Fairbank,
Maslin,
Maullin,
Metz &
Associates
FM3

# PLACER COUNTY TRANSPORTATION ISSUES SURVEY 220-3641-WT

N=501

MARGIN OF SAMPLING ERROR ±4.4% (95% CONFIDENCE INTERVAL)

1.	_	know if I have reached you on a cell phone ely without endangering yourself or others?	The state of the s
		Yes, cell and in safe placeYes, cell not in safe placeNo, not on cell	TERMINATE
		(DON'T READ) DK/NA/REFUSED	
2.	me if you vote in every elect	several different types of elections. After I tion of that type, most of them, some, a few of first one( <b>READ LIST; DO NOT ROTA</b> <u>EVERY MOST SOME</u>	or if you never vote in that (TE)
[ ]a.	Statewide November general elections for Governor, Congress and the state		TERMTERM TERM.
	10515141410	01/0 13/0 3/0	IEMVI. IEMVI. IEMVI.
[ ]b.	Statewide June primary elections for Governor, Congress and the state	7204 1804 704	00/ 20/ 00/
[ ]b.	elections for Governor, Congress and the state legislature Special elections for local ba	72%18%7% allot 57%23%13%	
	elections for Governor, Congress and the state legislature Special elections for local ba measures	er County are generally headed in the right	4% 0%

4. Now, I am going to read you a list of names of some institutions that are often in the public eye. After I mention each one, please tell me if your overall impression of the institution is favorable or unfavorable. If you don't recognize any of them, just say so. Here's the first one: (IF FAVORABLE/UNFAVORABLE, ASK:) "Is that very or just somewhat?" (RANDOMIZE)

		VERY FAV	SMWT FAV	SMWT UNFAV	VERY UNFAV	NEVER HEARD <u>OF</u>	(CAN'T RATE/ <u>DK)</u>	TOT FAV	TOT <u>UNFAV</u>
[ ]a.	The Placer County Board of Supervisors	11%	45%	12%	3%	10%	20%	55%	15%
[ ]b.	The Placer County Transportation Planning								
	Agency							31%	12%
[ ]c.	Your local City Council	18%	39%	10%	5%	8%	21%	57%	15%

5. In general, how would you rate the County's need for additional funding? Is there a great need for additional funding, some need, a little need or no real need for additional funding? (**READ RESPONSES AND RECORD**)

<b>GREAT/SOME NEED61%</b>
Great need 20%
Some need41%
LITTLE/NO REAL NEED31%
Little need, or 11%
No real need 20%
( <b>DON'T READ</b> ) Don't know8%

6. More specifically, how would you rate the need for additional funding to maintain and improve transportation infrastructure, including local streets, regional roadways, and public transit, and reduce traffic congestion and improve road safety throughout the County? Is there a great need for additional funding, some need, a little need or no real need for additional funding? (**READ RESPONSES AND RECORD**)

GREAT/SOME NEED	· <b>70%</b>
Great need	27%
Some need	43%
LITTLE/NO REAL NEED	· <b>29%</b>
Little need, or	- 13%
No real need	16%
(DON'T READ) Don't know	1%

7. I'd like to read you a brief list of issues that could be problems for people living in your local area. After you hear each one, please tell me whether you personally consider it to be an extremely serious problem, a very serious problem, a somewhat serious problem, or not too serious a problem at all for people living in your area. (RANDOMIZE)

		EXT SER	VERY SER	SMWT SER	`	(DON'T READ) DK/	EXT/ VERY SER
		PROB	PROB	PROB	PROB	NA	<u>PROB</u>
[ ]a.	Traffic congestion	8%	17%	39%	36%	0%	24%
[ ]b.	The quality of public education						39%
[ ]c.	The amount you pay in taxes						34%
[ ]d.	Government waste and mismanagement	26%	24%	27%	19%	4%	50%
[ ]e.	Crime	6%	13%	44%	36%	1%	19%
[ ]f.	Air pollution	8%	14%	36%	42%	0%	22%
[ ]g.	Too much growth and development	8%	11%	33%	47%	1%	19%
[ ]h.	Injury-causing accidents on local roads and						
	highways						19%
[ ]i.	A lack of reliable public transit options	8%	15%	26%	39%	- 11%	23%
(SPLI	T SAMPLE A ONLY)						
[ ]j.	Deteriorating streets and roads						24%
[ ]k.	Jobs and unemployment						53%
[]1.	Global warming	16%	18%	24%	38%	4%	34%
[ ]m.	Reductions in state and federal funding for						
	transportation	8%	15%	35%	29%	- 12%	23%
(SPLI	T SAMPLE B ONLY)						
[ ]n.	Potholes on local streets and roadways						20%
[ ]o.	The condition of the local economy						32%
[ ]p.	Climate change	12%	13%	16%	55%	4%	25%
[ ]q.	The impact of state budget cuts on funding						
	for local services	13%	28%	29%	25%	6%	41%

NEXT I WOULD LIKE TO GIVE YOU SOME INFORMATION ABOUT REGIONAL TRANSPORTATION ISSUES.

THE PLACER COUNTY TRANSPORTATION PLANNING AGENCY IS ASSESSING THE CONDITION OF THE COUNTY'S TRANSPORTATION INFRASTRUCTURE AND EVALUATING LOCAL AND REGIONAL TRANSPORTATION IMPROVEMENT NEEDS. THE AGENCY HAS IDENTIFIED APPROXIMATELY ONE BILLION DOLLARS IN NEEDED IMPROVEMENTS FOR THE REGION OVER THE NEXT FEW YEARS.

8. I'm going to read you some a list of the objectives of the transportation improvement projects identified by the Placer County Transportation Planning Agency. After you hear each one, please tell me how important that objective is to you as a resident of Placer County: extremely important, very important, somewhat important, or not important. (**RANDOMIZE**)

		EXT IMP	VERY IMP	SMWT IMP	NOT <u>IMP</u>	(DON'T READ) <u>DK/NA</u>	EXT/ VERY <u>IMP</u>
[ ]a.	Fixing potholes, resurfacing roads, adding shoulders and maintaining and improving	210/	250/	2.40/	100/	10/	550/
[ ]b.	road surfaces countywide Improving the availability and capacity for dial-a-ride transit service for seniors	- 21%	33%	34%	10%	1%	55%
[ ]c.	and the disabled Making improvements to reduce the impact of trains on local roads and	- 17%	31%	31%	16%	5%	48%
	adjoining neighborhoods, including constructing overpasses and quiet zones						21%
[ ]d. [ ]e.	Reducing traffic congestion Promoting increased use of Capitol Corridor/Amtrack rail service to reduce	- 15%	28%	38%	18%	1%	43%
	the reliance on cars	- 16%	24%	34%	22%	3%	41%
[ ]f.	Expanding public transit	- 14%	24%	33%	25%	4%	38%
[ ]g. [ ]h.	Improving safety on streets and roads Making Placer County eligible for its fair share of state and federal transporation	- 16%	30%	37%	15%	1%	46%
[ ]i.	funds Widening roadways and reconfiguring highway interchanges to relieve traffic	- 27%	35%	26%	10%	2%	62%
	congestion and improve safety	- 14%	28%	40%	18%	1%	42%

(DON'T

READ)

NOT

VERY SMWT

**EXT** 

EXT/

**VERY** 

(07)		EXT IMP	VERY <u>IMP</u>	SMWT <u>IMP</u>	NOT <u>IMP</u>	(DON'T READ) <u>DK/NA</u>	EXT/ VERY <u>IMP</u>
•	T SAMPLE A ONLY)						
[ ]j.	Improving access between Tahoe City,	407	1.1.07	2224	1001	1.10/	150/
F 31	Truckee, and Kings Beach	4%	11%	32%	43%	11%	15%
[ ]k.	Providing safe routes for bicyclists and	40	2	2221		4.5.	<b>-</b> 40 /
	pedestrians	- 19%	35%	33%	11%	I%	54%
[]1.	Improving traffic flow and reducing						
	traffic congestion by adding traffic	<b>=</b> 0.4	1.60/	2 501	100/	201	0.10 /
	signals to local streets and roadways	5%	16%	36%	40%	3%	21%
(CDI I	UD CLAMDI E D. ONI V.)						
•	IT SAMPLE B ONLY)						
[ ]m.	Investing in transportation projects that						
	reduce pollution that causes global	1.00/	200/	260/	220/	20/	200/
r 1	warming						38%
[]n.	Building new bike lanes	- 11%	19%	33%	35%	1%	30%
[ ]o.	Providing safe routes to school for children	200/	270/	220/	120/	20/	6.10/
	children	- 28%	3/%	22%	12%	2%	64%
(RES	UME ASKING ALL RESPONDENTS)						
9.	Next I would like to read you a short list of sor	ne more	e specific	transporta	ation imp	rovement	projects
	that might be funded with local taxpayer doll	ars. A	fter you	hear each	one, pl	ease tell	me how
	important that project is to you as a resident of	Placer	County: 6	extremely	importar	nt, very in	nportant,
	somewhat important, or not important. (RANDO	MIZE)		_		•	
	somewhat important, or not important. (RANDO	MIZE)		·		·	
	somewhat important, or not important. (RANDO	·		G2 533/F	Nom	(DON'T	EXT/
	somewhat important, or not important. (RANDO	EXT	VERY	SMWT	NOT	READ)	EXT/ VERY
	somewhat important, or not important. (RANDO	·		SMWT IMP	NOT <u>IMP</u>	,	EXT/
[ ]a.		EXT	VERY			READ)	EXT/ VERY
[ ]a.	Reconfiguring the I-80/S-R 65 interchange to	EXT IMP	VERY <u>IMP</u>	<u>IMP</u>	<u>IMP</u>	READ) DK/NA	EXT/ VERY <u>IMP</u>
	Reconfiguring the I-80/S-R 65 interchange to add capacity and relieve traffic congestion	EXT IMP	VERY <u>IMP</u>	<u>IMP</u>	<u>IMP</u>	READ) DK/NA	EXT/ VERY
[ ]a. [ ]b.	Reconfiguring the I-80/S-R 65 interchange to add capacity and relieve traffic congestionReconfiguring the I-80/Rocklin interchange and	EXT IMP	VERY <u>IMP</u>	<u>IMP</u>	<u>IMP</u>	READ) DK/NA	EXT/ VERY <u>IMP</u>
	Reconfiguring the I-80/S-R 65 interchange to add capacity and relieve traffic congestion	EXT IMP - 23%	VERY <u>IMP</u> 32%	<u>IMP</u> 29%	<u>IMP</u> 14%	READ) <u>DK/NA</u> 2%	EXT/ VERY IMP
[ ]b.	Reconfiguring the I-80/S-R 65 interchange to add capacity and relieve traffic congestion	EXT IMP - 23%	VERY <u>IMP</u> 32%	<u>IMP</u> 29%	<u>IMP</u> 14%	READ) <u>DK/NA</u> 2%	EXT/ VERY <u>IMP</u>
	Reconfiguring the I-80/S-R 65 interchange to add capacity and relieve traffic congestion	EXT IMP - 23%	VERY <u>IMP</u> 32%	<u>IMP</u> 29%	<u>IMP</u> 14%	READ) <u>DK/NA</u> 2%	EXT/ VERY IMP
[ ]b.	Reconfiguring the I-80/S-R 65 interchange to add capacity and relieve traffic congestion	EXT IMP - 23%	VERY <u>IMP</u> 32%	<u>IMP</u> 29%	<u>IMP</u> 14% 23%	READ) DK/NA	EXT/ VERY IMP 56%
[ ]b.	Reconfiguring the I-80/S-R 65 interchange to add capacity and relieve traffic congestion	EXT IMP - 23%	VERY <u>IMP</u> 32%	<u>IMP</u> 29%	<u>IMP</u> 14% 23%	READ) DK/NA	EXT/ VERY IMP
[ ]b.	Reconfiguring the I-80/S-R 65 interchange to add capacity and relieve traffic congestion	EXT IMP	VERY <u>IMP</u> 32% 24%	<u>IMP</u> 29% 40%	<u>IMP</u> 14% 23% 36%	READ) <u>DK/NA</u> 2% 3%	EXT/ VERY IMP 56% 35%
[]b. []c. []d.	Reconfiguring the I-80/S-R 65 interchange to add capacity and relieve traffic congestion	EXT IMP	VERY <u>IMP</u> 32% 24%	<u>IMP</u> 29% 40%	<u>IMP</u> 14% 23% 36%	READ) <u>DK/NA</u> 2% 3%	EXT/ VERY IMP 56%
[ ]b.	Reconfiguring the I-80/S-R 65 interchange to add capacity and relieve traffic congestion	EXT IMP	VERY <u>IMP</u> 32% 24%	<u>IMP</u> 29% 40%	<u>IMP</u> 14% 23% 36%	READ) <u>DK/NA</u> 2% 3%	EXT/ VERY IMP 56% 35%
[]b. []c. []d.	Reconfiguring the I-80/S-R 65 interchange to add capacity and relieve traffic congestion	EXT IMP - 23% 11% 11%	VERY IMP 32% 24% 8%	<u>IMP</u> 29%29%25%	<u>IMP</u> 14% 23% 36% 28%	READ) DK/NA2%3%3%	EXT/ VERY IMP 56% 35% 12% 34%
[ ]b. [ ]c. [ ]d. [ ]e.	Reconfiguring the I-80/S-R 65 interchange to add capacity and relieve traffic congestion	EXT IMP - 23% 11% 11%	VERY IMP 32% 24% 8%	<u>IMP</u> 29%29%25%	<u>IMP</u> 14% 23% 36% 28%	READ) DK/NA2%3%3%	EXT/ VERY IMP 56% 35%
[]b. []c. []d.	Reconfiguring the I-80/S-R 65 interchange to add capacity and relieve traffic congestion	EXT IMP - 23% 11% 11% 11%	VERY IMP 32% 24% 22% 15%	<u>IMP</u> 29%29%35%	<u>IMP</u> 14%23%36%36%	READ) <u>DK/NA</u> 2%3%3%11%	EXT/ VERY IMP 56% 35% 12% 34%
[ ]b. [ ]c. [ ]d. [ ]e. [ ]f.	Reconfiguring the I-80/S-R 65 interchange to add capacity and relieve traffic congestion Reconfiguring the I-80/Rocklin interchange and surrounding intersections on Rocklin Road to relieve traffic congestion	EXT IMP - 23% 11% 11% 11%	VERY IMP 32% 24% 22% 15%	<u>IMP</u> 29%29%35%	<u>IMP</u> 14%23%36%36%	READ) <u>DK/NA</u> 2%3%3%11%	EXT/ VERY IMP 56% 35% 12% 34%
[ ]b. [ ]c. [ ]d. [ ]e.	Reconfiguring the I-80/S-R 65 interchange to add capacity and relieve traffic congestion	EXT IMP - 23% 11% 11% 11%	VERY IMP 32% 24% 22% 15%	<u>IMP</u> 29%29%35%	<u>IMP</u> 14%23%36%36%	READ) <u>DK/NA</u> 2%3%3%11%	EXT/ VERY IMP 56% 35% 12% 34%
[ ]b. [ ]c. [ ]d. [ ]e. [ ]f.	Reconfiguring the I-80/S-R 65 interchange to add capacity and relieve traffic congestion	EXT IMP - 23% 11% 11% 11%	VERY IMP 32% 24% 22% 15%	<u>IMP</u> 29%29%35%	<u>IMP</u> 14%23%36%36%	READ) <u>DK/NA</u> 2%3%3%11%	EXT/ VERY IMP 56% 35% 12% 34%
[ ]b. [ ]c. [ ]d. [ ]e. [ ]f.	Reconfiguring the I-80/S-R 65 interchange to add capacity and relieve traffic congestion	EXT IMP  - 23% 11% 11% 10%	VERY IMP 32% 24% 22% 15%	<u>IMP</u> 29%29%35%30%	<u>IMP</u> 14% 23% 36% 36% 36%	READ) DK/NA2%3%3%11%7%	EXT/ VERY IMP 56% 35% 12% 34%

FAIRBANK, MASLIN, MAULLIN, METZ & ASSOCIAT		ΓES	220-3641-WT			PAGE 6	
		<u>IMP</u>	<u>IMP</u>	<u>IMP</u>	<u>IMP</u>	DK/NA	<u>IMP</u>
[ ]h.	Widening the undercrossing of the Union Pacific railroad on S-R 89 just south of Truckee to improve access to North Lake Tahoe from I-80		- 10%	32%	43%	9%	15%
[ ]i.	Adding an express bus system to connect from Watt Avenue at I-80 through western Placer	5,0	10,0	52,0	.670	270	10,0
	County to downtown Roseville		- 21%	34%	32%	4%	30%
[ ]j.	Extending light rail from Watt Avenue at I-80 to		• • • •			•	1007
	Roseville	- 20%	- 29%	27%	22%	2%	49%
[ ]k.	Reconfiguring the I-80/Horseshoe Road						
	interchange to improve ramps to and from I-80,						
	as well as widening the Horseshoe Bar Road	<b>5</b> 04	1.10/	2501	100/	<b>50</b> /	1007
	overcrossing	7/%	- 11%	35%	42%	6%	18%
[]1.	Providing year-round transit service at shorter	407	0.04	2004	4.407	100/	1.407
	intervals throughout the North Lake Tahoe area-	4%	9%	29%	44%	13%	14%
[ ]m.	Improving safety and circulation on S-R 49						
	between I-80 and the Nevada County line,						

10. Many of these projects and improvements I just described to you are beyond the scope of the County's existing budget and may require additional funding through a local voter-approved tax measure. Based on what you've heard, do you think you would support or oppose a tax measure to fund some group of these transportation improvement projects? (**IF SUPPORT/OPPOSE, ASK:** "Is that strongly or just somewhat?")

traffic signals ------ 11% ---- 20% ----- 32% ----- 6%

including bike lanes and sidewalks and adding

<b>TOTAL SUPPORT54%</b> Strongly support 17% Somewhat support 37%
TOTAL OPPOSE
(DON'T READ) Don't know3%

31%

11. Regardless of how the measure was structured, would your household be willing to pay \_\_\_\_\_ in additional taxes if it were dedicated to the types of infrastructure repairs and improvements for Placer County we have been discussing? (IF WILLING/UNWILLING, ASK:) "Would that be very WILLING/UNWILLING, to pay that amount, or just somewhat?" (SPLIT SAMPLE A READ TOP TO BOTTOM, SPLIT SAMPLE B READ BOTTOM TO TOP)

		VERY WILL	SMWT WILL	SMWT UNWL	VERY UNWL	(DON'T READ) <u>DK/NA</u>	TOT WILL	TOT <u>UNWL</u>
[ ]a.	100 dollars per year	17%	22%	12%	48%	1%	39%	60%
[ ]b.	50 dollars per year	30%	18%	12%	38%	2%	48%	50%
[ ]c.	20 dollars per year	42%	20%	10%	28%	2%	61%	37%
[ ]d.	10 dollars per year	52%	20%	5%	21%	2%	71%	27%

12. Finally, I am going to read you a list of several methods that might be used to raise money to fund the types of transportation improvements we have been discussing. After you hear each one, please tell me if you would support or oppose using that particular way of raising new revenue for these purposes. FIRST/NEXT, would you support or oppose\_\_\_\_(RANDOMIZE) (IF SUPPORT/OPPOSE, ASK:) "Is that strongly SUPPORT/OPPOSE or just somewhat?"

		STRG SUPP	SMWT SUPP	SMWT OPP	STRG OPP	(DON'T READ) <u>DK/NA</u>	TOT SUPP	TOT <u>OPP</u>
[ ]a.	Issuing bonds, allowing the County to borrow money to complete the projects and pay it back over time with money from local property							
	taxes	16%	31%	14%	37%	2%	47%	51%
[ ]b.	Increasing the transient occupancy tax, charged to hotel and motel guests, by two percent	18%	30%	17%	31%	3%	49%	48%
[ ]c.	Establishing a half-percent local sales tax, paid by anyone who shops							
	in Placer County	13%	24%	14%	48%	1%	37%	62%
[ ]d.	Establishing a flat tax on every							
	parcel of property in Placer County	9%	19%	16%	53%	2%	28%	70%
[ ]e.	Establishing a local quarter percent tax on gasoline purchases	12%	13%	12%	63%	0%	25%	75%

### HERE ARE MY LAST QUESTIONS, AND THEY ARE FOR STATISTICAL PURPOSES ONLY.

13.	How many people in your household commute to work or school as the driver of a vehicle at least 3
	days a week?

1	25%
2	33%
3	10%
4 or more	4%
None	28%
(DON'T READ) Refused/DK	0%

14. If you personally commute to work or school each day, do you <u>most often</u> take transit, carpool, walk, bike, drive mostly on highways or drive mostly on local streets and roads?

Take transit	2%
Carpool	4%
Walk	0%
Bike	1%
Drive highways	26%
Drive local streets/roads	39%
Do not commute	25%
Other (Specify)	0%
(DON'T READ) Refused/DK	5%

### (IF CODE 7 IN Q14, SKIP TO Q16)

15. About how many minutes each way is your daily commute?

10 minutes or less 23%
11 to 20 minutes 27%
21-30 minutes 16%
31-40 minutes9%
41-60 minutes 12%
More than 1 hour6%
( <b>DON'T READ</b> ) Refused/DK6%

#### (RESUME ASKING ALL RESPONDENTS)

16. Do you ... (**READ LIST**),

Own a single family home 87%
Own a condominium1%
Rent an apartment or home 10%
( <b>DON'T READ</b> ) Refused3%

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

In what year were you born?

18.

Grades 1-80%
Grades 9-121%
High school graduate 11%
Some college/vocational school 30%
College graduate (4 years) 34%
Post graduate work/
Professional school 22%
( <b>DON'T READ</b> ) Refused2%
1995-1989 (18-24)3%
1988-1984 (25-29)2%
1983-1979 (30-34)5%
1978-1974 (35-39)5%
1973-1969 (40-44)6%
1968-1964 (45-49) 10%
1963-1959 (50-54) 11%
1958-1954 (55-59) 10%
1953-1949 (60-64) 12%
1948-1939 (65-74) 19%
1938 or earlier (75 & over) 15%

(DON'T READ) DK/Refused-----2%

## THANK AND TERMINATE

GENDER (BY OBSERVATION):	Male Female	
PARTY REGISTRATION:	Democrat	29%
	Republican	52%
	No Party Preference	16%
	Other	
<b>FLAGS</b>	PERMANENT ABSENTE	Œ
P08 52%	Yes	
G08 89%	No	35%
P10 67%		
G1093%	<b>HOUSEHOLD PARTY T</b>	YPE
P12 70%	Dem 1	
G1297%	Dem 2+	9%
	Rep 1	14%
<u>CITY</u>	Rep 2+	
Lincoln 13%	Ind 1+	13%
Rocklin 14%	Mix	26%
Roseville 33%		
Loomis2%	<b>BOARD OF SUPERVISO</b>	<u>RS</u>
Other5%	1	
Unincorporated 33%	2	19%
-	3	19%
VOTE BY MAIL	4	21%
17%	5	22%
26%		
3+59%		
Blank28%		