



**FOR IMMEDIATE RELEASE**

March 25, 2008

Contact: Greg Greenway  
Threshold 2008  
(650) 366-4163

Laurie Kappe  
i.e. communications, LLC  
(415) 616-3930

**INFORMED CITIZENS WANT MORE HOUSING**

*Majority Support Higher Density, More Regional Solutions*

**Foster City, CA** – Is there a critical housing shortage in San Mateo County? If so, what should be done about it? An unprecedented scientific random sample of 238 San Mateo County residents deliberated for two days on housing solutions at Threshold 2008’s Countywide Assembly on Housing Choices. More than two-thirds of the participants believe that more housing needs to be created in the county.

Threshold 2008, a non-profit organization formed to engage the public on housing issues in San Mateo County, held the Countywide Assembly to discuss the pros and cons of different options for dealing with the county’s future housing needs. The results of the weekend-long discussion show that 68% of participants think there is a need for more housing in the county, a dramatic increase from the 38% who held that view prior to the event.

The Countywide Assembly – technically known as a Deliberative Poll® - took place March 15-16, 2008 at Cañada College in Redwood City. Participants were surveyed before and after the event in order to see how their attitudes changed once they became informed through presentations of balanced information, small group discussions and Q&A sessions with experts.

“We want to bring an informed public voice into discussions about housing solutions,” said Greg Greenway, executive director of Threshold 2008. “The results show that people are willing to reconsider their own views when they get new information and talk in-depth with others.”

Other key findings include:

- 68% feel that the county’s vital services like education, fire, police and health would suffer if there continues to be a shortage of housing, compared to 46% prior to the event.
- 76% believe that new housing will increase the economic vitality of the region, as opposed to 61% before the event.
- 72% think any new housing should be located in already developed areas, an increase from 61% before to the event.
- 65% believe there should be “increased regional authority” in housing as compared to 43% before the event.

[Download the report, as well as view photos of the event, at [www.threshold2008.org](http://www.threshold2008.org).]



Participants were paid an honorarium of \$200, but the rewards of getting involved went beyond the money. An overwhelming majority of participants (95%) believed that the Countywide Assembly was valuable, specifically citing the usefulness of the small group discussions and Q&A sessions with experts. More than 90% of the 238 participants want to remain involved in the issue.

Approximately 400 people attended the event, including participants, discussion moderators, expert panelists, and observers. Policymakers and opinion leaders observed the action to ensure that people in the county were presented with balanced information and truly engaged.

“It was inspiring to watch people get excited and involved in housing issues and policies affecting residents and those commuting to jobs in our county,” said Duane Bay, San Mateo County Department of Housing. “Leaders will lead, and as we find out more about what people really want, they will lead more boldly. This event was a great step in that direction.”

Deliberative Polling®, a public process developed by Professor James Fishkin of Stanford University, is a technique that combines deliberation in small group discussions with scientific random sampling to provide public consultation for public policy issues.

“A representative sample of residents in San Mateo County were put in one room to think about some hard choices, become more informed and come to striking conclusions,” said Professor Fishkin. “This process showed what people think when they really consider competing arguments and I hope policymakers will pay attention.”

Threshold 2008 will now offer an opportunity for the entire community to weigh in on these choices in an interactive Online Dialogue and a series of Community Conversations. People who work or live in the county can sign up in April at [www.Threshold2008.org](http://www.Threshold2008.org)

Threshold 2008 is an unprecedented campaign to build the public voice about housing issues and options in San Mateo County. It is a community-driven effort supported by Open Square Foundation, Silicon Valley Community Foundation, The David & Lucile Packard Foundation, and W.K. Kellogg Foundation to make the process of developing housing policies and solutions more inclusive. Please visit [www.threshold2008.org](http://www.threshold2008.org) for more information.

+++



**THRESHOLD2008**  
Building the Public Voice San Mateo County

## Results of the San Mateo Countywide Assembly on Housing Choices

March 2008

### Contacts:

Greg Greenway, Executive Director  
650.366.4163 / [greg@threshold2008.org](mailto:greg@threshold2008.org)  
[www.threshold2008.org](http://www.threshold2008.org)

Professor James Fishkin, Stanford University  
650.384.5827 / [jfishkin@stanford.edu](mailto:jfishkin@stanford.edu)  
<http://cdd.stanford.edu>



**STANFORD UNIVERSITY**  
CENTER FOR DELIBERATIVE DEMOCRACY

James S. Fishkin, Director  
Janet M. Peck Chair in International Communication

**Informed Citizens Identify Need for More Housing**  
*Majority Support Higher Density, More Regional Solutions*

Is there a critical housing shortage in San Mateo County? If so, what should be done about it? A scientific sample of county residents recently participated in a Deliberative Poll® sponsored by Threshold 2008, a coalition of civic groups in the county. The weekend sample of 238 participants considered competing policy options, became more informed about them, questioned competing experts and by the end of the weekend, changed their views. The Deliberative Poll®, conducted as part of a Countywide Assembly on Housing Choices, was hosted by Cañada College on the weekend of March 15-16, 2008.

**Policy Attitudes**

Before the weekend, only 38% thought there was a need for more housing in the county. By the end of the weekend, the percentage supporting this view had risen to 68%, an increase of thirty points. Before the weekend 61% thought that any new housing should be located in already developed areas. After the weekend this increased to 72%. The percentage wanting to minimize the number of commuters, even if that means less job growth, rose from 25% before deliberation to 35% afterwards. And the percentage believing “developers should be required to provide a certain portion of their homes below the market rate” rose from 59% to 74%.

The participants wanted both more regional authority and more public consultation in housing decisions. Support for “increased regional authority” rose dramatically from 43% to 65%. There was a similar increase in support for “increased public consultation in the planning and approval of new housing development.” The percentage believing this was “extremely important” went from 43% to 64%.

The participants arrived at a clearer sense of the economic issues at stake in housing. Those believing “new housing development” would “increase economic vitality of the region” rose from 61% to 76%, while the percentage believing new housing development would be “good for the environment” rose from 33% to 44%. Participants also confronted the costs of not adding to housing. The percentage believing that “without new housing development companies would move away” increased from 29% to 51% (an increase of 22 points). And the percentage believing that “the county’s vital services like education, fire, police and health would suffer if there continues to be a shortage of affordable housing” increased from 46% to 68%. Participants clearly became more concerned about whether the workers who provide these services could find housing in the area.

## **Representativeness**

The project gathered a scientific random sample of 238 deliberators. These participants can be compared to 1,594 non-participants (residents who took the survey but did not participate). There are relatively few differences between participants and non-participants. The weekend group is representative on most demographic factors, with only modest differences in age, income and education. Ethnicity, race, gender were not significantly different among participants and non-participants. Attitudinally, the sample was even better. Only two of the policy questions showed any statistically significant differences between participants and non-participants.

## **Knowledge Gains**

The sample became significantly more informed about housing issues. Before deliberation only about 3 percent knew the median price of a single family home in the county. After deliberation this percentage rose to 19%. Before deliberation, only 26% could correctly answer the approximate percentage of households that could afford a median priced home in the county. Afterwards, the percentage getting this question right rose to 58%. On an index of eight knowledge questions, the percentage offering correct answers went from 13% to 28%, a statistically significant gain of fifteen points.

## **Evaluation**

Participants found the event very worthwhile. 95% said it was “valuable” and 65% gave it a perfect 10 rating on a scale from 0 to 10 (where 0 was “a waste of time” and 10 was “extremely valuable”). They offered almost identical ratings for the small group discussions (94% said they were valuable and 64% gave them a perfect 10 rating.). They were also enthusiastic about the plenary sessions with the experts (85% found them “valuable” and 47% gave them a perfect 10 rating). 94% agreed that “my small group moderator provided the opportunity for everyone to participate in the discussion” and 81% agreed that, “My small group moderator tried to make sure that opposing arguments were considered.” Participants also seemed to learn from engaging with people from such different walks of life. At the end, 85% agreed that, “I learned a lot about people very different from me—what they and their lives are like.”

## **Method**

Threshold 2008 used the Center for Deliberative Democracy at Stanford University, which conducts Deliberative Polls® around the world (see <http://cdd.stanford.edu>) to conduct this public consultation. Professors James Fishkin of Stanford University, who directs the Center, and Robert Luskin of the University of Texas at Austin, also associated with the center, participated in the design. Professor Fishkin commented “This process put all of San Mateo County in one room where it could think about some hard choices. They became more informed and came to clear and striking conclusions. I hope policy makers will pay attention as this is a public voice with a representative sample showing what the people think when they really consider competing arguments and become informed.”

Note: Deliberative Polling® is a trademark of James S. Fishkin. Any fees from the trademark are used to support research at Stanford’s Center for Deliberative Democracy (CDD). Our thanks to Alice Siu and Michael Weiksner, Research Assistants at the CDD, and Joyce Ichinose, Manager of the CDD, for their excellent work on this project.

# THE SURVEY DATA

A scientific random sample of 1,822 San Mateo County residents completed a phone survey within a month prior to the Countywide Assembly on Housing Choices on March 15-16, 2008 at Cañada College in Redwood City. Of these respondents, 238 attended the Countywide Assembly. The data below are summaries of the responses by the 238 participants before the Assembly (T1) and after the Assembly (T2), and the percentage change in their responses before and after the event (T2-T1). The demographic and attitudinal characteristics of the 238 participants are also compared to the larger sample of 1,822 to determine how representative the participants in the Assembly were of San Mateo County residents in general.

## Contents

Opinions Before and After Deliberation on All Policy Issues.....	4
Information Gains.....	12
Policy Questions Asked Only After Deliberation.....	13
Event Evaluation Questions.....	17
Representativeness in Demographics: Comparing Participants and Non-Participants.....	20
Representativeness in Policy Attitudes: Comparing Participants and Non-Participants.....	22

## Opinions Before and After Deliberation on All Policy Issues

Note: Significance Levels - \* p < .10; \*\* p < .05; \*\*\* p < .01

	T1 (%)	T2 (%)	T2-T1 (%)
<p>***1. Some people think we should create more housing in the county. Suppose people who believe this are at one end of a scale, at point 1. Other people think we should restrict housing growth in the county. Suppose people who believe this are at the other end, at point 7. People who are exactly in the middle are at point 4, and of course other people are at points 2, 3, 5, or 6. Where would you place yourself on this scale, or haven't you thought much about this?</p>			
1 Create more housing	25.5	34.3	8.8
2	5.4	18.4	13.0
3	7.5	15.1	7.5
4 Exactly in the middle	25.1	15.5	-9.6
5	10.9	5.4	-5.4
6	7.5	4.6	-2.9
7 Restrict housing	12.6	6.3	-6.3
<p>**2. Some people think that any new housing should be located in already developed areas. Suppose people who believe this are at one end of a scale, at point 1. Other people think that any new housing should be located in currently protected open space areas rezoned to allow housing developments. Suppose people who believe this are at the other end, at point 7. People who are exactly in the middle are at point 4, and of course other people are at points 2, 3, 5, or 6. Where would you place yourself on this scale, or haven't you thought much about this?</p>			
1 Already developed rezoned to	38.9	36.0	-2.9
1.50	0.0	0.4	0.4
2	14.6	20.5	5.9
3	7.5	15.1	7.5
4 Exactly in the middle	15.5	10.5	-5.0
5	4.2	5.9	1.7
6	2.9	2.1	-0.8
7 located in currently protected open space areas	12.6	8.4	-4.2
<p>***3. If new housing is restricted, some people think we should still try to attract new jobs to the county, even if that increases the number of commuters. Suppose people who believe this are at one end of a scale, at point 1. Other people think we should try to minimize the number of commuters, even if that reduces job growth. Suppose people who believe this are at the other end, at point 7. People who are exactly in the middle are at point 4. Where would you place yourself on this scale, or haven't you thought much about this?</p>			
1 Attract jobs to the county	28.9	13.8	-15.1
2	9.6	6.7	-2.9
3	8.4	12.6	4.2
3.5	0.0	0.4	0.4
4 Exactly in the middle	25.9	29.3	3.3
5	10.5	12.6	2.1
6	4.2	11.7	7.5
7 Restrict commuters	10.0	10.5	0.4

***4. Some people think developers should be required to provide a certain portion of their homes at prices below the market rate. Suppose people who believe this are at one end of a scale, at point 1. Other people think developers should be allowed to sell homes at whatever price the market will support. Suppose people who believe this are at the other end, at point 7. People who are exactly in the middle are at point 4. Where would you place yourself on this scale, or haven't you thought much about this?			
1 Portion devoted to below market rate housing	34.3	42.3	7.9
2	12.6	15.5	2.9
3	11.7	16.3	4.6
4 Exactly in the middle	13.8	8.4	-5.4
5	5.0	4.6	-0.4
6	4.6	3.3	-1.3
7 Market rate only	14.6	7.5	-7.1
5. Which of the following should have the <u>most</u> say in planning and approving new housing development?			
Local	56.1	65.3	9.2
County	28.0	26.8	-1.3
State	5.4	3.3	-2.1
6. And which should have the <u>least</u> say in planning and approving new housing development?			
Local	7.1	5.9	-1.3
County	6.7	4.6	-2.1
State	77.8	82.0	4.2
***7. On a scale of 0 to 10, where 0 is completely unimportant, 10 is extremely important, and 5 is exactly in the middle, how important would you say it is to increase public consultation in the planning and approval of new housing development?			
0 Completely Unimportant	0.0	0.8	0.8
1	0.8	0.4	-0.4
2	0.4	0.0	-0.4
3	2.1	2.5	0.4
4	1.7	0.0	-1.7
5 Exactly in the middle	9.6	5.9	-3.8
6	4.6	2.5	-2.1
7	10.5	4.2	-6.3
8	17.6	6.7	-10.9
9	8.4	11.7	3.3
10 Extremely important	42.7	64.0	21.3
8. Some people think local communities should retain control over land use. Suppose people who believe this are at one end of a scale, at point 1. Other people think land use policies should be coordinated countywide. Suppose people who believe this are at the other end, at point 7. People who are exactly in the middle are at point 4. Where would you place yourself on this scale, or haven't you thought much about this?			
1 Local control	25.5	20.1	-5.4
2	6.3	12.1	5.9
2.50	0.0	0.4	0.4
3	7.5	10.9	3.3
4 Exactly in the middle	17.2	13.4	-3.8
5	6.3	7.9	1.7
6	10.9	10.5	-0.4
7 Regional coordination	21.8	23.8	2.1



*9. Some people think housing is a county-level issue. Suppose people who believe this are at one end of a scale, at point 1. Other people think housing is a broader, state-level issue. Suppose people who believe this are at the other end, at point 7. People who are exactly in the middle are at point 4. Where would you place yourself on this scale, or haven't you thought much about this?			
1 County-level	37.2	30.5	-6.7
2	11.7	22.6	10.9
3	12.6	14.6	2.1
4 Exactly in the middle	14.2	17.6	3.3
5	4.2	4.2	0.0
6	2.9	3.3	0.4
7 State-level	13.0	4.6	-8.4
***10. How strongly would you support or oppose more regional authority over housing policy?			
Strongly support it	25.5	28.9	3.3
Somewhat support it	17.2	35.6	18.4
Neither support nor oppose it	17.2	6.7	-10.5
Somewhat oppose it	15.1	13.0	-2.1
Strongly oppose it	13.4	11.3	-2.1
11. Who should be most responsible for ensuring regional cooperation?			
1. Existing Bay Area regional agencies	15.9	23.8	7.9
*2. County government	16.3	13.4	-2.9
3. Local governments collaborating voluntarily	30.1	37.2	7.1
4. A new countywide authority for housing issues	19.7	20.5	0.8
12A. How much would you say that encouraging new housing development would increase or decrease, The quality of life.			
Greatly increase,	15.5	15.5	0.0
Somewhat increase,	25.1	31.0	5.9
Neither increase nor decrease,	20.9	22.6	1.7
Somewhat decrease or	20.1	20.9	0.8
Greatly decrease the quality of life	12.1	6.3	-5.9
*12B. How much would you say that encouraging new housing development would increase or decrease, Economic vitality.			
Greatly increase,	25.5	21.8	-3.8
Somewhat increase,	35.1	54.4	19.2
Neither increase nor decrease,	18.4	12.6	-5.9
Somewhat decrease or	10.9	5.0	-5.9
Greatly decrease economic vitality	3.8	2.1	-1.7
12C. How much would you say that encouraging new housing development would increase or decrease, Social and family connections.			
Greatly increase,	23.0	24.3	1.3
Somewhat increase,	25.1	36.4	11.3
Neither increase nor decrease,	28.9	29.3	0.4
Somewhat decrease or	7.9	3.8	-4.2
Greatly decrease social and family connections	5.9	2.5	-3.3
*12D. How much would you say that encouraging new housing development would increase or decrease, Property values.			
Greatly increase,	18.0	12.1	-5.9
Somewhat increase,	22.2	30.5	8.4
Neither increase nor decrease,	22.2	31.4	9.2
Somewhat decrease or	23.0	18.4	-4.6
Greatly decrease property values	5.9	3.3	-2.5

12E. How much would you say that encouraging new housing development would increase or decrease, Civic participation.			
Greatly increase,	17.2	16.3	-0.8
Somewhat increase,	26.8	33.1	6.3
Neither increase nor decrease,	33.5	41.8	8.4
Somewhat decrease or	5.9	2.5	-3.3
Greatly decrease civic life	4.6	0.8	-3.8
**12F. How much would you say that encouraging new housing development would increase or decrease, Quality of schools.			
Greatly increase,	19.7	9.6	-10.0
Somewhat increase,	21.3	23.4	2.1
Neither increase nor decrease,	27.2	35.6	8.4
Somewhat decrease or	13.8	18.4	4.6
Greatly decrease civic life	7.9	6.7	-1.3
***12G. How much would you say that encouraging new housing development would increase or decrease, City and county tax revenues.			
Greatly increase,	32.2	19.7	-12.6
Somewhat increase,	44.8	53.6	8.8
Neither increase nor decrease,	11.7	14.2	2.5
Somewhat decrease or	4.6	3.8	-0.8
Greatly decrease the quality of schools	1.7	1.7	0.0
***12H. How much would you say that encouraging new housing development would increase or decrease, Infrastructure costs.			
Greatly increase,	31.0	31.0	0.0
Somewhat increase,	39.7	44.8	5.0
Neither increase nor decrease,	14.6	10.9	-3.8
Somewhat decrease or	6.3	5.0	-1.3
Greatly decrease the quality of schools	0.8	3.3	2.5
***13. As far as the city and county governments are concerned, would new housing development in the county create: a large budget surplus, a small budget surplus, neither a budget deficit nor a budget surplus, a small budget deficit ora large budget deficit			
A large budget surplus	10.9	8.8	-2.1
A small budget surplus	13.0	18.8	5.9
Neither a budget deficit nor a budget surplus	37.2	44.4	7.1
A small budget deficit	11.3	9.6	-1.7
A large budget deficit or	6.3	7.1	0.8
***14. Now suppose any new housing development were concentrated in already developed areas. On a scale from 0 to 10, where 0 is extremely bad, 10 is extremely good, and 5 is exactly in the middle, how good or bad would new housing development be for the environment? Or haven't you thought much about this?			
0 Extremely bad	8.4	4.6	-3.8
1	2.1	0.8	-1.3
2	6.7	5.9	-0.8
3	7.5	7.1	-0.4
4	9.2	10.0	0.8
5 Exactly in the middle	23.4	24.7	1.3
6	5.0	4.2	-0.8
7	7.5	8.4	0.8
8	6.3	11.7	5.4
9	3.8	3.8	0.0
10 Extremely good	10.0	15.9	5.9

***15. And on another 0-to-10 scale, where 0 is not at all, 10 is a very great deal, and 5 is exactly in the middle, how much do you think restricting new housing development would cause companies in the county to move away? Or haven't you thought much about this?			
0 Not at all	16.7	6.3	-10.5
1	6.7	3.8	-2.9
2	6.7	4.6	-2.1
3	5.0	5.9	0.8
4	4.2	4.2	0.0
5 Exactly in the middle	20.9	18.8	-2.1
6	6.3	9.2	2.9
7	7.1	13.4	6.3
8	5.0	10.9	5.9
9	0.4	5.9	5.4
10 A very great deal	10.0	12.1	2.1
***16. And again on the same 0-to-10 scale, where 0 is not at all, 10 is a very great deal, and 5 is exactly in the middle, how much would you say the County's vital services like education, fire, police, and health care would suffer if there continues to be a shortage of affordable housing? Or haven't you thought much about this?			
0 Not at all	12.1	2.1	-10.0
1	2.9	1.3	-1.7
2	2.1	4.2	2.1
3	4.6	1.7	-2.9
4	4.6	4.6	0.0
5 Exactly in the middle	19.7	15.5	-4.2
6	4.2	5.9	1.7
7	7.9	12.1	4.2
8	7.9	13.8	5.9
9	5.0	6.3	1.3
10 A very great deal	20.9	30.1	9.2
**17A. Local review of housing projects is the only way communities can hold developers accountable			
Agree strongly	47.7	41.4	-6.3
Agree somewhat	26.8	35.6	8.8
Neither agree nor disagree	7.9	10.0	2.1
Disagree somewhat	9.2	7.5	-1.7
Disagree strongly	5.4	3.3	-2.1
17B. Local government is too responsive to the most vocal residents			
Agree strongly	30.1	27.6	-2.5
Agree somewhat	23.4	39.3	15.9
Neither agree nor disagree	10.9	12.1	1.3
Disagree somewhat	18.0	11.7	-6.3
Disagree strongly	10.5	7.9	-2.5
17C. Countywide approaches create new options unavailable to any individual city			
Agree strongly	25.9	35.6	9.6
Agree somewhat	28.0	33.5	5.4
Neither agree nor disagree	12.1	18.4	6.3
Disagree somewhat	13.4	7.5	-5.9
Disagree strongly	2.9	2.9	0.0

17D. Countywide approaches allow for sharing resources across cities			
Agree strongly	38.5	49.0	10.5
Agree somewhat	31.4	33.9	2.5
Neither agree nor disagree	10.9	10.5	-0.4
Disagree somewhat	5.4	1.3	-4.2
Disagree strongly	4.6	2.9	-1.7
***17E1. San Mateo County can have job growth without housing growth			
Agree strongly	13.8	2.1	-11.7
Agree somewhat	16.7	9.2	-7.5
Neither agree nor disagree	1.7	8.4	6.7
Disagree somewhat	8.4	17.2	8.8
Disagree strongly	12.1	14.6	2.5
***17E2. San Mateo County cannot accommodate job growth without housing growth.			
Agree strongly	16.3	21.3	5.0
Agree somewhat	11.3	14.6	3.3
Neither agree nor disagree	4.6	5.0	0.4
Disagree somewhat	7.1	4.2	-2.9
Disagree strongly	5.0	1.3	-3.8
17F. Requiring developers to include housing priced at below the market rate will make them build less housing			
Agree strongly	19.7	10.0	-9.6
Agree somewhat	24.3	28.5	4.2
Neither agree nor disagree	9.6	20.1	10.5
Disagree somewhat	25.5	26.8	1.3
Disagree strongly	16.7	13.8	-2.9
**17G. Rezoning some currently protected open space areas to allow housing development now will lead to still more similar rezoning and developments later.			
Agree strongly	43.9	38.9	-5.0
Agree somewhat	22.6	32.6	10.0
Neither agree nor disagree	7.5	12.6	5.0
Disagree somewhat	8.8	8.4	-0.4
Disagree strongly	10.5	4.2	-6.3
H1. Public funding for housing developments will bring the price down to what most people can afford			
Agree strongly	10.5	4.2	-6.3
Agree somewhat	12.6	12.1	-0.4
Neither agree nor disagree	2.9	10.5	7.5
Disagree somewhat	12.1	16.7	4.6
Disagree strongly	9.2	8.4	-0.8
H2. Public funding for housing developments will not be enough to bring the price down to what most people can afford			
Agree strongly	18.0	19.7	1.7
Agree somewhat	13.0	19.7	6.7
Neither agree nor disagree	3.8	4.2	0.4
Disagree somewhat	4.6	2.5	-2.1
Disagree strongly	2.1	0.8	-1.3
I1. Public funding for housing developments can be allocated fairly			
Agree strongly	14.2	7.1	-7.1
Agree somewhat	12.6	15.5	2.9
Neither agree nor disagree	4.2	15.9	11.7
Disagree somewhat	10.0	9.2	-0.8
Disagree strongly	8.4	3.8	-4.6

12. It is impossible to allocate public funding for housing developments fairly			
Agree strongly	10.5	7.1	-3.3
Agree somewhat	10.9	10.0	-0.8
Neither agree nor disagree	5.4	13.8	8.4
Disagree somewhat	8.4	9.6	1.3
Disagree strongly	7.5	5.9	-1.7
18a. Making sure that everyone has a place to live			
0 Completely unimportant	1.7	3.3	1.7
1	0.4	1.7	1.3
2	2.5	2.1	-0.4
3	1.7	0.8	-0.8
4	2.5	3.3	0.8
5 Exactly in the middle	8.4	8.8	0.4
6	6.3	4.6	-1.7
7	4.2	5.9	1.7
8	7.1	8.4	1.3
9	10.5	7.5	-2.9
10 Extremely important	53.1	52.7	-0.4
18b. Preserving open space			
0 Completely unimportant	1.7	2.1	0.4
1	1.3	0.8	-0.4
2	0.0	0.8	0.8
3	0.0	1.7	1.7
4	2.1	2.5	0.4
5 Exactly in the middle	5.9	8.8	2.9
6	4.2	2.9	-1.3
7	7.9	5.9	-2.1
8	12.6	9.2	-3.3
9	7.9	7.9	0.0
10 Extremely important	55.2	56.5	1.3
18c. Encouraging economic growth			
0 Completely unimportant	1.3	2.1	0.8
1	0.4	1.3	0.8
2	3.3	0.4	-2.9
3	1.3	1.7	0.4
4	1.3	3.8	2.5
5 Exactly in the middle	13.4	12.1	-1.3
6	8.8	7.5	-1.3
7	9.6	11.3	1.7
8	13.0	15.9	2.9
9	7.1	9.6	2.5
10 Extremely important	39.3	32.6	-6.7
18d. Maintaining the current character of our communities			
0 Completely unimportant	1.7	1.7	0.0
1	2.1	0.0	-2.1
2	2.5	2.5	0.0
3	1.3	3.3	2.1
4	1.7	3.3	1.7
5 Exactly in the middle	13.4	15.1	1.7
6	8.4	6.7	-1.7
7	9.6	8.4	-1.3
8	10.9	16.7	5.9
9	8.8	8.8	0.0
10 Extremely important	38.1	31.4	-6.7

18e. Having middle-income workers in the community			
0 Completely unimportant	0.0	1.7	1.7
1	0.8	0.8	0.0
2	0.4	0.4	0.0
3	0.0	0.0	0.0
4	0.0	2.1	2.1
5 Exactly in the middle	7.1	10.5	3.3
6	3.8	2.1	-1.7
7	10.5	8.4	-2.1
8	17.6	13.8	-3.8
9	11.7	8.8	-2.9
10 Extremely important	47.3	50.2	2.9
*18f. Making it possible for people who grew up here to live here			
0 Completely unimportant	2.1	2.1	0.0
1	2.5	1.7	-0.8
2	1.3	2.1	0.8
3	2.1	2.9	0.8
4	1.3	1.3	0.0
5 Exactly in the middle	9.2	14.2	5.0
6	6.3	4.2	-2.1
7	6.7	9.2	2.5
8	8.8	10.9	2.1
9	8.4	9.2	0.8
10 Extremely important	50.2	41.4	-8.8
18h. Slowing the growth of suburban sprawl			
0 Completely unimportant	3.3	3.3	0.0
1	3.8	0.8	-2.9
2	2.1	2.9	0.8
3	2.1	1.3	-0.8
4	2.5	3.8	1.3
5 Exactly in the middle	15.1	18.4	3.3
6	5.9	6.3	0.4
7	8.8	3.8	-5.0
8	10.5	12.1	1.7
9	8.4	6.7	-1.7
10 Extremely important	34.7	36.0	1.3
18i. Having lower income workers in the community			
0 Completely unimportant	3.8	2.5	-1.3
1	1.3	3.3	2.1
2	0.8	2.5	1.7
3	1.3	4.2	2.9
4	2.9	1.3	-1.7
5 Exactly in the middle	17.6	16.3	-1.3
6	7.9	5.9	-2.1
7	7.5	7.9	0.4
8	13.4	12.1	-1.3
9	6.7	7.5	0.8
10 Extremely important	34.7	34.3	-0.4

## Information Gains

Question	Pre	Post	Changes
19. According to the Association of Bay Area Governments, between 1999 and 2006, what was the gap each year between the number of new homes needed and the number actually produced in San Mateo County?	8.37%	16.74%	8.37%
20. As of September 2007, about how much was the median price of a single-family home in San Mateo County?	2.93%	19.25%	16.32%
21. As of 2006, about what percentage of County households could afford a median-priced house in San Mateo County?	25.94%	49.79%	23.85%
22. As of September 2007, what was the average rent for a 2-bedroom apartment in San Mateo County?	40.59%	58.16%	17.57%
23. According to the 2006 San Mateo County Housing Needs Study, by about how many housing units is the demand for housing in San Mateo County projected to grow between 2005 and 2025?	4.18%	30.13%	25.94%
24. According to the same Housing Needs Study, among the new households that are expected to form in the County between 2005 and 2025, about what percentage, combined, would be households with low, very low and extremely low-incomes?	8.79%	19.25%	10.46%
25. According to the 2006 San Mateo County Housing Needs Study, roughly how many new homes (including houses, townhomes, condos and apartments) will be built between 2005 and 2025 at the current rate of housing development?	19.67%	33.05%	13.39%
26. What percentage of San Mateo County's land is agricultural use, watershed, open space, wetlands, or	5.86%	27.20%	21.34%
<b>Knowledge Index (average of knowledge questions)</b>	<b>12.92%</b>	<b>28.17%</b>	<b>15.25%</b>

Note: All changes are statistically significant at .000 level

## Policy Questions Asked Only After Deliberation

	Post-only (%)
27A. New local transportation options like buses, trains, and shuttles could reduce the traffic congestion from new housing development.	
Agree strongly	64.0
Agree somewhat	26.4
Neither agree nor disagree	3.8
Disagree somewhat	2.9
Disagree strongly	2.5
27B. New regional transportation options like regional rail could reduce traffic congestion for long distance commuters.	
Agree strongly	67.4
Agree somewhat	25.1
Neither agree nor disagree	2.5
Disagree somewhat	2.1
Disagree strongly	1.7
27D. Higher density housing could help revitalize downtown areas	
Agree strongly	47.3
Agree somewhat	34.7
Neither agree nor disagree	8.8
Disagree somewhat	5.0
Disagree strongly	2.1
27E. Higher density housing would harm the character of our communities	
Agree strongly	7.9
Agree somewhat	18.0
Neither agree nor disagree	27.2
Disagree somewhat	25.9
Disagree strongly	18.8
28. How strongly would you favor or oppose each of the following? Building housing near bus, train, and BART service	
Favor strongly	67.7
Favor somewhat	25.2
Neither favor nor oppose	3.5
Oppose somewhat	2.2
Oppose strongly	1.3
29. How strongly would you favor or oppose each of the following? Having commercial establishments and housing together in one building or within short walking distance of one another	
Favor strongly	63.7
Favor somewhat	26.5
Neither favor nor oppose	6.0
Oppose somewhat	2.1
Oppose strongly	1.7



30. On a scale of 0 to 10, where 0 is something that will never happen, 10 is something that's certain to happen, and 5 is exactly in-between, how likely are you to want to live, at some point, in a higher density housing development within walking distance of retail services and public transit?	
0 Never happen	13.2
1.00	7.5
2.00	3.1
3.00	2.6
4.00	1.8
5.00	19.7
Exactly in the middle	3.5
7.00	6.6
8.00	17.5
9.00	6.6
Certain to happen	18.0
31A. How strongly would you favor or oppose each of the following? Making the housing approval process faster and less expensive for developers	
Strongly oppose it	5.5
Somewhat oppose it	11.1
Neither support nor oppose it	15.7
Somewhat support it	41.3
Strongly support it	26.4
31B. How strongly would you favor or oppose each of the following? Providing public funding for housing developments	
Strongly oppose it	8.2
Somewhat oppose it	6.0
Neither support nor oppose it	19.7
Somewhat support it	37.8
Strongly support it	28.3
31C. How strongly would you favor or oppose each of the following? Providing public subsidies for affordable housing	
Strongly oppose it	6.8
Somewhat oppose it	5.5
Neither support nor oppose it	12.8
Somewhat support it	40.0
Strongly support it	34.9
31D. How strongly would you favor or oppose each of the following? Requiring developers to include affordable housing in larger developments	
Strongly oppose it	5.1
Somewhat oppose it	2.1
Neither support nor oppose it	9.7
Somewhat support it	29.2
Strongly support it	53.8

31E. How strongly would you favor or oppose each of the following? Enforcing state laws that require cities to plan for housing development	
Strongly oppose it	5.7
Somewhat oppose it	5.7
Neither support nor oppose it	15.4
Somewhat support it	29.5
Strongly support it	43.6
31F. How strongly would you favor or oppose each of the following? Creating a countywide agency to hear appeals from developers when cities do not approve their projects	
Strongly oppose it	18.5
Somewhat oppose it	10.7
Neither support nor oppose it	18.0
Somewhat support it	26.3
Strongly support it	26.3
32A. How strongly would you favor or oppose each of the following? A fee of one to five dollars for each official document recorded by County Recorders office	
Strongly oppose it	30.4
Somewhat oppose it	31.3
Neither support nor oppose it	16.7
Somewhat support it	11.5
Strongly support it	10.1
33B. How strongly would you favor or oppose each of the following? An increase of \$12 per year for every \$100,000 of property value in property taxes	
Strongly support it	22.7
Somewhat support it	21.3
Neither support nor oppose it	17.8
Somewhat oppose it	15.6
Strongly oppose it	22.7
33C. How strongly would you favor or oppose each of the following? An increase of ¼% in the sales tax	
Strongly support it	15.7
Somewhat support it	24.0
Neither support nor oppose it	17.5
Somewhat oppose it	18.3
Strongly oppose it	24.5
33D. How strongly would you favor or oppose each of the following? A dedicated source of funding from the State of California to support construction of affordable housing.	
Strongly support it	43.2
Somewhat support it	29.1
Neither support nor oppose it	13.7
Somewhat oppose it	6.0
Strongly oppose it	8.1

33E. How strongly would you favor or oppose each of the following? A fee of one dollar per square foot on new commercial, industrial and office development	
Strongly support it	38.9
Somewhat support it	30.6
Neither support nor oppose it	17.5
Somewhat oppose it	5.7
Strongly oppose it	7.4
33.How often, if ever, would you say you have talked about housing issues with friends or family in the five years before being invited to this event?	
Very often	44.3
Now and then	31.9
Only a few times	17.4
Never	6.4
34.How often, if ever, have you participated in a planning process for your town or city in the 5 years before being invited to this event?	
Very often	10.2
Now and then	12.8
Only a few times	20.9
Never	56.2

## Event Evaluation Questions

	Post-only (%)
35a. On a scale of 0 to 10, where 0 is “a waste of time”, 10 is “extremely valuable” and 5 is exactly in the middle, how valuable was each of the following in helping you clarify your positions on the issues? Participating in the small group discussions	
0 Waster of time	0.0
1.00	0.9
2.00	0.0
3.00	1.7
4.00	0.4
5 '5 Exactly in the middle'	2.6
6.00	4.7
7.00	3.4
8.00	14.0
9.00	8.5
10 Extremely valuable	63.8
35b. On a scale of 0 to 10, where 0 is “a waste of time”, 10 is “extremely valuable” and 5 is exactly in the middle, how valuable was each of the following in helping you clarify your positions on the issues? Meeting and talking to other participants outside of the formal discussions	
0 A waste of time	0.9
1.00	0.0
2.00	0.9
3.00	0.4
4.00	0.4
5 '5 Exactly in the middle'	11.1
6.00	6.8
7.00	7.3
8.00	15.0
9.00	9.0
10 Extremely valuable	48.3
35c. On a scale of 0 to 10, where 0 is “a waste of time”, 10 is “extremely valuable” and 5 is exactly in the middle, how valuable was each of the following in helping you clarify your positions on the issues? Participating in the plenary sessions	
0 A waste of time	1.3
1.00	0.9
2.00	0.0
3.00	3.0
4.00	2.1
5 '5 Exactly in the middle'	8.2
6.00	4.7
7.00	6.9
8.00	12.9
9.00	12.9
10 Extremely valuable	47.2

35d. On a scale of 0 to 10, where 0 is “a waste of time”, 10 is “extremely valuable” and 5 is exactly in the middle, how valuable was each of the following in helping you clarify your positions on the issues? The event as a whole	
0 Waste of time	0.0
1.00	0.4
2.00	0.0
3.00	0.4
4.00	0.0
5 '5 Exactly in the middle'	3.9
6.00	1.3
7.00	3.9
8.00	12.1
9.00	12.9
10 Extremely valuable	65.1
36a. My small group moderator provided the opportunity for everyone to participate in the discussion	
Agree strongly	85.5
Agree somewhat	9.8
Neither agree nor disagree	1.7
Disagree somewhat	1.7
Disagree strongly	1.3
36b. The members of my small group participated relatively equally in the discussions	
Agree strongly	42.5
Agree somewhat	35.6
Neither agree nor disagree	6.0
Disagree somewhat	11.6
Disagree strongly	4.3
36c. My small group moderator sometimes tried to influence the group with this or her own views	
Agree strongly	3.8
Agree somewhat	2.1
Neither agree nor disagree	5.6
Disagree somewhat	6.8
Disagree strongly	81.6
36d. My small group moderator tried to make sure that opposing arguments were considered	
Agree strongly	61.6
Agree somewhat	19.4
Neither agree nor disagree	10.3
Disagree somewhat	3.4
Disagree strongly	5.2
36e. The important aspects of the issues were covered in the group discussions	
Agree strongly	60.9
Agree somewhat	28.9
Neither agree nor disagree	4.3
Disagree somewhat	3.8
Disagree strongly	2.1

36f. I learned a lot about people very different from me—about what they and their lives are like		
	Agree strongly	55.6
	Agree somewhat	29.1
	Neither agree nor disagree	11.1
	Disagree somewhat	2.1
	Disagree strongly	2.1
37. Before the deliberation started, how much of the briefing material you were sent would you say you had read?		
	Hadn't read or had just glanced at it	30.1
	Had read less than half of it	18.3
	Had read about half of it	16.9
	Had read more than half of it	8.7
	Had read all or nearly all of it	26.0
38. And by the end of the deliberations, how much of the briefing material you were sent would you say you had read?		
	Hadn't read or had just glanced at it	4.3
	Had read less than half of it	4.3
	Had read about half of it	12.5
	Had read more than half of it	15.5
	Had read all or nearly all of it	63.4
39. Would you say that the briefing material was mostly balanced, or that it clearly favored some positions over others?		
	Mostly balanced	80.9
	Favored some positions over others	19.1
40. Would you say that the briefing material was mostly clear, or unclear?		
	Clear	96.9
	Unclear	3.1
41. Would you say that the length of the small group sessions was too short, sufficient, or too long?		
	Too short	8.7
	Sufficient	86.5
	Too long	4.8
42. Would you say that the length of the plenary sessions was too short, sufficient, or too long?		
	Too short	13.8
	Sufficient	67.7
	Too long	18.5

## Representativeness in Demographics Comparing Participants and Non-Participants

	Participants N=238 (%)	Non-participants N=1594 (%)
<b>Gender</b>		
Male	40.1	40.8
Female	59.9	57.3
<b>Age***</b>	58.6 years	54.8 years
<b>Education***</b>		
Less than high school	0.8	1.3
High school	5.1	9.6
Some university / college	29.1	22.6
University / college graduate	20.7	25.2
Some graduate work	13.9	8.4
Graduate degree	29.1	28.6
Other	0.4	1.0
<b>Employment Status***</b>		
Employed full-time	31.2	45.3
Employed part-time	14.8	12.5
Not employed, but actively looking for work; or	8.9	6.3
Student	5.1	2.1
Not actively looking for work	38.8	29.5
<b>Type of Employer</b>		
Self employed	16.0	14.5
Business under 25 employees	7.2	8.2
Business with 25 or more employees	15.2	23.6
Government	4.2	7.5
Other	3.4	4.0
<b>Income***</b>		
Less than 23,000	10.5	6.0
23,001 to 40,000	11.0	9.1
40,001 to 55,000	7.2	6.9
55,001 to 75,000	14.8	9.0
75,001 to 95,000	9.7	8.6
95,001 to 125,000	11.4	10.4
More than 125,000	11.0	22.0
Refused	24.5	26.5
<b>Ethnicity</b>		
White (Non-Hispanic/Latino)	65.8	66.7
Black/African American	4.6	2.3
Hispanic/Latino(a)	8.9	9.0
American Indian/Alaskan Native	1.3	0.5
Asian	10.5	10.0
Native Hawaiian/Pacific Islander	0.0	0.9
Other	5.1	4.7

<b>Religious Attendance</b>		
Every week	24.1	20.1
Almost every week	4.6	6.2
Once or twice a month	9.3	10.9
A few times a year	25.7	25.7
Never	31.6	29.3
<b>Number of people in household</b>	2.32	2.73
<b>No. of children***</b>	0.38	0.57
<b>Participant who attended at one or more housing meetings***</b>	45.6	36.5

Note: \*\*\* p < .01



## Representativeness in Policy Attitudes Comparing Participants and Non-Participants

	Participant (%)	Non-participant (%)
<p>1. Some people think we should create more housing in the county. Suppose people who believe this are at one end of a scale, at point 1. Other people think we should restrict housing growth in the county. Suppose people who believe this are at the other end, at point 7. People who are exactly in the middle are at point 4, and of course other people are at points 2, 3, 5, or 6. Where would you place yourself on this scale, or haven't you thought much about this?</p>		
1 to 3	38.5	34.0
4	25.1	21.7
5 to 7	31.0	34.6
<p>2. Some people think that any new housing should be located in already developed areas. Suppose people who believe this are at one end of a scale, at point 1. Other people think that any new housing should be located in currently protected open space areas rezoned to allow housing developments. Suppose people who believe this are at the other end, at point 7. People who are exactly in the middle are at point 4, and of course other people are at points 2, 3, 5, or 6. Where would you place yourself on this scale, or haven't you thought much about this?</p>		
1 to 3	61.1	62.1
4	15.5	11.7
5 to 7	19.7	19.2
<p>3. If new housing is restricted, some people think we should still try to attract new jobs to the county, even if that increases the number of commuters. Suppose people who believe this are at one end of a scale, at point 1. Other people think we should try to minimize the number of commuters, even if that reduces job growth. Suppose people who believe this are at the other end, at point 7. People who are exactly in the middle are at point 4. Where would you place yourself on this scale, or haven't you thought much about this?</p>		
1 to 3	46.9	42.8
4	25.9	22.0
5 to 7	24.7	28.4
<p>4. Some people think developers should be required to provide a certain portion of their homes at prices below the market rate. Suppose people who believe this are at one end of a scale, at point 1. Other people think developers should be allowed to sell homes at whatever price the market will support. Suppose people who believe this are at the other end, at point 7. People who are exactly in the middle are at point 4. Where would you place yourself on this scale, or haven't you thought much about this?***</p>		
1 to 3	58.6	48.9
4	13.8	14.4
5 to 7	24.3	31.7

7. On a scale of 0 to 10, where 0 is completely unimportant, 10 is extremely important, and 5 is exactly in the middle, how important would you say it is to increase public consultation in the planning and approval of new housing development?***		
0 to 4	5.0	9.0
5	9.6	15.3
6 to 10	83.7	71.6
8. Some people think local communities should retain control over land use. Suppose people who believe this are at one end of a scale, at point 1. Other people think land use policies should be coordinated countywide. Suppose people who believe this are at the other end, at point 7. People who are exactly in the middle are at point 4. Where would you place yourself on this scale, or haven't you thought much about this?		
1 to 3	39.3	35.4
4	17.2	19.3
5 to 7	38.9	37.4
9. Some people think housing is a county-level issue. Suppose people who believe this are at one end of a scale, at point 1. Other people think housing is a broader, state-level issue. Suppose people who believe this are at the other end, at point 7. People who are exactly in the middle are at point 4. Where would you place yourself on this scale, or haven't you thought much about this?		
1 to 3	61.5	60.2
4	14.2	16.6
5 to 7	20.1	15.8
10. How strongly would you support or oppose more regional authority over housing policy?		
Strongly support it	25.5	20.0
Somewhat support it	17.2	25.3
Neither support nor oppose it	17.2	17.4
Somewhat oppose it	15.1	13.1
Strongly oppose it	13.4	11.8

Note: \*\*\* p < .01