



**MN2050 – Survey Monkey (SM)
2016 Caucus Survey
Final Report – April 29, 2016**

Introduction

The 2016 SM Caucus Survey was drafted March 10th. Input and changes to the survey design occurred on March 11th and the survey was emailed to the MN2050 Partner organizations on March 12, 2016 (see Appendix B) The Survey was closed on April 10, 2016.

Results

1. All 15 MN2050 Partner organizations were sent (3/12/16) a MN2050 email message and the SM hyperlink for their organization members responses. Seven of the 15 Partners did not have any respondents to the SM Survey.
2. A total of 82 responses were received by SM. The MN Section of ASCE [35] or 42.68% and MN Chapter APWA [21] or 25.61% constituted a super majority (68%) of the total.
3. Responses distribution was primarily across the Seven County Metro Area, although 15% came from greater Minnesota (e.g. Rochester, Mankato, Park Rapids, Dassel, Little Falls).
4. Caucus attendance by Party was divided almost evenly (Democratic: 48%, Republican: 52%). A survey design flaw, no minor parties option (Libertarian, Green, etc.) available.
5. Was the caucus informative? Respondents said Yes at 68% while 19% said No.
6. Infrastructure funding resolutions were offered by 11% (8) respondents and three more from other caucus attendees for 11 draft resolutions.
7. Of the 11 resolutions, they were evenly divided between Democratic and Republican attendees. Passage was very high, 10 of the 11 resolutions.
8. Respondents becoming a Delegate reflected 11.84% (9), however, an additional 16 indicated they could have, but chose not to at this time.
9. Is the Caucus process an effective way for MN2050 to get the message out, 41.56% (32) said No; while 36.36% said Yes. A fair number of respondents (17) or 22.08% provided other reasons with about half the reasons deemed non-controllable (e.g. facility too crowded, people voted then left, or not enough people).
10. A good number of respondents are willing to help MN2050. Subtracting those already involved means about 15 – 20 new persons could provide new ideas or approaches for MN2050.
11. Narrative comments for Questions: #4, #5, #7, #8 and #11 are provided in Appendix A.

Conclusions

1. Response from ASCE members was a pleasant surprise. Other MN2050 Partners, not so good (AWWA, CSWEA, MAPA, MRWA and MTA).
2. Caucuses reflected “purple” with an even Democratic and Republican distribution.
3. Overwhelmingly, respondents felt the caucus was informative, but the question also did not request more information on WHY. Note: such additional information request may not have been particularly useful.
4. Infrastructure resolutions were a ‘mixed bag’. A small number (11) were offered either by respondents or presented by attendees. Despite this low number, 10 of the 11 resolutions passed. Party affiliation seems not to have mattered in resolutions passed.
5. Becoming a delegate was not high on the respondents’ action and the caucus process or other aspects (see below) may adversely affect such.
6. Effectiveness of the Caucus process for MN2050 to get the message out was not conclusive, but may be leaning to the negative. With 42% of respondents saying No and about half of Other responses being uncontrollable, a Yes to a process conclusion is questionable. But, it’s only one statewide Caucus event.
7. Clearly there is more interest in MN2050 involvement by folks and this needs to be acted upon.
8. The narrative responses (Appendix) provide interesting insights into the caucus process, the good and the bad! Probably need to “noodle on these outcomes” some more. At best, the caucus process is a tool, but not necessarily an effective one for MN2050.

APPENDIX A – Narrative Responses

Question #4: Was the caucus informative?

1. Waste of time - overcrowded and unorganized.
2. I attended the Green Party Caucus.
3. So crowded left after voting for presidential candidate.
4. Leader poorly trained.
5. There was no discussion on any subject. It was like a polling station, you go, vote and if you like you stay for the count and volunteering for delegate.
6. Not a lot.
7. Only was able to vote.
8. Voted in primary and left, too crowded to attend meeting.
9. I attended only for the Presidential poll, then left.

Question #5: Did you offer a resolution related to infrastructure funding?

1. They did not allow any time for discussion at my caucus. They just passed out ballots and we voted.
2. Didn't even get inside.
3. Never got the opportunity to offer a Resolution.
4. I did not offer a resolution but several were brought forth from other citizens.
5. Not able to submit resolutions.
6. Facility was overwhelmed and arrived late to an overcrowded room.
7. Another member offered one.
8. Current platform.

Question #7: Did you become a delegate?

1. Could have been, but chose not to at this time. (15 respondents)
2. Ran out of time.
3. I became a city delegate.

Question #8: Do you think the caucus process is an effective way for MN2050 to get the message out?

1. Yes, but not this year, the place was crazy, way over crowded and very unorganized.
2. Not enough people in my ward stayed to engage in discussion.
3. It can be. Other resolutions proposed before mine contributed to lack of support.
4. Yes, with adequate preparation.
5. This caucus crowd was not receptive to the MN2050 message. In theory, this is a great forum to get the word out, but not on this particular night.
6. Yes, but need to follow it through the whole process to the convention.
7. Didn't know you had a need for us to introduce resolutions.
8. In presidential year - that is focus. May be more effective for other caucus years.
9. It depends. Many people didn't attend the full caucus session, only staying long enough for the straw poll. Perhaps more coverage could be found in other methods.
10. There was little or none preparation that would have helped getting the message out. Better coaching is needed.
11. If everybody has the information; however, many people went only to vote.
12. Caucus system needs additional facilities/space to be effective.
13. I think the issue is important, and you should do caucuses and also talk with the party leadership.
14. Likely if better run and organized.
15. Very limited as few people stay for the resolutions.

Question #11: Any general comments?

1. MN2050 has a good message that needs to get out.
2. While I value the message of MN2050, I think the approach of coming forward year after year with the deficit in funding is not effective. I'd like to see a new marketing approach.
3. My first caucus. Good advocacy by APWA to inform and remind members of the opportunity to attend caucuses.
4. I believe this is one avenue to get the word out
5. We need to keep pushing forward.
6. This seems like a good idea.
7. The public acts only on immediate concerns. Long term needs must be illustrated in terms of how folks are affected today. Perhaps pointing out how decisions made 30 years ago affect daily lives can help bring attention to this cause.
8. I am already involved with MN2050. I trust others had a better caucus experience than I did.
9. We could be effective in this process if we get enough people interested and involved.
10. Needed more locations - school too crowded.
11. I attended the Libertarian Party caucus.
12. You should allow more than one organization to be checked in the first question.
13. The MN2050 resolution was not offered at my caucus location. I would be happy to offer it in the future or at the Minnesota Democratic convention, which I will be attending.
14. Very unorganized.
15. Our caucus was a mess, with way too many people for the organization of the event. Perhaps another year would be a better one for MN2050.
16. A ballot initiative seems like a more effective approach.
17. The caucus process was poorly planned. As a result, it was chaos and I left after I voted for my candidate.
18. Rather have a primary.
19. My caucus was very disorganized and was not effective.

APPENDIX B – Survey Monkey Caucus Survey

**Infrastructure planning,
long term success**

**MN2050 - The 2016 MN
Caucus Survey**

mn2050.org

Minnesota 2050 is interested if you attended a caucus on March 1st. This short survey is being sent to our MN Chapter APWA members and our Partner organizations. Results will assist the MN2050 Steering Committee to determine future direction and tasks. Thanks for your time and effort.

* 1. In what city or ZIP code do you live?

2. What organization are you a member? (check only one)

<input type="radio"/> ACEC	<input type="radio"/> CSWEA	<input type="radio"/> MPA
<input type="radio"/> APWA	<input type="radio"/> MAPA	<input type="radio"/> MRWA
<input type="radio"/> ASCE	<input type="radio"/> MCEA	<input type="radio"/> MSPE
<input type="radio"/> AWWA	<input type="radio"/> MCOA	<input type="radio"/> MTA
<input type="radio"/> CEAM	<input type="radio"/> MGEC	<input type="radio"/> NCITE

3. Which caucus did you attend?

Democratic

Republican

4. Was the caucus informative?

Yes

No

Other (please specify)

1

5. Did you offer a resolution related to infrastructure funding?

Yes

No

Other (please specify)

6. Did the resolution pass?

Unanimously

Passed (not unanimous)

Did not pass

7. Did you become a delegate?

Yes

No

Could have been, but chose not to at this time

Other (please specify)

8. Do you think the caucus process is an effective way for MN2050 to get the message out?

Yes

No

Other (please specify)

9. Would you be willing to help MN2050?

Yes

No

Perhaps

10. If you answered yes or perhaps in 9., please provide your name.

11. Any general comments?