

Appendix A - Assets Included in the Plan – 2025

Service	Subservice	Asset Category
Administration & Operations/General Government	Administration	Facilities
	ITS	Hardware
		Software
	Public Works	Equipment
		Facilities
		Fleet
Arts, Culture & Heritage	Heritage Services	Facilities
	Library Services	Collections
		Equipment
		Facilities
	Museums and Arts	Collections
		Facilities
Community Recreation	Aquatics and Equipment	Public Beaches
		Splash Pads and Wading Pools
		Equipment
	Arenas & Recreation Facilities	Facilities
		Fleet
		Facilities
	Parks	Land
		Parks Amenities
		Parks Siteworks
		Equipment
	Urban Forest	Fleet
		Trees
Emergency Services	Fire Services	Equipment
		Facilities
		Fleet
	Police Services	Equipment
		Facilities
		Fleet
Environmental Services & Water Resource Systems	Solid Waste Management	Facilities
		Fleet
		Land
	Storm Water	Conveyance
		Stormwater Management
	Wastewater Collection	Conveyance

Appendix A

Service	Subservice	Asset Category
		Fleet
	Wastewater Treatment	Facilities
		Fleet
Social Services	Daycare	Facilities
	Housing	Facilities
Transportation	Airport	Airport Support Assets
		Facilities
		Land
	Roads & Related Assets	Active Transportation Network
		Equipment
		Facilities
		Fleet
		Municipal Structures
		Right of Way
		Traffic Management
	Transit	Facilities
		Fleet
		Linear
		Miscellaneous

Appendix B – Standardized Chart for Consequence Scores

<u>Consequence</u>	Description	Score
Minimal	No noticeable damage to environment society, no injuries, not a nuisance, no time delays, little to know fines, no media	5
	Minor amount of damage to environment or society, less than a few or very minor injuries, easy work around, limited delays, small fines, no media	4
Moderate	Some damage to environment or society, a few injuries or minor injuries, work around available, some delay, subject to fines or investigation, possibly media attention	3
	Damage to environment or society, a number of injuries (varying degrees), work around are not easy to implement, large delays, large fines and investigation, local media attention	2
Catastrophic	Major damage to environment/society, life threatening injuries or death, work around are not possible or time consuming and costly, major delays, legal action, large fines, major investigations, national media attention	1

Appendix C – Definitions

Abandonment: A stage in asset lifecycle management. Generally, part of disposal, a choice to leave an asset in place but in disuse, generally chosen when the removal of an asset is not cost effective

Asset: item, thing, or entity that has potential or actual value to the City

Asset Life: period from asset creation to abandonment, replacement or removal

Asset Portfolio: assets that are within the scope of the asset management system

Asset Solution: a means of obtaining a service objective that direction relates to the asset either via maintenance, renewal, rehabilitation, replacement, disposal, expansion

Asset Management Program: A management system for asset management whose function is to establish the asset management objectives and the tracking of performance

Asset Management Strategy: A series of actions used to manage assets through their lifecycle to reduce the risk and deliver services

Asset System: set of assets that interact or are interrelated

Asset Type: grouping of assets having common characteristics that distinguish those assets as a group or class

Bridge Condition Index: An index for the management of structure assets that is the result of an OSIM inspection program.

Building Together: the provincial guide from the MOI for developing Asset Management Plans

Business Practises: the day-to-day procedures used to complete tasks to achieve objectives

Capital Asset Management Plan: documented information that specifies the state of the infrastructure, the levels of service, asset strategy, funding strategy, prioritized project list and improvement strategy for to achieve the City's asset management objectives

Capital Investment: funds invested by the City for the purpose of furthering its objectives

Capital Planning: The process of planning and prioritizing for the delegation of capital funds to key projects and programs to meet the needs of the City

Collaboration: working together between several business groups to achieve a common objective

Condition: a measure of likelihood that is based on the status of the asset, it is often on a scale of 1-5 but can be in other scales or in percentage

Confidence: a measure of certainty in information being used or outcomes of a process

Consequence: A result or effect or outcome of an event

Context: the current state of interrelated policies, objectives, and plans that create the working environment of the City

Continual Improvement: recurring activity to enhance performance

Corrective Actions: action to eliminate the cause of nonconformity and to preventative recurrences

Cost/Benefit: the analysis that quantifies and compares benefits and costs over a period of time

Critical Asset: asset having potential to significantly impact the achievement of the City objectives

Customer Level of Service: The Level of Service measure that considers the user experience

Disposal: A stage in the asset lifecycle. Actions necessary to decommission and dispose of an asset that is no longer required

“Do Nothing” Strategy: A strategy that involves not maintaining or renewing an asset. Also considered as the run until failure strategy. For some assets this is an appropriate strategy especially if an asset repair value costly compared to the replacement cost. Generally, this is an expensive strategy as no effort is made to extend the life of an asset.

Documented Information: information required to be controlled and maintained by an organization

Effective: the extent to which planned activities are realized and planned results achieved

Evidence Based Decision Making: The use of real data from inspections, reports, operations, maintenance records, and performance to prioritize actions

Expansion: Part of lifecycle management. Relates to the need to improve the level of service delivered by

increasing the size or power etc. of an asset with replacement

Facility Condition Index: An index for the management of facilities to benchmark and compare the relative condition of a group of facilities. It is used primarily for the asset management of facilities. It compares the value of required repairs to the value of the facility

Failure: the inability to meet a service objective, City objective or other goals

Federal Gas Tax: funds available to municipalities by the federal government based on taxes collected from petrol sales

Future Strategy: An asset management strategy that has not been implemented but has been identified and is currently being researched or undergoing approvals

Historical Cost: The original cost incurred by the City to purchase and instate an asset

Infrastructure: Stationary systems forming a network or portfolio of assets serving whole communities, where the system is intended to be maintained indefinitely at a particular level of service potential by the continuing replacement and refurbishment of its components. The network may include normally recognized ordinary assets as components

Infrastructure Deficit: The amount of funding required to meet the needs of the infrastructure replacements and renewals that is not currently funded through City funding sources

Inflow & Infiltration (I&I): The process that water from sources other than approved drains enters a piped network. An I&I program seeks to find these

sources and remove them. An I&I program reduces the impact of storms on wastewater systems and reduces risks associated an overtaxed system

Integrated Program: a means of managing assets through several options including capital investments and changes to the maintenance and operation of the asset

Legal: requirements that relate to laws that the City must meet to avoid risks, these often create objectives

Levels of Service (LOS): The description of the service output for an activity or service area against which performance may be measured

Lifecycle: stages involved in the management of an asset

Lifecycle Strategy: the process of administering and supporting an asset over the entire life of the asset which begins at design and ends with asset disposal through thorough planning, analysis and timely execution allowing appropriate data-driven decision making to occur and enable optimization

MOI: Ministry of Infrastructure, the provincial ministry responsible for the province's infrastructure management including providing funding to municipalities relating to infrastructure investments

Maintenance: the processes and procedures used to extend and improve the life of an asset

Monitoring: determining the status of a system, process or activity

Measurement: process to determine a value

Non-asset Solution: a means of obtaining service objectives through solutions that lower the cost or extend

the life of the asset often via planning exercises, demand management, process optimization, insurance policy, and managed failures

Objective: results to be achieved

OEM: Original Equipment Manufacturer. Guidelines for the maintenance and upkeep of equipment and fleet to maximize the lifecycle of an asset.

Operation: the process and actions used by an asset to deliver a service

Opportunities: the identification of favourable outcomes when identifying solutions to achieve objectives

Optimized Decision Making (ODM): a formal process to identify and prioritize all potential solutions with consideration to financial viability, social and environmental responsibility and cultural outcomes

OSIM: Ontario Structures Inspection Manual, the process and requirements for the inspection of Bridge structures

Pavement Condition Index: An index for the management of pavement to benchmark and compare surfaces. It is developed through the assessment of the quantity of several specific defects

Planning: The first stage of an asset lifecycle that requires City staff to consider options of what is required to meet the needs for delivering a service in a sustainable way

PSAB 3150: Public Sector Accounting Board policy for reporting the value of tangible capital assets, requirement for funding since 2009

Performance: a measurable result

Process: set of interrelated activities which transforms inputs into outputs

Priorities: solutions which are more important than other solutions to meet the City objectives

Proactive: acting in anticipation of predicted nonconformity, changes, needs or challenges

Probability: The extent at which an event is possible

Programs: A planned series of tasks combined to meet the needs delivering a service and maintaining the City's assets

Road Map: A report that describes a path to achieve desired goals with specific objectives and targets

Regulatory: requirements made by external bodies where fees or fines are in place when requirements are not met, these regulations are generally set by the provincial and federal government

Rehabilitation: A stage in asset lifecycle management. Works to rebuild or replace parts or components of an asset, to resort it to a required functional condition and extend its life, which may incorporate some modification. Generally, involves repairing the asset to deliver its original level of service without restoring to significant upgrading or renewal, using available techniques and standards

Renewal: A stage in lifecycle management. Works to replace existing assets or facilities with assets or facilities of equivalent capacity or performance capability

Replacement: The complete replacement of an asset that has reached the end of its life to provide a similar or agreed alternative level of service

Replacement Cost: The cost the City would incur to acquire the asset on the

reporting date. The cost is measured by references to the lowest cost at which the gross future economic benefits could be obtained in the normal course of business or the minimum it would cost, to replace the existing asset with a new modern equivalent asset (not a second hand one) with the same economic benefits (gross service potential) allowing for any differences in the quantity and quality of output and in operating cost

Requirement: need or expectation that is stated, generally implied or obligatory

Resources: the number of people, hours, budget, tools available to achieve the objectives of the City and the Asset Management Plan

Risk: effect of uncertainty on attaining objectives or performing services

Risk Management: the process by which risks are identified, monitored, mitigated and reduced

Scope: the extent of the City asset management system includes, this scope can change over time to include or exclude items

Service: a benefit or action provided to the citizens, staff, and visitors to the City

Service Objective: The objective set by the levels of service program that is used to develop service measures and set targets

Stakeholder: a person or organization that can affect, be affected by, or perceive themselves to be affected by a decision or activity

State of the Infrastructure: A report card for infrastructure that shows the value, condition and risk of assets within infrastructure service delivery categories

Sustainable: The capacity to endure through balancing social, economic, environmental and cultural outcomes and needs when making decisions for the current state. It is forward thinking decision making.

Target: The aim of a level of service measure that shows that the service objective is being achieved

Technical: practical knowledge or skills used to achieve goals or regulations that are applied to the asset management system or committee

Technical Level of Service: The Level of Service measure that considers the operation or process used to deliver a service

Mainstreet Research Survey - Peterborough



About Mainstreet

Founded in 2010, Mainstreet Research is recognized as one of Canada's top public opinion and market research firms. Since our founding, we have been providing actionable and data-driven insights to our clients to help them make their most important evidence-based strategic decisions.

Mainstreet has an impressive track record in accurately forecasting election results in Canada and the United States and has become a trusted source for comprehensive market research, analysis and advice. Our insights are found in major media outlets across the country.

Our diverse team has decades of experience in conducting both quantitative and qualitative research, ranging from broad national surveys, to focus groups, to membership surveys, and all points in between.

Mainstreet Research is a proud corporate member of MRIA, WAPOR and AAPOR and exceeds all Canadian and international standards for market research and public opinion research.


Methodology

The analysis in this report is based on results of a survey conducted from Tuesday, December 17th to Tuesday, January 14th, 2025, among a sample of 298 adults, 18 years of age or older, living in Peterborough. The survey was conducted using text message to web. Respondents were interviewed on cellular phones. The survey is intended to represent the voting population in Peterborough.

The margin of error for the poll is +/- 5.7% at the 95% confidence level. Margins of error are higher in each subsample.

Totals may not add up 100% due to rounding. By Immanuel Giel - Own work, Public Domain, Wikimedia Commons

For each service please select the most accurate statement for you: Arts, Culture & Heritage (all respondents)



broken out by age, gender

	Total	Gender			Age		
		Male	Female	Non-Binary	18-49	50-64	65+
I Use	48.7%	42.6%	54.1%	69.3%	46.7%	50%	51.3%
I do not use	51.3%	57.4%	45.9%	30.7%	53.3%	50%	48.7%
Unweighted Frequency	298	114	158	26	60	88	150
Weighted Frequency	298	144	153	1	149	74	74


broken out by education, income

	Total	Education			Income			
		HS or less	College/Trade School	University	<\$50k	\$50k-\$75k	\$75k-\$100k	\$100k+
I Use	48.7%	47.7%	34%	63.4%	38.7%	65.1%	55.9%	40.7%
I do not use	51.3%	52.3%	66%	36.6%	61.3%	34.9%	44.1%	59.3%
Unweighted Frequency	298	32	130	136	98	66	52	82
Weighted Frequency	298	32	132	134	70	73	48	107

broken out by ward

	Total	Ward					
		1	2	3	4	5	6
I Use	48.7%	49.6%	41.2%	69.9%	32.2%	52.1%	37.3%
I do not use	51.3%	50.4%	58.8%	30.1%	67.8%	47.9%	62.7%
Unweighted Frequency	298	62	50	60	34	68	24
Weighted Frequency	298	69	41	47	34	69	38

For each service please select the most accurate statement for you: Police Services (all respondents)



broken out by age, gender

	Total	Gender			Age		
		Male	Female	Non-Binary	18-49	50-64	65+
I Use	56.3%	56.8%	56%	47.9%	54%	64.9%	52.4%
I do not use	43.7%	43.2%	44%	52.1%	46%	35.1%	47.6%
Unweighted Frequency	298	114	158	26	60	88	150
Weighted Frequency	298	144	153	1	149	74	74


broken out by education, income

	Total	Education			Income			
		HS or less	College/Trade School	University	<\$50k	\$50k-\$75k	\$75k-\$100k	\$100k+
I Use	56.3%	25.3%	64.9%	55.3%	71.5%	56.4%	32.3%	57.1%
I do not use	43.7%	74.7%	35.1%	44.7%	28.5%	43.6%	67.7%	42.9%
Unweighted Frequency	298	32	130	136	98	66	52	82
Weighted Frequency	298	32	132	134	70	73	48	107

broken out by ward

	Total	Ward					
		1	2	3	4	5	6
I Use	56.3%	58.5%	54.3%	57.9%	43.4%	62.4%	53.4%
I do not use	43.7%	41.5%	45.7%	42.1%	56.6%	37.6%	46.6%
Unweighted Frequency	298	62	50	60	34	68	24
Weighted Frequency	298	69	41	47	34	69	38

For each service please select the most accurate statement for you: Fire Services (all respondents)



broken out by age, gender

	Total	Gender			Age		
		Male	Female	Non-Binary	18-49	50-64	65+
I Use	59.5%	53.1%	65.6%	52.1%	63.9%	59.3%	50.9%
I do not use	40.5%	46.9%	34.4%	47.9%	36.1%	40.7%	49.1%
Unweighted Frequency	298	114	158	26	60	88	150
Weighted Frequency	298	144	153	1	149	74	74


broken out by education, income

	Total	Education			Income			
		HS or less	College/Trade School	University	<\$50k	\$50k-\$75k	\$75k-\$100k	\$100k+
I Use	59.5%	25.3%	64.8%	62.4%	69%	53.2%	42.8%	65%
I do not use	40.5%	74.7%	35.2%	37.6%	31%	46.8%	57.2%	35%
Unweighted Frequency	298	32	130	136	98	66	52	82
Weighted Frequency	298	32	132	134	70	73	48	107

broken out by ward

	Total	Ward					
		1	2	3	4	5	6
I Use	59.5%	56.3%	74.7%	51.2%	58%	63.5%	53.4%
I do not use	40.5%	43.7%	25.3%	48.8%	42%	36.5%	46.6%
Unweighted Frequency	298	62	50	60	34	68	24
Weighted Frequency	298	69	41	47	34	69	38

For each service please select the most accurate statement for you: Community Recreation (all respondents)



broken out by age, gender

	Total	Gender			Age		
		Male	Female	Non-Binary	18-49	50-64	65+
I Use	76.6%	74.8%	78.4%	63.8%	79.1%	84.4%	63.7%
I do not use	23.4%	25.2%	21.6%	36.2%	20.9%	15.6%	36.3%
Unweighted Frequency	298	114	158	26	60	88	150
Weighted Frequency	298	144	153	1	149	74	74


broken out by education, income

	Total	Education			Income			
		HS or less	College/Trade School	University	<\$50k	\$50k-\$75k	\$75k-\$100k	\$100k+
I Use	76.6%	51.4%	79.6%	79.6%	75.9%	78%	74.7%	76.8%
I do not use	23.4%	48.6%	20.4%	20.4%	24.1%	22%	25.3%	23.2%
Unweighted Frequency	298	32	130	136	98	66	52	82
Weighted Frequency	298	32	132	134	70	73	48	107

broken out by ward

	Total	Ward					
		1	2	3	4	5	6
I Use	76.6%	70.8%	77.1%	88%	82.1%	74.5%	71.3%
I do not use	23.4%	29.2%	22.9%	12%	17.9%	25.5%	28.7%
Unweighted Frequency	298	62	50	60	34	68	24
Weighted Frequency	298	69	41	47	34	69	38

For each service please select the most accurate statement for you: Transportation (all respondents)



broken out by age, gender

	Total	Gender			Age		
		Male	Female	Non-Binary	18-49	50-64	65+
I Use	86.2%	82.5%	89.8%	84.1%	82.1%	97.5%	83.3%
I do not use	13.8%	17.5%	10.2%	15.9%	17.9%	2.5%	16.7%
Unweighted Frequency	298	114	158	26	60	88	150
Weighted Frequency	298	144	153	1	149	74	74


broken out by education, income

	Total	Education			Income			
		HS or less	College/Trade School	University	<\$50k	\$50k-\$75k	\$75k-\$100k	\$100k+
I Use	86.2%	90.9%	84.5%	86.8%	93.8%	83.1%	86%	83.5%
I do not use	13.8%	9.1%	15.5%	13.2%	6.2%	16.9%	14%	16.5%
Unweighted Frequency	298	32	130	136	98	66	52	82
Weighted Frequency	298	32	132	134	70	73	48	107

broken out by ward

	Total	Ward					
		1	2	3	4	5	6
I Use	86.2%	78.7%	91.8%	93.7%	80.1%	96.6%	71.3%
I do not use	13.8%	21.3%	8.2%	6.3%	19.9%	3.4%	28.7%
Unweighted Frequency	298	62	50	60	34	68	24
Weighted Frequency	298	69	41	47	34	69	38

For each service please select the most accurate statement for you: Social Services (all respondents)



broken out by age, gender

	Total	Gender			Age		
		Male	Female	Non-Binary	18-49	50-64	65+
I Use	11.3%	7.9%	14.4%	20.4%	14.4%	9.5%	6.8%
I do not use	88.7%	92.1%	85.6%	79.6%	85.6%	90.5%	93.2%
Unweighted Frequency	298	114	158	26	60	88	150
Weighted Frequency	298	144	153	1	149	74	74


broken out by education, income

	Total	Education			Income			
		HS or less	College/Trade School	University	<\$50k	\$50k-\$75k	\$75k-\$100k	\$100k+
I Use	11.3%	3.2%	17.2%	7.3%	23.4%	7.7%	2.1%	9.8%
I do not use	88.7%	96.8%	82.8%	92.7%	76.6%	92.3%	97.9%	90.2%
Unweighted Frequency	298	32	130	136	98	66	52	82
Weighted Frequency	298	32	132	134	70	73	48	107

broken out by ward

	Total	Ward					
		1	2	3	4	5	6
I Use	11.3%	5.6%	6.7%	16.9%	5.3%	8.6%	29.4%
I do not use	88.7%	94.4%	93.3%	83.1%	94.7%	91.4%	70.6%
Unweighted Frequency	298	62	50	60	34	68	24
Weighted Frequency	298	69	41	47	34	69	38

For each service please select the most accurate statement for you: Water Resource Systems (all respondents)



broken out by age, gender

	Total	Gender			Age		
		Male	Female	Non-Binary	18-49	50-64	65+
I Use	70.7%	65.2%	76%	64%	64.1%	85%	69.7%
I do not use	29.3%	34.8%	24%	36%	35.9%	15%	30.3%
Unweighted Frequency	298	114	158	26	60	88	150
Weighted Frequency	298	144	153	1	149	74	74


broken out by education, income

	Total	Education			Income			
		HS or less	College/Trade School	University	<\$50k	\$50k-\$75k	\$75k-\$100k	\$100k+
I Use	70.7%	52.2%	68.4%	77.5%	59.5%	78.2%	71.8%	72.5%
I do not use	29.3%	47.8%	31.6%	22.5%	40.5%	21.8%	28.2%	27.5%
Unweighted Frequency	298	32	130	136	98	66	52	82
Weighted Frequency	298	32	132	134	70	73	48	107

broken out by ward

	Total	Ward					
		1	2	3	4	5	6
I Use	70.7%	65.5%	82.2%	79.1%	96.8%	79.4%	19.3%
I do not use	29.3%	34.5%	17.8%	20.9%	3.2%	20.6%	80.7%
Unweighted Frequency	298	62	50	60	34	68	24
Weighted Frequency	298	69	41	47	34	69	38

For each service please select the most accurate statement for you: Transit (all respondents)



broken out by age, gender

	Total	Gender			Age		
		Male	Female	Non-Binary	18-49	50-64	65+
I Use	18%	17.1%	18.7%	24.6%	18.2%	19.8%	15.7%
I do not use	82%	82.9%	81.3%	75.4%	81.8%	80.2%	84.3%
Unweighted Frequency	298	114	158	26	60	88	150
Weighted Frequency	298	144	153	1	149	74	74


broken out by education, income

	Total	Education			Income			
		HS or less	College/Trade School	University	<\$50k	\$50k-\$75k	\$75k-\$100k	\$100k+
I Use	18%	25%	18.2%	16%	20.2%	32.8%	8.1%	10.8%
I do not use	82%	75%	81.8%	84%	79.8%	67.2%	91.9%	89.2%
Unweighted Frequency	298	32	130	136	98	66	52	82
Weighted Frequency	298	32	132	134	70	73	48	107

broken out by ward

	Total	Ward					
		1	2	3	4	5	6
I Use	18%	21.6%	4.3%	26.6%	11.4%	28.2%	3.1%
I do not use	82%	78.4%	95.7%	73.4%	88.6%	71.8%	96.9%
Unweighted Frequency	298	62	50	60	34	68	24
Weighted Frequency	298	69	41	47	34	69	38

For each service please select the most accurate statement for you: Community Recreation (all respondents)



broken out by age, gender

	Total	Gender			Age		
		Male	Female	Non-Binary	18-49	50-64	65+
I Use	54.7%	52.5%	56.8%	49%	53.5%	65.4%	46.2%
I do not use	45.3%	47.5%	43.2%	51%	46.5%	34.6%	53.8%
Unweighted Frequency	298	114	158	26	60	88	150
Weighted Frequency	298	144	153	1	149	74	74


broken out by education, income

	Total	Education			Income			
		HS or less	College/Trade School	University	<\$50k	\$50k-\$75k	\$75k-\$100k	\$100k+
I Use	54.7%	69.9%	46%	59.6%	36.9%	65.4%	48.4%	61.8%
I do not use	45.3%	30.1%	54%	40.4%	63.1%	34.6%	51.6%	38.2%
Unweighted Frequency	298	32	130	136	98	66	52	82
Weighted Frequency	298	32	132	134	70	73	48	107

broken out by ward

	Total	Ward					
		1	2	3	4	5	6
I Use	54.7%	64.4%	56.1%	67.7%	29%	38.5%	71.1%
I do not use	45.3%	35.6%	43.9%	32.3%	71%	61.5%	28.9%
Unweighted Frequency	298	62	50	60	34	68	24
Weighted Frequency	298	69	41	47	34	69	38

For each service please select the most accurate statement for you: Landfill and Garbage Trucks (all respondents)



broken out by age, gender

	Total	Gender			Age		
		Male	Female	Non-Binary	18-49	50-64	65+
I Use	86.4%	82.6%	89.9%	84.1%	78.3%	95.1%	93.9%
I do not use	13.6%	17.4%	10.1%	15.9%	21.7%	4.9%	6.1%
Unweighted Frequency	298	114	158	26	60	88	150
Weighted Frequency	298	144	153	1	149	74	74


broken out by education, income

	Total	Education			Income			
		HS or less	College/Trade School	University	<\$50k	\$50k-\$75k	\$75k-\$100k	\$100k+
I Use	86.4%	79.2%	86.1%	88.4%	84.5%	90.7%	88.2%	83.9%
I do not use	13.6%	20.8%	13.9%	11.6%	15.5%	9.3%	11.8%	16.1%
Unweighted Frequency	298	32	130	136	98	66	52	82
Weighted Frequency	298	32	132	134	70	73	48	107

broken out by ward

	Total	Ward					
		1	2	3	4	5	6
I Use	86.4%	87.8%	97.5%	85.5%	100%	99.8%	37.1%
I do not use	13.6%	12.2%	2.5%	14.5%	0%	0.2%	62.9%
Unweighted Frequency	298	62	50	60	34	68	24
Weighted Frequency	298	69	41	47	34	69	38

**For each service please select the most accurate statement
for you: Wastewater (all respondents)**



broken out by age, gender

	Total	Gender			Age		
		Male	Female	Non-Binary	18-49	50-64	65+
I Use	76.6%	73.9%	79.2%	72.5%	75%	85%	71.5%
I do not use	23.4%	26.1%	20.8%	27.5%	25%	15%	28.5%
Unweighted Frequency	298	114	158	26	60	88	150
Weighted Frequency	298	144	153	1	149	74	74


broken out by education, income

	Total	Education			Income			
		HS or less	College/Trade School	University	<\$50k	\$50k-\$75k	\$75k-\$100k	\$100k+
I Use	76.6%	67%	76.4%	79.2%	69.2%	79.4%	75.6%	80.1%
I do not use	23.4%	33%	23.6%	20.8%	30.8%	20.6%	24.4%	19.9%
Unweighted Frequency	298	32	130	136	98	66	52	82
Weighted Frequency	298	32	132	134	70	73	48	107

broken out by ward

	Total	Ward					
		1	2	3	4	5	6
I Use	76.6%	65.5%	87.7%	79.4%	93.5%	84.8%	51.8%
I do not use	23.4%	34.5%	12.3%	20.6%	6.5%	15.2%	48.2%
Unweighted Frequency	298	62	50	60	34	68	24
Weighted Frequency	298	69	41	47	34	69	38

**Rate your level of satisfaction with the following service:
Arts, Cultural & Heritage (all respondents)**



broken out by age, gender

	Total	Gender			Age		
		Male	Female	Non-Binary	18-49	50-64	65+
Satisfied	31.4%	26.1%	36.4%	28.9%	25.2%	40%	35.1%
Neutral	13.5%	11.7%	15.1%	12.7%	17.4%	9.9%	9.1%
Dissatisfied	3.8%	4.7%	2.7%	27.8%	4%	0.1%	7%
Didn't Use	51.3%	57.4%	45.9%	30.7%	53.3%	50%	48.7%
Unweighted Frequency	298	114	158	26	60	88	150
Weighted Frequency	298	144	153	1	149	74	74


broken out by education, income

	Total	Education			Income			
		HS or less	College/Trade School	University	<\$50k	\$50k-\$75k	\$75k-\$100k	\$100k+
Satisfied	31.4%	44%	21.6%	38.1%	21.4%	41.5%	38.5%	27.9%
Neutral	13.5%	3.7%	10.1%	19.2%	15.9%	14.4%	15%	10.6%
Dissatisfied	3.8%	0%	2.3%	6.2%	1.5%	9.1%	2.5%	2.3%
Didn't Use	51.3%	52.3%	66%	36.6%	61.3%	34.9%	44.1%	59.3%
Unweighted Frequency	298	32	130	136	98	66	52	82
Weighted Frequency	298	32	132	134	70	73	48	107

broken out by ward

	Total	Ward					
		1	2	3	4	5	6
Satisfied	31.4%	37.5%	19%	39.9%	17.6%	32.1%	34.2%
Neutral	13.5%	10%	22.2%	23.2%	14.6%	10.3%	3.1%
Dissatisfied	3.8%	2.1%	0%	6.8%	0%	9.7%	0%
Didn't Use	51.3%	50.4%	58.8%	30.1%	67.8%	47.9%	62.7%
Unweighted Frequency	298	62	50	60	34	68	24
Weighted Frequency	298	69	41	47	34	69	38

**Rate your level of satisfaction with the following service:
Police Services (all respondents)**



broken out by age, gender

	Total	Gender			Age		
		Male	Female	Non-Binary	18-49	50-64	65+
Satisfied	32.2%	32.5%	32.1%	7.4%	28.8%	35.4%	35.6%
Neutral	12.6%	11.7%	13.3%	20.1%	10.9%	19.6%	9.1%
Dissatisfied	11.6%	12.6%	10.6%	20.4%	14.4%	9.9%	7.7%
Didn't Use	43.7%	43.2%	44%	52.1%	46%	35.1%	47.6%
Unweighted Frequency	298	114	158	26	60	88	150
Weighted Frequency	298	144	153	1	149	74	74


broken out by education, income

	Total	Education			Income			
		HS or less	College/Trade School	University	<\$50k	\$50k-\$75k	\$75k-\$100k	\$100k+
Satisfied	32.2%	16.1%	40.8%	27.5%	36%	34.5%	22.9%	32.1%
Neutral	12.6%	5.5%	15.3%	11.6%	24.5%	10.5%	2.6%	10.7%
Dissatisfied	11.6%	3.7%	8.8%	16.2%	11%	11.4%	6.8%	14.3%
Didn't Use	43.7%	74.7%	35.1%	44.7%	28.5%	43.6%	67.7%	42.9%
Unweighted Frequency	298	32	130	136	98	66	52	82
Weighted Frequency	298	32	132	134	70	73	48	107

broken out by ward

	Total	Ward					
		1	2	3	4	5	6
Satisfied	32.2%	32.8%	29%	25.5%	34.3%	27.6%	48.8%
Neutral	12.6%	13.8%	22.4%	23.3%	9.1%	6.9%	0%
Dissatisfied	11.6%	11.8%	2.8%	9.1%	0%	27.9%	4.6%
Didn't Use	43.7%	41.5%	45.7%	42.1%	56.6%	37.6%	46.6%
Unweighted Frequency	298	62	50	60	34	68	24
Weighted Frequency	298	69	41	47	34	69	38

**Rate your level of satisfaction with the following service:
Fire Services (all respondents)**



broken out by age, gender

	Total	Gender			Age		
		Male	Female	Non-Binary	18-49	50-64	65+
Satisfied	49%	43.9%	53.8%	43.6%	53.5%	44.3%	44.6%
Neutral	8.6%	5.3%	11.7%	8.5%	6.6%	15%	6.3%
Dissatisfied	1.9%	3.9%	0%	0%	3.8%	0%	0%
Didn't Use	40.5%	46.9%	34.4%	47.9%	36.1%	40.7%	49.1%
Unweighted Frequency	298	114	158	26	60	88	150
Weighted Frequency	298	144	153	1	149	74	74


broken out by education, income

	Total	Education			Income			
		HS or less	College/Trade School	University	<\$50k	\$50k-\$75k	\$75k-\$100k	\$100k+
Satisfied	49%	19.7%	55.2%	49.9%	56.8%	42.7%	33.6%	55.1%
Neutral	8.6%	5.5%	9.6%	8.3%	12.2%	2.8%	9.2%	9.9%
Dissatisfied	1.9%	0%	0%	4.2%	0%	7.7%	0%	0%
Didn't Use	40.5%	74.7%	35.2%	37.6%	31%	46.8%	57.2%	35%
Unweighted Frequency	298	32	130	136	98	66	52	82
Weighted Frequency	298	32	132	134	70	73	48	107

broken out by ward

	Total	Ward					
		1	2	3	4	5	6
Satisfied	49%	46.1%	74.5%	32.2%	49.2%	48.1%	48.8%
Neutral	8.6%	10.2%	0.2%	19%	8.8%	7.1%	4.6%
Dissatisfied	1.9%	0%	0%	0%	0%	8.2%	0%
Didn't Use	40.5%	43.7%	25.3%	48.8%	42%	36.5%	46.6%
Unweighted Frequency	298	62	50	60	34	68	24
Weighted Frequency	298	69	41	47	34	69	38

**Rate your level of satisfaction with the following service:
Community Recreation (all respondents)**



broken out by age, gender

	Total	Gender			Age		
		Male	Female	Non-Binary	18-49	50-64	65+
Satisfied	45%	41.3%	48.5%	33.1%	36.1%	63.8%	44%
Neutral	16.9%	14.6%	19.1%	11.6%	24.5%	10.4%	8.3%
Dissatisfied	14.6%	18.8%	10.7%	19%	18.5%	10.2%	11.4%
Didn't Use	23.4%	25.2%	21.6%	36.2%	20.9%	15.6%	36.3%
Unweighted Frequency	298	114	158	26	60	88	150
Weighted Frequency	298	144	153	1	149	74	74


broken out by education, income

	Total	Education			Income			
		HS or less	College/Trade School	University	<\$50k	\$50k-\$75k	\$75k-\$100k	\$100k+
Satisfied	45%	16.1%	54.8%	42.2%	36.4%	44%	42.2%	52.6%
Neutral	16.9%	0%	11.8%	26.1%	24.7%	10.9%	14.5%	17%
Dissatisfied	14.6%	35.3%	13%	11.3%	14.7%	23.2%	18%	7.2%
Didn't Use	23.4%	48.6%	20.4%	20.4%	24.1%	22%	25.3%	23.2%
Unweighted Frequency	298	32	130	136	98	66	52	82
Weighted Frequency	298	32	132	134	70	73	48	107

broken out by ward

	Total	Ward					
		1	2	3	4	5	6
Satisfied	45%	56.5%	67.8%	37.4%	36.7%	33.3%	37.3%
Neutral	16.9%	5.9%	0.2%	41.4%	45%	8.8%	14.7%
Dissatisfied	14.6%	8.4%	9.2%	9.1%	0.3%	32.4%	19.3%
Didn't Use	23.4%	29.2%	22.9%	12%	17.9%	25.5%	28.7%
Unweighted Frequency	298	62	50	60	34	68	24
Weighted Frequency	298	69	41	47	34	69	38

**Rate your level of satisfaction with the following service:
Transportation (all respondents)**



broken out by age, gender

	Total	Gender			Age		
		Male	Female	Non-Binary	18-49	50-64	65+
Satisfied	15.5%	14.8%	16.2%	20.4%	11.1%	19.8%	20.2%
Neutral	27.5%	21.7%	32.8%	28.6%	24%	27.8%	33.9%
Dissatisfied	43.2%	45.9%	40.8%	35.2%	47%	49.8%	29.2%
Didn't Use	13.8%	17.5%	10.2%	15.9%	17.9%	2.5%	16.7%
Unweighted Frequency	298	114	158	26	60	88	150
Weighted Frequency	298	144	153	1	149	74	74


broken out by education, income

	Total	Education			Income			
		HS or less	College/Trade School	University	<\$50k	\$50k-\$75k	\$75k-\$100k	\$100k+
Satisfied	15.5%	28.2%	12%	16%	11.9%	13.5%	19%	17.7%
Neutral	27.5%	17.4%	33.3%	24%	36.3%	11.2%	20%	36.1%
Dissatisfied	43.2%	45.3%	39.2%	46.8%	45.6%	58.4%	47%	29.7%
Didn't Use	13.8%	9.1%	15.5%	13.2%	6.2%	16.9%	14%	16.5%
Unweighted Frequency	298	32	130	136	98	66	52	82
Weighted Frequency	298	32	132	134	70	73	48	107

broken out by ward

	Total	Ward					
		1	2	3	4	5	6
Satisfied	15.5%	4.7%	35.5%	11.2%	6.1%	18.1%	22.4%
Neutral	27.5%	22.5%	35.7%	29.9%	25.2%	31.3%	19.5%
Dissatisfied	43.2%	51.5%	20.6%	52.7%	48.9%	47.1%	29.4%
Didn't Use	13.8%	21.3%	8.2%	6.3%	19.9%	3.4%	28.7%
Unweighted Frequency	298	62	50	60	34	68	24
Weighted Frequency	298	69	41	47	34	69	38

**Rate your level of satisfaction with the following service:
Social Services (all respondents)**



broken out by age, gender

	Total	Gender			Age		
		Male	Female	Non-Binary	18-49	50-64	65+
Satisfied	1.3%	0%	2.5%	0%	0%	2.4%	2.7%
Neutral	8.3%	7.9%	8.7%	0%	14.2%	4.8%	0%
Dissatisfied	1.7%	0%	3.2%	20.4%	0.2%	2.4%	4.1%
Didn't Use	88.7%	92.1%	85.6%	79.6%	85.6%	90.5%	93.2%
Unweighted Frequency	298	114	158	26	60	88	150
Weighted Frequency	298	144	153	1	149	74	74


broken out by education, income

	Total	Education			Income			
		HS or less	College/Trade School	University	<\$50k	\$50k-\$75k	\$75k-\$100k	\$100k+
Satisfied	1.3%	3.2%	0%	2.1%	1.5%	0%	0%	2.6%
Neutral	8.3%	0%	14.3%	4.2%	19%	7.7%	0%	5.3%
Dissatisfied	1.7%	0%	2.9%	1%	2.9%	0%	2.1%	1.9%
Didn't Use	88.7%	96.8%	82.8%	92.7%	76.6%	92.3%	97.9%	90.2%
Unweighted Frequency	298	32	130	136	98	66	52	82
Weighted Frequency	298	32	132	134	70	73	48	107

broken out by ward

	Total	Ward					
		1	2	3	4	5	6
Satisfied	1.3%	0%	6.7%	2.2%	0%	0%	0%
Neutral	8.3%	2.6%	0%	10.4%	5.3%	7.1%	29.4%
Dissatisfied	1.7%	3%	0%	4.3%	0%	1.5%	0%
Didn't Use	88.7%	94.4%	93.3%	83.1%	94.7%	91.4%	70.6%
Unweighted Frequency	298	62	50	60	34	68	24
Weighted Frequency	298	69	41	47	34	69	38

**Rate your level of satisfaction with the following service:
Water Resource Systems (all respondents)**



broken out by age, gender

	Total	Gender			Age		
		Male	Female	Non-Binary	18-49	50-64	65+
Satisfied	43.1%	37.2%	48.8%	32%	31.8%	55.2%	53.6%
Neutral	24.7%	23.3%	26.1%	11.6%	28.3%	27.5%	14.6%
Dissatisfied	3%	4.7%	1.2%	20.4%	4%	2.4%	1.6%
Didn't Use	29.3%	34.8%	24%	36%	35.9%	15%	30.3%
Unweighted Frequency	298	114	158	26	60	88	150
Weighted Frequency	298	144	153	1	149	74	74


broken out by education, income

	Total	Education			Income			
		HS or less	College/Trade School	University	<\$50k	\$50k-\$75k	\$75k-\$100k	\$100k+
Satisfied	43.1%	19.3%	42.9%	48.9%	37.3%	25.8%	42.2%	59.1%
Neutral	24.7%	32.9%	25.4%	21.9%	19.7%	44.2%	27.1%	13.5%
Dissatisfied	3%	0%	0%	6.7%	2.5%	8.1%	2.5%	0%
Didn't Use	29.3%	47.8%	31.6%	22.5%	40.5%	21.8%	28.2%	27.5%
Unweighted Frequency	298	32	130	136	98	66	52	82
Weighted Frequency	298	32	132	134	70	73	48	107

broken out by ward

	Total	Ward					
		1	2	3	4	5	6
Satisfied	43.1%	27.7%	73%	41%	45.7%	53.9%	19.3%
Neutral	24.7%	37.8%	9.2%	37.4%	51.1%	13%	0%
Dissatisfied	3%	0%	0%	0.6%	0%	12.5%	0%
Didn't Use	29.3%	34.5%	17.8%	20.9%	3.2%	20.6%	80.7%
Unweighted Frequency	298	62	50	60	34	68	24
Weighted Frequency	298	69	41	47	34	69	38

**Rate your level of satisfaction with the following service:
Transit (all respondents)**



broken out by age, gender

	Total	Gender			Age		
		Male	Female	Non-Binary	18-49	50-64	65+
Satisfied	3.6%	1.6%	5.5%	0%	0%	7.1%	7.2%
Neutral	8.1%	8.7%	7.5%	4.2%	10.9%	4.8%	5.8%
Dissatisfied	6.3%	6.8%	5.7%	20.4%	7.3%	7.9%	2.7%
Didn't Use	82%	82.9%	81.3%	75.4%	81.8%	80.2%	84.3%
Unweighted Frequency	298	114	158	26	60	88	150
Weighted Frequency	298	144	153	1	149	74	74


broken out by education, income

	Total	Education			Income			
		HS or less	College/Trade School	University	<\$50k	\$50k-\$75k	\$75k-\$100k	\$100k+
Satisfied	3.6%	7.3%	0.8%	5.5%	4.8%	1.4%	5.8%	3.3%
Neutral	8.1%	0%	15.1%	3%	11%	20.9%	0.1%	0.9%
Dissatisfied	6.3%	17.7%	2.3%	7.5%	4.4%	10.5%	2.1%	6.5%
Didn't Use	82%	75%	81.8%	84%	79.8%	67.2%	91.9%	89.2%
Unweighted Frequency	298	32	130	136	98	66	52	82
Weighted Frequency	298	32	132	134	70	73	48	107

broken out by ward

	Total	Ward					
		1	2	3	4	5	6
Satisfied	3.6%	0%	4.3%	2.2%	3%	8.4%	3.1%
Neutral	8.1%	18.2%	0%	18.5%	8.3%	0%	0%
Dissatisfied	6.3%	3.4%	0%	5.9%	0%	19.9%	0%
Didn't Use	82%	78.4%	95.7%	73.4%	88.6%	71.8%	96.9%
Unweighted Frequency	298	62	50	60	34	68	24
Weighted Frequency	298	69	41	47	34	69	38

**Rate your level of satisfaction with the following service:
Community Recreation (all respondents)**



broken out by age, gender

	Total	Gender			Age		
		Male	Female	Non-Binary	18-49	50-64	65+
Satisfied	29.1%	30.2%	28.2%	8.5%	21.7%	44.8%	28%
Neutral	23.8%	20.8%	26.7%	12.7%	31.6%	17.8%	14.1%
Dissatisfied	1.9%	1.4%	2%	27.8%	0.2%	2.9%	4.1%
Didn't Use	45.3%	47.5%	43.2%	51%	46.5%	34.6%	53.8%
Unweighted Frequency	298	114	158	26	60	88	150
Weighted Frequency	298	144	153	1	149	74	74


broken out by education, income

	Total	Education			Income			
		HS or less	College/Trade School	University	<\$50k	\$50k-\$75k	\$75k-\$100k	\$100k+
Satisfied	29.1%	12.9%	30.7%	31.3%	15.9%	30.9%	27.7%	37%
Neutral	23.8%	57%	14.6%	24.9%	19.5%	34.5%	20.7%	20.6%
Dissatisfied	1.9%	0%	0.8%	3.4%	1.5%	0%	0%	4.2%
Didn't Use	45.3%	30.1%	54%	40.4%	63.1%	34.6%	51.6%	38.2%
Unweighted Frequency	298	32	130	136	98	66	52	82
Weighted Frequency	298	32	132	134	70	73	48	107

broken out by ward

	Total	Ward					
		1	2	3	4	5	6
Satisfied	29.1%	35.5%	39.8%	21%	14.4%	16.1%	51.8%
Neutral	23.8%	28.3%	13.8%	42.3%	14.6%	19.5%	19.3%
Dissatisfied	1.9%	0.6%	2.5%	4.3%	0%	3%	0%
Didn't Use	45.3%	35.6%	43.9%	32.3%	71%	61.5%	28.9%
Unweighted Frequency	298	62	50	60	34	68	24
Weighted Frequency	298	69	41	47	34	69	38

**Rate your level of satisfaction with the following service:
Landfill and Garbage Trucks (all respondents)**



broken out by age, gender

	Total	Gender			Age		
		Male	Female	Non-Binary	18-49	50-64	65+
Satisfied	51.4%	55.2%	48.1%	15.9%	35.9%	63.1%	70.6%
Neutral	29.6%	22.1%	36.6%	47.9%	38.4%	19.7%	22%
Dissatisfied	5.4%	5.4%	5.3%	20.4%	4%	12.3%	1.4%
Didn't Use	13.6%	17.4%	10.1%	15.9%	21.7%	4.9%	6.1%
Unweighted Frequency	298	114	158	26	60	88	150
Weighted Frequency	298	144	153	1	149	74	74


broken out by education, income

	Total	Education			Income			
		HS or less	College/Trade School	University	<\$50k	\$50k-\$75k	\$75k-\$100k	\$100k+
Satisfied	51.4%	36.7%	46.6%	59.5%	32.8%	45.3%	57.4%	65%
Neutral	29.6%	37%	38.7%	18.9%	44.1%	34.8%	28.7%	17%
Dissatisfied	5.4%	5.5%	0.8%	10%	7.6%	10.5%	2.1%	1.9%
Didn't Use	13.6%	20.8%	13.9%	11.6%	15.5%	9.3%	11.8%	16.1%
Unweighted Frequency	298	32	130	136	98	66	52	82
Weighted Frequency	298	32	132	134	70	73	48	107

broken out by ward

	Total	Ward					
		1	2	3	4	5	6
Satisfied	51.4%	46.7%	80%	44.4%	61.5%	46.5%	37.1%
Neutral	29.6%	35%	17.5%	37.4%	33.2%	41%	0%
Dissatisfied	5.4%	6%	0%	3.8%	5.3%	12.3%	0%
Didn't Use	13.6%	12.2%	2.5%	14.5%	0%	0.2%	62.9%
Unweighted Frequency	298	62	50	60	34	68	24
Weighted Frequency	298	69	41	47	34	69	38

**Rate your level of satisfaction with the following service:
Wastewater (all respondents)**



broken out by age, gender

	Total	Gender			Age		
		Male	Female	Non-Binary	18-49	50-64	65+
Satisfied	43.2%	46.4%	40.3%	32%	36.1%	48.4%	52.2%
Neutral	30.3%	23.5%	36.7%	40.5%	35.1%	31.9%	19.3%
Dissatisfied	3.1%	3.9%	2.3%	0%	3.8%	4.8%	0%
Didn't Use	23.4%	26.1%	20.8%	27.5%	25%	15%	28.5%
Unweighted Frequency	298	114	158	26	60	88	150
Weighted Frequency	298	144	153	1	149	74	74


broken out by education, income

	Total	Education			Income			
		HS or less	College/Trade School	University	<\$50k	\$50k-\$75k	\$75k-\$100k	\$100k+
Satisfied	43.2%	16.9%	46.1%	46.6%	34.7%	35.7%	36.3%	57%
Neutral	30.3%	44.5%	30.3%	27%	29.4%	36%	39.2%	23.1%
Dissatisfied	3.1%	5.5%	0%	5.6%	5.1%	7.7%	0%	0%
Didn't Use	23.4%	33%	23.6%	20.8%	30.8%	20.6%	24.4%	19.9%
Unweighted Frequency	298	32	130	136	98	66	52	82
Weighted Frequency	298	32	132	134	70	73	48	107

broken out by ward

	Total	Ward					
		1	2	3	4	5	6
Satisfied	43.2%	43%	69%	27%	40.4%	43.7%	37.1%
Neutral	30.3%	22.5%	18.7%	48.7%	53.1%	30.2%	14.7%
Dissatisfied	3.1%	0%	0%	3.8%	0%	10.8%	0%
Didn't Use	23.4%	34.5%	12.3%	20.6%	6.5%	15.2%	48.2%
Unweighted Frequency	298	62	50	60	34	68	24
Weighted Frequency	298	69	41	47	34	69	38

Are you willing to pay more to improve a service or to prevent it from declining: Arts, Cultural & Heritage (all respondents)



broken out by age, gender

	Total	Gender			Age		
		Male	Female	Non-Binary	18-49	50-64	65+
Pay more to improve	18.4%	8.6%	27.2%	65.1%	20.6%	14.8%	17.6%
Pay to prevent decline	19.4%	21%	18%	0%	21.7%	19.8%	14.3%
Not willing to pay more	62.2%	70.3%	54.8%	34.9%	57.6%	65.4%	68.1%
Unweighted Frequency	298	114	158	26	60	88	150
Weighted Frequency	298	144	153	1	149	74	74


broken out by education, income

	Total	Education			Income			
		HS or less	College/Trade School	University	<\$50k	\$50k-\$75k	\$75k-\$100k	\$100k+
Pay more to improve	18.4%	20.8%	0.9%	35.2%	10.3%	13.2%	28.6%	22.7%
Pay to prevent decline	19.4%	21.3%	21.1%	17.2%	18.5%	27.4%	14.5%	16.7%
Not willing to pay more	62.2%	57.8%	78%	47.6%	71.2%	59.4%	56.9%	60.6%
Unweighted Frequency	298	32	130	136	98	66	52	82
Weighted Frequency	298	32	132	134	70	73	48	107

broken out by ward

	Total	Ward					
		1	2	3	4	5	6
Pay more to improve	18.4%	15.5%	6.7%	21.6%	26.1%	17.4%	27.4%
Pay to prevent decline	19.4%	33.3%	20.4%	12.7%	3%	23.9%	7.7%
Not willing to pay more	62.2%	51.2%	72.9%	65.7%	70.9%	58.7%	64.9%
Unweighted Frequency	298	62	50	60	34	68	24
Weighted Frequency	298	69	41	47	34	69	38

Are you willing to pay more to improve a service or to prevent it from declining: Police Services (all respondents)



Response

	Pay more to improve		Pay to prevent decline
	Not willing to pay more		

broken out by age, gender

	Total	Gender			Age		
		Male	Female	Non-Binary	18-49	50-64	65+
Pay more to improve	24.3%	33%	16.4%	7.4%	29.3%	15.2%	23.5%
Pay to prevent decline	26%	15.6%	36%	4.2%	20.2%	27.3%	36.1%
Not willing to pay more	49.7%	51.5%	47.6%	88.4%	50.5%	57.5%	40.3%
Unweighted Frequency	298	114	158	26	60	88	150
Weighted Frequency	298	144	153	1	149	74	74


broken out by education, income

	Total	Education			Income			
		HS or less	College/Trade School	University	<\$50k	\$50k-\$75k	\$75k-\$100k	\$100k+
Pay more to improve	24.3%	44.6%	19.2%	24.6%	20.4%	15.3%	26.6%	32.1%
Pay to prevent decline	26%	24.5%	29.8%	22.5%	24.2%	22%	32.3%	27%
Not willing to pay more	49.7%	30.9%	50.9%	52.9%	55.5%	62.6%	41.2%	40.8%
Unweighted Frequency	298	32	130	136	98	66	52	82
Weighted Frequency	298	32	132	134	70	73	48	107

broken out by ward

	Total	Ward					
		1	2	3	4	5	6
Pay more to improve	24.3%	15.1%	23.5%	4.3%	12.6%	25.5%	74.6%
Pay to prevent decline	26%	30%	40.2%	29.4%	37.5%	17.3%	4.6%
Not willing to pay more	49.7%	54.9%	36.3%	66.3%	49.9%	57.3%	20.7%
Unweighted Frequency	298	62	50	60	34	68	24
Weighted Frequency	298	69	41	47	34	69	38

Are you willing to pay more to improve a service or to prevent it from declining: Fire Services (all respondents)



broken out by age, gender

	Total	Gender			Age		
		Male	Female	Non-Binary	18-49	50-64	65+
Pay more to improve	23.1%	33.8%	13.2%	0%	33.1%	9.9%	16.3%
Pay to prevent decline	34.7%	27.3%	41.5%	49%	27.5%	37.7%	45.9%
Not willing to pay more	42.2%	38.9%	45.3%	51%	39.4%	52.3%	37.8%
Unweighted Frequency	298	114	158	26	60	88	150
Weighted Frequency	298	144	153	1	149	74	74


broken out by education, income

	Total	Education			Income			
		HS or less	College/Trade School	University	<\$50k	\$50k-\$75k	\$75k-\$100k	\$100k+
Pay more to improve	23.1%	31.4%	30.4%	13.9%	21.2%	20.1%	30.7%	23%
Pay to prevent decline	34.7%	38.2%	34.1%	34.4%	28.5%	28.6%	44%	38.7%
Not willing to pay more	42.2%	30.4%	35.6%	51.6%	50.3%	51.4%	25.3%	38.3%
Unweighted Frequency	298	32	130	136	98	66	52	82
Weighted Frequency	298	32	132	134	70	73	48	107

broken out by ward

	Total	Ward					
		1	2	3	4	5	6
Pay more to improve	23.1%	36.6%	30.4%	16.7%	3%	7.1%	45.2%
Pay to prevent decline	34.7%	41.6%	38%	28%	26.4%	34.6%	34.2%
Not willing to pay more	42.2%	21.8%	31.6%	55.4%	70.5%	58.4%	20.6%
Unweighted Frequency	298	62	50	60	34	68	24
Weighted Frequency	298	69	41	47	34	69	38

Are you willing to pay more to improve a service or to prevent it from declining: Community Recreation (all respondents)



broken out by age, gender

	Total	Gender			Age		
		Male	Female	Non-Binary	18-49	50-64	65+
Pay more to improve	16.4%	24.4%	8.9%	24.6%	22.5%	7.5%	13.2%
Pay to prevent decline	25.3%	14.7%	35.4%	15.9%	23.5%	25.1%	29.2%
Not willing to pay more	58.3%	60.9%	55.8%	59.5%	54%	67.4%	57.6%
Unweighted Frequency	298	114	158	26	60	88	150
Weighted Frequency	298	144	153	1	149	74	74


broken out by education, income

	Total	Education			Income			
		HS or less	College/Trade School	University	<\$50k	\$50k-\$75k	\$75k-\$100k	\$100k+
Pay more to improve	16.4%	28.7%	10.9%	19%	8%	19.9%	2.3%	25.9%
Pay to prevent decline	25.3%	6.8%	28.3%	26.8%	32.2%	6.1%	40.6%	27.1%
Not willing to pay more	58.3%	64.5%	60.8%	54.3%	59.8%	74.1%	57.1%	47%
Unweighted Frequency	298	32	130	136	98	66	52	82
Weighted Frequency	298	32	132	134	70	73	48	107

broken out by ward

	Total	Ward					
		1	2	3	4	5	6
Pay more to improve	16.4%	3.9%	22.8%	2.2%	3%	17%	59.9%
Pay to prevent decline	25.3%	35.3%	23.5%	35.9%	29.1%	18.9%	4.6%
Not willing to pay more	58.3%	60.8%	53.6%	62%	67.8%	64.1%	35.5%
Unweighted Frequency	298	62	50	60	34	68	24
Weighted Frequency	298	69	41	47	34	69	38

Are you willing to pay more to improve a service or to prevent it from declining: Transportation (all respondents)



broken out by age, gender

	Total	Gender			Age		
		Male	Female	Non-Binary	18-49	50-64	65+
Pay more to improve	34.3%	32.3%	36.4%	15.9%	42%	24.7%	28.7%
Pay to prevent decline	30%	28.6%	31.4%	24.6%	28.5%	32.8%	30.2%
Not willing to pay more	35.7%	39.1%	32.2%	59.5%	29.5%	42.4%	41.1%
Unweighted Frequency	298	114	158	26	60	88	150
Weighted Frequency	298	144	153	1	149	74	74


broken out by education, income

	Total	Education			Income			
		HS or less	College/Trade School	University	<\$50k	\$50k-\$75k	\$75k-\$100k	\$100k+
Pay more to improve	34.3%	49.9%	40%	24.9%	32.8%	43.9%	22.7%	33.9%
Pay to prevent decline	30%	16.1%	20.2%	43.1%	24.2%	22%	29.7%	39.5%
Not willing to pay more	35.7%	34.1%	39.7%	32%	43%	34.1%	47.6%	26.6%
Unweighted Frequency	298	32	130	136	98	66	52	82
Weighted Frequency	298	32	132	134	70	73	48	107

broken out by ward

	Total	Ward					
		1	2	3	4	5	6
Pay more to improve	34.3%	55.9%	18.9%	29.7%	29.2%	29.7%	30.5%
Pay to prevent decline	30%	16.7%	51.3%	27.3%	34%	36.6%	19.3%
Not willing to pay more	35.7%	27.5%	29.8%	43%	36.8%	33.7%	50.2%
Unweighted Frequency	298	62	50	60	34	68	24
Weighted Frequency	298	69	41	47	34	69	38

Are you willing to pay more to improve a service or to prevent it from declining: Social Services (all respondents)



broken out by age, gender

	Total	Gender			Age		
		Male	Female	Non-Binary	18-49	50-64	65+
Pay more to improve	22%	25.8%	18%	53.5%	25.9%	19.8%	16.1%
Pay to prevent decline	18.4%	13.2%	23.5%	4.2%	24%	12.7%	13%
Not willing to pay more	59.6%	61.1%	58.5%	42.3%	50.1%	67.5%	70.9%
Unweighted Frequency	298	114	158	26	60	88	150
Weighted Frequency	298	144	153	1	149	74	74


broken out by education, income

	Total	Education			Income			
		HS or less	College/Trade School	University	<\$50k	\$50k-\$75k	\$75k-\$100k	\$100k+
Pay more to improve	22%	24.5%	24%	19.4%	29.5%	19.2%	20.8%	19.4%
Pay to prevent decline	18.4%	32.9%	14.1%	19.2%	14.3%	21.6%	8%	23.6%
Not willing to pay more	59.6%	42.6%	62%	61.4%	56.1%	59.2%	71.2%	57.1%
Unweighted Frequency	298	32	130	136	98	66	52	82
Weighted Frequency	298	32	132	134	70	73	48	107

broken out by ward

	Total	Ward					
		1	2	3	4	5	6
Pay more to improve	22%	28.1%	11.7%	25.2%	3.2%	15.9%	45.2%
Pay to prevent decline	18.4%	20.6%	30.4%	14.8%	5.3%	25.6%	4.6%
Not willing to pay more	59.6%	51.4%	57.9%	60%	91.5%	58.4%	50.2%
Unweighted Frequency	298	62	50	60	34	68	24
Weighted Frequency	298	69	41	47	34	69	38

Are you willing to pay more to improve a service or to prevent it from declining: Water Resource Systems (all respondents)



broken out by age, gender

	Total	Gender			Age		
		Male	Female	Non-Binary	18-49	50-64	65+
Pay more to improve	12.1%	14%	10.1%	33.1%	14.4%	10.3%	9.3%
Pay to prevent decline	36.6%	29.6%	43.2%	24.6%	38.4%	27.7%	41.8%
Not willing to pay more	51.4%	56.4%	46.7%	42.3%	47.3%	62%	48.9%
Unweighted Frequency	298	114	158	26	60	88	150
Weighted Frequency	298	144	153	1	149	74	74


broken out by education, income

	Total	Education			Income			
		HS or less	College/Trade School	University	<\$50k	\$50k-\$75k	\$75k-\$100k	\$100k+
Pay more to improve	12.1%	13.3%	12.6%	11.2%	7.8%	20.6%	10.4%	9.8%
Pay to prevent decline	36.6%	22.1%	31.9%	44.6%	38%	22.2%	44.3%	42%
Not willing to pay more	51.4%	64.6%	55.5%	44.1%	54.2%	57.2%	45.3%	48.2%
Unweighted Frequency	298	32	130	136	98	66	52	82
Weighted Frequency	298	32	132	134	70	73	48	107

broken out by ward

	Total	Ward					
		1	2	3	4	5	6
Pay more to improve	12.1%	22.5%	2.5%	0.8%	23.9%	7.3%	15.8%
Pay to prevent decline	36.6%	47.8%	44.5%	47%	20.1%	39.1%	4.6%
Not willing to pay more	51.4%	29.7%	53%	52.2%	55.9%	53.6%	79.6%
Unweighted Frequency	298	62	50	60	34	68	24
Weighted Frequency	298	69	41	47	34	69	38

Are you willing to pay more to improve a service or to prevent it from declining: Transit (all respondents)



broken out by age, gender

	Total	Gender			Age		
		Male	Female	Non-Binary	18-49	50-64	65+
Pay more to improve	14.7%	10.9%	18.1%	28.9%	17.6%	14.7%	8.8%
Pay to prevent decline	20.8%	19.6%	22.1%	4.2%	21.2%	17.4%	23.2%
Not willing to pay more	64.5%	69.5%	59.8%	66.9%	61.1%	67.9%	68%
Unweighted Frequency	298	114	158	26	60	88	150
Weighted Frequency	298	144	153	1	149	74	74


broken out by education, income

	Total	Education			Income			
		HS or less	College/Trade School	University	<\$50k	\$50k-\$75k	\$75k-\$100k	\$100k+
Pay more to improve	14.7%	39%	1.6%	21.9%	8.7%	10.7%	28%	15.3%
Pay to prevent decline	20.8%	15.6%	23.6%	19.2%	22.7%	29.3%	8.9%	19%
Not willing to pay more	64.5%	45.4%	74.8%	58.9%	68.6%	60%	63.1%	65.6%
Unweighted Frequency	298	32	130	136	98	66	52	82
Weighted Frequency	298	32	132	134	70	73	48	107

broken out by ward

	Total	Ward					
		1	2	3	4	5	6
Pay more to improve	14.7%	2.2%	4.3%	10.4%	19.9%	25%	30.5%
Pay to prevent decline	20.8%	42.5%	12.3%	30.5%	11.5%	10.9%	4.6%
Not willing to pay more	64.5%	55.2%	83.4%	59.1%	68.6%	64.1%	64.9%
Unweighted Frequency	298	62	50	60	34	68	24
Weighted Frequency	298	69	41	47	34	69	38

Are you willing to pay more to improve a service or to prevent it from declining: Community Recreation (all respondents)



broken out by age, gender

	Total	Gender			Age		
		Male	Female	Non-Binary	18-49	50-64	65+
Pay more to improve	15.1%	10.3%	19.6%	20.4%	17.1%	9.9%	16.3%
Pay to prevent decline	24.9%	34.2%	16.2%	16.9%	26%	25.3%	22.1%
Not willing to pay more	60%	55.5%	64.2%	62.7%	56.8%	64.8%	61.6%
Unweighted Frequency	298	114	158	26	60	88	150
Weighted Frequency	298	144	153	1	149	74	74


broken out by education, income

	Total	Education			Income			
		HS or less	College/Trade School	University	<\$50k	\$50k-\$75k	\$75k-\$100k	\$100k+
Pay more to improve	15.1%	10.1%	5.9%	25.4%	6.3%	19%	2.5%	23.9%
Pay to prevent decline	24.9%	45.8%	26.9%	17.8%	23%	31.5%	36.8%	16.2%
Not willing to pay more	60%	44.1%	67.1%	56.8%	70.7%	49.5%	60.8%	59.9%
Unweighted Frequency	298	32	130	136	98	66	52	82
Weighted Frequency	298	32	132	134	70	73	48	107

broken out by ward

	Total	Ward					
		1	2	3	4	5	6
Pay more to improve	15.1%	25.1%	9.2%	16.9%	6.1%	11.4%	15.8%
Pay to prevent decline	24.9%	21.5%	37.2%	19.1%	11.5%	26.2%	34%
Not willing to pay more	60%	53.4%	53.6%	64%	82.3%	62.4%	50.2%
Unweighted Frequency	298	62	50	60	34	68	24
Weighted Frequency	298	69	41	47	34	69	38

Are you willing to pay more to improve a service or to prevent it from declining: Landfill and Garbage Trucks (all respondents)



broken out by age, gender

	Total	Gender			Age		
		Male	Female	Non-Binary	18-49	50-64	65+
Pay more to improve	7.9%	10.9%	5%	4.2%	10.9%	5.1%	4.6%
Pay to prevent decline	42.2%	43.4%	41.4%	4.2%	49.5%	19.8%	49.9%
Not willing to pay more	49.9%	45.6%	53.6%	91.5%	39.6%	75.1%	45.5%
Unweighted Frequency	298	114	158	26	60	88	150
Weighted Frequency	298	144	153	1	149	74	74


broken out by education, income

	Total	Education			Income			
		HS or less	College/Trade School	University	<\$50k	\$50k-\$75k	\$75k-\$100k	\$100k+
Pay more to improve	7.9%	3.7%	10.9%	5.9%	6.1%	17.2%	0%	6.2%
Pay to prevent decline	42.2%	53%	32.1%	49.6%	36.4%	40.6%	41.7%	47.3%
Not willing to pay more	49.9%	43.3%	57.1%	44.5%	57.6%	42.2%	58.3%	46.5%
Unweighted Frequency	298	32	130	136	98	66	52	82
Weighted Frequency	298	32	132	134	70	73	48	107

broken out by ward

	Total	Ward					
		1	2	3	4	5	6
Pay more to improve	7.9%	18.1%	0%	0%	0.2%	7.1%	15.8%
Pay to prevent decline	42.2%	49.5%	47.7%	40.5%	32%	42.2%	34%
Not willing to pay more	49.9%	32.4%	52.3%	59.5%	67.8%	50.7%	50.2%
Unweighted Frequency	298	62	50	60	34	68	24
Weighted Frequency	298	69	41	47	34	69	38

Are you willing to pay more to improve a service or to prevent it from declining: Wastewater (all respondents)



broken out by age, gender

	Total	Gender			Age		
		Male	Female	Non-Binary	18-49	50-64	65+
Pay more to improve	13.1%	16.5%	10.1%	0%	17.9%	7.5%	9%
Pay to prevent decline	43.5%	42.2%	45.1%	12.7%	52.8%	27.7%	40.8%
Not willing to pay more	43.3%	41.3%	44.8%	87.3%	29.2%	64.8%	50.1%
Unweighted Frequency	298	114	158	26	60	88	150
Weighted Frequency	298	144	153	1	149	74	74


broken out by education, income

	Total	Education			Income			
		HS or less	College/Trade School	University	<\$50k	\$50k-\$75k	\$75k-\$100k	\$100k+
Pay more to improve	13.1%	21.3%	11.7%	12.5%	7.7%	18.5%	24.5%	7.9%
Pay to prevent decline	43.5%	53%	38.4%	46.3%	38.3%	39.3%	40.1%	51.3%
Not willing to pay more	43.3%	25.6%	49.8%	41.2%	53.9%	42.2%	35.3%	40.8%
Unweighted Frequency	298	32	130	136	98	66	52	82
Weighted Frequency	298	32	132	134	70	73	48	107

broken out by ward

	Total	Ward					
		1	2	3	4	5	6
Pay more to improve	13.1%	24.1%	2.5%	2.2%	14.6%	5.6%	30.5%
Pay to prevent decline	43.5%	49.2%	51.4%	44.8%	22.9%	47.6%	34%
Not willing to pay more	43.3%	26.7%	46.2%	53%	62.5%	46.8%	35.5%
Unweighted Frequency	298	62	50	60	34	68	24
Weighted Frequency	298	69	41	47	34	69	38

Are you willing to allow a service to decline in order to improve another, or to save money: Arts, Cultural & Heritage (all respondents)



broken out by age, gender

	Total	Gender			Age		
		Male	Female	Non-Binary	18-49	50-64	65+
Yes	53.2%	65.1%	42.3%	22.2%	61.4%	45.2%	44.8%
No	46.8%	34.9%	57.7%	77.8%	38.6%	54.8%	55.2%
Unweighted Frequency	298	114	158	26	60	88	150
Weighted Frequency	298	144	153	1	149	74	74


broken out by education, income

	Total	Education			Income			
		HS or less	College/Trade School	University	<\$50k	\$50k-\$75k	\$75k-\$100k	\$100k+
Yes	53.2%	54.2%	67.2%	39.1%	54.4%	59.9%	41.6%	53%
No	46.8%	45.8%	32.8%	60.9%	45.6%	40.1%	58.4%	47%
Unweighted Frequency	298	32	130	136	98	66	52	82
Weighted Frequency	298	32	132	134	70	73	48	107

broken out by ward

	Total	Ward					
		1	2	3	4	5	6
Yes	53.2%	50.9%	63.5%	37.3%	57.2%	51.8%	64.5%
No	46.8%	49.1%	36.5%	62.7%	42.8%	48.2%	35.5%
Unweighted Frequency	298	62	50	60	34	68	24
Weighted Frequency	298	69	41	47	34	69	38

Are you willing to allow a service to decline in order to improve another, or to save money: Police Services (all respondents)



broken out by age, gender

	Total	Gender			Age		
		Male	Female	Non-Binary	18-49	50-64	65+
Yes	23.7%	24.7%	22.4%	49.2%	25.4%	27.7%	16%
No	76.3%	75.3%	77.6%	50.8%	74.6%	72.3%	84%
Unweighted Frequency	298	114	158	26	60	88	150
Weighted Frequency	298	144	153	1	149	74	74


broken out by education, income

	Total	Education			Income			
		HS or less	College/Trade School	University	<\$50k	\$50k-\$75k	\$75k-\$100k	\$100k+
Yes	23.7%	23.2%	20.6%	26.8%	19.6%	30.2%	28.6%	19.6%
No	76.3%	76.8%	79.4%	73.2%	80.4%	69.8%	71.4%	80.4%
Unweighted Frequency	298	32	130	136	98	66	52	82
Weighted Frequency	298	32	132	134	70	73	48	107

broken out by ward

	Total	Ward					
		1	2	3	4	5	6
Yes	23.7%	36.9%	6.7%	31.4%	5.3%	30.4%	12.7%
No	76.3%	63.1%	93.3%	68.6%	94.7%	69.6%	87.3%
Unweighted Frequency	298	62	50	60	34	68	24
Weighted Frequency	298	69	41	47	34	69	38

Are you willing to allow a service to decline in order to improve another, or to save money: Fire Services (all respondents)



broken out by age, gender

	Total	Gender			Age		
		Male	Female	Non-Binary	18-49	50-64	65+
Yes	16%	20.4%	11.9%	20.4%	18.2%	12.7%	15.1%
No	84%	79.6%	88.1%	79.6%	81.8%	87.3%	84.9%
Unweighted Frequency	298	114	158	26	60	88	150
Weighted Frequency	298	144	153	1	149	74	74


broken out by education, income

	Total	Education			Income			
		HS or less	College/Trade School	University	<\$50k	\$50k-\$75k	\$75k-\$100k	\$100k+
Yes	16%	26.9%	8.5%	20.9%	12.8%	22.3%	4.9%	18.8%
No	84%	73.1%	91.5%	79.1%	87.2%	77.7%	95.1%	81.2%
Unweighted Frequency	298	32	130	136	98	66	52	82
Weighted Frequency	298	32	132	134	70	73	48	107

broken out by ward

	Total	Ward					
		1	2	3	4	5	6
Yes	16%	13.3%	14.3%	14.7%	5.3%	27.8%	12.7%
No	84%	86.7%	85.7%	85.3%	94.7%	72.2%	87.3%
Unweighted Frequency	298	62	50	60	34	68	24
Weighted Frequency	298	69	41	47	34	69	38

Are you willing to allow a service to decline in order to improve another, or to save money: Community Recreation (all respondents)



broken out by age, gender

	Total	Gender			Age		
		Male	Female	Non-Binary	18-49	50-64	65+
Yes	44%	40.9%	46.7%	64%	45.6%	42.3%	42.4%
No	56%	59.1%	53.3%	36%	54.4%	57.7%	57.6%
Unweighted Frequency	298	114	158	26	60	88	150
Weighted Frequency	298	144	153	1	149	74	74


broken out by education, income

	Total	Education			Income			
		HS or less	College/Trade School	University	<\$50k	\$50k-\$75k	\$75k-\$100k	\$100k+
Yes	44%	44.1%	52.9%	35.2%	48.2%	59.5%	31.9%	36%
No	56%	55.9%	47.1%	64.8%	51.8%	40.5%	68.1%	64%
Unweighted Frequency	298	32	130	136	98	66	52	82
Weighted Frequency	298	32	132	134	70	73	48	107

broken out by ward

	Total	Ward					
		1	2	3	4	5	6
Yes	44%	45.9%	57.9%	57.1%	22.7%	41.8%	32.1%
No	56%	54.1%	42.1%	42.9%	77.3%	58.2%	67.9%
Unweighted Frequency	298	62	50	60	34	68	24
Weighted Frequency	298	69	41	47	34	69	38

Are you willing to allow a service to decline in order to improve another, or to save money: Transportation (all respondents)



broken out by age, gender

	Total	Gender			Age		
		Male	Female	Non-Binary	18-49	50-64	65+
Yes	19.9%	21.4%	18.3%	39.4%	28.5%	7.4%	15.2%
No	80.1%	78.6%	81.7%	60.6%	71.5%	92.6%	84.8%
Unweighted Frequency	298	114	158	26	60	88	150
Weighted Frequency	298	144	153	1	149	74	74


broken out by education, income

	Total	Education			Income			
		HS or less	College/Trade School	University	<\$50k	\$50k-\$75k	\$75k-\$100k	\$100k+
Yes	19.9%	0.3%	23.8%	20.7%	24.8%	11.8%	16.9%	23.7%
No	80.1%	99.7%	76.2%	79.3%	75.2%	88.2%	83.1%	76.3%
Unweighted Frequency	298	32	130	136	98	66	52	82
Weighted Frequency	298	32	132	134	70	73	48	107

broken out by ward

	Total	Ward					
		1	2	3	4	5	6
Yes	19.9%	18.6%	14.9%	16.5%	0.3%	23.7%	42.2%
No	80.1%	81.4%	85.1%	83.5%	99.7%	76.3%	57.8%
Unweighted Frequency	298	62	50	60	34	68	24
Weighted Frequency	298	69	41	47	34	69	38

Are you willing to allow a service to decline in order to improve another, or to save money: Social Services (all respondents)



broken out by age, gender

	Total	Gender			Age		
		Male	Female	Non-Binary	18-49	50-64	65+
Yes	40.8%	39.5%	42%	29.6%	45.7%	29.9%	41.6%
No	59.2%	60.5%	58%	70.4%	54.3%	70.1%	58.4%
Unweighted Frequency	298	114	158	26	60	88	150
Weighted Frequency	298	144	153	1	149	74	74


broken out by education, income

	Total	Education			Income			
		HS or less	College/Trade School	University	<\$50k	\$50k-\$75k	\$75k-\$100k	\$100k+
Yes	40.8%	32.2%	46.9%	36.7%	45.7%	26.9%	47.6%	44%
No	59.2%	67.8%	53.1%	63.3%	54.3%	73.1%	52.4%	56%
Unweighted Frequency	298	32	130	136	98	66	52	82
Weighted Frequency	298	32	132	134	70	73	48	107

broken out by ward

	Total	Ward					
		1	2	3	4	5	6
Yes	40.8%	34.1%	45.9%	42.5%	51.9%	42.6%	32.1%
No	59.2%	65.9%	54.1%	57.5%	48.1%	57.4%	67.9%
Unweighted Frequency	298	62	50	60	34	68	24
Weighted Frequency	298	69	41	47	34	69	38

Are you willing to allow a service to decline in order to improve another, or to save money: Water Resource Systems (all respondents)



broken out by age, gender

	Total	Gender			Age		
		Male	Female	Non-Binary	18-49	50-64	65+
Yes	23.2%	27.4%	19.3%	22.2%	32.1%	17.9%	10.8%
No	76.8%	72.6%	80.7%	77.8%	67.9%	82.1%	89.2%
Unweighted Frequency	298	114	158	26	60	88	150
Weighted Frequency	298	144	153	1	149	74	74


broken out by education, income

	Total	Education			Income			
		HS or less	College/Trade School	University	<\$50k	\$50k-\$75k	\$75k-\$100k	\$100k+
Yes	23.2%	39.3%	28.2%	14.5%	24.2%	21.1%	25.3%	23.1%
No	76.8%	60.7%	71.8%	85.5%	75.8%	78.9%	74.7%	76.9%
Unweighted Frequency	298	32	130	136	98	66	52	82
Weighted Frequency	298	32	132	134	70	73	48	107

broken out by ward

	Total	Ward					
		1	2	3	4	5	6
Yes	23.2%	5.7%	22.7%	6.3%	5.6%	31.7%	76.2%
No	76.8%	94.3%	77.3%	93.7%	94.4%	68.3%	23.8%
Unweighted Frequency	298	62	50	60	34	68	24
Weighted Frequency	298	69	41	47	34	69	38

Are you willing to allow a service to decline in order to improve another, or to save money: Transit (all respondents)



broken out by age, gender

	Total	Gender			Age		
		Male	Female	Non-Binary	18-49	50-64	65+
Yes	48%	56.6%	40%	42.6%	54%	37.7%	46.3%
No	52%	43.4%	60%	57.4%	46%	62.3%	53.7%
Unweighted Frequency	298	114	158	26	60	88	150
Weighted Frequency	298	144	153	1	149	74	74


broken out by education, income

	Total	Education			Income			
		HS or less	College/Trade School	University	<\$50k	\$50k-\$75k	\$75k-\$100k	\$100k+
Yes	48%	40.5%	61.3%	36.7%	40.7%	65.1%	40.3%	44.6%
No	52%	59.5%	38.7%	63.3%	59.3%	34.9%	59.7%	55.4%
Unweighted Frequency	298	32	130	136	98	66	52	82
Weighted Frequency	298	32	132	134	70	73	48	107

broken out by ward

	Total	Ward					
		1	2	3	4	5	6
Yes	48%	64%	42.6%	32.8%	24.3%	49.8%	61.5%
No	52%	36%	57.4%	67.2%	75.7%	50.2%	38.5%
Unweighted Frequency	298	62	50	60	34	68	24
Weighted Frequency	298	69	41	47	34	69	38

Are you willing to allow a service to decline in order to improve another, or to save money: Community Recreation (all respondents)



broken out by age, gender

	Total	Gender			Age		
		Male	Female	Non-Binary	18-49	50-64	65+
Yes	53%	58.1%	48.5%	26.4%	60.9%	47.2%	43.1%
No	47%	41.9%	51.5%	73.6%	39.1%	52.8%	56.9%
Unweighted Frequency	298	114	158	26	60	88	150
Weighted Frequency	298	144	153	1	149	74	74


broken out by education, income

	Total	Education			Income			
		HS or less	College/Trade School	University	<\$50k	\$50k-\$75k	\$75k-\$100k	\$100k+
Yes	53%	49.2%	67.6%	39.5%	45.1%	59.5%	63.6%	49.1%
No	47%	50.8%	32.4%	60.5%	54.9%	40.5%	36.4%	50.9%
Unweighted Frequency	298	32	130	136	98	66	52	82
Weighted Frequency	298	32	132	134	70	73	48	107

broken out by ward

	Total	Ward					
		1	2	3	4	5	6
Yes	53%	54.2%	55.1%	35.6%	46.5%	52.8%	76.2%
No	47%	45.8%	44.9%	64.4%	53.5%	47.2%	23.8%
Unweighted Frequency	298	62	50	60	34	68	24
Weighted Frequency	298	69	41	47	34	69	38

Are you willing to allow a service to decline in order to improve another, or to save money: Landfill and Garbage Trucks (all respondents)



broken out by age, gender

	Total	Gender			Age		
		Male	Female	Non-Binary	18-49	50-64	65+
Yes	20.3%	16.6%	23.7%	19%	24%	17.4%	15.6%
No	79.7%	83.4%	76.3%	81%	76%	82.6%	84.4%
Unweighted Frequency	298	114	158	26	60	88	150
Weighted Frequency	298	144	153	1	149	74	74


broken out by education, income

	Total	Education			Income			
		HS or less	College/Trade School	University	<\$50k	\$50k-\$75k	\$75k-\$100k	\$100k+
Yes	20.3%	4%	28.8%	15.6%	22.5%	15%	19.2%	22.8%
No	79.7%	96%	71.2%	84.4%	77.5%	85%	80.8%	77.2%
Unweighted Frequency	298	32	130	136	98	66	52	82
Weighted Frequency	298	32	132	134	70	73	48	107

broken out by ward

	Total	Ward					
		1	2	3	4	5	6
Yes	20.3%	8.6%	29.6%	16.9%	3.8%	21.8%	46.8%
No	79.7%	91.4%	70.4%	83.1%	96.2%	78.2%	53.2%
Unweighted Frequency	298	62	50	60	34	68	24
Weighted Frequency	298	69	41	47	34	69	38

Are you willing to allow a service to decline in order to improve another, or to save money: Wastewater (all respondents)



broken out by age, gender

	Total	Gender			Age		
		Male	Female	Non-Binary	18-49	50-64	65+
Yes	22.1%	25.9%	18.6%	14.8%	25%	20.1%	18.3%
No	77.9%	74.1%	81.4%	85.2%	75%	79.9%	81.7%
Unweighted Frequency	298	114	158	26	60	88	150
Weighted Frequency	298	144	153	1	149	74	74


broken out by education, income

	Total	Education			Income			
		HS or less	College/Trade School	University	<\$50k	\$50k-\$75k	\$75k-\$100k	\$100k+
Yes	22.1%	7.7%	31.2%	16.6%	22.5%	15%	31.5%	22.6%
No	77.9%	92.3%	68.8%	83.4%	77.5%	85%	68.5%	77.4%
Unweighted Frequency	298	32	130	136	98	66	52	82
Weighted Frequency	298	32	132	134	70	73	48	107

broken out by ward

	Total	Ward					
		1	2	3	4	5	6
Yes	22.1%	18.2%	22%	15.3%	5.3%	19.5%	56.9%
No	77.9%	81.8%	78%	84.7%	94.7%	80.5%	43.1%
Unweighted Frequency	298	62	50	60	34	68	24
Weighted Frequency	298	69	41	47	34	69	38

You have \$10 to spend on any of the service areas listed below, how would you allocate it: Arts, Cultural & Heritage (all respondents)



broken out by age, gender

	Total	Gender			Age		
		Male	Female	Non-Binary	18-49	50-64	65+
0	66.7%	72.2%	61.8%	30.7%	64.7%	62.3%	75.1%
1	20.9%	20.2%	21.7%	4.2%	25%	22.2%	11.4%
2	8.9%	5.9%	11.2%	60.9%	7%	15.6%	6.1%
3	0.7%	0.8%	0.7%	0%	0%	0%	2.9%
5	0.3%	0%	0.7%	0%	0%	0%	1.4%
6	0.4%	0.8%	0%	0%	0%	0%	1.6%
10	2%	0%	3.9%	4.2%	3.3%	0%	1.5%
Unweighted Frequency	298	114	158	26	60	88	150
Weighted Frequency	298	144	153	1	149	74	74


broken out by education, income

	Total	Education			Income			
		HS or less	College/Trade School	University	<\$50k	\$50k-\$75k	\$75k-\$100k	\$100k+
0	66.7%	64.7%	82%	52%	79.7%	68.5%	56.9%	61.3%
1	20.9%	35.3%	8.3%	30%	4.7%	19.7%	32.5%	27.2%
2	8.9%	0%	5.2%	14.7%	7%	10.4%	6%	10.4%
3	0.7%	0%	0%	1.6%	1.7%	1.4%	0%	0%
5	0.3%	0%	0.8%	0%	0%	0%	0%	0.9%
6	0.4%	0%	0%	0.9%	0%	0%	2.5%	0%
10	2%	0%	3.7%	0.8%	7%	0%	2.1%	0.1%
Unweighted Frequency	298	32	130	136	98	66	52	82
Weighted Frequency	298	32	132	134	70	73	48	107

broken out by ward

	Total	Ward					
		1	2	3	4	5	6
0	66.7%	68.3%	82.2%	53.1%	76.9%	68.8%	51.1%
1	20.9%	19%	11%	12.4%	17.6%	20.6%	48.9%
2	8.9%	11.2%	6.7%	21.5%	5.5%	6%	0%
3	0.7%	0%	0%	0%	0%	3.2%	0%
5	0.3%	1.5%	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%
6	0.4%	0%	0%	2.5%	0%	0%	0%
10	2%	0%	0%	10.5%	0%	1.5%	0%
Unweighted Frequency	298	62	50	60	34	68	24
Weighted Frequency	298	69	41	47	34	69	38

You have \$10 to spend on any of the service areas listed below, how would you allocate it: Police Services (all respondents)



broken out by age, gender

	Total	Gender			Age		
		Male	Female	Non-Binary	18-49	50-64	65+
0	37.8%	39.9%	35.5%	61.9%	42.9%	25.3%	40%
1	15.9%	14.6%	17.2%	11.6%	14.2%	25.1%	10.3%
2	16%	17.5%	14.8%	0%	11.4%	16.7%	24.7%
3	8.4%	10.9%	6.2%	0%	10.9%	7.5%	4.5%
4	7%	8.4%	5.7%	0%	7.1%	7.9%	5.9%
5	7%	2.5%	11.2%	14.8%	3.3%	9.8%	11.6%
6	1%	0.8%	1.2%	0%	0%	2.4%	1.6%
8	1.6%	0%	3.2%	0%	3.3%	0%	0%
10	5.2%	5.4%	5%	11.6%	7.1%	5.3%	1.5%
Unweighted Frequency	298	114	158	26	60	88	150
Weighted Frequency	298	144	153	1	149	74	74


broken out by education, income

	Total	Education			Income			
		HS or less	College/Trade School	University	<\$50k	\$50k-\$75k	\$75k-\$100k	\$100k+
0	37.8%	40.3%	43.4%	31.6%	39%	51.2%	39.6%	27%
1	15.9%	17.7%	6.1%	25.2%	11.2%	8.1%	34.7%	16%
2	16%	16.6%	9.2%	22.7%	10.2%	13%	5.8%	26.4%
3	8.4%	10.1%	10.2%	6.3%	5.9%	10.2%	2.1%	11.8%
4	7%	3.2%	12.5%	2.4%	14.1%	0%	11%	5.3%
5	7%	9.1%	11%	2.5%	16.7%	8.4%	2.5%	1.7%
6	1%	0%	0.9%	1.3%	0%	0%	0%	2.8%
8	1.6%	0%	0%	3.7%	0%	0%	0%	4.6%
10	5.2%	3.2%	6.7%	4.3%	2.8%	9.1%	4.3%	4.6%
Unweighted Frequency	298	32	130	136	98	66	52	82
Weighted Frequency	298	32	132	134	70	73	48	107

broken out by ward

	Total	Ward					
		1	2	3	4	5	6
0	37.8%	56.8%	12.6%	60.6%	19.1%	34.2%	25.5%
1	15.9%	10.8%	6.7%	19.1%	36.7%	12.2%	19.5%
2	16%	8.6%	32.4%	11.9%	31.2%	8.1%	17.8%
3	8.4%	12.2%	0%	2.5%	6.1%	9.7%	17.8%
4	7%	1.7%	12.1%	0%	3%	11.6%	14.7%
5	7%	4.3%	10.1%	5.9%	0%	13.3%	4.6%
6	1%	2.6%	0%	0%	3.5%	0%	0%
8	1.6%	0%	11.8%	0%	0%	0%	0%
10	5.2%	3%	14.3%	0%	0.3%	10.8%	0.2%
Unweighted Frequency	298	62	50	60	34	68	24
Weighted Frequency	298	69	41	47	34	69	38

You have \$10 to spend on any of the service areas listed below, how would you allocate it: Fire Services (all respondents)



broken out by age, gender

	Total	Gender			Age		
		Male	Female	Non-Binary	18-49	50-64	65+
0	36.6%	31.2%	41.7%	49%	31.3%	35.4%	48.7%
1	32.2%	32%	32.3%	36.2%	39.4%	32.2%	17.6%
2	17.1%	24.3%	10.5%	0%	15.2%	17.4%	20.6%
3	6.5%	7%	6.2%	0%	7.1%	7.5%	4.5%
4	1.7%	1.6%	1.8%	0%	0%	2.4%	4.5%
5	2.3%	0%	4.3%	14.8%	0%	5.1%	4.1%
10	3.5%	3.9%	3.2%	0%	7.1%	0%	0%
Unweighted Frequency	298	114	158	26	60	88	150
Weighted Frequency	298	144	153	1	149	74	74



broken out by education, income

	Total	Education			Income			
		HS or less	College/Trade School	University	<\$50k	\$50k-\$75k	\$75k-\$100k	\$100k+
0	36.6%	29.5%	41.7%	33.3%	42.8%	39.7%	38.6%	29.7%
1	32.2%	35.3%	21.6%	41.9%	24.4%	33.1%	24.4%	40.1%
2	17.1%	13.7%	14.7%	20.3%	7.1%	21%	18.4%	20.4%
3	6.5%	9.2%	12.5%	0%	14.3%	2.4%	4.3%	5.3%
4	1.7%	3.2%	2.2%	0.9%	5.7%	0%	2.5%	0%
5	2.3%	9.1%	3%	0%	5.8%	3.8%	0%	0%
10	3.5%	0%	4.3%	3.7%	0%	0%	11.8%	4.6%
Unweighted Frequency	298	32	130	136	98	66	52	82
Weighted Frequency	298	32	132	134	70	73	48	107

broken out by ward

	Total	Ward					
		1	2	3	4	5	6
0	36.6%	35.2%	32.1%	62%	37%	33.9%	17.5%
1	32.2%	39.5%	25.3%	17.7%	28.7%	47.7%	19.5%
2	17.1%	12%	22.8%	10.3%	31.3%	7.9%	32.5%
3	6.5%	2.6%	5%	6.3%	0%	8.6%	17.8%
4	1.7%	0%	7.1%	0%	3%	1.7%	0%
5	2.3%	2.6%	7.6%	3.8%	0%	0.2%	0%
10	3.5%	8.2%	0%	0%	0%	0%	12.7%
Unweighted Frequency	298	62	50	60	34	68	24
Weighted Frequency	298	69	41	47	34	69	38

You have \$10 to spend on any of the service areas listed below, how would you allocate it: Community Recreation (all respondents)



broken out by age, gender

	Total	Gender			Age		
		Male	Female	Non-Binary	18-49	50-64	65+
0	52.4%	46.5%	57.7%	79.9%	53.2%	44.5%	58.8%
1	21.9%	20.4%	23.4%	8.5%	21.2%	27%	18%
2	14%	17.4%	10.7%	11.6%	10.9%	21.1%	13%
3	2.9%	5.4%	0.7%	0%	3.8%	2.8%	1.4%
4	2.5%	3.9%	1.2%	0%	3.8%	2.4%	0%
5	3.2%	4.7%	1.8%	0%	3.8%	2.4%	2.9%
6	0.3%	0%	0.7%	0%	0%	0%	1.4%
10	2.8%	1.6%	3.9%	0%	3.3%	0%	4.5%
Unweighted Frequency	298	114	158	26	60	88	150
Weighted Frequency	298	144	153	1	149	74	74


broken out by education, income

	Total	Education			Income			
		HS or less	College/Trade School	University	<\$50k	\$50k-\$75k	\$75k-\$100k	\$100k+
0	52.4%	64.9%	62.2%	39.8%	62.4%	70.7%	45.7%	36.4%
1	21.9%	7.3%	10%	37.1%	22.9%	9.3%	21.1%	30%
2	14%	10.1%	11.8%	17%	10.1%	4.5%	20.6%	20%
3	2.9%	0%	5.8%	0.8%	1.5%	0%	4.3%	5.3%
4	2.5%	17.7%	1.3%	0%	0%	7.7%	3.7%	0%
5	3.2%	0%	6.4%	0.9%	0%	7.7%	4.6%	1.7%
6	0.3%	0%	0%	0.8%	0%	0%	0%	0.9%
10	2.8%	0%	2.5%	3.7%	3.1%	0%	0%	5.7%
Unweighted Frequency	298	32	130	136	98	66	52	82
Weighted Frequency	298	32	132	134	70	73	48	107

broken out by ward

	Total	Ward					
		1	2	3	4	5	6
0	52.4%	61%	61.2%	68%	34.1%	46.5%	35.3%
1	21.9%	17.4%	8.6%	12.4%	53.6%	27.5%	17.9%
2	14%	11.7%	18.6%	17.1%	9.3%	13.1%	14.7%
3	2.9%	0%	5%	0%	0%	1.5%	14.7%
4	2.5%	0%	4.3%	0%	0%	8.2%	0%
5	3.2%	8.2%	0%	0%	0%	3.2%	4.6%
6	0.3%	0%	0%	0%	3%	0%	0%
10	2.8%	1.7%	2.5%	2.5%	0%	0%	12.7%
Unweighted Frequency	298	62	50	60	34	68	24
Weighted Frequency	298	69	41	47	34	69	38

You have \$10 to spend on any of the service areas listed below, how would you allocate it: Transportation (all respondents)



broken out by age, gender

	Total	Gender			Age		
		Male	Female	Non-Binary	18-49	50-64	65+
0	38.3%	32.7%	43.2%	63.8%	42.2%	28.1%	40.6%
1	20.6%	26.6%	14.8%	28.9%	22.5%	19.8%	17.6%
2	19.5%	13.1%	25.7%	0%	13.6%	34.5%	16.3%
3	7.2%	10.9%	3.7%	7.4%	7.6%	7.7%	5.9%
4	2.6%	4.7%	0.7%	0%	3.8%	0%	2.9%
5	4.1%	3.1%	5%	0%	3.3%	5.1%	4.5%
6	0.6%	0%	1.2%	0%	0%	2.4%	0%
8	0.4%	0.8%	0%	0%	0%	0%	1.6%
10	6.8%	8%	5.7%	0%	7.1%	2.4%	10.6%
Unweighted Frequency	298	114	158	26	60	88	150
Weighted Frequency	298	144	153	1	149	74	74


broken out by education, income

	Total	Education			Income			
		HS or less	College/Trade School	University	<\$50k	\$50k-\$75k	\$75k-\$100k	\$100k+
0	38.3%	36.3%	45.9%	31.1%	40.3%	45.2%	38.3%	32.1%
1	20.6%	28.2%	6%	33.2%	12.1%	12.5%	18%	32.8%
2	19.5%	12.9%	16.7%	23.9%	28%	9.6%	24.4%	18.5%
3	7.2%	0%	8.2%	7.9%	5.4%	9.3%	4.3%	8.1%
4	2.6%	0%	5.9%	0%	1.5%	9.3%	0%	0%
5	4.1%	0%	8.2%	0.9%	1.5%	2.4%	6.8%	5.7%
6	0.6%	0%	0%	1.3%	0%	0%	3.7%	0%
8	0.4%	0%	0%	0.9%	0%	0%	0%	1.1%
10	6.8%	22.6%	9%	0.8%	11.2%	11.5%	4.6%	1.7%
Unweighted Frequency	298	32	130	136	98	66	52	82
Weighted Frequency	298	32	132	134	70	73	48	107

broken out by ward

	Total	Ward					
		1	2	3	4	5	6
0	38.3%	34.4%	53.7%	42.6%	15%	37.5%	45%
1	20.6%	7.7%	20.4%	15.4%	22.9%	18.5%	52%
2	19.5%	22.9%	20.2%	10%	48.1%	19.1%	0%
3	7.2%	10.9%	0%	0%	3.5%	18.5%	0%
4	2.6%	8.2%	0%	2.2%	0%	0%	3.1%
5	4.1%	7.1%	2.8%	4.4%	5.3%	3.2%	0%
6	0.6%	0%	0%	3.8%	0%	0%	0%
8	0.4%	0%	0%	2.5%	0%	0%	0%
10	6.8%	8.8%	2.8%	19.2%	5.3%	3.2%	0%
Unweighted Frequency	298	62	50	60	34	68	24
Weighted Frequency	298	69	41	47	34	69	38

You have \$10 to spend on any of the service areas listed below, how would you allocate it: Social Services (all respondents)



broken out by age, gender

	Total	Gender			Age		
		Male	Female	Non-Binary	18-49	50-64	65+
0	69.2%	64.4%	73.8%	62.7%	74.3%	62%	66.4%
1	14.8%	14.8%	14.9%	4.2%	14.2%	17.4%	13.4%
2	10.4%	18.5%	2.7%	12.7%	11.4%	8.3%	10.4%
3	3.5%	1.4%	5.3%	20.4%	0.2%	12.3%	1.4%
5	1%	0%	2%	0%	0%	0%	4.1%
10	1.1%	0.8%	1.3%	0%	0%	0%	4.3%
Unweighted Frequency	298	114	158	26	60	88	150
Weighted Frequency	298	144	153	1	149	74	74


broken out by education, income

	Total	Education			Income			
		HS or less	College/Trade School	University	<\$50k	\$50k-\$75k	\$75k-\$100k	\$100k+
0	69.2%	71.3%	75%	63%	70.3%	59.6%	75.4%	72.3%
1	14.8%	7.3%	12.6%	18.8%	12.3%	23.5%	8.3%	13.4%
2	10.4%	21.3%	7.5%	10.6%	9.1%	13.8%	12%	8.1%
3	3.5%	0%	2.7%	5.2%	4%	0%	4.3%	5.3%
5	1%	0%	1.5%	0.8%	1.5%	1.4%	0%	0.9%
10	1.1%	0%	0.8%	1.6%	2.9%	1.6%	0%	0%
Unweighted Frequency	298	32	130	136	98	66	52	82
Weighted Frequency	298	32	132	134	70	73	48	107

broken out by ward

	Total	Ward					
		1	2	3	4	5	6
0	69.2%	65.2%	83.7%	66.2%	96.8%	66.7%	45%
1	14.8%	15.9%	6.7%	16.9%	3%	20.2%	19.5%
2	10.4%	13%	0%	6.6%	0.2%	7.5%	35.5%
3	3.5%	3%	4.3%	5.9%	0%	5.6%	0%
5	1%	1.5%	2.5%	2.2%	0%	0%	0%
10	1.1%	1.5%	2.8%	2.2%	0%	0%	0%
Unweighted Frequency	298	62	50	60	34	68	24
Weighted Frequency	298	69	41	47	34	69	38

You have \$10 to spend on any of the service areas listed below, how would you allocate it: Water Resource Systems (all respondents)



broken out by age, gender

	Total	Gender			Age		
		Male	Female	Non-Binary	18-49	50-64	65+
0	61.3%	65%	57.8%	46.5%	60.9%	52.9%	70.3%
1	35.7%	34.1%	37.1%	33.1%	35.6%	44.8%	26.7%
2	3%	0.8%	5%	0%	3.3%	2.4%	2.9%
3	0.1%	0%	0%	20.4%	0.2%	0%	0%
Unweighted Frequency	298	114	158	26	60	88	150
Weighted Frequency	298	144	153	1	149	74	74



broken out by education, income

	Total	Education			Income			
		HS or less	College/Trade School	University	<\$50k	\$50k-\$75k	\$75k-\$100k	\$100k+
0	61.3%	73.9%	79.6%	40.1%	68.3%	71.5%	72.4%	44.6%
1	35.7%	26.1%	13.7%	59.7%	24.7%	25.1%	27.6%	53.7%
2	3%	0%	6.7%	0%	7%	3%	0%	1.7%
3	0.1%	0%	0%	0.2%	0%	0.4%	0%	0%
Unweighted Frequency	298	32	130	136	98	66	52	82
Weighted Frequency	298	32	132	134	70	73	48	107

broken out by ward

	Total	Ward					
		1	2	3	4	5	6
0	61.3%	59.4%	55.8%	64.2%	32%	59.7%	95.2%
1	35.7%	40.6%	41.8%	35.1%	62.7%	31.5%	4.8%
2	3%	0%	2.5%	0%	5.3%	8.9%	0%
3	0.1%	0%	0%	0.6%	0%	0%	0%
Unweighted Frequency	298	62	50	60	34	68	24
Weighted Frequency	298	69	41	47	34	69	38

You have \$10 to spend on any of the service areas listed below, how would you allocate it: Transit (all respondents)



broken out by age, gender

	Total	Gender			Age		
		Male	Female	Non-Binary	18-49	50-64	65+
0	74.7%	78.2%	71.6%	62.7%	74.8%	68.3%	81.1%
1	19.5%	17.9%	20.9%	28.9%	18.2%	27%	14.7%
2	4.5%	3.9%	5%	4.2%	7.1%	2.4%	1.5%
3	0.4%	0%	0.7%	4.2%	0%	0%	1.5%
10	0.9%	0%	1.8%	0%	0%	2.4%	1.4%
Unweighted Frequency	298	114	158	26	60	88	150
Weighted Frequency	298	144	153	1	149	74	74


broken out by education, income

	Total	Education			Income			
		HS or less	College/Trade School	University	<\$50k	\$50k-\$75k	\$75k-\$100k	\$100k+
0	74.7%	57.3%	93.3%	60.5%	80.3%	83.8%	69.5%	67.2%
1	19.5%	25%	4.6%	32.9%	14.2%	8.4%	18%	31.1%
2	4.5%	17.7%	0%	5.8%	1.5%	7.8%	10.2%	1.7%
3	0.4%	0%	0.8%	0%	1.5%	0%	0.1%	0%
10	0.9%	0%	1.3%	0.8%	2.5%	0%	2.1%	0%
Unweighted Frequency	298	32	130	136	98	66	52	82
Weighted Frequency	298	32	132	134	70	73	48	107

broken out by ward

	Total	Ward					
		1	2	3	4	5	6
0	74.7%	88.1%	91.4%	81.5%	32.6%	63.9%	80.5%
1	19.5%	11.8%	4.3%	16.3%	47.3%	24.9%	19.5%
2	4.5%	0%	4.3%	0%	14.8%	9.7%	0%
3	0.4%	0.1%	0%	0%	0%	1.5%	0%
10	0.9%	0%	0%	2.2%	5.3%	0%	0%
Unweighted Frequency	298	62	50	60	34	68	24
Weighted Frequency	298	69	41	47	34	69	38

You have \$10 to spend on any of the service areas listed below, how would you allocate it: Community Recreation (all respondents)



broken out by age, gender

	Total	Gender			Age		
		Male	Female	Non-Binary	18-49	50-64	65+
0	68.2%	63.3%	73.1%	46.5%	63.2%	72.7%	73.9%
1	26.7%	34.5%	19.2%	49.2%	33.5%	22.2%	17.6%
2	5%	2.2%	7.7%	0%	3.3%	5.1%	8.4%
10	0%	0%	0%	4.2%	0%	0%	0.1%
Unweighted Frequency	298	114	158	26	60	88	150
Weighted Frequency	298	144	153	1	149	74	74


broken out by education, income

	Total	Education			Income			
		HS or less	College/Trade School	University	<\$50k	\$50k-\$75k	\$75k-\$100k	\$100k+
0	68.2%	61%	79.5%	58.8%	83.4%	59.2%	73.2%	62.3%
1	26.7%	39%	15.3%	35.1%	12.1%	32.7%	16.4%	36.8%
2	5%	0%	5.2%	6.1%	4.4%	8.1%	10.4%	0.9%
10	0%	0%	0%	0%	0.1%	0%	0%	0%
Unweighted Frequency	298	32	130	136	98	66	52	82
Weighted Frequency	298	32	132	134	70	73	48	107

broken out by ward

	Total	Ward					
		1	2	3	4	5	6
0	68.2%	68.4%	84.5%	65.2%	60.3%	65.6%	65.8%
1	26.7%	31.6%	11%	17.5%	33.7%	29.9%	34.2%
2	5%	0%	4.3%	17.2%	6.1%	4.5%	0%
10	0%	0%	0.2%	0%	0%	0%	0%
Unweighted Frequency	298	62	50	60	34	68	24
Weighted Frequency	298	69	41	47	34	69	38

You have \$10 to spend on any of the service areas listed below, how would you allocate it: Landfill and Garbage Trucks (all respondents)



broken out by age, gender

	Total	Gender			Age		
		Male	Female	Non-Binary	18-49	50-64	65+
0	60.4%	53.3%	67.2%	39.1%	59.9%	54.7%	67%
1	32.7%	36.9%	28.4%	60.9%	36.3%	32.2%	25.8%
2	4.1%	5.9%	2.5%	0%	0%	10.6%	5.9%
5	2.5%	3.9%	1.2%	0%	3.8%	2.4%	0%
10	0.3%	0%	0.7%	0%	0%	0%	1.4%
Unweighted Frequency	298	114	158	26	60	88	150
Weighted Frequency	298	144	153	1	149	74	74


broken out by education, income

	Total	Education			Income			
		HS or less	College/Trade School	University	<\$50k	\$50k-\$75k	\$75k-\$100k	\$100k+
0	60.4%	80.7%	70.8%	45.1%	74%	51.9%	66.2%	54.6%
1	32.7%	7.3%	18.7%	52.6%	18.9%	33.5%	27.4%	43.4%
2	4.1%	12%	4.9%	1.5%	5.7%	4.4%	6.4%	1.9%
5	2.5%	0%	5.6%	0%	0%	10.2%	0%	0%
10	0.3%	0%	0%	0.8%	1.5%	0%	0%	0%
Unweighted Frequency	298	32	130	136	98	66	52	82
Weighted Frequency	298	32	132	134	70	73	48	107

broken out by ward

	Total	Ward					
		1	2	3	4	5	6
0	60.4%	49.8%	69%	63.3%	26.5%	60.8%	95.2%
1	32.7%	36.1%	28.1%	30.8%	62.1%	34.5%	4.8%
2	4.1%	5.9%	2.8%	3.8%	6.1%	4.7%	0%
5	2.5%	8.2%	0%	0%	5.3%	0%	0%
10	0.3%	0%	0%	2.2%	0%	0%	0%
Unweighted Frequency	298	62	50	60	34	68	24
Weighted Frequency	298	69	41	47	34	69	38

You have \$10 to spend on any of the service areas listed below, how would you allocate it: Wastewater (all respondents)



broken out by age, gender

	Total	Gender			Age		
		Male	Female	Non-Binary	18-49	50-64	65+
0	64%	59.4%	68.4%	50.8%	56.6%	65.2%	77.4%
1	27.9%	28.2%	27.3%	49.2%	35.8%	24.6%	15.3%
2	7.4%	11.5%	3.7%	0%	7.6%	10.3%	4.3%
10	0.7%	0.8%	0.7%	0%	0%	0%	2.9%
Unweighted Frequency	298	114	158	26	60	88	150
Weighted Frequency	298	144	153	1	149	74	74

broken out by education, income

	Total	Education			Income			
		HS or less	College/Trade School	University	<\$50k	\$50k-\$75k	\$75k-\$100k	\$100k+
0	64%	57.3%	77%	52.6%	77.9%	55.9%	61.8%	61.2%
1	27.9%	25%	13%	43.3%	20.4%	28.3%	16.2%	37.7%
2	7.4%	17.7%	9.3%	3.2%	0%	14.4%	22%	1.1%
10	0.7%	0%	0.8%	0.9%	1.7%	1.4%	0%	0%
Unweighted Frequency	298	32	130	136	98	66	52	82
Weighted Frequency	298	32	132	134	70	73	48	107

broken out by ward

	Total	Ward					
		1	2	3	4	5	6
0	64%	61.5%	70%	70.2%	65.4%	48.4%	80.7%
1	27.9%	17.5%	25.1%	29.8%	31.6%	49.9%	4.6%
2	7.4%	21%	4.9%	0%	0%	0%	14.7%
10	0.7%	0%	0%	0%	3%	1.7%	0%
Unweighted Frequency	298	62	50	60	34	68	24
Weighted Frequency	298	69	41	47	34	69	38