

## SUMMARY OF THE FINDINGS

### PHOENIX AS A PLACE TO LIVE

Better than nine out of 10 Phoenix residents (91%) either strongly agree (17%) or agree (74%) that "Phoenix is a good place to live." This reading has not varied since 2000 and is universal across all population subgroups.

TABLE 1: PHOENIX AS A PLACE TO LIVE

"Would you say you strongly agree, agree, disagree or strongly disagree with the following statement, 'Overall, Phoenix is a good place to live'."

	Strongly Agree/ Agree	Disagree/ Strongly Disagree	Not Sure
2010	91%	8%	1%
2008	91	9	*
2006	91	8	1
2004	91	8	1
2002	91	8	1

#### 2010 READING – DETAIL

<u>GENDER</u>			
Male	91%	9%	*
Female	90	9	1
<u>AGE</u>			
Under 35	88	12	0
35 to 49	91	8	1
50 to 64	90	9	1
65 or over	95	4	1
<u>INCOME</u>			
Under \$25,000	91	7	2
\$25,000 to \$49,999	87	13	0
\$50,000 to \$74,999	96	4	0
\$75,000 or over	90	8	2
<u>ETHNICITY</u>			
White	92	7	1
Minority	89	11	*
<u>LENGTH OF RESIDENCE</u>			
Under 10	93	7	0
10 or over	90	9	1

\*Indicates % less than .5

~~~~~

## CONTACT WITH CITY PERSONNEL

Residents were next asked if they had had any contact with the City in the preceding 12 months. As Table 2 indicates, 34 percent of residents had contact with the City during this time period – in line with previous years. As in the prior studies, the most common method of contacting City personnel was via the telephone (83%), followed by in-person visits (13%) and the Internet (3%). Compared to 2008, the telephone reading has increased by eight points while the Internet reading has declined by an identical eight points.

TABLE 2: CONTACT WITH CITY PERSONNEL

"During the past 12 months, did you contact any city employee, official or department to seek service or information, or to make a complaint?" (IF YES)  
 "Was your most recent contact conducted in person, over the phone, by mail, or electronically by computer?"

|      | % MAKING CONTACT | METHOD OF CONTACT |           |          |      |
|------|------------------|-------------------|-----------|----------|------|
|      |                  | Phone             | In Person | Internet | Mail |
| 2010 | 34%              | 83%               | 13%       | 3%       | 1%   |
| 2008 | 34               | 75                | 14        | 11       | 0    |
| 2006 | 33               | 77                | 13        | 7        | 3    |
| 2004 | 32               | 78                | 12        | 5        | 5    |
| 2002 | 30               | 75                | 21        | 3        | 1    |

### 2010 READING – % MAKING CONTACT

#### GENDER

|        |     |
|--------|-----|
| Male   | 36% |
| Female | 32  |

#### AGE

|            |    |
|------------|----|
| Under 35   | 31 |
| 35 to 49   | 40 |
| 50 to 64   | 34 |
| 65 or over | 30 |

#### INCOME

|                      |    |
|----------------------|----|
| Under \$25,000       | 37 |
| \$25,000 to \$49,999 | 38 |
| \$50,000 to \$74,999 | 30 |
| \$75,000 or over     | 37 |

#### ETHNICITY

|          |    |
|----------|----|
| White    | 32 |
| Minority | 37 |

#### LENGTH OF RESIDENCE

|            |    |
|------------|----|
| Under 10   | 33 |
| 10 or over | 35 |

~~~~~

By far, the primary reason residents give for contacting the City is to report a crime (44%).

TABLE 3: REASON FOR LAST CONTACT

"What was the reason for your most recent contact?"

	2010	2008	2006
Report a crime	44%	36%	42%
Request trash/garbage pick-up information	16	8	8
Request repairs – roads, lights, water	7	9	5
File complaint about neighbor	6	10	12
Water service/information	5	5	8
Request social services	4	4	5
Animal control/dog pound	3	7	3
Public transportation information	3	5	1
Parks/recreation information	2	2	3
Historic district information	2	*	*
Report mosquito problem	1	3	2
Building permit information	1	3	2
File housing/landlord dispute	1	2	1
Election information	0	*	1
Zoning issues	0	4	1
All other	6	5	6
Don't recall	3	3	2

\*Indicates % less than .5

~~~~~

Finally, those residents who had contacted the City were asked to evaluate their most recent contact on three variables. As may be seen on the following table, two out of three residents or more indicate: 1) they were treated in a professional and courteous manner (95%); 2) they were promptly directed to the individual who could best respond to their needs (81%); and 3) their needs were handled in a timely fashion (69%). Each of these readings is improved from 2008.

TABLE 4: EVALUATION OF LAST CONTACT

"Thinking about your last contact with the City, would you strongly agree, agree, disagree or strongly disagree with each of the following statements?"

|                                                                              | Strongly Agree/<br>Agree | Disagree/<br>Strongly Disagree | Not Sure |
|------------------------------------------------------------------------------|--------------------------|--------------------------------|----------|
| I was treated in a professional and courteous manner                         | 95%                      | 5%                             | 0%       |
| I was promptly directed to the individual who could best respond to my needs | 81                       | 14                             | 5        |
| My needs were handled in a timely fashion                                    | 69                       | 30                             | 1        |

% AGREE

|                                                                              | 2010 | 2008 | 2006 | 2004 | 2002 |
|------------------------------------------------------------------------------|------|------|------|------|------|
| I was treated in a professional and courteous manner                         | 95%  | 86%  | 89%  | 86%  | 85%  |
| I was promptly directed to the individual who could best respond to my needs | 81   | 70   | 70   | 78   | 86   |
| My needs were handled in a timely fashion                                    | 69   | 65   | 64   | 76   | 70   |

~~~~~

## ATTITUDES ABOUT PHOENIX POLICE DEPARTMENT

A new study question reveals that seven out of 10 residents or more have positive attitudes about the Department on a variety of issues:

- The Phoenix Police Department has a difficult job protecting the community (87% agree)
- I have confidence in the Phoenix Police Department (79% agree)
- I trust the Phoenix Police Department to do the right thing (78% agree)
- The Phoenix Police Department cares about people like me (76% agree)
- The Phoenix Police Department uses appropriate force in performing their duties (71% agree).

Several other issues receive positive response from roughly six out of 10 residents or more, while at the same time generating negative response from over 25 percent:

- The Phoenix Police Department treats all residents with respect (66% agree/26% disagree)
- The Phoenix Police Department is honest and open with the public (65% agree/29% disagree)
- The Phoenix Police Department treats all residents fairly regardless of race (59% agree/30% disagree).

TABLE 5: ATTITUDES ABOUT PHOENIX POLICE DEPARTMENT

“Next, do you strongly agree, agree, disagree or strongly disagree with each of the following statements about the Phoenix Police Department? Here is the first one.”

	Strongly Agree	Agree	Disagree	Strongly Disagree	Not Sure	TOTAL AGREE
The Phoenix Police Dept. has a difficult job protecting the community	28%	59%	10%	1%	2%	87%
I have confidence in the Phoenix Police Dept.	17	62	13	6	2	79
I trust the Phoenix Police Dept. to do the right thing	13	65	15	4	3	78
The Phoenix Police Dept. cares about people like me	16	60	16	2	6	76
The Phoenix Police Dept. uses appropriate force in performing their duties	11	60	17	3	9	71
The Phoenix Police Dept. treats all residents with respect	10	56	20	6	8	66
The Phoenix Police Dept. is honest and open with the public	7	58	27	2	6	65
The Phoenix Police Dept. treats all residents fairly regardless of race	10	49	20	10	11	59

-----

## OVERALL SATISFACTION WITH CITY PERFORMANCE

More than eight out of 10 Phoenix residents (83%) indicate they are either very satisfied (13%) or satisfied (70%) with the overall performance of the City in providing services. This figure is down from 88 percent in 2008, but the change does not reach the six points needed for statistical significance. The percentage of residents who profess dissatisfaction is 15 percent.

Demographically, overall satisfaction with the City's performance does not drop below 76 percent within any population subgroup and satisfaction tends to increase in relationship to increased age and income. These response patterns continue to indicate broad-based satisfaction among residents with the City's performance.

TABLE 6: OVERALL SATISFACTION WITH CITY PERFORMANCE

"Would you say that you are very satisfied, satisfied, dissatisfied, or very dissatisfied with the overall performance of the City in providing services to Phoenix residents?"

	Very Satisfied/ Satisfied	Dissatisfied/ Very Dissatisfied	Not Sure
2010	83%	15%	2%
2008	88	10	2
2006	89	10	1
2004	91	8	1
2002	87	12	1
<u>2010 READING – DETAIL</u>			
<u>GENDER</u>			
Male	85%	14%	1%
Female	80	18	2
<u>AGE</u>			
Under 35	79	19	2
35 to 49	83	16	1
50 to 64	82	15	3
65 or over	88	10	2
<u>INCOME</u>			
Under \$25,000	77	22	1
\$25,000 to \$49,999	80	18	2
\$50,000 to \$74,999	91	8	1
\$75,000 or over	93	7	0
<u>ETHNICITY</u>			
White	87	11	2
Minority	76	23	1
<u>LENGTH OF RESIDENCE</u>			
Under 10	83	15	2
10 or over	83	16	1

~~~~~

## SATISFACTION WITH SELECTED CITY SERVICES

Phoenix residents were asked to indicate how satisfied they are with each of 30 services provided by the City using a ten-point scale, where one means the City is doing a poor job and 10 means it is doing an excellent job. As has been the case since the start of this series of studies, emergency medical response by the Fire Department (8.3) and fire protection in your area (8.2) receive the highest ratings. Also receiving a high rating over 8.0 this year is garbage and recycling collection (8.2).

Also receiving very positive ratings are 12 additional services which receive satisfaction readings between 7.0 and 7.7:

- Library services in your area (7.7)
- Preserving our mountains and deserts (7.6)
- Collection frequency of uncontainerized trash such as yard clippings (7.5)
- Keeping parks in your area clean (7.5)
- Providing citizens with Internet access to City information and services (7.4)
- Police protection in your area (7.3)
- Keeping our streets clean (7.2)
- Operating wastewater plants in a way that protects the environment (7.1)
- Preserving historic Phoenix houses and other historic buildings (7.1)
- Handling street flooding during rains in your area (7.0)
- Providing park and recreation programs in your area (7.0)
- Providing city bus service (7.0)

A third tier of 11 City services receives satisfactory readings between 6.0 and 6.9:

- Providing drinking water which meets health and safety standards (6.8)
- Controlling cut-through traffic in your neighborhood (6.8)
- Enforcing traffic laws on city streets (6.8)
- Providing art and cultural events and programs (6.7)
- Preserving residential neighborhoods (6.6)
- Street repair and maintenance (6.6)
- Requiring property owners to maintain their properties to minimum standards and enforcing cleanup ordinances (6.5)
- Crime prevention efforts in your area (6.4)
- Providing services for the elderly such as housing and meals at home (6.2)
- Providing programs for youth (6.2)
- Preventing illegal dumping (6.1)

Four of the 30 City services evaluated receive a satisfaction reading under 6.0. As might be expected given the nation's, state's and Valley's economic woes, the two lowest rated services relate to job creation.

- Countering gang activities (5.9)
- Providing services and housing for the poor and homeless (5.4)
- Providing job training and placement services for the unemployed (5.3)
- Attracting new employers to the community and helping existing employers to grow (5.1)

**TABLE 7: SATISFACTION WITH SELECTED CITY SERVICES**

"As you know, the City of Phoenix provides various services to the community ranging from fire protection to street maintenance. On a scale of one to 10 where one means you think the city is doing a poor job and 10 means you think the city is doing an excellent job, how would you rate the City of Phoenix on each of the following? Remember, one means a poor job and 10 means an excellent job."

|                                                                                                                    | Low<br>(1-4) | Mod-<br>erate<br>(5-6) | High<br>(7-8) | Very<br>High<br>(9-10) | Not<br>Sure | MEAN<br>RATING |
|--------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|--------------|------------------------|---------------|------------------------|-------------|----------------|
| Emergency medical response by the Fire Dept.                                                                       | 6%           | 9%                     | 23%           | 54%                    | 8%          | 8.3            |
| Fire protection in your area                                                                                       | 6            | 7                      | 31            | 52                     | 4           | 8.2            |
| Garbage and recycling collection                                                                                   | 10           | 8                      | 23            | 58                     | 1           | 8.2            |
| Library services in your area                                                                                      | 10           | 14                     | 29            | 41                     | 6           | 7.7            |
| Preserving our mountains and deserts                                                                               | 10           | 14                     | 36            | 35                     | 5           | 7.6            |
| Collection frequency of uncontainerized trash<br>such as yard clippings                                            | 13           | 13                     | 30            | 39                     | 5           | 7.5            |
| Keeping the parks in your area clean                                                                               | 10           | 15                     | 37            | 33                     | 5           | 7.5            |
| Providing citizens with Internet access to City<br>information and services                                        | 8            | 22                     | 24            | 33                     | 13          | 7.4            |
| Police protection in your area                                                                                     | 13           | 18                     | 34            | 34                     | 1           | 7.3            |
| Keeping our streets clean                                                                                          | 14           | 17                     | 36            | 33                     | *           | 7.2            |
| Operating wastewater plants in a way that<br>protects the environment                                              | 9            | 18                     | 29            | 24                     | 20          | 7.1            |
| Preserving historic Phoenix houses and other<br>historic buildings                                                 | 10           | 22                     | 31            | 27                     | 10          | 7.1            |
| Handling street flooding during rains in your area                                                                 | 14           | 18                     | 33            | 28                     | 7           | 7.0            |
| Providing city bus service in your area                                                                            | 16           | 17                     | 32            | 30                     | 5           | 7.0            |
| Providing parks and recreation programs in<br>your area                                                            | 17           | 21                     | 33            | 23                     | 6           | 7.0            |
| Providing drinking water which meets health<br>and safety standards                                                | 14           | 22                     | 28            | 30                     | 6           | 6.8            |
| Controlling cut-through traffic in your neighbor-<br>hood                                                          | 17           | 20                     | 31            | 28                     | 4           | 6.8            |
| Enforcing traffic laws on city streets                                                                             | 21           | 18                     | 32            | 27                     | 2           | 6.8            |
| Providing art and cultural events and programs                                                                     | 16           | 20                     | 33            | 23                     | 8           | 6.7            |
| Preserving residential neighborhoods                                                                               | 17           | 24                     | 36            | 17                     | 6           | 6.6            |
| Street repair and maintenance                                                                                      | 19           | 23                     | 34            | 23                     | 1           | 6.6            |
| Requiring property owners to maintain<br>their properties to minimum standards<br>and enforcing cleanup ordinances | 21           | 24                     | 30            | 21                     | 4           | 6.5            |
| Crime prevention efforts in your area                                                                              | 19           | 24                     | 36            | 17                     | 4           | 6.4            |
| Providing services for the elderly such as<br>housing and meals at home                                            | 21           | 17                     | 19            | 18                     | 25          | 6.2            |
| Providing programs for youth                                                                                       | 21           | 22                     | 25            | 14                     | 18          | 6.2            |
| Preventing illegal dumping                                                                                         | 25           | 20                     | 25            | 17                     | 13          | 6.1            |
| Countering gang activities                                                                                         | 27           | 20                     | 25            | 17                     | 11          | 5.9            |
| Providing services and housing for the poor<br>and homeless                                                        | 33           | 22                     | 19            | 12                     | 14          | 5.4            |
| Providing job training and placement services<br>for the unemployed                                                | 27           | 25                     | 17            | 12                     | 19          | 5.3            |
| Attracting new employers to the community<br>and helping existing employers to grow                                | 34           | 27                     | 23            | 7                      | 9           | 5.1            |

\*Indicates % less than .5

When the 2010 satisfaction ratings are compared to the 2008 ratings, we find that in two areas, the ratings are down (a .6 negative shift): attracting new employers (-1.2), safe drinking water (-.6). In the remaining 28 service areas, the ratings are unchanged (less than a .6 positive or negative shift).

**TABLE 8: HISTORICAL RATING OF CITY SERVICES**

|                                           | <u>MEAN RATING</u> |      |      |      |      | '08-'10<br>Change |
|-------------------------------------------|--------------------|------|------|------|------|-------------------|
|                                           | 2010               | 2008 | 2006 | 2004 | 2002 |                   |
| <u>PROTECTIVE SERVICES</u>                |                    |      |      |      |      |                   |
| Emergency medical response                | 8.3                | 8.5  | 8.5  | 8.3  | 8.2  | -2                |
| Fire protection                           | 8.2                | 8.4  | 8.4  | 8.4  | 8.5  | -2                |
| Police protection                         | 7.3                | 7.0  | 7.2  | 7.2  | 7.0  | +3                |
| Enforcing traffic laws                    | 6.8                | 7.0  | 6.8  | 6.5  | 6.1  | -2                |
| Crime prevention efforts                  | 6.4                | 6.6  | 6.4  | 6.4  | 6.5  | -2                |
| Gang programs                             | 5.9                | 6.1  | 6.1  | 6.0  | 6.0  | -2                |
| <u>TRANSPORTATION SERVICES</u>            |                    |      |      |      |      |                   |
| Keeping streets clean                     | 7.2                | 7.0  | 7.1  | 7.2  | —    | +2                |
| City bus service                          | 7.0                | 7.0  | 7.1  | 7.1  | 7.0  | 0                 |
| Street flooding                           | 7.0                | 7.2  | 7.3  | 7.2  | 7.4  | -2                |
| Cut-through traffic                       | 6.8                | 7.1  | 6.6  | 6.4  | 6.5  | -3                |
| Street repair/maintenance                 | 6.6                | 6.6  | 6.6  | 6.6  | 6.8  | 0                 |
| <u>SOCIAL SERVICES</u>                    |                    |      |      |      |      |                   |
| Elderly services                          | 6.2                | 6.5  | 6.8  | 6.7  | 6.5  | -3                |
| Youth programs                            | 6.2                | 6.5  | 6.6  | 6.6  | 6.3  | -3                |
| Poor/homeless services                    | 5.4                | 5.5  | 5.5  | 5.1  | 5.7  | -1                |
| Job training/placement                    | 5.3                | 5.8  | 5.9  | 5.5  | 5.8  | -5                |
| <u>ENVIRONMENTAL SERVICES</u>             |                    |      |      |      |      |                   |
| Garbage/recycling collection              | 8.2                | 8.0  | 8.0  | 7.8  | 7.6  | +2                |
| Preserving mountains/deserts              | 7.6                | 7.7  | 7.1  | 6.9  | 7.0  | -1                |
| Uncontainerized trash collection          | 7.5                | 7.5  | 7.2  | 7.1  | 7.2  | 0                 |
| Wastewater plants                         | 7.1                | 7.1  | 7.3  | 7.3  | 7.3  | 0                 |
| Safe drinking water                       | 6.8                | 7.4  | 7.0  | 6.9  | 6.8  | -6                |
| Preventing illegal dumping                | 6.1                | 6.3  | 6.1  | 6.1  | 6.0  | -2                |
| <u>PARKS AND RECREATION SERVICES</u>      |                    |      |      |      |      |                   |
| Library services                          | 7.7                | 7.9  | 7.9  | 7.7  | 7.9  | -2                |
| Keeping the parks in your area clean      | 7.5                | 8.0  | —    | —    | —    | -5                |
| Parks/recreation programs                 | 7.0                | 6.9  | 7.0  | 7.0  | 6.9  | +1                |
| Art/cultural events/programs              | 6.7                | 6.9  | 6.9  | 6.8  | 6.9  | -2                |
| <u>ECONOMIC DEVELOPMENT SERVICES</u>      |                    |      |      |      |      |                   |
| Internet access                           | 7.4                | 7.6  | 7.4  | 7.4  | 7.1  | -2                |
| Attracting new employers                  | 5.1                | 6.3  | 6.8  | 6.3  | 6.7  | -1.2              |
| <u>NEIGHBORHOOD PRESERVATION SERVICES</u> |                    |      |      |      |      |                   |
| Preserving historic buildings             | 7.1                | 7.0  | 7.1  | 7.1  | —    | +1                |
| Preserving neighborhoods                  | 6.6                | 6.6  | 6.7  | 6.8  | 6.6  | 0                 |
| Property maintenance standards            | 6.5                | 6.3  | 6.5  | 6.4  | 6.1  | +2                |

## CITY SPENDING PRIORITIES

After residents had evaluated each of the 30 service areas under consideration, they were asked to indicate whether they would or would not be willing to pay more to improve each of them. Seven services are mentioned by at least seven out of 10 residents as areas where they would be willing to pay more:

- Youth programs (75%)
- Poor and homeless services (74%)
- Gang programs (73%)
- Job training and placement services for the unemployed (73%)
- Elderly services (73%)
- Crime prevention efforts (70%)
- Emergency medical response (70%)

There is also a second tier of five service areas where at least six out of 10 residents would be willing to pay more:

- Police protection (68%)
- Parks and recreation programs (66%)
- Provide safe drinking water (66%)
- Attracting new employers to the community and helping existing employers grow (62%)
- Fire protection (62%)

Of particular interest among the 12 service spending priorities noted above, is the fact that they include four of the six protective service categories and all of the four social service categories tested. This pattern clearly reveals the high priority which residents give these service areas.

On the other end of the spectrum, the following services receive the lowest spending priority readings with at least 50 percent or more of residents indicating they would not be willing to pay more for each.

- Cut-through traffic (61%)
- Street flooding (59%)
- Uncontainerized trash collection (57%)
- Preserving historic Phoenix houses and other historic buildings (54%)
- Internet access to City information (54%)
- Garbage and recycling collection (50%)

**TABLE 9: WILLINGNESS TO PAY MORE FOR  
IMPROVED CITY SERVICES**

"Now I'd like to quickly read the list again, but this time, please tell me if each service is one you would or would not be willing to pay more for to improve."

|                                  | Willing<br>To Pay<br>More | Not<br>Willing<br>To Pay<br>More | Not<br>Sure | NET <sup>1</sup><br>MORE/<br>(LESS) |
|----------------------------------|---------------------------|----------------------------------|-------------|-------------------------------------|
| Youth programs                   | 75%                       | 22%                              | 3%          | 53%                                 |
| Poor/homeless services           | 74                        | 24                               | 2           | 50                                  |
| Gang programs                    | 73                        | 23                               | 4           | 50                                  |
| Job training/placement           | 73                        | 23                               | 4           | 50                                  |
| Elderly services                 | 73                        | 25                               | 2           | 48                                  |
| Crime prevention efforts         | 70                        | 27                               | 3           | 43                                  |
| Emergency medical response       | 70                        | 28                               | 2           | 42                                  |
| Police protection                | 68                        | 30                               | 2           | 38                                  |
| Parks/recreation programs        | 66                        | 31                               | 3           | 35                                  |
| Safe drinking water              | 66                        | 32                               | 2           | 34                                  |
| Attracting new employers         | 62                        | 35                               | 3           | 27                                  |
| Fire protection                  | 62                        | 36                               | 2           | 26                                  |
| Property maintenance standards   | 59                        | 38                               | 3           | 21                                  |
| Preventing illegal dumping       | 58                        | 38                               | 4           | 20                                  |
| Keeping streets clean            | 58                        | 40                               | 2           | 18                                  |
| Wastewater plants                | 57                        | 39                               | 4           | 18                                  |
| Keeping parks clean              | 58                        | 41                               | 1           | 17                                  |
| Library services                 | 57                        | 42                               | 1           | 15                                  |
| Enforcing traffic laws           | 54                        | 43                               | 3           | 11                                  |
| Preserving neighborhoods         | 53                        | 43                               | 4           | 10                                  |
| Preserving mountains/deserts     | 53                        | 44                               | 3           | 9                                   |
| Street repair/maintenance        | 53                        | 45                               | 2           | 8                                   |
| City bus service                 | 51                        | 46                               | 3           | 5                                   |
| Art/cultural events/programs     | 50                        | 47                               | 3           | 3                                   |
| Garbage/recycling collection     | 49                        | 50                               | 1           | (1)                                 |
| Internet access                  | 42                        | 54                               | 4           | (12)                                |
| Preserving historic buildings    | 40                        | 54                               | 6           | (14)                                |
| Uncontainerized trash collection | 41                        | 57                               | 2           | (16)                                |
| Street flooding                  | 39                        | 59                               | 2           | (20)                                |
| Cut-through traffic              | 37                        | 61                               | 2           | (24)                                |

<sup>1</sup>Willing to pay more minus not willing

~~~~~

Next in this section we present a Priority Spending Index. This Index correlates the earlier discussed service satisfaction ratings with residents' willingness to pay more for improved service. The effect of this Index is that it affords higher spending priority to those services that receive lower satisfaction readings.

As may be seen in the following table, the result of this exercise is a reordering of the top 10 spending priorities from Table 9 with job training/placement (137.7) and poor/homeless services (137.0) receiving the highest Index reading, followed by gang problems (123.7). Also notice that since 2008, Index increases are recorded for 12 services, while decreases are recorded for 18 services. Similar to 2008, the strongest increases are recorded in attracting new employers (+35.9) and job training/placement (+22.2) – a likely reflection of current economic conditions.

**TABLE 10: PRIORITY SPENDING INDEX**

	1-10 Rating	Willing To Pay More	PRIORITY SPENDING INDEX			'08-'10 Change
			2010	2008	2006	
Job training/placement	5.3	73%	137.7	115.5	105.1	+ 22.2
Poor/homeless services	5.4	74	137.0	130.9	125.5	+ 6.1
Gang programs	5.9	73	123.7	121.3	127.9	+ 2.4
Attracting new employers	5.1	62	121.6	85.7	76.5	+ 35.9
Youth programs	6.2	75	121.0	109.2	113.6	+ 10.8
Elderly services	6.2	73	117.7	118.5	111.8	- .8
Crime prevention efforts	6.4	70	109.4	115.2	126.6	- 5.8
Safe drinking water	6.8	66	97.1	94.6	101.4	+ 2.5
Preventing illegal dumping	6.1	58	95.1	100.0	96.7	- 4.9
Parks/recreation programs	7.0	66	94.3	100.0	92.9	- 5.7
Police protection	7.3	68	93.2	101.4	106.9	- 8.2
Property maintenance standards	6.5	59	90.8	88.9	87.7	+ 1.9
Emergency medical response	8.3	70	84.3	83.5	87.1	+ .8
Keeping streets clean	7.2	58	80.6	85.7	95.8	- 5.1
Wastewater plants	7.1	57	80.3	95.8	93.2	- 15.5
Street repair/maintenance	6.6	53	80.3	93.9	93.9	- 13.6
Preserving neighborhoods	6.6	53	80.3	86.4	89.6	- 6.1
Enforcing traffic laws	6.8	54	79.4	81.4	97.1	- 2.0
Keeping parks clean	7.5	58	77.3	76.3	-	+ 1.0
Fire protection	8.2	62	75.6	79.8	83.3	- 4.2
Art/cultural events/programs	6.7	50	74.6	76.8	76.8	- 2.2
Library services	7.7	57	74.0	65.8	67.1	+ 8.2
City bus service	7.0	51	72.9	80.0	73.2	- 7.1
Preserving mountains/deserts	7.6	53	69.7	80.5	94.4	- 10.8
Garbage/recycling collection	8.2	49	59.8	63.8	60.0	- 4.0
Internet access	7.4	42	56.8	48.7	55.4	+ 8.1
Preserving historic buildings	7.1	40	56.3	68.6	63.3	- 12.3
Street flooding	7.0	39	55.7	55.6	58.9	+ .1
Uncontainerized trash collection	7.5	41	54.7	64.0	65.3	- 9.3
Cut-through traffic	6.8	37	54.4	63.4	77.3	- 9.0

Calculation: Willing to pay more divided by rating

## QUALITY OF LIFE IN THE CITY OF PHOENIX

Phoenix residents continue to rate the quality of life in Phoenix quite highly, with nearly two out of three residents (64%) indicating it is either excellent (12%) or good (52%). In comparison, 26 percent of residents rate the quality of life as fair, while 10 percent rate it in negative terms (poor/very poor). The current level of positive response has remained relatively consistent since 2002, while the negative response has increased somewhat.

When residents' attitudes about the quality of life in Phoenix are analyzed based on demographic subgroup, we find several interesting differences between subgroups. For example, as in the past, positive impressions tend to increase in direct correlation to increases in yearly income, and white residents reveal a more positive impression about the quality of life in the City than do minority residents (72% vs. 54%). Negative impressions reach the highest level among lower income households (16%) and minority households (14%).

**TABLE 11: QUALITY OF LIFE IN THE CITY OF PHOENIX**

"On the whole, would you say that the quality of life in the City of Phoenix is excellent, good, fair, poor, or very poor?"

	Excellent/ Good	Fair	Poor/ Very Poor	Not Sure
2010	64%	26%	10%	*%
2008	67	28	5	*
2006	70	24	5	1
2004	70	25	5	*
2002	66	28	6	*

### 2010 READING – DETAIL

	Excellent/ Good	Fair	Poor/ Very Poor	Not Sure
<u>GENDER</u>				
Male	67%	23%	10%	0%
Female	63	28	9	*
<u>AGE</u>				
Under 35	60	28	12	0
35 to 49	59	32	9	0
50 to 64	68	22	9	1
65 or over	77	15	7	1
<u>INCOME</u>				
Under \$25,000	54	30	16	0
\$25,000 to \$49,999	64	20	16	*
\$50,000 to \$74,999	64	34	2	0
\$75,000 or over	75	20	5	0
<u>ETHNICITY</u>				
White	72	21	7	*
Minority	54	32	14	0
<u>LENGTH OF RESIDENCE</u>				
Under 10	61	28	11	0
10 or over	66	25	9	*

\*Indicates % less than .5

~~~~~

## NEIGHBORHOOD PROBLEMS

Residents were next asked to indicate the single most important problem the City should be working on to solve in their neighborhood. As Table 12 indicates, crime-related issues (22%) continue to lead the responses followed by transportation issues (15%). Each of these issues is down from 2008. The only other problem to register a two-digit reading is the economy with 10 percent – up from only two percent in 2008.

**TABLE 12: MOST IMPORTANT PROBLEMS  
CITY SHOULD BE WORKING TO SOLVE**

"Next, what do you feel is the single most important problem the City should be working to solve in your neighborhood?" (IF CRIME MENTIONED, PROBE). "And what is the next most important problem?"

|                                | 2010       | 2008       | 2006       | 2004       | 2002       |
|--------------------------------|------------|------------|------------|------------|------------|
| <b>CRIME</b>                   | <b>22%</b> | <b>32%</b> | <b>33%</b> | <b>34%</b> | <b>30%</b> |
| Robberies                      | 6          | 5          | 5          | 8          | 5          |
| Drugs                          | 4          | 4          | 7          | 6          | 7          |
| Gangs                          | 4          | 2          | 3          | 5          | 8          |
| Crime, too much                | 3          | 9          | 11         | 9          | 4          |
| Need more police               | 2          | 3          | 3          | 3          | 4          |
| Car theft/jacking              | 1          | 1          | 2          | 3          | 5          |
| Other responses                | 2          | 8          | 5          | 3          | 5          |
| <b>TRANSPORTATION</b>          | <b>15</b>  | <b>20</b>  | <b>23</b>  | <b>26</b>  | <b>26</b>  |
| Street/road conditions         | 5          | 3          | 4          | 2          | 3          |
| Traffic congestion             | 3          | 4          | 7          | 9          | 7          |
| Bad drivers, red light runners | 3          | 1          | 4          | 6          | 7          |
| Lack of public transit         | 2          | 5          | 4          | 6          | 6          |
| Other responses                | 4          | 8          | 5          | 4          | 5          |
| Economy/jobs/unemployment      | 10         | 2          | 2          | 3          | 3          |
| Trash/litter/graffiti          | 8          | 5          | 8          | 5          | 6          |
| Illegal immigration            | 6          | 7          | 7          | 1          | *          |
| Education                      | 5          | 3          | 3          | 4          | 6          |
| Lack of social services        | 4          | 3          | 4          | 3          | 3          |
| Environment/pollution          | 2          | 4          | 4          | 5          | 6          |
| Neighborhood maintenance       | 2          | 2          | 4          | 4          | 3          |
| Parks and recreation           | 2          | 2          | 1          | 1          | 2          |
| Uncontrolled growth            | 1          | 1          | 2          | 2          | 3          |
| All other responses            | 4          | 3          | 3          | 6          | 7          |
| No problems                    | 12         | 10         | 11         | 8          | 12         |
| Not sure                       | 8          | 8          | 9          | 7          | 6          |

Totals exceed 100% due to multiple responses

~~~~~

In a related question, residents were asked if each of 10 issues was a major, a minor, or not a problem in their neighborhood. As may be seen, air pollution is viewed as the primary problem facing neighborhoods, with 38 percent of residents rating it a major problem. Three additional problems are rated as major problems by roughly three out of 10 residents – graffiti (29%), drug activity (28% ) and juvenile crime (27%).

**TABLE 13: EVALUATION OF SELECTED  
NEIGHBORHOOD PROBLEMS**

"Next, would you say the following things are major problems, minor problems, or not problems in your neighborhood?"

	Major	Minor	Not A Problem	Not Sure
Air pollution	38%	30%	31%	1%
Graffiti	29	38	33	*
Drug activity	28	29	38	5
Juvenile crime	27	34	34	5
Traffic congestion	20	37	43	*
Houses and yards that are not well maintained	20	35	44	1
Traffic cutting through neighborhood streets	16	34	50	*
Signs on utility poles for things like yard sales or model homes	12	31	56	1
Vacant lots	12	32	56	*
Interference from industrial or commercial operations	8	24	66	2

\*Indicates % less than .5

When the current readings are compared to those recorded in 2008, we find statistically significant improvement in two areas – air pollution, which declined from 49 percent in 2008 to 38 percent today, and traffic congestion which declined from 28 percent in 2008 and 37 percent in 2006 to 20 percent today.

TABLE 14: EVALUATION OF SELECTED  
NEIGHBORHOOD PROBLEMS – DETAIL

% "MAJOR" PROBLEM

	2010	2008	2006	2004	2002	'08 - '10 CHANGE
Air pollution	38%	49%	46%	42%	45%	-11
Graffiti	29	32	31	19	22	- 3
Drug activity	28	32	38	29	33	- 4
Juvenile crime	27	31	34	26	32	- 4
Traffic congestion	20	28	37	31	35	- 8
Houses and yards that are not well maintained	20	24	21	22	24	- 4
Traffic cutting through neigh- borhood streets	16	19	24	20	23	- 3
Signs on utility poles for things like yard sales or model homes	12	13	13	11	11	- 1
Vacant lots	12	12	14	9	11	0
Interference from industrial or commercial operations	8	9	9	8	7	- 1

## STEPS CITY COULD TAKE TO MAKE PHOENIX MORE LIVEABLE

Similar to prior years, the main thing residents believe the City could do to make Phoenix a more liveable community is to improve the transportation system with a reading of 18 percent, down from 26 percent in 2008. Also receiving noteworthy mention are improving the economy (16%) and crime (12%).

TABLE 15: STEPS CITY COULD TAKE  
TO MAKE PHOENIX MORE LIVEABLE

“What do you feel the City could do to make Phoenix a more liveable city in the future? (PROBE) What else?”

	2010	2008	2006	2004
IMPROVE THE TRANSPORTATION SYSTEM	18%	26%	24%	23%
Public transit/light rail – extend	11	14	11	11
Fix roads – pot holes	3	2	1	1
Traffic congestion	2	4	5	4
Freeways	1	2	4	5
Other responses	4	4	5	5
Improve the economy/jobs	16	9	5	6
Reduce crime	12	16	17	18
Protect environment – air pollution, conserve water	8	12	6	8
Reduce illegal immigration	7	4	5	2
Better government – listen to the people	7	3	3	2
Improve parks/recreation	6	4	4	4
Improve education	5	3	3	4
Improve social services	4	2	4	5
Slow growth – control	3	6	6	9
Lower taxes	3	2	1	2
Improve city services	3	1	2	1
Revitalize – downtown, vacant lots, run down areas	2	*	4	7
Expand cultural opportunities	1	2	1	1
Miscellaneous	3	1	3	5
Nothing – doing fine	8	10	8	5
Not sure	12	14	20	17

Totals exceed 100% due to multiple response

\*Indicates % less than .5

~~~~~

## ATTITUDES ABOUT COMMUNITY-BASED POLICING AND OTHER PUBLIC SAFETY ISSUES

Residents were next read a description of community-based policing and asked to evaluate the job the Phoenix Police Department is doing operating the philosophy in their neighborhood. As Table 16 reveals, residents are very favorable in their evaluation with 64 percent rating the Police Department either excellent (24%) or good (40%) and only 12 percent rating it poor (8%) or very poor (4%). The positive readings for community-based policing have remained relatively constant since 2000.

TABLE 16: ATTITUDES ABOUT COMMUNITY-BASED POLICING

"Next, for the past several years the Phoenix Police Department has been operating under a community-based policing philosophy. Under community-based policing, the Department, in partnership with other City departments, residents and businesses, assists the community in enhancing the quality of life. Such programs as Block Watch are a result of this effort along with in-school programs for children. As far as you're concerned, is the Phoenix Police Department doing an excellent, good, fair, poor or very poor job of operating this philosophy in your neighborhood?"

|      | Excellent/<br>Good | Fair | Poor/<br>Very Poor | Not<br>Sure |
|------|--------------------|------|--------------------|-------------|
| 2010 | 64%                | 18%  | 12%                | 6%          |
| 2008 | 66                 | 20   | 8                  | 6           |
| 2006 | 68                 | 19   | 7                  | 6           |
| 2004 | 70                 | 19   | 4                  | 7           |
| 2002 | 67                 | 18   | 6                  | 9           |

### 2010 READING – DETAIL

| <u>GENDER</u>              |     |     |     |    |
|----------------------------|-----|-----|-----|----|
| Male                       | 62% | 18% | 11% | 9% |
| Female                     | 67  | 18  | 12  | 3  |
| <u>AGE</u>                 |     |     |     |    |
| Under 35                   | 63  | 15  | 16  | 6  |
| 35 to 49                   | 62  | 22  | 12  | 4  |
| 50 to 64                   | 65  | 17  | 10  | 8  |
| 65 or over                 | 68  | 17  | 8   | 7  |
| <u>INCOME</u>              |     |     |     |    |
| Under \$25,000             | 59  | 23  | 16  | 2  |
| \$25,000 to \$49,999       | 73  | 9   | 12  | 6  |
| \$50,000 to \$74,999       | 69  | 16  | 8   | 7  |
| \$75,000 or over           | 69  | 14  | 7   | 10 |
| <u>ETHNICITY</u>           |     |     |     |    |
| White                      | 68  | 17  | 7   | 8  |
| Minority                   | 60  | 18  | 18  | 4  |
| <u>LENGTH OF RESIDENCE</u> |     |     |     |    |
| Under 10                   | 64  | 15  | 9   | 12 |
| 10 or over                 | 65  | 19  | 12  | 4  |

~~~~~

Continuing with this line of questioning, we find that 35 percent of residents have had contact with a Phoenix police officer in the past 12 months and that 81 percent of these residents rate their contact as positive.

TABLE 17: CONTACT WITH  
PHOENIX POLICE DEPARTMENT

“During the past 12 months, have you had any contact with a City of Phoenix police officer?”

Yes	35%
No	65

(AMONG THOSE HAVING CONTACT)

“Would you rate your last contact with a City of Phoenix police officer as very positive, positive, negative or very negative?”

Very positive	29%
Positive	52
Negative	13
Very negative	<u>6</u>
	100%

~~~~~

Residents also were asked about safety in their neighborhood. Here we find that 53 percent of residents believe their neighborhood is safer than other neighborhoods in Phoenix, while 35 percent believe safety in their neighborhood is on par with other Phoenix neighborhoods. In comparison, only 11 percent of residents believe their neighborhood is not as safe as other Phoenix neighborhoods. Compared to 2008, an increase of four points is recorded in the “safer” reading (53% vs. 49%) and compared to 2006, a 13-point increase (53% vs. 40%).

**TABLE 18: ATTITUDES ABOUT  
NEIGHBORHOOD SAFETY**

“From what you know or have heard, is your neighborhood safer than other neighborhoods in Phoenix, about the same as other neighborhoods in Phoenix, or not as safe as other neighborhoods in Phoenix?”

|      | Safer | About Same | Not as Safe | Not Sure |
|------|-------|------------|-------------|----------|
| 2010 | 53%   | 35%        | 11%         | 1%       |
| 2008 | 49    | 37         | 10          | 4        |
| 2006 | 40    | 41         | 16          | 3        |
| 2004 | 46    | 39         | 11          | 4        |

**2010 READING – DETAIL**

| <u>GENDER</u>              |     |     |     |    |
|----------------------------|-----|-----|-----|----|
| Male                       | 53% | 34% | 11% | 2% |
| Female                     | 52  | 37  | 11  | 0  |
| <u>AGE</u>                 |     |     |     |    |
| Under 35                   | 59  | 27  | 12  | 2  |
| 35 to 49                   | 50  | 40  | 10  | 0  |
| 50 to 64                   | 48  | 40  | 12  | 0  |
| 65 or over                 | 52  | 33  | 12  | 3  |
| <u>INCOME</u>              |     |     |     |    |
| Under \$25,000             | 42  | 46  | 11  | 1  |
| \$25,000 to \$49,999       | 52  | 35  | 12  | 1  |
| \$50,000 to \$74,999       | 64  | 31  | 5   | 0  |
| \$75,000 or over           | 61  | 22  | 13  | 4  |
| <u>ETHNICITY</u>           |     |     |     |    |
| White                      | 50  | 38  | 10  | 2  |
| Minority                   | 53  | 33  | 14  | 0  |
| <u>LENGTH OF RESIDENCE</u> |     |     |     |    |
| Under 10                   | 69  | 26  | 3   | 2  |
| 10 or over                 | 49  | 37  | 13  | 1  |

~~~~~

In a related question, 50 percent of residents indicate their neighborhood participates in a Block Watch or similar crime prevention program which is little changed from 2008. Two out of three residents (66%) participating in crime prevention programs feel they are effective in reducing crime, down 14 points from 80 percent in 2008.

**TABLE 19: PARTICIPATION IN BLOCK WATCH**

“Does your neighborhood participate in a Block Watch or other similar crime reduction program?”

	% YES			
	2010	2008	2006	2004
<u>TOTAL</u>	50%	51%	45%	46%
<u>AGE</u>				
Under 35	48	49	27	36
35 to 49	49	49	51	47
50 to 64	54	59	52	51
65 or over	48	48	59	54
<u>INCOME</u>				
Under \$25,000	51	47	31	41
\$25,000 to \$49,999	48	43	42	47
\$50,000 to \$74,999	47	62	47	52
\$75,000 or over	46	56	54	46
<u>ETHNICITY</u>				
White	53	54	58	48
Minority	46	46	29	42

(AMONG THOSE WHO PARTICIPATE)

“Do you feel it is effective in reducing crime in your neighborhood?”

Yes	66%	80%	78%	70%
No	26	14	15	19
Not sure	<u>8</u>	<u>6</u>	<u>7</u>	<u>11</u>
	100%	100%	100%	100%

~~~~~

## SOURCES OF INFORMATION

The most commonly relied on source of information about what is happening in the City of Phoenix continues to be local television programs, with 45 percent of residents indicating they rely on such programs a lot. In comparison, 39 percent rely on the Internet a lot, while 28 percent rely on newspapers a lot and 22 percent rely on radio news programs a lot. These readings reveal drops in the television, newspaper and radio readings and a sharp increase in the Internet reading over the past eight years. Also note that some major variations exist between the various demographic subgroups.

TABLE 20: SOURCES OF INFORMATION

"Next, do you rely a lot, some, only a little or not at all on each of the following for information about the City of Phoenix?"

### 2010 READING – % A LOT

|                     | A Lot | Some | Only A Little | Not At All | A LOT |      |      |      |
|---------------------|-------|------|---------------|------------|-------|------|------|------|
|                     |       |      |               |            | 2008  | 2006 | 2004 | 2002 |
| Television programs | 45%   | 22%  | 19%           | 14%        | 44%   | 48%  | 48%  | 51%  |
| The Internet        | 39    | 21   | 15            | 25         | 36    | 22   | 16   | 17   |
| Newspapers          | 28    | 16   | 17            | 39         | 30    | 32   | 40   | 35   |
| Radio news programs | 22    | 20   | 23            | 35         | 30    | 30   | 29   | 31   |

\*Indicates percent less than .5

### 2010 READING – % A LOT

|                            | Tele-<br>vision | Internet | News-<br>papers | Radio |
|----------------------------|-----------------|----------|-----------------|-------|
| <u>TOTAL</u>               | 45%             | 39%      | 28%             | 22%   |
| <u>GENDER</u>              |                 |          |                 |       |
| Male                       | 39              | 39       | 27              | 23    |
| Female                     | 51              | 39       | 28              | 21    |
| <u>AGE</u>                 |                 |          |                 |       |
| Under 35                   | 43              | 46       | 14              | 22    |
| 35 to 49                   | 42              | 42       | 30              | 20    |
| 50 to 64                   | 47              | 37       | 26              | 26    |
| 65 or over                 | 54              | 25       | 53              | 22    |
| <u>INCOME</u>              |                 |          |                 |       |
| Under \$25,000             | 59              | 33       | 27              | 14    |
| \$25,000 to \$49,999       | 51              | 28       | 35              | 22    |
| \$50,000 to \$74,999       | 57              | 54       | 19              | 35    |
| \$75,000 or over           | 27              | 61       | 30              | 22    |
| <u>ETHNICITY</u>           |                 |          |                 |       |
| White                      | 38              | 41       | 30              | 18    |
| Minority                   | 57              | 34       | 27              | 26    |
| <u>LENGTH OF RESIDENCE</u> |                 |          |                 |       |
| Under 10                   | 31              | 49       | 17              | 8     |
| 10 or over                 | 48              | 37       | 30              | 25    |

~~~~~

## USE OF CITY'S WEB SITE

Forty-four percent of residents indicate they have used the City's web site. Similar to the drop recorded earlier on Internet use in contacting the City, this figure represents a seven-point drop since 2008. Nonetheless, the reading is up 20 points from 2002. The highest use of the site is among upper-income residents (70%). The data also reveals that the City's web site receives positive readings from users, with 72 percent giving it a rating of seven or more on a 10-point scale (up from 66 percent in 2008).

TABLE 21: USE OF CITY'S WEB SITE

"Have you ever used phoenix.gov, the City's web site, to obtain information or conduct business with the City?" (IF YES): "On a 10 point scale where 1 means poor and 10 means excellent, how would you rate the City's web site?"

	<u>AMONG USERS</u>						MEAN RATING
	% USING	Low (1-4)	Mod-erate (5-6)	High (7-8)	Very High (9-10)	Not Sure	
2010	44%	9%	18%	45%	27%	1%	7.4
2008	51	4	28	40	26	2	7.3
2006	36	6	22	45	26	1	7.3
2004	34	9	23	51	16	1	7.0
2002	24	6	16	42	28	8	7.4

### 2010 READING – % USING

#### GENDER

Male 44%  
Female 44

#### AGE

Under 35 43  
35 to 49 43  
50 to 64 56  
65 or over 24

#### INCOME

Under \$25,000 22  
\$25,000 to \$49,999 32  
\$50,000 to \$74,999 54  
\$75,000 or over 70

#### ETHNICITY

White 51  
Minority 30

#### LENGTH OF RESIDENCE

Under 10 56  
10 or over 41

~~~~~

The research also reveals that residents' main reason for visiting the site is to get water bill information or pay a water bill (21%). This reading has increased from 12 percent in 2008. Ninety-seven percent of residents indicate they were able to find what they were looking for the last time they visited the City's web site – up sharply from 83 percent in 2004.

**TABLE 22: REASONS FOR VISITING  
CITY'S WEB SITE**

“For what purpose did you last visit the City’s web site?”

|                                          | 2010 | 2008 | 2006 | 2004 |
|------------------------------------------|------|------|------|------|
| Water bill information/pay bill          | 21%  | 12%  | 9%   | 12%  |
| Request trash pickup                     | 10   | 10   | 7    | 12   |
| Entertainment – concerts, theatres, arts | 8    | 8    | 2    | 2    |
| Employment information                   | 7    | 12   | 14   | 14   |
| Tax forms/information                    | 6    | 3    | 5    | 4    |
| Police information                       | 6    | 3    | 3    | 1    |
| Building permit                          | 4    | 3    | 7    | 3    |
| Property/zoning                          | 4    | 2    | 2    | 5    |
| Library information                      | 4    | *    | 3    | 5    |
| Neighborhood services                    | 3    | 1    | 2    | 2    |
| Parks and recreation                     | 2    | 6    | 4    | 3    |
| City elections                           | 2    | 1    | 4    | 3    |
| Report repairs need                      | 2    | *    | *    | 0    |
| Court records/jury duty                  | 1    | 4    | 6    | 7    |
| Social services                          | 1    | 4    | 6    | 1    |
| Public transit                           | 1    | 3    | 2    | 1    |
| Graffiti cleanup                         | 1    | *    | 1    | 2    |
| Animal control                           | 1    | *    | *    | *    |
| Business license                         | *    | 2    | 1    | 2    |
| Schools/education                        | 0    | 2    | 0    | 3    |
| All others with mentions                 | 12   | 14   | 12   | 14   |
| Don't recall                             | 9    | 12   | 13   | 14   |

Total exceeds 100% due to multiple responses

\* Indicates % less than .5

“Were you able to find what you were looking for on your last visit?”

|     |          |           |          |           |
|-----|----------|-----------|----------|-----------|
| Yes | 97%      | 90%       | 92%      | 83%       |
| No  | <u>3</u> | <u>10</u> | <u>8</u> | <u>17</u> |
|     | 100%     | 100%      | 100%     | 100%      |

~~~~~

## AWARENESS OF AND ATTITUDES TOWARD NEIGHBORHOOD ORDINANCES

Residents were queried about their awareness of a City ordinance designed to help neighborhoods fight blight and require owners to keep up their property. Fifty-one percent of residents indicate they are aware of the ordinance, which is down sharply from 64 percent in 2008.

Those aware of the ordinance were asked a follow-up question regarding how well they felt the ordinance is working in their neighborhood. Here we find that more than eight out of 10 residents (84%) believe the ordinance is working either very well (43%) or fairly well (41%), while 15 percent believe it is either not working too well (11%) or not at all (4%). The percent of residents who believe the ordinance is working well (very/fairly) has increased from 77 percent in 2008.

**TABLE 23: AWARENESS OF AND ATTITUDES  
TOWARD NEIGHBORHOOD ORDINANCES**

"Next, were you aware that the City of Phoenix has an ordinance to help neighborhoods fight blight and require owners to keep up their property, or not?"

"How well would you say these ordinances are working in your neighborhood – very well, fairly well, not too well or not well at all?"

### EVALUATION AMONG THOSE AWARE

	PERCENT AWARE	Very Well	Fairly Well	Not Too Well	Not Well At All	Not Sure	TOTAL WELL <sup>1</sup>
2010	51%	43%	41%	11%	4%	1%	84%
2008	64	30	47	15	6	2	77
2006	64	33	48	12	6	1	81
2004	55	29	46	15	6	4	75
2002	59	36	38	14	8	4	74

### 2010 READING – % AWARE

#### GENDER

Male 49%  
Female 52

#### AGE

Under 35 47  
35 to 49 48  
50 to 64 61  
65 or over 49

#### INCOME

Under \$25,000 49  
\$25,000 to \$49,999 52  
\$50,000 to \$74,999 48  
\$75,000 or over 58

#### ETHNICITY

White 55  
Minority 43

#### LENGTH OF RESIDENCE

Under 10 42  
10 or over 54

-----

## EVALUATION OF SKY HARBOR INTERNATIONAL AIRPORT

Phoenix residents were asked to evaluate Sky Harbor International Airport on 11 different factors using a one-to-ten scale. As may be seen on Table 24, Sky Harbor continues to receive a very positive reading with an overall rating of 8.1 with 77 percent of residents offering a rating of seven or higher – up from 70 percent in 2008. The specific factors receiving the highest positive readings are convenient airport location (8.4) and overall cleanliness of airport terminals (8.3). On the flip side, Sky Harbor continues to receive its lowest ratings on high quality food and beverages at reasonable prices (5.9) and quality retail merchandise at reasonable prices (6.0).

When the 2010 readings are compared to those from the 2008 study, we find that on each of the 11 factors studied, the readings are unchanged (less than .6 shift).

**TABLE 24: EVALUATION OF SKY HARBOR INTERNATIONAL AIRPORT**

"Next, on a 10-point scale where 1 means you think the airport is doing a poor job and 10 means you think the airport is doing an excellent job, how would you rate Sky Harbor International Airport for. . .?"

	Low (1-4)	Mod- erate (5-6)	High (7-8)	Very High (9-10)	Not Sure	MEAN RATING				'08-'10 Change
						2010	2008	2006	2004	
A convenient Airport location	5%	9%	25%	53%	8%	8.4	8.4	8.2	8.3	0
Overall cleanliness of Airport terminals	4	7	30	47	12	8.3	8.3	8.2	8.2	0
<b>Overall rating of Sky Harbor International Airport</b>	<b>4</b>	<b>8</b>	<b>37</b>	<b>40</b>	<b>11</b>	<b>8.1</b>	<b>7.7</b>	<b>8.0</b>	<b>8.1</b>	<b>+.4</b>
Clean and well-supplied restrooms	7	6	29	44	14	8.0	8.2	8.1	7.9	-.2
Courteous and knowledgeable Airport employees	4	10	33	37	16	8.0	7.7	7.8	7.8	+.3
Availability of taxis, limousines and shuttle services	4	12	25	40	19	8.0	8.0	7.8	7.5	0
Frequency and quality of shuttle bus service between terminals, parking lots and the rental car center	8	10	26	32	24	7.7	7.7	7.4	7.6	0
Clear and understandable directional signs on the airport roadway system	13	17	22	39	9	7.4	7.4	7.3	7.4	0
Ease and availability of parking facilities at reasonable prices	15	19	29	18	19	6.5	6.6	6.5	6.9	-.1
Quality retail merchandise at reasonable prices	21	23	25	13	18	6.0	5.7	6.1	5.8	+.3
High quality food and beverages at reasonable prices	23	21	28	14	14	5.9	5.7	5.9	7.0	+.2

~~~~~

**PERCEPTIONS OF DOWNTOWN PHOENIX**

More than six out of 10 Phoenix residents (62%) believe downtown Phoenix has become either much better (23%) or a little better (39%) over the past few years. The overall change for the better reading of 62 percent is down slightly from 66 percent in 2008.

The downtown area receives its highest better readings from residents 50 to 64 (77%), residents who earn \$75,000 or more (72%) and white residents (68%).

TABLE 25: CHANGES IN DOWNTOWN PHOENIX

"Do you think downtown Phoenix is much better now than it was a few years ago, a little better, about the same, or worse?"

|      | Much Better | Little Better | About The Same | Worse | Not Sure | TOTAL BETTER <sup>1</sup> |
|------|-------------|---------------|----------------|-------|----------|---------------------------|
| 2010 | 23%         | 39%           | 18%            | 12%   | 8%       | 62%                       |
| 2008 | 32          | 34            | 17             | 5     | 12       | 66                        |
| 2006 | 30          | 34            | 17             | 9     | 10       | 64                        |
| 2004 | 33          | 31            | 16             | 9     | 11       | 64                        |
| 2002 | 44          | 23            | 13             | 4     | 16       | 67                        |

2010 READING – % BETTER

GENDER

Male 64%  
Female 59

AGE

Under 35 49  
35 to 49 66  
50 to 64 77  
65 or over 53

INCOME

Under \$25,000 58  
\$25,000 to \$49,999 62  
\$50,000 to \$74,999 65  
\$75,000 or over 72

ETHNICITY

White 68  
Minority 55

LENGTH OF RESIDENCE

Under 10 61  
10 or over 62

~~~~~

**AWARENESS OF CITY'S SUSTAINABILITY EFFORTS**

Seven out of 10 Phoenix residents (70%) are aware of the City's sustainability efforts with few Phoenix residents (14%) indicating they know "a lot" and a majority (56%) indicating they know a little. These figures are little changed from 2008.

TABLE 26: AWARENESS OF CITY'S SUSTAINABILITY EFFORTS

"Would you say you know a lot, a little or nothing at all about the City's efforts to establish sustainability programs? That is, programs to reduce energy and greenhouse gases, use of alternative fuel vehicles, design of city-owned green buildings, water reuse and conservation, recycling, restore blighted land for reuse and preserve desert and open spaces?"

	<u>A Lot</u>	<u>A Little</u>	<u>Nothing</u>
<u>TOTAL</u> – 2010	14%	56%	30%
– 2008	15	54	31

2010 READING – % A LOT/  
A LITTLE

<u>TOTAL</u>	70%
<u>GENDER</u>	
Male	71
Female	69
<u>AGE</u>	
Under 35	66
35 to 49	69
50 to 64	80
65 or over	64
<u>INCOME</u>	
Under \$25,000	60
\$25,000 to \$49,999	83
\$50,000 to \$74,999	80
\$75,000 or over	80
<u>ETHNICITY</u>	
White	75
Minority	63
<u>LENGTH OF RESIDENCE</u>	
Under 10	66
10 or over	71

~~~~~