



BRISBANE CITY COUNCIL

ACTION MINUTES

DRAFT

THURSDAY, OCTOBER 27, 2015

BRISBANE CITY HALL, 50 PARK PLACE, BRISBANE

7:30 P.M. CALL TO ORDER – FLAG SALUTE

Mayor O’Connell called the meeting to order and led the flag salute.

ROLL CALL

Councilmembers present: Conway, Lentz, Liu, Miller, and Mayor O’Connell
Councilmembers absent: None
Staff present: City Manager Holstine, City Clerk Spediacci, Community Development Director Swiecki

Mayor O’Connell requested a comment from the City Manager on the format of the meeting. City Manager Holstine noted the agenda pertains to the survey results only and discussion and deliberations need to be focused on the survey itself.

PRESENTATION

A. Consultant Presentation on Baylands Survey Results

Curt Below, Consultant with FM3 Research presented the findings from the City of Brisbane Baylands Community Survey. He said the Baylands Community Survey was sent to all registered voters in Brisbane to gauge community opinions and attitudes on a number of issues pertaining to the Baylands. He indicated that the survey was mailed on August 25, 2015 with a response deadline of September 12, 2015. He further reported that the raw survey results were posted on the City’s website on October 16, 2015.

Mr. Below then covered the methodology of the survey and indicated that there were 580 survey responses. He said that this is a very high response rate. He also reviewed the Summary of Findings, which included contentment with the quality of living in Brisbane, the high level of engagement of the population with local government, the keen concern with the drought, the split feelings of the rate of growth of Brisbane and of housing on the Baylands, the high rate of knowledge that the public has of the Baylands, the importance of protecting water and air quality, the preserving open space and the wetlands, and the interest in expanding lanes and trails

and building new parks in the development of the Baylands. He said that background information on the Baylands was provided in the survey.

The detailed survey results are attached to this document for reference.

Councilmembers asked questions of Mr. Below regarding the use of ID codes on the surveys, concerns over the printing errors, the methodology of how questions were asked, the issue of not being allowed to backtrack with the online version of the survey, and whether there was a difference in the responses between the online and paper survey.

Mr. Below answered the Council's questions and stated that he could run a report showing separate results in the online survey and paper copy survey responses.

Councilmembers acknowledged that future surveys would drill down into specific project details.

Mayor O'Connell opened the public comment period.

B. Public Comments

Barbara Ebel said that she felt that the support in the survey results for renewable energy alternative was profound. She expressed her concern with the definition of "safe" relating to the question of housing on the Baylands.

Tom Heinz said he disagreed with the numbers in the report and felt that they were inflated and inaccurate. He also suggested that those who were surveyed should be referred to as "respondents" instead of "voters".

Coleen Mackin expressed her concern over the cumulative effects of housing in the region and said that the survey questions did not take that into account.

Greg Anderson said that he was disappointed in the analysis of the survey results but felt that there was more information received from the survey that could be cross-correlated enabling it to be viewed in a variety of different ways.

Joel Diaz said that he did not find the results of the survey to be very compelling. He said he was hoping to see a clearer distinction on how to advance the project.

Carolyn Parker said she agreed with Greg Anderson that more information could be revealed in the survey details.

After further Councilmember discussion they asked that staff work with Mr. Below on how to make cross-tabulated survey results, open-ended survey response comments, and demographic information available to the Council and public.

Mayor O'Connell thanked the public for their input and Curt Below for his presentation.

ADJOURNMENT

The Council meeting was adjourned at 9:39 p.m.

Sheri Marie Spediacci, City Clerk

Fairbank,
Maslin,
Maullin,
Metz &
Associates

FM3

CITY OF BRISBANE COMMUNITY SURVEY
320-580-WT
N=580
MARGIN OF SAMPLING ERROR ±3.5% (95% CONFIDENCE INTERVAL)

The City of Brisbane is conducting a survey of its residents to better understand general community attitudes and particularly impressions of the Brisbane Baylands. A critical element of the planning process is collecting citizen views, thus your participation is very important. Thank you, in advance, for taking the time to respond to this survey.

The City has retained the independent public opinion research company of Fairbank, Maslin, Maullin, Metz & Associates (FM3) to administer the survey and evaluate the data. We want to assure you that your individual responses will be completely anonymous and confidential, and that no individual’s survey responses will be transmitted to City officials or anyone else.

The first questions deal with general issues in the City of Brisbane.

1. First, generally speaking, how would you rate the City of Brisbane as a place to live?

EXCELLENT/GOOD -----	90%
Excellent -----	48%
Good -----	43%
Just average-----	5%
POOR/EXTREMELY POOR -----	0%
Poor -----	0%
Extremely poor-----	0%
DK/NA/Refused -----	5%

2. Next, below is a list of general issues facing Brisbane. Please indicate how serious of an issue each is to you personally: extremely serious, very serious, somewhat serious, not too serious or not at all serious.

		<u>EXT</u> <u>SER</u>	<u>VERY</u> <u>SER</u>	<u>SMWT</u> <u>SER</u>	<u>NOT</u> <u>TOO</u> <u>SER</u>	<u>NOT</u> <u>AT ALL</u> <u>SER</u>	<u>DK/NA</u> <u>/REF</u>	<u>EXT/</u> <u>VERY</u> <u>SER</u>	<u>TOTAL</u> <u>NOT</u> <u>SER</u>
a.	Climate change -----	27%	30%	19%	12%	11%	1%	57%	23%
b.	The quality of local schools ----	30%	28%	23%	12%	6%	2%	58%	18%
c.	Public transit -----	19%	32%	26%	17%	5%	1%	50%	22%
d.	Crime -----	24%	18%	21%	27%	8%	1%	43%	36%
e.	The cost of housing -----	28%	26%	31%	10%	4%	1%	54%	14%
f.	Jobs and the local economy ----	19%	30%	31%	15%	4%	1%	49%	19%
g.	Open space preservation and enhancement -----	30%	32%	20%	12%	5%	2%	61%	16%
h.	A lack of good places to go shopping -----	25%	21%	23%	19%	10%	1%	47%	29%
i.	The drought and reduced water supplies -----	42%	35%	14%	7%	1%	1%	77%	8%
j.	Traffic congestion -----	14%	24%	22%	23%	16%	1%	39%	38%

3. Next, below is a list of issues facing Brisbane residents. For each one, please indicate how important it is to you personally that Brisbane City government do something to address that issue.

	<u>EXT</u> <u>IMPT</u>	<u>VERY</u> <u>IMPT</u>	<u>SMWT</u> <u>IMPT</u>	<u>NOT</u> <u>TOO</u> <u>IMPT</u>	<u>NOT</u> <u>AT ALL</u> <u>IMPT</u>	<u>DK/NA</u> <u>/REF</u>	<u>EXT/</u> <u>VERY</u> <u>IMPT</u>	<u>TOTAL</u> <u>NOT</u> <u>IMPT</u>
a. Parking on local streets -----	17%	23%	31%	21%	8%	1%	40%	28%
b. Open space preservation and enhancement -----	33%	32%	20%	10%	4%	1%	65%	14%
c. Replacing the old library-----	9%	16%	34%	28%	11%	1%	25%	39%
d. Potholes and street repair -----	12%	34%	36%	14%	3%	1%	46%	17%
e. Crime-----	28%	27%	24%	16%	4%	1%	55%	20%
f. The future of the Brisbane Baylands -----	51%	26%	17%	4%	1%	1%	77%	5%
g. Park maintenance -----	20%	46%	28%	4%	1%	1%	66%	5%
h. Maintaining Brisbane's small town character -----	43%	26%	18%	9%	3%	1%	69%	12%
i. Energy efficiency -----	32%	36%	23%	6%	2%	1%	68%	8%
j. Providing more housing alternatives -----	13%	18%	35%	21%	11%	1%	31%	33%
k. Recreational activities and programs-----	15%	33%	35%	14%	2%	1%	48%	16%
l. Water conservation -----	39%	35%	19%	5%	1%	1%	74%	6%
m. Short-term residential rentals, such as Airbnb-----	12%	13%	26%	25%	22%	2%	25%	47%
n. Creating more retail shopping and dining options-----	24%	20%	25%	18%	11%	2%	44%	29%

4. Next, please select the below statement that comes closest to your personal opinion:

I worry that too much is changing too fast in Brisbane and we're losing our small-town character ----- 19%

OR

I feel that we're maintaining Brisbane's small-town character even as we change and grow as a community ----- 51%

OR

I feel that change is coming too slow to Brisbane and we need to more quickly adapt to the future----- 26%

DK/NA/Refused-----4%

5. Next, how would you describe the rate of development in Brisbane?

TOO FAST ----- 22%

Much too fast-----7%

Somewhat too fast ----- 14%

About right----- 39%

TOO SLOW ----- 38%

Somewhat too slow----- 23%

Much too slow ----- 14%

DK/NA/Refused -----2%

The next questions deal specifically with the Brisbane Baylands.

6. First, how familiar would you say you are with the Baylands portion of Brisbane?

EXT/VERY FAMILIAR----- 39%

Extremely familiar ----- 14%

Very familiar ----- 24%

Somewhat familiar----- 38%

TOTAL NOT FAMILIAR ----- 21%

Not too familiar ----- 17%

Not at all familiar-----5%

DK/NA/Refused -----2%

7. Next, prior to receiving this survey or hearing anything about this survey, had you heard, read or seen anything about plans to do something with the Baylands?

Yes, I have heard, read or seen a great deal -----	39%
Yes, I have heard, read or seen a little-----	50%
No, I have not heard, read or seen anything (SKIP TO Q9) ---	9%
DK/NA/Refused -----	2%

(IF "YES" IN Q7, PLEASE ANSWER Q8, N=518)

8. In a few words of your own, what have you heard, seen or read about plans to do something with the Baylands?

Mixed-use; retail/housing-----	25%
Green/open space/parks-----	15%
Just heard that there is a development plan for Baylands -----	14%
Attended meetings/read development plan/read EIR/participated in EIR process ---	12%
Housing units being built/developer pushing housing -----	11%
Toxic site/needs clean-up-----	11%
Businesses/shopping -----	9%
Solar/wind power/alternative energy considerations-----	7%
Received mailings/pamphlets -----	4%
Debate/question on best use of space/many different options/has not been decided ---	3%
Free tours/took a tour sponsored by Paragon -----	3%
TV news/newspapers -----	2%
Build a new high school-----	2%
Phone survey/focus group -----	1%
Online/city website -----	0%
Other -----	2%
DK/NA-----	6%
Refused -----	12%

(RESUME ASKING ALL RESPONDENTS)

9. Next, how important do you feel future development of the Baylands is to the City of Brisbane?

EXT/VERY IMPORTANT -----	68%
Extremely important -----	44%
Very important -----	24%
 Somewhat important -----	 18%
 TOTAL NOT IMPORTANT -----	 11%
Not too important -----	7%
Not at all important -----	3%
 DK/NA/Refused -----	 3%

10. Next, how important do you feel future development of the Baylands is to you personally?

EXT/VERY IMPORTANT -----	53%
Extremely important -----	27%
Very important -----	26%
 Somewhat important -----	 26%
 TOTAL NOT IMPORTANT -----	 18%
Not too important -----	13%
Not at all important -----	6%
 DK/NA/Refused -----	 3%

The next questions deal with some potential land use plans for the Baylands. However, before getting to those questions, below is some background information about the area, including a map.

The Baylands as defined by the City's General Plan is a 660 acre area bordered on the west by Bayshore Blvd, on the North by the City and County of San Francisco, on the east by the U.S. 101 causeway, and on the south by the Southern end of the Lagoon. The property is primarily owned by Universal Paragon Corporation (UPC), though other owners, including Golden State Lumber and Recology, own smaller portions.

As part of an ongoing process assessing future plans for the Baylands (a process that started nine years ago), the City is currently reviewing and considering two specific documents:

- *A Specific Plan application from UPC that includes a development proposal for that part of the Baylands owned by UPC.*
- *An Environmental Impact Report (EIR) that has studied the environmental impacts of the UPC proposal, as well as several other land use alternatives.*

The portions of the Baylands under consideration for development include a former municipal landfill to the east of the Caltrain rail line and a former rail yard to the west of the rail line. By law, any future land use in the Baylands will have to comply with federal and state regulations, including those requiring remediation of contamination to standards deemed appropriate for the planned land uses. Any proposed land use plan for the Baylands cannot be approved unless it is consistent with Brisbane's General Plan. Because Brisbane's General Plan does not allow housing on the Baylands, the General Plan would need to be amended to permit any Baylands development to include housing.

Two major portions of the Baylands are not included in UPC's development proposal:

- *The Kinder Morgan Tank Farm*
- *The Recology Solid Waste Transfer Facility that is situated partially within Brisbane and partially within San Francisco. (A separate Specific Plan and EIR will be reviewed and considered by the City for the proposal to expand the Recology facility.)*

In addition to citizen opinions collected by this survey and other outreach efforts, the current City Council has indicated voters will have an opportunity to express their views at an election before any final Baylands development plan is approved.

[Include map]

11. Next, below is a list of goals for any future development of the Baylands. For each one, please indicate how important each goal is to you personally.

		<u>EXT</u> <u>IMPT</u>	<u>VERY</u> <u>IMPT</u>	<u>SMWT</u> <u>IMPT</u>	<u>NOT</u> <u>TOO</u> <u>IMPT</u>	<u>NOT</u> <u>AT ALL</u> <u>IMPT</u>	<u>DK/NA</u> <u>/REF</u>	<u>EXT/</u> <u>VERY</u> <u>IMPT</u>	<u>TOTAL</u> <u>NOT</u> <u>IMPT</u>
a.	Creating local jobs -----	14%	31%	31%	15%	7%	2%	45%	22%
b.	Containing and remediating contaminants -----	61%	25%	7%	3%	2%	1%	86%	5%
c.	Preserving historic buildings ----	24%	26%	26%	15%	7%	2%	50%	22%
d.	Ensuring all new development and buildings are as energy efficient as possible -----	42%	32%	18%	4%	2%	2%	74%	6%
e.	Minimizing traffic impacts -----	52%	28%	15%	2%	1%	2%	80%	3%
f.	Generating new revenue for City services, such as public safety, parks, and street maintenance -----	34%	33%	23%	5%	3%	2%	67%	8%
g.	Generating renewable energy for all of Brisbane -----	38%	29%	19%	7%	5%	2%	67%	12%
h.	Preserving scenic views -----	52%	27%	14%	4%	2%	2%	79%	6%
i.	Protecting air quality -----	61%	27%	7%	2%	1%	2%	89%	3%
j.	Opening new retail establishments, local shopping, and dining -----	25%	21%	27%	13%	12%	2%	46%	26%
k.	Ensuring that any new development can generate enough renewable energy to meet its needs -----	34%	31%	19%	9%	4%	2%	66%	13%
l.	Preserving and expanding open space and wildlife habitat -----	46%	28%	14%	8%	2%	2%	74%	10%
m.	Protecting taxpayers -----	47%	31%	15%	3%	2%	4%	77%	4%
n.	Protecting water quality in local streams, creeks and wetlands -----	65%	24%	7%	2%	1%	2%	88%	3%
o.	Generating enough development revenue to pay for any necessary infrastructure improvements and remediation -	45%	30%	15%	5%	3%	3%	75%	7%
p.	Connecting residential Brisbane to the Baylands -----	17%	25%	27%	18%	10%	2%	42%	28%
q.	Improving the visual appeal of the area -----	36%	28%	22%	8%	4%	2%	65%	12%
r.	Providing housing that working families can afford -----	20%	23%	25%	14%	14%	3%	43%	29%
s.	Enhancing recreation opportunities -----	22%	32%	27%	13%	4%	2%	53%	17%

	<u>EXT</u> <u>IMPT</u>	<u>VERY</u> <u>IMPT</u>	<u>SMWT</u> <u>IMPT</u>	<u>NOT</u> <u>TOO</u> <u>IMPT</u>	<u>NOT</u> <u>AT ALL</u> <u>IMPT</u>	<u>DK/NA</u> <u>/REF</u>	<u>EXT/</u> <u>VERY</u> <u>IMPT</u>	<u>TOTAL</u> <u>NOT</u> <u>IMPT</u>
t. Minimizing landfill waste generated on an ongoing basis	41%	31%	19%	4%	2%	2%	72%	6%
u. Utilizing recycled and reclaimed water to reduce water supply needs	45%	30%	16%	4%	2%	3%	75%	7%

12. Are there any other goals that you find personally important that were not listed above?

No	9%
Preserve open/green space	4%
Provide more recreation opportunities around lagoon/more outdoor activities	4%
Expand/improve public/alternative transit/roads	4%
Keep developments true to Brisbane character/ preserve small-town feel/exclusive reputation	4%
Build a high school/improve public school	3%
No new housing/no affordable housing	3%
Minimize traffic/parking impacts/increase enforcement	2%
Create development that produces cash flow	2%
Ensure crime does not increase/police services	2%
Keep big-business/retail/chain restaurants out	2%
Clean up toxic areas/don't build on toxic areas	2%
Have more shopping/restaurants/theaters	2%
Ensure no extra costs to residents for public services/ infrastructure improvements/reduce water/sewage bills	2%
Prevent light/noise pollution	1%
Develop renewable energy; solar/wind	1%
Become part of biotech/research corridor/light industrial/manufacturing use	1%
Keep buildings small/don't block views	1%
Provide more quality/affordable housing/rent control	1%
Preserve railroad roundhouse	1%
Sustainable mixed-use development/"smart-growth"	1%
Don't develop/don't continue with plan	1%
Protect environment/wildlife habitats/natural beauty/save water/air pollution	1%
Set example for best of modern living design/showcase Brisbane as model for smart growth/become world-class destination	1%
Prevent Recology/landfill from expanding; keep out of Brisbane	0%
Art/cultural sites; museums/music/history	0%
Fostering community	0%
Reduce taxes	0%
Other	3%
DK/NA	1%
Refused	53%

13. Next, below is a list of different land uses and projects that could be a part of any future Baylands development. Please indicate whether you would strongly support, somewhat support, somewhat oppose or strongly oppose each potential land use or project.

	<u>STR</u>	<u>SMWT</u>	<u>SMWT</u>	<u>STR</u>	<u>DK/NA</u>	<u>TOTAL</u>	<u>TOTAL</u>
	<u>SUPP</u>	<u>SUPP</u>	<u>OPP</u>	<u>OPP</u>	<u>/REF</u>	<u>SUPP</u>	<u>OPP</u>
a. Expanding the Recology facility-----	13%	36%	28%	19%	4%	49%	47%
b. Building multi-unit residential housing-----	11%	31%	23%	32%	3%	42%	55%
c. Preserving open space and wetlands-----	61%	29%	5%	3%	2%	90%	8%
d. Building a hotel and conference center-----	14%	30%	28%	25%	3%	44%	53%
e. Building facilities for technical and industrial research and development-----	21%	43%	20%	14%	3%	64%	34%
f. Building a new public charter high school-----	27%	34%	18%	17%	4%	62%	35%
g. Building renewable energy generation facilities (e.g., solar, wind, biomass conversion)-----	41%	37%	12%	7%	2%	79%	19%
h. Building office space-----	14%	43%	24%	16%	3%	57%	40%
i. Building space for retail establishments-----	32%	36%	16%	13%	3%	68%	29%
j. Expanding bike lanes and trails-----	51%	33%	9%	5%	2%	84%	14%
k. Building new parks-----	48%	36%	10%	3%	3%	84%	13%
l. Building a transit hub for trains, busses and other kinds of transportation-----	37%	37%	13%	10%	3%	74%	23%
m. Building recreational facilities and areas-----	35%	46%	12%	4%	3%	81%	16%
n. Providing space for warehouses and light product assembly-----	10%	31%	35%	21%	3%	41%	56%
o. Providing space for entertainment venues (e.g., theaters, sports arenas, soccer fields, etc.)-----	24%	34%	20%	20%	3%	57%	39%

14. The City of Brisbane currently has approximately 2,000 residential housing units within its boundaries and the UPC proposal includes building 4,400 new housing units in the Baylands. Because Brisbane’s current General Plan does not allow housing on the Baylands, the General Plan would need to be amended for any housing to be included in an approved land use plan. Given this, how many housing units do you feel is appropriate to include in any future Baylands development?

Zero -----	(ASK Q15)	43%
1-500 -----	(GO TO Q16)	15%
501-1,000 -----	(GO TO Q16)	13%
1,001-2,000 -----	(GO TO Q16)	10%
2,001-3,000 -----	(GO TO Q16)	6%
3,001-4,000 -----	(GO TO Q16)	3%
4,001-5,000 -----	(GO TO Q16)	2%
5,001 or more -----	(GO TO Q16)	1%
DK/NA/Refused -----		6%

(ANSWER Q15 IF YOU ANSWERED “ZERO, CODE 1 NO ADDITIONAL HOUSING UNITS” IN Q14, N=250)

15. Please select the top two reasons why you do not want to see any additional housing units included in future Baylands development.

	<u>1ST REASON</u>	<u>2ND REASON</u>
Brisbane’s character and small town feel will change -----	26%	14%
Increased traffic congestion -----	12%	24%
The Baylands will never be safe for residential housing because of soil contamination -----	30%	7%
I’d rather see the lands used exclusively for other purposes -----	15%	24%
Housing development in the Baylands is currently prohibited by the City’s General Plan -----	5%	10%
The number of new voters could have more influence in local elections than current, long-term residents -----	2%	11%
DK/NA/Refused -----	10%	11%

(ANSWER Q16 IF YOU ANSWERED SOME AMOUNT GREATER THAN ZERO IN Q14, N=294)

16. Please select the top two reasons why you would support including additional housing units in future Baylands development.

	<u>1ST REASON</u>	<u>2ND REASON</u>
The Bay Area has a housing shortage -----	21%	14%
Some of the land in the Baylands can be made safe for residential use -----	6%	12%
It could result in more housing the working families can afford -----	22%	17%
New housing should be located next to transit and new jobs -----	18%	17%
Brisbane can accommodate the population increase -----	9%	8%
It will increase demand for retail, shopping, and dining -----	16%	25%
DK/NA/Refused -----	8%	8%

(ALL RESPONDENTS)

17. The following section contains several pairs of statements. For each pair, please indicate which statement comes closer to your own personal opinion. Please choose one, even if it is difficult to decide.

a. I feel that Brisbane would be better off if portions of the Baylands were developed, if doing so could finance a variety community amenities, such as parks, trails and public art ----- 71 %

OR

I feel that Brisbane would be better off if none of the Baylands were developed, even if that means no additional funding for community amenities, such as parks, trails and public art----- 25 %

DK/NA/Refused-----4 %

b. I am comfortable changing Brisbane’s General Plan in order to accommodate specific types of development such as housing on the Baylands ----- 43 %

OR

I would prefer that any new development on the Baylands work within the limits set in Brisbane’s General Plan and oppose changing it----- 51 %

DK/NA/Refused-----7 %

c. I feel the best way to deal with existing contamination in the Baylands is to take some of the funds generated by development and put them towards containment and remediation ----- 66 %

OR

I feel the best way to deal with existing contamination in the Baylands is to leave it relatively untouched and leave the contaminants where they are ----- 25 %

DK/NA/Refused----- 10 %

d. I think Brisbane should not proactively work with potential developers of the Baylands and the City should instead simply review and either approve or reject any proposals submitted to them ----- 16%

OR

I think Brisbane should proactively work with potential developers of the Baylands to ensure that future plans reflect the values of our community ----- 78%

DK/NA/Refused-----6%

18. Next, in a few words of your own, what would you tell a friend, neighbor or coworker should be done with the Baylands?

- Retail/businesses/markets----- 22%
- Park/nature reserve/open space/preserve wildlife habitats----- 21%
- Housing ----- 16%
- Renewable energy/solar farm ----- 10%
- Walking/bike trails/recreation -----9%
- Clean up toxic areas -----8%
- Sustainable/reasonable/smart developments/do what Brisbane citizens want-----7%
- No housing -----5%
- Attract income-producing development -----5%
- Transit hub/improve public transit -----5%
- Nothing/leave it alone -----4%
- Combination of preserving natural areas & creating new developments -----4%
- Light industry/science/tech/office space -----4%
- Minimal/small-scale development-----3%
- Just need to develop it/do something -----3%
- Preserve/enhance/create beauty -----2%
- Should create community/job growth-----2%
- Education/high school -----2%
- Preserve wetlands/lagoon-----2%
- Golf course -----1%
- No shopping/retail -----1%
- Never allow living/work spaces on toxic area -----1%
- Low traffic impact -----1%
- Keep buildings low/don't block views-----1%

- Other -----4%
- DK/NA-----1%
- Refused -----28%

The next questions are for classification purposes to ensure that the survey is reaching a representative sample of Brisbane residents.

19. First, about how long have you lived in Brisbane?

Five years or less -----	20%
Six to ten years -----	12%
11 to 20 years -----	29%
21 to 30 years -----	19%
31 to 40 years -----	13%
41 years or more -----	6%
DK/NA/Refused -----	2%

20. Next, below is a list of different ways you may have interacted with Brisbane City government. Please indicate whether you have done each during the past year.

	<u>YES</u>	<u>NO</u>	<u>DK/NA/REF</u>
a. Attended a public city meeting (e.g., City Council meeting, City commission meeting, City community workshops, etc.) -----	49%	48%	3%
b. Watched a City meeting or presentation on Channel 27 or online on a computer -----	49%	48%	3%
c. Written a letter or email to the City or City Council -----	30%	65%	4%
d. Met with a City employee or City Council member -----	56%	39%	4%
e. Read about City matters in the City News and Star, or Chamber of Commerce Luminary -----	91%	5%	3%

21. With which racial or ethnic group do you identify yourself?

African American or Black -----	1%
Asian or Pacific Islander -----	11%
White or Caucasian -----	59%
Filipino -----	4%
Latino or Hispanic -----	10%
Native American or Indian -----	1%
Some other ethnic or racial background --	4%
Mixed ethnic or racial background -----	3%
DK/NA/Refused -----	7%

22. What was the last level of school you completed?

Grades 1-8 -----	0%
Grades 9-11-----	0%
High school graduate(12) -----	18%
Some college/vocational school -----	4%
College (4 years)-----	39%
Post-graduate work -----	34%
DK/NA/Refused -----	4%

23. What was the total combined income for all the people in your household before taxes in 2014?

\$30,000 and under-----	3%
\$30,001 - \$60,000-----	8%
\$60,001 - \$75,000-----	9%
\$75,001 - \$100,000 -----	12%
\$100,001 - \$150,000-----	19%
\$150,001 - \$200,000-----	16%
More than \$200,000-----	22%
DK/NA/Refused -----	11%

24. What is your gender?

Male-----	46%
Female-----	46%
Refused-----	8%

THANK AND TERMINATE

PARTY REGISTRATION:

Democrat-----	54%
Republican-----	13%
No Party Preference-----	28%
Other-----	5%

FLAGS

P10-----	51%
G10-----	75%
P12-----	55%
G12-----	86%
P14-----	46%
G14-----	76%
BLANK-----	6%

PERMANENT ABSENTEE

Yes-----	53%
No-----	47%

AGE

18-29-----	8%
30-39-----	16%
40-49-----	20%
50-64-----	34%
65-74-----	17%
75+-----	5%
BLANK-----	0%

HOUSEHOLD PARTY TYPE

Dem 1-----	34%
Dem 2+-----	14%
Rep 1-----	6%
Rep 2+-----	2%
Ind 1+-----	27%
Mix-----	17%

SURVEY MODE

Mail-----	82%
Online-----	18%