



TUALATIN VALLEY
WATER DISTRICT

TVWD BOARD OF COMMISSIONERS

President Todd Sanders, PhD | Vice President Jim Duggan, PE
Secretary Jim Doane, PE | Treasurer Carl Fisher | Elliot Lisac

Board Work Session Agenda

October 4, 2022

WORK SESSION – 6:00 PM – MICROSOFT TEAMS MEETING*

CALL TO ORDER

ANNOUNCEMENTS

DISCUSSION ITEMS

- A. Willamette Water Supply System Commission Update. *Staff Report – Dave Kraska*
- B. 2022 Customer Satisfaction Benchmark Survey Results. *Staff Report – Andrea Watson*

ADJOURNMENT

*To slow the spread of COVID-19, this meeting is only available via phone or the web. It will not be held at a physical location. If you wish to attend, please email katherine.desau@tvwd.org or call 503-848-3078 by 4:30 p.m. on October 4, 2022.

The meeting is accessible to persons with disabilities and those who need qualified bilingual interpreters. A request for an interpreter for the hearing impaired, a bilingual interpreter or for other accommodations should be made at least 72 hours before the meeting to the contact listed above.

For online meeting information, Commissioner bios and more, visit tvwd.org.





TUALATIN VALLEY
WATER DISTRICT

This page intentionally left blank



TUALATIN VALLEY WATER DISTRICT

Date: October 4, 2022
To: Board of Commissioners
From: David Kraska, P.E., Willamette Water Supply System Commission General Manager
Subject: Willamette Water Supply System Commission Update

Key Concepts:

The purpose of this regular presentation is to update the TVWD Board on the current activities of the Willamette Water Supply System (WWSS) Commission. Since the TVWD Board has one representative on the WWSS Commission Board, these reports provide a means of keeping the other TVWD Board members current on relevant information. The topics of this month's update are:

- A. Review the October 2022 WWSS Commission Board Meeting agenda
- B. Review the Approvals and Procurements Forecast
- C. Update on Willamette Water Supply Program (WWSP) activities

Background:

The October WWSS Commission Board meeting will be held on October 6, 2022, and the agenda for that meeting is attached to this staff report. There is one Business Agenda item on the agenda:

- A. Approve PLM_1.3 BPA Engineering and Construction Agreement Amendment

At this time, there is just one informational item on the October agenda: a notice regarding the next regular Board meeting scheduled for December 1, 2022.

The Approvals and Procurements Forecast (Forecast) is a WWSP tool that summarizes recent decisions made, and previews decisions and approvals that are coming up in the next two months. The Forecast is divided along the various types of approvals and procurements that occur on the WWSP and the different approval levels: Program Director, WWSS Committees and WWSS Board. This document is a companion to the Management Authority Matrix that was approved by the WWSS Commission Board at its September 5, 2019 meeting. At the October TVWD Board work session, we will present a review of the current Forecast that covers the months of September through November 2022.

Activity on the WWSP will continue to increase as more of our projects enter the construction phase. To enable this, we are working to complete the remaining real estate, procurement, and permitting activities. Additionally, we now have 12 projects in construction. At the October TVWD Board work session, we will provide an update on our project delivery progress and on our active construction projects.

Budget Impact:

Informational item only. There are no budget impacts from this staff report. All items discussed in this report are included in WWSP Baseline 7.0 budget.


Staff Contact Information:

David Kraska, PE.; WWSS Commission General Manager; 503-941-4561; david.kraska@twwd.org

Attachments:

WWSS Commission October 2022 Board Meeting Agenda
WWSP Approvals and Procurements Forecast

Leadership Team Initials:

Chief Executive Officer	ARH	Customer Service Manager	N/A
Chief Operating Officer	PDS	IT Services Director	N/A
Chief Financial Officer	Pon	Human Resources Director	N/A
General Counsel	CS	Water Supply Program Director	



Willamette Water Supply System Commission
Board Meeting Agenda
Thursday, October 6, 2022 | 12:00 – 1:30 PM
Microsoft Teams Meeting

This meeting will not be held at a physical location. If you wish to attend and need dial-in information, please contact annette.rehms@tvwd.org or call 971-222-5957 by 10:00 a.m. on October 6, 2022.

If you wish to address the WWSS Board, please request the Public Comment Form and return it 48 hours prior to the day of the meeting.

The meeting is accessible to persons with disabilities and those who need qualified bilingual interpreters. A request for an interpreter for the hearing impaired, a bilingual interpreter or for other accommodations should be made at least 72 hours before the meeting to the contact listed above.

EXECUTIVE SESSION – 11:30 AM

An executive session of the Board is called under ORS 192.660(2)(e) to conduct deliberations with persons designated by the governing body to negotiate real property transactions.

REGULAR SESSION – 12:00 PM

CALL TO ORDER

1. GENERAL MANAGER'S REPORT – Dave Kraska

Brief presentation on current activities relative to the WWSS Commission

2. PUBLIC COMMENT

This time is set aside for persons wishing to address the Board on items on the Consent Agenda, as well as matters not on the agenda. Additional public comment will be invited on agenda items as they are presented. Each person is limited to five minutes unless an extension is granted by the Board. Should three or more people testify on the same topic, each person will be limited to three minutes.

3. CONSENT AGENDA

These items are considered to be routine and may be approved in one motion without separate discussion. Any Board member may request that an item be removed by motion for discussion and separate action. Any items requested to be removed from the Consent Agenda for separate discussion will be considered immediately after the Board has approved those items which do not require discussion.

- A. Approve the September 1, 2022 meeting minutes

4. BUSINESS AGENDA

- A. Approve PLM_1.3 BPA Engineering and Construction Agreement Amendment – *Joelle Bennett*

5. INFORMATION ITEMS

- A. The next Board Meeting is scheduled on December 1, 2022, via Microsoft Teams

6. COMMUNICATIONS AND NON-AGENDA ITEMS

- A. None scheduled

ADJOURNMENT

Approvals and Procurement Forecast: September 2022 through November 2022

This report provides a three-month projection of (1) forthcoming actions under the WWSS Management Authority Matrix and (2) ongoing and forthcoming procurements.

a = Actual date
 e = Email approval
 FC = Finance Committee
 LCRB = Local Contract Review Board
 MC = Management Committee
 N/A = Not applicable
 OC = Operations Committee

Rec. = Recommendation
 t = Tentative date
 TBD = To be determined; sufficient information not available to project a date
 Note: Dates in red text indicate meetings needed outside the normal meeting schedule

Type	Description	Projected Action	Body/Position (projected action date)		
			Program Director	WWSS Committees	WWSS Board
Program Baseline or Related Plans (above Program Director's Authority)	1. None	Approve	N/A	N/A	N/A
		Execute	N/A	N/A	N/A
Real Estate	2. None	Approve	N/A	N/A	N/A
IGAs, MOUs, Permit Commitments, & Similar Agreements	3. DCS_1.0 Sherwood Broadband Services IGA	Approve	N/A	MC: 3/18/2021 a	4/1/2021 a
		Execute	10/31/2022 t	N/A	N/A
	4. PLW_1.3 Pahlisch developer agreement	Approve	N/A	N/A	N/A
		Execute	9/30/2022 t	N/A	N/A
	5. PLM_1.3 BPA Engineering and Construction Agreement	Approve	N/A	9/22/2022 t	10/6/2022 t
Execute		10/31/2022 t	N/A	N/A	
Contracts (above Program Director's Authority)	6. None	Approve	N/A	N/A	N/A
		Execute	N/A	N/A	N/A
Contract Amendments and Change Orders (above Program Director's Authority)	7. RWF_1.0 GMP 2 for Construction <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Goal: Construct RWF_1.0 • Value: \$61.9 M (Estimated) • Contractor: Kiewit 	Approve	N/A	MC: 8/18/2022 a	9/1/2022 a
		Execute	9/2/2022 a	N/A	N/A
Local Contract Review Board (LCRB) Actions	8. None	Approve	N/A	N/A	N/A
Other	9. Operations Staffing Plan Evaluation <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Goal: O&M Staffing Plan Evaluation • Value: \$111,518 • Contractor: Brown and Caldwell *This item is here for awareness	Approve	N/A	N/A	N/A
		Execute	9/23/2022 t	N/A	N/A



Date: October 4, 2022
To: Board of Commissioners
From: Andrea Watson, Communications and Public Affairs Supervisor
Subject: 2022 Customer Satisfaction Benchmark Survey Results

Key Concepts:

- DHM Research was hired to conduct a benchmark survey for customer satisfaction. The field work was done in early August 2022.
- The findings include customer ratings on key services, customer priorities, preferences and comparison of these findings over time.
- Tony Iaccarino, PhD, DHM Research Manager for the survey, will be presenting the findings.

Background:

The methodology for the survey was modernized, with half the customers being contacted by phone and speaking with another person and half the customers being contacted with a link to complete the survey online. When comparing these results with prior surveys, it is important to know that using online responses can soften support, result in more identification of dissatisfaction and more, “don’t know” responses. This is a bias when answering online compared to telling another person you don’t know or that you aren’t satisfied.

Budget Impact:

Within biennium budget.

Staff Contact Information:

Andrea Watson; Communications and Public Affairs Supervisor; 503.848.3012; andrea.watson@tvwd.org

Attachments:

- Benchmark Survey Results
- Verbatim Responses
- Benchmark Survey Results by Crosstab

Leadership Team Initials:

Chief Executive Officer	<i>JRH</i>	Customer Service Manager	N/A
Chief Operating Officer	N/A	IT Services Director	N/A
Chief Financial Officer	N/A	Human Resources Director	N/A
General Counsel	N/A	Water Supply Program Director	N/A
Communications/Public Affairs Supervisor	<i>AW</i>		



August 12, 2022

To: Andrea Watson, Tualatin Valley Water District
From: Tony Iaccarino, DHM Research
Re: Tualatin Valley Water District Benchmark Survey, #01115

INTRODUCTION & METHODOLOGY

From August 3–8, 2022, DHM Research conducted a survey of Tualatin Valley Water District residential customers (n=400). The purpose of the survey was to measure customer satisfaction with key services, assess customer priorities, and identify communications preferences. As similar TVWD surveys have been conducted in previous years, another goal of the survey was to compare customer awareness, perceptions, and satisfaction over time.

Research Methodology: The hybrid (phone and text-to-online) survey consisted of 400 residential customers and took approximately 12 minutes to complete. This is a sufficient sample size to assess customer opinions generally and to review findings by multiple subgroups, including by age, gender, race and ethnicity, income, education level, and service area.

Respondents were contacted from a residential customer list provided by TVWD, supplemented by a list of registered voters. Telephone respondents were contacted by a live interviewer, while text-to-online respondents received a text invitation directing them to an online survey. In gathering responses, a variety of quality control measures were employed, including questionnaire pre-testing and validation. Quotas were set by age and gender, and the data was weighted by income, education level, and race and ethnicity to ensure a representative sample of Washington County residents. Quotas were also set by zip code to ensure a representative sample of customers in the TVWD service area.

Statement of Limitations: Any sampling of opinions or attitudes is subject to a margin of error. The margin of error is a standard statistical calculation that represents differences between the sample and total population at a confidence interval, or probability, calculated to be 95%. This means that there is a 95% probability that the sample taken for this study would fall within the stated margin of error if compared with the results achieved from surveying the entire population. The margin of error for this survey is +/- 4/9%.

DHM Research Background: DHM Research has been providing opinion research and consultation throughout the Pacific Northwest and other regions of the United States for over 40 years. The firm is nonpartisan and independent and specializes in research projects to support public policy making.

Tualatin Valley Water District Benchmark Survey
Residential Customers
August 2–8, 2022
N=400; +/- 4.9% margin of error
12 minutes
DHM Research
#01115

Hello, my name is _____ from **[field house]**. I am not selling anything. We're conducting a survey about important issues in your community. May I please speak to _____? **[Must speak to name on list. If unavailable, schedule callback.]**

As needed:

- The survey should only take about 10 minutes to complete.
- Your answers are strictly confidential.

TVWD AWARENESS AND GENERAL SATISFACTION

1. Could you tell me who provides water service to your home? **[Open]**

Response category	2022	2016	2014	2011	2008
Tualatin Valley Water District	88%	92%	84%	85%	88%
Clean Water Services	4%	--	--	--	--
All others	5%	2%	7%	7%	6%
None/Nothing	1%	0%	0%	0%	1%
Don't know	2%	7%	9%	9%	5%

2. Tualatin Valley Water District provides service to your area. Is your overall impression of the services provided by TVWD excellent, good, poor, or very poor?

Response category	2022	2016	2014	2011	2008
Excellent	31%	43%	49%	48%	45%
Good	54%	49%	46%	50%	53%
Poor	6%	5%	2%	1%	1%
Very poor	4%	1%	1%	1%	0%
Don't know	5%	1%	3%	1%	1%

3. Is there any particular reason you rate your service as [insert answer from Q2]? [Open, accept up to three responses]

Excellent/Good

Response category	2022	2016	2014	2011	2008
Excellent or Good	n=340	n=370	n=379	n=390	n=389
No problems/issues/complaints	32%	43%	42%	41%	45%
Good customer service	12%	14%	9%	11%	7%
Water comes through faucet/always have water/good pressure	10%	11%	9%	13%	--
Quality water/good water	7%	12%	16%	13%	5%
Reliable/consistent/don't have to think about it	7%	6%	4%	10%	12%
Clean/clean water	5%	3%	5%	5%	4%
Good tasting/drinkable	4%	6%	5%	8%	8%
Good communications	--	--	--	--	--
Efficient billing	--	--	--	--	--
All other responses	26%	<2%	<2%	<2%	<3%
None/no reason	13%	8%	12%	11%	14%
Don't know	8%	1%	1%	2%	2%

Poor/Very poor

Response category	2022	2016	2014	2011	2008
Poor or Very poor	n=38	n=26	n=10	n=7	n=6
Expensive/rates have gone up	70%	n=15	n=3	n=3	n=1
Poor water quality	26%	--	--	--	--
Bad customer service	9%	n=4	n=3	n=3	n=1
Billing issues	6%	n=2	--	--	--
All other responses	7%	n=1 for all	n=1 for all	n=1 for all	--
None/no reason	0%	0%	n=1	--	--
Don't know	3%	n=1	0%	0%	n=2

SATISFACTION IN KEY AREAS

I would like to ask you about some of the specific aspects of service that TVWD provides to you. Please tell me if you think TVWD is doing an excellent, good, poor, or very poor job in each particular area [Randomize]:

Response category	Excellent Job	Good Job	Poor Job	Very Poor Job	Don't know
4. Providing responsive customer service					
2022, n=400	21%	33%	4%	4%	38%
2016	35%	40%	4%	2%	19%
2014	36%	43%	2%	1%	18%
2011	28%	44%	2%	0%	27%
2008	27%	47%	2%	0%	24%
5. Keeping water rates reasonable					
2022	10%	40%	23%	17%	9%
2016	17%	52%	19%	6%	5%
2014	11%	56%	19%	5%	9%
2011	12%	59%	19%	2%	8%
2008	12%	67%	14%	2%	6%
6. Keeping you informed about issues related to your water service					
2022	30%	43%	7%	4%	16%
2016	36%	51%	5%	2%	6%
2014	39%	49%	5%	2%	5%
2011	34%	55%	5%	1%	5%
2008	36%	54%	4%	0%	7%
7. Promoting water conservation					
2022	22%	40%	9%	3%	27%
2016	30%	47%	6%	1%	16%
2014	28%	50%	6%	0%	15%
2011	34%	48%	6%	0%	13%
2008	31%	53%	5%	0%	12%
8. Providing a reliable source of water					
2022	58%	33%	1%	1%	6%
2016	60%	35%	0%	0%	5%
2014	53%	42%	1%	1%	3%
9. Providing water that tastes good					
2022	50%	38%	7%	2%	3%
2016	56%	37%	3%	1%	3%
2014	47%	44%	5%	1%	4%
2011	50%	45%	2%	1%	3%
10. Providing water that is safe to drink					
2022	55%	34%	3%	3%	6%
2016	58%	36%	1%	1%	4%

PRIORITIES

How important are the following statements to you about investing in the drinking water system – very important, somewhat important, not too important, or not at all important? **[Randomize]**

Response category	Very Important	Somewhat Important	Not Too Important	Not At All Important	Don't know
11. Provide an adequate and reliable supply of drinking water to meet the needs of our community today and in the future.					
2022, n=400	92%	6%	1%	<1%	1%
2016	86%	12%	0%	1%	1%
2014	88%	9%	1%	0%	2%
12. Protect the public's health and economic vitality of the community by building a water supply system to withstand major earthquakes and other emergencies.					
2022	79%	15%	3%	1%	2%
2016	81%	13%	1%	1%	3%
2014	81%	14%	2%	1%	2%
13. Develop partnerships with other local communities to share costs and expenses.					
2022	49%	33%	7%	2%	8%
2016	46%	37%	7%	3%	7%
2014	49%	37%	6%	1%	7%

DRINKING WATER AND FLOURIDATION

14. How often, if at all, do you drink bottled water at home?*

Response category	n=400
Most of the time	16%
Some of the time	18%
Rarely	32%
Never	34%
Don't know	0%

**Asterisks indicate new questions not asked in previous surveys.*

15. I will read three statements to you. Please tell me which statement most closely matches your opinion, even if no one statement matches your opinion exactly.

Response category	2022	2016
I support fluoridated drinking water. It's good for public health.	54%	53%
I am against fluoridated drinking water. It's bad for public health.	11%	15%
I neither support nor oppose fluoridated drinking water.	28%	28%
Don't know	7%	4%

AFFORDABILITY

16. Which statement comes closer to your point of view? **[Rotate statements]**

Response category	2022	2016	2014
Drinking water rates seem unreasonable to me. TVWD is charging too much for drinking water.	38%	27%	31%
Drinking water rates seem reasonable to me. TVWD is delivering a quality service at a good price.	43%	66%	64%
Don't know	19%	7%	6%

17. Do you think two cents per gallon is a reasonable or unreasonable cost for drinking water to be treated, stored, and delivered to your home?*

Response category	n=400
Reasonable	59%
Unreasonable	10%
Don't know	31%

18A. **[Split A]** If given the choice, would you be willing or unwilling to pay more on your utility bill to help low-income community members who are struggling to pay for their water?*

Response category	n=200
Willing	40%
Unwilling	40%
Don't know	20%

19A. **[Split A] [Ask if Q18A=1]** How much more, on each bill, would you be willing to pay to help low-income community members struggling to pay for their water? Enter whole dollar amount below. **[Open; accept single whole dollar amount only]***

Response category	n=80
\$0	6%
\$1-\$5	60%
\$6-\$10	22%
\$11-\$15	0%
\$16-\$20	5%
\$21-\$25	2%
\$26+	5%
Mean	\$7.90
Median	\$5.00

20A. **[Split A]** Do you think TVWD should provide a billing assistance program that offers a regular discount for low-income customers, even if this might increase rates for other customers?*

Response category	n=200
Yes	50%
No	34%
Don't know	16%

Beginning in 2026, customers in the Tualatin Valley Water District will no longer purchase water from the Bull Run Reservoir on Mount Hood. TVWD is currently investing in a new Willamette Water Supply System—a water intake facility and treatment plant to provide customers with water from the Willamette River. This project is in the final two years of completion and cannot be deferred or delayed. In order to help fund investments in the new Willamette Water Supply System, customers will pay more in their utility bills.

18B. **[Split B]** If given the choice, would you be willing or unwilling to pay more on your utility bill to help low-income community members who are struggling to pay for their water?*

Response category	n=200
Willing	40%
Unwilling	42%
Don't know	18%

19B. **[Split B]** **[Ask if Q18B=1]** How much more, on each bill, would you be willing to pay to help low-income community members struggling to pay for their water? Enter whole dollar amount below. **[Open; accept single whole dollar amount only]***

Response category	n=80
\$0	3%
\$1-\$5	48%
\$6-\$10	27%
\$11-\$15	2%
\$16-\$20	6%
\$21-\$25	6%
\$26+	9%
Mean	\$11.50
Median	\$5.00

20B. **[Split B]** Do you think TVWD should provide a billing assistance program that offers a regular discount for low-income customers, even if this might increase rates for other customers?*

Response category	n=200
Yes	51%
No	29%
Don't know	21%

BILLING FREQUENCY

21. If you could choose how often you receive your utility bill, which of the following would you prefer, even if the total billing amount over the course of the year would remain about the same? **[Rotate first two response categories]***

Response category	n=400
A monthly bill	55%
A bill every two months	26%
No preference	17%
Don't know	1%

COMMUNICATION AND ENGAGEMENT

22. What is the best way for TVWD to keep you updated on your water service? **[Open]**

Response category	2022	2016
Email	59%	39%
Text Message	15%	--
Mail	11%	25%
Bill	4%	--
Billing insert	--	20%
Newsletter/pamphlet	2%	--
Flyers	2%	--
Internet	1%	--
Phone	--	4%
Online/web page	--	3%
Other	5%	<2%
Nothing/none	0%	--
Don't know	<1%	2%

23. If TVWD needed to reach you in cases of emergency, such as a water service interruption, which of the following ways would you prefer to receive this notification? You can select more than one. **[All that apply] [Randomize]**

Response category	2022	2016
Text message	82%	54%
Email	49%	--
Phone call	28%	43%
Door hanger	17%	20%
Social Media (example Next Door and Twitter)	10%	5%
Don't know	1%	1%

DEMOGRAPHICS

24. What is your zip code **[Open]** **[Provide drop down menu of zip codes in TVWD]***

Response category	n=400
97003	13%
97005	3%
97006	12%
97007	11%
97008	1%
97078	11%
97123	n=1
97124	n=1
97219	--
97223	10%
97224	--
97225	6%
97229	33%
Refused	1%

Response category	n=400
North (97005, 97006, 97124, 97225, 97229)	54%
South (97003, 97007, 97008, 97078, 97123, 97219, 97223, 97224)	46%

25. Do you describe your gender as:

Response category	n=400
Male	48%
Female	48%
Non-binary or gender non-conforming	2%
Refused	2%

26. What is your age? **[Open]** **[Auto fill as:]**

Response category	n=400
18-29	20%
30-44	29%
45-64	31%
65+	20%
Refused	n=1

27. Which of the following best describes your race or ethnicity? **[Allow for multiple responses]**

Response category	n=400
African	3%
Asian/Pacific Islander	11%
Black/African American	4%
Hispanic/Latino/a/x	11%
Middle Eastern/North African	1%
Native American/American Indian	2%
White/Caucasian	58%
Other	5%
Refused	13%

28. Which category best describes your 2021 gross household income, before taxes? Remember to include everyone living in your household. Your best estimate will do.*

Response category	n=400
Less than \$25,000	7%
\$25,000 to less than \$50,000	11%
\$50,000 to less than \$75,000	18%
\$75,000 to less than \$100,000	14%
\$100,000 to less than \$150,000	23%
\$150,000 or more	17%
Refused	10%

29. What is the highest level of education that you have completed?*

Response category	n=400
Less than high school	8%
High school diploma/GED	13%
Some college/2-year degree	31%
College degree/4-year degree	20%
Graduate/professional school	22%
Refused	5%

Q3. Is there any particular reason you rate your service as [excellent/good—or—poor/very poor]?	Area	Income	Q2
Always available to help and very responsive	North	\$100,000 or more	Excellent/Good
Always have water	South	\$50,000 to less than \$100,000	Excellent/Good
Always have water. Generally no issues. Just a bit expensive	North	Less than \$50,000	Excellent/Good
Always works	South	Refused	Excellent/Good
Always works and it's not brown or some other color!	North	\$100,000 or more	Excellent/Good
Any time i've had to speak to them regarding my service or bill they have given excellent customer service.	South	Less than \$50,000	Excellent/Good
Basic water charge is too high	South	\$100,000 or more	Poor/Very Poor
Because i have water. This was a bad question.	North	\$50,000 to less than \$100,000	Excellent/Good
Because it is	South	Less than \$50,000	Excellent/Good
Because it's too expensive	South	Less than \$50,000	Excellent/Good
Because it's good!	South	Less than \$50,000	Excellent/Good
Because there have been very few issues with our water supply. Although, the new payment website sucks.	South	\$50,000 to less than \$100,000	Excellent/Good
Been living in this area for 29 years and no complaints	South	\$100,000 or more	Excellent/Good
Bill needs more details	South	\$50,000 to less than \$100,000	Excellent/Good
Billing	South	\$100,000 or more	Excellent/Good
Billing is easy, water is clean and cold	South	\$50,000 to less than \$100,000	Excellent/Good
Bo	North	\$50,000 to less than \$100,000	Excellent/Good
Bone	South	\$50,000 to less than \$100,000	Excellent/Good
Charge more than everybody else	South	\$100,000 or more	Poor/Very Poor
Charging too much money for a natural resource. Hint taste chlorine in water.	South	\$50,000 to less than \$100,000	Poor/Very Poor
Clean water	North	\$50,000 to less than \$100,000	Excellent/Good
Clean water. I appreciate it being fluoride fortified.	North	\$50,000 to less than \$100,000	Excellent/Good
Communication is consistent, newsletter has helpful tips	North	\$100,000 or more	Excellent/Good
Communication is minimal	South	Less than \$50,000	Excellent/Good
Communications	South	Less than \$50,000	Excellent/Good
Connecting the supply to the insanely polluted willamette river	North	\$50,000 to less than \$100,000	Poor/Very Poor
Consistency	South	\$50,000 to less than \$100,000	Excellent/Good
Consistent service, on the expensive side	South	\$100,000 or more	Excellent/Good
Cost	South	\$100,000 or more	Excellent/Good
Cost is extremely high	North	\$50,000 to less than \$100,000	Poor/Very Poor
Cost is pretty high	South	\$100,000 or more	Excellent/Good
Cost, way too expensive and you pay even more if you water your grass and flowers	North	\$50,000 to less than \$100,000	Poor/Very Poor
Cost. No discount for one senior.	North	\$50,000 to less than \$100,000	Poor/Very Poor
Costs are decent and they've been good about working out payment plans	South	\$50,000 to less than \$100,000	Excellent/Good
Costs too much money	South	\$100,000 or more	Excellent/Good
Dependable and good water	North	\$100,000 or more	Excellent/Good
Don't have much information about them, but no issues either	North	\$50,000 to less than \$100,000	Excellent/Good
Dont worry about it	South	Refused	Excellent/Good
Due to COVID, we are having issues keeping up with the bill and it's hard to work out payment arrangements	South	Less than \$50,000	Excellent/Good
Easy bill pay, proactive communication	North	\$100,000 or more	Excellent/Good
Easy website	North	\$100,000 or more	Excellent/Good
Even if I use very little water, my bill is too high	South	Less than \$50,000	Excellent/Good
Everything perfectly working	North	Refused	Excellent/Good
Expensive	North	\$50,000 to less than \$100,000	Excellent/Good
Expensive	North	Refused	Excellent/Good
Expensive	North	Less than \$50,000	Poor/Very Poor
Expensive	South	\$100,000 or more	Excellent/Good
Extremely expensive, the executives and most employees are over paid at my	North	\$50,000 to less than \$100,000	Poor/Very Poor
Extremely too expensive!	South	\$100,000 or more	Poor/Very Poor
Far too expensive	North	Less than \$50,000	Poor/Very Poor
Flouride	North	\$50,000 to less than \$100,000	Excellent/Good

Q3. Is there any particular reason you rate your service as [excellent/good—or—poor/very poor]?	Area	Income	Q2
Getting to expensive and they charge \$95 dollars to shut water off for the winter.	South	\$50,000 to less than \$100,000	Excellent/Good
Good but a tad expensive	South	Refused	Excellent/Good
Good clean water	South	\$100,000 or more	Excellent/Good
Good clean water. Good communication.	South	\$100,000 or more	Excellent/Good
Good customer service	North	\$50,000 to less than \$100,000	Excellent/Good
Good experience with them	North	Refused	Excellent/Good
Good news letters and emails and the show up at community events	North	\$50,000 to less than \$100,000	Excellent/Good
Good service and fair price	South	\$50,000 to less than \$100,000	Excellent/Good
Good tasting water	North	\$100,000 or more	Excellent/Good
Good was one up from poor and there wasn't an option of fair to mediocre	North	\$50,000 to less than \$100,000	Excellent/Good
Good water and decent price	North	\$100,000 or more	Excellent/Good
Good water high rates	South	Less than \$50,000	Excellent/Good
Good water	South	Less than \$50,000	Excellent/Good
Great customer service	South	Less than \$50,000	Excellent/Good
Great service high price	North	\$50,000 to less than \$100,000	Excellent/Good
Great service with a water main break	South	Less than \$50,000	Excellent/Good
Had no issue with service so far but expensive	North	\$50,000 to less than \$100,000	Excellent/Good
Hasn't killed me yet	Ref	Less than \$50,000	Excellent/Good
Have had no idea	South	\$50,000 to less than \$100,000	Excellent/Good
Have never had issues with services or payments	South	\$100,000 or more	Excellent/Good
Have plenty of water pressure	South	Less than \$50,000	Excellent/Good
Have water; don't think about it	South	Refused	Excellent/Good
Haven't any complaints except for price increase (timely survey)	North	\$50,000 to less than \$100,000	Excellent/Good
Haven't had any problems	South	\$100,000 or more	Excellent/Good
Heavy use of chemicals in water noticed. Filter all water!	North	Less than \$50,000	Excellent/Good
High bills	North	\$50,000 to less than \$100,000	Poor/Very Poor
How can it be excellent, it's good	South	Less than \$50,000	Excellent/Good
I always have water	South	\$50,000 to less than \$100,000	Excellent/Good
I always have water and it tase good	North	Refused	Excellent/Good
I am never without water, it's always clean and the billpay service always works	North	\$100,000 or more	Excellent/Good
I am not sure how great looks	North	Less than \$50,000	Excellent/Good
I didnt think about it. Its expensive but okay.	North	\$100,000 or more	Excellent/Good
I don't know what it would take to be "excellent"	South	\$50,000 to less than \$100,000	Excellent/Good
I don't like the hard water and it leaves stains and damages my hair and skin	South	\$50,000 to less than \$100,000	Excellent/Good
I feel their prices are too high. I would also like to use an equal pay billing system similar to the billing options with pge and nw natural.	North	Refused	Excellent/Good
I get good clean water	South	\$100,000 or more	Excellent/Good
I have clean water and i get my water and i dont think the bills are that bad	North	\$50,000 to less than \$100,000	Excellent/Good
I have consistent water everyday. Rarely, any incidents of contamination. I think we had to flush our line once since I have lived here is the past 23 years.	North	\$50,000 to less than \$100,000	Excellent/Good
I have literally never had to think about my water service until this moment - therefore: excellent	North	Less than \$50,000	Excellent/Good
I have not had any issues. And interactions have all been good.	North	\$100,000 or more	Excellent/Good
I have water	South	\$50,000 to less than \$100,000	Excellent/Good
I just haven't had any problems	South	\$50,000 to less than \$100,000	Excellent/Good
I just heard they are trying to raise rates	South	\$100,000 or more	Excellent/Good
I like 6 bills vs 12	North	Less than \$50,000	Excellent/Good
I like their newsletter, okay prices	South	\$50,000 to less than \$100,000	Excellent/Good
I mean I always have water, its always been available	Ref	Refused	Excellent/Good
I never had any problems, it comes whenever I turn the tap and the water is good	North	\$50,000 to less than \$100,000	Excellent/Good
I pay. I get water. That's all.	South	\$100,000 or more	Excellent/Good
I turn on a faucet and water comes out!	North	\$100,000 or more	Excellent/Good
I would like online billing. I seem to get a bill every other month.	North	\$50,000 to less than \$100,000	Excellent/Good

Q3. Is there any particular reason you rate your service as [excellent/good—or—poor/very poor]?	Area	Income	Q2
I'm just not sure I'd say it's excellent	North	\$100,000 or more	Excellent/Good
I've never had any problem but it's expensive	South	\$100,000 or more	Excellent/Good
Increasing rates	North	Refused	Poor/Very Poor
Incredibly overpriced. I cannot afford it. My water was literally shut off because I could not pay my bill, after losing my job.	South	Less than \$50,000	Poor/Very Poor
It costs too much, especially compared to many other states. It is ridiculous!	North	\$50,000 to less than \$100,000	Poor/Very Poor
It has more to do with our home facility than with the services	South	\$50,000 to less than \$100,000	Excellent/Good
It is always clean and available	South	\$100,000 or more	Excellent/Good
It is always there, it is clear, when there is a problem they handle it well	North	\$50,000 to less than \$100,000	Excellent/Good
It is water. We have a fresh and clean supply. Overall, water bill is high so rated as good not excellent.	North	\$100,000 or more	Excellent/Good
It just works; expensive	North	Less than \$50,000	Excellent/Good
It seems fine	South	\$50,000 to less than \$100,000	Excellent/Good
It seems like there is a rate increase annually. I'm not sure what I get for the extra costs.	North	\$50,000 to less than \$100,000	Excellent/Good
It works	North	\$50,000 to less than \$100,000	Excellent/Good
It works, very expensive	North	\$100,000 or more	Excellent/Good
It would nice if they would have auto pay, I pay through a bank system and every time the bill is different.	North	Less than \$50,000	Excellent/Good
It's my opinion	North	Refused	Excellent/Good
It's never been any trouble, no problems with it	North	\$50,000 to less than \$100,000	Excellent/Good
It's not like I have a choice of water companies. They are expensive!	South	\$50,000 to less than \$100,000	Excellent/Good
It's there when we need it, water quality seems to be fine	South	\$100,000 or more	Excellent/Good
It's acceptable. Communication has been poor on a couple occasions.	North	\$50,000 to less than \$100,000	Excellent/Good
It's expensive and they don't offer help to lower income people	South	Less than \$50,000	Excellent/Good
It's fine. It's water utility. It's expensive.	North	\$100,000 or more	Excellent/Good
It's good	North	\$50,000 to less than \$100,000	Excellent/Good
It's just excellent	North	\$100,000 or more	Excellent/Good
It's mostly good, not a big fan of storm water charges and it seems like reducing water usage doesn't reduce bill much.	North	\$100,000 or more	Excellent/Good
It's reliable but expensive	South	\$50,000 to less than \$100,000	Excellent/Good
It's water and it comes to me in the pipes whenever I need it. That's all I'm really asking for. Ha!	North	\$100,000 or more	Excellent/Good
It's just not bad	South	\$50,000 to less than \$100,000	Excellent/Good
Just good	North	Refused	Excellent/Good
Just good clean water easily	South	\$100,000 or more	Excellent/Good
Just moved here, no problems so far	South	\$100,000 or more	Excellent/Good
Just no reason not to, they bring us good water and reliably	South	\$50,000 to less than \$100,000	Excellent/Good
Meets all my needs	North	\$50,000 to less than \$100,000	Excellent/Good
Mismanagement of the district funds. Board members who have been there 30 years. Taking on \$1.2 billion in debt to build a new supply without asking the ratepayers first.	South	\$100,000 or more	Poor/Very Poor
Most time we have water	South	Less than \$50,000	Excellent/Good
My water is always on and tastes good	North	Less than \$50,000	Excellent/Good
My water tastes fresh	North	\$100,000 or more	Excellent/Good
N/a	North	Refused	Excellent/Good
N/a	South	\$50,000 to less than \$100,000	Excellent/Good
N/a	South	\$50,000 to less than \$100,000	Excellent/Good
N/a	South	Less than \$50,000	Excellent/Good
Never a problem	North	\$100,000 or more	Excellent/Good
Never a problem... in 35 years	South	Less than \$50,000	Excellent/Good
Never any complaints	South	\$50,000 to less than \$100,000	Excellent/Good
Never any interruptions and fair price	North	\$100,000 or more	Excellent/Good
Never any issues with service or water quality	North	\$50,000 to less than \$100,000	Excellent/Good
Never any issues; communicates well with customers	North	\$50,000 to less than \$100,000	Excellent/Good
Never any problems	North	\$100,000 or more	Excellent/Good
Never any problems	South	Less than \$50,000	Excellent/Good

Q3. Is there any particular reason you rate your service as [excellent/good—or—poor/very poor]?	Area	Income	Q2
Never had a problem	North	\$50,000 to less than \$100,000	Excellent/Good
Never had a problem with billing but wish billing was monthly and billing statement listed gallons instead of specialized units	South	\$100,000 or more	Excellent/Good
Never had a problem with them	North	\$50,000 to less than \$100,000	Excellent/Good
Never had a problem with them but their rates are getting high	South	Less than \$50,000	Excellent/Good
Never had a problem with water coming into the house or with the sewers. Water quality is good and affordable.	South	\$50,000 to less than \$100,000	Excellent/Good
Never had a water problem	North	\$50,000 to less than \$100,000	Excellent/Good
Never had an issue	North	\$100,000 or more	Excellent/Good
Never had an issue of any sort	South	\$50,000 to less than \$100,000	Excellent/Good
Never had an issue, water is fine to drink	North	\$100,000 or more	Excellent/Good
Never had any issues	South	Less than \$50,000	Excellent/Good
Never had any issues about the water quality	North	\$100,000 or more	Excellent/Good
Never had any issues and they offer classes	South	\$50,000 to less than \$100,000	Excellent/Good
Never had any issues with it	North	\$100,000 or more	Excellent/Good
Never had any problems and water is always clean and clear	South	\$100,000 or more	Excellent/Good
Never had problems	South	\$100,000 or more	Excellent/Good
Never had water interruption that I know of	South	Less than \$50,000	Excellent/Good
Never had water shut offs and bills normal no raises	North	\$100,000 or more	Excellent/Good
Never lacked water	North	Less than \$50,000	Excellent/Good
Never without water	North	\$100,000 or more	Excellent/Good
Nice, professional	South	Refused	Excellent/Good
No	North	\$100,000 or more	Excellent/Good
No	North	Refused	Excellent/Good
No	South	Less than \$50,000	Excellent/Good
No	South	\$50,000 to less than \$100,000	Excellent/Good
No	South	Refused	Excellent/Good
No	South	Less than \$50,000	Excellent/Good
No	North	\$100,000 or more	Excellent/Good
No	South	\$50,000 to less than \$100,000	Excellent/Good
No	North	\$100,000 or more	Excellent/Good
No	South	Less than \$50,000	Excellent/Good
No	North	Less than \$50,000	Excellent/Good
No	South	\$50,000 to less than \$100,000	Excellent/Good
No	South	Refused	Excellent/Good
No	South	Less than \$50,000	Excellent/Good
No	North	Refused	Excellent/Good
No	North	\$50,000 to less than \$100,000	Excellent/Good
No	South	Refused	Excellent/Good
No	South	Refused	Excellent/Good
No	South	Less than \$50,000	Excellent/Good
No	South	\$50,000 to less than \$100,000	Excellent/Good
No	North	\$100,000 or more	Excellent/Good
No	North	Less than \$50,000	Excellent/Good
No	North	\$50,000 to less than \$100,000	Excellent/Good
No	North	\$50,000 to less than \$100,000	Excellent/Good
No	South	\$100,000 or more	Excellent/Good
No	South	\$100,000 or more	Excellent/Good
No	North	\$50,000 to less than \$100,000	Excellent/Good
No	South	Less than \$50,000	Excellent/Good
No	South	\$50,000 to less than \$100,000	Excellent/Good
No	South	\$50,000 to less than \$100,000	Excellent/Good
No	North	Less than \$50,000	Excellent/Good
No	North	\$50,000 to less than \$100,000	Excellent/Good
No	North	Less than \$50,000	Excellent/Good
No	North	Less than \$50,000	Excellent/Good

Q3. Is there any particular reason you rate your service as [excellent/good—or—poor/very poor]?	Area	Income	Q2
No	North	\$50,000 to less than \$100,000	Excellent/Good
No	North	\$100,000 or more	Excellent/Good
No	South	\$50,000 to less than \$100,000	Excellent/Good
No	North	\$50,000 to less than \$100,000	Excellent/Good
No	South	\$50,000 to less than \$100,000	Excellent/Good
No	North	\$50,000 to less than \$100,000	Excellent/Good
No	North	Less than \$50,000	Excellent/Good
No	South	\$50,000 to less than \$100,000	Excellent/Good
No	North	\$50,000 to less than \$100,000	Excellent/Good
No	North	\$100,000 or more	Excellent/Good
No	South	Less than \$50,000	Excellent/Good
No	North	Less than \$50,000	Excellent/Good
No	South	\$100,000 or more	Excellent/Good
No	South	Less than \$50,000	Excellent/Good
No	North	\$50,000 to less than \$100,000	Excellent/Good
No comment	South	Less than \$50,000	Excellent/Good
No comparisons. Rates and service have been consistent for 20 years.	North	Less than \$50,000	Excellent/Good
No complaints	North	\$50,000 to less than \$100,000	Excellent/Good
No complaints but no reason to say excellent either.	North	Less than \$50,000	Excellent/Good
No expectations beyond I turn in faucet and there is water	North	\$50,000 to less than \$100,000	Excellent/Good
No interruptions in service	North	\$50,000 to less than \$100,000	Excellent/Good
No interruptions in service so far	North	\$100,000 or more	Excellent/Good
No issues	South	\$50,000 to less than \$100,000	Excellent/Good
No issues	South	\$50,000 to less than \$100,000	Excellent/Good
No issues	North	Less than \$50,000	Excellent/Good
No issues	North	\$100,000 or more	Excellent/Good
No issues but expensive	South	Less than \$50,000	Excellent/Good
No issues in 20+ years	South	\$50,000 to less than \$100,000	Excellent/Good
No issues never have to call them	North	\$50,000 to less than \$100,000	Excellent/Good
No issues so far	South	\$100,000 or more	Excellent/Good
No issues yet	North	\$100,000 or more	Excellent/Good
No issues, easy billing	North	\$100,000 or more	Excellent/Good
No issues. They do their job.	North	\$50,000 to less than \$100,000	Excellent/Good
No problem	South	\$50,000 to less than \$100,000	Excellent/Good
No problem of getting water	South	\$100,000 or more	Excellent/Good
No problem with service or customer service	South	\$100,000 or more	Excellent/Good
No problems	South	\$100,000 or more	Excellent/Good
No problems	South	\$100,000 or more	Excellent/Good
No problems	North	\$100,000 or more	Excellent/Good
No problems	North	\$50,000 to less than \$100,000	Excellent/Good
No problems	South	\$50,000 to less than \$100,000	Excellent/Good
No problems and solid service for many years	North	\$50,000 to less than \$100,000	Excellent/Good
No problems	South	Refused	Excellent/Good
No water quality problems or service disruptions that I know of	North	Less than \$50,000	Excellent/Good
Nobody is excellent	North	Refused	Excellent/Good
Nope, never had an issue	South	\$50,000 to less than \$100,000	Excellent/Good
Nope. Never had a problem. Glad fluoride is added.	North	\$100,000 or more	Excellent/Good
Not really	South	\$50,000 to less than \$100,000	Excellent/Good
Not really	North	Refused	Excellent/Good
Not sure	North	\$50,000 to less than \$100,000	Excellent/Good
Not that I can think of	South	\$50,000 to less than \$100,000	Excellent/Good
Not too hard and tastes good	North	\$50,000 to less than \$100,000	Excellent/Good
Not transparent about fees	North	\$50,000 to less than \$100,000	Poor/Very Poor
Nothing	South	\$50,000 to less than \$100,000	Excellent/Good
Nothing has gone wrong	North	\$100,000 or more	Excellent/Good

Q3. Is there any particular reason you rate your service as [excellent/good—or—poor/very poor]?	Area	Income	Q2
Nothing out of the ordinary	South	\$100,000 or more	Excellent/Good
Nothing specific	North	Refused	Excellent/Good
Overpriced	South	Less than \$50,000	Excellent/Good
Overpriced. We have very low usage, but with their sky-high base charges, our bill is always ridiculous.	North	\$50,000 to less than \$100,000	Poor/Very Poor
Overspending	South	\$50,000 to less than \$100,000	Poor/Very Poor
People	South	\$100,000 or more	Excellent/Good
Plastic in the water	North	\$100,000 or more	Excellent/Good
Predictable	South	\$50,000 to less than \$100,000	Excellent/Good
Pretty sure flushing the system burst my pipes a few years back	North	Less than \$50,000	Poor/Very Poor
Price	South	Refused	Excellent/Good
Price	South	\$100,000 or more	Excellent/Good
Price always going up	South	\$100,000 or more	Excellent/Good
Price feels a little high	North	\$100,000 or more	Excellent/Good
Price inconsistency, badly organized website	North	\$50,000 to less than \$100,000	Poor/Very Poor
Price seems high	South	\$100,000 or more	Excellent/Good
Prices are constantly increasing	South	Less than \$50,000	Excellent/Good
Prices are extremely high for area that gets alot of rain. My water bill in texas was like 20-30 bucks in the summer. Compared to 150+ here	North	\$50,000 to less than \$100,000	Poor/Very Poor
Prices keep going up	South	\$100,000 or more	Excellent/Good
Quality is good	North	\$50,000 to less than \$100,000	Excellent/Good
Quality of water	South	Less than \$50,000	Poor/Very Poor
Rates are extremely high	North	\$100,000 or more	Excellent/Good
Rates are too high	North	\$50,000 to less than \$100,000	Excellent/Good
Rates jacking up	South	\$50,000 to less than \$100,000	Excellent/Good
Really nice people, but the response to leaks in house were unsatisfactory	South	\$100,000 or more	Excellent/Good
Reasonable rates, no major outages	North	\$50,000 to less than \$100,000	Excellent/Good
Reliability and quality	North	Refused	Excellent/Good
Reliable	North	\$100,000 or more	Excellent/Good
Reliable clean water	North	Less than \$50,000	Excellent/Good
Reliable service	South	\$100,000 or more	Excellent/Good
Reliable supply	South	\$100,000 or more	Excellent/Good
Reliable, high water quality	North	\$50,000 to less than \$100,000	Excellent/Good
Requiring a backflow test when there's no link between our private system and tvwd. Money grab!	South	\$100,000 or more	Poor/Very Poor
Responsive and reliable	North	\$100,000 or more	Excellent/Good
Rising costs	South	\$50,000 to less than \$100,000	Excellent/Good
Seems fine	South	\$100,000 or more	Excellent/Good
Service is consistant and reliable. Bills are clear and easy to understand.	South	\$50,000 to less than \$100,000	Excellent/Good
Service is okay but too expensive	North	Refused	Excellent/Good
She thinks that the quality is excellent, but pricey	North	\$100,000 or more	Excellent/Good
Since the COVID crisis, they work with us regarding payments	North	Less than \$50,000	Excellent/Good
Some time difficult to deal with them	South	Less than \$50,000	Excellent/Good
Sometimes the water is low	South	\$50,000 to less than \$100,000	Excellent/Good
Stability	North	Refused	Excellent/Good
Sufficient, no complaints	South	Less than \$50,000	Excellent/Good
Tap water tastes good and water pressure is always reliable	South	\$100,000 or more	Excellent/Good
Taste	North	\$50,000 to less than \$100,000	Excellent/Good
Tastes good	South	Less than \$50,000	Excellent/Good
Tastes good	North	Less than \$50,000	Excellent/Good
The additional charges are insane, but the overall service is acceptable	North	\$50,000 to less than \$100,000	Excellent/Good
The bills feel a little expensive	South	\$100,000 or more	Excellent/Good
The cost is exorbitant. The water taste and my quality is poor.	South	\$100,000 or more	Poor/Very Poor
The cost is high	North	\$100,000 or more	Excellent/Good
The cost just keeps increasing. The total now is higher than when we had 2 more people living here a couple of years ago.	South	\$100,000 or more	Poor/Very Poor

Q3. Is there any particular reason you rate your service as [excellent/good—or—poor/very poor]?	Area	Income	Q2
The frequent rate increases keep me from rating excellent	North	\$50,000 to less than \$100,000	Excellent/Good
The need to careful of how much water we use. Always upping the cost.	South	\$50,000 to less than \$100,000	Excellent/Good
The pressure is excellent	South	Less than \$50,000	Excellent/Good
The prices are way too expensive	South	\$50,000 to less than \$100,000	Excellent/Good
The quality of our water is good and they're are constantly working to maintain the water system	North	\$50,000 to less than \$100,000	Excellent/Good
The quality of the service and product	South	Refused	Excellent/Good
The rates are so high	South	Less than \$50,000	Poor/Very Poor
The service is fine	North	\$50,000 to less than \$100,000	Excellent/Good
The staff is great	North	\$100,000 or more	Excellent/Good
The water always shows up	Ref	Refused	Excellent/Good
The water always works	North	Less than \$50,000	Excellent/Good
The water is clean and billing seems fair	South	\$50,000 to less than \$100,000	Excellent/Good
There hasn't been any problems	North	\$100,000 or more	Excellent/Good
There was no neutral option	North	\$50,000 to less than \$100,000	Excellent/Good
They are consistent in messaging and price increases	North	Less than \$50,000	Excellent/Good
They are excellent	South	Less than \$50,000	Excellent/Good
They are self sustaining, provide reliable service, and responsibly maintain their infrastructure	North	Less than \$50,000	Excellent/Good
They don't keep their word on agreements. The main pipe from the street to my house burst I had to pay to replace all of it including my house pipes, they assured me they would discount / help with the water wasted at the street but made me pay for all of it even though it took a month for a plumber to fix.	South	\$50,000 to less than \$100,000	Excellent/Good
They dont really have a negative impact so just as good	North	\$100,000 or more	Excellent/Good
They have always been responsive to any concerns or questions we have our service is great we've never had any problems with them at all	North	Refused	Excellent/Good
They just finish a repiping work	South	\$50,000 to less than \$100,000	Excellent/Good
They keep increasing rates. We have rates higher than people who live in the desert, and have no natural water source!!	South	\$100,000 or more	Poor/Very Poor
They offer interesting resources tans info in their newsletter	North	\$100,000 or more	Excellent/Good
They provide the service that I pay for. Never had any issues.	South	\$50,000 to less than \$100,000	Excellent/Good
They take of stuff the water is good and if you need help thye respond	South	\$100,000 or more	Excellent/Good
They took away leaf pick up	North	\$100,000 or more	Poor/Very Poor
They're very friendly and helpful when i call. Water is just very expensive here and with all the rain we get I'm still trying to understand the bill. It's gotta be behind the scenes part that we don't know or remember and it contributes to the expense.	South	\$50,000 to less than \$100,000	Excellent/Good
They've checked some problems I've had freely and it's reliable	North	\$100,000 or more	Excellent/Good
Too expensive	North	\$100,000 or more	Poor/Very Poor
Too expensive	North	Less than \$50,000	Poor/Very Poor
Too expensive	South	Less than \$50,000	Excellent/Good
Too high rates	North	\$50,000 to less than \$100,000	Poor/Very Poor
Unsure if we are actually on water coming from system on 65th ct	South	\$100,000 or more	Excellent/Good
Water and sewage costs are very high	North	\$50,000 to less than \$100,000	Poor/Very Poor
Water bill comes out every 2 months	South	\$50,000 to less than \$100,000	Excellent/Good
Water come out of tap when needed	South	Less than \$50,000	Excellent/Good
Water comes out of spigots. Price reasonable.	South	\$100,000 or more	Excellent/Good
Water company at beach wasn't friendly. Website is easy to use, including payment portal.	South	\$100,000 or more	Excellent/Good
Water flows!	North	\$100,000 or more	Excellent/Good
Water had contamination. Expensive prices no help for low income.	South	Less than \$50,000	Poor/Very Poor
Water is good quality	North	Refused	Excellent/Good
Water is there when i need it	South	\$50,000 to less than \$100,000	Excellent/Good
Water quality	South	\$100,000 or more	Poor/Very Poor
Water quality is good but the pricing is high	North	\$50,000 to less than \$100,000	Excellent/Good
Water taste terrible	South	\$100,000 or more	Excellent/Good
Water tastes good, can't tremendously having a boil water notice	North	\$50,000 to less than \$100,000	Excellent/Good

Q3. Is there any particular reason you rate your service as [excellent/good—or—poor/very poor]?	Area	Income	Q2
Water tastes ok and doesn't go out	North	Refused	Excellent/Good
We had a pipe leak/break a few years back. They reimbursed some but not all of the overpaid amount due to the leak	North	\$100,000 or more	Excellent/Good
We had a problem and they were prompt and helpful	South	\$100,000 or more	Excellent/Good
We had an underground leak and with the two month billing cycle we're not aware of the leak for a long time. The district refused to reduce our bill even after we repaired the break	South	Refused	Excellent/Good
We have good water, its never turned off on us, we never ran dry	North	Refused	Excellent/Good
We have had no issues with our water. Service is expensive, though.	North	\$50,000 to less than \$100,000	Excellent/Good
We have never had any complaints and can always count on great service.	South	Less than \$50,000	Excellent/Good
We have water. The prices continue to rise.	South	\$50,000 to less than \$100,000	Excellent/Good
We have water. Cost is relatively high.	North	Less than \$50,000	Excellent/Good
We haven't had any issues to rate otherwise	South	Less than \$50,000	Excellent/Good
We havent had any issues	North	\$100,000 or more	Excellent/Good
We never have any issues with water being shut off or unhealthy. I see them come and clean the manhole area and cost seems in normal range.	North	\$100,000 or more	Excellent/Good
We've never had a problem	South	\$50,000 to less than \$100,000	Excellent/Good
We've never had a problem	North	\$100,000 or more	Excellent/Good
Weak but good	South	Refused	Excellent/Good
Well I have never had any problems with it	North	Less than \$50,000	Excellent/Good
Well, I haven't had any problems with water service	North	Less than \$50,000	Excellent/Good
When I turn the water on it runs	North	\$50,000 to less than \$100,000	Excellent/Good
Works	North	\$50,000 to less than \$100,000	Excellent/Good
Would like more info on the website	South	\$100,000 or more	Excellent/Good
Would really love if they brought back curbside leaf pick up otherwise everything is awesome!	North	\$100,000 or more	Excellent/Good
Yes, our water main broke at the street and we lost all water. a representative came out and told us that there was full water pressure at the meter (there were several breaks in the line so that was not possible) and that the problem was on our side. We were forced to disrupt our non-profit rehab and spend thousands of dollars trying to find a problem that didn't exist.	North	Refused	Poor/Very Poor
Yes. I always have water when i want it.	North	\$50,000 to less than \$100,000	Excellent/Good

August 2022

Tualatin Valley Water District Customer Survey

Crosstabs



Prepared by DHM Research

503.220.0575
555 SE MLK Jr. Blvd, Suite 105
Portland, OR 97214
www.dhmresearch.com

Tualatin Valley Water District Customer Survey

August 2-8, 2022; n=400

HOW TO READ CROSSTABLES

Q1. All in all, do you think things are headed in the right direction or are things pretty much on the wrong track?

	Total	Gender	
		Male	Female
Total	1371 100%	599 100% (B)	772 100% (C)
Right direction	943 69%	394 66%	549B 71%
Wrong track	236 17%	126C 21%	100 14%
Don't know	192 14%	79 13%	113 15%

(sig=.05) (all_pairs) columns tested BC

How to Read Crosstables: In the example chart (left), rows represent the three possible response options to the question “All in all, do you think things are headed in the right direction, or are things pretty much on the wrong track?” The three response options are: “right direction,” “wrong track,” and “don’t know.” The amounts in each response category sum to the amount in the “total” row at the top of the table.

The first column, or banner, is the “Total” column. It reflects the overall results.

The next two columns reflect the results of a subgroup, “Gender.” The gender subgroup is composed of Males and Females, each with their own column. Both gender groups are assigned a letter (Male=B, Female=C).

These two columns show how males’ attitudes compare to females’ attitudes. As shown in the chart, 69% of the full sample thinks things are headed in the right direction. Looking at the gender subgroup, 71% of women think things are headed in the right direction, compared to 66% of men.

Statistically Significant Differences: If a pair of cells has a difference which is statistically significant, the larger of the two cells is flagged with the letter of the opposite column. The test shows the difference in females’ attitudes about things being headed in the right direction is statistically significantly different

than those of males’, which is signified by a “B” (the letter given to Males) next to females’ results for “right direction.”

The footnote indicates the level of significance (sig=.05). This level of significance means that 5% of the time, the difference between how the two groups feel about the direction is due to random chance, while 95% of the time the difference is meaningful.

Statement of Limitations: Any sampling of opinions or attitudes is subject to a margin of error, which represents the difference between a sample of a given population and the total population. The margin of error is a statistic expressing the amount of random sampling error in a survey’s results and differs by sample size, as reflected in the table below.

Margin of Error Based on Sample Size

N=1200	N=1000	N=800	N=600	N=500	N=400	N=300	N=200	N=150	N=100	N=50
+/- 2.8%	+/- 3.1%	+/- 3.5%	+/- 4.0%	+/- 4.4%	+/- 4.9%	+/- 5.7%	+/- 6.9%	+/- 8.0%	+/- 9.8%	+/- 13.8%

DHM Research - Tualatin Valley Water District Customer Survey: August 2-8, 2022

Q1. Could you tell me who provides water service to your home?

	Area			Zip Code											Gender		Age			
	Total	North	South	97003	97005	97006	97007	97008	97078	97123	97124	97223	97225	97229	Male	Fe- male	18-29	30-44	45-64	65+
Total	400 100%	215 100% (B)	181 100% (C)	51 100% (D)	12 100% (E)	48 100% (F)	44 100% (G)	2 100% (H)	44 100% (I)	1 100% (J)	1 100% (K)	40 100% (L)	24 100% (M)	131 100% (N)	193 100% (O)	193 100% (P)	80 100% (Q)	116 100% (R)	124 100% (S)	80 100% (T)
Tualatin Valley Water District/TVWD	352 88%	192 89%	160 88%	49HK 95%	11HK 94%	39HK 82%	39HK 90%	-	38HK 87%	-	0 24%	34HK 86%	23HK 95%	119H 91%K	163 84%	177O 92%	68 85%	107 93%	108 88%	68 85%
Clean Water Services	17 4%	10 5%	7 4%	2 3%	-	2 5%	2 5%	-	2 5%	-	-	1 3%	4 4%	7 5%	7 3%	10 5%	3 4%	4 3%	3 2%	7 9%
City of Hillsboro	3 1%	2 1%	1 *	-	-	-	-	-	-	1 100%	1DEFGI 43%LMN	-	-	1 1%	0 *	1 *	2 2%	-	0 *	1 1%
Landlord/HOA	2 *	-	2 1%	-	-	-	-	-	1 3%	-	-	1 1%	-	-	1 1%	1 *	1 2%	-	-	1 1%
Well	2 *	1 *	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	1 *	2 1%	-	-	-	1 1%	1 1%
City of Tigard	1 *	-	1 1%	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	1N 4%	-	-	1 1%	0 *	-	-	1 1%	-
Washington County	1 *	-	1 1%	-	-	-	1 3%	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	1 1%	-	-	-	1 1%	-
Tualatin Hills Water	1 *	1 1%	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	1 1%	1 1%	-	1 1%	-	-	-
PGE	0 *	-	0 *	-	-	-	-	0DFN 12%	-	-	-	-	-	-	0 *	-	0 *	-	-	-
Other	18 4%	10 5%	8 4%	1 2%	-	6N 12%	2 5%	2DEFGI 88%LMN	1 3%	-	-	1 2%	1 5%	3 3%	10 5%	7 3%	6 7%	2 2%	5 4%	5 7%
Nothing/None	3 1%	1 *	2 1%	-	-	1 1%	-	-	1 2%	-	-	1 3%	-	-	2 1%	0 *	-	1 1%	1 1%	-
Don't know	7 2%	5 2%	1 1%	-	1 6%	1 1%	-	-	-	-	-	0DFGIL 34%MN	1 4%	3 2%	3 2%	4 2%	-	1 1%	5 4%	1 2%
Refused	2 1%	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	2 1%	-	-	1 1%	-	-

(sig=.05) (all_pairs) columns tested BC, DEFGHIJKLMN, OP, QRST
 Note: Percentage less than 0.5 printed as *.

DHM Research - Tualatin Valley Water District Customer Survey: August 2-8, 2022

Q1. Could you tell me who provides water service to your home?

	Ethnicity			Education			Income			Q1: Provider		Q2: Impressions					Q16: Rates		Split		
	Total	White Alone	POC	H.S. Grad Or <	Some Coll	Coll Grad+	<\$50K	\$50K-\$100K	\$100K Or >	TVWD	Other/DK	Excellent	Good	Poor	Very Poor	Excellent/Very Good	Poor/Very Poor	Un-reason-able	Reason-able	A	B
		(B)	(C)	(D)	(E)	(F)	(G)	(H)	(I)	(J)	(K)	(L)	(M)	(N)	(O)	(P)	(Q)	(R)	(S)		
Total	400 100%	219 100%	129 100%	83 100%	125 100%	171 100%	72 100%	125 100%	162 100%	352 100%	48 100%	123 100%	217 100%	24 100%	14 100%	340 100%	38 100%	150 100%	173 100%	200 100%	200 100%
Tualatin Valley Water District/TVWD	352 88%	193 88%	111 86%	76 92%	109 87%	150 88%	59 83%	116 92%	140 87%	352 100%	-	109 88%	190 88%	22 92%	13 89%	298 88%	35 91%	138 92%	149 86%	175 87%	177 89%
Clean Water Services	17 4%	11 5%	5 4%	5 6%	8 6%	5 3%	5 7%	8 6%	4 3%	9 3%	8 17%	7 5%	9 4%	1 4%	-	16 5%	1 2%	3 2%	10 6%	9 4%	9 4%
City of Hillsboro	3 1%	3 1%	-	-	2 2%	0 *	1 1%	-	1 1%	-	3 5%	1 1%	1 1%	-	-	3 1%	-	0 *	2 1%	0 *	2 1%
Landlord/HOA	2 *	1 *	1 1%	-	1 1%	1 *	2 3%	-	-	-	2 4%	2 2%	-	-	-	2 1%	-	-	1 1%	1 *	1 1%
Well	2 *	1 *	1 1%	-	-	2 1%	1 1%	1 1%	-	-	2 3%	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	1 *	1 *
City of Tigard	1 *	1 1%	-	1 1%	-	0 *	-	0 *	1 1%	-	1 3%	-	1 *	-	-	1 *	-	1 1%	-	0 *	1 1%
Washington County	1 *	-	1 1%	-	1 1%	-	-	-	1 1%	-	1 3%	1 1%	-	-	-	1 *	-	-	1 1%	1 1%	-
Tualatin Hills Water	1 *	-	1 1%	-	-	1 1%	-	1 1%	-	-	1 2%	1 1%	-	-	-	1 *	-	-	1 1%	1 1%	-
PGE	0 *	0 *	-	-	-	0 *	-	-	-	-	0 1%	-	0 *	-	-	0 *	-	-	0 *	0 *	-
Other	18 4%	10 5%	6 5%	4 5%	6 5%	6 4%	7 9%	2 1%	8 5%	-	18 37%	3 2%	12 6%	1 6%	2 11%	15 4%	3 8%	5 4%	7 4%	9 4%	9 5%
Nothing/None	3 1%	2 1%	1 1%	-	-	1 1%	0 *	1 1%	1 1%	-	3 6%	0 *	1 *	0 2%	-	1 *	0 1%	1 1%	2 1%	2 1%	0 *
Don't know	7 2%	5 2%	2 1%	-	1 1%	6 3%	-	1 1%	5 3%	-	7 14%	3 3%	4 2%	-	-	7 2%	-	1 1%	3 2%	4 2%	3 1%
Refused	2 1%	-	1 1%	1 2%	-	-	1 2%	-	-	-	2 5%	-	2 1%	-	-	2 1%	-	1 1%	1 1%	1 1%	1 1%

(sig=.05) (all_pairs) columns tested BC, DEF, GHI, JK, LMNO, PQ, RS
 Note: Percentage less than 0.5 printed as *.

DHM Research - Tualatin Valley Water District Customer Survey: August 2-8, 2022

Q2. Tualatin Valley Water District provides service to your area. Is your overall impression of the services provided by TVWD excellent, good, poor, or very poor?

	Area			Zip Code											Gender		Age			
	Total	North	South	97003	97005	97006	97007	97008	97078	97123	97124	97223	97225	97229	Male	Fe- male	18-29	30-44	45-64	65+
Total	400 100%	215 100% (B)	181 100% (C)	51 100% (D)	12 100% (E)	48 100% (F)	44 100% (G)	2 100% (H)	44 100% (I)	1 100% (J)	1 100% (K)	40 100% (L)	24 100% (M)	131 100% (N)	193 100% (O)	193 100% (P)	80 100% (Q)	116 100% (R)	124 100% (S)	80 100% (T)
Excellent/Good	340 85%	184 85%	153 85%	40 78%	11 95%	38 80%	38H 87%	0 24%	38H 88%	1 100%	1 100%	36H 90%	21H 90%	112H 85%	167 87%	165 86%	65 82%	101 87%	101 82%	71 89%
Excellent	123 31%	75 35%	48 26%	14 27%	4 38%	9 20%	10 23%	-	11 26%	1 100%	1F 66%	12 30%	12FG 51%	48F 37%	57 30%	65 34%	21 26%	30 26%	37 30%	36QRS 45%
Good	217 54%	109 51%	106 58%	26 51%	7 57%	29 60%	28 64%	0 24%	27 62%	-	0 34%	24 60%	9 39%	64 49%	110 57%	100 52%	45 56%	71T 62%	64 52%	35 44%
Total poor	38 10%	18 8%	21 11%	8 15%	1 5%	6 12%	5 13%	2FGILM 76%N	5 12%	-	-	1 3%	2 7%	10 8%	20 10%	13 7%	11 14%	11 10%	11 9%	5 7%
Poor	24 6%	14 6%	10 6%	2 5%	1 5%	3 7%	2 4%	-	5 12%	-	-	1 3%	1 4%	9 7%	14 7%	9 5%	6 7%	9 7%	7 5%	3 4%
Very poor	14 4%	4 2%	10 6%	5N 10%	-	2 5%	4N 9%	2DEFGI 76%LMN	-	-	-	-	1 3%	1 1%	6 3%	4 2%	6 7%	2 2%	4 3%	2 3%
Don't know	21 5%	14 6%	7 4%	4 7%	-	4 8%	-	-	-	-	-	3 7%	1 3%	9 7%	6 3%	15 8%	3 4%	4 3%	12 10%	3 4%

(sig=.05) (all_pairs) columns tested BC, DEFGHIJKLMN, OP, QRST

DHM Research - Tualatin Valley Water District Customer Survey: August 2-8, 2022

Q2. Tualatin Valley Water District provides service to your area. Is your overall impression of the services provided by TVWD excellent, good, poor, or very poor?

	Ethnicity			Education			Income			Q1: Provider		Q2: Impressions					Q16: Rates		Split		
	Total	White Alone	POC	H.S. Grad Or <	Some Coll	Coll Grad+	<\$50K	\$50K-\$100K	\$100K Or >	TVWD	Other/DK	Exce-llent	Good	Poor	Very Poor	Exce-llent/Very Poor	Poor/Very Poor	Un-reason-able	Reason-able	A	B
Total	400 100%	219 100% (B)	129 100% (C)	83 100% (D)	125 100% (E)	171 100% (F)	72 100% (G)	125 100% (H)	162 100% (I)	352 100% (J)	48 100% (K)	123 100% (L)	217 100% (M)	24 100% (N)	14 100% (O)	340 100% (P)	38 100% (Q)	150 100% (R)	173 100% (S)	200 100%	200 100%
Excellent/Good	340 85%	199 91%	107 83%	66 80%	110 88%	151 88%	61 85%	104 83%	139 86%	298 85%	42 86%	123NO 100%	217NO 100%	-	-	340Q 100%	-	111 74%	162R 94%	172 86%	168 84%
Excellent	123 31%	71 32%	42 33%	21 25%	38 30%	61 35%	26 36%	37 30%	47 29%	109 31%	15 31%	123MNO 100%	-	-	-	123Q 36%	-	22 15%	80R 46%	65 32%	58 29%
Good	217 54%	128 58%	65 51%	45 55%	72 58%	90 53%	35 49%	67 54%	91 57%	190 54%	27 56%	-	217LNO 100%	-	-	217Q 64%	-	89 59%	82 47%	107 54%	109 55%
Total poor	38 10%	13 6%	12 9%	10 12%	10 8%	14 8%	7 9%	12 9%	18 11%	35 10%	3 7%	-	-	24LM 100%	14LM 100%	-	38P 100%	30S 20%	5 3%	16 8%	23 11%
Poor	24 6%	7 3%	6 5%	4 5%	8 6%	9 5%	5 6%	10 8%	7 4%	22 6%	2 4%	-	-	24LMO 100%	-	-	24P 62%	21S 14%	2 1%	8 4%	16 8%
Very poor	14 4%	6 3%	6 4%	6 7%	2 2%	6 3%	2 3%	2 1%	11H 7%	13 4%	2 3%	-	-	-	14LMN 100%	-	14P 38%	9 6%	3 2%	8 4%	6 3%
Don't know	21 5%	7 3%	10 7%	7 8%	5 4%	5 3%	4 6%	9 7%	5 3%	18 5%	3 7%	-	-	-	-	-	-	9 6%	5 3%	12 6%	10 5%

(sig=.05) (all_pairs) columns tested BC, DEF, GHI, JK, LMNO, PQ, RS

DHM Research - Tualatin Valley Water District Customer Survey: August 2-8, 2022

Q3. Is there any particular reason you rate your service as excellent/good?

Base: Excellent/Good

	Area			Zip Code										Gender		Age				
	Total	North	South	97003	97005	97006	97007	97008	97078	97123	97124	97223	97225	97229	Male	Female	18-29	30-44	45-64	65+
Total	340 100%	184 100% (B)	153 100% (C)	40 100% (D)	11 100% (E)	38 100% (F)	38 100% (G)	0 100% (H)	38 100% (I)	1 100% (J)	1 100% (K)	36 100% (L)	21 100% (M)	112 100% (N)	167 100% (O)	165 100% (P)	65 100% (Q)	101 100% (R)	101 100% (S)	71 100% (T)
No problems / issues / complaints	109 32%	64 35%	43 28%	12 29%	5 42%	14 37%	10 26%	-	11 28%	-	0 24%	10 29%	8 37%	37 34%	68P 41%	37 22%	20 31%	31 31%	32 32%	24 34%
Good customer service	42 12%	25 13%	17 11%	2 5%	-	8 20%	4 11%	-	7 18%	-	0DE 34%	4 11%	4 18%	13 11%	14 8%	27O 16%	5 8%	14 14%	15 15%	8 11%
Water comes through faucet / always have water / good pressure	33 10%	17 9%	16 11%	2 6%	4 31%	2 6%	4 10%	-	6 16%	1 100%	-	3 9%	1 3%	11 9%	21 12%	12 7%	11S 17%	8 8%	5 5%	9 12%
Quality water / good water	25 7%	14 7%	11 7%	5 12%	-	1 3%	2 5%	-	1 2%	-	-	4 10%	1 3%	12 11%	16 10%	9 5%	2 3%	6 6%	10 10%	7 10%
Reliable / consistent / don't have to think about it	25 7%	15 8%	9 6%	2 4%	1 7%	3 8%	7IL 17%	-	1 2%	-	0 11%	0 1%	2 9%	9 8%	12 7%	13 8%	6 10%	6 5%	6 6%	7 10%
Clean / clean water	18 5%	7 4%	11 7%	3 8%	-	1 2%	1 2%	-	-	-	-	7FGIN 20%	2 8%	4 4%	9 6%	8 5%	2 3%	6 6%	4 4%	6 8%
Good tasting / drinkable	15 4%	12C 7%	3 2%	-	3DI 26%	1 3%	1 3%	-	-	-	0DFGIL 32%M	2 4%	-	8 7%	6 4%	9 5%	0 1%	6 6%	2 2%	6S 9%
All other responses	88 26%	44 24%	43 28%	14 36%	0 3%	7 20%	12 32%	0 50%	9 22%	-	0 11%	8 21%	5 24%	31 28%	40 24%	47 28%	23T 35%	28 28%	27 27%	10 14%
None / no reason	44 13%	24 13%	20 13%	9 22%	-	6 15%	4 11%	0 50%	5 14%	-	-	2 6%	3 16%	14 13%	17 10%	26 16%	7 11%	15 15%	13 13%	9 13%
Don't know	27 8%	12 7%	15 10%	4 9%	2 17%	5N 13%	4N 11%	-	4 9%	-	0N 34%	4 10%	2 8%	3 3%	9 5%	18 11%	4 7%	9 9%	9 9%	5 7%

(sig=.05) (all_pairs) columns tested BC, DEFGHIJKLMN, OP, QRST

DHM Research - Tualatin Valley Water District Customer Survey: August 2-8, 2022

Q3. Is there any particular reason you rate your service as excellent/good?

Base: Excellent/Good

	Ethnicity			Education			Income			Q1: Provider		Q2: Impressions					Q16: Rates			Split	
	Total	White Alone	POC	H.S. Grad Or <	Some Coll	Coll Grad+	<\$50K	\$50K-\$100K	\$100K Or >	TVWD	Other/DK	Exce-llent	Good	Poor	Very Poor	Exce-llent/ Good	Poor/ Very Poor	Un-reason-able	Reason-able	A	B
Total	340 100%	199 100% (B)	107 100% (C)	66 100% (D)	110 100% (E)	151 100% (F)	61 100% (G)	104 100% (H)	139 100% (I)	298 100% (J)	42 100% (K)	123 100% (L)	217 100% (M)	- (N)	- (O)	340 100% (P)	- (Q)	111 100% (R)	162 100% (S)	172 100%	168 100%
No problems / issues / complaints	109 32%	51 25% (B)	47 43% (C)	14 22% (D)	39 35% (E)	51 34% (F)	18 29% (G)	33 31% (H)	47 34% (I)	90 30% (J)	19 46% (K)	51 41% (L)	58 27% (M)	- (N)	- (O)	109 32% (P)	- (Q)	30 27% (R)	59 37% (S)	54 32%	55 33%
Good customer service	42 12%	28 14% (B)	12 11% (C)	7 10% (D)	15 13% (E)	21 14% (F)	9 15% (G)	17 17% (H)	14 10% (I)	36 12% (J)	7 16% (K)	26 21% (L)	16 7% (M)	- (N)	- (O)	42 12% (P)	- (Q)	12 10% (R)	25 16% (S)	22 13%	20 12%
Water comes through faucet / always have water / good pressure	33 10%	21 11% (B)	11 10% (C)	7 11% (D)	13 11% (E)	13 9% (F)	8 13% (G)	10 10% (H)	11 8% (I)	31 10% (J)	2 5% (K)	14 12% (L)	19 9% (M)	- (N)	- (O)	33 10% (P)	- (Q)	8 7% (R)	17 10% (S)	17 10%	16 10%
Quality water / good water	25 7%	10 5% (B)	12 11% (C)	2 3% (D)	3 3% (E)	19 13% (F)	3 5% (G)	6 6% (H)	14 10% (I)	24 8% (J)	1 2% (K)	10 8% (L)	15 7% (M)	- (N)	- (O)	25 7% (P)	- (Q)	9 8% (R)	14 9% (S)	16 9%	9 6%
Reliable / consistent / don't have to think about it	25 7%	20 10% (B)	3 3% (C)	5 8% (D)	3 3% (E)	15 10% (F)	4 7% (G)	7 7% (H)	11 8% (I)	19 6% (J)	6 13% (K)	15 12% (L)	10 4% (M)	- (N)	- (O)	25 7% (P)	- (Q)	4 3% (R)	20 12% (S)	16 9%	9 5%
Clean / clean water	18 5%	11 5% (B)	4 4% (C)	4 6% (D)	3 3% (E)	11 7% (F)	2 3% (G)	5 5% (H)	11 8% (I)	18 6% (J)	- (K)	9 7% (L)	9 4% (M)	- (N)	- (O)	18 5% (P)	- (Q)	4 4% (R)	11 7% (S)	7 4%	11 6%
Good tasting / drinkable	15 4%	9 5% (B)	5 5% (C)	1 1% (D)	6 5% (E)	7 5% (F)	2 2% (G)	5 4% (H)	6 4% (I)	14 5% (J)	1 2% (K)	4 3% (L)	11 5% (M)	- (N)	- (O)	15 4% (P)	- (Q)	0 * (R)	8 5% (S)	10 6%	5 3%
All other responses	88 26%	56 28% (B)	24 22% (C)	23 35% (D)	31 28% (E)	30 20% (F)	16 26% (G)	24 23% (H)	39 28% (I)	81 27% (J)	7 17% (K)	11 9% (L)	77 35% (M)	- (N)	- (O)	88 26% (P)	- (Q)	46 41% (R)	30 19% (S)	50 29%	38 23%
None / no reason	44 13%	28 14% (B)	11 11% (C)	15 22% (D)	13 12% (E)	15 10% (F)	11 18% (G)	20 19% (H)	8 6% (I)	37 13% (J)	7 16% (K)	14 12% (L)	30 14% (M)	- (N)	- (O)	44 13% (P)	- (Q)	6 5% (R)	25 16% (S)	19 11%	25 15%
Don't know	27 8%	16 8% (B)	8 7% (C)	3 5% (D)	6 5% (E)	17 11% (F)	4 7% (G)	7 7% (H)	12 9% (I)	22 7% (J)	5 13% (K)	8 6% (L)	19 9% (M)	- (N)	- (O)	27 8% (P)	- (Q)	14 13% (R)	7 4% (S)	14 8%	13 8%

(sig=.05) (all_pairs) columns tested BC, DEF, GHI, JK, LMNO, PQ, RS
 Note: Percentage less than 0.5 printed as *.

DHM Research - Tualatin Valley Water District Customer Survey: August 2-8, 2022

Q3. Is there any particular reason you rate your service as poor/very poor?

Base: Poor/Very poor

	Area			Zip Code										Gender		Age				
	Total	North	South	97003	97005	97006	97007	97008	97078	97123	97124	97223	97225	97229	Male	Fe- male	18-29	30-44	45-64	65+
Total	38 100%	18 100% (B)	21 100% (C)	8 100% (D)	1 100% (E)	6 100% (F)	5 100% (G)	2 100% (H)	5 100% (I)	- (J)	- (K)	1 100% (L)	2 100% (M)	10 100% (N)	20 100% (O)	13 100% (P)	11 100% (Q)	11 100% (R)	11 100% (S)	5 100% (T)
Expensive / rates have gone up	27 70%	11 62%	16 77%	8 100%	-	5 86%	5 86%	-	3 52%	-	-	1 100%	2 100%	5 46%	12 61%	9 70%	8 73%	8 74%	6 58%	4 78%
Poor water quality	10 26%	2 9%	8 40%	3 38%	-	-	1 11%	2 100%	3 64%	-	-	-	-	2 16%	8 39%	2 16%	8 69%	0 4%	2 14%	-
Bad customer service	3 9%	1 8%	2 9%	-	1 100%	1 14%	1 15%	-	-	-	-	1 100%	-	-	3 17%	-	1 7%	1 7%	1 6%	1 19%
All other responses	3 7%	1 6%	2 9%	-	-	-	1 14%	-	1 20%	-	-	-	-	1 10%	2 9%	1 8%	-	2 18%	1 7%	-
Billing issues	2 6%	2 13%	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	2 24%	2 8%	1 6%	1 7%	-	2 15%	-
None / no reason	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
Don't know	1 3%	1 7%	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	1 12%	-	1 9%	-	-	-	1 22%

(sig=.05) (all_pairs) columns tested BC, DEFGHIJKLMN, OP, QRST

Q3. Is there any particular reason you rate your service as poor/very poor?

Base: Poor/Very poor

	Ethnicity			Education			Income			Q1: Provider		Q2: Impressions					Q16: Rates			Split	
	Total	White Alone	POC	H.S. Grad Or <	Some Coll	Coll Grad+	<\$50K	\$50K-\$100K	\$100K Or >	TVWD	Other/DK	Excellent	Good	Poor	Very Poor	Excellent/Very Good	Poor/Very Poor	Un-reason-able	Reason-able	A	B
Total	38 100%	13 100% (B)	12 100% (C)	10 100% (D)	10 100% (E)	14 100% (F)	7 100% (G)	12 100% (H)	18 100% (I)	35 100% (J)	3 100% (K)	-	-	24 100% (N)	14 100% (O)	-	38 100% (Q)	30 100% (R)	5 100% (S)	16 100%	23 100%
Expensive / rates have gone up	27 70%	10 73%	6 53%	9 94%	5 49%	11 77%	4 67%	8 69%	14 81%	27K 76%	0 12%	-	-	17 69%	10 71%	-	27 70%	23 77%	4 74%	11 71%	16 70%
Poor water quality	10 26%	3 22%	5 43%	3 29%	4 43%	3 18%	2 30%	2 17%	6 33%	7 19%	3J 88%	-	-	5 20%	5 35%	-	10 26%	6 21%	2 37%	5 32%	5 21%
Bad customer service	3 9%	2 13%	-	1 15%	-	1 7%	2 24%	-	1 6%	3 9%	-	-	-	2 10%	1 5%	-	3 9%	2 5%	1 19%	2 10%	2 7%
All other responses	3 7%	2 14%	1 9%	-	1 10%	2 12%	-	1 9%	2 10%	3 8%	-	-	-	1 4%	2 12%	-	3 7%	2 6%	-	1 6%	2 8%
Billing issues	2 6%	1 6%	-	-	-	1 6%	-	1 7%	-	2 7%	-	-	-	2 10%	-	-	2 6%	2 8%	-	-	2 10%
None / no reason	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
Don't know	1 3%	1 9%	-	-	1 12%	-	-	1 10%	-	1 3%	-	-	-	1 5%	-	-	1 3%	1 4%	-	1 8%	-

(sig=.05) (all_pairs) columns tested BC, DEF, GHI, JK, LMNO, PQ, RS

Q4. Rating given to TVWD in the following area:
Providing responsive customer service

	Area			Zip Code										Gender		Age						
	Total	North	South	97003	97005	97006	97007	97008	97078	97123	97124	97223	97225	97229	Male	Fe- male	18-29	30-44	45-64	65+		
Total	400 100%	215 100% (B)	181 100% (C)	51 100% (D)	12 100% (E)	48 100% (F)	44 100% (G)	2 100% (H)	44 100% (I)	1 100% (J)	1 100% (K)	40 100% (L)	24 100% (M)	131 100% (N)	193 100% (O)	193 100% (P)	80 100% (Q)	116 100% (R)	124 100% (S)	80 100% (T)		
Excellent/Good	216 54%	111 52%	102 57%	30 57%	11 91%	FKL 39%	18 45%	24 55%	0 24%	30 68%	1 100%	0 34%	18 46%	14 61%	67 51%	105 54%	102 53%	36 45%	63 54%	62 50%	55 69%	
Excellent job	84 21%	47 22%	37 20%	10 20%	8 66%	DFGLN 8%	4 16%	7 16%	-	11 25%	-	0 34%	9 22%	7 29%	28 21%	41 21%	41 21%	14 17%	19 17%	22 18%	29 36%	
Good job	133 33%	64 30%	66 36%	19 38%	3 25%	14 30%	17 39%	0 24%	19 44%	1 100%	-	-	9 24%	8 32%	39 30%	63 33%	62 32%	22 28%	43 38%	40 33%	26 32%	
Total poor	31 8%	13 6%	18 10%	6 11%	-	7 14%	IN 12%	5 12%	2 76%	DEFGI 1%	0	-	5 13%	1 3%	5 4%	18 10%	9 5%	14 17%	3 3%	9 7%	5 6%	
Poor job	16 4%	6 3%	10 6%	1 1%	-	2 4%	3 6%	3 6%	2 76%	DEFGI 1%	0	-	-	5 13%	DN	4 3%	11 6%	5 2%	6 8%	2 1%	3 3%	5 6%
Very poor job	15 4%	7 3%	8 4%	5 10%	N	5 10%	3 6%	-	-	-	-	-	-	1 3%	2 1%	8 4%	5 2%	7 9%	RT 1%	2 1%	6 5%	-
Don't know	153 38%	92 43%	60 33%	16 32%	1 9%	22 47%	14 33%	-	13 30%	-	-	1 66%	16 41%	9 36%	59 45%	70 36%	81 42%	30 38%	50 43%	52 42%	20 26%	

(sig=.05) (all_pairs) columns tested BC, DEFGHIJKLMN, OP, QRST

DHM Research - Tualatin Valley Water District Customer Survey: August 2-8, 2022

Q4. Rating given to TVWD in the following area:
Providing responsive customer service

	Ethnicity			Education			Income			Q1: Provider		Q2: Impressions					Q16: Rates			Split	
	Total	White Alone	POC	H.S. Grad Or <	Some Coll	Coll Grad+	<\$50K	\$50K-\$100K	\$100K Or >	TVWD	Other/DK	Exce-llent	Good	Poor	Very Poor	Exce-llent/Good	Poor/Very Poor	Un-reason-able	Reason-able	A	B
Total	400 100%	219 100% (B)	129 100% (C)	83 100% (D)	125 100% (E)	171 100% (F)	72 100% (G)	125 100% (H)	162 100% (I)	352 100% (J)	48 100% (K)	123 100% (L)	217 100% (M)	24 100% (N)	14 100% (O)	340 100% (P)	38 100% (Q)	150 100% (R)	173 100% (S)	200 100%	200 100%
Excellent/Good	216 54%	117 53%	75 58%	43 52%	74 59%	91 54%	43 60%	66 52%	85 52%	193 55%	24 49%	89MN 72%O	113O 52%	8 32%	2 16%	203Q 60%	10 26%	73 48%	105R 61%	109 55%	107 54%
Excellent job	84 21%	47 22%	29 22%	13 16%	26 20%	41 24%	20H 28%	16 13%	37H 23%	74 21%	10 21%	61MNO 50%	21 10%	-	-	83Q 24%	-	20 14%	51R 29%	43 21%	41 20%
Good job	133 33%	70 32%	46 36%	30 36%	49 39%	50 30%	23 32%	50 40%	47 29%	119 34%	14 28%	28 23%	92L 42%	8 32%	2 16%	120 35%	10 26%	52 35%	54 31%	66 33%	66 33%
Total poor	31 8%	17 8%	8 6%	9 10%	8 7%	12 7%	5 7%	9 7%	14 9%	27 8%	4 8%	-	12L 5%	7LM 28%	12LMN 80%	12 3%	18P 48%	25S 16%	2 1%	18 9%	13 7%
Poor job	16 4%	8 3%	5 4%	1 2%	8 6%	5 3%	3 4%	6 5%	5 3%	15 4%	2 3%	-	7 3%	5LM 22%	2L 16%	7 2%	8P 20%	13S 8%	2 1%	8 4%	8 4%
Very poor job	15 4%	9 4%	3 3%	7E 9%	1 *	7 4%	3 4%	3 2%	9 6%	12 4%	2 5%	-	4 2%	1L 6%	9LMN 64%	4 1%	11P 27%	12S 8%	1 *	9 5%	6 3%
Don't know	153 38%	86 39%	46 36%	31 38%	43 34%	68 40%	23 32%	51 40%	63 39%	132 38%	21 43%	34 28%	92LO 42%	10 40%	1 4%	126 37%	10 26%	53 35%	66 38%	73 37%	79 40%

(sig=.05) (all pairs) columns tested BC, DEF, GHI, JK, LMNO, PQ, RS
Note: Percentage less than 0.5 printed as *.

Q5. Rating given to TVWD in the following area:
 Keeping water rates reasonable

	Area			Zip Code										Gender		Age				
	Total	North	South	97003	97005	97006	97007	97008	97078	97123	97124	97223	97225	97229	Male	Fe- male	18-29	30-44	45-64	65+
Total	400 100%	215 100% (B)	181 100% (C)	51 100% (D)	12 100% (E)	48 100% (F)	44 100% (G)	2 100% (H)	44 100% (I)	1 100% (J)	1 100% (K)	40 100% (L)	24 100% (M)	131 100% (N)	193 100% (O)	193 100% (P)	80 100% (Q)	116 100% (R)	124 100% (S)	80 100% (T)
Excellent/Good	202 50%	113 52%	87 48%	19 37%	10 81%	19 40%	19 44%	0 24%	22 50%	1 100%	1 76%	26 66%	13 53%	70 54%	99 51%	99 51%	39 48%	63 54%	56 45%	45 56%
Excellent job	41 10%	25 11%	15 8%	5 9%	4 38%	3 6%	3 6%	-	5 12%	-	0 11%	3 7%	2 10%	15 11%	17 9%	22 11%	7 9%	13 11%	7 6%	13 17%
Good job	161 40%	88 41%	72 40%	14 27%	5 43%	16 34%	17 38%	0 24%	17 38%	1 100%	1 66%	23 59%	10 44%	56 43%	82 42%	78 40%	31 39%	50 43%	49 40%	31 39%
Total poor	161 40%	78 36%	82 46%	30 59%	1 6%	25 53%	23 52%	2 76%	18 42%	-	-	9 23%	9 37%	43 33%	72 37%	79 41%	37 47%	42 36%	52 42%	29 36%
Poor job	94 23%	43 20%	50 28%	20 39%	1 6%	11 23%	11 25%	2 76%	11 24%	-	-	7 17%	7 30%	24 18%	42 22%	48 25%	20 26%	25 22%	29 23%	18 23%
Very poor job	67 17%	35 16%	32 18%	10 19%	-	14 30%	12 27%	-	8 18%	-	-	3 7%	2 7%	19 15%	30 16%	31 16%	17 21%	17 14%	23 19%	11 13%
Don't know	37 9%	25 11%	11 6%	2 4%	2 13%	3 7%	2 4%	-	3 8%	-	0 24%	4 11%	2 9%	17 13%	22 11%	15 8%	4 5%	12 10%	15 12%	6 8%

 (sig=.05) (all_pairs) columns tested BC, DEFGHIJKLMN, OP, QRST

DHM Research - Tualatin Valley Water District Customer Survey: August 2-8, 2022

Q5. Rating given to TVWD in the following area:
Keeping water rates reasonable

	Ethnicity			Education			Income			Q1: Provider		Q2: Impressions					Q16: Rates		Split		
	Total	White Alone	POC	H.S. Grad Or <	Some Coll	Coll Grad+	<\$50K	\$50K-\$100K	\$100K Or >	TVWD	Other/DK	Excellent	Good	Poor	Very Poor	Excellent/Good	Poor/Very Poor	Un-reason-able	Reason-able	A	B
Total	400 100%	219 100%	129 100%	83 100%	125 100%	171 100%	72 100%	125 100%	162 100%	352 100%	48 100%	123 100%	217 100%	24 100%	14 100%	340 100%	38 100%	150 100%	173 100%	200 100%	200 100%
Excellent/Good	202 50%	120 55%	63 49%	39 47%	65 52%	90 53%	32 44%	63 50%	85 53%	175 50%	27 57%	95MN 77%O	102NO 47%	4 17%	-	197Q 58%	4 10%	25 17%	144R 83%	99 49%	103 52%
Excellent job	41 10%	27 12%	8 6%	8 9%	17 14%	14 8%	5 7%	12 9%	16 10%	33 9%	8 16%	30MN 24%	11 5%	-	-	41 12%	-	4 3%	35R 21%	26 13%	15 7%
Good job	161 40%	93 42%	55 43%	31 38%	48 38%	77 45%	27 37%	52 41%	69 43%	142 40%	20 41%	65NO 53%	91NO 42%	4 17%	-	156Q 46%	4 10%	21 14%	108R 63%	73 36%	88 44%
Total poor	161 40%	81 37%	51 39%	34 41%	49 39%	68 40%	33 46%	51 41%	62 38%	146 42%	15 31%	20 16%	97L 45%	19LM 81%	14LM 100%	116 34%	34P 88%	120S 80%	22 13%	82 41%	79 40%
Poor job	94 23%	48 22%	34 26%	12 14%	31 25%	44 26%	19 27%	27 22%	37 23%	83 24%	10 21%	17 14%	68LN 31%	1 4%	2 11%	85Q 25%	3 7%	62S 41%	17 10%	51 25%	43 21%
Very poor job	67 17%	33 15%	17 13%	22EF 27%	17 14%	24 14%	14 20%	24 19%	25 15%	63 18%	5 10%	3 2%	29L 13%	18LM 77%	13LM 89%	31 9%	31P 81%	58S 39%	5 3%	31 15%	37 18%
Don't know	37 9%	18 8%	15 12%	10 13%	12 9%	12 7%	7 9%	11 9%	14 9%	31 9%	6 13%	8 7%	18 9%	1 3%	-	27 8%	1 2%	5 3%	7 4%	20 10%	17 9%

(sig=.05) (all_pairs) columns tested BC, DEF, GHI, JK, LMNO, PQ, RS

DHM Research - Tualatin Valley Water District Customer Survey: August 2-8, 2022

Q6. Rating given to TVWD in the following area:
 Keeping you informed about issues related to your water service

	Area			Zip Code										Gender		Age				
	Total	North	South	97003	97005	97006	97007	97008	97078	97123	97124	97223	97225	97229	Male	Fe- male	18-29	30-44	45-64	65+
Total	400 100%	215 100%	181 100%	51 100%	12 100%	48 100%	44 100%	2 100%	44 100%	1 100%	1 100%	40 100%	24 100%	131 100%	193 100%	193 100%	80 100%	116 100%	124 100%	80 100%
Excellent/Good	291 73%	157 73%	132 73%	35 68%	11 92%	29 62%	28 64%	0 24%	35 81%	-	1 100%	33FG 84%	19 80%	97 74%	140 73%	145 75%	57 71%	85 73%	85 69%	63 79%
Excellent job	119 30%	71 33%	48 26%	14 26%	8N 68%	18 37%	12 27%	-	12 27%	-	1 55%	10 26%	9 37%	36 28%	50 26%	68 35%	27 34%	32 28%	29 23%	32S 40%
Good job	172 43%	86 40%	84 47%	21 42%	3 25%	12 25%	16 37%	0 24%	24F 54%	-	1 45%	23F 57%	10 43%	61F 46%	90 47%	77 40%	30 37%	53 46%	57 46%	31 39%
Total poor	44 11%	19 9%	24 13%	5 9%	1 5%	6 12%	10MN 23%	2DFILM 76%N	5 11%	-	-	3 8%	1 3%	12 9%	17 9%	21 11%	10 12%	10 9%	18 14%	7 8%
Poor job	28 7%	13 6%	13 7%	2 5%	-	4 9%	4 10%	2DEFGI 76%LMN	4 9%	-	-	2 4%	-	9 7%	14 7%	12 6%	7 9%	8 7%	8 7%	3 4%
Very poor job	16 4%	6 3%	11 6%	2 5%	1 5%	1 3%	6N 14%	-	1 2%	-	-	2 4%	1 3%	3 2%	3 2%	9 4%	2 3%	2 2%	9 7%	3 4%
Don't know	65 16%	39 18%	25 14%	12 23%	0 3%	13IL 26%	6 13%	-	3 8%	1 100%	-	3 9%	4 18%	22 17%	36 18%	27 14%	13 16%	20 18%	21 17%	10 13%

 (sig=.05) (all_pairs) columns tested BC, DEFGHIJKLMN, OP, QRST

DHM Research - Tualatin Valley Water District Customer Survey: August 2-8, 2022

Q6. Rating given to TVWD in the following area:
 Keeping you informed about issues related to your water service

	Ethnicity			Education			Income			Q1: Provider		Q2: Impressions					Q16: Rates		Split		
	Total	White Alone	POC	H.S. Grad Or <	Some Coll	Coll Grad+	<\$50K	\$50K-\$100K	\$100K Or >	TVWD	Other/DK	Exce-llent	Good	Poor	Very Poor	Exce-llent/Very Good	Poor/Very Poor	Un-reason-able	Reason-able	A	B
Total	400 100%	219 100% (B)	129 100% (C)	83 100% (D)	125 100% (E)	171 100% (F)	72 100% (G)	125 100% (H)	162 100% (I)	352 100% (J)	48 100% (K)	123 100% (L)	217 100% (M)	24 100% (N)	14 100% (O)	340 100% (P)	38 100% (Q)	150 100% (R)	173 100% (S)	200 100%	200 100%
Excellent/Good	291 73%	171 78% (B)	93 73% (C)	58 70% (D)	96 77% (E)	128 75% (F)	52 72% (G)	88 70% (H)	124 77% (I)	264 75% (J)	27 55% (K)	110 89% (L)	160 74% (M)	12 50% (N)	3 20% (O)	270 79% (P)	15 39% (Q)	94 63% (R)	151 87% (S)	144 72%	147 73%
Excellent job	119 30%	85 39% (B)	28 22% (C)	20 24% (D)	41 33% (E)	56 33% (F)	17 24% (G)	36 28% (H)	56 34% (I)	105 30% (J)	14 29% (K)	72 58% (L)	46 21% (M)	1 6% (N)	- (O)	117 34% (P)	1 4% (Q)	29 19% (R)	76 44% (S)	65 32%	55 27%
Good job	172 43%	86 39% (B)	65 50% (C)	38 46% (D)	55 44% (E)	72 42% (F)	35 48% (G)	52 41% (H)	69 43% (I)	159 45% (J)	13 26% (K)	39 31% (L)	114 53% (M)	11 44% (N)	3 20% (O)	153 45% (P)	14 35% (Q)	65 43% (R)	74 43% (S)	79 40%	92 46%
Total poor	44 11%	15 7% (B)	18 14% (C)	14 16% (D)	15 12% (E)	11 6% (F)	11 15% (G)	19 15% (H)	11 7% (I)	37 11% (J)	7 14% (K)	1 1% (L)	19 9% (M)	9 38% (N)	11 77% (O)	20 6% (P)	20 53% (Q)	25 16% (R)	8 4% (S)	19 9%	25 13%
Poor job	28 7%	9 4% (B)	9 7% (C)	8 10% (D)	9 7% (E)	6 3% (F)	7 10% (G)	13 11% (H)	5 3% (I)	21 6% (J)	7 14% (K)	1 1% (L)	14 7% (M)	8 34% (N)	3 21% (O)	16 5% (P)	11 29% (Q)	16 11% (R)	4 3% (S)	14 7%	14 7%
Very poor job	16 4%	6 3% (B)	8 6% (C)	5 7% (D)	6 5% (E)	5 3% (F)	3 5% (G)	6 5% (H)	6 4% (I)	16 5% (J)	- (K)	- (L)	5 2% (M)	1 4% (N)	8 56% (O)	5 1% (P)	9 24% (Q)	8 6% (R)	3 2% (S)	5 2%	11 6%
Don't know	65 16%	33 15% (B)	18 14% (C)	11 14% (D)	14 11% (E)	32 19% (F)	9 13% (G)	19 15% (H)	26 16% (I)	50 14% (J)	15 31% (K)	12 10% (L)	38 17% (M)	3 12% (N)	1 4% (O)	50 15% (P)	3 9% (Q)	31 21% (R)	14 8% (S)	37 18%	28 14%

 (sig=.05) (all_pairs) columns tested BC, DEF, GHI, JK, LMNO, PQ, RS

DHM Research - Tualatin Valley Water District Customer Survey: August 2-8, 2022

Q7. Rating given to TVWD in the following area:
Promoting water conservation

	Area			Zip Code										Gender		Age					
	Total	North	South	97003	97005	97006	97007	97008	97078	97123	97124	97223	97225	97229	Male	Fe- male	18-29	30-44	45-64	65+	
Total	400 100%	215 100% (B)	181 100% (C)	51 100% (D)	12 100% (E)	48 100% (F)	44 100% (G)	2 100% (H)	44 100% (I)	1 100% (J)	1 100% (K)	40 100% (L)	24 100% (M)	131 100% (N)	193 100% (O)	193 100% (P)	80 100% (Q)	116 100% (R)	124 100% (S)	80 100% (T)	
Excellent/Good	245 61%	130 60%	112 62%	30 58%	7 55%	23 47%	29 68%	0 24%	32 72%	-	1 66%	21 53%	16 68%	84 64%	114 59%	126 66%	59 74%	68 59%	70 57%	47 59%	
Excellent job	87 22%	53 24%	33 18%	7 14%	4 36%	8 17%	9 22%	-	11 26%	-	1 55%	DL 14%	5 30%	7 25%	33 18%	35 26%	50 26%	17 21%	22 19%	28 23%	19 24%
Good job	158 40%	77 36%	79 44%	23 44%	2 19%	15 31%	20 46%	0 24%	20 46%	-	0 11%	16 39%	9 38%	51 39%	79 41%	76 40%	42 52%	46 40%	42 34%	28 35%	
Total poor	47 12%	24 11%	23 13%	6 13%	1 8%	11 24% LN	8 18%	2 76%	DILMN 5 12%	-	-	2 5%	1 6%	10 8%	16 8%	27 14%	11 14%	8 7%	20 16%	9 11%	
Poor job	35 9%	20 9%	15 8%	3 6%	1 8%	8 16% L	4 9%	2 76% N	DGILM 5 12%	-	-	1 3%	1 6%	10 7%	11 6%	22 11%	9 11%	6 5%	14 11%	6 8%	
Very poor job	13 3%	4 2%	8 5%	3 6%	-	3 7% N	4 10% IN	-	-	-	-	1 2%	-	1 1%	5 2%	5 3%	2 3%	2 2%	6 5%	2 3%	
Don't know	107 27%	61 28%	45 25%	15 30%	4 37%	14 29%	6 14%	-	7 16%	1 100%	0 34%	17 42% GI	6 26%	36 28%	63 33% P	40 21%	10 12%	40 35% Q	34 27% Q	24 30% Q	

(sig=.05) (all_pairs) columns tested BC, DEFGHIJKLMN, OP, QRST

DHM Research - Tualatin Valley Water District Customer Survey: August 2-8, 2022

Q7. Rating given to TVWD in the following area:
Promoting water conservation

	Ethnicity			Education			Income			Q1: Provider		Q2: Impressions					Q16: Rates		Split		
	Total	White Alone	POC	H.S. Grad Or <	Some Coll	Coll Grad+	<\$50K	\$50K-\$100K	\$100K Or >	TVWD	Other/DK	Excellent	Good	Poor	Very Poor	Excellent/Very Good	Poor/Very Poor	Un-reason-able	Reason-able	A	B
Total	400 100%	219 100% (B)	129 100% (C)	83 100% (D)	125 100% (E)	171 100% (F)	72 100% (G)	125 100% (H)	162 100% (I)	352 100% (J)	48 100% (K)	123 100% (L)	217 100% (M)	24 100% (N)	14 100% (O)	340 100% (P)	38 100% (Q)	150 100% (R)	173 100% (S)	200 100%	200 100%
Excellent/Good	245 61%	131 60%	87 67%	54 64%	73 58%	108 63%	46 64%	73 58%	106 65%	220 63%	25 52%	92MN 75%	133N 61%	9 38%	7 46%	225Q 66%	16 41%	80 53%	121R 70%	131 65%	115 57%
Excellent job	87 22%	53 24%	27 21%	11 13%	30 24%	42 25%	21H 29%	21 17%	37 23%	76 21%	11 23%	56MNO 45%	29 13%	1 4%	-	85Q 25%	1 2%	21 14%	53R 31%	48 24%	39 20%
Good job	158 40%	78 36%	60 46%	43E 51%	43 35%	66 39%	26 36%	52 41%	69 43%	144 41%	14 29%	36 29%	104L 48%	8 34%	7 46%	140 41%	15 39%	58 39%	69 40%	83 41%	75 38%
Total poor	47 12%	24 11%	16 13%	12 14%	19 15%	16 10%	9 13%	22 17%	15 9%	43 12%	5 9%	4 3%	25L 11%	9LM 36%	6LM 43%	28 8%	15P 39%	27S 18%	12 7%	22 11%	25 13%
Poor job	35 9%	19 9%	14 11%	7 9%	18F 14%	10 6%	6 8%	18 14%	10 6%	32 9%	3 6%	3 2%	19L 9%	8LM 32%	2 15%	22 6%	10P 26%	19S 13%	8 5%	15 7%	20 10%
Very poor job	13 3%	5 2%	2 2%	5 6%	2 1%	6 4%	3 4%	4 3%	5 3%	11 3%	2 3%	1 *	6 3%	1 3%	4LM 28%	7 2%	5P 13%	8 5%	3 2%	7 4%	5 3%
Don't know	107 27%	64 29%	26 20%	18 21%	33 26%	46 27%	17 23%	31 25%	41 25%	89 25%	19 38%	27 22%	59 27%	6 26%	2 11%	86 25%	8 20%	44 29%	40 23%	47 24%	60 30%

(sig=.05) (all pairs) columns tested BC, DEF, GHI, JK, LMNO, PQ, RS
Note: Percentage less than 0.5 printed as *.

DHM Research - Tualatin Valley Water District Customer Survey: August 2-8, 2022

Q8. Rating given to TVWD in the following area:
Providing a reliable source of water

	Area			Zip Code											Gender		Age			
	Total	North	South	97003	97005	97006	97007	97008	97078	97123	97124	97223	97225	97229	Male	Fe- male	18-29	30-44	45-64	65+
Total	400 100%	215 100% (B)	181 100% (C)	51 100% (D)	12 100% (E)	48 100% (F)	44 100% (G)	2 100% (H)	44 100% (I)	1 100% (J)	1 100% (K)	40 100% (L)	24 100% (M)	131 100% (N)	193 100% (O)	193 100% (P)	80 100% (Q)	116 100% (R)	124 100% (S)	80 100% (T)
Excellent/Good	364 91%	193 90%	169 93%	49HK 95%	11 95%	42H 88%	39H 91%	0 24%	41H 93%	1 100%	1 66%	38HK 97%	23HK 96%	116H 89%	173 89%	181 94%	73 92%	109S 94%	105 85%	76S 96%
Excellent job	232 58%	133 62%	99 55%	28 54%	10 87%	27 57%	25 58%	0 12%	22 49%	1 100%	1 66%	23 58%	19I 80%	76 58%	100 52%	125O 65%	47 59%	67 58%	67 54%	51 63%
Good job	132 33%	60 28%	70B 39%	21 41%	1 8%	15 32%	14 33%	0 12%	19M 44%	-	-	15 38%	4 16%	40 31%	73 38%	55 29%	26 33%	42 36%	38 30%	26 32%
Total poor	11 3%	1 1%	9B 5%	2 5%	1 5%	-	4N 8%	2DFGIL 76%MN	2 5%	-	-	-	-	1 1%	3 1%	5 3%	4R 5%	-	7RT 6%	-
Poor job	6 1%	1 *	5 3%	-	-	-	2 5%	2DEFGI 76%LMN	1 2%	-	-	-	-	1 1%	1 *	4 2%	3 4%	-	2 2%	-
Very poor job	5 1%	1 *	5 3%	2N 5%	1 5%	-	1 3%	-	1 2%	-	-	-	-	-	2 1%	1 1%	1 1%	-	5 4%	-
Don't know	25 6%	21C 10%	3 2%	-	-	6D 12%	1 1%	-	1 2%	-	0DEGIL 34%M	1 3%	1 4%	14D 11%	18 9%	7 4%	2 3%	7 6%	12 10%	3 4%

(sig=.05) (all pairs) columns tested BC, DEFGHIJKLMN, OP, QRST
Note: Percentage less than 0.5 printed as *.

DHM Research - Tualatin Valley Water District Customer Survey: August 2-8, 2022

Q8. Rating given to TVWD in the following area:
Providing a reliable source of water

	Ethnicity			Education			Income			Q1: Provider		Q2: Impressions					Q16: Rates			Split	
	Total	White Alone	POC	H.S. Grad Or <	Some Coll	Coll Grad+	<\$50K	\$50K-\$100K	\$100K Or >	TVWD	Other/DK	Excellent	Good	Poor	Very Poor	Excellent/Good	Poor/Very Poor	Un-reason-able	Reason-able	A	B
Total	400 100%	219 100% (B)	129 100% (C)	83 100% (D)	125 100% (E)	171 100% (F)	72 100% (G)	125 100% (H)	162 100% (I)	352 100% (J)	48 100% (K)	123 100% (L)	217 100% (M)	24 100% (N)	14 100% (O)	340 100% (P)	38 100% (Q)	150 100% (R)	173 100% (S)	200 100%	200 100%
Excellent/Good	364 91%	207 94%	116 90%	74 89%	117 93%	159 93%	62 85%	118 94%	148 92%	327K 93%	38 78%	121NO 98%	203NO 94%	18 76%	9 60%	324Q 95%	27 70%	134 89%	167R 97%	184 92%	180 90%
Excellent job	232 58%	142 65%	68 53%	51 61%	65 52%	108 63%	35 49%	65 51%	110GH 68%	209 59%	23 48%	106MN 86% O	109N 51%	2 10%	7N 49%	216Q 63%	9 25%	64 43%	129R 75%	122 61%	110 55%
Good job	132 33%	65 30%	48 38%	23 28%	52 41%	51 30%	26 36%	53I 42%	38 24%	118 33%	15 30%	14 12%	94L 43%	16LMO 66%	2 11%	108 32%	18 46%	70S 46%	39 22%	62 31%	70 35%
Total poor	11 3%	3 1%	5 4%	4 5%	3 2%	4 3%	3 4%	1 1%	6 3%	9 3%	2 3%	1 1%	3 2%	1 6%	5LM 36%	4 1%	7P 17%	6 4%	1 1%	5 3%	6 3%
Poor job	6 1%	2 1%	3 2%	3 4%	2 1%	1 *	2 3%	-	3 2%	4 1%	2 3%	1 1%	2 1%	1 3%	2LM 11%	3 1%	2P 6%	2 1%	1 *	2 1%	3 2%
Very poor job	5 1%	1 1%	2 1%	1 1%	1 1%	4 2%	1 1%	1 1%	3 2%	5 2%	-	-	1 *	1 3%	4LM 25%	1 *	4P 11%	4 3%	1 *	3 1%	2 1%
Don't know	25 6%	9 4%	8 6%	6 7%	6 5%	7 4%	8 11%	7 5%	8 5%	16 4%	9J 18%	2 2%	10 5%	4LM 18%	1 4%	12 4%	5P 12%	11 7%	4 2%	10 5%	14 7%

(sig=.05) (all pairs) columns tested BC, DEF, GHI, JK, LMNO, PQ, RS
Note: Percentage less than 0.5 printed as *.

DHM Research - Tualatin Valley Water District Customer Survey: August 2-8, 2022

Q9. Rating given to TVWD in the following area:
Providing water that tastes good

	Area			Zip Code											Gender		Age			
	Total	North	South	97003	97005	97006	97007	97008	97078	97123	97124	97223	97225	97229	Male	Fe- male	18-29	30-44	45-64	65+
Total	400 100%	215 100% (B)	181 100% (C)	51 100% (D)	12 100% (E)	48 100% (F)	44 100% (G)	2 100% (H)	44 100% (I)	1 100% (J)	1 100% (K)	40 100% (L)	24 100% (M)	131 100% (N)	193 100% (O)	193 100% (P)	80 100% (Q)	116 100% (R)	124 100% (S)	80 100% (T)
Excellent/Good	354 88%	199C 92%	152 84%	43 83%	12H 100%	36 76%	39H 89%	0 24%	34 78%	1 100%	1 100%	35H 89%	24FHI 100%	126D 96% HI	169 88%	174 90%	65 82%	102 88%	110 89%	76Q 95%
Excellent job	200 50%	117 54%	82 45%	27 52%	8 70%	20 41%	18 41%	-	17 38%	-	1 66%	21 52%	18FGI 76%	70 54%	93 48%	104 54%	37 47%	56 49%	59 48%	47 59%
Good job	154 38%	82 38%	70 38%	16 31%	4 30%	17 35%	21 47%	0 24%	17 40%	1 100%	0 34%	15 37%	6 24%	56 42%	76 40%	70 36%	28 35%	46 39%	50 40%	29 36%
Total poor	36 9%	13 6%	23B 13%	9N 17%	-	9LMN 19%	4 8%	2EGLMN 76%	8MN 18%	-	-	2 4%	-	4 3%	17 9%	16 9%	12T 15%	11 9%	12 9%	2 3%
Poor job	28 7%	10 5%	18 10%	6N 12%	-	7N 14%	3 7%	2DEFGI 76% LMN	5N 12%	-	-	2 4%	-	3 3%	15 8%	12 6%	8T 11%	10 9%	8 6%	1 2%
Very poor job	9 2%	3 1%	5 3%	2 5%	-	2 5%	1 2%	-	2 6%	-	-	-	-	1 1%	2 1%	4 2%	3 4%	1 *	4 3%	1 1%
Don't know	10 3%	3 1%	6 3%	-	-	2N 5%	1 3%	-	2 4%	-	-	3N 7%	-	1 *	7 4%	3 1%	3 4%	3 2%	2 2%	2 2%

(sig=.05) (all pairs) columns tested BC, DEFGHIJKLMN, OP, QRST
Note: Percentage less than 0.5 printed as *.

DHM Research - Tualatin Valley Water District Customer Survey: August 2-8, 2022

Q9. Rating given to TVWD in the following area:
Providing water that tastes good

	Ethnicity			Education			Income			Q1: Provider		Q2: Impressions					Q16: Rates			Split	
	Total	White Alone	POC	H.S. Grad Or <	Some Coll	Coll Grad+	<\$50K	\$50K-\$100K	\$100K Or >	TVWD	Other/DK	Exce-llent	Good	Poor	Very Poor	Exce-llent/Good	Poor/Very Poor	Un-reason-able	Reason-able	A	B
Total	400 100%	219 100% (B)	129 100% (C)	83 100% (D)	125 100% (E)	171 100% (F)	72 100% (G)	125 100% (H)	162 100% (I)	352 100% (J)	48 100% (K)	123 100% (L)	217 100% (M)	24 100% (N)	14 100% (O)	340 100% (P)	38 100% (Q)	150 100% (R)	173 100% (S)	200 100%	200 100%
Excellent/Good	354 88%	196 89% (B)	117 91% (C)	70 84% (D)	109 87% (E)	157 92% (F)	60 83% (G)	110 88% (H)	144 89% (I)	315 90% (J)	39 80% (K)	122MN 99%O	193NO 89% (M)	17 71% (N)	5 33% (O)	315Q 93% (P)	22 57% (Q)	117 78% (R)	166R 96% (S)	174 87%	180 90%
Excellent job	200 50%	119 54% (B)	66 51% (C)	38 45% (D)	59 47% (E)	98 58% (F)	33 46% (G)	58 46% (H)	92 57% (I)	180 51% (J)	20 41% (K)	99MNO 80% (L)	88 41% (M)	6 25% (N)	2 12% (O)	187Q 55% (P)	8 20% (Q)	53 35% (R)	111R 64% (S)	102 51%	98 49%
Good job	154 38%	77 35% (B)	51 40% (C)	32 39% (D)	50 40% (E)	59 34% (F)	27 37% (G)	52 42% (H)	53 33% (I)	135 38% (J)	19 39% (K)	23 19% (L)	105L 48% (M)	11L 46% (N)	3 22% (O)	128 38% (P)	14 37% (Q)	64 42% (R)	55 32% (S)	71 36%	82 41%
Total poor	36 9%	16 7% (B)	10 8% (C)	10 12% (D)	14 11% (E)	9 6% (F)	9 13% (G)	14 12% (H)	11 7% (I)	31 9% (J)	6 12% (K)	1 1% (L)	17L 8% (M)	7LM 29% (N)	9LM 63% (O)	18 5% (P)	16P 42% (Q)	28S 19% (R)	4 2% (S)	19 9%	18 9%
Poor job	28 7%	12 5% (B)	9 7% (C)	9 10% (D)	9 7% (E)	7 4% (F)	8 11% (G)	11 9% (H)	7 5% (I)	23 6% (J)	5 10% (K)	0 * (L)	15L 7% (M)	6LM 23% (N)	6LM 43% (O)	15 4% (P)	12P 31% (Q)	21S 14% (R)	4 2% (S)	14 7%	14 7%
Very poor job	9 2%	4 2% (B)	1 1% (C)	1 1% (D)	5 4% (E)	2 1% (F)	1 2% (G)	4 3% (H)	4 2% (I)	8 2% (J)	1 2% (K)	1 1% (L)	2 1% (M)	1 6% (N)	3LM 20% (O)	2 1% (P)	4P 11% (Q)	8S 5% (R)	- (S)	5 2%	4 2%
Don't know	10 3%	8 4% (B)	2 1% (C)	4 4% (D)	2 2% (E)	4 2% (F)	3 4% (G)	1 1% (H)	6 4% (I)	6 2% (J)	4J 9% (K)	- (L)	7 3% (M)	- (N)	1 4% (O)	7 2% (P)	1 2% (Q)	5 3% (R)	2 1% (S)	8 4%	2 1%

(sig=.05) (all pairs) columns tested BC, DEF, GHI, JK, LMNO, PQ, RS
Note: Percentage less than 0.5 printed as *.

DHM Research - Tualatin Valley Water District Customer Survey: August 2-8, 2022

Q10. Rating given to TVWD in the following area:
Providing water that is safe to drink

	Area			Zip Code											Gender		Age			
	Total	North	South	97003	97005	97006	97007	97008	97078	97123	97124	97223	97225	97229	Male	Fe- male	18-29	30-44	45-64	65+
Total	400 100%	215 100% (B)	181 100% (C)	51 100% (D)	12 100% (E)	48 100% (F)	44 100% (G)	2 100% (H)	44 100% (I)	1 100% (J)	1 100% (K)	40 100% (L)	24 100% (M)	131 100% (N)	193 100% (O)	193 100% (P)	80 100% (Q)	116 100% (R)	124 100% (S)	80 100% (T)
Excellent/Good	354 89%	196 91%	157 87%	44 85%	12HK 100%	43H 91%	38H 86%	0 24%	37H 86%	1 100%	1 66%	37H 93%	24HK 100%	116H 89%	170 88%	175 91%	69 86%	104 90%	108 87%	74 93%
Excellent job	219 55%	124 58%	94 52%	28 55%	9 75%	22 46%	22 50%	-	19 45%	1 100%	1 66%	23 59%	20DFGH 83%IN	73 56%	99 51%	117 61%	41 52%	61 53%	64 52%	52 65%
Good job	136 34%	71 33%	63 35%	15 30%	3 25%	21M 45%	16 36%	0 24%	18 41%	-	-	14 34%	4 17%	43 33%	71 37%	58 30%	27 34%	43 37%	44 35%	22 28%
Total poor	22 5%	5 2%	16B 9%	5N 10%	-	3 5%	4N 9%	2DEFGI 76%LMN	4N 10%	-	-	1 2%	-	2 2%	11 6%	8 4%	10RT 13%	3 3%	6 5%	1 2%
Poor job	12 3%	3 1%	7 4%	-	-	3N 5%	3N 6%	2DEFGI 76%LMN	2N 5%	-	-	1 2%	-	1 *	5 3%	6 3%	5 7%	2 2%	1 1%	1 2%
Very poor job	10 3%	2 1%	9B 5%	5N 10%	-	-	1 3%	-	2 5%	-	-	-	-	2 1%	6 3%	3 1%	5 6%	1 1%	5 4%	-
Don't know	24 6%	14 7%	8 5%	3 5%	-	2 4%	2 4%	-	2 4%	-	0DEFGI 34%LM	2 5%	-	12 9%	12 6%	10 5%	1 1%	8 7%	10 8%	4 5%

(sig=.05) (all_pairs) columns tested BC, DEFGHIJKLMN, OP, QRST
Note: Percentage less than 0.5 printed as *.

DHM Research - Tualatin Valley Water District Customer Survey: August 2-8, 2022

Q10. Rating given to TVWD in the following area:
Providing water that is safe to drink

	Ethnicity			Education			Income			Q1: Provider		Q2: Impressions					Q16: Rates		Split		
	Total	White Alone	POC	H.S. Grad Or <	Some Coll	Coll Grad+	<\$50K	\$50K-\$100K	\$100K Or >	TVWD	Other/DK	Excellent	Good	Poor	Very Poor	Excellent/Good	Poor/Very Poor	Un-reason-able	Reason-able	A	B
Total	400 100%	219 100% (B)	129 100% (C)	83 100% (D)	125 100% (E)	171 100% (F)	72 100% (G)	125 100% (H)	162 100% (I)	352 100% (J)	48 100% (K)	123 100% (L)	217 100% (M)	24 100% (N)	14 100% (O)	340 100% (P)	38 100% (Q)	150 100% (R)	173 100% (S)	200 100%	200 100%
Excellent/Good	354 89%	196 89%	119 92%	75 90%	107 85%	154 91%	63 87%	110 88%	145 90%	314 89%	40 83%	122MN 99%O	193O 89%	19 78%	5 37%	315Q 92%	24 63%	125 83%	165R 96%	172 86%	182 91%
Excellent job	219 55%	135 62%	64 50%	44 53%	62 49%	104 61%	32 44%	60 48%	104GH 64%	197 56%	22 45%	108MN 87%O	101NO 46%	2 9%	1 5%	209Q 61%	3 7%	53 35%	129R 75%	115 58%	104 52%
Good job	136 34%	61 28%	54B 42%	30 36%	45 36%	51 30%	31I 43%	50I 40%	42 26%	117 33%	18 38%	14 11%	92L 43%	17LM 69%	5 32%	106 31%	21P 55%	71S 48%	36 21%	57 29%	78 39%
Total poor	22 5%	11 5%	6 5%	4 5%	9 7%	9 5%	6 8%	4 3%	12 7%	17 5%	5 10%	1 1%	8 4%	3L 12%	9LMN 63%	9 3%	12P 31%	17S 11%	2 1%	13 7%	9 4%
Poor job	12 3%	5 2%	5 4%	1 1%	6 5%	3 2%	4 6%	3 2%	3 2%	7 2%	5J 10%	1 1%	7 3%	1 6%	2L 11%	8 2%	3 8%	8S 5%	1 1%	7 3%	5 2%
Very poor job	10 3%	6 3%	1 *	3 3%	2 2%	5 3%	1 2%	1 1%	8 5%	10 3%	-	-	1 *	1LM 6%	8LMN 52%	1 *	9P 23%	9S 6%	1 *	6 3%	4 2%
Don't know	24 6%	12 5%	4 3%	5 5%	10 8%	8 4%	4 5%	12I 10%	5 3%	20 6%	3 7%	1 1%	16L 7%	2L 10%	-	17 5%	2 6%	9 6%	5 3%	14 7%	9 5%

(sig=.05) (all pairs) columns tested BC, DEF, GHI, JK, LMNO, PQ, RS
Note: Percentage less than 0.5 printed as *.

DHM Research - Tualatin Valley Water District Customer Survey: August 2-8, 2022

Q11. How important are the following statements to you about investing in the drinking water system:
 Provide an adequate and reliable supply of drinking water to meet the needs of our community today and in the future.

	Area			Zip Code										Gender		Age				
	Total	North	South	97003	97005	97006	97007	97008	97078	97123	97124	97223	97225	97229	Male	Fe- male	18-29	30-44	45-64	65+
Total	400 100%	215 100% (B)	181 100% (C)	51 100% (D)	12 100% (E)	48 100% (F)	44 100% (G)	2 100% (H)	44 100% (I)	1 100% (J)	1 100% (K)	40 100% (L)	24 100% (M)	131 100% (N)	193 100% (O)	193 100% (P)	80 100% (Q)	116 100% (R)	124 100% (S)	80 100% (T)
Very/Somewhat	391 98%	213 99%	176 97%	51 98%	12 100%	47 99%	39 91%	2 100%	44 100%	1 100%	1 100%	40 100%	24 100%	129G 98%	188 98%	191 99%	79 99%	113 98%	123 99%	76 95%
Very important	366 92%	203 94%	160 89%	48 94%	12 100%	44 93%	36 83%	2 100%	37 85%	1 100%	1 100%	36 91%	23 96%	123G 94%	173 90%	183 95%	76 96%	103 89%	112 91%	74 93%
Somewhat important	25 6%	9 4%	16 9%	2 4%	-	3 6%	3 8%	-	7N 15%	-	-	3 9%	1 4%	5 4%	15 8%	8 4%	3 4%	10 9%	10 8%	2 2%
Not too/Not at all	4 1%	1 *	4 2%	-	-	1 1%	4N 8%	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	2 1%	-	1 1%	-	1 1%	2 3%
Not too important	3 1%	1 *	3 2%	-	-	1 1%	3N 7%	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	1 1%	-	-	-	1 1%	2 3%
Not at all important	1 *	-	1 *	-	-	-	1 1%	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	1 *	-	1 1%	-	-	-
Don't know	5 1%	2 1%	2 1%	1 2%	-	-	1 1%	-	-	-	-	-	-	2 2%	3 2%	2 1%	-	3 2%	-	2 2%

 (sig=.05) (all_pairs) columns tested BC, DEFGHIJKLMN, OP, QRST
 Note: Percentage less than 0.5 printed as *.

DHM Research - Tualatin Valley Water District Customer Survey: August 2-8, 2022

Q11. How important are the following statements to you about investing in the drinking water system:
 Provide an adequate and reliable supply of drinking water to meet the needs of our community today and in the future.

	Ethnicity			Education			Income			Q1: Provider		Q2: Impressions					Q16: Rates		Split		
	Total	White Alone	POC	H.S. Grad Or <	Some Coll	Coll Grad+	<\$50K	\$50K-\$100K	\$100K Or >	TVWD	Other/DK	Exce-llent	Good	Poor	Very Poor	Exce-llent/Very Good	Poor/Very Poor	Un-reason-able	Reason-able	A	B
Total	400 100%	219 100% (B)	129 100% (C)	83 100% (D)	125 100% (E)	171 100% (F)	72 100% (G)	125 100% (H)	162 100% (I)	352 100% (J)	48 100% (K)	123 100% (L)	217 100% (M)	24 100% (N)	14 100% (O)	340 100% (P)	38 100% (Q)	150 100% (R)	173 100% (S)	200 100%	200 100%
Very/Somewhat	391 98%	217 99% (B)	123 96% (C)	78 94% (D)	125D 100% (E)	168 99% (F)	69 96% (G)	123 98% (H)	159 99% (I)	345 98% (J)	47 97% (K)	121O 98% (L)	215O 99% (M)	24 100% (N)	12 80% (O)	336Q 99% (P)	36 92% (Q)	148 98% (R)	167 97% (S)	195 97%	196 98%
Very important	366 92%	206 94% (B)	118 92% (C)	70 85% (D)	119D 95% (E)	161D 94% (F)	63 87% (G)	117 93% (H)	149 92% (I)	322 92% (J)	44 91% (K)	120NO 97% (L)	198 91% (M)	20 81% (N)	11 73% (O)	318Q 93% (P)	30 78% (Q)	133 88% (R)	164 95% (S)	181 90%	185 93%
Somewhat important	25 6%	11 5% (B)	5 4% (C)	8 9% (D)	6 5% (E)	8 5% (F)	6 8% (G)	7 5% (H)	11 7% (I)	22 6% (J)	3 6% (K)	1 1% (L)	17L 8% (M)	4L 19% (N)	1 7% (O)	19 5% (P)	5 14% (Q)	15S 10% (R)	4 2% (S)	14 7%	11 6%
Not too/Not at all	4 1%	1 * (B)	3 3% (C)	2 3% (D)	1 * (E)	1 1% (F)	1 1% (G)	1 1% (H)	2 1% (I)	4 1% (J)	- (K)	- (L)	1 1% (M)	- (N)	3LM 20% (O)	1 * (P)	3P 8% (Q)	1 1% (R)	3 2% (S)	1 1%	3 1%
Not too important	3 1%	1 * (B)	3 2% (C)	2 3% (D)	1 * (E)	1 * (F)	- (G)	1 1% (H)	2 1% (I)	3 1% (J)	- (K)	- (L)	1 1% (M)	- (N)	2LM 16% (O)	1 * (P)	2P 6% (Q)	1 1% (R)	2 1% (S)	1 *	3 1%
Not at all important	1 *	- (B)	1 * (C)	- (D)	- (E)	1 * (F)	1 1% (G)	- (H)	- (I)	1 * (J)	- (K)	- (L)	- (M)	- (N)	1M 4% (O)	- (P)	1 2% (Q)	- (R)	1 * (S)	1 *	-
Don't know	5 1%	1 1% (B)	2 2% (C)	2 3% (D)	- (E)	1 1% (F)	3I 4% (G)	1 1% (H)	- (I)	3 1% (J)	2 3% (K)	2 2% (L)	1 * (M)	- (N)	- (O)	3 1% (P)	- (Q)	2 1% (R)	2 1% (S)	4 2%	1 *

(sig=.05) (all_pairs) columns tested BC, DEF, GHI, JK, LMNO, PQ, RS
 Note: Percentage less than 0.5 printed as *.

DHM Research - Tualatin Valley Water District Customer Survey: August 2-8, 2022

Q12. How important are the following statements to you about investing in the drinking water system:
 Protect the public's health and economic vitality of the community by building a water supply system
 to withstand major earthquakes and other emergencies.

	Area			Zip Code										Gender		Age				
	Total	North	South	97003	97005	97006	97007	97008	97078	97123	97124	97223	97225	97229	Male	Fe- male	18-29	30-44	45-64	65+
Total	400 100%	215 100% (B)	181 100% (C)	51 100% (D)	12 100% (E)	48 100% (F)	44 100% (G)	2 100% (H)	44 100% (I)	1 100% (J)	1 100% (K)	40 100% (L)	24 100% (M)	131 100% (N)	193 100% (O)	193 100% (P)	80 100% (Q)	116 100% (R)	124 100% (S)	80 100% (T)
Very/Somewhat	378 95%	204 95%	171 95%	48 93%	11 95%	44 93%	41 93%	2 100%	44 100%	1 100%	1 100%	37 92%	24 100%	124 95%	182 94%	185 96%	79 99%	109 94%	117 94%	73 91%
Very important	318 79%	176 82%	139 77%	36 69%	10 87%	37 79%	34 78%	2 100%	36 83%	1 100%	1 100%	30 77%	21 87%	106 81%	145 75%	163 85%	68 85%	87 75%	100 81%	62 78%
Somewhat important	61 15%	28 13%	32 18%	12 23%	1 8%	7 14%	7 15%	-	8 17%	-	-	6 15%	3 13%	17 13%	37 19%	22 11%	11 14%	23 20%	16 13%	11 14%
Not too/Not at all	13 3%	8 4%	5 3%	3 5%	1 5%	3 7%	2 5%	-	-	-	-	-	-	4 3%	5 2%	5 3%	1 1%	4 3%	4 3%	4 5%
Not too important	10 3%	5 2%	5 3%	3 5%	1 5%	3 6%	2 5%	-	-	-	-	-	-	2 1%	4 2%	3 2%	1 1%	4 3%	3 3%	2 3%
Not at all important	2 1%	2 1%	-	-	-	1 2%	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	2 1%	1 *	2 1%	-	-	1 1%	2 2%
Don't know	9 2%	3 2%	5 3%	1 2%	-	-	1 1%	-	-	-	-	3 8%	-	3 3%	6 3%	3 1%	-	3 2%	3 2%	3 4%

 (sig=.05) (all pairs) columns tested BC, DEFGHIJKLMN, OP, QRST
 Note: Percentage less than 0.5 printed as *.

DHM Research - Tualatin Valley Water District Customer Survey: August 2-8, 2022

Q12. How important are the following statements to you about investing in the drinking water system:
 Protect the public's health and economic vitality of the community by building a water supply system
 to withstand major earthquakes and other emergencies.

	Ethnicity			Education			Income			Q1: Provider		Q2: Impressions					Q16: Rates		Split		
	Total	White Alone	POC	H.S. Grad Or <	Some Coll	Coll Grad+	<\$50K	\$50K-\$100K	\$100K Or >	TVWD	Other/DK	Exce-llent	Good	Poor	Very Poor	Exce-llent/Very Poor	Poor/Very Poor	Un-reason-able	Reason-able	A	B
Total	400 100%	219 100% (B)	129 100% (C)	83 100% (D)	125 100% (E)	171 100% (F)	72 100% (G)	125 100% (H)	162 100% (I)	352 100% (J)	48 100% (K)	123 100% (L)	217 100% (M)	24 100% (N)	14 100% (O)	340 100% (P)	38 100% (Q)	150 100% (R)	173 100% (S)	200 100%	200 100%
Very/Somewhat	378 95%	211 96%	120 93%	76 91%	119 95%	165 97%	66 92%	120 96%	154 96%	333 95%	46 95%	119 96%	209N 96%	21 86%	12 84%	327Q 96%	33 85%	141 94%	162 94%	190 95%	188 94%
Very important	318 79%	177 81%	108 84%	64 76%	104 83%	142 83%	55 76%	106 85%	128 79%	274 78%	44J 91%	111MN 90%O	173NO 80%	11 44%	7 49%	284Q 84%	18 46%	112 75%	143 83%	159 80%	158 79%
Somewhat important	61 15%	34 16%	12 9%	12 14%	15 12%	23 14%	12 16%	14 11%	26 16%	59K 17%	2 4%	7 6%	36L 16%	10LM 42%	5L 35%	43 13%	15P 39%	29 20%	20 11%	31 16%	30 15%
Not too/Not at all	13 3%	4 2%	5 4%	4 5%	5 4%	2 1%	3 4%	3 3%	4 2%	12 3%	1 2%	3 2%	4 2%	2 9%	2LM 16%	7 2%	4P 12%	5 3%	6 4%	4 2%	8 4%
Not too important	10 3%	3 1%	5 4%	4 5%	3 2%	2 1%	3 4%	2 2%	2 1%	9 3%	1 2%	1 1%	4 2%	1 6%	2LM 16%	5 2%	4P 10%	4 3%	4 3%	4 2%	7 3%
Not at all important	2 1%	2 1%	-	-	2 2%	-	-	1 1%	2 1%	2 1%	-	2 1%	-	1M 3%	-	2 *	1 2%	1 *	2 1%	1 *	2 1%
Don't know	9 2%	4 2%	4 3%	4 4%	1 1%	3 2%	3 4%	2 2%	3 2%	7 2%	2 3%	2 2%	4 2%	1 5%	-	6 2%	1 3%	4 3%	4 2%	5 3%	4 2%

(sig=.05) (all pairs) columns tested BC, DEF, GHI, JK, LMNO, PQ, RS
 Note: Percentage less than 0.5 printed as *.

DHM Research - Tualatin Valley Water District Customer Survey: August 2-8, 2022

Q13. How important are the following statements to you about investing in the drinking water system:
 Develop partnerships with other local communities to share costs and expenses.

	Area		Zip Code											Gender		Age				
	Total	North	South	97003	97005	97006	97007	97008	97078	97123	97124	97223	97225	97229	Male	Fe- male	18-29	30-44	45-64	65+
Total	400 100%	215 100% (B)	181 100% (C)	51 100% (D)	12 100% (E)	48 100% (F)	44 100% (G)	2 100% (H)	44 100% (I)	1 100% (J)	1 100% (K)	40 100% (L)	24 100% (M)	131 100% (N)	193 100% (O)	193 100% (P)	80 100% (Q)	116 100% (R)	124 100% (S)	80 100% (T)
Very/Somewhat	329 82%	182 84%	145 80%	36 70%	12 100%	39 82%	36 82%	2 88%	39 90%	1 100%	1 66%	31 79%	21 90%	108 83%	158 82%	162 84%	66 82%	94 82%	106 85%	63 79%
Very important	196 49%	97 45%	97 54%	23 45%	11 92%	17 36%	28 64%	2 76%	30 68%	-	0 34%	15 37%	9 37%	60 46%	86 44%	104 54%	46 57%	49 42%	66 53%	36 45%
Somewhat important	133 33%	84 39%	48 26%	13 25%	1 8%	22 46%	8 19%	0 12%	10 22%	1 100%	0 32%	17 42%	13 53%	49 37%	72 37%	57 30%	20 25%	46 39%	40 32%	27 34%
Not too/Not at all	37 9%	15 7%	23 13%	8 16%	-	4 9%	5 12%	-	4 9%	-	0 34%	5 13%	2 7%	8 6%	22 11%	12 6%	10 12%	13 11%	9 7%	5 7%
Not too important	28 7%	12 6%	16 9%	5 10%	-	4 8%	2 4%	-	3 7%	-	0 34%	5 13%	2 7%	6 5%	17 9%	10 5%	6 8%	12 10%	9 7%	1 1%
Not at all important	9 2%	2 1%	7 4%	3 6%	-	1 1%	4 8%	-	1 1%	-	-	-	-	2 1%	5 2%	2 1%	3 4%	1 1%	-	5 6%
Don't know	33 8%	19 9%	13 7%	8 15%	-	4 9%	2 5%	0 12%	0 1%	-	-	3 7%	1 3%	14 11%	13 7%	19 10%	4 5%	9 7%	9 7%	11 14%

 (sig=.05) (all_pairs) columns tested BC, DEFGHIJKLMN, OP, QRST

Q13. How important are the following statements to you about investing in the drinking water system:
 Develop partnerships with other local communities to share costs and expenses.

	Ethnicity			Education			Income			Q1: Provider		Q2: Impressions					Q16: Rates		Split		
	Total	White Alone	POC	H.S. Grad Or <	Some Coll	Coll Grad+	<\$50K	\$50K-\$100K	\$100K Or >	TWWD	Other/DK	Exce-llent	Good	Poor	Very Poor	Exce-llent/Very Good	Poor/Very Poor	Un-reason-able	Reason-able	A	B
Total	400 100%	219 100% (B)	129 100% (C)	83 100% (D)	125 100% (E)	171 100% (F)	72 100% (G)	125 100% (H)	162 100% (I)	352 100% (J)	48 100% (K)	123 100% (L)	217 100% (M)	24 100% (N)	14 100% (O)	340 100% (P)	38 100% (Q)	150 100% (R)	173 100% (S)	200 100%	200 100%
Very/Somewhat	329 82%	188 86%	107 83%	71 85%	102 82%	146 86%	61 84%	105 83%	135 84%	290 82%	39 82%	106 86%	186 86%	16 69%	8 55%	293 86%	24 64%	119 79%	149 86%	165 83%	164 82%
Very important	196 49%	106 49%	70 54%	44 53%	62 50%	89 52%	35 49%	64 51%	78 48%	172 49%	24 49%	71 58%	103 48%	7 27%	6 43%	175 51%	13 33%	71 47%	91 52%	106 53%	91 45%
Somewhat important	133 33%	82 37%	38 29%	27 33%	40 32%	57 33%	26 35%	41 32%	57 36%	118 33%	16 32%	35 28%	83 38%	10 41%	2 12%	118 35%	12 30%	49 32%	58 34%	60 30%	73 37%
Not too/Not at all	37 9%	15 7%	13 10%	7 9%	10 8%	13 8%	6 8%	7 6%	18 11%	33 9%	4 9%	7 6%	17 8%	5LM 22%	6LM 45%	25 7%	12P 31%	17 11%	13 8%	14 7%	23 12%
Not too important	28 7%	9 4%	11 8%	2 2%	8 7%	12 7%	5 7%	7 5%	11 7%	23 7%	4 9%	6 5%	16 7%	5L 19%	1 5%	22 6%	5 14%	14 9%	8 5%	10 5%	18 9%
Not at all important	9 2%	6 3%	3 2%	5F 6%	2 1%	1 1%	1 1%	1 1%	7 5%	9 3%	-	2 1%	1 1%	1 3%	6LMN 40%	3 1%	7P 17%	4 2%	5 3%	4 2%	5 3%
Don't know	33 8%	16 7%	8 6%	5 6%	13 11%	11 6%	6 8%	14 11%	8 5%	29 8%	4 9%	10 8%	13 6%	2 9%	-	23 7%	2 6%	14 9%	10 6%	21 10%	13 6%

 (sig=.05) (all_pairs) columns tested BC, DEF, GHI, JK, LMNO, PQ, RS

Q14. How often, if at all, do you drink bottled water at home?

	Area			Zip Code										Gender		Age				
	Total	North	South	97003	97005	97006	97007	97008	97078	97123	97124	97223	97225	97229	Male	Fe- male	18-29	30-44	45-64	65+
Total	400 100%	215 100% (B)	181 100% (C)	51 100% (D)	12 100% (E)	48 100% (F)	44 100% (G)	2 100% (H)	44 100% (I)	1 100% (J)	1 100% (K)	40 100% (L)	24 100% (M)	131 100% (N)	193 100% (O)	193 100% (P)	80 100% (Q)	116 100% (R)	124 100% (S)	80 100% (T)
Most/Some	137 34%	65 30%	73 40%	21 41%	7 55%	17 36%	14 32%	2 76%	22MN 51%	-	-	14 35%	4 18%	37 28%	64 33%	66 34%	27 34%	39 33%	46 37%	25 32%
Most of the time	65 16%	26 12%	39B 21%	12N 24%	3 29%	9N 20%	7 15%	2MN 76%	12N 28%	-	-	6 15%	2 9%	11 8%	34 18%	30 15%	13 16%	17 15%	22 18%	12 16%
Some of the time	73 18%	39 18%	34 19%	9 17%	3 26%	8 16%	7 16%	-	10 23%	-	-	8 20%	2 9%	26 20%	30 15%	36 19%	14 18%	21 19%	24 19%	13 16%
Rarely/Never	263 66%	151 70%	108 60%	30 59%	5 45%	30 64%	30 68%	0 24%	21 49%	1 100%	1 100%	26 65%	20I 82%	94I 72%	129 67%	127 66%	53 66%	77 67%	78 63%	55 68%
Rarely	127 32%	62 29%	61 34%	20 39%	0 3%	11 23%	17 39%	-	13 29%	1 100%	1E 66%	11 28%	9 39%	41 32%	63 33%	59 31%	29 36%	31 27%	28 22%	38RS 47%
Never	136 34%	88C 41%	47 26%	10 20%	5 42%	20I 41%	13 30%	0 24%	9 20%	-	0 34%	15 37%	10 43%	53DI 41%	66 34%	68 35%	24 29%	46T 39%	50T 41%	17 21%
Don't know	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-

(sig=.05) (all_pairs) columns tested BC, DEFGHIJKLMN, OP, QRST

Q14. How often, if at all, do you drink bottled water at home?

	Ethnicity			Education			Income			Q1: Provider		Q2: Impressions					Q16: Rates		Split		
	Total	White Alone	POC	H.S. Grad Or <	Some Coll	Coll Grad+	<\$50K	\$50K-\$100K	\$100K Or >	TVWD	Other/DK	Excellent	Good	Poor	Very Poor	Excellent/Very Poor	Poor/Very Poor	Unreasonable	Reasonable	A	B
		(B)	(C)	(D)	(E)	(F)	(G)	(H)	(I)	(J)	(K)	(L)	(M)	(N)	(O)	(P)	(Q)	(R)	(S)		
Total	400 100%	219 100%	129 100%	83 100%	125 100%	171 100%	72 100%	125 100%	162 100%	352 100%	48 100%	123 100%	217 100%	24 100%	14 100%	340 100%	38 100%	150 100%	173 100%	200 100%	200 100%
Most/Some	137 34%	71 32%	44 34%	35F 42%	53F 43%	40 24%	29 40%	45 36%	42 26%	122 35%	15 31%	34 27%	71 33%	12L 50%	9L 61%	104 31%	21P 54%	65S 43%	46 26%	68 34%	69 34%
Most of the time	65 16%	31 14%	23 17%	18 21%	22 18%	19 11%	14 19%	21 16%	20 12%	54 15%	10 21%	11 9%	37 17%	7L 27%	5L 35%	47 14%	12P 30%	34S 22%	18 11%	32 16%	32 16%
Some of the time	73 18%	40 18%	22 17%	17 20%	31F 25%	22 13%	15 21%	25 20%	22 14%	68 19%	5 10%	23 19%	34 16%	6 23%	4 26%	57 17%	9 24%	31 21%	27 16%	36 18%	37 18%
Rarely/Never	263 66%	148 68%	85 66%	48 58%	72 57%	130DE 76%	43 60%	80 64%	119 74%	230 65%	33 69%	90NO 73%	146 67%	12 50%	6 39%	236Q 69%	18 46%	85 57%	127R 74%	132 66%	131 66%
Rarely	127 32%	75 34%	40 31%	26 31%	41 33%	54 32%	24 33%	42 34%	47 29%	115 33%	11 24%	47 38%	66 30%	7 27%	3 22%	113 33%	10 25%	41 28%	66 38%	58 29%	69 34%
Never	136 34%	73 33%	44 34%	22 27%	31 25%	76DE 44%	20 27%	38 30%	72GH 45%	115 33%	22 45%	43 35%	80 37%	5 23%	2 17%	123 36%	8 20%	44 29%	61 35%	74 37%	62 31%
Don't know	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-

(sig=.05) (all_pairs) columns tested BC, DEF, GHI, JK, LMNO, PQ, RS

DHM Research - Tualatin Valley Water District Customer Survey: August 2-8, 2022

Q15. I will read three statements to you. Please tell me which statement most closely matches your opinion, even if no one statement matches your opinion exactly.

	Total	Area		Zip Code										Gender		Age				
		North	South	97003	97005	97006	97007	97008	97078	97123	97124	97223	97225	97229	Male	Fe- male	18-29	30-44	45-64	65+
Total	400 100%	215 100% (B)	181 100% (C)	51 100% (D)	12 100% (E)	48 100% (F)	44 100% (G)	2 100% (H)	44 100% (I)	1 100% (J)	1 100% (K)	40 100% (L)	24 100% (M)	131 100% (N)	193 100% (O)	193 100% (P)	80 100% (Q)	116 100% (R)	124 100% (S)	80 100% (T)
I support fluoridated drinking water. It's good for public health.	218 54%	128 59%	88 49%	20 40%	2 14%	22 47%	19 44%	2 88%	25 58%	-	1 66%	21 54%	18 76%	85 65%	94 49%	119 62%	39 49%	63 54%	66 53%	50 62%
I am against fluoridated drinking water. It's bad for public health.	42 11%	18 8%	23 13%	6 11%	-	7 14%	9 21%	-	5 12%	-	-	3 8%	2 9%	9 7%	21 11%	18 9%	11 14%	8 7%	17 14%	5 6%
I neither support, nor oppose, fluoridated drinking water.	113 28%	56 26%	55 30%	18 35%	7 60%	14 29%	12 28%	-	10 24%	1 100%	0 34%	14 34%	4 15%	31 24%	63 33%	43 23%	24 30%	32 27%	38 31%	19 24%
Don't know	28 7%	13 6%	15 8%	7 14%	3 26%	4 9%	3 8%	0 12%	3 6%	-	-	1 3%	-	5 4%	15 8%	12 6%	6 8%	13 11%	3 2%	6 7%

(sig=.05) (all_pairs) columns tested BC, DEFGHIJKLMN, OP, QRST

DHM Research - Tualatin Valley Water District Customer Survey: August 2-8, 2022

Q15. I will read three statements to you. Please tell me which statement most closely matches your opinion, even if no one statement matches your opinion exactly.

	Ethnicity			Education			Income			Q1: Provider		Q2: Impressions					Q16: Rates			Split	
	Total	White Alone	POC	H.S. Grad Or <	Some Coll	Coll Grad+	<\$50K	\$50K-\$100K	\$100K Or >	TVWD	Other/DK	Exce-llent	Good	Poor	Very Poor	Exce-llent/Good	Poor/Very Poor	Un-reason-able	Reason-able	Reason-able	A
Total	400 100%	219 100% (B)	129 100% (C)	83 100% (D)	125 100% (E)	171 100% (F)	72 100% (G)	125 100% (H)	162 100% (I)	352 100% (J)	48 100% (K)	123 100% (L)	217 100% (M)	24 100% (N)	14 100% (O)	340 100% (P)	38 100% (Q)	150 100% (R)	173 100% (S)	200 100%	200 100%
I support fluoridated drinking water. It's good for public health.	218 54%	133 61%	65 50%	39 47%	63 51%	108D 63%	32 44%	70 56%	99G 61%	199K 57%	19 39%	74O 60%	114 52%	16 66%	3 22%	187 55%	19 49%	67 45%	106R 61%	101 50%	117 58%
I am against fluoridated drinking water. It's bad for public health.	42 11%	25 11%	11 9%	11 13%	12 9%	15 9%	11 15%	11 9%	16 10%	34 10%	8 17%	7 6%	25 12%	3 12%	5LM 36%	32 9%	8 21%	23 15%	15 9%	27 13%	15 8%
I neither support, nor oppose, fluoridated drinking water.	113 28%	50 23%	40 31%	23 28%	39 31%	43 25%	21 29%	36 29%	44 27%	95 27%	17 36%	27 22%	69 32%	3 14%	6 42%	96 28%	9 25%	51 34%	43 25%	60 30%	52 26%
Don't know	28 7%	11 5%	13 10%	10F 12%	11F 9%	5 3%	9I 12%	8 6%	4 2%	24 7%	4 8%	16M 13%	9 4%	2 8%	-	25 7%	2 5%	9 6%	8 5%	12 6%	15 8%

(sig=.05) (all_pairs) columns tested BC, DEF, GHI, JK, LMNO, PQ, RS

DHM Research - Tualatin Valley Water District Customer Survey: August 2-8, 2022

Q16. Which statement comes closer to your point of view?

	Area			Zip Code										Gender		Age				
	Total	North	South	97003	97005	97006	97007	97008	97078	97123	97124	97223	97225	97229	Male	Fe- male	18-29	30-44	45-64	65+
Total	400 100%	215 100%	181 100%	51 100%	12 100%	48 100%	44 100%	2 100%	44 100%	1 100%	1 100%	40 100%	24 100%	131 100%	193 100%	193 100%	80 100%	116 100%	124 100%	80 100%
		(B)	(C)	(D)	(E)	(F)	(G)	(H)	(I)	(J)	(K)	(L)	(M)	(N)	(O)	(P)	(Q)	(R)	(S)	(T)
Drinking water rates seem unreasonable to me. TVWD is charging too much for drinking water.	150 38%	69 32%	80 44%	26 50%	0 3%	25 52%	20 46%	-	23 52%	-	0 32%	12 30%	6 24%	38 29%	76 39%	67 35%	34 42%	40 34%	52 42%	24 30%
Drinking water rates seem reasonable to me. TVWD is delivering a quality service at a good price.	173 43%	96 45%	74 41%	17 33%	10 84%	15 32%	18 42%	0 24%	15 34%	1 100%	0 11%	23 57%	14 60%	57 44%	81 42%	85 44%	33 41%	50 43%	45 37%	45 56%
Don't know	77 19%	50 23%	26 15%	9 17%	2 13%	8 17%	5 12%	2 76%	6 13%	-	1 57%	5 13%	4 16%	36 27%	36 19%	41 21%	13 17%	26 23%	26 21%	11 14%

(sig=.05) (all_pairs) columns tested BC, DEFGHIJKLMN, OP, QRST

DHM Research - Tualatin Valley Water District Customer Survey: August 2-8, 2022

Q16. Which statement comes closer to your point of view?

	Ethnicity			Education			Income			Q1: Provider		Q2: Impressions					Q16: Rates		Split		
	Total	White Alone	POC	H.S. Grad Or <	Some Coll	Coll Grad+	<\$50K	\$50K-\$100K	\$100K Or >	TVWD	Other/DK	Exce-llent	Good	Poor	Very Poor	Exce-llent/Very Good	Poor/Very Poor	Un-reason-able	Reason-able	A	B
Total	400 100%	219 100% (B)	129 100% (C)	83 100% (D)	125 100% (E)	171 100% (F)	72 100% (G)	125 100% (H)	162 100% (I)	352 100% (J)	48 100% (K)	123 100% (L)	217 100% (M)	24 100% (N)	14 100% (O)	340 100% (P)	38 100% (Q)	150 100% (R)	173 100% (S)	200 100%	200 100%
Drinking water rates seem unreasonable to me. TVWD is charging too much for drinking water.	150 38%	76 34%	44 35%	32 38%	45 36%	66 38%	30 41%	52 42%	54 34%	138 39%	12 25%	22 18%	89L 41%	21LM 87%	9L 62%	111 33%	30P 78%	150S 100%	-	78 39%	72 36%
Drinking water rates seem reasonable to me. TVWD is delivering a quality service at a good price.	173 43%	108 49%	54 42%	35 42%	53 42%	79 46%	25 34%	51 40%	80G 50%	149 42%	23 48%	80MNO 65%	82N 38%	2 10%	3 20%	162Q 48%	5 14%	-	173R 100%	86 43%	87 43%
Don't know	77 19%	36 16%	30 24%	16 19%	28 22%	26 15%	17 24%	22 18%	27 17%	64 18%	13 26%	21 17%	46N 21%	1 3%	3 18%	67 20%	3 8%	-	-	36 18%	41 21%

(sig=.05) (all_pairs) columns tested BC, DEF, GHI, JK, LMNO, PQ, RS

Q17. Do you think two cents per gallon is a reasonable or unreasonable cost for drinking water to be treated, stored, and delivered to your home?

	Area			Zip Code										Gender		Age				
	Total	North	South	97003	97005	97006	97007	97008	97078	97123	97124	97223	97225	97229	Male	Fe- male	18-29	30-44	45-64	65+
Total	400 100%	215 100%	181 100%	51 100%	12 100%	48 100%	44 100%	2 100%	44 100%	1 100%	1 100%	40 100%	24 100%	131 100%	193 100%	193 100%	80 100%	116 100%	124 100%	80 100%
Reasonable	237 59%	128 60%	105 58%	37G 71%	11FG 94%	24 51%	17 38%	2 88%	25 57%	1 100%	1G 100%	25G 63%	14 59%	77G 59%	110 57%	120 62%	49 62%	74 64%	70 57%	42 53%
Unreasonable	38 10%	15 7%	23 13%	4 7%	-	6 12%	10DIN 23%	-	3 7%	-	-	6 16%	2 9%	7 6%	20 11%	13 7%	7 9%	10 9%	12 10%	9 12%
Don't know	125 31%	72 33%	53 29%	11 22%	1 6%	18 37%	17 39%	0 12%	16 36%	-	-	9 22%	7 31%	46 35%	63 33%	59 31%	24 29%	32 27%	42 34%	28 35%

(sig=.05) (all_pairs) columns tested BC, DEFGHIJKLMN, OP, QRST

Q17. Do you think two cents per gallon is a reasonable or unreasonable cost for drinking water to be treated, stored, and delivered to your home?

	Ethnicity			Education			Income			Q1: Provider		Q2: Impressions					Q16: Rates		Split			
	Total	White Alone	POC	H.S. Grad Or <	Some Coll	Coll Grad+	<\$50K	\$50K-\$100K	\$100K Or >	TVWD	Other/DK	Exce-llent	Good	Poor	Very Poor	Exce-llent/Very Good	Poor/Very Poor	Un-reason-able	Reason-able	A	B	
Total	400 100%	219 100% (B)	129 100% (C)	83 100% (D)	125 100% (E)	171 100% (F)	72 100% (G)	125 100% (H)	162 100% (I)	352 100% (J)	48 100% (K)	123 100% (L)	217 100% (M)	24 100% (N)	14 100% (O)	340 100% (P)	38 100% (Q)	150 100% (R)	173 100% (S)	200 100%	200 100%	
Reasonable	237 59%	137 63%	76 59%	45 55%	85 68%	97 57%	42 58%	63 50%	108 67%	204 58%	33 67%	88 71%	MN 56%	121 37%	9 31%	7 51%	209 61%	16 42%	68 45%	120 70%	127 63%	110 55%
Unreasonable	38 10%	17 8%	14 11%	10 12%	10 8%	14 8%	5 7%	16 12%	14 9%	33 9%	6 12%	7 5%	17 8%	8 33%	LM 33%	5LM 33%	23 7%	13P 33%	31S 21%	6 4%	19 9%	20 10%
Don't know	125 31%	65 30%	39 30%	28 34%	30 24%	60 35%	25 35%	47I 37%	39 24%	115 33%	10 21%	29 23%	79L 37%	7 30%	2 16%	108 32%	10 25%	51 34%	46 27%	54 27%	71 35%	

(sig=.05) (all_pairs) columns tested BC, DEF, GHI, JK, LMNO, PQ, RS

DHM Research - Tualatin Valley Water District Customer Survey: August 2-8, 2022

Q18A. If given the choice, would you be willing or unwilling to pay more on your utility bill to help low-income community members who are struggling to pay for their water?

Base: Split A

	Area			Zip Code										Gender		Age				
	Total	North	South	97003	97005	97006	97007	97008	97078	97123	97124	97223	97225	97229	Male	Female	18-29	30-44	45-64	65+
Total	200 100%	107 100% (B)	91 100% (C)	26 100% (D)	6 100% (E)	24 100% (F)	22 100% (G)	2 100% (H)	22 100% (I)	- (J)	0 100% (K)	20 100% (L)	12 100% (M)	65 100% (N)	98 100% (O)	98 100% (P)	40 100% (Q)	58 100% (R)	62 100% (S)	40 100% (T)
Willing	80 40%	49 46%	30 33%	7 28%	3 51%	13 55%	8 35%	2 87%	5 21%	-	0 100%	9 47%	7 57%	26 41%	38 38%	42 43%	15 37%	17 30%	25 41%	23R 58%
Unwilling	79 40%	30 28%	49B 54%	16FMN 62%	3 49%	4 15%	10F 45%	0 13%	16FLMN 75%	-	-	6 32%	1 11%	22 33%	45 46%	31 31%	19 48%	25 43%	24 39%	11 27%
Don't know	41 20%	28C 26%	12 13%	2 10%	-	7 30%	4 20%	-	1 4%	-	-	4 21%	4I 32%	17 26%	16 16%	25 26%	6 15%	16 28%	13 21%	6 15%

(sig=.05) (all_pairs) columns tested BC, DEFGHIJKLMN, OP, QRST

Q18A. If given the choice, would you be willing or unwilling to pay more on your utility bill to help low-income community members who are struggling to pay for their water?

Base: Split A

	Ethnicity			Education			Income			Q1: Provider		Q2: Impressions					Q16: Rates		Split		
	Total	White Alone	POC	H.S. Grad Or <	Some Coll	Coll Grad+	<\$50K	\$50K-\$100K	\$100K Or >	TVWD	Other/DK	Exce-llent	Good	Poor	Very Poor	Exce-llent/ Good	Poor/ Very Poor	Un-reason-able	Reason-able	A	
Total	200 100%	110 100%	65 100%	37 100%	66 100%	85 100%	35 100%	64 100%	81 100%	175 100%	25 100%	65 100%	107 100%	8 100%	8 100%	172 100%	16 100%	78 100%	86 100%	200 100%	-
Willing	80 40%	53 48%	25 39%	16 43%	24 36%	39 46%	10 28%	24 37%	43G 52%	64 37%	16J 62%	36MN 56%	36N 34%	-	2 27%	72 42%	2 14%	15 19%	51R 59%	80 40%	-
Unwilling	79 40%	38 35%	21 33%	11 30%	29 44%	31 37%	17 49%	24 38%	26 32%	71 41%	8 32%	16 25%	50L 46%	5L 62%	6 73%	66 38%	11 68%	48S 61%	20 23%	79 40%	-
Don't know	41 20%	19 17%	18 28%	10 27%	13 20%	15 18%	8 24%	16 25%	12 15%	39 23%	2 6%	13 20%	22 20%	3 38%	-	34 20%	3 18%	16 20%	15 18%	41 20%	-

(sig=.05) (all_pairs) columns tested BC, DEF, GHI, JK, LMNO, PQ, RS

DHM Research - Tualatin Valley Water District Customer Survey: August 2-8, 2022

Q19A. How much more, on each bill, would you be willing to pay to help low-income community members struggling to pay for their water?

Base: Willing

	Area			Zip Code										Gender		Age				
	Total	North	South	97003	97005	97006	97007	97008	97078	97123	97124	97223	97225	97229	Male	Female	18-29	30-44	45-64	65+
Total	80 100%	49 100% (B)	30 100% (C)	7 100% (D)	3 100% (E)	13 100% (F)	8 100% (G)	2 100% (H)	5 100% (I)	- (J)	0 100% (K)	9 100% (L)	7 100% (M)	26 100% (N)	38 100% (O)	42 100% (P)	15 100% (Q)	17 100% (R)	25 100% (S)	23 100% (T)
\$0	5 6%	4 8%	1 2%	1 10%	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	4 15%	3 7%	2 5%	-	3 17%	2 7%	-
\$1 - \$5	48 60%	29 59%	19 62%	5 76%	3 100%	6 45%	5 67%	-	2 46%	-	0 100%	6 64%	4 65%	16 59%	23 60%	25 60%	5 34%	8 45%	16 63%	19 85% QR
\$6 - \$10	18 22%	13 27%	5 15%	1 13%	-	4 31%	1 13%	-	1 15%	-	-	2 21%	2 35%	7 26%	9 23%	9 22%	5 34%	4 24%	7 29%	1 6%
\$11 - \$15	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
\$16 - \$20	4 5%	2 3%	2 8%	-	-	2 13%	1 12%	-	-	-	-	1 15%	-	-	2 5%	2 5%	1 5%	2 14%	0 1%	1 2%
\$21 - \$25	2 2%	2 3%	-	-	-	2 12%	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	2 4%	-	-	-	-	2 7%
\$26+	4 5%	-	4 13% B	-	-	-	1 8%	2 100% FLN	2 39% N	-	-	-	-	-	1 2%	3 8%	4 27% ST	-	-	-
Mean	7.9	6.4	10.4	5.0	5.0	10.7 N	7.7	30.0 DF GLMN	22.2 N	?	5.0	7.4	6.1	4.6	6.8	9.0	16.5 ST	7.2	5.5	5.7
Median	5	5	5	5	5	9	5	30	10	?	5	5	5	5	5	5	10	5	5	5

(sig=.05) (all_pairs) columns tested BC, DEFGHIJKLMN, OP, QRST

Q19A. How much more, on each bill, would you be willing to pay to help low-income community members struggling to pay for their water?

Base: Willing

	Ethnicity			Education			Income			Q1: Provider		Q2: Impressions					Q16: Rates		Split		
	Total	White Alone	POC	H.S. Grad Or <	Some Coll	Coll Grad+	<\$50K	\$50K-\$100K	\$100K Or >	TVWD	Other/DK	Excellent	Good	Poor	Very Poor	Excellent/Very Poor	Poor/Very Poor	Un-reason-able	Reason-able	A	B
Total	80 100%	53 100% (B)	25 100% (C)	16 100% (D)	24 100% (E)	39 100% (F)	10 100% (G)	24 100% (H)	43 100% (I)	64 100% (J)	16 100% (K)	36 100% (L)	36 100% (M)	- (N)	2 100% (O)	72 100% (P)	2 100% (Q)	15 100% (R)	51 100% (S)	80 100%	-
\$0	5 6%	-	4 16% (B)	1 5%	-	4 10% (F)	-	1 3% (H)	4 9% (I)	5 7% (J)	-	3 7% (L)	2 6% (M)	-	-	5 6% (P)	-	-	3 5% (S)	5 6%	-
\$1 - \$5	48 60%	35 66%	12 47%	7 43%	15 61%	25 65%	6 57%	17 70%	22 52%	41 64%	7 43%	25 69%	21 58%	-	-	46 63%	-	10 70%	32 63%	48 60%	-
\$6 - \$10	18 22%	11 22%	6 25%	8 52% (D)	5 22%	4 11%	2 24%	4 18%	11 26%	12 19%	6 35%	6 16%	9 24%	-	-	15 20%	-	4 25%	9 18%	18 22%	-
\$11 - \$15	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
\$16 - \$20	4 5%	3 6%	1 4%	-	1 3%	3 8%	1 12%	0 1%	2 5%	4 6%	0 2%	1 3%	3 8%	-	-	4 5%	-	1 5%	3 6%	4 5%	-
\$21 - \$25	2 2%	2 3%	-	-	-	2 4%	-	-	2 4%	-	2 10% (K)	-	2 4%	-	-	2 2%	-	-	2 3%	2 2%	-
\$26+	4 5%	2 3%	2 9%	-	3 14%	1 2%	1 6%	2 7%	2 4%	2 4%	2 10%	2 5%	-	-	2 100% (O) LM	2 2%	2 100% (Q) P	-	2 5%	4 5%	-
Mean	7.9	8.3	7.6	7.1	11.0	6.5	8.8	8.4	7.6	7.3	10.7	7.2	7.3	?	30.0 LM	7.3	30.0 P	6.4	8.2	7.9	?
Median	5	5	5	9	5	5	5	5	5	5	10	5	5	?	30	5	30	5	5	5	?

(sig=.05) (all_pairs) columns tested BC, DEF, GHI, JK, LMNO, PQ, RS

DHM Research - Tualatin Valley Water District Customer Survey: August 2-8, 2022

Q20A. Do you think TVWD should provide a billing assistance program that offers a regular discount for low-income customers, even if this might increase rates for other customers?

Base: Split A

	Area			Zip Code										Gender		Age				
	Total	North	South	97003	97005	97006	97007	97008	97078	97123	97124	97223	97225	97229	Male	Female	18-29	30-44	45-64	65+
Total	200 100%	107 100% (B)	91 100% (C)	26 100% (D)	6 100% (E)	24 100% (F)	22 100% (G)	2 100% (H)	22 100% (I)	- (J)	0 (K)	20 100% (L)	12 100% (M)	65 100% (N)	98 100% (O)	98 100% (P)	40 100% (Q)	58 100% (R)	62 100% (S)	40 100% (T)
Yes	100 50%	58 54%	41 45%	13 49%	6 100%	15 64%	8 35%	-	11 52%	-	0 100%	9 47%	9 73%	28 42%	42 43%	57 59%	19 47%	26 45%	30 49%	25 62%
No	68 34%	30 28%	36 40%	12 48%	-	7 30%	8 36%	2 87%	10 48%	-	-	4 19%	1 11%	22 34%	39 40%	25 25%	15 38%	21 37%	24 40%	6 14%
Don't know	33 16%	19 18%	14 15%	1 3%	-	1 6%	6 29%	0 13%	-	-	-	7 34%	2 16%	16 24%	17 17%	16 16%	6 14%	11 19%	7 11%	9 24%

(sig=.05) (all_pairs) columns tested BC, DEFGHIJKLMN, OP, QRST

DHM Research - Tualatin Valley Water District Customer Survey: August 2-8, 2022

Q20A. Do you think TVWD should provide a billing assistance program that offers a regular discount for low-income customers, even if this might increase rates for other customers?

Base: Split A

	Ethnicity			Education			Income			Q1: Provider		Q2: Impressions					Q16: Rates		Split		
	Total	White Alone	POC	H.S. Grad Or <	Some Coll	Coll Grad+	<\$50K	\$50K-\$100K	\$100K Or >	TVWD	Other/DK	Exce-llent	Good	Poor	Very Poor	Exce-llent/Good	Poor/Very Poor	Un-reason-able	Reason-able	A	
Total	200 100%	110 100%	65 100%	37 100%	66 100%	85 100%	35 100%	64 100%	81 100%	175 100%	25 100%	65 100%	107 100%	8 100%	8 100%	172 100%	16 100%	78 100%	86 100%	200 100%	-
Yes	100 50%	65 59%	33 50%	22 59%	31 47%	44 52%	16 45%	32 49%	45 55%	85 48%	15 60%	35 54%	55 51%	1 18%	1 7%	90Q 52%	2 12%	28 35%	57R 67%	100 50%	-
No	68 34%	28 25%	20 31%	9 24%	27 40%	24 28%	15 41%	21 33%	24 29%	59 34%	9 35%	12 19%	40L 37%	4L 56%	8LM 93%	52 30%	12P 75%	40S 51%	14 16%	68 34%	-
Don't know	33 16%	17 16%	12 19%	7 17%	8 13%	17 20%	5 14%	11 17%	13 16%	31 18%	1 5%	17M 27%	13 12%	2 27%	-	30 18%	2 13%	10 13%	15 17%	33 16%	-

(sig=.05) (all_pairs) columns tested BC, DEF, GHI, JK, LMNO, PQ, RS

DHM Research - Tualatin Valley Water District Customer Survey: August 2-8, 2022

Beginning in 2026, customers in the Tualatin Valley Water District will no longer purchase water from the Bull Run Reservoir on Mount Hood. TVWD is currently investing in a new Willamette Water Supply System—a water intake facility and treatment plant to provide customers with water from the Willamette River. This project is in the final two years of completion and cannot be deferred or delayed. In order to help fund investments in the new Willamette Water Supply System, customers will pay more in their utility bills.

Q18B. If given the choice, would you be willing or unwilling to pay more on your utility bill to help low-income community members who are struggling to pay for their water?

Base: Split B

	Area		Zip Code											Gender		Age				
	Total	North	South	97003	97005	97006	97007	97008	97078	97123	97124	97223	97225	97229	Male	Female	18-29	30-44	45-64	65+
Total	200 100%	108 100% (B)	90 100% (C)	26 100% (D)	6 100% (E)	24 100% (F)	22 100% (G)	0 100% (H)	22 100% (I)	1 100% (J)	1 100% (K)	20 100% (L)	12 100% (M)	65 100% (N)	95 100% (O)	95 100% (P)	40 100% (Q)	58 100% (R)	62 100% (S)	40 100% (T)
Willing	80 40%	45 42%	34 38%	9 36%	3 51%	7 28%	7 30%	-	5 25%	-	0 26%	13FGI 66%	8FI 67%	27 41%	31 33%	46 48%	14 35%	27 47%	25 40%	14 35%
Unwilling	85 42%	42 39%	42 46%	14 54%	1 21%	10 41%	10 44%	-	12 54%	-	0 38%	6 31%	4 33%	27 41%	45 47%	34 36%	18 45%	23 39%	26 42%	18 45%
Don't know	35 18%	21 19%	14 16%	3 10%	2 28%	7L 30%	6 25%	0 100%	4 20%	1 100%	0LM 35%	1 3%	-	12 18%	19 20%	15 16%	8 21%	8 14%	11 17%	8 20%

(sig=.05) (all_pairs) columns tested BC, DEFGHIJKLMN, OP, QRST

DHM Research - Tualatin Valley Water District Customer Survey: August 2-8, 2022

Beginning in 2026, customers in the Tualatin Valley Water District will no longer purchase water from the Bull Run Reservoir on Mount Hood. TVWD is currently investing in a new Willamette Water Supply System—a water intake facility and treatment plant to provide customers with water from the Willamette River. This project is in the final two years of completion and cannot be deferred or delayed. In order to help fund investments in the new Willamette Water Supply System, customers will pay more in their utility bills.

Q18B. If given the choice, would you be willing or unwilling to pay more on your utility bill to help low-income community members who are struggling to pay for their water?

Base: Split B

	Ethnicity			Education			Income			Q1: Provider		Q2: Impressions					Q16: Rates		Split		
	Total	White Alone	POC	H.S. Grad Or <	Some Coll	Coll Grad+	<\$50K	\$50K-\$100K	\$100K Or >	TVWD	Other/DK	Exce-llent	Good	Poor	Very Poor	Exce-llent/ Good	Poor/ Very Poor	Un-reason-able	Reason-able	A	B
Total	200 100%	109 100%	64 100%	46 100%	59 100%	86 100%	37 100%	61 100%	80 100%	177 100%	23 100%	58 100%	109 100%	16 100%	6 100%	168 100%	23 100%	72 100%	87 100%	-	200 100%
Willing	80 40%	52 48%	23 36%	17 37%	26 43%	36 42%	8 23%	27G 45%	39G 49%	72 41%	8 34%	31 53%	40 36%	5 29%	2 25%	71 42%	6 28%	14 20%	51R 58%	-	80 40%
Unwilling	85 42%	39 35%	30 47%	21 45%	17 28%	41E 48%	18 48%	25 41%	32 40%	72 41%	12 54%	16 28%	48 44%	11L 69%	5L 75%	65 39%	16P 70%	48S 66%	25 29%	-	85 42%
Don't know	35 18%	18 16%	11 17%	8 18%	17F 28%	9 10%	11I 29%	9 15%	9 11%	32 18%	3 11%	11 19%	21 19%	0 3%	-	33 19%	0 2%	10 14%	11 13%	-	35 18%

(sig=.05) (all_pairs) columns tested BC, DEF, GHI, JK, LMNO, PQ, RS

DHM Research - Tualatin Valley Water District Customer Survey: August 2-8, 2022

Q19B. How much more, on each bill, would you be willing to pay to help low-income community members struggling to pay for their water?

Base: Willing

	Area			Zip Code										Gender		Age				
	Total	North	South	97003	97005	97006	97007	97008	97078	97123	97124	97223	97225	97229	Male	Fe- male	18-29	30-44	45-64	65+
Total	80 100%	45 100% (B)	34 100% (C)	9 100% (D)	3 100% (E)	7 100% (F)	7 100% (G)	- (H)	5 100% (I)	- (J)	0 100% (K)	13 100% (L)	8 100% (M)	27 100% (N)	31 100% (O)	46 100% (P)	14 100% (Q)	27 100% (R)	25 100% (S)	14 100% (T)
\$0	2 3%	0 1%	1 3%	-	-	0 6%	-	-	1N 20%	-	-	-	-	-	1 3%	1 2%	-	0 1%	0 1%	1 11%
\$1 - \$5	39 48%	16 36%	22B 65%	7M 81%	1 47%	4M 64%	4 58%	-	3 56%	-	0 100%	8 61%	1 8%	9 35%	16 51%	21 46%	7 53%	16 57%	12 48%	4 26%
\$6 - \$10	21 27%	16 36%	5 15%	1 8%	1 31%	2 30%	1 18%	-	1 10%	-	-	3 22%	2 24%	11 42%	6 19%	14 31%	2 15%	5 20%	8 32%	6 43%
\$11 - \$15	2 2%	1 1%	1 3%	1 11%	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	1 8%	-	1 2%	1 2%	1 5%	-	1 4%	-
\$16 - \$20	5 6%	3 6%	2 6%	-	-	-	1 9%	-	1 14%	-	-	1 7%	2 25%	1 3%	2 7%	3 6%	2 12%	-	2 8%	1 10%
\$21 - \$25	4 6%	3 7%	1 4%	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	1 11%	-	3 11%	3 11%	1 2%	1 10%	3 11%	-	-
\$26+	7 9%	6 13%	1 3%	-	1 23%	-	1 15%	-	-	-	-	-	3 34%	2 9%	2 7%	5 10%	1 5%	3 11%	2 7%	2 11%
Mean base	79 98%	44 97%	34 100%	9 100%	3 100%	7 100%	7 100%	-	5 100%	-	0 100%	13 100%	8 100%	25 95%	31 98%	45 98%	14 100%	27 100%	24 97%	13 94%
Mean	11.5	13.3	9.6	5.4	14.5	5.4	21.0	?	4.6	?	2.0	8.9	25.8DF ILN	11.4	12.3	11.3	11.2	13.8	9.8	10.4
Median	5	10	5	5	10	5	5	?	1	?	2	5	20	10	5	10	5	5	5	10

(sig=.05) (all_pairs) columns tested BC, DEFGHIJKLMN, OP, QRST

DHM Research - Tualatin Valley Water District Customer Survey: August 2-8, 2022

Q19B. How much more, on each bill, would you be willing to pay to help low-income community members struggling to pay for their water?

Base: Willing

	Ethnicity			Education			Income			Q1: Provider		Q2: Impressions					Q16: Rates			Split	
	Total	White Alone	POC	H.S. Grad Or <	Some Coll	Coll Grad+	<\$50K	\$50K-\$100K	\$100K Or >	TVWD	Other/DK	Excellent	Good	Poor	Very Poor	Excellent/Very Poor	Poor/Very Poor	Un-reason-able	Reason-able	A	B
Total	80 100%	52 100% (B)	23 100% (C)	17 100% (D)	26 100% (E)	36 100% (F)	8 100% (G)	27 100% (H)	39 100% (I)	72 100% (J)	8 100% (K)	31 100% (L)	40 100% (M)	5 100% (N)	2 100% (O)	71 100% (P)	6 100% (Q)	14 100% (R)	51 100% (S)	-	80 100%
\$0	2 3%	2 4%	-	-	-	2 6%	0 4%	0 1%	1 2%	0 *	2 24%	1 2%	1 3%	0 9%	-	2 3%	0 7%	0 3%	1 2%	-	2 3%
\$1 - \$5	39 48%	23 43%	12 50%	7 43%	13 52%	16 46%	5 54%	15 56%	15 38%	37 51%	2 25%	12 38%	21 53%	4 78%	1 34%	33 47%	4 67%	10 72%	24 48%	-	39 48%
\$6 - \$10	21 27%	14 26%	8 33%	3 19%	9 36%	9 25%	1 8%	8 28%	12 32%	17 24%	4 51%	12 39%	7 18%	1 13%	-	19 27%	1 10%	2 12%	15 29%	-	21 27%
\$11 - \$15	2 2%	2 3%	-	-	1 3%	1 3%	1 8%	-	1 3%	2 2%	-	2 5%	-	-	-	2 2%	-	1 5%	-	-	2 2%
\$16 - \$20	5 6%	5 10%	-	2 13%	1 2%	2 6%	1 9%	2 7%	2 6%	5 7%	-	2 7%	3 7%	-	-	5 7%	-	1 9%	2 4%	-	5 6%
\$21 - \$25	4 6%	2 5%	2 8%	1 8%	2 8%	1 3%	-	2 7%	2 6%	4 6%	-	-	3 8%	-	1 66%	3 5%	1 16%	-	1 3%	-	4 6%
\$26+	7 9%	5 9%	2 8%	3 17%	-	4 11%	1 17%	-	5 14%	7 9%	-	3 8%	4 11%	-	-	7 10%	-	-	7 13%	-	7 9%
Mean base	79 98%	51 97%	23 100%	17 100%	26 100%	34 96%	7 83%	27 100%	39 100%	71 98%	8 100%	30 98%	39 98%	5 100%	2 100%	69 98%	6 100%	14 100%	49 97%	-	79 98%
Mean	11.5	12.4	11.4	19.4	8.1	10.6	6.5	7.8	16.1	12.2	6.0	10.9	13.3	2.4	16.9	12.3	6.0	5.3	13.1	?	11.5
Median	5	10	10	10	5	5	5	5	10	5	10	10	5	1	25	5	1	2	5	?	5

(sig=.05) (all_pairs) columns tested BC, DEF, GHI, JK, LMNO, PQ, RS
 Note: Percentage less than 0.5 printed as *.

DHM Research - Tualatin Valley Water District Customer Survey: August 2-8, 2022

Q20B. Do you think TVWD should provide a billing assistance program that offers a regular discount for low-income customers, even if this might increase rates for other customers?

Base: Split B

	Area			Zip Code										Gender		Age				
	Total	North	South	97003	97005	97006	97007	97008	97078	97123	97124	97223	97225	97229	Male	Female	18-29	30-44	45-64	65+
Total	200 100%	108 100% (B)	90 100% (C)	26 100% (D)	6 100% (E)	24 100% (F)	22 100% (G)	0 100% (H)	22 100% (I)	1 100% (J)	1 100% (K)	20 100% (L)	12 100% (M)	65 100% (N)	95 100% (O)	95 100% (P)	40 100% (Q)	58 100% (R)	62 100% (S)	40 100% (T)
Yes	101 51%	51 48%	49 54%	13 51%	4 72%	11 45%	9 43%	0 100%	11 49%	1 100%	0 26%	15 76%	7 55%	30 45%	44 47%	52 55%	25 63%	36 62%	25 40%	15 38%
No	58 29%	29 27%	27 31%	9 36%	1 17%	8 32%	8 37%	-	8 37%	-	0 38%	2 10%	4 33%	16 25%	34 36%	20 21%	7 17%	15 26%	18 30%	17 43%
Don't know	41 21%	28 26%	14 15%	4 14%	1 11%	6 24%	4 19%	-	3 14%	-	0 35%	3 14%	1 12%	20 30%	17 17%	23 24%	8 20%	7 12%	19 30%	8 19%

(sig=.05) (all_pairs) columns tested BC, DEFGHIJKLMN, OP, QRST

DHM Research - Tualatin Valley Water District Customer Survey: August 2-8, 2022

Q20B. Do you think TVWD should provide a billing assistance program that offers a regular discount for low-income customers, even if this might increase rates for other customers?

Base: Split B

	Ethnicity			Education			Income			Q1: Provider		Q2: Impressions					Q16: Rates		Split		
	Total	White Alone	POC	H.S. Grad Or <	Some Coll	Coll Grad+	<\$50K	\$50K-\$100K	\$100K Or >	TVWD	Other/DK	Exce-llent	Good	Poor	Very Poor	Exce-llent/ Good	Poor/ Very Poor	Un-reason-able	Reason-able	A	B
Total	200 100%	109 100% (B)	64 100% (C)	46 100% (D)	59 100% (E)	86 100% (F)	37 100% (G)	61 100% (H)	80 100% (I)	177 100% (J)	23 100% (K)	58 100% (L)	109 100% (M)	16 100% (N)	6 100% (O)	168 100% (P)	23 100% (Q)	72 100% (R)	87 100% (S)	-	200 100%
Yes	101 51%	62 57%	34 54%	21 46%	30 50%	48 56%	15 41%	33 54%	44 54%	90 51%	11 48%	39M 67%	52 48%	6 38%	2 25%	91 54%	8 34%	25 34%	56R 64%	-	101 51%
No	58 29%	25 23%	19 30%	13 29%	17 28%	22 25%	13 36%	17 27%	20 25%	50 28%	8 35%	7 12%	32L 29%	8L 52%	5LM 75%	39 23%	13P 58%	34S 47%	16 19%	-	58 29%
Don't know	41 21%	22 20%	10 16%	11 25%	13 22%	16 19%	8 23%	11 18%	17 21%	37 21%	4 17%	13 22%	25 23%	2 11%	-	38 22%	2 8%	13 18%	15 17%	-	41 21%

(sig=.05) (all_pairs) columns tested BC, DEF, GHI, JK, LMNO, PQ, RS

Q21. If you could choose how often you receive your utility bill, which of the following would you prefer, even if the total billing amount over the course of the year would remain about the same?

	Area			Zip Code										Gender		Age				
	Total	North	South	97003	97005	97006	97007	97008	97078	97123	97124	97223	97225	97229	Male	Fe- male	18-29	30-44	45-64	65+
Total	400 100%	215 100% (B)	181 100% (C)	51 100% (D)	12 100% (E)	48 100% (F)	44 100% (G)	2 100% (H)	44 100% (I)	1 100% (J)	1 100% (K)	40 100% (L)	24 100% (M)	131 100% (N)	193 100% (O)	193 100% (P)	80 100% (Q)	116 100% (R)	124 100% (S)	80 100% (T)
A monthly bill	221 55%	120 56%	100 55%	23 44%	4 34%	24 50%	28 64%	2 76%	26 60%	1 100%	1 68%	21 53%	11 45%	81 62%	100 52%	112 58%	43 54%	72T 62%	73T 59%	33 42%
A bill every two months	105 26%	49 23%	55 30%	25FGIN 48%	8FGIN 63%	11 22%	8 18%	0 12%	10 22%	-	-	13 32%	5 21%	26 20%	52 27%	51 26%	17 21%	28 24%	31 25%	29 37%
No preference	67 17%	43 20%	24 13%	4 9%	0 3%	12 26%	6 13%	0 12%	7 16%	-	0 32%	6 16%	7D 30%	22 17%	38 20%	27 14%	18 23%	15 13%	18 14%	16 20%
Don't know	6 1%	3 1%	3 1%	-	-	1 1%	2 4%	-	1 2%	-	-	-	1 4%	2 1%	3 1%	3 2%	2 3%	1 1%	2 2%	1 1%

(sig=.05) (all_pairs) columns tested BC, DEFGHIJKLMN, OP, QRST

Q21. If you could choose how often you receive your utility bill, which of the following would you prefer, even if the total billing amount over the course of the year would remain about the same?

	Ethnicity			Education			Income			Q1: Provider		Q2: Impressions					Q16: Rates		Split		
	Total	White Alone	POC	H.S. Grad Or <	Some Coll	Coll Grad+	<\$50K	\$50K-\$100K	\$100K Or >	TVWD	Other/DK	Exce-llent	Good	Poor	Very Poor	Exce-llent/Good	Poor/Very Poor	Un-reason-able	Reason-able	A	B
Total	400 100%	219 100% (B)	129 100% (C)	83 100% (D)	125 100% (E)	171 100% (F)	72 100% (G)	125 100% (H)	162 100% (I)	352 100% (J)	48 100% (K)	123 100% (L)	217 100% (M)	24 100% (N)	14 100% (O)	340 100% (P)	38 100% (Q)	150 100% (R)	173 100% (S)	200 100%	200 100%
A monthly bill	221 55%	127 58%	65 51%	46 55%	73 59%	90 53%	32 45%	70 56%	98G 61%	195 55%	26 55%	71 57%	113 52%	14 57%	12 86%	183 54%	26 68%	86 57%	99 57%	111 55%	111 55%
A bill every two months	105 26%	54 25%	38 30%	18 22%	36 29%	48 28%	23 32%	34 27%	33 21%	95 27%	10 21%	25 20%	69L 32%	6 26%	2 10%	93 27%	8 20%	43 29%	46 27%	57 28%	49 24%
No preference	67 17%	35 16%	24 19%	15 18%	15 12%	31 18%	15 21%	20 16%	30 18%	55 16%	12 25%	27 22%	30 14%	4 17%	1 4%	58 17%	5 12%	20 13%	27 16%	30 15%	37 18%
Don't know	6 1%	3 1%	1 1%	4F 5%	1 1%	1 1%	2 3%	1 1%	1 1%	6 2%	-	1 1%	5 2%	-	-	6 2%	-	1 1%	1 *	2 1%	4 2%

(sig=.05) (all pairs) columns tested BC, DEF, GHI, JK, LMNO, PQ, RS
 Note: Percentage less than 0.5 printed as *.

Q22. What is the best way for TVWD to keep you updated on your water service?

	Area			Zip Code											Gender		Age			
	Total	North	South	97003	97005	97006	97007	97008	97078	97123	97124	97223	97225	97229	Male	Fe- male	18-29	30-44	45-64	65+
Total	400 100%	215 100% (B)	181 100% (C)	51 100% (D)	12 100% (E)	48 100% (F)	44 100% (G)	2 100% (H)	44 100% (I)	1 100% (J)	1 100% (K)	40 100% (L)	24 100% (M)	131 100% (N)	193 100% (O)	193 100% (P)	80 100% (Q)	116 100% (R)	124 100% (S)	80 100% (T)
Email	238 59%	132 61%	105 58%	27 52%	4 34%	33 69%	29 66%	2 88%	24 55%	1 100%	1 45%	23 59%	17 71%	77 59%	111 57%	121 63%	50 63%	79 69%	69 56%	38 48%
Text Message	59 15%	30 14%	29 16%	10 20%	1 5%	4 9%	6 14%	-	9 21%	-	-	3 8%	1 3%	24 19%	29 15%	27 14%	21 26%	14 12%	17 14%	7 9%
Mail	45 11%	21 10%	23 13%	8 15%	-	3 6%	1 3%	-	7 17%	-	1 55%	6 16%	1 5%	17 13%	21 11%	20 10%	3 4%	12 10%	17 13%	13 16%
Bill	15 4%	5 2%	9 5%	2 4%	3 26%	1 1%	3 7%	-	1 2%	-	-	4 9%	2 6%	-	11 6%	4 2%	1 1%	3 3%	2 2%	9 11%
Newsletter / Pamphlet	9 2%	6 3%	2 1%	-	-	4 8%	1 2%	-	0 1%	-	-	1 3%	1 3%	2 1%	3 2%	4 2%	-	1 1%	6 5%	1 1%
Flyers	7 2%	3 2%	4 2%	4 7%	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	1 3%	3 2%	6 3%	2 1%	3 4%	-	2 1%	3 3%
Internet	4 1%	3 1%	1 1%	-	-	1 1%	-	0 12%	1 2%	-	-	-	-	2 2%	2 1%	2 1%	1 1%	1 1%	2 2%	1 1%
Other	21 5%	13 6%	6 3%	1 2%	4 35%	3 5%	2 5%	-	1 2%	-	-	2 4%	1 3%	6 4%	11 6%	10 5%	-	5 4%	9 7%	8 9%
Nothing / None	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
Don't know	2 *	2 1%	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	2 7%	-	-	2 1%	2 2%	-	-	-
Refused	1 *	-	1 1%	-	-	-	1 3%	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	1 1%	-	1 *	-	1 1%

(sig=.05) (all_pairs) columns tested BC, DEFGHIJKLMN, OP, QRST
 Note: Percentage less than 0.5 printed as *.

Q22. What is the best way for TVWD to keep you updated on your water service?

	Ethnicity			Education			Income			Q1: Provider		Q2: Impressions					Q16: Rates			Split	
	Total	White Alone (B)	POC (C)	H.S. Grad Or < (D)	Some Coll (E)	Coll Grad+ (F)	<\$50K (G)	\$50K-\$100K (H)	\$100K Or > (I)	TVWD (J)	Other/DK (K)	Excellent (L)	Good (M)	Poor (N)	Very Poor (O)	Excellent/Very Good (P)	Poor/Very Poor (Q)	Un-reason-able (R)	Reason-able (S)	A	B
Total	400 100%	219 100%	129 100%	83 100%	125 100%	171 100%	72 100%	125 100%	162 100%	352 100%	48 100%	123 100%	217 100%	24 100%	14 100%	340 100%	38 100%	150 100%	173 100%	200 100%	200 100%
Email	238 59%	130 59%	82 64%	54 65%	70 56%	105 62%	38 53%	80 63%	104 65%	216K 62%	22 45%	78 63%	130 60%	14 60%	7 51%	208 61%	22 56%	94 62%	99 57%	110 55%	128 64%
Text Message	59 15%	32 15%	17 13%	12 15%	26F 21%	18 10%	13 17%	20 16%	22 13%	48 14%	10 21%	13 11%	30 14%	8LM 33%	4 24%	44 13%	11P 30%	26 18%	18 11%	26 13%	33 16%
Mail	45 11%	21 9%	14 11%	10 12%	10 8%	18 10%	9 13%	12 10%	13 8%	43 12%	2 4%	12 10%	24 11%	1 3%	3 20%	36 11%	4 9%	14 10%	24 14%	28 14%	16 8%
Bill	15 4%	11 5%	2 2%	1 1%	8 6%	7 4%	3 4%	3 2%	4 3%	14 4%	1 3%	10M 8%	4 2%	1 4%	-	14 4%	1 2%	4 3%	10 6%	8 4%	8 4%
Newsletter / Pamphlet	9 2%	7 3%	1 *	-	-	7E 4%	0 *	1 *	6 3%	8 2%	1 2%	2 2%	5 3%	-	-	8 2%	-	3 2%	5 3%	7 3%	2 1%
Flyers	7 2%	4 2%	2 1%	-	3 2%	4 3%	-	2 1%	5 3%	4 1%	3J 6%	3 2%	5 2%	-	-	7 2%	-	3 2%	4 3%	6 3%	1 *
Internet	4 1%	3 1%	1 1%	1 1%	2 2%	1 1%	1 1%	3 2%	1 *	2 1%	2 4%	1 1%	3 1%	-	-	3 1%	-	1 1%	2 1%	1 *	3 2%
Other	21 5%	9 4%	9 7%	4 5%	3 3%	11 7%	6 9%	4 3%	6 4%	13 4%	8J 16%	3 2%	14 6%	-	1 5%	16 5%	1 2%	5 3%	8 5%	13 6%	8 4%
Nothing / None	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
Don't know	2 *	-	2 1%	-	2 1%	-	-	2 1%	-	2 *	-	2 1%	-	-	-	2 *	-	-	2 1%	2 1%	-
Refused	1 *	1 1%	-	1 1%	1 1%	-	1 2%	-	-	1 *	1 1%	-	1 1%	-	-	1 *	-	1 *	-	-	1 1%

(sig=.05) (all_pairs) columns tested BC, DEF, GHI, JK, LMNO, PQ, RS
 Note: Percentage less than 0.5 printed as *.

DHM Research - Tualatin Valley Water District Customer Survey: August 2-8, 2022

Q23. If TVWD needed to reach you in cases of emergency, such as a water service interruption, which of the following ways would you prefer to receive this notification?

	Area			Zip Code										Gender		Age				
	Total	North	South	97003	97005	97006	97007	97008	97078	97123	97124	97223	97225	97229	Male	Fe- male	18-29	30-44	45-64	65+
Total	400 100%	215 100% (B)	181 100% (C)	51 100% (D)	12 100% (E)	48 100% (F)	44 100% (G)	2 100% (H)	44 100% (I)	1 100% (J)	1 100% (K)	40 100% (L)	24 100% (M)	131 100% (N)	193 100% (O)	193 100% (P)	80 100% (Q)	116 100% (R)	124 100% (S)	80 100% (T)
Door hanger	68 17%	29 13%	38 21%	11 22%	5M 38%	7 14%	12MN 27%	-	9 20%	-	0 11%	7 17%	1 4%	17 13%	36 18%	31 16%	22ST 28%	20 17%	17 14%	8 10%
Phone call	111 28%	56 26%	55 30%	12 24%	5 39%	15 32%	16 37%	0 12%	15 35%	-	0 34%	11 28%	6 25%	30 23%	60 31%	50 26%	32R 40%	25 21%	32 26%	22 28%
Text message	327 82%	173 80%	151 84%	44H 85%	8 69%	33 69%	37H 84%	0 12%	32 73%	1 100%	1 100%	38FHIM 95%	18 74%	113F 86%H	153 79%	160 83%	70T 88%	99 85%	99 80%	58 73%
Social Media (such as Facebook, Twitter, NextDoor)	40 10%	19 9%	21 12%	1 3%	1 6%	3 7%	6 14%	-	8D 19%	-	-	5 14%	3 15%	12 9%	20 10%	21 11%	11 14%	13 12%	12 10%	4 5%
Email	195 49%	98 46%	95 53%	25 48%	7 61%	24 51%	27N 63%	2 76%	23 52%	-	0 34%	19 48%	12 50%	55 42%	93 48%	99 51%	49ST 61%	66ST 57%	49 40%	31 39%
Don't know	2 1%	2 1%	0 *	-	-	2N 4%	-	0DN 12%	-	-	-	-	-	-	2 1%	-	0 *	-	1 1%	1 2%

(sig=.05) (all pairs) columns tested BC, DEFGHIJKLMN, OP, QRST
Note: Percentage less than 0.5 printed as *.

DHM Research - Tualatin Valley Water District Customer Survey: August 2-8, 2022

Q23. If TVWD needed to reach you in cases of emergency, such as a water service interruption, which of the following ways would you prefer to receive this notification?

	Ethnicity			Education			Income			Q1: Provider		Q2: Impressions					Q16: Rates		Split		
	Total	White Alone	POC	H.S. Grad Or <	Some Coll	Coll Grad+	<\$50K	\$50K-\$100K	\$100K Or >	TVWD	Other/DK	Exce-llent	Good	Poor	Very Poor	Exce-llent/Good	Poor/Very Poor	Un-reason-able	Reason-able	A	B
Total	400 100%	219 100% (B)	129 100% (C)	83 100% (D)	125 100% (E)	171 100% (F)	72 100% (G)	125 100% (H)	162 100% (I)	352 100% (J)	48 100% (K)	123 100% (L)	217 100% (M)	24 100% (N)	14 100% (O)	340 100% (P)	38 100% (Q)	150 100% (R)	173 100% (S)	200 100%	200 100%
Door hanger	68 17%	35 16%	20 16%	14 16%	24 19%	26 15%	16 23%	21 17%	23 14%	60 17%	9 18%	17 14%	37 17%	7 29%	2 14%	54 16%	9 24%	27 18%	29 17%	33 16%	36 18%
Phone call	111 28%	60 27%	36 28%	19 23%	43 35%	42 24%	23 31%	37 29%	39 24%	99 28%	12 25%	35 28%	61 28%	10 41%	1 10%	95 28%	11 29%	44 29%	41 24%	48 24%	63 32%
Text message	327 82%	181 82%	106 82%	73 88%	103 82%	138 81%	57 79%	106 85%	135 84%	292 83%	35 72%	102 82%	175 81%	21 87%	10 69%	276 81%	31 80%	119 79%	145 84%	156 78%	170 85%
Social Media (such as Facebook, Twitter, NextDoor)	40 10%	12 6%	23B 18%	11 13%	11 9%	18 10%	10 14%	12 9%	15 10%	40K 12%	-	15 12%	20 9%	3 14%	1 5%	35 10%	4 11%	17 11%	17 10%	16 8%	24 12%
Email	195 49%	96 44%	80B 62%	53E 63%	48 39%	86 50%	33 46%	64 51%	85 53%	176 50%	19 40%	64 52%	104 48%	16 65%	6 44%	168 49%	22 57%	75 50%	84 49%	84 42%	111 55%
Don't know	2 1%	0 *	-	-	-	0 *	-	-	-	1 *	1 2%	-	1 *	-	-	1 *	-	1 1%	0 *	0 *	2 1%

(sig=.05) (all_pairs) columns tested BC, DEF, GHI, JK, LMNO, PQ, RS
 Note: Percentage less than 0.5 printed as *.

DHM Research - Tualatin Valley Water District Customer Survey: August 2-8, 2022

Q24. What is your zip code?

	Area		Zip Code												Gender		Age			
	Total	North	South	97003	97005	97006	97007	97008	97078	97123	97124	97223	97225	97229	Male	Fe- male	18-29	30-44	45-64	65+
Total	400 100%	215 100% (B)	181 100% (C)	51 100% (D)	12 100% (E)	48 100% (F)	44 100% (G)	2 100% (H)	44 100% (I)	1 100% (J)	1 100% (K)	40 100% (L)	24 100% (M)	131 100% (N)	193 100% (O)	193 100% (P)	80 100% (Q)	116 100% (R)	124 100% (S)	80 100% (T)
97003	51 13%	-	51B 28%	51EFGHI 100%KLMN	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	23 12%	27 14%	14S 18%	19S 17%	9 7%	9 12%
97005	12 3%	12C 6%	-	-	12DFGHI 100%KLMN	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	7 3%	5 3%	1 2%	3 3%	2 1%	6S 7%
97006	48 12%	48C 22%	-	-	-	48DEGHI 100%KLMN	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	23 12%	21 11%	10 13%	15 13%	12 9%	10 13%
97007	44 11%	-	44B 24%	-	-	-	44DEFHI 100%KLMN	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	20 10%	21 11%	9 12%	11 9%	13 10%	10 13%
97008	2 1%	-	2 1%	-	-	-	-	2DEFGI 100%LMN	-	-	-	-	-	-	0 *	2 1%	2 2%	-	0 *	-
97078	44 11%	-	44B 24%	-	-	-	-	44DEFGH 100%KLMN	-	-	-	-	-	-	23 12%	21 11%	15T 19%	11 10%	13 10%	4 5%
97123	1 *	-	1 *	-	-	-	-	-	-	1 100%	-	-	-	-	-	1 *	-	-	-	1 1%
97124	1 *	1 1%	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	1DEFGI 100%LMN	-	-	-	1 *	0 *	0 1%	0 *	0 *	-
97223	40 10%	-	40B 22%	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	40DEFGH 100%IKMN	-	-	26P 14%	12 6%	6 8%	13 11%	14 11%	7 9%
97225	24 6%	24C 11%	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	24DEFGH 100%IKLN	-	10 5%	14 7%	5 6%	4 4%	4 4%	10RS 13%
97229	131 33%	131C 61%	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	131DE 100%F GHIKL M	58 30%	69 36%	16 20%	37 32%	57QRT 46%	20 25%
Refused	4 1%	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	3 2%	1 *	-	1 1%	-	2 2%

(sig=.05) (all_pairs) columns tested BC, DEFGHIJKLMN, OP, QRST
 Note: Percentage less than 0.5 printed as *.

DHM Research - Tualatin Valley Water District Customer Survey: August 2-8, 2022

Q24. What is your zip code?

	Ethnicity			Education			Income			Q1: Provider		Q2: Impressions					Q16: Rates		Split		
	Total	White Alone	POC	H.S. Grad Or <	Some Coll	Coll Grad+	<\$50K	\$50K-\$100K	\$100K Or >	TVWD	Other/DK	Excellent	Good	Poor	Very Poor	Excellent/Very Good	Poor/Very Poor	Un-reason-able	Reason-able	A	B
Total	400 100%	219 100% (B)	129 100% (C)	83 100% (D)	125 100% (E)	171 100% (F)	72 100% (G)	125 100% (H)	162 100% (I)	352 100% (J)	48 100% (K)	123 100% (L)	217 100% (M)	24 100% (N)	14 100% (O)	340 100% (P)	38 100% (Q)	150 100% (R)	173 100% (S)	200 100%	200 100%
97003	51 13%	24 11%	20 16%	14 17%	17 13%	18 10%	15 20%	16 12%	18 11%	49 14%	3 6%	14 11%	26 12%	2 10%	5 36%	40 12%	8 20%	26 17%	17 10%	26 13%	26 13%
97005	12 3%	9 4%	3 2%	2 2%	4 3%	7 4%	1 1%	1 1%	3 2%	11 3%	1 1%	4 4%	7 3%	1 3%	-	11 3%	1 2%	0 *	10R 6%	6 3%	6 3%
97006	48 12%	31C 14%	7 6%	10 12%	9 8%	23 14%	5 7%	16 13%	20 13%	39 11%	9 18%	9 8%	29 13%	3 13%	2 16%	38 11%	6 14%	25 16%	15 9%	24 12%	24 12%
97007	44 11%	26 12%	13 10%	13 15%	11 9%	18 11%	7 10%	11 9%	22 14%	39 11%	4 9%	10 8%	28 13%	2 7%	4 26%	38 11%	5 14%	20 13%	18 11%	22 11%	22 11%
97008	2 1%	0 *	2 1%	-	2 1%	0 *	-	0 *	2 1%	-	2J 4%	-	0 *	-	2LM 11%	0 *	2P 4%	-	0 *	2 1%	0 *
97078	44 11%	21 9%	17 13%	7 8%	17 14%	19 11%	13I 18%	17 14%	13 8%	38 11%	6 12%	11 9%	27 13%	5 21%	-	38 11%	5 13%	23 15%	15 9%	22 11%	22 11%
97123	1 *	1 *	-	-	1 *	-	-	-	-	-	1 1%	1 *	-	-	-	1 *	-	-	1 *	-	1 *
97124	1 *	1 *	-	-	1 1%	0 *	1 1%	1 1%	-	0 *	1J 2%	1 1%	0 *	-	-	1 *	-	0 *	0 *	0 *	1 1%
97223	40 10%	25 12%	12 10%	7 9%	14 11%	16 9%	5 7%	11 9%	21 13%	34 10%	6 12%	12 10%	24 11%	1 4%	-	36 10%	1 3%	12 8%	23 13%	20 10%	20 10%
97225	24 6%	14 6%	8 6%	7 9%	7 6%	8 5%	6 9%	5 4%	11 7%	23 6%	1 2%	12 10%	9 4%	1 4%	1 5%	21 6%	2 4%	6 4%	14 8%	12 6%	12 6%
97229	131 33%	67 31%	43 34%	22 26%	43 34%	59 35%	17 23%	47G 38%	51 32%	119 34%	12 24%	48 39%	64 29%	9 37%	1 7%	112 33%	10 26%	38 25%	57 33%	65 33%	65 33%
Refused	4 1%	1 *	2 2%	1 2%	-	2 1%	2HI 3%	-	-	-	4J 8%	1 1%	2 1%	-	-	3 1%	-	1 1%	2 1%	2 1%	2 1%

(sig=.05) (all_pairs) columns tested BC, DEF, GHI, JK, LMNO, PQ, RS
 Note: Percentage less than 0.5 printed as *.

DHM Research - Tualatin Valley Water District Customer Survey: August 2-8, 2022

Q25. Do you describe your gender as:

	Area			Zip Code										Gender		Age				
	Total	North	South	97003	97005	97006	97007	97008	97078	97123	97124	97223	97225	97229	Male	Fe- male	18-29	30-44	45-64	65+
Total	400 100%	215 100% (B)	181 100% (C)	51 100% (D)	12 100% (E)	48 100% (F)	44 100% (G)	2 100% (H)	44 100% (I)	1 100% (J)	1 100% (K)	40 100% (L)	24 100% (M)	131 100% (N)	193 100% (O)	193 100% (P)	80 100% (Q)	116 100% (R)	124 100% (S)	80 100% (T)
Male	193 48%	97 45%	92 51%	23 44%	7 56%	23 48%	20 46%	0 24%	23 53%	-	1 66%	26 66%	10 41%	58 44%	193 100%	-	45 56%	54 46%	52 42%	41 52%
Female	193 48%	110 51%	82 45%	27 52%	5 44%	21 45%	21 47%	2 76%	21 47%	1 100%	0 24%	12 31%	14 59%	69 53%	-	193 100%	33 42%	59 51%	66 54%	34 43%
Non-binary or gender non-conforming	8 2%	3 1%	5 3%	2 5%	-	1 3%	2 5%	-	-	-	0 11%	1 11%	-	1 1%	-	-	2 2%	-	2 2%	3 4%
Refused	6 2%	5 2%	2 1%	-	-	2 5%	1 2%	-	-	-	-	1 3%	-	2 2%	-	-	-	3 2%	3 2%	1 2%

(sig=.05) (all_pairs) columns tested BC, DEFGHIJKLMN, OP, QRST

DHM Research - Tualatin Valley Water District Customer Survey: August 2-8, 2022

Q25. Do you describe your gender as:

	Ethnicity			Education			Income			Q1: Provider		Q2: Impressions					Q16: Rates		Split		
	Total	White Alone	POC	H.S. Grad Or <	Some Coll	Coll Grad+	<\$50K	\$50K-\$100K	\$100K Or >	TVWD	Other/DK	Exce-llent	Good	Poor	Very Poor	Exce-llent/Very Good	Poor/Very Poor	Un-reason-able	Reason-able	A	B
Total	400 100%	219 100% (B)	129 100% (C)	83 100% (D)	125 100% (E)	171 100% (F)	72 100% (G)	125 100% (H)	162 100% (I)	352 100% (J)	48 100% (K)	123 100% (L)	217 100% (M)	24 100% (N)	14 100% (O)	340 100% (P)	38 100% (Q)	150 100% (R)	173 100% (S)	200 100%	200 100%
Male	193 48%	93 42%	70 54%	46 55%	61 49%	71 42%	37 51%	64 51%	73 45%	163 46%	30 63%	57 47%	110 51%	14 59%	6 39%	167 49%	20 51%	76 51%	81 47%	98 49%	95 48%
Female	193 48%	123 56%	56 44%	35 42%	61 49%	92 54%	35 48%	59 47%	81 50%	177 50%	16 32%	65 53%	100 46%	9 36%	4 28%	165 49%	13 33%	67 45%	85 49%	98 49%	95 47%
Non-binary or gender non-conforming	8 2%	2 1%	2 2%	2 3%	1 1%	4 2%	1 1%	-	6 4%	6 2%	2 3%	0 *	2 1%	0 2%	5 32%	2 1%	5 13%	4 2%	4 2%	2 1%	5 3%
Refused	6 2%	2 1%	-	-	1 1%	4 2%	-	2 2%	1 *	6 2%	1 2%	1 1%	4 2%	1 3%	-	5 1%	1 2%	3 2%	3 2%	2 1%	5 2%

(sig=.05) (all pairs) columns tested BC, DEF, GHI, JK, LMNO, PQ, RS
 Note: Percentage less than 0.5 printed as *.

DHM Research - Tualatin Valley Water District Customer Survey: August 2-8, 2022

Q26. Age

	Area			Zip Code											Gender		Age				
	Total	North	South	97003	97005	97006	97007	97008	97078	97123	97124	97223	97225	97229	Male	Fe- male	18-29	30-44	45-64	65+	
Total	400 100%	215 100% (B)	181 100% (C)	51 100% (D)	12 100% (E)	48 100% (F)	44 100% (G)	2 100% (H)	44 100% (I)	1 100% (J)	1 100% (K)	40 100% (L)	24 100% (M)	131 100% (N)	193 100% (O)	193 100% (P)	80 100% (Q)	116 100% (R)	124 100% (S)	80 100% (T)	
18 - 29	80 20%	33 15%	47 26%	14 27%	1 11%	10 21%	9 22%	2 88%	15 35%	-	0 32%	6 15%	5 21%	16 12%	45 23%	33 17%	80 100%	RST	-	-	-
30 - 44	116 29%	60 28%	54 30%	19 38%	3 25%	15 32%	11 25%	-	11 26%	-	0 34%	13 32%	4 18%	37 28%	54 28%	59 31%	-	116 100%	QST	-	-
45 - 64	124 31%	76 35%	48 27%	9 17%	2 13%	12 25%	13 30%	0 12%	13 29%	-	0 34%	14 35%	4 18%	57 44%	DF 27%	52 34%	66	-	-	124 100%	QRT
65+	80 20%	46 21%	32 18%	9 18%	6 50%	10 22%	10 24%	-	4 10%	1 100%	-	7 19%	10 43%	DIN 15%	20 21%	34 18%	-	-	-	80 100%	QRS
Refused	1 *	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	1 1%	-	-	-	-	-	-

(sig=.05) (all pairs) columns tested BC, DEFGHIJKLMN, OP, QRST
 Note: Percentage less than 0.5 printed as *.

DHM Research - Tualatin Valley Water District Customer Survey: August 2-8, 2022

Q26. Age

	Ethnicity			Education			Income			Q1: Provider		Q2: Impressions					Q16: Rates		Split		
	Total	White Alone	POC	H.S. Grad Or <	Some Coll	Coll Grad+	<\$50K	\$50K-\$100K	\$100K Or >	TVWD	Other/DK	Excellent	Good	Poor	Very Poor	Excellent/Very Good	Poor/Very Poor	Un-reason-able	Reason-able	A	B
Total	400 100%	219 100% (B)	129 100% (C)	83 100% (D)	125 100% (E)	171 100% (F)	72 100% (G)	125 100% (H)	162 100% (I)	352 100% (J)	48 100% (K)	123 100% (L)	217 100% (M)	24 100% (N)	14 100% (O)	340 100% (P)	38 100% (Q)	150 100% (R)	173 100% (S)	200 100%	200 100%
18 - 29	80 20%	49 22%	27 21%	26F 31%	36F 29%	18 11%	16 23%	30 24%	32 20%	68 19%	12 24%	21 17%	45 21%	6 24%	6 39%	65 19%	11 30%	34 22%	33 19%	40 20%	40 20%
30 - 44	116 29%	40 18%	57B 44%	29 35%	31 25%	45 27%	17 23%	44 35%	49 30%	107 31%	8 17%	30 24%	71 33%	9 36%	2 16%	101 30%	11 29%	40 26%	50 29%	58 29%	58 29%
45 - 64	124 31%	66 30%	37 29%	17 21%	33 26%	66DE 39%	21 29%	28 22%	59H 37%	108 31%	15 32%	37 30%	64 30%	7 27%	4 28%	101 30%	11 28%	52 35%	45 26%	62 31%	62 31%
65+	80 20%	65C 30%	7 6%	11 14%	25 20%	41 24%	18 25%	24 19%	22 14%	68 19%	12 25%	36M 29%	35 16%	3 13%	2 16%	71 21%	5 14%	24 16%	45 26%	40 20%	40 20%
Refused	1 *	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	1J 2%	-	1 *	-	-	1 *	-	1 1%	-	1 1%	-

(sig=.05) (all_pairs) columns tested BC, DEF, GHI, JK, LMNO, PQ, RS
 Note: Percentage less than 0.5 printed as *.

Q27. Which of the following best describes your race or ethnicity?

	Area			Zip Code										Gender		Age				
	Total	North	South	97003	97005	97006	97007	97008	97078	97123	97124	97223	97225	97229	Male	Fe- male	18-29	30-44	45-64	65+
Total	400 100%	215 100%	181 100%	51 100%	12 100%	48 100%	44 100%	2 100%	44 100%	1 100%	1 100%	40 100%	24 100%	131 100%	193 100%	193 100%	80 100%	116 100%	124 100%	80 100%
African	10 3%	4 2%	6 4%	2 4%	-	-	-	-	2 4%	-	-	3 7%	1 2%	3 3%	10P 5%	-	-	7T 6%	3 3%	-
Asian/ Pacific Islander	45 11%	26 12%	19 11%	6 11%	-	3 7%	6 14%	-	5 11%	-	-	3 6%	3 12%	20 15%	23 12%	20 10%	6 7%	23Q 20%	13 10%	3 4%
Black/ African American	16 4%	3 1%	13B 7%	4N 8%	-	2 4%	2 4%	-	5N 13%	-	-	1 4%	-	1 1%	6 3%	10 5%	5 6%	9T 7%	3 2%	-
Hispanic/Latino/a/x	42 11%	18 8%	24 13%	5 9%	1 6%	1 3%	5 12%	2DFGLN 76%	8F 19%	-	-	5 12%	4 15%	12 9%	23 12%	20 10%	14T 18%	13 11%	12 10%	3 4%
Middle Eastern/ North African	5 1%	1 *	5 3%	1 2%	-	-	1 1%	-	2 4%	-	-	1 3%	-	1 1%	4 2%	1 1%	1 1%	2 2%	2 2%	-
Native American/ American Indian	9 2%	2 1%	5 3%	-	-	-	-	-	5DFGLN 12%	-	-	-	-	2 1%	8P 4%	1 *	5S 6%	2 2%	1 1%	1 1%
White/Caucasian	233 58%	130 60%	103 57%	24 47%	9 75%	33 69%	26 60%	0 24%	26 59%	1 100%	1 66%	26 65%	16 67%	71 54%	100 52%	129O 67%	54R 67%	47 41%	67 54%	65RS 82%
Other	19 5%	12 5%	7 4%	3 5%	2G 19%	2 5%	-	-	2 5%	-	-	2 6%	2 7%	6 4%	13 7%	6 3%	5 6%	11ST 9%	3 3%	-
Refused	52 13%	32 15%	19 11%	8 15%	-	10L 20%	4 9%	-	6 13%	-	0EL 34%	2 4%	2 7%	20 15%	31P 16%	14 7%	4 5%	19Q 16%	21Q 17%	7 9%

(sig=.05) (all pairs) columns tested BC, DEFGHIJKLMN, OP, QRST
 Note: Percentage less than 0.5 printed as *.

DHM Research - Tualatin Valley Water District Customer Survey: August 2-8, 2022

Q27. Which of the following best describes your race or ethnicity?

	Ethnicity			Education			Income			Q1: Provider		Q2: Impressions					Q16: Rates		Split		
	Total	White Alone	POC	H.S. Grad Or <	Some Coll	Coll Grad+	<\$50K	\$50K-\$100K	\$100K Or >	TVWD	Other/DK	Exce-llent	Good	Poor	Very Poor	Exce-llent/Very Good	Poor/Very Poor	Un-reason-able	Reason-able	A	B
Total	400 100%	219 100% (B)	129 100% (C)	83 100% (D)	125 100% (E)	171 100% (F)	72 100% (G)	125 100% (H)	162 100% (I)	352 100% (J)	48 100% (K)	123 100% (L)	217 100% (M)	24 100% (N)	14 100% (O)	340 100% (P)	38 100% (Q)	150 100% (R)	173 100% (S)	200 100%	200 100%
African	10 3%	-	10B 8%	1 1%	4 4%	5 3%	2 3%	5 4%	3 2%	10 3%	-	3 3%	4 2%	3M 11%	-	8 2%	3 7%	7 5%	3 2%	4 2%	6 3%
Asian/ Pacific Islander	45 11%	-	45B 35%	10 12%	8 6%	27E 16%	6 9%	17 13%	22 13%	38 11%	7 14%	13 11%	24 11%	4 16%	2 16%	37 11%	6 16%	15 10%	22 12%	23 11%	22 11%
Black/ African American	16 4%	-	16B 12%	2 3%	4 4%	7 4%	3I 5%	12I 10%	-	12 4%	4 7%	4 4%	7 3%	1 6%	1 7%	12 3%	2 6%	8 5%	6 3%	6 3%	10 5%
Hispanic/Latino/a/x	42 11%	-	42B 33%	13 16%	11 9%	17 10%	13 18%	12 9%	18 11%	36 10%	7 14%	19 16%	18 8%	-	2 11%	38 11%	2 4%	9 6%	18 10%	20 10%	22 11%
Middle Eastern/ North African	5 1%	-	5B 4%	2 2%	2 2%	1 1%	3I 4%	2 2%	-	5 2%	-	1 1%	3 1%	-	1 4%	4 1%	1 2%	3 2%	2 1%	5 2%	1 *
Native American/ American Indian	9 2%	-	9B 7%	3 4%	3 2%	3 2%	6HI 8%	3 2%	-	5 2%	4J 8%	3 3%	5 2%	-	-	8 2%	-	3 2%	5 3%	5 2%	4 2%
White/Caucasian	233 58%	219C 100%	14 11%	48 58%	83 66%	99 58%	37 51%	65 52%	107GH 66%	204 58%	29 60%	77N 63%	136N 63%	7 31%	6 40%	213Q 63%	13 34%	80 53%	115R 66%	116 58%	117 58%
Other	19 5%	-	19B 14%	3 3%	14F 11%	2 1%	1 2%	14GI 11%	3 2%	16 5%	2 4%	6 5%	12 6%	-	-	18 5%	-	5 3%	9 5%	7 3%	12 6%
Refused	52 13%	-	-	10 12%	9 7%	18 11%	9 13%	15 12%	11 7%	48 14%	4 9%	10 8%	24 11%	10LM 43%	3 22%	34 10%	13P 35%	30S 20%	11 6%	25 13%	27 13%

(sig=.05) (all pairs) columns tested BC, DEF, GHI, JK, LMNO, PQ, RS
 Note: Percentage less than 0.5 printed as *.

DHM Research - Tualatin Valley Water District Customer Survey: August 2-8, 2022

Q28. Which category best describes your 2021 gross household income, before taxes?
Remember to include everyone living in your household. Your best estimate will do.

	Area			Zip Code											Gender		Age			
	Total	North	South	97003	97005	97006	97007	97008	97078	97123	97124	97223	97225	97229	Male	Fe- male	18-29	30-44	45-64	65+
Total	400 100%	215 100% (B)	181 100% (C)	51 100% (D)	12 100% (E)	48 100% (F)	44 100% (G)	2 100% (H)	44 100% (I)	1 100% (J)	1 100% (K)	40 100% (L)	24 100% (M)	131 100% (N)	193 100% (O)	193 100% (P)	80 100% (Q)	116 100% (R)	124 100% (S)	80 100% (T)
Less than \$25,000	28 7%	13 6%	14 8%	6 12%	1 6%	1 2%	3 7%	-	3 7%	-	-	1 3%	5 20% FLN	6 5%	14 7%	13 7%	6 8%	5 4%	9 7%	8 10%
\$25,000 to less than \$50,000	44 11%	17 8%	27 15%	9 17%	-	4 8%	4 10%	-	10 22% N	-	1 43% EFN	4 10%	2 8%	10 8%	23 12%	22 11%	10 13%	12 11%	12 10%	9 12%
\$50,000 to less than \$75,000	71 18%	44 20%	27 15%	9 17%	1 8%	9 19%	8 17%	-	6 14%	-	0 34%	4 11%	4 16%	30 23%	40 21%	29 15%	16 21%	24 21%	15 12%	15 19%
\$75,000 to less than \$100,000	55 14%	27 12%	28 16%	7 13%	0 3%	7 14%	3 7%	0 12%	11 25% G	-	0 24%	7 17%	2 7%	18 14%	25 13%	30 15%	14 17%	20 17%	13 10%	8 11%
\$100,000 to less than \$150,000	93 23%	45 21%	48 27%	9 18%	2 16%	10 21%	13 29%	2 76%	13 29%	-	-	12 31%	6 27%	27 21%	42 22%	49 25%	21 27%	27 24%	33 27% T	11 14%
\$150,000 or more	68 17%	41 19%	27 15%	9 17% I	1 11% I	11 22% I	9 22% I	-	-	-	-	9 23% I	5 21% I	24 19% I	31 16% I	32 17% I	10 13% I	21 19% I	26 21% I	11 14% I
Refused	41 10%	29 13% C	11 6%	4 7%	7 55% DFGIL MN	6 13%	3 8%	0 12%	1 2%	1 100%	-	2 4%	1 3%	15 12%	18 10%	18 9%	2 2%	6 5%	16 13% Q	17 21% QR

(sig=.05) (all_pairs) columns tested BC, DEFGHIJKLMN, OP, QRST

DHM Research - Tualatin Valley Water District Customer Survey: August 2-8, 2022

Q28. Which category best describes your 2021 gross household income, before taxes?
Remember to include everyone living in your household. Your best estimate will do.

	Ethnicity			Education			Income			Q1: Provider		Q2: Impressions					Q16: Rates		Split		
	Total	White Alone (B)	POC (C)	H.S. Grad Or < (D)	Some Coll (E)	Coll Grad+ (F)	<\$50K (G)	\$50K-\$100K (H)	\$100K Or > (I)	TVWD (J)	Other/DK (K)	Excellent (L)	Good (M)	Poor (N)	Very Poor (O)	Excellent/Very Good (P)	Poor/Very Poor (Q)	Un-reason-able (R)	Reason-able (S)	A	B
Total	400 100%	219 100%	129 100%	83 100%	125 100%	171 100%	72 100%	125 100%	162 100%	352 100%	48 100%	123 100%	217 100%	24 100%	14 100%	340 100%	38 100%	150 100%	173 100%	200 100%	200 100%
Less than \$25,000	28 7%	14 6%	10 8%	14EF 16%	6 5%	6 4%	28HI 39%	-	-	25 7%	3 6%	11 9%	13 6%	1 5%	1 9%	24 7%	3 7%	10 7%	11 7%	14 7%	14 7%
\$25,000 to less than \$50,000	44 11%	20 9%	18 14%	7 8%	24F 19%	11 6%	44HI 61%	-	-	35 10%	9 20%	15 12%	23 10%	3 14%	1 5%	37 11%	4 11%	20 13%	14 8%	22 11%	23 11%
\$50,000 to less than \$75,000	71 18%	32 15%	28 21%	19F 23%	30F 24%	19 11%	-	71GI 56%	-	65 19%	5 11%	21 17%	36 17%	7 29%	1 4%	58 17%	7 19%	26 17%	31 18%	36 18%	35 17%
\$75,000 to less than \$100,000	55 14%	24 11%	26 20%	15 17%	22 18%	18 10%	-	55GI 44%	-	50 14%	4 9%	16 13%	31 14%	3 14%	1 7%	47 14%	4 11%	26 18%	20 12%	28 14%	26 13%
\$100,000 to less than \$150,000	93 23%	61 28%	27 21%	15 18%	27 22%	49 29%	-	-	93GH 58%	83 24%	10 22%	24 19%	55 26%	6 24%	5 36%	79 23%	11 28%	41 27%	42 24%	44 22%	49 25%
\$150,000 or more	68 17%	45 20%	18 14%	10 11%	7 5%	51DE 30%	-	-	68GH 42%	57 16%	11 23%	24 19%	36 17%	1 4%	6N 40%	60 18%	7 18%	14 9%	39R 22%	37 19%	31 16%
Refused	41 10%	23C 11%	1 *	4 5%	8 6%	16 10%	-	-	-	36 10%	5 10%	13 11%	23 11%	2 9%	-	36 11%	2 6%	14 9%	17 10%	19 9%	22 11%

(sig=.05) (all pairs) columns tested BC, DEF, GHI, JK, LMNO, PQ, RS
Note: Percentage less than 0.5 printed as *.

Q29. What is the highest level of education that you have completed?

	Area		Zip Code											Gender		Age				
	Total	North	South	97003	97005	97006	97007	97008	97078	97123	97124	97223	97225	97229	Male	Fe- male	18-29	30-44	45-64	65+
Total	400 100%	215 100%	181 100%	51 100%	12 100%	48 100%	44 100%	2 100%	44 100%	1 100%	1 100%	40 100%	24 100%	131 100%	193 100%	193 100%	80 100%	116 100%	124 100%	80 100%
Less than high school	30 8%	15 7%	15 8%	6 11%	-	4 8%	4 10%	-	2 4%	-	-	3 7%	5 22%	5 4%	17 9%	11 6%	12 15%	9 8%	3 3%	6 7%
High school diploma/ GED	53 13%	27 12%	26 14%	8 16%	2 13%	6 13%	8 19%	-	5 12%	-	-	5 12%	2 8%	17 13%	29 15%	24 12%	14 17%	20 17%	14 11%	6 7%
Some college/ 2-year degree	125 31%	64 30%	61 34%	17 32%	4 31%	9 20%	11 25%	2 7%	17 40%	1 100%	1 89%	14 35%	7 29%	43 33%	61 32%	61 32%	36 45%	31 27%	33 27%	25 31%
College degree/ 4-year degree	81 20%	48 22%	32 18%	6 11%	5 39%	9 18%	7 16%	-	15 34%	-	-	5 11%	4 19%	30 23%	35 18%	45 23%	9 11%	19 17%	36 29%	17 21%
Graduate/ professional school	90 22%	49 23%	40 22%	12 23%	2 16%	14 30%	11 26%	0 24%	5 10%	-	0 11%	12 29%	3 14%	29 22%	36 19%	47 24%	9 12%	26 23%	30 24%	24 30%
Refused	21 5%	13 6%	7 4%	3 7%	-	5 10%	2 4%	-	-	-	-	2 6%	2 7%	6 5%	15 8%	5 2%	-	10 9%	7 6%	3 4%

(sig=.05) (all_pairs) columns tested BC, DEFGHIJKLMN, OP, QRST

Q29. What is the highest level of education that you have completed?

	Ethnicity			Education			Income			Q1: Provider		Q2: Impressions					Q16: Rates		Split		
	Total	White Alone	POC	H.S. Grad Or <	Some Coll	Coll Grad+	<\$50K	\$50K-\$100K	\$100K Or >	TVWD	Other/DK	Exce-llent	Good	Poor	Very Poor	Exce-llent/Very Poor	Poor/Very Poor	Un-reason-able	Reason-able	A	B
		(B)	(C)	(D)	(E)	(F)	(G)	(H)	(I)	(J)	(K)	(L)	(M)	(N)	(O)	(P)	(Q)	(R)	(S)		
Total	400 100%	219 100%	129 100%	83 100%	125 100%	171 100%	72 100%	125 100%	162 100%	352 100%	48 100%	123 100%	217 100%	24 100%	14 100%	340 100%	38 100%	150 100%	173 100%	200 100%	200 100%
Less than high school	30 8%	18 8%	8 6%	30EF 37%	-	-	5 8%	12 10%	13 8%	27 8%	4 8%	8 6%	16 7%	1 4%	6LMN 41%	24 7%	7 18%	12 8%	14 8%	12 6%	18 9%
High school diploma/GED	53 13%	25 11%	22 17%	53EF 63%	-	-	15I 21%	22I 17%	12 7%	50 14%	3 6%	13 11%	30 14%	3 13%	-	43 13%	3 8%	20 13%	21 12%	25 13%	28 14%
Some college/2-year degree	125 31%	79 36%	38 29%	-	125DF 100%	-	31I 42%	53I 42%	34 21%	109 31%	17 34%	38 31%	72 33%	8 33%	2 15%	110 32%	10 26%	45 30%	53 31%	66 33%	59 30%
College degree/4-year degree	81 20%	47 22%	25 20%	-	-	81DE 47%	12 16%	18 15%	40 24%	72 21%	9 18%	26 21%	48 22%	4 19%	2 16%	74 22%	7 18%	36 24%	30 18%	37 18%	44 22%
Graduate/professional school	90 22%	47 22%	33 25%	-	-	90DE 53%	5 7%	19 15%	61GH 38%	77 22%	12 25%	34 28%	42 20%	4 18%	3 23%	77 23%	8 20%	30 20%	49 28%	48 24%	42 21%
Refused	21 5%	3 2%	2 2%	-	-	-	4 6%	2 2%	2 1%	17 5%	4 8%	4 3%	9 4%	3L 14%	1 5%	13 4%	4 11%	8 5%	6 3%	12 6%	9 5%

(sig=.05) (all_pairs) columns tested BC, DEF, GHI, JK, LMNO, PQ, RS