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About the Survey

The Seventh Annual Idaho Public Policy Survey was conducted November 13-21, 2021, and surveyed 1,000 adults who currently live in Idaho. The sample is representative of the state’s population, both geographically and demographically, with a simple random sampling margin of error of +/- 3.1%. The survey covered a wide variety of topics, including growth, housing, transportation, state budgeting, taxes, education, the environment, and COVID-19. GS Strategy Group conducted the survey by cell phone (43%), landline phone (17%), online (30%), and text message (10%).

Key Findings

• Overall Idahoans (46%) believe the state is heading in the right direction, but many (41%) feel it is off on the wrong track. The gap between these two views has gone from 30 points in 2019 to five points this year.

• Idahoans’ legislative priorities remain unchanged from previous years, with Education viewed as the top issue for the Idaho Legislature to address. Housing saw the largest increase in priority ranking over last year (eight points).

• Idahoans are split on what should be done with the state’s budget surplus. Most favor increasing teachers’ pay (26%), giving tax relief (24%), or increasing workforce and affordable housing (23%).

• A quarter of Idahoans have experienced financial hardship since the start of the COVID-19 pandemic, with 26% reporting that they are worse off financially and 25% that have had trouble paying their bills.

• More than half of Idahoans (51%) would recommend a friend or family member get the COVID-19 vaccine. Almost as many Idahoans (46%) indicate vaccination should be a choice rather than a mandate.

• There is increasing concern surrounding growth issues, including housing and property taxes. Most Idahoans believe the state is growing too fast (71%).

• Idahoans strongly support funding full-day kindergarten, with over 60% of Republicans, Democrats, and Independents alike in favor of the proposal.

• Political engagement in Idaho is high relative to national numbers, with nearly one-third (32%) of Idahoans reporting they have contacted a public official within the last year.

For more information, visit: https://www.boisestate.edu/sps/2022-idaho-public-policy-survey/
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Overview

Each year, Idahoans’ assessment of the state’s direction serves as an indicator of overall approval. More Idahoans believe the state is headed in the right direction (46%) than on the wrong track (41%). These numbers continue a four-year trend where the gap between these two opinions has continued to close, shrinking from 30 points in 2019 to only five points this year. Most Republicans (56%) and Independents (46%) feel the state is headed in the right direction, compared to 30% of Democrats. Those who moved to Idaho within the last 10 years tend to have a more positive outlook (55%) than those who have lived here longer (44%).

Do you think things in Idaho are generally headed in the right direction, or do you feel that things are off on the wrong track?

To determine which issues Idahoans most prioritize, respondents rated the importance of the Idaho Legislature addressing a range of policy issues on a scale of 1-10 (1 being not at all important while 10 is extremely important). These issues include jobs and the economy, education, transportation, housing, healthcare, taxes, and the environment. Respondents were not asked about specific policy preferences in these questions, only to identify which areas they feel most warrant the legislature’s attention. Results of these ratings have been relatively stable over time.

On a scale of 1-10, with 1 being not at all important and 10 being extremely important, please indicate how important it is for the Idaho State Legislature to address each of the following issues? (% scoring 8-10)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Issue</th>
<th>Rating</th>
<th>Education</th>
<th>Jobs and the economy</th>
<th>Healthcare</th>
<th>Housing</th>
<th>The Environment</th>
<th>Taxes</th>
<th>Transportation</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Education</td>
<td>70.7%</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jobs and the economy</td>
<td>62.4%</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Healthcare</td>
<td>56.9%</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Housing</td>
<td>56.9%</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The Environment</td>
<td>50.1%</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Taxes</td>
<td>45.1%</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Transportation</td>
<td>35.6%</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Education is once again Idahoans’ most important issue to address, with 71% of respondents rating its importance 8-10. It is the highest rated issue among both Independents (73%) and Democrats (79%), and the second highest issue among Republicans (66%).

Jobs and the economy is the second highest rated issue overall, with 62% of Idahoans rating it 8-10, a four point decline from last year. It is the highest rated issue among Republicans, with 67% rating it 8-10 and second highest for Independents (61%). For Democrats (59%), it is the fifth highest priority.

The third highest rated issue for Idahoans is healthcare, with 59% rating its importance 8-10. While it is the second highest rated issue among Democrats (79%), it is the fourth highest rated issue among both Republicans (52%) and Independents (59%).

Housing increased the most in priority over previous years. More than half of Idahoans (57%) rated its importance 8-10, making it fourth highest overall, an eight point increase over last year’s 49%. It is the fifth highest issue among Republicans (50%), third highest among Independents (60%), and fourth highest among Democrats (68%).

Half of Idahoans (50%) give an 8-10 rating to the environment. For Democrats (77%) it is the third highest rated issue, while it is the fifth highest for Independents (51%) and sixth highest for Republicans (39%).

Taxes (45%) and transportation (36%) are the lowest rated issues overall, with less than half of Idahoans rating them 8-10. Compared to last year, taxes declined three points while transportation stayed the same. Taxes are the third highest rated issue among Republicans (52%), sixth highest among Independents (44%), and lowest rated issue among Democrats (33%). Conversely, transportation is the lowest rated issue among Republicans (31%) and Independents (37%), and the sixth highest rated issue among Democrats (48%).

For the first time since 2017, we asked respondents to identify the main reason they live in Idaho. The results are largely unchanged. Family remains the main reason Idahoans live in the state (45%). This represents a five point increase from the last time we asked the question. It is distantly followed by quality of life (16%) and work (14%) as the main reason.

What is the one main reason you live in Idaho?

Those who moved to Idaho within the last 10 years exhibit some differences compared to those who have lived here longer. While family remains the top reason for both groups, it is far more prevalent among longtime residents (48%) than newcomers (32%). Newcomers are more likely
to name work as the main reason they live in Idaho (23%) compared to longtime residents (11%). They are also more likely to cite political climate as their main reason (9%) compared to longtime residents (5%).

Idahoans interact with various levels of government in their daily lives, including city, county, state, and national governments. Those interactions can result in many different experiences. We asked Idahoans to identify which level of government they feel best responds to their needs. Results indicate that Idahoans feel that the local governments closest to them – cities (27%) and counties (24%) – are most responsive, followed by the state (20%). Few respondents (7%) feel the national (federal) government responds to their needs. About 12% of Idahoans feel no level of government is responsive, while 4% feel all are equally responsive.

Taxes and Budget
At the time of the survey, the State of Idaho was projected to have an approximate $1.5 billion budget surplus for the fiscal year. We asked the public how they feel the money should be spent.

Idahoans were split between three options on the best use of the surplus. Increasing teachers’ pay received the most support (26%), closely followed by giving tax relief to Idahoans (24%), and workforce and affordable housing (23%). Investing in road and bridge maintenance came in a distant fourth (14%) and putting the money into a rainy-day fund received the least support (8%).

The State of Idaho is currently on track for a $1.5 billion budget surplus in this fiscal year. Hearing that, which of the following is the best use of that surplus?

- **Increasing teacher’s pay**: 26.3%
- **Giving tax relief to Idahoans**: 24%
- **Workforce and affordable housing**: 23.1%
- **Investing in road and bridge maintenance**: 13.6%
- **Putting the money into the rainy-day fund**: 7.9%
- **DK/Refused**: 5.2%

Parties are split in their priorities. Republicans favor tax relief (30%) and increasing teachers’ pay (23%). Democrats most favor workforce and affordable housing (34%) and increasing teachers’ pay (33%). Independents favor increasing teachers’ pay (28%) and workforce and affordable housing (26%).

Idahoans are split on the best way to raise teachers’ salaries. The Idaho Legislature recently passed a pay raise for Idaho teachers that is scheduled to increase salaries over the next three years. Some have proposed using the budget surplus to increase teachers’ salaries all at once as opposed to smaller increases over a 3-year period. Knowing this which of the following comes closer to your opinion?

- 43.6% ...all at once, using the budget surplus
- 49.6% ...slowly over 3 years

Another budget surplus proposal under consideration is to use it to pay down $225 million in debt that the State of Idaho has on properties around the state, under the rationale that doing so early would save at least $80 million in interest payments over the life of the loan. We asked Idahoans if they would favor or oppose this proposal. Results suggest strong support, with 71% indicating they would favor using the budget surplus in this manner and only 16% opposed.

Some have proposed using the budget surplus to pay down $225 million in debt the State of Idaho has on properties around the state. Paying these debts off early could save $80 million or more in interest over the life of the loans. Knowing this, would you favor or oppose that proposal?

- **Strongly favor**: 32.9%
- **Somewhat favor**: 38.3%
- **Strongly oppose**: 15.6%
- **Somewhat oppose**: 8.9%
- **DK/Refused**: 13.2%

As we did last year, we asked Idahoans which type of tax reduction would provide the most help to Idahoans if the budget surplus is used to provide tax relief. Idahoans were split between property taxes (38%) and income tax (37%), a four point increase for property taxes over last year and a five point decrease for income taxes. Sales tax was a distant third (20%). Property tax was the highest response among all political parties, with 41% of Republicans, 44% of Democrats, and 36% of Independents identifying it as the best tax relief option.
Not surprisingly, home ownership also influenced responses. Property tax was the most frequent response among those who own their home (44%), while renters strongly favored income tax relief (50%) over property tax relief (22%).

Increasing concern over property taxes is evident in other areas of the survey. We asked Idahoans whether they thought that property taxes in Idaho are too high, too low, or about right. Last year Idahoans were fairly split between too high and about right. This year more Idahoans (46%) think they are too high, a five-point increase. Few (1%) think they are too low, while 41% think they are about right, a three-point decline over last year. Canyon County (58%) and Twin Falls County (57%) are the areas of the state with the highest levels of property tax concern, with more than half of their respondents indicating they are too high.

Property taxes are a complex subject. In Idaho, they serve as local governments’ primary revenue source and while local governments set property taxes through their budgeting process, they do so under the rules and parameters set by the state. This interrelationship makes addressing property tax levels complicated. With so many Idahoans indicating property taxes are a concern, we were interested in learning more about whose responsibility they consider them. We asked, based on what they know, who is primarily responsible for the rate or level of property taxes in Idaho. A majority of Idahoans (54%) believe that city and county governments are responsible, while 30% believe the responsibility lies with the state government. About 16% are not sure. Republicans (52%) and Independents (56%) are most likely to assign responsibility to city and county governments, while Democrats were more split between cities and counties (44%) and the state (41%).

**Growth, Housing, and Transportation**

To assess general attitudes about growth in Idaho, we asked respondents whether they believe growth in the state is occurring too fast, too slow, or about right. This is a question that we have asked Treasure Valley residents over the years, but this marks the first time we asked the question statewide.

A large majority of Idaho residents (71%) feel the pace of growth is occurring too fast. Only 20% believe the pace of growth is about right and 4% too slow. Republicans (79%), Democrats (65%) and Independents (66%) all believe that Idaho is growing too fast. Additionally, long-term Idaho residents – those who have lived in the state for 10 years or more – are far more likely to say the state is growing too fast (75%) than those who moved to the state more recently (58%).

When it comes to controlling growth, 28% feel the state should consider slowing its recruitment of new businesses to the state, but the majority disagree with that approach (60%). Republicans are more likely to say the state should slow its recruitment (35%) than Democrats (26%) or Independents (24%).

**Which of the following comes closer to your opinion?**

- Idaho is growing too fast and should stop recruiting businesses to the state even if that limits employment opportunities: 28.2%
- Idaho should continue to recruit companies with high paying jobs to the state even if it means the population continues to grow: 59.9%
- DK/Refused: 11.8%
**New Arrivals**

With the pace of Idaho’s growth, some wonder about the type of people moving to the state. By comparing those who have arrived in Idaho during the last 10 years (20% of the sample) to those who have lived in Idaho 10 years or longer (80% of the sample), we can identify whether these groups differ from one another.

We find few significant differences demographically between the recent arrivals and those who have lived here for a longer period of time. Approximately half of both groups are currently employed, while roughly one-quarter of each group are retired. While it is still possible that there are larger shares of retirees moving to certain parts of Idaho, or from certain states, these results suggest that when we look at the state as a whole, the recent arrivals have very similar employment profiles to those who have lived here for a longer period of time.

When it comes to ideology, people moving to the state identify as slightly more conservative (53%) than those having lived here longer (49%). That said, when it comes to party identification there is no significant difference. Independents are the largest group among both recent arrivals (42%) and long-term residents (39%), followed closely by Republicans (36% of recent arrivals, 38% of long-term residents). Democrats comprise a smaller share of both recent arrivals (16%) and long-term residents (13%).

**Housing**

Population growth increases housing demand. The state’s housing inventory has not kept up with growth, meaning that housing prices – both renter-occupied and owner-occupied – have increased. To test Idahoans’ perceptions on this trend, we asked “If you had to move out of your home today for whatever reason, how likely is it that you would be able to purchase or rent a similar home for the same amount?” An overwhelming 72% of respondents said it is unlikely they would be able to find a similar home for the same amount, with 60% going so far as to say it is very unlikely. Only a quarter of Idahoans (26%) said it was likely they could find a similar home for the same price.

**Transportation**

Growth also impacts transportation infrastructure across the state. A 2020 report found that in order to maintain existing infrastructure Idaho would need to invest an additional $242 million per year.1 We were interested in gauging not only if Idahoans thought the State was spending enough on maintaining roads and bridges, but also whether knowledge of what the State had already committed towards that end would affect their responses.

To test this, we asked half of our sample which of the following came closest to their opinion: Idaho is spending enough when it comes to building and maintaining roads and bridges OR Idaho needs to spend more on building and maintaining roads and bridges. The other half of our sample were asked a version of the question that included the following brief overview of recent state spending: “Recently, Idaho authorized $122 million in one-time funding and $80 million in permanent funding for roads and bridge projects.”

**Version A: Which of the following comes closer to your opinion?**

**Version B: Recently, Idaho authorized $122 million in one-time funding and $80 million in permanent funding for road and bridge projects. Knowing this, which comes closer to your opinion?**

Results were similar regardless of which version of the question was asked. A majority of those who were simply asked for their opinion (55%) indicated that the state needed to spend more on roads and bridges, while a similar majority (53%) of those who received the overview of recent spending also felt the state needed to spend more.

**Impact fees**

Impact fees are charged to developers to pay when there is a new development. These fees pay for the cost of new improvements needed to accommodate growth. Currently, impact fees can only be spent on widening roads and intersections. Knowing this, which of the following comes closer to your opinion?

Impact fees should only be spent on widening roads and intersections

Impact fees should be spent on other facilities like curbs, gutters, sidewalks, and bike lanes

9.4% DK/Refused

69.9% In addition to widening roads and intersections, impact fees should be spent on other facilities like curbs, gutters, sidewalks, and bike lanes

20.7% Impact fees should only be spent on widening roads and intersections
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One way that growth is often asked to help pay for itself is through the use of impact fees. Impact fees are charged to developers to help pay for the cost of new improvements needed to accommodate growth. Currently in Idaho, impact fees can only be spent on widening roads and intersections, though some wish to expand their use to include other infrastructure improvements such as curbs, gutters, sidewalks, and bike lanes. We asked Idahoans whether they felt impact fees should only be spent on widening roads and bridges OR if, in addition to that, their use should include these other uses. A sizable majority (70%) indicated that in addition to widening roads and intersections, they believe that impact fees should be spent on these other facilities, while 21% believe it should stay as it currently is. Support for expanding the use of impact fees was strongest among Democrats (86%), but also exceeded 60% support among both Independents (73%) and Republicans (63%).

**COVID-19**

Turning our attention to issues related to the COVID-19 pandemic, we were interested in identifying how the pandemic has affected Idahoans. We asked whether their financial situation since the start of the COVID-19 pandemic was better, worse, or about the same. While a clear majority (58%) said their financial situation was about the same, over a quarter of Idahoans (26%) reported that their financial situation had worsened. Only 15% said it had improved. The pandemic impacted long-term residents to a greater extent than newcomers, with 20% of newcomers being negatively impacted compared to 27% of long-term residents.

The COVID-19 pandemic has affected Idahoans in many different ways. A quarter (25%) said they had trouble paying their bills as a result of the pandemic, while 15% reported receiving food from a food bank or charitable organization. Additionally, 11% said they received unemployment benefits. As one might expect, these effects were most likely to be experienced by lower income households (<$50,000 a year) and Idahoans who were unemployed, temporarily laid off, or have disabilities.

Businesses, organizations, and public events have had to navigate various public health and safety issues during these uncertain times and much attention has been paid to what, if any, vaccination or testing requirements they should implement. Among various approaches, including no vaccination requirements of any kind, a choice between vaccination or regular testing, or required vaccinations, we asked Idahoans which option they felt best balanced public health with personal freedom.

The most frequent response (46%) was no requirement for COVID testing or vaccinations of any kind. A little less than a third (29%) support there being a choice between proof of vaccination and regular COVID testing. Requiring vaccinations of everyone, with exceptions allowed only for medical or religious reasons, received the least amount of support with 20%. There is a strong split between party identifications, with Republicans overwhelmingly favoring no requirement of any kind (63%), while Independents are split between no requirement (41%) and a choice between vaccination or testing (35%) and Democrats are split between requiring vaccinations (46%) and a choice between vaccination and testing (37%).

**When it comes to large businesses, organizations, and public events...**

Despite a strong overall preference for no requirement for testing or vaccinations among Idahoans, when asked what they would tell friends or family about whether or not to get the COVID vaccine, a majority (51%) said they would advise them to get the vaccine. A little over a quarter (26%) said they would advise them not to get the vaccine, while 23% either did not know or refused to say. Once again there is a clear party split, with 82% of Democrats saying they would recommend the vaccine compared to 58% of Independents and 36% of Republicans. Nearly a third of Republicans (29%) refused to answer the question, compared with 20% of Independents and only 6% of Democrats.

In order to get an idea of how well Idahoans are coping, we once again asked how many days in the past week they had felt depressed or lonely. About 63% of Idahoans reported feeling depressed less than a day or not at all over the previous week, while 72% reported feeling lonely less than a day or not at all. Conversely, 8% report feeling depressed 5-7 days in the past week, while 6% feel lonely
Education and Childcare

Education remains a major concern for Idahoans, as evidenced by its consistent ranking as a top legislative priority each year. About 44% of respondents had a K-12 aged child or grandchild currently in Idaho schools. We asked all respondents to rate the quality of K-12 education in Idaho statewide and in their district specifically using a scale of excellent, good, fair, or poor.

How would you rate the quality of education in Idaho’s K-12 public schools?

In terms of the statewide system, a third of Idahoans (33%) perceive the quality of K-12 education as fair, while a quarter each believe it is poor (26%) or good (26%). About 8% of Idahoans believe it is excellent. These numbers are similar to last year, with the proportion who consider it excellent seeing the most movement with a nearly four-point increase. Since 2019, good and poor have alternated places as the second highest rating, with the two essentially tied this year.

Similar to prior years, Republicans generally had a more positive view of K-12 education in the state than other party identifications – 43% of Republicans consider it excellent or good, compared to 33% of Democrats and 28% of Independents. Additionally, those who currently have children or grandchildren in K-12 schools in Idaho have a more positive attitude, with 38% considering the state’s schools good or excellent, compared to 30% of those without children or grandchildren.

Thinking specifically about your school district, how would you rate the quality of K-12 public schools in your area?

Idahoans continue to have a more favorable opinion of K-12 schools when asked about their own school districts. Most perceive the quality of education in their school district as good (31%) or fair (30%). While this is consistent with prior findings, the gap between the two ratings is tightening compared to previous years. The remainder of Idahoans are split between rating the quality of their district’s education as poor (17%) or excellent (13%).

Perceptions among Republicans are again more positive, with 50% saying schools in their district are good or excellent compared to 43% of Democrats and 41% of Independents. Once more, those with children or grandchildren in Idaho K-12 schools are more positive, with 48% rating their district’s schools as excellent or good, compared to 42% of those without.

Would you favor or oppose a plan for the State of Idaho to provide additional state funding so school districts could provide full-day kindergarten?

Shifting to specific policy proposals, much attention has been on whether the state should increase education funding to school districts so that they can offer full-day kindergarten. We asked Idahoans if they would favor or oppose this approach. Results were very favorable, with 68% of Idahoans favoring the plan compared to 26% opposed. While Democrats are most favorable (89%), support exceeded 60% for all party identifications – including Republicans (61%) and Independents (69%) – suggesting strong bipartisan support for full-day kindergarten in Idaho. Having a child or grandchild in Idaho schools did not appear to affect the likelihood of one’s response, as 68% of both groups favored the proposal.

Would you favor or oppose a plan to give an incentive or grant for private businesses to provide on-site daycare?

We also asked Idahoans if they would favor or oppose a plan for the state to offer an incentive or grant for private businesses to provide on-site daycare to allow for more flexibility in the workforce. Again, a majority of respondents (66%) indicated they favor such a plan, while 25% opposed. Support once more exceeded 60% for all political identifications, with Democrats (80%) most in favor, followed by Independents (64%) and Republicans (61%).
Environment

The environment remains a concern for a majority of Idahoans, with just over half (50%) ranking it as a top priority for the Idaho Legislature. We asked Idahoans to identify the environmental issue that they are most concerned about. Results indicate that their top concern is wildfire (22%), followed closely by drought (20%). Air quality (12%) and animals and wildlife (12%) are lesser concerns, while increased heat (5%) is the lowest response. About 24% of Idahoans think all of these issues are a concern, while 4% say they are not concerned about any of them.

Which of the following environmental issues are you most concerned about?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Issue</th>
<th>Concerned Idahoans</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Wildfire</td>
<td>21.7%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Drought</td>
<td>20%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Air quality</td>
<td>11.9%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Animals and wildlife</td>
<td>11.7%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Increased heat</td>
<td>5.1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>All</td>
<td>23.7%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>None</td>
<td>3.9%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DK/Refused</td>
<td>1.9%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

There are indications that a regional effect may be in play, as concern over wildfire is more pronounced in Kootenai County (33%) with its highest concentration of forest land than other areas, while drought is of greater concern to Twin Falls County (33%) given its agricultural focus.

When asked what they think has the greatest impact on wildfires in Idaho, most Idahoans indicated poor land management (34%), followed by increasing drought (23%), climate change (16%), and overbuilding in wild areas (7%). About 14% of Idahoans think that they all have an impact, while 2% say none of them do.

Which of the following do you think has the greatest impact on wildfires in Idaho?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Impact</th>
<th>Idahoans Concerned</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Poor land management</td>
<td>34.3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Increasing drought</td>
<td>23.2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Climate change</td>
<td>15.6%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Overbuilding in wild areas</td>
<td>6.5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>All</td>
<td>14.4%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>None</td>
<td>2.1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DK/Refused</td>
<td>3.8%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Law Enforcement

With increased attention on law enforcement, we were interested in ascertaining what percentage of crimes police must solve in order for Idahoans to say they are doing a “good job.” This would allow researchers to identify if Idahoans had realistic expectations compared to national crime statistics.

When asked about violent crimes specifically – crimes that involve the use of force or the threat of force against the victim – most Idahoans (46%) said that police must solve 75% to 100% of violent crimes for them to say police are doing a “good job.” For comparison, the U.S. national rate of cleared violent crimes is 46%. Only 12% of Idahoans indicated they would consider that clearance rate “good” for violent crimes.

Looking at property crimes – crimes where a victim’s property is stolen or damaged, but which did not involve the use or threat of force against the victim – Idahoans are marginally more tolerant, with 41% indicating that police must solve 75% to 100% of property crimes for them to say they are doing a “good job.” The U.S. national rate of cleared property crimes is 17%. Only 5% of Idahoans indicated they would consider that a good clearance rate.

Together, these results suggest that the public may lack a proper frame of reference for what level of case clearance constitutes a “good job” in law enforcement, but are slightly more tolerant of property crimes being solved at a lower rate than violent crimes.

Two years ago, we sought to understand what Idahoans thought about the proposal to remove the four federal dams on the lower Snake River in Washington to aid in salmon and steelhead recovery. At the time, a specific proposal had not yet been released. That is no longer the case. As such, we revisited the question to see if Idahoans’ opinions on the dam removals had changed with access to more information.

Would you favor or oppose removing four dams on the lower Snake River in an effort to restore salmon runs in Idaho?

Generally, the answer is no. As before, Idahoans remain divided on their opinions about removing the four dams on the lower Snake River, with 42% in favor and 42% opposed. As with two years ago, a sizable portion of the state is not sure or refused to share their opinion (17%). Once again, party identification was a strong indicator of support, with Democrats generally favoring the proposal (63%), while Republicans are opposed (52%). Independents are more split, with 43% in favor and 39% opposed.

Two years ago, we sought to understand what Idahoans thought about the proposal to remove the four federal dams on the lower Snake River in Washington to aid in salmon and steelhead recovery. At the time, a specific proposal had not yet been released. That is no longer the case. As such, we revisited the question to see if Idahoans’ opinions on the dam removals had changed with access to more information.
Political Engagement

We were interested in learning to what degree Idahoans have engaged politically, be it through attending protests or demonstrations, contacting public officials, or donating money to a political cause or campaign. Results suggest that political engagement among Idahoans is high, as 11% reported attending a public protest or demonstration within the past year (consistent with similar national figures) and 22% reported donating money to a political cause or party (eight points higher than national figures).4

In the past year, have you participated in any of the following activities at least once – yes or no?

A 2018 Pew study of the U.S. found that only 23% of individuals had contacted an elected official in the last year.5 Our survey shows that nearly a third (32%) of Idahoans reported contacting a public official in the last year. While we can only speculate on the reason for this increase, one possible explanation is that COVID-19-related proposals, including possible mask mandates or vaccination requirements, may have prompted more Idahoans to voice their opinions to public officials via phone or letter in lieu of testifying in public. Without more information, it is difficult to conclusively say one way or the other.

Conclusion

This seventh edition of the Idaho Public Policy Survey has explored Idahoans’ attitudes on a variety of policy issues, both new and old. It reflects increasing tension throughout the state on matters related to growth and its impacts, housing, and the COVID-19 pandemic. It also serves as an indicator that Idahoans remain generally positive about the direction of the state, while remaining engaged politically.

As always, understanding the attitudes of Idahoans can help inform policymakers regarding the interests and concerns of their constituencies as they deliberate the issues of 2022 and beyond.

Endnotes


3 Ibid.


5 Ibid.
Idaho Policy Institute at Boise State University works across the state with public, private and nonprofit entities. We help articulate your needs, create a research plan to address those needs and present practical data that allows for evidence based decision making. We leverage the skills of experienced researchers and subject-matter experts to respond to the growing demands of Idaho communities.
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Recommended citation:
ASK AN EXPERT
Below are topics that may be of interest to readers of our surveys, along with School of Public Service faculty and staff available to share their expertise (in alphabetical order).
A complete list is available at: boisestate.edu/sps/student-resources/meet-our-faculty

Conflict Management
Dr. Bayard Gregory: bayardgregory@boisestate.edu
Ashley Orme, M.A: ashleyorme@boisestate.edu

Corrections
Dr. Shaun Gann: shaungann@boisestate.edu

Economic Development
Dr. Amanda Johnson Ashley: AmandaAshley@boisestate.edu

Education
Dr. Chris Birdsall: chrisbirdsall@boisestate.edu
Dr. Vanessa Fry: VanessaFry@boisestate.edu
McAllister Hall, M.A: mcallisterhall@boisestate.edu

Elections
Dr. Charles Hunt: charleshunt@boisestate.edu
Dr. Jaclyn J. Kettler: jaclynkettler@boisestate.edu
Dr. Matthew May: MatthewMay1@boisestate.edu

Energy
Dr. Kathy Araujo: kathleenaraujo@boisestate.edu
Dr. Stephanie Lenhart: stephanieleanhart@boisestate.edu

Environmental Policy and Public Lands
Dr. Sophia Borgias: sophiaborgias@boisestate.edu
Dr. Luke Fowler: LukeFowler@boisestate.edu
Dr. Monica Hubbard: monicahubbard@boisestate.edu
Dr. Libby Lunstrum: LibbyLunstrum@boisestate.edu
Dr. Jared Talley: JaredTalley@boisestate.edu
Dr. Emily Wakild: EmilyWakild@boisestate.edu

Growth
Dr. Vanessa Fry: VanessaFry@boisestate.edu
Dr. Krista Paulsen: KristaPaulsen@boisestate.edu
Dr. Jen Schneider: JenSchneider@boisestate.edu
Dr. Stephanie Witt: StephanieWitt@boisestate.edu

Housing and Homelessness
Dr. Vanessa Fry: VanessaFry@boisestate.edu
Dr. Benjamin Larsen: BenjaminLarsen@boisestate.edu
Dr. Krista Paulsen: KristaPaulsen@boisestate.edu

New Residents in Idaho
Dr. Charles Hunt: charleshunt@boisestate.edu
Dr. Jeffrey Lyons: jeffreilyons@boisestate.edu

Policing
Dr. Lisa Growette Bostaph: lisaBostaph@boisestate.edu
Dr. Andrew L. Giacomazzi: agiacom@boisestate.edu
Dr. William King: WilliamKing@boisestate.edu

State and Local Government
Dr. Chris Birdsall: chrisbirdsall@boisestate.edu
Dr. Luke Fowler: LukeFowler@boisestate.edu
Dr. Jaclyn J. Kettler: jaclynkettler@boisestate.edu
Dr. Cheong Kim: CheongKim@boisestate.edu
Dr. Sanghee Park: SangheePark@boisestate.edu
Dr. Stephanie Witt: StephanieWitt@boisestate.edu

Taxes
Dr. Cheong Kim: CheongKim@boisestate.edu
Dr. Matthew May: MatthewMay1@boisestate.edu
Dr. Stephanie Witt: StephanieWitt@boisestate.edu

Transportation
Dr. Vanessa Fry: VanessaFry@boisestate.edu
Lantz McGinnis-Brown, M.P.A: lantzbrown@boisestate.edu
Gabe Osterhout, M.A: gabeOsterhout@boisestate.edu

Victimology and Victim Services
Dr. Lane Gillespie: LaneGillespie@boisestate.edu
Dr. Laura King: LauraKing2@boisestate.edu
Danielle Swerin, M.A.: DanielleSwerin@boisestate.edu

Women in Politics
Dr. Lori Hausegger: LoriHausegger@boisestate.edu
Dr. Jaclyn J. Kettler: JaclynKettler@boisestate.edu
Dr. Sanghee Park: SangheePark@boisestate.edu
Let us know how we can help you!

To support these surveys or to inquire about how we can conduct a survey for your organization, please contact:

Dr. Andrew Giacomazzi
Interim Dean of the School of Public Service
agliacom@boisestate.edu
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