

Clatsop Community College Post Bond Study Summary

Research Results & Opinions

Results of this study indicate that the main reason Measure No.4-118 failed with the voters of Clatsop County was due to proposed location issues of a new future site of the college. Thirty-seven percent of those interviewed indicated the failure was due to opposition of the John Warren Field (JWF) site. Not using donated property in Warrenton (6.7%) and no set location/ confusion (2.4%) also contributed to the location problem in general. This totals to more than 45 percent of the 460 county voters interviewed volunteering that the “location” issue was the main reason for failure.

When offered the option of voting in favor of, or against, a \$24 million bond to build CCC on property donated in Warrenton, 67 percent said they would support this option. On the contrast side of this issue, when the option is presented based on the location at the JWF site, 69 percent will be against the measure.

Analysis of the open-ended responses and answers to the questions posed in this study indicate that the location issue will have a profound impact on the outcome of a future measure. And it is significantly more important than any other factor including the “cost” to the taxpayers.

The secondary choice of the college remaining in it’s current location with renovations would receive support from 53 percent of the sample but does not show any where near the strength in the open-end response analysis which must be taken into account. The mention of renovation by respondents unaided is only done by 20 out of 460 (less than 5%), in comparison to unaided response on “location” which was brought up hundreds of times in the open-ended response.

Nearly 60 percent surveyed thought the measure should be brought up again in a May 2007 Measure. Twenty-four percent did not. The 24 percent somewhat erodes however, in analysis of options that could be offered in a May ballot. Some of these individuals indicate they would vote in favor of some options if offered in a May ballot after already previously indicating they thought the measure shouldn’t be on a May ballot again. Of course the respondent couldn’t anticipate our asking multiple future scenarios they may be in favor of or against.

Results from a pre-bond measure study indicated a general positive attitude of the voters toward the measure for the college before the election and this was also the same in this post bond measure study. Forty-seven percent said they would support a \$24 million bond for the school even when no location was specified. Thirty-three percent were against the bond and 20 percent indicated undecided.

Our opinion is that this study information shows enough consensus to unite a majority of the county to support a \$24 million CCC Warrenton location bond.

Clatsop Community College Post Bond Study Summary

Four hundred and sixty surveys were completed by phone during the month of December 2006. The sample was constructed from a randomized dial of registered voters within Clatsop County and stratified by precinct voter data. Respondents were screened to be registered voters. Ninety-three percent of those who participated in the survey indicated they had voted in the November election that included the Community College Bond Measure.

When asked in an open-ended question format, “What was the main reason the bond measure was rejected?”, respondents indicated a location reason at least 45 percent of the time. Below is a table (Q3_1) of the frequency of responses and percentage by response.

Q3_1. Main reason bond measure was rejected. (Base 460)

	Frequency	Percent
Location at JWF	172	37.4%
Project cost	139	30.2%
No idea why the rejection	85	18.5%
Location not on donated Warrenton property	31	6.7%
No set plan	14	3.0%
New college not needed	13	2.8%
Not enough information	12	2.6%
No set/confusion on location	11	2.4%
Communication problem	8	1.7%
Not enough local services from college	4	0.9%
Too much tax	3	0.7%
Current college should be re-constructed	3	0.7%
Other	16	3.3%
Total	511	110.9%

(Multiple responses allowed)

Forty percent of those surveyed believe the bond measure should be on a May 2007 ballot, 21 percent more said maybe with changes and 15 percent were undecided. Twenty-four percent did not think the bond should be put on a May ballot. (Note: Of those “maybe with changes”, 78 percent stated they needed to see a location change away from the JWF location before it was put on the May ballot.)

Q4. Should bond measure be put on a May ballot?

	Frequency	Percent
Valid Yes	184	40.0
No	112	24.3
Maybe, with changes	95	20.7
Don't know/refused	69	15.0
Total	460	100.0

Clatsop Community College Post Bond Study Summary

The following tables delineate the response to four construction scenarios: a new college in general, a new college in Warrenton, renovating the current college and building the college in Astoria at the JWF site. In general, respondents were in favor of the \$24 million to construct a new Clatsop Community College (47%), a third were against and a fifth were undecided. Support increased to 67 percent when the location specified Warrenton. A lesser amount of support was indicated when renovating/refurbishing of the current Jerome Street location was suggested (54%). There is an almost complete reversal of support when the location specified is the John Warren Football Field at Astoria High, 69 percent against. Support drops to less than a fifth of the sample for the JWF site.

Q6. ...for a \$24 million to construct a new Clatsop Community College.

		Frequency	Percent
Valid	in favor	216	47.0
	against	153	33.3
	undecided	91	19.8
	Total	460	100.0

Q7. ...for up to \$24 million, if new college were to be built in Warrenton, utilizing property donated to the college for that purpose.

		Frequency	Percent
Valid	in favor	306	66.5
	against	93	20.2
	undecided	61	13.3
	Total	460	100.0

Q8. ...of up to \$10 million to renovate/refurbish and upgrade the current Jerome Street campus.

		Frequency	Percent
Valid	in favor	248	53.9
	against	147	32.0
	undecided	65	14.1
	Total	460	100.0

Q9. ...to build a new college at (JWF) - John Warren Football Field - Astoria High

		Frequency	Percent
Valid	in favor	79	17.2
	against	318	69.1
	undecided	63	13.7
	Total	460	100.0

Clatsop Community College Post Bond Study Summary

The following cross tabulations are presented for discussion on vote conversion based on a potential May Ballot offering. This information presented in town meetings and other grass root discussion groups would put on the table the voters' stance on a Spring revival of the issues by type of specified construction.

Count

		Q4. Should bond measure be put on a May ballot?				Total
		Yes	No	Maybe, with changes	Don't know/refused	
Q6. ...for a \$24 million to construct a new Clatsop Community College.	in favor	129	18	47	22	216
	against	24	79	25	25	153
	undecided	31	15	23	22	91
Total		184	112	95	69	460

Count

		Q4. Should bond measure be put on a May ballot?				Total
		Yes	No	Maybe, with changes	Don't know/refused	
Q7. ...for up to \$24 million, if new college were to be built in Warrenton, utilizing property donated to the college for that purpose.	in favor	156	43	74	33	306
	against	19	52	11	11	93
	undecided	9	17	10	25	61
Total		184	112	95	69	460

Count

		Q4. Should bond measure be put on a May ballot?				Total
		Yes	No	Maybe, with changes	Don't know/refused	
Q8. ...of up to \$10 million to renovate/refurbish and upgrade the current Jerome Street campus.	in favor	96	68	52	32	248
	against	73	26	32	16	147
	undecided	15	18	11	21	65
Total		184	112	95	69	460

Count

		Q4. Should bond measure be put on a May ballot?				Total
		Yes	No	Maybe, with changes	Don't know/refused	
Q9. ...to build a new college at (JWF) - John Warren Football Field - Astoria High	in favor	54	8	9	8	79
	against	107	95	77	39	318
	undecided	23	9	9	22	63
Total		184	112	95	69	460

Clatsop Community College Post Bond Study Summary

This sample consisted of 60 percent female and 40 percent male votes of the county. The data has a slightly better than 95 percent confidence level ± 5 percent on the sample as a whole. Below is the Gender Table and Precinct break down.

Gender

	Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Valid Female	277	60.2	60.2	60.2
Male	183	39.8	39.8	100.0
Total	460	100.0	100.0	

Precinct

	Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Valid 01 Astoria	12	2.6	2.6	2.6
02 Astoria	18	3.9	3.9	6.5
03 Astoria	20	4.3	4.3	10.9
04 Astoria	17	3.7	3.7	14.6
05 Astoria	13	2.8	2.8	17.4
06 Astoria	13	2.8	2.8	20.2
07 Astoria	13	2.8	2.8	23.0
08 Astoria	11	2.4	2.4	25.4
20 Cannon Beach	22	4.8	4.8	30.2
21 Chadwell	14	3.0	3.0	33.3
22 North Clatsop	26	5.7	5.7	38.9
23 South Clatsop	23	5.0	5.0	43.9
25 Gearhart	16	3.5	3.5	47.4
28 Jewell	8	1.7	1.7	49.1
29 John Day	8	1.7	1.7	50.9
30 Knapper	22	4.8	4.8	55.7
31 Lewis & Clark	16	3.5	3.5	59.1
35 Necanicum	7	1.5	1.5	60.7
36 Olney	8	1.7	1.7	62.4
37 Seaside	16	3.5	3.5	65.9
38 Seaside	15	3.3	3.3	69.1
39 Seaside	14	3.0	3.0	72.2
40 Seaside	29	6.3	6.3	78.5
44 Svensen	12	2.6	2.6	81.1
46 Walluski	8	1.7	1.7	82.8
47 Warrenton	46	10.0	10.0	92.8
48 Warrenton	15	3.3	3.3	96.1
50 Westport	9	2.0	2.0	98.0
52 Hillcrest	9	2.0	2.0	100.0
Total	460	100.0	100.0	