Magellan Strategies

Colorado 2026 Housing & Land Use Opinion Survey Summary & Topline Results

Magellan Strategies is pleased to present the topline results of a survey of 1,121 Colorado registered voters. The survey data were weighted to be representative of the state's voter registration demographics. We conducted the interviews from September 9th to 20th, 2026. The survey results have a margin of error of +/- 2.93% at the 95 percent confidence level. Additionally, this survey document compares results to our 2023 Colorado Housing and Land Use Survey for questions that were exactly the same or very similar.

The Magellan Strategies staff designed each survey question. No individual, group, or organization contributed to the cost of this survey project. For any questions regarding the survey results or methodology, please contact David Flaherty at 303-861-8585 or by email at DFlaherty@MagellanStrategies.com.

Survey Overview & Objectives

Over the past five years, Colorado has seen a flurry of new housing and land-use legislative activity at the state and local levels to make affordable rental and homeownership opportunities a reality for tens of thousands of residents. Housing and land-use policy issues have expanded well beyond increased taxes on short-term rentals in mountain communities. Today, communities across Colorado are reviewing residential housing development applications with significantly higher housing-density limits and multi-unit structures.

As communities across our state discuss and implement these housing and land-use changes, our team wanted to measure and understand Coloradans' opinions on these important issues. We developed our questions in part by drawing on a survey we fielded in 2023 during that year's legislative debate over Governor Polis's housing policies. We wanted to see whether attitudes toward state and local housing solutions and policies had changed significantly.

As the data show, opinions on state and local housing and land-use policies have shifted only modestly since 2023. We hope this public opinion research project provides Colorado decision-makers with reliable data, information, and insights to inform housing and land-use policy development moving forward.

Key Findings

Housing satisfaction has risen slightly since 2023, but renters trail homeowners by a wide margin: 67% of respondents are satisfied with their current housing, up from 61% in 2023. However, satisfaction differs by 36 points between renters and homeowners: 80% of homeowners are satisfied compared with 44% of renters. Renters are also more supportive of

local rent control (71% compared to 53% of homeowners), a policy that 59% of all respondents support, nearly unchanged from 60% in 2023.

Large majorities want both local and state government to do more on affordable housing: 71% say local government should do more on affordable housing policy, including 51% who say a lot more, and 71% say the same of state government, up from 67% in 2023. Only 19% believe local affordable housing and land use policies are effective and moving in the right direction. Renters (91%) and Democratic voters (86%) are most likely to want more local action, compared with homeowners (61%) and Republican voters (54%).

A plurality trusts neither level of government on housing and land use: When asked who they trust more to address affordable housing, 46% choose neither, while 24% pick local government and 22% pick the state. On land use decisions, 40% trust neither. Republican voters are the most skeptical, with 67% trusting neither on affordable housing, compared with 25% of Democratic voters. A majority (51%) do not think state policies are more effective than local ones, while 28% do.

Support for allowing multi-unit housing on single-family lots has grown since the policy took effect: Half of respondents (50%) support the policy that bars local governments from limiting duplexes, triplexes, and add-on units on single-family land, while 39% oppose it. In 2023, when it was still a proposal, 46% supported it, and 47% opposed it. Support reaches 57% among voters 18 to 44 but falls to 40% among voters 65 and older. Opponents most often cite local control. The related law that bars local limits on new developments split 44% to 44%.

Few respondents credit the legislature with property tax relief: Just 13% agree that the state legislature has passed legislation that brought property tax relief for homeowners, while 58% disagree, including 46% who strongly disagree, and 29% are unsure. Among those who disagree, a clear majority say their own tax bill has continued to rise, with many describing bills that doubled over a few years or jumped 30 to 50 percent in a single year, often through mortgage escrow.

T1. To begin, could you please verify that you are 18 years old and a full-time resident of Colorado?

Yes	100%

T2. How satisfied are you with your current housing situation?

	2026	2023
Very & Somewhat Satisfied	67%	61%
Very Satisfied	32%	33%
Somewhat Satisfied	35%	28%
Not Too Satisfied	17%	18%
Not Satisfied at All	15%	20%
No Opinion	1%	1%

T3. How would you describe your current housing situation?

Total Stable.....84%
Total Unstable.....15%
No Opinion.....1%

Very Stable – I feel secure in my current housing.....49%
Somewhat Stable – Mostly secure but could change in the future.....35%

Somewhat Unstable – My housing situation is uncertain.....10%
Very Unstable – I'm at risk of losing my housing.....5%

T4. How much of a problem is the lack of availability of the following in your community?

	Total Problem	Big Problem	Somewhat of a Problem	Not a Problem at All	No Opinion
Rental opportunities	60%	29%	31%	25%	15%
Homeownership opportunities	78%	55%	23%	14%	8%

T5. How would you rate the speed of residential housing growth and development in your community for the past five years?

	2026	**2023**
Total Too Fast	48%	55%
Just The Right Amount	13%	9%
Total Too Slow	30%	30%
Unsure/No Opinion	9%	6%
Much Too Fast	28%	33%
Somewhat Too Fast	20%	22%
Much Too Slow	16%	19%
Somewhat Too Slow	14%	11%

For this survey, we define affordable housing as housing that costs no more than 30% of an individual's total income. We will define land use policies as residential zoning regulations and community master plans that shape a city, town, or neighborhood and can affect where housing, jobs, schools, open space, public services, and transportation are located.

T6. Understanding these definitions, do you think local affordable housing and land use policies in your community are effective and moving in the right direction?

	2026	2023
Total Yes	19%	20%
Total No	71%	73%
Unsure/No Opinion	10%	7%
Yes, Definitely	3%	7%
Yes, Probably	16%	13%
No, Definitely Not	39%	43%
No, Probably Not	32%	30%

T7. Who do you trust more to address the problem of affordable housing in Colorado?

	2026	2023
Neither	46%	—
Local Government	24%	48%
State Government	22%	29%
Unsure/No Opinion	8%	23%

Note: "Neither" was added as a response option in 2026. In 2023, respondents chose between Local Government, State Government, and Unsure or No Opinion, so the 2026 and 2023 results are not directly comparable.

T8. Who do you trust more to make land use policy decisions in Colorado?

	2026	2023
Neither	40%	—
Local Government	28%	54%
State Government	24%	28%
Unsure/No Opinion	8%	18%

Note: "Neither" was added as a response option in 2026. In 2023, respondents chose between Local Government, State Government, and Unsure or No Opinion, so the 2026 and 2023 results are not directly comparable.

T9. Do you think your local government should be doing more, about the same, or less regarding your community's affordable housing policies?

	2026	2023
Total More	71%	73%
About the Same	8%	10%
Total Less	15%	13%
Unsure/No Opinion	6%	4%
A Lot More	51%	54%
Somewhat More	20%	19%
A Lot Less	12%	8%
Somewhat Less	3%	5%

T10. Do you think state government should be doing more, about the same, or less regarding affordable housing policies?

	2026	2023
Total More	71%	67%
About the Same	5%	7%
Total Less	20%	23%
Unsure/No Opinion	4%	3%
A Lot More	54%	50%
Somewhat More	17%	17%
A Lot Less	16%	18%
Somewhat Less	4%	5%

T11. Do you agree or disagree with the following statement: "In the past few years, Colorado's state legislature has passed legislation that has brought property tax relief for homeowners."

Total Agree	13%
Total Disagree	58%
Unsure/No Opinion	29%
Strongly Agree	2%
Somewhat Agree	11%
Strongly Disagree	46%
Somewhat Disagree	12%

T12. Please describe the reasons why you agree that the state legislature has brought property tax relief for homeowners. (Asked to the 13% of respondents who strongly or somewhat agreed with T11)

Special Session & Lower Assessment Rates: The most common reason given is a specific legislative action respondents can point to. Many recall the 2024 special session called to hold down property taxes as home values climbed, and describe the result as lower residential assessment rates, reduced assessed values, or compromise legislation the governor signed that

fall. Others mention refunds, multiple relief bills passed in recent sessions, or state action that cut taxes before the relief later expired.

Exemptions for Seniors, Veterans, and Long-Time Owners: A number of respondents credit relief aimed at particular groups of homeowners rather than everyone. They cite the homestead exemption and its recent increase, exemptions extended to surviving spouses of military veterans, portability of the senior exemption when older owners move, and relief for retirees and people on fixed incomes. A few describe qualifying after living in their home for ten years, and some say this relief should reach all seniors regardless of how long they have owned their home.

Smaller Increases on Their Own Tax Bill: Many base their agreement on what they have seen on their own assessment or tax bill. They describe property taxes that rose only slightly, or less than expected, despite large jumps in home values after the pandemic and strong growth in nearby communities, and some mention mill levies that have moderated or valuations that were reduced. A few add that property taxes now feel stable or reasonable compared with homeowners insurance, which they see as the faster-rising cost.

General Awareness Without Specifics: A number of respondents agree on the strength of a general impression. They remember that some kind of bill passed, have seen ballot measures or news coverage about property tax changes, or looked it up online, but cannot name what the legislation did. A few point instead to related measures such as the renter rebate, rebates for low-income households, incentives for solar and wind, easier rules for accessory dwelling units, or TABOR limits on tax increases.

Relief That Falls Short or Carries Costs: Many who agree that relief was delivered still question whether it helped enough or was the right choice. Some say the cuts did little for anyone trying to buy a home, since home prices, rent, and the cost of living remain the larger problem, and a few argue renters deserve a share of the relief. Others describe uneven results, with some owners seeing valuations double, assessments still based on outdated high market values, or taxes climbing again this year. A smaller group objects to the relief itself: that it favored wealthier owners, overrode the will of voters on Proposition HH, pushed local governments into budget trouble that shortchanges fire departments, schools, and human services, or came when Colorado property taxes were already low.

T13. Please describe the reasons why you disagree that the state legislature has brought property tax relief for homeowners. (Asked to the 58% of respondents who strongly or somewhat disagreed with T11)

Tax Bills Keep Going Up: A clear majority give a simple reason for disagreeing: their property tax bill has risen, so whatever the legislature passed has not shown up as relief. Many describe bills that have doubled over a few years, single-year jumps of 30 to 50 percent, or increases of several hundred to a couple of thousand dollars a year. These increases often reach them through mortgage escrow, with monthly payments climbing by amounts they did not plan for when they bought. Respondents frequently say taxes are growing faster than inflation and faster than their paychecks, and some describe borrowing money, falling behind, or watching neighbors sell because of the payments.

Relief Wiped Out by Rising Valuations: A meaningful minority acknowledge that rates or assessment percentages may have come down, but say soaring home values erased any benefit. They argue that slowing the growth of a bill is not the same as lowering it, and that local mill levies were not cut as valuations climbed. Several dispute the county's estimate of their home's value, citing valuations that exceed recent appraisals, dismissed appeals, or values set by nearby

sales and new luxury construction rather than anything about their own property. Some object in principle to being taxed on value gains they have not realized by selling.

Relief Seen as Small, Temporary, or a Shifted Burden: A meaningful minority describe the measures as minor, one-time, or poorly designed. Respondents cite the repeal of the Gallagher Amendment as the cause of the spike and view the later bills as partial fixes that never made up for it. Several say the relief only shifted the burden, citing Proposition HH as an attempt to trade lower rates for TABOR refunds and the capping legislation as a shift to state reimbursement, while school districts, metro districts, and other local governments raised or added levies to cover shortfalls. Others call tax credits and deferral programs confusing and difficult to qualify for, and a few say the relief reached landlords, developers, and wealthier owners rather than typical homeowners.

Seniors and Fixed-Income Owners Being Pushed Out: Some respondents focus on retirees and longtime owners on Social Security or other fixed incomes who can no longer keep up with bills on paid-off homes. Some who have claimed the senior exemption say it still leaves their taxes too high or fails to deliver the break they expected. Several point to specific gaps: the income limits on the state's Property Tax Credit, the loss of the exemption when seniors downsize, and reports that the senior exemption is being discontinued. Respondents also describe parents and older relatives forced to sell homes they had owned for decades.

Spending, TABOR, and Distrust of State Government: A significant share frame their disagreement around distrust of how state and local governments handle money. They say government would rather collect more than cut spending, pointing to repeated ballot measures to raise taxes, fees they believe are used to get around TABOR, shrinking TABOR refunds, and ongoing efforts to weaken or repeal TABOR. Several say rising payments have brought no improvement in services, citing school closures, poor roads, and local bureaucracy. A few name specific charges, such as sidewalk fees, bag fees, and trash billing by bin size. A portion express broader anger at the governor and the majority party, and some tie their tax bills to state spending on services for immigrants.

Housing Costs Beyond the Tax Bill: A meaningful minority broaden the complaint to include the full cost of owning or renting. Homeowners insurance comes up repeatedly alongside taxes, along with HOA dues, utilities, and interest rates, as costs that together outweigh any tax savings. Renters in this group say higher property taxes are passed on in their rent or that landlords keep the savings, and many respondents describe home prices as so far out of reach that property tax relief feels beside the point. Some isolated responses argue that property taxes are not the real driver of affordability and instead point to housing supply, zoning, and building costs.

T14. Do you think affordable housing and land use policies determined by the state are more effective than local government policies at addressing the problem of affordable housing in your community?

	2026	2023
Total Yes	28%	26%
Total No	51%	49%
Unsure/No Opinion	21%	25%
Yes, Definitely	9%	12%
Yes, Probably	19%	14%
No, Definitely Not	25%	26%
No, Probably Not	26%	23%

T15. As you may be aware, local governments can no longer limit the building of multi-unit housing, such as duplexes, triplexes, and "add-on" housing units, on single-family residential-zoned land. Knowing this, do you support or oppose this land use policy?

	2026	2023
Total Support	50%	46%
Total Oppose	39%	47%
Unsure/No Opinion	11%	7%
Strongly Support	28%	27%
Somewhat Support	22%	19%
Strongly Oppose	26%	36%
Somewhat Oppose	13%	11%

Note: In 2023, this policy was still a proposal. Respondents were told the Governor and the State Legislature had debated a land-use proposal that would force local governments to allow multi-unit housing in single-family neighborhoods, and were asked whether they supported or opposed a state policy prohibiting local governments from restricting the construction of multi-unit housing on residential land zoned for single-family homes.

T16. Please describe the reasons why you support this land-use policy. (Asked to the 50% of respondents who strongly or somewhat supported the policy in T15)

More Housing & Lower Costs: The single most common reason given is that Colorado needs more housing and that adding supply will bring prices and rents down, or at least slow their rise. Respondents describe rents and home prices as out of reach for average earners, with new construction in their areas going mostly to large, expensive single-family homes or high-priced apartments. Many say smaller units such as duplexes, triplexes, and townhomes are the missing middle option that young adults, first-time buyers, seniors, people on fixed incomes, and local workers can actually afford. Several connect the shortage to grown children leaving the state, employers in their towns unable to find workers, and people living on the street.

Property Rights & Freedom From Government Restriction: Many supporters frame the policy as a matter of ownership, saying people who own land should be able to decide what to build on it without permission from any level of government. Some go further and argue zoning itself should be minimal or eliminated. A number attach limits to that freedom, such as meeting safety codes,

maintaining the property, not harming neighbors, and having enough water to serve more residents.

Getting Past Local Resistance & NIMBY Opposition: A significant share say local governments have blocked or slowed housing for years because they answer to vocal neighbors, HOAs, neighborhood associations, and established homeowners protecting their property values. Respondents describe single-family zoning as exclusionary by income and, for some, by race, and a few name Boulder, Denver, Douglas County, and Telluride as places where local decisions have held housing back. Several see the state as better placed to act because housing needs cross city lines and one city's choices affect its neighbors. A few who support the idea would still prefer that local governments make the decision themselves.

Add-On Units for Family & Extra Income: Several respondents focus on accessory dwelling units, mother-in-law suites, backyard cottages, and tiny homes. They describe using these to house aging parents who need daily care, adult children who cannot afford rent, and family members with disabilities, and retirees mention them as a way to age in place. Others value the rental income for helping cover a mortgage or other living expenses, and a few describe past fights over zoning for a garage apartment, a fourplex, or a second structure on their lot.

Density, Sprawl, and Better Use of Land: A number of supporters want communities to build up and fill in rather than spread outward, pointing to farmland, open space, wildlife habitat, and trees lost to new subdivisions. They describe denser neighborhoods as more walkable, less dependent on cars, better for transit and local businesses, and more efficient with water and infrastructure spending. Some tie this to climate change and to the ozone alerts that come with heavy car traffic each summer.

Support With Conditions: A number of respondents back the policy while naming what they want watched. They raise traffic, parking, water, and whether roads and utilities can keep up (such as a narrow wildfire evacuation road in Evergreen), along with preserving neighborhood character and green space. Others worry the new units will go to investors, corporations, second homeowners, or short-term rentals instead of full-time residents, and several say permit fees and construction costs will limit how much actually gets built. A few note that, as they understand it, local governments can still restrict these housing types.

T17. Please describe the reasons why you oppose this land-use policy. (Asked to the 39% of respondents who strongly or somewhat opposed the policy in T15)

Local Control & State Overreach: The most common reason for opposition is that land use and zoning should be decided locally, not by the state. Respondents say city and county governments know their communities, and that state lawmakers in Denver are too far removed to understand local conditions. Many object to a one-size-fits-all rule and argue that rural, mountain, and suburban towns should not be held to the same standards as the Denver metro area. Some want residents to have a say or a vote on what gets built in their neighborhoods, and some cite home rule by name. Several tie this to broader frustration with state government and the Democratic majority in the legislature.

Roads, Water, Parking, and Services Cannot Absorb More Density: Many respondents say neighborhoods built for single-family homes lack the infrastructure to support more units. Traffic and congested roads come up most often, followed by street parking and cars spilling onto lawns and curbs. Water is a recurring concern, with respondents citing drought and existing watering restrictions. Several also mention sewer, septic, and power capacity.

Others list crowded schools, stretched police and fire services, limited wildfire evacuation routes, and too few grocery stores, parks, and medical facilities near new development. Specific local examples include school pressure in Erie and a Westminster city council vote to replace schools with denser housing that lacked adequate parking.

Neighborhood Character and Property Values: Many respondents bought in single-family neighborhoods for yards, space, quiet, and low traffic, and view multi-unit construction as a breach of that expectation after the fact. They worry that duplexes, fourplexes, and apartments next door will lower home values, and a few mention covenant-controlled areas they believe should remain uniform. Several describe what they already see: homes with too many occupants, increased noise, cars parked in yards, and trash piling up.

Complaints about the appearance of new buildings are common, with respondents calling them cheaply built and out of scale, and citing the Barnes and Powers area and the former Bandimere site near old town Morrison. A number also raise crime and safety concerns tied to more people living close together, and a few object to lower-income or subsidized housing in their area. Some draw a line between an add-on unit for an aging parent or family member, which they would allow, and larger multi-unit buildings, which they oppose.

The Policy Helps Developers and Investors, Not Affordability: A significant share doubts the policy will make housing cheaper. They say new condos, townhomes, and apartments remain out of reach, and several note vacant units and move-in specials at recently built complexes. Respondents name developers, property management companies, hedge funds, private equity, BlackRock, and out-of-state landlords as the beneficiaries, often paying cash, converting homes into rentals, and packing more tenants onto each lot. Many want affordable single-family starter homes and a path to ownership rather than more rentals, and a few add that HOA fees and short-term rentals such as Airbnb push costs higher. Several would rather see older, vacant housing repaired before more is built.

Overdevelopment and Loss of Open Space: Several respondents object to the overall pace of growth, saying apartments are going up on every open parcel. They describe the loss of farmland, trees, green space, wildlife habitat, and mountain views, and compare parts of Colorado to California or Denver. Respondents mention Lakewood's open space and overbuilding in Fort Collins, and a few cite Greeley and Thornton as examples they do not want their towns to resemble. Some link the problem to rapid population growth in general, and a few raise drought alongside proposed data centers.

T18. Among the following options, please indicate how much each contributes to the problem of affordable rental and homeownership opportunities in Colorado.

	A Lot & Somewhat	A Lot	Somewhat	Not at All	Unsure/No Opinion
Economic market forces such as inflation and the availability of labor, construction, and housing materials.	89%	59%	30%	6%	5%
The increase in people moving to Colorado.	82%	46%	36%	13%	5%
A community not having the resources to put in a housing development's infrastructure, such as streets, sewers, and water.	72%	38%	34%	17%	11%
The impact of new and existing residential land use building codes and regulations.	65%	31%	34%	15%	20%
The dramatic increase in short-term rental properties.	65%	36%	29%	20%	15%
The extensive amount of time it takes for a residential developer to go through a local government's planning and zoning process.	64%	33%	31%	19%	17%
A group of community members who oppose any new rental or affordable housing developments in their neighborhood.	64%	35%	29%	24%	12%
Overly restrictive local land use and zoning policies.	63%	34%	29%	19%	18%
A local government's construction fees and permitting costs that residential developers must pay.	60%	28%	32%	23%	17%
The limitations on residential development infrastructure requirements, such as adequate sewage systems and a sustainable water supply.	58%	26%	32%	24%	18%
The cost of insurance for residential developers that protects them from construction defect lawsuits and liabilities.	56%	25%	31%	19%	25%

T19. Do you agree or disagree with the following statements?

A. Most local communities in Colorado have a "NIMBY" (not in my backyard) or negative attitude regarding multi-unit residential developments, and they would prefer single-family residential developments.

	2026	2023
Total Agree	77%	81%
Total Disagree	14%	11%
Unsure/No Opinion	9%	8%
Strongly Agree	45%	51%
Somewhat Agree	32%	30%
Strongly Disagree	6%	5%
Somewhat Disagree	8%	6%

B. "Restrictive residential zoning and land-use policies such as sewer capacity, water capacity, setback requirements, minimum square footage requirements, and height restrictions are the primary reasons Colorado has not been able to address the affordable housing problem."

	2026	2023
Total Agree	43%	38%
Total Disagree	41%	49%
Unsure/No Opinion	16%	13%
Strongly Agree	16%	13%
Somewhat Agree	27%	25%
Strongly Disagree	24%	28%
Somewhat Disagree	17%	21%

C. "Some residential zoning and land use policies in Colorado have been used to discriminate against minorities and individuals with lower incomes."

	2026	2023
Total Agree	53%	54%
Total Disagree	33%	32%
Unsure/No Opinion	14%	14%
Strongly Agree	33%	36%
Somewhat Agree	20%	18%
Strongly Disagree	25%	24%
Somewhat Disagree	8%	8%

T20. As you may be aware, Colorado law prohibits local governments from limiting the number of new residential housing developments that can be built. Knowing this, do you support or oppose this new law?

	2026	2023
Total Support	44%	44%
Total Oppose	44%	47%
Unsure/No Opinion	12%	9%
Strongly Support	23%	24%
Somewhat Support	21%	20%
Strongly Oppose	27%	31%
Somewhat Oppose	17%	16%

T21. As you may know, rent control is a policy that limits rental rates within a city or state. Knowing this, do you support or oppose a rent control policy in your local community?

	2026	2023
Total Support	59%	60%
Total Oppose	35%	32%
Unsure/No Opinion	6%	8%
Strongly Support	37%	40%
Somewhat Support	22%	20%
Strongly Oppose	25%	24%
Somewhat Oppose	10%	8%

And now, we have a few questions for statistical purposes only.

T22. Do you rent or own your home?

Own	63%
Rent	32%
Other	3%
Prefer not to say	2%

T23. Which gender do you most identify with?

Female	51%
Male	48%
Identify Differently	1%

T24. Are you between the ages of:

18 to 34	29%
35 to 44	19%
45 to 54	15%
55 to 64	14%
65 or Older	23%

T25. Are you registered to vote as an Unaffiliated voter, a Democrat, a Republican, or are you registered with another party, or are you not registered to vote?

Unaffiliated	50%
Democrat	24%
Republican	22%
Other party	3%
Not registered to vote	1%

T26. Which race or ethnicity do you most identify with?

White	70%
Hispanic or Latino	19%
Black or African-American	3%
Asian	2%
Other	6%

T27. Are you married or single?

Married	52%
Single	41%
Prefer Not to Say	7%

T28. Do you have a four-year college degree?

Yes	57%
No	43%

T29. Last year, what was your total household income before taxes?

Less than $50,000	19%
$50,000 to $74,999	16%
$75,000 to $99,999	14%
$100,000 to $149,999	19%
$150,000 to $199,999	8%
More than $200,000	11%
Prefer not to say	13%

Survey Methodology

This survey used an MMS text survey data collection method, inviting Colorado residents and voters to participate. The survey data were weighted to reflect Colorado voter registration demographics. The interviews were conducted from September 9 to 20, 2026. The survey results have a margin of error of +/- 2.93% at the 95% confidence level. The 2023 comparison results are from the Magellan Strategies Colorado Housing and Land Use Opinion Survey, an MMS text-to-online survey of 779 registered voters conducted from September 5 to 17, 2023.

The 2023 survey data were also weighted to be representative of Colorado voter registration demographics, and those results have a margin of error of +/- 3.51% at the 95% confidence level. The 2023 column appears only where the question wording and response options were the same or very similar in both surveys.