

Community Survey - 2020 Comprehensive Plan Update

How many children live in your home, using the following age brackets, at least part of the year? (Please select 0, 1, 2-3, or 4+ for each age range.)

CURRENT RESULTS					303 Total Responses
	0	1	2-3	4+	
Under 5 years old	85% (259)	10% (29)	5% (15)	0% (-)	
5-9	84% (254)	12% (35)	5% (14)	0% (-)	
10-14	88% (268)	9% (27)	3% (8)	0% (-)	
15-19	94% (286)	5% (14)	1% (3)	0% (-)	
20-25	94% (285)	4% (11)	2% (7)	0% (-)	

REGISTERED (181)

	0	1	2-3	4+	
Under 5 years old	82.0% (149)	11.0% (20)	7.0% (12)	-	
5-9	82.0% (149)	12.0% (21)	6.0% (11)	-	
10-14	87.0% (158)	9.0% (16)	4.0% (7)	-	
15-19	95.0% (172)	4.0% (8)	1.0% (1)	-	
20-25	95.0% (172)	4.0% (8)	1.0% (1)	-	

NON-REGISTERED (122)

	0	1	2-3	4+	
Under 5 years old	90.2% (110)	7.4% (9)	2.5% (3)	-	
5-9	86.1% (105)	11.5% (14)	2.5% (3)	-	
10-14	90.2% (110)	9.0% (11)	0.8% (1)	-	
15-19	93.4% (114)	4.9% (6)	1.6% (2)	-	
20-25	92.6% (113)	2.5% (3)	4.9% (6)	-	

ALL RESPONDENTS (303)

	0	1	2-3	4+	
Under 5 years old	85% (259)	10% (29)	5% (15)	0% (-)	
5-9	84% (254)	12% (35)	5% (14)	0% (-)	
10-14	88% (268)	9% (27)	3% (8)	0% (-)	
15-19	94% (286)	5% (14)	1% (3)	0% (-)	
20-25	94% (285)	4% (11)	2% (7)	0% (-)	

REGISTERED VOTERS IN FITCHBURG, WI (181)

	0	1	2-3	4+	
Under 5 years old	82% (149)	11% (20)	7% (12)	0% (-)	
5-9	82% (149)	12% (21)	6% (11)	0% (-)	
10-14	87% (158)	9% (16)	4% (7)	0% (-)	
15-19	95% (172)	4% (8)	1% (1)	0% (-)	
20-25	95% (172)	4% (8)	1% (1)	0% (-)	

LIVE IN FITCHBURG, WI (267) - SELF-REPORTED

	0	1	2-3	4+	
Under 5 years old	84% (225)	10% (27)	6% (15)	0% (-)	
5-9	82% (220)	12% (33)	5% (14)	0% (-)	
10-14	87% (233)	10% (26)	3% (8)	0% (-)	
15-19	94% (252)	4% (12)	1% (3)	0% (-)	
20-25	94% (252)	4% (11)	1% (4)	0% (-)	

SUBSCRIBERS TO FITCHBURG, WI (271)

	0	1	2-3	4+
Under 5 years old	84% (227)	11% (29)	6% (15)	0% (-)
5-9	82% (223)	13% (34)	5% (14)	0% (-)
10-14	87% (237)	10% (26)	3% (8)	0% (-)
15-19	94% (256)	4% (12)	1% (3)	0% (-)
20-25	94% (256)	4% (11)	1% (4)	0% (-)

REGISTER RESPONDENTS FROM ANYWHERE (187)

	0	1	2-3	4+
Under 5 years old	82% (154)	11% (21)	6% (12)	0% (-)
5-9	83% (155)	11% (21)	6% (11)	0% (-)
10-14	88% (164)	9% (16)	4% (7)	0% (-)
15-19	95% (178)	4% (8)	1% (1)	0% (-)
20-25	95% (178)	4% (8)	1% (1)	0% (-)

EDUCATION

187 REGISTERED VOTERS

	0	1	2-3	4+
--	---	---	-----	----

Bach Degree - Extremely Likely (30)

Under 5 years old	90.0% (27.0)	6.7% (2.0)	3.3% (1.0)	-
5-9	83.3% (25.0)	10.0% (3.0)	6.7% (2.0)	-
10-14	86.7% (26.0)	13.3% (4.0)	-	-
15-19	93.3% (28.0)	6.7% (2.0)	-	-
20-25	96.7% (29.0)	3.3% (1.0)	-	-

Bach Degree - Likely (21)

Under 5 years old	66.7% (14.0)	19.0% (4.0)	14.3% (3.0)	-
5-9	61.9% (13.0)	19.0% (4.0)	19.0% (4.0)	-
10-14	76.2% (16.0)	19.0% (4.0)	4.8% (1.0)	-
15-19	90.5% (19.0)	4.8% (1.0)	4.8% (1.0)	-
20-25	90.5% (19.0)	9.5% (2.0)	-	-

Grad Degree - Extremely Likely (22)

Under 5 years old	86.4% (19.0)	9.1% (2.0)	4.5% (1.0)	-
5-9	90.9% (20.0)	9.1% (2.0)	-	-
10-14	77.3% (17.0)	13.6% (3.0)	9.1% (2.0)	-
15-19	95.5% (21.0)	4.5% (1.0)	-	-
20-25	95.5% (21.0)	4.5% (1.0)	-	-

Grad Degree - Likely (13)

Under 5 years old	76.9% (10.0)	15.4% (2.0)	7.7% (1.0)	-
5-9	84.6% (11.0)	15.4% (2.0)	-	-
10-14	100.0% (13.0)	-	-	-
15-19	100.0% (13.0)	-	-	-
20-25	100.0% (13.0)	-	-	-

HS Diploma - Extremely Likely (9)

Under 5 years old	100.0% (9.0)	-	-	-
5-9	88.9% (8.0)	11.1% (1.0)	-	-
10-14	88.9% (8.0)	11.1% (1.0)	-	-
15-19	88.9% (8.0)	11.1% (1.0)	-	-
20-25	100.0% (9.0)	-	-	-

HS Diploma - Likely (4)

Under 5 years old	100.0% (4.0)	-	-	-
5-9	75.0% (3.0)	25.0% (1.0)	-	-
10-14	50.0% (2.0)	50.0% (2.0)	-	-
15-19	75.0% (3.0)	25.0% (1.0)	-	-
20-25	100.0% (4.0)	-	-	-

Less than HS Diploma - Likely (1)

Under 5 years old	-	100.0% (1.0)	-	-
5-9	-	100.0% (1.0)	-	-
10-14	100.0% (1.0)	-	-	-
15-19	100.0% (1.0)	-	-	-
20-25	100.0% (1.0)	-	-	-

Some College - Likely (12)

Under 5 years old	91.7% (11.0)	8.3% (1.0)	-	-
5-9	100.0% (12.0)	-	-	-
10-14	100.0% (12.0)	-	-	-
15-19	100.0% (12.0)	-	-	-
20-25	91.7% (11.0)	8.3% (1.0)	-	-

Some College -Extremely Likely (5)

Under 5 years old	100.0% (5.0)	-	-	-
5-9	80.0% (4.0)	-	20.0% (1.0)	-
10-14	100.0% (5.0)	-	-	-
15-19	80.0% (4.0)	20.0% (1.0)	-	-
20-25	80.0% (4.0)	20.0% (1.0)	-	-

Unknown (70)

Under 5 years old	78.6% (55.0)	12.9% (9.0)	8.6% (6.0)	-
5-9	84.3% (59.0)	10.0% (7.0)	5.7% (4.0)	-
10-14	91.4% (64.0)	2.9% (2.0)	5.7% (4.0)	-
15-19	98.6% (69.0)	1.4% (1.0)	-	-
20-25	95.7% (67.0)	2.9% (2.0)	1.4% (1.0)	-

VOTERS GENDER

187 REGISTERED VOTERS

	0	1	2-3	4+
--	---	---	-----	----

F (90)

Under 5 years old	85.6% (77.0)	8.9% (8.0)	5.6% (5.0)	-
5-9	84.4% (76.0)	10.0% (9.0)	5.6% (5.0)	-
10-14	86.7% (78.0)	7.8% (7.0)	5.6% (5.0)	-
15-19	95.6% (86.0)	4.4% (4.0)	-	-
20-25	95.6% (86.0)	4.4% (4.0)	-	-

M (95)

Under 5 years old	78.9% (75.0)	13.7% (13.0)	7.4% (7.0)	-
5-9	81.1% (77.0)	12.6% (12.0)	6.3% (6.0)	-
10-14	88.4% (84.0)	9.5% (9.0)	2.1% (2.0)	-
15-19	94.7% (90.0)	4.2% (4.0)	1.1% (1.0)	-
20-25	94.7% (90.0)	4.2% (4.0)	1.1% (1.0)	-

Unknown (2)

Under 5 years old	100.0% (2.0)	-	-	-
5-9	100.0% (2.0)	-	-	-
10-14	100.0% (2.0)	-	-	-
15-19	100.0% (2.0)	-	-	-
20-25	100.0% (2.0)	-	-	-

PRECINCT	187 REGISTERED VOTERS			
	0	1	2-3	4+
CHICAGO 43-04 (1)				
Under 5 years old	100.0% (1.0)	-	-	-
5-9	100.0% (1.0)	-	-	-
10-14	100.0% (1.0)	-	-	-
15-19	100.0% (1.0)	-	-	-
20-25	100.0% (1.0)	-	-	-
FITCHBURG CITY WARD 01 (9)				
Under 5 years old	66.7% (6.0)	22.2% (2.0)	11.1% (1.0)	-
5-9	66.7% (6.0)	33.3% (3.0)	-	-
10-14	77.8% (7.0)	-	22.2% (2.0)	-
15-19	88.9% (8.0)	11.1% (1.0)	-	-
20-25	77.8% (7.0)	22.2% (2.0)	-	-
FITCHBURG CITY WARD 02 (3)				
Under 5 years old	100.0% (3.0)	-	-	-
5-9	100.0% (3.0)	-	-	-
10-14	100.0% (3.0)	-	-	-
15-19	100.0% (3.0)	-	-	-
20-25	100.0% (3.0)	-	-	-
FITCHBURG CITY WARD 04 (2)				
Under 5 years old	100.0% (2.0)	-	-	-
5-9	100.0% (2.0)	-	-	-
10-14	100.0% (2.0)	-	-	-
15-19	100.0% (2.0)	-	-	-
20-25	100.0% (2.0)	-	-	-
FITCHBURG CITY WARD 05 (6)				
Under 5 years old	66.7% (4.0)	-	33.3% (2.0)	-
5-9	83.3% (5.0)	-	16.7% (1.0)	-
10-14	83.3% (5.0)	16.7% (1.0)	-	-
15-19	100.0% (6.0)	-	-	-
20-25	83.3% (5.0)	16.7% (1.0)	-	-
FITCHBURG CITY WARD 06 (12)				
Under 5 years old	83.3% (10.0)	8.3% (1.0)	8.3% (1.0)	-
5-9	83.3% (10.0)	-	16.7% (2.0)	-
10-14	75.0% (9.0)	16.7% (2.0)	8.3% (1.0)	-
15-19	75.0% (9.0)	25.0% (3.0)	-	-
20-25	91.7% (11.0)	-	8.3% (1.0)	-
FITCHBURG CITY WARD 07 (18)				
Under 5 years old	100.0% (18.0)	-	-	-
5-9	100.0% (18.0)	-	-	-
10-14	100.0% (18.0)	-	-	-
15-19	94.4% (17.0)	5.6% (1.0)	-	-
20-25	88.9% (16.0)	11.1% (2.0)	-	-
FITCHBURG CITY WARD 08 (14)				
Under 5 years old	64.3% (9.0)	28.6% (4.0)	7.1% (1.0)	-
5-9	71.4% (10.0)	21.4% (3.0)	7.1% (1.0)	-

10-14	100.0% (14.0)	-	-	-
15-19	100.0% (14.0)	-	-	-
20-25	100.0% (14.0)	-	-	-

FITCHBURG CITY WARD 09 (8)

Under 5 years old	100.0% (8.0)	-	-	-
5-9	100.0% (8.0)	-	-	-
10-14	100.0% (8.0)	-	-	-
15-19	100.0% (8.0)	-	-	-
20-25	100.0% (8.0)	-	-	-

FITCHBURG CITY WARD 12 (2)

Under 5 years old	100.0% (2.0)	-	-	-
5-9	100.0% (2.0)	-	-	-
10-14	100.0% (2.0)	-	-	-
15-19	100.0% (2.0)	-	-	-
20-25	100.0% (2.0)	-	-	-

FITCHBURG CITY WARD 13 (31)

Under 5 years old	90.3% (28.0)	3.2% (1.0)	6.5% (2.0)	-
5-9	87.1% (27.0)	3.2% (1.0)	9.7% (3.0)	-
10-14	90.3% (28.0)	6.5% (2.0)	3.2% (1.0)	-
15-19	93.5% (29.0)	3.2% (1.0)	3.2% (1.0)	-
20-25	96.8% (30.0)	3.2% (1.0)	-	-

FITCHBURG CITY WARD 14 (19)

Under 5 years old	73.7% (14.0)	15.8% (3.0)	10.5% (2.0)	-
5-9	84.2% (16.0)	15.8% (3.0)	-	-
10-14	89.5% (17.0)	10.5% (2.0)	-	-
15-19	94.7% (18.0)	5.3% (1.0)	-	-
20-25	94.7% (18.0)	5.3% (1.0)	-	-

FITCHBURG CITY WARD 15 (7)

Under 5 years old	100.0% (7.0)	-	-	-
5-9	85.7% (6.0)	-	14.3% (1.0)	-
10-14	100.0% (7.0)	-	-	-
15-19	100.0% (7.0)	-	-	-
20-25	100.0% (7.0)	-	-	-

FITCHBURG CITY WARD 16 (3)

Under 5 years old	100.0% (3.0)	-	-	-
5-9	66.7% (2.0)	33.3% (1.0)	-	-
10-14	66.7% (2.0)	33.3% (1.0)	-	-
15-19	100.0% (3.0)	-	-	-
20-25	66.7% (2.0)	33.3% (1.0)	-	-

FITCHBURG CITY WARD 17 (7)

Under 5 years old	85.7% (6.0)	14.3% (1.0)	-	-
5-9	100.0% (7.0)	-	-	-
10-14	100.0% (7.0)	-	-	-
15-19	100.0% (7.0)	-	-	-
20-25	100.0% (7.0)	-	-	-

FITCHBURG CITY WARD 18 (12)

Under 5 years old	58.3% (7.0)	33.3% (4.0)	8.3% (1.0)	-
5-9	41.7% (5.0)	58.3% (7.0)	-	-
10-14	58.3% (7.0)	41.7% (5.0)	-	-

15-19	100.0% (12.0)	-	-	-
20-25	100.0% (12.0)	-	-	-

FITCHBURG CITY WARD 19 (26)

Under 5 years old	80.8% (21.0)	11.5% (3.0)	7.7% (2.0)	-
5-9	80.8% (21.0)	7.7% (2.0)	11.5% (3.0)	-
10-14	76.9% (20.0)	11.5% (3.0)	11.5% (3.0)	-
15-19	100.0% (26.0)	-	-	-
20-25	100.0% (26.0)	-	-	-

MADISON CITY WARD 042 (1)

Under 5 years old	100.0% (1.0)	-	-	-
5-9	100.0% (1.0)	-	-	-
10-14	100.0% (1.0)	-	-	-
15-19	100.0% (1.0)	-	-	-
20-25	100.0% (1.0)	-	-	-

MADISON CITY WARD 053 (1)

Under 5 years old	100.0% (1.0)	-	-	-
5-9	100.0% (1.0)	-	-	-
10-14	100.0% (1.0)	-	-	-
15-19	100.0% (1.0)	-	-	-
20-25	100.0% (1.0)	-	-	-

MADISON CITY WARD 100 (1)

Under 5 years old	100.0% (1.0)	-	-	-
5-9	100.0% (1.0)	-	-	-
10-14	100.0% (1.0)	-	-	-
15-19	-	100.0% (1.0)	-	-
20-25	100.0% (1.0)	-	-	-

MADISON CITY WARD 107 (1)

Under 5 years old	-	100.0% (1.0)	-	-
5-9	100.0% (1.0)	-	-	-
10-14	100.0% (1.0)	-	-	-
15-19	100.0% (1.0)	-	-	-
20-25	100.0% (1.0)	-	-	-

MIDDLETON TOWN WARD 7 (1)

Under 5 years old	100.0% (1.0)	-	-	-
5-9	100.0% (1.0)	-	-	-
10-14	100.0% (1.0)	-	-	-
15-19	100.0% (1.0)	-	-	-
20-25	100.0% (1.0)	-	-	-

MOUNT HOREB VLG WARD 3 (1)

Under 5 years old	100.0% (1.0)	-	-	-
5-9	100.0% (1.0)	-	-	-
10-14	100.0% (1.0)	-	-	-
15-19	100.0% (1.0)	-	-	-
20-25	100.0% (1.0)	-	-	-

OREGON VLG WARD 10 (1)

Under 5 years old	-	100.0% (1.0)	-	-
5-9	-	100.0% (1.0)	-	-
10-14	100.0% (1.0)	-	-	-
15-19	100.0% (1.0)	-	-	-

20-25	100.0% (1.0)	-	-	-
-------	--------------	---	---	---

AGE RANGE

187 REGISTERED VOTERS

	0	1	2-3	4+
--	---	---	-----	----

18-29 (1)

Under 5 years old	100.0% (1.0)	-	-	-
5-9	-	100.0% (1.0)	-	-
10-14	-	-	100.0% (1.0)	-
15-19	100.0% (1.0)	-	-	-
20-25	100.0% (1.0)	-	-	-

30-39 (24)

Under 5 years old	79.2% (19.0)	16.7% (4.0)	4.2% (1.0)	-
5-9	62.5% (15.0)	25.0% (6.0)	12.5% (3.0)	-
10-14	100.0% (24.0)	-	-	-
15-19	95.8% (23.0)	4.2% (1.0)	-	-
20-25	100.0% (24.0)	-	-	-

40-49 (29)

Under 5 years old	79.3% (23.0)	13.8% (4.0)	6.9% (2.0)	-
5-9	62.1% (18.0)	31.0% (9.0)	6.9% (2.0)	-
10-14	51.7% (15.0)	34.5% (10.0)	13.8% (4.0)	-
15-19	86.2% (25.0)	13.8% (4.0)	-	-
20-25	93.1% (27.0)	6.9% (2.0)	-	-

50-59 (23)

Under 5 years old	100.0% (23.0)	-	-	-
5-9	100.0% (23.0)	-	-	-
10-14	87.0% (20.0)	13.0% (3.0)	-	-
15-19	87.0% (20.0)	13.0% (3.0)	-	-
20-25	78.3% (18.0)	17.4% (4.0)	4.3% (1.0)	-

60-69 (26)

Under 5 years old	96.2% (25.0)	3.8% (1.0)	-	-
5-9	92.3% (24.0)	-	7.7% (2.0)	-
10-14	92.3% (24.0)	3.8% (1.0)	3.8% (1.0)	-
15-19	96.2% (25.0)	-	3.8% (1.0)	-
20-25	100.0% (26.0)	-	-	-

70-79 (16)

Under 5 years old	100.0% (16.0)	-	-	-
5-9	100.0% (16.0)	-	-	-
10-14	100.0% (16.0)	-	-	-
15-19	100.0% (16.0)	-	-	-
20-25	100.0% (16.0)	-	-	-

unknown (68)

Under 5 years old	69.1% (47.0)	17.6% (12.0)	13.2% (9.0)	-
5-9	86.8% (59.0)	7.4% (5.0)	5.9% (4.0)	-
10-14	95.6% (65.0)	2.9% (2.0)	1.5% (1.0)	-
15-19	100.0% (68.0)	-	-	-
20-25	97.1% (66.0)	2.9% (2.0)	-	-

VOTERS
AGE

187 REGISTERED VOTERS

	0	1	2-3	4+
--	---	---	-----	----

28 (1)

Under 5 years old	100.0% (1.0)	-	-	-
5-9	-	100.0% (1.0)	-	-
10-14	-	-	100.0% (1.0)	-
15-19	100.0% (1.0)	-	-	-
20-25	100.0% (1.0)	-	-	-

31 (1)

Under 5 years old	100.0% (1.0)	-	-	-
5-9	100.0% (1.0)	-	-	-
10-14	100.0% (1.0)	-	-	-
15-19	100.0% (1.0)	-	-	-
20-25	100.0% (1.0)	-	-	-

32 (1)

Under 5 years old	100.0% (1.0)	-	-	-
5-9	100.0% (1.0)	-	-	-
10-14	100.0% (1.0)	-	-	-
15-19	100.0% (1.0)	-	-	-
20-25	100.0% (1.0)	-	-	-

33 (1)

Under 5 years old	100.0% (1.0)	-	-	-
5-9	100.0% (1.0)	-	-	-
10-14	100.0% (1.0)	-	-	-
15-19	100.0% (1.0)	-	-	-
20-25	100.0% (1.0)	-	-	-

34 (1)

Under 5 years old	100.0% (1.0)	-	-	-
5-9	100.0% (1.0)	-	-	-
10-14	100.0% (1.0)	-	-	-
15-19	100.0% (1.0)	-	-	-
20-25	100.0% (1.0)	-	-	-

35 (5)

Under 5 years old	80.0% (4.0)	-	20.0% (1.0)	-
5-9	60.0% (3.0)	40.0% (2.0)	-	-
10-14	100.0% (5.0)	-	-	-
15-19	100.0% (5.0)	-	-	-
20-25	100.0% (5.0)	-	-	-

36 (3)

Under 5 years old	66.7% (2.0)	33.3% (1.0)	-	-
5-9	66.7% (2.0)	33.3% (1.0)	-	-
10-14	100.0% (3.0)	-	-	-
15-19	100.0% (3.0)	-	-	-
20-25	100.0% (3.0)	-	-	-

37 (5)

Under 5 years old	80.0% (4.0)	20.0% (1.0)	-	-
5-9	20.0% (1.0)	40.0% (2.0)	40.0% (2.0)	-
10-14	100.0% (5.0)	-	-	-
15-19	100.0% (5.0)	-	-	-
20-25	100.0% (5.0)	-	-	-

38 (3)

Under 5 years old	100.0% (3.0)	-	-	-
5-9	100.0% (3.0)	-	-	-
10-14	100.0% (3.0)	-	-	-
15-19	66.7% (2.0)	33.3% (1.0)	-	-
20-25	100.0% (3.0)	-	-	-

39 (4)

Under 5 years old	50.0% (2.0)	50.0% (2.0)	-	-
5-9	50.0% (2.0)	25.0% (1.0)	25.0% (1.0)	-
10-14	100.0% (4.0)	-	-	-
15-19	100.0% (4.0)	-	-	-
20-25	100.0% (4.0)	-	-	-

40 (3)

Under 5 years old	66.7% (2.0)	33.3% (1.0)	-	-
5-9	33.3% (1.0)	66.7% (2.0)	-	-
10-14	66.7% (2.0)	-	33.3% (1.0)	-
15-19	100.0% (3.0)	-	-	-
20-25	100.0% (3.0)	-	-	-

41 (3)

Under 5 years old	100.0% (3.0)	-	-	-
5-9	33.3% (1.0)	33.3% (1.0)	33.3% (1.0)	-
10-14	66.7% (2.0)	33.3% (1.0)	-	-
15-19	100.0% (3.0)	-	-	-
20-25	100.0% (3.0)	-	-	-

43 (5)

Under 5 years old	40.0% (2.0)	40.0% (2.0)	20.0% (1.0)	-
5-9	40.0% (2.0)	60.0% (3.0)	-	-
10-14	40.0% (2.0)	60.0% (3.0)	-	-
15-19	80.0% (4.0)	20.0% (1.0)	-	-
20-25	60.0% (3.0)	40.0% (2.0)	-	-

44 (6)

Under 5 years old	66.7% (4.0)	16.7% (1.0)	16.7% (1.0)	-
5-9	66.7% (4.0)	16.7% (1.0)	16.7% (1.0)	-
10-14	66.7% (4.0)	16.7% (1.0)	16.7% (1.0)	-
15-19	100.0% (6.0)	-	-	-
20-25	100.0% (6.0)	-	-	-

45 (2)

Under 5 years old	100.0% (2.0)	-	-	-
5-9	50.0% (1.0)	50.0% (1.0)	-	-
10-14	-	100.0% (2.0)	-	-
15-19	100.0% (2.0)	-	-	-
20-25	100.0% (2.0)	-	-	-

46 (1)

Under 5 years old	100.0% (1.0)	-	-	-
5-9	100.0% (1.0)	-	-	-
10-14	-	-	100.0% (1.0)	-
15-19	100.0% (1.0)	-	-	-
20-25	100.0% (1.0)	-	-	-

47 (3)

Under 5 years old	100.0% (3.0)	-	-	-
5-9	100.0% (3.0)	-	-	-
10-14	33.3% (1.0)	33.3% (1.0)	33.3% (1.0)	-
15-19	66.7% (2.0)	33.3% (1.0)	-	-
20-25	100.0% (3.0)	-	-	-

48 (2)

Under 5 years old	100.0% (2.0)	-	-	-
5-9	100.0% (2.0)	-	-	-
10-14	100.0% (2.0)	-	-	-
15-19	50.0% (1.0)	50.0% (1.0)	-	-
20-25	100.0% (2.0)	-	-	-

49 (4)

Under 5 years old	100.0% (4.0)	-	-	-
5-9	75.0% (3.0)	25.0% (1.0)	-	-
10-14	50.0% (2.0)	50.0% (2.0)	-	-
15-19	75.0% (3.0)	25.0% (1.0)	-	-
20-25	100.0% (4.0)	-	-	-

50 (1)

Under 5 years old	100.0% (1.0)	-	-	-
5-9	100.0% (1.0)	-	-	-
10-14	100.0% (1.0)	-	-	-
15-19	-	100.0% (1.0)	-	-
20-25	-	100.0% (1.0)	-	-

51 (1)

Under 5 years old	100.0% (1.0)	-	-	-
5-9	100.0% (1.0)	-	-	-
10-14	-	100.0% (1.0)	-	-
15-19	100.0% (1.0)	-	-	-
20-25	100.0% (1.0)	-	-	-

52 (5)

Under 5 years old	100.0% (5.0)	-	-	-
5-9	100.0% (5.0)	-	-	-
10-14	60.0% (3.0)	40.0% (2.0)	-	-
15-19	80.0% (4.0)	20.0% (1.0)	-	-
20-25	80.0% (4.0)	20.0% (1.0)	-	-

53 (4)

Under 5 years old	100.0% (4.0)	-	-	-
5-9	100.0% (4.0)	-	-	-
10-14	100.0% (4.0)	-	-	-
15-19	100.0% (4.0)	-	-	-
20-25	75.0% (3.0)	25.0% (1.0)	-	-

54 (1)

Under 5 years old	100.0% (1.0)	-	-	-
5-9	100.0% (1.0)	-	-	-
10-14	100.0% (1.0)	-	-	-
15-19	100.0% (1.0)	-	-	-
20-25	100.0% (1.0)	-	-	-

55 (3)

Under 5 years old	100.0% (3.0)	-	-	-
-------------------	--------------	---	---	---

5-9	100.0% (3.0)	-	-	-
10-14	100.0% (3.0)	-	-	-
15-19	66.7% (2.0)	33.3% (1.0)	-	-
20-25	66.7% (2.0)	33.3% (1.0)	-	-

56 (2)

Under 5 years old	100.0% (2.0)	-	-	-
5-9	100.0% (2.0)	-	-	-
10-14	100.0% (2.0)	-	-	-
15-19	100.0% (2.0)	-	-	-
20-25	100.0% (2.0)	-	-	-

57 (1)

Under 5 years old	100.0% (1.0)	-	-	-
5-9	100.0% (1.0)	-	-	-
10-14	100.0% (1.0)	-	-	-
15-19	100.0% (1.0)	-	-	-
20-25	100.0% (1.0)	-	-	-

59 (5)

Under 5 years old	100.0% (5.0)	-	-	-
5-9	100.0% (5.0)	-	-	-
10-14	100.0% (5.0)	-	-	-
15-19	100.0% (5.0)	-	-	-
20-25	80.0% (4.0)	-	20.0% (1.0)	-

60 (3)

Under 5 years old	100.0% (3.0)	-	-	-
5-9	100.0% (3.0)	-	-	-
10-14	100.0% (3.0)	-	-	-
15-19	100.0% (3.0)	-	-	-
20-25	100.0% (3.0)	-	-	-

61 (1)

Under 5 years old	100.0% (1.0)	-	-	-
5-9	100.0% (1.0)	-	-	-
10-14	100.0% (1.0)	-	-	-
15-19	100.0% (1.0)	-	-	-
20-25	100.0% (1.0)	-	-	-

62 (5)

Under 5 years old	100.0% (5.0)	-	-	-
5-9	100.0% (5.0)	-	-	-
10-14	100.0% (5.0)	-	-	-
15-19	100.0% (5.0)	-	-	-
20-25	100.0% (5.0)	-	-	-

63 (2)

Under 5 years old	100.0% (2.0)	-	-	-
5-9	50.0% (1.0)	-	50.0% (1.0)	-
10-14	100.0% (2.0)	-	-	-
15-19	100.0% (2.0)	-	-	-
20-25	100.0% (2.0)	-	-	-

64 (5)

Under 5 years old	100.0% (5.0)	-	-	-
5-9	100.0% (5.0)	-	-	-

10-14	80.0% (4.0)	20.0% (1.0)	-	-
15-19	100.0% (5.0)	-	-	-
20-25	100.0% (5.0)	-	-	-

65 (2)

Under 5 years old	100.0% (2.0)	-	-	-
5-9	100.0% (2.0)	-	-	-
10-14	50.0% (1.0)	-	50.0% (1.0)	-
15-19	50.0% (1.0)	-	50.0% (1.0)	-
20-25	100.0% (2.0)	-	-	-

66 (2)

Under 5 years old	50.0% (1.0)	50.0% (1.0)	-	-
5-9	50.0% (1.0)	-	50.0% (1.0)	-
10-14	100.0% (2.0)	-	-	-
15-19	100.0% (2.0)	-	-	-
20-25	100.0% (2.0)	-	-	-

67 (1)

Under 5 years old	100.0% (1.0)	-	-	-
5-9	100.0% (1.0)	-	-	-
10-14	100.0% (1.0)	-	-	-
15-19	100.0% (1.0)	-	-	-
20-25	100.0% (1.0)	-	-	-

68 (3)

Under 5 years old	100.0% (3.0)	-	-	-
5-9	100.0% (3.0)	-	-	-
10-14	100.0% (3.0)	-	-	-
15-19	100.0% (3.0)	-	-	-
20-25	100.0% (3.0)	-	-	-

69 (2)

Under 5 years old	100.0% (2.0)	-	-	-
5-9	100.0% (2.0)	-	-	-
10-14	100.0% (2.0)	-	-	-
15-19	100.0% (2.0)	-	-	-
20-25	100.0% (2.0)	-	-	-

71 (2)

Under 5 years old	100.0% (2.0)	-	-	-
5-9	100.0% (2.0)	-	-	-
10-14	100.0% (2.0)	-	-	-
15-19	100.0% (2.0)	-	-	-
20-25	100.0% (2.0)	-	-	-

72 (3)

Under 5 years old	100.0% (3.0)	-	-	-
5-9	100.0% (3.0)	-	-	-
10-14	100.0% (3.0)	-	-	-
15-19	100.0% (3.0)	-	-	-
20-25	100.0% (3.0)	-	-	-

73 (3)

Under 5 years old	100.0% (3.0)	-	-	-
5-9	100.0% (3.0)	-	-	-
10-14	100.0% (3.0)	-	-	-

15-19	100.0% (3.0)	-	-	-
20-25	100.0% (3.0)	-	-	-

74 (4)

Under 5 years old	100.0% (4.0)	-	-	-
5-9	100.0% (4.0)	-	-	-
10-14	100.0% (4.0)	-	-	-
15-19	100.0% (4.0)	-	-	-
20-25	100.0% (4.0)	-	-	-

77 (2)

Under 5 years old	100.0% (2.0)	-	-	-
5-9	100.0% (2.0)	-	-	-
10-14	100.0% (2.0)	-	-	-
15-19	100.0% (2.0)	-	-	-
20-25	100.0% (2.0)	-	-	-

79 (2)

Under 5 years old	100.0% (2.0)	-	-	-
5-9	100.0% (2.0)	-	-	-
10-14	100.0% (2.0)	-	-	-
15-19	100.0% (2.0)	-	-	-
20-25	100.0% (2.0)	-	-	-

Unknown (68)

Under 5 years old	69.1% (47.0)	17.6% (12.0)	13.2% (9.0)	-
5-9	86.8% (59.0)	7.4% (5.0)	5.9% (4.0)	-
10-14	95.6% (65.0)	2.9% (2.0)	1.5% (1.0)	-
15-19	100.0% (68.0)	-	-	-
20-25	97.1% (66.0)	2.9% (2.0)	-	-

**STATE INCOME
DECILE**

187 REGISTERED VOTERS

	0	1	2-3	4+
--	---	---	-----	----

0 to 9 Pct range (6)

Under 5 years old	83.3% (5.0)	16.7% (1.0)	-	-
5-9	100.0% (6.0)	-	-	-
10-14	100.0% (6.0)	-	-	-
15-19	100.0% (6.0)	-	-	-
20-25	100.0% (6.0)	-	-	-

10 to 19 Pct range (1)

Under 5 years old	-	100.0% (1.0)	-	-
5-9	100.0% (1.0)	-	-	-
10-14	-	-	100.0% (1.0)	-
15-19	100.0% (1.0)	-	-	-
20-25	100.0% (1.0)	-	-	-

40 to 49 Pct range (2)

Under 5 years old	50.0% (1.0)	50.0% (1.0)	-	-
5-9	50.0% (1.0)	50.0% (1.0)	-	-
10-14	50.0% (1.0)	-	50.0% (1.0)	-
15-19	100.0% (2.0)	-	-	-
20-25	100.0% (2.0)	-	-	-

50 to 59 Pct range (9)

Under 5 years old	77.8% (7.0)	11.1% (1.0)	11.1% (1.0)	-
5-9	77.8% (7.0)	22.2% (2.0)	-	-
10-14	88.9% (8.0)	-	11.1% (1.0)	-
15-19	88.9% (8.0)	11.1% (1.0)	-	-
20-25	77.8% (7.0)	22.2% (2.0)	-	-

60 to 69 Pct range (7)

Under 5 years old	100.0% (7.0)	-	-	-
5-9	100.0% (7.0)	-	-	-
10-14	100.0% (7.0)	-	-	-
15-19	100.0% (7.0)	-	-	-
20-25	100.0% (7.0)	-	-	-

70 to 79 Pct range (5)

Under 5 years old	100.0% (5.0)	-	-	-
5-9	100.0% (5.0)	-	-	-
10-14	100.0% (5.0)	-	-	-
15-19	80.0% (4.0)	20.0% (1.0)	-	-
20-25	100.0% (5.0)	-	-	-

80 to 89 Pct range (70)

Under 5 years old	88.6% (62.0)	5.7% (4.0)	5.7% (4.0)	-
5-9	88.6% (62.0)	7.1% (5.0)	4.3% (3.0)	-
10-14	91.4% (64.0)	7.1% (5.0)	1.4% (1.0)	-
15-19	95.7% (67.0)	2.9% (2.0)	1.4% (1.0)	-
20-25	95.7% (67.0)	4.3% (3.0)	-	-

90 Pct and up (85)

Under 5 years old	76.5% (65.0)	15.3% (13.0)	8.2% (7.0)	-
5-9	76.5% (65.0)	15.3% (13.0)	8.2% (7.0)	-
10-14	83.5% (71.0)	12.9% (11.0)	3.5% (3.0)	-
15-19	95.3% (81.0)	4.7% (4.0)	-	-
20-25	95.3% (81.0)	3.5% (3.0)	1.2% (1.0)	-

Unknown (2)

Under 5 years old	100.0% (2.0)	-	-	-
5-9	50.0% (1.0)	-	50.0% (1.0)	-
10-14	100.0% (2.0)	-	-	-
15-19	100.0% (2.0)	-	-	-
20-25	100.0% (2.0)	-	-	-

HOME OWNER/RENTER

187 REGISTERED VOTERS

	0	1	2-3	4+
--	---	---	-----	----

Likely Homeowner (106)

Under 5 years old	79.2% (84.0)	12.3% (13.0)	8.5% (9.0)	-
5-9	78.3% (83.0)	14.2% (15.0)	7.5% (8.0)	-
10-14	86.8% (92.0)	10.4% (11.0)	2.8% (3.0)	-
15-19	94.3% (100.0)	4.7% (5.0)	0.9% (1.0)	-
20-25	95.3% (101.0)	4.7% (5.0)	-	-

Likely Renter (55)

Under 5 years old	94.5% (52.0)	3.6% (2.0)	1.8% (1.0)	-
5-9	94.5% (52.0)	5.5% (3.0)	-	-
10-14	90.9% (50.0)	3.6% (2.0)	5.5% (3.0)	-
15-19	98.2% (54.0)	1.8% (1.0)	-	-
20-25	96.4% (53.0)	3.6% (2.0)	-	-

Unknown (26)

Under 5 years old	69.2% (18.0)	23.1% (6.0)	7.7% (2.0)	-
5-9	76.9% (20.0)	11.5% (3.0)	11.5% (3.0)	-
10-14	84.6% (22.0)	11.5% (3.0)	3.8% (1.0)	-
15-19	92.3% (24.0)	7.7% (2.0)	-	-
20-25	92.3% (24.0)	3.8% (1.0)	3.8% (1.0)	-

Please rate your level of satisfaction with the following aspects of your neighborhood:

CURRENT RESULTS	303 Total Responses				
	Very Unsatisfied	Unsatisfied	Neutral	Satisfied	Very Satisfied
Sense of community (Type and quality of relationships with your neighbors)	1% (3)	8% (24)	23% (71)	43% (130)	25% (75)
Cleanliness and up-keep	1% (4)	6% (19)	9% (27)	52% (159)	31% (94)
Street tree quality and number (Street trees are those located in the public right of way.)	2% (5)	8% (25)	20% (60)	49% (149)	21% (64)
Walk-ability (Ability to walk to the places you would like to walk to)	9% (27)	17% (52)	22% (66)	29% (89)	23% (69)
Bike-ability (Ability to bike to the places you would like to bike to)	3% (9)	7% (20)	18% (55)	38% (114)	35% (105)
Traffic	9% (27)	21% (63)	24% (73)	38% (114)	9% (26)
Safety	6% (19)	19% (59)	19% (58)	43% (130)	12% (37)

REGISTERED (181)

	Very Unsatisfied	Unsatisfied	Neutral	Satisfied	Very Satisfied
Sense of community (Type and quality of relationships with your neighbors)	1.0% (2)	6.0% (10)	23.0% (42)	47.0% (85)	23.0% (42)
Cleanliness and up-keep	1.0% (2)	7.0% (12)	7.0% (13)	57.0% (104)	28.0% (50)
Street tree quality and number (Street trees are those located in the public right of way.)	2.0% (4)	7.0% (12)	21.0% (38)	48.0% (87)	22.0% (40)
Walk-ability (Ability to walk to the places you would like to walk to)	8.0% (15)	18.0% (33)	19.0% (34)	33.0% (60)	22.0% (39)
Bike-ability (Ability to bike to the places you would like to bike to)	2.0% (4)	5.0% (9)	16.0% (29)	41.0% (75)	35.0% (64)
Traffic	7.0% (12)	21.0% (38)	24.0% (43)	40.0% (72)	9.0% (16)
Safety	6.0% (10)	20.0% (36)	19.0% (35)	47.0% (85)	8.0% (15)

NON-REGISTERED (122)

	Very Unsatisfied	Unsatisfied	Neutral	Satisfied	Very Satisfied
Sense of community (Type and quality of relationships with your neighbors)	0.8% (1)	11.5% (14)	23.8% (29)	36.9% (45)	27.0% (33)
Cleanliness and up-keep	1.6% (2)	5.7% (7)	11.5% (14)	45.1% (55)	36.1% (44)
Street tree quality and number (Street trees are those located in the public right of way.)	0.8% (1)	10.7% (13)	18.0% (22)	50.8% (62)	19.7% (24)
Walk-ability (Ability to walk to the places you would like to walk to)	9.8% (12)	15.6% (19)	26.2% (32)	23.8% (29)	24.6% (30)
Bike-ability (Ability to bike to the places you would like to bike to)	4.1% (5)	9.0% (11)	21.3% (26)	32.0% (39)	33.6% (41)
Traffic	12.3% (15)	20.5% (25)	24.6% (30)	34.4% (42)	8.2% (10)
Safety	7.4% (9)	18.9% (23)	18.9% (23)	36.9% (45)	18.0% (22)

ALL RESPONDENTS (303)

	Very Unsatisfied	Unsatisfied	Neutral	Satisfied	Very Satisfied
Sense of community (Type and quality of relationships with your neighbors)	1% (3)	8% (24)	23% (71)	43% (130)	25% (75)
Cleanliness and up-keep	1% (4)	6% (19)	9% (27)	52% (159)	31% (94)
Street tree quality and number (Street trees are those located in the public right of way.)	2% (5)	8% (25)	20% (60)	49% (149)	21% (64)
Walk-ability (Ability to walk to the places you would like to walk to)	9% (27)	17% (52)	22% (66)	29% (89)	23% (69)
Bike-ability (Ability to bike to the places you would like to bike to)	3% (9)	7% (20)	18% (55)	38% (114)	35% (105)
Traffic	9% (27)	21% (63)	24% (73)	38% (114)	9% (26)
Safety	6% (19)	19% (59)	19% (58)	43% (130)	12% (37)

REGISTERED VOTERS IN FITCHBURG, WI (181)

	Very Unsatisfied	Unsatisfied	Neutral	Satisfied	Very Satisfied
Sense of community (Type and quality of relationships with your neighbors)	1% (2)	6% (10)	23% (42)	47% (85)	23% (42)
Cleanliness and up-keep	1% (2)	7% (12)	7% (13)	57% (104)	28% (50)
Street tree quality and number (Street trees are those located in the public right of way.)	2% (4)	7% (12)	21% (38)	48% (87)	22% (40)
Walk-ability (Ability to walk to the places you would like to walk to)	8% (15)	18% (33)	19% (34)	33% (60)	22% (39)
Bike-ability (Ability to bike to the places you would like to bike to)	2% (4)	5% (9)	16% (29)	41% (75)	35% (64)
Traffic	7% (12)	21% (38)	24% (43)	40% (72)	9% (16)
Safety	6% (10)	20% (36)	19% (35)	47% (85)	8% (15)

LIVE IN FITCHBURG, WI (267) - SELF-REPORTED

	Very Unsatisfied	Unsatisfied	Neutral	Satisfied	Very Satisfied
Sense of community (Type and quality of relationships with your neighbors)	1% (3)	8% (21)	23% (62)	44% (117)	24% (64)
Cleanliness and up-keep	1% (3)	6% (17)	9% (24)	53% (142)	30% (81)
Street tree quality and number (Street trees are those located in the public right of way.)	1% (4)	8% (22)	20% (54)	49% (131)	21% (56)
Walk-ability (Ability to walk to the places you would like to walk to)	8% (21)	18% (47)	22% (58)	30% (81)	22% (60)
Bike-ability (Ability to bike to the places you would like to bike to)	3% (7)	6% (16)	18% (49)	38% (101)	35% (94)
Traffic	9% (24)	21% (55)	24% (63)	39% (104)	8% (21)
Safety	7% (18)	20% (53)	19% (51)	43% (115)	11% (30)

SUBSCRIBERS TO FITCHBURG, WI (271)

	Very Unsatisfied	Unsatisfied	Neutral	Satisfied	Very Satisfied
Sense of community (Type and quality of relationships with your neighbors)	1% (3)	8% (21)	23% (63)	44% (120)	24% (64)
Cleanliness and up-keep	1% (3)	6% (17)	9% (25)	53% (143)	31% (83)
Street tree quality and number (Street trees are those located in the public right of way.)	1% (4)	8% (22)	20% (55)	49% (132)	21% (58)
Walk-ability (Ability to walk to the places you would like to walk to)	8% (21)	17% (47)	23% (61)	30% (81)	23% (61)
Bike-ability (Ability to bike to the places you would like to bike to)	3% (7)	6% (16)	19% (51)	38% (102)	35% (95)
Traffic	9% (24)	20% (55)	24% (65)	39% (105)	8% (22)
Safety	7% (18)	20% (53)	19% (52)	43% (117)	11% (31)

REGISTER RESPONDENTS FROM ANYWHERE (187)

	Very Unsatisfied	Unsatisfied	Neutral	Satisfied	Very Satisfied
Sense of community (Type and quality of relationships with your neighbors)	1% (2)	6% (11)	23% (43)	46% (86)	24% (45)
Cleanliness and up-keep	1% (2)	6% (12)	7% (14)	57% (107)	28% (52)
Street tree quality and number (Street trees are those located in the public right of way.)	2% (4)	7% (13)	21% (39)	48% (89)	22% (42)
Walk-ability (Ability to walk to the places you would like to walk to)	8% (15)	18% (33)	20% (37)	32% (60)	22% (42)
Bike-ability (Ability to bike to the places you would like to bike to)	2% (4)	5% (9)	17% (31)	41% (76)	36% (67)
Traffic	6% (12)	20% (38)	25% (47)	39% (73)	9% (17)
Safety	5% (10)	19% (36)	20% (37)	48% (89)	8% (15)

EDUCATION

187 REGISTERED VOTERS

	Very Unsatisfied	Unsatisfied	Neutral	Satisfied	Very Satisfied
Bach Degree - Extremely Likely (30)					
Sense of community (Type and quality of relationships with your neighbors)	-	3.3% (1.0)	33.3% (10.0)	33.3% (10.0)	30.0% (9.0)
Cleanliness and up-keep	-	3.3% (1.0)	10.0% (3.0)	53.3% (16.0)	33.3% (10.0)
Street tree quality and number (Street trees are those located in the public right of way.)	3.3% (1.0)	13.3% (4.0)	23.3% (7.0)	33.3% (10.0)	26.7% (8.0)
Walk-ability (Ability to walk to the places you would like to walk to)	3.3% (1.0)	10.0% (3.0)	26.7% (8.0)	36.7% (11.0)	23.3% (7.0)
Bike-ability (Ability to bike to the places you would like to bike to)	-	6.7% (2.0)	13.3% (4.0)	50.0% (15.0)	30.0% (9.0)
Traffic	-	20.0% (6.0)	23.3% (7.0)	46.7% (14.0)	10.0% (3.0)
Safety	3.3% (1.0)	30.0% (9.0)	16.7% (5.0)	40.0% (12.0)	10.0% (3.0)

Bach Degree - Likely (21)

Sense of community (Type and quality of relationships with your neighbors)	4.8% (1.0)	4.8% (1.0)	14.3% (3.0)	52.4% (11.0)	23.8% (5.0)
Cleanliness and up-keep	4.8% (1.0)	14.3% (3.0)	4.8% (1.0)	52.4% (11.0)	23.8% (5.0)
Street tree quality and number (Street trees are those located in the public right of way.)	-	4.8% (1.0)	14.3% (3.0)	66.7% (14.0)	14.3% (3.0)
Walk-ability (Ability to walk to the places you would like to walk to)	9.5% (2.0)	14.3% (3.0)	4.8% (1.0)	52.4% (11.0)	19.0% (4.0)
Bike-ability (Ability to bike to the places you would like to bike to)	-	9.5% (2.0)	14.3% (3.0)	38.1% (8.0)	38.1% (8.0)
Traffic	28.6% (6.0)	23.8% (5.0)	19.0% (4.0)	19.0% (4.0)	9.5% (2.0)
Safety	4.8% (1.0)	23.8% (5.0)	33.3% (7.0)	23.8% (5.0)	14.3% (3.0)

Grad Degree - Extremely Likely (22)

Sense of community (Type and quality of relationships with your neighbors)	-	-	27.3% (6.0)	50.0% (11.0)	22.7% (5.0)
Cleanliness and up-keep	-	4.5% (1.0)	4.5% (1.0)	59.1% (13.0)	31.8% (7.0)
Street tree quality and number (Street trees are those located in the public right of way.)	4.5% (1.0)	9.1% (2.0)	18.2% (4.0)	50.0% (11.0)	18.2% (4.0)
Walk-ability (Ability to walk to the places you would like to walk to)	-	18.2% (4.0)	27.3% (6.0)	36.4% (8.0)	18.2% (4.0)
Bike-ability (Ability to bike to the places you would like to bike to)	-	9.1% (2.0)	13.6% (3.0)	36.4% (8.0)	40.9% (9.0)
Traffic	4.5% (1.0)	18.2% (4.0)	27.3% (6.0)	36.4% (8.0)	13.6% (3.0)

Safety	-	36.4% (8.0)	18.2% (4.0)	40.9% (9.0)	4.5% (1.0)
--------	---	-------------	-------------	-------------	------------

Grad Degree - Likely (13)

Sense of community (Type and quality of relationships with your neighbors)	-	7.7% (1.0)	53.8% (7.0)	30.8% (4.0)	7.7% (1.0)
Cleanliness and up-keep	-	15.4% (2.0)	15.4% (2.0)	46.2% (6.0)	23.1% (3.0)
Street tree quality and number (Street trees are those located in the public right of way.)	-	23.1% (3.0)	23.1% (3.0)	38.5% (5.0)	15.4% (2.0)
Walk-ability (Ability to walk to the places you would like to walk to)	15.4% (2.0)	30.8% (4.0)	15.4% (2.0)	30.8% (4.0)	7.7% (1.0)
Bike-ability (Ability to bike to the places you would like to bike to)	7.7% (1.0)	-	38.5% (5.0)	38.5% (5.0)	15.4% (2.0)
Traffic	-	38.5% (5.0)	15.4% (2.0)	46.2% (6.0)	-
Safety	23.1% (3.0)	7.7% (1.0)	15.4% (2.0)	46.2% (6.0)	7.7% (1.0)

HS Diploma - Extremely Likely (9)

Sense of community (Type and quality of relationships with your neighbors)	-	-	11.1% (1.0)	55.6% (5.0)	33.3% (3.0)
Cleanliness and up-keep	-	-	-	55.6% (5.0)	44.4% (4.0)
Street tree quality and number (Street trees are those located in the public right of way.)	-	11.1% (1.0)	-	33.3% (3.0)	55.6% (5.0)
Walk-ability (Ability to walk to the places you would like to walk to)	11.1% (1.0)	11.1% (1.0)	33.3% (3.0)	22.2% (2.0)	22.2% (2.0)
Bike-ability (Ability to bike to the places you would like to bike to)	-	-	33.3% (3.0)	33.3% (3.0)	33.3% (3.0)
Traffic	-	11.1% (1.0)	55.6% (5.0)	11.1% (1.0)	22.2% (2.0)
Safety	11.1% (1.0)	-	33.3% (3.0)	44.4% (4.0)	11.1% (1.0)

HS Diploma - Likely (4)

Sense of community (Type and quality of relationships with your neighbors)	-	-	25.0% (1.0)	75.0% (3.0)	-
Cleanliness and up-keep	-	-	-	75.0% (3.0)	25.0% (1.0)
Street tree quality and number (Street trees are those located in the public right of way.)	-	-	25.0% (1.0)	50.0% (2.0)	25.0% (1.0)
Walk-ability (Ability to walk to the places you would like to walk to)	-	50.0% (2.0)	25.0% (1.0)	25.0% (1.0)	-
Bike-ability (Ability to bike to the places you would like to bike to)	-	-	-	75.0% (3.0)	25.0% (1.0)
Traffic	-	25.0% (1.0)	25.0% (1.0)	50.0% (2.0)	-
Safety	-	-	25.0% (1.0)	75.0% (3.0)	-

Less than HS Diploma - Likely (1)

Sense of community (Type and quality of relationships with your neighbors)	-	-	-	-	100.0% (1.0)
Cleanliness and up-keep	-	-	-	100.0% (1.0)	-
Street tree quality and number (Street trees are those located in the public right of way.)	-	-	100.0% (1.0)	-	-
Walk-ability (Ability to walk to the places you would like to walk to)	-	-	-	100.0% (1.0)	-
Bike-ability (Ability to bike to the places you would like to bike to)	-	-	-	100.0% (1.0)	-
Traffic	-	-	100.0% (1.0)	-	-
Safety	-	-	-	100.0% (1.0)	-

Some College - Likely (12)

Sense of community (Type and quality of relationships with your neighbors)	-	33.3% (4.0)	25.0% (3.0)	25.0% (3.0)	16.7% (2.0)
Cleanliness and up-keep	-	8.3% (1.0)	8.3% (1.0)	58.3% (7.0)	25.0% (3.0)
Street tree quality and number (Street trees are those located in the public right of way.)	-	8.3% (1.0)	33.3% (4.0)	33.3% (4.0)	25.0% (3.0)
Walk-ability (Ability to walk to the places you would like to walk to)	8.3% (1.0)	16.7% (2.0)	25.0% (3.0)	25.0% (3.0)	25.0% (3.0)
Bike-ability (Ability to bike to the places you would like to bike to)	-	-	25.0% (3.0)	41.7% (5.0)	33.3% (4.0)
Traffic	-	8.3% (1.0)	33.3% (4.0)	50.0% (6.0)	8.3% (1.0)
Safety	8.3% (1.0)	8.3% (1.0)	16.7% (2.0)	58.3% (7.0)	8.3% (1.0)

Some College -Extremely Likely (5)

Sense of community (Type and quality of relationships with your neighbors)	-	-	-	100.0% (5.0)	-
Cleanliness and up-keep	-	-	-	60.0% (3.0)	40.0% (2.0)
Street tree quality and number (Street trees are those located in the public right of way.)	-	-	-	60.0% (3.0)	40.0% (2.0)
Walk-ability (Ability to walk to the places you would like to walk to)	-	20.0% (1.0)	-	20.0% (1.0)	60.0% (3.0)
Bike-ability (Ability to bike to the places you would like to bike to)	20.0% (1.0)	-	-	20.0% (1.0)	60.0% (3.0)
Traffic	20.0% (1.0)	40.0% (2.0)	-	20.0% (1.0)	20.0% (1.0)
Safety	-	20.0% (1.0)	-	80.0% (4.0)	-

Unknown (70)

Sense of community (Type and quality of relationships with your neighbors)	1.4% (1.0)	5.7% (4.0)	17.1% (12.0)	48.6% (34.0)	27.1% (19.0)
Cleanliness and up-keep	1.4% (1.0)	5.7% (4.0)	8.6% (6.0)	60.0% (42.0)	24.3% (17.0)
Street tree quality and number (Street trees are those located in the public right of way.)	2.9% (2.0)	1.4% (1.0)	22.9% (16.0)	52.9% (37.0)	20.0% (14.0)
Walk-ability (Ability to walk to the places you would like to walk to)	11.4% (8.0)	18.6% (13.0)	18.6% (13.0)	25.7% (18.0)	25.7% (18.0)
Bike-ability (Ability to bike to the places you would like to bike to)	2.9% (2.0)	4.3% (3.0)	14.3% (10.0)	38.6% (27.0)	40.0% (28.0)
Traffic	5.7% (4.0)	18.6% (13.0)	24.3% (17.0)	44.3% (31.0)	7.1% (5.0)
Safety	4.3% (3.0)	15.7% (11.0)	18.6% (13.0)	54.3% (38.0)	7.1% (5.0)

VOTERS GENDER

187 REGISTERED VOTERS

	Very Unsatisfied	Unsatisfied	Neutral	Satisfied	Very Satisfied
--	------------------	-------------	---------	-----------	----------------

F (90)

Sense of community (Type and quality of relationships with your neighbors)	1.1% (1.0)	6.7% (6.0)	22.2% (20.0)	41.1% (37.0)	28.9% (26.0)
Cleanliness and up-keep	1.1% (1.0)	5.6% (5.0)	5.6% (5.0)	52.2% (47.0)	35.6% (32.0)
Street tree quality and number (Street trees are those located in the public right of way.)	1.1% (1.0)	6.7% (6.0)	21.1% (19.0)	44.4% (40.0)	26.7% (24.0)
Walk-ability (Ability to walk to the places you would like to walk to)	5.6% (5.0)	21.1% (19.0)	17.8% (16.0)	32.2% (29.0)	23.3% (21.0)
Bike-ability (Ability to bike to the places you would like to bike to)	2.2% (2.0)	3.3% (3.0)	14.4% (13.0)	42.2% (38.0)	37.8% (34.0)
Traffic	8.9% (8.0)	15.6% (14.0)	21.1% (19.0)	43.3% (39.0)	11.1% (10.0)
Safety	5.6% (5.0)	21.1% (19.0)	16.7% (15.0)	47.8% (43.0)	8.9% (8.0)

M (95)

Sense of community (Type and quality of relationships with your neighbors)	1.1% (1.0)	5.3% (5.0)	23.2% (22.0)	50.5% (48.0)	20.0% (19.0)
Cleanliness and up-keep	1.1% (1.0)	6.3% (6.0)	9.5% (9.0)	62.1% (59.0)	21.1% (20.0)
Street tree quality and number (Street trees are those located in the public right of way.)	3.2% (3.0)	7.4% (7.0)	20.0% (19.0)	50.5% (48.0)	18.9% (18.0)
Walk-ability (Ability to walk to the places you would like to walk to)	10.5% (10.0)	14.7% (14.0)	22.1% (21.0)	31.6% (30.0)	21.1% (20.0)
Bike-ability (Ability to bike to the places you would like to bike to)	2.1% (2.0)	6.3% (6.0)	18.9% (18.0)	38.9% (37.0)	33.7% (32.0)
Traffic	4.2% (4.0)	25.3% (24.0)	29.5% (28.0)	34.7% (33.0)	6.3% (6.0)
Safety	5.3% (5.0)	17.9% (17.0)	22.1% (21.0)	47.4% (45.0)	7.4% (7.0)

Unknown (2)

Sense of community (Type and quality of relationships with your neighbors)	-	-	50.0% (1.0)	50.0% (1.0)	-
Cleanliness and up-keep	-	50.0% (1.0)	-	50.0% (1.0)	-
Street tree quality and number (Street trees are those located in the public right of way.)	-	-	50.0% (1.0)	50.0% (1.0)	-
Walk-ability (Ability to walk to the places you would like to walk to)	-	-	-	50.0% (1.0)	50.0% (1.0)
Bike-ability (Ability to bike to the places you would like to bike to)	-	-	-	50.0% (1.0)	50.0% (1.0)
Traffic	-	-	-	50.0% (1.0)	50.0% (1.0)
Safety	-	-	50.0% (1.0)	50.0% (1.0)	-

PRECINCT

187 REGISTERED VOTERS

	Very Unsatisfied	Unsatisfied	Neutral	Satisfied	Very Satisfied
--	------------------	-------------	---------	-----------	----------------

CHICAGO 43-04 (1)

Sense of community (Type and quality of relationships with your neighbors)	-	-	-	-	100.0% (1.0)
Cleanliness and up-keep	-	-	-	-	100.0% (1.0)
Street tree quality and number (Street trees are those located in the public right of way.)	-	-	-	-	100.0% (1.0)
Walk-ability (Ability to walk to the places you would like to walk to)	-	-	-	-	100.0% (1.0)
Bike-ability (Ability to bike to the places you would like to bike to)	-	-	-	-	100.0% (1.0)
Traffic	-	-	-	-	100.0% (1.0)
Safety	-	-	-	100.0% (1.0)	-

FITCHBURG CITY WARD 01 (9)

Sense of community (Type and quality of relationships with your neighbors)	-	11.1% (1.0)	22.2% (2.0)	55.6% (5.0)	11.1% (1.0)
Cleanliness and up-keep	-	33.3% (3.0)	-	66.7% (6.0)	-
Street tree quality and number (Street trees are those located in the public right of way.)	-	-	55.6% (5.0)	33.3% (3.0)	11.1% (1.0)
Walk-ability (Ability to walk to the places you would like to walk to)	-	44.4% (4.0)	33.3% (3.0)	22.2% (2.0)	-
Bike-ability (Ability to bike to the places you would like to bike to)	-	-	33.3% (3.0)	66.7% (6.0)	-
Traffic	-	33.3% (3.0)	-	66.7% (6.0)	-

Safety	-	-	33.3% (3.0)	33.3% (3.0)	33.3% (3.0)	-
--------	---	---	-------------	-------------	-------------	---

FITCHBURG CITY WARD 02 (3)

Sense of community (Type and quality of relationships with your neighbors)	-	-	33.3% (1.0)	66.7% (2.0)	-	-
Cleanliness and up-keep	-	-	-	66.7% (2.0)	33.3% (1.0)	-
Street tree quality and number (Street trees are those located in the public right of way.)	-	-	33.3% (1.0)	33.3% (1.0)	33.3% (1.0)	-
Walk-ability (Ability to walk to the places you would like to walk to)	-	-	33.3% (1.0)	66.7% (2.0)	-	-
Bike-ability (Ability to bike to the places you would like to bike to)	-	-	-	100.0% (3.0)	-	-
Traffic	-	-	33.3% (1.0)	66.7% (2.0)	-	-
Safety	-	-	-	100.0% (3.0)	-	-

FITCHBURG CITY WARD 04 (2)

Sense of community (Type and quality of relationships with your neighbors)	-	-	50.0% (1.0)	50.0% (1.0)	-	-
Cleanliness and up-keep	-	50.0% (1.0)	-	50.0% (1.0)	-	-
Street tree quality and number (Street trees are those located in the public right of way.)	-	-	50.0% (1.0)	50.0% (1.0)	-	-
Walk-ability (Ability to walk to the places you would like to walk to)	-	-	50.0% (1.0)	-	50.0% (1.0)	-
Bike-ability (Ability to bike to the places you would like to bike to)	-	-	-	-	100.0% (2.0)	-
Traffic	-	-	50.0% (1.0)	50.0% (1.0)	-	-
Safety	50.0% (1.0)	-	-	50.0% (1.0)	-	-

FITCHBURG CITY WARD 05 (6)

Sense of community (Type and quality of relationships with your neighbors)	-	-	16.7% (1.0)	50.0% (3.0)	33.3% (2.0)	-
Cleanliness and up-keep	-	-	-	33.3% (2.0)	66.7% (4.0)	-
Street tree quality and number (Street trees are those located in the public right of way.)	-	16.7% (1.0)	-	33.3% (2.0)	50.0% (3.0)	-
Walk-ability (Ability to walk to the places you would like to walk to)	-	16.7% (1.0)	16.7% (1.0)	16.7% (1.0)	50.0% (3.0)	-
Bike-ability (Ability to bike to the places you would like to bike to)	-	16.7% (1.0)	-	16.7% (1.0)	66.7% (4.0)	-
Traffic	-	16.7% (1.0)	16.7% (1.0)	16.7% (1.0)	50.0% (3.0)	-
Safety	-	-	16.7% (1.0)	50.0% (3.0)	33.3% (2.0)	-

FITCHBURG CITY WARD 06 (12)

Sense of community (Type and quality of relationships with your neighbors)	-	-	33.3% (4.0)	41.7% (5.0)	25.0% (3.0)	-
Cleanliness and up-keep	-	8.3% (1.0)	-	41.7% (5.0)	50.0% (6.0)	-
Street tree quality and number (Street trees are those located in the public right of way.)	-	8.3% (1.0)	-	66.7% (8.0)	25.0% (3.0)	-
Walk-ability (Ability to walk to the places you would like to walk to)	-	16.7% (2.0)	25.0% (3.0)	33.3% (4.0)	25.0% (3.0)	-
Bike-ability (Ability to bike to the places you would like to bike to)	-	-	8.3% (1.0)	41.7% (5.0)	50.0% (6.0)	-
Traffic	-	16.7% (2.0)	33.3% (4.0)	50.0% (6.0)	-	-
Safety	8.3% (1.0)	33.3% (4.0)	8.3% (1.0)	50.0% (6.0)	-	-

FITCHBURG CITY WARD 07 (18)

Sense of community (Type and quality of relationships with your neighbors)	5.6% (1.0)	-	16.7% (3.0)	61.1% (11.0)	16.7% (3.0)	-
Cleanliness and up-keep	5.6% (1.0)	-	5.6% (1.0)	55.6% (10.0)	33.3% (6.0)	-
Street tree quality and number (Street trees are those located in the public right of way.)	5.6% (1.0)	5.6% (1.0)	22.2% (4.0)	38.9% (7.0)	27.8% (5.0)	-
Walk-ability (Ability to walk to the places you would like to walk to)	5.6% (1.0)	-	11.1% (2.0)	38.9% (7.0)	44.4% (8.0)	-
Bike-ability (Ability to bike to the places you would like to bike to)	5.6% (1.0)	-	5.6% (1.0)	27.8% (5.0)	61.1% (11.0)	-
Traffic	5.6% (1.0)	11.1% (2.0)	16.7% (3.0)	55.6% (10.0)	11.1% (2.0)	-
Safety	5.6% (1.0)	16.7% (3.0)	16.7% (3.0)	55.6% (10.0)	5.6% (1.0)	-

FITCHBURG CITY WARD 08 (14)

Sense of community (Type and quality of relationships with your neighbors)	-	7.1% (1.0)	35.7% (5.0)	57.1% (8.0)	-	-
Cleanliness and up-keep	-	7.1% (1.0)	-	78.6% (11.0)	14.3% (2.0)	-
Street tree quality and number (Street trees are those located in the public right of way.)	14.3% (2.0)	-	28.6% (4.0)	28.6% (4.0)	28.6% (4.0)	-
Walk-ability (Ability to walk to the places you would like to walk to)	14.3% (2.0)	-	35.7% (5.0)	35.7% (5.0)	14.3% (2.0)	-
Bike-ability (Ability to bike to the places you would like to bike to)	7.1% (1.0)	7.1% (1.0)	21.4% (3.0)	28.6% (4.0)	35.7% (5.0)	-
Traffic	-	28.6% (4.0)	21.4% (3.0)	50.0% (7.0)	-	-
Safety	14.3% (2.0)	21.4% (3.0)	14.3% (2.0)	50.0% (7.0)	-	-

FITCHBURG CITY WARD 09 (8)

Sense of community (Type and quality of relationships with your neighbors)	-	12.5% (1.0)	12.5% (1.0)	50.0% (4.0)	25.0% (2.0)
Cleanliness and up-keep	-	12.5% (1.0)	12.5% (1.0)	62.5% (5.0)	12.5% (1.0)
Street tree quality and number (Street trees are those located in the public right of way.)	12.5% (1.0)	-	25.0% (2.0)	50.0% (4.0)	12.5% (1.0)
Walk-ability (Ability to walk to the places you would like to walk to)	-	12.5% (1.0)	-	37.5% (3.0)	50.0% (4.0)
Bike-ability (Ability to bike to the places you would like to bike to)	-	-	25.0% (2.0)	25.0% (2.0)	50.0% (4.0)
Traffic	-	-	25.0% (2.0)	62.5% (5.0)	12.5% (1.0)
Safety	-	25.0% (2.0)	25.0% (2.0)	37.5% (3.0)	12.5% (1.0)

FITCHBURG CITY WARD 12 (2)

Sense of community (Type and quality of relationships with your neighbors)	-	-	100.0% (2.0)	-	-
Cleanliness and up-keep	-	-	-	100.0% (2.0)	-
Street tree quality and number (Street trees are those located in the public right of way.)	-	-	50.0% (1.0)	-	50.0% (1.0)
Walk-ability (Ability to walk to the places you would like to walk to)	-	50.0% (1.0)	-	50.0% (1.0)	-
Bike-ability (Ability to bike to the places you would like to bike to)	-	-	-	50.0% (1.0)	50.0% (1.0)
Traffic	-	-	50.0% (1.0)	50.0% (1.0)	-
Safety	-	50.0% (1.0)	-	50.0% (1.0)	-

FITCHBURG CITY WARD 13 (31)

Sense of community (Type and quality of relationships with your neighbors)	3.2% (1.0)	6.5% (2.0)	22.6% (7.0)	48.4% (15.0)	19.4% (6.0)
Cleanliness and up-keep	3.2% (1.0)	3.2% (1.0)	6.5% (2.0)	54.8% (17.0)	32.3% (10.0)
Street tree quality and number (Street trees are those located in the public right of way.)	-	9.7% (3.0)	12.9% (4.0)	61.3% (19.0)	16.1% (5.0)
Walk-ability (Ability to walk to the places you would like to walk to)	12.9% (4.0)	22.6% (7.0)	6.5% (2.0)	32.3% (10.0)	25.8% (8.0)
Bike-ability (Ability to bike to the places you would like to bike to)	-	3.2% (1.0)	19.4% (6.0)	38.7% (12.0)	38.7% (12.0)
Traffic	19.4% (6.0)	29.0% (9.0)	19.4% (6.0)	22.6% (7.0)	9.7% (3.0)
Safety	9.7% (3.0)	25.8% (8.0)	19.4% (6.0)	32.3% (10.0)	12.9% (4.0)

FITCHBURG CITY WARD 14 (19)

Sense of community (Type and quality of relationships with your neighbors)	-	10.5% (2.0)	31.6% (6.0)	36.8% (7.0)	21.1% (4.0)
Cleanliness and up-keep	-	5.3% (1.0)	10.5% (2.0)	68.4% (13.0)	15.8% (3.0)
Street tree quality and number (Street trees are those located in the public right of way.)	-	5.3% (1.0)	21.1% (4.0)	52.6% (10.0)	21.1% (4.0)
Walk-ability (Ability to walk to the places you would like to walk to)	5.3% (1.0)	21.1% (4.0)	15.8% (3.0)	36.8% (7.0)	21.1% (4.0)
Bike-ability (Ability to bike to the places you would like to bike to)	-	5.3% (1.0)	21.1% (4.0)	42.1% (8.0)	31.6% (6.0)
Traffic	5.3% (1.0)	26.3% (5.0)	26.3% (5.0)	36.8% (7.0)	5.3% (1.0)
Safety	-	15.8% (3.0)	26.3% (5.0)	42.1% (8.0)	15.8% (3.0)

FITCHBURG CITY WARD 15 (7)

Sense of community (Type and quality of relationships with your neighbors)	-	-	28.6% (2.0)	57.1% (4.0)	14.3% (1.0)
Cleanliness and up-keep	-	-	14.3% (1.0)	57.1% (4.0)	28.6% (2.0)
Street tree quality and number (Street trees are those located in the public right of way.)	-	-	-	85.7% (6.0)	14.3% (1.0)
Walk-ability (Ability to walk to the places you would like to walk to)	14.3% (1.0)	28.6% (2.0)	28.6% (2.0)	28.6% (2.0)	-
Bike-ability (Ability to bike to the places you would like to bike to)	-	14.3% (1.0)	42.9% (3.0)	42.9% (3.0)	-
Traffic	-	28.6% (2.0)	14.3% (1.0)	57.1% (4.0)	-
Safety	-	14.3% (1.0)	42.9% (3.0)	42.9% (3.0)	-

FITCHBURG CITY WARD 16 (3)

Sense of community (Type and quality of relationships with your neighbors)	-	-	-	66.7% (2.0)	33.3% (1.0)
Cleanliness and up-keep	-	-	-	66.7% (2.0)	33.3% (1.0)
Street tree quality and number (Street trees are those located in the public right of way.)	-	-	33.3% (1.0)	66.7% (2.0)	-
Walk-ability (Ability to walk to the places you would like to walk to)	-	-	-	100.0% (3.0)	-
Bike-ability (Ability to bike to the places you would like to bike to)	-	-	-	66.7% (2.0)	33.3% (1.0)
Traffic	-	-	-	66.7% (2.0)	33.3% (1.0)
Safety	-	-	-	66.7% (2.0)	33.3% (1.0)

FITCHBURG CITY WARD 17 (7)

Sense of community (Type and quality of relationships with your neighbors)	-	28.6% (2.0)	-	28.6% (2.0)	42.9% (3.0)
Cleanliness and up-keep	-	-	14.3% (1.0)	71.4% (5.0)	14.3% (1.0)
Street tree quality and number (Street trees are those located in the public right of way.)	-	-	14.3% (1.0)	57.1% (4.0)	28.6% (2.0)

Walk-ability (Ability to walk to the places you would like to walk to)	14.3% (1.0)	42.9% (3.0)	42.9% (3.0)	-	-
Bike-ability (Ability to bike to the places you would like to bike to)	14.3% (1.0)	28.6% (2.0)	28.6% (2.0)	28.6% (2.0)	-
Traffic	14.3% (1.0)	-	42.9% (3.0)	28.6% (2.0)	14.3% (1.0)
Safety	-	-	28.6% (2.0)	71.4% (5.0)	-

FITCHBURG CITY WARD 18 (12)

Sense of community (Type and quality of relationships with your neighbors)	-	8.3% (1.0)	41.7% (5.0)	33.3% (4.0)	16.7% (2.0)
Cleanliness and up-keep	-	16.7% (2.0)	8.3% (1.0)	58.3% (7.0)	16.7% (2.0)
Street tree quality and number (Street trees are those located in the public right of way.)	-	25.0% (3.0)	33.3% (4.0)	33.3% (4.0)	8.3% (1.0)
Walk-ability (Ability to walk to the places you would like to walk to)	16.7% (2.0)	16.7% (2.0)	41.7% (5.0)	16.7% (2.0)	8.3% (1.0)
Bike-ability (Ability to bike to the places you would like to bike to)	-	8.3% (1.0)	8.3% (1.0)	75.0% (9.0)	8.3% (1.0)
Traffic	8.3% (1.0)	25.0% (3.0)	25.0% (3.0)	41.7% (5.0)	-
Safety	8.3% (1.0)	25.0% (3.0)	25.0% (3.0)	41.7% (5.0)	-

FITCHBURG CITY WARD 19 (26)

Sense of community (Type and quality of relationships with your neighbors)	-	-	7.7% (2.0)	42.3% (11.0)	50.0% (13.0)
Cleanliness and up-keep	-	3.8% (1.0)	15.4% (4.0)	42.3% (11.0)	38.5% (10.0)
Street tree quality and number (Street trees are those located in the public right of way.)	-	7.7% (2.0)	23.1% (6.0)	42.3% (11.0)	26.9% (7.0)
Walk-ability (Ability to walk to the places you would like to walk to)	7.7% (2.0)	23.1% (6.0)	11.5% (3.0)	42.3% (11.0)	15.4% (4.0)
Bike-ability (Ability to bike to the places you would like to bike to)	-	3.8% (1.0)	11.5% (3.0)	46.2% (12.0)	38.5% (10.0)
Traffic	7.7% (2.0)	26.9% (7.0)	30.8% (8.0)	23.1% (6.0)	11.5% (3.0)
Safety	3.8% (1.0)	15.4% (4.0)	15.4% (4.0)	57.7% (15.0)	7.7% (2.0)

MADISON CITY WARD 042 (1)

Sense of community (Type and quality of relationships with your neighbors)	-	-	-	-	100.0% (1.0)
Cleanliness and up-keep	-	-	-	-	100.0% (1.0)
Street tree quality and number (Street trees are those located in the public right of way.)	-	100.0% (1.0)	-	-	-
Walk-ability (Ability to walk to the places you would like to walk to)	-	-	-	-	100.0% (1.0)
Bike-ability (Ability to bike to the places you would like to bike to)	-	-	-	-	100.0% (1.0)
Traffic	-	-	100.0% (1.0)	-	-
Safety	-	-	-	100.0% (1.0)	-

MADISON CITY WARD 053 (1)

Sense of community (Type and quality of relationships with your neighbors)	-	100.0% (1.0)	-	-	-
Cleanliness and up-keep	-	-	-	100.0% (1.0)	-
Street tree quality and number (Street trees are those located in the public right of way.)	-	-	-	100.0% (1.0)	-
Walk-ability (Ability to walk to the places you would like to walk to)	-	-	-	-	100.0% (1.0)
Bike-ability (Ability to bike to the places you would like to bike to)	-	-	-	-	100.0% (1.0)
Traffic	-	-	-	100.0% (1.0)	-
Safety	-	-	-	100.0% (1.0)	-

MADISON CITY WARD 100 (1)

Sense of community (Type and quality of relationships with your neighbors)	-	-	-	-	100.0% (1.0)
Cleanliness and up-keep	-	-	-	-	100.0% (1.0)
Street tree quality and number (Street trees are those located in the public right of way.)	-	-	-	-	100.0% (1.0)
Walk-ability (Ability to walk to the places you would like to walk to)	-	-	-	-	100.0% (1.0)
Bike-ability (Ability to bike to the places you would like to bike to)	-	-	-	-	100.0% (1.0)
Traffic	-	-	-	-	100.0% (1.0)
Safety	-	-	-	-	100.0% (1.0)

MADISON CITY WARD 107 (1)

Sense of community (Type and quality of relationships with your neighbors)	-	-	-	100.0% (1.0)	-
Cleanliness and up-keep	-	-	-	100.0% (1.0)	-
Street tree quality and number (Street trees are those located in the public right of way.)	-	-	-	100.0% (1.0)	-
Walk-ability (Ability to walk to the places you would like to walk to)	-	-	100.0% (1.0)	-	-
Bike-ability (Ability to bike to the places you would like to bike to)	-	-	100.0% (1.0)	-	-
Traffic	-	-	100.0% (1.0)	-	-
Safety	-	-	-	100.0% (1.0)	-

MIDDLETON TOWN WARD 7 (1)

Sense of community (Type and quality of relationships with your neighbors)	-	-	100.0% (1.0)	-	-
Cleanliness and up-keep	-	-	100.0% (1.0)	-	-
Street tree quality and number (Street trees are those located in the public right of way.)	-	-	100.0% (1.0)	-	-
Walk-ability (Ability to walk to the places you would like to walk to)	-	-	100.0% (1.0)	-	-
Bike-ability (Ability to bike to the places you would like to bike to)	-	-	100.0% (1.0)	-	-
Traffic	-	-	100.0% (1.0)	-	-
Safety	-	-	100.0% (1.0)	-	-

MOUNT HOREB VLG WARD 3 (1)

Sense of community (Type and quality of relationships with your neighbors)	-	-	-	-	100.0% (1.0)
Cleanliness and up-keep	-	-	-	100.0% (1.0)	-
Street tree quality and number (Street trees are those located in the public right of way.)	-	-	-	-	100.0% (1.0)
Walk-ability (Ability to walk to the places you would like to walk to)	-	-	100.0% (1.0)	-	-
Bike-ability (Ability to bike to the places you would like to bike to)	-	-	-	100.0% (1.0)	-
Traffic	-	-	100.0% (1.0)	-	-
Safety	-	-	100.0% (1.0)	-	-

OREGON VLG WARD 10 (1)

Sense of community (Type and quality of relationships with your neighbors)	-	-	-	100.0% (1.0)	-
Cleanliness and up-keep	-	-	-	100.0% (1.0)	-
Street tree quality and number (Street trees are those located in the public right of way.)	-	-	-	100.0% (1.0)	-
Walk-ability (Ability to walk to the places you would like to walk to)	100.0% (1.0)	-	-	-	-
Bike-ability (Ability to bike to the places you would like to bike to)	100.0% (1.0)	-	-	-	-
Traffic	-	-	100.0% (1.0)	-	-
Safety	-	100.0% (1.0)	-	-	-

AGE RANGE

187 REGISTERED VOTERS

	Very Unsatisfied	Unsatisfied	Neutral	Satisfied	Very Satisfied
--	------------------	-------------	---------	-----------	----------------

18-29 (1)

Sense of community (Type and quality of relationships with your neighbors)	-	-	-	100.0% (1.0)	-
Cleanliness and up-keep	-	-	-	100.0% (1.0)	-
Street tree quality and number (Street trees are those located in the public right of way.)	-	-	100.0% (1.0)	-	-
Walk-ability (Ability to walk to the places you would like to walk to)	-	100.0% (1.0)	-	-	-
Bike-ability (Ability to bike to the places you would like to bike to)	-	-	-	100.0% (1.0)	-
Traffic	-	100.0% (1.0)	-	-	-
Safety	-	-	-	100.0% (1.0)	-

30-39 (24)

Sense of community (Type and quality of relationships with your neighbors)	-	4.2% (1.0)	25.0% (6.0)	54.2% (13.0)	16.7% (4.0)
Cleanliness and up-keep	-	16.7% (4.0)	16.7% (4.0)	41.7% (10.0)	25.0% (6.0)
Street tree quality and number (Street trees are those located in the public right of way.)	-	12.5% (3.0)	16.7% (4.0)	41.7% (10.0)	29.2% (7.0)
Walk-ability (Ability to walk to the places you would like to walk to)	8.3% (2.0)	20.8% (5.0)	16.7% (4.0)	33.3% (8.0)	20.8% (5.0)
Bike-ability (Ability to bike to the places you would like to bike to)	4.2% (1.0)	8.3% (2.0)	16.7% (4.0)	41.7% (10.0)	29.2% (7.0)
Traffic	-	37.5% (9.0)	16.7% (4.0)	33.3% (8.0)	12.5% (3.0)
Safety	8.3% (2.0)	25.0% (6.0)	16.7% (4.0)	41.7% (10.0)	8.3% (2.0)

40-49 (29)

Sense of community (Type and quality of relationships with your neighbors)	-	6.9% (2.0)	34.5% (10.0)	41.4% (12.0)	17.2% (5.0)
Cleanliness and up-keep	-	13.8% (4.0)	10.3% (3.0)	44.8% (13.0)	31.0% (9.0)
Street tree quality and number (Street trees are those located in the public right of way.)	3.4% (1.0)	3.4% (1.0)	27.6% (8.0)	31.0% (9.0)	34.5% (10.0)
Walk-ability (Ability to walk to the places you would like to walk to)	3.4% (1.0)	13.8% (4.0)	31.0% (9.0)	27.6% (8.0)	24.1% (7.0)
Bike-ability (Ability to bike to the places you would like to bike to)	-	-	17.2% (5.0)	44.8% (13.0)	37.9% (11.0)
Traffic	3.4% (1.0)	13.8% (4.0)	27.6% (8.0)	41.4% (12.0)	13.8% (4.0)
Safety	3.4% (1.0)	24.1% (7.0)	24.1% (7.0)	37.9% (11.0)	10.3% (3.0)

50-59 (23)

Sense of community (Type and quality of relationships with your neighbors)	-	-	13.0% (3.0)	60.9% (14.0)	26.1% (6.0)
Cleanliness and up-keep	-	4.3% (1.0)	-	69.6% (16.0)	26.1% (6.0)
Street tree quality and number (Street trees are those located in the public right of way.)	4.3% (1.0)	4.3% (1.0)	17.4% (4.0)	60.9% (14.0)	13.0% (3.0)
Walk-ability (Ability to walk to the places you would like to walk to)	4.3% (1.0)	4.3% (1.0)	17.4% (4.0)	39.1% (9.0)	34.8% (8.0)
Bike-ability (Ability to bike to the places you would like to bike to)	-	8.7% (2.0)	8.7% (2.0)	52.2% (12.0)	30.4% (7.0)
Traffic	4.3% (1.0)	17.4% (4.0)	30.4% (7.0)	43.5% (10.0)	4.3% (1.0)
Safety	-	21.7% (5.0)	21.7% (5.0)	52.2% (12.0)	4.3% (1.0)

60-69 (26)

Sense of community (Type and quality of relationships with your neighbors)	-	7.7% (2.0)	34.6% (9.0)	34.6% (9.0)	23.1% (6.0)
Cleanliness and up-keep	-	3.8% (1.0)	7.7% (2.0)	50.0% (13.0)	38.5% (10.0)
Street tree quality and number (Street trees are those located in the public right of way.)	-	15.4% (4.0)	26.9% (7.0)	38.5% (10.0)	19.2% (5.0)
Walk-ability (Ability to walk to the places you would like to walk to)	7.7% (2.0)	11.5% (3.0)	15.4% (4.0)	30.8% (8.0)	34.6% (9.0)
Bike-ability (Ability to bike to the places you would like to bike to)	-	-	19.2% (5.0)	30.8% (8.0)	50.0% (13.0)
Traffic	3.8% (1.0)	23.1% (6.0)	15.4% (4.0)	46.2% (12.0)	11.5% (3.0)
Safety	3.8% (1.0)	26.9% (7.0)	23.1% (6.0)	42.3% (11.0)	3.8% (1.0)

70-79 (16)

Sense of community (Type and quality of relationships with your neighbors)	6.3% (1.0)	-	12.5% (2.0)	25.0% (4.0)	56.3% (9.0)
Cleanliness and up-keep	6.3% (1.0)	-	-	62.5% (10.0)	31.3% (5.0)
Street tree quality and number (Street trees are those located in the public right of way.)	6.3% (1.0)	-	18.8% (3.0)	31.3% (5.0)	43.8% (7.0)
Walk-ability (Ability to walk to the places you would like to walk to)	12.5% (2.0)	6.3% (1.0)	12.5% (2.0)	50.0% (8.0)	18.8% (3.0)
Bike-ability (Ability to bike to the places you would like to bike to)	6.3% (1.0)	6.3% (1.0)	18.8% (3.0)	37.5% (6.0)	31.3% (5.0)
Traffic	-	18.8% (3.0)	25.0% (4.0)	43.8% (7.0)	12.5% (2.0)
Safety	12.5% (2.0)	12.5% (2.0)	18.8% (3.0)	43.8% (7.0)	12.5% (2.0)

unknown (68)

Sense of community (Type and quality of relationships with your neighbors)	1.5% (1.0)	8.8% (6.0)	19.1% (13.0)	48.5% (33.0)	22.1% (15.0)
Cleanliness and up-keep	1.5% (1.0)	2.9% (2.0)	7.4% (5.0)	64.7% (44.0)	23.5% (16.0)
Street tree quality and number (Street trees are those located in the public right of way.)	1.5% (1.0)	5.9% (4.0)	17.6% (12.0)	60.3% (41.0)	14.7% (10.0)
Walk-ability (Ability to walk to the places you would like to walk to)	10.3% (7.0)	26.5% (18.0)	20.6% (14.0)	27.9% (19.0)	14.7% (10.0)
Bike-ability (Ability to bike to the places you would like to bike to)	2.9% (2.0)	5.9% (4.0)	17.6% (12.0)	38.2% (26.0)	35.3% (24.0)
Traffic	13.2% (9.0)	16.2% (11.0)	29.4% (20.0)	35.3% (24.0)	5.9% (4.0)
Safety	5.9% (4.0)	13.2% (9.0)	17.6% (12.0)	54.4% (37.0)	8.8% (6.0)

VOTERS AGE	187 REGISTERED VOTERS				
	Very Unsatisfied	Unsatisfied	Neutral	Satisfied	Very Satisfied

28 (1)

Sense of community (Type and quality of relationships with your neighbors)	-	-	-	100.0% (1.0)	-
Cleanliness and up-keep	-	-	-	100.0% (1.0)	-
Street tree quality and number (Street trees are those located in the public right of way.)	-	-	100.0% (1.0)	-	-
Walk-ability (Ability to walk to the places you would like to walk to)	-	100.0% (1.0)	-	-	-
Bike-ability (Ability to bike to the places you would like to bike to)	-	-	-	100.0% (1.0)	-
Traffic	-	100.0% (1.0)	-	-	-
Safety	-	-	-	100.0% (1.0)	-

31 (1)

Sense of community (Type and quality of relationships with your neighbors)	-	-	-	100.0% (1.0)	-
Cleanliness and up-keep	-	100.0% (1.0)	-	-	-
Street tree quality and number (Street trees are those located in the public right of way.)	-	-	-	100.0% (1.0)	-
Walk-ability (Ability to walk to the places you would like to walk to)	-	-	-	100.0% (1.0)	-
Bike-ability (Ability to bike to the places you would like to bike to)	-	-	-	100.0% (1.0)	-
Traffic	-	100.0% (1.0)	-	-	-
Safety	-	100.0% (1.0)	-	-	-

32 (1)

Sense of community (Type and quality of relationships with your neighbors)	-	-	-	100.0% (1.0)	-
Cleanliness and up-keep	-	-	100.0% (1.0)	-	-
Street tree quality and number (Street trees are those located in the public right of way.)	-	-	-	100.0% (1.0)	-
Walk-ability (Ability to walk to the places you would like to walk to)	-	100.0% (1.0)	-	-	-
Bike-ability (Ability to bike to the places you would like to bike to)	-	-	100.0% (1.0)	-	-
Traffic	-	100.0% (1.0)	-	-	-
Safety	-	-	100.0% (1.0)	-	-

33 (1)

Sense of community (Type and quality of relationships with your neighbors)	-	-	-	100.0% (1.0)	-
Cleanliness and up-keep	-	-	-	100.0% (1.0)	-
Street tree quality and number (Street trees are those located in the public right of way.)	-	100.0% (1.0)	-	-	-
Walk-ability (Ability to walk to the places you would like to walk to)	100.0% (1.0)	-	-	-	-
Bike-ability (Ability to bike to the places you would like to bike to)	-	-	-	100.0% (1.0)	-
Traffic	-	-	-	100.0% (1.0)	-
Safety	100.0% (1.0)	-	-	-	-

34 (1)

Sense of community (Type and quality of relationships with your neighbors)	-	-	100.0% (1.0)	-	-
Cleanliness and up-keep	-	-	-	100.0% (1.0)	-
Street tree quality and number (Street trees are those located in the public right of way.)	-	-	-	-	100.0% (1.0)
Walk-ability (Ability to walk to the places you would like to walk to)	-	-	-	100.0% (1.0)	-
Bike-ability (Ability to bike to the places you would like to bike to)	-	-	-	-	100.0% (1.0)
Traffic	-	-	-	100.0% (1.0)	-
Safety	-	-	-	100.0% (1.0)	-

35 (5)

Sense of community (Type and quality of relationships with your neighbors)	-	-	-	80.0% (4.0)	20.0% (1.0)
Cleanliness and up-keep	-	20.0% (1.0)	20.0% (1.0)	40.0% (2.0)	20.0% (1.0)
Street tree quality and number (Street trees are those located in the public right of way.)	-	-	20.0% (1.0)	40.0% (2.0)	40.0% (2.0)
Walk-ability (Ability to walk to the places you would like to walk to)	-	40.0% (2.0)	-	60.0% (3.0)	-
Bike-ability (Ability to bike to the places you would like to bike to)	-	20.0% (1.0)	-	80.0% (4.0)	-
Traffic	-	20.0% (1.0)	20.0% (1.0)	60.0% (3.0)	-
Safety	-	20.0% (1.0)	20.0% (1.0)	60.0% (3.0)	-

36 (3)

Sense of community (Type and quality of relationships with your neighbors)	-	-	33.3% (1.0)	66.7% (2.0)	-
Cleanliness and up-keep	-	-	33.3% (1.0)	33.3% (1.0)	33.3% (1.0)
Street tree quality and number (Street trees are those located in the public right of way.)	-	-	-	100.0% (3.0)	-
Walk-ability (Ability to walk to the places you would like to walk to)	-	33.3% (1.0)	33.3% (1.0)	33.3% (1.0)	-
Bike-ability (Ability to bike to the places you would like to bike to)	-	-	33.3% (1.0)	33.3% (1.0)	33.3% (1.0)
Traffic	-	33.3% (1.0)	33.3% (1.0)	-	33.3% (1.0)
Safety	-	-	33.3% (1.0)	66.7% (2.0)	-

37 (5)

Sense of community (Type and quality of relationships with your neighbors)	-	-	-	80.0% (4.0)	20.0% (1.0)
Cleanliness and up-keep	-	-	20.0% (1.0)	60.0% (3.0)	20.0% (1.0)
Street tree quality and number (Street trees are those located in the public right of way.)	-	20.0% (1.0)	60.0% (3.0)	-	20.0% (1.0)
Walk-ability (Ability to walk to the places you would like to walk to)	-	20.0% (1.0)	40.0% (2.0)	20.0% (1.0)	20.0% (1.0)
Bike-ability (Ability to bike to the places you would like to bike to)	-	20.0% (1.0)	20.0% (1.0)	60.0% (3.0)	-
Traffic	-	40.0% (2.0)	20.0% (1.0)	40.0% (2.0)	-
Safety	-	40.0% (2.0)	20.0% (1.0)	40.0% (2.0)	-

38 (3)

Sense of community (Type and quality of relationships with your neighbors)	-	-	66.7% (2.0)	-	33.3% (1.0)
Cleanliness and up-keep	-	33.3% (1.0)	-	33.3% (1.0)	33.3% (1.0)

Street tree quality and number (Street trees are those located in the public right of way.)	-	-	-	66.7% (2.0)	33.3% (1.0)
Walk-ability (Ability to walk to the places you would like to walk to)	-	-	33.3% (1.0)	-	66.7% (2.0)
Bike-ability (Ability to bike to the places you would like to bike to)	-	-	33.3% (1.0)	-	66.7% (2.0)
Traffic	-	33.3% (1.0)	-	33.3% (1.0)	33.3% (1.0)
Safety	-	-	-	66.7% (2.0)	33.3% (1.0)

39 (4)

Sense of community (Type and quality of relationships with your neighbors)	-	25.0% (1.0)	50.0% (2.0)	-	25.0% (1.0)
Cleanliness and up-keep	-	25.0% (1.0)	-	25.0% (1.0)	50.0% (2.0)
Street tree quality and number (Street trees are those located in the public right of way.)	-	25.0% (1.0)	-	25.0% (1.0)	50.0% (2.0)
Walk-ability (Ability to walk to the places you would like to walk to)	25.0% (1.0)	-	-	25.0% (1.0)	50.0% (2.0)
Bike-ability (Ability to bike to the places you would like to bike to)	25.0% (1.0)	-	-	-	75.0% (3.0)
Traffic	-	50.0% (2.0)	25.0% (1.0)	-	25.0% (1.0)
Safety	25.0% (1.0)	50.0% (2.0)	-	-	25.0% (1.0)

40 (3)

Sense of community (Type and quality of relationships with your neighbors)	-	-	33.3% (1.0)	33.3% (1.0)	33.3% (1.0)
Cleanliness and up-keep	-	33.3% (1.0)	-	66.7% (2.0)	-
Street tree quality and number (Street trees are those located in the public right of way.)	-	-	33.3% (1.0)	-	66.7% (2.0)
Walk-ability (Ability to walk to the places you would like to walk to)	-	-	33.3% (1.0)	33.3% (1.0)	33.3% (1.0)
Bike-ability (Ability to bike to the places you would like to bike to)	-	-	33.3% (1.0)	33.3% (1.0)	33.3% (1.0)
Traffic	-	-	33.3% (1.0)	33.3% (1.0)	33.3% (1.0)
Safety	33.3% (1.0)	-	66.7% (2.0)	-	-

41 (3)

Sense of community (Type and quality of relationships with your neighbors)	-	-	-	66.7% (2.0)	33.3% (1.0)
Cleanliness and up-keep	-	-	33.3% (1.0)	-	66.7% (2.0)
Street tree quality and number (Street trees are those located in the public right of way.)	-	-	33.3% (1.0)	33.3% (1.0)	33.3% (1.0)
Walk-ability (Ability to walk to the places you would like to walk to)	-	-	-	100.0% (3.0)	-
Bike-ability (Ability to bike to the places you would like to bike to)	-	-	-	66.7% (2.0)	33.3% (1.0)
Traffic	-	-	66.7% (2.0)	33.3% (1.0)	-
Safety	-	100.0% (3.0)	-	-	-

43 (5)

Sense of community (Type and quality of relationships with your neighbors)	-	20.0% (1.0)	40.0% (2.0)	40.0% (2.0)	-
Cleanliness and up-keep	-	40.0% (2.0)	20.0% (1.0)	20.0% (1.0)	20.0% (1.0)
Street tree quality and number (Street trees are those located in the public right of way.)	-	20.0% (1.0)	40.0% (2.0)	40.0% (2.0)	-
Walk-ability (Ability to walk to the places you would like to walk to)	20.0% (1.0)	-	60.0% (3.0)	20.0% (1.0)	-
Bike-ability (Ability to bike to the places you would like to bike to)	-	-	20.0% (1.0)	40.0% (2.0)	40.0% (2.0)
Traffic	20.0% (1.0)	20.0% (1.0)	40.0% (2.0)	20.0% (1.0)	-
Safety	-	20.0% (1.0)	40.0% (2.0)	40.0% (2.0)	-

44 (6)

Sense of community (Type and quality of relationships with your neighbors)	-	-	33.3% (2.0)	66.7% (4.0)	-
Cleanliness and up-keep	-	-	-	50.0% (3.0)	50.0% (3.0)
Street tree quality and number (Street trees are those located in the public right of way.)	16.7% (1.0)	-	-	50.0% (3.0)	33.3% (2.0)
Walk-ability (Ability to walk to the places you would like to walk to)	-	-	33.3% (2.0)	16.7% (1.0)	50.0% (3.0)
Bike-ability (Ability to bike to the places you would like to bike to)	-	-	-	33.3% (2.0)	66.7% (4.0)
Traffic	-	33.3% (2.0)	16.7% (1.0)	33.3% (2.0)	16.7% (1.0)
Safety	-	50.0% (3.0)	-	33.3% (2.0)	16.7% (1.0)

45 (2)

Sense of community (Type and quality of relationships with your neighbors)	-	-	50.0% (1.0)	50.0% (1.0)	-
Cleanliness and up-keep	-	-	-	100.0% (2.0)	-
Street tree quality and number (Street trees are those located in the public right of way.)	-	-	-	50.0% (1.0)	50.0% (1.0)
Walk-ability (Ability to walk to the places you would like to walk to)	-	50.0% (1.0)	50.0% (1.0)	-	-
Bike-ability (Ability to bike to the places you would like to bike to)	-	-	-	100.0% (2.0)	-

Traffic	-	-	50.0% (1.0)	-	50.0% (1.0)
Safety	-	-	-	50.0% (1.0)	50.0% (1.0)

46 (1)

Sense of community (Type and quality of relationships with your neighbors)	-	-	-	-	100.0% (1.0)
Cleanliness and up-keep	-	-	100.0% (1.0)	-	-
Street tree quality and number (Street trees are those located in the public right of way.)	-	-	-	-	100.0% (1.0)
Walk-ability (Ability to walk to the places you would like to walk to)	-	100.0% (1.0)	-	-	-
Bike-ability (Ability to bike to the places you would like to bike to)	-	-	-	100.0% (1.0)	-
Traffic	-	-	100.0% (1.0)	-	-
Safety	-	-	-	100.0% (1.0)	-

47 (3)

Sense of community (Type and quality of relationships with your neighbors)	-	-	66.7% (2.0)	33.3% (1.0)	-
Cleanliness and up-keep	-	-	-	66.7% (2.0)	33.3% (1.0)
Street tree quality and number (Street trees are those located in the public right of way.)	-	-	33.3% (1.0)	33.3% (1.0)	33.3% (1.0)
Walk-ability (Ability to walk to the places you would like to walk to)	-	33.3% (1.0)	33.3% (1.0)	-	33.3% (1.0)
Bike-ability (Ability to bike to the places you would like to bike to)	-	-	33.3% (1.0)	33.3% (1.0)	33.3% (1.0)
Traffic	-	33.3% (1.0)	-	66.7% (2.0)	-
Safety	-	-	33.3% (1.0)	66.7% (2.0)	-

48 (2)

Sense of community (Type and quality of relationships with your neighbors)	-	50.0% (1.0)	-	50.0% (1.0)	-
Cleanliness and up-keep	-	50.0% (1.0)	-	50.0% (1.0)	-
Street tree quality and number (Street trees are those located in the public right of way.)	-	-	50.0% (1.0)	-	50.0% (1.0)
Walk-ability (Ability to walk to the places you would like to walk to)	-	-	50.0% (1.0)	-	50.0% (1.0)
Bike-ability (Ability to bike to the places you would like to bike to)	-	-	50.0% (1.0)	-	50.0% (1.0)
Traffic	-	-	-	100.0% (2.0)	-
Safety	-	-	100.0% (2.0)	-	-

49 (4)

Sense of community (Type and quality of relationships with your neighbors)	-	-	50.0% (2.0)	-	50.0% (2.0)
Cleanliness and up-keep	-	-	-	50.0% (2.0)	50.0% (2.0)
Street tree quality and number (Street trees are those located in the public right of way.)	-	-	50.0% (2.0)	25.0% (1.0)	25.0% (1.0)
Walk-ability (Ability to walk to the places you would like to walk to)	-	25.0% (1.0)	-	50.0% (2.0)	25.0% (1.0)
Bike-ability (Ability to bike to the places you would like to bike to)	-	-	25.0% (1.0)	50.0% (2.0)	25.0% (1.0)
Traffic	-	-	-	75.0% (3.0)	25.0% (1.0)
Safety	-	-	-	75.0% (3.0)	25.0% (1.0)

50 (1)

Sense of community (Type and quality of relationships with your neighbors)	-	-	-	100.0% (1.0)	-
Cleanliness and up-keep	-	-	-	100.0% (1.0)	-
Street tree quality and number (Street trees are those located in the public right of way.)	-	-	-	100.0% (1.0)	-
Walk-ability (Ability to walk to the places you would like to walk to)	-	-	-	100.0% (1.0)	-
Bike-ability (Ability to bike to the places you would like to bike to)	-	-	-	100.0% (1.0)	-
Traffic	-	100.0% (1.0)	-	-	-
Safety	-	-	100.0% (1.0)	-	-

51 (1)

Sense of community (Type and quality of relationships with your neighbors)	-	-	-	100.0% (1.0)	-
Cleanliness and up-keep	-	-	-	100.0% (1.0)	-
Street tree quality and number (Street trees are those located in the public right of way.)	-	-	100.0% (1.0)	-	-
Walk-ability (Ability to walk to the places you would like to walk to)	100.0% (1.0)	-	-	-	-
Bike-ability (Ability to bike to the places you would like to bike to)	-	100.0% (1.0)	-	-	-
Traffic	-	100.0% (1.0)	-	-	-
Safety	-	100.0% (1.0)	-	-	-

52 (5)

Sense of community (Type and quality of relationships with your neighbors)	-	-	20.0% (1.0)	80.0% (4.0)	-
Cleanliness and up-keep	-	-	-	80.0% (4.0)	20.0% (1.0)
Street tree quality and number (Street trees are those located in the public right of way.)	-	-	20.0% (1.0)	80.0% (4.0)	-
Walk-ability (Ability to walk to the places you would like to walk to)	-	20.0% (1.0)	20.0% (1.0)	40.0% (2.0)	20.0% (1.0)
Bike-ability (Ability to bike to the places you would like to bike to)	-	-	20.0% (1.0)	60.0% (3.0)	20.0% (1.0)
Traffic	-	-	40.0% (2.0)	60.0% (3.0)	-
Safety	-	-	-	100.0% (5.0)	-

53 (4)

Sense of community (Type and quality of relationships with your neighbors)	-	-	-	100.0% (4.0)	-
Cleanliness and up-keep	-	-	-	100.0% (4.0)	-
Street tree quality and number (Street trees are those located in the public right of way.)	-	-	-	100.0% (4.0)	-
Walk-ability (Ability to walk to the places you would like to walk to)	-	-	-	50.0% (2.0)	50.0% (2.0)
Bike-ability (Ability to bike to the places you would like to bike to)	-	-	25.0% (1.0)	50.0% (2.0)	25.0% (1.0)
Traffic	-	-	-	100.0% (4.0)	-
Safety	-	25.0% (1.0)	25.0% (1.0)	50.0% (2.0)	-

54 (1)

Sense of community (Type and quality of relationships with your neighbors)	-	-	-	-	100.0% (1.0)
Cleanliness and up-keep	-	-	-	100.0% (1.0)	-
Street tree quality and number (Street trees are those located in the public right of way.)	-	-	-	-	100.0% (1.0)
Walk-ability (Ability to walk to the places you would like to walk to)	-	-	100.0% (1.0)	-	-
Bike-ability (Ability to bike to the places you would like to bike to)	-	-	-	100.0% (1.0)	-
Traffic	-	-	100.0% (1.0)	-	-
Safety	-	-	100.0% (1.0)	-	-

55 (3)

Sense of community (Type and quality of relationships with your neighbors)	-	-	-	33.3% (1.0)	66.7% (2.0)
Cleanliness and up-keep	-	-	-	-	100.0% (3.0)
Street tree quality and number (Street trees are those located in the public right of way.)	-	-	-	66.7% (2.0)	33.3% (1.0)
Walk-ability (Ability to walk to the places you would like to walk to)	-	-	-	33.3% (1.0)	66.7% (2.0)
Bike-ability (Ability to bike to the places you would like to bike to)	-	-	-	33.3% (1.0)	66.7% (2.0)
Traffic	33.3% (1.0)	-	-	33.3% (1.0)	33.3% (1.0)
Safety	-	33.3% (1.0)	-	66.7% (2.0)	-

56 (2)

Sense of community (Type and quality of relationships with your neighbors)	-	-	50.0% (1.0)	-	50.0% (1.0)
Cleanliness and up-keep	-	-	-	50.0% (1.0)	50.0% (1.0)
Street tree quality and number (Street trees are those located in the public right of way.)	-	-	50.0% (1.0)	-	50.0% (1.0)
Walk-ability (Ability to walk to the places you would like to walk to)	-	-	50.0% (1.0)	-	50.0% (1.0)
Bike-ability (Ability to bike to the places you would like to bike to)	-	-	-	50.0% (1.0)	50.0% (1.0)
Traffic	-	-	50.0% (1.0)	50.0% (1.0)	-
Safety	-	-	-	50.0% (1.0)	50.0% (1.0)

57 (1)

Sense of community (Type and quality of relationships with your neighbors)	-	-	100.0% (1.0)	-	-
Cleanliness and up-keep	-	100.0% (1.0)	-	-	-
Street tree quality and number (Street trees are those located in the public right of way.)	-	-	100.0% (1.0)	-	-
Walk-ability (Ability to walk to the places you would like to walk to)	-	-	100.0% (1.0)	-	-
Bike-ability (Ability to bike to the places you would like to bike to)	-	-	-	100.0% (1.0)	-
Traffic	-	100.0% (1.0)	-	-	-
Safety	-	100.0% (1.0)	-	-	-

59 (5)

Sense of community (Type and quality of relationships with your neighbors)	-	-	-	60.0% (3.0)	40.0% (2.0)
Cleanliness and up-keep	-	-	-	80.0% (4.0)	20.0% (1.0)
Street tree quality and number (Street trees are those located in the public right of way.)	20.0% (1.0)	20.0% (1.0)	-	60.0% (3.0)	-

Walk-ability (Ability to walk to the places you would like to walk to)	-	-	-	60.0% (3.0)	40.0% (2.0)
Bike-ability (Ability to bike to the places you would like to bike to)	-	20.0% (1.0)	-	40.0% (2.0)	40.0% (2.0)
Traffic	-	20.0% (1.0)	60.0% (3.0)	20.0% (1.0)	-
Safety	-	20.0% (1.0)	40.0% (2.0)	40.0% (2.0)	-

60 (3)

Sense of community (Type and quality of relationships with your neighbors)	-	-	66.7% (2.0)	-	33.3% (1.0)
Cleanliness and up-keep	-	33.3% (1.0)	-	33.3% (1.0)	33.3% (1.0)
Street tree quality and number (Street trees are those located in the public right of way.)	-	-	33.3% (1.0)	33.3% (1.0)	33.3% (1.0)
Walk-ability (Ability to walk to the places you would like to walk to)	-	33.3% (1.0)	-	-	66.7% (2.0)
Bike-ability (Ability to bike to the places you would like to bike to)	-	-	33.3% (1.0)	-	66.7% (2.0)
Traffic	-	66.7% (2.0)	-	33.3% (1.0)	-
Safety	-	33.3% (1.0)	33.3% (1.0)	33.3% (1.0)	-

61 (1)

Sense of community (Type and quality of relationships with your neighbors)	-	-	-	100.0% (1.0)	-
Cleanliness and up-keep	-	-	-	100.0% (1.0)	-
Street tree quality and number (Street trees are those located in the public right of way.)	-	-	-	100.0% (1.0)	-
Walk-ability (Ability to walk to the places you would like to walk to)	100.0% (1.0)	-	-	-	-
Bike-ability (Ability to bike to the places you would like to bike to)	-	-	100.0% (1.0)	-	-
Traffic	-	-	100.0% (1.0)	-	-
Safety	-	-	100.0% (1.0)	-	-

62 (5)

Sense of community (Type and quality of relationships with your neighbors)	-	-	40.0% (2.0)	20.0% (1.0)	40.0% (2.0)
Cleanliness and up-keep	-	-	-	40.0% (2.0)	60.0% (3.0)
Street tree quality and number (Street trees are those located in the public right of way.)	-	-	40.0% (2.0)	20.0% (1.0)	40.0% (2.0)
Walk-ability (Ability to walk to the places you would like to walk to)	-	-	-	20.0% (1.0)	80.0% (4.0)
Bike-ability (Ability to bike to the places you would like to bike to)	-	-	-	20.0% (1.0)	80.0% (4.0)
Traffic	-	20.0% (1.0)	-	40.0% (2.0)	40.0% (2.0)
Safety	-	-	40.0% (2.0)	40.0% (2.0)	20.0% (1.0)

63 (2)

Sense of community (Type and quality of relationships with your neighbors)	-	50.0% (1.0)	-	-	50.0% (1.0)
Cleanliness and up-keep	-	-	50.0% (1.0)	-	50.0% (1.0)
Street tree quality and number (Street trees are those located in the public right of way.)	-	-	-	100.0% (2.0)	-
Walk-ability (Ability to walk to the places you would like to walk to)	-	-	-	50.0% (1.0)	50.0% (1.0)
Bike-ability (Ability to bike to the places you would like to bike to)	-	-	-	50.0% (1.0)	50.0% (1.0)
Traffic	-	50.0% (1.0)	-	50.0% (1.0)	-
Safety	-	100.0% (2.0)	-	-	-

64 (5)

Sense of community (Type and quality of relationships with your neighbors)	-	20.0% (1.0)	40.0% (2.0)	20.0% (1.0)	20.0% (1.0)
Cleanliness and up-keep	-	-	20.0% (1.0)	60.0% (3.0)	20.0% (1.0)
Street tree quality and number (Street trees are those located in the public right of way.)	-	20.0% (1.0)	80.0% (4.0)	-	-
Walk-ability (Ability to walk to the places you would like to walk to)	-	-	60.0% (3.0)	40.0% (2.0)	-
Bike-ability (Ability to bike to the places you would like to bike to)	-	-	40.0% (2.0)	40.0% (2.0)	20.0% (1.0)
Traffic	-	20.0% (1.0)	40.0% (2.0)	40.0% (2.0)	-
Safety	20.0% (1.0)	40.0% (2.0)	20.0% (1.0)	20.0% (1.0)	-

65 (2)

Sense of community (Type and quality of relationships with your neighbors)	-	-	-	100.0% (2.0)	-
Cleanliness and up-keep	-	-	-	50.0% (1.0)	50.0% (1.0)
Street tree quality and number (Street trees are those located in the public right of way.)	-	-	-	50.0% (1.0)	50.0% (1.0)
Walk-ability (Ability to walk to the places you would like to walk to)	-	50.0% (1.0)	-	-	50.0% (1.0)
Bike-ability (Ability to bike to the places you would like to bike to)	-	-	50.0% (1.0)	-	50.0% (1.0)
Traffic	-	50.0% (1.0)	50.0% (1.0)	-	-

Safety	-	-	50.0% (1.0)	50.0% (1.0)	-
--------	---	---	-------------	-------------	---

66 (2)

Sense of community (Type and quality of relationships with your neighbors)	-	-	50.0% (1.0)	50.0% (1.0)	-
Cleanliness and up-keep	-	-	-	100.0% (2.0)	-
Street tree quality and number (Street trees are those located in the public right of way.)	-	50.0% (1.0)	-	50.0% (1.0)	-
Walk-ability (Ability to walk to the places you would like to walk to)	-	-	-	100.0% (2.0)	-
Bike-ability (Ability to bike to the places you would like to bike to)	-	-	-	-	100.0% (2.0)
Traffic	50.0% (1.0)	-	-	50.0% (1.0)	-
Safety	-	50.0% (1.0)	-	50.0% (1.0)	-

67 (1)

Sense of community (Type and quality of relationships with your neighbors)	-	-	-	-	100.0% (1.0)
Cleanliness and up-keep	-	-	-	-	100.0% (1.0)
Street tree quality and number (Street trees are those located in the public right of way.)	-	-	-	100.0% (1.0)	-
Walk-ability (Ability to walk to the places you would like to walk to)	-	-	-	100.0% (1.0)	-
Bike-ability (Ability to bike to the places you would like to bike to)	-	-	-	-	100.0% (1.0)
Traffic	-	-	-	-	100.0% (1.0)
Safety	-	-	-	100.0% (1.0)	-

68 (3)

Sense of community (Type and quality of relationships with your neighbors)	-	-	33.3% (1.0)	66.7% (2.0)	-
Cleanliness and up-keep	-	-	-	33.3% (1.0)	66.7% (2.0)
Street tree quality and number (Street trees are those located in the public right of way.)	-	33.3% (1.0)	-	33.3% (1.0)	33.3% (1.0)
Walk-ability (Ability to walk to the places you would like to walk to)	33.3% (1.0)	33.3% (1.0)	-	-	33.3% (1.0)
Bike-ability (Ability to bike to the places you would like to bike to)	-	-	-	66.7% (2.0)	33.3% (1.0)
Traffic	-	-	-	100.0% (3.0)	-
Safety	-	-	-	100.0% (3.0)	-

69 (2)

Sense of community (Type and quality of relationships with your neighbors)	-	-	50.0% (1.0)	50.0% (1.0)	-
Cleanliness and up-keep	-	-	-	100.0% (2.0)	-
Street tree quality and number (Street trees are those located in the public right of way.)	-	50.0% (1.0)	-	50.0% (1.0)	-
Walk-ability (Ability to walk to the places you would like to walk to)	-	-	50.0% (1.0)	50.0% (1.0)	-
Bike-ability (Ability to bike to the places you would like to bike to)	-	-	-	100.0% (2.0)	-
Traffic	-	-	-	100.0% (2.0)	-
Safety	-	50.0% (1.0)	-	50.0% (1.0)	-

71 (2)

Sense of community (Type and quality of relationships with your neighbors)	-	-	-	50.0% (1.0)	50.0% (1.0)
Cleanliness and up-keep	-	-	-	50.0% (1.0)	50.0% (1.0)
Street tree quality and number (Street trees are those located in the public right of way.)	-	-	-	-	100.0% (2.0)
Walk-ability (Ability to walk to the places you would like to walk to)	-	-	-	100.0% (2.0)	-
Bike-ability (Ability to bike to the places you would like to bike to)	-	-	-	50.0% (1.0)	50.0% (1.0)
Traffic	-	-	-	100.0% (2.0)	-
Safety	-	-	-	100.0% (2.0)	-

72 (3)

Sense of community (Type and quality of relationships with your neighbors)	-	-	-	33.3% (1.0)	66.7% (2.0)
Cleanliness and up-keep	-	-	-	33.3% (1.0)	66.7% (2.0)
Street tree quality and number (Street trees are those located in the public right of way.)	-	-	-	33.3% (1.0)	66.7% (2.0)
Walk-ability (Ability to walk to the places you would like to walk to)	-	-	-	33.3% (1.0)	66.7% (2.0)
Bike-ability (Ability to bike to the places you would like to bike to)	-	-	-	33.3% (1.0)	66.7% (2.0)
Traffic	-	-	66.7% (2.0)	33.3% (1.0)	-
Safety	-	-	66.7% (2.0)	33.3% (1.0)	-

73 (3)

Sense of community (Type and quality of relationships with your neighbors)	-	-	-	-	100.0% (3.0)
Cleanliness and up-keep	-	-	-	66.7% (2.0)	33.3% (1.0)
Street tree quality and number (Street trees are those located in the public right of way.)	-	-	-	33.3% (1.0)	66.7% (2.0)
Walk-ability (Ability to walk to the places you would like to walk to)	-	33.3% (1.0)	-	66.7% (2.0)	-
Bike-ability (Ability to bike to the places you would like to bike to)	-	33.3% (1.0)	-	66.7% (2.0)	-
Traffic	-	-	-	66.7% (2.0)	33.3% (1.0)
Safety	-	-	-	66.7% (2.0)	33.3% (1.0)

74 (4)

Sense of community (Type and quality of relationships with your neighbors)	25.0% (1.0)	-	25.0% (1.0)	-	50.0% (2.0)
Cleanliness and up-keep	25.0% (1.0)	-	-	50.0% (2.0)	25.0% (1.0)
Street tree quality and number (Street trees are those located in the public right of way.)	25.0% (1.0)	-	50.0% (2.0)	25.0% (1.0)	-
Walk-ability (Ability to walk to the places you would like to walk to)	50.0% (2.0)	-	50.0% (2.0)	-	-
Bike-ability (Ability to bike to the places you would like to bike to)	25.0% (1.0)	-	50.0% (2.0)	25.0% (1.0)	-
Traffic	-	75.0% (3.0)	25.0% (1.0)	-	-
Safety	25.0% (1.0)	25.0% (1.0)	25.0% (1.0)	25.0% (1.0)	-

77 (2)

Sense of community (Type and quality of relationships with your neighbors)	-	-	50.0% (1.0)	50.0% (1.0)	-
Cleanliness and up-keep	-	-	-	100.0% (2.0)	-
Street tree quality and number (Street trees are those located in the public right of way.)	-	-	50.0% (1.0)	50.0% (1.0)	-
Walk-ability (Ability to walk to the places you would like to walk to)	-	-	-	100.0% (2.0)	-
Bike-ability (Ability to bike to the places you would like to bike to)	-	-	50.0% (1.0)	50.0% (1.0)	-
Traffic	-	-	50.0% (1.0)	50.0% (1.0)	-
Safety	50.0% (1.0)	50.0% (1.0)	-	-	-

79 (2)

Sense of community (Type and quality of relationships with your neighbors)	-	-	-	50.0% (1.0)	50.0% (1.0)
Cleanliness and up-keep	-	-	-	100.0% (2.0)	-
Street tree quality and number (Street trees are those located in the public right of way.)	-	-	-	50.0% (1.0)	50.0% (1.0)
Walk-ability (Ability to walk to the places you would like to walk to)	-	-	-	50.0% (1.0)	50.0% (1.0)
Bike-ability (Ability to bike to the places you would like to bike to)	-	-	-	-	100.0% (2.0)
Traffic	-	-	-	50.0% (1.0)	50.0% (1.0)
Safety	-	-	-	50.0% (1.0)	50.0% (1.0)

Unknown (68)

Sense of community (Type and quality of relationships with your neighbors)	1.5% (1.0)	8.8% (6.0)	19.1% (13.0)	48.5% (33.0)	22.1% (15.0)
Cleanliness and up-keep	1.5% (1.0)	2.9% (2.0)	7.4% (5.0)	64.7% (44.0)	23.5% (16.0)
Street tree quality and number (Street trees are those located in the public right of way.)	1.5% (1.0)	5.9% (4.0)	17.6% (12.0)	60.3% (41.0)	14.7% (10.0)
Walk-ability (Ability to walk to the places you would like to walk to)	10.3% (7.0)	26.5% (18.0)	20.6% (14.0)	27.9% (19.0)	14.7% (10.0)
Bike-ability (Ability to bike to the places you would like to bike to)	2.9% (2.0)	5.9% (4.0)	17.6% (12.0)	38.2% (26.0)	35.3% (24.0)
Traffic	13.2% (9.0)	16.2% (11.0)	29.4% (20.0)	35.3% (24.0)	5.9% (4.0)
Safety	5.9% (4.0)	13.2% (9.0)	17.6% (12.0)	54.4% (37.0)	8.8% (6.0)

STATE INCOME DECILE

187 REGISTERED VOTERS

	Very Unsatisfied	Unsatisfied	Neutral	Satisfied	Very Satisfied
--	------------------	-------------	---------	-----------	----------------

0 to 9 Pct range (6)

Sense of community (Type and quality of relationships with your neighbors)	-	16.7% (1.0)	16.7% (1.0)	50.0% (3.0)	16.7% (1.0)
Cleanliness and up-keep	-	33.3% (2.0)	16.7% (1.0)	33.3% (2.0)	16.7% (1.0)
Street tree quality and number (Street trees are those located in the public right of way.)	-	16.7% (1.0)	16.7% (1.0)	50.0% (3.0)	16.7% (1.0)
Walk-ability (Ability to walk to the places you would like to walk to)	-	16.7% (1.0)	33.3% (2.0)	16.7% (1.0)	33.3% (2.0)
Bike-ability (Ability to bike to the places you would like to bike to)	-	-	-	50.0% (3.0)	50.0% (3.0)
Traffic	-	16.7% (1.0)	33.3% (2.0)	33.3% (2.0)	16.7% (1.0)
Safety	16.7% (1.0)	33.3% (2.0)	-	33.3% (2.0)	16.7% (1.0)

10 to 19 Pct range (1)

Sense of community (Type and quality of relationships with your neighbors)	-	-	-	-	100.0% (1.0)
Cleanliness and up-keep	-	-	-	-	100.0% (1.0)
Street tree quality and number (Street trees are those located in the public right of way.)	-	-	-	100.0% (1.0)	-
Walk-ability (Ability to walk to the places you would like to walk to)	100.0% (1.0)	-	-	-	-
Bike-ability (Ability to bike to the places you would like to bike to)	-	-	-	-	100.0% (1.0)
Traffic	-	-	100.0% (1.0)	-	-
Safety	100.0% (1.0)	-	-	-	-

40 to 49 Pct range (2)

Sense of community (Type and quality of relationships with your neighbors)	-	50.0% (1.0)	-	-	50.0% (1.0)
Cleanliness and up-keep	-	-	-	100.0% (2.0)	-
Street tree quality and number (Street trees are those located in the public right of way.)	-	-	-	50.0% (1.0)	50.0% (1.0)
Walk-ability (Ability to walk to the places you would like to walk to)	-	-	50.0% (1.0)	-	50.0% (1.0)
Bike-ability (Ability to bike to the places you would like to bike to)	-	-	50.0% (1.0)	-	50.0% (1.0)
Traffic	-	-	-	100.0% (2.0)	-
Safety	-	-	50.0% (1.0)	50.0% (1.0)	-

50 to 59 Pct range (9)

Sense of community (Type and quality of relationships with your neighbors)	-	11.1% (1.0)	22.2% (2.0)	55.6% (5.0)	11.1% (1.0)
Cleanliness and up-keep	-	33.3% (3.0)	-	55.6% (5.0)	11.1% (1.0)
Street tree quality and number (Street trees are those located in the public right of way.)	-	-	55.6% (5.0)	33.3% (3.0)	11.1% (1.0)
Walk-ability (Ability to walk to the places you would like to walk to)	-	44.4% (4.0)	22.2% (2.0)	22.2% (2.0)	11.1% (1.0)
Bike-ability (Ability to bike to the places you would like to bike to)	-	-	22.2% (2.0)	66.7% (6.0)	11.1% (1.0)
Traffic	-	33.3% (3.0)	-	55.6% (5.0)	11.1% (1.0)
Safety	-	33.3% (3.0)	22.2% (2.0)	33.3% (3.0)	11.1% (1.0)

60 to 69 Pct range (7)

Sense of community (Type and quality of relationships with your neighbors)	-	14.3% (1.0)	14.3% (1.0)	42.9% (3.0)	28.6% (2.0)
Cleanliness and up-keep	-	14.3% (1.0)	14.3% (1.0)	57.1% (4.0)	14.3% (1.0)
Street tree quality and number (Street trees are those located in the public right of way.)	14.3% (1.0)	-	28.6% (2.0)	42.9% (3.0)	14.3% (1.0)
Walk-ability (Ability to walk to the places you would like to walk to)	-	14.3% (1.0)	-	28.6% (2.0)	57.1% (4.0)
Bike-ability (Ability to bike to the places you would like to bike to)	-	-	28.6% (2.0)	28.6% (2.0)	42.9% (3.0)
Traffic	-	-	28.6% (2.0)	57.1% (4.0)	14.3% (1.0)
Safety	-	28.6% (2.0)	14.3% (1.0)	42.9% (3.0)	14.3% (1.0)

70 to 79 Pct range (5)

Sense of community (Type and quality of relationships with your neighbors)	-	-	20.0% (1.0)	40.0% (2.0)	40.0% (2.0)
Cleanliness and up-keep	-	-	-	60.0% (3.0)	40.0% (2.0)
Street tree quality and number (Street trees are those located in the public right of way.)	-	-	20.0% (1.0)	20.0% (1.0)	60.0% (3.0)
Walk-ability (Ability to walk to the places you would like to walk to)	-	-	40.0% (2.0)	40.0% (2.0)	20.0% (1.0)
Bike-ability (Ability to bike to the places you would like to bike to)	-	-	-	80.0% (4.0)	20.0% (1.0)
Traffic	-	-	40.0% (2.0)	40.0% (2.0)	20.0% (1.0)
Safety	-	-	20.0% (1.0)	60.0% (3.0)	20.0% (1.0)

80 to 89 Pct range (70)

Sense of community (Type and quality of relationships with your neighbors)	1.4% (1.0)	5.7% (4.0)	24.3% (17.0)	47.1% (33.0)	21.4% (15.0)
Cleanliness and up-keep	1.4% (1.0)	2.9% (2.0)	10.0% (7.0)	61.4% (43.0)	24.3% (17.0)
Street tree quality and number (Street trees are those located in the public right of way.)	-	5.7% (4.0)	18.6% (13.0)	58.6% (41.0)	17.1% (12.0)
Walk-ability (Ability to walk to the places you would like to walk to)	8.6% (6.0)	24.3% (17.0)	15.7% (11.0)	34.3% (24.0)	17.1% (12.0)
Bike-ability (Ability to bike to the places you would like to bike to)	1.4% (1.0)	7.1% (5.0)	22.9% (16.0)	38.6% (27.0)	30.0% (21.0)
Traffic	10.0% (7.0)	25.7% (18.0)	24.3% (17.0)	32.9% (23.0)	7.1% (5.0)
Safety	2.9% (2.0)	17.1% (12.0)	24.3% (17.0)	45.7% (32.0)	10.0% (7.0)

90 Pct and up (85)

Sense of community (Type and quality of relationships with your neighbors)	-	2.4% (2.0)	24.7% (21.0)	47.1% (40.0)	25.9% (22.0)
Cleanliness and up-keep	-	4.7% (4.0)	4.7% (4.0)	56.5% (48.0)	34.1% (29.0)
Street tree quality and number (Street trees are those located in the public right of way.)	2.4% (2.0)	8.2% (7.0)	20.0% (17.0)	42.4% (36.0)	27.1% (23.0)

Walk-ability (Ability to walk to the places you would like to walk to)	7.1% (6.0)	11.8% (10.0)	22.4% (19.0)	34.1% (29.0)	24.7% (21.0)
Bike-ability (Ability to bike to the places you would like to bike to)	2.4% (2.0)	4.7% (4.0)	11.8% (10.0)	38.8% (33.0)	42.4% (36.0)
Traffic	4.7% (4.0)	17.6% (15.0)	27.1% (23.0)	41.2% (35.0)	9.4% (8.0)
Safety	4.7% (4.0)	20.0% (17.0)	17.6% (15.0)	52.9% (45.0)	4.7% (4.0)

Unknown (2)

Sense of community (Type and quality of relationships with your neighbors)	50.0% (1.0)	50.0% (1.0)	-	-	-
Cleanliness and up-keep	50.0% (1.0)	-	50.0% (1.0)	-	-
Street tree quality and number (Street trees are those located in the public right of way.)	50.0% (1.0)	50.0% (1.0)	-	-	-
Walk-ability (Ability to walk to the places you would like to walk to)	100.0% (2.0)	-	-	-	-
Bike-ability (Ability to bike to the places you would like to bike to)	50.0% (1.0)	-	-	50.0% (1.0)	-
Traffic	50.0% (1.0)	50.0% (1.0)	-	-	-
Safety	100.0% (2.0)	-	-	-	-

HOME OWNER/RENTER

187 REGISTERED VOTERS

	Very Unsatisfied	Unsatisfied	Neutral	Satisfied	Very Satisfied
--	------------------	-------------	---------	-----------	----------------

Likely Homeowner (106)

Sense of community (Type and quality of relationships with your neighbors)	0.9% (1.0)	1.9% (2.0)	22.6% (24.0)	47.2% (50.0)	27.4% (29.0)
Cleanliness and up-keep	0.9% (1.0)	4.7% (5.0)	6.6% (7.0)	57.5% (61.0)	30.2% (32.0)
Street tree quality and number (Street trees are those located in the public right of way.)	1.9% (2.0)	5.7% (6.0)	22.6% (24.0)	48.1% (51.0)	21.7% (23.0)
Walk-ability (Ability to walk to the places you would like to walk to)	5.7% (6.0)	14.2% (15.0)	18.9% (20.0)	39.6% (42.0)	21.7% (23.0)
Bike-ability (Ability to bike to the places you would like to bike to)	-	6.6% (7.0)	16.0% (17.0)	39.6% (42.0)	37.7% (40.0)
Traffic	6.6% (7.0)	19.8% (21.0)	24.5% (26.0)	36.8% (39.0)	12.3% (13.0)
Safety	3.8% (4.0)	21.7% (23.0)	22.6% (24.0)	42.5% (45.0)	9.4% (10.0)

Likely Renter (55)

Sense of community (Type and quality of relationships with your neighbors)	-	10.9% (6.0)	27.3% (15.0)	45.5% (25.0)	16.4% (9.0)
Cleanliness and up-keep	-	9.1% (5.0)	10.9% (6.0)	54.5% (30.0)	25.5% (14.0)
Street tree quality and number (Street trees are those located in the public right of way.)	1.8% (1.0)	9.1% (5.0)	25.5% (14.0)	40.0% (22.0)	23.6% (13.0)
Walk-ability (Ability to walk to the places you would like to walk to)	3.6% (2.0)	29.1% (16.0)	18.2% (10.0)	20.0% (11.0)	29.1% (16.0)
Bike-ability (Ability to bike to the places you would like to bike to)	1.8% (1.0)	3.6% (2.0)	21.8% (12.0)	40.0% (22.0)	32.7% (18.0)
Traffic	5.5% (3.0)	20.0% (11.0)	25.5% (14.0)	43.6% (24.0)	5.5% (3.0)
Safety	3.6% (2.0)	12.7% (7.0)	14.5% (8.0)	63.6% (35.0)	5.5% (3.0)

Unknown (26)

Sense of community (Type and quality of relationships with your neighbors)	3.8% (1.0)	11.5% (3.0)	15.4% (4.0)	42.3% (11.0)	26.9% (7.0)
Cleanliness and up-keep	3.8% (1.0)	7.7% (2.0)	3.8% (1.0)	61.5% (16.0)	23.1% (6.0)
Street tree quality and number (Street trees are those located in the public right of way.)	3.8% (1.0)	7.7% (2.0)	3.8% (1.0)	61.5% (16.0)	23.1% (6.0)
Walk-ability (Ability to walk to the places you would like to walk to)	26.9% (7.0)	7.7% (2.0)	26.9% (7.0)	26.9% (7.0)	11.5% (3.0)
Bike-ability (Ability to bike to the places you would like to bike to)	11.5% (3.0)	-	7.7% (2.0)	46.2% (12.0)	34.6% (9.0)
Traffic	7.7% (2.0)	23.1% (6.0)	26.9% (7.0)	38.5% (10.0)	3.8% (1.0)
Safety	15.4% (4.0)	23.1% (6.0)	19.2% (5.0)	34.6% (9.0)	7.7% (2.0)

How many bedrooms are in your current home?

CURRENT RESULTS			303 Total Responses
A	1 bedroom (17)		6% (17)
B	2 bedrooms (38)		13% (38)
C	3 bedrooms (125)		41% (125)
D	4+ bedrooms (123)		41% (123)

REGISTERED VS NON-REGISTERED				
	A	B	C	D
Registered Voters (181)	5.5% (10)	16.0% (29)	34.8% (63)	43.6% (79)
Non-Registered Voters (122)	5.7% (7)	7.4% (9)	50.8% (62)	36.1% (44)

ALL RESPONDENTS				
	A	B	C	D
All respondents (303)	6.0% (17)	13.0% (38)	41.0% (125)	41.0% (123)
Registered Voters in Fitchburg, WI (181)	5.5% (10)	16.0% (29)	34.8% (63)	43.6% (79)
Live in Fitchburg, WI (267) - Self-reported	5.6% (15)	13.1% (35)	39.7% (106)	41.6% (111)
Subscribers to Fitchburg, WI (271)	5.5% (15)	12.9% (35)	39.9% (108)	41.7% (113)
Register respondents from anywhere (187)	6.0% (11)	16.0% (29)	35.0% (65)	44.0% (82)

EDUCATION					187 REGISTERED VOTERS
	A	B	C	D	
Bach Degree - Extremely Likely (30)	3.3% (1)	-	40.0% (12)	56.7% (17)	
Bach Degree - Likely (21)	-	4.8% (1)	38.1% (8)	57.1% (12)	
Grad Degree - Extremely Likely (22)	-	13.6% (3)	31.8% (7)	54.5% (12)	
Grad Degree - Likely (13)	23.1% (3)	30.8% (4)	30.8% (4)	15.4% (2)	
HS Diploma - Extremely Likely (9)	-	33.3% (3)	33.3% (3)	33.3% (3)	
HS Diploma - Likely (4)	25.0% (1)	-	-	75.0% (3)	
Less than HS Diploma - Likely (1)	-	-	-	100.0% (1)	
Some College - Likely (12)	25.0% (3)	16.7% (2)	41.7% (5)	16.7% (2)	
Some College -Extremely Likely (5)	-	-	40.0% (2)	60.0% (3)	
Unknown (70)	4.3% (3)	22.9% (16)	34.3% (24)	38.6% (27)	

VOTERS GENDER					187 REGISTERED VOTERS
	A	B	C	D	
F (90)	6.7% (6)	21.1% (19)	36.7% (33)	35.6% (32)	
M (95)	5.3% (5)	9.5% (9)	32.6% (31)	52.6% (50)	
Unknown (2)	-	50.0% (1)	50.0% (1)	-	

PRECINCT					187 REGISTERED VOTERS
	A	B	C	D	
CHICAGO 43-04 (1)	-	-	100.0% (1)	-	
FITCHBURG CITY WARD 01 (9)	-	-	77.8% (7)	22.2% (2)	
FITCHBURG CITY WARD 02 (3)	33.3% (1)	33.3% (1)	33.3% (1)	-	
FITCHBURG CITY WARD 04 (2)	-	50.0% (1)	50.0% (1)	-	
FITCHBURG CITY WARD 05 (6)	-	-	-	100.0% (6)	
FITCHBURG CITY WARD 06 (12)	-	-	25.0% (3)	75.0% (9)	
FITCHBURG CITY WARD 07 (18)	5.6% (1)	-	61.1% (11)	33.3% (6)	
FITCHBURG CITY WARD 08 (14)	-	35.7% (5)	35.7% (5)	28.6% (4)	
FITCHBURG CITY WARD 09 (8)	-	87.5% (7)	12.5% (1)	-	
FITCHBURG CITY WARD 12 (2)	50.0% (1)	50.0% (1)	-	-	

FITCHBURG CITY WARD 13 (31)	6.5% (2)	19.4% (6)	41.9% (13)	32.3% (10)
FITCHBURG CITY WARD 14 (19)	5.3% (1)	21.1% (4)	42.1% (8)	31.6% (6)
FITCHBURG CITY WARD 15 (7)	42.9% (3)	14.3% (1)	14.3% (1)	28.6% (2)
FITCHBURG CITY WARD 16 (3)	-	-	33.3% (1)	66.7% (2)
FITCHBURG CITY WARD 17 (7)	14.3% (1)	14.3% (1)	42.9% (3)	28.6% (2)
FITCHBURG CITY WARD 18 (12)	-	-	25.0% (3)	75.0% (9)
FITCHBURG CITY WARD 19 (26)	-	3.8% (1)	19.2% (5)	76.9% (20)
MADISON CITY WARD 042 (1)	-	-	-	100.0% (1)
MADISON CITY WARD 053 (1)	100.0% (1)	-	-	-
MADISON CITY WARD 100 (1)	-	100.0% (1)	-	-
MADISON CITY WARD 107 (1)	-	-	-	100.0% (1)
MIDDLETON TOWN WARD 7 (1)	-	-	-	100.0% (1)
MOUNT HOREB VLG WARD 3 (1)	-	-	100.0% (1)	-
OREGON VLG WARD 10 (1)	-	-	-	100.0% (1)

AGE RANGE

187 REGISTERED VOTERS

	A	B	C	D
18-29 (1)	-	-	100.0% (1)	-
30-39 (24)	4.2% (1)	16.7% (4)	54.2% (13)	25.0% (6)
40-49 (29)	-	6.9% (2)	44.8% (13)	48.3% (14)
50-59 (23)	8.7% (2)	17.4% (4)	21.7% (5)	52.2% (12)
60-69 (26)	3.8% (1)	3.8% (1)	23.1% (6)	69.2% (18)
70-79 (16)	-	25.0% (4)	56.3% (9)	18.8% (3)
unknown (68)	10.3% (7)	20.6% (14)	26.5% (18)	42.6% (29)

VOTERS AGE

187 REGISTERED VOTERS

	A	B	C	D
28 (1)	-	-	100.0% (1)	-
31 (1)	-	-	100.0% (1)	-
32 (1)	100.0% (1)	-	-	-
33 (1)	-	-	100.0% (1)	-
34 (1)	-	100.0% (1)	-	-
35 (5)	-	20.0% (1)	80.0% (4)	-
36 (3)	-	-	100.0% (3)	-
37 (5)	-	-	40.0% (2)	60.0% (3)
38 (3)	-	66.7% (2)	-	33.3% (1)
39 (4)	-	-	50.0% (2)	50.0% (2)
40 (3)	-	33.3% (1)	33.3% (1)	33.3% (1)
41 (3)	-	33.3% (1)	-	66.7% (2)
43 (5)	-	-	60.0% (3)	40.0% (2)
44 (6)	-	-	33.3% (2)	66.7% (4)
45 (2)	-	-	50.0% (1)	50.0% (1)
46 (1)	-	-	-	100.0% (1)
47 (3)	-	-	33.3% (1)	66.7% (2)
48 (2)	-	-	100.0% (2)	-
49 (4)	-	-	75.0% (3)	25.0% (1)
50 (1)	-	-	100.0% (1)	-
51 (1)	-	-	-	100.0% (1)
52 (5)	-	40.0% (2)	40.0% (2)	20.0% (1)
53 (4)	-	50.0% (2)	-	50.0% (2)
54 (1)	-	-	100.0% (1)	-
55 (3)	-	-	-	100.0% (3)
56 (2)	50.0% (1)	-	-	50.0% (1)
57 (1)	-	-	100.0% (1)	-
59 (5)	20.0% (1)	-	-	80.0% (4)
60 (3)	-	-	33.3% (1)	66.7% (2)
61 (1)	-	-	-	100.0% (1)

62 (5)	-	-	40.0% (2)	60.0% (3)
63 (2)	-	-	-	100.0% (2)
64 (5)	20.0% (1)	-	20.0% (1)	60.0% (3)
65 (2)	-	50.0% (1)	-	50.0% (1)
66 (2)	-	-	-	100.0% (2)
67 (1)	-	-	-	100.0% (1)
68 (3)	-	-	33.3% (1)	66.7% (2)
69 (2)	-	-	50.0% (1)	50.0% (1)
71 (2)	-	-	50.0% (1)	50.0% (1)
72 (3)	-	-	66.7% (2)	33.3% (1)
73 (3)	-	-	66.7% (2)	33.3% (1)
74 (4)	-	50.0% (2)	50.0% (2)	-
77 (2)	-	50.0% (1)	50.0% (1)	-
79 (2)	-	50.0% (1)	50.0% (1)	-
Unknown (68)	10.3% (7)	20.6% (14)	26.5% (18)	42.6% (29)

STATE INCOME
DECILE

187 REGISTERED VOTERS

	A	B	C	D
0 to 9 Pct range (6)	-	33.3% (2)	66.7% (4)	-
10 to 19 Pct range (1)	-	-	-	100.0% (1)
40 to 49 Pct range (2)	50.0% (1)	-	-	50.0% (1)
50 to 59 Pct range (9)	-	-	77.8% (7)	22.2% (2)
60 to 69 Pct range (7)	-	100.0% (7)	-	-
70 to 79 Pct range (5)	20.0% (1)	40.0% (2)	40.0% (2)	-
80 to 89 Pct range (70)	11.4% (8)	18.6% (13)	35.7% (25)	34.3% (24)
90 Pct and up (85)	1.2% (1)	5.9% (5)	29.4% (25)	63.5% (54)
Unknown (2)	-	-	100.0% (2)	-

HOME OWNER/RENTER

187 REGISTERED VOTERS

	A	B	C	D
Likely Homeowner (106)	-	10.4% (11)	37.7% (40)	51.9% (55)
Likely Renter (55)	20.0% (11)	27.3% (15)	29.1% (16)	23.6% (13)
Unknown (26)	-	11.5% (3)	34.6% (9)	53.8% (14)

How much does your household spend per month on housing (mortgage/rent, utilities, and insurance)?

CURRENT RESULTS		303 Total Responses
A	Less than \$300 (6)	2% (6)
B	\$300-\$499 (16)	5% (16)
C	\$500-\$799 (10)	3% (10)
D	\$800-\$999 (10)	3% (10)
E	\$1,000-\$1,499 (59)	19% (59)
F	\$1,500-\$1,999 (67)	22% (67)
G	\$2,000-\$2,499 (48)	16% (48)
H	\$2,500-\$2,999 (37)	12% (37)
I	\$3,000 or more (24)	8% (24)
J	Prefer not to answer (26)	9% (26)

REGISTERED VS NON-REGISTERED	A	B	C	D	E	F	G	H	I	J
Registered Voters (181)	3.3% (6)	5.0% (9)	2.8% (5)	2.2% (4)	18.8% (34)	24.3% (44)	17.1% (31)	11.6% (21)	7.7% (14)	7.2% (13)
Non-Registered Voters (122)	-	5.7% (7)	4.1% (5)	4.9% (6)	20.5% (25)	18.9% (23)	13.9% (17)	13.1% (16)	8.2% (10)	10.7% (13)

ALL RESPONDENTS	A	B	C	D	E	F	G	H	I	J
All respondents (303)	2.0% (6)	5.0% (16)	3.0% (10)	3.0% (10)	19.0% (59)	22.0% (67)	16.0% (48)	12.0% (37)	8.0% (24)	9.0% (26)
Registered Voters in Fitchburg, WI (181)	3.3% (6)	5.0% (9)	2.8% (5)	2.2% (4)	18.8% (34)	24.3% (44)	17.1% (31)	11.6% (21)	7.7% (14)	7.2% (13)
Live in Fitchburg, WI (267) - Self-reported	2.2% (6)	4.9% (13)	3.0% (8)	3.7% (10)	19.5% (52)	22.8% (61)	15.4% (41)	12.7% (34)	7.5% (20)	8.2% (22)
Subscribers to Fitchburg, WI (271)	2.2% (6)	5.2% (14)	3.0% (8)	3.7% (10)	19.2% (52)	22.5% (61)	15.5% (42)	12.5% (34)	8.1% (22)	8.1% (22)
Register respondents from anywhere (187)	3.0% (6)	5.0% (10)	3.0% (5)	2.0% (4)	19.0% (35)	24.0% (45)	17.0% (32)	12.0% (22)	7.0% (14)	7.0% (14)

EDUCATION	A	B	C	D	E	F	G	H	I	J
Bach Degree - Extremely Likely (30)	6.7% (2)	3.3% (1)	3.3% (1)	6.7% (2)	16.7% (5)	16.7% (5)	13.3% (4)	10.0% (3)	10.0% (3)	13.3% (4)
Bach Degree - Likely (21)	-	4.8% (1)	-	-	23.8% (5)	23.8% (5)	14.3% (3)	23.8% (5)	9.5% (2)	-
Grad Degree - Extremely Likely (22)	4.5% (1)	9.1% (2)	4.5% (1)	-	18.2% (4)	27.3% (6)	18.2% (4)	9.1% (2)	4.5% (1)	4.5% (1)
Grad Degree - Likely (13)	-	15.4% (2)	-	7.7% (1)	38.5% (5)	15.4% (2)	7.7% (1)	-	7.7% (1)	7.7% (1)
HS Diploma - Extremely Likely (9)	-	-	-	-	11.1% (1)	33.3% (3)	22.2% (2)	11.1% (1)	-	22.2% (2)
HS Diploma - Likely (4)	-	-	-	-	25.0% (1)	25.0% (1)	25.0% (1)	25.0% (1)	-	-
Less than HS Diploma - Likely (1)	-	-	-	-	-	-	100.0% (1)	-	-	-
Some College - Likely (12)	-	-	8.3% (1)	-	33.3% (4)	8.3% (1)	8.3% (1)	8.3% (1)	16.7% (2)	16.7% (2)
Some College -Extremely Likely (5)	-	-	-	20.0% (1)	20.0% (1)	40.0% (2)	20.0% (1)	-	-	-
Unknown (70)	4.3% (3)	5.7% (4)	2.9% (2)	-	12.9% (9)	28.6% (20)	20.0% (14)	12.9% (9)	7.1% (5)	5.7% (4)

VOTERS GENDER	A	B	C	D	E	F	G	H	I	J
F (90)	1.1% (1)	1.1% (1)	1.1% (1)	2.2% (2)	22.2% (20)	28.9% (26)	16.7% (15)	13.3% (12)	5.6% (5)	7.8% (7)
M (95)	4.2% (4)	9.5% (9)	4.2% (4)	2.1% (2)	15.8% (15)	20.0% (19)	17.9% (17)	10.5% (10)	8.4% (8)	7.4% (7)
Unknown (2)	50.0% (1)	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	50.0% (1)	-

PRECINCT	A	B	C	D	E	F	G	H	I	J
CHICAGO 43-04 (1)	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	100.0% (1)
FITCHBURG CITY WARD 01 (9)	-	-	-	-	44.4% (4)	44.4% (4)	11.1% (1)	-	-	-
FITCHBURG CITY WARD 02 (3)	33.3% (1)	-	-	-	66.7% (2)	-	-	-	-	-

FITCHBURG CITY WARD 04 (2)	-	-	-	50.0% (1)	50.0% (1)	-	-	-	-	-
FITCHBURG CITY WARD 05 (6)	-	-	-	-	-	16.7% (1)	33.3% (2)	16.7% (1)	33.3% (2)	-
FITCHBURG CITY WARD 06 (12)	-	-	-	-	-	33.3% (4)	33.3% (4)	16.7% (2)	8.3% (1)	8.3% (1)
FITCHBURG CITY WARD 07 (18)	16.7% (3)	-	5.6% (1)	5.6% (1)	22.2% (4)	5.6% (1)	16.7% (3)	11.1% (2)	-	16.7% (3)
FITCHBURG CITY WARD 08 (14)	7.1% (1)	14.3% (2)	-	7.1% (1)	28.6% (4)	21.4% (3)	14.3% (2)	-	-	7.1% (1)
FITCHBURG CITY WARD 09 (8)	-	12.5% (1)	12.5% (1)	-	-	62.5% (5)	-	-	12.5% (1)	-
FITCHBURG CITY WARD 12 (2)	-	-	-	-	100.0% (2)	-	-	-	-	-
FITCHBURG CITY WARD 13 (31)	-	3.2% (1)	-	-	22.6% (7)	12.9% (4)	29.0% (9)	12.9% (4)	9.7% (3)	9.7% (3)
FITCHBURG CITY WARD 14 (19)	-	-	-	-	21.1% (4)	47.4% (9)	-	21.1% (4)	-	10.5% (2)
FITCHBURG CITY WARD 15 (7)	14.3% (1)	-	-	-	42.9% (3)	14.3% (1)	14.3% (1)	-	-	14.3% (1)
FITCHBURG CITY WARD 16 (3)	-	-	-	-	-	66.7% (2)	-	-	33.3% (1)	-
FITCHBURG CITY WARD 17 (7)	-	14.3% (1)	14.3% (1)	-	14.3% (1)	28.6% (2)	14.3% (1)	14.3% (1)	-	-
FITCHBURG CITY WARD 18 (12)	-	8.3% (1)	8.3% (1)	8.3% (1)	8.3% (1)	25.0% (3)	-	33.3% (4)	-	8.3% (1)
FITCHBURG CITY WARD 19 (26)	-	11.5% (3)	3.8% (1)	-	3.8% (1)	15.4% (4)	26.9% (7)	11.5% (3)	23.1% (6)	3.8% (1)
MADISON CITY WARD 042 (1)	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	100.0% (1)	-	-
MADISON CITY WARD 053 (1)	-	-	-	-	100.0% (1)	-	-	-	-	-
MADISON CITY WARD 100 (1)	-	-	-	-	-	100.0% (1)	-	-	-	-
MADISON CITY WARD 107 (1)	-	-	-	-	-	-	100.0% (1)	-	-	-
MIDDLETON TOWN WARD 7 (1)	-	100.0% (1)	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
MOUNT HOREB VLG WARD 3 (1)	-	-	-	-	-	100.0% (1)	-	-	-	-
OREGON VLG WARD 10 (1)	-	-	-	-	-	-	100.0% (1)	-	-	-

AGE RANGE

187 REGISTERED VOTERS

	A	B	C	D	E	F	G	H	I	J
18-29 (1)	-	-	-	-	100.0% (1)	-	-	-	-	-
30-39 (24)	4.2% (1)	-	-	-	29.2% (7)	12.5% (3)	16.7% (4)	29.2% (7)	4.2% (1)	4.2% (1)
40-49 (29)	3.4% (1)	-	-	-	6.9% (2)	44.8% (13)	17.2% (5)	17.2% (5)	6.9% (2)	3.4% (1)
50-59 (23)	-	-	4.3% (1)	-	21.7% (5)	26.1% (6)	8.7% (2)	13.0% (3)	17.4% (4)	8.7% (2)
60-69 (26)	7.7% (2)	15.4% (4)	3.8% (1)	7.7% (2)	23.1% (6)	-	7.7% (2)	-	11.5% (3)	23.1% (6)
70-79 (16)	6.3% (1)	18.8% (3)	12.5% (2)	6.3% (1)	12.5% (2)	12.5% (2)	18.8% (3)	-	6.3% (1)	6.3% (1)
unknown (68)	1.5% (1)	4.4% (3)	1.5% (1)	1.5% (1)	17.6% (12)	30.9% (21)	23.5% (16)	10.3% (7)	4.4% (3)	4.4% (3)

VOTERS AGE

187 REGISTERED VOTERS

	A	B	C	D	E	F	G	H	I	J
28 (1)	-	-	-	-	100.0% (1)	-	-	-	-	-
31 (1)	-	-	-	-	-	-	100.0% (1)	-	-	-
32 (1)	-	-	-	-	100.0% (1)	-	-	-	-	-
33 (1)	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	100.0% (1)	-
34 (1)	-	-	-	-	100.0% (1)	-	-	-	-	-
35 (5)	20.0% (1)	-	-	-	40.0% (2)	-	-	40.0% (2)	-	-
36 (3)	-	-	-	-	33.3% (1)	-	-	33.3% (1)	-	33.3% (1)
37 (5)	-	-	-	-	20.0% (1)	-	40.0% (2)	40.0% (2)	-	-
38 (3)	-	-	-	-	33.3% (1)	33.3% (1)	-	33.3% (1)	-	-
39 (4)	-	-	-	-	-	50.0% (2)	25.0% (1)	25.0% (1)	-	-
40 (3)	-	-	-	-	-	33.3% (1)	33.3% (1)	-	33.3% (1)	-
41 (3)	-	-	-	-	-	66.7% (2)	-	33.3% (1)	-	-
43 (5)	-	-	-	-	20.0% (1)	20.0% (1)	20.0% (1)	20.0% (1)	20.0% (1)	-
44 (6)	16.7% (1)	-	-	-	-	66.7% (4)	16.7% (1)	-	-	-
45 (2)	-	-	-	-	-	50.0% (1)	50.0% (1)	-	-	-
46 (1)	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	100.0% (1)	-	-
47 (3)	-	-	-	-	-	-	33.3% (1)	66.7% (2)	-	-
48 (2)	-	-	-	-	50.0% (1)	50.0% (1)	-	-	-	-
49 (4)	-	-	-	-	-	75.0% (3)	-	-	-	25.0% (1)
50 (1)	-	-	-	-	100.0% (1)	-	-	-	-	-
51 (1)	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	100.0% (1)	-
52 (5)	-	-	20.0% (1)	-	-	20.0% (1)	20.0% (1)	20.0% (1)	20.0% (1)	-
53 (4)	-	-	-	-	-	50.0% (2)	25.0% (1)	-	-	25.0% (1)

54 (1)	-	-	-	-	-	100.0% (1)	-	-	-	-
55 (3)	-	-	-	-	-	66.7% (2)	-	-	33.3% (1)	-
56 (2)	-	-	-	-	50.0% (1)	-	-	-	50.0% (1)	-
57 (1)	-	-	-	-	100.0% (1)	-	-	-	-	-
59 (5)	-	-	-	-	40.0% (2)	-	-	40.0% (2)	-	20.0% (1)
60 (3)	-	-	-	-	33.3% (1)	-	-	-	-	66.7% (2)
61 (1)	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	100.0% (1)
62 (5)	-	20.0% (1)	-	-	20.0% (1)	-	20.0% (1)	-	20.0% (1)	20.0% (1)
63 (2)	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	50.0% (1)	50.0% (1)
64 (5)	-	20.0% (1)	-	20.0% (1)	20.0% (1)	-	-	-	20.0% (1)	20.0% (1)
65 (2)	-	-	-	-	50.0% (1)	-	50.0% (1)	-	-	-
66 (2)	-	50.0% (1)	-	-	50.0% (1)	-	-	-	-	-
67 (1)	-	100.0% (1)	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
68 (3)	33.3% (1)	-	-	33.3% (1)	33.3% (1)	-	-	-	-	-
69 (2)	50.0% (1)	-	50.0% (1)	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
71 (2)	-	50.0% (1)	-	-	-	-	50.0% (1)	-	-	-
72 (3)	-	-	-	33.3% (1)	33.3% (1)	-	33.3% (1)	-	-	-
73 (3)	-	-	66.7% (2)	-	-	33.3% (1)	-	-	-	-
74 (4)	25.0% (1)	25.0% (1)	-	-	25.0% (1)	-	25.0% (1)	-	-	-
77 (2)	-	50.0% (1)	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	50.0% (1)
79 (2)	-	-	-	-	-	50.0% (1)	-	-	50.0% (1)	-
Unknown (68)	1.5% (1)	4.4% (3)	1.5% (1)	1.5% (1)	17.6% (12)	30.9% (21)	23.5% (16)	10.3% (7)	4.4% (3)	4.4% (3)

STATE INCOME DECILE

187 REGISTERED VOTERS

	A	B	C	D	E	F	G	H	I	J
0 to 9 Pct range (6)	-	-	-	16.7% (1)	16.7% (1)	16.7% (1)	16.7% (1)	-	16.7% (1)	16.7% (1)
10 to 19 Pct range (1)	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	100.0% (1)	-
40 to 49 Pct range (2)	-	-	-	-	50.0% (1)	50.0% (1)	-	-	-	-
50 to 59 Pct range (9)	-	-	-	-	44.4% (4)	33.3% (3)	11.1% (1)	-	11.1% (1)	-
60 to 69 Pct range (7)	-	-	14.3% (1)	-	-	71.4% (5)	-	-	14.3% (1)	-
70 to 79 Pct range (5)	20.0% (1)	-	-	-	40.0% (2)	40.0% (2)	-	-	-	-
80 to 89 Pct range (70)	1.4% (1)	2.9% (2)	1.4% (1)	-	24.3% (17)	27.1% (19)	17.1% (12)	12.9% (9)	5.7% (4)	7.1% (5)
90 Pct and up (85)	3.5% (3)	9.4% (8)	3.5% (3)	3.5% (3)	11.8% (10)	16.5% (14)	21.2% (18)	14.1% (12)	7.1% (6)	9.4% (8)
Unknown (2)	50.0% (1)	-	-	-	-	-	-	50.0% (1)	-	-

HOME OWNER/RENTER

187 REGISTERED VOTERS

	A	B	C	D	E	F	G	H	I	J
Likely Homeowner (106)	1.9% (2)	6.6% (7)	3.8% (4)	3.8% (4)	14.2% (15)	21.7% (23)	16.0% (17)	14.2% (15)	8.5% (9)	9.4% (10)
Likely Renter (55)	3.6% (2)	1.8% (1)	1.8% (1)	-	34.5% (19)	30.9% (17)	12.7% (7)	7.3% (4)	5.5% (3)	1.8% (1)
Unknown (26)	7.7% (2)	7.7% (2)	-	-	3.8% (1)	19.2% (5)	30.8% (8)	11.5% (3)	7.7% (2)	11.5% (3)

At what rate should Fitchburg grow?

CURRENT RESULTS		303 Total Responses	
A	The rate it has over the past 30 years (approximately 5,000 new residents every 10 years). (137)		45% (137)
B	A slower rate (110)		36% (110)
C	A faster rate (56)		18% (56)

REGISTERED VS NON-REGISTERED	A	B	C
Registered Voters (181)	50.3% (91)	33.1% (60)	16.6% (30)
Non-Registered Voters (122)	37.7% (46)	41.0% (50)	21.3% (26)

ALL RESPONDENTS	A	B	C
All respondents (303)	45.0% (137)	36.0% (110)	18.0% (56)
Registered Voters in Fitchburg, WI (181)	50.3% (91)	33.1% (60)	16.6% (30)
Live in Fitchburg, WI (267) - Self-reported	46.8% (125)	35.6% (95)	17.6% (47)
Subscribers to Fitchburg, WI (271)	46.5% (126)	35.1% (95)	18.5% (50)
Register respondents from anywhere (187)	51.0% (95)	33.0% (61)	17.0% (31)

EDUCATION	187 REGISTERED VOTERS		
	A	B	C
Bach Degree - Extremely Likely (30)	56.7% (17)	33.3% (10)	10.0% (3)
Bach Degree - Likely (21)	42.9% (9)	38.1% (8)	19.0% (4)
Grad Degree - Extremely Likely (22)	36.4% (8)	45.5% (10)	18.2% (4)
Grad Degree - Likely (13)	38.5% (5)	15.4% (2)	46.2% (6)
HS Diploma - Extremely Likely (9)	22.2% (2)	55.6% (5)	22.2% (2)
HS Diploma - Likely (4)	75.0% (3)	25.0% (1)	-
Less than HS Diploma - Likely (1)	100.0% (1)	-	-
Some College - Likely (12)	66.7% (8)	16.7% (2)	16.7% (2)
Some College -Extremely Likely (5)	60.0% (3)	40.0% (2)	-
Unknown (70)	55.7% (39)	30.0% (21)	14.3% (10)

VOTERS GENDER	187 REGISTERED VOTERS		
	A	B	C
F (90)	54.4% (49)	35.6% (32)	10.0% (9)
M (95)	47.4% (45)	29.5% (28)	23.2% (22)
Unknown (2)	50.0% (1)	50.0% (1)	-

PRECINCT	187 REGISTERED VOTERS		
	A	B	C
CHICAGO 43-04 (1)	100.0% (1)	-	-
FITCHBURG CITY WARD 01 (9)	55.6% (5)	44.4% (4)	-
FITCHBURG CITY WARD 02 (3)	33.3% (1)	-	66.7% (2)
FITCHBURG CITY WARD 04 (2)	100.0% (2)	-	-
FITCHBURG CITY WARD 05 (6)	66.7% (4)	16.7% (1)	16.7% (1)
FITCHBURG CITY WARD 06 (12)	75.0% (9)	8.3% (1)	16.7% (2)
FITCHBURG CITY WARD 07 (18)	27.8% (5)	55.6% (10)	16.7% (3)
FITCHBURG CITY WARD 08 (14)	42.9% (6)	28.6% (4)	28.6% (4)
FITCHBURG CITY WARD 09 (8)	87.5% (7)	12.5% (1)	-
FITCHBURG CITY WARD 12 (2)	50.0% (1)	-	50.0% (1)
FITCHBURG CITY WARD 13 (31)	41.9% (13)	38.7% (12)	19.4% (6)

FITCHBURG CITY WARD 14 (19)	52.6% (10)	26.3% (5)	21.1% (4)
FITCHBURG CITY WARD 15 (7)	28.6% (2)	28.6% (2)	42.9% (3)
FITCHBURG CITY WARD 16 (3)	33.3% (1)	33.3% (1)	33.3% (1)
FITCHBURG CITY WARD 17 (7)	71.4% (5)	28.6% (2)	-
FITCHBURG CITY WARD 18 (12)	33.3% (4)	50.0% (6)	16.7% (2)
FITCHBURG CITY WARD 19 (26)	57.7% (15)	38.5% (10)	3.8% (1)
MADISON CITY WARD 042 (1)	100.0% (1)	-	-
MADISON CITY WARD 053 (1)	100.0% (1)	-	-
MADISON CITY WARD 100 (1)	-	100.0% (1)	-
MADISON CITY WARD 107 (1)	-	-	100.0% (1)
MIDDLETON TOWN WARD 7 (1)	100.0% (1)	-	-
MOUNT HOREB VLG WARD 3 (1)	-	100.0% (1)	-
OREGON VLG WARD 10 (1)	100.0% (1)	-	-

AGE RANGE

187 REGISTERED VOTERS

	A	B	C
18-29 (1)	-	100.0% (1)	-
30-39 (24)	54.2% (13)	12.5% (3)	33.3% (8)
40-49 (29)	48.3% (14)	37.9% (11)	13.8% (4)
50-59 (23)	56.5% (13)	34.8% (8)	8.7% (2)
60-69 (26)	38.5% (10)	50.0% (13)	11.5% (3)
70-79 (16)	43.8% (7)	50.0% (8)	6.3% (1)
unknown (68)	55.9% (38)	25.0% (17)	19.1% (13)

VOTERS
AGE

187 REGISTERED VOTERS

	A	B	C
28 (1)	-	100.0% (1)	-
31 (1)	100.0% (1)	-	-
32 (1)	-	-	100.0% (1)
33 (1)	100.0% (1)	-	-
34 (1)	-	-	100.0% (1)
35 (5)	40.0% (2)	-	60.0% (3)
36 (3)	33.3% (1)	33.3% (1)	33.3% (1)
37 (5)	80.0% (4)	20.0% (1)	-
38 (3)	66.7% (2)	33.3% (1)	-
39 (4)	50.0% (2)	-	50.0% (2)
40 (3)	66.7% (2)	-	33.3% (1)
41 (3)	66.7% (2)	33.3% (1)	-
43 (5)	20.0% (1)	60.0% (3)	20.0% (1)
44 (6)	50.0% (3)	33.3% (2)	16.7% (1)
45 (2)	-	100.0% (2)	-
46 (1)	100.0% (1)	-	-
47 (3)	33.3% (1)	33.3% (1)	33.3% (1)
48 (2)	100.0% (2)	-	-
49 (4)	50.0% (2)	50.0% (2)	-
50 (1)	100.0% (1)	-	-
51 (1)	-	-	100.0% (1)
52 (5)	60.0% (3)	20.0% (1)	20.0% (1)
53 (4)	25.0% (1)	75.0% (3)	-
54 (1)	-	100.0% (1)	-
55 (3)	66.7% (2)	33.3% (1)	-
56 (2)	100.0% (2)	-	-
57 (1)	-	100.0% (1)	-
59 (5)	80.0% (4)	20.0% (1)	-
60 (3)	-	100.0% (3)	-
61 (1)	-	-	100.0% (1)
62 (5)	60.0% (3)	40.0% (2)	-

63 (2)	-	50.0% (1)	50.0% (1)
64 (5)	80.0% (4)	20.0% (1)	-
65 (2)	-	100.0% (2)	-
66 (2)	50.0% (1)	50.0% (1)	-
67 (1)	-	100.0% (1)	-
68 (3)	66.7% (2)	33.3% (1)	-
69 (2)	-	50.0% (1)	50.0% (1)
71 (2)	-	100.0% (2)	-
72 (3)	33.3% (1)	66.7% (2)	-
73 (3)	33.3% (1)	66.7% (2)	-
74 (4)	50.0% (2)	50.0% (2)	-
77 (2)	100.0% (2)	-	-
79 (2)	50.0% (1)	-	50.0% (1)
Unknown (68)	55.9% (38)	25.0% (17)	19.1% (13)

**STATE INCOME
DECILE**

187 REGISTERED VOTERS

	A	B	C
0 to 9 Pct range (6)	83.3% (5)	16.7% (1)	-
10 to 19 Pct range (1)	-	100.0% (1)	-
40 to 49 Pct range (2)	100.0% (2)	-	-
50 to 59 Pct range (9)	55.6% (5)	44.4% (4)	-
60 to 69 Pct range (7)	85.7% (6)	14.3% (1)	-
70 to 79 Pct range (5)	20.0% (1)	40.0% (2)	40.0% (2)
80 to 89 Pct range (70)	50.0% (35)	28.6% (20)	21.4% (15)
90 Pct and up (85)	48.2% (41)	35.3% (30)	16.5% (14)
Unknown (2)	-	100.0% (2)	-

HOME OWNER/RENTER

187 REGISTERED VOTERS

	A	B	C
Likely Homeowner (106)	47.2% (50)	34.0% (36)	18.9% (20)
Likely Renter (55)	56.4% (31)	32.7% (18)	10.9% (6)
Unknown (26)	53.8% (14)	26.9% (7)	19.2% (5)

Where is Fitchburg’s “city center”?

CURRENT RESULTS		303 Total Responses
A	North Fish Hatchery Road area (14)	5% (14)
B	McKee Road area (29)	10% (29)
C	Verona Road area (1)	0% (1)
D	Lacy Road area (63)	21% (63)
E	Other area not listed. (5)	2% (5)
F	Fitchburg does not have a city center. (191)	63% (191)

REGISTERED VS NON-REGISTERED	A	B	C	D	E	F
Registered Voters (181)	4.4% (8)	8.3% (15)	-	17.1% (31)	2.8% (5)	67.4% (122)
Non-Registered Voters (122)	4.9% (6)	11.5% (14)	0.8% (1)	26.2% (32)	-	56.6% (69)

ALL RESPONDENTS	A	B	C	D	E	F
All respondents (303)	5.0% (14)	10.0% (29)	-	21.0% (63)	2.0% (5)	63.0% (191)
Registered Voters in Fitchburg, WI (181)	4.4% (8)	8.3% (15)	-	17.1% (31)	2.8% (5)	67.4% (122)
Live in Fitchburg, WI (267) - Self-reported	3.7% (10)	10.5% (28)	0.4% (1)	19.1% (51)	1.9% (5)	64.4% (172)
Subscribers to Fitchburg, WI (271)	4.1% (11)	10.7% (29)	0.4% (1)	19.6% (53)	1.8% (5)	63.5% (172)
Register respondents from anywhere (187)	5.0% (9)	8.0% (15)	-	19.0% (35)	3.0% (5)	66.0% (123)

EDUCATION	A	B	C	D	E	F
Bach Degree - Extremely Likely (30)	3.3% (1)	6.7% (2)	-	10.0% (3)	6.7% (2)	73.3% (22)
Bach Degree - Likely (21)	4.8% (1)	9.5% (2)	-	9.5% (2)	4.8% (1)	71.4% (15)
Grad Degree - Extremely Likely (22)	-	4.5% (1)	-	18.2% (4)	-	77.3% (17)
Grad Degree - Likely (13)	-	7.7% (1)	-	15.4% (2)	-	76.9% (10)
HS Diploma - Extremely Likely (9)	-	-	-	44.4% (4)	-	55.6% (5)
HS Diploma - Likely (4)	25.0% (1)	-	-	25.0% (1)	-	50.0% (2)
Less than HS Diploma - Likely (1)	-	-	-	-	-	100.0% (1)
Some College - Likely (12)	8.3% (1)	-	-	33.3% (4)	-	58.3% (7)
Some College -Extremely Likely (5)	-	20.0% (1)	-	40.0% (2)	-	40.0% (2)
Unknown (70)	7.1% (5)	11.4% (8)	-	18.6% (13)	2.9% (2)	60.0% (42)

VOTERS GENDER	A	B	C	D	E	F
F (90)	5.6% (5)	7.8% (7)	-	20.0% (18)	-	66.7% (60)
M (95)	3.2% (3)	8.4% (8)	-	17.9% (17)	5.3% (5)	65.3% (62)
Unknown (2)	50.0% (1)	-	-	-	-	50.0% (1)

PRECINCT	A	B	C	D	E	F
CHICAGO 43-04 (1)	-	-	-	100.0% (1)	-	-
FITCHBURG CITY WARD 01 (9)	-	-	-	22.2% (2)	-	77.8% (7)
FITCHBURG CITY WARD 02 (3)	33.3% (1)	-	-	-	-	66.7% (2)
FITCHBURG CITY WARD 04 (2)	-	-	-	-	-	100.0% (2)
FITCHBURG CITY WARD 05 (6)	-	33.3% (2)	-	16.7% (1)	-	50.0% (3)
FITCHBURG CITY WARD 06 (12)	8.3% (1)	8.3% (1)	-	25.0% (3)	-	58.3% (7)
FITCHBURG CITY WARD 07 (18)	5.6% (1)	11.1% (2)	-	16.7% (3)	-	66.7% (12)
FITCHBURG CITY WARD 08 (14)	-	7.1% (1)	-	14.3% (2)	-	78.6% (11)

FITCHBURG CITY WARD 09 (8)	-	12.5% (1)	-	12.5% (1)	-	75.0% (6)
FITCHBURG CITY WARD 12 (2)	-	-	-	-	-	100.0% (2)
FITCHBURG CITY WARD 13 (31)	6.5% (2)	6.5% (2)	-	19.4% (6)	3.2% (1)	64.5% (20)
FITCHBURG CITY WARD 14 (19)	-	5.3% (1)	-	21.1% (4)	5.3% (1)	68.4% (13)
FITCHBURG CITY WARD 15 (7)	14.3% (1)	-	-	14.3% (1)	-	71.4% (5)
FITCHBURG CITY WARD 16 (3)	33.3% (1)	33.3% (1)	-	33.3% (1)	-	-
FITCHBURG CITY WARD 17 (7)	-	-	-	42.9% (3)	14.3% (1)	42.9% (3)
FITCHBURG CITY WARD 18 (12)	-	-	-	16.7% (2)	8.3% (1)	75.0% (9)
FITCHBURG CITY WARD 19 (26)	3.8% (1)	15.4% (4)	-	3.8% (1)	3.8% (1)	73.1% (19)
MADISON CITY WARD 042 (1)	-	-	-	100.0% (1)	-	-
MADISON CITY WARD 053 (1)	-	-	-	-	-	100.0% (1)
MADISON CITY WARD 100 (1)	-	-	-	-	-	100.0% (1)
MADISON CITY WARD 107 (1)	100.0% (1)	-	-	-	-	-
MIDDLETON TOWN WARD 7 (1)	-	-	-	100.0% (1)	-	-
MOUNT HOREB VLG WARD 3 (1)	-	-	-	100.0% (1)	-	-
OREGON VLG WARD 10 (1)	-	-	-	100.0% (1)	-	-

AGE RANGE

187 REGISTERED VOTERS

	A	B	C	D	E	F
18-29 (1)	-	-	-	-	-	100.0% (1)
30-39 (24)	8.3% (2)	4.2% (1)	-	4.2% (1)	-	83.3% (20)
40-49 (29)	3.4% (1)	6.9% (2)	-	20.7% (6)	3.4% (1)	65.5% (19)
50-59 (23)	8.7% (2)	4.3% (1)	-	34.8% (8)	-	52.2% (12)
60-69 (26)	3.8% (1)	3.8% (1)	-	15.4% (4)	7.7% (2)	69.2% (18)
70-79 (16)	-	12.5% (2)	-	12.5% (2)	6.3% (1)	68.8% (11)
unknown (68)	4.4% (3)	11.8% (8)	-	20.6% (14)	1.5% (1)	61.8% (42)

VOTERS AGE

187 REGISTERED VOTERS

	A	B	C	D	E	F
28 (1)	-	-	-	-	-	100.0% (1)
31 (1)	-	-	-	-	-	100.0% (1)
32 (1)	-	-	-	-	-	100.0% (1)
33 (1)	-	-	-	-	-	100.0% (1)
34 (1)	-	-	-	-	-	100.0% (1)
35 (5)	20.0% (1)	-	-	-	-	80.0% (4)
36 (3)	-	-	-	-	-	100.0% (3)
37 (5)	20.0% (1)	-	-	20.0% (1)	-	60.0% (3)
38 (3)	-	-	-	-	-	100.0% (3)
39 (4)	-	25.0% (1)	-	-	-	75.0% (3)
40 (3)	-	-	-	-	-	100.0% (3)
41 (3)	-	-	-	33.3% (1)	-	66.7% (2)
43 (5)	-	20.0% (1)	-	20.0% (1)	20.0% (1)	40.0% (2)
44 (6)	-	16.7% (1)	-	16.7% (1)	-	66.7% (4)
45 (2)	-	-	-	-	-	100.0% (2)
46 (1)	-	-	-	-	-	100.0% (1)
47 (3)	-	-	-	-	-	100.0% (3)
48 (2)	50.0% (1)	-	-	50.0% (1)	-	-
49 (4)	-	-	-	50.0% (2)	-	50.0% (2)
50 (1)	-	-	-	-	-	100.0% (1)
51 (1)	-	-	-	-	-	100.0% (1)
52 (5)	-	-	-	-	-	100.0% (5)
53 (4)	25.0% (1)	-	-	50.0% (2)	-	25.0% (1)
54 (1)	-	-	-	100.0% (1)	-	-
55 (3)	33.3% (1)	33.3% (1)	-	33.3% (1)	-	-
56 (2)	-	-	-	-	-	100.0% (2)
57 (1)	-	-	-	-	-	100.0% (1)
59 (5)	-	-	-	80.0% (4)	-	20.0% (1)

60 (3)	-	-	-	-	-	100.0% (3)
61 (1)	-	-	-	-	-	100.0% (1)
62 (5)	-	20.0% (1)	-	20.0% (1)	-	60.0% (3)
63 (2)	-	-	-	50.0% (1)	-	50.0% (1)
64 (5)	-	-	-	20.0% (1)	-	80.0% (4)
65 (2)	-	-	-	50.0% (1)	50.0% (1)	-
66 (2)	-	-	-	-	-	100.0% (2)
67 (1)	-	-	-	-	-	100.0% (1)
68 (3)	-	-	-	-	33.3% (1)	66.7% (2)
69 (2)	50.0% (1)	-	-	-	-	50.0% (1)
71 (2)	-	50.0% (1)	-	-	-	50.0% (1)
72 (3)	-	-	-	-	-	100.0% (3)
73 (3)	-	-	-	-	-	100.0% (3)
74 (4)	-	-	-	50.0% (2)	25.0% (1)	25.0% (1)
77 (2)	-	-	-	-	-	100.0% (2)
79 (2)	-	50.0% (1)	-	-	-	50.0% (1)
Unknown (68)	4.4% (3)	11.8% (8)	-	20.6% (14)	1.5% (1)	61.8% (42)

STATE INCOME
DECILE

187 REGISTERED VOTERS

	A	B	C	D	E	F
0 to 9 Pct range (6)	-	-	-	33.3% (2)	-	66.7% (4)
10 to 19 Pct range (1)	100.0% (1)	-	-	-	-	-
40 to 49 Pct range (2)	-	-	-	-	-	100.0% (2)
50 to 59 Pct range (9)	-	-	-	22.2% (2)	-	77.8% (7)
60 to 69 Pct range (7)	-	14.3% (1)	-	14.3% (1)	-	71.4% (5)
70 to 79 Pct range (5)	20.0% (1)	-	-	20.0% (1)	-	60.0% (3)
80 to 89 Pct range (70)	5.7% (4)	8.6% (6)	-	21.4% (15)	4.3% (3)	60.0% (42)
90 Pct and up (85)	3.5% (3)	9.4% (8)	-	15.3% (13)	2.4% (2)	69.4% (59)
Unknown (2)	-	-	-	50.0% (1)	-	50.0% (1)

HOME OWNER/RENTER

187 REGISTERED VOTERS

	A	B	C	D	E	F
Likely Homeowner (106)	1.9% (2)	8.5% (9)	-	15.1% (16)	4.7% (5)	69.8% (74)
Likely Renter (55)	7.3% (4)	7.3% (4)	-	23.6% (13)	-	61.8% (34)
Unknown (26)	11.5% (3)	7.7% (2)	-	23.1% (6)	-	57.7% (15)

Please rate your level of agreement with the following statements about the location of Fitchburg's growth:

CURRENT RESULTS					303 Total Responses
	Strongly Disagree	Disagree	Neutral	Agree	Strongly Agree
Growth should occur in areas that are already developed.	2% (5)	12% (35)	20% (61)	43% (131)	23% (71)
Growth should occur ADJACENT to areas that are already developed.	6% (19)	11% (34)	28% (84)	44% (134)	11% (32)
Growth should occur in areas that were carefully evaluated by the City as most appropriate for development.	6% (17)	6% (17)	19% (59)	45% (137)	24% (73)
Growth should occur in areas in which there is an immediate interest from developers or landowners to develop.	31% (93)	25% (76)	25% (77)	13% (40)	6% (17)

REGISTERED (181)

	Strongly Disagree	Disagree	Neutral	Agree	Strongly Agree
Growth should occur in areas that are already developed.	3.0% (5)	13.0% (23)	19.0% (34)	43.0% (77)	23.0% (42)
Growth should occur ADJACENT to areas that are already developed.	7.0% (13)	10.0% (18)	28.0% (50)	44.0% (79)	12.0% (21)
Growth should occur in areas that were carefully evaluated by the City as most appropriate for development.	5.0% (9)	5.0% (9)	16.0% (29)	51.0% (93)	23.0% (41)
Growth should occur in areas in which there is an immediate interest from developers or landowners to develop.	29.0% (53)	24.0% (44)	25.0% (45)	15.0% (28)	6.0% (11)

NON-REGISTERED (122)

	Strongly Disagree	Disagree	Neutral	Agree	Strongly Agree
Growth should occur in areas that are already developed.	-	9.8% (12)	22.1% (27)	44.3% (54)	23.8% (29)
Growth should occur ADJACENT to areas that are already developed.	4.9% (6)	13.1% (16)	27.9% (34)	45.1% (55)	9.0% (11)
Growth should occur in areas that were carefully evaluated by the City as most appropriate for development.	6.6% (8)	6.6% (8)	24.6% (30)	36.1% (44)	26.2% (32)
Growth should occur in areas in which there is an immediate interest from developers or landowners to develop.	32.8% (40)	26.2% (32)	26.2% (32)	9.8% (12)	4.9% (6)

ALL RESPONDENTS (303)

	Strongly Disagree	Disagree	Neutral	Agree	Strongly Agree
Growth should occur in areas that are already developed.	2% (5)	12% (35)	20% (61)	43% (131)	23% (71)
Growth should occur ADJACENT to areas that are already developed.	6% (19)	11% (34)	28% (84)	44% (134)	11% (32)
Growth should occur in areas that were carefully evaluated by the City as most appropriate for development.	6% (17)	6% (17)	19% (59)	45% (137)	24% (73)
Growth should occur in areas in which there is an immediate interest from developers or landowners to develop.	31% (93)	25% (76)	25% (77)	13% (40)	6% (17)

REGISTERED VOTERS IN FITCHBURG, WI (181)

	Strongly Disagree	Disagree	Neutral	Agree	Strongly Agree
Growth should occur in areas that are already developed.	3% (5)	13% (23)	19% (34)	43% (77)	23% (42)
Growth should occur ADJACENT to areas that are already developed.	7% (13)	10% (18)	28% (50)	44% (79)	12% (21)
Growth should occur in areas that were carefully evaluated by the City as most appropriate for development.	5% (9)	5% (9)	16% (29)	51% (93)	23% (41)
Growth should occur in areas in which there is an immediate interest from developers or landowners to develop.	29% (53)	24% (44)	25% (45)	15% (28)	6% (11)

LIVE IN FITCHBURG, WI (267) - SELF-REPORTED

	Strongly Disagree	Disagree	Neutral	Agree	Strongly Agree

	Disagree	Disagree	Neutral	Agree	Strongly Agree
Growth should occur in areas that are already developed.	2% (5)	12% (32)	19% (52)	45% (120)	22% (58)
Growth should occur ADJACENT to areas that are already developed.	5% (14)	11% (29)	28% (76)	46% (123)	9% (25)
Growth should occur in areas that were carefully evaluated by the City as most appropriate for development.	5% (14)	6% (15)	18% (48)	48% (127)	24% (63)
Growth should occur in areas in which there is an immediate interest from developers or landowners to develop.	30% (80)	25% (66)	27% (71)	14% (37)	5% (13)

SUBSCRIBERS TO FITCHBURG, WI (271)

	Strongly Disagree	Disagree	Neutral	Agree	Strongly Agree
Growth should occur in areas that are already developed.	2% (5)	12% (32)	20% (54)	45% (121)	22% (59)
Growth should occur ADJACENT to areas that are already developed.	5% (14)	11% (29)	28% (77)	46% (125)	10% (26)
Growth should occur in areas that were carefully evaluated by the City as most appropriate for development.	6% (15)	6% (15)	18% (49)	48% (129)	23% (63)
Growth should occur in areas in which there is an immediate interest from developers or landowners to develop.	30% (80)	25% (68)	26% (71)	14% (38)	5% (14)

REGISTER RESPONDENTS FROM ANYWHERE (187)

	Strongly Disagree	Disagree	Neutral	Agree	Strongly Agree
Growth should occur in areas that are already developed.	3% (5)	12% (23)	20% (37)	42% (78)	24% (44)
Growth should occur ADJACENT to areas that are already developed.	7% (13)	10% (19)	28% (52)	43% (81)	12% (22)
Growth should occur in areas that were carefully evaluated by the City as most appropriate for development.	5% (9)	5% (9)	16% (30)	51% (95)	24% (44)
Growth should occur in areas in which there is an immediate interest from developers or landowners to develop.	29% (55)	25% (47)	24% (45)	16% (29)	6% (11)

EDUCATION

187 REGISTERED VOTERS

	Strongly Disagree	Disagree	Neutral	Agree	Strongly Agree
--	-------------------	----------	---------	-------	----------------

Bach Degree - Extremely Likely (30)

Growth should occur in areas that are already developed.	6.7% (2.0)	10.0% (3.0)	16.7% (5.0)	40.0% (12.0)	26.7% (8.0)
Growth should occur ADJACENT to areas that are already developed.	13.3% (4.0)	13.3% (4.0)	26.7% (8.0)	40.0% (12.0)	6.7% (2.0)
Growth should occur in areas that were carefully evaluated by the City as most appropriate for development.	6.7% (2.0)	3.3% (1.0)	23.3% (7.0)	43.3% (13.0)	23.3% (7.0)
Growth should occur in areas in which there is an immediate interest from developers or landowners to develop.	40.0% (12.0)	16.7% (5.0)	20.0% (6.0)	16.7% (5.0)	6.7% (2.0)

Bach Degree - Likely (21)

Growth should occur in areas that are already developed.	-	23.8% (5.0)	19.0% (4.0)	33.3% (7.0)	23.8% (5.0)
Growth should occur ADJACENT to areas that are already developed.	4.8% (1.0)	14.3% (3.0)	33.3% (7.0)	38.1% (8.0)	9.5% (2.0)
Growth should occur in areas that were carefully evaluated by the City as most appropriate for development.	14.3% (3.0)	9.5% (2.0)	4.8% (1.0)	57.1% (12.0)	14.3% (3.0)
Growth should occur in areas in which there is an immediate interest from developers or landowners to develop.	42.9% (9.0)	23.8% (5.0)	9.5% (2.0)	19.0% (4.0)	4.8% (1.0)

Grad Degree - Extremely Likely (22)

Growth should occur in areas that are already developed.	-	13.6% (3.0)	13.6% (3.0)	36.4% (8.0)	36.4% (8.0)
Growth should occur ADJACENT to areas that are already developed.	4.5% (1.0)	9.1% (2.0)	31.8% (7.0)	36.4% (8.0)	18.2% (4.0)
Growth should occur in areas that were carefully evaluated by the City as most appropriate for development.	4.5% (1.0)	13.6% (3.0)	18.2% (4.0)	54.5% (12.0)	9.1% (2.0)
Growth should occur in areas in which there is an immediate interest from developers or landowners to develop.	27.3% (6.0)	40.9% (9.0)	9.1% (2.0)	18.2% (4.0)	4.5% (1.0)

Grad Degree - Likely (13)

Growth should occur in areas that are already developed.	-	23.1% (3.0)	15.4% (2.0)	46.2% (6.0)	15.4% (2.0)
--	---	-------------	-------------	-------------	-------------

Growth should occur ADJACENT to areas that are already developed.	-	7.7% (1.0)	7.7% (1.0)	69.2% (9.0)	15.4% (2.0)
Growth should occur in areas that were carefully evaluated by the City as most appropriate for development.	-	-	15.4% (2.0)	53.8% (7.0)	30.8% (4.0)
Growth should occur in areas in which there is an immediate interest from developers or landowners to develop.	15.4% (2.0)	23.1% (3.0)	23.1% (3.0)	30.8% (4.0)	7.7% (1.0)

HS Diploma - Extremely Likely (9)

Growth should occur in areas that are already developed.	11.1% (1.0)	-	11.1% (1.0)	44.4% (4.0)	33.3% (3.0)
Growth should occur ADJACENT to areas that are already developed.	22.2% (2.0)	11.1% (1.0)	11.1% (1.0)	22.2% (2.0)	33.3% (3.0)
Growth should occur in areas that were carefully evaluated by the City as most appropriate for development.	11.1% (1.0)	-	22.2% (2.0)	44.4% (4.0)	22.2% (2.0)
Growth should occur in areas in which there is an immediate interest from developers or landowners to develop.	55.6% (5.0)	11.1% (1.0)	11.1% (1.0)	-	22.2% (2.0)

HS Diploma - Likely (4)

Growth should occur in areas that are already developed.	-	-	25.0% (1.0)	75.0% (3.0)	-
Growth should occur ADJACENT to areas that are already developed.	-	-	25.0% (1.0)	75.0% (3.0)	-
Growth should occur in areas that were carefully evaluated by the City as most appropriate for development.	-	-	-	50.0% (2.0)	50.0% (2.0)
Growth should occur in areas in which there is an immediate interest from developers or landowners to develop.	-	50.0% (2.0)	50.0% (2.0)	-	-

Less than HS Diploma - Likely (1)

Growth should occur in areas that are already developed.	-	-	-	100.0% (1.0)	-
Growth should occur ADJACENT to areas that are already developed.	-	-	-	100.0% (1.0)	-
Growth should occur in areas that were carefully evaluated by the City as most appropriate for development.	-	-	-	-	100.0% (1.0)
Growth should occur in areas in which there is an immediate interest from developers or landowners to develop.	-	-	100.0% (1.0)	-	-

Some College - Likely (12)

Growth should occur in areas that are already developed.	-	8.3% (1.0)	25.0% (3.0)	50.0% (6.0)	16.7% (2.0)
Growth should occur ADJACENT to areas that are already developed.	8.3% (1.0)	8.3% (1.0)	33.3% (4.0)	33.3% (4.0)	16.7% (2.0)
Growth should occur in areas that were carefully evaluated by the City as most appropriate for development.	-	-	8.3% (1.0)	58.3% (7.0)	33.3% (4.0)
Growth should occur in areas in which there is an immediate interest from developers or landowners to develop.	41.7% (5.0)	-	33.3% (4.0)	16.7% (2.0)	8.3% (1.0)

Some College -Extremely Likely (5)

Growth should occur in areas that are already developed.	-	-	-	40.0% (2.0)	60.0% (3.0)
Growth should occur ADJACENT to areas that are already developed.	-	-	20.0% (1.0)	60.0% (3.0)	20.0% (1.0)
Growth should occur in areas that were carefully evaluated by the City as most appropriate for development.	-	-	-	80.0% (4.0)	20.0% (1.0)
Growth should occur in areas in which there is an immediate interest from developers or landowners to develop.	20.0% (1.0)	40.0% (2.0)	20.0% (1.0)	20.0% (1.0)	-

Unknown (70)

Growth should occur in areas that are already developed.	2.9% (2.0)	11.4% (8.0)	25.7% (18.0)	41.4% (29.0)	18.6% (13.0)
Growth should occur ADJACENT to areas that are already developed.	5.7% (4.0)	10.0% (7.0)	31.4% (22.0)	44.3% (31.0)	8.6% (6.0)
Growth should occur in areas that were carefully evaluated by the City as most appropriate for development.	2.9% (2.0)	4.3% (3.0)	18.6% (13.0)	48.6% (34.0)	25.7% (18.0)
Growth should occur in areas in which there is an immediate interest from developers or landowners to develop.	21.4% (15.0)	28.6% (20.0)	32.9% (23.0)	12.9% (9.0)	4.3% (3.0)

VOTERS GENDER

187 REGISTERED VOTERS

	Strongly Disagree	Disagree	Neutral	Agree	Strongly Agree
--	-------------------	----------	---------	-------	----------------

F (90)

Growth should occur in areas that are already developed.	4.4% (4.0)	15.6% (14.0)	23.3% (21.0)	42.2% (38.0)	14.4% (13.0)
		13.3%	23.3%	51.1%	

Growth should occur ADJACENT to areas that are already developed.	7.8% (7.0)	(12.0)	(21.0)	(46.0)	4.4% (4.0)
Growth should occur in areas that were carefully evaluated by the City as most appropriate for development.	5.6% (5.0)	2.2% (2.0)	17.8% (16.0)	54.4% (49.0)	20.0% (18.0)
Growth should occur in areas in which there is an immediate interest from developers or landowners to develop.	28.9% (26.0)	22.2% (20.0)	28.9% (26.0)	16.7% (15.0)	3.3% (3.0)

M (95)

Growth should occur in areas that are already developed.	1.1% (1.0)	9.5% (9.0)	16.8% (16.0)	41.1% (39.0)	31.6% (30.0)
Growth should occur ADJACENT to areas that are already developed.	6.3% (6.0)	7.4% (7.0)	30.5% (29.0)	36.8% (35.0)	18.9% (18.0)
Growth should occur in areas that were carefully evaluated by the City as most appropriate for development.	4.2% (4.0)	7.4% (7.0)	13.7% (13.0)	47.4% (45.0)	27.4% (26.0)
Growth should occur in areas in which there is an immediate interest from developers or landowners to develop.	29.5% (28.0)	28.4% (27.0)	18.9% (18.0)	14.7% (14.0)	8.4% (8.0)

Unknown (2)

Growth should occur in areas that are already developed.	-	-	-	50.0% (1.0)	50.0% (1.0)
Growth should occur ADJACENT to areas that are already developed.	-	-	100.0% (2.0)	-	-
Growth should occur in areas that were carefully evaluated by the City as most appropriate for development.	-	-	50.0% (1.0)	50.0% (1.0)	-
Growth should occur in areas in which there is an immediate interest from developers or landowners to develop.	50.0% (1.0)	-	50.0% (1.0)	-	-

PRECINCT

187 REGISTERED VOTERS

	Strongly Disagree	Disagree	Neutral	Agree	Strongly Agree
--	-------------------	----------	---------	-------	----------------

CHICAGO 43-04 (1)

Growth should occur in areas that are already developed.	-	-	100.0% (1.0)	-	-
Growth should occur ADJACENT to areas that are already developed.	-	-	100.0% (1.0)	-	-
Growth should occur in areas that were carefully evaluated by the City as most appropriate for development.	-	-	-	100.0% (1.0)	-
Growth should occur in areas in which there is an immediate interest from developers or landowners to develop.	-	100.0% (1.0)	-	-	-

FITCHBURG CITY WARD 01 (9)

Growth should occur in areas that are already developed.	-	22.2% (2.0)	11.1% (1.0)	55.6% (5.0)	11.1% (1.0)
Growth should occur ADJACENT to areas that are already developed.	-	11.1% (1.0)	22.2% (2.0)	55.6% (5.0)	11.1% (1.0)
Growth should occur in areas that were carefully evaluated by the City as most appropriate for development.	-	11.1% (1.0)	-	77.8% (7.0)	11.1% (1.0)
Growth should occur in areas in which there is an immediate interest from developers or landowners to develop.	22.2% (2.0)	11.1% (1.0)	33.3% (3.0)	33.3% (3.0)	-

FITCHBURG CITY WARD 02 (3)

Growth should occur in areas that are already developed.	-	-	-	100.0% (3.0)	-
Growth should occur ADJACENT to areas that are already developed.	-	-	66.7% (2.0)	33.3% (1.0)	-
Growth should occur in areas that were carefully evaluated by the City as most appropriate for development.	-	-	-	100.0% (3.0)	-
Growth should occur in areas in which there is an immediate interest from developers or landowners to develop.	33.3% (1.0)	33.3% (1.0)	-	33.3% (1.0)	-

FITCHBURG CITY WARD 04 (2)

Growth should occur in areas that are already developed.	-	100.0% (2.0)	-	-	-
Growth should occur ADJACENT to areas that are already developed.	-	50.0% (1.0)	-	50.0% (1.0)	-
Growth should occur in areas that were carefully evaluated by the City as most appropriate for development.	-	-	-	50.0% (1.0)	50.0% (1.0)
Growth should occur in areas in which there is an immediate interest from developers or landowners to develop.	50.0% (1.0)	-	50.0% (1.0)	-	-

FITCHBURG CITY WARD 05 (6)

Growth should occur in areas that are already developed.	-	-	-	33.3% (2.0)	66.7% (4.0)
Growth should occur ADJACENT to areas that are already developed.	16.7% (1.0)	16.7% (1.0)	-	33.3% (2.0)	33.3% (2.0)
Growth should occur in areas that were carefully evaluated by the City as most appropriate for development.	-	16.7% (1.0)	-	50.0% (3.0)	33.3% (2.0)
Growth should occur in areas in which there is an immediate interest from developers or landowners to develop.	50.0% (3.0)	16.7% (1.0)	16.7% (1.0)	-	16.7% (1.0)
FITCHBURG CITY WARD 06 (12)					
Growth should occur in areas that are already developed.	-	8.3% (1.0)	33.3% (4.0)	50.0% (6.0)	8.3% (1.0)
Growth should occur ADJACENT to areas that are already developed.	-	-	33.3% (4.0)	50.0% (6.0)	16.7% (2.0)
Growth should occur in areas that were carefully evaluated by the City as most appropriate for development.	8.3% (1.0)	-	-	58.3% (7.0)	33.3% (4.0)
Growth should occur in areas in which there is an immediate interest from developers or landowners to develop.	8.3% (1.0)	16.7% (2.0)	33.3% (4.0)	41.7% (5.0)	-
FITCHBURG CITY WARD 07 (18)					
Growth should occur in areas that are already developed.	5.6% (1.0)	11.1% (2.0)	11.1% (2.0)	38.9% (7.0)	33.3% (6.0)
Growth should occur ADJACENT to areas that are already developed.	5.6% (1.0)	16.7% (3.0)	16.7% (3.0)	44.4% (8.0)	16.7% (3.0)
Growth should occur in areas that were carefully evaluated by the City as most appropriate for development.	5.6% (1.0)	-	22.2% (4.0)	50.0% (9.0)	22.2% (4.0)
Growth should occur in areas in which there is an immediate interest from developers or landowners to develop.	27.8% (5.0)	33.3% (6.0)	22.2% (4.0)	-	16.7% (3.0)
FITCHBURG CITY WARD 08 (14)					
Growth should occur in areas that are already developed.	7.1% (1.0)	14.3% (2.0)	21.4% (3.0)	42.9% (6.0)	14.3% (2.0)
Growth should occur ADJACENT to areas that are already developed.	7.1% (1.0)	-	42.9% (6.0)	35.7% (5.0)	14.3% (2.0)
Growth should occur in areas that were carefully evaluated by the City as most appropriate for development.	-	7.1% (1.0)	21.4% (3.0)	64.3% (9.0)	7.1% (1.0)
Growth should occur in areas in which there is an immediate interest from developers or landowners to develop.	28.6% (4.0)	21.4% (3.0)	14.3% (2.0)	14.3% (2.0)	21.4% (3.0)
FITCHBURG CITY WARD 09 (8)					
Growth should occur in areas that are already developed.	-	25.0% (2.0)	25.0% (2.0)	50.0% (4.0)	-
Growth should occur ADJACENT to areas that are already developed.	12.5% (1.0)	-	50.0% (4.0)	25.0% (2.0)	12.5% (1.0)
Growth should occur in areas that were carefully evaluated by the City as most appropriate for development.	-	12.5% (1.0)	12.5% (1.0)	37.5% (3.0)	37.5% (3.0)
Growth should occur in areas in which there is an immediate interest from developers or landowners to develop.	12.5% (1.0)	12.5% (1.0)	37.5% (3.0)	25.0% (2.0)	12.5% (1.0)
FITCHBURG CITY WARD 12 (2)					
Growth should occur in areas that are already developed.	-	50.0% (1.0)	-	50.0% (1.0)	-
Growth should occur ADJACENT to areas that are already developed.	-	-	-	50.0% (1.0)	50.0% (1.0)
Growth should occur in areas that were carefully evaluated by the City as most appropriate for development.	-	-	-	50.0% (1.0)	50.0% (1.0)
Growth should occur in areas in which there is an immediate interest from developers or landowners to develop.	-	-	50.0% (1.0)	50.0% (1.0)	-
FITCHBURG CITY WARD 13 (31)					
Growth should occur in areas that are already developed.	6.5% (2.0)	6.5% (2.0)	29.0% (9.0)	38.7% (12.0)	19.4% (6.0)
Growth should occur ADJACENT to areas that are already developed.	16.1% (5.0)	3.2% (1.0)	38.7% (12.0)	38.7% (12.0)	3.2% (1.0)
Growth should occur in areas that were carefully evaluated by the City as most appropriate for development.	12.9% (4.0)	3.2% (1.0)	16.1% (5.0)	51.6% (16.0)	16.1% (5.0)
Growth should occur in areas in which there is an immediate interest from developers or landowners to develop.	35.5% (11.0)	25.8% (8.0)	19.4% (6.0)	19.4% (6.0)	-
FITCHBURG CITY WARD 14 (19)					
Growth should occur in areas that are already developed.	-	10.5% (2.0)	21.1% (4.0)	42.1% (8.0)	26.3% (5.0)
Growth should occur ADJACENT to areas that are already developed.	5.3% (1.0)	10.5% (2.0)	15.8% (3.0)	47.4% (9.0)	21.1% (4.0)
Growth should occur in areas that were carefully evaluated by the City as most appropriate for development.	-	-	21.1% (4.0)	57.9% (11.0)	21.1% (4.0)
Growth should occur in areas in which there is an immediate interest from developers or landowners to develop.	42.1% (8.0)	26.3% (5.0)	21.1% (4.0)	5.3% (1.0)	5.3% (1.0)

FITCHBURG CITY WARD 15 (7)

Growth should occur in areas that are already developed.	-	14.3% (1.0)	-	71.4% (5.0)	14.3% (1.0)
Growth should occur ADJACENT to areas that are already developed.	-	28.6% (2.0)	14.3% (1.0)	42.9% (3.0)	14.3% (1.0)
Growth should occur in areas that were carefully evaluated by the City as most appropriate for development.	-	-	28.6% (2.0)	28.6% (2.0)	42.9% (3.0)
Growth should occur in areas in which there is an immediate interest from developers or landowners to develop.	28.6% (2.0)	14.3% (1.0)	28.6% (2.0)	28.6% (2.0)	-

FITCHBURG CITY WARD 16 (3)

Growth should occur in areas that are already developed.	-	33.3% (1.0)	-	33.3% (1.0)	33.3% (1.0)
Growth should occur ADJACENT to areas that are already developed.	-	33.3% (1.0)	33.3% (1.0)	33.3% (1.0)	-
Growth should occur in areas that were carefully evaluated by the City as most appropriate for development.	-	33.3% (1.0)	33.3% (1.0)	-	33.3% (1.0)
Growth should occur in areas in which there is an immediate interest from developers or landowners to develop.	66.7% (2.0)	33.3% (1.0)	-	-	-

FITCHBURG CITY WARD 17 (7)

Growth should occur in areas that are already developed.	-	-	28.6% (2.0)	28.6% (2.0)	42.9% (3.0)
Growth should occur ADJACENT to areas that are already developed.	14.3% (1.0)	-	28.6% (2.0)	42.9% (3.0)	14.3% (1.0)
Growth should occur in areas that were carefully evaluated by the City as most appropriate for development.	-	-	14.3% (1.0)	57.1% (4.0)	28.6% (2.0)
Growth should occur in areas in which there is an immediate interest from developers or landowners to develop.	14.3% (1.0)	28.6% (2.0)	42.9% (3.0)	14.3% (1.0)	-

FITCHBURG CITY WARD 18 (12)

Growth should occur in areas that are already developed.	-	8.3% (1.0)	25.0% (3.0)	33.3% (4.0)	33.3% (4.0)
Growth should occur ADJACENT to areas that are already developed.	-	25.0% (3.0)	25.0% (3.0)	50.0% (6.0)	-
Growth should occur in areas that were carefully evaluated by the City as most appropriate for development.	16.7% (2.0)	-	25.0% (3.0)	50.0% (6.0)	8.3% (1.0)
Growth should occur in areas in which there is an immediate interest from developers or landowners to develop.	33.3% (4.0)	25.0% (3.0)	16.7% (2.0)	25.0% (3.0)	-

FITCHBURG CITY WARD 19 (26)

Growth should occur in areas that are already developed.	3.8% (1.0)	15.4% (4.0)	15.4% (4.0)	38.5% (10.0)	26.9% (7.0)
Growth should occur ADJACENT to areas that are already developed.	7.7% (2.0)	11.5% (3.0)	23.1% (6.0)	50.0% (13.0)	7.7% (2.0)
Growth should occur in areas that were carefully evaluated by the City as most appropriate for development.	3.8% (1.0)	11.5% (3.0)	19.2% (5.0)	38.5% (10.0)	26.9% (7.0)
Growth should occur in areas in which there is an immediate interest from developers or landowners to develop.	26.9% (7.0)	34.6% (9.0)	30.8% (8.0)	3.8% (1.0)	3.8% (1.0)

MADISON CITY WARD 042 (1)

Growth should occur in areas that are already developed.	-	-	-	-	100.0% (1.0)
Growth should occur ADJACENT to areas that are already developed.	-	-	-	-	100.0% (1.0)
Growth should occur in areas that were carefully evaluated by the City as most appropriate for development.	-	-	-	-	100.0% (1.0)
Growth should occur in areas in which there is an immediate interest from developers or landowners to develop.	-	100.0% (1.0)	-	-	-

MADISON CITY WARD 053 (1)

Growth should occur in areas that are already developed.	-	-	-	-	100.0% (1.0)
Growth should occur ADJACENT to areas that are already developed.	-	100.0% (1.0)	-	-	-
Growth should occur in areas that were carefully evaluated by the City as most appropriate for development.	-	-	-	-	100.0% (1.0)
Growth should occur in areas in which there is an immediate interest from developers or landowners to develop.	100.0% (1.0)	-	-	-	-

MADISON CITY WARD 100 (1)

Growth should occur in areas that are already developed.	-	-	-	-	100.0% (1.0)
Growth should occur ADJACENT to areas that are already developed.	-	-	100.0% (1.0)	-	-
Growth should occur in areas that were carefully evaluated by the City as most appropriate for development.	-	-	-	100.0% (1.0)	-

Growth should occur in areas in which there is an immediate interest from developers or landowners to develop.	-	-	-	-	100.0% (1.0)
--	---	---	---	---	--------------

MADISON CITY WARD 107 (1)

Growth should occur in areas that are already developed.	-	-	100.0% (1.0)	-	-
--	---	---	--------------	---	---

Growth should occur ADJACENT to areas that are already developed.	-	-	-	100.0% (1.0)	-
---	---	---	---	--------------	---

Growth should occur in areas that were carefully evaluated by the City as most appropriate for development.	-	-	-	100.0% (1.0)	-
---	---	---	---	--------------	---

Growth should occur in areas in which there is an immediate interest from developers or landowners to develop.	-	100.0% (1.0)	-	-	-
--	---	--------------	---	---	---

MIDDLETON TOWN WARD 7 (1)

Growth should occur in areas that are already developed.	-	-	100.0% (1.0)	-	-
--	---	---	--------------	---	---

Growth should occur ADJACENT to areas that are already developed.	-	-	100.0% (1.0)	-	-
---	---	---	--------------	---	---

Growth should occur in areas that were carefully evaluated by the City as most appropriate for development.	-	-	100.0% (1.0)	-	-
---	---	---	--------------	---	---

Growth should occur in areas in which there is an immediate interest from developers or landowners to develop.	-	-	-	100.0% (1.0)	-
--	---	---	---	--------------	---

MOUNT HOREB VLG WARD 3 (1)

Growth should occur in areas that are already developed.	-	-	-	100.0% (1.0)	-
--	---	---	---	--------------	---

Growth should occur ADJACENT to areas that are already developed.	-	-	-	100.0% (1.0)	-
---	---	---	---	--------------	---

Growth should occur in areas that were carefully evaluated by the City as most appropriate for development.	-	-	-	-	100.0% (1.0)
---	---	---	---	---	--------------

Growth should occur in areas in which there is an immediate interest from developers or landowners to develop.	100.0% (1.0)	-	-	-	-
--	--------------	---	---	---	---

OREGON VLG WARD 10 (1)

Growth should occur in areas that are already developed.	-	-	-	100.0% (1.0)	-
--	---	---	---	--------------	---

Growth should occur ADJACENT to areas that are already developed.	-	-	-	100.0% (1.0)	-
---	---	---	---	--------------	---

Growth should occur in areas that were carefully evaluated by the City as most appropriate for development.	-	-	-	-	100.0% (1.0)
---	---	---	---	---	--------------

Growth should occur in areas in which there is an immediate interest from developers or landowners to develop.	-	-	100.0% (1.0)	-	-
--	---	---	--------------	---	---

AGE RANGE

187 REGISTERED VOTERS

	Strongly Disagree	Disagree	Neutral	Agree	Strongly Agree
--	-------------------	----------	---------	-------	----------------

18-29 (1)

Growth should occur in areas that are already developed.	-	-	100.0% (1.0)	-	-
--	---	---	--------------	---	---

Growth should occur ADJACENT to areas that are already developed.	-	100.0% (1.0)	-	-	-
---	---	--------------	---	---	---

Growth should occur in areas that were carefully evaluated by the City as most appropriate for development.	-	-	-	100.0% (1.0)	-
---	---	---	---	--------------	---

Growth should occur in areas in which there is an immediate interest from developers or landowners to develop.	100.0% (1.0)	-	-	-	-
--	--------------	---	---	---	---

30-39 (24)

Growth should occur in areas that are already developed.	-	12.5% (3.0)	12.5% (3.0)	58.3% (14.0)	16.7% (4.0)
--	---	-------------	-------------	--------------	-------------

Growth should occur ADJACENT to areas that are already developed.	-	12.5% (3.0)	20.8% (5.0)	54.2% (13.0)	12.5% (3.0)
---	---	-------------	-------------	--------------	-------------

Growth should occur in areas that were carefully evaluated by the City as most appropriate for development.	-	-	12.5% (3.0)	66.7% (16.0)	20.8% (5.0)
---	---	---	-------------	--------------	-------------

Growth should occur in areas in which there is an immediate interest from developers or landowners to develop.	33.3% (8.0)	12.5% (3.0)	20.8% (5.0)	29.2% (7.0)	4.2% (1.0)
--	-------------	-------------	-------------	-------------	------------

40-49 (29)

Growth should occur in areas that are already developed.	-	10.3% (3.0)	6.9% (2.0)	51.7% (15.0)	31.0% (9.0)
Growth should occur ADJACENT to areas that are already developed.	6.9% (2.0)	6.9% (2.0)	27.6% (8.0)	44.8% (13.0)	13.8% (4.0)
Growth should occur in areas that were carefully evaluated by the City as most appropriate for development.	6.9% (2.0)	13.8% (4.0)	17.2% (5.0)	41.4% (12.0)	20.7% (6.0)
Growth should occur in areas in which there is an immediate interest from developers or landowners to develop.	27.6% (8.0)	24.1% (7.0)	17.2% (5.0)	17.2% (5.0)	13.8% (4.0)
50-59 (23)					
Growth should occur in areas that are already developed.	-	13.0% (3.0)	13.0% (3.0)	39.1% (9.0)	34.8% (8.0)
Growth should occur ADJACENT to areas that are already developed.	8.7% (2.0)	13.0% (3.0)	30.4% (7.0)	34.8% (8.0)	13.0% (3.0)
Growth should occur in areas that were carefully evaluated by the City as most appropriate for development.	-	8.7% (2.0)	26.1% (6.0)	43.5% (10.0)	21.7% (5.0)
Growth should occur in areas in which there is an immediate interest from developers or landowners to develop.	39.1% (9.0)	34.8% (8.0)	21.7% (5.0)	4.3% (1.0)	-
60-69 (26)					
Growth should occur in areas that are already developed.	7.7% (2.0)	15.4% (4.0)	23.1% (6.0)	26.9% (7.0)	26.9% (7.0)
Growth should occur ADJACENT to areas that are already developed.	11.5% (3.0)	15.4% (4.0)	23.1% (6.0)	34.6% (9.0)	15.4% (4.0)
Growth should occur in areas that were carefully evaluated by the City as most appropriate for development.	11.5% (3.0)	-	26.9% (7.0)	42.3% (11.0)	19.2% (5.0)
Growth should occur in areas in which there is an immediate interest from developers or landowners to develop.	38.5% (10.0)	26.9% (7.0)	23.1% (6.0)	7.7% (2.0)	3.8% (1.0)
70-79 (16)					
Growth should occur in areas that are already developed.	6.3% (1.0)	12.5% (2.0)	-	31.3% (5.0)	50.0% (8.0)
Growth should occur ADJACENT to areas that are already developed.	12.5% (2.0)	6.3% (1.0)	25.0% (4.0)	50.0% (8.0)	6.3% (1.0)
Growth should occur in areas that were carefully evaluated by the City as most appropriate for development.	12.5% (2.0)	-	12.5% (2.0)	43.8% (7.0)	31.3% (5.0)
Growth should occur in areas in which there is an immediate interest from developers or landowners to develop.	43.8% (7.0)	31.3% (5.0)	12.5% (2.0)	-	12.5% (2.0)
unknown (68)					
Growth should occur in areas that are already developed.	2.9% (2.0)	11.8% (8.0)	32.4% (22.0)	41.2% (28.0)	11.8% (8.0)
Growth should occur ADJACENT to areas that are already developed.	5.9% (4.0)	7.4% (5.0)	32.4% (22.0)	44.1% (30.0)	10.3% (7.0)
Growth should occur in areas that were carefully evaluated by the City as most appropriate for development.	2.9% (2.0)	4.4% (3.0)	10.3% (7.0)	55.9% (38.0)	26.5% (18.0)
Growth should occur in areas in which there is an immediate interest from developers or landowners to develop.	17.6% (12.0)	25.0% (17.0)	32.4% (22.0)	20.6% (14.0)	4.4% (3.0)
VOTERS AGE					
187 REGISTERED VOTERS					
	Strongly Disagree	Disagree	Neutral	Agree	Strongly Agree
28 (1)					
Growth should occur in areas that are already developed.	-	-	100.0% (1.0)	-	-
Growth should occur ADJACENT to areas that are already developed.	-	100.0% (1.0)	-	-	-
Growth should occur in areas that were carefully evaluated by the City as most appropriate for development.	-	-	-	100.0% (1.0)	-
Growth should occur in areas in which there is an immediate interest from developers or landowners to develop.	100.0% (1.0)	-	-	-	-
31 (1)					
Growth should occur in areas that are already developed.	-	-	-	100.0% (1.0)	-
Growth should occur ADJACENT to areas that are already developed.	-	-	-	100.0% (1.0)	-
Growth should occur in areas that were carefully evaluated by the City as most appropriate for development.	-	-	-	100.0% (1.0)	-
Growth should occur in areas in which there is an immediate interest from developers or landowners to develop.	-	100.0% (1.0)	-	-	-

32 (1)

Growth should occur in areas that are already developed.	-	-	-	100.0% (1.0)	-
Growth should occur ADJACENT to areas that are already developed.	-	-	-	100.0% (1.0)	-
Growth should occur in areas that were carefully evaluated by the City as most appropriate for development.	-	-	-	-	100.0% (1.0)
Growth should occur in areas in which there is an immediate interest from developers or landowners to develop.	-	-	100.0% (1.0)	-	-

33 (1)

Growth should occur in areas that are already developed.	-	-	100.0% (1.0)	-	-
Growth should occur ADJACENT to areas that are already developed.	-	-	100.0% (1.0)	-	-
Growth should occur in areas that were carefully evaluated by the City as most appropriate for development.	-	-	-	-	100.0% (1.0)
Growth should occur in areas in which there is an immediate interest from developers or landowners to develop.	-	-	100.0% (1.0)	-	-

34 (1)

Growth should occur in areas that are already developed.	-	-	-	100.0% (1.0)	-
Growth should occur ADJACENT to areas that are already developed.	-	-	-	-	100.0% (1.0)
Growth should occur in areas that were carefully evaluated by the City as most appropriate for development.	-	-	-	-	100.0% (1.0)
Growth should occur in areas in which there is an immediate interest from developers or landowners to develop.	-	-	-	100.0% (1.0)	-

35 (5)

Growth should occur in areas that are already developed.	-	-	-	80.0% (4.0)	20.0% (1.0)
Growth should occur ADJACENT to areas that are already developed.	-	-	20.0% (1.0)	60.0% (3.0)	20.0% (1.0)
Growth should occur in areas that were carefully evaluated by the City as most appropriate for development.	-	-	20.0% (1.0)	60.0% (3.0)	20.0% (1.0)
Growth should occur in areas in which there is an immediate interest from developers or landowners to develop.	40.0% (2.0)	20.0% (1.0)	20.0% (1.0)	20.0% (1.0)	-

36 (3)

Growth should occur in areas that are already developed.	-	33.3% (1.0)	-	33.3% (1.0)	33.3% (1.0)
Growth should occur ADJACENT to areas that are already developed.	-	33.3% (1.0)	33.3% (1.0)	33.3% (1.0)	-
Growth should occur in areas that were carefully evaluated by the City as most appropriate for development.	-	-	33.3% (1.0)	66.7% (2.0)	-
Growth should occur in areas in which there is an immediate interest from developers or landowners to develop.	33.3% (1.0)	-	33.3% (1.0)	33.3% (1.0)	-

37 (5)

Growth should occur in areas that are already developed.	-	-	20.0% (1.0)	80.0% (4.0)	-
Growth should occur ADJACENT to areas that are already developed.	-	20.0% (1.0)	20.0% (1.0)	60.0% (3.0)	-
Growth should occur in areas that were carefully evaluated by the City as most appropriate for development.	-	-	-	100.0% (5.0)	-
Growth should occur in areas in which there is an immediate interest from developers or landowners to develop.	40.0% (2.0)	-	20.0% (1.0)	40.0% (2.0)	-

38 (3)

Growth should occur in areas that are already developed.	-	33.3% (1.0)	-	33.3% (1.0)	33.3% (1.0)
Growth should occur ADJACENT to areas that are already developed.	-	33.3% (1.0)	33.3% (1.0)	33.3% (1.0)	-
Growth should occur in areas that were carefully evaluated by the City as most appropriate for development.	-	-	-	100.0% (3.0)	-
Growth should occur in areas in which there is an immediate interest from developers or landowners to develop.	66.7% (2.0)	-	-	-	33.3% (1.0)

39 (4)

Growth should occur in areas that are already developed.	-	25.0% (1.0)	25.0% (1.0)	25.0% (1.0)	25.0% (1.0)
Growth should occur ADJACENT to areas that are already developed.	-	-	-	75.0% (3.0)	25.0% (1.0)
Growth should occur in areas that were carefully evaluated by the City as most appropriate for					

development.	-	-	25.0% (1.0)	50.0% (2.0)	25.0% (1.0)
Growth should occur in areas in which there is an immediate interest from developers or landowners to develop.	25.0% (1.0)	25.0% (1.0)	-	50.0% (2.0)	-
40 (3)					
Growth should occur in areas that are already developed.	-	33.3% (1.0)	-	66.7% (2.0)	-
Growth should occur ADJACENT to areas that are already developed.	-	-	33.3% (1.0)	33.3% (1.0)	33.3% (1.0)
Growth should occur in areas that were carefully evaluated by the City as most appropriate for development.	-	-	33.3% (1.0)	66.7% (2.0)	-
Growth should occur in areas in which there is an immediate interest from developers or landowners to develop.	-	-	66.7% (2.0)	-	33.3% (1.0)
41 (3)					
Growth should occur in areas that are already developed.	-	33.3% (1.0)	33.3% (1.0)	33.3% (1.0)	-
Growth should occur ADJACENT to areas that are already developed.	-	-	33.3% (1.0)	66.7% (2.0)	-
Growth should occur in areas that were carefully evaluated by the City as most appropriate for development.	-	33.3% (1.0)	-	33.3% (1.0)	33.3% (1.0)
Growth should occur in areas in which there is an immediate interest from developers or landowners to develop.	-	33.3% (1.0)	-	66.7% (2.0)	-
43 (5)					
Growth should occur in areas that are already developed.	-	-	-	20.0% (1.0)	80.0% (4.0)
Growth should occur ADJACENT to areas that are already developed.	20.0% (1.0)	20.0% (1.0)	20.0% (1.0)	-	40.0% (2.0)
Growth should occur in areas that were carefully evaluated by the City as most appropriate for development.	20.0% (1.0)	20.0% (1.0)	-	20.0% (1.0)	40.0% (2.0)
Growth should occur in areas in which there is an immediate interest from developers or landowners to develop.	60.0% (3.0)	20.0% (1.0)	-	-	20.0% (1.0)
44 (6)					
Growth should occur in areas that are already developed.	-	-	-	66.7% (4.0)	33.3% (2.0)
Growth should occur ADJACENT to areas that are already developed.	-	-	50.0% (3.0)	50.0% (3.0)	-
Growth should occur in areas that were carefully evaluated by the City as most appropriate for development.	-	16.7% (1.0)	-	66.7% (4.0)	16.7% (1.0)
Growth should occur in areas in which there is an immediate interest from developers or landowners to develop.	33.3% (2.0)	50.0% (3.0)	-	-	16.7% (1.0)
45 (2)					
Growth should occur in areas that are already developed.	-	-	-	50.0% (1.0)	50.0% (1.0)
Growth should occur ADJACENT to areas that are already developed.	50.0% (1.0)	-	-	50.0% (1.0)	-
Growth should occur in areas that were carefully evaluated by the City as most appropriate for development.	-	-	-	100.0% (2.0)	-
Growth should occur in areas in which there is an immediate interest from developers or landowners to develop.	50.0% (1.0)	50.0% (1.0)	-	-	-
46 (1)					
Growth should occur in areas that are already developed.	-	-	-	100.0% (1.0)	-
Growth should occur ADJACENT to areas that are already developed.	-	-	-	100.0% (1.0)	-
Growth should occur in areas that were carefully evaluated by the City as most appropriate for development.	-	-	100.0% (1.0)	-	-
Growth should occur in areas in which there is an immediate interest from developers or landowners to develop.	-	-	100.0% (1.0)	-	-
47 (3)					
Growth should occur in areas that are already developed.	-	-	-	66.7% (2.0)	33.3% (1.0)
Growth should occur ADJACENT to areas that are already developed.	-	-	-	66.7% (2.0)	33.3% (1.0)
Growth should occur in areas that were carefully evaluated by the City as most appropriate for development.	-	-	33.3% (1.0)	-	66.7% (2.0)
Growth should occur in areas in which there is an immediate interest from developers or landowners to develop.	-	-	66.7% (2.0)	-	33.3% (1.0)
48 (2)					
Growth should occur in areas that are already developed.	-	50.0% (1.0)	-	50.0% (1.0)	-

Growth should occur ADJACENT to areas that are already developed.	-	-	-	100.0% (2.0)	-
Growth should occur in areas that were carefully evaluated by the City as most appropriate for development.	50.0% (1.0)	-	-	50.0% (1.0)	-
Growth should occur in areas in which there is an immediate interest from developers or landowners to develop.	-	-	-	100.0% (2.0)	-
49 (4)					
Growth should occur in areas that are already developed.	-	-	25.0% (1.0)	50.0% (2.0)	25.0% (1.0)
Growth should occur ADJACENT to areas that are already developed.	-	25.0% (1.0)	50.0% (2.0)	25.0% (1.0)	-
Growth should occur in areas that were carefully evaluated by the City as most appropriate for development.	-	25.0% (1.0)	50.0% (2.0)	25.0% (1.0)	-
Growth should occur in areas in which there is an immediate interest from developers or landowners to develop.	50.0% (2.0)	25.0% (1.0)	-	25.0% (1.0)	-
50 (1)					
Growth should occur in areas that are already developed.	-	-	-	100.0% (1.0)	-
Growth should occur ADJACENT to areas that are already developed.	-	-	-	100.0% (1.0)	-
Growth should occur in areas that were carefully evaluated by the City as most appropriate for development.	-	-	-	100.0% (1.0)	-
Growth should occur in areas in which there is an immediate interest from developers or landowners to develop.	-	-	100.0% (1.0)	-	-
51 (1)					
Growth should occur in areas that are already developed.	-	-	-	-	100.0% (1.0)
Growth should occur ADJACENT to areas that are already developed.	-	-	-	100.0% (1.0)	-
Growth should occur in areas that were carefully evaluated by the City as most appropriate for development.	-	-	-	100.0% (1.0)	-
Growth should occur in areas in which there is an immediate interest from developers or landowners to develop.	-	-	-	100.0% (1.0)	-
52 (5)					
Growth should occur in areas that are already developed.	-	40.0% (2.0)	20.0% (1.0)	20.0% (1.0)	20.0% (1.0)
Growth should occur ADJACENT to areas that are already developed.	-	40.0% (2.0)	20.0% (1.0)	40.0% (2.0)	-
Growth should occur in areas that were carefully evaluated by the City as most appropriate for development.	-	-	20.0% (1.0)	40.0% (2.0)	40.0% (2.0)
Growth should occur in areas in which there is an immediate interest from developers or landowners to develop.	20.0% (1.0)	60.0% (3.0)	20.0% (1.0)	-	-
53 (4)					
Growth should occur in areas that are already developed.	-	-	25.0% (1.0)	50.0% (2.0)	25.0% (1.0)
Growth should occur ADJACENT to areas that are already developed.	-	-	25.0% (1.0)	50.0% (2.0)	25.0% (1.0)
Growth should occur in areas that were carefully evaluated by the City as most appropriate for development.	-	25.0% (1.0)	50.0% (2.0)	25.0% (1.0)	-
Growth should occur in areas in which there is an immediate interest from developers or landowners to develop.	50.0% (2.0)	25.0% (1.0)	25.0% (1.0)	-	-
54 (1)					
Growth should occur in areas that are already developed.	-	-	-	100.0% (1.0)	-
Growth should occur ADJACENT to areas that are already developed.	-	-	-	100.0% (1.0)	-
Growth should occur in areas that were carefully evaluated by the City as most appropriate for development.	-	-	-	-	100.0% (1.0)
Growth should occur in areas in which there is an immediate interest from developers or landowners to develop.	100.0% (1.0)	-	-	-	-
55 (3)					
Growth should occur in areas that are already developed.	-	-	33.3% (1.0)	33.3% (1.0)	33.3% (1.0)
Growth should occur ADJACENT to areas that are already developed.	33.3% (1.0)	-	33.3% (1.0)	33.3% (1.0)	-
Growth should occur in areas that were carefully evaluated by the City as most appropriate for development.	-	-	33.3% (1.0)	33.3% (1.0)	33.3% (1.0)
Growth should occur in areas in which there is an immediate interest from developers or landowners to develop.	66.7% (2.0)	-	33.3% (1.0)	-	-

56 (2)

Growth should occur in areas that are already developed.	-	-	-	50.0% (1.0)	50.0% (1.0)
Growth should occur ADJACENT to areas that are already developed.	50.0% (1.0)	-	50.0% (1.0)	-	-
Growth should occur in areas that were carefully evaluated by the City as most appropriate for development.	-	-	50.0% (1.0)	50.0% (1.0)	-
Growth should occur in areas in which there is an immediate interest from developers or landowners to develop.	50.0% (1.0)	50.0% (1.0)	-	-	-

57 (1)

Growth should occur in areas that are already developed.	-	-	-	100.0% (1.0)	-
Growth should occur ADJACENT to areas that are already developed.	-	-	100.0% (1.0)	-	-
Growth should occur in areas that were carefully evaluated by the City as most appropriate for development.	-	-	-	100.0% (1.0)	-
Growth should occur in areas in which there is an immediate interest from developers or landowners to develop.	-	100.0% (1.0)	-	-	-

59 (5)

Growth should occur in areas that are already developed.	-	20.0% (1.0)	-	20.0% (1.0)	60.0% (3.0)
Growth should occur ADJACENT to areas that are already developed.	-	20.0% (1.0)	40.0% (2.0)	-	40.0% (2.0)
Growth should occur in areas that were carefully evaluated by the City as most appropriate for development.	-	20.0% (1.0)	20.0% (1.0)	40.0% (2.0)	20.0% (1.0)
Growth should occur in areas in which there is an immediate interest from developers or landowners to develop.	40.0% (2.0)	40.0% (2.0)	20.0% (1.0)	-	-

60 (3)

Growth should occur in areas that are already developed.	33.3% (1.0)	-	33.3% (1.0)	33.3% (1.0)	-
Growth should occur ADJACENT to areas that are already developed.	33.3% (1.0)	33.3% (1.0)	-	33.3% (1.0)	-
Growth should occur in areas that were carefully evaluated by the City as most appropriate for development.	33.3% (1.0)	-	33.3% (1.0)	33.3% (1.0)	-
Growth should occur in areas in which there is an immediate interest from developers or landowners to develop.	100.0% (3.0)	-	-	-	-

61 (1)

Growth should occur in areas that are already developed.	-	-	-	100.0% (1.0)	-
Growth should occur ADJACENT to areas that are already developed.	-	-	-	-	100.0% (1.0)
Growth should occur in areas that were carefully evaluated by the City as most appropriate for development.	-	-	-	100.0% (1.0)	-
Growth should occur in areas in which there is an immediate interest from developers or landowners to develop.	100.0% (1.0)	-	-	-	-

62 (5)

Growth should occur in areas that are already developed.	-	-	20.0% (1.0)	20.0% (1.0)	60.0% (3.0)
Growth should occur ADJACENT to areas that are already developed.	-	20.0% (1.0)	40.0% (2.0)	20.0% (1.0)	20.0% (1.0)
Growth should occur in areas that were carefully evaluated by the City as most appropriate for development.	-	-	-	80.0% (4.0)	20.0% (1.0)
Growth should occur in areas in which there is an immediate interest from developers or landowners to develop.	20.0% (1.0)	40.0% (2.0)	40.0% (2.0)	-	-

63 (2)

Growth should occur in areas that are already developed.	-	-	-	100.0% (2.0)	-
Growth should occur ADJACENT to areas that are already developed.	-	-	50.0% (1.0)	-	50.0% (1.0)
Growth should occur in areas that were carefully evaluated by the City as most appropriate for development.	-	-	-	50.0% (1.0)	50.0% (1.0)
Growth should occur in areas in which there is an immediate interest from developers or landowners to develop.	-	-	-	50.0% (1.0)	50.0% (1.0)

64 (5)

Growth should occur in areas that are already developed.	-	60.0% (3.0)	20.0% (1.0)	20.0% (1.0)	-
Growth should occur ADJACENT to areas that are already developed.	-	20.0% (1.0)	20.0% (1.0)	60.0% (3.0)	-
Growth should occur in areas that were carefully evaluated by the City as most appropriate for					

development.	-	-	40.0% (2.0)	20.0% (1.0)	40.0% (2.0)
Growth should occur in areas in which there is an immediate interest from developers or landowners to develop.	20.0% (1.0)	20.0% (1.0)	40.0% (2.0)	20.0% (1.0)	-
65 (2)					
Growth should occur in areas that are already developed.	50.0% (1.0)	50.0% (1.0)	-	-	-
Growth should occur ADJACENT to areas that are already developed.	100.0% (2.0)	-	-	-	-
Growth should occur in areas that were carefully evaluated by the City as most appropriate for development.	100.0% (2.0)	-	-	-	-
Growth should occur in areas in which there is an immediate interest from developers or landowners to develop.	100.0% (2.0)	-	-	-	-
66 (2)					
Growth should occur in areas that are already developed.	-	-	100.0% (2.0)	-	-
Growth should occur ADJACENT to areas that are already developed.	-	-	50.0% (1.0)	50.0% (1.0)	-
Growth should occur in areas that were carefully evaluated by the City as most appropriate for development.	-	-	-	100.0% (2.0)	-
Growth should occur in areas in which there is an immediate interest from developers or landowners to develop.	50.0% (1.0)	-	50.0% (1.0)	-	-
67 (1)					
Growth should occur in areas that are already developed.	-	-	-	100.0% (1.0)	-
Growth should occur ADJACENT to areas that are already developed.	-	-	-	100.0% (1.0)	-
Growth should occur in areas that were carefully evaluated by the City as most appropriate for development.	-	-	-	100.0% (1.0)	-
Growth should occur in areas in which there is an immediate interest from developers or landowners to develop.	-	100.0% (1.0)	-	-	-
68 (3)					
Growth should occur in areas that are already developed.	-	-	33.3% (1.0)	-	66.7% (2.0)
Growth should occur ADJACENT to areas that are already developed.	-	33.3% (1.0)	-	33.3% (1.0)	33.3% (1.0)
Growth should occur in areas that were carefully evaluated by the City as most appropriate for development.	-	-	66.7% (2.0)	-	33.3% (1.0)
Growth should occur in areas in which there is an immediate interest from developers or landowners to develop.	-	66.7% (2.0)	33.3% (1.0)	-	-
69 (2)					
Growth should occur in areas that are already developed.	-	-	-	-	100.0% (2.0)
Growth should occur ADJACENT to areas that are already developed.	-	-	50.0% (1.0)	50.0% (1.0)	-
Growth should occur in areas that were carefully evaluated by the City as most appropriate for development.	-	-	100.0% (2.0)	-	-
Growth should occur in areas in which there is an immediate interest from developers or landowners to develop.	50.0% (1.0)	50.0% (1.0)	-	-	-
71 (2)					
Growth should occur in areas that are already developed.	-	50.0% (1.0)	-	50.0% (1.0)	-
Growth should occur ADJACENT to areas that are already developed.	-	-	-	100.0% (2.0)	-
Growth should occur in areas that were carefully evaluated by the City as most appropriate for development.	-	-	50.0% (1.0)	-	50.0% (1.0)
Growth should occur in areas in which there is an immediate interest from developers or landowners to develop.	-	50.0% (1.0)	-	-	50.0% (1.0)
72 (3)					
Growth should occur in areas that are already developed.	-	-	-	33.3% (1.0)	66.7% (2.0)
Growth should occur ADJACENT to areas that are already developed.	33.3% (1.0)	-	-	66.7% (2.0)	-
Growth should occur in areas that were carefully evaluated by the City as most appropriate for development.	-	-	-	66.7% (2.0)	33.3% (1.0)
Growth should occur in areas in which there is an immediate interest from developers or landowners to develop.	66.7% (2.0)	33.3% (1.0)	-	-	-
73 (3)					

Growth should occur in areas that are already developed.	33.3% (1.0)	-	-	66.7% (2.0)	-
Growth should occur ADJACENT to areas that are already developed.	33.3% (1.0)	-	33.3% (1.0)	33.3% (1.0)	-
Growth should occur in areas that were carefully evaluated by the City as most appropriate for development.	33.3% (1.0)	-	-	66.7% (2.0)	-
Growth should occur in areas in which there is an immediate interest from developers or landowners to develop.	33.3% (1.0)	-	66.7% (2.0)	-	-

74 (4)

Growth should occur in areas that are already developed.	-	-	-	-	100.0% (4.0)
Growth should occur ADJACENT to areas that are already developed.	-	25.0% (1.0)	50.0% (2.0)	25.0% (1.0)	-
Growth should occur in areas that were carefully evaluated by the City as most appropriate for development.	25.0% (1.0)	-	25.0% (1.0)	50.0% (2.0)	-
Growth should occur in areas in which there is an immediate interest from developers or landowners to develop.	75.0% (3.0)	25.0% (1.0)	-	-	-

77 (2)

Growth should occur in areas that are already developed.	-	-	-	-	100.0% (2.0)
Growth should occur ADJACENT to areas that are already developed.	-	-	-	50.0% (1.0)	50.0% (1.0)
Growth should occur in areas that were carefully evaluated by the City as most appropriate for development.	-	-	-	50.0% (1.0)	50.0% (1.0)
Growth should occur in areas in which there is an immediate interest from developers or landowners to develop.	-	100.0% (2.0)	-	-	-

79 (2)

Growth should occur in areas that are already developed.	-	50.0% (1.0)	-	50.0% (1.0)	-
Growth should occur ADJACENT to areas that are already developed.	-	-	50.0% (1.0)	50.0% (1.0)	-
Growth should occur in areas that were carefully evaluated by the City as most appropriate for development.	-	-	-	-	100.0% (2.0)
Growth should occur in areas in which there is an immediate interest from developers or landowners to develop.	50.0% (1.0)	-	-	-	50.0% (1.0)

Unknown (68)

Growth should occur in areas that are already developed.	2.9% (2.0)	11.8% (8.0)	32.4% (22.0)	41.2% (28.0)	11.8% (8.0)
Growth should occur ADJACENT to areas that are already developed.	5.9% (4.0)	7.4% (5.0)	32.4% (22.0)	44.1% (30.0)	10.3% (7.0)
Growth should occur in areas that were carefully evaluated by the City as most appropriate for development.	2.9% (2.0)	4.4% (3.0)	10.3% (7.0)	55.9% (38.0)	26.5% (18.0)
Growth should occur in areas in which there is an immediate interest from developers or landowners to develop.	17.6% (12.0)	25.0% (17.0)	32.4% (22.0)	20.6% (14.0)	4.4% (3.0)

STATE INCOME DECILE

187 REGISTERED VOTERS

	Strongly Disagree	Disagree	Neutral	Agree	Strongly Agree
--	-------------------	----------	---------	-------	----------------

0 to 9 Pct range (6)

Growth should occur in areas that are already developed.	-	33.3% (2.0)	16.7% (1.0)	33.3% (2.0)	16.7% (1.0)
Growth should occur ADJACENT to areas that are already developed.	-	16.7% (1.0)	16.7% (1.0)	66.7% (4.0)	-
Growth should occur in areas that were carefully evaluated by the City as most appropriate for development.	-	-	16.7% (1.0)	66.7% (4.0)	16.7% (1.0)
Growth should occur in areas in which there is an immediate interest from developers or landowners to develop.	33.3% (2.0)	33.3% (2.0)	33.3% (2.0)	-	-

10 to 19 Pct range (1)

Growth should occur in areas that are already developed.	-	-	100.0% (1.0)	-	-
Growth should occur ADJACENT to areas that are already developed.	-	-	100.0% (1.0)	-	-
Growth should occur in areas that were carefully evaluated by the City as most appropriate for development.	-	-	-	100.0% (1.0)	-
Growth should occur in areas in which there is an immediate interest from developers or landowners to develop.	-	100.0% (1.0)	-	-	-

40 to 49 Pct range (2)

Growth should occur in areas that are already developed.	-	50.0% (1.0)	-	-	50.0% (1.0)
--	---	-------------	---	---	-------------

Growth should occur ADJACENT to areas that are already developed.	-	50.0% (1.0)	-	50.0% (1.0)	-
Growth should occur in areas that were carefully evaluated by the City as most appropriate for development.	-	-	-	50.0% (1.0)	50.0% (1.0)
Growth should occur in areas in which there is an immediate interest from developers or landowners to develop.	50.0% (1.0)	-	50.0% (1.0)	-	-
50 to 59 Pct range (9)					
Growth should occur in areas that are already developed.	-	11.1% (1.0)	11.1% (1.0)	55.6% (5.0)	22.2% (2.0)
Growth should occur ADJACENT to areas that are already developed.	-	11.1% (1.0)	22.2% (2.0)	44.4% (4.0)	22.2% (2.0)
Growth should occur in areas that were carefully evaluated by the City as most appropriate for development.	-	11.1% (1.0)	-	66.7% (6.0)	22.2% (2.0)
Growth should occur in areas in which there is an immediate interest from developers or landowners to develop.	22.2% (2.0)	22.2% (2.0)	22.2% (2.0)	33.3% (3.0)	-
60 to 69 Pct range (7)					
Growth should occur in areas that are already developed.	-	28.6% (2.0)	28.6% (2.0)	42.9% (3.0)	-
Growth should occur ADJACENT to areas that are already developed.	14.3% (1.0)	-	57.1% (4.0)	14.3% (1.0)	14.3% (1.0)
Growth should occur in areas that were carefully evaluated by the City as most appropriate for development.	-	14.3% (1.0)	14.3% (1.0)	28.6% (2.0)	42.9% (3.0)
Growth should occur in areas in which there is an immediate interest from developers or landowners to develop.	-	14.3% (1.0)	42.9% (3.0)	28.6% (2.0)	14.3% (1.0)
70 to 79 Pct range (5)					
Growth should occur in areas that are already developed.	-	-	-	80.0% (4.0)	20.0% (1.0)
Growth should occur ADJACENT to areas that are already developed.	-	-	60.0% (3.0)	40.0% (2.0)	-
Growth should occur in areas that were carefully evaluated by the City as most appropriate for development.	-	-	-	80.0% (4.0)	20.0% (1.0)
Growth should occur in areas in which there is an immediate interest from developers or landowners to develop.	40.0% (2.0)	20.0% (1.0)	-	20.0% (1.0)	20.0% (1.0)
80 to 89 Pct range (70)					
Growth should occur in areas that are already developed.	2.9% (2.0)	10.0% (7.0)	22.9% (16.0)	42.9% (30.0)	21.4% (15.0)
Growth should occur ADJACENT to areas that are already developed.	10.0% (7.0)	8.6% (6.0)	25.7% (18.0)	42.9% (30.0)	12.9% (9.0)
Growth should occur in areas that were carefully evaluated by the City as most appropriate for development.	5.7% (4.0)	2.9% (2.0)	17.1% (12.0)	50.0% (35.0)	24.3% (17.0)
Growth should occur in areas in which there is an immediate interest from developers or landowners to develop.	31.4% (22.0)	25.7% (18.0)	25.7% (18.0)	15.7% (11.0)	1.4% (1.0)
90 Pct and up (85)					
Growth should occur in areas that are already developed.	3.5% (3.0)	11.8% (10.0)	18.8% (16.0)	40.0% (34.0)	25.9% (22.0)
Growth should occur ADJACENT to areas that are already developed.	5.9% (5.0)	10.6% (9.0)	25.9% (22.0)	45.9% (39.0)	11.8% (10.0)
Growth should occur in areas that were carefully evaluated by the City as most appropriate for development.	5.9% (5.0)	5.9% (5.0)	17.6% (15.0)	48.2% (41.0)	22.4% (19.0)
Growth should occur in areas in which there is an immediate interest from developers or landowners to develop.	28.2% (24.0)	25.9% (22.0)	22.4% (19.0)	14.1% (12.0)	9.4% (8.0)
Unknown (2)					
Growth should occur in areas that are already developed.	-	-	-	-	100.0% (2.0)
Growth should occur ADJACENT to areas that are already developed.	-	50.0% (1.0)	50.0% (1.0)	-	-
Growth should occur in areas that were carefully evaluated by the City as most appropriate for development.	-	-	50.0% (1.0)	50.0% (1.0)	-
Growth should occur in areas in which there is an immediate interest from developers or landowners to develop.	100.0% (2.0)	-	-	-	-

HOME OWNER/RENTER

187 REGISTERED VOTERS

	Strongly Disagree	Disagree	Neutral	Agree	Strongly Agree
Likely Homeowner (106)					
Growth should occur in areas that are already developed.	2.8% (3.0)	9.4% (10.0)	20.8% (22.0)	39.6% (42.0)	27.4% (29.0)
			30.2%	39.6%	

Growth should occur ADJACENT to areas that are already developed.	6.6% (7.0)	9.4% (10.0)	(32.0)	(42.0)	14.2% (15.0)
Growth should occur in areas that were carefully evaluated by the City as most appropriate for development.	6.6% (7.0)	6.6% (7.0)	15.1% (16.0)	51.9% (55.0)	19.8% (21.0)
Growth should occur in areas in which there is an immediate interest from developers or landowners to develop.	34.0% (36.0)	23.6% (25.0)	19.8% (21.0)	15.1% (16.0)	7.5% (8.0)
Likely Renter (55)					
Growth should occur in areas that are already developed.	3.6% (2.0)	18.2% (10.0)	16.4% (9.0)	40.0% (22.0)	21.8% (12.0)
Growth should occur ADJACENT to areas that are already developed.	10.9% (6.0)	14.5% (8.0)	23.6% (13.0)	40.0% (22.0)	10.9% (6.0)
Growth should occur in areas that were carefully evaluated by the City as most appropriate for development.	1.8% (1.0)	3.6% (2.0)	18.2% (10.0)	49.1% (27.0)	27.3% (15.0)
Growth should occur in areas in which there is an immediate interest from developers or landowners to develop.	25.5% (14.0)	20.0% (11.0)	30.9% (17.0)	18.2% (10.0)	5.5% (3.0)
Unknown (26)					
Growth should occur in areas that are already developed.	-	11.5% (3.0)	23.1% (6.0)	53.8% (14.0)	11.5% (3.0)
Growth should occur ADJACENT to areas that are already developed.	-	3.8% (1.0)	26.9% (7.0)	65.4% (17.0)	3.8% (1.0)
Growth should occur in areas that were carefully evaluated by the City as most appropriate for development.	3.8% (1.0)	-	15.4% (4.0)	50.0% (13.0)	30.8% (8.0)
Growth should occur in areas in which there is an immediate interest from developers or landowners to develop.	19.2% (5.0)	42.3% (11.0)	26.9% (7.0)	11.5% (3.0)	-

For the purposes of this survey, “greenfield development” is defined as new development that occurs on undeveloped land, often at the edge of developed areas. Please rate your level of agreement with the following statements about greenfield development in Fitchburg:

CURRENT RESULTS	303 Total Responses				
	Strongly Disagree	Disagree	Neutral	Agree	Strongly Agree
Greenfield development is important and should be a priority.	18% (55)	23% (70)	32% (98)	18% (56)	8% (24)
Greenfield development should take place in areas that were carefully evaluated by the City as most appropriate for growth.	7% (21)	8% (23)	17% (53)	42% (128)	26% (78)
Greenfield development should take place in areas in which there is an immediate interest from developers or landowners to develop.	31% (95)	24% (72)	28% (86)	11% (33)	6% (17)

REGISTERED (181)	Strongly Disagree	Disagree	Neutral	Agree	Strongly Agree
Greenfield development is important and should be a priority.	19.0% (35)	22.0% (40)	31.0% (56)	19.0% (34)	9.0% (16)
Greenfield development should take place in areas that were carefully evaluated by the City as most appropriate for growth.	5.0% (9)	8.0% (14)	16.0% (29)	45.0% (81)	27.0% (48)
Greenfield development should take place in areas in which there is an immediate interest from developers or landowners to develop.	30.0% (55)	24.0% (44)	28.0% (50)	11.0% (20)	7.0% (12)

NON-REGISTERED (122)	Strongly Disagree	Disagree	Neutral	Agree	Strongly Agree
Greenfield development is important and should be a priority.	16.4% (20)	24.6% (30)	34.4% (42)	18.0% (22)	6.6% (8)
Greenfield development should take place in areas that were carefully evaluated by the City as most appropriate for growth.	9.8% (12)	7.4% (9)	19.7% (24)	38.5% (47)	24.6% (30)
Greenfield development should take place in areas in which there is an immediate interest from developers or landowners to develop.	32.8% (40)	23.0% (28)	29.5% (36)	10.7% (13)	4.1% (5)

ALL RESPONDENTS (303)	Strongly Disagree	Disagree	Neutral	Agree	Strongly Agree
Greenfield development is important and should be a priority.	18% (55)	23% (70)	32% (98)	18% (56)	8% (24)
Greenfield development should take place in areas that were carefully evaluated by the City as most appropriate for growth.	7% (21)	8% (23)	17% (53)	42% (128)	26% (78)
Greenfield development should take place in areas in which there is an immediate interest from developers or landowners to develop.	31% (95)	24% (72)	28% (86)	11% (33)	6% (17)

REGISTERED VOTERS IN FITCHBURG, WI (181)	Strongly Disagree	Disagree	Neutral	Agree	Strongly Agree
Greenfield development is important and should be a priority.	19% (35)	22% (40)	31% (56)	19% (34)	9% (16)
Greenfield development should take place in areas that were carefully evaluated by the City as most appropriate for growth.	5% (9)	8% (14)	16% (29)	45% (81)	27% (48)
Greenfield development should take place in areas in which there is an immediate interest from developers or landowners to develop.	30% (55)	24% (44)	28% (50)	11% (20)	7% (12)

LIVE IN FITCHBURG, WI (267) - SELF-REPORTED	Strongly Disagree	Disagree	Neutral	Agree	Strongly Agree
Greenfield development is important and should be a priority.	18% (48)	24% (65)	31% (84)	19% (51)	7% (19)
Greenfield development should take place in areas that were carefully evaluated by the City as most appropriate for growth.	6% (16)	8% (21)	17% (45)	44% (117)	25% (68)
Greenfield development should take place in areas in which there is an immediate interest from developers or landowners to develop.	31% (82)	23% (62)	30% (79)	12% (31)	5% (13)

SUBSCRIBERS TO FITCHBURG, WI (271)

	Strongly Disagree	Disagree	Neutral	Agree	Strongly Agree
Greenfield development is important and should be a priority.	18% (48)	24% (65)	31% (85)	20% (53)	7% (20)
Greenfield development should take place in areas that were carefully evaluated by the City as most appropriate for growth.	6% (17)	8% (21)	17% (46)	44% (119)	25% (68)
Greenfield development should take place in areas in which there is an immediate interest from developers or landowners to develop.	30% (82)	24% (64)	29% (79)	12% (32)	5% (14)

REGISTER RESPONDENTS FROM ANYWHERE (187)

	Strongly Disagree	Disagree	Neutral	Agree	Strongly Agree
Greenfield development is important and should be a priority.	19% (35)	22% (41)	32% (60)	19% (35)	9% (16)
Greenfield development should take place in areas that were carefully evaluated by the City as most appropriate for growth.	5% (9)	7% (14)	16% (30)	44% (83)	27% (51)
Greenfield development should take place in areas in which there is an immediate interest from developers or landowners to develop.	30% (57)	25% (47)	27% (50)	11% (21)	6% (12)

EDUCATION

187 REGISTERED VOTERS

	Strongly Disagree	Disagree	Neutral	Agree	Strongly Agree
--	-------------------	----------	---------	-------	----------------

Bach Degree - Extremely Likely (30)

Greenfield development is important and should be a priority.	26.7% (8.0)	23.3% (7.0)	20.0% (6.0)	23.3% (7.0)	6.7% (2.0)
Greenfield development should take place in areas that were carefully evaluated by the City as most appropriate for growth.	10.0% (3.0)	13.3% (4.0)	10.0% (3.0)	36.7% (11.0)	30.0% (9.0)
Greenfield development should take place in areas in which there is an immediate interest from developers or landowners to develop.	46.7% (14.0)	10.0% (3.0)	23.3% (7.0)	13.3% (4.0)	6.7% (2.0)

Bach Degree - Likely (21)

Greenfield development is important and should be a priority.	9.5% (2.0)	33.3% (7.0)	42.9% (9.0)	4.8% (1.0)	9.5% (2.0)
Greenfield development should take place in areas that were carefully evaluated by the City as most appropriate for growth.	9.5% (2.0)	14.3% (3.0)	19.0% (4.0)	38.1% (8.0)	19.0% (4.0)
Greenfield development should take place in areas in which there is an immediate interest from developers or landowners to develop.	42.9% (9.0)	14.3% (3.0)	33.3% (7.0)	-	9.5% (2.0)

Grad Degree - Extremely Likely (22)

Greenfield development is important and should be a priority.	27.3% (6.0)	22.7% (5.0)	22.7% (5.0)	22.7% (5.0)	4.5% (1.0)
Greenfield development should take place in areas that were carefully evaluated by the City as most appropriate for growth.	4.5% (1.0)	13.6% (3.0)	22.7% (5.0)	45.5% (10.0)	13.6% (3.0)
Greenfield development should take place in areas in which there is an immediate interest from developers or landowners to develop.	31.8% (7.0)	31.8% (7.0)	13.6% (3.0)	13.6% (3.0)	9.1% (2.0)

Grad Degree - Likely (13)

Greenfield development is important and should be a priority.	7.7% (1.0)	23.1% (3.0)	23.1% (3.0)	23.1% (3.0)	23.1% (3.0)
Greenfield development should take place in areas that were carefully evaluated by the City as most appropriate for growth.	-	-	7.7% (1.0)	53.8% (7.0)	38.5% (5.0)
Greenfield development should take place in areas in which there is an immediate interest from developers or landowners to develop.	15.4% (2.0)	23.1% (3.0)	15.4% (2.0)	38.5% (5.0)	7.7% (1.0)

HS Diploma - Extremely Likely (9)

Greenfield development is important and should be a priority.	11.1% (1.0)	33.3% (3.0)	22.2% (2.0)	11.1% (1.0)	22.2% (2.0)
Greenfield development should take place in areas that were carefully evaluated by the City as most appropriate for growth.	11.1% (1.0)	-	33.3% (3.0)	22.2% (2.0)	33.3% (3.0)
Greenfield development should take place in areas in which there is an immediate interest from developers or landowners to develop.	33.3% (3.0)	22.2% (2.0)	11.1% (1.0)	11.1% (1.0)	22.2% (2.0)

HS Diploma - Likely (4)

Greenfield development is important and should be a priority.	-	-	100.0% (4.0)	-	-
---	---	---	--------------	---	---

Greenfield development should take place in areas that were carefully evaluated by the City as most appropriate for growth.	-	-	-	50.0% (2.0)	50.0% (2.0)
Greenfield development should take place in areas in which there is an immediate interest from developers or landowners to develop.	-	50.0% (2.0)	50.0% (2.0)	-	-

Less than HS Diploma - Likely (1)

Greenfield development is important and should be a priority.	-	-	100.0% (1.0)	-	-
Greenfield development should take place in areas that were carefully evaluated by the City as most appropriate for growth.	-	-	-	-	100.0% (1.0)
Greenfield development should take place in areas in which there is an immediate interest from developers or landowners to develop.	-	100.0% (1.0)	-	-	-

Some College - Likely (12)

Greenfield development is important and should be a priority.	25.0% (3.0)	16.7% (2.0)	25.0% (3.0)	8.3% (1.0)	25.0% (3.0)
Greenfield development should take place in areas that were carefully evaluated by the City as most appropriate for growth.	-	-	25.0% (3.0)	41.7% (5.0)	33.3% (4.0)
Greenfield development should take place in areas in which there is an immediate interest from developers or landowners to develop.	41.7% (5.0)	16.7% (2.0)	25.0% (3.0)	16.7% (2.0)	-

Some College -Extremely Likely (5)

Greenfield development is important and should be a priority.	20.0% (1.0)	40.0% (2.0)	20.0% (1.0)	20.0% (1.0)	-
Greenfield development should take place in areas that were carefully evaluated by the City as most appropriate for growth.	-	-	-	100.0% (5.0)	-
Greenfield development should take place in areas in which there is an immediate interest from developers or landowners to develop.	20.0% (1.0)	40.0% (2.0)	20.0% (1.0)	20.0% (1.0)	-

Unknown (70)

Greenfield development is important and should be a priority.	18.6% (13.0)	17.1% (12.0)	37.1% (26.0)	22.9% (16.0)	4.3% (3.0)
Greenfield development should take place in areas that were carefully evaluated by the City as most appropriate for growth.	2.9% (2.0)	5.7% (4.0)	15.7% (11.0)	47.1% (33.0)	28.6% (20.0)
Greenfield development should take place in areas in which there is an immediate interest from developers or landowners to develop.	22.9% (16.0)	31.4% (22.0)	34.3% (24.0)	7.1% (5.0)	4.3% (3.0)

VOTERS GENDER

187 REGISTERED VOTERS

	Strongly Disagree	Disagree	Neutral	Agree	Strongly Agree
--	-------------------	----------	---------	-------	----------------

F (90)

Greenfield development is important and should be a priority.	20.0% (18.0)	23.3% (21.0)	35.6% (32.0)	15.6% (14.0)	5.6% (5.0)
Greenfield development should take place in areas that were carefully evaluated by the City as most appropriate for growth.	5.6% (5.0)	3.3% (3.0)	21.1% (19.0)	44.4% (40.0)	25.6% (23.0)
Greenfield development should take place in areas in which there is an immediate interest from developers or landowners to develop.	27.8% (25.0)	23.3% (21.0)	34.4% (31.0)	12.2% (11.0)	2.2% (2.0)

M (95)

Greenfield development is important and should be a priority.	17.9% (17.0)	21.1% (20.0)	28.4% (27.0)	22.1% (21.0)	10.5% (10.0)
Greenfield development should take place in areas that were carefully evaluated by the City as most appropriate for growth.	4.2% (4.0)	11.6% (11.0)	11.6% (11.0)	43.2% (41.0)	29.5% (28.0)
Greenfield development should take place in areas in which there is an immediate interest from developers or landowners to develop.	33.7% (32.0)	27.4% (26.0)	18.9% (18.0)	9.5% (9.0)	10.5% (10.0)

Unknown (2)

Greenfield development is important and should be a priority.	-	-	50.0% (1.0)	-	50.0% (1.0)
Greenfield development should take place in areas that were carefully evaluated by the City as most appropriate for growth.	-	-	-	100.0% (2.0)	-
Greenfield development should take place in areas in which there is an immediate interest from developers or landowners to develop.	-	-	50.0% (1.0)	50.0% (1.0)	-

PRECINCT

187 REGISTERED VOTERS

	Strongly	Strongly
--	----------	----------

	Disagree	Disagree	Neutral	Agree	Agree
CHICAGO 43-04 (1)					
Greenfield development is important and should be a priority.	-	-	100.0% (1.0)	-	-
Greenfield development should take place in areas that were carefully evaluated by the City as most appropriate for growth.	-	-	-	-	100.0% (1.0)
Greenfield development should take place in areas in which there is an immediate interest from developers or landowners to develop.	-	100.0% (1.0)	-	-	-
FITCHBURG CITY WARD 01 (9)					
Greenfield development is important and should be a priority.	22.2% (2.0)	22.2% (2.0)	22.2% (2.0)	22.2% (2.0)	11.1% (1.0)
Greenfield development should take place in areas that were carefully evaluated by the City as most appropriate for growth.	-	11.1% (1.0)	22.2% (2.0)	44.4% (4.0)	22.2% (2.0)
Greenfield development should take place in areas in which there is an immediate interest from developers or landowners to develop.	22.2% (2.0)	22.2% (2.0)	22.2% (2.0)	33.3% (3.0)	-
FITCHBURG CITY WARD 02 (3)					
Greenfield development is important and should be a priority.	100.0% (3.0)	-	-	-	-
Greenfield development should take place in areas that were carefully evaluated by the City as most appropriate for growth.	33.3% (1.0)	-	-	66.7% (2.0)	-
Greenfield development should take place in areas in which there is an immediate interest from developers or landowners to develop.	100.0% (3.0)	-	-	-	-
FITCHBURG CITY WARD 04 (2)					
Greenfield development is important and should be a priority.	-	-	50.0% (1.0)	50.0% (1.0)	-
Greenfield development should take place in areas that were carefully evaluated by the City as most appropriate for growth.	-	-	-	50.0% (1.0)	50.0% (1.0)
Greenfield development should take place in areas in which there is an immediate interest from developers or landowners to develop.	50.0% (1.0)	-	50.0% (1.0)	-	-
FITCHBURG CITY WARD 05 (6)					
Greenfield development is important and should be a priority.	16.7% (1.0)	16.7% (1.0)	16.7% (1.0)	33.3% (2.0)	16.7% (1.0)
Greenfield development should take place in areas that were carefully evaluated by the City as most appropriate for growth.	-	-	16.7% (1.0)	33.3% (2.0)	50.0% (3.0)
Greenfield development should take place in areas in which there is an immediate interest from developers or landowners to develop.	50.0% (3.0)	16.7% (1.0)	16.7% (1.0)	-	16.7% (1.0)
FITCHBURG CITY WARD 06 (12)					
Greenfield development is important and should be a priority.	8.3% (1.0)	8.3% (1.0)	41.7% (5.0)	25.0% (3.0)	16.7% (2.0)
Greenfield development should take place in areas that were carefully evaluated by the City as most appropriate for growth.	8.3% (1.0)	-	-	58.3% (7.0)	33.3% (4.0)
Greenfield development should take place in areas in which there is an immediate interest from developers or landowners to develop.	8.3% (1.0)	-	58.3% (7.0)	25.0% (3.0)	8.3% (1.0)
FITCHBURG CITY WARD 07 (18)					
Greenfield development is important and should be a priority.	27.8% (5.0)	33.3% (6.0)	11.1% (2.0)	11.1% (2.0)	16.7% (3.0)
Greenfield development should take place in areas that were carefully evaluated by the City as most appropriate for growth.	-	5.6% (1.0)	11.1% (2.0)	61.1% (11.0)	22.2% (4.0)
Greenfield development should take place in areas in which there is an immediate interest from developers or landowners to develop.	27.8% (5.0)	44.4% (8.0)	16.7% (3.0)	-	11.1% (2.0)
FITCHBURG CITY WARD 08 (14)					
Greenfield development is important and should be a priority.	7.1% (1.0)	21.4% (3.0)	35.7% (5.0)	21.4% (3.0)	14.3% (2.0)
Greenfield development should take place in areas that were carefully evaluated by the City as most appropriate for growth.	-	7.1% (1.0)	28.6% (4.0)	42.9% (6.0)	21.4% (3.0)
Greenfield development should take place in areas in which there is an immediate interest from developers or landowners to develop.	28.6% (4.0)	14.3% (2.0)	21.4% (3.0)	14.3% (2.0)	21.4% (3.0)
FITCHBURG CITY WARD 09 (8)					
Greenfield development is important and should be a priority.	-	12.5%	50.0%	25.0%	12.5% (1.0)

		(1.0)	(4.0)	(2.0)	
Greenfield development should take place in areas that were carefully evaluated by the City as most appropriate for growth.	-	12.5% (1.0)	-	50.0% (4.0)	37.5% (3.0)
Greenfield development should take place in areas in which there is an immediate interest from developers or landowners to develop.	12.5% (1.0)	25.0% (2.0)	37.5% (3.0)	12.5% (1.0)	12.5% (1.0)
FITCHBURG CITY WARD 12 (2)					
Greenfield development is important and should be a priority.	-	-	-	50.0% (1.0)	50.0% (1.0)
Greenfield development should take place in areas that were carefully evaluated by the City as most appropriate for growth.	-	-	-	50.0% (1.0)	50.0% (1.0)
Greenfield development should take place in areas in which there is an immediate interest from developers or landowners to develop.	-	-	-	100.0% (2.0)	-
FITCHBURG CITY WARD 13 (31)					
Greenfield development is important and should be a priority.	25.8% (8.0)	19.4% (6.0)	35.5% (11.0)	16.1% (5.0)	3.2% (1.0)
Greenfield development should take place in areas that were carefully evaluated by the City as most appropriate for growth.	9.7% (3.0)	9.7% (3.0)	19.4% (6.0)	38.7% (12.0)	22.6% (7.0)
Greenfield development should take place in areas in which there is an immediate interest from developers or landowners to develop.	35.5% (11.0)	25.8% (8.0)	29.0% (9.0)	9.7% (3.0)	-
FITCHBURG CITY WARD 14 (19)					
Greenfield development is important and should be a priority.	5.3% (1.0)	31.6% (6.0)	26.3% (5.0)	31.6% (6.0)	5.3% (1.0)
Greenfield development should take place in areas that were carefully evaluated by the City as most appropriate for growth.	-	5.3% (1.0)	21.1% (4.0)	36.8% (7.0)	36.8% (7.0)
Greenfield development should take place in areas in which there is an immediate interest from developers or landowners to develop.	36.8% (7.0)	26.3% (5.0)	26.3% (5.0)	5.3% (1.0)	5.3% (1.0)
FITCHBURG CITY WARD 15 (7)					
Greenfield development is important and should be a priority.	14.3% (1.0)	14.3% (1.0)	14.3% (1.0)	42.9% (3.0)	14.3% (1.0)
Greenfield development should take place in areas that were carefully evaluated by the City as most appropriate for growth.	-	28.6% (2.0)	-	42.9% (3.0)	28.6% (2.0)
Greenfield development should take place in areas in which there is an immediate interest from developers or landowners to develop.	14.3% (1.0)	14.3% (1.0)	28.6% (2.0)	28.6% (2.0)	14.3% (1.0)
FITCHBURG CITY WARD 16 (3)					
Greenfield development is important and should be a priority.	-	33.3% (1.0)	66.7% (2.0)	-	-
Greenfield development should take place in areas that were carefully evaluated by the City as most appropriate for growth.	-	33.3% (1.0)	-	66.7% (2.0)	-
Greenfield development should take place in areas in which there is an immediate interest from developers or landowners to develop.	66.7% (2.0)	33.3% (1.0)	-	-	-
FITCHBURG CITY WARD 17 (7)					
Greenfield development is important and should be a priority.	42.9% (3.0)	14.3% (1.0)	28.6% (2.0)	14.3% (1.0)	-
Greenfield development should take place in areas that were carefully evaluated by the City as most appropriate for growth.	-	-	14.3% (1.0)	71.4% (5.0)	14.3% (1.0)
Greenfield development should take place in areas in which there is an immediate interest from developers or landowners to develop.	14.3% (1.0)	42.9% (3.0)	28.6% (2.0)	14.3% (1.0)	-
FITCHBURG CITY WARD 18 (12)					
Greenfield development is important and should be a priority.	25.0% (3.0)	25.0% (3.0)	41.7% (5.0)	8.3% (1.0)	-
Greenfield development should take place in areas that were carefully evaluated by the City as most appropriate for growth.	25.0% (3.0)	-	8.3% (1.0)	41.7% (5.0)	25.0% (3.0)
Greenfield development should take place in areas in which there is an immediate interest from developers or landowners to develop.	33.3% (4.0)	16.7% (2.0)	33.3% (4.0)	16.7% (2.0)	-
FITCHBURG CITY WARD 19 (26)					
Greenfield development is important and should be a priority.	19.2% (5.0)	30.8% (8.0)	38.5% (10.0)	7.7% (2.0)	3.8% (1.0)
Greenfield development should take place in areas that were carefully evaluated by the City as most appropriate for growth.	3.8% (1.0)	11.5% (3.0)	26.9% (7.0)	34.6% (9.0)	23.1% (6.0)
Greenfield development should take place in areas in which there is an immediate interest from developers or landowners to develop.	34.6% (9.0)	34.6% (9.0)	26.9% (7.0)	-	3.8% (1.0)

MADISON CITY WARD 042 (1)

Greenfield development is important and should be a priority.	-	100.0% (1.0)	-	-	-
Greenfield development should take place in areas that were carefully evaluated by the City as most appropriate for growth.	-	-	-	100.0% (1.0)	-
Greenfield development should take place in areas in which there is an immediate interest from developers or landowners to develop.	-	100.0% (1.0)	-	-	-

MADISON CITY WARD 053 (1)

Greenfield development is important and should be a priority.	-	-	100.0% (1.0)	-	-
Greenfield development should take place in areas that were carefully evaluated by the City as most appropriate for growth.	-	-	-	-	100.0% (1.0)
Greenfield development should take place in areas in which there is an immediate interest from developers or landowners to develop.	100.0% (1.0)	-	-	-	-

MADISON CITY WARD 100 (1)

Greenfield development is important and should be a priority.	-	-	-	-	100.0% (1.0)
Greenfield development should take place in areas that were carefully evaluated by the City as most appropriate for growth.	-	-	-	-	100.0% (1.0)
Greenfield development should take place in areas in which there is an immediate interest from developers or landowners to develop.	-	-	-	-	100.0% (1.0)

MADISON CITY WARD 107 (1)

Greenfield development is important and should be a priority.	-	-	100.0% (1.0)	-	-
Greenfield development should take place in areas that were carefully evaluated by the City as most appropriate for growth.	-	-	-	100.0% (1.0)	-
Greenfield development should take place in areas in which there is an immediate interest from developers or landowners to develop.	-	100.0% (1.0)	-	-	-

MIDDLETON TOWN WARD 7 (1)

Greenfield development is important and should be a priority.	-	-	-	100.0% (1.0)	-
Greenfield development should take place in areas that were carefully evaluated by the City as most appropriate for growth.	-	-	100.0% (1.0)	-	-
Greenfield development should take place in areas in which there is an immediate interest from developers or landowners to develop.	-	-	-	100.0% (1.0)	-

MOUNT HOREB VLG WARD 3 (1)

Greenfield development is important and should be a priority.	-	-	100.0% (1.0)	-	-
Greenfield development should take place in areas that were carefully evaluated by the City as most appropriate for growth.	-	-	-	-	100.0% (1.0)
Greenfield development should take place in areas in which there is an immediate interest from developers or landowners to develop.	100.0% (1.0)	-	-	-	-

OREGON VLG WARD 10 (1)

Greenfield development is important and should be a priority.	100.0% (1.0)	-	-	-	-
Greenfield development should take place in areas that were carefully evaluated by the City as most appropriate for growth.	-	-	100.0% (1.0)	-	-
Greenfield development should take place in areas in which there is an immediate interest from developers or landowners to develop.	-	-	100.0% (1.0)	-	-

AGE RANGE

187 REGISTERED VOTERS

	Strongly Disagree	Disagree	Neutral	Agree	Strongly Agree
18-29 (1)					
Greenfield development is important and should be a priority.	100.0% (1.0)	-	-	-	-
Greenfield development should take place in areas that were carefully evaluated by the City as most appropriate for growth.	-	-	100.0% (1.0)	-	-
Greenfield development should take place in areas in which there is an immediate interest from developers or landowners to develop.	100.0% (1.0)	-	-	-	-

30-39 (24)

Greenfield development is important and should be a priority.	20.8% (5.0)	12.5% (3.0)	29.2% (7.0)	25.0% (6.0)	12.5% (3.0)
Greenfield development should take place in areas that were carefully evaluated by the City as most appropriate for growth.	-	-	8.3% (2.0)	54.2% (13.0)	37.5% (9.0)
Greenfield development should take place in areas in which there is an immediate interest from developers or landowners to develop.	33.3% (8.0)	20.8% (5.0)	16.7% (4.0)	20.8% (5.0)	8.3% (2.0)

40-49 (29)

Greenfield development is important and should be a priority.	13.8% (4.0)	27.6% (8.0)	31.0% (9.0)	13.8% (4.0)	13.8% (4.0)
Greenfield development should take place in areas that were carefully evaluated by the City as most appropriate for growth.	6.9% (2.0)	10.3% (3.0)	20.7% (6.0)	31.0% (9.0)	31.0% (9.0)
Greenfield development should take place in areas in which there is an immediate interest from developers or landowners to develop.	24.1% (7.0)	24.1% (7.0)	27.6% (8.0)	10.3% (3.0)	13.8% (4.0)

50-59 (23)

Greenfield development is important and should be a priority.	26.1% (6.0)	30.4% (7.0)	26.1% (6.0)	17.4% (4.0)	-
Greenfield development should take place in areas that were carefully evaluated by the City as most appropriate for growth.	8.7% (2.0)	13.0% (3.0)	21.7% (5.0)	39.1% (9.0)	17.4% (4.0)
Greenfield development should take place in areas in which there is an immediate interest from developers or landowners to develop.	43.5% (10.0)	26.1% (6.0)	26.1% (6.0)	-	4.3% (1.0)

60-69 (26)

Greenfield development is important and should be a priority.	15.4% (4.0)	30.8% (8.0)	23.1% (6.0)	23.1% (6.0)	7.7% (2.0)
Greenfield development should take place in areas that were carefully evaluated by the City as most appropriate for growth.	3.8% (1.0)	15.4% (4.0)	15.4% (4.0)	42.3% (11.0)	23.1% (6.0)
Greenfield development should take place in areas in which there is an immediate interest from developers or landowners to develop.	34.6% (9.0)	23.1% (6.0)	26.9% (7.0)	11.5% (3.0)	3.8% (1.0)

70-79 (16)

Greenfield development is important and should be a priority.	31.3% (5.0)	31.3% (5.0)	18.8% (3.0)	6.3% (1.0)	12.5% (2.0)
Greenfield development should take place in areas that were carefully evaluated by the City as most appropriate for growth.	12.5% (2.0)	-	6.3% (1.0)	37.5% (6.0)	43.8% (7.0)
Greenfield development should take place in areas in which there is an immediate interest from developers or landowners to develop.	50.0% (8.0)	43.8% (7.0)	-	-	6.3% (1.0)

unknown (68)

Greenfield development is important and should be a priority.	14.7% (10.0)	14.7% (10.0)	42.6% (29.0)	20.6% (14.0)	7.4% (5.0)
Greenfield development should take place in areas that were carefully evaluated by the City as most appropriate for growth.	2.9% (2.0)	5.9% (4.0)	16.2% (11.0)	51.5% (35.0)	23.5% (16.0)
Greenfield development should take place in areas in which there is an immediate interest from developers or landowners to develop.	20.6% (14.0)	23.5% (16.0)	36.8% (25.0)	14.7% (10.0)	4.4% (3.0)

**VOTERS
AGE**

187 REGISTERED VOTERS

	Strongly Disagree	Disagree	Neutral	Agree	Strongly Agree
--	-------------------	----------	---------	-------	----------------

28 (1)

Greenfield development is important and should be a priority.	100.0% (1.0)	-	-	-	-
Greenfield development should take place in areas that were carefully evaluated by the City as most appropriate for growth.	-	-	100.0% (1.0)	-	-
Greenfield development should take place in areas in which there is an immediate interest from developers or landowners to develop.	100.0% (1.0)	-	-	-	-

31 (1)

Greenfield development is important and should be a priority.	-	-	100.0% (1.0)	-	-
Greenfield development should take place in areas that were carefully evaluated by the City as most appropriate for growth.	-	-	-	-	100.0% (1.0)
Greenfield development should take place in areas in which there is an immediate interest from developers or landowners to develop.	-	100.0% (1.0)	-	-	-

32 (1)

Greenfield development is important and should be a priority.	-	-	100.0% (1.0)	-	-
Greenfield development should take place in areas that were carefully evaluated by the City as most appropriate for growth.	-	-	-	-	100.0% (1.0)
Greenfield development should take place in areas in which there is an immediate interest from developers or landowners to develop.	-	-	100.0% (1.0)	-	-

33 (1)

Greenfield development is important and should be a priority.	-	-	100.0% (1.0)	-	-
Greenfield development should take place in areas that were carefully evaluated by the City as most appropriate for growth.	-	-	-	-	100.0% (1.0)
Greenfield development should take place in areas in which there is an immediate interest from developers or landowners to develop.	-	-	100.0% (1.0)	-	-

34 (1)

Greenfield development is important and should be a priority.	-	-	-	-	100.0% (1.0)
Greenfield development should take place in areas that were carefully evaluated by the City as most appropriate for growth.	-	-	-	-	100.0% (1.0)
Greenfield development should take place in areas in which there is an immediate interest from developers or landowners to develop.	-	-	-	100.0% (1.0)	-

35 (5)

Greenfield development is important and should be a priority.	40.0% (2.0)	-	20.0% (1.0)	40.0% (2.0)	-
Greenfield development should take place in areas that were carefully evaluated by the City as most appropriate for growth.	-	-	-	80.0% (4.0)	20.0% (1.0)
Greenfield development should take place in areas in which there is an immediate interest from developers or landowners to develop.	60.0% (3.0)	20.0% (1.0)	20.0% (1.0)	-	-

36 (3)

Greenfield development is important and should be a priority.	33.3% (1.0)	33.3% (1.0)	-	33.3% (1.0)	-
Greenfield development should take place in areas that were carefully evaluated by the City as most appropriate for growth.	-	-	33.3% (1.0)	33.3% (1.0)	33.3% (1.0)
Greenfield development should take place in areas in which there is an immediate interest from developers or landowners to develop.	33.3% (1.0)	33.3% (1.0)	-	33.3% (1.0)	-

37 (5)

Greenfield development is important and should be a priority.	40.0% (2.0)	-	40.0% (2.0)	-	20.0% (1.0)
Greenfield development should take place in areas that were carefully evaluated by the City as most appropriate for growth.	-	-	-	80.0% (4.0)	20.0% (1.0)
Greenfield development should take place in areas in which there is an immediate interest from developers or landowners to develop.	20.0% (1.0)	20.0% (1.0)	20.0% (1.0)	20.0% (1.0)	20.0% (1.0)

38 (3)

Greenfield development is important and should be a priority.	-	-	33.3% (1.0)	33.3% (1.0)	33.3% (1.0)
Greenfield development should take place in areas that were carefully evaluated by the City as most appropriate for growth.	-	-	33.3% (1.0)	33.3% (1.0)	33.3% (1.0)
Greenfield development should take place in areas in which there is an immediate interest from developers or landowners to develop.	66.7% (2.0)	-	-	-	33.3% (1.0)

39 (4)

Greenfield development is important and should be a priority.	-	50.0% (2.0)	-	50.0% (2.0)	-
Greenfield development should take place in areas that were carefully evaluated by the City as most appropriate for growth.	-	-	-	75.0% (3.0)	25.0% (1.0)
Greenfield development should take place in areas in which there is an immediate interest from developers or landowners to develop.	25.0% (1.0)	25.0% (1.0)	-	50.0% (2.0)	-

40 (3)

Greenfield development is important and should be a priority.	-	-	66.7% (2.0)	-	33.3% (1.0)
---	---	---	----------------	---	-------------

Greenfield development should take place in areas that were carefully evaluated by the City as most appropriate for growth.	-	-	33.3% (1.0)	66.7% (2.0)	-
Greenfield development should take place in areas in which there is an immediate interest from developers or landowners to develop.	-	33.3% (1.0)	33.3% (1.0)	-	33.3% (1.0)

41 (3)

Greenfield development is important and should be a priority.	-	-	66.7% (2.0)	33.3% (1.0)	-
Greenfield development should take place in areas that were carefully evaluated by the City as most appropriate for growth.	-	33.3% (1.0)	-	-	66.7% (2.0)
Greenfield development should take place in areas in which there is an immediate interest from developers or landowners to develop.	-	-	66.7% (2.0)	33.3% (1.0)	-

43 (5)

Greenfield development is important and should be a priority.	40.0% (2.0)	20.0% (1.0)	-	20.0% (1.0)	20.0% (1.0)
Greenfield development should take place in areas that were carefully evaluated by the City as most appropriate for growth.	20.0% (1.0)	-	40.0% (2.0)	-	40.0% (2.0)
Greenfield development should take place in areas in which there is an immediate interest from developers or landowners to develop.	60.0% (3.0)	20.0% (1.0)	-	-	20.0% (1.0)

44 (6)

Greenfield development is important and should be a priority.	16.7% (1.0)	33.3% (2.0)	33.3% (2.0)	16.7% (1.0)	-
Greenfield development should take place in areas that were carefully evaluated by the City as most appropriate for growth.	-	16.7% (1.0)	-	66.7% (4.0)	16.7% (1.0)
Greenfield development should take place in areas in which there is an immediate interest from developers or landowners to develop.	33.3% (2.0)	33.3% (2.0)	16.7% (1.0)	-	16.7% (1.0)

45 (2)

Greenfield development is important and should be a priority.	50.0% (1.0)	-	50.0% (1.0)	-	-
Greenfield development should take place in areas that were carefully evaluated by the City as most appropriate for growth.	-	-	50.0% (1.0)	-	50.0% (1.0)
Greenfield development should take place in areas in which there is an immediate interest from developers or landowners to develop.	-	100.0% (2.0)	-	-	-

46 (1)

Greenfield development is important and should be a priority.	-	100.0% (1.0)	-	-	-
Greenfield development should take place in areas that were carefully evaluated by the City as most appropriate for growth.	-	-	-	100.0% (1.0)	-
Greenfield development should take place in areas in which there is an immediate interest from developers or landowners to develop.	-	-	100.0% (1.0)	-	-

47 (3)

Greenfield development is important and should be a priority.	-	-	66.7% (2.0)	-	33.3% (1.0)
Greenfield development should take place in areas that were carefully evaluated by the City as most appropriate for growth.	-	-	33.3% (1.0)	-	66.7% (2.0)
Greenfield development should take place in areas in which there is an immediate interest from developers or landowners to develop.	-	-	66.7% (2.0)	-	33.3% (1.0)

48 (2)

Greenfield development is important and should be a priority.	-	-	-	50.0% (1.0)	50.0% (1.0)
Greenfield development should take place in areas that were carefully evaluated by the City as most appropriate for growth.	50.0% (1.0)	-	-	-	50.0% (1.0)
Greenfield development should take place in areas in which there is an immediate interest from developers or landowners to develop.	-	-	-	100.0% (2.0)	-

49 (4)

Greenfield development is important and should be a priority.	-	100.0% (4.0)	-	-	-
Greenfield development should take place in areas that were carefully evaluated by the City as most appropriate for growth.	-	25.0% (1.0)	25.0% (1.0)	50.0% (2.0)	-
Greenfield development should take place in areas in which there is an immediate interest from developers or landowners to develop.	50.0% (2.0)	25.0% (1.0)	25.0% (1.0)	-	-

50 (1)

Greenfield development is important and should be a priority.	-	100.0% (1.0)	-	-	-
Greenfield development should take place in areas that were carefully evaluated by the City as most appropriate for growth.	-	-	-	-	100.0% (1.0)
Greenfield development should take place in areas in which there is an immediate interest from developers or landowners to develop.	-	-	100.0% (1.0)	-	-

51 (1)

Greenfield development is important and should be a priority.	-	100.0% (1.0)	-	-	-
Greenfield development should take place in areas that were carefully evaluated by the City as most appropriate for growth.	-	-	100.0% (1.0)	-	-
Greenfield development should take place in areas in which there is an immediate interest from developers or landowners to develop.	-	100.0% (1.0)	-	-	-

52 (5)

Greenfield development is important and should be a priority.	20.0% (1.0)	40.0% (2.0)	20.0% (1.0)	20.0% (1.0)	-
Greenfield development should take place in areas that were carefully evaluated by the City as most appropriate for growth.	20.0% (1.0)	-	-	60.0% (3.0)	20.0% (1.0)
Greenfield development should take place in areas in which there is an immediate interest from developers or landowners to develop.	20.0% (1.0)	60.0% (3.0)	20.0% (1.0)	-	-

53 (4)

Greenfield development is important and should be a priority.	-	-	50.0% (2.0)	50.0% (2.0)	-
Greenfield development should take place in areas that were carefully evaluated by the City as most appropriate for growth.	-	25.0% (1.0)	25.0% (1.0)	50.0% (2.0)	-
Greenfield development should take place in areas in which there is an immediate interest from developers or landowners to develop.	25.0% (1.0)	-	50.0% (2.0)	-	25.0% (1.0)

54 (1)

Greenfield development is important and should be a priority.	-	-	100.0% (1.0)	-	-
Greenfield development should take place in areas that were carefully evaluated by the City as most appropriate for growth.	-	-	-	-	100.0% (1.0)
Greenfield development should take place in areas in which there is an immediate interest from developers or landowners to develop.	100.0% (1.0)	-	-	-	-

55 (3)

Greenfield development is important and should be a priority.	66.7% (2.0)	-	33.3% (1.0)	-	-
Greenfield development should take place in areas that were carefully evaluated by the City as most appropriate for growth.	-	33.3% (1.0)	-	66.7% (2.0)	-
Greenfield development should take place in areas in which there is an immediate interest from developers or landowners to develop.	66.7% (2.0)	-	33.3% (1.0)	-	-

56 (2)

Greenfield development is important and should be a priority.	100.0% (2.0)	-	-	-	-
Greenfield development should take place in areas that were carefully evaluated by the City as most appropriate for growth.	50.0% (1.0)	-	50.0% (1.0)	-	-
Greenfield development should take place in areas in which there is an immediate interest from developers or landowners to develop.	100.0% (2.0)	-	-	-	-

57 (1)

Greenfield development is important and should be a priority.	100.0% (1.0)	-	-	-	-
Greenfield development should take place in areas that were carefully evaluated by the City as most appropriate for growth.	-	-	100.0% (1.0)	-	-
Greenfield development should take place in areas in which there is an immediate interest from developers or landowners to develop.	100.0% (1.0)	-	-	-	-

59 (5)

Greenfield development is important and should be a priority.	-	60.0% (3.0)	20.0% (1.0)	20.0% (1.0)	-
Greenfield development should take place in areas that were carefully evaluated by the City as most appropriate for growth.	-	20.0% (1.0)	20.0% (1.0)	40.0% (2.0)	20.0% (1.0)

Greenfield development should take place in areas in which there is an immediate interest from developers or landowners to develop.	40.0% (2.0)	40.0% (2.0)	20.0% (1.0)	-	-
60 (3)					
Greenfield development is important and should be a priority.	66.7% (2.0)	33.3% (1.0)	-	-	-
Greenfield development should take place in areas that were carefully evaluated by the City as most appropriate for growth.	-	66.7% (2.0)	33.3% (1.0)	-	-
Greenfield development should take place in areas in which there is an immediate interest from developers or landowners to develop.	100.0% (3.0)	-	-	-	-
61 (1)					
Greenfield development is important and should be a priority.	-	-	-	100.0% (1.0)	-
Greenfield development should take place in areas that were carefully evaluated by the City as most appropriate for growth.	-	-	-	100.0% (1.0)	-
Greenfield development should take place in areas in which there is an immediate interest from developers or landowners to develop.	-	-	-	100.0% (1.0)	-
62 (5)					
Greenfield development is important and should be a priority.	20.0% (1.0)	20.0% (1.0)	20.0% (1.0)	40.0% (2.0)	-
Greenfield development should take place in areas that were carefully evaluated by the City as most appropriate for growth.	-	-	-	40.0% (2.0)	60.0% (3.0)
Greenfield development should take place in areas in which there is an immediate interest from developers or landowners to develop.	20.0% (1.0)	40.0% (2.0)	40.0% (2.0)	-	-
63 (2)					
Greenfield development is important and should be a priority.	-	50.0% (1.0)	-	-	50.0% (1.0)
Greenfield development should take place in areas that were carefully evaluated by the City as most appropriate for growth.	-	50.0% (1.0)	-	50.0% (1.0)	-
Greenfield development should take place in areas in which there is an immediate interest from developers or landowners to develop.	-	50.0% (1.0)	-	-	50.0% (1.0)
64 (5)					
Greenfield development is important and should be a priority.	-	-	60.0% (3.0)	40.0% (2.0)	-
Greenfield development should take place in areas that were carefully evaluated by the City as most appropriate for growth.	-	-	20.0% (1.0)	40.0% (2.0)	40.0% (2.0)
Greenfield development should take place in areas in which there is an immediate interest from developers or landowners to develop.	40.0% (2.0)	-	40.0% (2.0)	20.0% (1.0)	-
65 (2)					
Greenfield development is important and should be a priority.	50.0% (1.0)	50.0% (1.0)	-	-	-
Greenfield development should take place in areas that were carefully evaluated by the City as most appropriate for growth.	50.0% (1.0)	50.0% (1.0)	-	-	-
Greenfield development should take place in areas in which there is an immediate interest from developers or landowners to develop.	100.0% (2.0)	-	-	-	-
66 (2)					
Greenfield development is important and should be a priority.	-	50.0% (1.0)	50.0% (1.0)	-	-
Greenfield development should take place in areas that were carefully evaluated by the City as most appropriate for growth.	-	-	-	100.0% (2.0)	-
Greenfield development should take place in areas in which there is an immediate interest from developers or landowners to develop.	50.0% (1.0)	-	50.0% (1.0)	-	-
67 (1)					
Greenfield development is important and should be a priority.	-	-	-	100.0% (1.0)	-
Greenfield development should take place in areas that were carefully evaluated by the City as most appropriate for growth.	-	-	-	100.0% (1.0)	-
Greenfield development should take place in areas in which there is an immediate interest from developers or landowners to develop.	-	100.0% (1.0)	-	-	-
68 (3)					

Greenfield development is important and should be a priority.	-	100.0% (3.0)	-	-	-
Greenfield development should take place in areas that were carefully evaluated by the City as most appropriate for growth.	-	-	66.7% (2.0)	-	33.3% (1.0)
Greenfield development should take place in areas in which there is an immediate interest from developers or landowners to develop.	-	66.7% (2.0)	33.3% (1.0)	-	-
69 (2)					
Greenfield development is important and should be a priority.	-	-	50.0% (1.0)	-	50.0% (1.0)
Greenfield development should take place in areas that were carefully evaluated by the City as most appropriate for growth.	-	-	-	100.0% (2.0)	-
Greenfield development should take place in areas in which there is an immediate interest from developers or landowners to develop.	-	-	50.0% (1.0)	50.0% (1.0)	-
71 (2)					
Greenfield development is important and should be a priority.	-	50.0% (1.0)	-	-	50.0% (1.0)
Greenfield development should take place in areas that were carefully evaluated by the City as most appropriate for growth.	-	-	50.0% (1.0)	-	50.0% (1.0)
Greenfield development should take place in areas in which there is an immediate interest from developers or landowners to develop.	50.0% (1.0)	-	-	-	50.0% (1.0)
72 (3)					
Greenfield development is important and should be a priority.	33.3% (1.0)	33.3% (1.0)	-	33.3% (1.0)	-
Greenfield development should take place in areas that were carefully evaluated by the City as most appropriate for growth.	-	-	-	33.3% (1.0)	66.7% (2.0)
Greenfield development should take place in areas in which there is an immediate interest from developers or landowners to develop.	66.7% (2.0)	33.3% (1.0)	-	-	-
73 (3)					
Greenfield development is important and should be a priority.	66.7% (2.0)	33.3% (1.0)	-	-	-
Greenfield development should take place in areas that were carefully evaluated by the City as most appropriate for growth.	33.3% (1.0)	-	-	66.7% (2.0)	-
Greenfield development should take place in areas in which there is an immediate interest from developers or landowners to develop.	33.3% (1.0)	66.7% (2.0)	-	-	-
74 (4)					
Greenfield development is important and should be a priority.	50.0% (2.0)	25.0% (1.0)	25.0% (1.0)	-	-
Greenfield development should take place in areas that were carefully evaluated by the City as most appropriate for growth.	25.0% (1.0)	-	-	25.0% (1.0)	50.0% (2.0)
Greenfield development should take place in areas in which there is an immediate interest from developers or landowners to develop.	75.0% (3.0)	25.0% (1.0)	-	-	-
77 (2)					
Greenfield development is important and should be a priority.	-	50.0% (1.0)	-	-	50.0% (1.0)
Greenfield development should take place in areas that were carefully evaluated by the City as most appropriate for growth.	-	-	-	50.0% (1.0)	50.0% (1.0)
Greenfield development should take place in areas in which there is an immediate interest from developers or landowners to develop.	-	100.0% (2.0)	-	-	-
79 (2)					
Greenfield development is important and should be a priority.	-	-	100.0% (2.0)	-	-
Greenfield development should take place in areas that were carefully evaluated by the City as most appropriate for growth.	-	-	-	50.0% (1.0)	50.0% (1.0)
Greenfield development should take place in areas in which there is an immediate interest from developers or landowners to develop.	50.0% (1.0)	50.0% (1.0)	-	-	-
Unknown (68)					
Greenfield development is important and should be a priority.	14.7% (10.0)	14.7% (10.0)	42.6% (29.0)	20.6% (14.0)	7.4% (5.0)
Greenfield development should take place in areas that were carefully evaluated by the City as most appropriate for growth.	2.9% (2.0)	5.9% (4.0)	16.2% (11.0)	51.5% (35.0)	23.5% (16.0)

	20.6% (14.0)	23.5% (16.0)	36.8% (25.0)	14.7% (10.0)	4.4% (3.0)
Greenfield development should take place in areas in which there is an immediate interest from developers or landowners to develop.					
STATE INCOME DECILE					187 REGISTERED VOTERS
	Strongly Disagree	Disagree	Neutral	Agree	Strongly Agree
0 to 9 Pct range (6)					
Greenfield development is important and should be a priority.	-	33.3% (2.0)	50.0% (3.0)	16.7% (1.0)	-
Greenfield development should take place in areas that were carefully evaluated by the City as most appropriate for growth.	-	-	16.7% (1.0)	50.0% (3.0)	33.3% (2.0)
Greenfield development should take place in areas in which there is an immediate interest from developers or landowners to develop.	33.3% (2.0)	33.3% (2.0)	33.3% (2.0)	-	-
10 to 19 Pct range (1)					
Greenfield development is important and should be a priority.	100.0% (1.0)	-	-	-	-
Greenfield development should take place in areas that were carefully evaluated by the City as most appropriate for growth.	-	-	100.0% (1.0)	-	-
Greenfield development should take place in areas in which there is an immediate interest from developers or landowners to develop.	-	100.0% (1.0)	-	-	-
40 to 49 Pct range (2)					
Greenfield development is important and should be a priority.	-	-	100.0% (2.0)	-	-
Greenfield development should take place in areas that were carefully evaluated by the City as most appropriate for growth.	-	-	-	50.0% (1.0)	50.0% (1.0)
Greenfield development should take place in areas in which there is an immediate interest from developers or landowners to develop.	50.0% (1.0)	50.0% (1.0)	-	-	-
50 to 59 Pct range (9)					
Greenfield development is important and should be a priority.	22.2% (2.0)	22.2% (2.0)	11.1% (1.0)	33.3% (3.0)	11.1% (1.0)
Greenfield development should take place in areas that were carefully evaluated by the City as most appropriate for growth.	-	11.1% (1.0)	22.2% (2.0)	33.3% (3.0)	33.3% (3.0)
Greenfield development should take place in areas in which there is an immediate interest from developers or landowners to develop.	22.2% (2.0)	22.2% (2.0)	22.2% (2.0)	33.3% (3.0)	-
60 to 69 Pct range (7)					
Greenfield development is important and should be a priority.	-	14.3% (1.0)	42.9% (3.0)	28.6% (2.0)	14.3% (1.0)
Greenfield development should take place in areas that were carefully evaluated by the City as most appropriate for growth.	-	14.3% (1.0)	-	57.1% (4.0)	28.6% (2.0)
Greenfield development should take place in areas in which there is an immediate interest from developers or landowners to develop.	-	28.6% (2.0)	42.9% (3.0)	14.3% (1.0)	14.3% (1.0)
70 to 79 Pct range (5)					
Greenfield development is important and should be a priority.	60.0% (3.0)	-	20.0% (1.0)	-	20.0% (1.0)
Greenfield development should take place in areas that were carefully evaluated by the City as most appropriate for growth.	20.0% (1.0)	-	-	40.0% (2.0)	40.0% (2.0)
Greenfield development should take place in areas in which there is an immediate interest from developers or landowners to develop.	80.0% (4.0)	-	-	-	20.0% (1.0)
80 to 89 Pct range (70)					
Greenfield development is important and should be a priority.	18.6% (13.0)	20.0% (14.0)	32.9% (23.0)	22.9% (16.0)	5.7% (4.0)
Greenfield development should take place in areas that were carefully evaluated by the City as most appropriate for growth.	4.3% (3.0)	10.0% (7.0)	15.7% (11.0)	44.3% (31.0)	25.7% (18.0)
Greenfield development should take place in areas in which there is an immediate interest from developers or landowners to develop.	28.6% (20.0)	27.1% (19.0)	28.6% (20.0)	12.9% (9.0)	2.9% (2.0)
90 Pct and up (85)					
Greenfield development is important and should be a priority.	17.6% (15.0)	25.9% (22.0)	30.6% (26.0)	15.3% (13.0)	10.6% (9.0)
Greenfield development should take place in areas that were carefully evaluated by the City as most appropriate for growth.	5.9% (5.0)	5.9% (5.0)	17.6% (15.0)	44.7% (38.0)	25.9% (22.0)

Greenfield development should take place in areas in which there is an immediate interest from developers or landowners to develop.	30.6% (26.0)	23.5% (20.0)	27.1% (23.0)	9.4% (8.0)	9.4% (8.0)
---	--------------	--------------	--------------	------------	------------

Unknown (2)

Greenfield development is important and should be a priority.	50.0% (1.0)	-	50.0% (1.0)	-	-
Greenfield development should take place in areas that were carefully evaluated by the City as most appropriate for growth.	-	-	-	50.0% (1.0)	50.0% (1.0)
Greenfield development should take place in areas in which there is an immediate interest from developers or landowners to develop.	100.0% (2.0)	-	-	-	-

HOME OWNER/RENTER

187 REGISTERED VOTERS

	Strongly Disagree	Disagree	Neutral	Agree	Strongly Agree
--	-------------------	----------	---------	-------	----------------

Likely Homeowner (106)

Greenfield development is important and should be a priority.	17.9% (19.0)	26.4% (28.0)	28.3% (30.0)	18.9% (20.0)	8.5% (9.0)
Greenfield development should take place in areas that were carefully evaluated by the City as most appropriate for growth.	4.7% (5.0)	9.4% (10.0)	16.0% (17.0)	43.4% (46.0)	26.4% (28.0)
Greenfield development should take place in areas in which there is an immediate interest from developers or landowners to develop.	35.8% (38.0)	21.7% (23.0)	25.5% (27.0)	9.4% (10.0)	7.5% (8.0)

Likely Renter (55)

Greenfield development is important and should be a priority.	20.0% (11.0)	18.2% (10.0)	32.7% (18.0)	16.4% (9.0)	12.7% (7.0)
Greenfield development should take place in areas that were carefully evaluated by the City as most appropriate for growth.	5.5% (3.0)	5.5% (3.0)	16.4% (9.0)	45.5% (25.0)	27.3% (15.0)
Greenfield development should take place in areas in which there is an immediate interest from developers or landowners to develop.	23.6% (13.0)	27.3% (15.0)	25.5% (14.0)	18.2% (10.0)	5.5% (3.0)

Unknown (26)

Greenfield development is important and should be a priority.	19.2% (5.0)	11.5% (3.0)	46.2% (12.0)	23.1% (6.0)	-
Greenfield development should take place in areas that were carefully evaluated by the City as most appropriate for growth.	3.8% (1.0)	3.8% (1.0)	15.4% (4.0)	46.2% (12.0)	30.8% (8.0)
Greenfield development should take place in areas in which there is an immediate interest from developers or landowners to develop.	23.1% (6.0)	34.6% (9.0)	34.6% (9.0)	3.8% (1.0)	3.8% (1.0)

For the purposes of this survey, “grayfield development” is defined as new development that occurs on that land that is already developed, often surrounded by other developed areas. Please rate your level of agreement with the following statements about grayfield development in Fitchburg:

CURRENT RESULTS						303 Total Responses
	Strongly Disagree	Disagree	Neutral	Agree	Strongly Agree	
Grayfield development is important and should be a priority.	3% (8)	7% (21)	26% (78)	42% (126)	23% (70)	
Grayfield development should take place in areas that were carefully evaluated by the City as most appropriate for growth.	3% (8)	4% (12)	13% (40)	51% (154)	29% (89)	
Grayfield development should take place in areas in which there is an immediate interest from developers or landowners to develop.	15% (44)	12% (36)	31% (93)	32% (96)	11% (34)	
The City should take an active role in encouraging and supporting grayfield development.	6% (17)	7% (21)	22% (67)	39% (119)	26% (79)	

REGISTERED (181)

	Strongly Disagree	Disagree	Neutral	Agree	Strongly Agree	
Grayfield development is important and should be a priority.	3.0% (5)	7.0% (12)	24.0% (43)	42.0% (76)	25.0% (45)	
Grayfield development should take place in areas that were carefully evaluated by the City as most appropriate for growth.	2.0% (4)	4.0% (7)	13.0% (24)	52.0% (95)	28.0% (51)	
Grayfield development should take place in areas in which there is an immediate interest from developers or landowners to develop.	15.0% (28)	12.0% (21)	29.0% (52)	34.0% (61)	10.0% (19)	
The City should take an active role in encouraging and supporting grayfield development.	4.0% (8)	6.0% (11)	19.0% (35)	42.0% (76)	28.0% (51)	

NON-REGISTERED (122)

	Strongly Disagree	Disagree	Neutral	Agree	Strongly Agree	
Grayfield development is important and should be a priority.	2.5% (3)	7.4% (9)	28.7% (35)	41.0% (50)	20.5% (25)	
Grayfield development should take place in areas that were carefully evaluated by the City as most appropriate for growth.	3.3% (4)	4.1% (5)	13.1% (16)	48.4% (59)	31.1% (38)	
Grayfield development should take place in areas in which there is an immediate interest from developers or landowners to develop.	13.1% (16)	12.3% (15)	33.6% (41)	28.7% (35)	12.3% (15)	
The City should take an active role in encouraging and supporting grayfield development.	7.4% (9)	8.2% (10)	26.2% (32)	35.2% (43)	23.0% (28)	

ALL RESPONDENTS (303)

	Strongly Disagree	Disagree	Neutral	Agree	Strongly Agree	
Grayfield development is important and should be a priority.	3% (8)	7% (21)	26% (78)	42% (126)	23% (70)	
Grayfield development should take place in areas that were carefully evaluated by the City as most appropriate for growth.	3% (8)	4% (12)	13% (40)	51% (154)	29% (89)	
Grayfield development should take place in areas in which there is an immediate interest from developers or landowners to develop.	15% (44)	12% (36)	31% (93)	32% (96)	11% (34)	
The City should take an active role in encouraging and supporting grayfield development.	6% (17)	7% (21)	22% (67)	39% (119)	26% (79)	

REGISTERED VOTERS IN FITCHBURG, WI (181)

	Strongly Disagree	Disagree	Neutral	Agree	Strongly Agree	
Grayfield development is important and should be a priority.	3% (5)	7% (12)	24% (43)	42% (76)	25% (45)	
Grayfield development should take place in areas that were carefully evaluated by the City as most appropriate for growth.	2% (4)	4% (7)	13% (24)	52% (95)	28% (51)	
Grayfield development should take place in areas in which there is an immediate interest from developers or landowners to develop.	15% (28)	12% (21)	29% (52)	34% (61)	10% (19)	
The City should take an active role in encouraging and supporting grayfield development.	4% (8)	6% (11)	19% (35)	42% (76)	28% (51)	

LIVE IN FITCHBURG, WI (267) - SELF-REPORTED

	Strongly Disagree	Disagree	Neutral	Agree	Strongly Agree
Grayfield development is important and should be a priority.	3% (8)	7% (19)	26% (69)	40% (107)	24% (64)
Grayfield development should take place in areas that were carefully evaluated by the City as most appropriate for growth.	3% (7)	4% (11)	12% (33)	52% (138)	29% (78)
Grayfield development should take place in areas in which there is an immediate interest from developers or landowners to develop.	13% (35)	12% (33)	30% (80)	33% (89)	11% (30)
The City should take an active role in encouraging and supporting grayfield development.	6% (16)	6% (17)	21% (57)	40% (107)	26% (70)

SUBSCRIBERS TO FITCHBURG, WI (271)

	Strongly Disagree	Disagree	Neutral	Agree	Strongly Agree
Grayfield development is important and should be a priority.	3% (8)	7% (19)	26% (70)	40% (109)	24% (65)
Grayfield development should take place in areas that were carefully evaluated by the City as most appropriate for growth.	3% (8)	4% (11)	13% (34)	51% (139)	29% (79)
Grayfield development should take place in areas in which there is an immediate interest from developers or landowners to develop.	13% (35)	12% (33)	31% (83)	33% (89)	11% (31)
The City should take an active role in encouraging and supporting grayfield development.	6% (16)	6% (17)	21% (58)	40% (109)	26% (71)

REGISTER RESPONDENTS FROM ANYWHERE (187)

	Strongly Disagree	Disagree	Neutral	Agree	Strongly Agree
Grayfield development is important and should be a priority.	3% (5)	6% (12)	24% (45)	42% (78)	25% (47)
Grayfield development should take place in areas that were carefully evaluated by the City as most appropriate for growth.	2% (4)	4% (7)	13% (25)	51% (96)	29% (55)
Grayfield development should take place in areas in which there is an immediate interest from developers or landowners to develop.	16% (30)	11% (21)	29% (54)	33% (62)	11% (20)
The City should take an active role in encouraging and supporting grayfield development.	4% (8)	6% (11)	20% (37)	42% (78)	28% (53)

EDUCATION

187 REGISTERED VOTERS

	Strongly Disagree	Disagree	Neutral	Agree	Strongly Agree
Bach Degree - Extremely Likely (30)					
Grayfield development is important and should be a priority.	10.0% (3.0)	3.3% (1.0)	30.0% (9.0)	30.0% (9.0)	26.7% (8.0)
Grayfield development should take place in areas that were carefully evaluated by the City as most appropriate for growth.	6.7% (2.0)	10.0% (3.0)	10.0% (3.0)	43.3% (13.0)	30.0% (9.0)
Grayfield development should take place in areas in which there is an immediate interest from developers or landowners to develop.	16.7% (5.0)	3.3% (1.0)	23.3% (7.0)	40.0% (12.0)	16.7% (5.0)
The City should take an active role in encouraging and supporting grayfield development.	10.0% (3.0)	6.7% (2.0)	13.3% (4.0)	36.7% (11.0)	33.3% (10.0)
Bach Degree - Likely (21)					
Grayfield development is important and should be a priority.	-	9.5% (2.0)	33.3% (7.0)	28.6% (6.0)	28.6% (6.0)
Grayfield development should take place in areas that were carefully evaluated by the City as most appropriate for growth.	-	-	19.0% (4.0)	57.1% (12.0)	23.8% (5.0)
Grayfield development should take place in areas in which there is an immediate interest from developers or landowners to develop.	9.5% (2.0)	9.5% (2.0)	47.6% (10.0)	14.3% (3.0)	19.0% (4.0)
The City should take an active role in encouraging and supporting grayfield development.	4.8% (1.0)	9.5% (2.0)	38.1% (8.0)	33.3% (7.0)	14.3% (3.0)
Grad Degree - Extremely Likely (22)					
Grayfield development is important and should be a priority.	4.5% (1.0)	4.5% (1.0)	18.2% (4.0)	45.5% (10.0)	27.3% (6.0)
Grayfield development should take place in areas that were carefully evaluated by the City as most appropriate for growth.	-	13.6% (3.0)	13.6% (3.0)	45.5% (10.0)	27.3% (6.0)
Grayfield development should take place in areas in which there is an immediate interest from developers or landowners to develop.	31.8% (7.0)	13.6% (3.0)	13.6% (3.0)	31.8% (7.0)	9.1% (2.0)
The City should take an active role in encouraging and supporting grayfield development.	4.5% (1.0)	13.6% (3.0)	22.7% (5.0)	45.5% (10.0)	13.6% (3.0)

Grad Degree - Likely (13)

Grayfield development is important and should be a priority.	-	-	23.1% (3.0)	53.8% (7.0)	23.1% (3.0)
Grayfield development should take place in areas that were carefully evaluated by the City as most appropriate for growth.	-	-	7.7% (1.0)	53.8% (7.0)	38.5% (5.0)
Grayfield development should take place in areas in which there is an immediate interest from developers or landowners to develop.	7.7% (1.0)	7.7% (1.0)	23.1% (3.0)	61.5% (8.0)	-
The City should take an active role in encouraging and supporting grayfield development.	-	-	7.7% (1.0)	61.5% (8.0)	30.8% (4.0)

HS Diploma - Extremely Likely (9)

Grayfield development is important and should be a priority.	-	-	22.2% (2.0)	44.4% (4.0)	33.3% (3.0)
Grayfield development should take place in areas that were carefully evaluated by the City as most appropriate for growth.	-	-	33.3% (3.0)	55.6% (5.0)	11.1% (1.0)
Grayfield development should take place in areas in which there is an immediate interest from developers or landowners to develop.	11.1% (1.0)	-	22.2% (2.0)	55.6% (5.0)	11.1% (1.0)
The City should take an active role in encouraging and supporting grayfield development.	-	-	11.1% (1.0)	44.4% (4.0)	44.4% (4.0)

HS Diploma - Likely (4)

Grayfield development is important and should be a priority.	-	-	50.0% (2.0)	50.0% (2.0)	-
Grayfield development should take place in areas that were carefully evaluated by the City as most appropriate for growth.	-	-	-	25.0% (1.0)	75.0% (3.0)
Grayfield development should take place in areas in which there is an immediate interest from developers or landowners to develop.	-	25.0% (1.0)	50.0% (2.0)	25.0% (1.0)	-
The City should take an active role in encouraging and supporting grayfield development.	-	-	50.0% (2.0)	25.0% (1.0)	25.0% (1.0)

Less than HS Diploma - Likely (1)

Grayfield development is important and should be a priority.	-	-	-	100.0% (1.0)	-
Grayfield development should take place in areas that were carefully evaluated by the City as most appropriate for growth.	-	-	-	-	100.0% (1.0)
Grayfield development should take place in areas in which there is an immediate interest from developers or landowners to develop.	-	-	-	100.0% (1.0)	-
The City should take an active role in encouraging and supporting grayfield development.	-	-	-	-	100.0% (1.0)

Some College - Likely (12)

Grayfield development is important and should be a priority.	-	25.0% (3.0)	16.7% (2.0)	41.7% (5.0)	16.7% (2.0)
Grayfield development should take place in areas that were carefully evaluated by the City as most appropriate for growth.	-	-	8.3% (1.0)	50.0% (6.0)	41.7% (5.0)
Grayfield development should take place in areas in which there is an immediate interest from developers or landowners to develop.	33.3% (4.0)	-	41.7% (5.0)	16.7% (2.0)	8.3% (1.0)
The City should take an active role in encouraging and supporting grayfield development.	8.3% (1.0)	16.7% (2.0)	8.3% (1.0)	33.3% (4.0)	33.3% (4.0)

Some College -Extremely Likely (5)

Grayfield development is important and should be a priority.	-	-	20.0% (1.0)	40.0% (2.0)	40.0% (2.0)
Grayfield development should take place in areas that were carefully evaluated by the City as most appropriate for growth.	-	-	20.0% (1.0)	40.0% (2.0)	40.0% (2.0)
Grayfield development should take place in areas in which there is an immediate interest from developers or landowners to develop.	-	20.0% (1.0)	20.0% (1.0)	40.0% (2.0)	20.0% (1.0)
The City should take an active role in encouraging and supporting grayfield development.	-	-	-	60.0% (3.0)	40.0% (2.0)

Unknown (70)

Grayfield development is important and should be a priority.	1.4% (1.0)	7.1% (5.0)	21.4% (15.0)	45.7% (32.0)	24.3% (17.0)
Grayfield development should take place in areas that were carefully evaluated by the City as most appropriate for growth.	2.9% (2.0)	1.4% (1.0)	12.9% (9.0)	57.1% (40.0)	25.7% (18.0)
Grayfield development should take place in areas in which there is an immediate interest from developers or landowners to develop.	14.3% (10.0)	17.1% (12.0)	30.0% (21.0)	30.0% (21.0)	8.6% (6.0)
		2.9%	21.4%	42.9%	30.0%

The City should take an active role in encouraging and supporting grayfield development.	2.9% (2.0)	(2.0)	(15.0)	(30.0)	(21.0)
--	------------	-------	--------	--------	--------

VOTERS GENDER

187 REGISTERED VOTERS

	Strongly Disagree	Disagree	Neutral	Agree	Strongly Agree
--	-------------------	----------	---------	-------	----------------

F (90)

Grayfield development is important and should be a priority.	3.3% (3.0)	11.1% (10.0)	26.7% (24.0)	43.3% (39.0)	15.6% (14.0)
Grayfield development should take place in areas that were carefully evaluated by the City as most appropriate for growth.	2.2% (2.0)	3.3% (3.0)	13.3% (12.0)	54.4% (49.0)	26.7% (24.0)
Grayfield development should take place in areas in which there is an immediate interest from developers or landowners to develop.	20.0% (18.0)	12.2% (11.0)	30.0% (27.0)	32.2% (29.0)	5.6% (5.0)
The City should take an active role in encouraging and supporting grayfield development.	3.3% (3.0)	8.9% (8.0)	23.3% (21.0)	45.6% (41.0)	18.9% (17.0)

M (95)

Grayfield development is important and should be a priority.	2.1% (2.0)	2.1% (2.0)	20.0% (19.0)	41.1% (39.0)	34.7% (33.0)
Grayfield development should take place in areas that were carefully evaluated by the City as most appropriate for growth.	2.1% (2.0)	4.2% (4.0)	12.6% (12.0)	48.4% (46.0)	32.6% (31.0)
Grayfield development should take place in areas in which there is an immediate interest from developers or landowners to develop.	12.6% (12.0)	10.5% (10.0)	27.4% (26.0)	33.7% (32.0)	15.8% (15.0)
The City should take an active role in encouraging and supporting grayfield development.	5.3% (5.0)	3.2% (3.0)	15.8% (15.0)	37.9% (36.0)	37.9% (36.0)

Unknown (2)

Grayfield development is important and should be a priority.	-	-	100.0% (2.0)	-	-
Grayfield development should take place in areas that were carefully evaluated by the City as most appropriate for growth.	-	-	50.0% (1.0)	50.0% (1.0)	-
Grayfield development should take place in areas in which there is an immediate interest from developers or landowners to develop.	-	-	50.0% (1.0)	50.0% (1.0)	-
The City should take an active role in encouraging and supporting grayfield development.	-	-	50.0% (1.0)	50.0% (1.0)	-

PRECINCT

187 REGISTERED VOTERS

	Strongly Disagree	Disagree	Neutral	Agree	Strongly Agree
--	-------------------	----------	---------	-------	----------------

CHICAGO 43-04 (1)

Grayfield development is important and should be a priority.	-	-	100.0% (1.0)	-	-
Grayfield development should take place in areas that were carefully evaluated by the City as most appropriate for growth.	-	-	-	-	100.0% (1.0)
Grayfield development should take place in areas in which there is an immediate interest from developers or landowners to develop.	100.0% (1.0)	-	-	-	-
The City should take an active role in encouraging and supporting grayfield development.	-	-	100.0% (1.0)	-	-

FITCHBURG CITY WARD 01 (9)

Grayfield development is important and should be a priority.	-	-	33.3% (3.0)	55.6% (5.0)	11.1% (1.0)
Grayfield development should take place in areas that were carefully evaluated by the City as most appropriate for growth.	-	-	11.1% (1.0)	77.8% (7.0)	11.1% (1.0)
Grayfield development should take place in areas in which there is an immediate interest from developers or landowners to develop.	11.1% (1.0)	11.1% (1.0)	22.2% (2.0)	55.6% (5.0)	-
The City should take an active role in encouraging and supporting grayfield development.	-	-	55.6% (5.0)	22.2% (2.0)	22.2% (2.0)

FITCHBURG CITY WARD 02 (3)

Grayfield development is important and should be a priority.	-	-	-	33.3% (1.0)	66.7% (2.0)
Grayfield development should take place in areas that were carefully evaluated by the City as most appropriate for growth.	-	-	-	66.7% (2.0)	33.3% (1.0)
Grayfield development should take place in areas in which there is an immediate interest from developers or landowners to develop.	-	-	100.0% (3.0)	-	-

The City should take an active role in encouraging and supporting grayfield development.	-	-	-	-	100.0% (3.0)
FITCHBURG CITY WARD 04 (2)					
Grayfield development is important and should be a priority.	-	50.0% (1.0)	-	50.0% (1.0)	-
Grayfield development should take place in areas that were carefully evaluated by the City as most appropriate for growth.	-	-	-	50.0% (1.0)	50.0% (1.0)
Grayfield development should take place in areas in which there is an immediate interest from developers or landowners to develop.	50.0% (1.0)	-	-	50.0% (1.0)	-
The City should take an active role in encouraging and supporting grayfield development.	-	-	50.0% (1.0)	50.0% (1.0)	-
FITCHBURG CITY WARD 05 (6)					
Grayfield development is important and should be a priority.	-	-	-	33.3% (2.0)	66.7% (4.0)
Grayfield development should take place in areas that were carefully evaluated by the City as most appropriate for growth.	-	-	-	83.3% (5.0)	16.7% (1.0)
Grayfield development should take place in areas in which there is an immediate interest from developers or landowners to develop.	16.7% (1.0)	-	-	50.0% (3.0)	33.3% (2.0)
The City should take an active role in encouraging and supporting grayfield development.	-	16.7% (1.0)	-	33.3% (2.0)	50.0% (3.0)
FITCHBURG CITY WARD 06 (12)					
Grayfield development is important and should be a priority.	-	8.3% (1.0)	33.3% (4.0)	33.3% (4.0)	25.0% (3.0)
Grayfield development should take place in areas that were carefully evaluated by the City as most appropriate for growth.	8.3% (1.0)	8.3% (1.0)	-	41.7% (5.0)	41.7% (5.0)
Grayfield development should take place in areas in which there is an immediate interest from developers or landowners to develop.	16.7% (2.0)	8.3% (1.0)	33.3% (4.0)	33.3% (4.0)	8.3% (1.0)
The City should take an active role in encouraging and supporting grayfield development.	-	8.3% (1.0)	-	50.0% (6.0)	41.7% (5.0)
FITCHBURG CITY WARD 07 (18)					
Grayfield development is important and should be a priority.	5.6% (1.0)	5.6% (1.0)	22.2% (4.0)	50.0% (9.0)	16.7% (3.0)
Grayfield development should take place in areas that were carefully evaluated by the City as most appropriate for growth.	5.6% (1.0)	-	11.1% (2.0)	50.0% (9.0)	33.3% (6.0)
Grayfield development should take place in areas in which there is an immediate interest from developers or landowners to develop.	22.2% (4.0)	11.1% (2.0)	27.8% (5.0)	16.7% (3.0)	22.2% (4.0)
The City should take an active role in encouraging and supporting grayfield development.	5.6% (1.0)	5.6% (1.0)	22.2% (4.0)	38.9% (7.0)	27.8% (5.0)
FITCHBURG CITY WARD 08 (14)					
Grayfield development is important and should be a priority.	-	7.1% (1.0)	28.6% (4.0)	28.6% (4.0)	35.7% (5.0)
Grayfield development should take place in areas that were carefully evaluated by the City as most appropriate for growth.	-	7.1% (1.0)	28.6% (4.0)	50.0% (7.0)	14.3% (2.0)
Grayfield development should take place in areas in which there is an immediate interest from developers or landowners to develop.	14.3% (2.0)	7.1% (1.0)	28.6% (4.0)	28.6% (4.0)	21.4% (3.0)
The City should take an active role in encouraging and supporting grayfield development.	-	7.1% (1.0)	21.4% (3.0)	50.0% (7.0)	21.4% (3.0)
FITCHBURG CITY WARD 09 (8)					
Grayfield development is important and should be a priority.	-	-	37.5% (3.0)	50.0% (4.0)	12.5% (1.0)
Grayfield development should take place in areas that were carefully evaluated by the City as most appropriate for growth.	-	12.5% (1.0)	12.5% (1.0)	50.0% (4.0)	25.0% (2.0)
Grayfield development should take place in areas in which there is an immediate interest from developers or landowners to develop.	12.5% (1.0)	25.0% (2.0)	25.0% (2.0)	25.0% (2.0)	12.5% (1.0)
The City should take an active role in encouraging and supporting grayfield development.	-	12.5% (1.0)	37.5% (3.0)	37.5% (3.0)	12.5% (1.0)
FITCHBURG CITY WARD 12 (2)					
Grayfield development is important and should be a priority.	-	-	-	100.0% (2.0)	-
Grayfield development should take place in areas that were carefully evaluated by the City as most appropriate for growth.	-	-	-	50.0% (1.0)	50.0% (1.0)
Grayfield development should take place in areas in which there is an immediate interest from developers or	-	-	100.0%	-	-

landowners to develop.			(2.0)		
The City should take an active role in encouraging and supporting grayfield development.	-	-	-	100.0% (2.0)	-
FITCHBURG CITY WARD 13 (31)					
Grayfield development is important and should be a priority.	3.2% (1.0)	6.5% (2.0)	35.5% (11.0)	35.5% (11.0)	19.4% (6.0)
Grayfield development should take place in areas that were carefully evaluated by the City as most appropriate for growth.	3.2% (1.0)	3.2% (1.0)	12.9% (4.0)	41.9% (13.0)	38.7% (12.0)
Grayfield development should take place in areas in which there is an immediate interest from developers or landowners to develop.	16.1% (5.0)	6.5% (2.0)	35.5% (11.0)	32.3% (10.0)	9.7% (3.0)
The City should take an active role in encouraging and supporting grayfield development.	6.5% (2.0)	3.2% (1.0)	19.4% (6.0)	41.9% (13.0)	29.0% (9.0)
FITCHBURG CITY WARD 14 (19)					
Grayfield development is important and should be a priority.	5.3% (1.0)	10.5% (2.0)	10.5% (2.0)	47.4% (9.0)	26.3% (5.0)
Grayfield development should take place in areas that were carefully evaluated by the City as most appropriate for growth.	-	5.3% (1.0)	10.5% (2.0)	57.9% (11.0)	26.3% (5.0)
Grayfield development should take place in areas in which there is an immediate interest from developers or landowners to develop.	21.1% (4.0)	21.1% (4.0)	31.6% (6.0)	21.1% (4.0)	5.3% (1.0)
The City should take an active role in encouraging and supporting grayfield development.	5.3% (1.0)	10.5% (2.0)	5.3% (1.0)	47.4% (9.0)	31.6% (6.0)
FITCHBURG CITY WARD 15 (7)					
Grayfield development is important and should be a priority.	-	-	14.3% (1.0)	85.7% (6.0)	-
Grayfield development should take place in areas that were carefully evaluated by the City as most appropriate for growth.	-	14.3% (1.0)	14.3% (1.0)	57.1% (4.0)	14.3% (1.0)
Grayfield development should take place in areas in which there is an immediate interest from developers or landowners to develop.	-	14.3% (1.0)	-	85.7% (6.0)	-
The City should take an active role in encouraging and supporting grayfield development.	-	-	14.3% (1.0)	57.1% (4.0)	28.6% (2.0)
FITCHBURG CITY WARD 16 (3)					
Grayfield development is important and should be a priority.	-	33.3% (1.0)	33.3% (1.0)	-	33.3% (1.0)
Grayfield development should take place in areas that were carefully evaluated by the City as most appropriate for growth.	-	-	33.3% (1.0)	66.7% (2.0)	-
Grayfield development should take place in areas in which there is an immediate interest from developers or landowners to develop.	33.3% (1.0)	66.7% (2.0)	-	-	-
The City should take an active role in encouraging and supporting grayfield development.	-	-	33.3% (1.0)	66.7% (2.0)	-
FITCHBURG CITY WARD 17 (7)					
Grayfield development is important and should be a priority.	-	14.3% (1.0)	28.6% (2.0)	28.6% (2.0)	28.6% (2.0)
Grayfield development should take place in areas that were carefully evaluated by the City as most appropriate for growth.	-	-	14.3% (1.0)	57.1% (4.0)	28.6% (2.0)
Grayfield development should take place in areas in which there is an immediate interest from developers or landowners to develop.	14.3% (1.0)	-	14.3% (1.0)	42.9% (3.0)	28.6% (2.0)
The City should take an active role in encouraging and supporting grayfield development.	14.3% (1.0)	-	28.6% (2.0)	28.6% (2.0)	28.6% (2.0)
FITCHBURG CITY WARD 18 (12)					
Grayfield development is important and should be a priority.	-	-	16.7% (2.0)	41.7% (5.0)	41.7% (5.0)
Grayfield development should take place in areas that were carefully evaluated by the City as most appropriate for growth.	-	-	16.7% (2.0)	58.3% (7.0)	25.0% (3.0)
Grayfield development should take place in areas in which there is an immediate interest from developers or landowners to develop.	8.3% (1.0)	8.3% (1.0)	16.7% (2.0)	66.7% (8.0)	-
The City should take an active role in encouraging and supporting grayfield development.	8.3% (1.0)	-	8.3% (1.0)	41.7% (5.0)	41.7% (5.0)
FITCHBURG CITY WARD 19 (26)					
Grayfield development is important and should be a priority.	7.7% (2.0)	7.7% (2.0)	23.1% (6.0)	38.5% (10.0)	23.1% (6.0)
Grayfield development should take place in areas that were carefully evaluated by the City as most appropriate for growth.	3.8% (1.0)	3.8% (1.0)	15.4% (4.0)	50.0% (13.0)	26.9% (7.0)

Grayfield development should take place in areas in which there is an immediate interest from developers or landowners to develop.	15.4% (4.0)	15.4% (4.0)	34.6% (9.0)	26.9% (7.0)	7.7% (2.0)
The City should take an active role in encouraging and supporting grayfield development.	7.7% (2.0)	11.5% (3.0)	26.9% (7.0)	38.5% (10.0)	15.4% (4.0)
MADISON CITY WARD 042 (1)					
Grayfield development is important and should be a priority.	-	-	-	-	100.0% (1.0)
Grayfield development should take place in areas that were carefully evaluated by the City as most appropriate for growth.	-	-	-	-	100.0% (1.0)
Grayfield development should take place in areas in which there is an immediate interest from developers or landowners to develop.	-	-	-	100.0% (1.0)	-
The City should take an active role in encouraging and supporting grayfield development.	-	-	-	-	100.0% (1.0)
MADISON CITY WARD 053 (1)					
Grayfield development is important and should be a priority.	-	-	-	-	100.0% (1.0)
Grayfield development should take place in areas that were carefully evaluated by the City as most appropriate for growth.	-	-	-	-	100.0% (1.0)
Grayfield development should take place in areas in which there is an immediate interest from developers or landowners to develop.	-	-	-	-	100.0% (1.0)
The City should take an active role in encouraging and supporting grayfield development.	-	-	-	-	100.0% (1.0)
MADISON CITY WARD 100 (1)					
Grayfield development is important and should be a priority.	-	-	-	-	100.0% (1.0)
Grayfield development should take place in areas that were carefully evaluated by the City as most appropriate for growth.	-	-	100.0% (1.0)	-	-
Grayfield development should take place in areas in which there is an immediate interest from developers or landowners to develop.	-	-	100.0% (1.0)	-	-
The City should take an active role in encouraging and supporting grayfield development.	-	-	-	-	100.0% (1.0)
MADISON CITY WARD 107 (1)					
Grayfield development is important and should be a priority.	-	-	-	100.0% (1.0)	-
Grayfield development should take place in areas that were carefully evaluated by the City as most appropriate for growth.	-	-	-	-	100.0% (1.0)
Grayfield development should take place in areas in which there is an immediate interest from developers or landowners to develop.	-	-	100.0% (1.0)	-	-
The City should take an active role in encouraging and supporting grayfield development.	-	-	-	100.0% (1.0)	-
MIDDLETON TOWN WARD 7 (1)					
Grayfield development is important and should be a priority.	-	-	100.0% (1.0)	-	-
Grayfield development should take place in areas that were carefully evaluated by the City as most appropriate for growth.	-	-	100.0% (1.0)	-	-
Grayfield development should take place in areas in which there is an immediate interest from developers or landowners to develop.	-	-	100.0% (1.0)	-	-
The City should take an active role in encouraging and supporting grayfield development.	-	-	100.0% (1.0)	-	-
MOUNT HOREB VLG WARD 3 (1)					
Grayfield development is important and should be a priority.	-	-	-	100.0% (1.0)	-
Grayfield development should take place in areas that were carefully evaluated by the City as most appropriate for growth.	-	-	-	100.0% (1.0)	-
Grayfield development should take place in areas in which there is an immediate interest from developers or landowners to develop.	100.0% (1.0)	-	-	-	-
The City should take an active role in encouraging and supporting grayfield development.	-	-	-	100.0% (1.0)	-
OREGON VLG WARD 10 (1)					
Grayfield development is important and should be a priority.	-	-	-	100.0% (1.0)	-
Grayfield development should take place in areas that were carefully evaluated by the City as most appropriate for growth.	-	-	-	-	100.0% (1.0)

Grayfield development should take place in areas in which there is an immediate interest from developers or landowners to develop.	-	-	-	100.0% (1.0)	-
The City should take an active role in encouraging and supporting grayfield development.	-	-	-	100.0% (1.0)	-
AGE RANGE				187 REGISTERED VOTERS	
	Strongly Disagree	Disagree	Neutral	Agree	Strongly Agree
18-29 (1)					
Grayfield development is important and should be a priority.	-	-	-	-	100.0% (1.0)
Grayfield development should take place in areas that were carefully evaluated by the City as most appropriate for growth.	-	-	-	100.0% (1.0)	-
Grayfield development should take place in areas in which there is an immediate interest from developers or landowners to develop.	-	100.0% (1.0)	-	-	-
The City should take an active role in encouraging and supporting grayfield development.	-	-	-	-	100.0% (1.0)
30-39 (24)					
Grayfield development is important and should be a priority.	-	8.3% (2.0)	8.3% (2.0)	41.7% (10.0)	41.7% (10.0)
Grayfield development should take place in areas that were carefully evaluated by the City as most appropriate for growth.	-	4.2% (1.0)	4.2% (1.0)	54.2% (13.0)	37.5% (9.0)
Grayfield development should take place in areas in which there is an immediate interest from developers or landowners to develop.	12.5% (3.0)	8.3% (2.0)	25.0% (6.0)	45.8% (11.0)	8.3% (2.0)
The City should take an active role in encouraging and supporting grayfield development.	-	4.2% (1.0)	8.3% (2.0)	50.0% (12.0)	37.5% (9.0)
40-49 (29)					
Grayfield development is important and should be a priority.	-	6.9% (2.0)	24.1% (7.0)	44.8% (13.0)	24.1% (7.0)
Grayfield development should take place in areas that were carefully evaluated by the City as most appropriate for growth.	3.4% (1.0)	6.9% (2.0)	17.2% (5.0)	48.3% (14.0)	24.1% (7.0)
Grayfield development should take place in areas in which there is an immediate interest from developers or landowners to develop.	13.8% (4.0)	3.4% (1.0)	17.2% (5.0)	48.3% (14.0)	17.2% (5.0)
The City should take an active role in encouraging and supporting grayfield development.	3.4% (1.0)	10.3% (3.0)	17.2% (5.0)	31.0% (9.0)	37.9% (11.0)
50-59 (23)					
Grayfield development is important and should be a priority.	-	4.3% (1.0)	26.1% (6.0)	43.5% (10.0)	26.1% (6.0)
Grayfield development should take place in areas that were carefully evaluated by the City as most appropriate for growth.	-	-	8.7% (2.0)	65.2% (15.0)	26.1% (6.0)
Grayfield development should take place in areas in which there is an immediate interest from developers or landowners to develop.	26.1% (6.0)	8.7% (2.0)	34.8% (8.0)	17.4% (4.0)	13.0% (3.0)
The City should take an active role in encouraging and supporting grayfield development.	-	4.3% (1.0)	13.0% (3.0)	52.2% (12.0)	30.4% (7.0)
60-69 (26)					
Grayfield development is important and should be a priority.	11.5% (3.0)	3.8% (1.0)	34.6% (9.0)	30.8% (8.0)	19.2% (5.0)
Grayfield development should take place in areas that were carefully evaluated by the City as most appropriate for growth.	3.8% (1.0)	7.7% (2.0)	26.9% (7.0)	38.5% (10.0)	23.1% (6.0)
Grayfield development should take place in areas in which there is an immediate interest from developers or landowners to develop.	30.8% (8.0)	7.7% (2.0)	30.8% (8.0)	23.1% (6.0)	7.7% (2.0)
The City should take an active role in encouraging and supporting grayfield development.	11.5% (3.0)	3.8% (1.0)	26.9% (7.0)	42.3% (11.0)	15.4% (4.0)
70-79 (16)					
Grayfield development is important and should be a priority.	6.3% (1.0)	-	25.0% (4.0)	31.3% (5.0)	37.5% (6.0)
Grayfield development should take place in areas that were carefully evaluated by the City as most appropriate for growth.	6.3% (1.0)	-	6.3% (1.0)	43.8% (7.0)	43.8% (7.0)
Grayfield development should take place in areas in which there is an immediate interest from developers or landowners to develop.	12.5% (2.0)	31.3% (5.0)	18.8% (3.0)	25.0% (4.0)	12.5% (2.0)
The City should take an active role in encouraging and supporting grayfield development.	6.3% (1.0)	6.3% (1.0)	12.5% (2.0)	43.8% (7.0)	31.3% (5.0)

unknown (68)

Grayfield development is important and should be a priority.	1.5% (1.0)	8.8% (6.0)	25.0% (17.0)	47.1% (32.0)	17.6% (12.0)
Grayfield development should take place in areas that were carefully evaluated by the City as most appropriate for growth.	1.5% (1.0)	2.9% (2.0)	13.2% (9.0)	52.9% (36.0)	29.4% (20.0)
Grayfield development should take place in areas in which there is an immediate interest from developers or landowners to develop.	10.3% (7.0)	11.8% (8.0)	35.3% (24.0)	33.8% (23.0)	8.8% (6.0)
The City should take an active role in encouraging and supporting grayfield development.	4.4% (3.0)	5.9% (4.0)	26.5% (18.0)	39.7% (27.0)	23.5% (16.0)

VOTERS AGE 187 REGISTERED VOTERS

	Strongly Disagree	Disagree	Neutral	Agree	Strongly Agree
--	-------------------	----------	---------	-------	----------------

28 (1)

Grayfield development is important and should be a priority.	-	-	-	-	100.0% (1.0)
Grayfield development should take place in areas that were carefully evaluated by the City as most appropriate for growth.	-	-	-	100.0% (1.0)	-
Grayfield development should take place in areas in which there is an immediate interest from developers or landowners to develop.	-	100.0% (1.0)	-	-	-
The City should take an active role in encouraging and supporting grayfield development.	-	-	-	-	100.0% (1.0)

31 (1)

Grayfield development is important and should be a priority.	-	-	-	-	100.0% (1.0)
Grayfield development should take place in areas that were carefully evaluated by the City as most appropriate for growth.	-	-	-	-	100.0% (1.0)
Grayfield development should take place in areas in which there is an immediate interest from developers or landowners to develop.	-	-	-	100.0% (1.0)	-
The City should take an active role in encouraging and supporting grayfield development.	-	-	-	100.0% (1.0)	-

32 (1)

Grayfield development is important and should be a priority.	-	-	-	100.0% (1.0)	-
Grayfield development should take place in areas that were carefully evaluated by the City as most appropriate for growth.	-	-	-	100.0% (1.0)	-
Grayfield development should take place in areas in which there is an immediate interest from developers or landowners to develop.	-	-	-	100.0% (1.0)	-
The City should take an active role in encouraging and supporting grayfield development.	-	-	-	100.0% (1.0)	-

33 (1)

Grayfield development is important and should be a priority.	-	-	100.0% (1.0)	-	-
Grayfield development should take place in areas that were carefully evaluated by the City as most appropriate for growth.	-	-	-	-	100.0% (1.0)
Grayfield development should take place in areas in which there is an immediate interest from developers or landowners to develop.	-	-	100.0% (1.0)	-	-
The City should take an active role in encouraging and supporting grayfield development.	-	-	-	-	100.0% (1.0)

34 (1)

Grayfield development is important and should be a priority.	-	-	-	100.0% (1.0)	-
Grayfield development should take place in areas that were carefully evaluated by the City as most appropriate for growth.	-	-	-	-	100.0% (1.0)
Grayfield development should take place in areas in which there is an immediate interest from developers or landowners to develop.	-	-	100.0% (1.0)	-	-
The City should take an active role in encouraging and supporting grayfield development.	-	-	-	100.0% (1.0)	-

35 (5)

Grayfield development is important and should be a priority.	-	-	-	40.0% (2.0)	60.0% (3.0)
--	---	---	---	-------------	-------------

Grayfield development should take place in areas that were carefully evaluated by the City as most appropriate for growth.	-	-	-	60.0% (3.0)	40.0% (2.0)
Grayfield development should take place in areas in which there is an immediate interest from developers or landowners to develop.	20.0% (1.0)	20.0% (1.0)	40.0% (2.0)	20.0% (1.0)	-
The City should take an active role in encouraging and supporting grayfield development.	-	-	-	40.0% (2.0)	60.0% (3.0)
36 (3)					
Grayfield development is important and should be a priority.	-	-	-	100.0% (3.0)	-
Grayfield development should take place in areas that were carefully evaluated by the City as most appropriate for growth.	-	-	-	66.7% (2.0)	33.3% (1.0)
Grayfield development should take place in areas in which there is an immediate interest from developers or landowners to develop.	-	-	-	100.0% (3.0)	-
The City should take an active role in encouraging and supporting grayfield development.	-	-	-	66.7% (2.0)	33.3% (1.0)
37 (5)					
Grayfield development is important and should be a priority.	-	-	-	40.0% (2.0)	60.0% (3.0)
Grayfield development should take place in areas that were carefully evaluated by the City as most appropriate for growth.	-	-	-	60.0% (3.0)	40.0% (2.0)
Grayfield development should take place in areas in which there is an immediate interest from developers or landowners to develop.	-	-	-	80.0% (4.0)	20.0% (1.0)
The City should take an active role in encouraging and supporting grayfield development.	-	-	-	40.0% (2.0)	60.0% (3.0)
38 (3)					
Grayfield development is important and should be a priority.	-	33.3% (1.0)	-	-	66.7% (2.0)
Grayfield development should take place in areas that were carefully evaluated by the City as most appropriate for growth.	-	-	33.3% (1.0)	66.7% (2.0)	-
Grayfield development should take place in areas in which there is an immediate interest from developers or landowners to develop.	66.7% (2.0)	-	33.3% (1.0)	-	-
The City should take an active role in encouraging and supporting grayfield development.	-	-	33.3% (1.0)	33.3% (1.0)	33.3% (1.0)
39 (4)					
Grayfield development is important and should be a priority.	-	25.0% (1.0)	25.0% (1.0)	25.0% (1.0)	25.0% (1.0)
Grayfield development should take place in areas that were carefully evaluated by the City as most appropriate for growth.	-	25.0% (1.0)	-	50.0% (2.0)	25.0% (1.0)
Grayfield development should take place in areas in which there is an immediate interest from developers or landowners to develop.	-	25.0% (1.0)	25.0% (1.0)	25.0% (1.0)	25.0% (1.0)
The City should take an active role in encouraging and supporting grayfield development.	-	25.0% (1.0)	25.0% (1.0)	50.0% (2.0)	-
40 (3)					
Grayfield development is important and should be a priority.	-	-	66.7% (2.0)	-	33.3% (1.0)
Grayfield development should take place in areas that were carefully evaluated by the City as most appropriate for growth.	-	-	66.7% (2.0)	33.3% (1.0)	-
Grayfield development should take place in areas in which there is an immediate interest from developers or landowners to develop.	-	-	66.7% (2.0)	-	33.3% (1.0)
The City should take an active role in encouraging and supporting grayfield development.	-	-	66.7% (2.0)	-	33.3% (1.0)
41 (3)					
Grayfield development is important and should be a priority.	-	-	-	66.7% (2.0)	33.3% (1.0)
Grayfield development should take place in areas that were carefully evaluated by the City as most appropriate for growth.	-	33.3% (1.0)	-	33.3% (1.0)	33.3% (1.0)
Grayfield development should take place in areas in which there is an immediate interest from developers or landowners to develop.	-	-	-	100.0% (3.0)	-
The City should take an active role in encouraging and supporting grayfield development.	-	33.3% (1.0)	-	-	66.7% (2.0)
43 (5)					
				40.0%	40.0%

Grayfield development is important and should be a priority.	-	-	(2.0)	(2.0)	20.0% (1.0)
Grayfield development should take place in areas that were carefully evaluated by the City as most appropriate for growth.	-	-	20.0% (1.0)	60.0% (3.0)	20.0% (1.0)
Grayfield development should take place in areas in which there is an immediate interest from developers or landowners to develop.	40.0% (2.0)	-	20.0% (1.0)	20.0% (1.0)	20.0% (1.0)
The City should take an active role in encouraging and supporting grayfield development.	20.0% (1.0)	20.0% (1.0)	20.0% (1.0)	-	40.0% (2.0)

44 (6)

Grayfield development is important and should be a priority.	-	-	16.7% (1.0)	33.3% (2.0)	50.0% (3.0)
Grayfield development should take place in areas that were carefully evaluated by the City as most appropriate for growth.	-	16.7% (1.0)	16.7% (1.0)	16.7% (1.0)	50.0% (3.0)
Grayfield development should take place in areas in which there is an immediate interest from developers or landowners to develop.	16.7% (1.0)	-	-	50.0% (3.0)	33.3% (2.0)
The City should take an active role in encouraging and supporting grayfield development.	-	-	-	66.7% (4.0)	33.3% (2.0)

45 (2)

Grayfield development is important and should be a priority.	-	-	-	100.0% (2.0)	-
Grayfield development should take place in areas that were carefully evaluated by the City as most appropriate for growth.	-	-	-	100.0% (2.0)	-
Grayfield development should take place in areas in which there is an immediate interest from developers or landowners to develop.	-	-	-	100.0% (2.0)	-
The City should take an active role in encouraging and supporting grayfield development.	-	-	-	50.0% (1.0)	50.0% (1.0)

46 (1)

Grayfield development is important and should be a priority.	-	-	-	100.0% (1.0)	-
Grayfield development should take place in areas that were carefully evaluated by the City as most appropriate for growth.	-	-	-	100.0% (1.0)	-
Grayfield development should take place in areas in which there is an immediate interest from developers or landowners to develop.	-	-	-	100.0% (1.0)	-
The City should take an active role in encouraging and supporting grayfield development.	-	-	100.0% (1.0)	-	-

47 (3)

Grayfield development is important and should be a priority.	-	-	33.3% (1.0)	33.3% (1.0)	33.3% (1.0)
Grayfield development should take place in areas that were carefully evaluated by the City as most appropriate for growth.	-	-	-	33.3% (1.0)	66.7% (2.0)
Grayfield development should take place in areas in which there is an immediate interest from developers or landowners to develop.	-	-	33.3% (1.0)	33.3% (1.0)	33.3% (1.0)
The City should take an active role in encouraging and supporting grayfield development.	-	-	-	33.3% (1.0)	66.7% (2.0)

48 (2)

Grayfield development is important and should be a priority.	-	-	-	100.0% (2.0)	-
Grayfield development should take place in areas that were carefully evaluated by the City as most appropriate for growth.	50.0% (1.0)	-	-	50.0% (1.0)	-
Grayfield development should take place in areas in which there is an immediate interest from developers or landowners to develop.	-	-	-	100.0% (2.0)	-
The City should take an active role in encouraging and supporting grayfield development.	-	-	50.0% (1.0)	50.0% (1.0)	-

49 (4)

Grayfield development is important and should be a priority.	-	50.0% (2.0)	25.0% (1.0)	25.0% (1.0)	-
Grayfield development should take place in areas that were carefully evaluated by the City as most appropriate for growth.	-	-	25.0% (1.0)	75.0% (3.0)	-
Grayfield development should take place in areas in which there is an immediate interest from developers or landowners to develop.	25.0% (1.0)	25.0% (1.0)	25.0% (1.0)	25.0% (1.0)	-
The City should take an active role in encouraging and supporting grayfield development.	-	25.0% (1.0)	-	50.0% (2.0)	25.0% (1.0)

50 (1)

Grayfield development is important and should be a priority.	-	-	100.0% (1.0)	-	-
Grayfield development should take place in areas that were carefully evaluated by the City as most appropriate for growth.	-	-	-	-	100.0% (1.0)
Grayfield development should take place in areas in which there is an immediate interest from developers or landowners to develop.	-	-	-	100.0% (1.0)	-
The City should take an active role in encouraging and supporting grayfield development.	-	-	100.0% (1.0)	-	-

51 (1)

Grayfield development is important and should be a priority.	-	-	-	-	100.0% (1.0)
Grayfield development should take place in areas that were carefully evaluated by the City as most appropriate for growth.	-	-	-	100.0% (1.0)	-
Grayfield development should take place in areas in which there is an immediate interest from developers or landowners to develop.	-	-	-	-	100.0% (1.0)
The City should take an active role in encouraging and supporting grayfield development.	-	-	-	-	100.0% (1.0)

52 (5)

Grayfield development is important and should be a priority.	-	-	20.0% (1.0)	80.0% (4.0)	-
Grayfield development should take place in areas that were carefully evaluated by the City as most appropriate for growth.	-	-	-	80.0% (4.0)	20.0% (1.0)
Grayfield development should take place in areas in which there is an immediate interest from developers or landowners to develop.	-	20.0% (1.0)	60.0% (3.0)	20.0% (1.0)	-
The City should take an active role in encouraging and supporting grayfield development.	-	-	20.0% (1.0)	80.0% (4.0)	-

53 (4)

Grayfield development is important and should be a priority.	-	-	25.0% (1.0)	25.0% (1.0)	50.0% (2.0)
Grayfield development should take place in areas that were carefully evaluated by the City as most appropriate for growth.	-	-	25.0% (1.0)	75.0% (3.0)	-
Grayfield development should take place in areas in which there is an immediate interest from developers or landowners to develop.	25.0% (1.0)	-	50.0% (2.0)	-	25.0% (1.0)
The City should take an active role in encouraging and supporting grayfield development.	-	-	25.0% (1.0)	50.0% (2.0)	25.0% (1.0)

54 (1)

Grayfield development is important and should be a priority.	-	-	-	100.0% (1.0)	-
Grayfield development should take place in areas that were carefully evaluated by the City as most appropriate for growth.	-	-	-	100.0% (1.0)	-
Grayfield development should take place in areas in which there is an immediate interest from developers or landowners to develop.	100.0% (1.0)	-	-	-	-
The City should take an active role in encouraging and supporting grayfield development.	-	-	-	100.0% (1.0)	-

55 (3)

Grayfield development is important and should be a priority.	-	-	66.7% (2.0)	33.3% (1.0)	-
Grayfield development should take place in areas that were carefully evaluated by the City as most appropriate for growth.	-	-	-	66.7% (2.0)	33.3% (1.0)
Grayfield development should take place in areas in which there is an immediate interest from developers or landowners to develop.	66.7% (2.0)	-	33.3% (1.0)	-	-
The City should take an active role in encouraging and supporting grayfield development.	-	-	-	66.7% (2.0)	33.3% (1.0)

56 (2)

Grayfield development is important and should be a priority.	-	-	-	50.0% (1.0)	50.0% (1.0)
Grayfield development should take place in areas that were carefully evaluated by the City as most appropriate for growth.	-	-	-	50.0% (1.0)	50.0% (1.0)
Grayfield development should take place in areas in which there is an immediate interest from developers or landowners to develop.	-	-	50.0% (1.0)	-	50.0% (1.0)
The City should take an active role in encouraging and supporting grayfield development.	-	-	-	-	100.0% (2.0)

57 (1)

Grayfield development is important and should be a priority.	-	-	-	100.0% (1.0)	-
Grayfield development should take place in areas that were carefully evaluated by the City as most appropriate for growth.	-	-	-	100.0% (1.0)	-
Grayfield development should take place in areas in which there is an immediate interest from developers or landowners to develop.	-	-	-	100.0% (1.0)	-
The City should take an active role in encouraging and supporting grayfield development.	-	-	-	-	100.0% (1.0)
59 (5)					
Grayfield development is important and should be a priority.	-	20.0% (1.0)	20.0% (1.0)	20.0% (1.0)	40.0% (2.0)
Grayfield development should take place in areas that were carefully evaluated by the City as most appropriate for growth.	-	-	20.0% (1.0)	40.0% (2.0)	40.0% (2.0)
Grayfield development should take place in areas in which there is an immediate interest from developers or landowners to develop.	40.0% (2.0)	20.0% (1.0)	20.0% (1.0)	20.0% (1.0)	-
The City should take an active role in encouraging and supporting grayfield development.	-	20.0% (1.0)	-	60.0% (3.0)	20.0% (1.0)
60 (3)					
Grayfield development is important and should be a priority.	66.7% (2.0)	-	-	33.3% (1.0)	-
Grayfield development should take place in areas that were carefully evaluated by the City as most appropriate for growth.	33.3% (1.0)	33.3% (1.0)	33.3% (1.0)	-	-
Grayfield development should take place in areas in which there is an immediate interest from developers or landowners to develop.	100.0% (3.0)	-	-	-	-
The City should take an active role in encouraging and supporting grayfield development.	66.7% (2.0)	-	-	33.3% (1.0)	-
61 (1)					
Grayfield development is important and should be a priority.	-	-	-	100.0% (1.0)	-
Grayfield development should take place in areas that were carefully evaluated by the City as most appropriate for growth.	-	-	-	100.0% (1.0)	-
Grayfield development should take place in areas in which there is an immediate interest from developers or landowners to develop.	-	-	-	100.0% (1.0)	-
The City should take an active role in encouraging and supporting grayfield development.	-	-	-	100.0% (1.0)	-
62 (5)					
Grayfield development is important and should be a priority.	20.0% (1.0)	-	20.0% (1.0)	20.0% (1.0)	40.0% (2.0)
Grayfield development should take place in areas that were carefully evaluated by the City as most appropriate for growth.	-	-	-	60.0% (3.0)	40.0% (2.0)
Grayfield development should take place in areas in which there is an immediate interest from developers or landowners to develop.	40.0% (2.0)	-	-	40.0% (2.0)	20.0% (1.0)
The City should take an active role in encouraging and supporting grayfield development.	20.0% (1.0)	-	20.0% (1.0)	20.0% (1.0)	40.0% (2.0)
63 (2)					
Grayfield development is important and should be a priority.	-	-	50.0% (1.0)	50.0% (1.0)	-
Grayfield development should take place in areas that were carefully evaluated by the City as most appropriate for growth.	-	-	50.0% (1.0)	-	50.0% (1.0)
Grayfield development should take place in areas in which there is an immediate interest from developers or landowners to develop.	-	-	50.0% (1.0)	-	50.0% (1.0)
The City should take an active role in encouraging and supporting grayfield development.	-	-	50.0% (1.0)	-	50.0% (1.0)
64 (5)					
Grayfield development is important and should be a priority.	-	20.0% (1.0)	20.0% (1.0)	60.0% (3.0)	-
Grayfield development should take place in areas that were carefully evaluated by the City as most appropriate for growth.	-	20.0% (1.0)	20.0% (1.0)	40.0% (2.0)	20.0% (1.0)
Grayfield development should take place in areas in which there is an immediate interest from developers or landowners to develop.	40.0% (2.0)	-	40.0% (2.0)	20.0% (1.0)	-
The City should take an active role in encouraging and supporting grayfield development.	-	20.0% (1.0)	20.0% (1.0)	60.0% (3.0)	-

65 (2)					
Grayfield development is important and should be a priority.	-	-	100.0% (2.0)	-	-
Grayfield development should take place in areas that were carefully evaluated by the City as most appropriate for growth.	-	-	50.0% (1.0)	50.0% (1.0)	-
Grayfield development should take place in areas in which there is an immediate interest from developers or landowners to develop.	-	-	100.0% (2.0)	-	-
The City should take an active role in encouraging and supporting grayfield development.	-	-	50.0% (1.0)	50.0% (1.0)	-
66 (2)					
Grayfield development is important and should be a priority.	-	-	100.0% (2.0)	-	-
Grayfield development should take place in areas that were carefully evaluated by the City as most appropriate for growth.	-	-	-	100.0% (2.0)	-
Grayfield development should take place in areas in which there is an immediate interest from developers or landowners to develop.	50.0% (1.0)	-	50.0% (1.0)	-	-
The City should take an active role in encouraging and supporting grayfield development.	-	-	100.0% (2.0)	-	-
67 (1)					
Grayfield development is important and should be a priority.	-	-	-	-	100.0% (1.0)
Grayfield development should take place in areas that were carefully evaluated by the City as most appropriate for growth.	-	-	-	-	100.0% (1.0)
Grayfield development should take place in areas in which there is an immediate interest from developers or landowners to develop.	-	100.0% (1.0)	-	-	-
The City should take an active role in encouraging and supporting grayfield development.	-	-	-	100.0% (1.0)	-
68 (3)					
Grayfield development is important and should be a priority.	-	-	33.3% (1.0)	33.3% (1.0)	33.3% (1.0)
Grayfield development should take place in areas that were carefully evaluated by the City as most appropriate for growth.	-	-	66.7% (2.0)	-	33.3% (1.0)
Grayfield development should take place in areas in which there is an immediate interest from developers or landowners to develop.	-	33.3% (1.0)	66.7% (2.0)	-	-
The City should take an active role in encouraging and supporting grayfield development.	-	-	33.3% (1.0)	33.3% (1.0)	33.3% (1.0)
69 (2)					
Grayfield development is important and should be a priority.	-	-	50.0% (1.0)	-	50.0% (1.0)
Grayfield development should take place in areas that were carefully evaluated by the City as most appropriate for growth.	-	-	50.0% (1.0)	50.0% (1.0)	-
Grayfield development should take place in areas in which there is an immediate interest from developers or landowners to develop.	-	-	-	100.0% (2.0)	-
The City should take an active role in encouraging and supporting grayfield development.	-	-	-	100.0% (2.0)	-
71 (2)					
Grayfield development is important and should be a priority.	-	-	100.0% (2.0)	-	-
Grayfield development should take place in areas that were carefully evaluated by the City as most appropriate for growth.	-	-	-	50.0% (1.0)	50.0% (1.0)
Grayfield development should take place in areas in which there is an immediate interest from developers or landowners to develop.	-	-	50.0% (1.0)	50.0% (1.0)	-
The City should take an active role in encouraging and supporting grayfield development.	-	50.0% (1.0)	-	50.0% (1.0)	-
72 (3)					
Grayfield development is important and should be a priority.	-	-	-	33.3% (1.0)	66.7% (2.0)
Grayfield development should take place in areas that were carefully evaluated by the City as most appropriate for growth.	-	-	-	33.3% (1.0)	66.7% (2.0)
Grayfield development should take place in areas in which there is an immediate interest from developers or landowners to develop.	-	33.3% (1.0)	33.3% (1.0)	-	33.3% (1.0)
The City should take an active role in encouraging and supporting grayfield development.	-	-	-	33.3% (1.0)	66.7% (2.0)

73 (3)

Grayfield development is important and should be a priority.	33.3% (1.0)	-	-	66.7% (2.0)	-
Grayfield development should take place in areas that were carefully evaluated by the City as most appropriate for growth.	33.3% (1.0)	-	-	66.7% (2.0)	-
Grayfield development should take place in areas in which there is an immediate interest from developers or landowners to develop.	33.3% (1.0)	-	33.3% (1.0)	33.3% (1.0)	-
The City should take an active role in encouraging and supporting grayfield development.	33.3% (1.0)	-	-	66.7% (2.0)	-

74 (4)

Grayfield development is important and should be a priority.	-	-	25.0% (1.0)	25.0% (1.0)	50.0% (2.0)
Grayfield development should take place in areas that were carefully evaluated by the City as most appropriate for growth.	-	-	-	75.0% (3.0)	25.0% (1.0)
Grayfield development should take place in areas in which there is an immediate interest from developers or landowners to develop.	25.0% (1.0)	25.0% (1.0)	-	25.0% (1.0)	25.0% (1.0)
The City should take an active role in encouraging and supporting grayfield development.	-	-	25.0% (1.0)	50.0% (2.0)	25.0% (1.0)

77 (2)

Grayfield development is important and should be a priority.	-	-	-	-	100.0% (2.0)
Grayfield development should take place in areas that were carefully evaluated by the City as most appropriate for growth.	-	-	-	-	100.0% (2.0)
Grayfield development should take place in areas in which there is an immediate interest from developers or landowners to develop.	-	50.0% (1.0)	-	50.0% (1.0)	-
The City should take an active role in encouraging and supporting grayfield development.	-	-	-	-	100.0% (2.0)

79 (2)

Grayfield development is important and should be a priority.	-	-	50.0% (1.0)	50.0% (1.0)	-
Grayfield development should take place in areas that were carefully evaluated by the City as most appropriate for growth.	-	-	50.0% (1.0)	-	50.0% (1.0)
Grayfield development should take place in areas in which there is an immediate interest from developers or landowners to develop.	-	100.0% (2.0)	-	-	-
The City should take an active role in encouraging and supporting grayfield development.	-	-	50.0% (1.0)	50.0% (1.0)	-

Unknown (68)

Grayfield development is important and should be a priority.	1.5% (1.0)	8.8% (6.0)	25.0% (17.0)	47.1% (32.0)	17.6% (12.0)
Grayfield development should take place in areas that were carefully evaluated by the City as most appropriate for growth.	1.5% (1.0)	2.9% (2.0)	13.2% (9.0)	52.9% (36.0)	29.4% (20.0)
Grayfield development should take place in areas in which there is an immediate interest from developers or landowners to develop.	10.3% (7.0)	11.8% (8.0)	35.3% (24.0)	33.8% (23.0)	8.8% (6.0)
The City should take an active role in encouraging and supporting grayfield development.	4.4% (3.0)	5.9% (4.0)	26.5% (18.0)	39.7% (27.0)	23.5% (16.0)

STATE INCOME DECILE

187 REGISTERED VOTERS

	Strongly Disagree	Disagree	Neutral	Agree	Strongly Agree
--	-------------------	----------	---------	-------	----------------

0 to 9 Pct range (6)

Grayfield development is important and should be a priority.	-	50.0% (3.0)	16.7% (1.0)	16.7% (1.0)	16.7% (1.0)
Grayfield development should take place in areas that were carefully evaluated by the City as most appropriate for growth.	-	-	16.7% (1.0)	50.0% (3.0)	33.3% (2.0)
Grayfield development should take place in areas in which there is an immediate interest from developers or landowners to develop.	33.3% (2.0)	16.7% (1.0)	16.7% (1.0)	33.3% (2.0)	-
The City should take an active role in encouraging and supporting grayfield development.	-	33.3% (2.0)	33.3% (2.0)	33.3% (2.0)	-

10 to 19 Pct range (1)

Grayfield development is important and should be a priority.	-	-	-	100.0% (1.0)	-
--	---	---	---	--------------	---

Grayfield development should take place in areas that were carefully evaluated by the City as most appropriate for growth.	-	-	-	100.0% (1.0)	-
Grayfield development should take place in areas in which there is an immediate interest from developers or landowners to develop.	-	-	-	100.0% (1.0)	-
The City should take an active role in encouraging and supporting grayfield development.	-	-	-	100.0% (1.0)	-
40 to 49 Pct range (2)					
Grayfield development is important and should be a priority.	-	-	50.0% (1.0)	-	50.0% (1.0)
Grayfield development should take place in areas that were carefully evaluated by the City as most appropriate for growth.	-	-	50.0% (1.0)	-	50.0% (1.0)
Grayfield development should take place in areas in which there is an immediate interest from developers or landowners to develop.	-	-	50.0% (1.0)	-	50.0% (1.0)
The City should take an active role in encouraging and supporting grayfield development.	-	-	50.0% (1.0)	-	50.0% (1.0)
50 to 59 Pct range (9)					
Grayfield development is important and should be a priority.	-	-	22.2% (2.0)	55.6% (5.0)	22.2% (2.0)
Grayfield development should take place in areas that were carefully evaluated by the City as most appropriate for growth.	-	-	-	88.9% (8.0)	11.1% (1.0)
Grayfield development should take place in areas in which there is an immediate interest from developers or landowners to develop.	11.1% (1.0)	11.1% (1.0)	11.1% (1.0)	66.7% (6.0)	-
The City should take an active role in encouraging and supporting grayfield development.	-	-	44.4% (4.0)	22.2% (2.0)	33.3% (3.0)
60 to 69 Pct range (7)					
Grayfield development is important and should be a priority.	-	-	42.9% (3.0)	42.9% (3.0)	14.3% (1.0)
Grayfield development should take place in areas that were carefully evaluated by the City as most appropriate for growth.	-	14.3% (1.0)	14.3% (1.0)	57.1% (4.0)	14.3% (1.0)
Grayfield development should take place in areas in which there is an immediate interest from developers or landowners to develop.	-	28.6% (2.0)	28.6% (2.0)	28.6% (2.0)	14.3% (1.0)
The City should take an active role in encouraging and supporting grayfield development.	-	14.3% (1.0)	42.9% (3.0)	28.6% (2.0)	14.3% (1.0)
70 to 79 Pct range (5)					
Grayfield development is important and should be a priority.	-	-	-	40.0% (2.0)	60.0% (3.0)
Grayfield development should take place in areas that were carefully evaluated by the City as most appropriate for growth.	-	-	20.0% (1.0)	60.0% (3.0)	20.0% (1.0)
Grayfield development should take place in areas in which there is an immediate interest from developers or landowners to develop.	20.0% (1.0)	-	80.0% (4.0)	-	-
The City should take an active role in encouraging and supporting grayfield development.	-	-	-	20.0% (1.0)	80.0% (4.0)
80 to 89 Pct range (70)					
Grayfield development is important and should be a priority.	2.9% (2.0)	5.7% (4.0)	27.1% (19.0)	44.3% (31.0)	20.0% (14.0)
Grayfield development should take place in areas that were carefully evaluated by the City as most appropriate for growth.	1.4% (1.0)	4.3% (3.0)	14.3% (10.0)	48.6% (34.0)	31.4% (22.0)
Grayfield development should take place in areas in which there is an immediate interest from developers or landowners to develop.	12.9% (9.0)	12.9% (9.0)	31.4% (22.0)	34.3% (24.0)	8.6% (6.0)
The City should take an active role in encouraging and supporting grayfield development.	5.7% (4.0)	1.4% (1.0)	18.6% (13.0)	47.1% (33.0)	27.1% (19.0)
90 Pct and up (85)					
Grayfield development is important and should be a priority.	3.5% (3.0)	5.9% (5.0)	21.2% (18.0)	41.2% (35.0)	28.2% (24.0)
Grayfield development should take place in areas that were carefully evaluated by the City as most appropriate for growth.	3.5% (3.0)	3.5% (3.0)	12.9% (11.0)	48.2% (41.0)	31.8% (27.0)
Grayfield development should take place in areas in which there is an immediate interest from developers or landowners to develop.	17.6% (15.0)	9.4% (8.0)	27.1% (23.0)	31.8% (27.0)	14.1% (12.0)
The City should take an active role in encouraging and supporting grayfield development.	4.7% (4.0)	8.2% (7.0)	15.3% (13.0)	43.5% (37.0)	28.2% (24.0)
Unknown (2)					
Grayfield development is important and should be a priority.	-	-	50.0%	-	50.0% (1.0)

			(1.0)		
Grayfield development should take place in areas that were carefully evaluated by the City as most appropriate for growth.	-	-	-	100.0% (2.0)	-
Grayfield development should take place in areas in which there is an immediate interest from developers or landowners to develop.	100.0% (2.0)	-	-	-	-
The City should take an active role in encouraging and supporting grayfield development.	-	-	50.0% (1.0)	-	50.0% (1.0)

HOME OWNER/RENTER

187 REGISTERED VOTERS

	Strongly Disagree	Disagree	Neutral	Agree	Strongly Agree
--	-------------------	----------	---------	-------	----------------

Likely Homeowner (106)

Grayfield development is important and should be a priority.	4.7% (5.0)	4.7% (5.0)	25.5% (27.0)	34.0% (36.0)	31.1% (33.0)
Grayfield development should take place in areas that were carefully evaluated by the City as most appropriate for growth.	2.8% (3.0)	4.7% (5.0)	12.3% (13.0)	50.9% (54.0)	29.2% (31.0)
Grayfield development should take place in areas in which there is an immediate interest from developers or landowners to develop.	17.0% (18.0)	11.3% (12.0)	27.4% (29.0)	31.1% (33.0)	13.2% (14.0)
The City should take an active role in encouraging and supporting grayfield development.	6.6% (7.0)	5.7% (6.0)	21.7% (23.0)	38.7% (41.0)	27.4% (29.0)

Likely Renter (55)

Grayfield development is important and should be a priority.	-	9.1% (5.0)	23.6% (13.0)	49.1% (27.0)	18.2% (10.0)
Grayfield development should take place in areas that were carefully evaluated by the City as most appropriate for growth.	-	-	18.2% (10.0)	52.7% (29.0)	29.1% (16.0)
Grayfield development should take place in areas in which there is an immediate interest from developers or landowners to develop.	10.9% (6.0)	10.9% (6.0)	32.7% (18.0)	36.4% (20.0)	9.1% (5.0)
The City should take an active role in encouraging and supporting grayfield development.	1.8% (1.0)	5.5% (3.0)	18.2% (10.0)	43.6% (24.0)	30.9% (17.0)

Unknown (26)

Grayfield development is important and should be a priority.	-	7.7% (2.0)	19.2% (5.0)	57.7% (15.0)	15.4% (4.0)
Grayfield development should take place in areas that were carefully evaluated by the City as most appropriate for growth.	3.8% (1.0)	7.7% (2.0)	7.7% (2.0)	50.0% (13.0)	30.8% (8.0)
Grayfield development should take place in areas in which there is an immediate interest from developers or landowners to develop.	23.1% (6.0)	11.5% (3.0)	26.9% (7.0)	34.6% (9.0)	3.8% (1.0)
The City should take an active role in encouraging and supporting grayfield development.	-	7.7% (2.0)	15.4% (4.0)	50.0% (13.0)	26.9% (7.0)

Please rate your level of satisfaction with the amount and availability of the following housing types in Fitchburg:

CURRENT RESULTS	303 Total Responses				
	Very Unsatisfied	Unsatisfied	Neutral	Satisfied	Very Satisfied
Single-family homes	5% (15)	14% (41)	18% (56)	48% (146)	15% (45)
Multi-family apartments (rented by occupants)	7% (20)	10% (30)	27% (83)	39% (118)	17% (52)
Multi-family condominiums/ townhouses (owned or rented by occupants)	5% (14)	15% (46)	28% (85)	39% (119)	13% (39)
Housing for seniors and the elderly	5% (15)	15% (45)	47% (143)	26% (79)	7% (21)
Housing for persons with disabilities	5% (14)	14% (41)	63% (190)	15% (44)	5% (14)
Affordable workforce housing (housing that costs less than 30% of household income)	11% (34)	15% (46)	41% (125)	21% (64)	11% (34)

REGISTERED (181)

	Very Unsatisfied	Unsatisfied	Neutral	Satisfied	Very Satisfied
Single-family homes	4.0% (8)	15.0% (27)	19.0% (35)	49.0% (89)	12.0% (22)
Multi-family apartments (rented by occupants)	6.0% (11)	11.0% (20)	27.0% (48)	41.0% (75)	15.0% (27)
Multi-family condominiums/ townhouses (owned or rented by occupants)	4.0% (7)	18.0% (32)	25.0% (45)	42.0% (76)	12.0% (21)
Housing for seniors and the elderly	4.0% (7)	17.0% (30)	48.0% (87)	28.0% (51)	3.0% (6)
Housing for persons with disabilities	5.0% (9)	15.0% (27)	63.0% (114)	14.0% (25)	3.0% (6)
Affordable workforce housing (housing that costs less than 30% of household income)	11.0% (20)	18.0% (33)	39.0% (71)	22.0% (40)	9.0% (17)

NON-REGISTERED (122)

	Very Unsatisfied	Unsatisfied	Neutral	Satisfied	Very Satisfied
Single-family homes	5.7% (7)	11.5% (14)	17.2% (21)	46.7% (57)	18.9% (23)
Multi-family apartments (rented by occupants)	7.4% (9)	8.2% (10)	28.7% (35)	35.2% (43)	20.5% (25)
Multi-family condominiums/ townhouses (owned or rented by occupants)	5.7% (7)	11.5% (14)	32.8% (40)	35.2% (43)	14.8% (18)
Housing for seniors and the elderly	6.6% (8)	12.3% (15)	45.9% (56)	23.0% (28)	12.3% (15)
Housing for persons with disabilities	4.1% (5)	11.5% (14)	62.3% (76)	15.6% (19)	6.6% (8)
Affordable workforce housing (housing that costs less than 30% of household income)	11.5% (14)	10.7% (13)	44.3% (54)	19.7% (24)	13.9% (17)

ALL RESPONDENTS (303)

	Very Unsatisfied	Unsatisfied	Neutral	Satisfied	Very Satisfied
Single-family homes	5% (15)	14% (41)	18% (56)	48% (146)	15% (45)
Multi-family apartments (rented by occupants)	7% (20)	10% (30)	27% (83)	39% (118)	17% (52)
Multi-family condominiums/ townhouses (owned or rented by occupants)	5% (14)	15% (46)	28% (85)	39% (119)	13% (39)
Housing for seniors and the elderly	5% (15)	15% (45)	47% (143)	26% (79)	7% (21)
Housing for persons with disabilities	5% (14)	14% (41)	63% (190)	15% (44)	5% (14)
Affordable workforce housing (housing that costs less than 30% of household income)	11% (34)	15% (46)	41% (125)	21% (64)	11% (34)

REGISTERED VOTERS IN FITCHBURG, WI (181)

	Very Unsatisfied	Unsatisfied	Neutral	Satisfied	Very Satisfied
Single-family homes	4% (8)	15% (27)	19% (35)	49% (89)	12% (22)
Multi-family apartments (rented by occupants)	6% (11)	11% (20)	27% (48)	41% (75)	15% (27)
Multi-family condominiums/ townhouses (owned or rented by occupants)	4% (7)	18% (32)	25% (45)	42% (76)	12% (21)
Housing for seniors and the elderly	4% (7)	17% (30)	48% (87)	28% (51)	3% (6)
Housing for persons with disabilities	5% (9)	15% (27)	63% (114)	14% (25)	3% (6)
Affordable workforce housing (housing that costs less than 30% of household income)	11% (20)	18% (33)	39% (71)	22% (40)	9% (17)

LIVE IN FITCHBURG, WI (267) - SELF-REPORTED

	Very Unsatisfied	Unsatisfied	Neutral	Satisfied	Very Satisfied
Single-family homes	4% (12)	14% (38)	19% (50)	49% (132)	13% (35)
Multi-family apartments (rented by occupants)	6% (17)	10% (27)	27% (71)	40% (108)	16% (44)
Multi-family condominiums/ townhouses (owned or rented by occupants)	4% (12)	15% (40)	28% (74)	41% (110)	12% (31)
Housing for seniors and the elderly	5% (13)	14% (38)	49% (130)	26% (69)	6% (17)

	Very Unsatisfied	Unsatisfied	Neutral	Satisfied	Very Satisfied
Housing for persons with disabilities	4% (12)	14% (37)	64% (170)	14% (37)	4% (11)
Affordable workforce housing (housing that costs less than 30% of household income)	10% (28)	15% (41)	41% (110)	22% (59)	11% (29)
SUBSCRIBERS TO FITCHBURG, WI (271)					
	Very Unsatisfied	Unsatisfied	Neutral	Satisfied	Very Satisfied
Single-family homes	5% (13)	14% (38)	19% (51)	49% (134)	13% (35)
Multi-family apartments (rented by occupants)	7% (18)	10% (28)	27% (72)	40% (108)	17% (45)
Multi-family condominiums/ townhouses (owned or rented by occupants)	5% (13)	15% (41)	28% (75)	41% (110)	12% (32)
Housing for seniors and the elderly	5% (14)	14% (39)	49% (132)	25% (69)	6% (17)
Housing for persons with disabilities	5% (14)	14% (37)	63% (172)	14% (37)	4% (11)
Affordable workforce housing (housing that costs less than 30% of household income)	11% (29)	15% (41)	41% (111)	22% (59)	11% (31)

	Very Unsatisfied	Unsatisfied	Neutral	Satisfied	Very Satisfied
REGISTER RESPONDENTS FROM ANYWHERE (187)					
	Very Unsatisfied	Unsatisfied	Neutral	Satisfied	Very Satisfied
Single-family homes	4% (8)	14% (27)	20% (38)	49% (91)	12% (23)
Multi-family apartments (rented by occupants)	6% (12)	11% (21)	27% (50)	41% (76)	15% (28)
Multi-family condominiums/ townhouses (owned or rented by occupants)	4% (7)	19% (35)	25% (47)	41% (76)	12% (22)
Housing for seniors and the elderly	4% (7)	18% (33)	48% (90)	27% (51)	3% (6)
Housing for persons with disabilities	5% (10)	16% (29)	63% (117)	13% (25)	3% (6)
Affordable workforce housing (housing that costs less than 30% of household income)	12% (22)	18% (34)	39% (73)	21% (40)	10% (18)

EDUCATION					187 REGISTERED VOTERS
	Very Unsatisfied	Unsatisfied	Neutral	Satisfied	Very Satisfied

Bach Degree - Extremely Likely (30)					
Single-family homes	6.7% (2.0)	3.3% (1.0)	23.3% (7.0)	50.0% (15.0)	16.7% (5.0)
Multi-family apartments (rented by occupants)	3.3% (1.0)	13.3% (4.0)	26.7% (8.0)	33.3% (10.0)	23.3% (7.0)
Multi-family condominiums/ townhouses (owned or rented by occupants)	-	10.0% (3.0)	23.3% (7.0)	46.7% (14.0)	20.0% (6.0)
Housing for seniors and the elderly	6.7% (2.0)	16.7% (5.0)	36.7% (11.0)	36.7% (11.0)	3.3% (1.0)
Housing for persons with disabilities	3.3% (1.0)	16.7% (5.0)	60.0% (18.0)	16.7% (5.0)	3.3% (1.0)
Affordable workforce housing (housing that costs less than 30% of household income)	10.0% (3.0)	10.0% (3.0)	36.7% (11.0)	33.3% (10.0)	10.0% (3.0)

Bach Degree - Likely (21)					
Single-family homes	9.5% (2.0)	23.8% (5.0)	14.3% (3.0)	33.3% (7.0)	19.0% (4.0)
Multi-family apartments (rented by occupants)	9.5% (2.0)	9.5% (2.0)	33.3% (7.0)	38.1% (8.0)	9.5% (2.0)
Multi-family condominiums/ townhouses (owned or rented by occupants)	9.5% (2.0)	19.0% (4.0)	19.0% (4.0)	38.1% (8.0)	14.3% (3.0)
Housing for seniors and the elderly	-	9.5% (2.0)	52.4% (11.0)	33.3% (7.0)	4.8% (1.0)
Housing for persons with disabilities	-	14.3% (3.0)	71.4% (15.0)	9.5% (2.0)	4.8% (1.0)
Affordable workforce housing (housing that costs less than 30% of household income)	-	19.0% (4.0)	38.1% (8.0)	28.6% (6.0)	14.3% (3.0)

Grad Degree - Extremely Likely (22)					
Single-family homes	-	9.1% (2.0)	22.7% (5.0)	54.5% (12.0)	13.6% (3.0)
Multi-family apartments (rented by occupants)	9.1% (2.0)	-	36.4% (8.0)	36.4% (8.0)	18.2% (4.0)
Multi-family condominiums/ townhouses (owned or rented by occupants)	9.1% (2.0)	13.6% (3.0)	27.3% (6.0)	36.4% (8.0)	13.6% (3.0)
Housing for seniors and the elderly	4.5% (1.0)	13.6% (3.0)	45.5% (10.0)	31.8% (7.0)	4.5% (1.0)
Housing for persons with disabilities	-	9.1% (2.0)	59.1% (13.0)	27.3% (6.0)	4.5% (1.0)
Affordable workforce housing (housing that costs less than 30% of household income)	9.1% (2.0)	9.1% (2.0)	40.9% (9.0)	22.7% (5.0)	18.2% (4.0)

Grad Degree - Likely (13)					
Single-family homes	7.7% (1.0)	-	30.8% (4.0)	61.5% (8.0)	-
Multi-family apartments (rented by occupants)	-	7.7% (1.0)	30.8% (4.0)	46.2% (6.0)	15.4% (2.0)
Multi-family condominiums/ townhouses (owned or rented by occupants)	-	7.7% (1.0)	38.5% (5.0)	38.5% (5.0)	15.4% (2.0)
Housing for seniors and the elderly	7.7% (1.0)	-	84.6% (11.0)	7.7% (1.0)	-
Housing for persons with disabilities	-	15.4% (2.0)	76.9% (10.0)	7.7% (1.0)	-
Affordable workforce housing (housing that costs less than 30% of household income)	7.7% (1.0)	23.1% (3.0)	46.2% (6.0)	7.7% (1.0)	15.4% (2.0)

HS Diploma - Extremely Likely (9)					
--	--	--	--	--	--

Single-family homes	-	11.1% (1.0)	22.2% (2.0)	66.7% (6.0)	-
Multi-family apartments (rented by occupants)	-	11.1% (1.0)	33.3% (3.0)	44.4% (4.0)	11.1% (1.0)
Multi-family condominiums/ townhouses (owned or rented by occupants)	-	22.2% (2.0)	22.2% (2.0)	44.4% (4.0)	11.1% (1.0)
Housing for seniors and the elderly	-	33.3% (3.0)	55.6% (5.0)	11.1% (1.0)	-
Housing for persons with disabilities	11.1% (1.0)	44.4% (4.0)	33.3% (3.0)	-	11.1% (1.0)
Affordable workforce housing (housing that costs less than 30% of household income)	11.1% (1.0)	33.3% (3.0)	11.1% (1.0)	33.3% (3.0)	11.1% (1.0)

HS Diploma - Likely (4)

Single-family homes	-	-	-	75.0% (3.0)	25.0% (1.0)
Multi-family apartments (rented by occupants)	-	25.0% (1.0)	-	50.0% (2.0)	25.0% (1.0)
Multi-family condominiums/ townhouses (owned or rented by occupants)	-	25.0% (1.0)	-	50.0% (2.0)	25.0% (1.0)
Housing for seniors and the elderly	-	25.0% (1.0)	50.0% (2.0)	25.0% (1.0)	-
Housing for persons with disabilities	-	25.0% (1.0)	50.0% (2.0)	25.0% (1.0)	-
Affordable workforce housing (housing that costs less than 30% of household income)	-	50.0% (2.0)	25.0% (1.0)	25.0% (1.0)	-

Less than HS Diploma - Likely (1)

Single-family homes	-	-	-	100.0% (1.0)	-
Multi-family apartments (rented by occupants)	-	-	-	100.0% (1.0)	-
Multi-family condominiums/ townhouses (owned or rented by occupants)	-	-	-	100.0% (1.0)	-
Housing for seniors and the elderly	-	-	100.0% (1.0)	-	-
Housing for persons with disabilities	-	-	100.0% (1.0)	-	-
Affordable workforce housing (housing that costs less than 30% of household income)	-	-	100.0% (1.0)	-	-

Some College - Likely (12)

Single-family homes	8.3% (1.0)	33.3% (4.0)	25.0% (3.0)	25.0% (3.0)	8.3% (1.0)
Multi-family apartments (rented by occupants)	25.0% (3.0)	25.0% (3.0)	8.3% (1.0)	41.7% (5.0)	-
Multi-family condominiums/ townhouses (owned or rented by occupants)	8.3% (1.0)	41.7% (5.0)	16.7% (2.0)	25.0% (3.0)	8.3% (1.0)
Housing for seniors and the elderly	8.3% (1.0)	8.3% (1.0)	75.0% (9.0)	8.3% (1.0)	-
Housing for persons with disabilities	16.7% (2.0)	16.7% (2.0)	66.7% (8.0)	-	-
Affordable workforce housing (housing that costs less than 30% of household income)	50.0% (6.0)	41.7% (5.0)	8.3% (1.0)	-	-

Some College -Extremely Likely (5)

Single-family homes	-	20.0% (1.0)	-	60.0% (3.0)	20.0% (1.0)
Multi-family apartments (rented by occupants)	-	40.0% (2.0)	-	-	60.0% (3.0)
Multi-family condominiums/ townhouses (owned or rented by occupants)	-	20.0% (1.0)	60.0% (3.0)	-	20.0% (1.0)
Housing for seniors and the elderly	20.0% (1.0)	20.0% (1.0)	20.0% (1.0)	20.0% (1.0)	20.0% (1.0)
Housing for persons with disabilities	20.0% (1.0)	20.0% (1.0)	40.0% (2.0)	20.0% (1.0)	-
Affordable workforce housing (housing that costs less than 30% of household income)	20.0% (1.0)	40.0% (2.0)	-	20.0% (1.0)	20.0% (1.0)

Unknown (70)

Single-family homes	2.9% (2.0)	18.6% (13.0)	20.0% (14.0)	47.1% (33.0)	11.4% (8.0)
Multi-family apartments (rented by occupants)	5.7% (4.0)	10.0% (7.0)	27.1% (19.0)	45.7% (32.0)	11.4% (8.0)
Multi-family condominiums/ townhouses (owned or rented by occupants)	2.9% (2.0)	21.4% (15.0)	25.7% (18.0)	44.3% (31.0)	5.7% (4.0)
Housing for seniors and the elderly	1.4% (1.0)	24.3% (17.0)	41.4% (29.0)	30.0% (21.0)	2.9% (2.0)
Housing for persons with disabilities	7.1% (5.0)	12.9% (9.0)	64.3% (45.0)	12.9% (9.0)	2.9% (2.0)
Affordable workforce housing (housing that costs less than 30% of household income)	11.4% (8.0)	14.3% (10.0)	50.0% (35.0)	18.6% (13.0)	5.7% (4.0)

VOTERS GENDER

187 REGISTERED VOTERS

	Very Unsatisfied	Unsatisfied	Neutral	Satisfied	Very Satisfied
--	------------------	-------------	---------	-----------	----------------

F (90)

Single-family homes	4.4% (4.0)	18.9% (17.0)	24.4% (22.0)	41.1% (37.0)	11.1% (10.0)
Multi-family apartments (rented by occupants)	8.9% (8.0)	13.3% (12.0)	27.8% (25.0)	38.9% (35.0)	11.1% (10.0)
Multi-family condominiums/ townhouses (owned or rented by occupants)	5.6% (5.0)	21.1% (19.0)	21.1% (19.0)	43.3% (39.0)	8.9% (8.0)
Housing for seniors and the elderly	3.3% (3.0)	17.8% (16.0)	48.9% (44.0)	26.7% (24.0)	3.3% (3.0)
Housing for persons with disabilities	5.6% (5.0)	16.7% (15.0)	60.0% (54.0)	13.3% (12.0)	4.4% (4.0)

Affordable workforce housing (housing that costs less than 30% of household income)	13.3% (12.0)	20.0% (18.0)	38.9% (35.0)	16.7% (15.0)	11.1% (10.0)
M (95)					
Single-family homes	4.2% (4.0)	10.5% (10.0)	16.8% (16.0)	54.7% (52.0)	13.7% (13.0)
Multi-family apartments (rented by occupants)	4.2% (4.0)	9.5% (9.0)	26.3% (25.0)	41.1% (39.0)	18.9% (18.0)
Multi-family condominiums/ townhouses (owned or rented by occupants)	2.1% (2.0)	16.8% (16.0)	29.5% (28.0)	36.8% (35.0)	14.7% (14.0)
Housing for seniors and the elderly	4.2% (4.0)	17.9% (17.0)	48.4% (46.0)	26.3% (25.0)	3.2% (3.0)
Housing for persons with disabilities	5.3% (5.0)	14.7% (14.0)	66.3% (63.0)	11.6% (11.0)	2.1% (2.0)
Affordable workforce housing (housing that costs less than 30% of household income)	10.5% (10.0)	16.8% (16.0)	40.0% (38.0)	24.2% (23.0)	8.4% (8.0)

Unknown (2)

Single-family homes	-	-	-	100.0% (2.0)	-
Multi-family apartments (rented by occupants)	-	-	-	100.0% (2.0)	-
Multi-family condominiums/ townhouses (owned or rented by occupants)	-	-	-	100.0% (2.0)	-
Housing for seniors and the elderly	-	-	-	100.0% (2.0)	-
Housing for persons with disabilities	-	-	-	100.0% (2.0)	-
Affordable workforce housing (housing that costs less than 30% of household income)	-	-	-	100.0% (2.0)	-

PRECINCT

187 REGISTERED VOTERS

	Very Unsatisfied	Unsatisfied	Neutral	Satisfied	Very Satisfied
--	------------------	-------------	---------	-----------	----------------

CHICAGO 43-04 (1)

Single-family homes	-	-	100.0% (1.0)	-	-
Multi-family apartments (rented by occupants)	-	-	100.0% (1.0)	-	-
Multi-family condominiums/ townhouses (owned or rented by occupants)	-	-	100.0% (1.0)	-	-
Housing for seniors and the elderly	-	-	100.0% (1.0)	-	-
Housing for persons with disabilities	-	-	100.0% (1.0)	-	-
Affordable workforce housing (housing that costs less than 30% of household income)	-	-	100.0% (1.0)	-	-

FITCHBURG CITY WARD 01 (9)

Single-family homes	11.1% (1.0)	44.4% (4.0)	11.1% (1.0)	33.3% (3.0)	-
Multi-family apartments (rented by occupants)	-	22.2% (2.0)	22.2% (2.0)	55.6% (5.0)	-
Multi-family condominiums/ townhouses (owned or rented by occupants)	-	33.3% (3.0)	33.3% (3.0)	33.3% (3.0)	-
Housing for seniors and the elderly	11.1% (1.0)	11.1% (1.0)	33.3% (3.0)	44.4% (4.0)	-
Housing for persons with disabilities	22.2% (2.0)	11.1% (1.0)	44.4% (4.0)	22.2% (2.0)	-
Affordable workforce housing (housing that costs less than 30% of household income)	33.3% (3.0)	11.1% (1.0)	33.3% (3.0)	22.2% (2.0)	-

FITCHBURG CITY WARD 02 (3)

Single-family homes	-	-	33.3% (1.0)	66.7% (2.0)	-
Multi-family apartments (rented by occupants)	-	33.3% (1.0)	33.3% (1.0)	33.3% (1.0)	-
Multi-family condominiums/ townhouses (owned or rented by occupants)	-	33.3% (1.0)	33.3% (1.0)	33.3% (1.0)	-
Housing for seniors and the elderly	-	33.3% (1.0)	33.3% (1.0)	33.3% (1.0)	-
Housing for persons with disabilities	-	33.3% (1.0)	33.3% (1.0)	33.3% (1.0)	-
Affordable workforce housing (housing that costs less than 30% of household income)	-	-	66.7% (2.0)	33.3% (1.0)	-

FITCHBURG CITY WARD 04 (2)

Single-family homes	-	50.0% (1.0)	-	50.0% (1.0)	-
Multi-family apartments (rented by occupants)	-	50.0% (1.0)	-	50.0% (1.0)	-
Multi-family condominiums/ townhouses (owned or rented by occupants)	-	50.0% (1.0)	-	50.0% (1.0)	-
Housing for seniors and the elderly	50.0% (1.0)	-	-	50.0% (1.0)	-
Housing for persons with disabilities	-	-	50.0% (1.0)	50.0% (1.0)	-
Affordable workforce housing (housing that costs less than 30% of household income)	50.0% (1.0)	-	-	50.0% (1.0)	-

FITCHBURG CITY WARD 05 (6)

Single-family homes	-	16.7% (1.0)	33.3% (2.0)	50.0% (3.0)	-
Multi-family apartments (rented by occupants)	-	16.7% (1.0)	66.7% (4.0)	-	16.7% (1.0)
Multi-family condominiums/ townhouses (owned or rented by occupants)	-	16.7% (1.0)	33.3% (2.0)	33.3% (2.0)	16.7% (1.0)

Housing for seniors and the elderly	-	33.3% (2.0)	16.7% (1.0)	50.0% (3.0)	-
Housing for persons with disabilities	-	33.3% (2.0)	66.7% (4.0)	-	-
Affordable workforce housing (housing that costs less than 30% of household income)	-	33.3% (2.0)	50.0% (3.0)	16.7% (1.0)	-

FITCHBURG CITY WARD 06 (12)

Single-family homes	-	16.7% (2.0)	25.0% (3.0)	50.0% (6.0)	8.3% (1.0)
Multi-family apartments (rented by occupants)	16.7% (2.0)	16.7% (2.0)	33.3% (4.0)	8.3% (1.0)	25.0% (3.0)
Multi-family condominiums/ townhouses (owned or rented by occupants)	16.7% (2.0)	25.0% (3.0)	8.3% (1.0)	25.0% (3.0)	25.0% (3.0)
Housing for seniors and the elderly	-	8.3% (1.0)	66.7% (8.0)	16.7% (2.0)	8.3% (1.0)
Housing for persons with disabilities	-	25.0% (3.0)	58.3% (7.0)	8.3% (1.0)	8.3% (1.0)
Affordable workforce housing (housing that costs less than 30% of household income)	-	33.3% (4.0)	33.3% (4.0)	16.7% (2.0)	16.7% (2.0)

FITCHBURG CITY WARD 07 (18)

Single-family homes	-	16.7% (3.0)	16.7% (3.0)	55.6% (10.0)	11.1% (2.0)
Multi-family apartments (rented by occupants)	-	5.6% (1.0)	22.2% (4.0)	44.4% (8.0)	27.8% (5.0)
Multi-family condominiums/ townhouses (owned or rented by occupants)	-	16.7% (3.0)	16.7% (3.0)	38.9% (7.0)	27.8% (5.0)
Housing for seniors and the elderly	11.1% (2.0)	11.1% (2.0)	44.4% (8.0)	22.2% (4.0)	11.1% (2.0)
Housing for persons with disabilities	5.6% (1.0)	5.6% (1.0)	72.2% (13.0)	11.1% (2.0)	5.6% (1.0)
Affordable workforce housing (housing that costs less than 30% of household income)	11.1% (2.0)	11.1% (2.0)	38.9% (7.0)	27.8% (5.0)	11.1% (2.0)

FITCHBURG CITY WARD 08 (14)

Single-family homes	-	-	21.4% (3.0)	64.3% (9.0)	14.3% (2.0)
Multi-family apartments (rented by occupants)	-	7.1% (1.0)	21.4% (3.0)	42.9% (6.0)	28.6% (4.0)
Multi-family condominiums/ townhouses (owned or rented by occupants)	7.1% (1.0)	7.1% (1.0)	21.4% (3.0)	50.0% (7.0)	14.3% (2.0)
Housing for seniors and the elderly	7.1% (1.0)	21.4% (3.0)	57.1% (8.0)	14.3% (2.0)	-
Housing for persons with disabilities	21.4% (3.0)	14.3% (2.0)	57.1% (8.0)	7.1% (1.0)	-
Affordable workforce housing (housing that costs less than 30% of household income)	14.3% (2.0)	14.3% (2.0)	35.7% (5.0)	21.4% (3.0)	14.3% (2.0)

FITCHBURG CITY WARD 09 (8)

Single-family homes	-	-	25.0% (2.0)	62.5% (5.0)	12.5% (1.0)
Multi-family apartments (rented by occupants)	-	-	25.0% (2.0)	75.0% (6.0)	-
Multi-family condominiums/ townhouses (owned or rented by occupants)	-	-	12.5% (1.0)	87.5% (7.0)	-
Housing for seniors and the elderly	-	25.0% (2.0)	25.0% (2.0)	50.0% (4.0)	-
Housing for persons with disabilities	-	12.5% (1.0)	50.0% (4.0)	25.0% (2.0)	12.5% (1.0)
Affordable workforce housing (housing that costs less than 30% of household income)	12.5% (1.0)	-	50.0% (4.0)	25.0% (2.0)	12.5% (1.0)

FITCHBURG CITY WARD 12 (2)

Single-family homes	50.0% (1.0)	-	50.0% (1.0)	-	-
Multi-family apartments (rented by occupants)	50.0% (1.0)	-	-	50.0% (1.0)	-
Multi-family condominiums/ townhouses (owned or rented by occupants)	50.0% (1.0)	-	-	50.0% (1.0)	-
Housing for seniors and the elderly	-	-	100.0% (2.0)	-	-
Housing for persons with disabilities	-	-	100.0% (2.0)	-	-
Affordable workforce housing (housing that costs less than 30% of household income)	50.0% (1.0)	-	50.0% (1.0)	-	-

FITCHBURG CITY WARD 13 (31)

Single-family homes	6.5% (2.0)	9.7% (3.0)	22.6% (7.0)	54.8% (17.0)	6.5% (2.0)
Multi-family apartments (rented by occupants)	16.1% (5.0)	6.5% (2.0)	29.0% (9.0)	45.2% (14.0)	3.2% (1.0)
Multi-family condominiums/ townhouses (owned or rented by occupants)	6.5% (2.0)	9.7% (3.0)	22.6% (7.0)	58.1% (18.0)	3.2% (1.0)
Housing for seniors and the elderly	3.2% (1.0)	19.4% (6.0)	41.9% (13.0)	35.5% (11.0)	-
Housing for persons with disabilities	3.2% (1.0)	16.1% (5.0)	61.3% (19.0)	19.4% (6.0)	-
Affordable workforce housing (housing that costs less than 30% of household income)	9.7% (3.0)	22.6% (7.0)	29.0% (9.0)	35.5% (11.0)	3.2% (1.0)

FITCHBURG CITY WARD 14 (19)

Single-family homes	10.5% (2.0)	26.3% (5.0)	15.8% (3.0)	42.1% (8.0)	5.3% (1.0)
Multi-family apartments (rented by occupants)	10.5% (2.0)	15.8% (3.0)	21.1% (4.0)	42.1% (8.0)	10.5% (2.0)
Multi-family condominiums/ townhouses (owned or rented by occupants)	5.3% (1.0)	36.8% (7.0)	21.1% (4.0)	36.8% (7.0)	-
Housing for seniors and the elderly	-	15.8% (3.0)	57.9% (11.0)	26.3% (5.0)	-

Housing for persons with disabilities	5.3% (1.0)	26.3% (5.0)	63.2% (12.0)	5.3% (1.0)	-
Affordable workforce housing (housing that costs less than 30% of household income)	15.8% (3.0)	36.8% (7.0)	26.3% (5.0)	10.5% (2.0)	10.5% (2.0)
FITCHBURG CITY WARD 15 (7)					
Single-family homes	-	14.3% (1.0)	42.9% (3.0)	28.6% (2.0)	14.3% (1.0)
Multi-family apartments (rented by occupants)	-	28.6% (2.0)	28.6% (2.0)	28.6% (2.0)	14.3% (1.0)
Multi-family condominiums/ townhouses (owned or rented by occupants)	-	28.6% (2.0)	42.9% (3.0)	14.3% (1.0)	14.3% (1.0)
Housing for seniors and the elderly	-	14.3% (1.0)	71.4% (5.0)	14.3% (1.0)	-
Housing for persons with disabilities	-	14.3% (1.0)	71.4% (5.0)	14.3% (1.0)	-
Affordable workforce housing (housing that costs less than 30% of household income)	-	14.3% (1.0)	42.9% (3.0)	28.6% (2.0)	14.3% (1.0)
FITCHBURG CITY WARD 16 (3)					
Single-family homes	-	-	-	66.7% (2.0)	33.3% (1.0)
Multi-family apartments (rented by occupants)	-	33.3% (1.0)	33.3% (1.0)	33.3% (1.0)	-
Multi-family condominiums/ townhouses (owned or rented by occupants)	-	66.7% (2.0)	33.3% (1.0)	-	-
Housing for seniors and the elderly	-	33.3% (1.0)	-	66.7% (2.0)	-
Housing for persons with disabilities	-	66.7% (2.0)	-	33.3% (1.0)	-
Affordable workforce housing (housing that costs less than 30% of household income)	-	-	66.7% (2.0)	33.3% (1.0)	-
FITCHBURG CITY WARD 17 (7)					
Single-family homes	-	-	28.6% (2.0)	42.9% (3.0)	28.6% (2.0)
Multi-family apartments (rented by occupants)	-	-	28.6% (2.0)	42.9% (3.0)	28.6% (2.0)
Multi-family condominiums/ townhouses (owned or rented by occupants)	-	-	42.9% (3.0)	42.9% (3.0)	14.3% (1.0)
Housing for seniors and the elderly	-	14.3% (1.0)	57.1% (4.0)	28.6% (2.0)	-
Housing for persons with disabilities	-	14.3% (1.0)	57.1% (4.0)	14.3% (1.0)	14.3% (1.0)
Affordable workforce housing (housing that costs less than 30% of household income)	14.3% (1.0)	14.3% (1.0)	28.6% (2.0)	14.3% (1.0)	28.6% (2.0)
FITCHBURG CITY WARD 18 (12)					
Single-family homes	8.3% (1.0)	8.3% (1.0)	8.3% (1.0)	58.3% (7.0)	16.7% (2.0)
Multi-family apartments (rented by occupants)	-	25.0% (3.0)	16.7% (2.0)	41.7% (5.0)	16.7% (2.0)
Multi-family condominiums/ townhouses (owned or rented by occupants)	-	25.0% (3.0)	25.0% (3.0)	41.7% (5.0)	8.3% (1.0)
Housing for seniors and the elderly	8.3% (1.0)	16.7% (2.0)	50.0% (6.0)	25.0% (3.0)	-
Housing for persons with disabilities	-	8.3% (1.0)	75.0% (9.0)	16.7% (2.0)	-
Affordable workforce housing (housing that costs less than 30% of household income)	16.7% (2.0)	33.3% (4.0)	33.3% (4.0)	16.7% (2.0)	-
FITCHBURG CITY WARD 19 (26)					
Single-family homes	3.8% (1.0)	23.1% (6.0)	7.7% (2.0)	38.5% (10.0)	26.9% (7.0)
Multi-family apartments (rented by occupants)	3.8% (1.0)	-	23.1% (6.0)	50.0% (13.0)	23.1% (6.0)
Multi-family condominiums/ townhouses (owned or rented by occupants)	-	7.7% (2.0)	30.8% (8.0)	38.5% (10.0)	23.1% (6.0)
Housing for seniors and the elderly	-	11.5% (3.0)	53.8% (14.0)	23.1% (6.0)	11.5% (3.0)
Housing for persons with disabilities	-	3.8% (1.0)	76.9% (20.0)	11.5% (3.0)	7.7% (2.0)
Affordable workforce housing (housing that costs less than 30% of household income)	-	7.7% (2.0)	61.5% (16.0)	15.4% (4.0)	15.4% (4.0)
MADISON CITY WARD 042 (1)					
Single-family homes	-	-	100.0% (1.0)	-	-
Multi-family apartments (rented by occupants)	-	-	-	100.0% (1.0)	-
Multi-family condominiums/ townhouses (owned or rented by occupants)	-	100.0% (1.0)	-	-	-
Housing for seniors and the elderly	-	100.0% (1.0)	-	-	-
Housing for persons with disabilities	-	100.0% (1.0)	-	-	-
Affordable workforce housing (housing that costs less than 30% of household income)	-	100.0% (1.0)	-	-	-
MADISON CITY WARD 053 (1)					
Single-family homes	-	-	-	-	100.0% (1.0)
Multi-family apartments (rented by occupants)	100.0% (1.0)	-	-	-	-
Multi-family condominiums/ townhouses (owned or rented by occupants)	-	100.0% (1.0)	-	-	-
Housing for seniors and the elderly	-	100.0% (1.0)	-	-	-
Housing for persons with disabilities	-	100.0% (1.0)	-	-	-

Affordable workforce housing (housing that costs less than 30% of household income) 100.0% (1.0) - - - -

MADISON CITY WARD 100 (1)

Single-family homes	-	-	100.0% (1.0)	-	-
Multi-family apartments (rented by occupants)	-	-	100.0% (1.0)	-	-
Multi-family condominiums/ townhouses (owned or rented by occupants)	-	-	100.0% (1.0)	-	-
Housing for seniors and the elderly	-	-	100.0% (1.0)	-	-
Housing for persons with disabilities	100.0% (1.0)	-	-	-	-
Affordable workforce housing (housing that costs less than 30% of household income)	100.0% (1.0)	-	-	-	-

MADISON CITY WARD 107 (1)

Single-family homes	-	-	100.0% (1.0)	-	-
Multi-family apartments (rented by occupants)	-	100.0% (1.0)	-	-	-
Multi-family condominiums/ townhouses (owned or rented by occupants)	-	100.0% (1.0)	-	-	-
Housing for seniors and the elderly	-	100.0% (1.0)	-	-	-
Housing for persons with disabilities	100.0% (1.0)	-	-	-	-
Affordable workforce housing (housing that costs less than 30% of household income)	100.0% (1.0)	-	-	-	-

MIDDLETON TOWN WARD 7 (1)

Single-family homes	-	-	-	100.0% (1.0)	-
Multi-family apartments (rented by occupants)	-	-	-	-	100.0% (1.0)
Multi-family condominiums/ townhouses (owned or rented by occupants)	-	-	-	-	100.0% (1.0)
Housing for seniors and the elderly	-	-	100.0% (1.0)	-	-
Housing for persons with disabilities	-	-	100.0% (1.0)	-	-
Affordable workforce housing (housing that costs less than 30% of household income)	-	-	-	-	100.0% (1.0)

MOUNT HOREB VLG WARD 3 (1)

Single-family homes	-	-	-	100.0% (1.0)	-
Multi-family apartments (rented by occupants)	-	-	100.0% (1.0)	-	-
Multi-family condominiums/ townhouses (owned or rented by occupants)	-	-	100.0% (1.0)	-	-
Housing for seniors and the elderly	-	-	100.0% (1.0)	-	-
Housing for persons with disabilities	-	-	100.0% (1.0)	-	-
Affordable workforce housing (housing that costs less than 30% of household income)	-	-	100.0% (1.0)	-	-

OREGON VLG WARD 10 (1)

Single-family homes	-	-	-	100.0% (1.0)	-
Multi-family apartments (rented by occupants)	-	-	100.0% (1.0)	-	-
Multi-family condominiums/ townhouses (owned or rented by occupants)	-	-	100.0% (1.0)	-	-
Housing for seniors and the elderly	-	100.0% (1.0)	-	-	-
Housing for persons with disabilities	-	-	100.0% (1.0)	-	-
Affordable workforce housing (housing that costs less than 30% of household income)	-	-	100.0% (1.0)	-	-

AGE RANGE

187 REGISTERED VOTERS

Very Unsatisfied Unsatisfied Neutral Satisfied Very Satisfied

18-29 (1)

Single-family homes	-	100.0% (1.0)	-	-	-
Multi-family apartments (rented by occupants)	-	-	-	100.0% (1.0)	-
Multi-family condominiums/ townhouses (owned or rented by occupants)	-	100.0% (1.0)	-	-	-
Housing for seniors and the elderly	-	100.0% (1.0)	-	-	-
Housing for persons with disabilities	100.0% (1.0)	-	-	-	-
Affordable workforce housing (housing that costs less than 30% of household income)	100.0% (1.0)	-	-	-	-

30-39 (24)

Single-family homes	12.5% (3.0)	20.8% (5.0)	16.7% (4.0)	50.0% (12.0)	-
Multi-family apartments (rented by occupants)	20.8% (5.0)	8.3% (2.0)	12.5% (3.0)	54.2% (13.0)	4.2% (1.0)
Multi-family condominiums/ townhouses (owned or rented by occupants)	8.3% (2.0)	16.7% (4.0)	25.0% (6.0)	45.8% (11.0)	4.2% (1.0)

Housing for seniors and the elderly	-	8.3% (2.0)	54.2% (13.0)	37.5% (9.0)	-
Housing for persons with disabilities	8.3% (2.0)	8.3% (2.0)	58.3% (14.0)	25.0% (6.0)	-
Affordable workforce housing (housing that costs less than 30% of household income)	20.8% (5.0)	20.8% (5.0)	25.0% (6.0)	29.2% (7.0)	4.2% (1.0)

40-49 (29)

Single-family homes	3.4% (1.0)	6.9% (2.0)	17.2% (5.0)	55.2% (16.0)	17.2% (5.0)
Multi-family apartments (rented by occupants)	3.4% (1.0)	13.8% (4.0)	31.0% (9.0)	20.7% (6.0)	31.0% (9.0)
Multi-family condominiums/ townhouses (owned or rented by occupants)	3.4% (1.0)	13.8% (4.0)	24.1% (7.0)	37.9% (11.0)	20.7% (6.0)
Housing for seniors and the elderly	3.4% (1.0)	10.3% (3.0)	48.3% (14.0)	34.5% (10.0)	3.4% (1.0)
Housing for persons with disabilities	6.9% (2.0)	17.2% (5.0)	51.7% (15.0)	20.7% (6.0)	3.4% (1.0)
Affordable workforce housing (housing that costs less than 30% of household income)	17.2% (5.0)	27.6% (8.0)	31.0% (9.0)	17.2% (5.0)	6.9% (2.0)

50-59 (23)

Single-family homes	-	4.3% (1.0)	26.1% (6.0)	56.5% (13.0)	13.0% (3.0)
Multi-family apartments (rented by occupants)	-	4.3% (1.0)	39.1% (9.0)	52.2% (12.0)	4.3% (1.0)
Multi-family condominiums/ townhouses (owned or rented by occupants)	-	17.4% (4.0)	43.5% (10.0)	34.8% (8.0)	4.3% (1.0)
Housing for seniors and the elderly	8.7% (2.0)	17.4% (4.0)	43.5% (10.0)	26.1% (6.0)	4.3% (1.0)
Housing for persons with disabilities	-	30.4% (7.0)	65.2% (15.0)	4.3% (1.0)	-
Affordable workforce housing (housing that costs less than 30% of household income)	4.3% (1.0)	13.0% (3.0)	56.5% (13.0)	26.1% (6.0)	-

60-69 (26)

Single-family homes	-	23.1% (6.0)	11.5% (3.0)	53.8% (14.0)	11.5% (3.0)
Multi-family apartments (rented by occupants)	3.8% (1.0)	19.2% (5.0)	19.2% (5.0)	34.6% (9.0)	23.1% (6.0)
Multi-family condominiums/ townhouses (owned or rented by occupants)	-	30.8% (8.0)	7.7% (2.0)	42.3% (11.0)	19.2% (5.0)
Housing for seniors and the elderly	7.7% (2.0)	26.9% (7.0)	30.8% (8.0)	30.8% (8.0)	3.8% (1.0)
Housing for persons with disabilities	-	19.2% (5.0)	57.7% (15.0)	19.2% (5.0)	3.8% (1.0)
Affordable workforce housing (housing that costs less than 30% of household income)	7.7% (2.0)	19.2% (5.0)	30.8% (8.0)	26.9% (7.0)	15.4% (4.0)

70-79 (16)

Single-family homes	12.5% (2.0)	-	31.3% (5.0)	37.5% (6.0)	18.8% (3.0)
Multi-family apartments (rented by occupants)	6.3% (1.0)	6.3% (1.0)	31.3% (5.0)	37.5% (6.0)	18.8% (3.0)
Multi-family condominiums/ townhouses (owned or rented by occupants)	6.3% (1.0)	12.5% (2.0)	25.0% (4.0)	50.0% (8.0)	6.3% (1.0)
Housing for seniors and the elderly	12.5% (2.0)	12.5% (2.0)	37.5% (6.0)	31.3% (5.0)	6.3% (1.0)
Housing for persons with disabilities	12.5% (2.0)	12.5% (2.0)	62.5% (10.0)	6.3% (1.0)	6.3% (1.0)
Affordable workforce housing (housing that costs less than 30% of household income)	12.5% (2.0)	6.3% (1.0)	43.8% (7.0)	31.3% (5.0)	6.3% (1.0)

unknown (68)

Single-family homes	2.9% (2.0)	17.6% (12.0)	22.1% (15.0)	44.1% (30.0)	13.2% (9.0)
Multi-family apartments (rented by occupants)	5.9% (4.0)	11.8% (8.0)	27.9% (19.0)	42.6% (29.0)	11.8% (8.0)
Multi-family condominiums/ townhouses (owned or rented by occupants)	4.4% (3.0)	17.6% (12.0)	26.5% (18.0)	39.7% (27.0)	11.8% (8.0)
Housing for seniors and the elderly	-	20.6% (14.0)	57.4% (39.0)	19.1% (13.0)	2.9% (2.0)
Housing for persons with disabilities	4.4% (3.0)	11.8% (8.0)	70.6% (48.0)	8.8% (6.0)	4.4% (3.0)
Affordable workforce housing (housing that costs less than 30% of household income)	8.8% (6.0)	17.6% (12.0)	44.1% (30.0)	14.7% (10.0)	14.7% (10.0)

**VOTERS
AGE**

187 REGISTERED VOTERS

	Very Unsatisfied	Unsatisfied	Neutral	Satisfied	Very Satisfied
--	------------------	-------------	---------	-----------	----------------

28 (1)

Single-family homes	-	100.0% (1.0)	-	-	-
Multi-family apartments (rented by occupants)	-	-	-	100.0% (1.0)	-
Multi-family condominiums/ townhouses (owned or rented by occupants)	-	100.0% (1.0)	-	-	-
Housing for seniors and the elderly	-	100.0% (1.0)	-	-	-
Housing for persons with disabilities	100.0% (1.0)	-	-	-	-
Affordable workforce housing (housing that costs less than 30% of household income)	100.0% (1.0)	-	-	-	-

31 (1)

Single-family homes	-	-	-	100.0% (1.0)	-
Multi-family apartments (rented by occupants)	-	-	-	100.0% (1.0)	-
Multi-family condominiums/ townhouses (owned or rented by occupants)	-	-	-	100.0% (1.0)	-
Housing for seniors and the elderly	-	-	100.0% (1.0)	-	-
Housing for persons with disabilities	-	-	100.0% (1.0)	-	-
Affordable workforce housing (housing that costs less than 30% of household income)	-	-	100.0% (1.0)	-	-

32 (1)

Single-family homes	-	-	100.0% (1.0)	-	-
Multi-family apartments (rented by occupants)	-	-	100.0% (1.0)	-	-
Multi-family condominiums/ townhouses (owned or rented by occupants)	-	-	100.0% (1.0)	-	-
Housing for seniors and the elderly	-	-	100.0% (1.0)	-	-
Housing for persons with disabilities	-	-	100.0% (1.0)	-	-
Affordable workforce housing (housing that costs less than 30% of household income)	-	100.0% (1.0)	-	-	-

33 (1)

Single-family homes	-	-	-	100.0% (1.0)	-
Multi-family apartments (rented by occupants)	100.0% (1.0)	-	-	-	-
Multi-family condominiums/ townhouses (owned or rented by occupants)	-	-	100.0% (1.0)	-	-
Housing for seniors and the elderly	-	-	100.0% (1.0)	-	-
Housing for persons with disabilities	-	-	100.0% (1.0)	-	-
Affordable workforce housing (housing that costs less than 30% of household income)	-	-	100.0% (1.0)	-	-

34 (1)

Single-family homes	100.0% (1.0)	-	-	-	-
Multi-family apartments (rented by occupants)	100.0% (1.0)	-	-	-	-
Multi-family condominiums/ townhouses (owned or rented by occupants)	100.0% (1.0)	-	-	-	-
Housing for seniors and the elderly	-	-	100.0% (1.0)	-	-
Housing for persons with disabilities	-	-	100.0% (1.0)	-	-
Affordable workforce housing (housing that costs less than 30% of household income)	100.0% (1.0)	-	-	-	-

35 (5)

Single-family homes	20.0% (1.0)	40.0% (2.0)	-	40.0% (2.0)	-
Multi-family apartments (rented by occupants)	20.0% (1.0)	20.0% (1.0)	-	60.0% (3.0)	-
Multi-family condominiums/ townhouses (owned or rented by occupants)	-	60.0% (3.0)	20.0% (1.0)	20.0% (1.0)	-
Housing for seniors and the elderly	-	20.0% (1.0)	20.0% (1.0)	60.0% (3.0)	-
Housing for persons with disabilities	-	20.0% (1.0)	40.0% (2.0)	40.0% (2.0)	-
Affordable workforce housing (housing that costs less than 30% of household income)	20.0% (1.0)	20.0% (1.0)	20.0% (1.0)	40.0% (2.0)	-

36 (3)

Single-family homes	33.3% (1.0)	-	-	66.7% (2.0)	-
Multi-family apartments (rented by occupants)	-	-	-	100.0% (3.0)	-
Multi-family condominiums/ townhouses (owned or rented by occupants)	-	-	33.3% (1.0)	66.7% (2.0)	-
Housing for seniors and the elderly	-	-	66.7% (2.0)	33.3% (1.0)	-
Housing for persons with disabilities	-	-	66.7% (2.0)	33.3% (1.0)	-
Affordable workforce housing (housing that costs less than 30% of household income)	33.3% (1.0)	-	-	66.7% (2.0)	-

37 (5)

Single-family homes	-	20.0% (1.0)	20.0% (1.0)	60.0% (3.0)	-
Multi-family apartments (rented by occupants)	-	20.0% (1.0)	20.0% (1.0)	60.0% (3.0)	-
Multi-family condominiums/ townhouses (owned or rented by occupants)	-	20.0% (1.0)	20.0% (1.0)	60.0% (3.0)	-
Housing for seniors and the elderly	-	-	40.0% (2.0)	60.0% (3.0)	-
Housing for persons with disabilities	-	-	80.0% (4.0)	20.0% (1.0)	-
Affordable workforce housing (housing that costs less than 30% of household income)	-	40.0% (2.0)	40.0% (2.0)	20.0% (1.0)	-

38 (3)

Single-family homes	-	33.3% (1.0)	33.3% (1.0)	33.3% (1.0)	-
---------------------	---	-------------	-------------	-------------	---

Multi-family apartments (rented by occupants)	33.3% (1.0)	-	33.3% (1.0)	33.3% (1.0)	-
Multi-family condominiums/ townhouses (owned or rented by occupants)	-	-	33.3% (1.0)	66.7% (2.0)	-
Housing for seniors and the elderly	-	-	66.7% (2.0)	33.3% (1.0)	-
Housing for persons with disabilities	66.7% (2.0)	-	-	33.3% (1.0)	-
Affordable workforce housing (housing that costs less than 30% of household income)	66.7% (2.0)	-	-	33.3% (1.0)	-
39 (4)					
Single-family homes	-	25.0% (1.0)	25.0% (1.0)	50.0% (2.0)	-
Multi-family apartments (rented by occupants)	25.0% (1.0)	-	-	50.0% (2.0)	25.0% (1.0)
Multi-family condominiums/ townhouses (owned or rented by occupants)	25.0% (1.0)	-	-	50.0% (2.0)	25.0% (1.0)
Housing for seniors and the elderly	-	25.0% (1.0)	50.0% (2.0)	25.0% (1.0)	-
Housing for persons with disabilities	-	25.0% (1.0)	50.0% (2.0)	25.0% (1.0)	-
Affordable workforce housing (housing that costs less than 30% of household income)	-	25.0% (1.0)	25.0% (1.0)	25.0% (1.0)	25.0% (1.0)
40 (3)					
Single-family homes	-	-	-	100.0% (3.0)	-
Multi-family apartments (rented by occupants)	-	-	33.3% (1.0)	33.3% (1.0)	33.3% (1.0)
Multi-family condominiums/ townhouses (owned or rented by occupants)	-	-	33.3% (1.0)	33.3% (1.0)	33.3% (1.0)
Housing for seniors and the elderly	-	-	66.7% (2.0)	33.3% (1.0)	-
Housing for persons with disabilities	-	-	66.7% (2.0)	33.3% (1.0)	-
Affordable workforce housing (housing that costs less than 30% of household income)	33.3% (1.0)	-	-	66.7% (2.0)	-
41 (3)					
Single-family homes	-	-	-	66.7% (2.0)	33.3% (1.0)
Multi-family apartments (rented by occupants)	-	-	33.3% (1.0)	33.3% (1.0)	33.3% (1.0)
Multi-family condominiums/ townhouses (owned or rented by occupants)	-	-	-	100.0% (3.0)	-
Housing for seniors and the elderly	-	-	33.3% (1.0)	66.7% (2.0)	-
Housing for persons with disabilities	-	-	66.7% (2.0)	33.3% (1.0)	-
Affordable workforce housing (housing that costs less than 30% of household income)	33.3% (1.0)	33.3% (1.0)	33.3% (1.0)	-	-
43 (5)					
Single-family homes	20.0% (1.0)	-	-	60.0% (3.0)	20.0% (1.0)
Multi-family apartments (rented by occupants)	-	-	40.0% (2.0)	20.0% (1.0)	40.0% (2.0)
Multi-family condominiums/ townhouses (owned or rented by occupants)	-	20.0% (1.0)	20.0% (1.0)	40.0% (2.0)	20.0% (1.0)
Housing for seniors and the elderly	-	-	40.0% (2.0)	60.0% (3.0)	-
Housing for persons with disabilities	-	-	80.0% (4.0)	20.0% (1.0)	-
Affordable workforce housing (housing that costs less than 30% of household income)	-	20.0% (1.0)	40.0% (2.0)	40.0% (2.0)	-
44 (6)					
Single-family homes	-	16.7% (1.0)	33.3% (2.0)	50.0% (3.0)	-
Multi-family apartments (rented by occupants)	16.7% (1.0)	33.3% (2.0)	-	16.7% (1.0)	33.3% (2.0)
Multi-family condominiums/ townhouses (owned or rented by occupants)	16.7% (1.0)	-	50.0% (3.0)	16.7% (1.0)	16.7% (1.0)
Housing for seniors and the elderly	-	16.7% (1.0)	50.0% (3.0)	33.3% (2.0)	-
Housing for persons with disabilities	16.7% (1.0)	16.7% (1.0)	50.0% (3.0)	16.7% (1.0)	-
Affordable workforce housing (housing that costs less than 30% of household income)	16.7% (1.0)	33.3% (2.0)	16.7% (1.0)	16.7% (1.0)	16.7% (1.0)
45 (2)					
Single-family homes	-	-	-	100.0% (2.0)	-
Multi-family apartments (rented by occupants)	-	-	100.0% (2.0)	-	-
Multi-family condominiums/ townhouses (owned or rented by occupants)	-	50.0% (1.0)	-	50.0% (1.0)	-
Housing for seniors and the elderly	-	50.0% (1.0)	50.0% (1.0)	-	-
Housing for persons with disabilities	-	50.0% (1.0)	50.0% (1.0)	-	-
Affordable workforce housing (housing that costs less than 30% of household income)	-	100.0% (2.0)	-	-	-
46 (1)					
Single-family homes	-	-	100.0% (1.0)	-	-
Multi-family apartments (rented by occupants)	-	-	100.0% (1.0)	-	-

Multi-family condominiums/ townhouses (owned or rented by occupants)	-	-	100.0% (1.0)	-	-
Housing for seniors and the elderly	-	100.0% (1.0)	-	-	-
Housing for persons with disabilities	-	100.0% (1.0)	-	-	-
Affordable workforce housing (housing that costs less than 30% of household income)	-	100.0% (1.0)	-	-	-

47 (3)

Single-family homes	-	-	33.3% (1.0)	-	66.7% (2.0)
Multi-family apartments (rented by occupants)	-	-	33.3% (1.0)	-	66.7% (2.0)
Multi-family condominiums/ townhouses (owned or rented by occupants)	-	-	33.3% (1.0)	-	66.7% (2.0)
Housing for seniors and the elderly	-	-	100.0% (3.0)	-	-
Housing for persons with disabilities	-	33.3% (1.0)	33.3% (1.0)	33.3% (1.0)	-
Affordable workforce housing (housing that costs less than 30% of household income)	-	33.3% (1.0)	66.7% (2.0)	-	-

48 (2)

Single-family homes	-	50.0% (1.0)	50.0% (1.0)	-	-
Multi-family apartments (rented by occupants)	-	50.0% (1.0)	-	-	50.0% (1.0)
Multi-family condominiums/ townhouses (owned or rented by occupants)	-	50.0% (1.0)	-	-	50.0% (1.0)
Housing for seniors and the elderly	50.0% (1.0)	-	-	-	50.0% (1.0)
Housing for persons with disabilities	50.0% (1.0)	-	-	-	50.0% (1.0)
Affordable workforce housing (housing that costs less than 30% of household income)	50.0% (1.0)	-	-	-	50.0% (1.0)

49 (4)

Single-family homes	-	-	-	75.0% (3.0)	25.0% (1.0)
Multi-family apartments (rented by occupants)	-	25.0% (1.0)	25.0% (1.0)	50.0% (2.0)	-
Multi-family condominiums/ townhouses (owned or rented by occupants)	-	25.0% (1.0)	-	75.0% (3.0)	-
Housing for seniors and the elderly	-	-	50.0% (2.0)	50.0% (2.0)	-
Housing for persons with disabilities	-	25.0% (1.0)	50.0% (2.0)	25.0% (1.0)	-
Affordable workforce housing (housing that costs less than 30% of household income)	25.0% (1.0)	-	75.0% (3.0)	-	-

50 (1)

Single-family homes	-	-	100.0% (1.0)	-	-
Multi-family apartments (rented by occupants)	-	-	100.0% (1.0)	-	-
Multi-family condominiums/ townhouses (owned or rented by occupants)	-	-	100.0% (1.0)	-	-
Housing for seniors and the elderly	-	-	100.0% (1.0)	-	-
Housing for persons with disabilities	-	100.0% (1.0)	-	-	-
Affordable workforce housing (housing that costs less than 30% of household income)	-	-	100.0% (1.0)	-	-

51 (1)

Single-family homes	-	-	-	-	100.0% (1.0)
Multi-family apartments (rented by occupants)	-	-	-	100.0% (1.0)	-
Multi-family condominiums/ townhouses (owned or rented by occupants)	-	-	100.0% (1.0)	-	-
Housing for seniors and the elderly	-	-	-	100.0% (1.0)	-
Housing for persons with disabilities	-	-	100.0% (1.0)	-	-
Affordable workforce housing (housing that costs less than 30% of household income)	-	-	-	100.0% (1.0)	-

52 (5)

Single-family homes	-	-	-	100.0% (5.0)	-
Multi-family apartments (rented by occupants)	-	-	20.0% (1.0)	80.0% (4.0)	-
Multi-family condominiums/ townhouses (owned or rented by occupants)	-	-	20.0% (1.0)	80.0% (4.0)	-
Housing for seniors and the elderly	-	-	60.0% (3.0)	40.0% (2.0)	-
Housing for persons with disabilities	-	-	100.0% (5.0)	-	-
Affordable workforce housing (housing that costs less than 30% of household income)	-	-	100.0% (5.0)	-	-

53 (4)

Single-family homes	-	-	-	75.0% (3.0)	25.0% (1.0)
Multi-family apartments (rented by occupants)	-	-	25.0% (1.0)	75.0% (3.0)	-
Multi-family condominiums/ townhouses (owned or rented by occupants)	-	25.0% (1.0)	25.0% (1.0)	50.0% (2.0)	-

Housing for seniors and the elderly	-	50.0% (2.0)	25.0% (1.0)	25.0% (1.0)	-
Housing for persons with disabilities	-	50.0% (2.0)	50.0% (2.0)	-	-
Affordable workforce housing (housing that costs less than 30% of household income)	-	-	50.0% (2.0)	50.0% (2.0)	-
54 (1)					
Single-family homes	-	-	-	100.0% (1.0)	-
Multi-family apartments (rented by occupants)	-	-	100.0% (1.0)	-	-
Multi-family condominiums/ townhouses (owned or rented by occupants)	-	-	100.0% (1.0)	-	-
Housing for seniors and the elderly	-	-	100.0% (1.0)	-	-
Housing for persons with disabilities	-	-	100.0% (1.0)	-	-
Affordable workforce housing (housing that costs less than 30% of household income)	-	-	100.0% (1.0)	-	-
55 (3)					
Single-family homes	-	-	33.3% (1.0)	66.7% (2.0)	-
Multi-family apartments (rented by occupants)	-	33.3% (1.0)	-	33.3% (1.0)	33.3% (1.0)
Multi-family condominiums/ townhouses (owned or rented by occupants)	-	33.3% (1.0)	-	33.3% (1.0)	33.3% (1.0)
Housing for seniors and the elderly	-	33.3% (1.0)	-	33.3% (1.0)	33.3% (1.0)
Housing for persons with disabilities	-	33.3% (1.0)	66.7% (2.0)	-	-
Affordable workforce housing (housing that costs less than 30% of household income)	-	33.3% (1.0)	33.3% (1.0)	33.3% (1.0)	-
56 (2)					
Single-family homes	-	-	100.0% (2.0)	-	-
Multi-family apartments (rented by occupants)	-	-	100.0% (2.0)	-	-
Multi-family condominiums/ townhouses (owned or rented by occupants)	-	-	100.0% (2.0)	-	-
Housing for seniors and the elderly	-	-	100.0% (2.0)	-	-
Housing for persons with disabilities	-	-	100.0% (2.0)	-	-
Affordable workforce housing (housing that costs less than 30% of household income)	-	-	100.0% (2.0)	-	-
57 (1)					
Single-family homes	-	-	-	100.0% (1.0)	-
Multi-family apartments (rented by occupants)	-	-	-	100.0% (1.0)	-
Multi-family condominiums/ townhouses (owned or rented by occupants)	-	-	-	100.0% (1.0)	-
Housing for seniors and the elderly	-	-	-	100.0% (1.0)	-
Housing for persons with disabilities	-	-	-	100.0% (1.0)	-
Affordable workforce housing (housing that costs less than 30% of household income)	-	-	-	100.0% (1.0)	-
59 (5)					
Single-family homes	-	20.0% (1.0)	40.0% (2.0)	20.0% (1.0)	20.0% (1.0)
Multi-family apartments (rented by occupants)	-	-	60.0% (3.0)	40.0% (2.0)	-
Multi-family condominiums/ townhouses (owned or rented by occupants)	-	40.0% (2.0)	60.0% (3.0)	-	-
Housing for seniors and the elderly	40.0% (2.0)	20.0% (1.0)	40.0% (2.0)	-	-
Housing for persons with disabilities	-	60.0% (3.0)	40.0% (2.0)	-	-
Affordable workforce housing (housing that costs less than 30% of household income)	20.0% (1.0)	40.0% (2.0)	20.0% (1.0)	20.0% (1.0)	-
60 (3)					
Single-family homes	-	-	33.3% (1.0)	66.7% (2.0)	-
Multi-family apartments (rented by occupants)	-	66.7% (2.0)	-	33.3% (1.0)	-
Multi-family condominiums/ townhouses (owned or rented by occupants)	-	66.7% (2.0)	-	33.3% (1.0)	-
Housing for seniors and the elderly	-	33.3% (1.0)	33.3% (1.0)	33.3% (1.0)	-
Housing for persons with disabilities	-	33.3% (1.0)	33.3% (1.0)	33.3% (1.0)	-
Affordable workforce housing (housing that costs less than 30% of household income)	-	33.3% (1.0)	33.3% (1.0)	33.3% (1.0)	-
61 (1)					
Single-family homes	-	100.0% (1.0)	-	-	-
Multi-family apartments (rented by occupants)	-	100.0% (1.0)	-	-	-
Multi-family condominiums/ townhouses (owned or rented by occupants)	-	100.0% (1.0)	-	-	-
Housing for seniors and the elderly	-	100.0% (1.0)	-	-	-
Housing for persons with disabilities	-	100.0% (1.0)	-	-	-

Affordable workforce housing (housing that costs less than 30% of household income)	-	-	-	100.0% (1.0)	-
---	---	---	---	--------------	---

62 (5)

Single-family homes	-	20.0% (1.0)	20.0% (1.0)	40.0% (2.0)	20.0% (1.0)
Multi-family apartments (rented by occupants)	-	-	60.0% (3.0)	-	40.0% (2.0)
Multi-family condominiums/ townhouses (owned or rented by occupants)	-	20.0% (1.0)	20.0% (1.0)	40.0% (2.0)	20.0% (1.0)
Housing for seniors and the elderly	-	40.0% (2.0)	40.0% (2.0)	20.0% (1.0)	-
Housing for persons with disabilities	-	-	100.0% (5.0)	-	-
Affordable workforce housing (housing that costs less than 30% of household income)	-	20.0% (1.0)	60.0% (3.0)	-	20.0% (1.0)

63 (2)

Single-family homes	-	-	-	50.0% (1.0)	50.0% (1.0)
Multi-family apartments (rented by occupants)	-	-	-	100.0% (2.0)	-
Multi-family condominiums/ townhouses (owned or rented by occupants)	-	-	-	50.0% (1.0)	50.0% (1.0)
Housing for seniors and the elderly	-	50.0% (1.0)	-	50.0% (1.0)	-
Housing for persons with disabilities	-	50.0% (1.0)	-	50.0% (1.0)	-
Affordable workforce housing (housing that costs less than 30% of household income)	-	-	-	100.0% (2.0)	-

64 (5)

Single-family homes	-	40.0% (2.0)	20.0% (1.0)	40.0% (2.0)	-
Multi-family apartments (rented by occupants)	-	20.0% (1.0)	20.0% (1.0)	20.0% (1.0)	40.0% (2.0)
Multi-family condominiums/ townhouses (owned or rented by occupants)	-	40.0% (2.0)	20.0% (1.0)	-	40.0% (2.0)
Housing for seniors and the elderly	20.0% (1.0)	-	60.0% (3.0)	20.0% (1.0)	-
Housing for persons with disabilities	-	-	100.0% (5.0)	-	-
Affordable workforce housing (housing that costs less than 30% of household income)	20.0% (1.0)	20.0% (1.0)	20.0% (1.0)	20.0% (1.0)	20.0% (1.0)

65 (2)

Single-family homes	-	-	-	100.0% (2.0)	-
Multi-family apartments (rented by occupants)	50.0% (1.0)	-	-	50.0% (1.0)	-
Multi-family condominiums/ townhouses (owned or rented by occupants)	-	-	-	100.0% (2.0)	-
Housing for seniors and the elderly	-	-	-	100.0% (2.0)	-
Housing for persons with disabilities	-	50.0% (1.0)	-	50.0% (1.0)	-
Affordable workforce housing (housing that costs less than 30% of household income)	-	50.0% (1.0)	-	50.0% (1.0)	-

66 (2)

Single-family homes	-	-	-	50.0% (1.0)	50.0% (1.0)
Multi-family apartments (rented by occupants)	-	-	-	50.0% (1.0)	50.0% (1.0)
Multi-family condominiums/ townhouses (owned or rented by occupants)	-	-	-	50.0% (1.0)	50.0% (1.0)
Housing for seniors and the elderly	-	-	50.0% (1.0)	-	50.0% (1.0)
Housing for persons with disabilities	-	-	50.0% (1.0)	-	50.0% (1.0)
Affordable workforce housing (housing that costs less than 30% of household income)	-	-	50.0% (1.0)	-	50.0% (1.0)

67 (1)

Single-family homes	-	-	-	100.0% (1.0)	-
Multi-family apartments (rented by occupants)	-	-	-	100.0% (1.0)	-
Multi-family condominiums/ townhouses (owned or rented by occupants)	-	100.0% (1.0)	-	-	-
Housing for seniors and the elderly	-	100.0% (1.0)	-	-	-
Housing for persons with disabilities	-	-	100.0% (1.0)	-	-
Affordable workforce housing (housing that costs less than 30% of household income)	-	-	100.0% (1.0)	-	-

68 (3)

Single-family homes	-	33.3% (1.0)	-	66.7% (2.0)	-
Multi-family apartments (rented by occupants)	-	33.3% (1.0)	-	33.3% (1.0)	33.3% (1.0)
Multi-family condominiums/ townhouses (owned or rented by occupants)	-	33.3% (1.0)	-	66.7% (2.0)	-
Housing for seniors and the elderly	33.3% (1.0)	-	33.3% (1.0)	33.3% (1.0)	-
Housing for persons with disabilities	-	-	66.7% (2.0)	33.3% (1.0)	-
Affordable workforce housing (housing that costs less than 30% of household income)	33.3% (1.0)	-	33.3% (1.0)	-	33.3% (1.0)

69 (2)

Single-family homes	-	50.0% (1.0)	-	50.0% (1.0)	-
Multi-family apartments (rented by occupants)	-	-	50.0% (1.0)	50.0% (1.0)	-
Multi-family condominiums/ townhouses (owned or rented by occupants)	-	-	-	100.0% (2.0)	-
Housing for seniors and the elderly	-	50.0% (1.0)	-	50.0% (1.0)	-
Housing for persons with disabilities	-	50.0% (1.0)	-	50.0% (1.0)	-
Affordable workforce housing (housing that costs less than 30% of household income)	-	50.0% (1.0)	-	50.0% (1.0)	-

71 (2)

Single-family homes	-	-	-	50.0% (1.0)	50.0% (1.0)
Multi-family apartments (rented by occupants)	-	-	-	100.0% (2.0)	-
Multi-family condominiums/ townhouses (owned or rented by occupants)	-	-	-	100.0% (2.0)	-
Housing for seniors and the elderly	-	-	50.0% (1.0)	50.0% (1.0)	-
Housing for persons with disabilities	-	-	100.0% (2.0)	-	-
Affordable workforce housing (housing that costs less than 30% of household income)	-	-	100.0% (2.0)	-	-

72 (3)

Single-family homes	33.3% (1.0)	-	-	33.3% (1.0)	33.3% (1.0)
Multi-family apartments (rented by occupants)	33.3% (1.0)	33.3% (1.0)	33.3% (1.0)	-	-
Multi-family condominiums/ townhouses (owned or rented by occupants)	-	33.3% (1.0)	33.3% (1.0)	33.3% (1.0)	-
Housing for seniors and the elderly	33.3% (1.0)	33.3% (1.0)	33.3% (1.0)	-	-
Housing for persons with disabilities	33.3% (1.0)	-	66.7% (2.0)	-	-
Affordable workforce housing (housing that costs less than 30% of household income)	33.3% (1.0)	-	33.3% (1.0)	33.3% (1.0)	-

73 (3)

Single-family homes	-	-	66.7% (2.0)	-	33.3% (1.0)
Multi-family apartments (rented by occupants)	-	-	33.3% (1.0)	33.3% (1.0)	33.3% (1.0)
Multi-family condominiums/ townhouses (owned or rented by occupants)	-	-	33.3% (1.0)	33.3% (1.0)	33.3% (1.0)
Housing for seniors and the elderly	-	33.3% (1.0)	33.3% (1.0)	-	33.3% (1.0)
Housing for persons with disabilities	-	-	66.7% (2.0)	-	33.3% (1.0)
Affordable workforce housing (housing that costs less than 30% of household income)	-	-	33.3% (1.0)	33.3% (1.0)	33.3% (1.0)

74 (4)

Single-family homes	-	-	25.0% (1.0)	75.0% (3.0)	-
Multi-family apartments (rented by occupants)	-	-	25.0% (1.0)	50.0% (2.0)	25.0% (1.0)
Multi-family condominiums/ townhouses (owned or rented by occupants)	25.0% (1.0)	25.0% (1.0)	-	50.0% (2.0)	-
Housing for seniors and the elderly	-	-	75.0% (3.0)	25.0% (1.0)	-
Housing for persons with disabilities	25.0% (1.0)	-	50.0% (2.0)	25.0% (1.0)	-
Affordable workforce housing (housing that costs less than 30% of household income)	25.0% (1.0)	-	25.0% (1.0)	50.0% (2.0)	-

77 (2)

Single-family homes	50.0% (1.0)	-	50.0% (1.0)	-	-
Multi-family apartments (rented by occupants)	-	-	50.0% (1.0)	-	50.0% (1.0)
Multi-family condominiums/ townhouses (owned or rented by occupants)	-	-	50.0% (1.0)	50.0% (1.0)	-
Housing for seniors and the elderly	50.0% (1.0)	-	-	50.0% (1.0)	-
Housing for persons with disabilities	-	50.0% (1.0)	50.0% (1.0)	-	-
Affordable workforce housing (housing that costs less than 30% of household income)	-	50.0% (1.0)	-	50.0% (1.0)	-

79 (2)

Single-family homes	-	-	50.0% (1.0)	50.0% (1.0)	-
Multi-family apartments (rented by occupants)	-	-	50.0% (1.0)	50.0% (1.0)	-
Multi-family condominiums/ townhouses (owned or rented by occupants)	-	-	50.0% (1.0)	50.0% (1.0)	-
Housing for seniors and the elderly	-	-	-	100.0% (2.0)	-
Housing for persons with disabilities	-	50.0% (1.0)	50.0% (1.0)	-	-
Affordable workforce housing (housing that costs less than 30% of household income)	-	-	100.0% (2.0)	-	-

Unknown (68)

Single-family homes	2.9% (2.0)	17.6% (12.0)	22.1% (15.0)	44.1% (30.0)	13.2% (9.0)
Multi-family apartments (rented by occupants)	5.9% (4.0)	11.8% (8.0)	27.9% (19.0)	42.6% (29.0)	11.8% (8.0)
Multi-family condominiums/ townhouses (owned or rented by occupants)	4.4% (3.0)	17.6% (12.0)	26.5% (18.0)	39.7% (27.0)	11.8% (8.0)
Housing for seniors and the elderly	-	20.6% (14.0)	57.4% (39.0)	19.1% (13.0)	2.9% (2.0)
Housing for persons with disabilities	4.4% (3.0)	11.8% (8.0)	70.6% (48.0)	8.8% (6.0)	4.4% (3.0)
Affordable workforce housing (housing that costs less than 30% of household income)	8.8% (6.0)	17.6% (12.0)	44.1% (30.0)	14.7% (10.0)	14.7% (10.0)

**STATE INCOME
DECILE**

187 REGISTERED VOTERS

Very Unsatisfied Unsatisfied Neutral Satisfied Very Satisfied

0 to 9 Pct range (6)

Single-family homes	-	16.7% (1.0)	16.7% (1.0)	50.0% (3.0)	16.7% (1.0)
Multi-family apartments (rented by occupants)	-	16.7% (1.0)	-	83.3% (5.0)	-
Multi-family condominiums/ townhouses (owned or rented by occupants)	-	33.3% (2.0)	-	66.7% (4.0)	-
Housing for seniors and the elderly	16.7% (1.0)	-	66.7% (4.0)	16.7% (1.0)	-
Housing for persons with disabilities	-	16.7% (1.0)	66.7% (4.0)	16.7% (1.0)	-
Affordable workforce housing (housing that costs less than 30% of household income)	33.3% (2.0)	16.7% (1.0)	33.3% (2.0)	16.7% (1.0)	-

10 to 19 Pct range (1)

Single-family homes	-	-	-	100.0% (1.0)	-
Multi-family apartments (rented by occupants)	-	-	-	100.0% (1.0)	-
Multi-family condominiums/ townhouses (owned or rented by occupants)	-	-	-	100.0% (1.0)	-
Housing for seniors and the elderly	-	-	-	100.0% (1.0)	-
Housing for persons with disabilities	-	-	-	100.0% (1.0)	-
Affordable workforce housing (housing that costs less than 30% of household income)	-	-	-	-	100.0% (1.0)

40 to 49 Pct range (2)

Single-family homes	-	-	-	50.0% (1.0)	50.0% (1.0)
Multi-family apartments (rented by occupants)	50.0% (1.0)	-	50.0% (1.0)	-	-
Multi-family condominiums/ townhouses (owned or rented by occupants)	-	50.0% (1.0)	50.0% (1.0)	-	-
Housing for seniors and the elderly	-	50.0% (1.0)	50.0% (1.0)	-	-
Housing for persons with disabilities	-	50.0% (1.0)	50.0% (1.0)	-	-
Affordable workforce housing (housing that costs less than 30% of household income)	100.0% (2.0)	-	-	-	-

50 to 59 Pct range (9)

Single-family homes	11.1% (1.0)	44.4% (4.0)	11.1% (1.0)	33.3% (3.0)	-
Multi-family apartments (rented by occupants)	-	22.2% (2.0)	22.2% (2.0)	55.6% (5.0)	-
Multi-family condominiums/ townhouses (owned or rented by occupants)	-	33.3% (3.0)	22.2% (2.0)	44.4% (4.0)	-
Housing for seniors and the elderly	11.1% (1.0)	22.2% (2.0)	22.2% (2.0)	44.4% (4.0)	-
Housing for persons with disabilities	22.2% (2.0)	11.1% (1.0)	44.4% (4.0)	22.2% (2.0)	-
Affordable workforce housing (housing that costs less than 30% of household income)	22.2% (2.0)	22.2% (2.0)	33.3% (3.0)	22.2% (2.0)	-

60 to 69 Pct range (7)

Single-family homes	-	-	28.6% (2.0)	57.1% (4.0)	14.3% (1.0)
Multi-family apartments (rented by occupants)	-	-	14.3% (1.0)	85.7% (6.0)	-
Multi-family condominiums/ townhouses (owned or rented by occupants)	-	-	-	100.0% (7.0)	-
Housing for seniors and the elderly	-	28.6% (2.0)	14.3% (1.0)	57.1% (4.0)	-
Housing for persons with disabilities	-	14.3% (1.0)	42.9% (3.0)	28.6% (2.0)	14.3% (1.0)
Affordable workforce housing (housing that costs less than 30% of household income)	14.3% (1.0)	-	42.9% (3.0)	28.6% (2.0)	14.3% (1.0)

70 to 79 Pct range (5)

Single-family homes	-	-	40.0% (2.0)	60.0% (3.0)	-
Multi-family apartments (rented by occupants)	-	20.0% (1.0)	60.0% (3.0)	20.0% (1.0)	-
Multi-family condominiums/ townhouses (owned or rented by occupants)	-	20.0% (1.0)	60.0% (3.0)	20.0% (1.0)	-
Housing for seniors and the elderly	-	20.0% (1.0)	60.0% (3.0)	20.0% (1.0)	-

Housing for persons with disabilities	20.0% (1.0)	20.0% (1.0)	40.0% (2.0)	20.0% (1.0)	-
Affordable workforce housing (housing that costs less than 30% of household income)	20.0% (1.0)	-	60.0% (3.0)	20.0% (1.0)	-

80 to 89 Pct range (70)

Single-family homes	7.1% (5.0)	17.1% (12.0)	22.9% (16.0)	44.3% (31.0)	8.6% (6.0)
Multi-family apartments (rented by occupants)	11.4% (8.0)	11.4% (8.0)	27.1% (19.0)	41.4% (29.0)	8.6% (6.0)
Multi-family condominiums/ townhouses (owned or rented by occupants)	5.7% (4.0)	20.0% (14.0)	28.6% (20.0)	41.4% (29.0)	4.3% (3.0)
Housing for seniors and the elderly	1.4% (1.0)	17.1% (12.0)	50.0% (35.0)	30.0% (21.0)	1.4% (1.0)
Housing for persons with disabilities	2.9% (2.0)	18.6% (13.0)	62.9% (44.0)	14.3% (10.0)	1.4% (1.0)
Affordable workforce housing (housing that costs less than 30% of household income)	8.6% (6.0)	24.3% (17.0)	34.3% (24.0)	24.3% (17.0)	8.6% (6.0)

90 Pct and up (85)

Single-family homes	2.4% (2.0)	11.8% (10.0)	18.8% (16.0)	50.6% (43.0)	16.5% (14.0)
Multi-family apartments (rented by occupants)	3.5% (3.0)	10.6% (9.0)	27.1% (23.0)	32.9% (28.0)	25.9% (22.0)
Multi-family condominiums/ townhouses (owned or rented by occupants)	3.5% (3.0)	15.3% (13.0)	24.7% (21.0)	34.1% (29.0)	22.4% (19.0)
Housing for seniors and the elderly	4.7% (4.0)	16.5% (14.0)	50.6% (43.0)	22.4% (19.0)	5.9% (5.0)
Housing for persons with disabilities	5.9% (5.0)	11.8% (10.0)	68.2% (58.0)	9.4% (8.0)	4.7% (4.0)
Affordable workforce housing (housing that costs less than 30% of household income)	8.2% (7.0)	16.5% (14.0)	43.5% (37.0)	20.0% (17.0)	11.8% (10.0)

Unknown (2)

Single-family homes	-	-	-	100.0% (2.0)	-
Multi-family apartments (rented by occupants)	-	-	50.0% (1.0)	50.0% (1.0)	-
Multi-family condominiums/ townhouses (owned or rented by occupants)	-	50.0% (1.0)	-	50.0% (1.0)	-
Housing for seniors and the elderly	-	50.0% (1.0)	50.0% (1.0)	-	-
Housing for persons with disabilities	-	50.0% (1.0)	50.0% (1.0)	-	-
Affordable workforce housing (housing that costs less than 30% of household income)	50.0% (1.0)	-	50.0% (1.0)	-	-

HOME OWNER/RENTER

187 REGISTERED VOTERS

	Very Unsatisfied	Unsatisfied	Neutral	Satisfied	Very Satisfied
--	------------------	-------------	---------	-----------	----------------

Likely Homeowner (106)

Single-family homes	2.8% (3.0)	13.2% (14.0)	16.0% (17.0)	51.9% (55.0)	16.0% (17.0)
Multi-family apartments (rented by occupants)	7.5% (8.0)	13.2% (14.0)	23.6% (25.0)	38.7% (41.0)	17.0% (18.0)
Multi-family condominiums/ townhouses (owned or rented by occupants)	3.8% (4.0)	17.9% (19.0)	21.7% (23.0)	42.5% (45.0)	14.2% (15.0)
Housing for seniors and the elderly	4.7% (5.0)	16.0% (17.0)	42.5% (45.0)	33.0% (35.0)	3.8% (4.0)
Housing for persons with disabilities	3.8% (4.0)	17.0% (18.0)	58.5% (62.0)	17.9% (19.0)	2.8% (3.0)
Affordable workforce housing (housing that costs less than 30% of household income)	9.4% (10.0)	17.0% (18.0)	34.9% (37.0)	31.1% (33.0)	7.5% (8.0)

Likely Renter (55)

Single-family homes	7.3% (4.0)	20.0% (11.0)	32.7% (18.0)	32.7% (18.0)	7.3% (4.0)
Multi-family apartments (rented by occupants)	7.3% (4.0)	5.5% (3.0)	29.1% (16.0)	47.3% (26.0)	10.9% (6.0)
Multi-family condominiums/ townhouses (owned or rented by occupants)	5.5% (3.0)	16.4% (9.0)	36.4% (20.0)	38.2% (21.0)	3.6% (2.0)
Housing for seniors and the elderly	3.6% (2.0)	20.0% (11.0)	52.7% (29.0)	21.8% (12.0)	1.8% (1.0)
Housing for persons with disabilities	7.3% (4.0)	14.5% (8.0)	67.3% (37.0)	9.1% (5.0)	1.8% (1.0)
Affordable workforce housing (housing that costs less than 30% of household income)	16.4% (9.0)	21.8% (12.0)	43.6% (24.0)	9.1% (5.0)	9.1% (5.0)

Unknown (26)

Single-family homes	3.8% (1.0)	7.7% (2.0)	11.5% (3.0)	69.2% (18.0)	7.7% (2.0)
Multi-family apartments (rented by occupants)	-	15.4% (4.0)	34.6% (9.0)	34.6% (9.0)	15.4% (4.0)
Multi-family condominiums/ townhouses (owned or rented by occupants)	-	26.9% (7.0)	15.4% (4.0)	38.5% (10.0)	19.2% (5.0)
Housing for seniors and the elderly	-	19.2% (5.0)	61.5% (16.0)	15.4% (4.0)	3.8% (1.0)
Housing for persons with disabilities	7.7% (2.0)	11.5% (3.0)	69.2% (18.0)	3.8% (1.0)	7.7% (2.0)
Affordable workforce housing (housing that costs less than 30% of household income)	11.5% (3.0)	15.4% (4.0)	46.2% (12.0)	7.7% (2.0)	19.2% (5.0)

Please rate your level of satisfaction with the amount of the following retail and service business in Fitchburg:

CURRENT RESULTS					303 Total Responses
	Very Unsatisfied	Unsatisfied	Neutral	Satisfied	Very Satisfied
Arts, entertainment, and recreation facilities	7% (22)	33% (101)	22% (67)	32% (97)	5% (16)
Bars and breweries/wineries/distilleries	7% (22)	22% (68)	21% (64)	41% (124)	8% (25)
Childcare facilities	3% (9)	11% (32)	63% (192)	18% (55)	5% (15)
Clothing stores	10% (31)	35% (105)	39% (119)	14% (41)	2% (7)
Convenience stores/pharmacies	2% (6)	7% (22)	20% (61)	59% (178)	12% (36)
Department/super stores	5% (16)	14% (41)	29% (88)	41% (124)	11% (34)
Financial institutions	2% (5)	5% (14)	20% (61)	57% (172)	17% (51)
Gas stations	2% (7)	12% (37)	17% (53)	54% (163)	14% (43)
Grocery stores	6% (17)	17% (50)	14% (41)	51% (155)	13% (40)
Healthcare and social service facilities	3% (10)	12% (36)	35% (106)	41% (123)	9% (28)
Home improvement/maintenance stores	7% (21)	25% (77)	28% (84)	34% (103)	6% (18)
Hotels	3% (8)	6% (18)	36% (108)	46% (138)	10% (31)
Schools and educational facilities	13% (39)	22% (66)	32% (96)	28% (84)	6% (18)
Restaurants and food carts/trucks	16% (49)	31% (93)	17% (50)	31% (95)	5% (16)

REGISTERED (181)

	Very Unsatisfied	Unsatisfied	Neutral	Satisfied	Very Satisfied
Arts, entertainment, and recreation facilities	6.0% (10)	33.0% (60)	23.0% (42)	33.0% (59)	6.0% (10)
Bars and breweries/wineries/distilleries	7.0% (12)	23.0% (41)	22.0% (40)	40.0% (73)	8.0% (15)
Childcare facilities	2.0% (4)	9.0% (17)	64.0% (115)	21.0% (38)	4.0% (7)
Clothing stores	9.0% (17)	35.0% (64)	39.0% (71)	13.0% (24)	3.0% (5)
Convenience stores/pharmacies	1.0% (1)	7.0% (12)	19.0% (35)	62.0% (113)	11.0% (20)
Department/super stores	4.0% (7)	13.0% (23)	33.0% (60)	40.0% (73)	10.0% (18)
Financial institutions	1.0% (2)	3.0% (6)	18.0% (33)	60.0% (109)	17.0% (31)
Gas stations	-	10.0% (18)	17.0% (31)	61.0% (110)	12.0% (22)
Grocery stores	3.0% (6)	16.0% (29)	14.0% (26)	54.0% (97)	13.0% (23)
Healthcare and social service facilities	2.0% (3)	13.0% (24)	35.0% (64)	41.0% (74)	9.0% (16)
Home improvement/maintenance stores	6.0% (10)	23.0% (42)	30.0% (54)	36.0% (65)	6.0% (10)
Hotels	2.0% (4)	7.0% (12)	35.0% (63)	49.0% (88)	8.0% (14)
Schools and educational facilities	10.0% (18)	24.0% (44)	35.0% (63)	27.0% (48)	4.0% (8)
Restaurants and food carts/trucks	17.0% (31)	30.0% (55)	18.0% (33)	30.0% (54)	4.0% (8)

NON-REGISTERED (122)

	Very Unsatisfied	Unsatisfied	Neutral	Satisfied	Very Satisfied
Arts, entertainment, and recreation facilities	9.8% (12)	33.6% (41)	20.5% (25)	31.1% (38)	4.9% (6)
Bars and breweries/wineries/distilleries	8.2% (10)	22.1% (27)	19.7% (24)	41.8% (51)	8.2% (10)
Childcare facilities	4.1% (5)	12.3% (15)	63.1% (77)	13.9% (17)	6.6% (8)
Clothing stores	11.5% (14)	33.6% (41)	39.3% (48)	13.9% (17)	1.6% (2)
Convenience stores/pharmacies	4.1% (5)	8.2% (10)	21.3% (26)	53.3% (65)	13.1% (16)
Department/super stores	7.4% (9)	14.8% (18)	23.0% (28)	41.8% (51)	13.1% (16)
Financial institutions	2.5% (3)	6.6% (8)	23.0% (28)	51.6% (63)	16.4% (20)
Gas stations	5.7% (7)	15.6% (19)	18.0% (22)	43.4% (53)	17.2% (21)
Grocery stores	9.0% (11)	17.2% (21)	12.3% (15)	47.5% (58)	13.9% (17)
Healthcare and social service facilities	5.7% (7)	9.8% (12)	34.4% (42)	40.2% (49)	9.8% (12)
Home improvement/maintenance stores	9.0% (11)	28.7% (35)	24.6% (30)	31.1% (38)	6.6% (8)
Hotels	3.3% (4)	4.9% (6)	36.9% (45)	41.0% (50)	13.9% (17)
Schools and educational facilities	17.2% (21)	18.0% (22)	27.0% (33)	29.5% (36)	8.2% (10)
Restaurants and food carts/trucks	14.8% (18)	31.1% (38)	13.9% (17)	33.6% (41)	6.6% (8)

ALL RESPONDENTS (303)

	Very Unsatisfied	Unsatisfied	Neutral	Satisfied	Very Satisfied
Arts, entertainment, and recreation facilities	7% (22)	33% (101)	22% (67)	32% (97)	5% (16)
Bars and breweries/wineries/distilleries	7% (22)	22% (68)	21% (64)	41% (124)	8% (25)
Childcare facilities	3% (9)	11% (32)	63% (192)	18% (55)	5% (15)
Clothing stores	10% (31)	35% (105)	39% (119)	14% (41)	2% (7)
Convenience stores/pharmacies	2% (6)	7% (22)	20% (61)	59% (178)	12% (36)
Department/super stores	5% (16)	14% (41)	29% (88)	41% (124)	11% (34)
Financial institutions	2% (5)	5% (14)	20% (61)	57% (172)	17% (51)
Gas stations	2% (7)	12% (37)	17% (53)	54% (163)	14% (43)
Grocery stores	6% (17)	17% (50)	14% (41)	51% (155)	13% (40)
Healthcare and social service facilities	3% (10)	12% (36)	35% (106)	41% (123)	9% (28)
Home improvement/maintenance stores	7% (21)	25% (77)	28% (84)	34% (103)	6% (18)
Hotels	3% (8)	6% (18)	36% (108)	46% (138)	10% (31)
Schools and educational facilities	13% (39)	22% (66)	32% (96)	28% (84)	6% (18)
Restaurants and food carts/trucks	16% (49)	31% (93)	17% (50)	31% (95)	5% (16)

REGISTERED VOTERS IN FITCHBURG, WI (181)

	Very Unsatisfied	Unsatisfied	Neutral	Satisfied	Very Satisfied
Arts, entertainment, and recreation facilities	6% (10)	33% (60)	23% (42)	33% (59)	6% (10)
Bars and breweries/wineries/distilleries	7% (12)	23% (41)	22% (40)	40% (73)	8% (15)
Childcare facilities	2% (4)	9% (17)	64% (115)	21% (38)	4% (7)
Clothing stores	9% (17)	35% (64)	39% (71)	13% (24)	3% (5)
Convenience stores/pharmacies	1% (1)	7% (12)	19% (35)	62% (113)	11% (20)
Department/super stores	4% (7)	13% (23)	33% (60)	40% (73)	10% (18)
Financial institutions	1% (2)	3% (6)	18% (33)	60% (109)	17% (31)
Gas stations	0% (-)	10% (18)	17% (31)	61% (110)	12% (22)
Grocery stores	3% (6)	16% (29)	14% (26)	54% (97)	13% (23)
Healthcare and social service facilities	2% (3)	13% (24)	35% (64)	41% (74)	9% (16)
Home improvement/maintenance stores	6% (10)	23% (42)	30% (54)	36% (65)	6% (10)
Hotels	2% (4)	7% (12)	35% (63)	49% (88)	8% (14)
Schools and educational facilities	10% (18)	24% (44)	35% (63)	27% (48)	4% (8)
Restaurants and food carts/trucks	17% (31)	30% (55)	18% (33)	30% (54)	4% (8)

LIVE IN FITCHBURG, WI (267) - SELF-REPORTED

	Very Unsatisfied	Unsatisfied	Neutral	Satisfied	Very Satisfied
Arts, entertainment, and recreation facilities	6% (17)	34% (92)	22% (59)	33% (87)	4% (12)
Bars and breweries/wineries/distilleries	6% (17)	24% (64)	21% (57)	40% (108)	8% (21)
Childcare facilities	3% (8)	10% (28)	63% (168)	19% (51)	4% (12)
Clothing stores	10% (27)	35% (94)	38% (102)	14% (38)	2% (6)
Convenience stores/pharmacies	2% (5)	7% (20)	20% (53)	60% (159)	11% (30)
Department/super stores	4% (12)	13% (35)	29% (78)	41% (110)	12% (32)
Financial institutions	1% (3)	5% (13)	19% (52)	58% (155)	16% (44)
Gas stations	2% (6)	13% (36)	16% (42)	55% (146)	14% (37)
Grocery stores	6% (15)	15% (41)	14% (37)	52% (139)	13% (35)
Healthcare and social service facilities	3% (8)	12% (33)	35% (93)	41% (110)	9% (23)
Home improvement/maintenance stores	7% (19)	25% (67)	27% (73)	35% (93)	6% (15)
Hotels	2% (6)	6% (17)	35% (93)	47% (125)	10% (26)
Schools and educational facilities	13% (34)	22% (58)	33% (87)	28% (76)	4% (12)
Restaurants and food carts/trucks	16% (44)	33% (87)	16% (43)	31% (82)	4% (11)

SUBSCRIBERS TO FITCHBURG, WI (271)

	Very Unsatisfied	Unsatisfied	Neutral	Satisfied	Very Satisfied
Arts, entertainment, and recreation facilities	7% (19)	34% (93)	22% (60)	32% (87)	4% (12)
Bars and breweries/wineries/distilleries	7% (18)	24% (66)	21% (58)	40% (108)	8% (21)
Childcare facilities	3% (9)	11% (30)	62% (169)	19% (51)	4% (12)
Clothing stores	10% (28)	35% (94)	39% (105)	14% (38)	2% (6)
Convenience stores/pharmacies	2% (6)	7% (20)	20% (55)	59% (160)	11% (30)

Department/super stores	5% (13)	13% (35)	30% (81)	41% (110)	12% (32)
Financial institutions	1% (4)	5% (13)	20% (55)	57% (155)	16% (44)
Gas stations	3% (7)	13% (36)	17% (45)	54% (146)	14% (37)
Grocery stores	6% (16)	15% (42)	14% (38)	52% (140)	13% (35)
Healthcare and social service facilities	3% (9)	13% (34)	35% (95)	41% (110)	8% (23)
Home improvement/maintenance stores	7% (20)	25% (68)	28% (75)	34% (93)	6% (15)
Hotels	3% (7)	6% (17)	35% (96)	46% (125)	10% (26)
Schools and educational facilities	13% (36)	22% (59)	32% (88)	28% (76)	4% (12)
Restaurants and food carts/trucks	17% (45)	32% (88)	17% (45)	30% (82)	4% (11)

REGISTER RESPONDENTS FROM ANYWHERE (187)

	Very Unsatisfied	Unsatisfied	Neutral	Satisfied	Very Satisfied
Arts, entertainment, and recreation facilities	6% (11)	34% (63)	24% (44)	32% (59)	5% (10)
Bars and breweries/wineries/distilleries	6% (12)	23% (43)	23% (43)	40% (74)	8% (15)
Childcare facilities	2% (4)	10% (18)	64% (120)	20% (38)	4% (7)
Clothing stores	9% (17)	34% (64)	41% (77)	13% (24)	3% (5)
Convenience stores/pharmacies	1% (1)	6% (12)	21% (40)	61% (114)	11% (20)
Department/super stores	4% (7)	13% (24)	35% (65)	39% (73)	10% (18)
Financial institutions	1% (2)	3% (6)	20% (38)	59% (110)	17% (31)
Gas stations	0% (-)	10% (18)	18% (34)	60% (112)	12% (23)
Grocery stores	3% (6)	17% (32)	15% (28)	52% (98)	12% (23)
Healthcare and social service facilities	2% (3)	13% (25)	36% (68)	40% (75)	9% (16)
Home improvement/maintenance stores	5% (10)	22% (42)	31% (58)	36% (67)	5% (10)
Hotels	2% (4)	6% (12)	36% (67)	48% (90)	7% (14)
Schools and educational facilities	10% (18)	25% (46)	35% (66)	26% (49)	4% (8)
Restaurants and food carts/trucks	17% (31)	30% (57)	19% (36)	29% (55)	4% (8)

EDUCATION

187 REGISTERED VOTERS

	Very Unsatisfied	Unsatisfied	Neutral	Satisfied	Very Satisfied
--	------------------	-------------	---------	-----------	----------------

Bach Degree - Extremely Likely (30)

Arts, entertainment, and recreation facilities	3.3% (1.0)	40.0% (12.0)	16.7% (5.0)	40.0% (12.0)	-
Bars and breweries/wineries/distilleries	-	23.3% (7.0)	13.3% (4.0)	60.0% (18.0)	3.3% (1.0)
Childcare facilities	-	10.0% (3.0)	53.3% (16.0)	36.7% (11.0)	-
Clothing stores	10.0% (3.0)	40.0% (12.0)	33.3% (10.0)	16.7% (5.0)	-
Convenience stores/pharmacies	-	6.7% (2.0)	16.7% (5.0)	73.3% (22.0)	3.3% (1.0)
Department/super stores	3.3% (1.0)	20.0% (6.0)	30.0% (9.0)	43.3% (13.0)	3.3% (1.0)
Financial institutions	-	6.7% (2.0)	20.0% (6.0)	60.0% (18.0)	13.3% (4.0)
Gas stations	-	10.0% (3.0)	16.7% (5.0)	63.3% (19.0)	10.0% (3.0)
Grocery stores	-	10.0% (3.0)	13.3% (4.0)	63.3% (19.0)	13.3% (4.0)
Healthcare and social service facilities	-	16.7% (5.0)	30.0% (9.0)	46.7% (14.0)	6.7% (2.0)
Home improvement/maintenance stores	-	33.3% (10.0)	20.0% (6.0)	43.3% (13.0)	3.3% (1.0)
Hotels	-	6.7% (2.0)	30.0% (9.0)	63.3% (19.0)	-
Schools and educational facilities	6.7% (2.0)	30.0% (9.0)	23.3% (7.0)	40.0% (12.0)	-
Restaurants and food carts/trucks	10.0% (3.0)	20.0% (6.0)	23.3% (7.0)	46.7% (14.0)	-

Bach Degree - Likely (21)

Arts, entertainment, and recreation facilities	9.5% (2.0)	28.6% (6.0)	33.3% (7.0)	23.8% (5.0)	4.8% (1.0)
Bars and breweries/wineries/distilleries	14.3% (3.0)	28.6% (6.0)	23.8% (5.0)	23.8% (5.0)	9.5% (2.0)
Childcare facilities	-	9.5% (2.0)	57.1% (12.0)	23.8% (5.0)	9.5% (2.0)
Clothing stores	9.5% (2.0)	33.3% (7.0)	33.3% (7.0)	19.0% (4.0)	4.8% (1.0)
Convenience stores/pharmacies	-	4.8% (1.0)	28.6% (6.0)	57.1% (12.0)	9.5% (2.0)
Department/super stores	4.8% (1.0)	14.3% (3.0)	23.8% (5.0)	38.1% (8.0)	19.0% (4.0)
Financial institutions	-	-	19.0% (4.0)	61.9% (13.0)	19.0% (4.0)
Gas stations	-	4.8% (1.0)	28.6% (6.0)	52.4% (11.0)	14.3% (3.0)
Grocery stores	-	28.6% (6.0)	9.5% (2.0)	52.4% (11.0)	9.5% (2.0)
Healthcare and social service facilities	4.8% (1.0)	23.8% (5.0)	23.8% (5.0)	38.1% (8.0)	9.5% (2.0)

Home improvement/maintenance stores	4.8% (1.0)	23.8% (5.0)	33.3% (7.0)	28.6% (6.0)	9.5% (2.0)
Hotels	-	9.5% (2.0)	28.6% (6.0)	47.6% (10.0)	14.3% (3.0)
Schools and educational facilities	14.3% (3.0)	28.6% (6.0)	38.1% (8.0)	14.3% (3.0)	4.8% (1.0)
Restaurants and food carts/trucks	33.3% (7.0)	33.3% (7.0)	14.3% (3.0)	14.3% (3.0)	4.8% (1.0)

Grad Degree - Extremely Likely (22)

Arts, entertainment, and recreation facilities	-	36.4% (8.0)	13.6% (3.0)	31.8% (7.0)	18.2% (4.0)
Bars and breweries/wineries/distilleries	4.5% (1.0)	18.2% (4.0)	36.4% (8.0)	22.7% (5.0)	18.2% (4.0)
Childcare facilities	-	13.6% (3.0)	68.2% (15.0)	9.1% (2.0)	9.1% (2.0)
Clothing stores	9.1% (2.0)	36.4% (8.0)	40.9% (9.0)	9.1% (2.0)	4.5% (1.0)
Convenience stores/pharmacies	-	13.6% (3.0)	18.2% (4.0)	54.5% (12.0)	13.6% (3.0)
Department/super stores	4.5% (1.0)	13.6% (3.0)	36.4% (8.0)	27.3% (6.0)	18.2% (4.0)
Financial institutions	4.5% (1.0)	4.5% (1.0)	9.1% (2.0)	63.6% (14.0)	18.2% (4.0)
Gas stations	-	13.6% (3.0)	13.6% (3.0)	50.0% (11.0)	22.7% (5.0)
Grocery stores	4.5% (1.0)	13.6% (3.0)	9.1% (2.0)	63.6% (14.0)	9.1% (2.0)
Healthcare and social service facilities	-	22.7% (5.0)	31.8% (7.0)	27.3% (6.0)	18.2% (4.0)
Home improvement/maintenance stores	-	22.7% (5.0)	22.7% (5.0)	45.5% (10.0)	9.1% (2.0)
Hotels	4.5% (1.0)	13.6% (3.0)	31.8% (7.0)	36.4% (8.0)	13.6% (3.0)
Schools and educational facilities	13.6% (3.0)	22.7% (5.0)	31.8% (7.0)	27.3% (6.0)	4.5% (1.0)
Restaurants and food carts/trucks	9.1% (2.0)	31.8% (7.0)	13.6% (3.0)	36.4% (8.0)	9.1% (2.0)

Grad Degree - Likely (13)

Arts, entertainment, and recreation facilities	7.7% (1.0)	46.2% (6.0)	38.5% (5.0)	7.7% (1.0)	-
Bars and breweries/wineries/distilleries	7.7% (1.0)	30.8% (4.0)	23.1% (3.0)	38.5% (5.0)	-
Childcare facilities	7.7% (1.0)	-	92.3% (12.0)	-	-
Clothing stores	-	53.8% (7.0)	38.5% (5.0)	7.7% (1.0)	-
Convenience stores/pharmacies	-	7.7% (1.0)	23.1% (3.0)	69.2% (9.0)	-
Department/super stores	-	7.7% (1.0)	53.8% (7.0)	30.8% (4.0)	7.7% (1.0)
Financial institutions	-	-	30.8% (4.0)	61.5% (8.0)	7.7% (1.0)
Gas stations	-	23.1% (3.0)	15.4% (2.0)	53.8% (7.0)	7.7% (1.0)
Grocery stores	-	7.7% (1.0)	15.4% (2.0)	76.9% (10.0)	-
Healthcare and social service facilities	-	7.7% (1.0)	76.9% (10.0)	7.7% (1.0)	7.7% (1.0)
Home improvement/maintenance stores	23.1% (3.0)	7.7% (1.0)	46.2% (6.0)	23.1% (3.0)	-
Hotels	-	-	69.2% (9.0)	23.1% (3.0)	7.7% (1.0)
Schools and educational facilities	-	23.1% (3.0)	61.5% (8.0)	7.7% (1.0)	7.7% (1.0)
Restaurants and food carts/trucks	15.4% (2.0)	38.5% (5.0)	23.1% (3.0)	23.1% (3.0)	-

HS Diploma - Extremely Likely (9)

Arts, entertainment, and recreation facilities	11.1% (1.0)	11.1% (1.0)	22.2% (2.0)	44.4% (4.0)	11.1% (1.0)
Bars and breweries/wineries/distilleries	-	22.2% (2.0)	11.1% (1.0)	55.6% (5.0)	11.1% (1.0)
Childcare facilities	-	-	77.8% (7.0)	22.2% (2.0)	-
Clothing stores	-	11.1% (1.0)	77.8% (7.0)	11.1% (1.0)	-
Convenience stores/pharmacies	-	-	33.3% (3.0)	22.2% (2.0)	44.4% (4.0)
Department/super stores	-	22.2% (2.0)	44.4% (4.0)	33.3% (3.0)	-
Financial institutions	-	11.1% (1.0)	11.1% (1.0)	66.7% (6.0)	11.1% (1.0)
Gas stations	-	-	11.1% (1.0)	77.8% (7.0)	11.1% (1.0)
Grocery stores	-	22.2% (2.0)	22.2% (2.0)	22.2% (2.0)	33.3% (3.0)
Healthcare and social service facilities	-	22.2% (2.0)	44.4% (4.0)	11.1% (1.0)	22.2% (2.0)
Home improvement/maintenance stores	-	22.2% (2.0)	44.4% (4.0)	33.3% (3.0)	-
Hotels	11.1% (1.0)	-	33.3% (3.0)	55.6% (5.0)	-
Schools and educational facilities	11.1% (1.0)	22.2% (2.0)	44.4% (4.0)	22.2% (2.0)	-
Restaurants and food carts/trucks	11.1% (1.0)	22.2% (2.0)	22.2% (2.0)	33.3% (3.0)	11.1% (1.0)

HS Diploma - Likely (4)

Arts, entertainment, and recreation facilities	-	-	75.0% (3.0)	25.0% (1.0)	-
Bars and breweries/wineries/distilleries	-	50.0% (2.0)	50.0% (2.0)	-	-
Childcare facilities	-	-	50.0% (2.0)	50.0% (2.0)	-
Clothing stores	-	50.0% (2.0)	50.0% (2.0)	-	-

Convenience stores/pharmacies	-	-	-	100.0% (4.0)	-
Department/super stores	-	25.0% (1.0)	50.0% (2.0)	25.0% (1.0)	-
Financial institutions	-	-	25.0% (1.0)	50.0% (2.0)	25.0% (1.0)
Gas stations	-	-	-	75.0% (3.0)	25.0% (1.0)
Grocery stores	-	25.0% (1.0)	-	50.0% (2.0)	25.0% (1.0)
Healthcare and social service facilities	-	-	25.0% (1.0)	75.0% (3.0)	-
Home improvement/maintenance stores	-	25.0% (1.0)	50.0% (2.0)	25.0% (1.0)	-
Hotels	-	-	25.0% (1.0)	50.0% (2.0)	25.0% (1.0)
Schools and educational facilities	-	25.0% (1.0)	25.0% (1.0)	50.0% (2.0)	-
Restaurants and food carts/trucks	-	75.0% (3.0)	25.0% (1.0)	-	-
Less than HS Diploma - Likely (1)					
Arts, entertainment, and recreation facilities	-	-	100.0% (1.0)	-	-
Bars and breweries/wineries/distilleries	-	-	-	100.0% (1.0)	-
Childcare facilities	-	-	-	100.0% (1.0)	-
Clothing stores	-	-	100.0% (1.0)	-	-
Convenience stores/pharmacies	-	-	-	-	100.0% (1.0)
Department/super stores	-	-	-	-	100.0% (1.0)
Financial institutions	-	-	-	-	100.0% (1.0)
Gas stations	-	-	100.0% (1.0)	-	-
Grocery stores	-	-	-	100.0% (1.0)	-
Healthcare and social service facilities	-	-	-	100.0% (1.0)	-
Home improvement/maintenance stores	-	-	-	100.0% (1.0)	-
Hotels	-	-	-	100.0% (1.0)	-
Schools and educational facilities	-	-	-	-	100.0% (1.0)
Restaurants and food carts/trucks	-	-	100.0% (1.0)	-	-
Some College - Likely (12)					
Arts, entertainment, and recreation facilities	-	25.0% (3.0)	25.0% (3.0)	50.0% (6.0)	-
Bars and breweries/wineries/distilleries	-	25.0% (3.0)	16.7% (2.0)	58.3% (7.0)	-
Childcare facilities	-	8.3% (1.0)	75.0% (9.0)	16.7% (2.0)	-
Clothing stores	8.3% (1.0)	25.0% (3.0)	50.0% (6.0)	16.7% (2.0)	-
Convenience stores/pharmacies	-	16.7% (2.0)	33.3% (4.0)	41.7% (5.0)	8.3% (1.0)
Department/super stores	-	8.3% (1.0)	58.3% (7.0)	25.0% (3.0)	8.3% (1.0)
Financial institutions	-	8.3% (1.0)	41.7% (5.0)	41.7% (5.0)	8.3% (1.0)
Gas stations	-	8.3% (1.0)	25.0% (3.0)	41.7% (5.0)	25.0% (3.0)
Grocery stores	-	33.3% (4.0)	33.3% (4.0)	16.7% (2.0)	16.7% (2.0)
Healthcare and social service facilities	8.3% (1.0)	8.3% (1.0)	50.0% (6.0)	33.3% (4.0)	-
Home improvement/maintenance stores	-	33.3% (4.0)	33.3% (4.0)	33.3% (4.0)	-
Hotels	8.3% (1.0)	16.7% (2.0)	50.0% (6.0)	25.0% (3.0)	-
Schools and educational facilities	8.3% (1.0)	25.0% (3.0)	50.0% (6.0)	16.7% (2.0)	-
Restaurants and food carts/trucks	8.3% (1.0)	33.3% (4.0)	25.0% (3.0)	33.3% (4.0)	-
Some College -Extremely Likely (5)					
Arts, entertainment, and recreation facilities	-	20.0% (1.0)	-	40.0% (2.0)	40.0% (2.0)
Bars and breweries/wineries/distilleries	-	40.0% (2.0)	20.0% (1.0)	-	40.0% (2.0)
Childcare facilities	-	20.0% (1.0)	40.0% (2.0)	20.0% (1.0)	20.0% (1.0)
Clothing stores	-	60.0% (3.0)	20.0% (1.0)	-	20.0% (1.0)
Convenience stores/pharmacies	-	20.0% (1.0)	20.0% (1.0)	20.0% (1.0)	40.0% (2.0)
Department/super stores	-	-	60.0% (3.0)	20.0% (1.0)	20.0% (1.0)
Financial institutions	-	20.0% (1.0)	20.0% (1.0)	40.0% (2.0)	20.0% (1.0)
Gas stations	-	-	20.0% (1.0)	40.0% (2.0)	40.0% (2.0)
Grocery stores	-	20.0% (1.0)	40.0% (2.0)	20.0% (1.0)	20.0% (1.0)
Healthcare and social service facilities	-	-	40.0% (2.0)	40.0% (2.0)	20.0% (1.0)
Home improvement/maintenance stores	-	40.0% (2.0)	-	40.0% (2.0)	20.0% (1.0)
Hotels	-	-	20.0% (1.0)	60.0% (3.0)	20.0% (1.0)
Schools and educational facilities	-	-	20.0% (1.0)	60.0% (3.0)	20.0% (1.0)
Restaurants and food carts/trucks	20.0% (1.0)	20.0% (1.0)	20.0% (1.0)	40.0% (2.0)	-

Unknown (70)					
Arts, entertainment, and recreation facilities	8.6% (6.0)	37.1% (26.0)	21.4% (15.0)	30.0% (21.0)	2.9% (2.0)
Bars and breweries/wineries/distilleries	10.0% (7.0)	18.6% (13.0)	24.3% (17.0)	40.0% (28.0)	7.1% (5.0)
Childcare facilities	4.3% (3.0)	11.4% (8.0)	64.3% (45.0)	17.1% (12.0)	2.9% (2.0)
Clothing stores	12.9% (9.0)	30.0% (21.0)	41.4% (29.0)	12.9% (9.0)	2.9% (2.0)
Convenience stores/pharmacies	1.4% (1.0)	2.9% (2.0)	20.0% (14.0)	67.1% (47.0)	8.6% (6.0)
Department/super stores	5.7% (4.0)	10.0% (7.0)	28.6% (20.0)	48.6% (34.0)	7.1% (5.0)
Financial institutions	1.4% (1.0)	-	20.0% (14.0)	60.0% (42.0)	18.6% (13.0)
Gas stations	-	10.0% (7.0)	17.1% (12.0)	67.1% (47.0)	5.7% (4.0)
Grocery stores	7.1% (5.0)	15.7% (11.0)	14.3% (10.0)	51.4% (36.0)	11.4% (8.0)
Healthcare and social service facilities	1.4% (1.0)	8.6% (6.0)	34.3% (24.0)	50.0% (35.0)	5.7% (4.0)
Home improvement/maintenance stores	8.6% (6.0)	17.1% (12.0)	34.3% (24.0)	34.3% (24.0)	5.7% (4.0)
Hotels	1.4% (1.0)	4.3% (3.0)	35.7% (25.0)	51.4% (36.0)	7.1% (5.0)
Schools and educational facilities	11.4% (8.0)	24.3% (17.0)	34.3% (24.0)	25.7% (18.0)	4.3% (3.0)
Restaurants and food carts/trucks	20.0% (14.0)	31.4% (22.0)	17.1% (12.0)	25.7% (18.0)	5.7% (4.0)

VOTERS GENDER					187 REGISTERED VOTERS
	Very Unsatisfied	Unsatisfied	Neutral	Satisfied	Very Satisfied

F (90)					
Arts, entertainment, and recreation facilities	4.4% (4.0)	35.6% (32.0)	26.7% (24.0)	26.7% (24.0)	6.7% (6.0)
Bars and breweries/wineries/distilleries	4.4% (4.0)	24.4% (22.0)	30.0% (27.0)	33.3% (30.0)	7.8% (7.0)
Childcare facilities	2.2% (2.0)	10.0% (9.0)	64.4% (58.0)	17.8% (16.0)	5.6% (5.0)
Clothing stores	13.3% (12.0)	35.6% (32.0)	37.8% (34.0)	10.0% (9.0)	3.3% (3.0)
Convenience stores/pharmacies	1.1% (1.0)	6.7% (6.0)	22.2% (20.0)	55.6% (50.0)	14.4% (13.0)
Department/super stores	4.4% (4.0)	13.3% (12.0)	34.4% (31.0)	36.7% (33.0)	11.1% (10.0)
Financial institutions	1.1% (1.0)	3.3% (3.0)	20.0% (18.0)	55.6% (50.0)	20.0% (18.0)
Gas stations	-	10.0% (9.0)	14.4% (13.0)	61.1% (55.0)	14.4% (13.0)
Grocery stores	5.6% (5.0)	15.6% (14.0)	16.7% (15.0)	48.9% (44.0)	13.3% (12.0)
Healthcare and social service facilities	2.2% (2.0)	11.1% (10.0)	33.3% (30.0)	44.4% (40.0)	8.9% (8.0)
Home improvement/maintenance stores	6.7% (6.0)	17.8% (16.0)	31.1% (28.0)	34.4% (31.0)	10.0% (9.0)
Hotels	1.1% (1.0)	4.4% (4.0)	36.7% (33.0)	47.8% (43.0)	10.0% (9.0)
Schools and educational facilities	12.2% (11.0)	27.8% (25.0)	33.3% (30.0)	21.1% (19.0)	5.6% (5.0)
Restaurants and food carts/trucks	15.6% (14.0)	34.4% (31.0)	18.9% (17.0)	25.6% (23.0)	5.6% (5.0)

M (95)					
Arts, entertainment, and recreation facilities	7.4% (7.0)	32.6% (31.0)	21.1% (20.0)	34.7% (33.0)	4.2% (4.0)
Bars and breweries/wineries/distilleries	8.4% (8.0)	21.1% (20.0)	16.8% (16.0)	45.3% (43.0)	8.4% (8.0)
Childcare facilities	2.1% (2.0)	9.5% (9.0)	64.2% (61.0)	22.1% (21.0)	2.1% (2.0)
Clothing stores	5.3% (5.0)	32.6% (31.0)	45.3% (43.0)	14.7% (14.0)	2.1% (2.0)
Convenience stores/pharmacies	-	6.3% (6.0)	21.1% (20.0)	65.3% (62.0)	7.4% (7.0)
Department/super stores	3.2% (3.0)	11.6% (11.0)	35.8% (34.0)	41.1% (39.0)	8.4% (8.0)
Financial institutions	1.1% (1.0)	3.2% (3.0)	21.1% (20.0)	61.1% (58.0)	13.7% (13.0)
Gas stations	-	9.5% (9.0)	22.1% (21.0)	57.9% (55.0)	10.5% (10.0)
Grocery stores	1.1% (1.0)	18.9% (18.0)	13.7% (13.0)	54.7% (52.0)	11.6% (11.0)
Healthcare and social service facilities	1.1% (1.0)	14.7% (14.0)	40.0% (38.0)	35.8% (34.0)	8.4% (8.0)
Home improvement/maintenance stores	4.2% (4.0)	26.3% (25.0)	31.6% (30.0)	36.8% (35.0)	1.1% (1.0)
Hotels	3.2% (3.0)	8.4% (8.0)	35.8% (34.0)	47.4% (45.0)	5.3% (5.0)
Schools and educational facilities	7.4% (7.0)	21.1% (20.0)	37.9% (36.0)	30.5% (29.0)	3.2% (3.0)
Restaurants and food carts/trucks	17.9% (17.0)	26.3% (25.0)	20.0% (19.0)	32.6% (31.0)	3.2% (3.0)

Unknown (2)					
Arts, entertainment, and recreation facilities	-	-	-	100.0% (2.0)	-
Bars and breweries/wineries/distilleries	-	50.0% (1.0)	-	50.0% (1.0)	-
Childcare facilities	-	-	50.0% (1.0)	50.0% (1.0)	-
Clothing stores	-	50.0% (1.0)	-	50.0% (1.0)	-

Convenience stores/pharmacies	-	-	-	100.0% (2.0)	-
Department/super stores	-	50.0% (1.0)	-	50.0% (1.0)	-
Financial institutions	-	-	-	100.0% (2.0)	-
Gas stations	-	-	-	100.0% (2.0)	-
Grocery stores	-	-	-	100.0% (2.0)	-
Healthcare and social service facilities	-	50.0% (1.0)	-	50.0% (1.0)	-
Home improvement/maintenance stores	-	50.0% (1.0)	-	50.0% (1.0)	-
Hotels	-	-	-	100.0% (2.0)	-
Schools and educational facilities	-	50.0% (1.0)	-	50.0% (1.0)	-
Restaurants and food carts/trucks	-	50.0% (1.0)	-	50.0% (1.0)	-

PRECINCT

187 REGISTERED VOTERS

Very Unsatisfied Unsatisfied Neutral Satisfied Very Satisfied

CHICAGO 43-04 (1)

Arts, entertainment, and recreation facilities	-	-	100.0% (1.0)	-	-
Bars and breweries/wineries/distilleries	-	-	100.0% (1.0)	-	-
Childcare facilities	-	-	100.0% (1.0)	-	-
Clothing stores	-	-	100.0% (1.0)	-	-
Convenience stores/pharmacies	-	-	-	100.0% (1.0)	-
Department/super stores	-	-	100.0% (1.0)	-	-
Financial institutions	-	-	100.0% (1.0)	-	-
Gas stations	-	-	-	-	100.0% (1.0)
Grocery stores	-	-	-	100.0% (1.0)	-
Healthcare and social service facilities	-	-	100.0% (1.0)	-	-
Home improvement/maintenance stores	-	-	-	100.0% (1.0)	-
Hotels	-	-	100.0% (1.0)	-	-
Schools and educational facilities	-	-	100.0% (1.0)	-	-
Restaurants and food carts/trucks	-	-	100.0% (1.0)	-	-

FITCHBURG CITY WARD 01 (9)

Arts, entertainment, and recreation facilities	11.1% (1.0)	44.4% (4.0)	11.1% (1.0)	33.3% (3.0)	-
Bars and breweries/wineries/distilleries	-	11.1% (1.0)	22.2% (2.0)	66.7% (6.0)	-
Childcare facilities	-	11.1% (1.0)	66.7% (6.0)	22.2% (2.0)	-
Clothing stores	-	22.2% (2.0)	66.7% (6.0)	11.1% (1.0)	-
Convenience stores/pharmacies	-	-	33.3% (3.0)	55.6% (5.0)	11.1% (1.0)
Department/super stores	-	-	33.3% (3.0)	66.7% (6.0)	-
Financial institutions	-	-	11.1% (1.0)	77.8% (7.0)	11.1% (1.0)
Gas stations	-	-	22.2% (2.0)	66.7% (6.0)	11.1% (1.0)
Grocery stores	-	-	22.2% (2.0)	77.8% (7.0)	-
Healthcare and social service facilities	-	11.1% (1.0)	22.2% (2.0)	66.7% (6.0)	-
Home improvement/maintenance stores	-	-	22.2% (2.0)	77.8% (7.0)	-
Hotels	-	-	11.1% (1.0)	77.8% (7.0)	11.1% (1.0)
Schools and educational facilities	11.1% (1.0)	22.2% (2.0)	33.3% (3.0)	33.3% (3.0)	-
Restaurants and food carts/trucks	-	33.3% (3.0)	22.2% (2.0)	44.4% (4.0)	-

FITCHBURG CITY WARD 02 (3)

Arts, entertainment, and recreation facilities	-	-	66.7% (2.0)	33.3% (1.0)	-
Bars and breweries/wineries/distilleries	-	33.3% (1.0)	-	66.7% (2.0)	-
Childcare facilities	-	-	66.7% (2.0)	33.3% (1.0)	-
Clothing stores	-	-	33.3% (1.0)	66.7% (2.0)	-
Convenience stores/pharmacies	-	-	-	100.0% (3.0)	-
Department/super stores	-	-	-	66.7% (2.0)	33.3% (1.0)
Financial institutions	-	-	33.3% (1.0)	66.7% (2.0)	-
Gas stations	-	-	33.3% (1.0)	66.7% (2.0)	-
Grocery stores	-	-	-	66.7% (2.0)	33.3% (1.0)
Healthcare and social service facilities	-	-	-	100.0% (3.0)	-
Home improvement/maintenance stores	-	-	-	100.0% (3.0)	-

Hotels	-	-	-	66.7% (2.0)	33.3% (1.0)
Schools and educational facilities	-	-	33.3% (1.0)	33.3% (1.0)	33.3% (1.0)
Restaurants and food carts/trucks	-	-	33.3% (1.0)	66.7% (2.0)	-
FITCHBURG CITY WARD 04 (2)					
Arts, entertainment, and recreation facilities	-	100.0% (2.0)	-	-	-
Bars and breweries/wineries/distilleries	-	-	50.0% (1.0)	50.0% (1.0)	-
Childcare facilities	-	-	50.0% (1.0)	50.0% (1.0)	-
Clothing stores	50.0% (1.0)	50.0% (1.0)	-	-	-
Convenience stores/pharmacies	-	-	-	100.0% (2.0)	-
Department/super stores	50.0% (1.0)	-	-	-	50.0% (1.0)
Financial institutions	-	-	-	50.0% (1.0)	50.0% (1.0)
Gas stations	-	-	-	100.0% (2.0)	-
Grocery stores	-	-	-	50.0% (1.0)	50.0% (1.0)
Healthcare and social service facilities	-	-	50.0% (1.0)	50.0% (1.0)	-
Home improvement/maintenance stores	-	50.0% (1.0)	-	-	50.0% (1.0)
Hotels	-	50.0% (1.0)	50.0% (1.0)	-	-
Schools and educational facilities	-	50.0% (1.0)	50.0% (1.0)	-	-
Restaurants and food carts/trucks	50.0% (1.0)	50.0% (1.0)	-	-	-
FITCHBURG CITY WARD 05 (6)					
Arts, entertainment, and recreation facilities	-	50.0% (3.0)	16.7% (1.0)	33.3% (2.0)	-
Bars and breweries/wineries/distilleries	-	33.3% (2.0)	16.7% (1.0)	50.0% (3.0)	-
Childcare facilities	-	16.7% (1.0)	66.7% (4.0)	16.7% (1.0)	-
Clothing stores	-	66.7% (4.0)	16.7% (1.0)	16.7% (1.0)	-
Convenience stores/pharmacies	-	-	16.7% (1.0)	83.3% (5.0)	-
Department/super stores	-	16.7% (1.0)	16.7% (1.0)	66.7% (4.0)	-
Financial institutions	-	-	16.7% (1.0)	66.7% (4.0)	16.7% (1.0)
Gas stations	-	16.7% (1.0)	16.7% (1.0)	66.7% (4.0)	-
Grocery stores	16.7% (1.0)	16.7% (1.0)	16.7% (1.0)	50.0% (3.0)	-
Healthcare and social service facilities	-	-	50.0% (3.0)	50.0% (3.0)	-
Home improvement/maintenance stores	-	50.0% (3.0)	-	50.0% (3.0)	-
Hotels	-	-	33.3% (2.0)	66.7% (4.0)	-
Schools and educational facilities	-	16.7% (1.0)	50.0% (3.0)	33.3% (2.0)	-
Restaurants and food carts/trucks	16.7% (1.0)	33.3% (2.0)	-	50.0% (3.0)	-
FITCHBURG CITY WARD 06 (12)					
Arts, entertainment, and recreation facilities	-	41.7% (5.0)	33.3% (4.0)	25.0% (3.0)	-
Bars and breweries/wineries/distilleries	-	41.7% (5.0)	25.0% (3.0)	33.3% (4.0)	-
Childcare facilities	-	16.7% (2.0)	41.7% (5.0)	33.3% (4.0)	8.3% (1.0)
Clothing stores	8.3% (1.0)	58.3% (7.0)	8.3% (1.0)	25.0% (3.0)	-
Convenience stores/pharmacies	-	-	-	91.7% (11.0)	8.3% (1.0)
Department/super stores	-	-	33.3% (4.0)	58.3% (7.0)	8.3% (1.0)
Financial institutions	-	-	25.0% (3.0)	58.3% (7.0)	16.7% (2.0)
Gas stations	-	-	8.3% (1.0)	66.7% (8.0)	25.0% (3.0)
Grocery stores	-	8.3% (1.0)	16.7% (2.0)	50.0% (6.0)	25.0% (3.0)
Healthcare and social service facilities	8.3% (1.0)	8.3% (1.0)	33.3% (4.0)	41.7% (5.0)	8.3% (1.0)
Home improvement/maintenance stores	8.3% (1.0)	16.7% (2.0)	25.0% (3.0)	41.7% (5.0)	8.3% (1.0)
Hotels	-	-	33.3% (4.0)	50.0% (6.0)	16.7% (2.0)
Schools and educational facilities	33.3% (4.0)	41.7% (5.0)	8.3% (1.0)	16.7% (2.0)	-
Restaurants and food carts/trucks	33.3% (4.0)	33.3% (4.0)	25.0% (3.0)	-	8.3% (1.0)
FITCHBURG CITY WARD 07 (18)					
Arts, entertainment, and recreation facilities	5.6% (1.0)	16.7% (3.0)	38.9% (7.0)	27.8% (5.0)	11.1% (2.0)
Bars and breweries/wineries/distilleries	11.1% (2.0)	11.1% (2.0)	38.9% (7.0)	27.8% (5.0)	11.1% (2.0)
Childcare facilities	-	5.6% (1.0)	61.1% (11.0)	22.2% (4.0)	11.1% (2.0)
Clothing stores	11.1% (2.0)	22.2% (4.0)	55.6% (10.0)	5.6% (1.0)	5.6% (1.0)

Convenience stores/pharmacies	-	-	16.7% (3.0)	66.7% (12.0)	16.7% (3.0)
Department/super stores	-	5.6% (1.0)	38.9% (7.0)	38.9% (7.0)	16.7% (3.0)
Financial institutions	-	-	22.2% (4.0)	55.6% (10.0)	22.2% (4.0)
Gas stations	-	11.1% (2.0)	5.6% (1.0)	55.6% (10.0)	27.8% (5.0)
Grocery stores	-	-	16.7% (3.0)	61.1% (11.0)	22.2% (4.0)
Healthcare and social service facilities	-	11.1% (2.0)	16.7% (3.0)	50.0% (9.0)	22.2% (4.0)
Home improvement/maintenance stores	-	11.1% (2.0)	38.9% (7.0)	33.3% (6.0)	16.7% (3.0)
Hotels	-	11.1% (2.0)	27.8% (5.0)	50.0% (9.0)	11.1% (2.0)
Schools and educational facilities	-	22.2% (4.0)	38.9% (7.0)	27.8% (5.0)	11.1% (2.0)
Restaurants and food carts/trucks	11.1% (2.0)	27.8% (5.0)	27.8% (5.0)	27.8% (5.0)	5.6% (1.0)

FITCHBURG CITY WARD 08 (14)

Arts, entertainment, and recreation facilities	7.1% (1.0)	35.7% (5.0)	28.6% (4.0)	28.6% (4.0)	-
Bars and breweries/wineries/distilleries	-	14.3% (2.0)	28.6% (4.0)	42.9% (6.0)	14.3% (2.0)
Childcare facilities	-	-	78.6% (11.0)	21.4% (3.0)	-
Clothing stores	28.6% (4.0)	35.7% (5.0)	28.6% (4.0)	7.1% (1.0)	-
Convenience stores/pharmacies	-	7.1% (1.0)	21.4% (3.0)	57.1% (8.0)	14.3% (2.0)
Department/super stores	7.1% (1.0)	14.3% (2.0)	21.4% (3.0)	42.9% (6.0)	14.3% (2.0)
Financial institutions	7.1% (1.0)	-	7.1% (1.0)	57.1% (8.0)	28.6% (4.0)
Gas stations	-	14.3% (2.0)	7.1% (1.0)	64.3% (9.0)	14.3% (2.0)
Grocery stores	-	14.3% (2.0)	-	71.4% (10.0)	14.3% (2.0)
Healthcare and social service facilities	-	28.6% (4.0)	42.9% (6.0)	21.4% (3.0)	7.1% (1.0)
Home improvement/maintenance stores	14.3% (2.0)	35.7% (5.0)	28.6% (4.0)	14.3% (2.0)	7.1% (1.0)
Hotels	14.3% (2.0)	7.1% (1.0)	35.7% (5.0)	28.6% (4.0)	14.3% (2.0)
Schools and educational facilities	7.1% (1.0)	28.6% (4.0)	50.0% (7.0)	14.3% (2.0)	-
Restaurants and food carts/trucks	14.3% (2.0)	35.7% (5.0)	21.4% (3.0)	28.6% (4.0)	-

FITCHBURG CITY WARD 09 (8)

Arts, entertainment, and recreation facilities	-	25.0% (2.0)	12.5% (1.0)	50.0% (4.0)	12.5% (1.0)
Bars and breweries/wineries/distilleries	-	12.5% (1.0)	12.5% (1.0)	62.5% (5.0)	12.5% (1.0)
Childcare facilities	-	-	75.0% (6.0)	25.0% (2.0)	-
Clothing stores	12.5% (1.0)	37.5% (3.0)	25.0% (2.0)	12.5% (1.0)	12.5% (1.0)
Convenience stores/pharmacies	-	-	-	100.0% (8.0)	-
Department/super stores	12.5% (1.0)	12.5% (1.0)	37.5% (3.0)	37.5% (3.0)	-
Financial institutions	-	-	12.5% (1.0)	75.0% (6.0)	12.5% (1.0)
Gas stations	-	-	-	87.5% (7.0)	12.5% (1.0)
Grocery stores	-	-	12.5% (1.0)	75.0% (6.0)	12.5% (1.0)
Healthcare and social service facilities	-	12.5% (1.0)	50.0% (4.0)	25.0% (2.0)	12.5% (1.0)
Home improvement/maintenance stores	-	37.5% (3.0)	25.0% (2.0)	25.0% (2.0)	12.5% (1.0)
Hotels	12.5% (1.0)	-	25.0% (2.0)	62.5% (5.0)	-
Schools and educational facilities	-	12.5% (1.0)	50.0% (4.0)	25.0% (2.0)	12.5% (1.0)
Restaurants and food carts/trucks	12.5% (1.0)	12.5% (1.0)	-	62.5% (5.0)	12.5% (1.0)

FITCHBURG CITY WARD 12 (2)

Arts, entertainment, and recreation facilities	-	-	50.0% (1.0)	50.0% (1.0)	-
Bars and breweries/wineries/distilleries	-	50.0% (1.0)	-	50.0% (1.0)	-
Childcare facilities	-	-	100.0% (2.0)	-	-
Clothing stores	-	50.0% (1.0)	50.0% (1.0)	-	-
Convenience stores/pharmacies	-	-	-	50.0% (1.0)	50.0% (1.0)
Department/super stores	-	-	100.0% (2.0)	-	-
Financial institutions	-	-	50.0% (1.0)	50.0% (1.0)	-
Gas stations	-	-	-	50.0% (1.0)	50.0% (1.0)
Grocery stores	-	-	-	50.0% (1.0)	50.0% (1.0)
Healthcare and social service facilities	-	-	100.0% (2.0)	-	-
Home improvement/maintenance stores	-	-	100.0% (2.0)	-	-
Hotels	-	-	100.0% (2.0)	-	-
Schools and educational facilities	-	-	100.0% (2.0)	-	-
Restaurants and food carts/trucks	-	-	-	100.0% (2.0)	-

FITCHBURG CITY WARD 13 (31)

Arts, entertainment, and recreation facilities	9.7% (3.0)	38.7% (12.0)	19.4% (6.0)	29.0% (9.0)	3.2% (1.0)
Bars and breweries/wineries/distilleries	12.9% (4.0)	25.8% (8.0)	29.0% (9.0)	29.0% (9.0)	3.2% (1.0)
Childcare facilities	6.5% (2.0)	19.4% (6.0)	64.5% (20.0)	6.5% (2.0)	3.2% (1.0)
Clothing stores	12.9% (4.0)	38.7% (12.0)	38.7% (12.0)	9.7% (3.0)	-
Convenience stores/pharmacies	3.2% (1.0)	19.4% (6.0)	19.4% (6.0)	48.4% (15.0)	9.7% (3.0)
Department/super stores	3.2% (1.0)	29.0% (9.0)	35.5% (11.0)	29.0% (9.0)	3.2% (1.0)
Financial institutions	3.2% (1.0)	9.7% (3.0)	22.6% (7.0)	48.4% (15.0)	16.1% (5.0)
Gas stations	-	16.1% (5.0)	29.0% (9.0)	45.2% (14.0)	9.7% (3.0)
Grocery stores	12.9% (4.0)	38.7% (12.0)	6.5% (2.0)	38.7% (12.0)	3.2% (1.0)
Healthcare and social service facilities	3.2% (1.0)	9.7% (3.0)	38.7% (12.0)	41.9% (13.0)	6.5% (2.0)
Home improvement/maintenance stores	12.9% (4.0)	19.4% (6.0)	38.7% (12.0)	29.0% (9.0)	-
Hotels	3.2% (1.0)	6.5% (2.0)	32.3% (10.0)	58.1% (18.0)	-
Schools and educational facilities	19.4% (6.0)	29.0% (9.0)	22.6% (7.0)	29.0% (9.0)	-
Restaurants and food carts/trucks	25.8% (8.0)	29.0% (9.0)	22.6% (7.0)	19.4% (6.0)	3.2% (1.0)

FITCHBURG CITY WARD 14 (19)

Arts, entertainment, and recreation facilities	10.5% (2.0)	31.6% (6.0)	26.3% (5.0)	31.6% (6.0)	-
Bars and breweries/wineries/distilleries	15.8% (3.0)	36.8% (7.0)	10.5% (2.0)	36.8% (7.0)	-
Childcare facilities	-	15.8% (3.0)	73.7% (14.0)	10.5% (2.0)	-
Clothing stores	21.1% (4.0)	31.6% (6.0)	31.6% (6.0)	15.8% (3.0)	-
Convenience stores/pharmacies	-	5.3% (1.0)	42.1% (8.0)	52.6% (10.0)	-
Department/super stores	10.5% (2.0)	21.1% (4.0)	31.6% (6.0)	26.3% (5.0)	10.5% (2.0)
Financial institutions	-	5.3% (1.0)	26.3% (5.0)	57.9% (11.0)	10.5% (2.0)
Gas stations	-	15.8% (3.0)	21.1% (4.0)	57.9% (11.0)	5.3% (1.0)
Grocery stores	5.3% (1.0)	21.1% (4.0)	42.1% (8.0)	31.6% (6.0)	-
Healthcare and social service facilities	5.3% (1.0)	10.5% (2.0)	31.6% (6.0)	47.4% (9.0)	5.3% (1.0)
Home improvement/maintenance stores	10.5% (2.0)	31.6% (6.0)	36.8% (7.0)	15.8% (3.0)	5.3% (1.0)
Hotels	-	10.5% (2.0)	42.1% (8.0)	42.1% (8.0)	5.3% (1.0)
Schools and educational facilities	10.5% (2.0)	42.1% (8.0)	36.8% (7.0)	10.5% (2.0)	-
Restaurants and food carts/trucks	21.1% (4.0)	42.1% (8.0)	15.8% (3.0)	21.1% (4.0)	-

FITCHBURG CITY WARD 15 (7)

Arts, entertainment, and recreation facilities	-	28.6% (2.0)	14.3% (1.0)	28.6% (2.0)	28.6% (2.0)
Bars and breweries/wineries/distilleries	14.3% (1.0)	14.3% (1.0)	42.9% (3.0)	28.6% (2.0)	-
Childcare facilities	14.3% (1.0)	-	57.1% (4.0)	28.6% (2.0)	-
Clothing stores	-	28.6% (2.0)	57.1% (4.0)	14.3% (1.0)	-
Convenience stores/pharmacies	-	42.9% (3.0)	14.3% (1.0)	42.9% (3.0)	-
Department/super stores	14.3% (1.0)	14.3% (1.0)	42.9% (3.0)	28.6% (2.0)	-
Financial institutions	-	14.3% (1.0)	28.6% (2.0)	57.1% (4.0)	-
Gas stations	-	14.3% (1.0)	42.9% (3.0)	42.9% (3.0)	-
Grocery stores	-	42.9% (3.0)	-	57.1% (4.0)	-
Healthcare and social service facilities	-	28.6% (2.0)	42.9% (3.0)	14.3% (1.0)	14.3% (1.0)
Home improvement/maintenance stores	-	28.6% (2.0)	42.9% (3.0)	14.3% (1.0)	14.3% (1.0)
Hotels	-	14.3% (1.0)	57.1% (4.0)	14.3% (1.0)	14.3% (1.0)
Schools and educational facilities	-	14.3% (1.0)	57.1% (4.0)	28.6% (2.0)	-
Restaurants and food carts/trucks	-	57.1% (4.0)	14.3% (1.0)	28.6% (2.0)	-

FITCHBURG CITY WARD 16 (3)

Arts, entertainment, and recreation facilities	-	66.7% (2.0)	33.3% (1.0)	-	-
Bars and breweries/wineries/distilleries	-	-	100.0% (3.0)	-	-
Childcare facilities	-	33.3% (1.0)	66.7% (2.0)	-	-
Clothing stores	-	33.3% (1.0)	66.7% (2.0)	-	-
Convenience stores/pharmacies	-	-	66.7% (2.0)	33.3% (1.0)	-
Department/super stores	-	-	66.7% (2.0)	33.3% (1.0)	-
Financial institutions	-	-	33.3% (1.0)	66.7% (2.0)	-
Gas stations	-	-	66.7% (2.0)	33.3% (1.0)	-

Grocery stores	-	100.0% (3.0)	-	-	-
Healthcare and social service facilities	-	-	66.7% (2.0)	33.3% (1.0)	-
Home improvement/maintenance stores	-	33.3% (1.0)	66.7% (2.0)	-	-
Hotels	-	-	100.0% (3.0)	-	-
Schools and educational facilities	-	-	100.0% (3.0)	-	-
Restaurants and food carts/trucks	-	33.3% (1.0)	33.3% (1.0)	33.3% (1.0)	-

FITCHBURG CITY WARD 17 (7)

Arts, entertainment, and recreation facilities	14.3% (1.0)	28.6% (2.0)	-	42.9% (3.0)	14.3% (1.0)
Bars and breweries/wineries/distilleries	14.3% (1.0)	14.3% (1.0)	14.3% (1.0)	42.9% (3.0)	14.3% (1.0)
Childcare facilities	-	-	71.4% (5.0)	28.6% (2.0)	-
Clothing stores	-	28.6% (2.0)	42.9% (3.0)	28.6% (2.0)	-
Convenience stores/pharmacies	-	-	28.6% (2.0)	42.9% (3.0)	28.6% (2.0)
Department/super stores	-	14.3% (1.0)	57.1% (4.0)	28.6% (2.0)	-
Financial institutions	-	-	14.3% (1.0)	71.4% (5.0)	14.3% (1.0)
Gas stations	-	14.3% (1.0)	-	57.1% (4.0)	28.6% (2.0)
Grocery stores	-	14.3% (1.0)	28.6% (2.0)	42.9% (3.0)	14.3% (1.0)
Healthcare and social service facilities	-	14.3% (1.0)	42.9% (3.0)	28.6% (2.0)	14.3% (1.0)
Home improvement/maintenance stores	-	42.9% (3.0)	-	57.1% (4.0)	-
Hotels	-	14.3% (1.0)	28.6% (2.0)	57.1% (4.0)	-
Schools and educational facilities	-	14.3% (1.0)	42.9% (3.0)	42.9% (3.0)	-
Restaurants and food carts/trucks	14.3% (1.0)	14.3% (1.0)	-	71.4% (5.0)	-

FITCHBURG CITY WARD 18 (12)

Arts, entertainment, and recreation facilities	8.3% (1.0)	41.7% (5.0)	25.0% (3.0)	16.7% (2.0)	8.3% (1.0)
Bars and breweries/wineries/distilleries	-	41.7% (5.0)	8.3% (1.0)	41.7% (5.0)	8.3% (1.0)
Childcare facilities	8.3% (1.0)	16.7% (2.0)	41.7% (5.0)	33.3% (4.0)	-
Clothing stores	-	66.7% (8.0)	33.3% (4.0)	-	-
Convenience stores/pharmacies	-	-	16.7% (2.0)	75.0% (9.0)	8.3% (1.0)
Department/super stores	-	25.0% (3.0)	33.3% (4.0)	41.7% (5.0)	-
Financial institutions	-	-	8.3% (1.0)	75.0% (9.0)	16.7% (2.0)
Gas stations	-	8.3% (1.0)	25.0% (3.0)	58.3% (7.0)	8.3% (1.0)
Grocery stores	-	8.3% (1.0)	8.3% (1.0)	58.3% (7.0)	25.0% (3.0)
Healthcare and social service facilities	-	25.0% (3.0)	25.0% (3.0)	41.7% (5.0)	8.3% (1.0)
Home improvement/maintenance stores	8.3% (1.0)	50.0% (6.0)	16.7% (2.0)	25.0% (3.0)	-
Hotels	-	8.3% (1.0)	41.7% (5.0)	50.0% (6.0)	-
Schools and educational facilities	8.3% (1.0)	33.3% (4.0)	16.7% (2.0)	41.7% (5.0)	-
Restaurants and food carts/trucks	25.0% (3.0)	25.0% (3.0)	16.7% (2.0)	33.3% (4.0)	-

FITCHBURG CITY WARD 19 (26)

Arts, entertainment, and recreation facilities	-	23.1% (6.0)	15.4% (4.0)	53.8% (14.0)	7.7% (2.0)
Bars and breweries/wineries/distilleries	3.8% (1.0)	15.4% (4.0)	3.8% (1.0)	50.0% (13.0)	26.9% (7.0)
Childcare facilities	-	-	57.7% (15.0)	30.8% (8.0)	11.5% (3.0)
Clothing stores	-	23.1% (6.0)	46.2% (12.0)	19.2% (5.0)	11.5% (3.0)
Convenience stores/pharmacies	-	3.8% (1.0)	15.4% (4.0)	61.5% (16.0)	19.2% (5.0)
Department/super stores	-	-	23.1% (6.0)	50.0% (13.0)	26.9% (7.0)
Financial institutions	-	-	7.7% (2.0)	65.4% (17.0)	26.9% (7.0)
Gas stations	-	7.7% (2.0)	11.5% (3.0)	73.1% (19.0)	7.7% (2.0)
Grocery stores	-	3.8% (1.0)	11.5% (3.0)	65.4% (17.0)	19.2% (5.0)
Healthcare and social service facilities	-	15.4% (4.0)	34.6% (9.0)	38.5% (10.0)	11.5% (3.0)
Home improvement/maintenance stores	-	7.7% (2.0)	23.1% (6.0)	65.4% (17.0)	3.8% (1.0)
Hotels	-	3.8% (1.0)	26.9% (7.0)	53.8% (14.0)	15.4% (4.0)
Schools and educational facilities	7.7% (2.0)	11.5% (3.0)	30.8% (8.0)	34.6% (9.0)	15.4% (4.0)
Restaurants and food carts/trucks	11.5% (3.0)	30.8% (8.0)	19.2% (5.0)	26.9% (7.0)	11.5% (3.0)

MADISON CITY WARD 042 (1)

Arts, entertainment, and recreation facilities	-	-	100.0% (1.0)	-	-
Bars and breweries/wineries/distilleries	-	-	-	100.0% (1.0)	-

Childcare facilities	-	-	100.0% (1.0)	-	-
Clothing stores	-	-	100.0% (1.0)	-	-
Convenience stores/pharmacies	-	-	100.0% (1.0)	-	-
Department/super stores	-	-	100.0% (1.0)	-	-
Financial institutions	-	-	100.0% (1.0)	-	-
Gas stations	-	-	-	100.0% (1.0)	-
Grocery stores	-	100.0% (1.0)	-	-	-
Healthcare and social service facilities	-	-	100.0% (1.0)	-	-
Home improvement/maintenance stores	-	-	-	100.0% (1.0)	-
Hotels	-	-	-	100.0% (1.0)	-
Schools and educational facilities	-	100.0% (1.0)	-	-	-
Restaurants and food carts/trucks	-	-	-	100.0% (1.0)	-

MADISON CITY WARD 053 (1)

Arts, entertainment, and recreation facilities	-	100.0% (1.0)	-	-	-
Bars and breweries/wineries/distilleries	-	-	100.0% (1.0)	-	-
Childcare facilities	-	-	100.0% (1.0)	-	-
Clothing stores	-	-	100.0% (1.0)	-	-
Convenience stores/pharmacies	-	-	100.0% (1.0)	-	-
Department/super stores	-	-	100.0% (1.0)	-	-
Financial institutions	-	-	100.0% (1.0)	-	-
Gas stations	-	-	100.0% (1.0)	-	-
Grocery stores	-	-	100.0% (1.0)	-	-
Healthcare and social service facilities	-	-	100.0% (1.0)	-	-
Home improvement/maintenance stores	-	-	100.0% (1.0)	-	-
Hotels	-	-	100.0% (1.0)	-	-
Schools and educational facilities	-	-	100.0% (1.0)	-	-
Restaurants and food carts/trucks	-	100.0% (1.0)	-	-	-

MADISON CITY WARD 100 (1)

Arts, entertainment, and recreation facilities	-	-	100.0% (1.0)	-	-
Bars and breweries/wineries/distilleries	-	-	100.0% (1.0)	-	-
Childcare facilities	-	-	100.0% (1.0)	-	-
Clothing stores	-	-	100.0% (1.0)	-	-
Convenience stores/pharmacies	-	-	-	-	100.0% (1.0)
Department/super stores	-	-	100.0% (1.0)	-	-
Financial institutions	-	100.0% (1.0)	-	-	-
Gas stations	-	-	-	100.0% (1.0)	-
Grocery stores	-	-	100.0% (1.0)	-	-
Healthcare and social service facilities	-	-	100.0% (1.0)	-	-
Home improvement/maintenance stores	-	-	100.0% (1.0)	-	-
Hotels	-	-	100.0% (1.0)	-	-
Schools and educational facilities	100.0% (1.0)	-	-	-	-
Restaurants and food carts/trucks	100.0% (1.0)	-	-	-	-

MADISON CITY WARD 107 (1)

Arts, entertainment, and recreation facilities	-	100.0% (1.0)	-	-	-
Bars and breweries/wineries/distilleries	-	100.0% (1.0)	-	-	-
Childcare facilities	-	100.0% (1.0)	-	-	-
Clothing stores	-	-	100.0% (1.0)	-	-
Convenience stores/pharmacies	-	-	100.0% (1.0)	-	-
Department/super stores	-	-	100.0% (1.0)	-	-
Financial institutions	-	-	100.0% (1.0)	-	-
Gas stations	-	-	100.0% (1.0)	-	-
Grocery stores	-	100.0% (1.0)	-	-	-
Healthcare and social service facilities	-	100.0% (1.0)	-	-	-
Home improvement/maintenance stores	-	-	100.0% (1.0)	-	-
Hotels	-	-	100.0% (1.0)	-	-

Schools and educational facilities	-	100.0% (1.0)	-	-	-
Restaurants and food carts/trucks	-	-	100.0% (1.0)	-	-
MIDDLETON TOWN WARD 7 (1)					
Arts, entertainment, and recreation facilities	100.0% (1.0)	-	-	-	-
Bars and breweries/wineries/distilleries	-	-	100.0% (1.0)	-	-
Childcare facilities	-	-	100.0% (1.0)	-	-
Clothing stores	-	-	100.0% (1.0)	-	-
Convenience stores/pharmacies	-	-	100.0% (1.0)	-	-
Department/super stores	-	-	100.0% (1.0)	-	-
Financial institutions	-	-	100.0% (1.0)	-	-
Gas stations	-	-	100.0% (1.0)	-	-
Grocery stores	-	-	100.0% (1.0)	-	-
Healthcare and social service facilities	-	-	100.0% (1.0)	-	-
Home improvement/maintenance stores	-	-	100.0% (1.0)	-	-
Hotels	-	-	100.0% (1.0)	-	-
Schools and educational facilities	-	-	100.0% (1.0)	-	-
Restaurants and food carts/trucks	-	-	100.0% (1.0)	-	-

MOUNT HOREB VLG WARD 3 (1)					
Arts, entertainment, and recreation facilities	-	100.0% (1.0)	-	-	-
Bars and breweries/wineries/distilleries	-	100.0% (1.0)	-	-	-
Childcare facilities	-	-	100.0% (1.0)	-	-
Clothing stores	-	-	100.0% (1.0)	-	-
Convenience stores/pharmacies	-	-	100.0% (1.0)	-	-
Department/super stores	-	100.0% (1.0)	-	-	-
Financial institutions	-	-	-	100.0% (1.0)	-
Gas stations	-	-	-	100.0% (1.0)	-
Grocery stores	-	100.0% (1.0)	-	-	-
Healthcare and social service facilities	-	-	-	100.0% (1.0)	-
Home improvement/maintenance stores	-	-	100.0% (1.0)	-	-
Hotels	-	-	-	100.0% (1.0)	-
Schools and educational facilities	-	-	-	100.0% (1.0)	-
Restaurants and food carts/trucks	-	100.0% (1.0)	-	-	-

OREGON VLG WARD 10 (1)					
Arts, entertainment, and recreation facilities	-	100.0% (1.0)	-	-	-
Bars and breweries/wineries/distilleries	-	-	-	100.0% (1.0)	-
Childcare facilities	-	-	100.0% (1.0)	-	-
Clothing stores	-	-	100.0% (1.0)	-	-
Convenience stores/pharmacies	-	-	-	100.0% (1.0)	-
Department/super stores	-	-	-	100.0% (1.0)	-
Financial institutions	-	-	100.0% (1.0)	-	-
Gas stations	-	-	-	100.0% (1.0)	-
Grocery stores	-	-	-	100.0% (1.0)	-
Healthcare and social service facilities	-	-	-	100.0% (1.0)	-
Home improvement/maintenance stores	-	-	100.0% (1.0)	-	-
Hotels	-	-	100.0% (1.0)	-	-
Schools and educational facilities	-	-	-	100.0% (1.0)	-
Restaurants and food carts/trucks	-	-	-	-	100.0% (1.0)

AGE RANGE	187 REGISTERED VOTERS				
	Very Unsatisfied	Unsatisfied	Neutral	Satisfied	Very Satisfied

18-29 (1)					
Arts, entertainment, and recreation facilities	-	-	-	100.0% (1.0)	-
Bars and breweries/wineries/distilleries	-	-	-	100.0% (1.0)	-

Childcare facilities	-	-	100.0% (1.0)	-	-
Clothing stores	-	-	-	100.0% (1.0)	-
Convenience stores/pharmacies	-	-	-	-	100.0% (1.0)
Department/super stores	-	-	-	100.0% (1.0)	-
Financial institutions	-	-	-	100.0% (1.0)	-
Gas stations	-	-	-	100.0% (1.0)	-
Grocery stores	-	-	-	100.0% (1.0)	-
Healthcare and social service facilities	-	-	-	100.0% (1.0)	-
Home improvement/maintenance stores	-	-	-	100.0% (1.0)	-
Hotels	-	-	-	100.0% (1.0)	-
Schools and educational facilities	-	-	100.0% (1.0)	-	-
Restaurants and food carts/trucks	-	-	-	100.0% (1.0)	-
30-39 (24)					
Arts, entertainment, and recreation facilities	8.3% (2.0)	37.5% (9.0)	25.0% (6.0)	25.0% (6.0)	4.2% (1.0)
Bars and breweries/wineries/distilleries	16.7% (4.0)	20.8% (5.0)	16.7% (4.0)	41.7% (10.0)	4.2% (1.0)
Childcare facilities	4.2% (1.0)	20.8% (5.0)	58.3% (14.0)	12.5% (3.0)	4.2% (1.0)
Clothing stores	12.5% (3.0)	37.5% (9.0)	37.5% (9.0)	12.5% (3.0)	-
Convenience stores/pharmacies	-	12.5% (3.0)	29.2% (7.0)	50.0% (12.0)	8.3% (2.0)
Department/super stores	4.2% (1.0)	12.5% (3.0)	29.2% (7.0)	41.7% (10.0)	12.5% (3.0)
Financial institutions	-	8.3% (2.0)	29.2% (7.0)	50.0% (12.0)	12.5% (3.0)
Gas stations	-	16.7% (4.0)	25.0% (6.0)	50.0% (12.0)	8.3% (2.0)
Grocery stores	4.2% (1.0)	16.7% (4.0)	12.5% (3.0)	50.0% (12.0)	16.7% (4.0)
Healthcare and social service facilities	8.3% (2.0)	12.5% (3.0)	37.5% (9.0)	41.7% (10.0)	-
Home improvement/maintenance stores	16.7% (4.0)	25.0% (6.0)	25.0% (6.0)	29.2% (7.0)	4.2% (1.0)
Hotels	4.2% (1.0)	4.2% (1.0)	41.7% (10.0)	41.7% (10.0)	8.3% (2.0)
Schools and educational facilities	20.8% (5.0)	20.8% (5.0)	29.2% (7.0)	20.8% (5.0)	8.3% (2.0)
Restaurants and food carts/trucks	25.0% (6.0)	33.3% (8.0)	16.7% (4.0)	20.8% (5.0)	4.2% (1.0)
40-49 (29)					
Arts, entertainment, and recreation facilities	6.9% (2.0)	20.7% (6.0)	27.6% (8.0)	44.8% (13.0)	-
Bars and breweries/wineries/distilleries	3.4% (1.0)	24.1% (7.0)	24.1% (7.0)	44.8% (13.0)	3.4% (1.0)
Childcare facilities	-	6.9% (2.0)	44.8% (13.0)	44.8% (13.0)	3.4% (1.0)
Clothing stores	3.4% (1.0)	51.7% (15.0)	31.0% (9.0)	13.8% (4.0)	-
Convenience stores/pharmacies	-	6.9% (2.0)	13.8% (4.0)	72.4% (21.0)	6.9% (2.0)
Department/super stores	-	17.2% (5.0)	27.6% (8.0)	48.3% (14.0)	6.9% (2.0)
Financial institutions	-	6.9% (2.0)	6.9% (2.0)	62.1% (18.0)	24.1% (7.0)
Gas stations	-	6.9% (2.0)	20.7% (6.0)	62.1% (18.0)	10.3% (3.0)
Grocery stores	3.4% (1.0)	13.8% (4.0)	24.1% (7.0)	41.4% (12.0)	17.2% (5.0)
Healthcare and social service facilities	-	20.7% (6.0)	37.9% (11.0)	37.9% (11.0)	3.4% (1.0)
Home improvement/maintenance stores	-	27.6% (8.0)	27.6% (8.0)	41.4% (12.0)	3.4% (1.0)
Hotels	3.4% (1.0)	3.4% (1.0)	34.5% (10.0)	48.3% (14.0)	10.3% (3.0)
Schools and educational facilities	6.9% (2.0)	24.1% (7.0)	37.9% (11.0)	27.6% (8.0)	3.4% (1.0)
Restaurants and food carts/trucks	13.8% (4.0)	27.6% (8.0)	13.8% (4.0)	37.9% (11.0)	6.9% (2.0)
50-59 (23)					
Arts, entertainment, and recreation facilities	-	30.4% (7.0)	39.1% (9.0)	26.1% (6.0)	4.3% (1.0)
Bars and breweries/wineries/distilleries	4.3% (1.0)	13.0% (3.0)	26.1% (6.0)	47.8% (11.0)	8.7% (2.0)
Childcare facilities	-	-	87.0% (20.0)	8.7% (2.0)	4.3% (1.0)
Clothing stores	8.7% (2.0)	26.1% (6.0)	47.8% (11.0)	13.0% (3.0)	4.3% (1.0)
Convenience stores/pharmacies	-	4.3% (1.0)	17.4% (4.0)	69.6% (16.0)	8.7% (2.0)
Department/super stores	4.3% (1.0)	13.0% (3.0)	43.5% (10.0)	30.4% (7.0)	8.7% (2.0)
Financial institutions	4.3% (1.0)	-	21.7% (5.0)	69.6% (16.0)	4.3% (1.0)
Gas stations	-	4.3% (1.0)	13.0% (3.0)	73.9% (17.0)	8.7% (2.0)
Grocery stores	-	13.0% (3.0)	4.3% (1.0)	73.9% (17.0)	8.7% (2.0)
Healthcare and social service facilities	-	8.7% (2.0)	34.8% (8.0)	52.2% (12.0)	4.3% (1.0)
Home improvement/maintenance stores	4.3% (1.0)	8.7% (2.0)	34.8% (8.0)	47.8% (11.0)	4.3% (1.0)
Hotels	4.3% (1.0)	-	30.4% (7.0)	60.9% (14.0)	4.3% (1.0)

Schools and educational facilities	8.7% (2.0)	26.1% (6.0)	43.5% (10.0)	17.4% (4.0)	4.3% (1.0)
Restaurants and food carts/trucks	8.7% (2.0)	26.1% (6.0)	34.8% (8.0)	30.4% (7.0)	-
60-69 (26)					
Arts, entertainment, and recreation facilities	7.7% (2.0)	38.5% (10.0)	11.5% (3.0)	26.9% (7.0)	15.4% (4.0)
Bars and breweries/wineries/distilleries	-	26.9% (7.0)	19.2% (5.0)	38.5% (10.0)	15.4% (4.0)
Childcare facilities	-	11.5% (3.0)	57.7% (15.0)	26.9% (7.0)	3.8% (1.0)
Clothing stores	11.5% (3.0)	30.8% (8.0)	42.3% (11.0)	11.5% (3.0)	3.8% (1.0)
Convenience stores/pharmacies	-	3.8% (1.0)	15.4% (4.0)	65.4% (17.0)	15.4% (4.0)
Department/super stores	3.8% (1.0)	15.4% (4.0)	42.3% (11.0)	26.9% (7.0)	11.5% (3.0)
Financial institutions	-	3.8% (1.0)	15.4% (4.0)	65.4% (17.0)	15.4% (4.0)
Gas stations	-	7.7% (2.0)	15.4% (4.0)	57.7% (15.0)	19.2% (5.0)
Grocery stores	-	11.5% (3.0)	11.5% (3.0)	61.5% (16.0)	15.4% (4.0)
Healthcare and social service facilities	-	23.1% (6.0)	26.9% (7.0)	26.9% (7.0)	23.1% (6.0)
Home improvement/maintenance stores	-	34.6% (9.0)	23.1% (6.0)	34.6% (9.0)	7.7% (2.0)
Hotels	-	7.7% (2.0)	38.5% (10.0)	46.2% (12.0)	7.7% (2.0)
Schools and educational facilities	7.7% (2.0)	30.8% (8.0)	23.1% (6.0)	34.6% (9.0)	3.8% (1.0)
Restaurants and food carts/trucks	7.7% (2.0)	34.6% (9.0)	11.5% (3.0)	34.6% (9.0)	11.5% (3.0)
70-79 (16)					
Arts, entertainment, and recreation facilities	-	43.8% (7.0)	18.8% (3.0)	37.5% (6.0)	-
Bars and breweries/wineries/distilleries	-	12.5% (2.0)	25.0% (4.0)	56.3% (9.0)	6.3% (1.0)
Childcare facilities	-	6.3% (1.0)	68.8% (11.0)	25.0% (4.0)	-
Clothing stores	6.3% (1.0)	25.0% (4.0)	43.8% (7.0)	25.0% (4.0)	-
Convenience stores/pharmacies	-	-	25.0% (4.0)	68.8% (11.0)	6.3% (1.0)
Department/super stores	-	-	37.5% (6.0)	56.3% (9.0)	6.3% (1.0)
Financial institutions	-	-	12.5% (2.0)	75.0% (12.0)	12.5% (2.0)
Gas stations	-	6.3% (1.0)	18.8% (3.0)	56.3% (9.0)	18.8% (3.0)
Grocery stores	-	12.5% (2.0)	12.5% (2.0)	68.8% (11.0)	6.3% (1.0)
Healthcare and social service facilities	-	12.5% (2.0)	25.0% (4.0)	50.0% (8.0)	12.5% (2.0)
Home improvement/maintenance stores	-	18.8% (3.0)	25.0% (4.0)	56.3% (9.0)	-
Hotels	-	6.3% (1.0)	31.3% (5.0)	56.3% (9.0)	6.3% (1.0)
Schools and educational facilities	-	12.5% (2.0)	50.0% (8.0)	37.5% (6.0)	-
Restaurants and food carts/trucks	6.3% (1.0)	12.5% (2.0)	25.0% (4.0)	56.3% (9.0)	-
unknown (68)					
Arts, entertainment, and recreation facilities	7.4% (5.0)	35.3% (24.0)	22.1% (15.0)	29.4% (20.0)	5.9% (4.0)
Bars and breweries/wineries/distilleries	8.8% (6.0)	27.9% (19.0)	25.0% (17.0)	29.4% (20.0)	8.8% (6.0)
Childcare facilities	4.4% (3.0)	10.3% (7.0)	67.6% (46.0)	13.2% (9.0)	4.4% (3.0)
Clothing stores	10.3% (7.0)	32.4% (22.0)	44.1% (30.0)	8.8% (6.0)	4.4% (3.0)
Convenience stores/pharmacies	1.5% (1.0)	7.4% (5.0)	25.0% (17.0)	54.4% (37.0)	11.8% (8.0)
Department/super stores	5.9% (4.0)	13.2% (9.0)	33.8% (23.0)	36.8% (25.0)	10.3% (7.0)
Financial institutions	1.5% (1.0)	1.5% (1.0)	26.5% (18.0)	50.0% (34.0)	20.6% (14.0)
Gas stations	-	11.8% (8.0)	17.6% (12.0)	58.8% (40.0)	11.8% (8.0)
Grocery stores	5.9% (4.0)	23.5% (16.0)	17.6% (12.0)	42.6% (29.0)	10.3% (7.0)
Healthcare and social service facilities	1.5% (1.0)	8.8% (6.0)	42.6% (29.0)	38.2% (26.0)	8.8% (6.0)
Home improvement/maintenance stores	7.4% (5.0)	20.6% (14.0)	38.2% (26.0)	26.5% (18.0)	7.4% (5.0)
Hotels	1.5% (1.0)	10.3% (7.0)	36.8% (25.0)	44.1% (30.0)	7.4% (5.0)
Schools and educational facilities	10.3% (7.0)	26.5% (18.0)	33.8% (23.0)	25.0% (17.0)	4.4% (3.0)
Restaurants and food carts/trucks	23.5% (16.0)	35.3% (24.0)	19.1% (13.0)	19.1% (13.0)	2.9% (2.0)

VOTERS 187 REGISTERED VOTERS
AGE

Very Unsatisfied Unsatisfied Neutral Satisfied Very Satisfied

28 (1)

Arts, entertainment, and recreation facilities	-	-	-	100.0% (1.0)	-
Bars and breweries/wineries/distilleries	-	-	-	100.0% (1.0)	-

Childcare facilities	-	-	100.0% (1.0)	-	-
Clothing stores	-	-	-	100.0% (1.0)	-
Convenience stores/pharmacies	-	-	-	-	100.0% (1.0)
Department/super stores	-	-	-	100.0% (1.0)	-
Financial institutions	-	-	-	100.0% (1.0)	-
Gas stations	-	-	-	100.0% (1.0)	-
Grocery stores	-	-	-	100.0% (1.0)	-
Healthcare and social service facilities	-	-	-	100.0% (1.0)	-
Home improvement/maintenance stores	-	-	-	100.0% (1.0)	-
Hotels	-	-	-	100.0% (1.0)	-
Schools and educational facilities	-	-	100.0% (1.0)	-	-
Restaurants and food carts/trucks	-	-	-	100.0% (1.0)	-

31 (1)

Arts, entertainment, and recreation facilities	-	-	-	100.0% (1.0)	-
Bars and breweries/wineries/distilleries	-	-	-	100.0% (1.0)	-
Childcare facilities	-	-	100.0% (1.0)	-	-
Clothing stores	-	-	100.0% (1.0)	-	-
Convenience stores/pharmacies	-	-	100.0% (1.0)	-	-
Department/super stores	-	-	-	100.0% (1.0)	-
Financial institutions	-	-	-	100.0% (1.0)	-
Gas stations	-	-	-	100.0% (1.0)	-
Grocery stores	-	-	-	100.0% (1.0)	-
Healthcare and social service facilities	-	100.0% (1.0)	-	-	-
Home improvement/maintenance stores	-	-	-	100.0% (1.0)	-
Hotels	-	-	-	100.0% (1.0)	-
Schools and educational facilities	-	-	-	100.0% (1.0)	-
Restaurants and food carts/trucks	100.0% (1.0)	-	-	-	-

32 (1)

Arts, entertainment, and recreation facilities	-	100.0% (1.0)	-	-	-
Bars and breweries/wineries/distilleries	100.0% (1.0)	-	-	-	-
Childcare facilities	-	-	100.0% (1.0)	-	-
Clothing stores	-	-	100.0% (1.0)	-	-
Convenience stores/pharmacies	-	100.0% (1.0)	-	-	-
Department/super stores	-	-	100.0% (1.0)	-	-
Financial institutions	-	-	100.0% (1.0)	-	-
Gas stations	-	-	100.0% (1.0)	-	-
Grocery stores	-	-	-	100.0% (1.0)	-
Healthcare and social service facilities	-	-	100.0% (1.0)	-	-
Home improvement/maintenance stores	-	-	100.0% (1.0)	-	-
Hotels	-	-	100.0% (1.0)	-	-
Schools and educational facilities	-	-	100.0% (1.0)	-	-
Restaurants and food carts/trucks	-	100.0% (1.0)	-	-	-

33 (1)

Arts, entertainment, and recreation facilities	-	-	-	100.0% (1.0)	-
Bars and breweries/wineries/distilleries	-	100.0% (1.0)	-	-	-
Childcare facilities	-	-	100.0% (1.0)	-	-
Clothing stores	-	-	100.0% (1.0)	-	-
Convenience stores/pharmacies	-	-	100.0% (1.0)	-	-
Department/super stores	-	-	100.0% (1.0)	-	-
Financial institutions	-	-	100.0% (1.0)	-	-
Gas stations	-	-	100.0% (1.0)	-	-
Grocery stores	-	100.0% (1.0)	-	-	-
Healthcare and social service facilities	-	-	100.0% (1.0)	-	-
Home improvement/maintenance stores	-	-	100.0% (1.0)	-	-
Hotels	100.0% (1.0)	-	-	-	-

Schools and educational facilities	-	-	100.0% (1.0)	-	-
Restaurants and food carts/trucks	-	100.0% (1.0)	-	-	-

34 (1)

Arts, entertainment, and recreation facilities	-	-	-	100.0% (1.0)	-
Bars and breweries/wineries/distilleries	-	-	-	100.0% (1.0)	-
Childcare facilities	-	-	100.0% (1.0)	-	-
Clothing stores	-	-	100.0% (1.0)	-	-
Convenience stores/pharmacies	-	-	-	-	100.0% (1.0)
Department/super stores	-	-	100.0% (1.0)	-	-
Financial institutions	-	-	100.0% (1.0)	-	-
Gas stations	-	-	-	-	100.0% (1.0)
Grocery stores	-	-	-	-	100.0% (1.0)
Healthcare and social service facilities	-	-	100.0% (1.0)	-	-
Home improvement/maintenance stores	-	-	100.0% (1.0)	-	-
Hotels	-	-	100.0% (1.0)	-	-
Schools and educational facilities	-	-	100.0% (1.0)	-	-
Restaurants and food carts/trucks	-	-	-	100.0% (1.0)	-

35 (5)

Arts, entertainment, and recreation facilities	20.0% (1.0)	40.0% (2.0)	20.0% (1.0)	20.0% (1.0)	-
Bars and breweries/wineries/distilleries	40.0% (2.0)	-	-	60.0% (3.0)	-
Childcare facilities	-	40.0% (2.0)	40.0% (2.0)	20.0% (1.0)	-
Clothing stores	20.0% (1.0)	40.0% (2.0)	20.0% (1.0)	20.0% (1.0)	-
Convenience stores/pharmacies	-	-	20.0% (1.0)	80.0% (4.0)	-
Department/super stores	20.0% (1.0)	20.0% (1.0)	-	60.0% (3.0)	-
Financial institutions	-	-	20.0% (1.0)	80.0% (4.0)	-
Gas stations	-	-	40.0% (2.0)	60.0% (3.0)	-
Grocery stores	20.0% (1.0)	-	20.0% (1.0)	60.0% (3.0)	-
Healthcare and social service facilities	-	-	-	100.0% (5.0)	-
Home improvement/maintenance stores	20.0% (1.0)	20.0% (1.0)	-	60.0% (3.0)	-
Hotels	-	-	20.0% (1.0)	60.0% (3.0)	20.0% (1.0)
Schools and educational facilities	20.0% (1.0)	40.0% (2.0)	-	20.0% (1.0)	20.0% (1.0)
Restaurants and food carts/trucks	40.0% (2.0)	20.0% (1.0)	-	40.0% (2.0)	-

36 (3)

Arts, entertainment, and recreation facilities	33.3% (1.0)	33.3% (1.0)	-	33.3% (1.0)	-
Bars and breweries/wineries/distilleries	33.3% (1.0)	33.3% (1.0)	-	33.3% (1.0)	-
Childcare facilities	33.3% (1.0)	-	33.3% (1.0)	33.3% (1.0)	-
Clothing stores	33.3% (1.0)	33.3% (1.0)	-	33.3% (1.0)	-
Convenience stores/pharmacies	-	-	66.7% (2.0)	33.3% (1.0)	-
Department/super stores	-	33.3% (1.0)	-	66.7% (2.0)	-
Financial institutions	-	-	-	100.0% (3.0)	-
Gas stations	-	66.7% (2.0)	-	33.3% (1.0)	-
Grocery stores	-	-	-	100.0% (3.0)	-
Healthcare and social service facilities	-	-	66.7% (2.0)	33.3% (1.0)	-
Home improvement/maintenance stores	33.3% (1.0)	33.3% (1.0)	33.3% (1.0)	-	-
Hotels	-	33.3% (1.0)	33.3% (1.0)	33.3% (1.0)	-
Schools and educational facilities	-	-	33.3% (1.0)	66.7% (2.0)	-
Restaurants and food carts/trucks	33.3% (1.0)	33.3% (1.0)	33.3% (1.0)	-	-

37 (5)

Arts, entertainment, and recreation facilities	-	20.0% (1.0)	60.0% (3.0)	20.0% (1.0)	-
Bars and breweries/wineries/distilleries	-	20.0% (1.0)	40.0% (2.0)	40.0% (2.0)	-
Childcare facilities	-	20.0% (1.0)	80.0% (4.0)	-	-
Clothing stores	-	40.0% (2.0)	60.0% (3.0)	-	-
Convenience stores/pharmacies	-	-	40.0% (2.0)	60.0% (3.0)	-
Department/super stores	-	-	40.0% (2.0)	60.0% (3.0)	-

Financial institutions	-	-	40.0% (2.0)	60.0% (3.0)	-
Gas stations	-	-	40.0% (2.0)	40.0% (2.0)	20.0% (1.0)
Grocery stores	-	20.0% (1.0)	20.0% (1.0)	60.0% (3.0)	-
Healthcare and social service facilities	20.0% (1.0)	-	40.0% (2.0)	40.0% (2.0)	-
Home improvement/maintenance stores	20.0% (1.0)	40.0% (2.0)	20.0% (1.0)	20.0% (1.0)	-
Hotels	-	-	60.0% (3.0)	40.0% (2.0)	-
Schools and educational facilities	20.0% (1.0)	20.0% (1.0)	40.0% (2.0)	20.0% (1.0)	-
Restaurants and food carts/trucks	-	40.0% (2.0)	20.0% (1.0)	40.0% (2.0)	-

38 (3)

Arts, entertainment, and recreation facilities	-	33.3% (1.0)	66.7% (2.0)	-	-
Bars and breweries/wineries/distilleries	-	-	33.3% (1.0)	66.7% (2.0)	-
Childcare facilities	-	-	66.7% (2.0)	33.3% (1.0)	-
Clothing stores	33.3% (1.0)	33.3% (1.0)	33.3% (1.0)	-	-
Convenience stores/pharmacies	-	33.3% (1.0)	-	33.3% (1.0)	33.3% (1.0)
Department/super stores	-	-	66.7% (2.0)	-	33.3% (1.0)
Financial institutions	-	33.3% (1.0)	33.3% (1.0)	-	33.3% (1.0)
Gas stations	-	33.3% (1.0)	-	66.7% (2.0)	-
Grocery stores	-	33.3% (1.0)	33.3% (1.0)	-	33.3% (1.0)
Healthcare and social service facilities	33.3% (1.0)	-	33.3% (1.0)	33.3% (1.0)	-
Home improvement/maintenance stores	-	33.3% (1.0)	33.3% (1.0)	-	33.3% (1.0)
Hotels	-	-	100.0% (3.0)	-	-
Schools and educational facilities	66.7% (2.0)	-	33.3% (1.0)	-	-
Restaurants and food carts/trucks	33.3% (1.0)	33.3% (1.0)	33.3% (1.0)	-	-

39 (4)

Arts, entertainment, and recreation facilities	-	75.0% (3.0)	-	-	25.0% (1.0)
Bars and breweries/wineries/distilleries	-	50.0% (2.0)	25.0% (1.0)	-	25.0% (1.0)
Childcare facilities	-	50.0% (2.0)	25.0% (1.0)	-	25.0% (1.0)
Clothing stores	-	75.0% (3.0)	-	25.0% (1.0)	-
Convenience stores/pharmacies	-	25.0% (1.0)	-	75.0% (3.0)	-
Department/super stores	-	25.0% (1.0)	-	25.0% (1.0)	50.0% (2.0)
Financial institutions	-	25.0% (1.0)	-	25.0% (1.0)	50.0% (2.0)
Gas stations	-	25.0% (1.0)	-	75.0% (3.0)	-
Grocery stores	-	25.0% (1.0)	-	25.0% (1.0)	50.0% (2.0)
Healthcare and social service facilities	-	50.0% (2.0)	25.0% (1.0)	25.0% (1.0)	-
Home improvement/maintenance stores	25.0% (1.0)	25.0% (1.0)	-	50.0% (2.0)	-
Hotels	-	-	-	75.0% (3.0)	25.0% (1.0)
Schools and educational facilities	25.0% (1.0)	50.0% (2.0)	-	-	25.0% (1.0)
Restaurants and food carts/trucks	25.0% (1.0)	25.0% (1.0)	25.0% (1.0)	-	25.0% (1.0)

40 (3)

Arts, entertainment, and recreation facilities	33.3% (1.0)	-	33.3% (1.0)	33.3% (1.0)	-
Bars and breweries/wineries/distilleries	-	66.7% (2.0)	33.3% (1.0)	-	-
Childcare facilities	-	-	100.0% (3.0)	-	-
Clothing stores	-	66.7% (2.0)	33.3% (1.0)	-	-
Convenience stores/pharmacies	-	-	33.3% (1.0)	33.3% (1.0)	33.3% (1.0)
Department/super stores	-	33.3% (1.0)	-	66.7% (2.0)	-
Financial institutions	-	-	-	100.0% (3.0)	-
Gas stations	-	-	-	100.0% (3.0)	-
Grocery stores	-	-	-	66.7% (2.0)	33.3% (1.0)
Healthcare and social service facilities	-	33.3% (1.0)	66.7% (2.0)	-	-
Home improvement/maintenance stores	-	33.3% (1.0)	66.7% (2.0)	-	-
Hotels	33.3% (1.0)	-	-	66.7% (2.0)	-
Schools and educational facilities	-	66.7% (2.0)	33.3% (1.0)	-	-
Restaurants and food carts/trucks	-	66.7% (2.0)	33.3% (1.0)	-	-

41 (3)

Arts, entertainment, and recreation facilities	-	-	66.7% (2.0)	33.3% (1.0)	-
Bars and breweries/wineries/distilleries	-	33.3% (1.0)	-	66.7% (2.0)	-
Childcare facilities	-	-	-	100.0% (3.0)	-
Clothing stores	-	66.7% (2.0)	-	33.3% (1.0)	-
Convenience stores/pharmacies	-	-	-	66.7% (2.0)	33.3% (1.0)
Department/super stores	-	-	33.3% (1.0)	66.7% (2.0)	-
Financial institutions	-	-	33.3% (1.0)	33.3% (1.0)	33.3% (1.0)
Gas stations	-	-	66.7% (2.0)	33.3% (1.0)	-
Grocery stores	-	-	-	66.7% (2.0)	33.3% (1.0)
Healthcare and social service facilities	-	-	33.3% (1.0)	66.7% (2.0)	-
Home improvement/maintenance stores	-	-	33.3% (1.0)	66.7% (2.0)	-
Hotels	-	-	66.7% (2.0)	33.3% (1.0)	-
Schools and educational facilities	33.3% (1.0)	33.3% (1.0)	-	33.3% (1.0)	-
Restaurants and food carts/trucks	-	33.3% (1.0)	-	66.7% (2.0)	-

43 (5)

Arts, entertainment, and recreation facilities	-	-	40.0% (2.0)	60.0% (3.0)	-
Bars and breweries/wineries/distilleries	-	-	20.0% (1.0)	80.0% (4.0)	-
Childcare facilities	-	20.0% (1.0)	40.0% (2.0)	40.0% (2.0)	-
Clothing stores	-	40.0% (2.0)	60.0% (3.0)	-	-
Convenience stores/pharmacies	-	-	-	100.0% (5.0)	-
Department/super stores	-	40.0% (2.0)	-	60.0% (3.0)	-
Financial institutions	-	-	-	60.0% (3.0)	40.0% (2.0)
Gas stations	-	-	-	80.0% (4.0)	20.0% (1.0)
Grocery stores	-	40.0% (2.0)	-	60.0% (3.0)	-
Healthcare and social service facilities	-	-	40.0% (2.0)	60.0% (3.0)	-
Home improvement/maintenance stores	-	-	40.0% (2.0)	60.0% (3.0)	-
Hotels	-	-	20.0% (1.0)	60.0% (3.0)	20.0% (1.0)
Schools and educational facilities	-	-	40.0% (2.0)	60.0% (3.0)	-
Restaurants and food carts/trucks	-	20.0% (1.0)	-	80.0% (4.0)	-

44 (6)

Arts, entertainment, and recreation facilities	-	33.3% (2.0)	-	66.7% (4.0)	-
Bars and breweries/wineries/distilleries	-	66.7% (4.0)	-	16.7% (1.0)	16.7% (1.0)
Childcare facilities	-	-	16.7% (1.0)	66.7% (4.0)	16.7% (1.0)
Clothing stores	16.7% (1.0)	66.7% (4.0)	-	16.7% (1.0)	-
Convenience stores/pharmacies	-	16.7% (1.0)	16.7% (1.0)	66.7% (4.0)	-
Department/super stores	-	16.7% (1.0)	33.3% (2.0)	33.3% (2.0)	16.7% (1.0)
Financial institutions	-	16.7% (1.0)	-	50.0% (3.0)	33.3% (2.0)
Gas stations	-	16.7% (1.0)	16.7% (1.0)	50.0% (3.0)	16.7% (1.0)
Grocery stores	-	16.7% (1.0)	33.3% (2.0)	33.3% (2.0)	16.7% (1.0)
Healthcare and social service facilities	-	16.7% (1.0)	16.7% (1.0)	50.0% (3.0)	16.7% (1.0)
Home improvement/maintenance stores	-	50.0% (3.0)	-	33.3% (2.0)	16.7% (1.0)
Hotels	-	16.7% (1.0)	16.7% (1.0)	50.0% (3.0)	16.7% (1.0)
Schools and educational facilities	-	33.3% (2.0)	16.7% (1.0)	50.0% (3.0)	-
Restaurants and food carts/trucks	50.0% (3.0)	16.7% (1.0)	-	33.3% (2.0)	-

45 (2)

Arts, entertainment, and recreation facilities	-	50.0% (1.0)	-	50.0% (1.0)	-
Bars and breweries/wineries/distilleries	-	-	50.0% (1.0)	50.0% (1.0)	-
Childcare facilities	-	-	100.0% (2.0)	-	-
Clothing stores	-	50.0% (1.0)	50.0% (1.0)	-	-
Convenience stores/pharmacies	-	50.0% (1.0)	50.0% (1.0)	-	-
Department/super stores	-	50.0% (1.0)	50.0% (1.0)	-	-
Financial institutions	-	-	-	100.0% (2.0)	-
Gas stations	-	50.0% (1.0)	-	50.0% (1.0)	-
Grocery stores	50.0% (1.0)	-	50.0% (1.0)	-	-

Healthcare and social service facilities	-	50.0% (1.0)	50.0% (1.0)	-	-
Home improvement/maintenance stores	-	50.0% (1.0)	50.0% (1.0)	-	-
Hotels	-	-	50.0% (1.0)	50.0% (1.0)	-
Schools and educational facilities	50.0% (1.0)	-	50.0% (1.0)	-	-
Restaurants and food carts/trucks	-	50.0% (1.0)	-	50.0% (1.0)	-
46 (1)					
Arts, entertainment, and recreation facilities	-	-	100.0% (1.0)	-	-
Bars and breweries/wineries/distilleries	-	-	100.0% (1.0)	-	-
Childcare facilities	-	-	100.0% (1.0)	-	-
Clothing stores	-	100.0% (1.0)	-	-	-
Convenience stores/pharmacies	-	-	-	100.0% (1.0)	-
Department/super stores	-	-	-	100.0% (1.0)	-
Financial institutions	-	-	-	100.0% (1.0)	-
Gas stations	-	-	-	100.0% (1.0)	-
Grocery stores	-	-	-	100.0% (1.0)	-
Healthcare and social service facilities	-	100.0% (1.0)	-	-	-
Home improvement/maintenance stores	-	100.0% (1.0)	-	-	-
Hotels	-	-	100.0% (1.0)	-	-
Schools and educational facilities	-	-	100.0% (1.0)	-	-
Restaurants and food carts/trucks	-	100.0% (1.0)	-	-	-
47 (3)					
Arts, entertainment, and recreation facilities	-	-	66.7% (2.0)	33.3% (1.0)	-
Bars and breweries/wineries/distilleries	33.3% (1.0)	-	33.3% (1.0)	33.3% (1.0)	-
Childcare facilities	-	-	33.3% (1.0)	66.7% (2.0)	-
Clothing stores	-	33.3% (1.0)	33.3% (1.0)	33.3% (1.0)	-
Convenience stores/pharmacies	-	-	-	100.0% (3.0)	-
Department/super stores	-	-	66.7% (2.0)	-	33.3% (1.0)
Financial institutions	-	-	-	33.3% (1.0)	66.7% (2.0)
Gas stations	-	-	-	66.7% (2.0)	33.3% (1.0)
Grocery stores	-	-	33.3% (1.0)	-	66.7% (2.0)
Healthcare and social service facilities	-	-	66.7% (2.0)	33.3% (1.0)	-
Home improvement/maintenance stores	-	-	33.3% (1.0)	66.7% (2.0)	-
Hotels	-	-	-	66.7% (2.0)	33.3% (1.0)
Schools and educational facilities	-	33.3% (1.0)	33.3% (1.0)	-	33.3% (1.0)
Restaurants and food carts/trucks	33.3% (1.0)	-	33.3% (1.0)	-	33.3% (1.0)
48 (2)					
Arts, entertainment, and recreation facilities	-	50.0% (1.0)	-	50.0% (1.0)	-
Bars and breweries/wineries/distilleries	-	-	-	100.0% (2.0)	-
Childcare facilities	-	-	-	100.0% (2.0)	-
Clothing stores	-	-	50.0% (1.0)	50.0% (1.0)	-
Convenience stores/pharmacies	-	-	50.0% (1.0)	50.0% (1.0)	-
Department/super stores	-	-	50.0% (1.0)	50.0% (1.0)	-
Financial institutions	-	-	50.0% (1.0)	50.0% (1.0)	-
Gas stations	-	-	50.0% (1.0)	50.0% (1.0)	-
Grocery stores	-	-	50.0% (1.0)	50.0% (1.0)	-
Healthcare and social service facilities	-	50.0% (1.0)	-	50.0% (1.0)	-
Home improvement/maintenance stores	-	-	-	100.0% (2.0)	-
Hotels	-	-	50.0% (1.0)	50.0% (1.0)	-
Schools and educational facilities	-	-	50.0% (1.0)	50.0% (1.0)	-
Restaurants and food carts/trucks	-	50.0% (1.0)	-	-	50.0% (1.0)
49 (4)					
Arts, entertainment, and recreation facilities	25.0% (1.0)	50.0% (2.0)	-	25.0% (1.0)	-
Bars and breweries/wineries/distilleries	-	-	50.0% (2.0)	50.0% (2.0)	-
Childcare facilities	-	25.0% (1.0)	75.0% (3.0)	-	-

Clothing stores	-	50.0% (2.0)	50.0% (2.0)	-	-
Convenience stores/pharmacies	-	-	-	100.0% (4.0)	-
Department/super stores	-	-	25.0% (1.0)	75.0% (3.0)	-
Financial institutions	-	25.0% (1.0)	-	75.0% (3.0)	-
Gas stations	-	-	50.0% (2.0)	50.0% (2.0)	-
Grocery stores	-	25.0% (1.0)	50.0% (2.0)	25.0% (1.0)	-
Healthcare and social service facilities	-	25.0% (1.0)	50.0% (2.0)	25.0% (1.0)	-
Home improvement/maintenance stores	-	50.0% (2.0)	25.0% (1.0)	25.0% (1.0)	-
Hotels	-	-	75.0% (3.0)	25.0% (1.0)	-
Schools and educational facilities	-	25.0% (1.0)	75.0% (3.0)	-	-
Restaurants and food carts/trucks	-	-	50.0% (2.0)	50.0% (2.0)	-
50 (1)					
Arts, entertainment, and recreation facilities	-	100.0% (1.0)	-	-	-
Bars and breweries/wineries/distilleries	-	-	-	100.0% (1.0)	-
Childcare facilities	-	-	100.0% (1.0)	-	-
Clothing stores	-	100.0% (1.0)	-	-	-
Convenience stores/pharmacies	-	-	-	100.0% (1.0)	-
Department/super stores	-	-	100.0% (1.0)	-	-
Financial institutions	-	-	-	100.0% (1.0)	-
Gas stations	-	-	-	100.0% (1.0)	-
Grocery stores	-	-	-	100.0% (1.0)	-
Healthcare and social service facilities	-	-	-	100.0% (1.0)	-
Home improvement/maintenance stores	-	-	-	100.0% (1.0)	-
Hotels	-	-	-	100.0% (1.0)	-
Schools and educational facilities	100.0% (1.0)	-	-	-	-
Restaurants and food carts/trucks	-	-	100.0% (1.0)	-	-
51 (1)					
Arts, entertainment, and recreation facilities	-	-	100.0% (1.0)	-	-
Bars and breweries/wineries/distilleries	100.0% (1.0)	-	-	-	-
Childcare facilities	-	-	100.0% (1.0)	-	-
Clothing stores	-	-	100.0% (1.0)	-	-
Convenience stores/pharmacies	-	-	-	100.0% (1.0)	-
Department/super stores	-	-	-	100.0% (1.0)	-
Financial institutions	-	-	-	100.0% (1.0)	-
Gas stations	-	-	-	100.0% (1.0)	-
Grocery stores	-	-	-	100.0% (1.0)	-
Healthcare and social service facilities	-	-	-	100.0% (1.0)	-
Home improvement/maintenance stores	-	-	-	100.0% (1.0)	-
Hotels	-	-	-	100.0% (1.0)	-
Schools and educational facilities	100.0% (1.0)	-	-	-	-
Restaurants and food carts/trucks	100.0% (1.0)	-	-	-	-
52 (5)					
Arts, entertainment, and recreation facilities	-	40.0% (2.0)	20.0% (1.0)	40.0% (2.0)	-
Bars and breweries/wineries/distilleries	-	20.0% (1.0)	20.0% (1.0)	60.0% (3.0)	-
Childcare facilities	-	-	80.0% (4.0)	20.0% (1.0)	-
Clothing stores	-	40.0% (2.0)	60.0% (3.0)	-	-
Convenience stores/pharmacies	-	-	-	80.0% (4.0)	20.0% (1.0)
Department/super stores	-	20.0% (1.0)	20.0% (1.0)	60.0% (3.0)	-
Financial institutions	-	-	-	100.0% (5.0)	-
Gas stations	-	-	20.0% (1.0)	80.0% (4.0)	-
Grocery stores	-	-	20.0% (1.0)	80.0% (4.0)	-
Healthcare and social service facilities	-	20.0% (1.0)	20.0% (1.0)	60.0% (3.0)	-
Home improvement/maintenance stores	-	-	20.0% (1.0)	80.0% (4.0)	-
Hotels	-	-	40.0% (2.0)	60.0% (3.0)	-

Schools and educational facilities	-	40.0% (2.0)	60.0% (3.0)	-	-
Restaurants and food carts/trucks	-	20.0% (1.0)	40.0% (2.0)	40.0% (2.0)	-

53 (4)

Arts, entertainment, and recreation facilities	-	50.0% (2.0)	25.0% (1.0)	25.0% (1.0)	-
Bars and breweries/wineries/distilleries	-	-	75.0% (3.0)	25.0% (1.0)	-
Childcare facilities	-	-	100.0% (4.0)	-	-
Clothing stores	25.0% (1.0)	25.0% (1.0)	50.0% (2.0)	-	-
Convenience stores/pharmacies	-	-	25.0% (1.0)	75.0% (3.0)	-
Department/super stores	-	-	75.0% (3.0)	25.0% (1.0)	-
Financial institutions	-	-	50.0% (2.0)	50.0% (2.0)	-
Gas stations	-	-	25.0% (1.0)	75.0% (3.0)	-
Grocery stores	-	25.0% (1.0)	-	75.0% (3.0)	-
Healthcare and social service facilities	-	-	50.0% (2.0)	50.0% (2.0)	-
Home improvement/maintenance stores	25.0% (1.0)	25.0% (1.0)	50.0% (2.0)	-	-
Hotels	-	-	75.0% (3.0)	25.0% (1.0)	-
Schools and educational facilities	-	-	100.0% (4.0)	-	-
Restaurants and food carts/trucks	-	50.0% (2.0)	25.0% (1.0)	25.0% (1.0)	-

54 (1)

Arts, entertainment, and recreation facilities	-	100.0% (1.0)	-	-	-
Bars and breweries/wineries/distilleries	-	100.0% (1.0)	-	-	-
Childcare facilities	-	-	100.0% (1.0)	-	-
Clothing stores	-	-	100.0% (1.0)	-	-
Convenience stores/pharmacies	-	-	100.0% (1.0)	-	-
Department/super stores	-	100.0% (1.0)	-	-	-
Financial institutions	-	-	-	100.0% (1.0)	-
Gas stations	-	-	-	100.0% (1.0)	-
Grocery stores	-	100.0% (1.0)	-	-	-
Healthcare and social service facilities	-	-	-	100.0% (1.0)	-
Home improvement/maintenance stores	-	-	100.0% (1.0)	-	-
Hotels	-	-	-	100.0% (1.0)	-
Schools and educational facilities	-	-	-	100.0% (1.0)	-
Restaurants and food carts/trucks	-	100.0% (1.0)	-	-	-

55 (3)

Arts, entertainment, and recreation facilities	-	-	33.3% (1.0)	33.3% (1.0)	33.3% (1.0)
Bars and breweries/wineries/distilleries	-	-	33.3% (1.0)	33.3% (1.0)	33.3% (1.0)
Childcare facilities	-	-	33.3% (1.0)	33.3% (1.0)	33.3% (1.0)
Clothing stores	-	-	-	66.7% (2.0)	33.3% (1.0)
Convenience stores/pharmacies	-	-	-	66.7% (2.0)	33.3% (1.0)
Department/super stores	-	-	-	66.7% (2.0)	33.3% (1.0)
Financial institutions	-	-	-	66.7% (2.0)	33.3% (1.0)
Gas stations	-	-	-	66.7% (2.0)	33.3% (1.0)
Grocery stores	-	-	-	66.7% (2.0)	33.3% (1.0)
Healthcare and social service facilities	-	-	-	66.7% (2.0)	33.3% (1.0)
Home improvement/maintenance stores	-	-	-	66.7% (2.0)	33.3% (1.0)
Hotels	-	-	-	66.7% (2.0)	33.3% (1.0)
Schools and educational facilities	-	-	-	66.7% (2.0)	33.3% (1.0)
Restaurants and food carts/trucks	33.3% (1.0)	33.3% (1.0)	-	33.3% (1.0)	-

56 (2)

Arts, entertainment, and recreation facilities	-	-	100.0% (2.0)	-	-
Bars and breweries/wineries/distilleries	-	50.0% (1.0)	-	50.0% (1.0)	-
Childcare facilities	-	-	100.0% (2.0)	-	-
Clothing stores	-	-	50.0% (1.0)	50.0% (1.0)	-
Convenience stores/pharmacies	-	-	-	100.0% (2.0)	-
Department/super stores	-	-	50.0% (1.0)	-	50.0% (1.0)

Financial institutions	-	-	50.0% (1.0)	50.0% (1.0)	-
Gas stations	-	-	-	50.0% (1.0)	50.0% (1.0)
Grocery stores	-	-	-	50.0% (1.0)	50.0% (1.0)
Healthcare and social service facilities	-	-	50.0% (1.0)	50.0% (1.0)	-
Home improvement/maintenance stores	-	-	50.0% (1.0)	50.0% (1.0)	-
Hotels	-	-	50.0% (1.0)	50.0% (1.0)	-
Schools and educational facilities	-	50.0% (1.0)	50.0% (1.0)	-	-
Restaurants and food carts/trucks	-	-	100.0% (2.0)	-	-

57 (1)

Arts, entertainment, and recreation facilities	-	100.0% (1.0)	-	-	-
Bars and breweries/wineries/distilleries	-	-	-	100.0% (1.0)	-
Childcare facilities	-	-	100.0% (1.0)	-	-
Clothing stores	-	100.0% (1.0)	-	-	-
Convenience stores/pharmacies	-	-	-	100.0% (1.0)	-
Department/super stores	-	100.0% (1.0)	-	-	-
Financial institutions	-	-	-	100.0% (1.0)	-
Gas stations	-	-	-	100.0% (1.0)	-
Grocery stores	-	-	-	100.0% (1.0)	-
Healthcare and social service facilities	-	-	-	100.0% (1.0)	-
Home improvement/maintenance stores	-	-	-	100.0% (1.0)	-
Hotels	-	-	-	100.0% (1.0)	-
Schools and educational facilities	-	-	-	100.0% (1.0)	-
Restaurants and food carts/trucks	-	-	-	100.0% (1.0)	-

59 (5)

Arts, entertainment, and recreation facilities	-	-	60.0% (3.0)	40.0% (2.0)	-
Bars and breweries/wineries/distilleries	-	-	20.0% (1.0)	60.0% (3.0)	20.0% (1.0)
Childcare facilities	-	-	100.0% (5.0)	-	-
Clothing stores	20.0% (1.0)	20.0% (1.0)	60.0% (3.0)	-	-
Convenience stores/pharmacies	-	20.0% (1.0)	40.0% (2.0)	40.0% (2.0)	-
Department/super stores	20.0% (1.0)	-	80.0% (4.0)	-	-
Financial institutions	20.0% (1.0)	-	40.0% (2.0)	40.0% (2.0)	-
Gas stations	-	20.0% (1.0)	20.0% (1.0)	60.0% (3.0)	-
Grocery stores	-	20.0% (1.0)	-	80.0% (4.0)	-
Healthcare and social service facilities	-	20.0% (1.0)	80.0% (4.0)	-	-
Home improvement/maintenance stores	-	20.0% (1.0)	60.0% (3.0)	20.0% (1.0)	-
Hotels	20.0% (1.0)	-	20.0% (1.0)	60.0% (3.0)	-
Schools and educational facilities	-	60.0% (3.0)	40.0% (2.0)	-	-
Restaurants and food carts/trucks	-	20.0% (1.0)	40.0% (2.0)	40.0% (2.0)	-

60 (3)

Arts, entertainment, and recreation facilities	33.3% (1.0)	33.3% (1.0)	-	33.3% (1.0)	-
Bars and breweries/wineries/distilleries	-	66.7% (2.0)	-	33.3% (1.0)	-
Childcare facilities	-	-	66.7% (2.0)	33.3% (1.0)	-
Clothing stores	33.3% (1.0)	33.3% (1.0)	33.3% (1.0)	-	-
Convenience stores/pharmacies	-	-	33.3% (1.0)	66.7% (2.0)	-
Department/super stores	-	-	66.7% (2.0)	33.3% (1.0)	-
Financial institutions	-	-	33.3% (1.0)	66.7% (2.0)	-
Gas stations	-	-	33.3% (1.0)	66.7% (2.0)	-
Grocery stores	-	-	33.3% (1.0)	66.7% (2.0)	-
Healthcare and social service facilities	-	-	66.7% (2.0)	33.3% (1.0)	-
Home improvement/maintenance stores	-	33.3% (1.0)	33.3% (1.0)	33.3% (1.0)	-
Hotels	-	-	66.7% (2.0)	33.3% (1.0)	-
Schools and educational facilities	-	33.3% (1.0)	33.3% (1.0)	33.3% (1.0)	-
Restaurants and food carts/trucks	33.3% (1.0)	33.3% (1.0)	-	33.3% (1.0)	-

61 (1)

Arts, entertainment, and recreation facilities	-	-	-	100.0% (1.0)	-
Bars and breweries/wineries/distilleries	-	-	-	100.0% (1.0)	-
Childcare facilities	-	-	-	100.0% (1.0)	-
Clothing stores	-	-	100.0% (1.0)	-	-
Convenience stores/pharmacies	-	-	-	100.0% (1.0)	-
Department/super stores	-	-	100.0% (1.0)	-	-
Financial institutions	-	-	-	100.0% (1.0)	-
Gas stations	-	-	100.0% (1.0)	-	-
Grocery stores	-	-	-	100.0% (1.0)	-
Healthcare and social service facilities	-	100.0% (1.0)	-	-	-
Home improvement/maintenance stores	-	100.0% (1.0)	-	-	-
Hotels	-	-	100.0% (1.0)	-	-
Schools and educational facilities	-	100.0% (1.0)	-	-	-
Restaurants and food carts/trucks	-	-	100.0% (1.0)	-	-

62 (5)

Arts, entertainment, and recreation facilities	-	40.0% (2.0)	40.0% (2.0)	-	20.0% (1.0)
Bars and breweries/wineries/distilleries	-	-	40.0% (2.0)	40.0% (2.0)	20.0% (1.0)
Childcare facilities	-	-	100.0% (5.0)	-	-
Clothing stores	-	40.0% (2.0)	40.0% (2.0)	-	20.0% (1.0)
Convenience stores/pharmacies	-	-	20.0% (1.0)	60.0% (3.0)	20.0% (1.0)
Department/super stores	-	20.0% (1.0)	40.0% (2.0)	20.0% (1.0)	20.0% (1.0)
Financial institutions	-	-	20.0% (1.0)	60.0% (3.0)	20.0% (1.0)
Gas stations	-	20.0% (1.0)	-	40.0% (2.0)	40.0% (2.0)
Grocery stores	-	-	20.0% (1.0)	80.0% (4.0)	-
Healthcare and social service facilities	-	-	40.0% (2.0)	40.0% (2.0)	20.0% (1.0)
Home improvement/maintenance stores	-	40.0% (2.0)	20.0% (1.0)	40.0% (2.0)	-
Hotels	-	-	40.0% (2.0)	40.0% (2.0)	20.0% (1.0)
Schools and educational facilities	-	40.0% (2.0)	40.0% (2.0)	20.0% (1.0)	-
Restaurants and food carts/trucks	-	20.0% (1.0)	20.0% (1.0)	40.0% (2.0)	20.0% (1.0)

63 (2)

Arts, entertainment, and recreation facilities	-	50.0% (1.0)	-	50.0% (1.0)	-
Bars and breweries/wineries/distilleries	-	50.0% (1.0)	50.0% (1.0)	-	-
Childcare facilities	-	50.0% (1.0)	-	50.0% (1.0)	-
Clothing stores	-	100.0% (2.0)	-	-	-
Convenience stores/pharmacies	-	50.0% (1.0)	-	-	50.0% (1.0)
Department/super stores	-	100.0% (2.0)	-	-	-
Financial institutions	-	50.0% (1.0)	-	-	50.0% (1.0)
Gas stations	-	50.0% (1.0)	-	-	50.0% (1.0)
Grocery stores	-	50.0% (1.0)	-	-	50.0% (1.0)
Healthcare and social service facilities	-	50.0% (1.0)	-	-	50.0% (1.0)
Home improvement/maintenance stores	-	50.0% (1.0)	-	-	50.0% (1.0)
Hotels	-	-	-	100.0% (2.0)	-
Schools and educational facilities	50.0% (1.0)	-	50.0% (1.0)	-	-
Restaurants and food carts/trucks	-	100.0% (2.0)	-	-	-

64 (5)

Arts, entertainment, and recreation facilities	20.0% (1.0)	60.0% (3.0)	-	20.0% (1.0)	-
Bars and breweries/wineries/distilleries	-	20.0% (1.0)	40.0% (2.0)	40.0% (2.0)	-
Childcare facilities	-	-	80.0% (4.0)	20.0% (1.0)	-
Clothing stores	40.0% (2.0)	-	60.0% (3.0)	-	-
Convenience stores/pharmacies	-	-	40.0% (2.0)	60.0% (3.0)	-
Department/super stores	20.0% (1.0)	20.0% (1.0)	40.0% (2.0)	20.0% (1.0)	-
Financial institutions	-	-	40.0% (2.0)	60.0% (3.0)	-
Gas stations	-	-	20.0% (1.0)	80.0% (4.0)	-
Grocery stores	-	20.0% (1.0)	20.0% (1.0)	60.0% (3.0)	-
Healthcare and social service facilities	-	20.0% (1.0)	60.0% (3.0)	20.0% (1.0)	-

Home improvement/maintenance stores	-	20.0% (1.0)	60.0% (3.0)	20.0% (1.0)	-
Hotels	-	20.0% (1.0)	60.0% (3.0)	20.0% (1.0)	-
Schools and educational facilities	-	40.0% (2.0)	20.0% (1.0)	40.0% (2.0)	-
Restaurants and food carts/trucks	20.0% (1.0)	20.0% (1.0)	20.0% (1.0)	40.0% (2.0)	-
65 (2)					
Arts, entertainment, and recreation facilities	-	-	-	50.0% (1.0)	50.0% (1.0)
Bars and breweries/wineries/distilleries	-	-	-	50.0% (1.0)	50.0% (1.0)
Childcare facilities	-	-	100.0% (2.0)	-	-
Clothing stores	-	50.0% (1.0)	50.0% (1.0)	-	-
Convenience stores/pharmacies	-	-	-	50.0% (1.0)	50.0% (1.0)
Department/super stores	-	-	50.0% (1.0)	50.0% (1.0)	-
Financial institutions	-	-	-	100.0% (2.0)	-
Gas stations	-	-	-	100.0% (2.0)	-
Grocery stores	-	-	-	50.0% (1.0)	50.0% (1.0)
Healthcare and social service facilities	-	-	-	50.0% (1.0)	50.0% (1.0)
Home improvement/maintenance stores	-	-	-	100.0% (2.0)	-
Hotels	-	-	-	100.0% (2.0)	-
Schools and educational facilities	-	50.0% (1.0)	-	50.0% (1.0)	-
Restaurants and food carts/trucks	-	-	-	50.0% (1.0)	50.0% (1.0)
66 (2)					
Arts, entertainment, and recreation facilities	-	50.0% (1.0)	-	-	50.0% (1.0)
Bars and breweries/wineries/distilleries	-	50.0% (1.0)	-	-	50.0% (1.0)
Childcare facilities	-	-	-	50.0% (1.0)	50.0% (1.0)
Clothing stores	-	-	50.0% (1.0)	50.0% (1.0)	-
Convenience stores/pharmacies	-	-	-	50.0% (1.0)	50.0% (1.0)
Department/super stores	-	-	-	50.0% (1.0)	50.0% (1.0)
Financial institutions	-	-	-	50.0% (1.0)	50.0% (1.0)
Gas stations	-	-	50.0% (1.0)	-	50.0% (1.0)
Grocery stores	-	-	-	50.0% (1.0)	50.0% (1.0)
Healthcare and social service facilities	-	50.0% (1.0)	-	-	50.0% (1.0)
Home improvement/maintenance stores	-	50.0% (1.0)	-	-	50.0% (1.0)
Hotels	-	-	-	50.0% (1.0)	50.0% (1.0)
Schools and educational facilities	-	-	50.0% (1.0)	-	50.0% (1.0)
Restaurants and food carts/trucks	-	50.0% (1.0)	-	-	50.0% (1.0)
67 (1)					
Arts, entertainment, and recreation facilities	-	100.0% (1.0)	-	-	-
Bars and breweries/wineries/distilleries	-	100.0% (1.0)	-	-	-
Childcare facilities	-	-	100.0% (1.0)	-	-
Clothing stores	-	100.0% (1.0)	-	-	-
Convenience stores/pharmacies	-	-	-	100.0% (1.0)	-
Department/super stores	-	-	100.0% (1.0)	-	-
Financial institutions	-	-	-	100.0% (1.0)	-
Gas stations	-	-	-	100.0% (1.0)	-
Grocery stores	-	100.0% (1.0)	-	-	-
Healthcare and social service facilities	-	100.0% (1.0)	-	-	-
Home improvement/maintenance stores	-	-	-	100.0% (1.0)	-
Hotels	-	-	100.0% (1.0)	-	-
Schools and educational facilities	-	-	-	100.0% (1.0)	-
Restaurants and food carts/trucks	-	100.0% (1.0)	-	-	-
68 (3)					
Arts, entertainment, and recreation facilities	-	33.3% (1.0)	33.3% (1.0)	33.3% (1.0)	-
Bars and breweries/wineries/distilleries	-	33.3% (1.0)	-	66.7% (2.0)	-
Childcare facilities	-	33.3% (1.0)	33.3% (1.0)	33.3% (1.0)	-
Clothing stores	-	33.3% (1.0)	33.3% (1.0)	33.3% (1.0)	-

Convenience stores/pharmacies	-	-	-	100.0% (3.0)	-
Department/super stores	-	-	33.3% (1.0)	33.3% (1.0)	33.3% (1.0)
Financial institutions	-	-	-	66.7% (2.0)	33.3% (1.0)
Gas stations	-	-	-	66.7% (2.0)	33.3% (1.0)
Grocery stores	-	-	-	66.7% (2.0)	33.3% (1.0)
Healthcare and social service facilities	-	-	-	33.3% (1.0)	66.7% (2.0)
Home improvement/maintenance stores	-	33.3% (1.0)	33.3% (1.0)	33.3% (1.0)	-
Hotels	-	-	33.3% (1.0)	66.7% (2.0)	-
Schools and educational facilities	-	33.3% (1.0)	-	66.7% (2.0)	-
Restaurants and food carts/trucks	-	33.3% (1.0)	-	66.7% (2.0)	-
69 (2)					
Arts, entertainment, and recreation facilities	-	-	-	50.0% (1.0)	50.0% (1.0)
Bars and breweries/wineries/distilleries	-	-	-	50.0% (1.0)	50.0% (1.0)
Childcare facilities	-	50.0% (1.0)	-	50.0% (1.0)	-
Clothing stores	-	-	50.0% (1.0)	50.0% (1.0)	-
Convenience stores/pharmacies	-	-	-	100.0% (2.0)	-
Department/super stores	-	-	50.0% (1.0)	50.0% (1.0)	-
Financial institutions	-	-	-	100.0% (2.0)	-
Gas stations	-	-	-	100.0% (2.0)	-
Grocery stores	-	-	-	100.0% (2.0)	-
Healthcare and social service facilities	-	50.0% (1.0)	-	50.0% (1.0)	-
Home improvement/maintenance stores	-	50.0% (1.0)	-	50.0% (1.0)	-
Hotels	-	50.0% (1.0)	-	50.0% (1.0)	-
Schools and educational facilities	50.0% (1.0)	-	-	50.0% (1.0)	-
Restaurants and food carts/trucks	-	50.0% (1.0)	-	50.0% (1.0)	-
71 (2)					
Arts, entertainment, and recreation facilities	-	50.0% (1.0)	-	50.0% (1.0)	-
Bars and breweries/wineries/distilleries	-	-	-	100.0% (2.0)	-
Childcare facilities	-	-	50.0% (1.0)	50.0% (1.0)	-
Clothing stores	-	-	50.0% (1.0)	50.0% (1.0)	-
Convenience stores/pharmacies	-	-	-	100.0% (2.0)	-
Department/super stores	-	-	50.0% (1.0)	50.0% (1.0)	-
Financial institutions	-	-	-	100.0% (2.0)	-
Gas stations	-	-	-	100.0% (2.0)	-
Grocery stores	-	-	50.0% (1.0)	50.0% (1.0)	-
Healthcare and social service facilities	-	-	100.0% (2.0)	-	-
Home improvement/maintenance stores	-	-	50.0% (1.0)	50.0% (1.0)	-
Hotels	-	-	50.0% (1.0)	50.0% (1.0)	-
Schools and educational facilities	-	-	50.0% (1.0)	50.0% (1.0)	-
Restaurants and food carts/trucks	-	-	50.0% (1.0)	50.0% (1.0)	-
72 (3)					
Arts, entertainment, and recreation facilities	-	66.7% (2.0)	-	33.3% (1.0)	-
Bars and breweries/wineries/distilleries	-	-	33.3% (1.0)	66.7% (2.0)	-
Childcare facilities	-	33.3% (1.0)	33.3% (1.0)	33.3% (1.0)	-
Clothing stores	-	33.3% (1.0)	33.3% (1.0)	33.3% (1.0)	-
Convenience stores/pharmacies	-	-	33.3% (1.0)	66.7% (2.0)	-
Department/super stores	-	-	-	100.0% (3.0)	-
Financial institutions	-	-	-	100.0% (3.0)	-
Gas stations	-	-	33.3% (1.0)	66.7% (2.0)	-
Grocery stores	-	33.3% (1.0)	-	66.7% (2.0)	-
Healthcare and social service facilities	-	-	33.3% (1.0)	66.7% (2.0)	-
Home improvement/maintenance stores	-	-	33.3% (1.0)	66.7% (2.0)	-
Hotels	-	-	-	100.0% (3.0)	-
Schools and educational facilities	-	-	66.7% (2.0)	33.3% (1.0)	-
Restaurants and food carts/trucks	-	-	66.7% (2.0)	33.3% (1.0)	-

73 (3)

Arts, entertainment, and recreation facilities	-	66.7% (2.0)	-	33.3% (1.0)	-
Bars and breweries/wineries/distilleries	-	33.3% (1.0)	33.3% (1.0)	33.3% (1.0)	-
Childcare facilities	-	-	66.7% (2.0)	33.3% (1.0)	-
Clothing stores	-	66.7% (2.0)	-	33.3% (1.0)	-
Convenience stores/pharmacies	-	-	33.3% (1.0)	66.7% (2.0)	-
Department/super stores	-	-	33.3% (1.0)	66.7% (2.0)	-
Financial institutions	-	-	-	100.0% (3.0)	-
Gas stations	-	33.3% (1.0)	-	66.7% (2.0)	-
Grocery stores	-	-	-	100.0% (3.0)	-
Healthcare and social service facilities	-	33.3% (1.0)	-	66.7% (2.0)	-
Home improvement/maintenance stores	-	33.3% (1.0)	-	66.7% (2.0)	-
Hotels	-	33.3% (1.0)	-	66.7% (2.0)	-
Schools and educational facilities	-	33.3% (1.0)	33.3% (1.0)	33.3% (1.0)	-
Restaurants and food carts/trucks	-	33.3% (1.0)	-	66.7% (2.0)	-

74 (4)

Arts, entertainment, and recreation facilities	-	-	50.0% (2.0)	50.0% (2.0)	-
Bars and breweries/wineries/distilleries	-	25.0% (1.0)	25.0% (1.0)	50.0% (2.0)	-
Childcare facilities	-	-	75.0% (3.0)	25.0% (1.0)	-
Clothing stores	-	-	75.0% (3.0)	25.0% (1.0)	-
Convenience stores/pharmacies	-	-	25.0% (1.0)	50.0% (2.0)	25.0% (1.0)
Department/super stores	-	-	25.0% (1.0)	50.0% (2.0)	25.0% (1.0)
Financial institutions	-	-	25.0% (1.0)	25.0% (1.0)	50.0% (2.0)
Gas stations	-	-	25.0% (1.0)	25.0% (1.0)	50.0% (2.0)
Grocery stores	-	-	25.0% (1.0)	75.0% (3.0)	-
Healthcare and social service facilities	-	25.0% (1.0)	-	50.0% (2.0)	25.0% (1.0)
Home improvement/maintenance stores	-	-	50.0% (2.0)	50.0% (2.0)	-
Hotels	-	-	50.0% (2.0)	25.0% (1.0)	25.0% (1.0)
Schools and educational facilities	-	25.0% (1.0)	25.0% (1.0)	50.0% (2.0)	-
Restaurants and food carts/trucks	25.0% (1.0)	25.0% (1.0)	-	50.0% (2.0)	-

77 (2)

Arts, entertainment, and recreation facilities	-	50.0% (1.0)	-	50.0% (1.0)	-
Bars and breweries/wineries/distilleries	-	-	-	100.0% (2.0)	-
Childcare facilities	-	-	100.0% (2.0)	-	-
Clothing stores	-	50.0% (1.0)	50.0% (1.0)	-	-
Convenience stores/pharmacies	-	-	-	100.0% (2.0)	-
Department/super stores	-	-	50.0% (1.0)	50.0% (1.0)	-
Financial institutions	-	-	50.0% (1.0)	50.0% (1.0)	-
Gas stations	-	-	-	100.0% (2.0)	-
Grocery stores	-	-	-	100.0% (2.0)	-
Healthcare and social service facilities	-	-	-	50.0% (1.0)	50.0% (1.0)
Home improvement/maintenance stores	-	-	-	100.0% (2.0)	-
Hotels	-	-	50.0% (1.0)	50.0% (1.0)	-
Schools and educational facilities	-	-	50.0% (1.0)	50.0% (1.0)	-
Restaurants and food carts/trucks	-	-	50.0% (1.0)	50.0% (1.0)	-

79 (2)

Arts, entertainment, and recreation facilities	-	50.0% (1.0)	50.0% (1.0)	-	-
Bars and breweries/wineries/distilleries	-	-	50.0% (1.0)	-	50.0% (1.0)
Childcare facilities	-	-	100.0% (2.0)	-	-
Clothing stores	50.0% (1.0)	-	50.0% (1.0)	-	-
Convenience stores/pharmacies	-	-	50.0% (1.0)	50.0% (1.0)	-
Department/super stores	-	-	100.0% (2.0)	-	-
Financial institutions	-	-	-	100.0% (2.0)	-

Gas stations	-	-	50.0% (1.0)	-	50.0% (1.0)
Grocery stores	-	50.0% (1.0)	-	-	50.0% (1.0)
Healthcare and social service facilities	-	-	50.0% (1.0)	50.0% (1.0)	-
Home improvement/maintenance stores	-	100.0% (2.0)	-	-	-
Hotels	-	-	50.0% (1.0)	50.0% (1.0)	-
Schools and educational facilities	-	-	100.0% (2.0)	-	-
Restaurants and food carts/trucks	-	-	-	100.0% (2.0)	-

Unknown (68)

Arts, entertainment, and recreation facilities	7.4% (5.0)	35.3% (24.0)	22.1% (15.0)	29.4% (20.0)	5.9% (4.0)
Bars and breweries/wineries/distilleries	8.8% (6.0)	27.9% (19.0)	25.0% (17.0)	29.4% (20.0)	8.8% (6.0)
Childcare facilities	4.4% (3.0)	10.3% (7.0)	67.6% (46.0)	13.2% (9.0)	4.4% (3.0)
Clothing stores	10.3% (7.0)	32.4% (22.0)	44.1% (30.0)	8.8% (6.0)	4.4% (3.0)
Convenience stores/pharmacies	1.5% (1.0)	7.4% (5.0)	25.0% (17.0)	54.4% (37.0)	11.8% (8.0)
Department/super stores	5.9% (4.0)	13.2% (9.0)	33.8% (23.0)	36.8% (25.0)	10.3% (7.0)
Financial institutions	1.5% (1.0)	1.5% (1.0)	26.5% (18.0)	50.0% (34.0)	20.6% (14.0)
Gas stations	-	11.8% (8.0)	17.6% (12.0)	58.8% (40.0)	11.8% (8.0)
Grocery stores	5.9% (4.0)	23.5% (16.0)	17.6% (12.0)	42.6% (29.0)	10.3% (7.0)
Healthcare and social service facilities	1.5% (1.0)	8.8% (6.0)	42.6% (29.0)	38.2% (26.0)	8.8% (6.0)
Home improvement/maintenance stores	7.4% (5.0)	20.6% (14.0)	38.2% (26.0)	26.5% (18.0)	7.4% (5.0)
Hotels	1.5% (1.0)	10.3% (7.0)	36.8% (25.0)	44.1% (30.0)	7.4% (5.0)
Schools and educational facilities	10.3% (7.0)	26.5% (18.0)	33.8% (23.0)	25.0% (17.0)	4.4% (3.0)
Restaurants and food carts/trucks	23.5% (16.0)	35.3% (24.0)	19.1% (13.0)	19.1% (13.0)	2.9% (2.0)

STATE INCOME DECILE

187 REGISTERED VOTERS

	Very Unsatisfied	Unsatisfied	Neutral	Satisfied	Very Satisfied
--	------------------	-------------	---------	-----------	----------------

0 to 9 Pct range (6)

Arts, entertainment, and recreation facilities	-	33.3% (2.0)	16.7% (1.0)	50.0% (3.0)	-
Bars and breweries/wineries/distilleries	-	16.7% (1.0)	16.7% (1.0)	66.7% (4.0)	-
Childcare facilities	-	-	83.3% (5.0)	16.7% (1.0)	-
Clothing stores	16.7% (1.0)	33.3% (2.0)	50.0% (3.0)	-	-
Convenience stores/pharmacies	-	-	33.3% (2.0)	66.7% (4.0)	-
Department/super stores	16.7% (1.0)	-	33.3% (2.0)	33.3% (2.0)	16.7% (1.0)
Financial institutions	-	16.7% (1.0)	-	66.7% (4.0)	16.7% (1.0)
Gas stations	-	-	16.7% (1.0)	83.3% (5.0)	-
Grocery stores	-	-	33.3% (2.0)	50.0% (3.0)	16.7% (1.0)
Healthcare and social service facilities	-	16.7% (1.0)	50.0% (3.0)	33.3% (2.0)	-
Home improvement/maintenance stores	-	50.0% (3.0)	-	33.3% (2.0)	16.7% (1.0)
Hotels	-	33.3% (2.0)	33.3% (2.0)	33.3% (2.0)	-
Schools and educational facilities	-	33.3% (2.0)	50.0% (3.0)	16.7% (1.0)	-
Restaurants and food carts/trucks	33.3% (2.0)	33.3% (2.0)	16.7% (1.0)	16.7% (1.0)	-

10 to 19 Pct range (1)

Arts, entertainment, and recreation facilities	-	-	-	100.0% (1.0)	-
Bars and breweries/wineries/distilleries	-	-	-	-	100.0% (1.0)
Childcare facilities	-	-	100.0% (1.0)	-	-
Clothing stores	-	100.0% (1.0)	-	-	-
Convenience stores/pharmacies	-	100.0% (1.0)	-	-	-
Department/super stores	-	-	-	100.0% (1.0)	-
Financial institutions	-	-	-	-	100.0% (1.0)
Gas stations	-	-	-	100.0% (1.0)	-
Grocery stores	-	-	100.0% (1.0)	-	-
Healthcare and social service facilities	-	-	-	100.0% (1.0)	-
Home improvement/maintenance stores	-	-	-	100.0% (1.0)	-
Hotels	-	-	-	100.0% (1.0)	-
Schools and educational facilities	-	100.0% (1.0)	-	-	-

Restaurants and food carts/trucks	-	-	-	100.0% (1.0)	-
-----------------------------------	---	---	---	--------------	---

40 to 49 Pct range (2)

Arts, entertainment, and recreation facilities	-	50.0% (1.0)	50.0% (1.0)	-	-
Bars and breweries/wineries/distilleries	-	-	100.0% (2.0)	-	-
Childcare facilities	-	-	100.0% (2.0)	-	-
Clothing stores	-	-	100.0% (2.0)	-	-
Convenience stores/pharmacies	-	-	100.0% (2.0)	-	-
Department/super stores	-	-	50.0% (1.0)	50.0% (1.0)	-
Financial institutions	-	-	50.0% (1.0)	50.0% (1.0)	-
Gas stations	-	-	50.0% (1.0)	50.0% (1.0)	-
Grocery stores	-	-	50.0% (1.0)	50.0% (1.0)	-
Healthcare and social service facilities	-	-	100.0% (2.0)	-	-
Home improvement/maintenance stores	-	-	100.0% (2.0)	-	-
Hotels	-	-	50.0% (1.0)	50.0% (1.0)	-
Schools and educational facilities	-	50.0% (1.0)	50.0% (1.0)	-	-
Restaurants and food carts/trucks	-	50.0% (1.0)	50.0% (1.0)	-	-

50 to 59 Pct range (9)

Arts, entertainment, and recreation facilities	11.1% (1.0)	55.6% (5.0)	-	33.3% (3.0)	-
Bars and breweries/wineries/distilleries	-	11.1% (1.0)	11.1% (1.0)	77.8% (7.0)	-
Childcare facilities	-	11.1% (1.0)	66.7% (6.0)	22.2% (2.0)	-
Clothing stores	-	33.3% (3.0)	55.6% (5.0)	11.1% (1.0)	-
Convenience stores/pharmacies	-	-	22.2% (2.0)	66.7% (6.0)	11.1% (1.0)
Department/super stores	-	-	33.3% (3.0)	66.7% (6.0)	-
Financial institutions	-	-	11.1% (1.0)	77.8% (7.0)	11.1% (1.0)
Gas stations	-	-	22.2% (2.0)	66.7% (6.0)	11.1% (1.0)
Grocery stores	-	-	22.2% (2.0)	77.8% (7.0)	-
Healthcare and social service facilities	-	11.1% (1.0)	11.1% (1.0)	77.8% (7.0)	-
Home improvement/maintenance stores	-	-	11.1% (1.0)	88.9% (8.0)	-
Hotels	-	-	11.1% (1.0)	77.8% (7.0)	11.1% (1.0)
Schools and educational facilities	11.1% (1.0)	11.1% (1.0)	33.3% (3.0)	44.4% (4.0)	-
Restaurants and food carts/trucks	-	44.4% (4.0)	11.1% (1.0)	44.4% (4.0)	-

60 to 69 Pct range (7)

Arts, entertainment, and recreation facilities	-	28.6% (2.0)	14.3% (1.0)	42.9% (3.0)	14.3% (1.0)
Bars and breweries/wineries/distilleries	-	14.3% (1.0)	14.3% (1.0)	57.1% (4.0)	14.3% (1.0)
Childcare facilities	-	-	71.4% (5.0)	28.6% (2.0)	-
Clothing stores	14.3% (1.0)	42.9% (3.0)	14.3% (1.0)	14.3% (1.0)	14.3% (1.0)
Convenience stores/pharmacies	-	-	-	100.0% (7.0)	-
Department/super stores	14.3% (1.0)	14.3% (1.0)	28.6% (2.0)	42.9% (3.0)	-
Financial institutions	-	-	-	85.7% (6.0)	14.3% (1.0)
Gas stations	-	-	-	85.7% (6.0)	14.3% (1.0)
Grocery stores	-	-	14.3% (1.0)	71.4% (5.0)	14.3% (1.0)
Healthcare and social service facilities	-	14.3% (1.0)	42.9% (3.0)	28.6% (2.0)	14.3% (1.0)
Home improvement/maintenance stores	-	42.9% (3.0)	28.6% (2.0)	14.3% (1.0)	14.3% (1.0)
Hotels	14.3% (1.0)	-	28.6% (2.0)	57.1% (4.0)	-
Schools and educational facilities	-	14.3% (1.0)	57.1% (4.0)	14.3% (1.0)	14.3% (1.0)
Restaurants and food carts/trucks	14.3% (1.0)	14.3% (1.0)	-	57.1% (4.0)	14.3% (1.0)

70 to 79 Pct range (5)

Arts, entertainment, and recreation facilities	-	20.0% (1.0)	60.0% (3.0)	20.0% (1.0)	-
Bars and breweries/wineries/distilleries	-	40.0% (2.0)	20.0% (1.0)	40.0% (2.0)	-
Childcare facilities	-	-	80.0% (4.0)	20.0% (1.0)	-
Clothing stores	-	-	60.0% (3.0)	40.0% (2.0)	-
Convenience stores/pharmacies	-	-	20.0% (1.0)	60.0% (3.0)	20.0% (1.0)
Department/super stores	-	20.0% (1.0)	20.0% (1.0)	40.0% (2.0)	20.0% (1.0)
Financial institutions	-	20.0% (1.0)	20.0% (1.0)	60.0% (3.0)	-

Gas stations	-	-	20.0% (1.0)	80.0% (4.0)	-
Grocery stores	-	20.0% (1.0)	20.0% (1.0)	40.0% (2.0)	20.0% (1.0)
Healthcare and social service facilities	-	-	20.0% (1.0)	80.0% (4.0)	-
Home improvement/maintenance stores	-	-	40.0% (2.0)	60.0% (3.0)	-
Hotels	-	-	20.0% (1.0)	60.0% (3.0)	20.0% (1.0)
Schools and educational facilities	20.0% (1.0)	-	20.0% (1.0)	40.0% (2.0)	20.0% (1.0)
Restaurants and food carts/trucks	20.0% (1.0)	20.0% (1.0)	20.0% (1.0)	40.0% (2.0)	-
80 to 89 Pct range (70)					
Arts, entertainment, and recreation facilities	8.6% (6.0)	35.7% (25.0)	20.0% (14.0)	30.0% (21.0)	5.7% (4.0)
Bars and breweries/wineries/distilleries	11.4% (8.0)	25.7% (18.0)	25.7% (18.0)	32.9% (23.0)	4.3% (3.0)
Childcare facilities	4.3% (3.0)	12.9% (9.0)	70.0% (49.0)	11.4% (8.0)	1.4% (1.0)
Clothing stores	11.4% (8.0)	31.4% (22.0)	44.3% (31.0)	12.9% (9.0)	-
Convenience stores/pharmacies	1.4% (1.0)	14.3% (10.0)	30.0% (21.0)	45.7% (32.0)	8.6% (6.0)
Department/super stores	5.7% (4.0)	20.0% (14.0)	40.0% (28.0)	30.0% (21.0)	4.3% (3.0)
Financial institutions	1.4% (1.0)	5.7% (4.0)	25.7% (18.0)	55.7% (39.0)	11.4% (8.0)
Gas stations	-	17.1% (12.0)	24.3% (17.0)	48.6% (34.0)	10.0% (7.0)
Grocery stores	5.7% (4.0)	34.3% (24.0)	14.3% (10.0)	40.0% (28.0)	5.7% (4.0)
Healthcare and social service facilities	2.9% (2.0)	11.4% (8.0)	41.4% (29.0)	37.1% (26.0)	7.1% (5.0)
Home improvement/maintenance stores	7.1% (5.0)	22.9% (16.0)	38.6% (27.0)	28.6% (20.0)	2.9% (2.0)
Hotels	1.4% (1.0)	7.1% (5.0)	41.4% (29.0)	47.1% (33.0)	2.9% (2.0)
Schools and educational facilities	11.4% (8.0)	28.6% (20.0)	35.7% (25.0)	24.3% (17.0)	-
Restaurants and food carts/trucks	17.1% (12.0)	37.1% (26.0)	15.7% (11.0)	28.6% (20.0)	1.4% (1.0)
90 Pct and up (85)					
Arts, entertainment, and recreation facilities	4.7% (4.0)	30.6% (26.0)	27.1% (23.0)	31.8% (27.0)	5.9% (5.0)
Bars and breweries/wineries/distilleries	3.5% (3.0)	22.4% (19.0)	22.4% (19.0)	40.0% (34.0)	11.8% (10.0)
Childcare facilities	1.2% (1.0)	8.2% (7.0)	55.3% (47.0)	28.2% (24.0)	7.1% (6.0)
Clothing stores	8.2% (7.0)	37.6% (32.0)	36.5% (31.0)	12.9% (11.0)	4.7% (4.0)
Convenience stores/pharmacies	-	1.2% (1.0)	12.9% (11.0)	71.8% (61.0)	14.1% (12.0)
Department/super stores	1.2% (1.0)	8.2% (7.0)	31.8% (27.0)	43.5% (37.0)	15.3% (13.0)
Financial institutions	1.2% (1.0)	-	18.8% (16.0)	57.6% (49.0)	22.4% (19.0)
Gas stations	-	7.1% (6.0)	12.9% (11.0)	63.5% (54.0)	16.5% (14.0)
Grocery stores	1.2% (1.0)	8.2% (7.0)	10.6% (9.0)	61.2% (52.0)	18.8% (16.0)
Healthcare and social service facilities	1.2% (1.0)	15.3% (13.0)	34.1% (29.0)	37.6% (32.0)	11.8% (10.0)
Home improvement/maintenance stores	4.7% (4.0)	23.5% (20.0)	27.1% (23.0)	37.6% (32.0)	7.1% (6.0)
Hotels	2.4% (2.0)	5.9% (5.0)	35.3% (30.0)	44.7% (38.0)	11.8% (10.0)
Schools and educational facilities	8.2% (7.0)	23.5% (20.0)	32.9% (28.0)	28.2% (24.0)	7.1% (6.0)
Restaurants and food carts/trucks	16.5% (14.0)	24.7% (21.0)	24.7% (21.0)	27.1% (23.0)	7.1% (6.0)
Unknown (2)					
Arts, entertainment, and recreation facilities	-	50.0% (1.0)	50.0% (1.0)	-	-
Bars and breweries/wineries/distilleries	50.0% (1.0)	50.0% (1.0)	-	-	-
Childcare facilities	-	50.0% (1.0)	50.0% (1.0)	-	-
Clothing stores	-	50.0% (1.0)	50.0% (1.0)	-	-
Convenience stores/pharmacies	-	-	50.0% (1.0)	50.0% (1.0)	-
Department/super stores	-	50.0% (1.0)	50.0% (1.0)	-	-
Financial institutions	-	-	50.0% (1.0)	50.0% (1.0)	-
Gas stations	-	-	50.0% (1.0)	50.0% (1.0)	-
Grocery stores	50.0% (1.0)	-	50.0% (1.0)	-	-
Healthcare and social service facilities	-	50.0% (1.0)	-	50.0% (1.0)	-
Home improvement/maintenance stores	50.0% (1.0)	-	50.0% (1.0)	-	-
Hotels	-	-	50.0% (1.0)	50.0% (1.0)	-
Schools and educational facilities	50.0% (1.0)	-	50.0% (1.0)	-	-
Restaurants and food carts/trucks	50.0% (1.0)	50.0% (1.0)	-	-	-

	Very Unsatisfied	Unsatisfied	Neutral	Satisfied	Very Satisfied
Likely Homeowner (106)					
Arts, entertainment, and recreation facilities	5.7% (6.0)	36.8% (39.0)	19.8% (21.0)	33.0% (35.0)	4.7% (5.0)
Bars and breweries/wineries/distilleries	6.6% (7.0)	21.7% (23.0)	20.8% (22.0)	41.5% (44.0)	9.4% (10.0)
Childcare facilities	-	14.2% (15.0)	58.5% (62.0)	21.7% (23.0)	5.7% (6.0)
Clothing stores	11.3% (12.0)	35.8% (38.0)	34.9% (37.0)	14.2% (15.0)	3.8% (4.0)
Convenience stores/pharmacies	-	6.6% (7.0)	19.8% (21.0)	64.2% (68.0)	9.4% (10.0)
Department/super stores	2.8% (3.0)	15.1% (16.0)	28.3% (30.0)	40.6% (43.0)	13.2% (14.0)
Financial institutions	0.9% (1.0)	3.8% (4.0)	15.1% (16.0)	61.3% (65.0)	18.9% (20.0)
Gas stations	-	8.5% (9.0)	20.8% (22.0)	59.4% (63.0)	11.3% (12.0)
Grocery stores	2.8% (3.0)	15.1% (16.0)	11.3% (12.0)	59.4% (63.0)	11.3% (12.0)
Healthcare and social service facilities	1.9% (2.0)	14.2% (15.0)	30.2% (32.0)	43.4% (46.0)	10.4% (11.0)
Home improvement/maintenance stores	3.8% (4.0)	24.5% (26.0)	29.2% (31.0)	36.8% (39.0)	5.7% (6.0)
Hotels	1.9% (2.0)	5.7% (6.0)	34.9% (37.0)	48.1% (51.0)	9.4% (10.0)
Schools and educational facilities	10.4% (11.0)	27.4% (29.0)	28.3% (30.0)	28.3% (30.0)	5.7% (6.0)
Restaurants and food carts/trucks	15.1% (16.0)	30.2% (32.0)	22.6% (24.0)	29.2% (31.0)	2.8% (3.0)
Likely Renter (55)					
Arts, entertainment, and recreation facilities	5.5% (3.0)	29.1% (16.0)	32.7% (18.0)	27.3% (15.0)	5.5% (3.0)
Bars and breweries/wineries/distilleries	5.5% (3.0)	21.8% (12.0)	30.9% (17.0)	34.5% (19.0)	7.3% (4.0)
Childcare facilities	3.6% (2.0)	1.8% (1.0)	76.4% (42.0)	18.2% (10.0)	-
Clothing stores	9.1% (5.0)	30.9% (17.0)	45.5% (25.0)	12.7% (7.0)	1.8% (1.0)
Convenience stores/pharmacies	1.8% (1.0)	5.5% (3.0)	27.3% (15.0)	52.7% (29.0)	12.7% (7.0)
Department/super stores	7.3% (4.0)	10.9% (6.0)	45.5% (25.0)	30.9% (17.0)	5.5% (3.0)
Financial institutions	1.8% (1.0)	1.8% (1.0)	27.3% (15.0)	58.2% (32.0)	10.9% (6.0)
Gas stations	-	16.4% (9.0)	10.9% (6.0)	58.2% (32.0)	14.5% (8.0)
Grocery stores	3.6% (2.0)	16.4% (9.0)	23.6% (13.0)	43.6% (24.0)	12.7% (7.0)
Healthcare and social service facilities	1.8% (1.0)	10.9% (6.0)	45.5% (25.0)	34.5% (19.0)	7.3% (4.0)
Home improvement/maintenance stores	5.5% (3.0)	20.0% (11.0)	36.4% (20.0)	32.7% (18.0)	5.5% (3.0)
Hotels	3.6% (2.0)	7.3% (4.0)	38.2% (21.0)	47.3% (26.0)	3.6% (2.0)
Schools and educational facilities	5.5% (3.0)	18.2% (10.0)	56.4% (31.0)	16.4% (9.0)	3.6% (2.0)
Restaurants and food carts/trucks	12.7% (7.0)	34.5% (19.0)	12.7% (7.0)	34.5% (19.0)	5.5% (3.0)
Unknown (26)					
Arts, entertainment, and recreation facilities	7.7% (2.0)	30.8% (8.0)	19.2% (5.0)	34.6% (9.0)	7.7% (2.0)
Bars and breweries/wineries/distilleries	7.7% (2.0)	30.8% (8.0)	15.4% (4.0)	42.3% (11.0)	3.8% (1.0)
Childcare facilities	7.7% (2.0)	7.7% (2.0)	61.5% (16.0)	19.2% (5.0)	3.8% (1.0)
Clothing stores	-	34.6% (9.0)	57.7% (15.0)	7.7% (2.0)	-
Convenience stores/pharmacies	-	7.7% (2.0)	15.4% (4.0)	65.4% (17.0)	11.5% (3.0)
Department/super stores	-	7.7% (2.0)	38.5% (10.0)	50.0% (13.0)	3.8% (1.0)
Financial institutions	-	3.8% (1.0)	26.9% (7.0)	50.0% (13.0)	19.2% (5.0)
Gas stations	-	-	23.1% (6.0)	65.4% (17.0)	11.5% (3.0)
Grocery stores	3.8% (1.0)	26.9% (7.0)	11.5% (3.0)	42.3% (11.0)	15.4% (4.0)
Healthcare and social service facilities	-	15.4% (4.0)	42.3% (11.0)	38.5% (10.0)	3.8% (1.0)
Home improvement/maintenance stores	11.5% (3.0)	19.2% (5.0)	26.9% (7.0)	38.5% (10.0)	3.8% (1.0)
Hotels	-	7.7% (2.0)	34.6% (9.0)	50.0% (13.0)	7.7% (2.0)
Schools and educational facilities	15.4% (4.0)	26.9% (7.0)	19.2% (5.0)	38.5% (10.0)	-
Restaurants and food carts/trucks	30.8% (8.0)	23.1% (6.0)	19.2% (5.0)	19.2% (5.0)	7.7% (2.0)

Fitchburg currently has approximately 11,000 acres of agricultural land within its borders. Please rate your level of agreement with the following statements about agriculture in Fitchburg:

CURRENT RESULTS	303 Total Responses				
	Strongly Disagree	Disagree	Neutral	Agree	Strongly Agree
Preserving large blocks of agricultural land is important and should be a priority.	4% (12)	11% (32)	13% (38)	28% (86)	45% (135)
Producing and processing food for local consumption is important and should be a priority.	3% (8)	6% (18)	15% (46)	38% (116)	38% (115)
The City should allow new agricultural-related uses, such as dairy stores, wineries, and farm cafes, on agricultural lands.	4% (12)	4% (11)	11% (33)	42% (127)	40% (120)
REGISTERED (181)					
	Strongly Disagree	Disagree	Neutral	Agree	Strongly Agree
Preserving large blocks of agricultural land is important and should be a priority.	3.0% (5)	10.0% (19)	13.0% (24)	28.0% (51)	45.0% (82)
Producing and processing food for local consumption is important and should be a priority.	3.0% (6)	4.0% (7)	14.0% (25)	40.0% (72)	39.0% (71)
The City should allow new agricultural-related uses, such as dairy stores, wineries, and farm cafes, on agricultural lands.	5.0% (9)	3.0% (5)	12.0% (21)	44.0% (79)	37.0% (67)
NON-REGISTERED (122)					
	Strongly Disagree	Disagree	Neutral	Agree	Strongly Agree
Preserving large blocks of agricultural land is important and should be a priority.	5.7% (7)	10.7% (13)	11.5% (14)	28.7% (35)	43.4% (53)
Producing and processing food for local consumption is important and should be a priority.	1.6% (2)	9.0% (11)	17.2% (21)	36.1% (44)	36.1% (44)
The City should allow new agricultural-related uses, such as dairy stores, wineries, and farm cafes, on agricultural lands.	2.5% (3)	4.9% (6)	9.8% (12)	39.3% (48)	43.4% (53)
ALL RESPONDENTS (303)					
	Strongly Disagree	Disagree	Neutral	Agree	Strongly Agree
Preserving large blocks of agricultural land is important and should be a priority.	4% (12)	11% (32)	13% (38)	28% (86)	45% (135)
Producing and processing food for local consumption is important and should be a priority.	3% (8)	6% (18)	15% (46)	38% (116)	38% (115)
The City should allow new agricultural-related uses, such as dairy stores, wineries, and farm cafes, on agricultural lands.	4% (12)	4% (11)	11% (33)	42% (127)	40% (120)
REGISTERED VOTERS IN FITCHBURG, WI (181)					
	Strongly Disagree	Disagree	Neutral	Agree	Strongly Agree
Preserving large blocks of agricultural land is important and should be a priority.	3% (5)	10% (19)	13% (24)	28% (51)	45% (82)
Producing and processing food for local consumption is important and should be a priority.	3% (6)	4% (7)	14% (25)	40% (72)	39% (71)
The City should allow new agricultural-related uses, such as dairy stores, wineries, and farm cafes, on agricultural lands.	5% (9)	3% (5)	12% (21)	44% (79)	37% (67)
LIVE IN FITCHBURG, WI (267) - SELF-REPORTED					
	Strongly Disagree	Disagree	Neutral	Agree	Strongly Agree
Preserving large blocks of agricultural land is important and should be a priority.	3% (8)	10% (27)	13% (35)	30% (81)	43% (116)
Producing and processing food for local consumption is important and should be a priority.	3% (8)	5% (13)	14% (37)	41% (110)	37% (99)
The City should allow new agricultural-related uses, such as dairy stores, wineries, and farm cafes, on agricultural lands.	4% (10)	3% (9)	10% (28)	43% (114)	40% (106)

SUBSCRIBERS TO FITCHBURG, WI (271)

	Strongly Disagree	Disagree	Neutral	Agree	Strongly Agree
Preserving large blocks of agricultural land is important and should be a priority.	3% (9)	10% (28)	13% (35)	30% (82)	43% (117)
Producing and processing food for local consumption is important and should be a priority.	3% (8)	5% (14)	14% (38)	41% (110)	37% (101)
The City should allow new agricultural-related uses, such as dairy stores, wineries, and farm cafes, on agricultural lands.	4% (10)	3% (9)	10% (28)	42% (115)	40% (109)

REGISTER RESPONDENTS FROM ANYWHERE (187)

	Strongly Disagree	Disagree	Neutral	Agree	Strongly Agree
Preserving large blocks of agricultural land is important and should be a priority.	3% (5)	10% (19)	13% (24)	28% (53)	46% (86)
Producing and processing food for local consumption is important and should be a priority.	3% (6)	4% (8)	14% (27)	39% (72)	40% (74)
The City should allow new agricultural-related uses, such as dairy stores, wineries, and farm cafes, on agricultural lands.	5% (9)	3% (5)	12% (22)	43% (81)	37% (70)

EDUCATION

187 REGISTERED VOTERS

	Strongly Disagree	Disagree	Neutral	Agree	Strongly Agree
--	-------------------	----------	---------	-------	----------------

Bach Degree - Extremely Likely (30)

Preserving large blocks of agricultural land is important and should be a priority.	-	3.3% (1.0)	10.0% (3.0)	30.0% (9.0)	56.7% (17.0)
Producing and processing food for local consumption is important and should be a priority.	-	3.3% (1.0)	16.7% (5.0)	33.3% (10.0)	46.7% (14.0)
The City should allow new agricultural-related uses, such as dairy stores, wineries, and farm cafes, on agricultural lands.	6.7% (2.0)	3.3% (1.0)	3.3% (1.0)	36.7% (11.0)	50.0% (15.0)

Bach Degree - Likely (21)

Preserving large blocks of agricultural land is important and should be a priority.	4.8% (1.0)	9.5% (2.0)	23.8% (5.0)	14.3% (3.0)	47.6% (10.0)
Producing and processing food for local consumption is important and should be a priority.	4.8% (1.0)	-	14.3% (3.0)	47.6% (10.0)	33.3% (7.0)
The City should allow new agricultural-related uses, such as dairy stores, wineries, and farm cafes, on agricultural lands.	-	9.5% (2.0)	19.0% (4.0)	42.9% (9.0)	28.6% (6.0)

Grad Degree - Extremely Likely (22)

Preserving large blocks of agricultural land is important and should be a priority.	9.1% (2.0)	9.1% (2.0)	4.5% (1.0)	22.7% (5.0)	54.5% (12.0)
Producing and processing food for local consumption is important and should be a priority.	4.5% (1.0)	13.6% (3.0)	9.1% (2.0)	27.3% (6.0)	45.5% (10.0)
The City should allow new agricultural-related uses, such as dairy stores, wineries, and farm cafes, on agricultural lands.	9.1% (2.0)	-	27.3% (6.0)	50.0% (11.0)	13.6% (3.0)

Grad Degree - Likely (13)

Preserving large blocks of agricultural land is important and should be a priority.	7.7% (1.0)	-	15.4% (2.0)	53.8% (7.0)	23.1% (3.0)
Producing and processing food for local consumption is important and should be a priority.	-	15.4% (2.0)	-	53.8% (7.0)	30.8% (4.0)
The City should allow new agricultural-related uses, such as dairy stores, wineries, and farm cafes, on agricultural lands.	-	-	-	69.2% (9.0)	30.8% (4.0)

HS Diploma - Extremely Likely (9)

Preserving large blocks of agricultural land is important and should be a priority.	-	22.2% (2.0)	-	11.1% (1.0)	66.7% (6.0)
Producing and processing food for local consumption is important and should be a priority.	11.1% (1.0)	11.1% (1.0)	11.1% (1.0)	22.2% (2.0)	44.4% (4.0)
The City should allow new agricultural-related uses, such as dairy stores, wineries, and farm cafes, on agricultural lands.	11.1% (1.0)	-	-	55.6% (5.0)	33.3% (3.0)

HS Diploma - Likely (4)

Preserving large blocks of agricultural land is important and should be a priority.	-	-	25.0% (1.0)	50.0% (2.0)	25.0% (1.0)
			25.0%	25.0%	

Producing and processing food for local consumption is important and should be a priority.	-	-	(1.0)	(1.0)	50.0% (2.0)
The City should allow new agricultural-related uses, such as dairy stores, wineries, and farm cafes, on agricultural lands.	-	-	-	50.0% (2.0)	50.0% (2.0)

Less than HS Diploma - Likely (1)

Preserving large blocks of agricultural land is important and should be a priority.	-	-	-	-	100.0% (1.0)
Producing and processing food for local consumption is important and should be a priority.	-	-	-	-	100.0% (1.0)
The City should allow new agricultural-related uses, such as dairy stores, wineries, and farm cafes, on agricultural lands.	-	-	-	-	100.0% (1.0)

Some College - Likely (12)

Preserving large blocks of agricultural land is important and should be a priority.	-	16.7% (2.0)	16.7% (2.0)	25.0% (3.0)	41.7% (5.0)
Producing and processing food for local consumption is important and should be a priority.	-	-	33.3% (4.0)	33.3% (4.0)	33.3% (4.0)
The City should allow new agricultural-related uses, such as dairy stores, wineries, and farm cafes, on agricultural lands.	-	-	25.0% (3.0)	33.3% (4.0)	41.7% (5.0)

Some College -Extremely Likely (5)

Preserving large blocks of agricultural land is important and should be a priority.	-	-	20.0% (1.0)	40.0% (2.0)	40.0% (2.0)
Producing and processing food for local consumption is important and should be a priority.	-	-	60.0% (3.0)	20.0% (1.0)	20.0% (1.0)
The City should allow new agricultural-related uses, such as dairy stores, wineries, and farm cafes, on agricultural lands.	-	-	-	80.0% (4.0)	20.0% (1.0)

Unknown (70)

Preserving large blocks of agricultural land is important and should be a priority.	1.4% (1.0)	14.3% (10.0)	12.9% (9.0)	30.0% (21.0)	41.4% (29.0)
Producing and processing food for local consumption is important and should be a priority.	4.3% (3.0)	1.4% (1.0)	11.4% (8.0)	44.3% (31.0)	38.6% (27.0)
The City should allow new agricultural-related uses, such as dairy stores, wineries, and farm cafes, on agricultural lands.	5.7% (4.0)	2.9% (2.0)	11.4% (8.0)	37.1% (26.0)	42.9% (30.0)

VOTERS GENDER

187 REGISTERED VOTERS

	Strongly Disagree	Disagree	Neutral	Agree	Strongly Agree
--	-------------------	----------	---------	-------	----------------

F (90)

Preserving large blocks of agricultural land is important and should be a priority.	1.1% (1.0)	6.7% (6.0)	11.1% (10.0)	30.0% (27.0)	51.1% (46.0)
Producing and processing food for local consumption is important and should be a priority.	2.2% (2.0)	1.1% (1.0)	11.1% (10.0)	40.0% (36.0)	45.6% (41.0)
The City should allow new agricultural-related uses, such as dairy stores, wineries, and farm cafes, on agricultural lands.	4.4% (4.0)	3.3% (3.0)	12.2% (11.0)	43.3% (39.0)	36.7% (33.0)

M (95)

Preserving large blocks of agricultural land is important and should be a priority.	4.2% (4.0)	13.7% (13.0)	14.7% (14.0)	26.3% (25.0)	41.1% (39.0)
Producing and processing food for local consumption is important and should be a priority.	4.2% (4.0)	7.4% (7.0)	17.9% (17.0)	35.8% (34.0)	34.7% (33.0)
The City should allow new agricultural-related uses, such as dairy stores, wineries, and farm cafes, on agricultural lands.	5.3% (5.0)	2.1% (2.0)	11.6% (11.0)	43.2% (41.0)	37.9% (36.0)

Unknown (2)

Preserving large blocks of agricultural land is important and should be a priority.	-	-	-	50.0% (1.0)	50.0% (1.0)
Producing and processing food for local consumption is important and should be a priority.	-	-	-	100.0% (2.0)	-
The City should allow new agricultural-related uses, such as dairy stores, wineries, and farm cafes, on agricultural lands.	-	-	-	50.0% (1.0)	50.0% (1.0)

PRECINCT

187 REGISTERED VOTERS

	Strongly Disagree	Disagree	Neutral	Agree	Strongly Agree
--	-------------------	----------	---------	-------	----------------

CHICAGO 43-04 (1)

Preserving large blocks of agricultural land is important and should be a priority.	-	-	-	-	100.0% (1.0)
Producing and processing food for local consumption is important and should be a priority.	-	100.0% (1.0)	-	-	-
The City should allow new agricultural-related uses, such as dairy stores, wineries, and farm cafes, on agricultural lands.	-	-	100.0% (1.0)	-	-

FITCHBURG CITY WARD 01 (9)

Preserving large blocks of agricultural land is important and should be a priority.	-	-	22.2% (2.0)	22.2% (2.0)	55.6% (5.0)
Producing and processing food for local consumption is important and should be a priority.	-	-	11.1% (1.0)	22.2% (2.0)	66.7% (6.0)
The City should allow new agricultural-related uses, such as dairy stores, wineries, and farm cafes, on agricultural lands.	-	11.1% (1.0)	22.2% (2.0)	44.4% (4.0)	22.2% (2.0)

FITCHBURG CITY WARD 02 (3)

Preserving large blocks of agricultural land is important and should be a priority.	-	-	-	-	100.0% (3.0)
Producing and processing food for local consumption is important and should be a priority.	-	-	-	33.3% (1.0)	66.7% (2.0)
The City should allow new agricultural-related uses, such as dairy stores, wineries, and farm cafes, on agricultural lands.	-	-	-	66.7% (2.0)	33.3% (1.0)

FITCHBURG CITY WARD 04 (2)

Preserving large blocks of agricultural land is important and should be a priority.	-	-	-	-	100.0% (2.0)
Producing and processing food for local consumption is important and should be a priority.	-	-	-	-	100.0% (2.0)
The City should allow new agricultural-related uses, such as dairy stores, wineries, and farm cafes, on agricultural lands.	-	-	-	-	100.0% (2.0)

FITCHBURG CITY WARD 05 (6)

Preserving large blocks of agricultural land is important and should be a priority.	-	-	33.3% (2.0)	50.0% (3.0)	16.7% (1.0)
Producing and processing food for local consumption is important and should be a priority.	-	-	33.3% (2.0)	50.0% (3.0)	16.7% (1.0)
The City should allow new agricultural-related uses, such as dairy stores, wineries, and farm cafes, on agricultural lands.	-	-	-	33.3% (2.0)	66.7% (4.0)

FITCHBURG CITY WARD 06 (12)

Preserving large blocks of agricultural land is important and should be a priority.	8.3% (1.0)	25.0% (3.0)	16.7% (2.0)	25.0% (3.0)	25.0% (3.0)
Producing and processing food for local consumption is important and should be a priority.	8.3% (1.0)	8.3% (1.0)	25.0% (3.0)	41.7% (5.0)	16.7% (2.0)
The City should allow new agricultural-related uses, such as dairy stores, wineries, and farm cafes, on agricultural lands.	-	-	8.3% (1.0)	75.0% (9.0)	16.7% (2.0)

FITCHBURG CITY WARD 07 (18)

Preserving large blocks of agricultural land is important and should be a priority.	-	11.1% (2.0)	-	38.9% (7.0)	50.0% (9.0)
Producing and processing food for local consumption is important and should be a priority.	-	5.6% (1.0)	22.2% (4.0)	22.2% (4.0)	50.0% (9.0)
The City should allow new agricultural-related uses, such as dairy stores, wineries, and farm cafes, on agricultural lands.	-	-	16.7% (3.0)	50.0% (9.0)	33.3% (6.0)

FITCHBURG CITY WARD 08 (14)

Preserving large blocks of agricultural land is important and should be a priority.	-	14.3% (2.0)	14.3% (2.0)	14.3% (2.0)	57.1% (8.0)
Producing and processing food for local consumption is important and should be a priority.	-	7.1% (1.0)	21.4% (3.0)	42.9% (6.0)	28.6% (4.0)
The City should allow new agricultural-related uses, such as dairy stores, wineries, and farm cafes, on agricultural lands.	-	7.1% (1.0)	14.3% (2.0)	35.7% (5.0)	42.9% (6.0)

FITCHBURG CITY WARD 09 (8)

Preserving large blocks of agricultural land is important and should be a priority.	25.0% (2.0)	12.5% (1.0)	25.0% (2.0)	25.0% (2.0)	12.5% (1.0)
Producing and processing food for local consumption is important and should be a priority.	37.5% (3.0)	-	-	50.0% (4.0)	12.5% (1.0)
The City should allow new agricultural-related uses, such as dairy stores, wineries, and farm cafes, on agricultural lands.	25.0% (2.0)	-	12.5%	37.5%	25.0% (2.0)

agricultural lands.			(1.0)	(3.0)	
FITCHBURG CITY WARD 12 (2)					
Preserving large blocks of agricultural land is important and should be a priority.	-	-	50.0% (1.0)	50.0% (1.0)	-
Producing and processing food for local consumption is important and should be a priority.	-	-	50.0% (1.0)	50.0% (1.0)	-
The City should allow new agricultural-related uses, such as dairy stores, wineries, and farm cafes, on agricultural lands.	-	-	50.0% (1.0)	50.0% (1.0)	-
FITCHBURG CITY WARD 13 (31)					
Preserving large blocks of agricultural land is important and should be a priority.	-	12.9% (4.0)	16.1% (5.0)	19.4% (6.0)	51.6% (16.0)
Producing and processing food for local consumption is important and should be a priority.	-	-	6.5% (2.0)	45.2% (14.0)	48.4% (15.0)
The City should allow new agricultural-related uses, such as dairy stores, wineries, and farm cafes, on agricultural lands.	6.5% (2.0)	3.2% (1.0)	3.2% (1.0)	54.8% (17.0)	32.3% (10.0)
FITCHBURG CITY WARD 14 (19)					
Preserving large blocks of agricultural land is important and should be a priority.	-	10.5% (2.0)	26.3% (5.0)	31.6% (6.0)	31.6% (6.0)
Producing and processing food for local consumption is important and should be a priority.	-	5.3% (1.0)	10.5% (2.0)	52.6% (10.0)	31.6% (6.0)
The City should allow new agricultural-related uses, such as dairy stores, wineries, and farm cafes, on agricultural lands.	-	-	15.8% (3.0)	26.3% (5.0)	57.9% (11.0)
FITCHBURG CITY WARD 15 (7)					
Preserving large blocks of agricultural land is important and should be a priority.	14.3% (1.0)	14.3% (1.0)	-	28.6% (2.0)	42.9% (3.0)
Producing and processing food for local consumption is important and should be a priority.	-	28.6% (2.0)	-	28.6% (2.0)	42.9% (3.0)
The City should allow new agricultural-related uses, such as dairy stores, wineries, and farm cafes, on agricultural lands.	-	-	14.3% (1.0)	28.6% (2.0)	57.1% (4.0)
FITCHBURG CITY WARD 16 (3)					
Preserving large blocks of agricultural land is important and should be a priority.	-	-	33.3% (1.0)	-	66.7% (2.0)
Producing and processing food for local consumption is important and should be a priority.	-	-	-	66.7% (2.0)	33.3% (1.0)
The City should allow new agricultural-related uses, such as dairy stores, wineries, and farm cafes, on agricultural lands.	-	-	33.3% (1.0)	66.7% (2.0)	-
FITCHBURG CITY WARD 17 (7)					
Preserving large blocks of agricultural land is important and should be a priority.	-	-	-	28.6% (2.0)	71.4% (5.0)
Producing and processing food for local consumption is important and should be a priority.	-	-	28.6% (2.0)	42.9% (3.0)	28.6% (2.0)
The City should allow new agricultural-related uses, such as dairy stores, wineries, and farm cafes, on agricultural lands.	-	-	14.3% (1.0)	42.9% (3.0)	42.9% (3.0)
FITCHBURG CITY WARD 18 (12)					
Preserving large blocks of agricultural land is important and should be a priority.	-	8.3% (1.0)	-	41.7% (5.0)	50.0% (6.0)
Producing and processing food for local consumption is important and should be a priority.	-	-	8.3% (1.0)	33.3% (4.0)	58.3% (7.0)
The City should allow new agricultural-related uses, such as dairy stores, wineries, and farm cafes, on agricultural lands.	8.3% (1.0)	8.3% (1.0)	-	33.3% (4.0)	50.0% (6.0)
FITCHBURG CITY WARD 19 (26)					
Preserving large blocks of agricultural land is important and should be a priority.	3.8% (1.0)	11.5% (3.0)	7.7% (2.0)	38.5% (10.0)	38.5% (10.0)
Producing and processing food for local consumption is important and should be a priority.	3.8% (1.0)	3.8% (1.0)	15.4% (4.0)	42.3% (11.0)	34.6% (9.0)
The City should allow new agricultural-related uses, such as dairy stores, wineries, and farm cafes, on agricultural lands.	11.5% (3.0)	3.8% (1.0)	15.4% (4.0)	42.3% (11.0)	26.9% (7.0)
MADISON CITY WARD 042 (1)					
Preserving large blocks of agricultural land is important and should be a priority.	-	-	-	-	100.0% (1.0)

Producing and processing food for local consumption is important and should be a priority.	-	-	100.0% (1.0)	-	-
The City should allow new agricultural-related uses, such as dairy stores, wineries, and farm cafes, on agricultural lands.	-	-	-	100.0% (1.0)	-

MADISON CITY WARD 053 (1)

Preserving large blocks of agricultural land is important and should be a priority.	-	-	-	-	100.0% (1.0)
Producing and processing food for local consumption is important and should be a priority.	-	-	-	-	100.0% (1.0)
The City should allow new agricultural-related uses, such as dairy stores, wineries, and farm cafes, on agricultural lands.	-	-	-	-	100.0% (1.0)

MADISON CITY WARD 100 (1)

Preserving large blocks of agricultural land is important and should be a priority.	-	-	-	-	100.0% (1.0)
Producing and processing food for local consumption is important and should be a priority.	100.0% (1.0)	-	-	-	-
The City should allow new agricultural-related uses, such as dairy stores, wineries, and farm cafes, on agricultural lands.	100.0% (1.0)	-	-	-	-

MADISON CITY WARD 107 (1)

Preserving large blocks of agricultural land is important and should be a priority.	-	-	-	-	100.0% (1.0)
Producing and processing food for local consumption is important and should be a priority.	-	-	-	-	100.0% (1.0)
The City should allow new agricultural-related uses, such as dairy stores, wineries, and farm cafes, on agricultural lands.	-	-	-	100.0% (1.0)	-

MIDDLETON TOWN WARD 7 (1)

Preserving large blocks of agricultural land is important and should be a priority.	-	-	-	100.0% (1.0)	-
Producing and processing food for local consumption is important and should be a priority.	-	-	100.0% (1.0)	-	-
The City should allow new agricultural-related uses, such as dairy stores, wineries, and farm cafes, on agricultural lands.	-	-	-	-	100.0% (1.0)

MOUNT HOREB VLG WARD 3 (1)

Preserving large blocks of agricultural land is important and should be a priority.	-	-	-	100.0% (1.0)	-
Producing and processing food for local consumption is important and should be a priority.	-	-	-	-	100.0% (1.0)
The City should allow new agricultural-related uses, such as dairy stores, wineries, and farm cafes, on agricultural lands.	-	-	-	-	100.0% (1.0)

OREGON VLG WARD 10 (1)

Preserving large blocks of agricultural land is important and should be a priority.	-	-	-	-	100.0% (1.0)
Producing and processing food for local consumption is important and should be a priority.	-	-	-	-	100.0% (1.0)
The City should allow new agricultural-related uses, such as dairy stores, wineries, and farm cafes, on agricultural lands.	-	-	-	-	100.0% (1.0)

AGE RANGE

187 REGISTERED VOTERS

	Strongly Disagree	Disagree	Neutral	Agree	Strongly Agree
--	-------------------	----------	---------	-------	----------------

18-29 (1)

Preserving large blocks of agricultural land is important and should be a priority.	-	-	-	-	100.0% (1.0)
Producing and processing food for local consumption is important and should be a priority.	-	-	-	-	100.0% (1.0)
The City should allow new agricultural-related uses, such as dairy stores, wineries, and farm cafes, on agricultural lands.	-	-	-	100.0% (1.0)	-

30-39 (24)

Preserving large blocks of agricultural land is important and should be a priority.	-	20.8% (5.0)	20.8% (5.0)	20.8% (5.0)	37.5% (9.0)
Producing and processing food for local consumption is important and should be a priority.	4.2% (1.0)	-	12.5% (3.0)	50.0% (12.0)	33.3% (8.0)
The City should allow new agricultural-related uses, such as dairy stores, wineries, and farm cafes, on agricultural lands.	4.2% (1.0)	-	4.2% (1.0)	45.8% (11.0)	45.8% (11.0)

40-49 (29)

Preserving large blocks of agricultural land is important and should be a priority.	3.4% (1.0)	10.3% (3.0)	13.8% (4.0)	27.6% (8.0)	44.8% (13.0)
Producing and processing food for local consumption is important and should be a priority.	6.9% (2.0)	10.3% (3.0)	20.7% (6.0)	24.1% (7.0)	37.9% (11.0)
The City should allow new agricultural-related uses, such as dairy stores, wineries, and farm cafes, on agricultural lands.	3.4% (1.0)	3.4% (1.0)	17.2% (5.0)	44.8% (13.0)	31.0% (9.0)

50-59 (23)

Preserving large blocks of agricultural land is important and should be a priority.	4.3% (1.0)	4.3% (1.0)	8.7% (2.0)	17.4% (4.0)	65.2% (15.0)
Producing and processing food for local consumption is important and should be a priority.	8.7% (2.0)	-	8.7% (2.0)	17.4% (4.0)	65.2% (15.0)
The City should allow new agricultural-related uses, such as dairy stores, wineries, and farm cafes, on agricultural lands.	-	-	21.7% (5.0)	47.8% (11.0)	30.4% (7.0)

60-69 (26)

Preserving large blocks of agricultural land is important and should be a priority.	-	3.8% (1.0)	3.8% (1.0)	34.6% (9.0)	57.7% (15.0)
Producing and processing food for local consumption is important and should be a priority.	-	3.8% (1.0)	15.4% (4.0)	38.5% (10.0)	42.3% (11.0)
The City should allow new agricultural-related uses, such as dairy stores, wineries, and farm cafes, on agricultural lands.	7.7% (2.0)	-	11.5% (3.0)	34.6% (9.0)	46.2% (12.0)

70-79 (16)

Preserving large blocks of agricultural land is important and should be a priority.	-	-	12.5% (2.0)	31.3% (5.0)	56.3% (9.0)
Producing and processing food for local consumption is important and should be a priority.	-	6.3% (1.0)	12.5% (2.0)	43.8% (7.0)	37.5% (6.0)
The City should allow new agricultural-related uses, such as dairy stores, wineries, and farm cafes, on agricultural lands.	6.3% (1.0)	6.3% (1.0)	6.3% (1.0)	43.8% (7.0)	37.5% (6.0)

unknown (68)

Preserving large blocks of agricultural land is important and should be a priority.	4.4% (3.0)	13.2% (9.0)	14.7% (10.0)	32.4% (22.0)	35.3% (24.0)
Producing and processing food for local consumption is important and should be a priority.	1.5% (1.0)	4.4% (3.0)	14.7% (10.0)	47.1% (32.0)	32.4% (22.0)
The City should allow new agricultural-related uses, such as dairy stores, wineries, and farm cafes, on agricultural lands.	5.9% (4.0)	4.4% (3.0)	10.3% (7.0)	42.6% (29.0)	36.8% (25.0)

VOTERS AGE 187 REGISTERED VOTERS

	Strongly Disagree	Disagree	Neutral	Agree	Strongly Agree
--	-------------------	----------	---------	-------	----------------

28 (1)

Preserving large blocks of agricultural land is important and should be a priority.	-	-	-	-	100.0% (1.0)
Producing and processing food for local consumption is important and should be a priority.	-	-	-	-	100.0% (1.0)
The City should allow new agricultural-related uses, such as dairy stores, wineries, and farm cafes, on agricultural lands.	-	-	-	100.0% (1.0)	-

31 (1)

Preserving large blocks of agricultural land is important and should be a priority.	-	100.0% (1.0)	-	-	-
Producing and processing food for local consumption is important and should be a priority.	-	-	-	100.0% (1.0)	-
The City should allow new agricultural-related uses, such as dairy stores, wineries, and farm cafes, on agricultural lands.	-	-	-	100.0% (1.0)	-

32 (1)

Preserving large blocks of agricultural land is important and should be a priority.	-	-	-	100.0% (1.0)	-
Producing and processing food for local consumption is important and should be a priority.	-	-	-	100.0% (1.0)	-
The City should allow new agricultural-related uses, such as dairy stores, wineries, and farm cafes, on agricultural lands.	-	-	-	100.0% (1.0)	-

33 (1)

Preserving large blocks of agricultural land is important and should be a priority.	-	100.0% (1.0)	-	-	-
Producing and processing food for local consumption is important and should be a priority.	-	-	-	100.0% (1.0)	-
The City should allow new agricultural-related uses, such as dairy stores, wineries, and farm cafes, on agricultural lands.	-	-	-	-	100.0% (1.0)
34 (1)					
Preserving large blocks of agricultural land is important and should be a priority.	-	-	100.0% (1.0)	-	-
Producing and processing food for local consumption is important and should be a priority.	-	-	100.0% (1.0)	-	-
The City should allow new agricultural-related uses, such as dairy stores, wineries, and farm cafes, on agricultural lands.	-	-	100.0% (1.0)	-	-
35 (5)					
Preserving large blocks of agricultural land is important and should be a priority.	-	20.0% (1.0)	20.0% (1.0)	20.0% (1.0)	40.0% (2.0)
Producing and processing food for local consumption is important and should be a priority.	-	-	-	60.0% (3.0)	40.0% (2.0)
The City should allow new agricultural-related uses, such as dairy stores, wineries, and farm cafes, on agricultural lands.	-	-	-	40.0% (2.0)	60.0% (3.0)
36 (3)					
Preserving large blocks of agricultural land is important and should be a priority.	-	-	-	33.3% (1.0)	66.7% (2.0)
Producing and processing food for local consumption is important and should be a priority.	-	-	-	33.3% (1.0)	66.7% (2.0)
The City should allow new agricultural-related uses, such as dairy stores, wineries, and farm cafes, on agricultural lands.	-	-	-	66.7% (2.0)	33.3% (1.0)
37 (5)					
Preserving large blocks of agricultural land is important and should be a priority.	-	-	60.0% (3.0)	40.0% (2.0)	-
Producing and processing food for local consumption is important and should be a priority.	-	-	20.0% (1.0)	80.0% (4.0)	-
The City should allow new agricultural-related uses, such as dairy stores, wineries, and farm cafes, on agricultural lands.	-	-	-	60.0% (3.0)	40.0% (2.0)
38 (3)					
Preserving large blocks of agricultural land is important and should be a priority.	-	-	-	-	100.0% (3.0)
Producing and processing food for local consumption is important and should be a priority.	33.3% (1.0)	-	-	-	66.7% (2.0)
The City should allow new agricultural-related uses, such as dairy stores, wineries, and farm cafes, on agricultural lands.	33.3% (1.0)	-	-	-	66.7% (2.0)
39 (4)					
Preserving large blocks of agricultural land is important and should be a priority.	-	50.0% (2.0)	-	-	50.0% (2.0)
Producing and processing food for local consumption is important and should be a priority.	-	-	25.0% (1.0)	25.0% (1.0)	50.0% (2.0)
The City should allow new agricultural-related uses, such as dairy stores, wineries, and farm cafes, on agricultural lands.	-	-	-	50.0% (2.0)	50.0% (2.0)
40 (3)					
Preserving large blocks of agricultural land is important and should be a priority.	-	33.3% (1.0)	-	33.3% (1.0)	33.3% (1.0)
Producing and processing food for local consumption is important and should be a priority.	-	33.3% (1.0)	-	33.3% (1.0)	33.3% (1.0)
The City should allow new agricultural-related uses, such as dairy stores, wineries, and farm cafes, on agricultural lands.	-	-	33.3% (1.0)	66.7% (2.0)	-
41 (3)					
Preserving large blocks of agricultural land is important and should be a priority.	33.3% (1.0)	-	-	33.3% (1.0)	33.3% (1.0)
Producing and processing food for local consumption is important and should be a priority.	33.3% (1.0)	-	-	33.3% (1.0)	33.3% (1.0)
The City should allow new agricultural-related uses, such as dairy stores, wineries, and farm cafes, on agricultural lands.	33.3% (1.0)	-	33.3% (1.0)	-	33.3% (1.0)

43 (5)

Preserving large blocks of agricultural land is important and should be a priority.	-	20.0% (1.0)	20.0% (1.0)	-	60.0% (3.0)
Producing and processing food for local consumption is important and should be a priority.	-	20.0% (1.0)	20.0% (1.0)	-	60.0% (3.0)
The City should allow new agricultural-related uses, such as dairy stores, wineries, and farm cafes, on agricultural lands.	-	20.0% (1.0)	20.0% (1.0)	20.0% (1.0)	40.0% (2.0)

44 (6)

Preserving large blocks of agricultural land is important and should be a priority.	-	-	16.7% (1.0)	66.7% (4.0)	16.7% (1.0)
Producing and processing food for local consumption is important and should be a priority.	-	-	33.3% (2.0)	50.0% (3.0)	16.7% (1.0)
The City should allow new agricultural-related uses, such as dairy stores, wineries, and farm cafes, on agricultural lands.	-	-	-	50.0% (3.0)	50.0% (3.0)

45 (2)

Preserving large blocks of agricultural land is important and should be a priority.	-	-	-	-	100.0% (2.0)
Producing and processing food for local consumption is important and should be a priority.	-	-	-	-	100.0% (2.0)
The City should allow new agricultural-related uses, such as dairy stores, wineries, and farm cafes, on agricultural lands.	-	-	-	100.0% (2.0)	-

46 (1)

Preserving large blocks of agricultural land is important and should be a priority.	-	-	-	100.0% (1.0)	-
Producing and processing food for local consumption is important and should be a priority.	-	-	-	100.0% (1.0)	-
The City should allow new agricultural-related uses, such as dairy stores, wineries, and farm cafes, on agricultural lands.	-	-	-	-	100.0% (1.0)

47 (3)

Preserving large blocks of agricultural land is important and should be a priority.	-	33.3% (1.0)	33.3% (1.0)	-	33.3% (1.0)
Producing and processing food for local consumption is important and should be a priority.	-	33.3% (1.0)	33.3% (1.0)	-	33.3% (1.0)
The City should allow new agricultural-related uses, such as dairy stores, wineries, and farm cafes, on agricultural lands.	-	-	33.3% (1.0)	66.7% (2.0)	-

48 (2)

Preserving large blocks of agricultural land is important and should be a priority.	-	-	50.0% (1.0)	-	50.0% (1.0)
Producing and processing food for local consumption is important and should be a priority.	50.0% (1.0)	-	50.0% (1.0)	-	-
The City should allow new agricultural-related uses, such as dairy stores, wineries, and farm cafes, on agricultural lands.	-	-	50.0% (1.0)	50.0% (1.0)	-

49 (4)

Preserving large blocks of agricultural land is important and should be a priority.	-	-	-	25.0% (1.0)	75.0% (3.0)
Producing and processing food for local consumption is important and should be a priority.	-	-	25.0% (1.0)	25.0% (1.0)	50.0% (2.0)
The City should allow new agricultural-related uses, such as dairy stores, wineries, and farm cafes, on agricultural lands.	-	-	-	50.0% (2.0)	50.0% (2.0)

50 (1)

Preserving large blocks of agricultural land is important and should be a priority.	-	-	-	-	100.0% (1.0)
Producing and processing food for local consumption is important and should be a priority.	-	-	-	-	100.0% (1.0)
The City should allow new agricultural-related uses, such as dairy stores, wineries, and farm cafes, on agricultural lands.	-	-	-	100.0% (1.0)	-

51 (1)

Preserving large blocks of agricultural land is important and should be a priority.	100.0% (1.0)	-	-	-	-
Producing and processing food for local consumption is important and should be a priority.	100.0% (1.0)	-	-	-	-
The City should allow new agricultural-related uses, such as dairy stores, wineries, and farm cafes, on agricultural lands.	-	-	-	100.0% (1.0)	-

52 (5)

Preserving large blocks of agricultural land is important and should be a priority.	-	-	40.0% (2.0)	20.0% (1.0)	40.0% (2.0)
Producing and processing food for local consumption is important and should be a priority.	-	-	20.0% (1.0)	40.0% (2.0)	40.0% (2.0)
The City should allow new agricultural-related uses, such as dairy stores, wineries, and farm cafes, on agricultural lands.	-	-	20.0% (1.0)	20.0% (1.0)	60.0% (3.0)

53 (4)

Preserving large blocks of agricultural land is important and should be a priority.	-	25.0% (1.0)	-	25.0% (1.0)	50.0% (2.0)
Producing and processing food for local consumption is important and should be a priority.	25.0% (1.0)	-	-	25.0% (1.0)	50.0% (2.0)
The City should allow new agricultural-related uses, such as dairy stores, wineries, and farm cafes, on agricultural lands.	-	-	25.0% (1.0)	25.0% (1.0)	50.0% (2.0)

54 (1)

Preserving large blocks of agricultural land is important and should be a priority.	-	-	-	100.0% (1.0)	-
Producing and processing food for local consumption is important and should be a priority.	-	-	-	-	100.0% (1.0)
The City should allow new agricultural-related uses, such as dairy stores, wineries, and farm cafes, on agricultural lands.	-	-	-	-	100.0% (1.0)

55 (3)

Preserving large blocks of agricultural land is important and should be a priority.	-	-	-	33.3% (1.0)	66.7% (2.0)
Producing and processing food for local consumption is important and should be a priority.	-	-	-	-	100.0% (3.0)
The City should allow new agricultural-related uses, such as dairy stores, wineries, and farm cafes, on agricultural lands.	-	-	-	100.0% (3.0)	-

56 (2)

Preserving large blocks of agricultural land is important and should be a priority.	-	-	-	-	100.0% (2.0)
Producing and processing food for local consumption is important and should be a priority.	-	-	-	-	100.0% (2.0)
The City should allow new agricultural-related uses, such as dairy stores, wineries, and farm cafes, on agricultural lands.	-	-	-	50.0% (1.0)	50.0% (1.0)

57 (1)

Preserving large blocks of agricultural land is important and should be a priority.	-	-	-	-	100.0% (1.0)
Producing and processing food for local consumption is important and should be a priority.	-	-	-	-	100.0% (1.0)
The City should allow new agricultural-related uses, such as dairy stores, wineries, and farm cafes, on agricultural lands.	-	-	100.0% (1.0)	-	-

59 (5)

Preserving large blocks of agricultural land is important and should be a priority.	-	-	-	-	100.0% (5.0)
Producing and processing food for local consumption is important and should be a priority.	-	-	20.0% (1.0)	20.0% (1.0)	60.0% (3.0)
The City should allow new agricultural-related uses, such as dairy stores, wineries, and farm cafes, on agricultural lands.	-	-	40.0% (2.0)	60.0% (3.0)	-

60 (3)

Preserving large blocks of agricultural land is important and should be a priority.	-	-	-	33.3% (1.0)	66.7% (2.0)
Producing and processing food for local consumption is important and should be a priority.	-	-	-	-	100.0% (3.0)
The City should allow new agricultural-related uses, such as dairy stores, wineries, and farm cafes, on agricultural lands.	-	-	33.3% (1.0)	66.7% (2.0)	-

61 (1)

Preserving large blocks of agricultural land is important and should be a priority.	-	100.0% (1.0)	-	-	-
Producing and processing food for local consumption is important and should be a priority.	-	-	-	-	100.0% (1.0)
The City should allow new agricultural-related uses, such as dairy stores, wineries, and farm cafes, on agricultural lands.	-	-	-	-	100.0% (1.0)

62 (5)

Preserving large blocks of agricultural land is important and should be a priority.	-	-	20.0% (1.0)	20.0% (1.0)	60.0% (3.0)
Producing and processing food for local consumption is important and should be a priority.	-	20.0% (1.0)	40.0% (2.0)	40.0% (2.0)	-
The City should allow new agricultural-related uses, such as dairy stores, wineries, and farm cafes, on agricultural lands.	20.0% (1.0)	-	20.0% (1.0)	40.0% (2.0)	20.0% (1.0)
63 (2)					
Preserving large blocks of agricultural land is important and should be a priority.	-	-	-	50.0% (1.0)	50.0% (1.0)
Producing and processing food for local consumption is important and should be a priority.	-	-	-	50.0% (1.0)	50.0% (1.0)
The City should allow new agricultural-related uses, such as dairy stores, wineries, and farm cafes, on agricultural lands.	-	-	-	50.0% (1.0)	50.0% (1.0)
64 (5)					
Preserving large blocks of agricultural land is important and should be a priority.	-	-	-	60.0% (3.0)	40.0% (2.0)
Producing and processing food for local consumption is important and should be a priority.	-	-	20.0% (1.0)	40.0% (2.0)	40.0% (2.0)
The City should allow new agricultural-related uses, such as dairy stores, wineries, and farm cafes, on agricultural lands.	-	-	-	20.0% (1.0)	80.0% (4.0)
65 (2)					
Preserving large blocks of agricultural land is important and should be a priority.	-	-	-	-	100.0% (2.0)
Producing and processing food for local consumption is important and should be a priority.	-	-	-	50.0% (1.0)	50.0% (1.0)
The City should allow new agricultural-related uses, such as dairy stores, wineries, and farm cafes, on agricultural lands.	-	-	-	-	100.0% (2.0)
66 (2)					
Preserving large blocks of agricultural land is important and should be a priority.	-	-	-	-	100.0% (2.0)
Producing and processing food for local consumption is important and should be a priority.	-	-	-	50.0% (1.0)	50.0% (1.0)
The City should allow new agricultural-related uses, such as dairy stores, wineries, and farm cafes, on agricultural lands.	-	-	-	-	100.0% (2.0)
67 (1)					
Preserving large blocks of agricultural land is important and should be a priority.	-	-	-	-	100.0% (1.0)
Producing and processing food for local consumption is important and should be a priority.	-	-	-	-	100.0% (1.0)
The City should allow new agricultural-related uses, such as dairy stores, wineries, and farm cafes, on agricultural lands.	-	-	100.0% (1.0)	-	-
68 (3)					
Preserving large blocks of agricultural land is important and should be a priority.	-	-	-	66.7% (2.0)	33.3% (1.0)
Producing and processing food for local consumption is important and should be a priority.	-	-	33.3% (1.0)	33.3% (1.0)	33.3% (1.0)
The City should allow new agricultural-related uses, such as dairy stores, wineries, and farm cafes, on agricultural lands.	33.3% (1.0)	-	-	66.7% (2.0)	-
69 (2)					
Preserving large blocks of agricultural land is important and should be a priority.	-	-	-	50.0% (1.0)	50.0% (1.0)
Producing and processing food for local consumption is important and should be a priority.	-	-	-	100.0% (2.0)	-
The City should allow new agricultural-related uses, such as dairy stores, wineries, and farm cafes, on agricultural lands.	-	-	-	50.0% (1.0)	50.0% (1.0)
71 (2)					
Preserving large blocks of agricultural land is important and should be a priority.	-	-	50.0% (1.0)	50.0% (1.0)	-
Producing and processing food for local consumption is important and should be a priority.	-	50.0% (1.0)	50.0% (1.0)	-	-
The City should allow new agricultural-related uses, such as dairy stores, wineries, and farm cafes, on agricultural lands.	-	-	-	100.0% (2.0)	-
72 (3)					

Preserving large blocks of agricultural land is important and should be a priority.	-	-	-	33.3% (1.0)	66.7% (2.0)
Producing and processing food for local consumption is important and should be a priority.	-	-	33.3% (1.0)	33.3% (1.0)	33.3% (1.0)
The City should allow new agricultural-related uses, such as dairy stores, wineries, and farm cafes, on agricultural lands.	33.3% (1.0)	33.3% (1.0)	-	33.3% (1.0)	-

73 (3)

Preserving large blocks of agricultural land is important and should be a priority.	-	-	-	33.3% (1.0)	66.7% (2.0)
Producing and processing food for local consumption is important and should be a priority.	-	-	-	66.7% (2.0)	33.3% (1.0)
The City should allow new agricultural-related uses, such as dairy stores, wineries, and farm cafes, on agricultural lands.	-	-	-	66.7% (2.0)	33.3% (1.0)

74 (4)

Preserving large blocks of agricultural land is important and should be a priority.	-	-	-	25.0% (1.0)	75.0% (3.0)
Producing and processing food for local consumption is important and should be a priority.	-	-	-	50.0% (2.0)	50.0% (2.0)
The City should allow new agricultural-related uses, such as dairy stores, wineries, and farm cafes, on agricultural lands.	-	-	-	25.0% (1.0)	75.0% (3.0)

77 (2)

Preserving large blocks of agricultural land is important and should be a priority.	-	-	-	50.0% (1.0)	50.0% (1.0)
Producing and processing food for local consumption is important and should be a priority.	-	-	-	50.0% (1.0)	50.0% (1.0)
The City should allow new agricultural-related uses, such as dairy stores, wineries, and farm cafes, on agricultural lands.	-	-	-	50.0% (1.0)	50.0% (1.0)

79 (2)

Preserving large blocks of agricultural land is important and should be a priority.	-	-	50.0% (1.0)	-	50.0% (1.0)
Producing and processing food for local consumption is important and should be a priority.	-	-	-	50.0% (1.0)	50.0% (1.0)
The City should allow new agricultural-related uses, such as dairy stores, wineries, and farm cafes, on agricultural lands.	-	-	50.0% (1.0)	-	50.0% (1.0)

Unknown (68)

Preserving large blocks of agricultural land is important and should be a priority.	4.4% (3.0)	13.2% (9.0)	14.7% (10.0)	32.4% (22.0)	35.3% (24.0)
Producing and processing food for local consumption is important and should be a priority.	1.5% (1.0)	4.4% (3.0)	14.7% (10.0)	47.1% (32.0)	32.4% (22.0)
The City should allow new agricultural-related uses, such as dairy stores, wineries, and farm cafes, on agricultural lands.	5.9% (4.0)	4.4% (3.0)	10.3% (7.0)	42.6% (29.0)	36.8% (25.0)

STATE INCOME DECILE

187 REGISTERED VOTERS

	Strongly Disagree	Disagree	Neutral	Agree	Strongly Agree
--	-------------------	----------	---------	-------	----------------

0 to 9 Pct range (6)

Preserving large blocks of agricultural land is important and should be a priority.	-	16.7% (1.0)	-	33.3% (2.0)	50.0% (3.0)
Producing and processing food for local consumption is important and should be a priority.	-	-	-	50.0% (3.0)	50.0% (3.0)
The City should allow new agricultural-related uses, such as dairy stores, wineries, and farm cafes, on agricultural lands.	-	-	-	50.0% (3.0)	50.0% (3.0)

10 to 19 Pct range (1)

Preserving large blocks of agricultural land is important and should be a priority.	-	-	-	100.0% (1.0)	-
Producing and processing food for local consumption is important and should be a priority.	-	-	-	100.0% (1.0)	-
The City should allow new agricultural-related uses, such as dairy stores, wineries, and farm cafes, on agricultural lands.	-	-	-	100.0% (1.0)	-

40 to 49 Pct range (2)

Preserving large blocks of agricultural land is important and should be a priority.	-	-	-	-	100.0% (2.0)
Producing and processing food for local consumption is important and should be a priority.	-	-	-	-	100.0% (2.0)
The City should allow new agricultural-related uses, such as dairy stores, wineries, and farm cafes, on agricultural lands.	-	-	50.0% (1.0)	-	50.0% (1.0)

50 to 59 Pct range (9)

Preserving large blocks of agricultural land is important and should be a priority.	-	-	22.2% (2.0)	33.3% (3.0)	44.4% (4.0)
Producing and processing food for local consumption is important and should be a priority.	-	-	11.1% (1.0)	33.3% (3.0)	55.6% (5.0)
The City should allow new agricultural-related uses, such as dairy stores, wineries, and farm cafes, on agricultural lands.	-	11.1% (1.0)	11.1% (1.0)	44.4% (4.0)	33.3% (3.0)

60 to 69 Pct range (7)

Preserving large blocks of agricultural land is important and should be a priority.	28.6% (2.0)	14.3% (1.0)	14.3% (1.0)	28.6% (2.0)	14.3% (1.0)
Producing and processing food for local consumption is important and should be a priority.	42.9% (3.0)	-	-	42.9% (3.0)	14.3% (1.0)
The City should allow new agricultural-related uses, such as dairy stores, wineries, and farm cafes, on agricultural lands.	28.6% (2.0)	-	14.3% (1.0)	28.6% (2.0)	28.6% (2.0)

70 to 79 Pct range (5)

Preserving large blocks of agricultural land is important and should be a priority.	-	-	-	20.0% (1.0)	80.0% (4.0)
Producing and processing food for local consumption is important and should be a priority.	20.0% (1.0)	-	-	20.0% (1.0)	60.0% (3.0)
The City should allow new agricultural-related uses, such as dairy stores, wineries, and farm cafes, on agricultural lands.	20.0% (1.0)	-	-	40.0% (2.0)	40.0% (2.0)

80 to 89 Pct range (70)

Preserving large blocks of agricultural land is important and should be a priority.	1.4% (1.0)	11.4% (8.0)	18.6% (13.0)	24.3% (17.0)	44.3% (31.0)
Producing and processing food for local consumption is important and should be a priority.	-	4.3% (3.0)	11.4% (8.0)	48.6% (34.0)	35.7% (25.0)
The City should allow new agricultural-related uses, such as dairy stores, wineries, and farm cafes, on agricultural lands.	4.3% (3.0)	1.4% (1.0)	11.4% (8.0)	44.3% (31.0)	38.6% (27.0)

90 Pct and up (85)

Preserving large blocks of agricultural land is important and should be a priority.	2.4% (2.0)	10.6% (9.0)	9.4% (8.0)	31.8% (27.0)	45.9% (39.0)
Producing and processing food for local consumption is important and should be a priority.	2.4% (2.0)	5.9% (5.0)	21.2% (18.0)	31.8% (27.0)	38.8% (33.0)
The City should allow new agricultural-related uses, such as dairy stores, wineries, and farm cafes, on agricultural lands.	3.5% (3.0)	3.5% (3.0)	12.9% (11.0)	44.7% (38.0)	35.3% (30.0)

Unknown (2)

Preserving large blocks of agricultural land is important and should be a priority.	-	-	-	-	100.0% (2.0)
Producing and processing food for local consumption is important and should be a priority.	-	-	-	-	100.0% (2.0)
The City should allow new agricultural-related uses, such as dairy stores, wineries, and farm cafes, on agricultural lands.	-	-	-	-	100.0% (2.0)

HOME OWNER/RENTER

187 REGISTERED VOTERS

	Strongly Disagree	Disagree	Neutral	Agree	Strongly Agree
--	-------------------	----------	---------	-------	----------------

Likely Homeowner (106)

Preserving large blocks of agricultural land is important and should be a priority.	1.9% (2.0)	10.4% (11.0)	14.2% (15.0)	26.4% (28.0)	47.2% (50.0)
Producing and processing food for local consumption is important and should be a priority.	1.9% (2.0)	3.8% (4.0)	12.3% (13.0)	38.7% (41.0)	43.4% (46.0)
The City should allow new agricultural-related uses, such as dairy stores, wineries, and farm cafes, on agricultural lands.	6.6% (7.0)	2.8% (3.0)	9.4% (10.0)	42.5% (45.0)	38.7% (41.0)

Likely Renter (55)

Preserving large blocks of agricultural land is important and should be a priority.	3.6% (2.0)	7.3% (4.0)	10.9% (6.0)	34.5% (19.0)	43.6% (24.0)
Producing and processing food for local consumption is important and should be a priority.	5.5% (3.0)	5.5% (3.0)	20.0% (11.0)	38.2% (21.0)	30.9% (17.0)
The City should allow new agricultural-related uses, such as dairy stores, wineries, and farm cafes, on agricultural lands.	3.6% (2.0)	3.6% (2.0)	16.4% (9.0)	38.2% (21.0)	38.2% (21.0)

Unknown (26)

Preserving large blocks of agricultural land is important and should be a priority.	3.8% (1.0)	15.4% (4.0)	11.5% (3.0)	23.1% (6.0)	46.2% (12.0)
Producing and processing food for local consumption is important and should be a priority.	3.8% (1.0)	3.8% (1.0)	11.5% (3.0)	38.5% (10.0)	42.3% (11.0)
The City should allow new agricultural-related uses, such as dairy stores, wineries, and farm cafes, on agricultural lands.	-	-	11.5% (3.0)	57.7% (15.0)	30.8% (8.0)

Please rate your level of satisfaction with the following aspects of transportation in Fitchburg:

CURRENT RESULTS	303 Total Responses				
	Very Unsatisfied	Unsatisfied	Neutral	Satisfied	Very Satisfied
Public transit	14% (41)	25% (76)	45% (137)	12% (35)	5% (14)
On-street bicycling lanes	5% (14)	17% (51)	28% (86)	38% (116)	12% (36)
Off-street bike/pedestrian paths	2% (5)	10% (30)	17% (51)	45% (137)	26% (80)
Bike share (B-Cycle, other transit sharing options, etc.)	6% (18)	18% (54)	60% (183)	10% (31)	6% (17)
Infrastructure for alternative-fuel vehicles (Electric vehicle charging stations, etc.)	5% (15)	21% (65)	59% (180)	11% (33)	3% (10)

REGISTERED (181)

	Very Unsatisfied	Unsatisfied	Neutral	Satisfied	Very Satisfied
Public transit	14.0% (25)	28.0% (51)	42.0% (76)	12.0% (21)	4.0% (8)
On-street bicycling lanes	4.0% (7)	17.0% (31)	27.0% (48)	43.0% (77)	10.0% (18)
Off-street bike/pedestrian paths	1.0% (1)	10.0% (19)	15.0% (28)	50.0% (91)	23.0% (42)
Bike share (B-Cycle, other transit sharing options, etc.)	4.0% (8)	18.0% (33)	60.0% (109)	12.0% (22)	5.0% (9)
Infrastructure for alternative-fuel vehicles (Electric vehicle charging stations, etc.)	4.0% (7)	25.0% (45)	59.0% (106)	9.0% (17)	3.0% (6)

NON-REGISTERED (122)

	Very Unsatisfied	Unsatisfied	Neutral	Satisfied	Very Satisfied
Public transit	13.1% (16)	20.5% (25)	50.0% (61)	11.5% (14)	4.9% (6)
On-street bicycling lanes	5.7% (7)	16.4% (20)	31.1% (38)	32.0% (39)	14.8% (18)
Off-street bike/pedestrian paths	3.3% (4)	9.0% (11)	18.9% (23)	37.7% (46)	31.1% (38)
Bike share (B-Cycle, other transit sharing options, etc.)	8.2% (10)	17.2% (21)	60.7% (74)	7.4% (9)	6.6% (8)
Infrastructure for alternative-fuel vehicles (Electric vehicle charging stations, etc.)	6.6% (8)	16.4% (20)	60.7% (74)	13.1% (16)	3.3% (4)

ALL RESPONDENTS (303)

	Very Unsatisfied	Unsatisfied	Neutral	Satisfied	Very Satisfied
Public transit	14% (41)	25% (76)	45% (137)	12% (35)	5% (14)
On-street bicycling lanes	5% (14)	17% (51)	28% (86)	38% (116)	12% (36)
Off-street bike/pedestrian paths	2% (5)	10% (30)	17% (51)	45% (137)	26% (80)
Bike share (B-Cycle, other transit sharing options, etc.)	6% (18)	18% (54)	60% (183)	10% (31)	6% (17)
Infrastructure for alternative-fuel vehicles (Electric vehicle charging stations, etc.)	5% (15)	21% (65)	59% (180)	11% (33)	3% (10)

REGISTERED VOTERS IN FITCHBURG, WI (181)

	Very Unsatisfied	Unsatisfied	Neutral	Satisfied	Very Satisfied
Public transit	14% (25)	28% (51)	42% (76)	12% (21)	4% (8)
On-street bicycling lanes	4% (7)	17% (31)	27% (48)	43% (77)	10% (18)
Off-street bike/pedestrian paths	1% (1)	10% (19)	15% (28)	50% (91)	23% (42)
Bike share (B-Cycle, other transit sharing options, etc.)	4% (8)	18% (33)	60% (109)	12% (22)	5% (9)
Infrastructure for alternative-fuel vehicles (Electric vehicle charging stations, etc.)	4% (7)	25% (45)	59% (106)	9% (17)	3% (6)

LIVE IN FITCHBURG, WI (267) - SELF-REPORTED

	Very Unsatisfied	Unsatisfied	Neutral	Satisfied	Very Satisfied
Public transit	13% (36)	25% (68)	45% (121)	11% (30)	4% (12)
On-street bicycling lanes	5% (14)	16% (42)	27% (72)	41% (109)	11% (30)
Off-street bike/pedestrian paths	2% (5)	10% (27)	15% (41)	48% (128)	25% (66)
Bike share (B-Cycle, other transit sharing options, etc.)	6% (16)	18% (49)	60% (161)	10% (27)	5% (14)
Infrastructure for alternative-fuel vehicles (Electric vehicle charging stations, etc.)	4% (11)	22% (59)	60% (160)	11% (29)	3% (8)

SUBSCRIBERS TO FITCHBURG, WI (271)

	Very Unsatisfied	Unsatisfied	Neutral	Satisfied	Very Satisfied
Public transit	14% (37)	26% (70)	45% (122)	11% (30)	4% (12)

On-street bicycling lanes	5% (14)	16% (43)	27% (74)	40% (109)	11% (31)
Off-street bike/pedestrian paths	2% (5)	10% (28)	15% (42)	48% (129)	25% (67)
Bike share (B-Cycle, other transit sharing options, etc.)	6% (17)	18% (50)	60% (163)	10% (27)	5% (14)
Infrastructure for alternative-fuel vehicles (Electric vehicle charging stations, etc.)	4% (12)	22% (59)	60% (163)	11% (29)	3% (8)

REGISTER RESPONDENTS FROM ANYWHERE (187)

	Very Unsatisfied	Unsatisfied	Neutral	Satisfied	Very Satisfied
Public transit	14% (27)	28% (53)	42% (78)	11% (21)	4% (8)
On-street bicycling lanes	4% (7)	18% (34)	27% (51)	41% (77)	10% (18)
Off-street bike/pedestrian paths	1% (1)	11% (20)	16% (30)	50% (93)	23% (43)
Bike share (B-Cycle, other transit sharing options, etc.)	5% (9)	19% (36)	59% (111)	12% (22)	5% (9)
Infrastructure for alternative-fuel vehicles (Electric vehicle charging stations, etc.)	5% (9)	25% (46)	58% (109)	9% (17)	3% (6)

EDUCATION

187 REGISTERED VOTERS

	Very Unsatisfied	Unsatisfied	Neutral	Satisfied	Very Satisfied
--	------------------	-------------	---------	-----------	----------------

Bach Degree - Extremely Likely (30)

Public transit	10.0% (3.0)	16.7% (5.0)	50.0% (15.0)	13.3% (4.0)	10.0% (3.0)
On-street bicycling lanes	-	16.7% (5.0)	33.3% (10.0)	40.0% (12.0)	10.0% (3.0)
Off-street bike/pedestrian paths	-	6.7% (2.0)	13.3% (4.0)	50.0% (15.0)	30.0% (9.0)
Bike share (B-Cycle, other transit sharing options, etc.)	10.0% (3.0)	20.0% (6.0)	56.7% (17.0)	6.7% (2.0)	6.7% (2.0)
Infrastructure for alternative-fuel vehicles (Electric vehicle charging stations, etc.)	3.3% (1.0)	20.0% (6.0)	66.7% (20.0)	6.7% (2.0)	3.3% (1.0)

Bach Degree - Likely (21)

Public transit	19.0% (4.0)	33.3% (7.0)	42.9% (9.0)	4.8% (1.0)	-
On-street bicycling lanes	9.5% (2.0)	19.0% (4.0)	14.3% (3.0)	47.6% (10.0)	9.5% (2.0)
Off-street bike/pedestrian paths	-	14.3% (3.0)	14.3% (3.0)	42.9% (9.0)	28.6% (6.0)
Bike share (B-Cycle, other transit sharing options, etc.)	-	33.3% (7.0)	61.9% (13.0)	4.8% (1.0)	-
Infrastructure for alternative-fuel vehicles (Electric vehicle charging stations, etc.)	-	33.3% (7.0)	57.1% (12.0)	4.8% (1.0)	4.8% (1.0)

Grad Degree - Extremely Likely (22)

Public transit	18.2% (4.0)	31.8% (7.0)	36.4% (8.0)	9.1% (2.0)	4.5% (1.0)
On-street bicycling lanes	4.5% (1.0)	22.7% (5.0)	31.8% (7.0)	22.7% (5.0)	18.2% (4.0)
Off-street bike/pedestrian paths	-	13.6% (3.0)	13.6% (3.0)	59.1% (13.0)	13.6% (3.0)
Bike share (B-Cycle, other transit sharing options, etc.)	-	13.6% (3.0)	54.5% (12.0)	22.7% (5.0)	9.1% (2.0)
Infrastructure for alternative-fuel vehicles (Electric vehicle charging stations, etc.)	4.5% (1.0)	31.8% (7.0)	50.0% (11.0)	13.6% (3.0)	-

Grad Degree - Likely (13)

Public transit	15.4% (2.0)	38.5% (5.0)	30.8% (4.0)	15.4% (2.0)	-
On-street bicycling lanes	-	38.5% (5.0)	30.8% (4.0)	30.8% (4.0)	-
Off-street bike/pedestrian paths	7.7% (1.0)	15.4% (2.0)	23.1% (3.0)	46.2% (6.0)	7.7% (1.0)
Bike share (B-Cycle, other transit sharing options, etc.)	15.4% (2.0)	15.4% (2.0)	69.2% (9.0)	-	-
Infrastructure for alternative-fuel vehicles (Electric vehicle charging stations, etc.)	7.7% (1.0)	23.1% (3.0)	61.5% (8.0)	7.7% (1.0)	-

HS Diploma - Extremely Likely (9)

Public transit	22.2% (2.0)	22.2% (2.0)	33.3% (3.0)	11.1% (1.0)	11.1% (1.0)
On-street bicycling lanes	-	33.3% (3.0)	22.2% (2.0)	33.3% (3.0)	11.1% (1.0)
Off-street bike/pedestrian paths	-	-	33.3% (3.0)	33.3% (3.0)	33.3% (3.0)
Bike share (B-Cycle, other transit sharing options, etc.)	11.1% (1.0)	11.1% (1.0)	44.4% (4.0)	22.2% (2.0)	11.1% (1.0)
Infrastructure for alternative-fuel vehicles (Electric vehicle charging stations, etc.)	11.1% (1.0)	-	66.7% (6.0)	11.1% (1.0)	11.1% (1.0)

HS Diploma - Likely (4)

Public transit	25.0% (1.0)	50.0% (2.0)	-	25.0% (1.0)	-
On-street bicycling lanes	-	25.0% (1.0)	-	75.0% (3.0)	-
Off-street bike/pedestrian paths	-	25.0% (1.0)	-	25.0% (1.0)	50.0% (2.0)
Bike share (B-Cycle, other transit sharing options, etc.)	-	-	50.0% (2.0)	50.0% (2.0)	-

Infrastructure for alternative-fuel vehicles (Electric vehicle charging stations, etc.)	-	-	75.0% (3.0)	25.0% (1.0)	-
---	---	---	-------------	-------------	---

Less than HS Diploma - Likely (1)

Public transit	-	100.0% (1.0)	-	-	-
On-street bicycling lanes	-	-	100.0% (1.0)	-	-
Off-street bike/pedestrian paths	-	-	-	100.0% (1.0)	-
Bike share (B-Cycle, other transit sharing options, etc.)	-	-	100.0% (1.0)	-	-
Infrastructure for alternative-fuel vehicles (Electric vehicle charging stations, etc.)	-	-	100.0% (1.0)	-	-

Some College - Likely (12)

Public transit	8.3% (1.0)	50.0% (6.0)	41.7% (5.0)	-	-
On-street bicycling lanes	16.7% (2.0)	8.3% (1.0)	33.3% (4.0)	41.7% (5.0)	-
Off-street bike/pedestrian paths	-	8.3% (1.0)	16.7% (2.0)	66.7% (8.0)	8.3% (1.0)
Bike share (B-Cycle, other transit sharing options, etc.)	8.3% (1.0)	8.3% (1.0)	66.7% (8.0)	16.7% (2.0)	-
Infrastructure for alternative-fuel vehicles (Electric vehicle charging stations, etc.)	8.3% (1.0)	8.3% (1.0)	83.3% (10.0)	-	-

Some College -Extremely Likely (5)

Public transit	20.0% (1.0)	20.0% (1.0)	20.0% (1.0)	20.0% (1.0)	20.0% (1.0)
On-street bicycling lanes	20.0% (1.0)	-	-	60.0% (3.0)	20.0% (1.0)
Off-street bike/pedestrian paths	-	-	-	60.0% (3.0)	40.0% (2.0)
Bike share (B-Cycle, other transit sharing options, etc.)	-	-	60.0% (3.0)	20.0% (1.0)	20.0% (1.0)
Infrastructure for alternative-fuel vehicles (Electric vehicle charging stations, etc.)	-	40.0% (2.0)	20.0% (1.0)	20.0% (1.0)	20.0% (1.0)

Unknown (70)

Public transit	12.9% (9.0)	24.3% (17.0)	47.1% (33.0)	12.9% (9.0)	2.9% (2.0)
On-street bicycling lanes	1.4% (1.0)	14.3% (10.0)	28.6% (20.0)	45.7% (32.0)	10.0% (7.0)
Off-street bike/pedestrian paths	-	11.4% (8.0)	17.1% (12.0)	48.6% (34.0)	22.9% (16.0)
Bike share (B-Cycle, other transit sharing options, etc.)	2.9% (2.0)	22.9% (16.0)	60.0% (42.0)	10.0% (7.0)	4.3% (3.0)
Infrastructure for alternative-fuel vehicles (Electric vehicle charging stations, etc.)	5.7% (4.0)	28.6% (20.0)	52.9% (37.0)	10.0% (7.0)	2.9% (2.0)

VOTERS GENDER

187 REGISTERED VOTERS

	Very Unsatisfied	Unsatisfied	Neutral	Satisfied	Very Satisfied
--	------------------	-------------	---------	-----------	----------------

F (90)

Public transit	12.2% (11.0)	34.4% (31.0)	40.0% (36.0)	8.9% (8.0)	4.4% (4.0)
On-street bicycling lanes	4.4% (4.0)	15.6% (14.0)	30.0% (27.0)	40.0% (36.0)	10.0% (9.0)
Off-street bike/pedestrian paths	1.1% (1.0)	13.3% (12.0)	16.7% (15.0)	42.2% (38.0)	26.7% (24.0)
Bike share (B-Cycle, other transit sharing options, etc.)	4.4% (4.0)	17.8% (16.0)	60.0% (54.0)	11.1% (10.0)	6.7% (6.0)
Infrastructure for alternative-fuel vehicles (Electric vehicle charging stations, etc.)	3.3% (3.0)	18.9% (17.0)	62.2% (56.0)	11.1% (10.0)	4.4% (4.0)

M (95)

Public transit	16.8% (16.0)	23.2% (22.0)	44.2% (42.0)	11.6% (11.0)	4.2% (4.0)
On-street bicycling lanes	3.2% (3.0)	21.1% (20.0)	25.3% (24.0)	41.1% (39.0)	9.5% (9.0)
Off-street bike/pedestrian paths	-	8.4% (8.0)	15.8% (15.0)	55.8% (53.0)	20.0% (19.0)
Bike share (B-Cycle, other transit sharing options, etc.)	5.3% (5.0)	20.0% (19.0)	60.0% (57.0)	11.6% (11.0)	3.2% (3.0)
Infrastructure for alternative-fuel vehicles (Electric vehicle charging stations, etc.)	6.3% (6.0)	29.5% (28.0)	55.8% (53.0)	6.3% (6.0)	2.1% (2.0)

Unknown (2)

Public transit	-	-	-	100.0% (2.0)	-
On-street bicycling lanes	-	-	-	100.0% (2.0)	-
Off-street bike/pedestrian paths	-	-	-	100.0% (2.0)	-
Bike share (B-Cycle, other transit sharing options, etc.)	-	50.0% (1.0)	-	50.0% (1.0)	-
Infrastructure for alternative-fuel vehicles (Electric vehicle charging stations, etc.)	-	50.0% (1.0)	-	50.0% (1.0)	-

PRECINCT

187 REGISTERED VOTERS

	Very Unsatisfied	Unsatisfied	Neutral	Satisfied	Very Satisfied
--	------------------	-------------	---------	-----------	----------------

CHICAGO 43-04 (1)

Public transit	-	-	100.0% (1.0)	-	-
On-street bicycling lanes	-	-	100.0% (1.0)	-	-
Off-street bike/pedestrian paths	-	-	100.0% (1.0)	-	-
Bike share (B-Cycle, other transit sharing options, etc.)	-	-	100.0% (1.0)	-	-
Infrastructure for alternative-fuel vehicles (Electric vehicle charging stations, etc.)	-	-	100.0% (1.0)	-	-

FITCHBURG CITY WARD 01 (9)

Public transit	11.1% (1.0)	44.4% (4.0)	22.2% (2.0)	11.1% (1.0)	11.1% (1.0)
On-street bicycling lanes	-	33.3% (3.0)	33.3% (3.0)	22.2% (2.0)	11.1% (1.0)
Off-street bike/pedestrian paths	-	11.1% (1.0)	22.2% (2.0)	66.7% (6.0)	-
Bike share (B-Cycle, other transit sharing options, etc.)	-	22.2% (2.0)	55.6% (5.0)	22.2% (2.0)	-
Infrastructure for alternative-fuel vehicles (Electric vehicle charging stations, etc.)	11.1% (1.0)	-	66.7% (6.0)	22.2% (2.0)	-

FITCHBURG CITY WARD 02 (3)

Public transit	33.3% (1.0)	33.3% (1.0)	33.3% (1.0)	-	-
On-street bicycling lanes	-	-	66.7% (2.0)	33.3% (1.0)	-
Off-street bike/pedestrian paths	-	33.3% (1.0)	33.3% (1.0)	33.3% (1.0)	-
Bike share (B-Cycle, other transit sharing options, etc.)	-	33.3% (1.0)	66.7% (2.0)	-	-
Infrastructure for alternative-fuel vehicles (Electric vehicle charging stations, etc.)	-	33.3% (1.0)	33.3% (1.0)	33.3% (1.0)	-

FITCHBURG CITY WARD 04 (2)

Public transit	50.0% (1.0)	-	-	50.0% (1.0)	-
On-street bicycling lanes	-	-	-	100.0% (2.0)	-
Off-street bike/pedestrian paths	-	-	-	-	100.0% (2.0)
Bike share (B-Cycle, other transit sharing options, etc.)	-	-	50.0% (1.0)	50.0% (1.0)	-
Infrastructure for alternative-fuel vehicles (Electric vehicle charging stations, etc.)	-	-	50.0% (1.0)	50.0% (1.0)	-

FITCHBURG CITY WARD 05 (6)

Public transit	-	50.0% (3.0)	50.0% (3.0)	-	-
On-street bicycling lanes	-	16.7% (1.0)	33.3% (2.0)	33.3% (2.0)	16.7% (1.0)
Off-street bike/pedestrian paths	-	16.7% (1.0)	-	33.3% (2.0)	50.0% (3.0)
Bike share (B-Cycle, other transit sharing options, etc.)	-	33.3% (2.0)	66.7% (4.0)	-	-
Infrastructure for alternative-fuel vehicles (Electric vehicle charging stations, etc.)	-	-	100.0% (6.0)	-	-

FITCHBURG CITY WARD 06 (12)

Public transit	8.3% (1.0)	25.0% (3.0)	58.3% (7.0)	-	8.3% (1.0)
On-street bicycling lanes	-	16.7% (2.0)	16.7% (2.0)	50.0% (6.0)	16.7% (2.0)
Off-street bike/pedestrian paths	-	-	-	75.0% (9.0)	25.0% (3.0)
Bike share (B-Cycle, other transit sharing options, etc.)	-	25.0% (3.0)	50.0% (6.0)	16.7% (2.0)	8.3% (1.0)
Infrastructure for alternative-fuel vehicles (Electric vehicle charging stations, etc.)	-	16.7% (2.0)	75.0% (9.0)	-	8.3% (1.0)

FITCHBURG CITY WARD 07 (18)

Public transit	-	33.3% (6.0)	38.9% (7.0)	16.7% (3.0)	11.1% (2.0)
On-street bicycling lanes	-	5.6% (1.0)	11.1% (2.0)	61.1% (11.0)	22.2% (4.0)
Off-street bike/pedestrian paths	-	5.6% (1.0)	5.6% (1.0)	55.6% (10.0)	33.3% (6.0)
Bike share (B-Cycle, other transit sharing options, etc.)	5.6% (1.0)	5.6% (1.0)	50.0% (9.0)	16.7% (3.0)	22.2% (4.0)
Infrastructure for alternative-fuel vehicles (Electric vehicle charging stations, etc.)	11.1% (2.0)	22.2% (4.0)	50.0% (9.0)	11.1% (2.0)	5.6% (1.0)

FITCHBURG CITY WARD 08 (14)

Public transit	28.6% (4.0)	14.3% (2.0)	42.9% (6.0)	14.3% (2.0)	-
On-street bicycling lanes	7.1% (1.0)	28.6% (4.0)	21.4% (3.0)	35.7% (5.0)	7.1% (1.0)
Off-street bike/pedestrian paths	7.1% (1.0)	7.1% (1.0)	7.1% (1.0)	64.3% (9.0)	14.3% (2.0)
Bike share (B-Cycle, other transit sharing options, etc.)	14.3% (2.0)	28.6% (4.0)	42.9% (6.0)	14.3% (2.0)	-
Infrastructure for alternative-fuel vehicles (Electric vehicle charging stations, etc.)	14.3% (2.0)	35.7% (5.0)	50.0% (7.0)	-	-

FITCHBURG CITY WARD 09 (8)

Public transit	12.5% (1.0)	12.5% (1.0)	50.0% (4.0)	12.5% (1.0)	12.5% (1.0)
On-street bicycling lanes	-	12.5% (1.0)	25.0% (2.0)	50.0% (4.0)	12.5% (1.0)
Off-street bike/pedestrian paths	-	-	25.0% (2.0)	37.5% (3.0)	37.5% (3.0)
Bike share (B-Cycle, other transit sharing options, etc.)	-	25.0% (2.0)	75.0% (6.0)	-	-
Infrastructure for alternative-fuel vehicles (Electric vehicle charging stations, etc.)	12.5% (1.0)	37.5% (3.0)	37.5% (3.0)	-	12.5% (1.0)

FITCHBURG CITY WARD 12 (2)

Public transit	50.0% (1.0)	-	-	50.0% (1.0)	-
On-street bicycling lanes	50.0% (1.0)	-	-	50.0% (1.0)	-
Off-street bike/pedestrian paths	-	-	-	50.0% (1.0)	50.0% (1.0)
Bike share (B-Cycle, other transit sharing options, etc.)	-	-	100.0% (2.0)	-	-
Infrastructure for alternative-fuel vehicles (Electric vehicle charging stations, etc.)	-	-	100.0% (2.0)	-	-

FITCHBURG CITY WARD 13 (31)

Public transit	6.5% (2.0)	25.8% (8.0)	51.6% (16.0)	16.1% (5.0)	-
On-street bicycling lanes	6.5% (2.0)	16.1% (5.0)	25.8% (8.0)	45.2% (14.0)	6.5% (2.0)
Off-street bike/pedestrian paths	-	6.5% (2.0)	9.7% (3.0)	45.2% (14.0)	38.7% (12.0)
Bike share (B-Cycle, other transit sharing options, etc.)	3.2% (1.0)	12.9% (4.0)	67.7% (21.0)	9.7% (3.0)	6.5% (2.0)
Infrastructure for alternative-fuel vehicles (Electric vehicle charging stations, etc.)	3.2% (1.0)	29.0% (9.0)	58.1% (18.0)	9.7% (3.0)	-

FITCHBURG CITY WARD 14 (19)

Public transit	-	57.9% (11.0)	36.8% (7.0)	-	5.3% (1.0)
On-street bicycling lanes	5.3% (1.0)	26.3% (5.0)	26.3% (5.0)	31.6% (6.0)	10.5% (2.0)
Off-street bike/pedestrian paths	-	15.8% (3.0)	15.8% (3.0)	47.4% (9.0)	21.1% (4.0)
Bike share (B-Cycle, other transit sharing options, etc.)	5.3% (1.0)	10.5% (2.0)	78.9% (15.0)	5.3% (1.0)	-
Infrastructure for alternative-fuel vehicles (Electric vehicle charging stations, etc.)	-	31.6% (6.0)	63.2% (12.0)	5.3% (1.0)	-

FITCHBURG CITY WARD 15 (7)

Public transit	14.3% (1.0)	-	71.4% (5.0)	14.3% (1.0)	-
On-street bicycling lanes	-	14.3% (1.0)	28.6% (2.0)	57.1% (4.0)	-
Off-street bike/pedestrian paths	-	14.3% (1.0)	42.9% (3.0)	42.9% (3.0)	-
Bike share (B-Cycle, other transit sharing options, etc.)	14.3% (1.0)	-	57.1% (4.0)	28.6% (2.0)	-
Infrastructure for alternative-fuel vehicles (Electric vehicle charging stations, etc.)	-	28.6% (2.0)	42.9% (3.0)	28.6% (2.0)	-

FITCHBURG CITY WARD 16 (3)

Public transit	33.3% (1.0)	66.7% (2.0)	-	-	-
On-street bicycling lanes	-	-	33.3% (1.0)	66.7% (2.0)	-
Off-street bike/pedestrian paths	-	33.3% (1.0)	-	66.7% (2.0)	-
Bike share (B-Cycle, other transit sharing options, etc.)	-	66.7% (2.0)	33.3% (1.0)	-	-
Infrastructure for alternative-fuel vehicles (Electric vehicle charging stations, etc.)	-	66.7% (2.0)	33.3% (1.0)	-	-

FITCHBURG CITY WARD 17 (7)

Public transit	42.9% (3.0)	-	42.9% (3.0)	14.3% (1.0)	-
On-street bicycling lanes	14.3% (1.0)	28.6% (2.0)	28.6% (2.0)	28.6% (2.0)	-
Off-street bike/pedestrian paths	-	14.3% (1.0)	28.6% (2.0)	42.9% (3.0)	14.3% (1.0)
Bike share (B-Cycle, other transit sharing options, etc.)	-	14.3% (1.0)	57.1% (4.0)	28.6% (2.0)	-
Infrastructure for alternative-fuel vehicles (Electric vehicle charging stations, etc.)	-	42.9% (3.0)	28.6% (2.0)	14.3% (1.0)	14.3% (1.0)

FITCHBURG CITY WARD 18 (12)

Public transit	50.0% (6.0)	41.7% (5.0)	8.3% (1.0)	-	-
On-street bicycling lanes	-	33.3% (4.0)	41.7% (5.0)	16.7% (2.0)	8.3% (1.0)
Off-street bike/pedestrian paths	-	8.3% (1.0)	25.0% (3.0)	50.0% (6.0)	16.7% (2.0)
Bike share (B-Cycle, other transit sharing options, etc.)	8.3% (1.0)	41.7% (5.0)	50.0% (6.0)	-	-
Infrastructure for alternative-fuel vehicles (Electric vehicle charging stations, etc.)	-	33.3% (4.0)	66.7% (8.0)	-	-

FITCHBURG CITY WARD 19 (26)

Public transit	7.7% (2.0)	19.2% (5.0)	50.0% (13.0)	19.2% (5.0)	3.8% (1.0)
----------------	------------	-------------	--------------	-------------	------------

On-street bicycling lanes	3.8% (1.0)	7.7% (2.0)	30.8% (8.0)	50.0% (13.0)	7.7% (2.0)
Off-street bike/pedestrian paths	-	15.4% (4.0)	23.1% (6.0)	50.0% (13.0)	11.5% (3.0)
Bike share (B-Cycle, other transit sharing options, etc.)	3.8% (1.0)	11.5% (3.0)	65.4% (17.0)	15.4% (4.0)	3.8% (1.0)
Infrastructure for alternative-fuel vehicles (Electric vehicle charging stations, etc.)	-	11.5% (3.0)	65.4% (17.0)	15.4% (4.0)	7.7% (2.0)

MADISON CITY WARD 042 (1)

Public transit	100.0% (1.0)	-	-	-	-
On-street bicycling lanes	-	100.0% (1.0)	-	-	-
Off-street bike/pedestrian paths	-	-	-	100.0% (1.0)	-
Bike share (B-Cycle, other transit sharing options, etc.)	-	100.0% (1.0)	-	-	-
Infrastructure for alternative-fuel vehicles (Electric vehicle charging stations, etc.)	-	-	100.0% (1.0)	-	-

MADISON CITY WARD 053 (1)

Public transit	-	100.0% (1.0)	-	-	-
On-street bicycling lanes	-	100.0% (1.0)	-	-	-
Off-street bike/pedestrian paths	-	100.0% (1.0)	-	-	-
Bike share (B-Cycle, other transit sharing options, etc.)	-	100.0% (1.0)	-	-	-
Infrastructure for alternative-fuel vehicles (Electric vehicle charging stations, etc.)	-	100.0% (1.0)	-	-	-

MADISON CITY WARD 100 (1)

Public transit	-	-	-	-	100.0% (1.0)
On-street bicycling lanes	-	-	-	-	100.0% (1.0)
Off-street bike/pedestrian paths	-	-	100.0% (1.0)	-	-
Bike share (B-Cycle, other transit sharing options, etc.)	-	-	-	-	100.0% (1.0)
Infrastructure for alternative-fuel vehicles (Electric vehicle charging stations, etc.)	-	-	100.0% (1.0)	-	-

MADISON CITY WARD 107 (1)

Public transit	-	100.0% (1.0)	-	-	-
On-street bicycling lanes	-	-	100.0% (1.0)	-	-
Off-street bike/pedestrian paths	-	-	100.0% (1.0)	-	-
Bike share (B-Cycle, other transit sharing options, etc.)	-	100.0% (1.0)	-	-	-
Infrastructure for alternative-fuel vehicles (Electric vehicle charging stations, etc.)	100.0% (1.0)	-	-	-	-

MIDDLETON TOWN WARD 7 (1)

Public transit	-	-	100.0% (1.0)	-	-
On-street bicycling lanes	-	-	100.0% (1.0)	-	-
Off-street bike/pedestrian paths	-	-	-	100.0% (1.0)	-
Bike share (B-Cycle, other transit sharing options, etc.)	-	-	100.0% (1.0)	-	-
Infrastructure for alternative-fuel vehicles (Electric vehicle charging stations, etc.)	-	-	100.0% (1.0)	-	-

MOUNT HOREB VLG WARD 3 (1)

Public transit	100.0% (1.0)	-	-	-	-
On-street bicycling lanes	-	100.0% (1.0)	-	-	-
Off-street bike/pedestrian paths	-	-	-	-	100.0% (1.0)
Bike share (B-Cycle, other transit sharing options, etc.)	100.0% (1.0)	-	-	-	-
Infrastructure for alternative-fuel vehicles (Electric vehicle charging stations, etc.)	100.0% (1.0)	-	-	-	-

OREGON VLG WARD 10 (1)

Public transit	-	-	100.0% (1.0)	-	-
On-street bicycling lanes	-	-	100.0% (1.0)	-	-
Off-street bike/pedestrian paths	-	100.0% (1.0)	-	-	-
Bike share (B-Cycle, other transit sharing options, etc.)	-	100.0% (1.0)	-	-	-
Infrastructure for alternative-fuel vehicles (Electric vehicle charging stations, etc.)	-	100.0% (1.0)	-	-	-

AGE RANGE

187 REGISTERED VOTERS

	Very Unsatisfied	Unsatisfied	Neutral	Satisfied	Very Satisfied
--	------------------	-------------	---------	-----------	----------------

18-29 (1)

Public transit	-	100.0% (1.0)	-	-	-
On-street bicycling lanes	-	-	100.0% (1.0)	-	-
Off-street bike/pedestrian paths	-	-	-	100.0% (1.0)	-
Bike share (B-Cycle, other transit sharing options, etc.)	-	-	100.0% (1.0)	-	-
Infrastructure for alternative-fuel vehicles (Electric vehicle charging stations, etc.)	-	-	-	100.0% (1.0)	-

30-39 (24)

Public transit	16.7% (4.0)	29.2% (7.0)	45.8% (11.0)	4.2% (1.0)	4.2% (1.0)
On-street bicycling lanes	8.3% (2.0)	25.0% (6.0)	25.0% (6.0)	33.3% (8.0)	8.3% (2.0)
Off-street bike/pedestrian paths	4.2% (1.0)	12.5% (3.0)	12.5% (3.0)	54.2% (13.0)	16.7% (4.0)
Bike share (B-Cycle, other transit sharing options, etc.)	8.3% (2.0)	20.8% (5.0)	54.2% (13.0)	12.5% (3.0)	4.2% (1.0)
Infrastructure for alternative-fuel vehicles (Electric vehicle charging stations, etc.)	4.2% (1.0)	16.7% (4.0)	66.7% (16.0)	12.5% (3.0)	-

40-49 (29)

Public transit	3.4% (1.0)	44.8% (13.0)	24.1% (7.0)	20.7% (6.0)	6.9% (2.0)
On-street bicycling lanes	-	20.7% (6.0)	24.1% (7.0)	37.9% (11.0)	17.2% (5.0)
Off-street bike/pedestrian paths	-	10.3% (3.0)	20.7% (6.0)	44.8% (13.0)	24.1% (7.0)
Bike share (B-Cycle, other transit sharing options, etc.)	6.9% (2.0)	24.1% (7.0)	51.7% (15.0)	10.3% (3.0)	6.9% (2.0)
Infrastructure for alternative-fuel vehicles (Electric vehicle charging stations, etc.)	10.3% (3.0)	20.7% (6.0)	58.6% (17.0)	6.9% (2.0)	3.4% (1.0)

50-59 (23)

Public transit	26.1% (6.0)	30.4% (7.0)	30.4% (7.0)	8.7% (2.0)	4.3% (1.0)
On-street bicycling lanes	8.7% (2.0)	13.0% (3.0)	39.1% (9.0)	30.4% (7.0)	8.7% (2.0)
Off-street bike/pedestrian paths	-	8.7% (2.0)	8.7% (2.0)	56.5% (13.0)	26.1% (6.0)
Bike share (B-Cycle, other transit sharing options, etc.)	4.3% (1.0)	13.0% (3.0)	60.9% (14.0)	13.0% (3.0)	8.7% (2.0)
Infrastructure for alternative-fuel vehicles (Electric vehicle charging stations, etc.)	4.3% (1.0)	21.7% (5.0)	69.6% (16.0)	-	4.3% (1.0)

60-69 (26)

Public transit	11.5% (3.0)	26.9% (7.0)	42.3% (11.0)	15.4% (4.0)	3.8% (1.0)
On-street bicycling lanes	-	11.5% (3.0)	38.5% (10.0)	46.2% (12.0)	3.8% (1.0)
Off-street bike/pedestrian paths	-	7.7% (2.0)	23.1% (6.0)	50.0% (13.0)	19.2% (5.0)
Bike share (B-Cycle, other transit sharing options, etc.)	7.7% (2.0)	19.2% (5.0)	53.8% (14.0)	11.5% (3.0)	7.7% (2.0)
Infrastructure for alternative-fuel vehicles (Electric vehicle charging stations, etc.)	-	26.9% (7.0)	57.7% (15.0)	15.4% (4.0)	-

70-79 (16)

Public transit	25.0% (4.0)	18.8% (3.0)	31.3% (5.0)	18.8% (3.0)	6.3% (1.0)
On-street bicycling lanes	-	25.0% (4.0)	12.5% (2.0)	43.8% (7.0)	18.8% (3.0)
Off-street bike/pedestrian paths	-	18.8% (3.0)	12.5% (2.0)	31.3% (5.0)	37.5% (6.0)
Bike share (B-Cycle, other transit sharing options, etc.)	-	12.5% (2.0)	62.5% (10.0)	18.8% (3.0)	6.3% (1.0)
Infrastructure for alternative-fuel vehicles (Electric vehicle charging stations, etc.)	6.3% (1.0)	18.8% (3.0)	50.0% (8.0)	18.8% (3.0)	6.3% (1.0)

unknown (68)

Public transit	13.2% (9.0)	22.1% (15.0)	54.4% (37.0)	7.4% (5.0)	2.9% (2.0)
On-street bicycling lanes	4.4% (3.0)	17.6% (12.0)	23.5% (16.0)	47.1% (32.0)	7.4% (5.0)
Off-street bike/pedestrian paths	-	10.3% (7.0)	16.2% (11.0)	51.5% (35.0)	22.1% (15.0)
Bike share (B-Cycle, other transit sharing options, etc.)	2.9% (2.0)	20.6% (14.0)	64.7% (44.0)	10.3% (7.0)	1.5% (1.0)
Infrastructure for alternative-fuel vehicles (Electric vehicle charging stations, etc.)	4.4% (3.0)	30.9% (21.0)	54.4% (37.0)	5.9% (4.0)	4.4% (3.0)

VOTERS					187 REGISTERED VOTERS
AGE					
	Very Unsatisfied	Unsatisfied	Neutral	Satisfied	Very Satisfied

28 (1)

Public transit	-	100.0% (1.0)	-	-	-
On-street bicycling lanes	-	-	100.0% (1.0)	-	-
Off-street bike/pedestrian paths	-	-	-	100.0% (1.0)	-

Bike share (B-Cycle, other transit sharing options, etc.)	-	-	100.0% (1.0)	-	-
Infrastructure for alternative-fuel vehicles (Electric vehicle charging stations, etc.)	-	-	-	100.0% (1.0)	-

31 (1)

Public transit	-	-	100.0% (1.0)	-	-
On-street bicycling lanes	100.0% (1.0)	-	-	-	-
Off-street bike/pedestrian paths	-	-	-	100.0% (1.0)	-
Bike share (B-Cycle, other transit sharing options, etc.)	-	-	100.0% (1.0)	-	-
Infrastructure for alternative-fuel vehicles (Electric vehicle charging stations, etc.)	-	-	100.0% (1.0)	-	-

32 (1)

Public transit	-	-	100.0% (1.0)	-	-
On-street bicycling lanes	-	-	100.0% (1.0)	-	-
Off-street bike/pedestrian paths	-	-	100.0% (1.0)	-	-
Bike share (B-Cycle, other transit sharing options, etc.)	-	-	100.0% (1.0)	-	-
Infrastructure for alternative-fuel vehicles (Electric vehicle charging stations, etc.)	-	-	100.0% (1.0)	-	-

33 (1)

Public transit	-	-	100.0% (1.0)	-	-
On-street bicycling lanes	-	-	-	100.0% (1.0)	-
Off-street bike/pedestrian paths	-	-	-	100.0% (1.0)	-
Bike share (B-Cycle, other transit sharing options, etc.)	100.0% (1.0)	-	-	-	-
Infrastructure for alternative-fuel vehicles (Electric vehicle charging stations, etc.)	-	-	100.0% (1.0)	-	-

34 (1)

Public transit	100.0% (1.0)	-	-	-	-
On-street bicycling lanes	100.0% (1.0)	-	-	-	-
Off-street bike/pedestrian paths	-	-	-	-	100.0% (1.0)
Bike share (B-Cycle, other transit sharing options, etc.)	-	-	100.0% (1.0)	-	-
Infrastructure for alternative-fuel vehicles (Electric vehicle charging stations, etc.)	-	-	100.0% (1.0)	-	-

35 (5)

Public transit	20.0% (1.0)	60.0% (3.0)	20.0% (1.0)	-	-
On-street bicycling lanes	-	20.0% (1.0)	40.0% (2.0)	40.0% (2.0)	-
Off-street bike/pedestrian paths	-	20.0% (1.0)	20.0% (1.0)	60.0% (3.0)	-
Bike share (B-Cycle, other transit sharing options, etc.)	-	20.0% (1.0)	60.0% (3.0)	20.0% (1.0)	-
Infrastructure for alternative-fuel vehicles (Electric vehicle charging stations, etc.)	-	40.0% (2.0)	40.0% (2.0)	20.0% (1.0)	-

36 (3)

Public transit	33.3% (1.0)	-	66.7% (2.0)	-	-
On-street bicycling lanes	-	66.7% (2.0)	-	33.3% (1.0)	-
Off-street bike/pedestrian paths	-	33.3% (1.0)	-	33.3% (1.0)	33.3% (1.0)
Bike share (B-Cycle, other transit sharing options, etc.)	-	33.3% (1.0)	33.3% (1.0)	33.3% (1.0)	-
Infrastructure for alternative-fuel vehicles (Electric vehicle charging stations, etc.)	-	33.3% (1.0)	66.7% (2.0)	-	-

37 (5)

Public transit	-	40.0% (2.0)	60.0% (3.0)	-	-
On-street bicycling lanes	-	20.0% (1.0)	40.0% (2.0)	40.0% (2.0)	-
Off-street bike/pedestrian paths	-	20.0% (1.0)	-	80.0% (4.0)	-
Bike share (B-Cycle, other transit sharing options, etc.)	-	20.0% (1.0)	80.0% (4.0)	-	-
Infrastructure for alternative-fuel vehicles (Electric vehicle charging stations, etc.)	-	-	100.0% (5.0)	-	-

38 (3)

Public transit	-	33.3% (1.0)	-	33.3% (1.0)	33.3% (1.0)
On-street bicycling lanes	-	-	33.3% (1.0)	33.3% (1.0)	33.3% (1.0)
Off-street bike/pedestrian paths	-	-	33.3% (1.0)	33.3% (1.0)	33.3% (1.0)
Bike share (B-Cycle, other transit sharing options, etc.)	-	-	33.3% (1.0)	33.3% (1.0)	33.3% (1.0)

Infrastructure for alternative-fuel vehicles (Electric vehicle charging stations, etc.)	-	-	66.7% (2.0)	33.3% (1.0)	-
---	---	---	-------------	-------------	---

39 (4)

Public transit	25.0% (1.0)	25.0% (1.0)	50.0% (2.0)	-	-
On-street bicycling lanes	-	50.0% (2.0)	-	25.0% (1.0)	25.0% (1.0)
Off-street bike/pedestrian paths	25.0% (1.0)	-	-	50.0% (2.0)	25.0% (1.0)
Bike share (B-Cycle, other transit sharing options, etc.)	25.0% (1.0)	50.0% (2.0)	25.0% (1.0)	-	-
Infrastructure for alternative-fuel vehicles (Electric vehicle charging stations, etc.)	25.0% (1.0)	25.0% (1.0)	25.0% (1.0)	25.0% (1.0)	-

40 (3)

Public transit	-	-	-	100.0% (3.0)	-
On-street bicycling lanes	-	33.3% (1.0)	-	66.7% (2.0)	-
Off-street bike/pedestrian paths	-	33.3% (1.0)	-	66.7% (2.0)	-
Bike share (B-Cycle, other transit sharing options, etc.)	-	33.3% (1.0)	33.3% (1.0)	33.3% (1.0)	-
Infrastructure for alternative-fuel vehicles (Electric vehicle charging stations, etc.)	-	33.3% (1.0)	66.7% (2.0)	-	-

41 (3)

Public transit	-	66.7% (2.0)	33.3% (1.0)	-	-
On-street bicycling lanes	-	33.3% (1.0)	-	66.7% (2.0)	-
Off-street bike/pedestrian paths	-	-	33.3% (1.0)	66.7% (2.0)	-
Bike share (B-Cycle, other transit sharing options, etc.)	-	33.3% (1.0)	66.7% (2.0)	-	-
Infrastructure for alternative-fuel vehicles (Electric vehicle charging stations, etc.)	-	66.7% (2.0)	33.3% (1.0)	-	-

43 (5)

Public transit	-	60.0% (3.0)	20.0% (1.0)	-	20.0% (1.0)
On-street bicycling lanes	-	-	60.0% (3.0)	-	40.0% (2.0)
Off-street bike/pedestrian paths	-	-	20.0% (1.0)	40.0% (2.0)	40.0% (2.0)
Bike share (B-Cycle, other transit sharing options, etc.)	-	20.0% (1.0)	80.0% (4.0)	-	-
Infrastructure for alternative-fuel vehicles (Electric vehicle charging stations, etc.)	20.0% (1.0)	-	80.0% (4.0)	-	-

44 (6)

Public transit	-	33.3% (2.0)	33.3% (2.0)	33.3% (2.0)	-
On-street bicycling lanes	-	50.0% (3.0)	-	33.3% (2.0)	16.7% (1.0)
Off-street bike/pedestrian paths	-	-	16.7% (1.0)	50.0% (3.0)	33.3% (2.0)
Bike share (B-Cycle, other transit sharing options, etc.)	16.7% (1.0)	33.3% (2.0)	33.3% (2.0)	16.7% (1.0)	-
Infrastructure for alternative-fuel vehicles (Electric vehicle charging stations, etc.)	16.7% (1.0)	33.3% (2.0)	33.3% (2.0)	16.7% (1.0)	-

45 (2)

Public transit	-	100.0% (2.0)	-	-	-
On-street bicycling lanes	-	-	50.0% (1.0)	50.0% (1.0)	-
Off-street bike/pedestrian paths	-	-	-	50.0% (1.0)	50.0% (1.0)
Bike share (B-Cycle, other transit sharing options, etc.)	-	-	100.0% (2.0)	-	-
Infrastructure for alternative-fuel vehicles (Electric vehicle charging stations, etc.)	-	-	100.0% (2.0)	-	-

46 (1)

Public transit	-	100.0% (1.0)	-	-	-
On-street bicycling lanes	-	-	100.0% (1.0)	-	-
Off-street bike/pedestrian paths	-	-	100.0% (1.0)	-	-
Bike share (B-Cycle, other transit sharing options, etc.)	100.0% (1.0)	-	-	-	-
Infrastructure for alternative-fuel vehicles (Electric vehicle charging stations, etc.)	-	-	-	100.0% (1.0)	-

47 (3)

Public transit	-	33.3% (1.0)	33.3% (1.0)	33.3% (1.0)	-
On-street bicycling lanes	-	-	-	66.7% (2.0)	33.3% (1.0)
Off-street bike/pedestrian paths	-	33.3% (1.0)	-	33.3% (1.0)	33.3% (1.0)
Bike share (B-Cycle, other transit sharing options, etc.)	-	-	33.3% (1.0)	33.3% (1.0)	33.3% (1.0)
Infrastructure for alternative-fuel vehicles (Electric vehicle charging stations, etc.)	33.3% (1.0)	-	66.7% (2.0)	-	-

48 (2)

Public transit	-	-	50.0% (1.0)	-	50.0% (1.0)
On-street bicycling lanes	-	-	50.0% (1.0)	-	50.0% (1.0)
Off-street bike/pedestrian paths	-	-	50.0% (1.0)	-	50.0% (1.0)
Bike share (B-Cycle, other transit sharing options, etc.)	-	-	50.0% (1.0)	-	50.0% (1.0)
Infrastructure for alternative-fuel vehicles (Electric vehicle charging stations, etc.)	-	-	50.0% (1.0)	-	50.0% (1.0)

49 (4)

Public transit	25.0% (1.0)	50.0% (2.0)	25.0% (1.0)	-	-
On-street bicycling lanes	-	25.0% (1.0)	25.0% (1.0)	50.0% (2.0)	-
Off-street bike/pedestrian paths	-	25.0% (1.0)	25.0% (1.0)	50.0% (2.0)	-
Bike share (B-Cycle, other transit sharing options, etc.)	-	50.0% (2.0)	50.0% (2.0)	-	-
Infrastructure for alternative-fuel vehicles (Electric vehicle charging stations, etc.)	-	25.0% (1.0)	75.0% (3.0)	-	-

50 (1)

Public transit	-	100.0% (1.0)	-	-	-
On-street bicycling lanes	-	-	-	100.0% (1.0)	-
Off-street bike/pedestrian paths	-	-	-	100.0% (1.0)	-
Bike share (B-Cycle, other transit sharing options, etc.)	-	-	100.0% (1.0)	-	-
Infrastructure for alternative-fuel vehicles (Electric vehicle charging stations, etc.)	-	-	100.0% (1.0)	-	-

51 (1)

Public transit	-	-	-	100.0% (1.0)	-
On-street bicycling lanes	-	100.0% (1.0)	-	-	-
Off-street bike/pedestrian paths	-	100.0% (1.0)	-	-	-
Bike share (B-Cycle, other transit sharing options, etc.)	-	-	100.0% (1.0)	-	-
Infrastructure for alternative-fuel vehicles (Electric vehicle charging stations, etc.)	-	100.0% (1.0)	-	-	-

52 (5)

Public transit	20.0% (1.0)	40.0% (2.0)	40.0% (2.0)	-	-
On-street bicycling lanes	20.0% (1.0)	-	80.0% (4.0)	-	-
Off-street bike/pedestrian paths	-	-	20.0% (1.0)	60.0% (3.0)	20.0% (1.0)
Bike share (B-Cycle, other transit sharing options, etc.)	-	-	100.0% (5.0)	-	-
Infrastructure for alternative-fuel vehicles (Electric vehicle charging stations, etc.)	-	20.0% (1.0)	80.0% (4.0)	-	-

53 (4)

Public transit	-	25.0% (1.0)	75.0% (3.0)	-	-
On-street bicycling lanes	-	-	75.0% (3.0)	25.0% (1.0)	-
Off-street bike/pedestrian paths	-	-	25.0% (1.0)	75.0% (3.0)	-
Bike share (B-Cycle, other transit sharing options, etc.)	-	25.0% (1.0)	75.0% (3.0)	-	-
Infrastructure for alternative-fuel vehicles (Electric vehicle charging stations, etc.)	-	-	100.0% (4.0)	-	-

54 (1)

Public transit	100.0% (1.0)	-	-	-	-
On-street bicycling lanes	-	100.0% (1.0)	-	-	-
Off-street bike/pedestrian paths	-	-	-	-	100.0% (1.0)
Bike share (B-Cycle, other transit sharing options, etc.)	100.0% (1.0)	-	-	-	-
Infrastructure for alternative-fuel vehicles (Electric vehicle charging stations, etc.)	100.0% (1.0)	-	-	-	-

55 (3)

Public transit	-	33.3% (1.0)	-	33.3% (1.0)	33.3% (1.0)
On-street bicycling lanes	-	-	-	33.3% (1.0)	66.7% (2.0)
Off-street bike/pedestrian paths	-	-	-	33.3% (1.0)	66.7% (2.0)
Bike share (B-Cycle, other transit sharing options, etc.)	-	-	-	33.3% (1.0)	66.7% (2.0)
Infrastructure for alternative-fuel vehicles (Electric vehicle charging stations, etc.)	-	33.3% (1.0)	33.3% (1.0)	-	33.3% (1.0)

56 (2)

Public transit	-	-	100.0% (2.0)	-	-
On-street bicycling lanes	-	-	50.0% (1.0)	50.0% (1.0)	-
Off-street bike/pedestrian paths	-	-	-	50.0% (1.0)	50.0% (1.0)
Bike share (B-Cycle, other transit sharing options, etc.)	-	-	100.0% (2.0)	-	-
Infrastructure for alternative-fuel vehicles (Electric vehicle charging stations, etc.)	-	-	100.0% (2.0)	-	-

57 (1)

Public transit	-	100.0% (1.0)	-	-	-
On-street bicycling lanes	-	-	-	100.0% (1.0)	-
Off-street bike/pedestrian paths	-	-	-	100.0% (1.0)	-
Bike share (B-Cycle, other transit sharing options, etc.)	-	-	100.0% (1.0)	-	-
Infrastructure for alternative-fuel vehicles (Electric vehicle charging stations, etc.)	-	-	100.0% (1.0)	-	-

59 (5)

Public transit	80.0% (4.0)	20.0% (1.0)	-	-	-
On-street bicycling lanes	20.0% (1.0)	20.0% (1.0)	20.0% (1.0)	40.0% (2.0)	-
Off-street bike/pedestrian paths	-	20.0% (1.0)	-	60.0% (3.0)	20.0% (1.0)
Bike share (B-Cycle, other transit sharing options, etc.)	-	40.0% (2.0)	20.0% (1.0)	40.0% (2.0)	-
Infrastructure for alternative-fuel vehicles (Electric vehicle charging stations, etc.)	-	40.0% (2.0)	60.0% (3.0)	-	-

60 (3)

Public transit	-	66.7% (2.0)	-	-	33.3% (1.0)
On-street bicycling lanes	-	33.3% (1.0)	33.3% (1.0)	33.3% (1.0)	-
Off-street bike/pedestrian paths	-	33.3% (1.0)	33.3% (1.0)	-	33.3% (1.0)
Bike share (B-Cycle, other transit sharing options, etc.)	-	33.3% (1.0)	33.3% (1.0)	-	33.3% (1.0)
Infrastructure for alternative-fuel vehicles (Electric vehicle charging stations, etc.)	-	33.3% (1.0)	66.7% (2.0)	-	-

61 (1)

Public transit	-	-	100.0% (1.0)	-	-
On-street bicycling lanes	-	-	-	100.0% (1.0)	-
Off-street bike/pedestrian paths	-	-	100.0% (1.0)	-	-
Bike share (B-Cycle, other transit sharing options, etc.)	-	-	100.0% (1.0)	-	-
Infrastructure for alternative-fuel vehicles (Electric vehicle charging stations, etc.)	-	-	-	100.0% (1.0)	-

62 (5)

Public transit	-	-	80.0% (4.0)	20.0% (1.0)	-
On-street bicycling lanes	-	20.0% (1.0)	40.0% (2.0)	40.0% (2.0)	-
Off-street bike/pedestrian paths	-	-	20.0% (1.0)	60.0% (3.0)	20.0% (1.0)
Bike share (B-Cycle, other transit sharing options, etc.)	-	-	100.0% (5.0)	-	-
Infrastructure for alternative-fuel vehicles (Electric vehicle charging stations, etc.)	-	-	80.0% (4.0)	20.0% (1.0)	-

63 (2)

Public transit	-	-	50.0% (1.0)	50.0% (1.0)	-
On-street bicycling lanes	-	-	-	100.0% (2.0)	-
Off-street bike/pedestrian paths	-	-	-	50.0% (1.0)	50.0% (1.0)
Bike share (B-Cycle, other transit sharing options, etc.)	50.0% (1.0)	50.0% (1.0)	-	-	-
Infrastructure for alternative-fuel vehicles (Electric vehicle charging stations, etc.)	-	100.0% (2.0)	-	-	-

64 (5)

Public transit	20.0% (1.0)	20.0% (1.0)	60.0% (3.0)	-	-
On-street bicycling lanes	-	20.0% (1.0)	60.0% (3.0)	20.0% (1.0)	-
Off-street bike/pedestrian paths	-	20.0% (1.0)	40.0% (2.0)	20.0% (1.0)	20.0% (1.0)
Bike share (B-Cycle, other transit sharing options, etc.)	-	-	80.0% (4.0)	20.0% (1.0)	-
Infrastructure for alternative-fuel vehicles (Electric vehicle charging stations, etc.)	-	-	100.0% (5.0)	-	-

65 (2)

Public transit	-	100.0% (2.0)	-	-	-
----------------	---	--------------	---	---	---

On-street bicycling lanes	-	-	50.0% (1.0)	50.0% (1.0)	-
Off-street bike/pedestrian paths	-	-	50.0% (1.0)	50.0% (1.0)	-
Bike share (B-Cycle, other transit sharing options, etc.)	-	-	100.0% (2.0)	-	-
Infrastructure for alternative-fuel vehicles (Electric vehicle charging stations, etc.)	-	-	100.0% (2.0)	-	-

66 (2)

Public transit	50.0% (1.0)	50.0% (1.0)	-	-	-
On-street bicycling lanes	-	-	50.0% (1.0)	-	50.0% (1.0)
Off-street bike/pedestrian paths	-	-	-	50.0% (1.0)	50.0% (1.0)
Bike share (B-Cycle, other transit sharing options, etc.)	-	50.0% (1.0)	-	-	50.0% (1.0)
Infrastructure for alternative-fuel vehicles (Electric vehicle charging stations, etc.)	-	100.0% (2.0)	-	-	-

67 (1)

Public transit	-	-	100.0% (1.0)	-	-
On-street bicycling lanes	-	-	-	100.0% (1.0)	-
Off-street bike/pedestrian paths	-	-	-	100.0% (1.0)	-
Bike share (B-Cycle, other transit sharing options, etc.)	-	-	100.0% (1.0)	-	-
Infrastructure for alternative-fuel vehicles (Electric vehicle charging stations, etc.)	-	-	100.0% (1.0)	-	-

68 (3)

Public transit	33.3% (1.0)	-	33.3% (1.0)	33.3% (1.0)	-
On-street bicycling lanes	-	-	33.3% (1.0)	66.7% (2.0)	-
Off-street bike/pedestrian paths	-	-	-	100.0% (3.0)	-
Bike share (B-Cycle, other transit sharing options, etc.)	33.3% (1.0)	33.3% (1.0)	-	33.3% (1.0)	-
Infrastructure for alternative-fuel vehicles (Electric vehicle charging stations, etc.)	-	33.3% (1.0)	33.3% (1.0)	33.3% (1.0)	-

69 (2)

Public transit	-	50.0% (1.0)	-	50.0% (1.0)	-
On-street bicycling lanes	-	-	50.0% (1.0)	50.0% (1.0)	-
Off-street bike/pedestrian paths	-	-	-	100.0% (2.0)	-
Bike share (B-Cycle, other transit sharing options, etc.)	-	50.0% (1.0)	-	50.0% (1.0)	-
Infrastructure for alternative-fuel vehicles (Electric vehicle charging stations, etc.)	-	50.0% (1.0)	-	50.0% (1.0)	-

71 (2)

Public transit	-	-	50.0% (1.0)	50.0% (1.0)	-
On-street bicycling lanes	-	-	50.0% (1.0)	50.0% (1.0)	-
Off-street bike/pedestrian paths	-	50.0% (1.0)	50.0% (1.0)	-	-
Bike share (B-Cycle, other transit sharing options, etc.)	-	-	100.0% (2.0)	-	-
Infrastructure for alternative-fuel vehicles (Electric vehicle charging stations, etc.)	-	-	100.0% (2.0)	-	-

72 (3)

Public transit	-	33.3% (1.0)	33.3% (1.0)	33.3% (1.0)	-
On-street bicycling lanes	-	-	-	100.0% (3.0)	-
Off-street bike/pedestrian paths	-	-	-	66.7% (2.0)	33.3% (1.0)
Bike share (B-Cycle, other transit sharing options, etc.)	-	-	66.7% (2.0)	33.3% (1.0)	-
Infrastructure for alternative-fuel vehicles (Electric vehicle charging stations, etc.)	-	-	66.7% (2.0)	33.3% (1.0)	-

73 (3)

Public transit	33.3% (1.0)	33.3% (1.0)	-	-	33.3% (1.0)
On-street bicycling lanes	-	33.3% (1.0)	-	-	66.7% (2.0)
Off-street bike/pedestrian paths	-	66.7% (2.0)	-	-	33.3% (1.0)
Bike share (B-Cycle, other transit sharing options, etc.)	-	-	66.7% (2.0)	-	33.3% (1.0)
Infrastructure for alternative-fuel vehicles (Electric vehicle charging stations, etc.)	-	33.3% (1.0)	33.3% (1.0)	-	33.3% (1.0)

74 (4)

Public transit	25.0% (1.0)	-	50.0% (2.0)	25.0% (1.0)	-
On-street bicycling lanes	-	50.0% (2.0)	25.0% (1.0)	25.0% (1.0)	-

Off-street bike/pedestrian paths	-	-	25.0% (1.0)	50.0% (2.0)	25.0% (1.0)
Bike share (B-Cycle, other transit sharing options, etc.)	-	25.0% (1.0)	25.0% (1.0)	50.0% (2.0)	-
Infrastructure for alternative-fuel vehicles (Electric vehicle charging stations, etc.)	-	25.0% (1.0)	25.0% (1.0)	50.0% (2.0)	-

77 (2)

Public transit	-	50.0% (1.0)	50.0% (1.0)	-	-
On-street bicycling lanes	-	50.0% (1.0)	-	50.0% (1.0)	-
Off-street bike/pedestrian paths	-	-	-	-	100.0% (2.0)
Bike share (B-Cycle, other transit sharing options, etc.)	-	-	100.0% (2.0)	-	-
Infrastructure for alternative-fuel vehicles (Electric vehicle charging stations, etc.)	-	-	100.0% (2.0)	-	-

79 (2)

Public transit	100.0% (2.0)	-	-	-	-
On-street bicycling lanes	-	-	-	50.0% (1.0)	50.0% (1.0)
Off-street bike/pedestrian paths	-	-	-	50.0% (1.0)	50.0% (1.0)
Bike share (B-Cycle, other transit sharing options, etc.)	-	50.0% (1.0)	50.0% (1.0)	-	-
Infrastructure for alternative-fuel vehicles (Electric vehicle charging stations, etc.)	50.0% (1.0)	50.0% (1.0)	-	-	-

Unknown (68)

Public transit	13.2% (9.0)	22.1% (15.0)	54.4% (37.0)	7.4% (5.0)	2.9% (2.0)
On-street bicycling lanes	4.4% (3.0)	17.6% (12.0)	23.5% (16.0)	47.1% (32.0)	7.4% (5.0)
Off-street bike/pedestrian paths	-	10.3% (7.0)	16.2% (11.0)	51.5% (35.0)	22.1% (15.0)
Bike share (B-Cycle, other transit sharing options, etc.)	2.9% (2.0)	20.6% (14.0)	64.7% (44.0)	10.3% (7.0)	1.5% (1.0)
Infrastructure for alternative-fuel vehicles (Electric vehicle charging stations, etc.)	4.4% (3.0)	30.9% (21.0)	54.4% (37.0)	5.9% (4.0)	4.4% (3.0)

**STATE INCOME
DECILE**

187 REGISTERED VOTERS

	Very Unsatisfied	Unsatisfied	Neutral	Satisfied	Very Satisfied
0 to 9 Pct range (6)					
Public transit	16.7% (1.0)	16.7% (1.0)	50.0% (3.0)	16.7% (1.0)	-
On-street bicycling lanes	16.7% (1.0)	-	16.7% (1.0)	66.7% (4.0)	-
Off-street bike/pedestrian paths	-	-	-	66.7% (4.0)	33.3% (2.0)
Bike share (B-Cycle, other transit sharing options, etc.)	-	-	83.3% (5.0)	16.7% (1.0)	-
Infrastructure for alternative-fuel vehicles (Electric vehicle charging stations, etc.)	-	-	83.3% (5.0)	16.7% (1.0)	-

10 to 19 Pct range (1)

Public transit	-	-	-	100.0% (1.0)	-
On-street bicycling lanes	-	-	-	100.0% (1.0)	-
Off-street bike/pedestrian paths	-	-	-	100.0% (1.0)	-
Bike share (B-Cycle, other transit sharing options, etc.)	-	-	-	100.0% (1.0)	-
Infrastructure for alternative-fuel vehicles (Electric vehicle charging stations, etc.)	-	-	-	100.0% (1.0)	-

40 to 49 Pct range (2)

Public transit	-	50.0% (1.0)	-	50.0% (1.0)	-
On-street bicycling lanes	-	100.0% (2.0)	-	-	-
Off-street bike/pedestrian paths	-	100.0% (2.0)	-	-	-
Bike share (B-Cycle, other transit sharing options, etc.)	-	50.0% (1.0)	50.0% (1.0)	-	-
Infrastructure for alternative-fuel vehicles (Electric vehicle charging stations, etc.)	-	50.0% (1.0)	50.0% (1.0)	-	-

50 to 59 Pct range (9)

Public transit	11.1% (1.0)	44.4% (4.0)	33.3% (3.0)	-	11.1% (1.0)
On-street bicycling lanes	-	22.2% (2.0)	33.3% (3.0)	33.3% (3.0)	11.1% (1.0)
Off-street bike/pedestrian paths	-	-	22.2% (2.0)	66.7% (6.0)	11.1% (1.0)
Bike share (B-Cycle, other transit sharing options, etc.)	-	22.2% (2.0)	55.6% (5.0)	22.2% (2.0)	-
Infrastructure for alternative-fuel vehicles (Electric vehicle charging stations, etc.)	11.1% (1.0)	-	66.7% (6.0)	22.2% (2.0)	-

60 to 69 Pct range (7)

Public transit	14.3% (1.0)	14.3% (1.0)	42.9% (3.0)	14.3% (1.0)	14.3% (1.0)
On-street bicycling lanes	-	14.3% (1.0)	28.6% (2.0)	42.9% (3.0)	14.3% (1.0)
Off-street bike/pedestrian paths	-	-	28.6% (2.0)	42.9% (3.0)	28.6% (2.0)
Bike share (B-Cycle, other transit sharing options, etc.)	-	28.6% (2.0)	71.4% (5.0)	-	-
Infrastructure for alternative-fuel vehicles (Electric vehicle charging stations, etc.)	14.3% (1.0)	42.9% (3.0)	28.6% (2.0)	-	14.3% (1.0)

70 to 79 Pct range (5)

Public transit	40.0% (2.0)	20.0% (1.0)	20.0% (1.0)	-	20.0% (1.0)
On-street bicycling lanes	-	20.0% (1.0)	40.0% (2.0)	20.0% (1.0)	20.0% (1.0)
Off-street bike/pedestrian paths	-	20.0% (1.0)	40.0% (2.0)	20.0% (1.0)	20.0% (1.0)
Bike share (B-Cycle, other transit sharing options, etc.)	20.0% (1.0)	20.0% (1.0)	40.0% (2.0)	-	20.0% (1.0)
Infrastructure for alternative-fuel vehicles (Electric vehicle charging stations, etc.)	20.0% (1.0)	20.0% (1.0)	40.0% (2.0)	20.0% (1.0)	-

80 to 89 Pct range (70)

Public transit	11.4% (8.0)	30.0% (21.0)	45.7% (32.0)	11.4% (8.0)	1.4% (1.0)
On-street bicycling lanes	7.1% (5.0)	20.0% (14.0)	25.7% (18.0)	41.4% (29.0)	5.7% (4.0)
Off-street bike/pedestrian paths	-	11.4% (8.0)	17.1% (12.0)	47.1% (33.0)	24.3% (17.0)
Bike share (B-Cycle, other transit sharing options, etc.)	4.3% (3.0)	12.9% (9.0)	68.6% (48.0)	11.4% (8.0)	2.9% (2.0)
Infrastructure for alternative-fuel vehicles (Electric vehicle charging stations, etc.)	1.4% (1.0)	32.9% (23.0)	54.3% (38.0)	10.0% (7.0)	1.4% (1.0)

90 Pct and up (85)

Public transit	15.3% (13.0)	28.2% (24.0)	41.2% (35.0)	10.6% (9.0)	4.7% (4.0)
On-street bicycling lanes	1.2% (1.0)	15.3% (13.0)	29.4% (25.0)	41.2% (35.0)	12.9% (11.0)
Off-street bike/pedestrian paths	1.2% (1.0)	10.6% (9.0)	14.1% (12.0)	51.8% (44.0)	22.4% (19.0)
Bike share (B-Cycle, other transit sharing options, etc.)	5.9% (5.0)	23.5% (20.0)	52.9% (45.0)	10.6% (9.0)	7.1% (6.0)
Infrastructure for alternative-fuel vehicles (Electric vehicle charging stations, etc.)	5.9% (5.0)	20.0% (17.0)	63.5% (54.0)	5.9% (5.0)	4.7% (4.0)

Unknown (2)

Public transit	50.0% (1.0)	-	50.0% (1.0)	-	-
On-street bicycling lanes	-	50.0% (1.0)	-	50.0% (1.0)	-
Off-street bike/pedestrian paths	-	-	-	50.0% (1.0)	50.0% (1.0)
Bike share (B-Cycle, other transit sharing options, etc.)	-	50.0% (1.0)	-	50.0% (1.0)	-
Infrastructure for alternative-fuel vehicles (Electric vehicle charging stations, etc.)	-	50.0% (1.0)	50.0% (1.0)	-	-

HOME OWNER/RENTER

187 REGISTERED VOTERS

Very Unsatisfied Unsatisfied Neutral Satisfied Very Satisfied

Likely Homeowner (106)

Public transit	10.4% (11.0)	34.0% (36.0)	39.6% (42.0)	11.3% (12.0)	4.7% (5.0)
On-street bicycling lanes	0.9% (1.0)	17.9% (19.0)	25.5% (27.0)	43.4% (46.0)	12.3% (13.0)
Off-street bike/pedestrian paths	-	10.4% (11.0)	12.3% (13.0)	53.8% (57.0)	23.6% (25.0)
Bike share (B-Cycle, other transit sharing options, etc.)	3.8% (4.0)	24.5% (26.0)	55.7% (59.0)	11.3% (12.0)	4.7% (5.0)
Infrastructure for alternative-fuel vehicles (Electric vehicle charging stations, etc.)	4.7% (5.0)	26.4% (28.0)	58.5% (62.0)	7.5% (8.0)	2.8% (3.0)

Likely Renter (55)

Public transit	14.5% (8.0)	23.6% (13.0)	43.6% (24.0)	14.5% (8.0)	3.6% (2.0)
On-street bicycling lanes	7.3% (4.0)	16.4% (9.0)	29.1% (16.0)	40.0% (22.0)	7.3% (4.0)
Off-street bike/pedestrian paths	-	12.7% (7.0)	20.0% (11.0)	49.1% (27.0)	18.2% (10.0)
Bike share (B-Cycle, other transit sharing options, etc.)	7.3% (4.0)	9.1% (5.0)	69.1% (38.0)	9.1% (5.0)	5.5% (3.0)
Infrastructure for alternative-fuel vehicles (Electric vehicle charging stations, etc.)	3.6% (2.0)	20.0% (11.0)	60.0% (33.0)	14.5% (8.0)	1.8% (1.0)

Unknown (26)

Public transit	30.8% (8.0)	15.4% (4.0)	46.2% (12.0)	3.8% (1.0)	3.8% (1.0)
On-street bicycling lanes	7.7% (2.0)	23.1% (6.0)	30.8% (8.0)	34.6% (9.0)	3.8% (1.0)
Off-street bike/pedestrian paths	3.8% (1.0)	7.7% (2.0)	23.1% (6.0)	34.6% (9.0)	30.8% (8.0)

Bike share (B-Cycle, other transit sharing options, etc.)	3.8% (1.0)	19.2% (5.0)	53.8% (14.0)	19.2% (5.0)	3.8% (1.0)
Infrastructure for alternative-fuel vehicles (Electric vehicle charging stations, etc.)	7.7% (2.0)	26.9% (7.0)	53.8% (14.0)	3.8% (1.0)	7.7% (2.0)

Please rate your level of satisfaction with the following sustainability efforts in Fitchburg:

CURRENT RESULTS					303 Total Responses
	Very Unsatisfied	Unsatisfied	Neutral	Satisfied	Very Satisfied
Locally-produced renewable energy	5% (15)	21% (63)	55% (166)	16% (48)	4% (11)
Waste/recycling collection	5% (14)	14% (43)	20% (62)	47% (143)	14% (41)
Managing flooding and stormwater	10% (31)	18% (54)	33% (101)	34% (102)	5% (15)
Access to nature	1% (4)	10% (30)	17% (51)	53% (162)	18% (56)

REGISTERED (181)					
	Very Unsatisfied	Unsatisfied	Neutral	Satisfied	Very Satisfied
Locally-produced renewable energy	6.0% (11)	21.0% (38)	54.0% (98)	16.0% (29)	3.0% (5)
Waste/recycling collection	3.0% (6)	17.0% (31)	23.0% (42)	46.0% (83)	10.0% (19)
Managing flooding and stormwater	7.0% (12)	19.0% (35)	35.0% (64)	33.0% (60)	6.0% (10)
Access to nature	1.0% (2)	9.0% (16)	17.0% (31)	56.0% (101)	17.0% (31)

NON-REGISTERED (122)					
	Very Unsatisfied	Unsatisfied	Neutral	Satisfied	Very Satisfied
Locally-produced renewable energy	3.3% (4)	20.5% (25)	55.7% (68)	15.6% (19)	4.9% (6)
Waste/recycling collection	6.6% (8)	9.8% (12)	16.4% (20)	49.2% (60)	18.0% (22)
Managing flooding and stormwater	15.6% (19)	15.6% (19)	30.3% (37)	34.4% (42)	4.1% (5)
Access to nature	1.6% (2)	11.5% (14)	16.4% (20)	50.0% (61)	20.5% (25)

ALL RESPONDENTS (303)					
	Very Unsatisfied	Unsatisfied	Neutral	Satisfied	Very Satisfied
Locally-produced renewable energy	5% (15)	21% (63)	55% (166)	16% (48)	4% (11)
Waste/recycling collection	5% (14)	14% (43)	20% (62)	47% (143)	14% (41)
Managing flooding and stormwater	10% (31)	18% (54)	33% (101)	34% (102)	5% (15)
Access to nature	1% (4)	10% (30)	17% (51)	53% (162)	18% (56)

REGISTERED VOTERS IN FITCHBURG, WI (181)					
	Very Unsatisfied	Unsatisfied	Neutral	Satisfied	Very Satisfied
Locally-produced renewable energy	6% (11)	21% (38)	54% (98)	16% (29)	3% (5)
Waste/recycling collection	3% (6)	17% (31)	23% (42)	46% (83)	10% (19)
Managing flooding and stormwater	7% (12)	19% (35)	35% (64)	33% (60)	6% (10)
Access to nature	1% (2)	9% (16)	17% (31)	56% (101)	17% (31)

LIVE IN FITCHBURG, WI (267) - SELF-REPORTED					
	Very Unsatisfied	Unsatisfied	Neutral	Satisfied	Very Satisfied
Locally-produced renewable energy	5% (14)	21% (55)	57% (151)	15% (39)	3% (8)
Waste/recycling collection	4% (11)	14% (38)	22% (59)	47% (126)	12% (33)
Managing flooding and stormwater	9% (25)	18% (48)	34% (90)	34% (92)	4% (12)
Access to nature	1% (4)	9% (23)	17% (46)	55% (148)	17% (46)

SUBSCRIBERS TO FITCHBURG, WI (271)					
	Very Unsatisfied	Unsatisfied	Neutral	Satisfied	Very Satisfied
Locally-produced renewable energy	5% (14)	21% (56)	56% (152)	15% (40)	3% (9)
Waste/recycling collection	4% (11)	14% (38)	23% (61)	46% (126)	13% (35)
Managing flooding and stormwater	9% (25)	18% (48)	34% (93)	34% (92)	5% (13)
Access to nature	1% (4)	9% (24)	18% (48)	55% (148)	17% (47)

REGISTER RESPONDENTS FROM ANYWHERE (187)					
---	--	--	--	--	--

	Very Unsatisfied	Unsatisfied	Neutral	Satisfied	Very Satisfied
Locally-produced renewable energy	6% (11)	22% (42)	53% (100)	16% (29)	3% (5)
Waste/recycling collection	3% (6)	17% (32)	24% (44)	45% (85)	11% (20)
Managing flooding and stormwater	6% (12)	19% (36)	35% (66)	34% (63)	5% (10)
Access to nature	1% (2)	10% (18)	17% (32)	55% (102)	18% (33)

EDUCATION

187 REGISTERED VOTERS

	Very Unsatisfied	Unsatisfied	Neutral	Satisfied	Very Satisfied
--	------------------	-------------	---------	-----------	----------------

Bach Degree - Extremely Likely (30)

Locally-produced renewable energy	-	26.7% (8.0)	53.3% (16.0)	13.3% (4.0)	6.7% (2.0)
Waste/recycling collection	3.3% (1.0)	10.0% (3.0)	23.3% (7.0)	46.7% (14.0)	16.7% (5.0)
Managing flooding and stormwater	3.3% (1.0)	16.7% (5.0)	43.3% (13.0)	30.0% (9.0)	6.7% (2.0)
Access to nature	-	3.3% (1.0)	16.7% (5.0)	53.3% (16.0)	26.7% (8.0)

Bach Degree - Likely (21)

Locally-produced renewable energy	4.8% (1.0)	19.0% (4.0)	61.9% (13.0)	14.3% (3.0)	-
Waste/recycling collection	4.8% (1.0)	19.0% (4.0)	23.8% (5.0)	42.9% (9.0)	9.5% (2.0)
Managing flooding and stormwater	19.0% (4.0)	4.8% (1.0)	38.1% (8.0)	33.3% (7.0)	4.8% (1.0)
Access to nature	-	9.5% (2.0)	19.0% (4.0)	47.6% (10.0)	23.8% (5.0)

Grad Degree - Extremely Likely (22)

Locally-produced renewable energy	-	31.8% (7.0)	40.9% (9.0)	22.7% (5.0)	4.5% (1.0)
Waste/recycling collection	-	22.7% (5.0)	13.6% (3.0)	50.0% (11.0)	13.6% (3.0)
Managing flooding and stormwater	4.5% (1.0)	18.2% (4.0)	40.9% (9.0)	31.8% (7.0)	4.5% (1.0)
Access to nature	4.5% (1.0)	4.5% (1.0)	22.7% (5.0)	50.0% (11.0)	18.2% (4.0)

Grad Degree - Likely (13)

Locally-produced renewable energy	15.4% (2.0)	23.1% (3.0)	53.8% (7.0)	7.7% (1.0)	-
Waste/recycling collection	-	30.8% (4.0)	15.4% (2.0)	46.2% (6.0)	7.7% (1.0)
Managing flooding and stormwater	-	38.5% (5.0)	15.4% (2.0)	38.5% (5.0)	7.7% (1.0)
Access to nature	-	-	30.8% (4.0)	61.5% (8.0)	7.7% (1.0)

HS Diploma - Extremely Likely (9)

Locally-produced renewable energy	-	33.3% (3.0)	66.7% (6.0)	-	-
Waste/recycling collection	-	11.1% (1.0)	33.3% (3.0)	44.4% (4.0)	11.1% (1.0)
Managing flooding and stormwater	11.1% (1.0)	-	33.3% (3.0)	55.6% (5.0)	-
Access to nature	11.1% (1.0)	11.1% (1.0)	22.2% (2.0)	55.6% (5.0)	-

HS Diploma - Likely (4)

Locally-produced renewable energy	-	-	100.0% (4.0)	-	-
Waste/recycling collection	-	-	25.0% (1.0)	75.0% (3.0)	-
Managing flooding and stormwater	-	-	75.0% (3.0)	-	25.0% (1.0)
Access to nature	-	-	-	100.0% (4.0)	-

Less than HS Diploma - Likely (1)

Locally-produced renewable energy	-	-	100.0% (1.0)	-	-
Waste/recycling collection	-	100.0% (1.0)	-	-	-
Managing flooding and stormwater	-	100.0% (1.0)	-	-	-
Access to nature	-	-	-	100.0% (1.0)	-

Some College - Likely (12)

Locally-produced renewable energy	25.0% (3.0)	8.3% (1.0)	58.3% (7.0)	8.3% (1.0)	-
Waste/recycling collection	8.3% (1.0)	8.3% (1.0)	50.0% (6.0)	33.3% (4.0)	-
Managing flooding and stormwater	-	25.0% (3.0)	33.3% (4.0)	41.7% (5.0)	-
Access to nature	-	16.7% (2.0)	25.0% (3.0)	33.3% (4.0)	25.0% (3.0)

Some College -Extremely Likely (5)

Locally-produced renewable energy	-	40.0% (2.0)	40.0% (2.0)	20.0% (1.0)	-
Waste/recycling collection	-	-	20.0% (1.0)	60.0% (3.0)	20.0% (1.0)
Managing flooding and stormwater	-	40.0% (2.0)	20.0% (1.0)	20.0% (1.0)	20.0% (1.0)
Access to nature	-	20.0% (1.0)	-	60.0% (3.0)	20.0% (1.0)

Unknown (70)

Locally-produced renewable energy	7.1% (5.0)	20.0% (14.0)	50.0% (35.0)	20.0% (14.0)	2.9% (2.0)
Waste/recycling collection	4.3% (3.0)	18.6% (13.0)	22.9% (16.0)	44.3% (31.0)	10.0% (7.0)
Managing flooding and stormwater	7.1% (5.0)	21.4% (15.0)	32.9% (23.0)	34.3% (24.0)	4.3% (3.0)
Access to nature	-	14.3% (10.0)	12.9% (9.0)	57.1% (40.0)	15.7% (11.0)

VOTERS GENDER

187 REGISTERED VOTERS

	Very Unsatisfied	Unsatisfied	Neutral	Satisfied	Very Satisfied
--	------------------	-------------	---------	-----------	----------------

F (90)

Locally-produced renewable energy	5.6% (5.0)	23.3% (21.0)	58.9% (53.0)	11.1% (10.0)	1.1% (1.0)
Waste/recycling collection	2.2% (2.0)	16.7% (15.0)	20.0% (18.0)	48.9% (44.0)	12.2% (11.0)
Managing flooding and stormwater	3.3% (3.0)	20.0% (18.0)	35.6% (32.0)	35.6% (32.0)	5.6% (5.0)
Access to nature	-	5.6% (5.0)	17.8% (16.0)	55.6% (50.0)	21.1% (19.0)

M (95)

Locally-produced renewable energy	6.3% (6.0)	21.1% (20.0)	49.5% (47.0)	18.9% (18.0)	4.2% (4.0)
Waste/recycling collection	4.2% (4.0)	16.8% (16.0)	27.4% (26.0)	42.1% (40.0)	9.5% (9.0)
Managing flooding and stormwater	9.5% (9.0)	17.9% (17.0)	35.8% (34.0)	31.6% (30.0)	5.3% (5.0)
Access to nature	2.1% (2.0)	13.7% (13.0)	16.8% (16.0)	52.6% (50.0)	14.7% (14.0)

Unknown (2)

Locally-produced renewable energy	-	50.0% (1.0)	-	50.0% (1.0)	-
Waste/recycling collection	-	50.0% (1.0)	-	50.0% (1.0)	-
Managing flooding and stormwater	-	50.0% (1.0)	-	50.0% (1.0)	-
Access to nature	-	-	-	100.0% (2.0)	-

PRECINCT

187 REGISTERED VOTERS

	Very Unsatisfied	Unsatisfied	Neutral	Satisfied	Very Satisfied
--	------------------	-------------	---------	-----------	----------------

CHICAGO 43-04 (1)

Locally-produced renewable energy	-	100.0% (1.0)	-	-	-
Waste/recycling collection	-	-	-	100.0% (1.0)	-
Managing flooding and stormwater	-	-	-	100.0% (1.0)	-
Access to nature	-	-	-	-	100.0% (1.0)

FITCHBURG CITY WARD 01 (9)

Locally-produced renewable energy	11.1% (1.0)	-	77.8% (7.0)	11.1% (1.0)	-
Waste/recycling collection	11.1% (1.0)	11.1% (1.0)	22.2% (2.0)	55.6% (5.0)	-
Managing flooding and stormwater	-	22.2% (2.0)	55.6% (5.0)	22.2% (2.0)	-
Access to nature	-	33.3% (3.0)	11.1% (1.0)	55.6% (5.0)	-

FITCHBURG CITY WARD 02 (3)

Locally-produced renewable energy	33.3% (1.0)	-	33.3% (1.0)	-	33.3% (1.0)
Waste/recycling collection	-	33.3% (1.0)	-	-	66.7% (2.0)
Managing flooding and stormwater	-	33.3% (1.0)	-	66.7% (2.0)	-
Access to nature	-	33.3% (1.0)	-	66.7% (2.0)	-

FITCHBURG CITY WARD 04 (2)

Locally-produced renewable energy	-	50.0% (1.0)	50.0% (1.0)	-	-
-----------------------------------	---	-------------	-------------	---	---

Waste/recycling collection	-	-	50.0% (1.0)	50.0% (1.0)	-
Managing flooding and stormwater	-	50.0% (1.0)	-	50.0% (1.0)	-
Access to nature	-	-	-	50.0% (1.0)	50.0% (1.0)
FITCHBURG CITY WARD 05 (6)					
Locally-produced renewable energy	-	16.7% (1.0)	66.7% (4.0)	-	16.7% (1.0)
Waste/recycling collection	-	-	33.3% (2.0)	50.0% (3.0)	16.7% (1.0)
Managing flooding and stormwater	-	16.7% (1.0)	33.3% (2.0)	16.7% (1.0)	33.3% (2.0)
Access to nature	-	-	33.3% (2.0)	16.7% (1.0)	50.0% (3.0)
FITCHBURG CITY WARD 06 (12)					
Locally-produced renewable energy	-	16.7% (2.0)	66.7% (8.0)	8.3% (1.0)	8.3% (1.0)
Waste/recycling collection	-	16.7% (2.0)	33.3% (4.0)	33.3% (4.0)	16.7% (2.0)
Managing flooding and stormwater	-	8.3% (1.0)	50.0% (6.0)	33.3% (4.0)	8.3% (1.0)
Access to nature	-	-	16.7% (2.0)	50.0% (6.0)	33.3% (4.0)
FITCHBURG CITY WARD 07 (18)					
Locally-produced renewable energy	5.6% (1.0)	16.7% (3.0)	55.6% (10.0)	16.7% (3.0)	5.6% (1.0)
Waste/recycling collection	5.6% (1.0)	16.7% (3.0)	22.2% (4.0)	33.3% (6.0)	22.2% (4.0)
Managing flooding and stormwater	-	5.6% (1.0)	33.3% (6.0)	44.4% (8.0)	16.7% (3.0)
Access to nature	-	11.1% (2.0)	11.1% (2.0)	55.6% (10.0)	22.2% (4.0)
FITCHBURG CITY WARD 08 (14)					
Locally-produced renewable energy	14.3% (2.0)	21.4% (3.0)	50.0% (7.0)	14.3% (2.0)	-
Waste/recycling collection	7.1% (1.0)	-	28.6% (4.0)	64.3% (9.0)	-
Managing flooding and stormwater	14.3% (2.0)	14.3% (2.0)	35.7% (5.0)	28.6% (4.0)	7.1% (1.0)
Access to nature	7.1% (1.0)	7.1% (1.0)	7.1% (1.0)	64.3% (9.0)	14.3% (2.0)
FITCHBURG CITY WARD 09 (8)					
Locally-produced renewable energy	12.5% (1.0)	37.5% (3.0)	37.5% (3.0)	12.5% (1.0)	-
Waste/recycling collection	12.5% (1.0)	37.5% (3.0)	12.5% (1.0)	25.0% (2.0)	12.5% (1.0)
Managing flooding and stormwater	12.5% (1.0)	25.0% (2.0)	37.5% (3.0)	25.0% (2.0)	-
Access to nature	-	12.5% (1.0)	12.5% (1.0)	62.5% (5.0)	12.5% (1.0)
FITCHBURG CITY WARD 12 (2)					
Locally-produced renewable energy	50.0% (1.0)	-	50.0% (1.0)	-	-
Waste/recycling collection	-	-	50.0% (1.0)	50.0% (1.0)	-
Managing flooding and stormwater	-	-	50.0% (1.0)	50.0% (1.0)	-
Access to nature	-	-	-	50.0% (1.0)	50.0% (1.0)
FITCHBURG CITY WARD 13 (31)					
Locally-produced renewable energy	9.7% (3.0)	22.6% (7.0)	61.3% (19.0)	6.5% (2.0)	-
Waste/recycling collection	3.2% (1.0)	22.6% (7.0)	16.1% (5.0)	41.9% (13.0)	16.1% (5.0)
Managing flooding and stormwater	3.2% (1.0)	22.6% (7.0)	41.9% (13.0)	29.0% (9.0)	3.2% (1.0)
Access to nature	-	6.5% (2.0)	16.1% (5.0)	54.8% (17.0)	22.6% (7.0)
FITCHBURG CITY WARD 14 (19)					
Locally-produced renewable energy	5.3% (1.0)	26.3% (5.0)	42.1% (8.0)	26.3% (5.0)	-
Waste/recycling collection	-	21.1% (4.0)	36.8% (7.0)	42.1% (8.0)	-
Managing flooding and stormwater	-	26.3% (5.0)	36.8% (7.0)	36.8% (7.0)	-
Access to nature	-	5.3% (1.0)	31.6% (6.0)	52.6% (10.0)	10.5% (2.0)
FITCHBURG CITY WARD 15 (7)					
Locally-produced renewable energy	-	-	71.4% (5.0)	28.6% (2.0)	-
Waste/recycling collection	-	-	28.6% (2.0)	57.1% (4.0)	14.3% (1.0)
Managing flooding and stormwater	14.3% (1.0)	14.3% (1.0)	14.3% (1.0)	42.9% (3.0)	14.3% (1.0)
Access to nature	14.3% (1.0)	-	-	85.7% (6.0)	-

FITCHBURG CITY WARD 16 (3)

Locally-produced renewable energy	-	-	66.7% (2.0)	33.3% (1.0)	-
Waste/recycling collection	-	-	33.3% (1.0)	66.7% (2.0)	-
Managing flooding and stormwater	33.3% (1.0)	33.3% (1.0)	-	33.3% (1.0)	-
Access to nature	-	33.3% (1.0)	-	66.7% (2.0)	-

FITCHBURG CITY WARD 17 (7)

Locally-produced renewable energy	-	42.9% (3.0)	42.9% (3.0)	14.3% (1.0)	-
Waste/recycling collection	-	-	28.6% (2.0)	71.4% (5.0)	-
Managing flooding and stormwater	-	28.6% (2.0)	28.6% (2.0)	42.9% (3.0)	-
Access to nature	-	28.6% (2.0)	-	42.9% (3.0)	28.6% (2.0)

FITCHBURG CITY WARD 18 (12)

Locally-produced renewable energy	-	41.7% (5.0)	50.0% (6.0)	8.3% (1.0)	-
Waste/recycling collection	-	41.7% (5.0)	8.3% (1.0)	41.7% (5.0)	8.3% (1.0)
Managing flooding and stormwater	8.3% (1.0)	25.0% (3.0)	33.3% (4.0)	33.3% (4.0)	-
Access to nature	-	-	41.7% (5.0)	41.7% (5.0)	16.7% (2.0)

FITCHBURG CITY WARD 19 (26)

Locally-produced renewable energy	-	19.2% (5.0)	42.3% (11.0)	34.6% (9.0)	3.8% (1.0)
Waste/recycling collection	3.8% (1.0)	19.2% (5.0)	15.4% (4.0)	53.8% (14.0)	7.7% (2.0)
Managing flooding and stormwater	19.2% (5.0)	19.2% (5.0)	30.8% (8.0)	26.9% (7.0)	3.8% (1.0)
Access to nature	-	7.7% (2.0)	19.2% (5.0)	65.4% (17.0)	7.7% (2.0)

MADISON CITY WARD 042 (1)

Locally-produced renewable energy	-	100.0% (1.0)	-	-	-
Waste/recycling collection	-	-	-	100.0% (1.0)	-
Managing flooding and stormwater	-	-	-	100.0% (1.0)	-
Access to nature	-	-	-	100.0% (1.0)	-

MADISON CITY WARD 053 (1)

Locally-produced renewable energy	-	-	100.0% (1.0)	-	-
Waste/recycling collection	-	100.0% (1.0)	-	-	-
Managing flooding and stormwater	-	100.0% (1.0)	-	-	-
Access to nature	-	-	-	-	100.0% (1.0)

MADISON CITY WARD 100 (1)

Locally-produced renewable energy	-	-	100.0% (1.0)	-	-
Waste/recycling collection	-	-	100.0% (1.0)	-	-
Managing flooding and stormwater	-	-	100.0% (1.0)	-	-
Access to nature	-	-	100.0% (1.0)	-	-

MADISON CITY WARD 107 (1)

Locally-produced renewable energy	-	100.0% (1.0)	-	-	-
Waste/recycling collection	-	-	100.0% (1.0)	-	-
Managing flooding and stormwater	-	-	100.0% (1.0)	-	-
Access to nature	-	100.0% (1.0)	-	-	-

MIDDLETON TOWN WARD 7 (1)

Locally-produced renewable energy	-	-	100.0% (1.0)	-	-
Waste/recycling collection	-	-	100.0% (1.0)	-	-
Managing flooding and stormwater	-	-	100.0% (1.0)	-	-
Access to nature	-	-	100.0% (1.0)	-	-

MOUNT HOREB VLG WARD 3 (1)

Locally-produced renewable energy	-	100.0% (1.0)	-	-	-
Waste/recycling collection	-	-	-	-	100.0% (1.0)
Managing flooding and stormwater	-	-	-	100.0% (1.0)	-
Access to nature	-	100.0% (1.0)	-	-	-
OREGON VLG WARD 10 (1)					
Locally-produced renewable energy	-	-	100.0% (1.0)	-	-
Waste/recycling collection	-	-	-	100.0% (1.0)	-
Managing flooding and stormwater	-	-	-	100.0% (1.0)	-
Access to nature	-	-	-	100.0% (1.0)	-
AGE RANGE					
					187 REGISTERED VOTERS
	Very Unsatisfied	Unsatisfied	Neutral	Satisfied	Very Satisfied
18-29 (1)					
Locally-produced renewable energy	-	-	100.0% (1.0)	-	-
Waste/recycling collection	-	100.0% (1.0)	-	-	-
Managing flooding and stormwater	-	-	100.0% (1.0)	-	-
Access to nature	-	-	-	100.0% (1.0)	-
30-39 (24)					
Locally-produced renewable energy	16.7% (4.0)	16.7% (4.0)	45.8% (11.0)	16.7% (4.0)	4.2% (1.0)
Waste/recycling collection	4.2% (1.0)	16.7% (4.0)	33.3% (8.0)	29.2% (7.0)	16.7% (4.0)
Managing flooding and stormwater	-	25.0% (6.0)	37.5% (9.0)	33.3% (8.0)	4.2% (1.0)
Access to nature	-	8.3% (2.0)	16.7% (4.0)	54.2% (13.0)	20.8% (5.0)
40-49 (29)					
Locally-produced renewable energy	3.4% (1.0)	27.6% (8.0)	48.3% (14.0)	13.8% (4.0)	6.9% (2.0)
Waste/recycling collection	6.9% (2.0)	17.2% (5.0)	31.0% (9.0)	37.9% (11.0)	6.9% (2.0)
Managing flooding and stormwater	6.9% (2.0)	24.1% (7.0)	48.3% (14.0)	13.8% (4.0)	6.9% (2.0)
Access to nature	-	13.8% (4.0)	17.2% (5.0)	51.7% (15.0)	17.2% (5.0)
50-59 (23)					
Locally-produced renewable energy	-	17.4% (4.0)	73.9% (17.0)	8.7% (2.0)	-
Waste/recycling collection	4.3% (1.0)	17.4% (4.0)	21.7% (5.0)	39.1% (9.0)	17.4% (4.0)
Managing flooding and stormwater	8.7% (2.0)	17.4% (4.0)	43.5% (10.0)	26.1% (6.0)	4.3% (1.0)
Access to nature	4.3% (1.0)	13.0% (3.0)	13.0% (3.0)	52.2% (12.0)	17.4% (4.0)
60-69 (26)					
Locally-produced renewable energy	3.8% (1.0)	34.6% (9.0)	46.2% (12.0)	11.5% (3.0)	3.8% (1.0)
Waste/recycling collection	-	19.2% (5.0)	19.2% (5.0)	50.0% (13.0)	11.5% (3.0)
Managing flooding and stormwater	7.7% (2.0)	19.2% (5.0)	26.9% (7.0)	42.3% (11.0)	3.8% (1.0)
Access to nature	3.8% (1.0)	-	23.1% (6.0)	50.0% (13.0)	23.1% (6.0)
70-79 (16)					
Locally-produced renewable energy	-	31.3% (5.0)	37.5% (6.0)	25.0% (4.0)	6.3% (1.0)
Waste/recycling collection	-	12.5% (2.0)	18.8% (3.0)	50.0% (8.0)	18.8% (3.0)
Managing flooding and stormwater	6.3% (1.0)	12.5% (2.0)	25.0% (4.0)	50.0% (8.0)	6.3% (1.0)
Access to nature	-	6.3% (1.0)	12.5% (2.0)	62.5% (10.0)	18.8% (3.0)
unknown (68)					
Locally-produced renewable energy	7.4% (5.0)	17.6% (12.0)	57.4% (39.0)	17.6% (12.0)	-
Waste/recycling collection	2.9% (2.0)	16.2% (11.0)	20.6% (14.0)	54.4% (37.0)	5.9% (4.0)
Managing flooding and stormwater	7.4% (5.0)	17.6% (12.0)	30.9% (21.0)	38.2% (26.0)	5.9% (4.0)
Access to nature	-	11.8% (8.0)	17.6% (12.0)	55.9% (38.0)	14.7% (10.0)

	Very Unsatisfied	Unsatisfied	Neutral	Satisfied	Very Satisfied
28 (1)					
Locally-produced renewable energy	-	-	100.0% (1.0)	-	-
Waste/recycling collection	-	100.0% (1.0)	-	-	-
Managing flooding and stormwater	-	-	100.0% (1.0)	-	-
Access to nature	-	-	-	100.0% (1.0)	-
31 (1)					
Locally-produced renewable energy	-	100.0% (1.0)	-	-	-
Waste/recycling collection	-	100.0% (1.0)	-	-	-
Managing flooding and stormwater	-	-	100.0% (1.0)	-	-
Access to nature	-	100.0% (1.0)	-	-	-
32 (1)					
Locally-produced renewable energy	-	-	100.0% (1.0)	-	-
Waste/recycling collection	-	-	100.0% (1.0)	-	-
Managing flooding and stormwater	-	-	100.0% (1.0)	-	-
Access to nature	-	-	-	100.0% (1.0)	-
33 (1)					
Locally-produced renewable energy	-	-	100.0% (1.0)	-	-
Waste/recycling collection	-	-	-	100.0% (1.0)	-
Managing flooding and stormwater	-	100.0% (1.0)	-	-	-
Access to nature	-	-	-	100.0% (1.0)	-
34 (1)					
Locally-produced renewable energy	100.0% (1.0)	-	-	-	-
Waste/recycling collection	-	-	100.0% (1.0)	-	-
Managing flooding and stormwater	-	-	100.0% (1.0)	-	-
Access to nature	-	-	-	-	100.0% (1.0)
35 (5)					
Locally-produced renewable energy	20.0% (1.0)	-	20.0% (1.0)	40.0% (2.0)	20.0% (1.0)
Waste/recycling collection	-	20.0% (1.0)	-	40.0% (2.0)	40.0% (2.0)
Managing flooding and stormwater	-	20.0% (1.0)	20.0% (1.0)	60.0% (3.0)	-
Access to nature	-	-	-	80.0% (4.0)	20.0% (1.0)
36 (3)					
Locally-produced renewable energy	-	33.3% (1.0)	66.7% (2.0)	-	-
Waste/recycling collection	-	66.7% (2.0)	-	33.3% (1.0)	-
Managing flooding and stormwater	-	33.3% (1.0)	-	66.7% (2.0)	-
Access to nature	-	33.3% (1.0)	33.3% (1.0)	33.3% (1.0)	-
37 (5)					
Locally-produced renewable energy	20.0% (1.0)	-	80.0% (4.0)	-	-
Waste/recycling collection	20.0% (1.0)	-	60.0% (3.0)	20.0% (1.0)	-
Managing flooding and stormwater	-	-	60.0% (3.0)	40.0% (2.0)	-
Access to nature	-	-	40.0% (2.0)	40.0% (2.0)	20.0% (1.0)
38 (3)					
Locally-produced renewable energy	-	33.3% (1.0)	66.7% (2.0)	-	-
Waste/recycling collection	-	-	100.0% (3.0)	-	-
Managing flooding and stormwater	-	66.7% (2.0)	33.3% (1.0)	-	-
Access to nature	-	-	33.3% (1.0)	66.7% (2.0)	-

39 (4)

Locally-produced renewable energy	25.0% (1.0)	25.0% (1.0)	-	50.0% (2.0)	-
Waste/recycling collection	-	-	-	50.0% (2.0)	50.0% (2.0)
Managing flooding and stormwater	-	25.0% (1.0)	25.0% (1.0)	25.0% (1.0)	25.0% (1.0)
Access to nature	-	-	-	50.0% (2.0)	50.0% (2.0)

40 (3)

Locally-produced renewable energy	-	33.3% (1.0)	66.7% (2.0)	-	-
Waste/recycling collection	-	33.3% (1.0)	33.3% (1.0)	33.3% (1.0)	-
Managing flooding and stormwater	-	33.3% (1.0)	66.7% (2.0)	-	-
Access to nature	-	-	-	100.0% (3.0)	-

41 (3)

Locally-produced renewable energy	-	66.7% (2.0)	33.3% (1.0)	-	-
Waste/recycling collection	-	66.7% (2.0)	-	33.3% (1.0)	-
Managing flooding and stormwater	-	66.7% (2.0)	-	33.3% (1.0)	-
Access to nature	-	33.3% (1.0)	-	66.7% (2.0)	-

43 (5)

Locally-produced renewable energy	20.0% (1.0)	-	40.0% (2.0)	40.0% (2.0)	-
Waste/recycling collection	20.0% (1.0)	-	20.0% (1.0)	60.0% (3.0)	-
Managing flooding and stormwater	20.0% (1.0)	20.0% (1.0)	40.0% (2.0)	20.0% (1.0)	-
Access to nature	-	20.0% (1.0)	40.0% (2.0)	20.0% (1.0)	20.0% (1.0)

44 (6)

Locally-produced renewable energy	-	33.3% (2.0)	33.3% (2.0)	16.7% (1.0)	16.7% (1.0)
Waste/recycling collection	16.7% (1.0)	-	33.3% (2.0)	33.3% (2.0)	16.7% (1.0)
Managing flooding and stormwater	16.7% (1.0)	16.7% (1.0)	33.3% (2.0)	16.7% (1.0)	16.7% (1.0)
Access to nature	-	-	-	83.3% (5.0)	16.7% (1.0)

45 (2)

Locally-produced renewable energy	-	50.0% (1.0)	50.0% (1.0)	-	-
Waste/recycling collection	-	100.0% (2.0)	-	-	-
Managing flooding and stormwater	-	-	100.0% (2.0)	-	-
Access to nature	-	-	50.0% (1.0)	-	50.0% (1.0)

46 (1)

Locally-produced renewable energy	-	-	-	100.0% (1.0)	-
Waste/recycling collection	-	-	100.0% (1.0)	-	-
Managing flooding and stormwater	-	-	100.0% (1.0)	-	-
Access to nature	-	-	100.0% (1.0)	-	-

47 (3)

Locally-produced renewable energy	-	33.3% (1.0)	66.7% (2.0)	-	-
Waste/recycling collection	-	-	66.7% (2.0)	33.3% (1.0)	-
Managing flooding and stormwater	-	-	100.0% (3.0)	-	-
Access to nature	-	-	33.3% (1.0)	66.7% (2.0)	-

48 (2)

Locally-produced renewable energy	-	-	50.0% (1.0)	-	50.0% (1.0)
Waste/recycling collection	-	-	50.0% (1.0)	-	50.0% (1.0)
Managing flooding and stormwater	-	50.0% (1.0)	-	-	50.0% (1.0)
Access to nature	-	50.0% (1.0)	-	-	50.0% (1.0)

49 (4)

Locally-produced renewable energy	-	25.0% (1.0)	75.0% (3.0)	-	-
-----------------------------------	---	-------------	-------------	---	---

Waste/recycling collection	-	-	25.0% (1.0)	75.0% (3.0)	-
Managing flooding and stormwater	-	25.0% (1.0)	50.0% (2.0)	25.0% (1.0)	-
Access to nature	-	25.0% (1.0)	-	50.0% (2.0)	25.0% (1.0)
50 (1)					
Locally-produced renewable energy	-	-	100.0% (1.0)	-	-
Waste/recycling collection	-	-	-	100.0% (1.0)	-
Managing flooding and stormwater	-	-	100.0% (1.0)	-	-
Access to nature	-	-	100.0% (1.0)	-	-
51 (1)					
Locally-produced renewable energy	-	-	100.0% (1.0)	-	-
Waste/recycling collection	100.0% (1.0)	-	-	-	-
Managing flooding and stormwater	100.0% (1.0)	-	-	-	-
Access to nature	-	-	-	100.0% (1.0)	-
52 (5)					
Locally-produced renewable energy	-	-	80.0% (4.0)	20.0% (1.0)	-
Waste/recycling collection	-	40.0% (2.0)	20.0% (1.0)	40.0% (2.0)	-
Managing flooding and stormwater	-	20.0% (1.0)	60.0% (3.0)	20.0% (1.0)	-
Access to nature	-	-	20.0% (1.0)	80.0% (4.0)	-
53 (4)					
Locally-produced renewable energy	-	-	100.0% (4.0)	-	-
Waste/recycling collection	-	-	25.0% (1.0)	50.0% (2.0)	25.0% (1.0)
Managing flooding and stormwater	25.0% (1.0)	-	50.0% (2.0)	25.0% (1.0)	-
Access to nature	-	25.0% (1.0)	-	75.0% (3.0)	-
54 (1)					
Locally-produced renewable energy	-	100.0% (1.0)	-	-	-
Waste/recycling collection	-	-	-	-	100.0% (1.0)
Managing flooding and stormwater	-	-	-	100.0% (1.0)	-
Access to nature	-	100.0% (1.0)	-	-	-
55 (3)					
Locally-produced renewable energy	-	33.3% (1.0)	66.7% (2.0)	-	-
Waste/recycling collection	-	33.3% (1.0)	33.3% (1.0)	-	33.3% (1.0)
Managing flooding and stormwater	-	33.3% (1.0)	33.3% (1.0)	-	33.3% (1.0)
Access to nature	-	-	33.3% (1.0)	33.3% (1.0)	33.3% (1.0)
56 (2)					
Locally-produced renewable energy	-	-	100.0% (2.0)	-	-
Waste/recycling collection	-	50.0% (1.0)	-	50.0% (1.0)	-
Managing flooding and stormwater	-	50.0% (1.0)	-	50.0% (1.0)	-
Access to nature	-	50.0% (1.0)	-	-	50.0% (1.0)
57 (1)					
Locally-produced renewable energy	-	-	100.0% (1.0)	-	-
Waste/recycling collection	-	-	-	100.0% (1.0)	-
Managing flooding and stormwater	-	-	100.0% (1.0)	-	-
Access to nature	-	-	-	100.0% (1.0)	-
59 (5)					
Locally-produced renewable energy	-	40.0% (2.0)	40.0% (2.0)	20.0% (1.0)	-
Waste/recycling collection	-	-	40.0% (2.0)	40.0% (2.0)	20.0% (1.0)
Managing flooding and stormwater	-	20.0% (1.0)	40.0% (2.0)	40.0% (2.0)	-
Access to nature	20.0% (1.0)	-	-	40.0% (2.0)	40.0% (2.0)

60 (3)

Locally-produced renewable energy	-	33.3% (1.0)	66.7% (2.0)	-	-
Waste/recycling collection	-	33.3% (1.0)	33.3% (1.0)	-	33.3% (1.0)
Managing flooding and stormwater	-	66.7% (2.0)	33.3% (1.0)	-	-
Access to nature	-	-	66.7% (2.0)	33.3% (1.0)	-

61 (1)

Locally-produced renewable energy	-	-	100.0% (1.0)	-	-
Waste/recycling collection	-	-	100.0% (1.0)	-	-
Managing flooding and stormwater	100.0% (1.0)	-	-	-	-
Access to nature	100.0% (1.0)	-	-	-	-

62 (5)

Locally-produced renewable energy	-	20.0% (1.0)	60.0% (3.0)	20.0% (1.0)	-
Waste/recycling collection	-	20.0% (1.0)	20.0% (1.0)	60.0% (3.0)	-
Managing flooding and stormwater	-	60.0% (3.0)	20.0% (1.0)	20.0% (1.0)	-
Access to nature	-	-	-	60.0% (3.0)	40.0% (2.0)

63 (2)

Locally-produced renewable energy	-	50.0% (1.0)	50.0% (1.0)	-	-
Waste/recycling collection	-	50.0% (1.0)	-	50.0% (1.0)	-
Managing flooding and stormwater	-	-	50.0% (1.0)	50.0% (1.0)	-
Access to nature	-	-	-	50.0% (1.0)	50.0% (1.0)

64 (5)

Locally-produced renewable energy	-	20.0% (1.0)	80.0% (4.0)	-	-
Waste/recycling collection	-	-	40.0% (2.0)	60.0% (3.0)	-
Managing flooding and stormwater	-	-	60.0% (3.0)	40.0% (2.0)	-
Access to nature	-	-	40.0% (2.0)	40.0% (2.0)	20.0% (1.0)

65 (2)

Locally-produced renewable energy	-	50.0% (1.0)	50.0% (1.0)	-	-
Waste/recycling collection	-	50.0% (1.0)	-	50.0% (1.0)	-
Managing flooding and stormwater	-	-	50.0% (1.0)	50.0% (1.0)	-
Access to nature	-	-	-	100.0% (2.0)	-

66 (2)

Locally-produced renewable energy	50.0% (1.0)	50.0% (1.0)	-	-	-
Waste/recycling collection	-	50.0% (1.0)	-	50.0% (1.0)	-
Managing flooding and stormwater	-	-	-	100.0% (2.0)	-
Access to nature	-	-	-	100.0% (2.0)	-

67 (1)

Locally-produced renewable energy	-	-	-	100.0% (1.0)	-
Waste/recycling collection	-	-	-	100.0% (1.0)	-
Managing flooding and stormwater	-	-	-	100.0% (1.0)	-
Access to nature	-	-	-	100.0% (1.0)	-

68 (3)

Locally-produced renewable energy	-	66.7% (2.0)	-	-	33.3% (1.0)
Waste/recycling collection	-	-	-	33.3% (1.0)	66.7% (2.0)
Managing flooding and stormwater	33.3% (1.0)	-	-	33.3% (1.0)	33.3% (1.0)
Access to nature	-	-	33.3% (1.0)	-	66.7% (2.0)

69 (2)

Locally-produced renewable energy	-	50.0% (1.0)	-	50.0% (1.0)	-
-----------------------------------	---	-------------	---	-------------	---

Waste/recycling collection	-	-	-	100.0% (2.0)	-
Managing flooding and stormwater	-	-	-	100.0% (2.0)	-
Access to nature	-	-	50.0% (1.0)	50.0% (1.0)	-

71 (2)

Locally-produced renewable energy	-	-	50.0% (1.0)	50.0% (1.0)	-
Waste/recycling collection	-	-	-	100.0% (2.0)	-
Managing flooding and stormwater	-	-	-	100.0% (2.0)	-
Access to nature	-	-	50.0% (1.0)	50.0% (1.0)	-

72 (3)

Locally-produced renewable energy	-	66.7% (2.0)	-	33.3% (1.0)	-
Waste/recycling collection	-	-	33.3% (1.0)	66.7% (2.0)	-
Managing flooding and stormwater	-	33.3% (1.0)	33.3% (1.0)	33.3% (1.0)	-
Access to nature	-	-	-	100.0% (3.0)	-

73 (3)

Locally-produced renewable energy	-	33.3% (1.0)	33.3% (1.0)	-	33.3% (1.0)
Waste/recycling collection	-	33.3% (1.0)	-	33.3% (1.0)	33.3% (1.0)
Managing flooding and stormwater	-	33.3% (1.0)	-	33.3% (1.0)	33.3% (1.0)
Access to nature	-	-	33.3% (1.0)	33.3% (1.0)	33.3% (1.0)

74 (4)

Locally-produced renewable energy	-	25.0% (1.0)	50.0% (2.0)	25.0% (1.0)	-
Waste/recycling collection	-	-	25.0% (1.0)	50.0% (2.0)	25.0% (1.0)
Managing flooding and stormwater	25.0% (1.0)	-	50.0% (2.0)	25.0% (1.0)	-
Access to nature	-	25.0% (1.0)	-	75.0% (3.0)	-

77 (2)

Locally-produced renewable energy	-	-	100.0% (2.0)	-	-
Waste/recycling collection	-	-	50.0% (1.0)	-	50.0% (1.0)
Managing flooding and stormwater	-	-	-	100.0% (2.0)	-
Access to nature	-	-	-	50.0% (1.0)	50.0% (1.0)

79 (2)

Locally-produced renewable energy	-	50.0% (1.0)	-	50.0% (1.0)	-
Waste/recycling collection	-	50.0% (1.0)	-	50.0% (1.0)	-
Managing flooding and stormwater	-	-	50.0% (1.0)	50.0% (1.0)	-
Access to nature	-	-	-	50.0% (1.0)	50.0% (1.0)

Unknown (68)

Locally-produced renewable energy	7.4% (5.0)	17.6% (12.0)	57.4% (39.0)	17.6% (12.0)	-
Waste/recycling collection	2.9% (2.0)	16.2% (11.0)	20.6% (14.0)	54.4% (37.0)	5.9% (4.0)
Managing flooding and stormwater	7.4% (5.0)	17.6% (12.0)	30.9% (21.0)	38.2% (26.0)	5.9% (4.0)
Access to nature	-	11.8% (8.0)	17.6% (12.0)	55.9% (38.0)	14.7% (10.0)

**STATE INCOME
DECILE**

187 REGISTERED VOTERS

Very Unsatisfied	Unsatisfied	Neutral	Satisfied	Very Satisfied
------------------	-------------	---------	-----------	----------------

0 to 9 Pct range (6)

Locally-produced renewable energy	-	50.0% (3.0)	33.3% (2.0)	16.7% (1.0)	-
Waste/recycling collection	-	33.3% (2.0)	16.7% (1.0)	50.0% (3.0)	-
Managing flooding and stormwater	-	16.7% (1.0)	33.3% (2.0)	50.0% (3.0)	-
Access to nature	-	33.3% (2.0)	-	33.3% (2.0)	33.3% (2.0)

10 to 19 Pct range (1)

Locally-produced renewable energy	-	-	-	100.0% (1.0)	-
Waste/recycling collection	-	-	-	100.0% (1.0)	-
Managing flooding and stormwater	-	-	-	100.0% (1.0)	-
Access to nature	-	-	-	100.0% (1.0)	-

40 to 49 Pct range (2)

Locally-produced renewable energy	-	-	100.0% (2.0)	-	-
Waste/recycling collection	-	50.0% (1.0)	-	50.0% (1.0)	-
Managing flooding and stormwater	-	50.0% (1.0)	50.0% (1.0)	-	-
Access to nature	-	-	-	50.0% (1.0)	50.0% (1.0)

50 to 59 Pct range (9)

Locally-produced renewable energy	11.1% (1.0)	-	77.8% (7.0)	11.1% (1.0)	-
Waste/recycling collection	11.1% (1.0)	11.1% (1.0)	33.3% (3.0)	44.4% (4.0)	-
Managing flooding and stormwater	-	22.2% (2.0)	55.6% (5.0)	22.2% (2.0)	-
Access to nature	-	33.3% (3.0)	11.1% (1.0)	44.4% (4.0)	11.1% (1.0)

60 to 69 Pct range (7)

Locally-produced renewable energy	14.3% (1.0)	42.9% (3.0)	42.9% (3.0)	-	-
Waste/recycling collection	14.3% (1.0)	42.9% (3.0)	14.3% (1.0)	14.3% (1.0)	14.3% (1.0)
Managing flooding and stormwater	14.3% (1.0)	28.6% (2.0)	28.6% (2.0)	28.6% (2.0)	-
Access to nature	-	14.3% (1.0)	14.3% (1.0)	57.1% (4.0)	14.3% (1.0)

70 to 79 Pct range (5)

Locally-produced renewable energy	20.0% (1.0)	20.0% (1.0)	40.0% (2.0)	-	20.0% (1.0)
Waste/recycling collection	-	20.0% (1.0)	20.0% (1.0)	-	60.0% (3.0)
Managing flooding and stormwater	-	20.0% (1.0)	20.0% (1.0)	60.0% (3.0)	-
Access to nature	-	40.0% (2.0)	20.0% (1.0)	40.0% (2.0)	-

80 to 89 Pct range (70)

Locally-produced renewable energy	7.1% (5.0)	22.9% (16.0)	55.7% (39.0)	14.3% (10.0)	-
Waste/recycling collection	1.4% (1.0)	15.7% (11.0)	28.6% (20.0)	45.7% (32.0)	8.6% (6.0)
Managing flooding and stormwater	7.1% (5.0)	24.3% (17.0)	32.9% (23.0)	32.9% (23.0)	2.9% (2.0)
Access to nature	1.4% (1.0)	7.1% (5.0)	17.1% (12.0)	58.6% (41.0)	15.7% (11.0)

90 Pct and up (85)

Locally-produced renewable energy	3.5% (3.0)	21.2% (18.0)	52.9% (45.0)	17.6% (15.0)	4.7% (4.0)
Waste/recycling collection	3.5% (3.0)	15.3% (13.0)	21.2% (18.0)	48.2% (41.0)	11.8% (10.0)
Managing flooding and stormwater	7.1% (6.0)	14.1% (12.0)	35.3% (30.0)	34.1% (29.0)	9.4% (8.0)
Access to nature	1.2% (1.0)	4.7% (4.0)	20.0% (17.0)	54.1% (46.0)	20.0% (17.0)

Unknown (2)

Locally-produced renewable energy	-	50.0% (1.0)	-	50.0% (1.0)	-
Waste/recycling collection	-	-	-	100.0% (2.0)	-
Managing flooding and stormwater	-	-	100.0% (2.0)	-	-
Access to nature	-	50.0% (1.0)	-	50.0% (1.0)	-

HOME OWNER/RENTER

187 REGISTERED VOTERS

Very Unsatisfied	Unsatisfied	Neutral	Satisfied	Very Satisfied
------------------	-------------	---------	-----------	----------------

Likely Homeowner (106)

Locally-produced renewable energy	3.8% (4.0)	21.7% (23.0)	55.7% (59.0)	16.0% (17.0)	2.8% (3.0)
Waste/recycling collection	1.9% (2.0)	14.2% (15.0)	25.5% (27.0)	45.3% (48.0)	13.2% (14.0)
Managing flooding and stormwater	8.5% (9.0)	18.9% (20.0)	31.1% (33.0)	37.7% (40.0)	3.8% (4.0)
Access to nature	1.9% (2.0)	6.6% (7.0)	19.8% (21.0)	53.8% (57.0)	17.9% (19.0)




















Likely Renter (55)

Locally-produced renewable energy	9.1% (5.0)	23.6% (13.0)	54.5% (30.0)	10.9% (6.0)	1.8% (1.0)
Waste/recycling collection	5.5% (3.0)	21.8% (12.0)	21.8% (12.0)	45.5% (25.0)	5.5% (3.0)
Managing flooding and stormwater	5.5% (3.0)	25.5% (14.0)	38.2% (21.0)	23.6% (13.0)	7.3% (4.0)
Access to nature	-	12.7% (7.0)	16.4% (9.0)	52.7% (29.0)	18.2% (10.0)

Unknown (26)

Locally-produced renewable energy	7.7% (2.0)	23.1% (6.0)	42.3% (11.0)	23.1% (6.0)	3.8% (1.0)
Waste/recycling collection	3.8% (1.0)	19.2% (5.0)	19.2% (5.0)	46.2% (12.0)	11.5% (3.0)
Managing flooding and stormwater	-	7.7% (2.0)	46.2% (12.0)	38.5% (10.0)	7.7% (2.0)
Access to nature	-	15.4% (4.0)	7.7% (2.0)	61.5% (16.0)	15.4% (4.0)

Complete the following sentence: Fitchburg's sustainability efforts should focus on...

-
-  **Anonymous user's Opinion**
infrastructure, roads specifically, single family homes, commercial
-  **Anonymous user's Opinion**
Reducing traffic related delays contributing to greenhouse gas emissions.
-  **Anonymous user's Opinion**
Maintaining and adding green space, not more high density housing
-  **Anonymous user's Opinion**
Solar
-  **Anonymous user's Opinion**
Ensuring that we don't end up with water runoff and flood due to blacktop.
-  **Anonymous user's Opinion**
Not hindering business development.
-  **Anonymous user's Opinion**
developing sustainable parks and nature areas. "Sustainability" plans are a joke.
-  **Anonymous user's Opinion**
Expanding and creating new parks and shared spaces for families to enjoy. Adding in unique public spaces like the one originally planned for McKee but was cancelled because NIMBYs were upset.
-  **Anonymous user's Opinion**
practical easy to implement measures that maximize effect without putting a burden on residents.
-  **Anonymous user's Opinion**
Managing flooding and stormwater
-  **Anonymous user's Opinion**
keeping some access to nature
-  **Anonymous user's Opinion**
preserving green space and natural preserves (DNR land if the DNR ever renders it free).
-  **Anonymous user's Opinion**
Waste reduction and efficient energy usage
-  **Anonymous user's Opinion**
Lowering the City's carbon footprint, providing better mass-transit options, electric vehicle infrastructure, regulate EV charging and solar in new developments to jumpstart the process. Education on these initiatives will also be important in not only getting regulatory approval but also in getting compliance with residents.
-  **Anonymous user's Opinion**
Local
-  **Anonymous user's Opinion**
Waste cleanup in natural areas.
-  **Anonymous user's Opinion**
We could use recycling pick up weekly. We should add some wind energy to help for our future.
-  **Anonymous user's Opinion**
Green space for activities in every new development, especially Veridian neighborhoods!
-  **Anonymous user's Opinion**
Reducing the impact of climate change and adaptation (ex. Making sure trees are planted in areas without them since this creates heat protection).

**Anonymous user's Opinion**

maintaining green space but allowing growth in developed areas. Keep an eye on the sprawl.

**Anonymous user's Opinion**

Lowering greenhouse gas emissions and increasing alternative renewable energy sources!

**Anonymous user's Opinion**

Waste reduction (composting options would be nice)

**Anonymous user's Opinion**

preserving wildlife habitats, recycling, green spaces. Equitable access and a lens of equity is important to ensure access to all.

**Anonymous user's Opinion**

zero carbon emissions

**Anonymous user's Opinion**

Reduced development

**Anonymous user's Opinion**

protect the environment

**Anonymous user's Opinion**

utilizing existing parks to create more natural areas (like prairies and tree plantings) instead of committing maintenance efforts and dollars to mowing useless grass areas.

**Anonymous user's Opinion**

Renewable energy

**Anonymous user's Opinion**

Preserving as much "greenspace" as possible, its what makes Fitchburg a very special place

**Anonymous user's Opinion**

Managing flooding and stormwater.

**Anonymous user's Opinion**

controlling growth, and utilizing already developed, but empty, properties.

**Anonymous user's Opinion**

encouraging walkability / bike access to local business hubs

**Anonymous user's Opinion**

Renewable energy.

**Anonymous user's Opinion**

renewable energy.

**Anonymous user's Opinion**

Mitigation of climate change.

**Anonymous user's Opinion**

Having recycling pick up EVERY week. We have more recyclables than trash.

**Anonymous user's Opinion**

focus on stormwater runoff, especially for new developments. You've let developers run this city for too long.

**Anonymous user's Opinion**

Managing flooding






















**Anonymous user's Opinion**






















Improved walkability




















**Anonymous user's Opinion**

Connecting bike paths

Anonymous user's Opinion

-  Making solar panels more affordable and accessible to those of us who want some on our houses. Have Peliterri pick up our recyclables every week, not every other week.
-  **Anonymous user's Opinion**
Adding weekly recycling
-  **Anonymous user's Opinion**
preserving the wild areas that we have and supporting appropriate use and reuse of the resources we already use.
-  **Anonymous user's Opinion**
composting.
-  **Anonymous user's Opinion**
expansion of municipal renewable energy sources in order to meet our town's 100% by 2030 goal.
-  **Anonymous user's Opinion**
Renewable energy
-  **Anonymous user's Opinion**
Recycling efforts.
-  **Anonymous user's Opinion**
recycle program and pickup needs improvement. Current vendor is not good - look at Madison, it's much better
-  **Anonymous user's Opinion**
Compost options
-  **Anonymous user's Opinion**
Fitchburg doesn't NEED to keep growing. It offered a better quality of life when it was smaller and more rural. Stop eliminating farm land for mega-churches!
-  **Anonymous user's Opinion**
Making the city even more bike friendly and encouraging renewable energy
-  **Anonymous user's Opinion**
Preserving the marsh areas/arboretum
-  **Anonymous user's Opinion**
sustainable agriculture, small farms that grow food for local consumption/schools/community centers....
-  **Anonymous user's Opinion**
Alternative energies
-  **Anonymous user's Opinion**
Approving commercial development in a manner that leaves our natural areas protected, in particular our watershed and marsh system around Nine Springs, to manage flooding and run off in an environmentally appropriate fashion. Requiring public and encouraging private construction to use renewable resources, local materials, and / or implement renewable energy production into the building.
-  **Anonymous user's Opinion**
Improving public transit and encouraging more walking and cycling by improving safety for walkers and cyclists.
-  **Anonymous user's Opinion**
preserving wetlands and planting more trees; weaning off from fossil fuels.
-  **Anonymous user's Opinion**
managing flooding
-  **Anonymous user's Opinion**
Green power in all aspects of green efforts
-  **Anonymous user's Opinion**
Increase recycling to weekly collection
-  **Anonymous user's Opinion**
zero emission or carbon neutral fleet vehicles and equipment, zero net energy public buildings, creation/preservation of open space, green space, wetland, pollinator habitat, etc, to support biological processes and outdoor recreation.

-  **Anonymous user's Opinion**
solar policies for homeowners and using agricultural land for community solar.
-  **Anonymous user's Opinion**
Smart city design that centralizes attractions/retail/entertainment...you can bike around town fine but there's nowhere to go. Also, preserve the big trees.
-  **Anonymous user's Opinion**
More education on what citizens can do ... maybe even have contests or other promotions to encourage environmentally conscious efforts
-  **Anonymous user's Opinion**
Clean water
-  **Anonymous user's Opinion**
housing growth being in corridors closest to transportation.
-  **Anonymous user's Opinion**
Renewable energy in the future
-  **Anonymous user's Opinion**
Bringing back the plastic recycling bin at the recycle drop off on Fish Hatchery / Whalen
-  **Anonymous user's Opinion**
Complete energy independence for public and private sector/residences
-  **Anonymous user's Opinion**
walkability and policies that protect nature as the city grows.
-  **Anonymous user's Opinion**
energy
-  **Anonymous user's Opinion**
Reducing waste
-  **Anonymous user's Opinion**
Unsure
-  **Anonymous user's Opinion**
Energy
-  **Anonymous user's Opinion**
continuing to improve bike transit access and safety and public transit options.
-  **Anonymous user's Opinion**
Allow alternative energy, particularly wind power. Encourage and support residential solar power and geothermal.
-  **Anonymous user's Opinion**
reducing our carbon footprint.
-  **Anonymous user's Opinion**
reducing carbon footprint, compact development
-  **Anonymous user's Opinion**
Reducing energy consumption - I feel the city does a good job for the most part with urban forestry, which helps reduce energy needed for A/C and heating units.
-  **Anonymous user's Opinion**
Partner with MGE on large scale renewables
-  **Anonymous user's Opinion**
one element is maintaining/repaving roads with more thought about shoulders and bike lanes (where appropriate). we have miles of rural two lane roads that share increasing bicycle traffic but are not safe due to lack of shoulders and/or bike lanes
-  **Anonymous user's Opinion**
Adding organic waste to the trash service.

-  **Anonymous user's Opinion**
Reducing redundancies and increasing efficiency
-  **Anonymous user's Opinion**
Preserving the natural areas around the city.
-  **Anonymous user's Opinion**
Minimizing non-renewable energy use.
-  **Anonymous user's Opinion**
reducing government involvement
-  **Anonymous user's Opinion**
more Bike paths. A bike Path from Syene to Fitchrona (Off road) along Lacy. A Bike Bridge over McKee at Fish Hatchery.
-  **Anonymous user's Opinion**
current goals.
-  **Anonymous user's Opinion**
Greater efforts to reduce waste and improve recycling. Dumpsters over filled on the weekends. I would encourage a contract with waste company to manage garbage and recycling on the weekends.
-  **Anonymous user's Opinion**
access to nature
-  **Anonymous user's Opinion**
Going energy neutral as soon as possible - all city energy from green sources and put pressure on MG&E to do the same. Implement better and more comprehensive recycling programs, ban un-recyclable products like plastic straws and plastic grocery bags. Implement programs to prevent and remove litter from parks and public ponds.
-  **Anonymous user's Opinion**
To add to my comments in Question 10, I would like to see Fitchburg curtail the development of agricultural land. It's so disheartening to see the loss of our farm fields. But at the same time, many of those farmers seem to be using GMO crops and pesticides which are harmful to our pollinators. If "green space" development is to continue, it would be nice if Fitchburg was one of the first communities in Wisconsin (similar to the efforts in California) to require developers, builders, and landscapers to use sustainable building materials, including the use of solar panels, native plantings and cultivars, and many other things that will help toward preserving the community for our children and generations to come.
-  **Anonymous user's Opinion**
Reduce waste
-  **Anonymous user's Opinion**
Runoff management and preserving green-space.
-  **Anonymous user's Opinion**
Renewable energy.
-  **Anonymous user's Opinion**
most efficient use of resources.
-  **Anonymous user's Opinion**
Recycling & environment footprint education!
-  **Anonymous user's Opinion**
Floodwater management
-  **Anonymous user's Opinion**
prairies and parks
-  **Stephen Lloyd Arnold's Opinion**
The Natural Step. This system takes into account all important factors and avoids false tradeoffs (e.g., lowering carbon emissions by using nuclear power).
-  **Anonymous user's Opinion**
Electricity generation using sustainable free and available sources such as wind and solar.
-  **Anonymous user's Opinion**
maximizing recycling and not sending recyclable items to the trash.
-  **Anonymous user's Opinion**
Preserving green space.

**Anonymous user's Opinion**

NO additional high density housing either apartments or houses similar to the ones just built on Syene rd

**Anonymous user's Opinion**

walk-able neighborhoods and local generation of renewable energy.

**Anonymous user's Opinion**

preserving the environment, reducing consumption, education, renewable energy subsidies.

**Anonymous user's Opinion**

Allow the solar farm on the O'Brien property

**Anonymous user's Opinion**

Stormwater drainage

**Anonymous user's Opinion**

Maintaining nature with careful development

**Anonymous user's Opinion**

Fitchburg should allow residents to use their own resources to focus on initiatives which a plurality of residents are not supportive of

**Anonymous user's Opinion**

Adding more recycle collection days and reducing normal garbage collection days.

**Anonymous user's Opinion**

managing flooding and stormwater.

**Anonymous user's Opinion**

Worrying about Fitchburg and stop supporting surrounding areas. City recycling center is a good example of misuse by non-Fitchburg residents using our benefits.

**Anonymous user's Opinion**

creating more renewable energy sources and making those accessible to residents.

**Anonymous user's Opinion**

Waste/recycling collection

**Anonymous user's Opinion**

Better recycling - need more pick up dates for recycling as well as yard waste. Would also like to see more options for sustainable electric.

**Anonymous user's Opinion**

Protecting the environment.

**Anonymous user's Opinion**

Being "green" - preserving forested areas reclaiming them, erradicating garlic mustard and other invasives that discourage natural growth

**Anonymous user's Opinion**

Garbage disposal and flood water management.

**Anonymous user's Opinion**

Maintaining the land.

**Anonymous user's Opinion**

probably watershed and drainage/runoff management--especially due to our lake proximity. Water is life.

**Anonymous user's Opinion**

keeping taxes low. We don't need fancy street signs all over the place.

**Anonymous user's Opinion**

Solar power

**Anonymous user's Opinion**

recycling and scalability



Anonymous user's Opinion

Access to nature.



Anonymous user's Opinion

More renewable energy to reduce our carbon footprint.



Anonymous user's Opinion

increased access to Epic via bus.



Anonymous user's Opinion

More renewable energy and better public transportation



Anonymous user's Opinion

Public transit



Anonymous user's Opinion

More greenspace, wildlife, nature. It is getting way too overwhelmed with cookie cutter housing, rental properties, condos/apartments. Undeveloped land is important to have and keep!



Anonymous user's Opinion

Better ability to dispose of more things curbside



Anonymous user's Opinion

Appropriate land use, expanding composting programs



Anonymous user's Opinion

a good mix of development and green space



Anonymous user's Opinion

being green. There should not be anything built that does not have some sort of sustainability feature in it.



Anonymous user's Opinion

renewable energy



Anonymous user's Opinion

Could do a little better with managing flooding and storm water run off.



Anonymous user's Opinion

flood control.



Anonymous user's Opinion

safe practices during winter months - ie using environmentally friendly snowmelt products



Anonymous user's Opinion

Solar energy production



Anonymous user's Opinion

reusing, plastic free and energy saving.



Anonymous user's Opinion

Renewable energy, recycling and water quality.



Anonymous user's Opinion

managing flooding and stormwater



Anonymous user's Opinion

Recycling, maintaining public and private greenspace and city emissions
























Anonymous user's Opinion

don't know
























Anonymous user's Opinion

reducing chemicals, especially that go into water, we should change our standard for chemicals to the Precautionary Principle, too many kids are getting sick!

-  **Anonymous user's Opinion**
Waste/Recycling collection--it would be nice to have a weekly recycling pick-up and also an option for disposal of organics/compost.
-  **Anonymous user's Opinion**
improving existing programs
-  **Anonymous user's Opinion**
Becoming more numerous.
-  **Anonymous user's Opinion**
Preserving greenspace
-  **Anonymous user's Opinion**
sustaining the forest as they currently exist.
-  **Anonymous user's Opinion**
Electric vehicles
-  **Anonymous user's Opinion**
access to nature
-  **Anonymous user's Opinion**
adding more items to be dropped at recycling center and getting rid of the water collecting ditches behind homes, put sewers in. There would be less mosquitos if drains were used not standing water pits.
-  **Anonymous user's Opinion**
Increased parks and paths
-  **Anonymous user's Opinion**
Floodwater prevention and remediation and preserving greenspace
-  **Anonymous user's Opinion**
Controlling flooding better, especially in the kettle in Seminole Forest.
-  **Anonymous user's Opinion**
better managing flooding and storm water, especially helping management companies fix their issues as well with surrounding areas
-  **Anonymous user's Opinion**
Increasing recycling and the frequency of recycling pick up. Lessen garbage pick up.
-  **Anonymous user's Opinion**
All new buildings, residential and commercial, should be required to include solar, gray water collection, zero VOC and chemical free materials. They should also be sited to take advantage of solar gain.
-  **Anonymous user's Opinion**
proper flood drainage and clean safe to use and drink tap water on south side zooming in district on district 2 also zooming into flood waters accumulating in apartment communities in district 2
-  **Anonymous user's Opinion**
Continuing to ensure that we don't have flooding like Oregon. Don't overdevelop all the land/nature.
-  **Anonymous user's Opinion**
maintaining green space and parks, minimizing speed of sprawl.
-  **Anonymous user's Opinion**
what applies the total picture of sustainability. This includes sustainability, green initiatives, but overlaid with reasonable policies and changes that all people (at all income levels) can afford and agree with.
-  **Anonymous user's Opinion**
Alternative transportation and local food
-  **Anonymous user's Opinion**
recycling
-  **Anonymous user's Opinion**
N/a
- Anonymous user's Opinion**

-  Weekly recycling pickups
-  **Anonymous user's Opinion**
more practical, safe bicycle routes (e.g., along Fish Hatchery directly to downtown, rather than far out of the way to east or west)
-  **Anonymous user's Opinion**
Solar/ renewable energy.
-  **Anonymous user's Opinion**
renewable green energy.
-  **Anonymous user's Opinion**
composting and renewable energy
-  **Anonymous user's Opinion**
Wind and solar options Not paving over everything
-  **Anonymous user's Opinion**
Park connections
-  **Anonymous user's Opinion**
Curbside food composting; recycling in all businesses, hotels, etc.; no more plastic straws
-  **Anonymous user's Opinion**
residential composting and solar opportunities for residents
-  **Anonymous user's Opinion**
recreational sustainability like more hiking trails
-  **Anonymous user's Opinion**
Installing solar panels on all public facilities
-  **Anonymous user's Opinion**
energy saving renovations on current buildings and renewable energy
-  **Anonymous user's Opinion**
Renewable energy
-  **Anonymous user's Opinion**
Preserving nature in a thoughtful way so it can be enjoyed by ALL residents as part of their daily life for generations to come.
-  **Anonymous user's Opinion**
Purchase of wetlands for flood control, and a program for recycling household batteries.
-  **Anonymous user's Opinion**
More yard waste and brush pick ups, more recycle and shred events. Recycling education.
-  **Anonymous user's Opinion**
-Curb side composting! -Additional recycling bins at city yard (plastic, glass, paper, etc. or single-sort) -Incentives for new housing, existing housing, and businesses to include renewable energy (solar PV and hot water panels), where appropriate -Renewable energy in public spaces (wind turbines in parks, solar panels in parking lots, municipal buildings, etc.)
-  **Anonymous user's Opinion**
More engagement from the community
-  **Anonymous user's Opinion**
preserving farm land
-  **Anonymous user's Opinion**
Using existing infrastructure usage for new ideas that dont harm the environment. Let's use whats in place by coming up with new ideas.
-  **Anonymous user's Opinion**
establishing programs and social norms to reduce dependence on fossil fuels and long supply chains.

-  **Anonymous user's Opinion**
communicating with citizens about how to recycle plastic so we know it is getting recycled. We are worried our plastic is not being recycled but aren't sure.
-  **Anonymous user's Opinion**
...making sure material that are blue-binned and recyclable don't end up in landfills but are actually recycled as intended.
-  **Anonymous user's Opinion**
Limiting development in order to manage stormwater and flooding and prepare for climate change. Limit development to preserve some access to nature. Limit development to protect the organisms we depend on to maintain balance in the eco-system.
-  **Anonymous user's Opinion**
renewable energy and sourcing locally grown food.
-  **Anonymous user's Opinion**
Cause and effect planning - in my time here, stormwater runoff has been an afterthought and from the massive runoff issues I've seen, the city simply accepts calculations from developers as good. We should focus on creating natural areas like prairie parks that don't require as much upkeep. I'd also like to see the city create a city forest program where neighborhoods could plant trees in park space to reduce the amount of required lawn maintenance for spaces that literally no one uses.
-  **Anonymous user's Opinion**
Preserving green spaces.
-  **Anonymous user's Opinion**
recycling, composting!!!!
-  **Anonymous user's Opinion**
Filling in open areas with development and fixing all the stormwater runoff issues.
-  **Anonymous user's Opinion**
Renewable energy
-  **Anonymous user's Opinion**
Keeping close access to green space
-  **Anonymous user's Opinion**
reducing costs to residents, while also opting for greener systems.
-  **Anonymous user's Opinion**
affordable options for sustainability
-  **Anonymous user's Opinion**
Locally-produced renewable energy, stormwater management
-  **Anonymous user's Opinion**
absorbing "worst-case" scenarios for projected climate change.
-  **Anonymous user's Opinion**
renewable energy sources
-  **Anonymous user's Opinion**
Keeping open areas of land natural and open for hunting.
-  **Steve Steinhoff's Opinion**
Achieving net zero carbon emissions by 2050 and 50% reduction by 2030. Green infrastructure to absorb most stormwater
-  **Anonymous user's Opinion**
Continued energy efficiency
-  **Anonymous user's Opinion**
Utilizing the economic boom that is the bike path, as many homeowners, as many high level professionals, as many access points for residents, even though private property... is turning the city of fitzburg into a booming hub. With the growing division of Fitchburg's streets and Engineering propositioning the neighborhood it would be a great thing.
-  **Anonymous user's Opinion**
Renewable energy, and continue to focus on recycling efforts including organic waste recycling/composting.
-  **Anonymous user's Opinion**
Keeping the planet healthy

**Anonymous user's Opinion**

pursuit of higher density development as some priority (to prevent general sprawl) and let the market determine exactly where such higher density housing should be located

**Anonymous user's Opinion**

preserving green spaces

**Anonymous user's Opinion**

preserving agricultural land and green spaces.

**Anonymous user's Opinion**

access to nature and limit tree destruction for development purposes

**Anonymous user's Opinion**

Not causing problems with poor planning

**Anonymous user's Opinion**

better waste collection, having bulk item picked up

**Anonymous user's Opinion**

Renewable energy

**Anonymous user's Opinion**

Storm water issues - the city engineers don't seem to know what is going on when new developments occur. That said, development companies are allowed to get projects rubber stamped to increase the tax roll and aren't held accountable for flooding people's basement.

**Anonymous user's Opinion**

Access to nature

**Anonymous user's Opinion**

Solar. Protecting wetlands and access to nature with development around that. Keep waste yard facility and recycling day.

**Anonymous user's Opinion**

encouraging builders and developers to incorporate sustainability as a city policy.

**Anonymous user's Opinion**

renewable energy - carbon neutral

**Anonymous user's Opinion**

keeping planet clean, next generations

**Anonymous user's Opinion**

Access to nature.

**Anonymous user's Opinion**

Renewable energy

**Anonymous user's Opinion**

Balance

**Anonymous user's Opinion**

Preserving natural areas, protecting animals, birds, wildlife; and stop paving green areas.

**Anonymous user's Opinion**

More public green spaces with multipurpose activities, including activities for adults and not just children .

**Anonymous user's Opinion**

Preserving green spaces

**Anonymous user's Opinion**

Farming. Purchase of development rights

**Anonymous user's Opinion**

water management in rural areas



Anonymous user's Opinion

Stop travesties such as ruining the kettle in Seminole Forest



Anonymous user's Opinion

stormwater and renewable energy



Anonymous user's Opinion

managing flooding - there's an increased amount of rainfall due to climate change. The last two years have more rain inches than were seen in WI since 1850.



Anonymous user's Opinion

Listening to what people say is needed, for any points brought up, and then work on solutions to those needs. Residents know best!

In the past year, have you or your household used services provided by or attended events and/or activities at any of the following (Please select all that apply.):

CURRENT RESULTS		303 Total Responses
A	Fitchburg Parks (256)	84% (256)
B	Fitchburg Recreation (108)	36% (108)
C	Fitchburg Community Center (79)	26% (79)
D	Fitchburg Senior Center (49)	16% (49)
E	My household did not use any services provided by or attend events and/or activities at any of the aforementioned. (27)	9% (27)
F	Fitchburg Public Library (185)	61% (185)

REGISTERED VS NON-REGISTERED						
	A	B	C	D	E	F
Registered Voters (181)	87.3% (158)	37.0% (67)	29.8% (54)	16.0% (29)	7.7% (14)	61.9% (112)
Non-Registered Voters (122)	80.3% (98)	33.6% (41)	20.5% (25)	16.4% (20)	10.7% (13)	59.8% (73)

ALL RESPONDENTS						
	A	B	C	D	E	F
All respondents (303)	84.0% (256)	36.0% (108)	26.0% (79)	16.0% (49)	9.0% (27)	61.0% (185)
Registered Voters in Fitchburg, WI (181)	87.3% (158)	37.0% (67)	29.8% (54)	16.0% (29)	7.7% (14)	61.9% (112)
Live in Fitchburg, WI (267) - Self-reported	85.0% (227)	36.7% (98)	25.5% (68)	14.2% (38)	9.0% (24)	61.8% (165)
Subscribers to Fitchburg, WI (271)	84.9% (230)	36.5% (99)	25.1% (68)	14.4% (39)	8.9% (24)	62.4% (169)
Register respondents from anywhere (187)	87.0% (162)	36.0% (67)	29.0% (55)	16.0% (30)	9.0% (16)	61.0% (114)

EDUCATION							444 REGISTERED VOTERS
	A	B	C	D	E	F	
Bach Degree - Extremely Likely (30)	83.3% (25)	36.7% (11)	33.3% (10)	13.3% (4)	6.7% (2)	70.0% (21)	
Bach Degree - Likely (21)	100.0% (21)	61.9% (13)	33.3% (7)	19.0% (4)	-	38.1% (8)	
Grad Degree - Extremely Likely (22)	77.3% (17)	36.4% (8)	27.3% (6)	18.2% (4)	18.2% (4)	59.1% (13)	
Grad Degree - Likely (13)	84.6% (11)	7.7% (1)	-	7.7% (1)	7.7% (1)	69.2% (9)	
HS Diploma - Extremely Likely (9)	77.8% (7)	11.1% (1)	44.4% (4)	11.1% (1)	22.2% (2)	44.4% (4)	
HS Diploma - Likely (4)	100.0% (4)	100.0% (4)	50.0% (2)	25.0% (1)	-	75.0% (3)	
Less than HS Diploma - Likely (1)	100.0% (1)	100.0% (1)	100.0% (1)	-	-	100.0% (1)	
Some College - Likely (12)	83.3% (10)	8.3% (1)	8.3% (1)	-	-	66.7% (8)	
Some College -Extremely Likely (5)	80.0% (4)	20.0% (1)	20.0% (1)	20.0% (1)	20.0% (1)	20.0% (1)	
Unknown (70)	88.6% (62)	37.1% (26)	32.9% (23)	20.0% (14)	8.6% (6)	65.7% (46)	

VOTERS GENDER							444 REGISTERED VOTERS
	A	B	C	D	E	F	
F (90)	86.7% (78)	33.3% (30)	31.1% (28)	13.3% (12)	6.7% (6)	60.0% (54)	
M (95)	87.4% (83)	37.9% (36)	27.4% (26)	18.9% (18)	9.5% (9)	63.2% (60)	
Unknown (2)	50.0% (1)	50.0% (1)	50.0% (1)	-	50.0% (1)	-	

PRECINCT							444 REGISTERED VOTERS
	A	B	C	D	E	F	
CHICAGO 43-04 (1)	100.0% (1)	-	-	-	-	-	
FITCHBURG CITY WARD 01 (9)	66.7% (6)	11.1% (1)	11.1% (1)	11.1% (1)	33.3% (3)	33.3% (3)	
FITCHBURG CITY WARD 02 (3)	66.7% (2)	-	-	-	33.3% (1)	66.7% (2)	
FITCHBURG CITY WARD 04 (2)	50.0% (1)	-	50.0% (1)	-	-	100.0% (2)	
FITCHBURG CITY WARD 05 (6)	100.0% (6)	33.3% (2)	50.0% (3)	-	-	66.7% (4)	
FITCHBURG CITY WARD 06 (12)	100.0% (12)	50.0% (6)	-	8.3% (1)	-	58.3% (7)	
FITCHBURG CITY WARD 07 (18)	94.4% (17)	27.8% (5)	33.3% (6)	27.8% (5)	5.6% (1)	66.7% (12)	

FITCHBURG CITY WARD 08 (14)	100.0% (14)	21.4% (3)	21.4% (3)	7.1% (1)	-	64.3% (9)
FITCHBURG CITY WARD 09 (8)	50.0% (4)	-	37.5% (3)	37.5% (3)	37.5% (3)	37.5% (3)
FITCHBURG CITY WARD 12 (2)	50.0% (1)	-	-	-	50.0% (1)	100.0% (2)
FITCHBURG CITY WARD 13 (31)	93.5% (29)	51.6% (16)	29.0% (9)	12.9% (4)	-	58.1% (18)
FITCHBURG CITY WARD 14 (19)	84.2% (16)	36.8% (7)	31.6% (6)	10.5% (2)	5.3% (1)	68.4% (13)
FITCHBURG CITY WARD 15 (7)	100.0% (7)	57.1% (4)	42.9% (3)	-	-	57.1% (4)
FITCHBURG CITY WARD 16 (3)	100.0% (3)	66.7% (2)	66.7% (2)	66.7% (2)	-	66.7% (2)
FITCHBURG CITY WARD 17 (7)	85.7% (6)	14.3% (1)	14.3% (1)	42.9% (3)	14.3% (1)	57.1% (4)
FITCHBURG CITY WARD 18 (12)	91.7% (11)	58.3% (7)	50.0% (6)	25.0% (3)	-	75.0% (9)
FITCHBURG CITY WARD 19 (26)	84.6% (22)	50.0% (13)	38.5% (10)	15.4% (4)	7.7% (2)	65.4% (17)
MADISON CITY WARD 042 (1)	-	-	-	-	100.0% (1)	-
MADISON CITY WARD 053 (1)	-	-	-	-	100.0% (1)	-
MADISON CITY WARD 100 (1)	-	-	-	-	100.0% (1)	-
MADISON CITY WARD 107 (1)	100.0% (1)	-	-	100.0% (1)	-	100.0% (1)
MIDDLETON TOWN WARD 7 (1)	100.0% (1)	-	-	-	-	100.0% (1)
MOUNT HOREB VLG WARD 3 (1)	100.0% (1)	-	100.0% (1)	-	-	-
OREGON VLG WARD 10 (1)	100.0% (1)	-	-	-	-	100.0% (1)

AGE RANGE

444 REGISTERED VOTERS

	A	B	C	D	E	F
18-29 (1)	100.0% (1)	100.0% (1)	-	-	-	-
30-39 (24)	91.7% (22)	33.3% (8)	25.0% (6)	8.3% (2)	4.2% (1)	62.5% (15)
40-49 (29)	79.3% (23)	37.9% (11)	20.7% (6)	-	20.7% (6)	55.2% (16)
50-59 (23)	78.3% (18)	17.4% (4)	30.4% (7)	13.0% (3)	17.4% (4)	39.1% (9)
60-69 (26)	84.6% (22)	30.8% (8)	38.5% (10)	23.1% (6)	3.8% (1)	76.9% (20)
70-79 (16)	81.3% (13)	37.5% (6)	43.8% (7)	56.3% (9)	6.3% (1)	87.5% (14)
unknown (68)	92.6% (63)	42.6% (29)	27.9% (19)	14.7% (10)	4.4% (3)	58.8% (40)

VOTERS AGE

444 REGISTERED VOTERS

	A	B	C	D	E	F
28 (1)	100.0% (1)	100.0% (1)	-	-	-	-
31 (1)	100.0% (1)	-	-	-	-	-
32 (1)	100.0% (1)	-	-	-	-	100.0% (1)
33 (1)	100.0% (1)	-	-	-	-	-
34 (1)	100.0% (1)	-	-	-	-	100.0% (1)
35 (5)	100.0% (5)	40.0% (2)	40.0% (2)	20.0% (1)	-	80.0% (4)
36 (3)	100.0% (3)	-	-	-	-	33.3% (1)
37 (5)	100.0% (5)	80.0% (4)	60.0% (3)	-	-	80.0% (4)
38 (3)	33.3% (1)	-	-	-	33.3% (1)	66.7% (2)
39 (4)	100.0% (4)	50.0% (2)	25.0% (1)	25.0% (1)	-	50.0% (2)
40 (3)	66.7% (2)	33.3% (1)	33.3% (1)	-	33.3% (1)	66.7% (2)
41 (3)	66.7% (2)	33.3% (1)	33.3% (1)	-	33.3% (1)	66.7% (2)
43 (5)	80.0% (4)	40.0% (2)	20.0% (1)	-	20.0% (1)	40.0% (2)
44 (6)	83.3% (5)	50.0% (3)	-	-	16.7% (1)	33.3% (2)
45 (2)	100.0% (2)	50.0% (1)	50.0% (1)	-	-	100.0% (2)
46 (1)	100.0% (1)	100.0% (1)	100.0% (1)	-	-	100.0% (1)
47 (3)	66.7% (2)	66.7% (2)	33.3% (1)	-	33.3% (1)	66.7% (2)
48 (2)	100.0% (2)	-	-	-	-	50.0% (1)
49 (4)	75.0% (3)	-	-	-	25.0% (1)	50.0% (2)
50 (1)	-	-	-	-	100.0% (1)	-
51 (1)	100.0% (1)	100.0% (1)	100.0% (1)	-	-	100.0% (1)
52 (5)	80.0% (4)	40.0% (2)	40.0% (2)	-	20.0% (1)	60.0% (3)
53 (4)	75.0% (3)	25.0% (1)	75.0% (3)	25.0% (1)	-	75.0% (3)
54 (1)	100.0% (1)	-	100.0% (1)	-	-	-
55 (3)	100.0% (3)	-	-	-	-	-
56 (2)	50.0% (1)	-	-	-	50.0% (1)	-
57 (1)	100.0% (1)	-	-	-	-	-

59 (5)	80.0% (4)	-	-	40.0% (2)	20.0% (1)	40.0% (2)
60 (3)	66.7% (2)	-	-	-	-	100.0% (3)
61 (1)	100.0% (1)	-	100.0% (1)	-	-	100.0% (1)
62 (5)	80.0% (4)	-	20.0% (1)	-	20.0% (1)	40.0% (2)
63 (2)	100.0% (2)	50.0% (1)	-	50.0% (1)	-	100.0% (2)
64 (5)	60.0% (3)	-	20.0% (1)	-	-	80.0% (4)
65 (2)	100.0% (2)	50.0% (1)	50.0% (1)	50.0% (1)	-	100.0% (2)
66 (2)	100.0% (2)	50.0% (1)	50.0% (1)	-	-	100.0% (2)
67 (1)	100.0% (1)	100.0% (1)	100.0% (1)	100.0% (1)	-	100.0% (1)
68 (3)	100.0% (3)	66.7% (2)	66.7% (2)	66.7% (2)	-	66.7% (2)
69 (2)	100.0% (2)	100.0% (2)	100.0% (2)	50.0% (1)	-	50.0% (1)
71 (2)	100.0% (2)	-	50.0% (1)	50.0% (1)	-	100.0% (2)
72 (3)	100.0% (3)	33.3% (1)	33.3% (1)	33.3% (1)	-	100.0% (3)
73 (3)	33.3% (1)	-	33.3% (1)	33.3% (1)	33.3% (1)	33.3% (1)
74 (4)	75.0% (3)	50.0% (2)	50.0% (2)	75.0% (3)	-	100.0% (4)
77 (2)	100.0% (2)	100.0% (2)	-	50.0% (1)	-	100.0% (2)
79 (2)	100.0% (2)	50.0% (1)	100.0% (2)	100.0% (2)	-	100.0% (2)
Unknown (68)	92.6% (63)	42.6% (29)	27.9% (19)	14.7% (10)	4.4% (3)	58.8% (40)

STATE INCOME DECILE

444 REGISTERED VOTERS

	A	B	C	D	E	F
0 to 9 Pct range (6)	66.7% (4)	-	16.7% (1)	-	-	83.3% (5)
10 to 19 Pct range (1)	100.0% (1)	-	-	-	-	-
40 to 49 Pct range (2)	50.0% (1)	-	-	-	50.0% (1)	50.0% (1)
50 to 59 Pct range (9)	66.7% (6)	11.1% (1)	11.1% (1)	11.1% (1)	33.3% (3)	22.2% (2)
60 to 69 Pct range (7)	42.9% (3)	-	28.6% (2)	28.6% (2)	42.9% (3)	28.6% (2)
70 to 79 Pct range (5)	60.0% (3)	-	20.0% (1)	-	40.0% (2)	40.0% (2)
80 to 89 Pct range (70)	90.0% (63)	44.3% (31)	28.6% (20)	15.7% (11)	5.7% (4)	61.4% (43)
90 Pct and up (85)	92.9% (79)	38.8% (33)	34.1% (29)	18.8% (16)	3.5% (3)	67.1% (57)
Unknown (2)	100.0% (2)	100.0% (2)	50.0% (1)	-	-	100.0% (2)

HOME OWNER/RENTER

444 REGISTERED VOTERS

	A	B	C	D	E	F
Likely Homeowner (106)	91.5% (97)	37.7% (40)	34.0% (36)	18.9% (20)	4.7% (5)	63.2% (67)
Likely Renter (55)	76.4% (42)	25.5% (14)	23.6% (13)	9.1% (5)	20.0% (11)	49.1% (27)
Unknown (26)	88.5% (23)	50.0% (13)	23.1% (6)	19.2% (5)	-	76.9% (20)

Which of the following do you prefer?

CURRENT RESULTS		303 Total Responses	
A	Smaller neighborhood parks with limited amenities within a 5-minute walk of my home. (178)	<div style="width: 59%;"></div>	59% (178)
B	Larger area parks with more amenities within a 10-minute walk my home. (125)	<div style="width: 41%;"></div>	41% (125)

REGISTERED VS NON-REGISTERED			
	A	B	
Registered Voters (181)	56.4% (102)	43.6% (79)	
Non-Registered Voters (122)	62.3% (76)	37.7% (46)	

ALL RESPONDENTS			
	A	B	
All respondents (303)	59.0% (178)	41.0% (125)	
Registered Voters in Fitchburg, WI (181)	56.4% (102)	43.6% (79)	
Live in Fitchburg, WI (267) - Self-reported	59.6% (159)	40.4% (108)	
Subscribers to Fitchburg, WI (271)	59.8% (162)	40.2% (109)	
Register respondents from anywhere (187)	56.0% (104)	44.0% (83)	

EDUCATION			
187 REGISTERED VOTERS			
	A	B	
Bach Degree - Extremely Likely (30)	63.3% (19)	36.7% (11)	
Bach Degree - Likely (21)	66.7% (14)	33.3% (7)	
Grad Degree - Extremely Likely (22)	54.5% (12)	45.5% (10)	
Grad Degree - Likely (13)	76.9% (10)	23.1% (3)	
HS Diploma - Extremely Likely (9)	55.6% (5)	44.4% (4)	
HS Diploma - Likely (4)	75.0% (3)	25.0% (1)	
Less than HS Diploma - Likely (1)	100.0% (1)	-	
Some College - Likely (12)	50.0% (6)	50.0% (6)	
Some College - Extremely Likely (5)	20.0% (1)	80.0% (4)	
Unknown (70)	47.1% (33)	52.9% (37)	

VOTERS GENDER			
187 REGISTERED VOTERS			
	A	B	
F (90)	58.9% (53)	41.1% (37)	
M (95)	52.6% (50)	47.4% (45)	
Unknown (2)	50.0% (1)	50.0% (1)	

PRECINCT			
187 REGISTERED VOTERS			
	A	B	
CHICAGO 43-04 (1)	-	100.0% (1)	
FITCHBURG CITY WARD 01 (9)	44.4% (4)	55.6% (5)	
FITCHBURG CITY WARD 02 (3)	100.0% (3)	-	
FITCHBURG CITY WARD 04 (2)	100.0% (2)	-	
FITCHBURG CITY WARD 05 (6)	50.0% (3)	50.0% (3)	
FITCHBURG CITY WARD 06 (12)	58.3% (7)	41.7% (5)	
FITCHBURG CITY WARD 07 (18)	38.9% (7)	61.1% (11)	
FITCHBURG CITY WARD 08 (14)	57.1% (8)	42.9% (6)	
FITCHBURG CITY WARD 09 (8)	50.0% (4)	50.0% (4)	
FITCHBURG CITY WARD 12 (2)	50.0% (1)	50.0% (1)	
FITCHBURG CITY WARD 13 (31)	58.1% (18)	41.9% (13)	
FITCHBURG CITY WARD 14 (19)	52.6% (10)	47.4% (9)	

FITCHBURG CITY WARD 15 (7)	71.4% (5)	28.6% (2)
FITCHBURG CITY WARD 16 (3)	33.3% (1)	66.7% (2)
FITCHBURG CITY WARD 17 (7)	57.1% (4)	42.9% (3)
FITCHBURG CITY WARD 18 (12)	50.0% (6)	50.0% (6)
FITCHBURG CITY WARD 19 (26)	69.2% (18)	30.8% (8)
MADISON CITY WARD 042 (1)	100.0% (1)	-
MADISON CITY WARD 053 (1)	-	100.0% (1)
MADISON CITY WARD 100 (1)	100.0% (1)	-
MADISON CITY WARD 107 (1)	-	100.0% (1)
MIDDLETON TOWN WARD 7 (1)	100.0% (1)	-
MOUNT HOREB VLG WARD 3 (1)	-	100.0% (1)
OREGON VLG WARD 10 (1)	-	100.0% (1)

AGE RANGE

187 REGISTERED VOTERS

	A	B
18-29 (1)	100.0% (1)	-
30-39 (24)	62.5% (15)	37.5% (9)
40-49 (29)	44.8% (13)	55.2% (16)
50-59 (23)	39.1% (9)	60.9% (14)
60-69 (26)	65.4% (17)	34.6% (9)
70-79 (16)	81.3% (13)	18.8% (3)
unknown (68)	52.9% (36)	47.1% (32)

**VOTERS
AGE**

187 REGISTERED VOTERS

	A	B
28 (1)	100.0% (1)	-
31 (1)	100.0% (1)	-
32 (1)	100.0% (1)	-
33 (1)	100.0% (1)	-
34 (1)	-	100.0% (1)
35 (5)	60.0% (3)	40.0% (2)
36 (3)	66.7% (2)	33.3% (1)
37 (5)	20.0% (1)	80.0% (4)
38 (3)	66.7% (2)	33.3% (1)
39 (4)	100.0% (4)	-
40 (3)	33.3% (1)	66.7% (2)
41 (3)	66.7% (2)	33.3% (1)
43 (5)	20.0% (1)	80.0% (4)
44 (6)	66.7% (4)	33.3% (2)
45 (2)	50.0% (1)	50.0% (1)
46 (1)	-	100.0% (1)
47 (3)	33.3% (1)	66.7% (2)
48 (2)	50.0% (1)	50.0% (1)
49 (4)	50.0% (2)	50.0% (2)
50 (1)	100.0% (1)	-
51 (1)	100.0% (1)	-
52 (5)	20.0% (1)	80.0% (4)
53 (4)	50.0% (2)	50.0% (2)
54 (1)	-	100.0% (1)
55 (3)	33.3% (1)	66.7% (2)
56 (2)	50.0% (1)	50.0% (1)
57 (1)	100.0% (1)	-
59 (5)	20.0% (1)	80.0% (4)
60 (3)	66.7% (2)	33.3% (1)
61 (1)	100.0% (1)	-
62 (5)	60.0% (3)	40.0% (2)
63 (2)	50.0% (1)	50.0% (1)

64 (5)	80.0% (4)	20.0% (1)
65 (2)	100.0% (2)	-
66 (2)	50.0% (1)	50.0% (1)
67 (1)	100.0% (1)	-
68 (3)	33.3% (1)	66.7% (2)
69 (2)	50.0% (1)	50.0% (1)
71 (2)	100.0% (2)	-
72 (3)	100.0% (3)	-
73 (3)	100.0% (3)	-
74 (4)	75.0% (3)	25.0% (1)
77 (2)	50.0% (1)	50.0% (1)
79 (2)	50.0% (1)	50.0% (1)
Unknown (68)	52.9% (36)	47.1% (32)

**STATE INCOME
DECILE**

187 REGISTERED VOTERS

	A	B
0 to 9 Pct range (6)	83.3% (5)	16.7% (1)
10 to 19 Pct range (1)	-	100.0% (1)
40 to 49 Pct range (2)	50.0% (1)	50.0% (1)
50 to 59 Pct range (9)	33.3% (3)	66.7% (6)
60 to 69 Pct range (7)	57.1% (4)	42.9% (3)
70 to 79 Pct range (5)	80.0% (4)	20.0% (1)
80 to 89 Pct range (70)	54.3% (38)	45.7% (32)
90 Pct and up (85)	56.5% (48)	43.5% (37)
Unknown (2)	50.0% (1)	50.0% (1)

HOME OWNER/RENTER

187 REGISTERED VOTERS

	A	B
Likely Homeowner (106)	59.4% (63)	40.6% (43)
Likely Renter (55)	47.3% (26)	52.7% (29)
Unknown (26)	57.7% (15)	42.3% (11)

Please rate your level of satisfaction with the following in Fitchburg:

CURRENT RESULTS					303 Total Responses
	Very Unsatisfied	Unsatisfied	Neutral	Satisfied	Very Satisfied
Social spaces (community centers, gathering places, etc.)	3% (9)	13% (40)	35% (105)	40% (122)	9% (27)
Public art (sculptures, murals, statues, etc.)	4% (12)	28% (86)	41% (124)	21% (65)	5% (16)
Streetscapes (landscaping, lighting, signage, traffic-calming devices, etc.)	8% (23)	23% (70)	27% (82)	36% (110)	6% (18)
REGISTERED (181)					
	Very Unsatisfied	Unsatisfied	Neutral	Satisfied	Very Satisfied
Social spaces (community centers, gathering places, etc.)	2.0% (3)	13.0% (23)	35.0% (63)	43.0% (77)	8.0% (15)
Public art (sculptures, murals, statues, etc.)	2.0% (4)	31.0% (57)	36.0% (66)	23.0% (42)	7.0% (12)
Streetscapes (landscaping, lighting, signage, traffic-calming devices, etc.)	9.0% (16)	25.0% (45)	25.0% (45)	34.0% (62)	7.0% (13)
NON-REGISTERED (122)					
	Very Unsatisfied	Unsatisfied	Neutral	Satisfied	Very Satisfied
Social spaces (community centers, gathering places, etc.)	4.9% (6)	13.9% (17)	34.4% (42)	36.9% (45)	9.8% (12)
Public art (sculptures, murals, statues, etc.)	6.6% (8)	23.8% (29)	47.5% (58)	18.9% (23)	3.3% (4)
Streetscapes (landscaping, lighting, signage, traffic-calming devices, etc.)	5.7% (7)	20.5% (25)	30.3% (37)	39.3% (48)	4.1% (5)
ALL RESPONDENTS (303)					
	Very Unsatisfied	Unsatisfied	Neutral	Satisfied	Very Satisfied
Social spaces (community centers, gathering places, etc.)	3% (9)	13% (40)	35% (105)	40% (122)	9% (27)
Public art (sculptures, murals, statues, etc.)	4% (12)	28% (86)	41% (124)	21% (65)	5% (16)
Streetscapes (landscaping, lighting, signage, traffic-calming devices, etc.)	8% (23)	23% (70)	27% (82)	36% (110)	6% (18)
REGISTERED VOTERS IN FITCHBURG, WI (181)					
	Very Unsatisfied	Unsatisfied	Neutral	Satisfied	Very Satisfied
Social spaces (community centers, gathering places, etc.)	2% (3)	13% (23)	35% (63)	43% (77)	8% (15)
Public art (sculptures, murals, statues, etc.)	2% (4)	31% (57)	36% (66)	23% (42)	7% (12)
Streetscapes (landscaping, lighting, signage, traffic-calming devices, etc.)	9% (16)	25% (45)	25% (45)	34% (62)	7% (13)
LIVE IN FITCHBURG, WI (267) - SELF-REPORTED					
	Very Unsatisfied	Unsatisfied	Neutral	Satisfied	Very Satisfied
Social spaces (community centers, gathering places, etc.)	2% (6)	13% (34)	36% (95)	41% (109)	9% (23)
Public art (sculptures, murals, statues, etc.)	4% (10)	28% (74)	40% (108)	22% (60)	6% (15)
Streetscapes (landscaping, lighting, signage, traffic-calming devices, etc.)	8% (21)	23% (61)	26% (70)	38% (101)	5% (14)
SUBSCRIBERS TO FITCHBURG, WI (271)					
	Very Unsatisfied	Unsatisfied	Neutral	Satisfied	Very Satisfied
Social spaces (community centers, gathering places, etc.)	3% (7)	13% (34)	35% (96)	41% (111)	8% (23)
Public art (sculptures, murals, statues, etc.)	4% (10)	27% (74)	41% (112)	22% (60)	6% (15)
Streetscapes (landscaping, lighting, signage, traffic-calming devices, etc.)	8% (21)	23% (61)	27% (72)	38% (103)	5% (14)
REGISTER RESPONDENTS FROM ANYWHERE (187)					
	Very Unsatisfied	Unsatisfied	Neutral	Satisfied	Very Satisfied
Social spaces (community centers, gathering places, etc.)	2% (4)	13% (25)	35% (65)	42% (78)	8% (15)
Public art (sculptures, murals, statues, etc.)	2% (4)	32% (60)	37% (69)	22% (42)	6% (12)
Streetscapes (landscaping, lighting, signage, traffic-calming devices, etc.)	9% (16)	25% (46)	26% (49)	33% (62)	7% (14)
EDUCATION					187 REGISTERED VOTERS
	Very Unsatisfied	Unsatisfied	Neutral	Satisfied	Very Satisfied

Bach Degree - Extremely Likely (30)

Social spaces (community centers, gathering places, etc.)	6.7% (2.0)	16.7% (5.0)	26.7% (8.0)	33.3% (10.0)	16.7% (5.0)
Public art (sculptures, murals, statues, etc.)	3.3% (1.0)	30.0% (9.0)	43.3% (13.0)	16.7% (5.0)	6.7% (2.0)
Streetscapes (landscaping, lighting, signage, traffic-calming devices, etc.)	6.7% (2.0)	30.0% (9.0)	33.3% (10.0)	23.3% (7.0)	6.7% (2.0)

Bach Degree - Likely (21)

Social spaces (community centers, gathering places, etc.)	-	9.5% (2.0)	47.6% (10.0)	33.3% (7.0)	9.5% (2.0)
Public art (sculptures, murals, statues, etc.)	-	38.1% (8.0)	33.3% (7.0)	19.0% (4.0)	9.5% (2.0)
Streetscapes (landscaping, lighting, signage, traffic-calming devices, etc.)	4.8% (1.0)	33.3% (7.0)	23.8% (5.0)	28.6% (6.0)	9.5% (2.0)

Grad Degree - Extremely Likely (22)

Social spaces (community centers, gathering places, etc.)	-	4.5% (1.0)	40.9% (9.0)	50.0% (11.0)	4.5% (1.0)
Public art (sculptures, murals, statues, etc.)	-	13.6% (3.0)	50.0% (11.0)	31.8% (7.0)	4.5% (1.0)
Streetscapes (landscaping, lighting, signage, traffic-calming devices, etc.)	4.5% (1.0)	22.7% (5.0)	36.4% (8.0)	31.8% (7.0)	4.5% (1.0)

Grad Degree - Likely (13)

Social spaces (community centers, gathering places, etc.)	-	7.7% (1.0)	53.8% (7.0)	38.5% (5.0)	-
Public art (sculptures, murals, statues, etc.)	7.7% (1.0)	23.1% (3.0)	38.5% (5.0)	30.8% (4.0)	-
Streetscapes (landscaping, lighting, signage, traffic-calming devices, etc.)	15.4% (2.0)	15.4% (2.0)	15.4% (2.0)	53.8% (7.0)	-

HS Diploma - Extremely Likely (9)

Social spaces (community centers, gathering places, etc.)	-	22.2% (2.0)	55.6% (5.0)	11.1% (1.0)	11.1% (1.0)
Public art (sculptures, murals, statues, etc.)	-	22.2% (2.0)	55.6% (5.0)	11.1% (1.0)	11.1% (1.0)
Streetscapes (landscaping, lighting, signage, traffic-calming devices, etc.)	-	22.2% (2.0)	44.4% (4.0)	11.1% (1.0)	22.2% (2.0)

HS Diploma - Likely (4)

Social spaces (community centers, gathering places, etc.)	-	25.0% (1.0)	-	75.0% (3.0)	-
Public art (sculptures, murals, statues, etc.)	-	25.0% (1.0)	25.0% (1.0)	50.0% (2.0)	-
Streetscapes (landscaping, lighting, signage, traffic-calming devices, etc.)	-	-	50.0% (2.0)	50.0% (2.0)	-

Less than HS Diploma - Likely (1)

Social spaces (community centers, gathering places, etc.)	-	-	-	100.0% (1.0)	-
Public art (sculptures, murals, statues, etc.)	-	100.0% (1.0)	-	-	-
Streetscapes (landscaping, lighting, signage, traffic-calming devices, etc.)	-	100.0% (1.0)	-	-	-

Some College - Likely (12)

Social spaces (community centers, gathering places, etc.)	-	-	50.0% (6.0)	41.7% (5.0)	8.3% (1.0)
Public art (sculptures, murals, statues, etc.)	8.3% (1.0)	41.7% (5.0)	33.3% (4.0)	16.7% (2.0)	-
Streetscapes (landscaping, lighting, signage, traffic-calming devices, etc.)	-	16.7% (2.0)	33.3% (4.0)	41.7% (5.0)	8.3% (1.0)

Some College -Extremely Likely (5)

Social spaces (community centers, gathering places, etc.)	-	20.0% (1.0)	20.0% (1.0)	40.0% (2.0)	20.0% (1.0)
Public art (sculptures, murals, statues, etc.)	-	40.0% (2.0)	20.0% (1.0)	40.0% (2.0)	-
Streetscapes (landscaping, lighting, signage, traffic-calming devices, etc.)	-	40.0% (2.0)	20.0% (1.0)	20.0% (1.0)	20.0% (1.0)

Unknown (70)

Social spaces (community centers, gathering places, etc.)	2.9% (2.0)	17.1% (12.0)	27.1% (19.0)	47.1% (33.0)	5.7% (4.0)
Public art (sculptures, murals, statues, etc.)	1.4% (1.0)	37.1% (26.0)	31.4% (22.0)	21.4% (15.0)	8.6% (6.0)
Streetscapes (landscaping, lighting, signage, traffic-calming devices, etc.)	14.3% (10.0)	22.9% (16.0)	18.6% (13.0)	37.1% (26.0)	7.1% (5.0)

VOTERS GENDER

187 REGISTERED VOTERS

Very Unsatisfied	Unsatisfied	Neutral	Satisfied	Very Satisfied
------------------	-------------	---------	-----------	----------------

F (90)

Social spaces (community centers, gathering places, etc.)	3.3% (3.0)	15.6% (14.0)	35.6% (32.0)	36.7% (33.0)	8.9% (8.0)
---	------------	--------------	--------------	--------------	------------

Public art (sculptures, murals, statues, etc.)	3.3% (3.0)	31.1% (28.0)	40.0% (36.0)	17.8% (16.0)	7.8% (7.0)
Streetscapes (landscaping, lighting, signage, traffic-calming devices, etc.)	5.6% (5.0)	22.2% (20.0)	27.8% (25.0)	35.6% (32.0)	8.9% (8.0)

M (95)

Social spaces (community centers, gathering places, etc.)	1.1% (1.0)	11.6% (11.0)	34.7% (33.0)	45.3% (43.0)	7.4% (7.0)
Public art (sculptures, murals, statues, etc.)	1.1% (1.0)	32.6% (31.0)	34.7% (33.0)	26.3% (25.0)	5.3% (5.0)
Streetscapes (landscaping, lighting, signage, traffic-calming devices, etc.)	11.6% (11.0)	26.3% (25.0)	25.3% (24.0)	30.5% (29.0)	6.3% (6.0)

Unknown (2)

Social spaces (community centers, gathering places, etc.)	-	-	-	100.0% (2.0)	-
Public art (sculptures, murals, statues, etc.)	-	50.0% (1.0)	-	50.0% (1.0)	-
Streetscapes (landscaping, lighting, signage, traffic-calming devices, etc.)	-	50.0% (1.0)	-	50.0% (1.0)	-

PRECINCT

187 REGISTERED VOTERS

	Very Unsatisfied	Unsatisfied	Neutral	Satisfied	Very Satisfied
--	------------------	-------------	---------	-----------	----------------

CHICAGO 43-04 (1)

Social spaces (community centers, gathering places, etc.)	-	-	100.0% (1.0)	-	-
Public art (sculptures, murals, statues, etc.)	-	-	100.0% (1.0)	-	-
Streetscapes (landscaping, lighting, signage, traffic-calming devices, etc.)	-	-	-	-	100.0% (1.0)

FITCHBURG CITY WARD 01 (9)

Social spaces (community centers, gathering places, etc.)	11.1% (1.0)	22.2% (2.0)	33.3% (3.0)	33.3% (3.0)	-
Public art (sculptures, murals, statues, etc.)	11.1% (1.0)	22.2% (2.0)	44.4% (4.0)	22.2% (2.0)	-
Streetscapes (landscaping, lighting, signage, traffic-calming devices, etc.)	-	33.3% (3.0)	11.1% (1.0)	55.6% (5.0)	-

FITCHBURG CITY WARD 02 (3)

Social spaces (community centers, gathering places, etc.)	-	-	66.7% (2.0)	33.3% (1.0)	-
Public art (sculptures, murals, statues, etc.)	-	33.3% (1.0)	33.3% (1.0)	33.3% (1.0)	-
Streetscapes (landscaping, lighting, signage, traffic-calming devices, etc.)	-	33.3% (1.0)	-	66.7% (2.0)	-

FITCHBURG CITY WARD 04 (2)

Social spaces (community centers, gathering places, etc.)	-	-	50.0% (1.0)	50.0% (1.0)	-
Public art (sculptures, murals, statues, etc.)	-	-	-	50.0% (1.0)	50.0% (1.0)
Streetscapes (landscaping, lighting, signage, traffic-calming devices, etc.)	-	50.0% (1.0)	-	50.0% (1.0)	-

FITCHBURG CITY WARD 05 (6)

Social spaces (community centers, gathering places, etc.)	-	16.7% (1.0)	-	83.3% (5.0)	-
Public art (sculptures, murals, statues, etc.)	16.7% (1.0)	-	33.3% (2.0)	50.0% (3.0)	-
Streetscapes (landscaping, lighting, signage, traffic-calming devices, etc.)	16.7% (1.0)	16.7% (1.0)	16.7% (1.0)	50.0% (3.0)	-

FITCHBURG CITY WARD 06 (12)

Social spaces (community centers, gathering places, etc.)	-	33.3% (4.0)	25.0% (3.0)	33.3% (4.0)	8.3% (1.0)
Public art (sculptures, murals, statues, etc.)	-	50.0% (6.0)	8.3% (1.0)	33.3% (4.0)	8.3% (1.0)
Streetscapes (landscaping, lighting, signage, traffic-calming devices, etc.)	8.3% (1.0)	16.7% (2.0)	33.3% (4.0)	33.3% (4.0)	8.3% (1.0)

FITCHBURG CITY WARD 07 (18)

Social spaces (community centers, gathering places, etc.)	-	5.6% (1.0)	22.2% (4.0)	61.1% (11.0)	11.1% (2.0)
Public art (sculptures, murals, statues, etc.)	-	27.8% (5.0)	27.8% (5.0)	38.9% (7.0)	5.6% (1.0)
Streetscapes (landscaping, lighting, signage, traffic-calming devices, etc.)	-	11.1% (2.0)	50.0% (9.0)	33.3% (6.0)	5.6% (1.0)

FITCHBURG CITY WARD 08 (14)

Social spaces (community centers, gathering places, etc.)	-	28.6% (4.0)	21.4% (3.0)	42.9% (6.0)	7.1% (1.0)
Public art (sculptures, murals, statues, etc.)	14.3% (2.0)	42.9% (6.0)	21.4% (3.0)	14.3% (2.0)	7.1% (1.0)
Streetscapes (landscaping, lighting, signage, traffic-calming devices, etc.)	21.4% (3.0)	50.0% (7.0)	14.3% (2.0)	7.1% (1.0)	7.1% (1.0)

FITCHBURG CITY WARD 09 (8)

Social spaces (community centers, gathering places, etc.)	12.5% (1.0)	-	25.0% (2.0)	37.5% (3.0)	25.0% (2.0)
Public art (sculptures, murals, statues, etc.)	-	25.0% (2.0)	50.0% (4.0)	12.5% (1.0)	12.5% (1.0)
Streetscapes (landscaping, lighting, signage, traffic-calming devices, etc.)	12.5% (1.0)	25.0% (2.0)	25.0% (2.0)	25.0% (2.0)	12.5% (1.0)

FITCHBURG CITY WARD 12 (2)

Social spaces (community centers, gathering places, etc.)	-	-	50.0% (1.0)	50.0% (1.0)	-
Public art (sculptures, murals, statues, etc.)	-	-	100.0% (2.0)	-	-
Streetscapes (landscaping, lighting, signage, traffic-calming devices, etc.)	-	-	50.0% (1.0)	50.0% (1.0)	-

FITCHBURG CITY WARD 13 (31)

Social spaces (community centers, gathering places, etc.)	3.2% (1.0)	12.9% (4.0)	45.2% (14.0)	29.0% (9.0)	9.7% (3.0)
Public art (sculptures, murals, statues, etc.)	-	29.0% (9.0)	58.1% (18.0)	9.7% (3.0)	3.2% (1.0)
Streetscapes (landscaping, lighting, signage, traffic-calming devices, etc.)	16.1% (5.0)	16.1% (5.0)	29.0% (9.0)	38.7% (12.0)	-

FITCHBURG CITY WARD 14 (19)

Social spaces (community centers, gathering places, etc.)	-	15.8% (3.0)	26.3% (5.0)	52.6% (10.0)	5.3% (1.0)
Public art (sculptures, murals, statues, etc.)	-	31.6% (6.0)	31.6% (6.0)	31.6% (6.0)	5.3% (1.0)
Streetscapes (landscaping, lighting, signage, traffic-calming devices, etc.)	5.3% (1.0)	15.8% (3.0)	10.5% (2.0)	47.4% (9.0)	21.1% (4.0)

FITCHBURG CITY WARD 15 (7)

Social spaces (community centers, gathering places, etc.)	-	14.3% (1.0)	57.1% (4.0)	28.6% (2.0)	-
Public art (sculptures, murals, statues, etc.)	-	-	28.6% (2.0)	42.9% (3.0)	28.6% (2.0)
Streetscapes (landscaping, lighting, signage, traffic-calming devices, etc.)	-	-	28.6% (2.0)	57.1% (4.0)	14.3% (1.0)

FITCHBURG CITY WARD 16 (3)

Social spaces (community centers, gathering places, etc.)	-	33.3% (1.0)	-	33.3% (1.0)	33.3% (1.0)
Public art (sculptures, murals, statues, etc.)	-	66.7% (2.0)	-	33.3% (1.0)	-
Streetscapes (landscaping, lighting, signage, traffic-calming devices, etc.)	-	33.3% (1.0)	-	66.7% (2.0)	-

FITCHBURG CITY WARD 17 (7)

Social spaces (community centers, gathering places, etc.)	-	-	28.6% (2.0)	42.9% (3.0)	28.6% (2.0)
Public art (sculptures, murals, statues, etc.)	-	28.6% (2.0)	28.6% (2.0)	28.6% (2.0)	14.3% (1.0)
Streetscapes (landscaping, lighting, signage, traffic-calming devices, etc.)	14.3% (1.0)	14.3% (1.0)	28.6% (2.0)	28.6% (2.0)	14.3% (1.0)

FITCHBURG CITY WARD 18 (12)

Social spaces (community centers, gathering places, etc.)	-	8.3% (1.0)	41.7% (5.0)	50.0% (6.0)	-
Public art (sculptures, murals, statues, etc.)	-	66.7% (8.0)	33.3% (4.0)	-	-
Streetscapes (landscaping, lighting, signage, traffic-calming devices, etc.)	8.3% (1.0)	41.7% (5.0)	41.7% (5.0)	8.3% (1.0)	-

FITCHBURG CITY WARD 19 (26)

Social spaces (community centers, gathering places, etc.)	-	3.8% (1.0)	50.0% (13.0)	38.5% (10.0)	7.7% (2.0)
Public art (sculptures, murals, statues, etc.)	-	26.9% (7.0)	42.3% (11.0)	23.1% (6.0)	7.7% (2.0)
Streetscapes (landscaping, lighting, signage, traffic-calming devices, etc.)	7.7% (2.0)	34.6% (9.0)	19.2% (5.0)	26.9% (7.0)	11.5% (3.0)

MADISON CITY WARD 042 (1)

Social spaces (community centers, gathering places, etc.)	-	100.0% (1.0)	-	-	-
Public art (sculptures, murals, statues, etc.)	-	100.0% (1.0)	-	-	-
Streetscapes (landscaping, lighting, signage, traffic-calming devices, etc.)	-	-	100.0% (1.0)	-	-

MADISON CITY WARD 053 (1)

Social spaces (community centers, gathering places, etc.)	-	100.0% (1.0)	-	-	-
Public art (sculptures, murals, statues, etc.)	-	100.0% (1.0)	-	-	-
Streetscapes (landscaping, lighting, signage, traffic-calming devices, etc.)	-	100.0% (1.0)	-	-	-

MADISON CITY WARD 100 (1)

Social spaces (community centers, gathering places, etc.)	-	-	100.0% (1.0)	-	-
---	---	---	--------------	---	---

Public art (sculptures, murals, statues, etc.)	-	-	100.0% (1.0)	-	-
Streetscapes (landscaping, lighting, signage, traffic-calming devices, etc.)	-	100.0% (1.0)	-	-	-

MADISON CITY WARD 107 (1)

Social spaces (community centers, gathering places, etc.)	-	-	-	100.0% (1.0)	-
Public art (sculptures, murals, statues, etc.)	-	-	100.0% (1.0)	-	-
Streetscapes (landscaping, lighting, signage, traffic-calming devices, etc.)	-	-	100.0% (1.0)	-	-

MIDDLETON TOWN WARD 7 (1)

Social spaces (community centers, gathering places, etc.)	100.0% (1.0)	-	-	-	-
Public art (sculptures, murals, statues, etc.)	-	-	100.0% (1.0)	-	-
Streetscapes (landscaping, lighting, signage, traffic-calming devices, etc.)	-	-	100.0% (1.0)	-	-

MOUNT HOREB VLG WARD 3 (1)

Social spaces (community centers, gathering places, etc.)	-	-	100.0% (1.0)	-	-
Public art (sculptures, murals, statues, etc.)	-	100.0% (1.0)	-	-	-
Streetscapes (landscaping, lighting, signage, traffic-calming devices, etc.)	-	-	100.0% (1.0)	-	-

OREGON VLG WARD 10 (1)

Social spaces (community centers, gathering places, etc.)	-	-	-	100.0% (1.0)	-
Public art (sculptures, murals, statues, etc.)	-	100.0% (1.0)	-	-	-
Streetscapes (landscaping, lighting, signage, traffic-calming devices, etc.)	-	100.0% (1.0)	-	-	-

AGE RANGE

187 REGISTERED VOTERS

	Very Unsatisfied	Unsatisfied	Neutral	Satisfied	Very Satisfied
--	------------------	-------------	---------	-----------	----------------

18-29 (1)

Social spaces (community centers, gathering places, etc.)	-	-	-	100.0% (1.0)	-
Public art (sculptures, murals, statues, etc.)	-	-	100.0% (1.0)	-	-
Streetscapes (landscaping, lighting, signage, traffic-calming devices, etc.)	-	-	-	100.0% (1.0)	-

30-39 (24)

Social spaces (community centers, gathering places, etc.)	-	16.7% (4.0)	45.8% (11.0)	33.3% (8.0)	4.2% (1.0)
Public art (sculptures, murals, statues, etc.)	4.2% (1.0)	29.2% (7.0)	41.7% (10.0)	20.8% (5.0)	4.2% (1.0)
Streetscapes (landscaping, lighting, signage, traffic-calming devices, etc.)	-	20.8% (5.0)	37.5% (9.0)	37.5% (9.0)	4.2% (1.0)

40-49 (29)

Social spaces (community centers, gathering places, etc.)	-	24.1% (7.0)	27.6% (8.0)	41.4% (12.0)	6.9% (2.0)
Public art (sculptures, murals, statues, etc.)	6.9% (2.0)	31.0% (9.0)	31.0% (9.0)	24.1% (7.0)	6.9% (2.0)
Streetscapes (landscaping, lighting, signage, traffic-calming devices, etc.)	3.4% (1.0)	20.7% (6.0)	34.5% (10.0)	27.6% (8.0)	13.8% (4.0)

50-59 (23)

Social spaces (community centers, gathering places, etc.)	4.3% (1.0)	8.7% (2.0)	39.1% (9.0)	39.1% (9.0)	8.7% (2.0)
Public art (sculptures, murals, statues, etc.)	-	47.8% (11.0)	39.1% (9.0)	13.0% (3.0)	-
Streetscapes (landscaping, lighting, signage, traffic-calming devices, etc.)	8.7% (2.0)	26.1% (6.0)	34.8% (8.0)	21.7% (5.0)	8.7% (2.0)

60-69 (26)

Social spaces (community centers, gathering places, etc.)	3.8% (1.0)	11.5% (3.0)	26.9% (7.0)	53.8% (14.0)	3.8% (1.0)
Public art (sculptures, murals, statues, etc.)	-	19.2% (5.0)	50.0% (13.0)	26.9% (7.0)	3.8% (1.0)
Streetscapes (landscaping, lighting, signage, traffic-calming devices, etc.)	3.8% (1.0)	30.8% (8.0)	30.8% (8.0)	30.8% (8.0)	3.8% (1.0)

70-79 (16)

Social spaces (community centers, gathering places, etc.)	-	-	37.5% (6.0)	31.3% (5.0)	31.3% (5.0)
Public art (sculptures, murals, statues, etc.)	-	18.8% (3.0)	50.0% (8.0)	25.0% (4.0)	6.3% (1.0)
Streetscapes (landscaping, lighting, signage, traffic-calming devices, etc.)	12.5% (2.0)	25.0% (4.0)	25.0% (4.0)	31.3% (5.0)	6.3% (1.0)

unknown (68)

Social spaces (community centers, gathering places, etc.)	2.9% (2.0)	13.2% (9.0)	35.3% (24.0)	42.6% (29.0)	5.9% (4.0)
Public art (sculptures, murals, statues, etc.)	1.5% (1.0)	36.8% (25.0)	27.9% (19.0)	23.5% (16.0)	10.3% (7.0)
Streetscapes (landscaping, lighting, signage, traffic-calming devices, etc.)	14.7% (10.0)	25.0% (17.0)	14.7% (10.0)	38.2% (26.0)	7.4% (5.0)

VOTERS 187 REGISTERED VOTERS
AGE

Very Unsatisfied Unsatisfied Neutral Satisfied Very Satisfied

28 (1)

Social spaces (community centers, gathering places, etc.)	-	-	-	100.0% (1.0)	-
Public art (sculptures, murals, statues, etc.)	-	-	100.0% (1.0)	-	-
Streetscapes (landscaping, lighting, signage, traffic-calming devices, etc.)	-	-	-	100.0% (1.0)	-

31 (1)

Social spaces (community centers, gathering places, etc.)	-	-	100.0% (1.0)	-	-
Public art (sculptures, murals, statues, etc.)	-	-	100.0% (1.0)	-	-
Streetscapes (landscaping, lighting, signage, traffic-calming devices, etc.)	-	-	100.0% (1.0)	-	-

32 (1)

Social spaces (community centers, gathering places, etc.)	-	-	100.0% (1.0)	-	-
Public art (sculptures, murals, statues, etc.)	-	-	100.0% (1.0)	-	-
Streetscapes (landscaping, lighting, signage, traffic-calming devices, etc.)	-	-	-	100.0% (1.0)	-

33 (1)

Social spaces (community centers, gathering places, etc.)	-	-	100.0% (1.0)	-	-
Public art (sculptures, murals, statues, etc.)	-	100.0% (1.0)	-	-	-
Streetscapes (landscaping, lighting, signage, traffic-calming devices, etc.)	-	-	100.0% (1.0)	-	-

34 (1)

Social spaces (community centers, gathering places, etc.)	-	-	100.0% (1.0)	-	-
Public art (sculptures, murals, statues, etc.)	-	-	100.0% (1.0)	-	-
Streetscapes (landscaping, lighting, signage, traffic-calming devices, etc.)	-	-	100.0% (1.0)	-	-

35 (5)

Social spaces (community centers, gathering places, etc.)	-	20.0% (1.0)	20.0% (1.0)	60.0% (3.0)	-
Public art (sculptures, murals, statues, etc.)	-	40.0% (2.0)	20.0% (1.0)	40.0% (2.0)	-
Streetscapes (landscaping, lighting, signage, traffic-calming devices, etc.)	-	20.0% (1.0)	-	80.0% (4.0)	-

36 (3)

Social spaces (community centers, gathering places, etc.)	-	-	66.7% (2.0)	33.3% (1.0)	-
Public art (sculptures, murals, statues, etc.)	-	33.3% (1.0)	33.3% (1.0)	33.3% (1.0)	-
Streetscapes (landscaping, lighting, signage, traffic-calming devices, etc.)	-	-	100.0% (3.0)	-	-

37 (5)

Social spaces (community centers, gathering places, etc.)	-	20.0% (1.0)	40.0% (2.0)	40.0% (2.0)	-
Public art (sculptures, murals, statues, etc.)	-	20.0% (1.0)	80.0% (4.0)	-	-
Streetscapes (landscaping, lighting, signage, traffic-calming devices, etc.)	-	40.0% (2.0)	60.0% (3.0)	-	-

38 (3)

Social spaces (community centers, gathering places, etc.)	-	-	66.7% (2.0)	33.3% (1.0)	-
Public art (sculptures, murals, statues, etc.)	-	33.3% (1.0)	33.3% (1.0)	-	33.3% (1.0)
Streetscapes (landscaping, lighting, signage, traffic-calming devices, etc.)	-	33.3% (1.0)	-	66.7% (2.0)	-

39 (4)

Social spaces (community centers, gathering places, etc.)	-	50.0% (2.0)	-	25.0% (1.0)	25.0% (1.0)
---	---	-------------	---	-------------	-------------

Public art (sculptures, murals, statues, etc.)	25.0% (1.0)	25.0% (1.0)	-	50.0% (2.0)	-
Streetscapes (landscaping, lighting, signage, traffic-calming devices, etc.)	-	25.0% (1.0)	-	50.0% (2.0)	25.0% (1.0)
40 (3)					
Social spaces (community centers, gathering places, etc.)	-	33.3% (1.0)	33.3% (1.0)	33.3% (1.0)	-
Public art (sculptures, murals, statues, etc.)	-	33.3% (1.0)	33.3% (1.0)	33.3% (1.0)	-
Streetscapes (landscaping, lighting, signage, traffic-calming devices, etc.)	-	100.0% (3.0)	-	-	-
41 (3)					
Social spaces (community centers, gathering places, etc.)	-	33.3% (1.0)	33.3% (1.0)	33.3% (1.0)	-
Public art (sculptures, murals, statues, etc.)	-	33.3% (1.0)	66.7% (2.0)	-	-
Streetscapes (landscaping, lighting, signage, traffic-calming devices, etc.)	-	-	66.7% (2.0)	33.3% (1.0)	-
43 (5)					
Social spaces (community centers, gathering places, etc.)	-	-	40.0% (2.0)	40.0% (2.0)	20.0% (1.0)
Public art (sculptures, murals, statues, etc.)	-	40.0% (2.0)	-	40.0% (2.0)	20.0% (1.0)
Streetscapes (landscaping, lighting, signage, traffic-calming devices, etc.)	-	40.0% (2.0)	-	40.0% (2.0)	20.0% (1.0)
44 (6)					
Social spaces (community centers, gathering places, etc.)	-	33.3% (2.0)	-	66.7% (4.0)	-
Public art (sculptures, murals, statues, etc.)	16.7% (1.0)	16.7% (1.0)	16.7% (1.0)	50.0% (3.0)	-
Streetscapes (landscaping, lighting, signage, traffic-calming devices, etc.)	16.7% (1.0)	16.7% (1.0)	33.3% (2.0)	33.3% (2.0)	-
45 (2)					
Social spaces (community centers, gathering places, etc.)	-	-	50.0% (1.0)	50.0% (1.0)	-
Public art (sculptures, murals, statues, etc.)	-	-	100.0% (2.0)	-	-
Streetscapes (landscaping, lighting, signage, traffic-calming devices, etc.)	-	-	50.0% (1.0)	-	50.0% (1.0)
46 (1)					
Social spaces (community centers, gathering places, etc.)	-	100.0% (1.0)	-	-	-
Public art (sculptures, murals, statues, etc.)	-	100.0% (1.0)	-	-	-
Streetscapes (landscaping, lighting, signage, traffic-calming devices, etc.)	-	-	100.0% (1.0)	-	-
47 (3)					
Social spaces (community centers, gathering places, etc.)	-	33.3% (1.0)	33.3% (1.0)	33.3% (1.0)	-
Public art (sculptures, murals, statues, etc.)	-	33.3% (1.0)	66.7% (2.0)	-	-
Streetscapes (landscaping, lighting, signage, traffic-calming devices, etc.)	-	-	66.7% (2.0)	33.3% (1.0)	-
48 (2)					
Social spaces (community centers, gathering places, etc.)	-	-	50.0% (1.0)	-	50.0% (1.0)
Public art (sculptures, murals, statues, etc.)	50.0% (1.0)	-	-	-	50.0% (1.0)
Streetscapes (landscaping, lighting, signage, traffic-calming devices, etc.)	-	-	50.0% (1.0)	-	50.0% (1.0)
49 (4)					
Social spaces (community centers, gathering places, etc.)	-	25.0% (1.0)	25.0% (1.0)	50.0% (2.0)	-
Public art (sculptures, murals, statues, etc.)	-	50.0% (2.0)	25.0% (1.0)	25.0% (1.0)	-
Streetscapes (landscaping, lighting, signage, traffic-calming devices, etc.)	-	-	25.0% (1.0)	50.0% (2.0)	25.0% (1.0)
50 (1)					
Social spaces (community centers, gathering places, etc.)	100.0% (1.0)	-	-	-	-
Public art (sculptures, murals, statues, etc.)	-	-	100.0% (1.0)	-	-
Streetscapes (landscaping, lighting, signage, traffic-calming devices, etc.)	-	-	-	100.0% (1.0)	-
51 (1)					
Social spaces (community centers, gathering places, etc.)	-	-	100.0% (1.0)	-	-
Public art (sculptures, murals, statues, etc.)	-	100.0% (1.0)	-	-	-
Streetscapes (landscaping, lighting, signage, traffic-calming devices, etc.)	-	100.0% (1.0)	-	-	-

52 (5)

Social spaces (community centers, gathering places, etc.)	-	20.0% (1.0)	40.0% (2.0)	40.0% (2.0)	-
Public art (sculptures, murals, statues, etc.)	-	60.0% (3.0)	40.0% (2.0)	-	-
Streetscapes (landscaping, lighting, signage, traffic-calming devices, etc.)	-	20.0% (1.0)	60.0% (3.0)	20.0% (1.0)	-

53 (4)

Social spaces (community centers, gathering places, etc.)	-	-	-	75.0% (3.0)	25.0% (1.0)
Public art (sculptures, murals, statues, etc.)	-	25.0% (1.0)	75.0% (3.0)	-	-
Streetscapes (landscaping, lighting, signage, traffic-calming devices, etc.)	-	50.0% (2.0)	25.0% (1.0)	-	25.0% (1.0)

54 (1)

Social spaces (community centers, gathering places, etc.)	-	-	100.0% (1.0)	-	-
Public art (sculptures, murals, statues, etc.)	-	100.0% (1.0)	-	-	-
Streetscapes (landscaping, lighting, signage, traffic-calming devices, etc.)	-	-	100.0% (1.0)	-	-

55 (3)

Social spaces (community centers, gathering places, etc.)	-	-	33.3% (1.0)	33.3% (1.0)	33.3% (1.0)
Public art (sculptures, murals, statues, etc.)	-	66.7% (2.0)	-	33.3% (1.0)	-
Streetscapes (landscaping, lighting, signage, traffic-calming devices, etc.)	33.3% (1.0)	-	-	33.3% (1.0)	33.3% (1.0)

56 (2)

Social spaces (community centers, gathering places, etc.)	-	-	100.0% (2.0)	-	-
Public art (sculptures, murals, statues, etc.)	-	50.0% (1.0)	50.0% (1.0)	-	-
Streetscapes (landscaping, lighting, signage, traffic-calming devices, etc.)	-	50.0% (1.0)	-	50.0% (1.0)	-

57 (1)

Social spaces (community centers, gathering places, etc.)	-	-	-	100.0% (1.0)	-
Public art (sculptures, murals, statues, etc.)	-	100.0% (1.0)	-	-	-
Streetscapes (landscaping, lighting, signage, traffic-calming devices, etc.)	100.0% (1.0)	-	-	-	-

59 (5)

Social spaces (community centers, gathering places, etc.)	-	20.0% (1.0)	40.0% (2.0)	40.0% (2.0)	-
Public art (sculptures, murals, statues, etc.)	-	20.0% (1.0)	40.0% (2.0)	40.0% (2.0)	-
Streetscapes (landscaping, lighting, signage, traffic-calming devices, etc.)	-	20.0% (1.0)	60.0% (3.0)	20.0% (1.0)	-

60 (3)

Social spaces (community centers, gathering places, etc.)	-	33.3% (1.0)	33.3% (1.0)	33.3% (1.0)	-
Public art (sculptures, murals, statues, etc.)	-	33.3% (1.0)	66.7% (2.0)	-	-
Streetscapes (landscaping, lighting, signage, traffic-calming devices, etc.)	-	33.3% (1.0)	66.7% (2.0)	-	-

61 (1)

Social spaces (community centers, gathering places, etc.)	-	-	100.0% (1.0)	-	-
Public art (sculptures, murals, statues, etc.)	-	-	100.0% (1.0)	-	-
Streetscapes (landscaping, lighting, signage, traffic-calming devices, etc.)	-	-	100.0% (1.0)	-	-

62 (5)

Social spaces (community centers, gathering places, etc.)	-	-	40.0% (2.0)	60.0% (3.0)	-
Public art (sculptures, murals, statues, etc.)	-	-	60.0% (3.0)	20.0% (1.0)	20.0% (1.0)
Streetscapes (landscaping, lighting, signage, traffic-calming devices, etc.)	-	40.0% (2.0)	-	40.0% (2.0)	20.0% (1.0)

63 (2)

Social spaces (community centers, gathering places, etc.)	-	-	50.0% (1.0)	-	50.0% (1.0)
Public art (sculptures, murals, statues, etc.)	-	-	50.0% (1.0)	50.0% (1.0)	-
Streetscapes (landscaping, lighting, signage, traffic-calming devices, etc.)	50.0% (1.0)	-	-	50.0% (1.0)	-

64 (5)

Social spaces (community centers, gathering places, etc.)	20.0% (1.0)	20.0% (1.0)	20.0% (1.0)	40.0% (2.0)	-
Public art (sculptures, murals, statues, etc.)	-	20.0% (1.0)	40.0% (2.0)	40.0% (2.0)	-
Streetscapes (landscaping, lighting, signage, traffic-calming devices, etc.)	-	60.0% (3.0)	40.0% (2.0)	-	-
65 (2)					
Social spaces (community centers, gathering places, etc.)	-	-	-	100.0% (2.0)	-
Public art (sculptures, murals, statues, etc.)	-	-	100.0% (2.0)	-	-
Streetscapes (landscaping, lighting, signage, traffic-calming devices, etc.)	-	-	-	100.0% (2.0)	-
66 (2)					
Social spaces (community centers, gathering places, etc.)	-	-	-	100.0% (2.0)	-
Public art (sculptures, murals, statues, etc.)	-	50.0% (1.0)	-	50.0% (1.0)	-
Streetscapes (landscaping, lighting, signage, traffic-calming devices, etc.)	-	-	100.0% (2.0)	-	-
67 (1)					
Social spaces (community centers, gathering places, etc.)	-	-	-	100.0% (1.0)	-
Public art (sculptures, murals, statues, etc.)	-	-	100.0% (1.0)	-	-
Streetscapes (landscaping, lighting, signage, traffic-calming devices, etc.)	-	-	-	100.0% (1.0)	-
68 (3)					
Social spaces (community centers, gathering places, etc.)	-	33.3% (1.0)	33.3% (1.0)	33.3% (1.0)	-
Public art (sculptures, murals, statues, etc.)	-	66.7% (2.0)	-	33.3% (1.0)	-
Streetscapes (landscaping, lighting, signage, traffic-calming devices, etc.)	-	33.3% (1.0)	33.3% (1.0)	33.3% (1.0)	-
69 (2)					
Social spaces (community centers, gathering places, etc.)	-	-	-	100.0% (2.0)	-
Public art (sculptures, murals, statues, etc.)	-	-	50.0% (1.0)	50.0% (1.0)	-
Streetscapes (landscaping, lighting, signage, traffic-calming devices, etc.)	-	50.0% (1.0)	-	50.0% (1.0)	-
71 (2)					
Social spaces (community centers, gathering places, etc.)	-	-	50.0% (1.0)	50.0% (1.0)	-
Public art (sculptures, murals, statues, etc.)	-	-	100.0% (2.0)	-	-
Streetscapes (landscaping, lighting, signage, traffic-calming devices, etc.)	-	-	50.0% (1.0)	50.0% (1.0)	-
72 (3)					
Social spaces (community centers, gathering places, etc.)	-	-	66.7% (2.0)	33.3% (1.0)	-
Public art (sculptures, murals, statues, etc.)	-	33.3% (1.0)	33.3% (1.0)	33.3% (1.0)	-
Streetscapes (landscaping, lighting, signage, traffic-calming devices, etc.)	-	66.7% (2.0)	-	33.3% (1.0)	-
73 (3)					
Social spaces (community centers, gathering places, etc.)	-	-	66.7% (2.0)	-	33.3% (1.0)
Public art (sculptures, murals, statues, etc.)	-	-	33.3% (1.0)	33.3% (1.0)	33.3% (1.0)
Streetscapes (landscaping, lighting, signage, traffic-calming devices, etc.)	-	-	66.7% (2.0)	-	33.3% (1.0)
74 (4)					
Social spaces (community centers, gathering places, etc.)	-	-	25.0% (1.0)	50.0% (2.0)	25.0% (1.0)
Public art (sculptures, murals, statues, etc.)	-	25.0% (1.0)	50.0% (2.0)	25.0% (1.0)	-
Streetscapes (landscaping, lighting, signage, traffic-calming devices, etc.)	25.0% (1.0)	25.0% (1.0)	25.0% (1.0)	25.0% (1.0)	-
77 (2)					
Social spaces (community centers, gathering places, etc.)	-	-	-	50.0% (1.0)	50.0% (1.0)
Public art (sculptures, murals, statues, etc.)	-	-	100.0% (2.0)	-	-
Streetscapes (landscaping, lighting, signage, traffic-calming devices, etc.)	50.0% (1.0)	-	-	50.0% (1.0)	-
79 (2)					
Social spaces (community centers, gathering places, etc.)	-	-	-	-	100.0% (2.0)

Public art (sculptures, murals, statues, etc.)	-	50.0% (1.0)	-	50.0% (1.0)	-
Streetscapes (landscaping, lighting, signage, traffic-calming devices, etc.)	-	50.0% (1.0)	-	50.0% (1.0)	-
Unknown (68)					
Social spaces (community centers, gathering places, etc.)	2.9% (2.0)	13.2% (9.0)	35.3% (24.0)	42.6% (29.0)	5.9% (4.0)
Public art (sculptures, murals, statues, etc.)	1.5% (1.0)	36.8% (25.0)	27.9% (19.0)	23.5% (16.0)	10.3% (7.0)
Streetscapes (landscaping, lighting, signage, traffic-calming devices, etc.)	14.7% (10.0)	25.0% (17.0)	14.7% (10.0)	38.2% (26.0)	7.4% (5.0)
STATE INCOME DECILE					
				187 REGISTERED VOTERS	
	Very Unsatisfied	Unsatisfied	Neutral	Satisfied	Very Satisfied
0 to 9 Pct range (6)					
Social spaces (community centers, gathering places, etc.)	-	-	33.3% (2.0)	66.7% (4.0)	-
Public art (sculptures, murals, statues, etc.)	-	16.7% (1.0)	16.7% (1.0)	50.0% (3.0)	16.7% (1.0)
Streetscapes (landscaping, lighting, signage, traffic-calming devices, etc.)	-	16.7% (1.0)	16.7% (1.0)	50.0% (3.0)	16.7% (1.0)
10 to 19 Pct range (1)					
Social spaces (community centers, gathering places, etc.)	-	-	-	100.0% (1.0)	-
Public art (sculptures, murals, statues, etc.)	-	-	-	100.0% (1.0)	-
Streetscapes (landscaping, lighting, signage, traffic-calming devices, etc.)	-	-	-	100.0% (1.0)	-
40 to 49 Pct range (2)					
Social spaces (community centers, gathering places, etc.)	-	50.0% (1.0)	50.0% (1.0)	-	-
Public art (sculptures, murals, statues, etc.)	-	50.0% (1.0)	50.0% (1.0)	-	-
Streetscapes (landscaping, lighting, signage, traffic-calming devices, etc.)	-	100.0% (2.0)	-	-	-
50 to 59 Pct range (9)					
Social spaces (community centers, gathering places, etc.)	11.1% (1.0)	22.2% (2.0)	22.2% (2.0)	44.4% (4.0)	-
Public art (sculptures, murals, statues, etc.)	11.1% (1.0)	22.2% (2.0)	33.3% (3.0)	33.3% (3.0)	-
Streetscapes (landscaping, lighting, signage, traffic-calming devices, etc.)	-	22.2% (2.0)	11.1% (1.0)	66.7% (6.0)	-
60 to 69 Pct range (7)					
Social spaces (community centers, gathering places, etc.)	14.3% (1.0)	-	28.6% (2.0)	28.6% (2.0)	28.6% (2.0)
Public art (sculptures, murals, statues, etc.)	-	28.6% (2.0)	42.9% (3.0)	14.3% (1.0)	14.3% (1.0)
Streetscapes (landscaping, lighting, signage, traffic-calming devices, etc.)	14.3% (1.0)	28.6% (2.0)	28.6% (2.0)	14.3% (1.0)	14.3% (1.0)
70 to 79 Pct range (5)					
Social spaces (community centers, gathering places, etc.)	-	-	80.0% (4.0)	20.0% (1.0)	-
Public art (sculptures, murals, statues, etc.)	-	40.0% (2.0)	40.0% (2.0)	20.0% (1.0)	-
Streetscapes (landscaping, lighting, signage, traffic-calming devices, etc.)	-	40.0% (2.0)	20.0% (1.0)	40.0% (2.0)	-
80 to 89 Pct range (70)					
Social spaces (community centers, gathering places, etc.)	-	14.3% (10.0)	40.0% (28.0)	35.7% (25.0)	10.0% (7.0)
Public art (sculptures, murals, statues, etc.)	-	28.6% (20.0)	44.3% (31.0)	20.0% (14.0)	7.1% (5.0)
Streetscapes (landscaping, lighting, signage, traffic-calming devices, etc.)	10.0% (7.0)	17.1% (12.0)	24.3% (17.0)	41.4% (29.0)	7.1% (5.0)
90 Pct and up (85)					
Social spaces (community centers, gathering places, etc.)	1.2% (1.0)	14.1% (12.0)	30.6% (26.0)	47.1% (40.0)	7.1% (6.0)
Public art (sculptures, murals, statues, etc.)	3.5% (3.0)	35.3% (30.0)	32.9% (28.0)	22.4% (19.0)	5.9% (5.0)
Streetscapes (landscaping, lighting, signage, traffic-calming devices, etc.)	8.2% (7.0)	28.2% (24.0)	31.8% (27.0)	23.5% (20.0)	8.2% (7.0)
Unknown (2)					
Social spaces (community centers, gathering places, etc.)	50.0% (1.0)	-	-	50.0% (1.0)	-
Public art (sculptures, murals, statues, etc.)	-	100.0% (2.0)	-	-	-
Streetscapes (landscaping, lighting, signage, traffic-calming devices, etc.)	50.0% (1.0)	50.0% (1.0)	-	-	-

HOME OWNER/RENTER

187 REGISTERED VOTERS

	Very Unsatisfied	Unsatisfied	Neutral	Satisfied	Very Satisfied
--	------------------	-------------	---------	-----------	----------------

Likely Homeowner (106)

Social spaces (community centers, gathering places, etc.)	1.9% (2.0)	11.3% (12.0)	36.8% (39.0)	40.6% (43.0)	9.4% (10.0)
Public art (sculptures, murals, statues, etc.)	0.9% (1.0)	31.1% (33.0)	40.6% (43.0)	23.6% (25.0)	3.8% (4.0)
Streetscapes (landscaping, lighting, signage, traffic-calming devices, etc.)	5.7% (6.0)	28.3% (30.0)	28.3% (30.0)	30.2% (32.0)	7.5% (8.0)

Likely Renter (55)

Social spaces (community centers, gathering places, etc.)	1.8% (1.0)	14.5% (8.0)	38.2% (21.0)	40.0% (22.0)	5.5% (3.0)
Public art (sculptures, murals, statues, etc.)	3.6% (2.0)	29.1% (16.0)	38.2% (21.0)	23.6% (13.0)	5.5% (3.0)
Streetscapes (landscaping, lighting, signage, traffic-calming devices, etc.)	10.9% (6.0)	20.0% (11.0)	23.6% (13.0)	40.0% (22.0)	5.5% (3.0)

Unknown (26)

Social spaces (community centers, gathering places, etc.)	3.8% (1.0)	19.2% (5.0)	19.2% (5.0)	50.0% (13.0)	7.7% (2.0)
Public art (sculptures, murals, statues, etc.)	3.8% (1.0)	42.3% (11.0)	19.2% (5.0)	15.4% (4.0)	19.2% (5.0)
Streetscapes (landscaping, lighting, signage, traffic-calming devices, etc.)	15.4% (4.0)	19.2% (5.0)	23.1% (6.0)	30.8% (8.0)	11.5% (3.0)

Please rate your level of satisfaction with the following aspects of schools and education in Fitchburg:

CURRENT RESULTS					303 Total Responses
	Very Unsatisfied	Unsatisfied	Neutral	Satisfied	Very Satisfied
Access to resources	7% (21)	14% (41)	53% (162)	20% (61)	6% (18)
Distance to schools	11% (34)	18% (54)	45% (136)	19% (59)	7% (20)
After-school programming	7% (20)	11% (32)	67% (202)	11% (34)	5% (15)

REGISTERED (181)					
	Very Unsatisfied	Unsatisfied	Neutral	Satisfied	Very Satisfied
Access to resources	7.0% (13)	14.0% (26)	53.0% (96)	22.0% (39)	4.0% (7)
Distance to schools	9.0% (17)	17.0% (31)	48.0% (86)	22.0% (39)	4.0% (8)
After-school programming	8.0% (14)	12.0% (21)	66.0% (119)	12.0% (22)	3.0% (5)

NON-REGISTERED (122)					
	Very Unsatisfied	Unsatisfied	Neutral	Satisfied	Very Satisfied
Access to resources	6.6% (8)	12.3% (15)	54.1% (66)	18.0% (22)	9.0% (11)
Distance to schools	13.9% (17)	18.9% (23)	41.0% (50)	16.4% (20)	9.8% (12)
After-school programming	4.9% (6)	9.0% (11)	68.0% (83)	9.8% (12)	8.2% (10)

ALL RESPONDENTS (303)					
	Very Unsatisfied	Unsatisfied	Neutral	Satisfied	Very Satisfied
Access to resources	7% (21)	14% (41)	53% (162)	20% (61)	6% (18)
Distance to schools	11% (34)	18% (54)	45% (136)	19% (59)	7% (20)
After-school programming	7% (20)	11% (32)	67% (202)	11% (34)	5% (15)

REGISTERED VOTERS IN FITCHBURG, WI (181)					
	Very Unsatisfied	Unsatisfied	Neutral	Satisfied	Very Satisfied
Access to resources	7% (13)	14% (26)	53% (96)	22% (39)	4% (7)
Distance to schools	9% (17)	17% (31)	48% (86)	22% (39)	4% (8)
After-school programming	8% (14)	12% (21)	66% (119)	12% (22)	3% (5)

LIVE IN FITCHBURG, WI (267) - SELF-REPORTED					
	Very Unsatisfied	Unsatisfied	Neutral	Satisfied	Very Satisfied
Access to resources	7% (19)	14% (38)	53% (142)	20% (54)	5% (14)
Distance to schools	11% (29)	18% (47)	45% (121)	20% (54)	6% (16)
After-school programming	7% (18)	11% (29)	66% (177)	12% (31)	4% (12)

SUBSCRIBERS TO FITCHBURG, WI (271)					
	Very Unsatisfied	Unsatisfied	Neutral	Satisfied	Very Satisfied
Access to resources	7% (19)	14% (39)	54% (145)	20% (54)	5% (14)
Distance to schools	11% (30)	18% (48)	45% (123)	20% (54)	6% (16)
After-school programming	7% (18)	11% (30)	66% (180)	11% (31)	4% (12)

REGISTER RESPONDENTS FROM ANYWHERE (187)					
	Very Unsatisfied	Unsatisfied	Neutral	Satisfied	Very Satisfied
Access to resources	7% (13)	15% (28)	53% (99)	21% (40)	4% (7)
Distance to schools	10% (18)	18% (33)	48% (89)	21% (39)	4% (8)
After-school programming	7% (14)	12% (22)	66% (123)	12% (23)	3% (5)

EDUCATION					187 REGISTERED VOTERS
	Very Unsatisfied	Unsatisfied	Neutral	Satisfied	Very Satisfied

Bach Degree - Extremely Likely (30)

Access to resources	10.0% (3.0)	26.7% (8.0)	33.3% (10.0)	23.3% (7.0)	6.7% (2.0)
Distance to schools	13.3% (4.0)	20.0% (6.0)	30.0% (9.0)	33.3% (10.0)	3.3% (1.0)
After-school programming	6.7% (2.0)	16.7% (5.0)	56.7% (17.0)	16.7% (5.0)	3.3% (1.0)

Bach Degree - Likely (21)

Access to resources	14.3% (3.0)	9.5% (2.0)	42.9% (9.0)	28.6% (6.0)	4.8% (1.0)
Distance to schools	19.0% (4.0)	19.0% (4.0)	33.3% (7.0)	23.8% (5.0)	4.8% (1.0)
After-school programming	19.0% (4.0)	9.5% (2.0)	52.4% (11.0)	14.3% (3.0)	4.8% (1.0)

Grad Degree - Extremely Likely (22)

Access to resources	4.5% (1.0)	13.6% (3.0)	50.0% (11.0)	27.3% (6.0)	4.5% (1.0)
Distance to schools	9.1% (2.0)	9.1% (2.0)	50.0% (11.0)	27.3% (6.0)	4.5% (1.0)
After-school programming	4.5% (1.0)	18.2% (4.0)	68.2% (15.0)	9.1% (2.0)	-

Grad Degree - Likely (13)

Access to resources	-	7.7% (1.0)	84.6% (11.0)	7.7% (1.0)	-
Distance to schools	-	7.7% (1.0)	76.9% (10.0)	7.7% (1.0)	7.7% (1.0)
After-school programming	-	-	92.3% (12.0)	7.7% (1.0)	-

HS Diploma - Extremely Likely (9)

Access to resources	-	11.1% (1.0)	55.6% (5.0)	22.2% (2.0)	11.1% (1.0)
Distance to schools	11.1% (1.0)	33.3% (3.0)	22.2% (2.0)	33.3% (3.0)	-
After-school programming	-	-	77.8% (7.0)	11.1% (1.0)	11.1% (1.0)

HS Diploma - Likely (4)

Access to resources	-	25.0% (1.0)	25.0% (1.0)	50.0% (2.0)	-
Distance to schools	-	-	50.0% (2.0)	50.0% (2.0)	-
After-school programming	-	25.0% (1.0)	25.0% (1.0)	50.0% (2.0)	-

Less than HS Diploma - Likely (1)

Access to resources	-	-	-	100.0% (1.0)	-
Distance to schools	-	-	-	100.0% (1.0)	-
After-school programming	-	-	-	100.0% (1.0)	-

Some College - Likely (12)

Access to resources	-	8.3% (1.0)	83.3% (10.0)	8.3% (1.0)	-
Distance to schools	-	-	83.3% (10.0)	16.7% (2.0)	-
After-school programming	-	8.3% (1.0)	83.3% (10.0)	8.3% (1.0)	-

Some College - Extremely Likely (5)

Access to resources	-	40.0% (2.0)	20.0% (1.0)	40.0% (2.0)	-
Distance to schools	20.0% (1.0)	20.0% (1.0)	20.0% (1.0)	40.0% (2.0)	-
After-school programming	20.0% (1.0)	20.0% (1.0)	20.0% (1.0)	40.0% (2.0)	-

Unknown (70)

Access to resources	8.6% (6.0)	12.9% (9.0)	58.6% (41.0)	17.1% (12.0)	2.9% (2.0)
Distance to schools	8.6% (6.0)	22.9% (16.0)	52.9% (37.0)	10.0% (7.0)	5.7% (4.0)
After-school programming	8.6% (6.0)	11.4% (8.0)	70.0% (49.0)	7.1% (5.0)	2.9% (2.0)

VOTERS GENDER

187 REGISTERED VOTERS

Very Unsatisfied	Unsatisfied	Neutral	Satisfied	Very Satisfied
------------------	-------------	---------	-----------	----------------

F (90)

Access to resources	7.8% (7.0)	17.8% (16.0)	54.4% (49.0)	15.6% (14.0)	4.4% (4.0)
---------------------	------------	--------------	--------------	--------------	------------

Distance to schools	10.0% (9.0)	21.1% (19.0)	52.2% (47.0)	13.3% (12.0)	3.3% (3.0)
After-school programming	8.9% (8.0)	12.2% (11.0)	65.6% (59.0)	10.0% (9.0)	3.3% (3.0)

M (95)

Access to resources	6.3% (6.0)	11.6% (11.0)	51.6% (49.0)	27.4% (26.0)	3.2% (3.0)
Distance to schools	9.5% (9.0)	13.7% (13.0)	43.2% (41.0)	28.4% (27.0)	5.3% (5.0)
After-school programming	6.3% (6.0)	10.5% (10.0)	66.3% (63.0)	14.7% (14.0)	2.1% (2.0)

Unknown (2)

Access to resources	-	50.0% (1.0)	50.0% (1.0)	-	-
Distance to schools	-	50.0% (1.0)	50.0% (1.0)	-	-
After-school programming	-	50.0% (1.0)	50.0% (1.0)	-	-

PRECINCT

187 REGISTERED VOTERS

	Very Unsatisfied	Unsatisfied	Neutral	Satisfied	Very Satisfied
--	------------------	-------------	---------	-----------	----------------

CHICAGO 43-04 (1)

Access to resources	-	-	100.0% (1.0)	-	-
Distance to schools	-	-	100.0% (1.0)	-	-
After-school programming	-	-	100.0% (1.0)	-	-

FITCHBURG CITY WARD 01 (9)

Access to resources	-	33.3% (3.0)	44.4% (4.0)	22.2% (2.0)	-
Distance to schools	-	33.3% (3.0)	66.7% (6.0)	-	-
After-school programming	-	22.2% (2.0)	77.8% (7.0)	-	-

FITCHBURG CITY WARD 02 (3)

Access to resources	-	-	100.0% (3.0)	-	-
Distance to schools	-	-	100.0% (3.0)	-	-
After-school programming	-	-	100.0% (3.0)	-	-

FITCHBURG CITY WARD 04 (2)

Access to resources	-	-	50.0% (1.0)	-	50.0% (1.0)
Distance to schools	-	-	50.0% (1.0)	50.0% (1.0)	-
After-school programming	-	-	100.0% (2.0)	-	-

FITCHBURG CITY WARD 05 (6)

Access to resources	-	16.7% (1.0)	66.7% (4.0)	16.7% (1.0)	-
Distance to schools	-	16.7% (1.0)	33.3% (2.0)	50.0% (3.0)	-
After-school programming	16.7% (1.0)	-	83.3% (5.0)	-	-

FITCHBURG CITY WARD 06 (12)

Access to resources	33.3% (4.0)	33.3% (4.0)	25.0% (3.0)	-	8.3% (1.0)
Distance to schools	16.7% (2.0)	25.0% (3.0)	41.7% (5.0)	8.3% (1.0)	8.3% (1.0)
After-school programming	16.7% (2.0)	33.3% (4.0)	41.7% (5.0)	-	8.3% (1.0)

FITCHBURG CITY WARD 07 (18)

Access to resources	-	22.2% (4.0)	66.7% (12.0)	11.1% (2.0)	-
Distance to schools	11.1% (2.0)	11.1% (2.0)	55.6% (10.0)	22.2% (4.0)	-
After-school programming	5.6% (1.0)	5.6% (1.0)	83.3% (15.0)	5.6% (1.0)	-

FITCHBURG CITY WARD 08 (14)

Access to resources	7.1% (1.0)	21.4% (3.0)	50.0% (7.0)	21.4% (3.0)	-
Distance to schools	14.3% (2.0)	21.4% (3.0)	42.9% (6.0)	21.4% (3.0)	-
After-school programming	7.1% (1.0)	21.4% (3.0)	42.9% (6.0)	28.6% (4.0)	-

FITCHBURG CITY WARD 09 (8)

Access to resources	-	12.5% (1.0)	75.0% (6.0)	12.5% (1.0)	-
Distance to schools	-	12.5% (1.0)	62.5% (5.0)	12.5% (1.0)	12.5% (1.0)
After-school programming	-	12.5% (1.0)	87.5% (7.0)	-	-

FITCHBURG CITY WARD 12 (2)

Access to resources	-	-	100.0% (2.0)	-	-
Distance to schools	-	-	100.0% (2.0)	-	-
After-school programming	-	-	100.0% (2.0)	-	-

FITCHBURG CITY WARD 13 (31)

Access to resources	16.1% (5.0)	12.9% (4.0)	54.8% (17.0)	12.9% (4.0)	3.2% (1.0)
Distance to schools	19.4% (6.0)	12.9% (4.0)	54.8% (17.0)	12.9% (4.0)	-
After-school programming	19.4% (6.0)	6.5% (2.0)	67.7% (21.0)	6.5% (2.0)	-

FITCHBURG CITY WARD 14 (19)

Access to resources	-	10.5% (2.0)	57.9% (11.0)	31.6% (6.0)	-
Distance to schools	10.5% (2.0)	26.3% (5.0)	47.4% (9.0)	15.8% (3.0)	-
After-school programming	5.3% (1.0)	10.5% (2.0)	68.4% (13.0)	15.8% (3.0)	-

FITCHBURG CITY WARD 15 (7)

Access to resources	-	-	85.7% (6.0)	14.3% (1.0)	-
Distance to schools	-	14.3% (1.0)	85.7% (6.0)	-	-
After-school programming	-	-	100.0% (7.0)	-	-

FITCHBURG CITY WARD 16 (3)

Access to resources	-	-	33.3% (1.0)	66.7% (2.0)	-
Distance to schools	-	33.3% (1.0)	33.3% (1.0)	33.3% (1.0)	-
After-school programming	-	-	33.3% (1.0)	66.7% (2.0)	-

FITCHBURG CITY WARD 17 (7)

Access to resources	-	14.3% (1.0)	57.1% (4.0)	14.3% (1.0)	14.3% (1.0)
Distance to schools	14.3% (1.0)	-	57.1% (4.0)	28.6% (2.0)	-
After-school programming	-	14.3% (1.0)	57.1% (4.0)	14.3% (1.0)	14.3% (1.0)

FITCHBURG CITY WARD 18 (12)

Access to resources	-	25.0% (3.0)	50.0% (6.0)	25.0% (3.0)	-
Distance to schools	-	41.7% (5.0)	16.7% (2.0)	33.3% (4.0)	8.3% (1.0)
After-school programming	8.3% (1.0)	25.0% (3.0)	50.0% (6.0)	16.7% (2.0)	-

FITCHBURG CITY WARD 19 (26)

Access to resources	11.5% (3.0)	-	30.8% (8.0)	46.2% (12.0)	11.5% (3.0)
Distance to schools	7.7% (2.0)	7.7% (2.0)	23.1% (6.0)	42.3% (11.0)	19.2% (5.0)
After-school programming	3.8% (1.0)	3.8% (1.0)	53.8% (14.0)	26.9% (7.0)	11.5% (3.0)

MADISON CITY WARD 042 (1)

Access to resources	-	100.0% (1.0)	-	-	-
Distance to schools	100.0% (1.0)	-	-	-	-
After-school programming	-	-	100.0% (1.0)	-	-

MADISON CITY WARD 053 (1)

Access to resources	-	-	100.0% (1.0)	-	-
Distance to schools	-	-	100.0% (1.0)	-	-
After-school programming	-	-	100.0% (1.0)	-	-

MADISON CITY WARD 100 (1)

Access to resources	-	-	100.0% (1.0)	-	-
---------------------	---	---	--------------	---	---

Distance to schools	-	-	-	100.0% (1.0)	-
After-school programming	-	-	100.0% (1.0)	-	-

MADISON CITY WARD 107 (1)

Access to resources	-	100.0% (1.0)	-	-	-
Distance to schools	-	100.0% (1.0)	-	-	-
After-school programming	-	100.0% (1.0)	-	-	-

MIDDLETON TOWN WARD 7 (1)

Access to resources	-	-	100.0% (1.0)	-	-
Distance to schools	-	-	100.0% (1.0)	-	-
After-school programming	-	-	100.0% (1.0)	-	-

MOUNT HOREB VLG WARD 3 (1)

Access to resources	-	-	-	100.0% (1.0)	-
Distance to schools	-	100.0% (1.0)	-	-	-
After-school programming	-	-	-	100.0% (1.0)	-

OREGON VLG WARD 10 (1)

Access to resources	-	-	-	100.0% (1.0)	-
Distance to schools	-	-	100.0% (1.0)	-	-
After-school programming	-	100.0% (1.0)	-	-	-

AGE RANGE

187 REGISTERED VOTERS

Very Unsatisfied	Unsatisfied	Neutral	Satisfied	Very Satisfied
------------------	-------------	---------	-----------	----------------

18-29 (1)

Access to resources	-	-	100.0% (1.0)	-	-
Distance to schools	-	-	100.0% (1.0)	-	-
After-school programming	-	-	100.0% (1.0)	-	-

30-39 (24)

Access to resources	12.5% (3.0)	12.5% (3.0)	58.3% (14.0)	12.5% (3.0)	4.2% (1.0)
Distance to schools	16.7% (4.0)	12.5% (3.0)	50.0% (12.0)	12.5% (3.0)	8.3% (2.0)
After-school programming	16.7% (4.0)	8.3% (2.0)	62.5% (15.0)	12.5% (3.0)	-

40-49 (29)

Access to resources	3.4% (1.0)	24.1% (7.0)	24.1% (7.0)	44.8% (13.0)	3.4% (1.0)
Distance to schools	-	27.6% (8.0)	31.0% (9.0)	34.5% (10.0)	6.9% (2.0)
After-school programming	3.4% (1.0)	27.6% (8.0)	51.7% (15.0)	13.8% (4.0)	3.4% (1.0)

50-59 (23)

Access to resources	4.3% (1.0)	21.7% (5.0)	56.5% (13.0)	17.4% (4.0)	-
Distance to schools	17.4% (4.0)	17.4% (4.0)	47.8% (11.0)	13.0% (3.0)	4.3% (1.0)
After-school programming	4.3% (1.0)	13.0% (3.0)	69.6% (16.0)	13.0% (3.0)	-

60-69 (26)

Access to resources	3.8% (1.0)	11.5% (3.0)	57.7% (15.0)	23.1% (6.0)	3.8% (1.0)
Distance to schools	15.4% (4.0)	19.2% (5.0)	34.6% (9.0)	30.8% (8.0)	-
After-school programming	7.7% (2.0)	3.8% (1.0)	73.1% (19.0)	15.4% (4.0)	-

70-79 (16)

Access to resources	6.3% (1.0)	12.5% (2.0)	43.8% (7.0)	25.0% (4.0)	12.5% (2.0)
Distance to schools	6.3% (1.0)	18.8% (3.0)	50.0% (8.0)	18.8% (3.0)	6.3% (1.0)
After-school programming	-	6.3% (1.0)	68.8% (11.0)	18.8% (3.0)	6.3% (1.0)

unknown (68)

Access to resources	8.8% (6.0)	11.8% (8.0)	61.8% (42.0)	14.7% (10.0)	2.9% (2.0)
Distance to schools	7.4% (5.0)	14.7% (10.0)	57.4% (39.0)	17.6% (12.0)	2.9% (2.0)
After-school programming	8.8% (6.0)	10.3% (7.0)	67.6% (46.0)	8.8% (6.0)	4.4% (3.0)

VOTERS 187 REGISTERED VOTERS
AGE

	Very Unsatisfied	Unsatisfied	Neutral	Satisfied	Very Satisfied
--	------------------	-------------	---------	-----------	----------------

28 (1)

Access to resources	-	-	100.0% (1.0)	-	-
Distance to schools	-	-	100.0% (1.0)	-	-
After-school programming	-	-	100.0% (1.0)	-	-

31 (1)

Access to resources	-	-	100.0% (1.0)	-	-
Distance to schools	-	-	100.0% (1.0)	-	-
After-school programming	-	-	100.0% (1.0)	-	-

32 (1)

Access to resources	-	-	100.0% (1.0)	-	-
Distance to schools	-	-	100.0% (1.0)	-	-
After-school programming	-	-	100.0% (1.0)	-	-

33 (1)

Access to resources	-	-	100.0% (1.0)	-	-
Distance to schools	-	-	100.0% (1.0)	-	-
After-school programming	-	-	100.0% (1.0)	-	-

34 (1)

Access to resources	-	-	100.0% (1.0)	-	-
Distance to schools	-	-	100.0% (1.0)	-	-
After-school programming	-	-	100.0% (1.0)	-	-

35 (5)

Access to resources	-	20.0% (1.0)	60.0% (3.0)	20.0% (1.0)	-
Distance to schools	20.0% (1.0)	40.0% (2.0)	40.0% (2.0)	-	-
After-school programming	20.0% (1.0)	20.0% (1.0)	60.0% (3.0)	-	-

36 (3)

Access to resources	-	-	66.7% (2.0)	33.3% (1.0)	-
Distance to schools	-	-	66.7% (2.0)	-	33.3% (1.0)
After-school programming	-	-	100.0% (3.0)	-	-

37 (5)

Access to resources	20.0% (1.0)	40.0% (2.0)	20.0% (1.0)	20.0% (1.0)	-
Distance to schools	20.0% (1.0)	-	40.0% (2.0)	40.0% (2.0)	-
After-school programming	20.0% (1.0)	20.0% (1.0)	40.0% (2.0)	20.0% (1.0)	-

38 (3)

Access to resources	-	-	100.0% (3.0)	-	-
Distance to schools	-	-	66.7% (2.0)	33.3% (1.0)	-
After-school programming	-	-	100.0% (3.0)	-	-

39 (4)

Access to resources	50.0% (2.0)	-	25.0% (1.0)	-	25.0% (1.0)
---------------------	-------------	---	-------------	---	-------------

Distance to schools	50.0% (2.0)	25.0% (1.0)	-	-	25.0% (1.0)
After-school programming	50.0% (2.0)	-	-	50.0% (2.0)	-
40 (3)					
Access to resources	-	33.3% (1.0)	-	66.7% (2.0)	-
Distance to schools	-	33.3% (1.0)	33.3% (1.0)	33.3% (1.0)	-
After-school programming	-	33.3% (1.0)	66.7% (2.0)	-	-
41 (3)					
Access to resources	33.3% (1.0)	33.3% (1.0)	33.3% (1.0)	-	-
Distance to schools	-	66.7% (2.0)	33.3% (1.0)	-	-
After-school programming	-	33.3% (1.0)	66.7% (2.0)	-	-
43 (5)					
Access to resources	-	-	40.0% (2.0)	60.0% (3.0)	-
Distance to schools	-	20.0% (1.0)	20.0% (1.0)	60.0% (3.0)	-
After-school programming	20.0% (1.0)	-	80.0% (4.0)	-	-
44 (6)					
Access to resources	-	33.3% (2.0)	16.7% (1.0)	50.0% (3.0)	-
Distance to schools	-	16.7% (1.0)	33.3% (2.0)	50.0% (3.0)	-
After-school programming	-	50.0% (3.0)	16.7% (1.0)	33.3% (2.0)	-
45 (2)					
Access to resources	-	-	50.0% (1.0)	50.0% (1.0)	-
Distance to schools	-	50.0% (1.0)	-	50.0% (1.0)	-
After-school programming	-	50.0% (1.0)	50.0% (1.0)	-	-
46 (1)					
Access to resources	-	-	-	100.0% (1.0)	-
Distance to schools	-	-	-	100.0% (1.0)	-
After-school programming	-	-	100.0% (1.0)	-	-
47 (3)					
Access to resources	-	33.3% (1.0)	33.3% (1.0)	33.3% (1.0)	-
Distance to schools	-	-	66.7% (2.0)	-	33.3% (1.0)
After-school programming	-	33.3% (1.0)	66.7% (2.0)	-	-
48 (2)					
Access to resources	-	50.0% (1.0)	-	-	50.0% (1.0)
Distance to schools	-	-	50.0% (1.0)	-	50.0% (1.0)
After-school programming	-	50.0% (1.0)	-	-	50.0% (1.0)
49 (4)					
Access to resources	-	25.0% (1.0)	25.0% (1.0)	50.0% (2.0)	-
Distance to schools	-	50.0% (2.0)	25.0% (1.0)	25.0% (1.0)	-
After-school programming	-	-	50.0% (2.0)	50.0% (2.0)	-
50 (1)					
Access to resources	-	100.0% (1.0)	-	-	-
Distance to schools	-	100.0% (1.0)	-	-	-
After-school programming	-	100.0% (1.0)	-	-	-
51 (1)					
Access to resources	100.0% (1.0)	-	-	-	-
Distance to schools	100.0% (1.0)	-	-	-	-
After-school programming	-	-	100.0% (1.0)	-	-

52 (5)

Access to resources	-	20.0% (1.0)	80.0% (4.0)	-	-
Distance to schools	-	20.0% (1.0)	80.0% (4.0)	-	-
After-school programming	-	20.0% (1.0)	80.0% (4.0)	-	-

53 (4)

Access to resources	-	-	75.0% (3.0)	25.0% (1.0)	-
Distance to schools	-	-	50.0% (2.0)	50.0% (2.0)	-
After-school programming	-	-	75.0% (3.0)	25.0% (1.0)	-

54 (1)

Access to resources	-	-	-	100.0% (1.0)	-
Distance to schools	-	100.0% (1.0)	-	-	-
After-school programming	-	-	-	100.0% (1.0)	-

55 (3)

Access to resources	-	33.3% (1.0)	66.7% (2.0)	-	-
Distance to schools	33.3% (1.0)	-	66.7% (2.0)	-	-
After-school programming	33.3% (1.0)	-	66.7% (2.0)	-	-

56 (2)

Access to resources	-	-	100.0% (2.0)	-	-
Distance to schools	-	-	100.0% (2.0)	-	-
After-school programming	-	-	100.0% (2.0)	-	-

57 (1)

Access to resources	-	-	-	100.0% (1.0)	-
Distance to schools	-	-	-	100.0% (1.0)	-
After-school programming	-	-	-	100.0% (1.0)	-

59 (5)

Access to resources	-	40.0% (2.0)	40.0% (2.0)	20.0% (1.0)	-
Distance to schools	40.0% (2.0)	20.0% (1.0)	20.0% (1.0)	-	20.0% (1.0)
After-school programming	-	20.0% (1.0)	80.0% (4.0)	-	-

60 (3)

Access to resources	-	33.3% (1.0)	33.3% (1.0)	33.3% (1.0)	-
Distance to schools	33.3% (1.0)	-	33.3% (1.0)	33.3% (1.0)	-
After-school programming	-	-	66.7% (2.0)	33.3% (1.0)	-

61 (1)

Access to resources	-	-	100.0% (1.0)	-	-
Distance to schools	-	100.0% (1.0)	-	-	-
After-school programming	-	-	100.0% (1.0)	-	-

62 (5)

Access to resources	-	-	100.0% (5.0)	-	-
Distance to schools	20.0% (1.0)	40.0% (2.0)	40.0% (2.0)	-	-
After-school programming	-	-	100.0% (5.0)	-	-

63 (2)

Access to resources	50.0% (1.0)	50.0% (1.0)	-	-	-
Distance to schools	50.0% (1.0)	-	-	50.0% (1.0)	-
After-school programming	50.0% (1.0)	-	50.0% (1.0)	-	-

64 (5)

Access to resources	-	-	60.0% (3.0)	20.0% (1.0)	20.0% (1.0)
Distance to schools	-	-	60.0% (3.0)	40.0% (2.0)	-
After-school programming	-	-	80.0% (4.0)	20.0% (1.0)	-
65 (2)					
Access to resources	-	-	50.0% (1.0)	50.0% (1.0)	-
Distance to schools	50.0% (1.0)	-	50.0% (1.0)	-	-
After-school programming	50.0% (1.0)	-	50.0% (1.0)	-	-
66 (2)					
Access to resources	-	-	50.0% (1.0)	50.0% (1.0)	-
Distance to schools	-	-	50.0% (1.0)	50.0% (1.0)	-
After-school programming	-	-	50.0% (1.0)	50.0% (1.0)	-
67 (1)					
Access to resources	-	-	-	100.0% (1.0)	-
Distance to schools	-	-	-	100.0% (1.0)	-
After-school programming	-	-	-	100.0% (1.0)	-
68 (3)					
Access to resources	-	-	66.7% (2.0)	33.3% (1.0)	-
Distance to schools	-	33.3% (1.0)	-	66.7% (2.0)	-
After-school programming	-	-	100.0% (3.0)	-	-
69 (2)					
Access to resources	-	50.0% (1.0)	50.0% (1.0)	-	-
Distance to schools	-	50.0% (1.0)	50.0% (1.0)	-	-
After-school programming	-	50.0% (1.0)	50.0% (1.0)	-	-
71 (2)					
Access to resources	-	-	50.0% (1.0)	50.0% (1.0)	-
Distance to schools	-	-	50.0% (1.0)	50.0% (1.0)	-
After-school programming	-	-	50.0% (1.0)	50.0% (1.0)	-
72 (3)					
Access to resources	-	33.3% (1.0)	33.3% (1.0)	33.3% (1.0)	-
Distance to schools	-	33.3% (1.0)	33.3% (1.0)	33.3% (1.0)	-
After-school programming	-	33.3% (1.0)	33.3% (1.0)	33.3% (1.0)	-
73 (3)					
Access to resources	-	33.3% (1.0)	33.3% (1.0)	-	33.3% (1.0)
Distance to schools	-	33.3% (1.0)	33.3% (1.0)	-	33.3% (1.0)
After-school programming	-	-	66.7% (2.0)	-	33.3% (1.0)
74 (4)					
Access to resources	-	-	50.0% (2.0)	25.0% (1.0)	25.0% (1.0)
Distance to schools	-	25.0% (1.0)	50.0% (2.0)	25.0% (1.0)	-
After-school programming	-	-	75.0% (3.0)	25.0% (1.0)	-
77 (2)					
Access to resources	50.0% (1.0)	-	50.0% (1.0)	-	-
Distance to schools	50.0% (1.0)	-	50.0% (1.0)	-	-
After-school programming	-	-	100.0% (2.0)	-	-
79 (2)					
Access to resources	-	-	50.0% (1.0)	50.0% (1.0)	-

Distance to schools	-	-	100.0% (2.0)	-	-
After-school programming	-	-	100.0% (2.0)	-	-
Unknown (68)					
Access to resources	8.8% (6.0)	11.8% (8.0)	61.8% (42.0)	14.7% (10.0)	2.9% (2.0)
Distance to schools	7.4% (5.0)	14.7% (10.0)	57.4% (39.0)	17.6% (12.0)	2.9% (2.0)
After-school programming	8.8% (6.0)	10.3% (7.0)	67.6% (46.0)	8.8% (6.0)	4.4% (3.0)
STATE INCOME DECILE					
187 REGISTERED VOTERS					
	Very Unsatisfied	Unsatisfied	Neutral	Satisfied	Very Satisfied
0 to 9 Pct range (6)					
Access to resources	-	-	66.7% (4.0)	16.7% (1.0)	16.7% (1.0)
Distance to schools	-	-	66.7% (4.0)	33.3% (2.0)	-
After-school programming	-	-	83.3% (5.0)	16.7% (1.0)	-
10 to 19 Pct range (1)					
Access to resources	-	-	-	100.0% (1.0)	-
Distance to schools	-	-	-	100.0% (1.0)	-
After-school programming	-	-	-	-	100.0% (1.0)
40 to 49 Pct range (2)					
Access to resources	-	-	50.0% (1.0)	50.0% (1.0)	-
Distance to schools	-	-	100.0% (2.0)	-	-
After-school programming	-	-	100.0% (2.0)	-	-
50 to 59 Pct range (9)					
Access to resources	-	33.3% (3.0)	55.6% (5.0)	11.1% (1.0)	-
Distance to schools	-	33.3% (3.0)	66.7% (6.0)	-	-
After-school programming	-	22.2% (2.0)	77.8% (7.0)	-	-
60 to 69 Pct range (7)					
Access to resources	-	14.3% (1.0)	71.4% (5.0)	14.3% (1.0)	-
Distance to schools	-	14.3% (1.0)	57.1% (4.0)	14.3% (1.0)	14.3% (1.0)
After-school programming	-	14.3% (1.0)	85.7% (6.0)	-	-
70 to 79 Pct range (5)					
Access to resources	-	-	80.0% (4.0)	20.0% (1.0)	-
Distance to schools	-	20.0% (1.0)	60.0% (3.0)	20.0% (1.0)	-
After-school programming	-	-	80.0% (4.0)	20.0% (1.0)	-
80 to 89 Pct range (70)					
Access to resources	10.0% (7.0)	10.0% (7.0)	58.6% (41.0)	18.6% (13.0)	2.9% (2.0)
Distance to schools	15.7% (11.0)	15.7% (11.0)	55.7% (39.0)	12.9% (9.0)	-
After-school programming	10.0% (7.0)	7.1% (5.0)	71.4% (50.0)	10.0% (7.0)	1.4% (1.0)
90 Pct and up (85)					
Access to resources	7.1% (6.0)	18.8% (16.0)	44.7% (38.0)	24.7% (21.0)	4.7% (4.0)
Distance to schools	8.2% (7.0)	18.8% (16.0)	35.3% (30.0)	29.4% (25.0)	8.2% (7.0)
After-school programming	7.1% (6.0)	16.5% (14.0)	56.5% (48.0)	16.5% (14.0)	3.5% (3.0)
Unknown (2)					
Access to resources	-	50.0% (1.0)	50.0% (1.0)	-	-
Distance to schools	-	50.0% (1.0)	50.0% (1.0)	-	-
After-school programming	50.0% (1.0)	-	50.0% (1.0)	-	-

HOME OWNER/RENTER

187 REGISTERED VOTERS

	Very Unsatisfied	Unsatisfied	Neutral	Satisfied	Very Satisfied
--	------------------	-------------	---------	-----------	----------------

Likely Homeowner (106)

Access to resources	6.6% (7.0)	17.9% (19.0)	45.3% (48.0)	25.5% (27.0)	4.7% (5.0)
Distance to schools	11.3% (12.0)	23.6% (25.0)	37.7% (40.0)	23.6% (25.0)	3.8% (4.0)
After-school programming	8.5% (9.0)	13.2% (14.0)	60.4% (64.0)	16.0% (17.0)	1.9% (2.0)

Likely Renter (55)

Access to resources	5.5% (3.0)	9.1% (5.0)	70.9% (39.0)	14.5% (8.0)	-
Distance to schools	7.3% (4.0)	5.5% (3.0)	67.3% (37.0)	14.5% (8.0)	5.5% (3.0)
After-school programming	5.5% (3.0)	3.6% (2.0)	85.5% (47.0)	5.5% (3.0)	-

Unknown (26)

Access to resources	11.5% (3.0)	15.4% (4.0)	46.2% (12.0)	19.2% (5.0)	7.7% (2.0)
Distance to schools	7.7% (2.0)	19.2% (5.0)	46.2% (12.0)	23.1% (6.0)	3.8% (1.0)
After-school programming	7.7% (2.0)	23.1% (6.0)	46.2% (12.0)	11.5% (3.0)	11.5% (3.0)

Please rate your level of satisfaction with Fitchburg as a “place” to do the following:

CURRENT RESULTS					303 Total Responses
	Very Unsatisfied	Unsatisfied	Neutral	Satisfied	Very Satisfied
A place to live	1% (2)	4% (11)	6% (19)	56% (171)	33% (100)
A place to work	1% (4)	7% (20)	50% (153)	29% (89)	12% (37)
A place to raise a family	1% (2)	4% (13)	23% (69)	46% (139)	26% (80)
A place to retire	4% (12)	12% (36)	33% (99)	35% (105)	17% (51)
A place to feel safe	3% (10)	17% (50)	22% (67)	42% (127)	16% (49)
A place to visit	8% (25)	22% (67)	31% (95)	30% (91)	8% (25)
A place to have a “night on the town”	20% (60)	37% (113)	29% (89)	11% (34)	2% (7)
A place to learn	5% (15)	17% (50)	49% (148)	24% (73)	6% (17)
A place for “opportunities for all”	5% (15)	16% (47)	41% (125)	31% (94)	7% (22)
A place to be healthy	1% (2)	3% (10)	17% (52)	61% (185)	18% (54)
A place for business	1% (4)	7% (22)	39% (119)	42% (126)	11% (32)
A place to call home	1% (4)	5% (14)	11% (33)	59% (178)	24% (74)
A place moving in the “right direction”	5% (16)	13% (40)	32% (97)	39% (119)	10% (31)

REGISTERED (181)

	Very Unsatisfied	Unsatisfied	Neutral	Satisfied	Very Satisfied
A place to live	-	2.0% (3)	5.0% (9)	59.0% (106)	35.0% (63)
A place to work	1.0% (2)	6.0% (11)	54.0% (98)	28.0% (51)	10.0% (19)
A place to raise a family	1.0% (1)	3.0% (5)	25.0% (45)	46.0% (84)	25.0% (46)
A place to retire	3.0% (5)	10.0% (18)	33.0% (60)	40.0% (72)	14.0% (26)
A place to feel safe	2.0% (3)	14.0% (26)	23.0% (42)	48.0% (87)	13.0% (23)
A place to visit	8.0% (14)	24.0% (43)	31.0% (56)	30.0% (54)	8.0% (14)
A place to have a “night on the town”	18.0% (33)	37.0% (67)	29.0% (53)	14.0% (25)	2.0% (3)
A place to learn	4.0% (7)	14.0% (26)	52.0% (94)	25.0% (45)	5.0% (9)
A place for “opportunities for all”	4.0% (7)	16.0% (29)	45.0% (82)	30.0% (54)	5.0% (9)
A place to be healthy	-	4.0% (7)	13.0% (24)	66.0% (119)	17.0% (31)
A place for business	-	6.0% (11)	42.0% (76)	41.0% (74)	11.0% (20)
A place to call home	1.0% (1)	3.0% (5)	9.0% (17)	62.0% (113)	25.0% (45)
A place moving in the “right direction”	4.0% (7)	10.0% (18)	35.0% (64)	41.0% (75)	9.0% (17)

NON-REGISTERED (122)

	Very Unsatisfied	Unsatisfied	Neutral	Satisfied	Very Satisfied
A place to live	1.6% (2)	6.6% (8)	8.2% (10)	53.3% (65)	30.3% (37)
A place to work	1.6% (2)	7.4% (9)	45.1% (55)	31.1% (38)	14.8% (18)
A place to raise a family	0.8% (1)	6.6% (8)	19.7% (24)	45.1% (55)	27.9% (34)
A place to retire	5.7% (7)	14.8% (18)	32.0% (39)	27.0% (33)	20.5% (25)
A place to feel safe	5.7% (7)	19.7% (24)	20.5% (25)	32.8% (40)	21.3% (26)
A place to visit	9.0% (11)	19.7% (24)	32.0% (39)	30.3% (37)	9.0% (11)
A place to have a “night on the town”	22.1% (27)	37.7% (46)	29.5% (36)	7.4% (9)	3.3% (4)
A place to learn	6.6% (8)	19.7% (24)	44.3% (54)	23.0% (28)	6.6% (8)
A place for “opportunities for all”	6.6% (8)	14.8% (18)	35.2% (43)	32.8% (40)	10.7% (13)
A place to be healthy	1.6% (2)	2.5% (3)	23.0% (28)	54.1% (66)	18.9% (23)
A place for business	3.3% (4)	9.0% (11)	35.2% (43)	42.6% (52)	9.8% (12)
A place to call home	2.5% (3)	7.4% (9)	13.1% (16)	53.3% (65)	23.8% (29)
A place moving in the “right direction”	7.4% (9)	18.0% (22)	27.0% (33)	36.1% (44)	11.5% (14)

ALL RESPONDENTS (303)

	Very Unsatisfied	Unsatisfied	Neutral	Satisfied	Very Satisfied
A place to live	1% (2)	4% (11)	6% (19)	56% (171)	33% (100)
A place to work	1% (4)	7% (20)	50% (153)	29% (89)	12% (37)

A place to raise a family	1% (2)	4% (13)	23% (69)	46% (139)	26% (80)
A place to retire	4% (12)	12% (36)	33% (99)	35% (105)	17% (51)
A place to feel safe	3% (10)	17% (50)	22% (67)	42% (127)	16% (49)
A place to visit	8% (25)	22% (67)	31% (95)	30% (91)	8% (25)
A place to have a "night on the town"	20% (60)	37% (113)	29% (89)	11% (34)	2% (7)
A place to learn	5% (15)	17% (50)	49% (148)	24% (73)	6% (17)
A place for "opportunities for all"	5% (15)	16% (47)	41% (125)	31% (94)	7% (22)
A place to be healthy	1% (2)	3% (10)	17% (52)	61% (185)	18% (54)
A place for business	1% (4)	7% (22)	39% (119)	42% (126)	11% (32)
A place to call home	1% (4)	5% (14)	11% (33)	59% (178)	24% (74)
A place moving in the "right direction"	5% (16)	13% (40)	32% (97)	39% (119)	10% (31)

REGISTERED VOTERS IN FITCHBURG, WI (181)

	Very Unsatisfied	Unsatisfied	Neutral	Satisfied	Very Satisfied
A place to live	0% (-)	2% (3)	5% (9)	59% (106)	35% (63)
A place to work	1% (2)	6% (11)	54% (98)	28% (51)	10% (19)
A place to raise a family	1% (1)	3% (5)	25% (45)	46% (84)	25% (46)
A place to retire	3% (5)	10% (18)	33% (60)	40% (72)	14% (26)
A place to feel safe	2% (3)	14% (26)	23% (42)	48% (87)	13% (23)
A place to visit	8% (14)	24% (43)	31% (56)	30% (54)	8% (14)
A place to have a "night on the town"	18% (33)	37% (67)	29% (53)	14% (25)	2% (3)
A place to learn	4% (7)	14% (26)	52% (94)	25% (45)	5% (9)
A place for "opportunities for all"	4% (7)	16% (29)	45% (82)	30% (54)	5% (9)
A place to be healthy	0% (-)	4% (7)	13% (24)	66% (119)	17% (31)
A place for business	0% (-)	6% (11)	42% (76)	41% (74)	11% (20)
A place to call home	1% (1)	3% (5)	9% (17)	62% (113)	25% (45)
A place moving in the "right direction"	4% (7)	10% (18)	35% (64)	41% (75)	9% (17)

LIVE IN FITCHBURG, WI (267) - SELF-REPORTED

	Very Unsatisfied	Unsatisfied	Neutral	Satisfied	Very Satisfied
A place to live	0% (-)	3% (8)	5% (14)	58% (154)	34% (90)
A place to work	1% (3)	7% (18)	51% (136)	30% (79)	12% (31)
A place to raise a family	0% (-)	4% (11)	22% (60)	46% (124)	27% (71)
A place to retire	4% (10)	12% (33)	34% (91)	34% (92)	15% (41)
A place to feel safe	3% (9)	17% (45)	22% (58)	44% (117)	14% (38)
A place to visit	8% (22)	23% (61)	32% (85)	30% (81)	7% (18)
A place to have a "night on the town"	20% (53)	38% (102)	29% (78)	11% (29)	2% (5)
A place to learn	5% (13)	17% (45)	50% (133)	24% (63)	5% (13)
A place for "opportunities for all"	5% (13)	15% (41)	42% (112)	31% (84)	6% (17)
A place to be healthy	0% (-)	3% (9)	16% (43)	63% (168)	17% (46)
A place for business	1% (2)	7% (19)	41% (109)	42% (112)	9% (25)
A place to call home	1% (3)	4% (12)	9% (24)	61% (164)	24% (64)
A place moving in the "right direction"	4% (12)	13% (34)	32% (85)	41% (109)	10% (27)

SUBSCRIBERS TO FITCHBURG, WI (271)

	Very Unsatisfied	Unsatisfied	Neutral	Satisfied	Very Satisfied
A place to live	0% (-)	3% (9)	6% (16)	57% (155)	33% (90)
A place to work	1% (3)	7% (18)	51% (139)	29% (79)	12% (32)
A place to raise a family	0% (-)	4% (12)	23% (61)	46% (125)	27% (72)
A place to retire	4% (10)	13% (34)	35% (94)	34% (92)	15% (41)
A place to feel safe	3% (9)	17% (46)	22% (60)	43% (117)	14% (39)
A place to visit	8% (22)	23% (62)	32% (87)	30% (81)	7% (19)
A place to have a "night on the town"	20% (53)	38% (104)	30% (80)	11% (29)	2% (5)
A place to learn	5% (13)	17% (46)	50% (136)	23% (63)	5% (13)
A place for "opportunities for all"	5% (13)	15% (42)	42% (115)	31% (84)	6% (17)
A place to be healthy	0% (-)	3% (9)	17% (45)	62% (169)	17% (47)
A place for business	1% (2)	7% (19)	41% (112)	41% (112)	10% (26)

A place to call home	1% (3)	5% (13)	10% (26)	61% (165)	24% (64)
A place moving in the "right direction"	4% (12)	13% (34)	32% (87)	41% (110)	10% (28)

REGISTER RESPONDENTS FROM ANYWHERE (187)

	Very Unsatisfied	Unsatisfied	Neutral	Satisfied	Very Satisfied
A place to live	0% (-)	2% (4)	6% (12)	57% (107)	34% (64)
A place to work	1% (2)	6% (11)	55% (102)	28% (52)	11% (20)
A place to raise a family	1% (1)	3% (6)	25% (47)	46% (86)	25% (47)
A place to retire	3% (5)	10% (19)	33% (62)	40% (74)	14% (27)
A place to feel safe	2% (3)	14% (26)	25% (46)	48% (89)	12% (23)
A place to visit	7% (14)	24% (45)	32% (59)	29% (55)	7% (14)
A place to have a "night on the town"	19% (35)	37% (69)	29% (55)	13% (25)	2% (3)
A place to learn	4% (7)	15% (28)	52% (98)	24% (45)	5% (9)
A place for "opportunities for all"	4% (7)	17% (31)	44% (83)	30% (57)	5% (9)
A place to be healthy	0% (-)	4% (7)	14% (27)	65% (121)	17% (32)
A place for business	0% (-)	6% (11)	42% (78)	41% (77)	11% (21)
A place to call home	1% (1)	4% (7)	10% (19)	61% (114)	25% (46)
A place moving in the "right direction"	4% (7)	10% (18)	36% (68)	41% (77)	9% (17)

EDUCATION

187 REGISTERED VOTERS

	Very Unsatisfied	Unsatisfied	Neutral	Satisfied	Very Satisfied
--	------------------	-------------	---------	-----------	----------------

Bach Degree - Extremely Likely (30)

A place to live	-	-	6.7% (2.0)	53.3% (16.0)	40.0% (12.0)
A place to work	3.3% (1.0)	10.0% (3.0)	50.0% (15.0)	20.0% (6.0)	16.7% (5.0)
A place to raise a family	-	-	16.7% (5.0)	43.3% (13.0)	40.0% (12.0)
A place to retire	-	10.0% (3.0)	33.3% (10.0)	30.0% (9.0)	26.7% (8.0)
A place to feel safe	3.3% (1.0)	13.3% (4.0)	30.0% (9.0)	33.3% (10.0)	20.0% (6.0)
A place to visit	10.0% (3.0)	13.3% (4.0)	33.3% (10.0)	26.7% (8.0)	16.7% (5.0)
A place to have a "night on the town"	10.0% (3.0)	33.3% (10.0)	36.7% (11.0)	16.7% (5.0)	3.3% (1.0)
A place to learn	6.7% (2.0)	16.7% (5.0)	40.0% (12.0)	23.3% (7.0)	13.3% (4.0)
A place for "opportunities for all"	13.3% (4.0)	10.0% (3.0)	40.0% (12.0)	30.0% (9.0)	6.7% (2.0)
A place to be healthy	-	3.3% (1.0)	16.7% (5.0)	60.0% (18.0)	20.0% (6.0)
A place for business	-	6.7% (2.0)	40.0% (12.0)	36.7% (11.0)	16.7% (5.0)
A place to call home	-	3.3% (1.0)	13.3% (4.0)	46.7% (14.0)	36.7% (11.0)
A place moving in the "right direction"	6.7% (2.0)	13.3% (4.0)	23.3% (7.0)	40.0% (12.0)	16.7% (5.0)

Bach Degree - Likely (21)

A place to live	-	4.8% (1.0)	-	81.0% (17.0)	14.3% (3.0)
A place to work	4.8% (1.0)	4.8% (1.0)	47.6% (10.0)	33.3% (7.0)	9.5% (2.0)
A place to raise a family	-	-	23.8% (5.0)	52.4% (11.0)	23.8% (5.0)
A place to retire	4.8% (1.0)	14.3% (3.0)	33.3% (7.0)	33.3% (7.0)	14.3% (3.0)
A place to feel safe	-	23.8% (5.0)	23.8% (5.0)	47.6% (10.0)	4.8% (1.0)
A place to visit	9.5% (2.0)	23.8% (5.0)	28.6% (6.0)	28.6% (6.0)	9.5% (2.0)
A place to have a "night on the town"	23.8% (5.0)	38.1% (8.0)	33.3% (7.0)	4.8% (1.0)	-
A place to learn	-	9.5% (2.0)	71.4% (15.0)	14.3% (3.0)	4.8% (1.0)
A place for "opportunities for all"	-	9.5% (2.0)	61.9% (13.0)	23.8% (5.0)	4.8% (1.0)
A place to be healthy	-	4.8% (1.0)	23.8% (5.0)	42.9% (9.0)	28.6% (6.0)
A place for business	-	4.8% (1.0)	42.9% (9.0)	33.3% (7.0)	19.0% (4.0)
A place to call home	-	4.8% (1.0)	19.0% (4.0)	57.1% (12.0)	19.0% (4.0)
A place moving in the "right direction"	9.5% (2.0)	14.3% (3.0)	42.9% (9.0)	19.0% (4.0)	14.3% (3.0)

Grad Degree - Extremely Likely (22)

A place to live	-	-	4.5% (1.0)	59.1% (13.0)	36.4% (8.0)
A place to work	-	4.5% (1.0)	50.0% (11.0)	40.9% (9.0)	4.5% (1.0)
A place to raise a family	-	4.5% (1.0)	27.3% (6.0)	36.4% (8.0)	31.8% (7.0)
A place to retire	4.5% (1.0)	-	27.3% (6.0)	50.0% (11.0)	18.2% (4.0)

A place to feel safe	-	22.7% (5.0)	22.7% (5.0)	50.0% (11.0)	4.5% (1.0)
A place to visit	-	13.6% (3.0)	40.9% (9.0)	36.4% (8.0)	9.1% (2.0)
A place to have a "night on the town"	9.1% (2.0)	31.8% (7.0)	40.9% (9.0)	13.6% (3.0)	4.5% (1.0)
A place to learn	4.5% (1.0)	9.1% (2.0)	63.6% (14.0)	18.2% (4.0)	4.5% (1.0)
A place for "opportunities for all"	-	4.5% (1.0)	54.5% (12.0)	36.4% (8.0)	4.5% (1.0)
A place to be healthy	-	4.5% (1.0)	13.6% (3.0)	72.7% (16.0)	9.1% (2.0)
A place for business	-	4.5% (1.0)	45.5% (10.0)	40.9% (9.0)	9.1% (2.0)
A place to call home	-	-	9.1% (2.0)	63.6% (14.0)	27.3% (6.0)
A place moving in the "right direction"	-	13.6% (3.0)	40.9% (9.0)	36.4% (8.0)	9.1% (2.0)

Grad Degree - Likely (13)

A place to live	-	-	15.4% (2.0)	53.8% (7.0)	30.8% (4.0)
A place to work	-	7.7% (1.0)	69.2% (9.0)	23.1% (3.0)	-
A place to raise a family	-	-	38.5% (5.0)	46.2% (6.0)	15.4% (2.0)
A place to retire	-	7.7% (1.0)	38.5% (5.0)	38.5% (5.0)	15.4% (2.0)
A place to feel safe	-	15.4% (2.0)	30.8% (4.0)	38.5% (5.0)	15.4% (2.0)
A place to visit	30.8% (4.0)	23.1% (3.0)	38.5% (5.0)	7.7% (1.0)	-
A place to have a "night on the town"	30.8% (4.0)	53.8% (7.0)	15.4% (2.0)	-	-
A place to learn	7.7% (1.0)	30.8% (4.0)	46.2% (6.0)	15.4% (2.0)	-
A place for "opportunities for all"	7.7% (1.0)	30.8% (4.0)	30.8% (4.0)	30.8% (4.0)	-
A place to be healthy	-	7.7% (1.0)	7.7% (1.0)	69.2% (9.0)	15.4% (2.0)
A place for business	-	7.7% (1.0)	53.8% (7.0)	30.8% (4.0)	7.7% (1.0)
A place to call home	-	7.7% (1.0)	7.7% (1.0)	69.2% (9.0)	15.4% (2.0)
A place moving in the "right direction"	-	-	69.2% (9.0)	30.8% (4.0)	-

HS Diploma - Extremely Likely (9)

A place to live	-	-	22.2% (2.0)	33.3% (3.0)	44.4% (4.0)
A place to work	-	-	55.6% (5.0)	33.3% (3.0)	11.1% (1.0)
A place to raise a family	-	-	44.4% (4.0)	33.3% (3.0)	22.2% (2.0)
A place to retire	-	-	55.6% (5.0)	44.4% (4.0)	-
A place to feel safe	11.1% (1.0)	-	44.4% (4.0)	44.4% (4.0)	-
A place to visit	-	11.1% (1.0)	33.3% (3.0)	55.6% (5.0)	-
A place to have a "night on the town"	11.1% (1.0)	22.2% (2.0)	33.3% (3.0)	22.2% (2.0)	11.1% (1.0)
A place to learn	-	-	66.7% (6.0)	33.3% (3.0)	-
A place for "opportunities for all"	11.1% (1.0)	11.1% (1.0)	33.3% (3.0)	33.3% (3.0)	11.1% (1.0)
A place to be healthy	-	-	33.3% (3.0)	44.4% (4.0)	22.2% (2.0)
A place for business	-	-	55.6% (5.0)	22.2% (2.0)	22.2% (2.0)
A place to call home	-	-	33.3% (3.0)	55.6% (5.0)	11.1% (1.0)
A place moving in the "right direction"	-	11.1% (1.0)	55.6% (5.0)	33.3% (3.0)	-

HS Diploma - Likely (4)

A place to live	-	-	-	75.0% (3.0)	25.0% (1.0)
A place to work	-	-	50.0% (2.0)	50.0% (2.0)	-
A place to raise a family	-	-	25.0% (1.0)	25.0% (1.0)	50.0% (2.0)
A place to retire	-	-	50.0% (2.0)	50.0% (2.0)	-
A place to feel safe	-	-	-	75.0% (3.0)	25.0% (1.0)
A place to visit	-	-	75.0% (3.0)	25.0% (1.0)	-
A place to have a "night on the town"	-	50.0% (2.0)	50.0% (2.0)	-	-
A place to learn	-	-	25.0% (1.0)	75.0% (3.0)	-
A place for "opportunities for all"	-	-	50.0% (2.0)	50.0% (2.0)	-
A place to be healthy	-	-	-	100.0% (4.0)	-
A place for business	-	-	50.0% (2.0)	50.0% (2.0)	-
A place to call home	-	-	-	25.0% (1.0)	75.0% (3.0)
A place moving in the "right direction"	-	-	-	100.0% (4.0)	-

Less than HS Diploma - Likely (1)

A place to live	-	-	-	-	100.0% (1.0)
A place to work	-	-	-	100.0% (1.0)	-

A place to raise a family	-	-	-	-	100.0% (1.0)
A place to retire	-	-	100.0% (1.0)	-	-
A place to feel safe	-	-	-	100.0% (1.0)	-
A place to visit	-	100.0% (1.0)	-	-	-
A place to have a "night on the town"	-	100.0% (1.0)	-	-	-
A place to learn	-	-	-	100.0% (1.0)	-
A place for "opportunities for all"	-	-	-	100.0% (1.0)	-
A place to be healthy	-	-	-	100.0% (1.0)	-
A place for business	-	-	-	100.0% (1.0)	-
A place to call home	-	-	-	-	100.0% (1.0)
A place moving in the "right direction"	-	-	-	100.0% (1.0)	-

Some College - Likely (12)

A place to live	-	8.3% (1.0)	8.3% (1.0)	58.3% (7.0)	25.0% (3.0)
A place to work	-	8.3% (1.0)	66.7% (8.0)	16.7% (2.0)	8.3% (1.0)
A place to raise a family	-	16.7% (2.0)	16.7% (2.0)	58.3% (7.0)	8.3% (1.0)
A place to retire	-	25.0% (3.0)	16.7% (2.0)	50.0% (6.0)	8.3% (1.0)
A place to feel safe	-	16.7% (2.0)	16.7% (2.0)	41.7% (5.0)	25.0% (3.0)
A place to visit	-	50.0% (6.0)	8.3% (1.0)	33.3% (4.0)	8.3% (1.0)
A place to have a "night on the town"	8.3% (1.0)	66.7% (8.0)	8.3% (1.0)	16.7% (2.0)	-
A place to learn	-	-	75.0% (9.0)	16.7% (2.0)	8.3% (1.0)
A place for "opportunities for all"	-	41.7% (5.0)	41.7% (5.0)	16.7% (2.0)	-
A place to be healthy	-	8.3% (1.0)	16.7% (2.0)	66.7% (8.0)	8.3% (1.0)
A place for business	-	16.7% (2.0)	41.7% (5.0)	33.3% (4.0)	8.3% (1.0)
A place to call home	-	8.3% (1.0)	8.3% (1.0)	58.3% (7.0)	25.0% (3.0)
A place moving in the "right direction"	-	8.3% (1.0)	33.3% (4.0)	50.0% (6.0)	8.3% (1.0)

Some College -Extremely Likely (5)

A place to live	-	-	-	40.0% (2.0)	60.0% (3.0)
A place to work	-	-	40.0% (2.0)	60.0% (3.0)	-
A place to raise a family	-	20.0% (1.0)	20.0% (1.0)	60.0% (3.0)	-
A place to retire	-	20.0% (1.0)	-	60.0% (3.0)	20.0% (1.0)
A place to feel safe	-	-	20.0% (1.0)	60.0% (3.0)	20.0% (1.0)
A place to visit	-	20.0% (1.0)	-	60.0% (3.0)	20.0% (1.0)
A place to have a "night on the town"	20.0% (1.0)	40.0% (2.0)	40.0% (2.0)	-	-
A place to learn	-	-	40.0% (2.0)	60.0% (3.0)	-
A place for "opportunities for all"	-	20.0% (1.0)	60.0% (3.0)	20.0% (1.0)	-
A place to be healthy	-	20.0% (1.0)	-	60.0% (3.0)	20.0% (1.0)
A place for business	-	20.0% (1.0)	20.0% (1.0)	40.0% (2.0)	20.0% (1.0)
A place to call home	-	-	-	80.0% (4.0)	20.0% (1.0)
A place moving in the "right direction"	-	20.0% (1.0)	20.0% (1.0)	60.0% (3.0)	-

Unknown (70)

A place to live	-	2.9% (2.0)	5.7% (4.0)	55.7% (39.0)	35.7% (25.0)
A place to work	-	5.7% (4.0)	57.1% (40.0)	22.9% (16.0)	14.3% (10.0)
A place to raise a family	1.4% (1.0)	2.9% (2.0)	25.7% (18.0)	48.6% (34.0)	21.4% (15.0)
A place to retire	4.3% (3.0)	11.4% (8.0)	34.3% (24.0)	38.6% (27.0)	11.4% (8.0)
A place to feel safe	1.4% (1.0)	11.4% (8.0)	22.9% (16.0)	52.9% (37.0)	11.4% (8.0)
A place to visit	7.1% (5.0)	30.0% (21.0)	31.4% (22.0)	27.1% (19.0)	4.3% (3.0)
A place to have a "night on the town"	25.7% (18.0)	31.4% (22.0)	25.7% (18.0)	17.1% (12.0)	-
A place to learn	4.3% (3.0)	21.4% (15.0)	47.1% (33.0)	24.3% (17.0)	2.9% (2.0)
A place for "opportunities for all"	1.4% (1.0)	20.0% (14.0)	41.4% (29.0)	31.4% (22.0)	5.7% (4.0)
A place to be healthy	-	1.4% (1.0)	11.4% (8.0)	70.0% (49.0)	17.1% (12.0)
A place for business	-	4.3% (3.0)	38.6% (27.0)	50.0% (35.0)	7.1% (5.0)
A place to call home	1.4% (1.0)	4.3% (3.0)	5.7% (4.0)	68.6% (48.0)	20.0% (14.0)
A place moving in the "right direction"	4.3% (3.0)	7.1% (5.0)	34.3% (24.0)	45.7% (32.0)	8.6% (6.0)

VOTERS GENDER

187 REGISTERED VOTERS

	Very Unsatisfied	Unsatisfied	Neutral	Satisfied	Very Satisfied
F (90)					
A place to live	-	3.3% (3.0)	5.6% (5.0)	58.9% (53.0)	32.2% (29.0)
A place to work	-	5.6% (5.0)	62.2% (56.0)	20.0% (18.0)	12.2% (11.0)
A place to raise a family	-	3.3% (3.0)	25.6% (23.0)	48.9% (44.0)	22.2% (20.0)
A place to retire	1.1% (1.0)	12.2% (11.0)	33.3% (30.0)	38.9% (35.0)	14.4% (13.0)
A place to feel safe	-	16.7% (15.0)	26.7% (24.0)	43.3% (39.0)	13.3% (12.0)
A place to visit	4.4% (4.0)	28.9% (26.0)	27.8% (25.0)	28.9% (26.0)	10.0% (9.0)
A place to have a "night on the town"	16.7% (15.0)	42.2% (38.0)	27.8% (25.0)	12.2% (11.0)	1.1% (1.0)
A place to learn	3.3% (3.0)	21.1% (19.0)	50.0% (45.0)	18.9% (17.0)	6.7% (6.0)
A place for "opportunities for all"	4.4% (4.0)	15.6% (14.0)	47.8% (43.0)	25.6% (23.0)	6.7% (6.0)
A place to be healthy	-	4.4% (4.0)	14.4% (13.0)	64.4% (58.0)	16.7% (15.0)
A place for business	-	4.4% (4.0)	45.6% (41.0)	37.8% (34.0)	12.2% (11.0)
A place to call home	-	4.4% (4.0)	11.1% (10.0)	62.2% (56.0)	22.2% (20.0)
A place moving in the "right direction"	1.1% (1.0)	10.0% (9.0)	36.7% (33.0)	45.6% (41.0)	6.7% (6.0)

M (95)

A place to live	-	1.1% (1.0)	7.4% (7.0)	55.8% (53.0)	35.8% (34.0)
A place to work	2.1% (2.0)	5.3% (5.0)	48.4% (46.0)	35.8% (34.0)	8.4% (8.0)
A place to raise a family	1.1% (1.0)	3.2% (3.0)	25.3% (24.0)	43.2% (41.0)	27.4% (26.0)
A place to retire	4.2% (4.0)	7.4% (7.0)	33.7% (32.0)	41.1% (39.0)	13.7% (13.0)
A place to feel safe	3.2% (3.0)	11.6% (11.0)	22.1% (21.0)	52.6% (50.0)	10.5% (10.0)
A place to visit	10.5% (10.0)	18.9% (18.0)	35.8% (34.0)	30.5% (29.0)	4.2% (4.0)
A place to have a "night on the town"	20.0% (19.0)	32.6% (31.0)	31.6% (30.0)	13.7% (13.0)	2.1% (2.0)
A place to learn	4.2% (4.0)	9.5% (9.0)	54.7% (52.0)	28.4% (27.0)	3.2% (3.0)
A place for "opportunities for all"	3.2% (3.0)	17.9% (17.0)	41.1% (39.0)	34.7% (33.0)	3.2% (3.0)
A place to be healthy	-	3.2% (3.0)	14.7% (14.0)	64.2% (61.0)	17.9% (17.0)
A place for business	-	6.3% (6.0)	38.9% (37.0)	44.2% (42.0)	10.5% (10.0)
A place to call home	1.1% (1.0)	3.2% (3.0)	9.5% (9.0)	60.0% (57.0)	26.3% (25.0)
A place moving in the "right direction"	6.3% (6.0)	9.5% (9.0)	35.8% (34.0)	36.8% (35.0)	11.6% (11.0)

Unknown (2)

A place to live	-	-	-	50.0% (1.0)	50.0% (1.0)
A place to work	-	50.0% (1.0)	-	-	50.0% (1.0)
A place to raise a family	-	-	-	50.0% (1.0)	50.0% (1.0)
A place to retire	-	50.0% (1.0)	-	-	50.0% (1.0)
A place to feel safe	-	-	50.0% (1.0)	-	50.0% (1.0)
A place to visit	-	50.0% (1.0)	-	-	50.0% (1.0)
A place to have a "night on the town"	50.0% (1.0)	-	-	50.0% (1.0)	-
A place to learn	-	-	50.0% (1.0)	50.0% (1.0)	-
A place for "opportunities for all"	-	-	50.0% (1.0)	50.0% (1.0)	-
A place to be healthy	-	-	-	100.0% (2.0)	-
A place for business	-	50.0% (1.0)	-	50.0% (1.0)	-
A place to call home	-	-	-	50.0% (1.0)	50.0% (1.0)
A place moving in the "right direction"	-	-	50.0% (1.0)	50.0% (1.0)	-

PRECINCT

187 REGISTERED VOTERS

	Very Unsatisfied	Unsatisfied	Neutral	Satisfied	Very Satisfied
CHICAGO 43-04 (1)					
A place to live	-	-	-	-	100.0% (1.0)
A place to work	-	-	100.0% (1.0)	-	-
A place to raise a family	-	-	-	-	100.0% (1.0)
A place to retire	-	-	-	-	100.0% (1.0)
A place to feel safe	-	-	-	100.0% (1.0)	-

A place to visit	-	-	100.0% (1.0)	-	-
A place to have a "night on the town"	-	-	100.0% (1.0)	-	-
A place to learn	-	-	100.0% (1.0)	-	-
A place for "opportunities for all"	-	-	-	100.0% (1.0)	-
A place to be healthy	-	-	-	100.0% (1.0)	-
A place for business	-	-	-	100.0% (1.0)	-
A place to call home	-	-	-	-	100.0% (1.0)
A place moving in the "right direction"	-	-	100.0% (1.0)	-	-

FITCHBURG CITY WARD 01 (9)

A place to live	-	-	11.1% (1.0)	77.8% (7.0)	11.1% (1.0)
A place to work	-	22.2% (2.0)	44.4% (4.0)	33.3% (3.0)	-
A place to raise a family	-	-	11.1% (1.0)	77.8% (7.0)	11.1% (1.0)
A place to retire	-	22.2% (2.0)	44.4% (4.0)	33.3% (3.0)	-
A place to feel safe	-	22.2% (2.0)	44.4% (4.0)	33.3% (3.0)	-
A place to visit	-	55.6% (5.0)	22.2% (2.0)	22.2% (2.0)	-
A place to have a "night on the town"	-	44.4% (4.0)	33.3% (3.0)	22.2% (2.0)	-
A place to learn	-	22.2% (2.0)	66.7% (6.0)	11.1% (1.0)	-
A place for "opportunities for all"	11.1% (1.0)	33.3% (3.0)	22.2% (2.0)	33.3% (3.0)	-
A place to be healthy	-	11.1% (1.0)	33.3% (3.0)	55.6% (5.0)	-
A place for business	-	11.1% (1.0)	44.4% (4.0)	44.4% (4.0)	-
A place to call home	-	-	33.3% (3.0)	66.7% (6.0)	-
A place moving in the "right direction"	11.1% (1.0)	11.1% (1.0)	55.6% (5.0)	22.2% (2.0)	-

FITCHBURG CITY WARD 02 (3)

A place to live	-	-	-	33.3% (1.0)	66.7% (2.0)
A place to work	-	-	33.3% (1.0)	66.7% (2.0)	-
A place to raise a family	-	-	33.3% (1.0)	66.7% (2.0)	-
A place to retire	-	-	66.7% (2.0)	33.3% (1.0)	-
A place to feel safe	-	-	-	100.0% (3.0)	-
A place to visit	33.3% (1.0)	33.3% (1.0)	-	33.3% (1.0)	-
A place to have a "night on the town"	33.3% (1.0)	33.3% (1.0)	-	33.3% (1.0)	-
A place to learn	-	-	66.7% (2.0)	33.3% (1.0)	-
A place for "opportunities for all"	-	33.3% (1.0)	33.3% (1.0)	33.3% (1.0)	-
A place to be healthy	-	-	33.3% (1.0)	66.7% (2.0)	-
A place for business	-	-	33.3% (1.0)	66.7% (2.0)	-
A place to call home	-	-	-	100.0% (3.0)	-
A place moving in the "right direction"	-	-	66.7% (2.0)	33.3% (1.0)	-

FITCHBURG CITY WARD 04 (2)

A place to live	-	-	-	50.0% (1.0)	50.0% (1.0)
A place to work	-	-	50.0% (1.0)	50.0% (1.0)	-
A place to raise a family	-	-	-	50.0% (1.0)	50.0% (1.0)
A place to retire	-	-	50.0% (1.0)	50.0% (1.0)	-
A place to feel safe	-	-	50.0% (1.0)	50.0% (1.0)	-
A place to visit	-	50.0% (1.0)	50.0% (1.0)	-	-
A place to have a "night on the town"	-	100.0% (2.0)	-	-	-
A place to learn	-	-	50.0% (1.0)	50.0% (1.0)	-
A place for "opportunities for all"	-	-	-	100.0% (2.0)	-
A place to be healthy	-	-	-	100.0% (2.0)	-
A place for business	-	-	-	100.0% (2.0)	-
A place to call home	-	-	-	100.0% (2.0)	-
A place moving in the "right direction"	-	-	-	100.0% (2.0)	-

FITCHBURG CITY WARD 05 (6)

A place to live	-	-	-	33.3% (2.0)	66.7% (4.0)
A place to work	-	-	50.0% (3.0)	-	50.0% (3.0)
A place to raise a family	-	-	-	16.7% (1.0)	83.3% (5.0)

A place to retire	-	-	50.0% (3.0)	33.3% (2.0)	16.7% (1.0)
A place to feel safe	-	16.7% (1.0)	16.7% (1.0)	33.3% (2.0)	33.3% (2.0)
A place to visit	-	16.7% (1.0)	50.0% (3.0)	16.7% (1.0)	16.7% (1.0)
A place to have a "night on the town"	-	66.7% (4.0)	33.3% (2.0)	-	-
A place to learn	-	-	50.0% (3.0)	50.0% (3.0)	-
A place for "opportunities for all"	-	16.7% (1.0)	50.0% (3.0)	-	33.3% (2.0)
A place to be healthy	-	-	-	33.3% (2.0)	66.7% (4.0)
A place for business	-	16.7% (1.0)	-	50.0% (3.0)	33.3% (2.0)
A place to call home	-	-	-	33.3% (2.0)	66.7% (4.0)
A place moving in the "right direction"	-	-	16.7% (1.0)	50.0% (3.0)	33.3% (2.0)

FITCHBURG CITY WARD 06 (12)

A place to live	-	-	-	83.3% (10.0)	16.7% (2.0)
A place to work	-	8.3% (1.0)	58.3% (7.0)	25.0% (3.0)	8.3% (1.0)
A place to raise a family	-	8.3% (1.0)	-	75.0% (9.0)	16.7% (2.0)
A place to retire	8.3% (1.0)	8.3% (1.0)	41.7% (5.0)	41.7% (5.0)	-
A place to feel safe	8.3% (1.0)	33.3% (4.0)	8.3% (1.0)	50.0% (6.0)	-
A place to visit	8.3% (1.0)	41.7% (5.0)	33.3% (4.0)	16.7% (2.0)	-
A place to have a "night on the town"	50.0% (6.0)	25.0% (3.0)	25.0% (3.0)	-	-
A place to learn	16.7% (2.0)	25.0% (3.0)	41.7% (5.0)	8.3% (1.0)	8.3% (1.0)
A place for "opportunities for all"	-	16.7% (2.0)	50.0% (6.0)	25.0% (3.0)	8.3% (1.0)
A place to be healthy	-	-	-	91.7% (11.0)	8.3% (1.0)
A place for business	-	8.3% (1.0)	50.0% (6.0)	33.3% (4.0)	8.3% (1.0)
A place to call home	-	-	-	75.0% (9.0)	25.0% (3.0)
A place moving in the "right direction"	-	16.7% (2.0)	41.7% (5.0)	33.3% (4.0)	8.3% (1.0)

FITCHBURG CITY WARD 07 (18)

A place to live	-	-	-	66.7% (12.0)	33.3% (6.0)
A place to work	-	-	55.6% (10.0)	33.3% (6.0)	11.1% (2.0)
A place to raise a family	-	5.6% (1.0)	33.3% (6.0)	44.4% (8.0)	16.7% (3.0)
A place to retire	5.6% (1.0)	11.1% (2.0)	11.1% (2.0)	50.0% (9.0)	22.2% (4.0)
A place to feel safe	-	5.6% (1.0)	33.3% (6.0)	44.4% (8.0)	16.7% (3.0)
A place to visit	-	11.1% (2.0)	27.8% (5.0)	50.0% (9.0)	11.1% (2.0)
A place to have a "night on the town"	-	44.4% (8.0)	44.4% (8.0)	11.1% (2.0)	-
A place to learn	-	5.6% (1.0)	61.1% (11.0)	27.8% (5.0)	5.6% (1.0)
A place for "opportunities for all"	-	16.7% (3.0)	27.8% (5.0)	44.4% (8.0)	11.1% (2.0)
A place to be healthy	-	5.6% (1.0)	5.6% (1.0)	66.7% (12.0)	22.2% (4.0)
A place for business	-	5.6% (1.0)	44.4% (8.0)	38.9% (7.0)	11.1% (2.0)
A place to call home	-	-	-	66.7% (12.0)	33.3% (6.0)
A place moving in the "right direction"	-	11.1% (2.0)	38.9% (7.0)	33.3% (6.0)	16.7% (3.0)

FITCHBURG CITY WARD 08 (14)

A place to live	-	-	14.3% (2.0)	42.9% (6.0)	42.9% (6.0)
A place to work	7.1% (1.0)	-	28.6% (4.0)	50.0% (7.0)	14.3% (2.0)
A place to raise a family	-	-	35.7% (5.0)	42.9% (6.0)	21.4% (3.0)
A place to retire	-	7.1% (1.0)	28.6% (4.0)	57.1% (8.0)	7.1% (1.0)
A place to feel safe	14.3% (2.0)	14.3% (2.0)	21.4% (3.0)	42.9% (6.0)	7.1% (1.0)
A place to visit	14.3% (2.0)	28.6% (4.0)	28.6% (4.0)	28.6% (4.0)	-
A place to have a "night on the town"	14.3% (2.0)	42.9% (6.0)	21.4% (3.0)	21.4% (3.0)	-
A place to learn	14.3% (2.0)	7.1% (1.0)	50.0% (7.0)	28.6% (4.0)	-
A place for "opportunities for all"	7.1% (1.0)	14.3% (2.0)	35.7% (5.0)	42.9% (6.0)	-
A place to be healthy	-	-	14.3% (2.0)	64.3% (9.0)	21.4% (3.0)
A place for business	-	7.1% (1.0)	21.4% (3.0)	71.4% (10.0)	-
A place to call home	-	-	7.1% (1.0)	71.4% (10.0)	21.4% (3.0)
A place moving in the "right direction"	7.1% (1.0)	14.3% (2.0)	21.4% (3.0)	57.1% (8.0)	-

FITCHBURG CITY WARD 09 (8)

A place to live	-	-	12.5% (1.0)	50.0% (4.0)	37.5% (3.0)
A place to work	-	12.5% (1.0)	50.0% (4.0)	12.5% (1.0)	25.0% (2.0)
A place to raise a family	-	-	50.0% (4.0)	37.5% (3.0)	12.5% (1.0)
A place to retire	-	25.0% (2.0)	25.0% (2.0)	12.5% (1.0)	37.5% (3.0)
A place to feel safe	-	25.0% (2.0)	25.0% (2.0)	37.5% (3.0)	12.5% (1.0)
A place to visit	-	37.5% (3.0)	25.0% (2.0)	25.0% (2.0)	12.5% (1.0)
A place to have a "night on the town"	25.0% (2.0)	12.5% (1.0)	37.5% (3.0)	25.0% (2.0)	-
A place to learn	-	-	50.0% (4.0)	37.5% (3.0)	12.5% (1.0)
A place for "opportunities for all"	-	-	50.0% (4.0)	37.5% (3.0)	12.5% (1.0)
A place to be healthy	-	-	12.5% (1.0)	75.0% (6.0)	12.5% (1.0)
A place for business	-	12.5% (1.0)	37.5% (3.0)	37.5% (3.0)	12.5% (1.0)
A place to call home	-	-	12.5% (1.0)	62.5% (5.0)	25.0% (2.0)
A place moving in the "right direction"	-	-	50.0% (4.0)	25.0% (2.0)	25.0% (2.0)

FITCHBURG CITY WARD 12 (2)

A place to live	-	-	-	50.0% (1.0)	50.0% (1.0)
A place to work	-	-	50.0% (1.0)	50.0% (1.0)	-
A place to raise a family	-	50.0% (1.0)	50.0% (1.0)	-	-
A place to retire	-	-	100.0% (2.0)	-	-
A place to feel safe	-	-	50.0% (1.0)	50.0% (1.0)	-
A place to visit	-	-	100.0% (2.0)	-	-
A place to have a "night on the town"	-	100.0% (2.0)	-	-	-
A place to learn	-	-	100.0% (2.0)	-	-
A place for "opportunities for all"	-	-	100.0% (2.0)	-	-
A place to be healthy	-	-	-	50.0% (1.0)	50.0% (1.0)
A place for business	-	-	50.0% (1.0)	50.0% (1.0)	-
A place to call home	-	-	-	50.0% (1.0)	50.0% (1.0)
A place moving in the "right direction"	-	-	50.0% (1.0)	50.0% (1.0)	-

FITCHBURG CITY WARD 13 (31)

A place to live	-	6.5% (2.0)	-	67.7% (21.0)	25.8% (8.0)
A place to work	-	3.2% (1.0)	67.7% (21.0)	22.6% (7.0)	6.5% (2.0)
A place to raise a family	-	-	51.6% (16.0)	25.8% (8.0)	22.6% (7.0)
A place to retire	3.2% (1.0)	9.7% (3.0)	32.3% (10.0)	35.5% (11.0)	19.4% (6.0)
A place to feel safe	-	12.9% (4.0)	12.9% (4.0)	58.1% (18.0)	16.1% (5.0)
A place to visit	6.5% (2.0)	19.4% (6.0)	29.0% (9.0)	35.5% (11.0)	9.7% (3.0)
A place to have a "night on the town"	19.4% (6.0)	41.9% (13.0)	25.8% (8.0)	9.7% (3.0)	3.2% (1.0)
A place to learn	-	29.0% (9.0)	41.9% (13.0)	19.4% (6.0)	9.7% (3.0)
A place for "opportunities for all"	3.2% (1.0)	12.9% (4.0)	61.3% (19.0)	19.4% (6.0)	3.2% (1.0)
A place to be healthy	-	3.2% (1.0)	16.1% (5.0)	58.1% (18.0)	22.6% (7.0)
A place for business	-	9.7% (3.0)	54.8% (17.0)	25.8% (8.0)	9.7% (3.0)
A place to call home	-	9.7% (3.0)	9.7% (3.0)	54.8% (17.0)	25.8% (8.0)
A place moving in the "right direction"	6.5% (2.0)	16.1% (5.0)	29.0% (9.0)	38.7% (12.0)	9.7% (3.0)

FITCHBURG CITY WARD 14 (19)

A place to live	-	5.3% (1.0)	5.3% (1.0)	47.4% (9.0)	42.1% (8.0)
A place to work	-	10.5% (2.0)	47.4% (9.0)	31.6% (6.0)	10.5% (2.0)
A place to raise a family	-	5.3% (1.0)	21.1% (4.0)	47.4% (9.0)	26.3% (5.0)
A place to retire	5.3% (1.0)	10.5% (2.0)	26.3% (5.0)	42.1% (8.0)	15.8% (3.0)
A place to feel safe	-	21.1% (4.0)	31.6% (6.0)	21.1% (4.0)	26.3% (5.0)
A place to visit	15.8% (3.0)	31.6% (6.0)	21.1% (4.0)	21.1% (4.0)	10.5% (2.0)
A place to have a "night on the town"	36.8% (7.0)	31.6% (6.0)	21.1% (4.0)	10.5% (2.0)	-
A place to learn	-	21.1% (4.0)	52.6% (10.0)	21.1% (4.0)	5.3% (1.0)
A place for "opportunities for all"	-	31.6% (6.0)	52.6% (10.0)	15.8% (3.0)	-
A place to be healthy	-	-	26.3% (5.0)	52.6% (10.0)	21.1% (4.0)
A place for business	-	5.3% (1.0)	47.4% (9.0)	26.3% (5.0)	21.1% (4.0)
A place to call home	-	5.3% (1.0)	26.3% (5.0)	36.8% (7.0)	31.6% (6.0)
A place moving in the "right direction"	-	10.5% (2.0)	47.4% (9.0)	36.8% (7.0)	5.3% (1.0)

FITCHBURG CITY WARD 15 (7)

A place to live	-	-	14.3% (1.0)	28.6% (2.0)	57.1% (4.0)
A place to work	-	-	42.9% (3.0)	28.6% (2.0)	28.6% (2.0)
A place to raise a family	-	-	28.6% (2.0)	42.9% (3.0)	28.6% (2.0)
A place to retire	-	14.3% (1.0)	28.6% (2.0)	28.6% (2.0)	28.6% (2.0)
A place to feel safe	-	28.6% (2.0)	-	28.6% (2.0)	42.9% (3.0)
A place to visit	14.3% (1.0)	14.3% (1.0)	14.3% (1.0)	28.6% (2.0)	28.6% (2.0)
A place to have a "night on the town"	28.6% (2.0)	42.9% (3.0)	-	14.3% (1.0)	14.3% (1.0)
A place to learn	-	-	85.7% (6.0)	14.3% (1.0)	-
A place for "opportunities for all"	-	14.3% (1.0)	28.6% (2.0)	57.1% (4.0)	-
A place to be healthy	-	-	-	85.7% (6.0)	14.3% (1.0)
A place for business	-	14.3% (1.0)	28.6% (2.0)	42.9% (3.0)	14.3% (1.0)
A place to call home	-	14.3% (1.0)	-	57.1% (4.0)	28.6% (2.0)
A place moving in the "right direction"	-	-	28.6% (2.0)	57.1% (4.0)	14.3% (1.0)

FITCHBURG CITY WARD 16 (3)

A place to live	-	-	-	66.7% (2.0)	33.3% (1.0)
A place to work	-	33.3% (1.0)	33.3% (1.0)	33.3% (1.0)	-
A place to raise a family	-	-	-	33.3% (1.0)	66.7% (2.0)
A place to retire	-	33.3% (1.0)	33.3% (1.0)	-	33.3% (1.0)
A place to feel safe	-	-	33.3% (1.0)	66.7% (2.0)	-
A place to visit	-	-	66.7% (2.0)	33.3% (1.0)	-
A place to have a "night on the town"	-	66.7% (2.0)	33.3% (1.0)	-	-
A place to learn	-	-	100.0% (3.0)	-	-
A place for "opportunities for all"	-	33.3% (1.0)	66.7% (2.0)	-	-
A place to be healthy	-	-	66.7% (2.0)	-	33.3% (1.0)
A place for business	-	-	33.3% (1.0)	66.7% (2.0)	-
A place to call home	-	-	-	100.0% (3.0)	-
A place moving in the "right direction"	-	-	66.7% (2.0)	-	33.3% (1.0)

FITCHBURG CITY WARD 17 (7)

A place to live	-	-	14.3% (1.0)	28.6% (2.0)	57.1% (4.0)
A place to work	-	-	57.1% (4.0)	28.6% (2.0)	14.3% (1.0)
A place to raise a family	14.3% (1.0)	-	28.6% (2.0)	28.6% (2.0)	28.6% (2.0)
A place to retire	-	-	42.9% (3.0)	42.9% (3.0)	14.3% (1.0)
A place to feel safe	-	-	28.6% (2.0)	57.1% (4.0)	14.3% (1.0)
A place to visit	-	28.6% (2.0)	-	57.1% (4.0)	14.3% (1.0)
A place to have a "night on the town"	14.3% (1.0)	-	28.6% (2.0)	57.1% (4.0)	-
A place to learn	-	14.3% (1.0)	28.6% (2.0)	42.9% (3.0)	14.3% (1.0)
A place for "opportunities for all"	-	14.3% (1.0)	28.6% (2.0)	28.6% (2.0)	28.6% (2.0)
A place to be healthy	-	42.9% (3.0)	-	42.9% (3.0)	14.3% (1.0)
A place for business	-	-	42.9% (3.0)	42.9% (3.0)	14.3% (1.0)
A place to call home	14.3% (1.0)	-	-	57.1% (4.0)	28.6% (2.0)
A place moving in the "right direction"	14.3% (1.0)	14.3% (1.0)	14.3% (1.0)	57.1% (4.0)	-

FITCHBURG CITY WARD 18 (12)

A place to live	-	-	8.3% (1.0)	91.7% (11.0)	-
A place to work	8.3% (1.0)	8.3% (1.0)	66.7% (8.0)	16.7% (2.0)	-
A place to raise a family	-	8.3% (1.0)	8.3% (1.0)	75.0% (9.0)	8.3% (1.0)
A place to retire	8.3% (1.0)	16.7% (2.0)	33.3% (4.0)	41.7% (5.0)	-
A place to feel safe	-	16.7% (2.0)	33.3% (4.0)	41.7% (5.0)	8.3% (1.0)
A place to visit	33.3% (4.0)	8.3% (1.0)	25.0% (3.0)	33.3% (4.0)	-
A place to have a "night on the town"	25.0% (3.0)	41.7% (5.0)	25.0% (3.0)	8.3% (1.0)	-
A place to learn	16.7% (2.0)	8.3% (1.0)	58.3% (7.0)	16.7% (2.0)	-
A place for "opportunities for all"	25.0% (3.0)	8.3% (1.0)	50.0% (6.0)	16.7% (2.0)	-
A place to be healthy	-	8.3% (1.0)	8.3% (1.0)	83.3% (10.0)	-

A place for business	-	-	50.0% (6.0)	41.7% (5.0)	8.3% (1.0)
A place to call home	-	-	25.0% (3.0)	66.7% (8.0)	8.3% (1.0)
A place moving in the "right direction"	8.3% (1.0)	16.7% (2.0)	41.7% (5.0)	33.3% (4.0)	-

FITCHBURG CITY WARD 19 (26)

A place to live	-	-	-	57.7% (15.0)	42.3% (11.0)
A place to work	-	7.7% (2.0)	57.7% (15.0)	26.9% (7.0)	7.7% (2.0)
A place to raise a family	-	-	3.8% (1.0)	53.8% (14.0)	42.3% (11.0)
A place to retire	-	-	34.6% (9.0)	50.0% (13.0)	15.4% (4.0)
A place to feel safe	-	7.7% (2.0)	19.2% (5.0)	69.2% (18.0)	3.8% (1.0)
A place to visit	-	19.2% (5.0)	46.2% (12.0)	26.9% (7.0)	7.7% (2.0)
A place to have a "night on the town"	11.5% (3.0)	26.9% (7.0)	42.3% (11.0)	15.4% (4.0)	3.8% (1.0)
A place to learn	3.8% (1.0)	15.4% (4.0)	38.5% (10.0)	38.5% (10.0)	3.8% (1.0)
A place for "opportunities for all"	-	7.7% (2.0)	50.0% (13.0)	42.3% (11.0)	-
A place to be healthy	-	-	7.7% (2.0)	80.8% (21.0)	11.5% (3.0)
A place for business	-	-	38.5% (10.0)	46.2% (12.0)	15.4% (4.0)
A place to call home	-	-	-	73.1% (19.0)	26.9% (7.0)
A place moving in the "right direction"	3.8% (1.0)	3.8% (1.0)	23.1% (6.0)	57.7% (15.0)	11.5% (3.0)

MADISON CITY WARD 042 (1)

A place to live	-	-	100.0% (1.0)	-	-
A place to work	-	-	100.0% (1.0)	-	-
A place to raise a family	-	-	100.0% (1.0)	-	-
A place to retire	-	-	100.0% (1.0)	-	-
A place to feel safe	-	-	100.0% (1.0)	-	-
A place to visit	-	100.0% (1.0)	-	-	-
A place to have a "night on the town"	-	100.0% (1.0)	-	-	-
A place to learn	-	-	100.0% (1.0)	-	-
A place for "opportunities for all"	-	100.0% (1.0)	-	-	-
A place to be healthy	-	-	100.0% (1.0)	-	-
A place for business	-	-	-	100.0% (1.0)	-
A place to call home	-	-	100.0% (1.0)	-	-
A place moving in the "right direction"	-	-	100.0% (1.0)	-	-

MADISON CITY WARD 053 (1)

A place to live	-	-	100.0% (1.0)	-	-
A place to work	-	-	-	-	100.0% (1.0)
A place to raise a family	-	-	-	100.0% (1.0)	-
A place to retire	-	-	-	100.0% (1.0)	-
A place to feel safe	-	-	-	100.0% (1.0)	-
A place to visit	-	100.0% (1.0)	-	-	-
A place to have a "night on the town"	100.0% (1.0)	-	-	-	-
A place to learn	-	100.0% (1.0)	-	-	-
A place for "opportunities for all"	-	-	-	100.0% (1.0)	-
A place to be healthy	-	-	-	100.0% (1.0)	-
A place for business	-	-	-	100.0% (1.0)	-
A place to call home	-	100.0% (1.0)	-	-	-
A place moving in the "right direction"	-	-	-	100.0% (1.0)	-

MADISON CITY WARD 100 (1)

A place to live	-	-	100.0% (1.0)	-	-
A place to work	-	-	100.0% (1.0)	-	-
A place to raise a family	-	-	100.0% (1.0)	-	-
A place to retire	-	-	100.0% (1.0)	-	-
A place to feel safe	-	-	100.0% (1.0)	-	-
A place to visit	-	-	100.0% (1.0)	-	-
A place to have a "night on the town"	-	-	100.0% (1.0)	-	-
A place to learn	-	-	100.0% (1.0)	-	-

A place for "opportunities for all"	100.0% (1.0)	-	-	-	-
A place to be healthy	-	-	100.0% (1.0)	-	-
A place for business	-	-	100.0% (1.0)	-	-
A place to call home	-	-	100.0% (1.0)	-	-
A place moving in the "right direction"	-	-	100.0% (1.0)	-	-

MADISON CITY WARD 107 (1)

A place to live	-	100.0% (1.0)	-	-	-
A place to work	-	-	100.0% (1.0)	-	-
A place to raise a family	-	100.0% (1.0)	-	-	-
A place to retire	-	100.0% (1.0)	-	-	-
A place to feel safe	-	-	100.0% (1.0)	-	-
A place to visit	-	-	100.0% (1.0)	-	-
A place to have a "night on the town"	-	100.0% (1.0)	-	-	-
A place to learn	-	100.0% (1.0)	-	-	-
A place for "opportunities for all"	-	100.0% (1.0)	-	-	-
A place to be healthy	-	-	100.0% (1.0)	-	-
A place for business	-	-	100.0% (1.0)	-	-
A place to call home	-	100.0% (1.0)	-	-	-
A place moving in the "right direction"	-	-	100.0% (1.0)	-	-

MIDDLETON TOWN WARD 7 (1)

A place to live	-	-	100.0% (1.0)	-	-
A place to work	-	-	100.0% (1.0)	-	-
A place to raise a family	-	-	100.0% (1.0)	-	-
A place to retire	-	-	100.0% (1.0)	-	-
A place to feel safe	-	-	100.0% (1.0)	-	-
A place to visit	-	-	100.0% (1.0)	-	-
A place to have a "night on the town"	-	-	100.0% (1.0)	-	-
A place to learn	-	-	100.0% (1.0)	-	-
A place for "opportunities for all"	-	-	100.0% (1.0)	-	-
A place to be healthy	-	-	100.0% (1.0)	-	-
A place for business	-	-	100.0% (1.0)	-	-
A place to call home	-	-	100.0% (1.0)	-	-
A place moving in the "right direction"	-	-	100.0% (1.0)	-	-

MOUNT HOREB VLG WARD 3 (1)

A place to live	-	-	-	100.0% (1.0)	-
A place to work	-	-	-	100.0% (1.0)	-
A place to raise a family	-	-	-	100.0% (1.0)	-
A place to retire	-	-	-	100.0% (1.0)	-
A place to feel safe	-	-	100.0% (1.0)	-	-
A place to visit	-	-	-	100.0% (1.0)	-
A place to have a "night on the town"	100.0% (1.0)	-	-	-	-
A place to learn	-	-	100.0% (1.0)	-	-
A place for "opportunities for all"	-	-	-	100.0% (1.0)	-
A place to be healthy	-	-	-	-	100.0% (1.0)
A place for business	-	-	-	-	100.0% (1.0)
A place to call home	-	-	-	100.0% (1.0)	-
A place moving in the "right direction"	-	-	-	100.0% (1.0)	-

OREGON VLG WARD 10 (1)

A place to live	-	-	-	-	100.0% (1.0)
A place to work	-	-	100.0% (1.0)	-	-
A place to raise a family	-	-	-	100.0% (1.0)	-
A place to retire	-	100.0% (1.0)	-	-	-
A place to feel safe	-	-	-	100.0% (1.0)	-
A place to visit	-	-	100.0% (1.0)	-	-

A place to have a "night on the town"	-	-	100.0% (1.0)	-	-
A place to learn	-	-	100.0% (1.0)	-	-
A place for "opportunities for all"	-	100.0% (1.0)	-	-	-
A place to be healthy	-	-	-	100.0% (1.0)	-
A place for business	-	-	100.0% (1.0)	-	-
A place to call home	-	-	-	100.0% (1.0)	-
A place moving in the "right direction"	-	-	100.0% (1.0)	-	-

AGE RANGE

187 REGISTERED VOTERS

	Very Unsatisfied	Unsatisfied	Neutral	Satisfied	Very Satisfied
18-29 (1)					
A place to live	-	-	-	100.0% (1.0)	-
A place to work	-	100.0% (1.0)	-	-	-
A place to raise a family	-	-	-	100.0% (1.0)	-
A place to retire	-	-	100.0% (1.0)	-	-
A place to feel safe	-	-	-	100.0% (1.0)	-
A place to visit	-	-	100.0% (1.0)	-	-
A place to have a "night on the town"	-	-	-	100.0% (1.0)	-
A place to learn	-	-	100.0% (1.0)	-	-
A place for "opportunities for all"	-	100.0% (1.0)	-	-	-
A place to be healthy	-	-	-	100.0% (1.0)	-
A place for business	-	-	100.0% (1.0)	-	-
A place to call home	-	-	-	100.0% (1.0)	-
A place moving in the "right direction"	-	-	100.0% (1.0)	-	-

30-39 (24)

A place to live	-	-	16.7% (4.0)	58.3% (14.0)	25.0% (6.0)
A place to work	-	4.2% (1.0)	70.8% (17.0)	20.8% (5.0)	4.2% (1.0)
A place to raise a family	-	4.2% (1.0)	33.3% (8.0)	54.2% (13.0)	8.3% (2.0)
A place to retire	4.2% (1.0)	4.2% (1.0)	45.8% (11.0)	37.5% (9.0)	8.3% (2.0)
A place to feel safe	-	25.0% (6.0)	16.7% (4.0)	50.0% (12.0)	8.3% (2.0)
A place to visit	12.5% (3.0)	33.3% (8.0)	20.8% (5.0)	25.0% (6.0)	8.3% (2.0)
A place to have a "night on the town"	33.3% (8.0)	50.0% (12.0)	12.5% (3.0)	4.2% (1.0)	-
A place to learn	4.2% (1.0)	16.7% (4.0)	62.5% (15.0)	16.7% (4.0)	-
A place for "opportunities for all"	4.2% (1.0)	33.3% (8.0)	29.2% (7.0)	33.3% (8.0)	-
A place to be healthy	-	-	12.5% (3.0)	79.2% (19.0)	8.3% (2.0)
A place for business	-	12.5% (3.0)	33.3% (8.0)	50.0% (12.0)	4.2% (1.0)
A place to call home	-	4.2% (1.0)	8.3% (2.0)	66.7% (16.0)	20.8% (5.0)
A place moving in the "right direction"	-	4.2% (1.0)	41.7% (10.0)	50.0% (12.0)	4.2% (1.0)

40-49 (29)

A place to live	-	-	6.9% (2.0)	55.2% (16.0)	37.9% (11.0)
A place to work	6.9% (2.0)	17.2% (5.0)	34.5% (10.0)	31.0% (9.0)	10.3% (3.0)
A place to raise a family	-	-	17.2% (5.0)	48.3% (14.0)	34.5% (10.0)
A place to retire	6.9% (2.0)	17.2% (5.0)	31.0% (9.0)	41.4% (12.0)	3.4% (1.0)
A place to feel safe	10.3% (3.0)	6.9% (2.0)	41.4% (12.0)	31.0% (9.0)	10.3% (3.0)
A place to visit	13.8% (4.0)	20.7% (6.0)	34.5% (10.0)	24.1% (7.0)	6.9% (2.0)
A place to have a "night on the town"	20.7% (6.0)	31.0% (9.0)	34.5% (10.0)	13.8% (4.0)	-
A place to learn	6.9% (2.0)	6.9% (2.0)	55.2% (16.0)	24.1% (7.0)	6.9% (2.0)
A place for "opportunities for all"	6.9% (2.0)	13.8% (4.0)	55.2% (16.0)	17.2% (5.0)	6.9% (2.0)
A place to be healthy	-	3.4% (1.0)	20.7% (6.0)	58.6% (17.0)	17.2% (5.0)
A place for business	-	13.8% (4.0)	44.8% (13.0)	24.1% (7.0)	17.2% (5.0)
A place to call home	-	-	17.2% (5.0)	55.2% (16.0)	27.6% (8.0)
A place moving in the "right direction"	10.3% (3.0)	10.3% (3.0)	41.4% (12.0)	27.6% (8.0)	10.3% (3.0)

50-59 (23)

A place to live	-	-	4.3% (1.0)	65.2% (15.0)	30.4% (7.0)
A place to work	-	4.3% (1.0)	43.5% (10.0)	39.1% (9.0)	13.0% (3.0)
A place to raise a family	-	4.3% (1.0)	17.4% (4.0)	60.9% (14.0)	17.4% (4.0)
A place to retire	-	8.7% (2.0)	39.1% (9.0)	39.1% (9.0)	13.0% (3.0)
A place to feel safe	-	8.7% (2.0)	26.1% (6.0)	60.9% (14.0)	4.3% (1.0)
A place to visit	4.3% (1.0)	21.7% (5.0)	34.8% (8.0)	34.8% (8.0)	4.3% (1.0)
A place to have a "night on the town"	21.7% (5.0)	34.8% (8.0)	30.4% (7.0)	13.0% (3.0)	-
A place to learn	-	13.0% (3.0)	56.5% (13.0)	30.4% (7.0)	-
A place for "opportunities for all"	4.3% (1.0)	8.7% (2.0)	47.8% (11.0)	39.1% (9.0)	-
A place to be healthy	-	-	26.1% (6.0)	60.9% (14.0)	13.0% (3.0)
A place for business	-	-	34.8% (8.0)	47.8% (11.0)	17.4% (4.0)
A place to call home	-	-	8.7% (2.0)	78.3% (18.0)	13.0% (3.0)
A place moving in the "right direction"	-	8.7% (2.0)	39.1% (9.0)	52.2% (12.0)	-

60-69 (26)

A place to live	-	-	7.7% (2.0)	53.8% (14.0)	38.5% (10.0)
A place to work	-	7.7% (2.0)	57.7% (15.0)	23.1% (6.0)	11.5% (3.0)
A place to raise a family	-	3.8% (1.0)	15.4% (4.0)	42.3% (11.0)	38.5% (10.0)
A place to retire	3.8% (1.0)	7.7% (2.0)	26.9% (7.0)	42.3% (11.0)	19.2% (5.0)
A place to feel safe	-	15.4% (4.0)	42.3% (11.0)	34.6% (9.0)	7.7% (2.0)
A place to visit	3.8% (1.0)	15.4% (4.0)	34.6% (9.0)	42.3% (11.0)	3.8% (1.0)
A place to have a "night on the town"	-	42.3% (11.0)	42.3% (11.0)	11.5% (3.0)	3.8% (1.0)
A place to learn	3.8% (1.0)	3.8% (1.0)	65.4% (17.0)	23.1% (6.0)	3.8% (1.0)
A place for "opportunities for all"	7.7% (2.0)	19.2% (5.0)	30.8% (8.0)	34.6% (9.0)	7.7% (2.0)
A place to be healthy	-	7.7% (2.0)	19.2% (5.0)	57.7% (15.0)	15.4% (4.0)
A place for business	-	-	46.2% (12.0)	50.0% (13.0)	3.8% (1.0)
A place to call home	-	3.8% (1.0)	19.2% (5.0)	46.2% (12.0)	30.8% (8.0)
A place moving in the "right direction"	3.8% (1.0)	11.5% (3.0)	42.3% (11.0)	38.5% (10.0)	3.8% (1.0)

70-79 (16)

A place to live	-	-	6.3% (1.0)	50.0% (8.0)	43.8% (7.0)
A place to work	-	6.3% (1.0)	50.0% (8.0)	31.3% (5.0)	12.5% (2.0)
A place to raise a family	-	-	37.5% (6.0)	31.3% (5.0)	31.3% (5.0)
A place to retire	-	6.3% (1.0)	6.3% (1.0)	43.8% (7.0)	43.8% (7.0)
A place to feel safe	-	6.3% (1.0)	12.5% (2.0)	68.8% (11.0)	12.5% (2.0)
A place to visit	-	6.3% (1.0)	37.5% (6.0)	31.3% (5.0)	25.0% (4.0)
A place to have a "night on the town"	-	25.0% (4.0)	37.5% (6.0)	25.0% (4.0)	12.5% (2.0)
A place to learn	-	6.3% (1.0)	31.3% (5.0)	43.8% (7.0)	18.8% (3.0)
A place for "opportunities for all"	-	12.5% (2.0)	56.3% (9.0)	31.3% (5.0)	-
A place to be healthy	-	6.3% (1.0)	12.5% (2.0)	56.3% (9.0)	25.0% (4.0)
A place for business	-	-	50.0% (8.0)	31.3% (5.0)	18.8% (3.0)
A place to call home	-	-	6.3% (1.0)	56.3% (9.0)	37.5% (6.0)
A place moving in the "right direction"	6.3% (1.0)	18.8% (3.0)	18.8% (3.0)	18.8% (3.0)	37.5% (6.0)

unknown (68)

A place to live	-	5.9% (4.0)	2.9% (2.0)	57.4% (39.0)	33.8% (23.0)
A place to work	-	-	61.8% (42.0)	26.5% (18.0)	11.8% (8.0)
A place to raise a family	1.5% (1.0)	4.4% (3.0)	29.4% (20.0)	41.2% (28.0)	23.5% (16.0)
A place to retire	1.5% (1.0)	11.8% (8.0)	35.3% (24.0)	38.2% (26.0)	13.2% (9.0)
A place to feel safe	-	16.2% (11.0)	16.2% (11.0)	48.5% (33.0)	19.1% (13.0)
A place to visit	7.4% (5.0)	30.9% (21.0)	29.4% (20.0)	26.5% (18.0)	5.9% (4.0)
A place to have a "night on the town"	23.5% (16.0)	36.8% (25.0)	26.5% (18.0)	13.2% (9.0)	-
A place to learn	4.4% (3.0)	25.0% (17.0)	45.6% (31.0)	20.6% (14.0)	4.4% (3.0)
A place for "opportunities for all"	1.5% (1.0)	13.2% (9.0)	47.1% (32.0)	30.9% (21.0)	7.4% (5.0)
A place to be healthy	-	4.4% (3.0)	7.4% (5.0)	67.6% (46.0)	20.6% (14.0)
A place for business	-	5.9% (4.0)	41.2% (28.0)	42.6% (29.0)	10.3% (7.0)
A place to call home	1.5% (1.0)	7.4% (5.0)	5.9% (4.0)	61.8% (42.0)	23.5% (16.0)
A place moving in the "right direction"	2.9% (2.0)	8.8% (6.0)	32.4% (22.0)	47.1% (32.0)	8.8% (6.0)

VOTERS
AGE

187 REGISTERED VOTERS

	Very Unsatisfied	Unsatisfied	Neutral	Satisfied	Very Satisfied
28 (1)					
A place to live	-	-	-	100.0% (1.0)	-
A place to work	-	100.0% (1.0)	-	-	-
A place to raise a family	-	-	-	100.0% (1.0)	-
A place to retire	-	-	100.0% (1.0)	-	-
A place to feel safe	-	-	-	100.0% (1.0)	-
A place to visit	-	-	100.0% (1.0)	-	-
A place to have a "night on the town"	-	-	-	100.0% (1.0)	-
A place to learn	-	-	100.0% (1.0)	-	-
A place for "opportunities for all"	-	100.0% (1.0)	-	-	-
A place to be healthy	-	-	-	100.0% (1.0)	-
A place for business	-	-	100.0% (1.0)	-	-
A place to call home	-	-	-	100.0% (1.0)	-
A place moving in the "right direction"	-	-	100.0% (1.0)	-	-

31 (1)

A place to live	-	-	-	100.0% (1.0)	-
A place to work	-	-	100.0% (1.0)	-	-
A place to raise a family	-	-	-	100.0% (1.0)	-
A place to retire	-	-	-	100.0% (1.0)	-
A place to feel safe	-	-	-	100.0% (1.0)	-
A place to visit	-	100.0% (1.0)	-	-	-
A place to have a "night on the town"	100.0% (1.0)	-	-	-	-
A place to learn	-	-	100.0% (1.0)	-	-
A place for "opportunities for all"	-	100.0% (1.0)	-	-	-
A place to be healthy	-	-	-	100.0% (1.0)	-
A place for business	-	-	-	100.0% (1.0)	-
A place to call home	-	-	-	100.0% (1.0)	-
A place moving in the "right direction"	-	-	-	100.0% (1.0)	-

32 (1)

A place to live	-	-	100.0% (1.0)	-	-
A place to work	-	-	100.0% (1.0)	-	-
A place to raise a family	-	-	100.0% (1.0)	-	-
A place to retire	-	-	100.0% (1.0)	-	-
A place to feel safe	-	100.0% (1.0)	-	-	-
A place to visit	100.0% (1.0)	-	-	-	-
A place to have a "night on the town"	100.0% (1.0)	-	-	-	-
A place to learn	-	-	100.0% (1.0)	-	-
A place for "opportunities for all"	-	100.0% (1.0)	-	-	-
A place to be healthy	-	-	-	100.0% (1.0)	-
A place for business	-	100.0% (1.0)	-	-	-
A place to call home	-	100.0% (1.0)	-	-	-
A place moving in the "right direction"	-	-	100.0% (1.0)	-	-

33 (1)

A place to live	-	-	-	100.0% (1.0)	-
A place to work	-	-	100.0% (1.0)	-	-
A place to raise a family	-	-	-	100.0% (1.0)	-
A place to retire	-	-	-	100.0% (1.0)	-
A place to feel safe	-	100.0% (1.0)	-	-	-
A place to visit	-	100.0% (1.0)	-	-	-
A place to have a "night on the town"	-	100.0% (1.0)	-	-	-

A place to learn	-	-	100.0% (1.0)	-	-
A place for "opportunities for all"	-	-	100.0% (1.0)	-	-
A place to be healthy	-	-	100.0% (1.0)	-	-
A place for business	-	-	100.0% (1.0)	-	-
A place to call home	-	-	-	100.0% (1.0)	-
A place moving in the "right direction"	-	-	-	100.0% (1.0)	-

34 (1)

A place to live	-	-	-	-	100.0% (1.0)
A place to work	-	-	100.0% (1.0)	-	-
A place to raise a family	-	100.0% (1.0)	-	-	-
A place to retire	-	-	100.0% (1.0)	-	-
A place to feel safe	-	-	-	100.0% (1.0)	-
A place to visit	-	-	100.0% (1.0)	-	-
A place to have a "night on the town"	-	100.0% (1.0)	-	-	-
A place to learn	-	-	100.0% (1.0)	-	-
A place for "opportunities for all"	-	-	100.0% (1.0)	-	-
A place to be healthy	-	-	-	-	100.0% (1.0)
A place for business	-	-	100.0% (1.0)	-	-
A place to call home	-	-	-	-	100.0% (1.0)
A place moving in the "right direction"	-	-	-	100.0% (1.0)	-

35 (5)

A place to live	-	-	20.0% (1.0)	40.0% (2.0)	40.0% (2.0)
A place to work	-	20.0% (1.0)	40.0% (2.0)	40.0% (2.0)	-
A place to raise a family	-	-	40.0% (2.0)	60.0% (3.0)	-
A place to retire	20.0% (1.0)	-	40.0% (2.0)	40.0% (2.0)	-
A place to feel safe	-	20.0% (1.0)	20.0% (1.0)	60.0% (3.0)	-
A place to visit	20.0% (1.0)	60.0% (3.0)	-	20.0% (1.0)	-
A place to have a "night on the town"	40.0% (2.0)	40.0% (2.0)	-	20.0% (1.0)	-
A place to learn	-	40.0% (2.0)	40.0% (2.0)	20.0% (1.0)	-
A place for "opportunities for all"	-	60.0% (3.0)	-	40.0% (2.0)	-
A place to be healthy	-	-	-	100.0% (5.0)	-
A place for business	-	-	20.0% (1.0)	80.0% (4.0)	-
A place to call home	-	-	20.0% (1.0)	80.0% (4.0)	-
A place moving in the "right direction"	-	-	80.0% (4.0)	20.0% (1.0)	-

36 (3)

A place to live	-	-	-	100.0% (3.0)	-
A place to work	-	-	100.0% (3.0)	-	-
A place to raise a family	-	-	33.3% (1.0)	66.7% (2.0)	-
A place to retire	-	-	100.0% (3.0)	-	-
A place to feel safe	-	-	-	100.0% (3.0)	-
A place to visit	33.3% (1.0)	33.3% (1.0)	33.3% (1.0)	-	-
A place to have a "night on the town"	33.3% (1.0)	33.3% (1.0)	33.3% (1.0)	-	-
A place to learn	-	-	100.0% (3.0)	-	-
A place for "opportunities for all"	-	33.3% (1.0)	33.3% (1.0)	33.3% (1.0)	-
A place to be healthy	-	-	-	100.0% (3.0)	-
A place for business	-	-	66.7% (2.0)	33.3% (1.0)	-
A place to call home	-	-	-	100.0% (3.0)	-
A place moving in the "right direction"	-	-	100.0% (3.0)	-	-

37 (5)

A place to live	-	-	20.0% (1.0)	80.0% (4.0)	-
A place to work	-	-	60.0% (3.0)	40.0% (2.0)	-
A place to raise a family	-	-	40.0% (2.0)	60.0% (3.0)	-
A place to retire	-	20.0% (1.0)	40.0% (2.0)	40.0% (2.0)	-
A place to feel safe	-	40.0% (2.0)	40.0% (2.0)	20.0% (1.0)	-

A place to visit	-	40.0% (2.0)	20.0% (1.0)	40.0% (2.0)	-
A place to have a "night on the town"	20.0% (1.0)	60.0% (3.0)	20.0% (1.0)	-	-
A place to learn	-	-	100.0% (5.0)	-	-
A place for "opportunities for all"	-	20.0% (1.0)	40.0% (2.0)	40.0% (2.0)	-
A place to be healthy	-	-	-	100.0% (5.0)	-
A place for business	-	20.0% (1.0)	40.0% (2.0)	40.0% (2.0)	-
A place to call home	-	-	-	80.0% (4.0)	20.0% (1.0)
A place moving in the "right direction"	-	-	20.0% (1.0)	80.0% (4.0)	-

38 (3)

A place to live	-	-	33.3% (1.0)	33.3% (1.0)	33.3% (1.0)
A place to work	-	-	66.7% (2.0)	33.3% (1.0)	-
A place to raise a family	-	-	66.7% (2.0)	33.3% (1.0)	-
A place to retire	-	-	66.7% (2.0)	33.3% (1.0)	-
A place to feel safe	-	-	33.3% (1.0)	33.3% (1.0)	33.3% (1.0)
A place to visit	-	-	66.7% (2.0)	33.3% (1.0)	-
A place to have a "night on the town"	33.3% (1.0)	33.3% (1.0)	33.3% (1.0)	-	-
A place to learn	-	-	33.3% (1.0)	66.7% (2.0)	-
A place for "opportunities for all"	33.3% (1.0)	33.3% (1.0)	-	33.3% (1.0)	-
A place to be healthy	-	-	33.3% (1.0)	66.7% (2.0)	-
A place for business	-	-	33.3% (1.0)	66.7% (2.0)	-
A place to call home	-	-	33.3% (1.0)	66.7% (2.0)	-
A place moving in the "right direction"	-	-	33.3% (1.0)	66.7% (2.0)	-

39 (4)

A place to live	-	-	-	50.0% (2.0)	50.0% (2.0)
A place to work	-	-	75.0% (3.0)	-	25.0% (1.0)
A place to raise a family	-	-	-	50.0% (2.0)	50.0% (2.0)
A place to retire	-	-	-	50.0% (2.0)	50.0% (2.0)
A place to feel safe	-	25.0% (1.0)	-	50.0% (2.0)	25.0% (1.0)
A place to visit	-	-	-	50.0% (2.0)	50.0% (2.0)
A place to have a "night on the town"	25.0% (1.0)	75.0% (3.0)	-	-	-
A place to learn	25.0% (1.0)	50.0% (2.0)	-	25.0% (1.0)	-
A place for "opportunities for all"	-	-	50.0% (2.0)	50.0% (2.0)	-
A place to be healthy	-	-	25.0% (1.0)	50.0% (2.0)	25.0% (1.0)
A place for business	-	25.0% (1.0)	-	50.0% (2.0)	25.0% (1.0)
A place to call home	-	-	-	25.0% (1.0)	75.0% (3.0)
A place moving in the "right direction"	-	25.0% (1.0)	-	50.0% (2.0)	25.0% (1.0)

40 (3)

A place to live	-	-	-	33.3% (1.0)	66.7% (2.0)
A place to work	-	33.3% (1.0)	33.3% (1.0)	33.3% (1.0)	-
A place to raise a family	-	-	33.3% (1.0)	33.3% (1.0)	33.3% (1.0)
A place to retire	-	33.3% (1.0)	66.7% (2.0)	-	-
A place to feel safe	33.3% (1.0)	-	66.7% (2.0)	-	-
A place to visit	-	33.3% (1.0)	33.3% (1.0)	33.3% (1.0)	-
A place to have a "night on the town"	33.3% (1.0)	-	33.3% (1.0)	33.3% (1.0)	-
A place to learn	-	-	66.7% (2.0)	33.3% (1.0)	-
A place for "opportunities for all"	-	-	66.7% (2.0)	33.3% (1.0)	-
A place to be healthy	-	-	33.3% (1.0)	33.3% (1.0)	33.3% (1.0)
A place for business	-	33.3% (1.0)	33.3% (1.0)	33.3% (1.0)	-
A place to call home	-	-	-	100.0% (3.0)	-
A place moving in the "right direction"	-	-	66.7% (2.0)	33.3% (1.0)	-

41 (3)

A place to live	-	-	33.3% (1.0)	66.7% (2.0)	-
A place to work	-	-	66.7% (2.0)	33.3% (1.0)	-
A place to raise a family	-	-	33.3% (1.0)	66.7% (2.0)	-

A place to retire	-	-	66.7% (2.0)	33.3% (1.0)	-
A place to feel safe	-	66.7% (2.0)	33.3% (1.0)	-	-
A place to visit	-	33.3% (1.0)	33.3% (1.0)	33.3% (1.0)	-
A place to have a "night on the town"	-	33.3% (1.0)	66.7% (2.0)	-	-
A place to learn	-	-	66.7% (2.0)	33.3% (1.0)	-
A place for "opportunities for all"	-	-	66.7% (2.0)	33.3% (1.0)	-
A place to be healthy	-	-	33.3% (1.0)	66.7% (2.0)	-
A place for business	-	-	66.7% (2.0)	33.3% (1.0)	-
A place to call home	-	-	33.3% (1.0)	66.7% (2.0)	-
A place moving in the "right direction"	-	-	66.7% (2.0)	33.3% (1.0)	-

43 (5)

A place to live	-	-	-	60.0% (3.0)	40.0% (2.0)
A place to work	20.0% (1.0)	-	20.0% (1.0)	40.0% (2.0)	20.0% (1.0)
A place to raise a family	-	-	-	60.0% (3.0)	40.0% (2.0)
A place to retire	20.0% (1.0)	-	20.0% (1.0)	60.0% (3.0)	-
A place to feel safe	-	-	40.0% (2.0)	40.0% (2.0)	20.0% (1.0)
A place to visit	20.0% (1.0)	20.0% (1.0)	20.0% (1.0)	20.0% (1.0)	20.0% (1.0)
A place to have a "night on the town"	-	40.0% (2.0)	40.0% (2.0)	20.0% (1.0)	-
A place to learn	-	-	80.0% (4.0)	20.0% (1.0)	-
A place for "opportunities for all"	-	20.0% (1.0)	40.0% (2.0)	20.0% (1.0)	20.0% (1.0)
A place to be healthy	-	-	40.0% (2.0)	20.0% (1.0)	40.0% (2.0)
A place for business	-	-	40.0% (2.0)	-	60.0% (3.0)
A place to call home	-	-	40.0% (2.0)	20.0% (1.0)	40.0% (2.0)
A place moving in the "right direction"	40.0% (2.0)	-	40.0% (2.0)	-	20.0% (1.0)

44 (6)

A place to live	-	-	-	66.7% (4.0)	33.3% (2.0)
A place to work	16.7% (1.0)	33.3% (2.0)	16.7% (1.0)	33.3% (2.0)	-
A place to raise a family	-	-	16.7% (1.0)	66.7% (4.0)	16.7% (1.0)
A place to retire	-	33.3% (2.0)	16.7% (1.0)	50.0% (3.0)	-
A place to feel safe	16.7% (1.0)	-	50.0% (3.0)	16.7% (1.0)	16.7% (1.0)
A place to visit	33.3% (2.0)	33.3% (2.0)	16.7% (1.0)	16.7% (1.0)	-
A place to have a "night on the town"	66.7% (4.0)	16.7% (1.0)	16.7% (1.0)	-	-
A place to learn	33.3% (2.0)	16.7% (1.0)	16.7% (1.0)	33.3% (2.0)	-
A place for "opportunities for all"	33.3% (2.0)	-	33.3% (2.0)	33.3% (2.0)	-
A place to be healthy	-	-	-	83.3% (5.0)	16.7% (1.0)
A place for business	-	33.3% (2.0)	50.0% (3.0)	16.7% (1.0)	-
A place to call home	-	-	16.7% (1.0)	66.7% (4.0)	16.7% (1.0)
A place moving in the "right direction"	16.7% (1.0)	33.3% (2.0)	16.7% (1.0)	16.7% (1.0)	16.7% (1.0)

45 (2)

A place to live	-	-	-	-	100.0% (2.0)
A place to work	-	-	100.0% (2.0)	-	-
A place to raise a family	-	-	-	-	100.0% (2.0)
A place to retire	-	-	-	100.0% (2.0)	-
A place to feel safe	-	-	50.0% (1.0)	50.0% (1.0)	-
A place to visit	-	-	100.0% (2.0)	-	-
A place to have a "night on the town"	-	50.0% (1.0)	50.0% (1.0)	-	-
A place to learn	-	-	100.0% (2.0)	-	-
A place for "opportunities for all"	-	50.0% (1.0)	50.0% (1.0)	-	-
A place to be healthy	-	-	50.0% (1.0)	50.0% (1.0)	-
A place for business	-	-	100.0% (2.0)	-	-
A place to call home	-	-	-	-	100.0% (2.0)
A place moving in the "right direction"	-	-	50.0% (1.0)	50.0% (1.0)	-

46 (1)

A place to live	-	-	-	100.0% (1.0)	-
A place to work	-	-	100.0% (1.0)	-	-
A place to raise a family	-	-	-	100.0% (1.0)	-
A place to retire	-	-	-	100.0% (1.0)	-
A place to feel safe	-	-	-	100.0% (1.0)	-
A place to visit	-	-	-	100.0% (1.0)	-
A place to have a "night on the town"	-	100.0% (1.0)	-	-	-
A place to learn	-	-	-	100.0% (1.0)	-
A place for "opportunities for all"	-	-	100.0% (1.0)	-	-
A place to be healthy	-	-	-	100.0% (1.0)	-
A place for business	-	-	-	100.0% (1.0)	-
A place to call home	-	-	-	100.0% (1.0)	-
A place moving in the "right direction"	-	-	-	100.0% (1.0)	-

47 (3)

A place to live	-	-	-	66.7% (2.0)	33.3% (1.0)
A place to work	-	-	33.3% (1.0)	66.7% (2.0)	-
A place to raise a family	-	-	33.3% (1.0)	-	66.7% (2.0)
A place to retire	-	-	33.3% (1.0)	66.7% (2.0)	-
A place to feel safe	-	-	33.3% (1.0)	66.7% (2.0)	-
A place to visit	-	-	66.7% (2.0)	33.3% (1.0)	-
A place to have a "night on the town"	-	33.3% (1.0)	66.7% (2.0)	-	-
A place to learn	-	-	66.7% (2.0)	33.3% (1.0)	-
A place for "opportunities for all"	-	-	100.0% (3.0)	-	-
A place to be healthy	-	-	-	100.0% (3.0)	-
A place for business	-	-	66.7% (2.0)	33.3% (1.0)	-
A place to call home	-	-	-	66.7% (2.0)	33.3% (1.0)
A place moving in the "right direction"	-	-	33.3% (1.0)	66.7% (2.0)	-

48 (2)

A place to live	-	-	50.0% (1.0)	-	50.0% (1.0)
A place to work	-	50.0% (1.0)	-	-	50.0% (1.0)
A place to raise a family	-	-	-	50.0% (1.0)	50.0% (1.0)
A place to retire	50.0% (1.0)	50.0% (1.0)	-	-	-
A place to feel safe	50.0% (1.0)	-	50.0% (1.0)	-	-
A place to visit	50.0% (1.0)	50.0% (1.0)	-	-	-
A place to have a "night on the town"	50.0% (1.0)	-	50.0% (1.0)	-	-
A place to learn	-	-	50.0% (1.0)	-	50.0% (1.0)
A place for "opportunities for all"	-	50.0% (1.0)	-	-	50.0% (1.0)
A place to be healthy	-	50.0% (1.0)	-	-	50.0% (1.0)
A place for business	-	50.0% (1.0)	-	-	50.0% (1.0)
A place to call home	-	-	50.0% (1.0)	-	50.0% (1.0)
A place moving in the "right direction"	-	-	50.0% (1.0)	-	50.0% (1.0)

49 (4)

A place to live	-	-	-	75.0% (3.0)	25.0% (1.0)
A place to work	-	25.0% (1.0)	25.0% (1.0)	25.0% (1.0)	25.0% (1.0)
A place to raise a family	-	-	25.0% (1.0)	50.0% (2.0)	25.0% (1.0)
A place to retire	-	25.0% (1.0)	50.0% (2.0)	-	25.0% (1.0)
A place to feel safe	-	-	25.0% (1.0)	50.0% (2.0)	25.0% (1.0)
A place to visit	-	-	50.0% (2.0)	25.0% (1.0)	25.0% (1.0)
A place to have a "night on the town"	-	50.0% (2.0)	-	50.0% (2.0)	-
A place to learn	-	25.0% (1.0)	50.0% (2.0)	-	25.0% (1.0)
A place for "opportunities for all"	-	25.0% (1.0)	75.0% (3.0)	-	-
A place to be healthy	-	-	25.0% (1.0)	75.0% (3.0)	-
A place for business	-	-	25.0% (1.0)	50.0% (2.0)	25.0% (1.0)
A place to call home	-	-	-	75.0% (3.0)	25.0% (1.0)
A place moving in the "right direction"	-	25.0% (1.0)	50.0% (2.0)	25.0% (1.0)	-

50 (1)

A place to live	-	-	-	100.0% (1.0)	-
A place to work	-	-	100.0% (1.0)	-	-
A place to raise a family	-	-	-	100.0% (1.0)	-
A place to retire	-	100.0% (1.0)	-	-	-
A place to feel safe	-	-	100.0% (1.0)	-	-
A place to visit	-	100.0% (1.0)	-	-	-
A place to have a "night on the town"	-	100.0% (1.0)	-	-	-
A place to learn	-	100.0% (1.0)	-	-	-
A place for "opportunities for all"	100.0% (1.0)	-	-	-	-
A place to be healthy	-	-	100.0% (1.0)	-	-
A place for business	-	-	100.0% (1.0)	-	-
A place to call home	-	-	100.0% (1.0)	-	-
A place moving in the "right direction"	-	-	100.0% (1.0)	-	-

51 (1)

A place to live	-	-	-	100.0% (1.0)	-
A place to work	-	100.0% (1.0)	-	-	-
A place to raise a family	-	-	-	100.0% (1.0)	-
A place to retire	-	-	-	100.0% (1.0)	-
A place to feel safe	-	-	100.0% (1.0)	-	-
A place to visit	-	-	100.0% (1.0)	-	-
A place to have a "night on the town"	100.0% (1.0)	-	-	-	-
A place to learn	-	-	100.0% (1.0)	-	-
A place for "opportunities for all"	-	-	-	100.0% (1.0)	-
A place to be healthy	-	-	100.0% (1.0)	-	-
A place for business	-	-	100.0% (1.0)	-	-
A place to call home	-	-	-	100.0% (1.0)	-
A place moving in the "right direction"	-	-	100.0% (1.0)	-	-

52 (5)

A place to live	-	-	-	60.0% (3.0)	40.0% (2.0)
A place to work	-	-	60.0% (3.0)	20.0% (1.0)	20.0% (1.0)
A place to raise a family	-	-	20.0% (1.0)	60.0% (3.0)	20.0% (1.0)
A place to retire	-	-	60.0% (3.0)	40.0% (2.0)	-
A place to feel safe	-	-	-	100.0% (5.0)	-
A place to visit	-	20.0% (1.0)	40.0% (2.0)	40.0% (2.0)	-
A place to have a "night on the town"	20.0% (1.0)	40.0% (2.0)	20.0% (1.0)	20.0% (1.0)	-
A place to learn	-	40.0% (2.0)	20.0% (1.0)	40.0% (2.0)	-
A place for "opportunities for all"	-	-	60.0% (3.0)	40.0% (2.0)	-
A place to be healthy	-	-	20.0% (1.0)	80.0% (4.0)	-
A place for business	-	-	60.0% (3.0)	40.0% (2.0)	-
A place to call home	-	-	-	80.0% (4.0)	20.0% (1.0)
A place moving in the "right direction"	-	-	40.0% (2.0)	60.0% (3.0)	-

53 (4)

A place to live	-	-	-	50.0% (2.0)	50.0% (2.0)
A place to work	-	-	50.0% (2.0)	25.0% (1.0)	25.0% (1.0)
A place to raise a family	-	-	-	50.0% (2.0)	50.0% (2.0)
A place to retire	-	-	25.0% (1.0)	50.0% (2.0)	25.0% (1.0)
A place to feel safe	-	25.0% (1.0)	25.0% (1.0)	50.0% (2.0)	-
A place to visit	-	25.0% (1.0)	25.0% (1.0)	50.0% (2.0)	-
A place to have a "night on the town"	25.0% (1.0)	25.0% (1.0)	50.0% (2.0)	-	-
A place to learn	-	-	75.0% (3.0)	25.0% (1.0)	-
A place for "opportunities for all"	-	-	50.0% (2.0)	50.0% (2.0)	-
A place to be healthy	-	-	-	75.0% (3.0)	25.0% (1.0)
A place for business	-	-	-	75.0% (3.0)	25.0% (1.0)

A place to call home	-	-	-	75.0% (3.0)	25.0% (1.0)
A place moving in the "right direction"	-	-	50.0% (2.0)	50.0% (2.0)	-
54 (1)					
A place to live	-	-	-	100.0% (1.0)	-
A place to work	-	-	-	100.0% (1.0)	-
A place to raise a family	-	-	-	100.0% (1.0)	-
A place to retire	-	-	-	100.0% (1.0)	-
A place to feel safe	-	-	100.0% (1.0)	-	-
A place to visit	-	-	-	100.0% (1.0)	-
A place to have a "night on the town"	100.0% (1.0)	-	-	-	-
A place to learn	-	-	100.0% (1.0)	-	-
A place for "opportunities for all"	-	-	-	100.0% (1.0)	-
A place to be healthy	-	-	-	-	100.0% (1.0)
A place for business	-	-	-	-	100.0% (1.0)
A place to call home	-	-	-	100.0% (1.0)	-
A place moving in the "right direction"	-	-	-	100.0% (1.0)	-

55 (3)

A place to live	-	-	-	66.7% (2.0)	33.3% (1.0)
A place to work	-	-	33.3% (1.0)	66.7% (2.0)	-
A place to raise a family	-	33.3% (1.0)	33.3% (1.0)	33.3% (1.0)	-
A place to retire	-	-	33.3% (1.0)	33.3% (1.0)	33.3% (1.0)
A place to feel safe	-	-	-	66.7% (2.0)	33.3% (1.0)
A place to visit	-	-	-	66.7% (2.0)	33.3% (1.0)
A place to have a "night on the town"	-	66.7% (2.0)	-	33.3% (1.0)	-
A place to learn	-	-	33.3% (1.0)	66.7% (2.0)	-
A place for "opportunities for all"	-	33.3% (1.0)	33.3% (1.0)	33.3% (1.0)	-
A place to be healthy	-	-	-	66.7% (2.0)	33.3% (1.0)
A place for business	-	-	-	66.7% (2.0)	33.3% (1.0)
A place to call home	-	-	-	100.0% (3.0)	-
A place moving in the "right direction"	-	-	-	100.0% (3.0)	-

56 (2)

A place to live	-	-	-	50.0% (1.0)	50.0% (1.0)
A place to work	-	-	-	50.0% (1.0)	50.0% (1.0)
A place to raise a family	-	-	-	50.0% (1.0)	50.0% (1.0)
A place to retire	-	-	50.0% (1.0)	-	50.0% (1.0)
A place to feel safe	-	-	-	100.0% (2.0)	-
A place to visit	50.0% (1.0)	-	50.0% (1.0)	-	-
A place to have a "night on the town"	50.0% (1.0)	-	50.0% (1.0)	-	-
A place to learn	-	-	100.0% (2.0)	-	-
A place for "opportunities for all"	-	-	100.0% (2.0)	-	-
A place to be healthy	-	-	50.0% (1.0)	50.0% (1.0)	-
A place for business	-	-	50.0% (1.0)	-	50.0% (1.0)
A place to call home	-	-	-	50.0% (1.0)	50.0% (1.0)
A place moving in the "right direction"	-	-	50.0% (1.0)	50.0% (1.0)	-

57 (1)

A place to live	-	-	-	100.0% (1.0)	-
A place to work	-	-	-	100.0% (1.0)	-
A place to raise a family	-	-	-	100.0% (1.0)	-
A place to retire	-	-	-	100.0% (1.0)	-
A place to feel safe	-	-	-	100.0% (1.0)	-
A place to visit	-	100.0% (1.0)	-	-	-
A place to have a "night on the town"	-	100.0% (1.0)	-	-	-
A place to learn	-	-	100.0% (1.0)	-	-
A place for "opportunities for all"	-	-	-	100.0% (1.0)	-

A place to be healthy	-	-	-	100.0% (1.0)	-
A place for business	-	-	-	100.0% (1.0)	-
A place to call home	-	-	-	100.0% (1.0)	-
A place moving in the "right direction"	-	100.0% (1.0)	-	-	-

59 (5)

A place to live	-	-	20.0% (1.0)	60.0% (3.0)	20.0% (1.0)
A place to work	-	-	60.0% (3.0)	40.0% (2.0)	-
A place to raise a family	-	-	40.0% (2.0)	60.0% (3.0)	-
A place to retire	-	20.0% (1.0)	60.0% (3.0)	20.0% (1.0)	-
A place to feel safe	-	20.0% (1.0)	40.0% (2.0)	40.0% (2.0)	-
A place to visit	-	20.0% (1.0)	60.0% (3.0)	20.0% (1.0)	-
A place to have a "night on the town"	-	20.0% (1.0)	60.0% (3.0)	20.0% (1.0)	-
A place to learn	-	-	60.0% (3.0)	40.0% (2.0)	-
A place for "opportunities for all"	-	20.0% (1.0)	60.0% (3.0)	20.0% (1.0)	-
A place to be healthy	-	-	40.0% (2.0)	60.0% (3.0)	-
A place for business	-	-	40.0% (2.0)	60.0% (3.0)	-
A place to call home	-	-	20.0% (1.0)	80.0% (4.0)	-
A place moving in the "right direction"	-	20.0% (1.0)	40.0% (2.0)	40.0% (2.0)	-

60 (3)

A place to live	-	-	33.3% (1.0)	33.3% (1.0)	33.3% (1.0)
A place to work	-	33.3% (1.0)	66.7% (2.0)	-	-
A place to raise a family	-	-	-	66.7% (2.0)	33.3% (1.0)
A place to retire	-	33.3% (1.0)	-	33.3% (1.0)	33.3% (1.0)
A place to feel safe	-	-	66.7% (2.0)	-	33.3% (1.0)
A place to visit	33.3% (1.0)	-	33.3% (1.0)	33.3% (1.0)	-
A place to have a "night on the town"	-	66.7% (2.0)	33.3% (1.0)	-	-
A place to learn	33.3% (1.0)	33.3% (1.0)	-	33.3% (1.0)	-
A place for "opportunities for all"	33.3% (1.0)	33.3% (1.0)	-	33.3% (1.0)	-
A place to be healthy	-	33.3% (1.0)	33.3% (1.0)	33.3% (1.0)	-
A place for business	-	-	100.0% (3.0)	-	-
A place to call home	-	-	66.7% (2.0)	-	33.3% (1.0)
A place moving in the "right direction"	-	33.3% (1.0)	33.3% (1.0)	33.3% (1.0)	-

61 (1)

A place to live	-	-	-	100.0% (1.0)	-
A place to work	-	-	-	100.0% (1.0)	-
A place to raise a family	-	-	-	100.0% (1.0)	-
A place to retire	-	-	-	100.0% (1.0)	-
A place to feel safe	-	-	-	100.0% (1.0)	-
A place to visit	-	-	-	100.0% (1.0)	-
A place to have a "night on the town"	-	-	-	-	100.0% (1.0)
A place to learn	-	-	100.0% (1.0)	-	-
A place for "opportunities for all"	-	-	-	100.0% (1.0)	-
A place to be healthy	-	-	-	100.0% (1.0)	-
A place for business	-	-	100.0% (1.0)	-	-
A place to call home	-	-	-	100.0% (1.0)	-
A place moving in the "right direction"	-	-	100.0% (1.0)	-	-

62 (5)

A place to live	-	-	-	40.0% (2.0)	60.0% (3.0)
A place to work	-	-	60.0% (3.0)	20.0% (1.0)	20.0% (1.0)
A place to raise a family	-	-	-	20.0% (1.0)	80.0% (4.0)
A place to retire	-	-	20.0% (1.0)	60.0% (3.0)	20.0% (1.0)
A place to feel safe	-	-	40.0% (2.0)	60.0% (3.0)	-
A place to visit	-	20.0% (1.0)	80.0% (4.0)	-	-

A place to have a "night on the town"	-	60.0% (3.0)	40.0% (2.0)	-	-
A place to learn	-	-	100.0% (5.0)	-	-
A place for "opportunities for all"	-	20.0% (1.0)	40.0% (2.0)	20.0% (1.0)	20.0% (1.0)
A place to be healthy	-	-	-	60.0% (3.0)	40.0% (2.0)
A place for business	-	-	40.0% (2.0)	60.0% (3.0)	-
A place to call home	-	-	-	40.0% (2.0)	60.0% (3.0)
A place moving in the "right direction"	-	-	40.0% (2.0)	60.0% (3.0)	-

63 (2)

A place to live	-	-	-	50.0% (1.0)	50.0% (1.0)
A place to work	-	50.0% (1.0)	-	-	50.0% (1.0)
A place to raise a family	-	-	50.0% (1.0)	-	50.0% (1.0)
A place to retire	-	-	50.0% (1.0)	-	50.0% (1.0)
A place to feel safe	-	50.0% (1.0)	50.0% (1.0)	-	-
A place to visit	-	-	50.0% (1.0)	50.0% (1.0)	-
A place to have a "night on the town"	-	50.0% (1.0)	50.0% (1.0)	-	-
A place to learn	-	-	50.0% (1.0)	-	50.0% (1.0)
A place for "opportunities for all"	-	50.0% (1.0)	-	-	50.0% (1.0)
A place to be healthy	-	-	50.0% (1.0)	-	50.0% (1.0)
A place for business	-	-	50.0% (1.0)	-	50.0% (1.0)
A place to call home	-	50.0% (1.0)	-	-	50.0% (1.0)
A place moving in the "right direction"	-	50.0% (1.0)	-	-	50.0% (1.0)

64 (5)

A place to live	-	-	20.0% (1.0)	60.0% (3.0)	20.0% (1.0)
A place to work	-	-	100.0% (5.0)	-	-
A place to raise a family	-	-	20.0% (1.0)	60.0% (3.0)	20.0% (1.0)
A place to retire	-	20.0% (1.0)	40.0% (2.0)	40.0% (2.0)	-
A place to feel safe	-	20.0% (1.0)	80.0% (4.0)	-	-
A place to visit	-	40.0% (2.0)	20.0% (1.0)	40.0% (2.0)	-
A place to have a "night on the town"	-	40.0% (2.0)	60.0% (3.0)	-	-
A place to learn	-	-	80.0% (4.0)	20.0% (1.0)	-
A place for "opportunities for all"	-	40.0% (2.0)	20.0% (1.0)	40.0% (2.0)	-
A place to be healthy	-	20.0% (1.0)	40.0% (2.0)	40.0% (2.0)	-
A place for business	-	-	60.0% (3.0)	40.0% (2.0)	-
A place to call home	-	-	20.0% (1.0)	80.0% (4.0)	-
A place moving in the "right direction"	-	-	60.0% (3.0)	40.0% (2.0)	-

65 (2)

A place to live	-	-	-	50.0% (1.0)	50.0% (1.0)
A place to work	-	-	50.0% (1.0)	50.0% (1.0)	-
A place to raise a family	-	-	50.0% (1.0)	50.0% (1.0)	-
A place to retire	-	-	50.0% (1.0)	50.0% (1.0)	-
A place to feel safe	-	-	50.0% (1.0)	50.0% (1.0)	-
A place to visit	-	-	-	100.0% (2.0)	-
A place to have a "night on the town"	-	50.0% (1.0)	50.0% (1.0)	-	-
A place to learn	-	-	-	100.0% (2.0)	-
A place for "opportunities for all"	-	-	50.0% (1.0)	50.0% (1.0)	-
A place to be healthy	-	-	-	100.0% (2.0)	-
A place for business	-	-	50.0% (1.0)	50.0% (1.0)	-
A place to call home	-	-	50.0% (1.0)	50.0% (1.0)	-
A place moving in the "right direction"	50.0% (1.0)	50.0% (1.0)	-	-	-

66 (2)

A place to live	-	-	-	50.0% (1.0)	50.0% (1.0)
A place to work	-	-	-	100.0% (2.0)	-
A place to raise a family	-	-	-	50.0% (1.0)	50.0% (1.0)
A place to retire	-	-	50.0% (1.0)	50.0% (1.0)	-

A place to feel safe	-	50.0% (1.0)	-	50.0% (1.0)	-
A place to visit	-	50.0% (1.0)	50.0% (1.0)	-	-
A place to have a "night on the town"	-	-	50.0% (1.0)	50.0% (1.0)	-
A place to learn	-	-	50.0% (1.0)	50.0% (1.0)	-
A place for "opportunities for all"	-	-	50.0% (1.0)	50.0% (1.0)	-
A place to be healthy	-	-	-	50.0% (1.0)	50.0% (1.0)
A place for business	-	-	-	100.0% (2.0)	-
A place to call home	-	-	-	50.0% (1.0)	50.0% (1.0)
A place moving in the "right direction"	-	-	50.0% (1.0)	50.0% (1.0)	-

67 (1)

A place to live	-	-	-	-	100.0% (1.0)
A place to work	-	-	-	100.0% (1.0)	-
A place to raise a family	-	-	-	-	100.0% (1.0)
A place to retire	-	-	-	-	100.0% (1.0)
A place to feel safe	-	-	-	100.0% (1.0)	-
A place to visit	-	-	-	100.0% (1.0)	-
A place to have a "night on the town"	-	-	100.0% (1.0)	-	-
A place to learn	-	-	100.0% (1.0)	-	-
A place for "opportunities for all"	-	-	100.0% (1.0)	-	-
A place to be healthy	-	-	-	100.0% (1.0)	-
A place for business	-	-	-	100.0% (1.0)	-
A place to call home	-	-	-	-	100.0% (1.0)
A place moving in the "right direction"	-	-	-	100.0% (1.0)	-

68 (3)

A place to live	-	-	-	100.0% (3.0)	-
A place to work	-	-	100.0% (3.0)	-	-
A place to raise a family	-	-	33.3% (1.0)	66.7% (2.0)	-
A place to retire	33.3% (1.0)	-	-	66.7% (2.0)	-
A place to feel safe	-	-	33.3% (1.0)	66.7% (2.0)	-
A place to visit	-	-	33.3% (1.0)	66.7% (2.0)	-
A place to have a "night on the town"	-	66.7% (2.0)	33.3% (1.0)	-	-
A place to learn	-	-	100.0% (3.0)	-	-
A place for "opportunities for all"	33.3% (1.0)	-	33.3% (1.0)	33.3% (1.0)	-
A place to be healthy	-	-	-	100.0% (3.0)	-
A place for business	-	-	33.3% (1.0)	66.7% (2.0)	-
A place to call home	-	-	-	100.0% (3.0)	-
A place moving in the "right direction"	-	-	66.7% (2.0)	33.3% (1.0)	-

69 (2)

A place to live	-	-	-	50.0% (1.0)	50.0% (1.0)
A place to work	-	-	50.0% (1.0)	-	50.0% (1.0)
A place to raise a family	-	50.0% (1.0)	-	-	50.0% (1.0)
A place to retire	-	-	50.0% (1.0)	-	50.0% (1.0)
A place to feel safe	-	50.0% (1.0)	-	-	50.0% (1.0)
A place to visit	-	-	-	50.0% (1.0)	50.0% (1.0)
A place to have a "night on the town"	-	-	-	100.0% (2.0)	-
A place to learn	-	-	50.0% (1.0)	50.0% (1.0)	-
A place for "opportunities for all"	-	-	50.0% (1.0)	50.0% (1.0)	-
A place to be healthy	-	-	50.0% (1.0)	50.0% (1.0)	-
A place for business	-	-	-	100.0% (2.0)	-
A place to call home	-	-	50.0% (1.0)	-	50.0% (1.0)
A place moving in the "right direction"	-	-	50.0% (1.0)	50.0% (1.0)	-

71 (2)

A place to live	-	-	-	50.0% (1.0)	50.0% (1.0)
A place to work	-	50.0% (1.0)	-	50.0% (1.0)	-

A place to raise a family	-	-	-	-	100.0% (2.0)
A place to retire	-	-	-	50.0% (1.0)	50.0% (1.0)
A place to feel safe	-	-	50.0% (1.0)	50.0% (1.0)	-
A place to visit	-	-	50.0% (1.0)	-	50.0% (1.0)
A place to have a "night on the town"	-	-	50.0% (1.0)	50.0% (1.0)	-
A place to learn	-	-	-	100.0% (2.0)	-
A place for "opportunities for all"	-	-	-	100.0% (2.0)	-
A place to be healthy	-	-	-	100.0% (2.0)	-
A place for business	-	-	50.0% (1.0)	-	50.0% (1.0)
A place to call home	-	-	-	50.0% (1.0)	50.0% (1.0)
A place moving in the "right direction"	-	-	50.0% (1.0)	-	50.0% (1.0)

72 (3)

A place to live	-	-	-	66.7% (2.0)	33.3% (1.0)
A place to work	-	-	66.7% (2.0)	33.3% (1.0)	-
A place to raise a family	-	-	33.3% (1.0)	66.7% (2.0)	-
A place to retire	-	33.3% (1.0)	-	33.3% (1.0)	33.3% (1.0)
A place to feel safe	-	-	-	100.0% (3.0)	-
A place to visit	-	-	33.3% (1.0)	66.7% (2.0)	-
A place to have a "night on the town"	-	-	100.0% (3.0)	-	-
A place to learn	-	-	-	100.0% (3.0)	-
A place for "opportunities for all"	-	33.3% (1.0)	33.3% (1.0)	33.3% (1.0)	-
A place to be healthy	-	-	-	100.0% (3.0)	-
A place for business	-	-	-	100.0% (3.0)	-
A place to call home	-	-	-	66.7% (2.0)	33.3% (1.0)
A place moving in the "right direction"	33.3% (1.0)	33.3% (1.0)	-	33.3% (1.0)	-

73 (3)

A place to live	-	-	-	66.7% (2.0)	33.3% (1.0)
A place to work	-	-	66.7% (2.0)	-	33.3% (1.0)
A place to raise a family	-	-	33.3% (1.0)	33.3% (1.0)	33.3% (1.0)
A place to retire	-	-	33.3% (1.0)	33.3% (1.0)	33.3% (1.0)
A place to feel safe	-	-	-	66.7% (2.0)	33.3% (1.0)
A place to visit	-	33.3% (1.0)	66.7% (2.0)	-	-
A place to have a "night on the town"	-	33.3% (1.0)	33.3% (1.0)	-	33.3% (1.0)
A place to learn	-	33.3% (1.0)	33.3% (1.0)	-	33.3% (1.0)
A place for "opportunities for all"	-	-	100.0% (3.0)	-	-
A place to be healthy	-	33.3% (1.0)	-	33.3% (1.0)	33.3% (1.0)
A place for business	-	-	66.7% (2.0)	-	33.3% (1.0)
A place to call home	-	-	-	66.7% (2.0)	33.3% (1.0)
A place moving in the "right direction"	-	-	33.3% (1.0)	33.3% (1.0)	33.3% (1.0)

74 (4)

A place to live	-	-	25.0% (1.0)	-	75.0% (3.0)
A place to work	-	-	25.0% (1.0)	50.0% (2.0)	25.0% (1.0)
A place to raise a family	-	-	50.0% (2.0)	25.0% (1.0)	25.0% (1.0)
A place to retire	-	-	-	50.0% (2.0)	50.0% (2.0)
A place to feel safe	-	-	25.0% (1.0)	50.0% (2.0)	25.0% (1.0)
A place to visit	-	-	25.0% (1.0)	25.0% (1.0)	50.0% (2.0)
A place to have a "night on the town"	-	25.0% (1.0)	-	50.0% (2.0)	25.0% (1.0)
A place to learn	-	-	50.0% (2.0)	25.0% (1.0)	25.0% (1.0)
A place for "opportunities for all"	-	25.0% (1.0)	25.0% (1.0)	50.0% (2.0)	-
A place to be healthy	-	-	25.0% (1.0)	25.0% (1.0)	50.0% (2.0)
A place for business	-	-	25.0% (1.0)	50.0% (2.0)	25.0% (1.0)
A place to call home	-	-	25.0% (1.0)	25.0% (1.0)	50.0% (2.0)
A place moving in the "right direction"	-	25.0% (1.0)	-	25.0% (1.0)	50.0% (2.0)

77 (2)

A place to live	-	-	-	100.0% (2.0)	-
A place to work	-	-	100.0% (2.0)	-	-
A place to raise a family	-	-	50.0% (1.0)	50.0% (1.0)	-
A place to retire	-	-	-	100.0% (2.0)	-
A place to feel safe	-	50.0% (1.0)	-	50.0% (1.0)	-
A place to visit	-	-	50.0% (1.0)	50.0% (1.0)	-
A place to have a "night on the town"	-	50.0% (1.0)	-	50.0% (1.0)	-
A place to learn	-	-	-	50.0% (1.0)	50.0% (1.0)
A place for "opportunities for all"	-	-	100.0% (2.0)	-	-
A place to be healthy	-	-	-	50.0% (1.0)	50.0% (1.0)
A place for business	-	-	100.0% (2.0)	-	-
A place to call home	-	-	-	100.0% (2.0)	-
A place moving in the "right direction"	-	50.0% (1.0)	50.0% (1.0)	-	-

79 (2)

A place to live	-	-	-	50.0% (1.0)	50.0% (1.0)
A place to work	-	-	50.0% (1.0)	50.0% (1.0)	-
A place to raise a family	-	-	50.0% (1.0)	-	50.0% (1.0)
A place to retire	-	-	-	-	100.0% (2.0)
A place to feel safe	-	-	-	100.0% (2.0)	-
A place to visit	-	-	-	50.0% (1.0)	50.0% (1.0)
A place to have a "night on the town"	-	50.0% (1.0)	50.0% (1.0)	-	-
A place to learn	-	-	100.0% (2.0)	-	-
A place for "opportunities for all"	-	-	100.0% (2.0)	-	-
A place to be healthy	-	-	50.0% (1.0)	50.0% (1.0)	-
A place for business	-	-	100.0% (2.0)	-	-
A place to call home	-	-	-	50.0% (1.0)	50.0% (1.0)
A place moving in the "right direction"	-	-	-	-	100.0% (2.0)

Unknown (68)

A place to live	-	5.9% (4.0)	2.9% (2.0)	57.4% (39.0)	33.8% (23.0)
A place to work	-	-	61.8% (42.0)	26.5% (18.0)	11.8% (8.0)
A place to raise a family	1.5% (1.0)	4.4% (3.0)	29.4% (20.0)	41.2% (28.0)	23.5% (16.0)
A place to retire	1.5% (1.0)	11.8% (8.0)	35.3% (24.0)	38.2% (26.0)	13.2% (9.0)
A place to feel safe	-	16.2% (11.0)	16.2% (11.0)	48.5% (33.0)	19.1% (13.0)
A place to visit	7.4% (5.0)	30.9% (21.0)	29.4% (20.0)	26.5% (18.0)	5.9% (4.0)
A place to have a "night on the town"	23.5% (16.0)	36.8% (25.0)	26.5% (18.0)	13.2% (9.0)	-
A place to learn	4.4% (3.0)	25.0% (17.0)	45.6% (31.0)	20.6% (14.0)	4.4% (3.0)
A place for "opportunities for all"	1.5% (1.0)	13.2% (9.0)	47.1% (32.0)	30.9% (21.0)	7.4% (5.0)
A place to be healthy	-	4.4% (3.0)	7.4% (5.0)	67.6% (46.0)	20.6% (14.0)
A place for business	-	5.9% (4.0)	41.2% (28.0)	42.6% (29.0)	10.3% (7.0)
A place to call home	1.5% (1.0)	7.4% (5.0)	5.9% (4.0)	61.8% (42.0)	23.5% (16.0)
A place moving in the "right direction"	2.9% (2.0)	8.8% (6.0)	32.4% (22.0)	47.1% (32.0)	8.8% (6.0)

**STATE INCOME
DECILE**

187 REGISTERED VOTERS

Very Unsatisfied	Unsatisfied	Neutral	Satisfied	Very Satisfied
------------------	-------------	---------	-----------	----------------

0 to 9 Pct range (6)

A place to live	-	16.7% (1.0)	-	50.0% (3.0)	33.3% (2.0)
A place to work	-	-	66.7% (4.0)	16.7% (1.0)	16.7% (1.0)
A place to raise a family	-	16.7% (1.0)	16.7% (1.0)	33.3% (2.0)	33.3% (2.0)
A place to retire	-	16.7% (1.0)	33.3% (2.0)	33.3% (2.0)	16.7% (1.0)
A place to feel safe	-	16.7% (1.0)	16.7% (1.0)	50.0% (3.0)	16.7% (1.0)
A place to visit	-	66.7% (4.0)	16.7% (1.0)	-	16.7% (1.0)
A place to have a "night on the town"	16.7% (1.0)	50.0% (3.0)	16.7% (1.0)	16.7% (1.0)	-
A place to learn	-	16.7% (1.0)	50.0% (3.0)	16.7% (1.0)	16.7% (1.0)

A place for "opportunities for all"	-	16.7% (1.0)	50.0% (3.0)	33.3% (2.0)	-
A place to be healthy	-	-	-	100.0% (6.0)	-
A place for business	-	-	16.7% (1.0)	66.7% (4.0)	16.7% (1.0)
A place to call home	-	16.7% (1.0)	-	66.7% (4.0)	16.7% (1.0)
A place moving in the "right direction"	-	-	16.7% (1.0)	83.3% (5.0)	-

10 to 19 Pct range (1)

A place to live	-	-	-	100.0% (1.0)	-
A place to work	-	-	100.0% (1.0)	-	-
A place to raise a family	-	-	-	100.0% (1.0)	-
A place to retire	-	-	100.0% (1.0)	-	-
A place to feel safe	-	100.0% (1.0)	-	-	-
A place to visit	-	-	-	100.0% (1.0)	-
A place to have a "night on the town"	-	-	-	100.0% (1.0)	-
A place to learn	-	-	100.0% (1.0)	-	-
A place for "opportunities for all"	-	-	100.0% (1.0)	-	-
A place to be healthy	-	-	-	100.0% (1.0)	-
A place for business	-	-	-	100.0% (1.0)	-
A place to call home	-	-	-	100.0% (1.0)	-
A place moving in the "right direction"	-	-	-	100.0% (1.0)	-

40 to 49 Pct range (2)

A place to live	-	-	50.0% (1.0)	-	50.0% (1.0)
A place to work	-	-	50.0% (1.0)	-	50.0% (1.0)
A place to raise a family	-	-	-	50.0% (1.0)	50.0% (1.0)
A place to retire	-	-	50.0% (1.0)	50.0% (1.0)	-
A place to feel safe	-	-	50.0% (1.0)	50.0% (1.0)	-
A place to visit	-	50.0% (1.0)	50.0% (1.0)	-	-
A place to have a "night on the town"	50.0% (1.0)	-	50.0% (1.0)	-	-
A place to learn	-	50.0% (1.0)	50.0% (1.0)	-	-
A place for "opportunities for all"	-	-	50.0% (1.0)	50.0% (1.0)	-
A place to be healthy	-	-	50.0% (1.0)	50.0% (1.0)	-
A place for business	-	-	50.0% (1.0)	50.0% (1.0)	-
A place to call home	-	50.0% (1.0)	-	50.0% (1.0)	-
A place moving in the "right direction"	-	-	50.0% (1.0)	50.0% (1.0)	-

50 to 59 Pct range (9)

A place to live	-	-	11.1% (1.0)	77.8% (7.0)	11.1% (1.0)
A place to work	-	22.2% (2.0)	44.4% (4.0)	33.3% (3.0)	-
A place to raise a family	-	-	11.1% (1.0)	77.8% (7.0)	11.1% (1.0)
A place to retire	-	22.2% (2.0)	33.3% (3.0)	44.4% (4.0)	-
A place to feel safe	-	22.2% (2.0)	44.4% (4.0)	33.3% (3.0)	-
A place to visit	-	55.6% (5.0)	22.2% (2.0)	22.2% (2.0)	-
A place to have a "night on the town"	-	55.6% (5.0)	22.2% (2.0)	22.2% (2.0)	-
A place to learn	-	22.2% (2.0)	66.7% (6.0)	11.1% (1.0)	-
A place for "opportunities for all"	11.1% (1.0)	44.4% (4.0)	11.1% (1.0)	33.3% (3.0)	-
A place to be healthy	-	11.1% (1.0)	22.2% (2.0)	55.6% (5.0)	11.1% (1.0)
A place for business	-	11.1% (1.0)	33.3% (3.0)	55.6% (5.0)	-
A place to call home	-	-	33.3% (3.0)	55.6% (5.0)	11.1% (1.0)
A place moving in the "right direction"	11.1% (1.0)	11.1% (1.0)	44.4% (4.0)	33.3% (3.0)	-

60 to 69 Pct range (7)

A place to live	-	-	14.3% (1.0)	57.1% (4.0)	28.6% (2.0)
A place to work	-	14.3% (1.0)	42.9% (3.0)	14.3% (1.0)	28.6% (2.0)
A place to raise a family	-	-	57.1% (4.0)	28.6% (2.0)	14.3% (1.0)
A place to retire	-	28.6% (2.0)	28.6% (2.0)	14.3% (1.0)	28.6% (2.0)
A place to feel safe	-	28.6% (2.0)	14.3% (1.0)	42.9% (3.0)	14.3% (1.0)
A place to visit	-	42.9% (3.0)	14.3% (1.0)	28.6% (2.0)	14.3% (1.0)

A place to have a "night on the town"	28.6% (2.0)	14.3% (1.0)	42.9% (3.0)	14.3% (1.0)	-
A place to learn	-	-	57.1% (4.0)	28.6% (2.0)	14.3% (1.0)
A place for "opportunities for all"	-	-	42.9% (3.0)	42.9% (3.0)	14.3% (1.0)
A place to be healthy	-	-	14.3% (1.0)	71.4% (5.0)	14.3% (1.0)
A place for business	-	14.3% (1.0)	42.9% (3.0)	28.6% (2.0)	14.3% (1.0)
A place to call home	-	-	14.3% (1.0)	57.1% (4.0)	28.6% (2.0)
A place moving in the "right direction"	-	-	42.9% (3.0)	28.6% (2.0)	28.6% (2.0)

70 to 79 Pct range (5)

A place to live	-	-	20.0% (1.0)	40.0% (2.0)	40.0% (2.0)
A place to work	-	-	40.0% (2.0)	60.0% (3.0)	-
A place to raise a family	-	-	40.0% (2.0)	60.0% (3.0)	-
A place to retire	-	-	60.0% (3.0)	40.0% (2.0)	-
A place to feel safe	-	-	40.0% (2.0)	60.0% (3.0)	-
A place to visit	20.0% (1.0)	20.0% (1.0)	20.0% (1.0)	40.0% (2.0)	-
A place to have a "night on the town"	40.0% (2.0)	20.0% (1.0)	20.0% (1.0)	20.0% (1.0)	-
A place to learn	-	-	80.0% (4.0)	20.0% (1.0)	-
A place for "opportunities for all"	20.0% (1.0)	20.0% (1.0)	20.0% (1.0)	40.0% (2.0)	-
A place to be healthy	-	-	40.0% (2.0)	40.0% (2.0)	20.0% (1.0)
A place for business	-	-	40.0% (2.0)	40.0% (2.0)	20.0% (1.0)
A place to call home	-	-	20.0% (1.0)	80.0% (4.0)	-
A place moving in the "right direction"	-	-	60.0% (3.0)	40.0% (2.0)	-

80 to 89 Pct range (70)

A place to live	-	1.4% (1.0)	5.7% (4.0)	55.7% (39.0)	37.1% (26.0)
A place to work	-	5.7% (4.0)	58.6% (41.0)	27.1% (19.0)	8.6% (6.0)
A place to raise a family	1.4% (1.0)	1.4% (1.0)	35.7% (25.0)	37.1% (26.0)	24.3% (17.0)
A place to retire	2.9% (2.0)	8.6% (6.0)	35.7% (25.0)	35.7% (25.0)	17.1% (12.0)
A place to feel safe	-	12.9% (9.0)	24.3% (17.0)	44.3% (31.0)	18.6% (13.0)
A place to visit	8.6% (6.0)	21.4% (15.0)	28.6% (20.0)	31.4% (22.0)	10.0% (7.0)
A place to have a "night on the town"	21.4% (15.0)	38.6% (27.0)	22.9% (16.0)	14.3% (10.0)	2.9% (2.0)
A place to learn	1.4% (1.0)	21.4% (15.0)	51.4% (36.0)	20.0% (14.0)	5.7% (4.0)
A place for "opportunities for all"	-	21.4% (15.0)	51.4% (36.0)	22.9% (16.0)	4.3% (3.0)
A place to be healthy	-	5.7% (4.0)	18.6% (13.0)	54.3% (38.0)	21.4% (15.0)
A place for business	-	5.7% (4.0)	48.6% (34.0)	34.3% (24.0)	11.4% (8.0)
A place to call home	1.4% (1.0)	4.3% (3.0)	12.9% (9.0)	55.7% (39.0)	25.7% (18.0)
A place moving in the "right direction"	2.9% (2.0)	11.4% (8.0)	35.7% (25.0)	41.4% (29.0)	8.6% (6.0)

90 Pct and up (85)

A place to live	-	1.2% (1.0)	4.7% (4.0)	60.0% (51.0)	34.1% (29.0)
A place to work	2.4% (2.0)	4.7% (4.0)	52.9% (45.0)	29.4% (25.0)	10.6% (9.0)
A place to raise a family	-	4.7% (4.0)	15.3% (13.0)	51.8% (44.0)	28.2% (24.0)
A place to retire	3.5% (3.0)	9.4% (8.0)	28.2% (24.0)	45.9% (39.0)	12.9% (11.0)
A place to feel safe	3.5% (3.0)	12.9% (11.0)	23.5% (20.0)	51.8% (44.0)	8.2% (7.0)
A place to visit	8.2% (7.0)	17.6% (15.0)	38.8% (33.0)	30.6% (26.0)	4.7% (4.0)
A place to have a "night on the town"	15.3% (13.0)	37.6% (32.0)	36.5% (31.0)	9.4% (8.0)	1.2% (1.0)
A place to learn	7.1% (6.0)	9.4% (8.0)	49.4% (42.0)	30.6% (26.0)	3.5% (3.0)
A place for "opportunities for all"	4.7% (4.0)	11.8% (10.0)	43.5% (37.0)	34.1% (29.0)	5.9% (5.0)
A place to be healthy	-	2.4% (2.0)	9.4% (8.0)	72.9% (62.0)	15.3% (13.0)
A place for business	-	4.7% (4.0)	40.0% (34.0)	43.5% (37.0)	11.8% (10.0)
A place to call home	-	1.2% (1.0)	5.9% (5.0)	65.9% (56.0)	27.1% (23.0)
A place moving in the "right direction"	3.5% (3.0)	10.6% (9.0)	36.5% (31.0)	40.0% (34.0)	9.4% (8.0)

Unknown (2)

A place to live	-	50.0% (1.0)	-	-	50.0% (1.0)
A place to work	-	-	50.0% (1.0)	-	50.0% (1.0)
A place to raise a family	-	-	50.0% (1.0)	-	50.0% (1.0)
A place to retire	-	-	50.0% (1.0)	-	50.0% (1.0)

A place to feel safe	-	-	-	50.0% (1.0)	50.0% (1.0)
A place to visit	-	50.0% (1.0)	-	-	50.0% (1.0)
A place to have a "night on the town"	50.0% (1.0)	-	-	50.0% (1.0)	-
A place to learn	-	50.0% (1.0)	50.0% (1.0)	-	-
A place for "opportunities for all"	50.0% (1.0)	-	-	50.0% (1.0)	-
A place to be healthy	-	-	-	50.0% (1.0)	50.0% (1.0)
A place for business	-	50.0% (1.0)	-	50.0% (1.0)	-
A place to call home	-	50.0% (1.0)	-	-	50.0% (1.0)
A place moving in the "right direction"	50.0% (1.0)	-	-	-	50.0% (1.0)

HOME OWNER/RENTER

187 REGISTERED VOTERS

	Very Unsatisfied	Unsatisfied	Neutral	Satisfied	Very Satisfied
--	------------------	-------------	---------	-----------	----------------

Likely Homeowner (106)

A place to live	-	0.9% (1.0)	4.7% (5.0)	62.3% (66.0)	32.1% (34.0)
A place to work	1.9% (2.0)	8.5% (9.0)	48.1% (51.0)	34.0% (36.0)	7.5% (8.0)
A place to raise a family	-	1.9% (2.0)	24.5% (26.0)	44.3% (47.0)	29.2% (31.0)
A place to retire	1.9% (2.0)	9.4% (10.0)	31.1% (33.0)	41.5% (44.0)	16.0% (17.0)
A place to feel safe	1.9% (2.0)	13.2% (14.0)	25.5% (27.0)	49.1% (52.0)	10.4% (11.0)
A place to visit	4.7% (5.0)	20.8% (22.0)	34.9% (37.0)	32.1% (34.0)	7.5% (8.0)
A place to have a "night on the town"	15.1% (16.0)	40.6% (43.0)	30.2% (32.0)	11.3% (12.0)	2.8% (3.0)
A place to learn	2.8% (3.0)	15.1% (16.0)	52.8% (56.0)	23.6% (25.0)	5.7% (6.0)
A place for "opportunities for all"	3.8% (4.0)	16.0% (17.0)	45.3% (48.0)	32.1% (34.0)	2.8% (3.0)
A place to be healthy	-	1.9% (2.0)	14.2% (15.0)	63.2% (67.0)	20.8% (22.0)
A place for business	-	6.6% (7.0)	40.6% (43.0)	39.6% (42.0)	13.2% (14.0)
A place to call home	-	1.9% (2.0)	11.3% (12.0)	62.3% (66.0)	24.5% (26.0)
A place moving in the "right direction"	3.8% (4.0)	12.3% (13.0)	37.7% (40.0)	36.8% (39.0)	9.4% (10.0)

Likely Renter (55)

A place to live	-	1.8% (1.0)	9.1% (5.0)	54.5% (30.0)	34.5% (19.0)
A place to work	-	3.6% (2.0)	60.0% (33.0)	23.6% (13.0)	12.7% (7.0)
A place to raise a family	-	3.6% (2.0)	32.7% (18.0)	49.1% (27.0)	14.5% (8.0)
A place to retire	3.6% (2.0)	10.9% (6.0)	32.7% (18.0)	41.8% (23.0)	10.9% (6.0)
A place to feel safe	-	14.5% (8.0)	23.6% (13.0)	50.9% (28.0)	10.9% (6.0)
A place to visit	12.7% (7.0)	29.1% (16.0)	27.3% (15.0)	25.5% (14.0)	5.5% (3.0)
A place to have a "night on the town"	20.0% (11.0)	34.5% (19.0)	32.7% (18.0)	12.7% (7.0)	-
A place to learn	3.6% (2.0)	14.5% (8.0)	56.4% (31.0)	23.6% (13.0)	1.8% (1.0)
A place for "opportunities for all"	1.8% (1.0)	14.5% (8.0)	49.1% (27.0)	29.1% (16.0)	5.5% (3.0)
A place to be healthy	-	5.5% (3.0)	18.2% (10.0)	65.5% (36.0)	10.9% (6.0)
A place for business	-	5.5% (3.0)	45.5% (25.0)	43.6% (24.0)	5.5% (3.0)
A place to call home	-	5.5% (3.0)	10.9% (6.0)	61.8% (34.0)	21.8% (12.0)
A place moving in the "right direction"	1.8% (1.0)	9.1% (5.0)	34.5% (19.0)	49.1% (27.0)	5.5% (3.0)

Unknown (26)

A place to live	-	7.7% (2.0)	7.7% (2.0)	42.3% (11.0)	42.3% (11.0)
A place to work	-	-	69.2% (18.0)	11.5% (3.0)	19.2% (5.0)
A place to raise a family	3.8% (1.0)	7.7% (2.0)	11.5% (3.0)	46.2% (12.0)	30.8% (8.0)
A place to retire	3.8% (1.0)	11.5% (3.0)	42.3% (11.0)	26.9% (7.0)	15.4% (4.0)
A place to feel safe	3.8% (1.0)	15.4% (4.0)	23.1% (6.0)	34.6% (9.0)	23.1% (6.0)
A place to visit	7.7% (2.0)	26.9% (7.0)	26.9% (7.0)	26.9% (7.0)	11.5% (3.0)
A place to have a "night on the town"	30.8% (8.0)	26.9% (7.0)	19.2% (5.0)	23.1% (6.0)	-
A place to learn	7.7% (2.0)	15.4% (4.0)	42.3% (11.0)	26.9% (7.0)	7.7% (2.0)
A place for "opportunities for all"	7.7% (2.0)	23.1% (6.0)	30.8% (8.0)	26.9% (7.0)	11.5% (3.0)
A place to be healthy	-	7.7% (2.0)	7.7% (2.0)	69.2% (18.0)	15.4% (4.0)
A place for business	-	3.8% (1.0)	38.5% (10.0)	42.3% (11.0)	15.4% (4.0)
A place to call home	3.8% (1.0)	7.7% (2.0)	3.8% (1.0)	53.8% (14.0)	30.8% (8.0)
A place moving in the "right direction"	7.7% (2.0)	-	34.6% (9.0)	42.3% (11.0)	15.4% (4.0)

What do you like best about Fitchburg?

**Anonymous user's Opinion**

Quietness

**Anonymous user's Opinion**

Lots of outdoor trails and a sense of community

**Anonymous user's Opinion**

community events held at McKee Farms Park

**Anonymous user's Opinion**

My neighborhood

**Anonymous user's Opinion**

Bike paths

**Anonymous user's Opinion**

When we purchased our house, the roads were quiet, well maintained, and we had ready access to bike paths that allowed us to walk in nature. Proximity to Madison city center is good for trekking downtown when we want some entertainment or good restaurants, but far enough away to remain quiet/relaxed.

**Anonymous user's Opinion**

My neighbors

**Anonymous user's Opinion**

The bike paths and the people who are interested in improving our community.

**Anonymous user's Opinion**

I liked the housing prices when we moved here. It was more "bang for my buck" than the other suburbs. Max 20 min downtown and 20 min to work.

**Anonymous user's Opinion**

Proximity to Madison

**Anonymous user's Opinion**

Small town feel while being close to downtown Madison

**Anonymous user's Opinion**

Safety and walkability/bikability

**Anonymous user's Opinion**

Proximity to other activities in the greater Madison area. The bike friendliness.

**Anonymous user's Opinion**

The amount of bike trails and infrastructure available.

**Anonymous user's Opinion**

The small community feel

**Anonymous user's Opinion**

The library and parks

**Anonymous user's Opinion**

The diversity of the residents. The closeness to nature and bike paths.

**Anonymous user's Opinion**

Bike paths, safety, neighbors.

**Anonymous user's Opinion**

Proximity to downtown and nature.

**Anonymous user's Opinion**

The Fitchburg bike shop and the fitchburg bike trails.

**Anonymous user's Opinion**

Lots of parks, natural prairie/green space that I hope doesn't get over developed

**Anonymous user's Opinion**

Fitchburg feels very safe and friendly, and I think it holds a lot of potential.

**Anonymous user's Opinion**

Seemingly safe neighborhood with an easy commute to downtown Madison.

**Anonymous user's Opinion**

Proximity to Madison

**Anonymous user's Opinion**

promoting races and healthy activities

**Anonymous user's Opinion**

Proximity to downtown and campus, parks.

**Anonymous user's Opinion**

The freedom to enjoy access to both Madison and the agricultural countryside of Southern Wisconsin.

**Anonymous user's Opinion**

Its very close to Madison with all of the things available to do in Madison. Fitchburg does not need to become Madison or compete with Madison. I love all the farmland and greenspace!

**Anonymous user's Opinion**

The public parks

**Anonymous user's Opinion**

The many businesses available to us.

**Anonymous user's Opinion**

Range of basic amenities within a short distance.

**Anonymous user's Opinion**

A great neighborhood close to more interesting areas of the greater Madison area

**Anonymous user's Opinion**

Location related to other areas: Madison down town, airport, west side, etc.

**Anonymous user's Opinion**

Location to everything else in Madison

**Anonymous user's Opinion**

My neighbors.

**Anonymous user's Opinion**

Bike trails and the library.

**Anonymous user's Opinion**

Nice community

**Anonymous user's Opinion**

It's close to everything and a generally nice suburb of Madison.

**Anonymous user's Opinion**

Access to green spaces and bike paths. Proximity to central Madison.

**Anonymous user's Opinion**

Great value for the Madison area

Anonymous user's Opinion



Country-like living



Anonymous user's Opinion

proximity to Madison



Anonymous user's Opinion

Close proximity to everything in madison



Anonymous user's Opinion

the location



Anonymous user's Opinion

I enjoy the proximity to both work in Madison and youth programs in Verona.



Anonymous user's Opinion

It has a nice mix of rural and suburban character.



Anonymous user's Opinion

Location



Anonymous user's Opinion

Bikeability throughout



Anonymous user's Opinion

Diversity, emphasis on sustainability, parks and bike paths



Anonymous user's Opinion

The Fitchburg library is great, as well as Fitchburg Recreation. I also like McKee park, however, I have at times felt unsafe at the splash pad as well as the park near the Boys and Girls Club.



Anonymous user's Opinion

a rural feel, close to the country/nature while close to Madison.



Anonymous user's Opinion

Location



Anonymous user's Opinion

convenience - 15 minutes to everything you need.



Anonymous user's Opinion

Access to Madison



Anonymous user's Opinion

close to everything without feeling we are closed in--probably because there seems to be no real center and it seems to work for now.



Anonymous user's Opinion

central location and access to Madison



Anonymous user's Opinion

It has nice streets and sidewalks for families



Anonymous user's Opinion

Centrally located for greater Madison area access to both east and west locations.



Anonymous user's Opinion

the library is excellent but, I'm concerned how most under-represented or minoritized people can reach it as our bus service is subpar. Glad to see there is partnering with Leopold elem.

Anonymous user's Opinion



Fitchburg has been an excellent community to start my "adult" life in, first renting an apartment and then choosing to buy a home here. The neighborhood of Swan Creek is a lovely mix of homes, walking paths, and natural beauty; the additional construction east of Syene Road has added housing density pressures which are changing negatively my feelings due to the multiple apartment complexes and houses too near to the road and one another, which bring substantially increased traffic and reduced aesthetics. Another reason I enjoy where I live is the ease of travel between Fitchburg and my work in Verona, to recreational areas, like KEVA and Lake Kegonsa State Park, and to downtown Madison for food and entertainment. This year's overly aggressive road construction season and poor communication from the city also reduced my satisfaction with my Fitchburg location, though one I hope is temporary. I also wish I did not need to leave Fitchburg so much to get enjoyment / opportunities.



Anonymous user's Opinion

Safe. Community. Great bike trails and walking trails.

**Anonymous user's Opinion**

small town feel with big city amenities. Waste and recycling services are better than anywhere else I have lived.

**Anonymous user's Opinion**

Location, parks, open spaces

**Anonymous user's Opinion**

Location - set well between downtown and peripheral communities.

**Anonymous user's Opinion**

Verona Schools, McKee Farms Park, Target, good restaurants, movie theater

**Anonymous user's Opinion**

McKee park, Fitchburg Rec, bike paths, proximity to down town and Verona

**Anonymous user's Opinion**

reasonable property taxes and not as many "whacky" ideas as the city of Madison often has.

**Anonymous user's Opinion**

Sense of community. Lots to do out here, close to Madison

**Anonymous user's Opinion**

We've been very pleased with Verona area schools so far

**Anonymous user's Opinion**

The variety of it

**Anonymous user's Opinion**

The new Terravessa Development

**Anonymous user's Opinion**

Affordability of housing versus Madison.

**Anonymous user's Opinion**

Location and people

**Anonymous user's Opinion**

Outdoor spaces, McKee Farms Park/Splash Pad

**Anonymous user's Opinion**

Easy access to Madison and other surrounding areas

**Anonymous user's Opinion**

McKee Farms Park with the events and water park!

**Anonymous user's Opinion**

Its easy access to Madison

**Anonymous user's Opinion**

The Fitchburg Library is excellent!

**Anonymous user's Opinion**

The suburban feel.

**Anonymous user's Opinion**

Access to Madison and the countryside.

**Anonymous user's Opinion**

commitment to quality of life

**Anonymous user's Opinion**

location, not too big (population-wise), still has green space and outdoor rec opportunities

**Anonymous user's Opinion**

The community size is just right, I have access to all the amenities of the greater Madison area (within a reasonable driving distance) without having to live in an urban setting.

**Anonymous user's Opinion**

It's near to all parts of Madison and surrounding communities.

**Anonymous user's Opinion**

Nine Springs Golf Course

**Anonymous user's Opinion**

moved here in 1979. attracted to rural like setting and school choices other than Madison.

**Anonymous user's Opinion**

Fitchburg is family-friendly, close to Madison, has an excellent library and senior center!

**Anonymous user's Opinion**

The people

**Anonymous user's Opinion**

It's location relative to other major cities.

**Anonymous user's Opinion**

I think Fitchburg is one of the prettier outlying cities to Madison. I like the focus on art and culture and I appreciate the level of quiet and the scene.

**Anonymous user's Opinion**

Low crime, easy access to Madison

**Anonymous user's Opinion**

Bike Paths

**Anonymous user's Opinion**

Centralized location

**Anonymous user's Opinion**

Growth with respect for the land and multiple use - agriculture, business, residential.

**Anonymous user's Opinion**

lack of crime

**Anonymous user's Opinion**

Good distance between downtown and Verona

**Anonymous user's Opinion**

See comments above.

**Anonymous user's Opinion**

The right distance from downtown Madison with more affordability than Middleton.

**Anonymous user's Opinion**

Affordability of housing. Easy commute to Verona and Isthmus.

**Anonymous user's Opinion**

It seems to be a city that has managed its growth fairly well.

**Anonymous user's Opinion**

Location. More intimate feel than Madison, but close and benefit from those perks.

**Anonymous user's Opinion**

Quiet, proximity to everything in Madison, no sidewalks

**Anonymous user's Opinion**

Until recently it was safe

Anonymous user's Opinion



Wooded areas



Anonymous user's Opinion

It is small with good services.



Stephen Lloyd Arnold's Opinion

Location, natural resources, and proximity to cultural resources (e.g., UW-Madison)



Anonymous user's Opinion

The location is perfect and holds easy access to everything I need.



Anonymous user's Opinion

Quarry Ridge (and some bike paths in general)



Anonymous user's Opinion

Green space



Anonymous user's Opinion

Proximity to Madison without being Madison. We have the space we want in a nice area without crowded streets.



Anonymous user's Opinion

Size and convenient location.



Anonymous user's Opinion

Proximity to Madison - easy to get to entertainment downtown



Anonymous user's Opinion

Rural feel but close to urban amenities, the fact that it is not high density



Anonymous user's Opinion

Great neighborhood and easy access to downtown.



Anonymous user's Opinion

combination of urban and rural setting close to Madison - great walking paths and open areas



Anonymous user's Opinion

Not much. Taxes are too high. Too much section 8 housing.



Anonymous user's Opinion

It's a nice place to live that is relatively close to Downtown Madison and the east and west sides where there are more restaurants and things to do than Fitchburg.



Anonymous user's Opinion

great library and rec programs



Anonymous user's Opinion

Location to our present employer.



Anonymous user's Opinion

It's close proximity to most things we need to get to in the greater Madison area.



Anonymous user's Opinion

Nice homes, proximity to work, nice place to raise a family.



Anonymous user's Opinion

Access to Madison. Police, Fire, and Safety departments do a great job!



Anonymous user's Opinion






















Green space





Anonymous user's Opinion

Green space, rural feel yet close to Madison.


Anonymous user's Opinion

-  The close location to Madison.
-  **Anonymous user's Opinion**
How we are planning to re-do Fish Hatchery Road soon.
-  **Anonymous user's Opinion**
Location, location, location
-  **Anonymous user's Opinion**
Location
-  **Anonymous user's Opinion**
The splash pad, library, my neighborhood
-  **Anonymous user's Opinion**
proximity
-  **Anonymous user's Opinion**
The neighborhood/community and overall safety. Great place to raise a family.
-  **Anonymous user's Opinion**
Parks, walkability, convenient commute to the interstate and downtown Madison. The library is excellent.
-  **Anonymous user's Opinion**
It's proximity to my workplace.
-  **Anonymous user's Opinion**
local parks (for kids and dogs)
-  **Anonymous user's Opinion**
Community events (McKee Farms), access to Madison
-  **Anonymous user's Opinion**
The parks, the bike trails, the neighborhood feel, the community events, and the proximity to Madison.
-  **Anonymous user's Opinion**
The location
-  **Anonymous user's Opinion**
Parks
-  **Anonymous user's Opinion**
location, preserving the nice look of fitchburg, safety, recycling program! free mulch, thanks!
-  **Anonymous user's Opinion**
Easy access to surrounding areas while feeling like we are living in a big city
-  **Anonymous user's Opinion**
No crowded downtown
-  **Anonymous user's Opinion**
Bike path accessibility
-  **Anonymous user's Opinion**
Distance to downtown, mix of rural and urban
-  **Anonymous user's Opinion**
access to Madison without living in Madison and access to great road biking.
-  **Anonymous user's Opinion**
I like living here.. it is great to live in the country and have space for our property, but yet close to Madison and all the conveniences needed. We especially love having the library so close and now that Oregon is building a new school we will be much closer to school too (for a while)
- Anonymous user's Opinion**


 The fact that it is not Madison but very close to Madison. Fitchburg is a Verona, a Mt Horeb or an Oregon without an original city center. Fitchburg has an exemplary Civic Campus (library, city hall, community center, senior center), excellent bike and walking trails, neighborhood parks and natural areas and some remarkable businesses (Promega, Subzero, Playcon) and a few good residential areas.

 **Anonymous user's Opinion**


Very easy to walk or bike through the area

 **Anonymous user's Opinion**


Centrally located.

 **Anonymous user's Opinion**


It feels like a safe and friendly place that's close by to other cities

 **Anonymous user's Opinion**

That it is close to a lot of things, even if I have to get into my car to reach them.

 **Anonymous user's Opinion**


It's location to Madison, the bike paths and the parks.

 **Anonymous user's Opinion**


Safety and comfort.

 **Anonymous user's Opinion**


There are a few things that I like best about Fitchburg which include the ability to ride my bike in safety due to the bike trails and lanes, the people and the parks.

 **Anonymous user's Opinion**


Parks, Library, neighbors and proximity to Madison for culture/activities.

 **Anonymous user's Opinion**


local restaurants - Lilianas, Great Dane, Loredos; library, parks

 **Anonymous user's Opinion**


clean, healthy, kind, safe

 **Anonymous user's Opinion**


The bike trails.

 **Anonymous user's Opinion**


Small town feel with big city nearby.

 **Anonymous user's Opinion**


The proximity to downtown Madison (while also being far enough away from the city) as well as all of the bike-trails nearby.

 **Anonymous user's Opinion**


Peacefulness

 **Anonymous user's Opinion**


The accessibility to Madison and other suburbs.

 **Anonymous user's Opinion**


Location

 **Anonymous user's Opinion**


location

 **Anonymous user's Opinion**

Location






















 **Anonymous user's Opinion**

Fitchburg is close to Madison. Our daughter lives in nicer area in Fitchburg than we do. She lives in Oak Creek, We live in Swan Creek. No one in our neighborhood even says hello to each other.

 **Anonymous user's Opinion**

Green spaces, farm fields and "remoteness"

Anonymous user's Opinion

- 
- It's proximity to Madison yet also retaining the feel of a smaller community.
- 
- Anonymous user's Opinion**
love how quiet it can be
- 
- Anonymous user's Opinion**
Not sure. Taxes are high, there is no schools, and we are increasingly feeling less and less safe.
- 
- Anonymous user's Opinion**
That Uber comes out here, our Target is awesome, the biking and walking trails are great and really well maintained.
- 
- Anonymous user's Opinion**
The sense of community and generally open dialogue.
- 
- Anonymous user's Opinion**
road improvements and business development near me
- 
- Anonymous user's Opinion**
Proximity to downtown Madison while still having suburban vibe and great Oregon school district.
- 
- Anonymous user's Opinion**
Proximity to work, beltline, downtown Madison.
- 
- Anonymous user's Opinion**
Close proximity to Madison while still having a small town feel.
- 
- Anonymous user's Opinion**
Fitchburg's location and proximity to the greater Madison areas without losing its own identity. Along with that, a person does not need to venture to Madison because Fitchburg has much to offer on its own.
- 
- Anonymous user's Opinion**
Mix of rural and urban
- 
- Anonymous user's Opinion**
Rural environment close to Madison
- 
- Anonymous user's Opinion**
Access to madison
- 
- Anonymous user's Opinion**
Location
- 
- Anonymous user's Opinion**
Good support for bike trails and nature.
- 
- Anonymous user's Opinion**
The high quality development being done - just wish there was more. Focusing on high quality buildings and homes.
- 
- Anonymous user's Opinion**
Parks and bike trails.
- 
- Anonymous user's Opinion**
Bike/running paths.
- 
- Anonymous user's Opinion**
Peaceful and safe
- 
- Anonymous user's Opinion**
Proximity to downtown Madison
- 
- Anonymous user's Opinion**
Farmers Market; Yoga studio; bike paths; nature and maintained Prairie areas

**Anonymous user's Opinion**

Small town feel with access to many everyday resources and a country-feeling on the outskirts; ability to work with the government agencies (most of the time)

**Anonymous user's Opinion**

Location

**Anonymous user's Opinion**

Close to Madison, newer neighborhoods, well kept neighborhoods

**Anonymous user's Opinion**

Feeling of a small town yet with proximity to all Madison has to offer.

**Anonymous user's Opinion**

mixed income housing model and proximity to Madison

**Anonymous user's Opinion**

The library and Great Dane shopping center / fish hatchery medical space.

**Anonymous user's Opinion**

Easy access to Fitchburg businesses and other parts of Dane County.

**Anonymous user's Opinion**

Great location, rural and urban areas, impressive large and small local businesses. Good employment opportunities.

**Anonymous user's Opinion**

Low crime, general lack of "big city" problems

**Anonymous user's Opinion**

The small feel yet being part of something bigger. Parks/library.

**Anonymous user's Opinion**

housing not packed in like a sardine

**Anonymous user's Opinion**

Nice peopl

**Anonymous user's Opinion**

access to Madison and rural areas

**Anonymous user's Opinion**

The parks and bike paths. The convenience to stores, GHC, gas stations and Starbucks.

**Anonymous user's Opinion**

Its proximity to Madison is a big plus, as I work there and am a UW alum. A significant factor for choosing the house my wife and I bought was its proximity to bike paths (that I can use to commute to campus) and Metro Bus stops (I use the one on Brendan/Chapel Valley). Our neighborhood is quiet and mostly well kept and neighbors are generally friendly and not too weird. The city puts a lot of effort into bike paths and recycling, which is great. I really like that I can just walk out my door and am a short walk to 4 parks or more.

**Anonymous user's Opinion**

That it was founded to limit development by the city of Madison. Unfortunately it's leaders lost sight of the importance of allowing Fitchburg to develop as a city and encouraging exploitation of what should be preserved.

**Anonymous user's Opinion**

That there is still nature and it is on the edge of a big city. Resources and shops are relatively close and people are friendly.

**Anonymous user's Opinion**

Accessibility to rural life - escape from the pavement and embrace farmland and trees and wildlife.

**Anonymous user's Opinion**






















It reminds me of Minneapolis suburbs, which is where I am from.

**Anonymous user's Opinion**

Its pretty. Homes are nice, developments while numerous, are nice

**Anonymous user's Opinion**

That we aren't part of Madison and that we a few great community assets like the library and splash pad.

-  **Anonymous user's Opinion**
Location, cleanliness
-  **Anonymous user's Opinion**
Lots of parks
-  **Anonymous user's Opinion**
The variety of parks spread throughout our community. Access to bike paths. Mature neighborhoods with trees, communities, etc.
-  **Anonymous user's Opinion**
The sense of being "almost out in the country."
-  **Anonymous user's Opinion**
My neighborhood is nice, great neighborhood association, and most often feels safe, however there is room for improvement. The police department needs more resources and this should be prioritized. Without safety, we have nothing and our neighborhoods loose value.
-  **Anonymous user's Opinion**
Great access to parks and trails blocks from our home. Convenient basic needs shopping, e.g. grocery, coffee shops. Local library! And the police and fire department. They are always quick with a hello to my kids when they are out in public. They have a strong public presence.
-  **Anonymous user's Opinion**
Lower cost of living than downtown, but still easy enough to access downtown amenities
-  **Anonymous user's Opinion**
The blending of urban and rural communities
-  **Anonymous user's Opinion**
my family members also live here
-  **Anonymous user's Opinion**
Actually location to everything. 15 mins or less in every direction for everywhere I tend to go.
-  **Anonymous user's Opinion**
Development of a downtown feel around Lacy/Cheryl Parkway. Biking/running off-road trails.
-  **Anonymous user's Opinion**
Access to bike paths
-  **Anonymous user's Opinion**
The target super center and hyvee fresh grocery gave me great hope for potential drive thru quick exit business to give my property and neighborhood greater value. I
-  **Anonymous user's Opinion**
Location, green spaces, recreation facilities, the library, a responsive city hall and police department.
-  **Anonymous user's Opinion**
The simplicity of getting around
-  **Anonymous user's Opinion**
Fitchburg has done a nice job of including bike paths in all neighborhood built in the last 15 years. And it does a good job of maintaining paths and roadsides throughout the year.
-  **Anonymous user's Opinion**
Close to verona
-  **Anonymous user's Opinion**
I think the city is changing and is trying to serve all constituents and their needs. But it's basically a soul-less suburb with some nice bike paths, poverty, crime and few services. I think people are more invested in Madison, Verona or Oregon.
-  **Anonymous user's Opinion**
Access to green space Yeis still good.
-  **Anonymous user's Opinion**
People
-  **Anonymous user's Opinion**
Not over-developed

**Anonymous user's Opinion**

farmland!

**Anonymous user's Opinion**

Parks, recreation, schools

**Anonymous user's Opinion**

Near nature and access to bikes.

**Anonymous user's Opinion**

easy life and proximity to places I frequent

**Anonymous user's Opinion**

Location

**Anonymous user's Opinion**

mix of housing and ownership

**Anonymous user's Opinion**

Friendly neighborhoods

**Anonymous user's Opinion**

Proximity to Madison

**Anonymous user's Opinion**

Easy access to UW, Overture, Lakes & Belt-line

**Anonymous user's Opinion**

Proximity to work, services, exercise

**Anonymous user's Opinion**

Library, green space, senior center!

**Anonymous user's Opinion**

I like the potential I see in Fitchburg even though development has been surprisingly slow

**Anonymous user's Opinion**

Farming and open space

**Anonymous user's Opinion**

The rural farming area

**Anonymous user's Opinion**

the people

**Anonymous user's Opinion**

Rural, country living

**Anonymous user's Opinion**

location, diversity and energy


**Anonymous user's Opinion**





















Access to green spaces

**Anonymous user's Opinion**

Nice size of populations, good enough local amenities, and close enough to larger or specialized services in Madison.

What could Fitchburg do better?

-  **Anonymous user's Opinion**
More single family homes, less apartments.
-  **Anonymous user's Opinion**
Stop building apartments. There are a disproportionate amount of apartments to single family dwellings, retail, restaurants and entertainment. Traffic is becoming too heavy for infrastructure as population density is quickly increasing.
-  **Anonymous user's Opinion**
Get rid of the service fee for registering online for Rec department programs. Neighboring towns (Oregon, Verona) do not charge anything.
-  **Anonymous user's Opinion**
Safety
-  **Anonymous user's Opinion**
City planning for road construction is the major criticism I have currently. We had several major thoroughfares closed at the same time this summer which made travel unbearable. My other major complaint is the amount of construction that's happening from Promega expansion to massive apartments all around Swan Creek is that it is dramatically increasing the traffic on our streets. Especially in a neighborhood that doesn't allow for fences to protect children and pets. My third complaint is the lack of competitive restaurants. There isn't a single restaurant I'd pick in Fitchburg over going downtown, which is sad. I'd love to be able to walk to a happy hour or to grab a coffee within 5-10 minutes of my home.
-  **Anonymous user's Opinion**
Have the government stay out of the way of growth. Get a Federal Government Post Office. Solve crimes. And most importantly have a Fitchburg School District. We will never have a true community without one!
-  **Anonymous user's Opinion**
Composting
-  **Anonymous user's Opinion**
Elementary school. Bike lane on Syene Road. Widening lacy and syene road. Less roundabouts.
-  **Anonymous user's Opinion**
Keep ponds better accessible and cleaner for fishing.
-  **Anonymous user's Opinion**
Ensure retail and restaurant spaces are interspersed with new apartment growth. East Fitchburg has a ton of new residents and no retail or restaurants in walking distance.
-  **Anonymous user's Opinion**
Expand on non-car transportation, Limit the number of developments per year.
-  **Anonymous user's Opinion**
Everything. Reduce multi-family housing, encourage more business/retail so that residents can stay local. Better school options for all residents not just those who happen to be zoned for better schools
-  **Anonymous user's Opinion**
We need more gas stations down by lacy rd and the library, more restaurants and our own school
-  **Anonymous user's Opinion**
We need powder coated lamp posts and traffic signals. Green to match our fire trucks or dark brown would be lovely and different from Verona/Monona. The silver lamp posts are hideous and boring. The yellow and green traffic signals are chipping paint and rusted. Let's start doing this now in our lower income areas to make them more beautiful! We need more trees in the center medians of PD and Fish Hatch. We should add winter lights to these trees in blue and white LED. See City of Plymouth, MN for what they do around the city hall area. We should add more public art banners to the light poles. We should hang more US flags. We need better advertising, promotion of our fireworks. We could use a community stage/performance center in either the city center area or in McKee park. See City of Plymouth, MN Hilde Performance Center for a benchmark. Then we should have an orchestra/fireworks event like City of Plymouth, MN. How about a yearly parade in summer or fall? We need Metcalf's grocery store in Fitchburg. Please pretty please with sugar on top!! We need Festival Foods too and Trader Joes. Let's have a food truck area for the summer.
-  **Anonymous user's Opinion**
Improve roadways. Slow down roadways. Tell developers what to do, not the other way around.
-  **Anonymous user's Opinion**
Bike lane on Whalen road. Two lanes on syene to support new uptown development traffic.
-  **Anonymous user's Opinion**
Could use more urban type restaurants like Forage and less strip mall restaurants and bars.

-  **Anonymous user's Opinion**
Availability of affordable housing
-  **Anonymous user's Opinion**
Stormwater flow on S. Syene Rd near 2878, all flows to one drain near my front lawn, and that terrifies me on the offchance it backs up.
-  **Anonymous user's Opinion**
More opportunities for children and families - we fund the senior center at a very high level and there is not a similar/equitable space for children and youth. What after school care options are available and accessible? We would like to also support more local businesses, however we find ourselves going to Madison or Verona if we want to go out to eat, to a brewery, or to shop. Fitchburg lacks a city center and any sense of cohesion. It doesn't feel like a "real city" with an identity. There are MANY apartments going in, however they aren't considered affordable housing - and there is a lack of affordable single family homes for young families.
-  **Anonymous user's Opinion**
Limit Development
-  **Anonymous user's Opinion**
plan more trees and increase the number of small public parks
-  **Anonymous user's Opinion**
Keeping citizens up to date on proposed changes within the city, listening to citizens-first instead of developers, holding our officials accountable for their developer-drunk behavior (we all like to be loved, but we don't need to make the process easier out of concern for speculative profit), making sure we continue to promote in-fill growth as opposed to expanding at our edges or beyond, and working to develop an actual city center at Lacy/Fish Hatchery.
-  **Anonymous user's Opinion**
Instead of only growing by building new homes and apartment buildings, I think there could be an emphasis on local restaurants and retailers.
-  **Anonymous user's Opinion**
Tough question, probably many things but nothing urgent hits my head
-  **Anonymous user's Opinion**
My family LOVES our neighborhood, Tower Hill. But with kids coming up on elementary school we will probably be moving out of Fitchburg because we are zoned for Leopold, which we aren't thrilled about. Meanwhile, we live about 2 minutes from Stoner Prairie. Many families with young kids who I know have moved out of nice Fitchburg neighborhoods and into other towns because of this.
-  **Anonymous user's Opinion**
Clean up the area west of North Fish Hatchery. And I'm not talking landscaping. We have to stop slapping these people on the hand and sending them back home to commit more crimes. Get tough on crime!
-  **Anonymous user's Opinion**
Control growth. The last few years have created unnecessary sprawl.
-  **Anonymous user's Opinion**
We need an identity, a central downtown.
-  **Anonymous user's Opinion**
Create a center where restaurants and shops (preferably non-franchise) would exist perhaps around a village green?
-  **Anonymous user's Opinion**
Crime is ridiculous. Fitchburg echos the rest of Madison & Dane County to welcome in gangs and drugs. The police do what they can, but offenders are released and recidivate. There are several "pockets" of the city that have to be avoided. It's bad and getting worse...
-  **Anonymous user's Opinion**
support renewable energy for residents. support alternative transportation, especially biking.
-  **Anonymous user's Opinion**
Stop allowing developers to decide how our community will work. Since when do we care about developers' feelings and pocketbooks?
-  **Anonymous user's Opinion**
Have smaller neighborhood parks within five minutes walking distance. Have recycling pick up EVERY week.
-  **Anonymous user's Opinion**
Work on initiatives that bring our community together rather than letting builders and apartment people divide us. I'm so sick of the new developments and the extinction of open spaces. Our city has no direction and is lacking a visionary to take us to the next decade. Marsh is a puppet for developers and he's put his "people" in place to do his bidding. Literally no better than Trump.
-  **Anonymous user's Opinion**
We need to stop pandering to the elderly who only want to keep Fitchburg rural. Both Verona and Middleton run circles around Fitchburg in terms of amenities and small businesses. They are focused on encouraging young adults and young families in their community. We can't even develop Lacy road without the older community screeching. The economic growth comes from new households wanting to move here and people making more from moving up in their careers. Not from Ritas who stay home all day and complain about the sun, moon, sky, and ground.
-  **Anonymous user's Opinion**

-  Traffic control
-  **Anonymous user's Opinion**
Control the spread of crime. Accept well planned responsible growth.
-  **Anonymous user's Opinion**
More growth and more density. Need to develop a stronger community feeling like you see in Verona or Middleton.
-  **Anonymous user's Opinion**
get rid of the ridiculous politics and realize you're not madison
-  **Anonymous user's Opinion**
Steet repair
-  **Anonymous user's Opinion**
safety in certain pockets
-  **Anonymous user's Opinion**
Have more street sweepers out. It's an immediate way, and I think low-cost way, to clean up our city.
-  **Anonymous user's Opinion**
Less crime for such a small city
-  **Anonymous user's Opinion**
smaller neighborhoods outside on the borders of the city are isolated and do not have easy access to the same amenities as the rest of the city.
-  **Anonymous user's Opinion**
Bring residents together
-  **Anonymous user's Opinion**
More schools and more restaurants/bars/clothing stores
-  **Anonymous user's Opinion**
Develop a way to create more of a central city area to better identify Fitchburg as a city instead of a bedroom community.
-  **Anonymous user's Opinion**
The crime issues from the same apparent net complex over an over.
-  **Anonymous user's Opinion**
More variety of restaurants
-  **Anonymous user's Opinion**
Just stop destroying farm land and open spaces for new neighborhoods. And stop building apartments five feet from the curb. The more recent developments in Fitchburg are hideous!
-  **Anonymous user's Opinion**
More emphasis on sustainability and renewable energy, social support for youth from disadvantaged communities
-  **Anonymous user's Opinion**
There needs to be more police presence in Fitchburg as I do not feel safe in our neighborhood, especially with our proximity to low income housing areas where we have witnessed criminal activity and drug deals.
-  **Anonymous user's Opinion**
Bike lanes on country roads. Affordable housing. Help find/support locally owned businesses (stores, restaurants, etc.) expand in Fitchburg over chain stores.
-  **Anonymous user's Opinion**
More shopping and dining. A school district.
-  **Anonymous user's Opinion**
focus on making it a place to people want to spend time in - not just drive through - spaces you want to visit with friends and family
-  **Anonymous user's Opinion**
Its professional employees could be more responsive to citizen concerns and comments. Too many are dismissive. Incidentally, I have two advanced degrees in urban planning.

**Anonymous user's Opinion**

I do not know offhand.

**Anonymous user's Opinion**

lower property taxes

**Anonymous user's Opinion**

Safety regulation and enforcement

**Anonymous user's Opinion**

better public transportation...I'd ride a bus in to UW but I don't have an hour plus each way. Love to see MMSD build their next middle school or HS south of the beltline

Anonymous user's Opinion

The proactive communication of road closures and detours, for both planned construction projects and event permits, needs to be substantially greater than it currently is. As a resident who's home is on East Cheryl Parkway & Sunflower Drive in the Swan Creek neighborhood, I have spent the last two years with significant construction projects impacting the flow of traffic past my house. The construction on Lacy in 2018 and now the construction at Promega and on East Cheryl Parkway's roundabout, have greatly increased traffic around my home; this has increased noise & light pollution, decreased road safety, and decreased the comfort I feel in my own home. Agrace, Promega, Agora, and McKee Park frequently host events that block traffic or change traffic patterns, and the communication of these events have been next to nil. When I wake up and find that I can suddenly barely leave my home or need a 20 minute detour, instead of appreciating the event and wishing to support it, I become frustrated at the organizers and the city for poor communication. Road construction across Dane County has been poorly planned and communicated, and the delays of construction on Whalen Road in both 2018 and 2019 and nightly road closures along Hwy 18 & PD were not communicated at all in a meaningful way. I am frustrated that I received a postcard to ask me to take this survey but not to let me know that my daily life would be impacted by road closures. PROPOSED SOLUTION: A clear website with a calendar and map of road closures, including for permitted events like Turkey Trot at Agora, be created and maintained by Fitchburg's government and communicated proactively to residents yearly, or more frequently, via postcard mailings. Road construction and detour signage for the East Cheryl roundabout construction (currently underway) has been the best handled of any recent construction project, and future projects should follow its model of over signage & placement of signage at major entry points to neighborhoods (at Syene and Lacy, ex.) instead of only at the last possible turn off (only at Sunflower Drive, ex.).

**Anonymous user's Opinion**

Housing is being built quickly causing an increase in traffic without the right infrastructure for roads. For example, there are lots of roads that are single lane, no turn lanes, and no stop lights. It's hard to get around safely during peak traffic times. High volumes of cars are driving fast through neighborhoods with small children.

**Anonymous user's Opinion**

civic engagement and aggressive policies to address the climate crisis.

**Anonymous user's Opinion**

encourage community building

Anonymous user's Opinion

Establish any sort of identity/cohesion - there is no "Fitchburg" in so many ways - it's just a geographic zone on the edge of Madison and the edge of the farm fields. No city center/walkable district like Middleton that would engage someone to visit, few destination restaurants/attractions (and the ones that are are single-stop venues - you won't stop and visit multiple spots). The "what's the center of Fitchburg" question is interesting and I'd love to see the results, because that is usually pretty definable for a city but since Fitchburg has no true center it's probably just the geographic middle in most people's eyes. I understand why we don't have a school district - and that solidifies a city's identity in many ways - but we don't even have a "city" to speak of, just some neighborhoods and roads going in and out of where people live. It's a fine place to have a house, but it's not much of a "place" in any other regard.

**Anonymous user's Opinion**

More pedestrian paths/sidewalks. There is lot of focus on bike lanes -- I wish there was more focus on pedestrian paths/sidewalks especially on/around busy rounds. Not everyone can ride a bike, but most people whether they walk or use a mobility device can use pedestrian paths/sidewalks.

**Anonymous user's Opinion**

More destination retail - nice restaurants or other retail - no more big box

**Anonymous user's Opinion**

control crime. Especially theft of cars and from within homes.

**Anonymous user's Opinion**

The alders don't appear to function as a team, nor do they appear in alignment with city leadership. Less focusing on personal, pet issues and more on working together for the betterment of the city. Work with MAdison to improve Leopold School.

**Anonymous user's Opinion**

Lower speed limits, enforce speed limits, better public transit, rezone the school districts

**Anonymous user's Opinion**

affordable housing and programs for underprivileged households

**Anonymous user's Opinion**

Add sidewalks to all areas, not just new developed areas













**Anonymous user's Opinion**





















Refrain from reversing decisions made regarding land use.


**Anonymous user's Opinion**

Better multiuse developments. Vast stretches of housing and apartments without businesses intermingled is disappointing.

Anonymous user's Opinion


-  Add a school district so that we don't have to send our children to MMSD. Improve safety around Post Road and northern Fish Hatchery Road. Do not permit anymore larger lower income apartments such as around Post Road. Recycling every week instead of alternating weeks.
-  **Anonymous user's Opinion**
More locally owned bars, restaurants, small shops within walking distance of neighborhoods
-  **Anonymous user's Opinion**
More speeding tickets issued on PD
-  **Anonymous user's Opinion**
Maintain public spaces, better adult programming at library, more local restaurants, fewer chains and bars with food, traffic enforcement, improve the website so people can actually find information and keep the home page up to date
-  **Anonymous user's Opinion**
Work to build community among the neighborhoods.
-  **Anonymous user's Opinion**
Make sure infrastructure is in place before approving developments
-  **Anonymous user's Opinion**
Work with legislature to get Fitchburg their own schools system. It is what holds a community together.
-  **Anonymous user's Opinion**
enforcement of speeding as opposed to speed bumps
-  **Anonymous user's Opinion**
Slow development growth, more single family homes and many fewer large apartment complexes, senior housing, keep taxes down
-  **Anonymous user's Opinion**
Attend to the upkeep of parks and recreation areas (other than mowing) i.e. removal of invasives, planting of native trees and shrubs.
-  **Anonymous user's Opinion**
I answered earlier that there is no "city center". The reason I put that answer in was that most activities you can do in Fitchburg are separated from each other. I think of a city center as a single location where people can go for things like groceries, entertainment, restaurants (to give you a visual of what I mean - think of the Hilldale Mall in Shorewood Hills)
-  **Anonymous user's Opinion**
Not let Dane County government bully it; and don't build any more apartments; the local roads can't take any more!
-  **Anonymous user's Opinion**
Limit low income housing. It has ruined our neighborhood
-  **Anonymous user's Opinion**
1) we do not have to grow for the sake of growth. being adjacent to Madison and metro area means a certain level of growth will be self fulfilling. question is can we do it in a manner that is beneficial financially and aesthetically to existing residents. Need more thought about traffic associated with growth. Syene road is one example where setbacks for recent apartments and medium density housing in my opinion is a major mistake. With high and medium density housing, traffic will only increase. Thought should be given to 4 lanes with turn lanes where appropriate. I personally do not like roundabouts because they are engineered too small in diameter, but maybe they would make sense or stop lights at some intersections like syene rd and lacy intersection. Fish Hatchery road is another concern as traffic continues increase and it's very difficult to turn onto from adjacent roads during rush hours. Also think there is generally no reason for any TIF financing. Taxes continue to increase, growth continues, but associated safety on roads is declining. Associated aesthetics with landscaping and lighting on major arteries is not very apparent.
-  **Anonymous user's Opinion**
Add more sidewalks, please!!
-  **Anonymous user's Opinion**
Better community development of the economically challenged areas.
-  **Anonymous user's Opinion**
Less construction. The constant stream of construction vehicles throughout all hours of day and night has caused my neighbors to leave and myself considering other locations.
-  **Anonymous user's Opinion**
Some areas are difficult to walk (eg no sidewalks). Also, there isn't a walking distance grocery store in my area.
-  **Anonymous user's Opinion**
Arrest and jail criminals
-  **Anonymous user's Opinion**
more Bike paths. A bike Path from Syene to Fitchrona (Off road) along Lacy. A Bike Bridge over McKee at Fish Hatchery.

-  **Anonymous user's Opinion**
More bars and restaurants
-  **Anonymous user's Opinion**
Traffic and waste management
-  **Anonymous user's Opinion**
stop growing
-  **Anonymous user's Opinion**
More sustainability, more public transit within Fitchburg and between Fitchburg and downtown
-  **Anonymous user's Opinion**
See comments above.
-  **Anonymous user's Opinion**
More trees/wooded areas or at least preserving existing ones. On the other hand, it would be nice to have more bars/breweries/etc as I find myself leaving Fitchburg when I want something to do.
-  **Anonymous user's Opinion**
Public transit options. Renewable energy. Should have more affordable, dense housing.
-  **Anonymous user's Opinion**
Haven't lived here long enough to have a good answer.
-  **Anonymous user's Opinion**
Own school district.
-  **Anonymous user's Opinion**
Stop approving apartments. Start caring for parkland-get rid of invasive growth.
-  **Anonymous user's Opinion**
Discourage influx of jobless residents
-  **Anonymous user's Opinion**
Property taxes. Development should lower property taxes not contribute to increases
-  **Stephen Lloyd Arnold's Opinion**
Stop investing in roads and parking. Provide bike share and much more transit, especially light rail and BRT to Madison. More and safer facilities for biking and walking. More interesting nearby destinations.
-  **Anonymous user's Opinion**
Generate 100% of our energy using completely renewable resources.
-  **Anonymous user's Opinion**
Sidewalks in ALL neighborhoods. Not putting sidewalks in a community because owners do not want to shovel them is unacceptable when there are children walking to bus stops and elderly and disabled people walking through the neighborhood. The King James neighborhoods, like Chesapeake Drive, are a prime example. I have seen children almost get hit by cars in that neighborhood. More single-level housing. We retired in 2017 and moved to Fitchburg and it took months to find a condo that was single level. Elevators are not a complete answer because I am not able to walk down stairs in case of an emergency - but better than ANY stairs going into the units or within the units.
-  **Anonymous user's Opinion**
STOP the high density housing
-  **Anonymous user's Opinion**
- Single family home neighborhoods, when properly planned, are not the enemy of Fitchburg. The recent trend of forcing every new development to have large apartment buildings will only serve to further strain the tight resources of the city without adding valuable tax money and the sense of pride and ownership that homeowners would. - Crime is a major problem in Fitchburg and a real reason why we are considering other towns to move to. It is unacceptable that shootings occur weekly in our town and that car thefts/break-ins happen multiple times each week. Our neighborhood now has cameras to try to help but we shouldn't have to turn our homes in a security vault just for daily protection. - Fitchburg has no city center and no identity other than being a spot with big plots of land for homes near Madison. We have the population to support a city center and identity (like Verona, Middleton, Oregon) yet no effort has been made to make that a reality.
-  **Anonymous user's Opinion**
Sense of community - difficult w/ no City Center and no school system. I'd like to see Fitchburg explore the costs of its own school system vs. the cost residents pay now in school taxes. Some City staff need an attitude adjustment. They act like residents are a bother.
-  **Anonymous user's Opinion**
Feel more like it's own community - no post office, no identity like other communities in Dane County
-  **Anonymous user's Opinion**
Create urban woods, place trees, stop massive apartment complexes and development that is destroying the beauty that once was Fitchburg. It's starting to look like ugly Madison. Have a professional


 market researcher design the survey - requiring answers to many of the questions forces any old answer just to move forward and there should have been an "Unsure" or "not applicable" option. I don't know anything about the educational facilities here but your survey forced a response that didn't have any meaning (among other questions). You also should have told us we would need to set up an account before we started the survey. Also, the survey wasn't mobile friendly and cut off the "very satisfied" option on at least one question so I had to answer satisfied when I wanted to answer very satisfied, just to move on. Very poorly done.

 **Anonymous user's Opinion**


Stop bickering in City Government

 **Anonymous user's Opinion**


More work/shop/housing together - several floors of condos on top of shops/restaurants. Parking structures (ideally underground) instead of lots

 **Anonymous user's Opinion**


Nightlife

 **Anonymous user's Opinion**


Schooling. Not wasting tons of money by HWY 14 to do nothing. Petty crime is pretty high.

 **Anonymous user's Opinion**


We need more single family homes and duplexes and fewer apartments. We need to be concerned about increased taxes forcing people out of their homes or not allowing them to buy in the first place.

 **Anonymous user's Opinion**


Stop wasting money on environmental projects, get rid of low income housing, lower taxes.

 **Anonymous user's Opinion**


Create a real city center and density around that including bars and restaurants. Get our own school system instead of this ridiculous split between Madison, Verona and Oregon. It's a joke.

 **Anonymous user's Opinion**

storm/drainage water management

 **Anonymous user's Opinion**

Look at infrastructure and develop prior to expanding neighborhoods and apartment buildings.

 **Anonymous user's Opinion**


Need better street lighting and street signs specifically in my neighborhood, Seminole Forest

 **Anonymous user's Opinion**

The news reports about shootings and break ins is terrifying.

 **Anonymous user's Opinion**


Enact an ordinance to regulate abusive Airbnb practices. Fitchburg could also focus on its residents more and its commercial development less.

 **Anonymous user's Opinion**


encourage agricultural pursuits - preserve land, clean up small forested areas restoring them

 **Anonymous user's Opinion**


Make bicycle trails available without assigning them a top priority.

 **Anonymous user's Opinion**


Provide more affordable housing for people to be able to own their own homes.

 **Anonymous user's Opinion**


Take note on the crime that seems to be moving into the area.

 **Anonymous user's Opinion**


Get some stability in the city government.

 **Anonymous user's Opinion**

Larger lots in developments. No more apartments/low income housing. Have a "downtown" area. The council could grow up and act like adults instead of all the petty fights.

 **Anonymous user's Opinion**

The school district lines are ridiculous. We've got an elementary school and middle school less than 5 minutes away yet my children will have to go to a school 20+ minutes away.

 **Anonymous user's Opinion**

growth. restaurants, bars

**Anonymous user's Opinion**

Being a part of MMSD (especially Leopold elementary) scares off many families that have school age kids. We're planning to move when our kids get to that age for this reason

Anonymous user's Opinion

I REALLY hope the Fish Hatch project is successful. It is a gateway into our city and currently is a disgrace, not unlike John Nolen heading into downtown Madison. I recognize that the commercial properties such as Cahill Main and the one that has the Dairy Queen are privately owned, but honestly they both are pretty subpar in terms of aesthetics. Likewise, it would be fantastic to have a HARDWARE store! Getting to Home Depot is a huge pain, together with being a big box. A locally owned hardware store would be excellent. Also, I was disappointed to see a Dollar Store go in. Not necessarily a Fitchburg decision. Nine Springs does not feel all that safe to golf at. ENOUGH apartment buildings already. Yikes. Some additional shopping options that are more cool than functional (think Agora versus the plaza where the Dairy Queen is). McKee will be better generally once Verona Road construction is done. What really looks bad is where the movie theater is, I think it's called Visions. Here again I understand it's privately owned, but wow it could use some upkeep. Maybe they could care less given that the place always seems to be packed. I wish there was some fine dining other than Lilianas. But definitely no chain restaurants please.

**Anonymous user's Opinion**

Provide more services for underserved groups.

**Anonymous user's Opinion**

Increase safety in a couple of neighborhoods.

**Anonymous user's Opinion**

Fitchburg has no identity. No post office, city center, school district, sports teams, limited city services (trash, yard waste, etc) what part is Verona, what part is Oregon, what part is Madison, who's taxes are we paying, what services are we funding, what brings us together as Fitchburg? How do all those towns have so much and Fitchburg just seems like a random subdivision stuck in between all of them?

**Anonymous user's Opinion**

Public safety, a few more shopping and gas options near the Library would be nice.

**Anonymous user's Opinion**

Cheaper housing , no more luxury apartments.

**Anonymous user's Opinion**

City government needs to be more transparent in agenda. Don't hide behind technical language.

**Anonymous user's Opinion**

SAVE greenspace and no more growth to overpopulate! I dont want to live in Madison. I dont want crime to increase and congestion and "slum" like areas.

**Anonymous user's Opinion**

1. Trash collection--allow more items to be disposed curbside. 2. Speed control on residential streets.

**Anonymous user's Opinion**

More unique and local restaurants within walking distance of most houses

**Anonymous user's Opinion**

Less bickering in local government

**Anonymous user's Opinion**

Provide development in current ag land

Anonymous user's Opinion

Fitchburg needs to pay attention to the increase in traffic. Our "country"/rural roads and intersections are quickly becoming more urban like with much heavier am/pm commuter traffic. Looking at a future with more development and the building of homes will bring traffic is going to be unbearable. I also feel like we could do better with diversity. I also feel the high density homes/communities are eye sores. We have so much land here, and I understand the desire to get the most amount of people living here, but why not give them some yards and a little more space away from the roads. There is also a large divide here culturally and socio-economically and as we continue to attract more and more young people from different backgrounds with more urban/city experiences that it seems we could use some more activities or meeting places in conjunction with organizations to help mentor, foster and provide some guidance, which could also help with some cross cultural growth and cohesion. Fear is based on misunderstandings and there are several older generations here who simply don't understand or care to understand the differences between cultures. I think there will also be several opportunities as time goes on for new generations to begin moving here, so we need to make a statement moving forward for our direction of our city.

**Anonymous user's Opinion**

Aim to be "better than average"...Envision and insist upon better Land Use and Transportation planning. Fitchburg is more about individual RE developments (strip malls, franchises, rental housing and starter homes) rather than about being a healthy community that is equitable, diverse, and socially integrated.

**Anonymous user's Opinion**

Preventing drive-by thefts of packages, parked cars, and open garages.

**Anonymous user's Opinion**




















A safe pleasant community to live






















**Anonymous user's Opinion**

Improved schools in the Madison district.

**Anonymous user's Opinion**

Improve roads - fish hatchery is terrible

-  **Anonymous user's Opinion**
Build more opportunities for food/recreation/shopping into the newly developed residential areas.
-  **Anonymous user's Opinion**
Make a better effort to get public transportation available.
-  **Anonymous user's Opinion**
Add in more local restaurants (not chains) and shops.
-  **Anonymous user's Opinion**
Affordable housing for seniors. We have too many multi-family units. The developers are getting rich but retiring residents have no place to go. Retirees can no longer afford to live in Fitchburg unless they remain in their same home.
- Anonymous user's Opinion**
-  **Anonymous user's Opinion**
I think Fitchburg needs to make listening to the neighborhood a higher priority. I was not happy with the process when a development was planned for the corner of Fish Hatchery Rd and Nobel Dr. It seemed as though the process was tainted in favor of the developer. I say this due to the amount of funds that were donated to politicians and an observation I made at one of the meetings. While at one of the meetings to discuss this project I saw the developer and several people sitting together. I thought they all worked together for the developer. They were laughing and being very social. I was totally surprised when a city staff member was asked to comment on something and the staff person was sitting with the developer. Now I am not saying that the staff person did something wrong. But since the project was controversial, optics and perception goes a long way to destroying trust in a process.
-  **Anonymous user's Opinion**
Try to cluster some development so there IS some kind of City Center.
-  **Anonymous user's Opinion**
I love the library and appreciate that it's near my home, BUT, I see very few children there. I suspect it's because of the location. I'd like to see an evening shuttle service for kids from the Leopold neighborhood, maybe a 6:00 pickup and 9:00 dropoff. I'd be willing to volunteer to drive one evening per week.
-  **Anonymous user's Opinion**
In poorer communities: add more safe parks within 5-min walking distance; increase helpful/caring policing tactics vs harshness in communities of color and train all Fitchburg staff on bias; add more healthy & low cost shopping options within poorer communities & public transportation to more locations
-  **Anonymous user's Opinion**
Improve schooling options, bother to install stop signs in all neighborhoods, more single family housing, more funding for library system
-  **Anonymous user's Opinion**
Fitchburg needs its own school district and better flood planning.
- Anonymous user's Opinion**
-  **Anonymous user's Opinion**
Be more walkable! We live in the Jamestown neighborhood (on Roanoke Dr) and often feel like we're an ignored part of Fitchburg. It's a pretty winding neighborhood, so even though we have a couple of parks nearby and are close to Orchard Pointe, it takes too long to walk. We also prefer not to walk the route through the King James Court area (as well as the New Fountains area) as it feels a bit run-down and sketchy. We'd also love more restaurant and cafe options (especially within walking distance). Sidewalks on both sides of Williamsburg by Jamestown-Huegel Park would be wonderful; it's a busy area and we find it to be a little dangerous at times to have to cross over at a blind curve (Williamsburg/King James).
-  **Anonymous user's Opinion**
Road maintenance
-  **Anonymous user's Opinion**
More lighting and better roads. My feelings of not being safe comes from being robbed a couple of times in our homes and cars and having registered sex offenders live behind us. Not sure what more can be done about that. Whenever I have had to call the Fitchburg police they have been very responsive.
-  **Anonymous user's Opinion**
Bring more business to the Lacy Rd area off RT 14.
-  **Anonymous user's Opinion**
add schools and a community center
-  **Anonymous user's Opinion**
We have a beekeeper in our neighborhood. Homes in our area are on .2 acre lots. We cannot be outside because of the bees from a neighbor. A visiting friend was stung by a honey bee at our house walking to their car. We can't eat outside in the summer, his bees swarm us. We would move but can't really afford to. Our quality of life stinks because of the bees.
-  **Anonymous user's Opinion**
Attract more business. Further development of uptown. There is no central location.
-  **Anonymous user's Opinion**
Stop encroaching and building on farm and agriculture lands and preserve wild life
-  **Anonymous user's Opinion**
Maintain the streets better and maintain the parks better, particularly the water issues in Seminole Glen Park

-  **Anonymous user's Opinion**
it could use more of a "town center" and more restaurants and bars for more of a "night out" for some of the younger people
-  **Anonymous user's Opinion**
Schools, create a real downtown for Fitchburg. There is not a central town location. No shops, or town like experiences.
-  **Anonymous user's Opinion**
Make it more appealing to young professionals, a brewery or winery, higher-rated public schools (that is the reason I am only renting because I don't want to send my future kids to a low rated public school), add a big department store, add more affordable housing for young professionals that we can own
-  **Anonymous user's Opinion**
A return to its rural roots. The bright LED street lights are awful. I miss the night sky. More community policing would be good. Also a food coop.)
-  **Anonymous user's Opinion**
New quality affordable housing along fitchrona road with opportunity for disabled individuals to live independently where application process that is considered on a case by case basis rather than holding any past housing issues older than ten years old should be considered for residency so that residents might have a sense of safety and efficiency in a new dwelling
-  **Anonymous user's Opinion**
Deter constant car theft crimes committed by adolescents.
-  **Anonymous user's Opinion**
More restaurant options, timeliness of repairing/replacing roads in disrepair (North Fish Hatchery).
-  **Anonymous user's Opinion**
Recycling pick-up weekly and trash bi-weekly. Have large item collection days.
-  **Anonymous user's Opinion**
Fitchburg could solicit more recreation and entertainment to the area. It is great that the University of Wisconsin and Overture Center offer that in Madison, but Fitchburg really only has the movie theater for non-nature (non-park) recreation and activities. This I believe is a void that should be filled.
-  **Anonymous user's Opinion**
Bike trails our to rural areas.
-  **Anonymous user's Opinion**
I wish it had a smaller town feel with a town center
-  **Anonymous user's Opinion**
School located in Fitchburg, crime reduction, apartment landlords who don't take care of properties or garbage on their curbs.
-  **Anonymous user's Opinion**
Re-develop an existing area to create a city center. More holiday lighting (lighting trees along roads)
-  **Anonymous user's Opinion**
Would like to see better and more shopping areas, especially grocery stores, gas stations, Costco, clothing
-  **Anonymous user's Opinion**
Public transportation
-  **Anonymous user's Opinion**
Hold developers accountable to the plans that the city approves
-  **Anonymous user's Opinion**
Mixed use development, walkability
-  **Anonymous user's Opinion**
More centralized development. A true downtown
-  **Anonymous user's Opinion**
Better smaller, more affordable housing in neighborhoods intermixed with larger houses and apartments/condos, rather than segregated in super high-density, high-turnover areas that are far away from amenities and not walkable and segregated from "traditional" single-family neighborhoods with large houses and large yards.
-  **Anonymous user's Opinion**
More retail within walking distance; step building apartments without also building retail; have their own school system so kids go to school w their neighbors
-  **Anonymous user's Opinion**

Fitchburg needs more senior housing and affordable senior housing. As the population ages and more older Americans move to the area to be where their children are raising their families, there need to be options for affordable senior housing.



Anonymous user's Opinion

Re-develop high crime areas.



Anonymous user's Opinion

More street lights. More direct bus transportation without having to transfer on Park Street.



Anonymous user's Opinion

Make community centers by allowing more mixed residential and business



Anonymous user's Opinion

Thoughtful housing for low and fixed income families. Would love to see a subdivision of tiny homes with a community center and park for residents to do laundry, take financial wellness and cooking/life skills classes. Built and priced in such a way that young people and families could build wealth toward their next home while keeping the price of the tiny home affordable and reasonable for the next person. Restrictions on residents to avoid those who don't NEED the cheaper housing from taking it over.



Anonymous user's Opinion

Please abide by the Comprehensive Development Plans that had been previously approved. Please review what happened to landowners within the Northeast Neighborhood Plan due to outside political forces. The City had a plan approved by citizen committees and the Common Council, but then local control was usurped by County political appointees and a flawed DNR process.



Anonymous user's Opinion

Control property taxes! Smart dense growth will help generate the tax revenue to support and sustain infrastructure and the all important public safety departments.



Anonymous user's Opinion

Lower property taxes! Encourage building a true city center.



Anonymous user's Opinion

Safety in certain parts of the city.



Anonymous user's Opinion

stop the spread of crime



Anonymous user's Opinion

Come together as a community and support businesses



Anonymous user's Opinion

a sense of direction and community



Anonymous user's Opinion

Patrol for car thieves. More restaurants that are a little fancier on the fine dining spectrum. Consider making its own school district.

Anonymous user's Opinion



There seems to be more crime lately with car thefts and break-ins. I'm sure this isn't a Fitchburg only thing, but I have to wonder whether something more can be done, beyond just increased police presence. Not sure what the solution is here. I'd love it if the Metro Bus came more frequently - throughout the day, not just morning and late afternoon (commuter times). But that is a Madison thing as well. I really think Fitchburg lacks a downtown center. It would be nice if we had a "real" downtown center like you see with lots of small Wisconsin towns. I think Fitchburg developed mostly as a commuter town for people working in Madison. But it has its own vibe. Verona, in contrast, has much more of a "small town" feel I think it does have a town center. So maybe some development focused on making downtown (whatever that may be) a destination and meeting place would be nice. I do understand that being adjacent to Madison, which isn't all that far away, is a challenge, as many people in Fitchburg may in fact relate more to Madison. I am kind of 50/50 on that.

Anonymous user's Opinion



Address citizen concerns Provide equitable services and resources. Maintain infrastructure rather than spend our tax money supporting developers Stop approving apartment complexes which are straining our resources, especially our roads. Improved bike access Improve roads and traffic flow Increase the police force to match the huge population explosion in recent years Support local, non-chain businesses, especially restaurants.



Anonymous user's Opinion

Please add biking and walking paths along main roadways - Fitchrona Rd. has the Quarry Vista Neighborhood that would love to be connected to the stores and we would like to have a safe way to access stores without a vehicle.



Anonymous user's Opinion

Stop thinking every development idea is a good idea for the city. It's like someone said, "Hey! Look at all this land, we should fill it up!" City leaders seem to eager to crawl in bed with developers and often work hard to take positions to defend developers over reasonable neighbors.



Anonymous user's Opinion

No opinion



Anonymous user's Opinion

More retail/consumer/restaurant space in areas that are already developed. Stop putting up apartments, and focus on stuff for current residents to do. Establish a downtown. Work on a better school network Swan Creek is an island forced to go to MMSD when Oregon school is right down the road.

**Anonymous user's Opinion**

Focus on existing residents. It seems like everyone is focused on helping out people with new building projects that either - 1) don't help our community and 2) take property off the tax roll. I live close to a small park and love it, but I've seen new developments with hundreds of apartments pop up with zero parks which is very odd.

**Anonymous user's Opinion**

Accessibility for low income, community center, lgbtq friendly

**Anonymous user's Opinion**

Better restaurants. Something that isn't pub food or Mexican.

**Anonymous user's Opinion**

There is no focus or planning to the development. We need a strong, walkable city center. Instead we get development wherever the developers feel like putting it, and we have a mish-mash of business with no plan in place. We don't need an industrial park with restaurants scattered throughout it. We need an industrial park in one place, and a shopping/retail center in another.

**Anonymous user's Opinion**

PUT A MORATORIUM ON NEW DEVELOPMENT (defined as anything not already submitted for zoning, permits requested, contracts signed, etc.) Also, any new development should pay a stiff entry tax to offset our already-high property taxes for those already living here.

**Anonymous user's Opinion**

Increase police and safety resources. Also city resources to public works - removing trash from curbs, providing support for property issues, concerns.

**Anonymous user's Opinion**

Public transportation options to get downtown, higher-density housing like affordable condos/townhomes/tiny homes

**Anonymous user's Opinion**

Planning roads and pedestrian infrastructure before developing high-density housing areas, not after. Providing more resources and programs for at-risk youth in the city.

**Anonymous user's Opinion**

listen to residents

**Anonymous user's Opinion**

Fix the STREETS.

**Anonymous user's Opinion**

Provide more transparency for the city's finances. It's difficult to understand how the city receives tax revenue from the various levels (federal, state, county) and how it spends those resources. It would be nice to have more easy-to-consume tools/graphs/reports that explain how it works.

**Anonymous user's Opinion**

Bike lanes on roads. Water management. Lower taxes.

**Anonymous user's Opinion**

Host more community events

**Anonymous user's Opinion**

I LOVE stoner's grove I for one think it was the Perfect spot in all of Madison to build. I wish there was a fitchburg Hilldale. Because they make so much money. Essentially it would be just outside of the Whalen Rd

**Anonymous user's Opinion**

Continue to work towards a better sense of community (A Fitchburg for All). A downtown would be a nice addition.

**Anonymous user's Opinion**

Provide more accessible places for education

**Anonymous user's Opinion**

Oh, jeez. Fitchburg isn't really a town so it is hard to compare ourselves to other suburbs in the area. Fish Hatchery is an eye sore but I understand you have big plans for that. But Fitchburg also had big plans for a new downtown and all we have is a bunch of empty streets in the most desirable undeveloped location left in Dane county. Meanwhile all the other Madison suburbs are getting more interesting development and seems to have a clearer set of development goals.

**Anonymous user's Opinion**

There are many places to live but there isn't enough low income housing why not put the low income housing on the land near the other land on PD closer to Verona

**Anonymous user's Opinion**

Nurture businesses -- for employment. Nurture amenities cities should have -- post office, grocery stores, hardware.

**Anonymous user's Opinion**

Traffic control and safety, at least on the northeast side of town near the new fire station, does not seem to be a priority. There are multiple accidents monthly at the intersections of Syene and South Syene Roads as well as Highway MM and McCoy Road. These accidents are usually serious accidents and the severity of the accidents could be reduced with a lower speed limit and/ or traffic controls such as lights or roundabouts. McCoy/South Syene Road is a rural road and the speed limit of 45 mph is not compatible with the vast increase in population due to apartment construction and new

subdivisions.



Anonymous user's Opinion

Better planning, listening to citizens, high taxes, run by developers



Anonymous user's Opinion

slow development



Anonymous user's Opinion

stop building apartment buildings! preserve the farm land



Anonymous user's Opinion

Fix neighborhood roads



Anonymous user's Opinion

Develop a real plan for the city. For some reason, our city managers think we should be developing every piece of land in sight. Makes me very concerned that we are missing a chance to create a community identity with a city center.



Anonymous user's Opinion

Better planning of too many businesses off of main arteries



Anonymous user's Opinion

Be more diverse



Anonymous user's Opinion

Maintain the park trails, fix the awful roads (washboards), get more police out during rush hours



Anonymous user's Opinion

Carve its own niche!! It needs to create a "go to" place or places to encourage neighboring communities to "do it in Fitchburg".



Anonymous user's Opinion

create a "real community" with Fitchburg high school sports, a local quality performing arts center (think Middleton PAC), an identifiable "downtown".



Anonymous user's Opinion

listen to land owners



Anonymous user's Opinion

A dedicated school system



Anonymous user's Opinion

1. Work on crime problem. 2. Focus on the future, NOT retirees.



Anonymous user's Opinion

Better frontage roads and roundabouts



Anonymous user's Opinion

Be more transparent and inclusive



Anonymous user's Opinion

Slow down development. Stop paving green spaces.



Anonymous user's Opinion

Development, especially commercial, has been ridiculously slow. Middleton and Verona have expanded their offerings by magnitudes more than Fitchburg has.



Anonymous user's Opinion

more protection for farming and open spaces



Anonymous user's Opinion

less development



Anonymous user's Opinion

inform citizens - especially rezoning and amendments

Anonymous user's Opinion



bring people together more through places and spaces



Anonymous user's Opinion



















make walkable commercial businesses (see downtown Middleton). Reduce more apt building.



Anonymous user's Opinion

City staff could listen to its own residents better. Staff do not have all the best ideas, or make the best decisions, and staff are not in charge (and should not be in charge).

Do you have any concerns about Fitchburg's future?

-  **Anonymous user's Opinion**
Too many apartments and not enough businesses, roads are bad.
-  **Anonymous user's Opinion**
Bedroom community that everyone leaves to go to work or play.
-  **Anonymous user's Opinion**
Crime rate
-  **Anonymous user's Opinion**
The lack of no school district.
-  **Anonymous user's Opinion**
Don't develop all the agricultural land. Preserve the natural aspects.
-  **Anonymous user's Opinion**
Rapid expansion without consideration of environmental impacts, traffic and overall aesthetics.
-  **Anonymous user's Opinion**
Education and traffic flow
-  **Anonymous user's Opinion**
Concerns of over-growth East of Syene. Traffic will become rough in that direction. Particularly the Rimrock, Hwy 14, and Syene intersections.
-  **Anonymous user's Opinion**
Concerned about the increase in crime.
-  **Anonymous user's Opinion**
Mass numbers of developments in a short time frame introduce many problems including traffic, stormwater, and access to services that are not probably studied because of the short time frame these pop up in. Development needs to occur at a pace that reflects the ability of the city to ensure that it is responsible development that will not produce financial burden down the road for the city.
-  **Anonymous user's Opinion**
Yes - with continued multi family development there is the potential to overpopulate and drive out families. Particularly those who are willing to frequent retail establishments and put economic value back into the city
-  **Anonymous user's Opinion**
Yes- safety, do we have the right growth with businesses and schools.
-  **Anonymous user's Opinion**
We will need more commercial development near Terravessa. Let's upgrade some of the parks with whimpy equipment such as the soccer nets and one swing set at the Nobel Woods park. It's pathetic. No one is using the soccer nets. Let's make sure our developers are mixing materials for the exterior of their buildings.
-  **Anonymous user's Opinion**
Infrastructure is not keeping up with development. Ambitious public servants need to stop over growing the city. They also need to stop giving away tax dollars to local businesses that employ mostly out of city people. What are we getting back?
-  **Anonymous user's Opinion**
I worry it will become a mega suburb and lose the proximity to nature.
-  **Anonymous user's Opinion**
I like the planned growth
-  **Anonymous user's Opinion**
Seems to be growing a lot and it should be a place where diverse populations can call home, not just "affluent" populations
-  **Anonymous user's Opinion**
Will crime stay low? There are not enough grocery stores/shopping options.
- Anonymous user's Opinion**

-  Fitchburg need to ensure equitable opportunities for all to thrive, not just white folks.
-  **Anonymous user's Opinion**
Over development and too much high density housing
-  **Anonymous user's Opinion**
I am concern about the growing of companies in the surrounding area and the impact to the ecosystem, by cutting a lot of trees
-  **Anonymous user's Opinion**
The City Administrator seems corrupt. The council and city leaders are more focused on appeasing developers and their profits than showing leadership and vision for the future of our community. We are too quick to trust people at their word and never hold them accountable for their "trust me" statements. Thanks to some very engaged neighbors, I've been able to stay abreast on updates related to me, but I'm so concerned for the areas of the city that have no one to stand up for community-building and less fragmented development. Additionally, the fragmented school system will continue to divide the city long into the future. The city has done a very poor job planning road projects in conjunction with the Verona road project - especially the round-a-bout at Fitchrona-Nesbitt. This was very predictable and could easily have been done next year.
-  **Anonymous user's Opinion**
More multi family housing than single family, not having a dedicated school district
-  **Anonymous user's Opinion**
There seems to be more instances of crime on the north side of Fitchburg .
-  **Anonymous user's Opinion**
PRESERVING GREENSPACE!!!!!!
-  **Anonymous user's Opinion**
Only concerns are about the school district situation. Would be great if Fitchburg had its own school district. I think it is very hard to push the "community" feel, when all your families are going 3 different places for school/sports/etc.
-  **Anonymous user's Opinion**
The crime!
-  **Anonymous user's Opinion**
Yes - unchecked growth. Too many subdivisions and rental properties; too much traffic. It has become an uncontrolled bedroom community.
-  **Anonymous user's Opinion**
Residents are losing faith in the city government planners due to all of the construction traffic and changing zoning without adequate neighbor input.
-  **Anonymous user's Opinion**
Yes, I am concerned about sprawl.
-  **Anonymous user's Opinion**
Gangs, crime, drugs, and lack of accountability are more present than ever. Almost to the point where it defines this city. I hardly flinch when I hear shots fired anymore. Fitchburg Days was shut down because this city can't handle a small neighborhood festival without nightly brawls. It's embarrassing.
-  **Anonymous user's Opinion**
The unchecked development is stressful and unbecoming of our community. Our rubber stamp planning commission is a disgrace, but they have no direction and no leadership from city leaders. It's time to start focusing on real long-term plan for Fitchburg. I was at a Burn Boot Camp (recently opened if Fitchburg) and the proprietor said she's opened more than 50 locations and Fitchburg was "by far" the easiest to get approvals and get up and running. I didn't take that as a positive and the city should be embarrassed.
-  **Anonymous user's Opinion**
Pat Marsh should go back to Monona. He's a forever wannabe and money-pleaser. Our city doesn't respect state laws in regards to hiring and we simply let our city administrator make the call on every hire. He isn't good for Fitchburg.
-  **Anonymous user's Opinion**
There are days I wish we paid more to live in Middleton or Verona. The only new developments in Fitchburg are housing. What a loss that we continue to lose developments like Exact Sciences to other cities because they offer a more compelling package. Look at what ES has been able to do for that poorer area of Madison and ask yourselves why we weren't able to attract that business to develop at the biotech campus here. There hasn't been anything new in this biotech campus except for Promega expanding even though Madison is full of biotech businesses.
-  **Anonymous user's Opinion**
Traffic and theft
-  **Anonymous user's Opinion**
Crime and reluctance to growth.
-  **Anonymous user's Opinion**
Schools and related community lack the support they need
-  **Anonymous user's Opinion**



no



Anonymous user's Opinion

Crime



Anonymous user's Opinion

Dont over develop. More apartments means more crime.



Anonymous user's Opinion

Not expanding too fast and overdevelopment of the existing wild spaces



Anonymous user's Opinion

I have concerns with over development and crowding too many people into the Jamestown area with development of the old quarry.



Anonymous user's Opinion

No



Anonymous user's Opinion

Crime



Anonymous user's Opinion

I do if it is not able to reduce crime.



Anonymous user's Opinion

massive developments of cookie cutter neighborhoods.



Anonymous user's Opinion

Crime



Anonymous user's Opinion

too much traffic at key intersections like verona road and fishhatch/mckee



Anonymous user's Opinion

Pace of new development may be too great presently, and open space needs to proceed at a similar rate.



Anonymous user's Opinion

Trying to grow too fast. Becoming overly industrialized. Losing its small town qualities.



Anonymous user's Opinion

not really



Anonymous user's Opinion

Allied Drive area not focused on catching up to rest of Seminole areas



Anonymous user's Opinion

Control development/ growth to keep it at a slower pace and not overly rapid.



Anonymous user's Opinion

seems like the haves are reticent to bring others to the table

Anonymous user's Opinion

Fitchburg has been significantly increasing the housing density on its eastern and southern edge without any, and I truly mean any, corresponding commercial development to serve those populations, such as bars, restaurants, or shops. This is particularly noticed with the increase in the Swan Creek and Quarry Hill neighborhoods, where multiple new apartment complexes, condo / townhouses, and higher density of single family residents (No. Oaks Ridge, for example) have gone in and zero commercial business have been included. Agora's complex is under utilized and the lack of dining or shopping options in Swan Creek adjacent areas, near the Riva / Prima apartment complexes, is truly disappointing. If we cannot grow ourselves commercially, particularly in walk-able or bike-able facilities similar to those on Monroe Street or in Middleton, we will see a community that overstretches itself. Forcing a commuter only life style that will eventually clog the streets with traffic, decrease safety and livability, and eventually slow or stop growth entirely. As a city, we are being surpassed by outlying suburbs of Sun Prairie, Mount Horeb, New Glarus, and especially Oregon, in terms of desirability of living; we already lost to Verona & Middleton. If increased traffic hinders access to the west side of Madison or, the really scary thought, the ease to downtown, then we will have failed as a city because as it stands we have not done enough ourselves to grow commercially. PROPOSED SOLUTION: We need to do more than just get out of the way of commercial enterprises but actively encourage & seek them out; these surveys and plans are a step in the right direction, but providing tax incentives to draw in restaurants (in particular) or changing zoning / city regulations to require a commitment for corresponding commercial development before new housing can go in may help.



Anonymous user's Opinion

We need our own school district.



Anonymous user's Opinion

loss of a sense of place through lack of character and coherence driven by the forces of development. Uniform highway design, strip malls, cookie-cutter suburbs, manufactured housing, garish franchise

architecture, and big-box stores surrounded by deserts of blacktop make communities less distinct from one another.



Anonymous user's Opinion

we may be a diverse city, but that diversity is segregated. We need to focus on providing opportunities to all of our citizens, and perhaps focusing on the low income areas at the expense of those who are more well off.



Anonymous user's Opinion

Inasmuch as "Fitchburg" is anything but an area between downtown Madison and the exurbs, I guess I do?



Anonymous user's Opinion

Not having a single school district is an issue. I also worry about sprawl. There are so many new housing areas that are adding to the sprawl and I wonder to what degree "smart" walkability planning around these developments has been incorporated. (See next question)



Anonymous user's Opinion

Number of apartments, low income housing with rising violence creeping into other communities, lack of large sporting centers like Keva or VAC



Anonymous user's Opinion

Only that growth both in housing and retail happen along the already established corridors vs. having to create new corridors. Hwy 14/Rimrock Rd. area makes perfect sense for new housing growth due to transportation already existing.



Anonymous user's Opinion

Can we meet/afford all the priorities out there.



Anonymous user's Opinion

Too many houses being built and the roads are not set up to accommodate the growing traffic problems



Anonymous user's Opinion

Not a grave concern, but I wonder how much can really change in Fitchburg when the mayor's term is so short



Anonymous user's Opinion

Disregarding the needs of the lower income for the sake of a dollar from a business investor. The working class being forced out due to small choice of affordable housing. Create more zoning for multifunctional housing options.



Anonymous user's Opinion

No



Anonymous user's Opinion

unsupervised sprawl.



Anonymous user's Opinion

safety



Anonymous user's Opinion

Lack of school district and safety



Anonymous user's Opinion

Yes. Cookie cutter/ mass builder neighborhoods where all of the houses look cheap and identical.



Anonymous user's Opinion

Yes-I believe we have saturated the high end apartment market, please consider slowing this specific development.



Anonymous user's Opinion

I am unhappy with the number of tax free buildings which have been built in Fitchburg, especially churches. I, am very concerned that the complex proposed by the O'Briens and Edgewood college will be another one of these and it will require a great deal of public money to support it without offering anything back. It looks like an end run to build the necessary infrastructure so the land owners who currently can't sell their land for development will be able to do so.



Anonymous user's Opinion

Fish Hatchery area has a lot of potential for improvement.



Anonymous user's Opinion

Yes, way too much development without having adequate infrastructure in place 1st.



Anonymous user's Opinion





















Lack of schools. Safety - crime from southern Madison moving into Fitchburg. Down to Lacy Rd area now.























Anonymous user's Opinion

uncontrolled growth

-  **Anonymous user's Opinion**
over-development, developers having too much influence, higher and higher taxes, more traffic
-  **Anonymous user's Opinion**
Stormwater management, Safety of residents and homes
-  **Anonymous user's Opinion**
Traffic on North Fish Hatchery once construction starts next year.
-  **Anonymous user's Opinion**
The city should not annex parts of the Town of Madison. This is lunacy and makes no sense. Why? Because city services will cost more than the so called "tax base growth". Let the City of Madison absorb this drug and crime infested hellhole!
-  **Anonymous user's Opinion**
Every day
-  **Anonymous user's Opinion**
Having lived here a long time, there is great opportunity to improve transparency in all aspects of our city government. Example, we should not have a library because it was a pet project of a former mayor. We do not necessarily need a city center or sports complex unless there is real citizen interest vs maybe just being a nice bedroom community. More transparency includes educating citizens and opportunity for citizen input. Not everyone can attend evening meetings at city hall. I understand it takes time and effort to reach out to actively inform citizens and/or ask for input, and it also invites opinions that our elected officials and city manager and planners may not like. Seems logical to work through all the issues in detail in advance though as compared to looking for solutions later to correct lack of due diligence later. Let's manage any growth as smartly as possible and it's okay to due it slowly if that's what it takes to do it right. I worked in healthcare for 4 decades and was trained to develop state of the art services that were cost effective and in our customers (patients) best interest. We always reminded ourselves that there is a patient at the end of everything we do so there needs to be focus on getting it right as best we can the first time. The same should apply to local city government. There are tax paying citizens looking for high level of quality where we reside and for a cost effective tax rate. It also helps to get it right as best possible the first time. Sorry about rambling, but we have been at a cross roads for some time now with active development along borders with Madison and the remainder with a large agricultural foot print. There are very different citizen opinions about development depending on where in the city you have lived and especially for residents that have been here for some time, and we have generational, race, and other change taking place. How do you plan for this? Since development of Fitchburg will have long lasting affects on our citizens, transparency and due diligence seem more important than ever. As mentioned before, there is great opportunity to improve transparency by developing solutions to actively educate citizens and provide easy access for opportunity for citizen input. The communication piece is key moving forward. Growing in a cost effective manner is another concern. Communication is key here as well. Accountability is a major concern. Decisions are made by elected officials and/or appointed citizens, but there is no personal accountability once that person is no longer in service. Seems to me that transparency up front becomes even more important. Having know several past mayors and council members, talk of transparency has been import during elections, but less of a reality otherwise. Another idea might be opportunities for advisory citizen focus groups. However, it really takes a skilled facilitator to do these right. Having attended some city hall sessions for local neighborhood issues, the city employee had little experience facilitating the diverse opinions and working to drill down to root concerns and possible solutions.
-  **Anonymous user's Opinion**
No. I think the city will continue to develop and grow.
-  **Anonymous user's Opinion**
Excess government and rules
-  **Anonymous user's Opinion**
Too much cookie-cutter housing development is taking place (i.e. Veridian type homes). This is ruining the countryside and needs to be curtailed.
-  **Anonymous user's Opinion**
Yes, would like to see access to interior neighborhood streets limited to certain hours of the day as people are cutting through the neighborhoods and driving at unsafe speeds for children playing and people walking in the streets.
-  **Anonymous user's Opinion**
I have concerns about this survey. First, some of these required questions ARE NOT APPLICABLE for people, such as how we get around. If we don't use public transit/bike, how can we rate the level of sanctification? Add a Not Applicable column. It's not that hard. You don't want to mix statistics for people that do see them as neutral to people that cannot rank it (like me, who chose neutral for not applicable). Second, some of these question should NOT require an answer, such as what we do for fun. We can "choose up to 6", but if we don't do ANY of them, then that result in forcing me to choose an answer that's inaccurate and will skew that statistics. Third, there should be a question about how this survey is in general. There isn't, so I'm forced to put it here. I hope whoever makes the survey takes time to read through these. I do appreciate the survey defining greenfield and grayfield development though. DON'T FORCE PEOPLE TO SIGN UP (AT THE SUBMIT BUTTON) TO SUBMIT A RESPONSE. That's a petty move and you know it, polco. I'm submitting as anonymous with a throwaway email.
-  **Anonymous user's Opinion**
no
-  **Anonymous user's Opinion**
No
-  **Anonymous user's Opinion**
In addition to the comments I've included in previous sections, one other area of concern I have is that the city is apparently eliminating (or has already eliminated) funding for the arborist. I think her name is Anna Healey; and I had a wonderful experience with her. Plus, as a city, we need to care for the trees that we have, and where possible, continue improving the health of those trees. Additionally, I've heard that Edgewood High School may be building on the land that's next to the library. Again, I'm concerned that a beautiful habitat area used by birds, bees, and other pollinators may be destroyed for development. I hope the city's alders take that into consideration if they decide to approve the building, and will require preservation of some of the land with requirements that Edgewood maintain habitat and use sustainable building practices.
-  **Anonymous user's Opinion**
Don't over-develop. If I wanted a busy city I'd just move closer to downtown Madison.
-  **Anonymous user's Opinion**
Increasing housing costs.

-  **Anonymous user's Opinion**
Nothing specific right now.
-  **Anonymous user's Opinion**
Cost of housing & school district
-  **Anonymous user's Opinion**
I want them to leave existing neighborhoods alone
-  **Anonymous user's Opinion**
Crime seems worse. Staff not keeping up with proper park maintenance. Real estate taxes are high.
-  **Anonymous user's Opinion**
Yes. The emphasis on over-development and high property taxes
-  **Stephen Lloyd Arnold's Opinion**
Fitchburg must stop mortgaging its future by channeling future tax revenue into TIF projects. Welcome businesses that can make it without taxpayer assistance. Evaluate development based on the (property tax) return for municipal (infrastructure, maintenance, and service) investment.
-  **Anonymous user's Opinion**
Yes. I feel Fitchburg is trying to make all housing good for the tech type young people and forgetting that one day these people will be old or, at any time, disabled. There are many stores that I can't go in because they do not have automatic disabled openers and I cannot open a door by myself and manage my walker. This means I end up doing most of my shopping on-line because of safety. I am also very concerned about the area of Fish Hatchery Road where there is constant crime - bank robberies, gas station robberies. This area needs a concentrated effort by our leaders to make it much safer.
-  **Anonymous user's Opinion**
STOP the high density housing and lack of new green space
-  **Anonymous user's Opinion**
Crime - if Fitchburg doesn't get crime under control people will leave. Crime will destroy any hope of Fitchburg having a successful future.
-  **Anonymous user's Opinion**
Taxes keep going up and not by small amounts. Based on the building plans, taxes are going to continue to rise. What happened to 100 yr. buildings? The fire station west of Verona Rd. wasn't even 25 years old. . .and has been replaced. Poor planning. Do we really need a new Police Station? Couldn't the current station be expanded. Do we really need to keep the fire station on Lacy Rd. just for admin. purposes? Seems short-sighted planning, again. Is Fitchburg being penny-wise and pound foolish? People are moving out of Fitchburg because of the taxes.
-  **Anonymous user's Opinion**
We should encourage grayfield projects to help with affordable housing
-  **Anonymous user's Opinion**
Crime. Letting developers run rampant.
-  **Anonymous user's Opinion**
Being able to serve the areas planned for development with adequate police and fire protection at a reasonable cost
-  **Anonymous user's Opinion**
Overdevelopment Too quickly
-  **Anonymous user's Opinion**
Don't grow too fast
-  **Anonymous user's Opinion**
Mayoral turnover and ineffectiveness. Madison and Fitchburg need to get together to fix Syene Road from Post to the bike path. Dangerous!
-  **Anonymous user's Opinion**
I have lived in Fitchburg more than 40 years and sadly I no longer feel safe living in this area. I do not blame this issue on our police department. I also have concerns about the annexing of town of Madison and what added costs (increased taxes) will come with that process. As a retired person I wonder how much longer I will be able to pay increasing property taxes. I noticed there were no references to tax levels on this survey.
-  **Anonymous user's Opinion**
Poor leadership
-  **Anonymous user's Opinion**
Yes. Not having a school system is a joke.
-  **Anonymous user's Opinion**
maintaining safety

-  **Anonymous user's Opinion**
yes. My taxes continue to go up, but the expansion and tax base should be covering and is not.
-  **Anonymous user's Opinion**
I'm definitely concerned about Seminole Glen Park and specifically the drainage pond.
-  **Anonymous user's Opinion**
I am concerned as more families move into the neighborhood about getting around with small kids. Lacy rd is extremely busy and I'm always a little worried about my kids walking anywhere.
-  **Anonymous user's Opinion**
Where and how the development will be. I am against more high density, apartment type living. Should focus more on single family dwellings.
-  **Anonymous user's Opinion**
Crime!!!
-  **Anonymous user's Opinion**
Yes - focus is too much on commercial growth and less on resident needs. No post office. Tough to be in the Verona School district when you live in Fitchburg.
-  **Anonymous user's Opinion**
Over population
-  **Anonymous user's Opinion**
Growth because of current amenities and proximity to large metro area.
-  **Anonymous user's Opinion**
The housing costs are getting to be high and the community is becoming unaffordable for middle class people to own homes.
-  **Anonymous user's Opinion**
No
-  **Anonymous user's Opinion**
Concentrated pockets of huge apartment buildings by Lacy/Syene/E Cheryl and what that means in the future. That area needs some commercial development to support a feeling of community. Also I think we will need to get a school system in place sooner than later (I fear backlash from the current partner cities) and hope this is being planned for.
-  **Anonymous user's Opinion**
Government. I wanted to put up storage sheds in this area and the city won't let that happen. There's a need for it with all these damn apartments
-  **Anonymous user's Opinion**
With the recent shootings and car robberies yes I'm worried about raising children here
-  **Anonymous user's Opinion**
Schools, Overall salability of infrastructure and services.
-  **Anonymous user's Opinion**
I would absolutely hate to see Fitchburg succumb to urban sprawl with no real center.
-  **Anonymous user's Opinion**
Traffic issues, especially since Verona Road is still in the process of being reconstructed and they're about to start work on Fish Hatch.
-  **Anonymous user's Opinion**
Yes. I am worried about the shootings that occur in the neighborhoods off Fish Hatchery. I'm concerned that these shootings will create run down neighborhoods where no one will want to live. I am also concerned about how far we must go for our child to attend school. Despite living off Lacy, we would need to go to Cherokee Heights middle school and Madison Memorial for high school? That's absurd. Why not go to Savannah Oaks and Verona high school? Why doesn't Fitchburg have its own high school?
-  **Anonymous user's Opinion**
City Government seems to be defective/verbally abusive/not coherent/personal fights and slights
-  **Anonymous user's Opinion**
It sometimes feels like Fitchburg is just an extension of Madison and not it's own entity, especially with the split between 3 school districts. I know that would be hard to change and I haven't lived here my whole life, but just a thought.
-  **Anonymous user's Opinion**
Not growing fast enough
-  **Anonymous user's Opinion**
Crime

**Anonymous user's Opinion**

see above. Nature preservation and the preserved land around me is one of the reason I moved here. Tiny lots with close housing and apartments and rental areas need to be LIMITED and already way to much. More greenspace needed!

**Anonymous user's Opinion**

Yes, too much development is happening.

**Anonymous user's Opinion**

No

**Anonymous user's Opinion**

Crime. Especially near my kids'school (Leopold). Also a lack of identity—we have no center, no easy borders. We meld into Madison. We have no school district. There is no definition in being a Fitchburg citizen.

**Anonymous user's Opinion**

As we grow, I feel strongly about our identity. We have always been a bit of a "sleeper" community and catered to farms and rural life. Our future needs a direction.. are we going to continue this path of adding city scapes and letting developers eat up all the farm land? I understand growth and development are a natural progression, but I would like to see us preserving some of this great open land/space we have because the more we allow it to happen the less we will have for the future of our children. The more building that happens the less the environment is will be able to sustain the natural state of it's being. We need the marshes and the open areas for water runoff, conservation, animals and to keep the balance the earth has naturally provided us.

**Anonymous user's Opinion**

Governmental leaders are too dependent and compliant with the idea that the owner of land (RE developers) are entitled to develop the land as they see fit (current market demand). Transportation is too automobile oriented, but then this is very typical in American cities. Fitchburg seems to be happy to be the place that one drives through in order to avoid the congestion on the beltline.

**Anonymous user's Opinion**

Balancing sustainable growth with sense of community

**Anonymous user's Opinion**

I think Fitchburg needs to cut back on the number of apartments being built. I would prefer larger single story homes rather than apartments. I don't agree with affordable cut rate housing and Fitchburg should not strive to bring in more affordable housing. I don't think Fitchburg should push for more public transit either. They should rethink the need for so many parks as they can't maintain what they have already.

**Anonymous user's Opinion**

Growth with proper road improvements.

**Anonymous user's Opinion**

No

**Anonymous user's Opinion**

Crime seems to be an issue lately—cars, garage door openers, etc. being stolen.

**Anonymous user's Opinion**

Yes. I'm worried about it becoming all apartments, condos and chain restaurants.

**Anonymous user's Opinion**

My only concern about Fitchburg's future is the amount of growth and the effect that has on traffic, public safety and public works. It appears that when new developments are proposed, we here how the tax base is going to increase which is fine. But I have not yet heard if this will then pay the costs for police and fire stations, personnel and infrastructure sustainability.

**Anonymous user's Opinion**

Safety. Again, too much theft / break ins. Plus the fact that we couldn't hold a controlled community festival in Fitchburg Days is sad.

**Anonymous user's Opinion**

overdevelopment and increased chemical use, less preservation of land/farming and health, racial/economic disparities

**Anonymous user's Opinion**

Lack of a school district is concerning

**Anonymous user's Opinion**

We will always be a resource leech on neighboring school districts. We need one of our own.

**Anonymous user's Opinion**

I'm a little worried that it's not providing all of the amenities that young people and families are looking for. There should be great potential for attracting Epic employees to live in some nicer apartments/townhouses due to being right between downtown Madison and the Epic campus. If the city is made to be more walkable with areas like The Current (in Monona) and Sequoya Commons (off Midvale) it would be more attractive. As an example of an apartment location that should be prime for Epic employees (or other young workforce people), New Fountains really takes away from our neighborhood. There constantly seem to be issues there and we typically try to avoid walking anywhere near that area if we can (the same goes for King James Court). It's been a shame to see the gas station and Luigi's close—that area is a huge eyesore now with only a liquor store and salon, and it should have so much potential.

Anonymous user's Opinion



Too much unregulated growth and urban sprawl



Anonymous user's Opinion

Growing to fast and losing the sense of community. Fitchburg days were canceled for what reason? Seemed very political to me. And to your point of one questions, where is the hub of Fitchburg?



Anonymous user's Opinion

Don't become a Madison



Anonymous user's Opinion

crime is concerning,



Anonymous user's Opinion

There are too many townhouses, apartments. Bees in residential neighborhoods. Our neighbor says he has a farm but this is residential area. The honey is being sold from all of the hives.



Anonymous user's Opinion

Fitchburg needs to develop a city center.



Anonymous user's Opinion

Growing too fast without regards to current and long-term residents and their needs. New street designs and roundabouts interfere with normal traffic flow.



Anonymous user's Opinion

Yes, that additional development is happening too quickly, and the addition of a mega-church will hurt the community feeling of Fitchburg



Anonymous user's Opinion

No



Anonymous user's Opinion

Just safety and the lack of schools.



Anonymous user's Opinion

I'm concerned about the breakneck pace of development - particularly on wetlands and farm fields. Also concerned about economic disparities.



Anonymous user's Opinion

Seeing much of the farm land off of Seminole, Syene and Lacy being developed is disheartening. The animals that lived in these areas are losing their habitat and if this continues they will have limited places to live.

Anonymous user's Opinion



flood areas and flood zones in apartment communities in district 2 seem like they could potentially end up being sinkholes. I think it is important that public works has a look at the drainage in the community at large and in the apartment communities This is a huge concern where water levels are rising each year and mold is growing bugs are coming bacteria and the water is no longer safe to drink due to flood issues please send public works into apartment communities for our safety and well being. Tenets are paying for tax credit housing properties are receiving the tax credits and the quality continues to decline in the areas of the water surrounding apartment and outdoor drains overflowing when it rains also basements in apartment communities are completely flooded when the ceilings happens almost every year according to the previous maintenance personnel Who recently left within the last four months



Anonymous user's Opinion

Yes, there are too many apartment complexes going up. Concerned about my home value and the amount of traffic that will be caused by this influx of people renting.



Anonymous user's Opinion

Road maintenance, maintaining responsible levels of development, providing more food/attractions that don't feel need to leave the city and travel to Madison.



Anonymous user's Opinion

I am greatly concerned about the safety of our community. Crime is increasing and moving away from the typical areas to typically safe places of Fitchburg. We should be tough on crime and on those that commit crimes. I realize this may fall on our local court systems, but any way we can ensure safety and reduction in crime risk should be a top priority.



Anonymous user's Opinion

Chaotic sprawl development.



Anonymous user's Opinion

No
























Anonymous user's Opinion

Crime, traffic



Anonymous user's Opinion

Road infrastructure is a low priority.

-  **Anonymous user's Opinion**
Management of car traffic
-  **Anonymous user's Opinion**
That development won't keep up with demand
-  **Anonymous user's Opinion**
No
-  **Anonymous user's Opinion**
Lack of a city center and "local" or "community" feel. It seems like everyone works in Madison and comes home, but doesn't have much of their social life in Fitchburg. Having a better, concentrated, walkable "downtown" with coffee shops, restaurants, public library, post office, etc. not so dependent on cars would be great.
-  **Anonymous user's Opinion**
Not really
-  **Anonymous user's Opinion**
I do worry about the city government's ability to work together and to be transparent in all actions and decisions.
-  **Anonymous user's Opinion**
Crime, lack of school district
-  **Anonymous user's Opinion**
No
-  **Anonymous user's Opinion**
Loose to much green spaces. Safety
-  **Anonymous user's Opinion**
Likely to be more gentrified
-  **Anonymous user's Opinion**
Yes. The racial tensions and lack of it's own school district are major concerns as my kids grow up in Dane County
-  **Anonymous user's Opinion**
Rigid development standards create high costs for housing and land for growth.
-  **Anonymous user's Opinion**
I worry that knee jerk reactions and frequent changes to development strategies and deviations from long laid plans will create uncertainty and make our city too risky to invest in.
-  **Anonymous user's Opinion**
With so much undeveloped land, Fitchburg must carefully approve and control how, when and where development occurs. The city must make these decisions, not developers.
-  **Anonymous user's Opinion**
That growth will be rushed.
-  **Anonymous user's Opinion**
too many apartments
-  **Anonymous user's Opinion**
Need more multi use properties closer to town
-  **Anonymous user's Opinion**
"there is no there there". fitchburg has no physical or philosophical center, and seems to embrace reckless development purely for the sake of development. any regulations or planning seems to be directed only at and cater only to development.
-  **Anonymous user's Opinion**
Worry about the VASD/MMSD polarization. Wonder if it is smarter in the long-term to build our own school district. My kids will be graduated by then, but would still support for younger families.
-  **Anonymous user's Opinion**
I don't want to see rampant development but some growth is good, and we should strive to keep those in both residential neighborhoods and rural farming areas "happy". I'd like to see affordable housing for those who need it and Fitchburg not be a segregated city where all the "po' folks" live in one small area. I do worry about the crime issues in the Allied Community and whether perhaps more community programs for kids could have a positive impact (since my impression is that much of the recent crime is from kids). But my perception could be wrong here. I have seen property values skyrocket in my neighborhood, which puts a heavier property tax burden on us. We can (mostly) afford it, but since I have no intent on leaving I do have concerns for overall property tax values being too high. So I'd hate to see neighborhoods get too gentrified/overpriced. We need affordable housing for all and expensive housing for some :)
-  **Anonymous user's Opinion**



The massive development of businesses and apartments has far outpaced infrastructure. Stop the development until roads, schools, services, police force, fire department have been fully funded and improved to serve the needs of all the citizens. Address the needs of those living in poverty instead of catering to the wealthy. That would benefit us all.



Anonymous user's Opinion

Having had kids go through the schools, I can say, I continue to struggle to see how Fitchburg can create an identity without its own school district. We have no ability to rally around a school and all of the events that go with it and we continue to allow Oregon and Verona to grow their own identity on our backs. Think of it kind of like the Badgers - without the University of Wisconsin affiliation, no one cares.



Anonymous user's Opinion

No opinion



Anonymous user's Opinion

If we continue to cram people in, with no outlet for activity, crime could rise



Anonymous user's Opinion

Common council and city administrators should start to focus on our existing city issues and stop looking at ways to develop farms. I worry that we are sprawl-obsessed. I worry that we don't have a unified school district. I worry that we don't have a city center. I wish our elected officials would wake up to the real problems in the city rather than fawning at developments in green fields. We are blessed with farmland, but it should be treated as a treasure for our community rather than a treasure for builders.



Anonymous user's Opinion

Concerned about growing gap between high and low income communities



Anonymous user's Opinion

Yes, without City officials that really push for growth in community, it becomes just a place where people live instead of a city



Anonymous user's Opinion

Yes, it is losing that sense of being "almost out in the country."



Anonymous user's Opinion

The western neighborhoods do not have access to the resources on the east side of the city. Fitchburg has not made space or plans for adding schools in areas of growth. In any development, there should be space set aside for schools, daycare, services that support families. The library is located in a place too far from most neighborhoods. The bookmobile was discontinued to fund the library and services and/or transportation were not delivered to the west side of the city as promised when the library was proposed.



Anonymous user's Opinion

Just that current residents will try to block future development like affordable housing and sidewalks



Anonymous user's Opinion

Growing too fast for residential safety to keep-up, and planning high-density housing developments off of County Highways that cannot be improved until after problems have been recognized by the County



Anonymous user's Opinion

yes



Anonymous user's Opinion

Yes, big time.



Anonymous user's Opinion

Too many large apartment complexes may depreciate the value of the city over time



Anonymous user's Opinion

No



Anonymous user's Opinion

Growing sustainably and an increasing divide in the city.



Anonymous user's Opinion

The rent costs are hard to sustain for people trying to live in houses/apartments



Anonymous user's Opinion

Fitchburg is kind of like the state and the country in that it has a group that is fairly well off and a group that is not thriving. The layout of development pretty much ensures that these groups never come into contact with one another and that can't be good. And I am concerned that this 10 year strategic plan will take eight years to complete, just like the last one.
























Anonymous user's Opinion

Yes



Anonymous user's Opinion

I really hate having to drive everywhere. That said, as the city grows, traffic is more and more of an issue. Fitchburg is a drive through bedroom community for most. This needs attention.

-  **Anonymous user's Opinion**
Yes, I am worried about the preservation of agricultural land.
-  **Anonymous user's Opinion**
traffic and overpopulation
-  **Anonymous user's Opinion**
Too much rental and lack of concern for traffic problems, not listening to citizens when they have concerns Plan Commission can overrule the council and does not listen to citizens' concerns high taxes could drive us out of Fitchburg
-  **Anonymous user's Opinion**
it will become like Middleton - over developed!
-  **Anonymous user's Opinion**
we won't have any farm land in the future due to so much buildings being built
-  **Anonymous user's Opinion**
growing too fast
-  **Anonymous user's Opinion**
I would really like to see way less high density. I don't feel like the city is really evaluating how projects fit into our community. There are thousands of apartments off of Syene and Lacy that have no access to downtown, no amenities, no groceries and no commercial or gas. It really makes no sense other than the land was cheap for someone who wanted to make a lot of money fast.
-  **Anonymous user's Opinion**
too many new businesses on North Fish Hatch - traffic concerns
-  **Anonymous user's Opinion**
Too many people
-  **Anonymous user's Opinion**
think of the kids more
-  **Anonymous user's Opinion**
that it's going to be just another suburb where only the affluent can afford to live
-  **Anonymous user's Opinion**
yes. what does it want to be? a sleepy town or a "go to place"? We need to plan for a vibrant future. See what is happening in Sun Prairie!!
-  **Anonymous user's Opinion**
it's too spread out. Little pockets of developments or shopping plazas that are far from each other eg Target is >.5 miles from City Hall/Library
-  **Anonymous user's Opinion**
few people driving the future
-  **Anonymous user's Opinion**
Constant mayoral change indicates too much dissension among members, too many accusations and that means too little teamwork to get important hard work done.
-  **Anonymous user's Opinion**
Yes; looking too much to preserve/maintain versus grow and prosper
-  **Anonymous user's Opinion**
I fear Madison's problems will become ours (crime, traffic).
-  **Anonymous user's Opinion**
Yes, catering to people who do not want any change whatsoever is backwards and will continue to discourage people from moving here.
-  **Anonymous user's Opinion**
Yes. Development, we must control it
-  **Anonymous user's Opinion**
traffic needs to be addressed
-  **Anonymous user's Opinion**
It is filling up agricultural land with housing blight. Developments used to have bigger lots with yard space



Anonymous user's Opinion

need political stability, balance between haves's and have not's



Anonymous user's Opinion












The amount of traffic is increasing because we don't have walkable commercial space











































Anonymous user's Opinion

Developers and their interests seem to be the prime driving force, i.e. always wanting TIF districts and funding, over all other public comments.

Do you have any hopes for Fitchburg's future?

-  **Anonymous user's Opinion**
focus on more single family homes/condos.
-  **Anonymous user's Opinion**
Better city planning and less focus on developers
-  **Anonymous user's Opinion**
High school, regardless of school district, in Fitchburg City limits
-  **Anonymous user's Opinion**
More renewable energy options
-  **Anonymous user's Opinion**
A Fitchburg School District.
-  **Anonymous user's Opinion**
N/a
-  **Anonymous user's Opinion**
Another elementary school and more housing options with over .25 acres.
-  **Anonymous user's Opinion**
More diversity while also keeping safety.
-  **Anonymous user's Opinion**
I hope it grows and allows new developments of different types. Not just going for population density. I hope it keeps improving bicycle infrastructure.
-  **Anonymous user's Opinion**
Fitchburg is already a recycling leader. I feel the residents here are forward thinking and my hope is that Fitchburg can be a leader in green infrastructure, sustainability, etc in the future. I think it is something that we have lagged with recently and have allowed other cities to catch up. My hope would be we can separate ourselves again.
-  **Anonymous user's Opinion**
Not really
-  **Anonymous user's Opinion**
Undecided. The area from Club 5 down till the Summit Credit Union is getting to be quite sketchy. Leopold elementary is in a very bad neighborhood. The boundary lines for school districts make no sense. Fitchburg really needs to be turned around. I'm not sure how long we'll continue to live here. We are considering moving.
-  **Anonymous user's Opinion**
That we continue to build affordable housing, middle income housing and more expensive housing to continue to get a diverse population. And to have the commercial development to support that!
-  **Anonymous user's Opinion**
I hope we stay alert and focused, don't trust others to do what we expect.
-  **Anonymous user's Opinion**
that is remains safe
-  **Anonymous user's Opinion**
Seems to be developing well.
-  **Anonymous user's Opinion**
A more small town feel with slower development
-  **Anonymous user's Opinion**
YES
-  **Anonymous user's Opinion**
More businesses and amenities needed. Fewer massive apartment complexes. Why do Middleton, Verona, and Sun Prairie always get the new restaurants, businesses, etc??

-  **Anonymous user's Opinion**
We have a wonderful city with a lot of possibility if we can just slow down our "high growth" mode and move to a more mature growth phase.
-  **Anonymous user's Opinion**
Dedicated school district, walkable neighborhoods and city center
-  **Anonymous user's Opinion**
I hope that Fitchburg becomes a destination suburb!
-  **Anonymous user's Opinion**
U hope Fitchburg doesnt try to become a large city, its perfect as a small suburb of Madison
-  **Anonymous user's Opinion**
School District
-  **Anonymous user's Opinion**
Hopefully the police can do something about certain areas of Fitchburg that are not safe.
-  **Anonymous user's Opinion**
If the sprawl is contained yes. If not, congestion and crime will increase, and Fitchburg will become increasingly unlivable. Belleville, here we come!
-  **Anonymous user's Opinion**
I hope that we can find an identity and become a destination, not just a place with nice homes and decent schools. We need better parks, restaurants, shopping, venues.
-  **Anonymous user's Opinion**
Yes, I am optimistic about Fitchburg's future. We should look at other areas throughout the country and even overseas where development/growth has been handled well and 'steal' the good ideas that have worked well.
-  **Anonymous user's Opinion**
I'd love to see city (and county) leaders step up and start holding people accountable for their actions without multiple rounds of "second chances". Fitchburg isn't really known for anything...it's "just a suburb." I hope that there can be something to draw people to this city in the future...even if it's as simple as safe neighborhoods.
-  **Anonymous user's Opinion**
I'm hopeful that our community captains will start to value the heritage of our city and stop pandering to developers. We've been burdened with a sizeable acreage, but it doesn't mean we need to focus on developing it. I'm so sick of our rubber stamp Common Council, City Admin, and Planning Comish. Have vision and stick to it. Don't let money grabbing developers like Ehlers spoil what our elders established here.
-  **Anonymous user's Opinion**
I would like our city admin relieved of duty and I'd like a council intent on seeing our city flourish thru development of land inside our current urban boundary. The fact that we have 3 school districts right now was a major flaw in our elders' design and we will have to address that at some time. The Madison school district is a leech on our property values - we could have values an average of \$50,000 higher without them. That income alone would offset Marsh's incompetent snuggle-up-with-a-developer behavior. But seriously, that guy should be embarrassed for his performance at city council meetings. Watch the tape. Also, the Epic inflation is going to pop at some point and the city leaders will have to address the serious traffic issues. Up to this point, they've literally sat on their hands and waited for the next developer to bring a project to line their pockets. The Marsh administration is bankrupt of ideas.
-  **Anonymous user's Opinion**
I want to see us develop into the city I know this area can be. We need to cater less to people who want to keep developing areas rural. They only hold this community back.
-  **Anonymous user's Opinion**
Bars and grocery store on east side
-  **Anonymous user's Opinion**
Use the amazing opportunity we have to build a thriving community. Fitchburg is mostly a blank slate located in the heart of one of the most dynamic regions in the country. Accept growth as it will provide for a better community for all. Atone for mistakes of the past and develop a central "downtown" retail/entertainment district that is highly walkable.
-  **Anonymous user's Opinion**
The potential to grow and be as interesting and engaging as Madison's other suburbs
-  **Anonymous user's Opinion**
Keep it small - keep it a best kept secret
-  **Anonymous user's Opinion**
Fewer drug related crimes, fewer thefts, more opportunities to engage youth to stay out of trouble, feeling safe at night
-  **Anonymous user's Opinion**
Better development of bicycling paths to the outskirts of the city, especially along Fish Hatchery Road
- Anonymous user's Opinion**

-  I hope that Fitchburg can become a more united city.
-  **Anonymous user's Opinion**
I'd like to see it flourish and continue to be a great place where people want to keep moving to.
-  **Anonymous user's Opinion**
Yes, I think with crime reduction it has a bright future.
-  **Anonymous user's Opinion**
Develops with the environment in mind, builds character as a unique place to live and visit. Not just another burb.
-  **Anonymous user's Opinion**
Uptown commercial development
-  **Anonymous user's Opinion**
more coffee shops, or interesting restaurants, or shops.
-  **Anonymous user's Opinion**
That it considers internal public transit service.
-  **Anonymous user's Opinion**
Find ways to participate in the fight against climate change before it is too late.
-  **Anonymous user's Opinion**
neutral
-  **Anonymous user's Opinion**
Fences and a place for families to settle down
-  **Anonymous user's Opinion**
Keep the city politically neutral in all aspects of its administration, growth and development so it doesn't become like Madison.
-  **Anonymous user's Opinion**
yes, work on access for all to the great things: parks, books, greenspace, groceries
-  **Anonymous user's Opinion**
I hope Fitchburg can become more than a place to sleep at night and then leave during the day. I want to see us bring in progressive & like minded commercial endeavors (like Delta Beer Lab and Promega) without sacrificing our existing natural spaces. I want us to actually learn how to grow as a city and as a city government with regards to planning and communication, as this survey suggests we are trying to do. I want us to stand out with a unique culture and vision from the other areas of Madison.
-  **Anonymous user's Opinion**
We need amenities like good restaurants and shopping.
-  **Anonymous user's Opinion**
incentives and policies to promote distributed power generation and energy conservation.
-  **Anonymous user's Opinion**
I hope we remain a bike centric city, learn from other cities that are innovating and progressing, and be willing to accept all those who wish to come Fitchburg home.
-  **Anonymous user's Opinion**
Sure! Do some planning/coordination to establish a "city center" and build from there to connect diverse types of housing to the things provided in that city center, make it accessible to different ethnic and socio-economic groups, capitalize on the location (between downtown and Epic), etc.
-  **Anonymous user's Opinion**
I would like Fitchburg to focus on businesses/services/parks that are within walking distances of neighborhoods. I wish for Fitchburg to become more walkable. Walkability as a focus is more inclusive than bikeability.
-  **Anonymous user's Opinion**
I love fitchburg, need to harness issues around Leopold - want more people to attend public schools, need some bigger attractions - like wineries/breweries or farm to table restaurants
-  **Anonymous user's Opinion**
that it continue to be independent in overall philosophy and governance from the city of Madison.
-  **Anonymous user's Opinion**
Yes, if everyone pulls together in the same page

**Anonymous user's Opinion**

I hope it doesn't become overdeveloped. I love that I can get out into corn fields (on a bike ride) just a few minutes away from home. p.s. Was hoping for a response option for NA or Indifferent. I answered neutral for many question items that I just don't think about or that don't apply.

**Anonymous user's Opinion**

Yes

**Anonymous user's Opinion**

There are opportunities to do bold things and create attractions like biergartens and other things young people enjoy. Embrace millennials and they will embrace you.

**Anonymous user's Opinion**

absolutely

**Anonymous user's Opinion**

That we'll be a community that accepts all and don't just want a better curb value

**Anonymous user's Opinion**

Hope to see a Verona School District elementary school closer to Fitchburg (we are in Verona attendance area). As stated before, more locally owned small businesses within walking distance to neighborhoods.

**Anonymous user's Opinion**

I wish Fitchburg had more of a 'downtown' area that would help unite our city. I hope that this will be kept in mind for all future development plans.

**Anonymous user's Opinion**

Yes, most definitely as long as infrastructure is in place before developments are approved and no more than 25 of developments are high density.

**Anonymous user's Opinion**

Yes. Need to focus on community, safety, and better planning to create cohesive community(s).

**Anonymous user's Opinion**

I do - I think this has been a good place to live for the last 4 years, and if I buy a home in the next few years, I will definitely look in Fitchburg.

**Anonymous user's Opinion**

I hope the city does not grow anymore. What for? Growth for growths sake? Let's keep Fitchburg the way it is; city government/alders are gradually ruining this place because your trying to fix what's not broken. If you don't like it here leave! Let's not become like Verona; sprawling out of control.

**Anonymous user's Opinion**

I hope to sell my home and move away before it loses more value (neighborhood issues)

**Anonymous user's Opinion**

We have lots of opportunity to grow and serve our tax paying citizens. I would hope that our elected officials, managers, and planners have a broader vision on what we can do better to make this a unique place to live and that vision includes a high level of transparency to guide us going forward.

**Anonymous user's Opinion**

I hope that as Fitchburg develops, they also protect some of the gorgeous natural areas around. And for developed areas, Fitchburg should take a look at how Promega has set up their grounds. Beautiful campus.

**Anonymous user's Opinion**

Yes.

**Anonymous user's Opinion**

Stop the intrusion of new housing developments into farmland.

**Anonymous user's Opinion**

Manage affordable housing locally to keep violent crime down.

**Anonymous user's Opinion**

no






















**Anonymous user's Opinion**






















I hope Fitchburg becomes an example to downtown and other suburbs for what a city can do to improve the quality of life for its residents

**Anonymous user's Opinion**

See comments above.

Anonymous user's Opinion

-  More growth
-  **Anonymous user's Opinion**
Seems like there's a push for a sense of identity.
-  **Anonymous user's Opinion**
A denser, more walkable city.
-  **Anonymous user's Opinion**
That it continues to be a well-managed city.
-  **Anonymous user's Opinion**
Maintains the rural feel in a larger town, with steps toward better sustainability, education & unity.
-  **Anonymous user's Opinion**
its own school system OR split away from Madison schools.
-  **Anonymous user's Opinion**
Disappearing farm land
-  **Anonymous user's Opinion**
Yes. Recently elected officials are doing a better job than many of those elected a few years ago who thought their particular social vision is more important than that of the residents
-  **Stephen Lloyd Arnold's Opinion**
I hope that the NIMBYism and concern about apartment living will subside and residents can work together to encourage affordable housing for all who would like to live here.
-  **Anonymous user's Opinion**
I hope, one day, the entire city of Fitchburg will look as beautiful and well maintained as the area around McKee Park. I hope one day the city will be safer and gangs and crime dealt with. I also hope that some kind of system will be put in place so that these 15 and 16 year old young people who steal cars (many multiple times) will be cared for in a juvenile delinquent facility instead of being let back out to repeat the same offenses.
-  **Anonymous user's Opinion**
Nope
-  **Anonymous user's Opinion**
If taxes continue to rise and crime isn't curbed, we won't be living here in the future.
-  **Anonymous user's Opinion**
Hoping for more walkable businesses to help create a community identity
-  **Anonymous user's Opinion**
Neutral. New city council is now in place and that is helping.
-  **Anonymous user's Opinion**
Continue to grow in a calculated fashion and provide opportunities for all its residents
-  **Anonymous user's Opinion**
Slow growth to maintain the open feel with city resources
-  **Anonymous user's Opinion**
Lots!
-  **Anonymous user's Opinion**
Societal problems in Fitchburg and surrounding cities and communities cause me to have far less hope than in past times.
-  **Anonymous user's Opinion**
Getting a real city center and school system.
-  **Anonymous user's Opinion**
become a green energy leader and make the city welcoming and inclusive for people from all backgrounds and economic statuses
-  **Anonymous user's Opinion**
Figure out what should be Fitchburg and what should be Oregon school district. New school at the east end of Lacy Road and Fitchburg has no comment on their own school system or partnering.

-  **Anonymous user's Opinion**
There are a lot of families moving into the neighborhood and I'm excited to have my kids have friends close.
-  **Anonymous user's Opinion**
The future is bright however need to be cognizant of the tax payer. Taxes in my opinion are already too high.
-  **Anonymous user's Opinion**
That Fitchburg truly becomes its own municipality.
-  **Anonymous user's Opinion**
Slower growth, slower pace, diversity in services
-  **Anonymous user's Opinion**
Maintain much of what is already here.
-  **Anonymous user's Opinion**
There is a lot of open land that can be developed within the city's borders to help solve housing problems.
-  **Anonymous user's Opinion**
I hope to maintain the infrastructure better (roads, bridges, sidewalks, etc).
-  **Anonymous user's Opinion**
That it can develop more of an identity and slow down on high-density residential development.
-  **Anonymous user's Opinion**
When I take an "anonymous" survey I shouldn't need to "sign up" and share info about myself to make my answers count. That's a bunch of crap!
-  **Anonymous user's Opinion**
Better schools
-  **Anonymous user's Opinion**
Own school district!
-  **Anonymous user's Opinion**
Once the Fish Hatch gateway into the city is improved, I hope it will spur all the businesses along Fish Hatch to clean up a bit. This is a city to be proud of but the gateway is just terrible.
-  **Anonymous user's Opinion**
I'd like to see less segregation between the underserved areas (closer to the beltline) and the affluent areas. There should be an attempt at bridging that gap and creating a more open and welcoming community.
-  **Anonymous user's Opinion**
If we are our own 'town' what does that mean? Something to bring the town together. Get something for ourselves with the dollars we're spending
-  **Anonymous user's Opinion**
More affordable single family housing
-  **Anonymous user's Opinion**
I think the future looks bright
-  **Anonymous user's Opinion**
see above
-  **Anonymous user's Opinion**
Less development
-  **Anonymous user's Opinion**
No
-  **Anonymous user's Opinion**
I would love to see a central downtown. Commitment to education and finding a solution to fractured neighborhoods where no one's kids attend the same school. Adequate public transportation that is appealing and usable for all.
-  **Anonymous user's Opinion**
I am hoping Fitchburg's future will be bright.

**Anonymous user's Opinion**

Fitchburg has an opportunity to "develop" into a unique community that is more than just an "average bedroom community" next to a great city (Madison).

**Anonymous user's Opinion**

I hope Fitchburg can develop more options for local shopping. It feels like you really have to go elsewhere for clothes/home improvement stuff.

**Anonymous user's Opinion**

Keep Fitchburg mostly single family residence for housing. Keep it a bedroom community without sidewalks.

**Anonymous user's Opinion**

Improved school in Madison district to help home values.

**Anonymous user's Opinion**

No - just moved here

**Anonymous user's Opinion**

I think Fitchburg has a good reputation for all the reasons cited in the questions you asked. We need to keep it.

**Anonymous user's Opinion**

Yes! I think it can become a safe place with a small town feel that has a lot to offer it's residents.

**Anonymous user's Opinion**

I have high hopes for Fitchburg's future. I understand that the City will grow. When I first moved to my neighborhood 21 years ago, there were more farm fields around me which have now been developed. So I understand that things do change. I just want to make sure that change is driven with consideration from all stakeholders and not have more preference being given to those who can afford it.

**Anonymous user's Opinion**

It's a good place to live and raise a family. I think that will continue.

**Anonymous user's Opinion**

See above, under "do better." (my name is Rick Rosen, phone 608-234-8852)

**Anonymous user's Opinion**

more inclusive for all economic, racial and religious groups

**Anonymous user's Opinion**

Better flood management. Climate change will only make this worse, so the city should prepare now.

**Anonymous user's Opinion**

A school district.

**Anonymous user's Opinion**

I hope that Fitchburg can continue to attract young families and begin to feel a little safer and more walkable. We really do like our neighborhood (Jamestown) and would love to not worry about which way we go on our walks. It seems like the Wingra Quarry area right behind our neighborhood would be a perfect spot to put a nice walkable neighborhood center with shops/cafes/restuarants and another park perhaps.

**Anonymous user's Opinion**

Maintain the present character

**Anonymous user's Opinion**

To continue to be a good place to live with good schools. To think about current residents needs and wants over "big business". Thank you for looking for our thoughts through this survey!

**Anonymous user's Opinion**

That it doesn't become a Madison with crazy regulations and ordinances.

**Anonymous user's Opinion**

local schools, half acre lot spaces at reasonable price























**Anonymous user's Opinion**

I hope someone changes law on beekeeping on properties less than 2 acres. My grandfather had bees in Minnesota but they were on a farm, not a neighborhood. He would put on gear and smoke the bees to calm them before going near the hives. We cant enjoy our retirement because of the bees.

**Anonymous user's Opinion**

Not much

Anonymous user's Opinion

-  The city needs to address obstacles and effects that it's rapid growth is causing to the environment, specially flood water and green spaces.
-  **Anonymous user's Opinion**
Yes, that it will continue to be a place where families want to live.
-  **Anonymous user's Opinion**
Yes
-  **Anonymous user's Opinion**
Yes.
-  **Anonymous user's Opinion**
I have high hopes for a green revival in Fitchburg. I believe sustainability is the key to creating good, lasting jobs while saving the planet.
-  **Anonymous user's Opinion**
More affordable housing with flexible consideration too renters on a case by case basis as it relates to rental history
-  **Anonymous user's Opinion**
Keep land for animal habitat and the enjoyment of the residents and visitors.
-  **Anonymous user's Opinion**
To be the next Middleton - great schools, safe community, strong home value.
-  **Anonymous user's Opinion**
Responsible development, gain amenities, stay ahead of infrastructure going into disrepair (see PD/Verona road, fish hatchery redevelopment).
-  **Anonymous user's Opinion**
I hope Fitchburg continues to define a vision and identity that is distinct and separate from Madison. It is a great place and it should continue to be unique.
-  **Anonymous user's Opinion**
No
-  **Anonymous user's Opinion**
More single family homes, More coffee shops/small retail, not so many apartments that aren't kept up.
-  **Anonymous user's Opinion**
Keep services at current level, control property taxes.
-  **Anonymous user's Opinion**
That the area where the library and city hall are will become more of a city center in the future
-  **Anonymous user's Opinion**
Continue to be the great city that we are
-  **Anonymous user's Opinion**
More retail/restaurants, a real city center/downtown
-  **Anonymous user's Opinion**
More feeling of community; walkable distance to retail
-  **Anonymous user's Opinion**
I hope that Fitchburg's future holds as much promise as it does today.
-  **Anonymous user's Opinion**
Growth and development of walkable neighborhoods with homes and businesses.
-  **Anonymous user's Opinion**
I hope residents can be proud to live in Fitchburg and be friendly and understanding of each other. All economic, racial, and religious groups represented - because that makes us a better community.
-  **Anonymous user's Opinion**
Hopefully the people who claim to be concerned about wetlands and other important areas will put their money where their mouth is and purchase these areas, rather than requiring farmers and others to provide the land at their expense.
-  **Anonymous user's Opinion**



I hope for calmer heads and less NIBMY behavior. Follow the plans.



Anonymous user's Opinion

That Fitchburg continues to thoughtfully grow into a thriving stand-alone city, focused on sustainability and renewal energy.



Anonymous user's Opinion

That we can all come together to be something that we're proud of.



Anonymous user's Opinion

not to develop the surrounding 11,000 acres of farmland



Anonymous user's Opinion

more high end apartments



Anonymous user's Opinion

i hope to move away? i hope that future development is dense and inclusive, and that this leads to a sense of place and sense of community. i hope that the "free for all" attitude of being a bedroom community is replaced by a "welcome to all" of being an actual city.



Anonymous user's Opinion

Of course, you always have to have hope for a better future :) I love my neighborhood. The last mayor was a dipshit, but that seems to be the way it goes these days with our "leaders." So long as the leaders represent the will of the people (and do their best to represent ALL people in their districts) I think we'll be OK.



Anonymous user's Opinion

That those making decisions start to listen to the citizens rather than allowing developers to exploit the city and decrease the quality of life.



Anonymous user's Opinion

I hope that Fitchburg will continue to invest in the resources to support connection, nature, and our environment.



Anonymous user's Opinion

Good location. Let's develop in a smart way. More restaurants of good quality.



Anonymous user's Opinion

I'm hopeful that city leaders will wake up to the problems they create by being focused on developers wishes. We have such a great base of passionate, community-oriented people. I'm a renter in an area that is mostly homeowners and I'm so happy with my neighbors and the relationships I have with them. Many of the high-end apartment complexes - especially those placed in the East Cheryl farmfields are too expensive and have no stores or gas or schools nearby. Seems like a huge misstep in city planning to allow those to ever be built. I encourage you all to stop hiding behind terms like "smart growth" and think about how we can use development to enhance our existing community and stop lining the pockets of government officials, council and commission members, and developers. Traffic issues, stormwater, LED light intensity issues, and community identity have been ignored in favor of flashy new buildings in the middle of cornfields where the developers paid small fees to not put in parks (so they could make \$\$\$ off of that acreage) - those buildings belong in the canyons of East Washington. Kudos to whoever built the library - best community asset we have.



Anonymous user's Opinion

No opinion



Anonymous user's Opinion

Actually focusing on a place to live.



Anonymous user's Opinion

I'm hopeful we can develop a city center and school district while keeping our identity as a rural community with access to Madison.



Anonymous user's Opinion

Make sure the lower income areas are prioritized with accessible grocery stores, robust and affordable public transit, after school programs, and participation in quality schools.



Anonymous user's Opinion

I hope the new development - residential, commercial, and industrial - that has appeared in the past 10 years can be viewed as "enough" for now.



Anonymous user's Opinion

The questions in the survey are unanswerable to the average person who doesn't know how each type of development will affect them and the city. Background information and examples of each should have been provided so they could relate to the questions & evaluation of what we already have what would feel right for the future. There is no city center, nowhere for community pride. Maybe it's not needed. Maybe controlled growth/taxes and safety is enough. Without safety, we have nothing.



Anonymous user's Opinion

I hope it can retain it's look and feel as it grows, e.g. that it remains accessible but without becoming just a generic bedroom community.



Anonymous user's Opinion

More affordable housing, improved public transit to the places people want to go for fun



Anonymous user's Opinion

City council members who continue to respect citizen input over the monetary interests of industrial and residential developers

-  **Anonymous user's Opinion**
yes
-  **Anonymous user's Opinion**
Always can be nicer.
-  **Anonymous user's Opinion**
It would be great to see more gathering places with non-smoking patios.
-  **Anonymous user's Opinion**
No
-  **Anonymous user's Opinion**
Grow collaboratively with other communities.
-  **Anonymous user's Opinion**
More affordable living in Fitchburg
-  **Anonymous user's Opinion**
I think we have a pretty good mayor for the first time since I have lived here. Maybe he will help.
-  **Anonymous user's Opinion**
In keeping with the Ag history of the area a new construction wedding venue in a rural area would be nice. Would be beneficial to the city, it's residents and food and hotel and other business in the area.
-  **Anonymous user's Opinion**
hope and pray for more lower income housing townhomes more restaurants that doesn't included alcohol chipotle Dollar tree
-  **Anonymous user's Opinion**
I hope Fitchburg can move toward smart growth and better use of land.
-  **Anonymous user's Opinion**
Fitchburg will listen
-  **Anonymous user's Opinion**
maintain environmental protections
-  **Anonymous user's Opinion**
slow down
-  **Anonymous user's Opinion**
The more I think about it, the more I start to believe that unless Fitchburg gets it's own school system, we might be better off dividing up into multiple communities by existing district boundaries. We don't have a city center and our government has failed to provide a vision for the community other than saying yes to ever development request. I imagine a west Fitchburg aligned with Verona, a middle Fitchburg aligned with Madison, and an east Fitchburg connected to Oregon. I'm hopeful we can find good people to stay involved in government that aren't so focused on green field developers and focused more on our people and our community. There are plenty of other communities that are doing a better job defining identity.
-  **Anonymous user's Opinion**
I like the fact that someone is concerned about "right" development
-  **Anonymous user's Opinion**
hope it's bright
-  **Anonymous user's Opinion**
hope they will realize that a lot of people came here for the rural character and open spaces within the city
-  **Anonymous user's Opinion**
Yes I have hope. Let's set the goals for the future and tap into our best and brightest.
-  **Anonymous user's Opinion**
grow slowly so the infrastructure can support the growth. you haven't asked any questions about city services (police, fire, ems, city hall staff)
-  **Anonymous user's Opinion**
think of the market in 5 years and 10 years
-  **Anonymous user's Opinion**
More leadership and better listening plus much greater collaboration and cooperation among members



Anonymous user's Opinion

Yes



Anonymous user's Opinion

That we continue to be a leader in protecting the environment (recycling, natural areas).



Anonymous user's Opinion

Yes. We bought in Fitchburg for the potential and we still see that but think Middleton or Verona would have been a better fit.



Anonymous user's Opinion

sale of development rights to keep farmland farmland



Anonymous user's Opinion

everyone counts



Anonymous user's Opinion

YES!! Future is bright



Anonymous user's Opinion

Yes, we need to assert who owns and pays (taxes) for the city, and who should make the decisions. It should be residents, not city staff or developers.

What do you think about these houses?

Rate the content of each image using the rating scale above.

CURRENT RESULTS						230 Total Responses
	1	2	3	4	5	
Image A	7% (15)	10% (22)	13% (29)	33% (77)	38% (87)	
Image B	13% (29)	29% (66)	20% (47)	24% (56)	14% (32)	
Image C	17% (38)	23% (52)	28% (65)	20% (46)	13% (29)	
Image D	8% (19)	9% (21)	10% (23)	31% (71)	42% (96)	

REGISTERED (136)						
	1	2	3	4	5	
Image A	7.0% (10)	13.0% (17)	13.0% (17)	33.0% (45)	35.0% (47)	
Image B	11.0% (15)	29.0% (40)	18.0% (25)	28.0% (38)	13.0% (18)	
Image C	13.0% (17)	21.0% (28)	33.0% (45)	18.0% (25)	15.0% (21)	
Image D	8.0% (11)	10.0% (14)	10.0% (13)	36.0% (49)	36.0% (49)	

NON-REGISTERED (94)						
	1	2	3	4	5	
Image A	5.3% (5)	5.3% (5)	12.8% (12)	34.0% (32)	42.6% (40)	
Image B	14.9% (14)	27.7% (26)	23.4% (22)	19.1% (18)	14.9% (14)	
Image C	22.3% (21)	25.5% (24)	21.3% (20)	22.3% (21)	8.5% (8)	
Image D	8.5% (8)	7.4% (7)	10.6% (10)	23.4% (22)	50.0% (47)	

ALL RESPONDENTS (230)						
	1	2	3	4	5	
Image A	7% (15)	10% (22)	13% (29)	33% (77)	38% (87)	
Image B	13% (29)	29% (66)	20% (47)	24% (56)	14% (32)	
Image C	17% (38)	23% (52)	28% (65)	20% (46)	13% (29)	
Image D	8% (19)	9% (21)	10% (23)	31% (71)	42% (96)	

REGISTERED VOTERS IN FITCHBURG, WI (136)						
	1	2	3	4	5	
Image A	7% (10)	13% (17)	13% (17)	33% (45)	35% (47)	
Image B	11% (15)	29% (40)	18% (25)	28% (38)	13% (18)	
Image C	13% (17)	21% (28)	33% (45)	18% (25)	15% (21)	
Image D	8% (11)	10% (14)	10% (13)	36% (49)	36% (49)	

LIVE IN FITCHBURG, WI (195) - SELF-REPORTED						
	1	2	3	4	5	
Image A	7% (13)	10% (19)	13% (26)	33% (65)	37% (72)	
Image B	13% (26)	31% (60)	17% (34)	25% (49)	13% (26)	
Image C	17% (33)	22% (42)	29% (57)	20% (39)	12% (24)	
Image D	9% (17)	9% (17)	9% (18)	33% (64)	41% (79)	

SUBSCRIBERS TO FITCHBURG, WI (200)						
	1	2	3	4	5	
Image A	7% (13)	10% (20)	13% (26)	34% (68)	37% (73)	
Image B	13% (26)	31% (61)	19% (37)	25% (49)	14% (27)	
Image C	17% (33)	22% (43)	29% (58)	21% (41)	13% (25)	

Image D	9% (17)	10% (19)	9% (18)	33% (66)	40% (80)
---------	---------	----------	---------	----------	----------

REGISTER RESPONDENTS FROM ANYWHERE (140)

	1	2	3	4	5
Image A	7% (10)	12% (17)	13% (18)	33% (46)	35% (49)
Image B	11% (15)	29% (41)	19% (27)	27% (38)	14% (19)
Image C	12% (17)	21% (29)	34% (47)	19% (26)	15% (21)
Image D	8% (11)	11% (15)	10% (14)	36% (50)	36% (50)

EDUCATION

140 REGISTERED VOTERS

	1	2	3	4	5
--	---	---	---	---	---

Bach Degree - Extremely Likely (25)

Image A	4.0% (1.0)	12.0% (3.0)	12.0% (3.0)	36.0% (9.0)	36.0% (9.0)
Image B	8.0% (2.0)	32.0% (8.0)	12.0% (3.0)	32.0% (8.0)	16.0% (4.0)
Image C	8.0% (2.0)	12.0% (3.0)	36.0% (9.0)	20.0% (5.0)	24.0% (6.0)
Image D	8.0% (2.0)	16.0% (4.0)	8.0% (2.0)	36.0% (9.0)	32.0% (8.0)

Bach Degree - Likely (17)

Image A	5.9% (1.0)	11.8% (2.0)	11.8% (2.0)	35.3% (6.0)	35.3% (6.0)
Image B	5.9% (1.0)	47.1% (8.0)	17.6% (3.0)	11.8% (2.0)	17.6% (3.0)
Image C	11.8% (2.0)	17.6% (3.0)	35.3% (6.0)	17.6% (3.0)	17.6% (3.0)
Image D	11.8% (2.0)	5.9% (1.0)	-	23.5% (4.0)	58.8% (10.0)

Grad Degree - Extremely Likely (19)

Image A	-	5.3% (1.0)	10.5% (2.0)	42.1% (8.0)	42.1% (8.0)
Image B	21.1% (4.0)	21.1% (4.0)	21.1% (4.0)	31.6% (6.0)	5.3% (1.0)
Image C	21.1% (4.0)	21.1% (4.0)	31.6% (6.0)	26.3% (5.0)	-
Image D	-	-	26.3% (5.0)	36.8% (7.0)	36.8% (7.0)

Grad Degree - Likely (12)

Image A	16.7% (2.0)	8.3% (1.0)	8.3% (1.0)	8.3% (1.0)	58.3% (7.0)
Image B	8.3% (1.0)	25.0% (3.0)	41.7% (5.0)	8.3% (1.0)	16.7% (2.0)
Image C	8.3% (1.0)	16.7% (2.0)	41.7% (5.0)	25.0% (3.0)	8.3% (1.0)
Image D	16.7% (2.0)	16.7% (2.0)	8.3% (1.0)	33.3% (4.0)	25.0% (3.0)

HS Diploma - Extremely Likely (5)

Image A	-	60.0% (3.0)	-	40.0% (2.0)	-
Image B	20.0% (1.0)	20.0% (1.0)	20.0% (1.0)	40.0% (2.0)	-
Image C	20.0% (1.0)	-	20.0% (1.0)	40.0% (2.0)	20.0% (1.0)
Image D	-	-	20.0% (1.0)	20.0% (1.0)	60.0% (3.0)

HS Diploma - Likely (1)

Image A	-	-	-	100.0% (1.0)	-
Image B	-	-	-	100.0% (1.0)	-
Image C	-	-	-	-	100.0% (1.0)
Image D	-	-	100.0% (1.0)	-	-

Less than HS Diploma - Likely (1)

Image A	-	-	-	-	100.0% (1.0)
Image B	-	-	100.0% (1.0)	-	-
Image C	-	-	100.0% (1.0)	-	-
Image D	-	-	-	100.0% (1.0)	-

Some College - Likely (8)

Image A	-	-	12.5% (1.0)	50.0% (4.0)	37.5% (3.0)
---------	---	---	-------------	-------------	-------------

Image B	12.5% (1.0)	25.0% (2.0)	-	50.0% (4.0)	12.5% (1.0)
Image C	12.5% (1.0)	25.0% (2.0)	37.5% (3.0)	12.5% (1.0)	12.5% (1.0)
Image D	-	-	-	62.5% (5.0)	37.5% (3.0)

Some College -Extremely Likely (3)

Image A	-	-	-	66.7% (2.0)	33.3% (1.0)
Image B	33.3% (1.0)	66.7% (2.0)	-	-	-
Image C	-	33.3% (1.0)	66.7% (2.0)	-	-
Image D	-	-	-	33.3% (1.0)	66.7% (2.0)

Unknown (49)

Image A	12.2% (6.0)	14.3% (7.0)	18.4% (9.0)	26.5% (13.0)	28.6% (14.0)
Image B	8.2% (4.0)	26.5% (13.0)	20.4% (10.0)	28.6% (14.0)	16.3% (8.0)
Image C	12.2% (6.0)	28.6% (14.0)	28.6% (14.0)	14.3% (7.0)	16.3% (8.0)
Image D	10.2% (5.0)	16.3% (8.0)	8.2% (4.0)	36.7% (18.0)	28.6% (14.0)

VOTERS GENDER

140 REGISTERED VOTERS

	1	2	3	4	5
--	---	---	---	---	---

F (70)

Image A	5.7% (4.0)	12.9% (9.0)	11.4% (8.0)	28.6% (20.0)	41.4% (29.0)
Image B	4.3% (3.0)	32.9% (23.0)	28.6% (20.0)	21.4% (15.0)	12.9% (9.0)
Image C	8.6% (6.0)	22.9% (16.0)	27.1% (19.0)	22.9% (16.0)	18.6% (13.0)
Image D	2.9% (2.0)	8.6% (6.0)	11.4% (8.0)	38.6% (27.0)	38.6% (27.0)

M (69)

Image A	8.7% (6.0)	11.6% (8.0)	14.5% (10.0)	37.7% (26.0)	27.5% (19.0)
Image B	17.4% (12.0)	24.6% (17.0)	10.1% (7.0)	33.3% (23.0)	14.5% (10.0)
Image C	15.9% (11.0)	18.8% (13.0)	40.6% (28.0)	14.5% (10.0)	10.1% (7.0)
Image D	13.0% (9.0)	11.6% (8.0)	8.7% (6.0)	33.3% (23.0)	33.3% (23.0)

Unknown (1)

Image A	-	-	-	-	100.0% (1.0)
Image B	-	100.0% (1.0)	-	-	-
Image C	-	-	-	-	100.0% (1.0)
Image D	-	100.0% (1.0)	-	-	-

PRECINCT

140 REGISTERED VOTERS

	1	2	3	4	5
--	---	---	---	---	---

CHICAGO 43-04 (1)

Image A	-	-	-	-	100.0% (1.0)
Image B	-	-	-	-	100.0% (1.0)
Image C	-	100.0% (1.0)	-	-	-
Image D	-	-	-	-	100.0% (1.0)

FITCHBURG CITY WARD 01 (8)

Image A	12.5% (1.0)	-	12.5% (1.0)	75.0% (6.0)	-
Image B	-	50.0% (4.0)	12.5% (1.0)	25.0% (2.0)	12.5% (1.0)
Image C	12.5% (1.0)	50.0% (4.0)	25.0% (2.0)	12.5% (1.0)	-
Image D	-	-	-	87.5% (7.0)	12.5% (1.0)

FITCHBURG CITY WARD 02 (2)

Image A	-	-	50.0% (1.0)	50.0% (1.0)	-
Image B	-	50.0% (1.0)	-	50.0% (1.0)	-
Image C	50.0% (1.0)	-	50.0% (1.0)	-	-

Image D	-	50.0% (1.0)	-	-	50.0% (1.0)
FITCHBURG CITY WARD 03 (2)					
Image A	-	50.0% (1.0)	-	50.0% (1.0)	-
Image B	-	100.0% (2.0)	-	-	-
Image C	-	50.0% (1.0)	50.0% (1.0)	-	-
Image D	-	-	-	50.0% (1.0)	50.0% (1.0)
FITCHBURG CITY WARD 04 (1)					
Image A	-	100.0% (1.0)	-	-	-
Image B	-	100.0% (1.0)	-	-	-
Image C	-	-	-	-	100.0% (1.0)
Image D	-	-	-	100.0% (1.0)	-
FITCHBURG CITY WARD 05 (6)					
Image A	-	16.7% (1.0)	16.7% (1.0)	16.7% (1.0)	50.0% (3.0)
Image B	-	16.7% (1.0)	-	50.0% (3.0)	33.3% (2.0)
Image C	-	16.7% (1.0)	33.3% (2.0)	16.7% (1.0)	33.3% (2.0)
Image D	-	-	16.7% (1.0)	50.0% (3.0)	33.3% (2.0)
FITCHBURG CITY WARD 06 (8)					
Image A	-	12.5% (1.0)	12.5% (1.0)	25.0% (2.0)	50.0% (4.0)
Image B	12.5% (1.0)	37.5% (3.0)	-	50.0% (4.0)	-
Image C	12.5% (1.0)	-	50.0% (4.0)	25.0% (2.0)	12.5% (1.0)
Image D	-	-	12.5% (1.0)	75.0% (6.0)	12.5% (1.0)
FITCHBURG CITY WARD 07 (11)					
Image A	18.2% (2.0)	-	9.1% (1.0)	36.4% (4.0)	36.4% (4.0)
Image B	27.3% (3.0)	27.3% (3.0)	18.2% (2.0)	27.3% (3.0)	-
Image C	36.4% (4.0)	18.2% (2.0)	18.2% (2.0)	27.3% (3.0)	-
Image D	-	-	9.1% (1.0)	54.5% (6.0)	36.4% (4.0)
FITCHBURG CITY WARD 08 (11)					
Image A	9.1% (1.0)	9.1% (1.0)	18.2% (2.0)	27.3% (3.0)	36.4% (4.0)
Image B	27.3% (3.0)	27.3% (3.0)	18.2% (2.0)	27.3% (3.0)	-
Image C	18.2% (2.0)	18.2% (2.0)	27.3% (3.0)	18.2% (2.0)	18.2% (2.0)
Image D	9.1% (1.0)	9.1% (1.0)	18.2% (2.0)	18.2% (2.0)	45.5% (5.0)
FITCHBURG CITY WARD 09 (4)					
Image A	-	25.0% (1.0)	-	50.0% (2.0)	25.0% (1.0)
Image B	-	50.0% (2.0)	25.0% (1.0)	25.0% (1.0)	-
Image C	-	25.0% (1.0)	25.0% (1.0)	25.0% (1.0)	25.0% (1.0)
Image D	-	75.0% (3.0)	-	25.0% (1.0)	-
FITCHBURG CITY WARD 12 (2)					
Image A	-	-	50.0% (1.0)	-	50.0% (1.0)
Image B	-	-	50.0% (1.0)	50.0% (1.0)	-
Image C	-	50.0% (1.0)	50.0% (1.0)	-	-
Image D	-	-	-	-	100.0% (2.0)
FITCHBURG CITY WARD 13 (22)					
Image A	4.5% (1.0)	18.2% (4.0)	4.5% (1.0)	22.7% (5.0)	50.0% (11.0)
Image B	9.1% (2.0)	31.8% (7.0)	13.6% (3.0)	13.6% (3.0)	31.8% (7.0)
Image C	13.6% (3.0)	18.2% (4.0)	36.4% (8.0)	18.2% (4.0)	13.6% (3.0)
Image D	9.1% (2.0)	4.5% (1.0)	9.1% (2.0)	13.6% (3.0)	63.6% (14.0)
FITCHBURG CITY WARD 14 (15)					

Image A	-	20.0% (3.0)	-	46.7% (7.0)	33.3% (5.0)
Image B	6.7% (1.0)	20.0% (3.0)	26.7% (4.0)	33.3% (5.0)	13.3% (2.0)
Image C	-	13.3% (2.0)	46.7% (7.0)	20.0% (3.0)	20.0% (3.0)
Image D	13.3% (2.0)	-	-	60.0% (9.0)	26.7% (4.0)
FITCHBURG CITY WARD 15 (4)					
Image A	-	-	25.0% (1.0)	25.0% (1.0)	50.0% (2.0)
Image B	25.0% (1.0)	-	-	75.0% (3.0)	-
Image C	25.0% (1.0)	-	25.0% (1.0)	-	50.0% (2.0)
Image D	-	25.0% (1.0)	25.0% (1.0)	-	50.0% (2.0)
FITCHBURG CITY WARD 16 (1)					
Image A	-	-	-	100.0% (1.0)	-
Image B	-	-	-	100.0% (1.0)	-
Image C	-	-	-	100.0% (1.0)	-
Image D	-	-	-	-	100.0% (1.0)
FITCHBURG CITY WARD 17 (7)					
Image A	14.3% (1.0)	-	14.3% (1.0)	28.6% (2.0)	42.9% (3.0)
Image B	14.3% (1.0)	28.6% (2.0)	14.3% (1.0)	28.6% (2.0)	14.3% (1.0)
Image C	14.3% (1.0)	42.9% (3.0)	28.6% (2.0)	14.3% (1.0)	-
Image D	14.3% (1.0)	14.3% (1.0)	14.3% (1.0)	28.6% (2.0)	28.6% (2.0)
FITCHBURG CITY WARD 18 (10)					
Image A	20.0% (2.0)	10.0% (1.0)	10.0% (1.0)	40.0% (4.0)	20.0% (2.0)
Image B	20.0% (2.0)	40.0% (4.0)	10.0% (1.0)	10.0% (1.0)	20.0% (2.0)
Image C	30.0% (3.0)	30.0% (3.0)	20.0% (2.0)	-	20.0% (2.0)
Image D	20.0% (2.0)	20.0% (2.0)	20.0% (2.0)	30.0% (3.0)	10.0% (1.0)
FITCHBURG CITY WARD 19 (20)					
Image A	10.0% (2.0)	10.0% (2.0)	25.0% (5.0)	20.0% (4.0)	35.0% (7.0)
Image B	5.0% (1.0)	15.0% (3.0)	45.0% (9.0)	20.0% (4.0)	15.0% (3.0)
Image C	-	20.0% (4.0)	40.0% (8.0)	25.0% (5.0)	15.0% (3.0)
Image D	15.0% (3.0)	15.0% (3.0)	10.0% (2.0)	25.0% (5.0)	35.0% (7.0)
MADISON CITY WARD 100 (1)					
Image A	-	100.0% (1.0)	-	-	-
Image B	-	100.0% (1.0)	-	-	-
Image C	-	-	-	-	100.0% (1.0)
Image D	-	-	-	-	100.0% (1.0)
MADISON CITY WARD 107 (1)					
Image A	-	-	-	-	100.0% (1.0)
Image B	-	100.0% (1.0)	-	-	-
Image C	-	-	100.0% (1.0)	-	-
Image D	-	-	-	100.0% (1.0)	-
OREGON VLG WARD 09 (1)					
Image A	-	-	-	100.0% (1.0)	-
Image B	-	-	100.0% (1.0)	-	-
Image C	-	-	-	100.0% (1.0)	-
Image D	-	100.0% (1.0)	-	-	-
OREGON VLG WARD 10 (1)					
Image A	-	-	-	100.0% (1.0)	-
Image B	-	-	-	100.0% (1.0)	-
Image C	-	-	-	100.0% (1.0)	-

Image D	-	100.0% (1.0)	-	-	-
---------	---	--------------	---	---	---

ROCHESTER W6 P02 (1)

Image A	-	-	100.0% (1.0)	-	-
Image B	-	-	100.0% (1.0)	-	-
Image C	-	-	100.0% (1.0)	-	-
Image D	-	-	100.0% (1.0)	-	-

AGE RANGE

140 REGISTERED VOTERS

	1	2	3	4	5
--	---	---	---	---	---

18-29 (1)

Image A	100.0% (1.0)	-	-	-	-
Image B	-	-	-	-	100.0% (1.0)
Image C	-	100.0% (1.0)	-	-	-
Image D	-	-	-	100.0% (1.0)	-

30-39 (17)

Image A	-	29.4% (5.0)	17.6% (3.0)	23.5% (4.0)	29.4% (5.0)
Image B	-	52.9% (9.0)	5.9% (1.0)	29.4% (5.0)	11.8% (2.0)
Image C	5.9% (1.0)	23.5% (4.0)	29.4% (5.0)	11.8% (2.0)	29.4% (5.0)
Image D	5.9% (1.0)	17.6% (3.0)	-	29.4% (5.0)	47.1% (8.0)

40-49 (25)

Image A	8.0% (2.0)	8.0% (2.0)	20.0% (5.0)	36.0% (9.0)	28.0% (7.0)
Image B	12.0% (3.0)	32.0% (8.0)	16.0% (4.0)	36.0% (9.0)	4.0% (1.0)
Image C	16.0% (4.0)	12.0% (3.0)	40.0% (10.0)	16.0% (4.0)	16.0% (4.0)
Image D	8.0% (2.0)	12.0% (3.0)	20.0% (5.0)	24.0% (6.0)	36.0% (9.0)

50-59 (15)

Image A	-	6.7% (1.0)	26.7% (4.0)	60.0% (9.0)	6.7% (1.0)
Image B	13.3% (2.0)	6.7% (1.0)	40.0% (6.0)	40.0% (6.0)	-
Image C	13.3% (2.0)	6.7% (1.0)	40.0% (6.0)	33.3% (5.0)	6.7% (1.0)
Image D	6.7% (1.0)	26.7% (4.0)	13.3% (2.0)	33.3% (5.0)	20.0% (3.0)

60-69 (17)

Image A	-	23.5% (4.0)	-	29.4% (5.0)	47.1% (8.0)
Image B	11.8% (2.0)	17.6% (3.0)	11.8% (2.0)	41.2% (7.0)	17.6% (3.0)
Image C	11.8% (2.0)	17.6% (3.0)	23.5% (4.0)	29.4% (5.0)	17.6% (3.0)
Image D	5.9% (1.0)	-	11.8% (2.0)	47.1% (8.0)	35.3% (6.0)

70-79 (14)

Image A	42.9% (6.0)	-	-	35.7% (5.0)	21.4% (3.0)
Image B	7.1% (1.0)	14.3% (2.0)	28.6% (4.0)	14.3% (2.0)	35.7% (5.0)
Image C	21.4% (3.0)	21.4% (3.0)	21.4% (3.0)	14.3% (2.0)	21.4% (3.0)
Image D	21.4% (3.0)	-	7.1% (1.0)	42.9% (6.0)	28.6% (4.0)

unknown (51)

Image A	2.0% (1.0)	9.8% (5.0)	11.8% (6.0)	27.5% (14.0)	49.0% (25.0)
Image B	13.7% (7.0)	35.3% (18.0)	19.6% (10.0)	17.6% (9.0)	13.7% (7.0)
Image C	9.8% (5.0)	27.5% (14.0)	37.3% (19.0)	15.7% (8.0)	9.8% (5.0)
Image D	5.9% (3.0)	9.8% (5.0)	7.8% (4.0)	37.3% (19.0)	39.2% (20.0)

**VOTERS
AGE**

140 REGISTERED VOTERS

	1	2	3	4	5
--	---	---	---	---	---

28 (1)

Image A	100.0% (1.0)	-	-	-	-
Image B	-	-	-	-	100.0% (1.0)
Image C	-	100.0% (1.0)	-	-	-
Image D	-	-	-	100.0% (1.0)	-

31 (1)

Image A	-	-	-	100.0% (1.0)	-
Image B	-	100.0% (1.0)	-	-	-
Image C	-	-	100.0% (1.0)	-	-
Image D	-	-	-	-	100.0% (1.0)

34 (1)

Image A	-	-	100.0% (1.0)	-	-
Image B	-	-	-	100.0% (1.0)	-
Image C	-	100.0% (1.0)	-	-	-
Image D	-	-	-	-	100.0% (1.0)

35 (3)

Image A	-	33.3% (1.0)	-	33.3% (1.0)	33.3% (1.0)
Image B	-	33.3% (1.0)	-	66.7% (2.0)	-
Image C	-	-	66.7% (2.0)	33.3% (1.0)	-
Image D	33.3% (1.0)	-	-	33.3% (1.0)	33.3% (1.0)

36 (2)

Image A	-	-	50.0% (1.0)	-	50.0% (1.0)
Image B	-	50.0% (1.0)	-	50.0% (1.0)	-
Image C	50.0% (1.0)	-	-	-	50.0% (1.0)
Image D	-	100.0% (2.0)	-	-	-

37 (4)

Image A	-	25.0% (1.0)	-	50.0% (2.0)	25.0% (1.0)
Image B	-	100.0% (4.0)	-	-	-
Image C	-	75.0% (3.0)	25.0% (1.0)	-	-
Image D	-	-	-	75.0% (3.0)	25.0% (1.0)

38 (3)

Image A	-	33.3% (1.0)	33.3% (1.0)	-	33.3% (1.0)
Image B	-	33.3% (1.0)	-	-	66.7% (2.0)
Image C	-	-	-	-	100.0% (3.0)
Image D	-	33.3% (1.0)	-	-	66.7% (2.0)

39 (3)

Image A	-	66.7% (2.0)	-	-	33.3% (1.0)
Image B	-	33.3% (1.0)	33.3% (1.0)	33.3% (1.0)	-
Image C	-	-	33.3% (1.0)	33.3% (1.0)	33.3% (1.0)
Image D	-	-	-	33.3% (1.0)	66.7% (2.0)

40 (5)

Image A	-	-	-	60.0% (3.0)	40.0% (2.0)
Image B	20.0% (1.0)	40.0% (2.0)	-	40.0% (2.0)	-
Image C	20.0% (1.0)	40.0% (2.0)	20.0% (1.0)	-	20.0% (1.0)
Image D	-	20.0% (1.0)	-	40.0% (2.0)	40.0% (2.0)

43 (4)

Image A	25.0% (1.0)	-	25.0% (1.0)	-	50.0% (2.0)
---------	-------------	---	-------------	---	-------------

Image B	25.0% (1.0)	25.0% (1.0)	-	25.0% (1.0)	25.0% (1.0)
Image C	50.0% (2.0)	-	25.0% (1.0)	-	25.0% (1.0)
Image D	25.0% (1.0)	-	25.0% (1.0)	25.0% (1.0)	25.0% (1.0)

44 (6)

Image A	-	-	33.3% (2.0)	50.0% (3.0)	16.7% (1.0)
Image B	16.7% (1.0)	50.0% (3.0)	-	33.3% (2.0)	-
Image C	16.7% (1.0)	-	83.3% (5.0)	-	-
Image D	-	16.7% (1.0)	16.7% (1.0)	50.0% (3.0)	16.7% (1.0)

45 (2)

Image A	-	50.0% (1.0)	-	-	50.0% (1.0)
Image B	-	-	100.0% (2.0)	-	-
Image C	-	-	50.0% (1.0)	50.0% (1.0)	-
Image D	-	-	-	-	100.0% (2.0)

46 (1)

Image A	-	-	100.0% (1.0)	-	-
Image B	-	-	-	100.0% (1.0)	-
Image C	-	-	-	100.0% (1.0)	-
Image D	-	100.0% (1.0)	-	-	-

47 (3)

Image A	-	33.3% (1.0)	-	66.7% (2.0)	-
Image B	-	-	33.3% (1.0)	66.7% (2.0)	-
Image C	-	-	-	66.7% (2.0)	33.3% (1.0)
Image D	-	-	66.7% (2.0)	-	33.3% (1.0)

49 (4)

Image A	25.0% (1.0)	-	25.0% (1.0)	25.0% (1.0)	25.0% (1.0)
Image B	-	50.0% (2.0)	25.0% (1.0)	25.0% (1.0)	-
Image C	-	25.0% (1.0)	50.0% (2.0)	-	25.0% (1.0)
Image D	25.0% (1.0)	-	25.0% (1.0)	-	50.0% (2.0)

50 (1)

Image A	-	-	-	100.0% (1.0)	-
Image B	-	100.0% (1.0)	-	-	-
Image C	-	-	100.0% (1.0)	-	-
Image D	-	-	-	100.0% (1.0)	-

51 (1)

Image A	-	-	100.0% (1.0)	-	-
Image B	-	-	100.0% (1.0)	-	-
Image C	-	-	100.0% (1.0)	-	-
Image D	100.0% (1.0)	-	-	-	-

52 (4)

Image A	-	25.0% (1.0)	-	75.0% (3.0)	-
Image B	25.0% (1.0)	-	50.0% (2.0)	25.0% (1.0)	-
Image C	-	25.0% (1.0)	-	50.0% (2.0)	25.0% (1.0)
Image D	-	50.0% (2.0)	25.0% (1.0)	25.0% (1.0)	-

53 (1)

Image A	-	-	-	100.0% (1.0)	-
Image B	-	-	-	100.0% (1.0)	-
Image C	-	-	-	100.0% (1.0)	-
Image D	-	100.0% (1.0)	-	-	-

55 (1)

Image A	-	-	-	100.0% (1.0)	-
Image B	-	-	-	100.0% (1.0)	-
Image C	-	-	-	100.0% (1.0)	-
Image D	-	-	-	100.0% (1.0)	-

56 (2)

Image A	-	-	50.0% (1.0)	50.0% (1.0)	-
Image B	-	-	50.0% (1.0)	50.0% (1.0)	-
Image C	50.0% (1.0)	-	50.0% (1.0)	-	-
Image D	-	50.0% (1.0)	-	-	50.0% (1.0)

57 (2)

Image A	-	-	50.0% (1.0)	50.0% (1.0)	-
Image B	-	-	50.0% (1.0)	50.0% (1.0)	-
Image C	-	-	50.0% (1.0)	50.0% (1.0)	-
Image D	-	-	50.0% (1.0)	50.0% (1.0)	-

59 (3)

Image A	-	-	33.3% (1.0)	33.3% (1.0)	33.3% (1.0)
Image B	33.3% (1.0)	-	33.3% (1.0)	33.3% (1.0)	-
Image C	33.3% (1.0)	-	66.7% (2.0)	-	-
Image D	-	-	-	33.3% (1.0)	66.7% (2.0)

60 (1)

Image A	-	-	-	100.0% (1.0)	-
Image B	-	-	100.0% (1.0)	-	-
Image C	-	-	100.0% (1.0)	-	-
Image D	-	-	-	100.0% (1.0)	-

61 (2)

Image A	-	-	-	50.0% (1.0)	50.0% (1.0)
Image B	-	-	50.0% (1.0)	50.0% (1.0)	-
Image C	-	-	100.0% (2.0)	-	-
Image D	-	-	50.0% (1.0)	-	50.0% (1.0)

62 (4)

Image A	-	-	-	50.0% (2.0)	50.0% (2.0)
Image B	-	-	-	50.0% (2.0)	50.0% (2.0)
Image C	-	25.0% (1.0)	-	50.0% (2.0)	25.0% (1.0)
Image D	-	-	-	50.0% (2.0)	50.0% (2.0)

63 (2)

Image A	-	-	-	-	100.0% (2.0)
Image B	50.0% (1.0)	-	-	50.0% (1.0)	-
Image C	50.0% (1.0)	-	-	50.0% (1.0)	-
Image D	-	-	50.0% (1.0)	-	50.0% (1.0)

64 (2)

Image A	-	50.0% (1.0)	-	-	50.0% (1.0)
Image B	-	50.0% (1.0)	-	50.0% (1.0)	-
Image C	-	-	50.0% (1.0)	-	50.0% (1.0)
Image D	-	-	-	100.0% (2.0)	-

65 (1)

Image A	-	100.0% (1.0)	-	-	-
---------	---	--------------	---	---	---

Image B	-	-	-	100.0% (1.0)	-
Image C	-	-	-	100.0% (1.0)	-
Image D	-	-	-	100.0% (1.0)	-
66 (1)					
Image A	-	-	-	-	100.0% (1.0)
Image B	100.0% (1.0)	-	-	-	-
Image C	100.0% (1.0)	-	-	-	-
Image D	-	-	-	-	100.0% (1.0)
68 (2)					
Image A	-	50.0% (1.0)	-	-	50.0% (1.0)
Image B	-	-	-	50.0% (1.0)	50.0% (1.0)
Image C	-	-	-	50.0% (1.0)	50.0% (1.0)
Image D	50.0% (1.0)	-	-	50.0% (1.0)	-
69 (2)					
Image A	-	50.0% (1.0)	-	50.0% (1.0)	-
Image B	-	100.0% (2.0)	-	-	-
Image C	-	100.0% (2.0)	-	-	-
Image D	-	-	-	50.0% (1.0)	50.0% (1.0)
70 (2)					
Image A	50.0% (1.0)	-	-	-	50.0% (1.0)
Image B	-	-	50.0% (1.0)	-	50.0% (1.0)
Image C	50.0% (1.0)	-	-	-	50.0% (1.0)
Image D	-	-	50.0% (1.0)	50.0% (1.0)	-
71 (2)					
Image A	50.0% (1.0)	-	-	50.0% (1.0)	-
Image B	-	-	50.0% (1.0)	-	50.0% (1.0)
Image C	-	-	100.0% (2.0)	-	-
Image D	50.0% (1.0)	-	-	50.0% (1.0)	-
72 (1)					
Image A	-	-	-	100.0% (1.0)	-
Image B	-	-	-	100.0% (1.0)	-
Image C	-	-	-	100.0% (1.0)	-
Image D	-	-	-	100.0% (1.0)	-
73 (3)					
Image A	33.3% (1.0)	-	-	33.3% (1.0)	33.3% (1.0)
Image B	-	33.3% (1.0)	33.3% (1.0)	-	33.3% (1.0)
Image C	33.3% (1.0)	33.3% (1.0)	-	-	33.3% (1.0)
Image D	-	-	-	66.7% (2.0)	33.3% (1.0)
74 (2)					
Image A	100.0% (2.0)	-	-	-	-
Image B	50.0% (1.0)	50.0% (1.0)	-	-	-
Image C	50.0% (1.0)	50.0% (1.0)	-	-	-
Image D	50.0% (1.0)	-	-	-	50.0% (1.0)
77 (2)					
Image A	50.0% (1.0)	-	-	-	50.0% (1.0)
Image B	-	-	-	-	100.0% (2.0)
Image C	-	50.0% (1.0)	-	-	50.0% (1.0)
Image D	50.0% (1.0)	-	-	-	50.0% (1.0)

79 (2)

Image A	-	-	-	100.0% (2.0)	-
Image B	-	-	50.0% (1.0)	50.0% (1.0)	-
Image C	-	-	50.0% (1.0)	50.0% (1.0)	-
Image D	-	-	-	50.0% (1.0)	50.0% (1.0)
Unknown (51)					
Image A	2.0% (1.0)	9.8% (5.0)	11.8% (6.0)	27.5% (14.0)	49.0% (25.0)
Image B	13.7% (7.0)	35.3% (18.0)	19.6% (10.0)	17.6% (9.0)	13.7% (7.0)
Image C	9.8% (5.0)	27.5% (14.0)	37.3% (19.0)	15.7% (8.0)	9.8% (5.0)
Image D	5.9% (3.0)	9.8% (5.0)	7.8% (4.0)	37.3% (19.0)	39.2% (20.0)

STATE INCOME DECILE

140 REGISTERED VOTERS

	1	2	3	4	5
--	---	---	---	---	---

0 to 9 Pct range (4)

Image A	-	25.0% (1.0)	50.0% (2.0)	25.0% (1.0)	-
Image B	-	50.0% (2.0)	25.0% (1.0)	-	25.0% (1.0)
Image C	-	-	25.0% (1.0)	25.0% (1.0)	50.0% (2.0)
Image D	-	25.0% (1.0)	25.0% (1.0)	25.0% (1.0)	25.0% (1.0)

10 to 19 Pct range (3)

Image A	-	33.3% (1.0)	-	33.3% (1.0)	33.3% (1.0)
Image B	33.3% (1.0)	66.7% (2.0)	-	-	-
Image C	-	66.7% (2.0)	33.3% (1.0)	-	-
Image D	-	-	-	33.3% (1.0)	66.7% (2.0)

40 to 49 Pct range (1)

Image A	-	-	-	100.0% (1.0)	-
Image B	-	-	-	100.0% (1.0)	-
Image C	-	100.0% (1.0)	-	-	-
Image D	-	-	-	100.0% (1.0)	-

50 to 59 Pct range (9)

Image A	11.1% (1.0)	-	22.2% (2.0)	55.6% (5.0)	11.1% (1.0)
Image B	-	44.4% (4.0)	22.2% (2.0)	11.1% (1.0)	22.2% (2.0)
Image C	11.1% (1.0)	33.3% (3.0)	33.3% (3.0)	11.1% (1.0)	11.1% (1.0)
Image D	-	-	11.1% (1.0)	66.7% (6.0)	22.2% (2.0)

60 to 69 Pct range (3)

Image A	-	-	-	66.7% (2.0)	33.3% (1.0)
Image B	-	33.3% (1.0)	33.3% (1.0)	33.3% (1.0)	-
Image C	-	-	33.3% (1.0)	33.3% (1.0)	33.3% (1.0)
Image D	-	66.7% (2.0)	-	33.3% (1.0)	-

70 to 79 Pct range (3)

Image A	-	33.3% (1.0)	33.3% (1.0)	33.3% (1.0)	-
Image B	-	66.7% (2.0)	-	33.3% (1.0)	-
Image C	33.3% (1.0)	-	33.3% (1.0)	-	33.3% (1.0)
Image D	-	33.3% (1.0)	-	-	66.7% (2.0)

80 to 89 Pct range (51)

Image A	3.9% (2.0)	11.8% (6.0)	7.8% (4.0)	31.4% (16.0)	45.1% (23.0)
Image B	9.8% (5.0)	25.5% (13.0)	17.6% (9.0)	29.4% (15.0)	17.6% (9.0)
Image C	9.8% (5.0)	21.6% (11.0)	35.3% (18.0)	17.6% (9.0)	15.7% (8.0)

Image D	7.8% (4.0)	5.9% (3.0)	7.8% (4.0)	29.4% (15.0)	49.0% (25.0)
90 Pct and up (64)					
Image A	9.4% (6.0)	10.9% (7.0)	14.1% (9.0)	29.7% (19.0)	35.9% (23.0)
Image B	12.5% (8.0)	26.6% (17.0)	21.9% (14.0)	29.7% (19.0)	9.4% (6.0)
Image C	14.1% (9.0)	18.8% (12.0)	32.8% (21.0)	21.9% (14.0)	12.5% (8.0)
Image D	9.4% (6.0)	12.5% (8.0)	12.5% (8.0)	39.1% (25.0)	26.6% (17.0)

Unknown (2)

Image A	50.0% (1.0)	50.0% (1.0)	-	-	-
Image B	50.0% (1.0)	-	-	-	50.0% (1.0)
Image C	50.0% (1.0)	-	50.0% (1.0)	-	-
Image D	50.0% (1.0)	-	-	-	50.0% (1.0)

HOME OWNER/RENTER

140 REGISTERED VOTERS

	1	2	3	4	5
--	---	---	---	---	---

Likely Homeowner (86)

Image A	8.1% (7.0)	8.1% (7.0)	8.1% (7.0)	37.2% (32.0)	38.4% (33.0)
Image B	11.6% (10.0)	29.1% (25.0)	19.8% (17.0)	24.4% (21.0)	15.1% (13.0)
Image C	11.6% (10.0)	17.4% (15.0)	37.2% (32.0)	18.6% (16.0)	15.1% (13.0)
Image D	10.5% (9.0)	7.0% (6.0)	10.5% (9.0)	36.0% (31.0)	36.0% (31.0)

Likely Renter (35)

Image A	2.9% (1.0)	14.3% (5.0)	22.9% (8.0)	31.4% (11.0)	28.6% (10.0)
Image B	5.7% (2.0)	31.4% (11.0)	25.7% (9.0)	28.6% (10.0)	8.6% (3.0)
Image C	11.4% (4.0)	28.6% (10.0)	25.7% (9.0)	22.9% (8.0)	11.4% (4.0)
Image D	-	14.3% (5.0)	11.4% (4.0)	40.0% (14.0)	34.3% (12.0)

Unknown (19)

Image A	10.5% (2.0)	26.3% (5.0)	15.8% (3.0)	15.8% (3.0)	31.6% (6.0)
Image B	15.8% (3.0)	26.3% (5.0)	5.3% (1.0)	36.8% (7.0)	15.8% (3.0)
Image C	15.8% (3.0)	21.1% (4.0)	31.6% (6.0)	10.5% (2.0)	21.1% (4.0)
Image D	10.5% (2.0)	21.1% (4.0)	5.3% (1.0)	26.3% (5.0)	36.8% (7.0)

If you have any comments about your answers to the above questions please provide them here.



Anonymous user's Opinion

Do not like houses that are so close together you could borrow a cup of sugar from your neighbor just by opening your window.



Anonymous user's Opinion

Families want yards - houses don't need to be right on top of each other



Anonymous user's Opinion

All the home pictures and distance from front set backs to side by side set backs are good. A mix within the city is important. I wouldn't like to see 5' side by side set backs as that gets a little tight.



Anonymous user's Opinion

The new neighborhood off of Syene Road has houses extremely close together. It is an absolute eye sore. Please do not allow house to be built this close together. I live in Fitchburg not downtown Chicago.



Anonymous user's Opinion

Depending on the exterior finishes, image B & C will age very poorly - especially with Builder-grade siding.



Anonymous user's Opinion

B and C are too close together and too close to the road



Anonymous user's Opinion

I prefer Option A because of the amount of green space and trees.



Anonymous user's Opinion

B and C too close to the streets.



Anonymous user's Opinion

The new homes by the new fire station are a joke. The lots are ridiculously tiny and way too close to the main road. It looks horrible and we're disappointed this was approved. Seems like a win for the developer to be able to cram some more lots in.



Anonymous user's Opinion

How is this relevant to a comprehensive plan survey? You should be ashamed of yourself for getting bed with the builders.



Anonymous user's Opinion

The lot and the house in image a are both too big



Anonymous user's Opinion

I strongly prefer that houses on smaller lots that are closer together be of different styles, rather than cookie-cutter designs that all look like each other (and which won't age as well and will look dated sooner). The thing I do like about image B is that garages aren't prominent on the front of the houses.



Anonymous user's Opinion

Everything depends on neighborhood and impact on the entire area. Too often Fitchburg has allowed developers to dictate without careful study or notice to those impacted.



Anonymous user's Opinion

Where are the garages for B and C?



Anonymous user's Opinion

I greatly dislike houses being too close to each other.



Anonymous user's Opinion

Houses B and C seem very close together and somewhat close to the road. I would not want to be so close together.























Anonymous user's Opinion

















I wish I knew the speedlimit to better answer these



Anonymous user's Opinion

The closeness of housing in Image C is becoming inappropriate in Fitchburg. The newest development on Syene Road, between Argus Ln and Central Park Pl, by the new Fitchburg Fire Department is honestly disgusting. The houses are too close to the road; too close to each other; and diminish the quality of life for all of those around it. If we're going to develop more homes, even if they are smaller or pre-fabricated have them on lot sizes as those in Swan Creek or those on Lacy Road between S Fish Hatchery Rd and Osmundsen Rd.

-  **Anonymous user's Opinion**
What is "1", good or bad? Please explain
-  **Anonymous user's Opinion**
Not really a fan of columns as a decorative element or cheaply put up big houses. But I like a more colorful craftsman style. But then again I'm an architecture snob so feel free to not listen to me.
-  **Anonymous user's Opinion**
Smaler footprints
-  **Anonymous user's Opinion**
In this city, we should be concerned about provided affordable quality housing for all incomes and abilities
-  **Anonymous user's Opinion**
where are the trees?
-  **Anonymous user's Opinion**
Not enough trees/privacy.
-  **Anonymous user's Opinion**
I like to have options and a variety of home and neighborhood designs
-  **Anonymous user's Opinion**
Houses in images B & C are TOO close together. Needs to be more space between houses
-  **Anonymous user's Opinion**
Too small for price. Living on top of one another.
-  **Stephen Lloyd Arnold's Opinion**
Front loaded buildings say "Cars live here." Alley loaded buildings say "People live here," and are more appealing and give the city better tax value per acre. D has especially low value and thus revenue to the city.
-  **Anonymous user's Opinion**
We need more one level homes for seniors and those with disabilities.
-  **Anonymous user's Opinion**
Fitchburg needs to stop allowing Veridian neighborhoods. They are low quality builds with small lots that drive down values of nearby neighborhoods.
-  **Anonymous user's Opinion**
The more space between houses, the better.
-  **Anonymous user's Opinion**
New development, looks as though we are going back to post war construction, building on top of each other and density without regard to current resident. South Syene Road is a great example of this crappy plan, motivated by \$ not reality.
-  **Anonymous user's Opinion**
We need to create accessible communities that encourage people to connect with each other so that those with disabilities can be fully integrated into society and people can age in place should they choose to because their family members can rest easy knowing their family member's neighbors know and care about them. This means homes need to be closer together, without steps to the front door and there need to be walking paths, parks, and coffee shops and grocery stores nearby so that people can easily access what they need and get to know each other. None of these homes or the environments they are shown in seem to fit these criteria.
-  **Anonymous user's Opinion**
B and C are too close together and too close to the street. Look like pre-fab housing.
-  **Anonymous user's Opinion**
It really doesn't cost much more to build interesting and attractive houses as opposed to ordinary and nondescript so why not make the city more attractive? Consider how these houses are going to hold up and appear in 20 years.
-  **Anonymous user's Opinion**
B and C are too close to the houses next to them. Myself and my family enjoy some privacy and space between houses
-  **Anonymous user's Opinion**
I don't agree with homes on small lots or driveways from an alley in the back.
-  **Anonymous user's Opinion**
Bedroom community housing. Not walkable, lacks character, interest. Very Midwestern

-  **Anonymous user's Opinion**
Any one of the houses would be nice in most neighborhoods.
-  **Anonymous user's Opinion**
These look fine
-  **Anonymous user's Opinion**
B & C look to be too close to the nearby homes as well as too close to the street.
-  **Anonymous user's Opinion**
good variety
-  **Anonymous user's Opinion**
nice looking neighborhood, good for people, not bees, not farms. C looks like my block. Neighbor has so many bee hives we cant be outside. I grilled for company last night, bees were all over. It was a warm October night, we would have eaten outside but too many bees.
-  **Anonymous user's Opinion**
Unique housing that minimizes urban sprawl of cookie cutter houses that are sandwiched close to each other with minimal trees is more appealing to me personally.
-  **Anonymous user's Opinion**
I don't like houses that don't have garages/have garages pushed back. It looks odd, and if the garage is behind the home then it typically means a super small lot and tight fits in the alley.
-  **Anonymous user's Opinion**
There are many other factors, like how busy the road is in front of the house and proximity to amenities. In general, smaller lots with bigger community spaces and ability to access amenities are most desirable.
-  **Anonymous user's Opinion**
I like the variety. I rate A slightly lower because hilled drives are hard to snow blow, but I like the look. There are limited ranches like in D in Fitchburg. I'd like to see more.
-  **Anonymous user's Opinion**
A. Too large for the size of the lot. D. Very typical B. and C. no street appeal. Where are the architects with good taste?
-  **Anonymous user's Opinion**
I think ALL of these homes are appropriate depending on the closeness of a subdivision park. Homes closer together with smaller yards need SAFE, CLEAN, ACCESSIBLE parks closer by.
-  **Anonymous user's Opinion**
We don't need more cheap veridian homes. Believe me, I owned one.
-  **Anonymous user's Opinion**
Prefer mature trees and space between houses
-  **Anonymous user's Opinion**
We can do better than this!
-  **Anonymous user's Opinion**
This survey makes no sense.
-  **Anonymous user's Opinion**
These all look like very expensive houses. Out of range for the average home buyer.

What do you think about these smaller apartments, condominiums, and townhouses (owned or rented)?

Rate the content of each image using the rating scale above.

CURRENT RESULTS						197 Total Responses
	1	2	3	4	5	
Image A	9% (17)	14% (28)	18% (35)	35% (69)	24% (48)	
Image B	14% (28)	19% (38)	20% (39)	27% (53)	20% (39)	

REGISTERED (114)						
	1	2	3	4	5	
Image A	6.0% (7)	15.0% (17)	18.0% (20)	40.0% (46)	21.0% (24)	
Image B	13.0% (15)	20.0% (23)	19.0% (22)	31.0% (35)	17.0% (19)	

NON-REGISTERED (83)						
	1	2	3	4	5	
Image A	12.0% (10)	13.3% (11)	18.1% (15)	27.7% (23)	28.9% (24)	
Image B	15.7% (13)	18.1% (15)	20.5% (17)	21.7% (18)	24.1% (20)	

ALL RESPONDENTS (197)						
	1	2	3	4	5	
Image A	9% (17)	14% (28)	18% (35)	35% (69)	24% (48)	
Image B	14% (28)	19% (38)	20% (39)	27% (53)	20% (39)	

REGISTERED VOTERS IN FITCHBURG, WI (114)						
	1	2	3	4	5	
Image A	6% (7)	15% (17)	18% (20)	40% (46)	21% (24)	
Image B	13% (15)	20% (23)	19% (22)	31% (35)	17% (19)	

LIVE IN FITCHBURG, WI (166) - SELF-REPORTED						
	1	2	3	4	5	
Image A	8% (14)	14% (23)	16% (27)	38% (63)	23% (39)	
Image B	16% (27)	18% (30)	20% (33)	28% (47)	17% (29)	

SUBSCRIBERS TO FITCHBURG, WI (169)						
	1	2	3	4	5	
Image A	8% (14)	14% (23)	17% (28)	38% (64)	24% (40)	
Image B	16% (27)	19% (32)	20% (34)	28% (47)	17% (29)	

REGISTER RESPONDENTS FROM ANYWHERE (117)						
	1	2	3	4	5	
Image A	6% (7)	15% (17)	18% (21)	39% (46)	22% (26)	
Image B	13% (15)	21% (24)	20% (23)	30% (35)	17% (20)	

EDUCATION						117 REGISTERED VOTERS
	1	2	3	4	5	
Bach Degree - Extremely Likely (24)						
Image A	8.3% (2.0)	8.3% (2.0)	25.0% (6.0)	33.3% (8.0)	25.0% (6.0)	
Image B	16.7% (4.0)	4.2% (1.0)	20.8% (5.0)	45.8% (11.0)	12.5% (3.0)	

Bach Degree - Likely (14)

Image A	14.3% (2.0)	21.4% (3.0)	14.3% (2.0)	28.6% (4.0)	21.4% (3.0)
Image B	21.4% (3.0)	14.3% (2.0)	21.4% (3.0)	35.7% (5.0)	7.1% (1.0)

Grad Degree - Extremely Likely (14)

Image A	-	7.1% (1.0)	21.4% (3.0)	50.0% (7.0)	21.4% (3.0)
Image B	-	28.6% (4.0)	21.4% (3.0)	28.6% (4.0)	21.4% (3.0)

Grad Degree - Likely (8)

Image A	-	37.5% (3.0)	12.5% (1.0)	25.0% (2.0)	25.0% (2.0)
Image B	-	25.0% (2.0)	25.0% (2.0)	37.5% (3.0)	12.5% (1.0)

HS Diploma - Extremely Likely (5)

Image A	-	20.0% (1.0)	20.0% (1.0)	20.0% (1.0)	40.0% (2.0)
Image B	-	20.0% (1.0)	-	60.0% (3.0)	20.0% (1.0)

HS Diploma - Likely (2)

Image A	-	-	-	50.0% (1.0)	50.0% (1.0)
Image B	-	-	50.0% (1.0)	-	50.0% (1.0)

Less than HS Diploma - Likely (1)

Image A	-	-	-	-	100.0% (1.0)
Image B	-	-	-	100.0% (1.0)	-

Some College - Likely (9)

Image A	11.1% (1.0)	11.1% (1.0)	44.4% (4.0)	33.3% (3.0)	-
Image B	11.1% (1.0)	22.2% (2.0)	22.2% (2.0)	11.1% (1.0)	33.3% (3.0)

Some College -Extremely Likely (3)

Image A	-	33.3% (1.0)	-	33.3% (1.0)	33.3% (1.0)
Image B	-	-	33.3% (1.0)	66.7% (2.0)	-

Unknown (37)

Image A	5.4% (2.0)	13.5% (5.0)	10.8% (4.0)	51.4% (19.0)	18.9% (7.0)
Image B	18.9% (7.0)	32.4% (12.0)	16.2% (6.0)	13.5% (5.0)	18.9% (7.0)

VOTERS GENDER

117 REGISTERED VOTERS

1	2	3	4	5
---	---	---	---	---

F (59)

Image A	3.4% (2.0)	18.6% (11.0)	16.9% (10.0)	39.0% (23.0)	22.0% (13.0)
Image B	5.1% (3.0)	15.3% (9.0)	22.0% (13.0)	30.5% (18.0)	27.1% (16.0)

M (57)

Image A	8.8% (5.0)	10.5% (6.0)	19.3% (11.0)	38.6% (22.0)	22.8% (13.0)
Image B	21.1% (12.0)	24.6% (14.0)	17.5% (10.0)	29.8% (17.0)	7.0% (4.0)

Unknown (1)

Image A	-	-	-	100.0% (1.0)	-
Image B	-	100.0% (1.0)	-	-	-

PRECINCT

117 REGISTERED VOTERS

1	2	3	4	5
---	---	---	---	---

CHICAGO 43-04 (1)

Image A	-	-	-	-	100.0% (1.0)
Image B	-	-	-	-	100.0% (1.0)
DUNN TOWN WARD 4 (1)					
Image A	-	-	-	100.0% (1.0)	-
Image B	100.0% (1.0)	-	-	-	-
FITCHBURG CITY WARD 01 (5)					
Image A	-	20.0% (1.0)	40.0% (2.0)	40.0% (2.0)	-
Image B	-	20.0% (1.0)	40.0% (2.0)	20.0% (1.0)	20.0% (1.0)
FITCHBURG CITY WARD 02 (2)					
Image A	-	-	100.0% (2.0)	-	-
Image B	50.0% (1.0)	-	50.0% (1.0)	-	-
FITCHBURG CITY WARD 03 (1)					
Image A	-	100.0% (1.0)	-	-	-
Image B	-	-	-	-	100.0% (1.0)
FITCHBURG CITY WARD 04 (1)					
Image A	-	-	-	-	100.0% (1.0)
Image B	-	-	100.0% (1.0)	-	-
FITCHBURG CITY WARD 05 (5)					
Image A	20.0% (1.0)	20.0% (1.0)	-	20.0% (1.0)	40.0% (2.0)
Image B	40.0% (2.0)	-	20.0% (1.0)	40.0% (2.0)	-
FITCHBURG CITY WARD 06 (9)					
Image A	-	11.1% (1.0)	22.2% (2.0)	44.4% (4.0)	22.2% (2.0)
Image B	-	44.4% (4.0)	11.1% (1.0)	22.2% (2.0)	22.2% (2.0)
FITCHBURG CITY WARD 07 (9)					
Image A	11.1% (1.0)	22.2% (2.0)	33.3% (3.0)	33.3% (3.0)	-
Image B	-	11.1% (1.0)	22.2% (2.0)	11.1% (1.0)	55.6% (5.0)
FITCHBURG CITY WARD 08 (10)					
Image A	-	30.0% (3.0)	-	30.0% (3.0)	40.0% (4.0)
Image B	-	20.0% (2.0)	10.0% (1.0)	50.0% (5.0)	20.0% (2.0)
FITCHBURG CITY WARD 09 (4)					
Image A	-	-	-	100.0% (4.0)	-
Image B	25.0% (1.0)	50.0% (2.0)	-	-	25.0% (1.0)
FITCHBURG CITY WARD 12 (2)					
Image A	-	-	-	50.0% (1.0)	50.0% (1.0)
Image B	-	50.0% (1.0)	-	50.0% (1.0)	-
FITCHBURG CITY WARD 13 (19)					
Image A	10.5% (2.0)	21.1% (4.0)	5.3% (1.0)	52.6% (10.0)	10.5% (2.0)
Image B	-	15.8% (3.0)	21.1% (4.0)	42.1% (8.0)	21.1% (4.0)
FITCHBURG CITY WARD 14 (12)					
Image A	-	16.7% (2.0)	33.3% (4.0)	41.7% (5.0)	8.3% (1.0)
Image B	16.7% (2.0)	-	16.7% (2.0)	58.3% (7.0)	8.3% (1.0)
FITCHBURG CITY WARD 15 (4)					

Image A	-	-	25.0% (1.0)	-	75.0% (3.0)
Image B	25.0% (1.0)	-	-	50.0% (2.0)	25.0% (1.0)

FITCHBURG CITY WARD 16 (1)

Image A	-	100.0% (1.0)	-	-	-
Image B	-	-	100.0% (1.0)	-	-

FITCHBURG CITY WARD 17 (7)

Image A	14.3% (1.0)	-	14.3% (1.0)	57.1% (4.0)	14.3% (1.0)
Image B	14.3% (1.0)	28.6% (2.0)	28.6% (2.0)	28.6% (2.0)	-

FITCHBURG CITY WARD 18 (8)

Image A	12.5% (1.0)	-	-	62.5% (5.0)	25.0% (2.0)
Image B	50.0% (4.0)	37.5% (3.0)	12.5% (1.0)	-	-

FITCHBURG CITY WARD 19 (13)

Image A	7.7% (1.0)	7.7% (1.0)	30.8% (4.0)	23.1% (3.0)	30.8% (4.0)
Image B	15.4% (2.0)	30.8% (4.0)	23.1% (3.0)	23.1% (3.0)	7.7% (1.0)

MADISON CITY WARD 100 (1)

Image A	-	-	-	-	100.0% (1.0)
Image B	-	-	-	100.0% (1.0)	-

MADISON CITY WARD 107 (1)

Image A	-	-	100.0% (1.0)	-	-
Image B	-	-	100.0% (1.0)	-	-

OREGON VLG WARD 09 (1)

Image A	-	-	-	-	100.0% (1.0)
Image B	-	100.0% (1.0)	-	-	-

AGE RANGE

117 REGISTERED VOTERS

	1	2	3	4	5
--	---	---	---	---	---

18-29 (1)

Image A	-	100.0% (1.0)	-	-	-
Image B	-	-	-	-	100.0% (1.0)

30-39 (16)

Image A	12.5% (2.0)	6.3% (1.0)	31.3% (5.0)	18.8% (3.0)	31.3% (5.0)
Image B	18.8% (3.0)	25.0% (4.0)	25.0% (4.0)	25.0% (4.0)	6.3% (1.0)

40-49 (19)

Image A	5.3% (1.0)	5.3% (1.0)	15.8% (3.0)	52.6% (10.0)	21.1% (4.0)
Image B	15.8% (3.0)	26.3% (5.0)	31.6% (6.0)	15.8% (3.0)	10.5% (2.0)

50-59 (14)

Image A	-	7.1% (1.0)	28.6% (4.0)	50.0% (7.0)	14.3% (2.0)
Image B	14.3% (2.0)	21.4% (3.0)	7.1% (1.0)	42.9% (6.0)	14.3% (2.0)

60-69 (15)

Image A	-	33.3% (5.0)	20.0% (3.0)	26.7% (4.0)	20.0% (3.0)
Image B	6.7% (1.0)	6.7% (1.0)	13.3% (2.0)	33.3% (5.0)	40.0% (6.0)

70-79 (11)

Image A	9.1% (1.0)	45.5% (5.0)	-	36.4% (4.0)	9.1% (1.0)
Image B	-	9.1% (1.0)	18.2% (2.0)	36.4% (4.0)	36.4% (4.0)

unknown (41)

Image A	7.3% (3.0)	7.3% (3.0)	14.6% (6.0)	43.9% (18.0)	26.8% (11.0)
Image B	14.6% (6.0)	24.4% (10.0)	19.5% (8.0)	31.7% (13.0)	9.8% (4.0)

VOTERS AGE 117 REGISTERED VOTERS

	1	2	3	4	5
--	---	---	---	---	---

28 (1)

Image A	-	100.0% (1.0)	-	-	-
Image B	-	-	-	-	100.0% (1.0)

31 (1)

Image A	-	-	100.0% (1.0)	-	-
Image B	100.0% (1.0)	-	-	-	-

34 (1)

Image A	-	-	-	100.0% (1.0)	-
Image B	-	100.0% (1.0)	-	-	-

35 (2)

Image A	-	50.0% (1.0)	50.0% (1.0)	-	-
Image B	50.0% (1.0)	-	50.0% (1.0)	-	-

36 (2)

Image A	-	-	-	-	100.0% (2.0)
Image B	50.0% (1.0)	50.0% (1.0)	-	-	-

37 (4)

Image A	25.0% (1.0)	-	25.0% (1.0)	50.0% (2.0)	-
Image B	-	-	50.0% (2.0)	25.0% (1.0)	25.0% (1.0)

38 (3)

Image A	-	-	33.3% (1.0)	-	66.7% (2.0)
Image B	-	33.3% (1.0)	-	66.7% (2.0)	-

39 (3)

Image A	33.3% (1.0)	-	33.3% (1.0)	-	33.3% (1.0)
Image B	-	33.3% (1.0)	33.3% (1.0)	33.3% (1.0)	-

40 (4)

Image A	-	-	25.0% (1.0)	50.0% (2.0)	25.0% (1.0)
Image B	-	75.0% (3.0)	25.0% (1.0)	-	-

43 (2)

Image A	50.0% (1.0)	-	-	50.0% (1.0)	-
Image B	50.0% (1.0)	-	-	-	50.0% (1.0)

44 (5)

Image A	-	20.0% (1.0)	-	60.0% (3.0)	20.0% (1.0)
Image B	40.0% (2.0)	-	40.0% (2.0)	20.0% (1.0)	-

45 (2)

Image A	-	-	-	100.0% (2.0)	-
Image B	-	-	50.0% (1.0)	50.0% (1.0)	-

46 (1)

Image A	-	-	-	-	100.0% (1.0)
Image B	-	100.0% (1.0)	-	-	-

47 (2)

Image A	-	-	-	50.0% (1.0)	50.0% (1.0)
Image B	-	50.0% (1.0)	-	-	50.0% (1.0)

49 (3)

Image A	-	-	66.7% (2.0)	33.3% (1.0)	-
Image B	-	-	66.7% (2.0)	33.3% (1.0)	-

50 (1)

Image A	-	-	100.0% (1.0)	-	-
Image B	-	-	-	100.0% (1.0)	-

52 (4)

Image A	-	-	25.0% (1.0)	50.0% (2.0)	25.0% (1.0)
Image B	-	50.0% (2.0)	25.0% (1.0)	25.0% (1.0)	-

53 (1)

Image A	-	-	-	100.0% (1.0)	-
Image B	100.0% (1.0)	-	-	-	-

55 (1)

Image A	-	100.0% (1.0)	-	-	-
Image B	-	-	-	-	100.0% (1.0)

56 (2)

Image A	-	-	50.0% (1.0)	50.0% (1.0)	-
Image B	50.0% (1.0)	-	-	50.0% (1.0)	-

57 (2)

Image A	-	-	-	100.0% (2.0)	-
Image B	-	50.0% (1.0)	-	50.0% (1.0)	-

59 (3)

Image A	-	-	33.3% (1.0)	33.3% (1.0)	33.3% (1.0)
Image B	-	-	-	66.7% (2.0)	33.3% (1.0)

60 (1)

Image A	-	-	100.0% (1.0)	-	-
Image B	-	-	-	100.0% (1.0)	-

61 (2)

Image A	-	50.0% (1.0)	50.0% (1.0)	-	-
Image B	-	-	-	50.0% (1.0)	50.0% (1.0)

62 (3)

Image A	-	33.3% (1.0)	-	33.3% (1.0)	33.3% (1.0)
Image B	-	-	-	66.7% (2.0)	33.3% (1.0)

63 (2)

Image A	-	-	-	100.0% (2.0)	-
Image B	-	-	-	50.0% (1.0)	50.0% (1.0)
64 (2)					
Image A	-	-	50.0% (1.0)	-	50.0% (1.0)
Image B	-	-	100.0% (2.0)	-	-
65 (1)					
Image A	-	100.0% (1.0)	-	-	-
Image B	-	-	-	-	100.0% (1.0)
66 (1)					
Image A	-	100.0% (1.0)	-	-	-
Image B	-	-	-	-	100.0% (1.0)
68 (1)					
Image A	-	-	-	-	100.0% (1.0)
Image B	100.0% (1.0)	-	-	-	-
69 (2)					
Image A	-	50.0% (1.0)	-	50.0% (1.0)	-
Image B	-	50.0% (1.0)	-	-	50.0% (1.0)
70 (1)					
Image A	-	100.0% (1.0)	-	-	-
Image B	-	-	-	-	100.0% (1.0)
72 (1)					
Image A	-	100.0% (1.0)	-	-	-
Image B	-	-	-	100.0% (1.0)	-
73 (3)					
Image A	-	-	-	100.0% (3.0)	-
Image B	-	-	33.3% (1.0)	66.7% (2.0)	-
74 (2)					
Image A	50.0% (1.0)	50.0% (1.0)	-	-	-
Image B	-	50.0% (1.0)	-	-	50.0% (1.0)
77 (2)					
Image A	-	50.0% (1.0)	-	-	50.0% (1.0)
Image B	-	-	-	50.0% (1.0)	50.0% (1.0)
79 (2)					
Image A	-	50.0% (1.0)	-	50.0% (1.0)	-
Image B	-	-	50.0% (1.0)	-	50.0% (1.0)
Unknown (41)					
Image A	7.3% (3.0)	7.3% (3.0)	14.6% (6.0)	43.9% (18.0)	26.8% (11.0)
Image B	14.6% (6.0)	24.4% (10.0)	19.5% (8.0)	31.7% (13.0)	9.8% (4.0)

STATE INCOME
DECILE



















117 REGISTERED VOTERS






















1	2	3	4	5
---	---	---	---	---

0 to 9 Pct range (3)

Image A	-	-	33.3% (1.0)	-	66.7% (2.0)
Image B	33.3% (1.0)	33.3% (1.0)	33.3% (1.0)	-	-
10 to 19 Pct range (1)					
Image A	-	100.0% (1.0)	-	-	-
Image B	-	-	-	-	100.0% (1.0)
40 to 49 Pct range (1)					
Image A	-	-	100.0% (1.0)	-	-
Image B	-	-	100.0% (1.0)	-	-
50 to 59 Pct range (5)					
Image A	-	20.0% (1.0)	20.0% (1.0)	60.0% (3.0)	-
Image B	-	20.0% (1.0)	20.0% (1.0)	40.0% (2.0)	20.0% (1.0)
60 to 69 Pct range (3)					
Image A	-	-	-	100.0% (3.0)	-
Image B	33.3% (1.0)	33.3% (1.0)	-	-	33.3% (1.0)
70 to 79 Pct range (3)					
Image A	-	-	66.7% (2.0)	-	33.3% (1.0)
Image B	33.3% (1.0)	-	33.3% (1.0)	33.3% (1.0)	-
80 to 89 Pct range (45)					
Image A	6.7% (3.0)	15.6% (7.0)	15.6% (7.0)	44.4% (20.0)	17.8% (8.0)
Image B	11.1% (5.0)	13.3% (6.0)	17.8% (8.0)	44.4% (20.0)	13.3% (6.0)
90 Pct and up (54)					
Image A	5.6% (3.0)	14.8% (8.0)	16.7% (9.0)	35.2% (19.0)	27.8% (15.0)
Image B	13.0% (7.0)	27.8% (15.0)	18.5% (10.0)	22.2% (12.0)	18.5% (10.0)
Unknown (2)					
Image A	50.0% (1.0)	-	-	50.0% (1.0)	-
Image B	-	-	50.0% (1.0)	-	50.0% (1.0)
HOME OWNER/RENTER					
	1	2	3	4	5
Likely Homeowner (68)					
Image A	7.4% (5.0)	19.1% (13.0)	20.6% (14.0)	33.8% (23.0)	19.1% (13.0)
Image B	14.7% (10.0)	19.1% (13.0)	22.1% (15.0)	32.4% (22.0)	11.8% (8.0)
Likely Renter (33)					
Image A	3.0% (1.0)	12.1% (4.0)	12.1% (4.0)	48.5% (16.0)	24.2% (8.0)
Image B	9.1% (3.0)	18.2% (6.0)	18.2% (6.0)	27.3% (9.0)	27.3% (9.0)
Unknown (16)					
Image A	6.3% (1.0)	-	18.8% (3.0)	43.8% (7.0)	31.3% (5.0)
Image B	12.5% (2.0)	31.3% (5.0)	12.5% (2.0)	25.0% (4.0)	18.8% (3.0)

If you have any comments about your answers to the above questions please provide them here.

-
-  **Anonymous user's Opinion**
Do not like houses that are so close together you could borrow a cup of sugar from your neighbor just by opening your window. Prefer housing set back from the street further.
-  **Anonymous user's Opinion**
A is attractive. B style or arrangement of the building is ok, but the exterior is dated for today's construction. It needs more color and differences in siding materials like A.
-  **Anonymous user's Opinion**
A too close to streets.
-  **Anonymous user's Opinion**
I live in a town home similar. I think it makes sense to have smaller condominiums and townhouses in this area. It's a great option for first time home buyers. Especially, with how close together the homes are the the gap between pricing.
-  **Anonymous user's Opinion**
Hey builders! We asked our community what they want and they said they want Image A, so put in a plan for Image A and we'll rubber stamp it for the next decade.
-  **Anonymous user's Opinion**
Image b is like a townhouse pretending to be a giant house x but it looks ridiculous. Especially that giant garage and the roof above it.
-  **Anonymous user's Opinion**
sick of building jamming these super housing units together without anyone altering traffic, putting in roundabouts or stop signs. Also closeness to the street depends on the speed limit. Syene's latest is not good
-  **Anonymous user's Opinion**
Townhouses that are closer to the road, with a carriage road to the garage / underground parking, is much preferred.
-  **Anonymous user's Opinion**
They're both ugly! Too much going on. A is at least honest that they are townhouses and I think that's appealing actually.
-  **Anonymous user's Opinion**
Not clear if "A" has a garage, which is essential.
-  **Anonymous user's Opinion**
I don't like the stairways of the 1st image. I like that the second image is one level for each
-  **Anonymous user's Opinion**
Condos are great to live in. I especially like the bright yellow with funky decorative elements. The other one looks boring and I'm sure people will buy it but it sucks aesthetically.
-  **Anonymous user's Opinion**
This type of housing should be denser than Image B. I also think they should be more vertical - allow more stories.
-  **Anonymous user's Opinion**
where are the trees?
-  **Anonymous user's Opinion**
Would like to see screen porches for greater privacy and to keep pets and small children safely inside. Also, steps at entrance are not handicap accessible - important as population ages in addition to just being accommodating.
-  **Stephen Lloyd Arnold's Opinion**
A uses land sparingly, and will coexist nicely with single-family homes. B wastes too much land and encourages driving everywhere. We need more mid-density housing like A!
-  **Anonymous user's Opinion**
We need more one level homes for seniors and those with disabilities. STAIRS are impossible for so many of these people.
-  **Anonymous user's Opinion**
The trees on A kept it from being a 2 - so close to the street. B is better away from the street but no trees downgraded it.
- Anonymous user's Opinion**
A has way too many steps to be practical for anyone with kids, dogs, disabilities, or elderly. What a pain to haul groceries up those steps! B is too big and looks like it's trying to be something it's not, but it

-  does appear to be more accessible.
-  **Anonymous user's Opinion**
Each are good. Variety and setting matter
-  **Anonymous user's Opinion**
A is too close to the street, looks attractive but no greenspace
-  **Anonymous user's Opinion**
very ordinary.... not special....I feel like I am in the midwest...
-  **Anonymous user's Opinion**
The building in image A is not as accessible as if building B, whether a person is a senior citizen or a young family pushing a baby stroller.
-  **Anonymous user's Opinion**
These look pretty bad
-  **Anonymous user's Opinion**
street parking terrible. In the winter its unsafe
-  **Anonymous user's Opinion**
N/A
-  **Anonymous user's Opinion**
Image A - no clear place for folks to park, street parking only clogs up neighborhood streets. Otherwise, both look like great sizes that would fit well into a neighborhood.
-  **Anonymous user's Opinion**
Like having a garage attached to the housing.
-  **Anonymous user's Opinion**
Both are visibly pleasing. A is not accessible for wheelchairs or elderly.
-  **Anonymous user's Opinion**
A.what an ugly color B. looks more like a home
-  **Anonymous user's Opinion**
I like the style of image A but hate the colors
-  **Anonymous user's Opinion**
A would be better than B if set back further from the road. B is deceiving in it's size and layout. It looks goofy but it's set back further from the road and would be nice for a multi-generation family or group of families if affordable.
-  **Anonymous user's Opinion**
clean front facing townhouses look modern
-  **Anonymous user's Opinion**
It depends on the context and surround developments. Selecting one building style out of its context is not relevant. Location, location, location. Is this in mixed use commercial area, or transitional to low density. For the lower density A is preferred. B looks dated and does not use land efficiently.
-  **Anonymous user's Opinion**
Please add biking and walking paths along main roadways - Fitchrona Rd. has the Quarry Vista Neighborhood that would love to be connected to the stores and we would like to have a safe way to access stores without a vehicle.
-  **Anonymous user's Opinion**
More appealing than the apartment buildings that contain dozens more apartments. Seem more homey.
-  **Anonymous user's Opinion**
All the developers want to pack as many units as possible onto lots. We should consider a patio home development for older folks. 3-4 floors is impossible for us to navigate.
-  **Anonymous user's Opinion**
Both look nice
-  **Anonymous user's Opinion**
A is really close to the road/sidewalk. I like properties that have more space between them or are oriented in a way they seem to take less space than they do.



Anonymous user's Opinion

I don't want either, I want more single family detached homes

What do you think about these larger apartments and condominiums (owned or rented)?

Rate the content of each image using the rating scale above.

CURRENT RESULTS					222 Total Responses
	1	2	3	4	5
Image A	14% (32)	15% (33)	18% (40)	32% (71)	21% (46)
Image B	9% (20)	11% (25)	21% (46)	34% (75)	25% (56)

REGISTERED (132)					
	1	2	3	4	5
Image A	12.0% (16)	14.0% (19)	16.0% (21)	36.0% (48)	21.0% (28)
Image B	9.0% (12)	11.0% (14)	21.0% (28)	36.0% (47)	23.0% (31)

NON-REGISTERED (90)					
	1	2	3	4	5
Image A	17.8% (16)	15.6% (14)	21.1% (19)	25.6% (23)	20.0% (18)
Image B	8.9% (8)	12.2% (11)	20.0% (18)	31.1% (28)	27.8% (25)

ALL RESPONDENTS (222)					
	1	2	3	4	5
Image A	14% (32)	15% (33)	18% (40)	32% (71)	21% (46)
Image B	9% (20)	11% (25)	21% (46)	34% (75)	25% (56)

REGISTERED VOTERS IN FITCHBURG, WI (132)					
	1	2	3	4	5
Image A	12% (16)	14% (19)	16% (21)	36% (48)	21% (28)
Image B	9% (12)	11% (14)	21% (28)	36% (47)	23% (31)

LIVE IN FITCHBURG, WI (189) - SELF-REPORTED					
	1	2	3	4	5
Image A	12% (23)	15% (28)	18% (34)	33% (63)	22% (41)
Image B	8% (16)	12% (23)	21% (40)	34% (64)	24% (46)

SUBSCRIBERS TO FITCHBURG, WI (194)					
	1	2	3	4	5
Image A	12% (23)	15% (30)	18% (34)	34% (66)	21% (41)
Image B	8% (16)	12% (23)	21% (41)	34% (66)	25% (48)

REGISTER RESPONDENTS FROM ANYWHERE (136)					
	1	2	3	4	5
Image A	13% (17)	15% (21)	15% (21)	37% (50)	21% (29)
Image B	9% (12)	10% (14)	21% (29)	36% (49)	25% (34)

EDUCATION					138 REGISTERED VOTERS
	1	2	3	4	5

Bach Degree - Extremely Likely (28)					
Image A	10.7% (3.0)	7.1% (2.0)	7.1% (2.0)	53.6% (15.0)	21.4% (6.0)
Image B	7.1% (2.0)	10.7% (3.0)	25.0% (7.0)	25.0% (7.0)	32.1% (9.0)

Bach Degree - Likely (16)

Image A	18.8% (3.0)	12.5% (2.0)	18.8% (3.0)	25.0% (4.0)	25.0% (4.0)
Image B	25.0% (4.0)	-	25.0% (4.0)	31.3% (5.0)	18.8% (3.0)

Grad Degree - Extremely Likely (16)

Image A	12.5% (2.0)	25.0% (4.0)	12.5% (2.0)	12.5% (2.0)	37.5% (6.0)
Image B	12.5% (2.0)	-	18.8% (3.0)	37.5% (6.0)	31.3% (5.0)

Grad Degree - Likely (11)

Image A	9.1% (1.0)	-	18.2% (2.0)	54.5% (6.0)	18.2% (2.0)
Image B	9.1% (1.0)	27.3% (3.0)	18.2% (2.0)	9.1% (1.0)	36.4% (4.0)

HS Diploma - Extremely Likely (5)

Image A	-	20.0% (1.0)	20.0% (1.0)	60.0% (3.0)	-
Image B	20.0% (1.0)	-	20.0% (1.0)	40.0% (2.0)	20.0% (1.0)

HS Diploma - Likely (2)

Image A	50.0% (1.0)	-	-	50.0% (1.0)	-
Image B	50.0% (1.0)	50.0% (1.0)	-	-	-

Less than HS Diploma - Likely (1)

Image A	-	-	-	-	100.0% (1.0)
Image B	-	-	-	100.0% (1.0)	-

Some College - Likely (10)

Image A	10.0% (1.0)	20.0% (2.0)	40.0% (4.0)	20.0% (2.0)	10.0% (1.0)
Image B	-	-	20.0% (2.0)	60.0% (6.0)	20.0% (2.0)

Some College -Extremely Likely (3)

Image A	-	-	33.3% (1.0)	-	66.7% (2.0)
Image B	-	-	-	33.3% (1.0)	66.7% (2.0)

Unknown (46)

Image A	13.0% (6.0)	21.7% (10.0)	13.0% (6.0)	37.0% (17.0)	15.2% (7.0)
Image B	2.2% (1.0)	15.2% (7.0)	21.7% (10.0)	43.5% (20.0)	17.4% (8.0)

VOTERS GENDER

138 REGISTERED VOTERS

1	2	3	4	5
---	---	---	---	---

F (69)

Image A	14.5% (10.0)	18.8% (13.0)	18.8% (13.0)	29.0% (20.0)	18.8% (13.0)
Image B	4.3% (3.0)	7.2% (5.0)	21.7% (15.0)	37.7% (26.0)	29.0% (20.0)

M (68)

Image A	10.3% (7.0)	11.8% (8.0)	11.8% (8.0)	44.1% (30.0)	22.1% (15.0)
Image B	13.2% (9.0)	13.2% (9.0)	20.6% (14.0)	33.8% (23.0)	19.1% (13.0)

Unknown (1)

Image A	-	-	-	-	100.0% (1.0)
Image B	-	-	-	-	100.0% (1.0)

PRECINCT

138 REGISTERED VOTERS

1	2	3	4	5
---	---	---	---	---

CHICAGO 43-04 (1)

Image A	-	-	-	-	100.0% (1.0)
Image B	-	-	-	-	100.0% (1.0)
FITCHBURG CITY WARD 01 (6)					
Image A	-	16.7% (1.0)	16.7% (1.0)	66.7% (4.0)	-
Image B	-	16.7% (1.0)	16.7% (1.0)	50.0% (3.0)	16.7% (1.0)
FITCHBURG CITY WARD 02 (2)					
Image A	-	-	50.0% (1.0)	50.0% (1.0)	-
Image B	-	50.0% (1.0)	50.0% (1.0)	-	-
FITCHBURG CITY WARD 03 (2)					
Image A	50.0% (1.0)	-	-	-	50.0% (1.0)
Image B	50.0% (1.0)	-	-	50.0% (1.0)	-
FITCHBURG CITY WARD 04 (2)					
Image A	-	-	50.0% (1.0)	-	50.0% (1.0)
Image B	-	-	50.0% (1.0)	50.0% (1.0)	-
FITCHBURG CITY WARD 05 (7)					
Image A	28.6% (2.0)	14.3% (1.0)	-	28.6% (2.0)	28.6% (2.0)
Image B	14.3% (1.0)	-	28.6% (2.0)	14.3% (1.0)	42.9% (3.0)
FITCHBURG CITY WARD 06 (9)					
Image A	22.2% (2.0)	22.2% (2.0)	-	33.3% (3.0)	22.2% (2.0)
Image B	11.1% (1.0)	11.1% (1.0)	22.2% (2.0)	22.2% (2.0)	33.3% (3.0)
FITCHBURG CITY WARD 07 (11)					
Image A	36.4% (4.0)	18.2% (2.0)	9.1% (1.0)	18.2% (2.0)	18.2% (2.0)
Image B	-	9.1% (1.0)	27.3% (3.0)	36.4% (4.0)	27.3% (3.0)
FITCHBURG CITY WARD 08 (11)					
Image A	-	9.1% (1.0)	9.1% (1.0)	63.6% (7.0)	18.2% (2.0)
Image B	9.1% (1.0)	-	18.2% (2.0)	27.3% (3.0)	45.5% (5.0)
FITCHBURG CITY WARD 09 (4)					
Image A	-	25.0% (1.0)	-	25.0% (1.0)	50.0% (2.0)
Image B	-	25.0% (1.0)	-	50.0% (2.0)	25.0% (1.0)
FITCHBURG CITY WARD 12 (1)					
Image A	-	-	-	100.0% (1.0)	-
Image B	-	-	-	-	100.0% (1.0)
FITCHBURG CITY WARD 13 (24)					
Image A	16.7% (4.0)	12.5% (3.0)	16.7% (4.0)	41.7% (10.0)	12.5% (3.0)
Image B	20.8% (5.0)	16.7% (4.0)	25.0% (6.0)	25.0% (6.0)	12.5% (3.0)
FITCHBURG CITY WARD 14 (16)					
Image A	6.3% (1.0)	6.3% (1.0)	43.8% (7.0)	31.3% (5.0)	12.5% (2.0)
Image B	-	12.5% (2.0)	6.3% (1.0)	50.0% (8.0)	31.3% (5.0)
FITCHBURG CITY WARD 15 (5)					
Image A	-	-	20.0% (1.0)	40.0% (2.0)	40.0% (2.0)
Image B	-	20.0% (1.0)	20.0% (1.0)	20.0% (1.0)	40.0% (2.0)
FITCHBURG CITY WARD 16 (2)					

Image A	-	-	-	50.0% (1.0)	50.0% (1.0)
Image B	-	-	-	50.0% (1.0)	50.0% (1.0)

FITCHBURG CITY WARD 17 (7)

Image A	14.3% (1.0)	14.3% (1.0)	-	28.6% (2.0)	42.9% (3.0)
Image B	-	14.3% (1.0)	42.9% (3.0)	14.3% (1.0)	28.6% (2.0)

FITCHBURG CITY WARD 18 (9)

Image A	22.2% (2.0)	11.1% (1.0)	22.2% (2.0)	33.3% (3.0)	11.1% (1.0)
Image B	11.1% (1.0)	11.1% (1.0)	22.2% (2.0)	55.6% (5.0)	-

FITCHBURG CITY WARD 19 (14)

Image A	-	28.6% (4.0)	14.3% (2.0)	28.6% (4.0)	28.6% (4.0)
Image B	14.3% (2.0)	-	21.4% (3.0)	50.0% (7.0)	14.3% (2.0)

MADISON CITY WARD 100 (1)

Image A	-	-	-	100.0% (1.0)	-
Image B	-	-	-	100.0% (1.0)	-

MADISON CITY WARD 107 (1)

Image A	-	100.0% (1.0)	-	-	-
Image B	-	-	-	-	100.0% (1.0)

OREGON VLG WARD 09 (1)

Image A	-	-	-	100.0% (1.0)	-
Image B	-	-	100.0% (1.0)	-	-

OREGON VLG WARD 10 (1)

Image A	-	100.0% (1.0)	-	-	-
Image B	-	-	-	100.0% (1.0)	-

VERONA CITY WARD 8 (1)

Image A	-	100.0% (1.0)	-	-	-
Image B	-	-	-	100.0% (1.0)	-

AGE RANGE

138 REGISTERED VOTERS

	1	2	3	4	5
--	---	---	---	---	---

18-29 (1)

Image A	-	-	-	100.0% (1.0)	-
Image B	-	100.0% (1.0)	-	-	-

30-39 (20)

Image A	5.0% (1.0)	5.0% (1.0)	25.0% (5.0)	50.0% (10.0)	15.0% (3.0)
Image B	-	15.0% (3.0)	20.0% (4.0)	50.0% (10.0)	15.0% (3.0)

40-49 (24)

Image A	16.7% (4.0)	20.8% (5.0)	16.7% (4.0)	29.2% (7.0)	16.7% (4.0)
Image B	16.7% (4.0)	-	25.0% (6.0)	25.0% (6.0)	33.3% (8.0)

50-59 (18)

Image A	-	16.7% (3.0)	5.6% (1.0)	38.9% (7.0)	38.9% (7.0)
Image B	11.1% (2.0)	5.6% (1.0)	22.2% (4.0)	33.3% (6.0)	27.8% (5.0)

60-69 (16)

Image A	18.8% (3.0)	25.0% (4.0)	18.8% (3.0)	18.8% (3.0)	18.8% (3.0)
Image B	12.5% (2.0)	12.5% (2.0)	12.5% (2.0)	37.5% (6.0)	25.0% (4.0)
70-79 (12)					
Image A	50.0% (6.0)	8.3% (1.0)	-	25.0% (3.0)	16.7% (2.0)
Image B	16.7% (2.0)	8.3% (1.0)	25.0% (3.0)	41.7% (5.0)	8.3% (1.0)
80-89 (1)					
Image A	100.0% (1.0)	-	-	-	-
Image B	-	-	-	-	100.0% (1.0)
unknown (46)					
Image A	4.3% (2.0)	15.2% (7.0)	17.4% (8.0)	41.3% (19.0)	21.7% (10.0)
Image B	4.3% (2.0)	13.0% (6.0)	21.7% (10.0)	34.8% (16.0)	26.1% (12.0)

VOTERS						138 REGISTERED VOTERS
AGE	1	2	3	4	5	

28 (1)					
Image A	-	-	-	100.0% (1.0)	-
Image B	-	100.0% (1.0)	-	-	-

31 (1)					
Image A	-	-	-	100.0% (1.0)	-
Image B	-	-	100.0% (1.0)	-	-

32 (1)					
Image A	-	-	-	100.0% (1.0)	-
Image B	-	100.0% (1.0)	-	-	-

33 (1)					
Image A	-	-	100.0% (1.0)	-	-
Image B	-	-	-	100.0% (1.0)	-

35 (3)					
Image A	33.3% (1.0)	-	33.3% (1.0)	33.3% (1.0)	-
Image B	-	66.7% (2.0)	-	33.3% (1.0)	-

36 (3)					
Image A	-	-	66.7% (2.0)	-	33.3% (1.0)
Image B	-	-	66.7% (2.0)	33.3% (1.0)	-

37 (4)					
Image A	-	25.0% (1.0)	-	75.0% (3.0)	-
Image B	-	-	25.0% (1.0)	50.0% (2.0)	25.0% (1.0)

38 (3)					
Image A	-	-	33.3% (1.0)	66.7% (2.0)	-
Image B	-	-	-	100.0% (3.0)	-

39 (4)					
Image A	-	-	-	50.0% (2.0)	50.0% (2.0)
Image B	-	-	-	50.0% (2.0)	50.0% (2.0)

40 (4)					
---------------	--	--	--	--	--

Image A	-	50.0% (2.0)	25.0% (1.0)	-	25.0% (1.0)
Image B	25.0% (1.0)	-	-	25.0% (1.0)	50.0% (2.0)
43 (4)					
Image A	50.0% (2.0)	-	-	50.0% (2.0)	-
Image B	50.0% (2.0)	-	25.0% (1.0)	-	25.0% (1.0)
44 (6)					
Image A	16.7% (1.0)	-	16.7% (1.0)	16.7% (1.0)	50.0% (3.0)
Image B	-	-	50.0% (3.0)	16.7% (1.0)	33.3% (2.0)
45 (2)					
Image A	-	-	50.0% (1.0)	50.0% (1.0)	-
Image B	-	-	-	50.0% (1.0)	50.0% (1.0)
46 (3)					
Image A	-	33.3% (1.0)	-	66.7% (2.0)	-
Image B	-	-	66.7% (2.0)	33.3% (1.0)	-
47 (2)					
Image A	50.0% (1.0)	50.0% (1.0)	-	-	-
Image B	50.0% (1.0)	-	-	50.0% (1.0)	-
49 (3)					
Image A	-	33.3% (1.0)	33.3% (1.0)	33.3% (1.0)	-
Image B	-	-	-	33.3% (1.0)	66.7% (2.0)
50 (1)					
Image A	-	-	-	100.0% (1.0)	-
Image B	-	-	-	-	100.0% (1.0)
51 (1)					
Image A	-	-	-	-	100.0% (1.0)
Image B	100.0% (1.0)	-	-	-	-
52 (4)					
Image A	-	25.0% (1.0)	-	50.0% (2.0)	25.0% (1.0)
Image B	25.0% (1.0)	-	25.0% (1.0)	25.0% (1.0)	25.0% (1.0)
53 (1)					
Image A	-	-	-	-	100.0% (1.0)
Image B	-	100.0% (1.0)	-	-	-
55 (3)					
Image A	-	33.3% (1.0)	-	33.3% (1.0)	33.3% (1.0)
Image B	-	-	-	66.7% (2.0)	33.3% (1.0)
56 (2)					
Image A	-	-	50.0% (1.0)	50.0% (1.0)	-
Image B	-	-	50.0% (1.0)	50.0% (1.0)	-
57 (2)					
Image A	-	-	-	50.0% (1.0)	50.0% (1.0)
Image B	-	-	100.0% (2.0)	-	-
59 (4)					

Image A	-	25.0% (1.0)	-	25.0% (1.0)	50.0% (2.0)
Image B	-	-	-	50.0% (2.0)	50.0% (2.0)
60 (1)					
Image A	-	100.0% (1.0)	-	-	-
Image B	-	100.0% (1.0)	-	-	-
61 (2)					
Image A	-	-	50.0% (1.0)	50.0% (1.0)	-
Image B	-	-	50.0% (1.0)	50.0% (1.0)	-
62 (4)					
Image A	25.0% (1.0)	25.0% (1.0)	-	25.0% (1.0)	25.0% (1.0)
Image B	-	-	-	50.0% (2.0)	50.0% (2.0)
63 (2)					
Image A	50.0% (1.0)	-	-	50.0% (1.0)	-
Image B	50.0% (1.0)	-	-	-	50.0% (1.0)
64 (2)					
Image A	-	-	50.0% (1.0)	-	50.0% (1.0)
Image B	-	-	-	100.0% (2.0)	-
65 (1)					
Image A	-	-	100.0% (1.0)	-	-
Image B	-	-	100.0% (1.0)	-	-
66 (1)					
Image A	-	100.0% (1.0)	-	-	-
Image B	-	-	-	-	100.0% (1.0)
68 (1)					
Image A	-	-	-	-	100.0% (1.0)
Image B	-	100.0% (1.0)	-	-	-
69 (2)					
Image A	50.0% (1.0)	50.0% (1.0)	-	-	-
Image B	50.0% (1.0)	-	-	50.0% (1.0)	-
70 (2)					
Image A	100.0% (2.0)	-	-	-	-
Image B	-	-	50.0% (1.0)	50.0% (1.0)	-
72 (1)					
Image A	-	-	-	100.0% (1.0)	-
Image B	-	100.0% (1.0)	-	-	-
73 (3)					
Image A	33.3% (1.0)	-	-	-	66.7% (2.0)
Image B	-	-	33.3% (1.0)	33.3% (1.0)	33.3% (1.0)
74 (2)					
Image A	50.0% (1.0)	-	-	50.0% (1.0)	-
Image B	-	-	50.0% (1.0)	50.0% (1.0)	-
77 (2)					

Image A	100.0% (2.0)	-	-	-	-
Image B	100.0% (2.0)	-	-	-	-

79 (2)

Image A	-	50.0% (1.0)	-	50.0% (1.0)	-
Image B	-	-	-	100.0% (2.0)	-

80 (1)

Image A	100.0% (1.0)	-	-	-	-
Image B	-	-	-	-	100.0% (1.0)

Unknown (46)

Image A	4.3% (2.0)	15.2% (7.0)	17.4% (8.0)	41.3% (19.0)	21.7% (10.0)
Image B	4.3% (2.0)	13.0% (6.0)	21.7% (10.0)	34.8% (16.0)	26.1% (12.0)

**STATE INCOME
DECILE**

138 REGISTERED VOTERS

	1	2	3	4	5
--	---	---	---	---	---

0 to 9 Pct range (5)

Image A	-	-	20.0% (1.0)	60.0% (3.0)	20.0% (1.0)
Image B	-	-	40.0% (2.0)	40.0% (2.0)	20.0% (1.0)

10 to 19 Pct range (2)

Image A	50.0% (1.0)	-	-	-	50.0% (1.0)
Image B	50.0% (1.0)	-	-	50.0% (1.0)	-

40 to 49 Pct range (1)

Image A	-	-	100.0% (1.0)	-	-
Image B	-	-	-	100.0% (1.0)	-

50 to 59 Pct range (6)

Image A	-	16.7% (1.0)	-	83.3% (5.0)	-
Image B	-	16.7% (1.0)	16.7% (1.0)	33.3% (2.0)	33.3% (2.0)

60 to 69 Pct range (3)

Image A	-	33.3% (1.0)	-	-	66.7% (2.0)
Image B	-	33.3% (1.0)	-	33.3% (1.0)	33.3% (1.0)

70 to 79 Pct range (4)

Image A	-	-	25.0% (1.0)	50.0% (2.0)	25.0% (1.0)
Image B	-	25.0% (1.0)	25.0% (1.0)	25.0% (1.0)	25.0% (1.0)

80 to 89 Pct range (53)

Image A	11.3% (6.0)	9.4% (5.0)	22.6% (12.0)	37.7% (20.0)	18.9% (10.0)
Image B	9.4% (5.0)	13.2% (7.0)	20.8% (11.0)	34.0% (18.0)	22.6% (12.0)

90 Pct and up (62)

Image A	14.5% (9.0)	21.0% (13.0)	9.7% (6.0)	32.3% (20.0)	22.6% (14.0)
Image B	9.7% (6.0)	4.8% (3.0)	21.0% (13.0)	37.1% (23.0)	27.4% (17.0)

Unknown (2)

Image A	50.0% (1.0)	50.0% (1.0)	-	-	-
Image B	-	50.0% (1.0)	50.0% (1.0)	-	-

HOME OWNER/RENTER

138 REGISTERED VOTERS

	1	2	3	4	5
--	---	---	---	---	---

Likely Homeowner (83)

Image A	14.5% (12.0)	14.5% (12.0)	13.3% (11.0)	36.1% (30.0)	21.7% (18.0)
Image B	12.0% (10.0)	8.4% (7.0)	18.1% (15.0)	36.1% (30.0)	25.3% (21.0)

Likely Renter (37)

Image A	8.1% (3.0)	16.2% (6.0)	18.9% (7.0)	32.4% (12.0)	24.3% (9.0)
Image B	2.7% (1.0)	13.5% (5.0)	21.6% (8.0)	37.8% (14.0)	24.3% (9.0)

Unknown (18)

Image A	11.1% (2.0)	16.7% (3.0)	16.7% (3.0)	44.4% (8.0)	11.1% (2.0)
Image B	5.6% (1.0)	11.1% (2.0)	33.3% (6.0)	27.8% (5.0)	22.2% (4.0)

If you have any comments about your answers to the above questions please provide them here.

-
-  **Anonymous user's Opinion**
I am tired of large units. We need to keep smaller sized and focus on condos and single family homes.
-  **Anonymous user's Opinion**
Image A is more modern.
-  **Anonymous user's Opinion**
The greenery in B is nice. More distance back from the street is nice.
-  **Anonymous user's Opinion**
I don't care as much how our city grows exactly as long as we maintain diversity in all areas(including economic)
-  **Anonymous user's Opinion**
I think having the entrance to the main roads to the parking lot is a terrible idea. During rush hour people are trying to cross traffic to get in and out of the parking lots backing up traffic at the main inner sections.
-  **Anonymous user's Opinion**
Image A - apartments are way too close to the road
-  **Anonymous user's Opinion**
Is the city now doing market research for developers? If so, is that appropriate?
-  **Anonymous user's Opinion**
Both create a parking problem...have under apartment parking to keep cars off the street.
-  **Anonymous user's Opinion**
Don't like flat roofs.
-  **Anonymous user's Opinion**
"A" has a cleaner, more modern look.
-  **Anonymous user's Opinion**
Faux beige stone = bad
-  **Anonymous user's Opinion**
I prefer Option A because of the amount of green space and softer appearance.
-  **Anonymous user's Opinion**
Both are good. Picture A is a little close to the street, but both are ok. Picture A is great for more commercial developed areas and B is better as a buffer with residential townhomes into houses.
-  **Anonymous user's Opinion**
I don't mind either as long as it fits within the neighborhood it's in. The interests of single family households should be prioritized over large developments that make developers a lot of money. Single family households who own their homes have a lot of stake put into that one property. Apartment complexes need to complement the space they are in.
-  **Anonymous user's Opinion**
Hey! The survey says "Build to the sidewalks!, but Pat Marsh says to build on the sidewalks and take the extra square footage!" What a joke this survey is.
-  **Anonymous user's Opinion**
Both are attractive sizes and heights. The green lawn in front of image b seems wasteful. That could either be used as more square footage or pooled into one dedicated green space that could be more than a small lawn.
-  **Anonymous user's Opinion**
Building in image A appears more likely to have issues handling heavy rain since it is so close to the street. Height is fine though.
-  **Anonymous user's Opinion**
The building in Image A is far too close to the street.
-  **Anonymous user's Opinion**
sick of building jamming these super housing units together without anyone altering traffic, putting in roundabouts or stop signs

**Anonymous user's Opinion**

With the density of housing in the neighborhood of Fitchburg that I am in, Swan Creek, I would please ask for no more multifamily dwellings unless they explicitly come with commercial development as well. We need more commercial development to offset the housing density.

**Anonymous user's Opinion**

The style of using mixed colors/materials on the exterior isn't really fooling anyone into thinking they are separate buildings. I don't imagine people really care about that. The top one A looks more modern.

**Anonymous user's Opinion**

We need more affordable owner-occupied opportunities.

**Anonymous user's Opinion**

I like the sidewalk accessibility around image a

**Anonymous user's Opinion**

I think apartment buildings and and condos should be allowed up to 8-10 stories; conserve the land we have. I think image A is mainly just ugly. Image B is better.

**Anonymous user's Opinion**

too much of this style already

**Anonymous user's Opinion**

where are the trees?

**Anonymous user's Opinion**

I appreciate the greener and the setback, but I do like the building A's architecture better.

**Anonymous user's Opinion**

Would like to see screen porches for greater privacy and to keep pets and small children safely inside.

**Anonymous user's Opinion**

We have too many multifamily rental buildings

**Stephen Lloyd Arnold's Opinion**

Buildings this size should be in SmartCode or PDD zoning districts, and so should be urban. B is too far from the street, uses too much land, and is not as walkable. It tries to be suburban, but a building this size can't be suburban. We need urban buildings!

**Anonymous user's Opinion**

Multi unit housing should incorporate some level of commercial space to make best use of available land.

**Anonymous user's Opinion**

Concerns for the flat roofing with the amount of snow we get in the area. Where does the snow go but to weigh down the roof?

**Anonymous user's Opinion**

The more greenspace the better

**Anonymous user's Opinion**

A lacks community scale and feel, esp. set up to the sidewalk. B feels more welcoming esp. set back with plenty of trees

**Anonymous user's Opinion**

Image B is so 1980s. Image A is cool and modern

**Anonymous user's Opinion**

The second one looks like a place families might want to live. It offers grass for drainage, ways for kids to play, and people to walk their dogs.

**Anonymous user's Opinion**

We need less apartments

**Anonymous user's Opinion**

A looks like its made for business not housing, no green space, no neighborhood feel

**Anonymous user's Opinion**

It really doesn't cost much more to build interesting and attractive buildings as opposed to ordinary and nondescript so why not make the city more attractive? Consider how these buildings are going to hold up and appear in 20 years.

**Anonymous user's Opinion**

I don't agree with large apartments or condos that lack green space around the building for the residents to use along with water being allowed to soak into the ground verses running off into the storm

sewers.



Anonymous user's Opinion

The building in photo A will define the period in which it was built, after 20 years.



Anonymous user's Opinion

These look awful



Anonymous user's Opinion

Both are fine. Preference would be based on the location. A is better if near other commercial property. B is better if closer to residential area.



Anonymous user's Opinion

A is too close to the streets



Anonymous user's Opinion

I believe these types of structures are plentiful in Fitchburg and these developments should be slowed.



Anonymous user's Opinion

I like all of the green space and distance to the street in image B.



Anonymous user's Opinion

Image B looks more like houses and therefore would blend more into a neighborhood/nearby neighborhood. Image A is too industrial, it would fit more into downtown Madison, but sticks out in a neighborhood.



Anonymous user's Opinion

It would be nice for there to be differentiation between the buildings so they don't all look alike. People deserve to live in buildings with character, not a development with identical buildings.



Anonymous user's Opinion

Both are visually pleasing. A not enough green space.



Anonymous user's Opinion

No



Anonymous user's Opinion

Image A is more modern style than I prefer.



Anonymous user's Opinion

Photo B is too traditional



Anonymous user's Opinion

A. looks too industrial in the context of a green area B. the roof line will be a major problem in winter with ice and snow



Anonymous user's Opinion

Image A seems to be more modern as all the other developments in the area and downtown look like this.



Anonymous user's Opinion

Image B looks safer for kids to ride bikes on the sidewalk or play in the grass. Nicer for pets and visitors/tenants to feel like they are at a home, not a business.



Anonymous user's Opinion

I don't know of the street access or parking situation so it is difficult to rate higher.



Anonymous user's Opinion

It depends on the context and surround developments. Selecting one building style out of its context is not relevant. Location, location, location. Is this in mixed use commercial area, or transitional to low density.



Anonymous user's Opinion

Please add biking and walking paths along main roadways - Fitchrona Rd. has the Quarry Vista Neighborhood that would love to be connected to the stores and we would like to have a safe way to access stores without a vehicle.



Anonymous user's Opinion

Too big, too crowded, too close to the street. Too much. Not something I would enjoy living in.



Anonymous user's Opinion

More apartments in cornfields?

**Anonymous user's Opinion**

A looks more consistent with the newer designs in broader community. But worried about it being "trendy" and getting stale quickly.

**Anonymous user's Opinion**

I think there should be variety of look and feel of properties. Above all else, they should be build well, made to last and meet the needs of those looking for housing. Low income housing should be measured and ensure that the city can provide services to those communities based on need. Do not over populate one area with low income. All neighborhood developments should have a balance and equity in housing. work with organizations like the United Way and community service organizations to meet the needs for jobs, housing, daycare and schools in our community.

**Anonymous user's Opinion**

Neither, more single family detached homes.

**Anonymous user's Opinion**

Like more lawn, but prefer more modern look with set back.

**Anonymous user's Opinion**

I prefer more of a setback from the sidewalk.

**Anonymous user's Opinion**

I have no problems with the style of the buildings (both are fine), but I object to the lack of retail space on the ground floor of those large buildings.

**Anonymous user's Opinion**

A looks too industrial and not friendly. It appears to be low cost housing, which I know we need. the second has more grass and isset back from the street. The resident has a lawn.

What do you think about these smaller commercial areas?

Rate the content of each image using the rating scale above.

CURRENT RESULTS						215 Total Responses
	1	2	3	4	5	
Image A	13% (27)	22% (48)	22% (47)	29% (63)	14% (30)	
Image B	12% (26)	21% (46)	32% (68)	25% (53)	10% (22)	
Image C	3% (6)	8% (17)	11% (24)	35% (76)	43% (92)	
Image D	3% (7)	15% (33)	14% (30)	37% (80)	30% (65)	

REGISTERED (124)						
	1	2	3	4	5	
Image A	12.0% (15)	19.0% (24)	23.0% (28)	30.0% (37)	16.0% (20)	
Image B	13.0% (16)	24.0% (30)	27.0% (33)	27.0% (33)	10.0% (12)	
Image C	3.0% (4)	7.0% (9)	9.0% (11)	34.0% (42)	47.0% (58)	
Image D	3.0% (4)	16.0% (20)	12.0% (15)	36.0% (45)	32.0% (40)	

NON-REGISTERED (91)						
	1	2	3	4	5	
Image A	13.2% (12)	26.4% (24)	20.9% (19)	28.6% (26)	11.0% (10)	
Image B	11.0% (10)	17.6% (16)	38.5% (35)	22.0% (20)	11.0% (10)	
Image C	2.2% (2)	8.8% (8)	14.3% (13)	37.4% (34)	37.4% (34)	
Image D	3.3% (3)	14.3% (13)	16.5% (15)	38.5% (35)	27.5% (25)	

ALL RESPONDENTS (215)						
	1	2	3	4	5	
Image A	13% (27)	22% (48)	22% (47)	29% (63)	14% (30)	
Image B	12% (26)	21% (46)	32% (68)	25% (53)	10% (22)	
Image C	3% (6)	8% (17)	11% (24)	35% (76)	43% (92)	
Image D	3% (7)	15% (33)	14% (30)	37% (80)	30% (65)	

REGISTERED VOTERS IN FITCHBURG, WI (124)						
	1	2	3	4	5	
Image A	12% (15)	19% (24)	23% (28)	30% (37)	16% (20)	
Image B	13% (16)	24% (30)	27% (33)	27% (33)	10% (12)	
Image C	3% (4)	7% (9)	9% (11)	34% (42)	47% (58)	
Image D	3% (4)	16% (20)	12% (15)	36% (45)	32% (40)	

LIVE IN FITCHBURG, WI (182) - SELF-REPORTED						
	1	2	3	4	5	
Image A	13% (23)	23% (41)	21% (39)	29% (53)	14% (26)	
Image B	13% (23)	21% (39)	32% (58)	24% (44)	10% (18)	
Image C	2% (4)	8% (15)	9% (17)	36% (66)	44% (80)	
Image D	3% (5)	15% (28)	14% (26)	37% (67)	31% (56)	

SUBSCRIBERS TO FITCHBURG, WI (187)						
	1	2	3	4	5	
Image A	12% (23)	22% (41)	21% (40)	30% (57)	14% (26)	
Image B	12% (23)	21% (40)	32% (59)	25% (47)	10% (18)	
Image C	2% (4)	9% (16)	9% (17)	37% (69)	43% (81)	

Image D	3% (5)	16% (29)	14% (26)	38% (71)	30% (56)
---------	--------	----------	----------	----------	----------

REGISTER RESPONDENTS FROM ANYWHERE (127)

	1	2	3	4	5
Image A	12% (15)	19% (24)	23% (29)	31% (39)	16% (20)
Image B	13% (16)	24% (30)	27% (34)	28% (35)	9% (12)
Image C	3% (4)	8% (10)	9% (11)	35% (44)	46% (58)
Image D	3% (4)	17% (21)	12% (15)	37% (47)	31% (40)

EDUCATION

127 REGISTERED VOTERS

	1	2	3	4	5
--	---	---	---	---	---

Bach Degree - Extremely Likely (23)

Image A	8.7% (2.0)	13.0% (3.0)	34.8% (8.0)	30.4% (7.0)	13.0% (3.0)
Image B	13.0% (3.0)	21.7% (5.0)	30.4% (7.0)	26.1% (6.0)	8.7% (2.0)
Image C	-	8.7% (2.0)	13.0% (3.0)	39.1% (9.0)	39.1% (9.0)
Image D	4.3% (1.0)	17.4% (4.0)	13.0% (3.0)	34.8% (8.0)	30.4% (7.0)

Bach Degree - Likely (16)

Image A	12.5% (2.0)	18.8% (3.0)	18.8% (3.0)	37.5% (6.0)	12.5% (2.0)
Image B	18.8% (3.0)	25.0% (4.0)	12.5% (2.0)	37.5% (6.0)	6.3% (1.0)
Image C	6.3% (1.0)	6.3% (1.0)	12.5% (2.0)	12.5% (2.0)	62.5% (10.0)
Image D	6.3% (1.0)	12.5% (2.0)	18.8% (3.0)	18.8% (3.0)	43.8% (7.0)

Grad Degree - Extremely Likely (18)

Image A	-	22.2% (4.0)	16.7% (3.0)	22.2% (4.0)	38.9% (7.0)
Image B	-	16.7% (3.0)	33.3% (6.0)	22.2% (4.0)	27.8% (5.0)
Image C	5.6% (1.0)	11.1% (2.0)	22.2% (4.0)	27.8% (5.0)	33.3% (6.0)
Image D	5.6% (1.0)	27.8% (5.0)	5.6% (1.0)	33.3% (6.0)	27.8% (5.0)

Grad Degree - Likely (11)

Image A	9.1% (1.0)	9.1% (1.0)	27.3% (3.0)	45.5% (5.0)	9.1% (1.0)
Image B	-	18.2% (2.0)	27.3% (3.0)	54.5% (6.0)	-
Image C	9.1% (1.0)	-	-	27.3% (3.0)	63.6% (7.0)
Image D	-	18.2% (2.0)	36.4% (4.0)	45.5% (5.0)	-

HS Diploma - Extremely Likely (5)

Image A	20.0% (1.0)	-	-	40.0% (2.0)	40.0% (2.0)
Image B	20.0% (1.0)	20.0% (1.0)	-	40.0% (2.0)	20.0% (1.0)
Image C	-	40.0% (2.0)	-	40.0% (2.0)	20.0% (1.0)
Image D	-	60.0% (3.0)	-	40.0% (2.0)	-

HS Diploma - Likely (2)

Image A	-	50.0% (1.0)	-	-	50.0% (1.0)
Image B	-	50.0% (1.0)	50.0% (1.0)	-	-
Image C	-	-	-	50.0% (1.0)	50.0% (1.0)
Image D	-	-	-	50.0% (1.0)	50.0% (1.0)

Less than HS Diploma - Likely (1)

Image A	-	100.0% (1.0)	-	-	-
Image B	-	-	100.0% (1.0)	-	-
Image C	-	-	-	-	100.0% (1.0)
Image D	-	-	-	-	100.0% (1.0)

Some College - Likely (8)

Image A	-	25.0% (2.0)	25.0% (2.0)	50.0% (4.0)	-
---------	---	-------------	-------------	-------------	---

Image B	25.0% (2.0)	25.0% (2.0)	12.5% (1.0)	25.0% (2.0)	12.5% (1.0)
Image C	-	12.5% (1.0)	-	62.5% (5.0)	25.0% (2.0)
Image D	-	12.5% (1.0)	12.5% (1.0)	50.0% (4.0)	25.0% (2.0)

Some College -Extremely Likely (3)

Image A	-	33.3% (1.0)	-	66.7% (2.0)	-
Image B	33.3% (1.0)	-	-	66.7% (2.0)	-
Image C	-	-	-	66.7% (2.0)	33.3% (1.0)
Image D	-	33.3% (1.0)	-	66.7% (2.0)	-

Unknown (40)

Image A	22.5% (9.0)	20.0% (8.0)	25.0% (10.0)	22.5% (9.0)	10.0% (4.0)
Image B	15.0% (6.0)	30.0% (12.0)	32.5% (13.0)	17.5% (7.0)	5.0% (2.0)
Image C	2.5% (1.0)	5.0% (2.0)	5.0% (2.0)	37.5% (15.0)	50.0% (20.0)
Image D	2.5% (1.0)	7.5% (3.0)	7.5% (3.0)	40.0% (16.0)	42.5% (17.0)

VOTERS GENDER

127 REGISTERED VOTERS

	1	2	3	4	5
--	---	---	---	---	---

F (60)

Image A	11.7% (7.0)	16.7% (10.0)	16.7% (10.0)	36.7% (22.0)	18.3% (11.0)
Image B	10.0% (6.0)	28.3% (17.0)	21.7% (13.0)	31.7% (19.0)	8.3% (5.0)
Image C	-	10.0% (6.0)	5.0% (3.0)	36.7% (22.0)	48.3% (29.0)
Image D	1.7% (1.0)	20.0% (12.0)	10.0% (6.0)	35.0% (21.0)	33.3% (20.0)

M (66)

Image A	10.6% (7.0)	21.2% (14.0)	28.8% (19.0)	25.8% (17.0)	13.6% (9.0)
Image B	15.2% (10.0)	19.7% (13.0)	30.3% (20.0)	24.2% (16.0)	10.6% (7.0)
Image C	6.1% (4.0)	6.1% (4.0)	12.1% (8.0)	33.3% (22.0)	42.4% (28.0)
Image D	4.5% (3.0)	13.6% (9.0)	13.6% (9.0)	37.9% (25.0)	30.3% (20.0)

Unknown (1)

Image A	100.0% (1.0)	-	-	-	-
Image B	-	-	100.0% (1.0)	-	-
Image C	-	-	-	-	100.0% (1.0)
Image D	-	-	-	100.0% (1.0)	-

PRECINCT

127 REGISTERED VOTERS

	1	2	3	4	5
--	---	---	---	---	---

CHICAGO 43-04 (1)

Image A	-	-	100.0% (1.0)	-	-
Image B	-	-	100.0% (1.0)	-	-
Image C	-	-	-	100.0% (1.0)	-
Image D	-	-	-	100.0% (1.0)	-

FITCHBURG CITY WARD 01 (5)

Image A	20.0% (1.0)	-	20.0% (1.0)	40.0% (2.0)	20.0% (1.0)
Image B	-	20.0% (1.0)	20.0% (1.0)	40.0% (2.0)	20.0% (1.0)
Image C	-	-	20.0% (1.0)	40.0% (2.0)	40.0% (2.0)
Image D	-	20.0% (1.0)	20.0% (1.0)	20.0% (1.0)	40.0% (2.0)

FITCHBURG CITY WARD 02 (2)

Image A	50.0% (1.0)	-	50.0% (1.0)	-	-
Image B	-	50.0% (1.0)	-	50.0% (1.0)	-
Image C	-	-	-	100.0% (2.0)	-

Image D	-	50.0% (1.0)	-	50.0% (1.0)	-
FITCHBURG CITY WARD 03 (2)					
Image A	-	-	50.0% (1.0)	50.0% (1.0)	-
Image B	-	50.0% (1.0)	-	50.0% (1.0)	-
Image C	-	50.0% (1.0)	-	50.0% (1.0)	-
Image D	-	50.0% (1.0)	-	-	50.0% (1.0)
FITCHBURG CITY WARD 04 (1)					
Image A	-	-	100.0% (1.0)	-	-
Image B	-	100.0% (1.0)	-	-	-
Image C	-	-	-	100.0% (1.0)	-
Image D	-	-	-	100.0% (1.0)	-
FITCHBURG CITY WARD 05 (5)					
Image A	20.0% (1.0)	20.0% (1.0)	20.0% (1.0)	20.0% (1.0)	20.0% (1.0)
Image B	20.0% (1.0)	40.0% (2.0)	20.0% (1.0)	20.0% (1.0)	-
Image C	-	-	20.0% (1.0)	40.0% (2.0)	40.0% (2.0)
Image D	-	20.0% (1.0)	20.0% (1.0)	20.0% (1.0)	40.0% (2.0)
FITCHBURG CITY WARD 06 (8)					
Image A	-	12.5% (1.0)	62.5% (5.0)	12.5% (1.0)	12.5% (1.0)
Image B	12.5% (1.0)	25.0% (2.0)	37.5% (3.0)	25.0% (2.0)	-
Image C	-	-	-	25.0% (2.0)	75.0% (6.0)
Image D	-	12.5% (1.0)	-	37.5% (3.0)	50.0% (4.0)
FITCHBURG CITY WARD 07 (11)					
Image A	9.1% (1.0)	27.3% (3.0)	9.1% (1.0)	27.3% (3.0)	27.3% (3.0)
Image B	9.1% (1.0)	27.3% (3.0)	27.3% (3.0)	18.2% (2.0)	18.2% (2.0)
Image C	9.1% (1.0)	18.2% (2.0)	9.1% (1.0)	27.3% (3.0)	36.4% (4.0)
Image D	-	36.4% (4.0)	18.2% (2.0)	-	45.5% (5.0)
FITCHBURG CITY WARD 08 (7)					
Image A	28.6% (2.0)	28.6% (2.0)	14.3% (1.0)	14.3% (1.0)	14.3% (1.0)
Image B	28.6% (2.0)	14.3% (1.0)	28.6% (2.0)	14.3% (1.0)	14.3% (1.0)
Image C	-	-	-	28.6% (2.0)	71.4% (5.0)
Image D	-	-	14.3% (1.0)	28.6% (2.0)	57.1% (4.0)
FITCHBURG CITY WARD 09 (4)					
Image A	25.0% (1.0)	25.0% (1.0)	-	25.0% (1.0)	25.0% (1.0)
Image B	-	-	75.0% (3.0)	25.0% (1.0)	-
Image C	-	-	-	25.0% (1.0)	75.0% (3.0)
Image D	-	25.0% (1.0)	-	50.0% (2.0)	25.0% (1.0)
FITCHBURG CITY WARD 12 (1)					
Image A	-	-	-	-	100.0% (1.0)
Image B	-	-	-	100.0% (1.0)	-
Image C	-	-	-	-	100.0% (1.0)
Image D	-	-	100.0% (1.0)	-	-
FITCHBURG CITY WARD 13 (21)					
Image A	4.8% (1.0)	14.3% (3.0)	19.0% (4.0)	52.4% (11.0)	9.5% (2.0)
Image B	9.5% (2.0)	14.3% (3.0)	23.8% (5.0)	38.1% (8.0)	14.3% (3.0)
Image C	4.8% (1.0)	9.5% (2.0)	9.5% (2.0)	33.3% (7.0)	42.9% (9.0)
Image D	4.8% (1.0)	4.8% (1.0)	9.5% (2.0)	57.1% (12.0)	23.8% (5.0)
FITCHBURG CITY WARD 14 (14)					

Image A	7.1% (1.0)	35.7% (5.0)	-	42.9% (6.0)	14.3% (2.0)
Image B	7.1% (1.0)	35.7% (5.0)	35.7% (5.0)	21.4% (3.0)	-
Image C	-	7.1% (1.0)	-	28.6% (4.0)	64.3% (9.0)
Image D	-	28.6% (4.0)	-	28.6% (4.0)	42.9% (6.0)
FITCHBURG CITY WARD 15 (5)					
Image A	-	20.0% (1.0)	-	40.0% (2.0)	40.0% (2.0)
Image B	-	20.0% (1.0)	-	40.0% (2.0)	40.0% (2.0)
Image C	-	20.0% (1.0)	40.0% (2.0)	40.0% (2.0)	-
Image D	-	40.0% (2.0)	20.0% (1.0)	40.0% (2.0)	-
FITCHBURG CITY WARD 16 (3)					
Image A	-	-	66.7% (2.0)	33.3% (1.0)	-
Image B	-	-	66.7% (2.0)	33.3% (1.0)	-
Image C	-	-	66.7% (2.0)	-	33.3% (1.0)
Image D	-	-	33.3% (1.0)	66.7% (2.0)	-
FITCHBURG CITY WARD 17 (6)					
Image A	16.7% (1.0)	33.3% (2.0)	16.7% (1.0)	16.7% (1.0)	16.7% (1.0)
Image B	50.0% (3.0)	16.7% (1.0)	-	16.7% (1.0)	16.7% (1.0)
Image C	-	16.7% (1.0)	-	50.0% (3.0)	33.3% (2.0)
Image D	-	16.7% (1.0)	-	50.0% (3.0)	33.3% (2.0)
FITCHBURG CITY WARD 18 (11)					
Image A	27.3% (3.0)	18.2% (2.0)	36.4% (4.0)	9.1% (1.0)	9.1% (1.0)
Image B	36.4% (4.0)	18.2% (2.0)	36.4% (4.0)	9.1% (1.0)	-
Image C	18.2% (2.0)	-	9.1% (1.0)	27.3% (3.0)	45.5% (5.0)
Image D	27.3% (3.0)	9.1% (1.0)	-	36.4% (4.0)	27.3% (3.0)
FITCHBURG CITY WARD 19 (15)					
Image A	6.7% (1.0)	20.0% (3.0)	33.3% (5.0)	26.7% (4.0)	13.3% (2.0)
Image B	6.7% (1.0)	33.3% (5.0)	26.7% (4.0)	26.7% (4.0)	6.7% (1.0)
Image C	-	6.7% (1.0)	-	40.0% (6.0)	53.3% (8.0)
Image D	-	6.7% (1.0)	26.7% (4.0)	33.3% (5.0)	33.3% (5.0)
MADISON CITY WARD 066 (1)					
Image A	-	-	-	100.0% (1.0)	-
Image B	-	-	-	100.0% (1.0)	-
Image C	-	-	100.0% (1.0)	-	-
Image D	-	-	100.0% (1.0)	-	-
MADISON CITY WARD 100 (1)					
Image A	-	-	-	-	100.0% (1.0)
Image B	-	-	-	-	100.0% (1.0)
Image C	-	-	-	100.0% (1.0)	-
Image D	-	-	-	100.0% (1.0)	-
MADISON CITY WARD 107 (1)					
Image A	-	-	-	100.0% (1.0)	-
Image B	-	-	-	100.0% (1.0)	-
Image C	-	-	-	100.0% (1.0)	-
Image D	-	-	-	100.0% (1.0)	-
OREGON VLG WARD 09 (1)					
Image A	-	-	-	100.0% (1.0)	-
Image B	-	-	-	100.0% (1.0)	-
Image C	-	100.0% (1.0)	-	-	-

Image D	-	100.0% (1.0)	-	-	-
---------	---	--------------	---	---	---

OREGON VLG WARD 10 (1)

Image A	100.0% (1.0)	-	-	-	-
Image B	-	100.0% (1.0)	-	-	-
Image C	-	-	-	-	100.0% (1.0)
Image D	-	-	-	100.0% (1.0)	-

AGE RANGE

127 REGISTERED VOTERS

	1	2	3	4	5
--	---	---	---	---	---

18-29 (1)

Image A	100.0% (1.0)	-	-	-	-
Image B	-	-	-	100.0% (1.0)	-
Image C	-	-	-	-	100.0% (1.0)
Image D	-	-	-	-	100.0% (1.0)

30-39 (15)

Image A	6.7% (1.0)	33.3% (5.0)	20.0% (3.0)	26.7% (4.0)	13.3% (2.0)
Image B	6.7% (1.0)	33.3% (5.0)	26.7% (4.0)	26.7% (4.0)	6.7% (1.0)
Image C	-	-	6.7% (1.0)	46.7% (7.0)	46.7% (7.0)
Image D	-	6.7% (1.0)	20.0% (3.0)	40.0% (6.0)	33.3% (5.0)

40-49 (21)

Image A	23.8% (5.0)	19.0% (4.0)	19.0% (4.0)	14.3% (3.0)	23.8% (5.0)
Image B	19.0% (4.0)	23.8% (5.0)	33.3% (7.0)	14.3% (3.0)	9.5% (2.0)
Image C	4.8% (1.0)	-	4.8% (1.0)	28.6% (6.0)	61.9% (13.0)
Image D	4.8% (1.0)	9.5% (2.0)	9.5% (2.0)	38.1% (8.0)	38.1% (8.0)

50-59 (15)

Image A	6.7% (1.0)	26.7% (4.0)	20.0% (3.0)	40.0% (6.0)	6.7% (1.0)
Image B	6.7% (1.0)	20.0% (3.0)	20.0% (3.0)	46.7% (7.0)	6.7% (1.0)
Image C	-	13.3% (2.0)	-	53.3% (8.0)	33.3% (5.0)
Image D	-	20.0% (3.0)	-	60.0% (9.0)	20.0% (3.0)

60-69 (20)

Image A	-	5.0% (1.0)	40.0% (8.0)	40.0% (8.0)	15.0% (3.0)
Image B	5.0% (1.0)	20.0% (4.0)	35.0% (7.0)	35.0% (7.0)	5.0% (1.0)
Image C	5.0% (1.0)	20.0% (4.0)	25.0% (5.0)	30.0% (6.0)	20.0% (4.0)
Image D	10.0% (2.0)	35.0% (7.0)	10.0% (2.0)	30.0% (6.0)	15.0% (3.0)

70-79 (13)

Image A	23.1% (3.0)	7.7% (1.0)	23.1% (3.0)	30.8% (4.0)	15.4% (2.0)
Image B	23.1% (3.0)	-	38.5% (5.0)	30.8% (4.0)	7.7% (1.0)
Image C	15.4% (2.0)	15.4% (2.0)	23.1% (3.0)	-	46.2% (6.0)
Image D	-	23.1% (3.0)	38.5% (5.0)	15.4% (2.0)	23.1% (3.0)

unknown (42)

Image A	9.5% (4.0)	21.4% (9.0)	19.0% (8.0)	33.3% (14.0)	16.7% (7.0)
Image B	14.3% (6.0)	31.0% (13.0)	19.0% (8.0)	21.4% (9.0)	14.3% (6.0)
Image C	-	4.8% (2.0)	2.4% (1.0)	40.5% (17.0)	52.4% (22.0)
Image D	2.4% (1.0)	11.9% (5.0)	7.1% (3.0)	38.1% (16.0)	40.5% (17.0)

**VOTERS
AGE**

127 REGISTERED VOTERS

	1	2	3	4	5
--	---	---	---	---	---

28 (1)

Image A	100.0% (1.0)	-	-	-	-
Image B	-	-	-	100.0% (1.0)	-
Image C	-	-	-	-	100.0% (1.0)
Image D	-	-	-	-	100.0% (1.0)

31 (1)

Image A	-	-	100.0% (1.0)	-	-
Image B	-	100.0% (1.0)	-	-	-
Image C	-	-	-	-	100.0% (1.0)
Image D	-	-	100.0% (1.0)	-	-

32 (1)

Image A	-	100.0% (1.0)	-	-	-
Image B	-	100.0% (1.0)	-	-	-
Image C	-	-	-	100.0% (1.0)	-
Image D	-	-	-	100.0% (1.0)	-

35 (3)

Image A	33.3% (1.0)	33.3% (1.0)	-	33.3% (1.0)	-
Image B	33.3% (1.0)	-	33.3% (1.0)	33.3% (1.0)	-
Image C	-	-	-	66.7% (2.0)	33.3% (1.0)
Image D	-	33.3% (1.0)	-	33.3% (1.0)	33.3% (1.0)

36 (2)

Image A	-	-	-	100.0% (2.0)	-
Image B	-	-	50.0% (1.0)	50.0% (1.0)	-
Image C	-	-	50.0% (1.0)	50.0% (1.0)	-
Image D	-	-	50.0% (1.0)	50.0% (1.0)	-

37 (3)

Image A	-	66.7% (2.0)	33.3% (1.0)	-	-
Image B	-	66.7% (2.0)	33.3% (1.0)	-	-
Image C	-	-	-	33.3% (1.0)	66.7% (2.0)
Image D	-	-	33.3% (1.0)	33.3% (1.0)	33.3% (1.0)

38 (3)

Image A	-	33.3% (1.0)	33.3% (1.0)	-	33.3% (1.0)
Image B	-	33.3% (1.0)	33.3% (1.0)	-	33.3% (1.0)
Image C	-	-	-	33.3% (1.0)	66.7% (2.0)
Image D	-	-	-	33.3% (1.0)	66.7% (2.0)

39 (2)

Image A	-	-	-	50.0% (1.0)	50.0% (1.0)
Image B	-	-	-	100.0% (2.0)	-
Image C	-	-	-	50.0% (1.0)	50.0% (1.0)
Image D	-	-	-	50.0% (1.0)	50.0% (1.0)

40 (4)

Image A	50.0% (2.0)	25.0% (1.0)	-	-	25.0% (1.0)
Image B	25.0% (1.0)	25.0% (1.0)	25.0% (1.0)	-	25.0% (1.0)
Image C	-	-	-	-	100.0% (4.0)
Image D	-	-	-	50.0% (2.0)	50.0% (2.0)

43 (2)

Image A	50.0% (1.0)	-	-	-	50.0% (1.0)
---------	-------------	---	---	---	-------------

Image B	50.0% (1.0)	-	50.0% (1.0)	-	-
Image C	50.0% (1.0)	-	-	-	50.0% (1.0)
Image D	50.0% (1.0)	-	-	-	50.0% (1.0)

44 (5)

Image A	40.0% (2.0)	20.0% (1.0)	-	40.0% (2.0)	-
Image B	20.0% (1.0)	20.0% (1.0)	20.0% (1.0)	40.0% (2.0)	-
Image C	-	-	-	40.0% (2.0)	60.0% (3.0)
Image D	-	20.0% (1.0)	-	40.0% (2.0)	40.0% (2.0)

45 (2)

Image A	-	50.0% (1.0)	-	-	50.0% (1.0)
Image B	-	100.0% (2.0)	-	-	-
Image C	-	-	-	50.0% (1.0)	50.0% (1.0)
Image D	-	50.0% (1.0)	-	50.0% (1.0)	-

46 (1)

Image A	-	-	100.0% (1.0)	-	-
Image B	-	100.0% (1.0)	-	-	-
Image C	-	-	-	-	100.0% (1.0)
Image D	-	-	-	-	100.0% (1.0)

47 (3)

Image A	-	-	33.3% (1.0)	-	66.7% (2.0)
Image B	-	-	33.3% (1.0)	33.3% (1.0)	33.3% (1.0)
Image C	-	-	-	33.3% (1.0)	66.7% (2.0)
Image D	-	-	-	66.7% (2.0)	33.3% (1.0)

48 (1)

Image A	-	-	-	100.0% (1.0)	-
Image B	-	-	100.0% (1.0)	-	-
Image C	-	-	-	100.0% (1.0)	-
Image D	-	-	-	100.0% (1.0)	-

49 (3)

Image A	-	33.3% (1.0)	66.7% (2.0)	-	-
Image B	33.3% (1.0)	-	66.7% (2.0)	-	-
Image C	-	-	33.3% (1.0)	33.3% (1.0)	33.3% (1.0)
Image D	-	-	66.7% (2.0)	-	33.3% (1.0)

50 (1)

Image A	-	-	-	100.0% (1.0)	-
Image B	-	-	-	100.0% (1.0)	-
Image C	-	-	-	100.0% (1.0)	-
Image D	-	100.0% (1.0)	-	-	-

52 (4)

Image A	25.0% (1.0)	50.0% (2.0)	-	25.0% (1.0)	-
Image B	-	25.0% (1.0)	25.0% (1.0)	50.0% (2.0)	-
Image C	-	25.0% (1.0)	-	50.0% (2.0)	25.0% (1.0)
Image D	-	25.0% (1.0)	-	50.0% (2.0)	25.0% (1.0)

53 (1)

Image A	-	100.0% (1.0)	-	-	-
Image B	-	-	100.0% (1.0)	-	-
Image C	-	-	-	-	100.0% (1.0)
Image D	-	-	-	-	100.0% (1.0)

55 (2)

Image A	-	-	-	100.0% (2.0)	-
Image B	-	-	-	100.0% (2.0)	-
Image C	-	-	-	50.0% (1.0)	50.0% (1.0)
Image D	-	-	-	100.0% (2.0)	-

56 (2)

Image A	-	-	100.0% (2.0)	-	-
Image B	50.0% (1.0)	50.0% (1.0)	-	-	-
Image C	-	-	-	50.0% (1.0)	50.0% (1.0)
Image D	-	-	-	100.0% (2.0)	-

57 (1)

Image A	-	100.0% (1.0)	-	-	-
Image B	-	100.0% (1.0)	-	-	-
Image C	-	-	-	100.0% (1.0)	-
Image D	-	-	-	100.0% (1.0)	-

59 (4)

Image A	-	-	25.0% (1.0)	50.0% (2.0)	25.0% (1.0)
Image B	-	-	25.0% (1.0)	50.0% (2.0)	25.0% (1.0)
Image C	-	25.0% (1.0)	-	50.0% (2.0)	25.0% (1.0)
Image D	-	25.0% (1.0)	-	50.0% (2.0)	25.0% (1.0)

60 (1)

Image A	-	-	-	100.0% (1.0)	-
Image B	-	-	100.0% (1.0)	-	-
Image C	-	100.0% (1.0)	-	-	-
Image D	-	100.0% (1.0)	-	-	-

61 (2)

Image A	-	-	50.0% (1.0)	50.0% (1.0)	-
Image B	-	-	50.0% (1.0)	50.0% (1.0)	-
Image C	-	50.0% (1.0)	-	-	50.0% (1.0)
Image D	-	50.0% (1.0)	50.0% (1.0)	-	-

62 (3)

Image A	-	-	66.7% (2.0)	33.3% (1.0)	-
Image B	-	33.3% (1.0)	33.3% (1.0)	33.3% (1.0)	-
Image C	-	-	33.3% (1.0)	66.7% (2.0)	-
Image D	-	33.3% (1.0)	-	66.7% (2.0)	-

63 (2)

Image A	-	-	50.0% (1.0)	50.0% (1.0)	-
Image B	-	-	50.0% (1.0)	50.0% (1.0)	-
Image C	-	-	50.0% (1.0)	-	50.0% (1.0)
Image D	50.0% (1.0)	-	-	-	50.0% (1.0)

64 (2)

Image A	-	-	50.0% (1.0)	50.0% (1.0)	-
Image B	-	100.0% (2.0)	-	-	-
Image C	-	-	-	100.0% (2.0)	-
Image D	-	-	-	100.0% (2.0)	-

65 (2)

Image A	-	-	50.0% (1.0)	50.0% (1.0)	-
---------	---	---	-------------	-------------	---

Image B	50.0% (1.0)	-	-	50.0% (1.0)	-
Image C	-	50.0% (1.0)	-	50.0% (1.0)	-
Image D	-	50.0% (1.0)	-	50.0% (1.0)	-
66 (3)					
Image A	-	-	66.7% (2.0)	-	33.3% (1.0)
Image B	-	-	100.0% (3.0)	-	-
Image C	33.3% (1.0)	-	33.3% (1.0)	33.3% (1.0)	-
Image D	33.3% (1.0)	33.3% (1.0)	-	33.3% (1.0)	-
68 (1)					
Image A	-	100.0% (1.0)	-	-	-
Image B	-	100.0% (1.0)	-	-	-
Image C	-	-	-	-	100.0% (1.0)
Image D	-	-	-	-	100.0% (1.0)
69 (4)					
Image A	-	-	-	50.0% (2.0)	50.0% (2.0)
Image B	-	-	-	75.0% (3.0)	25.0% (1.0)
Image C	-	25.0% (1.0)	50.0% (2.0)	-	25.0% (1.0)
Image D	-	50.0% (2.0)	25.0% (1.0)	-	25.0% (1.0)
70 (2)					
Image A	50.0% (1.0)	-	-	50.0% (1.0)	-
Image B	50.0% (1.0)	-	50.0% (1.0)	-	-
Image C	-	50.0% (1.0)	-	-	50.0% (1.0)
Image D	-	50.0% (1.0)	-	-	50.0% (1.0)
71 (1)					
Image A	-	-	-	100.0% (1.0)	-
Image B	-	-	100.0% (1.0)	-	-
Image C	-	-	-	-	100.0% (1.0)
Image D	-	-	100.0% (1.0)	-	-
72 (1)					
Image A	-	-	100.0% (1.0)	-	-
Image B	-	-	100.0% (1.0)	-	-
Image C	-	-	100.0% (1.0)	-	-
Image D	-	-	100.0% (1.0)	-	-
73 (3)					
Image A	33.3% (1.0)	-	-	33.3% (1.0)	33.3% (1.0)
Image B	33.3% (1.0)	-	-	33.3% (1.0)	33.3% (1.0)
Image C	-	33.3% (1.0)	33.3% (1.0)	-	33.3% (1.0)
Image D	-	33.3% (1.0)	33.3% (1.0)	-	33.3% (1.0)
74 (2)					
Image A	50.0% (1.0)	50.0% (1.0)	-	-	-
Image B	50.0% (1.0)	-	50.0% (1.0)	-	-
Image C	50.0% (1.0)	-	-	-	50.0% (1.0)
Image D	-	-	50.0% (1.0)	-	50.0% (1.0)
77 (2)					
Image A	-	-	50.0% (1.0)	50.0% (1.0)	-
Image B	-	-	-	100.0% (2.0)	-
Image C	50.0% (1.0)	-	-	-	50.0% (1.0)
Image D	-	-	-	100.0% (2.0)	-

79 (2)

Image A	-	-	50.0% (1.0)	-	50.0% (1.0)
Image B	-	-	50.0% (1.0)	50.0% (1.0)	-
Image C	-	-	50.0% (1.0)	-	50.0% (1.0)
Image D	-	50.0% (1.0)	50.0% (1.0)	-	-
Unknown (42)					
Image A	9.5% (4.0)	21.4% (9.0)	19.0% (8.0)	33.3% (14.0)	16.7% (7.0)
Image B	14.3% (6.0)	31.0% (13.0)	19.0% (8.0)	21.4% (9.0)	14.3% (6.0)
Image C	-	4.8% (2.0)	2.4% (1.0)	40.5% (17.0)	52.4% (22.0)
Image D	2.4% (1.0)	11.9% (5.0)	7.1% (3.0)	38.1% (16.0)	40.5% (17.0)

STATE INCOME DECILE

127 REGISTERED VOTERS

	1	2	3	4	5
--	---	---	---	---	---

0 to 9 Pct range (3)

Image A	-	-	100.0% (3.0)	-	-
Image B	-	100.0% (3.0)	-	-	-
Image C	-	-	-	33.3% (1.0)	66.7% (2.0)
Image D	-	-	33.3% (1.0)	33.3% (1.0)	33.3% (1.0)

10 to 19 Pct range (2)

Image A	-	-	50.0% (1.0)	50.0% (1.0)	-
Image B	-	50.0% (1.0)	-	50.0% (1.0)	-
Image C	-	50.0% (1.0)	-	50.0% (1.0)	-
Image D	-	50.0% (1.0)	-	-	50.0% (1.0)

40 to 49 Pct range (1)

Image A	-	-	-	-	100.0% (1.0)
Image B	-	-	-	-	100.0% (1.0)
Image C	-	-	-	-	100.0% (1.0)
Image D	-	-	-	-	100.0% (1.0)

50 to 59 Pct range (5)

Image A	20.0% (1.0)	-	40.0% (2.0)	40.0% (2.0)	-
Image B	-	40.0% (2.0)	20.0% (1.0)	40.0% (2.0)	-
Image C	-	-	20.0% (1.0)	60.0% (3.0)	20.0% (1.0)
Image D	-	20.0% (1.0)	20.0% (1.0)	40.0% (2.0)	20.0% (1.0)

60 to 69 Pct range (3)

Image A	33.3% (1.0)	33.3% (1.0)	-	-	33.3% (1.0)
Image B	-	-	66.7% (2.0)	33.3% (1.0)	-
Image C	-	-	-	-	100.0% (3.0)
Image D	-	33.3% (1.0)	-	33.3% (1.0)	33.3% (1.0)

70 to 79 Pct range (4)

Image A	25.0% (1.0)	-	25.0% (1.0)	25.0% (1.0)	25.0% (1.0)
Image B	-	25.0% (1.0)	-	50.0% (2.0)	25.0% (1.0)
Image C	-	-	-	75.0% (3.0)	25.0% (1.0)
Image D	-	25.0% (1.0)	-	75.0% (3.0)	-

80 to 89 Pct range (49)

Image A	4.1% (2.0)	22.4% (11.0)	14.3% (7.0)	42.9% (21.0)	16.3% (8.0)
Image B	12.2% (6.0)	18.4% (9.0)	24.5% (12.0)	32.7% (16.0)	12.2% (6.0)
Image C	2.0% (1.0)	10.2% (5.0)	14.3% (7.0)	32.7% (16.0)	40.8% (20.0)

Image D	2.0% (1.0)	16.3% (8.0)	12.2% (6.0)	44.9% (22.0)	24.5% (12.0)
90 Pct and up (58)					
Image A	15.5% (9.0)	19.0% (11.0)	25.9% (15.0)	24.1% (14.0)	15.5% (9.0)
Image B	17.2% (10.0)	22.4% (13.0)	31.0% (18.0)	22.4% (13.0)	6.9% (4.0)
Image C	3.4% (2.0)	6.9% (4.0)	5.2% (3.0)	34.5% (20.0)	50.0% (29.0)
Image D	5.2% (3.0)	15.5% (9.0)	10.3% (6.0)	31.0% (18.0)	37.9% (22.0)

Unknown (2)

Image A	50.0% (1.0)	50.0% (1.0)	-	-	-
Image B	-	50.0% (1.0)	50.0% (1.0)	-	-
Image C	50.0% (1.0)	-	-	-	50.0% (1.0)
Image D	-	-	50.0% (1.0)	-	50.0% (1.0)

HOME OWNER/RENTER

127 REGISTERED VOTERS

	1	2	3	4	5
--	---	---	---	---	---

Likely Homeowner (80)

Image A	12.5% (10.0)	20.0% (16.0)	20.0% (16.0)	32.5% (26.0)	15.0% (12.0)
Image B	15.0% (12.0)	16.3% (13.0)	31.3% (25.0)	27.5% (22.0)	10.0% (8.0)
Image C	3.8% (3.0)	8.8% (7.0)	11.3% (9.0)	30.0% (24.0)	46.3% (37.0)
Image D	5.0% (4.0)	15.0% (12.0)	12.5% (10.0)	35.0% (28.0)	32.5% (26.0)

Likely Renter (30)

Image A	6.7% (2.0)	20.0% (6.0)	26.7% (8.0)	30.0% (9.0)	16.7% (5.0)
Image B	10.0% (3.0)	30.0% (9.0)	16.7% (5.0)	36.7% (11.0)	6.7% (2.0)
Image C	-	10.0% (3.0)	3.3% (1.0)	50.0% (15.0)	36.7% (11.0)
Image D	-	23.3% (7.0)	10.0% (3.0)	40.0% (12.0)	26.7% (8.0)

Unknown (17)

Image A	17.6% (3.0)	11.8% (2.0)	29.4% (5.0)	23.5% (4.0)	17.6% (3.0)
Image B	5.9% (1.0)	47.1% (8.0)	23.5% (4.0)	11.8% (2.0)	11.8% (2.0)
Image C	5.9% (1.0)	-	5.9% (1.0)	29.4% (5.0)	58.8% (10.0)
Image D	-	11.8% (2.0)	11.8% (2.0)	41.2% (7.0)	35.3% (6.0)

Rate your level of agreement with the following statement: I want this type of development in Fitchburg.

CURRENT RESULTS						215 Total Responses
	Strongly Disagree	Disagree	Neutral	Agree	Strongly Agree	
Image A	13% (29)	22% (47)	23% (49)	31% (66)	11% (24)	
Image B	14% (31)	21% (46)	27% (58)	27% (59)	10% (21)	
Image C	2% (5)	8% (17)	17% (36)	33% (70)	40% (87)	
Image D	4% (8)	13% (28)	21% (46)	32% (68)	30% (65)	

REGISTERED (124)						
	Strongly Disagree	Disagree	Neutral	Agree	Strongly Agree	
Image A	16.0% (20)	19.0% (24)	19.0% (24)	33.0% (41)	12.0% (15)	
Image B	19.0% (23)	21.0% (26)	25.0% (31)	27.0% (33)	9.0% (11)	
Image C	2.0% (3)	9.0% (11)	13.0% (16)	35.0% (43)	41.0% (51)	
Image D	4.0% (5)	15.0% (19)	18.0% (22)	32.0% (40)	31.0% (38)	

NON-REGISTERED (91)						
	Strongly Disagree	Disagree	Neutral	Agree	Strongly Agree	
Image A	9.9% (9)	25.3% (23)	27.5% (25)	27.5% (25)	9.9% (9)	
Image B	8.8% (8)	22.0% (20)	29.7% (27)	28.6% (26)	11.0% (10)	
Image C	2.2% (2)	6.6% (6)	22.0% (20)	29.7% (27)	39.6% (36)	
Image D	3.3% (3)	9.9% (9)	26.4% (24)	30.8% (28)	29.7% (27)	

ALL RESPONDENTS (215)						
	Strongly Disagree	Disagree	Neutral	Agree	Strongly Agree	
Image A	13% (29)	22% (47)	23% (49)	31% (66)	11% (24)	
Image B	14% (31)	21% (46)	27% (58)	27% (59)	10% (21)	
Image C	2% (5)	8% (17)	17% (36)	33% (70)	40% (87)	
Image D	4% (8)	13% (28)	21% (46)	32% (68)	30% (65)	

REGISTERED VOTERS IN FITCHBURG, WI (124)						
	Strongly Disagree	Disagree	Neutral	Agree	Strongly Agree	
Image A	16% (20)	19% (24)	19% (24)	33% (41)	12% (15)	
Image B	19% (23)	21% (26)	25% (31)	27% (33)	9% (11)	
Image C	2% (3)	9% (11)	13% (16)	35% (43)	41% (51)	
Image D	4% (5)	15% (19)	18% (22)	32% (40)	31% (38)	

LIVE IN FITCHBURG, WI (182) - SELF-REPORTED						
	Strongly Disagree	Disagree	Neutral	Agree	Strongly Agree	
Image A	15% (28)	20% (37)	22% (40)	31% (57)	11% (20)	
Image B	16% (29)	20% (37)	27% (49)	27% (50)	9% (17)	
Image C	2% (3)	9% (16)	15% (27)	34% (61)	41% (75)	
Image D	3% (5)	13% (24)	21% (39)	33% (60)	30% (54)	

SUBSCRIBERS TO FITCHBURG, WI (187)						
	Strongly Disagree	Disagree	Neutral	Agree	Strongly Agree	
Image A	15% (28)	20% (37)	21% (40)	33% (62)	11% (20)	
Image B	16% (29)	20% (37)	27% (51)	28% (53)	9% (17)	
Image C	2% (3)	9% (16)	15% (28)	34% (63)	41% (77)	
Image D	3% (5)	13% (25)	21% (39)	33% (62)	30% (56)	

REGISTER RESPONDENTS FROM ANYWHERE (127)						

	Strongly Disagree	Disagree	Neutral	Agree	Strongly Agree
Image A	16% (20)	20% (25)	19% (24)	34% (43)	12% (15)
Image B	18% (23)	20% (26)	25% (32)	28% (35)	9% (11)
Image C	2% (3)	9% (11)	13% (17)	35% (45)	40% (51)
Image D	4% (5)	16% (20)	17% (22)	33% (42)	30% (38)

EDUCATION

127 REGISTERED VOTERS

	Strongly Disagree	Disagree	Neutral	Agree	Strongly Agree
--	-------------------	----------	---------	-------	----------------

Bach Degree - Extremely Likely (23)

Image A	13.0% (3.0)	17.4% (4.0)	26.1% (6.0)	30.4% (7.0)	13.0% (3.0)
Image B	17.4% (4.0)	21.7% (5.0)	26.1% (6.0)	26.1% (6.0)	8.7% (2.0)
Image C	-	8.7% (2.0)	17.4% (4.0)	30.4% (7.0)	43.5% (10.0)
Image D	4.3% (1.0)	13.0% (3.0)	17.4% (4.0)	21.7% (5.0)	43.5% (10.0)

Bach Degree - Likely (16)

Image A	25.0% (4.0)	6.3% (1.0)	18.8% (3.0)	43.8% (7.0)	6.3% (1.0)
Image B	31.3% (5.0)	12.5% (2.0)	18.8% (3.0)	31.3% (5.0)	6.3% (1.0)
Image C	6.3% (1.0)	18.8% (3.0)	6.3% (1.0)	12.5% (2.0)	56.3% (9.0)
Image D	6.3% (1.0)	18.8% (3.0)	12.5% (2.0)	25.0% (4.0)	37.5% (6.0)

Grad Degree - Extremely Likely (18)

Image A	11.1% (2.0)	16.7% (3.0)	11.1% (2.0)	38.9% (7.0)	22.2% (4.0)
Image B	5.6% (1.0)	11.1% (2.0)	27.8% (5.0)	33.3% (6.0)	22.2% (4.0)
Image C	5.6% (1.0)	11.1% (2.0)	22.2% (4.0)	38.9% (7.0)	22.2% (4.0)
Image D	11.1% (2.0)	5.6% (1.0)	27.8% (5.0)	33.3% (6.0)	22.2% (4.0)

Grad Degree - Likely (11)

Image A	9.1% (1.0)	9.1% (1.0)	27.3% (3.0)	45.5% (5.0)	9.1% (1.0)
Image B	-	9.1% (1.0)	36.4% (4.0)	36.4% (4.0)	18.2% (2.0)
Image C	9.1% (1.0)	-	-	36.4% (4.0)	54.5% (6.0)
Image D	-	27.3% (3.0)	27.3% (3.0)	45.5% (5.0)	-

HS Diploma - Extremely Likely (5)

Image A	20.0% (1.0)	-	-	40.0% (2.0)	40.0% (2.0)
Image B	40.0% (2.0)	-	20.0% (1.0)	40.0% (2.0)	-
Image C	-	40.0% (2.0)	20.0% (1.0)	20.0% (1.0)	20.0% (1.0)
Image D	20.0% (1.0)	40.0% (2.0)	40.0% (2.0)	-	-

HS Diploma - Likely (2)

Image A	-	50.0% (1.0)	-	-	50.0% (1.0)
Image B	-	100.0% (2.0)	-	-	-
Image C	-	-	-	100.0% (2.0)	-
Image D	-	-	-	50.0% (1.0)	50.0% (1.0)

Less than HS Diploma - Likely (1)

Image A	-	100.0% (1.0)	-	-	-
Image B	-	-	100.0% (1.0)	-	-
Image C	-	-	-	-	100.0% (1.0)
Image D	-	-	-	-	100.0% (1.0)

Some College - Likely (8)

Image A	12.5% (1.0)	12.5% (1.0)	37.5% (3.0)	37.5% (3.0)	-
Image B	25.0% (2.0)	25.0% (2.0)	12.5% (1.0)	37.5% (3.0)	-
Image C	-	12.5% (1.0)	25.0% (2.0)	50.0% (4.0)	12.5% (1.0)
Image D	-	12.5% (1.0)	37.5% (3.0)	50.0% (4.0)	-

Some College -Extremely Likely (3)

Image A	-	33.3% (1.0)	-	66.7% (2.0)	-
Image B	-	33.3% (1.0)	-	66.7% (2.0)	-
Image C	-	-	-	66.7% (2.0)	33.3% (1.0)
Image D	-	33.3% (1.0)	-	66.7% (2.0)	-

Unknown (40)

Image A	20.0% (8.0)	30.0% (12.0)	17.5% (7.0)	25.0% (10.0)	7.5% (3.0)
Image B	22.5% (9.0)	27.5% (11.0)	27.5% (11.0)	17.5% (7.0)	5.0% (2.0)
Image C	-	2.5% (1.0)	12.5% (5.0)	40.0% (16.0)	45.0% (18.0)
Image D	-	15.0% (6.0)	7.5% (3.0)	37.5% (15.0)	40.0% (16.0)

VOTERS GENDER

127 REGISTERED VOTERS

	Strongly Disagree	Disagree	Neutral	Agree	Strongly Agree
--	-------------------	----------	---------	-------	----------------

F (60)

Image A	13.3% (8.0)	23.3% (14.0)	15.0% (9.0)	35.0% (21.0)	13.3% (8.0)
Image B	13.3% (8.0)	21.7% (13.0)	30.0% (18.0)	28.3% (17.0)	6.7% (4.0)
Image C	-	10.0% (6.0)	15.0% (9.0)	33.3% (20.0)	41.7% (25.0)
Image D	3.3% (2.0)	20.0% (12.0)	15.0% (9.0)	31.7% (19.0)	30.0% (18.0)

M (66)

Image A	16.7% (11.0)	16.7% (11.0)	22.7% (15.0)	33.3% (22.0)	10.6% (7.0)
Image B	22.7% (15.0)	18.2% (12.0)	21.2% (14.0)	27.3% (18.0)	10.6% (7.0)
Image C	4.5% (3.0)	7.6% (5.0)	12.1% (8.0)	37.9% (25.0)	37.9% (25.0)
Image D	4.5% (3.0)	12.1% (8.0)	19.7% (13.0)	34.8% (23.0)	28.8% (19.0)

Unknown (1)

Image A	100.0% (1.0)	-	-	-	-
Image B	-	100.0% (1.0)	-	-	-
Image C	-	-	-	-	100.0% (1.0)
Image D	-	-	-	-	100.0% (1.0)

PRECINCT

127 REGISTERED VOTERS

	Strongly Disagree	Disagree	Neutral	Agree	Strongly Agree
--	-------------------	----------	---------	-------	----------------

CHICAGO 43-04 (1)

Image A	-	100.0% (1.0)	-	-	-
Image B	-	-	100.0% (1.0)	-	-
Image C	-	-	-	100.0% (1.0)	-
Image D	-	-	-	100.0% (1.0)	-

FITCHBURG CITY WARD 01 (5)

Image A	-	40.0% (2.0)	-	40.0% (2.0)	20.0% (1.0)
Image B	-	40.0% (2.0)	20.0% (1.0)	40.0% (2.0)	-
Image C	-	-	-	60.0% (3.0)	40.0% (2.0)
Image D	-	-	20.0% (1.0)	60.0% (3.0)	20.0% (1.0)

FITCHBURG CITY WARD 02 (2)

Image A	50.0% (1.0)	50.0% (1.0)	-	-	-
Image B	50.0% (1.0)	-	-	50.0% (1.0)	-
Image C	-	-	-	100.0% (2.0)	-
Image D	-	50.0% (1.0)	-	-	50.0% (1.0)

FITCHBURG CITY WARD 03 (2)

Image A	-	50.0% (1.0)	-	50.0% (1.0)	-
---------	---	-------------	---	-------------	---

Image B	-	-	50.0% (1.0)	50.0% (1.0)	-
Image C	-	50.0% (1.0)	50.0% (1.0)	-	-
Image D	-	50.0% (1.0)	-	-	50.0% (1.0)

FITCHBURG CITY WARD 04 (1)

Image A	-	-	100.0% (1.0)	-	-
Image B	-	-	100.0% (1.0)	-	-
Image C	-	-	-	100.0% (1.0)	-
Image D	-	-	-	100.0% (1.0)	-

FITCHBURG CITY WARD 05 (5)

Image A	20.0% (1.0)	20.0% (1.0)	20.0% (1.0)	40.0% (2.0)	-
Image B	20.0% (1.0)	60.0% (3.0)	-	20.0% (1.0)	-
Image C	-	-	20.0% (1.0)	40.0% (2.0)	40.0% (2.0)
Image D	20.0% (1.0)	-	20.0% (1.0)	20.0% (1.0)	40.0% (2.0)

FITCHBURG CITY WARD 06 (8)

Image A	12.5% (1.0)	12.5% (1.0)	37.5% (3.0)	25.0% (2.0)	12.5% (1.0)
Image B	25.0% (2.0)	12.5% (1.0)	37.5% (3.0)	25.0% (2.0)	-
Image C	-	12.5% (1.0)	-	37.5% (3.0)	50.0% (4.0)
Image D	-	25.0% (2.0)	-	37.5% (3.0)	37.5% (3.0)

FITCHBURG CITY WARD 07 (11)

Image A	9.1% (1.0)	18.2% (2.0)	27.3% (3.0)	36.4% (4.0)	9.1% (1.0)
Image B	9.1% (1.0)	18.2% (2.0)	27.3% (3.0)	36.4% (4.0)	9.1% (1.0)
Image C	-	9.1% (1.0)	27.3% (3.0)	27.3% (3.0)	36.4% (4.0)
Image D	-	27.3% (3.0)	27.3% (3.0)	18.2% (2.0)	27.3% (3.0)

FITCHBURG CITY WARD 08 (7)

Image A	42.9% (3.0)	28.6% (2.0)	-	14.3% (1.0)	14.3% (1.0)
Image B	42.9% (3.0)	28.6% (2.0)	-	-	28.6% (2.0)
Image C	-	-	-	42.9% (3.0)	57.1% (4.0)
Image D	-	-	28.6% (2.0)	14.3% (1.0)	57.1% (4.0)

FITCHBURG CITY WARD 09 (4)

Image A	25.0% (1.0)	-	25.0% (1.0)	50.0% (2.0)	-
Image B	-	25.0% (1.0)	50.0% (2.0)	25.0% (1.0)	-
Image C	-	-	25.0% (1.0)	25.0% (1.0)	50.0% (2.0)
Image D	-	25.0% (1.0)	-	25.0% (1.0)	50.0% (2.0)

FITCHBURG CITY WARD 12 (1)

Image A	-	-	-	-	100.0% (1.0)
Image B	-	-	-	100.0% (1.0)	-
Image C	-	-	-	-	100.0% (1.0)
Image D	-	-	-	100.0% (1.0)	-

FITCHBURG CITY WARD 13 (21)

Image A	4.8% (1.0)	19.0% (4.0)	23.8% (5.0)	47.6% (10.0)	4.8% (1.0)
Image B	9.5% (2.0)	23.8% (5.0)	19.0% (4.0)	42.9% (9.0)	4.8% (1.0)
Image C	4.8% (1.0)	14.3% (3.0)	-	38.1% (8.0)	42.9% (9.0)
Image D	-	14.3% (3.0)	4.8% (1.0)	52.4% (11.0)	28.6% (6.0)

FITCHBURG CITY WARD 14 (14)

Image A	21.4% (3.0)	21.4% (3.0)	-	42.9% (6.0)	14.3% (2.0)
Image B	35.7% (5.0)	14.3% (2.0)	28.6% (4.0)	21.4% (3.0)	-
Image C	-	7.1% (1.0)	7.1% (1.0)	28.6% (4.0)	57.1% (8.0)
Image D	7.1% (1.0)	14.3% (2.0)	14.3% (2.0)	28.6% (4.0)	35.7% (5.0)

FITCHBURG CITY WARD 15 (5)

Image A	-	-	20.0% (1.0)	40.0% (2.0)	40.0% (2.0)
Image B	-	-	20.0% (1.0)	40.0% (2.0)	40.0% (2.0)
Image C	-	40.0% (2.0)	40.0% (2.0)	20.0% (1.0)	-
Image D	20.0% (1.0)	40.0% (2.0)	20.0% (1.0)	20.0% (1.0)	-

FITCHBURG CITY WARD 16 (3)

Image A	-	-	66.7% (2.0)	33.3% (1.0)	-
Image B	-	-	66.7% (2.0)	-	33.3% (1.0)
Image C	-	-	66.7% (2.0)	-	33.3% (1.0)
Image D	-	-	66.7% (2.0)	33.3% (1.0)	-

FITCHBURG CITY WARD 17 (6)

Image A	33.3% (2.0)	16.7% (1.0)	16.7% (1.0)	16.7% (1.0)	16.7% (1.0)
Image B	50.0% (3.0)	16.7% (1.0)	-	16.7% (1.0)	16.7% (1.0)
Image C	-	-	33.3% (2.0)	33.3% (2.0)	33.3% (2.0)
Image D	-	-	33.3% (2.0)	33.3% (2.0)	33.3% (2.0)

FITCHBURG CITY WARD 18 (11)

Image A	36.4% (4.0)	9.1% (1.0)	36.4% (4.0)	9.1% (1.0)	9.1% (1.0)
Image B	36.4% (4.0)	18.2% (2.0)	27.3% (3.0)	9.1% (1.0)	9.1% (1.0)
Image C	18.2% (2.0)	-	-	54.5% (6.0)	27.3% (3.0)
Image D	18.2% (2.0)	9.1% (1.0)	9.1% (1.0)	36.4% (4.0)	27.3% (3.0)

FITCHBURG CITY WARD 19 (15)

Image A	6.7% (1.0)	33.3% (5.0)	13.3% (2.0)	33.3% (5.0)	13.3% (2.0)
Image B	6.7% (1.0)	26.7% (4.0)	33.3% (5.0)	20.0% (3.0)	13.3% (2.0)
Image C	-	6.7% (1.0)	13.3% (2.0)	26.7% (4.0)	53.3% (8.0)
Image D	-	13.3% (2.0)	33.3% (5.0)	20.0% (3.0)	33.3% (5.0)

MADISON CITY WARD 066 (1)

Image A	-	-	-	100.0% (1.0)	-
Image B	-	-	-	100.0% (1.0)	-
Image C	-	-	100.0% (1.0)	-	-
Image D	-	-	100.0% (1.0)	-	-

MADISON CITY WARD 100 (1)

Image A	-	-	-	-	100.0% (1.0)
Image B	-	-	100.0% (1.0)	-	-
Image C	-	100.0% (1.0)	-	-	-
Image D	-	100.0% (1.0)	-	-	-

MADISON CITY WARD 107 (1)

Image A	-	-	-	100.0% (1.0)	-
Image B	-	-	-	100.0% (1.0)	-
Image C	-	-	-	100.0% (1.0)	-
Image D	-	-	-	100.0% (1.0)	-

OREGON VLG WARD 09 (1)

Image A	-	-	-	100.0% (1.0)	-
Image B	-	-	-	100.0% (1.0)	-
Image C	-	-	100.0% (1.0)	-	-
Image D	-	100.0% (1.0)	-	-	-

OREGON VLG WARD 10 (1)

Image A	100.0% (1.0)	-	-	-	-
Image B	-	100.0% (1.0)	-	-	-
Image C	-	-	-	-	100.0% (1.0)
Image D	-	-	-	100.0% (1.0)	-

AGE RANGE

127 REGISTERED VOTERS

	Strongly Disagree	Disagree	Neutral	Agree	Strongly Agree
--	-------------------	----------	---------	-------	----------------

18-29 (1)

Image A	-	100.0% (1.0)	-	-	-
Image B	-	-	100.0% (1.0)	-	-
Image C	-	-	-	-	100.0% (1.0)
Image D	-	-	-	-	100.0% (1.0)

30-39 (15)

Image A	13.3% (2.0)	20.0% (3.0)	33.3% (5.0)	20.0% (3.0)	13.3% (2.0)
Image B	13.3% (2.0)	20.0% (3.0)	40.0% (6.0)	20.0% (3.0)	6.7% (1.0)
Image C	-	13.3% (2.0)	-	40.0% (6.0)	46.7% (7.0)
Image D	-	20.0% (3.0)	13.3% (2.0)	33.3% (5.0)	33.3% (5.0)

40-49 (21)

Image A	33.3% (7.0)	19.0% (4.0)	9.5% (2.0)	19.0% (4.0)	19.0% (4.0)
Image B	23.8% (5.0)	38.1% (8.0)	14.3% (3.0)	19.0% (4.0)	4.8% (1.0)
Image C	4.8% (1.0)	-	-	42.9% (9.0)	52.4% (11.0)
Image D	9.5% (2.0)	4.8% (1.0)	9.5% (2.0)	33.3% (7.0)	42.9% (9.0)

50-59 (15)

Image A	6.7% (1.0)	26.7% (4.0)	20.0% (3.0)	40.0% (6.0)	6.7% (1.0)
Image B	20.0% (3.0)	-	33.3% (5.0)	33.3% (5.0)	13.3% (2.0)
Image C	-	13.3% (2.0)	20.0% (3.0)	40.0% (6.0)	26.7% (4.0)
Image D	-	20.0% (3.0)	13.3% (2.0)	40.0% (6.0)	26.7% (4.0)

60-69 (20)

Image A	5.0% (1.0)	10.0% (2.0)	30.0% (6.0)	50.0% (10.0)	5.0% (1.0)
Image B	5.0% (1.0)	25.0% (5.0)	25.0% (5.0)	40.0% (8.0)	5.0% (1.0)
Image C	5.0% (1.0)	15.0% (3.0)	30.0% (6.0)	35.0% (7.0)	15.0% (3.0)
Image D	10.0% (2.0)	20.0% (4.0)	30.0% (6.0)	30.0% (6.0)	10.0% (2.0)

70-79 (13)

Image A	15.4% (2.0)	7.7% (1.0)	23.1% (3.0)	46.2% (6.0)	7.7% (1.0)
Image B	15.4% (2.0)	7.7% (1.0)	23.1% (3.0)	46.2% (6.0)	7.7% (1.0)
Image C	7.7% (1.0)	15.4% (2.0)	23.1% (3.0)	7.7% (1.0)	46.2% (6.0)
Image D	-	38.5% (5.0)	23.1% (3.0)	23.1% (3.0)	15.4% (2.0)

unknown (42)

Image A	16.7% (7.0)	23.8% (10.0)	11.9% (5.0)	33.3% (14.0)	14.3% (6.0)
Image B	23.8% (10.0)	21.4% (9.0)	21.4% (9.0)	21.4% (9.0)	11.9% (5.0)
Image C	-	4.8% (2.0)	11.9% (5.0)	38.1% (16.0)	45.2% (19.0)
Image D	2.4% (1.0)	9.5% (4.0)	16.7% (7.0)	35.7% (15.0)	35.7% (15.0)

VOTERS AGE

127 REGISTERED VOTERS

	Strongly Disagree	Disagree	Neutral	Agree	Strongly Agree
--	-------------------	----------	---------	-------	----------------

28 (1)

Image A	-	100.0% (1.0)	-	-	-
Image B	-	-	100.0% (1.0)	-	-

Image C	-	-	-	-	100.0% (1.0)
Image D	-	-	-	-	100.0% (1.0)
31 (1)					
Image A	-	-	-	100.0% (1.0)	-
Image B	-	100.0% (1.0)	-	-	-
Image C	-	-	-	-	100.0% (1.0)
Image D	-	-	100.0% (1.0)	-	-
32 (1)					
Image A	-	-	100.0% (1.0)	-	-
Image B	-	-	100.0% (1.0)	-	-
Image C	-	-	-	100.0% (1.0)	-
Image D	-	-	-	100.0% (1.0)	-
35 (3)					
Image A	33.3% (1.0)	33.3% (1.0)	-	33.3% (1.0)	-
Image B	33.3% (1.0)	-	-	66.7% (2.0)	-
Image C	-	-	-	66.7% (2.0)	33.3% (1.0)
Image D	-	33.3% (1.0)	-	33.3% (1.0)	33.3% (1.0)
36 (2)					
Image A	-	-	50.0% (1.0)	50.0% (1.0)	-
Image B	-	-	50.0% (1.0)	50.0% (1.0)	-
Image C	-	50.0% (1.0)	-	50.0% (1.0)	-
Image D	-	50.0% (1.0)	-	50.0% (1.0)	-
37 (3)					
Image A	33.3% (1.0)	33.3% (1.0)	33.3% (1.0)	-	-
Image B	33.3% (1.0)	33.3% (1.0)	33.3% (1.0)	-	-
Image C	-	-	-	33.3% (1.0)	66.7% (2.0)
Image D	-	-	33.3% (1.0)	33.3% (1.0)	33.3% (1.0)
38 (3)					
Image A	-	33.3% (1.0)	33.3% (1.0)	-	33.3% (1.0)
Image B	-	33.3% (1.0)	66.7% (2.0)	-	-
Image C	-	33.3% (1.0)	-	33.3% (1.0)	33.3% (1.0)
Image D	-	33.3% (1.0)	-	33.3% (1.0)	33.3% (1.0)
39 (2)					
Image A	-	-	50.0% (1.0)	-	50.0% (1.0)
Image B	-	-	50.0% (1.0)	-	50.0% (1.0)
Image C	-	-	-	-	100.0% (2.0)
Image D	-	-	-	-	100.0% (2.0)
40 (4)					
Image A	75.0% (3.0)	-	-	25.0% (1.0)	-
Image B	50.0% (2.0)	25.0% (1.0)	-	25.0% (1.0)	-
Image C	-	-	-	25.0% (1.0)	75.0% (3.0)
Image D	-	-	25.0% (1.0)	25.0% (1.0)	50.0% (2.0)
43 (2)					
Image A	50.0% (1.0)	-	-	-	50.0% (1.0)
Image B	50.0% (1.0)	50.0% (1.0)	-	-	-
Image C	50.0% (1.0)	-	-	-	50.0% (1.0)
Image D	50.0% (1.0)	-	-	-	50.0% (1.0)

44 (5)

Image A	60.0% (3.0)	-	-	40.0% (2.0)	-
Image B	20.0% (1.0)	20.0% (1.0)	20.0% (1.0)	40.0% (2.0)	-
Image C	-	-	-	40.0% (2.0)	60.0% (3.0)
Image D	-	20.0% (1.0)	-	40.0% (2.0)	40.0% (2.0)

45 (2)

Image A	-	50.0% (1.0)	-	-	50.0% (1.0)
Image B	50.0% (1.0)	50.0% (1.0)	-	-	-
Image C	-	-	-	50.0% (1.0)	50.0% (1.0)
Image D	50.0% (1.0)	-	-	-	50.0% (1.0)

46 (1)

Image A	-	-	100.0% (1.0)	-	-
Image B	-	-	100.0% (1.0)	-	-
Image C	-	-	-	-	100.0% (1.0)
Image D	-	-	-	-	100.0% (1.0)

47 (3)

Image A	-	33.3% (1.0)	-	-	66.7% (2.0)
Image B	-	33.3% (1.0)	-	33.3% (1.0)	33.3% (1.0)
Image C	-	-	-	66.7% (2.0)	33.3% (1.0)
Image D	-	-	-	66.7% (2.0)	33.3% (1.0)

48 (1)

Image A	-	-	-	100.0% (1.0)	-
Image B	-	100.0% (1.0)	-	-	-
Image C	-	-	-	100.0% (1.0)	-
Image D	-	-	-	100.0% (1.0)	-

49 (3)

Image A	-	66.7% (2.0)	33.3% (1.0)	-	-
Image B	-	66.7% (2.0)	33.3% (1.0)	-	-
Image C	-	-	-	66.7% (2.0)	33.3% (1.0)
Image D	-	-	33.3% (1.0)	33.3% (1.0)	33.3% (1.0)

50 (1)

Image A	-	-	-	100.0% (1.0)	-
Image B	-	-	-	100.0% (1.0)	-
Image C	-	-	-	100.0% (1.0)	-
Image D	-	-	100.0% (1.0)	-	-

52 (4)

Image A	-	75.0% (3.0)	-	25.0% (1.0)	-
Image B	-	-	75.0% (3.0)	25.0% (1.0)	-
Image C	-	-	25.0% (1.0)	50.0% (2.0)	25.0% (1.0)
Image D	-	25.0% (1.0)	-	50.0% (2.0)	25.0% (1.0)

53 (1)

Image A	-	-	100.0% (1.0)	-	-
Image B	-	-	100.0% (1.0)	-	-
Image C	-	-	100.0% (1.0)	-	-
Image D	-	-	-	-	100.0% (1.0)

55 (2)

Image A	-	-	-	100.0% (2.0)	-
---------	---	---	---	--------------	---

Image B	-	-	-	50.0% (1.0)	50.0% (1.0)
Image C	-	50.0% (1.0)	-	-	50.0% (1.0)
Image D	-	50.0% (1.0)	-	50.0% (1.0)	-

56 (2)

Image A	-	50.0% (1.0)	50.0% (1.0)	-	-
Image B	100.0% (2.0)	-	-	-	-
Image C	-	-	-	50.0% (1.0)	50.0% (1.0)
Image D	-	-	-	50.0% (1.0)	50.0% (1.0)

57 (1)

Image A	100.0% (1.0)	-	-	-	-
Image B	100.0% (1.0)	-	-	-	-
Image C	-	-	-	100.0% (1.0)	-
Image D	-	-	-	100.0% (1.0)	-

59 (4)

Image A	-	-	25.0% (1.0)	50.0% (2.0)	25.0% (1.0)
Image B	-	-	25.0% (1.0)	50.0% (2.0)	25.0% (1.0)
Image C	-	25.0% (1.0)	25.0% (1.0)	25.0% (1.0)	25.0% (1.0)
Image D	-	25.0% (1.0)	25.0% (1.0)	25.0% (1.0)	25.0% (1.0)

60 (1)

Image A	-	-	-	100.0% (1.0)	-
Image B	-	-	100.0% (1.0)	-	-
Image C	-	-	100.0% (1.0)	-	-
Image D	-	-	100.0% (1.0)	-	-

61 (2)

Image A	-	50.0% (1.0)	-	50.0% (1.0)	-
Image B	-	50.0% (1.0)	-	50.0% (1.0)	-
Image C	-	-	50.0% (1.0)	-	50.0% (1.0)
Image D	-	50.0% (1.0)	50.0% (1.0)	-	-

62 (3)

Image A	-	33.3% (1.0)	33.3% (1.0)	33.3% (1.0)	-
Image B	-	33.3% (1.0)	33.3% (1.0)	33.3% (1.0)	-
Image C	-	-	33.3% (1.0)	66.7% (2.0)	-
Image D	33.3% (1.0)	-	-	66.7% (2.0)	-

63 (2)

Image A	-	-	50.0% (1.0)	50.0% (1.0)	-
Image B	-	50.0% (1.0)	-	50.0% (1.0)	-
Image C	-	50.0% (1.0)	-	-	50.0% (1.0)
Image D	-	50.0% (1.0)	-	-	50.0% (1.0)

64 (2)

Image A	-	-	50.0% (1.0)	50.0% (1.0)	-
Image B	-	50.0% (1.0)	50.0% (1.0)	-	-
Image C	-	-	-	100.0% (2.0)	-
Image D	-	-	-	100.0% (2.0)	-

65 (2)

Image A	-	-	50.0% (1.0)	50.0% (1.0)	-
Image B	-	50.0% (1.0)	-	50.0% (1.0)	-
Image C	-	50.0% (1.0)	-	50.0% (1.0)	-
Image D	-	50.0% (1.0)	-	50.0% (1.0)	-

66 (3)

Image A	-	-	66.7% (2.0)	33.3% (1.0)	-
Image B	-	-	66.7% (2.0)	33.3% (1.0)	-
Image C	33.3% (1.0)	-	66.7% (2.0)	-	-
Image D	33.3% (1.0)	-	66.7% (2.0)	-	-

68 (1)

Image A	100.0% (1.0)	-	-	-	-
Image B	100.0% (1.0)	-	-	-	-
Image C	-	-	-	-	100.0% (1.0)
Image D	-	-	-	-	100.0% (1.0)

69 (4)

Image A	-	-	-	75.0% (3.0)	25.0% (1.0)
Image B	-	-	-	75.0% (3.0)	25.0% (1.0)
Image C	-	25.0% (1.0)	25.0% (1.0)	50.0% (2.0)	-
Image D	-	25.0% (1.0)	50.0% (2.0)	25.0% (1.0)	-

70 (2)

Image A	50.0% (1.0)	-	-	50.0% (1.0)	-
Image B	50.0% (1.0)	-	-	50.0% (1.0)	-
Image C	-	50.0% (1.0)	-	50.0% (1.0)	-
Image D	-	50.0% (1.0)	-	50.0% (1.0)	-

71 (1)

Image A	-	-	-	100.0% (1.0)	-
Image B	-	-	100.0% (1.0)	-	-
Image C	-	-	-	-	100.0% (1.0)
Image D	-	-	100.0% (1.0)	-	-

72 (1)

Image A	-	-	-	100.0% (1.0)	-
Image B	-	-	-	100.0% (1.0)	-
Image C	-	100.0% (1.0)	-	-	-
Image D	-	100.0% (1.0)	-	-	-

73 (3)

Image A	-	33.3% (1.0)	-	33.3% (1.0)	33.3% (1.0)
Image B	-	33.3% (1.0)	-	33.3% (1.0)	33.3% (1.0)
Image C	-	-	66.7% (2.0)	-	33.3% (1.0)
Image D	-	33.3% (1.0)	33.3% (1.0)	-	33.3% (1.0)

74 (2)

Image A	50.0% (1.0)	-	50.0% (1.0)	-	-
Image B	50.0% (1.0)	-	50.0% (1.0)	-	-
Image C	-	-	-	-	100.0% (2.0)
Image D	-	50.0% (1.0)	-	-	50.0% (1.0)

77 (2)

Image A	-	-	50.0% (1.0)	50.0% (1.0)	-
Image B	-	-	-	100.0% (2.0)	-
Image C	50.0% (1.0)	-	-	-	50.0% (1.0)
Image D	-	-	-	100.0% (2.0)	-

79 (2)

Image A	-	-	50.0% (1.0)	50.0% (1.0)	-
---------	---	---	-------------	-------------	---

Image B	-	-	50.0% (1.0)	50.0% (1.0)	-
Image C	-	-	50.0% (1.0)	-	50.0% (1.0)
Image D	-	50.0% (1.0)	50.0% (1.0)	-	-
Unknown (42)					
Image A	16.7% (7.0)	23.8% (10.0)	11.9% (5.0)	33.3% (14.0)	14.3% (6.0)
Image B	23.8% (10.0)	21.4% (9.0)	21.4% (9.0)	21.4% (9.0)	11.9% (5.0)
Image C	-	4.8% (2.0)	11.9% (5.0)	38.1% (16.0)	45.2% (19.0)
Image D	2.4% (1.0)	9.5% (4.0)	16.7% (7.0)	35.7% (15.0)	35.7% (15.0)

STATE INCOME DECILE

127 REGISTERED VOTERS

	Strongly Disagree	Disagree	Neutral	Agree	Strongly Agree
0 to 9 Pct range (3)					
Image A	-	-	66.7% (2.0)	33.3% (1.0)	-
Image B	-	66.7% (2.0)	33.3% (1.0)	-	-
Image C	-	-	-	33.3% (1.0)	66.7% (2.0)
Image D	-	-	33.3% (1.0)	33.3% (1.0)	33.3% (1.0)
10 to 19 Pct range (2)					
Image A	-	50.0% (1.0)	-	50.0% (1.0)	-
Image B	-	-	50.0% (1.0)	50.0% (1.0)	-
Image C	-	50.0% (1.0)	50.0% (1.0)	-	-
Image D	-	50.0% (1.0)	-	-	50.0% (1.0)
40 to 49 Pct range (1)					
Image A	-	-	-	100.0% (1.0)	-
Image B	-	-	-	100.0% (1.0)	-
Image C	-	-	-	100.0% (1.0)	-
Image D	-	-	-	100.0% (1.0)	-
50 to 59 Pct range (5)					
Image A	-	40.0% (2.0)	20.0% (1.0)	20.0% (1.0)	20.0% (1.0)
Image B	-	60.0% (3.0)	20.0% (1.0)	20.0% (1.0)	-
Image C	-	-	-	60.0% (3.0)	40.0% (2.0)
Image D	-	-	20.0% (1.0)	60.0% (3.0)	20.0% (1.0)
60 to 69 Pct range (3)					
Image A	33.3% (1.0)	-	33.3% (1.0)	33.3% (1.0)	-
Image B	-	33.3% (1.0)	33.3% (1.0)	33.3% (1.0)	-
Image C	-	-	33.3% (1.0)	-	66.7% (2.0)
Image D	-	33.3% (1.0)	-	-	66.7% (2.0)
70 to 79 Pct range (4)					
Image A	25.0% (1.0)	25.0% (1.0)	-	25.0% (1.0)	25.0% (1.0)
Image B	25.0% (1.0)	-	25.0% (1.0)	25.0% (1.0)	25.0% (1.0)
Image C	-	25.0% (1.0)	-	50.0% (2.0)	25.0% (1.0)
Image D	-	50.0% (2.0)	-	25.0% (1.0)	25.0% (1.0)
80 to 89 Pct range (49)					
Image A	10.2% (5.0)	16.3% (8.0)	18.4% (9.0)	40.8% (20.0)	14.3% (7.0)
Image B	20.4% (10.0)	14.3% (7.0)	22.4% (11.0)	34.7% (17.0)	8.2% (4.0)
Image C	2.0% (1.0)	12.2% (6.0)	16.3% (8.0)	30.6% (15.0)	38.8% (19.0)
Image D	4.1% (2.0)	14.3% (7.0)	18.4% (9.0)	38.8% (19.0)	24.5% (12.0)
90 Pct and up (58)					

Image A	20.7% (12.0)	22.4% (13.0)	17.2% (10.0)	29.3% (17.0)	10.3% (6.0)
Image B	20.7% (12.0)	20.7% (12.0)	25.9% (15.0)	22.4% (13.0)	10.3% (6.0)
Image C	3.4% (2.0)	5.2% (3.0)	12.1% (7.0)	39.7% (23.0)	39.7% (23.0)
Image D	5.2% (3.0)	13.8% (8.0)	19.0% (11.0)	29.3% (17.0)	32.8% (19.0)

Unknown (2)

Image A	50.0% (1.0)	-	50.0% (1.0)	-	-
Image B	-	50.0% (1.0)	50.0% (1.0)	-	-
Image C	-	-	-	-	100.0% (2.0)
Image D	-	50.0% (1.0)	-	-	50.0% (1.0)

HOME OWNER/RENTER

127 REGISTERED VOTERS

	Strongly Disagree	Disagree	Neutral	Agree	Strongly Agree
--	-------------------	----------	---------	-------	----------------

Likely Homeowner (80)

Image A	20.0% (16.0)	13.8% (11.0)	18.8% (15.0)	36.3% (29.0)	11.3% (9.0)
Image B	18.8% (15.0)	17.5% (14.0)	22.5% (18.0)	30.0% (24.0)	11.3% (9.0)
Image C	3.8% (3.0)	8.8% (7.0)	16.3% (13.0)	31.3% (25.0)	40.0% (32.0)
Image D	3.8% (3.0)	15.0% (12.0)	20.0% (16.0)	30.0% (24.0)	31.3% (25.0)



















Likely Renter (30)

Image A	3.3% (1.0)	33.3% (10.0)	20.0% (6.0)	33.3% (10.0)	10.0% (3.0)
Image B	16.7% (5.0)	16.7% (5.0)	33.3% (10.0)	33.3% (10.0)	-
Image C	-	10.0% (3.0)	10.0% (3.0)	46.7% (14.0)	33.3% (10.0)
Image D	3.3% (1.0)	20.0% (6.0)	13.3% (4.0)	36.7% (11.0)	26.7% (8.0)

Unknown (17)

Image A	17.6% (3.0)	23.5% (4.0)	17.6% (3.0)	23.5% (4.0)	17.6% (3.0)
Image B	17.6% (3.0)	41.2% (7.0)	23.5% (4.0)	5.9% (1.0)	11.8% (2.0)
Image C	-	5.9% (1.0)	5.9% (1.0)	35.3% (6.0)	52.9% (9.0)
Image D	5.9% (1.0)	11.8% (2.0)	11.8% (2.0)	41.2% (7.0)	29.4% (5.0)

If you have any comments about your answers to the above questions please provide them here.

-  **Anonymous user's Opinion**
D with older building we don't have so unless they are designed to look old it a no go
-  **Anonymous user's Opinion**
B is boring with not a lot of variation to the exterior facade. Love the old-time looks of C & D. This would be lovely and a fun contrast to the prairie style development near the farmer's market. Prairie style that we currently have can mix with old style of C & D. Those look great an quaint . Like what is going on in Middleton.
-  **Anonymous user's Opinion**
Prefer some parking available beyond street parking, although substantial parking lots are not required.
-  **Anonymous user's Opinion**
I think it would be great if more apartment complexes had small retail shops underneath. It builds a great community and allows the residents convenient options. I love the Agora Center.
-  **Anonymous user's Opinion**
It's really hard to fill main street retail spaces with tenant, but we haven't even attempted to fill-in our city center with any commercial at Lacy/Fish Hatchery. We're too focused on allowing developers to build megaplexes in cornfields.
-  **Anonymous user's Opinion**
I want to be clear. We don't want development in Fitchburg. Only Pat Marsh and his henchmen do.
-  **Anonymous user's Opinion**
We want more small businesses. Middleton for example does a great job at attracting businesses small and large. I don't see why Fitchburg can't support that except for the perception (and perhaps reality) that there's more crime here, especially along Fish Hatch and the Home Depot area.
-  **Anonymous user's Opinion**
A and B too modern. C and D seem more classic and will never fully go out of style. But I like the fact that parking is fully available in the first two. Building-wise, I prefer the last two, with wide roads and angled parking. What provides better revenue for Fitchburg, developer paying taxes on parking lot or street parking revenue?
-  **Anonymous user's Opinion**
The dedicated parking in a and b is wasteful, especially when it's between the sidewalk and the business. Put it behind the building or on the side if it's needed at all
-  **Anonymous user's Opinion**
There's a place for both styles. Generally, I prefer the "small town main street" look over the strip mall, but sometimes the easy availability of parking is preferable.
-  **Anonymous user's Opinion**
I want successful developments in Fitchburg and would need to know marketability of any particular development. I do not believe Fitchburg should dictate a specific architectural type (other than it should relate to its surrounding developments) or its location. For example: a former Mayor advocated "walkable" and small scale retail on Seminole Hwy near Lacy Rd; that type of development for that location would not be marketable and would either never happen or happen and then fail.
-  **Anonymous user's Opinion**
Do not like high density look. Don't want street facing retail
-  **Anonymous user's Opinion**
regardless of building type, I would like to see the focus be on locally owned over chain stores.
-  **Anonymous user's Opinion**
Please bring more commercial development to Fitchburg, particularly along Lacy Road between Syene and US Hwy 14 or in the development behind the Quarry Hill residential development. Any commercial development would be welcome in Fitchburg, as at this point Fitchburg is grossly lacking in even basic amenities. The forced usage of car / road transportation to reach commercial spaces, instead of bike / walking, paired with the unreasonable housing density has become a major dissatisfier and reducing my desire to live in Fitchburg.
-  **Anonymous user's Opinion**
For C and D, I don't feel as though Fitchburg has a "central" downtown type area where people could park a car elsewhere and walk to the shops. It would be nice if there was such a place, but I don't know where it would be.
-  **Christine Kane's Opinion**
Street parking is unappealing especially in winter
-  **Anonymous user's Opinion**
Centralize parking/bike access then provide a walkable network of retail/entertainment.
-  **Anonymous user's Opinion**

A lot of my preference would be affected by availability and ease of parking



Anonymous user's Opinion

Shopping needs to be big enough to draw people to be sustainable, but not overwhelming like the West Towne area.



Anonymous user's Opinion

how about some trees



Anonymous user's Opinion

I appreciate the parking options, but I think they could be behind the businesses to offer the esthetic of options c and d.



Anonymous user's Opinion

Keep accessibility - ease of getting into buildings; parking for bikes, ease of parking cars (spaces not too tight) and backing out.



Stephen Lloyd Arnold's Opinion

A and B encourage driving everywhere and waste land. C and D are much more attractive, make good use of valuable, high-turnover street parking for customers, keep long-term and overflow parking in the back, and encouraging walking and biking. C and D invite mixed use, with residential upstairs and on the back side of the block. I'd like to live near C or D!



Anonymous user's Opinion

Commercial space should incorporate some level of housing to make best use of available land. Combined functions that provide underground parking are critical to avoid urban sprawl and low value strip malls.



Anonymous user's Opinion

A and B are too cookie-cutter. C and D have more character, but are a little old fashioned. There's got to be a way to have more character and individuality without being so old fashioned.



Anonymous user's Opinion

The faux historical would be good C if authentic, but these look phony.



Anonymous user's Opinion

It really doesn't cost much more to build interesting and attractive buildings as opposed to ordinary and nondescript so why not make the city more attractive? Consider how these buildings are going to hold up and appear in 20 years.



Anonymous user's Opinion

I have concerns about the parking and access in image C and D, although I like the trees.



Anonymous user's Opinion

Monroe Street and Parameter are excellent examples of development. Pedestrian oriented...walkable commercial.



Anonymous user's Opinion

I feel the commercial spaces being built should have plenty of off street parking for their costumers. Image C & D are typical of older areas where there is no off street parking available. I don't know of any Fitchburg sites like C & D.



Anonymous user's Opinion

If these are representing newly built commercial establishments, then I would like all but D.



Anonymous user's Opinion

Parking lots should be in back of the business or nearby in free lots.



Anonymous user's Opinion

Strip malls rob a bit of character. Middleton has done a great job in the absence of older buildings. That is why I believe Image C makes more sense in Fitchburg than Image D (we do not have those historic Monroe Street buildings).



Anonymous user's Opinion

Like the downtown/small town walkable feel in c and d



Anonymous user's Opinion

It would be desirable to eventually have a walkable 'downtown' area of Fitchburg.



Anonymous user's Opinion


















Images C and D fit more with the Madison/Fitchburg culture and vibe. Images A and B are too modern/busy/large town feel for Madison/Fitchburg.



Anonymous user's Opinion

Street parking difficult for wheelchair van.

Anonymous user's Opinion

-  I really like C and D, but don't like the street parking. I'd like to see buildings like this in Fitchburg with parking around the back or within easy walking distance of large public lots.
- Anonymous user's Opinion**
-  I would like a grocery store and retail closer to Swan Creek and The Lacy Road round about. The open field in the middle of Swan Creek also needs something built that people can walk to for retail.
- Anonymous user's Opinion**
-  D. in dire need of a face lift which could be done without loosing its character
- Anonymous user's Opinion**
-  All are appropriate and lovely as long as they fit in with the neighborhood they are adjacent to and have appropriate parking to support!
- Anonymous user's Opinion**
-  A mix is necessary
- Anonymous user's Opinion**
-  I think fitchburg should strive for modern looks because we can't fake having an old downtown
- Anonymous user's Opinion**
-  Like C & D, but worry about parking. Fitchburg needs more shopping an\$ restaurant options. I would love to see a local restaurant & shoppe district like this in a Uptown. A & B look more suited to out lots in transportation corridors.
- Anonymous user's Opinion**
-  Please add biking and walking paths along main roadways - Fitchrona Rd. has the Quarry Vista Neighborhood that would love to be connected to the stores and we would like to have a safe way to access stores without a vehicle.
- Anonymous user's Opinion**
-  Adequate parking needs to be a consideration
- Anonymous user's Opinion**
-  C and D look more welcoming and cozy
- Anonymous user's Opinion**
-  If you are asking if I want a Middleton-style downtown in Fitchburg, my answer is 100% YES.
- Anonymous user's Opinion**
-  I am elderly and disabled. C and D look like it would be hard to park and access the building from a wheelchair.
- Anonymous user's Opinion**
-  It seems that C has little parking/access to the stores. Is this in a walk able area? is there public parking nearby available?
- Anonymous user's Opinion**
-  The style doesn't matter, just bring businesses in!
- Anonymous user's Opinion**
-  Prefer less visible parking and more landscape at street. More to the rural feel than urban. Greenscape.
- Anonymous user's Opinion**
-  Fitchburg does not need any more "strip malls". I don't believe that they are a responsible use of land (I much prefer mixed retail and residential) and only reinforce the need for people to get into their cars to access services. Fitchburg could do a lot more to foster walkability/bikeability to its local businesses.
- Anonymous user's Opinion**
-  Please consider adding businesses like this near the Swan Creek area where all the apartments have been constructed. This would minimize the amount of outbound driving because people could actually walk to a business.

What do you think about these larger commercial areas?

Rate the content of each image using the rating scale above.

CURRENT RESULTS						166 Total Responses
	1	2	3	4	5	
Image A	2% (4)	2% (3)	16% (27)	33% (55)	46% (77)	
Image B	13% (22)	25% (41)	32% (53)	17% (29)	13% (21)	

REGISTERED (95)						
	1	2	3	4	5	
Image A	3.0% (3)	1.0% (1)	16.0% (15)	36.0% (34)	44.0% (42)	
Image B	14.0% (13)	21.0% (20)	32.0% (30)	20.0% (19)	14.0% (13)	

NON-REGISTERED (71)						
	1	2	3	4	5	
Image A	1.4% (1)	2.8% (2)	16.9% (12)	29.6% (21)	49.3% (35)	
Image B	12.7% (9)	29.6% (21)	32.4% (23)	14.1% (10)	11.3% (8)	

ALL RESPONDENTS (166)						
	1	2	3	4	5	
Image A	2% (4)	2% (3)	16% (27)	33% (55)	46% (77)	
Image B	13% (22)	25% (41)	32% (53)	17% (29)	13% (21)	

REGISTERED VOTERS IN FITCHBURG, WI (95)						
	1	2	3	4	5	
Image A	3% (3)	1% (1)	16% (15)	36% (34)	44% (42)	
Image B	14% (13)	21% (20)	32% (30)	20% (19)	14% (13)	

LIVE IN FITCHBURG, WI (139) - SELF-REPORTED						
	1	2	3	4	5	
Image A	3% (4)	2% (3)	17% (23)	35% (49)	43% (60)	
Image B	14% (20)	24% (33)	33% (46)	17% (23)	12% (17)	

SUBSCRIBERS TO FITCHBURG, WI (141)						
	1	2	3	4	5	
Image A	3% (4)	2% (3)	16% (23)	35% (50)	43% (61)	
Image B	14% (20)	23% (33)	33% (47)	17% (24)	12% (17)	

REGISTER RESPONDENTS FROM ANYWHERE (96)						
	1	2	3	4	5	
Image A	3% (3)	1% (1)	16% (15)	36% (35)	45% (43)	
Image B	14% (13)	22% (21)	32% (31)	20% (19)	14% (13)	

EDUCATION						97 REGISTERED VOTERS
	1	2	3	4	5	
Bach Degree - Extremely Likely (20)						
Image A	-	-	20.0% (4.0)	55.0% (11.0)	25.0% (5.0)	
Image B	10.0% (2.0)	30.0% (6.0)	30.0% (6.0)	25.0% (5.0)	5.0% (1.0)	

Bach Degree - Likely (11)

Image A	9.1% (1.0)	-	36.4% (4.0)	9.1% (1.0)	45.5% (5.0)
Image B	27.3% (3.0)	18.2% (2.0)	36.4% (4.0)	18.2% (2.0)	-

Grad Degree - Extremely Likely (11)

Image A	-	-	18.2% (2.0)	45.5% (5.0)	36.4% (4.0)
Image B	9.1% (1.0)	27.3% (3.0)	18.2% (2.0)	18.2% (2.0)	27.3% (3.0)

Grad Degree - Likely (7)

Image A	-	-	-	-	100.0% (7.0)
Image B	28.6% (2.0)	14.3% (1.0)	14.3% (1.0)	42.9% (3.0)	-

HS Diploma - Extremely Likely (5)

Image A	20.0% (1.0)	-	-	-	80.0% (4.0)
Image B	-	40.0% (2.0)	-	-	60.0% (3.0)

HS Diploma - Likely (1)

Image A	-	-	-	-	100.0% (1.0)
Image B	-	-	-	-	100.0% (1.0)

Less than HS Diploma - Likely (1)

Image A	-	-	-	-	100.0% (1.0)
Image B	-	-	-	100.0% (1.0)	-

Some College - Likely (6)

Image A	-	-	33.3% (2.0)	50.0% (3.0)	16.7% (1.0)
Image B	16.7% (1.0)	-	66.7% (4.0)	-	16.7% (1.0)

Some College -Extremely Likely (2)

Image A	-	-	-	-	100.0% (2.0)
Image B	-	50.0% (1.0)	50.0% (1.0)	-	-

Unknown (33)

Image A	3.0% (1.0)	3.0% (1.0)	9.1% (3.0)	45.5% (15.0)	39.4% (13.0)
Image B	12.1% (4.0)	18.2% (6.0)	39.4% (13.0)	18.2% (6.0)	12.1% (4.0)

VOTERS GENDER

97 REGISTERED VOTERS

1	2	3	4	5
---	---	---	---	---

F (46)

Image A	2.2% (1.0)	2.2% (1.0)	15.2% (7.0)	30.4% (14.0)	50.0% (23.0)
Image B	8.7% (4.0)	15.2% (7.0)	39.1% (18.0)	19.6% (9.0)	17.4% (8.0)

M (50)

Image A	4.0% (2.0)	-	16.0% (8.0)	42.0% (21.0)	38.0% (19.0)
Image B	16.0% (8.0)	28.0% (14.0)	26.0% (13.0)	20.0% (10.0)	10.0% (5.0)

Unknown (1)

Image A	-	-	-	-	100.0% (1.0)
Image B	100.0% (1.0)	-	-	-	-

PRECINCT

97 REGISTERED VOTERS

1	2	3	4	5
---	---	---	---	---

FITCHBURG CITY WARD 01 (5)

Image A	-	-	20.0% (1.0)	80.0% (4.0)	-
Image B	-	20.0% (1.0)	60.0% (3.0)	20.0% (1.0)	-
FITCHBURG CITY WARD 02 (2)					
Image A	-	-	50.0% (1.0)	-	50.0% (1.0)
Image B	50.0% (1.0)	-	50.0% (1.0)	-	-
FITCHBURG CITY WARD 03 (1)					
Image A	-	-	100.0% (1.0)	-	-
Image B	-	-	100.0% (1.0)	-	-
FITCHBURG CITY WARD 04 (1)					
Image A	-	-	-	100.0% (1.0)	-
Image B	-	-	-	100.0% (1.0)	-
FITCHBURG CITY WARD 05 (4)					
Image A	-	-	-	50.0% (2.0)	50.0% (2.0)
Image B	25.0% (1.0)	25.0% (1.0)	25.0% (1.0)	-	25.0% (1.0)
FITCHBURG CITY WARD 06 (6)					
Image A	-	-	-	50.0% (3.0)	50.0% (3.0)
Image B	16.7% (1.0)	16.7% (1.0)	16.7% (1.0)	33.3% (2.0)	16.7% (1.0)
FITCHBURG CITY WARD 07 (7)					
Image A	-	14.3% (1.0)	14.3% (1.0)	57.1% (4.0)	14.3% (1.0)
Image B	-	-	57.1% (4.0)	14.3% (1.0)	28.6% (2.0)
FITCHBURG CITY WARD 08 (6)					
Image A	-	-	-	33.3% (2.0)	66.7% (4.0)
Image B	-	50.0% (3.0)	-	33.3% (2.0)	16.7% (1.0)
FITCHBURG CITY WARD 09 (4)					
Image A	-	-	-	25.0% (1.0)	75.0% (3.0)
Image B	25.0% (1.0)	-	50.0% (2.0)	-	25.0% (1.0)
FITCHBURG CITY WARD 12 (1)					
Image A	-	-	-	-	100.0% (1.0)
Image B	-	-	-	100.0% (1.0)	-
FITCHBURG CITY WARD 13 (17)					
Image A	-	-	17.6% (3.0)	41.2% (7.0)	41.2% (7.0)
Image B	5.9% (1.0)	29.4% (5.0)	17.6% (3.0)	23.5% (4.0)	23.5% (4.0)
FITCHBURG CITY WARD 14 (13)					
Image A	-	-	23.1% (3.0)	30.8% (4.0)	46.2% (6.0)
Image B	-	30.8% (4.0)	46.2% (6.0)	23.1% (3.0)	-
FITCHBURG CITY WARD 15 (4)					
Image A	-	-	-	-	100.0% (4.0)
Image B	25.0% (1.0)	-	25.0% (1.0)	-	50.0% (2.0)
FITCHBURG CITY WARD 16 (1)					
Image A	-	-	100.0% (1.0)	-	-
Image B	-	-	100.0% (1.0)	-	-
FITCHBURG CITY WARD 17 (7)					

Image A	-	-	28.6% (2.0)	28.6% (2.0)	42.9% (3.0)
Image B	28.6% (2.0)	28.6% (2.0)	42.9% (3.0)	-	-

FITCHBURG CITY WARD 18 (6)

Image A	16.7% (1.0)	-	16.7% (1.0)	50.0% (3.0)	16.7% (1.0)
Image B	33.3% (2.0)	50.0% (3.0)	-	16.7% (1.0)	-

FITCHBURG CITY WARD 19 (10)

Image A	10.0% (1.0)	-	10.0% (1.0)	20.0% (2.0)	60.0% (6.0)
Image B	30.0% (3.0)	10.0% (1.0)	30.0% (3.0)	30.0% (3.0)	-

MADISON CITY WARD 100 (1)

Image A	100.0% (1.0)	-	-	-	-
Image B	-	-	-	-	100.0% (1.0)

MADISON CITY WARD 107 (1)

Image A	-	-	-	-	100.0% (1.0)
Image B	-	-	100.0% (1.0)	-	-

AGE RANGE

97 REGISTERED VOTERS

	1	2	3	4	5
--	---	---	---	---	---

18-29 (1)

Image A	-	-	-	100.0% (1.0)	-
Image B	-	-	100.0% (1.0)	-	-

30-39 (12)

Image A	8.3% (1.0)	-	8.3% (1.0)	33.3% (4.0)	50.0% (6.0)
Image B	25.0% (3.0)	16.7% (2.0)	33.3% (4.0)	8.3% (1.0)	16.7% (2.0)

40-49 (17)

Image A	5.9% (1.0)	-	5.9% (1.0)	23.5% (4.0)	64.7% (11.0)
Image B	23.5% (4.0)	29.4% (5.0)	29.4% (5.0)	5.9% (1.0)	11.8% (2.0)

50-59 (12)

Image A	-	-	33.3% (4.0)	41.7% (5.0)	25.0% (3.0)
Image B	-	25.0% (3.0)	33.3% (4.0)	33.3% (4.0)	8.3% (1.0)

60-69 (12)

Image A	-	-	33.3% (4.0)	41.7% (5.0)	25.0% (3.0)
Image B	16.7% (2.0)	8.3% (1.0)	33.3% (4.0)	25.0% (3.0)	16.7% (2.0)

70-79 (10)

Image A	-	10.0% (1.0)	10.0% (1.0)	50.0% (5.0)	30.0% (3.0)
Image B	-	20.0% (2.0)	30.0% (3.0)	30.0% (3.0)	20.0% (2.0)

unknown (33)

Image A	3.0% (1.0)	-	12.1% (4.0)	33.3% (11.0)	51.5% (17.0)
Image B	12.1% (4.0)	24.2% (8.0)	30.3% (10.0)	21.2% (7.0)	12.1% (4.0)

VOTERS AGE

97 REGISTERED VOTERS

	1	2	3	4	5
--	---	---	---	---	---

28 (1)

Image A	-	-	-	100.0% (1.0)	-
---------	---	---	---	--------------	---

Image B	-	-	100.0% (1.0)	-	-
---------	---	---	--------------	---	---

35 (3)

Image A	-	-	-	33.3% (1.0)	66.7% (2.0)
---------	---	---	---	-------------	-------------

Image B	33.3% (1.0)	33.3% (1.0)	33.3% (1.0)	-	-
---------	-------------	-------------	-------------	---	---

36 (1)

Image A	-	-	-	-	100.0% (1.0)
---------	---	---	---	---	--------------

Image B	100.0% (1.0)	-	-	-	-
---------	--------------	---	---	---	---

37 (3)

Image A	-	-	-	66.7% (2.0)	33.3% (1.0)
---------	---	---	---	-------------	-------------

Image B	33.3% (1.0)	33.3% (1.0)	33.3% (1.0)	-	-
---------	-------------	-------------	-------------	---	---

38 (3)

Image A	33.3% (1.0)	-	33.3% (1.0)	-	33.3% (1.0)
---------	-------------	---	-------------	---	-------------

Image B	-	-	66.7% (2.0)	-	33.3% (1.0)
---------	---	---	-------------	---	-------------

39 (2)

Image A	-	-	-	50.0% (1.0)	50.0% (1.0)
---------	---	---	---	-------------	-------------

Image B	-	-	-	50.0% (1.0)	50.0% (1.0)
---------	---	---	---	-------------	-------------

40 (4)

Image A	-	-	25.0% (1.0)	25.0% (1.0)	50.0% (2.0)
---------	---	---	-------------	-------------	-------------

Image B	25.0% (1.0)	50.0% (2.0)	25.0% (1.0)	-	-
---------	-------------	-------------	-------------	---	---

43 (2)

Image A	50.0% (1.0)	-	-	-	50.0% (1.0)
---------	-------------	---	---	---	-------------

Image B	50.0% (1.0)	-	-	50.0% (1.0)	-
---------	-------------	---	---	-------------	---

44 (4)

Image A	-	-	-	25.0% (1.0)	75.0% (3.0)
---------	---	---	---	-------------	-------------

Image B	25.0% (1.0)	50.0% (2.0)	25.0% (1.0)	-	-
---------	-------------	-------------	-------------	---	---

45 (2)

Image A	-	-	-	-	100.0% (2.0)
---------	---	---	---	---	--------------

Image B	-	50.0% (1.0)	-	-	50.0% (1.0)
---------	---	-------------	---	---	-------------

46 (1)

Image A	-	-	-	-	100.0% (1.0)
---------	---	---	---	---	--------------

Image B	100.0% (1.0)	-	-	-	-
---------	--------------	---	---	---	---

47 (1)

Image A	-	-	-	-	100.0% (1.0)
---------	---	---	---	---	--------------

Image B	-	-	-	-	100.0% (1.0)
---------	---	---	---	---	--------------

49 (3)

Image A	-	-	-	66.7% (2.0)	33.3% (1.0)
---------	---	---	---	-------------	-------------

Image B	-	-	100.0% (3.0)	-	-
---------	---	---	--------------	---	---

50 (1)

Image A	-	-	100.0% (1.0)	-	-
---------	---	---	--------------	---	---

Image B	-	-	100.0% (1.0)	-	-
---------	---	---	--------------	---	---

52 (3)

Image A	-	-	33.3% (1.0)	33.3% (1.0)	33.3% (1.0)
Image B	-	-	33.3% (1.0)	66.7% (2.0)	-
53 (1)					
Image A	-	-	-	-	100.0% (1.0)
Image B	-	-	100.0% (1.0)	-	-
55 (1)					
Image A	-	-	-	100.0% (1.0)	-
Image B	-	100.0% (1.0)	-	-	-
56 (2)					
Image A	-	-	100.0% (2.0)	-	-
Image B	-	-	50.0% (1.0)	50.0% (1.0)	-
57 (1)					
Image A	-	-	-	100.0% (1.0)	-
Image B	-	100.0% (1.0)	-	-	-
59 (3)					
Image A	-	-	-	66.7% (2.0)	33.3% (1.0)
Image B	-	33.3% (1.0)	-	33.3% (1.0)	33.3% (1.0)
60 (1)					
Image A	-	-	-	100.0% (1.0)	-
Image B	-	100.0% (1.0)	-	-	-
61 (2)					
Image A	-	-	-	-	100.0% (2.0)
Image B	50.0% (1.0)	-	-	-	50.0% (1.0)
62 (1)					
Image A	-	-	-	100.0% (1.0)	-
Image B	-	-	100.0% (1.0)	-	-
63 (1)					
Image A	-	-	-	100.0% (1.0)	-
Image B	-	-	-	100.0% (1.0)	-
64 (2)					
Image A	-	-	50.0% (1.0)	50.0% (1.0)	-
Image B	-	-	50.0% (1.0)	50.0% (1.0)	-
65 (1)					
Image A	-	-	-	-	100.0% (1.0)
Image B	-	-	-	-	100.0% (1.0)
66 (1)					
Image A	-	-	100.0% (1.0)	-	-
Image B	-	-	100.0% (1.0)	-	-
68 (1)					
Image A	-	-	100.0% (1.0)	-	-
Image B	100.0% (1.0)	-	-	-	-
69 (2)					

Image A	-	-	50.0% (1.0)	50.0% (1.0)	-
Image B	-	-	50.0% (1.0)	50.0% (1.0)	-
70 (1)					
Image A	-	-	-	100.0% (1.0)	-
Image B	-	-	100.0% (1.0)	-	-
72 (1)					
Image A	-	-	-	100.0% (1.0)	-
Image B	-	100.0% (1.0)	-	-	-
73 (2)					
Image A	-	50.0% (1.0)	-	50.0% (1.0)	-
Image B	-	-	50.0% (1.0)	50.0% (1.0)	-
74 (2)					
Image A	-	-	-	50.0% (1.0)	50.0% (1.0)
Image B	-	-	-	50.0% (1.0)	50.0% (1.0)
77 (2)					
Image A	-	-	-	50.0% (1.0)	50.0% (1.0)
Image B	-	50.0% (1.0)	-	50.0% (1.0)	-
79 (2)					
Image A	-	-	50.0% (1.0)	-	50.0% (1.0)
Image B	-	-	50.0% (1.0)	-	50.0% (1.0)
Unknown (33)					
Image A	3.0% (1.0)	-	12.1% (4.0)	33.3% (11.0)	51.5% (17.0)
Image B	12.1% (4.0)	24.2% (8.0)	30.3% (10.0)	21.2% (7.0)	12.1% (4.0)

**STATE INCOME
DECILE**

97 REGISTERED VOTERS

	1	2	3	4	5
0 to 9 Pct range (2)					
Image A	-	-	-	50.0% (1.0)	50.0% (1.0)
Image B	-	-	50.0% (1.0)	50.0% (1.0)	-
10 to 19 Pct range (1)					
Image A	-	-	100.0% (1.0)	-	-
Image B	-	-	100.0% (1.0)	-	-
40 to 49 Pct range (1)					
Image A	-	-	-	100.0% (1.0)	-
Image B	-	100.0% (1.0)	-	-	-
50 to 59 Pct range (4)					
Image A	-	-	25.0% (1.0)	75.0% (3.0)	-
Image B	-	-	75.0% (3.0)	25.0% (1.0)	-
60 to 69 Pct range (3)					
Image A	-	-	-	-	100.0% (3.0)
Image B	33.3% (1.0)	-	33.3% (1.0)	-	33.3% (1.0)
70 to 79 Pct range (3)					

Image A	33.3% (1.0)	-	33.3% (1.0)	-	33.3% (1.0)
Image B	33.3% (1.0)	-	33.3% (1.0)	-	33.3% (1.0)

80 to 89 Pct range (42)

Image A	-	-	21.4% (9.0)	28.6% (12.0)	50.0% (21.0)
Image B	9.5% (4.0)	23.8% (10.0)	33.3% (14.0)	19.0% (8.0)	14.3% (6.0)

90 Pct and up (39)

Image A	5.1% (2.0)	2.6% (1.0)	7.7% (3.0)	43.6% (17.0)	41.0% (16.0)
Image B	17.9% (7.0)	23.1% (9.0)	25.6% (10.0)	23.1% (9.0)	10.3% (4.0)

Unknown (2)

Image A	-	-	-	50.0% (1.0)	50.0% (1.0)
Image B	-	50.0% (1.0)	-	-	50.0% (1.0)

HOME OWNER/RENTER

97 REGISTERED VOTERS

	1	2	3	4	5
--	---	---	---	---	---

Likely Homeowner (56)

Image A	3.6% (2.0)	1.8% (1.0)	17.9% (10.0)	37.5% (21.0)	39.3% (22.0)
Image B	17.9% (10.0)	21.4% (12.0)	25.0% (14.0)	26.8% (15.0)	8.9% (5.0)

Likely Renter (26)

Image A	3.8% (1.0)	-	11.5% (3.0)	26.9% (7.0)	57.7% (15.0)
Image B	7.7% (2.0)	15.4% (4.0)	46.2% (12.0)	11.5% (3.0)	19.2% (5.0)

Unknown (15)

Image A	-	-	13.3% (2.0)	46.7% (7.0)	40.0% (6.0)
Image B	6.7% (1.0)	33.3% (5.0)	33.3% (5.0)	6.7% (1.0)	20.0% (3.0)

Rate your level of agreement with the following statement: I want this type of development in Fitchburg.

CURRENT RESULTS						166 Total Responses
	Strongly Disagree	Disagree	Neutral	Agree	Strongly Agree	
Image A	3% (5)	5% (8)	21% (35)	38% (63)	33% (55)	
Image B	14% (23)	23% (39)	31% (51)	20% (34)	11% (19)	

REGISTERED (95)

	Strongly Disagree	Disagree	Neutral	Agree	Strongly Agree	
Image A	3.0% (3)	2.0% (2)	21.0% (20)	39.0% (37)	35.0% (33)	
Image B	16.0% (15)	19.0% (18)	31.0% (29)	21.0% (20)	14.0% (13)	

NON-REGISTERED (71)

	Strongly Disagree	Disagree	Neutral	Agree	Strongly Agree	
Image A	2.8% (2)	8.5% (6)	21.1% (15)	36.6% (26)	31.0% (22)	
Image B	11.3% (8)	29.6% (21)	31.0% (22)	19.7% (14)	8.5% (6)	

ALL RESPONDENTS (166)

	Strongly Disagree	Disagree	Neutral	Agree	Strongly Agree	
Image A	3% (5)	5% (8)	21% (35)	38% (63)	33% (55)	
Image B	14% (23)	23% (39)	31% (51)	20% (34)	11% (19)	

REGISTERED VOTERS IN FITCHBURG, WI (95)

	Strongly Disagree	Disagree	Neutral	Agree	Strongly Agree	
Image A	3% (3)	2% (2)	21% (20)	39% (37)	35% (33)	
Image B	16% (15)	19% (18)	31% (29)	21% (20)	14% (13)	

LIVE IN FITCHBURG, WI (139) - SELF-REPORTED

	Strongly Disagree	Disagree	Neutral	Agree	Strongly Agree	
Image A	4% (5)	5% (7)	22% (30)	37% (52)	32% (45)	
Image B	15% (21)	22% (31)	31% (43)	20% (28)	12% (16)	

SUBSCRIBERS TO FITCHBURG, WI (141)

	Strongly Disagree	Disagree	Neutral	Agree	Strongly Agree	
Image A	4% (5)	5% (7)	21% (30)	38% (54)	32% (45)	
Image B	15% (21)	22% (31)	31% (44)	21% (29)	11% (16)	

REGISTER RESPONDENTS FROM ANYWHERE (96)

	Strongly Disagree	Disagree	Neutral	Agree	Strongly Agree	
Image A	3% (3)	2% (2)	21% (20)	41% (39)	34% (33)	
Image B	16% (15)	20% (19)	31% (30)	21% (20)	14% (13)	

EDUCATION

97 REGISTERED VOTERS

	Strongly Disagree	Disagree	Neutral	Agree	Strongly Agree	
--	-------------------	----------	---------	-------	----------------	--

Bach Degree - Extremely Likely (20)

Image A	-	-	30.0% (6.0)	45.0% (9.0)	25.0% (5.0)	
Image B	10.0% (2.0)	25.0% (5.0)	30.0% (6.0)	25.0% (5.0)	10.0% (2.0)	

Bach Degree - Likely (11)

Image A	9.1% (1.0)	9.1% (1.0)	9.1% (1.0)	27.3% (3.0)	45.5% (5.0)	
---------	------------	------------	------------	-------------	-------------	--

Image B	27.3% (3.0)	18.2% (2.0)	18.2% (2.0)	27.3% (3.0)	9.1% (1.0)
---------	-------------	-------------	-------------	-------------	------------

Grad Degree - Extremely Likely (11)

Image A	-	-	18.2% (2.0)	45.5% (5.0)	36.4% (4.0)
Image B	18.2% (2.0)	9.1% (1.0)	18.2% (2.0)	27.3% (3.0)	27.3% (3.0)

Grad Degree - Likely (7)

Image A	-	-	-	14.3% (1.0)	85.7% (6.0)
Image B	14.3% (1.0)	28.6% (2.0)	-	57.1% (4.0)	-

HS Diploma - Extremely Likely (5)

Image A	20.0% (1.0)	-	40.0% (2.0)	-	40.0% (2.0)
Image B	20.0% (1.0)	20.0% (1.0)	20.0% (1.0)	-	40.0% (2.0)

HS Diploma - Likely (1)

Image A	-	-	-	-	100.0% (1.0)
Image B	-	-	-	-	100.0% (1.0)

Less than HS Diploma - Likely (1)

Image A	-	-	-	100.0% (1.0)	-
Image B	-	-	-	100.0% (1.0)	-

Some College - Likely (6)

Image A	-	-	66.7% (4.0)	16.7% (1.0)	16.7% (1.0)
Image B	16.7% (1.0)	-	66.7% (4.0)	-	16.7% (1.0)

Some College -Extremely Likely (2)

Image A	-	-	-	50.0% (1.0)	50.0% (1.0)
Image B	-	50.0% (1.0)	50.0% (1.0)	-	-

Unknown (33)

Image A	3.0% (1.0)	3.0% (1.0)	15.2% (5.0)	54.5% (18.0)	24.2% (8.0)
Image B	15.2% (5.0)	21.2% (7.0)	42.4% (14.0)	12.1% (4.0)	9.1% (3.0)

VOTERS GENDER

97 REGISTERED VOTERS

	Strongly Disagree	Disagree	Neutral	Agree	Strongly Agree
--	-------------------	----------	---------	-------	----------------

F (46)

Image A	2.2% (1.0)	4.3% (2.0)	17.4% (8.0)	34.8% (16.0)	41.3% (19.0)
Image B	8.7% (4.0)	17.4% (8.0)	34.8% (16.0)	21.7% (10.0)	17.4% (8.0)

M (50)

Image A	4.0% (2.0)	-	24.0% (12.0)	46.0% (23.0)	26.0% (13.0)
Image B	20.0% (10.0)	22.0% (11.0)	28.0% (14.0)	20.0% (10.0)	10.0% (5.0)

Unknown (1)

Image A	-	-	-	-	100.0% (1.0)
Image B	100.0% (1.0)	-	-	-	-

PRECINCT

97 REGISTERED VOTERS

	Strongly Disagree	Disagree	Neutral	Agree	Strongly Agree
--	-------------------	----------	---------	-------	----------------

FITCHBURG CITY WARD 01 (5)

Image A	-	-	40.0% (2.0)	20.0% (1.0)	40.0% (2.0)
Image B	-	40.0% (2.0)	40.0% (2.0)	20.0% (1.0)	-

FITCHBURG CITY WARD 02 (2)

Image A	-	-	50.0% (1.0)	-	50.0% (1.0)
Image B	50.0% (1.0)	-	50.0% (1.0)	-	-

FITCHBURG CITY WARD 03 (1)

Image A	-	-	-	100.0% (1.0)	-
Image B	-	-	-	100.0% (1.0)	-

FITCHBURG CITY WARD 04 (1)

Image A	-	-	-	-	100.0% (1.0)
Image B	-	-	-	-	100.0% (1.0)

FITCHBURG CITY WARD 05 (4)

Image A	-	-	-	50.0% (2.0)	50.0% (2.0)
Image B	25.0% (1.0)	25.0% (1.0)	-	25.0% (1.0)	25.0% (1.0)

FITCHBURG CITY WARD 06 (6)

Image A	-	-	-	66.7% (4.0)	33.3% (2.0)
Image B	33.3% (2.0)	-	16.7% (1.0)	33.3% (2.0)	16.7% (1.0)

FITCHBURG CITY WARD 07 (7)

Image A	-	14.3% (1.0)	28.6% (2.0)	28.6% (2.0)	28.6% (2.0)
Image B	-	-	42.9% (3.0)	28.6% (2.0)	28.6% (2.0)

FITCHBURG CITY WARD 08 (6)

Image A	-	-	33.3% (2.0)	33.3% (2.0)	33.3% (2.0)
Image B	16.7% (1.0)	33.3% (2.0)	16.7% (1.0)	16.7% (1.0)	16.7% (1.0)

FITCHBURG CITY WARD 09 (4)

Image A	-	-	-	50.0% (2.0)	50.0% (2.0)
Image B	25.0% (1.0)	-	50.0% (2.0)	-	25.0% (1.0)

FITCHBURG CITY WARD 12 (1)

Image A	-	-	-	-	100.0% (1.0)
Image B	-	-	-	100.0% (1.0)	-

FITCHBURG CITY WARD 13 (17)

Image A	5.9% (1.0)	5.9% (1.0)	17.6% (3.0)	41.2% (7.0)	29.4% (5.0)
Image B	11.8% (2.0)	23.5% (4.0)	29.4% (5.0)	23.5% (4.0)	11.8% (2.0)

FITCHBURG CITY WARD 14 (13)

Image A	-	-	30.8% (4.0)	38.5% (5.0)	30.8% (4.0)
Image B	-	38.5% (5.0)	38.5% (5.0)	23.1% (3.0)	-

FITCHBURG CITY WARD 15 (4)

Image A	-	-	-	-	100.0% (4.0)
Image B	25.0% (1.0)	-	25.0% (1.0)	-	50.0% (2.0)

FITCHBURG CITY WARD 16 (1)

Image A	-	-	100.0% (1.0)	-	-
Image B	-	-	100.0% (1.0)	-	-

FITCHBURG CITY WARD 17 (7)

Image A	-	-	28.6% (2.0)	42.9% (3.0)	28.6% (2.0)
Image B	28.6% (2.0)	14.3% (1.0)	42.9% (3.0)	14.3% (1.0)	-

FITCHBURG CITY WARD 18 (6)

Image A	16.7% (1.0)	-	16.7% (1.0)	50.0% (3.0)	16.7% (1.0)
Image B	33.3% (2.0)	33.3% (2.0)	16.7% (1.0)	16.7% (1.0)	-

FITCHBURG CITY WARD 19 (10)

Image A	10.0% (1.0)	-	10.0% (1.0)	60.0% (6.0)	20.0% (2.0)
Image B	20.0% (2.0)	20.0% (2.0)	30.0% (3.0)	20.0% (2.0)	10.0% (1.0)

MADISON CITY WARD 100 (1)

Image A	-	-	100.0% (1.0)	-	-
Image B	-	-	-	-	100.0% (1.0)

MADISON CITY WARD 107 (1)

Image A	-	-	-	100.0% (1.0)	-
Image B	-	-	100.0% (1.0)	-	-

AGE RANGE

97 REGISTERED VOTERS

Strongly Disagree Disagree Neutral Agree Strongly Agree

18-29 (1)

Image A	-	-	-	-	100.0% (1.0)
Image B	-	100.0% (1.0)	-	-	-

30-39 (12)

Image A	-	-	25.0% (3.0)	41.7% (5.0)	33.3% (4.0)
Image B	16.7% (2.0)	33.3% (4.0)	25.0% (3.0)	-	25.0% (3.0)

40-49 (17)

Image A	5.9% (1.0)	-	11.8% (2.0)	41.2% (7.0)	41.2% (7.0)
Image B	29.4% (5.0)	23.5% (4.0)	17.6% (3.0)	17.6% (3.0)	11.8% (2.0)

50-59 (12)

Image A	-	-	25.0% (3.0)	66.7% (8.0)	8.3% (1.0)
Image B	8.3% (1.0)	16.7% (2.0)	41.7% (5.0)	25.0% (3.0)	8.3% (1.0)

60-69 (12)

Image A	8.3% (1.0)	-	33.3% (4.0)	33.3% (4.0)	25.0% (3.0)
Image B	16.7% (2.0)	16.7% (2.0)	16.7% (2.0)	33.3% (4.0)	16.7% (2.0)

70-79 (10)

Image A	-	10.0% (1.0)	30.0% (3.0)	30.0% (3.0)	30.0% (3.0)
Image B	-	10.0% (1.0)	40.0% (4.0)	30.0% (3.0)	20.0% (2.0)

unknown (33)

Image A	3.0% (1.0)	3.0% (1.0)	15.2% (5.0)	36.4% (12.0)	42.4% (14.0)
Image B	15.2% (5.0)	15.2% (5.0)	39.4% (13.0)	21.2% (7.0)	9.1% (3.0)

VOTERS AGE

97 REGISTERED VOTERS

Strongly Disagree Disagree Neutral Agree Strongly Agree

28 (1)

Image A	-	-	-	-	100.0% (1.0)
Image B	-	100.0% (1.0)	-	-	-

35 (3)

Image A	-	-	-	66.7% (2.0)	33.3% (1.0)
Image B	33.3% (1.0)	66.7% (2.0)	-	-	-
36 (1)					
Image A	-	-	-	-	100.0% (1.0)
Image B	100.0% (1.0)	-	-	-	-
37 (3)					
Image A	-	-	33.3% (1.0)	33.3% (1.0)	33.3% (1.0)
Image B	-	66.7% (2.0)	33.3% (1.0)	-	-
38 (3)					
Image A	-	-	66.7% (2.0)	33.3% (1.0)	-
Image B	-	-	66.7% (2.0)	-	33.3% (1.0)
39 (2)					
Image A	-	-	-	50.0% (1.0)	50.0% (1.0)
Image B	-	-	-	-	100.0% (2.0)
40 (4)					
Image A	-	-	50.0% (2.0)	25.0% (1.0)	25.0% (1.0)
Image B	25.0% (1.0)	25.0% (1.0)	-	50.0% (2.0)	-
43 (2)					
Image A	50.0% (1.0)	-	-	-	50.0% (1.0)
Image B	50.0% (1.0)	-	-	50.0% (1.0)	-
44 (4)					
Image A	-	-	-	50.0% (2.0)	50.0% (2.0)
Image B	50.0% (2.0)	50.0% (2.0)	-	-	-
45 (2)					
Image A	-	-	-	-	100.0% (2.0)
Image B	-	-	50.0% (1.0)	-	50.0% (1.0)
46 (1)					
Image A	-	-	-	100.0% (1.0)	-
Image B	100.0% (1.0)	-	-	-	-
47 (1)					
Image A	-	-	-	-	100.0% (1.0)
Image B	-	-	-	-	100.0% (1.0)
49 (3)					
Image A	-	-	-	100.0% (3.0)	-
Image B	-	33.3% (1.0)	66.7% (2.0)	-	-
50 (1)					
Image A	-	-	100.0% (1.0)	-	-
Image B	-	-	100.0% (1.0)	-	-
52 (3)					
Image A	-	-	-	100.0% (3.0)	-
Image B	-	-	66.7% (2.0)	33.3% (1.0)	-
53 (1)					

Image A	-	-	-	100.0% (1.0)	-
Image B	-	-	100.0% (1.0)	-	-
55 (1)					
Image A	-	-	-	100.0% (1.0)	-
Image B	-	100.0% (1.0)	-	-	-
56 (2)					
Image A	-	-	100.0% (2.0)	-	-
Image B	-	-	50.0% (1.0)	50.0% (1.0)	-
57 (1)					
Image A	-	-	-	100.0% (1.0)	-
Image B	100.0% (1.0)	-	-	-	-
59 (3)					
Image A	-	-	-	66.7% (2.0)	33.3% (1.0)
Image B	-	33.3% (1.0)	-	33.3% (1.0)	33.3% (1.0)
60 (1)					
Image A	-	-	100.0% (1.0)	-	-
Image B	-	100.0% (1.0)	-	-	-
61 (2)					
Image A	-	-	-	-	100.0% (2.0)
Image B	-	50.0% (1.0)	-	-	50.0% (1.0)
62 (1)					
Image A	-	-	-	100.0% (1.0)	-
Image B	-	-	-	100.0% (1.0)	-
63 (1)					
Image A	-	-	-	100.0% (1.0)	-
Image B	-	-	-	100.0% (1.0)	-
64 (2)					
Image A	-	-	50.0% (1.0)	-	50.0% (1.0)
Image B	-	-	50.0% (1.0)	-	50.0% (1.0)
65 (1)					
Image A	100.0% (1.0)	-	-	-	-
Image B	100.0% (1.0)	-	-	-	-
66 (1)					
Image A	-	-	100.0% (1.0)	-	-
Image B	-	-	100.0% (1.0)	-	-
68 (1)					
Image A	-	-	100.0% (1.0)	-	-
Image B	100.0% (1.0)	-	-	-	-
69 (2)					
Image A	-	-	-	100.0% (2.0)	-
Image B	-	-	-	100.0% (2.0)	-
70 (1)					

Image A	-	-	-	100.0% (1.0)	-
Image B	-	-	-	100.0% (1.0)	-
72 (1)					
Image A	-	-	100.0% (1.0)	-	-
Image B	-	-	100.0% (1.0)	-	-
73 (2)					
Image A	-	50.0% (1.0)	-	50.0% (1.0)	-
Image B	-	-	50.0% (1.0)	50.0% (1.0)	-
74 (2)					
Image A	-	-	50.0% (1.0)	-	50.0% (1.0)
Image B	-	-	50.0% (1.0)	-	50.0% (1.0)
77 (2)					
Image A	-	-	-	50.0% (1.0)	50.0% (1.0)
Image B	-	50.0% (1.0)	-	50.0% (1.0)	-
79 (2)					
Image A	-	-	50.0% (1.0)	-	50.0% (1.0)
Image B	-	-	50.0% (1.0)	-	50.0% (1.0)
Unknown (33)					
Image A	3.0% (1.0)	3.0% (1.0)	15.2% (5.0)	36.4% (12.0)	42.4% (14.0)
Image B	15.2% (5.0)	15.2% (5.0)	39.4% (13.0)	21.2% (7.0)	9.1% (3.0)



















STATE INCOME
DECILE


















97 REGISTERED VOTERS

	Strongly Disagree	Disagree	Neutral	Agree	Strongly Agree
0 to 9 Pct range (2)					
Image A	-	-	-	50.0% (1.0)	50.0% (1.0)
Image B	-	-	50.0% (1.0)	-	50.0% (1.0)
10 to 19 Pct range (1)					
Image A	-	-	-	100.0% (1.0)	-
Image B	-	-	-	100.0% (1.0)	-
40 to 49 Pct range (1)					
Image A	-	-	100.0% (1.0)	-	-
Image B	-	-	-	100.0% (1.0)	-
50 to 59 Pct range (4)					
Image A	-	-	25.0% (1.0)	25.0% (1.0)	50.0% (2.0)
Image B	-	50.0% (2.0)	50.0% (2.0)	-	-
60 to 69 Pct range (3)					
Image A	-	-	-	33.3% (1.0)	66.7% (2.0)
Image B	33.3% (1.0)	-	33.3% (1.0)	-	33.3% (1.0)
70 to 79 Pct range (3)					
Image A	-	-	66.7% (2.0)	-	33.3% (1.0)
Image B	33.3% (1.0)	-	33.3% (1.0)	-	33.3% (1.0)
80 to 89 Pct range (42)					

Image A	2.4% (1.0)	2.4% (1.0)	23.8% (10.0)	33.3% (14.0)	38.1% (16.0)
Image B	11.9% (5.0)	21.4% (9.0)	35.7% (15.0)	21.4% (9.0)	9.5% (4.0)
90 Pct and up (39)					
Image A	5.1% (2.0)	2.6% (1.0)	15.4% (6.0)	51.3% (20.0)	25.6% (10.0)
Image B	20.5% (8.0)	17.9% (7.0)	25.6% (10.0)	23.1% (9.0)	12.8% (5.0)
Unknown (2)					
Image A	-	-	-	50.0% (1.0)	50.0% (1.0)
Image B	-	50.0% (1.0)	-	-	50.0% (1.0)
HOME OWNER/RENTER					
					97 REGISTERED VOTERS
	Strongly Disagree	Disagree	Neutral	Agree	Strongly Agree
Likely Homeowner (56)					
Image A	3.6% (2.0)	1.8% (1.0)	23.2% (13.0)	32.1% (18.0)	39.3% (22.0)
Image B	17.9% (10.0)	19.6% (11.0)	23.2% (13.0)	26.8% (15.0)	12.5% (7.0)
Likely Renter (26)					
Image A	3.8% (1.0)	-	23.1% (6.0)	46.2% (12.0)	26.9% (7.0)
Image B	11.5% (3.0)	19.2% (5.0)	42.3% (11.0)	15.4% (4.0)	11.5% (3.0)
Unknown (15)					
Image A	-	6.7% (1.0)	6.7% (1.0)	60.0% (9.0)	26.7% (4.0)
Image B	13.3% (2.0)	20.0% (3.0)	40.0% (6.0)	6.7% (1.0)	20.0% (3.0)

If you have any comments about your answers to the above questions please provide them here.

-
-  **Anonymous user's Opinion**
Having a more modern design vs just traditional big box is a big improvement.
-  **Anonymous user's Opinion**
I order everything online. I do not want the added traffic.
-  **Anonymous user's Opinion**
Requiring underground parking that accompanies Image A is a little ridiculous, however, centrally-located and accessible commercial corridors (unlike the poorly designed, inaccessible Quarry) would be very valuable for our city.
-  **Anonymous user's Opinion**
I think we have plenty of land in Fitch to do another regular Target' on the side by Oregon/Terravessa. The two story stores are harder to shop, get in and out of. But this building is nice looking. Just don't want my Target that I regularly shop to be a 2-story one.
-  **Anonymous user's Opinion**
Ick.
-  **Anonymous user's Opinion**
You literally rubber stamp anything, so why make the effort to give feedback?
-  **Anonymous user's Opinion**
Image a is more walkable (improving access to this store and surrounding businesses) by not wasting so much space just for parking
-  **Anonymous user's Opinion**
less chain stores, more locally owned stores
-  **Anonymous user's Opinion**
Inclusive green spaces, trees, etc. are important!
-  **Anonymous user's Opinion**
I like the parking underneath A, and that the building is more unique and not found in many locations.
-  **Anonymous user's Opinion**
Image B, with embedded parking causing higher building heights but a smaller footprint area, is much preferred. Image A with large area footprints, reduces the possibility of commercial density which Fitchburg desperately needs.
-  **Anonymous user's Opinion**
The building height and dedicated walking paths are good
-  **Anonymous user's Opinion**
Not only this type of commercial, but need some big stuff too.
-  **Anonymous user's Opinion**
trees trees trees
-  **Stephen Lloyd Arnold's Opinion**
A coexists better with nearby development, and hides parking underneath. Even better is the nearby Macy's, with nearby mixed use and reduced parking. B could be anywhere. You have to drive there, even from adjacent residential subdivisions! This type of development should be prohibited in our City. A restriction on on-site parking (a legal maximum) would improve this development somewhat.
-  **Anonymous user's Opinion**
Build up, not out.
-  **Anonymous user's Opinion**
B is ugly. Make sure commercial buildings have aesthetic appeal
-  **Anonymous user's Opinion**
There is already enough big box commercial in Fitchburg and areas adjacent to Fitchburg
- Anonymous user's Opinion**

-  Any mixed use buildings should supply off street parking for costumers and visitors of the tenants also. I also think large commercial building should have significant green space around them for the rain water to soak into the ground.
-  **Anonymous user's Opinion**
Since we already have buildings like this in Fitchburg, I don't really want many more. All commercial buildings require a lot of parking spaces. Ugh!
-  **Anonymous user's Opinion**
I don't like the 2 levels of image A as it's more convenient to just walk right in, but I like the look of it more than B.
-  **Anonymous user's Opinion**
I like these commercial buildings if they are kept up. And the parking lot is maintained.
-  **Anonymous user's Opinion**
We need shopping in Fitchburg for the residents
-  **Anonymous user's Opinion**
Living in the larger Madison area, we have ample access to these types of stores and I do not believe we need more of these unless the market research shows a need. These could bring jobs to the community and good tax revenue.
-  **Anonymous user's Opinion**
Image A just looks more modern and I like underground parking for winters!
-  **Anonymous user's Opinion**
Image A is more space efficient than Image B, we need to consider how much land we really need to develop to maintain a Fitchburg/Madison feel without using land we don't really need to use.
-  **Anonymous user's Opinion**
The more modern look is appealing and fresh. It adds geometry and interest to what is essentially the same offering in picture 2. If picture A can be obtained economically, I think it's more attractive and welcoming than picture B
-  **Anonymous user's Opinion**
Let's build up instead of wide. Love the glass facing of image A
-  **Anonymous user's Opinion**
Like C & D, but worry about parking. Fitchburg needs more shopping an\$ restaurant options. I would love to see a local restaurant & shoppe district like this in a Uptown. A & B look more suited to out lots in transportation corridors. For the busy road question, inside the urban service area land use should be compact and dense to take advantage of mass transit and keep the transient traffic with the corridor. In rural areas this should be avoided. For the big box question. I think our tax base would benefit from a few more big box stores. We have great sites where this would fit perfectly
-  **Anonymous user's Opinion**
We really don't need any more targets in Fitchburg.
-  **Anonymous user's Opinion**
I find both A and B appealing - BUT I don't want any more development in Fitchburg!
-  **Anonymous user's Opinion**
I think both are designed for the space available for development. Image A feels better if near an area of residential homes. Image B is in Fitchburg already, and the store feels like it fits in the location it is in.
-  **Anonymous user's Opinion**
Yes!!
-  **Anonymous user's Opinion**
Image A is a better and more responsible use of space--the parking is under the building. Less area for surface run-off and paved area.
-  **Anonymous user's Opinion**
all sites must be fully accessible for those with disabilities

What do you think about these mixed commercial and residential areas?

Rate the content of each image using the rating scale above.

CURRENT RESULTS						170 Total Responses
	1	2	3	4	5	
Image A	12% (20)	16% (28)	19% (32)	29% (49)	24% (41)	
Image B	9% (16)	8% (14)	20% (34)	38% (64)	25% (42)	

REGISTERED (93)						
	1	2	3	4	5	
Image A	8.0% (7)	17.0% (16)	24.0% (22)	29.0% (27)	23.0% (21)	
Image B	8.0% (7)	6.0% (6)	19.0% (18)	37.0% (34)	30.0% (28)	

NON-REGISTERED (77)						
	1	2	3	4	5	
Image A	16.9% (13)	15.6% (12)	13.0% (10)	28.6% (22)	26.0% (20)	
Image B	11.7% (9)	10.4% (8)	20.8% (16)	39.0% (30)	18.2% (14)	

ALL RESPONDENTS (170)						
	1	2	3	4	5	
Image A	12% (20)	16% (28)	19% (32)	29% (49)	24% (41)	
Image B	9% (16)	8% (14)	20% (34)	38% (64)	25% (42)	

REGISTERED VOTERS IN FITCHBURG, WI (93)						
	1	2	3	4	5	
Image A	8% (7)	17% (16)	24% (22)	29% (27)	23% (21)	
Image B	8% (7)	6% (6)	19% (18)	37% (34)	30% (28)	

LIVE IN FITCHBURG, WI (140) - SELF-REPORTED						
	1	2	3	4	5	
Image A	9% (12)	18% (25)	21% (29)	30% (42)	23% (32)	
Image B	7% (10)	7% (10)	19% (26)	41% (57)	26% (37)	

SUBSCRIBERS TO FITCHBURG, WI (142)						
	1	2	3	4	5	
Image A	8% (12)	18% (26)	20% (29)	30% (43)	23% (32)	
Image B	7% (10)	7% (10)	18% (26)	41% (58)	27% (38)	

REGISTER RESPONDENTS FROM ANYWHERE (94)						
	1	2	3	4	5	
Image A	7% (7)	18% (17)	24% (23)	29% (27)	23% (22)	
Image B	7% (7)	6% (6)	21% (20)	37% (35)	30% (28)	

EDUCATION						96 REGISTERED VOTERS
	1	2	3	4	5	

Bach Degree - Extremely Likely (20)						
	1	2	3	4	5	
Image A	5.0% (1.0)	15.0% (3.0)	35.0% (7.0)	30.0% (6.0)	15.0% (3.0)	
Image B	5.0% (1.0)	5.0% (1.0)	10.0% (2.0)	60.0% (12.0)	20.0% (4.0)	

Bach Degree - Likely (10)

Image A	20.0% (2.0)	10.0% (1.0)	30.0% (3.0)	10.0% (1.0)	30.0% (3.0)
Image B	20.0% (2.0)	10.0% (1.0)	20.0% (2.0)	30.0% (3.0)	20.0% (2.0)

Grad Degree - Extremely Likely (11)

Image A	-	18.2% (2.0)	9.1% (1.0)	45.5% (5.0)	27.3% (3.0)
Image B	9.1% (1.0)	-	27.3% (3.0)	36.4% (4.0)	27.3% (3.0)

Grad Degree - Likely (6)

Image A	-	16.7% (1.0)	16.7% (1.0)	50.0% (3.0)	16.7% (1.0)
Image B	-	-	33.3% (2.0)	16.7% (1.0)	50.0% (3.0)

HS Diploma - Extremely Likely (5)

Image A	20.0% (1.0)	-	40.0% (2.0)	-	40.0% (2.0)
Image B	20.0% (1.0)	-	20.0% (1.0)	-	60.0% (3.0)

HS Diploma - Likely (1)

Image A	-	-	100.0% (1.0)	-	-
Image B	-	-	-	-	100.0% (1.0)

Less than HS Diploma - Likely (1)

Image A	-	-	-	-	100.0% (1.0)
Image B	-	-	-	-	100.0% (1.0)

Some College - Likely (6)

Image A	-	33.3% (2.0)	33.3% (2.0)	16.7% (1.0)	16.7% (1.0)
Image B	16.7% (1.0)	-	33.3% (2.0)	33.3% (2.0)	16.7% (1.0)

Some College -Extremely Likely (2)

Image A	-	100.0% (2.0)	-	-	-
Image B	-	-	-	50.0% (1.0)	50.0% (1.0)

Unknown (34)

Image A	8.8% (3.0)	17.6% (6.0)	17.6% (6.0)	32.4% (11.0)	23.5% (8.0)
Image B	2.9% (1.0)	11.8% (4.0)	23.5% (8.0)	35.3% (12.0)	26.5% (9.0)

VOTERS GENDER

96 REGISTERED VOTERS

1	2	3	4	5
---	---	---	---	---

F (45)

Image A	8.9% (4.0)	13.3% (6.0)	22.2% (10.0)	33.3% (15.0)	22.2% (10.0)
Image B	8.9% (4.0)	4.4% (2.0)	15.6% (7.0)	37.8% (17.0)	33.3% (15.0)

M (50)

Image A	4.0% (2.0)	22.0% (11.0)	26.0% (13.0)	24.0% (12.0)	24.0% (12.0)
Image B	6.0% (3.0)	8.0% (4.0)	26.0% (13.0)	36.0% (18.0)	24.0% (12.0)

Unknown (1)

Image A	100.0% (1.0)	-	-	-	-
Image B	-	-	-	-	100.0% (1.0)

PRECINCT

96 REGISTERED VOTERS

1	2	3	4	5
---	---	---	---	---

FITCHBURG CITY WARD 01 (5)

Image A	20.0% (1.0)	40.0% (2.0)	20.0% (1.0)	20.0% (1.0)	-
Image B	-	-	20.0% (1.0)	80.0% (4.0)	-
FITCHBURG CITY WARD 02 (2)					
Image A	-	-	50.0% (1.0)	-	50.0% (1.0)
Image B	-	-	-	50.0% (1.0)	50.0% (1.0)
FITCHBURG CITY WARD 04 (1)					
Image A	-	-	-	100.0% (1.0)	-
Image B	-	-	-	100.0% (1.0)	-
FITCHBURG CITY WARD 05 (4)					
Image A	-	25.0% (1.0)	-	25.0% (1.0)	50.0% (2.0)
Image B	-	-	25.0% (1.0)	25.0% (1.0)	50.0% (2.0)
FITCHBURG CITY WARD 06 (6)					
Image A	-	-	50.0% (3.0)	50.0% (3.0)	-
Image B	-	-	16.7% (1.0)	50.0% (3.0)	33.3% (2.0)
FITCHBURG CITY WARD 07 (7)					
Image A	14.3% (1.0)	42.9% (3.0)	-	28.6% (2.0)	14.3% (1.0)
Image B	14.3% (1.0)	28.6% (2.0)	42.9% (3.0)	-	14.3% (1.0)
FITCHBURG CITY WARD 08 (7)					
Image A	-	-	14.3% (1.0)	42.9% (3.0)	42.9% (3.0)
Image B	-	-	14.3% (1.0)	42.9% (3.0)	42.9% (3.0)
FITCHBURG CITY WARD 09 (4)					
Image A	25.0% (1.0)	-	25.0% (1.0)	25.0% (1.0)	25.0% (1.0)
Image B	-	-	50.0% (2.0)	-	50.0% (2.0)
FITCHBURG CITY WARD 12 (1)					
Image A	-	-	100.0% (1.0)	-	-
Image B	-	-	-	-	100.0% (1.0)
FITCHBURG CITY WARD 13 (17)					
Image A	17.6% (3.0)	17.6% (3.0)	17.6% (3.0)	35.3% (6.0)	11.8% (2.0)
Image B	17.6% (3.0)	5.9% (1.0)	11.8% (2.0)	52.9% (9.0)	11.8% (2.0)
FITCHBURG CITY WARD 14 (13)					
Image A	-	15.4% (2.0)	46.2% (6.0)	30.8% (4.0)	7.7% (1.0)
Image B	-	7.7% (1.0)	30.8% (4.0)	23.1% (3.0)	38.5% (5.0)
FITCHBURG CITY WARD 15 (4)					
Image A	-	-	25.0% (1.0)	-	75.0% (3.0)
Image B	-	-	25.0% (1.0)	-	75.0% (3.0)
FITCHBURG CITY WARD 16 (1)					
Image A	-	100.0% (1.0)	-	-	-
Image B	-	-	-	100.0% (1.0)	-
FITCHBURG CITY WARD 17 (6)					
Image A	-	33.3% (2.0)	50.0% (3.0)	-	16.7% (1.0)
Image B	16.7% (1.0)	-	16.7% (1.0)	50.0% (3.0)	16.7% (1.0)
FITCHBURG CITY WARD 18 (6)					

Image A	16.7% (1.0)	-	33.3% (2.0)	16.7% (1.0)	33.3% (2.0)
Image B	16.7% (1.0)	-	16.7% (1.0)	50.0% (3.0)	16.7% (1.0)
FITCHBURG CITY WARD 19 (9)					
Image A	-	22.2% (2.0)	-	44.4% (4.0)	33.3% (3.0)
Image B	11.1% (1.0)	11.1% (1.0)	11.1% (1.0)	22.2% (2.0)	44.4% (4.0)
MADISON CITY WARD 100 (1)					
Image A	-	-	-	-	100.0% (1.0)
Image B	-	-	100.0% (1.0)	-	-
MADISON CITY WARD 107 (1)					
Image A	-	100.0% (1.0)	-	-	-
Image B	-	-	-	100.0% (1.0)	-
OREGON VLG WARD 10 (1)					
Image A	-	-	-	-	100.0% (1.0)
Image B	-	100.0% (1.0)	-	-	-
AGE RANGE					
	1	2	3	4	5
96 REGISTERED VOTERS					
18-29 (1)					
Image A	100.0% (1.0)	-	-	-	-
Image B	-	-	-	100.0% (1.0)	-
30-39 (10)					
Image A	-	10.0% (1.0)	20.0% (2.0)	30.0% (3.0)	40.0% (4.0)
Image B	-	-	40.0% (4.0)	30.0% (3.0)	30.0% (3.0)
40-49 (17)					
Image A	11.8% (2.0)	17.6% (3.0)	47.1% (8.0)	17.6% (3.0)	5.9% (1.0)
Image B	5.9% (1.0)	-	5.9% (1.0)	35.3% (6.0)	52.9% (9.0)
50-59 (12)					
Image A	-	8.3% (1.0)	16.7% (2.0)	58.3% (7.0)	16.7% (2.0)
Image B	8.3% (1.0)	-	33.3% (4.0)	41.7% (5.0)	16.7% (2.0)
60-69 (10)					
Image A	10.0% (1.0)	10.0% (1.0)	20.0% (2.0)	30.0% (3.0)	30.0% (3.0)
Image B	30.0% (3.0)	-	10.0% (1.0)	40.0% (4.0)	20.0% (2.0)
70-79 (10)					
Image A	20.0% (2.0)	60.0% (6.0)	-	10.0% (1.0)	10.0% (1.0)
Image B	-	20.0% (2.0)	20.0% (2.0)	40.0% (4.0)	20.0% (2.0)
80-89 (1)					
Image A	-	-	-	-	100.0% (1.0)
Image B	-	-	100.0% (1.0)	-	-
unknown (35)					
Image A	2.9% (1.0)	14.3% (5.0)	25.7% (9.0)	28.6% (10.0)	28.6% (10.0)
Image B	5.7% (2.0)	11.4% (4.0)	20.0% (7.0)	34.3% (12.0)	28.6% (10.0)

AGE	1	2	3	4	5
28 (1)					
Image A	100.0% (1.0)	-	-	-	-
Image B	-	-	-	100.0% (1.0)	-
35 (2)					
Image A	-	-	-	50.0% (1.0)	50.0% (1.0)
Image B	-	-	50.0% (1.0)	-	50.0% (1.0)
36 (1)					
Image A	-	-	-	-	100.0% (1.0)
Image B	-	-	100.0% (1.0)	-	-
37 (2)					
Image A	-	50.0% (1.0)	50.0% (1.0)	-	-
Image B	-	-	-	50.0% (1.0)	50.0% (1.0)
38 (3)					
Image A	-	-	33.3% (1.0)	33.3% (1.0)	33.3% (1.0)
Image B	-	-	66.7% (2.0)	33.3% (1.0)	-
39 (2)					
Image A	-	-	-	50.0% (1.0)	50.0% (1.0)
Image B	-	-	-	50.0% (1.0)	50.0% (1.0)
40 (4)					
Image A	25.0% (1.0)	25.0% (1.0)	50.0% (2.0)	-	-
Image B	-	-	-	50.0% (2.0)	50.0% (2.0)
43 (2)					
Image A	50.0% (1.0)	-	50.0% (1.0)	-	-
Image B	50.0% (1.0)	-	-	-	50.0% (1.0)
44 (4)					
Image A	-	50.0% (2.0)	25.0% (1.0)	25.0% (1.0)	-
Image B	-	-	-	50.0% (2.0)	50.0% (2.0)
45 (2)					
Image A	-	-	50.0% (1.0)	50.0% (1.0)	-
Image B	-	-	-	50.0% (1.0)	50.0% (1.0)
46 (1)					
Image A	-	-	-	-	100.0% (1.0)
Image B	-	-	-	-	100.0% (1.0)
47 (1)					
Image A	-	-	100.0% (1.0)	-	-
Image B	-	-	-	-	100.0% (1.0)
49 (3)					
Image A	-	-	66.7% (2.0)	33.3% (1.0)	-
Image B	-	-	33.3% (1.0)	33.3% (1.0)	33.3% (1.0)
50 (1)					

Image A	-	100.0% (1.0)	-	-	-
Image B	-	-	-	100.0% (1.0)	-
52 (3)					
Image A	-	-	-	100.0% (3.0)	-
Image B	33.3% (1.0)	-	33.3% (1.0)	-	33.3% (1.0)
53 (1)					
Image A	-	-	-	-	100.0% (1.0)
Image B	-	-	100.0% (1.0)	-	-
55 (1)					
Image A	-	-	100.0% (1.0)	-	-
Image B	-	-	100.0% (1.0)	-	-
56 (2)					
Image A	-	-	50.0% (1.0)	50.0% (1.0)	-
Image B	-	-	-	100.0% (2.0)	-
57 (1)					
Image A	-	-	-	100.0% (1.0)	-
Image B	-	-	-	100.0% (1.0)	-
59 (3)					
Image A	-	-	-	66.7% (2.0)	33.3% (1.0)
Image B	-	-	33.3% (1.0)	33.3% (1.0)	33.3% (1.0)
60 (1)					
Image A	-	-	100.0% (1.0)	-	-
Image B	-	-	-	100.0% (1.0)	-
61 (1)					
Image A	-	-	-	-	100.0% (1.0)
Image B	-	-	-	-	100.0% (1.0)
62 (1)					
Image A	-	-	-	100.0% (1.0)	-
Image B	-	-	-	100.0% (1.0)	-
63 (1)					
Image A	-	-	100.0% (1.0)	-	-
Image B	100.0% (1.0)	-	-	-	-
64 (2)					
Image A	-	50.0% (1.0)	-	50.0% (1.0)	-
Image B	-	-	-	100.0% (2.0)	-
65 (1)					
Image A	100.0% (1.0)	-	-	-	-
Image B	100.0% (1.0)	-	-	-	-
66 (1)					
Image A	-	-	-	100.0% (1.0)	-
Image B	100.0% (1.0)	-	-	-	-
68 (1)					

Image A	-	-	-	-	100.0% (1.0)
Image B	-	-	-	-	100.0% (1.0)
69 (1)					
Image A	-	-	-	-	100.0% (1.0)
Image B	-	-	100.0% (1.0)	-	-
70 (1)					
Image A	-	100.0% (1.0)	-	-	-
Image B	-	-	100.0% (1.0)	-	-
72 (1)					
Image A	100.0% (1.0)	-	-	-	-
Image B	-	100.0% (1.0)	-	-	-
73 (2)					
Image A	50.0% (1.0)	50.0% (1.0)	-	-	-
Image B	-	-	50.0% (1.0)	50.0% (1.0)	-
74 (2)					
Image A	-	50.0% (1.0)	-	-	50.0% (1.0)
Image B	-	50.0% (1.0)	-	-	50.0% (1.0)
77 (2)					
Image A	-	100.0% (2.0)	-	-	-
Image B	-	-	-	100.0% (2.0)	-
79 (2)					
Image A	-	50.0% (1.0)	-	50.0% (1.0)	-
Image B	-	-	-	50.0% (1.0)	50.0% (1.0)
80 (1)					
Image A	-	-	-	-	100.0% (1.0)
Image B	-	-	100.0% (1.0)	-	-
Unknown (35)					
Image A	2.9% (1.0)	14.3% (5.0)	25.7% (9.0)	28.6% (10.0)	28.6% (10.0)
Image B	5.7% (2.0)	11.4% (4.0)	20.0% (7.0)	34.3% (12.0)	28.6% (10.0)
STATE INCOME DECILE					
96 REGISTERED VOTERS					
	1	2	3	4	5
0 to 9 Pct range (2)					
Image A	-	-	-	100.0% (2.0)	-
Image B	-	-	-	100.0% (2.0)	-
40 to 49 Pct range (1)					
Image A	-	100.0% (1.0)	-	-	-
Image B	-	-	-	100.0% (1.0)	-
50 to 59 Pct range (4)					
Image A	25.0% (1.0)	25.0% (1.0)	25.0% (1.0)	25.0% (1.0)	-
Image B	-	-	25.0% (1.0)	75.0% (3.0)	-
60 to 69 Pct range (3)					

Image A	33.3% (1.0)	-	-	33.3% (1.0)	33.3% (1.0)
Image B	-	-	33.3% (1.0)	-	66.7% (2.0)

70 to 79 Pct range (3)

Image A	-	-	33.3% (1.0)	-	66.7% (2.0)
Image B	-	-	33.3% (1.0)	33.3% (1.0)	33.3% (1.0)

80 to 89 Pct range (41)

Image A	7.3% (3.0)	19.5% (8.0)	34.1% (14.0)	24.4% (10.0)	14.6% (6.0)
Image B	9.8% (4.0)	4.9% (2.0)	19.5% (8.0)	39.0% (16.0)	26.8% (11.0)

90 Pct and up (40)

Image A	5.0% (2.0)	15.0% (6.0)	17.5% (7.0)	32.5% (13.0)	30.0% (12.0)
Image B	7.5% (3.0)	7.5% (3.0)	22.5% (9.0)	30.0% (12.0)	32.5% (13.0)

Unknown (2)

Image A	-	50.0% (1.0)	-	-	50.0% (1.0)
Image B	-	50.0% (1.0)	-	-	50.0% (1.0)

HOME OWNER/RENTER

96 REGISTERED VOTERS

	1	2	3	4	5
--	---	---	---	---	---

Likely Homeowner (56)

Image A	8.9% (5.0)	17.9% (10.0)	21.4% (12.0)	28.6% (16.0)	23.2% (13.0)
Image B	7.1% (4.0)	5.4% (3.0)	25.0% (14.0)	37.5% (21.0)	25.0% (14.0)

Likely Renter (24)

Image A	8.3% (2.0)	20.8% (5.0)	20.8% (5.0)	29.2% (7.0)	20.8% (5.0)
Image B	12.5% (3.0)	-	16.7% (4.0)	33.3% (8.0)	37.5% (9.0)

Unknown (16)

Image A	-	12.5% (2.0)	37.5% (6.0)	25.0% (4.0)	25.0% (4.0)
Image B	-	18.8% (3.0)	12.5% (2.0)	37.5% (6.0)	31.3% (5.0)

Rate your level of agreement with the following statement: I want this type of development in Fitchburg.

CURRENT RESULTS						170 Total Responses
	Strongly Disagree	Disagree	Neutral	Agree	Strongly Agree	
Image A	12% (21)	15% (26)	22% (37)	28% (48)	22% (38)	
Image B	9% (16)	9% (16)	21% (36)	35% (59)	25% (43)	

REGISTERED (93)						
	Strongly Disagree	Disagree	Neutral	Agree	Strongly Agree	
Image A	8.0% (7)	13.0% (12)	29.0% (27)	31.0% (29)	19.0% (18)	
Image B	8.0% (7)	11.0% (10)	18.0% (17)	32.0% (30)	31.0% (29)	

NON-REGISTERED (77)						
	Strongly Disagree	Disagree	Neutral	Agree	Strongly Agree	
Image A	18.2% (14)	18.2% (14)	13.0% (10)	24.7% (19)	26.0% (20)	
Image B	11.7% (9)	7.8% (6)	24.7% (19)	37.7% (29)	18.2% (14)	

ALL RESPONDENTS (170)						
	Strongly Disagree	Disagree	Neutral	Agree	Strongly Agree	
Image A	12% (21)	15% (26)	22% (37)	28% (48)	22% (38)	
Image B	9% (16)	9% (16)	21% (36)	35% (59)	25% (43)	

REGISTERED VOTERS IN FITCHBURG, WI (93)						
	Strongly Disagree	Disagree	Neutral	Agree	Strongly Agree	
Image A	8% (7)	13% (12)	29% (27)	31% (29)	19% (18)	
Image B	8% (7)	11% (10)	18% (17)	32% (30)	31% (29)	

LIVE IN FITCHBURG, WI (140) - SELF-REPORTED						
	Strongly Disagree	Disagree	Neutral	Agree	Strongly Agree	
Image A	9% (13)	16% (22)	25% (35)	29% (41)	21% (29)	
Image B	6% (9)	9% (13)	20% (28)	37% (52)	27% (38)	

SUBSCRIBERS TO FITCHBURG, WI (142)						
	Strongly Disagree	Disagree	Neutral	Agree	Strongly Agree	
Image A	9% (13)	16% (23)	25% (35)	30% (42)	20% (29)	
Image B	6% (9)	9% (13)	20% (28)	37% (53)	27% (39)	

REGISTER RESPONDENTS FROM ANYWHERE (94)						
	Strongly Disagree	Disagree	Neutral	Agree	Strongly Agree	
Image A	7% (7)	14% (13)	30% (28)	31% (29)	20% (19)	
Image B	7% (7)	11% (10)	19% (18)	34% (32)	31% (29)	

EDUCATION						96 REGISTERED VOTERS
	Strongly Disagree	Disagree	Neutral	Agree	Strongly Agree	
Bach Degree - Extremely Likely (20)						
Image A	5.0% (1.0)	15.0% (3.0)	30.0% (6.0)	35.0% (7.0)	15.0% (3.0)	
Image B	5.0% (1.0)	5.0% (1.0)	15.0% (3.0)	55.0% (11.0)	20.0% (4.0)	
Bach Degree - Likely (10)						
Image A	10.0% (1.0)	10.0% (1.0)	20.0% (2.0)	40.0% (4.0)	20.0% (2.0)	

Image B	10.0% (1.0)	30.0% (3.0)	20.0% (2.0)	10.0% (1.0)	30.0% (3.0)
---------	-------------	-------------	-------------	-------------	-------------

Grad Degree - Extremely Likely (11)

Image A	-	18.2% (2.0)	36.4% (4.0)	27.3% (3.0)	18.2% (2.0)
Image B	9.1% (1.0)	18.2% (2.0)	27.3% (3.0)	18.2% (2.0)	27.3% (3.0)

Grad Degree - Likely (6)

Image A	-	16.7% (1.0)	16.7% (1.0)	33.3% (2.0)	33.3% (2.0)
Image B	-	-	33.3% (2.0)	33.3% (2.0)	33.3% (2.0)

HS Diploma - Extremely Likely (5)

Image A	20.0% (1.0)	-	40.0% (2.0)	-	40.0% (2.0)
Image B	20.0% (1.0)	-	20.0% (1.0)	-	60.0% (3.0)

HS Diploma - Likely (1)

Image A	-	-	100.0% (1.0)	-	-
Image B	-	-	-	-	100.0% (1.0)

Less than HS Diploma - Likely (1)

Image A	-	-	-	100.0% (1.0)	-
Image B	-	-	-	100.0% (1.0)	-

Some College - Likely (6)

Image A	16.7% (1.0)	-	33.3% (2.0)	50.0% (3.0)	-
Image B	16.7% (1.0)	16.7% (1.0)	16.7% (1.0)	33.3% (2.0)	16.7% (1.0)

Some College -Extremely Likely (2)

Image A	-	50.0% (1.0)	-	50.0% (1.0)	-
Image B	-	-	-	100.0% (2.0)	-

Unknown (34)

Image A	8.8% (3.0)	14.7% (5.0)	29.4% (10.0)	23.5% (8.0)	23.5% (8.0)
Image B	5.9% (2.0)	8.8% (3.0)	17.6% (6.0)	32.4% (11.0)	35.3% (12.0)

VOTERS GENDER

96 REGISTERED VOTERS

	Strongly Disagree	Disagree	Neutral	Agree	Strongly Agree
--	-------------------	----------	---------	-------	----------------

F (45)

Image A	6.7% (3.0)	13.3% (6.0)	28.9% (13.0)	28.9% (13.0)	22.2% (10.0)
Image B	6.7% (3.0)	11.1% (5.0)	13.3% (6.0)	33.3% (15.0)	35.6% (16.0)

M (50)

Image A	6.0% (3.0)	14.0% (7.0)	30.0% (15.0)	32.0% (16.0)	18.0% (9.0)
Image B	8.0% (4.0)	10.0% (5.0)	24.0% (12.0)	34.0% (17.0)	24.0% (12.0)

Unknown (1)

Image A	100.0% (1.0)	-	-	-	-
Image B	-	-	-	-	100.0% (1.0)

PRECINCT

96 REGISTERED VOTERS

	Strongly Disagree	Disagree	Neutral	Agree	Strongly Agree
--	-------------------	----------	---------	-------	----------------

FITCHBURG CITY WARD 01 (5)

Image A	-	20.0% (1.0)	60.0% (3.0)	20.0% (1.0)	-
Image B	-	-	40.0% (2.0)	20.0% (1.0)	40.0% (2.0)

FITCHBURG CITY WARD 02 (2)

Image A	-	-	50.0% (1.0)	-	50.0% (1.0)
Image B	-	-	-	50.0% (1.0)	50.0% (1.0)

FITCHBURG CITY WARD 04 (1)

Image A	-	-	-	100.0% (1.0)	-
Image B	-	-	-	100.0% (1.0)	-

FITCHBURG CITY WARD 05 (4)

Image A	25.0% (1.0)	-	-	50.0% (2.0)	25.0% (1.0)
Image B	-	-	-	50.0% (2.0)	50.0% (2.0)

FITCHBURG CITY WARD 06 (6)

Image A	-	-	50.0% (3.0)	33.3% (2.0)	16.7% (1.0)
Image B	-	-	16.7% (1.0)	33.3% (2.0)	50.0% (3.0)

FITCHBURG CITY WARD 07 (7)

Image A	28.6% (2.0)	42.9% (3.0)	-	28.6% (2.0)	-
Image B	14.3% (1.0)	42.9% (3.0)	14.3% (1.0)	28.6% (2.0)	-

FITCHBURG CITY WARD 08 (7)

Image A	-	-	42.9% (3.0)	14.3% (1.0)	42.9% (3.0)
Image B	-	-	42.9% (3.0)	14.3% (1.0)	42.9% (3.0)

FITCHBURG CITY WARD 09 (4)

Image A	25.0% (1.0)	-	25.0% (1.0)	25.0% (1.0)	25.0% (1.0)
Image B	-	-	50.0% (2.0)	-	50.0% (2.0)

FITCHBURG CITY WARD 12 (1)

Image A	-	-	100.0% (1.0)	-	-
Image B	-	-	-	100.0% (1.0)	-

FITCHBURG CITY WARD 13 (17)

Image A	5.9% (1.0)	23.5% (4.0)	29.4% (5.0)	23.5% (4.0)	17.6% (3.0)
Image B	11.8% (2.0)	23.5% (4.0)	-	35.3% (6.0)	29.4% (5.0)

FITCHBURG CITY WARD 14 (13)

Image A	-	15.4% (2.0)	23.1% (3.0)	46.2% (6.0)	15.4% (2.0)
Image B	-	15.4% (2.0)	23.1% (3.0)	30.8% (4.0)	30.8% (4.0)

FITCHBURG CITY WARD 15 (4)

Image A	-	25.0% (1.0)	-	25.0% (1.0)	50.0% (2.0)
Image B	-	-	25.0% (1.0)	-	75.0% (3.0)

FITCHBURG CITY WARD 16 (1)

Image A	-	-	100.0% (1.0)	-	-
Image B	-	-	100.0% (1.0)	-	-

FITCHBURG CITY WARD 17 (6)

Image A	-	-	50.0% (3.0)	50.0% (3.0)	-
Image B	16.7% (1.0)	-	-	83.3% (5.0)	-

FITCHBURG CITY WARD 18 (6)

Image A	16.7% (1.0)	-	16.7% (1.0)	50.0% (3.0)	16.7% (1.0)
Image B	16.7% (1.0)	-	16.7% (1.0)	33.3% (2.0)	33.3% (2.0)

FITCHBURG CITY WARD 19 (9)

Image A	11.1% (1.0)	11.1% (1.0)	33.3% (3.0)	22.2% (2.0)	22.2% (2.0)
Image B	22.2% (2.0)	-	22.2% (2.0)	33.3% (3.0)	22.2% (2.0)

MADISON CITY WARD 100 (1)

Image A	-	-	-	-	100.0% (1.0)
Image B	-	-	100.0% (1.0)	-	-

MADISON CITY WARD 107 (1)

Image A	-	100.0% (1.0)	-	-	-
Image B	-	-	-	100.0% (1.0)	-

OREGON VLG WARD 10 (1)

Image A	-	-	-	-	100.0% (1.0)
Image B	-	100.0% (1.0)	-	-	-

AGE RANGE

96 REGISTERED VOTERS

Strongly Disagree Disagree Neutral Agree Strongly Agree

18-29 (1)

Image A	-	-	100.0% (1.0)	-	-
Image B	-	-	-	-	100.0% (1.0)

30-39 (10)

Image A	10.0% (1.0)	-	10.0% (1.0)	40.0% (4.0)	40.0% (4.0)
Image B	-	-	30.0% (3.0)	40.0% (4.0)	30.0% (3.0)

40-49 (17)

Image A	17.6% (3.0)	11.8% (2.0)	52.9% (9.0)	11.8% (2.0)	5.9% (1.0)
Image B	5.9% (1.0)	5.9% (1.0)	5.9% (1.0)	35.3% (6.0)	47.1% (8.0)

50-59 (12)

Image A	-	-	50.0% (6.0)	33.3% (4.0)	16.7% (2.0)
Image B	8.3% (1.0)	8.3% (1.0)	41.7% (5.0)	33.3% (4.0)	8.3% (1.0)

60-69 (10)

Image A	10.0% (1.0)	20.0% (2.0)	10.0% (1.0)	40.0% (4.0)	20.0% (2.0)
Image B	30.0% (3.0)	-	30.0% (3.0)	20.0% (2.0)	20.0% (2.0)

70-79 (10)

Image A	10.0% (1.0)	50.0% (5.0)	20.0% (2.0)	10.0% (1.0)	10.0% (1.0)
Image B	-	20.0% (2.0)	20.0% (2.0)	40.0% (4.0)	20.0% (2.0)

80-89 (1)

Image A	-	-	-	-	100.0% (1.0)
Image B	-	-	-	100.0% (1.0)	-

unknown (35)

Image A	2.9% (1.0)	11.4% (4.0)	22.9% (8.0)	40.0% (14.0)	22.9% (8.0)
Image B	5.7% (2.0)	17.1% (6.0)	11.4% (4.0)	31.4% (11.0)	34.3% (12.0)

VOTERS AGE

96 REGISTERED VOTERS

Strongly Disagree Disagree Neutral Agree Strongly Agree

28 (1)



















Image A	-	-	100.0% (1.0)	-	-
Image B	-	-	-	-	100.0% (1.0)
35 (2)					
Image A	-	-	-	50.0% (1.0)	50.0% (1.0)
Image B	-	-	-	50.0% (1.0)	50.0% (1.0)
36 (1)					
Image A	-	-	-	100.0% (1.0)	-
Image B	-	-	100.0% (1.0)	-	-
37 (2)					
Image A	50.0% (1.0)	-	-	50.0% (1.0)	-
Image B	-	-	-	100.0% (2.0)	-
38 (3)					
Image A	-	-	33.3% (1.0)	33.3% (1.0)	33.3% (1.0)
Image B	-	-	66.7% (2.0)	33.3% (1.0)	-
39 (2)					
Image A	-	-	-	-	100.0% (2.0)
Image B	-	-	-	-	100.0% (2.0)
40 (4)					
Image A	25.0% (1.0)	25.0% (1.0)	50.0% (2.0)	-	-
Image B	-	-	-	50.0% (2.0)	50.0% (2.0)
43 (2)					
Image A	50.0% (1.0)	-	-	50.0% (1.0)	-
Image B	50.0% (1.0)	-	-	-	50.0% (1.0)
44 (4)					
Image A	25.0% (1.0)	25.0% (1.0)	25.0% (1.0)	25.0% (1.0)	-
Image B	-	-	-	50.0% (2.0)	50.0% (2.0)
45 (2)					
Image A	-	-	100.0% (2.0)	-	-
Image B	-	50.0% (1.0)	-	-	50.0% (1.0)
46 (1)					
Image A	-	-	-	-	100.0% (1.0)
Image B	-	-	-	-	100.0% (1.0)
47 (1)					
Image A	-	-	100.0% (1.0)	-	-
Image B	-	-	-	-	100.0% (1.0)
49 (3)					
Image A	-	-	100.0% (3.0)	-	-
Image B	-	-	33.3% (1.0)	66.7% (2.0)	-
50 (1)					
Image A	-	-	100.0% (1.0)	-	-
Image B	-	-	100.0% (1.0)	-	-
52 (3)					



















Image A	-	-	66.7% (2.0)	33.3% (1.0)	-
Image B	33.3% (1.0)	33.3% (1.0)	-	33.3% (1.0)	-
53 (1)					
Image A	-	-	-	-	100.0% (1.0)
Image B	-	-	100.0% (1.0)	-	-
55 (1)					
Image A	-	-	100.0% (1.0)	-	-
Image B	-	-	100.0% (1.0)	-	-
56 (2)					
Image A	-	-	50.0% (1.0)	50.0% (1.0)	-
Image B	-	-	-	100.0% (2.0)	-
57 (1)					
Image A	-	-	100.0% (1.0)	-	-
Image B	-	-	100.0% (1.0)	-	-
59 (3)					
Image A	-	-	-	66.7% (2.0)	33.3% (1.0)
Image B	-	-	33.3% (1.0)	33.3% (1.0)	33.3% (1.0)
60 (1)					
Image A	-	100.0% (1.0)	-	-	-
Image B	-	-	100.0% (1.0)	-	-
61 (1)					
Image A	-	-	-	-	100.0% (1.0)
Image B	-	-	-	-	100.0% (1.0)
62 (1)					
Image A	-	-	-	100.0% (1.0)	-
Image B	-	-	-	100.0% (1.0)	-
63 (1)					
Image A	-	-	100.0% (1.0)	-	-
Image B	100.0% (1.0)	-	-	-	-
64 (2)					
Image A	-	-	-	100.0% (2.0)	-
Image B	-	-	50.0% (1.0)	50.0% (1.0)	-
65 (1)					
Image A	100.0% (1.0)	-	-	-	-
Image B	100.0% (1.0)	-	-	-	-
66 (1)					
Image A	-	100.0% (1.0)	-	-	-
Image B	100.0% (1.0)	-	-	-	-
68 (1)					
Image A	-	-	-	-	100.0% (1.0)
Image B	-	-	-	-	100.0% (1.0)
69 (1)					

Image A	-	-	-	100.0% (1.0)	-
Image B	-	-	100.0% (1.0)	-	-
70 (1)					
Image A	-	100.0% (1.0)	-	-	-
Image B	-	-	100.0% (1.0)	-	-
72 (1)					
Image A	-	100.0% (1.0)	-	-	-
Image B	-	100.0% (1.0)	-	-	-
73 (2)					
Image A	50.0% (1.0)	-	50.0% (1.0)	-	-
Image B	-	-	-	100.0% (2.0)	-
74 (2)					
Image A	-	50.0% (1.0)	-	-	50.0% (1.0)
Image B	-	50.0% (1.0)	-	-	50.0% (1.0)
77 (2)					
Image A	-	100.0% (2.0)	-	-	-
Image B	-	-	-	100.0% (2.0)	-
79 (2)					
Image A	-	-	50.0% (1.0)	50.0% (1.0)	-
Image B	-	-	50.0% (1.0)	-	50.0% (1.0)
80 (1)					
Image A	-	-	-	-	100.0% (1.0)
Image B	-	-	-	100.0% (1.0)	-
Unknown (35)					
Image A	2.9% (1.0)	11.4% (4.0)	22.9% (8.0)	40.0% (14.0)	22.9% (8.0)
Image B	5.7% (2.0)	17.1% (6.0)	11.4% (4.0)	31.4% (11.0)	34.3% (12.0)
STATE INCOME DECILE					
96 REGISTERED VOTERS					
	Strongly Disagree	Disagree	Neutral	Agree	Strongly Agree
0 to 9 Pct range (2)					
Image A	-	-	50.0% (1.0)	50.0% (1.0)	-
Image B	-	-	50.0% (1.0)	50.0% (1.0)	-
40 to 49 Pct range (1)					
Image A	-	100.0% (1.0)	-	-	-
Image B	-	-	-	100.0% (1.0)	-
50 to 59 Pct range (4)					
Image A	-	-	75.0% (3.0)	25.0% (1.0)	-
Image B	-	-	50.0% (2.0)	-	50.0% (2.0)
60 to 69 Pct range (3)					
Image A	33.3% (1.0)	-	-	33.3% (1.0)	33.3% (1.0)
Image B	-	-	33.3% (1.0)	-	66.7% (2.0)
70 to 79 Pct range (3)					

Image A	-	-	33.3% (1.0)	-	66.7% (2.0)
Image B	-	-	33.3% (1.0)	33.3% (1.0)	33.3% (1.0)
80 to 89 Pct range (41)					
Image A	2.4% (1.0)	17.1% (7.0)	31.7% (13.0)	34.1% (14.0)	14.6% (6.0)
Image B	7.3% (3.0)	14.6% (6.0)	12.2% (5.0)	39.0% (16.0)	26.8% (11.0)
90 Pct and up (40)					
Image A	12.5% (5.0)	10.0% (4.0)	25.0% (10.0)	30.0% (12.0)	22.5% (9.0)
Image B	10.0% (4.0)	7.5% (3.0)	20.0% (8.0)	32.5% (13.0)	30.0% (12.0)
Unknown (2)					
Image A	-	50.0% (1.0)	-	-	50.0% (1.0)
Image B	-	50.0% (1.0)	-	-	50.0% (1.0)
HOME OWNER/RENTER					
					96 REGISTERED VOTERS
	Strongly Disagree	Disagree	Neutral	Agree	Strongly Agree
Likely Homeowner (56)					
Image A	8.9% (5.0)	16.1% (9.0)	23.2% (13.0)	35.7% (20.0)	16.1% (9.0)
Image B	7.1% (4.0)	12.5% (7.0)	19.6% (11.0)	33.9% (19.0)	26.8% (15.0)
Likely Renter (24)					
Image A	8.3% (2.0)	4.2% (1.0)	41.7% (10.0)	25.0% (6.0)	20.8% (5.0)
Image B	12.5% (3.0)	-	20.8% (5.0)	37.5% (9.0)	29.2% (7.0)
Unknown (16)					
Image A	-	18.8% (3.0)	31.3% (5.0)	18.8% (3.0)	31.3% (5.0)
Image B	-	18.8% (3.0)	12.5% (2.0)	25.0% (4.0)	43.8% (7.0)

If you have any comments about your answers to the above questions please provide them here.

-
-  **Anonymous user's Opinion**
Mixed use is great but I don't want to see tall building like that. Roads are already over crowded and 4-5 story building will only add to it.
-  **Anonymous user's Opinion**
I love this idea! But do like easy accessibility to parking
-  **Anonymous user's Opinion**
I have an idea - encourage development that doesn't blanket an entire property and encroach on sidewalks. We don't need to allow maximal impervious surfaces. We have to accept that we drive cars - especially when we are more than 2 miles from a grocery store - but we aren't a high density city and shouldn't pretend to be one.
-  **Anonymous user's Opinion**
Both are great. Again, we need a mixture of options for families, people, etc.
-  **Anonymous user's Opinion**
Fitchburg: Hey Fiduciary, what would you like us to put in our comp plan update? Fiduciary: Two renderings from recent projects. Choose A or B. We'll propose the most popular. Thanks for doing our research with your comp plan survey. Fitchburg Citizens: What a joke.
-  **Anonymous user's Opinion**
I prefer small businesses over retail chains. Retail chains can develop everywhere and anywhere. Small mom and pop stores need a nearby and easily accessible community to thrive.
-  **Anonymous user's Opinion**
Both do a good job of being accessible and inviting to the community. I prefer Image A's approach to parking (a lot behind the building), but the size of the building in Image B might fit better in the development of Fitchburg, at least early on.
-  **Anonymous user's Opinion**
what's the parking or bus stop info? hard to answer
-  **Anonymous user's Opinion**
I would prefer strongly for less mixed use and more pure commercial spaces; housing density in areas of Fitchburg feels like it is reaching an unsupportable level.
-  **Anonymous user's Opinion**
I like the looks of A, but I feel it lacks parking and is too close to the road for Fitchburg locations.
-  **Anonymous user's Opinion**
I think the "type" of development is the same (retail below, housing above) but the design of the first one is much classier, isn't trying to pretend it's multiple disparate buildings.
-  **Anonymous user's Opinion**
I like the setback on B. Nice to have sidewalk with space between it and the street
-  **Anonymous user's Opinion**
As long as either of those building are handicap accessible, they are good with me
-  **Stephen Lloyd Arnold's Opinion**
A would fit great into our new SmartCode areas. However, ditch the drive-through. It's not needed in a walkable neighborhood. (Folks who walk in buy more!) Too bad the intercity bus terminal was lost when this was built. B is a great solution for neighborhood services in otherwise all-residential areas, fostering a sense of community and cutting vehicle miles traveled (VMT). The residential component generates customer visits, increases tax revenue with no increase in infrastructure costs, and provides more affordable housing options. Make sure to serve these developments with frequent transit!
-  **Anonymous user's Opinion**
Either of these are only acceptable if they include elevators for the elderly and disabled.
-  **Anonymous user's Opinion**
This is the right path to avoid urban sprawl and massive strip malls.
-  **Anonymous user's Opinion**
It really doesn't cost much more to build interesting and attractive buildings as opposed to ordinary and nondescript so why not make the city more attractive? Consider how these buildings are going to hold up and appear in 20 years.
-  **Anonymous user's Opinion**
Any mixed use buildings should supply off street parking for costumers and visitors of the tenants also

-  **Anonymous user's Opinion**
From what I've heard, condos or apartments above commercial are expensive. The fact that they are there is a fair use of space though.
-  **Anonymous user's Opinion**
This would be good to place near a "City Center" to drive density plus activity / shopping.
-  **Anonymous user's Opinion**
Image A might be a bit too tall for Fitchburg, but I like the style/set-up of the building otherwise.
-  **Anonymous user's Opinion**
Both A is too high for residential proximity and both A and B are too close to street
-  **Anonymous user's Opinion**
Image A looks too metropolitan for Fitchburg.
-  **Anonymous user's Opinion**
Image A is much too large for Fitchburg, people live in Fitchburg and other Madison suburbs because we don't want the downtown Madison feel. Image B, with it's shorter building, is much more neighborhood-y and feels less industrial and downtown in vibe.
-  **Anonymous user's Opinion**
Traditional building materials never go out of style. The generic metal and EIFS boxes are already dated.
-  **Anonymous user's Opinion**
A is way too close to the street; it feels crowded and claustrophobic.
-  **Anonymous user's Opinion**
Shorter apartments are more accessible for young families and retirees. They look nicer and fit into a more green asthetic.
-  **Anonymous user's Opinion**
Please also consider religious facilities; churches, temples and so forth.
-  **Anonymous user's Opinion**
Parking and building height affect desirability.
-  **Anonymous user's Opinion**
They are building a monstrosity on Fish Hatchery right now that I can't believe got passed. There is literally no way for cars to get in and turn around in that place. Geico, State Farm and AMFAM should put up a sign to say they aren't responsible for accidents caused by the irresponsible design allowed by the City of Fitchburg.
-  **Anonymous user's Opinion**
Both look nice
-  **Anonymous user's Opinion**
Too urban for my taste.
-  **Anonymous user's Opinion**
The development would have be in a space that it felt in proportional and fulfill the demand for the type of development.
-  **Anonymous user's Opinion**
As long as the residents are condos
-  **Anonymous user's Opinion**
Having mixed development keeps the prices down for renters.
-  **Anonymous user's Opinion**
all buildings must be fully accessible for those with disabilities

What do you think about these land uses along busy roads?

Rate the content of each image set using the rating scale above:

CURRENT RESULTS						179 Total Responses
	1	2	3	4	5	
Image Set A	15% (27)	22% (39)	27% (49)	22% (40)	13% (24)	
Image Set B	13% (24)	15% (26)	23% (41)	31% (55)	18% (33)	
REGISTERED (101)						
	1	2	3	4	5	
Image Set A	16.0% (16)	24.0% (24)	25.0% (25)	25.0% (25)	11.0% (11)	
Image Set B	13.0% (13)	12.0% (12)	22.0% (22)	32.0% (32)	22.0% (22)	
NON-REGISTERED (78)						
	1	2	3	4	5	
Image Set A	14.1% (11)	19.2% (15)	30.8% (24)	19.2% (15)	16.7% (13)	
Image Set B	14.1% (11)	17.9% (14)	24.4% (19)	29.5% (23)	14.1% (11)	
ALL RESPONDENTS (179)						
	1	2	3	4	5	
Image Set A	15% (27)	22% (39)	27% (49)	22% (40)	13% (24)	
Image Set B	13% (24)	15% (26)	23% (41)	31% (55)	18% (33)	
REGISTERED VOTERS IN FITCHBURG, WI (101)						
	1	2	3	4	5	
Image Set A	16% (16)	24% (24)	25% (25)	25% (25)	11% (11)	
Image Set B	13% (13)	12% (12)	22% (22)	32% (32)	22% (22)	
LIVE IN FITCHBURG, WI (148) - SELF-REPORTED						
	1	2	3	4	5	
Image Set A	16% (23)	21% (31)	28% (41)	24% (35)	12% (18)	
Image Set B	13% (19)	14% (20)	22% (33)	32% (48)	19% (28)	
SUBSCRIBERS TO FITCHBURG, WI (150)						
	1	2	3	4	5	
Image Set A	15% (23)	21% (32)	28% (42)	23% (35)	12% (18)	
Image Set B	13% (19)	14% (21)	22% (33)	33% (49)	19% (28)	
REGISTER RESPONDENTS FROM ANYWHERE (102)						
	1	2	3	4	5	
Image Set A	16% (16)	25% (25)	26% (27)	25% (25)	12% (12)	
Image Set B	13% (13)	13% (13)	23% (23)	33% (34)	22% (22)	
EDUCATION						
	1	2	3	4	5	105 REGISTERED VOTERS
Bach Degree - Extremely Likely (23)						
Image Set A	26.1% (6.0)	13.0% (3.0)	30.4% (7.0)	21.7% (5.0)	8.7% (2.0)	
Image Set B	13.0% (3.0)	13.0% (3.0)	26.1% (6.0)	26.1% (6.0)	21.7% (5.0)	

Bach Degree - Likely (11)

Image Set A	18.2% (2.0)	18.2% (2.0)	18.2% (2.0)	36.4% (4.0)	9.1% (1.0)
Image Set B	27.3% (3.0)	-	36.4% (4.0)	18.2% (2.0)	18.2% (2.0)

Grad Degree - Extremely Likely (11)

Image Set A	-	27.3% (3.0)	9.1% (1.0)	36.4% (4.0)	27.3% (3.0)
Image Set B	18.2% (2.0)	9.1% (1.0)	18.2% (2.0)	36.4% (4.0)	18.2% (2.0)

Grad Degree - Likely (8)

Image Set A	-	62.5% (5.0)	25.0% (2.0)	-	12.5% (1.0)
Image Set B	-	-	12.5% (1.0)	50.0% (4.0)	37.5% (3.0)

HS Diploma - Extremely Likely (5)

Image Set A	-	40.0% (2.0)	-	40.0% (2.0)	20.0% (1.0)
Image Set B	-	20.0% (1.0)	20.0% (1.0)	20.0% (1.0)	40.0% (2.0)

HS Diploma - Likely (1)

Image Set A	-	-	100.0% (1.0)	-	-
Image Set B	-	-	100.0% (1.0)	-	-

Less than HS Diploma - Likely (1)

Image Set A	-	-	100.0% (1.0)	-	-
Image Set B	-	-	-	-	100.0% (1.0)

Some College - Likely (7)

Image Set A	14.3% (1.0)	14.3% (1.0)	28.6% (2.0)	42.9% (3.0)	-
Image Set B	14.3% (1.0)	14.3% (1.0)	28.6% (2.0)	28.6% (2.0)	14.3% (1.0)

Some College -Extremely Likely (3)

Image Set A	-	-	66.7% (2.0)	33.3% (1.0)	-
Image Set B	-	-	33.3% (1.0)	33.3% (1.0)	33.3% (1.0)

Unknown (35)

Image Set A	20.0% (7.0)	25.7% (9.0)	25.7% (9.0)	17.1% (6.0)	11.4% (4.0)
Image Set B	11.4% (4.0)	20.0% (7.0)	14.3% (5.0)	40.0% (14.0)	14.3% (5.0)

VOTERS GENDER

105 REGISTERED VOTERS

1	2	3	4	5
---	---	---	---	---

F (51)

Image Set A	9.8% (5.0)	21.6% (11.0)	19.6% (10.0)	33.3% (17.0)	15.7% (8.0)
Image Set B	15.7% (8.0)	11.8% (6.0)	25.5% (13.0)	31.4% (16.0)	15.7% (8.0)

M (53)

Image Set A	18.9% (10.0)	26.4% (14.0)	32.1% (17.0)	15.1% (8.0)	7.5% (4.0)
Image Set B	9.4% (5.0)	11.3% (6.0)	18.9% (10.0)	34.0% (18.0)	26.4% (14.0)

Unknown (1)

Image Set A	100.0% (1.0)	-	-	-	-
Image Set B	-	100.0% (1.0)	-	-	-

PRECINCT

105 REGISTERED VOTERS

1	2	3	4	5
---	---	---	---	---

FITCHBURG CITY WARD 01 (5)

Image Set A	-	20.0% (1.0)	40.0% (2.0)	40.0% (2.0)	-
Image Set B	20.0% (1.0)	40.0% (2.0)	20.0% (1.0)	20.0% (1.0)	-
FITCHBURG CITY WARD 02 (2)					
Image Set A	-	100.0% (2.0)	-	-	-
Image Set B	-	-	50.0% (1.0)	50.0% (1.0)	-
FITCHBURG CITY WARD 03 (2)					
Image Set A	50.0% (1.0)	-	-	50.0% (1.0)	-
Image Set B	50.0% (1.0)	-	-	50.0% (1.0)	-
FITCHBURG CITY WARD 04 (1)					
Image Set A	100.0% (1.0)	-	-	-	-
Image Set B	-	-	-	-	100.0% (1.0)
FITCHBURG CITY WARD 05 (6)					
Image Set A	33.3% (2.0)	33.3% (2.0)	16.7% (1.0)	-	16.7% (1.0)
Image Set B	-	-	16.7% (1.0)	66.7% (4.0)	16.7% (1.0)
FITCHBURG CITY WARD 06 (6)					
Image Set A	-	33.3% (2.0)	50.0% (3.0)	-	16.7% (1.0)
Image Set B	16.7% (1.0)	-	33.3% (2.0)	16.7% (1.0)	33.3% (2.0)
FITCHBURG CITY WARD 07 (8)					
Image Set A	12.5% (1.0)	-	25.0% (2.0)	25.0% (2.0)	37.5% (3.0)
Image Set B	37.5% (3.0)	25.0% (2.0)	12.5% (1.0)	12.5% (1.0)	12.5% (1.0)
FITCHBURG CITY WARD 08 (8)					
Image Set A	12.5% (1.0)	37.5% (3.0)	25.0% (2.0)	12.5% (1.0)	12.5% (1.0)
Image Set B	-	-	25.0% (2.0)	50.0% (4.0)	25.0% (2.0)
FITCHBURG CITY WARD 09 (4)					
Image Set A	25.0% (1.0)	25.0% (1.0)	-	50.0% (2.0)	-
Image Set B	-	50.0% (2.0)	25.0% (1.0)	25.0% (1.0)	-
FITCHBURG CITY WARD 12 (1)					
Image Set A	-	-	100.0% (1.0)	-	-
Image Set B	-	-	-	-	100.0% (1.0)
FITCHBURG CITY WARD 13 (18)					
Image Set A	11.1% (2.0)	16.7% (3.0)	22.2% (4.0)	38.9% (7.0)	11.1% (2.0)
Image Set B	16.7% (3.0)	11.1% (2.0)	22.2% (4.0)	44.4% (8.0)	5.6% (1.0)
FITCHBURG CITY WARD 14 (13)					
Image Set A	-	46.2% (6.0)	23.1% (3.0)	30.8% (4.0)	-
Image Set B	7.7% (1.0)	-	30.8% (4.0)	53.8% (7.0)	7.7% (1.0)
FITCHBURG CITY WARD 15 (4)					
Image Set A	-	25.0% (1.0)	-	25.0% (1.0)	50.0% (2.0)
Image Set B	-	-	25.0% (1.0)	-	75.0% (3.0)
FITCHBURG CITY WARD 16 (1)					
Image Set A	-	-	100.0% (1.0)	-	-
Image Set B	-	-	100.0% (1.0)	-	-
FITCHBURG CITY WARD 17 (6)					

Image Set A	16.7% (1.0)	-	33.3% (2.0)	50.0% (3.0)	-
Image Set B	16.7% (1.0)	16.7% (1.0)	33.3% (2.0)	16.7% (1.0)	16.7% (1.0)
FITCHBURG CITY WARD 18 (6)					
Image Set A	66.7% (4.0)	-	16.7% (1.0)	16.7% (1.0)	-
Image Set B	16.7% (1.0)	16.7% (1.0)	16.7% (1.0)	16.7% (1.0)	33.3% (2.0)
FITCHBURG CITY WARD 19 (11)					
Image Set A	9.1% (1.0)	27.3% (3.0)	36.4% (4.0)	9.1% (1.0)	18.2% (2.0)
Image Set B	9.1% (1.0)	18.2% (2.0)	9.1% (1.0)	18.2% (2.0)	45.5% (5.0)
MADISON CITY WARD 100 (1)					
Image Set A	-	100.0% (1.0)	-	-	-
Image Set B	-	-	-	-	100.0% (1.0)
MADISON CITY WARD 107 (1)					
Image Set A	-	-	100.0% (1.0)	-	-
Image Set B	-	100.0% (1.0)	-	-	-
OREGON VLG WARD 10 (1)					
Image Set A	100.0% (1.0)	-	-	-	-
Image Set B	-	-	-	100.0% (1.0)	-
AGE RANGE					
	105 REGISTERED VOTERS				
	1	2	3	4	5
18-29 (1)					
Image Set A	-	-	100.0% (1.0)	-	-
Image Set B	-	100.0% (1.0)	-	-	-
30-39 (11)					
Image Set A	-	63.6% (7.0)	18.2% (2.0)	18.2% (2.0)	-
Image Set B	-	9.1% (1.0)	9.1% (1.0)	36.4% (4.0)	45.5% (5.0)
40-49 (18)					
Image Set A	16.7% (3.0)	16.7% (3.0)	33.3% (6.0)	27.8% (5.0)	5.6% (1.0)
Image Set B	16.7% (3.0)	5.6% (1.0)	27.8% (5.0)	33.3% (6.0)	16.7% (3.0)
50-59 (12)					
Image Set A	8.3% (1.0)	50.0% (6.0)	8.3% (1.0)	25.0% (3.0)	8.3% (1.0)
Image Set B	-	16.7% (2.0)	25.0% (3.0)	50.0% (6.0)	8.3% (1.0)
60-69 (14)					
Image Set A	28.6% (4.0)	-	14.3% (2.0)	35.7% (5.0)	21.4% (3.0)
Image Set B	28.6% (4.0)	14.3% (2.0)	14.3% (2.0)	14.3% (2.0)	28.6% (4.0)
70-79 (11)					
Image Set A	9.1% (1.0)	-	36.4% (4.0)	27.3% (3.0)	27.3% (3.0)
Image Set B	27.3% (3.0)	18.2% (2.0)	36.4% (4.0)	9.1% (1.0)	9.1% (1.0)
80-89 (1)					
Image Set A	-	-	-	-	100.0% (1.0)
Image Set B	-	-	100.0% (1.0)	-	-
unknown (37)					

Image Set A	18.9% (7.0)	24.3% (9.0)	29.7% (11.0)	18.9% (7.0)	8.1% (3.0)
Image Set B	8.1% (3.0)	10.8% (4.0)	18.9% (7.0)	40.5% (15.0)	21.6% (8.0)

VOTERS 105 REGISTERED VOTERS
AGE

	1	2	3	4	5
--	---	---	---	---	---

28 (1)

Image Set A	-	-	100.0% (1.0)	-	-
Image Set B	-	100.0% (1.0)	-	-	-

35 (2)

Image Set A	-	100.0% (2.0)	-	-	-
Image Set B	-	-	-	100.0% (2.0)	-

36 (1)

Image Set A	-	100.0% (1.0)	-	-	-
Image Set B	-	-	-	-	100.0% (1.0)

37 (2)

Image Set A	-	-	50.0% (1.0)	50.0% (1.0)	-
Image Set B	-	50.0% (1.0)	50.0% (1.0)	-	-

38 (3)

Image Set A	-	66.7% (2.0)	33.3% (1.0)	-	-
Image Set B	-	-	-	33.3% (1.0)	66.7% (2.0)

39 (3)

Image Set A	-	66.7% (2.0)	-	33.3% (1.0)	-
Image Set B	-	-	-	33.3% (1.0)	66.7% (2.0)

40 (4)

Image Set A	25.0% (1.0)	-	25.0% (1.0)	50.0% (2.0)	-
Image Set B	-	25.0% (1.0)	75.0% (3.0)	-	-

43 (2)

Image Set A	50.0% (1.0)	-	50.0% (1.0)	-	-
Image Set B	50.0% (1.0)	-	-	-	50.0% (1.0)

44 (5)

Image Set A	20.0% (1.0)	20.0% (1.0)	20.0% (1.0)	20.0% (1.0)	20.0% (1.0)
Image Set B	20.0% (1.0)	-	20.0% (1.0)	40.0% (2.0)	20.0% (1.0)

45 (2)

Image Set A	-	50.0% (1.0)	-	50.0% (1.0)	-
Image Set B	-	-	-	100.0% (2.0)	-

46 (1)

Image Set A	-	100.0% (1.0)	-	-	-
Image Set B	-	-	-	-	100.0% (1.0)

47 (1)

Image Set A	-	-	100.0% (1.0)	-	-
Image Set B	-	-	100.0% (1.0)	-	-

49 (3)

Image Set A	-	-	66.7% (2.0)	33.3% (1.0)	-
Image Set B	33.3% (1.0)	-	-	66.7% (2.0)	-
50 (1)					
Image Set A	-	-	-	100.0% (1.0)	-
Image Set B	-	100.0% (1.0)	-	-	-
52 (3)					
Image Set A	-	33.3% (1.0)	-	66.7% (2.0)	-
Image Set B	-	33.3% (1.0)	-	66.7% (2.0)	-
53 (1)					
Image Set A	-	100.0% (1.0)	-	-	-
Image Set B	-	-	-	100.0% (1.0)	-
55 (1)					
Image Set A	-	100.0% (1.0)	-	-	-
Image Set B	-	-	-	100.0% (1.0)	-
56 (2)					
Image Set A	50.0% (1.0)	50.0% (1.0)	-	-	-
Image Set B	-	-	100.0% (2.0)	-	-
57 (1)					
Image Set A	-	100.0% (1.0)	-	-	-
Image Set B	-	-	-	100.0% (1.0)	-
59 (3)					
Image Set A	-	33.3% (1.0)	33.3% (1.0)	-	33.3% (1.0)
Image Set B	-	-	33.3% (1.0)	33.3% (1.0)	33.3% (1.0)
60 (1)					
Image Set A	-	-	100.0% (1.0)	-	-
Image Set B	100.0% (1.0)	-	-	-	-
61 (2)					
Image Set A	-	-	-	-	100.0% (2.0)
Image Set B	-	-	-	-	100.0% (2.0)
62 (2)					
Image Set A	100.0% (2.0)	-	-	-	-
Image Set B	-	-	-	100.0% (2.0)	-
63 (2)					
Image Set A	-	-	50.0% (1.0)	50.0% (1.0)	-
Image Set B	50.0% (1.0)	-	50.0% (1.0)	-	-
64 (2)					
Image Set A	50.0% (1.0)	-	-	50.0% (1.0)	-
Image Set B	-	-	50.0% (1.0)	-	50.0% (1.0)
65 (1)					
Image Set A	-	-	-	100.0% (1.0)	-
Image Set B	-	100.0% (1.0)	-	-	-
66 (1)					

Image Set A	-	-	-	-	100.0% (1.0)
-------------	---	---	---	---	--------------

Image Set B	100.0% (1.0)	-	-	-	-
-------------	--------------	---	---	---	---

68 (1)

Image Set A	100.0% (1.0)	-	-	-	-
-------------	--------------	---	---	---	---

Image Set B	-	-	-	-	100.0% (1.0)
-------------	---	---	---	---	--------------

69 (2)

Image Set A	-	-	-	100.0% (2.0)	-
-------------	---	---	---	--------------	---

Image Set B	50.0% (1.0)	50.0% (1.0)	-	-	-
-------------	-------------	-------------	---	---	---

70 (1)

Image Set A	-	-	-	-	100.0% (1.0)
-------------	---	---	---	---	--------------

Image Set B	100.0% (1.0)	-	-	-	-
-------------	--------------	---	---	---	---

72 (1)

Image Set A	-	-	-	100.0% (1.0)	-
-------------	---	---	---	--------------	---

Image Set B	-	100.0% (1.0)	-	-	-
-------------	---	--------------	---	---	---

73 (3)

Image Set A	-	-	66.7% (2.0)	33.3% (1.0)	-
-------------	---	---	-------------	-------------	---

Image Set B	33.3% (1.0)	-	66.7% (2.0)	-	-
-------------	-------------	---	-------------	---	---

74 (2)

Image Set A	50.0% (1.0)	-	-	-	50.0% (1.0)
-------------	-------------	---	---	---	-------------

Image Set B	-	50.0% (1.0)	-	-	50.0% (1.0)
-------------	---	-------------	---	---	-------------

77 (2)

Image Set A	-	-	50.0% (1.0)	-	50.0% (1.0)
-------------	---	---	-------------	---	-------------

Image Set B	50.0% (1.0)	-	-	50.0% (1.0)	-
-------------	-------------	---	---	-------------	---

79 (2)

Image Set A	-	-	50.0% (1.0)	50.0% (1.0)	-
-------------	---	---	-------------	-------------	---

Image Set B	-	-	100.0% (2.0)	-	-
-------------	---	---	--------------	---	---

80 (1)

Image Set A	-	-	-	-	100.0% (1.0)
-------------	---	---	---	---	--------------

Image Set B	-	-	100.0% (1.0)	-	-
-------------	---	---	--------------	---	---

Unknown (37)

Image Set A	18.9% (7.0)	24.3% (9.0)	29.7% (11.0)	18.9% (7.0)	8.1% (3.0)
-------------	-------------	-------------	--------------	-------------	------------

Image Set B	8.1% (3.0)	10.8% (4.0)	18.9% (7.0)	40.5% (15.0)	21.6% (8.0)
-------------	------------	-------------	-------------	--------------	-------------

**STATE INCOME
DECILE**

105 REGISTERED VOTERS

	1	2	3	4	5
--	---	---	---	---	---

0 to 9 Pct range (2)

Image Set A	50.0% (1.0)	-	50.0% (1.0)	-	-
-------------	-------------	---	-------------	---	---

Image Set B	-	-	-	-	100.0% (2.0)
-------------	---	---	---	---	--------------

10 to 19 Pct range (2)

Image Set A	50.0% (1.0)	-	-	50.0% (1.0)	-
-------------	-------------	---	---	-------------	---

Image Set B	50.0% (1.0)	-	-	50.0% (1.0)	-
-------------	-------------	---	---	-------------	---

40 to 49 Pct range (1)

Image Set A	-	-	100.0% (1.0)	-	-
Image Set B	-	-	100.0% (1.0)	-	-
50 to 59 Pct range (5)					
Image Set A	20.0% (1.0)	20.0% (1.0)	20.0% (1.0)	40.0% (2.0)	-
Image Set B	20.0% (1.0)	40.0% (2.0)	-	40.0% (2.0)	-
60 to 69 Pct range (3)					
Image Set A	33.3% (1.0)	33.3% (1.0)	-	33.3% (1.0)	-
Image Set B	-	33.3% (1.0)	33.3% (1.0)	33.3% (1.0)	-
70 to 79 Pct range (3)					
Image Set A	-	100.0% (3.0)	-	-	-
Image Set B	-	-	33.3% (1.0)	33.3% (1.0)	33.3% (1.0)
80 to 89 Pct range (42)					
Image Set A	7.1% (3.0)	21.4% (9.0)	26.2% (11.0)	35.7% (15.0)	9.5% (4.0)
Image Set B	11.9% (5.0)	7.1% (3.0)	28.6% (12.0)	35.7% (15.0)	16.7% (7.0)
90 Pct and up (45)					
Image Set A	20.0% (9.0)	22.2% (10.0)	28.9% (13.0)	13.3% (6.0)	15.6% (7.0)
Image Set B	13.3% (6.0)	13.3% (6.0)	17.8% (8.0)	28.9% (13.0)	26.7% (12.0)
Unknown (2)					
Image Set A	-	50.0% (1.0)	-	-	50.0% (1.0)
Image Set B	-	50.0% (1.0)	-	50.0% (1.0)	-
HOME OWNER/RENTER					
	1	2	3	4	5
105 REGISTERED VOTERS					

Likely Homeowner (62)

Image Set A	21.0% (13.0)	22.6% (14.0)	24.2% (15.0)	17.7% (11.0)	14.5% (9.0)
Image Set B	16.1% (10.0)	9.7% (6.0)	16.1% (10.0)	37.1% (23.0)	21.0% (13.0)

Likely Renter (26)

Image Set A	-	30.8% (8.0)	23.1% (6.0)	46.2% (12.0)	-
Image Set B	11.5% (3.0)	15.4% (4.0)	34.6% (9.0)	15.4% (4.0)	23.1% (6.0)

Unknown (17)

Image Set A	17.6% (3.0)	17.6% (3.0)	35.3% (6.0)	11.8% (2.0)	17.6% (3.0)
Image Set B	-	17.6% (3.0)	23.5% (4.0)	41.2% (7.0)	17.6% (3.0)

Rate your level of agreement with the following statement: I want this type of development in Fitchburg.

CURRENT RESULTS						179 Total Responses
	Strongly Disagree	Disagree	Neutral	Agree	Strongly Agree	
Image Set A	17% (30)	21% (37)	28% (51)	24% (43)	10% (18)	
Image Set B	15% (27)	15% (27)	23% (41)	28% (50)	19% (34)	

REGISTERED (101)						
	Strongly Disagree	Disagree	Neutral	Agree	Strongly Agree	
Image Set A	18.0% (18)	19.0% (19)	28.0% (28)	25.0% (25)	11.0% (11)	
Image Set B	14.0% (14)	14.0% (14)	25.0% (25)	26.0% (26)	22.0% (22)	

NON-REGISTERED (78)						
	Strongly Disagree	Disagree	Neutral	Agree	Strongly Agree	
Image Set A	15.4% (12)	23.1% (18)	29.5% (23)	23.1% (18)	9.0% (7)	
Image Set B	16.7% (13)	16.7% (13)	20.5% (16)	30.8% (24)	15.4% (12)	

ALL RESPONDENTS (179)						
	Strongly Disagree	Disagree	Neutral	Agree	Strongly Agree	
Image Set A	17% (30)	21% (37)	28% (51)	24% (43)	10% (18)	
Image Set B	15% (27)	15% (27)	23% (41)	28% (50)	19% (34)	

REGISTERED VOTERS IN FITCHBURG, WI (101)						
	Strongly Disagree	Disagree	Neutral	Agree	Strongly Agree	
Image Set A	18% (18)	19% (19)	28% (28)	25% (25)	11% (11)	
Image Set B	14% (14)	14% (14)	25% (25)	26% (26)	22% (22)	

LIVE IN FITCHBURG, WI (148) - SELF-REPORTED						
	Strongly Disagree	Disagree	Neutral	Agree	Strongly Agree	
Image Set A	18% (27)	20% (29)	28% (41)	24% (36)	10% (15)	
Image Set B	15% (22)	13% (19)	24% (36)	28% (42)	20% (29)	

SUBSCRIBERS TO FITCHBURG, WI (150)						
	Strongly Disagree	Disagree	Neutral	Agree	Strongly Agree	
Image Set A	18% (27)	20% (30)	28% (42)	24% (36)	10% (15)	
Image Set B	15% (22)	13% (20)	24% (36)	28% (42)	20% (30)	

REGISTER RESPONDENTS FROM ANYWHERE (102)						
	Strongly Disagree	Disagree	Neutral	Agree	Strongly Agree	
Image Set A	18% (18)	20% (20)	29% (30)	25% (26)	11% (11)	
Image Set B	14% (14)	15% (15)	25% (25)	28% (29)	22% (22)	

EDUCATION						105 REGISTERED VOTERS
	Strongly Disagree	Disagree	Neutral	Agree	Strongly Agree	

Bach Degree - Extremely Likely (23)						
	Strongly Disagree	Disagree	Neutral	Agree	Strongly Agree	
Image Set A	21.7% (5.0)	13.0% (3.0)	21.7% (5.0)	39.1% (9.0)	4.3% (1.0)	
Image Set B	13.0% (3.0)	13.0% (3.0)	17.4% (4.0)	34.8% (8.0)	21.7% (5.0)	

Bach Degree - Likely (11)						
	Strongly Disagree	Disagree	Neutral	Agree	Strongly Agree	
Image Set A	18.2% (2.0)	9.1% (1.0)	9.1% (1.0)	54.5% (6.0)	9.1% (1.0)	

Image Set B	18.2% (2.0)	18.2% (2.0)	27.3% (3.0)	18.2% (2.0)	18.2% (2.0)
-------------	-------------	-------------	-------------	-------------	-------------

Grad Degree - Extremely Likely (11)

Image Set A	9.1% (1.0)	18.2% (2.0)	18.2% (2.0)	27.3% (3.0)	27.3% (3.0)
Image Set B	18.2% (2.0)	27.3% (3.0)	18.2% (2.0)	18.2% (2.0)	18.2% (2.0)

Grad Degree - Likely (8)

Image Set A	12.5% (1.0)	50.0% (4.0)	37.5% (3.0)	-	-
Image Set B	-	12.5% (1.0)	25.0% (2.0)	25.0% (2.0)	37.5% (3.0)

HS Diploma - Extremely Likely (5)

Image Set A	-	-	60.0% (3.0)	20.0% (1.0)	20.0% (1.0)
Image Set B	20.0% (1.0)	-	20.0% (1.0)	20.0% (1.0)	40.0% (2.0)

HS Diploma - Likely (1)

Image Set A	-	-	100.0% (1.0)	-	-
Image Set B	-	-	100.0% (1.0)	-	-

Less than HS Diploma - Likely (1)

Image Set A	-	-	100.0% (1.0)	-	-
Image Set B	-	-	-	-	100.0% (1.0)

Some College - Likely (7)

Image Set A	14.3% (1.0)	14.3% (1.0)	28.6% (2.0)	42.9% (3.0)	-
Image Set B	28.6% (2.0)	14.3% (1.0)	28.6% (2.0)	14.3% (1.0)	14.3% (1.0)

Some College -Extremely Likely (3)

Image Set A	-	33.3% (1.0)	33.3% (1.0)	-	33.3% (1.0)
Image Set B	-	33.3% (1.0)	33.3% (1.0)	-	33.3% (1.0)

Unknown (35)

Image Set A	22.9% (8.0)	22.9% (8.0)	31.4% (11.0)	11.4% (4.0)	11.4% (4.0)
Image Set B	11.4% (4.0)	11.4% (4.0)	25.7% (9.0)	37.1% (13.0)	14.3% (5.0)

VOTERS GENDER

105 REGISTERED VOTERS

	Strongly Disagree	Disagree	Neutral	Agree	Strongly Agree
--	-------------------	----------	---------	-------	----------------

F (51)

Image Set A	7.8% (4.0)	17.6% (9.0)	31.4% (16.0)	31.4% (16.0)	11.8% (6.0)
Image Set B	13.7% (7.0)	15.7% (8.0)	29.4% (15.0)	27.5% (14.0)	13.7% (7.0)

M (53)

Image Set A	24.5% (13.0)	20.8% (11.0)	26.4% (14.0)	18.9% (10.0)	9.4% (5.0)
Image Set B	13.2% (7.0)	11.3% (6.0)	18.9% (10.0)	28.3% (15.0)	28.3% (15.0)

Unknown (1)

Image Set A	100.0% (1.0)	-	-	-	-
Image Set B	-	100.0% (1.0)	-	-	-

PRECINCT

105 REGISTERED VOTERS

	Strongly Disagree	Disagree	Neutral	Agree	Strongly Agree
--	-------------------	----------	---------	-------	----------------

FITCHBURG CITY WARD 01 (5)

Image Set A	-	20.0% (1.0)	40.0% (2.0)	40.0% (2.0)	-
Image Set B	20.0% (1.0)	20.0% (1.0)	40.0% (2.0)	20.0% (1.0)	-

FITCHBURG CITY WARD 02 (2)

Image Set A	50.0% (1.0)	50.0% (1.0)	-	-	-
Image Set B	-	-	50.0% (1.0)	50.0% (1.0)	-

FITCHBURG CITY WARD 03 (2)

Image Set A	-	50.0% (1.0)	-	50.0% (1.0)	-
Image Set B	-	50.0% (1.0)	-	50.0% (1.0)	-

FITCHBURG CITY WARD 04 (1)

Image Set A	100.0% (1.0)	-	-	-	-
Image Set B	-	-	-	-	100.0% (1.0)

FITCHBURG CITY WARD 05 (6)

Image Set A	16.7% (1.0)	16.7% (1.0)	16.7% (1.0)	50.0% (3.0)	-
Image Set B	-	16.7% (1.0)	-	83.3% (5.0)	-

FITCHBURG CITY WARD 06 (6)

Image Set A	-	33.3% (2.0)	50.0% (3.0)	-	16.7% (1.0)
Image Set B	16.7% (1.0)	-	33.3% (2.0)	16.7% (1.0)	33.3% (2.0)

FITCHBURG CITY WARD 07 (8)

Image Set A	12.5% (1.0)	12.5% (1.0)	12.5% (1.0)	25.0% (2.0)	37.5% (3.0)
Image Set B	50.0% (4.0)	-	12.5% (1.0)	25.0% (2.0)	12.5% (1.0)

FITCHBURG CITY WARD 08 (8)

Image Set A	25.0% (2.0)	12.5% (1.0)	37.5% (3.0)	12.5% (1.0)	12.5% (1.0)
Image Set B	12.5% (1.0)	-	37.5% (3.0)	12.5% (1.0)	37.5% (3.0)

FITCHBURG CITY WARD 09 (4)

Image Set A	50.0% (2.0)	-	-	50.0% (2.0)	-
Image Set B	-	25.0% (1.0)	50.0% (2.0)	-	25.0% (1.0)

FITCHBURG CITY WARD 12 (1)

Image Set A	-	-	100.0% (1.0)	-	-
Image Set B	-	-	-	-	100.0% (1.0)

FITCHBURG CITY WARD 13 (18)

Image Set A	16.7% (3.0)	16.7% (3.0)	27.8% (5.0)	27.8% (5.0)	11.1% (2.0)
Image Set B	16.7% (3.0)	22.2% (4.0)	22.2% (4.0)	33.3% (6.0)	5.6% (1.0)

FITCHBURG CITY WARD 14 (13)

Image Set A	7.7% (1.0)	30.8% (4.0)	30.8% (4.0)	23.1% (3.0)	7.7% (1.0)
Image Set B	7.7% (1.0)	7.7% (1.0)	38.5% (5.0)	38.5% (5.0)	7.7% (1.0)

FITCHBURG CITY WARD 15 (4)

Image Set A	-	25.0% (1.0)	-	25.0% (1.0)	50.0% (2.0)
Image Set B	-	-	-	25.0% (1.0)	75.0% (3.0)

FITCHBURG CITY WARD 16 (1)

Image Set A	-	-	100.0% (1.0)	-	-
Image Set B	-	-	100.0% (1.0)	-	-

FITCHBURG CITY WARD 17 (6)

Image Set A	16.7% (1.0)	-	33.3% (2.0)	50.0% (3.0)	-
Image Set B	16.7% (1.0)	16.7% (1.0)	33.3% (2.0)	16.7% (1.0)	16.7% (1.0)

FITCHBURG CITY WARD 18 (6)

Image Set A	66.7% (4.0)	-	-	33.3% (2.0)	-
Image Set B	16.7% (1.0)	16.7% (1.0)	16.7% (1.0)	16.7% (1.0)	33.3% (2.0)

FITCHBURG CITY WARD 19 (11)

Image Set A	-	36.4% (4.0)	45.5% (5.0)	9.1% (1.0)	9.1% (1.0)
Image Set B	9.1% (1.0)	27.3% (3.0)	9.1% (1.0)	18.2% (2.0)	36.4% (4.0)

MADISON CITY WARD 100 (1)

Image Set A	-	-	100.0% (1.0)	-	-
Image Set B	-	-	-	-	100.0% (1.0)

MADISON CITY WARD 107 (1)

Image Set A	-	-	100.0% (1.0)	-	-
Image Set B	-	100.0% (1.0)	-	-	-

OREGON VLG WARD 10 (1)

Image Set A	100.0% (1.0)	-	-	-	-
Image Set B	-	-	-	100.0% (1.0)	-

AGE RANGE

105 REGISTERED VOTERS

Strongly Disagree Disagree Neutral Agree Strongly Agree

18-29 (1)

Image Set A	-	-	100.0% (1.0)	-	-
Image Set B	-	-	100.0% (1.0)	-	-

30-39 (11)

Image Set A	9.1% (1.0)	36.4% (4.0)	18.2% (2.0)	27.3% (3.0)	9.1% (1.0)
Image Set B	9.1% (1.0)	9.1% (1.0)	9.1% (1.0)	27.3% (3.0)	45.5% (5.0)

40-49 (18)

Image Set A	16.7% (3.0)	11.1% (2.0)	38.9% (7.0)	22.2% (4.0)	11.1% (2.0)
Image Set B	22.2% (4.0)	22.2% (4.0)	22.2% (4.0)	16.7% (3.0)	16.7% (3.0)

50-59 (12)

Image Set A	25.0% (3.0)	33.3% (4.0)	25.0% (3.0)	8.3% (1.0)	8.3% (1.0)
Image Set B	-	16.7% (2.0)	41.7% (5.0)	25.0% (3.0)	16.7% (2.0)

60-69 (14)

Image Set A	21.4% (3.0)	14.3% (2.0)	14.3% (2.0)	35.7% (5.0)	14.3% (2.0)
Image Set B	21.4% (3.0)	21.4% (3.0)	14.3% (2.0)	21.4% (3.0)	21.4% (3.0)

70-79 (11)

Image Set A	9.1% (1.0)	9.1% (1.0)	27.3% (3.0)	36.4% (4.0)	18.2% (2.0)
Image Set B	27.3% (3.0)	18.2% (2.0)	36.4% (4.0)	9.1% (1.0)	9.1% (1.0)

80-89 (1)

Image Set A	-	-	-	100.0% (1.0)	-
Image Set B	-	-	-	100.0% (1.0)	-

unknown (37)

Image Set A	18.9% (7.0)	18.9% (7.0)	32.4% (12.0)	21.6% (8.0)	8.1% (3.0)
Image Set B	8.1% (3.0)	8.1% (3.0)	21.6% (8.0)	40.5% (15.0)	21.6% (8.0)

	Strongly Disagree	Disagree	Neutral	Agree	Strongly Agree
28 (1)					
Image Set A	-	-	100.0% (1.0)	-	-
Image Set B	-	-	100.0% (1.0)	-	-
35 (2)					
Image Set A	50.0% (1.0)	50.0% (1.0)	-	-	-
Image Set B	-	-	-	100.0% (2.0)	-
36 (1)					
Image Set A	-	100.0% (1.0)	-	-	-
Image Set B	-	-	-	-	100.0% (1.0)
37 (2)					
Image Set A	-	-	-	100.0% (2.0)	-
Image Set B	50.0% (1.0)	-	-	50.0% (1.0)	-
38 (3)					
Image Set A	-	33.3% (1.0)	66.7% (2.0)	-	-
Image Set B	-	33.3% (1.0)	-	-	66.7% (2.0)
39 (3)					
Image Set A	-	33.3% (1.0)	-	33.3% (1.0)	33.3% (1.0)
Image Set B	-	-	33.3% (1.0)	-	66.7% (2.0)
40 (4)					
Image Set A	25.0% (1.0)	-	25.0% (1.0)	50.0% (2.0)	-
Image Set B	25.0% (1.0)	25.0% (1.0)	50.0% (2.0)	-	-
43 (2)					
Image Set A	50.0% (1.0)	-	50.0% (1.0)	-	-
Image Set B	50.0% (1.0)	-	-	-	50.0% (1.0)
44 (5)					
Image Set A	20.0% (1.0)	20.0% (1.0)	-	20.0% (1.0)	40.0% (2.0)
Image Set B	20.0% (1.0)	40.0% (2.0)	20.0% (1.0)	-	20.0% (1.0)
45 (2)					
Image Set A	-	-	100.0% (2.0)	-	-
Image Set B	-	50.0% (1.0)	-	50.0% (1.0)	-
46 (1)					
Image Set A	-	100.0% (1.0)	-	-	-
Image Set B	-	-	-	-	100.0% (1.0)
47 (1)					
Image Set A	-	-	100.0% (1.0)	-	-
Image Set B	-	-	100.0% (1.0)	-	-
49 (3)					
Image Set A	-	-	66.7% (2.0)	33.3% (1.0)	-
Image Set B	33.3% (1.0)	-	-	66.7% (2.0)	-
50 (1)					

Image Set A	-	-	-	100.0% (1.0)	-
Image Set B	-	100.0% (1.0)	-	-	-
52 (3)					
Image Set A	-	33.3% (1.0)	66.7% (2.0)	-	-
Image Set B	-	33.3% (1.0)	33.3% (1.0)	33.3% (1.0)	-
53 (1)					
Image Set A	100.0% (1.0)	-	-	-	-
Image Set B	-	-	-	-	100.0% (1.0)
55 (1)					
Image Set A	-	100.0% (1.0)	-	-	-
Image Set B	-	-	-	100.0% (1.0)	-
56 (2)					
Image Set A	50.0% (1.0)	50.0% (1.0)	-	-	-
Image Set B	-	-	100.0% (2.0)	-	-
57 (1)					
Image Set A	100.0% (1.0)	-	-	-	-
Image Set B	-	-	100.0% (1.0)	-	-
59 (3)					
Image Set A	-	33.3% (1.0)	33.3% (1.0)	-	33.3% (1.0)
Image Set B	-	-	33.3% (1.0)	33.3% (1.0)	33.3% (1.0)
60 (1)					
Image Set A	-	-	100.0% (1.0)	-	-
Image Set B	100.0% (1.0)	-	-	-	-
61 (2)					
Image Set A	-	50.0% (1.0)	-	-	50.0% (1.0)
Image Set B	-	50.0% (1.0)	-	-	50.0% (1.0)
62 (2)					
Image Set A	50.0% (1.0)	50.0% (1.0)	-	-	-
Image Set B	-	-	-	100.0% (2.0)	-
63 (2)					
Image Set A	-	-	-	100.0% (2.0)	-
Image Set B	50.0% (1.0)	-	-	50.0% (1.0)	-
64 (2)					
Image Set A	50.0% (1.0)	-	-	50.0% (1.0)	-
Image Set B	-	-	50.0% (1.0)	-	50.0% (1.0)
65 (1)					
Image Set A	-	-	100.0% (1.0)	-	-
Image Set B	-	-	100.0% (1.0)	-	-
66 (1)					
Image Set A	-	-	-	-	100.0% (1.0)
Image Set B	100.0% (1.0)	-	-	-	-
68 (1)					

Image Set A	100.0% (1.0)	-	-	-	-
Image Set B	-	-	-	-	100.0% (1.0)

69 (2)

Image Set A	-	-	-	100.0% (2.0)	-
Image Set B	-	100.0% (2.0)	-	-	-

70 (1)

Image Set A	-	-	-	-	100.0% (1.0)
Image Set B	100.0% (1.0)	-	-	-	-

72 (1)

Image Set A	-	-	-	100.0% (1.0)	-
Image Set B	-	100.0% (1.0)	-	-	-

73 (3)

Image Set A	-	33.3% (1.0)	33.3% (1.0)	33.3% (1.0)	-
Image Set B	-	33.3% (1.0)	66.7% (2.0)	-	-

74 (2)

Image Set A	50.0% (1.0)	-	-	-	50.0% (1.0)
Image Set B	50.0% (1.0)	-	-	-	50.0% (1.0)

77 (2)

Image Set A	-	-	50.0% (1.0)	50.0% (1.0)	-
Image Set B	50.0% (1.0)	-	-	50.0% (1.0)	-

79 (2)

Image Set A	-	-	50.0% (1.0)	50.0% (1.0)	-
Image Set B	-	-	100.0% (2.0)	-	-

80 (1)

Image Set A	-	-	-	100.0% (1.0)	-
Image Set B	-	-	-	100.0% (1.0)	-

Unknown (37)

Image Set A	18.9% (7.0)	18.9% (7.0)	32.4% (12.0)	21.6% (8.0)	8.1% (3.0)
Image Set B	8.1% (3.0)	8.1% (3.0)	21.6% (8.0)	40.5% (15.0)	21.6% (8.0)

STATE INCOME DECILE

105 REGISTERED VOTERS

	Strongly Disagree	Disagree	Neutral	Agree	Strongly Agree
--	-------------------	----------	---------	-------	----------------

0 to 9 Pct range (2)

Image Set A	50.0% (1.0)	-	50.0% (1.0)	-	-
Image Set B	-	-	-	-	100.0% (2.0)

10 to 19 Pct range (2)

Image Set A	-	50.0% (1.0)	-	50.0% (1.0)	-
Image Set B	-	50.0% (1.0)	-	50.0% (1.0)	-

40 to 49 Pct range (1)

Image Set A	-	-	100.0% (1.0)	-	-
Image Set B	-	-	100.0% (1.0)	-	-

50 to 59 Pct range (5)

Image Set A	-	40.0% (2.0)	20.0% (1.0)	40.0% (2.0)	-
Image Set B	20.0% (1.0)	20.0% (1.0)	20.0% (1.0)	40.0% (2.0)	-

60 to 69 Pct range (3)

Image Set A	66.7% (2.0)	-	-	33.3% (1.0)	-
Image Set B	-	33.3% (1.0)	33.3% (1.0)	-	33.3% (1.0)

70 to 79 Pct range (3)

Image Set A	33.3% (1.0)	33.3% (1.0)	33.3% (1.0)	-	-
Image Set B	-	-	33.3% (1.0)	33.3% (1.0)	33.3% (1.0)

80 to 89 Pct range (42)

Image Set A	11.9% (5.0)	16.7% (7.0)	31.0% (13.0)	28.6% (12.0)	11.9% (5.0)
Image Set B	11.9% (5.0)	14.3% (6.0)	28.6% (12.0)	28.6% (12.0)	16.7% (7.0)

90 Pct and up (45)

Image Set A	20.0% (9.0)	17.8% (8.0)	28.9% (13.0)	22.2% (10.0)	11.1% (5.0)
Image Set B	15.6% (7.0)	13.3% (6.0)	20.0% (9.0)	26.7% (12.0)	24.4% (11.0)

Unknown (2)

Image Set A	-	50.0% (1.0)	-	-	50.0% (1.0)
Image Set B	50.0% (1.0)	-	-	50.0% (1.0)	-

HOME OWNER/RENTER

105 REGISTERED VOTERS

	Strongly Disagree	Disagree	Neutral	Agree	Strongly Agree
--	-------------------	----------	---------	-------	----------------

Likely Homeowner (62)

Image Set A	22.6% (14.0)	21.0% (13.0)	19.4% (12.0)	25.8% (16.0)	11.3% (7.0)
Image Set B	16.1% (10.0)	16.1% (10.0)	14.5% (9.0)	32.3% (20.0)	21.0% (13.0)



















Likely Renter (26)

Image Set A	3.8% (1.0)	15.4% (4.0)	46.2% (12.0)	30.8% (8.0)	3.8% (1.0)
Image Set B	11.5% (3.0)	11.5% (3.0)	42.3% (11.0)	11.5% (3.0)	23.1% (6.0)

Unknown (17)

Image Set A	17.6% (3.0)	17.6% (3.0)	35.3% (6.0)	11.8% (2.0)	17.6% (3.0)
Image Set B	5.9% (1.0)	11.8% (2.0)	29.4% (5.0)	35.3% (6.0)	17.6% (3.0)

If you have any comments about your answers to the above questions please provide them here.

-
-  **Anonymous user's Opinion**
want more of a setback, not right up to road edge. green space is good.
-  **Anonymous user's Opinion**
Recommend avoid continued addition of multifamily properties and postage stamp sized housing that is placed one atop the next
-  **Anonymous user's Opinion**
"High density in cornfields makes total sense, especially since there are no grocery stores with 1.6 miles or access to commuter routes," said the developer who got the land cheap and pulled the wool over the eyes of the decision-making body.
-  **Anonymous user's Opinion**
I used to live near the Prairie cafe in Middleton, loved the atmosphere of Middleton Hills
-  **Anonymous user's Opinion**
I like Image Set B, but I like easy accessibility to parking.
-  **Anonymous user's Opinion**
Busy streets should have controlled intersection with big parking lots.
-  **Anonymous user's Opinion**
Picture A is the existing PD area by Seminole Hwy. Looks like we need some center trees! Let's not build strip malls like the center picture of A with no variation on the heights, siding materials. But open space areas are also needed in the city. Again, let's add some trees to the middle of the road.
-  **Anonymous user's Opinion**
You haven't dealt with any of the real problems facing Fitchburg residents, why would we ever trust you to use our input in a positive way? We are sick and tired of developers running this city. We ARE NOT an extension of MABA. We don't need more houses or condos or cornfield apartments. My god. What a sad commentary on today's America. You don't want a better tomorrow, you want to believe that every project is a "Good Idea". Time to revisit our "motto". Also, Marsh needs to go.
-  **Anonymous user's Opinion**
Image set A looks like any boring town no one wants to go to. We have to be a compelling reason to visit over Verona and Middleton.
-  **Anonymous user's Opinion**
I like larger setbacks with landscaping along busy roads to preserve sightlines and make the development feel less dense, boxy, and crowded. However, I don't like the big parking lot in the middle of image set A. In that case, I'd prefer a smaller setback, nice landscaping, and the parking lot behind the building so it's not visually prominent. Minimal setbacks and taller buildings along less busy streets don't bother me at all.
-  **Anonymous user's Opinion**
Image Set A is not inviting. Each image feels distant and inaccessible or car-only. Image Set B promotes more walking & community.
-  **Anonymous user's Opinion**
For B, if Fitchburg had a central area where there were a lot of shops and restaurants I think it would be good for access, but I don't feel as though Fitchburg has there or will have that in the near future. B would be too close to the road for my liking.
-  **Anonymous user's Opinion**
I question the safety of having buildings so close with entrances 7 feet from cars rushing at 45 mph
-  **Anonymous user's Opinion**
Image A feels like a small, rural town development plan like Mount Horeb or New Glarus are pursuing. Image B feels like a suburban, modern development plan, like Middleton. I strongly prefer the Middleton approach to design, but any commercial development being developed in Fitchburg, especially around Swan Creek or Quarry Hill would be appreciated.
-  **Anonymous user's Opinion**
Along busy/big roads, go for density!
-  **Anonymous user's Opinion**
Along busy roads, there should be stretches that are more dormant so traffic doesn't become overwhelming
-  **Anonymous user's Opinion**
Image B is not dense enough, better if it was taller.
-  **Anonymous user's Opinion**
Keep areas near the road green rather than commercial. This allows for walking and biking and ease of snow removal as the busy streets push snow up into the sides of the roads.

**Anonymous user's Opinion**

I prefer the look of B but want to preserve green-space and some openness.

**Anonymous user's Opinion**

Multi purpose housing and commercial space with underground parking makes the most use of available space and should be prioritized over single story development that contributes to sprawl.

**Stephen Lloyd Arnold's Opinion**

A wastes land, provides low tax revenue per acre and per linear foot of infrastructure, and demands we drive everywhere. B encourages walking and biking, uses infrastructure sparingly for the tax revenue it generates, and lowers land and housing costs. I think B is much more attractive, too!

**Anonymous user's Opinion**

Monroe Street and Parameter Avenue are excellent examples of neighborhood commercial development. Pedestrian oriented....walkable commercial.

**Anonymous user's Opinion**

Building right up to the edge of the sidewalk concerns me because of snow removal, and the sidewalks seem very close to the street.

**Anonymous user's Opinion**

B is too high and to close to street for busy roads

**Anonymous user's Opinion**

Keep a balance. Too many of Image set B will make us look very metropolitan.

**Anonymous user's Opinion**

Image B is too large and industrial for Fitchburg, we should hold onto our suburban feel and not convert to a more industrial, downtown Madison vibe.

**Anonymous user's Opinion**

The taller the building the better

**Anonymous user's Opinion**

Like having more dense apartments and underground parking.

**Anonymous user's Opinion**

Having multiple use spaces along busy roads can lead to increased congestion and looks like we're shoving lower income families into small crowded appartments without parks or space to play.

**Anonymous user's Opinion**

Like C & D, but worry about parking. Fitchburg needs more shopping and restaurant options. I would love to see a local restaurant & shoppe district like this in a Uptown. A & B look more suited to out lots in transportation corridors. For the busy road question, inside the urban service area land use should be compact and dense to take advantage of mass transit and keep the transient traffic with the corridor. In rural areas this should be avoided.

**Anonymous user's Opinion**

Buildings that crowd the street and contribute large amounts of traffic as well as parking congestion are not desirable.

**Anonymous user's Opinion**

Please add biking and walking paths along main roadways - Fitchrona Rd. has the Quarry Vista Neighborhood that would love to be connected to the stores and we would like to have a safe way to access stores without a vehicle.

**Anonymous user's Opinion**

Vegetative buffers should be used as much as possible between busy roads and commercial/residential neighborhoods.

**Anonymous user's Opinion**

Prefer B for a city center type location

**Anonymous user's Opinion**

Buildings in B are too large and seem overwhelming, it would have be in a space that it felt in proportion.

**Anonymous user's Opinion**

They look like apartments and I don't want apartments.

**Anonymous user's Opinion**

Neither one seems like the best use of space along already busy roads/lanes

