December 2007

# NOTE: Percents may not add to 100 due to rounding. Total number of respondents shown in parentheses.

#### 2007

#### Prior Year **CITY TOTALS**

				С	oalition								CII	TIOTA	20			
		SW	NW/Downtown	North	Inner NE	Central	SE	Fast										
Q# Feeling of safety in	Very safe	5W 75%	NW/Downtown 66%	44%	Inner NE 56%	NE 47%	SE 57%	East 30%	City Total 51%	2006 54%	2005 49%	2004 51%	2003 48%	2002 47%	2001 49%	2000 48%	1999 46%	1998 48%
neighborhood in DAY	,	1376	00 %	4470	5078	4770	5178	5078	5176	5476	4978	5176	4078	4776	4370	4076	40 /8	4076
	Safe	22%	26%	45%	36%	42%	35%	49%	38%	35%	39%	37%	39%	41%	39%	40%	42%	40%
	Neither	2%	5%	8%	6%	8%	6%	14%	8%	8%		9%	9%	9%	9%	9%	9%	8%
	Unsafe	1%	2%	2%	2%	3%	2%	6%	3%	2%		3%	3%	2%	2%	3%	2%	3%
	Very unsafe	0% (2,295)	0% (1,570)	1% (2,136)	0% (2,157)	1% (1,657)	0% (5,457)	1% (4,575)	1% (19,847)	0% (2,708)		0% (3,378)	1% (5,309)	1% (5,292)	1% (4,808)	0% (3,687)	1% (3,589)	1% (3,781)
		(2,295)	(1,370)	(2,130)	(2,137)	(1,037)	(3,437)	(4,575)	(19,047)	(2,700)	(21,303)	(3,370)	(3,309)	(3,292)	(4,000)	(3,007)	(3,309)	(3,701)
Feeling of safety in 1B park in DAY	Very safe	54%	46%	30%	40%	35%	39%	17%	35%	37%	32%	34%	32%	30%	33%	30%	29%	31%
	Safe	35%	38%	45%	42%	45%	43%	46%	43%	41%		44%	44%	44%	43%	45%	45%	43%
	Neither	8% 3%	10% 5%	16% 7%	13% 5%	13% 6%	12% 4%	22% 12%	14% 7%	14% 6%		15% 6%	16% 7%	17% 7%	16% 7%	16% 7%	18% 7%	17% 7%
	Unsafe Very unsafe	3% 0%	5% 1%	2%	5% 1%	0% 2%	4% 1%	3%	7% 1%	2%		6% 1%	7% 2%	2%	7% 1%	7% 2%	7% 1%	2%
	vory unouro	(2,218)	(1,527)	(2,079)	(2,100)	(1,583)	(5,280)	(4,232)	(19,019)	(2,590)		(3,244)	(5,051)	(5,068)	(4,545)	(3,492)	(3,423)	(3,613)
				,									,					
Feeling of safety 1C downtown in DAY	Very safe	27%	33%	25%	35%	23%	29%	10%	24%	25%	22%	27%	26%	26%	29%	27%	24%	26%
	Safe	46%	44%	46%	43%	44%	43%	40%	43%	44%		43%	43%	44%	43%	43%	46%	45%
	Neither	18%	16%	18%	15%	19%	18%	28%	20%	20%		20%	21%	20%	20%	21%	21%	20%
	Unsafe Very unsafe	7% 2%	5% 2%	9% 2%	5% 1%	10% 3%	8% 2%	16% 7%	9% 3%	10% 3%		7% 3%	8% 3%	7% 3%	6% 2%	7% 2%	7% 2%	7% 2%
	very unsale	(2,222)	(1,507)	(2,005)	(2,061)	(1,563)	(5,167)	(4,130)	(18,655)	(2,555)		(3,214)	(5,023)	(5,007)	(4,519)	(3,437)	(3,406)	(3,606)
		(,)	(,,)	(_,)	(_,,	(,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,	(-,,	(,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,	(,)	(_,,	(,)	(-,)	(-,)	(0,000)	(1,212)	(0,)	(-,,	(-,)
Feeling of safety in 1D neigh. at NIGHT	Very safe	32%	26%	10%	13%	14%	18%	7%	16%	18%	14%	17%	17%	15%	16%	14%	14%	14%
	Safe	43%	40%	35%	39%	34%	39%	25%	35%	37%	35%	36%	36%	35%	37%	37%	34%	35%
	Neither	14%	18%	26%	23%	22%	20%	24%	21%	20%	22%	22%	23%	23%	22%	22%	24%	24%
	Unsafe	9%	11%	23%	20%	23%	18%	30%	20%	18%	22%	18%	18%	20%	18%	20%	21%	20%
	Very unsafe	1% (2,240)	5% (1,532)	8% (2,072)	5% (2,095)	7%	6% (5,285)	14% (4,386)	7% (19,208)	7% (2,637)	8% (21,008)	7% (3,312)	7% (5,206)	7% (5.1.4.)	7% (4,679)	7% (3,595)	7% (3,487)	7% (3,669)
		(2,240)	(1,532)	(2,072)	(2,095)	(1,598)	(5,265)	(4,300)	(19,200)	(2,037)	(21,000)	(3,312)	(5,206)	(5,144)	(4,679)	(3,595)	(3,407)	(3,009)
Feeling of safety in 1E park at NIGHT	Very safe	11%	10%	3%	4%	4%	6%	3%	5%	7%	5%	6%	6%	5%	5%	4%	4%	0%
	Safe	31%	28%	17%	20%	19%	21%	10%	20%	19%		19%	20%	18%	20%	18%	16%	16%
	Neither	29%	25%	25%	27%	27%	26%	21%	25%	27%	24%	27%	26%	26%	26%	27%	25%	25%
	Unsafe	24%	26%	35%	35%	33%	32%	41%	33%	32%	35%	33%	31%	33%	32%	33%	36%	35%
	Very unsafe	6% (2,135)	11% (1,488)	21% (2,025)	14% (2,045)	17% (1,525)	15% (5,126)	26% (4,122)	17% (18,466)	15% (2,521)		15% (3,175)	17% (4,971)	18% (4,929)	17% (4,451)	18% (3,404)	19% (3,349)	20% (3,534)
		(2,133)	(1,400)	(2,020)	(2,040)	(1,020)	(0,120)	(7,122)	(10,+00)	(2,521)	(20,001)	(3,173)	(4,371)	(4,328)	(4,431)	(3,404)	(3,549)	(3,334)
	I		I I		. 1	I	I		· I	ļ	I	I	I	I	1			· I

December 2007

# NOTE: Percents may not add to 100 due to rounding. Total number of respondents shown in parentheses.

2007

				С	oalition								CII	Y IOIA	19			
Q#		SW	NW/Downtown	North	Inner NE	Central NE	SE	East	City Total	2006	2005	2004	2003	2002	2001	2000	1999	1998
Feeling of safety downtown at NIGHT	Very safe	4%	6%	3%	5%	4%	4%	1%	4%	4%	3%	5%	5%	5%	5%	4%	4%	4%
	Safe Neither Unsafe Very unsafe	26% 32% 26% 12% (2,194)	29% 31% 23% 10% (1,502)	25% 30% 27% 15% (1,992)	31% 33% 23% 8% (2,013)	22% 29% 29% 16% (1,526)	25% 30% 26% 14% (5,088)	11% 22% 37% 28% (4,024)	23% 29% 28% 16% (18,339)	24% 30% 27% 16% (2,542)	19% 27% 31% 20% (20,354)	24% 31% 27% 13% (3,174)	25% 30% 26% 14% (4,984)	25% 31% 25% 14% (4,950)	26% 32% 25% 12% (4,462)	24% 32% 26% 14% (3,415)	22% 29% 29% 16% (3,344)	21% 31% 28% 16% (3,539)
How willing to help 2 police?	Very willng	14%	16%	19%	20%	18%	16%	17%	17%	17%	17%	17%	16%	15%	16%	14%	14%	15%
	Willing Neither Unwillng Very unwillng	41% 34% 9% 1% (2,104)	41% 31% 10% 2% (1,444)	44% 28% 7% 1% (1,926)	41% 27% 8% 3% (1,965)	44% 30% 8% 1% (1,482)	42% 31% 9% 2% (4,938)	43% 30% 9% 2% (4,074)	42% 30% 9% 2% (17,933)	45% 28% 9% 2% (2,471)	44% 30% 8% 2% (19,547)	42% 33% 7% 1% (3,199)	44% 31% 8% 2% (4,995)	43% 33% 7% 2% (4,941)	43% 33% 7% 1% (4,477)	41% 35% 9% 1% (3,372)	47% 32% 6% 1% (3,387)	45% 32% 7% 1% (3,585)
Burglary in last 12 3A months?	Yes	2%	5%	6%	7%	7%	5%	7%	5%	6%	7%	5%	6%	5%	5%	4%	5%	5%
	No	98% (2,282)	95% (1,547)	94% (2,131)	93% (2,138)	93% (1,647)	95% (5,436)	93% (4,569)	95% (19,750)	94% (2,696)	93% (21,593)	95% (3,397)	95% (5,342)	95% (5,311)	95% (4,831)	96% (3,713)	95% (3,617)	95% (3,790)
Was burglary 3B reported?	Yes	73%	66%	58%	66%	73%	71%	71%	69%	61%	69%	67%	58%	73%	57%	56%	66%	70%
	No	27% (45)	34% (71)	42% (114)	34% (137)	27% (110)	29% (254)	29% (302)	31% (1,033)	39% (160)	31% (1,539)	33% (171)	42% (291)	27% (255)	43% (212)	44% (158)	34% (164)	30% (181)
Know neighborhood 4 officer?	Yes	0	0	0	о	0	о	0	13.7%	14%	14%	14%	15%	14%	13%	14%	13%	13%
	No	85% (2,070)	89% (1,455)	83% (1,996)	87% (1,978)	84% (1,488)	86% (4,978)	89% (4,247)	86% (18,212)	86% (2,617)	86% (19,435)	86% (3,413)	85% (5,298)	86% (5,287)	87% (4,809)	86% (3,687)	87% (3,606)	87% (3,803)
Car prowl in last 12 5A months?	Yes	9%	13%	18%	18%	14%	19%	23%	17%	17%	21%	21%	22%	20%	19%	18%	20%	22%
	No	91% (2,276)	87% (1,524)	82% (2,111)	82% (2,125)	86% (1,632)	81% (5,397)	77% (4,507)	83% (19,572)	83% (2,693)	79% (21,566)	80% (3,396)	78% (5,309)	80% (5,284)	81% (4,799)	82% (3,665)	80% (3,597)	78% (3,785)
200 How many car	07 data for 5B ar	nd 5C not re	eported due to me	thodologica	al differences	s with prior	years' surve	eys										
5B prowls?		n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	586	6,761	970	704	1,611	1,349	991	1,055	1,299

December 2007

# NOTE: Percents may not add to 100 due to rounding. Total number of respondents shown in parentheses.

				С	oalition								UII	TIOTA	20			
Q#		SW	NW/Downtown	North	Inner NE	Central NE	SE	East	City Total	2006	2005	2004	2003	2002	2001	2000	1999	1998
How many car prowls 5C reported?	3	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	45%	45%	46%	44%	43%	39%	40%	40%	45%
Prepared to sustain 6A self?	Yes	64%	52%	54%	48%	57%	53%	64%	57%	56%	55%	54%	54%	53%	54%	61%	57%	52%
<u>on</u> <u>sei</u> :	No	36% (2,257)	48% (1,510)	46% (2,090)	52% (2,097)	43% (1,585)	47% (5,317)	36% (4,466)	43% (19,322)	44% (2,680)		46% (3,363)	46% (5,266)	47% (5,255)	46% (4,754)	39% (3,653)	43% (3,580)	48% (3,753)
6B prepared?	Yes	68%	54%	60%	61%	60%	60%	55%	60%	64%	60%	49%	56%	50%	50%	54%	57%	47%
propured.	No	32% (762)	46% (664)	40% (922)	39% (1,036)	40% (648)	40% (2,353)	45% (1,485)	40% (7,870)	36% (1,123)	41% (9,139)	51% (1,275)	44% (2,058)	50% (2,074)	50% (1,896)	46% (1,233)	43% (1,332)	53% (1,550)
Trained in first aid or 7 CPR?	Yes	40%	33%	41%	40%	37%	37%	39%	38%	41%	39%	43%	53%	52%	51%	52%	53%	51%
or it.	No	60% (2,173)	67% (1,488)	58% (2,039)	60% (2,064)	63% (1,546)	63% (5,214)	61% (4,299)	62% (18,823)	59% (2,673)	61% (20,740)	57% (3,319)	47% (5,324)	48% (5,265)	49% (4,767)	48% (3,679)	47% (3,571)	49% (3,781)
Call 911 in last 12 8A months?	Yes	13%	16%	23%	22%	19%	18%	24%	20%	19%	21%	19%	-	-	-	-	-	-
	No	87% (2,289)	84% (1,550)	77% (2,133)	78% (2,137)	81% (1,642)	82% (5,417)	76% (4,537)	80% (19,705)	81% (2,695)	79% (21,735)	81% (3,413)	-	-	-	-	-	-
Rating of 911 service	Very good	49%	50%	37%	37%	41%	41%	36%	40%	44%	42%	46%	-	-	-	-	-	-
	Good Neither Bad Very bad	34% 9% 4% (289)	10% 6%	37% 13% 8% 5% (487)	8%	38% 9% 6% (313)	34% 14% 7% 5% (967)	38% 13% 8% 5% (1,050)	36% 13% 7% 5% (3,806)	35% 10% 6% 4% (497)	35% 12% 7% 4% (4,390)	35% 11% 5% 2% (644)	- - - -		- - - -	-		- - - -
Rating of effort to control police	Very good	7%	9%	6%	5%	8%	6%	10%	7%	9%	8%	7%	-	-	-	-	-	-
9 misconduct	Good Neither Bad Very bad	33% 39% 15% 6% (1,886)	36% 18% 8%	31% 35% 18% 10% (1,794)	36% 21% 12%	31% 35% 18% 8% (1,392)	29% 38% 18% 9% (4,494)	35% 35% 14% 7% (3,871)	31% 36% 17% 8% (16,434)	33% 37% 15% 7% (2,338)	35% 18% 9%	28% 34% 20% 11% (2,999)	- - - -	- - - -	- - -		- - - -	- - -

December 2007

# NOTE: Percents may not add to 100 due to rounding. Total number of respondents shown in parentheses.

#### Prior Year **CITY TOTALS**

4

					oalition				ì				CII	YIOTA	13			
				U	Joantion	Central												
Q#		SW	NW/Downtown	North	Inner NE	NE	SE	East	City Total	2006	2005	2004	2003	2002	2001	2000	1999	1998
Rating of tap water 10 quality	Very good	41%	36%	30%	34%	32%	32%	23%	32%	32%	26%	26%	23%	-	-	-	-	-
	Good	43%	43%	45%	44%	45%	46%	47%	45%	47%	46%	45%	44%	-	-	-	-	-
	Neither	11%	15%	16%	16%	16%	14%	18%	15%	14%		19%	21%	-	-	-	-	-
	Bad Very bad	4% 1%	5% 1%	7% 2%	5% 1%	5% 2%	5% 2%	8% 3%	6% 2%	6% 1%	8% 2%	8% 3%	9% 3%	-	-	-	-	-
	very bau	(2,094)	(1,399)	(1,961)	(1,963)	(1,476)	(4,961)	(4,060)	(17,914)	(2,642)	(21,133)	(3,243)	(5,222)	-	-	-	-	-
		(2,001)	(1,000)	(1,001)	(1,000)	(1,110)	(1,001)	(1,000)	(17,011)	(2,042)	(21,100)	(0,240)	(0,222)					
Rating of sewer/drainage in 11A neighborhood	Very good	13%	15%	13%	12%	15%	11%	11%	12%	11%	10%	19%	22%	24%	24%	24%	25%	25%
	Good	50%	48%	53%	50%	51%	51%	48%	50%	49%	47%	50%	49%	47%	47%	51%	50%	49%
	Neither Bad	23% 10%	22% 12%	23% 9%	26% 11%	22% 9%	25% 10%	27% 10%	24% 10%	26% 10%	27%	22%	19%	18%	20%	17%	17%	18%
	Very bad	3%	3%	9% 3%	2%	9% 4%	4%	4%	3%	10%	11% 5%	6% 4%	7% 4%	7% 4%	6% 3%	5% 3%	5% 3%	5% 3%
	Very bad	(2,067)	(1,327)	(1,937)	(1,891)	(1,443)	(4,848)	(4,100)	(17,613)	(2,523)		(3,092)	(5,021)	(4,916)	(4,421)	(3,418)	(3,287)	(3,427)
		,					( )	( , ,	( , ,	( ))	( - / /	(-,,	(-,-,,	( ))	(,,,,	(-, -,	(-, - ,	(-, ,
How well sewers/drainage 11B protect rivers	Very good	4%	4%	4%	4%	4%	3%	5%	4%	4%	3%	5%	5%	5%	5%	6%	5%	6%
	Good	26%	25%	26%	24%	27%	22%	28%	25%	25%	22%	26%	23%	25%	22%	24%	23%	23%
	Neither	33%	27%	30%	29%	30%	32%	35%	32%	32%	32%	26%	25%	26%	27%	27%	27%	24%
	Bad	27%	31%	27%		29%	29%	21%	27%	26%	29%	27%	29%	28%	28%	26%	28%	30%
	Very bad	11%	12%	12%	10%	10%	14%	11%	12%	12%	14%	16%	18%	16%	18%	17%	17%	17%
		(1,770)	(1,113)	(1,702)	(1,583)	(1,248)	(4,124)	(3,351)	(14,891)	(2,177)	(16,883)	(2,832)	(4,496)	(4,295)	(3,954)	(2,933)	(2,871)	(3,016)
How rate garb/recycle 12A cost?	e Very good	9%	13%	9%	9%	9%	9%	8%	9%	10%	9%	10%	9%	9%	8%	8%	8%	9%
	Good	37%	40%	41%		43%	40%	37%	39%	41%		39%	37%	36%	36%	36%	36%	36%
	Neither	34%	33%	32%	33%	31%	34%	35%	34%	33%	32%	33%	34%	34%	35%	35%	34%	34%
	Bad	16%	11%	14%		13%	14%	16%	14%	12%	14%	14%	15%	16%	16%	16%	17%	16%
	Very bad	5% (2,052)	3% (1,113)	4% (1,938)	2% (1,885)	4% (1,496)	4% (4,707)	4% (4,070)	4% (17,261)	4% (2,431)	4% (19,351)	4% (2,934)	5% (4,704)	5% (4,616)	5% (4,075)	5% (3,186)	5% (3,110)	5% (3,235)
		(2,002)	(1,110)	(1,000)	(1,000)	(1,400)	(4,707)	(4,070)	(17,201)	(2,401)	(13,331)	(2,334)	(4,704)	(4,010)	(4,073)	(0,100)	(0,110)	(0,200)
How rate garbage 12B quality?	Very good	28%	23%	22%	24%	25%	24%	18%	23%	25%	24%	22%	23%	23%	22%	21%	22%	24%
_	Good	54%	55%	57%		54%	55%	56%	56%	55%	56%	55%	56%	55%	55%	55%	56%	54%
	Neither	14%	18%	15%		15%	16%	19%	16%	15%		18%	17%	17%	18%	19%	17%	17%
	Bad Vorv bad	3% 1%	3% 1%	5% 2%		3% 1%	4% 1%	5% 2%	4% 1%	4% 1%		4% 1%						
	Very bad	(2,217)	(1,366)	(2,056)	(2,078)	(1,591)	(5,251)	(4,418)	(18,977)	(2,610)		(3,182)	(5,099)	(5,022)	(4,506)	(3,490)	(3,338)	(3,514)
		(,)	(1,000)	(_,000)	(_,0.0)	(1,001)	(-,=0.)	(.,	(,)	(_,010)	(_0,, 0, )	(0,102)	(0,000)	(0,022)	(.,000)	(0,100)	(0,000)	(0,011)

December 2007

# NOTE: Percents may not add to 100 due to rounding. Total number of respondents shown in parentheses.

#### Prior Year **CITY TOTALS**

				<u></u>	oalition				1				CII	YIOTA	13			
				0	Cantion	Central												
Q#		SW	NW/Downtown	North	Inner NE	NE	SE	East	City Total	2006	2005	2004	2003	2002	2001	2000	1999	1998
How rate recycling quality?	Very good	26%	22%	21%	24%	26%	23%	20%	23%	27%	25%	25%	24%	25%	24%	23%	24%	26%
	Good Neither Bad	51% 15% 6%	51% 18% 7%	53% 15% 8%	52% 14% 8%	50% 16% 6%	51% 16% 8%	53% 18% 7%	52% 16% 7%	52% 15% 5%	53% 15% 5%	52% 17% 5%	53% 16% 5%	52% 16% 5%	52% 16% 6%	53% 17% 5%	52% 17% 5%	50% 16% 6%
	Very bad	2% (2,179)	2% (1,340)	3% (2,022)	2% (2,027)	2% (1,555)	2% (5,131)	2% (4,297)	2% (18,551)	2% (2,601)	2% (20,592)	2% (3,171)	2% (5,042)	2% (4,968)	2% (4,464)	2% (3,454)	2% (3,307)	2% (3,484)
13 Type of residence	1 family 2,3,4 plex	83% 4%	35% 5%	86% 5%	81% 8%	91% 3%	79% 8%	82% 5%	79% 6%	78% 5%	79% 6%	75% 7%	76% 7%	76% 6%	73% 7%	76% 5%	76% 5%	76% 5%
	Apt Other	11% 1% (2,257)	56% 4% (1,533)	7% 2% (2,110)	9% 1% (2,107)	5% 0% (1,612)	11% 2% (5,353)	10% 3% (4,480)	13% 2% (19,452)	15% 2% (2,606)		16% 2% (3,292)	15% 3% (5,298)	16% 2% (5,162)	17% 3% (4,694)	17% 2% (3,628)	17% 2% (3,370)	16% 3% (3,565)
How long at current 14 residence?	Less than year	7%	16%	10%	12%	8%	9%	7%	9%	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
	1-4 years 5-9 years 10+ years	27% 18% 48%	38% 19% 27%	35% 18% 38%	32% 19% 37%	27% 18% 47%	32% 18% 41%	26% 16% 51%	30% 18% 43%	-	- -	-	-	- -	-	-	- -	- -
		(2,258)	(1,532)	(2,106)	(2,109)	(1,618)	(5,350)	(4,497)	(19,470)	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
Traffic flow PEAK: 15A major streets	Very good	2%	2%	3%	3%	3%	2%	2%	2%	2%		2%	-	-	-	-	-	-
	Good Neither Bad	22% 27% 37%	20% 26% 38%	24% 26% 32%	25% 27% 35%	24% 26% 34%	21% 27% 38%	19% 27% 35%	22% 27% 36%	23% 25% 37%	23% 27% 37%	22% 30% 35%	-	-	-	-	- -	-
	Very bad	12% (2,248)	14% (1,477)	16% (2,085)	11% (2,082)	13% (1,600)	11% (5,291)	17% (4,471)	13% (19,254)	13% (2,624)	12% (20,742)	11% (3,207)	-	-	-	-	-	-
Traffic flow PEAK: neighborhood streets	Very good	19%	10%	15%	15%	13%	14%	12%	14%	14%	14%	11%	-	-	-	-	-	-
	Good Neither Bad	45% 20% 13%	38% 24% 21%	45% 21% 14%	46% 21% 14%	48% 21% 14%	43% 23% 15%	39% 25% 16%	43% 22% 15%	42% 23% 16%	43% 22% 15%	44% 25% 15%	-	- -	- -	- -	- -	- -
	Very bad	4% (2,247)	7% (1,494)	5% (2,094)	4% (2,099)	4% (1,613)	5% (5,324)	8% (4,460)	5% (19,331)	5% (2,615)	5% (20,967)	6% (3,225)	-	-	-	-	-	-

December 2007

# NOTE: Percents may not add to 100 due to rounding. Total number of respondents shown in parentheses.

#### Prior Year **CITY TOTALS**

6

				С	oalition				]				GI	TIOTA	19			
Q#		SW	NW/Downtown	North	Inner NE	Central NE	SE	East	City Total	2006	2005	2004	2003	2002	2001	2000	1999	1998
Traffic flow OFF- 16A PEAK: major streets	Very good	23%	20%	20%	21%	20%	19%	12%	18%	18	% 17%	14%	-	-	-	-	-	-
	Good Neither	52% 17%	52% 19%		54% 17%	51% 21%	51% 20%	50% 24%	51% 20%	53° 20°	6 21%	53% 23%	-	-	-	-	-	-
	Bad Very bad	7% 1% (2,196)	7% 1% (1,453)	8% 2% (2,050)	6% 1% (2,044)	7% 2% (1,566)	9% 1% (5,149)	12% 2% (4,334)	9% 2% (18,792)	89 19 (2,595	6 2%	9% 2% (3,211)	-	-	-	-	-	-
						,	,											
Traffic flow OFF- PEAK: neighborhood streets	Very good	46%	33%	35%	38%	34%	36%	24%	34%	33	% 32%	27%	-	-	-	-	-	-
16B	Good Neither	42% 9%	49% 12%	46% 12%	46% 10%	49% 11%	45% 13%	49% 17%	46% 13%	49 <sup>0</sup> 12 <sup>0</sup>		51% 14%	-	-	-	-	-	-
	Bad Very bad	3% 1%	5% 1%	2%	5% 1%	5% 1%	5% 1%	8% 2%	5% 2%	59	% 6% % 2%	5% 2%	-	-	-	-	-	-
		(2,212)	(1,460)	(2,052)	(2,069)	(1,588)	(5,206)	(4,349)	(18,936)	(2,606	6) (20,518)	(3,224)	-	-	-	-	-	-
Work outside home?		66%	65%	71%	72%	69%	70%	57%	66%	69'		69%	69%	67%	70%	66%	65%	68%
	No	34% (2,301)	35% (1,567)	29% (2,143)	28% (2,158)	31% (1,639)	30% (5,457)	43% (4,579)	34% (19,844)	319 (2,692		31% (3,187)	31% (5,304)	33% (5,234)	30% (4,749)	34% (3,640)	35% (3,541)	32% (3,686)
Commute during 17B peak hours?	Morning	10%	9%	10%	11%	11%	9%	11%	10%	9'	% 10%	12%	17%	17%	18%	16%	17%	16%
	Evening Both	9% 69%	8% 68%		8% 68%	10% 65%	12% 66%	14% 60%	11% 65%	10 <sup>0</sup> 68 <sup>0</sup>		12% 62%	11% 56%	10% 57%	10% 56%	10% 58%	12% 54%	10% 56%
	Neither	12% (1,492)	15% (987)	15% (1,498)	13% (1,516)	14% (1,111)	13% (3,743)	15% (2,542)	14% (12,889)	139 (1,828		15% (2,173)	16% (3,636)	16% (3,509)	16% (3,343)	16% (2,391)	17% (2,267)	18% (2,485)
17C Usual mode of travel	Drive alone Drive w/	76% 7%	58% 3%		62% 9%	74% 7%	65% 7%	82% 6%	70% 7%	729	% 71%	72%	72%	71%	70%	69%	70%	70%
	others Bus or Max	7%	13%	10%	11%	9%	11%	6%	10%	8 <sup>0</sup> 8 <sup>0</sup>		8% 11%	8% 10%	8% 10%	8% 11%	9% 12%	8% 12%	8% 12%
	Drive partway Walk	3%	4% 17%		3% 3%	4% 1%	3% 3%	3% 2%	4% 4%	4º 3º		2% 3%	3% 3%	3% 4%	3% 4%	2% 5%	3% 4%	2% 5%
	Bicycle	3% 3% (1,500)	4% (976)		12% (1,486)	4% (1,109)	10% (3,698)	1% (2,520)	6% (12,783)	5º (1,784	6 4%	4% (2,184)	4% (3,598)	4% (3,481)	4% (3,293)	3% (2,363)	3% (2,247)	3% (2,468)
							l			I					l			

December 2007

# NOTE: Percents may not add to 100 due to rounding. Total number of respondents shown in parentheses.

#### 2007

				С	oalition													
Q#		SW	NW/Downtown	North	Inner NE	Central NE	SE	East	City Total	2006	2005	2004	2003	2002	2001	2000	1999	1998
Alternate mode of travel	NONE	52%	44%	41%	35%	46%	40%	54%	44%	44%	46%	53%		-		-	-	
	Drive alone Drive w/	8% 12%	8% 8%	10% 13%	10% 11%	8% 12%	10% 12%	5% 17%	9% 13%	11%	9%	7%	-	-	-	-	-	-
	others Bus or Max	14%	20%	19%	20%	16%	18%	12%		12% 17%	12% 17%	9% 18%	-	-	-	-	-	-
	Drive partway Walk	2% 5%	2% 11%	3% 3%	2% 6%	4% 3%	2% 6%	3% 2%	3% 5%	2% 5%	3% 5%	2% 5%	-	-	-	-	-	-
	Bicycle	5% 7% (1,482)	8% (978)	3% 11% (1,461)	6% 16% (1,481)	3% 10% (1,090)	12% (3,660)	2% 6% (2,436)		5% 9% (1,784)	5% 9% (13,893)	5% 8% (2,186)	-	-	-	-	-	-
				,								(=,::::)						
How often alternate 17E mode used	A few times/yr More than a	41% 33%	30% 29%	39% 28%	32% 33%	38% 33%	35% 30%	50% 23%	38% 29%	41%	42%	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
	few times									29%	29%	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
	Fairly frequently Almost half	19% 8%	30% 11%	23% 10%	23% 12%	22% 7%	25% 10%	17% 10%	23% 10%	21% 9%	21% 9%	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
		(670)	(517)	(792)	(906)	(538)	(2,069)	(1,040)	(6,532)	(1,125)	(7,419)	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
Rating neighborhood housing affordability	Very good	4%	5%	8%	3%	6%	4%	6%	5%	5%	4%	5%	5%	6%	7%	6%	7%	7%
	Good Neither	29% 33%	25% 29%	41% 30%	25% 29%	39% 31%	31% 30%	46% 31%	31%	32% 30%	33% 30%	35% 32%	39% 30%	38% 30%	37% 30%	39% 31%	41% 27%	39% 28%
	Bad Very bad	27% 6% (2,196)	30% 11% (1,489)	17% 5% (2,043)	31% 12% (2,087)	19% 5% (1,569)	26% 8% (5,175)	14% 3% (4,283)	23% 7% (18,842)	25% 8% (2,607)	24% 8% (20,552)	21% 7% (3,205)	20% 6% (5,085)	20% 6% (5,028)	20% 6% (4,555)	18% 6% (3,496)	19% 6% (3,374)	19% 7% (3,589)
Rating neighborhood housing physical condition 18B	Very good	21%	29%	7%	14%	9%	11%	8%	13%	15%	12%	13%	13%	12%	11%	11%	13%	13%
	Good Neither Bad Very bad	61% 15% 2% 0% (2,273)	50% 15% 4% 1% (1,546)	50% 34% 8% 1% (2,120)	51% 27% 8% 1% (2,136)	52% 29% 9% 1% (1,628)	54% 26% 8% 1% (5,393)	48% 30% 12% 2% (4,492)	26% 8%	54% 24% 7% 1% (2,663)	52% 27% 8% 1% (21,312)	52% 27% 8% 1% (3,277)	53% 25% 7% 1% (5,241)	49% 30% 8% 1% (5,163)	52% 27% 9% 1% (4,710)	54% 27% 7% 1% (3,611)	53% 26% 7% 1% (3,479)	53% 27% 6% 1% (3,696)

December 2007

# NOTE: Percents may not add to 100 due to rounding. Total number of respondents shown in parentheses.

#### Prior Year **CITY TOTALS**

8

	r			<u> </u>	oalition				]				CII	Υ ΤΟΤΑ	L3			
Q#	·	SW	NW/Downtown	North	Inner NE	Central NE	SE	East	City Total	2006	2005	2004	2003	2002	2001	2000	1999	1998
Rating neighborhood park closeness	Very good	36%	51%	32%	31%	23%	33%	12%	29%	30%	27%	27%	29%	27%	27%	26%	26%	27%
	Good Neither Bad Very bad	48% 12% 4% 1% (2,273)	39% 6% 2% 1% (1,560)	54% 10% 3% 1% (2,118)	11% 4% 1%	49% 15% 10% 3% (1,621)	53% 10% 3% 0% (5,438)	54% 22% 10% 2% (4,406)	51% 13% 5% 1% (19,559)	51% 13% 5% 1% (2,666)	5% 1%	54% 14% 4% 1% (3,248)	53% 13% 4% 1% (5,222)	53% 14% 5% 1% (5,165)	53% 14% 5% 1% (4,666)	53% 16% 4% 1% (3,573)	54% 16% 3% 1% (3,448)	52% 15% 5% 1% (3,674)
Rating neighborhood walking distance to bus/max	Very good	39%	56%	46%	54%	40%	52%	25%	43%	44%	43%	45%	48%	45%	45%	42%	44%	45%
	Good Neither Bad Very bad	39% 10% 8% 4% (2,264)	28% 6% 5% (1,544)	44% 7% 3% 1% (2,127)	4% 1%	46% 8% 5% 1% (1,621)	41% 5% 2% 1% (5,428)	55% 12% 6% 2% (4,477)	43% 8% 4% 2% (19,602)	42% 8% 4% 2% (2,677)		42% 8% 4% 1% (3,277)	40% 7% 3% 2% (5,240)	43% 7% 3% 2% (5,229)	43% 7% 3% 2% (4,736)	45% 8% 3% 2% (3,636)	42% 8% 4% 2% (3,502)	43% 8% 3% 1% (3,718)
Rating neighborhood access to services	Very good	22%	45%	22%	38%	26%	35%	16%	28%	28%	28%	29%	30%	28%	28%	26%	27%	29%
10	Good Neither Bad Very bad	47% 21% 9% 2% (2,278)	35% 11% 6% 3% (1,557)	46% 20% 9% 2% (2,124)	44% 12% 5% 1% (2,137)	47% 17% 9% 1% (1,630)	45% 15% 4% 1% (5,411)	57% 19% 6% 2% (4,546)	47% 16% 6% 2% (19,683)	49% 15% 6% 1% (2,686)	6% 2%	45% 18% 7% 2% (3,291)	46% 16% 7% 2% (5,278)	46% 18% 6% 2% (5,258)	47% 17% 6% 2% (4,767)	46% 18% 7% 3% (3,676)	47% 17% 7% 2% (3,522)	46% 16% 7% 2% (3,737)
Rating neighborhood on-street parking	Very good	17%	13%	22%	28%	21%	24%	11%	19%	21%	18%	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
	Good Neither Bad Very bad	35% 24% 17% 8% (2,236)	27% 21% 24% 15% (1,462)	48% 18% 9% 4% (2,108)	46% 13% 9% 3% (2,094)	46% 17% 10% 6% (1,612)	44% 17% 11% 4% (5,330)	45% 24% 13% 7% (4,417)	43% 19% 13% 6% (19,259)	42% 18% 13% 7% (2,626)		- - -	- - - -	- - -	- - -	- - -	- - -	- - -

December 2007

# NOTE: Percents may not add to 100 due to rounding. Total number of respondents shown in parentheses.

#### 2007

		1		С	oalition				]					TIOTA	20			
						Central												
Q#		SW	NW/Downtown	North	Inner NE	NE	SE	East	City Total	2006	2005	2004	2003	2002	2001	2000	1999	1998
19A Neighborhood street smoothness	Very good	10%	12%	10%	11%	9%	9%	10%	10%	12%	11%	9%	10%	11%	12%	12%	11%	14%
	Good	40%	40%	47%	49%	44%	45%	49%	45%	47%	48%	44%	47%	46%	46%	50%	45%	46%
	Neither	21%	20%	21%	24%	21%	24%	26%	23%	22%	21%	23%	23%	21%	22%	20%	23%	22%
	Bad Very bad	19% 10%	21% 7%	15% 7%	12% 4%	19% 7%	15% 7%	11% 4%	15% 6%	14% 6%	14% 6%	17% 7%	14% 5%	15% 7%	14% 6%	13% 5%	15% 6%	13% 5%
	very bau	(2,287)	(1,531)	(2,137)	(2,139)	(1,632)	(5,420)	(4,564)	(19,710)	(2,675)	(21,474)	(3,307)	(5,291)	(5,266)	(4,787)	(3,688)	(3,503)	(3,676)
		(_,_0))	(1,001)	(_,,	(_,::::)	(1,002)	(0,120)	(1,001)	(10). 10)	(2,010)	(21,111)	(0,001)	(0,201)	(0,200)	(1,101)	(0,000)	(0,000)	(0,010)
Neighborhood street 19B cleanliness	Very good	16%	17%	9%	11%	11%	11%	9%	12%	14%	12%	10%	12%	11%	13%	12%	12%	14%
	Good	55%	53%	48%	47%	52%	52%	45%	50%	52%	50%	52%	51%	48%	50%	53%	51%	51%
	Neither	20% 6%	17% 9%	24%	21% 16%	21% 12%	24% 10%	26% 14%	23% 12%	21%	22%	24%	23%	24%	22%	23%	23%	22%
	Bad Very bad	6% 3%	9% 3%	14% 4%	6%	4%	4%	14% 5%	4%	10% 4%	12% 4%	12% 3%	11% 3%	12% 5%	12% 3%	10% 2%	10% 4%	10% 3%
	very bad	(2,265)	(1,539)	(2,126)	(2,116)	(1,617)	(5,381)	(4,487)	(19,531)	(2,684)	(21,556)	(3,310)	(5,302)	(5,263)	(4,779)	(3,676)	(3,488)	(3,666)
		(_,)	(1,000)	(_,)	(_,,	(,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,	(-,)	(.,,	(,)	(_,,	(,)	(0,0.0)	(-,)	(-,,	(.,)	(-,,	(0,100)	(-,)
Neighborhood traffic 19C speed	Very good	8%	9%	6%	6%	5%	6%	4%	6%	7%	6%	6%	5%	5%	6%	5%	5%	6%
	Good	42%	45%	40%	38%	37%	40%	36%	39%	40%	38%	39%	38%	32%	32%	32%	33%	31%
	Neither	24%	24%	22%	25%	25%	26%	23%	24%	24%	24%	25%	25%	24%	24%	26%	25%	24%
	Bad	19%	17%	23%	22%	24%	20% 7%	25%	22%	21%	23%	22%	23%	26%	26%	25%	25%	26%
	Very bad	7% (2,242)	6% (1,509)	9% (2,110)	8% (2,100)	9% (1,605)	(5,340)	12% (4,454)	9% (19,360)	8% (2,670)	9% (21,480)	9% (3,303)	9% (5,289)	13% (5,258)	12% (4,778)	12% (3,671)	12% (3,471)	13% (3,651)
		(2,242)	(1,503)	(2,110)	(2,100)	(1,000)	(0,040)	(+,+5+)	(13,300)	(2,070)	(21,400)	(3,303)	(3,209)	(3,230)	(4,770)	(3,071)	(3,471)	(3,031)
Neighborhood 19D pedestrian safety	Very good	8%	12%	9%	10%	8%	10%	6%	9%	9%	8%	8%	8%	7%	8%	7%	-	-
	Good	34%	45%	49%	52%	44%	49%	39%	44%	46%	43%	42%	43%	40%	39%	41%	-	-
	Neither	20%	19%	23%	22%	22%	23%	25%	23%	22%	24%	24%	25%	25%	26%	26%	-	-
	Bad	24%	16%	13%	11%	18%	13%	21%	17%	16%	17%	18%	17%	18%	19%	17%	-	-
	Very bad	14% (2,257)	9% (1,538)	6% (2,106)	4% (2,112)	7% (1,616)	5% (5,369)	9% (4,465)	8% (19,463)	8% (2,685)	8% (21,425)	9% (3,295)	8% (5,282)	10% (5,253)	8% (4,746)	9% (3,645)	-	-
		(2,207)	(1,550)	(2,100)	(2,112)	(1,010)	(0,000)	(4,400)	(13,403)	(2,000)	(21,423)	(3,293)	(3,202)	(3,233)	(4,740)	(3,043)	-	-
19E Neighborhood	Very good	6%	8%	7%	8%	7%	8%	6%	7%	8%	7%	7%	6%	6%	7%	6%	-	-
	Good	31%	36%	45%	43%	38%	43%	37%	40%	40%	38%	38%	38%	38%	35%	36%	-	-
	Neither	25%	25%	28%	26%	28%	26%	28%	27%	28%	28%	28%	29%	28%	29%	29%	-	-
	Bad	24%	20%	14%	16%	19%	17%	20%	19%	17%	19%	19%	19%	19%	20%	20%	-	-
	Very bad	14% (2,184)	10% (1,421)	6% (2.049)	6% (2,036)	8% (1,552)	5% (5,143)	9% (4,272)	8% (18,657)	7% (2,605)	9% (20,788)	8% (3,205)	8% (5,102)	9% (5,086)	9% (4,603)	9% (3,538)	-	-
		(2,104)	(1,421)	(2,049)	(2,030)	(1,002)	(3,143)	(4,∠1∠)	(10,007)	(2,005)	(20,100)	(3,203)	(3,102)	(0,000)	(4,003)	(3,330)	-	-
		1	I I		ı I	I	I	l	I I	1	I I	I	I	I	I	I	l	I

December 2007

# NOTE: Percents may not add to 100 due to rounding. Total number of respondents shown in parentheses.

#### Prior Year **CITY TOTALS**

		<u> </u>		C	oalition								CII	YIOTA	L3			
						Central												
Q#		SW	NW/Downtown	North	Inner NE	NE	SE	East	City Total	2006	2005	2004	2003	2002	2001	2000	1999	1998
Quality of parks: well- maintained grounds	Very good	29%	38%	27%	26%	21%	29%	17%	26%	26%	23%	24%	21%	21%	24%	25%	25%	24%
	Good	53%	48%	55%	58%	58%	56%	55%	55%	53%	56%	56%	56%	56%	59%	59%	58%	56%
	Neither	14%	11%	13%	12%	17%	12%	22%	15%	16%		16%	18%	18%	14%	13%	13%	16%
	Bad	3%	2%	4%	3%	4%	2%	5%	3%	4%		3%	4%	4%	3%	3%	3%	3%
	Very bad	1% (2,094)	1% (1,485)	1% (2,013)	1% (2,035)	0% (1,462)	1% (5,087)	1% (3,883)	1% (18,059)	1%		1%	1%	1% (4,849)	0%	0%	1%	1% (3,365)
		(2,094)	(1,403)	(2,013)	(2,033)	(1,402)	(3,007)	(3,003)	(16,059)	(2,505)	(19,933)	(3,105)	(4,912)	(4,049)	(4,374)	(3,320)	(3,206)	(3,303)
Quality of parks: beauty of landscaping	Very good	24%	40%	24%	22%	13%	25%	13%	22%	23%	20%	21%	19%	20%	22%	21%	22%	22%
	Good	47%	43%	47%	49%	48%	47%	47%	47%	45%	47%	48%	47%	48%	50%	52%	50%	49%
	Neither	23%	14%	22%	22%	30%	22%	31%	24%	24%		24%	28%	25%	22%	22%	23%	24%
	Bad	5%	3%	6%	6%	7%	5%	7%	5%	6%	6%	5%	5%	6%	5%	4%	4%	4%
	Very bad	1%	1%	1%	1% (2,022)	1%	1% (5.046)	2%	1%	1%		1%	1%	1%	1%	1%	1%	1%
		(2,088)	(1,464)	(2,013)	(2,022)	(1,454)	(5,046)	(3,829)	(17,916)	(2,502)	(19,858)	(3,091)	(4,919)	(4,861)	(4,378)	(3,326)	(3,184)	(3,347)
Quality of parks: well- 20C maintained facilities	Very good	23%	28%	16%	16%	12%	17%	12%	17%	18%	16%	16%	13%	13%	15%	16%	16%	14%
	Good	47%	44%	44%	46%	45%	47%	42%	45%	44%	44%	46%	42%	42%	44%	46%	45%	43%
	Neither	24%	21%	27%	27%	31%	27%	35%	28%	28%		28%	34%	32%	31%	29%	29%	32%
	Bad	5%	5%	9%	10%	10%	7%	8%	8%	8%		8%	9%	10%	7%	8%	8%	8%
	Very bad	1%	2%	4%	2%	2%	2%	3%	2%	2%		2%	3%	3%	3%	1%	2%	3%
		(1,986)	(1,335)	(1,847)	(1,839)	(1,304)	(4,641)	(3,523)	(16,475)	(2,324)	(18,324)	(2,860)	(4,195)	(4,110)	(3,703)	(2,746)	(2,590)	(2,741)
Visits to any City park in last 12 months 21A	x Never	8%	4%	8%	6%	12%	9%	22%	11%	10%	11%	12%	11%	12%	12%	14%	14%	13%
216	1 or 2	14%	11%	15%	12%	18%	15%	26%	17%	17%	18%	16%	18%	18%	18%	19%	19%	18%
	3 - 5	15%	14%	16%	14%	17%	14%	18%	15%	17%		15%	16%	17%	17%	18%	18%	17%
	6 - 10	14%	14%	12%	14%	12%	12%	11%	12%	12%	13%	15%	13%	13%	15%	13%	14%	13%
	10+	49%	56%	48%	54%	42%	51%	23%	44%	43%	42%	42%	43%	40%	38%	36%	35%	39%
		(2,202)	(1,488)	(2,046)	(2,051)	(1,569)	(5,215)	(4,293)	(18,864)	(2,670)	(21,342)	(3,291)	(5,250)	(5,228)	(4,733)	(3,638)	(3,469)	(3,655)
Visits to neigh. park 21B in last 12 months	Never	12%	6%	10%	8%	17%	10%	28%	14%	14%	15%	15%	14%	14%	16%	17%	17%	16%
	1 or 2	18%	13%	19%	17%	23%	17%	26%	20%	19%		18%	20%	21%	20%	22%	22%	21%
	3 - 5	14%	14%	16%	16%	14%	15%	16%	15%	16%		15%	16%	16%	17%	16%	17%	16%
	6 - 10	12%	14%	13%		11%	11%	10%	11%	12%		13%	12%	11%	12%	12%	12%	11%
	10+	43% (2,207)	54% (1,485)	43% (2,050)	47% (2,056)	35% (1,571)	46% (5,243)	19% (4,323)	39% (18,935)	39% (2,644)	38% (21,160)	39% (3,225)	38% (5,155)	38% (5,154)	35% (4,627)	33% (3,587)	32% (3,401)	36% (3,574)
		(2,207)	(1,400)	(2,030)	(2,000)	(1,571)	(3,243)	(4,323)	(10,935)	(2,044)	(21,100)	(3,225)	(0,100)	(3,134)	(4,027)	(3,307)	(3,401)	(3,574)
		1	1 1		ı I	Į	I		I I	I	1 I		1	Į	I			I I

December 2007

# NOTE: Percents may not add to 100 due to rounding. Total number of respondents shown in parentheses.

#### Prior Year **CITY TOTALS**

				С	oalition								CII	TIOTA	L3			
Q#		SW	NW/Downtown	North	Inner NE	Central NE	SE	East	City Total	2006	2005	2004	2003	2002	2001	2000	1999	1998
Recreation: affordable	Very satis.	23%	16%	20%	26%	18%	22%	14%	20%	20%	18%	17%	17%	18%	18%	19%	16%	15%
	Satis. Neither Dissat Very dissat	47% 22% 7% 2%	43% 30% 8% 3%	49% 23% 6% 2%	50% 18% 5% 2%	45% 31% 5% 2%	48% 24% 5% 1%	44% 31% 9% 3%	6% 2%	46% 26% 6% 2%	47% 26% 7% 2%	49% 26% 6% 2%	47% 27% 7% 2%	48% 25% 7% 2%	48% 25% 7% 2%	49% 24% 6% 2%	51% 25% 6% 2%	50% 26% 4% 2%
Recreation: good	Very satis.	(1,644) 24%	(817) 15%	(1,457) 17%	(1,460) 23%	(1,022) 18%	(3,452) 23%	(2,713) 12%	(12,565) 19%	(1,786)	(14,026) 18%	(2,133) 17%	(3,543) 16%	(3,412) 17%	(3,154) 17%	(2,247) 17%	(1,969) 17%	(2,046)
22B variety	Satis. Neither Dissat Very dissat	51% 21% 3% 1% (1,624)	45% 31% 7% 2% (810)	49% 26% 6% 2% (1,434)	52% 19% 4% 1% (1,429)	47% 28% 4% 2% (1,020)	48% 24% 4% 2% (3,423)	45% 34% 6% 2% (2,646)	48% 26%	48% 26% 6% 1% (1,770)	48% 27% 6% 2% (13,915)	48% 29% 5% 2% (2,099)	48% 29% 5% 2% (3,465)	48% 28% 5% 2% (3,355)	48% 28% 5% 2% (3,093)	50% 28% 4% 1% (2,196)	51% 27% 4% 1% (1,917)	49% 29% 4% 2%
Recreation: quality or instruction, coaching		21%	13%	14%	19%	15%	19%	12%	16%	16%	15%	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
22C etc	Satis. Neither Dissat Very dissat	47% 29% 3% 1% (1,336)	38% 42% 4% 2% (674)	44% 35% 5% 2% (1,203)	46% 29% 5% 1% (1,159)	44% 36% 3% 2% (868)	45% 32% 3% 1% (2,793)	39% 42% 5% 2% (2,325)	35%	43% 36% 4% 1% (1,479)	43% 35% 4% 2% (11,691)		- - -			- - -	- - -	- - -
How many members of your household took part in a City recreation activity in the past 12 months? 23 (% calculated)	12 years old & under	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	44%	48%	48%	64%	67%	-	-	-	-	-
	13 - 18 years old 19 - 54 years old 55 and older	- - -		- - -	- - -	-	- -	- -	35% 27% 22%	40% 31% 25%	29%	48% 30% 23%	47% 29% 23%	- - -	- - -	- - -	- - -	- - -

December 2007

# NOTE: Percents may not add to 100 due to rounding. Total number of respondents shown in parentheses.

Prior Year
CITY TOTALS

				С	oalition								0.1	1 1014	20			
Q#		SW	NW/Downtown	North	Inner NE	Central NE	SE	East	City Total	200	2005	2004	2003	2002	2001	2000	1999	1998
Visits to Willamette River in last 12 24 months	Never	17%	15%	23%	20%	33%	24%	48%	28%	2	7% 29%	30%	-	-	-	-	-	-
	1 or 2 3 - 5 6 - 10 10+	23% 22% 13% 25% (2,215)	20% 19% 15% 31% (1,506)	22% 21% 10% 23% (2,045)	21% 22% 13% 25% (2,075)	25% 20% 10% 12% (1,578)	22% 19% 12% 22% (5,247)	28% 13% 6% (4,374)	18% 11%	23 19 12 20 (2,6)	20% % 11% % 19%	22% 17% 11% 21% (3,278)	- - -		- - -			- - -
Commercial development last 12 25A mo.s?	Yes	40%	69%	64%	78%	70%	67%	46%	61%	6	% 57%	54%	52%	48%	49%	48%	48%	44%
	No	60% (2,266)	31% (1,544)	36% (2,114)	22% (2,128)	30% (1,621)	33% (5,378)	54% (4,466)		39 (2,64		46% (3,221)	48% (5,158)	52% (5,087)	51% (4,623)	52% (3,549)	52% (3,375)	56% (3,478)
Commercial development 25B attractiveness	Very good	13%	19%	19%	23%	16%	15%	8%	16%	1	3% 20%	23%	19%	19%	18%	17%	14%	16%
	Good Neither Bad Very bad	39% 33% 12% 4% (875)	43% 24% 6% 7% (1,018)	51% 20% 7% 3% (1,311)	50% 18% 6% 3% (1,616)	46% 23% 11% 4% (1,092)	43% 27% 11% 4% (3,457)	39% 36% 11% 5% (1,911)	26% 9% 4%	-	24% % 8% % 4%	43% 25% 7% 3% (1,692)	44% 25% 9% 4% (2,658)	46% 23% 8% 4% (2,373)	44% 26% 8% 4% (2,254)	41% 29% 9% 4% (1,638)	38% 31% 11% 6% (1,572)	41% 28% 10% 5% (1,461)
Commercial development improved access to	Very good	6%	15%	15%	19%	14%	11%	5%	12%	1:	5% 16%	20%	15%	16%	14%	12%	12%	12%
25C services	Good Neither Bad Very bad	22% 53% 13% 6% (830)	32% 39% 9% 6% (989)	42% 31% 9% 4% (1,278)	40% 32% 7% 2% (1,544)	33% 38% 9% 5% (1,047)	31% 45% 9% 4% (3,264)	31% 47% 11% 7% (1,817)	41% 9% 5%		8% 38% 8% 8% 9% 5%	32% 36% 7% 5% (1,636)	33% 39% 9% 5% (2,542)	34% 38% 8% 4% (2,258)	34% 38% 9% 5% (2,151)	31% 42% 9% 6% (1,562)	30% 40% 11% 7% (1,467)	30% 42% 10% 6% (1,380)

December 2007

# NOTE: Percents may not add to 100 due to rounding. Total number of respondents shown in parentheses.

#### Prior Year **CITY TOTALS**

	Coalition Central													Υ ΤΟΤΑ	LS			
Q#		SW	NW/Downtown	North	Inner NE	NE	SE	East	City Total	2006	2005	2004	2003	2002	2001	2000	1999	1998
Residential development last 12 26A months?	Yes	79%	86%	81%	77%	65%	74%	67%	74%	73%	69%	61%	58%	53%	51%	52%	59%	58%
	No	21% (2,292)	14% (1,563)	19% (2,118)	23% (2,134)	35% (1,639)	26% (5,396)	33% (4,506)	26% (19,648)	27% (2,645)	32% (21,162)	39% (3,184)	42% (5,103)	47% (5,074)	49% (4,607)	48% (3,558)	41% (2,910)	42% (2,880)
Residential development 26B attractiveness	Very good	16%	23%	15%	17%	13%	11%	8%	13%	16%	15%	17%	14%	15%	16%	14%	13%	15%
	Good Neither Bad Very bad	41% 25% 12% 6% (1,746)	39% 20% 12% 6% (1,298)	39% 24% 16% 7% (1,692)	44% 22% 10% 6% (1,609)	37% 27% 15% 7% (1,038)	36% 28% 17% 8% (3,910)	34% 31% 19% 8% (2,951)	38% 26% 15% 7% (14,244)	38% 24% 14% 7% (1,870)	39% 27% 14% 6% (13,968)	38% 25% 14% 6% (1,886)	37% 26% 15% 8% (3,004)	40% 26% 13% 6% (2,618)	38% 29% 12% 5% (2,390)	38% 31% 12% 6% (1,792)	35% 30% 15% 7% (1,666)	37% 32% 11% 5% (1,594)
Residential development neighborhood 26C improvement	Very good	12%	18%	13%	17%	11%	9%	6%	11%	15%	12%	-	12%	13%	14%	11%	10%	11%
	Good Neither Bad Very bad	27% 37% 16% 8% (1,709)	29% 31% 13% 9% (1,267)	34% 29% 15% 9% (1,660)	38% 29% 10% 5% (1,570)	30% 33% 15% 11% (1,011)	30% 35% 17% 9% (3,788)	26% 32% 21% 16% (2,853)	30% 33% 16% 10% (13,858)	29% 30% 17% 10% (1,830)	31% 33% 16% 9% (13,636)		29% 32% 17% 11% (2,934)	30% 34% 14% 9% (2,541)	30% 34% 14% 8% (2,319)	28% 37% 16% 8% (1,713)	27% 35% 17% 11% (1,635)	28% 37% 14% 10% (1,534)
Overall neighborhood livability	d Very good	50%	50%	27%	41%	29%	37%	14%	33%	0.50	32%	34%	32%	32%	34%	32%	32%	34%
27A	Good Neither Bad Very bad	44% 6% 1% 0% (2,291)	40% 6% 2% 1% (1,567)	57% 13% 3% 1% (2,130)	48% 8% 3% 1% (2,157)	50% 15% 5% 1% (1,638)	47% 12% 3% 0% (5,441)	51% 24% 8% 2% (4,502)	48% 13% 4% 1% (19,726)	35% 49% 12% 4% 1% (2,681)	49% 14% 5% 1% (21,388)	49% 13% 4% 1% (3,386)	50% 14% 4% 1% (5,291)	50% 13% 4% 1% (5,275)	48% 13% 4% 1% (4,812)	52% 12% 3% 1% (3,691)	51% 13% 3% 1% (3,550)	50% 12% 3% 1% (3,769)
27B Overall City livability	Very good Good Neither Bad Very bad	31% 53% 11% 3% 1% (2,239)	38% 48% 10% 3% 1% (1,546)	29% 51% 14% 4% 1% (2,077)	42% 46% 8% 2% 1% (2,121)	27% 54% 14% 3% 1% (1,600)	32% 50% 12% 4% 1% (5,291)	12% 52% 26% 8% 2% (4,351)	28% 51% 15% 5% 1% (19,225)	25% 54% 15% 5% 1% (2,586)	24% 52% 17% 6% 2% (20,718)	25% 52% 16% 5% 2% (3,238)	22% 52% 18% 6% 2% (5,085)	23% 54% 17% 4% 2% (5,129)	27% 52% 16% 4% 1% (4,687)	23% 57% 16% 3% 1% (3,571)	22% 56% 17% 4% 1% (3,422)	23% 56% 16% 4% 1% (3,644)

December 2007

# NOTE: Percents may not add to 100 due to rounding. Total number of respondents shown in parentheses.

#### 2007

		<b></b>		С	oalition				]					TIOTA	13			
Q#		SW	NW/Downtown	North	Inner NE	Central NE	SE	East	City Total	2006	2005	2004	2003	2002	2001	2000	1999	1998
Overall local government job	Very good	8%	10%	7%	10%	7%	8%	4%	7%	9%	6%	6%	6%	7%	9%	8%	7%	9%
	Good Neither	54% 28%	54% 23%	47% 32%	55% 25%	48% 33%	51% 29%	37% 38%	48% 31%	54% 27%	32%	48% 30%	43% 32%	46% 32%	52% 29%	57% 26%	53% 31%	53% 30%
	Bad Very bad	8% 3% (2,156)	9% 4% (1,427)	10% 4% (1,991)	7% 3% (2,014)	9% 5% (1,522)	9% 3% (5,052)	15% 6% (4,212)	10% 4% (18,374)	7% 3% (2,489)	5%	11% 5% (3,158)	12% 7% (4,982)	10% 5% (4,904)	7% 3% (4,435)	7% 2% (3,365)	7% 2% (3,159)	6% 2% (3,410)
Overall quality rating:	Very good	14%	13%	11%	10%	13%	12%	15%	13%	13%	12%	15%	16%	17%	19%	16%	17%	18%
29A POLICE	Good	55%	49%	54%	47%	52%	51%	52%	51%	55%		48%	47%	51%	51%	55%	56%	55%
	Neither Bad	23% 6%	49% 25% 8%	23% 8%	27% 12%	25% 8%	26% 9%	23% 8%	24% 8%	22% 8%	25%	48% 23% 10%	47% 23% 9%	20% 8%	20% 7%	20% 7%	19% 6%	19% 6%
	Very bad	1.9% (2,055)	4% (1,368)	3% (2,024)	3% (1,960)	2% (1,521)	3% (5,005)	3% (4,381)	3% (18,314)	2% (2,447)		4% (3,127)	4% (5,015)	4% (4,971)	3% (4,483)	2% (3,393)	2% (3,262)	2% (3,495)
Overall quality rating: 29B FIRE	Very good	34%	33%	32%	32%	30%	33%	33%	33%	34%	32%	33%	32%	32%	34%	31%	32%	33%
	Good Neither	57% 9%	56% 10%	59% 8%	57% 10%	61% 8%	58% 9%	57% 9%	58% 9%	56% 9%	9%	56% 11%	57% 10%	58% 9%	57% 9%	59% 10%	59% 9%	58% 9%
	Bad Very bad	0% 0% (1,836)	1% 0% (1,197)	0% 0% (1,798)	1% 0% (1,675)	1% 0% (1,334)	0% 0% (4,333)	1% 1% (4,087)	1% 0% (16,260)	0% 0% (2,237)	0%	1% 0% (2,878)	0% 0% (4,737)	1% 0% (4,737)	0% 0% (4,241)	0% 0% (3,153)	0% 0% (3,039)	0% 0% (3,207)
Overall quality rating:	Very good	22%	22%	20%	19%	20%	21%	24%	22%	22%	23%	25%	-	-	-	-	-	-
29C 911	Good Neither	54% 20%	50% 22%	56% 18%	53% 21%	56% 19%	54% 20%	52% 19%	54% 20%	54% 20%		54% 18%	-	-	-	-		-
	Bad Very bad	3% 1%	4% 2%	4% 2%	5% 2%	4% 2%	4% 1%	4% 1%	4% 1%	3% 1%	3%	2% 1%	-	-	-	-	-	-
		(1,550)	(965)	(1,648)	(1,512)	(1,224)	(3,816)	(3,762)	(14,477)	(1,950)	(15,510)	(2,531)	-	-	-	-	-	-
Overall quality rating: 29D WATER	Very good	23%	25%	18%	21%	20%	19%	16%	19%	15%	12%	14%	13%	14%	15%	16%	17%	19%
	Good Neither	53% 15%	55% 15%	56% 18%	56% 17%	55% 19%	55% 18%	53% 19%	54% 18%	54% 21%	23%	48% 24%	47% 23%	46% 23%	46% 22%	56% 19%	55% 21%	54% 19%
	Bad Very bad	6% 2% (2,183)	5% 1% (1,438)	6% 2% (2,059)	5% 1% (2,029)	5% 2% (1,570)	6% 2% (5,197)	9% 3% (4,368)	7% 2% (18,844)	8% 3% (2,545)	5%	10% 5% (3,226)	11% 6% (5,020)	11% 6% (4,900)	10% 7% (4,412)	6% 3% (3,383)	5% 2% (3,346)	6% 2% (3,552)
		( ,)	( , , , , , , , , , , , , , , , , , , ,	( ))	( )	( )- )	x + - 1	( ) <b>-</b> )			( , )	· · - /	· ·- ·/	( ,)	, , , ,	( ,)	、,· -/	

December 2007

# NOTE: Percents may not add to 100 due to rounding. Total number of respondents shown in parentheses.

Prior Year

					2007									Y TOTA				
				С	oalition													
Q#		SW	NW/Downtown	North	Inner NE	Central NE	SE	East	City Total	2006	2005	2004	2003	2002	2001	2000	1999	1998
Overall quality rating: 29E PARKS	Very good	30%	34%	26%	31%	23%	30%	14%	26%	25%	22%	21%	22%	21%	25%	24%	23%	22%
	Good	55%	55%	57%	56%	59%	56%	56%	56%	57%	57%	56%	57%	58%	58%	60%	60%	59%
	Neither	12%	9%	14%	10%	15%	12%	25%		15%	17%	18%	17%	17%	14%	13%	15%	16%
	Bad	2%	2%	3%	2%	2%	2%	3%		3%	3%	3%	3%	3%	2%	2%	2%	2%
	Very bad	0%	1%	1%	1%	1%	0%	1%	1%	1%	1%	1%	1%	1%	1%	1%	0%	1%
		(2,192)	(1,523)	(2,070)	(2,098)	(1,564)	(5,258)	(4,072)	(18,777)	(2,530)	(20,149)	(3,183)	(4,962)	(4,934)	(4,459)	(3,355)	(3,352)	(3,577)
Overall quality rating: REC. ACTIVITIES	Very good	27%	19%	20%	24%	21%	23%	14%	21%	20%	18%	19%	19%	18%	21%	20%	18%	17%
231	Good	54%	52%	53%	56%	50%	55%	49%	53%	54%	52%	51%	53%	55%	53%	55%	56%	52%
	Neither	16%	24%	23%	18%	24%	20%	31%		22%	25%	25%	25%	23%	22%	21%	22%	26%
	Bad	2%	4%	4%	2%	4%	2%	4%		3%	4%	3%	3%	3%	3%	3%	3%	4%
	Very bad	0%	2%	1%	1%	1%	1%	2%	1%	1%	1%	1%	1%	1%	1%	1%	1%	1%
		(1,791)	(969)	(1,609)	(1,616)	(1,136)	(3,941)	(3,136)	(14,198)	(1,964)	(15,402)	(2,537)	(3,974)	(3,988)	(3,679)	(2,710)	(2,726)	(2,842)
Overall quality rating: 29G RECYCLING	Very good	22%	20%	20%	23%	22%	20%	16%	20%	24%	23%	26%	23%	23%	25%	23%	22%	25%
	Good	57%	58%	57%	56%	58%	59%	58%	58%	58%	58%	56%	56%	58%	56%	58%	57%	55%
	Neither	14%	15%	15%	13%	14%	15%	20%	16%	14%	14%	14%	15%	14%	14%	14%	16%	14%
	Bad	5%	5%	6%	6%	5%	5%	6%	6%	4%	4%	4%	5%	4%	4%	4%	4%	5%
	Very bad	1%	1%	1%	1%	1%	1%	1%		1%	1%	1%	1%	1%	1%	1%	1%	1%
		(2,245)	(1,426)	(2,092)	(2,112)	(1,609)	(5,337)	(4,438)	(19,259)	(2,575)	(20,738)	(3,262)	(5,061)	(5,043)	(4,544)	(3,494)	(3,428)	(3,655)
Overall quality rating:	Very good	8%	10%	7%	8%	9%	7%	7%	8%	7%	7%	9%	8%	9%	9%	8%	11%	12%
29H SEWERS	_																	
	Good	43%	43%	49%	44%	47%	44%	46%		43%	40%	41%	41%	43%	42%	46%	46%	47%
	Neither	30%	29%	28%	32%	29%	30%	31%		29%	31%	27%	30%	30%	30%	29%	26%	26%
	Bad	14%	15% 4%	12%	13%	12% 3%	15%	12% 4%		14%	15%	14%	13%	12%	13%	12%	12%	11%
	Very bad	5% (2,028)	4% (1,237)	4% (1,913)	3% (1,848)	3% (1,450)	4% (4,707)	4% (4,098)		6% (2,361)	7%	8% (3,027)	7% (4,740)	6% (4,631)	6% (4,159)	5% (2.210)	5% (3,266)	4%
		(2,020)	(1,237)	(1,913)	(1,040)	(1,450)	(4,707)	(4,090)	(17,201)	(2,301)	(18,890)	(3,027)	(4,740)	(4,031)	(4,159)	(3,219)	(3,200)	(3,455)
Overall quality rating: STORM DRAINAGE	Very good	6%	7%	7%	6%	8%	6%	5%	6%	6%	6%	7%	7%	7%	6%	6%	8%	9%
	Good	37%	37%	42%	38%	41%	38%	40%	39%	39%	36%	33%	32%	36%	36%	37%	38%	37%
	Neither	31%	29%	29%	32%	29%	31%	31%	31%	30%	31%	29%	30%	30%	30%	29%	28%	28%
	Bad	19%	21%	17%	20%	17%	20%	17%	19%	18%	20%	20%	21%	19%	19%	20%	18%	19%
	Very bad	6%	6%	5%	4%	5%	5%	7%		7%	8%	10%	10%	8%	9%	8%	8%	7%
		(2,048)	(1,302)	(1,932)	(1,883)	(1,458)	(4,799)	(4,137)	(17,559)	(2,367)	(18,883)	(3,023)	(4,736)	(4,675)	(4,165)	(3,217)	(3,211)	(3,423)
		1								I		l			ļ			I

December 2007

# NOTE: Percents may not add to 100 due to rounding. Total number of respondents shown in parentheses.

Prior Year

					2007									Y TOTA				
				С	oalition													
Q#		SW	NW/Downtown	North	Inner NE	Central NE	SE	East	City Total	2006	2005	2004	2003	2002	2001	2000	1999	1998
Overall quality rating: STREET MAINT. 29J	Very good	5%	6%	5%	6%	6%	5%	5%	5%	5%	5%	6%	6%	6%	7%	6%	6%	7%
	Good Neither Bad Very bad	30% 31% 23% 11% (2,241)	37% 28% 20% 8% (1,509)	37% 31% 19% 8% (2,091)	40% 33% 17% 4% (2,107)	35% 29% 22% 7% (1,617)	34% 34% 19% 8% (5,323)	34% 35% 19% 7% (4,463)	35% 32% 20% 8% (19,351)	38% 32% 18% 7% (2,614)	39% 32% 18% 6% (20,922)	34% 32% 20% 8% (3,327)	36% 32% 18% 7% (5,177)	37% 32% 18% 7% (5,128)	37% 31% 18% 7% (4,641)	40% 32% 17% 5% (3,574)	38% 32% 17% 6% (3,477)	40% 32% 15% 6% (3,719)
Overall quality rating: STREET LIGHTING 29K	Very good	8%	10%	7%	8%	8%	7%	8%	8%	7%	7%	9%	9%	9%	10%	10%	8%	9%
	Good Neither Bad Very bad	48% 32% 10% 3% (2,225)	52% 26% 10% 2% (1,528)	52% 27% 11% 3% (2,111)	52% 28% 9% 2% (2,121)	52% 26% 11% 3% (1,621)	52% 28% 10% 2% (5,366)	52% 27% 10% 3% (4,513)	51% 28% 10% 3% (19,485)	53% 27% 10% 3% (2,608)	52% 27% 10% 3% (21,148)	50% 29% 9% 3% (3,317)	51% 28% 9% 3% (5,233)	53% 26% 9% 3% (5,199)	52% 27% 9% 2% (4,728)	53% 25% 10% 2% (3,640)	53% 27% 10% 2% (3,504)	51% 28% 9% 2% (3,724)
Overall quality rating: TRAFFIC MGMT- 29L CONGEST	Very good	3%	3%	2%	4%	3%	3%	3%	3%	3%	3%	3%	-	-	-	-	3%	3%
	Good Neither Bad Very bad	23% 34% 29% 11% (2,198)	24% 34% 26% 13% (1,479)	24% 34% 26% 13% (2,040)	28% 34% 25% 9% (2,059)	25% 35% 27% 10% (1,573)	26% 36% 26% 9% (5,236)	24% 34% 27% 12% (4,343)	25% 34% 27% 11% (18,928)	24% 34% 29% 11% (2,552)	26% 35% 27% 10% (20,479)	25% 36% 24% 11% (3,253)	- - - -		- - -	- - -	21% 32% 32% 12% (3,373)	21% 34% 30% 12% (3,616)
Overall quality rating: TRAFFIC MGMT- 29M SAFETY	Very good	5%	4%	3%	4%	4%	4%	4%	4%	4%	3%	4%	-	-	-	-	3%	4%
	Good Neither Bad Very bad	32% 39% 18% 6% (2,164)	35% 39% 16% 6% (1,461)	34% 38% 17% 8% (2,013)	39% 37% 15% 5% (2,024)	35% 37% 18% 6% (1,553)	35% 38% 17% 6% (5,133)	31% 39% 18% 8% (4,225)	34% 38% 17% 7% (18,573)	35% 38% 17% 6% (2,505)	34% 39% 18% 6% (20,117)	33% 39% 17% 7% (3,178)	- - - -	- - -	- - -	- - -	31% 38% 20% 8% (3,316)	29% 40% 19% 8% (3,550)

December 2007

# NOTE: Percents may not add to 100 due to rounding. Total number of respondents shown in parentheses.

				С	oalition										20			
Q#		SW	NW/Downtown	North	Inner NE	Central NE	SE	East	City Total	2006	2005	2004	2003	2002	2001	2000	1999	1998
Overall quality rating: HOUSING & NUISANCE 29N INSPECTIONS	Very good	5%	6%	4%	5%	6%	4%	3%	4%	4%	4%	5%	5%	4%	5%	4%	5%	6%
	Good Neither Bad Very bad	27% 52% 12% 5% (1,245)	28% 46% 14% 6% (823)	28% 42% 19% 8% (1,469)	27% 43% 17% 7% (1,321)	22% 48% 17% 8% (1,034)	25% 47% 17% 8% (3,228)	21% 42% 22% 11% (3,144)	25% 45% 18% 8% (12,264)	28% 46% 14% 8% (1,659)	25% 45% 18% 9% (13,489)	25% 48% 16% 6% (2,125)	25% 44% 17% 9% (3,556)	25% 45% 17% 9% (3,507)	26% 44% 16% 9% (3,176)	27% 46% 16% 7% (2,324)	28% 45% 15% 7% (2,085)	27% 48% 14% 7% (2,197)
Overall quality rating: HOUSING 290 DEVELOPMENT	Very good	4%	5%	3%	5%	3%	3%	3%	3%	4%	3%	4%	5%	5%	6%	4%	4%	4%
	Good Neither Bad Very bad	30% 42% 18% 6% (1,821)	34% 39% 16% 6% (1,251)	36% 36% 17% 8% (1,849)	39% 38% 13% 6% (1,749)	30% 45% 16% 6% (1,296)	29% 45% 17% 6% (4,263)	22% 40% 22% 13% (3,643)	30% 41% 17% 8% (15,872)	32% 40% 18% 8% (2,158)	30% 43% 17% 7% (17,013)	29% 46% 15% 7% (2,576)	29% 42% 16% 8% (4,349)	32% 42% 14% 7% (4,178)	33% 42% 13% 6% (3,751)	33% 43% 15% 5% (2,871)	30% 43% 15% 8% (2,603)	29% 46% 15% 6% (2,754)
Overall quality rating: LAND USE 29P PLANNING	Very good	7%	10%	6%	11%	7%	7%	4%	7%	8%	7%	8%	8%	8%	10%	8%	7%	8%
	Good Neither Bad Very bad	35% 33% 16% 9% (1,865)	37% 28% 15% 10% (1,240)	35% 34% 17% 9% (1,774)	42% 31% 10% 6% (1,706)	33% 35% 15% 10% (1,281)	34% 34% 16% 9% (4,183)	20% 36% 24% 16% (3,464)	32% 34% 17% 11% (15,513)	32% 33% 17% 10% (2,165)	31% 34% 19% 10% (16,896)	31% 34% 17% 10% (2,653)	30% 34% 18% 11% (4,374)	33% 33% 16% 10% (4,190)	34% 34% 14% 8% (3,845)	33% 36% 16% 7% (2,897)	31% 36% 16% 10% (2,738)	32% 35% 16% 9% (2,959)
What part of the City 30 do you live in?		12% (2,350)	8% (1,606)	11% (2,200)	11% (2,220)	8% (1,698)	28% (5,609)	23% (4,716)	100% (20,400)	100%	(22,071)	(3,442)	(5,374)	(5,364)	(4,883)	(3,758)	(3,645)	(3,848)
31 What is your sex?	Male Female	41% 59% (2,246)	44% 56% (1,526)	36% 64% (2,095)	36% 64% (2,114)	37% 63% (1,636)	38% 62% (5,389)	41% 59% (4,519)		47% 53% (2,667)	39% 61% (21,067)	46% 54% (3,363)	49% 51% (5,327)	46% 54% (5,291)	47% 53% (4,829)	46% 54% (3,703)	48% 52% (3,477)	49% 51% (3,667)

December 2007

# NOTE: Percents may not add to 100 due to rounding. Total number of respondents shown in parentheses.

#### 2007

						- Ch	TIOTA	20										
Q#		SW	NW/Downtown	North	Inner NE	Central NE	SE	East	City Total	2006	2005	2004	2003	2002	2001	2000	1999	1998
32 What is your age?	Under 20 20-29 30-44 45-59 60-74 Over 74	0% 5% 24% 38% 22% 11% (2,292)	0% 11% 25% 29% 26% 9% (1,571)	0% 10% 35% 27% 19% 9% (2,140)	17% 7%	0% 7% 31% 20% 10% (1,657)	0% 11% 30% 30% 18% 10% (5,466)	0% 7% 18% 33% 24% 17% (4,580)	0% 9% 28% 31% 21% 11% (19,869)	0% 7% 30% 34% 19% 11% (2,660)	0% 9% 29% 33% 18% 11% (21,517)	0% 10% 29% 32% 17% 12% (3,369)	0% 9% 30% 34% 17% (5,321)	0% 11% 30% 30% 17% 12% (5,293)	0% 12% 31% 30% 16% 11% (4,821)	0% 12% 28% 28% 18% 14% (3,710)	0% 11% 27% 27% 19% 16% (3,466)	0% 10% 31% 28% 19% 12% (3,684)
How many people I in your household?		-	-	-	-	-	-	-	8,520	1,030	8,444	927	1,570	1,617	1,560	1,056	-	1,103
	13 - 18 years old 19 - 54 years old 55 and older	- -	- - -	- -	-	-	-	- -	3,774 23,420 14,011	358 2,891 1,703	3,135 24,479 13,000	456 4,036 1,932	773 6,522 3,144	748 6,428 3,197	667 6,091 2,542	505 4,246 2,251	- -	563 4,389 2,902
34 Ethnicity	White African	92% 1%		84% 4%	79% 11%	86% 3%	88% 1%	87% 1%		86%	87%	86%	85%	86%	87%	89%	89%	90%
	American Asian Native	3% 0%	5% 1%	4% 1%	2% 1%	5% 1%	5% 1%	6% 1%	5% 1%	3% 5%	3% 4%	3% 6%	3% 5%	3% 5%	3% 5%	3% 4%	2% 4%	3% 3%
	American Hispanic Other	1% 2% (2,246)	3%	3% 4% (2,104)	2% 5% (2,130)	1% 4% (1,628)	2% 4% (5,429)	2% 3% (4,581)	2% 4% (19,659)	1% 1% 4% (2,650)	1% 2% 4% (21,291)	1% 2% 3% (3,328)	1% 2% 4% (5,232)	1% 2% 3% (5,227)	1% 2% 2% (4,759)	1% 2% 1% (3,659)	1% 2% 2% (3,447)	1% 1% 3% (3,659)
35 Education	Elem. Some HS HS grad Some college	0% 1% 3% 20%	4%	0% 2% 13% 33%	1% 1% 6% 26%	0% 2% 10% 36%	0% 2% 9% 30%	1% 4% 17% 44%	0% 2% 10% 32%	1% 2% 11%	1% 2% 13%	1% 3% 13%	1% 3% 13%	1% 3% 15%	1% 3% 16%	1% 4% 16%	1% 4% 16%	1% 4% 16%
	College grad	77% (2,293)		51% (2,139)		52% (1,651)	58% (5,479)	35% (4,605)	56% (19,895)	26% 61% (2,646)	30% 54% (21,463)	29% 55% (3,367)	30% 53% (5,300)	31% 50% (5,288)	31% 49% (4,811)	31% 48% (3,702)	31% 48% (3,476)	30% 50% (3,692)