				Gender Non-				Pa	rty	
						Non-				
		n	%	Male	Female	binary	Socialist	Dem	Ind	Rep
Number of cases		700		339	340	13	59	454	124	63
Row percent			100%	48%	49%	2%	8%	65%	18%	9%
QOL Index	Mean	700	4.66	4.79	4.50	6.35	4.86	5.06	3.63	3.66
Seattle right direction/Wrong	Right direction	333	48%	51%	43%	81%	57%	55%	26%	25%
track	Wrong track	365	52%	49%	56%	19%	43%	44%	74%	75%
	(Don't know/Refused)	2	0%	-	1%	-	-	0%	-	-
	Net Right direction	-33	-5	+1	-13	+63	+13	+11	-48	-50
Best thing about living in Seattle	Environment/Nature/Outdoors/Natural beauty	348	50%	45%	53%	70%	54%	54%	37%	41%
	Location/Geography/Puget Sound	137	20%	21%	18%	21%	21%	20%	19%	16%
	Weather/Summer/Climate	97	14%	15%	13%	8%	13%	12%	17%	22%
	Community/Culture/Neighborhoods/Small city	88	13%	12%	14%	0%	12%	16%	6%	3%
	Amenities/Food/Entertainment/Music/Sports	77	11%	9%	13%	5%	13%	11%	8%	11%
	Diversity/Tolerance/Politics/Progressivism	68	10%	8%	11%	14%	20%	9%	10%	3%
	Walkability/Transit	42	6%	6%	6%	6%	8%	7%	4%	0%
	Jobs/Economy/Property values/No income tax	34	5%	5%	4%	11%	6%	4%	6%	8%
	Family/Friends/Hometown	23	3%	4%	3%	0%	3%	2%	7%	2%
	Planning to leave/Has complaints about Seattle	17	2%	2%	2%	0%	0%	1%	6%	6%
	Other	22	3%	3%	3%	0%	1%	2%	6%	9%
	Nothing/Don't know	15	2%	3%	1%	0%	3%	1%	5%	3%

							Ра	rty		
						Non-				
		n	%	Male	Female	binary	Socialist	Dem	Ind	Rep
Number of cases		700		339	340	13	59	454	124	63
Row percent			100%	48%	49%	2%	8%	65%	18%	9%
Top issues facing Seattle	Crime/Drugs/Public safety	284	41%	38%	43%	20%	12%	39%	53%	57%
	Homelessness	262	37%	38%	39%	11%	29%	39%	37%	35%
	Cost of living/Affordable housing	195	28%	26%	29%	51%	47%	30%	17%	14%
	Government/Politicians/Public leaders	103	15%	16%	13%	18%	18%	12%	21%	20%
	Racial issues/Policing/Police brutality	43	6%	4%	8%	0%	9%	6%	5%	4%
	Jobs/Economy	36	5%	4%	6%	0%	12%	4%	5%	7%
	Streets/Roads/Infrastructure	30	4%	6%	3%	0%	2%	4%	6%	2%
	Taxes	28	4%	5%	3%	0%	0%	4%	8%	1%
	Growth/Development/Population	27	4%	5%	3%	0%	2%	5%	3%	0%
	Public transportation	24	3%	4%	3%	14%	10%	4%	2%	0%
	Cleanliness of city/Garbage	24	3%	3%	4%	0%	2%	4%	3%	3%
	Traffic/Congestion	22	3%	3%	3%	0%	2%	4%	3%	2%
	Mental health/Healthcare cost/access	20	3%	3%	2%	12%	12%	2%	0%	4%
	Schools/School district/SPS/Education	12	2%	2%	2%	0%	0%	2%	1%	1%
	Climate change/Environment	5	1%	1%	1%	0%	2%	1%	0%	0%
	Other	6	1%	1%	1%	0%	0%	1%	0%	1%
	None/Nothing/Don't know/Unsure/No comment	1	0%	0%	0%	0%	3%	0%	0%	0%
Change in quality of life in	Much better	2	0%	1%	-	-	1%	0%	-	-
Seattle	Somewhat better	149	21%	23%	20%	31%	20%	22%	21%	17%
	The same	188	27%	28%	25%	58%	30%	31%	14%	17%
	Somewhat worse	244	35%	33%	37%	11%	35%	37%	28%	31%
	Much worse	116	17%	16%	18%	-	13%	9%	37%	35%
	(Don't know/Refused)	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
Change in quality of life in	Better	151	22%	23%	20%	31%	22%	22%	21%	17%
Seattle	Same/(DK/Ref)	188	27%	28%	25%	58%	30%	31%	14%	17%
	Worse	361	52%	48%	55%	11%	48%	46%	64%	66%
	Net Better	-209	-30	-25	-35	+21	-26	-24	-43	-50
Considered moving out of	Yes	388	55%	55%	56%	38%	56%	50%	70%	69%
Seattle	No/(Don't know/Refused)	312	45%	45%	44%	62%	44%	50%	30%	31%

				Gender No				Par	ty	
						Non-				
		n	%	Male	Female	binary	Socialist	Dem	Ind	Rep
Number of cases		700		339	340	13		454	124	63
Row percent			100%	48%	49%	2%	8%	65%	18%	9%
Main reason for considering	Crime/Drugs/Public safety	118	30%	29%	31%	58%	10%	29%	39%	36%
moving out of Seattle	Expensive (Cost of living/housing)	112	29%	22%	35%	15%	51%	31%	22%	16%
	Government/Leadership/Politics	42	11%	15%	7%	-	3%	9%	15%	17%
	Homelessness	17	4%	6%	4%	-	3%	5%	6%	-
	Declining quality of life	15	4%	5%	3%	-	-	4%	3%	8%
	Taxes	12	3%	4%	2%	-	4%	4%	-	7%
	Work/Job opportunities/Business leaving	12	3%	4%	2%	-	8%	2%	1%	8%
	Traffic/Congestion	9	2%	2%	3%	-	3%	2%	4%	-
	Growth/Development/Space	7	2%	1%	3%	-	4%	2%	-	-
	Closer to family	7	2%	3%	0%	27%	-	2%	2%	-
	Cleanliness/Garbage	7	2%	2%	1%	-	3%	1%	4%	-
	Schools/School district/SPS/Education	6	2%	2%	1%	-	-	2%	1%	2%
	Weather	3	1%	1%	1%	-	3%	1%	-	2%
	Other	18	5%	5%	4%	-	9%	6%	1%	2%
	None/Nothing/Don't know/Unsure/No comment	3	1%	-	1%	-	-	-	2%	2%
Still actively considering moving	Yes	323	83%	82%	85%	56%	84%	80%	90%	89%
out of Seattle	No/(Don't know/Refused)	65	17%	18%	15%	44%	16%	20%	10%	11%
Considered moving/actively	Yes, still actively considering	323	46%	45%	48%	21%	47%	39%	63%	61%
considering moving out of	Yes, no longer actively considering	65	9%	10%	8%	17%	9%	10%	7%	8%
Seattle	No/(Don't know/Refused)	312	45%	45%	44%	62%	44%	50%	30%	31%
Agree: I'm optimistic about the	Strongly agree	106	15%	19%	11%	28%	19%	17%	9%	12%
future of this region	Somewhat agree	318	45%	44%	47%	56%	52%	50%	35%	29%
-	Somewhat disagree	170	24%	24%	24%	16%		23%	26%	35%
	Strongly disagree	104	15%	12%	18%	-	9%	10%	31%	25%
	(Don't know/Refused)	2	0%	0%	0%	-	-	0%	-	-

								Pai	ty	
						Non-				
		n	%	Male	Female	binary	Socialist	Dem	Ind	Rep
Number of cases		700		339	340	13	59	454	124	63
Row percent			100%	48%	49%	2%	8%	65%	18%	9%
Agree: A thriving downtown	Strongly agree	391	56%	56%	56%	41%	24%	54%	67%	78%
Seattle is critical to our region's	Somewhat agree	227	32%	34%	31%	37%	43%	35%	26%	16%
economic recovery	Somewhat disagree	54	8%	7%	9%	-	22%	8%	3%	2%
	Strongly disagree	28	4%	3%	4%	22%	12%	3%	4%	4%
	(Don't know/Refused)	1	0%	0%	-	-	-	0%	-	-
Agree: I'm worried about the	Strongly agree	334	48%	45%	51%	11%	23%	45%	59%	67%
future of downtown Seattle	Somewhat agree	233	33%	37%	30%	28%	31%	37%	25%	26%
	Somewhat disagree	97	14%	12%	14%	29%	30%	15%	8%	5%
	Strongly disagree	34	5%	5%	4%	22%	16%	4%	5%	2%
	(Don't know/Refused)	2	0%	0%	-	10%	-	-	2%	-
Agree: I would feel safe visiting	Strongly agree	268	38%	40%	36%	57%	65%	42%	27%	12%
downtown Seattle during the	Somewhat agree	254	36%	35%	38%	37%	26%	37%	32%	46%
day	Somewhat disagree	113	16%	17%	15%	6%	9%	16%	18%	22%
	Strongly disagree	65	9%	8%	10%	-	-	5%	23%	19%
	(Don't know/Refused)	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
Agree: I would feel safe visiting	Strongly agree	99	14%	16%	12%	32%	29%	13%	12%	9%
downtown Seattle at night	Somewhat agree	148	21%	25%	18%	12%	41%	24%	10%	3%
_	Somewhat disagree	190	27%	26%	27%	51%	12%	30%	22%	33%
	Strongly disagree	263	38%	33%	43%	6%	17%	33%	55%	56%
	(Don't know/Refused)	1	0%	-	0%	-	-	0%	-	-
Agree: I trust the City of Seattle	Strongly agree	15	2%	3%	1%	-	1%	3%	1%	2%
to spend my tax dollars	Somewhat agree	201	29%	30%	28%	35%	37%	33%	18%	15%
responsibly	Somewhat disagree	235	34%	30%	38%	38%	40%	38%	21%	22%
	Strongly disagree	247	35%	37%	33%	26%		27%	60%	62%
	(Don't know/Refused)	1	0%	0%	-	-	-	0%	-	-

					Gender			Par	ty	
						Non-			-	
		n	%	Male	Female	binary	Socialist	Dem	Ind	Rep
Number of cases		700		339	340	13	59	454	124	63
Row percent			100%	48%	49%	2%	8%	65%	18%	9%
Agree: All things considered,	Strongly agree	109	16%	21%	11%	6%	16%	18%	10%	11%
growth and development has	Somewhat agree	284	41%	39%	41%	80%	41%	42%	38%	32%
been a positive for my area	Somewhat disagree	170	24%	24%	25%	6%	21%	25%	21%	28%
	Strongly disagree	137	20%	16%	23%	8%	22%	15%	31%	29%
	(Don't know/Refused)	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
Agree: I'm proud to call myself a	Strongly agree	299	43%	46%	39%	47%	45%	50%	24%	22%
Seattleite	Somewhat agree	238	34%	30%	38%	28%	39%	37%	26%	26%
	Somewhat disagree	102	15%	16%	13%	14%	14%	7%	33%	30%
	Strongly disagree	61	9%	8%	9%	11%	2%	5%	17%	21%
	(Don't know/Refused)	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
Agree: I trust that the city has an	Strongly agree	3	0%	1%	0%	-	1%	0%	1%	_
effective plan to address the	Somewhat agree	110	16%	17%	15%	6%	18%	17%	11%	11%
critical issues facing our city like	Somewhat disagree	279	40%	37%	44%	40%	29%	46%	30%	25%
homelessness, affordability, and	Strongly disagree	306	44%	45%	41%	54%	52%	36%	58%	64%
public safety	(Don't know/Refused)	1	0%	0%	-	-	-	-	1%	-
Agree: The City of Seattle has	Strongly agree	305	44%	42%	45%	37%	34%	38%	62%	60%
enough money to address	Somewhat agree	230	33%	31%	37%	16%	32%	38%	18%	26%
important priorities; they just	Somewhat disagree	114	16%	19%	13%	38%	24%	17%	14%	11%
need to spend it more	Strongly disagree	40	6%	7%	5%	8%	10%	5%	6%	3%
effectively	(Don't know/Refused)	11	2%	2%	1%	-	-	2%	-	-
Agree: The city has made	Strongly agree	34	5%	6%	4%	-	4%	6%	3%	2%
meaningful progress in reducing	Somewhat agree	237	34%	36%	32%	27%	22%	37%	31%	26%
the number of homeless	Somewhat disagree	215	31%	29%	32%	41%	34%	32%	25%	27%
encampments in Seattle	Strongly disagree	210	30%	29%	31%	33%	37%	24%	40%	45%
	(Don't know/Refused)	4	1%	-	1%	-	4%	-	1%	-

					Gender			Pa	ty	
						Non-				
		n	%	Male	Female	binary	Socialist	Dem	Ind	Rep
Number of cases		700		339	340	13	59	454	124	63
Row percent			100%	48%	49%	2%	8%	65%	18%	9%
Agree: City policies that have	Strongly agree	303	43%	46%	41%	35%	11%	37%	65%	74%
increased business costs and the		181	26%	23%	29%	12%	23%	31%	13%	14%
failure to adequately address	Somewhat disagree	142	20%	19%	20%	45%	37%	22%	12%	10%
public safety make it hard to	Strongly disagree	63	9%	10%	9%	8%	25%	8%	9%	2%
start or grow a business in	(Don't know/Refused)	11	2%	2%	1%	-	4%	2%	-	-
Seattle										
Agree: I'm optimistic about the	Agree	424	61%	63%	57%	84%	71%	67%	44%	40%
future of this region	Disagree	274	39%	36%	42%	16%	29%	33%	56%	60%
_	(DK/Ref)	2	0%	0%	0%	-	-	0%	-	-
	Net Agree	+150	+21	+27	+15	+68	+42	+34	-13	-19
Agree: A thriving downtown	Agree	618	88%	90%	87%	78%	67%	89%	93%	94%
Seattle is critical to our region's	Disagree	81	12%	10%	13%	22%	33%	11%	7%	6%
economic recovery	(DK/Ref)	1	0%	0%	-		-	0%	-	-
	Net Agree	+536	+77	+79	+74	+55	+34	+78	+86	+88
Agree: I'm worried about the	Agree	567	81%	82%	82%	38%	54%	82%	85%	93%
future of downtown Seattle	Disagree	131	19%	82 <i>%</i> 17%	18%	52%	46%	18%	85% 14%	53% 7%
future of downtown Seattle	(DK/Ref)	2	0%	0%	1070	10%		1070	2%	-
	Net Agree	+436	+62	+65	+63	-13	+7	+64	+71	+86
Agree: I would feel safe visiting	Agroo	522	75%	75%	74%	94%	91%	79%	59%	58%
downtown Seattle during the	Agree Disagree	178	25%	25%	26%	54 <i>%</i>	9%	21%	41%	38 <i>%</i> 42%
day	(DK/Ref)	1/0	2370	23/0	2070	070	570	21/0	41/0	42/0
uay	Net Agree	+344	+49	+49	+49	+89	+81	+58	+18	+16
	A	246	350/	400/	2004	4.404	700/	270/	2201	120/
Agree: I would feel safe visiting	Agree	246	35%	40%	30%	44%	70%	37%	22%	12%
downtown Seattle at night	Disagree	453	65%	60%	70%	56%	30%	62%	78%	88%
	(DK/Ref)	1 207	0%	-	0%	-	-	0% 25	- 	- -77
	Net Agree	-207	-30	-19	-40	-12	+41	-25	-55	-//

								Par	ty	
						Non-				
		n	%	Male	Female	binary	Socialist	Dem	Ind	Rep
Number of cases		700		339	340	13	59	454	124	63
Row percent			100%	48%	49%	2%	8%	65%	18%	9%
Agree: I trust the City of Seattle	Agree	216	31%	33%	29%	35%	38%	35%	19%	17%
to spend my tax dollars	Disagree	483	69%	67%	71%	65%	62%	65%	81%	83%
responsibly	(DK/Ref)	1	0%	0%	-	-	-	0%	-	-
	Net Agree	-267	-38	-34	-42	-30	-24	-29	-63	-66
Agree: All things considered,	Agree	394	56%	60%	52%	86%	57%	60%	48%	43%
growth and development has	Disagree	306	44%	40%	48%	14%	43%	40%	52%	57%
been a positive for my area	(DK/Ref)	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
	Net Agree	+87	+12	+19	+5	+73	+14	+20	-3	-14
Agree: I'm proud to call myself a	Agree	537	77%	76%	77%	75%	84%	87%	50%	49%
Seattleite	Disagree	163	23%	24%	23%	25%	16%	13%	50%	51%
	(DK/Ref)	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
	Net Agree	+375	+54	+53	+55	+50	+68	+74	-1	-2
Agree: I trust that the city has an	Agree	113	16%	18%	15%	6%	19%	18%	11%	11%
effective plan to address the	Disagree	586	84%	82%	85%	94%	81%	82%	88%	89%
critical issues facing our city like	(DK/Ref)	1	0%	0%	-	-	-	-	1%	-
homelessness, affordability, and public safety	Net Agree	-473	-68	-64	-70	-88	-62	-64	-77	-77
Agree: The City of Seattle has	Agree	535	76%	72%	81%	53%	66%	76%	80%	86%
enough money to address	Disagree	154	22%	26%	18%	47%	34%	22%	20%	14%
important priorities; they just	(DK/Ref)	11	2%	2%	1%	-	-	2%	-	-
need to spend it more	Net Agree	+381	+54	+47	+64	+7	+31	+54	+59	+72
effectively Agree: The city has made	Agree	272	39%	43%	36%	27%	26%	43%	34%	27%
meaningful progress in reducing	-	425	59% 61%	43% 57%	30% 63%	73%	26% 70%	43% 57%	34% 65%	73%
the number of homeless	Disagree (DK/Ref)	425	1%	51%	63% 1%	13%	70% 4%	57%	65% 1%	13%
encampments in Seattle	Net Agree	4 -153	-22	- -15	-27	- -47	4% -45	-13	-31	- -45
		-100	-22	-13	-27	-47	-+5	-13	-21	-45

					Gender			Pa	rτy	
		Γ				Non-				
		n	%	Male	Female	binary	Socialist	Dem	Ind	Rep
Number of cases		700		339	340	13	59	454	124	63
Row percent			100%	48%	49%	2%	8%	65%	18%	9%
Agree: City policies that have A	gree	484	69%	69%	70%	47%	34%	68%	79%	88%
increased business costs and the Di	isagree	205	29%	29%	29%	53%	62%	30%	21%	12%
failure to adequately address (D	DK/Ref)	11	2%	2%	1%	-	4%	2%	-	-
public safety make it hard to N	et Agree	+279	+40	+40	+41	-6	-28	+39	+57	+75
start or grow a business in										
Impact: Closing encampments in 1	– Very little impact	61	9%	6%	11%	8%	42%	4%	11%	4%
parks, on sidewalks, and on 2		44	6%	5%	7%	25%	21%	6%	3%	-
other public right of ways 3		54	8%	8%	6%	34%	14%	9%	2%	8%
4		47	7%	6%	8%	13%	10%	7%	3%	4%
5		83	12%	13%	11%	15%	8%	13%	12%	6%
6		66	9%	9%	10%	-	-	12%	9%	3%
7	– Very significant impact	345	49%	53%	47%	5%	5%	49%	60%	74%
(C	Don't know/Refused)	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
M	1ean	700	5.32	5.56	5.17	3.21	2.41	5.49	5.69	6.12
Impact: Addressing property 1	– Very little impact	25	4%	2%	4%	8%	15%	2%	8%	-
crime like theft and car break-ins 2		22	3%	3%	4%	-	16%	2%	1%	-
3		45	6%	5%	7%	25%	15%	6%	5%	2%
4		65	9%	10%	9%	-	21%	9%	7%	8%
5		95	14%	14%	13%	24%	16%	15%	10%	8%
6		115	16%	16%	17%	24%	12%	20%	9%	10%
7	 Very significant impact 	333	48%	50%	45%	20%	5%	46%	60%	71%
(C	Don't know/Refused)	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
M	1ean	700	5.66	5.79	5.56	4.82	3.61	5.78	5.79	6.40

					Gender			Pa	rty	
						Non-				
		n	%	Male	Female	binary	Socialist	Dem	Ind	Rep
Number of cases		700		339	340	13		454	124	63
Row percent			100%	48%	49%	2%	8%	65%	18%	9%
Impact: Maintaining bridges and	1 – Very little impact	23	3%		4%	-	5%	3%	2%	5%
infrastructure	2	16	2%		2%	-	2%	2%	2%	4%
	3	17	2%		1%	-	1%	2%	5%	2%
	4	90	13%		15%	8%		15%	9%	11%
	5	125	18%	17%	19%	12%	11%	17%	19%	27%
	6	136	19%	21%	18%	7%	13%	22%	17%	14%
	7 – Very significant impact	292	42%	41%	41%	73%	58%	39%	46%	37%
	(Don't know/Refused)	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
	Mean	700	5.65	5.63	5.62	6.46	5.91	5.61	5.78	5.43
Impact: Addressing racially	1 – Very little impact	80	11%	18%	5%	5%	2%	7%	22%	33%
biased policing	2	37	5%	7%	4%	7%	-	5%	5%	10%
	3	47	7%	8%	6%	6%	1%	7%	7%	10%
	4	100	14%	13%	15%	11%	6%	14%	18%	19%
	5	123	18%	12%	23%	12%	8%	20%	13%	14%
	6	86	12%	14%	11%	21%	14%	14%	11%	2%
	7 – Very significant impact	227	32%	28%	36%	38%	69%	33%	24%	13%
	(Don't know/Refused)	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
	Mean	700	4.88	4.47	5.25	5.33	6.38	5.08	4.23	3.28
Impact: Making Seattle a good	1 – Very little impact	29	4%	4%	4%	22%	11%	3%	5%	2%
place to do business	2	19	3%	3%	2%	6%	12%	2%	3%	-
	3	45	6%	7%	6%	28%	13%	6%	4%	5%
	4	92	13%	10%	17%	12%	26%	12%	13%	6%
	5	164	23%	23%	25%	12%	23%	27%	13%	19%
	6	97	14%	15%	13%	14%	2%	15%	15%	15%
	7 – Very significant impact	253	36%	40%	34%	6%	13%	34%	47%	53%
	(Don't know/Refused)	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
	Mean	700	5.35	5.49	5.29	3.49	3.94	5.39	5.59	5.96

		Gender				Party			
					Non-				
	n	%	Male	Female	binary	Socialist	Dem	Ind	Rep
	700		339	340	13	59	454	124	63
		100%	48%	49%	2%	8%	65%	18%	9%
1 – Very little impact	23	3%	4%	2%	-	14%	3%	2%	-
2	26	4%	2%	5%	25%	9%	4%	4%	-
3	21	3%	3%	3%	12%	6%	3%	4%	-
4	52	7%	8%	6%	7%	16%	6%	6%	12%
5	88	13%	13%	11%	42%	15%	13%	8%	12%
6	104	15%	17%	14%	-	11%	16%	16%	12%
7 – Very significant impact	385	55%	52%	59%	15%	28%	56%	61%	64%
(Don't know/Refused)	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
Mean	700	5.87	5.83	5.96	4.24	4.57	5.93	6.06	6.29
1 – Very little impact	111	16%	21%	11%	24%	-	9%	29%	54%
2	42	6%	8%	4%	-	-	6%	7%	8%
3	57	8%	8%	8%	-	4%	8%	8%	12%
4	91	13%	11%	15%	-	9%	15%	9%	11%
5	133	19%	19%	19%	25%	17%	20%	20%	10%
6	83	12%	11%	13%	12%	17%	13%	9%	2%
7 – Very significant impact	184	26%	23%	29%	39%	54%	28%	18%	3%
	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
Mean	700	4.54	4.23	4.84	4.94	6.10	4.84	3.83	2.33
1 – Very little impact	63	9%	7%	11%	8%	40%	5%	9%	7%
2		4%	4%	4%	14%	10%	5%	1%	-
3		7%	8%	6%	28%	20%	7%	6%	2%
4					-				2%
5					18%				3%
6									7%
7 – Very significant impact									79%
	_		-			-	-	-	-
Mean	700	5.46	5.58	5.39	4.10	2.73	5.58	5.86	6.30
	3 4 5 6 7 - Very significant impact (Don't know/Refused) Mean 1 - Very little impact 2 3 4 5 6 7 - Very significant impact (Don't know/Refused) Mean 1 - Very little impact 2 3 4 5 6 7 - Very significant impact (Don't know/Refused)	1 - Very little impact 23 2 26 3 21 4 52 5 88 6 104 7 - Very significant impact 385 (Don't know/Refused) - Mean 700 1 - Very little impact 111 2 42 3 57 4 91 5 133 6 83 7 - Very significant impact 184 (Don't know/Refused) - Mean 700 1 - Very little impact 63 2 30 3 52 4 44 5 63 2 30 3 52 4 46 5 68 6 77 7 - Very significant impact 365 (Don't know/Refused) - 7 Very significant impact 365	1 - Very little impact 23 3% 2 26 4% 3 21 3% 4 52 7% 5 88 13% 6 104 15% 7 - Very significant impact 385 55% (Don't know/Refused) - - Mean 700 5.87 1 - Very little impact 111 16% 2 42 6% 3 57 8% 4 91 13% 5 133 19% 6 83 12% 7 - Very significant impact 184 26% (Don't know/Refused) - - Mean 700 4.54 1 - Very little impact 63 9% 2 30 4% 3 52 7% 4 66 7% 5 68 10% 6 77 11% </td <td>700 339 1 - Very little impact 23 3% 4% 2 26 4% 2% 3 21 3% 3% 4 52 7% 8% 5 88 13% 13% 6 104 15% 17% 7 - Very significant impact 385 55% 52% (Don't know/Refused) - - - Mean 700 5.87 5.83 1 - Very little impact 111 16% 21% 2 42 6% 8% 3 57 8% 8% 4 91 13% 11% 5 133 19% 19% 6 83 12% 11% 700 4.54 4.23 11% 6 83 12% 11% 7 Very significant impact 63 9% 1 Very significant impact <t< td=""><td>n % Male Female 700 339 340 100% 48% 49% 1 - Very little impact 23 3% 4% 2% 2 36 4% 2% 5% 3 21 3% 3% 3% 4 52 7% 8% 6% 5 88 13% 11% 11% 6 104 15% 17% 14% 7 - Very significant impact 385 55% 52% 59% (Don't know/Refused) - - - - Mean 700 5.87 5.83 5.96 1 - Very little impact 111 16% 21% 11% 2 6 8% 8% 8% 4 2 6% 8% 8% 5 133 19% 19% 19% 6 133 19% 11% 13%</td><td>n % Male Female Non-binary 700 339 340 13 1 - Very little impact 23 3% 4% 2% 2 26 4% 2% 5% 25% 3 21 3% 3% 3% 12% 4 52 7% 8% 6% 7% 5 88 13% 11% 42% - 7 - Very significant impact 385 55% 52% 59% 15% (Don't know/Refused) - - - - - Mean 700 5.87 5.83 5.96 4.24 1 - Very little impact 111 16% 21% 11% 24% 2 42 6% 8% 4% - 3 3 13 19% 11% 24% 2 42 6% 8% 4 - - 5 5</td><td>n % Male Female Non-binary Socialist 1 - Very little impact 23 3% 4% 2% 8% 1 - Very little impact 23 3% 4% 2% 8% 2 - Very little impact 23 3% 4% 2% 9% 3 - Very little impact 23 3% 4% 2% 9% 4 26 4% 2% 5% 9% 4 52 7% 8% 6% 7% 16% 5 88 13% 11% 42% 15% 28% (Don't know/Refused) -</td><td>$\begin{array}{c c c c c c c c c c c c c c c c c c c$</td><td>n % Male Female Non- binary Socialist Dem Ind 1 00 339 340 13 59 454 124 1 100% 48% 49% 2% 8% 65% 18% 1 - Very little impact 23 3% 4% 2% 5% 25% 9% 4% 4% 3 21 3% 3% 3% 12% 6% 3% 4% 4 52 7% 8% 6% 7% 16% 6% 6% 6% 3% 4% 6 104 15% 17% 14% - 11% 16% 66% 6%</td></t<></td>	700 339 1 - Very little impact 23 3% 4% 2 26 4% 2% 3 21 3% 3% 4 52 7% 8% 5 88 13% 13% 6 104 15% 17% 7 - Very significant impact 385 55% 52% (Don't know/Refused) - - - Mean 700 5.87 5.83 1 - Very little impact 111 16% 21% 2 42 6% 8% 3 57 8% 8% 4 91 13% 11% 5 133 19% 19% 6 83 12% 11% 700 4.54 4.23 11% 6 83 12% 11% 7 Very significant impact 63 9% 1 Very significant impact <t< td=""><td>n % Male Female 700 339 340 100% 48% 49% 1 - Very little impact 23 3% 4% 2% 2 36 4% 2% 5% 3 21 3% 3% 3% 4 52 7% 8% 6% 5 88 13% 11% 11% 6 104 15% 17% 14% 7 - Very significant impact 385 55% 52% 59% (Don't know/Refused) - - - - Mean 700 5.87 5.83 5.96 1 - Very little impact 111 16% 21% 11% 2 6 8% 8% 8% 4 2 6% 8% 8% 5 133 19% 19% 19% 6 133 19% 11% 13%</td><td>n % Male Female Non-binary 700 339 340 13 1 - Very little impact 23 3% 4% 2% 2 26 4% 2% 5% 25% 3 21 3% 3% 3% 12% 4 52 7% 8% 6% 7% 5 88 13% 11% 42% - 7 - Very significant impact 385 55% 52% 59% 15% (Don't know/Refused) - - - - - Mean 700 5.87 5.83 5.96 4.24 1 - Very little impact 111 16% 21% 11% 24% 2 42 6% 8% 4% - 3 3 13 19% 11% 24% 2 42 6% 8% 4 - - 5 5</td><td>n % Male Female Non-binary Socialist 1 - Very little impact 23 3% 4% 2% 8% 1 - Very little impact 23 3% 4% 2% 8% 2 - Very little impact 23 3% 4% 2% 9% 3 - Very little impact 23 3% 4% 2% 9% 4 26 4% 2% 5% 9% 4 52 7% 8% 6% 7% 16% 5 88 13% 11% 42% 15% 28% (Don't know/Refused) -</td><td>$\begin{array}{c c c c c c c c c c c c c c c c c c c$</td><td>n % Male Female Non- binary Socialist Dem Ind 1 00 339 340 13 59 454 124 1 100% 48% 49% 2% 8% 65% 18% 1 - Very little impact 23 3% 4% 2% 5% 25% 9% 4% 4% 3 21 3% 3% 3% 12% 6% 3% 4% 4 52 7% 8% 6% 7% 16% 6% 6% 6% 3% 4% 6 104 15% 17% 14% - 11% 16% 66% 6%</td></t<>	n % Male Female 700 339 340 100% 48% 49% 1 - Very little impact 23 3% 4% 2% 2 36 4% 2% 5% 3 21 3% 3% 3% 4 52 7% 8% 6% 5 88 13% 11% 11% 6 104 15% 17% 14% 7 - Very significant impact 385 55% 52% 59% (Don't know/Refused) - - - - Mean 700 5.87 5.83 5.96 1 - Very little impact 111 16% 21% 11% 2 6 8% 8% 8% 4 2 6% 8% 8% 5 133 19% 19% 19% 6 133 19% 11% 13%	n % Male Female Non-binary 700 339 340 13 1 - Very little impact 23 3% 4% 2% 2 26 4% 2% 5% 25% 3 21 3% 3% 3% 12% 4 52 7% 8% 6% 7% 5 88 13% 11% 42% - 7 - Very significant impact 385 55% 52% 59% 15% (Don't know/Refused) - - - - - Mean 700 5.87 5.83 5.96 4.24 1 - Very little impact 111 16% 21% 11% 24% 2 42 6% 8% 4% - 3 3 13 19% 11% 24% 2 42 6% 8% 4 - - 5 5	n % Male Female Non-binary Socialist 1 - Very little impact 23 3% 4% 2% 8% 1 - Very little impact 23 3% 4% 2% 8% 2 - Very little impact 23 3% 4% 2% 9% 3 - Very little impact 23 3% 4% 2% 9% 4 26 4% 2% 5% 9% 4 52 7% 8% 6% 7% 16% 5 88 13% 11% 42% 15% 28% (Don't know/Refused) -	$\begin{array}{c c c c c c c c c c c c c c c c c c c $	n % Male Female Non- binary Socialist Dem Ind 1 00 339 340 13 59 454 124 1 100% 48% 49% 2% 8% 65% 18% 1 - Very little impact 23 3% 4% 2% 5% 25% 9% 4% 4% 3 21 3% 3% 3% 12% 6% 3% 4% 4 52 7% 8% 6% 7% 16% 6% 6% 6% 3% 4% 6 104 15% 17% 14% - 11% 16% 66% 6%

					Gender			Pa	rty	
						Non-				
		n	%	Male	Female	binary	Socialist	Dem	Ind	Rep
Number of cases		700		339	340	13	59	454	124	63
Row percent			100%	48%	49%	2%	8%	65%	18%	9%
Impact: Closing encampments in	1-3 Little impact	159	23%	19%	25%	67%	77%	19%	16%	13%
parks, on sidewalks, and on	4/(DK)	47	7%	6%	8%	13%	10%	7%	3%	4%
other public right of ways	5-7 Significant impact	494	71%	75%	68%	20%	13%	74%	81%	83%
Impact: Addressing property	1-3 Little impact	92	13%	10%	15%	33%	46%	10%	13%	2%
crime like theft and car break-ins	4/(DK)	65	9%	10%	9%	-	21%	9%	7%	8%
	5-7 Significant impact	543	78%	80%	76%	67%	33%	81%	79%	90%
Impact: Maintaining bridges and	1-3 Little impact	56	8%	10%	7%	-	8%	8%	9%	11%
infrastructure	4/(DK)	90	13%	11%	15%	8%	11%	15%	9%	11%
	5-7 Significant impact	553	79%	79%	78%	92%	81%	78%	83%	79%
Impact: Addressing racially	1-3 Little impact	165	24%	33%	15%	18%	3%	19%	34%	52%
biased policing	4/(DK)	100	14%	13%	15%	11%	6%	14%	18%	19%
	5-7 Significant impact	436	62%	54%	70%	71%	91%	67%	48%	28%
Impact: Making Seattle a good	1-3 Little impact	93	13%	13%	12%	57%	36%	12%	12%	7%
place to do business	4/(DK)	92	13%	10%	17%	12%	26%	12%	13%	6%
	5-7 Significant impact	515	74%	78%	71%	31%	37%	76%	75%	87%
Impact: Addressing violent crime	1-3 Little impact	70	10%	10%	10%	37%	29%	9%	9%	_
and gun violence	4/(DK)	52	7%	8%	6%	7%	16%	6%	6%	12%
	5-7 Significant impact	577	82%	82%	84%	56%	55%	85%	85%	88%
	o y olganicarie impact	577	02/0	02/0	01/0	50/0	5570	0070	0070	00/1
Impact: Addressing climate	1-3 Little impact	209	30%	37%	24%	24%	4%	23%	44%	74%
change	4/(DK)	91	13%	11%	15%	-	9%	15%	9%	11%
	5-7 Significant impact	400	57%	52%	61%	76%	88%	62%	47%	15%
Impact: Shutting down open air	1-3 Little impact	144	21%	19%	21%	51%	70%	17%	16%	9%
drug markets	4/(DK)	46	7%	7%	7%	-	13%	7%	4%	2%
_	5-7 Significant impact	510	73%	74%	73%	49%	17%	76%	80%	89%

				Gender N				Ра	rty	
						Non-				
		n	%	Male	Female	binary	Socialist	Dem	Ind	Rep
Number of cases		700		339	340	13	59	454	124	63
Row percent			100%	48%	49%	2%	8%	65%	18%	9%
Taxes in Seattle given the level	Much too high	182	26%	26%	26%	5%	8%	20%	41%	53%
of services the city provides	Somewhat too high	220	31%	30%	33%	17%	23%	31%	35%	32%
	Too low	91	13%	12%	13%	37%	38%	12%	8%	4%
	About right	206	29%	32%	27%	41%	31%	36%	15%	11%
	(Don't know)	1	0%	-	0%	-	-	0%	-	-
Taxes in Seattle given the level	Too high	402	57%	56%	60%	22%	31%	52%	77%	85%
of services the city provides	About right/(DK)	207	30%	32%	27%	41%		36%	15%	11%
	Too low	91	13%	12%	13%	37%	38%	12%	8%	4%
	Net Too high	+311	+44	+44	+47	-15	-6	+39	+69	+81
Downtown Seattle recovery	1 – Very pessimistic	99	14%	13%	15%	6%	12%	10%	28%	22%
sentiment	2	165	24%	26%	22%	5%		23%	23%	35%
	3	313	45%	42%	46%	83%	54%	48%	36%	30%
	4	100	14%	16%	13%	6%	20%	15%	9%	12%
	5 – Very optimistic	21	3%	2%	4%	-	-	3%	4%	2%
	(Don't know/Refused)	2	0%	0%	-	-	-	0%	-	-
	Mean	698	2.68	2.68	2.68	2.90	2.81	2.79	2.39	2.37
Downtown Seattle recovery	1-2 Pessimistic	264	38%	39%	37%	11%	26%	33%	50%	57%
sentiment	3/(DK)	315	45%	42%	46%	83%	54%	48%	36%	30%
	4-5 Optimistic	121	17%	19%	17%	6%	20%	19%	13%	14%
Public safety preference: Need	Need action on public safety	373	53%	57%	50%	32%	3%	51%	70%	81%
action on public safety vs.	Address root causes	322	46%	43%	49%	68%	94%	48%	29%	17%
Address root causes	(Both)	4	1%	-	1%	-	2%	0%	1%	1%
	(Neither)	1	0%	0%	-	-	-	-	0%	-
	(Don't know/Refused)	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-

					Gender			Pa	rty	
						Non-				
		n	%	Male	Female	binary	Socialist	Dem	Ind	Rep
Number of cases		700		339	340	13	59	454	124	63
Row percent			100%	48%	49%	2%	8%	65%	18%	9%
Homelessness/housing	Prioritize housing for homelessness	373	53%	54%	53%	41%	32%	54%	57%	62%
preference: Prioritize housing for	Address broader housing affordability crisis	316	45%	45%	45%	59%	68%	46%	38%	31%
homelessness vs. Address	(Both)	1	0%	0%	-	-	-	-	1%	-
broader housing affordability	(Neither)	10	1%	1%	1%	-	-	0%	4%	7%
crisis	(Don't know/Refused)	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
City budget deficit preference:	Focus on the basics	473	68%	64%	72%	30%	40%	66%	77%	85%
Focus on the basics vs. Maintain	Maintain spending and raise new taxes	216	31%	35%	25%	70%	60%	33%	19%	14%
spending and raise new taxes	(Both)	1	0%	-	0%	-	-	0%	-	-
	(Neither)	7	1%	1%	1%	-	-	1%	3%	2%
	(Don't know/Refused)	3	0%	0%	1%	-	-	0%	1%	-
Public safety preference: Need	Need action on public safety	373	53%	57%	50%	32%	3%	51%	70%	81%
action on public safety vs.	Address root causes	322	46%	43%	49%	68%	94%	48%	29%	17%
Address root causes	(Both/Neither/DK/Ref)	5	1%	0%	1%	-	2%	0%	2%	1%
	Net Need action on public safety	+51	+7	+15	+1	-36	-91	+3	+41	+64
Homelessness/housing	Prioritize housing for homelessness	373	53%	54%	53%	41%	32%	54%	57%	62%
preference: Prioritize housing for	Address broader housing affordability crisis	316	45%	45%	45%	59%	68%	46%	38%	31%
homelessness vs. Address	(Both/Neither/DK/Ref)	10	1%	2%	1%	-	-	0%	5%	7%
broader housing affordability crisis	Net Prioritize housing for homelessness	+57	+8	+9	+8	-19	-36	+8	+19	+31
City budget deficit preference:	Focus on the basics	473	68%	64%	72%	30%	40%	66%	77%	85%
, , ,		216	31%	35%	25%	70%		33%	19%	14%
						-	-			2%
	Net Focus on the basics	+256	+37	+28	+47	-40	-20	+33	+59	+71
Focus on the basics vs. Maintain spending and raise new taxes	Maintain spending and raise new taxes (Both/Neither/DK/Ref) Net Focus on the basics	11	2%	1%	2%	-	-	1%	4%	

					Gender			Par	ty	
						Non-				
		n	%	Male	Female	binary	Socialist	Dem	Ind	Rep
Number of cases		700		339	340	13	59	454	124	63
Row percent			100%	48%	49%	2%	8%	65%	18%	9%
Support: Investing in the	1 – Strongly oppose	64	9%	8%	10%	15%		7%	12%	10%
continued revitalization of	2	48	7%	7%	6%	11%		7%	7%	6%
Seattle Center by bringing back	3	67	10%	8%	12%	-	15%	10%	6%	10%
the Sonics, redoing Memorial	4	127	18%	16%	21%	19%	18%	18%	22%	13%
Stadium which is used by high	5	163	23%	24%	23%	40%	27%	23%	22%	25%
school sport teams across the	6	74	11%	13%	9%	-	1%	11%	10%	15%
state, and making it easier to get	7 – Strongly support	156	22%	25%	20%	15%	9%	25%	21%	20%
from Seattle Center to the new	(Don't know/Refused)	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
Waterfront	Mean	700	4.60	4.78	4.46	4.16	3.60	4.76	4.50	4.63
Support: Providing support and	1 – Strongly oppose	36	5%	5%	5%	8%	6%	5%	8%	3%
funding for small- and medium-	2	52	7%	8%	6%	14%	14%	5%	11%	12%
sized Seattle businesses to help	3	63	9%	9%	8%	19%	8%	10%	9%	7%
them benefit from the economic	4	157	22%	18%	27%	17%	23%	24%	20%	14%
opportunities that big events like	5	156	22%	23%	22%	10%	29%	22%	20%	22%
Major League Baseball's All-Star	6	96	14%	13%	15%	21%	6%	13%	15%	22%
Game, the National Hockey	7 – Strongly support	137	20%	23%	16%	11%	14%	21%	18%	19%
League's Winter Classic, and the	(Don't know/Refused)	1	0%	-	0%	-	-	0%	-	-
upcoming 2026 FIFA World Cup present	Mean	699	4.69	4.77	4.65	4.13	4.27	4.78	4.49	4.82
Support: Keeping construction	1 – Strongly oppose	82	12%	11%	12%	25%	3%	9%	23%	16%
for light rail to West Seattle and		34	5%	4%	6%	2370	570	4%	23 <i>%</i> 9%	8%
Ballard on track to open in 2032		52	57% 7%	4% 7%	8%	_	4%	4% 6%	10%	14%
even if it costs more	1	74	11%	9%	12%		2%	10%	10%	25%
		99	14%	14%	12%	6%	270 9%	18%	8%	23% 9%
	5	85	14%	14%	14%	070	14%	13%	3% 11%	3 <i>%</i> 8%
	7 – Strongly support	274	39%	42%	35%	- 69%		41%	30%	21%
	(Don't know/Refused)	2/4	35%	4270	33%	09%	00%	4170	50%	2170
	Mean	700	- 5.04	5.18	4.88	- 5.38	6.28	5.23	4.22	- 4.12
	ivicali	/00	5.04	5.18	4.00	5.58	0.28	5.25	4.22	4.12

					Gender			Pa	rty	
						Non-				
		n	%	Male	Female	binary	Socialist	Dem	Ind	Rep
Number of cases		700		339	340	13	59	454	124	63
Row percent			100%	48%	49%	2%	8%	65%	18%	9%
Support: Working with the state		97	14%	14%	14%	13%	6%	11%	24%	23%
to fund a "lid" over I-5 where it	2	56	8%	8%	8%	-	-	7%	10%	17%
cuts through the downtown to	3	56	8%	7%	9%	-	2%	9%	8%	6%
free up new real estate for	4	130	19%	15%	22%	20%	18%	19%	19%	18%
housing, parks, and public	5	107	15%	16%	15%	6%	3%	17%	14%	16%
spaces and reconnect our	6	76	11%	12%	9%	12%	22%	10%	12%	5%
neighborhoods	7 – Strongly support	176	25%	28%	22%	49%	49%	27%	13%	14%
	(Don't know/Refused)	2	0%	-	0%	-	-	0%	-	-
	Mean	698	4.47	4.60	4.32	5.38	5.74	4.62	3.77	3.60
Support: Investing in the	1-3 Oppose	179	26%	23%	28%	26%	45%	23%	25%	27%
continued revitalization of	4/(DK)	127	18%	16%	21%	19%	18%	18%	22%	13%
Seattle Center by bringing back	5-7 Support	393	56%	61%	51%	55%	37%	59%	53%	61%
the Sonics, redoing Memorial										
Support: Providing support and	1-3 Oppose	152	22%	23%	19%	41%	29%	19%	27%	22%
funding for small- and medium-	4/(DK)	158	23%	18%	28%	17%	23%	24%	20%	14%
sized Seattle businesses to help	5-7 Support	390	56%	59%	53%	42%	48%	56%	53%	63%
them benefit from the economic										
Support: Keeping construction	1-3 Oppose	167	24%	22%	26%	25%	7%	19%	42%	37%
for light rail to West Seattle and	4/(DK)	74	11%	9%	12%	-	2%	10%	10%	25%
Ballard on track to open in 2032	5-7 Support	459	66%	69%	62%	75%	91%	71%	48%	38%
even if it costs more										
Support: Working with the state	1-3 Oppose	209	30%	29%	31%	13%	8%	27%	42%	46%
to fund a "lid" over I-5 where it	4/(DK)	132	19%	15%	23%	20%	18%	19%	19%	18%
cuts through the downtown to	5-7 Support	359	51%	56%	46%	67%	74%	54%	39%	36%
free up new real estate for										
Pre-pandemic downtown visit	Once a week or more	142	20%	22%	19%	5%	15%	20%	21%	25%
frequency (non-work)	A few times a month	238	34%	32%	36%	20%	45%	33%	33%	30%
	A few times a year	209	30%	30%	30%	46%	28%	32%	28%	22%
	Rarely	70	10%	10%	11%	-	7%	9%	11%	16%
	Never	39	6%	6%	4%	29%	2%	6%	7%	6%
	(Refused)	2	0%	-	1%	-	4%	-	-	-

					Gender			Pa	rty	
						Non-				
		n	%	Male	Female	binary	Socialist	Dem	Ind	Rep
Number of cases		700		339	340	13	59	454	124	63
Row percent			100%	48%	49%	2%	8%	65%	18%	9%
Pre-pandemic downtown visit	Weekly	142	20%	22%	19%	5%	15%	20%	21%	25%
frequency (non-work)	Few times a month	238	34%	32%	36%	20%		33%	33%	30%
	Less often	320	46%	46%	45%	75%	40%	46%	46%	45%
Current downtown visit	Much more often	55	8%	9%	6%	6%	5%	8%	9%	8%
frequency compared to pre-	Somewhat more often	40	6%	7%	5%	-	10%	6%	5%	2%
pandemic	About the same	173	25%	27%	21%	63%	44%	27%	15%	11%
	Somewhat less often	139	20%	18%	23%	-	20%	22%	15%	14%
	Much less often	292	42%	39%	45%	31%	19%	37%	57%	65%
	(Don't know/Refused)	1	0%	-	0%	-	2%	-	-	-
Current downtown visit	More often	95	14%	16%	11%	6%	15%	14%	14%	10%
frequency compared to pre-	Same/(DK/Ref)	174	25%	27%	21%	63%	46%	27%	15%	11%
pandemic	Less often	431	62%	57%	67%	31%	39%	59%	71%	79%
	Net More often	-337	-48	-41	-56	-25	-24	-46	-57	-70
Duration of residency	<2 years	15	2%	2%	2%	12%	2%	2%	2%	-
	2-5 years	126	18%	17%	18%	41%	31%	18%	13%	14%
	6-10 years	130	19%	20%	17%	17%	27%	19%	15%	16%
	11-20 years	139	20%	22%	19%	11%	20%	19%	21%	25%
	>20 years	282	40%	39%	42%	8%	16%	41%	49%	44%
Duration of residency	1-10 years	270	39%	39%	38%	69%	60%	40%	29%	31%
	11-20 years	139	20%	22%	19%	11%	20%	19%	21%	25%
	>20 years	290	41%	40%	43%	20%	20%	42%	50%	44%

					Gender			Pa	rty	
						Non-				
		n	%	Male	Female	binary	Socialist	Dem	Ind	Rep
Number of cases		700		339	340	13	59	454	124	63
Row percent			100%	48%	49%	2%	8%	65%	18%	9%
Party	Strong Democrat	260	37%	35%	42%	-	-	57%	-	-
	Not very strong Democrat	117	17%	18%	16%	7%	-	26%	-	-
	Independent, closer to Democratic party	76	11%	10%	11%	23%	-	17%	-	-
	Independent	44	6%	7%	5%	8%	-	-	36%	-
	Independent, closer to Republican party	25	4%	5%	3%	-	-	-	-	40%
	Not very strong Republican	23	3%	4%	3%	-	-	-	-	37%
	Strong Republican	15	2%	2%	2%	5%	-	-	-	23%
	Socialist	59	8%	7%	9%	38%	100%	-	-	-
	(Something else/Don't know/Refused)	80	11%	12%	10%	19%	-	-	64%	-
Party	Socialist	59	8%	7%	9%	38%	100%	-	-	-
	Democrat	454	65%	63%	69%	30%	-	100%	-	-
	Independent	124	18%	19%	15%	27%	-	-	100%	-
	Republican	63	9%	11%	7%	5%	-	-	-	100%
Perceived personal ideology	1 – Very liberal	150	21%	18%	24%	43%	80%	19%	12%	4%
	2	133	19%	18%	19%	44%	10%	25%	9%	2%
	3	167	24%	28%	21%	-	9%	31%	10%	12%
	4	120	17%	15%	19%	8%	-	16%	27%	20%
	5	61	9%	9%	9%	5%	-	5%	16%	29%
	6	18	3%	3%	2%	-	-	1%	3%	14%
	7 – Very conservative	12	2%	2%	2%	-	-	1%	2%	10%
	(Don't know/Refused)	38	5%	7%	4%	-	1%	1%	21%	8%
	Mean	662	2.87	2.96	2.82	1.88	1.28	2.69	3.53	4.66
Perceived personal ideology	Liberal	451	64%	64%	64%	87%	99%	75%	32%	18%
	Moderate	158	23%	22%	23%	8%		18%	48%	28%
	Conservative	91	13%		13%			7%	20%	54%

					Gender			Pai	ty	
						Non-				
		n	%	Male	Female	binary	Socialist	Dem	Ind	Rep
Number of cases		700		339	340	13	59	454	124	63
Row percent			100%	48%	49%	2%	8%	65%	18%	9%
Perceived city council ideology	1 – Very liberal	160	23%	26%	21%	16%	3%	17%	40%	48%
	2	119	17%	17%	18%	6%	1%	19%	16%	16%
	3	101	14%	15%	14%	-	11%	16%	9%	15%
	4	119	17%	16%	17%	48%		19%	6%	10%
	5	90	13%	13%	14%	6%	31%	14%	6%	5%
	6	39	6%	5%	6%	-	17%	5%	3%	4%
	7 – Very conservative	28	4%	4%	4%	15%	6%	4%	4%	-
	(Don't know/Refused)	43	6%	5%	7%	9%	2%	5%	14%	2%
	Mean	657	3.13	3.00	3.21	3.90	4.58	3.26	2.40	2.16
Perceived city council ideology	Liberal	381	54%	58%	52%	22%	16%	53%	66%	79%
	Moderate	163	23%	21%	24%	57%	32%	24%	20%	12%
	Conservative	157	22%	21%	24%	21%	53%	23%	14%	8%
Homeowner	Homeowner	350	50%	52%	49%	38%	29%	50%	54%	63%
	Renter	350	50%	48%	51%	62%	71%	50%	46%	37%
Ethnicity	White or Caucasian	511	73%	74%	72%	80%	75%	75%	64%	73%
	African American or Black	28	4%	3%	4%	6%	6%	4%	4%	6%
	Hispanic or Latino	42	6%	5%	7%	-	7%	6%	8%	1%
	Asian or Pacific Islander	56	8%	8%	8%	-	4%	8%	6%	16%
	Something else	49	7%	7%	6%	14%	7%	6%	12%	2%
	(Refused)	14	2%	2%	1%	-	1%	1%	7%	2%
Ethnicity	White or Caucasian	511	73%	74%	72%	80%	75%	75%	64%	73%
	African American or Black	28	4%	3%	4%	6%	6%	4%	4%	6%
	Hispanic or Latino	42	6%	5%	7%	-	7%	6%	8%	1%
	Asian or Pacific Islander	56	8%	8%	8%	-	4%	8%	6%	16%
	Another ethnicity/(Ref)	63	9%	9%	8%	14%	8%	7%	19%	4%

					Gender			Pai	ty	
						Non-				
		n	%	Male	Female	binary	Socialist	Dem	Ind	Rep
Number of cases		700		339	340	13	59	454	124	63
Row percent			100%	48%	49%	2%	8%	65%	18%	9%
Ethnicity	White	511	73%	74%	72%	80%	75%	75%	64%	73%
	POC	175	25%	24%	27%	20%	24%	24%	30%	24%
	(Ref)	14	2%	2%	1%	-	1%	1%	7%	2%
Age (Replaced)	18-29	132	19%	18%	17%	72%	31%	19%	14%	18%
	30-39	176	25%	25%	25%	23%	39%	27%	18%	15%
	40-49	123	18%	18%	18%	-	18%	16%	21%	21%
	50-64	140	20%	18%	22%	5%	3%	20%	27%	18%
	65+	129	18%	20%	18%	-	8%	18%	20%	28%
Two-Age Split	18-39	308	44%	44%	43%	95%	71%	45%	32%	33%
	40+	392	56%	56%	57%	5%	29%	55%	68%	67%
Generation	18-39	308	44%	44%	43%	95%	71%	45%	32%	33%
	40-64	263	38%	36%	40%	5%		37%	48%	39%
	65+	129	18%	20%	18%	-	8%	18%	20%	28%
Education	Some grade school	3	0%	-	0%	8%	-	0%	1%	-
	Some high school	1	0%	-	0%	-	-	0%	-	-
	Graduated high school	16	2%	2%	3%	-	-	2%	2%	7%
	Technical/vocational school	25	4%	3%	4%	-	5%	3%	6%	4%
	Some college/<4-year degree	132	19%	22%	17%	11%	26%	17%	20%	24%
	Graduated college/4-year degree	291	42%	41%	42%	51%	39%	45%	33%	38%
	Graduate/professional degree	221	32%	31%	32%	30%	31%	33%	31%	27%
	(Refused)	12	2%	1%	2%	-	-	1%	6%	-
Education	<4-year degree	188	27%	28%	26%	19%	31%	23%	36%	35%
	4-year degree+	512	73%	72%	74%	81%	69%	77%	64%	65%
Education	Less than college	188	27%	28%	26%	19%	31%	23%	36%	35%
	Graduated college	291	42%	41%	42%	51%	39%	45%	33%	38%
	Graduate/professional degree	221	32%		32%			33%	31%	27%

					Gender			Pai	rty	
		ľ				Non-			-	
		n	%	Male	Female	binary	Socialist	Dem	Ind	Rep
Number of cases		700		339	340	13	59	454	124	63
Row percent			100%	48%	49%	2%	8%	65%	18%	9%
Gender	Male	339	48%	100%	-	-	41%	47%	51%	61%
	Female	340	49%	-	100%	-	50%	52%	42%	38%
	Non-binary	13	2%	-	-	100%	8%	1%	3%	1%
	(Refused)	8	1%	-	-	-	-	1%	4%	-
Region	South	200	29%	28%	29%	13%	36%	30%	26%	13%
	Central	200	29%	30%	26%	35%	36%	26%	31%	33%
	North	301	43%	42%	44%	52%	29%	43%	43%	54%
City Council District	1	109	16%	17%	15%	7%	12%	17%	17%	8%
-	2	91	13%	12%	15%	6%	24%	14%	9%	5%
	3	109	16%	17%	13%	25%	30%	13%	20%	11%
	4	88	13%	14%	12%	12%	6%	12%	12%	23%
	5	102	15%	13%	16%	20%	14%	12%	21%	21%
	6	112	16%	15%	17%	20%	9%	20%	9%	10%
	7	91	13%	13%	13%	11%	6%	13%	10%	22%
Vote History (PG18 PG20 PG22)	0-3/6	378	54%	56%	51%	61%	52%	52%	53%	71%
	4-5/6	175	25%	22%	27%	33%	32%	23%	30%	21%
	6/6	147	21%	21%	22%	6%	16%	24%	17%	8%
Gender/Generation	M 18-39	148	21%	44%	-	-	26%	22%	15%	23%
	M 40-64	123	18%	36%	-	-	8%	17%	24%	20%
	M 65+	69	10%	20%	-	-	8%	8%	12%	18%
	F 18-39	145	21%	-	43%	-	37%	22%	13%	10%
	F 40-64	135	19%	-	40%	-	14%	19%	22%	18%
	F 65+	61	9%	-	18%	-	-	10%	7%	10%
	Other	21	3%	-	-	100%	8%	2%	7%	1%

					Gender			Ра	rty	
						Non-				
		n	%	Male	Female	binary	Socialist	Dem	Ind	Rep
Number of cases		700		339	340	13	59	454	124	63
Row percent			100%	48%	49%	2%	8%	65%	18%	9%
Party/Gender	D Male	213	30%	63%	-	-	-	47%	-	-
	D Female	234	33%	-	69%	-	-	52%	-	-
	R/I Male	102	15%	30%	-	-	-	-	51%	61%
	R/I Female	76	11%	-	22%	-	-	-	42%	38%
	Other	75	11%	7%	9%	100%	100%	2%	7%	1%

					Ag	e (Replac	ed)			Ethnicity	
		n	%	18-29	30-39	40-49	50-64	65+	White	POC	(Ref)
Number of cases		700		132	176	123	140	129	511	175	14
Row percent			100%	19%	25%	18%	20%	18%	73%	25%	2%
QOL Index	Mean	700	4.66	5.17	4.99	4.00	4.00	5.04	4.79	4.35	3.72
Seattle right direction/Wrong	Right direction	333	48%	57%	55%	34%	39%	50%	51%	37%	35%
track	Wrong track	365	52%	42%	45%	65%	61%	50%	48%	63%	65%
	(Don't know/Refused)	2	0%	1%	-	1%	-	-	0%	1%	-
	Net Right direction	-33	-5	+15	+9	-31	-23	+1	+3	-26	-30
Best thing about living in Seattle	Environment/Nature/Outdoors/Natural beauty	348	50%	54%	52%	46%	46%	51%	51%	48%	36%
	Location/Geography/Puget Sound	137	20%	18%	22%	13%	24%	19%	20%	17%	20%
	Weather/Summer/Climate	97	14%	6%	12%	20%	10%	22%	13%	16%	7%
	Community/Culture/Neighborhoods/Small city	88	13%	17%	15%	11%	11%	9%	12%	13%	25%
	Amenities/Food/Entertainment/Music/Sports	77	11%	11%	15%	10%	13%	5%	13%	7%	7%
	Diversity/Tolerance/Politics/Progressivism	68	10%	10%	13%	6%	9%	10%	9%	13%	0%
	Walkability/Transit	42	6%	8%	6%	3%	7%	6%	7%	3%	0%
	Jobs/Economy/Property values/No income tax	34	5%	4%	6%	9%	4%	2%	4%	6%	6%
	Family/Friends/Hometown	23	3%	3%	2%	1%	6%	5%	3%	4%	12%
	Planning to leave/Has complaints about Seattle	17	2%	1%	1%	2%	5%	4%	2%	2%	8%
	Other	22	3%	4%	1%	7%	1%	4%	3%	3%	0%
	Nothing/Don't know	15	2%	2%	1%	1%	3%	4%	2%	2%	7%

					Age	e (Replac	ed)			Ethnicity	
		n	%	18-29	30-39	40-49	50-64	65+	White	РОС	(Ref)
Number of cases		700	70	10 23	176	123	140	129	511	175	14
Row percent			100%	19%	25%	18%	20%	18%	73%	25%	2%
Top issues facing Seattle	Crime/Drugs/Public safety	284	41%	27%	38%	40%	54%	43%	41%	40%	42%
	Homelessness	262	37%	29%	35%	38%	45%	41%	38%	37%	20%
	Cost of living/Affordable housing	195	28%	42%	32%	31%	18%	15%	28%	28%	21%
	Government/Politicians/Public leaders	103	15%	11%	16%	18%	13%	16%	14%	17%	0%
	Racial issues/Policing/Police brutality	43	6%	3%	8%	7%	6%	6%	7%	4%	15%
	Jobs/Economy	36	5%	7%	7%	2%	3%	6%	4%	9%	0%
	Streets/Roads/Infrastructure	30	4%	7%	4%	6%	3%	2%	4%	4%	22%
	Taxes	28	4%	4%	2%	6%	3%	6%	4%	5%	0%
	Growth/Development/Population	27	4%	8%	6%	1%	1%	3%	3%	6%	0%
	Public transportation	24	3%	6%	6%	1%	1%	3%	4%	3%	8%
	Cleanliness of city/Garbage	24	3%	3%	2%	3%	5%	5%	3%	3%	9%
	Traffic/Congestion	22	3%	2%	1%	5%	3%	5%	4%	2%	0%
	Mental health/Healthcare cost/access	20	3%	2%	5%	2%	3%	2%	3%	3%	0%
	Schools/School district/SPS/Education	12	2%	0%	2%	3%	3%	1%	2%	1%	0%
	Climate change/Environment	5	1%	0%	1%	2%	1%	0%	1%	0%	0%
	Other	6	1%	2%	0%	0%	1%	1%	1%	0%	0%
	None/Nothing/Don't know/Unsure/No comment	1	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%	1%	0%	0%	0%
Change in quality of life in	Much better	2	0%	-	0%	1%	0%	-	0%	-	-
Seattle	Somewhat better	149	21%	25%	25%	14%	13%	29%	20%	24%	15%
	The same	188	27%	38%	29%	25%	21%	22%	31%	17%	9%
	Somewhat worse	244	35%	29%	40%	38%	37%	29%	34%	37%	34%
	Much worse	116	17%	8%	6%	23%	29%	19%	14%	22%	41%
	(Don't know/Refused)	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
Change in quality of life in	Better	151	22%	25%	25%	14%	13%	29%	21%	24%	15%
Seattle	Same/(DK/Ref)	188	27%	38%	29%	25%	21%	22%	31%	17%	9%
	Worse	361	52%	37%	46%	61%	66%	48%	48%	59%	76%
	Net Better	-209	-30	-12	-21	-47	-53	-19	-27	-34	-61
Considered moving out of	Yes	388	55%	45%	55%	63%	66%	48%	54%	59%	73%
Seattle	No/(Don't know/Refused)	312	45%	55%	45%	37%	34%	52%	46%	41%	27%

					Ag	e (Replac	ed)			Ethnicity	
		n	%	18-29	30-39	40-49	50-64	65+	White	POC	(Ref)
Number of cases		700		132	176	123	140	129	511	175	14
Row percent			100%	19%	25%	18%	20%	18%	73%	25%	2%
Main reason for considering	Crime/Drugs/Public safety	118	30%	16%	31%	28%	40%	32%	30%	31%	47%
moving out of Seattle	Expensive (Cost of living/housing)	112	29%	35%	34%	37%	18%	20%	30%	26%	21%
	Government/Leadership/Politics	42	11%	7%	14%	6%	12%	15%	9%	16%	10%
	Homelessness	17	4%	6%	4%	8%	3%	1%	4%	4%	13%
	Declining quality of life	15	4%	2%	1%	3%	6%	7%	3%	4%	10%
	Taxes	12	3%	3%	1%	1%	6%	3%	3%	5%	-
	Work/Job opportunities/Business leaving	12	3%	8%	2%	5%	1%	-	3%	3%	-
	Traffic/Congestion	9	2%	3%	1%	2%	3%	5%	3%	1%	-
	Growth/Development/Space	7	2%	6%	2%	1%	-	1%	2%	1%	-
	Closer to family	7	2%	6%	1%	-	1%	3%	2%	2%	-
	Cleanliness/Garbage	7	2%	-	2%	-	3%	3%	2%	2%	-
	Schools/School district/SPS/Education	6	2%	-	4%	1%	2%	-	2%	-	-
	Weather	3	1%	2%	-	1%	-	2%	0%	2%	-
	Other	18	5%	6%	2%	6%	2%	9%	6%	2%	-
	None/Nothing/Don't know/Unsure/No comment	3	1%	-	-	-	3%	-	0%	2%	-
Still actively considering moving	Yes	323	83%	71%	78%	94%	88%	84%	81%	90%	84%
out of Seattle	No/(Don't know/Refused)	65	17%	29%	22%	6%	12%	16%	19%	10%	16%
Considered moving/actively	Yes, still actively considering	323	46%	32%	42%	60%	57%	41%	43%	53%	61%
considering moving out of	Yes, no longer actively considering	65	9%	13%	12%	4%	8%	8%	10%	6%	12%
Seattle	No/(Don't know/Refused)	312	45%	55%	45%	37%	34%	52%	46%	41%	27%
Agree: I'm optimistic about the	Strongly agree	106	15%	19%	14%	12%	14%	17%	13%	21%	7%
future of this region	Somewhat agree	318	45%	58%	57%	35%	30%	44%	49%	34%	38%
	Somewhat disagree	170	24%	16%	17%	37%	31%	24%	23%	27%	34%
	Strongly disagree	104	15%	8%	12%	16%	25%	13%	14%	18%	20%
	(Don't know/Refused)	2	0%	-	-	-	-	1%		-	-

Number of cases Row percent Agree: A thriving downtown Stro	rongly agree	n 700	% 100%	18-29 132	30-39	40-49	50-64	65+	White	DOC	(5.0)
Row percent		700	100%	132	470				vvince	POC	(Ref)
			100%		176	123	140	129	511	175	14
Agree: A thriving downtown Stro			100/0	19%	25%	18%	20%	18%	73%	25%	2%
		391	56%	41%	49%	51%	73%		54%	60%	55%
e e e e e e e e e e e e e e e e e e e	omewhat agree	227	32%	47%	36%	36%	18%	24%	33%	29%	45%
	omewhat disagree	54	8%	7%	9%	10%	5%	7%	8%	6%	-
	rongly disagree	28	4%	5%	6%	3%	4%	2%	4%	4%	-
(Do	oon't know/Refused)	1	0%	-	-	-	-	1%	0%	-	-
Agree: I'm worried about the Stre	rongly agree	334	48%	32%	42%	58%	61%	48%	44%	59%	50%
future of downtown Seattle Sor	omewhat agree	233	33%	49%	31%	22%	29%	36%	36%	25%	43%
Sor	omewhat disagree	97	14%	12%	22%	15%	7%	11%	15%	11%	7%
Stro	rongly disagree	34	5%	5%	6%	5%	4%	4%	5%	5%	-
(Dc	0on't know/Refused)	2	0%	1%	-	1%	-	-	0%	-	-
Agree: I would feel safe visiting Stre	rongly agree	268	38%	62%	46%	32%	21%	28%	41%	31%	33%
downtown Seattle during the Sor	omewhat agree	254	36%	27%	34%	42%	38%	42%	37%	35%	31%
day Sor	omewhat disagree	113	16%	9%	15%	15%	28%	15%	14%	22%	16%
Stro	rongly disagree	65	9%	3%	5%	12%	13%	15%	8%	13%	20%
(Dc	on't know/Refused)	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
Agree: I would feel safe visiting Stro	rongly agree	99	14%	31%	15%	11%	8%	5%	16%	10%	_
downtown Seattle at night Sor	omewhat agree	148	21%	22%	25%	24%	14%	20%	22%	19%	21%
Sor	omewhat disagree	190	27%	27%	26%	24%	29%	30%	28%	26%	14%
Stro	rongly disagree	263	38%	20%	33%	41%	49%	46%	34%	45%	65%
(Dc	on't know/Refused)	1	0%	-	-	1%	-	-	0%	-	-
Agree: I trust the City of Seattle Stro	rongly agree	15	2%	1%	2%	2%	4%	2%	1%	4%	_
to spend my tax dollars Sor	omewhat agree	201	29%	34%	35%	21%	17%	35%	30%	25%	15%
	omewhat disagree	235	34%	42%	34%	34%	30%	29%	35%	31%	17%
	rongly disagree	247	35%	23%	29%	43%	50%	34%	33%	39%	68%
(Dc	oon't know/Refused)	1	0%	-	-	-	-	1%	0%	-	_

					Age	e (Replace	ed)			Ethnicity	
		n	%	18-29	30-39	40-49	50-64	65+	White	POC	(Ref)
Number of cases		700		132	176	123	140	129	511	175	14
Row percent			100%	19%	25%	18%	20%	18%	73%	25%	2%
Agree: All things considered,	Strongly agree	109	16%	25%	19%	11%	10%	12%	16%	16%	7%
growth and development has	Somewhat agree	284	41%	51%	49%	31%	34%	35%	42%	37%	34%
been a positive for my area	Somewhat disagree	170	24%	15%	21%	29%	28%	29%	24%	26%	24%
	Strongly disagree	137	20%	9%	11%	29%	28%	24%	19%	21%	36%
	(Don't know/Refused)	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
Agree: I'm proud to call myself a	Strongly agree	299	43%	52%	44%	35%	36%	46%	46%	32%	39%
Seattleite	Somewhat agree	238	34%	33%	42%	33%	28%	34%	33%	39%	22%
	Somewhat disagree	102	15%	9%	9%	24%	20%	13%	12%	21%	22%
	Strongly disagree	61	9%	6%	5%	9%	16%	8%	9%	8%	18%
	(Don't know/Refused)	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
Agree: I trust that the city has an	Strongly agree	3	0%	-	0%	-	0%	1%	1%	-	-
effective plan to address the	Somewhat agree	110	16%	13%	15%	12%	15%	24%	17%	13%	15%
critical issues facing our city like	Somewhat disagree	279	40%	52%	44%	37%	30%	36%	40%	41%	23%
homelessness, affordability, and	Strongly disagree	306	44%	36%	41%	50%	54%	38%	43%	46%	62%
public safety	(Don't know/Refused)	1	0%	-	-	1%	-	-	0%	-	-
Agree: The City of Seattle has	Strongly agree	305	44%	41%	43%	40%	54%	39%	40%	52%	50%
enough money to address	Somewhat agree	230	33%	33%	30%	30%	27%	45%	36%	27%	-
important priorities; they just	Somewhat disagree	114	16%	21%	16%	22%	12%	10%	16%	16%	35%
need to spend it more	Strongly disagree	40	6%	3%	8%	5%	6%	5%	6%	3%	6%
effectively	(Don't know/Refused)	11	2%	2%	2%	3%	1%	1%	2%	1%	9%
Agree: The city has made	Strongly agree	34	5%	3%	4%	8%	6%	3%	4%	6%	9%
meaningful progress in reducing	Somewhat agree	237	34%	34%	38%	32%	26%	38%	37%	27%	18%
the number of homeless	Somewhat disagree	215	31%	36%	33%	25%	27%	32%	29%	36%	22%
encampments in Seattle	Strongly disagree	210	30%	26%	25%	32%	42%	27%	29%	32%	50%
	(Don't know/Refused)	4	1%	-	-	3%	-	-	1%	-	-

	n	%			Age (Replaced)				Ethnicity		
		70	18-29	30-39	40-49	50-64	65+	White	POC	(Ref)	
	700		132	176	123	140	129	511	175	14	
		100%	19%	25%	18%	20%	18%	73%	25%	2%	
ongly agree	303	43%	30%	36%	48%	56%	48%	40%	53%	47%	
mewhat agree	181	26%	22%	25%	25%	26%	31%	27%	24%	13%	
mewhat disagree	142	20%	35%	27%	13%	9%	16%	23%	13%	25%	
ongly disagree	63	9%	12%	10%	11%	7%	4%	9%	9%	15%	
on't know/Refused)	11	2%	1%	1%	3%	2%	1%	2%	1%	-	
			/								
ree										45%	
Sagree			24%	29%	53%	56%			45%	55%	
			-	-	-	-			-	-	
t Agree	+150	+21	+53	+41	-6	-12	+25	+26	+10	-9	
ree	618	88%	88%	85%	87%	91%	90%	87%	90%	100%	
sagree	81	12%	12%	15%	13%	9%	9%	12%	10%	-	
K/Ref)	1	0%	-	-	-	-	1%	0%	-	-	
t Agree	+536	+77	+76	+71	+74	+82	+81	+75	+79	-	
ree	567	81%	81%	72%	80%	90%	85%	80%	84%	93%	
sagree	131	19%	18%	28%	19%	10%	15%	20%	16%	7%	
K/Ref)	2	0%	1%	-	1%	-	-	0%	-	-	
t Agree	+436	+62	+63	+44	+61	+79	+69	+60	+68	+86	
ree	522	75%	89%	80%	73%	59%	71%	78%	66%	64%	
sagree										36%	
K/Ref)	-	-	-			-			-	-	
t Agree	+344	+49	+78	+60	+47	+17	+41	+56	+31	+28	
ree	246	35%	53%	41%	35%	22%	25%	38%	29%	21%	
sagree										79%	
K/Ref)			-	- 22,0							
t Agree	-207	-30	+6	-18		-57	-51	-24	-42	-58	
sa K/ resa K/ t resa K/ t resa K/ t resa K/	ngree /Ref) Agree ee /Ref) Agree ee ngree /Ref) Agree ee ngree /Ref) Agree	agree 274 /Ref) 2 Agree +150 ee 618 agree 81 /Ref) 1 Agree +536 ee 567 agree 567 agree 567 agree 567 agree 522 agree 523 /Ref) - agree 246 agree 453 /Ref) 1	gree 274 39% /Ref) 2 0% Agree +150 +21 ee 618 88% ngree 81 12% /Ref) 1 0% Agree 567 81% ngree 131 19% /Ref) 2 0% ngree 522 75% ngree 522 75% ngree 1436 +62 ee 522 75% ngree 144 +49 ee 246 35% ngree 246 35% ngree 453 65% /Ref) 1 0%	gree 274 39% 24% /Ref) 2 0% - Agree +150 +21 +53 gree 618 88% 88% gree 81 12% 12% /Ref) 1 0% - Agree +536 +77 +76 ee 567 81% 81% ngree 131 19% 18% /Ref) 2 0% 1% Agree 522 75% 89% ngree 522 75% 89% ngree 178 25% 11% /Ref) - - - Agree +344 +49 +78 gree 246 35% 53% ngree 246 35% 53% ngree 453 65% 47% /Ref) 1 0% -	gree 274 39% 24% 29% /Ref) 2 0% - - Agree +150 +21 +53 +41 ee 618 88% 88% 85% igree 81 12% 12% 15% /Ref) 1 0% - - Agree +536 +77 +76 +71 ee 567 81% 81% 22% /Ref) 2 0% 1% - Agree 131 19% 18% 28% /Ref) 2 0% 1% - Agree 522 75% 89% 80% igree 522 75% 89% 80% igree 522 75% 89% 80% igree 178 25% 11% 20% /Ref) - - - - Agree 134 +49 +78 +60 ee 522 75% 89% 53%	gree 274 39% 24% 29% 53% /Ref) 2 0% - - Agree +150 +21 +53 +41 -6 ee 618 88% 88% 85% 87% gree 618 12% 12% 15% 13% /Ref) 1 0% - - - Agree +536 +77 +76 +71 +74 ee 567 81% 81% 72% 80% ngree 131 19% 18% 28% 19% /Ref) 2 0% 1% - 1% Agree 567 81% 81% 72% 80% gree 567 81% 81% 72% 80% gree 522 75% 89% 80% 73% gree 522 75% 89% 80% 73% gree 522 75% 89% 80% 27% Agree 178 25%	gree 274 39% 24% 29% 53% 56% /Ref) 2 0% - - - - Agree +150 +21 +53 +41 -6 -12 ee 618 88% 88% 85% 87% 91% gree 618 88% 88% 85% 87% 91% /Ref) 1 0% - - - - Agree +536 +77 +76 +71 +74 +82 ee 567 81% 81% 72% 80% 90% gree 567 81% 81% 72% 80% 90% gree 131 19% 18% 28% 19% 10% /Ref) 2 0% 11% - 14% +41 +61 +79 gree 522 75% 89% 80% 73% 59% gree 522 75% 89% 80% 22% 41% +61 +79	gree (Ref) Agree274 2 0%39% 24% 0%29% 53% 56% 1% 1% 1% 1% 1% 1% 1% 1%56% 1% 1% 1% 1% 9% 9% 9% 9% 9% 9% 9% 11% 	gree 274 39% 24% 29% 53% 56% 37% 37% Agree +150 +21 +53 +41 -6 -12 +25 +26 ee 618 88% 88% 85% 87% 91% 90% 87% gree 81 12% 12% 15% 13% 9% 9% 12% /Ref) 1 0% - - - - 1% 0% Agree +536 +77 776 171 174 +82 +81 +75 ee 567 81% 81% 72% 80% 90% 80% 80% gree 131 19% 18% 28% 19% 10% 15% 20% /Ref) 2 0% 1% - 1% - - 0% gree 522 75% 89% 80% 73% 59% 71% 78% gree 522 75% 89% 80% 73% 59% <t< td=""><td>gree 274 39% 24% 29% 53% 56% 37% 37% 45% Agree 110 2 0% - - - 1% 0% - Agree +150 +21 +53 +41 -6 -12 +25 +26 +10 see 618 88% 88% 85% 87% 91% 90% 87% 90% gree 81 12% 12% 15% 13% 9% 9% 12% 10% Agree 1 0% - - - - 1% 0% - - - 1% 0% - - - 1% 0% - - - 1% 0% - - - 1% 0%<!--</td--></td></t<>	gree 274 39% 24% 29% 53% 56% 37% 37% 45% Agree 110 2 0% - - - 1% 0% - Agree +150 +21 +53 +41 -6 -12 +25 +26 +10 see 618 88% 88% 85% 87% 91% 90% 87% 90% gree 81 12% 12% 15% 13% 9% 9% 12% 10% Agree 1 0% - - - - 1% 0% - - - 1% 0% - - - 1% 0% - - - 1% 0% - - - 1% 0% </td	

					Age	e (Replace	ed)			Ethnicity	
		n	%	18-29	30-39	40-49	50-64	65+	White	POC	(Ref)
Number of cases		700	70	132	176	123		129	511	175	14
Row percent			100%	19%	25%	18%		18%	73%	25%	2%
Agree: I trust the City of Seattle	Agree	216	31%	35%	37%	23%	20%	37%	32%	30%	15%
to spend my tax dollars	Disagree	483	69%	65%	63%	77%	80%	63%	68%	70%	85%
responsibly	(DK/Ref)	1	0%	-	-	-	-	1%	0%	-	-
	Net Agree	-267	-38	-30	-26	-53	-59	-26	-36	-40	-70
Agree: All things considered,	Agree	394	56%	76%	68%	42%	44%	47%	58%	53%	41%
growth and development has	Disagree	306	44%	24%	32%	58%	56%	53%	42%	47%	59%
been a positive for my area	(DK/Ref)	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
	Net Agree	+87	+12	+51	+37	-16	-13	-6	+15	+6	-19
Agree: I'm proud to call myself a	Agree	537	77%	85%	86%	67%	64%	79%	79%	71%	60%
Seattleite	Disagree	163	23%	15%	14%	33%	36%	21%	21%	29%	40%
	(DK/Ref)	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
	Net Agree	+375	+54	+69	+71	+35	+28	+59	+58	+42	+20
Agree: I trust that the city has an	Agree	113	16%	13%	15%	12%	16%	25%	17%	13%	15%
effective plan to address the	Disagree	586	84%	87%	85%	87%	84%	75%	83%	87%	85%
critical issues facing our city like	(DK/Ref)	1	0%	-	-	1%	-	-	0%	-	-
homelessness, affordability, and public safety	Net Agree	-473	-68	-75	-69	-75	-69	-50	-65	-74	-69
Agree: The City of Seattle has	Agree	535	76%	74%	73%	70%	81%	84%	76%	79%	50%
enough money to address	Disagree	154	22%	24%	25%	28%	18%	15%	22%	20%	41%
important priorities; they just	(DK/Ref)	11	2%	2%	2%	3%	1%	1%	2%	1%	9%
need to spend it more	Net Agree	+381	+54	+50	+49	+42	+63	+69	+54	+60	+8
effectively				_	-					-	
Agree: The city has made	Agree	272	39%	37%	42%	40%	32%	42%	41%	33%	28%
meaningful progress in reducing	Disagree	425	61%	63%	58%	57%	68%	58%	58%	67%	72%
the number of homeless	(DK/Ref)	4	1%	-	-	3%	-	-	1%	-	-
encampments in Seattle	Net Agree	-153	-22	-25	-15	-17	-36	-17	-17	-34	-45

					Ag	e (Replac	ed)			Ethnicity	
		n	%	18-29	30-39	40-49	50-64	65+	White	POC	(Ref)
Number of cases		700		132	176				511	175	14
Row percent			100%	19%	25%	18%	20%	18%	73%	25%	2%
Agree: City policies that have	Agree	484	69%	52%	61%	73%	82%	80%	67%	77%	60%
increased business costs and the	Disagree	205	29%	46%	38%	24%	16%	20%	32%	22%	40%
failure to adequately address	(DK/Ref)	11	2%	1%	1%	3%	2%	1%	2%	1%	-
public safety make it hard to	Net Agree	+279	+40	+6	+24	+48	+67	+60	+35	+55	+19
start or grow a business in											
Impact: Closing encampments in	1 – Very little impact	61	9%	8%	13%	7%	4%	10%	9%	7%	22%
parks, on sidewalks, and on	2	44	6%	7%	7%	5%	6%	5%	6%	7%	-
other public right of ways	3	54	8%	22%	9%	4%	1%	3%	9%	5%	-
	4	47	7%	9%	8%	5%	4%	6%	7%	6%	-
	5	83	12%	22%	14%	7%	8%	8%	13%	9%	17%
	6	66	9%	10%	8%	11%	7%	12%	9%	11%	9%
	7 – Very significant impact	345	49%	22%	40%	61%	69%	57%	48%	54%	52%
	(Don't know/Refused)	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
	Mean	700	5.32	4.48	4.86	5.76	6.03	5.63	5.26	5.51	5.23
Impact: Addressing property	1 – Very little impact	25	4%	5%	7%	2%	1%	3%	3%	5%	15%
crime like theft and car break-ins	2	22	3%	5%	4%	4%	2%	2%	3%	2%	7%
	3	45	6%	11%	11%	3%	3%	3%	7%	6%	-
	4	65	9%	7%	16%	13%	5%	5%	10%	8%	9%
	5	95	14%	18%	15%	14%	9%	12%	15%	9%	-
	6	115	16%	22%	13%	13%	14%	21%	18%	14%	6%
	7 – Very significant impact	333	48%	33%	36%	51%	66%	55%	45%	55%	62%
	(Don't know/Refused)	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
	Mean	700	5.66	5.28	5.11	5.76	6.28	6.02	5.62	5.77	5.39
<u> </u>											

				Age (Replaced)						Ethnicity	1
		n	%	18-29	30-39	40-49	50-64	65+	White	POC	(Ref)
Number of cases		700	,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,	132	176	123	140		511	175	14
Row percent			100%	19%	25%	18%	20%		73%	25%	2%
Impact: Maintaining bridges and	1 – Very little impact	23	3%	6%	3%	4%	3%	2%	4%	2%	9%
infrastructure	2	16	2%	4%	1%	4%	4%		2%	3%	15%
	3	17	2%	4%	3%	2%	1%	2%	3%	2%	-
	4	90	13%	13%	14%	19%	10%	9%	14%	11%	13%
	5	125	18%	13%	20%	18%	20%	17%	19%	14%	11%
	6	136	19%	20%	18%	15%	21%	24%	20%	18%	6%
	7 – Very significant impact	292	42%	41%	42%	38%	42%	46%	39%	50%	46%
	(Don't know/Refused)	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
	Mean	700	5.65	5.46	5.68	5.41	5.72	5.95	5.59	5.86	5.02
Impact: Addressing racially	1 – Very little impact	80	11%	6%	5%	19%	18%	11%	10%	15%	5%
biased policing	2	37	5%	5%	7%	5%	4%	4%	5%	6%	10%
	3	47	7%	6%	8%	8%	7%	5%	7%	7%	-
	4	100	14%	19%	12%	14%	14%	14%	17%	7%	24%
	5	123	18%	14%	16%	15%	20%	23%	17%	20%	-
	6	86	12%	18%	15%	8%	9%	9%	14%	10%	-
	7 – Very significant impact	227	32%	31%	36%	31%	28%	34%	30%	36%	60%
	(Don't know/Refused)	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
	Mean	700	4.88	5.09	5.19	4.50	4.54	4.96	4.87	4.86	5.43
Impact: Making Seattle a good	1 – Very little impact	29	4%	7%	6%	2%	4%	2%	4%	5%	15%
place to do business	2	19	3%	7%	0%	4%	2%	1%	3%	2%	-
	3	45	6%	9%	11%	6%	3%	2%	7%	5%	-
	4	92	13%	10%	16%	15%	11%	13%	13%	13%	31%
	5	164	23%	38%	25%	18%	14%			21%	26%
	6	97	14%		16%	18%	13%			11%	_
	7 – Very significant impact	253	36%		27%	38%	53%			43%	28%
	(Don't know/Refused)	-	-	-	-		-	-	_	-	
	Mean	700	5.35	4.73	5.08	5.45	5.82	5.76	5.34	5.46	4.64

				Age (Replaced)						Ethnicity	,
		n	%	18-29	30-39	40-49	50-64	65+	White	POC	(Ref)
Number of cases		700		132	176	123	140	129	511	175	14
Row percent			100%	19%	25%	18%	20%	18%	73%	25%	2%
Impact: Addressing violent crime 1 – Very little impact		23	3%	8%	4%	2%	1%	1%	4%	2%	-
and gun violence	26	4%		5%	4%	2%	-	3%	5%	-	
	3	21	3%	4%	3%	3%	2%	4%	3%	3%	-
	4	52	7%	12%	8%	8%	7%	4%	7%	8%	21%
	5	88	13%	16%	17%	7%	8%	13%	13%	11%	7%
	6	104	15%	14%	13%	17%	15%	16%	16%	14%	-
	7 – Very significant impact	385	55%	39%	51%	59%	65%	62%	54%	57%	72%
	(Don't know/Refused)	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
	Mean	700	5.87	5.21	5.70	6.02	6.24	6.24	5.86	5.89	6.23
Impact: Addressing climate	1 – Very little impact	111	16%	7%	9%	24%	25%	16%	15%	18%	33%
change	2	42	6%	4%	7%	7%	5%	7%	6%	5%	-
5	3	57	8%	9%	8%	6%	7%	11%	8%	8%	18%
	4	91	13%	11%	10%	17%	18%		13%	13%	15%
	5	133	19%	24%	20%	16%	15%	20%	20%	17%	7%
	6	83	12%	15%	12%	7%	12%	13%	12%	11%	12%
	7 – Very significant impact	184	26%		35%	22%	17%	23%		28%	15%
	(Don't know/Refused)	_	-	-	-	_	-	-	-	-	-
	Mean	700	4.54	5.11	4.98	4.04	4.01	4.41	4.58	4.50	3.60
Impact: Shutting down open air	1 – Very little impact	63	9%	14%	14%	7%	3%	5%	8%	12%	22%
drug markets	2	30	4%		7%	3%	3%	4%	4%	5%	-
	3	52	7%		5%	6%	4%	2%	8%	6%	6%
	4	46	7%		13%	8%	4%	3%	8%	2%	-
	5	68	10%		10%	7%	5%		10%	9%	9%
	6	77	11%		9%	9%	9%		12%	9%	11%
	7 – Very significant impact	365	52%		42%	60%	72%			57%	52%
	(Don't know/Refused)		-		,.	-	-		-	-	
	Mean	700	5.46	4.63	4.93	5.70	6.19	6.00	5.46	5.46	5.13

				Age (Replaced)						Ethnicity	
		n	%	18-29	30-39	40-49	50-64	65+	White	POC	(Ref)
Number of cases		700		132	176	123	140	129	511	175	14
Row percent			100%	19%	25%	18%	20%	18%	73%	25%	2%
Impact: Closing encampments in	1-3 Little impact	159	23%	37%	30%	16%	12%	17%	24%	20%	22%
parks, on sidewalks, and on	4/(DK)	47	7%	9%	8%	5%	4%	6%	7%	6%	-
other public right of ways	5-7 Significant impact	494	71%	54%	62%	79%	84%	77%	69%	74%	78%
Impact: Addressing property	1-3 Little impact	92	13%	20%	21%	9%	5%	8%	13%	13%	22%
crime like theft and car break-ins	4/(DK)	65	9%	7%	16%	13%	5%	5%	10%	8%	9%
	5-7 Significant impact	543	78%	73%	64%	78%	90%	87%	78%	78%	68%
Impact: Maintaining bridges and	1-3 Little impact	56	8%	14%	6%	10%	7%	4%	8%	7%	24%
infrastructure	4/(DK)	90	13%	13%	14%	19%	10%	9%	14%	11%	13%
	5-7 Significant impact	553	79%	74%	80%	71%	83%	87%	78%	82%	63%
Impact: Addressing racially	1-3 Little impact	165	24%	18%	20%	32%	29%	20%	23%	27%	16%
biased policing	4/(DK)	100	14%	19%	12%	14%	14%	14%	17%	7%	24%
	5-7 Significant impact	436	62%	63%	68%	55%	57%	66%	61%	66%	60%
Impact: Making Seattle a good	1-3 Little impact	93	13%	23%	17%	12%	9%	5%	14%	13%	15%
place to do business	4/(DK)	92	13%	10%	16%	15%	11%	13%	13%	13%	31%
	5-7 Significant impact	515	74%	67%	67%	73%	80%	82%	74%	74%	54%
Impact: Addressing violent crime	1-3 Little impact	70	10%	19%	12%	9%	5%	5%	10%	11%	-
and gun violence	4/(DK)	52	7%	12%	8%	8%	7%	4%	7%	8%	21%
	5-7 Significant impact	577	82%	70%	81%	83%	88%	91%	83%	82%	79%
Impact: Addressing climate	1-3 Little impact	209	30%	19%	24%	37%	37%	34%	29%	31%	51%
change	4/(DK)	91	13%	11%	10%	17%	18%	10%	13%	13%	15%
	5-7 Significant impact	400	57%	70%	66%	46%	45%	56%	58%	56%	35%
Impact: Shutting down open air	1-3 Little impact	144	21%	39%	26%	16%	10%	10%	20%	23%	28%
drug markets	4/(DK)	46	7%	2%	13%	8%	4%	3%	8%	2%	
	5-7 Significant impact	510	73%		61%	76%	86%	87%	72%	75%	72%

				Age (Replaced)						Ethnicity	
		n	%	18-29	30-39	40-49	50-64	65+	White	РОС	(Ref)
Number of cases		700		132	176	123	140	129	511	175	14
Row percent			100%	19%	25%	18%	20%	18%	73%	25%	2%
Taxes in Seattle given the level	Much too high	182	26%	16%	13%	38%	38%	30%	22%	35%	61%
of services the city provides	Somewhat too high	220	31%	24%	33%	30%	34%	36%		28%	21%
	Too low	91	13%	20%	19%	9%	7%	8%		12%	11%
	About right	206	29%	41%	33%	24%	22%	26%		26%	7%
	(Don't know)	1	0%	-	1%	-	-	-	0%	-	-
Taxes in Seattle given the level	Too high	402	57%	40%	46%	67%	71%	66%	55%	63%	82%
of services the city provides	About right/(DK)	207	30%	41%	34%	24%	22%	26%	32%	26%	7%
	Too low	91	13%	20%	19%	9%	7%	8%	14%	12%	11%
	Net Too high	+311	+44	+20	+27	+58	+65	+58	+41	+51	+71
Downtown Seattle recovery	1 – Very pessimistic	99	14%	7%	5%	25%	25%	12%	13%	16%	13%
sentiment	2	165	24%	20%	26%	26%	28%	16%	23%	23%	53%
	3	313	45%	56%	49%	35%	32%	50%	47%	41%	27%
	4	100	14%	14%	17%	10%	11%	20%	14%	14%	7%
	5 – Very optimistic	21	3%	3%	4%	3%	3%	2%	3%	5%	-
	(Don't know/Refused)	2	0%	-	-	1%	1%	-	0%	0%	-
	Mean	698	2.68	2.86	2.89	2.38	2.40	2.83	2.70	2.68	2.28
Downtown Seattle recovery	1-2 Pessimistic	264	38%	27%	31%	52%	53%	28%	36%	40%	66%
sentiment	3/(DK)	315	45%	56%	49%	36%	33%	50%	47%	41%	27%
	4-5 Optimistic	121	17%	17%	20%	13%	14%	21%	17%	19%	7%
Public safety preference: Need	Need action on public safety	373	53%	35%	43%	63%	71%	58%	52%	55%	61%
action on public safety vs.	Address root causes	322	46%	65%	57%	35%	28%	41%		45%	39%
Address root causes	(Both)	4	1%	_	-	2%	0%	1%		-	-
	(Neither)	1	0%	_	-	-	0%	-	0%	-	_
	(Don't know/Refused)	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-

				Age (Replaced)						Ethnicity	
		l n	%	18-29	30-39	40-49	50-64	65+	White	POC	(Ref)
Number of cases		700	70	10 23	176					175	14
Row percent			100%	19%						25%	2%
Homelessness/housing	Prioritize housing for homelessness	373	53%	43%	47%	49%	65%	64%	52%	60%	29%
preference: Prioritize housing for	Address broader housing affordability crisis	316	45%	57%	53%	50%	31%	34%	47%	38%	71%
homelessness vs. Address	(Both)	1	0%	-	-	-	1%	-	0%	-	-
broader housing affordability	(Neither)	10	1%	-	-	1%	4%	2%	1%	2%	-
crisis	(Don't know/Refused)	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
City budget deficit preference:	Focus on the basics	473	68%	54%	61%	73%	78%	74%	66%	73%	54%
Focus on the basics vs. Maintain	Maintain spending and raise new taxes	216	31%	46%	39%	26%	18%	23%	33%	25%	39%
spending and raise new taxes	(Both)	1	0%	-	-	-	0%	-	0%	-	-
	(Neither)	7	1%	-	-	-	4%	2%	1%	2%	7%
	(Don't know/Refused)	3	0%	-	-	1%	0%	1%	1%	-	-
Public safety preference: Need	Need action on public safety	373	53%	35%	43%	63%	71%	58%	52%	55%	61%
action on public safety vs.	Address root causes	322	46%	65%	57%	35%	28%	41%	47%	45%	39%
Address root causes	(Both/Neither/DK/Ref)	5	1%	-	-	2%	1%	1%	1%	-	-
	Net Need action on public safety	+51	+7	-30	-14	+28	+43	+17	+6	+11	+22
Homelessness/housing	Prioritize housing for homelessness	373	53%	43%	47%	49%	65%	64%	52%	60%	29%
preference: Prioritize housing for	Address broader housing affordability crisis	316	45%	57%	53%	50%	31%	34%	47%	38%	71%
homelessness vs. Address	(Both/Neither/DK/Ref)	10	1%	-	-	1%	5%	2%	1%	2%	-
broader housing affordability crisis	Net Prioritize housing for homelessness	+57	+8	-14	-6	-1	+34	+30	+5	+22	-42
City budget deficit preference:	Focus on the basics	473	68%	54%	61%	73%	78%	74%	66%	73%	54%
Focus on the basics vs. Maintain	Maintain spending and raise new taxes	216	31%	46%	39%	26%				25%	39%
spending and raise new taxes	(Both/Neither/DK/Ref)	11	2%	-	-	1%		3%		2%	7%
	Net Focus on the basics	+256		+7	+22	+47	+60		+33	+48	

			Age (Replaced)						,	
	n	%	18-29	30-39	40-49	50-64	65+	White	POC	(Ref)
Number of cases	700	70	132	176		140		511	175	14
Row percent		100%	19%	25%		20%	18%	73%	25%	2%
Support: Investing in the 1 – Strongly oppose	64	9%	6%	6%	12%	11%	11%	8%	12%	18%
continued revitalization of 2	48	7%	5%	11%		5%	4%	7%	4%	22%
Seattle Center by bringing back 3	67	10%	8%	13%	8%	8%	9%	10%	8%	-
the Sonics, redoing Memorial 4	127	18%	15%	18%	17%	17%	24%	18%	19%	23%
Stadium which is used by high 5	163	23%	38%	19%	19%	19%	23%	23%	24%	22%
school sport teams across the 6	74	11%	11%	7%	9%	15%	11%	11%	10%	-
state, and making it easier to get 7 – Strongly support	156	22%	15%	26%	25%	26%	18%	23%	22%	15%
from Seattle Center to the new (Don't know/Refused)	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
Waterfront Mean	700	4.60	4.67	4.56	4.53	4.75	4.52	4.63	4.59	3.69
Support: Providing support and 1 – Strongly oppose	36	5%	4%	5%	5%	6%	7%	4%	8%	-
funding for small- and medium- 2	52	7%	11%	5%	11%	5%	7%	8%	4%	18%
sized Seattle businesses to help 3	63	9%	12%	9%	8%	7%	9%	10%	6%	28%
them benefit from the economic 4	157	22%	32%	18%	20%	17%	26%	24%	19%	-
opportunities that big events like 5	156	22%	21%	21%	20%	25%	24%	22%	25%	24%
Major League Baseball's All-Star 6	96	14%	11%	18%	13%	15%	12%	14%	12%	9%
Game, the National Hockey 7 – Strongly support	137	20%	10%	23%	23%	26%	14%	17%	26%	20%
League's Winter Classic, and the (Don't know/Refused)	1	0%	-	1%	-	-	-	0%	-	-
upcoming 2026 FIFA World Cup Mean	699	4.69	4.27	4.93	4.71	4.97	4.47	4.64	4.88	4.40
present										
Support: Keeping construction 1 – Strongly oppose	82	12%	4%	8%	12%	18%	17%	9%	19%	5%
for light rail to West Seattle and 2	34	5%	1%	2%	12%	7%	3%	4%	5%	24%
Ballard on track to open in 2032 3	52	7%	9%	2%	10%	11%	7%	8%	7%	-
even if it costs more 4	74	11%	6%	8%	11%	13%	15%	11%	9%	10%
5	99	14%	14%	14%	12%	15%	15%	13%	19%	21%
6	85	12%	10%	13%	14%	9%	15%	14%	8%	-
7 – Strongly support	274	39%	55%	53%	29%	26%		41%	34%	39%
(Don't know/Refused)	-	_	-	-	-	-	-	_	-	-
Mean	700	5.04	5.77	5.67	4.57	4.33	4.66	5.18	4.65	4.74

				Age (Replaced)						Ethnicity	
		n	%	18-29	30-39	40-49	50-64	65+	White	РОС	(Ref)
Number of cases		700	70	10 25	176	123	140		511	175	14
Row percent			100%	19%	25%			18%	73%	25%	2%
Support: Working with the state	1 – Strongly oppose	97	14%	1%	12%	15%	20%	22%	13%	18%	5%
to fund a "lid" over I-5 where it		56	8%	6%	4%	9%	14%	7%	7%	9%	25%
cuts through the downtown to	3	56	8%	6%	6%	9%	10%	9%	9%	7%	-
free up new real estate for	4	130	19%	12%	14%	20%	23%	25%	18%	19%	21%
housing, parks, and public	5	107	15%	18%	15%	13%	14%	16%	15%	15%	20%
spaces and reconnect our	6	76	11%	9%	20%	9%	6%	8%	12%	7%	7%
neighborhoods	7 – Strongly support	176	25%	47%	27%	24%	13%	13%	25%	26%	21%
	(Don't know/Refused)	2	0%	-	0%	-	1%	-	0%	-	-
	Mean	698	4.47	5.57	4.87	4.30	3.69	3.80	4.54	4.28	4.31
Support: Investing in the	1-3 Oppose	179	26%	20%	31%	28%	24%	24%	26%	24%	40%
continued revitalization of	4/(DK)	127	18%	15%	18%	17%	17%	24%	18%	19%	23%
Seattle Center by bringing back	5-7 Support	393	56%	64%	52%	54%	59%	53%	57%	57%	37%
the Sonics, redoing Memorial											
Support: Providing support and	1-3 Oppose	152	22%	26%	19%	24%	18%	23%	22%	18%	46%
funding for small- and medium-	4/(DK)	158	23%	32%	19%	20%	17%	26%	24%	19%	-
sized Seattle businesses to help	5-7 Support	390	56%	42%	62%	56%	65%	51%	53%	63%	54%
them benefit from the economic											
Support: Keeping construction	1-3 Oppose	167	24%	14%	13%	34%	36%	27%	22%	30%	30%
for light rail to West Seattle and	4/(DK)	74	11%	6%	8%	11%	13%	15%	11%	9%	10%
Ballard on track to open in 2032	5-7 Support	459	66%	80%	79%	55%	51%	58%	67%	61%	60%
even if it costs more											
Support: Working with the state	1-3 Oppose	209	30%	14%	22%	34%	43%		29%	34%	30%
to fund a "lid" over I-5 where it	4/(DK)	132	19%	12%	15%	20%	24%	25%	19%	19%	21%
cuts through the downtown to	5-7 Support	359	51%	74%	63%	46%	33%	36%	53%	48%	48%
free up new real estate for											
Pre-pandemic downtown visit	Once a week or more	142	20%	11%	21%	27%	25%	18%	20%	22%	28%
frequency (non-work)	A few times a month	238	34%	27%	39%	34%	40%		34%	34%	51%
	A few times a year	209	30%	38%	29%	27%				28%	9%
	Rarely	70		12%	8%	4%	10%	16%		13%	12%
	Never	39		12%	4%		4%	2%	6%	4%	-
	(Refused)	2	0%	-	-	2%	-	-	0%	-	-

					Ag	e (Replac	ed)			Ethnicity	
			%	18-29	30-39	40-49	50-64	65+	White	POC	(Ref)
Number of cases		n 700	70	18-29	176	40-49	140			175	(Rel) 14
Row percent		,00	100%	19%	25%	123				25%	2%
			100/0	10/10	2370	10/0	20/0	20/0	, 3,0	23/0	270
Pre-pandemic downtown visit	Weekly	142	20%	11%	21%	27%	25%	18%	20%	22%	28%
frequency (non-work)	Few times a month	238	34%	27%	39%	34%	40%	29%	34%	34%	51%
	Less often	320	46%	62%	41%	39%	35%	53%	47%	44%	21%
Current downtown visit	Much more often	55	8%	20%	8%	6%	3%	2%	8%	8%	-
frequency compared to pre-	Somewhat more often	40	6%	10%	6%	6%	4%	3%	6%	7%	-
pandemic	About the same	173	25%	33%	30%	18%	20%	20%	27%	17%	28%
	Somewhat less often	139	20%	16%	19%	23%	19%	24%	20%	21%	11%
	Much less often	292	42%	21%	38%	46%	55%	50%	39%	47%	61%
	(Don't know/Refused)	1	0%	-	-	1%	-	-	0%	-	-
Current downtown visit	More often	95	14%	30%	14%	11%	7%	6%	13%	15%	-
frequency compared to pre-	Same/(DK/Ref)	174	25%	33%	30%	19%	20%	20%	27%	17%	28%
pandemic	Less often	431	62%	37%	57%	69%	73%	74%	59%	68%	72%
	Net More often	-337	-48	-7	-43	-58	-67	-68	-46	-53	-
Duration of residency	<2 years	15	2%	8%	1%	1%	-	-	2%	2%	-
	2-5 years	126	18%	39%	27%	16%	1%	4%	19%	16%	12%
	6-10 years	130	19%	23%	30%	18%	9%	10%	18%	21%	17%
	11-20 years	139	20%	10%	25%	36%	19%	9%	20%	20%	7%
	>20 years	282	40%	18%	16%	28%	70%	76%	40%	41%	63%
Duration of residency	1-10 years	270	39%	70%	58%	35%	11%	14%	39%	39%	29%
	11-20 years	139	20%	10%	25%	36%	19%	9%	20%	20%	7%
	>20 years	290	41%	20%	17%	29%	71%	77%	41%	41%	63%

					Ag	e (Replac	ed)			Ethnicity	'
			%	10.00	20.20	40.40			\A/b:to	DOC	(Def)
Number of cases		n 700	%	18-29 132	30-39 176	40-49 123	50-64 140	65+ 129	White 511	POC 175	(Ref) 14
Row percent		700	100%	19%	25%	125	20%	129		25%	
Now percent			100%	1970	2370	10/0	20%	10/0	/3/0	23/0	270
Party	Strong Democrat	260	37%	40%	35%	33%	40%	39%	38%	37%	9%
	Not very strong Democrat	117	17%	16%	23%	14%	14%	15%	17%	18%	
	Independent, closer to Democratic party	76	11%	9%	11%	12%	12%	10%	12%	7%	15%
	Independent	44	6%	1%	2%	7%	14%	8%	6%	8%	5%
	Independent, closer to Republican party	25	4%	4%	2%	4%	2%	7%	3%	3%	10%
	Not very strong Republican	23	3%	4%	2%	4%	3%	4%	3%	4%	
	Strong Republican	15	2%	1%	1%	3%	3%	3%	2%	1%	-
	Socialist	59	8%	14%	13%	9%	1%	3%	9%	8%	6%
	(Something else/Don't know/Refused)	80	11%	12%	11%	14%	10%	10%	10%	13%	54%
Party	Socialist	59	8%	14%	13%	9%	1%	3%	9%	8%	6%
	Democrat	454	65%	64%	69%	60%	66%	64%	67%	62%	24%
	Independent	124	18%	13%	13%	21%	24%	19%	15%	21%	60%
	Republican	63	9%	9%	5%	11%	8%	14%	9%	9%	10%
Perceived personal ideology	1 – Very liberal	150	21%	32%	30%	12%	13%	16%	23%	17%	30%
	2	133	19%	24%	25%	18%	11%	16%	19%	21%	11%
	3	167	24%	21%	24%	24%	24%	26%	25%	22%	15%
	4	120	17%	10%	9%	19%	30%	19%	17%	18%	8%
	5	61	9%	6%	6%	14%	10%	10%	9%	9%	5%
	6	18	3%	3%	1%	4%	4%	2%	2%	4%	7%
	7 – Very conservative	12	2%	-	2%	1%	2%	3%	1%	3%	-
	(Don't know/Refused)	38	5%	3%	4%	6%	6%	8%	5%	6%	24%
	Mean	662	2.87	2.40	2.43	3.22	3.37	3.08	2.81	3.05	2.59
Perceived personal ideology	Liberal	451	64%	78%	79%	55%	48%	58%	66%	60%	56%
	Moderate	158	23%	13%	13%	26%	36%	27%	22%	25%	31%
	Conservative	91	13%	9%	9%	19%	16%			16%	

				Age	e (Replace	ed)			Ethnicity	
	n	%	18-29	30-39	40-49	50-64	65+	White	POC	(Ref)
	700		132	176	123	140	129	511	175	14
		100%	19%	25%	18%	20%	18%	73%	25%	2%
1 – Very liberal	160	23%	12%	17%	35%	31%	22%	21%	28%	13%
2	119	17%	12%	17%	13%	27%	16%	17%	18%	6%
3	101	14%	15%	12%	11%	14%	20%	15%	12%	20%
4	119	17%	30%	19%	9%	7%	19%	18%	14%	7%
5	90	13%	15%	16%	16%	9%	7%	13%	11%	17%
6	39	6%	7%	7%	6%	3%	3%	5%	7%	-
7 – Very conservative	28	4%	5%	5%	2%	3%	5%	4%	2%	15%
(Don't know/Refused)	43	6%	3%	6%	7%	7%	8%	5%	8%	22%
Mean	657	3.13	3.69	3.46	2.84	2.53	3.02	3.20	2.89	3.87
Liberal	381	54%	39%	46%	59%	72%	58%	54%	58%	39%
Moderate	163	23%	33%	25%	16%	13%	28%	23%	23%	29%
Conservative	157	22%	27%	29%	24%	15%	15%	23%	20%	32%
Homeowner	350	50%	32%	45%	43%	62%	69%	50%	51%	44%
Renter	350	50%	68%	55%	57%	38%	31%	50%	49%	56%
White or Caucasian	511	73%	77%	77%	73%	63%	74%	100%	-	-
African American or Black	28	4%	4%	4%	3%	6%	4%	-	16%	-
Hispanic or Latino	42	6%	5%	5%	7%	9%	5%	-	24%	-
Asian or Pacific Islander	56	8%	6%	8%	12%	8%	7%	-	32%	-
Something else	49	7%	7%	5%	2%	12%	9%	-	28%	-
(Refused)	14	2%	2%	2%	3%	2%	1%	-	-	100%
White or Caucasian	511	73%	77%	77%	73%	63%	74%	100%	-	-
African American or Black	28	4%	4%	4%	3%	6%	4%	_	16%	-
Hispanic or Latino	42	6%	5%	5%	7%	9%	5%	_	24%	-
Asian or Pacific Islander	56	8%	6%	8%	12%	8%	7%	_	32%	-
Another ethnicity/(Ref)	63	9%	9%	7%	4%	14%	10%	-	28%	100%
	2 3 4 5 6 7 - Very conservative (Don't know/Refused) Mean Liberal Moderate Conservative Homeowner Renter White or Caucasian African American or Black Hispanic or Latino Asian or Pacific Islander Something else (Refused) White or Caucasian African American or Black Hispanic or Latino Asian or Pacific Islander	1 - Very liberal1602119310141195906397 - Very conservative28(Don't know/Refused)43Mean657Liberal381Moderate163Conservative157Homeowner350Renter350White or Caucasian511African American or Black28Hispanic or Latino42Asian or Pacific Islander56Something else49(Refused)14White or Caucasian511African American or Black28Hispanic or Latino42Asian or Pacific Islander56Something else49(Refused)14White or Caucasian511African American or Black28Hispanic or Latino42Asian or Pacific Islander56Mething else28Hispanic or Latino42Asian or Pacific Islander56	1 - Very liberal 160 23% 2 119 17% 3 101 14% 4 119 17% 5 90 13% 6 39 6% 7 - Very conservative 28 4% (Don't know/Refused) 43 6% Mean 657 3.13 Liberal 381 54% Moderate 163 23% Conservative 157 22% Homeowner 350 50% Renter 350 50% White or Caucasian 511 73% African American or Black 28 4% Hispanic or Latino 42 6% Something else 49 7% White or Caucasian 511 73% African American or Black 28 4% Hispanic or Latino 42 6% African American or Black 28 4% Hispanic or Latino <t< td=""><td>700 132 1 - Very liberal 160 23% 12% 2 119 17% 12% 3 101 14% 15% 4 119 17% 30% 5 90 13% 15% 6 39 6% 7% 7 - Very conservative 28 4% 5% (Don't know/Refused) 43 6% 3% Mean 657 3.13 3.69 Liberal 381 54% 39% Moderate 163 23% 33% Conservative 157 22% 27% Homeowner 350 50% 32% Renter 350 50% 68% White or Caucasian 511 73% 77% African American or Black 28 4% 4% Hispanic or Latino 42 6% 5% Something else 49 7% 7%</td><td>n % 18-29 30-39 700 132 176 100% 19% 25% 1 - Very liberal 160 23% 12% 17% 2 119 17% 12% 17% 3 101 14% 15% 12% 4 119 17% 30% 19% 5 90 13% 15% 16% 6 39 6% 7% 7% 7 - Very conservative 28 4% 5% 5% (Don't know/Refused) 43 6% 3% 6% Mean 657 3.13 3.69 3.46 Liberal 381 54% 39% 46% Moderate 163 23% 33% 25% Conservative 157 22% 27% 29% Homeowner 350 50% 68% 55% Khite or Caucasian 511 73% 77%</td><td>n % 18-29 30-39 40-49 700 132 176 123 1 - Very liberal 160 23% 12% 17% 35% 2 119 17% 12% 17% 35% 2 119 17% 12% 17% 35% 3 101 14% 15% 12% 11% 4 119 17% 30% 19% 9% 5 6 39 6% 7% 7% 6% 7 - Very conservative 28 4% 5% 5% 2% (Don't know/Refused) 43 6% 3% 6% 7% Mean 657 3.13 3.69 3.46 2.84 Liberal 381 54% 39% 46% 59% Moderate 163 23% 33% 25% 16% Conservative 157 22% 27% 29% 24%</td><td>700 132 176 123 140 1 - Very liberal 160 23% 12% 17% 35% 31% 2 119 17% 12% 17% 13% 27% 3 101 14% 15% 12% 11% 14% 4 119 17% 30% 19% 9% 7% 5 90 13% 15% 16% 16% 9% 6 7 - Very conservative 28 4% 5% 5% 2% 3% (Don't know/Refused) 43 6% 3% 6% 7% 7% Mean 657 3.13 3.69 3.46 2.84 2.53 Liberal 381 54% 39% 46% 59% 72% Moderate 163 23% 33% 25% 16% 13% Conservative 157 22% 27% 29% 24% 15% Homeow</td><td>nn%18-2930-3940-4950-6465+700132176123140129100%19%25%18%20%18%1 - Very liberal16023%12%17%35%31%22%211917%12%17%13%27%16%310114%15%12%11%14%20%411917%30%19%9%7%16%567%7%6%3%3%7%677%6%3%5%5%2%33%7 - Very conservative284%5%5%5%3%3%7 - Very conservative284%3%6%7%7%6%3%3%Mean6573.133.693.462.842.533.02Liberal38154%39%46%59%72%5%5%5%Moderate15722%27%29%24%15%15%Conservative15722%27%29%24%15%31%White or Caucasian51173%77%73%63%7%African American or Black284%4%4%3%2%15%Mite or Caucasian51173%77%7%7%63%7%Mite or Caucasian284%4%4%<t< td=""><td>n%18-2930-3940-4950-6465+White1100%13%12%11%1231401295111100%13%12%17%13322%18%73%1-Very liberal16023%12%17%35%31%22%21%211917%12%17%13%27%16%17%310114%15%12%11%14%20%15%411917%30%19%9%7%18%59013%15%16%16%3%3%5%6396%7%7%8%3%3%5%7-Very conservative284%5%5%2%3.023.023.00Mean6573.133.693.462.842.533.023.20Liberal38154%33%46%59%72%5%5%Moderate16323%33%25%16%13%28%23%Conservative15722%27%29%24%15%15%23%Homeowner35050%32%45%43%66%4%Hispanic or latino426%5%5%5%5%9%7%9%-Something else497%7%7%7%63%6%4</td><td>$\begin{array}{c c c c c c c c c c c c c c c c c c c$</td></t<></td></t<>	700 132 1 - Very liberal 160 23% 12% 2 119 17% 12% 3 101 14% 15% 4 119 17% 30% 5 90 13% 15% 6 39 6% 7% 7 - Very conservative 28 4% 5% (Don't know/Refused) 43 6% 3% Mean 657 3.13 3.69 Liberal 381 54% 39% Moderate 163 23% 33% Conservative 157 22% 27% Homeowner 350 50% 32% Renter 350 50% 68% White or Caucasian 511 73% 77% African American or Black 28 4% 4% Hispanic or Latino 42 6% 5% Something else 49 7% 7%	n % 18-29 30-39 700 132 176 100% 19% 25% 1 - Very liberal 160 23% 12% 17% 2 119 17% 12% 17% 3 101 14% 15% 12% 4 119 17% 30% 19% 5 90 13% 15% 16% 6 39 6% 7% 7% 7 - Very conservative 28 4% 5% 5% (Don't know/Refused) 43 6% 3% 6% Mean 657 3.13 3.69 3.46 Liberal 381 54% 39% 46% Moderate 163 23% 33% 25% Conservative 157 22% 27% 29% Homeowner 350 50% 68% 55% Khite or Caucasian 511 73% 77%	n % 18-29 30-39 40-49 700 132 176 123 1 - Very liberal 160 23% 12% 17% 35% 2 119 17% 12% 17% 35% 2 119 17% 12% 17% 35% 3 101 14% 15% 12% 11% 4 119 17% 30% 19% 9% 5 6 39 6% 7% 7% 6% 7 - Very conservative 28 4% 5% 5% 2% (Don't know/Refused) 43 6% 3% 6% 7% Mean 657 3.13 3.69 3.46 2.84 Liberal 381 54% 39% 46% 59% Moderate 163 23% 33% 25% 16% Conservative 157 22% 27% 29% 24%	700 132 176 123 140 1 - Very liberal 160 23% 12% 17% 35% 31% 2 119 17% 12% 17% 13% 27% 3 101 14% 15% 12% 11% 14% 4 119 17% 30% 19% 9% 7% 5 90 13% 15% 16% 16% 9% 6 7 - Very conservative 28 4% 5% 5% 2% 3% (Don't know/Refused) 43 6% 3% 6% 7% 7% Mean 657 3.13 3.69 3.46 2.84 2.53 Liberal 381 54% 39% 46% 59% 72% Moderate 163 23% 33% 25% 16% 13% Conservative 157 22% 27% 29% 24% 15% Homeow	nn%18-2930-3940-4950-6465+700132176123140129100%19%25%18%20%18%1 - Very liberal16023%12%17%35%31%22%211917%12%17%13%27%16%310114%15%12%11%14%20%411917%30%19%9%7%16%567%7%6%3%3%7%677%6%3%5%5%2%33%7 - Very conservative284%5%5%5%3%3%7 - Very conservative284%3%6%7%7%6%3%3%Mean6573.133.693.462.842.533.02Liberal38154%39%46%59%72%5%5%5%Moderate15722%27%29%24%15%15%Conservative15722%27%29%24%15%31%White or Caucasian51173%77%73%63%7%African American or Black284%4%4%3%2%15%Mite or Caucasian51173%77%7%7%63%7%Mite or Caucasian284%4%4% <t< td=""><td>n%18-2930-3940-4950-6465+White1100%13%12%11%1231401295111100%13%12%17%13322%18%73%1-Very liberal16023%12%17%35%31%22%21%211917%12%17%13%27%16%17%310114%15%12%11%14%20%15%411917%30%19%9%7%18%59013%15%16%16%3%3%5%6396%7%7%8%3%3%5%7-Very conservative284%5%5%2%3.023.023.00Mean6573.133.693.462.842.533.023.20Liberal38154%33%46%59%72%5%5%Moderate16323%33%25%16%13%28%23%Conservative15722%27%29%24%15%15%23%Homeowner35050%32%45%43%66%4%Hispanic or latino426%5%5%5%5%9%7%9%-Something else497%7%7%7%63%6%4</td><td>$\begin{array}{c c c c c c c c c c c c c c c c c c c$</td></t<>	n%18-2930-3940-4950-6465+White1100%13%12%11%1231401295111100%13%12%17%13322%18%73%1-Very liberal16023%12%17%35%31%22%21%211917%12%17%13%27%16%17%310114%15%12%11%14%20%15%411917%30%19%9%7%18%59013%15%16%16%3%3%5%6396%7%7%8%3%3%5%7-Very conservative284%5%5%2%3.023.023.00Mean6573.133.693.462.842.533.023.20Liberal38154%33%46%59%72%5%5%Moderate16323%33%25%16%13%28%23%Conservative15722%27%29%24%15%15%23%Homeowner35050%32%45%43%66%4%Hispanic or latino426%5%5%5%5%9%7%9%-Something else497%7%7%7%63%6%4	$ \begin{array}{c c c c c c c c c c c c c c c c c c c $

					Ag	e (Replac	ed)			Ethnicity	,
		n	%	18-29	30-39	40-49	50-64	65+	White	POC	(Ref)
Number of cases		700		132	176	123	140			175	14
Row percent			100%	19%	25%	18%	20%	18%	73%	25%	2%
Ethnicity	White	511	73%	77%	77%	73%	63%	74%	100%	-	-
	POC	175	25%	21%	21%	24%	35%	24%	-	100%	-
	(Ref)	14	2%	2%	2%	3%	2%	1%	-	-	100%
Age (Replaced)	18-29	132	19%	100%	-	-	-	-	20%	16%	21%
	30-39	176	25%	-	100%	-	-	-	27%	21%	22%
	40-49	123	18%	-	-	100%	-	-	18%	17%	23%
	50-64	140	20%	-	-	-	100%	-	17%	28%	22%
	65+	129	18%	-	-	-	-	100%	19%	18%	12%
Two-Age Split	18-39	308	44%	100%	100%	-	-	-	46%	37%	43%
	40+	392	56%	-	-	100%	100%	100%	54%	63%	57%
Generation	18-39	308	44%	100%	100%	-	-	-	46%	37%	43%
	40-64	263	38%	-	-	100%	100%	-	35%	45%	45%
	65+	129	18%	-	-	-	-	100%	19%	18%	12%
Education	Some grade school	3	0%	1%	1%	-	-	-	0%	-	-
	Some high school	1	0%	-	-	-	1%	-	0%	-	-
	Graduated high school	16	2%	1%	1%	4%	5%	1%	3%	1%	-
	Technical/vocational school	25	4%	7%	2%	5%	4%	1%	4%	3%	10%
	Some college/<4-year degree	132	19%	18%	15%	11%	27%	23%	18%	21%	15%
	Graduated college/4-year degree	291	42%	58%	47%	38%	32%	32%	41%	46%	13%
	Graduate/professional degree	221	32%	15%	35%	41%	27%	40%	33%	26%	39%
	(Refused)	12	2%	-	1%	1%	4%	3%	1%	2%	23%
Education	<4-year degree	188	27%	27%	19%	21%	41%	29%	26%	27%	48%
	4-year degree+	512	73%	73%	81%	79%	59%	71%	74%	73%	52%
Education	Less than college	188	27%	27%	19%	21%	41%	29%	26%	27%	48%
	Graduated college	291	42%	58%	47%	38%	32%	32%	41%	46%	
	Graduate/professional degree	221								26%	

Non- (Refi Region Sout	ale male on-binary efused)	n 700 339 340	% 100% 48%	18-29 132 19%	30-39 176 25%	40-49 123 18%	50-64 140 20%		White 511	POC 175	(Ref)
Row percent Gender Male Fem Non- (Refu Region Sout	male on-binary	339							511	175	
Gender Male Fem Non (Refi Region Sout	male on-binary			19%	25%	18%	200/			1/5	14
Fem. Non- (Refi Region Sout	male on-binary		48%				20%	18%	73%	25%	2%
Non- (Refi Region Sout	on-binary	340	-0/0	47%	49%	51%	43%	53%	49%	47%	49%
(Refi Region Sout	-	-	49%	45%	49%	49%	53%	47%	48%	52%	28%
Region Sout	efused)	13	2%	7%	2%	-	0%	-	2%	1%	-
0		8	1%	1%	1%	-	4%	-	1%	0%	23%
C	buth	200	29%	24%	27%	31%	31%	29%	27%	33%	19%
Cent	entral	200	29%	30%	32%	28%	26%	26%	30%	25%	15%
Nort	orth	301	43%	46%	41%	42%	43%	44%	43%	42%	66%
City Council District 1		109	16%	13%	14%	17%	22%	12%	15%	16%	11%
2		91	13%	11%	13%	14%	9%	17%		16%	8%
3		109	16%	14%	22%	14%	13%	13%	16%	14%	15%
4		88	13%	20%	6%	13%	10%	15%	14%	9%	17%
5		102	15%	11%	14%	19%	16%	12%	14%	14%	34%
6		112	16%	14%	21%	10%	16%	16%	15%	19%	15%
7		91	13%	16%	10%	14%	13%	14%	14%	12%	-
Vote History (PG18 PG20 PG22) 0-3/0	3/6	378	54%	77%	62%	56%	43%	29%	54%	51%	80%
4-5/	-	175	25%	18%	22%	27%	34%	24%		28%	14%
6/6		147	21%	5%	16%	17%	23%	46%	21%	21%	5%
Gender/Generation M 18	18-39	148	21%	47%	49%	-	-	-	23%	15%	28%
-	40-64	123	18%	-	-	51%	43%	-	17%	20%	15%
M 65		69	10%	-	-	-	-	53%		11%	5%
F 18	18-39	145	21%	45%	49%	-	-	-	21%	21%	7%
F 40	40-64	135	19%	-	-	49%	53%	-	18%	24%	15%
F 65 [.]	55+	61	9%	-	-	-	-	47%	9%	7%	6%
Othe	her	21	3%	8%	3%	_	4%	-	3%	2%	

					Ag	e (Replace	ed)			Ethnicity	
		n	%	18-29	30-39	40-49	50-64	65+	White	POC	(Ref)
Number of cases		700		132	176	123	140	129	511	175	14
Row percent			100%	19%	25%	18%	20%	18%	73%	25%	2%
Deute /Caudan		212	200/	210/	2.40/	200	210/	200/	220/	260/	00/
Party/Gender	D Male	213						29%			
	D Female	234	33%	31%	34%	33%	33%	35%	33%	36%	7%
	R/I Male	102	15%	13%	9%	21%	11%	21%	13%	18%	34%
	R/I Female	76	11%	7%	8%	10%	19%	12%	10%	12%	21%
	Other	75	11%	19%	16%	9%	5%	3%	11%	8%	29%

		I I		Educ	ation	Durat	ion of resi	dency	Home	owner
				<4-year	4-year	1-10	11-20			
		n	%	degree	degree+	years	years	>20 years	Owner	Renter
Number of cases		700		188	512	270	139	290	350	350
Row percent			100%	27%	73%	39%	20%	41%	50%	50%
QOL Index I	Mean	700	4.66	4.22	4.82	4.96	4.34	4.54	4.61	4.71
Seattle right direction/Wrong	Right direction	333	48%	42%	50%	54%	44%	43%	45%	50%
track	Wrong track	365	52%	58%	50%	46%	55%	57%	55%	50%
	(Don't know/Refused)	2	0%	-	0%	-	1%	0%	0%	0%
1	Net Right direction	-33	-5	-16	-0	+8	-11	-14	-10	+1
Best thing about living in Seattle	Environment/Nature/Outdoors/Natural beauty	348	50%	41%	53%	50%	51%	49%	50%	49%
	Location/Geography/Puget Sound	137	20%	20%	19%	22%	18%	18%	21%	18%
1	Weather/Summer/Climate	97	14%	15%	13%	13%	16%	14%	14%	14%
(Community/Culture/Neighborhoods/Small city	88	13%	10%	14%	15%	11%	12%	13%	12%
	Amenities/Food/Entertainment/Music/Sports	77	11%	12%	11%	12%	12%	10%	9%	13%
	Diversity/Tolerance/Politics/Progressivism	68	10%	8%	10%	10%	12%	8%	9%	11%
1	Walkability/Transit	42	6%	5%	6%	8%	5%	4%	4%	8%
L L	Jobs/Economy/Property values/No income tax	34	5%	5%	5%	5%	6%	4%	6%	4%
1	Family/Friends/Hometown	23	3%	5%	3%	3%	2%	4%	4%	3%
	Planning to leave/Has complaints about Seattle	17	2%	6%	1%	0%	3%	4%	4%	1%
	Other	22	3%	3%	3%	2%	2%	5%	3%	3%
	Nothing/Don't know	15	2%	3%	2%	1%	2%	4%	3%	1%

				Educ	ation	Durat	ion of resi	dency	Home	owner
				<4-year	4-year	1-10	11-20			
		n	%	degree	degree+	years	years	>20 years	Owner	Renter
Number of cases		700		188	512	270	139	290	350	350
Row percent			100%	27%	73%	39%	20%	41%	50%	50%
Top issues facing Seattle	Crime/Drugs/Public safety	284	41%	45%	39%	31%	47%	46%	47%	34%
	Homelessness	262	37%	41%	36%	34%	38%	40%	39%	35%
	Cost of living/Affordable housing	195	28%	22%	30%	34%	31%	21%	19%	37%
	Government/Politicians/Public leaders	103	15%	15%	14%	14%	19%	14%	17%	12%
	Racial issues/Policing/Police brutality	43	6%	6%	6%	6%	5%	7%	6%	6%
	Jobs/Economy	36	5%	4%	5%	7%	2%	5%	4%	6%
	Streets/Roads/Infrastructure	30	4%	5%	4%	6%	3%	3%	3%	6%
	Taxes	28	4%	3%	4%	2%	4%	5%	5%	3%
	Growth/Development/Population	27	4%	5%	3%	6%	3%	2%	3%	4%
	Public transportation	24	3%	3%	4%	5%	2%	2%	3%	4%
	Cleanliness of city/Garbage	24	3%	3%	3%	2%	2%	5%	4%	3%
	Traffic/Congestion	22	3%	5%	2%	4%	1%	4%	3%	4%
	Mental health/Healthcare cost/access	20	3%	2%	3%	2%	6%	2%	2%	4%
	Schools/School district/SPS/Education	12	2%	0%	2%	1%	2%	2%	3%	1%
	Climate change/Environment	5	1%	1%	1%	0%	2%	0%	0%	1%
	Other	6	1%	1%	1%	1%	0%	1%	1%	1%
	None/Nothing/Don't know/Unsure/No comment	1	0%	0%	0%	1%	0%	0%	0%	0%
Change in quality of life in	Much better	2	0%	1%	0%	0%	1%	0%	0%	0%
Seattle	Somewhat better	149	21%	17%	23%	25%	12%	22%	21%	22%
	The same	188	27%	19%	30%	35%	25%	20%	25%	29%
	Somewhat worse	244	35%	40%	33%	30%	44%	35%	35%	34%
	Much worse	116	17%	23%	14%	10%	18%	22%	19%	14%
	(Don't know/Refused)	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
Change in quality of life in	Better	151	22%	18%	23%	25%	13%	23%	21%	22%
Seattle	Same/(DK/Ref)	188	27%	19%	30%	35%	25%	20%	25%	29%
	Worse	361	52%	63%	47%	40%	62%	57%	54%	49%
	Net Better	-209	-30	-46	-24	-15			-34	-26
Considered moving out of	Yes	388	55%	64%	52%	53%	62%	55%	55%	56%
Seattle	No/(Don't know/Refused)	312	45%	36%	48%	47%	38%	45%	45%	44%

				Educ	ation	Durat	ion of resi	dency	Home	owner
				<4-year	4-year	1-10	11-20			
		n	%	degree	degree+	years	years	>20 years	Owner	Renter
Number of cases		700		188	512	270	139	290	350	350
Row percent			100%	27%	73%	39%	20%	41%	50%	50%
Main reason for considering	Crime/Drugs/Public safety	118	30%	32%	30%	28%	30%	34%	37%	24%
moving out of Seattle	Expensive (Cost of living/housing)	112	29%	25%	30%	36%	28%	23%	20%	37%
	Government/Leadership/Politics	42	11%	11%	11%	9%	9%	14%	10%	12%
	Homelessness	17	4%	7%	3%	4%	6%	4%	5%	4%
	Declining quality of life	15	4%	5%	3%	1%	2%	7%	6%	2%
	Taxes	12	3%	5%	2%	2%	3%	4%	4%	2%
	Work/Job opportunities/Business leaving	12	3%	1%	4%	5%	4%	0%	2%	4%
	Traffic/Congestion	9	2%	4%	2%	4%	1%	2%	3%	2%
	Growth/Development/Space	7	2%	1%	2%	1%	3%	2%	2%	1%
	Closer to family	7	2%	1%	2%	3%	2%	0%	1%	2%
	Cleanliness/Garbage	7	2%	2%	2%	2%	1%	2%	2%	1%
	Schools/School district/SPS/Education	6	2%	1%	2%	2%	3%	1%	2%	1%
	Weather	3	1%	1%	1%	-	3%	1%	1%	1%
	Other	18	5%	4%	5%	3%	6%	5%	4%	5%
	None/Nothing/Don't know/Unsure/No comment	3	1%	1%	1%	-	1%	1%	1%	1%
Still actively considering moving	Yes	323	83%	86%	82%	82%	86%	83%	81%	86%
out of Seattle	No/(Don't know/Refused)	65	17%	14%	18%	18%	14%	17%	19%	14%
Considered moving/actively	Yes, still actively considering	323	46%	56%	43%	43%	53%	45%	44%	48%
considering moving out of	Yes, no longer actively considering	65	9%	9%	9%	10%	9%	9%	10%	8%
Seattle	No/(Don't know/Refused)	312	45%	36%	48%	47%	38%	45%	45%	44%
Agree: I'm optimistic about the	Strongly agree	106	15%	11%	17%	17%	14%	14%	16%	15%
future of this region	Somewhat agree	318	45%	43%	46%	52%	38%	43%	42%	49%
-	Somewhat disagree	170	24%	25%	24%	17%	33%	27%	28%	20%
	Strongly disagree	104	15%	21%	13%	13%	14%	17%	14%	16%
	(Don't know/Refused)	2	0%	1%	0%	0%	1%		-	0%

				Luuc	ation	Durat	ion of resi	uency	ноте	owner
				<4-year	4-year	1-10	11-20			
		n	%	degree	degree+	years	years	>20 years	Owner	Renter
Number of cases		700		188	512	270	139	290	350	350
Row percent			100%	27%	73%	39%	20%	41%	50%	50%
Agree: A thriving downtown	Strongly agree	391	56%	62%	53%	48%	57%	63%	63%	49%
Seattle is critical to our region's	Somewhat agree	227	32%	28%	34%	41%	30%	26%	28%	37%
economic recovery	Somewhat disagree	54	8%	5%	9%	7%	9%	8%	6%	10%
	Strongly disagree	28	4%	4%	4%	5%	3%	4%	3%	4%
	(Don't know/Refused)	1	0%	1%	-	-	1%	-	-	0%
Agree: I'm worried about the	Strongly agree	334	48%	58%	44%	38%	52%	54%	50%	45%
future of downtown Seattle	Somewhat agree	233	33%	31%	34%	40%	28%	29%	31%	36%
	Somewhat disagree	97	14%	8%	16%	17%	15%	10%	14%	14%
	Strongly disagree	34	5%	3%	5%	4%	4%	6%	5%	5%
	(Don't know/Refused)	2	0%	-	0%	1%	-	-	0%	0%
Agree: I would feel safe visiting	Strongly agree	268	38%	26%	43%	47%	33%	32%	33%	44%
downtown Seattle during the	Somewhat agree	254	36%	41%	35%	34%	39%	37%	40%	33%
day	Somewhat disagree	113	16%	20%	15%	14%	15%	19%	17%	15%
	Strongly disagree	65	9%	14%	8%	5%	12%	12%	10%	8%
	(Don't know/Refused)	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
Agree: I would feel safe visiting	Strongly agree	99	14%	13%	15%	17%	15%	11%	12%	16%
downtown Seattle at night	Somewhat agree	148	21%	13%	24%	25%	19%	19%	20%	22%
	Somewhat disagree	190	27%	26%	28%	29%	22%	28%	27%	28%
	Strongly disagree	263	38%	49%	33%	30%	43%	42%	41%	34%
	(Don't know/Refused)	1	0%	-	0%	-	1%	-	0%	-
Agree: I trust the City of Seattle	Strongly agree	15	2%	2%	2%	1%	3%	3%	2%	2%
to spend my tax dollars	Somewhat agree	201	29%	22%	31%	30%	32%	26%	26%	32%
responsibly	Somewhat disagree	235	34%	33%	34%	41%	21%	33%	33%	35%
	Strongly disagree	247	35%	42%	33%	28%	43%		39%	32%
	(Don't know/Refused)	1	0%	1%	-	-	1%	-	-	0%

				Educ	ation	Durat	ion of resid	dency	Home	owner
				<4-year	4-year	1-10	11-20			
		n	%	degree	degree+	years	years	>20 years	Owner	Renter
Number of cases		700		188	512	270	139	290	350	350
Row percent			100%	27%	73%	39%	20%	41%	50%	50%
Agree: All things considered,	Strongly agree	109	16%	14%	16%	21%	13%		13%	18%
growth and development has	Somewhat agree	284	41%	30%	45%	48%	42%		39%	42%
been a positive for my area	Somewhat disagree	170	24%	28%	23%	18%	28%		27%	21%
	Strongly disagree	137	20%	29%	16%	14%	17%	26%	20%	19%
	(Don't know/Refused)	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
Agree: I'm proud to call myself a		299	43%	33%	46%	45%	38%	43%	41%	44%
Seattleite	Somewhat agree	238	34%	34%	34%	35%	36%	32%	32%	36%
	Somewhat disagree	102	15%	21%	12%	13%	15%	15%	17%	12%
	Strongly disagree	61	9%	12%	8%	7%	11%	10%	9%	8%
	(Don't know/Refused)	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
Agree: I trust that the city has an	Strongly agree	3	0%	1%	0%	0%	1%	1%	1%	0%
effective plan to address the	Somewhat agree	110	16%	11%	17%	14%	13%	18%	15%	17%
	-	279	40%	39%	40%	45%	35%	37%	36%	43%
homelessness, affordability, and	Strongly disagree	306	44%	48%	42%	40%	51%	44%	48%	40%
public safety	(Don't know/Refused)	1	0%	-	0%	0%	-	-	0%	-
Agree: The City of Seattle has	Strongly agree	305	44%	50%	41%	38%	47%	47%	45%	42%
enough money to address	Somewhat agree	230	33%	30%	34%	37%	27%	32%	33%	33%
important priorities; they just	Somewhat disagree	114	16%	13%	17%	19%	18%	14%	15%	17%
need to spend it more	Strongly disagree	40	6%	5%	6%	5%	6%	6%	6%	6%
effectively	(Don't know/Refused)	11	2%	2%	2%	2%	3%	1%	1%	2%
Agree: The city has made	Strongly agree	34	5%	5%	5%	6%	2%	6%	4%	6%
meaningful progress in reducing	Somewhat agree	237	34%	29%	36%	33%	39%	32%	37%	31%
the number of homeless	Somewhat disagree	215	31%	27%	32%	34%	25%		29%	33%
encampments in Seattle	Strongly disagree	210	30%	39%	27%	27%	33%		30%	30%
	(Don't know/Refused)	4	1%	-	1%	1%	1%	-		1%
	(,		_/0		_/0	_//	_/0			_//0
L										

				Educ	ation	Durat	ion of resi	dency	Home	owner
				<4-year	4-year	1-10	11-20			
		n	%	degree	degree+	years	years	>20 years	Owner	Renter
Number of cases		700		188	512	270	139	290	350	350
Row percent			100%	27%	73%	39%	20%	41%	50%	50%
Agree: City policies that have	Strongly agree	303	43%	50%	41%	35%	46%	50%	49%	38%
increased business costs and the		181	26%	29%	25%	28%	22%	26%	45% 24%	28%
failure to adequately address	Somewhat disagree	142	20%	11%	23%	27%	18%	15%	18%	23%
public safety make it hard to	Strongly disagree	63	9%	8%	9%	8%	11%	9%	8%	10%
start or grow a business in	(Don't know/Refused)	11	2%	1%	2%	2%	2%	0%	2%	1%
Seattle			270	1/0	2/0	270	270	0,0	270	1/0
Agree: I'm optimistic about the	Agree	424	61%	54%	63%	69%	53%	57%	57%	64%
future of this region	Disagree	274	39%	46%	37%	31%	47%		43%	36%
	(DK/Ref)	2	0%	1%	0%	0%	1%		-	0%
	Net Agree	+150	+21	+8	+26	+38	+6		+14	+28
Agree: A thriving downtown	Agree	618	88%	91%	87%	88%	87%	89%	91%	86%
Seattle is critical to our region's	Disagree	81	12%	9%	13%	12%	12%	11%	9%	14%
economic recovery	(DK/Ref)	1	0%	1%	-	-	1%	-	-	0%
	Net Agree	+536	+77	+82	+75	+77	+75	+77	+82	+71
Agree: I'm worried about the	Agree	567	81%	89%	78%	79%	80%	84%	82%	80%
future of downtown Seattle	Disagree	131	19%	11%	21%	21%	20%	16%	18%	19%
	(DK/Ref)	2	0%	-	0%	1%		-	0%	0%
	Net Agree	+436	+62	+77	+57	+58	+61	+67	+63	+61
Agree: I would feel safe visiting	Agree	522	75%	66%	78%	81%	72%		73%	76%
downtown Seattle during the	Disagree	178	25%	34%	22%	19%	28%	31%	27%	24%
day	(DK/Ref)	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
	Net Agree	+344	+49	+33	+55	+63	+45	+38	+46	+53
Agree: I would feel safe visiting	Agree	246	35%	25%	39%	41%	34%	30%	32%	38%
downtown Seattle at night	Disagree	453	65%	75%	61%	59%	66%	70%	68%	62%
	(DK/Ref)	1	0%	-	0%	-	1%	-	0%	-
	Net Agree	-207	-30	-49	-22	-17	-32	-40	-36	-23

				Educ	ation	Durat	ion of resi	dency	Home	owner
				<4-year	4-year	1-10	11-20			
		n	%	degree	degree+	years	years	>20 years	Owner	Renter
Number of cases		700		188	512	270	139	290	350	350
Row percent			100%	27%	73%	39%	20%	41%	50%	50%
Agree: I trust the City of Seattle	Agree	216	31%	25%	33%	31%	35%	29%	28%	34%
to spend my tax dollars	Disagree	483	69%	75%	67%	69%	65%	71%	72%	66%
responsibly	(DK/Ref)	1	0%	1%	-	-	1%	-	-	0%
	Net Agree	-267	-38	-50	-34	-38	-30	-42	-43	-33
Agree: All things considered,	Agree	394	56%	43%	61%	68%	55%	46%	52%	60%
growth and development has	Disagree	306	44%	57%	39%	32%	45%	54%	48%	40%
been a positive for my area	(DK/Ref)	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
	Net Agree	+87	+12	-14	+22	+37	+10	-9	+4	+21
Agree: I'm proud to call myself a	Agree	537	77%	67%	80%	80%	74%	75%	74%	80%
Seattleite	Disagree	163	23%	33%	20%	20%	26%	25%	26%	20%
	(DK/Ref)	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
	Net Agree	+375	+54	+34	+61	+60	+48	+50	+48	+60
Agree: I trust that the city has an	Agree	113	16%	13%	17%	15%	14%	19%	15%	17%
effective plan to address the	Disagree	586	84%	87%	82%	85%	86%	81%	84%	83%
-	(DK/Ref)	1	0%	-	0%	0%	-	-	0%	-
	Net Agree	-473	-68	-75	-65	-70	-73	-63	-69	-66
Agree: The City of Seattle has	Agree	535	76%	80%	75%	75%	73%	80%	78%	75%
enough money to address	Disagree	154	22%	18%	23%	24%	24%	20%	78% 21%	23%
important priorities; they just	(DK/Ref)	11	2%	2%	23%	24%	3%	1%	1%	23%
need to spend it more	Net Agree	+381	+54	+62	+52	+51	+50		+57	+52
effectively			. 54	102	. 32		. 50			. 52
Agree: The city has made	Agree	272	39%	34%	41%	38%	41%	38%	41%	37%
meaningful progress in reducing	Disagree	425	61%	66%	59%	61%	58%	62%	59%	62%
the number of homeless	(DK/Ref)	4	1%	-	1%	1%	1%	-	-	1%
encampments in Seattle	Net Agree	-153	-22	-33	-18	-22	-17	-24	-18	-25

				Educ	ation	Durat	ion of resi	dency	Home	owner
				<4-year	4-year	1-10	11-20			
		n	%	degree	degree+	years	years	>20 years	Owner	Renter
Number of cases		700		188	512	270	139	290	350	350
Row percent			100%	27%	73%	39%	20%	41%	50%	50%
			6000	700/	650/	6204	60%	7.00	700/	6604
Agree: City policies that have	Agree	484	69%		65%	62%	69%		73%	66%
increased business costs and the	0	205	29%	20%	33%	35%	29%		26%	33%
failure to adequately address	(DK/Ref)	11	2%	1%	2%	2%	2%		2%	1%
public safety make it hard to	Net Agree	+279	+40	+60	+33	+27	+39	+52	+47	+33
start or grow a business in										
Impact: Closing encampments in	1 – Very little impact	61	9%	9%	9%	8%	8%		8%	10%
parks, on sidewalks, and on	2	44	6%	8%	6%	6%	9%		7%	5%
other public right of ways	3	54	8%	9%	7%	14%	5%	3%	5%	10%
	4	47	7%	5%	7%	9%	5%	6%	6%	8%
	5	83	12%	8%	13%	16%	10%	9%	10%	14%
	6	66	9%	9%	10%	8%	10%	10%	10%	9%
	7 – Very significant impact	345	49%	52%	48%	39%	52%	58%	54%	44%
	(Don't know/Refused)	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
	Mean	700	5.32	5.33	5.32	4.97	5.39	5.61	5.51	5.13
Impact: Addressing property	1 – Very little impact	25	4%	2%	4%	4%	1%	5%	2%	5%
crime like theft and car break-ins		22	3%	6%	2%	3%	3%		3%	3%
erine ince there and car break inc	3	45	6%	3%	7%	3% 7%	9%	4%	3% 7%	6%
	4	65	9%	9%	9%	12%	14%		9%	9%
	5	95	14%		15%	17%	11%		13%	
	6	115	16%		17%	20%	8%		17%	16%
	7 – Very significant impact	333	48%		45%	38%	53%		49%	46%
	(Don't know/Refused)	555	-070	J)/0		5070	5570	5470	J /0	-070
	Mean	700	- 5.66	- 5.84	- 5.59	- 5.47	- 5.67	5.83	- 5.75	- 5.57
			5.50	5.54	5.55	5.17	2.07	5.55	5.75	3.37

				Educ	ation	Durat	ion of resi	dency	Home	owner
				<4-year	4-year	1-10	11-20			
		n	%	degree	degree+	years	years	>20 years	Owner	Renter
Number of cases		700		188	512	270	139	290	350	350
Row percent			100%	27%	73%	39%	20%	41%	50%	50%
Impact: Maintaining bridges and	1 – Very little impact	23	3%	4%	3%	2%	3%	4%	2%	4%
infrastructure	2	16	2%	4%	2%	2%	2%	3%	2%	3%
	3	17	2%	4%	2%	2%	1%	3%	2%	3%
	4	90	13%	15%	12%	12%	14%	13%	11%	15%
	5	125	18%	13%	20%	17%	23%	16%	20%	16%
	6	136	19%	14%	21%	22%	11%	21%	19%	20%
	7 – Very significant impact	292	42%	46%	40%	42%	45%	40%	43%	40%
	(Don't know/Refused)	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
	Mean	700	5.65	5.57	5.68	5.73	5.64	5.58	5.75	5.55
Impact: Addressing racially	1 – Very little impact	80	11%	11%	12%	7%	15%	14%	15%	8%
biased policing	2	37	5%	8%	4%	8%	5%	3%	4%	6%
	3	47	7%	4%	8%	7%	8%	6%	7%	7%
	4	100	14%	14%	14%	17%	12%	13%	14%	14%
	5	123	18%	14%	19%	16%	13%	21%	17%	18%
	6	86	12%	9%	14%	15%	12%	9%	12%	13%
	7 – Very significant impact	227	32%	40%	29%	29%	35%	34%	31%	34%
	(Don't know/Refused)	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
	Mean	700	4.88	4.99	4.83	4.89	4.81	4.89	4.73	5.02
Impact: Making Seattle a good	1 – Very little impact	29	4%	3%	5%	4%	5%	4%	5%	4%
place to do business	2	19	3%	2%	3%	3%	3%	2%	3%	3%
	3	45	6%	4%	7%	9%	6%	5%	5%	8%
	4	92	13%	12%	13%	13%	15%	13%	10%	16%
	5	164	23%	25%	23%	30%	15%	21%	21%	26%
	6	97	14%	13%	14%	14%	15%	13%	14%	14%
	7 – Very significant impact	253	36%	41%	34%	28%	41%	42%	42%	30%
	(Don't know/Refused)	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
	Mean	700	5.35	5.58	5.27	5.17	5.40	5.50	5.51	5.19

	n		<4-year	4-year	1-10	11.20			
	n			- ycu j	1-10	11-20			
		%	degree	degree+	years	years	>20 years	Owner	Renter
	700		188	512	270	139	290	350	350
		100%	27%	73%	39%	20%	41%	50%	50%
1 – Very little impact	23	3%	3%	3%	4%	4%	2%	2%	4%
2				4%	5%	4%	2%	3%	5%
3	21	3%	2%	3%	3%	2%	3%	3%	3%
4	52	7%	7%	8%	8%	10%	6%	7%	8%
5	88	13%	12%	13%	16%	6%	12%	14%	11%
6	104	15%	15%	15%	15%	15%	15%	16%	14%
7 – Very significant impact	385	55%	57%	54%	48%	59%	60%	55%	55%
(Don't know/Refused)	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
Mean	700	5.87	5.93	5.85	5.66	5.90	6.05	5.94	5.80
1 – Very little impact	111	16%	21%	14%	11%	16%	20%	20%	12%
2	42	6%	7%	5%	6%	9%	5%	7%	5%
3	57	8%	8%	8%	9%	8%	8%	8%	8%
4	91	13%	14%	13%	10%		15%	16%	10%
5		19%						17%	21%
6		12%	12%	12%	12%		14%	12%	12%
7 – Very significant impact									33%
	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
Mean	700	4.54	4.18	4.67	4.80	4.47	4.34	4.18	4.90
1 – Very little impact	63	9%	8%	9%	10%	7%	8%	7%	11%
2			3%	5%	6%	6%	2%	5%	4%
3			9%	7%	12%	6%		5%	10%
4									6%
5									10%
6									12%
7 – Very significant impact									47%
	_	-	-		-	-	-	-	-
Mean	700	5.46	5.68	5.37	5.07	5.49	5.80	5.64	5.28
	2 3 4 5 5 7 – Very significant impact Don't know/Refused) Mean 1 – Very little impact 2 7 – Very significant impact Don't know/Refused) Mean 1 – Very little impact 2 3 4 5 5 7 – Very significant impact 2 3 4 5 5 7 – Very significant impact 2 3	22632145258851047 - Very significant impact385Don't know/Refused)-47001 - Very little impact11124235749151335887 - Very significant impact184Don't know/Refused)-Mean7001 - Very little impact632303524465777 - Very significant impact635777 - Very significant impact635777 - Very significant impact635777 - Very significant impact3655777 - Very significant impact36555577 - Very significant impact3655777 - Very significant impact3655777 - Very significant impact3655777 - Very significant impact3657 - Very significant impact3657 - Very significant impact365	2 26 4% 3 21 3% 4 52 7% 5 104 15% 5 104 15% 5 104 15% 5 00't know/Refused) - 4 700 5.87 4 700 5.87 4 42 6% 3 57 8% 4 91 13% 5 133 19% 5 133 19% 5 83 12% 7 - Very significant impact 184 26% Don't know/Refused) - - 4 90 133 19% 5 83 12% - 7 - Very significant impact 63 9% - 2 30 4% - - 4 66 7% - - 5 68 10% - - 6 77 11% - -	2 26 4% 4% 3 21 3% 2% 4 52 7% 7% 5 88 13% 12% 5 104 15% 15% 7 - Very significant impact 385 55% 57% Don't know/Refused) - - - 4 90 5.87 5.93 - 4 91 16% 21% - 5 133 19% 16% - 5 83 12% 12% 12% 7 - Very significant impact 184 26% 21% 0on't know/Refused) - - - 4 63 9% 8% 30 4 46 7% 4% 36 5 30 4% 3% 3% 5 52 7% 9% 46 4 68 10% 7% 4% 5 68 10% 7% 5% 6 10%<	2 26 4% 4% 4% 3 21 3% 2% 3% 4 52 7% 7% 8% 5 104 15% 15% 15% 7 - Very significant impact 385 55% 57% 54% Don't know/Refused) - - - - Mean 700 5.87 5.93 5.85 1 - Very little impact 111 16% 21% 14% 2 6% 7% 5% 5% 3 13% 14% 13% 14% 5 133 19% 16% 20% 5 133 19% 16% 20% 5 133 19% 16% 20% 5 133 19% 16% 20% 6 133 19% 16% 20% 7 - Very significant impact 63 9% 8% 9% 4 52 7% 9% 7% 5% 5 30	2 26 4% 4% 4% 5% 3 21 3% 2% 3% 3% 5 52 7% 7% 8% 8% 5 7 7% 8% 8% 5 104 15% 13% 16% 5 7 5% 55% 57% 54% 48% 0on't know/Refused) -	2 1	2 26 4% 4% 4% 5% 4% 2% 3 21 3% 2% 3% 3% 2% 3% 4 52 7% 7% 8% 8% 10% 6% 5 104 15% 15% 15% 15% 15% 7 - Very significant impact 385 55% 57% 54% 48% 59% 60% 0on't know/Refused) -	2264%4%4%5%4%2%3%3213%2%3%3%2%3%3%4527%7%8%8%10%6%7%508813%12%13%15%15%15%15%510415%15%15%15%15%15%16%7Very significant impact38555%57%54%48%59%60%55%Don't know/Refused)Mean7005.875.935.855.665.906.055.94<

				Educ	ation	Durat	ion of resi	dency	Home	owner
				<4-year	4-year	1-10	11-20			
		n	%	degree	degree+	years	years	>20 years	Owner	Renter
Number of cases		700		188	512	270	139	290	350	350
Row percent			100%	27%	73%	39%	20%	41%	50%	50%
Impact: Closing encampments in	1-3 Little impact	159	23%	25%	22%	29%	23%	17%	20%	26%
parks, on sidewalks, and on	4/(DK)	47	7%	5%	7%	9%	5%	6%	6%	8%
other public right of ways	5-7 Significant impact	494	71%	70%	71%	63%	72%	77%	75%	67%
Impact: Addressing property	1-3 Little impact	92	13%	11%	14%	14%	14%	12%	12%	14%
crime like theft and car break-ins		65	9%		9%	14%	14%	5%	9%	9%
chine like their and car break-ins	5-7 Significant impact	543	78%		77%	75%	72%	83%	5% 79%	77%
	5-7 Significant impact	545	7070	8078	///0	7570	12/0	0570	1970	///0
Impact: Maintaining bridges and	1-3 Little impact	56	8%	12%	7%	7%	7%	10%	7%	10%
infrastructure	4/(DK)	90	13%	15%	12%	12%	14%	13%	11%	15%
	5-7 Significant impact	553	79%	73%	81%	81%	79%	77%	83%	76%
Impact: Addressing racially	1-3 Little impact	165	24%		24%	23%	28%	22%	26%	21%
biased policing	4/(DK)	100	14%		14%	17%	12%	13%	14%	14%
	5-7 Significant impact	436	62%	63%	62%	61%	61%	64%	60%	65%
Impact: Making Seattle a good	1-3 Little impact	93	13%	9%	15%	15%	14%	11%	12%	14%
place to do business	4/(DK)	92	13%	12%	13%	13%	15%	13%	10%	16%
	5-7 Significant impact	515	74%	79%	72%	72%	71%	76%	77%	70%
Impact: Addressing violent crime	-	70	10%		10%	12%	11%	8%	8%	12%
and gun violence	4/(DK)	52	7%		8%	8%	10%	6%	7%	8%
	5-7 Significant impact	577	82%	84%	82%	80%	80%	86%	84%	80%
Impact: Addressing climate	1-3 Little impact	209	30%	37%	27%	26%	34%	32%	35%	24%
change	4/(DK)	91	13%		13%	10%	15%	15%	16%	10%
	5-7 Significant impact	400	57%	49%	60%	64%	51%	53%	49%	65%
Impact: Shutting down open air	1-3 Little impact	144	21%		21%	28%	19%	15%	17%	24%
drug markets	4/(DK)	46	7%		7%	9%	7%	5%	7%	6%
	5-7 Significant impact	510	73%	77%	72%	64%	74%	81%	76%	70%

Much too high	n 700	%	<4-year degree	4-year degree+	1-10 years	11-20			
Much too high		%		degree+	Voars				
Much too high	700			0	years	years	>20 years	Owner	Renter
Much too high			188	512	270	139	290	350	350
Much too high		100%	27%	73%	39%	20%	41%	50%	50%
	182	26%	39%	21%	17%	26%	34%	27%	25%
Somewhat too high	220	31%	29%	32%	30%	32%	32%	34%	29%
Too low	91	13%	7%	15%	16%	15%	10%	11%	15%
About right	206	29%	24%	32%	37%	28%	24%	29%	30%
(Don't know)	1	0%	1%	-	0%	-	-	-	0%
Too high	402	57%	68%	53%	47%	58%	67%	60%	54%
About right/(DK)	207	30%	24%	32%	37%	28%	24%	29%	30%
Too low	91	13%	7%	15%	16%	15%	10%	11%	15%
Net Too high	+311	+44	+61	+38	+31	+43	+57	+49	+39
1 – Very pessimistic	99	14%	20%	12%	10%	14%	19%	16%	12%
2	165	24%	26%	23%	18%	32%	25%	28%	19%
3	313	45%	39%	47%	55%	40%	37%	40%	50%
4	100	14%	13%	15%	15%	10%	15%	13%	15%
5 – Very optimistic	21	3%	2%	4%	1%	4%	4%	3%	4%
(Don't know/Refused)	2	0%	-	0%	0%	1%	-	0%	-
Mean	698	2.68	2.51	2.75	2.81	2.59	2.62	2.58	2.79
1-2 Pessimistic	264	38%	46%	35%	28%	45%	43%	44%	31%
3/(DK)	315	45%	39%	47%	55%	41%	37%	40%	50%
4-5 Optimistic	121	17%	15%	18%	17%	14%	19%	16%	19%
Need action on public safety	373	53%	59%	51%	44%	56%	60%	59%	48%
Address root causes	322	46%	40%	48%	55%	43%	39%	41%	51%
(Both)	4	1%	-	1%	0%	1%	0%	0%	1%
(Neither)	1	0%	0%	-	-	-	0%	-	0%
(Don't know/Refused)	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
	Too low About right (Don't know) Too high About right/(DK) Too low Net Too high 1 – Very pessimistic 2 3 4 5 – Very optimistic (Don't know/Refused) Mean 1-2 Pessimistic 3/(DK) 4-5 Optimistic Need action on public safety Address root causes (Both) (Neither)	Too low91About right206(Don't know)1Too high402About right/(DK)207Too low91Net Too high+3111 - Very pessimistic992165331341005 - Very optimistic21(Don't know/Refused)2Mean6981-2 Pessimistic2643/(DK)3154-5 Optimistic121Need action on public safety373Address root causes322(Both)4(Neither)1	Too low 91 13% About right 206 29% (Don't know) 1 0% Too high 402 57% About right/(DK) 207 30% Too low 91 13% Net Too high +311 +44 1 – Very pessimistic 99 14% 2 165 24% 3 313 45% 4 100 14% 5 – Very optimistic 21 3% (Don't know/Refused) 2 0% Mean 698 2.68 1-2 Pessimistic 264 38% 3/(DK) 315 45% 4-5 Optimistic 121 17% Need action on public safety 373 53% Address root causes 322 46% (Both) 4 1% (Neither) 1 0%	Too low 91 13% 7% About right 206 29% 24% (Don't know) 1 0% 1% Too high 402 57% 68% About right/(DK) 207 30% 24% Too low 91 13% 7% Net Too high 402 57% 68% 1 - Very pessimistic 99 14% 20% 2 165 24% 26% 3 313 45% 39% 4 100 14% 13% 5 - Very optimistic 21 3% 2% (Don't know/Refused) 2 0% - Mean 698 2.68 2.51 1-2 Pessimistic 264 38% 46% 3/(DK) 315 45% 39% 4-5 Optimistic 121 17% 15% Need action on public safety 373 53% 59% Address root causes 322 46% 40% (Both) 4 1% - <td>Too low 91 13% 7% 15% About right 206 29% 24% 32% (Don't know) 1 0% 1% - Too high 402 57% 68% 53% About right/(DK) 207 30% 24% 32% Too low 91 13% 7% 15% Net Too high +311 +44 +61 +38 1 - Very pessimistic 99 14% 20% 12% 2 165 24% 26% 23% 3 313 45% 39% 47% 4 100 14% 13% 15% 5 - Very optimistic 21 3% 2% 4% (Don't know/Refused) 2 0% - 0% Mean 698 2.68 2.51 2.75 1-2 Pessimistic 264 38% 46% 35% 3/(DK) 315 45% 39% 47% 4-5 Optimistic 11 1% 1% 1%</td> <td>Too low 91 13% 7% 15% 16% About right 206 29% 24% 32% 37% (Don't know) 1 0% 1% 0% Too high 402 57% 68% 53% 47% About right/(DK) 207 30% 24% 32% 37% Too low 91 13% 7% 15% 16% Net Too high +311 +44 +61 +38 +31 1 - Very pessimistic 99 14% 20% 12% 10% 2 165 24% 26% 23% 18% 3 313 45% 39% 47% 55% 4 100 14% 13% 15% 15% 5 - Very optimistic 21 3% 2% 4% 1% (Don't know/Refused) 2 0% - 0% 0% Mean 264 38% 46% 35% 28% 3/(DK) 315 45% 39% <td< td=""><td>Too low 91 13% 7% 15% 16% 15% About right 206 29% 24% 32% 37% 28% (Don't know) 1 0% 1% - 0% - Too high 402 57% 68% 53% 47% 58% About right/(DK) 207 30% 24% 32% 37% 28% Too low 91 13% 7% 15% 16% 15% Net Too high +311 +44 +61 +38 +31 +43 1 - Very pessimistic 99 14% 20% 12% 10% 14% 2 165 24% 26% 23% 18% 32% 3 313 45% 39% 47% 55% 40% 4 100 14% 13% 15% 15% 10% 5 - Very optimistic 21 3% 2.68 2.51 2.75 2.81 2.59 1-2 Pessimistic 264 38% 46% 35%</td><td>Too low 91 13% 7% 15% 16% 15% 10% About right 206 29% 24% 32% 37% 28% 24% (Don't know) 1 0% 1% - 0% - - Too high 402 57% 68% 53% 47% 58% 67% About right/(DK) 207 30% 22% 32% 32% 24% Too low 91 13% 7% 15% 16% 15% 10% Net Too high +311 +44 +61 +38 +31 +43 +57 1 - Very pessimistic 99 14% 20% 12% 10% 14% 19% 2 165 24% 26% 23% 18% 32% 25% 4 100 14% 13% 15% 10% 15% 10% 15% 5 - Very petimistic 21 3% 2% 4% 4% 4% 4% 4% 37% 42 00% 2</td><td>Too low 91 13% 7% 15% 16% 15% 10% 11% About right 206 29% 24% 32% 37% 28% 24% 29% (Don't know) 1 0% 1% - 0% - - - Too high 402 57% 68% 53% 47% 58% 67% 60% About right/(DK) 207 30% 24% 32% 37% 22% 24% 29% Too low 91 13% 7% 15% 16% 15% 10% 11% Net Too high +311 +44 +61 +38 +31 +43 +57 +49 1 - Very pessimistic 99 14% 20% 12% 10% 14% 19% 16% 2 165 24% 26% 23% 18% 32% 25% 28% 3 313 45% 39% 47% 55% 40% 37% 40% 4 100 14% 13%</td></td<></td>	Too low 91 13% 7% 15% About right 206 29% 24% 32% (Don't know) 1 0% 1% - Too high 402 57% 68% 53% About right/(DK) 207 30% 24% 32% Too low 91 13% 7% 15% Net Too high +311 +44 +61 +38 1 - Very pessimistic 99 14% 20% 12% 2 165 24% 26% 23% 3 313 45% 39% 47% 4 100 14% 13% 15% 5 - Very optimistic 21 3% 2% 4% (Don't know/Refused) 2 0% - 0% Mean 698 2.68 2.51 2.75 1-2 Pessimistic 264 38% 46% 35% 3/(DK) 315 45% 39% 47% 4-5 Optimistic 11 1% 1% 1%	Too low 91 13% 7% 15% 16% About right 206 29% 24% 32% 37% (Don't know) 1 0% 1% 0% Too high 402 57% 68% 53% 47% About right/(DK) 207 30% 24% 32% 37% Too low 91 13% 7% 15% 16% Net Too high +311 +44 +61 +38 +31 1 - Very pessimistic 99 14% 20% 12% 10% 2 165 24% 26% 23% 18% 3 313 45% 39% 47% 55% 4 100 14% 13% 15% 15% 5 - Very optimistic 21 3% 2% 4% 1% (Don't know/Refused) 2 0% - 0% 0% Mean 264 38% 46% 35% 28% 3/(DK) 315 45% 39% <td< td=""><td>Too low 91 13% 7% 15% 16% 15% About right 206 29% 24% 32% 37% 28% (Don't know) 1 0% 1% - 0% - Too high 402 57% 68% 53% 47% 58% About right/(DK) 207 30% 24% 32% 37% 28% Too low 91 13% 7% 15% 16% 15% Net Too high +311 +44 +61 +38 +31 +43 1 - Very pessimistic 99 14% 20% 12% 10% 14% 2 165 24% 26% 23% 18% 32% 3 313 45% 39% 47% 55% 40% 4 100 14% 13% 15% 15% 10% 5 - Very optimistic 21 3% 2.68 2.51 2.75 2.81 2.59 1-2 Pessimistic 264 38% 46% 35%</td><td>Too low 91 13% 7% 15% 16% 15% 10% About right 206 29% 24% 32% 37% 28% 24% (Don't know) 1 0% 1% - 0% - - Too high 402 57% 68% 53% 47% 58% 67% About right/(DK) 207 30% 22% 32% 32% 24% Too low 91 13% 7% 15% 16% 15% 10% Net Too high +311 +44 +61 +38 +31 +43 +57 1 - Very pessimistic 99 14% 20% 12% 10% 14% 19% 2 165 24% 26% 23% 18% 32% 25% 4 100 14% 13% 15% 10% 15% 10% 15% 5 - Very petimistic 21 3% 2% 4% 4% 4% 4% 4% 37% 42 00% 2</td><td>Too low 91 13% 7% 15% 16% 15% 10% 11% About right 206 29% 24% 32% 37% 28% 24% 29% (Don't know) 1 0% 1% - 0% - - - Too high 402 57% 68% 53% 47% 58% 67% 60% About right/(DK) 207 30% 24% 32% 37% 22% 24% 29% Too low 91 13% 7% 15% 16% 15% 10% 11% Net Too high +311 +44 +61 +38 +31 +43 +57 +49 1 - Very pessimistic 99 14% 20% 12% 10% 14% 19% 16% 2 165 24% 26% 23% 18% 32% 25% 28% 3 313 45% 39% 47% 55% 40% 37% 40% 4 100 14% 13%</td></td<>	Too low 91 13% 7% 15% 16% 15% About right 206 29% 24% 32% 37% 28% (Don't know) 1 0% 1% - 0% - Too high 402 57% 68% 53% 47% 58% About right/(DK) 207 30% 24% 32% 37% 28% Too low 91 13% 7% 15% 16% 15% Net Too high +311 +44 +61 +38 +31 +43 1 - Very pessimistic 99 14% 20% 12% 10% 14% 2 165 24% 26% 23% 18% 32% 3 313 45% 39% 47% 55% 40% 4 100 14% 13% 15% 15% 10% 5 - Very optimistic 21 3% 2.68 2.51 2.75 2.81 2.59 1-2 Pessimistic 264 38% 46% 35%	Too low 91 13% 7% 15% 16% 15% 10% About right 206 29% 24% 32% 37% 28% 24% (Don't know) 1 0% 1% - 0% - - Too high 402 57% 68% 53% 47% 58% 67% About right/(DK) 207 30% 22% 32% 32% 24% Too low 91 13% 7% 15% 16% 15% 10% Net Too high +311 +44 +61 +38 +31 +43 +57 1 - Very pessimistic 99 14% 20% 12% 10% 14% 19% 2 165 24% 26% 23% 18% 32% 25% 4 100 14% 13% 15% 10% 15% 10% 15% 5 - Very petimistic 21 3% 2% 4% 4% 4% 4% 4% 37% 42 00% 2	Too low 91 13% 7% 15% 16% 15% 10% 11% About right 206 29% 24% 32% 37% 28% 24% 29% (Don't know) 1 0% 1% - 0% - - - Too high 402 57% 68% 53% 47% 58% 67% 60% About right/(DK) 207 30% 24% 32% 37% 22% 24% 29% Too low 91 13% 7% 15% 16% 15% 10% 11% Net Too high +311 +44 +61 +38 +31 +43 +57 +49 1 - Very pessimistic 99 14% 20% 12% 10% 14% 19% 16% 2 165 24% 26% 23% 18% 32% 25% 28% 3 313 45% 39% 47% 55% 40% 37% 40% 4 100 14% 13%

				Educ	ation	Durat	ion of resi	dency	Home	owner
				<4-year	4-year	1-10	11-20			
		n	%	degree	degree+	years	years	>20 years	Owner	Renter
Number of cases		700		188	512	270	139	290	350	350
Row percent			100%	27%	73%	39%	20%	41%	50%	50%
Homelessness/housing	Prioritize housing for homelessness	373	53%	53%	53%	52%	47%	58%	64%	43%
_	r Address broader housing affordability crisis	316	45%	45%	45%	47%	52%		34%	56%
homelessness vs. Address	(Both)	1	0%	-	0%	-	1%		-	0%
broader housing affordability	(Neither)	10	1%	2%	1%	1%	1%		2%	1%
crisis	(Don't know/Refused)	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
City budget deficit preference:	Focus on the basics	473	68%	72%	66%	61%	68%	73%	70%	65%
Focus on the basics vs. Maintain		216	31%	25%	33%	38%	31%		27%	35%
spending and raise new taxes	(Both)	1	0%	-	0%	-	-	0%	-	0%
	(Neither)	7	1%	2%	1%	-	1%	2%	2%	1%
	(Don't know/Refused)	3	0%	0%	0%	1%	-	0%	1%	-
Public safety preference: Need	Need action on public safety	373	53%	59%	51%	44%	56%	60%	59%	48%
action on public safety vs.	Address root causes	322	46%	40%	48%	55%	43%	39%	41%	51%
Address root causes	(Both/Neither/DK/Ref)	5	1%	0%	1%	0%	1%	1%	0%	1%
	Net Need action on public safety	+51	+7	+19	+3	-11	+13	+22	+18	-3
Homelessness/housing	Prioritize housing for homelessness	373	53%	53%	53%	52%	47%	58%	64%	43%
	r Address broader housing affordability crisis	316	45%	45%	45%	47%	52%	40%	34%	56%
homelessness vs. Address	(Both/Neither/DK/Ref)	10	1%	2%	1%	1%	1%		2%	1%
broader housing affordability	Net Prioritize housing for homelessness	+57	+8	+8	+8	+5	-5	+18	+29	-13
crisis										
City budget deficit preference:	Focus on the basics	473	68%	72%	66%	61%	68%	73%	70%	65%
Focus on the basics vs. Maintain	Maintain spending and raise new taxes	216	31%	25%	33%	38%	31%	24%	27%	35%
spending and raise new taxes	(Both/Neither/DK/Ref)	11	2%	2%	1%	1%	1%	3%	2%	1%
	Net Focus on the basics	+256	+37	+47	+33	+24	+36	+49	+43	+30

Row percent 100% 27% 73% 39% 20% 41% 50% 50% Support: Investing in the continued revitalization of 2 1 – Strongly oppose 64 9% 15% 7% 10% 10% 8% 8% 11% Seattle Center by bringing back Seattle Center by bringing back the Sonics, redoing Memorial 4 127 18% 20% 17% 18% 20% 18% 21% 16% Stadium which is used by high state, and making it easier to get rfrom Seattle Center to the new (Don't know/Refused) 74 11% 14% 9% 8% 12% 11% 10% Support: Providing support and from Seattle Center to the new (Don't know/Refused) -					Educ	ation	Durat	ion of resi	dency	Home	owner
Number of cases 700 188 512 270 139 290 350 350 Row percent 100% 27% 73% 39% 20% 41% 50% 50% Support: Investing in the 1 – Strongly oppose 64 9% 15% 7% 10% 8% 8% 6% 7% 8% 9% 5% 8% 6% 7% 10% 7% 10% 7% 10% 7% 10% 7% 10% 7% 10% 7% 10% 7% 10% 7% 10% 7% 10% 7% 10% 7% 10% 7% 13% 21% 11% 10% 5% 5% 10% 10% 10% 10% 10% 10% 10% 10% 10% 10% 10% 10% 10% 10% 10% 5% 6% 10% 10% 10% 10% 10% 10% 10% 10% 10% 10% 10% 10					<4-year	4-year	1-10	11-20			
Row percent 100% 27% 73% 39% 20% 41% 50% 50% Support: Investing in the continued revitalization of Seattle Center by bringing back 1 1 5 64 9% 15% 7% 8% 9% 5% 8% 6% Seattle Center by bringing back 3 67 10% 7% 10% 9% 66 12% 9% 10% 10% 8% 8% 12% 18% 21% 10% 10% 10% 10% 10% 10% 10% 10% 10% 10% 10% 10% 10% 10% 10% 10% 10% 10% 11% 10% <td< td=""><td></td><td></td><td>n</td><td>%</td><td>degree</td><td>degree+</td><td>years</td><td>years</td><td>>20 years</td><td>Owner</td><td>Renter</td></td<>			n	%	degree	degree+	years	years	>20 years	Owner	Renter
Support: Investing in the continued revitalization of 2 1 - Strongly oppose 64 9% 15% 7% 10% 10% 88% 88% 11% Seattle Center by bringing back Stadium which is used by high Stadium which is used by high 5 3 67 10% 7% 10% 9% 6% 12% 9% 10% Stadium which is used by high 5 163 23% 11% 12% 11% 10% 5% 5% 3% 12% 12% 12% 11% 10% 5% 5% 3% 10% 10% 5% 5% 3% 10% 10% 5% 5%	Number of cases		700		188	512	270	139	290	350	350
continued revitalization of 2 48 7% 6% 7% 8% 9% 5% 8% 6% Seattle Center by bringing back 3 67 10% 7% 10% 9% 6% 12% 9% 10% the Sonics, redoing Memorial 4 127 13% 20% 17% 18% 20% 18% 21% 16% Stadium which is used by high 5 6 74 11% 14% 9% 8% 12% 12% 11% 10% state, and making it easier to get 7 - Strongly support 156 22% 19% 23% 22% 26% 21% 20% 24% from Seattle Center to the new (Don't know/Refused) - <td>Row percent</td> <td></td> <td></td> <td>100%</td> <td>27%</td> <td>73%</td> <td>39%</td> <td>20%</td> <td>41%</td> <td>50%</td> <td>50%</td>	Row percent			100%	27%	73%	39%	20%	41%	50%	50%
Seattle Center by bringing back 3 67 10% 7% 10% 9% 6% 12% 9% 10% the Sonics, redoing Memorial 4 127 18% 20% 17% 18% 20% 11% 18% 20% 11% 18% 20% 12%	Support: Investing in the	1 – Strongly oppose	64		15%		10%				11%
the Sonics, redoing Memorial 4 127 18% 20% 17% 18% 20% 18% 21% 16% Stadium which is used by high 5 163 23% 12%	continued revitalization of	2									6%
Stadium which is used by high 5 163 23% 18% 25% 27% 17% 23% 24% school sport teams across the 6 74 11% 14% 9% 8% 12% 12% 11% 10% state, and making it easier to get 7 - Strongly support 156 22% 19% 23% 22% 26% 21% 20% 24% from Seattle Center to the nw (Don't know/Refused) - </td <td>Seattle Center by bringing back</td> <td>3</td> <td>67</td> <td>10%</td> <td>7%</td> <td>10%</td> <td>9%</td> <td>6%</td> <td>12%</td> <td>9%</td> <td>10%</td>	Seattle Center by bringing back	3	67	10%	7%	10%	9%	6%	12%	9%	10%
school sport teams across the 6 74 11% 14% 9% 8% 12% 12% 11% 10% state, and making it easier to get 7 - Strongly support 156 22% 19% 23% 22% 26% 21% 20% 24% from Seattle Center to the new (Don't know/Refused) -	the Sonics, redoing Memorial	4	127	18%	20%	17%	18%	20%	18%	21%	16%
state, and making it easier to get 7 - Strongly support 156 22% 19% 23% 22% 26% 21% 20% 24% from Seattle Center to the new (Don't know/Refused) 700 4.60 4.40 4.68 4.55 4.62 4.65 4.60 4.61 Support: Providing support and 1 - Strongly oppose 36 5% 6% 5% 5% 3% 7% 5% 6% funding for small- and medium- 2 52 7% 9% 7% 7% 11% 6% 7% 8% sized Seattle businesses to help 3 52 7% 9% 6% 10% 10% 10% 9% 2% 25% 26% 21% 11% 6% 22% 26% 21% 21% 10% 10% 9% 10% 10% 10% 9% 10% 10% 10% 25% 22% 26% 21% 11% 10% 11% 10% 11% 10% 11% 10% 11% 10% 11% 10% 11% 10% 11% 10%	Stadium which is used by high	5	163	23%	18%	25%	27%	17%	23%	23%	24%
from Seattle Center to the new Waterfront (Don't know/Refused) Mean Image: Construction of the constructi	school sport teams across the	6	74	11%	14%	9%	8%	12%	12%	11%	10%
Waterfront Mean 700 4.60 4.40 4.68 4.55 4.62 4.60 4.60 Support: Providing support and 1 – Strongly oppose 36 5% 6% 5% 3% 7% 5% 6% funding for small- and medium- 2 7% 9% 7% 7% 11% 6% 7% 8% sized Seattle businesses to help 3 6% 10% 10% 5% 10% 10% 9% them benefit from the economic 4 157 22% 18% 24% 27% 19% 20% 25% 20% opportunities that big events like 5 156 22% 26% 21% 11% 11% 11% 11% 12% 16% Game, the National Hockey 7 - Strongly support 137 20% 18% 20% 18% 27% 18% 19% 20% upcoming 2026 FIFA World Cup Mean 6 4.69 4.69 4.69 4.58 <	state, and making it easier to get	7 – Strongly support	156	22%	19%	23%	22%	26%	21%	20%	24%
Support: Providing support and 1 – Strongly oppose 36 5% 6% 5% 5% 3% 7% 5% 6% funding for small- and medium- 2 52 7% 9% 7% 7% 11% 6% 7% 8% sized Seattle businesses to help 3 63 9% 6% 10% 10% 5% 10% 10% 9% them benefit from the economic 4 157 22% 18% 24% 27% 19% 20% 22% 23% 22% Major League Baseball's All-Star 6 96 14% 16% 13% 11% 17% 14% 12% 16% Game, the National Hockey 7 – Strongly support 137 20% 18% 20% 18% 27% 18% 19% 20% 12% 16% 4.69 4.69 4.69 4.69 4.69 4.69 4.64 4.66 4.72 present 1 - Strongly oppose 82 12% 18%	from Seattle Center to the new	(Don't know/Refused)	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
funding for small- and medium- 2 7% 9% 7% 7% 11% 6% 7% 8% sized Seattle businesses to help 3 63 9% 6% 10% 10% 5% 10% 10% 9% them benefit from the economic 4 157 22% 18% 24% 27% 19% 20% 25% 20% opportunities that big events like 5 156 22% 26% 21% 19% 25% 23% 22% Major League Baseball's All-Star 6 96 14% 16% 13% 11% 17% 14% 12% 16% Game, the National Hockey 7 - Strongly support 137 20% 18% 20% 18% 27% 18% 19% 20% 16% League's Winter Classic, and the (Don't know/Refused) 1 0% 18% 27% 18% 19% 20% 16% 4.66 4.72 present 1 0% 14% 0% 4.68 4.69 4.68 4.66 5% 5%	Waterfront	Mean	700	4.60	4.40	4.68	4.55	4.62	4.65	4.60	4.61
sized Sattle businesses to help 3 63 9% 6% 10% 10% 5% 10% 10% 9% them benefit from the economic 4 157 22% 18% 24% 27% 19% 20% 25% 20% opportunities that big events like 5 156 22% 26% 21% 21% 19% 25% 23% 22% Major League Baseball's All-Star 6 96 14% 16% 13% 11% 17% 14% 12% 16% Game, the National Hockey 7 – Strongly support 137 20% 18% 20% 18% 27% 18% 19% 20% League's Winter Classic, and the (Don't know/Refused) 1 0% 1% - 0% - - - 0% present - - - - 0% - - - 0% Support: Keeping construction 1 – Strongly oppose 82 12% 18% 9% 9% 10% 15% 5% 5% Ballard on track to open in 2032 3	Support: Providing support and	1 – Strongly oppose	36	5%	6%	5%	5%	3%	7%	5%	6%
them benefit from the economic 4 157 22% 18% 24% 27% 19% 20% 25% 20% opportunities that big events like 5 156 22% 26% 21% 21% 19% 25% 23% 22% Major League Baseball's All-Star 6 96 14% 16% 13% 11% 17% 14% 12% 16% Game, the National Hockey 7 - Strongly support 137 20% 18% 20% 18% 27% 18% 19% 20% 16% League's Winter Classic, and the (Don't know/Refused) 1 0% 1% - 0% - - 0% upcoming 2026 FIFA World Cup Mean 699 4.69 4.69 4.58 5.00 4.64 4.66 4.72 present - - - - - 0% - - 0% Support: Keeping construction 1 - Strongly oppose 82 12% 18% 9% 9% 10% 15% 13% 15% 5% 8% 7% 6%	funding for small- and medium-	2	52	7%	9%	7%	7%	11%	6%	7%	8%
opportunities that big events like 5 156 22% 26% 21% 21% 19% 25% 23% 22% Major League Baseball's All-Star 6 96 14% 16% 13% 11% 17% 14% 12% 16% Game, the National Hockey 7 – Strongly support 137 20% 18% 20% 18% 27% 18% 19% 20% League's Winter Classic, and the (Don't know/Refused) 1 0% 1% - 0% - - 0% upcoming 2026 FIFA World Cup Mean 699 4.69 4.69 4.69 4.58 5.00 4.64 4.66 4.72 present - - - - - - - 0% for light rail to West Seattle and 2 12% 18% 9% 9% 10% 15% 13% 5% Ballard on track to open in 2032 3 5 7% 8% 7% 6% 13% 15%	sized Seattle businesses to help	3	63	9%	6%	10%	10%	5%	10%	10%	9%
Major League Baseball's All-Star 6 96 14% 16% 13% 11% 17% 14% 12% 16% Game, the National Hockey 7 – Strongly support 137 20% 18% 20% 18% 27% 18% 19% 20% League's Winter Classic, and the (Don't know/Refused) 1 0% 1% - 0% - - 0% upcoming 2026 FIFA World Cup Mean 699 4.69 4.69 4.69 4.58 5.00 4.64 4.66 4.72 present - - - - - - - 0% Support: Keeping construction 1 – Strongly oppose 82 12% 18% 9% 9% 10% 15% 13% 11% for light rail to West Seattle and 2 34 5% 8% 4% 3% 4% 6% 5% 5% Ballard on track to open in 2032 3 52 7% 8% 7% 6% 13% 13% 13% 13% 13% 13% 13% 13% <td>them benefit from the economic</td> <td>4</td> <td>157</td> <td>22%</td> <td>18%</td> <td>24%</td> <td>27%</td> <td>19%</td> <td>20%</td> <td>25%</td> <td>20%</td>	them benefit from the economic	4	157	22%	18%	24%	27%	19%	20%	25%	20%
Game, the National Hockey 7 - Strongly support 137 20% 18% 20% 18% 27% 18% 19% 20% League's Winter Classic, and the (Don't know/Refused) 1 0% 1% - 0% - - 0% upcoming 2026 FIFA World Cup Mean 699 4.69 4.69 4.69 4.69 4.69 4.69 4.64 4.66 4.72 present Support: Keeping construction 1 - Strongly oppose 82 12% 18% 9% 9% 10% 15% 13% 11% for light rail to West Seattle and 2 34 5% 8% 4% 3% 4% 6% 5% 5% Ballard on track to open in 2032 3 52 7% 8% 11% 13% 13% 8% 7% even if it costs more 4 64 74 11% 10% 11% 13% 13% 15% 9% 6 85 12% 11% 13% 16% 15% 9% 9% 16% 15% 9%	opportunities that big events like	5	156	22%	26%	21%	21%	19%	25%	23%	22%
League's Winter Classic, and the (Don't know/Refused) 1 0% 1% - 0% - - 0% upcoming 2026 FIFA World Cup Mean 699 4.69 4.69 4.69 4.69 4.68 5.00 4.64 4.66 4.72 present 1 - 18% 9% 9% 10% 15% 13% 11% Support: Keeping construction 1 – Strongly oppose 82 12% 18% 9% 9% 10% 15% 13% 11% for light rail to West Seattle and 2 34 5% 8% 4% 3% 4% 6% 5% 5% Ballard on track to open in 2032 3 52 7% 8% 7% 6% 13% 6% 8% 7% even if it costs more 4 6 85 12% 11% 13% 13% 13% 13% 13% 15% 6 85 12% 11% 13% 10% 18% 12% 15% 9% 7 – Strongly support 274 39% <	Major League Baseball's All-Star	6	96	14%	16%	13%	11%	17%	14%	12%	16%
upcoming 2026 FIFA World Cup Mean 699 4.69 4.69 4.69 4.69 4.69 4.69 4.69 4.69 4.64 4.66 4.72 present 1 – Strongly oppose 82 12% 18% 9% 9% 10% 15% 13% 11% for light rail to West Seattle and 2 34 5% 8% 4% 3% 4% 6% 5% 5% Ballard on track to open in 2032 3 52 7% 8% 7% 6% 13% 6% 8% 7% even if it costs more 4 6 85 12% 11% 10% 11% 8% 11% 13% 13% 15% 6 85 12% 11% 13% 15% 14% 10% 16% 13% 15% 6 85 12% 11% 13% 10% 18% 12% 15% 9% 6 7 39% 32% 42% 50% 33% 32% 34% 45% 6 6 6	Game, the National Hockey	7 – Strongly support	137	20%	18%	20%	18%	27%	18%	19%	20%
present Image: Normal Strongly oppose Result of the strongly oppose Result of th	League's Winter Classic, and the	(Don't know/Refused)	1	0%	1%	-	0%	-	-	-	0%
Support: Keeping construction 1 – Strongly oppose 82 12% 18% 9% 9% 10% 15% 13% 11% for light rail to West Seattle and 2 34 5% 8% 4% 3% 4% 6% 5% 5% Ballard on track to open in 2032 3 52 7% 8% 7% 6% 13% 6% 8% 7% even if it costs more 4 74 11% 10% 11% 8% 11% 13% 13% 8% 6 5 99 14% 13% 15% 14% 10% 16% 13% 15% 6 85 12% 11% 13% 10% 18% 12% 15% 9% 7 – Strongly support 274 39% 32% 42% 50% 33% 32% 34% 45% (Don't know/Refused) - - - - - - - - - - - - - - - - - - - <td< td=""><td></td><td>Mean</td><td>699</td><td>4.69</td><td>4.69</td><td>4.69</td><td>4.58</td><td>5.00</td><td>4.64</td><td>4.66</td><td>4.72</td></td<>		Mean	699	4.69	4.69	4.69	4.58	5.00	4.64	4.66	4.72
for light rail to West Seattle and 2 34 5% 8% 4% 3% 4% 6% 5% Ballard on track to open in 2032 3 52 7% 8% 7% 6% 13% 6% 8% 7% even if it costs more 4 74 11% 10% 11% 8% 11% 13% 13% 8% 6 5 12% 11% 13% 15% 14% 10% 16% 13% 15% 6 85 12% 11% 13% 10% 18% 12% 15% 9% 7 - Strongly support 274 39% 32% 42% 50% 33% 32% 45% (Don't know/Refused) -	1	1 - Strongly oppose	02	1.7%	100/	0%	0%	10%	15%	120/	110/
Ballard on track to open in 2032 3 52 7% 8% 7% 6% 13% 6% 8% 7% even if it costs more 4 74 11% 10% 11% 8% 11% 13% 13% 8% 5 99 14% 13% 15% 14% 10% 16% 13% 15% 6 85 12% 11% 13% 10% 18% 12% 15% 9% 7 - Strongly support 274 39% 32% 42% 50% 33% 32% 34% 45% (Don't know/Refused) - - - - - - - - - -				-							
even if it costs more 4 74 11% 10% 11% 8% 11% 13% 13% 8% 5 99 14% 13% 15% 14% 10% 16% 13% 15% 6 85 12% 11% 13% 10% 18% 12% 15% 9% 7 - Strongly support 274 39% 32% 42% 50% 33% 32% 45% (Don't know/Refused) - - - - - - - -	-										
5 99 14% 13% 15% 14% 10% 16% 13% 15% 6 85 12% 11% 13% 10% 18% 12% 15% 9% 7 - Strongly support 274 39% 32% 42% 50% 33% 32% 45% (Don't know/Refused) - - - - - - - -	-	3									
6 85 12% 11% 13% 10% 18% 12% 15% 9% 7 - Strongly support 274 39% 32% 42% 50% 33% 32% 34% 45% (Don't know/Refused) - - - - - - - - -	even in it costs more	4									
7 - Strongly support 274 39% 32% 42% 50% 33% 32% 45% (Don't know/Refused) - - - - - - - - -											
(Don't know/Refused)		U 7 Strongly support									
			2/4	39%	32%	42%	50%	33%	32%	34%	45%
iviean //00 5.04 4.54 5.22 5.44 4.94 4.71 4.88 5.20				-	- 4 - 4	- 	-	-	-	-	-
		iviean	/00	5.04	4.54	5.22	5.44	4.94	4./1	4.88	5.20

				Educ	ation	Durat	ion of resid	dency	Home	owner
				<4-year	4-year	1-10	11-20			
		n	%	degree	degree+	years	years	>20 years	Owner	Renter
Number of cases		700		188	512	270	139	290	350	350
Row percent			100%	27%	73%	39%	20%	41%	50%	50%
Support: Working with the state	1 – Strongly oppose	97	14%	16%	13%	8%	15%	19%	14%	14%
to fund a "lid" over I-5 where it	2	56	8%	7%	8%	6%	8%	10%	11%	5%
cuts through the downtown to	3	56	8%	9%	8%	5%	8%	11%	11%	5%
free up new real estate for	4	130	19%	21%	18%	14%	13%	26%	19%	19%
housing, parks, and public	5	107	15%	13%	16%	15%	21%	13%	14%	17%
spaces and reconnect our	6	76	11%	10%	11%	14%	10%	9%	11%	11%
neighborhoods	7 – Strongly support	176	25%	23%	26%	39%	25%	13%	20%	30%
	(Don't know/Refused)	2	0%	0%	0%	-	-	1%	0%	0%
	Mean	698	4.47	4.30	4.53	5.19	4.43	3.82	4.20	4.74
Support: Investing in the	1-3 Oppose	179	26%	28%	25%	26%	26%	25%	24%	27%
continued revitalization of	4/(DK)	127	18%	20%	17%	18%	20%	18%	21%	16%
Seattle Center by bringing back	5-7 Support	393	56%	51%	58%	56%	55%	57%	55%	57%
the Sonics, redoing Memorial										
Support: Providing support and	1-3 Oppose	152	22%	21%	22%	22%	18%	23%	21%	22%
funding for small- and medium-	4/(DK)	158	23%	19%	24%	27%	19%	20%	25%	20%
sized Seattle businesses to help	5-7 Support	390	56%	60%	54%	51%	63%	57%	54%	58%
them benefit from the economic										
Support: Keeping construction	1-3 Oppose	167	24%	34%	20%	18%	27%	28%	25%	22%
for light rail to West Seattle and	4/(DK)	74	11%	10%	11%	8%	11%	13%	13%	8%
Ballard on track to open in 2032	5-7 Support	459	66%	56%	69%	74%	61%	60%	62%	69%
even if it costs more										
Support: Working with the state	1-3 Oppose	209	30%	33%	29%	19%	32%	39%	36%	23%
to fund a "lid" over I-5 where it	4/(DK)	132	19%	21%	18%	14%	13%	26%	19%	19%
cuts through the downtown to	5-7 Support	359	51%	46%	53%	68%	55%	35%	45%	58%
free up new real estate for										
Pre-pandemic downtown visit	Once a week or more	142	20%	17%	21%	16%	26%	21%	20%	20%
frequency (non-work)	A few times a month	238	34%	36%	33%	32%	35%	36%	37%	31%
	A few times a year	209	30%		30%	31%			30%	
	Rarely	70	10%		9%	10%	7%		10%	
	Never	39	6%	4%	6%	11%	3%	2%	3%	8%
	(Refused)	2	0%		0%	0%	1%	-	-	1%

				Educ	ation	Durat	ion of resi	dency	Home	owner
		[[<4-year	4-year	1-10	11-20			
		n	%	degree	degree+	years	years	>20 years	Owner	Renter
Number of cases		700		188	512	270	139	290	350	350
Row percent			100%	27%	73%	39%	20%	41%	50%	50%
Pre-pandemic downtown visit	Weekly	142	20%	17%	21%	16%	26%	21%	20%	20%
frequency (non-work)	Few times a month	238	34%	36%	33%	32%	35%	36%	37%	31%
	Less often	320	46%	47%	45%	52%	39%	43%	42%	49%
Current downtown visit	Much more often	55	8%	6%	9%	11%	6%	6%	4%	11%
frequency compared to pre-	Somewhat more often	40	6%	5%	6%	9%	5%	3%	4%	8%
pandemic	About the same	173	25%	18%	27%	30%	19%	23%	24%	25%
	Somewhat less often	139	20%	16%	21%	19%	20%	21%	21%	19%
	Much less often	292	42%	55%	37%	31%	50%	48%	47%	37%
	(Don't know/Refused)	1	0%	-	0%	0%	-	-	-	0%
Current downtown visit	More often	95	14%	11%	15%	20%	11%	9%	8%	19%
frequency compared to pre-	Same/(DK/Ref)	174	25%	18%	27%	30%	19%	23%	24%	25%
pandemic	Less often	431	62%	71%	58%	50%	70%	69%	67%	56%
	Net More often	-337	-48	-61	-43	-30	-59	-60	-59	-37
Duration of residency	<2 years	15	2%	1%	2%	5%	-	-	1%	3%
	2-5 years	126	18%	13%	20%	47%	-	-	14%	22%
	6-10 years	130	19%	17%	19%	48%	-	-	14%	23%
	11-20 years	139	20%	16%	21%	-	100%	-	23%	17%
	>20 years	282	40%	51%	36%	-	-	97%	49%	32%
Duration of residency	1-10 years	270	39%	31%	41%	100%	-	-	28%	49%
	11-20 years	139	20%	16%	21%	-	100%	-	23%	17%
	>20 years	290	41%	53%	37%	-	-	100%	49%	34%

				Educ	ation	Durat	ion of resi	dency	Home	owner
				<4-year	4-year	1-10	11-20			
		n	%	degree	degree+	years	years	>20 years	Owner	Renter
Number of cases		700		188	512	270	139	290	350	
Row percent			100%	27%	73%	39%	20%	41%	50%	50%
Party	Strong Democrat	260	37%	30%	40%	35%	39%	39%	38%	37%
	Not very strong Democrat	117	17%	20%	16%	19%	14%	16%	15%	18%
	Independent, closer to Democratic party	76	11%	5%	13%	13%	8%	10%	12%	10%
	Independent	44	6%	7%	6%	3%	7%	9%	9%	3%
	Independent, closer to Republican party	25	4%	3%	4%	3%	3%	4%	3%	4%
	Not very strong Republican	23	3%	5%	3%	3%	5%	2%	5%	2%
	Strong Republican	15	2%	4%	2%	1%	3%	3%	3%	1%
	Socialist	59	8%	10%	8%	13%	9%	4%	5%	12%
	(Something else/Don't know/Refused)	80	11%	16%	10%	10%	12%	12%	10%	13%
Party	Socialist	59	8%	10%	8%	13%	9%	4%	5%	12%
	Democrat	454	65%	55%	68%	66%	61%	65%	65%	65%
	Independent	124	18%	23%	16%	13%	19%	21%	19%	16%
	Republican	63	9%	12%	8%	7%	11%	10%	11%	7%
Perceived personal ideology	1 – Very liberal	150	21%	19%	22%	29%	19%	16%	16%	27%
	2	133	19%	13%	21%	21%	21%	16%	19%	19%
	3	167	24%	17%	26%	25%	26%	22%	24%	24%
	4	120	17%	25%	14%	12%	16%	22%	19%	15%
	5	61	9%	9%	9%	5%	10%	12%	9%	8%
	6	18	3%	5%	2%	2%	3%	3%	4%	1%
	7 – Very conservative	12	2%	4%	1%	2%	1%	2%	2%	1%
	(Don't know/Refused)	38	5%	7%	5%	4%	3%	8%	6%	5%
	Mean	662	2.87	3.23	2.73	2.54	2.89	3.16	3.08	2.65
Perceived personal ideology	Liberal	451	64%	50%	70%	75%	67%	53%	60%	69%
	Moderate	158	23%	33%	19%	16%	19%	30%	25%	20%
	Conservative	91	13%	18%			14%		16%	

				Educ	ation	Durat	ion of resi	dency	Home	owner
				<4-year	4-year	1-10	11-20			
		n	%	degree	degree+	years	years	>20 years	Owner	Renter
Number of cases		700		188	512	270	139		350	
Row percent			100%	27%	73%	39%	20%	41%	50%	50%
Perceived city council ideology	1 – Very liberal	160	23%	32%	20%	16%	28%	27%	27%	19%
	2	119	17%	14%	18%	16%	21%	15%	20%	14%
	3	101	14%	15%	14%	15%	10%	16%	14%	15%
	4	119	17%	14%	18%	22%	10%	15%	14%	20%
	5	90	13%	10%	14%	14%	12%	12%	11%	15%
	6	39	6%	5%	6%	6%	8%	4%	5%	6%
	7 – Very conservative	28	4%	4%	4%	3%	6%	4%	3%	5%
	(Don't know/Refused)	43	6%	6%	6%	7%	4%	7%	6%	7%
	Mean	657	3.13	2.87	3.23	3.36	3.06	2.96	2.87	3.39
Perceived city council ideology	Liberal	381	54%	61%	52%	47%	60%	59%	61%	47%
	Moderate	163	23%	20%	24%	29%	14%		20%	26%
	Conservative	157	22%	19%	24%	23%	27%		19%	26%
Homeowner	Homeowner	350	50%	42%	53%	36%	57%	59%	100%	-
	Renter	350	50%	58%	47%	64%	43%		-	100%
Ethnicity	White or Caucasian	511	73%	71%	74%	73%	74%	72%	73%	73%
	African American or Black	28	4%	5%	4%	2%	4%		4%	4%
	Hispanic or Latino	42	6%	7%	6%	7%	7%		4%	8%
	Asian or Pacific Islander	56	8%	5%	9%	9%	9%	6%	9%	7%
	Something else	49	7%	7%	7%	7%	5%	8%	8%	6%
	(Refused)	14	2%	3%	1%	1%	1%	3%	2%	2%
Ethnicity	White or Caucasian	511	73%	71%	74%	73%	74%	72%	73%	73%
	African American or Black	28	4%	5%	4%	2%	4%		4%	4%
	Hispanic or Latino	42	6%	7%	6%	7%	7%	5%	4%	8%
	Asian or Pacific Islander	56	8%	5%	9%	9%	9%	6%	9%	7%
	Another ethnicity/(Ref)	63	9%	11%	8%	8%	6%	11%	9%	9%

				Educ	ation	Durat	ion of resi	dency	Home	owner
				<4-year	4-year	1-10	11-20			
		n	%	degree	degree+	years	years	>20 years	Owner	Renter
Number of cases		700		188	512	270	139	290	350	350
Row percent			100%	27%	73%	39%	20%	41%	50%	50%
Ethnicity	White	511	73%	71%	74%	73%	74%	72%	73%	73%
	POC	175	25%	25%	25%	25%	25%	25%	26%	24%
	(Ref)	14	2%	3%	1%	1%	1%	3%	2%	2%
Age (Replaced)	18-29	132	19%	19%	19%	34%	9%	9%	12%	26%
	30-39	176	25%	17%	28%	38%	32%	10%	23%	27%
	40-49	123	18%	14%	19%	16%	32%	12%	15%	20%
	50-64	140	20%	30%	16%	5%	19%	34%	25%	15%
	65+	129	18%	20%	18%	7%	8%	34%	25%	11%
Two-Age Split	18-39	308	44%	36%	47%	72%	41%	19%	35%	53%
	40+	392	56%	64%	53%	28%	59%	81%	65%	47%
Generation	18-39	308	44%	36%	47%	72%	41%	19%	35%	53%
	40-64	263	38%	44%	35%	21%	51%	46%	40%	36%
	65+	129	18%	20%	18%	7%	8%	34%	25%	11%
Education	Some grade school	3	0%	1%	-	-	-	1%	0%	0%
	Some high school	1	0%	0%	-	-	-	0%	0%	-
	Graduated high school	16	2%	8%	-	2%	2%	2%	2%	2%
	Technical/vocational school	25	4%	13%	-	3%	5%	3%	2%	5%
	Some college/<4-year degree	132	19%	70%	-	15%	14%	25%	16%	22%
	Graduated college/4-year degree	291	42%	-	57%	46%	40%	38%	41%	42%
	Graduate/professional degree	221	32%	-	43%	32%	38%	28%	37%	27%
	(Refused)	12	2%	6%	-	1%	1%	3%	2%	2%
Education	<4-year degree	188	27%	100%	-	22%	22%	34%	23%	31%
	4-year degree+	512	73%	-	100%	78%	78%	66%	77%	69%
Education	Less than college	188	27%	100%	-	22%	22%	34%	23%	31%
	Graduated college	291	42%	-	57%	46%	40%	38%	41%	42%
	Graduate/professional degree	221	32%	-	43%	32%	38%	28%	37%	27%

	+ years 2 270 % 39% % 49% % 47% % 3% % 1% % 28% % 31% % 41%	6 20% 6 52% 6 47% 6 1% 6 25% 6 32%	6 41% 6 46% 6 51% 6 1% - 2% 6 30%	350 50% 50% 47% 1% 1% 32%	50% 46% 50% 2% 2% 25%
Number of cases 700 188 51 Row percent 100% 27% 73 Gender Male 339 48% 51% 48 Female 340 49% 47% 49 Non-binary 13 2% 1% 2 (Refused) 8 1% 1% 1 Region South 200 29% 28% 29 Central 200 29% 30% 28 North 301 43% 42% 43 City Council District 1 109 16% 16% 15 2 91 13% 11% 14 3 109 16% 18% 15 4 8 13% 11% 13 14 14 13 14 14 13 14 14 14 14 14 14 14 14 14 14 14 14 14 14	2 270 % 39% % 49% % 47% % 3% % 1% % 28% % 31% % 41%	0 139 6 20% 6 52% 6 47% 6 1% 6 25% 6 32%	9 290 6 41% 6 46% 6 51% 6 1% - 2% 6 30%	350 50% 50% 47% 1% 1% 32%	350 50% 46% 50% 2% 2% 25%
Row percent 100% 27% 73 Gender Male 339 48% 51% 48 Female 340 49% 47% 49 Non-binary 13 2% 1% 2 (Refused) 13 2% 1% 1 Region South 200 29% 28% 29 Central 200 29% 30% 28 North 301 43% 42% 43 City Council District 1 1 1 1 2 3 11% 14 3 11% 14 3 4 3 109 16% 16% 15 4 3 109 16% 118% 15 4 3 109 16% 16% 15 5 1 102 15% 14 6 7 13% 12% 13% 5 1 13% 12% 13% 6 1 13% 12%	% 39% % 49% % 47% % 3% % 1% % 28% % 31% % 41%	6 20% 6 52% 6 47% 6 1% 6 25% 6 32%	6 41% 6 46% 6 51% 6 1% - 2% 6 30%	50% 50% 47% 1% 1% 32%	50% 46% 50% 2% 2% 25%
Gender Male 339 48% 51% 48 Female 340 49% 47% 49 Non-binary 13 2% 1% 2 (Refused) 8 1% 1% 1 Region South 200 29% 28% 29 Central 200 29% 30% 28 North 301 43% 42% 43 City Council District 1 109 16% 16% 15 2 91 13% 11% 14 3 109 16% 16% 15 2 91 13% 11% 14 3 109 16% 16% 15 4 88 13% 11% 13 5 102 15% 15% 14 6 7 91 13% 12% 13 109 16% 16% 16% 16% 16% 100 15% 15% 14 16% <td< td=""><td>% 49% % 47% % 3% % 1% % 28% % 31% % 41%</td><td>6 52% 6 47% 6 1% 6 25% 6 32%</td><td>6 46% 6 51% 6 1% - 2% 6 30%</td><td>50% 47% 1% 1% 32%</td><td>46% 50% 2% 2% 25%</td></td<>	% 49% % 47% % 3% % 1% % 28% % 31% % 41%	6 52% 6 47% 6 1% 6 25% 6 32%	6 46% 6 51% 6 1% - 2% 6 30%	50% 47% 1% 1% 32%	46% 50% 2% 2% 25%
Female 340 49% 47% 49 Non-binary 13 2% 1% 2 (Refused) 8 1% 1% 1 Region South 200 29% 28% 29 Central 200 29% 30% 28 North 301 43% 42% 43 City Council District 1 109 16% 15 2 91 13% 11% 14 3 109 16% 18% 15 4 8 13% 11% 14 5 102 15% 15% 14 6 112 16% 16% 16 7 91 13% 12% 13	% 47% % 3% % 1% % 28% % 31% % 41%	6 47% 6 1% 6 25% 6 32%	6 51% 6 1% - 2% 6 30%	47% 1% 1% 32%	50% 2% 2% 25%
Non-binary (Refused) 13 2% 1% 2 Region South Central North 200 29% 28% 29 North 301 43% 42% 43 City Council District 1 109 16% 16% 2 91 13% 11% 14 3 109 16% 15% 15% 4 88 13% 11% 14 5 102 15% 15% 14 6 112 16% 16% 16% 7 91 13% 12% 13	% 3% % 1% % 28% % 31% % 41%	6 1% 6 25% 6 32%	6 1% - 2% 6 30%	1% 1% 32%	2% 2% 25%
(Refused) 8 1% 1% 1 Region South Central North 200 29% 28% 29 North 301 43% 42% 43 City Council District 1 109 16% 16% 15 2 91 13% 11% 14 3 109 16% 18% 15 4 88 13% 11% 14 5 102 15% 14 6 112 16% 16% 16 7 91 13% 11% 13 100 15% 14 16% 16% 6 112 16% 16% 16 7 91 13% 12% 13	% 1% % 28% % 31% % 41%	6 25% 6 32%	- 2% 6 30%	1% 32%	2% 25%
Region South Central North 200 29% 28% 29 City Council District 1 109 16% 16% 15 2 91 13% 111% 14 3 109 16% 18% 15 4 88 13% 11% 13 5 102 15% 15% 14 6 112 16% 16% 16 7 91 13% 12% 13	% 28% % 31% % 41%	6 25% 6 32%	6 30%	32%	25%
Central 200 29% 30% 28 North 301 43% 42% 43 City Council District 1 109 16% 16% 15 2 91 13% 11% 14 3 109 16% 18% 15 4 88 13% 11% 13 5 102 15% 15% 14 6 112 16% 16% 16 7 1 13% 12% 13	% 31% % 41%	6 32%			
North 301 43% 42% 43% City Council District 1 109 16% 16% 15 2 91 13% 11% 144 3 109 16% 18% 15 4 109 16% 18% 15 5 102 15% 11% 14 6 112 16% 16% 16 7 91 13% 12% 13%	% 41%		6 24%		
City Council District 1 109 16% 16% 15 2 91 13% 11% 14 3 109 16% 18% 15 4 88 13% 11% 13 5 102 15% 15% 14 6 112 16% 16% 16 7 91 13% 12% 13		6 43%		22%	35%
29113%11%14310916%18%1548813%11%13510215%15%14611216%16%1679113%12%13			6 45%	46%	40%
3 109 16% 18% 15 4 88 13% 11% 13 5 102 15% 15% 14 6 112 16% 16% 16 7 91 13% 12% 13	% 15%	6 16%	6 16%	16%	15%
48813%11%13510215%15%14611216%16%1679113%12%13	% 13%	6 8%	6 15%	16%	10%
510215%14611216%16%1679113%12%13	% 14%	6 19%	6 15%	10%	21%
6 112 16% 16% 16 7 91 13% 12% 13	% 10%	6 13%	6 15%	16%	9%
7 91 13% 12% 13	% 14%	6 15%	6 14%	15%	14%
	% 16%	6 15%	6 16%	16%	16%
Vote History (PG18 PG20 PG22) 0-3/6 378 54% 59% 52	% 17%	6 13%	6 9%	11%	15%
	% 77%	6 39%	6 40%	44%	64%
4-5/6 175 25% 25% 25	% 16%	6 37%	6 28%	29%	21%
6/6 147 21% 17% 23	% 7%	6 24%	6 32%	27%	15%
Gender/Generation M 18-39 148 21% 18% 22	% 35%	6 19%	6 9%	18%	24%
M 40-64 123 18% 22% 16	% 9%	6 27%	6 21%	20%	15%
M 65+ 69 10% 10% 10	% 4%	6 7%	6 16%	12%	7%
F 18-39 145 21% 17% 22	% 33%	6 21%	6 9%	16%	26%
F 40-64 135 19% 21% 19	% 12%	6 24%	6 24%	19%	20%
	% 2%	6 1%	6 18%	13%	4%
Other 21 3% 2% 3	% 4%	6 1%	6 3%	2%	4%

				Educ	ation	Durat	ion of resi	dency	Homeowner	
				<4-year	4-year	1-10	11-20			
		n	%	degree	degree+	years	years	>20 years	Owner	Renter
Number of cases		700		188	512	270	139	290	350	350
Row percent			100%	27%	73%	39%	20%	41%	50%	50%
Party/Gender	D Male	213	30%	28%	31%	32%	29%	29%	30%	31%
	D Female	234	33%	26%	36%	32%	32%	35%	34%	33%
	R/I Male	102	15%	17%	14%	11%	18%	16%	18%	11%
	R/I Female	76	11%	17%	9%	8%	11%	13%	11%	11%
	Other	75	11%	12%	10%	16%	9%	7%	7%	15%

						Gender/G	eneration		
		n	%	M 18-39	M 40-64	M 65+	F 18-39	F 40-64	F 65+
Number of cases		700		148	123	69	145	135	61
Row percent			100%	21%	18%	10%	21%	19%	9%
QOL Index	Mean	700	4.66	5.37	4.08	4.81	4.63	3.99	5.31
Seattle right direction/Wrong	Right direction	333	48%	65%	36%	46%	44%	38%	55%
track	Wrong track	365	52%	35%	64%	54%	56%	61%	45%
	(Don't know/Refused)	2	0%	-	-	-	1%	1%	-
	Net Right direction	-33	-5	+30	-28	-8	-12	-24	+11
Best thing about living in Seattle	Environment/Nature/Outdoors/Natural beauty	348	50%	52%	37%	44%	50%	54%	58%
	Location/Geography/Puget Sound	137	20%	23%	16%	26%	16%	23%	11%
	Weather/Summer/Climate	97	14%	10%	17%	21%	9%	13%	22%
	Community/Culture/Neighborhoods/Small city	88	13%	16%	10%	8%	16%	12%	11%
	Amenities/Food/Entertainment/Music/Sports	77	11%	11%	10%	4%	16%	13%	7%
	Diversity/Tolerance/Politics/Progressivism	68	10%	9%	8%	9%	14%	8%	11%
	Walkability/Transit	42	6%	9%	5%	5%	6%	5%	7%
	Jobs/Economy/Property values/No income tax	34	5%	4%	10%	1%	5%	3%	3%
	Family/Friends/Hometown	23	3%	2%	4%	8%	3%	3%	1%
	Planning to leave/Has complaints about Seattle	17	2%	1%	3%	4%	1%	3%	4%
	Other	22	3%	3%	4%	4%	2%	3%	4%
	Nothing/Don't know	15	2%	1%	3%	6%	2%	1%	2%

						Gender/G	eneration	ſ	
		n	%	M 18-39	M 40-64	M 65+	F 18-39	F 40-64	F 65+
Number of cases		700	,,,	148	123	69		135	61
Row percent			100%	21%	18%	10%	21%	19%	9%
Top issues facing Seattle	Crime/Drugs/Public safety	284	41%	33%	46%	37%	36%	48%	50%
	Homelessness	262	37%	31%	44%	40%	35%	41%	43%
	Cost of living/Affordable housing	195	28%	34%	21%	16%	38%	27%	14%
	Government/Politicians/Public leaders	103	15%	16%	15%	20%	10%	17%	12%
	Racial issues/Policing/Police brutality	43	6%	3%	4%	6%	9%	8%	6%
	Jobs/Economy	36	5%	6%	3%	1%	9%	2%	10%
	Streets/Roads/Infrastructure	30	4%	7%	6%	4%	3%	3%	0%
	Taxes	28	4%	3%	7%	6%	3%	2%	5%
	Growth/Development/Population	27	4%	9%	1%	3%	5%	1%	3%
	Public transportation	24	3%	6%	2%	2%	5%	0%	3%
	Cleanliness of city/Garbage	24	3%	3%	3%	2%	2%	4%	7%
	Traffic/Congestion	22	3%	2%	4%	7%	2%	4%	3%
	Mental health/Healthcare cost/access	20	3%	4%	2%	3%	2%	3%	1%
	Schools/School district/SPS/Education	12	2%	1%	3%	1%	0%	3%	1%
	Climate change/Environment	5	1%	1%	1%	0%	1%	1%	0%
	Other	6	1%	1%	1%	2%	1%	1%	0%
	None/Nothing/Don't know/Unsure/No comment	1	0%	0%	0%	2%	0%	0%	0%
Change in quality of life in	Much better	2	0%	1%	1%	-	-	-	-
Seattle	Somewhat better	149	21%	29%	13%	26%	20%	14%	33%
	The same	188	27%	32%	24%	26%	31%	22%	17%
	Somewhat worse	244	35%	32%	38%	25%	40%	36%	34%
	Much worse	116	17%	6%	24%	23%	9%	28%	16%
	(Don't know/Refused)	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
Change in quality of life in	Better	151	22%	30%	14%	26%	20%	14%	33%
Seattle	Same/(DK/Ref)	188	27%	32%	24%	26%	31%	22%	17%
	Worse	361	52%	38%	61%	48%	49%	64%	49%
	Net Better	-209	-30	-8	-47	-22	-29	-51	-16
Considered moving out of	Yes	388	55%	48%	64%	54%	55%	63%	42%
Seattle	No/(Don't know/Refused)	312	45%	52%	36%	46%	45%	37%	58%
							1		

					I	Gender/G	eneration		1
		n	%	M 18-39	M 40-64	M 65+	F 18-39	F 40-64	F 65+
Number of cases		700		148	123	69	145	135	61
Row percent			100%	21%	18%	10%	21%	19%	9%
Main reason for considering	Crime/Drugs/Public safety	118	30%	26%	34%	25%	24%	34%	42%
moving out of Seattle	Expensive (Cost of living/housing)	112	29%	24%	21%	19%	44%	32%	20%
	Government/Leadership/Politics	42	11%	18%	12%	15%	7%	6%	14%
	Homelessness	17	4%	6%	7%	2%	5%	4%	
	Declining quality of life	15	4%	3%	4%	9%	-	6%	4%
	Taxes	12	3%	3%	5%	6%	1%	4%	
	Work/Job opportunities/Business leaving	12	3%	4%	6%	-	4%	1%	
	Traffic/Congestion	9	2%	2%	3%	2%	2%	2%	8%
	Growth/Development/Space	7	2%	1%	-	-	5%	1%	3%
	Closer to family	7	2%	5%	1%	3%	-	-	3%
	Cleanliness/Garbage	7	2%	1%	1%	6%	1%	2%	
	Schools/School district/SPS/Education	6	2%	4%	2%	-	1%	1%	
	Weather	3	1%	-	-	3%	2%	1%	
	Other	18	5%	3%	5%	11%	4%	3%	5%
	None/Nothing/Don't know/Unsure/No comment	3	1%	-	-	-	-	3%	
Still actively considering moving	Yes	323	83%	75%	89%	82%	76%	92%	88%
out of Seattle	No/(Don't know/Refused)	65	17%	25%	11%	18%	24%	8%	12%
Considered moving/actively	Yes, still actively considering	323	46%	35%	57%	44%	42%	58%	37%
considering moving out of	Yes, no longer actively considering	65	9%	12%	7%	10%	13%	5%	5%
Seattle	No/(Don't know/Refused)	312	45%	52%	36%	46%	45%	37%	58%
Agree: I'm optimistic about the	Strongly agree	106	15%	20%	17%	22%	11%	10%	129
future of this region	Somewhat agree	318	45%	54%	35%	39%	59%	31%	519
2	Somewhat disagree	170	24%		31%				
	Strongly disagree	104	15%		17%	14%	15%		
	(Don't know/Refused)	2	0%		-	1%		-	1%

						Gender/G	eneration		
		n	%	M 18-39	M 40-64	M 65+	F 18-39	F 40-64	F 65+
Number of cases		700		148	123	69	145	135	61
Row percent			100%	21%	18%	10%	21%	19%	9%
Agree: A thriving downtown	Strongly agree	391	56%	44%	65%	65%	49%	60%	68%
Seattle is critical to our region's	Somewhat agree	227	32%	44%	26%	24%	37%	27%	24%
economic recovery	Somewhat disagree	54	8%	8%	6%	6%	9%	9%	9%
	Strongly disagree	28	4%		3%	3%	5%	4%	-
	(Don't know/Refused)	1	0%	-	-	1%	-	-	-
Agree: I'm worried about the	Strongly agree	334	48%	34%	59%	45%	44%	59%	52%
future of downtown Seattle	Somewhat agree	233	33%	43%	30%	35%	34%	23%	38%
	Somewhat disagree	97	14%	16%	7%	14%	18%	13%	8%
	Strongly disagree	34	5%	6%	3%	6%	4%	5%	2%
	(Don't know/Refused)	2	0%	-	1%	-	-	-	-
Agree: I would feel safe visiting	Strongly agree	268	38%	56%	26%	29%	48%	27%	28%
downtown Seattle during the	Somewhat agree	254	36%	29%	39%	39%	33%	40%	46%
day	Somewhat disagree	113	16%	12%	23%	17%	13%	19%	12%
	Strongly disagree	65	9%	3%	11%	15%	6%	14%	14%
	(Don't know/Refused)	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
Agree: I would feel safe visiting	Strongly agree	99	14%	24%	11%	6%	19%	8%	3%
downtown Seattle at night	Somewhat agree	148	21%	28%	20%	25%	20%	18%	14%
	Somewhat disagree	190	27%	24%	29%	26%	28%	24%	33%
	Strongly disagree	263	38%	24%	39%	43%	33%	50%	50%
	(Don't know/Refused)	1	0%	-	-	-	-	1%	-
Agree: I trust the City of Seattle	Strongly agree	15	2%	2%	3%	4%	1%	3%	_
to spend my tax dollars	Somewhat agree	201	29%	34%	17%	42%	35%	21%	27%
responsibly	Somewhat disagree	235	34%	37%	29%	15%	38%	35%	44%
	Strongly disagree	247	35%	26%	51%	38%	26%	42%	29%
	(Don't know/Refused)	1	0%	-	-	1%	-	-	-

						Gender/G	eneration		
		n	%	M 18-39	M 40-64	M 65+	F 18-39	F 40-64	F 65+
Number of cases		700		148	123	69	145	135	61
Row percent			100%	21%	18%	10%	21%	19%	9%
Agree: All things considered,	Strongly agree	109	16%	33%	10%	15%	12%	11%	8%
growth and development has	Somewhat agree	284	41%	42%	35%	37%	54%	31%	33%
been a positive for my area	Somewhat disagree	170	24%	21%	28%	24%	17%	29%	35%
	Strongly disagree	137	20%	4%	27%	24%	16%	29%	24%
	(Don't know/Refused)	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
Agree: I'm proud to call myself a	Strongly agree	299	43%	53%	40%	43%	42%	33%	48%
Seattleite	Somewhat agree	238	34%	33%	25%	35%	44%	35%	32%
	Somewhat disagree	102	15%	9%	25%	14%	9%	18%	12%
	Strongly disagree	61	9%	6%	10%	8%	5%	15%	7%
	(Don't know/Refused)	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
Agree: I trust that the city has an	Strongly agree	3	0%	1%	1%	1%	-	-	2%
effective plan to address the	Somewhat agree	110	16%	15%	15%	27%	14%	12%	20%
critical issues facing our city like	Somewhat disagree	279	40%	44%	28%	36%	51%	39%	37%
homelessness, affordability, and	Strongly disagree	306	44%	41%	56%	36%	35%	48%	41%
public safety	(Don't know/Refused)	1	0%	-	1%	-	-	-	-
Agree: The City of Seattle has	Strongly agree	305	44%	35%	49%	44%	49%	45%	34%
enough money to address	Somewhat agree	230	33%	31%	26%	38%	34%	32%	53%
important priorities; they just	Somewhat disagree	114	16%	24%	16%	13%	12%	18%	6%
need to spend it more	Strongly disagree	40	6%	8%	8%	4%	4%	4%	7%
effectively	(Don't know/Refused)	11	2%	3%	2%	1%	2%	1%	-
Agree: The city has made	Strongly agree	34	5%	7%	7%	3%	1%	7%	4%
	Somewhat agree	237	34%	40%	29%	43%	34%	30%	33%
the number of homeless	Somewhat disagree	215	31%	30%	27%	30%	39%	23%	34%
encampments in Seattle	Strongly disagree	210	30%	23%	37%	25%	26%	37%	29%
	(Don't know/Refused)	4	1%	-	-	-	-	3%	-

						Gender/G	eneration		
		n	%	M 18-39	M 40-64	M 65+	F 18-39	F 40-64	F 65+
Number of cases		700		148	123	69	145	135	61
Row percent			100%	21%	18%	10%	21%	19%	9%
Agree: City policies that have	Strongly agree	303	43%	36%	55%	50%	31%	49%	47%
increased business costs and the	Somewhat agree	181	26%	21%	24%	28%	28%	27%	36%
failure to adequately address	Somewhat disagree	142	20%	28%	12%	15%	31%	11%	17%
public safety make it hard to	Strongly disagree	63	9%	13%	7%	7%	9%	11%	1%
start or grow a business in	(Don't know/Refused)	11	2%	3%	2%	1%	-	2%	-
Seattle									
Agree: I'm optimistic about the	Agree	424	61%	75%	52%	61%	71%	41%	63%
future of this region	Disagree	274	39%	25%	48%	38%	29%	59%	36%
	(DK/Ref)	2	0%	-	-	1%	-	-	1%
	Net Agree	+150	+21	+49	+3	+23	+41	-18	+27
Agree: A thriving downtown	Agree	618	88%	88%	91%	89%	85%	87%	91%
Seattle is critical to our region's	Disagree	81	12%	12%	9%	9%	15%	13%	9%
economic recovery	(DK/Ref)	1	0%	-	-	1%	-	-	-
	Net Agree	+536	+77	+76	+83	+80	+71	+74	+83
Agree: I'm worried about the	Agree	567	81%	78%	89%	80%	78%	82%	90%
future of downtown Seattle	Disagree	131	19%	22%	10%	20%	22%	18%	10%
	(DK/Ref)	2	0%	-	1%	-	-	-	-
	Net Agree	+436	+62	+55	+79	+60	+56	+63	+80
Agree: I would feel safe visiting	Agree	522	75%	85%	65%	68%	81%	67%	73%
downtown Seattle during the	Disagree	178	25%	15%	35%	32%	19%	33%	27%
day	(DK/Ref)	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
	Net Agree	+344	+49	+71	+30	+36	+62	+34	+47
Agree: I would feel safe visiting	Agree	246	35%	52%	31%	31%	39%	26%	17%
downtown Seattle at night	Disagree	453	65%	48%	69%	69%	61%	74%	83%
	(DK/Ref)	1	0%		-	-	-	1%	-
	Net Agree	-207	-30		-37	-38	-22	-48	-66

						Gender/G	eneration		
		n	%	M 18-39	M 40-64	M 65+	F 18-39	F 40-64	F 65+
Number of cases		700		148	123	69		135	61
Row percent			100%	21%	18%	10%	21%	19%	9%
Agree: I trust the City of Seattle	Agree	216	31%	37%	20%	46%	36%	23%	27%
to spend my tax dollars	Disagree	483	69%	63%	80%	53%	64%	77%	73%
responsibly	(DK/Ref)	1	0%	-	-	1%	-	-	-
	Net Agree	-267	-38	-27	-59	-7	-29	-53	-47
Agree: All things considered,	Agree	394	56%	75%	45%	52%	67%	42%	41%
growth and development has	Disagree	306	44%	25%	55%	48%	33%	58%	59%
been a positive for my area	(DK/Ref)	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
	Net Agree	+87	+12	+50	-10	+5	+33	-16	-19
Agree: I'm proud to call myself a	Agree	537	77%	85%	65%	78%	85%	67%	81%
Seattleite	Disagree	163	23%	15%	35%	22%	15%	33%	19%
	(DK/Ref)	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
	Net Agree	+375	+54	+71	+29	+56	+71	+35	+61
Agree: I trust that the city has an	Agree	113	16%	15%	16%	28%	14%	12%	22%
effective plan to address the	Disagree	586	84%		83%	72%		88%	78%
	(DK/Ref)	1	0%		1%	-	-	-	-
homelessness, affordability, and		-473	-68	-70	-67	-44	-72	-75	-56
public safety									
Agree: The City of Seattle has	Agree	535	76%		74%	82%		78%	87%
enough money to address	Disagree	154	22%		23%	17%		21%	13%
important priorities; they just	(DK/Ref)	11	2%		2%	1%		1%	-
need to spend it more effectively	Net Agree	+381	+54	+34	+51	+65	+67	+56	+73
Agree: The city has made	Agree	272	39%	47%	36%	45%	35%	37%	38%
• •	Disagree	425	61%		64%	55%		61%	62%
the number of homeless	(DK/Ref)	4	1%		-		-	3%	-
encampments in Seattle	Net Agree	-153	-22		-28	-10	-31	-24	-25

			Gender/Generation					
		~				- 40.00	- 10 - 11	5.65
	n	%	M 18-39	M 40-64	M 65+	F 18-39	F 40-64	F 65+
Number of cases	700		148	123	69			61
Row percent		100%	21%	18%	10%	21%	19%	9%
Agree: City policies that have Agree	484	69%	57%	79%	77%	60%	76%	82%
increased business costs and the Disagree	205	29%	41%	18%	22%	40%	22%	18%
failure to adequately address (DK/Ref)	11	2%	3%	2%	1%	-	2%	-
public safety make it hard to Net Agree	+279	+40	+16	+61	+55	+20	+54	+65
start or grow a business in								
Impact: Closing encampments in 1 – Very little impact	61	9%	7%	4%	7%	14%	7%	13%
parks, on sidewalks, and on 2	44	6%	6%	4%	3%	7%	8%	7%
other public right of ways 3	54	8%	15%	3%	4%	12%	2%	1%
4	47	7%	7%	3%	7%	10%	7%	5%
5	83	12%	18%	9%	10%	17%	6%	4%
6	66	9%	9%	9%	9%	10%	8%	16%
7 – Very significant impact	345	49%	37%	68%	60%	30%	62%	54%
(Don't know/Refused)	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
Mean	700	5.32	5.00	6.10	5.79	4.58	5.69	5.44
Impact: Addressing property 1 – Very little impact	25	4%	4%	2%	2%	6%	1%	5%
crime like theft and car break-ins 2	22	3%	4%	2%	2%	4%	3%	2%
3	45	6%	7%	2%	4%	13%	4%	2%
4	65	9%	15%	8%	3%	10%	10%	7%
5	95	14%	13%	14%	16%	19%	10%	7%
6	115	16%	19%	14%	13%	15%	13%	30%
7 – Very significant impact	333	48%	38%	59%	61%	33%	58%	47%
(Don't know/Refused)	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
Mean	700	5.66	5.40	6.07	6.14	5.06	5.97	5.89

				Gender/Generation					
		n	%	M 18-39	M 40-64	M 65+	F 18-39	F 40-64	F 65+
Number of cases		700		148	123	69	145	135	61
Row percent			100%	21%	18%	10%	21%	19%	9%
Impact: Maintaining bridges and	1 – Very little impact	23	3%	4%	3%	1%	4%	3%	3%
infrastructure	2	16					1%	3%	-
	3	17	2%	5%	2%	4%	2%	1%	-
	4	90	13%	10%	14%	8%	18%	15%	10%
	5	125	18%	16%	16%	21%	19%	23%	13%
	6	136	19%	20%	20%	25%	18%	16%	22%
	7 – Very significant impact	292	42%	42%	40%	41%	37%	40%	52%
	(Don't know/Refused)	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
	Mean	700	5.65	5.58	5.57	5.85	5.49	5.57	6.06
Impact: Addressing racially	1 – Very little impact	80	11%	8%	31%	17%	4%	7%	5%
biased policing	2	37	5%	10%	5%	4%	3%	4%	4%
	3	47	7%	9%	9%	5%	6%	5%	5%
	4	100	14%	15%	9%	15%	14%	18%	12%
	5	123	18%	7%	15%	20%	23%	20%	27%
	6	86	12%	19%	7%	15%	15%	11%	1%
	7 – Very significant impact	227	32%	33%	24%	24%	34%	35%	45%
	(Don't know/Refused)	-	-	_	-	-	-	-	-
	Mean	700	4.88	4.91	3.87	4.60	5.33	5.11	5.37
Impact: Making Seattle a good	1 – Very little impact	29	4%	5%	2%	3%	6%	4%	-
place to do business	2	19	3%					3%	
	3	45	6%	10%	6%	3%	9%	4%	2%
	4	92	13%					16%	
	5	164	23%			23%		19%	24%
	6	97	14%					13%	
	7 – Very significant impact	253						41%	
	(Don't know/Refused)	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
	Mean	700	5.35	5.05	5.84	5.82	4.96	5.46	5.70

				1	Gender/G	eneration		
	n	%	M 18-39	M 40-64	M 65+	F 18-39	F 40-64	F 65+
	700		148	123	69	145	135	61
		100%	21%	18%	10%	21%	19%	9%
1 – Very little impact	23	3%	7%	3%	2%	5%	1%	-
2	26	4%	3%	2%	-	7%	4%	-
3	21	3%	3%	3%	4%	3%	2%	4%
4	52	7%	8%	10%	7%	10%	5%	1%
5	88	13%	19%	6%	13%	13%	8%	13%
6	104	15%	17%	16%	19%	11%	17%	13%
7 – Very significant impact	385	55%	43%	60%	55%	51%	63%	69%
(Don't know/Refused)	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
Mean	700	5.87	5.53	6.04	6.07	5.55	6.20	6.43
1 – Very little impact	111	16%	11%	33%	22%	5%	17%	10%
2	42	6%	7%	7%	11%	5%	5%	2%
3	57	8%	10%	5%	9%	7%	8%	13%
4	91	13%	8%	15%	9%	13%	19%	12%
5	133	19%	23%	14%	17%	19%	17%	23%
6	83	12%	10%	11%	14%	17%	9%	12%
7 – Very significant impact	184	26%	31%	15%	18%	34%	25%	29%
	_	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
Mean	700	4.54	4.81	3.64	4.02	5.24	4.40	4.86
1 – Very little impact	63	9%	11%	4%	3%	16%	6%	7%
2	1 1	4%		3%			3%	
3		7%	15%	3%	4%	7%	7%	-
4	1 1	7%						
5	1 1							
6	77							
7 – Very significant impact	1 1							
	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
Mean	700	5.46	4.95	6.08	6.02	4.76	5.81	5.98
	3 4 5 6 7 - Very significant impact (Don't know/Refused) Mean 1 - Very little impact 2 3 4 5 6 7 - Very significant impact (Don't know/Refused) Mean 1 - Very little impact 2 3 4 5 6 7 - Very significant impact (Don't know/Refused)	1 - Very little impact 23 2 26 3 21 4 52 5 88 6 104 7 - Very significant impact 385 (Don't know/Refused) - Mean 700 1 - Very little impact 111 2 42 3 57 4 91 5 133 6 83 7 - Very significant impact 184 (Don't know/Refused) - Mean 700 1 - Very little impact 63 2 30 3 52 4 46 5 68 6 77 7 - Very significant impact 63 2 30 3 52 4 46 5 68 6 77 7 - Very significant impact 365 (Don't know/Refused) - 7 Very significant impact	1 - Very little impact 23 3% 2 26 4% 3 21 3% 4 52 7% 5 88 13% 6 104 15% 7 - Very significant impact 385 55% (Don't know/Refused) - - Mean 700 5.87 1 - Very little impact 111 16% 2 42 6% 3 57 8% 4 91 13% 5 133 19% 6 700 4.54 1 - Very significant impact 184 26% (Don't know/Refused) - - Mean 700 4.54 1 - Very little impact 63 9% 2 30 4% 3 52 7% 4 52 7% 4 6 7% 5 68 10% 6 77 11% 7 - Very significant impact	700 148 100% 21% 2 3% 7% 2 26 4% 3% 3 21 3% 3% 4 52 7% 8% 5 88 13% 19% 6 104 15% 17% 7 - Very significant impact 385 55% 43% (Don't know/Refused) - - - Mean 700 5.87 5.53 1 - Very little impact 111 16% 11% 2 42 6% 7% 3 57 8% 10% 4 26% 7% 3 5 133 19% 23% 6 133 19% 23% 6 83 12% 10% 700 4.54 4.81 10% 1 - Very significant impact 63 9% 11% 2 30 4% 5% 3 3 52 7% 15%	1 - Very little impact 23 3% 7% 3% 2 3% 7% 3% 2% 3 26 4% 3% 2% 3 21 3% 3% 3% 5 52 7% 8% 10% 6 104 15% 17% 16% 7 - Very significant impact 385 55% 43% 60% (Don't know/Refused) - - - - Mean 700 5.87 5.53 6.04 1 - Very little impact 111 16% 11% 33% 2 42 6% 7% 7% 3 57 8% 10% 5% 4 26% 7% 7% 3 5 133 19% 23% 14% 6 700 4.54 4.81 3.64 1 - Very significant impact 63 9% 11% 3%	n % M 18-39 M 40-64 M 65+ 700 148 123 69 100% 21% 18% 10% 2 23 3% 7% 3% 2% 2 26 4% 3% 2% - 3 21 3% 3% 2% - 3 21 3% 3% 4% 10% 5 88 13% 19% 6% 13% 6 104 15% 17% 16% 19% 7 - Very significant impact 385 55% 43% 60% 55% (Don't know/Refused) - - - - - Mean 700 5.87 5.53 6.04 6.07 1 - Very little impact 111 16% 11% 33% 22% 2 42 6% 7% 7% 11% 6 83 12% 10% <	700 148 123 69 145 100% 21% 18% 10% 21% 18% 10% 21% 2 26 4% 3% 2% - 7% 3 21 3% 7% 3% 2% - 7% 3 21 3% 3% 3% 4% 3% 3% 4% 3% 4 52 7% 8% 10% 7% 10% 5 5 88 13% 19% 6% 13% 13% 6 104 15% 17% 16% 19% 11% 7-Very significant impact 385 55% 43% 60% 55% 51% (Don't know/Refused) -	n % M 18-39 M 40-64 M 65+ F 18-39 F 40-64 100% 148 123 69 145 135 100% 21% 18% 10% 21% 135 100% 21% 18% 10% 21% 19% 1 - Very little impact 23 3% 7% 3% 2% - 7% 4% 3 21 3% 3% 3% 4% 3% 2% 4 52 7% 8% 10% 7% 10% 5% 5 6 104 15% 17% 16% 19% 11% 17% 7 - Very significant impact 385 55% 43% 60% 55.55 6.20 1 - Very little impact 111 16% 11% 33% 22% 5% 17% 2 42 6% 7% 7% 11% 5% 5% 3 10% 5%

						Gender/G	eneration		
		n	%	M 18-39	M 40-64	M 65+	F 18-39	F 40-64	F 65+
Number of cases		700		148	123	69	145	135	61
Row percent			100%	21%	18%	10%	21%	19%	9%
Impact: Closing encampments in	1-3 Little impact	159	23%	28%	11%	13%	33%	17%	21%
parks, on sidewalks, and on	4/(DK)	47	7%	7%	3%	7%	10%	7%	5%
other public right of ways	5-7 Significant impact	494	71%	64%	87%	79%	57%	76%	74%
Impact: Addressing property	1-3 Little impact	92	13%	15%	6%	7%	24%	9%	9%
crime like theft and car break-ins	4/(DK)	65	9%	15%	8%	3%	10%	10%	7%
	5-7 Significant impact	543	78%	70%	86%	90%	66%	82%	85%
Impact: Maintaining bridges and	1-3 Little impact	56	8%	12%	9%	5%	8%	7%	3%
infrastructure	4/(DK)	90	13%	10%	14%	8%	18%	15%	10%
	5-7 Significant impact	553	79%	78%	76%	87%	74%	78%	88%
Impact: Addressing racially	1-3 Little impact	165	24%	26%	46%	25%	13%	16%	14%
biased policing	4/(DK)	100	14%		9%	15%			12%
	5-7 Significant impact	436	62%		46%	59%			74%
Impact: Making Seattle a good	1-3 Little impact	93	13%	18%	10%	8%	18%	11%	2%
place to do business	4/(DK)	92	13%		10%	5%			22%
	5-7 Significant impact	515	74%	71%	80%	87%			76%
Impact: Addressing violent crime	1-3 Little impact	70	10%	13%	8%	6%	15%	7%	4%
and gun violence	4/(DK)	52	7%		10%	7%	10%	5%	1%
	5-7 Significant impact	577	82%	79%	82%	87%	75%	89%	95%
Impact: Addressing climate	1-3 Little impact	209	30%	27%	44%	42%	17%	30%	25%
change	4/(DK)	91	13%	8%	15%	9%	13%		12%
	5-7 Significant impact	400	57%		40%	48%			64%
Impact: Shutting down open air	1-3 Little impact	144	21%	31%	10%	10%	29%	16%	11%
drug markets	4/(DK)	46	7%		7%	1%			6%
	5-7 Significant impact	510			83%	89%			84%
	5-7 Significant impact	510	73%	59%	83%	89%	63%	78%	849

						Gender/G	eneration		
		n	%	M 18-39	M 40-64	M 65+	F 18-39	F 40-64	F 65+
Number of cases		700		148		69		135	61
Row percent			100%	21%	18%	10%		19%	9%
Taxes in Seattle given the level	Much too high	182	26%	13%	41%	28%	17%	33%	33%
of services the city provides	Somewhat too high	220	31%	30%	28%	33%	29%	35%	40%
	Too low	91	13%	18%	7%	10%	19%	9%	5%
	About right	206	29%	39%	25%	29%	34%	22%	23%
	(Don't know)	1	0%	-	-	-	1%	-	-
Taxes in Seattle given the level	Too high	402	57%	43%	69%	61%	46%	69%	72%
of services the city provides	About right/(DK)	207	30%	39%	25%	29%	35%	22%	23%
	Too low	91	13%	18%	7%	10%	19%	9%	5%
	Net Too high	+311	+44	+25	+62	+50	+27	+60	+67
Downtown Seattle recovery	1 – Very pessimistic	99	14%	5%	25%	11%	6%	26%	13%
sentiment	2	165	24%		30%	23%		24%	8%
	3	313	45%		32%	42%		34%	60%
	4	100	14%	19%	10%	22%	13%	11%	17%
	5 – Very optimistic	21	3%	3%	2%	2%	4%	5%	2%
	(Don't know/Refused)	2	0%	-	1%	-	-	-	-
	Mean	698	2.68	2.90	2.34	2.80	2.83	2.43	2.86
Downtown Seattle recovery	1-2 Pessimistic	264	38%	29%	55%	34%	32%	50%	21%
sentiment	3/(DK)	315	45%			42%		34%	60%
	4-5 Optimistic	121	17%	22%	12%	24%	17%	15%	19%
Public safety preference: Need	Need action on public safety	373	53%	45%	69%	64%	36%	65%	52%
action on public safety vs.	Address root causes	322	46%			36%		33%	47%
Address root causes	(Both)	4	1%			-	-	2%	1%
	(Neither)	1	0%		1%	-	-	-	_
	(Don't know/Refused)	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-

						Gender/G	eneration		
		n	%	M 18-39	M 40-64	M 65+	F 18-39	F 40-64	F 65+
Number of cases		700		148	123	69	145	135	61
Row percent			100%	21%	18%	10%	21%	19%	9%
Homelessness/housing	Prioritize housing for homelessness	373	53%	40%	64%	64%	52%	51%	64%
preference: Prioritize housing for	Address broader housing affordability crisis	316	45%	60%	32%	35%	48%	47%	33%
homelessness vs. Address	(Both)	1	0%	-	1%	-	-	-	-
broader housing affordability	(Neither)	10	1%	-	3%	1%	-	2%	3%
crisis	(Don't know/Refused)	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
City budget deficit preference:	Focus on the basics	473	68%	54%	71%	72%	65%	78%	77%
Focus on the basics vs. Maintain	Maintain spending and raise new taxes	216	31%	46%	27%	27%	35%	18%	18%
spending and raise new taxes	(Both)	1	0%	-	-	-	-	0%	-
	(Neither)	7	1%	-	1%	1%	-	3%	3%
	(Don't know/Refused)	3	0%	-	1%	-	-	0%	2%
Public safety preference: Need	Need action on public safety	373	53%	45%	69%	64%	36%	65%	52%
action on public safety vs.	Address root causes	322	46%	55%	30%	36%	64%	33%	47%
Address root causes	(Both/Neither/DK/Ref)	5	1%	-	1%	-	-	2%	1%
	Net Need action on public safety	+51	+7	-11	+39	+27	-29	+31	+5
Homelessness/housing	Prioritize housing for homelessness	373	53%	40%	64%	64%	52%	51%	64%
preference: Prioritize housing for	Address broader housing affordability crisis	316	45%	60%	32%	35%	48%	47%	33%
homelessness vs. Address	(Both/Neither/DK/Ref)	10	1%	-	4%	1%	-	2%	3%
broader housing affordability crisis	Net Prioritize housing for homelessness	+57	+8	-20	+33	+29	+3	+4	+31
City budget deficit preference:	Focus on the basics	473	68%	54%	71%	72%	65%	78%	77%
	Maintain spending and raise new taxes	216	31%		27%	27%	35%	18%	18%
spending and raise new taxes	(Both/Neither/DK/Ref)	11	2%	-	2%	1%	-	3%	5%
	Net Focus on the basics	+256	+37	+7	+45	+45	+30	+60	+58
		1250	137	+7	-45	647	130	.00	

	Gender/Generation							
n	%	M 18-39	M 40-64	M 65+	F 18-39	F 40-64	F 65+	
700		148	123	69	145	135	61	
	100%	21%	18%	10%	21%	19%	9%	
64			10%			13%	12%	
48	7%		4%		1	9%	2%	
67	10%	9%	6%	9%	15%	10%	9%	
127	18%	15%	17%	17%	19%	17%	32%	
163	23%	27%	19%	25%	26%	19%	22%	
74	11%	11%	15%	13%	8%	10%	8%	
156	22%	23%	29%	22%	20%	22%	15%	
-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	
700	4.60	4.70	4.93	4.70	4.58	4.40	4.31	
36	5%	5%	6%	5%	3%	5%	9%	
52	7%	9%	7%	10%	6%	8%	3%	
63	9%	10%	7%	11%	9%	7%	8%	
157	22%	20%	14%	20%	30%	22%	33%	
156	22%	21%	25%	25%	22%	21%	24%	
96	14%	13%	13%	11%	16%	15%	12%	
137	20%	21%	29%	18%	14%	21%	11%	
1	0%	-	-	-	1%	-	-	
699	4.69	4.68	4.99	4.56	4.67	4.76	4.37	
82	12%	5%	13%	19%	6%	17%	15%	
34	5%	2%	7%	4%	2%	11%	2%	
52	7%	3%	11%	8%	7%	11%	6%	
74			11%			14%	20%	
99	14%		12%			15%	13%	
85			10%		1	11%	12%	
			36%				31%	
-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	
700	5.04	5.80	4.76	4.57	5.61	4.15	4.76	
	700 64 48 67 127 163 74 156 - 700 36 52 63 157 156 96 137 156 96 137 1 599 82 34 52 34 52 74 99	700 64 48 67 10% 48 67 10% 127 18% 163 163 23% 74 156 22% 700 4.60 36 52 700 4.60 36 52 700 4.60 36 52 700 4.60 36 52 7% 63 9% 157 22% 156 22% 163 96 14% 137 20% 1 699 4.69 82 12% 34 5% 52 <	$\begin{array}{c c c c c c c c c c c c c c c c c c c $	$ \begin{array}{ c c c c c c c c c c c c c c c c c c c$	n % M 18-39 M 40-64 M 65+ 700 148 123 69 100% 21% 18% 10% 64 9% 6% 10% 9% 67 10% 9% 6% 9% 67 10% 9% 6% 9% 127 18% 15% 17% 17% 163 23% 27% 19% 25% 74 11% 11% 15% 13% 156 22% 23% 29% 22% 700 4.60 4.70 4.93 4.70 36 5% 5% 6% 5% 52 7% 9% 7% 10% 157 22% 20% 14% 20% 156 22% 21% 25% 25% 96 14% 13% 11% 11% 137 20% 21% 2% 7%	$\begin{array}{c c c c c c c c c c c c c c c c c c c $	n % M 18-39 M 40-64 M 65+ F 18-39 F 40-64 700 148 123 69 145 135 100% 21% 18% 10% 21% 19% 64 9% 6% 10% 9% 6% 13% 48 7% 10% 4% 5% 5% 9% 67 10% 9% 6% 9% 15% 10% 127 18% 15% 17% 17% 19% 17% 163 23% 27% 19% 25% 26% 19% 74 11% 11% 15% 13% 8% 10% 156 22% 23% 29% 22% 20% 22% 700 4.60 4.70 4.93 4.70 4.58 4.40 36 5% 5% 6% 5% 3% 5% 52 7% 9% 7%	

			Gender/Generation						
		n	%	M 18-39	M 40-64	M 65+	F 18-39	F 40-64	F 65+
Number of cases		700		148	123	69	145	135	61
Row percent			100%	21%	18%	10%	21%	19%	9%
Support: Working with the state	1 – Strongly oppose	97	14%	7%	16%	26%	7%	20%	17%
to fund a "lid" over I-5 where it	2	56	8%	6%	9%	10%	5%	13%	4%
cuts through the downtown to	3	56	8%	5%	11%	7%	8%	9%	12%
free up new real estate for	4	130	19%	11%	18%	18%	15%	25%	33%
housing, parks, and public	5	107	15%	17%	12%	21%	17%	16%	10%
spaces and reconnect our	6	76	11%	18%	9%	7%	13%	6%	8%
neighborhoods	7 – Strongly support	176	25%	37%	26%	11%	34%	11%	16%
	(Don't know/Refused)	2	0%	-	-	-	1%	1%	-
	Mean	698	4.47	5.28	4.32	3.61	5.06	3.67	4.02
Support: Investing in the	1-3 Oppose	179	26%	25%	20%	23%	27%	31%	24%
continued revitalization of	4/(DK)	127	18%	15%	17%	17%	19%	17%	32%
Seattle Center by bringing back	5-7 Support	393	56%	60%	63%	60%	54%	51%	44%
the Sonics, redoing Memorial									
Support: Providing support and	1-3 Oppose	152	22%	24%	19%	26%	18%	21%	20%
funding for small- and medium-	4/(DK)	158	23%	20%	14%	20%	30%	22%	33%
sized Seattle businesses to help	5-7 Support	390	56%	56%	66%	54%	52%	57%	47%
them benefit from the economic									
Support: Keeping construction	1-3 Oppose	167	24%	11%	31%	30%	16%	39%	23%
for light rail to West Seattle and	4/(DK)	74	11%	8%	11%	10%	7%	14%	20%
Ballard on track to open in 2032	5-7 Support	459	66%	82%	58%	59%	77%	47%	57%
even if it costs more									
Support: Working with the state	1-3 Oppose	209	30%	17%	35%	43%	20%	41%	34%
to fund a "lid" over I-5 where it	4/(DK)	132	19%	11%	18%	18%	16%	26%	33%
cuts through the downtown to free up new real estate for	5-7 Support	359	51%	72%	47%	39%	64%	33%	34%
Pre-pandemic downtown visit	Once a week or more	142	20%	19%	29%	16%	12%	24%	22%
frequency (non-work)	A few times a month	238	34%		32%			41%	28%
	A few times a year	209	30%		25%	36%		23%	34%
	Rarely	70	10%		7%	15%		8%	17%
	Never	39			7%	5%		3%	_,,,,
	(Refused)	2	0%		-	-	-	2%	-
		-	0,0					_/0	

						Gender/G	eneration		
		n	%	M 18-39	M 40-64	M 65+	F 18-39	F 40-64	F 65+
Number of cases		700		148	123	69	145	135	61
Row percent			100%	21%	18%	10%	21%	19%	9%
Pre-pandemic downtown visit	Weekly	142	20%	19%	29%	16%	12%	24%	22%
frequency (non-work)	Few times a month	238	34%	34%	32%	29%	36%	41%	28%
	Less often	320	46%	47%	39%	55%	52%	35%	50%
Current downtown visit	Much more often	55	8%	13%	6%	5%	13%	2%	-
frequency compared to pre-	Somewhat more often	40	6%	9%	6%	5%	7%	4%	2%
pandemic	About the same	173	25%	34%	19%	24%	25%	19%	17%
	Somewhat less often	139	20%	16%	21%	17%	20%	21%	32%
	Much less often	292	42%	27%	48%	51%	35%	53%	49%
	(Don't know/Refused)	1	0%	-	-	-	-	1%	-
Current downtown visit	More often	95	14%	22%	12%	9%	20%	6%	2%
frequency compared to pre-	Same/(DK/Ref)	174	25%	34%	19%	24%	25%	20%	17%
pandemic	Less often	431	62%	43%	69%	67%	55%	74%	82%
	Net More often	-337	-48	-21	-56	-58	-35	-68	-80
Duration of residency	<2 years	15	2%	4%	1%	-	4%	-	-
	2-5 years	126	18%	29%	10%	2%	34%	7%	6%
	6-10 years	130	19%	31%	9%	15%	23%	17%	5%
	11-20 years	139	20%	18%	30%	14%	21%	25%	3%
	>20 years	282	40%	16%	49%	69%	16%	51%	85%
Duration of residency	1-10 years	270	39%	64%	20%	17%	62%	24%	11%
	11-20 years	139	20%	18%	30%	14%	21%	25%	3%
	>20 years	290	41%	18%	50%	69%	17%	51%	87%

				Gender/Generation					
		n	%	M 18-39	M 40-64	M 65+	F 18-39	F 40-64	F 65+
Number of cases		700		148	123	69		135	61
Row percent			100%	21%	18%	10%	21%	19%	9%
Party	Strong Democrat	260	37%	36%	36%	29%	41%	39%	50%
	Not very strong Democrat	117	17%	22%	16%	16%	19%	13%	15%
	Independent, closer to Democratic party	76	11%	9%	11%	10%	10%	13%	11%
	Independent	44	6%	1%	10%	13%	1%	11%	4%
	Independent, closer to Republican party	25	4%	4%	5%	5%	2%	1%	9%
	Not very strong Republican	23	3%	4%	2%	8%	2%	5%	-
	Strong Republican	15	2%	2%	3%	4%	1%	3%	1%
	Socialist	59	8%	10%	4%	7%	15%	6%	-
	(Something else/Don't know/Refused)	80	11%	11%	14%	10%	9%	10%	11%
Party	Socialist	59	8%	10%	4%	7%	15%	6%	-
	Democrat	454	65%	67%	62%	54%	70%	65%	75%
	Independent	124	18%	13%	24%	23%	11%	20%	15%
	Republican	63	9%	10%	10%	17%	5%	9%	10%
Perceived personal ideology	1 – Very liberal	150	21%	27%	10%	15%	34%	15%	18%
	2	133	19%		13%			16%	17%
	3	167	24%		27%	27%		22%	24%
	4	120	17%		22%	18%	12%	27%	21%
	5	61	9%	5%	13%	9%	1	10%	11%
	6	18	3%	3%	4%	4%	1%	4%	-
	7 – Very conservative	12	2%	1%	2%	3%	1%	1%	3%
	(Don't know/Refused)	38	5%	4%	8%	10%	3%	5%	4%
	Mean	662	2.87	2.51	3.42	3.14	2.40	3.19	3.01
Perceived personal ideology	Liberal	451	64%	79%	50%	57%	76%	53%	60%
	Moderate	158	23%		30%	28%		31%	26%
	Conservative	91	13%		20%	15%		15%	14%

						Gender/G	eneration		
		n	%	M 18-39	M 40-64	M 65+	F 18-39	F 40-64	F 65+
Number of cases		700		148	123	69	145	135	61
Row percent			100%	21%	18%	10%	21%	19%	9%
Perceived city council ideology	1 – Very liberal	160	23%	14%	39%	26%	16%	27%	17%
	2	119	17%	15%	20%	19%	16%	22%	12%
	3	101	14%	14%	12%	24%	15%	12%	16%
	4	119	17%	25%	6%	13%	21%	10%	26%
	5	90	13%	18%	10%	6%	15%	14%	9%
	6	39	6%	6%	5%	1%	9%	5%	5%
	7 – Very conservative	28	4%	5%	2%	3%	4%	2%	7%
	(Don't know/Refused)	43	6%	4%	6%	8%	5%	8%	8%
	Mean	657	3.13	3.57	2.49	2.67	3.48	2.82	3.42
Perceived city council ideology	Liberal	381	54%	43%	71%	69%	47%	61%	45%
, , ,	Moderate	163	23%	28%	12%	21%	26%	18%	35%
	Conservative	157	22%		18%	10%	28%	21%	20%
Homeowner	Homeowner	350	50%	43%	56%	64%	38%	49%	75%
	Renter	350	50%	57%	44%	36%	62%	51%	25%
Ethnicity	White or Caucasian	511	73%	79%	70%	70%	74%	67%	80%
	African American or Black	28	4%	2%	4%	5%	5%	5%	2%
	Hispanic or Latino	42	6%	3%	7%	4%	7%	9%	6%
	Asian or Pacific Islander	56	8%	7%	8%	12%	8%	12%	2%
	Something else	49	7%	6%	9%	8%	6%	6%	10%
	(Refused)	14	2%	3%	2%	1%	1%	1%	1%
Ethnicity	White or Caucasian	511	73%	79%	70%	70%	74%	67%	80%
,	African American or Black	28	4%		4%	5%	5%	5%	2%
	Hispanic or Latino	42	6%			4%	7%	9%	6%
	Asian or Pacific Islander	56				12%		12%	2%
	Another ethnicity/(Ref)	63	9%			10%		7%	11%

				Gender/Generation						
		n	%	M 18-39	M 40-64	M 65+	F 18-39	F 40-64	F 65+	
Number of cases		700		148	123	69		135	61	
Row percent			100%	21%	18%	10%	21%	19%	9%	
Ethnicity	White	511	73%	79%	70%	70%	74%	67%	80%	
	POC	175	25%	18%	28%	29%	25%	31%	19%	
	(Ref)	14	2%	3%	2%	1%	1%	1%	1%	
Age (Replaced)	18-29	132	19%	42%	-	-	41%	-	-	
	30-39	176	25%	58%	-	-	59%	-	-	
	40-49	123	18%	-	51%	-	-	45%	-	
	50-64	140	20%	-	49%	-	-	55%	-	
	65+	129	18%	-	-	100%	-	-	100%	
Two-Age Split	18-39	308	44%	100%	-	-	100%	-	-	
	40+	392	56%	-	100%	100%	-	100%	100%	
Generation	18-39	308	44%	100%	-	-	100%	-	-	
	40-64	263	38%	-	100%	-	-	100%	-	
	65+	129	18%	-	-	100%	-	-	100%	
Education	Some grade school	3	0%	-	-	-	1%	-	-	
	Some high school	1	0%		-	-	-	1%	-	
	Graduated high school	16			4%	3%	2%	5%	-	
	Technical/vocational school	25	4%	4%	4%	-	4%	5%	2%	
	Some college/<4-year degree	132	19%	20%	25%	20%	14%	15%	26%	
	Graduated college/4-year degree	291	42%	52%	34%	29%	50%	35%	35%	
	Graduate/professional degree	221	32%	24%	31%	44%	28%	36%	34%	
	(Refused)	12	2%	-	1%	4%	1%	3%	2%	
Education	<4-year degree	188	27%	23%	34%	27%	22%	29%	30%	
	4-year degree+	512	73%							
Education	Less than college	188	27%	23%	34%	27%	22%	29%	30%	
	Graduated college	291								
	Graduate/professional degree	221					1			

						Gender/G	eneration		
		n	%	M 18-39	M 40-64	M 65+	F 18-39	F 40-64	F 65+
Number of cases		700		148	123	69	145	135	61
Row percent			100%	21%	18%	10%	21%	19%	9%
Gender	Male	339	48%	100%	100%	100%	-	-	-
	Female	340	49%	-	-	-	100%	100%	100%
	Non-binary	13	2%	-	-	-	-	-	-
	(Refused)	8	1%	-	-	-	-	-	-
Region	South	200	29%	29%	29%	26%	25%	33%	33%
5	Central	200	29%		34%	24%			29%
	North	301	43%	41%	37%	50%	45%	47%	38%
City Council District	1	109	16%	17%	19%	12%	11%	19%	12%
	2	91	13%		10%	14%			21%
	3	109	16%		19%	10%			15%
	4	88	13%		15%	16%			15%
	5	102	15%		13%	17%			7%
	6	112	16%		9%	17%			16%
	7	91	13%	12%	15%	14%	14%	11%	14%
Vote History (PG18 PG20 PG22)	0-3/6	378	54%	66%	57%	34%	72%	42%	23%
	4-5/6	175			26%	21%			28%
	6/6	147	21%		17%	44%			49%
Gender/Generation	M 18-39	148	21%	100%	-	-	_	-	-
	M 40-64	123	18%		100%	-	-	-	-
	M 65+	69	10%		-	100%	-	-	-
	F 18-39	145			-	-	100%	-	-
1	F 40-64	135			-	-	-	100%	-
1	F 65+	61	9%	-	-	-	-	-	100%
	Other	21	3%		-	-	-	-	-

						Gender/G	eneration		
		n	%	M 18-39	M 40-64	M 65+	F 18-39	F 40-64	F 65+
Number of cases		700		148	123	69	145	135	61
Row percent			100%	21%	18%	10%	21%	19%	9%
Party/Gender	D Male	213	30%	67%	62%	54%	-	_	-
	D Female	234	33%	-	-	-	70%	65%	75%
	R/I Male	102	15%	22%	34%	39%	-	-	-
	R/I Female	76	11%	-	-	-	15%	29%	25%
	Other	75	11%	10%	4%	7%	15%	6%	-

						arty/Gende	er	-		Region	
		n	%	D Male	D Female	R/I Male	R/I Female	Other	South	Central	North
Number of cases		700		213	234	102	76	75	200	200	301
Row percent			100%	30%	33%	15%	11%	11%	29%	29%	43%
QOL Index	Mean	700	4.66	5.25	4.88	3.73	3.45	4.82	4.82	4.74	4.51
Seattle right direction/Wrong F	Right direction	333	48%	62%	49%	26%	25%	56%	52%	47%	45%
track \	Wrong track	365	52%	38%	50%	74%	75%	44%	47%	53%	55%
((Don't know/Refused)	2	0%	-	1%	-	-	-	1%	-	0%
٦	Net Right direction	-33	-5	+23	-1	-49	-51	+13	+5	-7	-9
Best thing about living in Seattle [Environment/Nature/Outdoors/Natural beauty	348	50%	50%	57%	35%	41%	55%	48%	47%	53%
l I	Location/Geography/Puget Sound	137	20%	23%	17%	15%	23%	19%	15%	19%	23%
N N	Weather/Summer/Climate	97	14%	13%	11%	22%	15%	12%	15%	14%	13%
(Community/Culture/Neighborhoods/Small city	88	13%	15%	17%	8%	1%	11%	13%	13%	12%
4	Amenities/Food/Entertainment/Music/Sports	77	11%	11%	12%	6%	13%	12%	11%	10%	12%
ſ	Diversity/Tolerance/Politics/Progressivism	68	10%	9%	11%	5%	10%	17%	11%	11%	8%
l v	Walkability/Transit	42	6%	9%	6%	1%	6%	6%	3%	10%	5%
J	Jobs/Economy/Property values/No income tax	34	5%	4%	4%	6%	6%	8%	7%	5%	3%
F	Family/Friends/Hometown	23	3%	2%	3%	6%	4%	3%	2%	6%	2%
F	Planning to leave/Has complaints about Seattle	17	2%	1%	1%	5%	9%	1%	2%	2%	3%
(Other	22	3%	2%	2%	7%	7%	1%	3%	2%	4%
1	Nothing/Don't know	15	2%	1%	1%	5%	2%	4%	3%	0%	3%

							Region	_			
			0/	D Mala	D Comolo		D/I Comolo	Othor	Couth	Control	North
Number of cases						-				Central 200	
Row percent		/00									
Top issues facing Seattle	Crime/Drugs/Public safety	284	41%	37%	40%	45%	68%	17%	37%	39%	44%
Top issues rueing seattle	Homelessness	262	37%	37%	41%		36%	26%	35%		
	Cost of living/Affordable housing	195			29%				28%		
	Government/Politicians/Public leaders	103			13%				16%		
	Racial issues/Policing/Police brutality	43		4%	9%	5%	4%	10%	8%		
	Jobs/Economy	36		3%	5%	5%	8%	9%	4%	8%	
	Streets/Roads/Infrastructure	30			2%	6%	5%		6%		
	Taxes	28			3%	9%	3%	0%	4%		
	Growth/Development/Population	27	4%		3%	2%	3%	2%	3%		
	Public transportation	24		5%	3%	2%	0%	9%	4%		
	Cleanliness of city/Garbage	24		3%	4%	3%	5%	2%	2%		
	Traffic/Congestion	22	3%		3%	2%	3%				
	Mental health/Healthcare cost/access	20			3%	2%	0%		6%		
	Schools/School district/SPS/Education	12	2%	2%	2%	2%	1%		2%		
	Climate change/Environment	5		1%	1%	0%	0%	1%			
	Other	6	1%		1%	1%	1%		2%		
	None/Nothing/Don't know/Unsure/No comment	1	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%	2%	0%		
Change in quality of life in	Much better	2	0%	1%	-	-	-	1%	1%	-	-
Seattle	Somewhat better	149	21%	24%	20%	19%	22%	19%	23%		20%
	The same	188	27%	32%	30%	18%	8%	31%	23%		
	Somewhat worse	244	35%	34%	40%	29%	27%	35%	37%	33%	35%
	Much worse	116	17%	8%	9%	33%	43%	13%	17%	17%	16%
	(Don't know/Refused)	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
Change in quality of life in	Better	151	22%	25%	20%	19%	22%	20%	24%	23%	20%
Seattle	Same/(DK/Ref)	188	27%	32%	30%	18%	8%	31%	23%	28%	29%
	Worse	361	52%	43%	50%	63%	70%	48%	54%	50%	51%
	Net Better	-209			-30						
Considered moving out of	Yes	388	55%	49%	50%	68%	71%	56%	53%	54%	58%
Seattle	No/(Don't know/Refused)	312	45%	51%	50%	32%	29%	44%	47%	46%	42%

				Party/Gender % D Male D Female R/I Male R/I Female Other						Region		
		n	%	D Male	D Female	R/I Male	R/I Female	Other	South	Central	North	
Number of cases		700		213	234	102	76	75	200	200	301	
Row percent			100%	30%	33%	15%	11%	11%	29%	29%	43%	
Main reason for considering	Crime/Drugs/Public safety	118	30%	28%	28%	33%	44%	19%	32%	32%	29%	
moving out of Seattle	Expensive (Cost of living/housing)	112	29%	22%	39%	17%	22%	46%	24%	29%	31%	
	Government/Leadership/Politics	42	11%	12%	6%	20%	12%	3%	10%	12%	11%	
	Homelessness	17	4%	5%	5%	6%	2%	2%	6%	3%	4%	
	Declining quality of life	15	4%	5%	2%	5%	5%	-	3%	3%	5%	
	Taxes	12	3%	4%	3%	3%	1%	3%	6%	-	3%	
	Work/Job opportunities/Business leaving	12	3%	3%	1%	6%	-	6%	3%	5%	2%	
	Traffic/Congestion	9	2%	2%	2%	1%	5%	2%	4%	-	3%	
	Growth/Development/Space	7	2%	1%	4%	-		3%	5%	-	1%	
	Closer to family	7	2%	5%	1%	-		3%	1%	2%	2%	
	Cleanliness/Garbage	7	2%	1%	1%	2%	3%	2%	2%	3%	1%	
	Schools/School district/SPS/Education	6	2%	3%	2%	2%	-	-	2%	2%	1%	
	Weather	3	1%	-	1%	1%	-	3%	-	2%	1%	
	Other	18	5%	7%	5%	3%	-	7%	3%	6%	4%	
	None/Nothing/Don't know/Unsure/No comment	3	1%	-	-	-	5%	-	-	-	1%	
Still actively considering moving	Yes	323	83%	78%	82%	87%	91%	82%	83%	81%	85%	
out of Seattle	No/(Don't know/Refused)	65	17%	22%	18%	13%	9%	18%	17%	19%	15%	
Considered moving/actively	Yes, still actively considering	323	46%	38%	41%	60%	65%	46%	44%	43%	49%	
considering moving out of	Yes, no longer actively considering	65	9%	11%	9%	9%	6%	10%	9%	10%	9%	
Seattle	No/(Don't know/Refused)	312	45%	51%	50%	32%	29%	44%	47%	46%	42%	
Agree: I'm optimistic about the	Strongly agree	106	15%	22%	12%	13%	5%	16%	18%	17%	12%	
future of this region	Somewhat agree	318	45%	48%		33%		51%		48%	44%	
5	Somewhat disagree	170	24%		23%	30%		1		20%	28%	
	Strongly disagree	104	15%		12%					15%		
	(Don't know/Refused)	2	0%	0%			-	-	0%	-	0%	

					P	arty/Gende	er			Region	
		n	%	D Male	D Female	R/I Male	R/I Female	Other	South	Central	North
Number of cases		700	-	213	234				200		301
Row percent			100%	30%	33%	15%	11%	11%	29%	29%	43%
Agree: A thriving downtown	Strongly agree	391	56%	51%	56%		75%		55%		55%
Seattle is critical to our region's	Somewhat agree	227	32%	38%	32%			1	32%		35%
economic recovery	Somewhat disagree	54	8%	8%	8%	3%	3%	17%	8%		6%
	Strongly disagree	28	4%	3%	4%	3%	3%	10%	4%	4%	4%
	(Don't know/Refused)	1	0%	0%	-	-	-	-	0%	-	-
Agree: I'm worried about the	Strongly agree	334	48%	41%	49%	59%	69%	24%	44%	46%	52%
future of downtown Seattle	Somewhat agree	233	33%	40%	33%	29%	22%		35%		32%
	Somewhat disagree	97	14%	14%	15%	7%	5%	28%	14%	13%	14%
	Strongly disagree	34	5%	5%	3%	4%	4%	14%	8%	6%	2%
	(Don't know/Refused)	2	0%	-	-	1%	-	2%	-	1%	-
Agree: I would feel safe visiting	Strongly agree	268	38%	46%	38%	22%	17%	62%	40%	41%	35%
downtown Seattle during the	Somewhat agree	254	36%	34%	40%	38%	37%	26%	37%	32%	38%
day	Somewhat disagree	113	16%	15%	16%	21%	17%	11%	14%	17%	17%
	Strongly disagree	65	9%	4%	6%	19%	28%	1%	9%	10%	9%
	(Don't know/Refused)	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
Agree: I would feel safe visiting	Strongly agree	99	14%	15%	11%	14%	5%	29%	19%	12%	12%
downtown Seattle at night	Somewhat agree	148	21%	30%	19%	10%	4%	35%	23%	21%	20%
	Somewhat disagree	190	27%	30%	30%	23%	28%	16%	26%	29%	27%
	Strongly disagree	263	38%	25%	40%	53%	64%	19%	32%	38%	41%
	(Don't know/Refused)	1	0%	-	0%	-	-	-	0%	-	-
Agree: I trust the City of Seattle	Strongly agree	15	2%	4%	2%	1%	2%	1%	2%	3%	2%
to spend my tax dollars	Somewhat agree	201	29%	34%	32%	16%	16%	34%	33%	24%	29%
responsibly	Somewhat disagree	235	34%	34%	41%	20%	25%	37%	33%	38%	31%
	Strongly disagree	247	35%	27%	26%	63%	58%	28%	31%	35%	38%
	(Don't know/Refused)	1	0%	0%	-	-	-	-	0%	-	-

					Р	arty/Gende	er			Region	
		n	%	D Male	D Female	R/I Male	R/I Female	Other	South	Central	North
Number of cases		700		213	234	102	76	75	200	200	301
Row percent			100%	30%	33%	15%	11%	11%	29%	29%	43%
Agree: All things considered,	Strongly agree	109	16%						19%	16%	
growth and development has	Somewhat agree	284	41%			30%			39%	40%	
been a positive for my area	Somewhat disagree	170	24%		28%	26%			24%	21%	
	Strongly disagree	137	20%	11%	17%	28%	34%	24%	18%	22%	19%
	(Don't know/Refused)	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
Agree: I'm proud to call myself a	Strongly agree	299	43%	52%	49%	31%	12%	44%	48%	42%	40%
Seattleite	Somewhat agree	238	34%	34%	40%	20%	33%	36%	33%	35%	34%
	Somewhat disagree	102	15%	7%	8%	35%	27%	16%	13%	14%	16%
	Strongly disagree	61	9%	6%	4%	13%	28%	5%	6%	9%	10%
	(Don't know/Refused)	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
Agree: I trust that the city has an	Strongly agree	3	0%	1%	-	-	1%	1%	1%	-	0%
effective plan to address the	Somewhat agree	110	16%	19%	16%	12%	11%	15%	20%	9%	17%
critical issues facing our city like	Somewhat disagree	279	40%	43%	49%	26%	31%	30%	40%	43%	37%
	Strongly disagree	306	44%	37%	35%	61%	56%	55%	39%	47%	45%
public safety	(Don't know/Refused)	1	0%	-	-	1%	-	-	-	0%	-
Agree: The City of Seattle has	Strongly agree	305	44%	36%	39%	58%	65%	39%	43%	40%	46%
enough money to address	Somewhat agree	230	33%			20%			36%	36%	
important priorities; they just	Somewhat disagree	114	16%			17%			13%	17%	
need to spend it more	Strongly disagree	40	6%	6%	4%	5%	5%	9%	6%	6%	
effectively	(Don't know/Refused)	11	2%	4%	1%	-	-	-	3%	1%	
Agree: The city has made	Strongly agree	34	5%	8%	4%	2%	4%	3%	7%	3%	5%
meaningful progress in reducing	Somewhat agree	237	34%	39%		32%			24%	33%	
the number of homeless	Somewhat disagree	215	31%			24%			37%	31%	
encampments in Seattle	Strongly disagree	210	30%	22%		42%			32%	32%	
	(Don't know/Refused)	4	1%	-	-	-	2%		-	1%	
											i

					P	arty/Gende	er			Region	
		n	%	D Male	D Female	R/I Male	R/I Female	Other	South	Central	North
Number of cases		700		213	234	102			200	200	301
Row percent			100%	30%	33%	15%	11%	11%	29%	29%	43%
Agree: City policies that have	Strongly agree	303	43%	35%	38%	75%	61%	21%	33%	47%	48%
increased business costs and the	Somewhat agree	181	26%	29%	34%	12%	15%		29%	25%	
failure to adequately address	Somewhat disagree	142	20%	23%	20%	6%	17%	35%	23%	20%	19%
public safety make it hard to	Strongly disagree	63	9%	9%	7%	6%	7%	21%	13%	7%	8%
start or grow a business in Seattle	(Don't know/Refused)	11	2%	4%	0%	-	-	3%	3%	1%	1%
Agree: I'm optimistic about the	Agree	424	61%	70%	64%	47%	36%	67%	63%	65%	56%
future of this region	Disagree	274	39%	30%	36%	53%			37%		
	(DK/Ref)	2/4	0%	0%	0%	-	-	-	0%		0%
	Net Agree	+150	+21	+40	+28	-7	-28	+35	+26	+30	
Agree: A thriving downtown	Agree	618	88%	89%	88%	94%	94%	73%	88%	86%	90%
Seattle is critical to our region's	Disagree	81	12%	10%	12%	6%	6%	27%	12%	14%	10%
economic recovery	(DK/Ref)	1	0%	0%	-	-	-	-	0%	-	_
	Net Agree	+536	+77	+79	+77	+88	+87	+45	+76	+72	+80
Agree: I'm worried about the	Agree	567	81%	81%	83%	89%	91%	56%	78%	80%	83%
future of downtown Seattle	Disagree	131	19%	19%	17%	10%	9%	43%	22%	19%	17%
	(DK/Ref)	2	0%	-	-	1%	-	2%	-	1%	-
	Net Agree	+436	+62	+62	+65	+78	+81	+13	+57	+61	+67
Agree: I would feel safe visiting	Agree	522	75%	80%	78%	60%	55%	88%	77%	73%	74%
downtown Seattle during the	Disagree	178	25%	20%	22%	40%	45%	12%	23%	27%	26%
day	(DK/Ref)	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
	Net Agree	+344	+49	+61	+56	+20	+9	+76	+54	+46	+48
Agree: I would feel safe visiting	Agree	246	35%	45%	30%	24%			42%		
downtown Seattle at night	Disagree	453	65%	55%	69%	76%	91%	35%	58%	67%	68%
	(DK/Ref)	1	0%	-	0%	-	-	-	0%	-	-
	Net Agree	-207	-30	-10	-39	-51	-82	+29	-16	-34	-36

				P	arty/Gende	er			Region	
	n	%	D Male	D Female	R/I Male	R/I Female	Other	South	Central	North
	700		213	234	102	76	75	200	200	301
		100%	30%	33%	15%	11%	11%	29%	29%	43%
Agree	216			33%						
Disagree	483			67%	83%	83%	65%		73%	69%
(DK/Ref)	1	0%	0%	-	-	-	-	0%	-	-
Net Agree	-267	-38	-23	-34	-66	-66	-29	-29	-46	-39
Agree	394	56%	66%	55%	46%	46%	57%	58%	57%	55%
Disagree	306	44%	34%	45%	54%	54%	43%	42%	43%	45%
(DK/Ref)	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
Net Agree	+87	+12	+32	+10	-9	-8	+14	+16	+13	+9
Agree	537	77%	87%	88%	51%	45%	79%	81%	77%	74%
Disagree	163	23%	13%	12%	49%	55%	21%	19%	23%	26%
(DK/Ref)	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
Net Agree	+375	+54	+73	+77	+3	-10	+59	+62	+53	+48
Agree	113	16%	20%	16%	12%	12%	16%	21%	9%	18%
Disagree	586	84%	80%	84%	88%	88%	84%	79%	90%	82%
(DK/Ref)	1	0%	-	-	1%	-	-	-	0%	-
Net Agree	-473	-68	-60	-68	-76	-75	-68	-58	-81	-65
Agree	535	76%	70%	81%	78%	87%	66%	79%	76%	75%
-										
-					-	-	_			
					+57	+74	+32			
				•						
Agree	272	39%	48%	40%	34%	31%	24%	31%	36%	46%
Disagree	425	61%	52%	60%	66%	67%	73%	69%	63%	54%
(DK/Ref)	4	1%	-	-	-	2%	3%	-	1%	0%
Net Agree	-153	-22	-5	-20	-32	-36	-49	-38	-27	-8
	Disagree (DK/Ref) Net Agree Agree Disagree (DK/Ref) Net Agree Agree Disagree (DK/Ref) Net Agree Agree Disagree (DK/Ref) Net Agree Agree Disagree (DK/Ref) Net Agree Agree Disagree (DK/Ref) Net Agree Agree Disagree (DK/Ref) Net Agree	Agree 216 Disagree 483 (DK/Ref) 1 Net Agree -267 Agree 394 Disagree 306 (DK/Ref) - Net Agree 487 Agree 537 Disagree 163 (DK/Ref) - Net Agree 537 Disagree 163 (DK/Ref) - Net Agree 537 Disagree 163 (DK/Ref) - Net Agree 535 Disagree 535 Disagree 535 Disagree 111 Net Agree 535 Disagree 154 (DK/Ref) 11 Net Agree +381 Agree 272 Disagree 272 Disagree 425 (DK/Ref) 4	Agree 216 31% Disagree 483 69% (DK/Ref) 1 0% Net Agree -267 -38 Agree 394 56% Disagree 306 44% (DK/Ref) - - Net Agree 306 44% (DK/Ref) - - Net Agree 537 77% Disagree 163 23% (DK/Ref) - - Net Agree 113 16% Disagree 163 23% (DK/Ref) - - Net Agree 586 84% (DK/Ref) 1 0% Net Agree -473 -68 Agree 535 76% Disagree 154 22% (DK/Ref) 11 2% Net Agree 154 22% (DK/Ref) 11 2% Net Agree 272	Agree 216 31% 38% Disagree 483 69% 61% (DK/Ref) 1 0% 0% Net Agree -267 -38 -23 Agree 394 56% 66% Disagree 306 44% 34% OK/Ref) - - - Net Agree +87 +12 +32 Agree 537 77% 87% Disagree 163 23% 13% (DK/Ref) - - - Net Agree 131 16% 20% Disagree 113 16% 20% Disagree 535 76% 70% Disagree -473 -68 -60 Agree -473 -68 -60 Disagree 10% - - Net Agree -473 -68 -60 Disagree 154 22% 26%	n % D Male D Female 700 213 234 100% 30% 33% Agree 216 31% 38% 33% Disagree 483 69% 61% 67% (DK/Ref) 1 0% 0% - Net Agree -267 -38 -23 -34 Agree 394 56% 66% 55% Disagree 306 44% 34% 45% (DK/Ref) - - - - Net Agree 337 77% 87% 88% Disagree 163 23% 113 16% 20% (DK/Ref) - - - - - Net Agree 133 16% 20% 16% Disagree 133 16% 20% 16% Disagree 133 16% 20% 16% Disagree 535 76%	n % D Male D Female R/I Male 700 213 234 102 100% 30% 33% 15% Agree 216 31% 38% 33% 15% Disagree 483 69% 61% 67% 83% (DK/Ref) 1 0% 0% - - Net Agree -267 -38 -23 -34 -66 Agree 394 56% 66% 55% 46% Disagree 306 44% 34% 45% 54% (DK/Ref) - - - - - - Net Agree 537 77% 87% 88% 51% Disagree 163 23% 13% 12% 49% (DK/Ref) - - - - - Net Agree 113 16% 20% 16% 12% Disagree 586 <	700 213 234 102 76 Agree 100% 30% 33% 15% 11% Agree 216 31% 38% 33% 17% 17% Disagree 483 69% 61% 67% 83% 83% (DK/Ref) 1 0% 0% - - - - Net Agree -267 -38 -23 -34 -66 -66 Agree 306 44% 34% 45% 54% 54% Disagree 306 44% 34% 45% 54% 54% Disagree 306 44% 34% 45% 54% 54% Disagree 163 23% 13% 12% 49% 55% (DK/Ref) - - - - - - - Net Agree 113 16% 20% 16% 12% 12% Disagree 586	n % D Male D Female R/l Female Other Agree 100% 30% 33% 102 76 75 Disagree 216 31% 38% 33% 17% 11% 11% Disagree 216 31% 38% 63% 67% 83% 83% 65% Net Agree -267 -38 -23 -34 -66 -66 -29 Agree 394 56% 66% 55% 46% 46% 57% Disagree 394 56% 66% 55% 46% 46% 57% Disagree 306 44% 34% 45% 54% 43% Disagree 306 44% 34% 45% 54% 43% Disagree 110 - - - - - - - - - - - - - - - - - -	n % D Male D Female R/I Male R/I Male R/I Female Other South 700 100% 30% 33% 11% 11% 12% 20% Agree 216 31% 38% 33% 15% 111% 11% 29% Agree 216 31% 38% 33% 17% 11% 35% 55% Disagree 216 31% 0% 0.1 - - - 0% 61% 55% 64% 65% 64% 55% 64% 65% 64% 55% 64% 65% 65% 64% 55% 64% 65% 65% 64% 55% 64% 46% 57% 58% Disagree 326 44% 34% 45% 54% 54% 42% 42% Disagree 336 44% 34% 45% 54% 55% 46% 45% 7% 18% 11% 116 2	n % D Male D Female R/I Male R/I Female Other Court Central 700 213 234 100 76 75 200 200 200 100% 30% 33% 15% 11% 11% 23% 23% Agree 216 31% 38% 33% 17% 17% 35% 35% 27% Disagree 483 69% 61% 67% 83% 83% 65% 64% 73% Net Agree 267 -38 -23 -4 -6 -6 -7 -7 9% 44% Agree 306 44% 45% 54% 46% 43% 42% 43% Disagree 306 44% 45% 54% 45% 43% 42% 43% OK/Ref) - - - - - - - - - - - - -

umber of cases 7 pw percent 4 gree: City policies that have Agree 4 creased business costs and the Disagree 2 ilure to adequately address (DK/Ref) 4 ublic safety make it hard to Net Agree +2 art or grow a business in 1 – Very little impact +2 arks, on sidewalks, and on 2 4 5 5 5	n 700 484 205 11 +279	% 100% 69% 29%	D Male 213 30% 64%	D Female 234 33%	R/I Male 102 15%	76	75	South 200	Central 200	North
umber of cases 7 pw percent 4 gree: City policies that have Agree 4 creased business costs and the Disagree 2 ilure to adequately address (DK/Ref) 4 ublic safety make it hard to Net Agree +2 art or grow a business in 1 – Very little impact +2 arks, on sidewalks, and on 2 4 5 5 5	700 484 205 11	100% 69%	213 30%	234	102	76	75			
bow percent gree: City policies that have Agree 42 creased business costs and the Disagree 22 ilure to adequately address (DK/Ref) 42 ublic safety make it hard to Net Agree 42 art or grow a business in 1 – Very little impact 42 arks, on sidewalks, and on 2 her public right of ways 3 4 5	484 205 11	69%	30%					200	2001	201
gree: City policies that have Agree 4 creased business costs and the Disagree 2 ilure to adequately address (DK/Ref) 4 ublic safety make it hard to Net Agree +2 art or grow a business in 1 – Very little impact 4 pact: Closing encampments in 1 – Very little impact 4 ber public right of ways 3 4 5	205 11	69%		33%	15%	11%				301
creased business costs and the Disagree 2 ilure to adequately address (DK/Ref) ublic safety make it hard to Net Agree art or grow a business in +2 uppact: Closing encampments in 1 – Very little impact arks, on sidewalks, and on 2 her public right of ways 3 4 5	205 11		64%				11%	29%	29%	43%
ilure to adequately address (DK/Ref) ublic safety make it hard to Net Agree +2 art or grow a business in ppact: Closing encampments in 1 – Very little impact arks, on sidewalks, and on 2 her public right of ways 3 4 5	11	29%		72%	88%	76%	41%	61%	72%	73%
ublic safety make it hard to Net Agree +2 art or grow a business in - Very little impact +2 apact: Closing encampments in 1 – Very little impact +2 arks, on sidewalks, and on 2 +2 her public right of ways 3 4 5 5 5			32%	27%	12%	24%	56%	36%	27%	26%
art or grow a business in npact: Closing encampments in 1 – Very little impact arks, on sidewalks, and on 2 her public right of ways 3 4 5	+279	2%	4%	0%	-	-	3%	3%	1%	1%
appact: Closing encampments in arks, on sidewalks, and on1 – Very little impacther public right of ways345		+40	+32	+45	+75	+52	-15	+25	+44	+46
her public right of ways 3 4 5										
her public right of ways 3 4 5	61	9%	4%	5%	2%	15%	38%	10%	12%	6%
4 5	44	6%	6%	6%	3%	2%	18%	7%	6%	6%
4 5	54	8%	9%	8%	4%	2%	14%	5%	6%	11%
5	47	7%	5%	10%	6%	1%	9%	9%	5%	6%
	83	12%	16%	11%	7%	14%	8%	10%	16%	11%
6	66	9%	11%	12%	6%	7%	2%	12%	8%	8%
7 – Very significant impact	345	49%	49%	48%	73%	59%	11%	46%	48%	52%
(Don't know/Refused)	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
Mean 7	700	5.32	5.54	5.47	6.22	5.55	2.81	5.25	5.23	5.43
npact: Addressing property 1 – Very little impact	25	4%	2%	1%	2%	5%	17%	4%	6%	2%
ime like theft and car break-ins 2	22	3%	2%	3%	-	1%	13%	4%	2%	3%
3	45	6%	5%	7%	2%	6%	14%	6%	10%	5%
4	65	9%	9%	8%	8%	8%	16%	10%	10%	8%
5	95	14%	15%	15%	12%	8%	15%	15%	11%	14%
6	115	16%	20%	19%	8%	13%	13%	17%	17%	16%
7 – Very significant impact	333	48%	46%	47%	69%	59%	13%	44%	45%	52%
(Don't know/Refused)	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
Mean 7	700	5.66	5.79	5.76	6.27	5.85	3.92	5.55	5.49	5.84

					P	arty/Gend	er			Region	
		n	%	D Male	D Female	R/I Male	R/I Female	Other	South	Central	North
Number of cases		700		213		· · ·					
Row percent			100%	30%	33%	15%	11%	11%	29%	29%	43%
Impact: Maintaining bridges and	1 – Very little impact	23	3%	3%	4%	3%	4%	4%	4%	3%	3%
infrastructure	2	16	2%	2%	2%	4%	2%	3%	1%	0%	5%
	3	17	2%	3%	1%	6%	1%	1%	2%	1%	3%
	4	90	13%	14%	16%	6%	14%	10%	10%	14%	14%
	5	125	18%	15%	19%	22%	25%	10%	18%	15%	20%
	6	136	19%	24%	20%	18%	14%	14%	18%	24%	18%
	7 – Very significant impact	292	42%	39%	39%	43%	40%	58%	47%	43%	38%
	(Don't know/Refused)	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
	Mean	700	5.65	5.63	5.60	5.64	5.58	5.95	5.79	5.80	5.46
Impact: Addressing racially	1 – Very little impact	80	11%	11%	3%	36%	13%	3%	9%	10%	14%
biased policing	2	37	5%	7%	3%	8%	6%	1%	6%	6%	5%
	3	47	7%	8%	6%	9%	6%	1%	9%	7%	5%
	4	100	14%	13%	14%	14%	22%	9%	12%	16%	15%
	5	123	18%	14%	27%	11%	18%	8%	17%	15%	20%
	6	86	12%	16%	11%	7%	9%	15%	12%	11%	13%
	7 – Very significant impact	227	32%	30%	35%	14%	26%	63%	36%	35%	28%
	(Don't know/Refused)	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
	Mean	700	4.88	4.82	5.31	3.32	4.57	6.12	5.02	4.95	4.73
Impact: Making Seattle a good	1 – Very little impact	29	4%	3%	4%	4%	4%	10%	7%	4%	2%
place to do business	2	19	3%	2%	1%	1%	2%	11%	4%	3%	2%
	3	45	6%	7%	5%	4%	4%	15%	8%	5%	7%
	4	92	13%	11%	14%	3%	20%	23%	10%	16%	14%
	5	164	23%	25%	29%	17%	14%	22%	23%	19%	27%
	6	97	14%	17%	14%	16%	14%	4%	13%	13%	15%
	7 – Very significant impact	253	36%	35%	33%	56%	43%	15%	35%	40%	34%
	(Don't know/Refused)	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
	Mean	700	5.35	5.41	5.38	5.98	5.54	4.06	5.19	5.41	5.42

					Р	arty/Gend	er			Region	
		n	%	D Male	D Female	R/I Male	R/I Female	Other	South	Central	North
Number of cases		700		213	234	102	76	75	200	200	301
Row percent			100%	30%	33%	15%	11%	11%	29%	29%	43%
Impact: Addressing violent crime	e 1 – Very little impact	23		4%	2%	2%	-	11%			3%
and gun violence	2	26	4%	3%	4%					6%	4%
	3	21	3%	4%	2%	2%	3%	5%	5%	1%	3%
	4	52	7%	6%	6%	10%	4%	16%	10%	5%	7%
	5	88	13%	14%	12%	11%	7%	18%	15%	9%	13%
	6	104	15%	19%	13%	14%	16%	9%	9%	17%	18%
	7 – Very significant impact	385	55%	50%	61%	59%	67%	33%	56%	58%	52%
	(Don't know/Refused)	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
	Mean	700	5.87	5.79	6.06	6.07	6.31	4.80	5.81	5.93	5.88
Impact: Addressing climate	1 – Very little impact	111	16%	11%	7%	47%	27%	5%	14%	15%	17%
change	2	42	6%	9%	4%	8%	7%	-	6%	8%	4%
	3	57	8%	9%	8%	7%	12%	4%	8%	7%	9%
	4	91	13%	11%	19%	12%	8%	9%	12%	13%	14%
	5	133	19%	21%	19%	13%	20%	20%	26%	12%	19%
	6	83	12%	14%	14%	5%	9%	13%	13%	12%	11%
	7 – Very significant impact	184	26%	26%	30%	8%	17%	48%	22%	34%	24%
	(Don't know/Refused)	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
	Mean	700	4.54	4.68	5.01	2.85	3.81	5.72	4.53	4.70	4.44
Impact: Shutting down open air	1 – Very little impact	63	9%	5%	5%	4%	11%	36%	10%	10%	8%
drug markets	2	30	4%	6%	4%	-	2%	7%	5%	4%	4%
_	3	52	7%	8%	6%	5%	3%	17%	8%	7%	7%
	4	46	7%	7%	7%	3%	3%	10%	8%	7%	5%
	5	68	10%	11%	12%	3%	8%	10%	10%	8%	11%
	6	77	11%	13%	15%	8%	5%	5%	10%	8%	14%
	7 – Very significant impact	365	52%	49%	51%	76%	68%	14%	49%	56%	52%
	(Don't know/Refused)	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
	Mean	700	5.46	5.49	5.64	6.31	5.83	3.21	5.28	5.49	5.55

					Р	arty/Gende	er			Region	
		n	%	D Male	D Female	R/I Male	R/I Female	Other	South	Central	North
Number of cases		700	70	213	234	102			200	200	
Row percent			100%	30%	33%				29%	29%	
Impact: Closing encampments in	1-3 Little impact	159	23%	19%	19%	9%	19%	70%	22%	24%	23%
parks, on sidewalks, and on	4/(DK)	47	7%	5%	10%	6%	1%	9%	9%	5%	6%
other public right of ways	5-7 Significant impact	494	71%	76%	72%	85%	80%	21%	68%	72%	71%
Impact: Addressing property	1-3 Little impact	92	13%	10%	11%	4%	12%	43%	14%	17%	10%
crime like theft and car break-ins	4/(DK)	65	9%	9%	8%	8%	8%	16%	10%	10%	8%
	5-7 Significant impact	543	78%	82%	80%	89%	79%	41%	76%	73%	82%
Impact: Maintaining bridges and	1-3 Little impact	56	8%	8%	7%	12%	7%	8%	7%	5%	11%
infrastructure	4/(DK)	90	13%	14%	16%	6%	14%	10%	10%	14%	14%
	5-7 Significant impact	553	79%	78%	77%	82%	79%	82%	83%	81%	75%
Impact: Addressing racially	1-3 Little impact	165	24%	27%	13%	54%	25%	5%	23%	23%	24%
biased policing	4/(DK)	100	14%	13%	14%	14%	22%	9%	12%	16%	15%
	5-7 Significant impact	436	62%	60%	73%	32%	53%	85%	65%	62%	61%
Impact: Making Seattle a good	1-3 Little impact	93	13%	12%	10%	9%	9%	36%	19%	12%	10%
place to do business	4/(DK)	92	13%	11%	14%	3%	20%	23%	10%	16%	14%
	5-7 Significant impact	515	74%	76%	76%	88%	71%	40%	71%	72%	76%
Impact: Addressing violent crime	1-3 Little impact	70	10%	11%	8%	5%	6%	25%	10%	11%	9%
and gun violence	4/(DK)	52	7%	6%	6%	10%	4%	16%	10%	5%	7%
	5-7 Significant impact	577	82%	83%	86%	84%	90%	60%	80%	84%	83%
Impact: Addressing climate	1-3 Little impact	209	30%	28%	19%	62%	46%	9%	28%	30%	31%
change	4/(DK)	91	13%	11%	19%	12%	8%	9%	12%	13%	14%
	5-7 Significant impact	400	57%	61%	63%	27%	46%	82%	60%	58%	55%
Impact: Shutting down open air	1-3 Little impact	144	21%	19%	15%	9%	16%	61%	23%	20%	19%
drug markets	4/(DK)	46	7%	7%	7%	3%	3%	10%	8%	7%	5%
	5-7 Significant impact	510	73%	73%	78%	88%	81%	29%	69%	72%	76%

					P	arty/Gend	er			Region	
		n	%	D Male	D Female	R/I Male	R/I Female	Other	South	Central	North
Number of cases		700		213		102					
Row percent			100%	30%		15%	11%	11%	29%	29%	43%
Taxes in Seattle given the level	Much too high	182	26%	18%	22%	48%	45%	11%	28%	21%	
of services the city provides	Somewhat too high	220	31%	29%	34%	33%	33%	25%		38%	
	Too low	91	13%	13%	12%	5%	6%	33%	12%	13%	14%
	About right	206	29%	40%	31%	14%	15%	31%	31%	26%	30%
	(Don't know)	1	0%	-	0%	-	-	-	-	1%	-
Taxes in Seattle given the level	Too high	402	57%	47%	57%	81%	79%	36%	57%	60%	56%
of services the city provides	About right/(DK)	207	30%	40%	31%	14%	15%	31%	31%	27%	30%
	Too low	91	13%	13%	12%	5%	6%	33%	12%	13%	14%
	Net Too high	+311	+44	+34	+44	+76	+72	+3	+46	+46	+43
Downtown Seattle recovery	1 – Very pessimistic	99	14%	10%	10%	22%	34%	10%	14%	14%	14%
sentiment	2	165	24%	25%	22%	31%	23%	14%	17%	20%	30%
	3	313	45%	44%	51%	34%	30%	59%	47%	48%	41%
	4	100	14%	19%	13%	11%	9%	17%	15%	14%	14%
	5 – Very optimistic	21	3%	2%	4%	2%	5%	-	6%	3%	1%
	(Don't know/Refused)	2	0%	1%	-	-	-	-	1%	-	
	Mean	698	2.68	2.79	2.80	2.41	2.28	2.84	2.82	2.71	2.58
Downtown Seattle recovery	1-2 Pessimistic	264	38%	35%	32%	53%	57%	24%	31%	35%	44%
sentiment	3/(DK)	315	45%	44%	51%	34%	30%	59%	48%	48%	41%
	4-5 Optimistic	121	17%	21%	17%	13%	14%	17%	21%	17%	15%
Public safety preference: Need	Need action on public safety	373	53%	54%	49%	78%	71%	15%	49%	51%	58%
action on public safety vs.	Address root causes	322	46%			22%					
Address root causes	(Both)	4	1%		0%	-	3%			1%	
	(Neither)	1	0%		-	1%	-	-	0%	-	_
	(Don't know/Refused)	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-

					Party/Gender						
		n	%	D Male	D Female	R/I Male	R/I Female	Other	South	Central	North
Number of cases		700		213	234	102	76	75	200	200	301
Row percent			100%	30%	33%	15%	11%	11%	29%	29%	43%
Homelessness/housing	Prioritize housing for homelessness	373	53%	51%	56%	67%	51%	37%	61%	51%	50%
preference: Prioritize housing for	Address broader housing affordability crisis	316	45%	49%	44%	28%	43%	63%	38%	47%	48%
homelessness vs. Address	(Both)	1	0%	-	-	1%	-	-	-	0%	-
broader housing affordability	(Neither)	10	1%	0%	-	4%	6%	-	1%	1%	2%
crisis	(Don't know/Refused)	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
City budget deficit preference:	Focus on the basics	473	68%	61%	71%	77%	85%	45%	68%	66%	68%
Focus on the basics vs. Maintain	Maintain spending and raise new taxes	216	31%	39%	27%	20%	12%	55%	31%	32%	30%
spending and raise new taxes	(Both)	1	0%	-	0%	-	-	-	-	0%	-
	(Neither)	7	1%	-	1%	3%	3%	-	1%	1%	2%
	(Don't know/Refused)	3	0%	-	1%	1%	-	-	1%	1%	-
Public safety preference: Need	Need action on public safety	373	53%	54%	49%	78%	71%	15%	49%	51%	58%
action on public safety vs.	Address root causes	322	46%	46%	51%	22%	26%	83%	51%	48%	42%
Address root causes	(Both/Neither/DK/Ref)	5	1%	-	0%	1%	3%	2%	0%	1%	1%
	Net Need action on public safety	+51	+7	+7	-2	+56	+45	-68	-2	+4	+16
Homelessness/housing	Prioritize housing for homelessness	373	53%	51%	56%	67%	51%	37%	61%	51%	50%
preference: Prioritize housing for	Address broader housing affordability crisis	316	45%	49%	44%	28%	43%	63%	38%	47%	48%
homelessness vs. Address	(Both/Neither/DK/Ref)	10	1%	0%	-	5%	6%	-	1%	2%	2%
broader housing affordability crisis	Net Prioritize housing for homelessness	+57	+8	+2	+11	+39	+7	-27	+23	+4	+1
City budget deficit preference:	Focus on the basics	473	68%	61%	71%	77%	85%	45%	68%	66%	68%
	Maintain spending and raise new taxes	216	31%	39%		20%	12%	55%	31%		
spending and raise new taxes	(Both/Neither/DK/Ref)	11	2%	-	2%	3%	3%	-	1%	2%	
	Net Focus on the basics	+256	+37	+22	+45	+57	+73	-10	+37	+34	+38

					Р	arty/Gend	er		Region			
		n	%	D Male	D Female	R/I Male	R/I Female	Other	South	Central	North	
Number of cases		700		213	234	, 102			200	200		
Row percent			100%	30%	33%	15%	11%	11%	29%	29%	43%	
Support: Investing in the	1 – Strongly oppose	64	9%		7%	9%			11%	12%	6%	
continued revitalization of	2	48	7%	6%	7%	7%			7%	7%		
Seattle Center by bringing back	3	67	10%	8%	12%	6%	10%	12%	11%	7%	11%	
the Sonics, redoing Memorial	4	127	18%	15%	21%	17%	22%	16%	21%	16%	17%	
Stadium which is used by high	5	163	23%	23%	22%	25%	21%	26%	23%	25%	23%	
school sport teams across the	6	74	11%	13%	10%	15%	9%	2%	11%	8%	12%	
state, and making it easier to get	7 – Strongly support	156	22%	28%	21%	21%	22%	11%	17%	25%	24%	
from Seattle Center to the new	(Don't know/Refused)	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	
Waterfront	Mean	700	4.60	4.94	4.61	4.69	4.48	3.67	4.40	4.59	4.75	
Support: Providing support and	1 – Strongly oppose	36	5%	5%	4%	5%	6%	8%	5%	6%	5%	
funding for small- and medium-	2	52	7%	5%	5%	13%	9%	12%	6%	8%	8%	
sized Seattle businesses to help	3	63	9%	9%	9%	11%	4%	13%	8%	9%	10%	
them benefit from the economic	4	157	22%	19%	29%	18%	19%	21%	22%	17%	26%	
opportunities that big events like	5	156	22%	24%	21%	17%	27%	25%	27%	21%	20%	
Major League Baseball's All-Star	6	96	14%	12%	15%	16%	20%	7%	15%	13%	13%	
Game, the National Hockey	7 – Strongly support	137	20%	25%	17%	20%	15%	14%	17%	26%	17%	
League's Winter Classic, and the	(Don't know/Refused)	1	0%	-	0%	-	-	-	-	1%	-	
upcoming 2026 FIFA World Cup present	Mean	699	4.69	4.88	4.71	4.57	4.72	4.22	4.75	4.81	4.57	
	1 – Strongly oppose	82	12%	6%	12%	22%	18%	7%	13%	7%	14%	
for light rail to West Seattle and		34	5%	3%	4%	7%			4%	7 % 4%		
-		52	5% 7%	5% 8%	4% 5%	7%			4 <i>%</i> 6%			
Ballard on track to open in 2032	3	74								6%		
even if it costs more	4		11%		12%	17%			12%	12%		
	5	99	14%			7%			17%	10%		
		85	12%			12%			13%	12%		
	7 – Strongly support	274	39%	45%	37%	29%	21%	63%	34%	48%	37%	
	(Don't know/Refused)	-	-		-	-	-	-	-	-	-	
	Mean	700	5.04	5.46	5.03	4.31	3.92	6.00	4.90	5.41	4.88	

					P	arty/Gende	er		Region			
			0/	D 14					с. н.	c		
Number of cases		n 700	%	D Male	D Female		R/I Female 76		South 200	Central 200		
		/00		213 30%	234 33%	102 15%			200	200		
Row percent			100%	50%	5570	13%	11%	11%	29%	29%	45%	
Support: Working with the state	1 – Strongly oppose	97	14%	11%	11%	23%	26%	8%	13%	12%	16%	
to fund a "lid" over I-5 where it	2	56	8%	7%	8%	11%	13%	2%	8%	3%	11%	
cuts through the downtown to	3	56	8%	8%	10%	8%	7%	2%	10%	6%	8%	
free up new real estate for	4	130	19%	14%	22%	16%	20%	20%	19%	18%	19%	
housing, parks, and public	5	107	15%	19%	16%	14%	17%	3%	12%	20%	14%	
spaces and reconnect our	6	76	11%	13%	7%	10%	9%	19%	14%	12%	8%	
neighborhoods	7 – Strongly support	176	25%	29%	25%	17%	8%	44%	24%	29%	23%	
	(Don't know/Refused)	2	0%	-	1%	-	-	-	0%	-	0%	
	Mean	698	4.47	4.76	4.48	3.87	3.48	5.44	4.48	4.82	4.23	
Support: Investing in the	1-3 Oppose	179	26%	21%	25%	22%	26%	45%	28%	26%	24%	
continued revitalization of	4/(DK)	127	18%	15%	21%	17%		16%	21%	16%	17%	
Seattle Center by bringing back	5-7 Support	393	56%	64%	54%	61%		39%	51%	58%		
the Sonics, redoing Memorial												
Support: Providing support and	1-3 Oppose	152	22%	20%	18%	29%	19%	32%	19%	23%	23%	
funding for small- and medium-	4/(DK)	158	23%	19%	29%	18%	19%	21%	22%	17%	26%	
sized Seattle businesses to help	5-7 Support	390	56%	61%	53%	53%	62%	46%	59%	60%	51%	
them benefit from the economic												
Support: Keeping construction	1-3 Oppose	167	24%	17%	22%	36%	47%	11%	24%	18%	28%	
for light rail to West Seattle and	4/(DK)	74	11%	7%	12%	17%	15%	3%	12%	12%	8%	
Ballard on track to open in 2032	5-7 Support	459	66%	76%	66%	47%	38%	86%	64%	70%	63%	
even if it costs more												
Support: Working with the state	1-3 Oppose	209	30%	26%	29%	42%	46%	13%	31%	21%	35%	
to fund a "lid" over I-5 where it	4/(DK)	132	19%	14%	23%	16%	20%	20%	19%	18%	19%	
cuts through the downtown to	5-7 Support	359	51%	60%	48%	42%	34%	67%	50%	61%	46%	
free up new real estate for												
Pre-pandemic downtown visit	Once a week or more	142	20%	20%	20%	26%	16%	17%	21%	30%	14%	
frequency (non-work)	A few times a month	238	34%	32%	35%	30%	36%	39%	37%	34%	32%	
	A few times a year	209	30%	31%	32%	27%	23%	29%	30%	20%	37%	
	Rarely	70	10%	10%	8%	9%	20%	5%	7%	11%		
	Never	39	6%	6%	4%	8%			5%			
	(Refused)	2	0%	-	-	-	-	3%	-	1%		

					P		Region				
		n	%	D Male	D Female	R/I Male	R/I Female	Other	South	Central	North
Number of cases		700		213	234	-	76				
Row percent			100%	30%	33%	15%	11%	11%	29%	29%	43%
Pre-pandemic downtown visit	Weekly	142	20%	20%	20%	26%	16%	17%	21%	30%	14%
frequency (non-work)	Few times a month	238	34%	32%	35%	30%	36%	39%	37%	34%	32%
	Less often	320	46%	47%	45%	44%	48%	44%	43%	37%	54%
Current downtown visit	Much more often	55	8%	11%	5%	6%	11%	6%	10%	8%	6%
frequency compared to pre-	Somewhat more often	40	6%	7%	6%	5%	2%	8%	6%	7%	5%
pandemic	About the same	173	25%	32%	22%	15%	6%	44%	25%	28%	22%
	Somewhat less often	139	20%	20%	24%	14%	18%	17%	18%	19%	22%
	Much less often	292	42%	30%	43%	60%	63%	23%	41%	38%	45%
	(Don't know/Refused)	1	0%	-	-	-	-	2%	-	1%	-
Current downtown visit	More often	95	14%	17%	11%	12%	13%	14%	16%	15%	11%
frequency compared to pre-	Same/(DK/Ref)	174	25%	32%	22%	15%	6%	46%	25%	29%	22%
pandemic	Less often	431	62%	51%	67%	73%	81%	41%	59%	56%	67%
	Net More often	-337	-48	-33	-56	-61	-67	-27	-43	-42	-55
Duration of residency	<2 years	15	2%	3%	1%	-	3%	4%	1%	4%	1%
	2-5 years	126	18%	18%	19%	12%	13%	30%	16%	20%	17%
	6-10 years	130	19%	20%	17%	17%	14%	24%	22%	17%	18%
	11-20 years	139	20%	19%	19%	25%	21%	17%	17%	23%	20%
	>20 years	282	40%	38%	43%	45%	49%	22%	43%	35%	42%
Duration of residency	1-10 years	270	39%	41%	37%	30%	29%	58%	39%	42%	37%
	11-20 years	139	20%	19%	19%	25%	21%	17%	17%	23%	20%
	>20 years	290	41%	40%	44%	45%	50%	25%	44%	36%	43%

					Р		Region				
		n	%	D Male	D Female	R/I Male	R/I Female	Other	South	Central	North
Number of cases		700		213	234			75	200	200	301
Row percent			100%	30%	33%	15%	11%	11%	29%	29%	43%
Party	Strong Democrat	260	37%	55%	61%	-	-	2%	39%	36%	37%
	Not very strong Democrat	117	17%	29%	23%	-	-	2%	20%	14%	16%
	Independent, closer to Democratic party	76	11%	16%	17%	-	-	5%	10%	11%	12%
	Independent	44	6%	-	-	23%	24%	3%	8%	5%	6%
	Independent, closer to Republican party	25	4%	-	-	16%	11%	-	1%	5%	4%
	Not very strong Republican	23	3%	-	-	14%	12%	-	1%	3%	5%
	Strong Republican	15	2%	-	-	8%	8%	1%	2%	2%	2%
	Socialist	59	8%	-	-	-	-	78%	10%	11%	6%
	(Something else/Don't know/Refused)	80	11%	-	-	40%	44%	8%	9%	14%	11%
Party	Socialist	59	8%	-	-	_	-	78%	10%	11%	6%
	Democrat	454	65%	100%	100%	-	-	10%	69%	60%	65%
	Independent	124	18%	-	-	62%	68%	11%	16%	19%	18%
	Republican	63	9%	-	-	38%	32%	1%	4%	10%	11%
Perceived personal ideology	1 – Very liberal	150	21%	17%	20%	6%	11%	70%	23%	25%	18%
	2	133	19%	25%	25%	7%	7%	11%	21%	20%	17%
	3	167	24%	36%	27%	14%	8%	9%	26%	20%	25%
	4	120	17%	15%	17%	18%	34%	4%	12%	17%	21%
	5	61	9%	3%	7%	23%	18%	1%	8%	10%	9%
	6	18	3%	2%	1%	8%	6%	-	1%	2%	4%
	7 – Very conservative	12	2%	0%	1%	6%	4%	-	2%	3%	1%
	(Don't know/Refused)	38	5%	1%	2%	19%	12%	4%	8%	3%	5%
	Mean	662	2.87	2.70	2.71	4.11	3.88	1.48	2.68	2.87	2.98
Perceived personal ideology	Liberal	451	64%	78%	72%	27%	26%	91%	70%	64%	61%
	Moderate	158	23%	16%	19%	37%	46%	8%	20%	20%	26%
	Conservative	91	13%				29%	1%		15%	

					Р	arty/Gende	er		Region			
		_	%	D Male	D Female	D/I Mala	R/I Female	Other	South	Central	North	
Number of cases		n 700	70	213	234		76		200	200		
Row percent		,00	100%	30%	33%				29%	200		
Perceived city council ideology	1 – Very liberal	160	23%	19%	16%		41%		22%	21%		
	2	119	17%	21%	19%		22%		17%	16%		
	3	101	14%	16%	16%		8%		13%	12%		
	4	119	17%	18%	20%		9%	29%	16%	20%		
	5	90	13%	15%	13%		4%		14%	13%		
	6	39	6%	3%	7%		3%		7%	5%		
	7 – Very conservative	28	4%	4%	4%		5%		5%	6%		
	(Don't know/Refused)	43	6%	4%	7%	9%	9%	6%	6%	7%		
	Mean	657	3.13	3.17	3.31	2.17	2.35	4.49	3.25	3.28	2.96	
Perceived city council ideology	Liberal	381	54%	56%	50%	75%	71%	19%	52%	49%	60%	
	Moderate	163	23%	21%	27%		18%		23%	26%		
	Conservative	157	22%	23%	23%		12%		26%	24%		
Homeowner	Homeowner	350	50%	49%	51%	63%	50%	31%	57%	38%	53%	
	Renter	350	50%	51%	49%		50%		43%	62%		
Ethnicity	White or Caucasian	511	73%	78%	73%	65%	68%	75%	70%	77%	73%	
	African American or Black	28	4%	3%	3%		5%		8%	4%		
	Hispanic or Latino	42	6%	5%	8%		6%		4%	6%		
	Asian or Pacific Islander	56	8%	7%	9%		8%		9%	8%		
	Something else	49	7%	7%	6%		9%	1	7%	5%		
	(Refused)	14	2%	1%	0%		4%		1%	1%		
Ethnicity	White or Caucasian	511	73%	78%	73%	65%	68%	75%	70%	77%	73%	
	African American or Black	28	4%	3%	3%		5%		8%	4%		
	Hispanic or Latino	42	6%	5%	8%		6%		4%	6%		
	Asian or Pacific Islander	56	8%	7%	9%		8%		9%	8%		
	Another ethnicity/(Ref)	63	9%	7%	7%		13%		9%	6%		

					Р	arty/Gend	er	-	Region			
			0/	DMala	DEsmala		D/I Famala	Other	Cauth	Cambral	N	
Number of cases		n 700	%	D Male 213	D Female 234		R/I Female 76			Central 200		
Row percent		/00	100%	30%							1	
			10070	5070	3370	1370	11/0	11/0	2.570	2370	4370	
Ethnicity	White	511	73%	78%	73%	65%	68%	75%	70%	77%	73%	
	POC	175	25%	21%	27%	30%	28%	20%	29%	22%	24%	
	(Ref)	14	2%	1%	0%	5%	4%	5%	1%	1%	3%	
Age (Replaced)	18-29	132	19%	19%	17%	17%	12%	33%	16%	20%	20%	
	30-39	176	25%	28%	26%	15%	18%	37%	24%	28%	24%	
	40-49	123	18%	15%	18%	26%	17%	14%	19%	17%	17%	
	50-64	140	20%	21%	20%	16%	34%	10%	22%	18%	20%	
	65+	129	18%	17%	19%	26%	20%	6%	19%	17%	19%	
Two-Age Split	18-39	308	44%	47%	43%	32%	29%	70%	40%	48%	44%	
	40+	392	56%	53%	57%	68%	71%	30%	60%	52%	56%	
Generation	18-39	308	44%	47%	43%	32%	29%	70%	40%	48%	44%	
	40-64	263	38%	36%							37%	
	65+	129	18%				20%	6%	19%		19%	
Education	Some grade school	3	0%	-	1%	-	-	1%	-	-	1%	
	Some high school	1	0%	-	0%	-	-	-	-	-	0%	
	Graduated high school	16	2%	2%	1%	2%	8%	-	2%	3%	2%	
	Technical/vocational school	25	4%	2%	3%	6%	6%	4%	4%	5%	2%	
	Some college/<4-year degree	132	19%	20%	14%	21%	24%	22%	17%	19%	20%	
	Graduated college/4-year degree	291	42%	43%	46%	39%	30%	39%	45%	42%	39%	
	Graduate/professional degree	221	32%	32%	33%	29%	27%	32%	28%	30%	35%	
	(Refused)	12	2%	0%	1%	3%	5%	2%	3%	1%	1%	
Education	<4-year degree	188	27%	24%	21%	32%	43%	30%	26%	28%	26%	
	4-year degree+	512	73%	76%	79%	68%	57%	70%	74%	72%	74%	
Education	Less than college	188	27%	24%	21%	32%	43%	30%	26%	28%	26%	
	Graduated college	291	42%	43%	46%	39%	30%	39%	45%	42%	39%	
	Graduate/professional degree	221	32%	32%	33%	29%	27%	32%	28%	30%	35%	

					P	arty/Gend	er		Region			
		n	%	D Male	D Female	R/I Male	R/I Female	Other	South	Central	North	
cases		700		213	234	102	76	75	200	200	301	
nt			100%	30%	33%	15%	11%	11%	29%	29%	43%	
М	1ale	339	48%	100%	-	100%	-	32%	48%	51%	47%	
Fe	emale	340	49%	-	100%	-	100%	40%	50%	45%	50%	
No	lon-binary	13	2%	-	-	-	-	17%	1%	2%	2%	
(R	Refused)	8	1%	-	-	-	-	11%	1%	2%	1%	
Sc	outh	200	29%	28%	32%	23%	21%	32%	100%	-	-	
Ce	entral	200	29%	31%	23%	31%	30%	35%	-	100%	-	
No	lorth	301	43%	41%	45%	46%	49%	33%	-	-	100%	
il District 1		109	16%	15%	18%	19%	8%	12%	54%	-	-	
2		91	13%	14%		5%					- 1	
3		109	16%	17%		15%		1		54%	_	
4		88	13%	11%	12%	21%			-	-	29%	
5		102	15%	10%	14%	17%		1	-	-	34%	
6		112	16%	20%	19%	7%	12%	13%	-	-	37%	
7		91	13%	13%	14%	16%				46%	-	
ry (PG18 PG20 PG22) 0-	-3/6	378	54%	55%	49%	64%	55%	55%	50%	59%	53%	
,, ,	-5/6	175	25%	21%		22%						
6/	-	147	21%	24%		15%						
neration M	1 18-39	148	21%	47%	_	32%	-	20%	21%	22%	20%	
	1 40-64	123	18%	36%		41%		6%	18%			
	1 65+	69	10%	17%		26%		6%		8%		
	18-39	145	21%	-	43%	-	29%					
	40-64	135	19%	-	37%	-	51%	1				
	65+	61	9%	-	19%	-	20%		10%			
	other	21	3%	-	-	-	-	28%				
F	65+	61	9%	-		-		-	10%	ó	9%	

					Pa	arty/Gende	er		Region		
								0.1		.	
		n	%	D Male	D Female	R/I Male	R/I Female	Other	South	Central	North
Number of cases		700		213	234	102	76	75	200	200	301
Row percent			100%	30%	33%	15%	11%	11%	29%	29%	43%
Party/Gender	D Male	213	30%	100%	-	-	-	-	30%	33%	29%
	D Female	234	33%	-	100%	-	-	-	38%	27%	35%
	R/I Male	102	15%	-	-	100%	-	-	12%	16%	15%
	R/I Female	76	11%	-	-	-	100%	-	8%	11%	12%
	Other	75	11%	-	-	-	-	100%	12%	13%	8%