% of west-county residents considered the quality of services provided by the county to be either “very poor” or “below average.” In the northern and southern sections of the county a majority of respondents rated the quality of services provided by the county as “average” (59.7% of north-county residents, and 55.6% of south-county residents). Those living in western Summit County were considerably more likely to rate county services as either “above average” or “excellent” (a combined 56.1% of responses) than were either north-county (24.9%) or south-county (34.7%) residents.

The statistically weighted county-wide response patterns to this question indicate that in 2015 four out of ten residents considered the overall quality of county services to be “average” (43.6%), while nearly half considered county-provided services to be either above average or excellent and only 7.9% said they are either very poor or below average (Figure 19b). Overall, the response distribution suggests that in 2015 county residents were more satisfied overall with the services provided by county government (a combined 48.5% in the “above average” or “excellent” response categories) than was the case when an identical question was posed in surveys conducted in 2011 (35.6%) and 2013 (40%).
Figure 19a. Citizens' ratings of the overall quality of services provided by Summit County government

Figure 19b. Citizen's ratings of the overall quality of services provided by Summit County government (countywide results for 2011, 2013 and 2015)
The next survey question asked respondents to assess the “overall value of services, facilities and programs you receive from the county in return for what you pay in taxes and fees.” Over one-half of north-county and south-county residents, and one-third of those living in western portions of the county, indicated that they consider the value of services relative to what they pay in taxes and fees to be “average” (Figure 20a). West-county residents were considerably more likely to rate the value received in county services as either “above average” or “excellent” (55.5% in combination) than were those living in northern (18.1%) or southern (28.5%) areas of Summit County. The distributions produced from statistically weighted county-wide response data for this question (Figure 20b) provide clear evidence of a positive trend in response patterns over time – the estimated percentage of county residents considering the value of county services, facilities and programs to be above average or excellent was notably higher as of 2015 (46.1%) than was the case in either 2011 (33.7%) or 2013 (40.9%).

Responses to a question that asked about “the availability of information about Summit County services, facilities and programs” (Figure 21a) again reveal that roughly one-half of survey participants from both the north-county (52.1%) and south-county (49.7%) areas rated this aspect of county government performance as “average,” while only 37% of west-county respondents selected that response option. Nearly one-half (a combined 49.5%) of west-county residents, but only 22% of north-county residents and 26.3% of south-county residents, rated the availability of information about county services as either above average or excellent. Overall countywide response patterns for this question are compared across time in Figure 21b. That comparison makes it clear that by 2015 there had been a substantial increase in the percentage of residents rating the availability of information about county-provided services as above average or excellent (a combined 41.9%), relative to what was indicated by survey responses collected in 2011 (27.1%) and 2013 (31.6%).
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Figure 20a. Citizens' ratings of the value of county services, facilities and programs relative to taxes and fees

Figure 20b. Citizen's ratings of the value of county services, facilities and programs relative to taxes and fees (countywide results for 2011, 2013 and 2015)
Figure 21a. Citizens' ratings of the availability of information about Summit County services, facilities and programs

Figure 21b. Citizens' ratings of the availability of information about Summit County services, facilities and programs (countywide results for 2011, 2013 and 2015)
A similar pattern of responses was obtained for a question asking about “the efforts of Summit County government to keep you informed about local issues and events” (Figure 22a). In all three portions of the county respondents were most likely to select the “average” response category. At the same time, west-county residents were considerably more likely to rate this facet of county government performance as above average or excellent (a combined 42.7% of responses) than were those living in the north-county (16.9%) or south-county (20.4%) areas. The statistically weighted countywide response patterns derived from the 2011, 2013 and 2015 surveys (Figure 22b) indicate that citizens’ views on this topic have become more positive over time -- the combined percentage of responses falling into the “above average” and “excellent” categories was similar in 2011 (26.6%) and 2013 (26.8%), but increased to 35.5% by 2015.

When asked to evaluate “Summit County’s fiscal responsibility in using available funds to address the most important needs of county residents” (Figure 23a), survey participants from all three county areas were most likely to rate this aspect of local government as “average” (50.6% of north-county residents, 59.9% of south-county residents; 46.5% of west-county residents). However, west-county residents were considerably more likely than those living in other areas to rate the county’s fiscal responsibility as better than average (a combined 38.2% selected the “above average” or “excellent” response choices). Meanwhile, north-county residents were more likely than those living in either western or southern parts of the county to select the “below average” and “very poor” response options (a combined 35.4% of responses). Comparison of the statistically weighted countywide response patterns for this question (Figure 23b) reveals that following a slight increase from 2011 to 2013 in the percentage of respondents who considered the fiscal responsibility of county government to be less than average, ratings of county government fiscal responsibility became more positive in 2015.
Figure 22a. Citizen's ratings of efforts of county government to keep them informed about Summit County issues and events

Figure 22b. Citizens' ratings of efforts by county government to keep them informed about Summit County issues and events (countywide results for 2011, 2013 and 2015)
Figure 23a. Citizens' ratings of Summit County's fiscal responsibility in using available funds to address the most important needs of county residents

Figure 23b. Citizen's ratings of Summit County's fiscal responsibility in using available funds to address the most important needs of county residents (countywide results for 2011, 2013 and 2015)
Figure 24a summarizes responses to a question that asked residents to rate “the responsiveness of the Summit County Council to citizen input.” Once again the most common response across all three areas of the county was to rate this aspect of county government as “average.” However, a substantial minority of responses from north-county residents fell into the “below average” (25.4%) or “very poor” (15.1%) categories, as was true to a lesser extent for south-county residents (19.7% and 9.7%, respectively). West-county residents were considerably more likely to rate the responsiveness of county government as “above average” to “excellent” (a combined 28.5%) than were north-county (10.8%) or south-county (15.4%) residents. A comparison of county-wide response tendencies involving a similarly-worded question asked in 2011 and 2013 (in those years reference was made to county government rather than to the Summit County Council) reveals little change over time in residents’ assessments of the responsiveness of the County Council or county government (see Figure 24b).

Recent experiences with county government offices. The next series of survey questions focused on residents’ recent experiences in contacting Summit County government offices to obtain information, obtain a permit, or do other business. As indicated in Figure 25a, approximately one out of three respondents from the south-county (29.4%) and west-county (29.6%) areas and nearly four out of ten (38.3%) of those living in northern parts of the county said they had contacted a county government office at least once during the past year to conduct such business. For the county as a whole, the percentage of residents indicating contact with a county office was slightly lower in 2015 than had been the case in either 2011 or 2013 (Figure 25b).
Figure 24a. Citizens' ratings of the responsiveness of the Summit County Council to citizen input

Figure 24b. Citizens' ratings of the responsiveness of the Summit County Council to citizen input (countywide results for 2011, 2013 and 2015)
Figure 25a. Percentage of survey participants reporting contact with a Summit County government office during the past year

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Year</th>
<th>North</th>
<th>South</th>
<th>West</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2011</td>
<td>38.3%</td>
<td>29.4%</td>
<td>29.6%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2013</td>
<td>51.7%</td>
<td>61.7%</td>
<td>70.6%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2015</td>
<td>53.4%</td>
<td>70.4%</td>
<td>70.0%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Figure 25b. Percentage of survey participants reporting contact with a Summit County government office during the past year (countywide results for 2011, 2013 and 2015)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Year</th>
<th>Yes</th>
<th>No</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2011</td>
<td>40.0%</td>
<td>60.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2013</td>
<td>35.5%</td>
<td>64.5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2015</td>
<td>30.5%</td>
<td>69.5%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
When asked to identify the specific office they had contacted most recently, a total of 288 survey participants from across the county identified a total of 20 different county offices. Of these, the most frequently identified point of recent contact was the county’s planning/zoning/building permit offices, which were mentioned by 29.5% of those who identified a specific office they had been in contact with. Other offices reported as a point of contact by more than 5% of respondents included the county clerk’s office (listed by 11.8% of those who identified an office), the county recorder’s office (9.4%), motor vehicles/licensing (7.6%), the county assessor’s office (6.9%), public works (5.9%), and animal control (5.6%).

Following these initial questions, respondents were asked several questions focusing on their satisfaction with the county government office they had most recently contacted to conduct business or obtain information. As indicated in Figure 26a, across all portions of Summit County most survey participants were satisfied with “the accuracy of the information or assistance” they received from the county office they had contacted most recently; the percentage indicating they were “very satisfied” was especially high (50.7%) among north-county residents. For the county as a whole, expressions of satisfaction in response to this question were similar to those observed in previous years (see Figure 26b).

A substantial majority of respondents from each of the three county areas also expressed satisfaction with “how quickly the county staff in this office responded” to their needs (Figures 27a and 27b). Once again higher levels of satisfaction were reported by north-county residents, and countywide response tendencies in 2015 were similar to those observed in 2011 and 2015. These same general patterns of generally high satisfaction with county government offices were also evident when survey participants were asked to indicate “how effectively your concerns or needs were addressed” when they had contact with a Summit County government office (Figure 28a and 28b).

---

3 Many residents did not make a clear distinction between the planning department and the building department. Because of this, responses involving reference to those offices are combined for analysis purposes.
Figure 26a. Levels of satisfaction with accuracy of information or assistance from most recently contacted Summit County government office

Figure 26b. Levels of satisfaction with accuracy of information or assistance from most recently contacted Summit County government office (countywide results for 2011, 2013 and 2015)
Figure 27a. Levels of satisfaction with how quickly county staff responded

Figure 27b. Levels of satisfaction with how quickly county staff responded (countywide results for 2011, 2013 and 2015)
Figure 28a. Levels of satisfaction with how effectively concerns or needs were addressed by county offices

Figure 28b. Levels of satisfaction with how effectively concerns or needs were addressed by county offices (countywide results for 2011, 2013 and 2015)
On balance, responses to this series of questions reveal generally high levels of satisfaction among most Summit County residents regarding their experiences in contacting county offices for information or to conduct business. At the same time, it is important to note that weighted data for the county as a whole indicate that nearly 32% of residents who reported contact with a county office during the past year expressed some degree of dissatisfaction with how effectively their needs were addressed. Because the overall response patterns outlined to this point do not allow for a determination as to whether such expressions of dissatisfaction occur at a higher rate among survey participants reporting contact with any particular county office, additional analyses were conducted. Specifically, we selected only those respondents who said they were very or somewhat dissatisfied with how effectively their needs were addressed, and then looked at the county offices those dissatisfied individuals reported as having contact with. For the county as a whole only 92 individuals who indicated dissatisfaction in response to this question also provided information identifying a specific county office they had contacted during the past year. Among those individuals, 31 of them (33.7%) mentioned the planning and/or building departments (many residents appear not to distinguish between these two county departments). Among those who expressed dissatisfaction and listed an office they had been in contact with, the area-specific percentages identifying the planning and/or building departments as a source of dissatisfaction were 27% (8 individuals) among north-county residents, 28% (8 individuals) among south-county residents, and 48% (16 individuals) among west-county residents. The county office identified next most frequently by those expressing dissatisfaction was the Assessor’s office (listed by 8.7% of those who provided a response). All other county departments were listed by only small numbers of persons who had expressed dissatisfaction.
Setting Priorities for County Government and Services

The next set of questions asked survey participants to provide input regarding the extent to which a broad range of county government services should be given higher or lower priority with respect to the future allocation of public funds. For each of these items, respondents were asked to indicate whether they thought funding for a particular service should be “significantly reduced,” “reduced slightly,” “stay at current levels,” or “increased.” The first item in this series asked respondents to consider the funding of “public library services.” As indicated in Figure 29a, a substantial majority of residents across all three areas of the county said funding should stay at current levels. Among those calling for a change, slightly higher percentages suggested that funds should be increased as opposed to decreased. Comparison of overall countywide response distributions derived from surveys conducted in 2011, 2013 and 2015 indicate slightly lower support for increased library funding in 2015 than was the case in 2013 (Figure 29b).

A similar response pattern resulted when residents were asked to consider allocation of county funds to support public health clinics (Figure 30a). Across the three county areas approximately two-thirds of respondents thought funding levels should stay at current levels, and about one in four felt funding for health clinics should be increased. The countywide response patterns for 2011, 2013 and 2015 (Figure 30b) exhibited only small differences.

The next item in this series focused on allocation of funding to support the county sheriff’s department. As indicated in Figure 31a, respondents were most likely to prefer that funding remain at current levels (58.2% of north-county responses, 56.8% of south-county responses, and 65.5% of west-county responses). South-county residents were slightly more likely to support some increase in funding levels for the sheriff’s department than were those living in northern or western areas of the county. Response distributions for the county as a whole (Figure 31b) indicate that there was slightly more support for increased funding of the sheriff’s department in 2015 than had been the case in 2011 or 2013.
Figure 29a. Citizens' views about future funding priorities for public library services

- Funding should be significantly reduced
- Funding should be reduced slightly
- Funding should stay at current levels
- Funding should be increased

Figure 29b. Citizens' views about future funding priorities for public library services (countywide results for 2011, 2013 and 2015)

- Funding should be significantly reduced
- Funding should be reduced slightly
- Funding should stay at current levels
- Funding should be increased
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Figure 30a. Citizens' views about future funding priorities for public health clinics

Figure 30b. Citizens' views about future funding priorities for public health clinics (countywide results for 2011, 2013 and 2015)
Funding should be significantly reduced  
Funding should be reduced slightly  
Funding should stay at current levels  
Funding should be increased

Figure 31a. Citizens' views about future funding priorities for the Summit County sheriff’s department
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Figure 31b. Citizens' views about future funding priorities for the Summit County sheriff’s department (countywide results for 2011, 2013 and 2015)

2011  
2013  
2015
When asked to consider allocation of public funds to support emergency response (EMT) services, county residents were again most likely to indicate a preference that funding remain at current levels. That response option was selected by 61.1% of north-county residents, 59.7% of south-county residents, and 73.3% of west-county residents (see Figure 32a). At the same time, a substantial minority of residents in all three areas indicated support for having increased public funds directed to emergency services; this was especially the case among those living in north-county (35%) and south-county (37.5%) areas. Countywide response patterns (Figure 32b) suggest that support for increased funding of EMT services was slightly higher in 2015 than had been the case in either 2011 or 2013.

The next item focused on the degree to which public funding should be allocated in support of public use indoor recreation centers. As indicated in Figure 33a, a substantial majority of west-county (60.4%) and south-county (66%) residents indicated a preference for funding of such recreation centers to remain at current levels. While north-county residents were also most likely to express a preference that funding for such facilities remain at current levels (42.7%), they were at the same time more likely than residents of either the west-county or south-county areas to prefer a funding decrease. When considering the county as a whole (Figure 33b), response patterns derived from the 2015 survey indicate slightly more overall support for increased allocations of funding of indoor recreation centers than was evident in 2013.

Responses to the next item, which focused on the question of funding for public use outdoor sports fields, revealed generally similar tendencies (Figure 34a). Once again a majority of respondents in all three areas of Summit County said funding of these facilities should remain at current levels, though the percentage selecting that response option was higher among south-county (65.9%) and west-county (64.8%) residents than among north-county residents (53.3%). Residents of the northern area were more likely than those living elsewhere to prefer reduced funding for outdoor sports facilities. Countywide results for 2011, 2013 and 2015 (Figure 34b) were generally similar, reflecting a strong tendency for most Summit County residents to prefer that funding of such outdoor sports facilities remain at current levels.
Figure 32a. Citizens' views about future funding priorities for emergency response (EMT) services

Figure 32b. Citizens' views about future funding priorities for emergency response (EMT) services (countywide results for 2011, 2013 and 2015)
Funding should be significantly reduced | Funding should be reduced slightly | Funding should stay at current levels | Funding should be increased

North | South | West

0.0% | 0.0% | 0.0% | 0.0%

13.4% | 4.7% | 7.5% | 14.8%

26.4% | 14.8% | 12.3% | 19.2%

66.0% | 60.4% | 42.7% | 57.6%

17.5% | 14.5% | 19.8% | 18.4%

Figure 33a. Citizens' views about future funding priorities for public use indoor recreation centers

2011 | 2013 | 2015

0.0% | 0.0% | 0.0% | 0.0%

4.8% | 16.3% | 14.3% | 15.5%

7.6% | 14.3% | 18.5% | 18.5%

64.5% | 59.6% | 57.6% | 19.2%

18.4% | 15.5% | 18.5% | 19.2%

Figure 33b. Citizens' views about future funding priorities for public use indoor recreation centers (countywide results for 2011, 2013 and 2015)
Funding should be significantly reduced
Funding should be reduced slightly
Funding should stay at current levels
Funding should be increased

Figure 34a. Citizens' views about future funding priorities for public use outdoor sports fields

Figure 34b. Citizens' views about future funding priorities for public use outdoor sports fields (countywide results for 2011, 2013 and 2015)
Next, survey participants were asked to consider the question of having public funds allocated for the provision of public use hiking and biking trails (Figure 35a). Among west-county residents, just over one-half (53.3%) of respondents said funding levels for trails should remain at current levels, while over one-third (37.1%) expressed a preference for increased funding and only 9.6% called for decreased funding. In contrast, nearly half (45.7%) of north-county residents indicated that funding of hiking/biking trails should remain at current levels, while a combined 40.5% expressed a preference for some level of funding reduction and only 13.8% felt funding should be increased. The views of south-county residents fell between these two extremes, with about half of respondents from that portion of the county (49.7%) indicating a preference for current funding levels, 24.1% saying they would like to see increased funding of public use trails, and 26.3% calling for some degree of funding reduction. The weighted countywide response distributions (Figure 35b) suggest that in 2015 residents were generally more likely to support increased funding of hiking and biking trails than had been the case in either 2011 or 2013.

As indicated in Figure 36a, few residents from any part of Summit County said they would prefer to see reduced allocations of public funds in support of senior citizen centers and services. In all three areas a majority of respondents stated that funding should remain at current levels. Support for increased funding of senior centers and programs was highest among west-county (27.4%) and north-county (27.2%) residents, and only slightly lower among those living in southern areas of Summit County (23.2%). Countywide, the statistically weighted response distributions derived from the 2011, 2013 and 2015 surveys (Figure 36b) reveal that by 2015 there had been a slight increase in the percentage of residents expressing a preference that funding of senior citizen centers and services remain at current levels.
Figure 35a. Citizens' views about future funding priorities for public use hiking and biking trails

Figure 35b. Citizens' views about future funding priorities for public use hiking and biking trails (countywide results for 2011, 2013 and 2015)
Figure 36a. Citizens' views about future funding priorities for senior citizen centers and services

Figure 36b. Citizens' views about future funding priorities for senior citizen centers and services (countywide results for 2011, 2013 and 2015)
The next question in this series focused on future funding priorities for fire protection services (Figure 37a). In all three areas of the county a majority of survey respondents thought funding for fire protection should remain at current levels, and very few indicated any preference for reduced funding. Support for increased allocation of county funds for fire protection services was highest among south-county residents (39.7%), slightly lower among north-county residents (31.5%), and lowest among west-county residents (24.5%). A comparison of countywide response patterns for 2011, 2013 and 2015 (Figure 37b) indicates a modest increase over time in the percentage of residents expressing support for increased allocations of funding for fire protection services.

Across each of the three areas of the county, most residents said that use of public funds to support public bus transportation systems should remain at current levels (Figure 38a). Support for increased funding was relatively limited in the north-county area (13.1% of responses), somewhat higher in the south-county area (21.9%), and highest in the western portion of Summit County (30.5%). Preferences for some level of funding reduction were more frequent among north-county residents (a combined 31.3% of responses) than among residents of either the southern (23.8%) or western (8.1%) areas of the county. The countywide response distributions (Figure 38b) indicate a modest increase by 2015 in the percentage of residents supporting increased use of county funds to support public transportation services.
Figure 37a. Citizens' views about future funding priorities for fire protection services

Figure 37b. Citizens' views about future funding priorities for fire protection services (countywide results for 2011, 2013 and 2015)
Figure 38a. Citizens' views about future funding priorities for public bus transportation services

Figure 38b. Citizens' views about future funding priorities for public bus transportation services (countywide results for 2011, 2013 and 2015)
As indicated in Figure 39a, residents’ views about the allocation of funding to support county planning and zoning enforcement differed considerably across the three areas of Summit County. In all areas over one-half of respondents indicated a preference that funding for such activities remain at current levels. At the same time, the percentage of respondents expressing a preference for some degree of reduced funding for planning and zoning enforcement was considerably higher in northern Summit County (a combined 39.3% of responses) than in either the south-county (23.3%) or west-county (13.3%) areas. Also, support for increased funding of such activities was much higher in the western areas of the county (27.2% of responses) than elsewhere. Countywide, there is evidence of a modest overall increase in support for increased funding of county planning and zoning enforcement by 2015 when compared to survey response patterns obtained in 2011 and 2013 (Figure 39b).

Results summarized in Figure 40a indicate that across all three portions of Summit County there is little support for reductions in the amount of county funding allocated to solid waste recycling. In each of the three areas about two-thirds of respondents expressed a preference that funding of recycling programs remain at current levels. Nearly one-third (31.5%) of west-county residents and over one-fourth (26.6%) of south-county residents, but only about 14% of those living in the north-county area, said they would prefer to see funding for such programs increased. Countywide response distributions derived from the 2011, 2013 and 2015 surveys were very similar overall (Figure 40b).
Figure 39a. Citizens' views about future funding priorities for county planning and zoning enforcement

Figure 39b. Citizens' views about future funding priorities for county planning and zoning enforcement (countywide results for 2011, 2013 and 2015)
Funding should be significantly reduced  
Funding should be reduced slightly  
Funding should stay at current levels  
Funding should be increased

Figure 40a. Citizens' views about future funding priorities for solid waste recycling programs
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Figure 40b. Citizens' views about future funding priorities for solid waste recycling programs (countywide results for 2011, 2013 and 2015)

2011  
2013  
2015

2.4% 2.3% 2.2%  
7.0% 5.5% 5.8%  
62.3% 65.3% 63.3%  
28.2% 27.0% 28.7%
Most county residents also support continuation of current funding allocations to support air and water quality monitoring (Figure 41a). At the same time, there is considerable variation in views about this issue across the three areas of the county. Nearly four out of ten (38%) of west-county residents called for an increase in funding to support of such programs, a result that can likely be attributed at least in part to greater exposure to air and water quality problems in that more heavily-populated portion of the county nearest to Utah’s Wasatch Front corridor. In contrast, only about 16% of those living in the north-county area and 23% of south-county respondents indicated that funding of air and water quality monitoring programs should be increased. Weighted response distributions derived from the three survey periods (Figure 41b) indicate nearly identical levels of support in 2013 and 2015 for air and water quality monitoring.

The next two questions in this series focused on different aspects of county road maintenance. First, respondents were asked to indicate their preferences for future funding of annual maintenance of county roadways (Figure 42a). Across the three areas of Summit County a substantial majority (61% to 67%) of residents said they would prefer that funding levels for road maintenance remain at current levels. Very few indicated a preference for reduced funding, while approximately three out of ten said funding should be increased. A comparison of countywide response patterns from the 2011, 2013 and 2015 surveys (Figure 42b) indicates that residents expressed slightly more support for increased funding of road maintenance programs (29.3%) in 2015 than in 2013 (26.7%), but less support than was observed in 2011 (36.1%).

When asked about funding of winter snow plowing on county roadways (Figure 43a), a large majority of residents from the north-county (75.7%), south-county (74.1%) and west-county (85%) areas indicated that funding should remain at current levels. Support for increased allocations of funds for winter snow plowing was higher in the northern (18.8%) and southern (19.2%) areas than in the western portion of the county (11.1%). Statistically weighted countywide response distributions derived from the 2011, 2013 and 2015 surveys reveal a slight increase over time in the percentage of residents who would prefer that funding for snow plowing remain at current levels (Figure 43b).
Figure 41a. Citizens' views about future funding priorities for air and water quality monitoring

- Funding should be significantly reduced: North 6.3%, South 3.5%, West 1.5%
- Funding should be reduced slightly: North 15.1%, South 8.9%, West 5.4%
- Funding should stay at current levels: North 62.2%, South 64.2%, West 55.1%
- Funding should be increased: North 16.4%, South 23.3%, West 38.0%

Figure 41b. Citizens' views about future funding priorities for air and water quality monitoring (countywide results for 2011, 2013 and 2015)

- Funding should be significantly reduced: 2011 2.6%, 2013 2.0%, 2015 2.4%
- Funding should be reduced slightly: 2011 10.0%, 2013 8.5%, 2015 7.1%
- Funding should stay at current levels: 2011 62.1%, 2013 57.3%, 2015 57.7%
- Funding should be increased: 2011 25.3%, 2013 32.2%, 2015 32.8%
Figure 42a. Citizens' views about future funding priorities for annual maintenance of county roadways

Figure 42b. Citizen's views about future funding priorities for maintenance of county roadways (countywide results for 2011, 2013 and 2015)
Figure 43a. Citizens' views about future funding priorities for winter plowing of county roadways

Figure 43b. Citizens' views about future funding priorities for winter plowing of county roadways (countywide results for 2011, 2013 and 2015)
Figure 44a summarizes responses to an item that asked county residents to indicate whether they thought allocations of public funds to support the purchase of private lands for open space protection and public recreation access should be increased or decreased. Responses to this question reveal considerable differences of opinion among residents living in different areas of Summit County. Among west-county residents the most common response was that funding should be increased (52.5%). South-county and north-county residents were most likely to say that funding for such programs should remain at current levels (40.3% and 36.4% of responses, respectively). Over four out of ten (42.2%) of those living in north-county areas expressed a preference for some reduction in funding to purchase lands for open space and recreation areas, with nearly one in four (22%) indicating that they would like to see funding of such programs reduced significantly. Statistically weighted countywide response distributions derived from the 2011 and 2013 surveys were highly similar, but for 2015 there was a substantial increase in overall levels of support for increased funding to purchase lands for open space protection and public recreation access (Figure 44b). Indeed, by 2015 the countywide totals reveal that expressions of support for increased funding of such land purchase programs (46%) substantially outweighed preferences for reduced funding (a combined 20.2%).

Finally, survey participants were asked about the allocation of public funds to support economic development and business recruitment programs. In all three areas of the county respondents were most likely to indicate that they thought funding for such programs should remain at current levels (Figure 45a). At the same time, respondents in all areas were considerably more likely to indicate a preference for some reduction in the expenditure of county funds for such economic development activities (a combined 43.5% of north-county responses, 39.9% of south-county responses, and 39.9% of west county responses) than to support funding increases. While countywide response distributions derived from the 2011, 2013 and 2015 surveys were generally similar (Figure 45b), there is evidence of a slight increase over time in the percentages of residents expressing support for either significant reductions or slight reductions in funding of economic development and business recruitment programs.
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Figure 44a. Citizens' views about future funding priorities for purchase of private lands for open space protection and public recreation access
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Figure 44b. Citizens' views about future funding priorities for purchase of private lands for open space protection and public recreation access (countywide results for 2011, 2013 and 2015)
Figure 45a. Citizens’ views about future funding for economic development and business recruitment programs

Figure 45b. Citizens’ views about future funding for economic development and business recruitment programs (countywide results for 2011, 2013 and 2015)
Transportation Conditions and Priorities

The 2015 Summit County Citizens Survey included a new series of questions focused specifically on residents’ experiences with and perspectives on transportation conditions and traffic issues. The first set of questions in this series asked about the extent to which residents use any alternative form of transportation (e.g., public transportation, bicycling, or walking) rather than a car for various purposes.

As indicated in Figure 46a, survey participants living in the northern and southern portions of Summit County were considerably less likely to report the use of alternative transportation forms for recreational activities than were west-county residents. Only 23.4% of north-county respondents and 35.1% of south-county residents said they use such alternative transportation forms for recreational activities either frequently or always, compared to over half (55.6%) of west-county respondents. The weighted countywide totals displayed in Figure 46b reveal that nearly four out of ten residents of Summit County use alternative transportation forms for recreational activities “frequently” (38.4%), while nearly one out of ten (9.7%) say they do so “always.”

Survey participants were also asked to report the extent to which they use alternative forms of transportation for purposes involving shopping or keeping appointments. Response distributions summarized in Figure 47a reveal that for all three portions of the county respondents were most likely to say they “never” use alternative forms of transportation for such purposes (82.8% of north-county responses, 80.2% of south-county responses, and 57.3% of west-county responses). The statistically weighted countywide response totals (Figure 47b) indicate that nearly two-thirds of residents “never” use alternative transportation for shopping or appointment purposes.
Figure 46a. Reported frequency of use of alternative forms of transportation for recreational activities

- **North**: 50.6%, 39.9%, 15.8%, 5.6%
- **South**: 26.0%, 25.0%, 17.8%, 11.4%
- **West**: 38.4%, 29.3%, 28.7%, 5.6%

Figure 46b. Reported frequency of use of alternative forms of transportation for recreational activities (countywide results for 2015)

- **Never**: 24.3%
- **Occasionally**: 27.6%
- **Frequently**: 38.4%
- **Always**: 9.7%
Figure 47a. Reported frequency of use of alternative forms of transportation for shopping or appointments

Figure 47b. Reported frequency of use of alternative forms of transportation for shopping or appointments (countywide results for 2015)
A third question in this series asked respondents about their use of alternative forms of transportation for commuting to work. A large majority of survey participants in all three areas of Summit County (92.4% of north-county respondents, 90.1% of south-county respondents, and 78.4% of west-county respondents) said they never do so (Figure 48a). Statistically weighted results for the county as a whole (Figure 48b) reveal that about 82% of residents do not use alternative forms of transportation when they commute.

The next item in this portion of the questionnaire asked respondents to indicate whether, if traffic congestion in parts of Summit County continues to worsen, they are likely to begin to use an alternative form of transportation (other than a car) on a regular basis. Results summarized in Figure 49a indicate that residents of western Summit County were more likely to anticipate that they may use alternative forms of transportation in the future than were those living in north-county or south-county areas. In combination 40.9% of west-county respondents said they probably or definitely would expect to do so, compared to only 14% of north-county respondents and 21.8% of south-county respondents. The statistically-weighted countywide totals reported in Figure 49b suggest that while most Summit County residents do not anticipate future use of alternative forms of transportation in response to worsening traffic congestion, about 34% say they either probably or definitely would do so.

Respondents were asked next to provide their ratings of the quality of the public bus transportation system that currently provides service to the Park City/Snyderville Basin portions of Summit County, in terms of its ability to meet the needs of county residents. Not surprisingly, west-side residents who live in areas where this bus service is most accessible were considerably more likely to rate the service as “above average” (55%) than were those living in north-county (21.7%) or south-county (26.4%) areas (Figure 50a). At the same time, relatively few respondents from any of the three areas rated this service as either very poor or below average. When considering the county as a whole, the statistically weighted response distribution reported in Figure 50b suggests that four out of ten residents consider the bus service to be at least “average,” and nearly half consider it “above average.”
Figure 48a. Reported frequency of use of alternative forms of transportation for commuting to work
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Figure 48b. Reported frequency of use of alternative forms of transportation for commuting to work (countywide results for 2015)
Figure 49a. If traffic congestion in parts of Summit County continues to become worse, are you likely to begin using an alternative form of transportation on a regular basis?

- North: Definitely not 36.1%, Probably not 49.9%, Probably yes 46.5%, Definitely yes 34.4%
- South: Definitely not 25.5%, Probably not 52.8%, Probably yes 11.9%, Definitely yes 2.1%
- West: Definitely not 12.6%, Probably not 18.1%, Probably yes 3.7%, Definitely yes 6.5%

Figure 49b. If traffic congestion in parts of Summit County continues to become worse, are you likely to begin using an alternative form of transportation on a regular basis? (countywide results for 2015)

- Definitely not: 17.7%
- Probably not: 48.1%
- Probably yes: 28.8%
- Definitely yes: 5.5%
Figure 50a. Citizens' ratings of the public bus transportation system that provides service to the Park City/Snyderville Basin portions of Summit County

Figure 50b. Citizens' ratings of the public bus transportation system that provides service to the Park City/Snyderville Basin portions of Summit County (countywide results for 2015)
When asked what might make them more likely to regularly use the public bus transportation system in Summit County, north-county and south-county residents were most likely to indicate that having bus stops located nearer to their homes (47.1% and 49%, respectively) and having stops located more conveniently near to areas where they wish to travel (27.2% and 26%) would encourage increased bus use (Figure 51a). Among west-county residents, respondents most frequently identified “more frequent service” as something that would encourage regular use of the bus system (checked by 45.1% of respondents), followed by having bus stops located near to their homes (37.9%) and stops located conveniently near to areas where they wish to travel (30.1%). Statistically weighted countywide totals (Figure 51b) indicate that having bus stops located nearer to residents’ homes, providing more frequent service, and having stops located more conveniently near areas where residents wish to travel were identified most often as factors that would encourage regular use of the bus system in Summit County.

The next item in the series of questions about transportation issues asked survey participants for their views about how improvements to or expansion of the public transportation system that serves western portions of Summit County should be pursued. As indicated in Figure 52a, the percentage of respondents indicating that no improvements are needed was considerably higher in the northern (37%) and southern (33.3%) areas of Summit County than in the west-county area (11.5%). Among the majority of respondents from all areas who indicated that some improvements to or expansion of the public transportation are needed, most indicated that such improvements should address the needs of both local residents and visitors (32.8% of north-county responses, 41.4% of south-county responses, and 46.4% of west-county responses). Overall support for improvements that would address the needs of both residents and visitors is also clearly evident from the statistically weighted countywide response totals (Figure 52b).
Figure 51a. Which of the following would make you more likely to regularly use the public bus transportation system in Summit County? (Please check ALL that apply)

- More frequent service to reduce waiting times: North - 13.2%, South - 45.1%, West - 47.1%
- Bus stops located nearer to your home: North - 12.1%, South - 49.2%, West - 37.9%
- Bus stops located more conveniently near areas where you wish to travel: North - 27.2%, South - 30.1%, West - 26.0%
- Availability of Wi-Fi service on the bus: North - 5.7%, South - 6.6%, West - 6.0%
- More comfortable bus stop facilities: North - 10.1%, South - 16.5%, West - 6.0%

Figure 51b. Which of the following would make you more likely to regularly use the public bus transportation system in Summit County? (countywide results for 2015)

- More frequent service to reduce waiting times: 35.1%
- Bus stops located nearer to your home: 41.1%
- Bus stops located more conveniently near areas where you wish to travel: 28.9%
- Availability of Wi-Fi service on the bus: 9.0%
- More comfortable bus stop facilities: 13.4%
Figure 52a. Citizens' views about how improvements to or expansion of the public transportation system that serves western portions of Summit County should be pursued

Figure 52b. Citizens' views about how improvements to or expansion of the public transportation system that serves western portions of Summit County should be pursued (countywide results for 2015)
Respondents were also asked whether they thought the county should consider expanding public bus systems to provide service to parts of Summit County located outside of the Park City/Snyderville Basin areas. As indicated in Figure 53a, across all three areas of the county slightly over four out of ten respondents felt such expansion should occur, so long as it were to involve a fee charged to riders to cover the costs of expanded service. Support for expansion of bus service to outlying areas at no cost to riders was highest among west-county respondents (28.8%) and lowest among north-county respondents (21.5%). Interestingly, the percentage of respondents indicating a belief that expansion of bus service to other parts of the county is not needed was highest among north-county (37.2%) and south-county (33%) residents – the areas of Summit County where bus service is currently not available. Looking at the countywide weighted totals (Figure 53b) it is clear that there is overall support for an expansion of public bus service, particularly if rider fees are implemented to cover increased system costs.

Responses to a similarly-structured question regarding potential expansion of public bus systems to provide service for commuting workers who live in Summit County but travel to work elsewhere (such as the Salt Lake City area) were also generally positive. Response distributions summarized in Figure 54a indicate that across all three portions of the county a majority of survey participants (54.5% of north-county respondents, 55.8% of south-county respondents, and 67.5% of west-county respondents) felt such expansion of bus services should occur so long as rider fees were implemented to cover increased system costs. Relatively few respondents from any of the county areas expressed support for bus system expansion if it were to occur at no cost to riders. For the county as a whole, statistically weighted response totals indicate that nearly two-thirds of county residents would support such system expansion if rider fees were imposed to cover increased costs for such services (Figure 54b).
Figure 53a. Citizens' views about expanding public bus systems to provide service in parts of Summit County located outside of the Park City/Snyderville Basin areas

No -- expansion of bus service to these areas is not needed
Yes -- expansion of bus service should be provided at no cost to riders
Yes -- expansion of bus service but only if it involves a fee charged to riders

North
South
West

37.2% 33.0% 28.8%
21.5% 25.8% 28.8%
41.3% 41.2% 42.4%

Figure 53b. Citizens' views about expanding public bus systems to provide service in parts of Summit County located outside of the Park City/Snyderville Basin areas (countywide results for 2015)

No -- expansion of bus service to these areas is not needed
Yes -- expansion of bus service should be provided at no cost to riders
Yes -- expansion of bus service but only if it involves a fee charged to riders

30.5% 27.4% 42.1%
Figure 54a. Citizens' views about expanding public bus systems to provide service for commuters who live in Summit County but need to travel to work elsewhere

No -- expansion of bus service to these areas is not needed: 38.8% North, 33.9% South, 24.4% West
Yes -- expansion of bus service should be provided at no cost to riders: 6.8% North, 10.3% South, 8.1% West
Yes -- expansion of bus service but only if it involves a fee charged to riders: 54.5% North, 55.8% South, 67.5% West

Figure 54b. Citizens' views about expanding public bus systems to provide service for commuters who live in Summit County but need to travel to work elsewhere (countywide results for 2015)

No -- expansion of bus service to these areas is not needed: 27.7%
Yes -- expansion of bus service should be provided at no cost to riders: 8.4%
Yes -- expansion of bus service but only if it involves a fee charged to riders: 63.8%

2015
The last two questions focused on transportation issues asked survey participants to consider issues involving funding for transportation programs and projects in Summit County. First, respondents were whether they thought the Summit County Council should reduce or increase the use of public funds for transportation improvement programs and projects. Across all three areas of the county relatively few residents felt funding for transportation programs should be reduced, though support for funding reductions was higher among north-county residents than elsewhere (Figure 55a). North-county and south-county residents were most likely to believe that funding for transportation programs and projects should remain at current levels (45.2% and 44.5% of responses, respectively), while west-county residents were most likely to believe that funding should be increased slightly (43.1%) or increased significantly (17.4%). The statistically weighted countywide response totals presented in Figure 55b reveal that there is little overall support for reduced funding of transportation programs, with nearly equal percentages of residents saying they would support either maintaining funding at current funding levels or increasing funding slightly.
Finally, respondents were asked how they thought additional funding for transportation improvements in Summit County should be spent, if such funding were to become available. Results summarized in Figure 56a indicate that respondents throughout the county were most likely to express support for funding allocations that would be split evenly between public transportation and road system improvements. At the same time, west-county residents were consistently more supportive of allocations that would prioritize funding of public transportation improvements than were those living elsewhere, while respondents from the north-county and south-county areas were more likely to express support for allocations that would prioritize road system improvements. When considering the county as a whole (Figure 56b), statistically weighted response patterns indicate that roughly equal percentages of residents would prefer that such funds focus entirely or primarily on public transportation (a combined 30%), that funding be split evenly between public transportation and road system improvements (36.4%), and that funding be focused entirely or primarily on road system improvements (a combined 33.6%).
Figure 55a. Citizens' views about whether the Summit County Council should reduce or increase the use of public funds for transportation improvement programs and projects

Figure 55b. Citizens' views about whether the Summit County Council should reduce or increase the use of public funds for transportation improvement programs and projects (countywide results for 2015)
Figure 56a. Citizens' views about how additional public funding for transportation-related improvements should be spent, if such funding did become available

Figure 56b. Citizens' views about how additional public funding for transportation-related improvements should be spent, if such funding did become available (countywide results for 2015)
Economic Development Conditions and Priorities

An entirely new series of questions was inserted into the 2015 survey questionnaire to explore the views of Summit County residents about economic development issues, priorities, and preferences. The first of these questions asked survey participants to indicate the extent to which they think efforts to encourage economic development and the creation of new job opportunities should be a priority for Summit County government. Response distributions summarized in Figure 57a reveal that across all three areas of the county respondents were most likely to indicate that economic development efforts should be a “medium” priority for county government. Support for making economic development a “high” priority was most evident in the north-county and south-county areas, (where about one out of five residents selected that response option), and considerably lower among west-county residents (about one out of ten responses). At the same time, the combined percentage of respondents saying that economic development should be either “no priority at all” or a “low” priority for county government ranged from a low of 29.1% of north-county responses, to 37.1% among south-county residents, to 46.6% among west-county residents. The statistically-weighted totals for the county as a whole (Figure 57b) indicate that Summit County residents generally tend to see economic development as either a medium or low priority issue.
Figure 57a. Citizens' views about the extent to which efforts to encourage economic development and the creation of new job opportunities should be a priority for Summit County government

Figure 58b. Citizens' views about the extent to which efforts to encourage economic development and the creation of new job opportunities should be a priority for Summit County government (countywide results for 2015)
Next, survey participants were asked to think about what they would consider to be important evidence that economic development is taking place in the community where they live. Nine possible indicators of economic development were presented with this question, and respondents were instructed to select up to three indicators they considered most important or appropriate for their community. As indicated in Figure 58a, among north-county residents the indicators selected as most important included “improving amenities and services to improve local quality of life and make the community more attractive to businesses looking for a place to start up or relocate” (15%), “working to improve average wage levels for jobs available in the community” (16%), “improving the educational assets and skills of local residents so they are better prepared to fill new jobs as they become available” (16%), and “working to increase the number of local-area jobs in your community” (22%). Indicators selected as most important by south-county residents included “improving amenities and services to improve local quality of life and make the community more attractive to businesses looking for a place to start up or relocate” (13%), “working to increase the number of local-area jobs” (18%), “working to improve average wage levels for jobs available in your community” (19%), and “improving the educational assets and skills of local residents so they are better prepared to fill new jobs as they become available” (20%). The indicators selected most frequently by west-county residents included “working to attract more tourists and expand tourism-related business” (10%), “working to increase the number of local-area jobs” (12%), “improving the educational assets and skills of local residents so they are better prepared to fill new jobs as they become available” (15%), “recruiting and expanding high-tech and scientific research businesses” (17%), “improving amenities and services to improve local quality of life and make the community more attractive to businesses looking for a place to start up or relocate” (17%), and “working to improve average wage levels for jobs available in your community” (17%). Countywide, “working to improve average wage levels” is considered most important as an indicator of local economic development, followed by “improving the educational assets and skills of local residents so they are better prepared to fill new jobs” and “improving amenities and services to improve local quality of life and make the community more attractive to businesses” (Figure 58b).
Figure 58a (part 1). Which of the following would you consider to be important evidence that successful economic development is taking place in the community where you live?

- Starting any type of new companies
- Expanding manufacturing industries
- Expanding retail businesses
- Expanding high-tech and scientific research

North South West

9% 6% 6% 5% 3% 3% 5% 2% 6% 9% 17%

Figure 58a (part 2). Which of the following would you consider to be important evidence that successful economic development is taking place in the community where you live?

- Improving the skills of local residents
- Improving local “quality of life”
- Expanding tourism-related businesses
- Increasing the number of local-area jobs
- Improving average wage levels

North South West

16% 20% 15% 15% 17% 17% 10% 7% 5% 22% 18% 12% 16% 19% 17%
Figure 58b. Which of the following would you consider to be important evidence that successful economic development is taking place in the community where you live? (countywide results for 2015)
The next item in this section of the questionnaire asked survey participants to think about things that they consider to be ‘competitive strengths’ that give their community an advantage in attracting new business and other economic development opportunities. The question provided a list of twelve different community attributes, and respondents were instructed to select up to three of those that they considered most important as competitive strengths of their community. Figure 59a (presented in two parts) provides a summary of how Summit County residents viewed the ‘competitive strengths’ that may serve to increase economic development opportunities in their communities. Figure 59b presents the statistically weighted response patterns for the county as a whole.

Among north-county residents, the attributes most often identified as competitive strengths included “a positive local business climate in terms of government and citizen support” (10% of responses), “the quality of local public schools” (10%), “the quality of the local natural environment” (17%), and “the lifestyle conditions that exist in the community” (19%). South-side residents were most likely to highlight “a positive local business climate in terms of government and citizen support” (10%), “a reasonable commuting time to get to places where people work or conduct business” (10%), “the quality of the local natural environment” (22%), and “the lifestyle conditions that exist in the community” (48%). Among west-side residents, the attributes most often identified as key competitive strengths included “a positive local business climate” (10%), “the quality of local public schools” (12%), “geographic location in relation to transportation systems or population centers” (14%), “the quality of the local natural environment” (21%), and “the lifestyle conditions that exist in the community” (68%). Although response percentages differ across the three areas of Summit County, in each area the two most highly-rated attributes considered by residents to be competitive strengths are “the quality of the natural environment” and “the lifestyle conditions that exist in the community.”
Figure 59a (part 1). To what extent do you consider any of the following to be “competitive strengths” that give the community where you live an advantage in attracting new businesses and other economic development opportunities?

Figure 59a (part 2). To what extent do you consider any of the following to be “competitive strengths” that give the community where you live an advantage in attracting new businesses and other economic development opportunities?
Figure 59b. To what extent do you consider any of the following to be “competitive strengths” that give the community where you live an advantage in attracting new businesses and other economic development opportunities? (countywide results for 2015)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Factor</th>
<th>Percentage</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Geographic location</td>
<td>12.1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The quality of the local environment</td>
<td>20.6%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The community lifestyle conditions</td>
<td>23.7%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Availability of building sites for business development</td>
<td>4.1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A positive local “business climate”</td>
<td>5.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A capable local workforce</td>
<td>3.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The quality of transportation infrastructure</td>
<td>11.3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The quality of local public (K-12) schools</td>
<td>3.4%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Availability of affordable housing</td>
<td>3.4%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Availability of high-quality jobs for local residents</td>
<td>8.1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A reasonable commuting time</td>
<td>2.9%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Availability of high-quality internet</td>
<td>0.0%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: Countywide results for 2015.
A similarly-structured question asked survey participants to indicate what they considered to be the most important ‘competitive weaknesses’ that place the community where they live at a disadvantage in attracting new businesses or other economic development opportunities. The question presented a list of twelve attributes that might represent such weaknesses or liabilities, and respondents were once again asked to identify up to three of those that they considered most important with respect to competitive weaknesses experienced by their communities.

Response patterns across the three areas of Summit County are summarized in Figure 60a (two parts), and for the county as a whole in Figure 60b. Attributes identified most frequently by north-county residents as competitive weaknesses that limit local economic development prospects included “geographic location in relation to transportation systems or population centers” (10% of responses), “a poor local business climate in terms of government and citizen support” (12%), “limited availability of high-quality, high-wage jobs for local residents” (16%), and “limited availability of affordable housing” (17%). For south-county residents the issues highlighted most frequently as competitive weaknesses included “geographic location in relation to transportation systems or population centers” (14% of responses), “limited availability of high-quality, high-wage jobs for local residents” (16%), and “limited availability of affordable housing” (20%). West-county residents emphasized two key competitive weaknesses – “limited availability of high-quality, high-wage jobs” (22% of responses) and “limited availability of affordable housing” (24%). Across all three areas and for the county as a whole, the two issues that emerged most strongly as competitive weaknesses were the limited availability of high-quality, high-wage jobs and the limited availability of affordable housing.
Figure 60a (part 1). To what extent do you consider any of the following to be “competitive weaknesses” that place the community where you live at a disadvantage in attracting new businesses or other economic development opportunities?

- Geographic location
- The condition of the local environment
- The community lifestyle conditions
- Limited building sites for business development
- A poor local “business climate”
- An incapable local workforce

North | South | West
--- | --- | ---
Geographic location | 14% | 10% | 4%
The condition of the local environment | 2% | 1% | 1%
The community lifestyle conditions | 3% | 2% | 4%
Limited building sites for business development | 8% | 6% | 8%
A poor local “business climate” | 12% | 9% | 4%
An incapable local workforce | 5% | 6% | 8%

Figure 60a (part 2). To what extent do you consider any of the following to be “competitive weaknesses” that place the community where you live at a disadvantage in attracting new businesses or other economic development opportunities?

- Poor quality transportation infrastructure
- Poor quality of local public (K-12) schools
- Limited availability of affordable housing
- Limited availability of high-quality jobs
- An unreasonable commuting time
- Limited availability of internet

North | South | West
--- | --- | ---
Poor quality transportation infrastructure | 5% | 3% | 7%
Poor quality of local public (K-12) schools | 4% | 5% | 3%
Limited availability of affordable housing | 17% | 20% | 26%
Limited availability of high-quality jobs | 16% | 16% | 22%
An unreasonable commuting time | 7% | 8% | 7%
Limited availability of internet | 8% | 8% | 10%
Figure 60b. To what extent do you consider any of the following to be “competitive weaknesses” that place the community where you live at a disadvantage in attracting new businesses or other economic development opportunities? (countywide results for 2015)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Geographic location</th>
<th>The condition of the local environment</th>
<th>The community lifestyle conditions</th>
<th>Limited building sites for business development</th>
<th>A poor local “business climate”</th>
<th>An incapable local workforce</th>
<th>Poor quality transportation infrastructure</th>
<th>Poor quality of local public (K-12) schools</th>
<th>Limited availability of affordable housing</th>
<th>Limited availability of high-quality jobs</th>
<th>Limited commuting time</th>
<th>Limited availability of internet</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>6%</td>
<td>1%</td>
<td>3%</td>
<td>8%</td>
<td>6%</td>
<td>7%</td>
<td>6%</td>
<td>4%</td>
<td>24%</td>
<td>20%</td>
<td>7%</td>
<td>9%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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The next question in the series addressing economic development issues asked respondents to identify different kinds of businesses they would consider most desirable for the community where they live. The question presented a list of twelve different types of businesses, and respondents were again asked to indicate up to three of those that they would consider most desirable. Response patterns across the three separate areas of Summit County are summarized in Figure 61a, and countywide totals are presented in Figure 61b.

Among north-county residents, the types of businesses identified as “most desirable” were “lodging and food services businesses” (12% of responses) and “ranching and farming” (19%); several other business types (research and development; professional services; arts/entertainment/recreation; retail stores; and health care businesses) were also highlighted, though less frequently. South-county residents most often identified “research and development business” (10%), “professional services” (10%), “lodging and food services” (10%), “arts, entertainment and recreation businesses” (13%), and “ranching and farming” (18%) as the most desirable types of businesses for their communities. Among west-county residents the most frequently-mentioned types of “most desirable” businesses were “health care” (11%), “corporate offices of national and regional businesses” (12%), “professional services” (14%), “research and development businesses” (20%), and “arts, entertainment and recreation businesses” (21%). Overall, responses to this question illuminate some clear differences across the three areas of the county, with north-county and south-county residents far more likely than west-county residents to highlight ranching and farming as a most-desirable local business type.
Figure 61a (part 1). Looking at the different kinds of businesses below, please select UP TO THREE of these you would consider MOST DESIRABLE for the community where you live.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Business Category</th>
<th>North</th>
<th>South</th>
<th>West</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Research and development</td>
<td>9%</td>
<td>10%</td>
<td>20%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Professional services</td>
<td>9%</td>
<td>10%</td>
<td>14%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Arts, entertainment, and recreation</td>
<td>9%</td>
<td></td>
<td>13%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Construction</td>
<td>6%</td>
<td>5%</td>
<td>1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ranching and Farming</td>
<td>19%</td>
<td>18%</td>
<td>5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Corporate offices</td>
<td>4%</td>
<td>5%</td>
<td>12%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Figure 61a (part 2). Looking at the different kinds of businesses below, please select UP TO THREE of these you would consider MOST DESIRABLE for the community where you live.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Business Category</th>
<th>North</th>
<th>South</th>
<th>West</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Manufacturing</td>
<td>8%</td>
<td>5%</td>
<td>2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sales and customer support</td>
<td>2%</td>
<td>3%</td>
<td>2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Warehousing and transportation logistics centers</td>
<td>4%</td>
<td>2%</td>
<td>1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lodging and food services</td>
<td>12%</td>
<td>12%</td>
<td>7%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Retail stores</td>
<td>9%</td>
<td>8%</td>
<td>4%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Health care</td>
<td>9%</td>
<td>9%</td>
<td>11%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Figure 61b. Looking at the different kinds of businesses below, please select UP TO THREE of these you would consider MOST DESIRABLE for the community where you live (countywide results for 2015)
The final question in this series asked survey participants to identify up to three types of businesses that they consider to be least desirable for the community where they live. Responses across the three designated areas of Summit County are presented in Figure 62a, and overall (statistically weighted) countywide response tendencies are summarized in Figure 62b. For north-county residents, the business types identified most often as least desirable included “manufacturing and manufactured goods assembly businesses” (11% of responses), “corporate offices of national and regional businesses” (14%), “on-line and telephone sales and customer support businesses” (14%), and “warehousing and transportation logistics centers for regional or national retail businesses” (17%). A similar pattern emerged in the responses of south-county residents, who most often identified “on-line and telephone sales and customer support businesses” (13%), “corporate offices of national and regional businesses” (14%), “manufacturing and manufactured goods assembly businesses” (15%), and “warehousing and transportation logistics centers for regional or national retail businesses” (21%) as least-desirable business types. A somewhat different pattern emerged among west-county residents, who most frequently selected “construction businesses” (11% of responses), “on-line and telephone sales and customer support businesses” (11%), “crop and animal production operations” (12%), “manufacturing and manufactured goods assembly businesses” (23%), and “warehousing and transportation logistics centers for regional and national retail businesses” (26%) as the least desirable business types for their communities.
Figure 62a (part 1). Looking at the different kinds of businesses below, please select UP TO THREE of these you would consider LEAST DESIRABLE for the community where you live.

- Research and development
- Professional services
- Arts, entertainment, and recreation
- Construction
- Ranching and Farming
- Corporate offices

North
South
West

Figure 62a (part 2). Looking at the different kinds of businesses below, please select UP TO THREE of these you would consider LEAST DESIRABLE for the community where you live.

- Manufacturing and manufactured goods
- Sales and customer support
- Warehousing and transportation logistics
- Lodging and food services
- Retail stores
- Health Care

North
South
West
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Figure 62b. Looking at the different kinds of businesses below, please select UP TO THREE of these you would consider LEAST DESIRABLE for the community where you live (countywide results for 2015)
Respondent Socio-Demographic Characteristics

The final section of the survey, designed to provide a characterization of participants with respect to selected socio-demographic characteristics, revealed both similarities and differences when comparing those who live in west-county, north-county, and south-county areas. In all three areas a large majority of survey participants said they are year-around residents of Summit County (97.2% of north-county, 97.5% of south-county, and 96.8% of west-county respondents). Since there are substantial numbers of seasonal homes in parts of the county, it is clear that use of USPS delivery sequence files as the basis for household sampling largely excluded seasonally-occupied residences from the sample. Overall, the proportion of male and female respondents was evenly balanced across all three portions of the county, with slightly more women than men responding in the west-county (53.2%), north-county (50.2%), and south-county (54.2%) areas. Respondent age distributions (Figure 63) reveal that slightly higher percentages of west-county residents fell into the 50-59 and 60-69 age brackets than was the case in the north-county or south-county areas.

![Figure 63. Age of survey participants across three areas of Summit County](chart.png)
In terms of length of residence in Summit County, residents of north-county and south-county areas were considerably more likely to report having lived in the county for an extended time period than were those from the western portion of Summit County (Figure 64). More than three-quarters of north-county (82%) and south-county (78%) residents said they had lived in the county for longer than 10 years, and more than half (66% of north-county respondents and 59% of south county respondents) had lived there for longer than 20 years. In contrast, 63% of west-county residents said they had lived in Summit County for longer than 10 years, and about one-third (34%) had lived there for longer than 20 years. When asked to indicate the likelihood that they might move away from Summit County within the next five years, a substantial majority of respondents in all three areas of the county (a combined 77% of north-county residents, 78% of south-county residents, and 69% of west-county residents) said they probably or definitely would not be moving within that time period. At the same time, west-county residents were most likely to indicate that they probably will move away from the county (Figure 65).

Responses summarized in Figure 66 reveal that across all parts of the county more than half of survey participants reported that their household was comprised of two or fewer persons (61% in the north-county area, 56% in the south-county area, and 66% in the west-county area). The percentage of respondents reporting one or more children under the age of 18 as members of their households was slightly higher in the north-county (38%) and south-county (41%) areas than was the case in western Summit County (30%).
Figure 64. Length of residence of survey participants across three areas of Summit County

Less than one year: North 1%, South 3%, West 2%
One to two years: North 2%, South 4%, West 5%
Three to five years: North 5%, South 6%, West 13%
Six to ten years: North 10%, South 9%, West 17%
Eleven to twenty years: North 16%, South 19%, West 29%
Over twenty years: North 66%, South 59%, West 34%

Figure 65. Likelihood of moving away from Summit County within the next five years

Definitely will NOT move: North 48.5%, South 42.0%, West 35.6%
Probably will NOT move: North 35.6%, South 33.2%, West 28.9%
Uncertain: North 14.7%, South 14.4%, West 17.6%
Probably WILL move: North 6.1%, South 5.8%, West 11.5%
Definitely WILL move: North 1.8%, South 2.1%, West 2.1%
Figure 66. Including yourself, how many people currently live in your household?
Responses to questions that asked survey participants to indicate their racial and ethnic identities reveal that across all areas of the county a large majority of respondents were non-Hispanic and white. The percentage of respondents indicating that they or any member of their household were of Hispanic origin was very low in all three county areas (4.9% of north-county respondents, 4.3% of south-county respondents, and 4.2% of west-county respondents). With respect to racial background, nearly all respondents (98.2% for the north-county area, 98.5% for the south-county area, and 96.7% for the west-county area) identified themselves as white/Caucasian. Since available data indicate that about 11% of Summit County residents are Hispanic and about 10% are non-white (Utah Governor’s Office of Planning and Budget 2012), it is clear that responses to this survey slightly under-represent the county’s ethnic and minority populations.

Responses to a question that asked participants to report the highest level of education they have completed (Figure 67) reveal that west-county residents were much more likely to report completion of a college bachelor’s degree or post-graduate degree (a combined 84%) than were those living in the north-county (40%) or south-county (42%) areas. And, while about one in five respondents living in the north-county and south-county areas indicated that they had completed a high school degree or less, only 3% of west-county residents did not report at least some post-high school educational experience.

The final survey question asked respondents to indicate whether they work outside of their home in a paid job or business, and then whether that job is located in Summit County and the one-way commuting distance from their home to their place of work. As indicated in Figure 68, 60%-70% of respondents across all three areas of the county said that they do work outside of their homes. While a majority of those who indicated they work at a job or business said their employment is situated in Summit County (Figure 69), about one in three north-county and south-county respondents and over forty percent of those living in the west-county area travel to jobs located outside of the county. And, as indicated in Figure 70, substantial numbers of residents in all three areas reported that their one-way commuting distance was greater than 20 miles (51% of north-county responses, 42% of south-county responses, and 38% of west-county responses).
Figure 67. Highest level of education completed by survey participants

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Education Level</th>
<th>North</th>
<th>South</th>
<th>West</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Some high school</td>
<td>2%</td>
<td>2%</td>
<td>0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>High school graduate/GED</td>
<td>18%</td>
<td>16%</td>
<td>3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Some college or associate's degree</td>
<td>40%</td>
<td>40%</td>
<td>13%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>College graduate (Bachelor's degree)</td>
<td>24%</td>
<td>27%</td>
<td>16%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Post-graduate degree (Master's/PhD)</td>
<td>16%</td>
<td>15%</td>
<td>38%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Figure 68. Do you work outside of your home in a paid job or business?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Work Status</th>
<th>No</th>
<th>Yes</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>North</td>
<td>38.1%</td>
<td>61.9%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>South</td>
<td>30.2%</td>
<td>69.8%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>West</td>
<td>34.9%</td>
<td>65.1%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Figure 69. If you work at a paid job or business, is this job located in Summit County?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Location</th>
<th>No</th>
<th>Yes</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>North</td>
<td>32.6%</td>
<td>67.4%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>South</td>
<td>31.7%</td>
<td>68.3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>West</td>
<td>43.3%</td>
<td>56.7%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Figure 70. What is the ONE-WAY commuting distance from your home to your place of work?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Distance</th>
<th>North</th>
<th>South</th>
<th>West</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>less than 2 miles</td>
<td>11%</td>
<td>15%</td>
<td>21%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Between 2 and 20 miles</td>
<td>38%</td>
<td>43%</td>
<td>41%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Between 21 and 40 miles</td>
<td>32%</td>
<td>23%</td>
<td>32%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>over 40 miles</td>
<td>19%</td>
<td>19%</td>
<td>6%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Summary and Conclusions

Taken as a whole, the results of this 2015 survey of people living in Summit County, Utah reveal that on the whole residents are very satisfied with the overall quality of life in the area. Locally-available outdoor recreation opportunities, the quality of the natural environment, and the rural and agricultural character of portions of the county are of particular importance as factors as contributing to residents’ generally positive views regarding life in the county. Also, residents indicate that they are generally satisfied with the facilities, programs and services provided by Summit County government. Whether asked to consider the overall effectiveness of county government, the value of public services relative to taxes and fees, or their experiences in conducting business with county offices, most residents indicate that they are at least moderately if not highly satisfied. When results from the 2015 survey are compared with those obtained from similar surveys conducted in 2011 and in 2013, there is clear evidence that over this period residents have on the whole become more positive in their assessments of the performance of county government.

Although the overall picture painted by survey responses reflects considerable satisfaction with respect to most issues and conditions, it is noteworthy that in 2015 survey participants were slightly more likely to say that over the past 4 to 5 years Summit County had become “less desirable” as a place to live than to say the area had become “more desirable.” In addition, a comparison of responses from the 2011, 2013 and 2015 surveys indicates that over this time period there has been an increase in the percentage of residents who believe conditions in the county have become less desirable. Such beliefs are attributed most frequently to concerns about changes that residents associate with excessive growth and development. Countywide a large majority of residents believe that growth and development are causing a loss of important and valued characteristics of the area, and the percentage expressing agreement that this has occurred was notably higher in 2015 than had been the case in 2011 or 2013. Across all areas of the county a majority of residents express support for policies that would manage growth and development, limit the expansion of new residential development, and protect and preserve agricultural lands. Expressions of
support for growth management policies are, as might be expected, generally higher among those who live in the more extensively developed west-county area than is the case for those who live in southern and especially northern portions of the county. And, when compared to west-county and south-county residents, those living in northern Summit County tend generally to express greater ambivalence about policies and programs designed to manage growth and development patterns, and more concern about policies that limit the ability of private property owners to use their lands as they wish. Still, it appears that over time there has been some convergence across the three areas of the county with respect to citizens’ views about certain growth and growth management issues. Even in the less populous and less-developed north-county and south-county areas, responses to the 2015 survey reveal broad-based support for protection of agricultural lands and open space, placing limits on new residential development, and enforcing housing density and parcel size requirements.

Linked to citizens’ views about the effects of growth and development are concerns about increased problems with traffic and traffic congestion. Such concerns were highlighted frequently by survey participants who said Summit County had in recent years become less desirable as a place to live, and across all areas a substantial majority of residents indicated that they consider it important to develop strategies that would address problems of traffic congestion in more heavily-developed portions of the county. While relatively few residents of any portion of the county report regular use of alternative forms of transportation for activities like shopping or commuting to work, and only modest numbers say it is likely they would begin to do so if traffic congestion continues to become worse, a majority do support improvements to or expansion of county-supported public transportation, including provision of service to areas other than the Park City/Snyderville Basin area.

Given widespread expressions of concern about the effects of growth and development, it is perhaps not surprising to find that relatively few residents believe efforts to recruit new businesses or otherwise promote increased economic development should be a high priority for Summit County government.
Residents in all parts of the county tend most often to equate economic development with things like improving wage levels, improving the educational assets and skills of area residents, and increasing the number of jobs available in their communities. At the same time, they are considerably less likely to consider the expansion of “any type of new companies,” or of manufacturing industries, retail businesses, or tourism-related businesses, to be evidence of successful economic development for their communities. Lifestyle conditions and the quality of the local environment are widely viewed as important “competitive assets” in attracting new economic development opportunities. However, it is clear that in the minds of some residents there may be an inherent tension between the ability to sustain the positive lifestyle and environmental characteristics that they value so highly and ongoing expansion of economic activity and associated residential and commercial development.
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APPENDIX

Self-Completion Questionnaire Used in the
2013 Summit County Citizens Survey (printed version)
1. To begin, how would you rate the overall quality of life in Summit County?

☐ Very poor
☐ Below average
☐ Average
☐ Above average
☐ Excellent

2. To what extent is each of the following an important factor that contributes in a positive way to the quality of life you experience as a resident of Summit County?

a. Outdoor recreation opportunities
   ☐ Not at all important
   ☐ Slightly important
   ☐ Moderately important
   ☐ Very important

b. The clean environment of the area
   ☐ Not at all important
   ☐ Slightly important
   ☐ Moderately important
   ☐ Very important

c. The rural and agricultural character of some parts of the county
   ☐ Not at all important
   ☐ Slightly important
   ☐ Moderately important
   ☐ Very important

d. The local availability of retail shopping and commercial services
   ☐ Not at all important
   ☐ Slightly important
   ☐ Moderately important
   ☐ Very important

3. Please think about what you would like to see happen in Summit County over the next 10 years or so. Then, indicate how important each of the following is to your vision of what would be best for the future of the county.

a. Protecting and preserving agricultural land and open space
   ☐ Not at all important
   ☐ Slightly important
   ☐ Moderately important
   ☐ Very important

b. Increasing the number of commercial shopping facilities
   ☐ Not at all important
   ☐ Slightly important
   ☐ Moderately important
   ☐ Very important

c. Limiting the expansion of new residential development
   ☐ Not at all important
   ☐ Slightly important
   ☐ Moderately important
   ☐ Very important

d. Placing limits on future land development through enforcement of ordinances involving housing density and parcel size requirements
   ☐ Not at all important
   ☐ Slightly important
   ☐ Moderately important
   ☐ Very important

e. Increasing job opportunities in clean, high-tech industries, health services, and other professional service occupations
   ☐ Not at all important
   ☐ Slightly important
   ☐ Moderately important
   ☐ Very important

f. Developing strategies to reduce traffic congestion in more heavily-developed portions of Summit County
   ☐ Not at all important
   ☐ Slightly important
   ☐ Moderately important
   ☐ Very important
4. Over the past 4 to 5 years, would you say that in general Summit County has become MORE or LESS desirable as a place to live?

☐ Much more desirable  ☐ Somewhat less desirable
☐ Somewhat more desirable  ☐ Much less desirable
☐ Stayed about the same

WHY?  ______________________________________

5. For each of the following statements please indicate the extent to which you agree or disagree by checking the answer that best reflects your opinion.

a. Growth and development in Summit County are causing a loss of important and valued characteristics that have traditionally been associated with the area

b. It is not acceptable to restrict private property rights in order to protect the environment or preserve open space

c. Proper planning policies to manage growth and development are needed to control the rate and locations of development in Summit County

d. Uses of private land should be based on what the owner wants, without being restricted by regulations or land use ordinances

e. Future growth and development should occur throughout Summit County, so that people who live in less-developed areas of the county will have more access to the economic opportunities and services that accompany such growth

f. Summit County should require most new housing developments to be built at higher density with smaller lots
6. Next, please rate the following aspects of Summit County government:

a. The overall quality of services provided by county government
   
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Very Poor</th>
<th>Below Average</th>
<th>Average</th>
<th>Above Average</th>
<th>Excellent</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

b. The overall value of services, facilities and programs you receive from the county in return for what you pay in taxes and fees

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Very Poor</th>
<th>Below Average</th>
<th>Average</th>
<th>Above Average</th>
<th>Excellent</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

c. The availability of information about Summit County services, facilities and programs

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Very Poor</th>
<th>Below Average</th>
<th>Average</th>
<th>Above Average</th>
<th>Excellent</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

d. The efforts of County government to keep you informed about Summit County issues and events

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Very Poor</th>
<th>Below Average</th>
<th>Average</th>
<th>Above Average</th>
<th>Excellent</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

e. Summit County’s fiscal responsibility in using available funds to address the most important needs of county residents

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Very Poor</th>
<th>Below Average</th>
<th>Average</th>
<th>Above Average</th>
<th>Excellent</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

f. The responsiveness of the Summit County Council to citizen input

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Very Poor</th>
<th>Below Average</th>
<th>Average</th>
<th>Above Average</th>
<th>Excellent</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

7. During the past year, have you contacted any of the Summit County government offices to obtain information, obtain a permit, or do other business involving a branch of county government?

   ☐ No (please skip ahead to question 10 on the next page)
   ☐ Yes (please answer questions 8 and 9 below)

8. If you answered ‘Yes’ to question 7, which Summit County government office did you contact most recently?

   ______________________________________________________

9. If you answered ‘Yes’ to question 7, please rate your satisfaction with the Summit County office you had contact with most recently on each of the following:

a. The accuracy of the information or assistance you received

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Very Dissatisfied</th>
<th>Somewhat Dissatisfied</th>
<th>Neutral</th>
<th>Somewhat Satisfied</th>
<th>Very Satisfied</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

b. How quickly the county staff in this office responded to your needs

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Very Dissatisfied</th>
<th>Somewhat Dissatisfied</th>
<th>Neutral</th>
<th>Somewhat Satisfied</th>
<th>Very Satisfied</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

c. How effectively your concerns or needs were addressed

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Very Dissatisfied</th>
<th>Somewhat Dissatisfied</th>
<th>Neutral</th>
<th>Somewhat Satisfied</th>
<th>Very Satisfied</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
10. Provision of county services and programs requires allocation of public funds. As a result, Summit County officials need to make decisions about which of these will receive highest priority, and which might need to receive lower priority when funding is limited. Given this, please share your views about whether funding levels should be significantly reduced, reduced slightly, stay at current levels, or be increased for the following services or programs provided by Summit County:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Service</th>
<th>Funding should be significantly reduced</th>
<th>Funding should be reduced slightly</th>
<th>Funding should stay at current levels</th>
<th>Funding should be increased</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>a. Public library services</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>b. Public health clinics</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>c. County sheriff's department</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>d. Emergency response (EMT) services</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>e. Public use indoor recreation centers</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>f. Public use outdoor sports fields</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>g. Public use hiking and biking trails</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>h. Senior citizen centers and services</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>i. Fire protection services</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>j. Public bus transportation services</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>k. County planning and zoning enforcement</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>l. Solid waste recycling programs</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>m. Air and water quality monitoring</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>n. Annual maintenance of county roadways</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>o. Winter plowing of county roadways</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>p. Purchase of private lands for open space protection and public recreation access</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>q. Economic development and business recruitment programs</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Transportation Conditions and Priorities

11. To what extent do you currently use any alternative form of transportation (something other than a private car – e.g., public transportation, bicycling, or walking) for the following purposes?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Never</th>
<th>Occasionally</th>
<th>Frequently</th>
<th>Always</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>a. Recreational activity</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>b. Shopping or appointments</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>c. Commuting to work</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

12. If traffic congestion in parts of Summit County continues to become worse over the next few years, are you likely to begin using an alternative form of transportation (something other than a private car) on a regular basis?

☐ Definitely not  ☐ Probably not
☐ Probably yes  ☐ Definitely yes

13. How would you rate the public bus transportation system that currently provides service to the Park City/Snyderville Basin portions of Summit County in terms of its ability to meet the needs of county residents?

☐ Very poor  ☐ Average
☐ Below average  ☐ Above average

14. Which of the following would make you more likely to regularly use the public bus transportation system in Summit County? (Please check ALL that apply):

☐ More frequent service to reduce waiting times
☐ Bus stops located nearer to your home
☐ Bus stops located more conveniently near areas where you wish to travel
☐ Availability of Wi-Fi service on the bus
☐ More comfortable bus stop facilities

15. Which of the following best represents your views about how improvements to or expansion of the public transportation system that serves western portions of Summit County should be pursued?

☐ No improvements to/expansion of this public transportation system are needed
☐ Improvements should concentrate mostly on meeting the needs of local residents in the Park City/Snyderville Basin areas of Summit County
☐ Improvements should concentrate mostly on meeting the needs of tourists/visitors by providing service from the Salt Lake City airport to the Park City/Snyderville Basin areas
☐ Improvements should concentrate equally on meeting the needs of local residents in the Park City/Snyderville Basin areas and providing service from the Salt Lake City airport to meet the needs of visitors and tourists
16. Since bus ridership can reduce traffic congestion and air pollution, future expansion of public transportation systems is a possibility. Should the county consider expanding public bus systems to provide service in parts of Summit County located outside of the Park City/Snyderville Basin areas?

☐ No – expansion of bus service to these areas is not needed
☐ Yes – expansion of bus service to these areas is a good idea, but only if it involves a fee charged to riders to recover the costs of expanded service
☐ Yes – expansion of bus service to these areas is a good idea, and should be provided at no cost to riders

17. To help address traffic congestion and air pollution concerns, should public bus transportation systems provided by Summit County be expanded to provide service for commuters who live in the county but need to travel to work elsewhere, such as the Salt Lake City area?

☐ No – expansion of bus service to these areas is not needed
☐ Yes – expansion of bus service to these areas is a good idea, but only if it involves a fee charged to riders to recover the costs of expanded service
☐ Yes – expansion of bus service to these areas is a good idea, and should be provided at no cost to riders

18. Which of the following best represents your opinion about whether the Summit County Council should reduce or increase the use of public funds for transportation improvement programs and projects?

☐ County funding for transportation programs should be significantly reduced
☐ County funding for transportation programs should be reduced slightly
☐ County funding for transportation programs should stay at current levels
☐ County funding for transportation programs should be increased slightly
☐ County funding for transportation programs should be significantly increased

19. If increased funding for transportation-related improvements in Summit County does become available, how do you think such additional funding should be spent?

☐ Entirely on expansion of public transportation systems and services
☐ Mostly on public transportation, with some funds also used for road system improvements
☐ Split evenly between expansion of public transportation and road system improvements
☐ Mostly on road system improvements, with some funds also used for public transportation
☐ Entirely on improvements to road systems
Economic Development Conditions and Priorities

20. To what extent do you think efforts to encourage economic development and the creation of new job opportunities should be a priority for Summit County government?

☐ Not a priority at all  ☐ Medium priority
☐ Low priority  ☐ High priority

21. Which of the following would you consider to be important evidence that successful economic development is taking place in the community where you live? Please place an ‘x’ next to UP TO THREE of these you think are MOST important and appropriate for your community (please do not mark more than three).

☐ Starting and growing new companies of almost any type
☐ Recruiting and expanding manufacturing industries
☐ Recruiting and expanding retail businesses
☐ Recruiting and expanding high-tech and scientific research businesses
☐ Improving the educational assets and skills of local residents so they are better prepared to fill new jobs as they become available
☐ Improving amenities and services to improve local “quality of life” and make the community more attractive to businesses looking for a place to start up or relocate
☐ Working to attract more tourists and expand tourism-related businesses
☐ Working to increase the number of local-area jobs in your community
☐ Working to improve average wage levels for the jobs available in your community

22. To what extent do you consider any of the following to be “competitive strengths” that give the community where you live an advantage in attracting new businesses and other economic development opportunities? Please place an ‘x’ next to UP TO THREE of these you think are the MOST important competitive strengths of your community.

☐ Geographic location in relation to transportation systems or population centers
☐ The quality of the local natural environment
☐ The lifestyle conditions that exist in the community
☐ Availability of business sites and real estate that could be used for business development
☐ A positive local “business climate” in terms of government and citizen support
☐ The skills and capabilities of the local workforce
☐ The quality of road systems and other transportation infrastructure
☐ The quality of local public (K-12) schools
☐ Availability of affordable housing
☐ Availability of high-quality, high-wage jobs for local residents
☐ A reasonable commuting time to get to places where people work or conduct business
☐ Availability of high-quality broadband (internet) services
23. To what extent do you consider any of the following to be “competitive weaknesses” that place the community where you live at a disadvantage in attracting new businesses or other economic development opportunities? Please place an ‘x’ next to UP TO THREE of these you think are the MOST important competitive weaknesses of your community.

☐ Geographic location in relation to transportation systems or population centers
☐ The condition of the local natural environment
☐ The lifestyle conditions that exist in the community
☐ Limited business sites and real estate that could be used for business development
☐ A poor local “business climate” in terms of government and citizen support
☐ Limitations involving the skills and capabilities of the local workforce
☐ Poor quality local road systems and other transportation infrastructure
☐ Poor quality of local public (K-12) schools
☐ Limited availability of affordable housing
☐ Limited availability of high-quality, high-wage jobs for local residents
☐ Commuting time needed to get to places where people work or conduct business
☐ Limited availability or performance of broadband (internet) service

24. Looking at the different kinds of businesses listed below, please place an ‘x’ next to UP TO THREE of these you would consider MOST DESIRABLE for the community where you live.

☐ Research and development businesses
☐ Professional services (medical services, legal services, financial services, etc.)
☐ Arts, entertainment, and recreation-oriented businesses
☐ Construction businesses
☐ Crop and animal production operations
☐ Corporate offices of national and regional businesses
☐ Manufacturing and manufactured goods assembly businesses
☐ On-line and telephone sales and customer support businesses
☐ Warehousing and transportation logistics centers for regional or national retail businesses
☐ Lodging and food services businesses
☐ Retail stores
☐ Hospitals, clinics, and other health care businesses
25. Looking at the list of different kinds of business operations below, please place an ‘x’ next to UP TO THREE of these that you consider to be LEAST DESIRABLE for the community where you live.

- Research and development businesses
- Professional services (medical services, legal services, financial services, etc.)
- Arts, entertainment, and recreation-oriented businesses
- Construction businesses
- Crop and animal production operations
- Corporate offices of national and regional businesses
- Manufacturing and manufactured goods assembly businesses
- On-line and telephone sales and customer support businesses
- Warehousing and transportation logistics centers for regional or national retail businesses
- Lodging and food services businesses
- Retail stores
- Hospitals, clinics, and other health care businesses

---

**Background Information**

*To enable us to compare the responses of people with similar or different characteristics, in this final section we ask a few questions about you and your household. As with all answers, this information will remain completely confidential.*

26. What is your gender?
- Male
- Female

27. In what year were you born? (enter 4-digit year, for example, ‘1976’)

28. How long have you lived in Summit County?
- Less than one year
- One to two years
- Three to five years
- Six to ten years
- Eleven to twenty years
- Over twenty years

29. Are you a permanent, year-around resident of Summit County, or do you spend only a part of the year living here?
- I live in Summit County year-around
- I live in Summit County for only a part of the year
30. How likely do you think it is that you might move away from Summit County within the next five years?
   ☐ Definitely will NOT move
   ☐ Probably will NOT move
   ☐ Uncertain
   ☐ Probably WILL move → WHY DO YOU THINK YOU
   ☐ Definitely WILL move → ARE LIKELY TO MOVE?

31. Including yourself, how many people currently live in your household?
   ___ (write in number of people in household)
   Of that total, how many are children under the age of 18?
   ___ (write in number of children in household)

32. Are you or any other member of your household of Hispanic origin (e.g., Latino/Latina)?
   ☐ No
   ☐ Yes

33. Which of the following best describes your racial background?
   ☐ White/Caucasian/Anglo
   ☐ African American/Black
   ☐ Asian
   ☐ Pacific Islander
   ☐ Native American/American Indian
   ☐ Other (please specify): _______

34. What is the highest level of education you have completed?
   ☐ Some high school
   ☐ High school graduate/GED
   ☐ Some college or associate’s degree
   ☐ College graduate (Bachelor’s degree)
   ☐ Post-graduate degree (Master’s/PHD)

35. Do you work outside of your home in a paid job or business?
   ☐ No
   ☐ Yes → IF YES:
      a). Is this job located in Summit County? ☐ No ☐ Yes
      b). What is the one-way commuting distance from your home to your place of work?
      ☐ Less than 2 miles
      ☐ Between 2 and 20 miles
      ☐ Between 21 and 40 miles
      ☐ Over 40 miles
Thank you for your cooperation!

Please feel free to use available space in this questionnaire or on a separate page to provide any additional information or share other comments.

When finished, just place the questionnaire in the provided return envelope and drop it in the mail – no postage is necessary.