User's Guide and Codebook

Michigan Public Policy Survey (MPPS)

Michigan Public Policy Survey Restricted Use Datasets:

Fall 2014 Data

CENTER FOR LOCAL, STATE, AND URBAN POLICY (CLOSUP)

FORD SCHOOL OF PUBLIC POLICY

THE UNIVERSITY OF MICHIGAN

ABOUT THE DATASET:

Title: Michigan Public Policy Survey Restricted Use Datasets: Fall 2014

Responses: 1,478 responses from 1,356 distinct local jurisdictions

Sample: census survey of all 1,856 Michigan counties, cities, villages, and townships. Top elected and appointed officials in each jurisdiction were surveyed. One response from each responding jurisdiction is included. If two responses are received from the same jurisdiction, the criteria for inclusion in the data set are based on [in order]: completeness of the survey, if the official is appointed (rather than elected), or if the respondent is the top elected official.

Field period: October 6 to December 11, 2014

Response rate: 73% by jurisdiction

Dataset Version: Version 1

Dataset Release Date: February 9, 2016

PROGRAM DESCRIPTION:

The Michigan Public Policy Survey (MPPS) is a program of state-wide surveys of local government leaders in Michigan. The MPPS is administered online and via hard copy questionnaire and takes place twice each year, in spring and fall. Each wave investigates local officials' opinions and perspectives on a variety of important public policy issues. Respondents for the MPPS include county administrators, clerks and board chairs, city mayors and managers, village presidents, clerks, and managers, and township supervisors, clerks, and managers from every general-purpose unit of government across the state.

SURVEY WAVE CONTENT:

The Fall 2014 MPPS wave focused on road condition, maintenance, and funding with additional questions on private roads, Complete Streets, transit, the relationship between local jurisdictions and their county road commissions or departments, and state and local government ethics.

MISSING DATA:

Missing data in the Fall 2014 dataset can reflect two distinct types of missing data: questions that a respondent chose to not answer (refused), and questions that were not asked due to skip patterns in the data (not applicable). Skip patterns are indicated where applicable in this codebook.

TABLE OF CONTENTS:

CONTACT INFORMATION:

The Michigan Public Policy Survey (MPPS) is administered by the Center for Local, State, and Urban Policy (CLOSUP) at the University of Michigan.

For the benefit of users of MPPS data, we have prepared this guide to the design, methods, and content of the Fall 2014 wave of the survey. Please address questions or comments to:

Sarah Mills, Project Manager

or

Tom Ivacko, Center Administrator

Center for Local, State, and, Urban Policy (CLOSUP)

735 S. State Street

Ann Arbor, MI 48109

Phone: (734) 647-4091

Fax: (734) 615-5389

Email: closup-mpps@umich.edu

HOW TO CITE MPPS DATA:

When using data from the Michigan Public Policy Survey, please use the folder citation provided by ICPSR, including DOI.

Center for Local, State, and Urban Policy. Michigan Public Policy Survey Restricted Use Datasets: Fall 2014 Data. Ann Arbor, MI: Inter-university Consortium for Political and Social Research [distributor], 2016-02-09. http://doi.org/10.3886/E55168V2

DATA COLLECTION OVERVIEW:

Sample:

The sample for the Fall 2014 MPPS included on average two officials from each of the local general purpose units of government (83 counties, 278 cities, 255 villages, and 1,240 townships) in the state of Michigan. The sample frame included, where the position existed and was not vacant, the top elected and top appointed official in each jurisdiction. For counties, this consisted of county administrators, executives, and board chairs; for cities, mayors and city managers; for villages, village presidents, clerks, and managers. Townships are a special case, in that, typically, their governing officials are all elected. Therefore, in townships, both the elected supervisors and the elected clerks were administered surveys, as well as the few appointed township managers.

Sample frame:

	Elected Officials	Appointed Officials	Total
Counties (83)	109	57	166
Townships (1240)	2,438	42	2,480
Cities (278)	278	241	519
Villages (255)	352	158	510
Total (1856)	3,177	498	3,675

Method:

The Fall 2014 MPPS was administered via two modes. For those officials for whom an email address could be identified, an email invitation was sent containing a url link to the survey instrument online. For those officials for whom no email address was available, hard copy questionnaires were mailed out in the week prior to the launch of the survey via USPS, scheduled for delivery during the first week of field period.

Survey administration:

	Electronically	Via hardcopy	Total
Surveys sent	3,136	505	3,641
Responses in full database	1,386	92	1,478
Responses in public use dataset	1,268	88	1,356

Field dates, recontacts to non-respondents, and partial completes:

Respondents received initial email invitations and hard copy questionnaires during the week of October 6, 2014. Non-respondents with valid email addresses were recontacted each Monday of field period by email to urge them to participate. Respondents with invalid addresses were subsequently mailed hard copy questionnaires. Non-respondents who had been originally sent a hard copy questionnaire and for whom a fax number was available were sent another questionnaire by fax. Field period closed on December 8. Partially-completed ("partials") surveys captured by the online survey software are included in the dataset if respondents completed

through Q7.

Data anomalies:

Known data anomalies are noted at the appropriate variable in the codebook below. If you notice possible undocumented errors in the dataset, we would appreciate an email to "closup-mpps@umich.edu" describing the problem so that we can research and address it.

ISSUES OF RESPONDENT CONFIDENTIALITY:

The MPPS program pledges to all of its respondents that all survey answers will remain confidential, meaning that researchers will not link survey responses to individual respondents or jurisdictions in any publications or public analysis of the data. Thus, users of the MPPS datasets should publish statistical summary information that does <u>not</u> permit the identification, either directly or inferentially, of any individual person, official position, or local jurisdiction.

Any intentional identification of a research subject (whether an individual or a jurisdiction) or unauthorized disclosure of his or her confidential information violates the promise of confidentiality given to the providers of the information. Therefore, users of data agree:

To use these datasets solely for research or statistical purposes and not for investigation of specific research subjects.

To make no use of the identity of any research subject discovered inadvertently, and to advise CLOSUP of any such discovery (closup-mpps@umich.edu).

Merging your data with MPPS Data

CLOSUP recognizes that there is significant research value in being able to link external datasets to the MPPS data. However, to protect respondent and jurisdiction confidentiality, direct geographic identifiers are not available in the MPPS datasets. Users who are interested in merging their own geographically-keyed datasets to MPPS datasets should contact CLOSUP (closup@umich.edu) to apply to have wave_id added to the researcher's dataset, in order to enable links between datasets. CLOSUP will review all applications and determine whether providing the key would pose an unacceptable risk to confidentiality. If your application is approved, you will send your dataset to CLOSUP, the wave key will be merged onto the dataset and replace any existing geographic ID variables, and you can upload this new dataset to the VDE following openICPSR's policies.

LIST OF VARIABLES:

name	label
respondent_id	Unique ID for each case
master_id	Longitudinal Jurisdiction ID
wave_id	Single-wave Jurisdiction ID
idcompleted	Completion status
source	Hardcopies/online completes/partials
idenddate	ID.endDate
idend	ID.end
idstart	ID.start
iddate	ID.date
idtime	ID.time
jtype	Jurisdiction Type
samp_juris	Identifies unique survey responses for each jurisdiction
snap_elec_app	Elected or appointed to position
snap_pos	Position held--numeric
q2a	Current Condition: State & county primary roads
q2b	Current Condition: Local paved roads
q2c	Current Condition: Local unpaved roads
q2d	Current Condition: Bridges within jurisdiction
q2e	Current Condition: Roads within jurisdiction
q3a	Road & Bridge Impact: Jurisdiction's economic development
q3b	Road & Bridge Impact: Jurisdiction govt.'s fiscal health
q3c	Road & Bridge Impact: Tourism in jurisdiction
q3d	Road & Bridge Impact: Agricultural sector in jurisdiction
q3e	Road & Bridge Impact: Emergency response
q3f	Road & Bridge Impact: Citizen satisfaction with jurisdiction's govt.
q4a	Priority of roads: Jurisdiction's Board/Council
q4b	Priority of roads: Jurisdiction's citizens
q4c	Priority of roads: Jurisdiction's business community
q4d	Priority of roads: Respondent as local official
q5	Change in road & bridge conditions - 5 years
q6	Jurisdiction's current approach to road & bridge maintenance & improvement
q7	Has jurisdiction ground up paved road in last 5 years?
q8a	No change in funding: Maintain roads & bridges in jurisdiction
q8b	No change in funding: Improve roads & bridges in jurisdiction
q9a	Increase funding: Maintain roads & bridges in jurisdiction
q9b	Increase funding: Improve roads & bridges in jurisdiction
q10a	State funding options: Increase gas/diesel taxes
q10b	State funding options: Increase vehicle registration fees
q10c	State funding options: Increase fees for overweight trucks
q10d	State funding options: Increase sales tax
q10e	State funding options: Add toll roads/lanes
q10f	State funding options: Introduce mileage fees (VMT)
q10g	State funding options: Increase drivers' license fees

q10h	State funding options: Increase fines, surcharges, permit fees
q10i	State funding options: Lease road right-of-way & state property
q10j	State funding options: Other
q11	Does jurisdiction expend own-source local revenues on roads and/or bridges?
q12a	Local revenue sources: Jurisdiction's general fund
q12b	Local revenue sources: Special assessment(s)
q12c	Local revenue sources: Millage(s) levied by jurisdiction
q12bc	Local revenue sources: Special assessment(s) or millage(s)
q12d	Local revenue sources: Don't know
q12e	Local revenue sources: Other
q13a1	Jurisdiction-level Millage(s): No, have not pursued
q13a2	Jurisdiction-level Millage(s): Yes, pursued but failed
q13a3	Jurisdiction-level Millage(s): Yes, pursued and succeeded
q13a4	Jurisdiction-level Millage(s): Yes, currently pursuing
q13a5	Jurisdiction-level Millage(s): Don't Know
q13b1	Special Assessment(s): No, have not pursued
q13b2	Special Assessment(s): Yes, pursued but failed
q13b3	Special Assessment(s): Yes, pursued and succeeded
q13b4	Special Assessment(s): Yes, currently pursuing
q13b5	Special Assessment(s): Don't Know
q14a	Support for additional revenue: Jurisdiction's Board/Council
q14b	Support for additional revenue: Jurisdiction's citizens
q14c	Support for additional revenue: Jurisdiction's business community
q14d	Support for additional revenue: Respondent as local official
q15a	Citizen Support: Special assessment
q15b	Citizen Support: Local/county millage
q15c	Citizen Support: Local/regional vehicle registration fee
q15d	Citizen Support: Local/regional fuel tax
q15e	Citizen Support: Local/regional sales tax
q15f	Citizen Support: Local/regional income tax
q17	Does jurisdiction contain one or more private roads?
q18a	Support or oppose private roads: Jurisdiction's Board/Council
q18b	Support or oppose private roads: Respondent as local official
q19a	Private road regulations: Design
q19b	Private road regulations: Surface maintenance
q19c	Private road regulations: Summer maintenance
q19d	Private road regulations: Winter maintenance
q19e	Private road regulations: Don't Know
q19f	Private road regulations: Other
q19count	Number of private road regulations
q20	Any problems or controversies regarding private roads in community?
q22	Jurisdiction's policies for ownership of roads for new developments

q23	Road responsibilities in the county should be managed by...
q24a	Relation w/ CRC: Commission/Dept. generally makes fair decisions
q24b	Relation w/ CRC: Road work is generally high quality
q24c	Relation w/ CRC: Commission/Dept. decision-making is generally transparent
q24d	Relation w/ CRC: Matching requirements generally fair
q24e	Relation w/ CRC: Local govt. has good relationship w/ Commission/Dept.
q24f	Relation w/ CRC: Commission/Dept. generally responds in timely manner
q24g	Relation w/ CRC: Overall satisfaction w/ performance of Commission/Dept.
q26a	Implemented: Added or expanded biking or walking trails
q26b	Implemented: Added or expanded dedicated bike lanes on streets
q26c	Implemented: Added or expanded ATV or snowmobile trails
q26d	Implemented: Added or widened sidewalks
q26e	Implemented: Reduced number of vehicle lanes (road diet)
q26f	Implemented: Don't Know
q26_offroad	Implemented: at least one off-road change
q26_onroad	Implemented: at least one on-road change
q27	Familiarity with Complete Streets
q28	Jurisdiction's approach to Complete Streets
q28_combined	Jurisdiction's approach to Complete Streets - recoded
q29a	Impact of Complete Streets: Quality of life
q29b	Impact of Complete Streets: Cost-effectiveness of road spending
q29c	Impact of Complete Streets: Economic development
q29d	Impact of Complete Streets: Traffic congestion
q29e	Impact of Complete Streets: Pedestrian and/or cyclist safety
q29f	Impact of Complete Streets: Jurisdiction's relationship with MDOT
q30	Respondent support/oppose Complete Streets in Jurisdiction
q31a	Available transit options: Amtrak
q31b	Available transit options: Municipal, county-wide, regional bus service
q31c	Available transit options: Private bus service
q31d	Available transit options: Dial-a-ride/on-demand para-transit service
q31e	Available transit options: Taxi service
q31f	Available transit options: Van pool service
q31g	Available transit options: None
q31h	Available transit options: Don't Know
q31i	Available transit options: Other
q31count	Number of transit options
q32a	Transit Satisfaction: Elderly or disabled
q32b	Transit Satisfaction: Young people (35 years and younger)
q32c	Transit Satisfaction: Employers, employees, and job seekers
q32d	Transit Satisfaction: Visitors and tourists

```
q32e            Transit Satisfaction: Jurisdiction's Board/Council
q32f            Transit Satisfaction: Respondent as local official
q33a            Transit Dissatisfaction: Routes, frequency, coverage, etc.
q33b            Transit Dissatisfaction: Cost
q33c            Transit Dissatisfaction: Reliability
q33d            Transit Dissatisfaction: Connectivity to other communities
q33e            Transit Dissatisfaction: Don't Know
q33f            Transit Dissatisfaction: Other
q34a            Encourage or Discourage Transit: Public demand
q34b            Encourage or Discourage Transit: Operation and maintenance
                costs
q34c            Encourage or Discourage Transit: Availability of state or
                federal funding
q34d            Encourage or Discourage Transit: Availability of local
                funding
q34e            Encourage or Discourage Transit: Influence of community
                leaders/organizers
q34f            Encourage or Discourage Transit: Concern over traffic
                congestion
q34g            Encourage or Discourage Transit: Jurisdiction's
                relationship w/ neighbors
q35             How important is transit system to needs of Jurisdiction?
q36a            Ethical Rating: Michigan's state legislators
q36b            Ethical Rating: Michigan's state executive branch leaders
q36c            Ethical Rating: Elected and appointed officials in
                Jurisdiction
q36d            Ethical Rating: Local government elected and appointed
                officials across Michigan
q37a            Disclose Financial Interests: Michigan's state legislators
q37b            Disclose Financial Interests: Michigan's state executive
                branch leaders
q37c            Disclose Financial Interests: Local government elected
                officials
q37d            Disclose Financial Interests: Local government department
                and agency leaders
q38a            Revolving Door: Michigan's state legislators
q38b            Revolving Door: Michigan's state executive branch leaders
q39a            Gifts & Honoraria: Appointed state officials should also
                be prohibited
q39b            Gifts & Honoraria: A yearly cap should be enforced
q39c            Gifts & Honoraria: Should be reported by both donor and
                public official
q39d            Gifts & Honoraria: Policies should apply to local
                officials across the state
q40a            Jurisdiction Policies: Honoraria for elected/appointed
                officials
q40b            Jurisdiction Policies: Gifts, food, travel, lodging paid
                by outside sources
q40any          Jurisdiction Policies: Honoraria or gifts
q41             Does Jurisdiction have local government code of ethics?
q40_41_any      Jurisdiction Policies: Honoraria or gifts, or ethics code
q42             Jurisdiction officials face potential conflicts of
                interest
```

```
q43a1              Ethical concerns: FOIA requests: No, not experienced
q43a2              Ethical concerns: FOIA requests: Yes, no findings of
                   concern
q43a3              Ethical concerns: FOIA requests: Yes, with findings of
                   concern
q43a4              Ethical concerns: FOIA requests: Don't Know
q43b1              Ethical concerns: OMA violations: No, not experienced
q43b2              Ethical concerns: OMA violations: Yes, no findings of
                   concern
q43b3              Ethical concerns: OMA violations: Yes, with findings of
                   concern
q43b4              Ethical concerns: OMA violations: Don't Know
q43c1              Ethical concerns: Accusations of impropriety: No, not
                   experienced
q43c2              Ethical concerns: Accusations of impropriety: Yes, no
                   findings of concern
q43c3              Ethical concerns: Accusations of impropriety: Yes, with
                   findings of concern
q43c4              Ethical concerns: Accusations of impropriety: Don't Know
q43any             Ethical Concerns: Any
q44                Respondent pressure to do something unethical
q45a               Sources of unethical pressure: Other Jurisdiction
                   officials
q45b               Sources of unethical pressure: Officials from other juris.
                   or level of govt.
q45c               Sources of unethical pressure: Members of business
                   community
q45d               Sources of unethical pressure: Members of the public
q45e               Sources of unethical pressure: Family and friends
q45f               Sources of unethical pressure: Other
q46                Satisfaction with Jurisdiction's policies and practices
                   governing ethics
q48                Gender
age_category       Respondent Age
tenure             Respondent's time in office
q51                Are you of Spanish, Hispanic, or Latino descent
q52a               Race: White
q52b               Race: Black or African American
q52c               Race: American Indian or Alaskan Native
q52d               Race: Native Hawaiian or other Pacific Islander
q52e               Race: Asian
q52f               Race: Multiracial
q52g               Race: Other
q52h               Race: Don't Know
q53                Highest level of education
q54                Political affiliation
q55                Strength of political affiliation
q56                As an Independent, which party are you closer to?
q57                Date hardcopy received
partyid            7-point partisanship scale
threepty           3-point partisanship scale
region             MI regions
juris_rr           Jurisdiction-level Response Rate
```

```
juris_wgt          Jurisdiction-level Weight
ind_rr             Individual-level Response Rate
ind_wgt            Individual-level Weight
pop_density        Population Density
pop_township       Population Category: Township
pop_city           Population Category: City
pop_village        Population Category: Village
pop_county         Population Category: County
```

FULL VARIABLE TEXT AND FREQUENCIES:

```
------------------------------------------------------------------------------
respondent_id
Unique ID for each case
------------------------------------------------------------------------------

                type:  numeric (int)

               range:  [1,1497]                      units:  1
       unique values:  1,478                     missing .:  0/1,478

                mean:  747.526
            std. dev:  431.954

         percentiles:        10%       25%       50%       75%       90%
                             150       373     747.5      1121      1348
```

CODEBOOK NOTE: respondent_id is a unique identifier for each MPPS
respondent. It varies between datasets, and cannot be used to link datasets
from multiple waves.

```
------------------------------------------------------------------------------
master_id
Longitudinal Jurisdiction ID
------------------------------------------------------------------------------

                type:  numeric (int)

               range:  [1,1999]                      units:  1
       unique values:  1,356                     missing .:  0/1,478

                mean:  1011.38
            std. dev:  576.712

         percentiles:        10%       25%       50%       75%       90%
                             203       523      1007      1520      1800
```

CODEBOOK NOTE: master_id is an anonymized jurisdiction-level identifier that
allows datasets to be linked across multiple waves of the MPPS at the
jurisdiction level. Datasets cannot be linked at the individual respondent
level. Users should be aware that master_id is linked to a unique
combination of fips code and jurisdiction type, so when a jurisdiction type
changes (for example, when a village incorporates into a city), the
master_id for that jurisdiction also changes.

```
------------------------------------------------------------------------------
wave_id
Single-wave Jurisdiction ID
------------------------------------------------------------------------------

                type:  numeric (int)

               range:  [1,1356]                      units:  1
       unique values:  1,356                     missing .:  0/1,478
```

```
            mean:    676.844
       std. dev:    390.661

     percentiles:        10%       25%       50%       75%       90%
                         133       338     676.5      1015      1218
```

CODEBOOK NOTE: wave_id is an anonymized jurisdiction-level identifier which
can be used to link external datafiles with geographic ID's to MPPS
datasets. Unlike master_id, wave_id is randomized for every wave of the
MPPS, so it does not allow datasets to be linked across years. CLOSUP
recognizes that there is significant research value in being able to link
external datasets to the MPPS data. However, to protect respondent and
jurisdiction confidentiality, direct geographic identifiers are not
available in the MPPS datasets. Users who are interested in merging their
own geographically-keyed datasets to MPPS datasets should contact CLOSUP
(closup@umich.edu) to apply to have wave_id added to the researcher's
dataset, in order to enable links between datasets.

```
-------------------------------------------------------------------------------
idcompleted
Completion status
-------------------------------------------------------------------------------

              type:   numeric (byte)
             label:   completepart

             range:   [0,1]                            units:  1
     unique values:   2                            missing .:  0/1,478

        tabulation:   Freq.    Numeric  Label
                         79          0  Partial
                      1,399          1  Complete
```

CODEBOOK NOTE: The Fall 2014 database includes partial surveys by
respondents who answered at least through Q7 on the survey instrument.

```
-------------------------------------------------------------------------------
source
Hardcopies/online completes/partials
-------------------------------------------------------------------------------

              type:   numeric (byte)
             label:   source3

             range:   [1,3]                            units:  1
     unique values:   3                            missing .:  0/1,478

        tabulation:   Freq.    Numeric  Label
                         92          1  Hard Copy
                      1,307          2  Online Complete
                         79          3  Online Partial
```

```
--------------------------------------------------------------------------------
idenddate
ID.endDate
--------------------------------------------------------------------------------

                   type:  string (str10)

         unique values:  62                        missing "":  0/1,478


CODEBOOK NOTE: Variable indicates date on which respondent submitted survey
online or on which an unfinished ''partial'' response was closed.

--------------------------------------------------------------------------------
idend
ID.end
--------------------------------------------------------------------------------

                   type:  string (str8)

         unique values:  1,416                     missing "":  0/1,478

CODEBOOK NOTE: Variable indicates time at which respondent submitted survey
online or at which an unfinished ''partial'' response was closed.

--------------------------------------------------------------------------------
idstart
ID.start
--------------------------------------------------------------------------------

                   type:  string (str8)

         unique values:  1,452                     missing "":  0/1,478


CODEBOOK NOTE: Variable indicates time at which respondent started survey
online

--------------------------------------------------------------------------------
iddate
ID.date
--------------------------------------------------------------------------------

                   type:  string (str10)

         unique values:  62                        missing "":  0/1,478


CODEBOOK NOTE: Variable indicates date on which respondent started survey
online.

--------------------------------------------------------------------------------
idtime
ID.time
--------------------------------------------------------------------------------
```

```
                    type:  numeric (float)

                   range:  [4.98,23844.73]                units:  .01
           unique values:  1,198                       missing .:  0/1,478

                    mean:  456.461
                std. dev:  2170.11

             percentiles:       10%       25%       50%       75%       90%
                              14.87     19.87     28.64     45.42     90.97
```

CODEBOOK NOTE: Variable indicates length of time (in minutes) respondent took to complete survey online

```
-------------------------------------------------------------------------------
jtype
Jurisdiction Type
-------------------------------------------------------------------------------

                    type:  numeric (byte)
                   label:  jurisdiction

                   range:  [1,4]                          units:  1
           unique values:  4                           missing .:  0/1,478

             tabulation:   Freq.   Numeric  Label
                             65         1   County
                            996         2   Township
                            223         3   City
                            194         4   Village

-------------------------------------------------------------------------------
samp_juris
Identifies unique survey responses for each jurisdiction
-------------------------------------------------------------------------------

                    type:  numeric (byte)

                   range:  [0,1]                          units:  1
           unique values:  2                           missing .:  0/1,478

             tabulation:   Freq.  Value
                             122   0
                           1,356   1
```

CODEBOOK NOTE: Variable designates one survey response as representative for each individual jurisdiction:

- If there is a single response from the jurisdiction, samp_juris = 1
- If there are two (or more) responses from the jurisdiction where only one is complete (either hardcopy or online), the complete response is coded as samp_juris = 1, the other(s) coded as samp_juris = 0

- If two (or more) complete responses from jurisdiction, the one from the appointed official (or clerk, if it's a township) is coded as samp_juris = 1, the other(s) coded as samp_juris = 0
- If two (or more) complete responses from jurisdiction but none are appointed (or clerk), then the top elected (or supervisor, if it's a township) is coded as samp_juris = 1, the other(s) coded as samp_juris = 0

----
snap_elec_app
Elected or appointed to position

```
             type:  numeric (byte)
            label:  elec_app

            range:  [1,2]                        units:  1
    unique values:  2                        missing .:  0/1,478

      tabulation:  Freq.   Numeric  Label
                   1,201         1  Elected
                     277         2  Appointed
```

CODEBOOK NOTE: Variable designates whether respondent is an elected or appointed official. Elected officials include Chairs of County Commission, County Clerks, County Executives, Mayors, Village Presidents, Village Clerks, Township Supervisors, Township Clerks, self-identified ''Other'' elected; Appointed officials include County Administrators/Controllers, City Administrators/Managers/Superintendents, Village Managers/Superintendents, Village Clerks, Township Managers/Superintendents, self-identified ''Other'' appointed.

----
snap_pos
Position held--numeric

```
             type:  numeric (byte)

            range:  [1,9]                        units:  1
    unique values:  9                        missing .:  1/1,478

      tabulation:  Freq.  Value
                     57   1
                    138   2
                     43   3
                    121   4
                    101   5
                     49   6
                    491   7
                    470   8
                      7   9
                      1   .
```

CODEBOOK NOTE: Variable designates what position respondent holds.

Elected officials:
1 - Chair of County Commission
2 - County Clerk
3 - County Executive
4 - Mayor
5 - Village President
6 - Village Clerk
7 - Township Supervisor
8 - Township Clerk
9 - Other

Appointed officials:
1 - County Administrator/Controller
2 - City Administrator/Manager/Superintendent
3 - Village Manager/Superintendent
4 - Village Clerk
5 - Township Manager/Superintendent
6 - Other

CODEBOOK NOTE: Users interested in performing longitudinal analysis using
MPPS data should be aware that the positions included in the MPPS sample
frame have changed over time, and as a result the codes in snap_pos have
changed over time. Users should consult the codebook for an individual wave
to determine what position a combination of snap_elec_app and snap_pos
indicates in a given wave.

----
q2a
Current Condition: State & county primary roads

QUESTIONNAIRE TEXT: We know there are regular assessments of many public
roads using formal scoring methods, however we are interested in your
personal evaluation of the overall condition of roads and bridges within
your jurisdiction's geographic boundaries. In your opinion, how would you
rate the overall current condition within your jurisdiction of… state trunk
lines and county primary roads?

                  type: numeric (byte)
                 label: condition_rating

                 range: [1,5]   units: 1
         unique values: 5   missing .: 18/1,478

           tabulation: Freq.   Numeric Label
                           490   1 Good
                           683   2 Fair
                           241   3 Poor
                            31   4 Not Applicable
                            15   5 Don't Know
                            18   .

----

q2b
Current Condition: Local paved roads

QUESTIONNAIRE TEXT: We know there are regular assessments of many public
roads using formal scoring methods, however we are interested in your
personal evaluation of the overall condition of roads and bridges within
your jurisdiction's geographic boundaries. In your opinion, how would you
rate the overall current condition within your jurisdiction of… local paved
roads?

```
                 type:  numeric (byte)
                label:  condition_rating

                range:  [1,5]                            units:  1
        unique values:  5                            missing .:  25/1,478

           tabulation:  Freq.    Numeric  Label
                          323          1  Good
                          686          2  Fair
                          431          3  Poor
                           10          4  Not Applicable
                            3          5  Don't Know
                           25          .
```

----
q2c
Current Condition: Local unpaved roads

QUESTIONNAIRE TEXT: We know there are regular assessments of many public
roads using formal scoring methods, however we are interested in your
personal evaluation of the overall condition of roads and bridges within
your jurisdiction's geographic boundaries. In your opinion, how would you
rate the overall current condition within your jurisdiction of… local
unpaved roads?

```
                 type:  numeric (byte)
                label:  condition_rating

                range:  [1,5]                            units:  1
        unique values:  5                            missing .:  39/1,478

           tabulation:  Freq.    Numeric  Label
                          212          1  Good
                          602          2  Fair
                          386          3  Poor
                          217          4  Not Applicable
                           22          5  Don't Know
                           39          .
```

----
q2d
Current Condition: Bridges within jurisdiction

QUESTIONNAIRE TEXT: We know there are regular assessments of many public roads using formal scoring methods, however we are interested in your personal evaluation of the overall condition of roads and bridges within your jurisdiction's geographic boundaries. In your opinion, how would you rate the overall current condition within your jurisdiction of… bridges, in general, within your geographic boundaries?

```
             type:  numeric (byte)
            label:  condition_rating

            range:  [1,5]                          units:  1
    unique values:  5                          missing .:  23/1,478

       tabulation:  Freq.   Numeric  Label
                      391         1  Good
                      604         2  Fair
                      217         3  Poor
                      165         4  Not Applicable
                       78         5  Don't Know
                       23         .
```

----
q2e
Current Condition: Roads within jurisdiction

QUESTIONNAIRE TEXT: We know there are regular assessments of many public roads using formal scoring methods, however we are interested in your personal evaluation of the overall condition of roads and bridges within your jurisdiction's geographic boundaries. In your opinion, how would you rate the overall current condition within your jurisdiction of… roads, in general, within your geographic boundaries?

```
             type:  numeric (byte)
            label:  condition_rating

            range:  [1,5]                          units:  1
    unique values:  5                          missing .:  20/1,478

       tabulation:  Freq.   Numeric  Label
                      269         1  Good
                      821         2  Fair
                      360         3  Poor
                        3         4  Not Applicable
                        5         5  Don't Know
                       20         .
```

----
q3a
Road & Bridge Impact: Jurisdiction's economic development

QUESTIONNAIRE TEXT: Thinking about the condition of roads and bridges within your community overall, to what degree would you say their current condition has a positive or negative impact, if any, on the following? Your jurisdiction's economic development

```
            type:  numeric (byte)
           label:  impact_na

           range:  [1,8]                        units:  1
   unique values:  8                        missing .:  41/1,478

      tabulation:  Freq.   Numeric  Label
                     181         1  No Impact
                     133         2  Very Positive Impact
                     251         3  Somewhat Positive Impact
                     353         4  Mixed Positive and Negative
                                       Impact
                     309         5  Somewhat Negative Impact
                      87         6  Very Negative Impact
                      57         7  Not Applicable
                      66         8  Don't Know
                      41         .
```

----
q3b
Road & Bridge Impact: Jurisdiction govt.'s fiscal health

QUESTIONNAIRE TEXT: Thinking about the condition of roads and bridges within
your community overall, to what degree would you say their current condition
has a positive or negative impact, if any, on the following? Your
jurisdiction government's fiscal health

```
            type:  numeric (byte)
           label:  impact_na

           range:  [1,8]                        units:  1
   unique values:  8                        missing .:  41/1,478

      tabulation:  Freq.   Numeric  Label
                     163         1  No Impact
                     148         2  Very Positive Impact
                     255         3  Somewhat Positive Impact
                     320         4  Mixed Positive and Negative
                                       Impact
                     301         5  Somewhat Negative Impact
                     133         6  Very Negative Impact
                      59         7  Not Applicable
                      58         8  Don't Know
                      41         .
```

----
q3c
Road & Bridge Impact: Tourism in jurisdiction

QUESTIONNAIRE TEXT: Thinking about the condition of roads and bridges within
your community overall, to what degree would you say their current condition
has a positive or negative impact, if any, on the following? Tourism in your
jurisdiction

```
            type:  numeric (byte)
```

```
              label:  impact_na

              range:  [1,8]                          units:  1
      unique values:  8                          missing .:  35/1,478

          tabulation:  Freq.   Numeric  Label
                         230         1  No Impact
                         134         2  Very Positive Impact
                         224         3  Somewhat Positive Impact
                         272         4  Mixed Positive and Negative
                                        Impact
                         249         5  Somewhat Negative Impact
                          83         6  Very Negative Impact
                         174         7  Not Applicable
                          77         8  Don't Know
                          35         .
```

----
q3d
Road & Bridge Impact: Agricultural sector in jurisdiction

QUESTIONNAIRE TEXT: Thinking about the condition of roads and bridges within
your community overall, to what degree would you say their current condition
has a positive or negative impact, if any, on the following? The
agricultural sector in your jurisdiction

```
               type:  numeric (byte)
              label:  impact_na

              range:  [1,8]                          units:  1
      unique values:  8                          missing .:  51/1,478

          tabulation:  Freq.   Numeric  Label
                         218         1  No Impact
                         157         2  Very Positive Impact
                         181         3  Somewhat Positive Impact
                         307         4  Mixed Positive and Negative
                                        Impact
                         176         5  Somewhat Negative Impact
                          43         6  Very Negative Impact
                         244         7  Not Applicable
                         101         8  Don't Know
                          51         .
```

----
q3e
Road & Bridge Impact: Emergency response

QUESTIONNAIRE TEXT: Thinking about the condition of roads and bridges within
your community overall, to what degree would you say their current condition
has a positive or negative impact, if any, on the following? The ability of
public safety personnel to respond to an emergency in your jurisdiction

```
               type:  numeric (byte)
              label:  impact_na
```

```
              range:  [1,8]                          units:  1
      unique values:  8                         missing .:  34/1,478

         tabulation:  Freq.   Numeric  Label
                        167         1  No Impact
                        308         2  Very Positive Impact
                        234         3  Somewhat Positive Impact
                        310         4  Mixed Positive and Negative
                                       Impact
                        295         5  Somewhat Negative Impact
                         73         6  Very Negative Impact
                         17         7  Not Applicable
                         40         8  Don't Know
                         34         .
```

----
q3f
Road & Bridge Impact: Citizen satisfaction with jurisdiction's govt.

QUESTIONNAIRE TEXT: Thinking about the condition of roads and bridges within
your community overall, to what degree would you say their current condition
has a positive or negative impact, if any, on the following? Citizen
satisfaction with your jurisdiction's government

```
               type:  numeric (byte)
              label:  impact_na

              range:  [1,8]                          units:  1
      unique values:  8                         missing .:  32/1,478

         tabulation:  Freq.   Numeric  Label
                         44         1  No Impact
                        293         2  Very Positive Impact
                        289         3  Somewhat Positive Impact
                        306         4  Mixed Positive and Negative
                                       Impact
                        280         5  Somewhat Negative Impact
                        174         6  Very Negative Impact
                          8         7  Not Applicable
                         52         8  Don't Know
                         32         .
```

----
q4a
Priority of roads: Jurisdiction's Board/Council

QUESTIONNAIRE TEXT: In your opinion, where would you say the following
groups or individuals would rank the need for road and bridge maintenance
and improvement compared to other public service priorities (e.g., public
safety services, economic development, public health, trash collection,
etc.) for your local government? The majority of your jurisdiction's
Board/Council

```
               type:  numeric (byte)
```

```
            label:  priority

            range:  [1,5]                              units:  1
    unique values:  5                              missing .:  12/1,478

        tabulation:  Freq.   Numeric  Label
                       453         1  Top priority
                       925         2  A priority, but not top
                        58         3  Low priority
                        13         4  Not a priority
                        17         5  Don't Know
                        12         .
```

---

q4b
Priority of roads: Jurisdiction's citizens

QUESTIONNAIRE TEXT: In your opinion, where would you say the following
groups or individuals would rank the need for road and bridge maintenance
and improvement compared to other public service priorities (e.g., public
safety services, economic development, public health, trash collection,
etc.) for your local government? The majority of your jurisdiction's
citizens

```
             type:  numeric (byte)
            label:  priority

            range:  [1,5]                              units:  1
    unique values:  5                              missing .:  19/1,478

        tabulation:  Freq.   Numeric  Label
                       500         1  Top priority
                       860         2  A priority, but not top
                        60         3  Low priority
                         4         4  Not a priority
                        35         5  Don't Know
                        19         .
```

---

q4c
Priority of roads: Jurisdiction's business community

QUESTIONNAIRE TEXT: In your opinion, where would you say the following
groups or individuals would rank the need for road and bridge maintenance
and improvement compared to other public service priorities (e.g., public
safety services, economic development, public health, trash collection,
etc.) for your local government? The majority of your jurisdiction's
business community

```
             type:  numeric (byte)
            label:  priority

            range:  [1,5]                              units:  1
```

```
        unique values:  5                              missing .:  35/1,478

          tabulation:  Freq.   Numeric  Label
                        390        1    Top priority
                        842        2    A priority, but not top
                         91        3    Low priority
                         16        4    Not a priority
                        104        5    Don't Know
                         35        .
```

----
q4d
Priority of roads: Respondent as local official

QUESTIONNAIRE TEXT: In your opinion, where would you say the following
groups or individuals would rank the need for road and bridge maintenance
and improvement compared to other public service priorities (e.g., public
safety services, economic development, public health, trash collection,
etc.) for your local government? You personally in your role as a local
official

```
               type:  numeric (byte)
              label:  priority

              range:  [1,5]                            units:  1
       unique values:  5                              missing .:  22/1,478

          tabulation:  Freq.   Numeric  Label
                        494        1    Top priority
                        901        2    A priority, but not top
                         43        3    Low priority
                         11        4    Not a priority
                          7        5    Don't Know
                         22        .
```

----
q5
Change in road & bridge conditions - 5 years

QUESTIONNAIRE TEXT: Once again, thinking about the condition of roads and
bridges in your community overall, to what degree would you say their
condition has changed over the past five years, if at all? Please indicate
whether—in your opinion—the overall condition of road and bridges in your
geographic boundaries, in general, has improved, deteriorated, or not
changed significantly over the past five years.

```
               type:  numeric (byte)
              label:  change

              range:  [1,6]                            units:  1
       unique values:  6                              missing .:  19/1,478

          tabulation:  Freq.   Numeric  Label
                        145        1    Significantly Improved
                        379        2    Somewhat Improved
```

```
                         209              3  No Significant Change Overall
                         419              4  Somewhat Deteriorated
                         292              5  Significantly Deteriorated
                          15              6  Don't Know
                          19              .
```

----
q6
Jurisdiction's current approach to road & bridge maintenance & improvement
----

QUESTIONNAIRE TEXT: In some local jurisdictions, the focus of road and/or
bridge maintenance and improvement is on long-term asset management. In
other jurisdictions, the focus is necessarily on short-term repairs and
"band-aid" fixes. Which of the following, in your opinion, best describes
the current approach to road and/or bridge maintenance and improvement
within your jurisdiction's geographic boundaries? (Please respond to the
best of your knowledge, even if your jurisdiction does not control local
road policy.)

```
                 type:  numeric (byte)
                label:  fixes

                range:  [1,5]                        units:  1
        unique values:  5                        missing .:  16/1,478

           tabulation:  Freq.   Numeric  Label
                         177           1  Only short-term fixes
                         580           2  Mostly short-term fixes, some
                                          long-term management
                         595           3  Mostly long-term management,
                                          some short-term fixes
                          49           4  Only long-term management
                          61           5  Don't Know
                          16           .
```

----
q7
Has jurisdiction ground up paved road in last 5 years?

QUESTIONNAIRE TEXT: Some counties or localities have had to resort to
grinding up paved roads that they can no longer afford to maintain. As far
as you know, has this been done to one or more paved roads within your
jurisdiction's geographic boundaries during the past five years?

```
                 type:  numeric (byte)
                label:  y_n_dk

                range:  [1,3]                        units:  1
        unique values:  3                        missing .:  11/1,478

           tabulation:  Freq.   Numeric  Label
                         170           1  Yes
                       1,189           2  No
                         108           3  Don't Know
                          11           .
```

```
------------------------------------------------------------------------------
q8a
No change in funding: Maintain roads & bridges in jurisdiction
------------------------------------------------------------------------------

QUESTIONNAIRE TEXT: If the state legislature does not significantly increase
funding for roads and/or bridges in your jurisdiction, in your opinion, how
much of a problem, if at all, would it be… to maintain the roads and
bridges, in general, within your geographic boundaries?

                    type:  numeric (byte)
                   label:  problem

                   range:  [1,5]                          units:  1
           unique values:  5                          missing .:  19/1,478

              tabulation:  Freq.   Numeric  Label
                             768         1  A Significant Problem
                             533         2  Somewhat of a Problem
                             115         3  Not Much of a Problem
                              13         4  Not a Problem at All
                              30         5  Don't Know
                              19         .

------------------------------------------------------------------------------
q8b
No change in funding: Improve roads & bridges in jurisdiction
------------------------------------------------------------------------------

QUESTIONNAIRE TEXT: If the state legislature does not significantly increase
funding for roads and/or bridges in your jurisdiction, in your opinion, how
much of a problem, if at all, would it be… to improve the roads and bridges,
in general, within your geographic boundaries?

                    type:  numeric (byte)
                   label:  problem

                   range:  [1,5]                          units:  1
           unique values:  5                          missing .:  76/1,478

              tabulation:  Freq.   Numeric  Label
                             922         1  A Significant Problem
                             367         2  Somewhat of a Problem
                              74         3  Not Much of a Problem
                               9         4  Not a Problem at All
                              30         5  Don't Know
                              76         .

------------------------------------------------------------------------------
q9a
Increase funding: Maintain roads & bridges in jurisdiction
------------------------------------------------------------------------------

QUESTIONNAIRE TEXT: Now, if the state legislature increases funding for
roads and/or bridges in your jurisdiction by some amount, which of the
following, in your opinion, would be closest to meeting your jurisdiction's
```

needs… to maintain the roads and bridges, in general, within your geographic
boundaries?

```
                    type:  numeric (byte)
                   label:  funding_needed

                   range:  [1,5]                          units:  1
           unique values:  5                         missing .:  34/1,478

              tabulation:  Freq.   Numeric  Label
                              82         1  No state funding increase needed
                             597         2  50% increase in state funding
                                            needed
                             383         3  100% increase in state funding
                                            needed
                             162         4  More than 100% increase in state
                                            funding needed
                             220         5  Don't Know
                              34         .
```

----
q9b
Increase funding: Improve roads & bridges in jurisdiction

QUESTIONNAIRE TEXT: Now, if the state legislature increases funding for
roads and/or bridges in your jurisdiction by some amount, which of the
following, in your opinion, would be closest to meeting your jurisdiction's
needs… to improve the roads and bridges, in general, within your geographic
boundaries?

```
                    type:  numeric (byte)
                   label:  funding_needed

                   range:  [1,5]                          units:  1
           unique values:  5                         missing .:  65/1,478

              tabulation:  Freq.   Numeric  Label
                              25         1  No state funding increase needed
                             385         2  50% increase in state funding
                                            needed
                             478         3  100% increase in state funding
                                            needed
                             304         4  More than 100% increase in state
                                            funding needed
                             221         5  Don't Know
                              65         .
```

----
q10a
State funding options: Increase gas/diesel taxes

QUESTIONNAIRE TEXT: There are many methods states could use to fund roads
and bridges, including some that are not currently allowed in Michigan.
Thinking about a broad range of policy options, and assuming the Michigan
Legislature does increase funding for roads and bridges, please identify

whether you would support or oppose the following methods for the state to
raise more revenue. Increasing the gas and/or diesel taxes

```
                type:   numeric (byte)
               label:   support_oppose

               range:   [1,6]                          units:  1
       unique values:   6                          missing .:  69/1,478

          tabulation:   Freq.   Numeric  Label
                          262         1  Strongly Support
                          369         2  Somewhat Support
                          169         3  Neither Support nor Oppose
                          213         4  Somewhat Oppose
                          354         5  Strongly Oppose
                           42         6  Don't Know
                           69         .
```
----
q10b
State funding options: Increase vehicle registration fees

QUESTIONNAIRE TEXT: There are many methods states could use to fund roads
and bridges, including some that are not currently allowed in Michigan.
Thinking about a broad range of policy options, and assuming the Michigan
Legislature does increase funding for roads and bridges, please identify
whether you would support or oppose the following methods for the state to
raise more revenue. Increasing vehicle registration fees

```
                type:   numeric (byte)
               label:   support_oppose

               range:   [1,6]                          units:  1
       unique values:   6                          missing .:  78/1,478

          tabulation:   Freq.   Numeric  Label
                          129         1  Strongly Support
                          330         2  Somewhat Support
                          246         3  Neither Support nor Oppose
                          329         4  Somewhat Oppose
                          321         5  Strongly Oppose
                           45         6  Don't Know
                           78         .
```
----
q10c
State funding options: Increase fees for overweight trucks

QUESTIONNAIRE TEXT: There are many methods states could use to fund roads
and bridges, including some that are not currently allowed in Michigan.
Thinking about a broad range of policy options, and assuming the Michigan
Legislature does increase funding for roads and bridges, please identify
whether you would support or oppose the following methods for the state to
raise more revenue. Increasing fees for overweight trucks

```
              type:  numeric (byte)
             label:  support_oppose

             range:  [1,6]                         units:  1
      unique values:  6                      missing .:  64/1,478

        tabulation:  Freq.   Numeric  Label
                      677         1  Strongly Support
                      401         2  Somewhat Support
                      151         3  Neither Support nor Oppose
                       69         4  Somewhat Oppose
                       66         5  Strongly Oppose
                       50         6  Don't Know
                       64         .
```

----
q10d
State funding options: Increase sales tax

QUESTIONNAIRE TEXT: There are many methods states could use to fund roads
and bridges, including some that are not currently allowed in Michigan.
Thinking about a broad range of policy options, and assuming the Michigan
Legislature does increase funding for roads and bridges, please identify
whether you would support or oppose the following methods for the state to
raise more revenue. Increasing the sales tax

```
              type:  numeric (byte)
             label:  support_oppose

             range:  [1,6]                         units:  1
      unique values:  6                      missing .:  76/1,478

        tabulation:  Freq.   Numeric  Label
                      219         1  Strongly Support
                      373         2  Somewhat Support
                      232         3  Neither Support nor Oppose
                      228         4  Somewhat Oppose
                      300         5  Strongly Oppose
                       50         6  Don't Know
                       76         .
```

----
q10e
State funding options: Add toll roads/lanes

QUESTIONNAIRE TEXT: There are many methods states could use to fund roads
and bridges, including some that are not currently allowed in Michigan.
Thinking about a broad range of policy options, and assuming the Michigan
Legislature does increase funding for roads and bridges, please identify
whether you would support or oppose the following methods for the state to
raise more revenue. Adding toll roads and/or lanes

```
            type:  numeric (byte)
           label:  support_oppose

           range:  [1,6]                              units:  1
    unique values:  6                          missing .:  76/1,478

      tabulation:  Freq.   Numeric  Label
                     151         1  Strongly Support
                     245         2  Somewhat Support
                     269         3  Neither Support nor Oppose
                     187         4  Somewhat Oppose
                     447         5  Strongly Oppose
                     103         6  Don't Know
                      76         .
```

----
q10f
State funding options: Introduce mileage fees (VMT)

QUESTIONNAIRE TEXT: There are many methods states could use to fund roads
and bridges, including some that are not currently allowed in Michigan.
Thinking about a broad range of policy options, and assuming the Michigan
Legislature does increase funding for roads and bridges, please identify
whether you would support or oppose the following methods for the state to
raise more revenue. Introducing mileage fees (Vehicle Miles Traveled)

```
            type:  numeric (byte)
           label:  support_oppose

           range:  [1,6]                              units:  1
    unique values:  6                          missing .:  72/1,478

      tabulation:  Freq.   Numeric  Label
                      57         1  Strongly Support
                     156         2  Somewhat Support
                     247         3  Neither Support nor Oppose
                     231         4  Somewhat Oppose
                     613         5  Strongly Oppose
                     102         6  Don't Know
                      72         .
```

----
q10g
State funding options: Increase drivers' license fees

QUESTIONNAIRE TEXT: There are many methods states could use to fund roads
and bridges, including some that are not currently allowed in Michigan.
Thinking about a broad range of policy options, and assuming the Michigan
Legislature does increase funding for roads and bridges, please identify
whether you would support or oppose the following methods for the state to
raise more revenue. Increasing drivers' license fees

```
            type:  numeric (byte)
```

```
             label:  support_oppose

             range:  [1,6]                              units:  1
     unique values:  6                           missing .:  76/1,478

        tabulation:  Freq.   Numeric  Label
                        47         1  Strongly Support
                       288         2  Somewhat Support
                       288         3  Neither Support nor Oppose
                       325         4  Somewhat Oppose
                       415         5  Strongly Oppose
                        39         6  Don't Know
                        76         .
```

----
q10h
State funding options: Increase fines, surcharges, permit fees
----

QUESTIONNAIRE TEXT: There are many methods states could use to fund roads
and bridges, including some that are not currently allowed in Michigan.
Thinking about a broad range of policy options, and assuming the Michigan
Legislature does increase funding for roads and bridges, please identify
whether you would support or oppose the following methods for the state to
raise more revenue. Increasing traffic violation fines, surcharges, and
permit fees

```
              type:  numeric (byte)
             label:  support_oppose

             range:  [1,6]                              units:  1
     unique values:  6                           missing .:  75/1,478

        tabulation:  Freq.   Numeric  Label
                       167         1  Strongly Support
                       477         2  Somewhat Support
                       286         3  Neither Support nor Oppose
                       216         4  Somewhat Oppose
                       210         5  Strongly Oppose
                        47         6  Don't Know
                        75         .
```

----
q10i
State funding options: Lease road right-of-way & state property
----

QUESTIONNAIRE TEXT: There are many methods states could use to fund roads
and bridges, including some that are not currently allowed in Michigan.
Thinking about a broad range of policy options, and assuming the Michigan
Legislature does increase funding for roads and bridges, please identify
whether you would support or oppose the following methods for the state to
raise more revenue. Leasing road right-of-way and/or state property for cell
phone towers, advertisements, etc.

```
              type:  numeric (byte)
```

```
                  label:  support_oppose

                  range:  [1,6]                        units:  1
          unique values:  6                       missing .:  72/1,478

             tabulation:  Freq.   Numeric  Label
                            289         1  Strongly Support
                            489         2  Somewhat Support
                            260         3  Neither Support nor Oppose
                            132         4  Somewhat Oppose
                            148         5  Strongly Oppose
                             88         6  Don't Know
                             72         .
```

----
q10j
State funding options: Other

QUESTIONNAIRE TEXT: There are many methods states could use to fund roads
and bridges, including some that are not currently allowed in Michigan.
Thinking about a broad range of policy options, and assuming the Michigan
Legislature does increase funding for roads and bridges, please identify
whether you would support or oppose the following methods for the state to
raise more revenue. Other

```
                   type:  numeric (byte)
                  label:  support_oppose

                  range:  [1,6]                        units:  1
          unique values:  6                       missing .:  1,072/1,478

             tabulation:  Freq.   Numeric  Label
                             96         1  Strongly Support
                             18         2  Somewhat Support
                             51         3  Neither Support nor Oppose
                              8         4  Somewhat Oppose
                             19         5  Strongly Oppose
                            214         6  Don't Know
                          1,072         .
```

----
q10other
State funding options: Other-specify

QUESTIONNAIRE TEXT: There are many methods states could use to fund roads
and bridges, including some that are not currently allowed in Michigan.
Thinking about a broad range of policy options, and assuming the Michigan
Legislature does increase funding for roads and bridges, please identify
whether you would support or oppose the following methods for the state to
raise more revenue. Other (please specify)

```
                   type:  string (str243)

          unique values:  168                      missing "":  1,310/1,478
```

```
--------------------------------------------------------------------------
q11
Does jurisdiction expend own-source local revenues on roads and/or bridges?
--------------------------------------------------------------------------

QUESTIONNAIRE TEXT: Thinking beyond state funding, does your jurisdiction
currently expend any own-source local revenues on road and/or bridge
maintenance, improvement, or construction—either directly or as matching
funds?

                     type:  numeric (byte)
                    label:  y_n_dk

                    range:  [1,3]                        units:  1
            unique values:  3                        missing .:  34/1,478

               tabulation:  Freq.   Numeric  Label
                            1,173         1  Yes
                              195         2  No
                               76         3  Don't Know
                               34         .

--------------------------------------------------------------------------
q12a
Local revenue sources: Jurisdiction's general fund
--------------------------------------------------------------------------

QUESTIONNAIRE TEXT: Which of the following local revenue sources does your
jurisdiction use to fund its contributions to road and/or bridge
maintenance, improvement, or construction? Your jurisdiction's general fund

                     type:  numeric (byte)
                    label:  selected

                    range:  [0,1]                        units:  1
            unique values:  2                        missing .:  311/1,478

               tabulation:  Freq.   Numeric  Label
                              323         0  Not Selected
                              844         1  Selected
                              311         .

SKIP PATTERN: Not asked unless q11=1.

--------------------------------------------------------------------------
q12b
Local revenue sources: Special assessment(s)
--------------------------------------------------------------------------

QUESTIONNAIRE TEXT: Which of the following local revenue sources does your
jurisdiction use to fund its contributions to road and/or bridge
maintenance, improvement, or construction? Special assessment(s)

                     type:  numeric (byte)
                    label:  selected
```

```
             range:  [0,1]                          units:  1
     unique values:  2                           missing .:  311/1,478

        tabulation:  Freq.   Numeric  Label
                     1,032         0  Not Selected
                       135         1  Selected
                       311         .
```

SKIP PATTERN: Not asked unless q11=1.

----
q12c
Local revenue sources: Millage(s) levied by jurisdiction

QUESTIONNAIRE TEXT: Which of the following local revenue sources does your
jurisdiction use to fund its contributions to road and/or bridge
maintenance, improvement, or construction? Millage(s) levied by your
jurisdiction

```
              type:  numeric (byte)
             label:  selected

             range:  [0,1]                          units:  1
     unique values:  2                           missing .:  311/1,478

        tabulation:  Freq.   Numeric  Label
                       720         0  Not Selected
                       447         1  Selected
                       311         .
```

SKIP PATTERN: Not asked unless q11=1.

----
q12bc
Local revenue sources: Special assessment(s) or millage(s)

```
              type:  numeric (float)
             label:  selected

             range:  [0,1]                          units:  1
     unique values:  2                           missing .:  311/1,478

        tabulation:  Freq.   Numeric  Label
                       623         0  Not Selected
                       544         1  Selected
                       311         .
```

CODEBOOK NOTE: q12bc was calculated by CLOSUP to summarize responses to q12b
and q12c. q12bc=1 if q12b=1 or q12c=1. If both q12b and q12c were missing,
q12bc was set missing. Otherwise, q12bc=0.

----
q12d
Local revenue sources: Don't know

QUESTIONNAIRE TEXT: Which of the following local revenue sources does your
jurisdiction use to fund its contributions to road and/or bridge
maintenance, improvement, or construction? Don't know

                  type: numeric (byte)
                 label: selected

                 range: [0,1]   units: 1
         unique values: 2   missing .: 311/1,478

            tabulation: Freq.   Numeric Label
                         1,162   0 Not Selected
                             5   1 Selected
                           311   .

SKIP PATTERN: Not asked unless q11=1.

----
q12e
Local revenue sources: Other

QUESTIONNAIRE TEXT: Which of the following local revenue sources does your
jurisdiction use to fund its contributions to road and/or bridge
maintenance, improvement, or construction? Other

                  type: numeric (byte)
                 label: selected

                 range: [0,1]   units: 1
         unique values: 2   missing .: 311/1,478

            tabulation: Freq.   Numeric Label
                         1,069   0 Not Selected
                            98   1 Selected
                           311   .

SKIP PATTERN: Not asked unless q11=1.

----
q12other
Local revenue sources: Other-specify

QUESTIONNAIRE TEXT: Which of the following local revenue sources does your
jurisdiction use to fund its contributions to road and/or bridge
maintenance, improvement, or construction? Other

                  type: string (str226)

         unique values: 109   missing "": 1,367/1,478

SKIP PATTERN: Not asked unless q11=1.

```
--------------------------------------------------------------------------------
q13a1
Jurisdiction-level Millage(s): No, have not pursued
--------------------------------------------------------------------------------

QUESTIONNAIRE TEXT: In the last two years, has your jurisdiction tried to
raise local funding for roads and/or bridges through either new or renewed
road millage(s) or special assessment(s)? Jurisdiction-level millage(s): No,
have not pursued

                    type:  numeric (byte)
                   label:  selected

                   range:  [0,1]                          units:  1
           unique values:  2                          missing .:  55/1,478

              tabulation:  Freq.    Numeric  Label
                             456          0  Not Selected
                             967          1  Selected
                              55          .

--------------------------------------------------------------------------------
q13a2
Jurisdiction-level Millage(s): Yes, pursued but failed
--------------------------------------------------------------------------------

QUESTIONNAIRE TEXT: In the last two years, has your jurisdiction tried to
raise local funding for roads and/or bridges through either new or renewed
road millage(s) or special assessment(s)? Jurisdiction-level millage(s):
Yes, pursued but failed

                    type:  numeric (byte)
                   label:  selected

                   range:  [0,1]                          units:  1
           unique values:  2                          missing .:  55/1,478

              tabulation:  Freq.    Numeric  Label
                           1,363          0  Not Selected
                              60          1  Selected
                              55          .

--------------------------------------------------------------------------------
q13a3
Jurisdiction-level Millage(s): Yes, pursued and succeeded
--------------------------------------------------------------------------------

QUESTIONNAIRE TEXT: In the last two years, has your jurisdiction tried to
raise local funding for roads and/or bridges through either new or renewed
road millage(s) or special assessment(s)? Jurisdiction-level millage(s):
Yes, pursued and succeeded

                    type:  numeric (byte)
                   label:  selected

                   range:  [0,1]                          units:  1
```

```
            unique values:  2                              missing .:  55/1,478

               tabulation:  Freq.   Numeric  Label
                            1,118         0  Not Selected
                              305         1  Selected
                               55         .

--------------------------------------------------------------------------------
q13a4
Jurisdiction-level Millage(s): Yes, currently pursuing
--------------------------------------------------------------------------------

QUESTIONNAIRE TEXT: In the last two years, has your jurisdiction tried to
raise local funding for roads and/or bridges through either new or renewed
road millage(s) or special assessment(s)? Jurisdiction-level millage(s):
Yes, currently pursuing

                     type:  numeric (byte)
                    label:  selected

                    range:  [0,1]                             units:  1
            unique values:  2                              missing .:  55/1,478

               tabulation:  Freq.   Numeric  Label
                            1,353         0  Not Selected
                               70         1  Selected
                               55         .

--------------------------------------------------------------------------------
q13a5
Jurisdiction-level Millage(s): Don't Know
--------------------------------------------------------------------------------

QUESTIONNAIRE TEXT: In the last two years, has your jurisdiction tried to
raise local funding for roads and/or bridges through either new or renewed
road millage(s) or special assessment(s)? Jurisdiction-level millage(s):
Don't Know

                     type:  numeric (byte)
                    label:  selected

                    range:  [0,1]                             units:  1
            unique values:  2                              missing .:  55/1,478

               tabulation:  Freq.   Numeric  Label
                            1,396         0  Not Selected
                               27         1  Selected
                               55         .

--------------------------------------------------------------------------------
q13b1
Special Assessment(s): No, have not pursued
--------------------------------------------------------------------------------

QUESTIONNAIRE TEXT: In the last two years, has your jurisdiction tried to
raise local funding for roads and/or bridges through either new or renewed
```

road millage(s) or special assessment(s)? Special assessment(s): No, have
not pursued

```
              type:  numeric (byte)
             label:  selected

             range:  [0,1]                        units:  1
     unique values:  2                        missing .:  184/1,478

         tabulation:  Freq.   Numeric  Label
                       191         0  Not Selected
                     1,103         1  Selected
                       184         .
```

----
q13b2
Special Assessment(s): Yes, pursued but failed

QUESTIONNAIRE TEXT: In the last two years, has your jurisdiction tried to
raise local funding for roads and/or bridges through either new or renewed
road millage(s) or special assessment(s)? Special assessment(s): Yes,
pursued but failed

```
              type:  numeric (byte)
             label:  selected

             range:  [0,1]                        units:  1
     unique values:  2                        missing .:  184/1,478

         tabulation:  Freq.   Numeric  Label
                     1,274         0  Not Selected
                        20         1  Selected
                       184         .
```

----
q13b3
Special Assessment(s): Yes, pursued and succeeded

QUESTIONNAIRE TEXT: In the last two years, has your jurisdiction tried to
raise local funding for roads and/or bridges through either new or renewed
road millage(s) or special assessment(s)? Special assessment(s): Yes,
pursued and succeeded

```
              type:  numeric (byte)
             label:  selected

             range:  [0,1]                        units:  1
     unique values:  2                        missing .:  184/1,478

         tabulation:  Freq.   Numeric  Label
                     1,209         0  Not Selected
                        85         1  Selected
                       184         .
```

----

q13b4
Special Assessment(s): Yes, currently pursuing

QUESTIONNAIRE TEXT: In the last two years, has your jurisdiction tried to
raise local funding for roads and/or bridges through either new or renewed
road millage(s) or special assessment(s)? Special assessment(s): Yes,
currently pursuing

```
                 type:  numeric (byte)
                label:  selected

                range:  [0,1]                        units:  1
        unique values:  2                         missing .:  184/1,478

           tabulation:  Freq.   Numeric  Label
                        1,248         0  Not Selected
                           46         1  Selected
                          184         .
```

----
q13b5
Special Assessment(s): Don't Know

QUESTIONNAIRE TEXT: In the last two years, has your jurisdiction tried to
raise local funding for roads and/or bridges through either new or renewed
road millage(s) or special assessment(s)? Special assessment(s): Don't Know

```
                 type:  numeric (byte)
                label:  selected

                range:  [0,1]                        units:  1
        unique values:  2                         missing .:  184/1,478

           tabulation:  Freq.   Numeric  Label
                        1,244         0  Not Selected
                           50         1  Selected
                          184         .
```

----
q14a
Support for additional revenue: Jurisdiction's Board/Council

QUESTIONNAIRE TEXT: Looking ahead, if the state legislature does not
significantly increase funding for roads and/or bridges in your
jurisdiction, in your opinion, would the following groups or individuals
support or oppose the pursuit of additional local revenue dedicated to
roads, through existing options such as millages or potential new options
like sales or fuel taxes, vehicle registration fees, etc.? The majority of
your jurisdiction's Board/Council

```
                 type:  numeric (byte)
                label:  support_oppose

                range:  [1,6]                        units:  1
```

```
        unique values:  6                          missing .:  48/1,478

           tabulation:  Freq.   Numeric  Label
                         164         1  Strongly Support
                         446         2  Somewhat Support
                         188         3  Neither Support nor Oppose
                         235         4  Somewhat Oppose
                         178         5  Strongly Oppose
                         219         6  Don't Know
                          48         .
```

----
q14b
Support for additional revenue: Jurisdiction's citizens

QUESTIONNAIRE TEXT: Looking ahead, if the state legislature does not
significantly increase funding for roads and/or bridges in your
jurisdiction, in your opinion, would the following groups or individuals
support or oppose the pursuit of additional local revenue dedicated to
roads, through existing options such as millages or potential new options
like sales or fuel taxes, vehicle registration fees, etc.? The majority of
your jurisdiction's citizens

```
                 type:  numeric (byte)
                label:  support_oppose

                range:  [1,6]                        units:  1
        unique values:  6                          missing .:  53/1,478

           tabulation:  Freq.   Numeric  Label
                          50         1  Strongly Support
                         331         2  Somewhat Support
                         180         3  Neither Support nor Oppose
                         311         4  Somewhat Oppose
                         307         5  Strongly Oppose
                         246         6  Don't Know
                          53         .
```

----
q14c
Support for additional revenue: Jurisdiction's business community
----

QUESTIONNAIRE TEXT: Looking ahead, if the state legislature does not
significantly increase funding for roads and/or bridges in your
jurisdiction, in your opinion, would the following groups or individuals
support or oppose the pursuit of additional local revenue dedicated to
roads, through existing options such as millages or potential new options
like sales or fuel taxes, vehicle registration fees, etc.? The majority of
your jurisdiction's citizens

```
                 type:  numeric (byte)
                label:  support_oppose

                range:  [1,6]                        units:  1
```

```
        unique values:  6                              missing .:  67/1,478

            tabulation:  Freq.   Numeric  Label
                            61        1  Strongly Support
                           343        2  Somewhat Support
                           232        3  Neither Support nor Oppose
                           240        4  Somewhat Oppose
                           214        5  Strongly Oppose
                           321        6  Don't Know
                            67        .
```

----
q14d
Support for additional revenue: Respondent as local official

QUESTIONNAIRE TEXT: Looking ahead, if the state legislature does not
significantly increase funding for roads and/or bridges in your
jurisdiction, in your opinion, would the following groups or individuals
support or oppose the pursuit of additional local revenue dedicated to
roads, through existing options such as millages or potential new options
like sales or fuel taxes, vehicle registration fees, etc.? You personally in
your role as a local official

```
                 type:  numeric (byte)
                label:  support_oppose

                range:  [1,6]                            units:  1
        unique values:  6                              missing .:  62/1,478

            tabulation:  Freq.   Numeric  Label
                           272        1  Strongly Support
                           433        2  Somewhat Support
                           196        3  Neither Support nor Oppose
                           203        4  Somewhat Oppose
                           231        5  Strongly Oppose
                            81        6  Don't Know
                            62        .
```

----
q15a
Citizen Support: Special assessment

QUESTIONNAIRE TEXT: Looking ahead, if the state legislature does not
significantly increase funding for the maintenance, improvement, and
construction of roads and/or bridges in your jurisdiction, do you think the
majority of your citizens would support or oppose raising additional local
revenue through the following sources (if they were allowed in Michigan)?
Special assessment

```
                 type:  numeric (byte)
                label:  support_oppose

                range:  [1,6]                            units:  1
        unique values:  6                              missing .:  679/1,478
```

```
         tabulation:  Freq.   Numeric  Label
                         18         1  Strongly Support
                        157         2  Somewhat Support
                        125         3  Neither Support nor Oppose
                        177         4  Somewhat Oppose
                        166         5  Strongly Oppose
                        156         6  Don't Know
                        679         .
```

----
q15b
Citizen Support: Local/county millage

QUESTIONNAIRE TEXT: Looking ahead, if the state legislature does not
significantly increase funding for the maintenance, improvement, and
construction of roads and/or bridges in your jurisdiction, do you think the
majority of your citizens would support or oppose raising additional local
revenue through the following sources (if they were allowed in Michigan)?
Local/county millage

```
              type:  numeric (byte)
             label:  support_oppose

             range:  [1,6]                        units:  1
      unique values:  6                    missing .:  675/1,478

         tabulation:  Freq.   Numeric  Label
                         64         1  Strongly Support
                        276         2  Somewhat Support
                        113         3  Neither Support nor Oppose
                        120         4  Somewhat Oppose
                         90         5  Strongly Oppose
                        140         6  Don't Know
                        675         .
```

----
q15c
Citizen Support: Local/regional vehicle registration fee

QUESTIONNAIRE TEXT: Looking ahead, if the state legislature does not
significantly increase funding for the maintenance, improvement, and
construction of roads and/or bridges in your jurisdiction, do you think the
majority of your citizens would support or oppose raising additional local
revenue through the following sources (if they were allowed in Michigan)?
Local/regional vehicle registration fee

```
              type:  numeric (byte)
             label:  support_oppose
```

```
              range:  [1,6]                          units:  1
      unique values:  6                          missing .:  688/1,478

          tabulation:  Freq.   Numeric  Label
                          8         1  Strongly Support
                         98         2  Somewhat Support
                        161         3  Neither Support nor Oppose
                        187         4  Somewhat Oppose
                        169         5  Strongly Oppose
                        167         6  Don't Know
                        688         .
```

----
q15d
Citizen Support: Local/regional fuel tax

QUESTIONNAIRE TEXT: Looking ahead, if the state legislature does not
significantly increase funding for the maintenance, improvement, and
construction of roads and/or bridges in your jurisdiction, do you think the
majority of your citizens would support or oppose raising additional local
revenue through the following sources (if they were allowed in Michigan)?
Local/regional fuel tax

```
               type:  numeric (byte)
              label:  support_oppose

              range:  [1,6]                          units:  1
      unique values:  6                          missing .:  686/1,478

          tabulation:  Freq.   Numeric  Label
                         13         1  Strongly Support
                        102         2  Somewhat Support
                        137         3  Neither Support nor Oppose
                        198         4  Somewhat Oppose
                        184         5  Strongly Oppose
                        158         6  Don't Know
                        686         .
```

----
q15e
Citizen Support: Local/regional sales tax

QUESTIONNAIRE TEXT: Looking ahead, if the state legislature does not
significantly increase funding for the maintenance, improvement, and
construction of roads and/or bridges in your jurisdiction, do you think the
majority of your citizens would support or oppose raising additional local
revenue through the following sources (if they were allowed in Michigan)?
Local/regional sales tax

```
          type:  numeric (byte)
         label:  support_oppose

         range:  [1,6]                          units:  1
 unique values:  6                          missing .:  688/1,478

    tabulation:  Freq.   Numeric  Label
                    29        1   Strongly Support
                   114        2   Somewhat Support
                   129        3   Neither Support nor Oppose
                   181        4   Somewhat Oppose
                   172        5   Strongly Oppose
                   165        6   Don't Know
                   688        .
```

----
q15f
Citizen Support: Local/regional income tax

QUESTIONNAIRE TEXT: Looking ahead, if the state legislature does not
significantly increase funding for the maintenance, improvement, and
construction of roads and/or bridges in your jurisdiction, do you think the
majority of your citizens would support or oppose raising additional local
revenue through the following sources (if they were allowed in Michigan)?
Local/regional income tax

```
          type:  numeric (byte)
         label:  support_oppose

         range:  [1,6]                          units:  1
 unique values:  6                          missing .:  688/1,478

    tabulation:  Freq.   Numeric  Label
                     6        1   Strongly Support
                    41        2   Somewhat Support
                   117        3   Neither Support nor Oppose
                   201        4   Somewhat Oppose
                   261        5   Strongly Oppose
                   164        6   Don't Know
                   688        .
```

----
q16
What have you done to get through era of insufficient funding?

QUESTIONNAIRE TEXT: Finally, to conclude this section of questions on road
funding issues, if sufficient financial support has not been available to
build and maintain roads within your jurisdiction's geographic boundaries
over the last few years, what have you done to get through this era of

insufficient funding?

```
              type:  string (str2045)

      unique values:  886                          missing "":  592/1,478
```

----
q17
Does jurisdiction contain one or more private roads?

QUESTIONNAIRE TEXT: Does your jurisdiction currently contain one or more
private roads (i.e., roads owned or maintained by developers, by private
entities such as homeowners associations, or by the abutting property
owners)?

```
              type:  numeric (byte)
             label:  y_n_dk

             range:  [1,3]                         units:  1
      unique values:  3                        missing .:  48/1,478

        tabulation:  Freq.    Numeric  Label
                      916          1  Yes
                      414          2  No
                      100          3  Don't Know
                       48          .
```

----
q18a
Support or oppose private roads: Jurisdiction's Board/Council
----

QUESTIONNAIRE TEXT: Whether or not your jurisdiction has any private roads,
would you say the majority of your jurisdiction's Board or Council support
or oppose having private roads in your jurisdiction? And what about you? The
majority of your jurisdiction's Board/Council

```
              type:  numeric (byte)
             label:  support_oppose

             range:  [1,6]                         units:  1
      unique values:  6                        missing .:  59/1,478

        tabulation:  Freq.    Numeric  Label
                       91          1  Strongly Support
                      220          2  Somewhat Support
                      576          3  Neither Support nor Oppose
                      137          4  Somewhat Oppose
                      129          5  Strongly Oppose
                      266          6  Don't Know
                       59          .
```

----

q18b
Support or oppose private roads: Respondent as local official
----

QUESTIONNAIRE TEXT: Whether or not your jurisdiction has any private roads,
would you say the majority of your jurisdiction's Board or Council support
or oppose having private roads in your jurisdiction? And what about you? You
personally in your role as a local official

```
                  type:  numeric (byte)
                 label:  support_oppose

                 range:  [1,6]                        units:  1
         unique values:  6                        missing .:  108/1,478

             tabulation:  Freq.   Numeric  Label
                    113         1  Strongly Support
                    222         2  Somewhat Support
                    587         3  Neither Support nor Oppose
                    149         4  Somewhat Oppose
                    180         5  Strongly Oppose
                    119         6  Don't Know
                    108         .
```

----
q19a
Private road regulations: Design

QUESTIONNAIRE TEXT: Does your jurisdiction have specific policies regulating
any of the following on private roads within your jurisdiction? Design
(e.g., lane width, turn lanes, grading/drainage, surface-type, etc.)

```
                  type:  numeric (byte)
                 label:  selected

                 range:  [0,1]                        units:  1
         unique values:  2                        missing .:  730/1,478

             tabulation:  Freq.   Numeric  Label
                    347         0  Not Selected
                    401         1  Selected
                    730         .
```

SKIP PATTERN: not asked unless q17=1

----
q19b
Private road regulations: Surface maintenance

QUESTIONNAIRE TEXT: Does your jurisdiction have specific policies regulating
any of the following on private roads within your jurisdiction? Surface
maintenance (e.g., pothole filling, repaving/regraveling, etc.)

```
                type:  numeric (byte)
               label:  selected

               range:  [0,1]                          units:  1
       unique values:  2                           missing .:  730/1,478

           tabulation:  Freq.   Numeric  Label
                          601         0  Not Selected
                          147         1  Selected
                          730         .
```

SKIP PATTERN: not asked unless q17=1

----
q19c
Private road regulations: Summer maintenance

QUESTIONNAIRE TEXT: Does your jurisdiction have specific policies regulating
any of the following on private roads within your jurisdiction? Summer
maintenance (e.g., mowing road right-of-way, street cleaning, dust
containment, etc.)

```
                type:  numeric (byte)
               label:  selected

               range:  [0,1]                          units:  1
       unique values:  2                           missing .:  730/1,478

           tabulation:  Freq.   Numeric  Label
                          656         0  Not Selected
                           92         1  Selected
                          730         .
```

SKIP PATTERN: not asked unless q17=1

----
q19d
Private road regulations: Winter maintenance

QUESTIONNAIRE TEXT: Does your jurisdiction have specific policies regulating
any of the following on private roads within your jurisdiction? Winter
maintenance (e.g., plowing, sanding/salting, etc.)

```
                type:  numeric (byte)
               label:  selected

               range:  [0,1]                          units:  1
       unique values:  2                           missing .:  730/1,478

           tabulation:  Freq.   Numeric  Label
                          615         0  Not Selected
                          133         1  Selected
                          730         .
```

SKIP PATTERN: not asked unless q17=1

----
q19e
Private road regulations: Don't Know

QUESTIONNAIRE TEXT: Does your jurisdiction have specific policies regulating
any of the following on private roads within your jurisdiction? Don't know

```
              type:  numeric (byte)
              label:  selected

              range:  [0,1]                        units:  1
      unique values:  2                        missing .:  730/1,478

          tabulation:  Freq.   Numeric  Label
                        574         0  Not Selected
                        174         1  Selected
                        730         .
```

SKIP PATTERN: not asked unless q17=1

----
q19f
Private road regulations: Other

QUESTIONNAIRE TEXT: Does your jurisdiction have specific policies regulating
any of the following on private roads within your jurisdiction? Other

```
              type:  numeric (byte)
              label:  selected

              range:  [0,1]                        units:  1
      unique values:  2                        missing .:  730/1,478

          tabulation:  Freq.   Numeric  Label
                        602         0  Not Selected
                        146         1  Selected
                        730         .
```

SKIP PATTERN: not asked unless q17=1

----
q19count
Number of private road regulations

```
              type:  numeric (float)
              label:  count

              range:  [0,4]                        units:  1
      unique values:  5                        missing .:  0/1,478

          tabulation:  Freq.   Numeric  Label
```

```
                      730          0  None selected
                      390          1  1 selected
                       83          2  2 selected
                      101          3  3+ selected
                      174          4  Don't know selected
```
CODEBOOK NOTE: q19count is a summary variable counting the number of private
road regulations were selected by the respondent in q19a-q19f. This was top
coded at 3 or more private regulations selected. q19count=4 if q19e=1
(Don't know selected).

----
q20
Any problems or controversies regarding private roads in community?

QUESTIONNAIRE TEXT: Have there been any problems or controversies regarding
private roads in your community?

```
                 type:  numeric (byte)
                label:  y_n_dk

                range:  [1,3]                        units:  1
        unique values:  3                    missing .:  578/1,478

           tabulation:  Freq.   Numeric  Label
                          302          1  Yes
                          517          2  No
                           81          3  Don't Know
                          578          .
```

SKIP PATTERN: not asked unless q17=1

----
q21
Description of problems or controversies regarding private roads in
community

QUESTIONNAIRE TEXT: Please briefly describe the problems or controversies
regarding private roads in your community.

```
                 type:  string (str1298)

        unique values:  248                 missing "":  1,228/1,478
```

SKIP PATTERN: not asked unless q17=1 and q20=1

----
q22
Jurisdiction's policies for ownership of roads for new developments
----

QUESTIONNAIRE TEXT: Now thinking about ownership of roads for new
developments, which of the following best describes your jurisdiction's
policies?

```
                type:  numeric (byte)
                label:  private_policies

                range:  [1,4]                              units:  1
        unique values:  4                            missing .:  85/1,478

            tabulation:  Freq.   Numeric  Label
                            79         1  Encourage private roads
                           370         2  Encourage public roads
                           642         3  Case-by-case basis
                           302         4  Don't Know
                            85         .
```

----
q23
Road responsibilities in the county should be managed by...

QUESTIONNAIRE TEXT: Recently, Michigan enacted laws that allow for a county
to transfer the powers, duties, and functions of road commissioners to the
County Board. Regardless of whether or not your county's road commission is
still in place, would you say that road responsibilities in your county
should be managed by an elected county road commission, an appointed county
road commission, or the county government itself?

```
                type:  numeric (byte)
                label:  county_roads

                range:  [1,4]                              units:  1
        unique values:  4                            missing .:  68/1,478

            tabulation:  Freq.   Numeric  Label
                           681         1  Elected county road commission
                           348         2  Appointed county road commission
                           237         3  County government
                           144         4  Don't Know
                            68         .
```

----
q24a
Relation w/ CRC: Commission/Dept. generally makes fair decisions
----

QUESTIONNAIRE TEXT: We're interested in getting a sense of local officials'
views on their local county road commissions or county road departments
(where road commission duties have been transferred to the county). Thinking
about how the county road commission or road department interacts with your
jurisdiction in particular, to what extent do you agree or disagree with
each of the following statements? Our county road commission/road department
generally makes fair decisions.

```
                type:  numeric (byte)
                label:  agree_disagree_na

                range:  [1,7]                              units:  1
```

```
         unique values:  7                           missing .:  77/1,478

            tabulation:  Freq.   Numeric  Label
                          328        1  Strongly Agree
                          606        2  Somewhat Agree
                          202        3  Neither Agree nor Disagree
                          142        4  Somewhat Disagree
                           59        5  Strongly Disagree
                           12        6  Not Applicable
                           52        7  Don't Know
                           77        .
```

----
q24b
Relation w/ CRC: Road work is generally high quality

QUESTIONNAIRE TEXT: We're interested in getting a sense of local officials'
views on their local county road commissions or county road departments
(where road commission duties have been transferred to the county). Thinking
about how the county road commission or road department interacts with your
jurisdiction in particular, to what extent do you agree or disagree with
each of the following statements? Road work done or managed by the county
road commission/road department is generally of high quality.

```
                  type:  numeric (byte)
                 label:  agree_disagree_na

                 range:  [1,7]                         units:  1
         unique values:  7                           missing .:  77/1,478

            tabulation:  Freq.   Numeric  Label
                          342        1  Strongly Agree
                          556        2  Somewhat Agree
                          208        3  Neither Agree nor Disagree
                          174        4  Somewhat Disagree
                           68        5  Strongly Disagree
                           12        6  Not Applicable
                           41        7  Don't Know
                           77        .
```

----
q24c
Relation w/ CRC: Commission/Dept. decision-making is generally transparent
----

QUESTIONNAIRE TEXT: We're interested in getting a sense of local officials'
views on their local county road commissions or county road departments
(where road commission duties have been transferred to the county). Thinking
about how the county road commission or road department interacts with your
jurisdiction in particular, to what extent do you agree or disagree with
each of the following statements? The decision-making process of our county
road commission/road department is generally transparent.

```
                  type:  numeric (byte)
                 label:  agree_disagree_na
```

```
            range:  [1,7]                           units:  1
    unique values:  7                           missing .:  86/1,478

      tabulation:  Freq.   Numeric  Label
                    245         1   Strongly Agree
                    461         2   Somewhat Agree
                    279         3   Neither Agree nor Disagree
                    195         4   Somewhat Disagree
                    102         5   Strongly Disagree
                     13         6   Not Applicable
                     97         7   Don't Know
                     86         .
```

----
q24d
Relation w/ CRC: Matching requirements generally fair

QUESTIONNAIRE TEXT: We're interested in getting a sense of local officials'
views on their local county road commissions or county road departments
(where road commission duties have been transferred to the county). Thinking
about how the county road commission or road department interacts with your
jurisdiction in particular, to what extent do you agree or disagree with
each of the following statements? Our county's matching requirements for our
local road funding are generally fair.

```
             type:  numeric (byte)
            label:  agree_disagree_na

            range:  [1,7]                           units:  1
    unique values:  7                           missing .:  88/1,478

      tabulation:  Freq.   Numeric  Label
                    224         1   Strongly Agree
                    470         2   Somewhat Agree
                    215         3   Neither Agree nor Disagree
                    147         4   Somewhat Disagree
                    133         5   Strongly Disagree
                     91         6   Not Applicable
                    110         7   Don't Know
                     88         .
```

----
q24e
Relation w/ CRC: Local govt. has good relationship w/ Commission/Dept.

QUESTIONNAIRE TEXT: We're interested in getting a sense of local officials'
views on their local county road commissions or county road departments
(where road commission duties have been transferred to the county). Thinking
about how the county road commission or road department interacts with your
jurisdiction in particular, to what extent do you agree or disagree with
each of the following statements? My local government has a good
relationship with our county road commission/road department.

```
             type:  numeric (byte)
            label:  agree_disagree_na
```

```
              range:  [1,7]                           units:  1
      unique values:  7                        missing .:   77/1,478

        tabulation:  Freq.   Numeric  Label
                       608         1  Strongly Agree
                       477         2  Somewhat Agree
                       153         3  Neither Agree nor Disagree
                        76         4  Somewhat Disagree
                        38         5  Strongly Disagree
                        13         6  Not Applicable
                        36         7  Don't Know
                        77         .
```

----
q24f
Relation w/ CRC: Commission/Dept. generally responds in timely manner
----

QUESTIONNAIRE TEXT: We're interested in getting a sense of local officials'
views on their local county road commissions or county road departments
(where road commission duties have been transferred to the county). Thinking
about how the county road commission or road department interacts with your
jurisdiction in particular, to what extent do you agree or disagree with
each of the following statements? Our county road commission/road department
generally responds to my government's communications in a timely manner.

```
               type:  numeric (byte)
              label:  agree_disagree_na

              range:  [1,7]                           units:  1
      unique values:  7                        missing .:   81/1,478

        tabulation:  Freq.   Numeric  Label
                       586         1  Strongly Agree
                       456         2  Somewhat Agree
                       137         3  Neither Agree nor Disagree
                        97         4  Somewhat Disagree
                        52         5  Strongly Disagree
                        24         6  Not Applicable
                        45         7  Don't Know
                        81         .
```

----
q24g
Relation w/ CRC: Overall satisfaction w/ performance of Commission/Dept.

QUESTIONNAIRE TEXT: We're interested in getting a sense of local officials'
views on their local county road commissions or county road departments
(where road commission duties have been transferred to the county). Thinking
about how the county road commission or road department interacts with your
jurisdiction in particular, to what extent do you agree or disagree with
each of the following statements? Overall, I'm satisfied with the
performance of our county road commission/road department.

```
               type:  numeric (byte)
```

```
                label:  agree_disagree_na

                range:  [1,7]                          units:  1
        unique values:  7                          missing .:  81/1,478

           tabulation:  Freq.   Numeric  Label
                          472         1  Strongly Agree
                          455         2  Somewhat Agree
                          192         3  Neither Agree nor Disagree
                          144         4  Somewhat Disagree
                           90         5  Strongly Disagree
                           13         6  Not Applicable
                           31         7  Don't Know
                           81         .
```

----
q25
What has worked well/not so well in interaction w/ Co. Road
Commission/Dept.?

QUESTIONNAIRE TEXT: Please describe what, if anything, has worked
particularly well or not so well in terms of your government's interactions
with your county's road commission or road department.

```
                 type:  string (str1412)

        unique values:  608                      missing "":  866/1,478
```

CODEBOOK NOTE: PLACEHOLDER FOR CBN ABOUT STRING VARS.

----
q26a
Implemented: Added or expanded biking or walking trails

QUESTIONNAIRE TEXT: Thinking beyond traditional road issues, which of the
following, if any, have been implemented within your jurisdiction's
geographic boundaries in the last five years? Added or expanded biking or
walking trails

```
                 type:  numeric (byte)
                label:  selected

                range:  [0,1]                          units:  1
        unique values:  2                          missing .:  487/1,478

           tabulation:  Freq.   Numeric  Label
                          511         0  Not Selected
                          480         1  Selected
                          487         .
```

----
q26b
Implemented: Added or expanded dedicated bike lanes on streets
----

QUESTIONNAIRE TEXT: Thinking beyond traditional road issues, which of the
following, if any, have been implemented within your jurisdiction's
geographic boundaries in the last five years? Added or expanded dedicated
bike lanes on streets

```
                 type:  numeric (byte)
                label:  selected

                range:  [0,1]                        units:  1
        unique values:  2                        missing .:  487/1,478

           tabulation:  Freq.   Numeric  Label
                          779         0  Not Selected
                          212         1  Selected
                          487         .
```

----
q26c
Implemented: Added or expanded ATV or snowmobile trails

QUESTIONNAIRE TEXT: Thinking beyond traditional road issues, which of the
following, if any, have been implemented within your jurisdiction's
geographic boundaries in the last five years? Added or expanded ATV or
snowmobile trails

```
                 type:  numeric (byte)
                label:  selected

                range:  [0,1]                        units:  1
        unique values:  2                        missing .:  487/1,478

           tabulation:  Freq.   Numeric  Label
                          804         0  Not Selected
                          187         1  Selected
                          487         .
```

----
q26d
Implemented: Added or widened sidewalks

QUESTIONNAIRE TEXT: Thinking beyond traditional road issues, which of the
following, if any, have been implemented within your jurisdiction's
geographic boundaries in the last five years? Added or widened sidewalks

```
                 type:  numeric (byte)
                label:  selected

                range:  [0,1]                        units:  1
        unique values:  2                        missing .:  487/1,478

           tabulation:  Freq.   Numeric  Label
                          731         0  Not Selected
                          260         1  Selected
                          487         .
```

```
--------------------------------------------------------------------------------
q26e
Implemented: Reduced number of vehicle lanes (road diet)
--------------------------------------------------------------------------------

QUESTIONNAIRE TEXT: Thinking beyond traditional road issues, which of the
following, if any, have been implemented within your jurisdiction's
geographic boundaries in the last five years? Reduced the number of vehicle
lanes (a "road diet")

                type:  numeric (byte)
                label:  selected

                range:  [0,1]                          units:  1
        unique values:  2                       missing .:  487/1,478

            tabulation:  Freq.   Numeric  Label
                          912         0  Not Selected
                           79         1  Selected
                          487         .


--------------------------------------------------------------------------------
q26f
Implemented: Don't Know
--------------------------------------------------------------------------------

QUESTIONNAIRE TEXT: Thinking beyond traditional road issues, which of the
following, if any, have been implemented within your jurisdiction's
geographic boundaries in the last five years? Don't know

                type:  numeric (byte)
                label:  selected

                range:  [0,1]                          units:  1
        unique values:  2                       missing .:  487/1,478

            tabulation:  Freq.   Numeric  Label
                          710         0  Not Selected
                          281         1  Selected
                          487         .


--------------------------------------------------------------------------------
q26_offroad
Implemented: at least one off-road change
--------------------------------------------------------------------------------


                type:  numeric (float)
                label:  implementoff

                range:  [0,2]                          units:  1
        unique values:  3                       missing .:  487/1,478

            tabulation:  Freq.   Numeric  Label
                           44         0  No off-road changes selected
                          666         1  At least one selected
```

```
                      281           2  Don't know selected
                      487           .
CODEBOOK NOTE: q26_offroad and q26_onroad are variables created by CLOSUP to
summarize responses to q26a-q26f. q26_offroad=2 if q26f "Don't Know" was
selected. q26_offroad=0 if any of q26b and q26e were selected.

 ----------------------------------------------------------------------------
q26_onroad
Implemented: at least one on-road change
 ----------------------------------------------------------------------------

                 type:  numeric (float)
                label:  implementon

                range:  [0,2]                              units:  1
        unique values:  3                          missing .:  487/1,478

           tabulation:  Freq.   Numeric  Label
                          466         0  No on-road changes selected
                          244         1  At least one selected
                          281         2  Don't know selected
                          487         .


CODEBOOK NOTE: q26_offroad and q26_onroad are variables created by CLOSUP to
summarize responses to q26a-q26f. q26_onroad=1 if at least one of q26b and
q26e was selected. q26_onroad=2 if  q26f "Don't Know" was selected.
q26_onroad=0 if any of q26a, q26c, or q26d were selected.

 ----------------------------------------------------------------------------


q27
Familiarity with Complete Streets
 ----------------------------------------------------------------------------

QUESTIONNAIRE TEXT: In 2010, "Complete Streets" legislation gave project
planning and coordination responsibilities to local governments and the
Michigan Department of Transportation (MDOT) to develop "roadways planned,
designed, and constructed to provide appropriate access to all legal
users...whether by car, truck, transit, assistive device, foot or bicycle."
How familiar are you with the Complete Streets initiative?

                 type:  numeric (byte)
                label:  familiar

                range:  [1,5]                              units:  1
        unique values:  5                          missing .:  86/1,478

           tabulation:  Freq.   Numeric  Label
                          153         1  Very Familiar
                          375         2  Somewhat Familiar
                          329         3  Mostly Unfamiliar
                          420         4  Completely Unfamiliar
                          115         5  Don't Know
                           86         .


 ----------------------------------------------------------------------------
```

```
q28
Jurisdiction's approach to Complete Streets
-------------------------------------------------------------------------------

QUESTIONNAIRE TEXT: Which of the following best describes your
jurisdiction's approach to Complete Streets policies?

                type:  numeric (byte)
               label:  complete_streets

               range:  [1,6]                          units:  1
       unique values:  6                          missing .:  522/1,478

          tabulation:  Freq.   Numeric  Label
                          83         1  Enacted and is implementing
                          52         2  Enacted but has not implemented
                         200         3  Takes into account, but no
                                        formal policy
                         267         4  Taken no action, but might in
                                        future
                         179         5  Taken no action, unlikely to in
                                        future
                         175         6  Don't Know
                         522         .

SKIP PATTERN: not asked if q27=4.


-------------------------------------------------------------------------------
q28_combined
Jurisdiction's approach to Complete Streets – recoded
-------------------------------------------------------------------------------

                type:  numeric (float)
               label:  complete_streets2

               range:  [1,5]                          units:  1
       unique values:  5                          missing .:  522/1,478

          tabulation:  Freq.   Numeric  Label
                         135         1  Enacted, regardless of
                                        implementation
                         200         2  Taken into account, but no
                                        formal policy
                         267         3  Taken no action, but might in
                                        future
                         179         4  Taken no action, unlikely to in
                                        future
                         175         5  Don't know
                         522         .

CODEBOOK NOTE: q28_combined is a recoded version of q28, which collapses the
categories 1 "Enacted and is implementing" and 2 "Enacted but has not
implemented" into 1 "Enacted, regardless of implementation".

-------------------------------------------------------------------------------
```

```
q29a
Impact of Complete Streets: Quality of life
-------------------------------------------------------------------------------

QUESTIONNAIRE TEXT: What overall impact, if any, do you believe Complete
Streets policies have or would have on each of the following in your
jurisdiction? Quality of life

                 type:  numeric (byte)
                label:  impact

                range:  [1,7]                         units:  1
        unique values:  7                         missing .:  578/1,478

           tabulation:  Freq.   Numeric  Label
                           91         1  No Impact
                          228         2  Very Positive Impact
                          254         3  Somewhat Positive Impact
                          127         4  Mixed Positive and Negative
                                         Impact
                            2         5  Somewhat Negative Impact
                            3         6  Very Negative Impact
                          195         7  Don't Know
                          578         .


SKIP PATTERN: not asked if q27=4.


-------------------------------------------------------------------------------
q29b
Impact of Complete Streets: Cost-effectiveness of road spending
-------------------------------------------------------------------------------

QUESTIONNAIRE TEXT: What overall impact, if any, do you believe Complete
Streets policies have or would have on each of the following in your
jurisdiction? Cost-effectiveness of road spending

                 type:  numeric (byte)
                label:  impact

                range:  [1,7]                         units:  1
        unique values:  7                         missing .:  585/1,478

           tabulation:  Freq.   Numeric  Label
                           74         1  No Impact
                           95         2  Very Positive Impact
                          172         3  Somewhat Positive Impact
                          186         4  Mixed Positive and Negative
                                         Impact
                          110         5  Somewhat Negative Impact
                           34         6  Very Negative Impact
                          222         7  Don't Know
                          585         .


SKIP PATTERN: not asked if q27=4.
```

```
------------------------------------------------------------------------
q29c
Impact of Complete Streets: Economic development
------------------------------------------------------------------------

QUESTIONNAIRE TEXT: What overall impact, if any, do you believe Complete
Streets policies have or would have on each of the following in your
jurisdiction? Economic development

                 type:  numeric (byte)
                label:  impact

                range:  [1,7]                         units:  1
        unique values:  7                         missing .:  581/1,478

           tabulation:  Freq.   Numeric  Label
                         100         1  No Impact
                         177         2  Very Positive Impact
                         241         3  Somewhat Positive Impact
                         158         4  Mixed Positive and Negative
                                        Impact
                          10         5  Somewhat Negative Impact
                           6         6  Very Negative Impact
                         205         7  Don't Know
                         581         .

SKIP PATTERN: not asked if q27=4.

------------------------------------------------------------------------
q29d
Impact of Complete Streets: Traffic congestion
------------------------------------------------------------------------

QUESTIONNAIRE TEXT: What overall impact, if any, do you believe Complete
Streets policies have or would have on each of the following in your
jurisdiction? Traffic congestion

                 type:  numeric (byte)
                label:  impact

                range:  [1,7]                         units:  1
        unique values:  7                         missing .:  586/1,478

           tabulation:  Freq.   Numeric  Label
                         128         1  No Impact
                          97         2  Very Positive Impact
                         186         3  Somewhat Positive Impact
                         216         4  Mixed Positive and Negative
                                        Impact
                          47         5  Somewhat Negative Impact
                          11         6  Very Negative Impact
                         207         7  Don't Know
                         586         .

SKIP PATTERN: not asked if q27=4.

------------------------------------------------------------------------
```

```
q29e
Impact of Complete Streets: Pedestrian and/or cyclist safety
------------------------------------------------------------------------

QUESTIONNAIRE TEXT: What overall impact, if any, do you believe Complete
Streets policies have or would have on each of the following in your
jurisdiction? Pedestrian and/or cyclist safety

                 type:  numeric (byte)
                label:  impact

                range:  [1,7]                         units:  1
        unique values:  7                       missing .:  587/1,478

            tabulation:  Freq.    Numeric  Label
                           66           1  No Impact
                          274           2  Very Positive Impact
                          229           3  Somewhat Positive Impact
                          119           4  Mixed Positive and Negative
                                           Impact
                           11           5  Somewhat Negative Impact
                            8           6  Very Negative Impact
                          184           7  Don't Know
                          587           .

SKIP PATTERN: not asked if q27=4.

------------------------------------------------------------------------
q29f
Impact of Complete Streets: Jurisdiction's relationship with MDOT
------------------------------------------------------------------------

QUESTIONNAIRE TEXT: What overall impact, if any, do you believe Complete
Streets policies have or would have on each of the following in your
jurisdiction? Your jurisdiction's relationship with the Michigan Department
of Transportation (MDOT)

                 type:  numeric (byte)
                label:  impact

                range:  [1,7]                         units:  1
        unique values:  7                       missing .:  580/1,478

            tabulation:  Freq.    Numeric  Label
                          114           1  No Impact
                          139           2  Very Positive Impact
                          201           3  Somewhat Positive Impact
                          174           4  Mixed Positive and Negative
                                           Impact
                           28           5  Somewhat Negative Impact
                            6           6  Very Negative Impact
                          236           7  Don't Know
                          580           .

SKIP PATTERN: not asked if q27=4.

------------------------------------------------------------------------
```

```
q30
Respondent support/oppose Complete Streets in Jurisdiction
------------------------------------------------------------------------------

QUESTIONNAIRE TEXT: Overall, would you say that, in your role as a local
official, you support or oppose pursuing Complete Streets policies in your
jurisdiction?

                   type:  numeric (byte)
                  label:  support_oppose

                  range:  [1,6]                          units:  1
          unique values:  6                          missing .:  532/1,478

             tabulation:  Freq.    Numeric  Label
                            179          1  Strongly Support
                            264          2  Somewhat Support
                            260          3  Neither Support nor Oppose
                             42          4  Somewhat Oppose
                             37          5  Strongly Oppose
                            164          6  Don't Know
                            532          .

SKIP PATTERN: not asked if q27=4.

------------------------------------------------------------------------------
q31a
Available transit options: Amtrak
------------------------------------------------------------------------------

QUESTIONNAIRE TEXT: Thinking more broadly about transit options in your
jurisdiction, which of the following, if any, are currently available to
members of your community? Amtrak

                   type:  numeric (byte)
                  label:  selected

                  range:  [0,1]                          units:  1
          unique values:  2                          missing .:  91/1,478

             tabulation:  Freq.    Numeric  Label
                          1,311          0  Not Selected
                             76          1  Selected
                             91          .

------------------------------------------------------------------------------
q31b
Available transit options: Municipal, county-wide, regional bus service
------------------------------------------------------------------------------

QUESTIONNAIRE TEXT: Thinking more broadly about transit options in your
jurisdiction, which of the following, if any, are currently available to
members of your community? Municipal, county-wide, or regional fixed-route
bus service

                   type:  numeric (byte)
                  label:  selected
```

```
                    range:  [0,1]                         units:  1
            unique values:  2                          missing .:  91/1,478

              tabulation:  Freq.   Numeric  Label
                            988         0  Not Selected
                            399         1  Selected
                             91         .

-------------------------------------------------------------------------------
q31c
Available transit options: Private bus service
-------------------------------------------------------------------------------

QUESTIONNAIRE TEXT: Thinking more broadly about transit options in your
jurisdiction, which of the following, if any, are currently available to
members of your community? Greyhound, Indian Trails, or other private bus
service

                     type:  numeric (byte)
                    label:  selected

                    range:  [0,1]                         units:  1
            unique values:  2                          missing .:  91/1,478

              tabulation:  Freq.   Numeric  Label
                          1,212         0  Not Selected
                            175         1  Selected
                             91         .

-------------------------------------------------------------------------------
q31d
Available transit options: Dial-a-ride/on-demand para-transit service
-------------------------------------------------------------------------------

QUESTIONNAIRE TEXT: Thinking more broadly about transit options in your
jurisdiction, which of the following, if any, are currently available to
members of your community? Dial-a-ride/on-demand para-transit service

                     type:  numeric (byte)
                    label:  selected

                    range:  [0,1]                         units:  1
            unique values:  2                          missing .:  91/1,478

              tabulation:  Freq.   Numeric  Label
                            730         0  Not Selected
                            657         1  Selected
                             91         .

-------------------------------------------------------------------------------
q31e
Available transit options: Taxi service
-------------------------------------------------------------------------------
```

QUESTIONNAIRE TEXT: Thinking more broadly about transit options in your
jurisdiction, which of the following, if any, are currently available to
members of your community? Taxi service

```
               type:  numeric (byte)
              label:  selected

              range:  [0,1]                        units:  1
      unique values:  2                        missing .:  91/1,478

         tabulation:  Freq.   Numeric  Label
                      1,028         0  Not Selected
                        359         1  Selected
                         91         .
```

----
q31f
Available transit options: Van pool service

QUESTIONNAIRE TEXT: Thinking more broadly about transit options in your
jurisdiction, which of the following, if any, are currently available to
members of your community? Van pool service

```
               type:  numeric (byte)
              label:  selected

              range:  [0,1]                        units:  1
      unique values:  2                        missing .:  91/1,478

         tabulation:  Freq.   Numeric  Label
                      1,304         0  Not Selected
                         83         1  Selected
                         91         .
```

----
q31g
Available transit options: None

QUESTIONNAIRE TEXT: Thinking more broadly about transit options in your
jurisdiction, which of the following, if any, are currently available to
members of your community? None

```
               type:  numeric (byte)
              label:  selected

              range:  [0,1]                        units:  1
      unique values:  2                        missing .:  91/1,478

         tabulation:  Freq.   Numeric  Label
                      1,024         0  Not Selected
                        363         1  Selected
                         91         .
```

```
q31h
Available transit options: Don't Know
-------------------------------------------------------------------------------

QUESTIONNAIRE TEXT: Thinking more broadly about transit options in your
jurisdiction, which of the following, if any, are currently available to
members of your community? Don't know

                  type:  numeric (byte)
                 label:  selected

                 range:  [0,1]                            units:  1
         unique values:  2                            missing .:  91/1,478

            tabulation:  Freq.   Numeric  Label
                         1,348         0  Not Selected
                            39         1  Selected
                            91         .

-------------------------------------------------------------------------------
q31i
Available transit options: Other
-------------------------------------------------------------------------------

QUESTIONNAIRE TEXT: Thinking more broadly about transit options in your
jurisdiction, which of the following, if any, are currently available to
members of your community? Other

                  type:  numeric (byte)
                 label:  selected

                 range:  [0,1]                            units:  1
         unique values:  2                            missing .:  91/1,478

            tabulation:  Freq.   Numeric  Label
                         1,324         0  Not Selected
                            63         1  Selected
                            91         .

-------------------------------------------------------------------------------
q31count
Number of transit options
-------------------------------------------------------------------------------

                  type:  numeric (float)
                 label:  count

                 range:  [0,4]                            units:  1
         unique values:  5                            missing .:  0/1,478

            tabulation:  Freq.   Numeric  Label
                           454         0  None selected
                           520         1  1 selected
                           257         2  2 selected
                           208         3  3+ selected
                            39         4  Don't know selected
```

CODEBOOK NOTE: q31count is a variable calculated by CLOSUP to summarize
responses to q31a-q31i. q31count is equal to the number of transit options
selected in q31a-q31f and q31i. It was top-coded at 3 or more transit
options selected. q31count=4 if q31h=1.

----
q32a
Transit Satisfaction: Elderly or disabled

QUESTIONNAIRE TEXT: In your opinion, how satisfied or dissatisfied would you
say the following groups are regarding the transit options currently
available in your jurisdiction? The elderly or disabled

```
              type:  numeric (byte)
             label:  satisfaction_na

             range:  [1,7]                          units:  1
     unique values:  7                          missing .:  129/1,478

       tabulation:  Freq.   Numeric  Label
                     138          1  Very Satisfied
                     409          2  Somewhat Satisfied
                     162          3  Neither Satisfied nor
                                      Dissatisfied
                     245          4  Somewhat Dissatisfied
                      88          5  Very Dissatisfied
                      79          6  Not Applicable
                     228          7  Don't Know
                     129          .
```

----
q32b
Transit Satisfaction: Young people (35 years and younger)

QUESTIONNAIRE TEXT: In your opinion, how satisfied or dissatisfied would you
say the following groups are regarding the transit options currently
available in your jurisdiction? Young people (35 years and younger)

```
              type:  numeric (byte)
             label:  satisfaction_na

             range:  [1,7]                          units:  1
     unique values:  7                          missing .:  144/1,478

       tabulation:  Freq.   Numeric  Label
                      69          1  Very Satisfied
                     231          2  Somewhat Satisfied
                     374          3  Neither Satisfied nor
                                      Dissatisfied
                     156          4  Somewhat Dissatisfied
                      71          5  Very Dissatisfied
                     112          6  Not Applicable
                     321          7  Don't Know
                     144          .
```

----
q32c
Transit Satisfaction: Employers, employees, and job seekers

QUESTIONNAIRE TEXT: In your opinion, how satisfied or dissatisfied would you
say the following groups are regarding the transit options currently
available in your jurisdiction? Employers, employees, and job seekers

```
                type:  numeric (byte)
                label:  satisfaction_na

                range:  [1,7]                          units:  1
        unique values:  7                         missing .:  142/1,478

            tabulation:  Freq.   Numeric  Label
                           64         1  Very Satisfied
                          235         2  Somewhat Satisfied
                          379         3  Neither Satisfied nor
                                         Dissatisfied
                          160         4  Somewhat Dissatisfied
                           69         5  Very Dissatisfied
                          118         6  Not Applicable
                          311         7  Don't Know
                          142         .
```

----
q32d
Transit Satisfaction: Visitors and tourists

QUESTIONNAIRE TEXT: In your opinion, how satisfied or dissatisfied would you
say the following groups are regarding the transit options currently
available in your jurisdiction? Visitors and tourists

```
                type:  numeric (byte)
                label:  satisfaction_na

                range:  [1,7]                          units:  1
        unique values:  7                         missing .:  151/1,478

            tabulation:  Freq.   Numeric  Label
                           63         1  Very Satisfied
                          161         2  Somewhat Satisfied
                          400         3  Neither Satisfied nor
                                         Dissatisfied
                          114         4  Somewhat Dissatisfied
                           46         5  Very Dissatisfied
                          163         6  Not Applicable
                          380         7  Don't Know
                          151         .
```

----
q32e
Transit Satisfaction: Jurisdiction's Board/Council

QUESTIONNAIRE TEXT: In your opinion, how satisfied or dissatisfied would you
say the following groups are regarding the transit options currently
available in your jurisdiction? The majority of your jurisdiction's
Board/Council

```
                type:  numeric (byte)
                label:  satisfaction_na

               range:  [1,7]                         units:  1
       unique values:  7                         missing .:  149/1,478

           tabulation:  Freq.   Numeric  Label
                         109         1  Very Satisfied
                         298         2  Somewhat Satisfied
                         389         3  Neither Satisfied nor
                                         Dissatisfied
                         138         4  Somewhat Dissatisfied
                          37         5  Very Dissatisfied
                         104         6  Not Applicable
                         254         7  Don't Know
                         149         .
```

----
q32f
Transit Satisfaction: Respondent as local official

QUESTIONNAIRE TEXT: In your opinion, how satisfied or dissatisfied would you
say the following groups are regarding the transit options currently
available in your jurisdiction? You personally in your role as a local
official

```
                type:  numeric (byte)
                label:  satisfaction_na

               range:  [1,7]                         units:  1
       unique values:  7                         missing .:  143/1,478

           tabulation:  Freq.   Numeric  Label
                         135         1  Very Satisfied
                         319         2  Somewhat Satisfied
                         376         3  Neither Satisfied nor
                                         Dissatisfied
                         202         4  Somewhat Dissatisfied
                          88         5  Very Dissatisfied
                         112         6  Not Applicable
                         103         7  Don't Know
                         143         .
```

----
q33a
Transit Dissatisfaction: Routes, frequency, coverage, etc.

QUESTIONNAIRE TEXT: Which of the following factors, if any, do you believe
contribute to local dissatisfaction with the transit options currently
available in your jurisdiction? Routes, frequency, coverage, etc.

```
              type:  numeric (byte)
             label:  selected

             range:  [0,1]                          units:  1
     unique values:  2                          missing .:  986/1,478

         tabulation:  Freq.   Numeric  Label
                       190         0   Not Selected
                       302         1   Selected
                       986         .
```

SKIP PATTERN: asked if q32a=4 or 5, q32b=4 or 5, q32c=4 or 5, q32d=4 or 5,
q33e=4 or 5, or q33f=4 or 5.

----
q33b
Transit Dissatisfaction: Cost

QUESTIONNAIRE TEXT: Which of the following factors, if any, do you believe
contribute to local dissatisfaction with the transit options currently
available in your jurisdiction? Cost

```
              type:  numeric (byte)
             label:  selected

             range:  [0,1]                          units:  1
     unique values:  2                          missing .:  986/1,478

         tabulation:  Freq.   Numeric  Label
                       333         0   Not Selected
                       159         1   Selected
                       986         .
```

SKIP PATTERN: asked if q32a=4 or 5, q32b=4 or 5, q32c=4 or 5, q32d=4 or 5,
q33e=4 or 5, or q33f=4 or 5.

----
q33c
Transit Dissatisfaction: Reliability

QUESTIONNAIRE TEXT: Which of the following factors, if any, do you believe
contribute to local dissatisfaction with the transit options currently
available in your jurisdiction? Reliability

```
              type:  numeric (byte)
             label:  selected

             range:  [0,1]                          units:  1
     unique values:  2                          missing .:  986/1,478

         tabulation:  Freq.   Numeric  Label
                       379         0   Not Selected
                       113         1   Selected
```

```
                              986          .

SKIP PATTERN: asked if q32a=4 or 5, q32b=4 or 5, q32c=4 or 5, q32d=4 or 5,
q33e=4 or 5, or q33f=4 or 5.


-------------------------------------------------------------------------------
q33d
Transit Dissatisfaction: Connectivity to other communities
-------------------------------------------------------------------------------

QUESTIONNAIRE TEXT: Which of the following factors, if any, do you believe
contribute to local dissatisfaction with the transit options currently
available in your jurisdiction? Connectivity to other communities

                  type:  numeric (byte)
                 label:  selected

                 range:  [0,1]                        units:  1
         unique values:  2                        missing .:  986/1,478

            tabulation:  Freq.   Numeric  Label
                          262        0  Not Selected
                          230        1  Selected
                          986        .

SKIP PATTERN: asked if q32a=4 or 5, q32b=4 or 5, q32c=4 or 5, q32d=4 or 5,
q33e=4 or 5, or q33f=4 or 5.


-------------------------------------------------------------------------------
q33e
Transit Dissatisfaction: Don't Know
-------------------------------------------------------------------------------

QUESTIONNAIRE TEXT: Which of the following factors, if any, do you believe
contribute to local dissatisfaction with the transit options currently
available in your jurisdiction? Don't know

                  type:  numeric (byte)
                 label:  selected

                 range:  [0,1]                        units:  1
         unique values:  2                        missing .:  986/1,478

            tabulation:  Freq.   Numeric  Label
                          445        0  Not Selected
                           47        1  Selected
                          986        .

SKIP PATTERN: asked if q32a=4 or 5, q32b=4 or 5, q32c=4 or 5, q32d=4 or 5,
q33e=4 or 5, or q33f=4 or 5.


-------------------------------------------------------------------------------
q33f
Transit Dissatisfaction: Other
```

QUESTIONNAIRE TEXT: Which of the following factors, if any, do you believe
contribute to local dissatisfaction with the transit options currently
available in your jurisdiction? Other

                type: numeric (byte)
                label: selected

                range: [0,1]   units: 1
        unique values: 2   missing .: 986/1,478

           tabulation: Freq.   Numeric Label
                          436   0 Not Selected
                           56   1 Selected
                          986   .

SKIP PATTERN: asked if q32a=4 or 5, q32b=4 or 5, q32c=4 or 5, q32d=4 or 5,
q33e=4 or 5, or q33f=4 or 5.

----
q34a
Encourage or Discourage Transit: Public demand

QUESTIONNAIRE TEXT: We're interested in factors that may be encouraging or
discouraging expansion of transit in jurisdictions across the state. To what
degree would you say the following have been encouraging or discouraging the
development of transit within your jurisdiction? Public demand

                type: numeric (byte)
                label: encourage_discourage

                range: [1,7]   units: 1
        unique values: 7   missing .: 181/1,478

           tabulation: Freq.   Numeric Label
                           62   1 Significantly Encouraging
                          284   2 Somewhat Encouraging
                          452   3 Neither Encouraging nor
                                          Discouraging
                          121   4 Somewhat Discouraging
                           49   5 Significantly Discouraging
                          156   6 Not Applicable
                          173   7 Don't Know
                          181   .

----
q34b
Encourage or Discourage Transit: Operation and maintenance costs
----

QUESTIONNAIRE TEXT: We're interested in factors that may be encouraging or
discouraging expansion of transit in jurisdictions across the state. To what
degree would you say the following have been encouraging or discouraging the
development of transit within your jurisdiction? Operation and maintenance
costs

```
                type:  numeric (byte)
               label:  encourage_discourage

               range:  [1,7]                           units:  1
       unique values:  7                          missing .:  191/1,478

          tabulation:  Freq.   Numeric  Label
                          20         1  Significantly Encouraging
                          88         2  Somewhat Encouraging
                         348         3  Neither Encouraging nor
                                        Discouraging
                         282         4  Somewhat Discouraging
                         180         5  Significantly Discouraging
                         165         6  Not Applicable
                         204         7  Don't Know
                         191         .
```
----
q34c
Encourage or Discourage Transit: Availability of state or federal funding
----

QUESTIONNAIRE TEXT: We're interested in factors that may be encouraging or
discouraging expansion of transit in jurisdictions across the state. To what
degree would you say the following have been encouraging or discouraging the
development of transit within your jurisdiction? Availability of state or
federal funding

```
                type:  numeric (byte)
               label:  encourage_discourage

               range:  [1,7]                           units:  1
       unique values:  7                          missing .:  188/1,478

          tabulation:  Freq.   Numeric  Label
                          41         1  Significantly Encouraging
                         115         2  Somewhat Encouraging
                         288         3  Neither Encouraging nor
                                        Discouraging
                         241         4  Somewhat Discouraging
                         213         5  Significantly Discouraging
                         151         6  Not Applicable
                         241         7  Don't Know
                         188         .
```
----
q34d
Encourage or Discourage Transit: Availability of local funding
----

QUESTIONNAIRE TEXT: We're interested in factors that may be encouraging or
discouraging expansion of transit in jurisdictions across the state. To what
degree would you say the following have been encouraging or discouraging the
development of transit within your jurisdiction? Availability of local
funding

```
                type:  numeric (byte)
```

```
                label:  encourage_discourage

                range:  [1,7]                             units:  1
        unique values:  7                          missing .:  192/1,478

           tabulation:  Freq.   Numeric  Label
                           32         1  Significantly Encouraging
                          118         2  Somewhat Encouraging
                          276         3  Neither Encouraging nor
                                         Discouraging
                          246         4  Somewhat Discouraging
                          250         5  Significantly Discouraging
                          170         6  Not Applicable
                          194         7  Don't Know
                          192         .
```

----
q34e
Encourage or Discourage Transit: Influence of community leaders/organizers
----

QUESTIONNAIRE TEXT: We're interested in factors that may be encouraging or
discouraging expansion of transit in jurisdictions across the state. To what
degree would you say the following have been encouraging or discouraging the
development of transit within your jurisdiction? The influence of persistent
community leaders/organizers

```
                 type:  numeric (byte)
                label:  encourage_discourage

                range:  [1,7]                             units:  1
        unique values:  7                          missing .:  202/1,478

           tabulation:  Freq.   Numeric  Label
                           38         1  Significantly Encouraging
                          190         2  Somewhat Encouraging
                          476         3  Neither Encouraging nor
                                         Discouraging
                          121         4  Somewhat Discouraging
                           55         5  Significantly Discouraging
                          176         6  Not Applicable
                          220         7  Don't Know
                          202         .
```

----
q34f
Encourage or Discourage Transit: Concern over traffic congestion
----

QUESTIONNAIRE TEXT: We're interested in factors that may be encouraging or
discouraging expansion of transit in jurisdictions across the state. To what
degree would you say the following have been encouraging or discouraging the
development of transit within your jurisdiction? Concern over traffic
congestion

```
                 type:  numeric (byte)
                label:  encourage_discourage
```

```
             range:  [1,7]                            units:  1
     unique values:  7                            missing .:  194/1,478

        tabulation:  Freq.   Numeric  Label
                        18         1  Significantly Encouraging
                       108         2  Somewhat Encouraging
                       571         3  Neither Encouraging nor
                                      Discouraging
                        63         4  Somewhat Discouraging
                        35         5  Significantly Discouraging
                       298         6  Not Applicable
                       191         7  Don't Know
                       194         .
```

----
q34g
Encourage or Discourage Transit: Jurisdiction's relationship w/ neighbors
----

QUESTIONNAIRE TEXT: We're interested in factors that may be encouraging or
discouraging expansion of transit in jurisdictions across the state. To what
degree would you say the following have been encouraging or discouraging the
development of transit within your jurisdiction? Your jurisdiction's
relationship with neighboring jurisdictions (for interjurisdictional
service)

```
              type:  numeric (byte)
             label:  encourage_discourage

             range:  [1,7]                            units:  1
     unique values:  7                            missing .:  199/1,478

        tabulation:  Freq.   Numeric  Label
                        69         1  Significantly Encouraging
                       198         2  Somewhat Encouraging
                       516         3  Neither Encouraging nor
                                      Discouraging
                        57         4  Somewhat Discouraging
                        29         5  Significantly Discouraging
                       214         6  Not Applicable
                       196         7  Don't Know
                       199         .
```

----
q35
How important is transit system to needs of Jurisdiction?

QUESTIONNAIRE TEXT: Some people think a well-functioning transit system is
important to communities in a variety of ways, such as for economic
development, environmental sustainability, residents' mobility, etc. Others
do not. How important, if at all, do you think a well-functioning transit
system is to the overall needs of your jurisdiction?

```
              type:  numeric (byte)
             label:  important
```

```
                 range:  [1,5]                            units:  1
         unique values:  5                           missing .:  140/1,478

            tabulation:  Freq.   Numeric  Label
                           263         1  Very Important
                           513         2  Somewhat Important
                           286         3  Not Very Important
                           185         4  Not Important At All
                            91         5  Don't Know
                           140         .
```

----
q36a
Ethical Rating: Michigan's state legislators

QUESTIONNAIRE TEXT: First of all, we are interested in your general opinions
about the state of ethics and integrity in Michigan government. In general,
how would you rate the following groups of people overall in terms of
ethical behavior in their official positions? Michigan's state legislators

```
                  type:  numeric (byte)
                 label:  ethical_rating

                 range:  [1,6]                            units:  1
         unique values:  6                           missing .:  124/1,478

            tabulation:  Freq.   Numeric  Label
                            66         1  Very Ethical
                           568         2  Mostly Ethical
                           447         3  Equally Ethical and Unethical
                           135         4  Mostly Unethical
                            40         5  Very Unethical
                            98         6  Don't Know
                           124         .
```

----
q36b
Ethical Rating: Michigan's state executive branch leaders

QUESTIONNAIRE TEXT: First of all, we are interested in your general opinions
about the state of ethics and integrity in Michigan government. In general,
how would you rate the following groups of people overall in terms of
ethical behavior in their official positions? Michigan's state executive
branch leaders (Governor, Lt. Gov., department leaders, etc.)

```
                  type:  numeric (byte)
                 label:  ethical_rating

                 range:  [1,6]                            units:  1
         unique values:  6                           missing .:  125/1,478

            tabulation:  Freq.   Numeric  Label
                           185         1  Very Ethical
```

```
                        592        2  Mostly Ethical
                        324        3  Equally Ethical and Unethical
                        116        4  Mostly Unethical
                         38        5  Very Unethical
                         98        6  Don't Know
                        125        .

------------------------------------------------------------------------
q36c
Ethical Rating: Elected and appointed officials in Jurisdiction
------------------------------------------------------------------------

QUESTIONNAIRE TEXT: First of all, we are interested in your general opinions
about the state of ethics and integrity in Michigan government. In general,
how would you rate the following groups of people overall in terms of
ethical behavior in their official positions? Elected and appointed
officials in your jurisdiction


                 type:  numeric (byte)
                label:  ethical_rating

                range:  [1,6]                         units:  1
        unique values:  6                         missing .:  117/1,478

           tabulation:  Freq.   Numeric  Label
                        721        1  Very Ethical
                        483        2  Mostly Ethical
                        103        3  Equally Ethical and Unethical
                         10        4  Mostly Unethical
                          9        5  Very Unethical
                         35        6  Don't Know
                        117        .

------------------------------------------------------------------------
q36d
Ethical Rating: Local government elected and appointed officials across
Michigan
------------------------------------------------------------------------

QUESTIONNAIRE TEXT: First of all, we are interested in your general opinions
about the state of ethics and integrity in Michigan government. In general,
how would you rate the following groups of people overall in terms of
ethical behavior in their official positions? Local government elected and
appointed officials in general across the state

                 type:  numeric (byte)
                label:  ethical_rating

                range:  [1,6]                         units:  1
        unique values:  6                         missing .:  120/1,478

           tabulation:  Freq.   Numeric  Label
                        209        1  Very Ethical
                        740        2  Mostly Ethical
                        248        3  Equally Ethical and Unethical
                         37        4  Mostly Unethical
```

```
                          4          5  Very Unethical
                        120          6  Don't Know
                        120           .

--------------------------------------------------------------------------------
q37a
Disclose Financial Interests: Michigan's state legislators
--------------------------------------------------------------------------------

QUESTIONNAIRE TEXT: To what extent do you agree or disagree that the
following types of Michigan government officials should be required to
disclose their financial interests (occupations, sources of income, business
interests, property holdings, creditors and debtors, etc.)? Michigan's state
legislators

                  type:  numeric (byte)
                 label:  agree_disagree

                 range:  [1,6]                          units:  1
         unique values:  6                         missing .:  125/1,478

            tabulation:  Freq.   Numeric  Label
                          540          1  Strongly Agree
                          375          2  Somewhat Agree
                          227          3  Neither Agree nor Disagree
                           75          4  Somewhat Disagree
                           85          5  Strongly Disagree
                           51          6  Don't Know
                          125           .

--------------------------------------------------------------------------------
q37b
Disclose Financial Interests: Michigan's state executive branch leaders
--------------------------------------------------------------------------------

QUESTIONNAIRE TEXT: To what extent do you agree or disagree that the
following types of Michigan government officials should be required to
disclose their financial interests (occupations, sources of income, business
interests, property holdings, creditors and debtors, etc.)? Michigan's state
executive branch leaders (Governor, Lt. Gov., department leaders, etc.)

                  type:  numeric (byte)
                 label:  agree_disagree

                 range:  [1,6]                          units:  1
         unique values:  6                         missing .:  135/1,478

            tabulation:  Freq.   Numeric  Label
                          577          1  Strongly Agree
                          346          2  Somewhat Agree
                          217          3  Neither Agree nor Disagree
                           72          4  Somewhat Disagree
                           81          5  Strongly Disagree
                           50          6  Don't Know
                          135           .

--------------------------------------------------------------------------------
```

q37c
Disclose Financial Interests: Local government elected officials
----

QUESTIONNAIRE TEXT: To what extent do you agree or disagree that the
following types of Michigan government officials should be required to
disclose their financial interests (occupations, sources of income, business
interests, property holdings, creditors and debtors, etc.)? Local government
elected officials

```
              type:  numeric (byte)
              label:  agree_disagree

              range:  [1,6]                              units:  1
      unique values:  6                          missing .:  128/1,478

         tabulation:  Freq.   Numeric  Label
                        278          1  Strongly Agree
                        320          2  Somewhat Agree
                        374          3  Neither Agree nor Disagree
                        145          4  Somewhat Disagree
                        189          5  Strongly Disagree
                         44          6  Don't Know
                        128          .
```

----
q37d
Disclose Financial Interests: Local government department and agency leaders
----

QUESTIONNAIRE TEXT: To what extent do you agree or disagree that the
following types of Michigan government officials should be required to
disclose their financial interests (occupations, sources of income, business
interests, property holdings, creditors and debtors, etc.)? Local government
department and agency leaders

```
              type:  numeric (byte)
              label:  agree_disagree

              range:  [1,6]                              units:  1
      unique values:  6                          missing .:  136/1,478

         tabulation:  Freq.   Numeric  Label
                        247          1  Strongly Agree
                        285          2  Somewhat Agree
                        391          3  Neither Agree nor Disagree
                        167          4  Somewhat Disagree
                        206          5  Strongly Disagree
                         46          6  Don't Know
                        136          .
```

----
q38a
Revolving Door: Michigan's state legislators

QUESTIONNAIRE TEXT: To what extent do you agree or disagree that the
following Michigan state officials should be required to wait a certain
period of time (a year or two) after leaving office before becoming a
lobbyist or consultant that does work for the state government, also known
as a "revolving door" restriction? Michigan's state legislators

```
              type:  numeric (byte)
              label:  agree_disagree

              range:  [1,6]                        units:  1
      unique values:  6                      missing .:  130/1,478

          tabulation:  Freq.   Numeric  Label
                        696         1  Strongly Agree
                        241         2  Somewhat Agree
                        216         3  Neither Agree nor Disagree
                         73         4  Somewhat Disagree
                         39         5  Strongly Disagree
                         83         6  Don't Know
                        130         .
```

----
q38b
Revolving Door: Michigan's state executive branch leaders

QUESTIONNAIRE TEXT: To what extent do you agree or disagree that the
following Michigan state officials should be required to wait a certain
period of time (a year or two) after leaving office before becoming a
lobbyist or consultant that does work for the state government, also known
as a "revolving door" restriction? Michigan's state government executive
branch department and agency leaders

```
              type:  numeric (byte)
              label:  agree_disagree

              range:  [1,6]                        units:  1
      unique values:  6                      missing .:  138/1,478

          tabulation:  Freq.   Numeric  Label
                        705         1  Strongly Agree
                        225         2  Somewhat Agree
                        218         3  Neither Agree nor Disagree
                         74         4  Somewhat Disagree
                         36         5  Strongly Disagree
                         82         6  Don't Know
                        138         .
```

----
q39a
Gifts & Honoraria: Appointed state officials should also be prohibited
----

QUESTIONNAIRE TEXT: Michigan currently prohibits state legislators from
receiving honoraria (e.g., speaking fees or other payments for service), but
allows certain levels of gifts, food, and travel or lodging expenses to be
paid by outside interests. To what extent do you agree or disagree with each

of the following statements about gifts and honoraria received by
legislators, other government officials, or their staff members? Like state
legislators, appointed state government officials should also be prohibited
from receiving honoraria while in office.

```
                type:  numeric (byte)
                label:  agree_disagree

                range:  [1,6]                        units:  1
        unique values:  6                       missing .:  134/1,478

            tabulation:  Freq.   Numeric  Label
                          722        1  Strongly Agree
                          297        2  Somewhat Agree
                          181        3  Neither Agree nor Disagree
                           66        4  Somewhat Disagree
                           25        5  Strongly Disagree
                           53        6  Don't Know
                          134        .
```

----
q39b
Gifts & Honoraria: A yearly cap should be enforced

QUESTIONNAIRE TEXT: Michigan currently prohibits state legislators from
receiving honoraria (e.g., speaking fees or other payments for service), but
allows certain levels of gifts, food, and travel or lodging expenses to be
paid by outside interests. To what extent do you agree or disagree with each
of the following statements about gifts and honoraria received by
legislators, other government officials, or their staff members? An overall
yearly cap should be enforced limiting the total amount of gifts, food, and
travel/lodging reimbursements any state government official may receive.

```
                type:  numeric (byte)
                label:  agree_disagree

                range:  [1,6]                        units:  1
        unique values:  6                       missing .:  145/1,478

            tabulation:  Freq.   Numeric  Label
                          702        1  Strongly Agree
                          312        2  Somewhat Agree
                          167        3  Neither Agree nor Disagree
                           48        4  Somewhat Disagree
                           38        5  Strongly Disagree
                           66        6  Don't Know
                          145        .
```

----
q39c
Gifts & Honoraria: Should be reported by both donor and public official
----

QUESTIONNAIRE TEXT: Michigan currently prohibits state legislators from
receiving honoraria (e.g., speaking fees or other payments for service), but
allows certain levels of gifts, food, and travel or lodging expenses to be

paid by outside interests. To what extent do you agree or disagree with each
of the following statements about gifts and honoraria received by
legislators, other government officials, or their staff members?
Expenditures above a certain threshold made on behalf of a state government
official should be reported by both the donor and the public official.

```
              type:  numeric (byte)
             label:  agree_disagree

             range:  [1,6]                        units:  1
      unique values:  6                       missing .:  145/1,478

         tabulation:  Freq.   Numeric  Label
                       822         1  Strongly Agree
                       279         2  Somewhat Agree
                       139         3  Neither Agree nor Disagree
                        24         4  Somewhat Disagree
                        18         5  Strongly Disagree
                        51         6  Don't Know
                       145         .
```

----
q39d
Gifts & Honoraria: Policies should apply to local officials across the state
----

QUESTIONNAIRE TEXT: Michigan currently prohibits state legislators from
receiving honoraria (e.g., speaking fees or other payments for service), but
allows certain levels of gifts, food, and travel or lodging expenses to be
paid by outside interests. To what extent do you agree or disagree with each
of the following statements about gifts and honoraria received by
legislators, other government officials, or their staff members? Policies
prohibiting honoraria, limiting gifts, and requiring gift disclosure should
apply to local government officials across the state.

```
              type:  numeric (byte)
             label:  agree_disagree

             range:  [1,6]                        units:  1
      unique values:  6                       missing .:  154/1,478

         tabulation:  Freq.   Numeric  Label
                       714         1  Strongly Agree
                       290         2  Somewhat Agree
                       182         3  Neither Agree nor Disagree
                        43         4  Somewhat Disagree
                        37         5  Strongly Disagree
                        58         6  Don't Know
                       154         .
```

----
q40a
Jurisdiction Policies: Honoraria for elected/appointed officials
----

QUESTIONNAIRE TEXT: Does your jurisdiction currently have any policies that
prohibit, limit, or require disclosure for any of the following? Honoraria
for local elected and/or appointed officials

```
            type:  numeric (byte)
            label:  y_n_dk

            range:  [1,3]                         units:  1
    unique values:  3                       missing .:  116/1,478

       tabulation:  Freq.    Numeric  Label
                      320          1  Yes
                      802          2  No
                      240          3  Don't Know
                      116          .
```

----
q40b
Jurisdiction Policies: Gifts, food, travel, lodging paid by outside sources
----

QUESTIONNAIRE TEXT: Does your jurisdiction currently have any policies that
prohibit, limit, or require disclosure for any of the following? Gifts,
food, travel, and lodging paid for by outside sources

```
            type:  numeric (byte)
            label:  y_n_dk

            range:  [1,3]                         units:  1
    unique values:  3                       missing .:  133/1,478

       tabulation:  Freq.    Numeric  Label
                      372          1  Yes
                      758          2  No
                      215          3  Don't Know
                      133          .
```

----
q40any
Jurisdiction Policies: Honoraria or gifts

```
            type:  numeric (float)
            label:  q40_any

            range:  [1,3]                         units:  1
    unique values:  3                       missing .:  111/1,478

       tabulation:  Freq.    Numeric  Label
                      391          1  Yes, juris has existing policies
                      768          2  Juris has no existing policies
                      208          3  Don't know
                      111          .
```

CODEBOOK NOTE:q40any is a variable calculated by CLOSUP to summarize
responses to q40a and q40b. q40any=1 if q40a=1 or q40b=1. If q40a=3 "Don't

know" and q40b=3 "Don't know" q40any=3 "Don't know", and if both q40a and
q40b were missing q40any was set missing. Otherwise q40any=2.

```
--------------------------------------------------------------------------------
q41
Does Jurisdiction have local government code of ethics?
--------------------------------------------------------------------------------

QUESTIONNAIRE TEXT: Does your jurisdiction's local government have a code of
ethics?

                     type:  numeric (byte)
                    label:  y_n_dk

                    range:  [1,3]                          units:  1
            unique values:  3                          missing .:  120/1,478

               tabulation:  Freq.   Numeric  Label
                              810         1  Yes
                              388         2  No
                              160         3  Don't Know
                              120         .


--------------------------------------------------------------------------------
q40_41_any
Jurisdiction Policies: Honoraria or gifts, or ethics code
--------------------------------------------------------------------------------

                     type:  numeric (float)
                    label:  q40_41

                    range:  [1,3]                          units:  1
            unique values:  3                          missing .:  93/1,478

               tabulation:  Freq.   Numeric  Label
                              895         1  Juris has policies or ethics
                                             code
                              421         2  No policies or ethics code
                               69         3  Don't know
                               93         .
```

CODEBOOK NOTE: q40_41_any was calculated by CLOSUP to summarize the
variables q40a, q40b, and q41. A jurisdiction that reported having at least
one of a policy on honoraria, a policy on gifts, or an ethics code was coded
as 1 "Juris has policies or ethics code". A jurisdiction that reported
having none of those policies (no to q40a, q40b, and q41) was coded as 2 "No
policies or ethics code". Jurisdictions that answered "Don't know" to q40a,
q40b, and q41 were coded as 3 "Don't know", and jurisdictions that did not
respond to any of q40a, q40b, and q41 were left as missing.
```
--------------------------------------------------------------------------------
q42
Jurisdiction officials face potential conflicts of interest
--------------------------------------------------------------------------------
```

QUESTIONNAIRE TEXT: How often, if at all, would you say local elected and/or
appointed officials in your jurisdiction's government face issues that

present potential conflicts of interest (that is, where the official or
his/her family may receive tangible benefits—personal or business-related—
because of actions taken or decisions made as a government official)?

```
                  type:  numeric (byte)
                 label:  ethics_frequency

                 range:  [1,5]                        units:  1
         unique values:  5                        missing .:  106/1,478

            tabulation:  Freq.   Numeric  Label
                            38         1  Frequently
                           254         2  Occasionally
                           687         3  Rarely
                           343         4  Never
                            50         5  Don't Know
                           106         .
```

----
q43a1
Ethical concerns: FOIA requests: No, not experienced

QUESTIONNAIRE TEXT: Concerns about government ethics—some with merit, others
without—can sometimes be raised by citizens and organizations in the
community. Please identify whether your jurisdiction has experienced any of
the following in the last five years, and whether any of the actions
ultimately resulted in findings of legitimate concern. Freedom of
Information Act (FOIA) requests related to potential ethical concerns: No,
have not experienced

```
                  type:  numeric (byte)
                 label:  selected

                 range:  [0,1]                        units:  1
         unique values:  2                        missing .:  114/1,478

            tabulation:  Freq.   Numeric  Label
                           420         0  Not Selected
                           944         1  Selected
                           114         .
```

----
q43a2
Ethical concerns: FOIA requests: Yes, no findings of concern

QUESTIONNAIRE TEXT: Concerns about government ethics—some with merit, others
without—can sometimes be raised by citizens and organizations in the
community. Please identify whether your jurisdiction has experienced any of
the following in the last five years, and whether any of the actions
ultimately resulted in findings of legitimate concern. Freedom of
Information Act (FOIA) requests related to potential ethical concerns: Yes,
but no findings of legitimate ethical concerns

```
                  type:  numeric (byte)
                 label:  selected
```

```
             range:  [0,1]                          units:  1
     unique values:  2                          missing .:  114/1,478

       tabulation:  Freq.   Numeric  Label
                    1,051         0  Not Selected
                      313         1  Selected
                      114         .
```

----
q43a3
Ethical concerns: FOIA requests: Yes, with findings of concern
----

QUESTIONNAIRE TEXT: Concerns about government ethics—some with merit, others
without—can sometimes be raised by citizens and organizations in the
community. Please identify whether your jurisdiction has experienced any of
the following in the last five years, and whether any of the actions
ultimately resulted in findings of legitimate concern. Freedom of
Information Act (FOIA) requests related to potential ethical concerns: Yes,
with findings of legitimate ethical concerns

```
              type:  numeric (byte)
             label:  selected

             range:  [0,1]                          units:  1
     unique values:  2                          missing .:  114/1,478

       tabulation:  Freq.   Numeric  Label
                    1,325         0  Not Selected
                       39         1  Selected
                      114         .
```

----
q43a4
Ethical concerns: FOIA requests: Don't Know

QUESTIONNAIRE TEXT: Concerns about government ethics—some with merit, others
without—can sometimes be raised by citizens and organizations in the
community. Please identify whether your jurisdiction has experienced any of
the following in the last five years, and whether any of the actions
ultimately resulted in findings of legitimate concern. Freedom of
Information Act (FOIA) requests related to potential ethical concerns: Don't
Know

```
              type:  numeric (byte)
             label:  selected

             range:  [0,1]                          units:  1
     unique values:  2                          missing .:  114/1,478

       tabulation:  Freq.   Numeric  Label
                    1,295         0  Not Selected
                       69         1  Selected
                      114         .
```

----
q43b1
Ethical concerns: OMA violations: No, not experienced

QUESTIONNAIRE TEXT: Concerns about government ethics—some with merit, others
without—can sometimes be raised by citizens and organizations in the
community. Please identify whether your jurisdiction has experienced any of
the following in the last five years, and whether any of the actions
ultimately resulted in findings of legitimate concern. Accusations of Open
Meetings Act violations: No, have not experienced

```
                 type:  numeric (byte)
                label:  selected

                range:  [0,1]                          units:  1
        unique values:  2                          missing .:  109/1,478

           tabulation:  Freq.   Numeric  Label
                          292         0  Not Selected
                        1,077         1  Selected
                          109         .
```

----
q43b2
Ethical concerns: OMA violations: Yes, no findings of concern
----

QUESTIONNAIRE TEXT: Concerns about government ethics—some with merit, others
without—can sometimes be raised by citizens and organizations in the
community. Please identify whether your jurisdiction has experienced any of
the following in the last five years, and whether any of the actions
ultimately resulted in findings of legitimate concern. Accusations of Open
Meetings Act violations: Yes, but no findings of legitimate ethical concerns

```
                 type:  numeric (byte)
                label:  selected

                range:  [0,1]                          units:  1
        unique values:  2                          missing .:  109/1,478

           tabulation:  Freq.   Numeric  Label
                        1,150         0  Not Selected
                          219         1  Selected
                          109         .
```

----
q43b3
Ethical concerns: OMA violations: Yes, with findings of concern
----

QUESTIONNAIRE TEXT: Concerns about government ethics—some with merit, others
without—can sometimes be raised by citizens and organizations in the
community. Please identify whether your jurisdiction has experienced any of
the following in the last five years, and whether any of the actions
ultimately resulted in findings of legitimate concern. Accusations of Open
Meetings Act violations: Yes, with findings of legitimate ethical concerns

```
                  type:  numeric (byte)
                 label:  selected

                 range:  [0,1]                          units:  1
         unique values:  2                          missing .:  109/1,478

             tabulation:  Freq.   Numeric  Label
                          1,344         0  Not Selected
                             25         1  Selected
                            109         .
```

----
q43b4
Ethical concerns: OMA violations: Don't Know

QUESTIONNAIRE TEXT: Concerns about government ethics—some with merit, others
without—can sometimes be raised by citizens and organizations in the
community. Please identify whether your jurisdiction has experienced any of
the following in the last five years, and whether any of the actions
ultimately resulted in findings of legitimate concern. Accusations of Open
Meetings Act violations: Don't Know

```
                  type:  numeric (byte)
                 label:  selected

                 range:  [0,1]                          units:  1
         unique values:  2                          missing .:  109/1,478

             tabulation:  Freq.   Numeric  Label
                          1,318         0  Not Selected
                             51         1  Selected
                            109         .
```

----
q43c1
Ethical concerns: Accusations of impropriety: No, not experienced
----

QUESTIONNAIRE TEXT: Concerns about government ethics—some with merit, others
without—can sometimes be raised by citizens and organizations in the
community. Please identify whether your jurisdiction has experienced any of
the following in the last five years, and whether any of the actions
ultimately resulted in findings of legitimate concern. Accusations of
impropriety against one or more of your jurisdiction's government officials:
No, have not experienced

```
                  type:  numeric (byte)
                 label:  selected

                 range:  [0,1]                          units:  1
         unique values:  2                          missing .:  115/1,478

             tabulation:  Freq.   Numeric  Label
                            369         0  Not Selected
                            994         1  Selected
```

---

q43c2
Ethical concerns: Accusations of impropriety: Yes, no findings of concern

---

QUESTIONNAIRE TEXT: Concerns about government ethics—some with merit, others
without—can sometimes be raised by citizens and organizations in the
community. Please identify whether your jurisdiction has experienced any of
the following in the last five years, and whether any of the actions
ultimately resulted in findings of legitimate concern. Accusations of
impropriety against one or more of your jurisdiction's government officials:
Yes, but no findings of legitimate ethical concerns

```
            type:  numeric (byte)
           label:  selected

           range:  [0,1]                          units:  1
   unique values:  2                         missing .:  115/1,478

      tabulation:  Freq.   Numeric  Label
                   1,124         0  Not Selected
                     239         1  Selected
                     115         .
```

---

q43c3
Ethical concerns: Accusations of impropriety: Yes, with findings of concern

---

QUESTIONNAIRE TEXT: Concerns about government ethics—some with merit, others
without—can sometimes be raised by citizens and organizations in the
community. Please identify whether your jurisdiction has experienced any of
the following in the last five years, and whether any of the actions
ultimately resulted in findings of legitimate concern. Accusations of
impropriety against one or more of your jurisdiction's government officials:
Yes, with findings of legitimate ethical concerns

```
            type:  numeric (byte)
           label:  selected

           range:  [0,1]                          units:  1
   unique values:  2                         missing .:  115/1,478

      tabulation:  Freq.   Numeric  Label
                   1,299         0  Not Selected
                      64         1  Selected
                     115         .
```

---

q43c4
Ethical concerns: Accusations of impropriety: Don't Know

QUESTIONNAIRE TEXT: Concerns about government ethics—some with merit, others
without—can sometimes be raised by citizens and organizations in the

community. Please identify whether your jurisdiction has experienced any of
the following in the last five years, and whether any of the actions
ultimately resulted in findings of legitimate concern. Accusations of
impropriety against one or more of your jurisdiction's government officials:
Don't Know

```
              type:  numeric (byte)
              label:  selected

              range:  [0,1]                           units:  1
      unique values:  2                         missing .:  115/1,478

         tabulation:  Freq.   Numeric  Label
                      1,295         0  Not Selected
                         68         1  Selected
                        115         .
```

----
q43any
Ethical Concerns: Any

```
              type:  numeric (float)
              label:  q43_any

              range:  [1,4]                           units:  1
      unique values:  4                         missing .:  107/1,478

         tabulation:  Freq.   Numeric  Label
                        790         1  No, never
                        446         2  Yes, no findings of concern
                         93         3  Yes, with findings of concern
                         42         4  Don't know
                        107         .
```

CODEBOOK NOTE: q43any was calculated by CLOSUP to summarize responses to
q43a1-q43c4. q43any was coded as 1 if respondents reported "No, have not
experienced" to at least one of q43a, q43b, and q43c, and did not respond
"Yes" to any of these questions. q43any was coded as 2 if at least one of
q43a, q43b, and q43c had a reported "Yes, with no findings of concern", and
but none of the questions had a response of "Yes, with findings of concern".
q443any was coded as 3 if a respondent answered "Yes, with findings of
concern" to at least one of q43a, q43b, and q43c. Respondents who answered
don't know to q43a, q43b, and q43c were coded as 4 "Don't know", and
respondents who didn't answer any of q43a, q43b, and q43c were coded as
missing.

----
q44
Respondent pressure to do something unethical

QUESTIONNAIRE TEXT: Thinking back over the past five years, have you in your
role as a local official ever come under pressure to do something that you
felt might be unethical?

```
              type:  numeric (byte)
              label:  y_n_dk

              range:  [1,3]                        units:  1
      unique values:  3                        missing .:  91/1,478

          tabulation:  Freq.    Numeric  Label
                        184          1   Yes
                      1,180          2   No
                         23          3   Don't Know
                         91          .
```

----
q45a
Sources of unethical pressure: Other Jurisdiction officials

QUESTIONNAIRE TEXT: Please identify which of the following were sources from
which you felt pressure to do something during the past five years that, in
your role as a local official, you felt might be unethical. Other officials
from your own jurisdiction

```
              type:  numeric (byte)
              label:  selected

              range:  [0,1]                        units:  1
      unique values:  2                        missing .:  1,300/1,478

          tabulation:  Freq.    Numeric  Label
                         84          0   Not Selected
                         94          1   Selected
                      1,300          .
```

SKIP PATTERN: asked if q44=1

----
q45b
Sources of unethical pressure: Officials from other juris. or level of govt.

QUESTIONNAIRE TEXT: Please identify which of the following were sources from
which you felt pressure to do something during the past five years that, in
your role as a local official, you felt might be unethical. Officials from
other jurisdictions or other levels of government

```
              type:  numeric (byte)
              label:  selected

              range:  [0,1]                        units:  1
      unique values:  2                        missing .:  1,300/1,478

          tabulation:  Freq.    Numeric  Label
                        148          0   Not Selected
                         30          1   Selected
                      1,300          .
```

SKIP PATTERN: asked if q44=1

```
------------------------------------------------------------------------
q45c
Sources of unethical pressure: Members of business community
------------------------------------------------------------------------

QUESTIONNAIRE TEXT: Please identify which of the following were sources from
which you felt pressure to do something during the past five years that, in
your role as a local official, you felt might be unethical. Members of the
business community

                 type:  numeric (byte)
                label:  selected

                range:  [0,1]                          units:  1
        unique values:  2                           missing .:  1,300/1,478

           tabulation:  Freq.   Numeric  Label
                          112         0  Not Selected
                           66         1  Selected
                        1,300         .

SKIP PATTERN: asked if q44=1

------------------------------------------------------------------------
q45d
Sources of unethical pressure: Members of the public
------------------------------------------------------------------------

QUESTIONNAIRE TEXT: Please identify which of the following were sources from
which you felt pressure to do something during the past five years that, in
your role as a local official, you felt might be unethical. Members of the
public

                 type:  numeric (byte)
                label:  selected

                range:  [0,1]                          units:  1
        unique values:  2                           missing .:  1,300/1,478

           tabulation:  Freq.   Numeric  Label
                           94         0  Not Selected
                           84         1  Selected
                        1,300         .

SKIP PATTERN: asked if q44=1

------------------------------------------------------------------------
q45e
Sources of unethical pressure: Family and friends
------------------------------------------------------------------------

QUESTIONNAIRE TEXT: Please identify which of the following were sources from
which you felt pressure to do something during the past five years that, in
your role as a local official, you felt might be unethical. Family and
friends
```

```
              type:  numeric (byte)
              label:  selected

              range:  [0,1]                          units:  1
      unique values:  2                         missing .:  1,300/1,478

        tabulation:  Freq.   Numeric  Label
                      173         0  Not Selected
                        5         1  Selected
                    1,300         .
```

SKIP PATTERN: asked if q44=1

----
q45f
Sources of unethical pressure: Other

QUESTIONNAIRE TEXT: Please identify which of the following were sources from
which you felt pressure to do something during the past five years that, in
your role as a local official, you felt might be unethical. Other

```
              type:  numeric (byte)
              label:  selected

              range:  [0,1]                          units:  1
      unique values:  2                         missing .:  1,300/1,478

        tabulation:  Freq.   Numeric  Label
                      165         0  Not Selected
                       13         1  Selected
                    1,300         .
```

SKIP PATTERN: asked if q44=1

----
q46
Satisfaction with Jurisdiction's policies and practices governing ethics
----

QUESTIONNAIRE TEXT: Overall, how satisfied are you with your jurisdiction's
policies and practices governing ethics?

```
              type:  numeric (byte)
              label:  satisfaction

              range:  [1,6]                          units:  1
      unique values:  6                         missing .:  108/1,478

        tabulation:  Freq.   Numeric  Label
                      811         1  Very Satisfied
                      329         2  Somewhat Satisfied
                      123         3  Neither Satisfied nor
                                      Dissatisfied
                       42         4  Somewhat Dissatisfied
                       32         5  Very Dissatisfied
                       33         6  Don't Know
```

----
q48
Gender

```
              type:  numeric (byte)
              label:  gender

              range:  [1,2]                        units:  1
      unique values:  2                        missing .:  146/1,478

        tabulation:  Freq.    Numeric  Label
                       802          1  Male
                       530          2  Female
                       146          .
```

----
age_category
Respondent Age

```
              type:  numeric (byte)
              label:  age

              range:  [1,8]                        units:  1
      unique values:  8                        missing .:  203/1,478

        tabulation:  Freq.    Numeric  Label
                         6          1  20s
                        61          2  30s
                       155          3  40s
                       337          4  50s
                       472          5  60s
                       216          6  70s
                        27          7  80s
                         1          8  90s
                       203          .
```

CODEBOOK NOTE: A variable generated based on response to Q49 (not included
in the restricted dataset). The original answers to Q49 are not available to
secondary users of the data.

----
tenure
Respondent's time in office

```
              type:  numeric (byte)
              label:  tenure

              range:  [1,5]                        units:  1
      unique values:  5                        missing .:  146/1,478

        tabulation:  Freq.    Numeric  Label
```

```
                       355        1  Two or less years
                       169        2  Three to five years
                       361        3  Six to ten years
                       284        4  Eleven to twenty years
                       163        5  More than twenty years
                       146        .
```

CODEBOOK NOTE: A variable generated based on response to Q50 (not included
in the restricted dataset). The original answers to Q50 are not available to
secondary users of the data.

----
q51
Are you of Spanish, Hispanic, or Latino descent

```
               type:  numeric (byte)
              label:  y_n

              range:  [1,2]                          units:  1
      unique values:  2                          missing .:  169/1,478

         tabulation:  Freq.   Numeric  Label
                         14         1  Yes
                      1,295         2  No
                        169         .
```

----
q52a
Race: White

```
               type:  numeric (byte)
              label:  selected

              range:  [0,1]                          units:  1
      unique values:  2                          missing .:  169/1,478

         tabulation:  Freq.   Numeric  Label
                         31         0  Not Selected
                      1,278         1  Selected
                        169         .
```

----
q52b
Race: Black or African American

```
               type:  numeric (byte)
              label:  selected

              range:  [0,1]                          units:  1
      unique values:  2                          missing .:  169/1,478

         tabulation:  Freq.   Numeric  Label
                      1,296         0  Not Selected
                         13         1  Selected
```

```
                             169              .

-------------------------------------------------------------------------------
q52c
Race: American Indian or Alaskan Native
-------------------------------------------------------------------------------

                      type:  numeric (byte)
                     label:  selected

                     range:  [0,1]                              units:  1
             unique values:  2                            missing .:  169/1,478

                tabulation:  Freq.   Numeric  Label
                             1,293         0  Not Selected
                                16         1  Selected
                               169         .

-------------------------------------------------------------------------------
q52d
Race: Native Hawaiian or other Pacific Islander
-------------------------------------------------------------------------------

                      type:  numeric (byte)
                     label:  selected

                     range:  [0,1]                              units:  1
             unique values:  2                            missing .:  169/1,478

                tabulation:  Freq.   Numeric  Label
                             1,308         0  Not Selected
                                 1         1  Selected
                               169         .

-------------------------------------------------------------------------------
q52e
Race: Asian
-------------------------------------------------------------------------------

                      type:  numeric (byte)
                     label:  selected

                     range:  [0,1]                              units:  1
             unique values:  2                            missing .:  169/1,478

                tabulation:  Freq.   Numeric  Label
                             1,308         0  Not Selected
                                 1         1  Selected
                               169         .

-------------------------------------------------------------------------------
q52f
Race: Multiracial
-------------------------------------------------------------------------------

                      type:  numeric (byte)
                     label:  selected
```

```
          range:  [0,1]                        units:  1
  unique values:  2                        missing .:  169/1,478

      tabulation:  Freq.   Numeric  Label
                   1,299         0  Not Selected
                      10         1  Selected
                     169         .
```

----
q52g
Race: Other

```
           type:  numeric (byte)
          label:  selected

          range:  [0,1]                        units:  1
  unique values:  2                        missing .:  169/1,478

      tabulation:  Freq.   Numeric  Label
                   1,298         0  Not Selected
                      11         1  Selected
                     169         .
```

----
q52h
Race: Don't Know

```
           type:  numeric (byte)
          label:  selected

          range:  [0,1]                        units:  1
  unique values:  2                        missing .:  169/1,478

      tabulation:  Freq.   Numeric  Label
                   1,307         0  Not Selected
                       2         1  Selected
                     169         .
```

----
q53
Highest level of education

```
           type:  numeric (byte)
          label:  schooling

          range:  [1,7]                        units:  1
  unique values:  7                        missing .:  157/1,478

      tabulation:  Freq.   Numeric  Label
                      41         1  12th grade or less, no diploma
                     185         2  High school graduate or GED
                     379         3  Some college, no degree
                     162         4  Associate degree
```

```
                      281          5  Bachelor's degree
                      229          6  Master's degree
                       44          7  Professional/Doctorate degree
                      157          .

-------------------------------------------------------------------------------
q54
Political affiliation
-------------------------------------------------------------------------------

                  type:  numeric (byte)
                 label:  party

                 range:  [1,4]                          units:  1
         unique values:  4                         missing .:  202/1,478

            tabulation:  Freq.   Numeric  Label
                          615          1  Republican
                          357          2  Independent
                          258          3  Democrat
                           46          4  Something Else
                          202          .

-------------------------------------------------------------------------------
q55
Strength of political affiliation
-------------------------------------------------------------------------------

                  type:  numeric (byte)
                 label:  strength

                 range:  [1,3]                          units:  1
         unique values:  3                         missing .:  630/1,478

            tabulation:  Freq.   Numeric  Label
                          389          1  Very Strong
                          413          2  Not Very Strong
                           46          3  Don't Know
                          630          .

-------------------------------------------------------------------------------
q56
As an Independent, which party are you closer to?
-------------------------------------------------------------------------------

                  type:  numeric (byte)
                 label:  political_leaning

                 range:  [1,3]                          units:  1
         unique values:  3                         missing .:  1,080/1,478

            tabulation:  Freq.   Numeric  Label
                           83          1  Democratic Party
                          147          2  Republican Party
                          168          3  Neither
                        1,080          .
```

```
------------------------------------------------------------------------------
q57
Date hardcopy received
------------------------------------------------------------------------------

                type:  string (str10)

       unique values:  27                        missing "":  1,386/1,478



------------------------------------------------------------------------------
partyid
7-point partisanship scale
------------------------------------------------------------------------------

                type:  numeric (byte)
               label:  partisanship

               range:  [1,7]                          units:  1
       unique values:  7                        missing .:  278/1,478

          tabulation:  Freq.   Numeric  Label
                         272         1  Strong Republican
                         290         2  Weak Republican
                         147         3  Independent leaning Republican
                         168         4  Independent
                          83         5  Independent leaning Democrat
                         123         6  Weak Democrat
                         117         7  Strong Democrat
                         278         .

CODEBOOK NOTE: This variable is a recoded version of q54, q55, and q56,
which measure political affiliation and strength of party affiliation.

------------------------------------------------------------------------------
threepty
3-point partisanship scale
------------------------------------------------------------------------------

                type:  numeric (byte)
               label:  partisanship2

               range:  [1,3]                          units:  1
       unique values:  3                        missing .:  278/1,478

          tabulation:  Freq.   Numeric  Label
                         709         1  Republican
                         168         2  Independent
                         323         3  Democrat
                         278         .

CODEBOOK NOTE: This variable is a recoded version of q54 and q56, which
measure political affiliation.
```

```
-------------------------------------------------------------------------------
region
MI region
-------------------------------------------------------------------------------

                   type:  numeric (byte)
                  label:  soss_reg

                  range:  [1,6]                      units:  1
          unique values:  6                      missing .:  0/1,478

              tabulation:  Freq.   Numeric  Label
                            169          1  Upper Peninsula
                            268          2  Northern Lower Peninsula
                            267          3  West Central Lower Peninsula
                            260          4  East Central Lower Peninsula
                            236          5  Southwest Lower Peninsula
                            278          6  Southeast Lower Peninsula

CODEBOOK NOTE: Regional groupings by county, as developed by MSU's State of
the State Survey.


   1. Upper Peninsula - Alger, Baraga, Chippewa, Delta, Dickinson, Gogebic,
   Houghton, Iron, Keweenaw, Luce, Ontonagon, Mackinac, Marquette,
   Menominee, Schoolcraft


   2. Northern Lower Peninsula - Alcona, Alpena, Antrim, Benzie, Charlevoix,
   Cheboygan, Crawford, Emmet, Grand Traverse, Iosco, Kalkaska, Leelanau,
   Missaukee, Montmorency, Ogemaw, Oscoda, Otsego, Presque Isle, Roscommon,
   Wexford


   3. West Central - Allegan, Barry, Ionia, Kent, Lake, Manistee, Mason,
   Mecosta, Montcalm, Muskegon, Newaygo, Oceana, Osceola, Ottawa


   4. East Central - Arenac, Bay, Clare, Clinton, Gladwin, Gratiot, Huron,
   Isabella, Midland, Saginaw, Sanilac, Shiawassee, Tuscola


   5. Southwest - Berrien, Branch, Calhoun, Cass, Eaton, Hillsdale, Ingham,
   Jackson, Kalamazoo, St. Joseph, Van Buren


   6. Southeast - Genesee, Lapeer, Lenawee, Livingston, Macomb, Monroe,
   Oakland, St. Clair, Washtenaw, Wayne


-------------------------------------------------------------------------------
```

```
juris_rr
Jurisdiction-level Response Rate
-----------------------------------------------------------------------------

                    type:  numeric (float)

                   range:  [.48148149,1]                units:  1.000e-08
          unique values:  41                        missing .:  0/1,478

                    mean:   .743101
               std. dev:   .090883

             percentiles:        10%        25%        50%        75%        90%
                             .629921    .692308    .745455    .782051    .833333


CODEBOOK NOTE: Response rate used to calculate jurisdiction-level weights,
jurisdictions in database compared with number of jurisdictions in sample
frame.

-----------------------------------------------------------------------------
juris_wgt
Jurisdiction-level Weight
-----------------------------------------------------------------------------

                    type:  numeric (float)

                   range:  [1,2.0769231]                units:  1.000e-07
          unique values:  41                        missing .:  0/1,478

                    mean:   1.36671
               std. dev:   .176956

             percentiles:        10%        25%        50%        75%        90%
                                 1.2    1.27869    1.34146    1.44444     1.5875

CODEBOOK NOTE: Weights to be used when analyzing data at the jurisdiction
level.


-----------------------------------------------------------------------------
ind_rr
Individual-level Response Rate
-----------------------------------------------------------------------------

                    type:  numeric (float)

                   range:  [.27522936,.66666669]        units:  1.000e-08
          unique values:  15                        missing .:  0/1,478

                    mean:   .411509
               std. dev:   .078548

             percentiles:        10%        25%        50%        75%        90%
                               .3147    .384686    .395706     .39604    .571429
```

CODEBOOK NOTE: Response rate used to calculate individual-level weights,
individual respondents in database compared with number of individual
officials in sample frame.

----
ind_wgt
Individual-level Weight
----

                   type: numeric (float)

                  range: [1.5,3.6333332]   units: 1.000e-07
          unique values: 15   missing .: 0/1,478

                   mean: 2.5072
               std. dev: .417475

            percentiles: 10%   25%   50%   75%   90%
                              1.75   2.525   2.52713   2.59952   3.17763

CODEBOOK NOTE: Weights to be used when analyzing data at the individual
level.

----
pop_density
Population Density
----

                   type: numeric (byte)
                  label: pop_density

                  range: [1,3]   units: 1
          unique values: 3   missing .: 0/1,478

            tabulation: Freq.   Numeric Label
                           735   1 Low <100
                           415   2 Mid
                           328   3 High >800

CODEBOOK NOTE: The categories are based on the number of residents per
square mile, as determined by the jurisdiction's 2010 US Census population
and the jurisdiction's land area. Corrections have not been made for any
annexations or incorporations that have occurred since 2010.

----

pop_township
Population Category: Township
----

                   type: numeric (byte)

```
              label:  pop_twp_city

              range:  [1,3]                           units:  1
      unique values:  3                          missing .:  482/1,478

         tabulation:  Freq.   Numeric  Label
                        388         1  <1500
                        512         2  1500-10000
                         96         3  >10000
                        482         .
```

CODEBOOK NOTE: This categorical population variable was created to allow for
some analysis by population level, while reducing the risk of jurisdiction
re-identification that is present when a single population variable is
provided for all jurisdiction types. It is based upon the township's 2010
US Census population. Corrections have not been made for any annexations or
incorporations that have occurred since 2010.

----
pop_city
Population Category: City

```
               type:  numeric (byte)
              label:  pop_twp_city

              range:  [1,3]                           units:  1
      unique values:  3                          missing .:  1,255/1,478

         tabulation:  Freq.   Numeric  Label
                         22         1  <1500
                        122         2  1500-10000
                         79         3  >10000
                      1,255         .
```

CODEBOOK NOTE: This categorical population variable was created to allow for
some analysis by population level, while reducing the risk of jurisdiction
re-identification that is present when a single population variable is
provided for all jurisdiction types. It is based upon the city's 2010 US
Census population. Corrections have not been made for any annexations or
incorporations that have occurred since 2010.

----
pop_village
Population Category: Village

```
               type:  numeric (byte)
              label:  popvillage

              range:  [1,2]                           units:  1
      unique values:  2                          missing .:  1,284/1,478

         tabulation:  Freq.   Numeric  Label
                        140         1  <1500
                         54         2  >/=1500
```

```
                     1,284            .
```

CODEBOOK NOTE: This categorical population variable was created to allow for
some analysis by population level, while reducing the risk of jurisdiction
re-identification that is present when a single population variable is
provided for all jurisdiction types. It is based upon the village's 2010 US
Census population. Corrections have not been made for any annexations or
incorporations that have occurred since 2010.

```
-------------------------------------------------------------------------
pop_county
Population Category: County
-------------------------------------------------------------------------

                 type:  numeric (byte)
                label:  popcounty

                range:  [1,2]                            units:  1
        unique values:  2                        missing .:  1,413/1,478

           tabulation:  Freq.    Numeric  Label
                           25          1  </=30000
                           40          2  >30000
                        1,413          .
```

CODEBOOK NOTE: This categorical population variable was created to allow for
some analysis by population level, while reducing the risk of jurisdiction
re-identification that is present when a single population variable is
provided for all jurisdiction types. It is based upon the county's 2010 US
Census population. Corrections have not been made for any annexations or
incorporations that have occurred since 2010.

Center for Local, State, and Urban Policy
UNIVERSITY OF MICHIGAN

CLOSUP

MICHIGAN PUBLIC POLICY SURVEY (MPPS)
LOCAL GOVERNMENT
ROAD AND TRANSIT ISSUES
FALL 2014

For more information, please contact: closup-mpps@umich.edu / (734) 647-4091

To start, please confirm:

Q1. What type of jurisdiction do you represent?

☐ County
☐ Township
☐ City
☐ Village

What is the jurisdiction's name? _____

(If not a county) **In what county is it located?** _____

What position do you hold? _____

We'd like to start off by asking you a range of questions about the roads and bridges in your jurisdiction's geographic boundaries. We understand some jurisdictions have direct control over road- and bridge-related decisions and/or funding within their boundaries; others—like many townships—are not the primary decision-makers. Throughout this questionnaire, we want you to answer questions to the best of your knowledge about road and road funding issues, whether or not your government has authority over road policy.

Q2. We know there are regular assessments of many public roads using formal scoring methods, however we are interested in your personal evaluation of the overall condition of roads and bridges within your jurisdiction's geographic boundaries. In your opinion, how would you rate the overall current condition within your jurisdiction of…

	Good	Fair	Poor	Not Applicable	Don't Know
… state trunk lines and county primary roads?	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐
… local paved roads?	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐
… local unpaved roads?	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐
… bridges, in general, within your geographic boundaries?	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐
… roads, in general, within your geographic boundaries?	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐

Q3. Thinking about the condition of roads and bridges within your community overall, to what degree would you say their current condition has a positive or negative impact, if any, on the following?

	No Impact	Very Positive Impact	Somewhat Positive Impact	Mixed Positive and Negative Impact	Somewhat Negative Impact	Very Negative Impact	Not Applicable	Don't Know
Your jurisdiction's economic development	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐
Your jurisdiction government's fiscal health	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐
Tourism in your jurisdiction	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐
The agricultural sector in your jurisdiction	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐
The ability of public safety personnel to respond to an emergency in your jurisdiction	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐
Citizen satisfaction with your jurisdiction's government	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐

Q4. In your opinion, where would you say the following groups or individuals would rank the need for road and bridge maintenance and improvement compared to other public service priorities (e.g., public safety services, economic development, public health, trash collection, etc.) for your local government?

	Roads are the top priority for the jurisdiction	Roads are a priority, but not the top	Roads are a low priority	Roads are not a priority at all	Don't Know
The majority of your jurisdiction's Board/Council	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐
The majority of your jurisdiction's citizens	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐
The majority of your jurisdiction's business community	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐
You personally in your role as a local official	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐

Q5. Once again, thinking about the condition of roads and bridges in your community overall, to what degree would you say their condition has changed over the past five years, if at all? Please indicate whether—in your opinion—the overall condition of road and bridges in your geographic boundaries, in general, has improved, deteriorated, or not changed significantly over the past five years.

Significantly Improved	Somewhat Improved	No Significant Change Overall	Somewhat Deteriorated	Significantly Deteriorated	Don't Know
☐	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐

Q6. In some local jurisdictions, the focus of road and/or bridge maintenance and improvement is on long-term asset management. In other jurisdictions, the focus is necessarily on short-term repairs and "band-aid" fixes. Which of the following, in your opinion, best describes the current approach to road and/or bridge maintenance and improvement within your jurisdiction's geographic boundaries? *(Please respond to the best of your knowledge, even if your jurisdiction does not control local road policy.)*

- ☐ Only short-term fixes
- ☐ Mostly short-term fixes, with some long-term asset management
- ☐ Mostly long-term asset management, with some short-term fixes
- ☐ Only long-term asset management

- ☐ Don't know

Q7. Some counties or localities have had to resort to grinding up paved roads that they can no longer afford to maintain. As far as you know, has this been done to one or more paved roads within your jurisdiction's geographic boundaries during the past five years?

☐ Yes   ☐ No   ☐ Don't know

This survey was written before the Michigan Legislature decided whether or not to significantly increase road funding levels in fall 2014, so we have questions about two possible scenarios: one in which there's no significant increase and one in which there's some level of increase.

Assuming that federal funding remains consistent with recent years, we'd like your opinions specifically about the impact of <u>state funding</u> for roads and/or bridges in your jurisdiction (even if the funding is not controlled directly by your jurisdiction's government).

Q8. If the state legislature does <u>not</u> significantly increase funding for roads and/or bridges in your jurisdiction, in your opinion, how much of a problem, if at all, would it be…

	A Significant Problem	Somewhat of a Problem	Not Much of a Problem	Not a Problem At All	Don't Know
… to <u>maintain</u> the roads and bridges, in general, within your geographic boundaries?	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐
… to <u>improve</u> the roads and bridges, in general, within your geographic boundaries?	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐

Q9. Now, if the state legislature increases funding for roads and/or bridges in your jurisdiction by some amount, which of the following, in your opinion, would be <u>closest</u> to meeting your jurisdiction's needs…

	No state funding increase needed	50% increase in state funding needed	100% increase (doubling) in state funding needed	More than 100% increase in state funding needed	Don't Know
… to <u>maintain</u> the roads and bridges, in general, within your geographic boundaries?	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐
… to <u>improve</u> the roads and bridges, in general, within your geographic boundaries?	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐

Q10. There are many methods states could use to fund roads and bridges, including some that are not currently allowed in Michigan. Thinking about a broad range of policy options, and assuming the Michigan Legislature does increase funding for roads and bridges, please identify whether you would support or oppose the following methods for the state to raise more revenue.

	Strongly Support	Somewhat Support	Neither Support nor Oppose	Somewhat Oppose	Strongly Oppose	Don't Know
Increasing the gas and/or diesel taxes	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐
Increasing vehicle registration fees	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐
Increasing fees for overweight trucks	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐
Increasing the sales tax	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐
Adding toll roads and/or lanes	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐
Introducing mileage fees (Vehicle Miles Traveled)	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐
Increasing drivers' license fees	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐
Increasing traffic violation fines, surcharges, and permit fees	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐
Leasing road right-of-way and/or state property for cell phone towers, advertisements, etc.	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐
Other *(please specify)* _____	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐

Q11. Thinking beyond state funding, does your jurisdiction currently expend any own-source local revenues on road and/or bridge maintenance, improvement, or construction—either directly or as matching funds?

☐ Yes   ☐ No   ☐ Don't know

Q12. *(If you selected "yes" in Q11)* Which of the following local revenue sources does your jurisdiction use to fund its contributions to road and/or bridge maintenance, improvement, or construction? *(check all that apply)*

- ☐ Your jurisdiction's general fund
- ☐ Special assessment(s)
- ☐ Millage(s) levied by your jurisdiction
- ☐ Other *(please specify)* _____

- ☐ Don't know

Q13. In the last two years, has your jurisdiction tried to raise local funding for roads and/or bridges through either new or renewed road millage(s) or special assessment(s)? *(check all that apply)*

	No, have not pursued	Yes, pursued but failed	Yes, pursued and succeeded	Yes, currently pursuing	Don't Know
Jurisdiction-level millage(s)	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐
Special assessment(s)	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐

Q14. Looking ahead, if the state legislature <u>does not significantly increase</u> funding for roads and/or bridges in your jurisdiction, in your opinion, would the following groups or individuals support or oppose the pursuit of <u>additional</u> local revenue dedicated to roads, through existing options such as millages or potential new options like sales or fuel taxes, vehicle registration fees, etc.?

	Strongly Support	Somewhat Support	Neither Support nor Oppose	Somewhat Oppose	Strongly Oppose	Don't Know
The majority of your jurisdiction's Board/Council	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐
The majority of your jurisdiction's citizens	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐
The majority of your jurisdiction's business community	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐
You personally in your role as a local official	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐

Q15. *(Please skip if you selected "majority of citizens oppose " in Q14)* Looking ahead, if the state legislature <u>does not significantly increase funding</u> for the maintenance, improvement, and construction of roads and/or bridges in your jurisdiction, do you think <u>the majority of your citizens</u> would support or oppose raising additional local revenue through the following sources (if they were allowed in Michigan)?

	Strongly Support	Somewhat Support	Neither Support nor Oppose	Somewhat Oppose	Strongly Oppose	Don't Know
Special assessment	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐
Local/county millage	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐
Local/regional vehicle registration fee	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐
Local/regional fuel tax	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐
Local/regional sales tax	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐
Local/regional income tax	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐

Q16. Finally, to conclude this section of questions on road funding issues, if sufficient financial support has <u>not</u> been available to build and maintain roads within your jurisdiction's geographic boundaries over the last few years, what have you done to get through this era of insufficient funding?

[text box]

Now we have a series of questions about private roads in Michigan jurisdictions.

Q17. Does your jurisdiction currently contain one or more private roads (i.e., roads owned or maintained by developers, by private entities such as homeowners associations, or by the abutting property owners)?

☐ Yes   ☐ No   ☐ Don't know

Q18. Whether or not your jurisdiction has any private roads, would you say the majority of your jurisdiction's Board or Council support or oppose having private roads in your jurisdiction? And what about you?

	Strongly Support	Somewhat Support	Neither Support nor Oppose	Somewhat Oppose	Strongly Oppose	Don't Know
The majority of your jurisdiction's Board/Council	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐
You personally in your role as a local official	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐

Q19. *(If you selected "yes" in Q17)* Does your jurisdiction have specific policies regulating any of the following on private roads within your jurisdiction? *(check all that apply)*

☐ Design (e.g., lane width, turn lanes, grading/drainage, surface-type, etc.)
☐ Surface maintenance (e.g., pothole filling, repaving/regraveling, etc.)
☐ Summer maintenance (e.g., mowing road right-of-way, street cleaning, dust containment, etc.)
☐ Winter maintenance (e.g., plowing, sanding/salting, etc.)
☐ Other *(please specify)* _____

☐ Don't know

Q20. *(If you selected "yes" in Q17)* **Have there been any problems or controversies regarding private roads in your community?**

☐ Yes   ☐ No   ☐ Don't know

    Q21. *(If you selected "yes" in Q20)* **Please briefly describe the problems or controversies regarding private roads in your community.**

Q22. **Now thinking about ownership of roads for new developments, which of the following best describes your jurisdiction's policies?**

☐ Our policies generally encourage private roads for new development.
☐ Our policies generally encourage public roads for new development.
☐ Our policies on roads for new development are determined on a case-by-case basis.

☐ Don't know

Q23. **Recently, Michigan enacted laws that allow for a county to transfer the powers, duties, and functions of road commissioners to the County Board. Regardless of whether or not your county's road commission is still in place, would you say that road responsibilities in your county should be managed by an elected county road commission, an appointed county road commission, or the county government itself?**

☐ An elected county road commission
☐ An appointed county road commission
☐ The county government itself

☐ Don't know

Q24. **We're interested in getting a sense of local officials' views on their local county road commissions or county road departments (where road commission duties have been transferred to the county). Thinking about how the county road commission or road department interacts with your jurisdiction in particular, to what extent do you agree or disagree with each of the following statements?**

	Strongly Agree	Somewhat Agree	Neither Agree nor Disagree	Somewhat Disagree	Strongly Disagree	Not Applicable	Don't Know
Our county road commission/road department generally makes fair decisions.	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐
Road work done or managed by the county road commission/road department is generally of high quality.	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐
The decision-making process of our county road commission/road department is generally transparent.	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐
Our county's matching requirements for our local road funding are generally fair.	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐
My local government has a good relationship with our county road commission/road department.	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐
Our county road commission/road department generally responds to my government's communications in a timely manner.	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐
Overall, I'm satisfied with the performance of our county road commission/road department.	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐

Q25. **Please describe what, if anything, has worked particularly well or not so well in terms of your government's interactions with your county's road commission or road department.**

Q26. **Thinking beyond traditional road issues, which of the following, if any, have been implemented within your jurisdiction's geographic boundaries in the last five years?** *(check all that apply)*

☐ Added or expanded biking or walking trails
☐ Added or expanded dedicated bike lanes on streets
☐ Added or expanded ATV or snowmobile trails
☐ Added or widened sidewalks
☐ Reduced the number of vehicle lanes (a "road diet")

☐ Don't know

Q27. In 2010, "Complete Streets" legislation gave project planning and coordination responsibilities to local governments and the Michigan Department of Transportation (MDOT) to develop "roadways planned, designed, and constructed to provide appropriate access to all legal users...whether by car, truck, transit, assistive device, foot or bicycle." How familiar are you with the Complete Streets initiative?

- ☐ **Very familiar** — I know a great deal about it
- ☐ **Somewhat familiar** — I have heard of it, and understand it fairly well, but don't know many details
- ☐ **Mostly unfamiliar** — I have heard of it, but know very little about it
- ☐ **Completely unfamiliar** — I have never heard of it before *(if you select "completely unfamiliar," please skip to Q31)*
- ☐ **Don't know**

Q28. *(Please skip if you selected "completely unfamiliar" in Q27)* **Which of the following best describes your jurisdiction's approach to Complete Streets policies?**

- ☐ **It has enacted and is implementing a formal Complete Streets policy.**
- ☐ **It has enacted but has not implemented a formal Complete Streets policy.**
- ☐ **It takes into account Complete Streets goals in planning and design, but has no formal policy.**
- ☐ **It has taken no action on Complete Streets, but might consider it in the future.**
- ☐ **It has taken no action on Complete Streets, and is unlikely to consider it in the future.**
- ☐ **Don't know**

Q29. *(Please skip if you selected "completely unfamiliar" in Q27)* **What overall impact, if any, do you believe Complete Streets policies have or would have on each of the following in your jurisdiction?**

	No Impact	Very Positive Impact	Somewhat Positive Impact	Mixed Positive and Negative Impact	Somewhat Negative Impact	Very Negative Impact	Don't Know
Quality of life	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐
Cost-effectiveness of road spending	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐
Economic development	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐
Traffic congestion	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐
Pedestrian and/or cyclist safety	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐
Your jurisdiction's relationship with the Michigan Department of Transportation (MDOT)	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐

Q30. *(Please skip if you selected "completely unfamiliar" in Q27)* **Overall, would you say that, in your role as a local official, you support or oppose pursuing Complete Streets policies in your jurisdiction?**

Strongly Support	Somewhat Support	Neither Support nor Oppose	Somewhat Oppose	Strongly Oppose	Don't Know
☐	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐

Q31. **Thinking more broadly about transit options in your jurisdiction, which of the following, if any, are currently available to members of your community?** *(check all that apply)*

- ☐ **Amtrak**
- ☐ **Municipal, county-wide, or regional fixed-route bus service**
- ☐ **Greyhound, Indian Trails, or other private bus service**
- ☐ **Dial-a-ride/on-demand para-transit service**
- ☐ **Taxi service**
- ☐ **Van pool service**
- ☐ **Other** *(please specify)* _____

- ☐ **None**
- ☐ **Don't know**

Q32. **In your opinion, how satisfied or dissatisfied would you say the following groups are regarding the transit options currently available in your jurisdiction?**

	Very Satisfied	Somewhat Satisfied	Neither Satisfied nor Dissatisfied	Somewhat Dissatisfied	Very Dissatisfied	Not Applicable	Don't Know
The elderly or disabled	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐
Young people (35 years and younger)	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐
Employers, employees, and job seekers	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐
Visitors and tourists	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐
The majority of your jurisdiction's Board/Council	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐
You personally in your role as a local official	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐

Q33. *(If you selected "dissatisfied" for any group in Q32)* **Which of the following factors, if any, do you believe contribute to local dissatisfaction with the transit options currently available in your jurisdiction?** *(check all that apply)*

- ☐ **Routes, frequency, coverage, etc.**
- ☐ **Cost**
- ☐ **Reliability**
- ☐ **Connectivity to other communities**
- ☐ **Other** *(please specify)* _____

- ☐ **Don't know**

Q34. We're interested in factors that may be encouraging or discouraging expansion of transit in jurisdictions across the state. To what degree would you say the following have been encouraging or discouraging the development of transit within your jurisdiction?

	Significantly Encouraging	Somewhat Encouraging	Neither Encouraging Nor Discouraging	Somewhat Discouraging	Significantly Discouraging	Not applicable	Don't know
Public demand	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐
Operation and maintenance costs	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐
Availability of state or federal funding	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐
Availability of local funding	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐
The influence of persistent community leaders/organizers	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐
Concern over traffic congestion	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐
Your jurisdiction's relationship with neighboring jurisdictions (for inter-jurisdictional service)	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐

Q35. Some people think a well-functioning transit system is important to communities in a variety of ways, such as for economic development, environmental sustainability, residents' mobility, etc. Others do not. How important, if at all, do you think a well-functioning transit system is to the overall needs of your jurisdiction?

☐ Very important   ☐ Somewhat important   ☐ Not very important   ☐ Not important at all   ☐ Don't know

---

Finally, we have a few questions on political ethics in Michigan state and local governance.

Q36. First of all, we are interested in your general opinions about the state of ethics and integrity in Michigan government. In general, how would you rate the following groups of people overall in terms of ethical behavior in their official positions?

	Very Ethical	Mostly Ethical	Equally Ethical and Unethical	Mostly Unethical	Very Unethical	Don't Know
Michigan's state legislators	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐
Michigan's state executive branch leaders (Governor, Lt. Gov., department leaders, etc.)	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐
Elected and appointed officials in your jurisdiction	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐
Local government elected and appointed officials in general across the state	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐

Q37. To what extent do you agree or disagree that the following types of Michigan government officials should be required to disclose their financial interests (occupations, sources of income, business interests, property holdings, creditors and debtors, etc.)?

	Strongly Agree	Somewhat Agree	Neither Agree nor Disagree	Somewhat Disagree	Strongly Disagree	Don't Know
Michigan's state legislators	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐
Michigan's state executive branch leaders (Governor, Lt. Gov., department leaders, etc.)	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐
Local government elected officials	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐
Local government department and agency leaders	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐

Q38. To what extent do you agree or disagree that the following Michigan state officials should be required to wait a certain period of time (a year or two) after leaving office before becoming a lobbyist or consultant that does work for the state government, also known as a "revolving door" restriction?

	Strongly Agree	Somewhat Agree	Neither Agree nor Disagree	Somewhat Disagree	Strongly Disagree	Don't Know
Michigan's state legislators	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐
Michigan's state government executive branch department and agency leaders	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐

Q39. Michigan currently prohibits state legislators from receiving honoraria (e.g., speaking fees or other payments for service), but allows certain levels of gifts, food, and travel or lodging expenses to be paid by outside interests. To what extent do you agree or disagree with each of the following statements about gifts and honoraria received by legislators, other government officials, or their staff members?

	Strongly Agree	Somewhat Agree	Neither Agree nor Disagree	Somewhat Disagree	Strongly Disagree	Don't Know
Like state legislators, appointed state government officials should also be prohibited from receiving honoraria while in office.	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐
An overall yearly cap should be enforced limiting the total amount of gifts, food, and travel/lodging reimbursements any state government official may receive.	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐
Expenditures above a certain threshold made on behalf of a state government official should be reported by both the donor and the public official.	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐
Policies prohibiting honoraria, limiting gifts, and requiring gift disclosure should apply to local government officials across the state.	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐

Q40. Does your jurisdiction currently have any policies that prohibit, limit, or require disclosure for any of the following?

	Yes	No	Don't Know
Honoraria for local elected and/or appointed officials	☐	☐	☐
Gifts, food, travel, and lodging paid for by outside sources	☐	☐	☐

The following questions address ethics issues specific to your jurisdiction. We understand these might be sensitive questions, however, please remember we do not release any MPPS data that identify respondents or jurisdictions individually.

Q41. Does your jurisdiction's local government have a code of ethics?

☐ Yes   ☐ No   ☐ Don't know

Q42. How often, if at all, would you say local elected and/or appointed officials in your jurisdiction's government face issues that present potential conflicts of interest (that is, where the official or his/her family may receive tangible benefits—personal or business-related—because of actions taken or decisions made as a government official)?

☐ Frequently   ☐ Occasionally   ☐ Rarely   ☐ Never   ☐ Don't know

Q43. Concerns about government ethics—some with merit, others without—can sometimes be raised by citizens and organizations in the community. Please identify whether your jurisdiction has experienced any of the following in the last five years, and whether any of the actions ultimately resulted in findings of legitimate concern. *(check all that apply)*

	No, have not experienced	Yes, but no findings of legitimate ethical concerns	Yes, with findings of legitimate ethical concerns	Don't Know
Freedom of Information Act (FOIA) requests related to potential ethical concerns	☐	☐	☐	☐
Accusations of Open Meetings Act violations	☐	☐	☐	☐
Accusations of impropriety against one or more of your jurisdiction's government officials	☐	☐	☐	☐

Q44. Thinking back over the past five years, have you in your role as a local official ever come under pressure to do something that you felt might be unethical?

☐ Yes   ☐ No   ☐ Don't know

Q45. *(If you selected "yes" in Q44)* **Please identify which of the following were sources from which you felt pressure to do something during the past five years that, in your role as a local official, you felt might be unethical.** *(check all that apply)*

☐ Other officials from your own jurisdiction
☐ Officials from other jurisdictions or other levels of government
☐ Members of the business community
☐ Members of the public
☐ Family and friends
☐ Other *(please specify)* _____

Q46. Overall, how satisfied are you with your jurisdiction's policies and practices governing ethics?

Very Satisfied	Somewhat Satisfied	Neither Satisfied nor Dissatisfied	Somewhat Dissatisfied	Very Dissatisfied	Don't Know
☐	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐

Q47. CLOSUP will protect your privacy and anonymity to the full extent provided by law. We need to confirm your personal information such as name, email address, and phone number for tracking and administrative purposes only. Your personal information will not be shared with any outside sources. As with all of the questions in this survey, these are optional.

Your name _____   Your phone number ___ ___ ___ - ___ ___ ___- ___ ___ ___ ___

Your email address _____

We would like to ask some demographic questions. Responses will be reported in aggregate form only so that your individual responses will remain confidential.

Q48. What is your gender?   ☐ Male   ☐ Female

Q49. In what year were you born? 1 9 ____ ____

Q50. How many years have you served in your current position? _____

Q51. Are you of Spanish, Hispanic, or Latino descent? ☐ Yes   ☐ No

Q52. Please check one or more categories below to indicate what race(s) you consider yourself to be. *(check all that apply)*
☐ White
☐ Black or African American
☐ American Indian or Alaskan Native
☐ Native Hawaiian or other Pacific Islander
☐ Asian
☐ Multiracial
☐ Other
☐ Don't know

Q53. What is the highest degree or level of school you have completed?
☐ 12th grade or less/no diploma
☐ High school graduate or GED
☐ Some college, no degree
☐ Associate's degree
☐ Bachelor's degree
☐ Master's degree
☐ Professional/Doctorate degree

Q54. Generally speaking, do you think of yourself as a...?
☐ Republican   ☐ Independent   ☐ Democrat
☐ Something else *(please specify)* _____

Q55. *(if Republican or Democrat)* **Would you consider yourself a strong or not very strong Republican/Democrat?**
☐ Very strong   ☐ Not very strong   ☐ Don't know

Q56. *(if Independent or something else)* **Would you consider yourself closer to...?**
☐ the Democratic Party   ☐ the Republican Party   ☐ Neither