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## Statement of Confidentiality and Ownership

All the analyses, findings and recommendations contained within this report are the exclusive property of Gilpin County and the Gilpin County Board of County Commissioners.

As required by the Code of Ethics of the National Council on Public Polls and the United States Privacy Act of 1974, The Center for Research and Public Policy maintains the anonymity of respondents to surveys the firm conducts. No information will be released that might, in any way, reveal the identity of the respondent.

Moreover, no information regarding these findings will be released without the written consent of an authorized representative of Gilpin County and the Gilpin County Board of County Commissioners.
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## Summary of Findings

[^0]The Center for Research \& Public Policy (CRPP) is pleased to present the results to a County Quality of Life survey on behalf of Gilpin County and the Gilpin County Board of County Commissioners. The survey was conducted to collect citizen input regarding quality of life living in Gilpin County and views on programs and services, county employees, community needs, economic and housing development, emergency planning, taxation and communication.

The research study included 509 completed online surveys among residents and property owners in Gilpin County.

The online survey ( $\mathrm{N}=509$ ) was conducted April 26 - June 7, 2019.
The survey included the following areas for investigation:

```
History of and reasons for living in Gilpin County;
> Quality of life and standard of living in Gilpin County;
Awareness and familiarity of county services and programs;
Experiences living in Gilpin County;
Satisfaction with county programs, facilities and services;
> Rating county employees;
\ Views on current issues;
Community needs;
> Input on economic and housing development;
> Preparation for emergencies;
> Views on taxes and taxation;
Views on county communication; and,
Demographics
```

Section II of this report discusses the Methodology used in the study, while Section III includes Highlights derived from an analysis of the quantitative research. Section IV is a Summary of Findings from the survey.

Section V is an Appendix to the report containing the crosstabulations and the survey instrument employed.

Using a quantitative research design, an online survey was also completed among 509 residents or property owners within Gilpin County, Colorado.

Survey design input was provided during meetings with CRPP which included County Commissioners, the Gilpin County senior leadership staff team, community leaders, elected officials and stakeholders.

The survey link was posted on various Gilpin County websites and social media pages. Paper versions were also available at Gilpin County offices. An Every Door Direct Mail (EDDM) broadcast was distributed to approximately 3133 addresses through the United States Post Office. Gilpin County mailed a postcard survey participation invitation to approximately 1200 absent Gilpin property owners, and placed approximately 2000 survey invitation flyers as inserts in local/community newspapers.

Survey design is a careful, deliberative process to ensure fair, objective and balanced surveys. Staff members, with years of survey design experience, edit out any bias. Further, all scales used by CRPP (either numeric, such as one through ten, or wording such as strongly agree, somewhat agree, somewhat disagree, or strongly disagree) are balanced evenly. Additionally, placement of questions is carefully accomplished so that order has minimal impact.

CRPP programmed the online survey instrument. Gilpin County residents and property owners were encouraged to go to the online link and complete the survey. All online surveys were completed between April 26 - June 7, 2019.

Statistically, a sample of 509 completed surveys has an associated margin for error of $+/-4.15 \%$ at a $95 \%$ confidence level.

Results throughout this report are presented for composite data - all 509 cases.

## On History

Mountain living was, by far, the single most frequently named reason ( $88.0 \%$ ) provided by survey respondents when asked why they chose to move to or continue to live in Gilpin County. This was followed by privacy and rural feel ( $64.2 \%$ ) and county property tax rates $(52.7 \%)$. A mid-tier range of reasons included: housing ( $38.7 \%$ ), location ( $37.5 \%$ ), county appearance ( $34.2 \%$ ), affordability (33.6\%) and neighborhood (32.0\%).

## ON QUALITY OF LIFE / STANDARD OF LIVING

Impressively, $\mathbf{9 6 . 0} \%$ of all respondents reported their quality of life as very good (47.3\%) or good (48.7\%).

On standard of living, $88.4 \%$ noted their current standard of living compared to two years ago was either improved (32.8\%) or had no movement but was good (55.6\%).

The aspects of life, living in Gilpin County, receiving the highest positive ratings included: neighborhoods ( $93.3 \%$ ), Gilpin County recreational opportunities ( $85.3 \%$ ), and overall reputation of Gilpin County (80.6\%).

If a survey respondent was to leave Gilpin County, the most frequently cited reasons included: proximity to health-care facilities ( $43.4 \%$ ), health reasons ( $37.9 \%$ ), proximity to shopping needs ( $35.6 \%$ ) and work-related move ( $33.3 \%$ ).

## ON AWARENESS AND FAMILIARITY

Large percentages of respondents were familiar (very or somewhat) with county recreational opportunities ( $89.6 \%$ ), departments and offices ( $85.1 \%$ ) and county services in general ( $84.3 \%$ ). Just $21.9 \%$ noted they were very or somewhat familiar with the county Master Plan.

## ON SATISFACTION WITH Programs/Facilities/SERVICES

Respondents were asked to rate 19 county programs, services and facilities. Ratings were collected from those who were aware of, or used, each program, service or facility. The average overall positive rating was $84.9 \%$. The highest positive ratings were recorded for the library ( $\mathbf{9 7 . 8 \%}$ ), the Colorado State University Extension Services (94.9\%), the County Treasurer ( $\mathbf{9 4 . 7 \%}$ ), the Clerk and Recorder (92.4\%) and the Public Health Department (90.9\%).

Respondents were also asked to rate 18 programs, services and offices that were offered by others and not Gilpin County government. The average overall positive rating was $79.8 \%$. The highest positive ratings, offered by those who were aware of, or used, each program, office or service, were recorded for the Coal Creek Fire Department (96.6\%), the Black Hawk Fired Department (95.8\%), the Ambulance Authority (93.3\%), the Central City Post Office (92.8\%), the Central City Courts at Central City Hall ((91.5\%).

Nearly two-thirds, $65.0 \%$, of all respondents reported being very or somewhat aware that there are two different school tax levies within the county.

## On Rating County Employees

A large majority of respondents, $96.1 \%$, reported being in contact with a Gilpin County employee over the past year. Of this group, $95.3 \%$ suggested they were either very ( $78.7 \%$ ) or somewhat satisfied $(16.6 \%)$ with their experience with the last employee they had contact with in Gilpin County.

Respondents were asked to rate Gilpin County employees across 17 departments. The average overall positive rating was $87.6 \%$. The highest ratings were recorded for employees of the library ( $\mathbf{9 8 . 9 \%}$ ), Treasurer office ( $\mathbf{9 6 . 0 \%}$ ), Colorado State University Extension Services ( $\mathbf{9 5 . 6 \%}$ ), Passports ( $94.3 \%$ ) and the Community Center ( $93.3 \%$ ).

## On Perceptions

Importantly, just $36.0 \%$ of survey respondents agreed (strongly or somewhat) that shooting, and gun discharge is being done safely within the county.

Nearly two-thirds agreed (strongly or somewhat) that they are concerned about non-hunting shooting near where they live, and they are concerned about the levels of seasonal motorcycle noise $\mathbf{- 6 2 . 5 \%}$ and $62.9 \%$, respectively.

## On Community NEEDS

Respondents were asked to review 10 different potential county goals or objectives and prioritize each using a 10-point scale. Those ranked highest, at or near $75 \%$, included: helping to secure a health care facility ( $75.4 \%$ ), enhancing broadband service ( $72.8 \%$ ), building a trained/knowledgeable county workforce (72.7\%) and securing financial sustainability (71.7\%).

## ON ECONOMIC AND HOUSING DEVELOPMENT

Just over one-half of those surveyed, $56.8 \%$, support (strongly or somewhat) higher density housing in the county. The largest group of these supportive respondents, $40.7 \%$, would like to see this development as "infill" or developed within already existing housing areas.

Over three-quarters of all respondents, 77.8\%), agree (strongly or somewhat) that Gilpin County should encourage business development. The largest group of these supportive respondents, $57.8 \%$, would like to see these new businesses located as "infill" or developed within already existing commercial areas.

By far, the most frequently named community need was for grocery stores ( $82.1 \%$ ). This was followed by a second tier of business or service needs including: banking ( $64.2 \%$ ), restaurants (59.5\%), general retail (58.2\%), and health food opportunities (56.9\%).

## ON EmERGENCY PLANNING

Nearly three-quarters of all respondents report having an emergency action plan in place at home or a willingness to attend a community emergency action presentation to learn more about county plans $-71.3 \%$ and $70.5 \%$, respectively.

A large majority of respondents, $82.9 \%$, have cleared areas of debris around structures for fire mitigation. Just $22.6 \%$ say they are confident they know enough about Gilpin County emergency action planning while $31.8 \%$ noted they have attended a community emergency action plan presentation.

## On Taxes and Taxation

Respondents were asked to prioritize five different areas of county services. Using a question format of assigning "importance points" to each of the five areas, respondents assigned the following:
$>$ Transportation:
$>$ Community/economic services:
> Law enforcement:
$>$ Human services:
> Public services:

12,091 points (or $24.0 \%$ of all points)
11,630 points (or $23.1 \%$ of all points)
11,497 points (or $22.8 \%$ of all points)
8,280 points (or $16.4 \%$ of all points)
$\mathbf{6 , 9 0 2}$ points (or $13.7 \%$ of all points)

There exists majority willingness (very and somewhat willing) to pay more in taxes to secure a health-care facility ( $72.7 \%$ ), enhanced internet/broadband service ( $62.5 \%$ ), fiscal sustainability ( $56.2 \%$ ), maintain government buildings and equipment (56.0\%), and developing parks and playgrounds (55.4\%).

There also exists majority willingness (very and somewhat willing) to pay more in taxes to enhance some non-essential services such as recycling/trash ( $67.2 \%$ ), slash drop-off ( $66.2 \%$ ), benefits for county workers ( $65.4 \%$ ), water conservation practices ( $65.2 \%$ ), library ( $62.9 \%$ ), senior services ( $57.6 \%$ ), energy conservation practices ( $55.5 \%$ ), youth services ( $53.6 \%$ ), and building upkeep based on green design principles (53.0\%).

## ON COMMUNICATION

An impressive percentage of all respondents surveyed access the Gilpin County website (88.6\%). This group offered fair ratings of the website. The positive ratings for appearance, content and ease of use were recorded as $67.1 \%, 67.6 \%$ and $60.2 \%$, respectively.

While $21.8 \%$ of all respondents noted they don't use social media, there exists heavy use of Facebook (66.4\%), YouTube (41.7\%) and Next Door (28.9\%).

A large number, 22, of potential ways respondents may get information about Gilpin County were presented. The heaviest use was recorded for various internet sources/websites ( $64.2 \%$ ), friends/family/neighbors/co-workers (57.5\%), and local newspapers/printed (47.4\%). Other named sources range in use percentage from $0.6 \%$ to $26.8 \%$ and are displayed within this report.

## Summary of Findings

Readers are reminded that the narrative throughout this report refers to composite aggregate online survey data -509 residents and property owners. Text, tables and graphs throughout this report present these composite results.

## History

All respondents were asked to indicate the reasons they chose to move to or continue to live (or own property / own/manage a business) in Gilpin County. The following table depicts the results collected and are presented in declining order by frequency of mention. Multiple responses were accepted.

| Reasons for Choosing Gilpin County | Percent |
| :--- | :---: |
| Mountain living | 88.0 |
| Privacy and rural feel | 64.2 |
| County property tax rates | 52.7 |
| Housing (nice house/affordable) | 38.7 |
| Location (close to work/close to highways) | 37.5 |
| County appearance (county character/community feeling) | 34.2 |
| Affordability | 33.6 |
| Neighborhood (nice neighborhood) | 32.0 |
| County amenities (recreational opportunities, county services) | 23.8 |
| School systems | 16.7 |
| County reputation | 13.2 |
| Birthplace or family nearby | 12.4 |
| Other | 4.9 |
| Unsure | 1.2 |

## Quality of Life / Standard of Living

All respondents were asked if their quality of life was very good, good, poor or very poor. A large majority, $96.0 \%$, suggested their overall quality of life living in Gilpin County was either very good ( $47.3 \%$ ) or good (48.7\%). The following graph presents the results as collected.


A strong majority, $88.4 \%$, noted that their current standard of living has improved or there was no movement over the past two years, but it is good. Results are displayed in the following graph.


Survey respondents were asked to rate several aspects of life in Gilpin County as very good, good, poor or very poor. The following table holds the results as collected. Readers are reminded that those not working, are retired or those without children likely responded "unsure" on these aspects of life in the county.

| Quality of Life <br> Statements | Very <br> Good | Good | Total: <br> Very <br>  <br> Good | Poor | Total: <br> Pory <br> Poor |  <br> Very <br> Poor | Unsure |
| :--- | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Your neighborhood <br> as a place to live | 45.2 | 48.1 | 93.3 | 5.3 | 0.6 | 5.9 | 0.8 |
| Gilpin County as a <br> place with ample <br> recreational <br> opportunity | 39.1 | 46.2 | 85.3 | 9.2 | 2.6 | 11.8 | 2.9 |
| Overall reputation of <br> Gilpin County | 20.8 | 59.7 | 80.6 | 2.4 | 7.3 | 9.7 | 7.3 |
| Gilpin County as a <br> place to retire | 26.7 | 41.5 | 68.2 | 13.4 | 4.7 | 18.1 | 13.8 |
| Gilpin County as a <br> place to raise children | 25.1 | 39.3 | 64.4 | 4.9 | 1.6 | 6.5 | 29.1 |
| Gilpin County as a <br> place to work | 11.0 | 30.3 | 41.3 | 19.7 | 8.9 | 28.6 | 30.1 |

Respondents were asked to indicate the potential reasons if they were to move out of Gilpin County. Results are presented in the following table and displayed in declining order. Multiple responses were accepted.

| Potential Reasons for Leaving Gilpin County | Percent |
| :--- | :---: |
| Proximity to health-care facilities | 43.4 |
| Health reasons | 37.9 |
| Proximity to shopping needs | 35.6 |
| Work-related move | 33.2 |
| Different or better housing | 23.4 |
| Proximity to amenities | 20.8 |
| Affordability | 18.3 |
| Other | 17.7 |
| Unsure | 11.6 |
| Different or better education system | 8.1 |
| Lower property tax rate | 6.3 |
| To go away to school | 1.0 |

## AWARENESS / FAMILIARITY

To learn how familiar residents and property owners are with different aspects of the county and county government services, respondents were asked if they were very familiar, somewhat familiar, somewhat unfamiliar or not at all familiar with each of the following. The cumulative totals for those reporting very and somewhat familiar are presented in the following table.

Respondents were most familiar with recreational opportunities and least familiar with the county Master Plan.

| County Services/Functions | Very \& Somewhat Familiar |
| :--- | :---: |
| County recreation opportunities | 89.6 |
| County departments or offices | 85.1 |
| County services in general | 84.3 |
| The county Master Plan | 21.9 |

## Experiences in Gilpin County

Two open-end format questions were included in the survey:
"Please tell us what you like most about being a Gilpin County resident"; and,
"Please tell us the issues or problems you are most concerned about living in Gilpin County today.".
A total of 482, sometimes lengthy, multiple responses were recorded in response to the first open-end question, while 478 responses were recorded for the second open-end question.

These verbatim responses, because of length, are held within the appendix to this report. Readers are encouraged to review the responses to build an understanding of what residents/owners like about being in Gilpin County and the issues or problems residents/owners are most concerned about.

## Satisfaction: Programs / Facilities / Services

Respondents were presented with several services provided by the Gilpin County government. Each was asked, based on all they know or have heard, to indicate if they are very satisfied, somewhat satisfied, somewhat dissatisfied or not at all satisfied with each. Those unsure, or who don't use the service, were removed from the data. A final column holds the actual number $(\mathrm{N}=)$ of respondents who did provide a rating. The following table holds the satisfaction ratings (very and somewhat satisfied) in declining order.

| Gilpin County Programs, Offices and Services | Very \& Somewhat Satisfied | Total $\mathrm{N}=$ |
| :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Library | 97.8 | 411 |
| Colorado State University Extension Services (noxious weeds program, 4-H, forestry, mountain gardening and other classes) | 94.9 | 333 |
| Treasurer (collection of property taxes) | 94.7 | 389 |
| Clerk \& Recorder (vehicle plates, titles or registration, recorded documents, elections) | 92.4 | 484 |
| Passports | 92.4 | 118 |
| Public Health Department (water testing, cardiac assessments, immunizations, radon testing and food inspections) | 90.9 | 265 |
| County facilities (appearance, maintenance and general upkeep) | 89.9 | 476 |
| Community Center (pottery studio, senior lunch, programs, and services) | 88.7 | 380 |
| Arena | 87.8 | 254 |
| Exhibit hall | 87.0 | 215 |
| Sheriff (jail, victim services, dispatch, police records, patrol, and dog and animal control) | 86.4 | 418 |
| Parks and Recreation (outdoor and indoor sports opportunities, classes and facilities) | 85.5 | 449 |
| Assessor (property assessment, on-line property record searches and inquiries) | 85.1 | 404 |
| Equestrian opportunities or pack animal events | 83.1 | 136 |
| Public Works (roadway maintenance, snow and ice removal, drainage infrastructure, trash and slash services) | 80.2 | 490 |
| Human Services (child-care assistance, veteran services, adult and child protection, adoption services, employment assistance, Snap/food assistance) | 77.0 | 191 |
| Community Development (building permits and inspections, zoning, septic permits and inspections, and code enforcement) | 75.3 | 340 |
| Human Resources (county government employment opportunities) | 73.5 | 230 |
| Gilpin Connect transportation | 50.0 | 142 |
| AVERAGE | 84.9 | --- |

Respondents were presented with several services provided by others and not Gilpin County government. Each was asked, based on all they know or have heard, to indicate if they are very satisfied, somewhat satisfied, somewhat dissatisfied or not at all satisfied with each. Those unsure or who don't use the service were removed from the data. A final column holds the actual number $(\mathrm{N}=)$ of respondents who did provide a rating. The following table holds the satisfaction ratings (very and somewhat satisfied) in declining order.

| Non-Gilpin County Government, Programs, Offices and <br> Services |  <br> Somewhat <br> Satisfied | Total N= |
| :--- | :---: | :---: |
| Coal Creek Fire Department | 96.6 | 88 |
| Black Hawk Fire Department | 95.8 | 168 |
| Ambulance Authority | 93.3 | 225 |
| Central City Post Office | 92.8 | 166 |
| Central City Courts at Central City Hall | 91.5 | 106 |
| Timberline Fire Department | 89.9 | 348 |
| Gilpin County and Black Hawk Courts at the Justice Center | 89.7 | 319 |
| Central City Fire Department | 88.9 | 144 |
| Montessori Program | 87.7 | 122 |
| Black Hawk Police Department | 85.6 | 181 |
| Gilpin County Schools RE-1 | 85.4 | 254 |
| Eagle's Nest Learning Center | 78.8 | 118 |
| Jefferson Center for Mental Health | 77.6 | 98 |
| District Attorney | 73.5 | 132 |
| Rollinsville Post Office | 73.5 | 185 |
| Boulder Valley Schools RE-2 | 52.7 | 131 |
| Black Hawk Post Office | 41.6 | 379 |
| Pinecliffe Post Office | 41.6 | 68 |
| AVERAGE | 79.8 | --- |

Respondents were asked how aware they were that the school levies are different for Gilpin RE-1 and Boulder Valley School RE-2. Each was asked if they were very aware, somewhat aware, somewhat unaware or not at all aware. Results are displayed in the following graph.

Nearly two-thirds, $65.0 \%$, suggested they were very or somewhat aware.


## Rating County Employees

Many respondents, $96.1 \%$, reported having had contact with at least one Gilpin County employee over the past year. This group was asked to rate their overall experience with the last Gilpin County employee they had been in contact with. Of this group, $95.3 \%$ suggested they were either very or somewhat satisfied with the contact. Results are displayed here.


Respondents were presented with services provided by Gilpin County government. Each was asked to rate their experience with the employees within each department offering these services. Each was asked if they were very satisfied, somewhat satisfied, somewhat dissatisfied or not at all satisfied with the department employees. Those unsure or who don't use the service were removed from the data. A final column holds the actual number $(\mathrm{N}=)$ of respondents who did provide a rating. The following table holds the employee satisfaction ratings (very and somewhat satisfied) in declining order.

| Rating Gilpin County Government Employees |  <br> Somewhat <br> Satisfied | Total N= |
| :--- | :---: | :---: |
| Library | 98.9 | 373 |
| Treasurer (collection of property taxes) | 96.0 | 299 |
| Colorado State University Extension Services (noxious weeds <br> program, 4-H, forestry, mountain gardening and other classes) | 95.6 | 273 |
| Passports | 94.3 | 106 |
| Community Center (pottery studio, senior lunch, programs, and <br> services) | 93.3 | 312 |
| Parks and Recreation (outdoor and indoor sports opportunities, <br> classes and facilities) | 91.9 | 356 |
| County facilities (appearance, maintenance and general upkeep) | 91.6 | 359 |
| Clerk \& Recorder (vehicle plates, titles or registration, recorded <br> documents, elections) | 91.2 | 465 |
| Exhibit barn and arena | 91.1 | 191 |
| Assessor (property assessment, on-line property record searches <br> and inquiries) | 90.2 | 295 |
| Public Health Department (water testing, cardiac assessments, <br> immunizations, radon testing and food inspections) | 90.2 | 193 |
| Sheriff (jail, victim services, dispatch, police records, patrol, and <br> dog and animal control) | 89.0 | 346 |
| Human Services (child-care assistance, veteran services, adult and <br> child protection, adoption services, employment assistance, <br> Snap/food assistance) | 85.3 | 143 |
| Public Works (roadway maintenance, snow and ice removal, <br> drainage infrastructure, trash and slash services) | 82.9 | 410 |
| Community Development (building permits and inspections, <br> zoning, septic permits and inspections, and code enforcement) | 80.4 | 240 |
| Human Resources (county government employment opportunities) | 77.7 | 157 |
| Gilpin Connect transportation | 50.7 | 73 |
| AVERAGE | $\mathbf{8 7 . 6}$ | $\mathbf{- - -}$ |

## PERCEPTION STATEMENTS

Resident and property owner respondents were asked how strongly they agreed or disagreed with a few statements regarding safety and noise in the county. For each, respondents were asked if they strongly agreed, somewhat agreed, somewhat disagreed, or strongly disagreed.

| Statements | Strongly <br> Agree | Somewhat <br> Agree | Total: <br>  <br> Somewhat <br> Agree | Somewhat <br> Disagree | Strongly <br> Disagree | Total: <br>  <br> Strongly <br> Disagree |
| :--- | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Shooting and <br> gun discharge is <br> being done safely | 15.9 | 20.0 | 36.0 | 20.2 | 28.9 | 49.1 |
| I am concerned <br> about non- <br> hunting shooting <br> near where I live | 41.3 | 21.2 | 62.5 | 8.8 | 21.2 | 30.0 |
| I am concerned <br> about the levels <br> of seasonal <br> motorcycle noise | 36.7 | 26.1 | 62.8 | 16.1 | 15.3 | 31.4 |

## COMMUNITY NEEDS

Survey participants were presented with the following regarding community needs: "We need your help in determining community needs. The county can't do everything and can't do everything all at once. The following are several possible goals or objectives for the future. In your opinion, for each of the following, please indicate how you would prioritize each using a scale of one to ten, where one is a very high priority and ten is a very low priority."

The cumulative totals for ratings of one through four (high priority) are presented within the following table. The table is presented in declining order from highest priority to lowest.

Readers are reminded that, sometimes, even the lowest-ranked community need, when extrapolated on the total population of the county, can be sizable.

| Prioritizing County Goals/Objectives | Very High Priority |
| :--- | :---: |
| Helping to secure a health care facility (clinic, ER, Urgent Care, and <br> primary care physician) | 75.4 |
| Enhancing broadband service throughout the county | 72.8 |
| Building and maintaining a knowledgeable and well-trained county <br> workforce | 72.7 |
| Financial sustainability | 71.7 |
| Long-range planning | 69.3 |
| Ensuring fiscal sustainability (reducing waste and diversifying the <br> economy) | 63.3 |
| Community education programs (such as living with wildlife, wildfire <br> preparedness, mountain gardening, and well and septic maintenance) | 57.8 |
| Securing more open space for residential use including creating trails | 57.7 |
| Moving towards electronic processes and internet access to county <br> departments/offices | 52.8 |
| Helping to secure transportation services | 48.1 |

## Economic and Housing Development

The topic of housing in Gilpin County was introduced as follows: "Gilpin County may need more available housing for younger residents, "empty-nesters" and "aging-in-place" residents. This may include more diverse and affordable options such as apartments, starter/smaller homes and mixed-use developments. How strongly would you support or oppose this higher density housing to meet this need?"

A total of $56.8 \%$ of all respondents either strongly ( $22.2 \%$ ) or somewhat support $(34.6 \%)$ higher density housing. Results are displayed here.


Those in support of higher density housing ( $56.8 \%$ ) were asked where they would prefer to see the new housing placed. The following table presents the results as collected.

| Locating Higher Density Housing | Percent |
| :--- | :---: |
| On very large lots in rural areas | 14.9 |
| On large lots in suburban style | 27.7 |
| As "infill" or developed within already existing housing areas | 40.5 |
| Unsure / don't know | 15.6 |
| No development | 1.4 |

All respondents were asked how strongly they agreed or disagreed with the following statement: "Gilpin county should encourage additional business development within the county".

Over three-quarters, $77.8 \%$, either strongly ( $38.7 \%$ ) or somewhat agreed (39.1\%) with the statement as shown in the following graph.


Those agreeing Gilpin County should encourage business development were asked where they would prefer to see it placed. The following table reflects these views.

| Locating New Business Development | Percent |
| :--- | :---: |
| As "infill" or developed within already existing commercial areas | 57.8 |
| Along the edges of existing commercial areas | 32.3 |
| In more rural areas with sufficient open spaces | 5.8 |
| No Development | 0.3 |
| Unsure / don't know | 3.8 |

Community needs were studied. Respondents were asked to report if they saw too few, enough, or too many of specific amenities within the county. The following table depicts the results as collected. Results are displayed in declining order by the "too few" column - used to determine community need.

| Amenities | Too <br> Few | Enough | Too <br> Many | Unsure |
| :--- | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Grocery stores | 82.1 | 15.3 | 0.2 | 2.4 |
| Banking | 64.2 | 28.1 | 0.6 | 7.1 |
| Restaurants | 59.5 | 36.3 | 1.3 | 2.6 |
| General retail and shopping areas | 58.2 | 33.2 | 2.8 | 5.9 |
| Health food opportunities | 56.9 | 24.0 | 1.6 | 17.5 |
| Employment opportunities | 49.1 | 29.9 | 0.8 | 20.2 |
| Arts and culture venues | 40.7 | 40.9 | 3.1 | 15.3 |
| Accessible, active county-owned and operated open <br> space for recreation, sports, and biking/hiking trails | 38.1 | 50.1 | 2.0 | 9.8 |
| Civic and community events | 35.4 | 49.1 | 1.0 | 14.5 |
| Accessible, passive open space that is preserved with <br> minimal activities such as birdwatching | 35.2 | 46.8 | 2.2 | 15.9 |
| Housing | 29.9 | 52.1 | 4.9 | 13.2 |
| Youth programs/services | 22.6 | 40.2 | 0.6 | 36.6 |
| Community Center programs | 18.1 | 68.8 | 1.4 | 11.8 |
| Senior services | 17.9 | 44.6 | 0.8 | 36.7 |
| Home businesses | 14.4 | 33.7 | 2.4 | 49.4 |
| Industrial areas | 9.8 | 60.4 | 9.1 | 20.5 |
| Vacation rentals (VRBO or AirBnB) | 8.6 | 37.9 | 20.6 | 32.8 |
| Libraries or library branches | 5.9 | 90.2 | 0.8 | 3.1 |

## Emergency Planning

Emergency planning at home and within the county was covered in the next survey section. Nearly threequarters, $71.3 \%$, reported they have an emergency action plan in place within their respective households. Results to the questions posed are presented in the following table.

| Emergency Plans / Planning | Yes |
| :--- | :---: |
| I/we have an emergency action plan in place in <br> our household | 71.3 |
| I would attend (or would attend again) a <br> community emergency action presentation to <br> learn more about county plans | 70.5 |
| I have attended a community emergency action <br> plan presentation | 31.8 |
| I am confident I know enough about Gilpin <br> County emergency action planning | 22.6 |
| I have cleared areas and debris around structures <br> for fire mitigation | 82.9 |

## Taxes and TAXATION

The survey included a question asking respondents to rate the value they receive in return for the Gilpin County taxes paid. A large majority, $80.0 \%$ indicated either very good ( $40.7 \%$ ) or good ( $39.3 \%$ ). Results are displayed in the following graph.

## Value for Taxes Paid?



Respondents were asked which of five initiatives/services, if any, the county should use taxes dollars to secure or enhance. Multiple responses were accepted. Results are displayed in the following table.

| Meeting Community Needs with Tax <br> Dollars | Yes |
| :--- | :---: |
| Community Center | 54.5 |
| Fire evacuation routes | 49.4 |
| Library | 35.4 |
| CSU Extension education programs | 33.1 |
| Retail shopping development | 28.0 |
| None of these | 11.4 |
| Unsure | 10.0 |

Survey respondents were presented with the following:
"Pretend for a moment that you are responsible for making decisions about service provisions in Gilpin County that require difficult tradeoffs. Now say you have a total of 100 "importance" points that you can distribute among six service categories. Please give each category the number of points you think it deserves based on how important you think this is to the quality of community life in Gilpin County. The most important category should receive the largest number of points. (You must use all but not more than 100 points. You do not have to give points to every category. In fact, if you would like to assign all the points to one, two or three categories and 0 points to all the others, you may do so)."

The following table holds both the importance points assigned by respondents as well as the percentage of the total points for each service.

| Gilpin County Services | Importance Points |
| :---: | :---: |
| Community services and Economic services (includes development review, including long-range planning, fostering public / private partnerships, attracting and retaining businesses and jobs, code enforcement, sustainability efforts to save taxpayer dollars and reduce the county's impact on the environment, funds to help rehab a home or business, public health services including immunization clinics, open space, parks, and trails) | Points: <br> 11,630 <br> Percent: <br> 23.1 |
| Human services (includes unemployment assistance, workforce training, child protection, adult protection, services for financially challenged families, and mental health) | Points: <br> 8280 <br> Percent: <br> 16.4 |
| Law enforcement (includes Sheriff patrol, crime prevention, jail, District Attorney, prosecution, and courts) | Points: <br> 11,497 <br> Percent: <br> 22.8 |
| Public services (includes maintaining official public records, Clerk and Recorder functions such as marriage licenses, elections, Assessor's valuation of property, Coroner, and Treasurer) | Points: <br> 6902 <br> Percent: <br> 13.7 |
| Transportation (includes maintenance and construction of roads, bridges, drainage systems; snow removal, and sidewalk construction) | Points: 12,091 <br> Percent: <br> 24.0 |

Willingness among residents and property owners to pay more in taxes was explored for specific county services in the following tables.
The cumulative totals for very and somewhat willing are presented here. The table is presented in declining order by willingness to pay more in taxes.

| I am willing to pay somewhat more in taxes to... | Very \& Somewhat Willing |
| :--- | :---: |
| Help secure a health-care facility (clinic, ER, Urgent <br> Care, or primary care physician) | 72.7 |
| Enhance internet/broadband service county wide | 62.5 |
| Ensure fiscal sustainability | 56.2 |
| Maintain government buildings \& equipment | 56.0 |
| Develop parks and playgrounds | 55.4 |
| Attract and retain business | 49.5 |
| Move towards electronic processes and internet <br> access to county departments | 46.7 |
| Add to existing Gilpin Community Center programs | 46.2 |
| Develop county transportation services | 44.7 |
| Attract senior housing | 41.8 |

The survey measured willingness to pay more in taxes for the following non-essential and enhanced services as well. The cumulative totals for very and somewhat willing are presented. The table is shown in declining order by willingness.

| I am willing to pay somewhat more in taxes to... | Very \& Somewhat Willing |
| :--- | :---: |
| Recycling / trash fees | 67.2 |
| Slash drop-off | 66.2 |
| Benefits for county employees to ensure a quality <br> workforce, good staffing levels, and reduce turnover | 65.4 |
| Water conservation practices | 65.2 |
| Library | 62.9 |
| Senior services (i.e. lunch program) | 57.6 |
| Energy conservation practices (including lighting, <br> heating, cooling, ventilation, windows) | 55.5 |
| Youth services (i.e. camp) | 53.6 |
| Building upkeep or renovation based on green <br> design principles (LEED) | 53.0 |
| Swimming pool or hot tub | 49.3 |
| Fair | 48.9 |
| Ballfields | 46.6 |
| Radon testing | 40.7 |
| Gilpin Connect | 39.9 |
| Passports | 20.6 |

## COMMUNICATION

A large percentage of survey respondents, $88.6 \%$, have visited the County's website. This group of users were asked to rate the website on three important characteristics - appearance/graphics, content/information and ease of use/maneuverability. Respondents used a scale of one through ten to rate the site. The following graph presents the cumulative total positive rating of one through four.

## Rating the Gilpin County Website: <br> Positive Rating 1-4



Use of social media was explored. Among only users, the following table presents the total percentages of those using each identified social media venue. A total of $21.8 \%$ reported they don't use social media.

| Social Media Used | Percent |
| :--- | :---: |
| Facebook | 66.4 |
| YouTube | 41.7 |
| Next Door Forum or similar <br> community forum | 28.9 |
| LinkedIn | 23.2 |
| Instagram | 21.0 |
| Pinterest | 16.9 |
| Yelp | 12.2 |
| Twitter | 12.0 |
| Snapchat | 7.3 |
| Foursquare | 0.4 |

Respondents were asked to report how they usually get information about Gilpin County. The following table depicts the results as collected. Multiple responses were accepted. The table is displayed in declining order by frequency of mention.

| Sources for Information about Gilpin County | Percent |
| :--- | :---: |
| Various internet sources/websites | 64.2 |
| Friends/family/neighbors/co-workers | 57.5 |
| Local newspapers: printed | 47.4 |
| Gilpin County newsletter "Gazette" | 26.8 |
| Gilpin County on Facebook | 25.8 |
| Gilpin County Parks and Recreation website | 25.8 |
| Board of County Commissioner meeting minutes | 22.4 |
| Directly from schools / school system | 17.9 |
| Emails | 17.5 |
| Local businesses | 16.3 |
| Gilpin County Sheriffs website | 14.8 |
| Direct mail | 14.4 |
| Flyers/brochures | 13.6 |
| Gilpin County Sheriffs Facebook page | 11.0 |
| Blogs | 10.0 |
| Local newspapers: online | 8.9 |
| Next Door or similar community forums | 7.9 |
| Employer | 7.3 |
| Clerk \& Recorder's Facebook page | 2.8 |
| TV | 1.0 |
| Attending Gilpin County meetings | 1.0 |
| Radio | 0.6 |

## DEMOGRAPHICS

The following are demographics collected among survey respondents.
$\left.\begin{array}{lc}\hline \text { RESIDENT OF... } & \text { ONLINE } \\ \hline \begin{array}{l}\text { North County including, but not limited to, Rollinsville, Tolland, } \\ \text { Wondervu, Lincoln Hills, Pinecliffe, La Chula Vista, and Whispering Pines }\end{array} & 24.6 \\ \hline \begin{array}{l}\text { Mid County including, but not limited to, Sierra Pines, Braecher Park, Dory } \\ \text { Hill, Dory Lakes subdivision, Colorado Sierra, Gilpin Gardens, Aspen } \\ \text { Springs, Missouri Lakes, Paradise Valley, Golden Gate Canyon State Park, } \\ \text { Dory Lakes and Forest Hills subdivisions }\end{array} & 59.7 \\ \hline \text { South County including, but not limited to, Russell Gulch, and Nevadaville }\end{array}\right] .3 .19 .2 .4$.

LENGTH OF RESIDENCY

## ONLINE

$\begin{array}{ll}\text { Less than } 10 \text { years } & 35.8\end{array}$

| 10 to less than 30 years | 45.6 |
| :--- | :---: |
| 30 or more years | 17.5 |
| Unsure | 0.4 |

## EDUCATION

## ONLINE

| Some high school | 0.2 |
| :--- | :---: |
| High school graduate or equivalent | 4.3 |
| Associates degree / trade or vocational certification | 9.2 |
| Some college | 19.4 |
| College graduate | 27.9 |
| Some postgraduate | 9.4 |
| Post-graduate or professional degree | 27.5 |
| Prefer not to answer | 2.0 |


| RENT OR OWN | ONLINE |
| :--- | :---: |
| Rent | 5.9 |
| Own | 92.6 |
| Prefer not to answer | 1.8 |
|  |  |
| AGE | ONLINE |
| $18-24$ | 0.2 |
| $25-34$ | 7.1 |
| $35-44$ | 16.5 |
| $45-54$ | 22.6 |
| $55-64$ | 24.4 |
| 65 or older | 22.8 |
| Prefer not to answer | 6.1 |

## HAVE CHILDREN UNDER 18 LIVING IN HOME <br> ONLINE

| Yes | 28.7 |
| :--- | :---: |
| No | 69.4 |
| Prefer not to answer | 2.0 |


| GENDER | ONLINE |
| :--- | :---: |
| Male | 39.7 |
| Female | 55.6 |
| Unsure / Prefer not to answer | 4.7 |
| Other / Not listed | --- |

## INCOME LEVEL

## ONLINE

$\begin{array}{ll}\text { Under } \$ 25,000 & 2.6\end{array}$
$\$ 25,000$ to less than $\$ 50,000 \quad 9.8$
$\$ 50,000$ to less than $\$ 100,000 \quad 34.2$
$\$ 100,000$ to less than $\$ 150,000 \quad 22.4$
$\$ 150,000$ to less than $\$ 200,000 \quad 7.1$
$\$ 200,000$ to less than $\$ 250,000 \quad 4.5$
$\$ 250,000$ to less than $\$ 300,000 \quad 1.4$
$\$ 300,000$ or more 1.2
Unsure 0.8
$\begin{array}{ll}\text { Prefer not to answer } & 16.1\end{array}$

| RACE / ETHNICITY | ONLINE |
| :--- | :---: |
| White | 86.2 |
| Black or African American | 0.4 |
| Hispanic or Latino | 2.4 |
| Asian | 0.6 |
| Native Hawaiian or Pacific Islander | 0.2 |
| American Indian or Alaska Native | 2.0 |
| Middle Eastern / North African | --- |
| Other | 0.6 |
| None of these | 0.2 |
| Prefer not to answer | 10.2 |

## OWN OR MANAGE A BUSINESS IN GILPIN COUNTY

## ONLINE

Yes, own
14.9
$\begin{array}{ll}\text { Yes, manage } & 1.6\end{array}$

SCHOOL DISTRICT?
ONLINE
RE1
59.7

RE2
29.3

Unsure
11.0

## APPENDIX

## INTERPRETATION OF AGGREGATE RESULTS

The computer processed data for this survey are presented in the following frequency distributions. It is important to note that the wordings of the variable labels and value labels in the computer-processed data are largely abbreviated descriptions of the Questionnaire items and available response categories.

The frequency distributions include the category or response for the question items. Responses deemed not appropriate for classification have been grouped together under the "Other" code.

Each frequency distribution includes the absolute observed occurrence of each response (i.e. the total number of cases in each category). Immediately adjacent to the right of the column of absolute frequencies is the column of relative frequencies. These are the percentages of cases falling in each category response, including those cases designated as missing data. To the right of the relative frequency column is the adjusted frequency distribution column that contains the relative frequencies based on the legitimate (i.e. nonmissing) cases. That is, the total base for the adjusted frequency distribution excludes the missing data. For many Questionnaire items, the relative frequencies and the adjusted frequencies will be nearly the same. However, some items that elicit a sizable number of missing data will produce quite substantial percentage differences between the two columns of frequencies. The careful analyst will cautiously consider both distributions.

The last column of data within the frequency distribution is the cumulative frequency distribution (Cum Freq.). This column is simply an adjusted frequency distribution of the sum of all previous categories of response and the current category of response. Its primary usefulness is to gauge some ordered or ranked meaning.
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