Data from the Initial On-Campus Stadium Proposal Forums

At the end of each of 10 initial forums held in late February and early March, participants completed a two page survey at the end of the process. The front side focused on the issue of the stadium, and five questions on the back evaluated the forums and allowed additional open comment. This document includes all the data from those surveys. 221 at least partially completed surveys were collected. By the keypads, 259 participated in the forums, but a few participants either left early, or chose not to complete a survey. Scans of all the original surveys are available online at www.cpd.colostate.edu.
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Part 1: Overview and Key Findings

The CPD designed and facilitated the 10 initial forums concerning the stadium proposal. A full explanation of the CPD role is available online at www.cpd.colostate.edu, as well as data from all the forums. Participants were placed in small groups of 5 to 8, with a facilitator and notetaker from the CPD. The forums began with a brief overview of the stadium process and explanation of the purpose of the forums by either CPD director Martín Carcasson or associate director Leah Sprain. Using wireless keypads, a series of initial questions captured demographics and an initial response to a series of value questions. The initial list of values included:

1. A legitimate decision-making process, including significant public engagement
2. CSU academic quality
3. Effective management of CSU resources
4. Environmental stewardship and green leadership
5. Financial sustainability and affordability of CSU
6. Fort Collins economy
7. High quality of life in communities surrounding CSU
8. Strong CSU athletics program
9. Strong CSU-Alumni relationship
10. Strong CSU-Community relationship

All the data from the keypads is available at the end of this report. Discussions then shifted to the small groups, who first responded to the list of values. Groups then completed a mapping process using visual maps of the pro and con argument of the stadium proposal (copies of the complete maps are all posted online). Due to confusion and inconsistencies in how people completed the maps, this report does not provide analysis of the maps. After the mapping exercise, participants were introduced to the CPD backgrounder, and spent most of the remainder of the time working through particular arguments on that document. With a few minutes left, they were asked to complete a two page survey with questions about the backgrounder.

The backgrounder (available at http://www.colostate.edu/stadium/cpd-stadium-backgrounder.pdf) was created by the CPD working as an independent resource and represents a summary of arguments being made concerning the stadium proposal. It was developed from analysis of various forms of public input and comment that were available at that time, including comments from the input forms at the first stadium advisory committee meeting and online; articles, letters, and message board comments at the Coloradoan; discussion at on-line sites such as the CSU alumni Linked In site and Facebook and petition sites, as well as information from the athletic department and members of the Save our Stadium, Hughes group. The document served as a starting point and a “living document” throughout the process. It did not represent a full and final representation of the arguments, but rather something for groups to react to that seeks to fairly lay out the arguments currently being offered. The document was designed to help us move from a polarized debate to robust deliberation concerning this issue that considers multiple perspectives.
Key points from the survey and keypad data:

- 259 participants attended at least one of the 10 forums. 53% of those that attended were opposed to the stadium (34% strongly), while 24% for in support (15% strongly). The remaining 23% self-identified as in the middle (10% did not have enough information, and 13% are currently conflicted). While the opinions of those that attended the forums should not be overemphasized—they were not necessarily a representative group—they do represent a group of stakeholders that through their participation in the forum were clearly exposed to both sides of the issue, and had the opportunity over two hours to discuss many of the issues involved with the stadium in some depth, often with people at the table that disagreed with them. Their opinions in the final survey, therefore, generally represent a higher quality of data than typical from a survey.

- Questions 2 and 3 on the keypad data at the end of this report provides demographic information of the participants. Question 2 allowed them to choose multiple options, question 3 asked them to choose one primary connection. 29% primarily identified as “community members,” 25% as athletics fans, 10% as CSU employees, 9% as alumni, 8% as students, 6% as CSU neighbors, 4% as CSU parents, 3% as CSU donors, 2% as faculty, and 4% as other.

- A preliminary CPD analysis identified 10 key values underlying arguments both for and against the stadium proposal. The keypad data (part 11 of this report) shows how participants reacted to those values with questions 4-7. CSU academic quality was clearly the most important value held by participants, and “financial stability and affordability of CSU” was second. Having a strong CSU athletic department was only chosen by 35% and a strong CSU-Alumni relationship was chosen only by 37% of the participants when they could pick as many values as they wanted, the two lowest numbers. Overall, participants did not support those as key values on their own.

- Participants were asked for the 3 most important values from the list, and then were asked which they thought should be the most important for CSU when they make this decision. Between the two questions, CSU academic quality moved from 64 to 67%, remaining the highest chosen value. Financial stability and affordability of CSU increased from 47% to 63%, and effective management of resources increased from 30% to 45%, the two largest increases. The “High quality of life in communities surrounding CSU” dropped the most, from 33% to 12%.

- Part 2 of this report provides results from the end of forum questions concerning what people considered the most important argument areas. Community impacts were seen as the most important issue, and those impacts were strongly considered negative. The funding of the stadium, the impact on academics, the impact on CSU funding, and the appropriate role of athletics at the university were considered 2nd, 3rd, and 4th, and 5th most important. Each was considered more negative than positive, but all four were cited by both sides. This data is being used to update the background for the May 30th meeting.

- The assessment of the forums overall were very positive (see parts 6-10). A main function of the forums was to test the impartiality and completeness of the backgrounder, and a strong majority supported the document. Participants were asked for changes, and generally only minor changes or additions were offered (see part 4).
Part 2: Most important issue

Participants were asked the questions on the first three columns below on the survey. The fourth column was developed from the notes from the small group discussions. During the process, participants were asked what topics they wanted to spend time discussing, with each participant picking one issue and the facilitator capturing that data. Each small group then had 45 minutes to talk through that list of chosen issues. The “Total” column simply adds across to provide an overall sense of which of the issues A-R from the backgrounder garnered the most attention.

Table 1: Overview of Responses Concerning Key Arguments

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Rank</th>
<th>Of arguments A-R, circle up to three* you feel are the most important for deciding this issue</th>
<th>Of arguments A-R, circle up to three* you feel are the strongest in support of the stadium?</th>
<th>Of arguments A-R, circle up to three* you feel are the strongest in opposition to the stadium?</th>
<th>Topics chosen for further discussion during small group conversations</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>D. Community impacts</td>
<td>84</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>108</td>
<td>36</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>F. Funding of stadium</td>
<td>58</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>48</td>
<td>28</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>K. Impact on academics and core mission</td>
<td>65</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>51</td>
<td>30</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>C. Impact on CSU funding and affordability</td>
<td>72</td>
<td>31</td>
<td>41</td>
<td>15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>G. Appropriate role of athletics at a university</td>
<td>45</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>58</td>
<td>21</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>J. Location</td>
<td>55</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>59</td>
<td>20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>B. Impact on football team and national profile</td>
<td>33</td>
<td>67</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td>H. Environmental impact/message</td>
<td>41</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>52</td>
<td>14</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9</td>
<td>A. Impact on alumni connection</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>57</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>14</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10</td>
<td>L. Multi-function facility</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>46</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11</td>
<td>E. Utilizing Hughes to achieve these new goals</td>
<td>32</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>38</td>
<td>14</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12</td>
<td>M. Current state of Hughes Stadium</td>
<td>33</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>32</td>
<td>15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13</td>
<td>Q. Impact on Fort Collins economy</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>33</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14</td>
<td>R. Game day experience</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15</td>
<td>P. Impact on other CSU sports</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>33</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16</td>
<td>O. Student Attendance</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>32</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17</td>
<td>I. Quality of new facility</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>18</td>
<td>N. Athletic conference issues</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>622</td>
<td>479</td>
<td>592</td>
<td>268</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Because Table 1 includes how participants identified the most important arguments both for and against the stadium proposal, the data in the table provides a sense of which argument areas were generally considered as for or against the stadium. By simply comparing the gaps between the 2\textsuperscript{nd} and 3\textsuperscript{rd} columns, the results are as follows (including arguments with at least a gap of 20):

**Argument areas with largest gaps in opposition to the stadium**
1. D. Community impacts (+99 in opposition)
2. J. Location (+50)
3. H. Environmental impact/message (+41)
4. G. Appropriate role of athletics at a university (+33)
5. K. Impacts on academics and core mission (+33)
6. E. Utilizing Hughes to achieve these new goals (+29)
7. M. Current state of Hughes (+20)

**Argument areas with largest gaps in favor of the stadium**
1. B. Impact on football team and national profile (+55 in favor)
2. A. Impact on alumni (+49)
3. L. Multi-function facility (+33)
4. O. Student attendance (+27)
5. Q. Impact on Fort Collins economy (+24)
6. I. Quality of new facility (+20)

**That leaves 6 argument areas with a gap of less than 20 either way**
F. Funding of stadium (gap of 18 opposed)
P. Impact on other CSU sports (gap of 15 opposed)
C. Impact on CSU funding and affordability (gap of 10 opposed)
N. Athletic conference issues (gap of 8 in favor)
R. Game day experience (gap of 19 in favor)
Part 3: What was the most important argument that you heard today?
Participants were also provided space on the form to provide open ended comments on what they perceived to be the most important specific argument that they heard during the forum, as well as identify what argument area it was connected to, if applicable. First column below includes those answers when the participants only chose one argument areas as instructed. "Extras" includes when multiple picks were made (i.e. some participants listed 2-4 “most important” arguments).

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Most important argument</th>
<th>Participant Chose One</th>
<th>Extras</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>D. Community impacts</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>30</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>K. Impact on academics and core mission</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>24</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C. Impact on CSU funding and affordability</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>18</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>F. Funding of stadium</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>18</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>H. Environmental impact/message</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>14</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>L. Multi-function facility</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A. Impact on alumni connection</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>14</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B. Impact on football team and national profile</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>E. Utilizing Hughes to achieve these new goals</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>G. Appropriate role of athletics at a university</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>14</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>J. Location</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>M. Current state of Hughes Stadium</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>N. Athletic conference issues</td>
<td>3</td>
<td></td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Q. Impact on Fort Collins economy</td>
<td>3</td>
<td></td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>R. Game day experience</td>
<td>3</td>
<td></td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>O. Student Attendance</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I. Quality of new facility</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>P. Impact on other CSU sports</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Comments provided in this section:

**A. Impact on alumni connection**
- Denver alumni in our group who travels for all games. What makes him come up.
- It was good to hear the viewpoints of alums and athletes
- Connection with the university
- Student athletes/academics

**B. Impact on football team and national profile**
- The vision and future of the athletic departments will inspire and motivate students to become lifelong fans, donors, and overall supporters

**C. Impact on CSU funding and affordability**
- Not only being able to afford the stadium, but sustainability for years to come as well as focusing on the main purpose of CSU. --> Academics - building a strong economy post college
- I am a full time student with 3 jobs. I would really like to see CSU be more adorable or remain relatively affordable for future generations of students who are not as fortunate to have work like I do.
- use of resources
- C &D will sink or float this entire issue
• The funding must be private including the razing and reposition of current buildings
• Specific definitions of what constitutes stadium construction needs to be made. Private funding covers the costs, but what about hidden costs, indirect issues cause by razing, construction, etc.
• How do we fund CSU? What do we value most?

D. Community impacts
• Where will people park
• Impact on neighborhoods!
• Parking! Don't sacrifice academics or change core mission to focus on athletics. It might not work. Use academics to draw students.
• If built: impact of expected increased student population
• Impact on community in all areas is 12 months of the year, not just 6 "football Saturdays"
• Source of "Private" funding, neighborhood impact, effect on credibility on government at federal, state and local level that this ostentatious expense makes "fiscal conservatism" an insult to reason.
• As a student I did not realize the immense impact on neighbors
• Need to address: traffic, parking, noise as you discuss location
• Negative impact on adjacent community; parking noise, trash

E. Utilizing Hughes to achieve these new goals
• The Hughes Stadium does not have as many multi-use opportunities i.e. dorm living
• Hughes is already there and a stadium does not create a winning football team
• New stadium would be an useful and important venue for the future of CSU
• A stadium assumes athletics are more important than they really are. The diverse student body should be honored.
• Is "private money" truly available
• I believe that the committee is underestimating how much this stadium
• there is a difference in football success and a new stadium. A new stadium is a want and not a need.
• One of our group suggested reusing $ for stadium and academics simultaneously. One donation then split 50/50
• Fundraising to focus on whole of university
• issue of definite funding & what happens if we go over the budget

G. Appropriate role of athletics at a university
• I think this was the biggest issue we dealt with (who benefits, who cares, etc.)

H. Environmental impact/message
• superfluous building aren’t green
• had not really considered the gravity of this element
• Students come to CSU for the "green" sustainable lifestyle. Football success is not a value.
• CSU is a sustainable school. We need to maintain our opinion either way.
• CSU does not need this stadium. Do we need the extra funding? Even if we did, the funds could be generated from other avenues. Environmental sustainability should be the most important focus on everything we do, we have Hughes, why do we need to add something unnecessary?

J. Location
• In terms of transportation, environment, and community impact.
• Location hasn't even been determined. This causes mass speculation about various aspects of debate. For example: funding, traffic issues, environ. Issues, etc.

K. Impact on academics and core mission
• New stadium is not relevant to the academic role and mission fo the university.
• Seems very chicken and eggish. We should increase alumni involvement because we are a great university, not because of a building/football team. Not everyone cares about football.
• Most arguments against funneled into K and was articulately using Murray Sperber's Beer and Circus as a resource.
• Building a stadium on campus will inevitably take away from academics because of the land the will be used. Something will be lost, such as academic agricultural land.
• Any future for CSU needs to be aligned around a core value that is loftier than profit
• Funding for the stadium may be coming from outside donors, but why not ask them to donate to academics instead?
• Intercollegiate athletics have no place on CSU's campus!
• None of the concern lead to the conclusion we need a new stadium to do the job. The argument of money will flow from athletic to academic, etc. are completely empty. I see no prove and I see no reason why things cannot go to the opposite like improve academic --> the improve athletic

L. Multi-function facility
• multi-use
• I had not considered the notion of a multi-use facility
• the stadium could be redeveloped to accommodate so much more than the football games

M. Current state of Hughes Stadium
• Hughes can be made to satisfy many of the goals the proposed stadium claims.
• Hughes is fundamentally flawed: shaky foundations, outdated architecture
• I think that if they want a new stadium, use the one they have. It would be cheaper to just renovate Hughes rather than building a new stadium as well as using money to take down Hughes.
• What's wrong with Hughes? Can't we make additions/improvements to Hughes that will create the same outcomes as building a new stadium?

N. Athletic conference issues
• Need to get to more lucrative conference that win pay $15-20M in TV revenues. Also, location and doing a quality mixed use facility

O. Student Attendance
• Students won't necessarily attend a new stadium without a winning team

Q. Impact on Fort Collins economy
• A stadium done right can add to Fort Collins

R. Game day experience
• I really do wonder what impact the stadium will have on the before-game activities. Tailgating and alcohol have been a significant part of our previous experiences at Hughes

General comments not tied to a specific argument
• Mandate of CSU as land grant university
• parking on-campus
• Must be multi-use, need a new game day experience
• role of athletics vs. academics
• makes no sense
• That these are "billionaire" alumni who want us to succeed in athletics as well as academics
• Traffic problems, academics negatively impacted
• How can you justify tearing up on campus buildings etc when CSU owns land where if possible a new stadium could be built to replace Hughes (re-use current place)
• Lack of trust in the process, the committee makeup, and lack of factual information. 2. That the potential long term negative impact on students is not being fully weighed into equation. 3. Why football? Couldn't we be a basketball great like Duke?
• Not on your list! Need for CSU to pursue attentive sources of funding such as licensing nights to inventions or products designed by CSU researchers. (eg. Lithium batteries)
• That the real economic issues facing CSU is not the athletic programs it is the lost revenues of Intellectual Properties from CSU research. "Billions lost"
• If the stadium was built on campus and was multi functional, it could be used more often than just for games, and could mitigate adverse impacts of games on surrounding community.
• Impact on community
• The most important has been that for most people athletics is not the most important aspect of the university, albeit a fun & exciting one. Pride in the university is drawn from many places. I also learned that football does draw a revenue which supports other sports.
• the stadium is not equal to a good team
• That the stadium does not need to be located on campus to have the goals of the new stadium met for most arguments
• Location restrictions very appropriate. Multi-functional stadium is possible/should be goal.
• All had valuable points/args
• Bad community impacts, over emphasis on sports over academics, questionable economic benefit (university may actually lose money) for a few old town bar/restaurant is just too. Hughes is nice facility so use it to accomplish goals for athletic program & augment university finances
• How green is it really to build a new stadium where is the funding for the stadium going to come from after the private donations are used to build the stadium where is parking going to be
• I believe Jack Graham's goals are good. However, I don't believe the way to those goals is through a new stadium at least from the information we currently have.
• Attendance increasing as well as footballs ability increasing
• We have an opportunity to create a spark in athletics that will result in financial benefit as well as pride in the university on a bigger scale.
• Prospect of CSU's conference move
• Impact environmentally

Comments tied to those that chose multiple “most important arguments”
• A, E - Alumni involvement - new/importance in fundraising  E- How to use Hughes to achieve better football/funding
• C, F, H - Student insight was very important to me and helped change some of my views
• D, G, L - One student at our table hit it on the nail – CSU is trying to be something that it is NOT - It is not an athletic exceller and shouldn't try to pretend that FOOTBALL will be the answer to so many things
• D, M - what is the life span for Hughes? What are its current maintenance costs?
• J, M - Using the existing stadium with needed improvements, in its current beautiful setting makes sense - both ecologically & for minimal negative impact on the community
• J,K - Keep university green-not much green left on campus and need to maintain what is left-need to update existing facilities on campus-
Part 4: What new additions or changes to the backgrounder would you suggest?

121 surveys left this question blank. Answers are categorized below. Overall, there were not many similar suggested changes; the backgrounder seemed to hold up very well. Most comments here focused on slight adjustments or asked for additional data.

**Suggested changes not tied to current categories or about combining categories (10)**
- Clarify into two categories the community impact 1) adjacent 2) Ft. Collins
- Combining E & M
- Focus on direct stadium impact rename arguments that are not changed by location of stadium
- I think there are some topical redundancies like E-M, C-K
- Larimer County, Process - separate category
- M and E could be merged or at least put next to each other because they're so similar
- Parking issues!
- something about transportation & infrastructure
- There is a definite weather impact
- Transportation

**Suggestions for minor changes to topics that are already somewhat included in the backgrounder (18)**
- Emphasize the multi-purpose aspect
- Talk about use of land and open space that would be taken away by building the stadium. PERC might be destroyed.
- The Morrill Act's mandate that we are here for agriculture and the "common" state resident
- Quality of life throughout the entire community, not just adjacent to stadium!
- A more serious statement related to possible environmental impacts
- A strong alumni organization is a must for CSU to grow regardless of stadium. Issue: How can CSU builds overall support for all aspects of CSU?
- I would consider the effects that a winning team would have on admissions to the university & our school's support & spirit.
- If all the $ is coming from private donors and not student or state funding in any way why would you turn down a $200 million asset to campus. And remove anything about increased TV exposure because it wouldn't change at all because of the Mountain West Conference media restrictions.
- Impact of increasing the size of the stadium
- Impact on student experience
- Impacts to CSU employees, additional costs of game day security & vandalism
- Remember Penn State - We don't want to be a Penn State where football is overdone
- Talk about school pride
- The new bus routes/systems Alcohol consumption
- To build a better transit system to Hughes from campus. Utilize Hughes and make it more green and/or larger
- Tradition associated with Hughes
- What about maintenance of new stadium?
- I would like to see an argument focusing on the students.

**Requests for additional data and information (33)**
- Qualifications of AD
- Add the student survey (ASCSU) Jan 2012 that found only 5% of students gave priority to an athletics program.
- Concrete info. Transportation(and packing)-possible evacuations?
• **Add research** listings from alumni associations, business analysts etc. to pro/con arguments. These for/against arguments are primarily opinion/ anecdotal and therefore not helpful to decision making.

• An honest balanced, thorough analysis of options (e.g. Hughes, new stadium) for achieving specific university objectives

• Data from a recent poll of ± 500 students.

• Data from controllable studies our process involves in developing a good football team.

• Data to back up arguments

• Evaluate if property values would detrimentally be affected by nearby stadium.

• Explain the commonly asked questions, what has and hasn't been decided. Cost benefit analysis, comparable areas, etc.

• Factual information based on experiences at other comparable universities

• How does inserting new stadium in the picture/plans fit with the long term planning for CSU facilitates to plan space

• How much they get paid

• I'd like context - other stadiums, communities universities, models - whether successes of cautionary tales. This entire endeavor & undertaking has been tried and done (well) before!

• Information of the current athletic budget spending, facts and figures. Examples of other athletic departments nationally and how successful you must be to turn a profit.

• Information on maintenance costs of proposed facility and how these costs will be paid for!

• It will be good to get the proposed locations of the proposed stadium to make more specific judgments.

• Location-can't give though. Other uses proposed for the stadium and Hughes

• Long term academics of CSU

• More comparisons to other schools with on campus vs off campus stadiums

• More facts about priorities between athletics and academics

• more financial projections

• more info on possibilities at Hughes

• More information about where, when, how much

• much information is not available for us to consider

• Some factual data that relates to the stadium or supports statements, case studies of other stadiums.

• Some kind of proof - it is all so theoretical at this point, I can't believe that this is even being discussed as a viable option

• student/fan routes out of the stadium after the game.

• What might unintended consequences of each decision (build/don't build) be?

• What other factors are impacting performance of the team nationally

• What state is the current stadium in. Will it need to be updated? Conference Needs?

• What will be done w/ Hughes and the surrounding land?

• What would become of the current stadium and grounds?

**Comments/Suggestions concerning the overall process, suggestions (but not specifically about back grounder content) (14)**

• Less options for tonight’s time constraints i.e. we could not have lengthy conversations

• Less speakers, no boxed blue form - too leading - allow for more time to discuss green sheet.

• make an a-r list of the topics so I don't have to keep flipping through them

• Make an addition to initial analysis of key values underlying the arguments for and against the proposal: "perceived need for new stadium" "Is a new stadium necessary?"

• Maybe age group. Get more student involvement. Advertise more in statewide papers to get alumni.

• space to submit written questions of factual nature

• Take pressure off plan time - two years is far too soon because invalued in such an athletic "renewal"
• When people call to RSVP notify them of the backgrounder being online so they can have a chance to read it in advance
• Clearer instructions, i.e. "mapping" at the session
• Have a presentations on the proposed sites for the stadium
• Discuss exit strategy - how to avoid this being a wedge issue (regardless of the final decision)
• I don’t know, but it is hard to follow/understand without prior studying
• Ease of backgrounder could be more clear
• What teachable opportunities are we missing with the process.

Suggestions not clearly related to the backgrounder or process (2)
• We should build a stadium for $700 million not $100 million make it count, a landmark for CSU, Ft. C, and Colorado. 2. This would engender that we not only teach information but we teach "CAN DO".
• Current Hughes needs more bathrooms, concession access, and parking paving 3 Lanes must be open for west bound traffic to stadium on Saturday mornings

Positive comments concerning the backgrounder ("none" is considered a positive comment since the question asked about suggested additions or changes) (23)
• Addressed all issues I could think of. State projections or outcomes what could happen
• Backgrounder is fine
• Backgrounder is ok. It is how you use it that is critical
• good as it is
• Great arguments!
• It all seems good. Maybe to include more detail in a few of the arguments.
• it was easy and clear to understand
• N/a
• N/A
• Nice job!
• No it was good
• none
• None
• none
• none
• None - a good approach
• None, it was good and well facilitated in the discussion.
• Not at this time
• not sure
• Nothing, it was great.
• seems fine
• seems good as is
• Well done
Part 5: Which issue in particular would you like to see more research done for both sides?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>One options chosen</th>
<th>Multiple chosen</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>F. Funding of stadium</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>37</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>D. Community impacts</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>35</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C. Impact on CSU funding and affordability</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>28</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>M. Current state of Hughes Stadium</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>18</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>E. Utilizing Hughes to achieve these new goals</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>16</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>H. Environmental impact/message</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>25</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Q. Impact on Fort Collins economy</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>19</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B. Impact on football team and national profile</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>J. Location</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>L. Multi-function facility</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A. Impact on alumni connection</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>14</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>K. Impact on academics and core mission</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>17</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>P. Impact on other CSU sports</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>G. Appropriate role of athletics at a university</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>13</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I. Quality of new facility</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>N. Athletic conference issues</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>R. Game day experience</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>O. Student Attendance</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Additional Comments:

A. Impact on alumni connection
   - The research should have been a part of the forums.
   - Just a list of solid evidence
   - Stats for alumni giving at CSU for athletics vs. academics & how this compares to other schools -- local and national

B. Impact on football team and national profile
   - cost of stadium/location
   - I would like to see data to support the premise that better stadium = better football = self-supporting/ self-funded. Prove it!

C. Impact on CSU funding and affordability
   - Can the stadium cost cover all costs long term (ie 40 years) without higher tuition or fees.
   - This is important. I believe it’s a plus.
   - it seems like there are a lot of different studies real world examples of where a stadium worked & where it didn’t. There just seems a lot of risk. Is true a way to research the financial impacts a little more deeply?
   - How has building a better sports facility affect other universities?
   - How does it affect CSU & FC’s financial health & well-being
   - No evidence that athletes will bring in additional funds to the academic programs.

D. Community impacts
   - Impact on neighborhoods!
• Would it really improve recruiting? We'll root for the Rams even if not a nationally recognized football team or new stadium. Improve academics!!
• Transporting everyone in/out and parking are critical.
• Impacts on CSU neighbors and local economy, and access to CSU for students (for other activities) on game days.
• Develop a win-win proposal for raising funds for CSU academics and funds for new on campus stadium by splitting private donations with 1/2 stadium and 1/2 academics.
• We own a business on South Shields (eyecare) next to Summit and Ingersol Hall. We feel the impact of significant traffic and parking has not been evaluated and would significantly detract from our business.
• The potential site of proposed new stadium

E. Utilizing Hughes to achieve these new goals
• As a community and alumni - this could really provide everyone with a lot of possibilities. The question in my mind is what happens when the newness wears off?
• What's going to happen to Hughes? Is it just wasted money that just went into renovating it?
• There's no efforts making evaluation of term E. It's more or less an issue how the university sell the idea, not the idea is in nature to be failed.

F. Funding of stadium
• F, in combination with a true, accurate building cost analysis
• How does more football money further CSU's mission. Does the school need to continue to grow - is it overreaching?
• CSU needs and should build a new stadium. Now is the time to act & location is going to be the deciding factor, as well as co$t.
• cost benefits analysis should be done
• Future funding MUST be considered - there will be MASSIVE upset to students if we are paying for this new stadium (that many may not have been in support of) in the future.
• good discussion
• Make sure it is known it helps academics
• A member stated that of 120 NCAA Division I college sports programs, 20 are money-making and 100 are supported in large part by general college funds. I'd like to see data available easily to the public. Thanks!
• Multi-purpose aspects

G. Appropriate role of athletics at a university
• This is a green university! The environment is very important regardless. A thorough investigation/report needs to be done.

I. Quality of new facility
• All it says is that it would be "a jewel" or "ugly" more detail & research

J. Location
• Need for openness

L. Multi-function facility
• What will the stadium look like and what facilities will it provide. Where will it be located.

M. Current state of Hughes Stadium
• Hughes still has lots of life in it!
• About the only argument I have heard to even contemplate discussion of a new stadium is that Hughes is structurally deficient and unsafe.
• What will be done with the old stadium? Can it be deconstructed and partially recycled?
• Costs to keep maintaining and go forward with Hughes Stadium

Q. Impact on Fort Collins economy
• I don’t believe that the community benefit as much as is being advertised by stadium boosters.
• The impact of new stadium on local economies is unclear.

R. Game day experience
• There were many great points brought up the negative game exposure that I’d never experienced.

Comments from no argument letter circled
• Is the estimated $100-200 million cost accurate?
• Increase the connectivity of Hughes to the campus. What is the financial impact of a new stadium?
• Benchmarking the impact on-campus stadiums have had at other universities
• Feasibility of (traffic-community-long term funding)-
• Plans floated in 2005 for new stadium. Why did they disappear?
• How Hughes Stadium can be improved to make it a multiuse facility
• all of this flies in the face of an argument for university transparency: better transparency by the football staff ... closed practices, no media interviews, no asst coaches give interviews.
• blank
• I would like data on current football budget vs. projections with new stadium, with Hughes, and with no football.
• "Independence" of CSU
• ?
• cost benefits analysis is needed
• Location/funding
• Rehab the current stadium no go for a expensive new improved stadium
• All of the issues our group identified and the facilitators report.
• Resolution of parking issues
• More info on how CSU is funded now % state % tuition % research overhead. Some numbers on how high out of state tuition students could really help meet problem. How will upkeep of stadium be funded?
• Dollars needed to build stadium. Does research show that athletics really bring out of state students-show the facts.
• Economics. Does new stadium=better team=more attendance=more revenue? Economic impact on city
• No doubt the decision has been made. Nothing going to stop the momentum. Cynical? Yes. Just do it well.
• b4
• economic benefits are completely overstated - supporter of stadium must have had data/evidence on many levels to support such a huge impact on this community and they do not - to say it will help university budgets doesn’t make it so. Better use what already have - Hughes.
• How much revenue and sales tax is going to come out of a new stadium and how long is it before improved sales tax (if any) is seen and makes an impact
• I think all, I really want to see numbers on how this effects, good or bad aspects. For instance, how much does building a stadium increase student or alumni attendance? Where is there research to support claims.
• Location - which sites are being considered? Data to support arguments
• Possible future uses of Hughes Stadium especially as it relates to partnerships with the county and city
• If there were increased ticket sales and merchandising where would that money go? Athletics? Academics?
• Sustainability
• All the topics dealing with financials could use more data. I hope the committee is gathering this.

Comments from surveys that marked multiple letters
• B, J, Q - Would like to see empirical data from other schools that have tried similar things
• D, H, I - What would a multi-purpose facility look lie, and how would it function? What resources natural (e.g. concrete, stone) would be required to build the stadium and what environmental impact would that have? How would CSU offset that impact as a "green university"?
• C, H - We had several students are our table who attended for "extra credit" or field experiences. It would have been nice to have more members of the "outside CSU students" group in the discussion
• I, J - The stadium has to be unique to us
• F, H - The specific environmental impacts of a new stadium & what would happen to Hughes as well as a breakdown of the funding beyond construction (maintenance).
• F, L, M - Source of funds for maintenance and upkeep
• Need more information, but a good start to the process
• B, E, Q - More facts on how much income football generates. How often has Hughes sold out or been full in it whole history? Why can't we improve football team at less cost?
• J, K - Locations - pros/cons and impact on academics - could increased revenue "trickle over" into academic funding
• B, C, K - Just in general how high of a ranking would we need to make a positive out of state student profit return? How much money besides a new stadium does this require?
• D, L - I live in the university area -- Tony Frank, would you like this in your backyard? The blue Sheet I think is ridiculous, almost non-understandable...very confusing.
• J, K - I believe that these two are strongly intertwined
• F, H - How much will the maintenance of a campus stadium cost? Who is going to pay for this? How can this be built in a sustainable way? Is that even possible? If not then why is it even an option?
• A, B, D, F - data already exists for some of these as reported in the Coloradoan. The NCAA website, etc.
• C, D, F - Affordability, funding, community impact
• A, B, C, F, J - abc-some aren't contacted now; will they for the stadium? F - Give us more info about how this will happen
Part 6: Evaluation Question #1: Satisfaction with the discussion

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>“I was satisfied with today’s discussion”</th>
<th>Strongly agree</th>
<th>Agree</th>
<th>No opinion</th>
<th>Disagree</th>
<th>Strongly Disagree</th>
<th>Left blank</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>66</td>
<td>114</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>21</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>30.0%</td>
<td>51.6%</td>
<td>5.9%</td>
<td>3.2%</td>
<td>0.0%</td>
<td>9.5%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Percentages not including blanks

33.0% 57% 6.5% 3.5% 0.0%

**CPD summary:** Despite the fact this was a polarized issue and participants were, if possible, placed in small groups with people with opposing views, an overwhelming majority (90%) of those that answered this question either agreed or strongly agreed that they were satisfied with the discussion. These results are particularly uplifting to the CPD, because it shows that a process can be designed putting together strong proponents and opponents on a very polarized issue that has spurred many heated comments in the media or through email, and they can together work through a difficult issue in a way they ultimately find an enjoyable experience. The work of the CPD is focused on creating opportunities for productive interaction between perspectives on tough issues—opportunities we rarely have in the 21st century—and these results show that not only are just interactions possible, but participants find them satisfying.

**Comments provided under this question:**

**From participants that answered “Strongly Agree”**
- girls did a great job mediating
- good facilitation of discussion
- Great respectful dialogue. I learned a lot about both sides and now have a more fully formed and educated opinion on this issue.
- It was a great discussion it’s a lot of diverse opinions. The process itself inspired respectful participatory dialogue. I felt some people were more inclined to interrupt & dominate the conversation.
- very helpful and much more value centered than either Jack Graham's Feb. 3 meeting or SOSH meetings

**From participants that answered “Agree”**
- good discussion but I don’t think that any opinions were changed
- I feel both sides were heard
- It was too short
- nothing can be done about, but the makeup of the crowd was overwhelmingly opposed
- There was a good balance of supporters as well as nonsupporters
- too complicated
- Exceptionally well thought out, designed and implemented.
- fascinating conversation

**From participants that answered “Disagree”**
- ask for a quick view of which 3-4 want to talk about most not enough time for each argument
- Some participants dominated the conversation and I wasn’t able to express my full perspective
- The CPD did a great job, Participants were respectful. However, 6 of the 7 people at our table live immediately near CSU & were highly focused on the pacts to their neighborhood.
Part 7: Evaluation Question #2: Helpfulness of the Facilitator

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Strongly agree</th>
<th>Agree</th>
<th>No opinion</th>
<th>Disagree</th>
<th>Strongly Disagree</th>
<th>Left blank</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>102</td>
<td>90</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>22</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>46.2%</td>
<td>40.7%</td>
<td>2.3%</td>
<td>0.5%</td>
<td>0.5%</td>
<td>10.0%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Percentages not including blanks

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Strongly agree</th>
<th>Agree</th>
<th>No opinion</th>
<th>Disagree</th>
<th>Strongly Disagree</th>
<th>Left blank</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>51.3%</td>
<td>45.2%</td>
<td>2.5%</td>
<td>0.5%</td>
<td>0.5%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**CPD summary:** An overwhelming majority (96.5% of those who answered the question) felt the facilitator was helpful to the process. The CPD trains CSU undergraduates, graduate students, and community members to serve as small group facilitators to assist in our processes. Small groups allow much more interaction between perspectives, as well as allow more people to talk at one time, rather than the typical “3 minutes at the microphone” style public meeting. The facilitator helps run the process, takes notes, keeps it on time, sparks interaction through questions and paraphrasing, and enforces ground rules to help insure a more productive and civil discussion. The CPD is part of two different networks of around 100 centers and institutes that do similar work, but we are one of the very few that rely on students as our facilitators. These results show that students are certainly capable of fulfilling the difficult task of facilitating controversial issues with the public.

**Comments provided under this question:**

*From participants that answered “Strongly Agree”*
- both did a good job facilitating
- Dilan and Kirstin were excellent
- Jack rocks!
- thank you!
- They did well with transitions between topics as well as staying true to the schedule
- they were great at keeping the conversation on track & checking.
- well done!

*From participants that answered “Agree”*
- Agree, but she didn't control very well toward the ground rules and wouldn't let me have the hard copy of the Frank letter. In the future, maybe have people raise hands be recognized and not go on and on. I'm glad she didn’t evil, a.k.a., devil has enough advocacy suggest injected a thought redirect conversation.
- I feel the facilitator did an effective job of making sure both sides were heard and understood
- it was a start
- They could have tried to focus the discussion better at times.
Part 8: Evaluation Question #3: Impartiality of the Facilitator

Participants were presented with the following prompt:

Your facilitator(s): (check all that apply)
- did not seem to advocate a particular point of view
- played devil’s advocate as necessary
- Seemed strongly biased toward the stadium
- Seemed slightly biased toward the stadium
- Seemed strongly biased against the stadium
- Seemed slightly biased against the stadium

Results for this question:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Did not seem to advocate a particular point of view</th>
<th>Played devil’s advocate as necessary</th>
<th>Seemed strongly biased toward the stadium</th>
<th>Seemed slightly biased toward the stadium</th>
<th>Seemed strongly biased against the stadium</th>
<th>Seemed slightly biased against the stadium</th>
<th>Left blank</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>165</td>
<td>96</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>23</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>74.7%</td>
<td>43.4%</td>
<td>0.9%</td>
<td>1.8%</td>
<td>0.0%</td>
<td>1.4%</td>
<td>10.41%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Percentages not including blanks:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Did not seem to advocate a particular point of view</th>
<th>Played devil’s advocate as necessary</th>
<th>Seemed strongly biased toward the stadium</th>
<th>Seemed slightly biased toward the stadium</th>
<th>Seemed strongly biased against the stadium</th>
<th>Seemed slightly biased against the stadium</th>
<th>Left blank</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>83.3%</td>
<td>48.5%</td>
<td>1.0%</td>
<td>2.0%</td>
<td>0.0%</td>
<td>1.5%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**CPD summary:** These results were also very satisfying to the CPD. The facilitators are trained to be impartial in that their personal view is not relevant, but at the same time they are trained to help insure a full discussion that considers multiple perspectives. Playing devil’s advocate while remaining impartial is certainly a difficult task. That task is made even more difficult when the groups being facilitated are polarized or imbalanced. For many of the forums, both conditions existed, meaning the students were likely often put in the role of introducing opposing views to draw reaction from the participants. Nonetheless, participants overwhelmingly answered that the facilitators completed their roles very well. 93 participants (42% of the surveys) choose both “did not seem to advocate a particular point of view” and “played devil’s advocate as necessary.” The total of responses is more than 221 because people chose multiple options. Only 9 of the 221 (4.1%) participants that completed surveys felt the facilitators were biased in any way, with 7 of those 9 choosing that they were “slightly” biased.

**Written comments concerning facilitators:**

**From participants that picked played devil’s advocate as necessary:**
- Can work on neutrality - be careful about quoting Jack Graham.
- good job from both, fair and kept discussion moving forward
- The women were very professional - nice job!

**From participants that picked both “Did not seem to advocate a particular point of view” and played devil’s advocate as necessary:**
- was great both Lauren & Ryan! Great job Ryan for first time
- great job!
- helped us understand each other’s views
- Neutral to very slight bias for the stadium
- could have been more of a devil’s advocate, draw the people into the discussion who were no actively participating
- excellent facilitator!! 2 hours passed quickly
- Overall, she was very good. Alex, another CPD student and Wesley another student. Impressive young people.
- they did a very good job
- they did explain Mr. Graham’s viewpoint
- they were totally neutral

**From participant that picked strongly biased toward stadium:**
- I only see facilitator explain the support opinion to people opposing it. However, not a time for explaining opposing opinions to supporters.

**From participant that picked slightly biased toward stadium:**
- (but maybe because the pro-stadium participants were pretty mean)
Part 8: Evaluation Question #4: Impartiality of the process and background material

The process and background materials:

- ☐ didn’t seem to advocate a particular point of view
- ☐ Seemed strongly biased toward the stadium
- ☐ Seemed slightly biased toward the stadium
- ☐ Seemed slightly biased against the stadium
- ☐ Seemed strongly biased against the stadium

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Did not seem to advocate a particular point of view</th>
<th>Seemed strongly biased toward the stadium</th>
<th>Seemed slightly biased toward the stadium</th>
<th>Seemed strongly biased against the stadium</th>
<th>Seemed slightly biased against the stadium</th>
<th>Left blank</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>158</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>30</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>71.5%</td>
<td>1.8%</td>
<td>10.4%</td>
<td>0.9%</td>
<td>1.8%</td>
<td>13.5%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Percentages not including blanks:

| 82.7%                                              | 2.1%                                     | 12%                                      | 1%                                       | 2.1%                                     | n/A       |

CPD summary: One important piece of data that helps situate this information was captured with a keypad survey at the beginning of the meeting rather than the ending survey. During that process, we asked for the initial position of the participants concerning the stadium proposal (all the results from keypad questions are available at the end of this report.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>How do you currently feel about the proposed stadium? (from keypad questions)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Strongly opposed</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>89</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>34%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Considering how polarized the issue has been and that the forums were attended by more in opposition than support, the results concerning the backgrounder showing some concern about bias toward the stadium is somewhat understandable. Of those answering the question, only 14.1% felt the process or background documents were slightly biased, and 3.1% felt they were strongly biased. More certainly felt it was biased toward the stadium than against, but bias was perceived both ways. Impartiality is certainly a difficult target with a complex, polarized issue, and avoiding the perception of being “slightly” biased when participants begin a forum with a strong opinion is a tall order.

Additional comments added under the question:

Chose “did not seem to advocate a particular point of view”
- seems confining
- Excellent plus over all.
- I feel it accurately represents what people have been saying on this issue
- showed both sides
- The information gathering is pretty good.
- the material was very well prepared
- tried too hard to be balanced
- very informative

Chose “Seemed strongly biased toward the stadium”
- especially the "blue sheet"
Chose “Seemed slightly biased toward the stadium”
- lacked background materials
- Materials provide a great information to both sides
- except the blue sheet this seems slightly more biased toward new stadium
- some were not complete, or bias
- the process is too far along for this meeting

Chose “Seemed slightly biased against the stadium”
- one person dominated too much

Part 10: Final survey question: Responses concerning additional concerns, suggestions, and comments on the process

The final question on the post-forum survey was: Do you have any specific concerns, suggestions, or comments you would like to share about either the CPD process or the broader Stadium Advisory Board process?

Below are all the answers provided (many surveys left this question blank).

- Add transportation
- all I would like to say is that I am not for the stadium. It is coming down to "want v. need" People want a new stadium, we don't need one. We already have Hughes. The new stadium is kind of a stupid idea.
- All it takes is a spark! Ex: Boise state, Oregon, TCU
- allow natural convos to take their course instead of forcing to change topic
- Background material strongly biased to new stadium.
- Being a CSU employee, the timing of this issue is poor considering no raises and hiring freezes have taken place the past 4 years.
- Better communication of the "real cost" of the stadium.
- Build it!
- Build it!
- Cite is going to be particularly important for a more detailed discussion for local impacts.
- Cost benefit analysis is needed/Comparing a new stadium vs. renovating Hughes/ Too many critical piece of info are missing: proposed sites, economic impact to Fort Collins, measurable goals How do you measure "enhance the campus and student experience"
- Don't know if it is avoidable but the discussion tends to devolve quickly into more general comments about athletics. It is also frustrating how many arguments are mostly conclusory statements. Good session.
- Excellent process, would be nice to publish results in Coloradoan or Collegian media and online.
- Go rams!
- Good job!
- Good job!
- Great discussion - enjoyed the round table. Appreciated seeing the arguments consolidated into the backgrounder.
- Great job was not expecting this at all! What a great group of facilitators. Ryan and Lauren - they both know very well that they are ... Great training!! Like the small group setting brought that different views!
- Great job. (in comment area in "your facilitator" said great job as well)
- Great! Better than I expected.
- Had a hard time getting the group started
- How satisfied were you with today's discussions?: Very open. Good cooperation. Was the facilitator helpful?: Didn't need much but it worked well.

21
• I am concerned that the search for more money is based on a false value that is leading to using stadium as a way to be a bigger and better university. This search for success is akin to winning the lottery and not in line with the values of the citizens of Fort Collins.

• I have a strong concern that this was intended as a railroad job, e.g. Frank's paper, firings of coach and A.D., new A.D. on the job about two days, and oh, build a stadium on main campus as a high objective. Let's invade Poland, then come up with the rationale for why we did. "Ready, Fire, Aim" When the issue first came up I said "Get better bread and a new coliseum and maybe the lions and gladiators will perform better." Unfortunately, it has gone downhill from there. Enough bad news, the good news is that CSU has risen to the top of our consciousness and has made us all, at a minimum, cautious about trusting current administration, BOG, and some alumni.

• I have some concerns about the decision-making process, specifically about who, ultimately will make decision. My impression is that the committee is pretty biased. Also, I'm concerned about how T. Frank and the AD can reverse course on this and save face. For that reason alone, a new stadium seems like a foregone conclusion.

• I highly advise that the SAB consider the possibility that the majority of the participants in this discussion are neighbors who are most concerned with the impact to their homes & not what may be in the best interest of CSU.

• I really, truly hope that our opinions matter and they are taken heavily under consideration.

• I think it’s a good thing - discourse on the topic

• I think the mapping activity was formatted to be confusing, so the table could bond while experiencing frustration :-)

• I'll probably e-mail/add to online boards ideas come to mind.

• Is there an option to purchase property for the stadium?

• It appears that the Board is stacked in favor of the new on-campus stadium. Actions by the Admin seem to imply that the decision to build is a done deal. The facilitator was helpful: kept us on task and moving along.

• It appears to be a decision that has already been made and the SAB process is a railroad.

• Just the idea plan of new stadium site. Where to be located.

• Keep all directions at table side vs. by speaker to large group or they can explain 1 step at a time

• Keep up the great work. I appreciate what you all do

• Less press as a "done deal". Why isn't a new stadium at Hughes site an option?!?

• Listen to what F.C. wants! Not a stadium, please!

• Maintenance costs and full cost of removing existing buildup/building stadium=concern. Realistic expectations, viewpoint as the norm, if build stadium

• Martin Carcasson spent way too much time talking. When discussing the arguments on the backgrounder, there is no need to read about each argument. We can read, this took up valuable time.

• More stats & figures to make decision on as they become available through the process

• more than 1 public hearing/meeting - SAC may use this data for communication campaign

• My concerns are that CSU will not listen and that the CPD process like many "advisory opinions" are requested as a cursory attempt to claim, public input was provided when in fact it is not really considered P.S. I favor the stadium

• My only concern is that this process is to promote a democratic process, however the decision will not be made by the same - Tony Frank is basically it! I hope he makes the best choice: I don't envy him

• N/A

• Needs more community, alumni, student, faculty stake holders on the advisory board. Perhaps subcommittees of these four groups could be created immediately or very soon. I was satisfied with today's discussion: well done.

• Nice work with this process-please thank students, volunteers and Martin, "most excellent". Take out building-add green space then put in the stadium. Get the CSU staff off the committee and get community involved. How can "the academics"-core content be involved in next steps/vision? Have departments/units have classes work with the facility, ie currently hospitality industry works with Aspen Grill. Horti programs could use ground as a living lab and class. A museum to honor CSU history (ie CU has one across from Mac Auditorium).

• No, this was great

• No. Excellent experience.

• Open up stadium advisory board-not 14 people from university hand picked by university (president?)

• Open up the "site" meetings to the general public. This is a core issue for many community members and as a public institution CU should be transparent in its site deliberations.
• Opinions can & will be changed or cemented once a location can be identified.
• Overall ..of CSU worldwide Peace Corps or football
• Packed only with stadium supporters. The facilitator was helpful: we had 2. I was satisfied with today’s discussion: student facilitators handles the discussion well; several table members were very knowledgeable and added to my knowledge base.
• pictures of what the stadium would look like
• Please consider residents, streets, parking. Also, having 1 community member on the Adv. Board is alarming, disturbing, and embarrassing
• Please keep in mind the CSU vision, mission, and values statement!
• Please listen to the students!!!
• Please release an audit of the last 5 years of the athletic department - the Coloradoan gave summary data for 2010, and approx. $10 million of the $26 million comes from "CSU General Fund". In particular - where is all this "private money" that covered multiple salaries for terminated coaches and athletic directors?
• Please tell us what the plans are for Hughes Stadium if the new stadium is built.
• Please think about how the stadium would affect the game day experience
• Prove without shadow of a doubt the efficacy of this project
• See attached
• Should have more facts available especially so community members could have the ability to assess community impact
• Thank you for giving us an opportunity to discuss and learn about the many different sides of this very important issue.
• Thanks for doing this.
• Thanks for the opportunity to participate
• Thanks for the thoughtful process. Well done.
• Thanks! Glad to be here.
• The back grounder was very helpful in explaining the pros and cons for further decisions.
• The blue map sheet was a bit useless, it was interesting to thank about, however in the long run I feel like it was unnecessary. It would be better to use that time for discussion.
• The blue sheet was leading
• The broader process began with very little public input "done deal" attitude on the part of CSU & CSU athletic dept. I feel respect was not given to community-at-large and offending impact on community.
• The CPD process was interesting and broadening.
• The facilitator was helpful: a nice person doing her job professionally.
• The facilitator was helpful: mainly as time keeper
• The facilitator was helpful: paraphrased well, intervened when necessary.
• The facilitator was helpful: They did a very good job although I felt maybe they leaned a little toward defending CSU admin and committee.
• The facilitators were very helpful with explaining the issue so we could be as informed as possible. It was extremely helpful and I really I learned more about the issue.
• The feeling in the community is it is a "done deal" -Not sure why they have input if it is not considered
• The map form was extremely confusing and the results, in my opinion, should not be strongly believed.
• The process and background materials: Gave no input from students.
• The process seemed way complicated and may have been easier to follow if instead of using letters the topic [illegible]
• **The process**: Time will tell just how effective Martin’s forum are. Up to this point it would seem they won’t be effective because the assurances that the process is open and transparent is a complete sham. Two public committee meetings two months apart? Sub Committee meetings that are closed to the public. Jim Smith as a committee member, and a so called "community member" coming out with the public statement (Coloradoan Soapbox 3/2/12) was extremely poor judgment. Put the energy and research into making Hughes live up to its potential leave the campus space for more pressing needs. ie student housing. - Doug Brobst
• The stronger opinions were less than respectful. I really like back grounder and its format. It does a good job of expressing both sides, while demonizing neither. I wish that there had been more pro-stadium voices so that I could
better appreciate their perspective. The pro-stadium voice pretty much said that if I didn't agree with him it's because I'm stupid, wasn't too persuasive.

- These should be a requirement that any group that is picked to pursue a stadium project have a local group of vested, knowledgeable people who know comprehensive planning and community values of F.C. We are an engaged community!
- They did a great job! Top engineering students could play crucial roles in the construction of a new stadium.
- They should have a large community meeting so that students, alumni, and citizens can gather together to get a sense of others' views in a large group.
- This has been a step forward in citizen participation. Thanx!
- Too many things were reported too soon (eg-coach hired on basis of ___)-Grahams
- Very good at conveying both sides
- We are missing two legs of the triangle - experts/ decision makers
- We need more of a tangible vision to make rational discussions possible...We all have a different vision in our heads of what this could be
- What will the multi-purpose functions be? I don't want my football tickets & Ram Club dues to increase in cost.
- Who is Graham to infiltrate our university with this outrageous proposition? What stake does he hold? What is his profit? Also, the majority of student I have spoken with are strongly opposed. If Frank doesn't want to listen to the Ft. Collins community, he needs to at least speak to students listen to their voices.
- Why are so many of the board members not residents of FC, even through this most affects FC, not Windsor, not Brighton, not Denver, not Boulder, etc.
- Would like to hear more facts
- Would like to see polling of students, faculty, and community.
- Yes, Thomas Jefferson said Democracy (which is what is being tried here) is mob rule where 51% of mob tries to tell 49% what to do and trample on their rights even if they are smarter.

**Part 11: Answers to Question about Hughes Stadium from the Mapping Exercise**

During the map exercise at the initial set of forums, participants were asked “Issue E on the Backgrounder focuses on the argument that these outcomes [the potential positive outcomes from building a new on campus stadium, such as increased alumni connection, national exposure, and a better program] through utilizing Hughes Stadium. What is your view of that possibility?"

Many participants left that question blank, but below are the answers provided, organized by Yes, No, or Miscellaneous.

**“Yes” Answers**

- Because of the location of Hughes Stadium. It could be used for years to come
- Good possibility that outcomes could be reached by using Hughes.
- Great idea - think we should use what we have instead of taking away from others Hughes has history that should be restored.
- has very likely depends on the new coach meeting the high expectations of him
- Hughes has every chance of providing these same outcomes given a modest investment... to attract fans, improve same day, etc. Further, many of these outcomes are possible without any further investment in Hughes. It isn't the place that matters. It's the program.
- Hughes is perfectly fine!
- Hughes should be redone and can be a better facility than it is now. Space is not at a premium there.
- Hughes Stadium has not been full in years. It would be better to exceed its capacity prior to grab at a dream stadium.
- I agree that many can be achieved at Hughes.
- I agree that many/most of these outcomes could be achieved just as easily at/through Hughes Stadium.
• I agree with the argument against building a new stadium on campus. A better football team and improved excitement about football can result in a revitalized department at Hughes.
• I agree with this we could take the donations and invest it in better coaches, better marketing, etc.
• I believe it could be done by using Hughes Stadium to expand as opposed to building an entirely new stadium.
• I believe most of these outcomes could be utilized through Hughes. Possibly renovations and better accessibility may increase the atmosphere which could lead to better team/recruits.
• I believe that they are least as likely to be realized at Hughes as a new stadium.
• With stronger recruiting & better football team much can be accomplished utilizing Hughes,
  Agree
• Agree that they could
• Agreed I think Hughes is awesome and located in a beautiful place that connects the community
• I agree that using Hughes to me meet these goals is a fiscally responsible and realistic alternative. I would support spending money on the Hughes experience instead.
• I believe this is true, especially if CSU puts funding towards transportation to & from the stadium instead of building a new one
• I definitely think that Hughes could be utilized to achieve the same suggested benefits at an on campus stadium. There is much more space available at Hughes far fulfilling AD Grahams "dreams".
• I feel since Hughes is only 2 miles from campus a stadium on main campus already exists (Hughes) where do you consider campus -- Foothills, Equine, ARBL are all around the current stadium
• I like it.
• I strongly agree that utilizing Hughes Stadium can accomplish these outcomes.
• I strongly feel if energy and money were put into Hughes, that some of the goals of improving athletics, raising energy/$, making football more fun - could definitely be accomplished use what we already have a great stadium at a great location
• I think reuse and save money and put it to use to in other areas. We can build a bigger stadium in the same place.
• I think that is a good option so that we can keep some of the same traditions and have a new stadium.
• I think that it is not only possible, but very likely.
• I think this is a very valid possibility that should be considered. Equating a new on campus stadium with a better team, better attendance and more revenue is a statement I feel needs more research.
• I would like to see that happen, with more communities, traditions, traffic access made simpler and other creative approaches.
• If Hughes were to be re-vamped then these could potentially be achieved.
• If there CSU has a winning football team Hughes stadium will be filled. (If a new stadium is built only a winning football team will fill it) Hughes is in a great location and only 3 miles from campus. Since Fort Collins prides itself on being fit and healthy, what is the hangup about walking & bikeriding to get there??
• Increased funding or more emphasis on building from the current resources would be more beneficial
• It is always better to use resources already available rather than replacing resources.
• Keep Hughes Stadium
• Make the area outstandingly beautiful...trees, walkways, plantings
• Most of the benefit can have substitution instead of the new stadium and yes, a careful planning of using old stadium can get those benefits.
• Same as for new stadium
• Save our stadium Hughes
• Sounds good to me
• Strongly agree that outcome could be used/accomplished with use of Hughes stadium
• That Hughes Stadium could be improved and it is really not that far from campus (it is walkable or bus), therefore a new stadium does not need to be constructed because people would have to park off campus for an on campus stadium regardless.
• This could be possible by keeping Hughes
• This is my belief
• Very good possibility of achieving as many position as on campus
• very likely
• Why not? Spend money to enhance the existing facility; use it more frequently
• Would like to see Hughes saved
• Yes
• Yes at this point I believe this
• Yes I believe Hughes could fill the need.
• Yes I think it is possible to get the positives from Hughes.
• Yes, Hughes is GOOD location - improve
• Yes, I agree, it intent was to are Hughes Stadium to achieve the above possibilities, it could be done without all of the negative outcomes.
• Yes, I think that all of these ways of raising money for academics are ultimately derived from better gladiators not the coliseum in which they are being barbaric.
• Yes, with additional remodel & additions sports complex @ Hughes

“No” answers
• Due to Hughes Stadium's location, it cannot possibly impact all of the above the way an on campus stadium would.
• Hughes stadium is not going to create any excitement among students of Alumni, the facility itself will not be able to accommodate the potential positive outcomes.
• Hughes will remain distant from the focus of the university. The on-campus nature remains vital.
• I believe Hughes is too far from the main campus and lack individuality to really incite this level of excitement.
• Hughes is in wrong location, old and without any walkable connectivity to the community
• Hughes is too far from the central of town to achieve these goals.
• I think students would be more willing to go and participate whether or not they enjoyed football because of its distance.
• If this were true those goals would have already been met
• It may be possible to achieve some of these outcomes at Hughes; however, it will be much more difficult to maximize positive economic impact, student attendance, and donor/alumni connective at Hughes
• Main concerns that Hughes does not have enough seating capacity to take us to the next level eg. New conference.
• No
• Not happening.
• Skeptical/ doubtful
• The costs to provide similar benefits at Hughes would be much higher than commonly thought. There is no private push to fund those. And some of the benefits simply cannot be realized at the present location.
• Weak possibility - need to get the students there - bussing, etc.
• SLIM. Change is hard for many people and they prefer the status quo. What they know they are comfortable with - What they don’t know they fear.

Miscellaneous answers
• All this depends on a total effort coordinated with building CSU alumni
• Better stadium & better coaches does not equal more wins
• Dave Van Lanen "66" --> Definitely improves CSU image; students can walk to games or bicycle
• Guess it would depend on effective marketing of Hughes but likely on-campus stadium would generate more interest but something more positive at Hughes could be generated with effort.
• Hughes stadium need upgrading including parking lot, amenities and appearance
• I cannot answer this. I am not having a football program would improve CSU's reputation and attract better students.
• I don't think a new stadium will significantly realize these outcomes. A more balanced athletic program and attention to academic programs will lead to (Bottom box on Page 1)
• My ears are opened.
• The "outsider" nature of Hughes - - Foothills/Park like location bring CSU to the Foothills.
• The biggest issue is that all the positive outcomes of the stadium are hypothetical while the problems are definitely going to happen without much forethought and planning.
• What are the options?
Compiled Responses from all initial stadium proposal meetings from February 27 - March 8

1.) Where do you live? Select the best answer

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>%</th>
<th>Total</th>
<th>1</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>4</th>
<th>5</th>
<th>6</th>
<th>7</th>
<th>8</th>
<th>9</th>
<th>10</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>On campus</td>
<td>5%</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Within 1 mile of Hughes stadium</td>
<td>15%</td>
<td>38</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Within 1 mile of CSU campus</td>
<td>38%</td>
<td>97</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fort Collins</td>
<td>33%</td>
<td>84</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>8</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Northern Colorado</td>
<td>7%</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Colorado</td>
<td>2%</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>USA</td>
<td>1%</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Outside the USA</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

100% 258 23 16 29 17 16 20 48 27 40 22

2.) How do you connect to this issue? Answer all that apply

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>%*</th>
<th>Total</th>
<th>1</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>4</th>
<th>5</th>
<th>6</th>
<th>7</th>
<th>8</th>
<th>9</th>
<th>10</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Community member</td>
<td>63%</td>
<td>162</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CSU alumni</td>
<td>36%</td>
<td>92</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CSU athletics fan</td>
<td>38%</td>
<td>99</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>14</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CSU donor</td>
<td>17%</td>
<td>45</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CSU employee</td>
<td>25%</td>
<td>65</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CSU faculty</td>
<td>8%</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CSU neighbor</td>
<td>26%</td>
<td>66</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CSU parent</td>
<td>30%</td>
<td>78</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Current CSU student</td>
<td>21%</td>
<td>54</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other</td>
<td>11%</td>
<td>29</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

710 73 46 87 55 34 44 132 82 104 53

*Percent is divided by number of people (258), not number of responses

Note: at the first meeting "Coloradoan" was used as the option rather than "community member." It caused some confusion, so we changed it for subsequent meetings
3.) How do you connect to this issue? Answer what you feel is your PRIMARY connection

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>%</th>
<th>Total</th>
<th>1</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>4</th>
<th>5</th>
<th>6</th>
<th>7</th>
<th>8</th>
<th>9</th>
<th>10</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Community member</td>
<td>29%</td>
<td>75</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CSU alumni</td>
<td>9%</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CSU athletics fan</td>
<td>25%</td>
<td>65</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CSU donor</td>
<td>3%</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CSU employee</td>
<td>10%</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CSU faculty</td>
<td>2%</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CSU neighbor</td>
<td>6%</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CSU parent</td>
<td>4%</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Current CSU student</td>
<td>8%</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other</td>
<td>4%</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>100%</td>
<td>255</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>46</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>39</td>
<td>23</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

4.) Which do you value? (choose all that apply)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>%*</th>
<th>Total</th>
<th>1</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>4</th>
<th>5</th>
<th>6</th>
<th>7</th>
<th>8</th>
<th>9</th>
<th>10</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>A legitimate d-m process</td>
<td>72%</td>
<td>186</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>36</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>35</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CSU academic quality</td>
<td>78%</td>
<td>200</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>39</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>33</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Effective management of CSU resources</td>
<td>67%</td>
<td>173</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>35</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>29</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Environmental stewardship and green</td>
<td>57%</td>
<td>148</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>29</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>23</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Financial sustainability and affordability of</td>
<td>74%</td>
<td>192</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>38</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>30</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fort Collins economy</td>
<td>55%</td>
<td>143</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>25</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>High quality of life in communities</td>
<td>69%</td>
<td>177</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>33</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>32</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Strong CSU athletics program</td>
<td>35%</td>
<td>91</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Strong CSU-Alumni relationship</td>
<td>37%</td>
<td>96</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Strong CSU-Community relationship</td>
<td>66%</td>
<td>169</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>31</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>100%</td>
<td>1575</td>
<td>148</td>
<td>94</td>
<td>163</td>
<td>107</td>
<td>98</td>
<td>108</td>
<td>297</td>
<td>168</td>
<td>265</td>
<td>127</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Average # of values chosen


* Percent represents the percentage of participants that chose that option (out of 258)
5.) Which are most important to you? (choose top 3)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>%*</th>
<th>Total</th>
<th>1</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>4</th>
<th>5</th>
<th>6</th>
<th>7</th>
<th>8</th>
<th>9</th>
<th>10</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>A legitimate decision-making process,</td>
<td>31%</td>
<td>80</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>17</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CSU academic quality</td>
<td>64%</td>
<td>165</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>34</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>23</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Effective management of CSU resources</td>
<td>30%</td>
<td>77</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Environmental stewardship and green</td>
<td>25%</td>
<td>65</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Financial sustainability and affordability of</td>
<td>47%</td>
<td>121</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>29</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>13</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fort Collins economy</td>
<td>14%</td>
<td>37</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>High quality of life in communities</td>
<td>33%</td>
<td>85</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>19</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Strong CSU athletics program</td>
<td>15%</td>
<td>39</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Strong CSU-Alumni relationship</td>
<td>11%</td>
<td>29</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Strong CSU-Community relationship</td>
<td>24%</td>
<td>63</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>12</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

* Percent represents the percentage of participants that chose that option (out of 258)

6.) From CSU’s perspective, which of these should be most important to CSU concerning this decision? (choose top 3)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>%*</th>
<th>Total</th>
<th>1</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>4</th>
<th>5</th>
<th>6</th>
<th>7</th>
<th>8</th>
<th>9</th>
<th>10</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>A legitimate decision-making process,</td>
<td>24%</td>
<td>62</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>16</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CSU academic quality</td>
<td>67%</td>
<td>172</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>29</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>19</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Effective management of CSU resources</td>
<td>45%</td>
<td>115</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>31</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>16</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Environmental stewardship and green</td>
<td>15%</td>
<td>38</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Financial sustainability and affordability of</td>
<td>63%</td>
<td>163</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>33</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fort Collins economy</td>
<td>7%</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>High quality of life in communities</td>
<td>12%</td>
<td>31</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Strong CSU athletics program</td>
<td>18%</td>
<td>46</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Strong CSU-Alumni relationship</td>
<td>14%</td>
<td>36</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Strong CSU-Community relationship</td>
<td>22%</td>
<td>57</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>11</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Percent is percent of participants that picked that value as one of their top 3
7.) From CSU’s perspective, which of these should be least important to CSU concerning this decision? (choose bottom 3)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Value</th>
<th>%</th>
<th>Total</th>
<th>1</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>4</th>
<th>5</th>
<th>6</th>
<th>7</th>
<th>8</th>
<th>9</th>
<th>10</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>A legitimate decision-making process,</td>
<td>27%</td>
<td>69</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CSU academic quality</td>
<td>7%</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Effective management of CSU resources</td>
<td>6%</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Environmental stewardship and green</td>
<td>29%</td>
<td>75</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Financial sustainability and affordability of Fort Collins</td>
<td>5%</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>High quality of life in communities</td>
<td>7%</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Strong CSU athletics program</td>
<td>42%</td>
<td>108</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Strong CSU-Alumni relationship</td>
<td>47%</td>
<td>122</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Strong CSU-Community relationship</td>
<td>16%</td>
<td>41</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>676</td>
<td>70</td>
<td>43</td>
<td>72</td>
<td>43</td>
<td>35</td>
<td>55</td>
<td>128</td>
<td>72</td>
<td>98</td>
<td>60</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Percent is percent of participants that picked that value as one of their bottom 3

8.) How do you currently feel about the proposed stadium? Select

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Feeling</th>
<th>%</th>
<th>Total</th>
<th>1</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>4</th>
<th>5</th>
<th>6</th>
<th>7</th>
<th>8</th>
<th>9</th>
<th>10</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Strongly opposed</td>
<td>34%</td>
<td>89</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Opposed but need more information</td>
<td>19%</td>
<td>49</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Don’t have enough information to know</td>
<td>10%</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Currently conflicted, see both sides</td>
<td>13%</td>
<td>33</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Support but need more information</td>
<td>9%</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Strongly in support</td>
<td>15%</td>
<td>38</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>100%</td>
<td>259</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>49</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>38</td>
<td>23</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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