



Beaconsfield

# Beaconsfield Citizens and the Construction of a Sound Barrier

## Analysis Report of a Telephone Survey

File 70764-004

November 18, 2015

# Table of Contents

<b>Background and Objectives</b>	<b>3</b>
<b>Methodological Approach</b>	<b>5</b>
<b>Respondent Profiles</b>	<b>8</b>
<b>Highlights</b>	<b>11</b>
<b>Detailed Results</b>	<b>13</b>
<hr/>	
<b>1. General Satisfaction with Municipal Services</b>	<b>14</b>
<b>2. Noise Pollution Issue</b>	<b>16</b>
2.1 Impact of Noise from Highway 20 on Quality of Life	17
2.2 Extent of Agreement with the Construction of a Sound Barrier	18
2.3 Reasons for Disagreeing with the Sound Barrier Construction Project	19
<b>3. Financial Scenarios</b>	<b>20</b>
3.1 Preferable Financial Scenario	21
3.2 Sharing of Costs between Concerned Owners and Other Owners	22
<b>4. Conclusion</b>	<b>23</b>
<b>Appendix: Questionnaire</b>	<b>25</b>

# Background and Objectives

# Background and Objectives

**What do the citizens of Beaconsfield think of the noise pollution issue caused by Highway 20?**

**Are they in favour of building a sound barrier?**

For the past several years, the City of Beaconsfield has been demanding that the Ministry of Transportation (MTQ) build a sound barrier along Highway 20. Last September 3, during a meeting between Quebec Transport Minister Robert Poëti and Beaconsfield Mayor Georges Bourelle, an agreement was reached on the sharing of costs for the construction of a 5 km sound barrier that would stretch nearly the entire length of Beaurepaire Street, i.e., from Woodland Avenue to the boundaries of Pointe-Claire. This exceptional agreement stipulates that the MTQ will assume 75% of the costs and the City 25%, whereas the MTQ's usual policy is a 50/50 share. The costs would therefore be shared 75%-25% between the MTQ and the City of Beaconsfield.

In this regard, the mayor of Beaconsfield promised to consult his citizens to obtain their opinions on the matter. To do so, the City contracted Leger to conduct a telephone survey of its citizens.

More precisely, the study had the following objectives:

- To determine the actual magnitude of the noise pollution issue caused by Highway 20 and the extent to which citizens are disturbed by this issue;
- To know how the construction of a sound barrier is perceived by citizens, regardless of whether or not they are directly affected by the issue;
- To poll citizens on the ideal allocation of costs generated by the construction of a sound barrier.

# Methodological Approach

# Methodological Approach

## Telephone survey of 600 citizens of the City of Beaconsfield

### Study population

The present study was conducted by means of a telephone survey of 600 respondents. The target population is made up of Beaconsfield citizens aged 18 and over, who are able to communicate in French or English and who are accessible by landline telephone. The sample was drawn randomly using the Canada Survey Sampler software. It should be noted that members of the City Council were removed from the sample.

In order to ensure a sufficient number of respondents in each of the districts, a non-proportional stratified random sampling method was used. In order to account for the actual weight of each district, the sample was corrected during statistical processing, based on the actual weight of the district according to the number of residents. A quota was imposed for each district.

### Questionnaire

The questionnaire was developed by Leger professionals in collaboration with professionals from the City of Beaconsfield. It was then programmed by Leger professionals on the telephone survey platform. The questionnaire was composed of approximately forty variables and lasted about five minutes on average.

### Questionnaire pre-test

Before officially starting the data collection, a pre-test was conducted on October 15, 2015, in order to validate the questionnaire and the logical sequence thereof, as well as respondents' understanding of the questions. In total, 20 pre-test interviews were conducted with Beaconsfield citizens. No changes were made to the questionnaire following the pre-test.

### Data collection

Data were collected from October 16 to 23, 2015, by means of a telephone survey. Supervisors from Leger's call centre were present at all times in order to ensure the quality control of interviews. Surveys were listened to constantly and the data entered into the computer file was simultaneously monitored. In this manner, supervisors not only controlled the quality of the interview but also ensured that the answers provided matched the codes entered into the file.

# Methodological Approach

## Statistical accuracy

The size of the sample (600 respondents) is sufficient to allow the overall results to be extrapolated to the entire study population with a margin of error of  $\pm 4.0\%$  and a confidence interval of 95% (19 times out of 20).

## Weighting of results

In order to ensure the representativeness of the study population, the results were weighted according to gender, age, owner/renter status, and the district of residence as based on Statistics Canada's 2011 census data.

## Reading the report

### Interpreting the report

In the tables and figures, "n" represents the actual number of persons questioned.

Where applicable, totals that do not add up to 100% are due to unanswered questions or rounding to a whole number. In some cases, respondents were allowed to provide more than one response. The totals presented for these questions are thus more than 100%.

In order to underscore the variance between districts, significantly higher proportions are presented in **red** in the tables and figures, while those that are significantly lower are presented in **blue**.

# Respondent Profiles

# Respondent Profiles

Respondent Profiles After weighting of results	Total (n=600)	District 1 (n=102)	District 2 (n=100)	District 3 (n=100)	District 4 (n=101)	District 5 (n=101)	District 6 (n=96)
<b>Gender</b>							
Male	48%	42%	46%	49%	46%	54%	52%
Female	52%	58%	54%	51%	54%	46%	48%
<b>Age</b>							
18-24	13%	2%	10%	8%	0%	25%	27%
25-34	8%	9%	2%	10%	6%	11%	7%
35-44	17%	13%	22%	17%	10%	23%	15%
45-54	24%	32%	24%	22%	24%	12%	30%
55-64	18%	17%	23%	21%	24%	15%	11%
65 or over	21%	27%	19%	22%	36%	13%	10%
<b>Education</b>							
Elementary school / high school	10%	8%	6%	15%	11%	11%	9%
College	20%	18%	31%	13%	19%	18%	20%
University	69%	71%	61%	70%	68%	71%	70%
<b>Gross annual household income</b>							
\$19,999 or less	1%	1%	1%	2%	3%	1%	1%
\$20,000 to \$39,999	2%	4%	0%	2%	5%	1%	1%
\$40,000 to \$59,999	4%	8%	2%	4%	9%	3%	0%
\$60,000 to \$79,999	10%	10%	6%	17%	9%	10%	6%
\$80,000 to \$99,999	9%	15%	7%	16%	7%	6%	7%
\$100,000 or more	41%	37%	48%	32%	37%	45%	45%
Refusal	33%	25%	37%	27%	30%	34%	41%

# Respondent Profiles

Respondent Profiles After weighting of results	Total (n=600)	District 1 (n=102)	District 2 (n=100)	District 3 (n=100)	District 4 (n=101)	District 5 (n=101)	District 6 (n=96)
<b>Child under the age of 18 in the household</b>							
Yes	46%	40%	54%	39%	31%	44%	64%
No	54%	60%	44%	61%	68%	56%	36%
<b>Status – owner/renter</b>							
Owner	90%	96%	87%	93%	89%	85%	92%
Renter	6%	4%	1%	7%	11%	15%	1%
<b>Number of years of residence</b>							
Less than 15 years	42%	37%	33%	41%	36%	53%	52%
Between 15 and 29 years	35%	32%	41%	34%	32%	33%	39%
30 years or more	22%	31%	25%	25%	32%	14%	9%

# Highlights

# Highlights

## Beaconsfield citizens are satisfied with the services provided by the City

Amongst all the citizens surveyed, an average rating of 7.4 out of 10 is observed with regard to their satisfaction with the services generally offered by the City, which is a satisfactory result. This result is similar to the Leger norm for cities of the same size (7.6 out of 10).

## Noise generated by Highway 20 seems to have an impact on the quality of life of a minority of citizens

Overall, 76% of citizens consider the impact of noise pollution on their quality of life to be low. On a scale of 0 to 10, the results obtained translate into an average score of 3.3 out of 10.

- Citizens of District 3 are somewhat more disturbed by the noise, giving an average rating of 4.1 out of 10, which is higher than that of other districts. However, no less than 66% of them are of the opinion that the impact of noise from Highway 20 on the quality of their life is low.

## Opinions are divided with regard to construction of a sound barrier

In light of the information shared, 44% of the citizens agree with the construction project, compared to 54% who disagree. These results translate into an average score of 5.0 out of 10.

- Citizens of District 3, for whom the impact of noise from Highway 20 is a little higher, indicate that they are more in favour of the construction of a sound barrier (6.5 out of 10).
- Moreover, although residents of Districts 1 and 2 indicate that they are more or less in agreement with constructing a sound barrier (score of 5.6 out of 10 in both cases), large proportions of respondents are observed to be strongly in favour of this project (44% and 41%, respectively, gave a rating of 8 to 10 out of 10). Consequently, it would seem that opinions are more polarized in these districts.

Those who disagree with this construction project justify their position on monetary grounds (53%) or by the fact that they are simply not affected by the noise (46%).

If the City were to go ahead with the sound barrier construction project, a larger proportion of citizens would favour a financial scenario in which the costs were shared amongst owners in the sectors affected by the issue (30%).

# Detailed Results

# 1. General Satisfaction with Municipal Services

# 1. General Satisfaction with Municipal Services

**88% of Beaconsfield citizens indicate they are satisfied with the services offered in general by their City, including 55% who are very satisfied.**

Citizens of the City of Beaconsfield were first asked to indicate their level of satisfaction with the services offered in general by the City.

Amongst all the citizens surveyed, an average score of 7.4 out of 10 is observed with regard to their satisfaction with the services offered in general by the City, which is a satisfactory result.

➤ The average satisfaction score is similar to that observed in other Quebec cities with 10,000 to 24,999 inhabitants (Leger norm: 7.6 out of 10).

More specifically, 55% of polled citizens said that they were very satisfied with the quality of services offered in general by their municipality, 33% said they were satisfied, and 12% said they were not very satisfied or not satisfied.

Overall satisfaction is significantly higher for:

- persons aged 65 and over (7.7 out of 10);
- those who do not have a child under the age of 18 living at home (7.6 out of 10).

**Q1. Firstly, on a scale of 0 to 10, with 0 meaning "not at all satisfied" and 10 meaning "very satisfied," how would you describe your level of satisfaction with the services offered in general by the City of Beaconsfield?**

	Total 2015 (n=600)	District 1 (n=102)	District 2 (n=100)	District 3 (n=100)	District 4 (n=101)	District 5 (n=101)	District 6 (n=96)
Very satisfied (ratings 8 through 10)	55%	55%	52%	62%	52%	52%	57%
Satisfied (ratings 6 and 7)	33%	39%	30%	29%	37%	31%	31%
Not very satisfied or not satisfied (ratings 0 through 5)	12%	7%	18%	9%	11%	17%	11%
<i>Average on a scale of 10</i>	7.4	7.6	7.3	7.5	7.4	7.3	7.4

## 2. Noise Pollution Issue

## 2. Noise Pollution Issue

Regardless of the district in which they reside, most citizens in the City of Beaconsfield state that noise from Highway 20 has only a low impact on their quality of life.

### 2.1 Noise Impact from Highway 20 on Quality of Life

Citizens were asked to express their views on the noise impact from Highway 20 on their quality of life, and more specifically, whether or not this impact is considerable.

For more than three-quarters of citizens polled, this impact is low (76% giving a rating of 0 to 5 out of 10), particularly for residents of Districts 5 and 6, where 85% and 86% of citizens, respectively, consider the impact of Highway 20 on their quality of life to be low.

Citizens who are somewhat more affected by the noise are those residing in District 3, who gave an average rating of 4.1 out of 10. However, no less than 66% of them are of the opinion that the noise impact from Highway 20 is low.

- Depending on the sub-groups, it is found that citizens, regardless of their socio-demographic profile or the number of years they've lived in the City of Beaconsfield, always give an average rating of between 0 and 5. Consequently, the different sub-groups do not seem to perceive a considerable impact from the noise generated by Highway 20 on their quality of life.

Q2. Now, on a scale of 0 to 10, where 0 means "no impact" and 10 means "a very high impact," how would you rate the noise impact from Highway 20 on your own quality of life?

	Total 2015 (n=600)	District 1 (n=102)	District 2 (n=100)	District 3 (n=100)	District 4 (n=101)	District 5 (n=101)	District 6 (n=96)
Very high impact (ratings 8 through 10)	13%	14%	26%	19%	6%	9%	4%
Moderate impact (ratings 6 and 7)	11%	16%	7%	15%	12%	6%	10%
Low impact (ratings 0 through 5)	76%	70%	67%	66%	83%	85%	86%
Average on a scale of 10	3.3	3.7	3.9	4.1	2.6	2.5	2.9

## 2. Noise Pollution Issue

Citizens of District 3, whose quality of life is more affected by the noise from Highway 20, generally agree with the construction of a sound barrier.

Others mostly or completely disagree, particularly residents in District 6.

### 2.2 Extent of Agreement with the Construction of a Sound Barrier

Subsequently, citizens were provided with a description of the sound barrier construction project as well as the cost sharing structure associated with this construction, and asked to indicate the degree to which they agreed with the latter.

For the past several years, the City of Beaconsfield has been demanding that the Ministry of Transportation (MTQ) build a sound barrier south of Highway 20. During a recent meeting between the MTQ, the mayor of Beaconsfield and the president of the Citizens' Sound Wall Committee, an offer was made on the sharing of costs for the construction of a sound barrier. The latter would measure 5 km long and 4.5 m high, and would run nearly the entire length of Beaurepaire Street, i.e., from Baie d'Urfé to the boundaries of Pointe-Claire. The offer stipulates that 75% (approximately \$15M) of the costs would be assumed by the MTQ and 25% (approximately \$5M) by the City.

In light of the information presented, 44% of the citizens agree with this project (completely or somewhat agree), compared to 54% who disagree. It is noted that residents of District 3, for whom the noise impact from Highway 20 is greater, come out as being more in favour of the construction of a sound barrier (6.5 out of 10). Conversely, residents of District 6 are less in favour (3.7 out of 10). It should be recalled that the quality of life of the aforementioned residents does not appear to be greatly affected by noise from Highway 20.

Moreover, although residents of Districts 1 and 2 indicate that they are more or less in agreement with constructing a sound barrier (ratings of 5.6 out of 10), large proportions of respondents are observed to be strongly in favour of this project (44% and 41%, respectively, gave a rating of 8 to 10 out of 10). Consequently, it would seem that opinions are more polarized in these districts.

#### Q3. Knowing that, to what extent would you agree with the sound barrier construction project?

Please answer using a scale of 0 to 10, with 0 meaning "completely disagree" and 10 meaning "completely agree."

	Total 2015 (n=600)	District 1 (n=102)	District 2 (n=100)	District 3 (n=100)	District 4 (n=101)	District 5 (n=101)	District 6 (n=96)
Completely agree (ratings 8 through 10)	33%	44%	41%	43%	26%	22%	22%
Somewhat agree (ratings 6 and 7)	11%	9%	7%	15%	14%	13%	10%
Mostly or completely disagree (ratings 0 through 5)	54%	44%	50%	38%	58%	63%	67%
<i>Average on a scale of 10</i>	5.0	5.6	5.6	6.5	4.4	4.4	3.7
Does not know / Refusal	3%	4%	2%	4%	2%	3%	1%

## 2. Noise Pollution Issue

**Monetary reasons and the fact that they are not affected by the noise are the main reasons why some citizens disagree with the construction of a noise barrier.**

### 2.3 Reasons for Disagreeing with the Sound Barrier Construction Project

Citizens who say they disagree with the sound barrier construction project (who gave ratings of 0 to 5 out of 10, or 54% of all citizens surveyed) were asked to give reasons for their position.

By far, monetary reasons (project too costly, potential tax hikes, etc.; 53%) and the fact of not being affected by the noise (46%) are the primary reasons spontaneously mentioned in all districts. Other reasons were mentioned by between 2% and 18% of respondents.

#### Q4. What is (are) the main reason(s) why you disagree with the construction of a sound barrier?

More than one response possible; spontaneous responses	Total 2015 (n=311)	District 1 (n=46)	District 2 (n=45)	District 3 (n=42)	District 4 (n=58)	District 5 (n=58)	District 6 (n=62)
Monetary reasons (too costly, tax hike, etc.)	53%	49%	60%	52%	53%	49%	53%
I'm not affected by the noise	46%	36%	51%	41%	48%	49%	47%
Aesthetic reasons (landscape, unattractive, etc.)	18%	31%	29%	15%	11%	11%	17%
I won't benefit from it (I live on the north side)	7%	0%	0%	8%	8%	13%	8%
Owners should accept the fact that they bought property close to a highway	7%	10%	4%	6%	15%	5%	6%
It will split the city in two (division, etc.)	6%	2%	20%	0%	4%	1%	6%
It is not necessary (non-specified)	3%	8%	3%	0%	2%	6%	2%
It won't be effective	2%	0%	2%	1%	1%	1%	5%
Money should be invested elsewhere (education, bike paths, composting, etc.)	2%	0%	0%	4%	2%	0%	6%
Other	4%	11%	0%	2%	5%	5%	2%
Does not know / Refusal	2%	0%	3%	0%	0%	6%	0%

## 3. Financial Scenarios

# 3. Financial Scenarios

If the City were to go ahead with the construction project, the preferable financial scenario according to citizens is one in which the costs would be shared amongst the owners of the sectors affected by the issue.

## 3.1 Preferable Financial Scenario

In the event that the City were to go ahead with the building of a sound barrier, a larger proportion of citizens would prefer that the costs be assumed only by the owners in the sectors affected by the issue (30%). This opinion is more prevalent in residents of District 6, who, it should be recalled, are more opposed to this construction project.

Moreover, 23% would favour a scenario whereby the costs are shared by all owners in the City. This is especially the case for residents of Districts 1 (38%) and 2 (34%). Lastly, 19% of all citizens would apply a formula in which all owners pay, but concerned owners pay a larger share than the others.

It is noted that for a little over a quarter of the citizens polled (26%), none of the financial scenarios is appealing, as they disagree with raising municipal taxes to address this issue.

Disregarding the latter, 40% of citizens would favour a financial scenario whereby only owners in concerned sectors pay, 31% a scenario where costs are shared by all owners, and 26% a scenario with a formula whereby all owners pay but concerned owners pay more than the others.

Q5A. If the City were to go ahead with the construction of the sound barrier, what financial scenario do you feel would be preferable to pay for the 25% component (approximately \$5M)? Should costs be shared...							
	Total 2015 (n=600)	District 1 (n=102)	District 2 (n=100)	District 3 (n=100)	District 4 (n=101)	District 5 (n=101)	District 6 (n=96)
By all property owners in Beaconsfield	23%	38%	34%	27%	17%	13%	11%
Only by owners in sectors concerned by the issue	30%	18%	23%	29%	35%	33%	42%
According to a formula by which all owners pay, but concerned owners pay more than the others	19%	11%	20%	20%	23%	19%	22%
None of these choices: I disagree with increasing municipal taxes to address this issue	26%	31%	20%	23%	20%	33%	25%
Does not know / Refusal	2%	2%	3%	1%	4%	2%	1%

# 3. Financial Scenarios

Citizens in favour of a financial scenario in which all owners pay, but concerned owners pay more than others feel that the sharing of costs should be as follows:

67% for concerned owners and 33% for owners from other sectors.

## 3.2 Sharing of Costs between Concerned Owners and Other Owners

Citizens who stated that they favoured a financial scenario in which all owners pay, but concerned owners pay more than the others (19% overall) were questioned with regard to the percentage of the costs that should be assumed by concerned owners versus owners in other sectors.

Overall, the latter consider that owners concerned by the noise stemming from Highway 20 should pay 67% of the costs, while owners in other sectors should pay 33%.

No significant difference is observed between the six districts of residence.

Q5B. Based on what percentage should costs be shared between concerned owners and other owners?		
Base: citizens who consider that costs should be shared according to a formula in which all owners pay, but affected owners pay more than the others (n=119)	Amongst concerned owners	Amongst owners from other sectors
Between 1% and 25%	2%	42%
Between 26% and 50%	12%	47%
Between 51% and 75%	70%	5%
Between 76% and 99%	10%	0%
<i>Average (%)</i>	67%	33%
Does not know / Refusal	7%	7%

## 4. Conclusion

## 4. Conclusion

### IN CONCLUSION:

Based on information available at the time of the survey, a majority of Beaconsfield residents seem unconvinced of the necessity to build a sound wall along the south side of Highway 20.

This report, combined with our expertise and analysis tools, leads us to the conclusion that many residents seem preoccupied by the costs related to this project as well as by issues regarding its appearance and efficiency and by the impact that this project will have on the achievement of other priorities in the city. In their opinion, several questions remain unanswered, and residents would like to obtain more information from the City before deciding whether to support the sound wall project.

# Appendix

# Appendix: Questionnaire

70764-004  
City of Beaconsfield – Noise Pollution  
TEL600 – 5 minutes

Good morning (afternoon, evening), my name is \_\_\_\_\_ from the LEGER research firm. We are currently conducting a study for the City of Beaconsfield about the noise from Highway 20 and which measures the City could take to resolve the issue.

The purpose of this study is to find out what Beaconsfield residents think about this issue, whether or not they are directly affected by the problem.

We guarantee that your answers will remain completely confidential.

Do you accept to participate?

Yes  
No => END

**AGE:** Ask all – One possible answer - Read

Could you tell me in which age group you belong, is it between...?

...18 and 24  
...25 and 34  
...35 and 44  
...45 and 54  
...55 and 64  
...65 and 74  
...or 75 and over  
Refusal

**SEXE:** Ask all – One possible answer – Do not read

Record respondent's gender:

Male  
Female

**TEMPS:** Ask all – One possible answer – Do not read

How many years have you been living in Beaconsfield?

Record the number of years  
Less than a year 00  
I don't know  
I prefer not to answer

**Q1.** Ask all – One possible answer – Read if necessary only

First, on a scale of 0 to 10, where 0 means not satisfied at all and 10 means very satisfied, how would you qualify your satisfaction with the SERVICES OFFERED by the City of Beaconsfield IN GENERAL?

Not satisfied at all										Very satisfied										DNK / Refusal		
0	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	0	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	99

70764-004  
City of Beaconsfield – Noise Pollution  
Tel.600 – 5 minutes

**Q2.** Ask all – One possible answer – Read if necessary only

Now, on a scale of 0 to 10, where 0 means no impact and 10 means a very strong impact, how would you qualify the impact of the noise from Highway 20 on your own quality of life?

No impact										Very strong impact										DNK / Refusal		
0	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	0	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	99

**Q3.** Ask all – One possible answer – Read if necessary only

For many years, the City of Beaconsfield has been asking the Ministry of Transport to build a sound barrier along the south side of Highway 20.

During a recent meeting between the Minister of Transport, the mayor of Beaconsfield and the chairman of the sound wall committee, an offer was made on sharing the cost to build a sound barrier. The concrete sound barrier would be 5 km long, 4,5 m high, and run almost the entire length of Beaurepaire Drive, that is, from Baie d'Urfé to the Pointe-Claire borders.

The offer sets out that the Ministry will cover 75% (or approximately \$ 15 Millions) of the costs and the City 25% (or approximately \$ 5 Millions).

Knowing this, what is your level of agreement with the project to build a sound barrier?

Please answer on a scale of 0 to 10, where 0 means strongly disagree and 10 means strongly agree.

Strongly disagree										Strongly agree										DNK / Refusal		
0	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	0	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	99

**Q4.** Ask only if Q3 = 5 or less – Multiple answers allowed – **PRE-CODED: DO NOT READ**

What are the main reasons why you don't agree with the construction of a sound barrier?

Aesthetic reasons (landscape, doesn't look nice, etc.)  
It will divide the city in two (division, etc.)  
Monetary reasons (too expensive, taxes, etc.)  
Other, please specify: \_\_\_\_\_  
Doesn't know / Refusal

**Q5A.**

If the City moves forward with the construction of this wall, in your opinion, which financial scenario should be favoured to pay for the remaining 25% (or approximately \$5 million)? Should the cost be shared...

Between all Beaconsfield property owners  
Only among property owners in the sectors affected by the problem  
According to a formula under which all property owners pay, but the affected property owners pay more than the others =>ASK Q5B

# Appendix: Questionnaire

70764-004  
City of Beaconsfield – Noise Pollution  
TeL600 – 5 minutes

Neither of these choices: I don't agree with increasing municipal taxes to remedy this problem  
Doesn't know / Refusal

**Q5B. Ask only if Q5A = 03 – One possible answer - Read**

Based on what percentage should the costs be divided between affected property owners and other property owners?

Note: the total must equal 100%.

\_\_\_\_\_ % among property owners in the affected sectors  
\_\_\_\_\_ % among property owners in the other sectors  
Doesn't know / Refusal

**Q6. Ask all – One possible answer**

Finally, do you have any comments or suggestions for the City of Beaconsfield concerning this issue?

\_\_\_\_\_ No comments

For classification purposes, I now need to ask you a few additional questions.

**PROP: Ask all – One possible answer**

Do you OWN or RENT your current main residence?

Own  
Rent  
I prefer not to answer

**ENFAN: Ask all – One possible answer**

Are there any children UNDER 18 YEARS OF AGE living in your household?  
(IF SO): Are any of them 12 and OLDER or UNDER 12?

Yes: 12 years of age and OLDER ONLY  
Yes: 12 years of age and older AND younger than 12  
Yes: YOUNGER than 12 years of age ONLY  
No children under 18 years of age at all in the household  
I prefer not to answer

**SCOL: Ask all – One possible answer**

What is the last year of education that you have completed?

Primary  
High school (general education or vocational diploma)  
College  
University certificates and diplomas  
University Bachelor's degree (including classical studies)  
University Master's degree  
University Doctorate (PhD)  
I prefer not to answer

**REVEN: Ask all – One possible answer**

70764-004  
City of Beaconsfield – Noise Pollution  
TeL600 – 5 minutes

Which of the following categories best reflects the total INCOME before taxes of all members of your household in 2014?

...\$19,999 or less  
...between \$20,000 and \$39,999  
...between \$40,000 and \$59,999  
...between \$60,000 and \$79,999  
...between \$80,000 and \$99,999  
...\$100,000 or more  
I prefer not to answer

On behalf of Leger and the City of Beaconsfield, thank you very much for taking the time to participate.

[www.leger360.com](http://www.leger360.com)

For more information on this study:

**Cyntia Darisse**  
Research Manager

Leger | The Research • Intelligence • Group  
580-580 Grande Allée East  
Québec (Quebec) G1R 2K2

 418-522-7467

 [cdarisse@leger360.com](mailto:cdarisse@leger360.com)