

## **Appendix A: Questionnaire**



# PRINCE WILLIAM SURVEY QUESTIONNAIRE (2010)<sup>1</sup>

## INTRO SECTION FOR LISTED AND RDD SAMPLES

{Q: INTRO}

Hello. My name is \_\_\_\_\_ and I'm calling on behalf of the Prince William County Government. Each year we conduct a survey to find out how satisfied people are with the services that the County provides. Your household was selected at random to be part of our sample this year. Prince William County will be using the results to try to improve its services and programs.

- |                  |                     |
|------------------|---------------------|
| 1 NO ANSWER      | 5 IMMEDIATE HANGUP  |
| 2 BUSY           | 6 IMMEDIATE REFUSAL |
| 3 ANSWER MACHINE | 7 CALLBACK          |
| 4 BAD NUMBER     | 8 GO ON             |

[IF FINISHING INCOMPLETE SURVEY]

Hello. My name is \_\_\_\_\_ and I'm calling on behalf of the Prince William County Government. We're doing a survey to find out how satisfied people are with the services that the County provides. Your household was selected at random to be part of our sample, and we had started a survey with someone in your home but were unable to complete it. Would this be a good time to finish up the questions?

**INTERVIEWER:** PRESS '1' TO GO ON OR CTRL-END FOR DISPOSITION OR CALLBACK

{Q: INTRO2}

[CONTINUATION OF INTRO AS NECESSARY HERE]

[IF APPROPRIATE: We can conduct the interview in English or Spanish.

Which would you prefer?]

- |                                  |
|----------------------------------|
| 1 ENGLISH - GO ON                |
| 2 SPANISH - GO ON                |
| 3 CALL BACK                      |
| 4 CALL BACK WITH SPANISH SPEAKER |
| 9 REFUSED                        |

**INTERVIEWER:** IF NECESSARY - We're calling from the University of Virginia on behalf of Prince William County. We're not selling anything. We're conducting a survey of Prince William residents which we do each year for the County.

IF ASKED, DO NOT SUGGEST EXAMPLES OF SERVICES, YOU MAY SAY: All the things the County spends its money on that benefit its residents.

<sup>1</sup> The survey script is reproduced in abbreviated form. Question wording, instructions, and key definitions are reproduced in full from the actual computer-aided script used in interviewing. The sequence of questions follows the order in which they were presented to the respondent. Only responses in lower case were read by the interviewer, while responses in upper case were not read. Bold text comments are included solely in the Appendix to indicate programming notes.

{Q: ADULTRES}

First, I need to confirm that you are at least 18 years old, and that you live at the residence I am calling. [IF NECESSARY SAY: Your answers are confidential, and we don't use anybody's name.]

- 1 R IS RESIDENT ADULT, PROCEED
- 2 R IS NOT RESIDENT OR ADULT, WE NEED TO GET ONE
- 3 REFUSED

{Q: ADCOME}

***If R is not resident or adult in ADULTRES, ASK***

Can you ask someone 18 or older who lives in your house to come to the phone?

- 1 YES, ASKING RESIDENT ADULT TO COME TO THE PHONE
- 2 NO, CAN'T ASK RESIDENT ADULT TO COME TO THE PHONE
- 3 REFUSES TO ASK RESIDENT ADULT TO COME TO PHONE

{Q: ADCALLBK}

***If NO to ADCOME, ASK***

Would it be possible to reach an adult at another time?

- 1 YES, SCHEDULE CALLBACK
- 2 NO (OR NOT SURE), ADULT NOT AVAILABLE DURING STUDY PERIOD
- 3 REFUSED

{Q: REINTRO}

Hello, my name is \_\_\_\_\_ and I'm calling on behalf of the Prince William County Government. Each year we conduct a survey to find out how satisfied people are with the services that the County provides. Prince William County will be using the results to try to improve its services and programs. Your household was selected at random to be part of our sample this time. Would you be willing to help us out by answering a few questions?

- 1 R1 READY, PROCEED
- 2 R1 CALLBACK [WON'T NEED NAME]
- 3 R1 REFUSED

{Q: CONFIRM}

I also need to confirm that you are a resident of Prince William County, and that you are not located on-post at Quantico. In what city or county do you live?

IF R IS NOT SURE, ASK: Where do you get your utility bills from, pay local property taxes to, or which public schools do children in your neighborhood go?

PRINCE WILLIAM COUNTY	CULPEPER COUNTY
MANASSAS CITY [IN CITY LIMITS]	STAFFORD COUNTY
MANASSAS PARK [IN CITY LIMITS]	OTHER LOC. NOT IN PWC
FAIRFAX COUNTY	ON-POST AT QUANTICO
LOUDOUN COUNTY	DON'T KNOW/REFUSED
FAUQUIER COUNTY	

[If answer is different from PWC then TERMINATE]

[If in Quantico but not on-post proceed with interview]

{Q: ZIPCODE}

Could you tell me the correct ZIP code for your address [just 5 digits]:

[INTERVIEWERS: BE SURE RESPONDENT IS GIVING NEW ZIPCODE = AS OF JULY 1998]

20109	20143	22134
20110	20155	22172
20111	20169	22191
20112	20181	22192
20119	22025	22193
20136	22026	OTHER
20137	22125	DON'T KNOW/REFUSED

[IF NECESSARY: We dialed your number at random, so I don't know your address.]

{Q: INTRSECTN}

***If DON'T KNOW or REFUSED to ZIPCODE, ASK***

Please think of the nearest major intersection to your house. Could you tell me the names or route numbers of the roads that cross there?

[IF NECESSARY: We've dialed your number at random and we don't want to know your address--all your answers on this survey are confidential.]

{Q: HOWMANY}

To ensure a valid survey, I need to randomly select an adult in your household to complete the interview with.

[IF NECESSARY: If we always interview the person who answers the phone the survey will not accurately reflect the opinions of the whole population.]

First of all, could you please tell me how many adults 18 and over there are in your household including yourself? TYPE "99" FOR REFUSED (GO TO Q:LASTBDA2)

If there is only 1 person in the household, then skip to R1GO. If there are 2 persons in the household, then 50% skip to R1GO and the other 50% go on to the next question.

If there are 3 persons in the household, then 33% skip to R1GO and the other 67% go on to the next question.

If there are 4 persons in the household, then 25% skip to R1GO and the other 75% go on to the next question.

And so on.

{Q: LASTBDAY}

The computer has randomly determined that one of the adults other than yourself should be selected for the rest of the interview.

To help us select this person, do you know which one of these adults has had the most recent birthday? [IF NECESSARY SAY: I don't mean the youngest person in your house; I mean the last one other than yourself to have had a birthday according to the calendar.]

- 1 R1 says YES, I HAD LAST BIRTHDAY
- 2 R1 says YES, KNOW OTHER ADULT HAD LAST BIRTHDAY
- 8 R1 says DOESN'T KNOW WHO HAD LAST BIRTHDAY
- 9 REFUSED TO SAY WHO HAD LAST BIRTHDAY/R1 REFUSES TO CONTINUE

If answer = 1 then skip to R2COME  
If answer = 2 then go on to R2KISH  
If answer = 3 TERMINATE

{Q: LASTBDA2}

IF (HOWMANY = 99)

Then our next selection criterion is to select the person who has had the most recent birthday among adults in the household. Do you know who that is or would that be you?

IF NECESSARY: I mean any resident over 18 to have had a birthday

- 1 R1 says YES, I HAD LAST BIRTHDAY
- 2 R1 says YES, KNOWS OTHER ADULT HAD LAST BIRTHDAY
- 3 R1 SAYS DOESN'T KNOW WHO HAD LAST BIRTHDAY
- 4 REF TO SAY WHO HAD LAST BIRTHDAY / R1 REFUSES TO CONTINUE

If answer = 1 then skip to R1GO  
If answer = 2 then skip to R2COME  
If answer = 3 or 4 TERMINATE

{Q: R2KISH}

If you do not know the last birthday person, could you tell me the first name of the other adults in the household?

- 1 R1 SAYS YES
- 2 R1 DOESN'T KNOW
- 3 R1 REFUSES TO CONTINUE

{Q: R2Names}

Now, the computer will randomly select a name from the list of names as you tell them to me. Please say the names now

INTERVIEWER: HIT 1 EACH TIME A NAME IS SPOKEN OUT

{Q: R1GO}

Okay, let's move on to the rest of the survey, and I want to remind you that all of your answers are confidential, and you can decline to answer any question at any time. This survey is being conducted by the Center for Survey Research at the University of Virginia. If you have any questions as we go along, please feel free to ask. [ONLY IF ASKED: The survey should take between 15-20 minutes, depending on your answers.]

- 1 R1 READY, [GO TO CELLPHONE]
- 2 R1 CALLBACK [GET NAME OF R1 FOR CALLBACK MESSAGE LINE]
- 3 R1 REFUSES

{Q: R2COME}

***If LASTBDAY is other adult, ASK***

Can you ask that person to come to the phone?

- 1 YES, R1 ASKING R2 TO COME TO PHONE
- 2 NO, CAN'T ASK R2 TO COME TO PHONE
- 3 R1 REFUSES TO ASK PERSON TO COME TO PHONE

{Q: R2CALLBK}

***If NO to R2COME, ASK***

Would it be possible to reach this person at another time?

- 1 YES, SCHEDULE CALLBACK
- 2 NO (OR NOT SURE), R2 IS NOT AVAILABLE DURING STUDY PERIOD
- 3 REFUSED

{Q: R2INTRO}

***If R2 IS SELECTED to NEWBDAY, ASK***

Hello, my name is \_\_\_\_\_ and I'm calling on behalf of the Prince William County Government. Each year we conduct a survey to find out how satisfied people are with the services that the County provides. Prince William County will be using the results to try to improve its services and programs. Your household was selected at random to be part of our sample this time, and you have been selected at random from all the adults in your household to complete the rest of the survey. Would you be willing to help us out by answering a few questions?

- 1 R2 READY, [GO TO CELLPHONE]
- 2 R2 CALLBACK [GET NAME OF R2 FOR CALLBACK MESSAGE LINE]
- 3 R2 CAME TO PHONE, BUT REFUSED [WE CANNOT SWITCH BACK TO R1]
- 4 R2 WOULD NOT COME TO PHONE [CANNOT SWITCH BACK TO R1]

{Q: R2GO}

***If R2 READY to R2INTRO, ASK***

Okay, let's move on to the rest of the survey, and I want to remind you that all of your answers are confidential, and you can decline to answer any question at any time. This survey is being conducted by the Center for Survey Research at the University of Virginia. If you have any questions as we go along, please feel free to ask.

- 1 R2 READY [GO TO CELLPHONE]
- 2 R2 CALLBACK [GET NAME OF R2 FOR CALLBACK MESSAGE LINE]
- 3 R2 REFUSES

**INTRO SECTON FOR CELL PHONE SAMPLE**

{Q: INTRO}\*

Hello. My name is \_\_\_\_\_ and I'm calling on behalf of the Prince William County Government. Each year we conduct a survey to find out how satisfied people are with the services that the County provides. Your cellphone number was randomly selected to be part of our sample this year. If you are currently doing any activity that requires your full attention, I need to call you back at a later time.

- |                                 |                          |
|---------------------------------|--------------------------|
| 1 NO ANSWER/TEMP UNAVAIL        | 5 IMMEDIATE HANGUP       |
| 2 BUSY /NETWORK BUSY            | 6 IMMEDIATE REFUSAL      |
| 3 ANS MACH/VOICEMAIL/SYSTEM MSG | 7 CALLBACK/CALL LANDLINE |
| 4 BAD NUMBER                    | 8 GO ON                  |

[IF FINISHING INCOMPLETE SURVEY]

Hello. My name is \_\_\_\_\_ and I'm calling on behalf of the Prince William County Government. We're doing a survey to find out how satisfied people are with the services that the County provides. You were selected at random to be part of our sample, and we had started a survey with you but were unable to complete it. Would this be a good time to finish up the questions?

{Q: INTRO2}\*

[CONTINUATION OF INTRO AS NECESSARY HERE]

[IF APPROPRIATE: We can conduct the interview in English or Spanish. Which would you prefer?]

- 1 ENGLISH - GO O
- 2 SPANISH - GO ON
- 3 CALL BACK
- 4 CALL BACK WITH SPANISH SPEAKER
- 9 REFUSED

**INTERVIEWER:** IF NECESSARY - We're calling from the University of Virginia on behalf of Prince William County. We're not selling anything. We're conducting a survey of Prince William residents which we do each year for the County.

Q: ADULTCEL}\*

First, I need to confirm that you are at least 18 years old.

- 1 YES
- 2 NO [TERMINATE]
- 8 DON'T KNOW/REFUSED

[IF NO, OR DON'T KNOW/REFUSED SAY:

Thank you very much, but we are only interviewing persons aged 18 or older at this time.

[IV: IF YOU PERCEIVE THAT THESE MAY NOT BE CONDITIONS FOR AN INTERVIEW, ASK: Are you in a position to answer some questions without distraction or in conditions that are comfortable to you?]



{Q: CELLAND}\*  


---

To begin we have a few questions about how we reached you.

Are you speaking to me on a cellular telephone or on a regular, landline phone located in your home?

[IF NECESSARY SAY: By cellular telephone, we mean a telephone that is mobile and usable outside of your neighborhood.]

- 1 CELL PHONE
- 2 REGULAR OR LANDLINE PHONE
- 3 VOICE OVER IP [VOLUNTEERED]
- 9 DON'T KNOW/REFUSED

IF NECESSARY, PROBE:

“I mean: is the number that I reached a cellular or landline phone?”

[IV: VOICE OVER IP ALSO KNOWN AS VOICE OVER INTERNET PROTOCOL SERVICE OR VOIP. RESPONDENT MAY SAY “make calls over internet” OR MENTION “web services such as Skype” TO INDICATE VOIP.]

{Q: OWNCELL}\*  


---

Do you also have a cell phone for your personal use?

- 1 YES [GO TO ZIPCODE]
- 2 NO [GO TO ZIPCODE]
- 9 DON'T KNOW/REFUSED [GO TO ZIPCODE]

{Q: CELLUSE}\*  


---

Okay, then may I ask is this cell phone used for ...?

[IF SAYS: “I have one phone for business and one for personal” ASK: “Which is the one I have reached?”]

- 1 Personal use only
- 2 Business use only or [TERMINATE]
- 3 Personal and business use
- 8 DON'T KNOW/NOT SURE
- 9 REFUSED

{Q: HAVELINE}\*  


---

Do you also have a regular telephone at home?

[IF NECESSARY SAY: By regular telephone, we mean a land line telephone]

- 1 YES
- 2 NO
- 3 YES, VOICE OVER INTERNET PROTOCOL SERVICE (VOIP) [VOLUNTEERED]
- 8 DON'T KNOW/NOT SURE
- 9 REFUSED

[IV: VOICE OVER IP ALSO KNOWN AS VOICE OVER INTERNET PROTOCOL SERVICE OR VOIP RESPONDENT MAY SAY “make calls over internet” OR MENTION “web services such as Skype” TO INDICATE VOIP]

{Q: HOWLONG}

How long have you lived in Prince William County?

- 1 Less than one year
- 2 One to two years
- 3 Three to five years
- 4 Six to ten years
- 5 Eleven to nineteen years
- 6 Twenty years or more, but not all my life
- 7 All my life
- 8 NOT SURE
- 9 REFUSED

[DEFINITION: COUNT TOTAL TIME THAT R HAS EVER RESIDED WITHIN THE COUNTY ITSELF--DON'T COUNT CITY RESIDENCE TIME.]

{Q: PREVRES}

***If LESS THAN FIVE YEARS to HOWLONG, ASK***

Where did you live before moving to Prince William County?

- |                                 |                               |
|---------------------------------|-------------------------------|
| 1 MANASSAS                      | 9 ALEXANDRIA                  |
| 2 MANASSAS PARK                 | 10 RICHMOND CITY OR AREA      |
| 3 STAFFORD COUNTY               | 11 ELSEWHERE IN VIRGINIA      |
| 4 FREDERICKSBURG/SPOTSYLVANIA   | 12 WASHINGTON, D.C.           |
| 5 FAUQUIER COUNTY/WARRENTON     | 13 MARYLAND                   |
| 6 LOUDOUN COUNTY                | 14 ANOTHER LOCATION [SPECIFY] |
| 7 FAIRFAX CTY/CITY/FALLS CHURCH | 15 LIVES ALL OVER [VOLUNTEER] |
| 8 ARLINGTON                     | 99 DON'T KNOW/NO ANSWER       |

{Q: OWNHOME}

Do you own your own home, or are you renting?

- 1 Owns [Dwelling is owner-occupied]
- 2 Rents
- 3 Other [SPECIFY:]
- 8 DON'T KNOW
- 9 REFUSED

{Q: KINDPLCE}

And what kind of place are you living in? Is it a...

- 1 Single-family home,
- 2 A duplex or townhouse,
- 3 An apartment or condominium [MULTI-FAMILY UNIT WITH 3 OR MORE UNITS]
- 4 A mobile home or trailer,
- 5 A dormitory, or
- 5 Some other kind of structure? [SPECIFY:]
- 7 CALLBACK
- 8 DON'T KNOW
- 9 REFUSED

[IV: WE ARE INTERVIEWING MOST TYPES OF “GROUP QUARTERS” NOW AS LONG AS THE RESPONDENT IS A (MENTALLY COMPETENT) ADULT. IF YOU ARE UNCERTAIN ABOUT THE APPROPRIATENESS OF YOUR PLACE (A PRISON, FOR EXAMPLE) PLEASE ARRANGE A CALL BACK AND ASK THE SUPERVISOR ABOUT THE PLACE AND CIRCUMSTANCES OF YOUR RESPONDENT.]

{Q: QOL10}

We'd like first to get a sense of your overall impression about Prince William County.

Please imagine a scale from 1 to 10, where 1 represents the worst possible community in which to live and 10 represents the best possible community. Where on that scale would you rate Prince William County as a place to live?

- 1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10  
 WORST BEST  
 98 DON'T KNOW/UNABLE TO RATE  
 99 REFUSED

{Q: YR5AGOB}

***If LONGER THAN FIVE YEARS to HOWLONG, ASK***

Where on the same 1 to 10 scale would you say that Prince William County stood five years ago?

- 1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10  
 WORST BEST  
 98 DON'T KNOW/UNABLE TO RATE  
 99 REFUSED

{Q: FUTUREB}

***ASK OF 47% OF RESPONDENTS***

Now, thinking about the future, where on the same 1 to 10 scale would you say that Prince William County will stand five years from now?

- 1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10  
 WORST BEST  
 98 DON'T KNOW/UNABLE TO RATE  
 99 REFUSED

{Q: HPELIVB}

Would you like to be living in Prince William County five years from now, or do you hope to be living someplace else by then?

- 1 PRINCE WILLIAM COUNTY  
 2 MANASSAS/MANASSAS PARK [VOLUNTEERED]  
 3 SOMEPLACE ELSE  
 8 DON'T KNOW  
 9 REFUSED

{Q: CTYSAT97}

One of our main purposes in doing this survey is to find out how satisfied residents of Prince William are with services they receive from the County. Before I ask you about any specific services, I'd like to ask you how satisfied you are in general with the services the County provides. Are you . . .

- 1 VERY SATISFIED
- 2 SOMEWHAT SATISFIED
- 3 SOMEWHAT DISSATISFIED
- 4 VERY DISSATISFIED
- 8 DON'T KNOW/UNABLE TO RATE
- 9 REFUSED

[IV: IF ASKED, DO NOT SUGGEST EXAMPLES OF SERVICES, YOU MAY SAY: All the things the County spends it money on that benefit its residents.]

{Q: SATCHG}

**ASK OF 53% OF RESPONDENTS**

Thinking back over the past year, would you say that your satisfaction with services provided by the Prince William County government has increased, decreased, or stayed about the same?

- 1 Increased/more satisfied
- 2 Decreased/less satisfied
- 3 Stayed about the same
- 8 DON'T KNOW
- 9 REFUSED

{Q: LISTSERV}

Now I have several brief lists of services to ask you about. For each one I'd like you to tell me whether you are very satisfied, somewhat satisfied, somewhat dissatisfied, or very dissatisfied with the job the County is doing.

If you don't feel you can rate a particular service, just say so.

{Q: VOTE}

**ASK OF 53% OF RESPONDENTS**

First, how satisfied are you with the job the County is doing in providing convenient ways for people to register to vote?

- 1 VERY SATISFIED
- 2 SOMEWHAT SATISFIED
- 3 SOMEWHAT DISSATISFIED
- 4 VERY DISSATISFIED
- 8 DON'T KNOW/UNABLE TO RATE
- 9 REFUSED

{Q: VOTEYEAR}\*  


---

**ASK OF 60% OF RESPONDENTS**

In the past year, have you gone to a voting precinct in Prince William County to vote in any election ?

- 1 YES
- 2 NO
- 8 CAN'T RECALL/DON'T KNOW
- 9 REFUSED

{Q: PCTUP}\*  


---

**ASK IF VOTEYEAR=1**

How satisfied are you with the efficiency and effectiveness of the voting precinct set-up for handling voters on election days?

- 1 VERY SATISFIED
- 2 SOMEWHAT SATISFIED
- 3 SOMEWHAT DISSATISFIED
- 4 VERY DISSATISFIED
- 8 DON'T KNOW/UNABLE TO RATE
- 9 REFUSED

{Q: GOVTSERV}  


---

**ASK OF 53% OF RESPONDENTS**

How satisfied are you with the job the County is doing in keeping residents informed about County government programs and services?

- 1 VERY SATISFIED
- 2 SOMEWHAT SATISFIED
- 3 SOMEWHAT DISSATISFIED
- 4 VERY DISSATISFIED
- 8 DON'T KNOW/UNABLE TO RATE
- 9 REFUSED

{Q: STRLTA}  


---

**ASK OF 67% OF RESPONDENTS**

How satisfied are you with the job the County is doing in providing street lighting where it's needed in the County?

- 1 VERY SATISFIED
- 2 SOMEWHAT SATISFIED
- 3 SOMEWHAT DISSATISFIED
- 4 VERY DISSATISFIED
- 8 DON'T KNOW/UNABLE TO RATE
- 9 REFUSED

{Q: FIRE}

**ASK OF 53% OF RESPONDENTS**

How satisfied are you with the job the County is doing in fire fighting in your area?

- 1 VERY SATISFIED
- 2 SOMEWHAT SATISFIED
- 3 SOMEWHAT DISSATISFIED
- 4 VERY DISSATISFIED
- 8 DON'T KNOW/UNABLE TO RATE
- 9 REFUSED

{Q: RESCUE}

**ASK OF 53% OF RESPONDENTS**

How satisfied are you with the job the County is doing in providing emergency medical rescue services?

- 1 VERY SATISFIED
- 2 SOMEWHAT SATISFIED
- 3 SOMEWHAT DISSATISFIED
- 4 VERY DISSATISFIED
- 8 DON'T KNOW/UNABLE TO RATE
- 9 REFUSED

{Q: POLINTRO}

Now I'd like to ask about some other services having to do with crime and the police department.

{Q: AMCRIME}

**ASK OF 67% OF RESPONDENTS**

How satisfied are you with safety from crime in your neighborhood during daylight hours?

- 1 VERY SATISFIED
- 2 SOMEWHAT SATISFIED
- 3 SOMEWHAT DISSATISFIED
- 4 VERY DISSATISFIED
- 8 DON'T KNOW/UNABLE TO RATE
- 9 REFUSED

{Q: PMCRIME}

**ASK OF 67% OF RESPONDENTS**

How satisfied are you with safety from crime in your neighborhood after dark?

- 1 VERY SATISFIED
- 2 SOMEWHAT SATISFIED
- 3 SOMEWHAT DISSATISFIED
- 4 VERY DISSATISFIED
- 8 DON'T KNOW/UNABLE TO RATE
- 9 REFUSED

{Q: DYCRIMEB}

**ASK OF 47% OF RESPONDENTS**

How satisfied are you with safety from crime in commercial and business areas of the County during daylight hours?

- 1 VERY SATISFIED
- 2 SOMEWHAT SATISFIED
- 3 SOMEWHAT DISSATISFIED
- 4 VERY DISSATISFIED
- 8 DON'T KNOW/UNABLE TO RATE
- 9 REFUSED

{Q: NTCRIMEB}

**ASK OF 47% OF RESPONDENTS**

How satisfied are you with safety from crime in commercial and business areas of the County after dark?

- 1 VERY SATISFIED
- 2 SOMEWHAT SATISFIED
- 3 SOMEWHAT DISSATISFIED
- 4 VERY DISSATISFIED
- 8 DON'T KNOW/UNABLE TO RATE
- 9 REFUSED

{Q: PREVENTB}

**ASK OF 50% OF RESPONDENTS**

How satisfied are you with crime prevention programs and information provided by the police department?

- 1 VERY SATISFIED
- 2 SOMEWHAT SATISFIED
- 3 SOMEWHAT DISSATISFIED
- 4 VERY DISSATISFIED
- 8 DON'T KNOW/UNABLE TO RATE
- 9 REFUSED

{Q: ATTITUDE}

**ASK OF 80% OF RESPONDENTS**

How satisfied are you with police department attitudes and behaviors toward residents?

- 1 VERY SATISFIED
- 2 SOMEWHAT SATISFIED
- 3 SOMEWHAT DISSATISFIED
- 4 VERY DISSATISFIED
- 8 DON'T KNOW/UNABLE TO RATE
- 9 REFUSED

{Q: POLFAIR}\*

**ASK OF 80% OF RESPONDENTS**

How satisfied are you that the Police Department treats everyone fairly regardless of race, gender, ethnic or national origin. Are you . . .

- 1 VERY SATISFIED
- 2 SOMEWHAT SATISFIED
- 3 SOMEWHAT DISSATISFIED
- 4 VERY DISSATISFIED
- 8 DON'T KNOW/UNABLE TO RATE
- 9 REFUSED

{Q: DRUGS}

**ASK OF 50% OF RESPONDENTS**

How satisfied are you with the police department's efforts to reduce the use of illegal drugs?

- 1 VERY SATISFIED
- 2 SOMEWHAT SATISFIED
- 3 SOMEWHAT DISSATISFIED
- 4 VERY DISSATISFIED
- 8 DON'T KNOW/UNABLE TO RATE
- 9 REFUSED

{Q: GANGS}

**ASK OF 50% OF RESPONDENTS**

How satisfied are you with the police department's efforts to combat gang activity?

- 1 VERY SATISFIED
- 2 SOMEWHAT SATISFIED
- 3 SOMEWHAT DISSATISFIED
- 4 VERY DISSATISFIED
- 8 DON'T KNOW/UNABLE TO RATE
- 9 REFUSED

{Q: POLICE}

**ASK OF 80% OF RESPONDENTS**

How satisfied are you with the overall performance of the police department?

- 1 VERY SATISFIED
- 2 SOMEWHAT SATISFIED
- 3 SOMEWHAT DISSATISFIED
- 4 VERY DISSATISFIED
- 8 DON'T KNOW/UNABLE TO RATE
- 9 REFUSED



{Q: VCRIME}\*  

Thinking back over the past twelve (12) months, were you or anyone in your household the victim of ANY crime?

- 1 YES
- 2 NO
- 3 YES, BUT NOT IN PWC (VOLUNTEERED)
- 8 CAN'T RECALL/DON'T KNOW
- 9 REFUSED

{Q: VCRIMER} \*

*Ask if VCRIMER = 1*

Did you report it to the Prince William County Police Department?

- 1 YES
- 2 NO
- 8 CAN'T RECALL/DON'T KNOW
- 9 REFUSED

{Q: VCRIMNR} \*

*Ask if VCRIME = 2*What are reasons you did not report it to the Prince William County Police Department?  
[OPEN END]{Q: CRMTYPES}\*  
*Ask if VCRIME = 1*What types of crime were you a victim of?  
[OPEN END]

{Q: PPOLICY}

**ASK OF 67% OF RESPONDENTS**

In late April 2008, The Prince William County Board of County Supervisors ordered the Department of Police to check the citizenship of immigration status of anyone who is placed under arrest, to see if they are in violation of federal immigration law. How satisfied are you with the job the Police Department is doing in carrying out this policy? Are you...

- 1 VERY SATISFIED
- 2 SOMEWHAT SATISFIED
- 3 SOMEWHAT DISSATISFIED
- 4 VERY DISSATISFIED
- 7 DECLINES TO RATE (OPPOSES POLICY) (VOLUNTEERED)
- 8 DON'T KNOW/UNABLE TO RATE
- 9 REFUSED

IV: If R SAYS OPPOSED TO POLICY, SAY: We realize that opinions are divided on the policy. Would you be able to rate the job the police department is doing in carrying out the policy? IF INSISTS THAT CANNOT RATE: Select option 7

**IF SAYS POLICY CHANGED:** In July 2007, the Board ordered the Dept of Police to inquire into the citizenship or immigration status of detained persons when they are stopped and there's probable cause to believe the person is in violation of federal immigration law. In late April 2008, the policy was modified and it now applies only to persons who are actually placed under arrest. Just thinking about the new policy, are you . . .

{Q: WPOLSAT1}\*

**Ask if PPOLICY = 1**

What are some reasons you are very satisfied with the job the Police Department is doing in carrying out this policy?

[OPEN END]

{Q: WPOLSAT2}\*

**Ask if PPOLICY = 4**

What are some reasons you are very dissatisfied with the job the Police Department is doing in carrying out this policy?

[OPEN END]

{Q: COURT}

**ASK OF 77% OF RESPONDENTS**

In the pasy year, have you had occasion to visit the Judicial Center? That's the courthouse in downtown Manassas.

- 1 YES, VISITED IN LAST 12 MONTHS
- 2 NO, HAS NOT VISITIED
- 8 CAN'T RECALL/DON'T KNOW
- 9 REFUSED

{Q: COURTSAT}

**If YES to COURT, ASK**

How satisfied were you with the level of security in the courthouse?

- 1 VERY SATISFIED
- 2 SOMEWHAT SATISFIED
- 3 SOMEWHAT DISSATISFIED
- 4 VERY DISSATISFIED
- 8 DON'T KNOW/UNABLE TO RATE
- 9 REFUSED

{Q: EMERG911}

Thinking back over the past twelve months, have you dialed 9-1-1 to call the County's emergency services?

[IF HOWLONG=1 SHOW, "Since you moved to Prince William County,"]

- 1 YES, CONTACTED IN LAST 12 MONTHS
- 2 NO, HAS NOT CONTACTED
- 8 CAN'T RECALL/DON'T KNOW
- 9 REFUSED

[INCLUDE ANY TIME THAT R DIALED 9-1-1 FOR ANY REASON, WHETHER OR NOT IT WAS AN EMERGENCY OR TO HELP THEMSELVES OR SOMEBODY ELSE]

[IF SAYS: "Dialed by accident" SELECT "2 NO"]

Q: EMSERVB}

***If YES to EMERG911, ASK***

Thinking back to the last time you called 9-1-1, which services did you call for...  
[ENTER ALL THAT APPLY]

- 1 Police
- 2 Fire
- 3 Ambulance or rescue squad, or
- 4 Something else ... [SPECIFY:]
- 7 CAN'T RECALL/DON'T KNOW
- 8 REFUSED
- 9 NO MORE, GO ON

[IF SAYS "Dialed by accident" GO BACK TO PRIOR QUESTION AND SELECT "2 NO"]

{Q: EMERGSB}

***If POLICE on EMERG911, ASK***

Was your call to the police because of an emergency situation or for some other reason?

- 1 EMERGENCY
- 2 SOME OTHER REASON
- 8 CAN'T REMEMBER/DON'T KNOW
- 9 REFUSED

{Q: EMSATIS}

***If YES to EMERG911, ASK***

Thinking back to the last time you called 9-1-1, how satisfied were you with the assistance you received from the person who took your call?

- 1 VERY SATISFIED
- 2 SOMEWHAT SATISFIED
- 3 SOMEWHAT DISSATISFIED
- 4 VERY DISSATISFIED
- 7 NOT APPLICABLE [NO HELP SENT, ETC]
- 8 DON'T KNOW/UNABLE TO RATE
- 9 REFUSED

{Q: EMSATRES}

***Ask if EMSATIS = 3 or 4***

What caused you to be dissatisfied with the assistance that you received from the person who took your 9-1-1 call?

[OPEN END]

{Q: EMTIMEB}

**If YES to EMERG911, ASK**

Thinking back to the last time you called 9-1-1, how satisfied were you with the time it took for help to arrive on the scene?

- 1 VERY SATISFIED
- 2 SOMEWHAT SATISFIED
- 3 SOMEWHAT DISSATISFIED
- 4 VERY DISSATISFIED
- 7 NOT APPLICABLE [NO HELP SENT, ETC]
- 8 DON'T KNOW/UNABLE TO RATE
- 9 REFUSED

{Q: EMTIMES}

**Ask if EMTIMEB = 3 or 4**

How much time did it take for help to arrive on the scene?

ENTER TIME IN HOURS AND MINUTES: \_\_\_\_\_ HOURS \_\_\_\_\_ MINUTES  
ENTER 99 IF DK OR REFUSED

{Q: EMTIMRE}

**Ask if EMTIMEB = 3 or 4**

What would you say is a reasonable amount of time to receive help?

ENTER TIME IN HOURS AND MINUTES: \_\_\_\_\_ HOURS \_\_\_\_\_ MINUTES  
ENTER 99 IF DK OR REFUSED  
ENTER 0 FOR HOURS IF LESS THAN AN HOUR

{Q: EMASSTB}

**If YES to EMERG911, ASK**

Thinking back to the last time you called 9-1-1, how satisfied were you with the assistance provided on the scene?

- 1 VERY SATISFIED
- 2 SOMEWHAT SATISFIED
- 3 SOMEWHAT DISSATISFIED
- 4 VERY DISSATISFIED
- 7 NOT APPLICABLE [NO HELP SENT, ETC]
- 8 DON'T KNOW/UNABLE TO RATE
- 9 REFUSED

{EMASSRES}

**Ask if EMASSTB = 3 or 4**

What caused you to be dissatisfied with the assistance provided on the scene?  
[OPEN END]

{Q: CPR97}

**ASK OF 48% OF RESPONDENTS**

We're also interested in knowing how many people in the county have been trained in cardio-pulmonary resuscitation, also known as CPR. How many persons in your household, if any, have been trained in CPR?

[IF NECESSARY SAY: CPR can save the life of a person whose heart has stopped beating.]

ENTER NUMBER HERE \_\_ AND PRESS RETURN  
[ENTER "99" FOR DON'T KNOW/REFUSED]

{Q: SHELTER1 &amp; 2}

Now a question about preparedness: In case of a natural or man-made disaster, people might be directed to "shelter in place." This means staying at home until the emergency is over, without leaving home, even to get things you need. Assume an emergency happened today but you still have electrical power, for how many days would you be able to shelter in place at your home, with the food, water, medication and supplies you have on hand now?

- 1 NO CAPABILITY FOR SHELTERING
- 2 ONE DAY
- 3 2 TO 3 DAYS
- 4 4 DAYS TO 1 WEEK
- 5 8 DAYS TO 2 WEEKS
- 6 2 WEEKS TO 1 MONTH
- 7 MORE THAN 1 MONTH
- 8 DON'T KNOW
- 9 REFUSED

{Q: SHELTER3}

**ASK OF 38% OF RESPONDENTS**

And now a question about preparedness. In case of a natural or man-made disaster, it could take days for help to arrive if businesses close, fallen trees block the roads, and power goes out in your area. Do you have enough food, water, and other supplies to stay on your own for at least three days?

- 1 YES
- 2 NO
- 8 DON'T KNOW
- 9 REFUSED

{Q: LSTSERV2}

Now, I have another list of services that are aimed at people's social, recreational, and economic needs. Again I'd like you to tell me how satisfied you are with the job the County is doing.

{Q: LIBRARY}

**ASK OF 61% OF RESPONDENTS**

How satisfied are you with the job the County is doing in providing library services to County residents?

- 1 VERY SATISFIED
- 2 SOMEWHAT SATISFIED
- 3 SOMEWHAT DISSATISFIED
- 4 VERY DISSATISFIED
- 8 DON'T KNOW/UNABLE TO RATE
- 9 REFUSED

{Q: LIBRY12}

**ASK OF 77% OF RESPONDENTS**

Within the past twelve months, have you or a member of your household gone to any of the County Libraries or used the County's library services?

[IF HOWLONG=1 SHOW, "Since you moved to Prince William County,"]

- 1 YES
- 2 NO
- 8 CAN'T RECALL/DON'T KNOW

{Q: LIBRYSAT}

**If YES to LIBRY12, ASK**

And how satisfied were you with the service you received from the Library staff?

- 1 VERY SATISFIED
- 2 SOMEWHAT SATISFIED
- 3 SOMEWHAT DISSATISFIED
- 4 VERY DISSATISFIED
- 7 R HAD NO CONTACT WITH STAFF
- 8 DON'T KNOW/UNABLE TO RATE
- 9 REFUSED

{Q: PARK}

**ASK OF 61% OF RESPONDENTS**

How satisfied are you with the job the County is doing in providing park and recreation facilities and programs?

- 1 VERY SATISFIED
- 2 SOMEWHAT SATISFIED
- 3 SOMEWHAT DISSATISFIED
- 4 VERY DISSATISFIED
- 8 DON'T KNOW/UNABLE TO RATE
- 9 REFUSED

{Q: ELDERLY}

**ASK OF 54% OF RESPONDENTS**

How satisfied are you with the job the County is doing in providing programs to help the County's elderly populations?

- 1 VERY SATISFIED
- 2 SOMEWHAT SATISFIED
- 3 SOMEWHAT DISSATISFIED
- 4 VERY DISSATISFIED
- 8 DON'T KNOW/UNABLE TO RATE
- 9 REFUSED

[DEFINITION: By "elderly population", we mean people 60 years old and older]\*

{Q: FINNEEDB}

**ASK OF 54% OF RESPONDENTS**

How satisfied are you with the job the County is doing in providing help to people in financial need?

- 1 VERY SATISFIED
- 2 SOMEWHAT SATISFIED
- 3 SOMEWHAT DISSATISFIED
- 4 VERY DISSATISFIED
- 8 DON'T KNOW/UNABLE TO RATE
- 9 REFUSED

{Q: DEPTSS}

**ASK OF 77% OF RESPONDENTS**

Are you familiar enough with the services of the Department of Social Services to tell us how satisfied you are with them?

- 1 YES – FAMILIAR ENOUGH TO RATE
- 2 NOT SURE
- 3 NO – NOT FAMILIAR

{Q: DSSSAT}

**If YES to DEPTSS, ASK**

How satisfied are you with their services [DEPARTMENT OF SOCIAL SERVICES]?

- 1 VERY SATISFIED
- 2 SOMEWHAT SATISFIED
- 3 SOMEWHAT DISSATISFIED
- 4 VERY DISSATISFIED
- 8 DON'T KNOW/UNABLE TO RATE
- 9 REFUSED

{Q: HLTHDEPT}

**ASK OF 77% OF RESPONDENTS**

Are you familiar enough with the services of the Health Department to tell us how satisfied you are with them?

- 1 YES – FAMILIAR ENOUGH TO RATE
- 2 NOT SURE
- 3 NO – NOT FAMILIAR

{Q: HLTHSAT}

**If YES to HLTHDEPT, ASK**

How satisfied are you with the services of the Health Department?

- 1 VERY SATISFIED
- 2 SOMEWHAT SATISFIED
- 3 SOMEWHAT DISSATISFIED
- 4 VERY DISSATISFIED
- 8 DON'T KNOW/UNABLE TO RATE
- 9 REFUSED

{Q: MENTAL}

**ASK OF 77% OF RESPONDENTS**

Are you familiar enough with the services of the department know as Community Services (CS)? They provide mental health, intellectual disability – formerly termed mental retardation – and substance abuse services to the local community.

- 1 YES – FAMILIAR ENOUGH TO RATE
- 2 NOT SURE
- 3 NO – NOT FAMILIAR

[IV: ONLY IF THEY ASK ABOUT USING THE TERM “MENTAL RETARDATION,” EXPLAIN: We are aware that some consider the term “mental retardation” offensive and we are transitioning to the more generally used term, “intellectual disability,” during this survey. However, for data quality purposes 50 percent of our respondents this year are receiving the old phrase and you (the respondent) were randomly selected to receive the old phrase. IF NECESSARY: We have to compare the data to prior years when the older phrase was used and this procedure ensures that we can properly measure and wording differences as we go forward.]

{Q: MENTHPB}

**If YES to MENTAL, ASK**

How satisfied are you with their services to people with mental health problems? [COMMUNITY MENTAL HEALTH, INTELLECTUAL DISABILITY (FORMERLY TERMED MENTAL RETARDATION), SUBSTANCE ABUSE SERVICES]

- 1 VERY SATISFIED
- 2 SOMEWHAT SATISFIED
- 3 SOMEWHAT DISSATISFIED
- 4 VERY DISSATISFIED
- 8 DON'T KNOW/UNABLE TO RATE
- 9 REFUSED



{Q: MENTRET}

***If YES to MENTAL, ASK***

How satisfied are you with their services to people with intellectual disability, formerly termed mental retardation?

- 1 VERY SATISFIED
- 2 SOMEWHAT SATISFIED
- 3 SOMEWHAT DISSATISFIED
- 4 VERY DISSATISFIED
- 8 DON'T KNOW/UNABLE TO RATE
- 9 REFUSED

{Q: MENTEIS}

***If YES to MENTAL, ASK***

How satisfied are you with their Early Intervention Services?

- 1 VERY SATISFIED
- 2 SOMEWHAT SATISFIED
- 3 SOMEWHAT DISSATISFIED
- 4 VERY DISSATISFIED
- 8 DON'T KNOW/UNABLE TO RATE
- 9 REFUSED

{Q: MENTSUB}

***If YES to MENTAL, ASK***

How satisfied are you with their services to people with substance abuse problems?

- 1 VERY SATISFIED
- 2 SOMEWHAT SATISFIED
- 3 SOMEWHAT DISSATISFIED
- 4 VERY DISSATISFIED
- 8 DON'T KNOW/UNABLE TO RATE
- 9 REFUSED

{Q: MENTALL}

***If YES to MENTAL, ASK***

How satisfied are you with their services overall?

- 1 VERY SATISFIED
- 2 SOMEWHAT SATISFIED
- 3 SOMEWHAT DISSATISFIED
- 4 VERY DISSATISFIED
- 8 DON'T KNOW/UNABLE TO RATE
- 9 REFUSED

{Q: ANYBODY}

Thinking back over the past twelve months, have you had any occasion to contact anybody in the County government about anything -- a problem, a question, a complaint, or just needing some information or assistance?

[IF HOWLONG = 1 SHOW "Since you moved to Prince William County,"]

- 1 YES, CONTACTED IN LAST 12 MONTHS
- 2 NO, HAS NOT CONTACTED
- 9 CAN'T RECALL/DON'T KNOW/REFUSED

{Q: HELPFUL2}

***If YES to ANYBODY, ASK***

Thinking back to the last time you had contact with people at the County Government, how satisfied were you with the helpfulness of County employees?

- 1 VERY SATISFIED
- 2 SOMEWHAT SATISFIED
- 3 SOMEWHAT DISSATISFIED
- 4 VERY DISSATISFIED
- 8 DON'T KNOW/UNABLE TO RATE
- 9 REFUSED

{Q: TAXESA}

Over the past twelve months, have you had any occasion to contact the County about your taxes for real estate, personal property, or business license?

[IF HOWLONG = 1 SHOW "Since you moved to Prince William County,"]

- 1 YES
- 2 NO
- 9 DON'T KNOW/REFUSED/NON ANSWER

[IF NEEDED: Just sending in a payment does NOT count as "contact".]

{Q: HOWCONA}

***Ask if TAXESA = 1 (YES)***

Did you contact the county?

[MULTIPLE RESPONSES; ALL THAT APPLY]

- 1 In person
- 2 By telephone
- 3 By mail
- 9 NONE/NO ANSWER/NO MORE, GO ON

{Q: HELPFULA}

***Ask if TAXESA = 1 (YES)***

When you contacted the County, how satisfied were you with the helpfulness of County employees?

- 1 VERY SATISFIED
- 2 SOMEWHAT SATISFIED
- 3 SOMEWHAT DISSATISFIED
- 4 VERY DISSATISFIED
- 8 DON'T KNOW/UNABLE TO RATE
- 9 REFUSED

{Q: TIMESATA}

**Ask if TAXESA = 1 (YES)**

When you contacted the County, how satisfied were you with the time it took for your request to be answered?

- 1 VERY SATISFIED
- 2 SOMEWHAT SATISFIED
- 3 SOMEWHAT DISSATISFIED
- 4 VERY DISSATISFIED
- 8 DON'T KNOW/UNABLE TO RATE
- 9 REFUSED

{Q: NET1}

**ASK OF 51% OF RESPONDENTS**

Have you ever used the Prince William County government internet web site?  
[DEFINITION: COUNTY WEBSITE IS LOCATED AT [www.co.prince-william.va.us](http://www.co.prince-william.va.us)]

- 1 YES
- 2 NO
- 8 DON'T KNOW
- 9 REFUSED

{Q: NET2}

**If YES to NET1, ASK**

How satisfied are you with the Prince William County site? Would you say you are . . .

- 1 very satisfied,
- 2 somewhat satisfied,
- 3 somewhat dissatisfied,
- 4 or very dissatisfied with the site?
- 8 DON'T KNOW/UNABLE TO RATE
- 9 REFUSED

Now I'd like to ask about some issues concerning how the County is growing and developing.

{Q: LAND1/LAND2}

**50% of respondents will receive this question after the jobs series (NEWJOBS)**

**ASK OF 38% OF RESPONDENTS**

First, in general, how satisfied are you with the job the County is doing in planning how land will be used and developed in the County?

- 1 VERY SATISFIED
- 2 SOMEWHAT SATISFIED
- 3 SOMEWHAT DISSATISFIED
- 4 VERY DISSATISFIED
- 8 DON'T KNOW/UNABLE TO RATE
- 9 REFUSED

{Q: RATEJOBS}

**ASK OF 77% OF RESPONDENTS**

Are you familiar enough with the County's efforts to attract new jobs and businesses to rate those efforts?

- 1 Yes
- 2 No
- 8 DON'T KNOW
- 9 REFUSED

{Q: NEWJOBS}

**If YES to RATEJOBS, ASK**

How satisfied are you with the job the County is doing in trying to attract new jobs and businesses to the County?

- 1 VERY SATISFIED
- 2 SOMEWHAT SATISFIED
- 3 SOMEWHAT DISSATISFIED
- 4 VERY DISSATISFIED
- 8 DON'T KNOW/UNABLE TO RATE
- 9 REFUSED

{Q: JOBSDIS}

**Ask if NEWJOBS = 3 or 4 (COLLECT 100 RESPONSES)**

What caused you to be dissatisfied with the job the County is doing to attract new jobs and businesses?

[OPEN END]

{Q: JOBSAT}

**Ask if NEWJOBS = 1 (COLLECT 50 RESPONSES)**

What are some reasons you are very satisfied with the job the County is doing to attract new jobs and businesses?

[OPEN END]

{Q: LAND2/LAND1}

**50% of respondents receive this question before the jobs series (NEWJOBS)**

**ASK OF 38% OF RESPONDENTS**

Now I'd like to ask about some issues concerning how the County is growing and developing.

First, in general, how satisfied are you with the job the County is doing in planning how land will be used and developed in the County?

{Q: NEIGHBOR}

**ASK OF 51% OF RESPONDENTS**

How satisfied are you with the job the County is doing in prevents neighborhoods from deteriorating and making sure the community is well kept up?

- 1 VERY SATISFIED
- 2 SOMEWHAT SATISFIED
- 3 SOMEWHAT DISSATISFIED
- 4 VERY DISSATISFIED
- 8 DON'T KNOW/UNABLE TO RATE
- 9 REFUSED

{Q: N10CROWD}

Now, thinking about your neighborhood, how big a problem is there now with residential overcrowding, that is: too many people living at one residence? Is that . . .

- 1 A BIG PROBLEM
- 2 SOMEWHAT OF A PROBLEM
- 3 OR NOT A PROBLEM IN YOU NEIGHBORHOOD?
- 4 RURAL AREA/DOES NOT APPLY
- 8 DON'T KNOW
- 9 REFUSED

{Q: N2OCROWD}

**If N10CROWD is 1 or 2, ASK**

Compared to one year ago, has this [overcrowding]. . .

[IF HOWLONG=1 SHOW, "Since you moved to Prince William County,"]

- 1 GOTTEN A LOT BETTER,
- 2 GOTTEN A LITTLE BETTER,
- 3 STAYED ABOUT THE SAME,
- 4 GOTTEN A LITTLE WORSE,
- 5 OR GOTTEN A LOT WORSE?
- 6 NEVER HAD THIS PROBLEM [VOLUNTEERED]
- 8 DON'T KNOW
- 9 REFUSED

{Q: N3VACANT}

How big a problem is there in your neighborhood now with vacant houses or properties that are not well kept up? Is that . . .

- 1 A BIG PROBLEM,
- 2 SOMEWHAT OF A PROBLEM
- 3 OR NOT A PROBLEM IN YOUR NEIGHBORHOOD?
- 4 RURAL AREA/DOES NOT APPLY
- 8 DON'T KNOW
- 9 REFUSED

{Q: N4VACANT}

***If N3VACANT is 1 or 2, ASK***

Compared to one year ago, has this [UPKEEP OF VACANT HOUSES] . . .

[IF HOWLONG=1 SHOW, "Since you moved to Prince William County,"]

- 1 GOTTEN A LOT BETTER,
- 2 GOTTEN A LITTLE BETTER,
- 3 STAYED ABOUT THE SAME,
- 4 GOTTEN A LITTLE WORSE,
- 5 OR GOTTEN A LOT WORSE?
- 6 NEVER HAD THIS PROBLEM [VOLUNTEERED]
- 8 DON'T KNOW
- 9 REFUSED

{Q: N5UPKEEP}

How big a problem is there in your neighborhood now with occupied homes or apartments that are not well kept up? Is that . . .

- 1 A BIG PROBLEM,
- 2 SOMEWHAT OF A PROBLEM,
- 3 OR NOT A PROBLEM IN YOUR NEIGHBORHOOD?
- 8 DON'T KNOW
- 9 REFUSED

{Q: N6UPKEEP}

***If N5UPKEEP is a problem or a big problem, ASK***

Compared to one year ago, has this [UPKEEP OF OCCUPIED HOMES] ...

[IF HOWLONG=1 SHOW, "Since you moved to Prince William County,"]

- 1 GOTTEN A LOT BETTER,
- 2 GOTTEN A LITTLE BETTER,
- 3 STAYED ABOUT THE SAME,
- 4 GOTTEN A LITTLE WORSE,
- 5 OR GOTTEN A LOT WORSE?
- 6 NEVER HAD THIS PROBLEM [VOLUNTEERED]
- 8 DON'T KNOW
- 9 REFUSED

Q: LOITER

***ASK OF 86% OF RESPONDENTS***

Thinking about the places you drive or walk to in Prince William County, how big a problem is there now with loitering, that is: groups of people hanging out on street corners or in store parking lots? Is that . . .

- 1 A BIG PROBLEM,
- 2 SOMEWHAT OF A PROBLEM,
- 3 OR NOT A PROBLEM IN PRINCE WILLIAM COUNTY?
- 8 DON'T KNOW
- 9 REFUSED

{Q: LOITNOW}

***If LOITER is a problem or a big problem, ASK***

Compared to one year ago, has this [LOITERING] ...

[IF HOWLONG=1 SHOW, "Since you moved to Prince William County,"]

- 1 GOTTEN A LOT BETTER,
- 2 GOTTEN A LITTLE BETTER,
- 3 STAYED ABOUT THE SAME,
- 4 GOTTEN A LITTLE WORSE,
- 5 OR GOTTEN A LOT WORSE?
- 6 NEVER HAD THIS PROBLEM [VOLUNTEERED]
- 8 DON'T KNOW
- 9 REFUSED

{Q: LANDFILL}

***ASK OF 51% OF RESPONDENTS***

In the past twelve months, have you or a member of your family taken trash or other items out to the County landfill at Independent Hill?

[IF HOWLONG=1 SHOW, "Since you moved to Prince William County,"]

- 1 Yes
- 2 No
- 8 CAN'T RECALL/DON'T KNOW

{Q: LFILLSAT}

***ASK IF LANDFILL = 1 (YES)***

And how satisfied were you with the County's landfill services?

- 1 VERY SATISFIED
- 2 SOMEWHAT SATISFIED
- 3 SOMEWHAT DISSATISFIED
- 4 VERY DISSATISFIED
- 8 DON'T KNOW/UNABLE TO RATE
- 9 REFUSED

{Q: COMPOST}

***ASK OF 51% OF RESPONDENTS***

In the past twelve months, have you or a member of your family used the Balls Ford Road compost facility?

DEFINITION: "This is a Waste Composting facility is located just west of the intersections of Balls Ford Road and the Prince William Parkway (on Balls Ford Road). The facility produces compost and mulch from leaves, grass and brush, and has a facility where residents can dispose of household trash and drop-off recyclable material."

- 1 Yes
- 2 No
- 8 DON'T KNOW
- 9 REFUSED

{Q: COMPSAT}

**ASK IF COMPOST = 1 (YES)**

And how satisfied were you with the Balls Ford Road compost facility?

- 1 VERY SATISFIED
- 2 SOMEWHAT SATISFIED
- 3 SOMEWHAT DISSATISFIED
- 4 VERY DISSATISFIED
- 8 DON'T KNOW/UNABLE TO RATE
- 9 REFUSED

{Q: TRAVEL97}

**ASK OF 58% OF RESPONDENTS**

How satisfied are you with the ease of travel or getting around within Prince William County?

- 1 VERY SATISFIED
- 2 SOMEWHAT SATISFIED
- 3 SOMEWHAT DISSATISFIED
- 4 VERY DISSATISFIED
- 8 DON'T KNOW/UNABLE TO RATE
- 9 REFUSED

[DEFINITION: "Getting around" refers to all forms of transportation, including driving a car, taking public transportation, biking, or walking--whatever applies to your household's situation.]

{Q: OUTSIDEC}

**ASK OF 51% OF RESPONDENTS**

How satisfied are you with the ease of getting around Northern Virginia outside of Prince William County?

- 1 VERY SATISFIED
- 2 SOMEWHAT SATISFIED
- 3 SOMEWHAT DISSATISFIED
- 4 VERY DISSATISFIED
- 8 DON'T KNOW/UNABLE TO RATE
- 9 REFUSED

{Q: GROWTHC}

**ASK OF 58% OF RESPONDENTS**

How satisfied are you with the rate of Prince William County's growth?

- 1 VERY SATISFIED
- 2 SOMEWHAT SATISFIED
- 3 SOMEWHAT DISSATISFIED
- 4 VERY DISSATISFIED
- 8 DON'T KNOW/UNABLE TO RATE
- 9 REFUSED



{Q: ROADDEVA}

**ASK OF 51% OF RESPONDENTS**

How satisfied are you with the way that residential and business development is coordinated with the transportation and road systems?

- 1 VERY SATISFIED
- 2 SOMEWHAT SATISFIED
- 3 SOMEWHAT DISSATISFIED
- 4 VERY DISSATISFIED
- 8 DON'T KNOW/UNABLE TO RATE
- 9 REFUSED

{Q: QSSCREEN}

Are you familiar with the County's efforts to preserve and improve the water quality of the streams?

- 1 YES
- 2 NO
- 8 DON'T KNOW
- 9 REFUSED

{Q: QSTREAMS}

**If YES to QSSCREEN, ASK**

How satisfied are you with the County's efforts to preserve and improve the water quality of the streams?

- 1 VERY SATISFIED
- 2 SOMEWHAT SATISFIED
- 3 SOMEWHAT DISSATISFIED
- 4 VERY DISSATISFIED
- 8 DON'T KNOW/UNABLE TO RATE
- 9 REFUSED

{Q: INPUTDEV}

**ASK OF 51% OF RESPONDENTS**

How satisfied are you with opportunities for citizen input on the planning process in the County?

- 1 VERY SATISFIED
- 2 SOMEWHAT SATISFIED
- 3 SOMEWHAT DISSATISFIED
- 4 VERY DISSATISFIED
- 8 DON'T KNOW/UNABLE TO RATE
- 9 REFUSED

{Q: VISDEV}

**ASK OF 51% OF RESPONDENTS**

How satisfied are you with the visual appearance of new development in the County?

- 1 VERY SATISFIED
- 2 SOMEWHAT SATISFIED
- 3 SOMEWHAT DISSATISFIED
- 4 VERY DISSATISFIED
- 8 DON'T KNOW/UNABLE TO RATE
- 9 REFUSED

{Q: BUILDNGS}\*

**ASK OF 48% OF RESPONDENTS**

How satisfied are you with the safety of buildings, residential and non-residential, constructed in the County in the last two years?

- 1 VERY SATISFIED
- 2 SOMEWHAT SATISFIED
- 3 SOMEWHAT DISSATISFIED
- 4 VERY DISSATISFIED
- 8 DON'T KNOW/UNABLE TO RATE
- 9 REFUSED

{Q: VIEW}

**ASK OF 51% OF RESPONDENTS**

Considering all the County Government's services on the one hand and taxes on the other, which of the following statements comes closest to your view:

- 1 They should decrease services and taxes
- 2 Keep taxes and services about where they are
- 3 Increase services and taxes
- 4 INCREASE SERVICES, KEEP TAXES THE SAME [VOLUNTEERED]
- 5 INCREASE SERVICES, DECREASE TAXES [VOLUNTEERED]
- 6 KEEP SERVICES AS THEY ARE, DECREASE TAXES [VOLUNTEERED]
- 7 SOME OTHER CHANGE [VOLUNTEERED]
- 9 DON'T KNOW/NO OPINION

{Q: VALUE}

**ASK OF 51% OF RESPONDENTS**

And how satisfied are you, in general, with the job the County is doing in giving you value for your tax dollar?

- 1 VERY SATISFIED
- 2 SOMEWHAT SATISFIED
- 3 SOMEWHAT DISSATISFIED
- 4 VERY DISSATISFIED
- 8 DON'T KNOW/UNABLE TO RATE
- 9 REFUSED

{Q: EFFNEFF}

**ASK OF 51% OF RESPONDENTS**

And how satisfied are you that the County provides efficient and effective service?

- 1 VERY SATISFIED
- 2 SOMEWHAT SATISFIED
- 3 SOMEWHAT DISSATISFIED
- 4 VERY DISSATISFIED
- 8 DON'T KNOW/UNABLE TO RATE
- 9 REFUSED

[DEFINITION: This means how satisfied you are that the County accomplishes its goals and does so without wasting a lot of time or money.]

{Q: TRSTGOV1}

**ASK OF 51% OF RESPONDENTS**

How much of the time do you think you can trust the County government to do what is right – just about always, most of the time, or only some of the time?

- 1 JUST ABOUT ALWAYS
- 2 MOST OF THE TIME
- 3 ONLY SOME OF THE TIME
- 4 NEVER/ALMOST NEVER [VOLUNTEERED]
- 8 DON'T KNOW/NO ANSWER
- 9 REFUSED

{Q: UNDER18}

Thanks for rating those services. Now I'm going to ask you about the Prince William County public schools, but first I'd like to know

How many persons under 18 live in your household?

ENTER NUMBER HERE \_\_ AND PRESS RETURN

ENTER "99" FOR REFUSAL

CHILDREN = PERSONS 17 AND UNDER

{Q: KUNDR597}

**If 1 or more to UNDER18, ASK**

Are any of those children less than 5 years old?

- 1 Yes
- 2 No
- 9 REFUSED

{Q: K5TO1297}

**If 1 or more to UNDER18, ASK**

Are any of those children ages 5 to 12?

- 1 Yes
- 2 No
- 9 REFUSED

{Q: KOVR1297}

***If 1 or more to UNDER18, ASK***

And are any of those children ages 13 to 17?

- 1 Yes
- 2 No
- 9 REFUSED

{Q: INTROSCH}

***If YES to K5TO1297 OR KOVR1297, ASK***

Now, about the Prince William County Public Schools....

{Q: SCHL1}

Do you currently have any children attending the Prince William County Public Schools?

- 1 Yes
- 2 No
- 8 DON'T KNOW
- 9 REFUSED

{Q: SCHL4}

***ASK OF 56% OF RESPONDENTS***

IF NO KIDS IN THE SCHOOL, OR REFUSAL, SHOW: "Even if you do not have children in the public schools, we are still interested in your opinion about the school system."  
How satisfied are you that the school system provides efficient and effective service?

- 1 VERY SATISFIED
- 2 SOMEWHAT SATISFIED
- 3 SOMEWHAT DISSATISFIED
- 4 VERY DISSATISFIED
- 8 DON'T KNOW/UNABLE TO RATE
- 9 REFUSED

[DEFINITION: This means how satisfied you are that the school system accomplishes its goals and does so without wasting a lot of time or money.]

{Q: PARK12}

***ASK OF 64% OF RESPONDENTS***

In the past twelve months, have you or a member of your household used any of the Park Authority's parks or recreation facilities? This does not include the Prince William Forest Park or Leesylvania State park.

- 1 YES – HAS USED
- 2 NO – HAS NO
- 3 CAN'T RECALL/DON'T KNOW

[INTERVIEWERS: DALE CITY RECREATION CENTER IS RUN BY PARK AUTHORITY]

{Q: PARK1}

**ASK OF 64% OF RESPONDENTS**

Are you familiar enough with the services of the Prince William County Park Authority to tell us how satisfied you are with them?

- 1 YES – FAMILIAR ENOUGH TO RATE
- 2 NOT SURE
- 3 NO – NOT FAMILIAR

{Q: PARK2}

**If YES to PARK1, ASK**

How satisfied are you that the County Park Authority provides efficient and effective service?

- 1 VERY SATISFIED
- 2 SOMEWHAT SATISFIED
- 3 SOMEWHAT DISSATISFIED
- 4 VERY DISSATISFIED
- 8 DON'T KNOW/UNABLE TO RATE
- 9 REFUSED

[DEFINITION: This means how satisfied you are that the County Park Authority accomplishes its goals and does so without wasting a lot of time or money.]

{Q: CTYSERV1}

**ASK OF 64% OF RESPONDENTS**

Are you familiar enough with the services of the Prince William County Service Authority to tell us how satisfied you are with them?

- 1 Yes – familiar enough to rate
- 2 Not sure
- 3 No – not familiar

[IF NECESSARY: "They provide water and sewer service to many County residents."]

{Q: CTYSERV2}

**If YES to CTYSERV1, ASK**

How satisfied are you that the County Service Authority provides efficient and effective service?

- 1 VERY SATISFIED
- 2 SOMEWHAT SATISFIED
- 3 SOMEWHAT DISSATISFIED
- 4 VERY DISSATISFIED
- 8 DON'T KNOW/UNABLE TO RATE
- 9 REFUSED

[DEFINITION: This means how satisfied you are that the County Service Authority accomplishes its goals and does so without wasting a lot of time or money.]

{Q: OLDER18}

**If *HOWMANY* > 0 & <> 99 SHOW:**

“IV: WE ASKED THIS EARLIER BUT WANT TO CONFIRM IT.”

EARLIER RESPONSE WAS: \_\_\_\_

How many persons live in your household who are age 18 or older, including yourself?

ENTER NUMBER HERE \_\_ AND PRESS RETURN

ENTER "99" FOR REFUSAL

{Q: CELLSHARE}\*  
 {Q: CELLCOUNT}\*  
 {Q: CELLCOMP}\*  
 {Q: PHONE1A}\*

**If *OLDER18*>1 AND [*CELLPHONE*=1 OR *OWNCELL*=1], ASK**

Do any of these adults share this cell phone?

[IF OLDER18 = 2: SHOW “Do you share this cell phone with the other adult?”

- 1 YES
- 2 NO
- 8 DON'T KNOW
- 9 REFUSED

**If *OLDER18*>1, ASK**

Of the other adults in your household, how many have their own cell phone?

ENTER NUMBER HERE \_\_ AND PRESS RETURN

ENTER "99" FOR REFUSAL

**If [*HAS BOTH CELL AND LANDLINE*], ASK**

You mentioned before that you have a regular telephone at home...Thinking about ALL the telephone calls that you and other members of your household make and receive.

Would you say that . . .

- 1 Almost all are on a landline phone,
- 2 Most of them are on a landline phone,
- 3 Amount of calls on a landline and cell phone are about equal,
- 4 Most of the calls are on a cell phone, or
- 5 Almost all of them are on a cell phone?
- 8 DON'T KNOW/UNABLE TO RATE
- 9 REFUSED

**If *HAVELINE*=1, ASK**

As far as you know, is the landline or regular phone for your household listed in the current telephone book?

- 1 YES
- 2 NO
- 8 DON'T KNOW
- 9 REFUSED

[IF ASKED: Our center is doing some research on listed and unlisted telephone households]

{Q: PHONE1B}

***If CELLPHONE=2 AND LANDLINE=1, ASK***

As far as you know, is the number I dialed listed in the current telephone book?

- 1 YES
- 2 NO
- 8 DON'T KNOW
- 9 REFUSED

[IF ASKED: Our center is doing some research on listed and unlisted telephone households]

{Q: PHONE2}

***If No to PHONE1A or No to PHONE1B, ASK***

Is the number not in the phone book because you chose to have an unlisted number, or because you got this number after the current phone book came out?

- 1 UNLISTED OR UNPUBLISHED
- 2 GOT NUMBER AFTER PHONE BOOK CAME OUT
- 3 OTHER SPECIFY [SPECIFY:]
- 8 DON'T KNOW
- 9 REFUSED

{Q: YRBORN}

Thanks for answering those questions. We have just a few more in this last section about working in the County. But first we'll need to know...

In what year were you born?

ENTER YEAR HERE 19\_\_ AND PRESS RETURN  
TYPE 2 DIGITS ONLY!  
ENTER "00" FOR ANY YEAR PRIOR TO 1900  
ENTER "99" FOR REFUSED

{Q: WORK}

Which of the following best describes you? Are you working full time, working part time, looking for work, a homemaker, retired, or a student?

[INTERVIEWERS: IF YOU ARE GIVEN TWO ASK "WHICH BEST DESCRIBES YOU?"]

- 1 Working full time [35 HRS/WK OR MORE]
- 2 Working part time
- 3 Looking for work
- 4 Homemaker
- 5 Retired
- 6 Student
- 7 Other [SPECIFY:]
- 9 DON'T KNOW/REFUSED

{Q: CRED98B}

***If WORKING FULL TIME or WORKING PART TIME to WORK, ASK***

Do you have any specialized work-related license or credential? I mean something other than a high school diploma, college degree, or university degree?

- 1 Yes [SPECIFY]
- 2 NO
- 8 DON'T KNOW
- 9 REFUSED

{Q: JOB1B}

***If WORKING FULL TIME or WORKING PART TIME to WORK, ASK***

I'd like to ask you some questions now about your primary job.  
First, what kind of work do you do at your job?

[INTERVIEWER PROBE: What is your job title? For example, are you a high school teacher, a machine operator, a sales manager?]

[OPEN-END]

{Q: JOB2B}

***If WORKING FULL TIME or WORKING PART TIME to WORK, ASK***

What is the main business or industry of the organization that you work for?

[OPEN-END]

{Q: JOB3B}

***If WORKING FULL TIME or WORKING PART TIME to WORK, ASK***

So are you employed in...

[INTERVIEWER: READ ONLY THOSE THAT APPLY]

- 1 A private company,
- 2 A non-profit organization,
- 3 The federal government,
- 4 The state government,
- 5 Local government
- 6 Or your own business, professional practice, or farm?
- 8 DON'T KNOW/NO ANSWER
- 9 REFUSED



{Q: JOB4B}

***If WORKING FULL TIME or WORKING PART TIME to WORK, ASK***

The next categories may not apply to you but this information is helpful to the County.

Is the place where you work primarily concerned with?

[INTERVIEWER: READ AS NECESSARY AND SELECT ALL THAT APPLY]

[SELECT NONE OF THE ABOVE IF CERTAIN THAT NONE APPLY]

- 1 Biotechnology
- 2 Manufacturing of computer hardware
- 3 Manufacturing of specialized measuring, analyzing, or controlling instruments
- 4 Pharmaceuticals
- 5 Research, development, or design of software
- 6 Other research and development or testing services
- 7 NONE OF THE ABOVE
- 8 DON'T KNOW / NO ANSWER
- 9 REFUSAL

{Q: JOBCITY}

***If WORKING FULL TIME or WORKING PART TIME to WORK, ASK***

And in what county or city is your job located?

[INTERVIEWER: TYPE BOTH DIGITS OR MOVE THE CURSOR AND HIT ENTER]

[READ AS NECESSARY]

- |                                |                                  |
|--------------------------------|----------------------------------|
| 11 PRINCE WILLIAM COUNTY       | 22 ALEXANDRIA                    |
| 12 MANASSAS                    | 23 RICHMOND CITIES OR AREA       |
| 13 MANASSAS PARK               | 24 ELSEWHERE IN VIRGINIA         |
| 14 STAFFORD COUNTY             | 25 WASHINGTON, D.C.              |
| 15 FREDERICKSBURG/SPOTSYLVANIA | 26 MARYLAND                      |
| 16 FAUQUIER COUNTY/WARRENTON   | 27 ANOTHER LOCATION [SPECIFY...] |
| 17 LOUDOUN COUNTY              | 28 WORKS ALL OVER VOLUNTEER]     |
| 18 FAIRFAX COUNTY              | 29 DON'T KNOW/NO ANSWER          |
| 19 FAIRFAX CITY                |                                  |
| 20 FALLS CHURCH CITY           |                                  |
| 21 ARLINGTON                   |                                  |

{Q: FAIRFAX}

***If WORKING IN FAIRFAX COUNTY, ASK***

And where in Fairfax is your job located?

- 1 Fort Belvoir
- 2 Springfield
- 3 Tyson's Corner
- 4 Dulles
- 5 Or elsewhere in Fairfax
- 8 DON'T KNOW/NO ANSWER
- 9 REFUSED

{Q: SAMEHOME}

***If WORKING FULL TIME or WORKING PART TIME to WORK, ASK***

Are you living today in the same house as you were a year ago?

- 1 Yes
- 2 NO
- 8 DON'T KNOW/REFUSED

{Q: SAMEWORK}

***If WORKING FULL TIME or WORKING PART TIME to WORK, ASK***

And are you commuting to the same workplace as you were a year ago?

- 1 Yes
- 2 NO
- 3 NOT WORKING A YEAR AGO [VOLUNTEERED]
- 9 DON'T KNOW/REFUSED

{Q: COMM98}

***If WORKING FULL TIME or WORKING PART TIME to WORK, ASK***

How long, on average, does it take you to get to work (one way)?

INTERVIEWER RECORD IN NUMBER OF MINUTES:

HOUR/MINUTE CONVERSION:

HALF HOUR	= 30 MINUTES
THREE QUARTERS HOUR	= 45 MINUTES
ONE HOUR	= 60 MINUTES
HOUR AND 15 MINUTES	= 75 MINUTES
ONE AND A HALF HOURS	= 90 MINUTES
ONE AND THREE QTR HRS	= 105 MINUTES
TWO HOURS	= 120 MINUTES
TWO AND A QUARTER HRS	= 135 MINUTES
TWO AND A HALF HOURS	= 150 MINUTES
999 = DON'T KNOW/NO ANSWER	
ENTER NUMBER HERE ----->	MINUTES

[IV: IF TELECOMMUTE, ASK HOW LONG IT TAKES IF/WHEN THEY DO DRIVE]

{Q: COMMTIME}

***If WORKING FULL TIME or WORKING PART TIME to WORK, ASK***

During the past year, has your commuting time to and from work gotten longer, gotten shorter or stayed about the same?

- 1 GOTTEN LONGER
- 2 GOTTEN SHORTER
- 3 STAYED ABOUT THE SAME
- 4 NOT WORKING ONE YEAR AGO [VOLUNTEERED]
- 8 DON'T KNOW
- 9 REFUSED

{Q: TELECOM}

***If WORKING FULL TIME or WORKING PART TIME to WORK, ASK***

Now we'd like to ask about telecommuting or teleworking. A telecommuter is someone who spends a whole day or more per week working at home or at a telecommuting center closer to home, instead of going to their main place of work.

Do you ever telecommute or telework?

- 1 Yes
- 2 No
- 3 Home is main place of work
- 8 DON'T KNOW
- 9 REFUSED

{Q: TELTIME}

***If YES to TELECOM, ASK***

In the past 12 months, how often have you telecommuted or teleworked?

- 1 All the time
- 2 Several times a week but not every day
- 3 Several times a month
- 4 Once or twice a month
- 5 Several times a year
- 8 DON'T KNOW
- 9 REFUSED

{Q: RGENDER}

There are just a couple of final questions. As I mentioned, all of your answers are strictly confidential, and you can skip any questions you don't wish to answer.

[ENTER RESPONDENT'S GENDER: ASK ONLY IF NECESSARY: SAY: "The survey requires that you tell me your gender."]

- 3 MALE
- 4 FEMALE
- 8 DON'T KNOW/CAN'T TELL
- 9 REFUSED

{Q: MARITAL}

What is your current marital status? Are you married, separated, divorced, widowed, or have you never been married?

- 1 MARRIED
- 2 SEPARATED
- 3 DIVORCED
- 4 WIDOWED
- 5 NEVER MARRIED
- 9 REFUSED

{Q: EDUC}

What is the highest level of education you completed?

- 1 Less than 9<sup>th</sup> grade
- 2 9<sup>th</sup>-12<sup>th</sup>, but did not finish high school
- 3 High school graduate
- 4 Some college but no degree
- 5 2 year college degree/A.A./A.S.
- 6 4 year college degree/B.A./B.S.
- 7 SOME GRADUATE WORK
- 8 COMPLETED MASTERS OR PROFESSIONAL DEGREE
- 9 ADVANCED GRADUATE WORK OR PH.D.
- 10 DON'T KNOW
- 11 REFUSED

{Q: INCOME}

I am going to read a list of income ranges. Would you please stop me when I read the range that best describes your annual household income from all sources? That would be before taxes and other deductions.

[PRECISE CATEGORIES: ]

- 1 Less than 15 thousand? [\$0 -- \$14,999]
- 2 Fifteen to less than 35 thousand? [\$15,000 -- \$34,999]
- 3 Thirty-five to less than 50 thousand? [\$35,000 -- \$49,999]
- 4 Fifty to less than 75 thousand? [\$50,000 -- \$74,999]
- 5 Seventy-five to less than 100 thousand? [\$75,000 -- \$99,999]
- 6 One hundred to less than 150 thousand? [\$100,000 - \$149,999]
- 7 Over 150 thousand? [\$150,000 + ]
- 9 DON'T KNOW/REFUSED/NO ANSWER

{Q: HISPANIC}

Do you consider yourself to be of Hispanic origin?

- 1 Yes
- 2 No
- 9 DON'T KNOW/REFUSED

{Q: RACE}

Finally, I am going to read a list of racial categories. Would you tell me what category best describes you?

- 1 [READ ONE:] Caucasian / White
- 2 [READ ONE:] African American / Black
- 3 Asian [INCLUDE SOUTH ASIAN]
- 4 American Indian [NATIVE AMERICAN; INCLUDES ESKIMO, ALEUT]
- 5 Pacific Islander
- 6 MULTI-RACIAL [RECORD IN THE ORDER GIVEN BY RESPONDENT]
- 7 OTHER [SPECIFY]
- 8 HISPANIC ONLY: PLEASE PROMPT (BELOW) BEFORE SELECTING THIS
- 9 REFUSED/NO ANSWER

[IF NEC: Other than Hispanic, how might you describe yourself.]

[IF NECESSARY: Many Hispanic people may identify with a particular racial group, in addition to being Hispanic. They may think of themselves as “Black Hispanic,” “White Hispanic,” or some other racial group as well.]

{Q: RCOMM}

Those are all the questions I have for you. Before I say good-bye, are there any other comments you'd like to make? [OPEN-END]

{Q: THANKYOU}

Thank you very much for participating. We appreciate the time you have taken to complete this interview. The survey's results will be reported to the County Board at a public meeting in early fall.

[READ IF NECESSARY:] If you have any questions on the purpose of this study, you can call the Prince William Office of Executive Management at 703-792-6720, or you can call my supervisor here at the Center for Survey Research. We're at 1-800-CSR-POLL--just mention the Prince William survey.

Again, thank you and goodbye.



**Appendix B:**  
**Survey and Sampling Methodology**





---

## SURVEY AND SAMPLING METHODOLOGY

The 2010 Prince William County Citizen Satisfaction Survey was conducted by the Center for Survey Research (CSR) using a Computer-Assisted Telephone Interviewing (CATI) system, employing an innovative triple-frame telephone sampling methodology that included Random Digit Dialing [RDD] of landline telephones, a random sample of directory-listed telephone numbers, and RDD sampling of cell phone exchanges. A discussion of the general methodology appears in Section I of this report. This appendix provides additional details on how the questionnaire was developed, how the sample was selected, how the survey was administered, statistical weighting and how statistical testing was used to evaluate the results.

### Sample

In previous years, CSR employed list-assisted random-digit dialing (RDD) to reach a random sample of the households in Prince William County. RDD produces a more representative sample of the population than do most other sampling methods because households are selected for contact at random and all households with a working landline telephone can be reached. Listed and unlisted residential telephones have equal probability of being included in an RDD study. However, because of the increase in the use of cell phones by respondents, the rise in cell phone-only adults, and the decreasing efficiency in RDD, leading survey organizations have begun to field telephone surveys that include cell phone samples. Cell phone samples are less efficient to call than landlines (fewer completions per hour) but reach populations that are less well represented in landline samples. CSR is the first academic survey organization in Virginia to use this developing methodology.

A pilot study of cell phones, funded jointly by CSR and by Prince William County, was fielded by CSR in January-February 2008.<sup>1</sup> This pilot study completed interviews with 134 adult cell phone users residing in the County, including 45 cell phone-only adults, and provided CSR with an opportunity to develop appropriate procedures, disposition codes, survey questions, and training materials for surveying cell phones. The pilot demonstrated the feasibility of cell phone surveying and allowed assessment of the costs, which are two to three times higher (per interview) than ordinary RDD interviewing. Respondents in the cell phone pilot were offered a cash incentive to complete the interview, in recognition of the fact that some cell phone users incur usage fees if they stay on the phone to complete the interview.

The cell phone pilot not only showed the feasibility of cell phone calling, but demonstrated that the demographics of those reached via cell phone are quite different from those currently reachable via landline phone. Cell phone respondents are markedly younger, more likely to be single and never-married, more likely to be renters, newcomers to the County, low-income, and members of minority groups (African-American or Hispanic). The pilot also tested the extent to which these respondents differed from those in the main survey in their level of satisfaction with County services. For most items, there was little difference in satisfaction, but for some items differences were large enough to be substantively significant.

In light of these results, County staff agreed that subsequent citizen satisfaction surveys should include a cellular (wireless) telephone sample. For the 2008 survey, CSR repeated a cell phone incentive experiment from the 2007 pilot study and demonstrated that if cell phone samples were randomly divided into two groups where half were offered a \$5 incentive and the other half \$10, using the higher \$10.00 incentive actually led to a net cost savings. Given a standard cost estimate of \$32 per interviewing hour for telephone production, the increase in the rate of completions per hour can actually save more than the

---

<sup>1</sup> Abdoulaye Diop, Young-Il Kim, John Lee Holmes, and Thomas M. Guterbock. *Prince William County Cell Phone Pilot Survey [A Supplement to the 2007 Citizen Satisfaction Survey]: Summary Report of Results*. Center for Survey Research, March 2008.

cost of an extra \$5.00 in incentive payment. This estimate does not include processing fees and other administrative costs. Table B-1 illustrates this result.

**Table B-1: Cell phone \$5.00 v. \$10.00 incentive cost calculations from 2008 experiment**

PWC Incentive Productivity 2008							
	Rate/hr	minutes / interview		Ave. cost / hour	Interview cost	Incentive cost	Total \$ / Interview
2008 Cell+\$10	0.56	107.61	Min	\$32.00	\$57.39	\$10.00	\$67.39
2008 Cell+\$5	0.46	131.37	Min	\$32.00	\$70.06	\$5.00	\$75.06
<b>Difference</b>		<b>23.76</b>	<b>minutes less for \$10</b>		<b>\$12.67</b>	<b>Savings:</b>	<b>\$7.67</b>

As a consequence of this experiment, the current Citizen Satisfaction Survey includes only a \$10.00 incentive for interviewing on the telephone.

To partially offset the additional cost of including cell phones, the sample design included a substantial number of cases to be completed from a random sample of directory-listed numbers, referred to below as “listed sample.” (Listed sample is sometimes referred to as EWP sample in the literature because it is derived from the “electronic white pages.”) In several conference presentations since 2008, CSR researchers have demonstrated that the cost of pursuing an RDD sample may not be worthwhile if cell phone numbers are sampled as well, arguing that listed sample combined with cell phone sample might offer a closely comparable degree of representativeness.<sup>2</sup> Rather than discard the RDD approach entirely, the 2008 through 2010 survey designs split the landline portion of the sample into an RDD portion (the method used in prior years of the survey) and a listed-sample portion drawing on a random selection of directory-listed telephone numbers from any area of Prince William County. This choice was made to preserve comparability with prior years of the survey, and to allow further exploration of whether RDD produces different results. In addition, for the eighth year the survey included geographic over-sampling (based on listed sample for specific areas) to include a larger number of respondents in smaller study areas. The larger sample size allows for a more detailed examination of the responses from the less populated areas in the county. This targeted directory-listed supplement included the Forest Park (22025, 22026 and 22172), Potomac (22191), Dale (22193) and Hoadly (20112) areas. Geographic weighting was used to generalize results to the entire county without over-representing any particular district.

Finally, since the 2009 survey, the relative sizes of RDD, listed and cell phone samples have shifted towards a lower proportion of RDD and higher proportion of cell phone sample. In 2010, the RDD sample of numbers randomly generated from five-digit call groups known to be in operation in Prince William County comprised 23% of the total sample, down from 31% in 2009 and 45% in 2008. A second, general directory-listed sample from the electronic white pages supplemented by a targeted-geography listed sample was roughly equivalent for the three years (32% of the 2010 total compared to 29% in 2009 and 28% in 2008) since implementing the triple-frame study design (RDD, listed and cellular). These

<sup>2</sup>Thomas M. Guterbock, James Ellis, Abdoulaye Diop, Kien Le, and John Lee Holmes. “Who Needs RDD: Combining Directory Listings with Cell Phone Exchanges for an Alternative Sampling Frame” Paper presented at the Annual Meetings of the American Association for Public Opinion Research, New Orleans, May 2008, and accepted for publication in *Social Science Research*, 2010.

landline samples are combined with a cell phone sample which in 2010 was increased to 45% of the total, up from 40% in 2009 and 28% in 2008. However, because of the greater efficiency of landline calling, the proportion of listed to RDD completed interviews shifted towards the listed sample. In the completed interviews, 16.4 percent of respondents were reached via cell phone. Overall, an increase in the proportion of cell phone to landline sample along with the use of targeted listed sample helps to ensure greater representation of harder to reach populations and geographies.

Samples were purchased from Survey Sampling, Inc. of Fairfield, CT, a commercial sampling company that uses state-of-the-art methodologies. Table B-2 summarizes the sample purchased and completions (completions and partials used for analysis) for the different sample types.

**Table B-2: Summary of Survey Sample Types Used, 2010**

Phone Type	Sample (%)	Completed (%)	Ratio (sample:completes)
RDD	3254 (22.0%)	427 (26.1%)	8:1
Listed-General	3804 (25.7%)	756 (46.2%)	5:1
Listed-Targeted	1365 (9.2%)	186 (11.4%)	7:1
Cellular	6399 (43.2%)	268 (16.4%)	24:1
<b>Total</b>	<b>14822</b>	<b>1637 100%</b>	<b>9:1</b>

Table B-3 below breaks down sample type by geography and illustrates how interviews from the targeted-listed sample were used to supplement responses in these four areas.

**Table B-3: Respondents by Sample Type and Area, 2010**

2010 AREA	Sample Type				Total
	Random Digit Dialing	Directory Listed-General	Directory Listed-Targeted	Cell phone	
Battlefield	96	133	--	42	271
Broad Run	60	111	--	49	220
Hoadly	26	57	125	18	226
Old Bridge	51	137	1	32	221
Dale	90	139	12	39	280
Potomac	52	73	32	56	213
Forest Park	<u>48</u>	<u>103</u>	<u>16</u>	<u>30</u>	<u>198</u>
<b>Total</b>	<b>423</b>	<b>753</b>	<b>186</b>	<b>266</b>	<b>1,628*</b>

\*18 cases were not associated with an area

Telephone surveys risk biases owing to variation among members of a household in the likelihood of answering the telephone. For example, persons who do not work may be more likely to be available to answer the phone than are those who are employed. Various methods have been developed to randomize respondents within households in order to reduce these biases. For the fourth year, CSR used a “minimally intrusive method” which combines random selection (between two adults) by computer with the “last-birthday” method (if household has three or more adults), in which we ask to speak to the adult

in the household who had the most recent birthday or, if last birthday is unknown, with the Kish selection process of enumerating first names of eligible household members for random selection by the computer.<sup>3</sup> This protocol was applied to all households reached via the RDD or listed samples. Cell phone adults, however, were considered to be sampled as individuals. Prior research by others has shown that the percentage of cell phones actively shared by more than one adult is low and that it is very difficult in practice to accomplish a ‘hand-off’ of the cell phone from one adult to another randomly selected user of the phone.<sup>4</sup> Therefore, no within-household selection was attempted in the cell phone interviews for this study.

## Questionnaire

This is the tenth Prince William County survey to use the alternating-questions survey format. In an effort to reduce the overall number of questions asked in every year while retaining the ability to make comparisons over multiple years, beginning in 2001 questions were divided into three categories: those that are to be asked every year, those to be asked in only even years, and those to be asked in only odd years. This format, implemented January 2001 by the County government and CSR staff to control survey length, contains core questions to be asked each year and two sets of questions included in the survey in alternate years. The form is: Core plus group A in odd-numbered years, followed by Core plus group B in the even years. The 2010 survey includes the core questions, plus many of the questions designated group B. To allow reliable comparisons among the results of the eighteen surveys, the wording of most of the questions was left identical to that used in the previous surveys.

The 2010 survey continued the practice of “question rationing” begun in 1995. This is a system for asking certain questions of fewer than all respondents, in order to ask a larger number of questions and obtain a sufficiently large sample of responses to each question without making the survey substantially longer for any individual respondent.

In early 2008, the Prince William County Police Department contracted with the Center for Survey Research for an inter-disciplinary, two-year evaluation of the Department’s execution of the illegal immigration enforcement policy enacted by the County Board in 2007 and put into effect in March 2008. As part of this evaluation process, the department requested that additional questions be placed on the annual citizen survey to measure public perceptions of the police performance in this controversial arena of activity. It is expected that the questions added for the 2008 through 2010 surveys about the police execution of the policy (PPOLICY), fairness of the police (POLFAIR), and about crime victimization and reporting will be retained in subsequent surveys as part of this continued evaluation process. (Part of the cost of these additional questions is offset by funding from the police department through the separate evaluation contract with U.Va.). For the 2009 and 2010 surveys, four new pairs of questions were added to the survey for use by the evaluation team, N1/2OCROWD, N3/4VACANT, N5/6UPKEEP, LOITER/LOITNOW.

The questionnaire was pre-tested May 27<sup>th</sup>, May 28<sup>th</sup> and May 30<sup>th</sup>, 2010. The pre-test resulted in 40 completed interviews with households in Prince William County. The median survey length on the pretest was 20 minutes from the start of the survey to hang-up. Based on the pre-test, we refined our training procedures, evaluated the average interview length, adjusted the question-rationing percentages

---

<sup>3</sup> Programmed by CSR into the CATI system based on the method’s description in Louis Rizzo, J. Michael Brick and Inho Park “A Minimally Intrusive Method for Sampling Persons in Random Digit Dial Surveys,” *Public Opinion Quarterly*, Vol. 68, No. 2 (2004), pp. 267-274.

<sup>4</sup> J. Michael Brick, W. Sherman Edwards, and Sunghee Lee.”Sampling Telephone Numbers and Adults, Interview Length, and Weighting in The California Health Interview Survey Cell Phone Pilot Study.” *Public Opinion Quarterly* ( 2007) 71: 793-813.

downward to bring the median interview length below 19 minutes, and corrected minor errors in the CATI program for production interviews.

This year for the fifth time, CSR translated the survey into Spanish and used Spanish-English bilingual interviewers so that the survey could be conducted as easily in Spanish as in English. To enable a proper translation that would achieve comparable results in the Spanish language version of the survey, the English language instrument was sent out to Research Support Services (RSS), a firm that specializes in language translation of survey instruments. They used a Modified Committee Approach carried out by a team of three experienced survey translators and a committee referee. The translators and referee were all native speakers of Spanish (from Mexico, Puerto Rico, Peru and Argentina). In the committee meeting they discussed item by item to determine which word choices would convey the closest meaning to the widest spectrum of Spanish speakers. In addition, decisions on word choice were also affected by the firm's assessment of the demographic characteristics of Spanish speakers in the Virginia area. CSR's lead Spanish interviewer discussed translation decisions with the referee of the RSS team to ensure that the on-site interviewers understood why word choices were made.

The Sawtooth WinCATI software enables switching out English and Spanish surveys without interruption as long as the interviewer is bilingual. Otherwise, English speaking interviewers coded a household as likely Spanish-speaking and then a bilingual interviewer received that number in their calling queue. The lead bilingual interviewer monitored the other Spanish language interviewers to ensure quality and adherence to the Spanish language text. Open-end comments were recorded verbatim in Spanish and then translated by the lead bilingual interviewer.

## **Interviewing Procedures**

CSR conducted the telephone interviews from its Computer-Assisted Telephone Interviewing (CATI) Laboratory at the University of Virginia. CATI is a system in which computers are employed to increase the efficiency, accuracy, and flexibility of telephone surveys conducted by trained interviewers. Questions appear on the computer screen in programmed sequence as the interviewer presses the keys on the keyboard to record the respondent's answers. Accurate, instantaneous data entry is assured by the system. The computer system stores the database of telephone numbers and is used to control the sampling process, dial each sampled number, schedule callbacks, and record the disposition of each attempted call.

Production calling for the survey was carried out from June 27 through August 29, 2010. All telephone calls for the study were made from the CATI laboratory under the direct supervision of CSR staff. Numbers were dialed automatically by the WinCATI computer system. Calling was done on Sunday through Friday evenings and on Sunday afternoons. The interviewers received at least six hours of training prior to production interviewing. Many had prior interviewing experience on similar studies, some had prior experience with the Prince William County studies specifically, and many were veterans of several cell phone studies. Each phone number was given from 8 to 12 call attempts before it was treated as a "no answer" or "busy" number. Landline phones answered by automatic answering machines were treated the same as "no answer" calls (although counted separately); CSR interviewers did not leave messages on the answering machines of potential landline respondents but simply returned the phone number to the sample pool for another calling attempt at a later time. However, answering machine announcements that identified the phone number as a place of business were recorded as such and not re-attempted.

For cell phones, which are often answered by voicemail systems, interviewers left an appropriate message on the first calling attempt only. The message included an invitation to call back at a toll-free number, but very few callbacks were received. Nevertheless, the messages probably served to increase future receptivity to calls from CSR. On cell phones that identified themselves as businesses, the number was not removed until the cell phone owner confirmed that it was a business only, or three attempts were made. This is because many small business owners use their cell phone for business and personal affairs but leave only a business message on their voice mail.

During the 1996 survey we began the practice known as “conversion calling,” which was used again this year, in order to reduce “non-response bias.” Non-response bias in surveys results when qualified respondents do not complete a survey, usually because they refuse to cooperate. In conversion calling, our most highly trained interviewers call back households in which we previously had someone refuse to take the survey. First, we kept track of the “tone” of initial refusals. “Hard” refusals, those in which people explicitly asked not to be called again, or were noticeably agitated or upset about our phone call, were not called back at all. “Soft” refusals, those for which it seemed that we only caught someone at a bad time, were called back once more after an interval of at least three days. In addition, “hard” refusal respondents who additionally request to be put on CSR’s do not call list are removed from calling for three years. This is in keeping with best practices recommendations in the survey industry.

## Productivity and Response Rates

A total of 79,630 dialing attempts were made in the course of the survey, involving a sample of 14,822 different attempted phone numbers and resulting in 1637 complete or nearly complete cases used for analysis. The interviews took an average of 19.5 minutes to complete once a qualified respondent was identified, with a median time of 18.6 minutes.<sup>5</sup> Interviews completed in the Spanish language took 26.4 minutes on average to complete once a qualified respondent was identified compared to 19.3 minutes in English. Some of the differences in length can be accounted for because a higher proportion of Spanish language surveys were conducted by cell phone (70.2%) than was the case in English (14.4%). Cell phone surveys tend to be shorter at the beginning because of the simpler selection process but longer at the end because of the need to obtain information for providing the incentive. In addition, questions were rationed less for Spanish language interviews to gain more question coverage by this subgroup.

Landline surveys have a more complex selection process (discussed above) aimed at randomizing participant selection within a household. For the cell phone it was assumed that the person answering the phone was the primary user unless stated otherwise by the respondent. This contributed to cell phone surveys being shorter at the respondent selection portion on average than landline. However, overall, cell phone interviews tend to be longer: the average length from greeting to goodbye on a landline interview was 22.4 minutes whereas for the cell phone it was 25.4 minutes. If we look at the point at which a qualified respondent was selected, the cellular telephone survey took 22.2 minutes on average compared to 19.3 minutes for the landline.

The final disposition of each of the attempted phone numbers is shown in two tables at the end of this Appendix. This year’s disposition report, like those reported since 1998, is presented in a format that has been recommended as an industry standard by the American Association for Public Opinion Research.<sup>6</sup> The AAPOR rate was calculated by a custom analysis of the complete call history of each attempted number, using a program written in SPSS by CSR technical staff. This report is based on 1637 interviews, including 1541 complete interviews (including those completed in the conversion phase of calling) and 96 partial interviews which were sufficiently complete for use in the analysis. The overall response rate is

---

<sup>5</sup>These times indicate the “completion time”—the time that it took the interviewer to complete the interview from within-household selection of a qualified respondent to goodbye. For this year, the amount of time that the respondent household was actually on the phone, e.g. from greeting to goodbye, comprised an average of 21.81 minutes, with a median of 20.77 minutes and the total amount of time spent by the interviewer on each record (which adds interviewer time making any final comments on the interview and clearing the record) was 22.94 minutes on average (21.83 median).

<sup>6</sup>The American Association for Public Opinion Research. 1998. *Standard Definitions: Final Dispositions of Case Codes and Outcome Rates for RDD Telephone Surveys and In-Person Household Surveys*. Ann Arbor, Michigan: AAPOR. See also the AAPOR website, [www.aapor.org](http://www.aapor.org).

20.2%, including a landline response rate of 24.0% and a wireless (cellular) sample response rate of 14.3%.<sup>7</sup> Fifty-seven interviews were conducted in Spanish.

The true response rate depends on how one estimates the percentage of working residential phones that exist among the many numbers that never answered our numerous call attempts. This is especially significant for our RDD sample where the most conservative estimate (equivalent to the CASRO rate – not shown in the table) excludes partial cases and assumes that the percentage of residential households among unreachable numbers is the same as the percentage among those we reached, *i.e.*, 73.7%. This would lower our estimate of RR3 for the RDD sample to 21.6%. However, because CSR completed multiple attempts to nearly all of the no-answer numbers and based upon prior experimentation with listed and RDD samples in Virginia, we estimate that the residency rate is in fact around 20% of no-answer numbers and that our true response rate (adjusted RR3) for RDD is closer to 23.5%. Within the landline sample, however, listed numbers (22.2% RR3) do not receive this adjustment and so our total landline response rate is the weighted average of the two landline components. For the cell phone portion of the sample, the estimated response rate is 12.9% (RR3) and as with directory-listed sample the adjustment is not used since there are as yet no verified estimates of actual “residency” (that is, the proportion cell phones in the sample that are activated and used in the target geography). The total response rate is the weighted average of the triple-frame components.<sup>8</sup>

Finally, the efficiency of the calling can be expressed in terms of number of completions per hour of calling (CPH). The overall interview production rate (0.74 interviews per hour) is less than prior surveys, mostly due to the higher proportion of cell phones in the sample as well as declining rates of RDD productivity nationwide. For the 1369 landline cases the production rate was .86, whereas for the 281 cellular respondents production was .45. Table B-4 breaks out the production rates for each sample component.

**Table B-4: Respondents by Sample Type and Area, 2010**

<b>PWC Citizen Satisfaction Survey 2010 Productivity</b>		
	<b>Interviews</b>	<b>Rate/hr</b>
PR1: RDD	427	0.74
PR2: List-General Area	756	1.03
PR3: Cell	268	0.45
PR4 List-Targeted geography	186	1.07
<b>Cell respondents only</b>	268	0.45
<b>Landline respondents only</b>	1369	.86
<b>TOTAL</b>	<b>1637</b>	<b>0.74</b>

<sup>7</sup> Calculated according to AAPOR suggested formula RR4, with  $e1=.45$  and  $e2=.72$ . For RDD cases we estimated the percent of working, residential numbers among those that were found to always be busy or no-answer (the residency rate) to be .20. This estimate is based on the results of prior CSR experiments that compare RDD sample results with directory-listed sample results for Virginia. We estimated  $e2$  by dividing households determined to be eligible by the N of households overall. The estimated  $e2$  was applied to housing units where eligibility could not be determined. We derived  $e1$  by taking the product of  $e2$  and the estimated residency rate. This rate was applied to numbers that were never reached and could not be determined to be residential households. Partial interviews are not counted in the numerator of the RR3 formula but are counted in the RR4. Our RR3 response rate with partial interviews excluded was 19.0% overall, 22.7% for landline and 12.9% for wireless.

<sup>8</sup> The RR4 estimates for RDD and directory-listed samples for 2010 were 25.1% and 23.3%, respectively.

## Geography

In order to perform a geographic analysis of survey responses, CSR has grouped respondents into areas according to the Zone Improvement Plan (ZIP) code area in which they live. The Zip code is preferable to other methods because most respondents are willing and able to specify their Zip code. Obtaining Zip codes in each annual survey facilitates comparisons over time.

The regions of Prince William County used in the present analysis are defined by Zip code groupings, which were developed in consultation with the study sponsors. They were originally selected to represent distinct and meaningful groupings of the population, while collecting a sufficient number of respondents from each region to allow fruitful statistical analysis.

From the survey’s inception in 1993 through 2001, the County was divided into five geographic areas. Several Zip code numbers in the County changed effective 1 July 1996; however, except for the splitting of two previous Manassas-area Zip code areas, this involved no changes in Zip code boundaries, and the boundaries of the five geographic regions used in our 1997-2001 analysis are identical to those used in 1994, 1995 and 1996, before the number changes took effect.

In 2002, because of growth in the County, the regional groupings were further refined. The “Rural-Residential Crescent” was divided into four areas – North County, Gainesville/Linton Hall, Brentsville and Mid County – creating a total of eight geographic areas. The 2002 regions are defined by Zip code in the table below.

For the 2006 survey a few changes in population distribution were significant. A portion of the areas designated with the 22193 Zip code in prior surveys were moved to 22192 because these areas, formerly part of the Dale City survey area, are now part of the Lake Ridge-Westridge-Occoquan survey area. It is likely that survey respondents living in this area reported their Zip code differently that year but this change did not affect the definition of the distribution areas for Prince William County. One change that did slightly modify the distribution areas from the 2005 Survey was the addition of Zip code 22025 to the Woodbridge-Dumfries survey area. Table B-5 shows the relationship between the Zip codes and the geographic areas through 2006.

**Table B-5: Zip Code by Area Distribution, 1993-2006**

AREA	2006 Zip Codes	2002-2005 Zip Codes	1997-2001 Zip Codes	1993-1996 Zip Codes
Woodbridge-Dumfries	22025, 22026, 22172, 22191	22026, 22172, 22191	Same	Same
Dale City	22193	Same	Same	Same
Lake Ridge-Westridge- Occoquan	22125, 22192	Same	Same	Same
Sudley-Yorkshire	20109, 20110	Same	Same	Same
Rural-Residential Crescent:		Divided into four additional areas	20111, 20112, 20119, 20136, 20137, 20143, 20155, 20169, 20181	Same
North County	20137, 20169, 20143	Same		
Gainesville-Linton Hall	20136, 20155			
Brentsville	20181	20119, 20181		
Mid County	20111, 20112	Same		



The County determined that for the 2007 and subsequent surveys an entirely new distribution of the areas would be implemented to better approximate all magisterial districts using the Zip codes. This new grouping of seven areas permitted statistically significant comparisons between the sub-regions using a lower overall sample size than in previous years. Table B-6 shows the relationship between these new areas and the Zip codes.

**Table B-6: Zip Code by Area Distribution, since 2007**

<b>2007-current AREA</b>	<b>2007-current Zip Codes</b>
Battlefield	20109, 20137, 20143, 20155, 20169
Broad Run	20110, 20111, 20136, 20181
Hoadly	20112
Old Bridge	22125, 22192
Dale	22193
Potomac	22191
Forest Park	22025, 22026, 22172

Table B-7 provides the sample distribution of the post-2007 seven-area grouping, indicating how the Zip code distribution for the current 2010 sample responses falls into each. Note that we did not have 2010 Zip code population estimates available and weighted the data to the 2009 statistics. In addition, the geographic weight presented in the table is prior to the process of iterative combination of weights described below.

**Table B-7: Distribution of Current Responses into New Regional Breakdown, and Weight Values**

<b>2007-9 Areas (7)</b>	<b>Population of Households, 2009</b>		<b>2010 Unweighted Sample</b>		<b>Geographic Weight</b>
	(count)	(%)	(count)	(%)	
Battlefield	30,719	23.60%	279	16.55%	1.426
Broad Run	16,914	12.99%	237	13.44%	0.967
Hoadly	7,857	6.04%	234	13.81%	0.437
Old Bridge	18,058	13.87%	245	13.50%	1.028
Dale	24,036	18.47%	298	17.10%	1.080
Potomac	20,100	15.44%	220	13.01%	1.187
Forest Park	12,482	9.59%	208	12.03%	0.797
<b>Total</b>	<b>130,166</b>	<b>100.00%</b>	<b>1,646</b>	<b>100.00%</b>	

## Weighting

Statistical weighting of the survey results was designed this year to accomplish two objectives: (1) to correctly represent the seven geographic areas, and (2) to properly represent different types of phone service in the County's population (cell phone-only cases, landline-only cases, and those with both kinds of telephone service), as well as the correct proportion of unlisted landline telephones.

*Geographic weighting.* This year continues the practice begun five years ago of using statistical weighting to correct within-county geographic representation. This procedure was necessary for countywide generalizations because of the over-sample designed to offer a more detailed examination of the responses from the four less populated areas in the county. The data are weighted to properly reflect the proportion

of households in each of the County's districts as demonstrated in Table B-7 above.<sup>9</sup> The table shows the percentage of the area in the population as of June 30, 2010 compared to its percentage in the sample. The geographic weight is the amount each case would need to be multiplied by in order to have the sample percentage for each area be equal to its actual population proportion. In practice, the geographic weight is often combined with other weights through an iterative process called "raking."

*Cell phone weighting.* Current research on cell phone interviewing is developing rapidly, and there are no standard, accepted methods for weighting the results of a 'dual frame' sample that combines completed interviews from landline samples with completed interviews from cell phone samples. Prof. Guterbock has been working on the development of appropriate methods, and our approach to the current study applies his latest research to the available local data. Here we treat RDD and listed samples as one "landline" sample, thus treating our triple-frame design as a dual-frame sample (cell phone and landline sampling frames).

The heart of the weighting problem is simple: there is no available external source that will tell us the percentage of the County population that has cell phone-only service, landline only, or both. Authoritative data are collected at the national level by the Centers for Disease Control in the National Health Interview Survey, a very large, continuous, in-person data collection focused on health issues.<sup>10</sup> That survey determines the phone-service status of each household in a representative national sample, and results from as recently as the second half of 2008 are currently available. However, these data are available only at the national or broad regional level. It is doubtful that these broad averages across regions are directly applicable to Prince William County.

The estimation problem is made somewhat more difficult by the fact that rates of survey response are not even across different phone-use segments. That is, cell phone-only adults are much more likely to answer their cell phones than are those who have both kinds of phones. This is understood to reflect differences in telephone behavior between cell phone-onlies and dual-phone users. Cell phone-onlies are presumably more likely to have their phones with them, to have their phones turned on, and to accept calls from unknown numbers than are those who continue to rely on landline phones. For these reasons, the percentage of cell phone-only cases encountered in actual cell phone surveys is much higher than their actual share among all cell phone users. It is probably also the case that landline-only households are somewhat overrepresented within landline samples, as compared to those who have both kinds of phone. The latter group is referred to below as the *overlap sample*, because the households having both landline and cell phones lie at the intersection of the cell phone frame and the landline frame.

In order to estimate the degree of under-representation of the overlap sample segment in the cell phone sample and in the landline sample, we compared results from the 2007 California Health Interview Survey (a telephone survey combining RDD sample with cell phone-only households) with the results from NHIS for the Western Region of the United States (second-half 2007 results).<sup>11</sup> Using algebraic formulas developed by Prof. Guterbock, we were able to determine the values for two *response rate ratios*:  $r_1$ , the ratio of the response rate to cell phone calling in the overlap sample compared to the response rate of cell phone-onlies, and  $r_2$ , the ratio of the response rate to landline calling in the overlap sample to the response rate of landline-onlies. The NHIS for the Western region reports that the phone-service proportions in the Western region were: 13.2% cell phone-only, 67.9% dual-phone (overlap), and 18.9% landline only. If response rates were equal ( $r_1 = r_2 = 1.0$ ), and if California's phone usage is the

---

<sup>9</sup> This household population information by Zip code was provided by Prince William County and is based on Census Survey Area Demographics excluding Quantico base and is accurate to June 30, 2009.

<sup>10</sup> Steven J. Blumberg and J.V. Luke. "Wireless Substitution: Early Release of Estimates from the National Health Interview Survey, July-December 2007." National Center for Health Statistics, May 13, 2008. Available at: <http://www.cdc.gov/nchs/nhis.htm>.

<sup>11</sup> Thanks to Michael Brick of Westat for sharing some of the preliminary results from CHIS 2007 for this purpose.

same as that of the Western region, then the CHIS 2007 would have found 16.3% of the cell phone completions to be cell phone-onlies. Instead, CHIS 2007 reports 34.6% percent cell phone-onlies. CHIS should have found 21.7% landline-onlies in the landline sample, but actually had 32.7% landline-onlies in its landline RDD sample. Applying Guterbock’s formulas to these data results in an estimate of  $r_1 = .368$  and  $r_2 = .598$ .

The telephone service weights were determined using final survey data as shown in Table B-8. The “estimated true” values are derived by application of the values for  $r_1$  and  $r_2$  estimated above to the data from our 2010 survey completions in PWC.

**Table B-8: Initial estimates of the phone-service segments in Prince William County**

	Cell phone sample		Landline sample		Combined samples		Est. true	Weight	Weighted N	
<b>Cell Only</b>	124	46.3%	1	0.1%	125	7.6%	23.41%	3.066	383	23.4%
<b>Overlap (Both)</b>	142	53.0%	1230	89.8%	1372	83.8%	71.74%	0.856	1174	71.7%
<b>LL Only</b>	2	--	138	10.1%	140	8.6%	4.85%	0.567	79	4.8%
	<b>268</b>		<b>1369</b>		<b>1637</b>		<b>100%</b>		<b>1637</b>	

Once these estimates were made, a further decision needed to be made about weighting the overlap sample. By design, we did not complete a very large number of cell phone cases because of their greater expense. In theory, if all phones in the County had been called with equal likelihood, we would have reached one half of the overlap sample through their cell phone and one half through their landline. This would call for weighting the portion of the overlap sample reached through cell phone up by a very large weight to bring their share of the overlap to 50%, which could potentially have distorted the results and also increased the ‘design effect’ in the study, reducing the precision of the estimates. We decided to apply a weight of 2.0 to the cell phone cases in our overlap sample, allowing the weight on the landline cases in the overlap sample to take a value that would result in an overall overlap percentage in the weighted sample of 71.74%. Table B-9 shows these weights as applied to the completions in the final sample.

**Table B-9: Final estimates of the phone-service segments in Prince William County**

	Cell phone sample		Landline sample		Combined samples		Est. true	Weight	Weighted N	
<b>Cell only</b>	124	46.3%	1	0.1%	125	7.6%	23.41%	3.066	383	23.4%
<b>Overlap:</b>										
Cell	142	53.0%	0		142	8.7%	<b>17.35%</b>	2.000	284	17.4%
<b>Overlap</b>										
: LL	0		1230	89.8%	1230	75.1%	54.39%	0.724	890	54.4%
<b>LL only</b>	2	--	138	10.1%	140	8.6%	4.85%	0.567	79	4.9%
	<b>268</b>		<b>1369</b>		<b>1637</b>		<b>100%</b>		<b>1637</b>	

*Listed status weighting.* We also weighted the results to accurately represent unlisted landline cases. These are somewhat underrepresented because the directory-listed sample has only a small percentage of unlisted households. To correct for this, we weighted all unlisted landline households reached on either the RDD or EWP (listed) samples so that, in total, they represent 16.6 percent of the landline completions, or 12.7 percent of all completions.

The final step in the weighting process was “raking,” a statistical procedure used to produce combined weights for the three weighting factors: geography, phone service type, and listed versus unlisted telephone status. The percentages for geographical areas in Table B-7 were used along with the weights for phone usage from Table B-9 in an iterative process that produced a final weight for each of the 56 design cells (4 phone-service segments × 7 areas × 2 listed statuses [unlisted landline versus all others]) that would best fit with the given marginal population distribution for each weighting factor. This procedure necessarily treats the distribution of phone-service segments as being equal across the geographic areas.

A more complete description of the cell phone estimation procedures used here, along with algebraic formulas needed to calculate and apply the response rate ratios, is available upon request.<sup>12</sup>

## Sampling Error and Statistical Testing

Our final sample includes 1,637 respondents. If these cases had been drawn by simple random sample, the survey would have a margin of error of plus or minus 2.42 percent. However, in addition to sampling error there is a design effect that impacts the total margin of error which we calculate by introducing the weights derived by the “raking” process described above into the Complex Sampling module of SPSS statistical software. This tool allows calculation of a “design effect” for each question in the survey. The design effect shows how the variance of sample estimates is increased by the effect of post-stratification weighting. We base our estimate of the overall margin of error on a key survey question, the satisfaction with overall services in the County (CTYSAT). For that question, the design effect is 1.692, meaning that the margin of error in our sample for the 1,622 respondents who answered that question is equivalent (because of the weighting) to the margin of error we would have obtained from a simple random sample of 959 (1,622/1.691). The margin of error is increased by the square root of the design effect, a factor in this case of 1.30. The final margin of error is 3.16%. This means that in 95 out of 100 samples of this size drawn from Prince William County, the results obtained in the sample would fall in a range of ± 3.16 percentage points of what would have been obtained had every household in the County with a working landline or cellular telephone been interviewed. Larger sampling errors are present when analyzing subgroups of the sample or questions that were not asked of all respondents; smaller sampling errors are present when a lopsided majority gives the same answer (e.g., 80 percent of the sample are satisfied with a given service).

Statistical significance tests were used for two principal purposes. One was to compare the results of the 2010 survey with those obtained in previous years. The other was to verify the existence of satisfaction differences among various subgroups. For both of these purposes, we used the Pearson Chi-Square test of independence. We report in these pages differences that yield a “p-value” of .05 or less. A level of .05 indicates that there is only a 5 percent chance that the difference we find is due to sampling error, rather than reflecting a real relationship within the study population. In comparisons of satisfaction items, the four response categories were collapsed into two, “satisfied” and “dissatisfied.” The statistics for evaluating statistical significance were calculated using the SPSS Complex Sampling module and hence take into account the “design effect.”<sup>13</sup> However, they do not measure sources of error, which can occur in any poll or survey that are not related to sampling or weighting.

---

<sup>12</sup> Thomas M. Guterbock. “Estimating Phone Service and Usage Percentages: How to Weight the Data from a Local, Dual-Frame Sample Survey of Cellphone and Landline Telephone Users in the United States.” Paper presented at the Annual Meetings of the American Association for Public Opinion Research, Hollywood, Florida, May 14, 2009.

<sup>13</sup> When the design effect is taken into account, tests of significance become more conservative, requiring a somewhat larger difference between groups (or change between years) to achieve significance at the 95% confidence level. In the tables that compare satisfaction across years, the tests comparing 2008 and 2009 to all other years take the design effect into account. Comparisons among earlier years do not, but there was no weighting at all in years prior to 2006, so the design effect was equal to 1.0 (no effect) for those years. For 2006 – 2007, weights

**Table B-10: Sample Disposition Report****PRINCE WILLIAM 2010 – Disposition Listing for All Samples**

[Dispositions arranged for calculation of AAPOR standard rates]

<b>Disposition Code</b>	<b>Disposition Description</b>	<b>All Samples Total</b>	<b>Random Digit Dialing</b>	<b>Directory Listed</b>	<b>Cellular (Wireless)</b>
1100	Complete	1541	400	898	243
1200	Partial	96	27	44	25
2110	Eligible: Refusal	1068	279	527	262
2120	Eligible: Break-off	210	53	113	44
2210	Eligible: Resp Never Avail	629	162	316	151
2221	Eligible: Ans Mach, No Mess	2642	819	1556	267
2222	Eligible: Ans Mach, Message	1470		1	1469
2310	Eligible: Dead	1			1
2320	Eligible: Phys/Mentally Unable	30	5	19	6
2330	Eligible: Language Unable	77	18	26	33
2340	Eligible: Misc. Unable	85	3	13	69
3120	Busy	185	56	87	42
3130	No Answer	632	203	66	363
3140	Ans Mach (Don't Know if HU)	520	53	87	380
3150	Technical Phone Problems	355	31	72	252
3210	HU, Unknown Eligible: No Scnr	1398	190	413	795
3220	HU, Unknown Eligible: Other	0			
4100	Out of Sample	1334	230	91	1013
4200	Fax/Data Line	302	213	78	11
4310	Non-working Number	1049	59	312	678
4320	Disconnected Number	401	78	240	83
4410	Number Changed	38	9	15	14
4420	Cell Phone	N/A			
4430	Call Forwarding	0			
4510	Business/Govt/Other Org	570	338	108	124
4520	Institution	1		1	
4530	Group Quarter	1		1	
4700	No Eligible Respondent	31	4	2	25
4800	Quota Filled	156	24	83	49
<b>Total</b>		<b>14822</b>	<b>3254</b>	<b>5169</b>	<b>6399</b>

used on the data were fairly small, so the design effects are not generally large enough to change the conclusions about statistical significance.

**Table B-11: Sample Disposition Summary**

**PRINCE WILLIAM 2010 – AAPOR Standard Rates Calculation**  
 [Dispositions summary for all Telephone Samples]

<b>AAPOR Standard Rates and Dispositions Summary</b>	<b>OVERALL Ave</b>	<b>Random Digit Dialing</b>	<b>Directory Listed</b>	<b>LANDLINE Ave</b>	<b>Cellular (Wireless)</b>
<i>Estimated Residency 1*</i>	0.454	0.159	0.800	0.552	0.324
<i>Estimated Residency 2</i>	0.722	0.797	0.953	0.896	0.411
Response Rate 1	0.141	0.174	0.212	0.199	0.055
Response Rate 2	0.150	0.186	0.222	0.209	0.061
Response Rate 3 *	0.190	0.235	0.222	0.227	0.129
Response Rate 4 *	0.202	0.251	0.233	0.240	0.143
Response Rate 5	0.252	0.268	0.265	0.266	0.200
Response Rate 6	0.267	0.286	0.278	0.281	0.221
Cooperation Rate 1	0.496	0.510	0.548	0.535	0.356
Cooperation Rate 2	0.527	0.544	0.574	0.565	0.392
Cooperation Rate 3	0.529	0.527	0.568	0.554	0.423
Cooperation Rate 4	0.562	0.563	0.595	0.585	0.467
Refusal Rate 1	0.117	0.144	0.151	0.149	0.070
Refusal Rate 2 *	0.158	0.195	0.159	0.173	0.188
Refusal Rate 3	0.163	0.188	0.182	0.184	0.119
Contact Rate 1	0.284	0.341	0.387	0.371	0.155
Contact Rate 2 *	0.316	0.398	0.395	0.396	0.229
Contact Rate 3	0.396	0.445	0.467	0.459	0.266
Total Dialed Attempts	79630	23467	31302	54769	24861
Complete Interview	1541	400	898	1298	243
Partial Interview	96	27	44	71	25
Refusal and Break-off	1278	332	640	972	306
Non-contact	4741	981	1873	2854	1887
Other eligible but unable	193	26	58	84	109
Unknown if household	1692	343	312	655	1037
Unknown if other	1398	190	413	603	795
Ineligible Numbers	3883	955	931	1886	1997
<b>TOTAL NUMBER OF CASES DIALED</b>	<b>14822</b>	<b>3254</b>	<b>5169</b>	<b>8423</b>	<b>6399</b>
<b>% of Landline</b>		38.6%	61.4%	100.0%	
<b>% of Overall</b>	100.0%	22.0%	34.9%	56.8%	43.2%

\*Contains CSR adjustment rate for Virginia residency for RDD portion of the sample.  
 Estimated residency rate for cellular (wireless) sample derives from Landline assumptions.  
 No adjustment estimates available for cellular samples at this time.

## **Appendix C: Demographics**





**rgender R gender**

		Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Valid	3 Male	767	46.9	50.3	50.3
	4 Female	758	46.3	49.7	100.0
	Total	1525	93.2	100.0	
Missing	8 Don't know/Can't tell	1	.1		
	9 Refused	3	.2		
	System	108	6.6		
	Total	112	6.8		
Total		1637	100.0		

**race4 Race (4 Categories)**

		Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Valid	1 White	1008	61.6	69.3	69.3
	2 Black	277	16.9	19.0	88.4
	3 Asian	60	3.6	4.1	92.5
	4 Other	109	6.7	7.5	100.0
	Total	1454	88.8	100.0	
Missing	9 Refused	68	4.2		
	System	115	7.0		
	Total	183	11.2		
Total		1637	100.0		

**agecat5 Age (5 Categories)**

		Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Valid	1 18-25	171	10.5	11.8	11.8
	2 26-37	321	19.6	22.2	34.0
	3 38-49	373	22.8	25.8	59.8
	4 50-64	382	23.4	26.4	86.2
	5 Over 64	200	12.2	13.8	100.0
	Total	1448	88.5	100.0	
Missing	System	189	11.5		
Total		1637	100.0		

**marital R's Marital Status**

		Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Valid	1 Married	897	54.8	60.4	60.4
	2 Separated	40	2.4	2.7	63.1
	3 Divorced	160	9.8	10.8	73.8
	4 Widowed	55	3.3	3.7	77.5
	5 Never married	334	20.4	22.5	100.0
	Total	1484	90.7	100.0	
Missing	9 Refused	44	2.7		
	System	108	6.6		
	Total	153	9.3		
Total		1637	100.0		

**under18\_rec**

		Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Valid	1 No children under 18	806	49.2	52.6	52.6
	2 Children under 18	726	44.4	47.4	100.0
	Total	1532	93.6	100.0	
Missing	System	105	6.4		
Total		1637	100.0		

**kundr597 Any children Under 5**

		Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Valid	1 Yes	292	17.9	40.4	40.4
	2 No	431	26.3	59.6	100.0
	Total	723	44.2	100.0	
Missing	9 Refused	2	.1		
	System	912	55.7		
	Total	914	55.8		
Total		1637	100.0		

**k5to1297 Any children age 5-12**

		Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Valid	1 Yes	377	23.0	58.6	58.6
	2 No	266	16.2	41.4	100.0
	Total	642	39.2	100.0	
Missing	9 Refused	2	.1		
	System	993	60.7		
	Total	995	60.8		
Total		1637	100.0		

**kovr1297 Any children age 13-17**

		Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Valid	1 Yes	304	18.6	58.1	58.1
	2 No	219	13.4	41.9	100.0
	Total	523	32.0	100.0	
Missing	9 Refused	2	.1		
	System	1112	67.9		
	Total	1114	68.0		
Total		1637	100.0		

**hispanic Is R of Hispanic Origin**

		Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Valid	1 Yes	214	13.1	14.3	14.3
	2 No	1285	78.5	85.7	100.0
	Total	1499	91.6	100.0	
Missing	9 Don't know/Refused	23	1.4		
	System	115	7.0		
	Total	138	8.4		
Total		1637	100.0		

**income4 Income (4 Categories)**

		Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Valid	1 Up to \$35k	214	13.1	17.3	17.3
	2 \$35k to \$50k	146	8.9	11.8	29.1
	3 \$50k to \$75k	202	12.3	16.3	45.4
	4 Over \$75k	675	41.2	54.6	100.0
	Total	1236	75.5	100.0	
Missing	System	401	24.5		
Total		1637	100.0		

**educ4 Education (4 categories)**

		Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Valid	1 High school grad or less	435	26.6	29.0	29.0
	2 Some college	371	22.7	24.7	53.8
	3 4 year degree	368	22.5	24.6	78.3
	4 Graduate work	325	19.9	21.7	100.0
	Total	1499	91.6	100.0	
Missing	System	138	8.4		
Total		1637	100.0		

**howlong\_rec Length of residence in PWC**

		Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Valid	1 2 years or less	209	12.8	12.8	12.8
	2 3 to 5 years	274	16.8	16.8	29.6
	3 6 to 10 years	413	25.3	25.3	54.9
	4 11 to 19 years	273	16.7	16.7	71.6
	5 20 years or more & all my life	464	28.3	28.4	100.0
Total		1634	99.8	100.0	
Missing	System	3	.2		
Total		1637	100.0		

**ownhome\_rec Homeowner status**

		Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Valid	1 Owns	1109	67.8	68.3	68.3
	2 Renters & others	515	31.4	31.7	100.0
	Total	1624	99.2	100.0	
Missing	System	13	.8		
Total		1637	100.0		

**kindplce\_rec Kind of place Resp. lives in**

		Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Valid	1 Single-family home	1029	62.9	63.1	63.1
	2 Duplex/Townhome	348	21.3	21.3	84.4
	3 Apartment or condo or other	254	15.5	15.6	100.0
	Total	1632	99.7	100.0	
Missing	System	5	.3		
Total		1637	100.0		

**work\_rec Work Status**

		Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Valid	1 Working full time	915	55.9	59.9	59.9
	2 Working part time	114	7.0	7.5	67.4
	3 Looking for work	113	6.9	7.4	74.8
	4 Homemaker	80	4.9	5.2	80.0
	5 Retired	215	13.1	14.1	94.1
	6 Other	90	5.5	5.9	100.0
	Total	1528	93.3	100.0	
Missing	System	109	6.7		
Total		1637	100.0		

**newarea**

		Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Valid	1 Battlefield	378	23.1	23.2	23.2
	2 Broad Run	213	13.0	13.1	36.3
	3 Hoadly	99	6.0	6.1	42.3
	4 Old Bridge	227	13.9	13.9	56.3
	5 Dale	302	18.5	18.6	74.8
	6 Potomac	253	15.4	15.5	90.4
	7 Forest Park	157	9.6	9.6	100.0
	Total	1629	99.5	100.0	
Missing	8 Other areas	8	.5		
Total		1637	100.0		



## **Appendix D: Survey Results**





zipcode R's zipcode

		Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent	
Valid	1 20109	123	7.5	7.6	7.6	
	2 20110	51	3.1	3.1	10.7	
	3 20111	60	3.7	3.7	14.4	
	4 20112	99	6.0	6.1	20.5	
	5 20119	3	.2	.2	20.7	
	6 20136	69	4.2	4.2	24.9	
	8 20143	11	.7	.7	25.6	
	9 20155	137	8.4	8.4	34.0	
	10 20169	99	6.1	6.1	40.1	
	11 20181	29	1.8	1.8	41.9	
	12 22025	74	4.5	4.5	46.4	
	13 22026	50	3.0	3.1	49.5	
	14 22125	11	.7	.7	50.2	
	16 22172	33	2.0	2.0	52.2	
	17 22191	244	14.9	15.0	67.2	
	18 22192	214	13.1	13.2	80.4	
	19 22193	302	18.4	18.6	99.0	
	20 OTHER	16	1.0	1.0	100.0	
	Total		1624	99.2	100.0	
	Missing	21 Don't know/Refused	7	.4		
System		5	.3			
Total		13	.8			
Total		1637	100.0			

cellland Is this a cellphone or landline?

		Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Valid	1 Cell phone	631	38.6	38.6	38.6
	2 Regular or landline phone	996	60.9	61.0	99.6
	3 Voice over IP [VOL.]	7	.4	.4	100.0
	Total	1634	99.8	100.0	
Missing	8 DON'T KNOW/REFUSED	1	.1		
	System	2	.1		
	Total	3	.2		
Total		1637	100.0		

**owncell Do you also have a cell phone for your personal use?**

		Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Valid	1 Yes	927	56.6	92.6	92.6
	2 No	74	4.5	7.4	100.0
	Total	1001	61.2	100.0	
Missing	9 DON'T KNOW/REFUSED	3	.2		
	System	633	38.7		
	Total	636	38.8		
Total		1637	100.0		

**celluse cellphone use**

		Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Valid	1 Personal use only	313	19.1	49.6	49.6
	3 Personal and business use	318	19.4	50.4	100.0
	Total	631	38.6	100.0	
Missing	System	1006	61.4		
Total		1637	100.0		

**haveline Do you also have a regular telephone at home?**

		Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Valid	1 Yes	254	15.5	40.2	40.2
	2 No	377	23.0	59.8	100.0
	Total	631	38.6	100.0	
Missing	System	1006	61.4		
Total		1637	100.0		

**prevres Previous Residence**

		Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Valid	1 Manassas	9	.5	1.8	1.8
	2 Manassas Park	3	.2	.6	2.4
	3 Stafford County	4	.3	.9	3.3
	4 Fredericksburg/Spotsylvania	5	.3	1.0	4.2
	5 Fauquier County/Warrenton	3	.2	.6	4.9
	6 Loudoun County	11	.7	2.2	7.1
	7 Fairfax County/Fairfax City/Falls Church	93	5.7	19.3	26.4
	8 Arlington	17	1.0	3.4	29.8
	9 Alexandria	42	2.6	8.8	38.6
	10 Richmond City or Area	1	.1	.2	38.8
	11 Elsewhere in VA	20	1.2	4.2	43.0
	12 Washington DC	4	.2	.8	43.8
	13 Maryland	25	1.5	5.1	48.9
	14 Another location	242	14.8	50.1	99.1
	15 Lived all over	3	.2	.6	99.7
	16	1	.1	.3	100.0
	Total	483	29.5	100.0	
Missing	System	1154	70.5		
Total		1637	100.0		

**qol10 Overall Impression of PWC**

		Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Valid	1 Worst	14	.9	.9	.9
	2	11	.7	.7	1.6
	3	24	1.5	1.5	3.0
	4	26	1.6	1.6	4.7
	5	142	8.7	8.8	13.4
	6	145	8.9	9.0	22.4
	7	475	29.0	29.4	51.8
	8	496	30.3	30.7	82.5
	9	158	9.7	9.8	92.2
	10 Best	125	7.7	7.8	100.0
	Total	1617	98.8	100.0	
Missing	98 Don't know/Unable to rate	6	.4		
	System	14	.9		
	Total	20	1.2		
Total		1637	100.0		

**yr5agob Rating PWC 5 Years Ago**

		Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Valid	1 Worst	4	.2	.4	.4
	2	3	.2	.3	.6
	3	11	.7	1.0	1.7
	4	37	2.3	3.5	5.2
	5	125	7.6	11.8	17.0
	6	135	8.3	12.7	29.7
	7	244	14.9	23.0	52.7
	8	311	19.0	29.3	81.9
	9	109	6.7	10.3	92.2
	10 Best	82	5.0	7.8	100.0
	Total	1062	64.9	100.0	
Missing	98 Don't know/Unable to rate	22	1.3		
	99 Refused	1	.0		
	System Total	553	33.8		
Total	1637	100.0			

**futureb Rating PWC 5 Years From Now**

		Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Valid	1 Worst	25	1.5	2.9	2.9
	2	14	.8	1.6	4.5
	3	21	1.3	2.5	7.0
	4	37	2.3	4.3	11.3
	5	60	3.6	6.9	18.2
	6	80	4.9	9.3	27.5
	7	160	9.7	18.6	46.1
	8	217	13.2	25.2	71.3
	9	141	8.6	16.4	87.7
	10 Best	106	6.5	12.3	100.0
	Total	860	52.5	100.0	
Missing	98 Don't know/Unable to rate	96	5.9		
	99 Refused	5	.3		
	System Total	676	41.3		
Total	1637	100.0			

**hpelivb Hope to live in PWC or elsewhere five years from now**

		Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Valid	1 Prince William County	897	54.8	60.7	60.7
	3 Somewhere Else	580	35.4	39.3	100.0
	Total	1477	90.2	100.0	
Missing	8 Don't know	124	7.6		
	9 Refused	2	.1		
	System	35	2.1		
	Total	160	9.8		
Total		1637	100.0		

**ctysat97 Gen Sat**

		Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Valid	1 Very satisfied	532	32.5	34.6	34.6
	2 Somewhat satisfied	880	53.8	57.3	91.9
	3 Somewhat dissatisfied	102	6.2	6.6	98.5
	4 Very dissatisfied	23	1.4	1.5	100.0
	Total	1537	93.9	100.0	
Missing	8 Don't know/Unable to rate	76	4.6		
	9 Refused	2	.1		
	System	23	1.4		
	Total	100	6.1		
Total		1637	100.0		

**vote Sat w/ Convenient Ways to Register to Vote**

		Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Valid	1 Very satisfied	524	32.0	67.0	67.0
	2 Somewhat satisfied	236	14.4	30.1	97.1
	3 Somewhat dissatisfied	12	.8	1.6	98.7
	4 Very dissatisfied	10	.6	1.3	100.0
	Total	782	47.8	100.0	
Missing	8 Don't know/Unable to rate	218	13.3		
	9 Refused	1	.0		
	System	637	38.9		
	Total	855	52.2		
Total		1637	100.0		

**voteyear Gone to voting precinct in PWC for any election in past year**

		Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Valid	1 Yes	652	39.8	58.9	58.9
	2 No	454	27.7	41.1	100.0
	Total	1105	67.5	100.0	
Missing	8 Can't recall/Don't know	6	.4		
	9 Refused	6	.3		
	System	520	31.8		
	Total	532	32.5		
Total		1637	100.0		

**pctup Sat w/ efficiency & effectiveness of voting precinct**

		Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Valid	1 Very satisfied	497	30.4	76.8	76.8
	2 Somewhat satisfied	131	8.0	20.2	97.0
	3 Somewhat dissatisfied	14	.9	2.2	99.2
	4 Very dissatisfied	5	.3	.8	100.0
	Total	648	39.6	100.0	
Missing	8 Don't know/Unable to rate	4	.2		
	System	985	60.2		
	Total	989	60.4		
Total		1637	100.0		

**govtserv Sat w/ Informing Citizens about Government**

		Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Valid	1 Very satisfied	231	14.1	27.2	27.2
	2 Somewhat satisfied	420	25.7	49.4	76.7
	3 Somewhat dissatisfied	148	9.0	17.4	94.0
	4 Very dissatisfied	51	3.1	6.0	100.0
	Total	850	51.9	100.0	
Missing	8 Don't know/Unable to rate	105	6.4		
	9 Refused	1	.0		
	System	681	41.6		
	Total	787	48.1		
Total		1637	100.0		

**strlta Sat w/ Street Lighting**

		Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Valid	1 Very satisfied	444	27.1	38.4	38.4
	2 Somewhat satisfied	517	31.6	44.7	83.2
	3 Somewhat dissatisfied	140	8.5	12.1	95.2
	4 Very dissatisfied	55	3.4	4.8	100.0
	Total	1156	70.6	100.0	
Missing	8 Don't know/Unable to rate	90	5.5		
	9 Refused	1	.1		
	System	390	23.8		
	Total	481	29.4		
Total	1637	100.0			

**fire Sat w/ Fire Fighting in R's Area**

		Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Valid	1 Very satisfied	793	48.5	82.1	82.1
	2 Somewhat satisfied	155	9.4	16.0	98.1
	3 Somewhat dissatisfied	17	1.1	1.8	99.9
	4 Very dissatisfied	1	.1	.1	100.0
	Total	967	59.1	100.0	
Missing	8 Don't know/Unable to rate	133	8.1		
	9 Refused	2	.1		
	System	536	32.7		
	Total	670	40.9		
Total	1637	100.0			

**rescue Sat w/ Emergency Medical Rescue Services**

		Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Valid	1 Very satisfied	655	40.0	77.1	77.1
	2 Somewhat satisfied	158	9.7	18.6	95.7
	3 Somewhat dissatisfied	28	1.7	3.3	98.9
	4 Very dissatisfied	9	.5	1.1	100.0
	Total	850	51.9	100.0	
Missing	8 Don't know/Unable to rate	191	11.7		
	9 Refused	3	.2		
	System	593	36.2		
	Total	787	48.1		
Total	1637	100.0			

**amcrime Sat w/ Safety in Neighborhood in Daytime**

		Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Valid	1 Very satisfied	784	47.9	68.0	68.0
	2 Somewhat satisfied	310	18.9	26.9	94.9
	3 Somewhat dissatisfied	35	2.1	3.0	97.9
	4 Very dissatisfied	24	1.5	2.1	100.0
	Total	1152	70.4	100.0	
Missing	8 Don't know/Unable to rate	25	1.5		
	System	460	28.1		
	Total	485	29.6		
Total		1637	100.0		

**pmcrime Sat w/ Safety in Neighborhood at Night**

		Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Valid	1 Very satisfied	596	36.4	52.5	52.5
	2 Somewhat satisfied	394	24.1	34.7	87.2
	3 Somewhat dissatisfied	100	6.1	8.8	96.0
	4 Very dissatisfied	46	2.8	4.0	100.0
	Total	1136	69.4	100.0	
Missing	8 Don't know/Unable to rate	26	1.6		
	9 Refused	0	.0		
	System	474	29.0		
Total		501	30.6		
Total		1637	100.0		

**attitude Sat w/ Police Dept. Attitudes Towards Citizens**

		Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Valid	1 Very satisfied	634	38.7	50.5	50.5
	2 Somewhat satisfied	430	26.3	34.3	84.7
	3 Somewhat dissatisfied	104	6.4	8.3	93.1
	4 Very dissatisfied	87	5.3	6.9	100.0
	Total	1256	76.7	100.0	
Missing	8 Don't know/Unable to rate	198	12.1		
	9 Refused	3	.2		
	System	180	11.0		
Total		381	23.3		
Total		1637	100.0		



**polfair Sat that Police Dept treats everyone fairly**

		Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Valid	1 Very satisfied	568	34.7	48.6	48.6
	2 Somewhat satisfied	367	22.4	31.4	79.9
	3 Somewhat dissatisfied	124	7.6	10.6	90.5
	4 Very dissatisfied	111	6.8	9.5	100.0
	Total	1170	71.5	100.0	
Missing	8 Don't know/Unable to rate	294	18.0		
	9 Refused	7	.4		
	System	166	10.1		
	Total	467	28.5		
Total	1637	100.0			

**drugs Sat w/ Reduce the Use of Illegal Drugs**

		Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Valid	1 Very satisfied	344	21.0	47.0	47.0
	2 Somewhat satisfied	279	17.1	38.2	85.2
	3 Somewhat dissatisfied	72	4.4	9.8	95.0
	4 Very dissatisfied	37	2.3	5.0	100.0
	Total	732	44.7	100.0	
Missing	8 Don't know/Unable to rate	347	21.2		
	9 Refused	1	.0		
	System	558	34.1		
	Total	905	55.3		
Total	1637	100.0			

**police Sat w/ Overall Performance of Police Dept.**

		Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Valid	1 Very satisfied	670	40.9	49.4	49.4
	2 Somewhat satisfied	582	35.5	42.8	92.2
	3 Somewhat dissatisfied	73	4.5	5.4	97.6
	4 Very dissatisfied	33	2.0	2.4	100.0
	Total	1358	82.9	100.0	
Missing	8 Don't know/Unable to rate	71	4.3		
	9 Refused	4	.3		
	System	204	12.5		
	Total	279	17.1		
Total	1637	100.0			

**vcrime you or household the victim of ANY crime past year**

		Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Valid	1 Yes	183	11.2	11.5	11.5
	2 No	1397	85.3	88.2	99.8
	3 Yes, but not in PWC	4	.2	.2	100.0
	Total	1584	96.7	100.0	
Missing	8 Can't Recall/Don't know	6	.4		
	System	47	2.9		
	Total	53	3.3		
Total		1637	100.0		

**vcrimer Did you report crime to PWC Police Dept**

		Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Valid	1 Yes	155	9.4	84.5	84.5
	2 No	28	1.7	15.5	100.0
	Total	183	11.2	100.0	
Missing	System	1454	88.8		
Total		1637	100.0		

**ppolicy Sat w/ Police check status of anyone placed under arrest**

		Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Valid	1 Very satisfied	412	25.2	43.3	43.3
	2 Somewhat satisfied	311	19.0	32.7	76.0
	3 Somewhat dissatisfied	102	6.2	10.7	86.7
	4 Very dissatisfied	127	7.7	13.3	100.0
	Total	951	58.1	100.0	
Missing	7 DECLINES TO RATE (OPPOSES POLICY) (VOLUNTEERED)	61	3.7		
	8 Don't know/Unable to rate	374	22.9		
	9 Refused	5	.3		
	System	245	15.0		
Total		686	41.9		
Total		1637	100.0		

**court Visited Judicial Center in past year**

		Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Valid	1 Yes, visited in last 12 months	429	26.2	29.7	29.7
	2 No, has not visited	1015	62.0	70.3	100.0
	Total	1444	88.2	100.0	
Missing	8 Can't Recall/Don't know	3	.2		
	System	190	11.6		
	Total	193	11.8		
Total		1637	100.0		

**courtsat Sat w/ Security in Courthouse**

		Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Valid	1 Very satisfied	340	20.7	80.1	80.1
	2 Somewhat satisfied	70	4.3	16.5	96.6
	3 Somewhat dissatisfied	10	.6	2.2	98.9
	4 Very dissatisfied	5	.3	1.1	100.0
	Total	424	25.9	100.0	
Missing	8 Don't know/Unable to rate	4	.2		
	System	1209	73.9		
	Total	1213	74.1		
Total		1637	100.0		

**emerg911 Dialed 9-1-1 in Last 12 Months**

		Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Valid	1 Yes, contacted in last 12 months	276	16.9	17.4	17.4
	2 No, has not contacted	1306	79.8	82.6	100.0
	Total	1583	96.7	100.0	
Missing	8 Can't recall/Don't know	3	.2		
	System	51	3.1		
	Total	54	3.3		
Total		1637	100.0		

**emservb1 911: Police**

		Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Valid	0 Not Selected	139	8.5	50.4	50.4
	1 Selected	137	8.4	49.6	100.0
	Total	276	16.9	100.0	
Missing	System	1361	83.1		
Total		1637	100.0		

**emservb2 911: Fire**

		Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Valid	0 Not Selected	258	15.8	93.5	93.5
	1 Selected	18	1.1	6.5	100.0
	Total	276	16.9	100.0	
Missing	System	1361	83.1		
Total		1637	100.0		

**emservb3 911: Ambulance/rescue squad**

		Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Valid	0 Not Selected	154	9.4	55.7	55.7
	1 Selected	122	7.5	44.3	100.0
	Total	276	16.9	100.0	
Missing	System	1361	83.1		
Total		1637	100.0		

**emservb4 911: Something else**

		Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Valid	0 Not Selected	258	15.8	93.6	93.6
	1 Selected	18	1.1	6.4	100.0
	Total	276	16.9	100.0	
Missing	System	1361	83.1		
Total		1637	100.0		

**emservb7 911: Can't recall/Don't know**

		Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Valid	0 Not Selected	276	16.9	100.0	100.0
Missing	System	1361	83.1		
Total		1637	100.0		

**emservb8 911: Refused**

		Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Valid	0 Not Selected	276	16.9	100.0	100.0
Missing	System	1361	83.1		
Total		1637	100.0		

**emergsb Nature of Call for POLICE (emerg or other)**

		Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Valid	1 Emergency	69	4.2	57.7	57.7
	2 Some other reason	51	3.1	42.3	100.0
	Total	119	7.3	100.0	
Missing	3 Can't remember/Don't know	2	.1		
	System	1516	92.6		
	Total	1518	92.7		
Total		1637	100.0		

**Case Summary(b)**

	Cases					
	Valid		Missing		Total	
	N	Percent	N	Percent	N	Percent
\$emergency(a)	276	16.9%	1361	83.1%	1637	100.0%

a Dichotomy group tabulated at value 1.

b Fractional values were found. They are truncated to integers.

**\$emergency Frequencies**

		Responses		Percent of Cases
		N	Percent	
\$emergency emergency services contacted(a)	emservb1 911: Police	137	46.4%	49.6%
	emservb2 911: Fire	18	6.1%	6.5%
	emservb3 911: Ambulance/rescue squad	122	41.5%	44.3%
	emservb4 911: Something else	18	6.0%	6.4%
Total		295	100.0%	106.8%

a Dichotomy group tabulated at value 1.

**emsatis Sat w/ Assistance from 9-1-1 Operator**

		Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Valid	1 Very satisfied	229	14.0	83.8	83.8
	2 Somewhat satisfied	29	1.8	10.7	94.5
	3 Somewhat dissatisfied	10	.6	3.7	98.2
	4 Very dissatisfied	5	.3	1.8	100.0
	Total	273	16.7	100.0	
Missing	7 Not Applicable/No Help Sent	2	.1		
	8 Don't Know/Unable to rate	1	.1		
	System	1361	83.1		
Total		1364	83.3		
Total		1637	100.0		

**emtimeb Sat w/ Time for Help to Arrive**

		Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Valid	1 Very satisfied	186	11.4	72.9	72.9
	2 Somewhat satisfied	45	2.7	17.5	90.4
	3 Somewhat dissatisfied	9	.6	3.5	93.9
	4 Very dissatisfied	16	1.0	6.1	100.0
	Total	256	15.6	100.0	
Missing	7 Not Applicable/No Help Sent	11	.7		
	8 Don't Know/Unable to rate	10	.6		
	System	1361	83.1		
Total		1381	84.4		
Total		1637	100.0		

**emasstb Sat w/ Assistance on the Scene**

		Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Valid	1 Very satisfied	180	11.0	76.5	76.5
	2 Somewhat satisfied	38	2.3	16.0	92.5
	3 Somewhat dissatisfied	2	.1	.9	93.4
	4 Very dissatisfied	16	1.0	6.6	100.0
	Total	236	14.4	100.0	
Missing	7 Not Applicable/No Help Sent	10	.6		
	8 Don't Know/Unable to rate	17	1.1		
	System	1374	83.9		
Total		1401	85.6		
Total		1637	100.0		

**cpr97 Number of People in HH with Cpt**

		Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Valid	0	367	22.4	36.7	36.7
	1	341	20.9	34.1	70.8
	2	218	13.3	21.7	92.5
	3	56	3.4	5.5	98.0
	4	13	.8	1.3	99.3
	5	3	.2	.3	99.6
	6	1	.1	.1	99.7
	7	3	.2	.3	100.0
	Total	1002	61.2	100.0	
Missing	99 Don't know/Refused	4	.2		
	System	631	38.6		
	Total	635	38.8		
Total		1637	100.0		

**cpr97 Number of People in HH with Cpt**

		Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Valid	0	367	22.4	36.7	36.7
	1	341	20.9	34.1	70.8
	2	218	13.3	21.7	92.5
	3	56	3.4	5.5	98.0
	4	13	.8	1.3	99.3
	5	3	.2	.3	99.6
	6	1	.1	.1	99.7
	7	3	.2	.3	100.0
	Total	1002	61.2	100.0	
Missing	99 Don't know/Refused	4	.2		
	System	631	38.6		
	Total	635	38.8		
Total		1637	100.0		

**shelter3 have supplies for 3 days during disaster**

		Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Valid	1 Yes	1242	75.9	86.8	86.8
	2 No	189	11.5	13.2	100.0
	Total	1431	87.4	100.0	
Missing	8 Don't know	5	.3		
	9 Refused	1	.1		
	System	200	12.2		
Total		206	12.6		
Total		1637	100.0		

**library Sat w/ Providing Library Services**

		Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Valid	1 Very satisfied	742	45.3	70.3	70.3
	2 Somewhat satisfied	264	16.1	25.0	95.3
	3 Somewhat dissatisfied	34	2.0	3.2	98.4
	4 Very dissatisfied	16	1.0	1.6	100.0
	Total	1056	64.5	100.0	
Missing	8 Don't know/Unable to rate	137	8.3		
	9 Refused	2	.1		
	System	443	27.1		
	Total	581	35.5		
Total	1637	100.0			

**park Sat with Providing Park and Recreation Programs**

		Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Valid	1 Very satisfied	554	33.9	57.6	57.6
	2 Somewhat satisfied	308	18.8	32.0	89.6
	3 Somewhat dissatisfied	72	4.4	7.5	97.1
	4 Very dissatisfied	28	1.7	2.9	100.0
	Total	961	58.7	100.0	
Missing	8 Don't know/Unable to rate	173	10.6		
	System	502	30.7		
	Total	676	41.3		
Total	1637	100.0			

**elderly Sat w/ Programs for Elderly Population**

		Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Valid	1 Very satisfied	192	11.7	39.4	39.4
	2 Somewhat satisfied	206	12.6	42.3	81.7
	3 Somewhat dissatisfied	62	3.8	12.7	94.4
	4 Very dissatisfied	27	1.7	5.6	100.0
	Total	487	29.8	100.0	
Missing	8 Don't know/Unable to rate	641	39.1		
	9 Refused	1	.0		
	System	508	31.1		
	Total	1150	70.2		
Total	1637	100.0			



**libry12 Has R Used Library Services**

		Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Valid	1 Yes	975	59.6	69.3	69.3
	2 No	432	26.4	30.7	100.0
	Total	1408	86.0	100.0	
Missing	8 Can't recall/Don't know	14	.9		
	System	215	13.1		
	Total	229	14.0		
Total		1637	100.0		

**librysat Sat w/ Service from Library Staff**

		Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Valid	1 Very satisfied	842	51.4	87.2	87.2
	2 Somewhat satisfied	108	6.6	11.2	98.4
	3 Somewhat dissatisfied	9	.6	1.0	99.3
	4 Very dissatisfied	1	.1	.1	99.5
	7 R had no contact with staff	5	.3	.5	100.0
	Total	966	59.0	100.0	
Missing	8 Don't know/Unable to rate	10	.6		
	System	662	40.4		
	Total	671	41.0		
Total		1637	100.0		

**deptss Familiar with Dept. of Soc. Services**

		Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Valid	1 Yes--familiar	396	24.2	27.2	27.2
	2 Not sure	8	.5	.6	27.8
	3 No--not familiar	1050	64.1	72.2	100.0
	Total	1455	88.9	100.0	
Missing	System	182	11.1		
Total		1637	100.0		

**dsssat Sat w/ Dept. of Soc. Services**

		Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Valid	1 Very satisfied	158	9.6	41.1	41.1
	2 Somewhat satisfied	125	7.6	32.6	73.7
	3 Somewhat dissatisfied	52	3.1	13.4	87.1
	4 Very dissatisfied	49	3.0	12.9	100.0
	Total	384	23.4	100.0	
Missing	8 Don't know/Unable to rate	13	.8		
	System	1241	75.8		
Total		1253	76.6		
Total		1637	100.0		

**hlthdept Familiar with Health Department**

		Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Valid	1 Yes--familiar	371	22.7	25.7	25.7
	2 Not sure	21	1.3	1.4	27.1
	3 No--not familiar	1053	64.3	72.9	100.0
	Total	1445	88.3	100.0	
Missing	System	192	11.7		
Total		1637	100.0		

**hlthsat Sat w/ Health Department**

		Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Valid	1 Very satisfied	166	10.2	45.9	45.9
	2 Somewhat satisfied	135	8.3	37.3	83.2
	3 Somewhat dissatisfied	32	2.0	8.9	92.1
	4 Very dissatisfied	29	1.8	7.9	100.0
	Total	363	22.2	100.0	
Missing	8 Don't know/Unable to rate	5	.3		
	System	1269	77.5		
Total		1274	77.8		
Total		1637	100.0		

**mental Familiar with Mental Health Services**

		Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Valid	1 Yes--familiar	275	16.8	17.5	17.5
	2 Not sure	15	.9	.9	18.4
	3 No--not familiar	1284	78.4	81.6	100.0
	Total	1574	96.1	100.0	
Missing	System	63	3.9		
Total		1637	100.0		

**menthpb Sat w/ services to people w/ mental health problems**

		Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Valid	1 Very satisfied	112	6.8	43.1	43.1
	2 Somewhat satisfied	97	5.9	37.4	80.5
	3 Somewhat dissatisfied	30	1.9	11.8	92.3
	4 Very dissatisfied	20	1.2	7.7	100.0
	Total	259	15.8	100.0	
Missing	8 Don't know/Unable to rate	16	1.0		
	System	1362	83.2		
	Total	1378	84.2		
Total		1637	100.0		

**mentret Sat w/ Services to Mental Retardation**

		Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Valid	1 Very satisfied	105	6.4	49.4	49.4
	2 Somewhat satisfied	76	4.6	35.8	85.2
	3 Somewhat dissatisfied	16	1.0	7.8	93.0
	4 Very dissatisfied	15	.9	7.0	100.0
	Total	212	13.0	100.0	
Missing	8 Don't know/Unable to rate	62	3.8		
	9 Refused	1	.0		
	System	1362	83.2		
Total		1425	87.0		
Total		1637	100.0		

**menteis Sat w/ Early Intervention Services**

		Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Valid	1 Very satisfied	81	4.9	43.6	43.6
	2 Somewhat satisfied	74	4.5	40.1	83.7
	3 Somewhat dissatisfied	15	.9	8.1	91.8
	4 Very dissatisfied	15	.9	8.2	100.0
	Total	185	11.3	100.0	
Missing	8 Don't know/Unable to rate	90	5.5		
	System	1362	83.2		
	Total	1452	88.7		
Total		1637	100.0		

**mentsub Sat w/ Services to Substance Abuse**

		Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Valid	1 Very satisfied	85	5.2	43.3	43.3
	2 Somewhat satisfied	66	4.0	33.8	77.1
	3 Somewhat dissatisfied	24	1.5	12.5	89.7
	4 Very dissatisfied	20	1.2	10.3	100.0
	Total	195	11.9	100.0	
Missing	8 Don't know/Unable to rate	79	4.8		
	System	1362	83.2		
	Total	1442	88.1		
Total		1637	100.0		

**mentall Sat w/ Mental Health Services Overall**

		Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Valid	1 Very satisfied	109	6.6	40.7	40.7
	2 Somewhat satisfied	127	7.7	47.6	88.3
	3 Somewhat dissatisfied	20	1.2	7.6	95.9
	4 Very dissatisfied	11	.7	4.1	100.0
	Total	267	16.3	100.0	
Missing	8 Don't know/Unable to rate	7	.5		
	9 Refused	1	.0		
	System	1362	83.2		
Total		1370	83.7		
Total		1637	100.0		

**anybody Has R Contacted County Govt.**

		Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Valid	1 Yes	556	34.0	35.8	35.8
	2 No	1000	61.1	64.2	100.0
	Total	1556	95.0	100.0	
Missing	9 Can't recall/Don't know/Refused	13	.8		
	System	69	4.2		
	Total	81	5.0		
Total		1637	100.0		

**helpful2 Helpfulness of County Employees**

		Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Valid	1 Very satisfied	297	18.2	54.1	54.1
	2 Somewhat satisfied	156	9.5	28.3	82.4
	3 Somewhat dissatisfied	52	3.2	9.5	91.9
	4 Very dissatisfied	45	2.7	8.1	100.0
	Total	550	33.6	100.0	
Missing	8 Don't know/Unable to rate	6	.4		
	System	1081	66.0		
	Total	1087	66.4		
Total		1637	100.0		

**taxesa Contact County about taxes**

		Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Valid	1 Yes	300	18.3	21.8	21.8
	2 No	1074	65.6	78.2	100.0
	Total	1374	83.9	100.0	
Missing	9 Dont know/refused/not applicable	4	.3		
	System	259	15.8		
	Total	263	16.1		
Total		1637	100.0		

**Case Summary(b)**

	Cases					
	Valid		Missing		Total	
	N	Percent	N	Percent	N	Percent
\$ccounty(a)	299	18.3%	1338	81.7%	1637	100.0%

a Dichotomy group tabulated at value 1.

b Fractional values were found. They are truncated to integers.

**\$ccounty Frequencies**

		Responses		Percent of Cases
		N	Percent	
\$ccounty	howcona1 Contact taxes: Person	95	24.9%	31.8%
Contacting the County(a)	howcona2 Contact taxes: Phone	195	51.1%	65.1%
	howcona3 Contact taxes: Mail	22	5.8%	7.3%
	howcona4 Contact taxes: Email, website, or Internet	69	18.2%	23.2%
Total		381	100.0%	127.4%

a Dichotomy group tabulated at value 1.

**helpfula Sat w/ helpfulness of tax County employees**

		Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Valid	1 Very satisfied	175	10.7	59.6	59.6
	2 Somewhat satisfied	80	4.9	27.4	87.0
	3 Somewhat dissatisfied	15	.9	5.0	92.0
	4 Very dissatisfied	23	1.4	8.0	100.0
	Total	293	17.9	100.0	
Missing	8 Don't know/Unable to rate	6	.4		
	System	1337	81.7		
Total	Total	1344	82.1		
Total		1637	100.0		

**timesata Sat w/ timeliness of tax request**

		Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Valid	1 Very satisfied	204	12.4	68.9	68.9
	2 Somewhat satisfied	58	3.5	19.5	88.5
	3 Somewhat dissatisfied	17	1.0	5.7	94.2
	4 Very dissatisfied	17	1.0	5.8	100.0
	Total	296	18.1	100.0	
Missing	8 Don't know/Unable to rate	4	.3		
	System	1337	81.7		
	Total	1341	81.9		
Total		1637	100.0		

**net1 Used the PWC Government Web Site**

		Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Valid	1 Yes	573	35.0	58.2	58.2
	2 No	412	25.2	41.8	100.0
	Total	985	60.2	100.0	
Missing	8 Don't know	15	.9		
	System	637	38.9		
	Total	652	39.8		
Total		1637	100.0		

**net2 Sat w/ PWC Government Web Site**

		Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Valid	1 Very satisfied	305	18.6	54.1	54.1
	2 Somewhat satisfied	219	13.4	38.7	92.8
	3 Somewhat dissatisfied	32	2.0	5.7	98.5
	4 Very dissatisfied	8	.5	1.5	100.0
	Total	565	34.5	100.0	
Missing	8 Don't know/Unable to rate	7	.4		
	System	1066	65.1		
	Total	1072	65.5		
Total		1637	100.0		

**land1 Sat w/ Planning of Land Devel-prejob**

		Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Valid	1 Very satisfied	105	6.4	18.5	18.5
	2 Somewhat satisfied	213	13.0	37.4	55.9
	3 Somewhat dissatisfied	73	4.5	12.8	68.7
	4 Very dissatisfied	52	3.2	9.1	77.8
	8 Don't know/Unable to rate	127	7.7	22.2	100.0
	Total	570	34.8	100.0	
Missing	System	1067	65.2		
Total		1637	100.0		

**ratejobs Familiar w/ Attracting New Jobs**

		Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Valid	1 Yes	425	25.9	28.6	28.6
	2 No	1058	64.6	71.4	100.0
	Total	1482	90.5	100.0	
Missing	8 Don't know	83	5.1		
	System	71	4.4		
	Total	155	9.5		
Total		1637	100.0		

**newjobs Sat w/ Attracting New Jobs to PWC**

		Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Valid	1 Very satisfied	140	8.5	33.4	33.4
	2 Somewhat satisfied	178	10.9	42.5	75.9
	3 Somewhat dissatisfied	64	3.9	15.3	91.2
	4 Very dissatisfied	37	2.3	8.8	100.0
	Total	419	25.6	100.0	
Missing	8 Don't know/Unable to rate	6	.4		
	System	1212	74.1		
	Total	1218	74.4		
Total		1637	100.0		



**land2 Sat w/ Planning of Land Devel-postjob**

		Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Valid	1 Very satisfied	91	5.6	15.3	15.3
	2 Somewhat satisfied	205	12.5	34.6	50.0
	3 Somewhat dissatisfied	99	6.1	16.8	66.7
	4 Very dissatisfied	56	3.4	9.4	76.1
	8 Don't know/Unable to rate	141	8.6	23.7	99.9
	9 Refused	1	.0	.1	100.0
	Total	593	36.2	100.0	
Missing	System	1044	63.8		
Total		1637	100.0		

**neighbor Sat w/ Preventing Neighborhood Deterioration**

		Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Valid	1 Very satisfied	237	14.5	27.6	27.6
	2 Somewhat satisfied	352	21.5	41.0	68.6
	3 Somewhat dissatisfied	194	11.8	22.5	91.1
	4 Very dissatisfied	76	4.7	8.9	100.0
	Total	860	52.5	100.0	
Missing	8 Don't know/Unable to rate	226	13.8		
	9 Refused	3	.2		
	System	549	33.5		
Total	777	47.5			
Total		1637	100.0		

**n1ocrowd How big problem/ residential overcrowding**

		Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Valid	1 A big problem	115	7.0	7.5	7.5
	2 Somewhat of a problem	324	19.8	21.1	28.6
	3 Or not a problem in your neighborhood	1084	66.2	70.6	99.2
	4 Rural area/does not apply	13	.8	.8	100.0
	Total	1536	93.8	100.0	
Missing	8 Don't know	25	1.6		
	9 Refused	1	.1		
	System	75	4.6		
Total	101	6.2			
Total		1637	100.0		

**n2ocrowd Residential overcrowding compared to year ago**

		Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Valid	1 Gotten a lot better	82	5.0	5.5	5.5
	2 Gotten a little better	159	9.7	10.7	16.2
	3 Stayed about the same	880	53.8	59.3	75.4
	4 Gotten a little worse	128	7.8	8.6	84.0
	5 Or Gotten a lot worse	65	4.0	4.4	88.4
	6 Never had this problem	172	10.5	11.6	100.0
	Total	1485	90.7	100.0	
Missing	8 Don't know	38	2.3		
	System	114	7.0		
	Total	152	9.3		
Total		1637	100.0		

**n3vacant How big problem/ upkeep of vacant houses**

		Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Valid	1 A big problem	97	5.9	6.4	6.4
	2 Somewhat of a problem	351	21.4	23.0	29.4
	3 Or not a problem in your neighborhood	1073	65.6	70.4	99.8
	4 Rural area/does not apply	3	.2	.2	100.0
	Total	1524	93.1	100.0	
Missing	8 Don't know	22	1.3		
	9 Refused	1	.1		
	System	90	5.5		
Total		113	6.9		
Total		1637	100.0		

**n4vacant Upkeep of vacant houses compared to year ago**

		Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Valid	1 Gotten a lot better	99	6.1	6.6	6.6
	2 Gotten a little better	228	13.9	15.2	21.8
	3 Stayed about the same	860	52.6	57.3	79.0
	4 Gotten a little worse	110	6.7	7.3	86.3
	5 Or Gotten a lot worse	37	2.3	2.5	88.8
	6 Never had this problem	168	10.2	11.2	100.0
	Total	1503	91.8	100.0	
Missing	8 Don't know	18	1.1		
	System	116	7.1		
	Total	134	8.2		
Total		1637	100.0		

**n5upkeep How big problem/ upkeep of occupied houses**

		Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Valid	1 A big problem	77	4.7	5.1	5.1
	2 Somewhat of a problem	321	19.6	21.1	26.1
	3 Or not a problem in your neighborhood	1124	68.7	73.8	99.9
	4 Rural area/does not apply	1	.1	.1	100.0
	Total	1524	93.1	100.0	
Missing	8 Don't know	16	1.0		
	System	97	5.9		
	Total	113	6.9		
Total	1637	100.0			

**n6upkeep Upkeep of occupied houses compared to year ago**

		Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Valid	1 Gotten a lot better	60	3.7	4.0	4.0
	2 Gotten a little better	156	9.5	10.3	14.3
	3 Stayed about the same	1019	62.3	67.5	81.8
	4 Gotten a little worse	104	6.4	6.9	88.7
	5 Or Gotten a lot worse	18	1.1	1.2	89.9
	6 Never had this problem	153	9.3	10.1	100.0
	Total	1510	92.3	100.0	
Missing	8 Don't know	13	.8		
	System	114	7.0		
	Total	127	7.7		
Total	1637	100.0			

**loiter How big problem/ loitering**

		Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Valid	1 A big problem	177	10.8	13.6	13.6
	2 Somewhat of a problem	462	28.2	35.4	49.0
	3 Or not a problem in your neighborhood	665	40.6	51.0	100.0
	Total	1304	79.7	100.0	
Missing	8 Don't know	65	4.0		
	9 Refused	2	.1		
	System	266	16.2		
	Total	333	20.3		
Total	1637	100.0			

**loitnow Loitering compared to year ago**

		Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Valid	1 Gotten a lot better	62	3.8	4.8	4.8
	2 Gotten a little better	149	9.1	11.6	16.4
	3 Stayed about the same	833	50.9	64.6	81.0
	4 Gotten a little worse	126	7.7	9.8	90.8
	5 Or Gotten a lot worse	48	2.9	3.7	94.5
	6 Never had this problem	71	4.3	5.5	100.0
	Total	1288	78.7	100.0	
Missing	8 Don't know	15	.9		
	9 Refused	1	.1		
	System	334	20.4		
	Total	349	21.3		
Total		1637	100.0		

**landfill Has R Taken Trash to Landfill**

		Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Valid	1 Yes	445	27.2	44.5	44.5
	2 No	555	33.9	55.5	100.0
	Total	1000	61.1	100.0	
Missing	8 Can't recall/Don't know	11	.7		
	System	626	38.2		
	Total	637	38.9		
Total		1637	100.0		

**lfillsat Sat w/ Landfill**

		Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Valid	1 Very satisfied	394	24.0	89.0	89.0
	2 Somewhat satisfied	39	2.4	8.7	97.8
	3 Somewhat dissatisfied	5	.3	1.2	99.0
	4 Very dissatisfied	4	.3	1.0	100.0
	Total	442	27.0	100.0	
Missing	8 Don't know/Unable to rate	3	.2		
	System	1192	72.8		
	Total	1195	73.0		
Total		1637	100.0		

**travel97 Sat w/ Ease of Travel in PWC**

		Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Valid	1 Very satisfied	271	16.5	27.5	27.5
	2 Somewhat satisfied	360	22.0	36.6	64.1
	3 Somewhat dissatisfied	191	11.7	19.4	83.5
	4 Very dissatisfied	162	9.9	16.5	100.0
	Total	984	60.1	100.0	
Missing	8 Don't know/Unable to rate	5	.3		
	9 Refused	4	.2		
	System	645	39.4		
	Total	653	39.9		
Total	1637	100.0			

**outsidec Sat w/ Ease of Travel around NoVA outside PWC**

		Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Valid	1 Very satisfied	120	7.3	13.1	13.1
	2 Somewhat satisfied	255	15.5	27.7	40.8
	3 Somewhat dissatisfied	240	14.6	26.1	66.9
	4 Very dissatisfied	305	18.6	33.1	100.0
	Total	919	56.2	100.0	
Missing	8 Don't know/Unable to rate	28	1.7		
	9 Refused	1	.1		
	System	689	42.1		
	Total	718	43.8		
Total	1637	100.0			

**growthc Sat w/ Rate of PWC Growth**

		Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Valid	1 Very satisfied	166	10.1	18.6	18.6
	2 Somewhat satisfied	453	27.7	50.7	69.3
	3 Somewhat dissatisfied	188	11.5	21.1	90.3
	4 Very dissatisfied	87	5.3	9.7	100.0
	Total	894	54.6	100.0	
Missing	8 Don't know/Unable to rate	140	8.5		
	9 Refused	1	.1		
	System	602	36.8		
	Total	743	45.4		
Total	1637	100.0			

**roaddeva Sat w/ Coordination of Development with Road Systems**

		Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Valid	1 Very satisfied	164	10.0	18.9	18.9
	2 Somewhat satisfied	331	20.2	38.2	57.1
	3 Somewhat dissatisfied	199	12.1	22.9	80.0
	4 Very dissatisfied	173	10.6	20.0	100.0
	Total	866	52.9	100.0	
Missing	8 Don't know/Unable to rate	169	10.3		
	9 Refused	1	.1		
	System	601	36.7		
	Total	771	47.1		
Total	1637	100.0			

**inputdev Sat w/ Opportunities for Citizen Input**

		Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Valid	1 Very satisfied	130	7.9	24.2	24.2
	2 Somewhat satisfied	266	16.2	49.5	73.7
	3 Somewhat dissatisfied	96	5.9	17.9	91.7
	4 Very dissatisfied	45	2.7	8.3	100.0
	Total	537	32.8	100.0	
Missing	8 Don't know/Unable to rate	493	30.1		
	9 Refused	2	.1		
	System	605	37.0		
	Total	1100	67.2		
Total	1637	100.0			

**visdev Sat w/ Visual Appearance of New Development**

		Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Valid	1 Very satisfied	373	22.8	41.8	41.8
	2 Somewhat satisfied	414	25.3	46.4	88.2
	3 Somewhat dissatisfied	66	4.0	7.3	95.5
	4 Very dissatisfied	40	2.5	4.5	100.0
	Total	893	54.6	100.0	
Missing	8 Don't know/Unable to rate	80	4.9		
	9 Refused	1	.1		
	System	662	40.5		
	Total	744	45.4		
Total	1637	100.0			

**buildings Sat w/ the safety of buildings constructed in the last two years**

		Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Valid	1 Very satisfied	328	20.0	49.1	49.1
	2 Somewhat satisfied	311	19.0	46.5	95.6
	3 Somewhat dissatisfied	24	1.5	3.7	99.3
	4 Very dissatisfied	5	.3	.7	100.0
	Total	669	40.8	100.0	
Missing	8 Don't know/Unable to rate	223	13.7		
	9 Refused	1	.1		
	System	744	45.4		
	Total	968	59.2		
Total	1637	100.0			

**view View of Services and Taxes**

		Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Valid	1 Decrease services & taxes	138	8.5	14.7	14.7
	2 Keep services & taxes same	610	37.3	65.0	79.8
	3 Increase services & taxes	100	6.1	10.7	90.5
	4 Increase services, keep taxes same (vol)	20	1.2	2.1	92.6
	5 Increase services, decrease taxes (vol)	34	2.1	3.6	96.2
	6 Keep services same, decrease taxes (vol)	18	1.1	1.9	98.0
	7 Some other change (vol)	18	1.1	2.0	100.0
	Total	938	57.3	100.0	
Missing	8 Don't know/No opinion	27	1.7		
	System	671	41.0		
	Total	699	42.7		
Total	1637	100.0			

**value Sat w/ Value for Tax Dollar**

		Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Valid	1 Very satisfied	286	17.5	26.8	26.8
	2 Somewhat satisfied	602	36.8	56.3	83.1
	3 Somewhat dissatisfied	118	7.2	11.0	94.1
	4 Very dissatisfied	63	3.8	5.9	100.0
	Total	1068	65.2	100.0	
Missing	8 Don't know/Unable to rate	81	5.0		
	9 Refused	1	.0		
	System	487	29.7		
	Total	569	34.8		
Total	1637	100.0			

**effneff Sat w/ Efficient and Effective Service**

		Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Valid	1 Very satisfied	246	15.0	29.1	29.1
	2 Somewhat satisfied	501	30.6	59.3	88.4
	3 Somewhat dissatisfied	68	4.1	8.0	96.5
	4 Very dissatisfied	30	1.8	3.5	100.0
	Total	844	51.6	100.0	
Missing	8 Don't know/Unable to rate	94	5.7		
	9 Refused	1	.1		
	System	698	42.6		
	Total	793	48.4		
Total	1637	100.0			

**trstgov1 Trust of Government to do What is Right**

		Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Valid	1 Just about always	130	7.9	14.4	14.4
	2 Most of the time	438	26.8	48.6	63.0
	3 Only some of the time	318	19.4	35.3	98.3
	4 Never/almost never (vol)	15	.9	1.7	100.0
	Total	902	55.1	100.0	
Missing	8 Don't know/No answer	37	2.3		
	9 Refused	1	.1		
	System	697	42.6		
	Total	735	44.9		
Total	1637	100.0			



**sch11 R Has Children in PWC Schools**

		Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Valid	1 Yes	464	28.3	82.7	82.7
	2 No	97	5.9	17.3	100.0
	Total	561	34.3	100.0	
Missing	System	1076	65.7		
Total		1637	100.0		

**sch14 Sat that School System Provides Efficient Service**

		Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Valid	1 Very satisfied	531	32.4	49.7	49.7
	2 Somewhat satisfied	400	24.4	37.4	87.2
	3 Somewhat dissatisfied	83	5.1	7.7	94.9
	4 Very dissatisfied	54	3.3	5.1	100.0
	Total	1068	65.2	100.0	
Missing	8 Don't know/Unable to rate	283	17.3		
	9 Refused	6	.3		
	System	280	17.1		
	Total	569	34.8		
Total		1637	100.0		

**park12 Has R Used Park Authority's Parks**

		Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Valid	1 Yes--has used	617	37.7	52.0	52.0
	2 No--has not	548	33.5	46.2	98.3
	8	20	1.3	1.7	100.0
	Total	1185	72.4	100.0	
Missing	System	452	27.6		
Total		1637	100.0		

**park1 Familiar with Park Authority**

		Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Valid	1 Yes--familiar	531	32.4	44.9	44.9
	2 Not sure	34	2.1	2.9	47.8
	3 No--not familiar	616	37.7	52.2	100.0
	Total	1182	72.2	100.0	
Missing	System	455	27.8		
Total		1637	100.0		

**park2 Sat with Park Authority**

		Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Valid	1 Very satisfied	329	20.1	62.3	62.3
	2 Somewhat satisfied	173	10.6	32.8	95.1
	3 Somewhat dissatisfied	16	1.0	3.0	98.1
	4 Very dissatisfied	10	.6	1.9	100.0
	Total	528	32.3	100.0	
Missing	8 Don't know/Unable to rate	1	.1		
	System	1107	67.7		
Total		1109	67.7		
Total		1637	100.0		

**ctyserv1 Familiar with Service Authority**

		Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Valid	1 Yes--familiar	598	36.5	53.4	53.4
	2 Not sure	15	.9	1.3	54.7
	3 No--not familiar	508	31.0	45.3	100.0
	Total	1121	68.5	100.0	
Missing	System	516	31.5		
Total		1637	100.0		

**ctyserv2 Sat with Service Authority**

		Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Valid	1 Very satisfied	398	24.3	66.7	66.7
	2 Somewhat satisfied	163	9.9	27.3	94.0
	3 Somewhat dissatisfied	23	1.4	3.9	97.9
	4 Very dissatisfied	13	.8	2.1	100.0
	Total	597	36.5	100.0	
Missing	8 Don't know	2	.1		
	System	1039	63.5		
Total		1040	63.5		
Total		1637	100.0		

**cellcomp Composition of phone calls received or made**

		Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Valid	1 Almost all are on a landline phone	110	6.7	9.8	9.8
	2 Most of them are on a landline phone	234	14.3	20.9	30.7
	3 Amount of calls on a landline and cell phone are about equal	325	19.9	29.1	59.9
	4 Most of the calls are on a cell phone	301	18.4	26.9	86.8
	5 Almost all of them are on a cell phone	148	9.0	13.2	100.0
	Total	1117	68.3	100.0	
Missing	8 Don't know/unable to rate	8	.5		
	9 Refused	1	.1		
	System	511	31.2		
	Total	520	31.7		
Total	1637	100.0			

**phone1a Is Landline Phone Number Listed**

		Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Valid	1 Yes	138	8.4	68.3	68.3
	2 No	64	3.9	31.7	100.0
	Total	202	12.3	100.0	
Missing	8 Don't know	34	2.1		
	System	1401	85.6		
	Total	1435	87.7		
Total	1637	100.0			

**phone1b Is Number dialed Listed**

		Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Valid	1 Yes	719	43.9	83.2	83.2
	2 No	145	8.9	16.8	100.0
	Total	864	52.8	100.0	
Missing	8 Don't know	85	5.2		
	9 Refused	2	.1		
	System	687	42.0		
	Total	773	47.2		
Total	1637	100.0			

**phone2 The Reason Number is listed**

		Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Valid	1 Unlisted/Unpublished	183	11.2	91.2	91.2
	2 Got number after phone book came out	11	.7	5.4	96.6
	3 Other	7	.4	3.4	100.0
	Total	200	12.2	100.0	
Missing	8 Don't know	7	.5		
	9 Refused	1	.1		
	System	1428	87.2		
	Total	1437	87.8		
	Total	1637	100.0		

**jobcity City Where R Works**

		Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Valid	1 Prince William County	261	16.0	25.4	25.4
	2 Manassas	69	4.2	6.7	32.1
	3 Manassas Park	7	.4	.6	32.7
	4 Stafford County	9	.5	.9	33.6
	5 Fredericksburg/Spotsylvania	3	.2	.3	33.9
	6 Fauquier County/Warrenton	14	.9	1.4	35.2
	7 Loudon County	16	1.0	1.5	36.7
	8 Fairfax County	234	14.3	22.7	59.5
	9 Fairfax City	16	1.0	1.5	61.0
	10 Falls Church	5	.3	.4	61.4
	11 Arlington	70	4.3	6.8	68.2
	12 Alexandria	66	4.1	6.4	74.7
	14 Elsewhere in VA	22	1.4	2.1	76.8
	15 Washington, DC	106	6.4	10.2	87.1
	16 Maryland	16	1.0	1.5	88.6
	17 Another location (specify)	64	3.9	6.2	94.8
	18 Works all over (vol)	38	2.3	3.7	98.5
	19 Don't know/No answer	15	.9	1.5	100.0
		Total	1031	63.0	100.0
Missing	System	606	37.0		
	Total	1637	100.0		

**samehome Live in Same House as 1 Year Ago**

		Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Valid	1 Yes	913	55.8	92.6	92.6
	2 No	73	4.5	7.4	100.0
	Total	986	60.2	100.0	
Missing	9 Don't know/No answer	4	.3		
	System	647	39.5		
	Total	651	39.8		
Total		1637	100.0		

**samework Same Workplace as 1 Year Ago**

		Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Valid	1 Yes	876	53.5	86.0	86.0
	2 No	138	8.4	13.5	99.5
	3 Not working a year ago (vol)	5	.3	.5	100.0
	Total	1019	62.3	100.0	
Missing	9 Don't know/Refused	12	.7		
	System	606	37.0		
	Total	618	37.7		
Total		1637	100.0		

**commtime Commute Time Difference From 1 Year Ago**

		Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Valid	1 Gotten longer	304	18.6	30.1	30.1
	2 Gotten shorter	102	6.2	10.1	40.2
	3 Stayed about the same	602	36.8	59.6	99.8
	4 Not working 1 year ago (vol)	2	.1	.2	100.0
	Total	1010	61.7	100.0	
Missing	8 Don't know	11	.7		
	9 Refused	8	.5		
	System	608	37.1		
Total		627	38.3		
Total		1637	100.0		

**telecom Does R Telecommute**

		Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Valid	1 Yes	214	13.0	20.9	20.9
	2 No	789	48.2	77.2	98.0
	3 Home is main place of work	20	1.2	2.0	100.0
	Total	1022	62.5	100.0	
Missing	8 Don't know	2	.1		
	9 Refused	4	.3		
	System	608	37.1		
	Total	615	37.5		
Total		1637	100.0		

**teltime How Often R Telecommutes**

		Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Valid	1 All the time	15	.9	7.3	7.3
	2 Several times a week	51	3.1	25.0	32.3
	3 Several times a month	52	3.1	25.2	57.5
	4 Once or twice a month	46	2.8	22.3	79.8
	5 Several times a year	41	2.5	20.2	100.0
	Total	204	12.5	100.0	
Missing	8 Don't know	10	.6		
	System	1423	87.0		
	Total	1433	87.5		
Total		1637	100.0		

**commuter Commuter Status**

		Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Valid	.000 Does not commute	429	26.2	42.6	42.6
	1.000 Commutes	579	35.4	57.4	100.0
	Total	1008	61.6	100.0	
Missing	99.000	629	38.4		
Total		1637	100.0		

**Open-ended Comments-  
Reasons for Satisfaction/Dissatisfaction with the Job the  
Police Department is Doing in Carrying out Immigration Policy**

**Case Summary(b)**

	Cases					
	Valid		Missing		Total	
	N	Percent	N	Percent	N	Percent
\$Wpolsat1(a)	394	95.5%	19	4.5%	412	100.0%

a Group

b Fractional values were found. They are truncated to integers.

**\$Wpolsat1 Frequencies**

		Responses		Percent of Cases
		N	Percent	
\$Wpolsat1 Satisfaction reasons - with job Police Dept doing in carrying out policy(a)	1.0 Illegal immigration causes problems in the community	56	11.4%	14.3%
	2.0 General positive comments on PWC's policy	138	28.0%	35.0%
	3.0 Favorable outcomes or effects from police enforcement	124	25.3%	31.6%
	4.0 Favorable comments on police actions	129	26.2%	32.8%
	9.0 Other, no experience with, no affect, no opinion, comments not codable	44	9.0%	11.3%
Total		492	100.0%	125.0%

a Group

**Case Summary(b)**

	Cases					
	Valid		Missing		Total	
	N	Percent	N	Percent	N	Percent
\$Wpolsat2(a)	351	85.1%	61	14.9%	412	100.0%

a Group

b Fractional values were found. They are truncated to integers.



**\$Wpolsat1 Frequencies**

		Responses		Percent of Cases
		N	Percent	
\$Wpolsat1	10.00 Illegal immigration causes problems in the community	12	2.8%	3.5%
Very Satisfied reasons - with job	11.00 Not fair that illegals are here getting benefits, not paying taxes, getting jobs that could go to Americans	22	4.8%	6.1%
Police Dept doing in carrying out policy(a)	12.00 Overcrowding of houses, unsightly property appearance	7	1.6%	2.0%
	13.00 Crime	10	2.3%	2.9%
	14.00 Loitering, day laborers gathering	5	1.2%	1.5%
	20.00 General positive comments on PWC's policy	38	8.5%	10.8%
	21.00 Needed to do something	14	3.1%	4.0%
	22.00 Good that PWC is addressing the problem; support the policy; agree that it should exist; in favor	27	6.0%	7.6%
	23.00 Policy is fair, well-designed	5	1.1%	1.5%
	24.00 If someone is illegal, that should be addressed; the law should be followed	36	8.1%	10.3%
	25.00 If someone is illegal, they should leave the country; they should not be here	18	4.0%	5.1%
	30.00 Favorable outcomes or effects from police enforcement	24	5.4%	6.9%
	31.00 Less loitering	20	4.4%	5.7%
	33.00 Less crime	42	9.5%	12.1%
	34.00 Feel safer	6	1.3%	1.7%
	35.00 Increased property values	3	.6%	.8%
	36.00 Illegal immigrants are leaving the county	29	6.6%	8.4%
	40.00 Favorable comments on police actions	57	12.8%	16.3%
	41.00 Good effort or trying hard	16	3.6%	4.6%
	42.00 Fairness or not targeting	12	2.7%	3.4%
	43.00 Police doing as instructed; Sticking to procedures	33	7.4%	9.5%
	44.00 Checking all ID's; checking more often	10	2.3%	3.0%
Total		447	100.0%	127.5%

a Group

**Case Summary(b)**

	Cases					
	Valid		Missing		Total	
	N	Percent	N	Percent	N	Percent
\$Wpolsat2(a)	113	89.1%	14	10.9%	127	100.0%

a Group

b Fractional values were found. They are truncated to integers.

**\$Wpolsat2 Frequencies**

		Responses		Percent of Cases
		N	Percent	
\$Wpolsat2	6.0 Unfavorable comments about the PWC policy	31	25.0%	27.7%
Very Dissat reasons - with job	7.0 Unfavorable outcomes or negative effects from the policy or from police enforcement - general	10	7.6%	8.5%
Police Dept doing in carrying out policy(a)	8.0 Unfavorable comments on police actions - general	35	28.0%	31.0%
	9.0 Other, no experience with, no affect, no opinion, comments not codable	24	19.3%	21.4%
	10.0 Police are discriminatory/racial profiling	23	18.7%	20.7%
	13.0 Illegal immigration causing problems and policy does not do enough	2	1.4%	1.5%
Total		125	100.0%	110.8%

a Group

**\$Wpolsat2 Frequencies**

		Responses		Percent of Cases
		N	Percent	
\$Wpolsat2	60.00 Unfavorable comments about the PWC policy	4	3.0%	3.4%
Very Dissat reasons - with job	61.00 Immigration is a federal job, not County's business to do	22	17.4%	19.2%
Police Dept doing in carrying out policy(a)	63.00 Policy is unfair	5	4.3%	4.7%
	65.00 Policy costs too much	0	.3%	.3%
	70.00 Unfavorable outcomes or negative effects from the policy or from police enforcement - general	10	7.6%	8.5%
	80.00 Unfavorable comments on police actions - general	12	9.2%	10.2%
	81.00 Not trying hard enough	24	18.8%	20.8%
	92.00 Other reason	16	13.1%	14.6%
	93.00 Response not codable	8	6.2%	6.8%
	100.00 Police are discriminatory/racial profiling	20	16.3%	18.1%
	101.00 Police are profiling/selectively targeting/being arbitrary	3	2.4%	2.6%
	130.00 Illegal immigration causing problems and policy does not do enough	2	1.4%	1.5%
Total		125	100.0%	110.8%

a Group



**Appendix E:  
Crosstabulations/Satisfaction Mean  
Ratings by Demographic Variables**



**TABLE E: Satisfaction Mean Ratings by Demographic Variables\***

\* A mean rating with a superscript indicates that this mean is significantly higher (at the 5% level) than the mean in the column corresponding to the superscript.

Table E1		Gender			
		Male (3)		Female (4)	
Quality of life		mean	n	mean	n
qol10	Quality of life (ratings on 10 point-scale)	7.23	766	7.37	755
Satisfaction with Services		%	n	%	n
ctysat97d	General Satisfaction with Services	91.1%	739	93.3%	715
voted	Sat w/ Convenient Ways to Register to Vote	97.2%	379	97.2%	369
pctupd	Sat w/ efficiency & effectiveness of voting precinct	97.7%	318	96.1%	309
govtservd	Sat w/ Informing Citizens about Government	73.9%	394	78.2%	414

Table E2		Gender			
		Male (3)		Female (4)	
Public Safety		%	n	%	n
strltad	Sat w/ Street Lighting	84.7%	549	81.8%	550
fired	Sat w/ Fire Fighting in R's Area	97.3%	479	98.7%	433
rescued	Sat w/ Emergency Medical Rescue Services	94.6%	418	97.2%	389
amcrimed	Sat w/ Safety in Neighborhood in Daytime	94.8%	561	95.4%	544
pmcrimed	Sat w/ Safety in Neighborhood at Night	89.0%	534	85.5%	553
dycrimebd	Sat w/ Safety in Business Areas in Daytime	93.6%	394	91.3%	404
ntcrimebd	Sat w/ Safety in Business Areas at Night	83.9%	310	81.4%	286
preventbd	Sat w/ Crime Prevention Programs	85.2%	333	81.4%	381
attituded	Sat w/ Police Dept. Attitudes Towards Citizens	86.1%	628	83.5%	572
polfaird	Sat that Police Dept treats everyone fairly	80.3%	584	79.1%	532
drugsd	Sat w/ Reduce the Use of Illegal Drugs	83.9%	382	86.5%	317
gangsd	Sat w/ Police Dept Efforts to Combat Gangs	83.2%	392	87.7%	339
policed	Sat w/ Overall Performance of Police Dept.	91.5%	670	92.9%	632
ppolicyd	Sat w/ Police check status of anyone placed under arrest	73.4%	489	79.5%	427
courtsatd	Sat w/ Security in Courthouse	95.7%	236	98.2%	176
emsatisd	Sat w/ Assistance from 9-1-1 Operator	97.5%	139	90.7%	124
emtimebd	Sat w/ Time for Help to Arrive	92.9%	130	88.4%	117
emasstbd	Sat w/ Assistance on the Scene	94.7%	125	89.8%	108



Table E3		Gender			
		Male (3)		Female (4)	
Public Services		%	n	%	n
libraryd	Sat w/ Providing Library Services	95.1%	519	95.3%	509
librysatd	Sat w/ Service from Library Staff	99.8%	477	97.9%	455
parkd	Sat with Providing Park and Recreation Programs	90.4%	496	89.3%	438
elderlyd	Sat w/ Programs for Elderly Population	81.9%	221	81.3%	245
finneedbd	Sat w/ County's Help to People in Need	71.5%	231	68.1%	260
dsssatd	Sat w/ Dept. of Soc. Services	76.9%	155	71.7%	212
hlthsatd	Sat w/ Health Department	85.1%	194	82.0%	160
menthpb	Sat w/ services to people w/ mental health problems	81.4%	131	81.0%	120
mentret	Sat w/ Services to Mental Retardation	90.4%	115	81.2%	90
menteis	Sat w/ Early Intervention Services	76.9%	89	90.2%	91
mentsub	Sat w/ Services to Substance Abuse	77.7%	96	78.7%	93
mentall	Sat w/ Mental Health Services Overall	89.2%	135	88.8%	125
schl4d	Sat that School System Provides Efficient Service	88.2%	538	86.2%	520
park2d	Sat with Park Authority	94.0%	268	96.2%	259
ctyserv2d	Sat with Service Authority	94.8%	310	93.1%	286

Table E4		Gender			
		Male (3)		Female (4)	
Communication with the County		%	n	%	n
		helpful2d	Helpfulness of County Employees	84.1%	293
helpfulad	Sat w/ helpfulness of tax County employees	83.2%	159	91.9%	130
timesatad	Sat w/ timeliness of tax request	87.4%	160	90.2%	131
net2d	Sat w/ PWC Government Web Site	93.1%	288	92.3%	270

Table E5		Gender			
		Male (3)		Female (4)	
Planning and Development Issues		%	n	%	n
newjobsd	Sat w/ Attracting New Jobs to PWC	78.5%	214	72.2%	196
land1d	Sat w/ Planning of Land Devel-prejob	72.9%	239	70.4%	196
land2d	Sat w/ Planning of Land Devel-postjob	62.6%	223	69.7%	222
landd	Sat w/ Planning of Land Devel (combined)	67.9%	463	69.8%	415
neighbord	Sat w/ Preventing Neighborhood Deterioration	69.3%	446	67.1%	395
lfillsatd	Sat w/ Landfill	98.0%	254	97.4%	188
compsatd	Sat w/ Compost Facility	97.8%	83	98.2%	42
travel97d	Sat w/ Ease of Travel in PWC	63.7%	485	64.4%	482
outsidedc	Sat w/ Ease of Travel around NoVA outside PWC	38.2%	460	43.0%	444
growthcd	Sat w/ Rate of PWC Growth	69.4%	453	69.0%	428
roaddevad	Sat w/ Coordination of Development with Road Systems	57.4%	434	56.2%	420
qstreams	Sat w/ PWC Efforts to Preserve Water Quality	89.2%	198	95.3%	182
inputdevd	Sat w/ Opportunities for Citizen Input	69.7%	275	77.8%	254
visdevd	Sat w/ Visual Appearance of New Development	85.7%	437	90.5%	450
buildngsd	Sat w/ the safety of buildings constructed in the last two years	96.8%	362	94.1%	302

Table E6		Gender			
		Male (3)		Female (4)	
View of Government		%	n	%	n
valued	Sat w/ Value for Tax Dollar	80.6%	550	86.4% <sup>(3)</sup>	504
effneffd	Sat w/ Efficient and Effective Service	85.2%	430	91.9% <sup>(3)</sup>	408
trstgovld	Trust of Government to do What is Right: Dichotomized	64.5%	457	61.9%	434

**TABLE E: Satisfaction Mean Ratings by Demographic Variables\***

\* A mean rating with a superscript indicates that this mean is significantly higher (at the 5% level) than the mean in the column corresponding to the superscript.

Table E7		Race							
		White (1)		Black (2)		Asian (3)		Other (4)	
Quality of life		mean	n	mean	n	mean	n	mean	n
qol10	Quality of life (ratings on 10 point-scale)	7.30	1,005	7.50	277	6.95	60	7.25	109
Satisfaction with Services									
ctysat97d	General Satisfaction with Services	93.5%	966	88.4%	257	89.3%	56	93.4%	106
voted	Sat w/ Convenient Ways to Register to Vote	98.6%	484	95.0%	143	90.3%	30	98.9%	52
pctupd	Sat w/ efficiency & effectiveness of voting precinct	97.3%	427	97.0%	111	100.0% <sup>(1)</sup>	26	91.1%	32
govtservd	Sat w/ Informing Citizens about Government	78.1%	526	74.2%	157	73.6%	35	75.0%	52

Table E8		Race							
		White (1)		Black (2)		Asian (3)		Other (4)	
Public Safety		%	n	%	n	%	n	%	n
strltad	Sat w/ Street Lighting	85.1%	710	80.4%	216	88.5%	42	77.2%	83
fired	Sat w/ Fire Fighting in R's Area	97.5%	583	98.7%	180	98.0%	34	100.0% <sup>(1)</sup>	71
rescued	Sat w/ Emergency Medical Rescue Services	96.0%	515	94.4%	163	98.6%	38	95.5%	57
amcrimed	Sat w/ Safety in Neighborhood in Daytime	95.4%	730	94.6%	199	87.7%	33	98.1%	87
pmcrimed	Sat w/ Safety in Neighborhood at Night	90.1% <sup>(4)</sup>	697	86.6%	202	75.1%	51	75.3%	85
dycrimebd	Sat w/ Safety in Business Areas in Daytime	93.1%	519	89.8%	145	90.9%	33	95.5%	64
ntcrimebd	Sat w/ Safety in Business Areas at Night	83.1%	385	81.3%	99	81.2%	30	83.6%	51
preventbd	Sat w/ Crime Prevention Programs	84.3%	458	84.5%	147	90.2%	34	79.4%	41
attituded	Sat w/ Police Dept. Attitudes Towards Citizens	88.8% <sup>(2)</sup>	778	75.8%	220	85.2%	52	79.3%	95
polfaird	Sat that Police Dept treats everyone fairly	85.0% <sup>(2)(4)</sup>	711	72.8%	215	83.4% <sup>(4)</sup>	45	58.9%	87
drugsd	Sat w/ Reduce the Use of Illegal Drugs	85.8%	452	84.7%	143	74.8%	28	91.2%	49
gangsd	Sat w/ Police Dept Efforts to Combat Gangs	83.5%	455	92.0% <sup>(1)</sup>	141	74.4%	38	92.0% <sup>(1)</sup>	69
policed	Sat w/ Overall Performance of Police Dept.	95.0% <sup>(2)</sup>	860	87.8%	240	83.0%	53	92.1%	88
ppolicyd	Sat w/ Police check status of anyone placed under arrest	82.1% <sup>(4)</sup>	558	80.5% <sup>(4)</sup>	190	64.7%	46	43.4%	77
courtsatd	Sat w/ Security in Courthouse	96.2%	249	96.5%	91	100.0% <sup>(1)</sup>	20	100.0% <sup>(1)</sup>	33
emsatsid	Sat w/ Assistance from 9-1-1 Operator	94.7%	155	92.5%	60	100.0% <sup>(1)</sup>	16	96.1%	20
emtimebd	Sat w/ Time for Help to Arrive	92.3%	143	86.0%	59	100.0% <sup>(1)</sup>	14	90.0%	20
emasstbd	Sat w/ Assistance on the Scene	92.5%	137	88.6%	51	100.0% <sup>(1)</sup>	14	96.1%	20

Table E9		Race							
		White (1)		Black (2)		Asian (3)		Other (4)	
Public Services		%	n	%	n	%	n	%	n
libraryd	Sat w/ Providing Library Services	95.7%	671	93.8%	206	92.7%	38	94.9%	73
librysatd	Sat w/ Service from Library Staff	99.1%	606	98.0%	191	100.0%	31	100.0%	64
parkd	Sat with Providing Park and Recreation Programs	91.7% <sup>(2)</sup>	608	81.3%	177	92.3%	39	93.7% <sup>(2)</sup>	72
elderlyd	Sat w/ Programs for Elderly Population	80.0%	273	83.7%	118	88.5%	21	94.7% <sup>(1)</sup>	35
finneedbd	Sat w/ County's Help to People in Need	74.8% <sup>(2)</sup>	258	58.2%	133	56.2%	22	81.1% <sup>(2)</sup>	51
dsstsd	Sat w/ Dept. of Soc. Services	70.4%	193	72.7%	110	86.1%	13	94.0% <sup>(1)(2)</sup>	31
hlthsatd	Sat w/ Health Department	85.9%	197	80.5%	74	69.6%	12	82.5%	52
menthpb	Sat w/ services to people w/ mental health problems	79.3%	154	81.5%	69	88.4%	5	94.5% <sup>(1)</sup>	17
mentret	Sat w/ Services to Mental Retardation	87.8%	119	88.3%	65	85.1%	4	91.4%	11
menteis	Sat w/ Early Intervention Services	82.9%	110	81.7%	55	85.1%	4	100.0% <sup>(1)(2)</sup>	5
mentsub	Sat w/ Services to Substance Abuse	74.5%	114	84.0%	54	85.1%	4	84.7%	11
mentald	Sat w/ Mental Health Services Overall	88.5%	159	89.5%	72	100.0% <sup>(1)</sup>	4	94.5%	17
schl4d	Sat that School System Provides Efficient Service	87.9%	678	87.4%	211	86.2%	47	86.9%	80
park2d	Sat with Park Authority	95.0%	378	96.0%	88	93.6%	22	90.9%	24
ctyserv2d	Sat with Service Authority	94.4%	416	95.5%	111	94.5%	14	87.7%	32

Table E10		Race							
		White (1)		Black (2)		Asian (3)		Other (4)	
Communication with the County		%	n	%	n	%	n	%	n
helpful2d	Helpfulness of County Employees	83.3%	391	84.2%	91	96.7% <sup>(1)</sup>	14	69.9%	23
helpfulad	Sat w/ helpfulness of tax County employees	85.6%	197	88.8%	57	100.0% <sup>(1)</sup>	11	95.1%	14
timesatad	Sat w/ timeliness of tax request	88.4%	199	91.1%	57	90.4%	11	90.8%	14
net2d	Sat w/ PWC Government Web Site	92.7%	381	94.1%	99	84.9%	24	100.0% <sup>(1)</sup>	29



Table E11		Race							
		White (1)		Black (2)		Asian (3)		Other (4)	
Planning and Development Issues		%	n	%	n	%	n	%	n
newjobsd	Sat w/ Attracting New Jobs to PWC	74.2%	266	75.0%	89	80.9%	12	81.9%	24
land1d	Sat w/ Planning of Land Devel-prejob	71.5%	297	72.6%	77	89.1% <sup>(1)</sup>	12	74.8%	29
land2d	Sat w/ Planning of Land Devel-postjob	57.6%	285	80.1% <sup>(1)</sup>	92	95.6% <sup>(1)(2)</sup>	18	84.8% <sup>(1)</sup>	29
landd	Sat w/ Planning of Land Devel (combined)	64.7%	581	76.7% <sup>(1)</sup>	170	92.1% <sup>(1)(2)</sup>	27	79.8%	58
neighborbd	Sat w/ Preventing Neighborhood Deterioration	66.0%	561	71.7%	149	87.4% <sup>(1)(2)</sup>	26	80.4% <sup>(1)</sup>	65
lfillsatd	Sat w/ Landfill	98.7%	345	92.0%	51	93.0%	11	96.3%	18
compsatd	Sat w/ Compost Facility	100.0%	115	55.3%	4	100.0%	2	100.0%	1
travel97d	Sat w/ Ease of Travel in PWC	62.0%	644	65.5%	173	67.3%	30	77.3% <sup>(1)</sup>	67
outsidedcd	Sat w/ Ease of Travel around NoVA outside PWC	35.3%	599	44.3%	165	64.2% <sup>(1)</sup>	29	61.7% <sup>(1)</sup>	62
growthcd	Sat w/ Rate of PWC Growth	66.6%	607	74.0%	155	92.0% <sup>(1)(2)</sup>	31	76.9%	56
roaddevad	Sat w/ Coordination of Development with Road Systems	52.2%	581	64.3% <sup>(1)</sup>	153	78.6% <sup>(1)</sup>	38	75.0% <sup>(1)</sup>	46
qstreamsdc	Sat w/ PWC Efforts to Preserve Water Quality	93.1%	276	93.9%	57	76.8%	17	87.8%	21
inputdevd	Sat w/ Opportunities for Citizen Input	74.8%	358	77.4%	91	70.6%	17	69.2%	36
visdevd	Sat w/ Visual Appearance of New Development	86.7%	605	97.1% <sup>(1)</sup>	147	88.4%	34	86.4%	57
buildngsd	Sat w/ the safety of buildings constructed in the last two years	95.3%	421	94.0%	139	100.0% <sup>(1)</sup>	22	100.0% <sup>(1)</sup>	56

Table E12		Race							
		White (1)		Black (2)		Asian (3)		Other (4)	
View of Government		%	n	%	n	%	n	%	n
		valued	Sat w/ Value for Tax Dollar	84.8%	684	80.9%	205	86.1%	41
effneffd	Sat w/ Efficient and Effective Service	88.2%	560	93.1%	157	83.2%	28	89.2%	59
trstgov1d	Trust of Government to do What is Right: Dichotomized	68.7% <sup>(2)</sup>	595	52.7%	155	59.7%	34	53.8%	70

**TABLE E: Satisfaction Mean Ratings by Demographic Variables\***

\* A mean rating with a superscript indicates that this mean is significantly higher (at the 5% level) than the mean in the column corresponding to the superscript.

Table E13		Age									
		18-25 (1)		26-37 (2)		38-49 (3)		50-64 (4)		Over 64 (5)	
Quality of life		mean	n	mean	n	mean	n	mean	n	mean	n
qol10	Quality of life (ratings on 10 point-scale)	7.39	171	7.03	321	7.37	372	7.40 <sup>(2)</sup>	382	7.46 <sup>(2)</sup>	200
<b>Satisfaction with Services</b>											
ctysat97d	General Satisfaction with Services	90.7%	165	94.7%	302	91.3%	362	92.4%	365	95.1%	191
voted	Sat w/ Convenient Ways to Register to Vote	92.5%	87	97.6%	161	97.8%	183	97.5%	188	98.7%	102
pctupd	Sat w/ efficiency & effectiveness of voting precinct	97.9%	29	94.6%	84	96.0%	171	98.1%	204	98.7%	107
govtservd	Sat w/ Informing Citizens about Government	72.2%	83	68.5%	157	73.2%	208	77.6%	208	91.9% <sup>(1)(2)(3)(4)</sup>	115

Table E14		Age									
		18-25 (1)		26-37 (2)		38-49 (3)		50-64 (4)		Over 64 (5)	
Public Safety		%	n	%	n	%	n	%	n	%	n
strltad	Sat w/ Street Lighting	82.4%	131	89.4% <sup>(3)</sup> (4)	253	79.9%	267	82.0%	279	81.7%	120
fired	Sat w/ Fire Fighting in R's Area	100.0% <sup>(4)</sup>	104	96.0%	189	99.1%	222	97.8%	238	97.3%	117
rescued	Sat w/ Emergency Medical Rescue Services	89.7%	102	96.1%	185	97.5%	195	96.2%	197	96.7%	98
amcrimed	Sat w/ Safety in Neighborhood in Daytime	96.9%	132	94.8%	219	92.3%	276	95.9%	280	97.2% <sup>(3)</sup>	145
pmcrimed	Sat w/ Safety in Neighborhood at Night	90.4%	123	81.5%	225	85.5%	277	89.0%	284	94.7% <sup>(2)</sup> (3)(4)	130
dycrimebd	Sat w/ Safety in Business Areas in Daytime	91.3%	84	93.0%	191	91.3%	196	92.9%	194	95.2%	98
ntcrimebd	Sat w/ Safety in Business Areas at Night	96.8% <sup>(2)</sup> (3)(4)	59	79.7%	129	78.4%	146	83.0%	167	90.9% <sup>(2)</sup> (3)(4)	63
preventbd	Sat w/ Crime Prevention Programs	79.2%	87	80.9%	152	87.1% <sup>(4)</sup>	181	76.6%	167	94.9% <sup>(1)</sup> (2)(3)(4)	87
attituded	Sat w/ Police Dept. Attitudes Towards Citizens	79.3%	146	81.9%	268	84.0%	292	86.2%	297	92.7% <sup>(1)</sup> (2)(3)(4)	147
polfaird	Sat that Police Dept treats everyone fairly	83.7%	138	71.3%	247	80.3%	274	79.9%	270	88.4% <sup>(2)</sup> (3)(4)	139
drugsd	Sat w/ Reduce the Use of Illegal Drugs	80.9%	102	83.6%	156	85.8%	156	88.3%	172	86.7%	80
gangsd	Sat w/ Police Dept Efforts to Combat Gangs	90.8%	97	80.9%	169	86.4%	175	84.3%	177	90.2%	87
policed	Sat w/ Overall Performance of Police Dept.	92.3%	161	88.7%	279	94.5%	313	90.1%	322	98.1% <sup>(2)</sup> (3)(4)	163
ppolicyd	Sat w/ Police check status of anyone placed under arrest	71.6%	119	62.1%	184	79.4% <sup>(2)</sup>	231	81.2% <sup>(2)</sup>	222	89.2% <sup>(1)</sup> (2)(3)	116
courtsatd	Sat w/ Security in Courthouse	90.1%	58	98.4%	96	98.6%	115	96.5%	102	97.5%	33
emsatisd	Sat w/ Assistance from 9-1-1 Operator	88.2%	27	96.6%	75	94.2%	60	95.5%	50	96.5%	37
emtimebd	Sat w/ Time for Help to Arrive	85.5%	25	94.9%	68	88.5%	60	90.9%	43	91.0%	36
emasstbd	Sat w/ Assistance on the Scene	87.3%	25	93.0%	64	93.7%	54	93.6%	40	90.9%	35

Table E15		Age									
		18-25 (1)		26-37 (2)		38-49 (3)		50-64 (4)		Over 64 (5)	
Public Services		%	n	%	n	%	%	n	%	n	%
libraryd	Sat w/ Providing Library Services	91.4%	107	94.0%	209	94.9%	266	97.1%	268	97.4%	131
librysatd	Sat w/ Service from Library Staff	95.8%	91	100.0%	179	97.9%	264	100.0%	247	100.0%	109
parkd	Sat with Providing Park and Recreation Programs	87.6%	103	89.3%	215	88.3%	235	91.3%	240	96.8% <sup>(2)(3)(4)</sup>	103
elderlyd	Sat w/ Programs for Elderly Population	81.5%	70	87.2%	94	79.9%	86	79.0%	111	84.9%	85
finneedbd	Sat w/ County's Help to People in Need	81.3% <sup>(3)</sup>	82	69.1%	139	61.8%	109	75.3%	102	71.6%	36
dsssatd	Sat w/ Dept. of Soc. Services	78.2%	40	74.6%	91	75.2%	80	74.5%	96	71.6%	39
hlthsatd	Sat w/ Health Department	75.9%	55	87.5%	83	82.0%	81	85.3%	89	84.9%	32
menthpbd	Sat w/ services to people w/ mental health problems	95.3% <sup>(2)(5)</sup>	41	69.1%	48	87.5%	49	83.7%	74	74.4%	27
mentretbd	Sat w/ Services to Mental Retardation	89.1%	38	100.0% <sup>(4)(5)</sup>	39	90.3%	36	86.0%	59	70.2%	22
menteisd	Sat w/ Early Intervention Services	93.9%	31	72.8%	39	92.3%	34	85.5%	53	80.4%	14
mentsubd	Sat w/ Services to Substance Abuse	76.1%	40	79.9%	36	83.1%	33	84.0%	56	67.6%	17
mentalld	Sat w/ Mental Health Services Overall	95.5% <sup>(5)</sup>	43	98.6% <sup>(4)(5)</sup>	48	92.5% <sup>(5)</sup>	52	89.1% <sup>(5)</sup>	78	70.5%	27
schl4d	Sat that School System Provides Efficient Service	94.1% <sup>(2)(3)</sup>	127	82.8%	240	86.3%	296	88.3%	242	90.6%	106
park2d	Sat with Park Authority	86.3%	48	99.0% <sup>(4)</sup>	121	95.8%	140	94.0%	141	93.3%	55
ctyserv2d	Sat with Service Authority	100.0% <sup>(3)(4)(5)</sup>	39	93.0%	106	94.0%	163	93.6%	180	94.3%	79

Table E16		Age									
		18-25 (1)		26-37 (2)		38-49 (3)		50-64 (4)		Over 64 (5)	
Communication with the County		%	n	%	n	%	%	n	%	n	%
helpful2d	Helpfulness of County Employees	75.5%	32	78.6%	92	79.8%	155	86.7%	151	86.2%	81
helpfulad	Sat w/ helpfulness of tax County employees	84.1%	20	92.7%	68	85.5%	79	82.5%	64	87.6%	45
timesatad	Sat w/ timeliness of tax request	100.0% <sup>(4)</sup> <sub>(5)</sub>	20	94.6% <sup>(4)(5)</sup>	68	92.4% <sup>(4)</sup>	78	79.5%	66	80.4%	46
net2d	Sat w/ PWC Government Web Site	90.8%	43	90.6%	134	95.9%	153	90.3%	161	98.1% <sup>(2)(4)</sup>	46

Table E17		Age									
		18-25 (1)		26-37 (2)		38-49 (3)		50-64 (4)		Over 64 (5)	
Planning and Development Issues		%	n	%	n	%	%	n	%	n	%
newjobsd	Sat w/ Attracting New Jobs to PWC	79.8%	48	62.4%	85	85.5% <sup>(2)</sup>	91	75.3%	122	86.5% <sup>(2)</sup>	37
land1d	Sat w/ Planning of Land Devel-prejob	86.9% <sup>(4)</sup>	64	75.0%	79	71.0%	102	61.9%	107	74.0%	57
land2d	Sat w/ Planning of Land Devel-postjob	73.8%	46	70.9%	95	74.7% <sup>(4)</sup>	106	57.8%	135	55.2%	54
landd	Sat w/ Planning of Land Devel (combined)	80.8% <sup>(4)</sup>	106	72.7% <sup>(4)</sup>	174	72.9% <sup>(4)</sup>	209	59.6%	242	64.8%	111
neighbord	Sat w/ Preventing Neighborhood Deterioration	77.7%	99	70.4%	171	67.6%	215	64.2%	225	73.5%	98
lfillsatd	Sat w/ Landfill	92.8%	40	99.1%	64	96.8%	118	98.1%	136	100.0% <sup>(4)</sup>	63
compsatd	Sat w/ Compost Facility	100.0% <sup>(4)</sup>	8	100.0% <sup>(1)</sup>	19	100.0% <sup>(1)</sup>	37	94.9% <sup>(5)</sup>	35	100.0%	19

Table E18		Age									
		18-25 (1)		26-37 (2)		38-49 (3)		50-64 (4)		Over 64 (5)	
Planning and Development Issues		%	n	%	n	%	%	n	%	n	%
travel97d	Sat w/ Ease of Travel in PWC	64.7%	107	65.1%	208	69.9% <sup>(4)</sup>	225	58.8%	243	63.5%	133
outsidedcd	Sat w/ Ease of Travel around NoVA outside PWC	60.3% <sup>(3)</sup> ) <sup>(4)</sup> (5)	104	45.3% <sup>(4)</sup>	189	43.5% <sup>(4)</sup>	214	26.6%	234	43.4% <sup>(4)</sup>	116
growthcd	Sat w/ Rate of PWC Growth	67.1%	98	79.0% <sup>(4)</sup>	179	71.1% <sup>(4)</sup>	232	60.5%	222	69.5%	120
roaddevad	Sat w/ Coordination of Development with Road Systems	75.2% <sup>(3)</sup> ) <sup>(4)</sup> (5)	111	63.3% <sup>(4)</sup>	187	56.1%	209	47.2%	214	57.8%	94
qstreamsdc	Sat w/ PWC Efforts to Preserve Water Quality	82.6%	35	99.0% <sup>(4)</sup> ) <sup>(5)</sup>	46	95.9%	73	93.2%	147	92.0%	61
inputdevd	Sat w/ Opportunities for Citizen Input	76.6%	62	70.1%	92	78.4%	120	71.0%	154	74.8%	81
visdevd	Sat w/ Visual Appearance of New Development	86.3%	101	92.3%	178	89.9%	212	85.7%	238	89.6%	119
buildngsd	Sat w/ the safety of buildings constructed in the last two years	94.6%	84	97.7%	134	95.2%	161	95.7%	179	93.7%	78



Table E19		Age									
		18-25 (1)		26-37 (2)		38-49 (3)		50-64 (4)		Over 64 (5)	
View of Government		%	n	%	n	%	%	n	%	n	%
valued	Sat w/ Value for Tax Dollar	86.7%	132	81.2%	230	85.4%	267	80.7%	251	88.0%	128
effneffd	Sat w/ Efficient and Effective Service	88.5%	89	92.1% <sup>(4)</sup> )	165	91.4% <sup>(4)</sup> )	220	83.8%	209	89.7%	110
trstgov1d	Trust of Government to do What is Right: Dichotomized	69.7%	88	61.3%	205	63.4%	207	62.7%	231	69.5%	118

**TABLE E: Satisfaction Mean Ratings by Demographic Variables\***

\* A mean rating with a superscript indicates that this mean is significantly higher (at the 5% level) than the mean in the column corresponding to the superscript.

Table E20		Marital Status									
		Married (1)		Separated (2)		Divorced (3)		Widowed (4)		Never married (5)	
Quality of life		mean	n	mean	n	mean	n	mean	n	mean	n
qol10	Quality of life (ratings on 10 point-scale)	7.31	894	6.94	40	7.30	160	7.62	55	7.24	332
<b>Satisfaction with Services</b>											
ctysat97d	General Satisfaction with Services	93.0%	865	98.1% <sup>(1)(3)(5)</sup>	38	88.5%	145	95.2%	50	90.6%	317
voted	Sat w/ Convenient Ways to Register to Vote	97.5%	458	100.0% <sup>(1)</sup>	28	97.0%	69	94.8%	29	95.4%	150
pctupd	Sat w/ efficiency & effectiveness of voting precinct	97.1%	433	100.0% <sup>(1)</sup>	11	92.6%	63	98.2%	26	97.4%	69
govtservd	Sat w/ Informing Citizens about Government	77.2%	485	81.2%	28	74.8%	80	88.5% <sup>(1)(5)</sup>	28	72.6%	173

Table E21		Marital Status									
		Married (1)		Separated (2)		Divorced (3)		Widowed (4)		Never married (5)	
Public Safety		%	n	%	n	%	n	%	n	%	n
strltad	Sat w/ Street Lighting	83.5%	621	90.2%	34	77.3%	126	77.4%	34	85.5%	258
fired	Sat w/ Fire Fighting in R's Area	97.6%	532	96.6%	30	95.4%	90	100.0% <sup>(1)</sup> <sub>)</sub>	27	99.8% <sup>(1)</sup>	211
rescued	Sat w/ Emergency Medical Rescue Services	96.8%	442	90.9%	29	96.2%	86	100.0% <sup>(1)</sup> <sub>)</sub> (3)(5)	31	93.3%	200
amcrimed	Sat w/ Safety in Neighborhood in Daytime	96.0%	646	91.2%	29	89.2%	118	100.0% <sup>(1)</sup> <sub>)</sub> (3)(5)	34	95.1%	244
pmcrimed	Sat w/ Safety in Neighborhood at Night	87.8%	650	95.6% <sup>(1)</sup> <sub>)</sub> (3)	27	78.0%	123	98.5% <sup>(1)</sup> <sub>)</sub> (3)(5)	35	88.0%	224
dycrimebd	Sat w/ Safety in Business Areas in Daytime	92.9%	469	100.0% <sup>(1)</sup> <sub>)</sub> (3)(5)	22	89.9%	88	98.0% <sup>(1)</sup>	23	90.8%	174
ntcrimebd	Sat w/ Safety in Business Areas at Night	82.9%	370	97.8% <sup>(1)</sup> <sub>)</sub> (3)	16	70.4%	63	77.9%	12	92.1% <sup>(1)</sup> <sub>)</sub> (3)	117
preventbd	Sat w/ Crime Prevention Programs	86.8% <sup>(3)</sup>	411	83.7%	20	69.1%	73	100.0% <sup>(1)</sup> <sub>)</sub> (3)(5)	28	78.3%	170

Table E22		Marital Status									
		Married (1)		Separated (2)		Divorced (3)		Widowed (4)		Never married (5)	
Public Safety		%	n	%	n	%	%	n	%	n	%
attituded	Sat w/ Police Dept. Attitudes Towards Citizens	86.7%	708	87.1%	33	85.0%	130	91.9% <sup>(5)</sup>	33	78.6%	268
polfaird	Sat that Police Dept treats everyone fairly	83.0% <sup>(3)</sup>	642	70.6%	27	69.8%	118	89.6% <sup>(3)</sup> <sub>(5)</sub>	39	75.6%	272
drugsd	Sat w/ Reduce the Use of Illegal Drugs	86.0%	388	100.0% <sup>(1)</sup> <sub>(3)(5)</sub>	26	81.8%	68	88.5%	22	82.8%	183
gangsd	Sat w/ Police Dept Efforts to Combat Gangs	83.5%	423	83.6%	26	89.1%	66	94.8% <sup>(1)</sup>	22	86.9%	183
policed	Sat w/ Overall Performance of Police Dept.	93.9%	764	84.5%	39	87.0%	131	100.0% <sup>(1)</sup> <sub>(3)(5)</sub>	44	89.1%	291
ppolicyd	Sat w/ Police check status of anyone placed under arrest	78.5%	520	87.3%	32	71.7%	95	91.4% <sup>(1)</sup> <sub>(3)(5)</sub>	27	72.1%	222
courtsatd	Sat w/ Security in Courthouse	96.5%	220	100.0% <sup>(1)</sup>	12	100.0% <sup>(1)</sup>	53	90.6%	9	94.9%	111
emsatisd	Sat w/ Assistance from 9-1-1 Operator	95.7%	162	87.8%	5	90.6%	27	100.0% <sup>(1)</sup>	9	92.5%	53
emtimebd	Sat w/ Time for Help to Arrive	94.0%	152	44.0%	5	91.6%	26	100.0% <sup>(1)</sup>	8	84.1%	51
emasstbd	Sat w/ Assistance on the Scene	93.5%	145	44.0%	5	100.0% <sup>(1)</sup>	23	100.0% <sup>(1)</sup>	8	89.8%	46

Table E23  Public Services		Marital Status									
		Married (1)		Separated (2)		Divorced (3)		Widowed (4)		Never married (5)	
		%	n	%	n	%	%	n	%	n	%
libraryd	Sat w/ Providing Library Services	95.1%	623	85.9%	29	97.3%	117	100.0% <sup>(1)(5)</sup>	35	94.3%	196
librysatd	Sat w/ Service from Library Staff	99.6%	584	100.0%	24	97.4%	99	100.0%	24	97.6%	177
parkd	Sat with Providing Park and Recreation Programs	91.2%	577	88.0%	26	83.3%	93	100.0% <sup>(1)(3)(5)</sup>	25	87.1%	197
elderlyd	Sat w/ Programs for Elderly Population	82.6%	238	84.7%	17	78.9%	48	90.0%	21	78.2%	133
finneedbd	Sat w/ County's Help to People in Need	72.4%	246	83.6% <sup>(3)</sup>	24	52.7%	45	77.0%	10	71.7%	149
dsssatd	Sat w/ Dept. of Soc. Services	72.4%	158	92.8% <sup>(1)(3)(5)</sup>	16	66.6%	49	97.0% <sup>(1)(3)(5)</sup>	15	75.6%	112
hlthsatd	Sat w/ Health Department	85.2%	186	78.8%	12	82.1%	39	94.7%	14	81.0%	96
menthpb	Sat w/ services to people w/ mental health problems	81.7%	118	93.4%	10	74.0%	33	90.5%	10	80.3%	78
mentret	Sat w/ Services to Mental Retardation	85.1%	98	93.4%	10	92.3%	19	87.5%	7	85.0%	69
menteis	Sat w/ Early Intervention Services	83.2%	82	100.0% <sup>(1)(5)</sup>	10	89.3%	20	100.0% <sup>(1)(5)</sup>	6	77.3%	60
mentsub	Sat w/ Services to Substance Abuse	82.0%	78	92.6% <sup>(5)</sup>	10	90.7% <sup>(5)</sup>	23	86.1%	7	66.7%	71
mentall	Sat w/ Mental Health Services Overall	87.4%	123	100.0% <sup>(1)(3)</sup>	10	88.6%	35	90.5%	10	89.8%	80
schl4d	Sat that School System Provides Efficient Service	89.4%	660	89.8%	25	79.7%	93	91.4%	24	83.1%	234
park2d	Sat with Park Authority	95.8%	332	100.0% <sup>(1)</sup>	17	94.0%	61	94.7%	10	92.1%	100
ctyserv2d	Sat with Service Authority	94.0%	378	92.2%	10	91.2%	68	91.4%	21	96.1%	103

Table E24		Marital Status									
		Married (1)		Separated (2)		Divorced (3)		Widowed (4)		Never married (5)	
Communication with the County		%	n	%	n	%	%	n	%	n	%
		helpful2d	Helpfulness of County Employees	85.0%	342	88.3%	12	82.5%	55	88.5%	21
helpfulad	Sat w/ helpfulness of tax County employees	87.3%	180	91.1%	15	85.6%	38	80.7%	12	88.2%	35
timesatad	Sat w/ timeliness of tax request	88.9%	182	92.1% <sup>(4)</sup>	15	93.9% <sup>(4)</sup>	38	62.6%	12	89.3%	36
net2d	Sat w/ PWC Government Web Site	92.9%	365	92.2%	8	89.8%	59	100.0% <sup>(1)(3)(5)</sup>	11	92.3%	105

Table E25  Planning and Development Issues		Marital Status									
		Married (1)		Separated (2)		Divorced (3)		Widowed (4)		Never married (5)	
		%	n	%	n	%	%	n	%	n	%
newjobsd	Sat w/ Attracting New Jobs to PWC	78.3%	221	63.5%	11	74.3%	44	85.4%	8	71.9%	107
land1d	Sat w/ Planning of Land Devel-prejob	70.5%	251	86.4%	11	64.9%	38	88.9% <sup>(1)</sup> <sub>(3)</sub>	11	76.2%	109
land2d	Sat w/ Planning of Land Devel-postjob	64.4%	264	70.4%	15	64.9%	55	67.2%	16	71.6%	90
landd	Sat w/ Planning of Land Devel (combined)	67.3%	515	77.1%	25	64.9%	93	76.2%	28	73.7%	196
neighbord	Sat w/ Preventing Neighborhood Deterioration	67.6%	472	62.8%	21	61.7%	103	84.4% <sup>(1)</sup> <sub>(3)</sub>	24	74.5%	204
lfillsatd	Sat w/ Landfill	98.4%	317	81.7%	7	98.0%	30	100.0% <sub>(1)</sub>	11	95.9%	71
compsatd	Sat w/ Compost Facility	97.3%	95	100.0%	4	100.0%	12	100.0%	2	100.0%	12
travel97d	Sat w/ Ease of Travel in PWC	65.6%	566	82.1%	25	61.9%	97	59.7%	33	62.8%	218
outsidedcd	Sat w/ Ease of Travel around NoVA outside PWC	34.7%	528	55.1%	25	43.8%	90	44.2%	27	54.8% <sup>(1)</sup>	208
growthcd	Sat w/ Rate of PWC Growth	68.2%	544	82.6%	20	72.1%	89	70.1%	26	71.9%	179
roaddevad	Sat w/ Coordination of Development with Road Systems	52.7%	513	89.5% <sup>(1)</sup> <sub>(3)(4)(5)</sub>	15	59.8%	89	63.4%	22	65.6% <sup>(1)</sup>	194
qstreamsds	Sat w/ PWC Efforts to Preserve Water Quality	91.9%	229	100.0% <sub>(1)(5)</sub>	10	94.1%	45	94.3%	17	90.6%	69
inputdevd	Sat w/ Opportunities for Citizen Input	71.7%	327	75.1%	19	83.0% <sup>(1)</sup> <sub>( )</sub>	54	85.2%	15	75.3%	96
visdevd	Sat w/ Visual Appearance of New Development	88.6%	540	83.3%	23	90.4%	87	89.5%	31	85.1%	180
buildngsd	Sat w/ the safety of buildings constructed in the last two years	96.0%	403	96.8%	19	97.9%	63	96.6%	20	93.9%	142

Table E26		Marital Status									
		Married (1)		Separated (2)		Divorced (3)		Widowed (4)		Never married (5)	
View of Government		%	n	%	n	%	%	n	%	n	%
		valued	Sat w/ Value for Tax Dollar	84.0%	609	79.2%	33	87.5%	111	92.1%	26
effneffd	Sat w/ Efficient and Effective Service	88.8%	500	96.8% <sup>(1)(3)</sup>	25	78.5%	91	96.8% <sup>(1)(3)</sup>	25	90.4%	176
trstgov1d	Trust of Government to do What is Right: Dichotomized	64.2%	550	39.1%	18	71.2%	91	59.1%	33	62.4%	174



**TABLE E: Satisfaction Mean Ratings by Demographic Variables\***

\* A mean rating with a superscript indicates that this mean is significantly higher (at the 5% level) than the mean in the column corresponding to the superscript.

Table E27		Children Under 18			
		No children under 18 (1)		Children under 18 (2)	
Quality of life		mean	n	mean	n
qol10	Quality of life (ratings on 10 point-scale)	7.23	803	7.37	725
Satisfaction with Services					
ctysat97d	General Satisfaction with Services	91.6%	765	92.7%	695
voted	Sat w/ Convenient Ways to Register to Vote	97.8%	392	96.3%	357
pctupd	Sat w/ efficiency & effectiveness of voting precinct	96.8%	352	96.9%	268
govtservd	Sat w/ Informing Citizens about Government	76.8%	422	75.0%	391

Table E28		Children Under 18			
		No children under 18 (1)		Children under 18 (2)	
Public Safety		%	n	%	n
strltad	Sat w/ Street Lighting	84.1%	544	82.6%	559
fired	Sat w/ Fire Fighting in R's Area	98.1%	483	97.9%	437
rescued	Sat w/ Emergency Medical Rescue Services	96.3%	433	95.4%	378
amcrimed	Sat w/ Safety in Neighborhood in Daytime	95.4%	574	95.0%	536
pmcrimed	Sat w/ Safety in Neighborhood at Night	88.7%	565	85.4%	531
dycrimebd	Sat w/ Safety in Business Areas in Daytime	90.3%	411	95.0% <sup>(1)</sup>	392
ntcrimebd	Sat w/ Safety in Business Areas at Night	82.6%	297	82.8%	298
preventbd	Sat w/ Crime Prevention Programs	81.8%	358	84.7%	362
attituded	Sat w/ Police Dept. Attitudes Towards Citizens	87.7%	623	82.2%	586
polfaird	Sat that Police Dept treats everyone fairly	81.9%	565	77.8%	563
drugsd	Sat w/ Reduce the Use of Illegal Drugs	84.1%	339	86.2%	365
gangsd	Sat w/ Police Dept Efforts to Combat Gangs	84.0%	370	86.6%	369
policed	Sat w/ Overall Performance of Police Dept.	91.6%	675	93.0%	632
ppolicyd	Sat w/ Police check status of anyone placed under arrest	80.7% <sup>(2)</sup>	466	71.4%	455
courtsatd	Sat w/ Security in Courthouse	95.2%	179	97.6%	235
emsatisd	Sat w/ Assistance from 9-1-1 Operator	94.0%	123	95.2%	141
emtimebd	Sat w/ Time for Help to Arrive	89.5%	116	92.5%	132
emasstbd	Sat w/ Assistance on the Scene	91.9%	111	93.5%	122

Table E29		Children Under 18			
		No children under 18 (1)		Children under 18 (2)	
Public Services		%	n	%	n
libraryd	Sat w/ Providing Library Services	95.8%	515	94.6%	518
librysatd	Sat w/ Service from Library Staff	99.0%	428	98.8%	507
parkd	Sat with Providing Park and Recreation Programs	89.4%	440	89.9%	499
elderlyd	Sat w/ Programs for Elderly Population	78.8%	262	84.6%	210
finneedbd	Sat w/ County's Help to People in Need	67.6%	240	70.4%	256
dsstsd	Sat w/ Dept. of Soc. Services	66.5%	169	78.9% <sup>(1)</sup>	203
hlthsatd	Sat w/ Health Department	81.7%	157	85.4%	197
menthpb	Sat w/ services to people w/ mental health problems	77.1%	137	84.3%	117
mentret	Sat w/ Services to Mental Retardation	79.2%	112	92.4% <sup>(1)</sup>	95
menteis	Sat w/ Early Intervention Services	76.1%	86	90.6%	94
mentsub	Sat w/ Services to Substance Abuse	69.0%	102	86.4% <sup>(1)</sup>	91
mentall	Sat w/ Mental Health Services Overall	83.6%	144	93.7% <sup>(1)</sup>	119
schl4d	Sat that School System Provides Efficient Service	86.7%	421	87.5%	641
park2d	Sat with Park Authority	93.9%	230	96.0%	297
ctyserv2d	Sat with Service Authority	95.4%	315	92.8%	277

Table E30		Children Under 18			
		Communication with the County		No children under 18 (1)	
				%	n
helpful2d	Helpfulness of County Employees	84.2%	286	80.2%	257
helpfulad	Sat w/ helpfulness of tax County employees	82.6%	146	91.6%	141
timesatad	Sat w/ timeliness of tax request	83.4%	149	94.1% <sup>(1)</sup>	141
net2d	Sat w/ PWC Government Web Site	91.0%	285	94.5%	276

Table E31		Children Under 18			
		No children under 18 (1)		Children under 18 (2)	
Planning and Development Issues		%	n	%	n
newjobsd	Sat w/ Attracting New Jobs to PWC	74.2%	222	77.5%	192
land1d	Sat w/ Planning of Land Devel-prejob	68.1%	234	76.3%	203
land2d	Sat w/ Planning of Land Devel-postjob	64.0%	232	68.4%	215
landd	Sat w/ Planning of Land Devel (combined)	66.1%	466	72.0%	415
neighbord	Sat w/ Preventing Neighborhood Deterioration	65.4%	434	71.6%	414
lfillsatd	Sat w/ Landfill	99.1%	229	96.3%	212
compsatd	Sat w/ Compost Facility	97.3%	67	98.8%	61
travel97d	Sat w/ Ease of Travel in PWC	60.5%	505	68.4% <sup>(1)</sup>	465
outsidecd	Sat w/ Ease of Travel around NoVA outside PWC	37.0%	468	44.8%	439
growthcd	Sat w/ Rate of PWC Growth	68.3%	468	70.8%	418
roaddevad	Sat w/ Coordination of Development with Road Systems	54.7%	436	59.5%	423
qstreamsd	Sat w/ PWC Efforts to Preserve Water Quality	92.5%	227	91.1%	154
inputdevd	Sat w/ Opportunities for Citizen Input	73.4%	322	74.4%	211
visdevd	Sat w/ Visual Appearance of New Development	86.5%	490	90.2%	398
buildngsd	Sat w/ the safety of buildings constructed in the last two years	94.3%	309	96.7%	358

Table E32		Children Under 18			
		View of Government		No children under 18 (1)	
				%	n
valued	Sat w/ Value for Tax Dollar	80.8%	543	85.4%	517
effneffd	Sat w/ Efficient and Effective Service	87.2%	434	89.6%	405
trstgov1d	Trust of Government to do What is Right: Dichotomized	64.4%	467	61.6%	430

**TABLE E: Satisfaction Mean Ratings by Demographic Variables\***

\* A mean rating with a superscript indicates that this mean is significantly higher (at the 5% level) than the mean in the column corresponding to the superscript.

Table E33		Children Under 5			
		Yes (1)		No (2)	
Quality of life		mean	n	mean	n
qol10	Quality of life (ratings on 10 point-scale)	6.98	292	7.62 <sup>(1)</sup>	430
Satisfaction with Services					
ctysat97d	General Satisfaction with Services	91.2%	276	93.6%	416
voted	Sat w/ Convenient Ways to Register to Vote	94.9%	143	97.3%	214
pctupd	Sat w/ efficiency & effectiveness of voting precinct	96.1%	87	97.4%	181
govtservd	Sat w/ Informing Citizens about Government	76.3%	155	74.0%	234

Table E34		Children Under 5			
		Yes (1)		No (2)	
Public Safety		%	n	%	n
strltad	Sat w/ Street Lighting	80.9%	225	83.5%	331
fired	Sat w/ Fire Fighting in R's Area	97.4%	176	98.3%	259
rescued	Sat w/ Emergency Medical Rescue Services	96.3%	152	94.8%	225
amcrimed	Sat w/ Safety in Neighborhood in Daytime	92.8%	205	96.3%	330
pmcrimed	Sat w/ Safety in Neighborhood at Night	81.3%	218	88.1%	310
dycrimebd	Sat w/ Safety in Business Areas in Daytime	93.7%	151	95.8%	239
ntcrimebd	Sat w/ Safety in Business Areas at Night	80.4%	125	84.6%	174
preventbd	Sat w/ Crime Prevention Programs	89.2%	133	81.9%	226
attituded	Sat w/ Police Dept. Attitudes Towards Citizens	79.7%	237	83.8%	346
polfaird	Sat that Police Dept treats everyone fairly	71.3%	223	81.8% <sup>(1)</sup>	337
drugsd	Sat w/ Reduce the Use of Illegal Drugs	89.8%	158	83.4%	205
gangsd	Sat w/ Police Dept Efforts to Combat Gangs	86.7%	145	86.4%	220
policed	Sat w/ Overall Performance of Police Dept.	92.5%	253	93.2%	376
ppolicyd	Sat w/ Police check status of anyone placed under arrest	59.8%	175	78.4% <sup>(1)</sup>	277
courtsatd	Sat w/ Security in Courthouse	94.4%	84	99.3%	151
emsatisd	Sat w/ Assistance from 9-1-1 Operator	90.4%	57	98.4%	85
emtimebd	Sat w/ Time for Help to Arrive	90.4%	55	94.0%	77
emasstbd	Sat w/ Assistance on the Scene	95.5%	52	92.1%	70



Table E35		Children Under 5			
		Yes (1)		No (2)	
Public Services		%	n	%	n
libraryd	Sat w/ Providing Library Services	93.3%	202	95.3%	313
librysatd	Sat w/ Service from Library Staff	99.0%	170	98.6%	334
parkd	Sat with Providing Park and Recreation Programs	90.0%	188	89.8%	309
elderlyd	Sat w/ Programs for Elderly Population	82.4%	85	86.0%	124
finneedbd	Sat w/ County's Help to People in Need	73.7%	105	68.1%	151
dssatd	Sat w/ Dept. of Soc. Services	85.1%	82	74.7%	122
hlthsatd	Sat w/ Health Department	82.0%	70	87.3%	128
menthpb	Sat w/ services to people w/ mental health problems	78.2%	35	86.7%	80
mentret	Sat w/ Services to Mental Retardation	100.0% <sup>(2)</sup>	27	89.1%	66
menteis	Sat w/ Early Intervention Services	84.8%	26	92.6%	66
mentsub	Sat w/ Services to Substance Abuse	97.1% <sup>(2)</sup>	26	84.1%	64
mentall	Sat w/ Mental Health Services Overall	98.4%	36	91.4%	81
schl4d	Sat that School System Provides Efficient Service	84.6%	227	89.1%	413
park2d	Sat with Park Authority	97.8%	103	95.1%	194
ctyserv2d	Sat with Service Authority	97.3% <sup>(2)</sup>	101	90.1%	175

Table E36		Children Under 5			
		Communication with the County		Yes (1)	
helpful2d	Helpfulness of County Employees			76.6%	92
helpfulad	Sat w/ helpfulness of tax County employees	85.1%	60	96.4%	81
timesatad	Sat w/ timeliness of tax request	96.8%	59	92.1%	81
net2d	Sat w/ PWC Government Web Site	95.0%	124	94.1%	151

Table E37		Children Under 5			
		Yes (1)		No (2)	
Planning and Development Issues		%	n	%	n
newjobsd	Sat w/ Attracting New Jobs to PWC	71.9%	70	80.5%	121
land1d	Sat w/ Planning of Land Devel-prejob	81.0%	94	72.2%	109
land2d	Sat w/ Planning of Land Devel-postjob	63.9%	78	71.0%	136
landd	Sat w/ Planning of Land Devel (combined)	72.7%	169	71.6%	246
neighbord	Sat w/ Preventing Neighborhood Deterioration	73.8%	156	69.9%	256
lfillsatd	Sat w/ Landfill	99.1%	69	94.9%	143
compsatd	Sat w/ Compost Facility	96.2%	19	100.0%	42
travel97d	Sat w/ Ease of Travel in PWC	70.3%	197	66.8%	266
outsidedc	Sat w/ Ease of Travel around NoVA outside PWC	50.6%	191	40.0%	247
growthcd	Sat w/ Rate of PWC Growth	77.6%	151	66.6%	264
roaddevad	Sat w/ Coordination of Development with Road Systems	67.0% <sup>(2)</sup>	168	54.2%	253
qstreams	Sat w/ PWC Efforts to Preserve Water Quality	88.2%	59	92.8%	93
inputdevd	Sat w/ Opportunities for Citizen Input	69.5%	77	76.6%	132
visdevd	Sat w/ Visual Appearance of New Development	88.6%	168	91.4%	230
buildngsd	Sat w/ the safety of buildings constructed in the last two years	97.0%	126	96.5%	229

Table E38		Children Under 5			
		View of Government		Yes (1)	
				%	n
valued	Sat w/ Value for Tax Dollar	86.5%	199	84.6%	317
effneffd	Sat w/ Efficient and Effective Service	83.5%	144	93.0% <sup>(1)</sup>	261
trstgov1d	Trust of Government to do What is Right: Dichotomized	57.1%	170	65.0%	259

**TABLE E: Satisfaction Mean Ratings by Demographic Variables\***

\* A mean rating with a superscript indicates that this mean is significantly higher (at the 5% level) than the mean in the column corresponding to the superscript.

Table E39		Children age 5-12			
		Yes (1)		No (2)	
Quality of life		mean	n	mean	n
qol10	Quality of life (ratings on 10 point-scale)	7.40	377	7.43	264
Satisfaction with Services					
ctysat97d	General Satisfaction with Services	92.4%	362	92.9%	255
voted	Sat w/ Convenient Ways to Register to Vote	95.0%	204	99.6% <sup>(1)</sup>	115
pctupd	Sat w/ efficiency & effectiveness of voting precinct	97.2%	151	97.4%	92
govtservd	Sat w/ Informing Citizens about Government	70.4%	194	79.4%	160

Table E40		Children age 5-12			
		Public Safety		Yes (1)	
				%	n
strltad	Sat w/ Street Lighting	81.7%	289	85.3%	210
fired	Sat w/ Fire Fighting in R's Area	97.7%	237	99.6%	147
rescued	Sat w/ Emergency Medical Rescue Services	93.0%	206	98.4%	126
amcrimed	Sat w/ Safety in Neighborhood in Daytime	96.3%	278	94.8%	203
pmcrimed	Sat w/ Safety in Neighborhood at Night	86.5%	262	87.4%	206
dycrimebd	Sat w/ Safety in Business Areas in Daytime	93.6%	209	96.9%	132
ntcrimebd	Sat w/ Safety in Business Areas at Night	81.7%	162	87.4%	101
preventbd	Sat w/ Crime Prevention Programs	84.2%	206	87.7%	116
attituded	Sat w/ Police Dept. Attitudes Towards Citizens	79.9%	294	86.2%	226
polfaird	Sat that Police Dept treats everyone fairly	76.4%	296	80.6%	201
drugsd	Sat w/ Reduce the Use of Illegal Drugs	86.6%	175	87.8%	134
gangsd	Sat w/ Police Dept Efforts to Combat Gangs	85.7%	187	87.3%	136
policed	Sat w/ Overall Performance of Police Dept.	92.3%	329	94.2%	232
ppolicyd	Sat w/ Police check status of anyone placed under arrest	76.1%	234	70.0%	166
courtsatd	Sat w/ Security in Courthouse	98.6%	115	95.6%	94
emsatisd	Sat w/ Assistance from 9-1-1 Operator	93.9%	82	95.6%	40
emtimebd	Sat w/ Time for Help to Arrive	89.9%	76	96.9%	39
emasstbd	Sat w/ Assistance on the Scene	91.2%	69	97.8%	36

<b>Table E41</b>		<b>Children age 5-12</b>			
<b>Public Services</b>		<b>Yes (1)</b>		<b>No (2)</b>	
		%	n	%	n
libraryd	Sat w/ Providing Library Services	95.3%	270	95.4%	196
librysatd	Sat w/ Service from Library Staff	99.3%	286	98.3%	184
parkd	Sat with Providing Park and Recreation Programs	89.9%	280	93.9%	166
elderlyd	Sat w/ Programs for Elderly Population	80.6%	106	92.8%	72
finneedbd	Sat w/ County's Help to People in Need	69.1%	143	72.2%	86
dsssatd	Sat w/ Dept. of Soc. Services	75.4%	112	82.6%	73
hlthsatd	Sat w/ Health Department	87.9%	115	89.6%	64
menthpb	Sat w/ services to people w/ mental health problems	91.3%	56	86.7%	47
mentret	Sat w/ Services to Mental Retardation	91.0%	47	92.4%	39
menteis	Sat w/ Early Intervention Services	97.5%	44	90.9%	41
mentsub	Sat w/ Services to Substance Abuse	87.9%	39	85.3%	41
mentall	Sat w/ Mental Health Services Overall	93.3%	56	92.4%	50
schl4d	Sat that School System Provides Efficient Service	87.1%	362	89.5%	230
park2d	Sat with Park Authority	95.7%	154	96.2%	112
ctyserv2d	Sat with Service Authority	90.2%	141	95.2%	110

Table E42		Children age 5-12			
		Communication with the County		Yes (1)	
				%	n
helpful2d	Helpfulness of County Employees	81.3%	137	77.3%	92
helpfulad	Sat w/ helpfulness of tax County employees	97.3%	76	85.8%	46
timesatad	Sat w/ timeliness of tax request	92.6%	76	94.1%	46
net2d	Sat w/ PWC Government Web Site	93.1%	156	96.8%	94



Table E43		Children age 5-12			
		Yes (1)		No (2)	
Planning and Development Issues		%	n	%	n
newjobsd	Sat w/ Attracting New Jobs to PWC	79.3%	98	80.4%	67
land1d	Sat w/ Planning of Land Devel-prejob	68.4%	89	85.3% <sup>(1)</sup>	81
land2d	Sat w/ Planning of Land Devel-postjob	71.2%	108	69.3%	79
landd	Sat w/ Planning of Land Devel (combined)	69.9%	196	77.4%	160
neighbord	Sat w/ Preventing Neighborhood Deterioration	69.5%	217	78.2%	149
lfillsatd	Sat w/ Landfill	94.4%	118	98.5%	78
compsatd	Sat w/ Compost Facility	97.8%	34	100.0%	19
travel97d	Sat w/ Ease of Travel in PWC	68.4%	244	70.0%	156
outsidedcd	Sat w/ Ease of Travel around NoVA outside PWC	44.3%	225	45.3%	153
growthcd	Sat w/ Rate of PWC Growth	70.3%	228	73.1%	142
roaddevad	Sat w/ Coordination of Development with Road Systems	53.6%	218	64.1%	157
qstreams	Sat w/ PWC Efforts to Preserve Water Quality	93.1%	64	89.0%	74
inputdevd	Sat w/ Opportunities for Citizen Input	71.1%	104	77.7%	80
visdevd	Sat w/ Visual Appearance of New Development	93.5%	214	85.2%	139
buildngsd	Sat w/ the safety of buildings constructed in the last two years	95.5%	180	99.3%	141

<b>Table E44</b>		<b>Children age 5-12</b>			
<b>View of Government</b>		<b>Yes (1)</b>		<b>No (2)</b>	
		%	n	%	n
valued	Sat w/ Value for Tax Dollar	85.1%	273	88.1%	188
effneffd	Sat w/ Efficient and Effective Service	90.7%	216	88.8%	155
trstgov1d	Trust of Government to do What is Right: Dichotomized	61.1%	223	68.7%	159

**TABLE E: Satisfaction Mean Ratings by Demographic Variables\***

\* A mean rating with a superscript indicates that this mean is significantly higher (at the 5% level) than the mean in the column corresponding to the superscript.

Table E45		Children age 13-17			
		Yes (1)		No (2)	
Quality of life		mean	n	mean	n
qol10	Quality of life (ratings on 10 point-scale)	7.56	303	7.25	219
Satisfaction with Services					
ctysat97d	General Satisfaction with Services	92.5%	296	95.5%	212
voted	Sat w/ Convenient Ways to Register to Vote	99.3%	148	95.2%	106
pctupd	Sat w/ efficiency & effectiveness of voting precinct	96.3%	138	97.8%	65
govtservd	Sat w/ Informing Citizens about Government	76.1%	158	73.5%	132

Table E46		Children age 13-17			
Public Safety		Yes (1)		No (2)	
		%	n	%	n
strltad	Sat w/ Street Lighting	83.4%	234	87.7%	176
fired	Sat w/ Fire Fighting in R's Area	99.7%	187	98.9%	126
rescued	Sat w/ Emergency Medical Rescue Services	98.3%	153	95.5%	109
amcrimed	Sat w/ Safety in Neighborhood in Daytime	96.6%	234	93.5%	154
pmcrimed	Sat w/ Safety in Neighborhood at Night	89.4%	213	83.0%	160
dycrimebd	Sat w/ Safety in Business Areas in Daytime	97.7%	157	92.0%	110
ntcrimebd	Sat w/ Safety in Business Areas at Night	84.4%	114	79.8%	91
preventbd	Sat w/ Crime Prevention Programs	87.7%	131	83.0%	115
attituded	Sat w/ Police Dept. Attitudes Towards Citizens	87.2%	251	80.0%	173
polfaird	Sat that Police Dept treats everyone fairly	82.1%	224	74.8%	173
drugsd	Sat w/ Reduce the Use of Illegal Drugs	82.6%	151	94.2% <sup>(1)</sup>	98
gangsd	Sat w/ Police Dept Efforts to Combat Gangs	87.4%	155	88.3%	107
policed	Sat w/ Overall Performance of Police Dept.	95.0%	276	93.7%	186
ppolicyd	Sat w/ Police check status of anyone placed under arrest	79.5%	207	66.3%	116
courtsatd	Sat w/ Security in Courthouse	98.0%	125	95.7%	51
emsatsid	Sat w/ Assistance from 9-1-1 Operator	98.7%	46	89.0%	44
emtimebd	Sat w/ Time for Help to Arrive	98.3%	43	86.5%	44
emasstbd	Sat w/ Assistance on the Scene	98.2%	42	93.7%	38

Table E47		Children age 13-17			
		Yes (1)		No (2)	
Public Services		%	n	%	n
libraryd	Sat w/ Providing Library Services	94.3%	230	96.2%	153
librysatd	Sat w/ Service from Library Staff	98.3%	237	99.2%	147
parkd	Sat with Providing Park and Recreation Programs	91.5%	214	93.0%	152
elderlyd	Sat w/ Programs for Elderly Population	85.7%	81	90.1%	59
finneedbd	Sat w/ County's Help to People in Need	66.9%	99	71.0%	86
dsssatd	Sat w/ Dept. of Soc. Services	85.1%	82	70.7%	64
hlthsatd	Sat w/ Health Department	88.3%	87	96.4%	56
menthpbd	Sat w/ services to people w/ mental health problems	86.3%	66	96.2%	20
mentretbd	Sat w/ Services to Mental Retardation	89.0%	52	96.0%	18
menteisd	Sat w/ Early Intervention Services	92.5%	56	95.5%	16
mentsubd	Sat w/ Services to Substance Abuse	84.0%	54	94.8%	14
mentalld	Sat w/ Mental Health Services Overall	92.1%	68	96.2%	19
schl4d	Sat that School System Provides Efficient Service	84.3%	293	92.2% <sup>(1)</sup>	190
park2d	Sat with Park Authority	93.3%	141	98.4%	85
ctyserv2d	Sat with Service Authority	91.1%	132	96.2%	71

<b>Table E48</b>		<b>Children age 13-17</b>			
<b>Communication with the County</b>		<b>Yes (1)</b>		<b>No (2)</b>	
helpful2d	Helpfulness of County Employees	85.6%	110	74.2%	76
helpfulad	Sat w/ helpfulness of tax County employees	94.0%	54	88.3%	40
timesatad	Sat w/ timeliness of tax request	94.9%	54	91.0%	40
net2d	Sat w/ PWC Government Web Site	97.2%	115	89.8%	85

Table E49		Children age 13-17			
Planning and Development Issues		Yes (1)		No (2)	
		%	n	%	n
newjobsd	Sat w/ Attracting New Jobs to PWC	69.1%	74	85.7%	59
land1d	Sat w/ Planning of Land Devel-prejob	75.4%	79	75.2%	60
land2d	Sat w/ Planning of Land Devel-postjob	69.4%	99	74.2%	57
landd	Sat w/ Planning of Land Devel (combined)	72.1%	178	74.7%	117
neighbord	Sat w/ Preventing Neighborhood Deterioration	75.3%	176	70.0%	124
lfillsatd	Sat w/ Landfill	98.9%	107	92.1%	57
compsatd	Sat w/ Compost Facility	100.0%	28	100.0% <sup>(1)</sup>	20
travel97d	Sat w/ Ease of Travel in PWC	65.7%	183	76.4%	141
outsidedc	Sat w/ Ease of Travel around NoVA outside PWC	36.3%	173	53.8% <sup>(1)</sup>	133
growthcd	Sat w/ Rate of PWC Growth	70.4%	179	74.8%	126
roaddevad	Sat w/ Coordination of Development with Road Systems	60.6%	185	59.1%	128
qstreams	Sat w/ PWC Efforts to Preserve Water Quality	92.7%	84	87.9%	39
inputdevd	Sat w/ Opportunities for Citizen Input	77.9%	95	68.3%	59
visdevd	Sat w/ Visual Appearance of New Development	88.6%	157	90.0%	132
buildngsd	Sat w/ the safety of buildings constructed in the last two years	99.6%	156	96.3%	105

Table E50		Children age 13-17			
View of Government		Yes (1)		No (2)	
		%	n	%	n
valued	Sat w/ Value for Tax Dollar	86.2%	225	87.0%	157
effneffd	Sat w/ Efficient and Effective Service	93.0%	179	86.3%	119
trstgov1d	Trust of Government to do What is Right: Dichotomized	66.7%	167	61.7%	140



**TABLE E: Satisfaction Mean Ratings by Demographic Variables\***

\* A mean rating with a superscript indicates that this mean is significantly higher (at the 5% level) than the mean in the column corresponding to the superscript.

Table E51		Hispanic Origin			
		Yes (1)		No (2)	
Quality of life		mean	n	mean	n
qol10	Quality of life (ratings on 10 point-scale)	7.09	213	7.34	1,282
Satisfaction with Services					
ctysat97d	General Satisfaction with Services	91.9%	210	92.2%	1,220
voted	Sat w/ Convenient Ways to Register to Vote	93.3%	94	97.7%	640
pctupd	Sat w/ efficiency & effectiveness of voting precinct	97.1%	35	97.0%	581
govtservd	Sat w/ Informing Citizens about Government	78.3%	112	75.7%	688

Table E52		Hispanic Origin			
		Yes (1)		No (2)	
Public Safety		%	n	%	n
strltad	Sat w/ Street Lighting	80.4%	175	83.8%	910
fired	Sat w/ Fire Fighting in R's Area	100.0% <sup>(2)</sup>	139	97.7%	761
rescued	Sat w/ Emergency Medical Rescue Services	91.9%	117	96.4%	677
amcrimed	Sat w/ Safety in Neighborhood in Daytime	94.4%	152	95.3%	931
pmcrimed	Sat w/ Safety in Neighborhood at Night	79.7%	165	88.8%	905
dycrimebd	Sat w/ Safety in Business Areas in Daytime	94.3%	126	92.3%	657
ntcrimebd	Sat w/ Safety in Business Areas at Night	76.7%	109	84.2%	476
preventbd	Sat w/ Crime Prevention Programs	91.9% <sup>(2)</sup>	96	82.1%	606
attituded	Sat w/ Police Dept. Attitudes Towards Citizens	76.3%	181	86.4% <sup>(1)</sup>	995
polfaird	Sat that Police Dept treats everyone fairly	55.7%	173	84.1% <sup>(1)</sup>	923
drugsd	Sat w/ Reduce the Use of Illegal Drugs	89.7%	105	84.2%	589
gangsd	Sat w/ Police Dept Efforts to Combat Gangs	92.1% <sup>(2)</sup>	128	83.9%	594
policed	Sat w/ Overall Performance of Police Dept.	92.0%	187	92.1%	1,094
ppolicyd	Sat w/ Police check status of anyone placed under arrest	34.2%	146	84.4% <sup>(1)</sup>	758
courtsatd	Sat w/ Security in Courthouse	91.0%	72	98.1%	332
emsatisd	Sat w/ Assistance from 9-1-1 Operator	90.0%	43	95.4%	216
emtimebd	Sat w/ Time for Help to Arrive	98.4% <sup>(2)</sup>	43	89.3%	199
emasstbd	Sat w/ Assistance on the Scene	100.0% <sup>(2)</sup>	41	90.6%	187

Table E53		Hispanic Origin			
		Yes (1)		No (2)	
Public Services		%	n	%	n
		libraryd	Sat w/ Providing Library Services	93.0%	126
librysatd	Sat w/ Service from Library Staff	99.5%	123	98.8%	797
parkd	Sat with Providing Park and Recreation Programs	91.0%	140	89.6%	782
elderlyd	Sat w/ Programs for Elderly Population	89.8%	89	79.7%	375
finneedbd	Sat w/ County's Help to People in Need	74.5%	108	68.2%	379
dsssatd	Sat w/ Dept. of Soc. Services	90.3% <sup>(2)</sup>	67	70.4%	297
hlthsatd	Sat w/ Health Department	82.2%	89	84.8%	261
menthpb	Sat w/ services to people w/ mental health problems	83.9%	30	80.8%	218
mentret	Sat w/ Services to Mental Retardation	96.7% <sup>(2)</sup>	28	85.1%	175
menteis	Sat w/ Early Intervention Services	79.7%	20	83.9%	159
mentsub	Sat w/ Services to Substance Abuse	96.1% <sup>(2)</sup>	24	75.7%	164
mentall	Sat w/ Mental Health Services Overall	97.0% <sup>(2)</sup>	30	88.2%	226
schl4d	Sat that School System Provides Efficient Service	90.2%	168	87.1%	875
park2d	Sat with Park Authority	92.5%	67	95.4%	457
ctyserv2d	Sat with Service Authority	96.1%	81	93.7%	509

Table E54		Hispanic Origin			
Communication with the County		Yes (1)		No (2)	
		%	n	%	n
helpful2d	Helpfulness of County Employees	69.4%	43	84.1%	483
helpfulad	Sat w/ helpfulness of tax County employees	93.2%	25	86.2%	257
timesatad	Sat w/ timeliness of tax request	94.9%	25	87.8%	259
net2d	Sat w/ PWC Government Web Site	98.6% <sup>(2)</sup>	49	92.6%	496

Table E55		Hispanic Origin			
		Yes (1)		No (2)	
Planning and Development Issues		%	n	%	n
newjobsd	Sat w/ Attracting New Jobs to PWC	78.5%	57	75.0%	351
land1d	Sat w/ Planning of Land Devel-prejob	77.2%	62	71.2%	371
land2d	Sat w/ Planning of Land Devel-postjob	77.5%	60	64.0%	377
landd	Sat w/ Planning of Land Devel (combined)	76.8%	118	67.6%	747
neighbord	Sat w/ Preventing Neighborhood Deterioration	78.7% <sup>(2)</sup>	114	66.5%	716
lfillsatd	Sat w/ Landfill	92.6%	39	98.2%	397
compsatd	Sat w/ Compost Facility	100.0%	6	98.5%	120
travel97d	Sat w/ Ease of Travel in PWC	76.6% <sup>(2)</sup>	127	62.1%	822
outsidecd	Sat w/ Ease of Travel around NoVA outside PWC	67.9% <sup>(2)</sup>	116	36.3%	772
growthcd	Sat w/ Rate of PWC Growth	84.1% <sup>(2)</sup>	111	67.1%	758
roaddevad	Sat w/ Coordination of Development with Road Systems	75.5% <sup>(2)</sup>	116	54.1%	727
qstreams	Sat w/ PWC Efforts to Preserve Water Quality	86.6%	49	93.0%	329
inputdevd	Sat w/ Opportunities for Citizen Input	73.2%	64	74.5%	457
visdevd	Sat w/ Visual Appearance of New Development	86.0%	127	88.5%	740
buildngsd	Sat w/ the safety of buildings constructed in the last two years	98.0%	104	95.0%	552

<b>Table E56</b>		<b>Hispanic Origin</b>			
<b>View of Government</b>		<b>Yes (1)</b>		<b>No (2)</b>	
		%	n	%	n
valued	Sat w/ Value for Tax Dollar	86.0%	166	83.0%	875
effneffd	Sat w/ Efficient and Effective Service	81.0%	112	89.6%	714
trstgov1d	Trust of Government to do What is Right: Dichotomized	59.5%	125	63.9%	748

**TABLE E: Satisfaction Mean Ratings by Demographic Variables\***

\* A mean rating with a superscript indicates that this mean is significantly higher (at the 5% level) than the mean in the column corresponding to the superscript.

Table E57		Income (4 Categories)							
		Up to \$35k (1)		\$35k to \$50k (2)		\$50k to \$75k (3)		Over \$75k (4)	
Quality of life		mean	n	mean	n	mean	n	mean	n
qol10	Quality of life (ratings on 10 point-scale)	7.16	213	7.49	146	7.07	202	7.33	673
Satisfaction with Services									
ctysat97d	General Satisfaction with Services	90.1%	212	94.4%	143	89.6%	190	93.5%	633
voted	Sat w/ Convenient Ways to Register to Vote	93.8%	99	94.4%	71	99.3%	100	98.3%	353
pctupd	Sat w/ efficiency & effectiveness of voting precinct	94.7%	33	95.3%	37	98.5%	99	97.1%	334
govtservd	Sat w/ Informing Citizens about Government	77.3%	107	82.2%	80	75.9%	118	72.5%	364

Table E58		Income (4 Categories)							
		Public Safety		Up to \$35k (1)		\$35k to \$50k (2)		\$50k to \$75k (3)	
		%	n	%	n	%	n	%	n
strltad	Sat w/ Street Lighting	78.3%	185	90.7% <sup>(1)(4)</sup>	102	86.4%	135	82.0%	463
fired	Sat w/ Fire Fighting in R's Area	95.1%	141	100.0%	99	100.0%	118	98.2%	395
rescued	Sat w/ Emergency Medical Rescue Services	86.1%	124	96.5%	90	98.3% <sup>(1)</sup>	110	97.5% <sup>(1)</sup>	334
amcrimed	Sat w/ Safety in Neighborhood in Daytime	97.5%	150	97.0%	107	93.4%	140	94.4%	490
pmcrimed	Sat w/ Safety in Neighborhood at Night	86.1%	165	82.7%	99	91.8%	139	86.8%	483
dycrimebd	Sat w/ Safety in Business Areas in Daytime	84.4%	112	95.7% <sup>(1)</sup>	70	96.9% <sup>(1)</sup>	102	92.9%	370
ntcrimebd	Sat w/ Safety in Business Areas at Night	74.6%	83	96.0% <sup>(1)(3)(4)</sup>	50	84.5%	82	81.8%	276
preventbd	Sat w/ Crime Prevention Programs	87.2%	95	85.5%	75	80.2%	103	82.7%	315
attituded	Sat w/ Police Dept. Attitudes Towards Citizens	76.5%	190	80.0%	123	87.1%	144	89.1% <sup>(1)</sup>	532
polfaird	Sat that Police Dept treats everyone fairly	67.3%	167	77.7%	115	77.1%	157	84.4% <sup>(1)</sup>	476
drugsd	Sat w/ Reduce the Use of Illegal Drugs	84.8%	115	88.7%	66	87.6%	90	83.9%	308
gangsd	Sat w/ Police Dept Efforts to Combat Gangs	94.7% <sup>(4)</sup>	122	85.9%	62	89.1%	101	81.3%	328
policed	Sat w/ Overall Performance of Police Dept.	90.8%	190	87.6%	132	88.7%	168	94.3%	569
ppolicyd	Sat w/ Police check status of anyone placed under arrest	49.4%	138	71.4% <sup>(1)</sup>	101	78.0% <sup>(1)</sup>	122	84.6% <sup>(1)</sup>	387
courtsatd	Sat w/ Security in Courthouse	90.5%	64	100.0%	30	100.0%	69	96.9%	185
emsatisd	Sat w/ Assistance from 9-1-1 Operator	85.2%	46	100.0% <sup>(4)</sup>	28	94.2%	41	96.5%	101
emtimebd	Sat w/ Time for Help to Arrive	88.5%	40	90.4%	27	90.9%	41	94.5%	94
emasstbd	Sat w/ Assistance on the Scene	92.0%	40	90.4%	27	90.3%	38	94.1%	89



Table E59		Income (4 Categories)							
		Up to \$35k (1)		\$35k to \$50k (2)		\$50k to \$75k (3)		Over \$75k (4)	
Public Services		%	n	%	n	%	n	%	n
libraryd	Sat w/ Providing Library Services	89.9%	136	99.0% <sup>(4)</sup>	99	97.9%	131	94.5%	463
librysatd	Sat w/ Service from Library Staff	97.4%	123	100.0%	92	100.0%	125	98.8%	422
parkd	Sat with Providing Park and Recreation Programs	82.9%	127	95.7% <sup>(1)</sup>	89	91.2%	119	90.3%	440
elderlyd	Sat w/ Programs for Elderly Population	84.2%	100	85.5%	71	79.0%	56	78.6%	156
finneedbd	Sat w/ County's Help to People in Need	72.1%	112	76.8%	65	59.0%	71	71.9%	171
dsssatd	Sat w/ Dept. of Soc. Services	76.3%	85	79.5%	47	65.2%	63	73.9%	111
hlthsatd	Sat w/ Health Department	81.5%	85	87.8%	38	82.7%	48	84.8%	128
menthpb	Sat w/ services to people w/ mental health problems	85.8%	49	82.3%	29	66.5%	42	83.2%	100
mentret	Sat w/ Services to Mental Retardation	94.9%	46	91.0%	21	79.8%	37	85.5%	76
menteis	Sat w/ Early Intervention Services	89.2%	42	76.3%	19	70.8%	26	83.3%	73
mentsub	Sat w/ Services to Substance Abuse	80.9%	43	90.7% <sup>(3)</sup>	19	54.0%	33	83.6% <sup>(3)</sup>	72
mentall	Sat w/ Mental Health Services Overall	94.1%	50	96.6% <sup>(4)</sup>	29	80.3%	44	86.8%	104
schl4d	Sat that School System Provides Efficient Service	93.1%	152	82.3%	105	86.4%	123	88.1%	490
park2d	Sat with Park Authority	91.2%	75	96.1%	42	96.5%	66	96.4%	259
ctyserv2d	Sat with Service Authority	98.2% <sup>(4)</sup>	74	93.4%	53	94.5%	89	93.2%	283

Table E60		Income (4 Categories)							
		Up to \$35k (1)		\$35k to \$50k (2)		\$50k to \$75k (3)		Over \$75k (4)	
Communication with the County		%	n	%	n	%	n	%	n
helpful2d	Helpfulness of County Employees	80.8%	63	84.9%	44	88.0%	69	86.3%	270
helpfulad	Sat w/ helpfulness of tax County employees	91.3%	37	100.0% <sup>(4)</sup>	27	97.9% <sup>(4)</sup>	47	78.8%	133
timesatad	Sat w/ timeliness of tax request	92.1%	37	100.0% <sup>(4)</sup>	27	98.4% <sup>(4)</sup>	47	83.7%	135
net2d	Sat w/ PWC Government Web Site	91.6%	47	95.6%	40	99.1% <sup>(4)</sup>	67	91.6%	304

Table E61		Income (4 Categories)							
Planning and Development Issues		Up to \$35k (1)		\$35k to \$50k (2)		\$50k to \$75k (3)		Over \$75k (4)	
		%	n	%	n	%	n	%	n
newjobsd	Sat w/ Attracting New Jobs to PWC	78.3%	66	77.4%	44	69.3%	52	75.2%	197
land1d	Sat w/ Planning of Land Devel-prejob	69.3%	64	85.2%	34	68.6%	63	73.0%	202
land2d	Sat w/ Planning of Land Devel-postjob	80.1%	61	78.5% <sup>(3)</sup>	49	56.2%	57	63.5%	211
landd	Sat w/ Planning of Land Devel (combined)	73.8%	121	81.3% <sup>(3)(4)</sup>	83	62.7%	120	68.1%	413
neighbord	Sat w/ Preventing Neighborhood Deterioration	90.0% <sup>(2)(3)(4)</sup>	112	64.3%	93	61.2%	114	65.0%	389
lfillsatd	Sat w/ Landfill	87.5%	29	100.0% <sup>(4)</sup>	41	100.0% <sup>(4)</sup>	50	98.0%	251
compsatd	Sat w/ Compost Facility	83.4% <sup>(2)(4)</sup>	11	100.0% <sup>(4)</sup>	9	100.0% <sup>(2)(4)</sup>	14	100.0%	74
travel97d	Sat w/ Ease of Travel in PWC	74.0%	120	70.4%	95	60.3%	143	63.0%	439
outsided	Sat w/ Ease of Travel around NoVA outside PWC	66.1% <sup>(3)(4)</sup>	113	49.4% <sup>(4)</sup>	88	41.4%	135	30.7%	411
growthcd	Sat w/ Rate of PWC Growth	78.0%	97	74.1%	88	70.8%	118	68.0%	426
roaddevad	Sat w/ Coordination of Development with Road Systems	74.8% <sup>(3)(4)</sup>	111	67.3% <sup>(4)</sup>	81	51.0%	102	51.4%	405
qstreams	Sat w/ PWC Efforts to Preserve Water Quality	84.6%	61	94.7%	40	93.6%	40	96.4%	174
inputdevd	Sat w/ Opportunities for Citizen Input	85.9%	57	78.3%	59	71.8%	61	71.5%	252
visdevd	Sat w/ Visual Appearance of New Development	91.1%	110	94.1%	88	86.7%	118	88.4%	408
buildngsd	Sat w/ the safety of buildings constructed in the last two years	91.6%	86	97.3%	72	98.9% <sup>(4)</sup>	94	96.4%	299

Table E62		Income (4 Categories)							
		View of Government		Up to \$35k (1)		\$35k to \$50k (2)		\$50k to \$75k (3)	
		%	n	%	n	%	n	%	n
valued	Sat w/ Value for Tax Dollar	87.4%	167	85.1%	111	78.5%	134	84.3%	463
effneffd	Sat w/ Efficient and Effective Service	87.1%	119	89.9%	76	93.9%	113	88.6%	376
trstgovld	Trust of Government to do What is Right: Dichotomized	54.6%	117	75.9% <sup>(1)</sup>	78	67.0%	131	65.9%	411

**TABLE E: Satisfaction Mean Ratings by Demographic Variables\***

\* A mean rating with a superscript indicates that this mean is significantly higher (at the 5% level) than the mean in the column corresponding to the superscript.

Table E63		Education 4 categories							
		High school grad or less (1)		Some college (2)		4 year degree (3)		Graduate work (4)	
Quality of life		mean	n	mean	n	mean	n	mean	n
qol10	Quality of life (ratings on 10 point-scale)	7.36	435	7.29	370	7.30	367	7.30	323
<b>Satisfaction with Services</b>									
ctysat97d	General Satisfaction with Services	94.1%	420	90.0%	356	93.4%	349	93.0%	304
voted	Sat w/ Convenient Ways to Register to Vote	94.6%	213	96.8%	185	98.5%	186	99.5% <sup>(1)(2)</sup>	159
pctupd	Sat w/ efficiency & effectiveness of voting precinct	98.3%	102	96.7%	153	96.2%	188	97.4%	174
govtservd	Sat w/ Informing Citizens about Government	77.8%	247	75.9%	180	77.4%	201	73.7%	165

Table E64		Education 4 categories							
Public Safety		High school grad or less (1)		Some college (2)		4 year degree (3)		Graduate work (4)	
		%	n	%	n	%	n	%	n
strltad	Sat w/ Street Lighting	85.3%	345	83.0%	260	82.8%	253	81.5%	222
fired	Sat w/ Fire Fighting in R's Area	99.4%	274	94.7%	219	98.9%	206	98.8%	198
rescued	Sat w/ Emergency Medical Rescue Services	95.8%	253	95.7%	205	98.9% <sup>(4)</sup>	171	94.3%	162
amcrimed	Sat w/ Safety in Neighborhood in Daytime	95.5%	319	94.2%	283	96.1%	254	94.7%	234
pmcrimed	Sat w/ Safety in Neighborhood at Night	84.2%	337	86.2%	252	93.0% <sup>(1)(2)</sup>	250	87.9%	233
dycrimebd	Sat w/ Safety in Business Areas in Daytime	93.3%	232	90.9%	208	91.5%	181	93.8%	172
ntcrimebd	Sat w/ Safety in Business Areas at Night	81.2%	173	76.5%	124	88.6% <sup>(2)</sup>	170	82.9%	126
preventbd	Sat w/ Crime Prevention Programs	84.6%	182	81.5%	170	86.3%	197	80.8%	152
attituded	Sat w/ Police Dept. Attitudes Towards Citizens	82.5%	351	87.2%	288	87.2%	283	84.5%	255
polfaird	Sat that Police Dept treats everyone fairly	75.0%	356	82.5%	243	84.9% <sup>(1)</sup>	264	77.9%	237
drugsd	Sat w/ Reduce the Use of Illegal Drugs	92.0% <sup>(2)(3)</sup>	231	78.9%	167	82.5%	155	84.9%	133
gangsd	Sat w/ Police Dept Efforts to Combat Gangs	89.8% <sup>(3)</sup>	236	86.6%	178	79.7%	161	83.2%	153
policed	Sat w/ Overall Performance of Police Dept.	94.5%	387	91.0%	304	93.4%	317	89.5%	271
ppolicyd	Sat w/ Police check status of anyone placed under arrest	67.7%	287	81.7% <sup>(1)</sup>	212	83.9% <sup>(1)</sup>	221	78.0%	181
courtsatd	Sat w/ Security in Courthouse	99.4%	133	93.3%	101	94.4%	92	100.0%	79
emsatsid	Sat w/ Assistance from 9-1-1 Operator	99.0% <sup>(4)</sup>	80	88.9%	71	98.1%	54	91.4%	53
emtimebd	Sat w/ Time for Help to Arrive	93.3%	77	87.4%	63	94.4%	51	87.7%	50
emasstbd	Sat w/ Assistance on the Scene	97.9% <sup>(4)</sup>	73	92.9%	59	94.0%	47	80.6%	47

Table E65		Education 4 categories							
		High school grad or less (1)		Some college (2)		4 year degree (3)		Graduate work (4)	
Public Services		%	n	%	n	%	n	%	n
libraryd	Sat w/ Providing Library Services	94.0%	270	96.5%	258	96.1%	271	93.9%	217
librysatd	Sat w/ Service from Library Staff	99.7%	234	96.6%	226	99.7%	232	99.4%	227
parkd	Sat with Providing Park and Recreation Programs	91.1%	255	89.1%	225	91.4%	231	88.8%	214
elderlyd	Sat w/ Programs for Elderly Population	86.9%	171	76.2%	116	78.5%	94	79.3%	76
finneedbd	Sat w/ County's Help to People in Need	70.2%	186	69.9%	110	76.7%	107	63.3%	80
dsstsd	Sat w/ Dept. of Soc. Services	80.2%	137	69.3%	95	77.3%	59	72.5%	66
hlthsatd	Sat w/ Health Department	82.0%	131	82.7%	81	89.0%	77	86.0%	58
menthpb	Sat w/ services to people w/ mental health problems	86.9%	77	87.4%	68	72.0%	51	72.9%	51
mentret	Sat w/ Services to Mental Retardation	94.7% <sup>(3)(4)</sup>	70	88.8%	53	82.1%	39	72.7%	40
menteis	Sat w/ Early Intervention Services	79.6%	58	98.1% <sup>(1)(3)(4)</sup>	40	85.2%	39	71.8%	39
mentsub	Sat w/ Services to Substance Abuse	83.2%	65	86.1%	49	69.5%	38	65.2%	33
mentall	Sat w/ Mental Health Services Overall	95.2% <sup>(4)</sup>	83	95.3% <sup>(4)</sup>	70	84.5%	52	74.7%	51
schl4d	Sat that School System Provides Efficient Service	88.5%	316	85.6%	232	86.5%	259	87.6%	235
park2d	Sat with Park Authority	95.9%	144	91.1%	114	95.4%	135	97.2%	129
ctyserv2d	Sat with Service Authority	95.0%	155	94.5%	157	96.3%	142	90.1%	137

Table E66		Education 4 categories							
Communication with the County		High school grad or less (1)		Some college (2)		4 year degree (3)		Graduate work (4)	
		%	n	%	n	%	n	%	n
helpful2d	Helpfulness of County Employees	79.7%	122	83.9%	138	82.7%	132	86.2%	138
helpfulad	Sat w/ helpfulness of tax County employees	96.2% <sup>(2)</sup>	66	76.7%	88	89.9%	66	89.5%	65
timesatad	Sat w/ timeliness of tax request	91.2%	68	89.5%	88	87.4%	66	86.8%	65
net2d	Sat w/ PWC Government Web Site	91.5%	92	91.8%	154	91.0%	159	96.0%	149



<b>Table E67</b>		<b>Education 4 categories</b>							
<b>Planning and Development Issues</b>		High school grad or less (1)		Some college (2)		4 year degree (3)		Graduate work (4)	
		%	n	%	n	%	n	%	n
newjobsd	Sat w/ Attracting New Jobs to PWC	84.7% <sup>(2)</sup>	114	69.1%	108	72.2%	103	74.7%	78
land1d	Sat w/ Planning of Land Devel-prejob	78.8%	119	76.8%	106	68.2%	101	63.1%	100
land2d	Sat w/ Planning of Land Devel-postjob	72.3%	134	63.8%	104	66.1%	118	60.0%	89
landd	Sat w/ Planning of Land Devel (combined)	75.0% <sup>(4)</sup>	249	70.4%	209	67.1%	218	61.6%	189
neighbord	Sat w/ Preventing Neighborhood Deterioration	77.8% <sup>(3)(4)</sup>	230	68.3%	218	66.7%	210	58.5%	170
lfillsatd	Sat w/ Landfill	95.0%	90	99.5%	115	98.8%	120	96.9%	111
compsatd	Sat w/ Compost Facility	100.0%	29	100.0% <sup>(1)(3)(4)</sup>	33	92.8%	25	100.0% <sup>(1)(3)</sup>	36
travel97d	Sat w/ Ease of Travel in PWC	69.2% <sup>(4)</sup>	282	64.4%	243	64.2%	217	56.6%	210
outsidedcd	Sat w/ Ease of Travel around NoVA outside PWC	54.0% <sup>(2)(3)(4)</sup>	269	41.1% <sup>(4)</sup>	223	34.5%	195	27.2%	204
growthcd	Sat w/ Rate of PWC Growth	70.9%	222	73.3% <sup>(4)</sup>	217	72.4% <sup>(4)</sup>	230	61.5%	199
roaddevad	Sat w/ Coordination of Development with Road Systems	75.7% <sup>(2)(3)(4)</sup>	231	53.0%	220	51.4%	216	44.5%	177
qstreamsd	Sat w/ PWC Efforts to Preserve Water Quality	93.4%	94	95.4%	98	91.4%	92	92.2%	89
inputdevd	Sat w/ Opportunities for Citizen Input	76.6%	138	78.3%	139	67.7%	114	70.8%	130
visdevd	Sat w/ Visual Appearance of New Development	89.2%	229	89.4%	223	88.4%	227	86.7%	193
buildngsd	Sat w/ the safety of buildings constructed in the last two years	96.0%	216	95.0%	151	96.7%	155	96.7%	130

<b>Table E68</b>		<b>Education 4 categories</b>							
<b>View of Government</b>		High school grad or less (1)		Some college (2)		4 year degree (3)		Graduate work (4)	
		%	n	%	n	%	n	%	n
valued	Sat w/ Value for Tax Dollar	83.3%	323	84.5%	257	83.8%	236	83.1%	222
effneffd	Sat w/ Efficient and Effective Service	90.6%	225	86.4%	215	87.9%	216	90.7%	167
trstgov1d	Trust of Government to do What is Right: Dichotomized	59.9%	243	67.5%	209	69.0%	218	59.6%	202

**TABLE E: Satisfaction Mean Ratings by Demographic Variables\***

\* A mean rating with a superscript indicates that this mean is significantly higher (at the 5% level) than the mean in the column corresponding to the superscript.

Table E69		Length of residence in PWC									
		2 years or less (1)		3 to 5 years (2)		6 to 10 years (3)		11 to 19 years (4)		20 years or more & all my life (5)	
Quality of life		mean	n	mean	n	mean	n	mean	n	mean	n
qol10	Quality of life (ratings on 10 point-scale)	7.26	208	7.43 <sup>(3)</sup>	272	7.02	404	7.35 <sup>(3)</sup>	273	7.37 <sup>(3)</sup>	458
<b>Satisfaction with Services</b>											
ctysat97d	General Satisfaction with Services	91.0%	192	93.0%	256	91.3%	384	90.2%	263	93.1%	440
voted	Sat w/ Convenient Ways to Register to Vote	98.0%	79	95.5%	135	97.7%	198	97.9%	135	96.9%	234
pctupd	Sat w/ efficiency & effectiveness of voting precinct	100.0% <sup>(3)(5)</sup>	25	98.0%	88	96.2%	155	97.6%	148	96.4%	232
govtservd	Sat w/ Informing Citizens about Government	75.0%	89	79.9%	150	77.0%	210	69.2%	155	79.6% <sup>(4)</sup>	247

Table E70		Length of residence in PWC									
		2 years or less (1)		3 to 5 years (2)		6 to 10 years (3)		11 to 19 years (4)		20 years or more & all my life (5)	
Public Safety		%	n	%	n	%	n	%	n	%	n
strltad	Sat w/ Street Lighting	86.3%	155	85.2%	208	80.7%	282	82.5%	189	83.0%	321
fired	Sat w/ Fire Fighting in R's Area	96.1%	118	99.6% <sup>(5)</sup>	155	99.1%	251	99.6% <sup>(5)</sup>	157	96.3%	286
rescued	Sat w/ Emergency Medical Rescue Services	95.0%	94	93.0%	144	96.1%	209	96.1%	152	96.8%	251
amcrimed	Sat w/ Safety in Neighborhood in Daytime	93.0%	157	94.9%	192	96.3%	283	94.8%	194	94.6%	325
pmcrimed	Sat w/ Safety in Neighborhood at Night	89.9%	158	83.7%	199	89.5%	273	84.4%	188	87.5%	316
dycrimebd	Sat w/ Safety in Business Areas in Daytime	95.2%	103	88.6%	137	93.2%	213	92.3%	130	93.7%	243
ntcrimebd	Sat w/ Safety in Business Areas at Night	92.1% <sup>(3)(4)(5)</sup>	75	88.9%	106	80.0%	157	77.4%	104	80.9%	178
preventbd	Sat w/ Crime Prevention Programs	81.7%	99	87.0%	137	80.4%	179	82.4%	122	82.7%	216

Table E71		Length of residence in PWC									
		2 years or less (1)		3 to 5 years (2)		6 to 10 years (3)		11 to 19 years (4)		20 years or more & all my life (5)	
Public Safety		%	n	%	n	%	%	n	%	n	%
attituded	Sat w/ Police Dept. Attitudes Towards Citizens	85.8%	143	88.9% <sup>(3)</sup>	213	79.9%	332	83.9%	195	86.7%	370
polfaired	Sat that Police Dept treats everyone fairly	85.8% <sup>(3)</sup>	134	80.8%	192	72.8%	307	80.1%	187	83.3% <sup>(3)</sup>	350
drugsd	Sat w/ Reduce the Use of Illegal Drugs	86.0%	89	90.7%	104	80.8%	169	82.6%	125	86.8%	243
gangsd	Sat w/ Police Dept Efforts to Combat Gangs	96.7% <sup>(2)</sup> (3)(4)(5)	98	87.4%	135	83.5%	176	79.5%	115	82.7%	250
policed	Sat w/ Overall Performance of Police Dept.	95.3% <sup>(3)</sup>	167	93.7%	236	87.0%	343	93.4%	228	93.8% <sup>(3)</sup>	383
ppolicyd	Sat w/ Police check status of anyone placed under arrest	75.5%	97	64.9%	167	71.6%	218	80.7% <sup>(2)</sup>	172	83.0% <sup>(2)</sup> (3)	296
courtsatd	Sat w/ Security in Courthouse	88.0%	32	100.0% <sup>(3)</sup>	55	91.8%	118	100.0% <sup>(3)</sup>	84	99.4% <sup>(3)</sup>	136
emsatisd	Sat w/ Assistance from 9-1-1 Operator	88.3%	37	100.0% <sup>(5)</sup>	53	89.8%	53	95.6%	49	96.2%	81
emtimebd	Sat w/ Time for Help to Arrive	82.8%	33	89.4%	53	88.0%	50	94.0%	44	93.8%	76
emasstbd	Sat w/ Assistance on the Scene	87.5%	30	96.7%	49	86.8%	45	89.7%	39	96.8%	72

Table E72		Length of residence in PWC									
		2 years or less (1)		3 to 5 years (2)		6 to 10 years (3)		11 to 19 years (4)		20 years or more & all my life (5)	
Public Services		%	n	%	n	%	%	n	%	n	%
libraryd	Sat w/ Providing Library Services	94.7%	114	94.6%	185	93.8%	243	95.7%	195	96.6%	317
librysatd	Sat w/ Service from Library Staff	93.8%	104	99.4%	166	99.2%	251	99.6%	170	99.8%	270
parkd	Sat with Providing Park and Recreation Programs	93.6% <sup>(3)</sup>	106	95.0% <sup>(3)</sup>	167	84.0%	247	87.0%	156	91.5% <sup>(3)</sup>	285
elderlyd	Sat w/ Programs for Elderly Population	90.9%	54	91.9% <sup>(3)</sup> <sub>(5)</sub>	69	76.0%	115	83.9%	67	78.0%	183
finneedbd	Sat w/ County's Help to People in Need	73.6%	55	74.0% <sup>(4)</sup>	93	70.2%	141	55.5%	90	72.9% <sup>(4)</sup>	132
dsssatd	Sat w/ Dept. of Soc. Services	78.6%	46	70.6%	48	79.5%	95	73.7%	70	68.5%	125
hlthsatd	Sat w/ Health Department	90.6%	42	78.1%	66	82.2%	89	89.3%	63	80.7%	103

Table E73		Length of residence in PWC									
		2 years or less (1)		3 to 5 years (2)		6 to 10 years (3)		11 to 19 years (4)		20 years or more & all my life (5)	
Public Services		%	n	%	n	%	%	n	%	n	%
menthpb	Sat w/ services to people w/ mental health problems	74.4%	21	97.0% <sup>(3)</sup> ) <sub>(4)(5)</sub>	28	71.7%	68	80.0%	40	83.3%	103
mentret	Sat w/ Services to Mental Retardation	96.3% <sup>(3)</sup> )	18	95.8% <sup>(3)</sup> )	20	75.9%	56	82.4%	30	87.4%	87
menteis	Sat w/ Early Intervention Services	96.1% <sup>(3)</sup> )	17	100.0% <sup>(3)</sup> ) <sub>(3)(4)(5)</sub>	18	65.4%	45	91.9% <sup>(3)</sup> )	33	84.1%	71
mentsub	Sat w/ Services to Substance Abuse	63.3%	17	81.5%	23	80.6%	41	76.7%	33	77.2%	82
mentalld	Sat w/ Mental Health Services Overall	93.6%	21	93.8%	30	83.6%	67	90.1%	42	87.9%	106
schl4d	Sat that School System Provides Efficient Service	89.7%	115	93.2% <sup>(3)</sup> ) <sub>(5)</sub>	187	84.6%	275	88.1%	190	84.1%	300
park2d	Sat with Park Authority	98.7%	58	97.8%	81	91.2%	111	94.7%	94	95.3%	184
ctyserv2d	Sat with Service Authority	94.2%	69	98.4% <sup>(3)</sup> ) <sub>(4)</sub>	113	89.3%	136	92.8%	98	95.3%	181

Table E74		Length of residence in PWC									
		2 years or less (1)		3 to 5 years (2)		6 to 10 years (3)		11 to 19 years (4)		20 years or more & all my life (5)	
Communication with the County		%	n	%	n	%	%	n	%	n	%
helpful2d	Helpfulness of County Employees	84.9%	62	76.7%	75	83.2%	124	81.6%	105	83.7%	184
helpfulad	Sat w/ helpfulness of tax County employees	88.6%	47	88.7%	37	87.3%	69	86.0%	57	85.6%	82
timesatad	Sat w/ timeliness of tax request	87.0%	47	95.8%	37	92.5%	70	83.4%	57	86.2%	84
net2d	Sat w/ PWC Government Web Site	88.0%	61	94.3%	96	95.2%	142	91.1%	105	92.7%	161



Table E75		Length of residence in PWC									
		2 years or less (1)		3 to 5 years (2)		6 to 10 years (3)		11 to 19 years (4)		20 years or more & all my life (5)	
Planning and Development Issues		%	n	%	n	%	%	n	%	n	%
newjobsd	Sat w/ Attracting New Jobs to PWC	78.2%	44	82.6%	56	74.5%	118	70.9%	73	76.2%	129
land1d	Sat w/ Planning of Land Devel-prejob	91.3% <sup>(3)</sup> ) <sub>(4)(5)</sub>	59	77.8%	75	70.2%	117	62.4%	71	65.8%	120
land2d	Sat w/ Planning of Land Devel-postjob	90.1% <sup>(3)</sup> ) <sub>(4)(5)</sub>	22	89.0% <sup>(3)</sup> ) <sub>(4)(5)</sub>	68	67.6%	98	59.9%	94	54.7%	168
landd	Sat w/ Planning of Land Devel (combined)	91.0% <sup>(3)</sup> ) <sub>(4)(5)</sub>	82	82.7% <sup>(3)</sup> ) <sub>(4)(5)</sub>	140	69.0%	215	61.0%	165	59.3%	288
neighbord	Sat w/ Preventing Neighborhood Deterioration	81.1% <sup>(3)</sup> ) <sub>(4)(5)</sub>	102	78.0% <sup>(5)</sup> )	122	67.2%	208	67.5%	159	61.1%	266
lfillsatd	Sat w/ Landfill	97.8%	27	87.9%	49	99.3%	90	100.0%	100	98.4%	177
compsatd	Sat w/ Compost Facility	100.0%	2	100.0%	23	94.0%	42	100.0%	21	100.0%	40

Table E76		Length of residence in PWC									
		2 years or less (1)		3 to 5 years (2)		6 to 10 years (3)		11 to 19 years (4)		20 years or more & all my life (5)	
Planning and Development Issues		%	n	%	n	%	%	n	%	n	%
travel97d	Sat w/ Ease of Travel in PWC	64.6%	126	77.9% <sup>(1)</sup> ) <sub>(3)(4)(5)</sub>	174	63.2%	225	62.4%	162	57.3%	296
outsidecd	Sat w/ Ease of Travel around NoVA outside PWC	44.9%	111	51.1% <sup>(4)</sup> ) <sub>(5)</sub>	163	42.4%	210	36.6%	154	34.1%	280
growthcd	Sat w/ Rate of PWC Growth	82.5% <sup>(4)</sup> ) <sub>(5)</sub>	96	83.9% <sup>(3)</sup> ) <sub>(4)(5)</sub>	131	72.3% <sup>(5)</sup> )	219	61.2%	162	60.2%	284
roaddevad	Sat w/ Coordination of Development with Road Systems	74.2% <sup>(4)</sup> ) <sub>(5)</sub>	107	68.5% <sup>(4)</sup> ) <sub>(5)</sub>	136	61.5% <sup>(4)</sup> ) <sub>(5)</sub>	216	43.4%	150	48.2%	257
qstreams	Sat w/ PWC Efforts to Preserve Water Quality	100.0% <sup>(2)</sup> ) <sub>(5)</sub>	27	85.9%	67	96.5%	81	92.9%	64	90.6%	145
inputdevd	Sat w/ Opportunities for Citizen Input	82.2% <sup>(4)</sup> )	48	80.0%	79	73.7%	128	65.6%	96	73.1%	186
visdevd	Sat w/ Visual Appearance of New Development	90.3%	105	90.8%	138	88.6%	221	90.2%	155	84.4%	274
buildngsd	Sat w/ the safety of buildings constructed in the last two years	97.2%	88	95.2%	117	98.5% <sup>(5)</sup> )	153	94.3%	115	93.6%	195

Table E77		Length of residence in PWC									
		2 years or less (1)		3 to 5 years (2)		6 to 10 years (3)		11 to 19 years (4)		20 years or more & all my life (5)	
View of Government		%	n	%	n	%	%	n	%	n	%
valued	Sat w/ Value for Tax Dollar	85.8%	137	88.6% <sup>(3)</sup>	202	78.5%	274	83.4%	170	82.2%	283
effneffd	Sat w/ Efficient and Effective Service	92.5%	88	94.0% <sup>(5)</sup>	174	86.4%	192	88.3%	140	84.8%	251
trstgovld	Trust of Government to do What is Right: Dichotomized	68.9%	112	62.4%	159	62.7%	217	55.6%	149	65.4%	265

**TABLE E: Satisfaction Mean Ratings by Demographic Variables\***

\* A mean rating with a superscript indicates that this mean is significantly higher (at the 5% level) than the mean in the column corresponding to the superscript.

Table E78		Homeowner status			
		Owns (1)		Renters & others (2)	
Quality of life		mean	n	mean	n
qol10	Quality of life (ratings on 10 point-scale)	7.25	1,100	7.36	509
Satisfaction with Services					
ctysat97d	General Satisfaction with Services	93.2%	1,042	89.7%	486
voted	Sat w/ Convenient Ways to Register to Vote	97.1%	542	97.2%	238
pctupd	Sat w/ efficiency & effectiveness of voting precinct	97.6%	533	94.2%	108
govtservd	Sat w/ Informing Citizens about Government	77.3%	577	75.7%	272

Table E79		Homeowner status			
		Owns (1)		Renters & others (2)	
Public Safety		%	n	%	n
strltad	Sat w/ Street Lighting	81.8%	751	86.5%	399
fired	Sat w/ Fire Fighting in R's Area	98.6%	657	97.9%	303
rescued	Sat w/ Emergency Medical Rescue Services	96.7%	549	93.8%	299
amcrimed	Sat w/ Safety in Neighborhood in Daytime	94.6%	783	95.5%	365
pmcrimed	Sat w/ Safety in Neighborhood at Night	88.0%	758	86.4%	371
dycrimebd	Sat w/ Safety in Business Areas in Daytime	93.2%	556	91.5%	267
ntcrimebd	Sat w/ Safety in Business Areas at Night	85.4%	421	77.4%	199
preventbd	Sat w/ Crime Prevention Programs	84.5%	505	79.4%	246
attituded	Sat w/ Police Dept. Attitudes Towards Citizens	86.9% <sup>(2)</sup>	845	80.1%	404
polfaird	Sat that Police Dept treats everyone fairly	83.4% <sup>(2)</sup>	759	73.5%	406
drugsd	Sat w/ Reduce the Use of Illegal Drugs	86.3%	462	84.2%	262
gangsd	Sat w/ Police Dept Efforts to Combat Gangs	84.2%	503	86.2%	264
policed	Sat w/ Overall Performance of Police Dept.	94.3% <sup>(2)</sup>	905	88.7%	445
ppolicyd	Sat w/ Police check status of anyone placed under arrest	82.7% <sup>(2)</sup>	624	63.6%	322
courtsatd	Sat w/ Security in Courthouse	97.5%	266	95.0%	153
emsatsid	Sat w/ Assistance from 9-1-1 Operator	95.0%	179	93.1%	89
emtimebd	Sat w/ Time for Help to Arrive	91.2%	168	88.2%	82
emasstbd	Sat w/ Assistance on the Scene	94.0%	158	88.8%	73

Table E80		Homeowner status			
		Owns (1)		Renters & others (2)	
Public Services		%	n	%	n
libraryd	Sat w/ Providing Library Services	95.8%	727	94.0%	321
librysatd	Sat w/ Service from Library Staff	99.5%	667	97.7%	291
parkd	Sat with Providing Park and Recreation Programs	90.0%	660	89.6%	297
elderlyd	Sat w/ Programs for Elderly Population	80.7%	284	84.7%	199
finneedbd	Sat w/ County's Help to People in Need	66.2%	278	73.2%	232
dsssatd	Sat w/ Dept. of Soc. Services	70.1%	209	77.7%	171
hlthsatd	Sat w/ Health Department	82.3%	204	84.3%	154
menthpb	Sat w/ services to people w/ mental health problems	79.8%	153	84.2%	101
mentret	Sat w/ Services to Mental Retardation	77.8%	118	94.8% <sup>(1)</sup>	93
menteis	Sat w/ Early Intervention Services	82.9%	103	84.5%	80
mentsub	Sat w/ Services to Substance Abuse	77.4%	104	77.0%	89
mentald	Sat w/ Mental Health Services Overall	84.9%	155	93.1%	106
schl4d	Sat that School System Provides Efficient Service	87.7%	712	87.1%	350
park2d	Sat with Park Authority	95.0%	367	95.1%	158
ctyserv2d	Sat with Service Authority	94.3%	442	93.0%	154

<b>Table E81</b>		<b>Homeowner status</b>			
<b>Communication with the County</b>		<b>Owns (1)</b>		<b>Renters &amp; others (2)</b>	
		%	n	%	n
helpful2d	Helpfulness of County Employees	83.4%	416	78.3%	128
helpfulad	Sat w/ helpfulness of tax County employees	85.3%	210	94.7%	80
timesatad	Sat w/ timeliness of tax request	87.0%	212	91.8%	80
net2d	Sat w/ PWC Government Web Site	93.0%	443	92.1%	121

Table E82		Homeowner status			
		Owns (1)		Renters & others (2)	
Planning and Development Issues		%	n	%	n
newjobsd	Sat w/ Attracting New Jobs to PWC	73.8%	282	82.2%	132
land1d	Sat w/ Planning of Land Devel-prejob	72.1%	317	70.9%	125
land2d	Sat w/ Planning of Land Devel-postjob	60.0%	306	79.9% <sup>(1)</sup>	141
landd	Sat w/ Planning of Land Devel (combined)	66.2%	623	75.3%	262
neighbord	Sat w/ Preventing Neighborhood Deterioration	65.9%	578	74.8%	276
lfillsatd	Sat w/ Landfill	98.5%	375	93.3%	62
compsatd	Sat w/ Compost Facility	99.3%	110	89.7%	17
travel97d	Sat w/ Ease of Travel in PWC	61.8%	667	69.9%	311
outsidedc	Sat w/ Ease of Travel around NoVA outside PWC	34.7%	616	53.6% <sup>(1)</sup>	297
growthcd	Sat w/ Rate of PWC Growth	65.7%	639	78.1% <sup>(1)</sup>	252
roaddevad	Sat w/ Coordination of Development with Road Systems	51.5%	595	70.5% <sup>(1)</sup>	263
qstreamsd	Sat w/ PWC Efforts to Preserve Water Quality	93.5%	287	88.6%	97
inputdevd	Sat w/ Opportunities for Citizen Input	73.1%	393	75.4%	143
visdevd	Sat w/ Visual Appearance of New Development	88.0%	644	88.8%	248
buildngsd	Sat w/ the safety of buildings constructed in the last two years	95.5%	445	96.1%	222



Table E83		Homeowner status			
View of Government		Owns (1)		Renters & others (2)	
		%	n	%	n
valued	Sat w/ Value for Tax Dollar	82.2%	706	85.0%	358
effneffd	Sat w/ Efficient and Effective Service	89.3%	600	87.3%	238
trstgovld	Trust of Government to do What is Right: Dichotomized	63.2%	621	63.2%	275

**TABLE E: Satisfaction Mean Ratings by Demographic Variables\***

\* A mean rating with a superscript indicates that this mean is significantly higher (at the 5% level) than the mean in the column corresponding to the superscript.

Table E84		Kind of place respondent lives in					
		Single-family home (1)		Duplex/Townhome (2)		Apartment or condo or other (3)	
Quality of life		Mean	n	Mean	n	Mean	n
qol10	Quality of life (ratings on 10 point-scale)	7.32	1,016	7.19	347	7.21	254
Satisfaction with Services							
ctysat97d	General Satisfaction with Services	92.9%	970	89.1%	323	91.4%	243
voted	Sat w/ Convenient Ways to Register to Vote	98.2%	491	97.0%	174	92.6%	117
pctupd	Sat w/ efficiency & effectiveness of voting precinct	96.9%	473	96.1%	117	100.0% <sup>(1)(2)</sup>	57
govtservd	Sat w/ Informing Citizens about Government	76.5%	522	75.2%	186	79.2%	142

Table E85		Kind of place respondent lives in					
		Single-family home (1)		Duplex/Townhome (2)		Apartment or condo or other (3)	
Public Safety		%	n	%	n	%	n
strltad	Sat w/ Street Lighting	82.1%	728	82.3%	243	88.6%	184
fired	Sat w/ Fire Fighting in R's Area	98.1%	593	99.7% <sup>(1)</sup>	220	95.8%	153
rescued	Sat w/ Emergency Medical Rescue Services	96.3%	515	95.1%	194	94.1%	142
amcrimed	Sat w/ Safety in Neighborhood in Daytime	95.7%	729	93.4%	257	93.8%	166
pmcrimed	Sat w/ Safety in Neighborhood at Night	90.8% <sup>(2)</sup>	707	78.7%	260	85.3%	169
dycrimebd	Sat w/ Safety in Business Areas in Daytime	92.7%	516	94.4%	170	90.7%	142
ntcrimebd	Sat w/ Safety in Business Areas at Night	83.8%	392	86.7%	124	74.8%	105
preventbd	Sat w/ Crime Prevention Programs	84.6%	463	77.4%	161	83.0%	130
attituded	Sat w/ Police Dept. Attitudes Towards Citizens	88.3% <sup>(2)</sup>	795	75.9%	267	82.4%	193
polfaird	Sat that Police Dept treats everyone fairly	83.9% <sup>(2)</sup>	725	70.0%	254	78.2%	190
drugsd	Sat w/ Reduce the Use of Illegal Drugs	83.8%	462	87.1%	152	88.3%	117
gangsd	Sat w/ Police Dept Efforts to Combat Gangs	82.1%	476	89.0% <sup>(1)</sup>	167	90.6% <sup>(1)</sup>	130
policed	Sat w/ Overall Performance of Police Dept.	93.7%	845	89.7%	295	90.0%	217
ppolicyd	Sat w/ Police check status of anyone placed under arrest	80.6% <sup>(3)</sup>	608	71.6%	196	62.7%	147
courtsatd	Sat w/ Security in Courthouse	97.5%	266	98.4%	109	87.4%	48
emsatisd	Sat w/ Assistance from 9-1-1 Operator	96.9%	157	95.2%	68	85.6%	48
emtimebd	Sat w/ Time for Help to Arrive	90.5%	147	91.0%	66	89.0%	42
emasstbd	Sat w/ Assistance on the Scene	92.4%	139	93.4%	59	91.6%	38

Table E86		Kind of place respondent lives in					
		Single-family home (1)		Duplex/Townhome (2)		Apartment or condo or other (3)	
Public Services		%	n	%	%	n	%
libraryd	Sat w/ Providing Library Services	95.3%	702	96.9%	210	92.8%	143
librysatd	Sat w/ Service from Library Staff	99.4%	620	98.3%	193	97.8%	148
parkd	Sat with Providing Park and Recreation Programs	91.0% <sup>(2)</sup>	611	82.6%	203	93.9% <sup>(2)</sup>	147
elderlyd	Sat w/ Programs for Elderly Population	81.8%	288	80.1%	100	83.1%	99
finneedbd	Sat w/ County's Help to People in Need	75.9% <sup>(2)</sup>	277	55.0%	110	68.0%	125
dsssatd	Sat w/ Dept. of Soc. Services	76.8%	197	71.0%	90	70.1%	96
hlthsatd	Sat w/ Health Department	86.3%	202	80.5%	86	78.5%	75
menthpb	Sat w/ services to people w/ mental health problems	81.4%	158	82.0%	53	76.6%	47
mentret	Sat w/ Services to Mental Retardation	82.3%	123	93.6% <sup>(1)</sup>	47	85.3%	42
menteis	Sat w/ Early Intervention Services	84.4%	111	83.7%	41	81.1%	33
mentsub	Sat w/ Services to Substance Abuse	77.8%	111	88.6%	42	65.1%	43
mentall	Sat w/ Mental Health Services Overall	88.4%	163	92.4%	54	84.1%	49
schl4d	Sat that School System Provides Efficient Service	87.0%	697	86.8%	231	89.0%	139
park2d	Sat with Park Authority	94.5%	344	94.7%	118	99.1% <sup>(1)</sup>	66
ctyserv2d	Sat with Service Authority	94.2%	402	91.5%	135	98.3% <sup>(1)</sup>	60

<b>Table E87</b>		<b>Kind of place respondent lives in</b>					
<b>Communication with the County</b>		Single-family home (1)		Duplex/Townhome (2)		Apartment or condo or other (3)	
		%	n	%	%	n	%
helpful2d	Helpfulness of County Employees	81.9%	376	89.0%	106	74.6%	66
helpfulad	Sat w/ helpfulness of tax County employees	83.5%	177	92.5%	76	92.1%	40
timesatad	Sat w/ timeliness of tax request	87.6%	180	89.2%	76	90.9%	40
net2d	Sat w/ PWC Government Web Site	92.0%	408	95.9%	105	92.6%	52

Table E88  Planning and Development Issues		Kind of place respondent lives in					
		Single-family home (1)		Duplex/Townhome (2)		Apartment or condo or other (3)	
		%	n	%	%	n	%
newjobsd	Sat w/ Attracting New Jobs to PWC	77.8%	265	78.3%	88	65.1%	65
land1d	Sat w/ Planning of Land Devel-prejob	73.1%	272	71.9%	100	67.5%	71
land2d	Sat w/ Planning of Land Devel-postjob	63.6%	313	65.7%	76	76.2%	62
landd	Sat w/ Planning of Land Devel (combined)	67.8%	582	69.2%	176	71.5%	132
neighborbd	Sat w/ Preventing Neighborhood Deterioration	65.1%	550	75.4% <sup>(1)</sup>	183	74.0%	126
lfillsatd	Sat w/ Landfill	98.2%	364	98.8%	49	89.9%	29
compsatd	Sat w/ Compost Facility	100.0%	102	84.3%	16	100.0%	9
travel97d	Sat w/ Ease of Travel in PWC	64.1%	612	57.5%	196	71.7% <sup>(2)</sup>	176
outsidecd	Sat w/ Ease of Travel around NoVA outside PWC	36.5%	583	43.6%	184	53.8% <sup>(1)</sup>	152
growthcd	Sat w/ Rate of PWC Growth	66.4%	587	71.8%	164	78.4% <sup>(1)</sup>	143
roaddevad	Sat w/ Coordination of Development with Road Systems	52.5%	549	66.5% <sup>(1)</sup>	179	63.3%	137
qstreamsd	Sat w/ PWC Efforts to Preserve Water Quality	90.3%	253	94.1%	87	97.7% <sup>(1)</sup>	45
inputdevd	Sat w/ Opportunities for Citizen Input	72.1%	377	77.3%	92	78.0%	69
visdevd	Sat w/ Visual Appearance of New Development	86.2%	575	92.8% <sup>(1)</sup>	186	90.3%	131
buildngsd	Sat w/ the safety of buildings constructed in the last two years	95.3%	420	95.1%	147	97.7%	101

Table E89		Kind of place respondent lives in					
View of Government		Single-family home (1)		Duplex/Townhome (2)		Apartment or condo or other (3)	
		%	n	%	%	n	%
valued	Sat w/ Value for Tax Dollar	83.3%	653	82.1%	235	83.8%	179
effneffd	Sat w/ Efficient and Effective Service	88.9%	571	83.4%	164	93.7% <sup>(2)</sup>	109
trstgov1d	Trust of Government to do What is Right: Dichotomized	62.9%	576	63.0%	192	63.9%	133

**TABLE E: Satisfaction Mean Ratings by Demographic Variables\***

\* A mean rating with a superscript indicates that this mean is significantly higher (at the 5% level) than the mean in the column corresponding to the superscript.

Table E90		Work Status											
		Working full time (1)		Working part time (2)		Looking for work (3)		Homemaker (4)		Retired (5)		Other (6)	
Quality of life		Mean	n	Mean	n	Mean	n	Mean	n	Mean	n	Mean	n
qol10	Quality of life (ratings on 10 point-scale)	7.21	913	7.25	114	7.30	113	7.24	80	7.54 <sup>(1)</sup>	214	7.64 <sup>(1)</sup>	90
<b>Satisfaction with Services</b>													
ctysat97d	General Satisfaction with Services	92.8%	869	95.4%	114	84.2%	107	94.8%	76	92.7%	205	88.7%	85
voted	Sat w/ Convenient Ways to Register to Vote	97.5%	448	94.3%	58	94.2%	50	99.0%	45	96.8%	104	98.5%	45
pctupd	Sat w/ efficiency & effectiveness of voting precinct	97.3%	393	97.1%	46	100.0% <sup>(1)(5)</sup>	18	94.5%	32	96.3%	114	93.3%	22
govtservd	Sat w/ Informing Citizens about Government	71.4%	498	85.3% <sup>(1)</sup>	54	73.1%	51	86.7% <sup>(1)</sup>	42	90.7% <sup>(1)(3)(6)</sup>	119	68.9%	46



Table E91		Work Status											
		Working full time (1)		Working part time (2)		Looking for work (3)		Homemaker (4)		Retired (5)		Other (6)	
		%	n	%	n	%	n	%	n	%	n	%	n
strltad	Sat w/ Street Lighting	83.6%	667	82.7%	86	82.6%	96	84.1%	54	81.8%	135	84.6%	65
fired	Sat w/ Fire Fighting in R's Area	98.6%	557	98.8%	57	93.7%	79	100.0% (1)(5)	45	96.5%	128	99.0%	46
rescued	Sat w/ Emergency Medical Rescue Services	97.9%	488	89.1%	46	87.7%	67	95.8%	47	94.8%	116	95.1%	48
amcrimed	Sat w/ Safety in Neighborhood in Daytime	94.8%	645	98.3% (1)	83	94.1%	84	97.9%	65	96.2%	156	90.4%	73
pmcrimed	Sat w/ Safety in Neighborhood at Night	86.7%	656	86.8%	94	87.1%	69	86.9%	65	89.1%	138	92.1%	71
dycrimebd	Sat w/ Safety in Business Areas in Daytime	92.2%	486	92.0%	68	91.3%	64	98.2% (1)(5)	43	91.2%	96	94.5%	44
ntcrimebd	Sat w/ Safety in Business Areas at Night	81.3%	374	86.0%	39	88.1%	46	86.4%	39	80.5%	67	87.7%	33
preventbd	Sat w/ Crime Prevention Programs	83.5%	428	91.3%	53	75.1%	59	86.6%	39	86.1%	95	73.4%	42
attituded	Sat w/ Police Dept. Attitudes Towards Citizens	86.0% (3)	721	83.9%	88	68.9%	93	90.1% (3)	64	87.4% (3)	160	84.0%	75
polfaird	Sat that Police Dept treats everyone fairly	77.2%	684	78.2%	74	81.7%	87	82.7%	54	85.3% (1)	156	86.6%	66

Table E92		Work Status											
		Working full time (1)		Working part time (2)		Looking for work (3)		Homemaker (4)		Retired (5)		Other (6)	
		%	n	%	n	%	n	%	n	%	n	%	n
drugsd	Sat w/ Reduce the Use of Illegal Drugs	85.3%	419	90.0%	43	84.9%	74	89.4%	32	85.6%	82	78.2%	49
gangsd	Sat w/ Police Dept Efforts to Combat Gangs	85.3%	467	82.1%	45	89.2%	56	84.1%	34	89.8%	92	75.0%	44
policed	Sat w/ Overall Performance of Police Dept.	92.7%	783	89.7%	100	85.1%	102	96.0%	63	93.3%	180	92.5%	77
ppolicyd	Sat w/ Police check status of anyone placed under arrest	76.3% <sup>(3)</sup>	544	64.5%	68	55.8%	75	82.2% <sup>(3)</sup>	47	90.7% <sup>(1)(2)(3)</sup>	126	79.2% <sup>(3)</sup>	60
courtsatd	Sat w/ Security in Courthouse	97.2%	278	100.0% <sup>(1)</sup>	28	90.9%	35	100.0% <sup>(1)</sup>	12	100.0% <sup>(1)</sup>	32	87.5%	27
emsatisd	Sat w/ Assistance from 9-1-1 Operator	94.3%	148	94.8%	14	87.3%	30	100.0% <sup>(1)</sup>	18	96.4%	41	95.2%	13
entimebd	Sat w/ Time for Help to Arrive	92.9%	140	88.7%	13	80.6%	25	92.5%	15	90.6%	40	87.6%	12
emasstbd	Sat w/ Assistance on the Scene	94.5%	128	86.0%	13	87.0%	24	96.3%	15	91.5%	40	86.6%	12

Table E93		Work Status											
		Working full time (1)		Working part time (2)		Looking for work (3)		Homemaker (4)		Retired (5)		Other (6)	
		%	n	%	n	%	n	%	n	%	n	%	n
libraryd	Sat w/ Providing Library Services	95.5%	625	95.5%	67	90.6%	77	93.6%	60	97.1%	143	94.3%	57
librysatd	Sat w/ Service from Library Staff	99.4%	566	100.0%	73	93.3%	56	99.0%	58	99.3%	121	96.6%	61
parkd	Sat with Providing Park and Recreation Programs	88.4%	589	85.4%	73	92.6%	63	91.3%	45	97.7% <sup>(1)</sup> <sub>(2)</sub>	119	89.8%	49
elderlyd	Sat w/ Programs for Elderly Population	80.2%	232	88.1%	42	89.1%	48	75.5%	22	83.7%	91	69.8%	30
finneedbd	Sat w/ County's Help to People in Need	66.8%	289	58.0%	43	82.7% <sup>(1)</sup> <sub>(3)</sub>	65	74.1%	21	73.8%	40	78.3%	35
dsssatd	Sat w/ Dept. of Soc. Services	72.7%	205	93.0% <sup>(1)</sup> <sub>(3)(5)</sub>	19	58.1%	43	81.0%	21	76.1%	47	84.6%	32
hlthsatd	Sat w/ Health Department	81.5%	208	90.4%	25	91.9%	37	88.1%	18	83.8%	39	80.6%	27

Table E94		Work Status											
		Working full time (1)		Working part time (2)		Looking for work (3)		Homemaker (4)		Retired (5)		Other (6)	
		%	n	%	n	%	n	%	n	%	n	%	n
menthpb	Sat w/ services to people w/ mental health problems	78.2%	150	73.7%	11	100.0% <sup>(1)(2)(5)</sup>	23	82.6%	14	73.4%	28	94.0% <sup>(1)(5)</sup>	25
mentret	Sat w/ Services to Mental Retardation	90.5% <sup>(5)</sup>	121	79.0%	9	100.0% <sup>(1)(4)(5)</sup>	23	76.5%	13	66.6%	21	75.3%	19
menteis	Sat w/ Early Intervention Services	77.2%	115	100.0% <sup>(1)(5)</sup>	7	100.0% <sup>(1)(5)</sup>	16	96.1% <sup>(1)</sup>	9	82.4%	15	100.0% <sup>(1)(5)</sup>	16
mentsub	Sat w/ Services to Substance Abuse	75.7%	117	66.2%	6	89.0%	23	72.0%	7	66.4%	18	97.6% <sup>(1)(5)</sup>	20
mentald	Sat w/ Mental Health Services Overall	88.6% <sup>(5)</sup>	156	93.7% <sup>(5)</sup>	12	100.0% <sup>(1)(5)</sup>	23	90.8% <sup>(5)</sup>	14	71.0%	29	98.2% <sup>(1)(5)</sup>	26
schl4d	Sat that School System Provides Efficient Service	86.2% <sup>(4)</sup>	651	94.1% <sup>(1)(4)</sup>	89	95.6% <sup>(1)(4)(6)</sup>	84	72.9%	63	92.7% <sup>(1)(4)</sup>	110	83.4%	64
park2d	Sat with Park Authority	95.2%	337	90.5%	42	100.0% <sup>(1)</sup>	32	96.4%	30	93.6%	57	100.0% <sup>(1)</sup>	27
ctyserv2d	Sat with Service Authority	94.3%	375	98.1% <sup>(5)</sup>	32	96.4%	43	91.1%	32	89.5%	91	100.0% <sup>(1)(4)(5)</sup>	23

Table E95		Work Status											
		Working full time (1)		Working part time (2)		Looking for work (3)		Homemaker (4)		Retired (5)		Other (6)	
		%	n	%	n	%	n	%	n	%	n	%	n
helpful2d	Helpfulness of County Employees	83.0% <sup>(3)</sup>	332	94.6% <sup>(1)(3)(6)</sup>	28	53.4%	35	79.7%	24	89.9% <sup>(3)(6)</sup>	100	65.5%	21
helpfulad	Sat w/ helpfulness of tax County employees	85.6%	183	95.9%	19	77.3%	19	100.0% <sup>(1)(5)</sup>	12	90.9%	47	81.6%	9
timesatad	Sat w/ timeliness of tax request	88.7%	184	90.5%	19	100.0% <sup>(1)(5)</sup>	19	93.9%	12	84.8%	48	73.2%	9
net2d	Sat w/ PWC Government Web Site	92.0%	376	96.5%	39	89.9%	38	92.3%	31	98.2% <sup>(1)</sup>	53	90.5%	22

Table E96  Planning and Development Issues		Work Status											
		Working full time (1)		Working part time (2)		Looking for work (3)		Homemaker (4)		Retired (5)		Other (6)	
		%	n	%	n	%	n	%	n	%	n	%	n
newjobsd	Sat w/ Attracting New Jobs to PWC	72.7%	270	81.3%	25	66.0%	29	94.1% <sup>(1)</sup> <sub>(3)</sub>	10	91.7% <sup>(1)</sup> <sub>(3)</sub>	47	75.3%	31
land1d	Sat w/ Planning of Land Devel-prejob	69.2%	261	84.3% <sup>(4)</sup>	33	78.7%	31	55.8%	20	73.2%	58	80.9% <sup>(4)</sup>	34
land2d	Sat w/ Planning of Land Devel-postjob	68.3%	287	65.0%	25	59.4%	22	61.1%	21	63.9%	64	59.8%	27
landd	Sat w/ Planning of Land Devel (combined)	68.6%	545	75.9%	59	70.8%	53	58.5%	40	68.3%	122	71.6%	61
neighbord	Sat w/ Preventing Neighborhood Deterioration	65.7%	535	68.0%	51	92.6% <sup>(1)</sup> <sub>(2)(4)(5)</sub>	44	65.2%	45	68.1%	107	76.7%	60
lfillsatd	Sat w/ Landfill	97.5%	278	92.1%	20	100.0% <sup>(1)</sup>	22	98.1%	31	99.0%	67	100.0% <sup>(1)</sup>	23
compsatd	Sat w/ Compost Facility	97.9%	86	91.1%	8	100.0%	7	100.0%	4	100.0%	17	100.0%	3
travel97d	Sat w/ Ease of Travel in PWC	63.9%	591	66.7%	59	62.7%	64	69.4%	57	63.1%	133	61.3%	68

Table E97  Planning and Development Issues		Work Status											
		Working full time (1)		Working part time (2)		Looking for work (3)		Homemaker (4)		Retired (5)		Other (6)	
		%	n	%	n	%	n	%	n	%	n	%	n
outsidedcd	Sat w/ Ease of Travel around NoVA outside PWC	36.2%	563	58.8% <sup>(1)(5)</sup>	53	54.4%	59	41.5%	52	41.0%	117	51.0%	66
growthcd	Sat w/ Rate of PWC Growth	68.3%	560	73.1%	58	79.7%	55	75.5%	41	68.9%	117	61.3%	52
roaddevad	Sat w/ Coordination of Development with Road Systems	52.5%	528	66.1%	59	75.2% <sup>(1)(5)</sup>	79	61.9%	36	57.7%	100	59.1%	55
qstreamsdc	Sat w/ PWC Efforts to Preserve Water Quality	94.4%	212	97.7% <sup>(5)</sup>	33	79.8%	22	93.0%	15	88.2%	75	87.3%	24
inputdevd	Sat w/ Opportunities for Citizen Input	69.8%	331	79.5%	43	88.4% <sup>(1)</sup>	28	70.3%	24	79.2%	81	85.9% <sup>(1)</sup>	25
visdevd	Sat w/ Visual Appearance of New Development	89.0%	547	81.0%	54	85.1%	52	90.3%	52	90.5%	129	81.8%	54
buildngsd	Sat w/ the safety of buildings constructed in the last two years	96.5%	406	97.6%	49	95.5%	66	96.7%	32	92.1%	71	89.4%	43

Table E98		Work Status											
		Working full time (1)		Working part time (2)		Looking for work (3)		Homemaker (4)		Retired (5)		Other (6)	
		%	n	%	n	%	n	%	n	%	n	%	n
valued	Sat w/ Value for Tax Dollar	82.7%	637	87.2%	76	80.0%	89	77.3%	47	87.8%	138	85.4%	71
effneffd	Sat w/ Efficient and Effective Service	90.2%	516	90.0%	58	79.5%	62	90.2%	46	85.8%	109	84.8%	48
trstgov1d	Trust of Government to do What is Right: Dichotomized	65.1%	554	62.3%	61	49.3%	64	61.8%	40	64.5%	126	59.8%	46



**TABLE E: Satisfaction Mean Ratings by Demographic Variables\***

\* A mean rating with a superscript indicates that this mean is significantly higher (at the 5% level) than the mean in the column corresponding to the superscript.

Table E99		Newarea													
		Battlefield (1)		Broad Run (2)		Hoadly (3)		Old Bridge (4)		Dale (5)		Potomac (6)		Forest Park (7)	
Quality of life		Mean	n	Mean	n	Mean	n	Mean	n	Mean	n	Mean	n	Mean	n
qol10	Quality of life (ratings on 10 point-scale)	7.23	263	7.40 <sup>(6)</sup>	246	7.50 <sup>(6)</sup>	186	7.36	210	7.16	270	6.92	254	7.65 <sup>(5)(6)</sup>	184
<b>Satisfaction with Services</b>															
ctysat97d	General Satisfaction with Services	93.2%	246	94.9% <sup>(4)</sup>	239	93.4%	174	85.8%	207	93.0%	248	91.1%	241	91.0%	177
voted	Sat w/ Convenient Ways to Register to Vote	98.7%	108	98.6%	128	95.8%	106	100.0%	98	97.8%	121	93.0%	134	94.5%	101
pctupd	Sat w/ efficiency & effectiveness of voting precinct	98.0%	103	98.4%	88	100.0%	118	97.4%	101	96.1%	97	93.0%	80	95.4%	73
govtservd	Sat w/ Informing Citizens about Government	80.6%	126	81.4%	130	77.2%	125	73.8%	103	74.7%	149	74.0%	136	73.4%	99

Table E100		New area													
		Battlefield (1)		Broad Run (2)		Hoadly (3)		Old Bridge (4)		Dale (5)		Potomac (6)		Forest Park (7)	
Public Safety		%	n	%	n	%	n	%	n	%	n	%	n	%	n
strltad	Sat w/ Street Lighting	89.7%	173	84.2%	168	82.2%	140	80.6%	147	81.5%	204	79.6%	193	81.2%	137
fired	Sat w/ Fire Fighting in R's Area	96.6%	130	98.4%	154	98.1%	128	96.0%	123	98.9%	168	99.6%	163	98.4%	123
rescued	Sat w/ Emergency Medical Rescue Services	91.6%	125	97.9%	132	99.4% (1)	111	95.9%	114	95.8%	145	95.7%	135	97.3%	97
amcrimed	Sat w/ Safety in Neighborhood in Daytime	96.4%	191	96.5%	187	97.6%	102	97.3%	153	91.3%	189	92.4%	182	94.5%	126
pmcrimed	Sat w/ Safety in Neighborhood at Night	88.7% (6)	190	95.8% (5)(6)	189	93.1% (6)	111	92.0% (6)	140	83.2%	193	75.7%	173	84.4%	127
dycrimebd	Sat w/ Safety in Business Areas in Daytime	97.1%	135	96.8%	121	93.1%	86	88.1%	111	92.2%	142	87.8%	141	92.7%	84
ntcrimebd	Sat w/ Safety in Business Areas at Night	86.7%	76	84.6%	88	84.4%	109	84.1%	77	85.2%	105	71.7%	117	86.4%	74
preventbd	Sat w/ Crime Prevention Programs	86.6%	107	83.9%	123	80.1%	96	77.3%	98	84.6%	130	78.8%	121	83.9%	88

Table E101		New area													
		Battlefield (1)		Broad Run (2)		Hoadly (3)		Old Bridge (4)		Dale (5)		Potomac (6)		Forest Park (7)	
Public Safety		%	n	%	n	%	n	%	n	%	n	%	n	%	n
attituded	Sat w/ Police Dept. Attitudes Towards Citizens	85.6%	185	89.8%	197	86.7%	157	78.7%	157	84.8%	204	81.6%	220	86.8%	149
polfaird	Sat that Police Dept treats everyone fairly	76.8%	180	85.9% (6)	175	83.0%	146	79.5%	153	79.7%	197	71.6%	189	87.8% (6)	136
drugsd	Sat w/ Reduce the Use of Illegal Drugs	82.5%	89	84.9%	113	95.0% (4)	97	79.7%	95	84.7%	136	88.5%	134	84.2%	81
gangs	Sat w/ Police Dept Efforts to Combat Gangs	90.5%	109	82.6%	125	78.8%	106	84.3%	96	81.9%	131	86.5%	130	85.5%	90
policed	Sat w/ Overall Performance of Police Dept.	91.2%	216	95.6%	209	95.4%	161	88.2%	188	91.0%	213	92.2%	213	94.9%	163
ppolicyd	Sat w/ Police check status of anyone placed under arrest	71.0%	128	78.7%	162	86.4% (6)	125	78.5%	119	76.5%	156	65.2%	167	83.5% (6)	113
courtsatd	Sat w/ Security in Courthouse	96.2%	51	96.0%	62	100.0% %	60	94.8%	59	100.0% %	74	95.3%	80	93.7%	49
emsatisd	Sat w/ Assistance from 9-1-1 Operator	98.7%	44	95.0%	28	95.8%	30	86.4%	38	95.2%	51	91.3%	43	98.1%	36
emtimebd	Sat w/ Time for Help to Arrive	88.6%	39	92.7%	26	94.8%	27	87.4%	35	87.8%	51	93.7%	39	100.0%	35
emasstbd	Sat w/ Assistance on the Scene	88.0%	37	94.6%	26	100.0% %	25	80.7%	35	95.5%	45	98.6% (4)	39	100.0%	25

Table E102		New area													
		Battlefield (1)		Broad Run (2)		Hoadly (3)		Old Bridge (4)		Dale (5)		Potomac (6)		Forest Park (7)	
Public Services		%	n	%	n	%	n	%	%	n	%	n	%	n	%
libraryd	Sat w/ Providing Library Services	90.8%	145	96.8%	170	96.4%	141	98.0%	150	96.4%	183	95.8%	164	93.5%	114
librysatd	Sat w/ Service from Library Staff	99.1%	132	97.2%	157	100.0%	109	97.9%	146	99.6%	151	99.5%	151	99.5%	121
parkd	Sat with Providing Park and Recreation Programs	84.9%	145	91.6%	143	96.2% <sup>(1)</sup>	141	86.9%	142	91.8%	152	90.9%	145	90.1%	108
elderlyd	Sat w/ Programs for Elderly Population	85.4%	63	81.5%	73	86.1%	58	71.8%	70	86.0%	86	79.2%	90	83.6%	56
finneedbd	Sat w/ County's Help to People in Need	65.2%	55	65.4%	59	73.1%	62	71.1%	58	70.8%	99	73.7%	125	61.7%	69
dsssatd	Sat w/ Dept. of Soc. Services	73.3%	45	82.7%	57	71.6%	39	70.0%	48	65.0%	66	78.5%	83	74.4%	55

Table E103 Public Services		New area													
		Battlefield (1)		Broad Run (2)		Hoadly (3)		Old Bridge (4)		Dale (5)		Potomac (6)		Forest Park (7)	
		%	n	%	n	%	n	%	%	n	%	n	%	n	%
hlthsatd	Sat w/ Health Department	76.7%	56	81.9%	66	93.8%	42	82.0%	44	79.9%	46	93.1%	70	79.0%	45
menthpb	Sat w/ services to people w/ mental health problems	58.9%	33	93.1% (1)(4)	54	93.1% (1)(4)	30	63.1%	37	86.5% (1)	35	86.1% (1)	35	91.3% (1)(4)	42
mentret	Sat w/ Services to Mental Retardation	77.4%	26	80.8%	48	91.8%	25	86.6%	28	92.7%	28	83.4%	25	88.8%	39
menteis	Sat w/ Early Intervention Services	59.7%	24	97.3% (1)	47	75.1%	19	77.9%	28	87.6%	28	90.7%	13	92.9% (1)	29
mentsub	Sat w/ Services to Substance Abuse	63.9%	27	90.1%	48	83.7%	21	76.6%	27	76.5%	23	87.3%	22	66.2%	34
mentalld	Sat w/ Mental Health Services Overall	80.1%	35	93.4%	57	87.2%	31	86.2%	37	92.1%	35	91.8%	35	87.4%	45
schl4d	Sat that School System Provides Efficient Service	91.0% (6)	153	90.3% (6)	190	90.4% (6)	138	87.2%	145	86.5%	177	78.4%	155	86.1%	127
park2d	Sat with Park Authority	86.4%	78	98.7% (1)	107	94.7%	65	96.3%	67	96.4% (1)	88	99.2% (1)	68	98.0% (1)	61
ctyserv2d	Sat with Service Authority	94.9%	86	94.5%	93	88.9%	56	88.0%	89	91.7%	88	98.8% (4)	104	98.3%	79

Table E104  Communication with the County		New area													
		Battlefield (1)		Broad Run (2)		Hoadly (3)		Old Bridge (4)		Dale (5)		Potomac (6)		Forest Park (7)	
		%	n	%	n	%	n	%	%	n	%	n	%	n	%
helpful2d	Helpfulness of County Employees	78.2%	96	91.8%	72	81.4%	86	90.2%	90	79.6%	84	78.8%	62	77.5%	63
helpfulad	Sat w/ helpfulness of tax County employees	81.5%	52	97.4%	54	86.2%	41	79.9%	44	94.3%	36	79.5%	39	97.8%	31
timesatad	Sat w/ timeliness of tax request	91.8% (6)	53	94.8% (6)	53	89.6% (6)	41	90.7% (6)	44	92.4% (6)	36	62.5%	39	95.5% (6)	31
net2d	Sat w/ PWC Government Web Site	96.7%	75	97.6%	86	92.0%	95	88.2%	76	91.8%	108	85.9%	77	97.7%	59

Table E105 Planning and Development Issues		New area													
		Battlefield (1)		Broad Run (2)		Hoadly (3)		Old Bridge (4)		Dale (5)		Potomac (6)		Forest Park (7)	
		%	n	%	n	%	n	%	%	n	%	n	%	n	%
newjobsd	Sat w/ Attracting New Jobs to PWC	79.7%	74	79.5%	78	81.2%	43	62.7%	65	71.6%	45	80.4%	66	74.7%	49
land1d	Sat w/ Planning of Land Devel-prejob	67.0%	97	75.9%	64	73.0%	22	66.3%	61	76.8%	65	79.4%	72	67.5%	36
land2d	Sat w/ Planning of Land Devel-postjob	72.7%	38	76.0%	71	62.8%	115	55.7%	63	63.4%	73	73.7%	74	54.2%	65
landd	Sat w/ Planning of Land Devel (combined)	68.6%	134	75.9%	135	64.4%	137	60.9%	124	69.1%	135	76.5%	146	59.0%	101
neighbord	Sat w/ Preventing Neighborhood Deterioration	68.6%	112	81.8% <sup>(5)</sup>	134	65.8%	138	68.4%	107	61.0%	158	67.0%	139	70.1%	97
lfillsatd	Sat w/ Landfill	95.5%	36	100.0% <sup>(4)</sup>	64	96.0%	103	100.0% <sup>(4)</sup>	75	100.0% <sup>(4)</sup>	94	91.7%	45	96.5%	59
compsatd	Sat w/ Compost Facility	100.0% <sup>(4)</sup>	44	100.0% <sup>(4)</sup>	37	100.0% <sup>(4)</sup>	8	90.2%	7	100.0% <sup>(4)</sup>	3	100.0% <sup>(4)</sup>	6	100.0% <sup>(4)</sup>	12
travel97d	Sat w/ Ease of Travel in PWC	72.9% <sup>(4)(6)(7)</sup>	179	74.7% <sup>(4)(6)(7)</sup>	141	73.4% <sup>(4)(7)</sup>	118	54.9%	136	61.6%	147	56.1%	135	51.6%	120

Table E106  Planning and Development Issues		New area													
		Battlefield (1)		Broad Run (2)		Hoadly (3)		Old Bridge (4)		Dale (5)		Potomac (6)		Forest Park (7)	
		%	n	%	n	%	n	%	%	n	%	n	%	n	%
outsidedcd	Sat w/ Ease of Travel around NoVA outside PWC	45.3%	163	46.6%	140	28.3%	114	34.0%	128	41.1%	138	43.4%	122	36.2%	111
growthcd	Sat w/ Rate of PWC Growth	73.8%	129	75.2%	136	68.2%	132	60.9%	120	70.3%	150	66.8%	141	66.4%	102
roaddevad	Sat w/ Coordination of Development with Road Systems	63.5% (4)	134	65.0% (4)	132	55.8%	124	40.0%	113	55.2%	134	65.0% (4)	140	48.9%	105
qstreamsdc	Sat w/ PWC Efforts to Preserve Water Quality	89.5%	59	85.3%	49	87.0%	50	96.7%	53	88.3%	57	97.7%	60	96.8%	60
inputdevd	Sat w/ Opportunities for Citizen Input	81.3%	73	61.2%	83	74.8%	96	74.1%	64	74.0%	85	67.4%	85	81.9%	71
visdevd	Sat w/ Visual Appearance of New Development	86.9%	123	91.2% (7)	152	85.1%	133	91.3%	108	90.2%	149	89.3%	146	77.8%	103
buildngsd	Sat w/ the safety of buildings constructed in the last two years	97.5%	81	95.1%	116	93.6%	94	96.0%	86	95.6%	116	94.7%	114	95.6%	81



Table E107		New area													
		Battlefield (1)		Broad Run (2)		Hoadly (3)		Old Bridge (4)		Dale (5)		Potomac (6)		Forest Park (7)	
View of Government		%	n	%	n	%	n	%	%	n	%	n	%	n	%
valued	Sat w/ Value for Tax Dollar	86.9%	182	85.3%	182	81.3%	90	76.5%	148	84.4%	155	79.5%	178	84.9%	115
effneffd	Sat w/ Efficient and Effective Service	85.5%	121	92.6%	142	89.7%	119	84.0%	111	93.0%	142	84.2%	133	91.6%	87
trstgovld	Trust of Government to do What is Right: Dichotomized	62.6%	159	63.1%	140	61.0%	99	62.3%	110	70.8%	144	56.4%	148	60.6%	90



**Appendix F:  
Question Revisions and Rotation Plan**



PRINCE WILLIAM COUNTY - CITIZEN SATISFACTION -						
Order	Question	Question Name	Core	Not Core Incl. 2008	Added in 2008	2010 rotation
1	Introduction	INTRO	1			1
2	First, I need to confirm that you are at least 18 years old	CONFIRM1	1			1
3	I also need to confirm that you are a resident of PWC - and not located on-post at Quantico	CONFIRM2	1			1
4	Is this a cellular telephone?	CELLPHONE			1	1
5	Is this a landline or regular phone located in your home?	LANDLINE			1	1
6	Do you also have a cell phone for your personal use?	OWNCELL			1	1
7	Is this cell phone used for? (personal, business, personal & business)	CELLUSE			1	1
8	Do you also have a regular telephone at home?	HAVELINE			1	1
9	Could you tell me the correct ZIP code for your address (just 5 digits)?	ZIPCODE	1			1
10	Intersection - names or route numbers of the roads that cross there?	INTRSCTN	1			1
11	How long have you lived in Prince William County?	HOWLONG	1			1
12	Where did you live before moving to Prince William County?	PREVRES	1			1
13	Do you own your own home, or are you renting?	OWNHOME	1			1
14	And what kind of place are you living in?	KINDPLCE	1			1
15	Between 1 and 10 how would you rate PWC as a place to live?	QOL10	1			1
16	how satisfied in general with services provided by PWC	CTYSAT97	1			1
17	since last year satisfaction with services increased/decreased/ same	SATCHG		1		1
18	On the same scale where would you say PWC stood 5 yrs. Ago?	5YRAGOB		1		1
19	On the same scale where would you say PWC will stand 5 yrs from now?	FUTUREB		1		1
20	Would you like to be living in PWC 5 yrs from now or someplace else?	HPELIVEB		1		1
21	The job the county is doing in providing convenient ways to vote?	VOTE	1			1
22	Have you gone to a voting precinct in PWC to vote in any election (screen)	VOTEYEAR			1	1
23	Satisfaction: efficiency and effectiveness of the voting precinct set-up	PCTUP			1	1
24	Satisfaction:The job the county is doing keeping citizens informed about programs?	GOVTSERV	1			1
25	Where do you generally get your information about what is going on in Pwc and its government?	INFOSORC				
26	Satisfaction: The job the County is doing in animal control services?	ANIMALA				

PRINCE WILLIAM COUNTY - CITIZEN SATISFACTION -						
	Question	Question	Core	Not Core	Added	2010
Order	Question	Name		Incl. 2008	in 2008	rotation
27	Satisfaction: The job the County is doing in providing street lighting?	STRLTA	1			1
28	Satisfaction: The job the County is doing in fire fighting in your area?	FIRE	1			1
29	Satisfaction: The job the County is doing in providing emergency medical rescue?	RESCUE	1			1
30	Satisfaction: the job County is doing in controlling mosquitoes?	MOSCONT				
31	Satisfaction: Safety from crime in your neighborhood during daylight?	AMCRIME	1			1
32	Satisfaction: Safety from crime in your neighborhood after dark?	PMCRIME	1			1
33	Satisfaction: Safety from crime in commercial areas during daylight?	DYCRIMEB		1		1
34	Satisfaction: Safety from crime in commercial areas after dark?	NTCRIMEB		1		1
35	Satisfaction: Crime prevention programs and information provided by police?	PREVENTB		1		1
36	Satisfaction: Police dept. attitudes and behaviors towards citizens?	ATTITUDE	1			1
37	Satisfaction: Police department treat everyone fairly?	POLFAIR			1	1
38	Satisfaction: Police dept. efforts to reduce the use of illegal drugs?	DRUGS	1			1
39	Satisfaction: Police Department's efforts to combat gang activity?	GANGS		1		1
40	Satisfaction: The overall performance of the police department?	POLICE	1			1
41	Were you or anyone in your household victim of ANY crime	VCRIME			1	1
42	Did you report it to PWC Police Department	VCRIMER			1	1
43	Reasons for not report crime to PWC Police Department	VCRIMNR			1	1
44	What types of crimes were you a victim of?	CRMTYPES			1	1
45	Satisfaction with the job the Police Department is doing in carrying the immigration policy?	PPOLICY			1	1
46	Reasons for satisfaction (open-end)	WPOLSAT1			1	1
47	Reasons for dissatisfaction (open-ends)	WPOLSAT2			1	1
48	In the past year have you had occasion to visit the Judicial Center?	COURT	1			1
49	How satisfied are you with the level of security in the courthouse?	COURTSAT	1			1
50	Are you familiar enough with the services of the PWC Sheriff's office?	CTYSHERF				
51	How satisfied are you with Sheriff's Office attitude & behavior towards citizens	ATTITUT				

PRINCE WILLIAM COUNTY - CITIZEN SATISFACTION -						
	Question	Question	Core	Not Core	Added	2010
Order	Question	Name		Incl. 2008	in 2008	rotation
52	How satisfied are you with Sheriff's Office overall performance	SHERIFFA				
53	Have you dialed 911 over the past 12 months?	EMERG911	1			1
54	When you dialed 911 which services did you call for?	EMSERVB	1			1
55	Was your call because of an emergency?	EMERGSB	1			1
56	How satisfied were you with the assistance you received from the person who took your 911 call?	EMSATIS	1			1
57	What caused you to be dissatisfied with the assistance received from 911 operator?	ENSATRES	1			1
58	How satisfied were you with the time it took for help to arrive on scene?	EMTIMEB	1			1
59	How satisfied were you with the assistance provided on the scene?	EMASSTB	1			1
60	What caused you to be dissatisfied with the assistance provided on the scene?	EMASSRES	1			1
61	How much time did it take for help to arrive on the scene?	EMTIMES	1			1
62	What would you say that is a reasonable amount of time to receive help?	EMTIMRE	1			1
63	How many people in your household have been trained in CPR?	CPR97	1			1
64	In the Event of an Emergency, how long could you shelter in your home?- with power	SHELTER1	1			1
65	In the Event of an Emergency, how long could you shelter in your home?- without power	SHELTER2	1			1
66	Satisfaction: providing library services?	LIBRARY	1			1
67	Satisfaction: providing park and recreation facilities and programs?	PARK	1			1
68	Satisfaction: providing programs to help the County's elderly population?	ELDERLY	1			1
69	Satisfaction: providing help to people in financial need?	FINNEEDB		1		1
70	Satisfaction: providing help to people with emotional, mental, drug problems?	PROBLEMB				
71	have you used the county libraries in the past 12 months?	LIBRY12	1			1
72	If so, how satisfied were you with service from library staff?	LIBRYSAT	1			1
73	Are you familiar enough to rate Dept of Social Services?	DEPTSS	1			1
74	if so, how satisfied are you with DSS services?	DSSSAT	1			1
75	Are you familiar enough with Health Dept to rate their services?	HLTHDEPT	1			1
76	If so, how satisfied are you with Healt Dept. services?	HLTHSAT	1			1

PRINCE WILLIAM COUNTY - CITIZEN SATISFACTION -						
	Question	Question	Core	Not Core	Added	2010
Order	Question	Name		Incl. 2008	in 2008	rotation
77	Are you familiar with the services of the Community Services Board?	MENTAL	1			1
78	Satisfaction: Services to people with mental health problems?	MENTHPB	1			1
79	Satisfaction: Services to people with mental retardation?	MENTRET	1			1
80	Satisfaction: Early Intervention Services?	MENTEIS	1			1
81	Satisfaction: Services to people with substance abuse problems?	MENSUB	1			1
82	Satisfaction: Services overall?	MENTALL	1			1
83	Over the past 12 months have you contacted anybody in the County Gvmt about anything	ANYBODY	1			1
84	If so, how satisfied were you with the helpfulness of employees?	HELPFUL2	1			1
85	Have you contacted the County about your taxes over last 12 months?	TAXESA	1			1
86	What was the specific reason you contacted the County?	CONTACTA				
87	How did you contact the county (telephone, walk in, etc).	HOWCONA	1			1
88	How satisfied were you with the helpfulness of employees?	HELPFULA	1			
89	How satisfied were you with time it took for your request to be answered?	TIMESATA	1			1
90	Have you ever used the PWC website?	NET1	1			1
91	If so, how satisfied were you with the site?	NET2	1			1
92	Satisfaction: job the County is doing in planning how land be used and developed?	LAND1/LAND2	1			1
93	Are you familiar enough with County's efforts to attract new jobs and businesses to rate those efforts?	RATEJOBS	1			1
94	If so, how satisfied are you with the County's efforts to attract new jobs and businesses?	NEWJOBS	1			1
95	What caused you to be dissatisfied with the job PWC is doing to attract new jobs and businesses?	JOBSDIS		1		1
96	What caused you to be satisfied with the job PWC is doing to attract new jobs and businesses?	JOBSSAT		1		1
97	How satisfied with preventing neighborhoods from deteriorating and making sure the community is well kept up?	NEIGHBOR	1			1
98	How big a problem is there now with residential overcrowding, that is: too many people living at one residence?	N10CROWD				1
99	Compared to one year ago, how has overcrowding in your area changed?	N20CROWD				1



PRINCE WILLIAM COUNTY - CITIZEN SATISFACTION -						
Order	Question	Question Name	Core	Not Core Incl. 2008	Added in 2008	2010 rotation
100	How big a problem is there in our neighborhood now with vacant houses or properties that are not well kept up?	N3VACANT				1
101	Compared to one year ago, how has the upkeep of vacant houses in your area changed?	N4VACANT				1
102	How big a problem is there in your neighborhood now with occupied homes or apartments that are not well kept up?	N5UPKEEP				1
103	Compared to one year ago, how has upkeep of occupied homes in your area changed?	N6UPKEEP				1
104	How big a problem is there now with loitering, that is: groups of people hanging out on street corners or in store parking lots?	LOITER				1
105	Compared to one year ago, how has loitering in your area changed?	LOITNOW				1
106	Have you used the landfill in the last 12 months?	LANDFILL	1			1
107	If so, how satisfied were you with landfill services?	LFILLSAT	1			1
108	Have you used the Balls Ford Road Compost facility in the last 12 months?	COMPOST		1		1
109	If so, how satisfied were you with the Balls Ford Road Compost facility?	COMPSAT		1		1
110	How satisfied are you with recycling services in the County?	RECYCLEC				
111	Satisfaction: visual appearance-the amount of trash / debris, litter along roadways and in neighborhoods	TRASHC				
112	Satisfaction: visual appearance-the number of illegal signs in the right of way	SIGNSC				
113	Satisfaction: visual appearance-the number of deteriorated buildings and other structures	BUILDNGC				
114	Satisfaction: visual appearance-the number of junk cars along roadways and in neighborhoods	JUNKC				
115	How satisfied are you with the ease of travel or getting around within PWC?	TRAVEL97	1			1
116	How satisfied are you with the ease of getting around Northern VA outside of PWC?	OUTSIDE97	1			1
117	Satisfaction: Public transportation for destinations within the Prince William area	TRANSC2				
118	What would make you more satisfied with public transportation?	MORESAT				
119	What aspects of PWC's public transportation contribute to your satisfaction?	WHYSAT				
120	For destinations elsewhere in Northern Virginia and DC	NOVATRC2				
121	How satisfied are you with the rate of growth in the County?	GROWTHC	1			1

<b>PRINCE WILLIAM COUNTY - CITIZEN SATISFACTION -</b>						
	<b>Question</b>	<b>Question Name</b>	<b>Core</b>	<b>Not Core</b>	<b>Added</b>	<b>2010</b>
<b>Order</b>	<b>Question</b>	<b>Name</b>		<b>Incl. 2008</b>	<b>in 2008</b>	<b>rotation</b>
122	Satisfaction: coordination of development with transportation and road systems?	ROADEVA	1			1
123	Satisfaction: coordination of development with locations of public facilities?	SVEDEVA				
124	Satisfaction: County's efforts to protect the environment?	ENVRDEVA				
125	Satisfaction: County's efforts to preserve open space?	SPCEDEVA				
126	Satisfaction: The County's efforts in Historic Preservation	HISTORIC				
127	Familiar with the County's efforts to preserve and improve stream water quality?	QSSCREEN		1		1
128	If so, how satisfied with efforts to preserve and improve stream water quality?	QSTREAMS		1		1
129	Satisfaction: opportunitites for citizen input on planning process?	INPUTDEV	1			1
130	Satisfaction: visual appearance of new development in the County?	VISDEV	1			1
131	Satisfaction: safety of buildings, residential and non-residential constructed in the County in the 2 years	BUILDNGS			1	1
132	Should decrease service and taxes, increase service and taxes?	VIEW	1			1
133	How satisfied are you with value for tax dollar?	VALUE	1			1
134	How satisfied are you County provides efficient and effective service?	EFFNEFF	1			1
135	How much of the time can you trust County government to do right?	TRSTGOV1	1			1
136	How many persons under 18 live in your household?	UNDER18	1			1
137	Are any of those children less than 5?	KUNDR597	1			1
138	Are any of those children ages 5 to 12?	K5TO1297	1			1
139	Are any of those children ages 13 to 17?	KOVR1297	1			1
140	Do you currently have any children attending PWC Schools?	SCHL1	1			1
141	How satisfied that school system provides efficient effective service?	SCHL4	1			1
142	Have you used park and recreation facilities in the past 12 months?	PARK12	1			1
142	Are you familiar enough with Park Authority services to rate?	PARK1	1			1
144	How satisfied that Park Authority provides efficient effective service?	PARK2	1			1
145	Are you familiar enough with Service Authority to rate?	CTYSERV1	1			1
146	How satisfied that Service Authority provides efficient effective service?	CTYSERV2	1			1

PRINCE WILLIAM COUNTY - CITIZEN SATISFACTION -						
Order	Question	Question Name	Core	Not Core Incl. 2008	Added in 2008	2010 rotation
147	How many persons in your household are 18 or older?	OLDER18	1			1
148	Do any of these adults share this cell phone?	CELLSHARE			1	1
149	Distribution of calls made and received (cell/landline)	CELLCOMP			1	1
150	Of the other adults in the household, how many have their own cell phone	CELLCOUNT			1	1
151	Is your landline or regular telephone listed in the current telephone book?	PHONE1A	1			1
152	Is the number I dialed listed in the current telephone book?	PHONE1B			1	1
153	Reasons for not listing phone number?	PHONE2	1			1
154	In what year were you born?	YRBORN	1			1
155	Are you working full time, part time, looking for work?	WORK	1			1
156	Do you have any specialized work related license?	CRED98B		1		1
157	What kind of work do you do at your job?	JOB1B		1		1
158	What is the main business or industry of your organization?	JOB2B		1		1
159	So you are employed in?	JOB3B		1		1
160	Is the place where you work primarily concerned with?	JOB4B		1		1
161	In what county or city is your job located?	JOBCITY	1			1
162	If Fairfax County, where in Fairfax is your job located?	FAIRFAX		1		1
163	Are you living today in the same house as you were a year ago?	SAMEHOME	1			1
164	Are you commuting to the same workplace as you were a year ago?	SAMEWORK	1			1
165	How long on average does it take you to get to work?	COMM98	1			1
166	During past year has your commuting time gotten longer / shorter/ same	COMMTIME	1			1
167	Do you telecommute or telework?	TELECOM	1			1
168	In the past 12 months, how often have you telecommuted or teleworked?	TELTIME	1			1
169	Gender	GENDER	1			1
170	what is your marital status?	MARITAL	1			1
171	what is the highest level of education you completed?	EDUC	1			1
172	are you currently serving or have served in U.S. military?	MILTRY	1			
173	what is your income range?	INCOME	1			1
174	Do you consider yourself to be of hispanic origin?	HISPANIC	1			1
175	What is your race?	RACE	1			1
<b>TOTAL</b>			<b>105</b>	<b>21</b>	<b>20</b>	<b>153</b>



## SATISFACTION ITEM INDEX

ITEM	SATISFACTION ITEM DESCRIPTION	FREQUENCY PAGE NUMBER	QUESTIONNAIRE PAGE NUMBER	REPORT PAGE NUMBER
<i>General Satisfaction with Government Services</i>				
<b>CTYSAT97</b>	Services of the County Government in General	D-3	A-10	13
<b>GOVTSERV</b>	Informing Citizens on Government Services	D-5	A-11	14
<b>PCTUP</b>	Efficiency and Effectiveness of the Voting Precinct Setup	D-4	A-11	13
<b>VOTE</b>	Voter Registration	D-4	A-11	13
<i>Public Safety</i>				
<b>POLICE</b>	Overall Satisfaction with Police	D-10	A-15	14
<b>ATTITUDE</b>	Police Attitudes and Behaviors Towards Citizens	D-8	A-14	16
<b>PPOLICY</b>	Police Department Carrying Out Immigration Policy	D-11	A-15	17
<b>POLFAIR</b>	Police Department Treats Everyone Fairly	D-9	A-14	19
<b>DRUGS</b>	Reduce Illegal Drugs	D-9	A-14	20
<b>GANGS</b>	Efforts to Combat Gang Activity	D-9	A-14	20
<b>FIRE</b>	Fire Protection	D-6	A-12	20
<b>RESCUE</b>	Medical Rescue	D-6	A-12	20
<b>COURTSAT</b>	Security in Courthouse	D-11	A-16	20
<b>EMSATIS</b>	911 Phone Help	D-14	A-18	21
<b>EMTIMEB</b>	Time for Help to Arrive	D-15	A-19	21
<b>EMASSTB</b>	Assistance on the Scene	D-17	A-19	21
<b>AMCRIME</b>	Safety in Neighborhood in Daylight	D-6	A-12	22
<b>PMCRIME</b>	Safety in Neighborhood after Dark	D-7	A-13	22
<b>STRLTA</b>	Street Lighting	D-5	A-12	22
<b>PREVENTB</b>	Crime Prevention Program and Information	D-8	A-13	23
<b>DYCRIMEB</b>	Safety in Commercial and Business Areas in Daylight	D-7	A-13	22
<b>NTCRIMEB</b>	Safety in Commercial and Business Areas at Night	D-7	A-13	22
<i>Public Services</i>				
<b>SCHL4</b>	School System Provides Efficient and Effective Service	D-37	A-33	26
<b>LIBRARY</b>	Library Services	D-19	A-21	26
<b>LIBRYSAT</b>	Library Staff	D-21	A-22	26
<b>PARK</b>	Park & Recreation Facilities and Programs	D-19	A-21	26
<b>PARK2</b>	Park Authority Provides Efficient & Effective Service	D-38	A-33	26
<b>ELDERLY</b>	Helping the Elderly	D-20	A-21	27
<b>FINNEEDB</b>	Help to People in Financial Need	D-20	A-22	27
<b>DSSSAT</b>	Satisfaction with DSS	D-21	A-22	27
<b>HLTHSAT</b>	Health Department	D-22	A-23	26
<b>MENTHPB</b>	Services to People with Mental Health Problem	D-23	A-23	27
<b>MENTRET</b>	Services those with Mental Retardation	D-23	A-23	27
<b>MENTEIS</b>	Early Intervention Services	D-23	A-24	27
<b>MENTSUB</b>	Services to People with Substance Abuse Problems	D-24	A-24	27
<b>MENTALL</b>	Overall Services of CSB	D-24	A-23	27

<i>Communication with the County</i>				
<b>HELPFUL2</b>	Helpfulness of Employees	D-25	A-25	29
<b>TIMESATA</b>	Time Taken for Requests to be Answered	D-26	A-25	29
<b>NET2</b>	County Web Site	D-27	A-26	29
<i>Planning and Development</i>				
<b>COMPSAT</b>	Balls Ford Road Compost Facility	D-30	A-28	36
<b>LAND1/ LAND2</b>	County Planning of Land Use and Development	D-27	A-26	32
<b>QSTREAMS</b>	Efforts to Preserve and Improve Water Quality of Streams	D-32	A-30	38
<b>GROWTHC</b>	Growth in County	D-31	A-29	32
<b>INPUTDEV</b>	Citizen Input Opportunity re: Development	D-32	A-30	34
<b>ROADDEVA</b>	Coordination of Development with Road Systems	D-31	A-29	34
<b>VISDEV</b>	Appearance of New Development	D-33	A-30	35
<b>BUILDINGS</b>	Safety of Buildings	D-33	A-31	35
<b>NEIGHBOR</b>	Prevent Neighborhood Deterioration	D-29	A-27	35
<b>NEWJOBS</b>	Attract New Jobs and Businesses	D-28	A-27	36
<b>TRAVEL97</b>	Getting Around	D-30	A-29	37
<b>OUTSIDE C</b>	Ease of Travel around Northern Virginia	D-31	A-29	36
<b>LFILLSAT</b>	Landfill	D-29	A-28	36
<b>CTYSERV2</b>	Satisfaction with Service Authority	D-38	A-35	26
<i>Government</i>				
<b>EFFNEFF</b>	County Provides Efficient and Effective Service in General	D-35	A-31	40
<b>VALUE</b>	Value for Tax Dollar	D-34	A-31	42