

User's Guide and Codebook
Michigan Public Policy Survey (MPPS)

Michigan Public Policy Survey Restricted Use Datasets:
Spring 2016 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: Spring 2016 Data

Responses: 1,530 total surveys from 1,378 distinct local jurisdictions

Sample: census survey of 3,712 top elected and top appointed officials from all 1,856 Michigan counties, cities, villages, and townships

Field period: April 4 – June 6, 2016

Response rate: 74% by jurisdiction

Dataset Version: Version 1

Dataset Release Date: September 20, 2018

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 and board chairs, mayors and city 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 Spring 2016 MPPS wave focused on fiscal, budgetary and operational issues. Additional questions focused on Michigan's system of funding local government, drinking water provision and infrastructure, property tax appeals, and job approval assessments for the governor and state legislators.

WEIGHTS AND DATA ANALYSIS:

The Spring 2016 dataset includes two separate weights—one for individual-level (`ind_wgt`) and one for jurisdiction-level (`juris_wgt`) analyses—that should be used to account for nonresponse at the individual and jurisdictional levels, respectively. The variable `samp_juris` can be used to select cases according to whether analysis is being done at the individual-level or jurisdiction-level.

MISSING DATA:

Missing data in the Spring 2016 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:

I. About the dataset.....	3
II. Contact information.....	6
III. How to cite the dataset.....	7
IV. Data collection overview.....	8
V. Issues of respondent confidentiality.....	10
VI. List of variables.....	12
VII.Full variable text and frequencies.....	17
VIII. Appendices	
a.Hardcopy questionnaire.....	104

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 Spring 2016 wave of the survey. Please address questions or comments to:

Debra Horner, 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

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: Spring 2016 Data. Ann Arbor, MI: Inter-university Consortium for Political and Social Research [distributor], 2018-09-20. <http://doi.org/>

DATA COLLECTION OVERVIEW:

Sample:

The sample for the Spring 2016 MPPS included on average two officials from each of the local general purpose units of government (83 counties, 279 cities, 254 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 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:

	<i>Elected Officials</i>	<i>Appointed Officials</i>	<i>Total</i>
Counties (83)	109	57	166
Townships (1,240)	2,430	42	2,472
Cities (279)	300	254	554
Villages (254)	349	157	506
<i>Total (1856)</i>	<i>3,188</i>	<i>510</i>	<i>3,698</i>

Method:

The Spring 2016 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:

	<i>Electronically</i>	<i>Via hardcopy</i>	<i>Total</i>
Surveys sent	3,234	464	3,697
Responses in full database	1,439	91	1,530
Responses in public use dataset	1,290	88	1,378

Field dates and recontacts to non-respondents:

Respondents received initial email invitations and hard copy questionnaires during the week of April 4, 2016. 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 June 6. Partially-completed ("partials") surveys captured by the online survey software are included in the dataset if respondents completed through Q5 on the questionnaire.

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 only publish statistical summary information that does not permit the identification, either directly or inferentially, of any individual person, official position, or local jurisdiction.

In order to protect respondent confidentiality, CLOSUP made the following modifications to the dataset available for use by researchers:

- 1) Open-ended responses were extracted from the main datafile. Identifying information from open-ended responses was redacted (denoted in the data as [redacted]). These responses can be linked back to the main datafile using the variables: respondent_id, ID.date, ID.start, ID.endDate, ID.end, and ID.time.
- 2) Certain identifying variables were removed from the dataset
 - Direct identifiers for jurisdiction such as FIPS codes, county names, and jurisdiction names
 - Direct identifiers for respondents, such as name and contact information (corresponding to survey questions Q41a, Q41b, Q41c)
 - Other information potentially identifying individual respondents, including year of birth (corresponding to survey question q43), years in office (corresponding to survey question q44). Recoded versions of these variables are available.
- 3) The original population variables taken from US census data were removed/masked from the dataset. New categorical population variables were created for the different jurisdiction types: pop_county, pop_township, pop_city, pop_village. Additionally, a population density variable was added to the dataset.

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:

<u>Name</u>	<u>Variable Label</u>
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
q2	During the next twelve months, business conditions will be...
q3a	Ability of govt to meet fin. needs this year
q3b	Ability of govt to meet fin. needs next year
q4a	Changes in revenue from property taxes...
q4b	Changes in revenue from fees, licenses, transfers...
q4c	Changes in amount of debt...
q4d	Changes in ability of jurisdiction to repay debt...
q4e	Changes in amount of federal aid...
q4f	Changes in amount of state aid...
q4g	Changes in number of tax delinquencies...
q4h	Changes in number of home foreclosures...
q4i	Changes in public safety needs...
q4j	Changes in infrastructure needs...
q4k	Changes in human service needs...
q4l	Changes in general government operations needs...
q4m	Changes in number of employees...
q4n	Changes in pay rates for juris.'s employee wages and salaries...
q4o	Changes in cost of juris.'s employee pensions...
q4p	Changes in cost of juris.'s current employee health benefits...
q4q	Changes in cost of juris.'s retired employee health benefits...
q5a	Jurisdiction's property tax rates...
q5b	Jurisdiction's charges for fees, licenses, etc...
q5c	Jurisdiction's reliance on general fund balance...
q5d	Jurisdiction's reliance on rainy day funds...
q5e	Jurisdiction's amount of services provided...
q5f	Jurisdiction's actual public safety spending...
q5g	Jurisdiction's actual infrastructure spending...
q5h	Jurisdiction's actual human services spending...
q5i	Jurisdiction's actual general government operations spending...
q5j	Jurisdiction's funding for economic development programs...
q5k	Jurisdiction's amount of debt...

q5l Jurisdiction's sale of public assets...

q5m Jurisdiction's privatizing or contracting out services...

q5n Jurisdiction's number/scope of interlocal agreements or cost sharing plans...

q5o Jurisdiction's number of employees...

q5p Jurisdiction's employee pay rates...

q5q Jurisdiction's employees' share of health benefits...

q5r Jurisdiction's employees' share of retirement contributions...

q5s Jurisdiction's retirees' share of health benefits...

q6 Juris.'s unreserved gen. fund balance as % gen. fund expenditures at end last FY

q7 You consider jurisdiction's unreserved gen. fund balance to be...

q8 Jurisdiction's cash flow and ability to pay bills in a timely manner is...

q9a Jurisdiction's overall fiscal health: Today

q9b Jurisdiction's overall fiscal health: Five years from now

q9a_new Fiscal Stress Index Today, 3 cat

q9b_new Fiscal Stress Index in 5 years, 3 cat

q10a How satisfied are citizens with current package of services provided?

q10b How satisfied are council/board with current package of services provided?

q10c How satisfied are you personally with current package of services provided?

q11a Would citizens choose higher tax or service cuts: Police services

q11b Would citizens choose higher tax or service cuts: Fire services

q11c Would citizens choose higher tax or service cuts: Parks/recreation/libraries

q11d Would citizens choose higher tax or service cuts: Roads

q11e Would citizens choose higher tax or service cuts: Public transportation/transit

q11f Would citizens choose higher tax or service cuts: Economic development

q11g Would citizens choose higher tax or service cuts: Utilities

q11h Would citizens choose higher tax or service cuts: General operations

q12a Will current system provide adequate funds to maintain services

q12b Will current system provide adequate funds to improve or add services

q13 Is current system broken and needs significant reform?

q14a Support for enabling regional tax-base sharing

q14b Support for reforming tax increment financing/tax captures

q14c Support for allowing local-options taxes

q14d Support for compelling State to pay for 'unfunded mandates'

q14e Support for increasing maximum allowable local millage rates

q14f Support for reforming Headlee to eliminate/limit roll-backs

q14g Support for establishing automatic millage rate 'roll-ups'

q14h Support for reforming Prop A to allow more taxable value growth

q14i Support for restoring full statutory revenue sharing
 q14j Support for adding services to the state sales tax base
 q14k Support for increasing rates on state taxes with revenue-sharing components
 q14l Support for other change
 q15a Priority: Enable regional tax base sharing
 q15b Priority: Reform tax increment financing/tax captures
 q15c Priority: Allow local-options taxes
 q15d Priority: Compel State to pay for 'unfunded mandates'
 q15e Priority: Increase maximum allowable local millage rates
 q15f Priority: Reform Headlee to eliminate/limit roll-backs
 q15g Priority: Establish automatic millage rate 'roll-ups'
 q15h Priority: Reforming Prop A to allow more taxable value growth
 q15i Priority: Restoring full statutory revenue sharing
 q15j Priority: Add services to the state sales tax base
 q15k Priority: Increase rates on state taxes with revenue-sharing components
 q15l Priority: Other change
 q16a Introduce / increase local rev.: Local property tax millage rates
 q16b Introduce / increase local rev.: Local income tax
 q16c Introduce / increase local rev.: Local sales tax
 q16d Introduce / increase local rev.: Local gas tax
 q16e Introduce / increase local rev.: Local sales tax on alcohol, tobacco, etc
 q16f Introduce / increase local rev.: Local public utility taxes/fees
 q16g Introduce / increase local rev.: Local hotel / tourism tax
 q16h Introduce / increase local rev.: Local motor vehicle license / registration fees
 q16i Introduce / increase local rev.: Regional tax base sharing
 q17 Drinking water provision in jurisdiction
 q18 Source(s) of shared drinking water system(s) in jurisdiction
 q19a Drinking water problems: Threats to water source quality / safety
 q19b Drinking water problems: Inadequate volume / low water tables
 q19c Drinking water problems: Compliance with state / federal regulations
 q19d Drinking water problems: Lead in on-premises plumbing
 q19e Drinking water problems: Lead in pipes connecting customers to system(s)
 q19f Drinking water problems: Aging / breaking pipes in shared system(s)
 q19g Drinking water problems: Affordability / delinquency on water bills
 q19h Drinking water problems: Other
 q20 Jurisdiction's role in shared water system
 q21 Overall current condition of drinking water infrastructure in juris.
 q22 Change in overall condition of drinking water systems in jurisdiction
 q23a Extent of board/council's discussion on drinking water infrastructure condition

q23b Extent of citizens' discussion on drinking water infrastructure condition

q24a Current funding levels adequate to maintain J's drinking water infrastructure

q24b Current funding levels adequate to improve J's drinking water infrastructure

q25a Drinking water funding use / increased: General fund contributions

q25b Drinking water funding use / increased: Water rates / user fees

q25c Drinking water funding use / increased: Special assessments

q25d Drinking water funding use / increased: Bonds

q25e Drinking water funding use / increased: Low-interest loans

q25f Drinking water funding use / increased: Federal / state grants

q25g Drinking water funding use / increased: Other

q25_used Number of options to fund drinking water used

q25_increased Number of options to fund drinking water increased in the last few years

q26a Support for increasing water rates/fees: Board/Council

q26b Support for increasing water rates/fees: Citizens

q26c Support for increasing water rates/fees: Respondent as local official

q27a Ensuring safe drinking water in juris.: Federal government rating

q27b Ensuring safe drinking water in juris.: MI's state government rating

q27c Ensuring safe drinking water in juris: Local government's rating

q28a Property tax appeals in last 2 years: Big box stores

q28b Property tax appeals in last 2 years: Other commercial properties

q28c Property tax appeals in last 2 years: Industrial properties

q28d Property tax appeals in last 2 years: Residential properties

q28e Property tax appeals in last 2 years: Agricultural properties

q28f Property tax appeals in last 2 years: Other properties

q28_count Number of classes of real property that appealed tax assessments in last two yrs

q29 Did any appeal a Board of Review determination to Michigan Tax Tribunal

q30a Response to appeal: Stipulated/agreed to value(s) landowner stated

q30b Response to appeal: Stipulated/agreed to alternate value prior to hearing

q30_ab Response to appeal: Stipulated/agreed to landowner stated or alternate value

q30c Response to appeal: Defended the assessment before the Tax Tribunal

q30d Response to appeal: Don't know

q31 Extent cost of legal representation impacted decision to stipulate

q32 Satisfaction with Tax Tribunal's determination(s) in last 2 years

q33	How much of a problem are property tax appeals for J's curr. fiscal health
q34	Tax assessment of retail chain stores should be based on comparable dark stores
q35	Actions taken to minimize impact of 'dark stores' tax appeals
q36	You feel things in the state of Michigan are generally going...
q38	How would you rate the way Rick Snyder is performing his job as MI's governor?
q39	How would you rate the way the MI Legislature is performing its job?
q42	Gender
age_category	Respondent Age
q44	Years in current position
tenure	Respondent's time in office
q45	Are you of Spanish, Hispanic, or Latino descent
q46a	Race: White
q46b	Race: Black or African American
q46c	Race: American Indian or Alaskan Native
q46d	Race: Native Hawaiian or other Pacific Islander
q46e	Race: Asian
q46f	Race: Multiracial
q46g	Race: Other
q46h	Race: Don't Know
q47	Highest level of education
q48	Political affiliation
q49	Strength of political affiliation
q50	As an Independent, which party are you closer to?
partyid	7-point partisanship scale
threpty	3-point partisanship scale
pop_density	Population Density
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_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:  [1,1539]
unique values:  1,530
                units:  1
                missing .: 0/1,530

                mean:   770.106
                std. dev: 445.388

percentiles:    10%      25%      50%      75%      90%
                153.5    384     770.5    1157    1386.5
```

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:  [1,2000]
unique values:  1,378
                units:  1
                missing .: 0/1,530

                mean:   991.946
                std. dev: 572.53

percentiles:    10%      25%      50%      75%      90%
                202     505     987.5    1494    1780
```

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:  [1,1378]
unique values:  1,378
                units:  1
                missing .: 0/1,530
```

```

          mean:    686.054
        std. dev:  398.667

percentiles:      10%      25%      50%      75%      90%
                  135.5    336    687.5    1032    1237.5

```

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
Completionstatus

```

          type:  numeric (byte)
          label:  completepart

          range:  [0,1]
unique values:  2
                                units:  1
                                missing .:  0/1,530

tabulation:  Freq.   Numeric  Label
              136      0   Partial
              1,394    1   Complete

```

CODEBOOK NOTE: The Spring 2016 database includes partial surveys by respondents who answered at least up to Q5s on the survey instrument.

source
Hardcopies/online completes/partials

```

          type:  numeric (byte)
          label:  source3

          range:  [1,3]
unique values:  3
                                units:  1
                                missing .:  0/1,530

tabulation:  Freq.   Numeric  Label
              91      1   Hard Copy
              1,303    2   Online Complete
              136      3   Online Partial

```

idenddate
ID.endDate

type: string (str9)
unique values: 51 missing "": 0/1,530

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: 1,417 missing "": 0/1,530

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: 1,498 missing "": 0/1,530

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

iddate
ID.date

type: string (str9)
unique values: 52 missing "": 0/1,530

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

idtime
ID.time

type: numeric (float)
range: [3.28,16878.92] units: .01
unique values: 1,245 missing .: 0/1,530
mean: 527.791

```

std. dev: 1874.03
percentiles: 10% 25% 50% 75% 90%
              13.755 19.15 27.265 45.58 212.94

```

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 .: 0/1,530

```

```

tabulation: Freq. Numeric Label
              72      1 County
            1,010    2 Township
              241    3 City
              207    4 Village

```

samp_juris
Identifies unique survey responses for each jurisdiction

```

type: numeric (byte)

range: [0,1] units: 1
unique values: 2 missing .: 0/1,530

```

```

tabulation: Freq. Value
              152  0
            1,378  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

Analyses appearing in MPPS reports published by CLOSUP are based on samp_juris=1 cases only, unless otherwise specified.

snap_elec_app
Elected or appointed to position

type: numeric (byte)
label: elec_app
range: [1,2] units: 1
unique values: 2 missing .: 0/1,530
tabulation: Freq. Numeric Label
1,206 1 Elected
324 2 Appointed

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

snap_pos
Position held--numeric

type: numeric (byte)
range: [1,10] units: 1
unique values: 10 missing .: 0/1,530
mean: 6.81765
std. dev: 2.54997
percentiles: 10% 25% 50% 75% 90%
2 5 8 9 9

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

Appointed officials:

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

q2

During the next twelve months, business conditions will be...

QUESTIONNAIRE TEXT: Thinking about business conditions in your community, do you think that during the next twelve months your community will have good times financially, or bad times financially?

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

      range:  [1,4]
unique values: 4                                units: 1
                                                missing .: 10/1,530

      tabulation:  Freq.   Numeric  Label
                   719      1   Good Times
                   165      2   Bad Times
                   467      3   Neither
                   169      4   Don't Know
                   10      .
```

q3a

Ability of govt to meet fin. needs this year

QUESTIONNAIRE TEXT: Thinking about the financial needs of your jurisdiction, would you say that your unit of government is less able or better able to meet its financial needs in this fiscal year compared to the last fiscal year?

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

      range:  [1,6]
unique values: 6                                units: 1
                                                missing .: 16/1,530

      tabulation:  Freq.   Numeric  Label
                   44      1   Significantly Less
                   278     2   Somewhat Less
                   671     3   Neither
                   427     4   Somewhat Better
                   68      5   Significantly Better
                   26      6   Don't Know
                   16      .
```

q3b
Ability of govt to meet fin. needs next year

QUESTIONNAIRE TEXT: Thinking about the financial needs of your jurisdiction, would you say that your unit of government is less able or better able to meet its financial needs in the next fiscal year compared to this fiscal year?

type: numeric (byte)
label: ability
range: [1,6] units: 1
unique values: 6 missing .: 199/1,530

tabulation:	Freq.	Numeric	Label
	52	1	Significantly Less
	239	2	Somewhat Less
	580	3	Neither
	323	4	Somewhat Better
	67	5	Significantly Better
	70	6	Don't Know
	199	.	

q4a
Changes in revenue from property taxes...

QUESTIONNAIRE TEXT: Comparing your jurisdiction's current fiscal year to its previous fiscal year, please consider the ways the following items have changed. Indicate whether—in your opinion—there has been a decrease, an increase, or no change from the previous fiscal year. Revenue from property taxes

type: numeric (byte)
label: comparison
range: [1,7] units: 1
unique values: 7 missing .: 22/1,530

tabulation:	Freq.	Numeric	Label
	39	1	Greatly Decreased
	329	2	Somewhat Decreased
	443	3	No Change
	643	4	Somewhat Increased
	6	5	Greatly Increased
	3	6	Not Applicable
	45	7	Don't Know
	22	.	

q4b
Changes in revenue from fees, licenses, transfers...

QUESTIONNAIRE TEXT: Comparing your jurisdiction's current fiscal year to its previous fiscal year, please consider the ways the following items have changed. Indicate whether—in your opinion—there has been a decrease, an increase, or no

change from the previous fiscal year. Revenue from fees for services, licenses, transfers, etc.

type: numeric (byte)
label: comparison
range: [1,7] units: 1
unique values: 7 missing .: 33/1,530

tabulation:	Freq.	Numeric	Label
	10	1	Greatly Decreased
	159	2	Somewhat Decreased
	881	3	No Change
	297	4	Somewhat Increased
	4	5	Greatly Increased
	102	6	Not Applicable
	44	7	Don't Know
	33	.	

q4c
Changes in amount of debt...

QUESTIONNAIRE TEXT: Comparing your jurisdiction's current fiscal year to its previous fiscal year, please consider the ways the following items have changed. Indicate whether—in your opinion—there has been a decrease, an increase, or no change from the previous fiscal year. Amount of debt

type: numeric (byte)
label: comparison
range: [1,7] units: 1
unique values: 7 missing .: 33/1,530

tabulation:	Freq.	Numeric	Label
	24	1	Greatly Decreased
	295	2	Somewhat Decreased
	661	3	No Change
	180	4	Somewhat Increased
	41	5	Greatly Increased
	264	6	Not Applicable
	32	7	Don't Know
	33	.	

q4d
Changes in ability of jurisdiction to repay debt...

QUESTIONNAIRE TEXT: Comparing your jurisdiction's current fiscal year to its previous fiscal year, please consider the ways the following items have changed. Indicate whether—in your opinion—there has been a decrease, an increase, or no change from the previous fiscal year. Ability of your jurisdiction to repay its debt

type: numeric (byte)

label: comparison
range: [1,7] units: 1
unique values: 7 missing .: 29/1,530

tabulation:	Freq.	Numeric	Label
	7	1	Greatly Decreased
	68	2	Somewhat Decreased
	890	3	No Change
	190	4	Somewhat Increased
	28	5	Greatly Increased
	293	6	Not Applicable
	25	7	Don't Know
	29	.	

q4e
Changes in amount of federal aid...

QUESTIONNAIRE TEXT: Comparing your jurisdiction's current fiscal year to its previous fiscal year, please consider the ways the following items have changed. Indicate whether—in your opinion—there has been a decrease, an increase, or no change from the previous fiscal year. Amount of federal aid to your jurisdiction

type: numeric (byte)
label: comparison
range: [1,7] units: 1
unique values: 7 missing .: 42/1,530

tabulation:	Freq.	Numeric	Label
	37	1	Greatly Decreased
	166	2	Somewhat Decreased
	727	3	No Change
	66	4	Somewhat Increased
	6	5	Greatly Increased
	357	6	Not Applicable
	129	7	Don't Know
	42	.	

q4f
Changes in amount of state aid...

QUESTIONNAIRE TEXT: Comparing your jurisdiction's current fiscal year to its previous fiscal year, please consider the ways the following items have changed. Indicate whether—in your opinion—there has been a decrease, an increase, or no change from the previous fiscal year. Amount of state aid to your jurisdiction

type: numeric (byte)
label: comparison
range: [1,7] units: 1
unique values: 7 missing .: 44/1,530

tabulation:	Freq.	Numeric	Label
	52	1	Greatly Decreased
	255	2	Somewhat Decreased
	698	3	No Change
	261	4	Somewhat Increased
	6	5	Greatly Increased
	125	6	Not Applicable
	89	7	Don't Know
	44	.	

q4g

Changes in number of tax delinquencies...

QUESTIONNAIRE TEXT: Comparing your jurisdiction's current fiscal year to its previous fiscal year, please consider the ways the following items have changed. Indicate whether—in your opinion—there has been a decrease, an increase, or no change from the previous fiscal year. Tax delinquencies

type: numeric (byte)
label: comparison

range: [1,7] units: 1
unique values: 7 missing .: 33/1,530

tabulation:	Freq.	Numeric	Label
	11	1	Greatly Decreased
	242	2	Somewhat Decreased
	845	3	No Change
	249	4	Somewhat Increased
	10	5	Greatly Increased
	13	6	Not Applicable
	127	7	Don't Know
	33	.	

q4h

Changes in number of home foreclosures...

QUESTIONNAIRE TEXT: Comparing your jurisdiction's current fiscal year to its previous fiscal year, please consider the ways the following items have changed. Indicate whether—in your opinion—there has been a decrease, an increase, or no change from the previous fiscal year. Home foreclosures in your jurisdiction

type: numeric (byte)
label: comparison

range: [1,7] units: 1
unique values: 7 missing .: 33/1,530

tabulation:	Freq.	Numeric	Label
	46	1	Greatly Decreased
	400	2	Somewhat Decreased
	635	3	No Change
	166	4	Somewhat Increased

9	5	Greatly Increased
22	6	Not Applicable
219	7	Don't Know
33	.	

q4i
Changes in public safety needs...

QUESTIONNAIRE TEXT: Comparing your jurisdiction's current fiscal year to its previous fiscal year, please consider the ways the following items have changed. Indicate whether—in your opinion—there has been a decrease, an increase, or no change from the previous fiscal year. Public safety needs

```

type: numeric (byte)
label: comparison

range: [1,7]
unique values: 7

units: 1
missing .: 26/1,530

```

tabulation:	Freq.	Numeric	Label
	4	1	Greatly Decreased
	31	2	Somewhat Decreased
	878	3	No Change
	455	4	Somewhat Increased
	50	5	Greatly Increased
	49	6	Not Applicable
	37	7	Don't Know
	26	.	

q4j
Changes in infrastructure needs...

QUESTIONNAIRE TEXT: Comparing your jurisdiction's current fiscal year to its previous fiscal year, please consider the ways the following items have changed. Indicate whether—in your opinion—there has been a decrease, an increase, or no change from the previous fiscal year. Infrastructure needs

```

type: numeric (byte)
label: comparison

range: [1,7]
unique values: 7

units: 1
missing .: 27/1,530

```

tabulation:	Freq.	Numeric	Label
	7	1	Greatly Decreased
	31	2	Somewhat Decreased
	514	3	No Change
	607	4	Somewhat Increased
	240	5	Greatly Increased
	54	6	Not Applicable
	50	7	Don't Know
	27	.	

QUESTIONNAIRE TEXT: Comparing your jurisdiction's current fiscal year to its previous fiscal year, please consider the ways the following items have changed. Indicate whether—in your opinion—there has been a decrease, an increase, or no change from the previous fiscal year. Number of employees that work for your jurisdiction

```

type: numeric (byte)
label: comparison

range: [1,7]
unique values: 7
units: 1
missing .: 23/1,530

```

tabulation:	Freq.	Numeric	Label
	2	1	Greatly Decreased
	86	2	Somewhat Decreased
	1,206	3	No Change
	159	4	Somewhat Increased
	3	5	Greatly Increased
	43	6	Not Applicable
	8	7	Don't Know
	23	.	

q4n
Changes in pay rates for juris.'s employee wages and salaries...

QUESTIONNAIRE TEXT: Comparing your jurisdiction's current fiscal year to its previous fiscal year, please consider the ways the following items have changed. Indicate whether—in your opinion—there has been a decrease, an increase, or no change from the previous fiscal year. Pay rates for your jurisdiction's employee wages and salaries

```

type: numeric (byte)
label: comparison

range: [2,7]
unique values: 6
units: 1
missing .: 24/1,530

```

tabulation:	Freq.	Numeric	Label
	20	2	Somewhat Decreased
	651	3	No Change
	783	4	Somewhat Increased
	8	5	Greatly Increased
	33	6	Not Applicable
	11	7	Don't Know
	24	.	

q4o
Changes in cost of juris.'s employee pensions...

QUESTIONNAIRE TEXT: Comparing your jurisdiction's current fiscal year to its previous fiscal year, please consider the ways the following items have changed. Indicate whether—in your opinion—there has been a decrease, an increase, or no

change from the previous fiscal year. Cost of your jurisdiction's employee pensions

type: numeric (byte)
label: comparison
range: [1,7] units: 1
unique values: 7 missing .: 28/1,530

tabulation:	Freq.	Numeric	Label
	3	1	Greatly Decreased
	24	2	Somewhat Decreased
	574	3	No Change
	354	4	Somewhat Increased
	93	5	Greatly Increased
	431	6	Not Applicable
	23	7	Don't Know
	28	.	

q4p

Changes in cost of juris.'s current employee health benefits...

QUESTIONNAIRE TEXT: Comparing your jurisdiction's current fiscal year to its previous fiscal year, please consider the ways the following items have changed. Indicate whether—in your opinion—there has been a decrease, an increase, or no change from the previous fiscal year. Cost of your jurisdiction's current employee health benefits

type: numeric (byte)
label: comparison
range: [1,7] units: 1
unique values: 7 missing .: 29/1,530

tabulation:	Freq.	Numeric	Label
	4	1	Greatly Decreased
	59	2	Somewhat Decreased
	273	3	No Change
	420	4	Somewhat Increased
	101	5	Greatly Increased
	620	6	Not Applicable
	24	7	Don't Know
	29	.	

q4q

Changes in cost of juris.'s retired employee health benefits...

QUESTIONNAIRE TEXT: Comparing your jurisdiction's current fiscal year to its previous fiscal year, please consider the ways the following items have changed. Indicate whether—in your opinion—there has been a decrease, an increase, or no change from the previous fiscal year. Cost of your jurisdiction's retired employee health benefits

```

type: numeric (byte)
label: comparison

range: [1,7]
unique values: 7

units: 1
missing .: 30/1,530

```

```

tabulation: Freq.   Numeric   Label
              5           1   Greatly Decreased
              32          2   Somewhat Decreased
             335          3   No Change
             222          4   Somewhat Increased
              55          5   Greatly Increased
             816          6   Not Applicable
              35          7   Don't Know
              30           .

```

q5a
Jurisdiction's property tax rates...

QUESTIONNAIRE TEXT: Now, comparing your jurisdiction's current fiscal year to the next fiscal year, please indicate which actions your jurisdiction has taken or is likely to take. Property tax rates

```

type: numeric (byte)
label: comparison2

range: [1,7]
unique values: 7

units: 1
missing .: 31/1,530

```

```

tabulation: Freq.   Numeric   Label
              6           1   Greatly Decrease
             86          2   Somewhat Decrease
            992          3   No Change
            336          4   Somewhat Increase
              3           5   Greatly Increase
             13          6   Not Applicable
             63          7   Don't Know
             31           .

```

q5b
Jurisdiction's charges for fees, licenses, etc...

QUESTIONNAIRE TEXT: Now, comparing your jurisdiction's current fiscal year to the next fiscal year, please indicate which actions your jurisdiction has taken or is likely to take. Charges for fees, licenses, etc.

```

type: numeric (byte)
label: comparison2

range: [2,7]
unique values: 6

units: 1
missing .: 32/1,530

```

```

tabulation: Freq.   Numeric   Label

```

0	1	Greatly Decrease
16	2	Somewhat Decrease
1,055	3	No Change
284	4	Somewhat Increase
4	5	Greatly Increase
100	6	Not Applicable
39	7	Don't Know
32	.	.

q5c
Jurisdiction's reliance on general fund balance...

QUESTIONNAIRE TEXT: Now, comparing your jurisdiction's current fiscal year to the next fiscal year, please indicate which actions your jurisdiction has taken or is likely to take. Reliance on general fund balance

```

type: numeric (byte)
label: comparison2

range: [1,7]
unique values: 7

units: 1
missing .: 36/1,530

```

tabulation:	Freq.	Numeric	Label
	4	1	Greatly Decrease
	69	2	Somewhat Decrease
	938	3	No Change
	397	4	Somewhat Increase
	40	5	Greatly Increase
	13	6	Not Applicable
	33	7	Don't Know
	36	.	.

q5d
Jurisdiction's reliance on rainy day funds...

QUESTIONNAIRE TEXT: Now, comparing your jurisdiction's current fiscal year to the next fiscal year, please indicate which actions your jurisdiction has taken or is likely to take. Reliance on "rainy day" funds

```

type: numeric (byte)
label: comparison2

range: [1,7]
unique values: 7

units: 1
missing .: 37/1,530

```

tabulation:	Freq.	Numeric	Label
	5	1	Greatly Decrease
	70	2	Somewhat Decrease
	949	3	No Change
	216	4	Somewhat Increase
	34	5	Greatly Increase
	173	6	Not Applicable
	46	7	Don't Know

q5e
Jurisdiction's amount of services provided...

QUESTIONNAIRE TEXT: Now, comparing your jurisdiction's current fiscal year to the next fiscal year, please indicate which actions your jurisdiction has taken or is likely to take. Amount of services provided

```

type: numeric (byte)
label: comparison2

range: [1,7]
unique values: 7
units: 1
missing .: 30/1,530

```

tabulation:	Freq.	Numeric	Label
	5	1	Greatly Decrease
	80	2	Somewhat Decrease
	1,117	3	No Change
	237	4	Somewhat Increase
	5	5	Greatly Increase
	27	6	Not Applicable
	29	7	Don't Know
	30	.	

q5f
Jurisdiction's actual public safety spending...

QUESTIONNAIRE TEXT: Now, comparing your jurisdiction's current fiscal year to the next fiscal year, please indicate which actions your jurisdiction has taken or is likely to take. Actual public safety spending

```

type: numeric (byte)
label: comparison2

range: [1,7]
unique values: 7
units: 1
missing .: 37/1,530

```

tabulation:	Freq.	Numeric	Label
	2	1	Greatly Decrease
	53	2	Somewhat Decrease
	746	3	No Change
	488	4	Somewhat Increase
	28	5	Greatly Increase
	132	6	Not Applicable
	44	7	Don't Know
	37	.	

q5g
Jurisdiction's actual infrastructure spending...

QUESTIONNAIRE TEXT: Now, comparing your jurisdiction's current fiscal year to the next fiscal year, please indicate which actions your jurisdiction has taken or is likely to take. Actual infrastructure spending

type: numeric (byte)
label: comparison2
range: [1,7] units: 1
unique values: 7 missing .: 39/1,530

tabulation:	Freq.	Numeric	Label
	8	1	Greatly Decrease
	74	2	Somewhat Decrease
	633	3	No Change
	531	4	Somewhat Increase
	111	5	Greatly Increase
	82	6	Not Applicable
	52	7	Don't Know
	39	.	

q5h
Jurisdiction's actual human services spending...

QUESTIONNAIRE TEXT: Now, comparing your jurisdiction's current fiscal year to the next fiscal year, please indicate which actions your jurisdiction has taken or is likely to take. Actual human services spending

type: numeric (byte)
label: comparison2
range: [1,7] units: 1
unique values: 7 missing .: 49/1,530

tabulation:	Freq.	Numeric	Label
	2	1	Greatly Decrease
	26	2	Somewhat Decrease
	1,003	3	No Change
	131	4	Somewhat Increase
	5	5	Greatly Increase
	246	6	Not Applicable
	68	7	Don't Know
	49	.	

q5i
Jurisdiction's actual general government operations spending...

QUESTIONNAIRE TEXT: Now, comparing your jurisdiction's current fiscal year to the next fiscal year, please indicate which actions your jurisdiction has taken or is likely to take. Actual government operations spending

type: numeric (byte)
label: comparison2

range: [1,7] units: 1
unique values: 7 missing .: 50/1,530

tabulation:	Freq.	Numeric	Label
	1	1	Greatly Decrease
	66	2	Somewhat Decrease
	768	3	No Change
	571	4	Somewhat Increase
	15	5	Greatly Increase
	16	6	Not Applicable
	43	7	Don't Know
	50	.	

q5j
Jurisdiction's funding for economic development programs...

QUESTIONNAIRE TEXT: Now, comparing your jurisdiction's current fiscal year to the next fiscal year, please indicate which actions your jurisdiction has taken or is likely to take. Funding for economic development programs

type: numeric (byte)
label: comparison2

range: [1,7] units: 1
unique values: 7 missing .: 44/1,530

tabulation:	Freq.	Numeric	Label
	6	1	Greatly Decrease
	54	2	Somewhat Decrease
	839	3	No Change
	174	4	Somewhat Increase
	15	5	Greatly Increase
	333	6	Not Applicable
	65	7	Don't Know
	44	.	

q5k
Jurisdiction's amount of debt...

QUESTIONNAIRE TEXT: Now, comparing your jurisdiction's current fiscal year to the next fiscal year, please indicate which actions your jurisdiction has taken or is likely to take. Amount of debt

type: numeric (byte)
label: comparison2

range: [1,7] units: 1
unique values: 7 missing .: 43/1,530

tabulation:	Freq.	Numeric	Label
	13	1	Greatly Decrease
	225	2	Somewhat Decrease
	671	3	No Change

189	4	Somewhat Increase
36	5	Greatly Increase
316	6	Not Applicable
37	7	Don't Know
43	.	

q5l

Jurisdiction's sale of public assets...

QUESTIONNAIRE TEXT: Now, comparing your jurisdiction's current fiscal year to the next fiscal year, please indicate which actions your jurisdiction has taken or is likely to take. Sale of public assets (i.e., parks, buildings, etc.)

```

      type: numeric (byte)
      label: comparison2

      range: [1,7]
unique values: 7
                                units: 1
                                missing .: 41/1,530

```

tabulation:	Freq.	Numeric	Label
	2	1	Greatly Decrease
	11	2	Somewhat Decrease
	827	3	No Change
	94	4	Somewhat Increase
	7	5	Greatly Increase
	507	6	Not Applicable
	41	7	Don't Know
	41	.	

q5m

Jurisdiction's privatizing or contracting out services...

QUESTIONNAIRE TEXT: Now, comparing your jurisdiction's current fiscal year to the next fiscal year, please indicate which actions your jurisdiction has taken or is likely to take. Privatizing or contracting out of services

```

      type: numeric (byte)
      label: comparison2

      range: [1,7]
unique values: 7
                                units: 1
                                missing .: 46/1,530

```

tabulation:	Freq.	Numeric	Label
	1	1	Greatly Decrease
	18	2	Somewhat Decrease
	1,002	3	No Change
	149	4	Somewhat Increase
	6	5	Greatly Increase
	264	6	Not Applicable
	44	7	Don't Know
	46	.	

q5n

Jurisdiction's number/scope of interlocal agreements or cost sharing plans...

QUESTIONNAIRE TEXT: Now, comparing your jurisdiction's current fiscal year to the next fiscal year, please indicate which actions your jurisdiction has taken or is likely to take. Number and/or scope of interlocal agreements or other cost-sharing plans with other governments

```

type: numeric (byte)
label: comparison2

range: [1,7]
unique values: 7

units: 1
missing .: 47/1,530

```

tabulation:	Freq.	Numeric	Label
	1	1	Greatly Decrease
	13	2	Somewhat Decrease
	957	3	No Change
	272	4	Somewhat Increase
	7	5	Greatly Increase
	165	6	Not Applicable
	68	7	Don't Know
	47	.	

q5o

Jurisdiction's number of employees...

QUESTIONNAIRE TEXT: Now, comparing your jurisdiction's current fiscal year to the next fiscal year, please indicate which actions your jurisdiction has taken or is likely to take. Number of employees that work for your jurisdiction

```

type: numeric (byte)
label: comparison2

range: [1,7]
unique values: 6

units: 1
missing .: 37/1,530

```

tabulation:	Freq.	Numeric	Label
	2	1	Greatly Decrease
	66	2	Somewhat Decrease
	1,212	3	No Change
	145	4	Somewhat Increase
	0	5	Greatly Increase
	56	6	Not Applicable
	12	7	Don't Know
	37	.	

q5p

Jurisdiction's employee pay rates...

QUESTIONNAIRE TEXT: Now, comparing your jurisdiction's current fiscal year to

the next fiscal year, please indicate which actions your jurisdiction has taken or is likely to take. Employee pay rates

type: numeric (byte)
label: comparison2
range: [1,7] units: 1
unique values: 7 missing .: 29/1,530

tabulation:	Freq.	Numeric	Label
	1	1	Greatly Decrease
	10	2	Somewhat Decrease
	678	3	No Change
	750	4	Somewhat Increase
	5	5	Greatly Increase
	39	6	Not Applicable
	18	7	Don't Know
	29	.	

q5q
Jurisdiction's employees' share of health benefits...

QUESTIONNAIRE TEXT: Now, comparing your jurisdiction's current fiscal year to the next fiscal year, please indicate which actions your jurisdiction has taken or is likely to take. Employees' share of premiums, deductibles, and/or co-pays on health insurance

type: numeric (byte)
label: comparison2
range: [1,7] units: 1
unique values: 7 missing .: 28/1,530

tabulation:	Freq.	Numeric	Label
	3	1	Greatly Decrease
	9	2	Somewhat Decrease
	590	3	No Change
	251	4	Somewhat Increase
	11	5	Greatly Increase
	608	6	Not Applicable
	30	7	Don't Know
	28	.	

q5r
Jurisdiction's employees' share of retirement contributions...

QUESTIONNAIRE TEXT: Now, comparing your jurisdiction's current fiscal year to the next fiscal year, please indicate which actions your jurisdiction has taken or is likely to take. Employees' share of contributions to retirement funds

type: numeric (byte)
label: comparison2

range: [1,7] units: 1
unique values: 7 missing .: 33/1,530

tabulation:	Freq.	Numeric	Label
	2	1	Greatly Decrease
	9	2	Somewhat Decrease
	799	3	No Change
	165	4	Somewhat Increase
	5	5	Greatly Increase
	491	6	Not Applicable
	26	7	Don't Know
	33	.	

q5s

Jurisdiction's retirees' share of health benefits...

QUESTIONNAIRE TEXT: Now, comparing your jurisdiction's current fiscal year to the next fiscal year, please indicate which actions your jurisdiction has taken or is likely to take. Retirees' share of premiums, deductibles, and/or co-pays on health insurance

type: numeric (byte)
label: comparison2

range: [1,7] units: 1
unique values: 7 missing .: 33/1,530

tabulation:	Freq.	Numeric	Label
	4	1	Greatly Decrease
	4	2	Somewhat Decrease
	536	3	No Change
	166	4	Somewhat Increase
	3	5	Greatly Increase
	755	6	Not Applicable
	29	7	Don't Know
	33	.	

q6

Juris.'s unreserved gen. fund balance as % gen. fund expenditures at end last FY

QUESTIONNAIRE TEXT: Different local jurisdictions manage their unreserved/unassigned general fund balances in different ways depending on their specific circumstances. Despite these differences, we're interested in tracking overall changes in these balances over time. Approximately what was your jurisdiction's unreserved/unassigned general fund balance as a percentage of general fund expenditures at the end of its last fiscal year?

type: numeric (byte)
label: percent

range: [1,13] units: 1
unique values: 13 missing .: 81/1,530

```

tabulation: Freq. Numeric Label
           28      1 0% or Less
           168     2 1-10%
           189     3 11-20%
           200     4 21-30%
            87     5 31-40%
            66     6 41-50%
            60     7 51-60%
                    32     8 61-70%
                    37     9 71-80%
                    26    10 81-90%
                    37    11 91-100%
                    93    12 Over 100%
                   426    13 Don't Know
                    81     .

```

q7

You consider jurisdiction's unreserved gen. fund balance to be...

QUESTIONNAIRE TEXT: Thinking about your jurisdiction's fiscal needs, overall, do you consider your jurisdiction's unreserved/unassigned general fund balance to be too high, about right, or too low?

```

           type: numeric (byte)
           label: high_low

           range: [1,4]                units: 1
unique values: 4                       missing .: 62/1,530

```

```

tabulation: Freq.  Numeric  Label
           76      1  Too High
           887     2  About Right
           334     3  Too Low
           171     4  Don't Know
            62     .

```

q8

Jurisdiction's cash flow and ability to pay bills in a timely manner is...

QUESTIONNAIRE TEXT: In your opinion, is your jurisdiction's cash flow and its ability to pay bills in a timely manner a significant fiscal problem, somewhat of a problem, not much of a problem, or not a problem at all?

```

           type: numeric (byte)
           label: problem

           range: [1,5]                units: 1
unique values: 5                       missing .: 40/1,530

```

```

tabulation: Freq.  Numeric  Label
           17      1  A Significant Problem
           76      2  Somewhat of a Problem

```


385	3	Not Much of a Problem
1,005	4	Not a Problem at All
7	5	Don't Know
40	.	

q9a

Jurisdiction's overall fiscal health: Today

QUESTIONNAIRE TEXT: Now, thinking about the overall fiscal stress in your jurisdiction today and what you expect it to be down the road – including any future financial obligations it may have – on a scale from 1 to 10, where 1 is the best: perfect fiscal health and 10 is the worst: fiscal crisis, how would you rate your jurisdiction's overall fiscal stress today?

```

type: numeric (byte)
label: fiscal_health

range: [1,11]
unique values: 11

units: 1
missing .: 115/1,530

```

tabulation: Freq.	Numeric	Label
173	1	1: Perfect Fiscal Health
292	2	
292	3	
156	4	
239	5	
111	6	
60	7	
	32	8
	9	9
	9	10 10: Fiscal Crisis
	42	11 Don't Know
	115	.

q9b

Jurisdiction's overall fiscal health: Five years from now

QUESTIONNAIRE TEXT: Now, thinking about the overall fiscal stress in your jurisdiction today and what you expect it to be down the road – including any future financial obligations it may have – on a scale from 1 to 10, where 1 is the best: perfect fiscal health and 10 is the worst: fiscal crisis, how would you rate your jurisdiction's overall fiscal stress as you expect it to be five years from now?

```

type: numeric (byte)
label: fiscal_health

range: [1,11]
unique values: 11

units: 1
missing .: 201/1,530

```

tabulation: Freq.	Numeric	Label
132	1	1: Perfect Fiscal Health

263	2		
204	3		
154	4		
192	5		
86	6		
88	7		
		42	8
		18	9
		10	10 10: Fiscal Crisis
		140	11 Don't Know
		201	.

q9a_new
Fiscal Stress Index Today, 3 cat

QUESTIONNAIRE TEXT: Now, thinking about the overall fiscal stress in your jurisdiction today and what you expect it to be down the road – including any future financial obligations it may have – on a scale from 1 to 10, where 1 is the best: perfect fiscal health and 10 is the worst: fiscal crisis, how would you rate your jurisdiction’s overall fiscal stress today?

```

      type: numeric (float)
      label: fsi

      range: [1,4]
      unique values: 4
      units: 1
      missing .: 115/1,530

      tabulation: Freq.   Numeric   Label
                  913       1   Low-stress (1-4)
                  350       2   Medium stress (5-6)
                  110       3   High-stress (7-10)
                   42       4   Don't know
                  115       .

```

CODEBOOK NOTE: q9a_new summarizes responses to q9a into three categories: Low-stress, Medium-stress, and High-stress. These categories match the categories used for analysis in CLOSUP’s reports for the Spring 2016 survey.

q9b_new
Fiscal Stress Index in 5 years, 3 cat

QUESTIONNAIRE TEXT: Now, thinking about the overall fiscal stress in your jurisdiction today and what you expect it to be down the road – including any future financial obligations it may have – on a scale from 1 to 10, where 1 is the best: perfect fiscal health and 10 is the worst: fiscal crisis, how would you rate your jurisdiction’s overall fiscal stress as you expect it to be five years from now?

```

      type: numeric (float)
      label: fsi

```

range: [1,4] units: 1
unique values: 4 missing .: 201/1,530

tabulation:	Freq.	Numeric	Label
	753	1	Low-stress (1-4)
	278	2	Medium stress (5-6)
	158	3	High-stress (7-10)
	140	4	Don't know
	201	.	

CODEBOOK NOTE: q9b_new summarizes responses to q9b into three categories: Low-stress, Medium-stress, and High-stress. These categories match the categories used for analysis in CLOSUP's reports for the Spring 2016 survey.

q10a

How satisfied are citizens with current package of services provided?

QUESTIONNAIRE TEXT: Next, we want to get an overall sense of the level of satisfaction with the services your jurisdiction currently provides. Thinking about any important aspects of service provision (such as the range of different types of services offered, the amount and quality of those services, etc.), overall, how satisfied would you say the following people or groups are with your jurisdiction's current services? The majority of your jurisdiction's citizens are...

type: numeric (byte)
label: satisfaction

range: [1,6] units: 1
unique values: 6 missing .: 52/1,530

tabulation:	Freq.	Numeric	Label
	434	1	Very Satisfied
	737	2	Somewhat Satisfied
	200	3	Neither Satisfied Nor Dissatisfied
	57	4	Somewhat Dissatisfied
	14	5	Very Dissatisfied
	36	6	Don't Know
	52	.	

q10b

How satisfied are council/board with current package of services provided?

QUESTIONNAIRE TEXT: Next, we want to get an overall sense of the level of satisfaction with the services your jurisdiction currently provides. Thinking about any important aspects of service provision (such as the range of different types of services offered, the amount and quality of those services, etc.), overall, how satisfied would you say the following people or groups are with your jurisdiction's current services? The majority of your jurisdiction's Board/Council are...

```

      type:  numeric (byte)
      label:  satisfaction

      range:  [1,6]
      unique values:  6

                        units:  1
                        missing .:  56/1,530

```

```

tabulation:  Freq.   Numeric  Label
              522     1  Very Satisfied
              694     2  Somewhat Satisfied
              145     3  Neither Satisfied Nor
                  Dissatisfied
              78      4  Somewhat Dissatisfied
              13      5  Very Dissatisfied
              22      6  Don't Know
              56      .

```

q10c

How satisfied are you personally with current package of services provided?

QUESTIONNAIRE TEXT: Next, we want to get an overall sense of the level of satisfaction with the services your jurisdiction currently provides. Thinking about any important aspects of service provision (such as the range of different types of services offered, the amount and quality of those services, etc.), overall, how satisfied would you say the following people or groups are with your jurisdiction's current services? You personally in your role as a local official are...

```

      type:  numeric (byte)
      label:  satisfaction

      range:  [1,6]
      unique values:  6

                        units:  1
                        missing .:  62/1,530

```

```

tabulation:  Freq.   Numeric  Label
              488     1  Very Satisfied
              676     2  Somewhat Satisfied
              140     3  Neither Satisfied Nor
                  Dissatisfied
              120     4  Somewhat Dissatisfied
              36      5  Very Dissatisfied
              8       6  Don't Know
              62      .

```

q11a

Would citizens choose higher tax or service cuts: Police services

QUESTIONNAIRE TEXT: We are interested in views about the trade-off between services and taxes. Thinking about particular services your jurisdiction may currently offer, if your jurisdiction's citizens were facing significant service cuts, in your opinion, what would they choose? Would the majority of citizens be more likely to choose higher taxes to avoid those service cuts or would they choose cuts to public services to avoid higher taxes? Please respond for each

of the following services. (If your jurisdiction does not provide a particular service below, please select "Not Applicable" for that service.) Police services

type: numeric (byte)
label: tax_or_cuts
range: [1,4] units: 1
unique values: 4 missing .: 71/1,530

tabulation:	Freq.	Numeric	Label
	463	1	Citizens would choose higher taxes to avoid service cuts
	245	2	Citizens would choose service cuts to avoid higher taxes
	596	3	Not Applicable
	155	4	Don't Know
	71	.	

q11b
Would citizens choose higher tax or service cuts: Fire services

QUESTIONNAIRE TEXT: We are interested in views about the trade-off between services and taxes. Thinking about particular services your jurisdiction may currently offer, if your jurisdiction's citizens were facing significant service cuts, in your opinion, what would they choose? Would the majority of citizens be more likely to choose higher taxes to avoid those service cuts or would they choose cuts to public services to avoid higher taxes? Please respond for each of the following services. (If your jurisdiction does not provide a particular service below, please select "Not Applicable" for that service.) Fire services

type: numeric (byte)
label: tax_or_cuts
range: [1,4] units: 1
unique values: 4 missing .: 68/1,530

tabulation:	Freq.	Numeric	Label
	913	1	Citizens would choose higher taxes to avoid service cuts
	187	2	Citizens would choose service cuts to avoid higher taxes
	159	3	Not Applicable
	203	4	Don't Know
	68	.	

q11c
Would citizens choose higher tax or service cuts: Parks/recreation/libraries

QUESTIONNAIRE TEXT: We are interested in views about the trade-off between services and taxes. Thinking about particular services your jurisdiction may currently offer, if your jurisdiction's citizens were facing significant service cuts, in your opinion, what would they choose? Would the majority of citizens be more likely to choose higher taxes to avoid those service cuts or would they

choose cuts to public services to avoid higher taxes? Please respond for each of the following services. (If your jurisdiction does not provide a particular service below, please select "Not Applicable" for that service.)
Parks/recreation/libraries

```

type: numeric (byte)
label: tax_or_cuts

range: [1,4]
unique values: 4

units: 1
missing .: 76/1,530

```

tabulation:	Freq.	Numeric	Label
	234	1	Citizens would choose higher taxes to avoid service cuts
	659	2	Citizens would choose service cuts to avoid higher taxes
	308	3	Not Applicable
	253	4	Don't Know
	76	.	

q11d
Would citizens choose higher tax or service cuts: Roads

QUESTIONNAIRE TEXT: We are interested in views about the trade-off between services and taxes. Thinking about particular services your jurisdiction may currently offer, if your jurisdiction's citizens were facing significant service cuts, in your opinion, what would they choose? Would the majority of citizens be more likely to choose higher taxes to avoid those service cuts or would they choose cuts to public services to avoid higher taxes? Please respond for each of the following services. (If your jurisdiction does not provide a particular service below, please select "Not Applicable" for that service.) Roads

```

type: numeric (byte)
label: tax_or_cuts

range: [1,4]
unique values: 4

units: 1
missing .: 79/1,530

```

tabulation:	Freq.	Numeric	Label
	639	1	Citizens would choose higher taxes to avoid service cuts
	393	2	Citizens would choose service cuts to avoid higher taxes
	92	3	Not Applicable
	327	4	Don't Know
	79	.	

q11e
Would citizens choose higher tax or service cuts: Public transportation/transit

QUESTIONNAIRE TEXT: We are interested in views about the trade-off between services and taxes. Thinking about particular services your jurisdiction may currently offer, if your jurisdiction's citizens were facing significant service

cuts, in your opinion, what would they choose? Would the majority of citizens be more likely to choose higher taxes to avoid those service cuts or would they choose cuts to public services to avoid higher taxes? Please respond for each of the following services. (If your jurisdiction does not provide a particular service below, please select "Not Applicable" for that service.) Public transportation/transit

```

type: numeric (byte)
label: tax_or_cuts

range: [1,4]
unique values: 4

units: 1
missing .: 69/1,530

```

tabulation:	Freq.	Numeric	Label
	108	1	Citizens would choose higher taxes to avoid service cuts
	358	2	Citizens would choose service cuts to avoid higher taxes
	855	3	Not Applicable
	140	4	Don't Know
	69	.	

q11f
Would citizens choose higher tax or service cuts: Economic development

QUESTIONNAIRE TEXT: We are interested in views about the trade-off between services and taxes. Thinking about particular services your jurisdiction may currently offer, if your jurisdiction's citizens were facing significant service cuts, in your opinion, what would they choose? Would the majority of citizens be more likely to choose higher taxes to avoid those service cuts or would they choose cuts to public services to avoid higher taxes? Please respond for each of the following services. (If your jurisdiction does not provide a particular service below, please select "Not Applicable" for that service.) Economic development

```

type: numeric (byte)
label: tax_or_cuts

range: [1,4]
unique values: 4

units: 1
missing .: 80/1,530

```

tabulation:	Freq.	Numeric	Label
	71	1	Citizens would choose higher taxes to avoid service cuts
	549	2	Citizens would choose service cuts to avoid higher taxes
	553	3	Not Applicable
	277	4	Don't Know
	80	.	

q11g
Would citizens choose higher tax or service cuts: Utilities

QUESTIONNAIRE TEXT: We are interested in views about the trade-off between services and taxes. Thinking about particular services your jurisdiction may currently offer, if your jurisdiction's citizens were facing significant service cuts, in your opinion, what would they choose? Would the majority of citizens be more likely to choose higher taxes to avoid those service cuts or would they choose cuts to public services to avoid higher taxes? Please respond for each of the following services. (If your jurisdiction does not provide a particular service below, please select "Not Applicable" for that service.) Utilities (water, sewer, lighting, etc.)

```

type: numeric (byte)
label: tax_or_cuts

range: [1,4]
unique values: 4

units: 1
missing .: 79/1,530

```

tabulation:	Freq.	Numeric	Label
	349	1	Citizens would choose higher taxes to avoid service cuts
	305	2	Citizens would choose service cuts to avoid higher taxes
	565	3	Not Applicable
	232	4	Don't Know
	79	.	

q11h
Would citizens choose higher tax or service cuts: General operations

QUESTIONNAIRE TEXT: We are interested in views about the trade-off between services and taxes. Thinking about particular services your jurisdiction may currently offer, if your jurisdiction's citizens were facing significant service cuts, in your opinion, what would they choose? Would the majority of citizens be more likely to choose higher taxes to avoid those service cuts or would they choose cuts to public services to avoid higher taxes? Please respond for each of the following services. (If your jurisdiction does not provide a particular service below, please select "Not Applicable" for that service.) General operations/governance (tax collections, accounting, training for officials, etc.)

```

type: numeric (byte)
label: tax_or_cuts

range: [1,4]
unique values: 4

units: 1
missing .: 80/1,530

```

tabulation:	Freq.	Numeric	Label
	124	1	Citizens would choose higher taxes to avoid service cuts
	856	2	Citizens would choose service cuts to avoid higher taxes
	91	3	Not Applicable
	379	4	Don't Know
	80	.	

q12a

Will current system provide adequate funds to maintain services

QUESTIONNAIRE TEXT: Thinking about the revenue caps facing your jurisdiction (for example, the Headlee Amendment, Proposal A, etc.), if the economy improves gradually over the coming years, do you agree or disagree that the current system of funding local government will provide adequate funding to... maintain the current quantity and quality of services you provide?

type: numeric (byte)
label: agree_disagree

range: [1,6] units: 1
unique values: 6 missing .: 87/1,530

tabulation:	Freq.	Numeric	Label
	85	1	Strongly Agree
	481	2	Somewhat Agree
	260	3	Neither Agree nor Disagree
	331	4	Somewhat Disagree
	204	5	Strongly Disagree
	82	6	Don't Know
	87	.	

q12b

Will current system provide adequate funds to improve or add services

QUESTIONNAIRE TEXT: Thinking about the revenue caps facing your jurisdiction (for example, the Headlee Amendment, Proposal A, etc.), if the economy improves gradually over the coming years, do you agree or disagree that the current system of funding local government will provide adequate funding to... improve or add more services, if they are necessary or desired?

type: numeric (byte)
label: agree_disagree

range: [1,6] units: 1
unique values: 6 missing .: 111/1,530

tabulation:	Freq.	Numeric	Label
	41	1	Strongly Agree
	284	2	Somewhat Agree
	341	3	Neither Agree nor Disagree
	327	4	Somewhat Disagree
	330	5	Strongly Disagree
	96	6	Don't Know
	111	.	

q13

Is current system broken and needs significant reform?

QUESTIONNAIRE TEXT: Some people think the current system of funding local

government in Michigan is broken and needs significant reform, while others disagree. What about you? Would you say you agree or disagree that the system of funding local government in Michigan is broken and needs significant reform?

type: numeric (byte)
label: agree_disagree
range: [1,6] units: 1
unique values: 6 missing .: 88/1,530

tabulation:	Freq.	Numeric	Label
	418	1	Strongly Agree
	521	2	Somewhat Agree
	258	3	Neither Agree nor Disagree
	122	4	Somewhat Disagree
	47	5	Strongly Disagree
	76	6	Don't Know
	88	.	

q14a
Support for enabling regional tax-base sharing

QUESTIONNAIRE TEXT: In 2012, the Michigan Public Policy Survey (MPPS) offered local officials the opportunity to suggest reforms to the system of funding local government. Now we'd like your opinions on some of the ideas that were suggested. Whether or not you think the current system is broken, to what extent would you support or oppose the following potential changes to the system of funding local government in Michigan? Enable regional tax-base sharing among local units

type: numeric (byte)
label: support_oppose
range: [1,6] units: 1
unique values: 6 missing .: 164/1,530

tabulation:	Freq.	Numeric	Label
	68	1	Strongly Support
	275	2	Somewhat Support
	429	3	Neither Support nor Oppose
	180	4	Somewhat Oppose
	145	5	Strongly Oppose
	269	6	Don't Know
	164	.	

q14b
Support for reforming tax increment financing/tax captures

QUESTIONNAIRE TEXT: In 2012, the Michigan Public Policy Survey (MPPS) offered local officials the opportunity to suggest reforms to the system of funding local government. Now we'd like your opinions on some of the ideas that were suggested. Whether or not you think the current system is broken, to what extent would you support or oppose the following potential changes to the system

of funding local government in Michigan? Reform tax increment financing/tax captures (e.g., DDAs, TIFs, LDFAs) to limit impact on general government revenues

type: numeric (byte)
label: support_oppose
range: [1,6] units: 1
unique values: 6 missing .: 167/1,530

tabulation:	Freq.	Numeric	Label
	109	1	Strongly Support
	303	2	Somewhat Support
	431	3	Neither Support nor Oppose
	128	4	Somewhat Oppose
	80	5	Strongly Oppose
	312	6	Don't Know
	167	.	

q14c
Support for allowing local-options taxes

QUESTIONNAIRE TEXT: In 2012, the Michigan Public Policy Survey (MPPS) offered local officials the opportunity to suggest reforms to the system of funding local government. Now we'd like your opinions on some of the ideas that were suggested. Whether or not you think the current system is broken, to what extent would you support or oppose the following potential changes to the system of funding local government in Michigan? Allow local governments to raise revenues through local-option taxes (e.g., sales, gas, hotel taxes, etc.)

type: numeric (byte)
label: support_oppose
range: [1,6] units: 1
unique values: 6 missing .: 163/1,530

tabulation:	Freq.	Numeric	Label
	111	1	Strongly Support
	367	2	Somewhat Support
	388	3	Neither Support nor Oppose
	205	4	Somewhat Oppose
	141	5	Strongly Oppose
	155	6	Don't Know
	163	.	

q14d
Support for compelling State to pay for 'unfunded mandates'

QUESTIONNAIRE TEXT: In 2012, the Michigan Public Policy Survey (MPPS) offered local officials the opportunity to suggest reforms to the system of funding local government. Now we'd like your opinions on some of the ideas that were suggested. Whether or not you think the current system is broken, to what extent would you support or oppose the following potential changes to the system

of funding local government in Michigan? Compel the State to pay for "unfunded mandates" imposed on local governments

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

      range: [1,6]                units: 1
unique values: 6                missing .: 153/1,530
```

tabulation:	Freq.	Numeric	Label
	834	1	Strongly Support
	295	2	Somewhat Support
	104	3	Neither Support nor Oppose
	16	4	Somewhat Oppose
	11	5	Strongly Oppose
	117	6	Don't Know
	153	.	

q14e
Support for increasing maximum allowable local millage rates

QUESTIONNAIRE TEXT: In 2012, the Michigan Public Policy Survey (MPPS) offered local officials the opportunity to suggest reforms to the system of funding local government. Now we'd like your opinions on some of the ideas that were suggested. Whether or not you think the current system is broken, to what extent would you support or oppose the following potential changes to the system of funding local government in Michigan? Increase maximum allowable local millage rates

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

      range: [1,6]                units: 1
unique values: 6                missing .: 166/1,530
```

tabulation:	Freq.	Numeric	Label
	194	1	Strongly Support
	393	2	Somewhat Support
	431	3	Neither Support nor Oppose
	148	4	Somewhat Oppose
	75	5	Strongly Oppose
	123	6	Don't Know
	166	.	

q14f
Support for reforming Headlee to eliminate/limit roll-backs

QUESTIONNAIRE TEXT: In 2012, the Michigan Public Policy Survey (MPPS) offered local officials the opportunity to suggest reforms to the system of funding local government. Now we'd like your opinions on some of the ideas that were suggested. Whether or not you think the current system is broken, to what extent would you support or oppose the following potential changes to the system

of funding local government in Michigan? Reform Headlee Amendment to eliminate or limit millage rate roll-backs

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

      range: [1,6]                units: 1
unique values: 6                missing .: 159/1,530
```

tabulation:	Freq.	Numeric	Label
	407	1	Strongly Support
	380	2	Somewhat Support
	276	3	Neither Support nor Oppose
	89	4	Somewhat Oppose
	66	5	Strongly Oppose
	153	6	Don't Know
	159	.	

q14g
Support for establishing automatic millage rate 'roll-ups'

QUESTIONNAIRE TEXT: In 2012, the Michigan Public Policy Survey (MPPS) offered local officials the opportunity to suggest reforms to the system of funding local government. Now we'd like your opinions on some of the ideas that were suggested. Whether or not you think the current system is broken, to what extent would you support or oppose the following potential changes to the system of funding local government in Michigan? Establish automatic millage rate "roll-ups" (increases up to the maximum authorized millage rate when tax base grows slower than inflation)

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

      range: [1,6]                units: 1
unique values: 6                missing .: 167/1,530
```

tabulation:	Freq.	Numeric	Label
	214	1	Strongly Support
	390	2	Somewhat Support
	330	3	Neither Support nor Oppose
	171	4	Somewhat Oppose
	98	5	Strongly Oppose
	160	6	Don't Know
	167	.	

q14h
Support for reforming Prop A to allow more taxable value growth

QUESTIONNAIRE TEXT: In 2012, the Michigan Public Policy Survey (MPPS) offered local officials the opportunity to suggest reforms to the system of funding local government. Now we'd like your opinions on some of the ideas that were suggested. Whether or not you think the current system is broken, to what extent would you support or oppose the following potential changes to the system

of funding local government in Michigan? Reform Proposal A to allow more taxable value growth for individual properties

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

range: [1,6] units: 1
unique values: 6 missing .: 163/1,530
```

tabulation:	Freq.	Numeric	Label
	224	1	Strongly Support
	374	2	Somewhat Support
	318	3	Neither Support nor Oppose
	171	4	Somewhat Oppose
	124	5	Strongly Oppose
	156	6	Don't Know
	163	.	

q14i
Support for restoring full statutory revenue sharing

QUESTIONNAIRE TEXT: In 2012, the Michigan Public Policy Survey (MPPS) offered local officials the opportunity to suggest reforms to the system of funding local government. Now we'd like your opinions on some of the ideas that were suggested. Whether or not you think the current system is broken, to what extent would you support or oppose the following potential changes to the system of funding local government in Michigan? Restore full statutory revenue sharing (i.e., reverse cuts that began in early 2000s)

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

range: [1,6] units: 1
unique values: 6 missing .: 160/1,530
```

tabulation:	Freq.	Numeric	Label
	675	1	Strongly Support
	359	2	Somewhat Support
	164	3	Neither Support nor Oppose
	29	4	Somewhat Oppose
	19	5	Strongly Oppose
	124	6	Don't Know
	160	.	

q14j
Support for adding services to the state sales tax base

QUESTIONNAIRE TEXT: In 2012, the Michigan Public Policy Survey (MPPS) offered local officials the opportunity to suggest reforms to the system of funding local government. Now we'd like your opinions on some of the ideas that were suggested. Whether or not you think the current system is broken, to what extent would you support or oppose the following potential changes to the system

of funding local government in Michigan? Add services that are not currently taxed to the state sales tax base

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

range: [1,6] units: 1
unique values: 6 missing .: 166/1,530
```

tabulation:	Freq.	Numeric	Label
	141	1	Strongly Support
	262	2	Somewhat Support
	440	3	Neither Support nor Oppose
	207	4	Somewhat Oppose
	141	5	Strongly Oppose
	173	6	Don't Know
	166	.	

q14k
Support for increasing rates on state taxes with revenue-sharing components

QUESTIONNAIRE TEXT: In 2012, the Michigan Public Policy Survey (MPPS) offered local officials the opportunity to suggest reforms to the system of funding local government. Now we'd like your opinions on some of the ideas that were suggested. Whether or not you think the current system is broken, to what extent would you support or oppose the following potential changes to the system of funding local government in Michigan? Increase rates on state taxes with revenue-sharing components (e.g., sales, gas)

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

range: [1,6] units: 1
unique values: 6 missing .: 174/1,530
```

tabulation:	Freq.	Numeric	Label
	158	1	Strongly Support
	361	2	Somewhat Support
	364	3	Neither Support nor Oppose
	192	4	Somewhat Oppose
	131	5	Strongly Oppose
	150	6	Don't Know
	174	.	

q14l
Support for other change

QUESTIONNAIRE TEXT: In 2012, the Michigan Public Policy Survey (MPPS) offered local officials the opportunity to suggest reforms to the system of funding local government. Now we'd like your opinions on some of the ideas that were suggested. Whether or not you think the current system is broken, to what extent would you support or oppose the following potential changes to the system of funding local government in Michigan? Other (please specify)

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

range: [1,6] units: 1
unique values: 6 missing .: 1,033/1,530
```

tabulation:	Freq.	Numeric	Label
	37	1	Strongly Support
	13	2	Somewhat Support
	134	3	Neither Support nor Oppose
	8	4	Somewhat Oppose
	9	5	Strongly Oppose
	296	6	Don't Know
	1,033	.	

q14other
Support for other change-specify

QUESTIONNAIRE TEXT: In 2012, the Michigan Public Policy Survey (MPPS) offered local officials the opportunity to suggest reforms to the system of funding local government. Now we'd like your opinions on some of the ideas that were suggested. Whether or not you think the current system is broken, to what extent would you support or oppose the following potential changes to the system of funding local government in Michigan? Other (please specify)

```
type: string (str244)

unique values: 74 missing "": 1,456/1,530
```

CODEBOOK NOTE: This variable does not appear in the Stata dataset, because some versions of Stata do not support long string variables. Responses to q14other are available in the excel file 2016-Spring-Opens-Redacted.xlsx, and can be linked back to the original data using the variable respondent_id, as well as the ID.date, ID.start, ID.endDate, and ID.end variables. Additionally, to protect respondent confidentiality, identifying information from responses was redacted. Redacted text was denoted [REDACTED]. The original responses are not available to secondary users of the data.

q15a
Priority: Enable regional tax base sharing

QUESTIONNAIRE TEXT: While many of these potential reforms may be important, we're interested in the reforms you believe are most critical. Looking at the potential changes listed above in Q14 that you support, please identify which you feel are the top three priorities for how Michigan's system of funding local government should be reformed. Enable regional tax-base sharing among local units

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

range: [1,3] units: 1
```


unique values: 3 missing .: 1,439/1,530

tabulation:	Freq.	Numeric	Label
	12	1	Top Priority
	37	2	Second Priority
	42	3	Third Priority
	1,439	.	

q15b

Priority: Reform tax increment financing/tax captures

QUESTIONNAIRE TEXT: While many of these potential reforms may be important, we're interested in the reforms you believe are most critical. Looking at the potential changes listed above in Q14 that you support, please identify which you feel are the top three priorities for how Michigan's system of funding local government should be reformed. Reform tax increment financing/tax-captures (e.g., DDAs, TIFs, LDFAS) to limit impact on general government revenues

type: numeric (byte)
label: priority

range: [1,3] units: 1
unique values: 3 missing .: 1,398/1,530

tabulation:	Freq.	Numeric	Label
	26	1	Top Priority
	45	2	Second Priority
	61	3	Third Priority
	1,398	.	

q15c

Priority: Allow local-options taxes

QUESTIONNAIRE TEXT: While many of these potential reforms may be important, we're interested in the reforms you believe are most critical. Looking at the potential changes listed above in Q14 that you support, please identify which you feel are the top three priorities for how Michigan's system of funding local government should be reformed. Allow local governments to raise revenues through local-option taxes (e.g., sales, gas, hotel taxes, etc.)

type: numeric (byte)
label: priority

range: [1,3] units: 1
unique values: 3 missing .: 1,375/1,530

tabulation:	Freq.	Numeric	Label
	29	1	Top Priority
	51	2	Second Priority
	75	3	Third Priority
	1,375	.	

q15d

Priority: Compel State to pay for 'unfunded mandates'

QUESTIONNAIRE TEXT: While many of these potential reforms may be important, we're interested in the reforms you believe are most critical. Looking at the potential changes listed above in Q14 that you support, please identify which you feel are the top three priorities for how Michigan's system of funding local government should be reformed. Compel the State to pay for "unfunded mandates" imposed on local governments

```

      type: numeric (byte)
      label: priority

      range: [1,3]
unique values: 3
                        units: 1
                        missing .: 707/1,530

      tabulation: Freq.   Numeric  Label
                  467       1   Top Priority
                  230       2   Second Priority
                  126       3   Third Priority
                  707       .

```

q15e

Priority: Increase maximum allowable local millage rates

QUESTIONNAIRE TEXT: While many of these potential reforms may be important, we're interested in the reforms you believe are most critical. Looking at the potential changes listed above in Q14 that you support, please identify which you feel are the top three priorities for how Michigan's system of funding local government should be reformed. Increase maximum allowable local millage rates

```

      type: numeric (byte)
      label: priority

      range: [1,3]
unique values: 3
                        units: 1
                        missing .: 1,365/1,530

      tabulation: Freq.   Numeric  Label
                  21       1   Top Priority
                  69       2   Second Priority
                  75       3   Third Priority
                  1,365    .

```

q15f

Priority: Reform Headlee to eliminate/limit roll-backs

QUESTIONNAIRE TEXT: While many of these potential reforms may be important, we're interested in the reforms you believe are most critical. Looking at the potential changes listed above in Q14 that you support, please identify which you feel are the top three priorities for how Michigan's system of funding local government should be reformed. Reform Headlee Amendment to eliminate or limit millage rate roll-backs

```

        type: numeric (byte)
        label: priority

        range: [1,3]
        unique values: 3

        units: 1
        missing .: 1,102/1,530

```

```

tabulation: Freq.   Numeric  Label
             110      1   Top Priority
             177      2   Second Priority
             141      3   Third Priority
             1,102      .

```

q15g

Priority: Establish automatic millage rate 'roll-ups'

QUESTIONNAIRE TEXT: While many of these potential reforms may be important, we're interested in the reforms you believe are most critical. Looking at the potential changes listed above in Q14 that you support, please identify which you feel are the top three priorities for how Michigan's system of funding local government should be reformed. Establish automatic millage rate "roll-ups" (increases up to the maximum authorized millage rate when tax base grows slower than inflation)

```

        type: numeric (byte)
        label: priority

        range: [1,3]
        unique values: 3

        units: 1
        missing .: 1,350/1,530

```

```

tabulation: Freq.   Numeric  Label
             26      1   Top Priority
             70      2   Second Priority
             84      3   Third Priority
             1,350      .

```

q15h

Priority: Reforming Prop A to allow more taxable value growth

QUESTIONNAIRE TEXT: While many of these potential reforms may be important, we're interested in the reforms you believe are most critical. Looking at the potential changes listed above in Q14 that you support, please identify which you feel are the top three priorities for how Michigan's system of funding local government should be reformed. Reform Proposal A to allow more taxable value growth for individual properties

```

        type: numeric (byte)
        label: priority

        range: [1,3]
        unique values: 3

        units: 1
        missing .: 1,278/1,530

```

```

tabulation: Freq.   Numeric  Label

```

QUESTIONNAIRE TEXT: While many of these potential reforms may be important, we're interested in the reforms you believe are most critical. Looking at the potential changes listed above in Q14 that you support, please identify which you feel are the top three priorities for how Michigan's system of funding local government should be reformed. Increase rates on state taxes with revenue-sharing components (e.g., sales, gas)

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

      range: [1,3]                units: 1
unique values: 3                missing .: 1,387/1,530

      tabulation: Freq.   Numeric  Label
                  22       1   Top Priority
                  45       2   Second Priority
                  76       3   Third Priority
                  1,387     .
```

q151
Priority: Other change

QUESTIONNAIRE TEXT: While many of these potential reforms may be important, we're interested in the reforms you believe are most critical. Looking at the potential changes listed above in Q14 that you support, please identify which you feel are the top three priorities for how Michigan's system of funding local government should be reformed. Other (please specify)

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

      range: [1,3]                units: 1
unique values: 3                missing .: 1,503/1,530

      tabulation: Freq.   Numeric  Label
                  17       1   Top Priority
                   6       2   Second Priority
                   4       3   Third Priority
                  1,503     .
```

q16a
Introduce / increase local rev.: Local property tax millage rates

QUESTIONNAIRE TEXT: If your jurisdiction had the authority to raise additional local revenues – including options that may not be available currently – would you support or oppose your jurisdiction introducing or increasing the following local revenue options? Local property tax millage rates

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

range: [1,6] units: 1
unique values: 6 missing .: 155/1,530

tabulation:	Freq.	Numeric	Label
	104	1	Strongly Support
	438	2	Somewhat Support
	334	3	Neither Support nor Oppose
	237	4	Somewhat Oppose
	209	5	Strongly Oppose
	53	6	Don't Know
	155	.	

q16b

Introduce / increase local rev.: Local income tax

QUESTIONNAIRE TEXT: If your jurisdiction had the authority to raise additional local revenues – including options that may not be available currently – would you support or oppose your jurisdiction introducing or increasing the following local revenue options? Local income tax

type: numeric (byte)
label: support_oppose

range: [1,6] units: 1
unique values: 6 missing .: 165/1,530

tabulation:	Freq.	Numeric	Label
	35	1	Strongly Support
	120	2	Somewhat Support
	313	3	Neither Support nor Oppose
	292	4	Somewhat Oppose
	515	5	Strongly Oppose
	90	6	Don't Know
	165	.	

q16c

Introduce / increase local rev.: Local sales tax

QUESTIONNAIRE TEXT: If your jurisdiction had the authority to raise additional local revenues – including options that may not be available currently – would you support or oppose your jurisdiction introducing or increasing the following local revenue options? Local sales tax

type: numeric (byte)
label: support_oppose

range: [1,6] units: 1
unique values: 6 missing .: 163/1,530

tabulation:	Freq.	Numeric	Label
	57	1	Strongly Support
	183	2	Somewhat Support
	306	3	Neither Support nor Oppose

```

                265          4 Somewhat Oppose
                478          5 Strongly Oppose
                 78          6 Don't Know
                163          .

```

q16d
Introduce / increase local rev.: Local gas tax

QUESTIONNAIRE TEXT: If your jurisdiction had the authority to raise additional local revenues – including options that may not be available currently – would you support or oppose your jurisdiction introducing or increasing the following local revenue options? Local gas tax

```

                type: numeric (byte)
                label: support_oppose

                range: [1,6]                      units: 1
unique values: 6                                missing .: 174/1,530

```

```

tabulation:  Freq.   Numeric  Label
              43      1  Strongly Support
              156     2  Somewhat Support
              307     3  Neither Support nor Oppose
              296     4  Somewhat Oppose
              471     5  Strongly Oppose
              83      6  Don't Know
              174     .

```

q16e
Introduce / increase local rev.: Local sales tax on alcohol, tobacco, etc

QUESTIONNAIRE TEXT: If your jurisdiction had the authority to raise additional local revenues – including options that may not be available currently – would you support or oppose your jurisdiction introducing or increasing the following local revenue options? Local sales tax on alcohol, tobacco, etc.

```

                type: numeric (byte)
                label: support_oppose

                range: [1,6]                      units: 1
unique values: 6                                missing .: 174/1,530

```

```

tabulation:  Freq.   Numeric  Label
              130     1  Strongly Support
              302     2  Somewhat Support
              283     3  Neither Support nor Oppose
              227     4  Somewhat Oppose
              338     5  Strongly Oppose
              76      6  Don't Know
              174     .

```

q16f

Introduce / increase local rev.: Local public utility taxes/fees

QUESTIONNAIRE TEXT: If your jurisdiction had the authority to raise additional local revenues – including options that may not be available currently – would you support or oppose your jurisdiction introducing or increasing the following local revenue options? Local public utility taxes/fees

type: numeric (byte)
label: support_oppose
range: [1,6] units: 1
unique values: 6 missing .: 162/1,530

tabulation:	Freq.	Numeric	Label
	46	1	Strongly Support
	252	2	Somewhat Support
	421	3	Neither Support nor Oppose
	262	4	Somewhat Oppose
	284	5	Strongly Oppose
	103	6	Don't Know
	162	.	.

q16g

Introduce / increase local rev.: Local hotel / tourism tax

QUESTIONNAIRE TEXT: If your jurisdiction had the authority to raise additional local revenues – including options that may not be available currently – would you support or oppose your jurisdiction introducing or increasing the following local revenue options? Local hotel/tourism tax

type: numeric (byte)
label: support_oppose
range: [1,6] units: 1
unique values: 6 missing .: 172/1,530

tabulation:	Freq.	Numeric	Label
	65	1	Strongly Support
	272	2	Somewhat Support
	416	3	Neither Support nor Oppose
	217	4	Somewhat Oppose
	237	5	Strongly Oppose
	151	6	Don't Know
	172	.	.

q16h

Introduce / increase local rev.: Local motor vehicle license / registration fees

QUESTIONNAIRE TEXT: If your jurisdiction had the authority to raise additional local revenues – including options that may not be available currently – would you support or oppose your jurisdiction introducing or increasing the following local revenue options? Local motor vehicle license/registration fees


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

      range: [1,6]
      unique values: 6

      units: 1
      missing .: 160/1,530
```

```
tabulation: Freq.   Numeric  Label
              32      1  Strongly Support
              168     2  Somewhat Support
              370     3  Neither Support nor Oppose
              310     4  Somewhat Oppose
              398     5  Strongly Oppose
               92     6  Don't Know
              160     .
```

q16i
Introduce / increase local rev.: Regional tax base sharing

QUESTIONNAIRE TEXT: If your jurisdiction had the authority to raise additional local revenues – including options that may not be available currently – would you support or oppose your jurisdiction introducing or increasing the following local revenue options? Regional tax-base sharing

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

      range: [1,6]
      unique values: 6

      units: 1
      missing .: 172/1,530
```

```
tabulation: Freq.   Numeric  Label
              56      1  Strongly Support
             255     2  Somewhat Support
             411     3  Neither Support nor Oppose
             185     4  Somewhat Oppose
             268     5  Strongly Oppose
             183     6  Don't Know
             172     .
```

q17
Drinking water provision in jurisdiction

QUESTIONNAIRE TEXT: Some people get their drinking water through a shared water supply system (such as a municipal system, a subdivision-wide system, a shared system for a single apartment building, etc.). Others get drinking water from individual private wells. Which of the following best describes how drinking water is provided in your jurisdiction?

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

      range: [1,5]
      unique values: 5

      units: 1
      missing .: 191/1,530
```

tabulation:	Freq.	Numeric	Label
	280	1	Entirely through shared water supply system(s)
	211	2	Mostly through shared water supply system(s), but some individual private wells
	276	3	Mostly through individual private wells, but some shared system(s)
	552	4	Entirely through individual private wells
	20	5	Don't know
	191	.	

SKIP PATTERN: Not asked if jtype=1 "County"

q18
Source(s) of shared drinking water system(s) in jurisdiction

QUESTIONNAIRE TEXT: To the best of your knowledge, which of the following best describes the source(s) of the shared drinking water system(s) in your jurisdiction?

type: numeric (byte)
label: source
range: [1,4] units: 1
unique values: 4 missing .: 748/1,530

tabulation:	Freq.	Numeric	Label
	202	1	Surface water only
	394	2	Groundwater only
	76	3	A combination of surface water and groundwater
	110	4	Don't Know
	748	.	

SKIP PATTERN: Not asked if jtype=1 "County" or q17=4 "Entirely through individual private wells"

q19a
Drinking water problems: Threats to water source quality / safety

QUESTIONNAIRE TEXT: To what extent - if any - are each of the following currently problems for drinking water provision in your jurisdiction? Threats to water source quality/safety

type: numeric (byte)
label: problem
range: [1,5] units: 1
unique values: 5 missing .: 226/1,530

tabulation:	Freq.	Numeric	Label
	31	1	A Significant Problem
	164	2	Somewhat of a Problem
	450	3	Not Much of a Problem
	551	4	Not a Problem at All
	108	5	Don't Know
	226	.	

SKIP PATTERN: Not asked if jtype=1 "County"

q19b

Drinking water problems: Inadequate volume / low water tables

QUESTIONNAIRE TEXT: To what extent - if any - are each of the following currently problems for drinking water provision in your jurisdiction? Inadequate volume/low water tables

type: numeric (byte)
label: problem

range: [1,5] units: 1
unique values: 5 missing .: 226/1,530

tabulation:	Freq.	Numeric	Label
	12	1	A Significant Problem
	73	2	Somewhat of a Problem
	377	3	Not Much of a Problem
	716	4	Not a Problem at All
	126	5	Don't Know
	226	.	

SKIP PATTERN: Not asked if jtype=1 "County"

q19c

Drinking water problems: Compliance with state / federal regulations

QUESTIONNAIRE TEXT: To what extent - if any - are each of the following currently problems for drinking water provision in your jurisdiction? Compliance with state and/or federal regulations

type: numeric (byte)
label: problem

range: [1,5] units: 1
unique values: 5 missing .: 241/1,530

tabulation:	Freq.	Numeric	Label
	19	1	A Significant Problem
	84	2	Somewhat of a Problem
	380	3	Not Much of a Problem
	639	4	Not a Problem at All
	167	5	Don't Know

SKIP PATTERN: Not asked if jtype=1 "County"

 q19d
 Drinking water problems: Lead in on-premises plumbing

QUESTIONNAIRE TEXT: To what extent - if any - are each of the following currently problems for drinking water provision in your jurisdiction? Presence of lead in on-premises plumbing (e.g., faucets, solder)

type: numeric (byte)
 label: problem
 range: [1,5] units: 1
 unique values: 5 missing .: 230/1,530

tabulation:	Freq.	Numeric	Label
	6	1	A Significant Problem
	72	2	Somewhat of a Problem
	308	3	Not Much of a Problem
	541	4	Not a Problem at All
	373	5	Don't Know
	230	.	

SKIP PATTERN: Not asked if jtype=1 "County"

 q19e
 Drinking water problems: Lead in pipes connecting customers to system(s)

QUESTIONNAIRE TEXT: To what extent - if any - are each of the following currently problems for drinking water provision in your jurisdiction? Presence of lead in pipes connecting customers to the system(s)

type: numeric (byte)
 label: problem
 range: [1,5] units: 1
 unique values: 5 missing .: 762/1,530

tabulation:	Freq.	Numeric	Label
	6	1	A Significant Problem
	47	2	Somewhat of a Problem
	194	3	Not Much of a Problem
	362	4	Not a Problem at All
	159	5	Don't Know
	762	.	

SKIP PATTERN: Not asked if jtype=1 "County" or q17=4 "Entirely through individual private wells"

q19f

Drinking water problems: Aging / breaking pipes in shared system(s)

QUESTIONNAIRE TEXT: To what extent - if any - are each of the following currently problems for drinking water provision in your jurisdiction? Aging/breaking pipes in the shared water supply system(s)

type: numeric (byte)
label: problem
range: [1,5] units: 1
unique values: 5 missing .: 759/1,530

tabulation:	Freq.	Numeric	Label
	56	1	A Significant Problem
	182	2	Somewhat of a Problem
	209	3	Not Much of a Problem
	213	4	Not a Problem at All
	111	5	Don't Know
	759	.	

SKIP PATTERN: Not asked if jtype=1 "County" or q17=4 "Entirely through individual private wells"

q19g

Drinking water problems: Affordability / delinquency on water bills

QUESTIONNAIRE TEXT: To what extent - if any - are each of the following currently problems for drinking water provision in your jurisdiction? Affordability/delinquency on water bills

type: numeric (byte)
label: problem
range: [1,5] units: 1
unique values: 5 missing .: 763/1,530

tabulation:	Freq.	Numeric	Label
	24	1	A Significant Problem
	179	2	Somewhat of a Problem
	287	3	Not Much of a Problem
	185	4	Not a Problem at All
	92	5	Don't Know
	763	.	

SKIP PATTERN: Not asked if jtype=1 "County" or q17=4 "Entirely through individual private wells"

q19h

Drinking water problems: Other

QUESTIONNAIRE TEXT: To what extent - if any - are each of the following currently problems for drinking water provision in your jurisdiction? Other (please specify)

type: numeric (byte)
label: problem
range: [1,5] units: 1
unique values: 5 missing .: 1,169/1,530

tabulation:	Freq.	Numeric	Label
	13	1	A Significant Problem
	14	2	Somewhat of a Problem
	25	3	Not Much of a Problem
	79	4	Not a Problem at All
	230	5	Don't Know
	1,169	.	

SKIP PATTERN: Not asked if jtype=1 "County"

q19other
Drinking water problems: Other-specify

QUESTIONNAIRE TEXT: To what extent - if any - are each of the following currently problems for drinking water provision in your jurisdiction? Other (please specify)

type: string (str244)
unique values: 57 missing "": 1,473/1,530

SKIP PATTERN: Not asked if jtype=1 "County"

CODEBOOK NOTE: This variable does not appear in the Stata dataset, because some versions of Stata do not support long string variables. Responses to q19other are available in the excel file 2016-Spring-Opens-Redacted.xlsx, and can be linked back to the original data using the variable respondent_id, as well as the ID.date, ID.start, ID.endDate, and ID.end variables. Additionally, to protect respondent confidentiality, identifying information from responses was redacted. Redacted text was denoted [REDACTED]. The original responses are not available to secondary users of the data.

q20
Jurisdiction's role in shared water system

QUESTIONNAIRE TEXT: Which of the following best describes your jurisdiction's role, if any, in the shared water system?

type: numeric (byte)

label: role
range: [1,3] units: 1
unique values: 3 missing .: 764/1,530

tabulation:	Freq.	Numeric	Label
	186	1	No role
	558	2	Some role
	22	3	Don't Know
	764	.	

SKIP PATTERN: Not asked if jtype=1 "County" or q17=4 "Entirely through individual private wells"

q21

Overall current condition of drinking water infrastructure in juris.

QUESTIONNAIRE TEXT: In your opinion, how would you rate the overall current condition of drinking water infrastructure (such as treatment plant, distribution pipes, etc.) in your jurisdiction?

type: numeric (byte)
label: rating
range: [1,5] units: 1
unique values: 5 missing .: 944/1,530

tabulation:	Freq.	Numeric	Label
	166	1	Excellent
	280	2	Good
	98	3	Fair
	19	4	Poor
	23	5	Don't Know
	944	.	

SKIP PATTERN: Not asked if jtype=1 "County" or q17=4 "Entirely through individual private wells" or q20=1 "No role"

q22

Change in overall condition of drinking water systems in jurisdiction

QUESTIONNAIRE TEXT: To what degree would you say the overall condition of drinking water systems in your jurisdiction has improved or deteriorated over the last decade?

type: numeric (byte)
label: improve
range: [1,6] units: 1
unique values: 6 missing .: 942/1,530

tabulation:	Freq.	Numeric	Label
	127	1	Significantly Improved

167	2	Somewhat Improved
172	3	Neither Improved Nor Deteriorated
78	4	Somewhat Deteriorated
13	5	Significantly Deteriorated
31	6	Don't Know
942	.	

SKIP PATTERN: Not asked if jtype=1 "County" or q17=4 "Entirely through individual private wells" or q20=1 "No role"

q23a
Extent of board/council's discussion on drinking water infrastructure condition

QUESTIONNAIRE TEXT: To what extent, if any, is the current condition of the drinking water infrastructure in your jurisdiction a topic of discussion... among your jurisdiction's Board/Council?

```

      type: numeric (byte)
      label: extent

      range: [1,5]                units: 1
unique values: 5                  missing .: 947/1,530

      tabulation: Freq.  Numeric  Label
                  72       1      A Great Deal
                  209      2      Somewhat
                  193      3      Very Little
                  102      4      Not At All
                   7       5      Don't Know
                  947      .

```

SKIP PATTERN: Not asked if jtype=1 "County" or q17=4 "Entirely through individual private wells" or q20=1 "No role"

q23b
Extent of citizens' discussion on drinking water infrastructure condition

QUESTIONNAIRE TEXT: To what extent, if any, is the current condition of the drinking water infrastructure in your jurisdiction a topic of discussion... among your jurisdiction's citizens?

```

      type: numeric (byte)
      label: extent

      range: [1,5]                units: 1
unique values: 5                  missing .: 974/1,530

      tabulation: Freq.  Numeric  Label
                  43       1      A Great Deal
                  156      2      Somewhat

```



```

239      3  Very Little
85       4  Not At All
33       5  Don't Know
974      .

```

SKIP PATTERN: Not asked if jtype=1 "County" or q17=4 "Entirely through individual private wells" or q20=1 "No role"

q24a

Current funding levels adequate to maintain J's drinking water infrastructure

QUESTIONNAIRE TEXT: Thinking about the current levels of funding for drinking water infrastructure in your jurisdiction, to what extent do you agree or disagree that current levels of funding are adequate... to maintain the drinking water infrastructure in your jurisdiction?

```

      type: numeric (byte)
      label: agree_disagree

      range: [1,6]                units: 1
unique values: 6                  missing .: 948/1,530

      tabulation: Freq.  Numeric  Label
                   79         1  Strongly Agree
                   213        2  Somewhat Agree
                   99         3  Neither Agree nor Disagree
                   115        4  Somewhat Disagree
                   47         5  Strongly Disagree
                   29         6  Don't Know
                   948        .

```

SKIP PATTERN: Not asked if jtype=1 "County" or q17=4 "Entirely through individual private wells" or q20=1 "No role"

q24b

Current funding levels adequate to improve J's drinking water infrastructure

QUESTIONNAIRE TEXT: Thinking about the current levels of funding for drinking water infrastructure in your jurisdiction, to what extent do you agree or disagree that current levels of funding are adequate... to improve the drinking water infrastructure in your jurisdiction?

```

      type: numeric (byte)
      label: agree_disagree

      range: [1,6]                units: 1
unique values: 6                  missing .: 959/1,530

      tabulation: Freq.  Numeric  Label
                   53         1  Strongly Agree
                   143        2  Somewhat Agree
                   117        3  Neither Agree nor Disagree

```

130	4	Somewhat Disagree
96	5	Strongly Disagree
32	6	Don't Know
959	.	

SKIP PATTERN: Not asked if jtype=1 "County" or q17=4 "Entirely through individual private wells" or q20=1 "No role"

q25a

Drinking water funding use / increased: General fund contributions

QUESTIONNAIRE TEXT: Please indicate whether your jurisdiction uses each of the following options to fund drinking water, and whether or not each has been increased in the last few years? General fund contributions

```

type: numeric (byte)
label: problem

range: [1,4]
unique values: 4

units: 1
missing .: 977/1,530

```

tabulation:	Freq.	Numeric	Label
	445	1	A Significant Problem
	50	2	Somewhat of a Problem
	29	3	Not Much of a Problem
	29	4	Not a Problem at All
	977	.	

SKIP PATTERN: Not asked if jtype=1 "County" or q17=4 "Entirely through individual private wells" or q20=1 "No role"

q25b

Drinking water funding use / increased: Water rates / user fees

QUESTIONNAIRE TEXT: Please indicate whether your jurisdiction uses each of the following options to fund drinking water, and whether or not each has been increased in the last few years? Water rates/user fees

```

type: numeric (byte)
label: problem

range: [1,4]
unique values: 4

units: 1
missing .: 958/1,530

```

tabulation:	Freq.	Numeric	Label
	28	1	A Significant Problem
	158	2	Somewhat of a Problem
	367	3	Not Much of a Problem
	19	4	Not a Problem at All
	958	.	

SKIP PATTERN: Not asked if jtype=1 "County" or q17=4 "Entirely through individual private wells" or q20=1 "No role"

q25c
Drinking water funding use / increased: Special assessments

QUESTIONNAIRE TEXT: Please indicate whether your jurisdiction uses each of the following options to fund drinking water, and whether or not each has been increased in the last few years? Special assessments

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

      range: [1,4]
      unique values: 4

                        units: 1
      missing .: 980/1,530

      tabulation:  Freq.  Numeric  Label
                   335      1  A Significant Problem
                   135      2  Somewhat of a Problem
                    38      3  Not Much of a Problem
                    42      4  Not a Problem at All
                   980      .
```

SKIP PATTERN: Not asked if jtype=1 "County" or q17=4 "Entirely through individual private wells" or q20=1 "No role"

q25d
Drinking water funding use / increased: Bonds

QUESTIONNAIRE TEXT: Please indicate whether your jurisdiction uses each of the following options to fund drinking water, and whether or not each has been increased in the last few years? Bonds

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

      range: [1,4]
      unique values: 4

                        units: 1
      missing .: 975/1,530

      tabulation:  Freq.  Numeric  Label
                   188      1  A Significant Problem
                   237      2  Somewhat of a Problem
                    84      3  Not Much of a Problem
                    46      4  Not a Problem at All
                   975      .
```

SKIP PATTERN: Not asked if jtype=1 "County" or q17=4 "Entirely through individual private wells" or q20=1 "No role"

q25e

Drinking water funding use / increased: Low-interest loans

QUESTIONNAIRE TEXT: Please indicate whether your jurisdiction uses each of the following options to fund drinking water, and whether or not each has been increased in the last few years? Low-interest loans

```

      type: numeric (byte)
      label: problem

      range: [1,4]
unique values: 4
                        units: 1
                        missing .: 992/1,530

      tabulation:  Freq.   Numeric  Label
                   299      1  A Significant Problem
                   132      2  Somewhat of a Problem
                    61      3  Not Much of a Problem
                    46      4  Not a Problem at All
                   992      .

```

SKIP PATTERN: Not asked if jtype=1 "County" or q17=4 "Entirely through individual private wells" or q20=1 "No role"

q25f

Drinking water funding use / increased: Federal / state grants

QUESTIONNAIRE TEXT: Please indicate whether your jurisdiction uses each of the following options to fund drinking water, and whether or not each has been increased in the last few years? Federal/state grants

```

      type: numeric (byte)
      label: problem

      range: [1,4]
unique values: 4
                        units: 1
                        missing .: 988/1,530

      tabulation:  Freq.   Numeric  Label
                   225      1  A Significant Problem
                   177      2  Somewhat of a Problem
                    73      3  Not Much of a Problem
                    67      4  Not a Problem at All
                   988      .

```

SKIP PATTERN: Not asked if jtype=1 "County" or q17=4 "Entirely through individual private wells" or q20=1 "No role"

q25g

Drinking water funding use / increased: Other

QUESTIONNAIRE TEXT: Please indicate whether your jurisdiction uses each of the

following options to fund drinking water, and whether or not each has been increased in the last few years? Other (please specify)

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

range: [1,4] units: 1
unique values: 4 missing .: 1,407/1,530
```

tabulation:	Freq.	Numeric	Label
	45	1	A Significant Problem
	4	2	Somewhat of a Problem
	1	3	Not Much of a Problem
	73	4	Not a Problem at All
	1,407	.	

SKIP PATTERN: Not asked if jtype=1 "County" or q17=4 "Entirely through individual private wells" or q20=1 "No role"

q25other
Drinking water funding use / increased: Other-specify

QUESTIONNAIRE TEXT: Please indicate whether your jurisdiction uses each of the following options to fund drinking water, and whether or not each has been increased in the last few years? Other (please specify)

```
type: string (str241)

unique values: 19 missing "": 1,421/1,530
```

SKIP PATTERN: Not asked if jtype=1 "County" or q17=4 "Entirely through individual private wells" or q20=1 "No role"

CODEBOOK NOTE: This variable does not appear in the Stata dataset, because some versions of Stata do not support long string variables. Responses to q19other are available in the excel file 2016-Spring-Opens-Redacted.xlsx, and can be linked back to the original data using the variable respondent_id, as well as the ID.date, ID.start, ID.endDate, and ID.end variables. Additionally, to protect respondent confidentiality, identifying information from responses was redacted. Redacted text was denoted [REDACTED]. The original responses are not available to secondary users of the data.

q25_used
Number of options to fund drinking water used

QUESTIONNAIRE TEXT: Please indicate whether your jurisdiction uses each of the following options to fund drinking water, and whether or not each has been increased in the last few years?

```
type: numeric (float)
```

label: used
 range: [0,5] units: 1
 unique values: 6 missing .: 954/1,530

tabulation:	Freq.	Numeric	Label
	34	0	No funding options selected
	115	1	
	124	2	
	113	3	
	121	4	
	69	5	5 or more funding options selected
	954	.	

CODEBOOK NOTE: q25_used and q25_increased summarize responses to q25a-q25g. q25_used gives the number of items in q25a-q25g in which a respondent selected 2 "We use, but have not increased recently" or 3 "We use and have increased recently". The maximum number of options that could have been selected was 7.

 q25_increased
 Number of options to fund drinking water increased in the last few years

QUESTIONNAIRE TEXT: Please indicate whether your jurisdiction uses each of the following options to fund drinking water, and whether or not each has been increased in the last few years?

type: numeric (float)
 label: increased
 range: [0,5] units: 1
 unique values: 6 missing .: 954/1,530

tabulation:	Freq.	Numeric	Label
	187	0	No funding options increased
	247	1	
	68	2	
	35	3	
	33	4	
	6	5	5 or more funding options increased
	954	.	

CODEBOOK NOTE: q25_used and q25_increased summarize responses to q25a-q25g. q25_increased gives the number of items in q25a-q25g in which a respondent selected 3 "We use and have increased recently". The maximum number of options that could have been selected was 7.

 q26a
 Support for increasing water rates/fees: Board/Council

QUESTIONNAIRE TEXT: Looking ahead, in order to maintain or improve drinking

water infrastructure in your jurisdiction, do you think the following groups or individuals would support or oppose increasing water rates or fees? The majority of your jurisdiction's Board/Council

type: numeric (byte)
label: support_oppose
range: [1,6] units: 1
unique values: 6 missing .: 953/1,530

tabulation:	Freq.	Numeric	Label
	101	1	Strongly Support
	286	2	Somewhat Support
	64	3	Neither Support nor Oppose
	66	4	Somewhat Oppose
	26	5	Strongly Oppose
	34	6	Don't Know
	953	.	

SKIP PATTERN: Not asked if jtype=1 "County" or q17=4 "Entirely through individual private wells" or q20=1 "No role"

q26b
Support for increasing water rates/fees: Citizens

QUESTIONNAIRE TEXT: Looking ahead, in order to maintain or improve drinking water infrastructure in your jurisdiction, do you think the following groups or individuals would support or oppose increasing water rates or fees? The majority of your jurisdiction's citizens

type: numeric (byte)
label: support_oppose
range: [1,6] units: 1
unique values: 6 missing .: 956/1,530

tabulation:	Freq.	Numeric	Label
	29	1	Strongly Support
	182	2	Somewhat Support
	97	3	Neither Support nor Oppose
	162	4	Somewhat Oppose
	67	5	Strongly Oppose
	37	6	Don't Know
	956	.	

SKIP PATTERN: Not asked if jtype=1 "County" or q17=4 "Entirely through individual private wells" or q20=1 "No role"

q26c
Support for increasing water rates/fees: Respondent as local official

QUESTIONNAIRE TEXT: Looking ahead, in order to maintain or improve drinking water infrastructure in your jurisdiction, do you think the following groups or individuals would support or oppose increasing water rates or fees? You personally in your role as a local official

```

type: numeric (byte)
label: support_oppose

range: [1,6]
unique values: 6
units: 1
missing .: 959/1,530

tabulation: Freq.   Numeric   Label
              159         1   Strongly Support
              250         2   Somewhat Support
              75          3   Neither Support nor Oppose
              40          4   Somewhat Oppose
              25          5   Strongly Oppose
              22          6   Don't Know
              959         .

```

SKIP PATTERN: Not asked if jtype=1 "County" or q17=4 "Entirely through individual private wells" or q20=1 "No role"

q27a
Ensuring safe drinking water in juris.: Federal government rating

QUESTIONNAIRE TEXT: The responsibility for ensuring safe drinking water is shared among many actors, including both public and private entities. We're particularly interested in the role of federal, state, and local governments. Please rate how well each of the following levels of government is doing in carrying out its responsibility to ensure safe drinking water in your jurisdiction. Federal government

```

type: numeric (byte)
label: rating

range: [1,5]
unique values: 5
units: 1
missing .: 260/1,530

tabulation: Freq.   Numeric   Label
              36         1   Excellent
              211        2   Good
              263        3   Fair
              201        4   Poor
              559        5   Don't Know
              260         .

```

SKIP PATTERN: Not asked if jtype=1 "County"

q27b
Ensuring safe drinking water in juris.: MI's state government rating

QUESTIONNAIRE TEXT: The responsibility for ensuring safe drinking water is shared among many actors, including both public and private entities. We're particularly interested in the role of federal, state, and local governments. Please rate how well each of the following levels of government is doing in carrying out its responsibility to ensure safe drinking water in your jurisdiction. Michigan's state government

type: numeric (byte)
label: rating
range: [1,5] units: 1
unique values: 5 missing .: 253/1,530

tabulation:	Freq.	Numeric	Label
	51	1	Excellent
	329	2	Good
	298	3	Fair
	233	4	Poor
	366	5	Don't Know
	253	.	

SKIP PATTERN: Not asked if jtype=1 "County"

q27c

Ensuring safe drinking water in juris: Local government's rating

QUESTIONNAIRE TEXT: The responsibility for ensuring safe drinking water is shared among many actors, including both public and private entities. We're particularly interested in the role of federal, state, and local governments. Please rate how well each of the following levels of government is doing in carrying out its responsibility to ensure safe drinking water in your jurisdiction. Your local government

type: numeric (byte)
label: rating
range: [1,5] units: 1
unique values: 5 missing .: 259/1,530

tabulation:	Freq.	Numeric	Label
	354	1	Excellent
	473	2	Good
	139	3	Fair
	27	4	Poor
	278	5	Don't Know
	259	.	

SKIP PATTERN: Not asked if jtype=1 "County"

q28a

Property tax appeals in last 2 years: Big box stores

QUESTIONNAIRE TEXT: Thinking about the last two years, have landowners for any of the following classes of real property in your jurisdiction appealed their tax assessments – either to your jurisdiction’s Board of Review or directly to the Michigan Tax Tribunal? (Please select “Not Applicable” if you do not have any parcels of that class within your jurisdiction.) Commercial “big box” stores (e.g., Lowe’s, Costco, etc.)

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

      range: [1,4]
unique values: 4                               units: 1
                                                missing .: 419/1,530

      tabulation: Freq.   Numeric   Label
                  163      1       Yes
                  184      2       No
                  712      3       Not Applicable
                   52      4       Don't Know
                  419      .
```

SKIP PATTERN: Not asked if jtype=1 “County” or jtype=4 “Village”

q28b
Property tax appeals in last 2 years: Other commercial properties

QUESTIONNAIRE TEXT: Thinking about the last two years, have landowners for any of the following classes of real property in your jurisdiction appealed their tax assessments – either to your jurisdiction’s Board of Review or directly to the Michigan Tax Tribunal? (Please select “Not Applicable” if you do not have any parcels of that class within your jurisdiction.) Other commercial properties aside from “big box” stores

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

      range: [1,4]
unique values: 4                               units: 1
                                                missing .: 430/1,530

      tabulation: Freq.   Numeric   Label
                  409      1       Yes
                  260      2       No
                  331      3       Not Applicable
                   100      4       Don't Know
                   430      .
```

SKIP PATTERN: Not asked if jtype=1 “County” or jtype=4 “Village”

q28c
Property tax appeals in last 2 years: Industrial properties

QUESTIONNAIRE TEXT: Thinking about the last two years, have landowners for any

of the following classes of real property in your jurisdiction appealed their tax assessments – either to your jurisdiction’s Board of Review or directly to the Michigan Tax Tribunal? (Please select “Not Applicable” if you do not have any parcels of that class within your jurisdiction.) Industrial

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

      range: [1,4]
unique values: 4
                        units: 1
                        missing .: 441/1,530

      tabulation: Freq.   Numeric   Label
                  286      1      Yes
                  367      2      No
                  311      3      Not Applicable
                  125      4      Don't Know
                  441      .
```

SKIP PATTERN: Not asked if jtype=1 “County” or jtype=4 “Village”

q28d
Property tax appeals in last 2 years: Residential properties

QUESTIONNAIRE TEXT: Thinking about the last two years, have landowners for any of the following classes of real property in your jurisdiction appealed their tax assessments – either to your jurisdiction’s Board of Review or directly to the Michigan Tax Tribunal? (Please select “Not Applicable” if you do not have any parcels of that class within your jurisdiction.) Residential

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

      range: [1,4]
unique values: 4
                        units: 1
                        missing .: 433/1,530

      tabulation: Freq.   Numeric   Label
                  845      1      Yes
                  129      2      No
                   26      3      Not Applicable
                   97      4      Don't Know
                  433      .
```

SKIP PATTERN: Not asked if jtype=1 “County” or jtype=4 “Village”

q28e
Property tax appeals in last 2 years: Agricultural properties

QUESTIONNAIRE TEXT: Thinking about the last two years, have landowners for any of the following classes of real property in your jurisdiction appealed their tax assessments – either to your jurisdiction’s Board of Review or directly to the Michigan Tax Tribunal? (Please select “Not Applicable” if you do not have any parcels of that class within your jurisdiction.) Agricultural

type: numeric (byte)
label: y_n_na_dk
range: [1,4] units: 1
unique values: 4 missing .: 450/1,530

tabulation:	Freq.	Numeric	Label
	395	1	Yes
	342	2	No
	196	3	Not Applicable
	147	4	Don't Know
	450	.	

SKIP PATTERN: Not asked if jtype=1 "County" or jtype=4 "Village"

q28f
Property tax appeals in last 2 years: Other properties

QUESTIONNAIRE TEXT: Thinking about the last two years, have landowners for any of the following classes of real property in your jurisdiction appealed their tax assessments – either to your jurisdiction’s Board of Review or directly to the Michigan Tax Tribunal? (Please select "Not Applicable" if you do not have any parcels of that class within your jurisdiction.) Other (please specify)

type: numeric (byte)
label: y_n_na_dk
range: [1,4] units: 1
unique values: 4 missing .: 1,246/1,530

tabulation:	Freq.	Numeric	Label
	30	1	Yes
	34	2	No
	73	3	Not Applicable
	147	4	Don't Know
	1,246	.	

SKIP PATTERN: Not asked if jtype=1 "County" or jtype=4 "Village"

q28other
Property tax appeals in last 2 years: Other-specify

QUESTIONNAIRE TEXT: Thinking about the last two years, have landowners for any of the following classes of real property in your jurisdiction appealed their tax assessments – either to your jurisdiction’s Board of Review or directly to the Michigan Tax Tribunal? (Please select "Not Applicable" if you do not have any parcels of that class within your jurisdiction.) Other (please specify)

type: string (str219)
unique values: 37 missing "": 1,491/1,530
warning: variable has embedded blanks

SKIP PATTERN: Not asked if jtype=1 "County" or jtype=4 "Village"

CODEBOOK NOTE: This variable does not appear in the Stata dataset, because some versions of Stata do not support long string variables. Responses to q28other are available in the excel file 2016-Spring-Opens-Redacted.xlsx, and can be linked back to the original data using the variable respondent_id, as well as the ID.date, ID.start, ID.endDate, and ID.end variables. Additionally, to protect respondent confidentiality, identifying information from responses was redacted. Redacted text was denoted [REDACTED]. The original responses are not available to secondary users of the data.

q28_count
Number of classes of real property that appealed tax assessments in last two yrs

QUESTIONNAIRE TEXT: Thinking about the last two years, have landowners for any of the following classes of real property in your jurisdiction appealed their tax assessments – either to your jurisdiction’s Board of Review or directly to the Michigan Tax Tribunal? (Please select "Not Applicable" if you do not have any parcels of that class within your jurisdiction.)

type: numeric (float)
label: count

range: [0,4] units: 1
unique values: 5 missing .: 407/1,530

tabulation:	Freq.	Numeric	Label
	201	0	No classes of real property selected
	221	1	
	367	2	
	195	3	
	139	4	4 or more classes of real property selected
	407	.	

SKIP PATTERN: q28a-q28f not asked if jtype=1 "County" or jtype=4 "Village"

CODEBOOK NOTE: q28_count summarizes responses to q28a-q28f. q28_count is a count of the number of classes of real property for which a respondent selected that there had been any tax assessment appeals in the last two years. The maximum number of options that could have been selected was 6, q28_count is top-coded at 4 or more classes of real property.

q29
Did any appeal a Board of Review determination to Michigan Tax Tribunal

QUESTIONNAIRE TEXT: Did any of these landowners appeal a Board of Review determination to the Michigan Tax Tribunal?

type: numeric (byte)

label: y_n_dk
range: [1,3] units: 1
unique values: 3 missing .: 614/1,530

tabulation:	Freq.	Numeric	Label
	566	1	Yes
	202	2	No
	148	3	Don't Know
	614	.	

SKIP PATTERN: Not asked unless q28a=1 or q28b=1 or q28c=1 or q28d=1 or q28e=1 or q28f=1

q30a

Response to appeal: Stipulated/agreed to value(s) landowner stated

QUESTIONNAIRE TEXT: Thinking about any appeals of a Board of Review determination to the Michigan Tax Tribunal in the last two years, how did your jurisdiction respond? (check all that apply) We stipulated/agreed to the value(s) the landowner stated in their Michigan Tax Tribunal petition.

type: numeric (byte)
label: selected

range: [0,1] units: 1
unique values: 2 missing .: 965/1,530

tabulation:	Freq.	Numeric	Label
	483	0	Not Selected
	82	1	Selected
	965	.	

SKIP PATTERN: Not asked unless q29=1

q30b

Response to appeal: Stipulated/agreed to alternate value prior to hearing

QUESTIONNAIRE TEXT: Thinking about any appeals of a Board of Review determination to the Michigan Tax Tribunal in the last two years, how did your jurisdiction respond? (check all that apply) We stipulated/agreed to an alternate taxable value with landowner prior to the Tax Tribunal hearing.

type: numeric (byte)
label: selected

range: [0,1] units: 1
unique values: 2 missing .: 965/1,530

tabulation:	Freq.	Numeric	Label
	356	0	Not Selected
	209	1	Selected
	965	.	

SKIP PATTERN: Not asked unless q29=1

q30_ab

Response to appeal: Stipulated/agreed to landowner stated or alternate value

type: numeric (float)
label: selected

range: [0,1] units: 1
unique values: 2 missing .: 965/1,530

tabulation:	Freq.	Numeric	Label
	323	0	Not Selected
	242	1	Selected
	965	.	

SKIP PATTERN: q30a and q30b not asked unless q29=1

CODEBOOK NOTE: q30_ab summarizes responses to q30a and q30b. q30_ab=1 "Selected" if q30a=1 "Selected" or q30b=1 "Selected".

q30c

Response to appeal: Defended the assessment before the Tax Tribunal

QUESTIONNAIRE TEXT: Thinking about any appeals of a Board of Review determination to the Michigan Tax Tribunal in the last two years, how did your jurisdiction respond? (check all that apply) We defended the assessment before the Tax Tribunal.

type: numeric (byte)
label: selected

range: [0,1] units: 1
unique values: 2 missing .: 965/1,530

tabulation:	Freq.	Numeric	Label
	207	0	Not Selected
	358	1	Selected
	965	.	

SKIP PATTERN: Not asked unless q29=1

q30d

Response to appeal: Don't know

QUESTIONNAIRE TEXT: Thinking about any appeals of a Board of Review determination to the Michigan Tax Tribunal in the last two years, how did your jurisdiction respond? (check all that apply) Don't Know

type: numeric (byte)
label: selected
range: [0,1] units: 1
unique values: 2 missing .: 965/1,530

tabulation:	Freq.	Numeric	Label
	489	0	Not Selected
	76	1	Selected
	965	.	

SKIP PATTERN: Not asked unless q29=1

q31
Extent cost of legal representation impacted decision to stipulate

QUESTIONNAIRE TEXT: To what extent – if at all – did the cost of legal representation for the appeal impact your decision to stipulate rather than defend the original assessment before the Tax Tribunal?

type: numeric (byte)
label: extent
range: [1,5] units: 1
unique values: 5 missing .: 1,291/1,530

tabulation:	Freq.	Numeric	Label
	68	1	A Great Deal
	71	2	Somewhat
	50	3	Very Little
	48	4	Not At All
	2	5	Don't Know
	1,291	.	

SKIP PATTERN: Not asked unless q30a=1 or q30b=1

q32
Satisfaction with Tax Tribunal's determination(s) in last 2 years

QUESTIONNAIRE TEXT: Thinking about property tax appeals that have gone to the Michigan Tax Tribunal from your jurisdiction in the last two years, would you say you are generally satisfied or dissatisfied with the Tax Tribunal's determination(s)?

type: numeric (byte)
label: satisfaction
range: [1,6] units: 1
unique values: 6 missing .: 1,172/1,530

tabulation:	Freq.	Numeric	Label
	40	1	Very Satisfied
	87	2	Somewhat Satisfied

62	3	Neither Satisfied Nor Dissatisfied
78	4	Somewhat Dissatisfied
77	5	Very Dissatisfied
14	6	Don't Know
1,172	.	

SKIP PATTERN: Not asked unless q30c=1

q33

How much of a problem are property tax appeals for J's curr. fiscal health

QUESTIONNAIRE TEXT: Overall, how much of a problem – if at all – are property tax appeals for your jurisdiction's current fiscal health?

```

type: numeric (byte)
label: problem

range: [1,5]
unique values: 5

units: 1
missing .: 159/1,530

```

tabulation:	Freq.	Numeric	Label
	100	1	A Significant Problem
	244	2	Somewhat of a Problem
	585	3	Not Much of a Problem
	340	4	Not a Problem at All
	102	5	Don't Know
	159	.	

SKIP PATTERN: Not asked if jtype=1 "County" or jtype=4 "Village"

q34

Tax assessment of retail chain stores should be based on comparable dark stores

QUESTIONNAIRE TEXT: In some jurisdictions, retail chains (including "big box" stores) have appealed their property tax assessments claiming their buildings are hard to sell for another use, making the market value significantly lower than construction costs. Recently, the Michigan Tax Tribunal has generally ruled that tax assessments for these properties should be based upon the selling price of comparable vacant "dark stores." To what extent do you agree or disagree that tax assessments of retail chain stores should be based on comparable vacant "dark stores?"

```

type: numeric (byte)
label: agree_disagree

range: [1,6]
unique values: 6

units: 1
missing .: 181/1,530

```

tabulation:	Freq.	Numeric	Label
	30	1	Strongly Agree
	95	2	Somewhat Agree
	198	3	Neither Agree nor Disagree

```

169          4 Somewhat Disagree
522          5 Strongly Disagree
335          6 Don't Know
181          .

```

SKIP PATTERN: Not asked if jtype=1 "County" or jtype=4 "Village"

q35

Actions taken to minimize impact of 'dark stores' tax appeals

QUESTIONNAIRE TEXT: Some jurisdictions have enacted local ordinances to address "dark stores" appeals (for example, requiring new commercial buildings to be constructed for more general reuse or addressing these issues in terms of deed restrictions). Which of the following best describes the actions – if any – your jurisdiction has taken to minimize the impact of "dark stores" tax appeals?

```

      type: numeric (byte)
      label: actions

      range: [1,6]                units: 1
unique values: 6                  missing .: 193/1,530

      tabulation: Freq.  Numeric  Label
                  4          1  It has enacted a relevant local
                        1  ordinance, or is in the process
                        2  of enacting an ordinance.
                  5          2  It discussed enacting an
                        3  ordinance, but has decided not
                        4  to.
                  49         3  It discussed enacting an
                        5  ordinance, but has not yet
                        6  decided what to do.
                  248        4  It has not discussed this issue,
                        7  but is likely to consider it in
                        8  the future.
                  728        5  It has not discussed this issue,
                        9  and is unlikely to discuss it in
                       10  the future.
                  303        6  Don't Know
                  193        .

```

SKIP PATTERN: Not asked if jtype=1 "County" or jtype=4 "Village"

q36

You feel things in the state of Michigan are generally going...

QUESTIONNAIRE TEXT: Do you feel things in the state of Michigan are generally going in the right direction, or do you feel things have gotten off on the wrong track?

```

      type: numeric (byte)
      label: track

```

range: [1,3] units: 1
unique values: 3 missing .: 164/1,530

tabulation:	Freq.	Numeric	Label
	599	1	Right Direction
	537	2	Wrong Track
	230	3	Don't Know
	164	.	

q37right

Main reason why things in the state of Michigan are going right direction

QUESTIONNAIRE TEXT: Please briefly tell us the main reasons why you think things in the state of Michigan are generally going that way.

type: string (str1423)

unique values: 317 missing "": 1,210/1,530

warning: variable has leading and embedded blanks

SKIP PATTERN: Not asked unless q36=1

CODEBOOK NOTE: This variable does not appear in the Stata dataset, because some versions of Stata do not support long string variables. Responses to q37right are available in the excel file 2016-Spring-Opens-Redacted.xlsx, and can be linked back to the original data using the variable respondent_id, as well as the ID.date, ID.start, ID.endDate, and ID.end variables. Additionally, to protect respondent confidentiality, identifying information from responses was redacted. Redacted text was denoted [REDACTED]. The original responses are not available to secondary users of the data.

q37wrong

Main reason why things in the state of Michigan are on wrong track

QUESTIONNAIRE TEXT: Please briefly tell us the main reasons why you think things in the state of Michigan are generally going that way.

type: string (str1991)

unique values: 385 missing "": 1,144/1,530

warning: variable has leading and embedded blanks

SKIP PATTERN: Not asked unless q36=2

CODEBOOK NOTE: This variable does not appear in the Stata dataset, because some versions of Stata do not support long string variables. Responses to q37wrong are available in the excel file 2016-Spring-Opens-Redacted.xlsx, and can be linked back to the original data using the variable respondent_id, as well as the ID.date, ID.start, ID.endDate, and ID.end variables. Additionally, to protect respondent confidentiality, identifying information from responses was

redacted. Redacted text was denoted [REDACTED]. The original responses are not available to secondary users of the data.

q38

How would you rate the way Rick Snyder is performing his job as MI's governor?

QUESTIONNAIRE TEXT: How would you rate the way Rick Snyder is performing his job as Michigan's governor?

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

      range: [1,5]
unique values: 5                               units: 1
                                              missing .: 166/1,530

      tabulation:  Freq.   Numeric  Label
                   101      1  Excellent
                   467      2   Good
                   423      3   Fair
                   343      4   Poor
                    30      5  Don't Know
                   166      .
```

q39

How would you rate the way the MI Legislature is performing its job?

QUESTIONNAIRE TEXT: How would you rate the way the Michigan Legislature is performing its job?

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

      range: [1,5]
unique values: 5                               units: 1
                                              missing .: 165/1,530

      tabulation:  Freq.   Numeric  Label
                   16      1  Excellent
                   257      2   Good
                   525      3   Fair
                   531      4   Poor
                    36      5  Don't Know
                   165      .
```

q40

What other resources/services CLOSUP could provide that would be useful to j.

QUESTIONNAIRE TEXT: CLOSUP wants to improve its public service to you and others. In addition to our web data tables and reports on the findings from each survey, we want to know if there are other resources or services CLOSUP could provide that would be useful to your jurisdiction. Please let us know below what else we can do to help.

```

type: string (str770)
unique values: 204 missing "": 1,313/1,530
warning: variable has leading and embedded blanks

```

CODEBOOK NOTE: This question was included in the survey for internal CLOSUP use only. The responses are not available to secondary users of the data.

age_category
Respondent Age

```

type: numeric (byte)
label: age
range: [1,8] units: 1
unique values: 8 missing .: 278/1,530

```

tabulation:	Freq.	Numeric	Label
	10	1	20s
	53	2	30s
	159	3	40s
	318	4	50s
	464	5	60s
	213	6	70s
	31	7	80s
	4	8	90s
	278	.	

CODEBOOK NOTE: In order to protect respondent confidentiality, CLOSUP recoded the continuous variable q43 "In what year were you born" into age_category, a categorical variable. Original responses to q43 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 .: 213/1,530

```

tabulation:	Freq.	Numeric	Label
	218	1	Two or less years
	287	2	Three to five years
	307	3	Six to ten years
	315	4	Eleven to twenty years
	190	5	More than twenty years
	213	.	


```
tabulation:  Freq.  Numeric  Label
              1,252      0  Not Selected
              11         1  Selected
              267         .
```

q46c

Race: American Indian or Alaskan Native

QUESTIONNAIRE TEXT: Please check one or more categories below to indicate what race(s) you consider yourself to be. (check all that apply) American Indian or Alaskan Native

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

      range:  [0,1]                units:  1
unique values:  2                missing .:  267/1,530

      tabulation:  Freq.  Numeric  Label
                  1,250      0  Not Selected
                  13         1  Selected
                  267         .
```

q46d

Race: Native Hawaiian or other Pacific Islander

QUESTIONNAIRE TEXT: Please check one or more categories below to indicate what race(s) you consider yourself to be. (check all that apply) Native Hawaiian or other Pacific Islander

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

      range:  [0,0]                units:  1
unique values:  1                missing .:  267/1,530

      tabulation:  Freq.  Numeric  Label
                  1,263      0  Not Selected
                  267         .
```

q46e

Race: Asian

QUESTIONNAIRE TEXT: Please check one or more categories below to indicate what race(s) you consider yourself to be. (check all that apply) Asian

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

      range:  [0,0]                units:  1
unique values:  1                missing .:  267/1,530
```

```
tabulation:  Freq.  Numeric  Label
              1,263      0  Not Selected
              267        .
```

q46f
Race: Multiracial

QUESTIONNAIRE TEXT: Please check one or more categories below to indicate what race(s) you consider yourself to be. (check all that apply) Multiracial

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

      range:  [0,1]
unique values:  2                               units:  1
                                          missing .:  267/1,530
```

```
tabulation:  Freq.  Numeric  Label
              1,253      0  Not Selected
               10       1  Selected
              267        .
```

q46g
Race: Other

QUESTIONNAIRE TEXT: Please check one or more categories below to indicate what race(s) you consider yourself to be. (check all that apply) Other

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

      range:  [0,1]
unique values:  2                               units:  1
                                          missing .:  267/1,530
```

```
tabulation:  Freq.  Numeric  Label
              1,252      0  Not Selected
               11       1  Selected
              267        .
```

q46h
Race: Don't Know

QUESTIONNAIRE TEXT: Please check one or more categories below to indicate what race(s) you consider yourself to be. (check all that apply) Don't know

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

      range:  [0,1]
unique values:  2                               units:  1
                                          missing .:  267/1,530
```

```
tabulation:  Freq.  Numeric  Label
              1,257      0  Not Selected
```


6 1 Selected
267 .

q47
Highest level of education

QUESTIONNAIRE TEXT: What is the highest degree or level of school you have completed?

type: numeric (byte)
label: schooling

range: [1,7] units: 1
unique values: 7 missing .: 235/1,530

tabulation:	Freq.	Numeric	Label
	38	1	12th grade or less, no diploma
	168	2	High school graduate or GED
	362	3	Some college, no degree
	158	4	Associate degree
	301	5	Bachelor's degree
	217	6	Master's degree
	51	7	Professional/Doctorate degree
	235	.	.

q48
Political affiliation

QUESTIONNAIRE TEXT: Generally speaking, do you think of yourself as a...?

type: numeric (byte)
label: party

range: [1,4] units: 1
unique values: 4 missing .: 293/1,530

tabulation:	Freq.	Numeric	Label
	595	1	Republican
	352	2	Independent
	236	3	Democrat
	54	4	Something Else
	293	.	.

q49
Strength of political affiliation

QUESTIONNAIRE TEXT: Would you consider yourself a strong or not very strong Republican/Democrat?

type: numeric (byte)
label: strength

range: [1,3] units: 1
unique values: 3 missing .: 724/1,530

tabulation:	Freq.	Numeric	Label
	362	1	Very Strong
	394	2	Not Very Strong
	50	3	Don't Know
	724	.	

q50
As an Independent, which party are you closer to?

QUESTIONNAIRE TEXT: Would you consider yourself closer to...?

type: numeric (byte)
label: political_leaning

range: [1,3] units: 1
unique values: 3 missing .: 1,138/1,530

tabulation:	Freq.	Numeric	Label
	103	1	Democratic Party
	119	2	Republican Party
	170	3	Neither
	1,138	.	

partyid
7-point partisanship scale

type: numeric (byte)
label: partisanship

range: [1,7] units: 1
unique values: 7 missing .: 382/1,530

tabulation:	Freq.	Numeric	Label
	257	1	Strong Republican
	287	2	Weak Republican
	119	3	Independent leaning Republican
	170	4	Independent
	103	5	Independent leaning Democrat
	107	6	Weak Democrat
	105	7	Strong Democrat
	382	.	

CODEBOOK NOTE: This variable is a recoded version of q48, q49, and q50, which measure political affiliation and strength of party affiliation.

threpty
3-point partisanship scale

```

-----
      type: numeric (byte)
      label: partisanship2

      range: [1,3]
unique values: 3
                        units: 1
                        missing .: 382/1,530

      tabulation: Freq.   Numeric  Label
                   663       1  Republican
                   170       2  Independent
                   315       3  Democrat
                   382       .

```

CODEBOOK NOTE: This variable is a recoded version of q48 and q50, which measure political affiliation.

```

-----
pop_density
Population Density
-----

```

```

      type: numeric (byte)
      label: pop_density

      range: [1,3]
unique values: 3
                        units: 1
                        missing .: 0/1,530

      tabulation: Freq.   Numeric  Label
                   725       1  Low <100
                   450       2  Mid
                   355       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.

```

-----
region
MI regions
-----

```

```

      type: numeric (byte)
      label: soss_reg

      range: [1,6]
unique values: 6
                        units: 1
                        missing .: 0/1,530

      tabulation: Freq.   Numeric  Label
                   174       1  Upper Peninsula
                   254       2  Northern Lower Peninsula
                   279       3  West Central Lower Peninsula
                   276       4  East Central Lower Peninsula

```

252 5 Southwest Lower Peninsula
295 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: [.58749998,1] units: 1.000e-08
unique values: 41 missing .: 0/1,530
mean: .752568
std. dev: .088644
percentiles: 10% 25% 50% 75% 90%
.666667 .684932 .75641 .793103 .88

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: [1,1.7021277] units: 1.000e-07
unique values: 41 missing .: 0/1,530

```

      mean: 1.34674
      std. dev: .154481

percentiles:      10%      25%      50%      75%      90%
                  1.13636  1.26087  1.32203  1.46     1.5

```

CODEBOOK NOTE: Weights to be used when analyzing data at the jurisdiction level.

ind_rr
Individual-level Response Rate

```

      type: numeric (float)

      range: [.24761905,.85714287]      units: 1.000e-08
unique values: 17                        missing .: 1/1,530

      mean: .428459
      std. dev: .103598

percentiles:      10%      25%      50%      75%      90%
                  .33631  .381391  .400369  .458015  .607143

```

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: [0,4.0384617]      units: 1.000e-07
unique values: 18                        missing .: 0/1,530

      mean: 2.45241
      std. dev: .533092

percentiles:      10%      25%      50%      75%      90%
                  1.64706  2.18333  2.4977  2.62198  2.97345

```

CODEBOOK NOTE: Weights to be used when analyzing data at the individual level.

pop_township
Population Category: Township

```

      type: numeric (byte)
      label: pop_twp_city

```

range: [1,3] units: 1
unique values: 3 missing .: 520/1,530

tabulation:	Freq.	Numeric	Label
	374	1	<1500
	536	2	1500-10000
	100	3	>10000
	520	.	

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 .: 1,289/1,530

tabulation:	Freq.	Numeric	Label
	26	1	<1500
	133	2	1500-10000
	82	3	>10000
	1,289	.	

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 .: 1,323/1,530

tabulation:	Freq.	Numeric	Label
-------------	-------	---------	-------

154	1	<1500
53	2	>/=1500
1,323	.	

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]
unique values: 2

units: 1
missing .: 1,458/1,530

```

```

tabulation: Freq.   Numeric  Label
              26         1  </=30000
              46         2  >30000
            1,458         .

```

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.

Q6. Different local jurisdictions manage their unreserved/unassigned general fund balances in different ways depending on their specific circumstances. Despite these differences, we're interested in tracking overall changes in these balances over time. Approximately what was your jurisdiction's unreserved/unassigned general fund balance as a percentage of general fund expenditures at the end of its last fiscal year?

- 0% or less 21-30% 51-60% 81-90% Don't Know
 1-10% 31-40% 61-70% 91-100%
 11-20% 41-50% 71-80% Over 100%

Q7. Thinking about your jurisdiction's fiscal needs, overall, do you consider your jurisdiction's unreserved/unassigned general fund balance to be too high, about right, or too low?

- Too High About Right Too Low Don't Know

Q8. In your opinion, is your jurisdiction's cash flow and its ability to pay bills in a timely manner a significant fiscal problem, somewhat of a problem, not much of a problem, or not a problem at all?

- A significant problem Somewhat of a problem Not much of a problem Not a problem at all Don't Know

Q9. Now, thinking about the overall fiscal stress in your jurisdiction today and what you expect it to be down the road — including any future financial obligations it may have — on a scale from 1 to 10, where 1 is the best: perfect fiscal health and 10 is the worst: fiscal crisis, how would you rate your jurisdiction's overall fiscal stress...

	The Best: Perfect Fiscal Health										The Worst: Fiscal Crisis		Don't Know
	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	10		
... today?												<input type="checkbox"/>	
... as you expect it to be five years from now?												<input type="checkbox"/>	

Q10. Next, we want to get an overall sense of the level of satisfaction with the services your jurisdiction currently provides. Thinking about any important aspects of service provision (such as the range of different types of services offered, the amount and quality of those services, etc.), overall, how satisfied would you say the following people or groups are with your jurisdiction's current services?

	Very Satisfied	Somewhat Satisfied	Neither Satisfied Nor Dissatisfied	Somewhat Dissatisfied	Very Dissatisfied	Don't Know
The majority of your jurisdiction's citizens are...	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
The majority of your jurisdiction's Board/Council are...	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
You personally in your role as a local official are...	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>

Q11. We are interested in views about the trade-off between services and taxes. Thinking about particular services your jurisdiction may currently offer, if your jurisdiction's citizens were facing significant service cuts, in your opinion, what would they choose? Would the majority of citizens be more likely to choose higher taxes to avoid those service cuts or would they choose cuts to public services to avoid higher taxes? Please respond for each of the following services. (If your jurisdiction does not provide a particular service below, please select "Not Applicable" for that service.)

	Citizens would choose higher taxes to avoid service cuts	Citizens would choose service cuts to avoid higher taxes	Not Applicable	Don't Know
Police services	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
Fire services	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
Parks / recreation / libraries	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
Roads	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
Public transportation / transit	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
Economic development	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
Utilities (water, sewer, lighting, etc.)	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
General operations / governance (tax collections, accounting, training for officials, etc.)	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>

Now, we'd like to ask you about drinking water issues in your jurisdiction. (County officials, please skip to Q33.)

Q17. Some people get their drinking water through a shared water supply system (such as a municipal system, a subdivision-wide system, a shared system for a single apartment building, etc.). Others get drinking water from individual private wells. Which of the following best describes how drinking water is provided in your jurisdiction?

- Entirely through shared water supply system(s)
- Mostly through shared water supply system(s), but some individual private wells
- Mostly through individual private wells, but some shared system(s)
- Entirely through individual private wells (please skip to Q19)
- Don't know

Q18. To the best of your knowledge, which of the following best describes the source(s) of the shared drinking water system(s) in your jurisdiction?

- Surface water only (e.g., lake, river)
- Groundwater only (subsurface sources)
- A combination of surface water and groundwater
- Don't know

Q19. To what extent – if any – are each of the following currently problems for drinking water provision in your jurisdiction?

	A Significant Problem	Somewhat of a Problem	Not Much of a Problem	Not a Problem at All	Not Applicable	Don't Know
Threats to water source quality / safety	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>		<input type="checkbox"/>
Inadequate volume / low water tables	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>		<input type="checkbox"/>
Compliance with state and/or federal regulations	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>		<input type="checkbox"/>
Presence of lead in on-premises plumbing (e.g., faucets, solder)	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>		<input type="checkbox"/>
Presence of lead in pipes connecting customers to the system(s)	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
Aging / breaking pipes in the shared water supply system(s)	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
Affordability / delinquency on water bills	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
Other (please specify) _____	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>		<input type="checkbox"/>

(If in Q17 you selected drinking water provision in your jurisdiction is "entirely through private wells", please skip to Q27.)

Q20. Which of the following best describes your jurisdiction's role, if any, in the shared water system?

- No role:** my jurisdiction plays no active role in drinking water supply or distribution (please skip now to Q27)
- Some role:** my jurisdiction plays some kind of active role in water supply or distribution (for example, supplying our own water; contracting / purchasing water from another provider; or owning / operating some portion of local drinking water infrastructure)
- Don't Know

Q21. In your opinion, how would you rate the overall current condition of drinking water infrastructure (such as treatment plant, distribution pipes, etc.) in your jurisdiction?

- Excellent
- Good
- Fair
- Poor
- Don't Know

Q22. To what degree would you say the overall condition of drinking water systems in your jurisdiction has improved or deteriorated over the last decade?

Significantly Improved	Somewhat Improved	Neither Improved Nor Deteriorated	Somewhat Deteriorated	Significantly Deteriorated	Don't Know
<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>

Q23. To what extent, if any, is the current condition of the drinking water infrastructure in your jurisdiction a topic of discussion...

	A Great Deal	Somewhat	Very Little	Not At All	Don't Know
... among your jurisdiction's Board/Council?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
... among your jurisdiction's citizens?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>

Q24. Thinking about the current levels of funding for drinking water infrastructure in your jurisdiction, to what extent do you agree or disagree that current levels of funding are adequate...

	Strongly Agree	Somewhat Agree	Neither Agree Nor Disagree	Somewhat Disagree	Strongly Disagree	Don't Know
... to <u>maintain</u> the drinking water infrastructure in your jurisdiction?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
... to <u>improve</u> the drinking water infrastructure in your jurisdiction?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>

Q25. Please indicate whether your jurisdiction uses each of the following options to fund drinking water, and whether or not each has been increased in the last few years?

	We do not use	We use, but <u>have not increased</u> recently	We use and <u>have increased</u> recently	Don't Know
General fund contributions	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
Water rates / user fees	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
Special assessments	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
Bonds	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
Low-interest loans	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
Federal / state grants	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
Other (please specify) _____	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>

Q26. Looking ahead, in order to maintain or improve drinking water infrastructure in your jurisdiction, do you think the following groups or individuals would support or oppose increasing water rates or fees?

	Strongly Support	Somewhat Support	Neither Support Nor Oppose	Somewhat Oppose	Strongly Oppose	Don't Know
The majority of your jurisdiction's Board/Council	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
The majority of your jurisdiction's citizens	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
You personally in your role as a local official	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>

Q27. (For all city, village, and township officials) The responsibility for ensuring safe drinking water is shared among many actors, including both public and private entities. We're particularly interested in the role of federal, state, and local governments. Please rate how well each of the following levels of government is doing in carrying out its responsibility to ensure safe drinking water in your jurisdiction.

	Excellent	Good	Fair	Poor	Don't Know
Federal government	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
Michigan's state government	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
Your local government	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>

Next, we have a few questions about tax appeals. (Village and county officials, please skip to Q33.)

Q28. (Township and city officials) Thinking about the last two years, have landowners for any of the following classes of real property in your jurisdiction appealed their tax assessments — either to your jurisdiction’s Board of Review or directly to the Michigan Tax Tribunal? (Please select “Not Applicable” if you do not have any parcels of that class within your jurisdiction.)

	Yes	No	Not Applicable	Don’t Know
Commercial “big box” stores (e.g., Lowe’s, Costco, etc.)	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
Other commercial properties aside from “big box” stores	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
Industrial	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
Residential	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
Agricultural	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
Other (please specify) _____	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>

Q29. (If you selected “yes” to any items in Q28) Did any of these landowners appeal a Board of Review determination to the Michigan Tax Tribunal?

- Yes No Don’t Know

Q30. (If you selected “yes” in Q29) Thinking about any appeals of a Board of Review determination to the Michigan Tax Tribunal in the last two years, how did your jurisdiction respond? (check all that apply)

- We stipulated/agreed to the value(s) the landowner stated in their Michigan Tax Tribunal petition.
 We stipulated/agreed to an alternate taxable value with landowner prior to the Tax Tribunal hearing.
 We defended the assessment before the Tax Tribunal.
 Don’t Know

Q31. (If you selected “stipulated” in Q30) To what extent — if at all — did the cost of legal representation for the appeal impact your decision to stipulate rather than defend the original assessment before the Tax Tribunal?

- A Great Deal Somewhat Not Much Not at All Don’t Know

Q32. (If you selected “defended” in Q30) Thinking about property tax appeals that have gone to the Michigan Tax Tribunal from your jurisdiction in the last two years, would you say you are generally satisfied or dissatisfied with the Tax Tribunal’s determination(s)?

- Very Satisfied Somewhat Satisfied Neither Satisfied Nor Dissatisfied Somewhat Dissatisfied Very Dissatisfied Don’t Know

Q33. (For all officials) Overall, how much of a problem — if at all — are property tax appeals for your jurisdiction’s current fiscal health?

- A Significant Problem Somewhat of a Problem Not Much of a Problem Not a Problem at All Don’t Know

Q34. In some jurisdictions, retail chains (including “big box” stores) have appealed their property tax assessments claiming their buildings are hard to sell for another use, making the market value significantly lower than construction costs. Recently, the Michigan Tax Tribunal has generally ruled that tax assessments for these properties should be based upon the selling price of comparable vacant “dark stores.” To what extent do you agree or disagree that tax assessments of retail chain stores should be based on comparable vacant “dark stores?”

- Strongly Agree Somewhat Agree Neither Agree Nor Disagree Somewhat Disagree Strongly Disagree Don’t Know

Q35. Some jurisdictions have enacted local ordinances to address “dark stores” appeals (for example, requiring new commercial buildings to be constructed for more general reuse or addressing these issues in terms of deed restrictions). Which of the following best describes the actions — if any — your jurisdiction has taken to minimize the impact of “dark stores” tax appeals?

- It has enacted a relevant local ordinance, or is in the process of enacting an ordinance.
 It discussed enacting an ordinance, but has decided not to.
 It discussed enacting an ordinance, but has not yet decided what to do.
 It has not discussed this issue, but is likely to consider it in the future.
 It has not discussed this issue, and is unlikely to discuss it in the future.
 Don’t Know

Finally, we have a few long-term tracking questions repeated each spring regarding the overall state of affairs in Michigan more broadly.

Q36. Do you feel things in the state of Michigan are generally going in the right direction, or do you feel things have gotten off on the wrong track?

- Right direction Wrong track Don't Know (please skip to Q38)

Q37. Please briefly tell us the main reasons why you think things in the state of Michigan are generally going that way.

Q38. How would you rate the way Rick Snyder is performing his job as Michigan's governor?

- Excellent Good Fair Poor Don't Know

Q39. How would you rate the way the Michigan Legislature is performing its job?

- Excellent Good Fair Poor Don't Know

Q40. CLOSUP wants to improve its public service to you and others. In addition to our web data tables and reports on the findings from each survey, we want to know if there are other resources or services CLOSUP could provide that would be useful to your jurisdiction. Please let us know below what else we can do to help.

Q41. CLOSUP will protect your privacy and anonymity to the full extent provided by law. We need to confirm your personal information such as name and email address 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.

Please provide us with...

Your name _____

Your email address _____

Today's date ____ / ____ / ____

We would like to ask some demographic questions. As with all of the questions in this survey, these are optional. Responses will be reported in aggregate form only so that your individual responses will remain confidential.

Q42. What is your gender? Male Female

Q43. In what year were you born? 19 ____

Q44. How many years have you served in your current position? _____

Q45. Are you of Spanish, Hispanic, or Latino descent? Yes No

Q46. Please check one or more categories below to indicate what race(s) you consider yourself to be. (check all that apply)

- | | |
|--|--------------------------------------|
| <input type="checkbox"/> White | <input type="checkbox"/> Asian |
| <input type="checkbox"/> Black or African American | <input type="checkbox"/> Multiracial |
| <input type="checkbox"/> American Indian or Alaskan Native | <input type="checkbox"/> Other |
| <input type="checkbox"/> Native Hawaiian or other Pacific Islander | <input type="checkbox"/> Don't Know |

Q47. What is the highest degree or level of school you have completed?

- | | |
|--|--|
| <input type="checkbox"/> 12th grade or less/no diploma | <input type="checkbox"/> Bachelor's degree |
| <input type="checkbox"/> High school graduate or GED | <input type="checkbox"/> Master's degree |
| <input type="checkbox"/> Some college, no degree | <input type="checkbox"/> Professional/Doctorate degree |
| <input type="checkbox"/> Associate's degree | |

Q48. Generally speaking, do you think of yourself as a...?

- Republican Independent Democrat Something Else (please specify) _____

Q49. (If Republican or Democrat) Would you consider yourself a strong or not very strong Republican/Democrat?

- Very strong Not very strong Don't Know

Q50. (If Independent or something else) Would you consider yourself closer to...?

- The Democratic Party The Republican Party Neither