

Appendix - Sampling Methodology

Voter Roll Update Summary

Before taking the random sample from the Voter Roll, we updated that database using postcards from previous City mailings that have been returned by the Post Office as not deliverable. We compared names on the returned cards with the Voter Roll; when there was a match, we coded the name on the Voter Roll with the Post Office reason for non-delivery. These names were excluded from the random sample draw.

Voter Roll Update Process

1. When an update was recorded on the Voter Roll, a red check was made on the card next to the name that was updated.
2. About 20% of the cards had more than one name on it. When we updated both names, each name got a red check. If we could not update one of the names because it was not on the Voter Roll, it was left without a red checkmark.
3. The cards are now organized in alphabetical bundles. Each alphabetic bundle is divided into those cards with names that were updated, and those cards that could not be updated because the name was not on the Voter Roll.

Voter Roll Update Totals

1. Total number of cards reviewed (including 'duplicates') – approximately 1900
2. Total number of cards with names not on the Voter roll - 263
3. Total number of updates recorded – 1191
 - a. New addresses recorded – 274
 - b. Attempted, address unknown (ANK) = 550
 - c. Insufficient address (IA) = 17
 - d. No mail receptacle (NMR) = 132
 - e. No such number (NSN) = 3
 - f. Other reason (OR) = 1
 - g. Temporarily Away (T) = 67
 - h. Undeliverable as addressed (UAA) = 103
 - i. Unable to forward (UF) = 9
 - j. Vacant (V) = 35

Voter Roll Random Sample

1. We 'removed' the names that were coded as undeliverable and did not have a forwarding address on the return-mail cards.
2. We 'removed' names with a zip code that was not 81611 or 81612.
3. We 'removed' names living on a street with an 81611 or 81612 zipcode, but not within the Urban Growth Boundary. (See following **Non-UGB Street Summary**)
4. We assigned identification numbers (IDN) to the remaining names in the pool.
5. We generated a randomized selection of 2,000 names and provided staff a list of the randomly selected names with mailing information and identification code.

Non-UGB Streets Summary

Street Name	# Removed	Street Name	# Removed	Street Name	# Removed
Badger Hollow	1	Jalanda Ln	3	S Cougar Canyon Rd	0
Brush Creek Rd	0	Johnson Dr	0	S Hayden Dr	0
Buchanan Dr	3	Junoper Hill Dr	0	S Starwood Dr	1
Bulkley Dr	0	Kessler Dr	3	Sage Brush Ln	15
Bullwinkle Pl	0	Larson Dr	4	Solar Way	6
Byers Ct	0	Liberty Ln	0	Star Mesa Dr	0
Carroll Dr	10	Little Annie Rd	0	Stevens St	3
Chattan Ln	0	Loges Spring Rd	0	Stewart Dr	5
Circle R Rd	0	Lower Bullwinkle Ln	0	Tabula Rasa Ln	1
Clay Ln	2	Mandalay Ln	0	Trentaz Dr	8
Cluny Rd	2	Mariposa Ln	0	Turtle Cove	0
Conundrum Creek Rd	0	Meadowlark Ln	0	Twining Flats Rd	20
Cougar Canyon Rd	0	Medicine Bow Rd	36	Upper Bullwinkle Cir	0
Cozy Point Way	0	Midnight Mine Rd	0	Upper Hurricane Rd	0
Daniel Dr	6	N Hayden Dr	0	Upper Ranch Rd	15
Danielsen Dr	4	N Starwood Dr	18	Upper River Rd	0
Difficult Ln	0	Owl Creek Ranch Rd	13	Warren Creek Ln	0
Eagle Pine Dr	0	Owl Creek Rd	1	White Horse Springs Ln	0
Eaglemont Rd	0	Popcorn Ln	0	White Star Dr	0
Elam Rd	0	Raceway Dr	0	Wildwood Ln	8
Eppley Dr	6	Red oak Ln	0	Woods Rd	13
Jalanda Ln	3	Red Tain Ln	0	Woody Creek Rd	0
		Richmond Hill Rd	0	Yellow Fox Ln	0

Assessor List Update Summary

Because the Assessor List is compiled through time probably by different individuals, recording of some of the information was inconsistent. For example, **'In Care of'** information could be found in several columns. Or **'Unit'** numbers were sometimes recorded in the **Address column** and other times in a separate **Unit column**. Also, for sorting purposes, some information needed to be separated into its own column, for example **'Entity'** information. Having this in a separate column allowed us to determine whether the mailing would likely go to an individual or an intermediary agency such as a law firm or a management company.

Assessor List Update Process

1. We moved information to the appropriate data columns.
2. We created an "Entity" column and populated it with information that was recorded in the 'Name' column. For example,
Smith John and Jane Family Trust became:
Name_1: Smith; **Name_2:** John and Jane; **Entity:** Family Trust
3. We formatted the information for consistency
4. We 'removed' names with overseas addresses. The purpose for this was to increase the response rate within the time frame allowed for the survey, assuming that mailings going overseas would take more time and be less likely to be returned. We also assumed that 'overseas second homeowners' did not represent a significantly different category of input from 'second homeowners' in general. The number of names removed was 76.
5. We 'removed' the names for which the mailing was going very clearly to a law firm or management company. The purpose was to increase the response rate, with the assumption that the law firm or management company may not forward the survey to the individuals. The number of names removed was approximately 225.
6. We removed the names of local, regional or national governmental entities or service agencies such as: U.S. Postal Service or Aspen Sanitation District. Number of names removed was 32.
7. We 'removed' extraneous data columns, leaving just the Name_1; Name_2; Entity, Care of; Mail_1; Mail_City; Mail_State; Mail_Zip.
8. We assigned numbers to the remaining names in the pool.
9. We generated a randomized selection of 2,000 names
10. We assigned an Identification Code.
11. We provided staff a list of the randomly selected names with mailing information and identification code

Disqualified Survey Responses

1. 566 total survey responses
2. 1 response was from the survey administrator = 565
3. 2 responses didn't have a proper IDN code = 563
4. 13 respondents put in an IDN code but didn't answer any questions = 550
5. 20 additional respondents answered less than half the Q's = 530
6. There were 30 respondents whose IDN code didn't match any of the assigned codes, but clearly due to a transcription error, e.g., the letter "O" was mistaken for the number "0"; the number "1" was mistaken for the letter "l")