

REPORT TO THE
DRESDEN ATHLETIC FIELDS COMMITTEE
AND
THE DRESDEN DISTRICT SCHOOL BOARD

RESULTS FROM A SURVEY OF DRESDEN SCHOOL DISTRICT
RESIDENTS ON ISSUES REGARDING PLANS FOR AN
ATHLETIC FIELDS BOND

MARCH 2005

ROBERT SOKOL

CONTENTS

3	Brief History
3	Who Returned Completed Questionnaires?
5	Why People Voted The Way They Did For the Previous Bond?
8	Opinions and Philosophy
8	Sharing Athletic Fields
9	Ownership/Control of Athletic Fields
10	Choices in Extra-Curricular Activities
12	Goals of a High School Athletic Program
14	Competing Optional Strategies for Proceeding
17	"So What Happens With The Norwich Route 5 Site"?
22	How Much Are Community Members Willing To Pay?
27	Summary and Maybe Some Conclusions
29	Survey Questionnaire Containing Percentages For Each Question

BRIEF HISTORY

The Dresden District School Board desiring to address a playing fields need at the Hanover High School twice requested Norwich and Hanover citizens to approve bond issues of upwards of 4.5 million dollars. The voting results indicated there wasn't the required majority to support them. In view of the continued felt need for new fields and the serious opposition to how these needs were addressed, the Board decided to conduct an opinion survey of the two communities.

In preparation, the Board invited residents to express their views and sentiments about the fields issue and to send them to the District's website. Together with many letters to the *Valley News*, members of the Dresden Athletic Fields Committee did a content analysis of all these communications. The Fields Committee used this information in the fall of 2004 as a starting point for creating a questionnaire for the survey. After many sometimes exasperating meetings, the Fields Committee eventually agreed on the types of information that would be helpful in formulating a new proposal to address the fields shortage issue. There was some concern about launching a survey so soon after residents were requested to vote in November 2004 for emergency funds for the new under-construction middle school. Nonetheless, the Board felt an urgent need for guidance in solving the fields' issues. Consequently, a survey questionnaire was mailed in January 2005 to more than 6000 residents in Hanover and Norwich. Completed questionnaires were received from 902 individuals.

WHO RETURNED COMPLETED QUESTIONNAIRES?

Of the 902 citizens returning their questionnaires, 40% said they were 'very familiar' with the Hanover High School athletic program and another 48% said they were 'somewhat familiar' with the program. This suggests that a substantial majority of the respondents were knowledgeable enough to provide informed answers to the questions about athletics and the like. The balance, 12% of the respondents, felt they were 'not at all familiar' with the program.

Another dimension important in shaping opinions about the program and the press on field use is whether respondents had family members currently or during the last ten years, enrolled in any of the Dresden, Norwich, or Hanover schools. Having children involved with school requirements and activities should presumably increase the chances for an individual to have opinions about school issues. This possibility will be tested later in the report, but for now, 60% said yes they did or had family members in the schools in contrast to 40% not having this connection.

At a third level of contact with schools, respondents were asked if their currently or recently enrolled family members do or did participate in the athletic program. A large majority of the parents of the students have been involved in the athletic program ---- 80% in contrast to 19% who were outside the athletic program. At this point in time there is no precise way in which to compare these figures with the actual proportions of students who participate or do not participate in the program. It could be said this large difference will affect how people will answer the questionnaire items, and that is a fact of life. However, it is possible, as you will soon see, to analyze the participating and non-participating groups separately to note how each group answered the questions.

A last important variable (e.g., a specific characteristic such as weight, gender, political party membership, place of residence, etc.) is information on past behavior such as how the respondents voted in the previous bond. The specific question 5 read as follows:

*5. Please indicate below why you voted YES or NO on the **previous** athletic fields bond. If you DID NOT vote on the bond, check here and proceed to Question 6.*

After this they were asked to check the reasons for why they voted 'yes' or the reasons for voting 'no'. These reasons will be discussed later in the report, suffice it to say that when all is said and done this group of citizens lined up in this fashion:

Voted yes	34% (304)	40% (304)
Voted no	52 (466)	<u>60 (466)</u>
Did not vote or no answer to question	14 (130)	
Checked yes and no	<u> </u> (<u> 2 </u>)	
	100% (902)	100% (770)

These figures show that 14% of the residents did not vote or did not choose to give an answer to the question. Another third of them claimed they voted 'yes', while a little more than half said they voted 'no'. Because this variable (named here, BONDVOTE) will be used often in the discussion, it will be more helpful to focus on only the 'yes' and 'no' voters, 40% and 60% respectively, who did vote. This should facilitate comparing the 'yes' and 'no' folks to determine if their predilections have influence on their viewpoints, attitudes, and preferences.

WHY PEOPLE VOTED THE WAY THEY DID FOR THE PREVIOUS BOND

In an effort to ferret out the rationales used by residents when they voted in favor or against the previous bond, respondents were asked to choose from a list of reasons for voting the way they did. They could check as many reasons as they wanted and in addition write-in additional reasons. Only 3% of the 'yes' voters and 7% of the 'no' voters offered additional reasons. These volunteered reasons are printed in the Appendix available on the Dresden District's web site. The rest of the discussion will deal with the listed reasons whose data appear below in decreasing order of being chosen:

I VOTED 'YES' BECAUSE I BELIEVE:

- 30% a. The plan allowed the District to maintain the athletic program
- 26% c. The plan was useful to the community at large
- 19% e. The plan improved student safety providing centralized location
- 12% f. The plan would relieve traffic problems
- 11% b. The plan was the best value
- 11% d. I supported the artificial turf
- 11% g. I was determined to vote YES

It would appear there was no overwhelming specific reason for approving the bond. Almost a third of the 'yes' voters believed that the athletic fields plan being proposed would provide continuity in the athletic program.

About a quarter of the 'yesses' were of the opinion that the bond's plan would be useful to the community at large, while about a fifth of them thought student safety would be enhanced by virtue of the centralized location of the

athletic fields. The remaining reasons each garnered about 10% of the yes voters.

I VOTED 'NO' BECAUSE:

- 49% a. The plan was too expensive
- 42% b. The plan was too elaborate
- 25% c. The plan was not useful to the community at large

- 19% e. It placed too many sport fields in Norwich
- 19% f. The plan would create more traffic problems
- 15% d. I opposed artificial turf
- 3% f. I was determined to vote NO

Unlike the 'yes' voters, those who were opposed to the bond had somewhat more consensus about what they did not like about the bond's plan. Just about half of them believed the plan was too expensive. Going hand in hand with cost was a critical assessment of the specific features of the plan regarding them as too elaborate. Comments along these lines can be read in Appendix: Question 12 on the District's website.

A quarter of the 'no' voters pointed to the fields plan as not being useful to the community at large. Perhaps it is simply a coincidence that it was also a quarter of 'yes' voters who thought the plan was useful to the community at large. As the saying goes: "Go figure?!"

A fifth of the 'no' voters said the plan located an objectionable number of sports fields in Norwich, while 19% indicated adoption of the plan would lead to more traffic problems. Artificial turf detractors numbered about 15% among this group.

Looking at the different sizes of the percentages in both voter blocs prompts the observation that the 'no' voters seemed to have more reasons for their decision than the 'yes' voters. That is, an opposing view to a community-wide issue might call for a more articulated set of reasons for one's objections in contrast to being on the affirmative side. It's possible, but don't bet on it. When all the multiple responses to the two sets of eight reasons were added and the average number of endorsed reasons calculated the 'yes' voters had a 3.6 reasons per person average in contrast to a 3.5 reasons per person average for the 'no' voters. Apparently, residents on both sides of the fields bond argument had been doing a considerable amount

of thinking before they voted...their votes were not thoughtless spur-of-the-moment decisions.

Shifting from these basic statistics to explore the interaction of the residents' bond votes and their links to the schools in Hanover and Norwich three tables are printed below. They test the hypothesis that the more residents have contact with the schools, the greater the probability they supported the previous fields bond. School contact is measured by the variables previously discussed:

Familiarity with the Hanover High School athletic program.
 Child(ren) currently enrolled or in the last ten years.
 Did they participate in the athletic program?

Table 1 shows how being familiar with the high school athletic program influenced how residents voted. In the first column under Very Familiar, 44% voted yes, compared to 29% who had some familiarity with the program and 15% who were devoid of any familiarity.

Table 1 Q.5 BONDVOTE: HOW THEY VOTED IN THE LAST BOND VOTE. by Q. 1 FAMILIAR: FAMILIARITY WITH THE HANOVER HIGH SCHOOL ATHLETIC PROGRAM

		FAMILIAR: FAMILIARITY WITH HANOVER HS ATHLETIC PROGRAM		
		Very Familiar	SomeFamil	Not Familiar
BONDVOTE: HOW THEY VOTED IN THE LAST BOND VOTE.	Yes Vote	158 44.0%	128 29.7%	16 15.2%
	No Vote	164 45.7%	252 58.5%	49 46.7%
	DidNotVote/NA	36 10.0%	50 11.6%	40 38.1%
Total		359 100.0%	431 100.0%	105 100.0%

To test the idea more precisely would involve excluding those who did not vote or did not give any information along those lines. So with your indulgence, those refined data are presented in Table 2. Now, just about 50% of the "Very familiar" residents voted yes in contrast to 33% and 24% of those with lesser degrees of knowledge of the athletic program. As you might expect, the obverse is also true, the less the familiarity the greater the 'no' vote.

Table 2 Q.5 BONDVOTE: HOW THEY VOTED IN THE LAST BOND VOTE. by Q. 1 FAMILIAR: FAMILIARITY WITH THE HANOVER HIGH SCHOOL ATHLETIC PROGRAM

		FAMILIAR: FAMILIARITY WITH HANOVER HS ATHLETIC PROGRAM		
		Very Familiar	SomeFamil	Not Familiar
BONDVOTE: HOW THEY VOTED IN THE LAST BOND VOTE.	Yes Vote	158 49.1%	128 33.7%	16 24.6%
	No Vote	164 50.9%	252 66.3%	49 75.4%
Total		322 100.0%	380 100.0%	65 100.0%

Rather than burden you with several more tables to further document the relationship between closer contact with the athletic program and how residents voted in the previous fields bond vote, suffice it to say those data echo the direction and strength found in Table 2.

OPINIONS AND PHILOSOPHY

Before turning to what the survey showed about residents' preferences regarding specific ideas on what should be done with Dresden's athletic fields dilemma, this section will discuss the residents' personal contexts, which informed and shaped their perspectives on how to solve that dilemma. Four of these personal attitudes and philosophies have been identified as having pertinence: sharing of fields, field oversight, student activity choices, and winning.

Sharing Athletic Fields

It became clear during and after the last bond vote that many people thought that the problem of enough athletic fields could be solved if there was more sharing of the existing Dresden District fields and those fields used by recreation programs in Norwich and Hanover. In terms of this topic, three statements focused on different types of field sharing. These items are listed below along with the percentages of those who agreed and disagreed with each one:

	<u>Agree</u>	<u>Disagree</u>
7d. When not in use by the district, the Dresden fields should be available to the Norwich and Hanover communities.	98%	2
7b. When possible, teams should share fields and stagger practices to minimize the need for new fields.	91%	9
7e. The Towns of Hanover and Norwich should make town-owned recreational facilities more available for Hanover High School use.	82%	18

The overwhelming majority of residents strongly endorse the sharing concept at least within the confines of current fiscal constraints. When the numbers for these three statements are combined into what is here called a Sharing Index, the consensus is more striking: 75% agreed with all three statements, 20% with two statements, leaving 5% to bring up the rear.

If there is one single resounding clarion call that emerges from this survey of Dresden District citizens it is: FOR GOODNESS SAKE, SHARE THE FIELDS! It is a sentiment, which the Dresden Fields Committee and School Board can bank on in their preparation of a new or revised Athletic Fields Plan.

Ownership/Control of Athletic Fields

The formulation of the survey questionnaire by the earlier Athletic Fields Committee encountered an assortment of hills and dales as questionnaire building by the variegated committee proceeded. All of the finally included questions and statements went through this process and none more so than how to express proprietary authority over athletic fields. There may be some concern about how, for want of a better term, athletic fields dominion is measured here, but this is what there is.

	<u>Agree</u>	<u>Disagree</u>
7c. The Dresden District should own and control the fields used in its athletic program.	42%	57
7a. Each soccer, lacrosse, and field hockey team should have its own field for the season.	14%	86

There appears support for the District's ownership and control of athletic program fields, but there is more opposition, 42% vs. 57%. Looking at a more micro level the vast majority of residents are opposed to exclusive field use by specific Hanover High School teams. Combining the answers to these statements into a Control Index results in 63% indicating no agreement with either statement, while 28% agreed with one and 10% with both, i.e., authority and field use rules should be modified.

Although not as resounding a consensus as exists for the sharing idea, these numbers tend to reinforce those results.

Choices in Extra-Curricular Activities

As well organized as the Dresden Athletic Program has been, many individuals have mentioned reservations and registered complaints. With these viewpoints as a backdrop the earlier Fields Committee drafted three statements that it hoped would gauge the level of support for some of these opinions.

	<u>Agree</u>	<u>Disagree</u>
4d. Non-varsity athletes should continue to have the opportunity to participate in team sports.	95%	5
4f. Hanover High School should encourage more athletic activities that do not require fields.	78%	22
4h. There should be increased support for other high school extra-curricular activities by diminishing some parts of the current athletic program.	49%	51

It would appear there is a great deal of support for facilitating the inclusion of non-varsity students in team sports presumably at the junior varsity and club levels. This would assume having sufficient field resources to continue to accommodate these activities.

The 4f statement directly points to whether the athletic program is paying enough attention to those athletic activities that have little or modest needs, but do not require fields. More than three-quarters of Dresden citizens agree it would be beneficial for the program and students to have additional choices to participate. Presumably, if this were done, the press on athletic

field availability would be diminished.

Perhaps one of the most sensitive and revealing statements in the questionnaire addressed the issue of the trade-off of diminishing some parts of the athletic program and increasing the resources devoted to other high school extra-curricular activities. About a quarter of the residents skipped this item or indicated they did not know how to reply to it. For the remaining three-quarters, there was essentially a 50-50 split of opinion, with 49% voting for such a basic change and 51% disagreeing with tampering with the athletic program for this reason.

It might be of some interest to inquire which residents are more inclined to go one way or the other. Are those with more knowledge about, and more family involvement with, the Hanover High School athletic program more likely to oppose diminishing the role of the program than their opposite number? The next table presents that sort of information.

Table 3 Q.4h DIMINISH: DIMINISH PARTS OF CURRENT ATHLETIC PROGRAM TO SUPPORT OTHER EXTRA-CURRICULAR ACTIVITIES by Q.1 FAMILIAR: FAMILIARITY WITH HANOVER HIGH SCHOOL ATHLETIC PROGRAM

		FAMILIAR: FAMILIARITY WITH HANOVER HS ATHLETIC PROGRAM		
		Very Familiar	Some Familiar	Not Familiar
DIMINISH: DIMINISH PARTS OF CURRENT ATH. PROG. TO SUPPORT OTHER EXTRA-CURRICULAR ACTIVITIES	Agree	106 33.9%	181 59.9%	36 72.0%
	Disagree	207 66.1%	121 40.1%	14 28.0%
Total		313 100.0%	302 100.0%	50 100.0%

The residents most opposed to diminishing parts of the athletic program to accommodate other extra-curricular endeavors are those who are most familiar with it. More than two-thirds of them disagree in contrast to 28% of those with the least familiarity. The flip side, as you might expect, reveals the inverse pattern.

Passing up on another table, it should be noted that these two patterns are almost identical if the variable 'having a child actually involved with the athletic program' is substituted for 'familiarity with the program.' It is apparent that knowledge and experience with the athletic program now, and in the recent past, tends to lead to a defense of that program. Yes, there are strong feelings about this issue, as one might expect given the community

debates and bond votes on the Dresden Athletic Program during the past few years.

Was their position on diminishing the program's role connected to what their decision was in the recent bond vote? If the Dresden community were so divided on this issue, it would have been reflected in the survey data. Table 4 provides the information for this question.

Table 4 Q.4h DIMINISH: DIMINISH PARTS OF CURRENT ATHLETIC PROGRAM TO SUPPORT OTHER EXTRA-CURRICULAR ACTIVITIES by Q5. BONDVOTE: HOW THEY VOTED IN THE LAST BOND VOTE.

		BONDVOTE: HOW THEY VOTED IN THE LAST BOND VOTE.	
		Yes Vote	No Vote
DIMINISH: DIMINISH PARTS OF CURRENT ATH. PROG. TO SUPPORT OTHER EX. CURRIC. ACTIVITIES	Agree	33 13.4%	254 73.0%
	Disagree	213 86.6%	94 27.0%
Total		246 100.0%	348 100.0%

Community members distributed their bond votes in very different ways. Among the bond supporters, a tiny 13% agreed with the proposition to reduce the scope of the athletic program to make way for other extra-curricular activities. While among those who voted against the bond, 73% came with the view that the athletic program should be rescaled.

These results leave no doubt about what should be on the agenda of the Fields Committee in fashioning a new athletic fields plan.

Goals of a High School Athletic Program

The preceding discussion illustrates some basic differences in opinions, possibly creating the impression that members of the Dresden community are deeply split and compromise may be elusive. To be sure, there are significant issues generating strong sentiment, but there are other sentiments, which render a picture of tranquility on the shores of the Connecticut River. For example:

	<u>Agree</u>	<u>Disagree</u>
4b. A primary purpose of the HHS athletic program should be to encourage physical fitness as a life value.	93%	4
4a. Team sports develop character and skills useful in later adult life.	87%	5
4e. Winning championships should not be the goal of varsity high school sports.	81%	14

The first statement and the overwhelming agreement with it will make all health professionals happy. The mantra of "take care of yourself with physical activity" should be a major goal for the Hanover High School Athletic Program, perhaps more significant than winning championships in varsity sports. A resounding 81% of the residents agree with the idea that winning in sports isn't everything, and the athletic program should keep this in mind when teaching and articulating the roles sports and athletics play for young people. Virtually everybody agrees that team sports contributes to personal character and social skills from which these same young people will benefit in later life.

Perhaps on the consensus of these philosophical strands of athletics and sports, rests the hope that agreements can be reached mitigating in some measure the dysfunctional animus residing in the community. One area of considerable disagreement that will need the calming touch, is how athletic competition is viewed.

Not to deflate the reader's euphoria with these results, it should be pointed out that answers to another statement paint a different picture. Residents were asked about their agreement or disagreement with this proposition:

4c. Hanover High School places too much emphasis on competitive interscholastic sports.

A quarter of the residents said they did not know or provided no answer, probably because most of these folks are personally removed from the issue, or genuinely could not easily decide. The rest of them, 677, were evenly split with 51% agreeing and 49% disagreeing. This philosophical divide is not

unique to the Dresden District, because it reflects a cultural split in the larger society. Be that as it may, the split is not without consequences for the future of the high school athletic program and the athletic fields plan the Fields Committee and the School Board must wrestle with. By way of illustration, Table 5 shows the interaction between residents' attitudes and their bond vote in 2004.

Table 5 Q.4c COMPSVRT: HANOVER HS PLACES TOO MUCH EMPHASIS ON COMPETITIVE INTERSCHOLASTIC SPORTS by Q.5 BONDVOTE: HOW THEY VOTED IN THE LAST BOND VOTE

		BONDVOTE: HOW THEY VOTED IN THE LAST BOND VOTE.	
		Yes Vote	No Vote
COMPSVRT: HHS PLACES TOO MUCH EMPHASIS ON COMPETITIVE INTERSCHOLASTIC SPORTS	Agree	36 14.8%	275 76.2%
	Disagree	207 85.2%	86 23.8%
Total		243 100.0%	361 100.0%

How one voted is very close to how one feels about competitive sports at the high school level. Among the "Yes" voters 15% agreed there was too much emphasis on these sports and 85% disagreed. In the next column, the 'No' residents aligned themselves 3 to 1 in the opposite direction. Or, to put it less confusingly, Bond supporters were in strong disagreement with the proposition while those who opposed the Bond were in strong agreement.

Some might say they knew this all along, but if pushed to specify the magnitude of the differences, their certainty would most likely have diminished. There is a very wide gap here, and to get some of the 'No' voters to evaluate this issue differently so they would be more inclined to affirm the next Bond, will require creativity and give and take.

COMPETING OPTIONAL STRATEGIES FOR PROCEEDING

After the defeat of the last Bond vote the understandable reactions were: "how did that happen?" or "where do we go now" or "what is in the cards now." Within this state of anomie, but appreciative of the need to solve the District's athletic fields problems, a variety of strategies were proposed which the late Athletic Fields Committee warranted exploration. Repondents were asked to answer the following question:

6. From your point of view, which of the following statements should be the most important element in a plan for the Dresden athletic fields? Assign a value to each statement using a five-point scale ranging from:

'1' (Very Important) to '5' (Unimportant)

The results from residents' evaluations will be simplified below with the mean weight assigned and the percentage of them saying 'Very Important' only listed. These two statistics provide the essence of the responses; those statistics not presented do not alter the rank order of preferences.

	<u>Very Important</u>	<u>Mean</u> 1=hi 5=lo
6c. Prepare a long-range fields plan that meets the needs of the Dresden District and the two towns' recreation programs.	53%	2.03
6a. Complete the field renovations at the HS site.	48%	2.04
6b. Prepare a Dresden fields plan that is less expensive than the previous bond proposals.	50%	2.24
6e. Prepare a Dresden fields plan providing enough fields to maintain the current HHS athletic program.	34%	2.57
6d. Have the communities and/or the schools acquire more land for sports fields.	11%	3.78
6e. Other plans volunteered by residents	83%	1.30

The other plans suggested by 96 respondents will not be discussed here because the full flavor of their ideas may be examined in the Appendix: Question 6 accessed through the Dresden District's website. But before leaving them, it should be pointed out that there is nothing as worthy and persuasive as one's own suggestions as witnessed in the highest scores in the array of proposals, 83% 'Very Important' and a 1.30 mean weight. Ego-involvement aside, the Fields Committee would be amiss if it did not consult these suggestions.

At the outset, three of the five strategies received the highest evaluations, each with about half of the residents rating them as 'Very

Important' and weighting them accordingly. In the 6c proposal, the Dresden District does not stand-alone as it does in 6b. It calls for a long-range plan, which satisfies the fields needs of both the Dresden District and the recreation programs of Hanover and Norwich. Of necessity, the time frame for effecting this proposal would be on the lengthy side due to the negotiations with each of the Select Boards and those who are in charge of the recreational programs.

Perhaps more quickly managed would be proposal 6a, which says that the best strategy would be to complete the field renovations at the Hanover High School site. The appeal of this way of going is that neither town has to be much involved and it temporarily bypasses the issue of the Route 5 location. Some might call it a quick fix, but with lots of creativity, it may be a practical alternative at this time.

The third strategy commands a less expensive plan without any specific direction as to the configuration of solutions for athletic field use, town cooperation, sharing facilities with community recreation programs, and what to do with the Route 5 property. Being without these directions however, should not disqualify this proposal from being included in the pot, for it says whatever model is chosen by the Fields Committee it should be not be too expensive.

The 6e strategy looks to a status quo situation in that it contends the current athletic program should be preserved. Things have to be done to have enough field resources for the program. Perhaps, for a fast track solution it might also entail informal field sharing with the towns' recreation programs.

In the judgment of community residents, the last strategy is a loser. Very few people think it is a good idea to have the Dresden District and/or the towns acquire more land. Possibly, if this strategy had included some provision about the disposition of the Route 5 parcel, it may have attracted more support.

Now that you have seen the comparative statistics for the different strategies, it might be instructive to expand on the analysis by asking how different sorts of residents align their preferences for each of these choices. Rather than bury you in more tables, some of the pertinent outcomes will be presented in shorthand capsules as for instance, that those who voted 'No' in the previous bond are much more likely to look favorably on the 6b 'less expensive' alternative than the 'Yes' voters. Of the 'No' voters, 73% said this alternative was 'Very Important' compared to 18% of the 'No' voters.

However, the 'Yes' voters more than 'No' voters, favored the other alternatives as in the 6c choice involving the cooperative long-range planning by the Dresden District and both towns. For 'Yes' voters, 65% assigned 'Very Important' to this perspective as opposed to 41% of the 'No' voters. This suggests some 'No' voters will not necessarily become more positive about a new bond proposal if it includes the long-range cooperative strategy.

Jumping ahead slightly, how does the level of willingness to pay for a new bond plan differentiate residents in their preferences for these strategies? Not surprisingly, the higher the willingness to pay threshold, the greater the support for all the strategies except one. For example, among residents who indicated they would be willing to pay four million dollars or more for an athletic fields bond, 64% called the long-range cooperative alternative 'Very Important' versus 30% of those who would not support any cost.

The one exception mentioned above tends to validate this last generalization. In the strategy pointing towards making the new bond less expensive than the previous bond proposals, willingness to pay is relatively unimportant to those with higher willingness to pay thresholds than those with lower thresholds.

"SO WHAT HAPPENS WITH THE NORWICH ROUTE 5 SITE"?

The report has not touched on a topic that at one extreme has been vexing for Dresden School District planners, and to others, as straight forward as in letting the land lie fallow or sell it. But unresolved issues have a way of becoming more complex over time as witness the variety of suggested solutions. Irrespective of this community split, the future of this parcel of land will be crucial in how the next athletic fields bond is structured. In order to explicitly focus on this issue the original Dresden Field Committee formulated a set of options for its questionnaire representing the diversity of opinions in the community. Residents would be asked to indicate a preference for only one of these options unlike question 6 which asked for evaluations for each of the listed strategies. Of the 902 residents completing the questionnaire, 743 made a definitive choice, but 153 did not and are set aside for this particular analysis. The options are listed below in the order of their endorsement.

8. Which of the following statements most closely reflects your views on the use of the land owned by the Dresden School District in Norwich? Please check ONLY ONE of these statements.

- | | | |
|-----|--|-----|
| 8:1 | The Norwich site should be fully developed with several playing fields, tennis courts, bathrooms, and changing rooms to provide one central facility to supplement the game fields at the high school. | 35% |
| 8:3 | The Norwich site should be developed as a large multi-purpose field. | 29% |
| 8:4 | The Norwich land should not be used for Dresden fields at all. | 21% |
| 8:2 | The Norwich site should be fully developed with playing fields designated for specific sports but with no facilities. | 15% |

The full development of the Norwich site was chosen by more than a third of the residents followed by 29% who preferred the option of minimal development to facilitate diverse uses. A fifth chose the option of not using the site for any kind of Dresden athletic field. Since it was not specified in the option there is no evidence of how many respondents think the Dresden School District should sell the land, but there are some District residents who are inclined this way. The least favorite option involved full site development for only specific sports fields without facilities was endorsed by 15%.

One initial conclusion derived from combining the preferences for Options 1, 2, and 3 indicates a solid consensus for developing the Norwich land at least in some minimal fashion for multi-purpose fields --- 79% of the residents were so inclined.

A second tentative conclusion emerging from these figures comes when the preferences for Options 1 and 2 are added together. This results in a total of 50% of the residents saying that at a minimum, the Norwich site should be fully developed with playing fields designated for specific sports but without facilities. Half of the residents are less than 79%, but it does illustrate substantial backing for moving ahead in this component of the new Bond.

It would seem the Athletic Fields Committee could proceed comfortably navigating to the approval of a new Bond. However, nonchalance often has its perils, and the Committee should closely examine the following information before adopting this stance. For instance, where the Bond 'No' voters lineup in their preferences for the use of the Norwich site probably would give a clue as to how they will vote the next time. Some insight along these lines may be revealed in Table 6.

TABLE 6 Q.8 NORLAND1: OPINION ON USING THE DRESDEN DISTRICT-OWNED LAND IN NORWICH by Q.5 BONDVOTE: HOW THEY VOTED IN THE LAST BOND VOTE.

		BONDVOTE: HOW THEY VOTED	
		Yes Vote	No Vote
NORLAND1: OPINION ON USING THE DRESDEN DISTRICT-OWNED LAND IN NORWICH	Develop Fully	191 69.7%	27 7.2%
	Fully-No Facilities	45 16.4%	55 14.6%
	Multiple Purpose	32 11.7%	158 41.9%
	No Dresden Fields	6 2.2%	137 36.3%
Total		274 100.0%	377 100.0%

Alas, we find in this table some caution flags. Of course one would expect the 'Yes' voters to be in favor of developing the Norwich site by a substantial margin---just about 70% favoring the full development and 16% supporting a more modest development.

Not so their neighbors who chose to vote 'No'. Among this group, 7% plus 14% preferred at least some degree of full development of the site. Another 36% of them sided with those citizens who did not want the site to be used for Dresden athletic fields.

Notwithstanding this discouraging news, it would behoove the Dresden Athletic Fields Committee to focus on those 41% of the 'No' voters who expressed support for multi-purpose development at the site. Apparently the cost of fuller development of the site puts them off, but more general use of the land would be acceptable. With this clutch of residents behind the Bond its chances of passage would be increased.

Continuing with the process of refining the outline of preferences in this section, Table 7 provides a perspective on where the funds for developing the site might come from among the residents. Since developing the site to whatever degree will entail public money, how much is the community willing to commit to this development in the event that such a recommendation is incorporated in the new Bond?

In an earlier section the variable 'level of willingness to support a new bond' was introduced to help elaborate a point. In the present context, the idea is to see what Norwich site preferences are supported more or less as a function of residents' financial willingness to support a new Bond. Table 7 contains data that elaborates on this line of thinking. The specific question asked was:

9. In the next Dresden District fields bond, what would be the highest amount you would be willing to support? The most recent athletic fields bond requested \$ 4,557,884.

Table 7 Q.8 NORWLAND: OPINION ON USING THE DRESDEN DISTRICT-OWNED LAND IN NORWICH by Q.9 SUPPORT: HIGHEST AMOUNT YOU WOULD SUPPORT IN THE NEXT DRESDEN FIELDS BOND?

		SUPPORT: HIGHEST AMOUNT YOU WOULD SUPPORT IN THE NEXT DRESDEN FIELDS BOND?					
		Would Not Support	Up to \$1 million	Up to \$2 million	Up to \$3 million	Up to \$4 million	\$4 million plus
NORWLAND: OPINION ON USING THE DRESDEN DISTRICT-OWNED LAND IN NORWICH	Develop Fully	5 7.5%	4 3.6%	16 15.5%	20 25.6%	52 80.0%	116 81.1%
	Fully-No Facilities	5 7.5%	12 10.7%	21 20.4%	22 28.2%	6 9.2%	14 9.8%
	Multiple Purpose	13 19.4%	49 43.8%	50 48.5%	30 38.5%	6 9.2%	6 4.2%
	No Dresden Fields	44 65.7%	47 42.0%	16 15.5%	6 7.7%	1 1.5%	7 4.9%
Total		67 100.0%	112 100.0%	103 100.0%	78 100.0%	65 100.0%	143 100.0%

Each column represents a willingness-to-pay threshold, except for the first column, which lists the Norwich site preferences for the 67 residents not willing to financially support the next Fields bond. Two-thirds of them do not want to have Dresden athletic fields at the site.

For the remaining columns, support for the 'develop fully' option

increases as the willingness threshold increases. This appears in the first row of percentages that ranges from 3% to 81%. In the last two columns on the right those people with \$4 million thresholds (up to \$4 million and \$4 million plus) appear overwhelmingly in favor of full development of an athletic complex at the Norwich site.

Of this group of 168 out of 208 residents (65 + 143) whose willingness thresholds are at least at the \$4 million level, 81% definitely prefer the 'develop fully' model. Because of this relatively small number of residents, it would be doubtful, even with their very strong endorsement, that the pursuing the full development model would add to the Bond's chances of passing.

On the other hand, if some reduced version of full development could be effected within the confines of a three million dollar Bond package, there might be a much better chance of passage. To analyze this possibility, Table 7a represents a smaller version of the mother Table 7, combining some of its rows and columns.

Table 7a Q.8 NORLAND2: OPINION ON USING THE DRESDEN DISTRICT-OWNED LAND IN NORWICH by Q.9 SUPPORT2: HIGHEST AMOUNT YOU WOULD SUPPORT IN THE NEXT DRESDEN FIELDS BOND?

		SUPPORT2: HIGHEST AMOUNT YOU WOULD SUPPORT IN THE NEXT DRESDEN FIELDS BOND?		
		Would Not Support	At Least \$1-2 million	At Least \$3 million
NORLAND2: OPINION ON USING THE DRESDEN DISTRICT-OWNED LAND IN NORWICH	Partly-Full Devel.	10 14.9%	53 24.7%	230 80.4%
	Multiple Purpose	13 19.4%	99 46.0%	42 14.7%
	No Dresden Fields	44 65.7%	63 29.3%	14 4.9%
Total		67 100.0%	215 100.0%	286 100.0%

There are 230 respondents out of 286 who are willing to support a Bond at least at the three million dollar level AND endorse either full or modified full development. By adding the 'full development without facilities' frequencies to those for 'full development', we've arrived at an 80% endorsement rate for at least a modified full development of the Norwich parcel. Thus, if full development was taken off the table as the only choice, the picture would change dramatically for this group of 286 residents willing to support at least a three million dollar bond.

These data also show the 'large multi-purpose' option receives its most support from those below the three million dollar threshold. Apparently, the one and two million dollar threshold supporters recognize the need to use the Norwich site, but not at the level of the two full development plans whose costs would be considerably higher than land with useful and undefined playing surfaces.

One additional refinement would lump the people preferring the multiple purpose option for the site with those preferring the more developed options. This would raise the three million dollar developing percentage to 95% (80.4% + 14.7%). Even 71% of the respondents at the one-two million-dollar thresholds like some kind of field development at the Norwich site.

Just with respect to the relationship of these two variables, it would seem that the Fields Committee and the Dresden School Board have a mandate to develop, at the least, multi-purpose fields at the Norwich parcel and probably more than the minimum.

This analysis suggests there is a pivotal group among the five threshold groups by virtue of the distribution of its preferences for using the Norwich land. It will be noted, those respondents who said they would support a Bond up to the three million dollar range were not of similar minds in their preferences for the different options. Lest, you just as soon, leave Table 7 in your past please consider the fact that they were more evenly divided than any of the other threshold groups, with 25% preferring the full development package, 28% choosing full development without facilities, and 38% selecting multi-purpose uses. These folks could determine the fate of the new Bond proposal, depending on the balance of the type of development planned in the Bond and its costs on Election Day.

HOW MUCH ARE COMMUNITY MEMBERS WILLING TO PAY?

The final section will concentrate on residents' answers to a question with which you are familiar, and one that has been used throughout the report. It warrants a more explicit discussion.

9. In the next Dresden District fields bond, what would be the highest amount you would be willing to support? The most recent athletic fields bond requested \$ 4,557,884.

There were 82 residents who checked they would not support any cost, while another 255 said they "really did not know; uncertain; too complicated". Since the focus in this report is on the specific amount of funds people were willing to support, this sizeable group is excluded from the discussion. The 'don't knows' alone constitute 28% of all those in this survey, and given its size, should not be lightly regarded by the Fields Committee and the School Board.

This leaves 565 citizens who did provide information on how much funds they would be willing to support for a future Bond. The statistics in Table 8 will present their answers.

Table 8 Q.10 SUPPORT: HIGHEST AMOUNT YOU WOULD SUPPORT IN THE NEXT DRESDEN FIELDS BOND?

	Frequency	Percent	Cumulative Percent Hi-->Lo	Cumulative Percent Lo-->Hi
Up to \$1 million	131	23.0	100.0	23.0
Up to \$2 million	113	20.0	77.0	43.0
Up to \$3 million	93	16.0	57.0	60.0
Up to \$4 million	68	12.0	40.0	72.0
\$4 million plus	160	28.0	28.0	100.0
Total	565			

Just short of one quarter of these community residents indicated they would be willing to support up to one million dollars for a new Bond. At the other end of the willingness to pay scale are the 28% declaring they would be willing to support a Bond in excess of 4 million dollars. Combined with the 12% willing to support up to four million dollars provides a group of about 40% who in are the ballpark of where the previous bond was located. However, to increase the probability of reaching a comfortable majority for the new Bond, the contingent (16%) willing to support up to three million dollars must be included.

Corralling the costs to around the three million range would appear to be a reasonable target for successful passage of the new Bond, all things being equal. The latter hedge is realistic considering the myriad elements in the mix of funding, local politics and scenarios, costs of materials and labor, and so on. This target is not unreasonable if the Athletic Fields Plan embraces some of the suggestions discussed in this report such as joining forces with the towns to make a community-wide recreational model, catering to the needs of high

school students, other students, adults, adult programs, and the like. This advisory is based on the data in your very last table that focused on the willingness to pay range in terms of whether residents would increase their willingness to pay if others benefited from the Fields Bond. This particular item in the questionnaire was asked immediately following the question on level of willingness to pay.

10. I would support a higher amount if it addressed the greater community needs, and enhanced greater recreational opportunities for everyone rather than just for the Dresden District students.

Fifty percent of the residents affirmed they would support a higher amount in comparison to 27% who said 'No', and 18% saying they did not know or left the question blank. Taking this to the next level permits a more refined perspective, showing how each level of willingness to support a new Bond is affected when the socially more inclusive condition is met. Table 9 connects these two variables.

TABLE 9 Q.9 SUPPORT: HIGHEST AMOUNT YOU WOULD SUPPORT IN THE NEXT DRESDEN BOND by Q.10 SUPPORT HIGHER AMOUNT IF IT AIDED EVERYONE NOT JUST DRESDEN STUDENTS

		SUPPORT: HIGHEST AMOUNT YOU WOULD SUPPORT IN THE NEXT DRESDEN FIELDS BOND?					
		Would Not Support	Up to \$1 million	Up to \$2 million	Up to \$3 million	Up to \$4 million	\$4 million plus
SUPPORT: SUPPORTS HIGHER AMOUNT IF IT AIDED EVERYONE NOT JUST DRESDEN STUDENTS	Yes	22 32.8%	46 41.4%	36 42.9%	47 61.8%	47 83.9%	124 87.3%
	No	45 67.2%	65 58.6%	48 57.1%	29 38.2%	9 16.1%	18 12.7%
Total		67 100.0%	111 100.0%	84 100.0%	76 100.0%	56 100.0%	142 100.0%

By concentrating on the first row of percentages, it will be noted there is a constant increase in willingness to pay, from 32% of the residents who claim they will not support any costs, to the extraordinarily high 87% of those willing to support a bond over four million dollars. By including other community beneficiaries of a new bond this second type of willingness to pay specifies more clearly the circumstances or conditions associated with the bond's passage.

To demonstrate this the last table is divided into approximate halves. The first group of 262 (67+111+84) consists of residents who would not

support or only support a bond at the one or two million dollar thresholds. These 'lower' supporting respondents are offset by those who evinced more willingness to approve a bond of upwards of three million dollars. There are 274 (76+56+142) residents in this latter 'higher' group. When these lower and higher groups are combined (536) they constitute more than half of the 902 respondents in this survey, 59% to be precise.

Table 9a provides information on how many of each group would be willing to go beyond their declared thresholds if everyone benefited from the bond plans.

Table 9a Q.10 SUPPMORE: SUPPORTS HIGHER AMOUNT IF IT AIDED EVERYONE NOT JUST DRESDEN STUDENTS by Q.9 SUPPORT3: HIGHEST AMOUNT YOU WOULD SUPPORT IN THE NEXT DRESDEN FIELDS BOND?

		SUPPORT3: HIGHEST AMOUNT YOU WOULD SUPPORT IN THE NEXT DRESDEN FIELDS BOND?	
		Lower 0- \$2 million	Higher At least \$3 mill.
SUPPMORE: SUPPORTS HIGHER AMT. IF IT AIDED EVERYONE NOT JUST DRESDEN STUDENTS	Yes	104 39.7%	218 79.6%
	No	158 60.3%	56 20.4%
Total		262 100.0%	274 100.0%

Among those in the 'lower' group, essentially 40% said 'yes' they would support additional funds for a bond, in contrast to 80% of the 'higher' group. These data suggest that Hanover and Norwich residents tend to be willing to increase their financial commitment to a new fields bond to the extent that it addresses the needs of the greater community rather than just Dresden District students. Obviously, care should be taken to include the concept of inclusiveness in formulating new bond plans especially depending on the level of funding the Dresden District will request. Alternatively, to minimize or avoid intersecting with community recreational needs and their attendant problems, the Fields Committee could scale back, consolidate, and rethink the needs of the extant Hanover High School Athletic Program.

Of course, these possible outcomes raise a larger issue beyond the scope of this report. What are the legal and political implications of school budgets and bonds being required to include the needs and perhaps wants of towns and communities? Might there be a time when passage of a school budget or bond is held hostage to political pressures irrelevant to the cognitive

education and physical education of a school's students? No public budget is constructed in a vacuum, certainly not a town's, but a school budget is qualitatively different and may require some insulation. And at the same time, the funds for the schools do come from the communities in which the schools are embedded. A school system and its School Board should be sensitively independent of the community as well as being concurrent functioning components of it.

SUMMARY AND MAYBE SOME CONCLUSIONS

1. Most of the respondents were familiar and/or had direct personal contact with the Hanover High School athletic program through their children's enrollment and participation.
2. Among survey participants, 40% voted in favor of the last Bond and 60% voted against it.
3. Regardless of their support or opposition to the Bond, residents gave on average, the same number of reasons for their vote, about 3.5 reasons per person. Both sides did their homework.
4. An overwhelming majority of residents endorse the idea that the two towns and the Dresden District share athletic fields.
5. Almost two-thirds of the respondents expressed dissatisfaction with the control and allocation of Dresden's athletic fields.
6. More thought should be directed to offering extra-curricular activities, which are not field-intensive. However, the idea of diminishing parts of the current athletic program to accommodate these activities splits Dresden residents' attitudes in half.

Mediating this attitude divide is the amount of knowledge and contact with the athletic program. The more experience residents have had with the program, the greater is their resistance to the idea of diminishing its scope.

In addition, residents' attitudes were correlated with their earlier Bond vote, as most 'No' voters favored the diminishing concept, and most 'Yes' voters opposed it.

7. There is overwhelming agreement about the health, developmental and value advantages of the athletic program, but there is absolutely no consensus on whether Hanover High School places too much emphasis on competitive interscholastic sports. Because so many of those who voted 'No' in the last Bond believe there is too much emphasis suggests some adjustments would have to be made to get these people on board for the next Bond vote.

8. The data dealing with preferred optional strategies for a new Fields Plan do not lend themselves easily to summary statements. Sorry about that. What is clear however are that very few people argue for more land acquisition. In addition, there continues to be ample support for continuing the process to create an acceptable and workable plan for athletic fields.

9. There is substantial support (79%) for developing the Norwich site, and this applies to both 'No' and 'Yes' voters. The support is broad; however, lest you think you are home free, remember the intrigue is in the details.

10. From the information regarding how much residents would be willing to support in the new Bond, one could conclude that with a cost between three and four million dollars and including athletic field benefits for Dresden students AND others living in Hanover and Norwich, the Bond would have a very good chance of passing.

Dresden School District Fields Questionnaire

PERCENTAGES BASED ON 902 RESIDENTS

The Dresden School Board is seeking community opinion about the best way to provide fields for our high school athletes. Following the defeat of two recent bond proposals, we conducted public discussions and solicited opinions via e-mail and mail. From that feedback, we created this questionnaire to gauge the sentiments and priorities of ALL community members, not just those with children in the school district.

Many of Hanover High School's current athletic teams have three levels: varsity, junior varsity and reserve. Each team practices or competes five afternoons a week with some games scheduled on Saturdays. Currently, the high school uses fields located on its campus and on an array of sites offered by the towns of Hanover and Norwich, Dartmouth College, and a private individual. Because the continued availability of these off-campus fields is not assured, the Dresden School Board must find additional field space off the Lebanon Street campus.

Please take a moment to complete this questionnaire and return it by January 28 to the main office of a local school or mail it to the SAU Office, 45 Lyme Road, Hanover NH 03755. If there is more than one voter in your household, you may copy the questionnaire, obtain a second copy from a local school, or download a copy from the SAU 70 web site: www.SAU70.org.

1. How familiar are you with the Hanover High School athletic program?	Very familiar	40%				5
	Somewhat familiar	48				
	Not at all familiar	12				
			<u>Yes</u>	<u>No</u>		
2. Do you have a child or children currently enrolled in the Dresden, Norwich, or Hanover schools, or one who was enrolled during the last 10 years?		58%	40			6
3. IF YES, do they or did they participate in the athletic program?		81%	19			7
4. Here are some statements reflecting different perspectives about high school athletics and competition. Please indicate whether you generally agree or disagree with each one.	<u>Agree</u>	<u>Disagree</u>	<u>Don'tKnow</u>	<u>NoAnsw</u>		
a. Team sports develop character and skills useful in later adult life.	87%	5	7	2		8
b. A primary purpose of the HHS athletic program should be to encourage physical fitness as a life value.	93%	4	2	1		9
c. HHS places too much emphasis on competitive interscholastic sports.	38%	37	23	2		10
d. Non-varsity athletes should continue to have the opportunity to participate in team sports.	89%	5	5	1		11
e. Winning championships should not be the main goal of varsity high school sports.	81%	14	5	1		12
f. HHS should encourage more athletic activities that do not require fields.	56%	16	27	2		13
g. The time commitment required to play team sports should be less at the junior varsity and reserve levels.	54%	23	21	2		14
h. There should be increased support for other high school extra-curricular activities by diminishing some parts of the current athletic program.	36%	38	24	1		15

5. Please indicate below why you voted YES or NO on the **previous** athletic fields bond.
 If you DID NOT vote on the bond, check here and **proceed to Question 6** ----->> **14%** 16

***I VOTED 'YES' BECAUSE I BELIEVE:* Check as many as apply.**

a. The plan allowed the District to maintain the athletic program.	30%	17
b. The plan was the best value.	11%	18
c. The plan was useful to the community at large.	26%	19
d. I supported the artificial turf.	11%	20
e. The plan improved student safety by providing a centralized location.	19%	21
f. The plan would relieve traffic problems.	12%	22
g. I was determined to vote YES.	11%	23
h. Other _____	3%	24

***I VOTED 'NO' BECAUSE:* Check as many as apply.**

a. The plan was too expensive.	49%	25
b. The plan was too elaborate.	42%	26
c. The plan was not useful to the community at large.	25%	27
d. I opposed artificial turf.	15%	28
e. It placed too many sports fields in Norwich.	19%	29
f. The plan would create more traffic problems.	19%	30
f. I was determined to vote NO.	3%	31
g. Other _____	7%	32

6. From your point of view, which of the following statements should be the most important element in a plan for the Dresden athletic fields? Assign a value to each statement, using a five-point scale ranging from:

“1” (VERY IMPORTANT) to 5 (UNIMPORTANT).

	<u>VERY IMPORTANT</u>	<u>MEAN</u>	
a. Complete the field renovations at the high school site.	53%	2.04	33
b. Prepare a Dresden fields plan that is less expensive than the previous bond proposals.	48%	2.24	34
c. Prepare a long-range fields plan that meets the needs of the Dresden District and the two towns' recreation programs.	50%	2.05	35
d. Have the communities and/or the schools acquire more land for sports fields.	34%	3.78	36
e. Prepare a Dresden fields plan providing enough fields to maintain the current Hanover High School athletic program.	11%	2.57	37
f. Other: PLEASE SPECIFY _____	83%	1.30	38

7. The next statements represent different viewpoints regarding athletic fields, their locations, and the responsibility for them. Please check your agreement or disagreement with each of them.

	<u>Agree</u>	<u>Disagree</u>	<u>Don'tKnow</u>	<u>NoAnsw.</u>	
a. Each soccer, lacrosse, and field hockey team should have its own field for the season.	12%	70	15	3	39
b. When possible, teams should share fields and stagger practices to minimize the need for new fields.	85%	9	4	2	40
c. The Dresden District should own and control the fields used in its athletic program.	32%	43	22	3	41
d. When not in use by the district, the Dresden fields should be available to the Norwich and Hanover communities.	92%	2	4	2	42
e. The Towns of Hanover and Norwich should make town-owned recreational facilities more available for Hanover High School use.	64%	14	20	3	43
f. The high school should be the primary site for game fields with other fields spread throughout both Norwich and Hanover.	60%	18	18	4	44
g. All athletic fields should be located at either the high school or the Route 5 site in Norwich.	28%	46	22	4	45
h. The Dresden District should provide student transportation to practice fields away from the high school site.	64%	18	15	3	46
i. The track should be relocated from the high school campus if that made it possible to create more field space.	27%	27	43	4	47
j. Artificial turf is less expensive in the long run and safer for students.	10%	28	59	2	48
k. I would favor using lights on at least one field at the high school to increase playing and practice time.	61%	20	15	3	49

8. Which of the following statements most closely reflects your views on the use of land owned by the Dresden School District in Norwich? Please check ONLY ONE of these statements.

1. The Norwich site should be fully developed with several playing fields, tennis courts, bathrooms, and changing rooms to provide one central facility to supplement the game fields at the high school.	28%	
2. The Norwich site should be fully developed with playing fields designated for specific sports but with no facilities.	12	
3. The Norwich site should be developed as a large multi-purpose field.	24	
4. The Norwich land should not be used for Dresden fields at all.	18	
5. Undecided, don't know, or too complicated.	17	

PLEASE TURN OVER TO LAST PAGE

9. In the next Dresden District fields bond, what would be the highest amount you would be willing to support?
The most recent athletic fields bond requested \$ 4,557,884. 51

1. I would not support any cost.	9%	
		[N=565]
2. I would support up to \$1 million.	15	23%
3. I would support up to \$2 million.	13	20
4. I would support up to \$3 million.	10	16
5. I would support up to \$4 million.	8	12
6. I would support more than \$4 million.	18	28
7. I really do not know; uncertain; too complicated.	28	

10. I would support a higher amount if it addressed the greater community needs, and enhanced greater recreational opportunities for everyone rather than just the Dresden District students. 52

		[N=695]
Yes	50%	65%
No	27	35
I do not know	23	

11. How do you think the Dresden School Board could help voters become more informed about the issues and problems facing the Dresden District? 53

36% OF THE RESIDENTS MADE SUGGESTIONS

12. If you have other comments or suggestions please write them here. 54

33% OF THE RESIDENTS MADE COMMENTS AND SUGGESTIONS

THANK YOU

Should other registered voters in your household desire to complete the questionnaire, you may copy it, obtain another copy at the main office of a local school, or download it from the www.SAU70.org web site.

Please return completed questionnaires to any school's main office or mail them to:
SAU 70 Superintendent of Schools, 45 Lyme Road, Hanover, NH 03755

Completed questionnaires are needed by January 28, 2005