

ANALYSIS OF THE RESULTS
OF
CZM LAND USE OPINION SURVEY

BUREAU OF PLANNING
GOVERNMENT OF GUAM
P.O. BOX 2950
AGANA, GUAM 96910



BUREAU OF PLANNING
GOVERNMENT OF GUAM
AGANA, GUAM

BUREAU OF PLANNING
GOVERNMENT OF GUAM
P.O. BOX 2950
AGANA, GUAM 96910

CONTENTS

1. Preliminary Raw Data Analysis

REGIONAL ATTITUDES CONCERNING COASTAL LAND USE

2. AN ANALYSIS OF THE INTER-RELATIONSHIPS IN THE COASTAL MANAGEMENT LAND-USE OPINION SURVEY RESULTS

3. Appendices

a) PERCENTAGE RESULTS OF "YES" ANSWERS BY ^{AGE} DISTRIBUTION

b) PERCENTAGE RESULTS OF "YES" ANSWERS BY ETHNIC DISTRIBUTION

Preliminary Raw Data Analysis

REGIONAL ATTITUDES CONCERNING COASTAL LAND USE

During January, 1977, the Bureau of Planning and the Bureau of Labor Statistics administered a Land Use Opinion Survey to identify certain local attitudes toward land and water use. A total of 931 residents were surveyed, 776 (83%) from northern districts and 155 (17%) from southern districts. The survey's results are discussed under four major sections: Shoreline Development, Recreational Facilities, Property Ownership, and Citizen Participation.

Shoreline Development

To determine the desirability of certain types of shoreline development to island residents, three questions were asked. The questions and responses are presented in Table 1:

Table 1: Regional Attitudes Concerning
Shoreline Development
(in percentages)

Questions	North			South			Total		
	Yes	No	No Op	Yes	No	No Op	Yes	No	No Op
1. Residential Development should be strictly limited	58	28	14	54	26	20	57	28	15
2. Tourism Development should be strictly limited	46	43	11	46	31	23	46	41	13
3. Business and Industrial Development should be strictly limited	52	36	12	48	35	17	52	36	12

The majority of respondents (57%) feel that residential development should be strictly limited along the coastline. Since 1970, many homes have

encroached upon shoreline areas which has severely limited shoreline use by the public. Although there is a slight difference between the north and south in their attitudes toward residential development, the south exhibits a surprisingly high percentage (54%) of respondents who feel that residential development should be strictly limited. Presently, the south is characterized by compact coastal settlements with little room for expansion. Government subdivisions and other government efforts to provide facilities and services in the south have been hampered by existing residential land use patterns. To experience the benefits of government investments in sorely needed road, water, and power systems would entail a certain degree of change in these patterns. However, strictly limiting residential development along the southern coast will alter the traditional living patterns and relationships in the south.

Local opinions lean toward restricting tourism development along the coast. However, the northern region exhibits a stronger tendency to accept coastal resort development than the south. Contrary to expectations, a higher percentage of northerners oppose resort limitations (43 vs. 31). The difference may be attributed to the 23% of the southern sample who have no opinion. Although resort development results in certain benefits, it is also accompanied by numerous costs. Many southerners have not taken a position on this issue.

Generally, residents feel that business and industrial development should be strictly limited along the coastline. Apparently, any development that does not contribute to the environmental qualities of coastal areas would be opposed. Minor regional differences in attitudes exist with the southern residents undecided over the costs and benefits accruing from business and industrial development.

Judging from the responses to the three questions, southern residents appear to be cautious in pursuing future residential, tourist, business, and industrial development in the south. The historic, social, and environmental qualities have made the south attractive to both island residents and tourists and the benefits of rapid growth as experienced in the north will probably be carefully reviewed by southern residents in the years to come. On the other hand, northern residents are definitely conscious of the negative impacts that have accompanied development. They appear to be against many types of development that may occur along the coast.

Thus far, the Shoreline Protection Act has functioned as the major regulatory mechanism to control coastal development. As shown in Table 2, however, only 7% of the respondents feel that 30 feet is adequate to restrict coastal development and ensure coastal protection. Although 25% feel that 300 feet is an adequate boundary, most respondents feel that more variables should be analyzed prior to delineating a boundary. Presumably, the more appropriate shoreline boundary would not be a uniform designation since it would depend upon the peculiar characteristics of specific geographic areas.

Table 2: Regional Attitudes Concerning the Adequacy
of the Shoreline Protection Act
(in percentages)

Shoreline Protection Act	North	South	Total
1. 30 feet is enough	6	11	7
2. The distance should depend on things like type of land, existing buildings, or road locations.	40	43	40
3. Should be 300 feet	26	18	25
4. No permit should be required	3	4	4
5. No Opinion	25	24	24

Table 3 compares the response totals of this year to last year's survey. Basically, previous attitudes toward residential development have remained consistent--a majority of respondents feel that residential development should be strictly limited along the coastline. However, a higher percentage of persons in the recent survey feel that tourist and business and industrial development should be strictly limited (see Table 3). Apparently, more residents are beginning to realize that these development should be strictly regulated and that coastal areas should be protected.

Table 3: A Comparison of the 1976 and 1977 Surveys
(in percentages)

Questions	1976 Totals			1977 Totals		
	Yes	No	No Op	Yes	No	No Op
1. Limit Residential Development	59	26	16	57	28	15
2. Limit Tourist Development	38	40	22	46	41	13
3. Limit Business and Industrial Development	57	27	16	62	36	12

Assuming that certain development located near a respondent's home would have a more direct impact on residents, the survey inquired about the desirability of these development. Table 4 presents the responses.

Table 4: Regional Attitudes Concerning the
Location of Specific Land Uses
(in percentages)

Questions	North			South			Total		
	Yes	No	No Op	Yes	No	No Op	Yes	No	No Op
1. Object to hotel development near home	49	44	7	39	53	8	47	45	8
2. Object to other Resort Facilities near home	36	58	6	32	61	7	35	58	7
3. Object to a new housing development near home	27	65	8	32	58	10	28	64	8
4. Object to major business establishment near home	30	63	7	31	63	6	30	63	7

It must be emphasized that Table 4 reflects attitudes toward particular projects that may locate near (1/2 mile qualification) a respondent's home and does not necessarily reflect attitudes toward coastal development.

In questions 2, 3, and 4 above, the majority of respondents do not object to these developments locating near their homes. This is particularly true in the south. Commercial and residential development would tend to increase property values in adjacent areas as well as increase convenience to nearby shopping facilities.

Whereas supporting tourist facilities can be used by local residents, hotels per se would primarily cater to a transient population. Forty-seven percent of the sample object to hotels locating near homes. The neighborhood character of communities would be destroyed if hotels located there. Northern residents tend to object to hotels locating in proximity to residents more than southern respondents since hotel development has primarily occurred in the north. The prospect of bringing some of the amenities to the south where few facilities exist is enticing to southern residents.

Recreational Facilities

Table 5 aggregates the questions and responses regarding beach access.

Table 5: Regional Attitudes Concerning Beach Access
(in percentages)

Questions	North			South			Total		
	Yes	No	No Op	Yes	No	No Op	Yes	No	No Op
1. Public Access should be guaranteed along the coastline	76	12	12	63	12	25	73	13	15
2. Owners of coastal property should be allowed to refuse access to adjacent beaches	30	54	16	23	61	16	29	55	16
3. Have you ever been turned away from private beaches	27	69	3	30	65	5	28	68	4

Our survey indicates that 17% of the southern sample own coastal property whereas only 5% in the north own coastal property. Consequently, we would expect that a higher percentage of southern residents would object to public access. The reverse is true probably because many of the desirable beach areas are located in the south and that more southern residents have been refused access by adjacent property owners. Many northern beaches are inaccessible because of the topographic features of the northern plateau and are less desirable because of the comparatively rougher waters. The probability for owners to refuse access is less in the north. Generally, however, the majority of respondents feel that public access along the coastline should be guaranteed, although beach access through private property to get to the coastline is less desired.

As indicated by the survey, a large majority of respondents feel that Guam lacks sufficient recreational facilities and areas. Also, those that are available are dirty and littered. Table 6 presents the specific responses to recreation-related questions.

The consensus is that Guam lacks recreational facilities and that public funds should be used to upgrade existing facilities. However, when certain facilities cater to particular user groups such as boat owners, respondents are less apt to agree that public funds should be utilized to construct these facilities. Although 86% of the sample indicated that more walking trails and scenic overlooks are necessary, these facilities would probably not be utilized by the local population. This statistic probably reflects the importance of tourism as perceived by the sample population. The frequent media coverage of tourism and proposals to further attract tourists has definitely contributed to this perception.

Table 6: Regional Attitudes Concerning the Quantity and Quality of Recreational Facilities and Areas (in percentages)

Questions	North			South			Total		
	Yes	No	No Op	Yes	No	No Op	Yes	No	No Op
1. Are there enough coastal recreational facilities now	19	72	9	14	73	13	18	72	10
2. Have you gone to a beach or park in the past month	62	35	3	72	25	3	64	34	2
3. Should there be more beaches and swimming areas	80	13	7	76	8	16	79	12	9
4. Should there be more parks and picnic areas	89	6	5	88	1	11	89	5	6
5. Should we build more walking trails and scenic overlooks	86	8	6	85	5	10	86	7	7
6. Should the government spend tax money to build marinas and boat launching ramps	48	32	20	43	30	27	47	32	21
7. Are public beaches and shorelines dirty and littered	76	16	8	72	14	14	75	16	9
8. Should military beaches be opened to the public	63	24	13	75	12	13	65	22	13
9. Should the government spend tax money to clean-up public beaches	75	14	11	59	26	15	72	16	12

Table 7 presents the responses to the questions regarding fishing and coral collection. Although more southerners still practice the traditions of fishing, the majority of islanders surveyed do not fish regularly.

Table 7: Regional Attitudes Concerning Fishing and Fish Control (in percentages)

Questions	North			South			Total		
	Yes	No	No Op	Yes	No	No Op	Yes	No	No Op
1. Does any member of your household go fishing regularly	29	68	3	51	45	4	32	65	3
2. Should there be laws that restrict fishing and coral collecting	45	42	13	32	58	10	43	45	12

There is little agreement on restricting fishing and coral collecting. Apparently, the fish and coral population are not perceived to be declining and therefore, restrictions are unnecessary at this time. However, this perception can be expected to change if proposals for encouraging the commercial fishing industry were implemented or if Guam succumbs to pressures for shoreline development.

Since the survey was administered during the off-season of fishes that are in high demand, the results may not accurately reflect public opinion. A majority of southerners do fish regularly and do not want any type of restrictions place on this practice.

Property Ownership

As indicated in the survey, 65% of the sample feel that property owners should be compensated if affected by government controls. Little regional difference in attitudes is seen between north and south. Apparently, government controls are perceived to have an adverse effect on property owners and are not perceived in the light of an overall public good. Government controls are established to ensure rational development and public health and safety. The consensus on Guam is that these controls take away development rights.

As shown in Table 8, of the 65% of the sample that possess the attitude of compensation for losses incurred by implementing development controls, a clear majority feel that they should be compensated either with money or with land exchange. A slightly higher percentage feel that compensation should be in the form of land exchange indicating the relatively strong values toward land ownership.

Table 8: Regional Attitudes Toward Compensation
For Losses Incurred Through
Development Controls
(in percentages)

Questions	North				South				Total			
	NA*	Yes	No	No Op	NA*	Yes	No	No Op	NA*	Yes	No	No Op
1. Should government pay for losses	28	58	7	7	27	56	7	10	27	58	7	8
2. Should government exchange land for losses	28	59	6	7	27	59	4	10	28	59	6	7

* Those answering "no" on the question relating to compensating property owners are affected by government controls.

Implicit in these questions is the government's ability to compensate property owners with either money or land. In these austere times, the government does not have the financial resources to compensate property owners. It is also questionable whether the government has enough land to compensate these owners. Again, although development controls have been implemented to promote the public welfare, these controls have an impact on individuals. Since the general public is composed of individual citizens, the dilemma of identifying the general public; i.e., who benefits, who does not, and how should these group interests be accommodated increases when the government is confronted with the problem of controlling development.

Citizen Participation Through Public Hearing

The survey posted many questions regarding participation at public hearings. As expected, a large majority (79%) of respondents have not attended a public hearing in the last year. In the south, however, more people have attended public hearings. The smallness of the area, the close personal relationships, and other southern characteristics may contribute to this regional difference.

In general, those that do attend public hearings have found out about them a variety of sources. Of these sources, the newspaper, the commissioner, and friends and relatives are the most common sources of finding out about public hearings.

Public hearings are the most common form of soliciting public responses to development projects. Table 9 presents the responses to some of the reasons for not attending public hearings.

Table 9: Some Reasons for Not Attending
Public Hearings
(in percentages)

Why Didn't You Attend?	North	South	Total
1. Not Applicable	19	32	21
2. Waste of Time	6	10	7
3. My Opinion Would Not be Used	4	3	3
4. Inconvenient Time	25	25	25
5. Did Not Affect Me Personally	13	13	13
6. Too Technical	2	2	2
7. Other	31	15	29

Although all of the reasons apply to a certain degree, one-fourth of those surveyed felt that public hearings were held at inconvenient times. Table 10 presents responses to the most appropriate time for public hearings.

Table 10: Appropriate Time for Public Hearings
(in percentages)

Questions	North			South			Total		
	Yes	No	No Op	Yes	No	No Op	Yes	No	No Op
1. Weekday Evenings	48	32	20	40	41	19	46	34	20
2. Weekends	51	31	18	52	28	21	51	30	19

Apparently, the respondents are ambivalent toward holding public hearings on weekday evenings. They generally feel that weekends would be an appropriate time. With all the weekend activities that occur, it is still questionable whether many residents will attend weekend public hearings. Before any proposals for weekend meetings are entertained, the other reasons stated in Table 9 must be studied.

As shown in Table 11, respondents are generally split on the question of whether public hearings provide an appropriate forum to voice opinions. Surprisingly, respondents rule out contact with the commissioner as a viable mechanism to obtain public opinion. In many cases, commissioners are not thought of as knowing exactly what village residents desire. It is generally felt that the size of the village has contributed to the decline in contacts with the commissioners with his constituents, with the northern commissioners suffering most. However, the southern respondents have similar opinions of their commissioner. The rapidly changing, complex of society of today may mean frequent contacts with residents themselves over and above contact with commissioners.

Table 11: Regional Attitudes Toward
Participation Mechanisms
(in percentages)

Questions	North			South			Total		
	Yes	No	No Op	Yes	No	No Op	Yes	No	No Op
1. Do public hearings provide opportunities to voice opinions	38	24	38	35	35	30	37	26	37
2. Does your village commissioner know your opinion	23	65	12	32	59	9	25	64	11

Apparently, most respondents feel that numerous forms of participation should be established and utilized. Table 12 provides these responses.

Table 12: Regional Attitudes Toward Various Participatory Mechanisms (in percentages)

How Should Planners Identify Future Village Needs	North			South			Total		
	Yes	No	No Op	Yes	No	No Op	Yes	No	No Op
1. Ask commissioner	74	18	8	74	12	14	74	17	9
2. Ask church	36	49	15	20	57	23	33	50	17
3. Village meetings	87	4	9	79	6	15	85	5	10
4. Appoint a village representative	67	20	13	56	22	22	65	20	15
5. Ask civic groups	65	19	16	40	37	23	61	22	17
6. Form special advisory committees	73	13	14	50	27	23	70	15	15

As a whole, the respondents to the survey feel that other mechanisms over and above public hearings should be established and utilized. Respondents are ambivalent that public hearings alone provide enough opportunities to voice opinions. However, the role of the church in providing guidance and shaping public opinion on contemporary issues is rapidly diminishing.

Conclusions

Many of the results of the survey were expected. Of interest, however, is the frequent "no opinion" response of the southern sample. In nearly every question, southern residents have a greater no opinion response percentage than northern residents. This may indicate the increasing pressure for development that the south is and will be experiencing. The tradeoffs between development and preservation have not been explicit and most southern residents have yet to take a position on this developing situation.

In summary, the survey brought out the following important points:

1. In general, all coastal development should be strictly limited.
2. Along the coastline, public access should be guaranteed although access through private property is less desired.
3. The boundary established by the Shoreline Protection Act in many cases is inadequate to protect Guam's coastline and needs to be re-defined.
4. Recreational areas and facilities are tremendously inadequate.
5. Public taxes should be utilized to maintain and construct only those recreational facilities that cater to a large number of users and not specific user groups.
6. Subsistence fishing is not widely practiced and consequently should not be strictly regulated.
7. Property owners should be compensated for implementing controls that affect the ability of owners to develop their property.
8. Citizen opinions should be obtained through a number of participatory mechanisms.

AN ANALYSIS OF THE INTER-RELATIONSHIPS IN THE COASTAL MANAGEMENT LAND-USE OPINION SURVEY RESULTS

After the straight tabulations of the Coastal Management Land-Use Opinion survey were analyzed, a set of cross-tabulations was done to establish whether there were inter-relationships between age, ethnic group, and other variables and the opinions expressed concerning the government's role in land use. This report contains an analysis of the cross-tabulations.

In all of the opinion questions, there was a fairly high rate of "no opinion" responses (ranging from 6% to 34%, but averaging about 15%). It may be that many of these people did not understand the questions, and would have expressed an opinion if the questions could have been presented in a more meaningful framework.

Table I
Various Characteristics of Different Age Groups
Percent of Age Group:

Age Group	With Ed Level 6th Grade or Lower	With Ed Level 9th Grade or Lower	Who Owned Property
16-29	0%	10%	44%
30-44	4%	17%	63%
Older than 44	38%	51%	74%

Who Responded
"No Opinion" (Average)

12%
15%
18%

Table I gives a comparison of educational level, property ownership, and "no opinion" response for the different age groups. Within the last generation there has been a great change in the average educational level

of the adult population. The property ownership column shows a significant difference in the percent of age group who own property. All other factors held constant, we would expect the age group, with some property owners, to have fewer "no opinion" responses. As the last column of the table shows, the situation is the reverse. More older people have "no opinion," about those issues, than younger people.

It is the opinion of this analysis that the situation is a result of differences in educational level. If older residents of the community are to have a voice in planning for the island, special attempts will need to gain their input.

In this report, all response to opinion questions are presented as the percentage of respondents who answered yes from those who answered either yes or no. This provides the simplest solution to the problem of people who may well have an opinion but were too polite to tell the interviewer that they did not know the meaning of some of the words in the questions.

Significant Differences

Whenever a question is asked of two different samples of people, some difference between the two answers is expected. If the answers are presented as the percentage of yes responses to yes and no responses, the expected difference depends on the sample size and the percentage itself. If the same questions were repeatedly presented to different samples of a population, 95% of the time the percentage would be written $\pm N$ percent.

$$\text{in } N = \frac{2/P(1-P)}{S}$$

where P = the percent and S = the sample size.

Roughly speaking, a difference of 11 percentage points or more is significantly different. Any smaller difference may be due to random variation and sampling error. This memo only reports significant differences. Attached to this report are copies of the questionnaire with the percentage of yes responses to each opinion questions for each of the ethnic groups, and for different age groups. The reader may wish to examine the pattern of differences in answers to all questions.

Ethnic Differences

In response to the statement "All Development Should Be Allowed," 45% of Filipinos agreed, as did 30% of Guamanians, and 14% of Caucasians. This difference of opinion between ethnic group was one of the greatest in the survey. Generally, Caucasians were the most strongly in favor of strict actions on development. (Residential 80%, tourist 71%, business and industrial 81%.) The majority of Guamanians desired to limit development (residential 59%, tourist 52%, business and industrial 55%), but slightly less than half of the Filipinos sampled wanted limitation on tourist development (45%) and business and industrial development (46%). Interestingly, a healthy majority of Filipino people wanted to limit residential development (70%).

Respondents were asked if they objected to each of the following being built near their home: tourist hotel, other tourist-related business, a new housing development, or a major business or shopping center. The only time the majority of an ethnic group objected to any of the items was the Guamanian population and a tourist hotel. Fifty-seven percent of the Guamanians interviewed would object to a tourist hotel being built

near their home. A tourist hotel was the least popular of the items for all ethnic groups (Caucasians 49% object, Filipinos 41%). Generally, fewer Filipinos objected to any of the items than did the other ethnic groups. Guamanians and Filipinos object about equally to residential development as to business and industrial development; but more Caucasians object to business and industrial development (36%) than to a housing development (20%).

There were no significant differences of opinion among ethnic groups concerning shoreline development. A large majority of all ethnic groups believed there should be more coastal recreational facilities, but 91% of Guamanian versus 78% of Filipinos wanted more beaches and swimming areas. People were asked if tax money should be spent to clean up public beaches, and to build marinas and boat launching ramps. Responses are given in Table II.

Table II
Tax Money Should be Used to:

	<u>Clean Up Beaches</u>	<u>Build Marinas</u>
Guamanians	77%	56%
Filipinos	88%	61%
Caucasian	82%	62%
All Other	87%	72%

Clearly, cleaning up beaches is a more popular activity than building marinas. Guamanians are less enthusiastic than the other ethnic groups about spending tax money for either activity. The grouping, all other, which was 15% of the sample, may include more boat owners and thus want tax money to be spent on marinas.

Concerning fishing and shelling, and laws restricting these activities, Guamanians are the most active (40% fish regularly) and Caucasians the least (20% fish regularly). Seventy-six percent of Caucasians are in favor of laws restricting fish and coral collecting, as opposed to 43% Guamanians and Filipinos and 47% of all other ethnic groups. This question produced the greatest divergence of opinion among ethnic groups.

There was a significant difference of opinion among ethnic groups about the best time to hold public hearings. Seventy-five percent of Caucasians favor week-day evenings, while a greater proportion of Filipinos and Guamanians favor weekends. Perhaps two public hearings, one during the week, and the other over the weekend, would allow everyone a chance to participate. Property is owned by significantly more Guamanians than the other ethnic groups (74% as opposed to 56% Filipinos, 37% Caucasians, and 42% other ethnic groups).

Difference of Opinion Among Age Groups

Difference of opinion among age groups are important because they may reflect trends for the future. In response to the question on shoreline development, 49% of young adults believe the distance should depend on characteristics of the area, as opposed to 39% of middle-aged people and 31% of older adults.

Concerning public input to the planning process, 52% of young adults believe public hearings to be adequate, as opposed to 64% of middle-aged people and 59% of the older group. The only other strong difference was in response to the question "should planners ask the church to find out your opinion." Forty-two percent of the older group said yes, but

only 25% of young adults wanted the church to represent them. This may reflect a growing independence away from the Spanish tradition of a church dominated society.

Other Inter-Relationships

Other cross-tabulations were done that depict how people answered one question by the way they responded to another. For example, a count was made of people who fish regularly or not by whether there should be laws that restrict fishing. The results showed that 53% of people who do not fish regularly want restrictions on fishing while only 39% of fishermen want such restrictions. Thus there is a reversal of majority opinion between the general population and fishermen. This is the only question for which a reversal of opinion was found. As we might expect, slightly fewer people who own ocean property thought public access should be guaranteed (78% as opposed to 86%). However, the difference does not matter because such a large majority of both groups support public access. Of the 18 possible inter-relationships examined in this way, more than half of them did not show a significant relationship. This is evidence for the overall consistency of responses to the survey, and shows that even people who might have a bias because of a special interest support the common good instead.

APPENDICES

PERCENTAGE RESULTS OF "YES"
ANSWERS BY AGE DISTRIBUTION

LAND-USE OPINION SURVEY

INSTRUCTIONS: Please fill out prior to survey using information of 305 Form.

A. SEX	C. CITIZENSHIP	D. MARITAL STATUS	E. EDUCATION	F. ETHNIC GROUP	G. CONTROL NO.
3 ☐	4 ☐	☐ 5	6 ☐ 7 ☐	8 ☐ 9 ☐	10 ☐ 11 ☐ 12 ☐ 13 ☐ 14 ☐ 15

SAY: We would like to ask some of your opinions about land and water use. We just want to know your opinion. If you have no opinion on a question, just say "no opinion."

1. Guam's coastline, particularly its beaches, are a limited natural resource. Do you agree that, along the coastline: AGE DISTRIBUTION
- | | <u>16-24</u> | <u>30-44</u> | <u>> 44</u> |
|--|--------------|--------------|----------------|
| a) residential development should be strictly limited..... | <u>62</u> | <u>68</u> | <u>67</u> |
| b) tourist development should be strictly limited..... | <u>52</u> | <u>54</u> | <u>51</u> |
| c) business and industrial development should be strictly limited..... | <u>60</u> | <u>55</u> | <u>53</u> |
| d) all development should be allowed..... | <u>30</u> | <u>31</u> | <u>33</u> |
| e) no development should be allowed..... | <u>13</u> | <u>19</u> | <u>19</u> |
| f) public access should be guaranteed..... | <u>37</u> | <u>35</u> | <u>35</u> |
2. Would you object:
- | | <u>16-24</u> | <u>30-44</u> | <u>> 44</u> |
|--|--------------|--------------|----------------|
| a) to a tourist hotel being built near your home..... | <u>53</u> | <u>49</u> | <u>49</u> |
| b) to some other tourist-related business like a restaurant or gift shop being built near your home..... | <u>37</u> | <u>34</u> | <u>45</u> |
| c) to a new housing development being built near your home.. | <u>25</u> | <u>34</u> | <u>30</u> |
| d) to a major business or shopping center being built near your home..... | <u>35</u> | <u>30</u> | <u>33</u> |

3. There is a law called the Seashore Protection Act which required special permits for Building within 300 feet of the shoreline. Recently the law was changed to require permits for building within 30 feet of the shoreline. What do you think about these distances? Choose one of the following:

- a) Thirty feet is enough to protect Guam's coast.
- b) The distance should depend on things like type of land, buildings already there, or road location.
- c) The distance should be 300 feet.
- d) There should be no permit required.
- e) No opinion.

<u>16-24</u>	<u>30-44</u>	<u>>44</u>
<u>3</u>	<u>9</u>	<u>10</u>
<u>44</u>	<u>39</u>	<u>31</u>
<u>22</u>	<u>24</u>	<u>29</u>
<u>2</u>	<u>4</u>	<u>5</u>
<u>24</u>	<u>24</u>	<u>25</u>

4) I would like to ask a few questions about coastal Recreation facilities

- a) Are there enough Coastal recreational facilities now?
- b) Have you gone to a beach or park near the beach in the past month?
- c) Should people who own coastal property be allowed to refuse access to the beach next to their property?
- d) Have you ever been turned away from a beach because it was private?
- e) Should there be more beaches and swimming areas in Guam?
- f) Should there be more parks and picnic areas?
- g) Should we build more walking trails and scenic overlooks?
- h) Should the government spend tax money to build marinas and boat launching ramps?
- i) Do you find that Guam's public beaches and shorelines are dirty and littered?
- j) Should military beaches be open to the public?
- k) Should the government spend tax money to cleanup the public beaches?

<u>16-24</u>	<u>30-44</u>	<u>>44</u>
<u>20</u>	<u>19</u>	<u>20</u>
<u>72</u>	<u>68</u>	<u>57</u>
<u>37</u>	<u>36</u>	<u>32</u>
<u>33</u>	<u>30</u>	<u>21</u>
<u>89</u>	<u>85</u>	<u>88</u>
<u>76</u>	<u>95</u>	<u>92</u>
<u>92</u>	<u>92</u>	<u>93</u>
<u>57</u>	<u>61</u>	<u>63</u>
<u>80</u>	<u>85</u>	<u>83</u>
<u>76</u>	<u>75</u>	<u>71</u>
<u>83</u>	<u>78</u>	<u>83</u>

- | | <u>16-24</u> | <u>25-44</u> | <u>45-64</u> |
|--|--------------|--------------|--------------|
| 5. Now, I would like to ask some questions about fishing and shelling. | <u>6</u> | <u>6</u> | <u>8</u> |
| a) Does any person or member of your household (relative) go fishing regularly? | <u>36</u> | <u>32</u> | <u>31</u> |
| b) Should there be laws that restrict fishing and coral collecting? | <u>46</u> | <u>53</u> | <u>46</u> |
| 6. If the government controls development, people who own property will not be able to do some things with it. | | | |
| a) Should something be done to compensate these property owners? | <u>80</u> | <u>77</u> | <u>84</u> |
| <u>If Yes</u> | | | |
| b) Should the government pay those landowners for the loss of their development rights? | <u>33</u> | <u>35</u> | <u>29</u> |
| c) Should the government offer to trade land for the loss of a property owners development rights? | <u>33</u> | <u>34</u> | <u>28</u> |
| 7. Have you ever heard of the Bureau of Planning? | <u>50</u> | <u>58</u> | <u>50</u> |
| 8. Let's talk about public hearings. | | | |
| a) Have you attended a public hearing in the last year? | <u>16</u> | <u>21</u> | <u>24</u> |
| b) How many meetings have you attended? | | | |
| c) How did you find out about these meetings?
(Enumerator - do <u>not</u> list the choices, check one). | | | |

- . Commissioners
- . Newspaper
- . Friends/Relatives
- . Radio/T.V.
- . Notice/Flyer
- . Other

- d) Why did you not attend?
(Enumerator - do not list the choices, check one).

- | | |
|--------------------------------|------------------|
| . Waste of my time | 1. <u> </u> |
| . My opinion would not be used | 2. <u> </u> |
| . Inconvenient time | 3. <u> </u> |
| . Did not affect me personally | 4. <u> </u> |
| . Too technical | 5. <u> </u> |
| . Other | 6. <u> </u> |

9. We want to know the best time to hold public hearings.
(Please check both questions).

a) Should they be held on week day evenings?

b) Should they be held on weekends?

16-29	30-44	45-74
53	61	60
55	63	60

10. The people of Guam should take part in planning for the future:

a) Do public hearings give you enough chance to say what you think?

b) Does the village commissioner know your opinion on community matters?

c) Are there enough ways now for the people of Guam to take parts in planning decisions?

✓ 52	64	59
✓ 21	32	31
41	44	43

11. Planners want to find out what your village wants in the future. Should they (answer all choices):

a) ask the commissioner.....

b) ask the church.....

c) hold village meetings.....

d) appoint a village representative.....

e) ask civic groups.....

f) form special advisory committees.....

~~g) ask civic groups.....~~

51	80	84
25	38	42
95	94	94
73	75	75
74	74	72
83	83	82

12. Do you own any property on Guam?

13. Do you own any property next to the ocean?

44	63	74
6	8	8

PERCENTAGE RESULTS OF "YES"
ANSWERS BY ETHNIC DISTRIBUTION

LAND-USE OPINION SURVEY

INSTRUCTIONS: Please fill out prior to survey using information of BLS Form.

3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11	12	13	14	15
☐	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐

SAY: We would like to ask some of your opinions about land and water use.
We just want to know your opinion. If you have no opinion on a question, just say "no opinion."

ETHNIC DISTRIBUTION

1. Guam's coastline, particularly its beaches, are a limited natural resource. Do you agree that, along the coastline:

GUAM FILP CAUC ALL OTHERS

a) residential development should be strictly limited.....	57	70	50	70
b) tourist development should be strictly limited.....	52	45	71	46
c) business and industrial development should be strictly limited.....	55	76	51	64
d) all development should be allowed.....	30	45	14	34
e) no development should be allowed.....	19	10	15	22
f) public access should be guaranteed.....	88	78	87	57

2. Would you object:

a) to a tourist hotel being built near your home.....	57	41	49	43
b) to some other tourist-related business like a restaurant or gift shop being built near your home.....	41	35	34	34
c) to a new housing development being built near your home.....	34	30	20	32
d) to a major business or shopping center being built near your home.....	34	29	36	31

3. There is a law called the Seashore Protection Act which required special permits for building within 300 feet of the shoreline. Recently the law was changed to require permits for building within 30 feet of the shoreline. What do you think about these distances? Choose one of the following:

	GUAM	FILIP	LAO	ALL OTHERS
a) Thirty feet is enough to protect Guam's coast.	12	8	7	4
b) The distance should depend on things like type of land buildings already there, or road location.	52	54	55	49
c) The distance should be 300 feet.	30	33	36	33
d) There should be no permit required.	5	5	3	7
e) No opinion.	28	27	5	28

4) I would like to ask a few questions about coastal Recreation facilities

a) Are there enough coastal recreational facilities, now?	16	25	23	19
b) Have you gone to a beach or picnic area near the beach in the past month?	62	72	76	59
c) Should people who own coastal property be allowed to refuse access to the beach next to their property?	35	31	33	43
d) Have you ever been turned away from a beach because it was private?	33	23	26	25
e) Should there be more beaches and swimming areas on Guam?	91	75	89	86
f) Should there be more parks and picnic areas?	96	90	94	97
g) Should we build more walking trails and scenic overlooks	91	94	91	95
h) Should the government spend tax money to build marinas and boat launching ramps?	56	61	62	72
i) Do you find that Guam's public beaches and shorelines are dirty and littered?	85	70	81	82
j) Should military beaches be open to the public?	77	73	63	82
k) Should the government spend tax money to cleanup the public beaches?	77	88	82	87

5. Now, I would like to ask some questions about fishing and shelling.

Quam Filo Cinc All Other

a) Does any person or member of your household (relative) go fishing regularly?

40 28 20 30

b) Should there be laws that restrict fishing and coral collecting?

43 43 70 47

6. If the government controls development, people who own property will not be able to do some things with it.

34 34 75 71 58

a) Should something be done to compensate these property owners?

84 75 71 56
92 82 91 87

If Yes

b) Should the government pay those landowners for the loss of their development rights?

92% 82% 91% 87%
94 87 95 94

c) Should the government offer to trade land for the loss of a property owners development rights?

94% 89% 88% 84%
94 89 88 84

7. Have you ever heard of the Bureau of Planning?

59 57 67 46

8. Let's talk about public hearings.

a) Have you attended a public hearing in the last year?

20 14 25 17

b) How many meetings have you attended?

c) How did you find out about these meetings?
(Enumerator - do not list the choices, check one).

1. Commissioners

1

2. Newspaper

2

3. Friends/Relatives

3

4. Radio/T.V.

4

5. Notice/Flyer

5

6. Other

6

d) Why did you not attend?
(Enumerator - do not list the choices, check one).

1. Waste of my time

1

2. My opinion would not be used

2

3. Inconvenient time

3

4. Did not affect me personally

4

5. Too technical

5

6. Other

6

9. We want to know the best time to hold public hearings.
(Please check both questions).

Guam Filp Came All other

a) Should they be held on week day evenings?

56 50 75 57

b) Should they be held on weekends?

45 77 41 60

10. The people of Guam should take part in planning for the future.

a) Do public hearings give you enough chance to say what you think?

57 71 49 60

b) Does the village commissioner know your opinion on community matters?

35 27 19 16

c) Are there enough ways now for the people of Guam to take parts in planning decisions?

73 43 36 40

11. Planners want to find out what your village wants in the Future. Should they (answer all choices):

a) ask the commissioner.....

51 87 73 80

b) ask the church.....

40 42 34 39

c) hold village meetings.....

96 95 95 55

d) appoint a village representative.....

76 77 70 54

e) ask civic groups.....

69 75 80 73

f) form special advisory committees.....

82 83 79 80

g) ~~ask civic groups.....~~

~~50 55 15 53~~

12. Do you own any property on Guam?

74 56 57 42

13. Do you own any property next to the ocean?

10 4 3 7

BUREAU OF PLANNING
GOVERNMENT OF GUAM
P.O. BOX 2950
AGANA, GUAM 96910