

## SUMMARY OF THE FINDINGS

### PHOENIX AS A PLACE TO LIVE

Better than nine out of 10 Phoenix residents (93%) either strongly agree (27%) or agree (66%) that "Phoenix is a good place to live." This reading has varied little 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
2012	93%	6%	1%
2010	91	8	1
2008	91	9	*
2006	91	8	1
2004	91	8	1

2012 READING – DETAIL

<u>GENDER</u>			
Male	94%	5%	1%
Female	92	7	1
 <u>AGE</u>			
Under 35	95	5	*
35 to 49	94	5	1
50 to 64	92	8	*
65 or over	92	6	2
 <u>ETHNICITY</u>			
White	93	6	1
Minority	94	5	1
 <u>LENGTH OF RESIDENCE</u>			
Under 10	93	6	1
10 or over	93	6	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, 27 percent of residents had contact with the City during this time period – down slightly from previous years. As in the prior studies, the most common method of contacting City personnel was via the telephone (79%), followed by in-person visits (15%) and the Internet (5%).

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 |
| 2012 | 27%              | 79%               | 15%       | 5%       | 1%   |
| 2010 | 34               | 83                | 13        | 3        | 1    |
| 2008 | 34               | 75                | 14        | 11       | 0    |
| 2006 | 33               | 77                | 13        | 7        | 3    |
| 2004 | 32               | 78                | 12        | 5        | 5    |

2012 READING – % MAKING CONTACT

|                            |     |
|----------------------------|-----|
| <u>GENDER</u>              |     |
| Male                       | 28% |
| Female                     | 25  |
| <u>AGE</u>                 |     |
| Under 35                   | 20  |
| 35 to 49                   | 25  |
| 50 to 64                   | 35  |
| 65 or over                 | 27  |
| <u>ETHNICITY</u>           |     |
| White                      | 30  |
| Minority                   | 23  |
| <u>LENGTH OF RESIDENCE</u> |     |
| Under 10                   | 21  |
| 10 or over                 | 28  |

~~~~~

The primary reasons residents give for contacting the City are to report a crime (26%) or file a complaint about a neighbor (20%). Note the major decline in the crime reading and the major increase in the report a neighbor reading compared to the prior studies.

**TABLE 3: REASON FOR LAST CONTACT**

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

	2012	2010	2008	2006
Report a crime	26%	44%	36%	42%
File complaint about neighbor	20	6	10	12
Request trash/garbage pick-up information	14	16	8	8
Request repairs – roads, lights, water	9	7	9	5
Water service/information	9	5	5	8
Request social services	3	4	4	5
Public transportation information	2	3	5	1
Report mosquito problem	2	1	3	2
Blue Stake information	2	*	*	*
Home loan information	2	0	0	0
Burn day information	2	*	*	*
Animal control/dog pound	1	3	7	3
Building permit information	1	1	3	2
File housing/landlord dispute	1	1	2	1
Election information	1	0	*	1
Zoning issues	1	0	4	1
Parks/recreation information	0	2	2	3
Historic district information	0	2	*	*
All other	4	6	5	6
Don't recall	5	3	3	2

\*Indicates % less than .5

~~~~~

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, roughly two out of three residents or more indicate: 1) they were treated in a professional and courteous manner (87%); 2) their needs were handled in a timely fashion (75%, and; 3) they were promptly directed to the individual who could best respond to their needs (63%). Note that the treated professionally and promptly directed readings are down after recording positive increases in 2010.

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<br>Agree/<br>Agree | Disagree/<br>Strongly<br>Disagree | Not<br>Sure |
|------------------------------------------------------------------------------|-----------------------------|-----------------------------------|-------------|
| I was treated in a professional and courteous manner                         | 87%                         | 11%                               | 2%          |
| My needs were handled in a timely fashion                                    | 75                          | 25                                | 0           |
| I was promptly directed to the individual who could best respond to my needs | 63                          | 34                                | 3           |

% AGREE

|                                                                              | 2012 | 2010 | 2008 | 2006 | 2004 |
|------------------------------------------------------------------------------|------|------|------|------|------|
| I was treated in a professional and courteous manner                         | 87%  | 95%  | 86%  | 89%  | 86%  |
| My needs were handled in a timely fashion                                    | 75   | 69   | 65   | 64   | 76   |
| I was promptly directed to the individual who could best respond to my needs | 63   | 81   | 70   | 70   | 78   |

~~~~~

**ATTITUDES ABOUT PHOENIX POLICE DEPARTMENT**

A new question was added in the 2010 study which 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 (84% agree)
- I trust the Phoenix Police Department to do the right thing (79% agree)
- I have confidence in the Phoenix Police Department (77% agree)
- The Phoenix Police Department cares about people like me (77% 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 20 percent:

- The Phoenix Police Department treats all residents with respect (67% agree/23% disagree)
- The Phoenix Police Department is honest and open with the public (65% agree/24% disagree)
- The Phoenix Police Department treats all residents fairly regardless of race (57% agree/32% disagree).

Each of the above readings is little changed from 2010.

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	
						2012	2010
The Phoenix Police Dept. has a difficult job protecting the community	27%	57%	10%	1%	5%	84%	87%
I trust the Phoenix Police Dept. to do the right thing	15	64	13	5	3	79	78
I have confidence in the Phoenix Police Dept.	17	60	16	4	3	77	79
The Phoenix Police Dept. cares about people like me	15	62	14	4	5	77	76
The Phoenix Police Dept. uses appropriate force in performing their duties	13	58	17	3	9	71	71
The Phoenix Police Dept. treats all residents with respect	14	53	18	5	10	67	66
The Phoenix Police Dept. is honest and open with the public	12	53	19	5	11	65	65
The Phoenix Police Dept. treats all residents fairly regardless of race	13	44	24	8	11	57	59

~~~~~

## OVERALL SATISFACTION WITH CITY PERFORMANCE

More than eight out of 10 Phoenix residents (87%) indicate they are either very satisfied (18%) or satisfied (69%) with the overall performance of the City in providing services. This figure is up from 83 percent in 2010 but the change does not reach the six points needed for statistical significance. The percentage of residents who profess dissatisfaction is ten percent.

Demographically, overall satisfaction with the City's performance does not drop below 83 percent within any population subgroup. 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/<br>Satisfied | Dissatisfied/<br>Very Dissatisfied | Not Sure |
|------------------------------|------------------------------|------------------------------------|----------|
| 2012                         | 87%                          | 10%                                | 3%       |
| 2010                         | 83                           | 15                                 | 2        |
| 2008                         | 88                           | 10                                 | 2        |
| 2006                         | 89                           | 10                                 | 1        |
| 2004                         | 91                           | 8                                  | 1        |
| <u>2012 READING – DETAIL</u> |                              |                                    |          |
| <u>GENDER</u>                |                              |                                    |          |
| Male                         | 88%                          | 9%                                 | 3%       |
| Female                       | 86                           | 11                                 | 3        |
| <u>AGE</u>                   |                              |                                    |          |
| Under 35                     | 88                           | 9                                  | 3        |
| 35 to 49                     | 85                           | 13                                 | 2        |
| 50 to 64                     | 88                           | 9                                  | 3        |
| 65 or over                   | 89                           | 8                                  | 3        |
| <u>ETHNICITY</u>             |                              |                                    |          |
| White                        | 90                           | 7                                  | 3        |
| Minority                     | 83                           | 15                                 | 2        |
| <u>LENGTH OF RESIDENCE</u>   |                              |                                    |          |
| Under 10                     | 92                           | 5                                  | 3        |
| 10 or over                   | 86                           | 12                                 | 2        |

~~~~~

In a new question, residents were asked to evaluate the job the City has done managing its finances during our country's economic downturn. Here we find that 40 percent of residents offer a positive reading of excellent (9%) or good (31%), while 28 percent offer a fair reading and 26 percent a poor (19%) or very poor (7%) reading. Males, white residents and residents over 50 offer the most positive readings.

**TABLE 7: CITY'S EFFORTS IN MANAGING  
DURING ECONOMIC DOWNTURN**

“As you are probably aware, over the past few years the United States and the City of Phoenix have faced the worst economy since the Great Depression in the 1930s. Do you feel the City has done an excellent, good, fair, poor or very poor job of managing its finances during this period?”

	Excellent/ Good	Fair	Poor/ Very Poor	Not Sure
<u>TOTAL</u>	40%	28%	26%	6%
<u>GENDER</u>				
Male	42	27	25	6
Female	38	29	28	5
<u>AGE</u>				
Under 35	39	27	27	7
35 to 49	35	30	30	5
50 to 64	44	29	23	4
65 or over	45	25	24	6
<u>ETHNICITY</u>				
White	43	29	22	6
Minority	35	27	33	5
<u>LENGTH OF RESIDENCE</u>				
Under 10	44	30	18	8
10 or over	39	27	29	5

~~~~~

## 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 (8.6) and fire protection in your area (8.6) receive the highest ratings. Also receiving a high ratings over 8.0 this year are garbage and recycling collection (8.2) and maintaining traffic signals and signs (8.1).

Also receiving very positive ratings are 16 additional services (compared to 12 in 2010) which receive satisfaction readings between 7.0 and 7.6:

- Library services in your area (7.6)
- Keeping our streets clean (7.6)
- Police protection in your area (7.6)
- Keeping parks in your area clean (7.6)
- Collection frequency of uncontainerized trash such as yard clippings (7.5)
- Handling street flooding during rains in your area (7.4)
- Preserving our mountains and deserts (7.4)
- Providing park and recreation programs in your area (7.4)
- Enforcing traffic laws on city streets (7.4)
- Operating wastewater plants in a way that protects the environment (7.4)
- Preserving historic Phoenix houses and other historic buildings (7.3)
- Providing city bus service (7.2)
- Providing drinking water which meets health and safety standards (7.1)
- Preserving residential neighborhoods (7.1)
- Requiring property owners to maintain their properties to minimum standards and enforcing cleanup ordinances (7.0)
- Providing services for the elderly such as housing and meals at home (7.0)

A third tier of eight City services receives satisfactory readings between 6.2 and 6.8:

- Providing art and cultural events and programs (6.8)
- Controlling cut-through traffic in your neighborhood (6.7)
- Street repair and maintenance (6.6)
- Crime prevention efforts in your area (6.6)
- Providing programs for youth (6.6)
- Countering gang activities (6.6)
- Preventing illegal dumping (6.5)
- Attracting new employers to the community and helping existing employers to grow (6.2)

Two of the 30 City services evaluated receive a satisfaction reading under 6.0.

- Providing services and housing for the poor and homeless (5.8)
- Providing job training and placement services for the unemployed (5.8)



**TABLE 8: 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.                                                                       | 3%           | 8%                     | 23%           | 58%                    | 8%          | 8.6            |
| Fire protection in your area                                                                                       | 2            | 8                      | 28            | 57                     | 5           | 8.6            |
| Garbage and recycling collection                                                                                   | 5            | 14                     | 27            | 52                     | 2           | 8.2            |
| Maintaining traffic signals and signs                                                                              | 7            | 8                      | 34            | 49                     | 2           | 8.1            |
| Library services in your area                                                                                      | 10           | 17                     | 28            | 42                     | 3           | 7.6            |
| Keeping our streets clean                                                                                          | 8            | 22                     | 29            | 40                     | 1           | 7.6            |
| Police protection in your area                                                                                     | 9            | 20                     | 31            | 39                     | 1           | 7.6            |
| Keeping the parks in your area clean                                                                               | 8            | 15                     | 37            | 36                     | 4           | 7.6            |
| Collection frequency of uncontainerized trash<br>such as yard clippings                                            | 12           | 17                     | 27            | 40                     | 4           | 7.5            |
| Handling street flooding during rains in your area                                                                 | 13           | 16                     | 30            | 37                     | 4           | 7.4            |
| Preserving our mountains and deserts                                                                               | 12           | 15                     | 33            | 35                     | 5           | 7.4            |
| Providing parks and recreation programs in<br>your area                                                            | 8            | 21                     | 32            | 32                     | 7           | 7.4            |
| Enforcing traffic laws on city streets                                                                             | 11           | 15                     | 43            | 28                     | 3           | 7.4            |
| Operating wastewater plants in a way that<br>protects the environment                                              | 7            | 19                     | 27            | 28                     | 19          | 7.4            |
| Preserving historic Phoenix houses and other<br>historic buildings                                                 | 10           | 17                     | 34            | 27                     | 12          | 7.3            |
| Providing city bus service in your area                                                                            | 16           | 18                     | 22            | 38                     | 6           | 7.2            |
| Providing drinking water which meets health<br>and safety standards                                                | 14           | 17                     | 29            | 34                     | 6           | 7.1            |
| Preserving residential neighborhoods                                                                               | 13           | 20                     | 38            | 24                     | 5           | 7.1            |
| Requiring property owners to maintain<br>their properties to minimum standards<br>and enforcing cleanup ordinances | 16           | 18                     | 31            | 29                     | 6           | 7.0            |
| Providing services for the elderly such as<br>housing and meals at home                                            | 11           | 20                     | 21            | 25                     | 23          | 7.0            |
| Providing art and cultural events and programs                                                                     | 16           | 22                     | 30            | 25                     | 7           | 6.8            |
| Controlling cut-through traffic in your neighbor-<br>hood                                                          | 18           | 21                     | 28            | 29                     | 4           | 6.7            |
| Street repair and maintenance                                                                                      | 19           | 25                     | 31            | 23                     | 2           | 6.6            |
| Countering gang activities                                                                                         | 18           | 21                     | 26            | 22                     | 13          | 6.6            |
| Providing programs for youth                                                                                       | 17           | 20                     | 27            | 21                     | 15          | 6.6            |
| Crime prevention efforts in your area                                                                              | 20           | 23                     | 34            | 20                     | 3           | 6.6            |
| Preventing illegal dumping                                                                                         | 17           | 25                     | 20            | 24                     | 14          | 6.5            |
| Attracting new employers to the community<br>and helping existing employers to grow                                | 18           | 30                     | 26            | 17                     | 9           | 6.2            |
| Providing services and housing for the poor<br>and homeless                                                        | 26           | 23                     | 19            | 14                     | 18          | 5.8            |
| Providing job training and placement services<br>for the unemployed                                                | 22           | 27                     | 17            | 14                     | 20          | 5.8            |

\*Indicates % less than .5

~~~~~

When the 2012 satisfaction ratings are compared to the 2010 ratings, we find that in four areas the ratings are up significantly (a .6 or more positive shift): attracting new employers (+1.1), elderly services (+.8), gangs programs (+.7), enforcing traffic laws (+.6). In the remaining 26 service areas, the ratings are unchanged (less than a .6 positive or negative shift). Compared to the 2002 ratings, five areas record significant positive change: enforcing traffic laws (+1.3), property maintenance standards (+.9), police protection (+.6), gang programs (+.6), and garbage recycling collection (+.6).

**TABLE 9: HISTORICAL RATING OF CITY SERVICES**

	<u>MEAN RATING</u>						'10-'12 Change	'02-'12 Change
	2012	2010	2008	2006	2004	2002		
<u>PROTECTIVE SERVICES</u>								
Emergency medical response	8.6	8.3	8.5	8.5	8.3	8.2	+3	+4
Fire protection	8.6	8.2	8.4	8.4	8.4	8.5	+4	+1
Police protection	7.6	7.3	7.0	7.2	7.2	7.0	+3	+6
Enforcing traffic laws	7.4	6.8	7.0	6.8	6.5	6.1	+6	+1.3
Crime prevention efforts	6.6	6.4	6.6	6.4	6.4	6.5	+2	+1
Gang programs	6.6	5.9	6.1	6.1	6.0	6.0	+7	+6
<u>TRANSPORTATION SERVICES</u>								
Maintaining traffic signals	8.1	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA
Keeping streets clean	7.6	7.2	7.0	7.1	7.2	NA	+4	NA
Street flooding	7.4	7.0	7.2	7.3	7.2	7.4	+4	0
City bus service	7.2	7.0	7.0	7.1	7.1	7.0	+2	+2
Cut-through traffic	6.7	6.8	7.1	6.6	6.4	6.5	-.1	+2
Street repair/maintenance	6.6	6.6	6.6	6.6	6.6	6.8	0	-.2
<u>SOCIAL SERVICES</u>								
Elderly services	7.0	6.2	6.5	6.8	6.7	6.5	+8	+5
Youth programs	6.6	6.2	6.5	6.6	6.6	6.3	+4	+3
Poor/homeless services	5.8	5.4	5.5	5.5	5.1	5.7	+4	+1
Job training/placement	5.8	5.3	5.8	5.9	5.5	5.8	+5	0
<u>ENVIRONMENTAL SERVICES</u>								
Garbage/recycling collection	8.2	8.2	8.0	8.0	7.8	7.6	0	+6
Uncontainerized trash collection	7.5	7.5	7.5	7.2	7.1	7.2	0	+3
Preserving mountains/deserts	7.4	7.6	7.7	7.1	6.9	7.0	-.2	+4
Wastewater plants	7.4	7.1	7.1	7.3	7.3	7.3	+3	+1
Safe drinking water	7.1	6.8	7.4	7.0	6.9	6.8	+3	+3
Preventing illegal dumping	6.5	6.1	6.3	6.1	6.1	6.0	+4	+5
<u>PARKS AND RECREATION SERVICES</u>								
Library services	7.6	7.7	7.9	7.9	7.7	7.9	-.1	-.3
Keeping the parks in your area clean	7.6	7.5	8.0	-	-	NA	+1	NA
Parks/recreation programs	7.4	7.0	6.9	7.0	7.0	6.9	+4	+5
Art/cultural events/programs	6.8	6.7	6.9	6.9	6.8	6.9	+1	-.1
<u>ECONOMIC DEVELOPMENT SERVICES</u>								
Attracting new employers	6.2	5.1	6.3	6.8	6.3	6.7	+1.1	-.5
<u>NEIGHBORHOOD PRESERVATION SERVICES</u>								
Preserving historic buildings	7.3	7.1	7.0	7.1	7.1	NA	+2	NA
Preserving neighborhoods	7.1	6.6	6.6	6.7	6.8	6.6	+5	+5
Property maintenance standards	7.0	6.5	6.3	6.5	6.4	6.1	+5	+9

## 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. Nine services are mentioned by at least six out of 10 residents as areas where they would be willing to pay more:

- Crime prevention efforts (69%)
- Emergency medical response (66%)
- Elderly services (65%)
- Youth programs (65%)
- Job training and placement services for the unemployed (64%)
- Poor and homeless services (62%)
- Countering gang activities (61%)
- Provide safe drinking water (61%)
- Police protection (60%)

It should be noted that the nine service spending priorities listed above include four of the six protective service categories tested 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 eight 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.

- Uncontainerized trash collection (66%)
- Street flooding (65%)
- Cut-through traffic (64%)
- Preserving historic Phoenix houses and other historic buildings (55%)
- Garbage and recycling collection (53%)
- Maintaining traffic signals (53%)
- Property maintenance standards (50%)
- Art/cultural events/programs (50%)

Of particular interest in this year's findings is the fact that, compared to 2010, in every case the volume of residents who are willing to pay more minus those who are not willing to pay more (net more/less) has declined (on 24 services significantly: 7 points or more).

**TABLE 10: 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 To Pay More	Not Willing To Pay More	Not Sure	NET MORE/(LESS) <sup>1</sup>		'10-'12 CHANGE
				2012	2010	
Crime prevention efforts	69%	28%	3%	41%	43%	-2
Elderly services	65	30	5	35	48	-13
Emergency medical response	66	32	2	34	42	-8
Youth programs	65	31	4	34	53	-19
Job training/placement	64	31	5	33	50	-17
Countering gang activities	61	32	7	29	50	-21
Poor/homeless services	62	34	4	28	50	-22
Safe drinking water	61	38	1	23	34	-11
Police protection	60	37	3	23	38	-15
Parks/recreation programs	59	36	5	23	35	-12
Attracting new employers	59	38	3	21	27	-6
Fire protection	58	37	5	21	26	-5
Wastewater plants	53	41	6	12	18	-6
Keeping parks clean	54	43	3	11	17	-6
Keeping streets clean	53	43	4	10	18	-8
Library services	52	44	4	8	15	-7
Preserving mountains/deserts	51	46	3	5	9	-4
Preserving neighborhoods	50	45	5	5	10	-5
Street repair/maintenance	48	48	4	0	8	-8
Preventing illegal dumping	47	48	5	(1)	20	-21
Enforcing traffic laws	47	49	4	(2)	11	-13
Art/cultural events/programs	47	50	3	(3)	3	-6
Property maintenance standards	46	50	4	(4)	21	-25
City bus service	44	49	7	(5)	5	-10
Garbage/recycling collection	42	53	5	(11)	(1)	-10
Maintaining traffic signals	42	53	5	(11)	NA	NA
Preserving historic buildings	40	55	5	(15)	(14)	-1
Cut-through traffic	32	64	4	(32)	(24)	-8
Street flooding	31	65	4	(34)	(20)	-14
Uncontainerized trash collection	30	66	4	(36)	(16)	-20

<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 10 with job training/placement (110.3) and poor/homeless services (106.9) receiving the highest Index reading, followed by crime prevention efforts (104.5). Also notice that since 2010, no Index increases are recorded, while decreases are recorded for each service tested. Additionally, when the current readings are compared with those from 2002, in only one case, "attracting new employers" is an increase recorded (+16.1).

**TABLE 11: PRIORITY SPENDING INDEX**

|                                  | 1-10 Rating | Willing To Pay More | PRIORITY SPENDING INDEX |       |       |       | '10-'12 Change | '02-'12 Change |
|----------------------------------|-------------|---------------------|-------------------------|-------|-------|-------|----------------|----------------|
|                                  |             |                     | 2012                    | 2010  | 2008  | 2002  |                |                |
| Job training/placement           | 5.8         | 64%                 | 110.3                   | 137.7 | 115.5 | 118.9 | -27.4          | - 8.6          |
| Poor/homeless services           | 5.8         | 62                  | 106.9                   | 137.0 | 130.9 | 122.8 | -30.1          | -15.9          |
| Crime prevention efforts         | 6.6         | 69                  | 104.5                   | 109.4 | 115.2 | 126.2 | -4.9           | -21.7          |
| Youth programs                   | 6.6         | 65                  | 98.5                    | 121.0 | 109.2 | 127.0 | -22.5          | -28.5          |
| Attracting new employers         | 6.2         | 59                  | 95.2                    | 121.6 | 85.7  | 79.1  | -26.4          | +16.1          |
| Elderly services                 | 7.0         | 65                  | 92.9                    | 117.7 | 118.5 | 116.9 | -24.8          | -24.0          |
| Countering gang activities       | 6.6         | 61                  | 92.4                    | 123.7 | 121.3 | 131.7 | -31.3          | -39.3          |
| Safe drinking water              | 7.1         | 61                  | 85.9                    | 97.1  | 94.6  | 107.4 | -11.2          | -21.5          |
| Parks/recreation programs        | 7.4         | 59                  | 79.7                    | 94.3  | 100.0 | 102.9 | -14.6          | -23.2          |
| Police protection                | 7.6         | 60                  | 78.9                    | 93.2  | 101.4 | 112.9 | -14.3          | -34.0          |
| Emergency medical response       | 8.6         | 66                  | 76.7                    | 84.3  | 83.5  | 85.4  | -7.6           | - 8.7          |
| Street repair/maintenance        | 6.6         | 48                  | 72.7                    | 80.3  | 93.9  | 94.1  | -7.6           | -21.4          |
| Preventing illegal dumping       | 6.5         | 47                  | 72.3                    | 95.1  | 100.0 | 113.3 | -22.8          | -41.0          |
| Wastewater plants                | 7.4         | 53                  | 71.6                    | 80.3  | 95.8  | 93.2  | -8.7           | -21.6          |
| Keeping parks clean              | 7.6         | 54                  | 71.1                    | 77.3  | 76.3  | NA    | -6.2           | NA             |
| Preserving neighborhoods         | 7.1         | 50                  | 70.4                    | 80.3  | 86.4  | 93.9  | -9.9           | -23.5          |
| Keeping streets clean            | 7.6         | 53                  | 69.7                    | 80.6  | 85.7  | NA    | -10.9          | NA             |
| Art/cultural events/programs     | 6.8         | 47                  | 69.1                    | 74.6  | 76.8  | 76.8  | -5.5           | - 7.7          |
| Preserving mountains/deserts     | 7.4         | 51                  | 68.9                    | 69.7  | 80.5  | 94.3  | -.8            | -25.4          |
| Library services                 | 7.6         | 52                  | 68.4                    | 74.0  | 65.8  | 78.5  | -5.6           | -10.1          |
| Fire protection                  | 8.6         | 58                  | 67.4                    | 75.6  | 79.8  | 87.1  | -8.2           | -19.7          |
| Property maintenance standards   | 7.0         | 46                  | 65.7                    | 90.8  | 88.9  | 101.6 | -25.1          | -35.9          |
| Enforcing traffic laws           | 7.4         | 47                  | 63.5                    | 79.4  | 81.4  | 109.8 | -15.9          | -46.3          |
| City bus service                 | 7.2         | 44                  | 61.1                    | 72.9  | 80.0  | 81.4  | -11.8          | -20.3          |
| Preserving historic buildings    | 7.3         | 40                  | 54.8                    | 56.3  | 68.6  | NA    | -1.5           | NA             |
| Maintaining traffic signals      | 8.1         | 42                  | 51.9                    | NA    | NA    | NA    | NA             | NA             |
| Garbage/recycling collection     | 8.2         | 42                  | 51.2                    | 59.8  | 63.8  | 69.7  | -8.6           | -18.5          |
| Cut-through traffic              | 6.7         | 32                  | 47.8                    | 54.4  | 63.4  | 80.0  | -6.6           | -32.2          |
| Street flooding                  | 7.4         | 31                  | 41.9                    | 55.7  | 55.6  | 54.1  | -13.8          | -12.2          |
| Uncontainerized trash collection | 7.5         | 30                  | 40.0                    | 54.7  | 64.0  | 66.7  | -14.7          | -26.7          |

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 over two out of three residents (69%) indicating it is either excellent (16%) or good (53%). In comparison, 26 percent of residents rate the quality of life as fair, while five percent rate it in negative terms (poor/very poor). The current level of positive response has remained relatively consistent since 2004.

When residents' attitudes about the quality of life in Phoenix are analyzed based on demographic subgroup, we find a couple of interesting differences between subgroups. For example, as in the past, positive impressions tend to increase with age, and white residents reveal a more positive impression about the quality of life in the City than do minority residents (72% vs. 64%).

TABLE 12: 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
2012	69%	26%	5%	*%
2010	64	26	10	*
2008	67	28	5	*
2006	70	24	5	1
2004	70	25	5	*

### 2012 READING – DETAIL

	Excellent/ Good	Fair	Poor/ Very Poor	Not Sure
<u>GENDER</u>				
Male	70%	26%	4%	*%
Female	68	27	5	*
<u>AGE</u>				
Under 35	55	38	7	0
35 to 49	72	25	3	0
50 to 64	72	22	6	*
65 or over	82	14	4	*
<u>ETHNICITY</u>				
White	72	24	4	*
Minority	64	30	6	0
<u>LENGTH OF RESIDENCE</u>				
Under 10	64	25	11	0
10 or over	70	26	4	*

\*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 13 indicates, crime-related issues (26%) continue to lead the responses followed by transportation issues (13%). Each of these issues is little changed from 2010. No other problems register a two-digit reading.

TABLE 13: 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?"

|                                | 2012       | 2010       | 2008       | 2006       | 2004       |
|--------------------------------|------------|------------|------------|------------|------------|
| <b>CRIME</b>                   | <b>26%</b> | <b>22%</b> | <b>32%</b> | <b>33%</b> | <b>34%</b> |
| Crime, too much                | 7          | 3          | 9          | 11         | 9          |
| Robberies                      | 6          | 6          | 5          | 5          | 8          |
| Need more police               | 5          | 2          | 3          | 3          | 3          |
| Drugs                          | 3          | 4          | 4          | 7          | 6          |
| Gangs                          | 3          | 4          | 2          | 3          | 5          |
| Car theft/jacking              | 1          | 1          | 1          | 2          | 3          |
| Other responses                | 2          | 2          | 8          | 5          | 3          |
| <b>TRANSPORTATION</b>          | <b>13</b>  | <b>15</b>  | <b>20</b>  | <b>23</b>  | <b>26</b>  |
| Street/road conditions         | 4          | 5          | 3          | 4          | 2          |
| Traffic congestion             | 3          | 3          | 4          | 7          | 9          |
| Lack of public transit         | 3          | 2          | 5          | 4          | 6          |
| Bad drivers, red light runners | 1          | 3          | 1          | 4          | 6          |
| Other responses                | 2          | 4          | 8          | 5          | 4          |
| Lack of social services        | 6          | 4          | 3          | 4          | 3          |
| Economy/jobs/unemployment      | 5          | 10         | 2          | 2          | 3          |
| Education                      | 5          | 5          | 3          | 3          | 4          |
| Trash/litter/graffiti          | 3          | 8          | 5          | 8          | 5          |
| Environment/pollution          | 3          | 2          | 4          | 4          | 5          |
| Illegal immigration            | 2          | 6          | 7          | 7          | 1          |
| Neighborhood maintenance       | 2          | 2          | 2          | 4          | 4          |
| Parks and recreation           | 1          | 2          | 2          | 1          | 1          |
| Uncontrolled growth            | 1          | 1          | 1          | 2          | 2          |
| All other responses            | 5          | 4          | 3          | 3          | 6          |
| No problems                    | 19         | 12         | 10         | 11         | 8          |
| Not sure                       | 6          | 8          | 8          | 9          | 7          |

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 33 percent of residents rating it a major problem. Two additional problems are rated as major problems by roughly one out of four residents – drug activity (28% ) and graffiti (24%).

**TABLE 14: 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	33%	30%	35%	2%
Drug activity	28	26	40	6
Graffiti	24	38	38	*
Juvenile crime	21	38	37	4
Traffic congestion	19	34	46	1
Houses and yards that are not well maintained	17	38	44	1
Traffic cutting through neighborhood streets	16	34	49	1
Vacant lots	13	32	54	1
Signs on utility poles for things like yard sales or model homes	9	31	58	2
Interference from industrial or commercial operations	5	30	63	2

\*Indicates % less than .5  
~~~~~

When the current readings are compared to those recorded in 2010, we find positive (albeit not statistically significant) improvement in three areas – air pollution, graffiti and juvenile crime.



TABLE 15: EVALUATION OF SELECTED  
NEIGHBORHOOD PROBLEMS – DETAIL

% "MAJOR" PROBLEM

|                                                                     | 2012 | 2010 | 2008 | 2006 | 2004 | '10 - '12<br>CHANGE |
|---------------------------------------------------------------------|------|------|------|------|------|---------------------|
| Air pollution                                                       | 34%  | 38%  | 49%  | 46%  | 42%  | -4                  |
| Drug activity                                                       | 28   | 28   | 32   | 38   | 29   | 0                   |
| Graffiti                                                            | 24   | 29   | 32   | 31   | 19   | -5                  |
| Juvenile crime                                                      | 21   | 27   | 31   | 34   | 26   | -6                  |
| Traffic congestion                                                  | 19   | 20   | 28   | 37   | 31   | -1                  |
| Houses and yards that are not<br>well maintained                    | 17   | 20   | 24   | 21   | 22   | -3                  |
| Traffic cutting through neigh-<br>borhood streets                   | 16   | 16   | 19   | 24   | 20   | 0                   |
| Vacant lots                                                         | 13   | 12   | 12   | 14   | 9    | +1                  |
| Signs on utility poles for things<br>like yard sales or model homes | 9    | 12   | 13   | 13   | 11   | -3                  |
| Interference from industrial or<br>commercial operations            | 5    | 8    | 9    | 9    | 8    | -3                  |
| ~~~~~                                                               |      |      |      |      |      |                     |

**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 (18%) followed by improving the economy (14%) and reducing crime (12%).

TABLE 16: 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?”

|                                                     | 2012 | 2010 | 2008 | 2006 | 2004 |
|-----------------------------------------------------|------|------|------|------|------|
| IMPROVE THE TRANSPORTATION SYSTEM                   | 18%  | 18%  | 26%  | 24%  | 23%  |
| Public transit/light rail – extend                  | 10   | 11   | 14   | 11   | 11   |
| Freeways                                            | 3    | 1    | 2    | 4    | 5    |
| Fix roads – pot holes                               | 2    | 3    | 2    | 1    | 1    |
| Traffic congestion                                  | 2    | 2    | 4    | 5    | 4    |
| Other responses                                     | 2    | 4    | 4    | 5    | 5    |
| Improve the economy/jobs                            | 14   | 16   | 9    | 5    | 6    |
| Reduce crime                                        | 12   | 12   | 16   | 17   | 18   |
| Protect environment – air pollution, conserve water | 8    | 8    | 12   | 6    | 8    |
| Improve social services                             | 7    | 4    | 2    | 4    | 5    |
| Improve parks/recreation                            | 6    | 6    | 4    | 4    | 4    |
| Improve education                                   | 4    | 5    | 3    | 3    | 4    |
| Better government – listen to the people            | 3    | 7    | 3    | 3    | 2    |
| Reduce illegal immigration                          | 3    | 7    | 4    | 5    | 2    |
| Lower taxes                                         | 3    | 3    | 2    | 1    | 2    |
| Improve city services                               | 2    | 3    | 1    | 2    | 1    |
| Revitalize – downtown, vacant lots, run down areas  | 2    | 2    | *    | 4    | 7    |
| Slow growth – control                               | 2    | 3    | 6    | 6    | 9    |
| Expand cultural opportunities                       | 1    | 1    | 2    | 1    | 1    |
| Miscellaneous                                       | 2    | 3    | 1    | 3    | 5    |
| Nothing – doing fine                                | 17   | 8    | 10   | 8    | 5    |
| Not sure                                            | 11   | 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 17 reveals, residents are very favorable in their evaluation with 66 percent rating the Police Department either excellent (22%) or good (44%) and only 11 percent rating it poor (7%) or very poor (4%). The positive readings for community-based policing have remained relatively constant since 2000.

TABLE 17: 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/ Good	Fair	Poor/ Very Poor	Not Sure
2012	66%	18%	11%	5%
2010	64	18	12	6
2008	66	20	8	6
2006	68	19	7	6
2004	70	19	4	7

### 2012 READING – DETAIL

	Excellent/ Good	Fair	Poor/ Very Poor	Not Sure
<u>GENDER</u>				
Male	68%	15%	13%	4%
Female	63	20	11	6
<u>AGE</u>				
Under 35	66	15	17	2
35 to 49	63	22	12	3
50 to 64	60	20	9	11
65 or over	79	9	7	5
<u>ETHNICITY</u>				
White	68	18	8	6
Minority	64	16	17	3
<u>LENGTH OF RESIDENCE</u>				
Under 10	66	21	9	4
10 or over	66	17	12	5

~~~~~

Continuing with this line of questioning, we find that 30 percent of residents have had contact with a Phoenix police officer in the past 12 months and that 75 percent of these residents rate their contact as positive.

TABLE 18: CONTACT WITH  
PHOENIX POLICE DEPARTMENT

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

|     | <u>2012</u> | <u>2010</u> |
|-----|-------------|-------------|
| Yes | 30%         | 35%         |
| No  | <u>70</u>   | <u>65</u>   |
|     | 100%        | 100%        |

(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 | 37%      | 29%      |
| Positive      | 38       | 52       |
| Negative      | 18       | 13       |
| Very negative | <u>7</u> | <u>6</u> |
|               | 100%     | 100%     |

~~~~~

Residents also were asked about safety in their neighborhood. Here we find that 44 percent of residents believe their neighborhood is safer than other neighborhoods in Phoenix, while an equal percentage (44%) 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 2010, a decrease of nine points is recorded in the “safer” reading (44% vs. 53%) and a compensating increase of nine points is recorded in the “about same” reading (44% vs. 35%). Of particular interest is the fact that the “not as safe” reading has remained relatively constant over the past three study cycles.

Demographically, white residents and those 50 or over offer the highest “safer” readings.

**TABLE 19: 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
2012	44%	44%	11%	1%
2010	53	35	11	1
2008	49	37	10	4
2006	40	41	16	3
2004	46	39	11	4

**2012 READING – DETAIL**

<u>GENDER</u>	Safer	About Same	Not as Safe	Not Sure
Male	42%	45%	12%	1%
Female	47	42	10	1
<u>AGE</u>				
Under 35	43	47	10	0
35 to 49	35	52	13	0
50 to 64	53	34	11	2
65 or over	52	33	13	2
<u>ETHNICITY</u>				
White	52	36	11	1
Minority	31	57	11	1
<u>LENGTH OF RESIDENCE</u>				
Under 10	40	54	5	1
10 or over	46	40	13	1

~~~~~

In a related question, 42 percent of residents indicate their neighborhood participates in a Block Watch or similar crime prevention program which is down from 50 percent in 2010. Seven out of 10 residents (73%) participating in crime prevention programs feel they are effective in reducing crime, up seven points from 66 percent in 2010.

**TABLE 20: PARTICIPATION IN BLOCK WATCH**

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

|                  | % YES |      |      |      |      |
|------------------|-------|------|------|------|------|
|                  | 2012  | 2010 | 2008 | 2006 | 2004 |
| <u>TOTAL</u>     | 42%   | 50%  | 51%  | 45%  | 46%  |
| <u>AGE</u>       |       |      |      |      |      |
| Under 35         | 27    | 48   | 49   | 27   | 36   |
| 35 to 49         | 43    | 49   | 49   | 51   | 47   |
| 50 to 64         | 51    | 54   | 59   | 52   | 51   |
| 65 or over       | 55    | 48   | 48   | 59   | 54   |
| <u>ETHNICITY</u> |       |      |      |      |      |
| White            | 47    | 53   | 54   | 58   | 48   |
| Minority         | 36    | 46   | 46   | 29   | 42   |

(AMONG THOSE WHO PARTICIPATE)

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

|          |           |          |          |          |           |
|----------|-----------|----------|----------|----------|-----------|
| Yes      | 73%       | 66%      | 80%      | 78%      | 70%       |
| No       | 15        | 26       | 14       | 15       | 19        |
| Not sure | <u>12</u> | <u>8</u> | <u>6</u> | <u>7</u> | <u>11</u> |
|          | 100%      | 100%     | 100%     | 100%     | 100%      |

~~~~~

## SOURCES OF INFORMATION

The most commonly relied on source of information about the City of Phoenix is the Internet with an “a lot” reading of 49 percent – up from only 16 percent in 2004. This marks the first time in this series of studies that the Internet outpaces local television (42% a lot) as the primary source. This year’s readings also reveal the continuing decline of newspapers as a source of City information (40% a lot in 2004, 25% today). Also note that some major variations exist between the various demographic subgroups.

TABLE 21: 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?"

2012 READING – % A LOT

	A Lot	Some	Only A Little	Not At All	A LOT			
					2010	2008	2006	2004
The Internet	49%	22%	10%	19%	39%	36%	22%	16%
Television programs	42	21	19	18	45	44	48	48
Newspapers	25	19	17	39	28	30	32	40
Radio news programs	23	27	17	33	22	30	30	29

\*Indicates percent less than .5

2012 READING – % A LOT

	<u>Internet</u>	<u>Tele- vision</u>	<u>News- papers</u>	<u>Radio</u>
<u>TOTAL</u>	49%	42%	25%	23%
<u>GENDER</u>				
Male	42	36	22	20
Female	55	47	28	25
<u>AGE</u>				
Under 35	70	46	23	26
35 to 49	49	35	14	25
50 to 64	39	38	32	19
65 or over	23	53	39	17
<u>ETHNICITY</u>				
White	46	35	26	21
Minority	56	52	23	27
<u>LENGTH OF RESIDENCE</u>				
Under 10	60	32	19	21
10 or over	46	44	26	23

~~~~~

**USE OF CITY'S WEB SITE**

Forty-seven percent of residents indicate they have used the City's web site – up from 44 percent in 2010. The data also reveals that the City's web site receives positive readings from users with 73 percent giving it a rating of seven or more on a 10-point scale.

TABLE 22: 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 |             |
| 2012 | 47%                | 11%       | 16%             | 51%        | 22%              | *%       | 7.1         |
| 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         |

2012 READING – % USING

GENDER

Male 49%  
 Female 44

AGE

Under 35 49  
 35 to 49 42  
 50 to 64 59  
 65 or over 31

ETHNICITY

White 49  
 Minority 43

LENGTH OF RESIDENCE

Under 10 43  
 10 or over 48

\*Indicates % less than 1

~~~~~



The research also reveals that residents' main reason for visiting the site is to get water bill information or pay a water bill (19%). This reading is little changed from 21 percent in 2010. Ninety-four 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 23: REASONS FOR VISITING  
CITY'S WEB SITE**

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

	2012	2010	2008	2006	2004
Water bill information/pay bill	19%	21%	12%	9%	12%
Request trash pickup	11	10	10	7	12
Employment information	7	7	12	14	14
Parks and recreation	7	2	6	4	3
Entertainment – concerts, theatres, arts	6	8	8	2	2
Tax forms/information	6	6	3	5	4
Phone numbers/addresses	5	1	*	1	1
Building permit	4	4	3	7	3
Neighborhood services	4	3	1	2	2
Court records/jury duty	4	1	4	6	7
Police information	3	6	3	3	1
Social services	3	1	4	6	1
Property/zoning	2	4	2	2	5
Public transit	2	1	3	2	1
Business license	2	*	2	1	2
Library information	1	4	*	3	5
City elections	1	2	1	4	3
Report repairs need	1	2	*	*	0
Graffiti cleanup	1	1	*	1	2
Animal control	1	1	*	*	*
Schools/education	0	0	2	0	3
All others with mentions	12	12	14	12	14
Don't recall	7	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	94%	97%	90%	92%	83%
No	<u>6</u>	<u>3</u>	<u>10</u>	<u>8</u>	<u>17</u>
~~~~~	100%	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-two percent of residents indicate they are aware of the ordinance, which is unchanged from 51 percent in 2010.

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 (36%) or fairly well (48%), while 11 percent believe it is either not working too well (5%) or not at all (6%). The percent of residents who believe the ordinance is working well (very/fairly) has increased from 77 percent in 2008.

**TABLE 24: AWARENESS OF AND ATTITUDES TOWARD NEIGHBORHOOD ORDINANCES**

"Next, were you aware that the City of Phoenix has an ordinance to help neighborhoods reduce 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>
2012	52%	36%	48%	5%	6%	5%	84%
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

2012 READING – % AWARE

GENDER

Male 53%  
Female 51

AGE

Under 35 41  
35 to 49 55  
50 to 64 52  
65 or over 64

ETHNICITY

White 54  
Minority 48

LENGTH OF RESIDENCE

Under 10 29  
10 or over 58

<sup>1</sup>Very Well + Fairly Well

~~~~~

## EVALUATION OF SKY HARBOR INTERNATIONAL AIRPORT

The 47 percent of residents who have visited Sky Harbor International Airport in the past 12 months were asked to evaluate the airport on 11 different factors using a one-to-ten scale. As may be seen on the next table, Sky Harbor receives a very positive reading with an overall rating of 8.4 with 83 percent of residents offering a rating of seven or higher. The specific factors receiving the highest positive readings are convenient airport location (8.5), clean and well-supplied restrooms (8.5) and overall cleanliness of airport terminals (8.4). On the flip side, Sky Harbor receives its lowest ratings on high quality food and beverages at reasonable prices (6.0) and quality retail merchandise at reasonable prices (6.0).

The 2012 readings are not comparable to those from the 2010 study since the 2010 readings were of all residents, not just those who had visited in the past 12 months.

**TABLE 25: 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<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 |
|--|--------------|------------------------|---------------|------------------------|-------------|----------------|
| A convenient airport location  | 5%           | 9%                     | 27%           | 56%                    | 3%          | 8.5            |
| Clean/well-supplied restrooms  | 2            | 8                      | 37            | 50                     | 3           | 8.5            |
| Overall cleanliness of Airport terminals   | 4            | 10                     | 27            | 58                     | 1           | 8.4            |
| <b>Overall rating of Sky Harbor International Airport</b>  | <b>3</b>     | <b>8</b>               | <b>37</b>     | <b>50</b>              | <b>2</b>    | <b>8.4</b>     |
| Courteous and knowledgeable airport employees  | 5            | 6                      | 37            | 47                     | 5           | 8.2            |
| Availability of taxis, limousines and shuttle services   | 3            | 9                      | 34            | 39                     | 15          | 8.2            |
| Frequency and quality of shuttle bus service between terminals, parking lots and the rental car center | 7            | 7                      | 33            | 33                     | 20          | 7.9            |
| Clear and understandable directional signs on the airport roadway system                               | 15           | 10                     | 27            | 46                     | 2           | 7.5            |
| Ease and availability of parking facilities at reasonable prices                                       | 13           | 21                     | 32            | 25                     | 9           | 6.8            |
| Quality retail merchandise at reasonable prices  | 24           | 25                     | 22            | 16                     | 13          | 6.0            |
| High quality food and beverages at reasonable prices   | 24           | 30                     | 20            | 22                     | 4           | 6.0            |

~~~~~

**PERCEPTIONS OF DOWNTOWN PHOENIX**

Two out of three Phoenix residents (66%) believe downtown Phoenix has become either much better (31%) or a little better (35%) over the past few years. The overall change for the better reading of 66 percent is up from 62 percent in 2010.

The downtown area receives its highest better readings from residents 35 to 64.

TABLE 26: 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>
2012	31%	35%	20%	6%	8%	66%
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

2012 READING – % BETTER

GENDER

Male 64%  
 Female 67

AGE

Under 35 64  
 35 to 49 72  
 50 to 64 71  
 65 or over 48

ETHNICITY

White 65  
 Minority 66

LENGTH OF RESIDENCE

Under 10 62  
 10 or over 66

<sup>1</sup>Much Better + Little Better

~~~~~

**AWARENESS OF CITY'S SUSTAINABILITY EFFORTS**

Seven out of 10 Phoenix residents (68%) are aware of the City's sustainability efforts with 20 percent indicating they know "a lot." These figures are little changed from 2010.

TABLE 27: 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<br/>Lot</u> | <u>A<br/>Little</u> | <u>Nothing</u> |
|---------------------|------------------|---------------------|----------------|
| <u>TOTAL</u> – 2012 | 20%              | 48%                 | 32%            |
| – 2010              | 14               | 56                  | 30             |
| – 2008              | 15               | 54                  | 31             |

2012 READING – % A LOT/  
A LITTLE

|                            |     |
|----------------------------|-----|
| <u>TOTAL</u>               | 68% |
| <u>GENDER</u>              |     |
| Male                       | 64  |
| Female                     | 72  |
| <u>AGE</u>                 |     |
| Under 35                   | 71  |
| 35 to 49                   | 59  |
| 50 to 64                   | 73  |
| 65 or over                 | 72  |
| <u>ETHNICITY</u>           |     |
| White                      | 71  |
| Minority                   | 64  |
| <u>LENGTH OF RESIDENCE</u> |     |
| Under 10                   | 60  |
| 10 or over                 | 70  |

~~~~~