

**Question 1 – When and How Voted in General Election?**

*Did you vote using an absentee ballot, or prior to November 7 did you vote at an early voting location, or did you vote at your precinct voting place on election day?*

	<u>TOTAL</u>	<u>Boulder</u>	<u>Longmont</u>	<u>SE Cities</u>	<u>Unincorp</u>
Absentee . . . . .	33%	26%	36%	32%	40%
Early vote location . . . . .	16	19	15	12	14
Precinct voting place . . . . .	51	55	47	56	45
No response . . . . .	--	0	2	0	0

***Discussion***

While no responses in the geographical breakout quite rose to levels that we define as anomalous (variances of 8 percent, plus or minus, compared with the countywide totals), Boulder and Southeast Cities active voters in Boulder and the southeast cities were particularly likely to have voted at their precinct voting places, while Longmont and unincorporated/small town areas were more likely than others to have voted absentee.

There was a notable gender disparity, with 37 percent of women saying that they voted absentee compared with 28 percent of men. It was the opposite with those who used their precinct voting place – 57 percent for men and 46 percent for women.

***Demographic Anomalies***

**With “Absentee” (501=33%)** – Anomalously high were: Republicans, +8%; and those 65 and older, +26%. Anomalously low were: Unaffiliated voters, -10%; those 44 and younger, -14%; and lived in County 9 years or less, -11%.

**With “Precinct Voting Place” (501=51%)** – Anomalously high were: Unaffiliated voters, +8%; those 44 and younger, +19%; and lived in County 9 years or less, +15%. Anomalously low were: those 55 and older, -19%.

## Question 2 – Paper or Electronic Ballot?

*Did you use a paper ballot or an electronic voting machine?*

	<u>TOTAL</u>	<u>Boulder</u>	<u>Longmont</u>	<u>SE Cities</u>	<u>Unincorp</u>
Paper ballot . . . . .	77%	78%	73%	85%	69%
Electronic voting machine . . . .	23	21	27	15	31
No response . . . . .	1	1	0	0	0

### ***Discussion***

Usage of electronic voting machines was highest among residents of unincorporated areas and small towns, an anomalous 31 percent, and was lowest in the Southeast Cities, at 15 percent. Considering the fact that there were no other demographic anomalies we suspect that the disparities had to do mostly with differences in the availability of machines from one part of the county to another.

**Question 3 – Would Have Preferred Electronic if Were More Machines?**

If there had been more electronic voting machines available, would you have preferred to use one of those rather than a paper ballot? (Asked only of persons who said they voted with paper ballots)

	<u>TOTAL</u>	<u>Boulder</u>	<u>Longmont</u>	<u>SE Cities</u>	<u>Unincorp</u>
Yes .....	25%	17%	33%	27%	33%
No .....	55	63	39	51	63
Made no difference .....	19	19	26	22	5
No response .....	1	1	1	0	0

**Discussion**

While more than half of respondents said in essence that they would rather not give up their paper ballots, we believe it's fair, in assessing the likelihood that the 77 percent of the 501 respondents who said they voted with paper would readily accept switching to machines next time, to combine the "yes" respondents with those who volunteered that it made no difference. That would make it 55 percent unfavorable versus 44 percent favorable.

**Demographic Anomalies**

**With "Yes" (263=25%)** – Anomalously high were: Longmont, +8%; those 25 to 34, +13%; and lived in County 5 to 9 years, +8%. Anomalously low were: Boulder, -8%; Democrats, -8%; and those 45 to 54, -14%.

**With "No" (263=55%)** -- Anomalously high were: unincorporated/small towns, -10%; those 18 to 24, -13%; and lived in County 4 years or less, -11%.

**With "No Difference" (263=19%)** – Anomalously low were: unincorporated/small towns, -14%; those 18 to 24, -14%; and lived in County 5 to 9 years, -9%.

**Question 4 – Views About Electronic Voting Machines**

*Which statement is closest to your view about electronic voting machines? (1) Electronic voting is reliable and tamper proof and generally an improvement over other voting systems as long as there’s a printed paper backup, or (2) Electronic voting is less reliable and less tamper-proof than other voting systems.*

	<u>TOTAL</u>	<u>Boulder</u>	<u>Longmont</u>	<u>SE Cities</u>	<u>Unincorp</u>
Reliable/tamper-proof . . . . .	45%	36%	55%	47%	46%
Less reliable/tamper-proof. . . .	37	47	27	34	33
No response . . . . .	18	17	18	20	20

***Discussion***

Only active voters in the City of Boulder among the four geographical zones feel that electronic voting is less reliable and tamper-proof than are other voting systems, and by a fair margin. Meanwhile, City of Longmont voters are particularly content with the reliability and tamper-proof characteristics of electronic voting, and it’s by a 2-to-1 margin. Both are demographic anomalies.

The 18 percent “no response” result was second-highest among the 24 issue questions in the survey. Also, there was a gender disparity here, with 23 percent of women being unresponsive versus 14 percent of the men.

***Other Demographic Anomalies***

**With “Reliable/Tamper Proof (501=45% -- Anomalously high were: those 25 to 34, +15%.**

**With “Less Reliable . . .” (501=37%) – Anomalously high were: Democrats, +11%; and those 18 to 24, +12%. Anomalously low were: Unaffiliated, -10%; and those 45 to 54, -9%.**

***Results of Cross-Tabulation (q.2 vs. q.4)***

Respondents were asked question 4 whether or not they voted by electronic machine. Seventy-four percent of those who actually voted electronically said they believe that such systems are reliable and tamper-proof and generally an improvement over other voting systems, but only 40 percent of those who voted absentee or with paper ballots felt that way.

### Question 5 – How Easy Was Voting System to Use?

*How easy was it to use that voting system? I'm talking about how easy it was to register each vote, checking each vote to see if it was what you intended to do, and quickly correcting any mistakes you might have made?*

	<u>TOTAL</u>	<u>Boulder</u>	<u>Longmont</u>	<u>SE Cities</u>	<u>Unincorp</u>
Very easy . . . . .	77%	76%	75%	78%	83%
Fairly easy . . . . .	19	19	22	18	16
Not very easy . . . . .	3	4	2	4	1
Not at all easy . . . . .	--	1	1	0	0
No response . . . . .	--	1	1	0	0

### ***Discussion***

There wasn't much difference in how easy respondents felt it was to use a voting system regardless of which one they said they used. It was pretty much a uniform assessment through all of the demographic breakouts, with no anomalies observed.

We also ran a cross-tabulation, question 2 versus question 4, and found the same result, with 95 percent of those who used paper ballots responding either "very easy" or "somewhat easy," compared with 96 percent by those who used electronic machines.

### Question 6 – How Voted on Question 1-A?

*County issue 1-A on your ballot asked whether the Boulder County sales and use tax should be increased by 8.1 million dollars annually . . . The purpose stated on the ballot was for regional transit enhancement programs, and incentives for people to use transit, including transit pass programs. 1-A also called for new trails acquisition, construction and maintenance. How did you vote?*

	<u>TOTAL</u>	<u>Boulder</u>	<u>Longmont</u>	<u>SE Cities</u>	<u>Unincorp</u>
Yes . . . . .	41%	42%	42%	44%	35%
No . . . . .	27	23	31	25	30
No response/can't recall . . . . .	32	34	27	30	34

### ***Discussion***

The responses to this question do not closely reflect the actual outcome of Question 1-A on November 7, which was a defeat. However, the “post mortem” ballot surveys we have conducted over the years have tended to drift to the positive side, particularly when more than a month has passed when the interviews take place. Another tendency is for respondents to decline to answer or to say simply that they can’t recall, and indeed that’s what happened here.

A gender divergence occurred among the “no” vote responses, at 33 percent of men versus 21 percent of women.

However, the purpose of asking the question was primarily to determine reasons behind “yes” and “no” votes, which was accomplished by the open-ended question that followed.

### ***Demographic Anomalies***

**With “Yes” Votes (501=41%)** – Anomalously high were: Democrats, +10%; those 18 to 24, +12%; and lived in the County 10 to 19 years, +13%. Anomalously low were: Republicans, -17%.

**With “No” Votes (501=27%)** – Anomalously high were: those 18 to 24, -12%.

## Question 7 – Why Voted (Yes)(No) in Question 6?

	<u>TOTAL</u>	<u>Boulder</u>	<u>Longmont</u>	<u>SE Cities</u>	<u>Unincorp</u>
<i><u>"Yes" responses</u></i>					
To improve transit system . . . . .	28%	32%	33%	22%	21%
To improve trails system . . . . .	11	12	9	14	8
Like transit <u>and</u> trails . . . . .	6	8	4	6	3
It's a good plan/necessary. . . . .	4	4	6	6	2
Will reduce traffic on roads. . . . .	3	0	5	4	5
Will reduce air pollution . . . . .	3	2	1	1	8
<i><u>"No" responses</u></i>					
I oppose all tax increases . . . . .	17	14	16	19	23
Money not spent wisely now . . . . .	3	1	2	6	6
It's RTD's job . . . . .	3	2	5	3	3
More trails not needed . . . . .	3	1	1	3	6
No response/can't recall . . . . .	3	4	4	6	0
<i>Note: Response categories totaling 2% or less are not shown but may be seen in "tabulations" volume</i>					

### **Discussion**

Clearly the transit system part of the question was by far the most important reason respondents gave for voting "yes" on 1-A, at 28%. Improvements to the trails system was back a bit at 11%. The fact that both transit and trails were included among purposes for the proposed tax increase came in third at 6%, and the balance of "yes" vote reasons were scattered.

The most prominent reason for "no," at 17 percent, consisted of persons who said that they always vote against proposed tax increases. None of the other reasons mentioned rose above 3 percent.

### **Demographic Anomalies**

#### REASONS VOTED "YES"

**With "Improve Transit System" (340=41%)** – Anomalously high were: those 18 to 24, +10%; lived in County 4 years or less, +11%; and lived in County 10 to 19 years, +9%. Anomalously low were: Republicans, -13%; and lived in County 4 years or less, -13%.

#### REASONS VOTED "NO"

**With "Oppose All Tax Increases" (340=17%)** – Anomalously high were: Republicans, +19%. Anomalously low were: Unaffiliated, -9%; and lived in County 4 years or less, -13%.

### **Preface to Questions 8-11 and Questions 12-19**

When the questionnaire was being designed we included two ways to determine the strengths of various reasons people might have voted “yes” or “no” with ballot question 1-A.

In conjunction with Commissioners and staff members we first devised a series of four “yes” reasons and a series of eight “no” reasons. The two series were to follow an open-ended question, which turned out to be Question 7, in which respondents would be asked to state, without prompting of any kind, the one reason that mostly caused them to vote “yes” or “no.”

Normally we allow open-ended question response categories to emerge quite on their own as the first 50 or so questionnaires are coded, with no assumptions in advance as to what categories would turn up. However, in this case we did drop questions 8 through 11 (the “yes” series), and questions 12 through 19 (the “no” series) into the emergent open-ended categories ahead of time to allow comparisons of open-ended versus closed-ended.

We comment on those comparisons following presentation of results of questions 8 through 11, and of questions 12 through 19. However, correlations are not very useful, in our opinion, because the open-ended question values are based on frequency and closed-end question values are based on degrees of importance. It’s definitely an “apples and oranges” situation.

Another concern is the fact that only 134 persons were asked questions 12 through 19. That would result in a confidence factor of close to 10%, plus or minus.

Also, please note that with questions 8 through 19 we highlight demographic anomalies for the “very important” and “not at all important” responses but not for the “somewhat important” and “not very important” responses. We did that because in nearly every case the two middle-ground responses detracted from rather than adding to the clarity of the analysis.

## Questions 8 through 11 – Relative Importance of Four Reasons to Vote “Yes”

A statement was read to those who responded “yes” to question 6 which said, in part: “I’m going to repeat some of the reasons other people have said they voted “yes” on County Issue 1-A and I will ask you how important those reasons were to you in making up your mind. I will ask you if each possible reason seemed very important, somewhat important, not very important or not at all important to you in deciding how to vote. What about the statement that:

	<u>Very</u> <u>Impt.</u>	<u>Some</u> <u>what</u> <u>Impt.</u>	<u>Not</u> <u>very</u> <u>Impt.</u>	<u>Not</u> <u>at all</u> <u>Impt.</u>	<u>No</u> <u>Resp.</u>
Q.8 It would improve transit service	63%	30%	5%	1%	1%
Q.11 It would reduce the consumption of oil and gasoline and prevent pollution	68	20	6	5	--
Q.9 It would improve the trails system	52	36	8	4	--
Q.10 It’s not much of a tax increase	26	40	20	12	1

(Note: The questions in the series are arrayed in descending order of “very” and “somewhat important” responses combined)

### Discussion

The rankings of these four “yes” questions correlate fairly well with what was observed with the open-ended Question 7. In both cases improvement of transit service rose to the top. However, improvement of the trails system ranked higher in the open-ended question, whereas reduction of oil and gasoline consumption/preventing pollution was in second place in the table above followed by improvement of the trails system.

“It’s not much of a tax increase” is considered important to some degree by 66 percent of the active voters in the table above. However, only 3 persons – 1 percent of respondents who were asked Question 7 – volunteered that response in the open-ended question, which indicate to us that it is even weaker as a motivator than it would seem in question 10.

### Demographic Anomalies

#### QUESTION 8 – Improve transit service

**With “Very Important” (210=63%)** – Anomalously high were: Southeast cities, +10%; and those 35 to 44, +10%. Anomalously low were: those 45 to 54, -12%; and 4 years or less in County, -19%.

Also, there was a gender divergence, with 71% of women responding “very important” versus 55% of the men.

QUESTION 9 – Improve trails system

**With “Very Important” (210=52%)** – Anomalously high were: Southeast cities, +12%; Unaffiliated, +8%; those 35 to 44, +13%; and 5 to 9 years in County, +20%. Anomalously low were: Unincorporated/towns, -8%; and those 18 to 24, -14%.

---

QUESTION 10 – It’s not much of a tax

**With “Very Important” (210=28%)** – Anomalously high were: Unincorporated/towns, +13%; those 35 to 44, +15%. Anomalously low were: Longmont, -7%;and those 25 to 34, -9%.

---

QUESTION 11 – Reduce gas/oil, cut pollution

**With “Very Important” (210=38%)** – Anomalously high were: 10 to 20 years In County, +8%. Anomalously low were: Republicans, -18%; and in County 4 years or less, -10%.

Also, there was a gender divergence, with 77 percent of women responding “very important” versus 59% of the men.

## Questions 12 Through 19 – Relative Importance of Eight Reasons to Vote “No”

A statement was read to those who responded “no” to question 6 which said, in part, “I’m going to repeat some of the reasons other people have said they voted “no” on County Issue 1-A and I will ask you how important those reasons were to you in making up your mind. I will ask you if each possible reason seemed very important, somewhat important, not very important or not at all important to you in deciding how to vote. What about the statement that:

	<i>Very <u>Impt.</u></i>	<i>Some what <u>Impt.</u></i>	<i>Not very <u>Impt.</u></i>	<i>Not at all <u>Impt.</u></i>	<i>No <u>Resp.</u></i>
Q.19 I don't believe the benefit was worth the cost of the tax	61%	18%	9%	8%	4%
Q.14 Trails and transit shouldn't have been included in the same tax question	48	19	11	18	5
Q.12 I oppose all tax increases	33	30	10	25	1
Q.13 Transit's RTD's job, not the county's	30	27	20	18	5
Q.15 There were too many tax questions	38	18	19	23	2
Q.18 It's not needed because of RTD's FasTracks program	16	27	19	31	7
Q.16 I didn't have enough information on 1-A	23	18	22	35	2
Q.17 The major newspapers in county didn't support this issue	5	13	23	52	8

*(Note: The questions in this series are arrayed in descending order of “very” and “somewhat important” responses combined)*

### Discussion

Unlike what was observed with questions 8 through 12, the results of questions 12 through 19 show very little correlation with those of emergent categories of the open-ended question 7. For example, “I oppose all tax increases,” which was by far the most-mentioned reason volunteered in question 7 for having voted against 1-A, ranked only third in the questions 12 through 19 series.

The two top-ranked reasons for “no” votes as seen in the table above -- that the benefit was not worth the cost of the tax, and that trails and transit shouldn't both have been included in 1-A – were barely visible among the emergent categories of question 7. Each was volunteered by only 1% of those who had said that they voted against the proposed tax increase.

While both formats are useful, we believe that question 7 is the most useful in understanding what happened on November 7.

## ***Demographic Anomalies***

### **QUESTION 12 – I oppose all tax increases**

**With “Very Important” (134=33%)** – Anomalously high were: Republicans, +8%; and those 65 or older, +11%. Anomalously low were: Democrats, -10%; and those 25 to 34, -19%.

**With “Not at All Important” (134=25%)** – Anomalously high were: Longmont, +10%; Democrats, +12%; those 25 to 34, +25%; and 10 to 19 years in County, +8%. Anomalously low were: those 55 to 64, -10%.

---

### **QUESTION 13 – It’s RTD’s job, not County’s**

**With “Very Important” (134=30%)** -- Anomalously high were: those 18 to 24, +8%; those 55 to 64, +20%; and 20 years or more in County, +11%.

**With “Not at All Important” (134=18%)** – Anomalously high were Boulder, +11%; those 25 to 34, +13%; and 5 to 20 years in County, +9%. Anomalously low were: Republicans, -12%; those 55 to 64, -10%; and 4 years or less in County, -11%.

---

### **QUESTION 14 – Transit and trails in same ballot question**

**With “Very Important” (134=48%)** – Anomalously high were: Unincorporated/towns, +15%; Republicans, +8%; those 55 or older, +21%; and 20 or more years in County, +16%. Anomalously low were: Longmont, -13%; those 18 to 24, -23%; those 35 to 44, -22%; and 9 years or less in County, -24%.

**With “Not at All Important” (134=23%)** – Anomalously high were: Unincorporated/towns, -8%; Republicans, +16%; those 25 to 34, -10; those 55 to 64, -10%; and 20 years or more in County, -8%.

Also, there was a gender divergence, with 57% of women indicating “very important” versus 42% for the men.

QUESTION 15 – Too many tax questions on ballot

**With “Very Important” (134=38%)** -- Anomalously high were: Unincorporated/towns, +19%; Republicans, +16%; and those 55 to 64, +12%. Anomalously low were: Democrats, -9%; those 34 and younger, -24%; and 4 years or less in County, -18%.

**With “Not at All Important” (134=23%)** – Anomalously high were: Unaffiliated, -15%. Anomalously low were: Unincorporated/towns, -13%; those 55 or older, -9%; and 20 years or more in County, -9%.

---

QUESTION 16 – Not enough information on Issue 1-A

**With “Very Important” (134=23%)** – Anomalously high were: Unincorporated/towns, +10%; and those 25 to 34, +23%. Anomalously low were: Boulder, -9%; and Unaffiliated, -8%.

**With “Not at All Important” (134=22%)** – Anomalously high were: Southeast cities, +17%.

Also, there was a gender divergence, with 30 percent of women responding 30% “very important” versus 18 percent of men.

---

QUESTION 17 – Major newspapers didn’t support 1-A

**With “Not at All Important” (134=52%)** -- Anomalously high were: Boulder, +8%; Unincorporated/towns, +8%; Unaffiliated, +10%; those 25 to 44, +11%; and 4 years or less in County, +28%. Anomalously low were: Longmont, -20%; Republicans, -8%; those 18 to 24, -14% and 5 to 9 years in County, -15%.

Also, there was a gender divergence, with 61% of men responding “not at all important” versus 39 percent of the women.

---

QUESTION 18 – Not needed because of RTD’s FasTracks

**With “Very Important” (134=16%)** – Anomalously high were: Southeast cities, +16%; those 18 to 24, +9%; and 4 years or less in County, +11%. Anomalously low were: Boulder, -9%; those 45 to 54, -9%; and 10 to 19 years in County, -12%.

**With “Not at All Important (134=35%)** -- Anomalously high were: Boulder, +12%; Unaffiliated, +10%; those 25 to 34, +23%; and 10 to 19 years in County, +10%. Anomalously low were: Republicans, -11%.

QUESTION 19 – Benefits not worth cost of the tax

**With “Very Important (134=61%)** – Anomalously high were: Unincorporated/towns, +12%; and those 55 to 64, +22%. Anomalously low were: Boulder, -9%; Democrats, -9%; and those 35 to 54, -9%.

**With “Not at All Important (134=8%)** -- Anomalously high were: those 35 to 44, +8%. Anomalously low were: those 55 to 64, -8%.

**Question 20 – Would Extension of Existing Tax Have Changed “No” Vote?**

*If Issue 1-A, which was about county transit, had involved extension of an existing tax instead of being a new tax, do you think you would have voted “yes” rather than “no?”*

	<u>TOTAL</u>	<u>Boulder</u>	<u>Longmont</u>	<u>SE Cities</u>	<u>Unincorp</u>
Yes .....	21%	17%	28%	32%	10%
No .....	69	81	56	64	72
No response .....	10	3	16	4	17

***Discussion***

We believe that the 21% “yes” responses to this question should be discounted by up to 50 percent. We base that statement on what didn’t turn up among volunteered answers to Question 7, which was open-ended and probed why respondents said they voted as they did with Issue 1-A. Not one of the 134 persons who had said they voted “no” indicated that they favored what was to be done with the proposed tax increase but felt that another way should have been found to pay for the transit and trails improvements.

In many past surveys for the County and for other public sector clients “find another way to pay for it” nearly always turns up among open-ended question responses to tax questions.

And, even a 10 percent swing would have changed the outcome Issue 1-A.

***Demographic Anomalies***

**With “Yes” Responses (134=21%)** – Anomalously high were: Southeast cities, +11%; those 18 to 34, +14%; and those 55 to 64, +8%. Anomalously low were: Unincorporated/towns, -11%; and those 65 and older, -17%.

**With “No” Responses (134=69%)** – Anomalously high were: Boulder, +12%; and those 64 or older, +10%. Anomalously low were: Longmont, -13%; and those 55 to 64, -15%.

## Question 21 – Best Source of Information About Ballot Questions

*What do you feel was your best source of information about various county, city or school district ballot questions? (Response categories were read and rotated)*

	<u>TOTAL</u>	<u>Boulder</u>	<u>Longmont</u>	<u>SE Cities</u>	<u>Unincorp</u>
Newspaper stories. . . . .	19%	20%	19%	18%	19%
Newspaper endorsements. . . . .	8	10	4	9	9
Election-related meetings . . . . .	2	1	0	2	4
County Clerk's mailed booklet . .	50	45	62	52	45
Other* . . . . .	9	11	5	9	12
No response . . . . .	3	3	4	1	2

\*Included: League of Women Voters booklet, word of mouth, mailings, radio, TV, all of above, and from the ballot language

### ***Discussion***

The County Clerk's mailed booklet was by far the most important source of elected-related information for the active voters, with newspaper stories a distant second. We were surprised by how few respondents picked newspaper endorsements.

### ***Demographic Anomalies***

**With “Newspaper Stories” (501=19%)** – Anomalously high were: those 65 and older, +8%. Anomalously low were: those 45 to 54, -8%; and 4 years or less in County, -8%.

**With “Internet Web Sites” (501=9%)** – Anomalously high were: Those 25 to 34, +21%; and 4 years or less in County, +10%.

**With “County Clerk’s Booklet” (501=50%)** – Anomalously high were: Longmont, +12%; Republicans, +10%; and those 45 to 54, +12%.

**Question 22 – Hold All November Elections by Mail?**

*If state law allowed it, do you believe that Boulder County should conduct all November elections entirely by mail?*

	<u>TOTAL</u>	<u>Boulder</u>	<u>Longmont</u>	<u>SE Cities</u>	<u>Unincorp</u>
Yes .....	32%	27%	35%	33%	33%
No .....	58	63	54	55	60
No response .....	10	10	11	12	7

***Discussion***

As the table above shows, there isn't a lot of support for conducting all November elections entirely by mail. Even the Unincorporated/small towns breakout, where many voters have comparatively long drives to precinct polling places, mirrors the countywide sentiment almost exactly.

***Demographic Anomalies***

**With "Yes" Responses (501=32%)** – Anomalously low were: those 18 to 24, -10%; and 4 years or less in the County, -22%

**With "No" Responses (501=58%)** – Anomalously high were: those 18 to 24, 9%; and 4 years or less in County, +14%. Anomalously low were: those 65 or older, -8%.

---

**Note about Question 23**

*This was a screening question to identify persons who said they voted at their precinct polling place. They were the only respondents who were asked question 24.*

**Question 24 – Use Early Voting Location If More Were Opened?**

*Do you feel that you would cast your vote at an early voting location in the next general election if more of them were opened and one would be reasonably close to your home? (Asked only of those who said they voted at their precinct on Nov. 7)*

	<u>TOTAL</u>	<u>Boulder</u>	<u>Longmont</u>	<u>SE Cities</u>	<u>Unincorp</u>
Yes .....	56%	51%	64%	58%	52%
No .....	36	38	27	34	44
No response .....	9	11	9	8	4

***Discussion***

We would depict the results as a fairly strong endorsement for more early voting locations, and as the table shows the idea was particularly supported by Longmont residents

***Other Demographic Anomalies***

**With “Yes” Responses (290=56%)** – Anomalously high were: 4 years or less in County, +9%. Anomalously low were 5 to 9 years in County, -9%.

**With “No” Responses (290=36%)** – Anomalously high were: Unincorporated/towns, +8%; those 65 or older, +44%. Anomalously low were: 10 to 20 years in County, -11%.