



Visit our website at: <http://mn2050.org/>

PARTNERS

American Council of
Engineering Companies of
Minnesota (ACECMN)

Central States Water
Environment Association

City Engineers Association of
Minnesota (CEAM)

Metropolitan Airports
Commission (MAC)

Minnesota Asphalt Pavement
Association (MAPA)

Minnesota Chapter – APWA
Minnesota Council of Airports

Minnesota County Engineers
Association (MCEA)

Minnesota Department of
Transportation (Mn/DOT)

Minnesota Government
Engineering Council (MGEC)

Minnesota Ports Association

Minnesota Rural Water
Association (MRWA)

Minnesota Section – ASCE

Minnesota Section - AWWA

Minnesota Society of
Professional Engineers

Minnesota Transportation
Alliance

North-Central Section Institute
of Transportation Engineers

MN2050 – Survey Monkey (SM) 2016 Caucus Survey Final Results - April 28, 2016

1. All 15 MN2050 Partner organizations were sent (3/12/16) a MN2050 email message and the SM hyperlink for their organization members. Seven of the 15 Partners did not have any respondents to the SM Survey.
2. A total of 82 responses were received by Survey Monkey(SM). The MN Section of ASCE [35] or 42.68% and MN Chapter APWA [21] or 25.61% constituted a super majority (68%). Survey transpired, 3/16 to 4/4/2016.
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: Yes at 68% while 19% said No.
6. Infrastructure funding resolutions were offered by 11% (8) respondents and three 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 may provide new ideas or approaches for MN2050.
11. Narrative comments for Questions: #4, #5, #7, #8 and #11 are provided in an Appendix. Final Report on MN2050 website.