



Prince William County Citizen Satisfaction Survey



REPORT OF RESULTS 2007

Prepared by:

Abdoulaye Diop, Ph.D.
Senior Research Analyst

Deborah A. Kermer, M.A.
Research Analyst

Thomas M. Guterbock, Ph.D.
Director

With the assistance of:

Trung Kien Le, M.A.
Research Analyst

Erin R. Witchurch, M.A.
Research Analyst

Prepared for:

OFFICE OF EXECUTIVE MANAGEMENT
Prince William County, Virginia
August 2007



Prince William County Citizen Satisfaction Survey

REPORT OF RESULTS 2007

TABLE OF CONTENTS

List of Figures	ii
List of Tables.....	iv
Acknowledgements	v
Executive Summary	vii
I. Introduction, Respondent Selection, and Summary of Methods.....	1
II. Quality of Life in Prince William County	7
III. Strategic Planning Goals	9
IV. Satisfaction with County Services.....	12
V. Communication with the County.....	22
VI. Development Issues	26
VII. Views of Government.....	34
VIII. Employment and Commuting.....	37
IX. Summary and Conclusion	42
Appendix A: <i>Questionnaire</i>	
Appendix B: <i>Survey and Sampling Methodology</i>	
Appendix C: <i>Demographics of Sample</i>	
Appendix D: <i>Survey Results</i>	
Appendix E: <i>Question Revisions and Rotation Plan</i>	

Satisfaction Item Index

LIST OF FIGURES

Figure I-1: Prince William County Citizen Satisfaction Survey Geographic Regions..... xi

Figure I-2: Age of Respondents, 2007..... 4

Figure I-3: Race of Respondents, 2007 5

Figure I-4: Household Income, 2007..... 5

Figure I-5: Educational Level, 2007 6

Figure II-1: Overall Quality of Life Ratings, 2007 7

Figure II-2: Mean Overall Quality of Life Ratings, 1993-2007 7

Figure II-3: Mean Overall Quality of Life Ratings by Area, 2007..... 8

Figure III-1: Strategic Goals—Relationships Between Average Scores, 2007 10

Figure IV-1: Overall Satisfaction with County Government Services, 2007 12

Figure IV-2: Overall Satisfaction with County Government Services, 1993 and 2003-2007 12

Figure IV-3: Satisfaction with Police Attitudes and Behaviors by Race, 2007..... 13

Figure IV-4: Satisfaction with Police Attitudes and Behaviors by Age, 2007 13

Figure IV-5: Satisfaction with County Emergency Services, 2007..... 15

Figure IV-6: Purpose of 911 Call, 2007 15

Figure IV-7: Satisfaction with 911 Services, 2007..... 16

Figure IV-8: Satisfaction with Safety from Crime, 2007 17

Figure IV-9: Capacity to Shelter in Place with/without Electricity, 2007..... 17

Figure IV-10: Satisfaction with Public Services, 2007 19

Figure IV-11: Satisfaction with Human Services, 2007..... 20

Figure IV-12: Satisfaction with Community Services Board Services, 2007 20

Figure V-1: Sources of Information about the County, 2007 22

Figure V-2: Satisfaction with County Employee Helpfulness, 2007 23

Figure V-3: Use of County Website, 1999-2007..... 23

Figure V-4: Satisfaction with County Website, 2007..... 24

Figure V-5: Methods of Contact regarding Taxes, 2007..... 24

Figure V-6: Specific Tax Questions, 2007 25

Figure VI-1: Satisfaction with Planning and Development (Question Asked Before New Jobs Question),
2007 26

Figure VI-2: Satisfaction with Planning and Development (Question Asked After New Jobs Question),
2007 27

Figure VI-3: Satisfaction with County Growth by Area, 2007 27

Figure VI-4: Satisfaction with Opportunities for Citizen Input by Geographic Area, 2007 28

Figure VI-5: Satisfaction with Development Items, 2007..... 29

Figure VI-6: Satisfaction with Appearance Items, 2007 30

Figure VI-7: Satisfaction with Ease of Travel in the County, 2007	31
Figure VI-8: Satisfaction with Ease of Travel in the County by Geographic Area, 2007	31
Figure VI-9: Satisfaction with Public Transportation within the County, 2007	32
Figure VI-10: Satisfaction with Transportation Items, 2007	32
Figure VII-1: Satisfaction with Efficiency & Effectiveness of County Service, 2007	34
Figure VII-2: Trust County Government Decisions, 2007	34
Figure VII-3: Trust County Government Decisions, 2003-2007	34
Figure VII-4: Preferred Level of Services and Taxes, 2007	35
Figure VII-5: Satisfaction with Value for Tax Dollar, 2007	35
Figure VII-6: Satisfaction with Government Items, 2007	36
Figure VIII-1: Employment Status, 2007	37
Figure VIII-2: Place of Work, 2007	37
Figure VIII-3: Average Commute Time, 2003-2007	38
Figure VIII-4: Length of Commute by Region, 2007	38
Figure VIII-5: Change in Travel Time from Last Year, 2007	38
Figure VIII-6: Percent of Residents who Commute by Region, 2007	39
Figure IX-1: Satisfaction by Visibility, 2007	54

LIST OF TABLES

Table III-1: Trends in Strategic Goals, 1995, 1999, 2003, and 2007 11

Table IV-1: Trends in General Satisfaction with Government Services, 1993 and 2003-2007 12

Table IV-2: Satisfaction with 911 by Type of Contact, 2007..... 16

Table IV-3: Trends in Satisfaction with Public Safety Services, 1993 and 2003-2007 18

Table IV-4: Trends in Satisfaction with Public and Human Services, 1993 and 2003-2007 21

Table V-1: Trends in Communication Items, 1993 and 2003-2007 25

Table VI-1: Trends in Developmental Issues, 1993 and 2003-2007 33

Table VII-1: Trends in Satisfaction with Government, 1993 and 2003-2007 36

Table VIII-1: Job Location of Commuters by Residence Area, 2007 40

Table VIII-2: Job Location of Commuters and Non-Commuters by Residence Area 41

Table IX-1: Percent Satisfied for All Satisfaction Items, 1993 and 2003-2007 45

Table IX-2: Ranked List of Satisfaction Items, 2007 49

Table IX-3: List of Satisfaction Items Ranked by Visibility, 2007 51

Table IX-4: List of Services in Satisfaction/Visibility Categories, 2007 53

Acknowledgements

This report details the fifteenth in an annual series of citizen satisfaction surveys conducted for Prince William County, through its Office of Executive Management, under contract with the Center for Survey Research of the University of Virginia. All those connected with this project are grateful to the hundreds of Prince William County residents who have given of their time to answer many detailed questions in order to help their government better to serve them.

Dr. Thomas M. Guterbock, Director of the Center and Professor of Sociology, has been the Principal Investigator from the commencement of these studies, and has been involved in all phases of the project, including budgeting, questionnaire drafting, logistical planning, data coding, data analysis, and editing this report.

Mr. James Webster, Internal Audit Director in the Prince William County Office of Executive Management, served as project manager and as primary point of contact between CSR and the County on all aspects of the project. He participated actively in the design of the questionnaire and in editing previous survey reports. This year's survey coincides with Mr. Webster's retiring from the County and joining the National Geospatial-Intelligence Agency Office of Inspector General. Dr. Guterbock and the whole CSR Staff would like to thank Mr. Webster and wish him well. He has been meticulous in his oversight of the project and has been a big part of our efforts to deliver a quality product over the past several years.

Mr. Lawrence R. Keller, Senior Auditor in the Prince William County Office of Executive Management/Internal Audit, replaced Mr. Webster as project manager and as primary point of contact between CSR and the County on all aspects of the project. He participated actively in the finalization and in editing of this year's survey report. Other Internal Audit professional staff members, Ms. Lucinda Mason and Ms. Sharen Johnson, assisted in editing the report.

At CSR, Dr. Abdoulaye Diop, Senior Research Analyst, and Deborah A. Kermer, M.A., Research Analyst, conducted the project analysis and co-authored the final report, which was then edited by Dr. Guterbock as co-author. During the early phases of the project, Dr. Guterbock prepared the analysis plan and Dr. Diop served as Project Coordinator.

Mr. John Lee Holmes, Survey Operations Manager, was chiefly responsible for the writing and debugging of the computer-assisted telephone script. Mr. Holmes was also responsible for supervising the data collection and writing the methods report.

Mr. Trung Kien Le, M.A., and Ms. Erin R. Whitchurch, Research Analysts, provided valuable assistance in the analysis phase and PowerPoint presentation. Mr. Andrew Farber-Miller and Ms. Kathy Coker, Project Assistants, provided assistance with the coding of the open-ended comments and format of the tables.

Dr. Alisú Schoua-Glusberg, General Partner in the firm Research Support Services, provided for the translation of the questionnaire into Spanish. Mr. Leonard Arnold supervised the Spanish language interviewing during data collection.

For Prince William County, Mr. Craig Gerhart, County Executive, gave his support and advice to this project from the outset. Staff members from many County offices contributed to the review of items for this year's questionnaire.

The Center for Survey Research is responsible for any errors or omissions in this report. Questions may be directed to the Center for Survey Research, P.O. Box 400767, Charlottesville Virginia 22904-4767. CSR also may be reached by telephone at 434-243-5222; by electronic mail at surveys@virginia.edu, or via the World Wide Web at: <http://www.virginia.edu/surveys>.

Executive Summary

2007 PRINCE WILLIAM COUNTY CITIZEN SATISFACTION SURVEY

CENTER FOR SURVEY RESEARCH
UNIVERSITY OF VIRGINIA
AUGUST 2007

The 2007 Prince William County Citizen Satisfaction Survey is the fifteenth in an annual series conducted by the Center for Survey Research (CSR) at the University of Virginia, at the request of the Prince William County government.

This year's telephone survey of 1,287 randomly selected individuals living in the County was conducted from May 20 to July 1, 2007. As in prior years, the goals of the survey were:

- To assess citizen satisfaction with services offered in the County;
- To compare satisfaction levels with those reported in previous surveys;
- To analyze which subgroups among the County's residents may be more or less satisfied than others with the services they receive;
- To continue annual measurement of overall perception of quality of life in Prince William County; and
- To examine the demographic characteristics of workers who commute out of Prince William County for their primary jobs.

This year's survey also rates the importance of the following twenty-four strategic goals:

- 1 Expanding services and facilities for the homeless
- 2 Making housing more affordable for all residents
- 3 Making the County safe from crime
- 4 Expanding regional cooperation
- 5 Maintaining or improving the County's environmental quality
- 6 Providing better public transportation
- 7 Providing job training and placement programs
- 8 Encouraging racial and cultural diversity
- 9 Expanding treatment programs for people who abuse drugs or alcohol

- 10 Promoting economic development
- 11 Bringing more higher-paying jobs to the County
- 12 Improving the quality of public education
- 13 Addressing new residential development
- 14 Emphasizing prevention and self-sufficiency in human services programs
- 15 Improving the County's road network
- 16 Relying more on fees to pay for County services
- 17 Making sure that tax rates don't go up
- 18 Meeting the basic food, shelter, and health needs of low-income residents
- 19 Improving and expanding parks and recreation facilities
- 20 Expanding child-care services
- 21 Increasing use of technology to make it more convenient to get services and information from the County government
- 22 Preventing fire and medical emergencies
- 23 Expanding the County's ability to generate revenue
- 24 Expanding services for the elderly.

This is the seventh Prince William County survey to use the alternating-questions survey format. This format, implemented in 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 one year, followed by Core plus group B in the next year. The 2007 survey includes the core questions, plus the questions designated group A. As a result of the reduction in the number of geographic regions from eight to seven, the number of targeted completed surveys was reduced from 1,350 to 1,260. Some geographic regions were over-sampled (see Appendix B) to include a larger number of respondents in order to allow for a comparison among all geographic areas. Geographic weighting was used to generalize results to the entire County without over-representing any particular district.

Changes from 2006

Most important, about two-thirds (64.1%) of respondents said that they felt that the County

could be trusted most of the time or just about always. These opinions show a significant increase from those expressed in 2006.

Overall satisfaction with County services was 89.5 percent, down about 1 percentage point from the 2006 level, a change which is not statistically significant. Citizen satisfaction levels remained relatively constant. Compared to 2006, three of the core items showed significant increases on satisfaction items, while three items showed significant decreases in satisfaction.

Increases in satisfaction:

- Satisfaction with the job the County is doing in providing emergency medical rescue services increased from 95.7 percent in 2006 to 98.5 percent in 2007.
- Satisfaction with the job the County is doing in giving value for tax dollars increased from 76.5 percent in 2006 to 80.2 percent in 2007.
- Satisfaction with the ease of travel or getting around within Prince William County increased from 39.6 percent in 2006 to 46.9 percent in 2007.

Decreases in satisfaction:

- Satisfaction with the overall services of the Community Services Board decreased from 83.1 percent in 2006 to 73.9 percent in 2007.
- Satisfaction with the appearance of new development decreased from 82.2 percent in 2006 to 78.5 percent in 2007.
- Satisfaction with the landfill decreased from 98.3 percent in 2006 to 96.0 percent in 2007.

Changes from 2005 on Non-Core Survey Items

Several items were returned to the survey this year, according to the rotating schedule of non-core items. While two of the items showed significant increases in satisfaction since the last time these questions were asked, in 2005, seven items showed a significant decrease in satisfaction:

Increases in satisfaction:

- Satisfaction with the County’s efforts in historic preservation increased from 81.2 percent in 2005 to 88.4 percent in 2007.
- Satisfaction with the County's efforts to preserve open space, including agricultural and forested lands, increased from 45.1 percent in 2005 to 51.5 percent in 2007.

Decreases in satisfaction:

- Satisfaction with the job the County is doing in providing street lighting where needed decreased from 82 percent in 2005 to 73.8 percent in 2007.
- Satisfaction with the job the County is doing in providing help to people with emotional problems, mental problems, or alcohol and drug problems decreased from 81.1 percent in 2005 to 73.9 percent in 2007.
- Satisfaction with public transportation provided to Prince William County residents for destinations within the Prince William area decreased from 66.4 percent in 2005 to 57 percent in 2007.
- Satisfaction with the way residential and business development is coordinated with the locations of community facilities, such as police and fire stations, libraries, schools, and parks, decreased from 80.1 percent in 2005 to 73.7 percent in 2007.
- Satisfaction with the appearance of the County in regards to the amount of trash, debris, and litter along roadways and in neighborhoods decreased from 81.7 percent in 2005 to 78.1 percent in 2007.
- Satisfaction with the appearance of the County in regards to the number of illegal signs (such as popsicle signs, election signs, weight loss ads, etc) along major roads decreased from 62.9 percent in 2005 to 49.2 percent in 2007.
- Satisfaction with the appearance of the County in regards to deteriorated buildings and other structures decreased from 81.4 percent in 2005 to 74.1 percent in 2007.

Strategic Planning Goals

For the most part, goals of Prince William County residents have remained stable. The top five goals, which were the same as in 2003, include:

- County Safe from Crime
- Improve County's Road Network
- Improve Quality of Public Education
- Prevent Fire & Medical Emergencies
- Maintain/Improve County's Environmental Quality.

The County’s road network increased in importance, jumping from the fourth most important to the second. The related goal, “Better Public Transportation,” also increased in importance and rank. Expanding the County’s

revenue and expanding regional cooperation also increased in importance and rank compared to 2003. The goal to rely more on fees, although still ranked last, increased in importance.

The only goal that dropped significantly in importance was job training and placement programs. “Encouraging racial and cultural diversity,” although not decreasing significantly in rated importance since 2003, dropped in rank from 11th in 1999 to 15th in 2003 to 21st in this year’s ratings.

Long-Term Trends

The overall long-term picture remains positive: a combination of steady rates of satisfaction in some indicators and sustained improvement in others over the annual surveys. Prince William County residents are on the whole very satisfied with their County government and quality of life. On most satisfaction items included in the 2007 survey, where significant changes in citizen satisfaction have occurred since the baseline survey taken in 1993, changes have been in the direction of greater satisfaction or continued high levels of satisfaction with minor fluctuations from year to year.

Those indicators showing a general trend of improvement since 1993 are as follows:

- Satisfaction with the County’s value for tax dollars is up more than 15 points since 1993.
- Satisfaction with helping the elderly is up approximately 15 points since 1993.
- Satisfaction with the Department of Social Services is up almost 14 percentage points since 1993.
- Satisfaction with information on government services is up over 8 percentage points since 1993.
- Satisfaction with the landfill is up over 4 percentage points since 1993.
- Satisfaction with providing help to those with emotional problems is up 4 percentage points since 1993.
- Satisfaction with the police department is up 4 points since 1993.
- Satisfaction with voter registration is up 3 points from 1993.
- Satisfaction with street lighting is up 3 percentage points since 1993.
- Satisfaction with medical rescue services is up approximately 2 percentage points since 1993.

An exception to this trend of increased satisfaction is:

- Satisfaction with the job the County is doing in planning how land will be used and developed is down approximately 6 percentage points from 1993.

Satisfaction with several other items pertaining to development, growth, and transportation issues has trended downward, but these items were not asked in the 1993 baseline survey. Against this background, this year’s upturn in satisfaction with ease of getting around is encouraging.

Overall Quality of Life

With regard to overall quality of life, Prince William County remains a place that people believe is a good place to live. On a scale of 1 to 10, with 10 being the highest quality, the mean rating has increased from 6.90 in 1993 to 7.18 in 2007, a statistically significant improvement. The 2007 mean rating is not statistically significant from last year’s mean of 7.15.

New Questions in 2007

In addition to the two open-ended questions asking residents the “the one thing about Prince William County they hope is different by 2030” and “the one thing they hope stays the same in Prince William County in 2030,” the 2007 survey included three completely new items:

- Are you familiar enough with the services of the Prince William Sheriff’s Office to tell us how satisfied you are with them? (23.9% familiarity)
- How satisfied are you with the overall performance of the Sheriff’s Office? (94.5% satisfied)
- How satisfied are you with the Sheriff’s Office attitudes and behaviors toward citizens? (91.9% satisfied)

Conclusion

The respondents rated 59 specific services not including a general rating of satisfaction with government service, for a total of 60 satisfaction items. The general County government rating, perhaps the single most important item in the survey, has a high satisfaction level of 89.5 percent. About one-third (30.4%) said they were “very satisfied” with the services of the County government in general.

The highest rated satisfaction items in our survey related to the libraries, medical rescue, fire protection, security in the Courthouse, the landfill, and opportunities for voter registration. Thirty-three of the 60 ranked satisfaction items (55%) scored ratings of 80 percent or better. Eight items (13.3%) received ratings less than 60 percent: satisfaction with ease of travel around Northern Virginia outside of Prince William County, coordination of development with road systems, growth in the County, ease of travel around Prince William County, planning and land use, illegal signs along major roads, efforts to preserve open space, and public transportation in Prince William County.

The survey results suggest that most residents of Prince William County are satisfied with the services they receive. The reductions in satisfaction levels on some items also indicate areas where improvements might be made. In general, people are least satisfied with development and transportation issues, suggesting that these areas are in need of improvement despite the significant progress with the ease of travel or getting around within Prince William County.

A more detailed discussion of the findings can be found in the body of the report. This detailed information is offered to assist County decision-makers and the public as they continue to seek ways to further improve the quality of services that Prince William County offers to its residents.

Figure I-1: Prince William County Citizen Satisfaction Survey Geographic Regions, 2007



I. Introduction, Respondent Selection, and Summary of Methods

Overview

The 2007 Prince William County Citizen Satisfaction Survey is the fifteenth in an annual series conducted by the Center for Survey Research (CSR) at the University of Virginia, at the request of the Prince William County government. This year's telephone survey of 1,287 randomly selected individuals living in the County was conducted in the spring and summer of 2007.

As in prior years, we have utilized an alternating-questions format for the survey. About half the questions are designated as "Core" questions, those that are included on the survey each year. The remaining questions are divided into two groups which are included in the survey in alternate years. Please refer to Appendix E for a list of which items were included this year.

This year's survey included a set of questions asked once every four years, asking respondents to rate the importance of various strategic goals. Another feature of this year's survey is the newly defined geographic regions: from eight in previous years to seven beginning this year. The new geographic regions include (1) Battlefield; (2) Broad Run; (3) Hoadly; (4) Old Bridge; (5) Dale; (6) Potomac; (7) Forest Park (Figure I-1).

The purposes of this year's survey are similar to those in most previous years:

- To assess citizen satisfaction with services offered in the County;
- To compare satisfaction levels with those reported in previous surveys;
- To analyze which subgroups among the County's residents may be more or less satisfied than others with the services they receive;
- To continue annual measurement of overall perception of quality of life in Prince William County;
- To examine the demographic and employment characteristics of workers who commute out

of Prince William County for their primary jobs.

This year's survey also rates the importance of the following twenty-four strategic goals:

- 1 Expanding services and facilities for the homeless
- 2 Making housing more affordable for all residents
- 3 Making the County safe from crime
- 4 Expanding regional cooperation
- 5 Maintaining or improving the County's environmental quality
- 6 Providing better public transportation
- 7 Providing job training and placement programs
- 8 Encouraging racial and cultural diversity
- 9 Expanding treatment programs for people who abuse drugs or alcohol
- 10 Promoting economic development
- 11 Bringing more higher-paying jobs to the County
- 12 Improving the quality of public education
- 13 Addressing new residential development
- 14 Emphasizing prevention and self-sufficiency in human services programs
- 15 Improving the County's road network
- 16 Relying more on fees to pay for County services
- 17 Making sure that tax rates don't go up
- 18 Meeting the basic food, shelter, and health needs of low-income residents
- 19 Improving and expanding parks and recreation facilities
- 20 Expanding child-care services
- 21 Increasing use of technology to make it more convenient to get services and information from the County government
- 22 Preventing fire and medical emergencies
- 23 Expanding the County's ability to generate revenue
- 24 Expanding services for the elderly.

The complete 2007 interview script is found in Appendix A of this report. Appendix B details survey methodology, Appendix C provides information on the demographic characteristics of the sample, and Appendix D includes the

frequency distributions for all substantive questions. Appendix E consists of a table that identifies the core questions and alternating-year questions, as well as new questions and questions eliminated from the survey. At the end of the report is an index for the satisfaction variables appearing in the report.

“I appreciate the survey. It covered a number of important issues. I’m very impressed with this County.”

The survey results reported here cover general perceptions of the Prince William County government, overall quality of life, and satisfaction with specific programs, processes, and services. The report begins with a look at assessments of quality of life (see Section II). Section III presents the strategic planning goals. Satisfaction with County services is examined in detail in Section IV. Section V explores communication with the County, and Section VI considers development, growth, transportation and County appearance. General attitudes toward government and taxes are covered in Section VII. Section VIII looks at employment and commuting issues. Finally, Section IX summarizes the findings of the survey on the whole, particularly with regard to trends in satisfaction levels.

Each section provides a descriptive summary and interpretation of the 2007 results. All satisfaction levels and certain other results are compared with results in prior years, with significant changes noted. We report the results from the first survey year, 1993, and the most recent five years, 2003 to 2007 but we do not report results for questions from prior surveys if they were not asked this year. Important significant differences among subgroups in the population are reported. The margin of error for the 2007 survey is ± 2.8 percentage points.

Subgroup Analysis

As in previous years, the responses were broken out and analyzed by several demographic categories. In discussing the results, we report those instances in which relevant *statistically significant* differences were found among demographic subgroups, such as, for example, between women and men, or between residents of different parts of the County. (Statistically significant differences are those that probably did not result merely from sampling variability, but

instead reflect real differences within the County's adult population.¹) The demographic variables listed below were those principally used in our subgroup analysis. In some cases, categories were combined to facilitate comparison.

- Age. Age was divided into five categories for most analyses: 18-25, 26-37, 38-49, 50-64, and over 64.
- Education level. Comparisons were made between persons with some high school, high school graduates, some college, four-year degrees, some graduate work, including professional and doctorate degrees.
- Marital status. Respondents presently married were compared with those in other categories (separated, divorced, widowed, and never married).
- Work status. Persons in the labor force working full-time, working part-time, or looking for work were compared with those not in the labor force: retirees, homemakers, and students.
- Military Status. We compared persons in the armed forces — serving currently, on reserve, and veterans — to those who had never served.
- Household income. Four categories of self-reported annual household incomes were compared: Less than \$35,000; \$35,000 - \$49,999; \$50,000 - \$74,999; and more than \$75,000.
- Homeowner status. We also compared homeowners with renters on satisfaction items.
- Race/ethnicity. Whites, Blacks, Asians, and “others” were compared. Hispanic respondents were also compared with non-Hispanic respondents.
- Gender. Women were compared with men.
- Geographic area. The study areas, shown in Figure 1-1, include the seven newly defined geographic areas each of which is a group of contiguous Zip code areas: (1) Battlefield; (2) Broad Run; (3) Hoadly; (4) Old Bridge; (5) Dale; (6) Potomac; (7) Forest Park. Our subgroup analysis of geography includes these

¹ Throughout this report, only those differences that reached statistical significance to the degree of $p < .05$ (a 95% level of confidence) will be discussed.

areas. Residents of the cities of Manassas and Manassas Park and Quantico Military Base were excluded from the study.

Interpreting Subgroup Differences

We have taken pains here to avoid speculative interpretations about why, for example, men as a group should differ significantly from women, or residents of one geographic area from residents in another, or persons with college degrees from those without college degrees, in their satisfaction levels with respect to given items. A variety of circumstances can cause two groups to differ in the levels of satisfaction they express with a given service, program, or process. People are "satisfied" when the level of service they receive (or perceive to be available to them) meets their expectations. Therefore, satisfaction depends both on what people receive and their expectations of what they think they ought to receive. When Group A expresses a higher level of satisfaction than Group B, it can mean one or more of the following:

Actual differences in service levels. People in Group A may actually be receiving a different level of service than those in Group B. This can happen because the service is site-specific, and the people in Group A are located closer to the service site(s) than are those in Group B. The given service also may be targeted specifically toward members of Group A for reasons of age, income, eligibility, need, etc. Older residents may be more satisfied than younger people with services to senior citizens, for instance, because they are the targeted recipients of those services. In several cases we are able to control for these factors by asking screening questions about the eligibility or familiarity of the respondent. In other instances, of course, it is impractical to determine eligibility or proximity to a service through the use of survey questions directed at County residents as a whole.

Differences in expectations. People in Group B may report lower satisfaction because they expect more service than do those in Group A. Expectations about service differ for many reasons. Often, people form expectations about what government services should be from past experience. Group B, then, may include people who experienced a higher level of service in some other community, leading to dissatisfaction with the service level available where they live now. Conversely, members of group A may be highly

satisfied now because they used to live somewhere with poorer provision of the service in question. When service levels in a community increase over time, satisfaction of long-term residents may be higher than the satisfaction of newcomers because their expectations are based on the lower service levels to which they had become accustomed in the past.

Differences in perceptions of costs versus benefits. Group B also may be less satisfied than Group A because they perceive the costs of the service differently, or think that government is doing "too much" as a general matter. For example, higher income residents may feel that welfare programs impose a tax burden upon them while not bringing them direct benefit. Political viewpoints differ among citizens to begin with: some expect their governments to provide many services, while others desire lower service levels. These differences can be especially important in people's judgments about human services provided by government. Thus, some residents may base their satisfaction level on an informal cost-benefit analysis involving both perceptions of service quality and considerations of service cost efficiency.

We hope, nonetheless, that the subgroup analyses provided will give both County decision-makers and the public a better sense of how different residents perceive County services, and will suggest possible avenues to improvement in service levels.

Visibility

At various places in this report, we refer to the "visibility" of various services. The visibility score refers to the percentage of County residents who are sufficiently familiar with a service to be able to rate it. For example, if 10 percent of those asked about a service say they don't know how to rate it or don't have an opinion about its rating, then that service has a visibility of 90 percent. For some services, we specifically asked respondents a screening question to determine if they were familiar enough with a particular service to give it a rating. The visibility of all service items is summarized and compared in Section IX of this report.

Summary of Methods

This survey was conducted by telephone in order to ensure the broadest possible representation of results. For most households, CSR employed a random-digit dialing method that ensures that all households in the County with landline telephones were equally likely to be selected for interviews; for the remainder we utilized the electronic white pages. According to respondents, about 21.5 percent of calls were to unlisted numbers; the majority of these (91.5%) had chosen an unlisted number, as opposed to other unlisted households whose number had simply not yet appeared in the latest phone book.

We conducted all interviews from CSR's Computer-Aided Telephone Interviewing (CATI) laboratory in Charlottesville, Virginia. Production interviews were conducted from May 20 to July 1, 2007. The interviewing staff was composed of carefully trained personnel, most of whom had prior experience as CSR interviewers, and a number of whom had prior experience with the previous Prince William County survey specifically. A total of 54,159 dialing attempts were made in the course of the survey, involving a sample of 12,715 different attempted phone numbers. All numbers were attempted at least once, but not all were working numbers and not all working numbers were those of residences located within the study area. At least eight attempts were made before a working number was inactivated, and a portion of the initial refusals were contacted again after no less than three days. CSR completed a total of 1,287 interviews, for a final response rate estimated at 18.5 percent of the number of qualified households in the original sample. The interview took an average of 20.2 minutes to complete, with a median time of 18.8 minutes.²

Based on 1,287 respondents, the survey has a sampling error of plus or minus 2.8 percentage points. This means that in 95 out of 100 samples of this size drawn from Prince William County, the percentage results obtained for each question in each sample would fall in a range of ± 2.8

² These indicate the "completion time"—the time that it took the interviewer to complete the interview after selection of a qualified respondent. The total time a household respondent was on the phone for this year was an average of 22 minutes, with a median of 20.5 minutes.

percent of what would have been obtained if every household in the County with a working landline telephone had been interviewed. Larger sampling errors are present when analyzing subgroups of the sample.


When comparing the results of the 2007 survey with those of previous years, statistical significance in difference in satisfaction is measured by the chi-square test of independence and indicated where applicable in the concluding chapter. The sample size of each survey is large enough that a change of approximately 5 percent, up or down, will be statistically significant if a service was rated by most of the respondents questioned each year. However, for services that were less "visible" and rated by smaller numbers of respondents, a change of only 5 percent in satisfaction may not be statistically significant. Further details on the sample and methodology may be found in Appendix B of this report.

Throughout the report, percentages may not total exactly to 100% due to rounding.

Demographic Profile

Each year we ask respondents some questions about themselves and their households to allow for analysis of the data by personal and social characteristics. The demographic profile this year was similar to prior years. Women were slightly over-represented in our sample, accounting for 56.6 percent of respondents. Four percent (4.1%) of the sample was between 18 and 25 years of age, 14.9 percent were between 26 and 37, 31.6 percent were between 38 and 49, 32.9 percent were between 50 and 64, and 16.5 percent were 65 and older. See Figure I-2.

Figure I-2: Age of Respondents, 2007




About two-thirds of the respondents were married

(65.8%), 15.8 percent were divorced or separated, 7.5 percent were widowed, and 10.9 percent were never married. Almost half (40.0%) of respondents had children under the age of 18 living in their home. Of those, 34.5 percent had children under the age of five, 63.0 percent had children between the ages of five and twelve, and 62.8 percent had teens from age thirteen to seventeen.

We asked respondents what race they considered themselves to be, and whether they considered themselves to be Hispanic. Almost three-quarters of our sample (74.6%) identified themselves as white, 15.9 percent black, 3.1 percent Asian, and 6.5 percent said they were something else (i.e., Native American, Pacific Islander, etc.). Not included in this breakdown are the 3.7 percent of our sample who refused to answer the question about race. Eight percent (8.2%) of the sample considered themselves to be Hispanic. Of this group, nearly two-thirds (65.35 %) completed the survey in English and the remaining one-third (34.65%) completed it in Spanish. See Figure I-3.

Figure I-3: Race of Respondents, 2007³




Almost 62 percent of respondents were working full-time and an additional 6.6 percent were working part-time. Those not employed comprised 8.0 percent homemakers, 18.5 percent retirees, 2.1 percent students, and 2.1 percent who were looking for work.

Over three quarters (77.1%) of our respondents had never served in the military, whereas 3.2 percent were currently serving on active duty, 0.8

percent were currently in the reserves, and 18.9 percent had past military service.

Again this year, our sample proved to be fairly wealthy and well-educated (see Figure I-4). The median annual household income for our sample was between \$75,000 and \$100,000. Over ten percent (10.5%) of the sample reported household incomes under \$35,000, 9.8 percent fell into the \$35,000 to \$49,999 range, 19.0 percent fell into the \$50,000 to \$74,999 range, and 60.7 percent reported incomes over \$75,000.


Figure I-4: Household Income, 2007



With respect to education, respondents were asked to tell us their highest level of academic achievement. As is illustrated in Figure I-5, 3.9 percent had some high school and 18.2 percent were high school graduates. About a quarter (24.6%) had attended some college, whereas 28.9 percent had a 4-year degree. Slightly more than one-fifth (21.4%) had done some graduate work and 2.9 percent had a Ph.D. or some other advanced degree.

³ These percentages total more than 100 percent because respondents were asked to indicate whether or not they were Hispanic in addition to selecting their race.

Figure I-5: Educational Level, 2007



Most of our respondents live in a home that they own (85.3%), whereas 13.4 percent rent and 1.2 percent have some other arrangement, such as living with their parents. Most respondents live in single-family homes (70.4%), 19.0 percent live in duplexes or townhouses, and 9.8 percent live in apartments. Less than 1 percent live in some other type of structure, such as a mobile home or trailer.

Four percent of the respondents have lived in Prince William County less than one year, 27.5

percent have lived in the County 1 to 5 years, 38.0 percent have lived in the County 6 to 19 years, and 27.6 percent reported living in the County twenty years or more. The rest, 2.8 percent, said they had lived in Prince William County all of their lives.

In terms of geographic distribution across parts of the County (defined by groups of Zip codes), the population of Hoadly, Potomac, and Forest Park were oversampled to ensure enough participants for statistically reliable comparisons. As a result, 13.7 percent of our sample lived in the Hoadly, 14.4 percent in Forest Park, 15.2 percent in the Battlefield area, and 13.6 percent in the Broad Run area. The Old Bridge area accounted for 13.8 percent, Dale accounted for 16.5 percent, and the Potomac area accounted for 12.8 percent.

The numbers for each region were weighted in the analysis to match the actual population of residents in those areas. For more about the weighting procedure, see the Methodology Report in Appendix B.

II. Quality of Life in Prince William County


Overall Impression of PWC

As in previous years, we asked a question about residents’ overall impressions of the quality of life in 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?”

This year’s mean rating of 7.18 is not significantly different than last year’s mean of 7.15, an indication of the continuing high regard the County’s residents have for the quality of life in Prince William County. Figure II-1 illustrates the distribution of ratings provided by respondents. The ratings were divided into three categories: “Best” includes ratings from 10 through 8, “Middle” is 7 and 6, and “Worst” is 5 through 1. Almost half (46.4%) felt the best about the quality of life in Prince William County, whereas 39.0 percent were in the middle, and 14.5 percent felt the worst. Figure II-2 tracks the average rating over the last 15 years.

Figure II-1: Overall Quality of Life Ratings, 2007



This year two new open-ended questions were added to the survey. Respondents were asked:

What’s the one thing about Prince William County you hope is different in 20 to 25 years?


What’s the one thing you hope stays the same in Prince William County in 20 to 25 years?

These open-ended questions were coded into groups and those results are presented in Appendix D (see D-50 & D-51). Of the things about Prince William County residents hope will be different in 20 to 25 years, transportation and development issues received the most mentions. Nearly half (41.9%) of respondents mentioned reduction of traffic and congestion, 26.5 percent mentioned improvement of roads and public transportation, and 16.7 percent mentioned reduction in development or housing construction, or controls on growth.

“I like the close-knit feeling of the area; we have everything we need here.”

Of the things residents hope will be the same in Prince William County in 20 to 25 years, maintaining green spaces (parks, trees, ruralness, etc.) was mentioned the most, by 28.8 percent of respondents. Nearly one-fifth (19.6%) of those who answered the question mentioned that the community feeling, the standards of living, or the way of life would be the one thing they hope stays the same (see Appendix D).

Figure II-2: Mean Overall Quality of Life Ratings, 1993-2007



Demographic Factors Affecting County Ratings

As in previous years, our subgroup analysis shows significant differences between the views of minority and white residents on their ratings of quality of life in the County. Again this year, minorities consistently gave higher ratings than whites. The mean quality of life rating was 7.14 for whites, 7.66 for blacks, 7.14 for Asians, and 7.22 for “Other.” Hispanics rated the quality of life at 7.48, which was not significantly different from that of non-Hispanics (mean of 7.19).


County residents with lower levels of education were also more likely to give the County a higher rating than those with higher levels of education. Residents with some high school education or less gave the County a mean rating of 7.62, whereas high school graduates rated it as a 7.34 and those with some college rated it a 7.01. Residents with a 4-year degree rated the quality of life at 7.07 and those with some graduate work rated it at 7.31. County residents with an advanced graduate degree rated the quality of life at 6.89. In previous years, education was also inversely related to quality of life ratings.

As in 2006, income, marital status, and age were not factors in quality of life ratings.

Of interest is the finding that those residents with children between the ages of 5-12 years at home gave higher ratings (7.50) than those without children between the ages of 5-12 years living in the home, who gave a mean rating of 7.10. Furthermore, residents with children under 5 gave quality of life a significantly higher mean rating (7.41) than those without children under 5 (7.09).

As opposed to the 2005 and 2006 results in which the Geographic areas showed significant differences, this year’s quality of life ratings, using newly defined geographic areas, show no such differences. Figure II-3 illustrates the overall quality of life ratings provided by the newly defined geographic areas.

Figure II-3: Mean Overall Quality of Life Ratings by Area, 2007



Summary

The mean satisfaction rating for quality of life in Prince William County is greater than 7 out of 10, an indication of the continuing high regard the County residents have for the quality of life in Prince William County. As in last year’s results, minorities gave higher ratings than whites. Also, education was inversely related to the quality of life ratings, such that County residents with some high school education level are more likely to give the County a higher rating than those with some graduate work. Also, residents with younger children gave higher ratings than those without younger children living in the home. There were no significant differences in the quality of life ratings among residents in the newly defined geographical areas.

III. Strategic Planning Goals

Importance of Goals

In both 1999 and 2003 residents of Prince William County were asked to assess the relative importance of various broad planning and strategic goals that the County might pursue. As the Board of County Supervisors prepares to update its Strategic Plan for the next four years, we again asked respondents to rate the list of possible goals.

The wording of the question posed to citizens was as follows:

“Over the next year, Prince William County will be updating its strategic plan. We’d like your help in deciding which goals should be most important for the plan. Now I’m going to read a list of things that we might plan for to make Prince William County a better place to live. After I read each one, please tell me how important you think it is as a goal that we should plan for in Prince William County.”

Each respondent rated twelve of the twenty-four goals, selected at random. The possible responses for importance of each goal were “very important, somewhat important, or not that important.”

- 1 Expanding services and facilities for the homeless
- 2 Making housing more affordable for all residents
- 3 Making the County safe from crime
- 4 Expanding regional cooperation
- 5 Maintaining or improving the County’s environmental quality
- 6 Providing better public transportation
- 7 Providing job training and placement programs
- 8 Encouraging racial and cultural diversity
- 9 Expanding treatment programs for people who abuse drugs or alcohol
- 10 Promoting economic development
- 11 Bringing more higher-paying jobs to the County
- 12 Improving the quality of public education

- 13 Addressing new residential development
- 14 Emphasizing prevention and self-sufficiency in human services programs
- 15 Improving the County’s road network
- 16 Relying more on fees to pay for County services
- 17 Making sure that tax rates don’t go up
- 18 Meeting the basic food, shelter, and health needs of low-income residents
- 19 Improving and expanding parks and recreation facilities
- 20 Expanding child-care services
- 21 Increasing use of technology to make it more convenient to get services and information from the County government
- 22 Preventing fire and medical emergencies
- 23 Expanding the County’s ability to generate revenue
- 24 Expanding services for the elderly.

Table III-1 lists each goal, ranked in order of perceived importance, and includes a comparison with the average rating of each goal in the 1999 and 2003 surveys. It also shows the percentage of respondents who rated each of the twenty-four strategic planning goals as “very important,” “somewhat important,” and “not that important.” This is translated into a three point scale, with the highest score (3) indicating “very important.” The higher the numeric average, the more important the goal to respondents.

Figure III-1 illustrates the relationships between the average scores of each goal for 2007.

The top five goals highlight the chief areas of public concern. “Making the County safe from crime” was the most important of the strategic goals by several percentage points, with 90.9 percent rating this item as very important. Next on the list were “Improving the County’s road network” and “Improving the quality of public education,” which were rated as very important by 84 percent and 83.6 percent of respondents respectively.

These were followed closely by “Prevention of fire and medical emergencies,” which 81.8 percent rated as very important. Rounding out the top five was “Maintaining/improving the County’s environmental quality,” rated as very important by 72.8 percent of respondents.

Various social services were scattered throughout the list. “Expanding services for the elderly” and “meeting basic needs of low-income residents” were the social services seen as most important. “Job training and placement,” “expanding services for the homeless,” “expansion of drug treatment programs,” and “expanding child care” ranked relatively low on importance.

Residents expressed the importance of “mak[ing] sure tax rates don’t go up,” ranking it eighth among the goals. The least important goal was the “reliance on more fees to pay for County services.” Residents felt that “bringing more higher-paying jobs into the County” was quite important, and it just missed being one of the top five most important goals.

Overall, Prince William County residents want a safe, healthy community and quality education for their children. They want to improve the County’s road network but also to protect the natural environment. Overall, residents want to make sure that tax rates do not go up and do not view expanding services as a high priority, excepting services for the elderly.

Changes to Goals over Time

For the most part, goals of Prince William County residents have remained stable. The top five goals (in fact, the top eight) were the same as in 2003. The only change in ranking was that improving the County’s road network again increased in importance, this time jumping from the fourth most important to the second. The related goal, “Better Public Transportation” also increased in importance and rank. Expanding the County’s revenue and expanding regional cooperation also increased in importance and rank compared to 2003. The goal to rely more on fees, although still ranked last, increased in importance.

The only goal that dropped significantly in importance was job training and placement programs. “Encouraging racial and cultural diversity,” although not decreasing significantly in rated importance since 2003, dropped in rank from 11th in 1999 to 15th in 2003 to 21st in this year’s ratings.

Figure III-1: Strategic Goals—Relationships Between Average Scores, 2007




Table III-1: Trends in Strategic Goals, 1995, 1999, 2003, and 2007

Rank 2007	Mean 2007	Goal Item	Description	Percent Indicating in 2007			Mean 2003	Rank 2003	Mean 1999	Rank 1999	Mean 1995
				Very Important	Somewhat Important	Not that Important					
1	2.91	GOALS_3	County Safe from Crime	90.9	8.7	0.3	2.88	1	2.91	1	2.89
2	2.82 ^{1,2}	GOALS_15	Improve County's Road Network	84.0	14.3	1.7	2.69 ¹	4	2.61	6	2.62
3	2.80	GOALS_12	Improve Quality of Public Education	83.6	12.6	3.8	2.77 ¹	2	2.83	2	2.84
4	2.79 ²	GOALS_22	Prevent Fire & Medical Emergencies	81.8	15.8	2.5	2.73	3	2.75	3	2.68
5	2.70 ^{1,2}	GOALS_5	Maintain/Improve County's Environ. Quality	72.8	24.4	2.8	2.63	5	2.6	8	2.58
6	2.67 ¹	GOALS_11	More Higher-Paying Jobs to County	72.6	22.2	5.2	2.62	6	2.61	7	2.66
7	2.63 ²	GOALS_24	Expand Services for Elderly	67.3	28.7	3.9	2.57	8	2.62	5	2.52
8	2.59 ¹	GOALS_17	Make Sure Tax Rates Don't Go Up	65.9	27.6	6.5	2.58 ¹	7	2.73	4	2.67
9	2.57 ^{1,2}	GOALS_6	Better Public Transportation	64.0	28.6	7.4	2.49	11	2.46	13	2.51
10	2.50 ¹	GOALS_2	Affordable Housing	59.1	31.3	9.6	2.43	14	2.37	18	2.4
11	2.49	GOALS_18	Meeting Basic Needs of Low Income Residents	55.9	37.8	6.4	2.55 ¹	9	2.45	14	2.38
12	2.47	GOALS_14	Emphasize Prevent. & Self-Suff. In Human Services	52.9	41.6	5.5	2.5	10	2.52	10	2.49
13	2.45 ^{1,2}	GOALS_4	Expanding Regional Cooperation	52.1	40.5	7.4	2.28 ¹	20	2.36	20	2.36
14	2.41	GOALS_21	Increase Use of Tech. for Convenience	51.5	38.0	10.5	2.35	17	2.42	16	2.32
15	2.40	GOALS_10	Promoting Economic Development	55.0	30.3	14.7	2.44	13	—	—	—
16	2.38	GOALS_19	Improving Parks & Rec. Facilities	46.7	44.5	8.8	2.37	16	2.36	19	2.2
17	2.37 ²	GOALS_23	Expand County's Revenue	50.9	35.5	13.6	2.24 ¹	22	2.42	15	2.5
18	2.36 ^{1,2}	GOALS_7	Job Training & Placement Programs	48.5	39.2	12.4	2.48	12	2.46	12	2.41
19	2.35	GOALS_1	Expanding Services for Homeless	48.1	38.8	13.1	2.28	19	2.27	23	2.19
20	2.34	GOALS_13	Address New Residential Development	52.6	28.9	18.5	2.31	18	—	—	—
21	2.34 ¹	GOALS_8	Encouraging Racial/Cultural Diversity	51.3	31.2	17.5	2.39 ¹	15	2.48	11	2.28
22	2.28	GOALS_9	Expand Drug/Alcohol Treatment Programs	41.5	44.8	13.7	2.21 ¹	23	2.31	22	2.18
23	2.27	GOALS_20	Expanding Child Care Services	43.4	40.6	15.9	2.26 ¹	21	2.35	21	2.29
24	2.21 ²	GOALS_16	Rely More on Fees to Pay for County Services	35.0	50.7	14.3	2.12	24	2.14	24	2.22

¹Significant Change from 1999; ² Significant Change from 2003

IV. Satisfaction with County Services

County Government Services

One of the main objectives of this survey is the determination of how satisfied the citizens of Prince William County are with the services they receive from their local government. Respondents were asked whether they were very satisfied, somewhat satisfied, somewhat dissatisfied, or very dissatisfied with an array of government services. For purposes of analysis, responses were typically dichotomized into two categories: satisfied or dissatisfied. In such cases, we report the percent of respondents satisfied with each service. Those who were not familiar enough with a service to respond were not counted in either of the two categories. These respondents are considered when determining the “visibility” of a service (see Section IX).

This chapter reports the general level of satisfaction with County government services, public services, social services, and specific services relating to public safety.

The first question, perhaps the most important question in the survey, inquires:

“How satisfied are you in general with the services the County provides?”

Figure IV-1 illustrates the response to this question, and Table IV-1 illustrates the mean level of satisfaction on this question in 1993 and over the past 5 years. This year 89.5 percent were satisfied. Of the rest, 8.7 percent were somewhat dissatisfied, and 1.9 percent were very dissatisfied (see Figure IV-1). The percent satisfied did not

change significantly from the 2006 percentage of 90.8%.

Figure IV-1: Overall Satisfaction with County Government Services, 2007




Figure IV-2: Overall Satisfaction with County Government Services, 1993 and 2003-2007




Table IV-1: Trends in General Satisfaction with Government Services, 1993 and 2003-2007

Item Number	Satisfaction Item	1993	2003	2004	2005	2006	2007	
CTYSAT97	Services of the County Government in General	90.5	89.6 ^{2, 4, 5, 7, 9}	90.2 ^{2, 4, 5, 7, 9}	92.1 ^{6, 10}	90.8 ^{5, 7}	89.5 ^{2, 4, 5, 7, 9, 12}	
VOTE	Voter Registration	91.5	95.3 ^{0, 1, 2, 3}	94.5 ^{0, 4, 5}	97.0 ^{0, 1, 2, 3, 11}	95.2 ^{0, 2, 4, 5, 12}	94.9 ^{0, 4, 5, 9, 12}	
GOVTSERV	Information on Government Services	70.9	75.3 ^{1, 3, 4, 5, 7, 9}	81.0 ^{0, 1, 2, 6, 7, 10}	84.3 ^{0, 1, 2, 5, 6, 8, 9, 10}	79.7 ^{0, 1, 2, 7, 10, 12}	78.8 ^{0, 1, 7, 12}	
Footnotes indicate value is significantly different from:		⁰ 1993	² 1995	⁴ 1997	⁶ 1999	⁸ 2001	¹⁰ 2003	¹² 2005
		¹ 1994	³ 1996	⁵ 1998	⁷ 2000	⁹ 2002	¹¹ 2004	¹³ 2006

Respondents were also asked about satisfaction in two areas of County government services, specifically: providing convenient opportunities for voters to register, and keeping citizens informed about government services. Ninety-five (94.9%) percent of respondents said they were satisfied with the job the County is doing in providing ways for people to register to vote and 78.8 percent expressed satisfaction with the job the County is doing keeping citizens informed about County government programs and services. This year’s ratings for both of these items are not significantly different from those reported in 2006 (95.2% and 79.7%, respectively). However, all three of the service ratings on Table IV-1 are significantly lower than their levels of satisfaction in 2005, which appears to have been an exceptional year in the survey series.

“There needs to be a way to educate community members to learn how to participate in the County government, through schools, libraries, and door postings.”

Emergency Services

Residents were asked to rate their satisfaction with County emergency services. This included police performance, police attitudes and behaviors toward citizens, efforts to reduce drug and gangs’ activities, fire department performance, rescue service performance, and the prevalence of cardio-pulmonary resuscitation (CPR) training among the public, and new questions this year about the Sheriff’s Office.

The vast majority of residents, 92.3 percent, said they were satisfied with the overall performance of the police department. This rating is not significantly different from 92.5 percent observed in 2006.


Contrary to last year, home ownership and type of residence did not play an important role in predicting views of police performance. However, non-Hispanic respondents (93.4%) were more likely to be satisfied with police performance than Hispanic residents (81.4%). There were no significant differences with respect to income, age and length of residence in Prince William County.

As in 2006, the 2007 results indicated no significant differences by gender, education, and geographical area.

Residents were asked about their satisfaction with police attitudes and behaviors toward citizens. Not significantly different from last year (86.6%), 87.9 percent were satisfied. However, as in 2006, satisfaction with police attitudes and behaviors toward citizens varied according to a number of demographic factors.


Similar to last year, race of the respondent was related to opinions about police attitudes and behaviors. Blacks were the least satisfied with the attitudes and behaviors of the police, with 80.2 percent satisfaction compared to 90.3 percent satisfaction among whites. This finding is illustrated in Figure IV-3.

Figure IV-3: Satisfaction with Police Attitudes and Behaviors by Race, 2007



As in 2005, younger people were much less likely to express satisfaction (for instance, 83.8% among 18-25 year olds). Older residents were much more satisfied (98.5% for those over age 64). Figure IV-4 presents the satisfaction with police attitudes and behaviors by age.

Figure IV-4: Satisfaction with Police Attitudes and Behaviors by Age, 2007



Also like last year, divorced, separated, and never married residents also expressed less satisfaction with police attitudes and behaviors (81.2%, 70.5%, and 78.9%, respectively) than their married and widowed counterparts (91.0% and 94.4%, respectively).

In general, homeowners (89.0%) expressed more satisfaction with police attitudes and behaviors than renters (79.9%). In addition, residents with a 4-year college degree (92.2%) were more likely to be satisfied than were residents with some college education (80.6%). Residents with an advanced graduate degree expressed the highest level of satisfaction (97.9%) whereas those with high school education or less expressed the lowest satisfaction ratings (79.5%).

With respect to the newly defined geographic areas, Old Bridge (93.5%), Battlefield (91.9%), Forest Park (90.2%), and Broad Run (89.2%), residents were more likely to express satisfaction with police attitudes and behaviors than residents from Potomac (84.5%), Dale (81.7%), and Hoadly (80.7%).

Unlike last year, the 2007 satisfaction ratings with police attitudes and behaviors showed no significant differences with respect to income, type of home, or the presence of children at home.

“Police that exist are doing a good job but my impression is they are understaffed.”

For the first time this year, respondents of the survey were also asked to rate their satisfaction with the performance of the Sheriff’s Office overall and with respect to its attitudes and behaviors towards citizens. Overall, Prince William County residents are very satisfied with their Sheriff’s Office. While 94.5 percent of residents said they were satisfied with the overall performance of the Sheriff’s Office, 91.9 percent expressed satisfaction with its attitudes and behaviors toward citizens.

When asked about the efforts law enforcement is making toward reducing the use of illegal drugs, 83.2 percent were satisfied. Responses to this item were not significantly different from last year and did not vary by area.

Residents with children between the ages of 5-12 expressed more satisfaction with the police department’s efforts to reduce the use of illegal drugs (90.9%) than did those residents who do not

(81.7%). Surprisingly, residents with a high school education or less were more likely to express satisfaction (92.4%) than those residents who had completed some graduate work (73.9%).


As in the past, residents are very satisfied with fire and rescue services. This year 98.4 percent were satisfied with fire fighting and 98.5 percent were satisfied with emergency rescue services. While satisfaction with fire fighting was not different from that of last year (97.9%), satisfaction with emergency rescue services has increased significantly from the 95.7 percent satisfaction reported last year.

For the second time this year, respondents were asked about the level of security in the Judicial Center, which is the courthouse in downtown Manassas. As in 2005, about thirty percent (29.1%) of the respondents had had the occasion to visit the Judicial Center during the past 12 months and the vast majority was satisfied with the level of security that they found there. About three-quarters (74.7%) were very satisfied with the level of security and an additional 22.6 percent were somewhat satisfied, for a total of 97.3 percent satisfaction. Although this year’s rating is not significantly different from the 96.3 percent satisfaction reported in 2005, it suggests an upward trend in satisfaction with the Courthouse security.

One important safety item that has been asked in previous years is how many people in the home are trained in CPR techniques. Our survey has consistently found that about 70 percent of households in the County have someone trained in CPR, and this year is no exception. The majority of homes, 64.2 percent, have at least one person trained in the technique, whereas 25.1 percent have two or more. The percentage of homes with at least one person trained in CPR techniques is significantly lower this year than the 69.1 percent reported in 2006.

Figure IV-5 illustrates satisfaction with all County emergency services.

Figure IV-5: Satisfaction with County Emergency Services, 2007




Calling 911

One-fifth (20.3%) of the respondents had dialed 911 in the past twelve months. Most had called for emergency medical services (45.9%) or police (43.0%). About 13.7 percent had called for fire fighters and about 7.1 percent for something else.⁴ Figure IV-6 illustrates these results.

Those who reported calling the police during the past 12 months were further asked whether the call was because of an emergency situation or because of some other reason. About 60 percent (59.7%) of those calling the police reported that it was an emergency, whereas the remaining 40.3 percent said that it was a non-emergency situation.

Figure IV-6: Purpose of 911 Call, 2007



Asked about the last time they called 911, 84.7 percent said they were very satisfied with the help they received from the person who took their call. An additional 9.9 percent said they were somewhat satisfied, meaning that 94.6 percent were satisfied in all. This year's ratings are not significantly different from the 92.5 percent satisfaction reported in 2006.

All respondents who had used 911 were also asked about their satisfaction with the length of time taken for emergency services to arrive. Slightly more than three quarters of the respondents (75.9%) were very satisfied, and an additional 13.5 percent were somewhat satisfied, for a total of 89.3 percent satisfied. This year's satisfaction rating is higher but not significantly different from the 86 percent satisfaction reported in 2006

Most respondents were also satisfied with the help they received at the scene. Eighty percent (80.0%) said they were very satisfied, whereas an additional 12.6 percent were somewhat satisfied, totaling to 92.6 percent. This year's satisfaction rating is not significantly different from the 90.1 percent satisfaction reported in 2006

⁴ These percentages sum to more than 100 percent because some respondents had called 911 for more than one service.

Figure IV-7 illustrates the overall satisfaction findings pertaining to calling 911 and Table IV-2 divides these satisfaction ratings by service used.

Figure IV-7: Satisfaction with 911 Services, 2007




Table IV-2: Satisfaction with 911 by Type of Contact, 2007

Satisfaction Item	PERCENT SATISFIED				Overall
	Police (Emergency)	Police (Non-Emergency)	Fire	Rescue Squad (Ambulance)	
Assistance from 911 Operator	86.9	95.5	93.5	98.1	94.6
Time for Help to Arrive	76.8	77.9	93.0	96.2	89.3
Assistance on Scene	82.0	82.4	92.8	100.0	92.6

Neighborhood Safety

Residents of Prince William County continue to feel safe in their neighborhoods. As we would expect, fewer (86.7%) report feeling satisfied with the safety in their neighborhood after dark than in the daytime (94.3%). These figures do not differ significantly from those reported in 2006 (85.6% and 93.0%).

Although women continue to feel somewhat less satisfied with their safety from crime in the daytime (94.0%) than men (95.0%), this difference is not statistically significant. Satisfaction did vary significantly among residents of the newly defined geographical areas, with those in Battlefield (97.3%) expressing more satisfaction with their daytime safety than residents from the Potomac area (90.2%). The remaining areas were in between, with Broad Run expressing 97.0 percent satisfaction, Hoadly 94.7 percent, Old Bridge 94.1 percent, Dale 93.1 percent, and Forest Park 92.2 percent.

Satisfaction with neighborhood safety from crime at night also varied by geographic area. Similarly

to their perceptions of daytime safety, residents of Hoadly (94.1%) and Battlefield (92.5%) were more likely to be satisfied than residents from Potomac (79.5%) and Dale (81.2%) areas. Satisfaction ratings for Forest Park, Old Bridge, and Broad Run were 85.5 percent, 86.5 percent, and 90.4 percent, respectively. Unlike last year, satisfaction with neighborhood safety from crime at night shows no significant differences with respect to gender.


One important factor related to satisfaction with neighborhood safety in the evening is street lighting. We asked residents how satisfied they were with the job the County is doing in providing street lighting where it is needed. Nearly three quarters of residents (73.8%) were satisfied. This represents a significant decrease from the 82 percent who were satisfied in 2005, when this question was last asked. As in 2005, there were no differences on this variable based on gender or geographic area of residence. However, homeowners (72.4%) expressed less satisfaction than renters (83.1%).

This year respondents were also asked how satisfied they were with the County’s animal control services. Over eighty-four percent (84.5%) expressed satisfaction on this item, a rating that is not significantly different from the 88 percent who expressed satisfaction in 2005. Residents from Potomac (76.8%), Hoadly (80.7%), Forest Park (80.6%), and Battlefield (81.1%) were less likely to be satisfied with the County animal control services than were residents from Dale (92.7%), Broad Run (88.7%), Old Bridge (87.1%).

County residents were also satisfied with County’s efforts to control mosquitoes, with 84.1 percent expressing satisfaction (compared to 83.5% in 2005). Satisfaction with County’s control of mosquitoes did not vary significantly by geographic region.

Figure IV-8 illustrates all neighborhood safety items.

Figure IV-8: Satisfaction with Safety from Crime, 2007



Capacity to Shelter in Place

In light of concerns regarding terrorism and citizen safety, we asked respondents, for the second time, two questions regarding their capacity to shelter at home if an emergency situation arose. As in 2005, when the question was first asked, respondents specified the number of days they would be able to

shelter at home with the food, water and supplies they had on hand in the case of a natural or man-made disaster. This year, though, the question was split with one half of respondents asked how long they could shelter “with electricity” and the other half how long they could shelter “without” electricity.

Imagining the presence of electricity, 16.0 percent of the respondents said they would be able to shelter for 3 days or less, 40.8 percent for 4 days to 1 week, and 43.2 percent for 8 days or more. Imagining the absence of electricity, 33.3 percent would be able to shelter for 3 days or less, 43.6 percent for 4 days to 1 week, and 23.1 percent for 8 days or more. As expected, the presence of electricity greatly extends residents’ capacity to shelter in the case of a natural or man-made disaster. The percentage of residents predicting they would be able to shelter for 8 days or more dropped significantly from 43.2 percent with electricity to 23.1 percent when electricity was not available (see Figure IV-9).

Trends for all public safety items from 1993 and the last five years are shown in Table IV-3.

Figure IV-9: Capacity to Shelter in Place with/without Electricity, 2007




Table IV-3: Trends in Satisfaction with Public Safety Services, 1993 and 2003-2007


Item Number	Satisfaction Item	1993	2003	2004	2005	2006	2007
POLICE	Overall Satisfaction with Police	88.7	93.2 ^{0,1}	93.7 ^{0,1,4}	93.7 ^{0,1,4}	92.5 ^{0,1}	92.3 ^{0,1}
ATTITUDE	Police Attitudes and Behaviors Toward Citizens	—	85.4	86.3	88.4 ^{3,4}	86.6	87.9
DRUGS	Reducing Illegal Drugs	79.2	82.6 ¹	84.1 ^{0,1}	84.3 ^{0,1}	82.0 ¹	83.2 ¹
FIRE	Fire Protection	97.2	97.1 ¹	98.2 ^{1,2,6}	98.2 ^{1,6}	97.9 ¹	98.4 ^{1,6,10}
RESCUE	Medical Rescue	96.6	97.2	97.4 ^{4,6}	98.3 ^{0,1,2,3,4,6,8}	95.7 ^{5,9,12}	98.5 ^{0,1,2,4,6,8,13}
EMSATIS	911 Phone Help	—	91.0 ^{4,7}	91.9	95.2 ³	92.5	94.6
EMTIMEB	Time for Help to Arrive	—	85.3	86.3	90.6 ^{5,6,9}	86.0	89.3 ^{6,9}
EMASSTB	Assistance on the Scene	—	88.9	89.7	94.9 ^{1,4,6,9,10,11}	90.1 ¹²	92.6
AMCRIME	Safety In Neighborhood in Daylight	—	93.1 ⁴	91.9 ⁶	92.8 ⁴	93.0 ⁴	94.3 ^{2,3,4,5,9,11}
PMCRIME	Safety in Neighborhood after Dark	—	86.2 ^{2,3,4,5}	86.3 ^{2,3,4,5}	85.7 ^{2,3,4}	85.6 ^{2,3,4}	86.7 ^{2,3,4,5}
COURTSAT	Security in Courthouse	—	—	—	96.3	—	97.3
STRLTA	Street Lighting	71.2	76.8 ⁰	—	82.0 ^{0,1,2,3,4,6,10}	—	73.8 ^{5,7,8,12}
SHERIFFA	Sheriff's Office Performance	-	-	-	-	-	94.5
ATTITUT	Sheriff's Office Attitudes and Behaviors Toward Citizens	-	-	-	-	-	91.9
ANIMALA	Animal Control	84.8	81.0 ^{4,7}	—	88.0 ^{2,6,8,10}	—	84.5
MOSCONT	Mosquito Control	—	70.6	—	83.5 ¹⁰	—	84.1 ¹⁰

Footnotes indicate value is significantly different from: ⁰ 1993 ¹ 1994 ² 1995 ³ 1996 ⁴ 1997 ⁵ 1998 ⁶ 1999 ⁷ 2000 ⁸ 2001 ⁹ 2002 ¹⁰ 2003 ¹¹ 2004 ¹² 2005 ¹³ 2006

Public Services

In addition to services relating to crime, safety and emergency services, Prince William residents were asked to rate their satisfaction with a number of other public services the County provides. Respondents were asked about education, libraries, parks, and County water/sewer services. Figure IV-10 illustrates the satisfaction levels with these services.

Figure IV-10: Satisfaction with Public Services, 2007



To ascertain satisfaction with libraries, respondents were first asked if at least one member of their household had visited or used the County Libraries within the past twelve months. About seventy-percent (69.8%) said at least one member of their household had (compared to 71.3% in 2006). Of those who had visited the library, 98.9 percent were satisfied with the quality of service they received from the library staff, with 88.4 percent very satisfied. As in 2006, the libraries received the highest satisfaction rating among the items asked in the entire survey. High school graduates were the most satisfied (100%), expressing more satisfaction with the quality of service received from the staff than residents with a 4-year college degree (91.9%). In addition, residents who have been living in Prince William for a period of 3 to 5 years (86.8%) were less satisfied than residents who have been living in Prince William for a

period of 11-19 years (97.3%) or 20 years or more (98.0%).

“We have an excellent school system, I hope, though it continues to grow, that the supervisors will continue to give it good attention.”

As in 2006, the great majority of parents (86.1%) reported that they had at least one child attending Prince William County public schools. Eighty-four percent (84.4%) of all residents were satisfied that the school system provided efficient and effective service, with 41.4 percent very satisfied. As in 2006, parents of children in the school system were even more satisfied with it than those without children in the school system (90.8%, as compared to 69.5%). There was no difference in satisfaction among residents in the newly defined areas.

When asked about the County’s park and recreation facilities and programs, almost two-thirds (57.0%) said they had used the County parks or recreation facilities and 89.6 percent of them were satisfied. This year’s not significantly different from last year’s satisfaction rating of 87.6 percent.

“Park services-they are very good”

Residents who have children between the ages of 13 to 17 (82.1%) were less likely to be satisfied with the County parks and recreation facilities and programs than those who do not (93.1%). Notably there were no significant geographic differences for this item.

When asked if they were familiar enough to rate the County Park Authority, about half (48.7%) said that they were. Of those, 93.7 percent were satisfied that the County Park Authority provides efficient and effective service, with 56.2 percent being very satisfied. Satisfaction on this item also did not vary by the newly defined geographical areas and is not significantly different than the 94.3 percent who were satisfied last year.

More than half of residents (57.2%) were familiar with the County Service Authority, which provides water and sewer service to County residents. The majority (93.3%) were satisfied that they provide efficient and effective service. This year’s rating is similar to the 93.1 percent satisfaction rating that was achieved in the 2006 survey.

Human and Mental Health Services

Respondents were asked a series of questions regarding health and human services, such as their satisfaction with the health department, programs for the elderly, social services, and services for the mentally ill. First, however, they were asked if they were familiar enough with each of these services to be able to rate them, as many respondents do not have experience with them.

Regarding the Health Department, 20.2 percent were familiar enough to rate it. Their response was positive, though, with 83.9 percent expressing satisfaction, not significantly different from last year (82.6%). While there were no significant differences by geographic area, satisfaction with the Health Department varied by gender. Male residents (92.1%) residents were more likely to be satisfied than female residents (78.5%).


“They do provide good health services for me.”

Satisfaction with programs and services available to the elderly reached 83.2 percent. This is not significantly different than the 81.0 percent who were satisfied with these services a year ago.

When asked specifically about the County’s Department of Social Services, almost one-fifth (19.5%) were able to rate it, with 73.8 percent of those who could expressing satisfaction. This is not significantly different from the 69.6 percent satisfaction reported last year.

Satisfaction for human service items is shown in Figure IV-11.

Figure IV-11: Satisfaction with Human Services, 2007




Respondents were asked if they were familiar with the Community Services Board (CSB), which provides mental health, mental retardation, and substance abuse services to the local community. Less than one-fifth (11.4%) of respondents were familiar enough with these services to rate them, a decrease from the 14.6 percent that was reported last year.

Of the relatively small number of residents who were familiar enough with the CSB, nearly three-quarters (73.9%) were satisfied with the CSB overall, a significant decrease from the 83.1 percent satisfaction reported in 2006. Unlike in 2006, there were no significant differences with respect to the demographic variables and geographic areas.

This year marked the third time respondents were asked separate questions about specific mental health services offered by the Community Services Board (CSB) as opposed to a single overall question. As in 2006, respondents were asked about their specific satisfaction with Early Intervention Services, and services to people with mental retardation and those with substance abuse problems.

Figure IV-12 illustrates the satisfaction with the CSB among residents who were familiar with it. Seven out of 10 residents (73.7%) were satisfied with the early intervention services, 73.3 percent were satisfied with services to people with mental retardation, and 63.7 percent were satisfied with services to people with substance abuse problems. Satisfaction with both overall mental services and services to mental retardation are not significantly different from those reported last year (73.9% and 73.3% compared to 83.1% and 77.1%).

Figure IV-12: Satisfaction with Community Services Board Services, 2007



Trends in Public and Human Services

Trends for all public and human service items from 1993 and the last five years are shown in Table IV-4.

“So much more can be done [for the elderly] beyond building facilities. They need vehicles and drivers to get out and do things.”

Table IV-4: Trends in Satisfaction with Public and Human Services, 1993 and 2003-2007

Item Number	Satisfaction Item	1993	2003	2004	2005	2006	2007
SCHL4	School System Provides Efficient and Effective Service	—	79.5	81.2	84.0 ^{4,5,6,7,8,9,10}	83.7 ^{4,5,6,7,8,9,10}	84.4 ^{6,7,8}
LIBRARY	Library Services	94.9	96.3 ⁵	96.2 ⁵	96.8 ⁵	95.5 ⁵	94.4 ^{2,5,6,7,8,9,12}
LIBRYSAT	Library Staff	98.2	97.8 ⁸	99.1 ¹⁰	99.1 ¹⁰	99.2 ¹⁰	98.9
PARK	Park & Recreation Facilities and Programs	88.7	89.5	91.0 ^{1,3,5}	87.9 ^{2,11}	87.6 ^{2,11}	89.6
PARK2	Park Authority Provides Efficient & Effective Service	—	93.8	94.6	94.8	94.3	93.7
CTYSERV2	Service Authority Provides Efficient & Effective Service	—	92.3	89.8 ⁵	93.4 ^{7,11}	93.1 ^{7,11}	93.3 ^{7,11}
ELDERLY	Helping the Elderly	68.3	77.6 ^{0,1,5,7,8}	77.9 ^{0,1,5,7}	83.4 ^{0,1,3,10,11}	81.0 ^{0,1,3}	83.2 ^{0,1,3,10,11}
DSSSAT	Satisfaction with DSS	60.3	69.2 ^{0,5}	75.4 ^{0,1,2}	76.4 ^{0,1,2,10}	69.6 ^{0,5}	73.8 ^{0,2}
HLTHSAT	Health Department	84.6	86.4	82.1 ^{5,7,8}	86.2	82.6 ^{5,7,8}	83.9 ^{5,7}
PROBLEMB	Providing Help to People with Emotional, Mental, or Alcohol and Drug Problems	70.1	71.2 ^{2,4,5,6,7}	73.7 ^{2,5,6,7}	81.1 ^{0,1,3,9,10,11}	—	73.9 ^{2,5,12}
MENTRET	Services to Those with Mental Retardation	—	—	—	85.6	77.1	73.3 ¹²
MENTEIS	Early Intervention Services	—	—	—	78.3	81.3	73.7
MENTSUB	Services to People with Substance Abuse Problems	—	—	—	73.1	73.0	63.7
MENTALL*	Overall services of CSB	—	—	—	86.7	83.1	73.9 ^{12,13}

Footnotes indicate value is significantly different from: ⁰ 1993 ¹ 1994 ² 1995 ³ 1996 ⁴ 1997 ⁵ 1998 ⁶ 1999 ⁷ 2000 ⁸ 2001 ⁹ 2002 ¹⁰ 2003 ¹¹ 2004 ¹² 2005 ¹³ 2006

* A similar question was asked prior to 2005, but due to changes in the structure and phrasing of the question, the two are not directly comparable.


V. Communication with the County

Information about the County and the Government

One important responsibility of the County is to keep citizens informed about the happenings of its government. Citizens pay taxes and voice their opinions through the ballot and other forums. Likewise, they must be able to inform themselves about the work of government in carrying out its duties.

As in 2005, respondents were asked where they get their information about what is going on in Prince William County and its government. Again, the newspaper was the primary source of this information, with 34.3 percent listing *The Washington Post* and 33.9 percent listing *The Potomac News* as a source. Television news was cited by 33.6 percent of respondents, the County website was listed by 31.5 percent of respondents, and 15.9 percent said they get their information from a newsletter. This information is illustrated in Figure V-1.

Figure V-1: Sources of Information about the County, 2007



This year more residents indicated using the County website as a source of information than in 2005 (31.5% compared to 20.2%). The percentage of residents mentioning TV News (33.6%) and Radio News (13.1%) as their source of information also increased significantly this year (compared to 20.9% and 4.3%, respectively, in 2005).

Contact with County for Any Purpose

Although the citizens of Prince William County receive a great deal of service from the County government, they also have responsibilities as residents. They pay taxes and purchase licenses for various projects. As consumers of services or providers of revenue, thus, citizens communicate with the County government in a number of ways. In the survey, we again asked a series of questions about citizens’ experiences as they contacted the County.

First, in order to evaluate the amount of contact residents have with the County government, they were asked the following question:

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

Less than half (43.1%) of the residents said they had contacted the County government. This percentage was significantly lower than last year’s response of 47.8 percent.

As in 2006, contact with the County government varied by a number of different demographic variables. White residents (45.5%) were more likely to contact the County government than blacks (39.5%) or Asians (35.1%). Respondents in the youngest age category (18-25) were less likely to contact the government (32.0%) than residents aged 38-49 (41.7%) and residents aged 50-64 (52.0%).

As in 2006, marital status also had a significant relationship with one’s likelihood of having contacted the County government, possibly related to the age differences. Those respondents who were separated were the most likely to contact the government (66.7%), whereas those who were never married (31.1%) were the least likely. Residents who served in the military were also


more likely to have contacted the government (50.9%) than those who have not served in the military (40.7%).

As in 2006, income was positively correlated with contact with the government; those with higher incomes contacted the government more often than those with lower incomes (e.g. 47.1% for residents with a household income of \$75,000 or more, compared to 33.3% for residents whose household income is less than \$35,000). Similarly, those with higher levels of education contacted the government more frequently than those with less education.

Residents living in single family homes were more likely to have contacted the County government than residents living in duplexes or town homes (43.2% as compared to 38.4%). There were no significant differences in contact among the newly defined geographic regions.

Of those who did contact the County, a total of 79.8 percent were satisfied with the helpfulness of County employees (55.1% were very satisfied). Satisfaction with helpfulness is illustrated in Figure V-2 and does not represent a significant change from the 80.1 percent satisfaction level reported in 2006.

Figure V-2: Satisfaction with County Employee Helpfulness, 2007




Residents with household income of \$35,000 or less (61.7%) were less likely to be satisfied with the helpfulness of County employees than were residents with household incomes between \$35,000 and \$50,000 (93.1%), and residents with household incomes over \$75,000 (81.2%). The level of satisfaction did not vary significantly by the newly defined geographic areas.

County Web Site

As in the previous years' surveys, residents were also asked about their use of the Prince William County government website. Sixty-two percent (62.4%) reported that they had used the website, compared with 60.4 percent in 2006 and 59.2 percent in 2005. There was initially a rapid upward trend in website usage from the 22.8 percent reported initially in 1999, but the rate of increase has leveled off in recent years. Figure V-3 illustrates the increasing use of the County government website since 1999, and its apparent leveling off.

Figure V-3: Use of County Website, 1999-2007




As in 2005 and 2006, use of the County website varies by a number of different demographic factors. Female residents (58.4%) were significantly less likely to have visited the website than male residents (68.5%). Residents aged 65 or older (30.2%) were far less likely to have visited the website than were younger residents (ranging from 62.5% to 75.0%). Likewise, widowed residents were also less likely to have visited the website. Hispanic respondents were significantly less likely (48.0%) than were non-Hispanics (64.1%).

Income is positively correlated with website use, with those earning higher amounts of money being more likely to have visited the website than those earning less money (74.6% for residents with a household income of \$75,000 or more as compared to 23.1% for residents whose household

income is less than \$35,000). Similarly, in general, higher levels of education were associated with higher usage of the website. Homeowners (65.5%) and residents with children under the age of 18 (71.6%) were more likely to have visited the website than renters (45.3%) and residents without children under the age of 18 (56.9%). Unlike in 2006, there were no significant differences with respect to the geographic areas.

As is illustrated in Figure V-4, of those who had used the website, 93.9 percent said they were satisfied with it (54.3% were very satisfied), a higher but not significantly different satisfaction rating from that reported in 2006 and 2005.

Figure V-4: Satisfaction with County Website, 2007




Residents without children under the age of 18 in the home (95.4%) expressed more satisfaction with the website than those residents who have children under the age of 18 in the home (92.0%). In addition, residents working full-time (94.4%) were more likely to be satisfied with the County Website as compared to those residents looking for work (69.6%). Satisfaction with the County Website was also positively correlated with household income. Residents with household income of \$35,000 or less (79.5%) were less likely to be satisfied as compared to residents whose household income ranged from \$50,000 to \$75,000 (94.9%) and residents whose household income is over \$75,000 (94.5%). There was no difference in satisfaction with the County Website among residents of the new geographic areas.

Contact with County for Tax Purposes


As in 2005, respondents were asked specifically if they “had any occasion to contact the County about taxes for real estate, personal property, or a business license.” Slightly more than one-third (35.9%) had contacted the County for this purpose. As is illustrated in Figure V-5, nearly three-quarters (71.9%) contacted the government by phone, 30.4 percent made contact in person, and 12 percent contacted the County by mail.⁵

Figure V-5: Methods of Contact regarding Taxes, 2007



Of those who had contacted the County about a tax issue, 85.2 percent expressed satisfaction with the level of assistance they received from the County employees, with 62.2 percent very satisfied. Most also reported that they were satisfied with the time it took for their request to be answered, with 83.2 percent satisfied, and 63.2 percent very satisfied. These overall levels of satisfaction are not significantly different than those received in 2005 (87.4% and 88.2%, respectively), when these questions were last asked. Also, there were no significant differences with respect to demographic variables or the newly defined geographic areas. Figure V-6 presents respondents’ specific tax questions by topic.

⁵ These percentages total to more than 100 percent because some respondents had contacted the government in more than one way.

Figure V-6: Specific Tax Questions, 2007**Table V-1: Trends in Communication Items, 1993 and 2003-2007**

Item Number	Satisfaction Item	1993	2003	2004	2005	2006	2007
HELPFUL2	Helpfulness of Employees	79.3	80.8	78.8	82.0 ⁶	80.1	79.8
HELPFULA	Helpfulness of Employees on Tax Questions	79.3	89.3	—	87.4 ^{2,5,6}	—	85.2 ⁶
TIMESATA	Time Taken for Requests to be Answered	—	87.3	—	88.2 ^{3,6,7}	—	83.2
NET2	County Website	—	93.5	92.6	92.6	92.9	93.9

Footnotes indicate value is significantly different from:

⁰ 1993	² 1995	⁴ 1997	⁶ 1999	⁸ 2001	¹⁰ 2003	¹² 2005
¹ 1994	³ 1996	⁵ 1998	⁷ 2000	⁹ 2002	¹¹ 2004	¹³ 2006

VI. Development Issues

In each year of the survey, a series of questions is included to gauge citizen opinion about land use, development, new jobs, ease of travel, waste management, and related issues in Prince William County. Growth and development mean new opportunities for employment but also can bring new demands on infrastructure, such as roads and community facilities. Again this year, in the free response portion of the survey, many residents commented that the population growth of the County had outpaced the development of necessary roads and other infrastructure. Correspondingly, many of the items reported in this chapter continue to show far lower levels of satisfaction than is the case with most other Prince William County services.


Land Use and Development

As in previous years, we asked:

“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?”

As illustrated in Figure VI-1 below, 6.9 percent said they were very satisfied, and an additional 40.2 percent said they were somewhat satisfied, for a total of 47.1 percent satisfied. Conversely, 52.9 percent of residents were dissatisfied (24.2% very dissatisfied, and 28.7% somewhat dissatisfied). This level of satisfaction is higher, but not significantly different from the 44.9 percent satisfied reported in 2006.

Figure VI-1: Satisfaction with Planning and Development (Question Asked Before New Jobs Question), 2007



Satisfaction varied by several demographic variables. Similarly to 2006, younger residents were more satisfied than older residents (57.7% for 18-25 year olds, but 38.5% for 50-64 year olds).

“I understand that so many of these zoning approvals occurred years ago and so they're kind of out of the hands of the guys that are in County government now. . . So I'm satisfied with the efforts they're making but not the results.”

As in 2006, Whites were less satisfied (44%) on the whole with planning and development. Blacks (53%), Asians (52%), but primarily those of other races (69%) were more satisfied. Hispanics were also much more satisfied (75%) than were non-Hispanics (45%).

Similarly to 2006, those with the greatest annual incomes tended to be less satisfied with planning and development in the County (41.9%).

As in 2006, those with less education were more satisfied. Similarly, those who own their own home were also significantly less satisfied than renters (46%, as compared to 62%).

As in 2006, length of residence in Prince William County also had a significant effect on how satisfied respondents were with planning and development. In general, the longer one had lived in the County, the less satisfied he or she was with the job the County is doing in planning how land will be used and developed.

As illustrated in Figure VI-2, when looking at those that answered the planning and development question after the question about new jobs, 15.0 percent said that they were very satisfied and an additional 34 percent were somewhat satisfied. A quarter (25.1%) of the respondents were somewhat dissatisfied and 25.9 percent were very dissatisfied. As noted, the satisfaction level for those who were asked the development question after jobs is significantly greater than for those asked about development first.


Rate of Growth

A related question is whether the citizens of Prince William County are satisfied with the rate of growth the County is experiencing. On this question less than half expressed satisfaction

(44.0%). More than thirty-six percent (36.5%) of respondents said they were somewhat satisfied and 7.5 percent said they were very satisfied with PWC’s rate of growth. On the other hand, almost 25 percent (24.8%) of respondents said they were very dissatisfied and 31.2 percent said they were somewhat dissatisfied with PWC’s rate of growth. This level of satisfaction with the rate of growth is not statistically different than that of 2006 (44.5%), but it continues the downward trend seen in recent years.

This item also varied by a number of different demographic characteristics, most of them similar to the demographic differences in satisfaction with the job the County is doing in planning how land will be used and developed.

Figure VI-2: Satisfaction with Planning and Development (Question Asked After New Jobs Question), 2007




As with satisfaction with planning and development, younger residents were more satisfied than older residents with the rate of growth (61.0% for 18-25 year olds, but 38.6% for 50-64 year olds). Again, whites were less satisfied (39.3%) than Blacks (53.7%) and Hispanics were much more satisfied (60.7%) than were non-Hispanics (42.7%).

As with satisfaction with planning and development, length of residence in Prince William County also had a significant effect on how satisfied respondents were with the rate of growth in the County. In general, short term residents were more satisfied than long-term residents. Similarly, those who own their own home were less satisfied than renters (42.6%, as compared to 53.6%).

There was also a significant difference based on gender, such that men were more satisfied with the

rate of growth in the County (51.1%, as compared to 38.4% for women). Finally, those with children under 18 living at home were significantly more satisfied (48.8%) than those without children (40.6%). The results show no significant differences with respect to the newly defined geographic areas.

Figure VI-3: Satisfaction with County Growth by Area, 2007



Citizen Input

Respondents were considerably more satisfied with the opportunities for citizen input into the planning process than they were with planning, development and growth, with 66.6 percent saying that they were satisfied (17.8% very satisfied and 48.8% somewhat satisfied). This is a similar rating from last year, when 68.5 percent were satisfied, which is at the usual level of satisfaction for this survey question in Prince William County.


“Citizens take it upon themselves if they want to be involved.”

As in 2006, residents of Prince William County who rent their home were more satisfied than home owners (81.0% as compared to 64.7%) in regards to citizen input on the development process. Education also played an important role. In general, those with lower levels of education

were more satisfied than those with higher levels of education (83.7% for residents with high education or less compared to 67.3% for those with advanced graduate studies).

As with satisfaction with development and planning, satisfaction with the opportunities for citizen input show no significant differences with respect to the newly defined geographic areas (see Figure VI-4).

Figure VI-4: Satisfaction with Opportunities for Citizen Input by Geographic Area, 2007



Returning to the survey this year were items about the County’s efforts to protect the environment and preserve open spaces, which were asked of about 65 percent of those surveyed. Among those queried, nearly three-quarters (73.6%) were satisfied with efforts at protecting the environment and 51.5 percent were satisfied with efforts to preserve open spaces, agriculture, and forested lands. While this year’s satisfaction ratings for the County’s efforts to protect the environment are similar to that of the 71 percent reported in 2005, satisfaction with the County’s efforts to preserve open spaces increased significantly from the 45.1 percent satisfaction reported in 2005 when this question was last asked.


As in previous years, we asked:

“How satisfied are you with the County’s efforts in historic preservation?”

The level of satisfaction with historic preservation was substantially higher than that of efforts to protect the environment and preserve open spaces, with 88.4 percent expressing satisfaction, a significantly higher rating than the 81.2 percent satisfaction reported in 2005.

Two additional rotating questions concerned the County’s efforts at coordinating development. When asked about satisfaction with the way residential and business development is coordinated with transportation and road systems, slightly more than one-third (35.5%) expressed satisfaction, a similar rating to the 34.9 percent satisfaction reported in 2005 when this question was last asked. When asked about satisfaction with the way residential and business development is coordinated with the location of community facilities, such as police and fire stations, libraries, schools, and parks, 73.7 percent expressed satisfaction. This rating is significantly lower than the 80.1 percent satisfaction reported in 2005.

Figure VI-5 illustrates satisfaction levels for all land use and development items.

Figure VI-5: Satisfaction with Development Items, 2007

Appearance

Two questions were posed to residents about the appearance of the County. Residents were first asked how satisfied they were with the visual appearance of new development in the County. Secondly, residents were asked to rate their satisfaction with the County in preventing neighborhoods from deteriorating and making sure the neighborhood is well kept. In addition, respondents were asked a number of rotating items, which were first included on the survey in 2001.

“Love that the County doesn't allow junk cars along roadways.”

When asked how satisfied they were with the visual appearance of new development, 78.5 percent said they were satisfied, with 25.1 percent saying they were very satisfied. When asked how satisfied citizens were with the job the County is doing in preventing neighborhoods from deteriorating and making sure the community is well kept, 66.9 percent expressed satisfaction

(46.6% somewhat satisfied and 20.3% very satisfied). Satisfaction with the visual appearance of new development is significantly lower than that reported in 2006 (82.2%).


With respect to the visual appearance of new development, Blacks (86.2%) and Hispanics (87.2%) were more likely to be satisfied than Whites (76.9%) and non-Hispanics (77.7%). Satisfaction decreased with the length of residence in the County, with short-term residents more likely to be satisfied than long-term residents (89.2% for less than 1 year residents compared to 63.4% for residents who lived in the County for all their lives). There were no significant differences with the respect to geographic area. Analysis of the satisfaction ratings with the job the County is doing in preventing neighborhood deterioration and the demographic variables also follow the same pattern. The lack of difference by area is to be noted.

Asked about the appearance of the County in regards to the amount of trash, debris, and litter along roadways and neighborhoods, 78.1 percent expressed satisfaction. This rating is significantly lower than the 81.7 percent satisfied reported in 2005. Also down significantly from when the question was last asked in 2005, was satisfaction with the number of illegal signs and advertisements along major roads, with 49.2 percent satisfied (as compared to 62.9% in 2005).

Most respondents (74.1%) were satisfied with the appearance of the County in regards to deteriorated buildings and other structures, and 78.1 percent were satisfied with regards to junk cars on roadways and neighborhoods. While this year's satisfaction with junk cars is not significantly different from that of 2005, satisfaction with deteriorated buildings and other structures decreased significantly from the 81.4 percent satisfied reported in 2005.

Figure VI-6 illustrates mean satisfaction levels for appearance items.

Figure VI-6: Satisfaction with Appearance Items, 2007



New Jobs

All respondents were asked a screener question to determine if they were familiar enough with the County’s efforts to attract new jobs and businesses to rate those efforts. Nearly one-third (29.4%) of the respondents said that they were familiar enough and were therefore asked to rate the job the County is doing in trying to attract new jobs and businesses to the County.

“The County continues to be open and receptive to new corporate business.”

A total of 79 percent said they were satisfied, with 31.4 percent reporting that they were very satisfied. This level of satisfaction does not differ from the 78.7 percent who were satisfied last year.⁶ Similarly to 2006, satisfaction on this item did not vary significantly by gender, race, income, work status, education, or geographic area. However, residents without children under the age of 5 (86.4%) were more likely to be satisfied than

⁶ In order to provide an unbiased comparison, this percentage only includes the satisfaction ratings of those that were asked the screener question in 2006. Those that were not asked the screener question are not included in this percentage and comparison.

those residents with children under the age of 5 (65.7%).

Waste Management

Regarding the landfill, approximately half (47.5%) of the responding PWC residents had taken trash to the County’s landfill at Independent Hill. The vast majority, 96 percent, were satisfied with the landfill (78.9% very satisfied). While this year’s satisfaction is still a high rating, it is significantly lower than the 98.3 percent satisfied reported in 2006. In terms of recycling, 88.3 percent said they were satisfied with the County recycling services. This item is not significantly different from the 89 percent reported in 2005.

Unlike 2006, the results show no significant differences with respect to the demographic variables or the newly defined geographic areas.

Transportation

Getting around is not always easy in the Northern Virginia area. Each year, respondents are asked about how satisfied they are with the ease of travel or getting around within Prince William County. This year satisfaction with this item was at 46.9 percent, a significantly higher satisfaction rating than those reported in 2006 and in 2005 (39.6% and 38.1% respectively).

Overall, Asians (63.2%) and Blacks (53.1%) were more likely to be satisfied than Whites (44.1%). Residents with household incomes of \$35,000 or less (58.0%) were also more likely to be satisfied than residents with household incomes of \$75,000 or more (42.5%). In general, satisfaction was a decreasing function of the level of income. The higher the income level, the lower the likelihood that the respondent was satisfied with the ease of travel or getting around within Prince William County. Satisfaction ratings and the level of education follow the same pattern.

“We need a very complete and detailed public transportation system both within the County and throughout the whole Northern Virginia area.”

Figure VI-7 illustrates results for this item, over the past nine years, documenting residents’ increasing dissatisfaction with transportation within the County from 2004 to 2006 and improvement in satisfaction in 2007.

Figure VI-7: Satisfaction with Ease of Travel in the County, 2007





Figure VI-8: Satisfaction with Ease of Travel in the County by Geographic Area, 2007



As we might expect, a respondent’s location in the County made a difference in how satisfied he or she was with this issue, as illustrated in Figure VI-8. The least satisfied were those in the Battlefield (39.8%), Potomac (40.5%), Broad Run (47.7%), and Forest Park (48.9%). Those respondents from Hoadly (49.7%), Old Bridge (54.3%), and Dale (52.7%) were the most satisfied on this item.


“Too many people for the roads that are there; it’s like rush hour traffic even on weekends.”

It must be noted that the transportation problem is not one that is unique to Prince William County. Respondents were also asked how satisfied they were with the ease of travel in Northern Virginia outside of Prince William County, and this was found to get the lowest rating in terms of satisfaction on the entire survey. Only 27.7 percent of respondents were satisfied with the ease of travel in Northern Virginia, with only 5.2 percent being very satisfied. This year’s rating is lower, but not significantly different from the 24.5 percent satisfied reported in 2005, when this question was last asked. There were some differences in satisfaction based on race, education, and income. In general, residents with higher levels of income or education were less likely to be satisfied than residents with low levels of education or income. White residents (24.9%) were also less likely to be satisfied than black residents (36.8%). There were no significant differences with respect to the new geographic areas.

Respondents were also asked how satisfied they were with public transportation provided to Prince William County residents for destinations within the Prince William area and for destinations elsewhere in Northern Virginia and Washington, DC. Respondents were much more satisfied with public transportation than they were with the ease of travel.

As is illustrated in Figure VI-9, more than half (57.0%) of the respondents reported that they were satisfied with public transportation provided to Prince William County residents for destinations within Prince William County, with 15.1 percent indicating that they were very satisfied. This rating is significantly lower than the 66.4 percent satisfaction rating reported in 2005, the last time the question was asked.

Figure VI-9: Satisfaction with Public Transportation within the County, 2007



There were some differences in satisfaction based on education, length of residence, whether or not the respondent has served in the military, and geographic area. In general, respondents with lower levels of education were more likely to be satisfied than those with graduate work or advanced graduate studies. For example, 84.5 percent of residents with high school education or less expressed satisfaction compared to 28.1 percent of those residents with advanced graduate studies. Residents who have been living in Prince William County for a period of 3 to 5 years (43.7%) were less likely to be satisfied than residents who have been in the County for a period of 1 to 2 years (71.3%) or 20 years or more (65.1%). Interestingly, residents who have been in the County for all their lives expressed the highest level of satisfaction (77.9%). With respect to the newly defined geographic areas, Battlefield residents (43.2%) were less likely to be satisfied than Old Bridge residents (67.1%) and Potomac residents (66.3%), who expressed the highest levels of satisfaction.

When asked about public transportation to destinations elsewhere in Northern Virginia or Washington, 65 percent were satisfied, with 22 percent saying they were very satisfied. This rating is not significantly different from the 67.4 percent satisfied reported in 2005.

Unlike in 2005, there are no significant differences on this rating with respect to the demographic variables. However, as with satisfaction with public transportation provided to Prince William County residents for destinations within Prince William County, Battlefield residents (50.0%) were less likely to be satisfied with public transportation to destinations elsewhere in Northern Virginia or Washington than residents from Forest Park (73.3%) and Potomac (75.7%), who expressed the highest levels of satisfaction.

Figure VI-10 illustrates mean satisfaction levels for transportation items. Table VI-1 indicates trends in satisfaction for all development items for 1993 and over the past five years

Figure VI-10: Satisfaction with Transportation Items, 2007




Table VI-1: Trends in Developmental Issues, 1993 and 2003-2007

Item Number	Satisfaction Item	PERCENT SATISFIED					
		1993	2003	2004	2005	2006	2007
LAND	Planning and Land Use	53.9	53.2 ³	49.8 ^{2, 3, 5, 6, 7}	44.8 ^{0, 1, 2, 3, 4, 5, 6, 7, 8, 9, 10, 11}	44.9 ^{0, 1, 2, 3, 4, 5, 6, 7, 8, 9, 10, 11}	47.5 ^{0, 2, 3, 5, 6, 7, 8, 9, 10}
GROWTHC	Growth in County	—	49.5 ⁸	48.7 ^{8, 9}	47.2 ^{8, 9}	44.5 ^{8, 9, 10, 11}	44.0 ^{8, 9, 10, 11}
INPUTDEV	Citizen Input Opportunity re: Development	—	69.2 ⁹	57.4 ^{3, 4, 5, 6, 7, 8, 10}	66.8 ^{9, 11}	68.5 ^{9, 11}	66.6 ¹¹
ENVRDEVA	Efforts to Protect Environment	—	73.2	—	71.0	—	73.6 ⁸
SPCEDEVA	Efforts to Preserve Open Space	—	58.3	—	45.1 ^{3, 4, 5, 6, 7, 8, 10}	—	51.5 ^{5, 6, 7, 10, 12}
HISTORIC	Historic Preservation Efforts	—	—	—	81.2	—	88.4 ¹²
ROADDEVA	Coordination of Development with Road Systems	—	42.8	—	34.9 ^{8, 10}	—	35.5 ^{8, 10}
SVEDEVA	Coordination of Development with Community Facilities	—	79.8	—	80.1 ^{3, 6, 7}	—	73.7 ^{3, 4, 5, 6, 7, 8, 10, 12}
VISDEV	Appearance of New Development	—	80.0 ^{3, 6, 7, 9}	81.9 ^{3, 7}	80.8 ^{3, 6, 7}	82.2 ^{3, 7}	78.5 ^{3, 6, 7, 9, 13}
NEIGHBOR	Prevent Neighborhood Deterioration	67.8	67.0 ^{2, 7, 8}	71.9 ¹⁰	70.8 ¹⁰	68.7 ⁸	66.9 ^{2, 5, 7, 11}
TRASHC	Appearance of Trash Along Roads & in Neighborhoods	—	82.5 ⁸	—	81.7	—	78.1 ^{10, 12}
SIGNSC	Appearance of Illegal Signs Along Major Roads	—	55.2	—	62.9 ^{8, 10}	—	49.2 ^{8, 10, 12}
BUILDNGC	Appearance of Deteriorated Buildings	—	80.4	—	81.4 ⁸	—	74.1 ^{10, 12}
JUNKC	Appearance of Junk Cars on Roads & in Neighborhoods	—	75.7	—	77.7	—	78.1
NEWJOBS**	Attract New Jobs and Businesses	—	—	81.0	82.4	78.7	79.0 ^{0, 1, 2, 9, 10, 11}
TRAVEL97	Getting Around	—	52.5 ^{4, 5, 6, 7, 9}	45.7 ^{4, 5, 6, 7, 8, 9, 10}	38.1 ^{4, 5, 6, 7, 8, 9, 10, 11}	39.6 ^{4, 5, 6, 7, 8, 9, 10, 11}	46.9 ^{4, 5, 6, 7, 8, 9, 10, 12, 13}
OUTSIDEV	Ease of Travel Around Northern Virginia	—	33.1	—	24.5 ^{8, 10}	—	27.7 ^{8, 10}
TRANSC2*	Public Transportation within Prince William County	—	—	—	66.4	—	57.0 ¹²
NOVATRC2*	Public Transportation Around Northern Virginia and DC	—	—	—	67.4	—	65.0
RECYCLEC	Recycling Services	—	86.9	—	89.0	—	88.3
LFILLSAT	Landfill	91.7	97.0 ^{0, 3, 4, 5, 6}	95.9 ^{0, 4, 5, 7}	98.8 ^{0, 1, 3, 4, 5, 6, 8, 9, 10, 11}	98.3 ^{0, 1, 3, 4, 5, 6, 9, 11}	96.0 ^{4, 5, 12, 13}

Footnotes indicate value is significantly different from: ⁰ 1993 ¹ 1994 ² 1995 ³ 1996 ⁴ 1997 ⁵ 1998 ⁶ 1999 ⁷ 2000 ⁸ 2001 ⁹ 2002 ¹⁰ 2003 ¹¹ 2004 ¹² 2005 ¹³ 2006

* A similar question was asked prior to 2005, but due to changes in the phrasing of the question, the two are not directly comparable.

**This question was also asked prior to 2004, but due to the addition of a screener question in 2004, responses prior to 2004 are not directly comparable with those from 2004 and 2005. Only the responses of those that were asked the screener question in 2004 (approximately half of the respondents) are included in this comparison. The figure that appears in this table therefore differs from the one that appeared in the 2004 report, which was a composite of those that were asked the screener and those that were not.


VII. Views of Government

In this section, we consider the general views of local government expressed by the citizens of Prince William County. In section III, we reported satisfaction levels with various government services and the overall sense of satisfaction with County services. In this chapter, we will examine attitudes of residents toward the County government and opinions about the value for their tax dollars.

Efficient and Effective Service

The County’s Strategic Plan contains “community outcome indicators” to help monitor progress in meeting goals stated in the Plan. This year we again asked the citizens of Prince William about the extent to which they believe the government provides efficient and effective service. The majority of residents were satisfied with this issue, with 85.6 percent expressing satisfaction. Figure VII-1 illustrates these results. This is not significantly different from the 84.4 percent who expressed satisfaction last year.

Figure VII-1: Satisfaction with Efficiency & Effectiveness of County Service, 2007




Hispanics were more satisfied that the County provides efficient and effective service (94%) than were non-Hispanics (85%).

Trust in Government

Respondents were also asked how often they trust the County government to do what is right. As is illustrated in Figure VII-2, the majority, a total of 64.1 percent, said that they felt that the County could be trusted most of the time or just about always. Slightly more than one-third (34.5%) said that the County government could be trusted only

some of the time, whereas only 1.5 percent said that they could never or almost never trust the government. These opinions show a significant increase from those expressed in 2006, returning to the level seen in 2005.


Figure VII-2: Trust County Government Decisions, 2007



There were some regional differences in response to this question. Those residing in Old Bridge trusted the County decisions the most, with 73% indicating they trust the decisions always or most of the time, and residents of Broad Run and Hoadly were the least trusting, with less than 60% trusting the decisions always or most of the time.

Figure VII-3 illustrates the trends for this question over the last five years of the citizen survey, showing the total percent of respondents who said they would trust the County government most of the time or just about always.

Figure VII-3: Trust County Government Decisions, 2003-2007




View of Taxes

As a general statement, local governments encounter the difficult tradeoff of operating within resource constraints while at the same time trying to satisfy the increasing demands and expectations of the community. Citizens, unlike elected leaders and other policy makers, are not faced every day with the need to choose the right mix of taxes and services. One question we posed to our respondents asked them to consider just this tradeoff:

“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: they should decrease services and taxes, keep taxes and services about where they are, or increase services and taxes?”

This year 63.3 percent of our respondents chose the middle path of maintaining services and taxes at roughly current levels; 9.6 percent said that they would cut services and taxes, whereas 14.2 percent opted for increased services and taxes, and 12.8 percent suggested some other change. Figure VII-4 illustrates this finding. This year more people believed that there should be increased services and taxes than in 2006 (14.2% compared to 10.3%).

Figure VII-4: Preferred Level of Services and Taxes, 2007



Among those volunteering some other change, 3 percent volunteered that services should be increased while taxes are decreased, 2.3 percent said that services should stay the same while taxes are decreased, and 5.9 percent said that services should be increased while taxes stayed the same.

Our subgroup analysis found some significant differences between groups. For the purpose of this analysis, we omitted those who suggested

some other type of change. This gives an average of 11.1 percent who want to decrease tax and services, 16.3 percent who want to increase tax and services, and 72.7 percent who want to keep things the same.

“Keep taxes as they are and reappropriate them.”

Not surprisingly, there was also a difference based on income. Those earning more than \$75,000 a year were more likely than those making up to \$35,000 to want to see an increase in both services and taxes (18.1% vs. 13.5%). Similarly, those earning less than \$35,000 were the most likely to want taxes and services to decrease (23.6%). Likewise, those with greater amounts of education were more likely to want taxes and services to increase, whereas those with less education were more likely to want both to decrease.

We also asked how satisfied the citizens were with the value for their tax dollar provided by the County government. Figure VII-5 shows that 80.2 percent said they were satisfied on this item, with 18.5 percent saying they were very satisfied. This is significantly greater than the 76.5 percent who were satisfied in 2006.

Figure VII-5: Satisfaction with Value for Tax Dollar, 2007




Figure VII-6 shows the level of satisfaction for these items for the current year. Table VII-1 indicates trends in satisfaction for attitudes toward government for 1993 and over the past five years.

Figure VII-6: Satisfaction with Government Items, 2007




Table VII-1: Trends in Satisfaction with Government, 1993 and 2003-2007

Item Number	Satisfaction Item	PERCENT SATISFIED					
		1993	2003	2004	2005	2006	2007
EFFNEFF	County Provides Efficient and Effective Service in General	—	89.1 ^{6, 8}	84.6 ^{4, 5, 7, 10}	85.3 ^{4, 5, 7, 10}	84.4 ^{4, 5, 7, 10}	85.6 ^{4, 5, 7, 10}
VALUE	Value for Tax Dollar	65.5	82.7 ^{0, 1, 2, 3, 4, 6, 9}	75.8 ^{0, 1, 5, 8, 10}	79.2 ^{0, 1, 2, 3, 10}	76.5 ^{0, 1, 10}	80.2 ^{0, 1, 2, 13}


Footnotes indicate value is significantly different from: ⁰ 1993, ¹ 1994, ² 1995, ³ 1996, ⁴ 1997, ⁵ 1998, ⁶ 1999, ⁷ 2000, ⁸ 2001, ⁹ 2002, ¹⁰ 2003, ¹¹ 2004, ¹² 2005, ¹³ 2006

VIII. Employment and Commuting

Employment


Figure VIII-1 shows that the respondents to our survey hold a variety of statuses in the labor force. Slightly less than two-thirds (61.6%) were working full time and an additional 6.6 percent were working part time. Homemakers accounted for 8.0 percent, and 18.5 percent were retired. Students made up 2.1 percent of the sample, and those looking for work also made up 2.1 percent. These figures are very similar to last year's figures.

Figure VIII-1: Employment Status, 2007



Almost a third of our sample, 30.7 percent, lives and works in Prince William County. Slightly less than 5 percent (3.3%) work in Manassas or Manassas Park. The remaining 66 percent work elsewhere; 28.3 percent of the workforce commute to Fairfax County, the City of Fairfax, or Falls Church, 13.4 percent work in Washington, DC, 5.7 percent commute to Arlington, and 4.6 percent commute to Alexandria. Figure VIII-2 details these findings.

Figure VIII-2: Place of Work, 2007



Commuting

The average one-way commute time for all Prince William County workers is 42.3 minutes, a similar amount of time as reported in 2006. For those who work in Prince William County, the mean commute time is almost 20 minutes (18.55 minutes). Figure VIII-3 illustrates the trend in overall commute time from 2003.

Figure VIII-3: Average Commute Time, 2003-2007





Figure VIII-4 shows the variation in average commute time for workers depending on the part of the County in which they reside. The longest commute is by Dale residents, followed by Potomac residents, at 46.7 and 45.6 minutes respectively. The shortest commute time is by respondents residing in Battlefield, who commute an average of 37.3 minutes. However, these differences are not statistically significant based on the limited sample size of workers in each area..

Figure VIII-4: Length of Commute by Region, 2007




As in previous surveys, we dichotomized workers into commuters and non-commuters. To be considered a commuter, a worker needed to be commuting outside of Prince William County or

Manassas/Manassas Park, and have a commute of 30 minutes or longer. Nearly 60 percent (57.1%) of the employed respondents met both criteria.

“They need to stop expansion until the roads get bigger.”

Most of our respondents (84.3%) were commuting to the same place as they were a year ago. Most were also living at the same address (94.7%). Those respondents who were commuting both to the same place from the same place and were asked if their commute time to and from work had gotten longer, gotten shorter, or stayed the same during the past year. The majority (52.0%) said that their commute time had stayed the same, but more than one-third (39.7%) of respondents said that it had gotten longer. Approximately eight percent (8.3%) said that it had gotten shorter. Results are shown in Figure VIII-5. These figures are significantly different from those reported in 2006 when more than half (54.0%) of the respondents said that their commute time had gotten longer.

Figure VIII-5: Change in Travel Time from Last Year, 2007




At the request of the County, we once again examined the socio-economic characteristics of commuters in more detail. As in the past, income was positively correlated with commuter status, such that those with higher incomes were much more likely than those with lower incomes to be commuters. Homeowners were also more likely to be commuters than renters. For example, 61.4 percent of residents with household income over \$75,000 were commuters as compared to 31.5 percent of residents with household income of \$35,000 or less. As in 2005, though, education did not make a difference in commuter status.

There was a significant difference based on gender, with men being much more likely (66.7%) than women (49.4%) to commute. Full-time workers (61.0%) were much more likely to be commuters than part-time workers (22.7%); the newer someone was to Prince William County, the more likely he or she was to be a commuter.

There was also a significant difference based on geographic area of residents, with residents of Battlefield being less likely to commute than were residents of the Potomac and Dale areas (see Figure VIII-6).

Figure VIII-6: Percent of Residents who Commute by Region, 2007



The County was also interested in where commuters' jobs were located for each geographic area of the County. Most commuters are traveling to the Fairfax County, Fairfax City, Falls Church, Arlington, and Washington DC areas. This information is detailed in Table VIII-1 for commuters and Table VIII-2 for both commuters and non-commuters together.

Telecommuting

We also asked employed respondents about telecommuting. The question asked:

“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?”

Slightly more than one-fifth (21.2%) of the employed respondents said they did telecommute. This is not significantly different from last year's number of 17.6 percent. Those who said they telecommute were asked how often they did: 10.3 percent said they telecommute all the time, 25.0 percent said they telecommute several times a week, 22.9 percent several times a month, 26.2 percent once or twice a month, and 15.7 percent several times a year.

Table VIII-1: Job Location of Commuters by Residence Area, 2007

Job Location	Battlefield	Broad Run	Hoadly	Old Bridge	Dale	Potomac	Forest Park
Stafford County	1.9%	-	-	1.6%	1.0%	-	-
Fredericksburg/Spotsylvania	1.9%	-	-	-		1.1%	1.7%
Loudoun County	11.5%	9.0%	4.9%	1.6%	3.1%	1.1%	1.7%
Fairfax County	44.2%	46.3%	32.8%	26.2%	35.7%	32.2%	31.7%
Fairfax City	5.8%	3.0%	6.6%	1.6%	4.1%	4.6%	-
Falls Church	1.9%	6.0%	1.6%	1.6%	1.0%	2.3%	-
Arlington	9.6%	3.0%	11.5%	11.5%	12.2%	8.0%	11.7%
Alexandria	3.8%	1.5%	6.6%	11.5%	8.2%	9.2%	10.0%
Washington, DC	11.5%	14.9%	19.7%	26.2%	25.5%	31.0%	33.3%
Maryland	1.9%	3.0%	9.8%	3.3%	5.1%	2.3%	1.7%
Fauquier County/Warrenton	-	1.5%	-	-	-	-	3.3%
Richmond City or area	-	1.5%	-	1.6%		-	-
Elsewhere in VA	-	3.0%	1.6%	3.3%	1.0%	2.3%	-
Another location	3.8%	4.5%	3.3%	8.2%	1.0%	3.4%	1.7%
Work all over	1.9%	3.0%	1.6%	1.6%	2.0%	2.3%	3.3%

Table VIII-2: Job Location of Commuters and Non-Commuters by Residence Area

Job Location	Battlefield	Broad Run	Hoadly	Old Bridge	Dale	Potomac	Forest Park
Prince William County	38.1%	27.5%	37.6%	37.3%	26.4%	17.9%	37.1%
Manassas	3.5%	6.7%	5.1%	0.8%	3.4%	1.6%	1.7%
Stafford County	0.9%	-	-	0.8%	1.4%	-	2.6%
Fredericksburg / Spotsylvania	0.5%	-	-	-	-	0.8%	1.7%
Fauquier County / Warrenton	1.8%	1.7%	-	-	-	-	1.7%
Loudoun County	7.1%	6.7%	2.6%	0.8%	2.0%	0.8%	1.7%
Fairfax County	24.8%	31.7%	18.8%	17.8%	25.0%	30.1%	17.2%
Fairfax City	2.7%	1.7%	3.4%	1.7%	2.7%	3.3%	-
Falls Church	1.8%	3.3%	0.9%	0.8%	0.7%	1.6%	-
Arlington	4.4%	1.7%	6.0%	5.9%	8.8%	6.5%	6.0%
Alexandria	1.8%	0.8%	3.4%	7.6%	5.4%	6.5%	6.9%
Elsewhere in VA	0.9%	1.7%	0.9%	2.5%	0.7%	1.6%	0.9%
Washington, DC	5.3%	8.3%	10.3%	13.6%	16.9%	22.0%	-
Maryland	0.9%	1.7%	5.1%	1.7%	3.4%	1.6%	-
Richmond City or area	-	0.8%	-	0.8%	-	-	-
Manassas Park	-	-	0.9%	-	0.7%	-	-
Another location	3.5%	3.3%	3.4%	5.9%	1.4%	4.1%	1.7%
Works all over	1.8%	2.5%	1.7%	1.7%	1.4%	1.6%	2.6%

IX. Summary and Conclusion

As in prior years the 2007 annual Citizen Satisfaction Survey continues to be good news for the leadership of Prince William County in most areas of service. The preceding sections of this report describe residents' predominantly high level of satisfaction with specific County services. In conclusion, we will consider the entire list of services the survey has rated.

Table IX-1 shows the satisfaction ratings for the services and programs, in the order in which they were discussed in the preceding sections, for this year and for the most recent five years in which a specific satisfaction item has been included in the survey. The superscripted numbers in this table indicate statistically significant changes in satisfaction levels between years, including between this year and any of the fourteen preceding years.

Changes from Prior Years

Most important, about two-thirds (64.1%) of respondents, said that they felt that the County could be trusted most of the time or just about always. These opinions show a significant increase from those expressed in 2006.

Overall satisfaction with County services was 89.5 percent, down about 1 percentage point from the 2006 level, a change which is not statistically significant. There were a number of significant increases and decreases on satisfaction items from 2006 (or 2005 for the rotating questions).

Five items showed increases in Satisfaction

Core Satisfaction Items:

- Satisfaction with the job the County is doing in providing emergency medical rescue services increased from 95.7 percent in 2006 to 98.5 percent in 2007.
- Satisfaction with the job the County is doing in giving value for tax dollars increased from 76.5 percent in 2006 to 80.2 percent in 2007.
- Satisfaction with the ease of travel or getting around within Prince William County increased from 39.6 percent in 2006 to 46.9 percent in 2007.

Rotating Satisfaction Items:

- Satisfaction with the County's efforts in historic preservation increased from 81.2 percent in 2005 to 88.4 percent in 2007.
- Satisfaction with the County's efforts to preserve open space, including agricultural and forested lands, increased from 45.1 percent in 2005 to 51.5 percent in 2007.

Ten items showed decreases in Satisfaction:

Core Satisfaction Items:

- Satisfaction with the overall services of the Community Services Board decreased from 83.1 percent in 2006 to 73.9 percent in 2007.
- Satisfaction with the appearance of new development decreased from 82.2 percent in 2006 to 78.5 percent in 2007.
- Satisfaction with the landfill decreased from 98.3 percent in 2006 to 96.0 percent in 2007.

Rotating Satisfaction Items:

- Satisfaction with the job the County is doing in providing street lighting where needed decreased from 82 percent in 2005 to 73.8 percent in 2007.
- Satisfaction with the job the County is doing in providing help to people with emotional problems, mental problems, or alcohol and drug problems decreased from 81.1 percent in 2005 to 73.9 percent in 2007.
- Satisfaction with public transportation provided to Prince William County residents for destinations within the Prince William area decreased from 66.4 percent in 2005 to 57 percent in 2007.
- Satisfaction with the way residential and business development is coordinated with the locations of community facilities, such as police and fire stations, libraries, schools, and parks, decreased from 80.1 percent in 2005 to 73.7 percent in 2007.
- Satisfaction with the appearance of the County in regards to the amount of trash, debris, and litter along roadways and in neighborhoods decreased from 81.7 percent in 2005 to 78.1 percent in 2007.
- Satisfaction with the appearance of the County in regards to the number of illegal signs (such as popsicle signs, election

signs, weight loss ads, etc) along major roads decreased from 62.9 percent in 2005 to 49.2 percent in 2007.

- Satisfaction with the appearance of the County in regards to deteriorated buildings and other structures decreased from 81.4 percent in 2005 to 74.1 percent in 2007.

Strategic Planning Goals

For the most part, goals of Prince William County residents have remained stable. The top five goals, which were the same as in 2003, include:

- County Safe from Crime
- Improve County's Road Network
- Improve Quality of Public Education
- Prevent Fire & Medical Emergencies
- Maintain/Improve County's Environmental Quality

Improving the County's road network again increased in importance and also was the only goal among the top five to change in ranking, jumping from the fourth most important to the second. The related goal, "Better Public Transportation," also increased in importance and rank. Expanding the County's revenue and expanding regional cooperation also increased in importance and rank compared to 2003. The goal to rely more on fees, although still ranked last, increased in importance.

The only goal that dropped significantly in importance was job training and placement programs. Encouraging Racial and Cultural Diversity, although not decreasing significantly in rated importance, dropped in rank from 11th in 1999 to 15th in 2003 to 21st in this year's ratings.

Long-Term Trends

The overall long-term picture remains positive: a combination of steady rates of satisfaction in some indicators and sustained improvement in others over the annual surveys. Prince William County residents are on the whole very satisfied with their County government and quality of life. On most satisfaction items included in the 2007 survey, where significant changes in citizen satisfaction have occurred since the baseline survey taken in 1993, changes have been in the direction of greater satisfaction or continued high levels of satisfaction with minor fluctuations from year to year.

Those indicators showing a general trend of improvement since 1993 are as follows:

- Satisfaction with the County's value for tax dollars is up more than 15 points since 1993.
- Satisfaction with helping the elderly is up approximately 15 points since 1993.
- Satisfaction with the Department of Social Services is up almost 14 percentage points since 1993.
- Satisfaction with information on government services is up over 8 percentage points since 1993.
- Satisfaction with the landfill is up over 4 percentage points since 1993.
- Satisfaction with providing help to those with emotional problems is up 4 percentage points since 1993.
- Satisfaction with the police department is up 4 points since 1993.
- Satisfaction with voter registration is up 3 points from 1993.
- Satisfaction with street lighting is up 3 percentage points since 1993.
- Satisfaction with medical rescue services is up approximately 2 percentage points since 1993.

An exception to this trend of increased satisfaction is:

- Satisfaction with the job the County is doing in planning how land will be used and developed is down approximately 6 percentage points from 1993.

Satisfaction with several other items pertaining to development, growth, and transportation issues has trended downward, but these items were not asked in the 1993 baseline survey. Against this background, this year's upturn in satisfaction with ease of getting around is encouraging.

Overall Quality of Life

With regard to overall quality of life, Prince William County remains a place that people believe is a good place to live. On a scale of 1 to 10, with 10 being the highest quality, the mean rating has increased from 6.90 in 1993 to 7.18 in 2007, a statistically significant improvement. The 2007 mean rating is not statistically significant from last year's mean of 7.15.

Services Ranked by Satisfaction Level

Table IX-2 provides a list of satisfaction items, ranked from those with the highest levels of satisfaction to those with the lowest. The respondents rated 59 specific services and a general rating of satisfaction with government services and quality of life in Prince William County, for a total of 60 satisfaction items. The highest rated satisfaction items in our survey related to the libraries, medical rescue, fire protection, security in the Courthouse, the landfill, and opportunities for voter registration. Thirty-three of the 60 ranked satisfaction items scored ratings of 80 percent or better. Eight items received ratings less than 60 percent: satisfaction with ease of travel around Northern Virginia outside of Prince William County, coordination of development with road systems, growth in the County, ease of travel around Prince William County, planning and land use, illegal signs along major roads, efforts to preserve open space, and public transportation in Prince William County.

The general County government rating, perhaps the single most important item in the survey, has a high satisfaction level of 89.5 percent. Nearly a third said they were “very satisfied” with the services of the County government in general.

Table IX-3 ranks all satisfaction items for 2007 by visibility. The visibility refers to the percentage of County residents who are sufficiently familiar with a service to be able to rate it. For example, if 10 percent of those asked about a service say they do not know how to rate it or do not have an opinion about its rating, then that service has a visibility of 90 percent. For some services, we specifically asked respondents a screening question to determine if they were familiar enough with a particular service to give it a rating.

Table IX-4 is a list of all satisfaction items, categorized by level of visibility and satisfaction level. Figure IX-1 illustrates those numbers graphically.

Conclusions

Overall, residents of Prince William County are satisfied with the services they receive. Reductions in satisfaction levels on some items also indicate areas where improvements might be made. In general, people are least satisfied with development and transportation issues, suggesting that these areas are in need of improvement despite the significant progress with the ease of travel or getting around within Prince William County.

As indicated earlier, the reasons for citizens’ satisfaction with any particular service relates not merely to its actual quality, but also to citizens’ expectations of its quality, or to their own informal cost-benefit analyses regarding the usefulness of a given service to them. These figures are subject to change as people’s life circumstances and expectations change. In addition, a citizen satisfaction survey is only one of many possible indicators of the actual quality of the work a public agency is doing, and the findings must of course be weighed against other objective and qualitative indicators when policy and resource allocation decisions are made.

Prince William County certainly can take continuing pride in the high levels of satisfaction its citizens have indicated toward most County government agencies, services and programs, and in the general improvement in citizen satisfaction levels, both overall and with several specific areas since 1993, the first year the survey was conducted. There is no doubt this survey series will continue to be of help to decision-makers and citizens as they work toward continuous improvement of public services and programs for the people of Prince William County.

Table IX-1: Percent Satisfied for All Satisfaction Items, 1993 and 2003-2007

Item Number	Satisfaction Item	1993	2003	2004	2005	2006	2007	
	<i>General Satisfaction with Government Services</i>							
CTYSAT97	Services of the County Government in General	90.5	89.6 ^{2,4,5,7,9}	90.2 ^{2,4,5,7,9}	92.1 ^{6,10}	90.8 ^{5,7}	89.5 ^{2,4,5,7,9,12}	
VOTE	Voter Registration	91.5	95.3 ^{0,1,2,3}	94.5 ^{0,4,5}	97.0 ^{0,1,2,3,11}	95.2 ^{0,2,4,5,12}	94.9 ^{0,4,5,9,12}	
GOVTSERV	Information on Government Services	70.9	75.3 ^{1,3,4,5,7,9}	81.0 ^{0,1,2,6,7,10}	84.3 ^{0,1,2,5,6,8,9,10}	79.7 ^{0,1,2,7,10,12}	78.8 ^{0,1,7,12}	
	<i>Public Safety</i>							
POLICE	Overall Satisfaction with Police	88.7	93.2 ^{0,1}	93.7 ^{0,1,4}	93.7 ^{0,1,4}	92.5 ^{0,1}	92.3 ^{0,1}	
ATTITUDE	Police Attitudes and Behaviors Toward Citizens	—	85.4	86.3	88.4 ^{3,4}	86.6	87.9	
DRUGS	Reducing Illegal Drugs	79.2	82.6 ¹	84.1 ^{0,1}	84.3 ^{0,1}	90.8 ^{5,7}	83.2 ¹	
FIRE	Fire Protection	97.2	97.1 ¹	98.2 ^{1,2,6}	98.2 ^{1,6}	97.9 ¹	98.4 ^{1,6,10}	
RESCUE	Medical Rescue	96.6	97.2	97.4 ^{4,6}	98.3 ^{0,1,2,3,4,6,8}	95.7 ^{5,9,12}	98.5 ^{0,1,2,4,6,8,13}	
COURTSAT	Security in Courthouse	—	—	—	96.3	—	97.3	
EMSATIS	911 Phone Help	—	91.0 ^{4,7}	91.9	95.2 ³	92.5	94.6	
EMTIMEB	Time for Help to Arrive	—	85.3	86.3	90.6 ^{5,6,9}	86.0	89.3 ^{6,9}	
EMASSTB	Assistance on the Scene	—	88.9	89.7	94.9 ^{1,4,6,9,10,11}	90.1 ¹²	92.6	
AMCRIME	Safety In Neighborhood in Daylight	—	93.1 ⁴	91.9 ⁶	92.8 ⁴	93.0 ⁴	94.3 ^{2,3,4,5,9,11}	
PMCRIME	Safety in Neighborhood after Dark	—	86.2 ^{2,3,4,5}	86.3 ^{2,3,4,5}	85.7 ^{2,3,4}	85.6 ^{2,3,4}	86.7 ^{2,3,4,5}	
STRLTA	Street Lighting	71.2	76.8 ⁰	—	82.0 ^{0,1,2,3,4,6,10}	—	73.8 ^{5,7,8,12}	
SHERIFFA	Sheriff's Office Performance	—	—	—	—	—	94.5	
ATTITUT	Sheriff's Office Attitudes and Behaviors Toward Citizens	—	—	—	—	—	91.9	
ANIMALA	Animal Control	84.8	81.0 ^{4,7}	—	88.0 ^{2,6,8,10}	—	84.5	
MOSCONT	Mosquito Control	—	70.6	—	83.5 ¹⁰	—	84.1 ¹⁰	
	Footnotes indicate value is significantly different from:	⁰ 1993	² 1995	⁴ 1997	⁶ 1999	⁸ 2001	¹⁰ 2003	¹² 2005
		¹ 1994	³ 1996	⁵ 1998	⁷ 2000	⁹ 2002	¹¹ 2004	¹³ 2006

Table IX-1 (cont'd.): Percent Satisfied for All Satisfaction Items, 1993 and 2003-2007

Item Number	Satisfaction Item	1993	2003	2004	2005	2006	2007	
	<i>Public Services</i>							
SCHL4	School System Provides Efficient and Effective Service	—	79.5	81.2	84.0 ^{4, 5, 6, 7, 8, 9, 10}	83.7 ^{4, 5, 6, 7, 8, 9, 10}	84.4 ^{6, 7, 8}	
LIBRARY	Library Services	94.9	96.3 ⁵	96.2 ⁵	96.8 ⁵	95.5 ⁵	94.4 ^{2, 5, 6, 7, 8, 9, 12}	
LIBRYSAT	Library Staff	98.2	97.8 ⁸	99.1 ¹⁰	99.1 ¹⁰	99.2 ¹⁰	98.9	
PARK	Park & Recreation Facilities and Programs	88.7	89.5	91.0 ^{1, 3, 5}	87.9 ^{2, 11}	87.6 ^{2, 11}	89.6	
PARK2	Park Authority Provides Efficient & Effective Service	—	93.8	94.6	94.8	94.3	93.7	
CTYSERV2	Service Authority Provides Efficient & Effective Service	—	92.3	89.8 ⁵	93.4 ^{7, 11}	93.1 ^{7, 11}	93.3 ^{7, 11}	
ELDERLY	Helping the Elderly	68.3	77.6 ^{0, 1, 5, 7, 8}	77.9 ^{0, 1, 5, 7}	83.4 ^{0, 1, 3, 10, 11}	81.0 ^{0, 1, 3}	83.2 ^{0, 1, 3, 10, 11}	
DSSSAT	Satisfaction with DSS	60.3	69.2 ^{0, 5}	75.4 ^{0, 1, 2}	76.4 ^{0, 1, 2, 10}	69.6 ^{0, 5}	73.8 ^{0, 2}	
HLTHSAT	Health Department	84.6	86.4	82.1 ^{5, 7, 8}	86.2	82.6 ^{5, 7, 8}	83.9 ^{5, 7}	
PROBLEMB	Providing Help to People with Emotional, Mental, or Alcohol and Drug Problems	70.1	71.2 ^{2, 4, 5, 6, 7}	73.7 ^{2, 5, 6, 7}	81.1 ^{0, 1, 3, 9, 10, 11}	—	73.9 ^{2, 5, 12}	
MENTRET	Services to Those with Mental Retardation	—	—	—	85.6	77.1	73.3 ¹²	
MENTEIS	Early Intervention Services	—	—	—	78.3	81.3	73.7	
MENTSUB	Services to People with Substance Abuse Problems	—	—	—	73.1	73.0	63.7	
MENTALL*	Overall services of CSB	—	—	—	86.7	83.1	73.9 ^{12, 13}	
	<i>Communication with the County</i>							
HELPFUL2	Helpfulness of Employees	79.3	80.8	78.8	82.0 ⁶	80.1	79.8	
HELPFULA	Helpfulness of Employees on Tax Questions	79.3	89.3	—	87.4 ^{2, 5, 6}	—	85.2 ⁶	
TIMESATA	Time Taken for Requests to be Answered	—	87.3	—	88.2 ^{3, 6, 7}	—	83.2	
NET2	County Website	—	93.5	92.6	92.6	92.9	93.9	
	Footnotes indicate value is significantly different from:	⁰ 1993	² 1995	⁴ 1997	⁶ 1999	⁸ 2001	¹⁰ 2003	¹² 2005
		¹ 1994	³ 1996	⁵ 1998	⁷ 2000	⁹ 2002	¹¹ 2004	¹³ 2006

* A similar question was asked prior to 2005, but due to changes in the structure and phrasing of the question, the two are not directly comparable.

Table IX-1 (cont'd.): Percent Satisfied for All Satisfaction Items, 1993 and 2003-2007

Item Number	Satisfaction Item	1993	2003	2004	2005	2006	2007	
	<i>Planning and Development</i>							
LAND	Planning and Land Use	53.9	53.2 ³	49.8 ^{2, 3, 5, 6, 7}	44.8 ^{0, 1, 2, 3, 4, 5, 6, 7, 8, 9, 10, 11}	44.9 ^{0, 1, 2, 3, 4, 5, 6, 7, 8, 9, 10, 11}	47.5 ^{0, 2, 3, 5, 6, 7, 8, 9, 10}	
GROWTHC	Growth in County	—	49.5 ⁸	48.7 ^{8, 9}	47.2 ^{8, 9}	44.5 ^{8, 9, 10, 11}	44.0 ^{8, 9, 10, 11}	
INPUTDEV	Citizen Input Opportunity re: Development	—	69.2 ⁹	57.4 ^{3, 4, 5, 6, 7, 8, 10}	66.8 ^{9, 11}	68.5 ^{9, 11}	66.6 ¹¹	
ENVRDEVA	Efforts to Protect Environment	—	73.2	—	71.0	—	73.6 ⁸	
SPCEDEVA	Efforts to Preserve Open Space	—	58.3	—	45.1 ^{3, 4, 5, 6, 7, 8, 10}	—	51.5 ^{5, 6, 7, 10, 12}	
HISTORIC	Historic Preservation Efforts	—	—	—	81.2	—	88.4 ¹²	
ROADDEVA	Coordination of Development with Road Systems	—	42.8	—	34.9 ^{8, 10}	—	35.5 ^{8, 10}	
SVEDEVA	Coordination of Development with Community Facilities	—	79.8	—	80.1 ^{3, 6, 7}	—	73.7 ^{3, 4, 5, 6, 7, 8, 10, 12}	
VISDEV	Appearance of New Development	—	80.0 ^{3, 6, 7, 9}	81.9 ^{3, 7}	80.8 ^{3, 6, 7}	82.2 ^{3, 7}	78.5 ^{3, 6, 7, 9, 13}	
NEIGHBOR	Prevent Neighborhood Deterioration	67.8	67.0 ^{2, 7, 8}	71.9 ¹⁰	70.8 ¹⁰	68.7 ⁸	66.9 ^{2, 5, 7, 11}	
TRASHC	Appearance of Trash Along Roads & in Neighborhoods	—	82.5 ⁸	—	81.7	—	78.1 ^{10, 12}	
SIGNSC	Appearance of Illegal Signs Along Major Roads	—	55.2	—	62.9 ^{8, 10}	—	49.2 ^{8, 10, 12}	
BUILDNGC	Appearance of Deteriorated Buildings	—	80.4	—	81.4 ⁸	—	74.1 ^{10, 12}	
JUNKC	Appearance of Junk Cars on Roads & in Neighborhoods	—	75.7	—	77.7	—	78.1	
NEWJOBS*	Attract New Jobs and Businesses	—	—	81.0	82.4	78.7	79.0 ^{0, 1, 2, 9, 10, 11}	
Footnotes indicate value is significantly different from:		⁰ 1993	² 1995	⁴ 1997	⁶ 1999	⁸ 2001	¹⁰ 2003	¹² 2005
		¹ 1994	³ 1996	⁵ 1998	⁷ 2000	⁹ 2002	¹¹ 2004	¹³ 2006

* This question was also asked prior to 2004, but due to the addition of a screener question in 2004, responses prior to 2004 are not directly comparable with those from 2004 and 2005. Only the responses of those that were asked the screener question in 2004 (approximately half of the respondents) are included in this comparison. The figure that appears in this table therefore differs from the one that appeared in the 2004 report, which was a composite of those that were asked the screener and those that were not.

Table IX-1 (cont'd.): Percent Satisfied for All Satisfaction Items, 1993 and 2003-2007

Item Number	Satisfaction Item	1993	2003	2004	2005	2006	2007	
	<i>Planning and Development (cont'd)</i>							
TRAVEL97	Getting around	—	52.5 ^{4, 5, 6, 7, 9}	45.7 ^{4, 5, 6, 7, 8, 9, 10}	38.1 ^{4, 5, 6, 7, 8, 9, 10, 11}	39.6 ^{4, 5, 6, 7, 8, 9, 10, 11}	46.9 ^{4, 5, 6, 7, 8, 9, 10, 12, 13}	
OUTSIDE C	Ease of Travel around Northern Virginia	—	33.1	—	24.5 ^{8, 10}		27.7 ^{8, 10}	
TRANSC2*	Public Transportation within Prince William County	—	—	—	66.4		57.0 ¹²	
NOVATRC2*	Public Transportation around Northern Virginia	—	—	—	67.4		65.0	
RECYCLE C	Recycling Services	—	86.9	—	89.0		88.3	
LFILLSAT	Landfill	91.7	97.0 ^{0, 3, 4, 5, 6}	95.9 ^{0, 4, 5, 7}	98.8 ^{0, 1, 3, 4, 5, 6, 8, 9, 10, 11}	98.3 ^{0, 1, 3, 4, 5, 6, 9, 11}	96.0 ^{4, 5, 12, 13}	
	<i>Government</i>							
EFFNEFF	County Provides Efficient and Effective Service in General	—	89.1 ^{6, 8}	84.6 ^{4, 5, 7, 10}	85.3 ^{4, 5, 7, 10}	84.4 ^{4, 5, 7, 10}	85.6 ^{4, 5, 7, 10}	
VALUE	Value for Tax Dollar	65.5	82.7 ^{0, 1, 2, 3, 4, 6, 9}	75.8 ^{0, 1, 5, 8, 10}	79.2 ^{0, 1, 2, 3, 10}	76.5 ^{0, 1, 10}	80.2 ^{0, 1, 2, 13}	
Footnotes indicate value is significantly different from:		⁰ 1993	² 1995	⁴ 1997	⁶ 1999	⁸ 2001	¹⁰ 2003	¹² 2005
		¹ 1994	³ 1996	⁵ 1998	⁷ 2000	⁹ 2002	¹¹ 2004	¹³ 2006

* A similar question was asked prior to 2005, but due to changes in the phrasing of the question, the two are not directly comparable.

Table IX-2: Ranked List of Satisfaction Items, 2007

Rank	Item Number	Satisfaction Item	Percent Satisfied
1	LIBRYSAT	Service from Library Staff	98.9%
2	RESCUE	Emergency Medical Rescue Services	98.5%
3	FIRE	Fire Fighting in Respondent's Area	98.4%
4	COURTSAT	Security in Courthouse	97.3%
5	LFILLSAT	Landfill	96.0%
6	VOTE	Convenient Ways to Register to Vote	94.9%
7	EMSATIS	Assistance from 9-1-1 Operator	94.6%
8	SHERIFFA	Sheriff's Office Performance	94.5%
9	LIBRARY	Library Services	94.4%
10	AMCRIME	Safety in Neighborhood in Daytime	94.3%
11	NET2	PWC Government Web Site	93.9%
12	PARK2	Park Authority	93.7%
13	CTYSERV2	Service Authority	93.3%
14	EMASSTB	Assistance on the Scene	92.6%
15	POLICE	Overall Performance of Police Dept.	92.3%
16	ATTITUT	Sheriff's Office Attitudes and Behaviors Toward Citizens	91.9%
17	PARK	Providing Park and Recreation Programs and Facilities	89.6%
18	CTYSAT97	Gen Satisfaction with County Services	89.5%
19	EMTIMEB	Time for Help to Arrive	89.3%
20	HISTORIC	County's Efforts in Historic Preservation	88.4%
21	RECYCLEC	Recycling Services	88.3%
22	ATTITUDE	Police Attitudes and Behaviors Towards Citizens	87.9%
23	PMCRIME	Safety in Neighborhood at Night	86.7%
24	EFFNEFF	Efficient and Effective Service	85.6%
25	HELPFULA	Helpfulness of Tax County employees	85.2%
26	ANIMALA	Animal Control	84.5%
27	SCHL4	School System Provides Efficient Service	84.4%
28	MOSCONT	Mosquito Control	84.1%
29	HLTHSAT	Health Department	83.9%
30	DRUGS	Reduce the Use of Illegal Drugs	83.2%
31	ELDERLY	Programs for Elderly Population	83.2%
32	TIMESATA	Timeliness of tax request	83.2%

Table IX-2 (cont'd.): Ranked List of Satisfaction Items, 2007

33	VALUE	Value for Tax Dollar	80.2%
34	HELPFUL2	Helpfulness of County Employees	79.8%
35	NEWJOBS	Attracting New Jobs to PWC	79.0%
36	GOVTSERV	Informing Citizens about Government	78.8%
37	VISDEV	Visual Appearance of New Development	78.5%
38	TRASHC	Appearance of Trash along Roadways & in Neighborhoods	78.1%
39	JUNKC	Appearance of Junk Cars	78.1%
40	BUILDNGC	Appearance of Deteriorated Buildings	74.1%
41	PROBLEMB	Providing Help to People with Emotional, Mental, or Alcohol and Drug Problems	73.9%
42	MENTALL	Mental Health Services Overall	73.9%
43	STRLTA	Street Lighting	73.8%
44	DSSSAT	Department of Social Services	73.8%
45	SVEDEVA	Coordination of Development with Community Facilities	73.7%
46	MENTEIS	Early Intervention Services	73.7%
47	ENVRDEVA	County's Efforts to Protect Environment	73.6%
48	MENTRET	Services to Mental Retardation	73.3%
49	NEIGHBOR	Preventing Neighborhood Deterioration	66.9%
50	INPUTDEV	Opportunities for Citizen Input	66.6%
51	NOVATRC2	Public Transportation in NoVA outside PWC	65.0%
52	MENTSUB	Services to Substance Abuse	63.7%
53	TRANSC2	Public Transportation in PWC	57.0%
54	SPCEDEVA	County's Efforts to Preserve Open Space	51.5%
55	SIGNSC	Appearance of Illegal Signs along Major Roads	49.2%
56	LAND	Land Use Planning and Development	47.5%
57	TRAVEL97	Ease of Travel in PWC	46.9%
58	GROWTHC	Rate of PWC Growth	44.0%
59	ROADDEVA	Coordination of Development with Road Systems	35.5%
60	OUTSIDEC	Ease of Travel around NoVA outside PWC	27.7%

Table IX-3: List of Satisfaction Items Ranked by Visibility, 2007

Rank	Item Number	Satisfaction Item	Visibility Score	Percent Satisfied
1	LIBRYSAT	Service from Library Staff	99.48%	98.90%
2	PARK2	Park Authority	99.20%	93.70%
3	HLTHSAT	Health Department	99.14%	83.90%
4	TRAVEL97	Ease of Travel in PWC	99.01%	46.90%
5	TRASHC	Appearance of Trash along Roadways & in Neighborhoods	98.62%	78.10%
6	COURTSAT	Security in Courthouse	97.86%	97.30%
7	AMCRIME	Safety in Neighborhood in Daytime	97.42%	94.30%
8	PMCRIME	Safety in Neighborhood at Night	96.53%	86.70%
9	OUTSIDEC	Ease of Travel around NoVA outside PWC	95.89%	27.70%
10	CTYSAT97	Gen Satisfaction with County Services	95.85%	89.50%
11	VISDEV	Visual Appearance of New Development	95.58%	78.50%
12	SIGNSC	Appearance of Illegal Signs along Major Roads	95.32%	49.20%
13	VALUE	Value for Tax Dollar	95.13%	80.20%
14	GROWTHC	Rate of PWC Growth	93.71%	44.00%
15	JUNKC	Appearance of Junk Cars	93.22%	78.10%
16	POLICE	Overall Performance of Police Dept.	93.12%	92.30%
17	GOVTSERV	Informing Citizens about Government	93.12%	78.80%
18	BUILDNGC	Appearance of Deteriorated Buildings	91.55%	74.10%
19	FIRE	Fire Fighting in Respondent's Area	91.26%	98.40%
20	EFFNEFF	Efficient and Effective Service	91.00%	85.60%
21	LAND	Land Use Planning and Development	89.79%	47.50%
22	RECYCLEC	Recycling Services	88.49%	88.30%
23	STRLTA	Street Lighting	88.27%	73.80%
24	MOSCONT	Mosquito Control	87.26%	84.10%
25	ROADDEVA	Coordination of Development with Road Systems	85.99%	35.50%
26	SVEDEVA	Coordination of Development with Community Facilities	85.70%	73.70%
27	SPCEDEVA	County's Efforts to Preserve Open Space	85.11%	51.50%
28	VOTE	Convenient Ways to Register to Vote	83.44%	94.90%
29	RESCUE	Emergency Medical Rescue Services	83.18%	98.50%
30	ATTITUDE	Police Attitudes and Behaviors Towards Citizens	82.73%	87.90%
31	SCHL4	School System Provides Efficient Service	81.62%	84.40%

Table IX-3 (cont'd.): Ranked List of Satisfaction Items by Visibility, 2007

32	NEIGHBOR	Preventing Neighborhood Deterioration	78.88%	66.90%
33	ENVRDEVA	County's Efforts to Protect Environment	72.29%	73.60%
34	HISTORIC	County's Efforts in Historic Preservation	71.87%	88.40%
35	LIBRARY	Library Services	69.20%	94.40%
36	ANIMALA	Animal Control	65.79%	84.50%
37	DRUGS	Reduce the Use of Illegal Drugs	65.13%	83.20%
38	NET2	PWC Government Web Site	62.30%	93.90%
39	INPUTDEV	Opportunities for Citizen Input	61.17%	66.60%
40	NOVATRC2	Public Transportation in NoVA outside PWC	59.06%	65.00%
41	CTYSERV2	Service Authority	57.20%	93.30%
42	TRANSC2	Public Transportation in PWC	48.83%	57.00%
43	PARK	Providing Park and Recreation Programs and Facilities	48.70%	89.60%
44	LFILLSAT	Landfill	47.00%	96.00%
45	HELPFUL2	Helpfulness of County Employees	42.60%	79.80%
46	ELDERLY	Programs for Elderly Population	42.39%	83.20%
47	HELPFULA	Helpfulness of Tax County employees	35.80%	85.20%
48	TIMESATA	Timeliness of tax request	35.80%	83.20%
49	PROBLEMB	Providing Help to People with Emotional, Mental, or Alcohol and Drug Problems	33.74%	73.90%
50	NEWJOBS	Attracting New Jobs to PWC	28.00%	79.00%
51	SHERIFFA	Sheriff's office Performance	22.60%	94.50%
52	ATTITUT	Sheriff's office Attitudes and Behaviors Toward Citizens	22.60%	91.90%
53	EMSATIS	Assistance from 9-1-1 Operator	20.20%	94.60%
54	EMTIMEB	Time for Help to Arrive	20.20%	89.30%
55	EMASSTB	Assistance on the Scene	20.20%	92.60%
56	DSSSAT	Department of Social Services	19.50%	73.80%
57	MENTRET	Services to Mental Retardation	11.40%	73.30%
58	MENTALL	Mental Health Services Overall	11.40%	73.90%
59	MENTEIS	Early Intervention Services	11.40%	73.70%
60	MENTSUB	Services to Substance Abuse	11.40%	63.70%

Table IX-4: List of Services in Satisfaction/Visibility Categories, 2007

High Satisfaction/High Visibility	
<i>Question Name</i>	<i>Service</i>
rescue	Emergency Medical Rescue Services
fire	Fire Fighting in R's Area
librysat	Service from Library Staff
courtsat	Security in Courthouse
vote	Convenient Ways to Register to Vote
amcrime	Safety in Neighborhood in Daytime
park2	Park Authority
schl4	School System Provides Efficient Service
moscont	Mosquito Control
hlthsat	Health Department
police	Overall Performance of Police Dept.
ctysat97	Gen Satisfaction with County Services
recyclec	Recycling Services
attitude	Police Attitudes and Behaviors Towards Citizens
effneff	Efficient and Effective Service
pmcrime	Safety in Neighborhood at Night

High Satisfaction/Medium Visibility	
<i>Question Name</i>	<i>Service</i>
lfillsat	Landfill
helpfula	Helpfulness of tax County employees
timesata	Timeliness of Tax request
elderly	Programs for Elderly Population
park	Providing Park and Recreation Programs
ctyserv2	Service Authority
net2	PWC Government Web Site
library	Library Services
historic	County's Efforts in Historic Preservation
animala	Animal Control
drugs	Reduce the Use of Illegal Drugs


High Satisfaction/Low Visibility	
<i>Question Name</i>	<i>Service</i>
emsatis	Assistance from 9-1-1 Operator
sheriffa	Sheriff's office Performance
emasstb	Assistance on the Scene
attitut	Sheriff's Office Attitudes and Behaviors Toward Citizens
emtimeb	Time for Help to Arrive

Low to Moderate Satisfaction/High Visibility	
<i>Question Name</i>	<i>Service</i>
value	Value for Tax Dollar
trashc	Appearance of Trash along Roadways & in Neighborhoods
govtserv	Informing Citizens about Government
junkc	Appearance of Junk Cars
visdev	Visual Appearance of New Development
strlta	Street Lighting
svedeva	Coordination of Development with Community Facilities
buildingc	Appearance of Deteriorated Buildings
neighbor	Preventing Neighborhood Deterioration
spcedeva	County's Efforts to Preserve Open Space
signsc	Appearance of Illegal Signs along Major Roads
land	Land Use Planning and Development
growthc	Rate of PWC Growth
travel97	Ease of Travel in PWC
roaddeva	Coordination of Development with Road Systems
outsidc	Ease of Travel around NoVA outside PWC

Low to Moderate Satisfaction/Medium Visibility	
<i>Question Name</i>	<i>Service</i>
problemb	Help to People with Emotional Problems
helpful2	Helpfulness of County Employees
transc2	Public Transportation in PWC
novatrc2	Public Transportation in NoVa outside PWC
inputdev	Opportunities for Citizen Input
envrdeva	County's Efforts to Protect Environment

Low to Moderate Satisfaction/Low Visibility	
<i>Question Name</i>	<i>Service</i>
mentall	Mental Health Services Overall
mentret	Services to Mental Retardation
menteis	Early Intervention Services
mentsub	Services to Substance Abuse
dsstt	Department of Social Services
newjobs	Attracting New Jobs to PWC

Figure IX-1: Satisfaction by Visibility, 2007



**Appendix A:
Questionnaire**

PRINCE WILLIAM SURVEY QUESTIONNAIRE (2007)¹

{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 ANSWERING 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}

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: ADGO}

First, I need to select the right person in your household to complete the interview with.

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

¹ 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: ADCOME}

If R is not resident or adult in INTRO2, 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: HOWMANY}

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

If there is only 1 person in the household, then skip to A1GO
If there are 2 persons in the household, then 50% skip to A1GO and the other 50% go on to the next question.
If there are 3 persons in the household, then 33% skip to A1GO and the other 67% go on to the next question.
If there are 4 persons in the household, then 25% skip to A1GO 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 who has had the most recent birthday among these adults? [IF NECESSARY SAY: I don't mean the youngest person in your house; I mean the last one to have had a birthday according to the calendar.]

- 1 R1 Says YES, Knows other adult has most recent birthday
- 2 R1 Doesn't know
- 8 REFUSED TO SAY WHO HAD LAST BIRTHDAY – TERMINATES
- 9 R1 REFUSES TO CONTINUE

If answer = 1 then skip to R2COME

If answer = 2 then go on to the next question

If answer = 8 or 9 then 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
- 8 R1 DOESN'T KNOW
- 9 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, which should take about 15 minutes. 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 R1 READY, PROCEED
- 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, PROCEED
- 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, which should take about 15 minutes. 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, PROCEED
- 2 R2 CALLBACK [GET NAME OF R2 FOR CALLBACK MESSAGE LINE]
- 3 R2 REFUSES

{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 | 22888 OTHER |
| 20137 | 22125 | 22999 DON'T KNOW/REFUSED |

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

{Q: INTRSCN}

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: 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/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?

- | | |
|-------------------------------|----------------------------------|
| 01 MANASSAS | 09 ALEXANDRIA |
| 02 MANASSAS PARK | 10 RICHMOND CITY OR AREA |
| 03 STAFFORD COUNTY | 11 ELSEWHERE IN VIRGINIA |
| 04 FREDRICKSBURG/SPOTSYLVANIA | 12 WASHINGTON, D.C. |
| 05 FAUQUIER COUNTY/WARRENTON | 13 MARYLAND |
| 06 LOUDOUN COUNTY | 14 ANOTHER LOCATION [SPECIFY...] |
| 07 FAIRFAX/FALLS CHURCH | 15 LIVES ALL OVER [VOLUNTEERED] |
| 08 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/NO ANSWER

{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, or
- 5 Some other kind of structure? [SPECIFY:]
- 8 DON'T KNOW/NO ANSWER

{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
- 99 REFUSED

{Q: HOPE1}

ASK OF 50% OF RESPONDENTS

What the one thing about Prince William County you hope is different in 20 to 25 years?

[OPEN END]

{Q: HOPE2}

ASK OF 50% OF RESPONDENTS

What's the one thing you hope stays the same in Prince William County in 20 to 25 years?

[OPEN END]

{Q: GOALS00}

Over the next year, Prince William County will be updating its strategic plan. We'd like your help in deciding which goals should be most important for the plan.

Now I'm going to read a list of things that we might plan for to make Prince William County a better place to live. After I read each one, please tell me how important you think it is as a goal that we should plan for in Prince William County.

EVERY RESPONDENT IS RANDOMLY ASKED 12 OF 24 GOALS.

{Q: GOALS01}

IF NECESSARY: [How important is _____ as a goal we should plan for in Prince William County: very important, somewhat important, or not that important?]

"Expanding services and facilities for the homeless"

[READ AS NECESSARY]

- 1 VERY IMPORTANT
- 2 SOMEWHAT IMPORTANT
- 3 NOT THAT IMPORTANT
- 4 UNABLE TO RATE OR DON'T KNOW

{Q: GOALS02}

IF NECESSARY: [How important is _____ as a goal we should plan for in Prince William County: very important, somewhat important, or not that important?]

"Making housing more affordable for all residents"

[READ AS NECESSARY]

- 1 VERY IMPORTANT
- 2 SOMEWHAT IMPORTANT
- 3 NOT THAT IMPORTANT
- 4 UNABLE TO RATE OR DON'T KNOW

{Q: GOALS03}

"Making the County safe from crime"

{Q: GOALS04}

"Expanding regional cooperation"

[DEFINITION: REGIONAL COOPERATION IS GOVERNMENT AND AGENCIES OF DIFFERENT CITIES AND COUNTIES WORKING TOGETHER]

{Q: GOALS05}

"Maintaining or improving the County's environmental quality"

{Q: GOALS06}

"Providing better public transportation"

{Q: GOALS07}

"Providing job training and placement programs"

{Q: GOALS08}

"Encouraging racial and cultural diversity"

{Q: GOALS09}

"Expanding treatment programs for people who abuse drugs or alcohol"

{Q: GOALS10}

"Promoting economic development"

{Q: GOALS11}

"Bringing more, higher-paying jobs to the County"

{Q: GOALS12}

"Improving the quality of public education"

- "Addressing new residential development" {Q: GOALS13}
- "Emphasizing prevention and self-sufficiency in human services programs" {Q: GOALS14}
- "Improving the County's road network" {Q: GOALS15}
- "Relying more on fees to pay for County services"
[DEFINITION: "That is, fees paid by those who use the services."] {Q: GOALS16}
- "Making sure that tax rates don't go up." {Q: GOALS17}
- "Meeting the basic food, shelter and health needs of low income residents" {Q: GOALS18}
- "Improving and expanding parks and recreation facilities" {Q: GOALS19}
- "Expanding child care services" {Q: GOALS20}
- "Increasing use of technology to make it more convenient for you
to get services and information from the County government" {Q: GOALS21}
- "Preventing fire and medical emergencies" {Q: GOALS22}
- "Expanding the County's ability to generate revenue"
[DEFINITION: "Such as improving the tax base, higher taxes, different taxes"] {Q: GOALS23}
- "Expanding services for the elderly" {Q: GOALS24}

{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 UNABLE TO RATE/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 75% 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 UNABLE TO RATE/DON'T KNOW
- 9 REFUSED

{Q: GOVTSERV}

ASK OF 75% OF RESPONDENTS

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

- 1 Very satisfied
- 2 Somewhat satisfied
- 3 Somewhat dissatisfied
- 4 Very dissatisfied
- 8 UNABLE TO RATE/DON'T KNOW
- 9 REFUSED

{Q: INFOSORC}

ASK OF 75% OF RESPONDENTS

Where do you generally get your information about what is going on in Prince William County and its government?

- [CHECK ALL THAT APPLY]
- 1 County web site
 - 2 PWC officials and staff
 - 3 Potomac News
 - 4 Washington Post
 - 5 TV news
 - 6 Radio news
 - 7 Automated telephone system (this system is PWC INFO)
 - 8 Newsletter (Infocus)
 - 9 Cable Channel 23
 - 10 Other SPECIFY _____
 - 98 DON'T KNOW
 - 99 REFUSED

{Q: ANIMALA}

ASK OF 75% OF RESPONDENTS

How satisfied are you with the job the County is doing in animal control services, such as enforcing dog-and-cat ordinances and operating the Animal Shelter?

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

{Q: STRLTA}

ASK OF 75% 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 UNABLE TO RATE/DON'T KNOW
- 9 REFUSED

{Q: FIRE}

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 UNABLE TO RATE/DON'T KNOW
- 9 REFUSED

{Q: RESCUE}

ASK OF 75% 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 UNABLE TO RATE/DON'T KNOW
- 9 REFUSED

{Q: MOSCONT}

How satisfied are you with the job the County is doing in controlling mosquitoes?

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

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 UNABLE TO RATE/DON'T KNOW
- 9 REFUSED

{Q: PMCRIME}

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 UNABLE TO RATE/DON'T KNOW
- 9 REFUSED

{Q: ATTITUDE}

ASK OF 75% OF RESPONDENTS

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

- 1 Very satisfied
- 2 Somewhat satisfied
- 3 Somewhat dissatisfied
- 4 Very dissatisfied
- 8 UNABLE TO RATE/DON'T KNOW
- 9 REFUSED

{Q: DRUGS}

ASK OF 75% 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 UNABLE TO RATE/DON'T KNOW
- 9 REFUSED

{Q: POLICE}

ASK OF 75% 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 UNABLE TO RATE/DON'T KNOW
- 9 REFUSED

{Q: CTYSHERF}

Are you familiar enough with the services of the Prince William Sheriff's Office to tell us how satisfied you are with them?

- 1 Yes - familiar enough to rate
- 2 No - not familiar (SKIP TO COURT)
- 8 DON'T KNOW/NOT SURE (SKIP TO COURT)
- 9 REFUSED (SKIP TO COURT)

{Q: ATTITUT}

If YES to CTYSHERF, ASK

How satisfied are you with the Sheriff's Office attitudes and behaviors toward citizens?

- 1 Very satisfied
- 2 Somewhat satisfied
- 3 Somewhat dissatisfied
- 4 Very dissatisfied
- 8 UNABLE TO RATE/DON'T KNOW
- 9 REFUSED

{Q: SHERIFFA}

If YES to CTYSHERF, ASK

How satisfied are you with the overall performance of the Sheriff's Office?

- 1 Very satisfied
- 2 Somewhat satisfied
- 3 Somewhat dissatisfied
- 4 Very dissatisfied
- 8 UNABLE TO RATE/DON'T KNOW
- 9 REFUSED

{Q: COURT}

In the past 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 VISITED
- 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 UNABLE TO RATE/DON'T KNOW
- 9 REFUSED

{Q: EMERG911}

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

- 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]

{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

{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
- 3 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 UNABLE TO RATE/DON'T KNOW
- 9 REFUSED

{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 UNABLE TO RATE/DON'T KNOW
- 9 REFUSED

{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 UNABLE TO RATE/DON'T KNOW
- 9 REFUSED

{Q: CPR97}

ASK OF 61% 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}

ASK OF 50% OF RESPONDENTS

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: SHELTER2}

ASK OF 50% OF RESPONDENTS

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 and the electrical power lines to your home are not working, 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: 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 UNABLE TO RATE/DON'T KNOW
- 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 UNABLE TO RATE/DON'T KNOW
- 9 REFUSED

{Q: ELDERLY}

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

- 1 Very satisfied
- 2 Somewhat satisfied
- 3 Somewhat dissatisfied
- 4 Very dissatisfied
- 8 UNABLE TO RATE/DON'T KNOW
- 9 REFUSED

{Q: PROBLEMB}

ASK OF 75% OF RESPONDENTS

How satisfied are you with the job the County is doing in providing help to people with emotional problems, mental problems, or alcohol and drug problems?

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

{Q: LIBRY12}

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
- 5 R HAD NO CONTACT WITH STAFF
- 8 UNABLE TO RATE/DON'T KNOW
- 9 REFUSED

{Q: DEPTSS}

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 UNABLE TO RATE/DON'T KNOW
- 9 REFUSED

{Q: HLTHDEPT}

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 UNABLE TO RATE/DON'T KNOW
- 9 REFUSED

{Q: MENTAL}

Are you familiar with the services of the Community Service Board (CSB)? They provide mental health, mental retardation, and substance abuse services to the local community.

- 1 YES
- 2 NOT SURE/DON'T KNOW
- 3 NO—NOT FAMILIAR

{Q: MENTRET}

If YES to MENTAL, ASK

How satisfied are you with their services to people with mental retardation?

- 1 Very satisfied
- 2 Somewhat satisfied
- 3 Somewhat dissatisfied
- 4 Very dissatisfied
- 8 UNABLE TO RATE/DON'T KNOW
- 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 UNABLE TO RATE/DON'T KNOW
- 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 UNABLE TO RATE/DON'T KNOW
- 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 UNABLE TO RATE/DON'T KNOW
- 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 UNABLE TO RATE/DON'T KNOW
- 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 DK/REFUSED/NA

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

{Q: CONTACTA}

Ask if TAXESA = 1 (YES)

What was the specific reason you contacted the County?

[OPEN END]

{Q: HOWCONA}

Ask if TAXESA = 1 (YES)

Did you contact the County:

[MULTIPLE RESPONSE; 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 UNABLE TO RATE/DON'T KNOW
- 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 UNABLE TO RATE/DON'T KNOW
- 9 REFUSED

{Q: NET1}

Have you ever used the Prince William County government internet web site?
[DEFINITION: COUNTY WEBSITE IS LOCATED AT
WWW.CO.PRINCEWILLIAM.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 Very dissatisfied
- 8 DON'T KNOW
- 9 REFUSED

{Q: LAND1/LAND2}

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

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?

- 1 Very satisfied,
- 2 Somewhat satisfied,
- 3 Somewhat dissatisfied
- 4 Very dissatisfied
- 8 DON'T KNOW
- 9 REFUSED

{Q: RATEJOBS}

Are you familiar enough with 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
- 9 REFUSED

{Q: NEIGHBOR}

How satisfied are you with the job the County is doing in preventing 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
- 9 REFUSED

{Q: RECYCLEC}

ASK OF 20% OF RESPONDENTS

How satisfied are you with the recycling services in the County?

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

{Q: LANDFILL}

ASK OF 75% 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?

- 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
- 9 REFUSED

{Q: TRAVEL97}

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
- 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}

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 UNABLE TO RATE/DON'T KNOW
- 9 REFUSED

{Q: TRANSC2}

How satisfied are you with public transportation provided to Prince William County residents for destinations within the Prince William area?

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

{Q: MORESAT}

IF DISSATISFIED WITH TRANSC2, ASK OF 100 RESPONDENTS

What would make you more satisfied with public transportation within Prince William County?

- 1 SERVICE TO OR FROM PLACES WHERE PUBLIC TRANSPORTATION DOESN'T GO NOW
- 2 LONGER HOURS OR SERVICE ON WEEKENDS
- 3 MORE FREQUENT SERVICE ON EXISTING ROUTES
- 4 OTHER [SPECIFY...]
- 8 DON'T KNOW
- 9 REFUSED

{Q: WHYSAT}

IF VERY SATISFIED WITH TRANSC2, ASK OF 50 RESPONDENTS

What aspects of Prince William County's public transportation contribute to your satisfaction?

[OPEN END]

{Q: NOVATRC2}

How satisfied are you with public transportation provided to Prince William County residents for destinations elsewhere in Northern Virginia and Washington DC?

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

{Q: GROWTHC}

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
- 9 REFUSED

{Q: ROADDEVA}

ASK OF 65% OF RESPONDENTS

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

[READ AS NECESSARY]

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

{Q: SVEDEVA}

How satisfied are you with the way that residential and business development is coordinated with the locations of community facilities, such as, police and fire stations, libraries, schools, and parks?

[READ AS NECESSARY]

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

{Q: ENVRDEVA}

ASK OF 65% OF RESPONDENTS

How satisfied are you with the County's efforts to protect the environment?

[READ AS NECESSARY]

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

{Q: SPCEDEVA}

ASK OF 65% OF RESPONDENTS

How satisfied are you with the County's efforts to preserve open space, including agricultural and forested lands?

[READ AS NECESSARY]

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

{Q: HISTORIC}

ASK OF 65% OF RESPONDENTS

How satisfied are you with the County's efforts in historic preservation?

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

{Q: INPUTDEV}

ASK OF 75% 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
- 9 REFUSED

{Q: VISDEV}

ASK OF 75% 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
- 9 REFUSED

{Q: TRASHC}

How satisfied are you with the appearance of the County in regards to the amount of trash, debris, and litter along roadways and in neighborhoods?

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

{Q: SIGNSC}

How satisfied are you with the appearance of the County in regards to the number of illegal signs (such as Popsicle signs, election signs, weight loss ads, etc) along major roads?

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

{Q: BUILDNGC}

How satisfied are you with the appearance of the County in regards to deteriorated buildings and other structures?

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

{Q: JUNKC}

How satisfied are you with the appearance of the County in regards to the number of junk cars along roadways and in neighborhoods?

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

{Q: VIEW}

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]
- 8 DON'T KNOW/NO OPINION

{Q: VALUE}

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
- 9 REFUSED

{Q: EFFNEFF}

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
- 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}

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 some questions 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 and 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}

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
- 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}

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.

- 1 Yes – has used
- 2 No – has not
- 3 CAN'T RECALL/DON'T KNOW

{Q: PARK1}

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
- 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}

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
- 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}

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: YRBORN}

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: 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 CITY OR AREA |
| 13 MANASSAS PARK | 24 ELSEWHERE IN VIRGINIA |
| 14 STAFFORD COUNTY | 25 WASHINGTON, D.C. |
| 15 FREDRICKSBURG/SPOTSYLVANIA | 26 MARYLAND |
| 16 FAUQUIER COUNTY/WARRENTON | 27 ANOTHER LOCATION [SPECIFY...] |
| 17 LOUDOUN COUNTY | 28 WORKS ALL OVER [VOLUNTEERED] |
| 18 FAIRFAX COUNTY | 29 DON'T KNOW/NO ANSWER |
| 19 FAIRFAX CITY | |
| 20 FALLS CHURCH CITY | |
| 21 ARLINGTON | |

{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
- 9 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

{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: PHONE1}

Our Center is doing some research on listed and unlisted telephone households. As far as you know, is the number I dialed listed in the current telephone book?

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

{Q: PHONE2}

If No to PHONE1, 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:]
- 9 DON'T KNOW/REFUSED

{Q: OUTRO}

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.

{Q: GENDER}

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

- 1 Male
- 2 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 9th grade
- 2 9th-12th, 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: MILTRY}

Are you currently serving, or have you ever served in the U.S. military, on either active duty or in the reserves?

- 1 Yes – Current active duty
- 2 Yes – Current reserve duty
- 3 Yes – Past military service
- 4 No – never in military
- 8 DON'T KNOW/NO ANSWER

{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 35 thousand ? [\$15,000 -- \$34,999]
- 3 Thirty-five to 50 thousand ? [\$35,000 -- \$49,999]
- 4 Fifty to 75 thousand ? [\$50,000 -- \$74,999]
- 5 Seventy-five to 100 thousand ? [\$75,000 -- \$99,999]
- 6 One hundred to 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 White
- 2 [READ ONE:] African American / Black
- 3 Asian [INCLUDING SOUTH ASIAN]
- 4 American Indian [NATIVE AMERICAN; INCLUDES ESKIMO, ALEUT]
- 5 Pacific Islander
- 6 OTHER [SPECIFY]
- 9 REFUSED / NO ANSWER

[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 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.

INTERVIEWERS: HANG UP THE PHONE
IF YOU ARE READY TO MOVE ON, PRESS "1" TO CONTINUE
THE RESULTS OF THIS CALL WILL NOT BE SAVED UNTIL YOU
COMPLETE THE REMAINING QUESTIONS

{Q: INTCOMM}

INTERVIEWERS: PLEASE TYPE IN HERE ANY SPECIAL COMMENTS BY THE RESPONDENT THAT YOU FEEL SHOULD BE RECORDED, OR ANY SPECIAL PROBLEMS INVOLVED IN THIS PARTICULAR INTERVIEW.

IF THERE IS NOTHING ESSENTIAL TO REPORT, JUST PRESS RETURN...

INTERVIEWERS:

ENTER YOUR INTERVIEWER NUMBER (ASSIGNED BY YOUR SUPERVISOR)

ENTER INTERVIEWER NUMBER HERE: _____

CHECK YOUR TYPING CAREFULLY!!

THEN: PRESS "ENTER" TO COMPLETE THE INTERVIEW. THE SYSTEM WILL RECORD THE DATA AND THE TIMING CLOCK FOR THE INTERVIEW WILL BE RESET TO ZERO.

**Appendix B:
Survey and Sampling Methodology**

SURVEY AND SAMPLING METHODOLOGY

The 2007 Prince William County Citizen Satisfaction Survey was conducted by the Center for Survey Research (CSR) using a Computer-Assisted Telephone Interviewing (CATI) system, employing random-digit dialing as the primary sampling method. A discussion of the general methodology appears in Chapter 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

As with previous years, CSR employed 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. This year marks the fifth use of over-sampling 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. Geographic weighting was used to generalize results to the entire county without over-representing any particular district. Both an RDD sample of 11,000 telephone numbers (87% of the total) randomly generated from five-digit call groups known to be in operation in Prince William County and a second, supplementary sample of 1,715 listed telephone numbers (13%) were purchased from Survey Sampling, Inc. of Fairfield, CT, a commercial sampling company that uses state-of-the-art methodologies. This directory-listed supplement included the Forest Park area (22025, 22026 and 22172), the Potomac area (22191), and Hoadly (20112). Table B-1 below illustrates how interviews from the listed sample were used to supplement RDD responses in these three areas.

Table B-1 Respondents by Sample Type and Area, 2007

2007 AREA	Sample Type		Total
	Random Digit Dialing	Directory Listed	
Battlefield	196	--	196
Broad Run	174	1	175
Hoadly	78	98	176
Old Bridge	176	2	178
Dale	212	--	212
Potomac	107	58	165
Forest Park	<u>148</u>	<u>37</u>	<u>185</u>
Total	1,091	196	1,287

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 second 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.¹

Questionnaire

This is the seventh 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 2007 survey includes the core questions, plus many of the questions designated group A. To allow reliable comparisons among the results of the fifteen surveys, the wording of most of the questions was left identical to that used in the previous fourteen surveys.

The 2007 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.

The questionnaire was pre-tested April 12 through April 17, 2007. The pre-test resulted in 40 completed interviews with households in Prince William County. Based on the pre-test, we refined our training procedures, evaluated the average interview length, adjusted the question-rationing percentages, and corrected minor errors in the CATI program for production interviews.

This year for the second 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 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.

The Spanish language survey tended to run longer than the English language version. For production interviewing the average time on the phone from greeting to goodbye was 21.75 minutes in English and 23.65 minutes in Spanish. 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.

¹Programmed 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.

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 May 20 through July 1, 2007. 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, and some had prior experience with the Prince William County studies specifically. Each phone number was given from 8 to 12 call attempts before it was treated as a "no answer" or "busy" number. Residential 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 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.

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.

A total of 12,715 phone numbers were attempted in the course of the survey. The final disposition of each of the attempted phone numbers is shown in Appendix Table B-6, the Sample Disposition Report. 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.² 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. CSR completed a total of 1264 interviews (including those completed in the conversion phase of calling), for an overall response rate of 18.5%.³ There were also 74 partial interviews of which 34 were sufficiently complete for inclusion in the study. However, 10 of those completions and 1 partial were later excluded because they were outside of the

² 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.

³ Calculated according to AAPOR suggested formula RR3, with $e1=.19$ and $e2=.93$. 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 RR4 response rate with partial interviews included was 20.4%.

target region and this left 1254 completed interviews and 33 partial surveys for use in the analysis. Of these interviews, 31 completions and one partial completion were conducted in Spanish. The interviews took an average of 20.15 minutes to complete once a qualified respondent was identified, with a median time of 18.78 minutes.⁴ The overall interview production rate (0.95 interviews per hour) is less than the 2006 survey.

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 many call attempts. An estimate of 17.6% for RR3 is based on the most conservative assumption (equivalent to the CASRO rate) that the percentage of residential households among unreachable numbers is the same as the percentage among those we reached, *i.e.*, 58.9%. 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 around 20% of no-answer numbers and that our true response rate (adjusted RR3) is closer to 18.5%. For the RDD portion of the sample, the estimated response rate is 19.8%.

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 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 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-2 shows the relationship between the Zip codes and the geographic areas through 2006.

⁴ 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 21.97 minutes, with a median of 20.53 minutes.

Table B-2 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 survey 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-3 shows the relationship between these new areas and the Zip codes.

Table B-3 Zip Code by Area Distribution, 2007

2007 AREA	2007 Zip Codes
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

Tables B-4 and B-5 compare the sample distribution of the new 2007 seven area grouping with the prior eight area grouping (used from 2002-2006) by indicating how the Zip code distribution for the current 2007 sample responses falls into each.

Table B-4 Distribution of Current Responses into Former Regional Boundaries

2002-2006 Areas (8)	Population of Households, 2006		2007 Respondents Breakdown by 2006 Areas	
	(count)	(%)	(count)	(%)
Woodbridge/Dumfries	28,521	23.6%	350	27.2%
Dale City	22,167	18.4%	212	16.5%
Lake Ridge/Westridge/Occoquan	19,993	16.6%	178	13.8%
Sudley/Yorkshire	14,479	12.0%	93	7.2%
North County	5,682	4.7%	58	4.5%
Gainesville/Linton Hall	14,252	11.8%	136	10.6%
Brentsville	2,654	2.2%	32	2.5%
Mid County	12,872	10.7%	228	17.7%
Total	120,626	100.00%	1,287	100.00%

Table B-5 Distribution of Current Responses into New Regional Breakdown, and Weight Values

2007 Areas (7)	Population of Households, 2007		2007 Sample		Weight
	(count)	(%)	(count)	(%)	
Battlefield	29,222	23.3%	196	15.2%	1.532
Broad Run	16,142	12.9%	175	13.6%	0.948
Hoadly	7,540	6.0%	176	13.7%	0.440
Old Bridge	17,926	14.3%	178	13.8%	1.035
Dale	23,746	18.9%	212	16.5%	1.151
Potomac	18,593	14.8%	165	12.8%	1.158
Forest Park	12,117	9.7%	185	14.4%	0.673
Total	125,286	100.00%	1,287	100.00%	

Weighting

This year continues the practice begun four 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 three 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-5 above.⁵

⁵ This household population information by Zip code was provided by Prince William County and is based on Census 2006 Survey Area Demographics excluding Quantico base.

Sampling Error and Statistical Testing

While CSR completed a total of 1,264 interviews, for purposes of this survey only the 1,254 respondents who identified themselves as being in the correct geographic regions were used for analysis in addition to 33 partial surveys. Based on a sample of 1,287 respondents, the survey has a sampling error of plus or minus 2.8 percent.⁶ 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 ± 2.8 percentage points of what would have been obtained had every household in the County with a working landline 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 2007 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 do not take into account the “design effect” and do not measure sources of error, which can occur in any poll or survey, that are not related to sampling.

⁶ These estimates do not take into account the “design effect” that somewhat increases sampling variance due to the over-sampling of smaller districts.

Table B-6 Sample Disposition Report

PRINCE WILLIAM 2007 – COMBINED CALLING
 [dispositions arranged for calculation of AAPOR standard rates]

Code	Disposition	Total	Group	Group Total
1100	Complete	1,264	Complete Interview	1,264
1200	Partial	74	Partial Interview	74
2110	Eligible: Refusal	1,587		
2120	Eligible: Break-off	18	Refusal and break-off	1,605
2210	Eligible: Resp Never Available	757		
2221	Eligible: Ans Mach, No Message	2,065		
2222	Eligible: Ans Machine, Message	0	Non-contact	2,822
2310	Eligible: Dead	0		
2320	Eligible: Phys/Mentally Unable	29	Other	59
2330	Eligible: Language Unable	27		
2340	Eligible: Misc Unable	3	Unknown if household	938
3120	Busy	101		
3130	No Answer	660	Unknown if other	905
3140	Ans Mach (Don't Know if HU)	101		
3150	Technical Phone Problems	76	Ineligible Numbers	5,048
3210	HU, Unknown Eligible: NoScrn	904	Total Dialed Attempts	54,159
3220	HU, Unknown Eligible: Other	1		
4100	Out of Sample	245	<u>Results [AAPOR RATES]:</u>	
4200	Fax/Data Line	671	*(Estimated 1 = 0.187	
4310	Non-working Number	778	(Estimated 2 = 0.934	
4320	Disconnected Number	2,134	Response Rate 1 = 0.165	
4410	Number Changed	109	Response Rate 2 = 0.175	
4420	Cell Phone	2	*Response Rate 3 = 0.185	
4430	Call Forwarding	0	*Response Rate 4 = 0.204	
4510	Business/Government/Other Org	1,005	Response Rate 5 = 0.217	
4520	Institution	0	Response Rate 6 = 0.230	
4530	Group Quarter	5	Cooperation Rate 1 = 0.421	
4700	No Eligible Respondent	15	Cooperation Rate 2 = 0.446	
4800	Quota Filled	84	Cooperation Rate 3 = 0.429	
			Cooperation Rate 4 = 0.455	
	Total	12,715	Refusal Rate 1 = 0.209	
			*Refusal Rate 2 = 0.245	
			Refusal Rate 3 = 0.276	
			Contact Rate 1 = 0.392	
			*Contact Rate 2 = 0.439	
			Contact Rate 3 = 0.515	

**CSR adjusted rate for VA residency*

Appendix C: Demographics

newarea

		Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Valid	1 Battlefield	300	23.3	23.3	23.3
	2 Broad Run	166	12.9	12.9	36.2
	3 Hoadly	77	6.0	6.0	42.2
	4 Old Bridge	184	14.3	14.3	56.5
	5 Dale	244	19.0	19.0	75.5
	6 Potomac	191	14.8	14.8	90.3
	7 Forest Park	124	9.7	9.7	100.0
	Total	1287	100.0	100.0	

howlong

		Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Valid	1 Less than 1 year	52	4.0	4.0	4.0
	2 1 to 2 years	107	8.3	8.3	12.3
	3 3 to 5 years	247	19.2	19.2	31.6
	4 6 to 10 years	266	20.7	20.7	52.3
	5 11 to 19 years	223	17.3	17.3	69.6
	6 20 years or more	355	27.6	27.6	97.2
	7 All my life	36	2.8	2.8	100.0
	Total	1286	99.9	100.0	
Missing	8 Not sure/refused	1	.1		
Total		1287	100.0		

ownhome

		Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Valid	1 Owns	1093	84.9	85.3	85.3
	2 Rents	172	13.4	13.4	98.8
	3 Other	16	1.2	1.2	100.0
	Total	1281	99.5	100.0	
Missing	8 Don't know/No answer	6	.5		
Total		1287	100.0		

kindplce

		Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Valid	1 Single-family home	904	70.2	70.4	70.4
	2 Duplex/townhouse	244	19.0	19.0	89.4
	3 Apartment or condo	125	9.7	9.8	99.2
	4 Mobile home	5	.4	.4	99.6
	5 Some other kind of structure	5	.4	.4	100.0
	Total	1284	99.8	100.0	
Missing	8 Don't know/No answer	3	.2		
Total		1287	100.0		

prevres

		Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Valid	1 Manassas	11	.9	2.7	2.7
	2 Manassas Park	3	.3	.8	3.6
	3 Stafford County	4	.3	.9	4.5
	4				
	Fredericksburg/Spotsylvania	5	.4	1.2	5.7
	5 Fauquier County/Warrenton	6	.5	1.5	7.2
	6 Loudoun County	9	.7	2.3	9.5
	7 Fairfax County	118	9.2	28.8	38.3
	8 Fairfax City	14	1.1	3.3	41.7
	9 Falls Church	2	.1	.4	42.1
	10 Arlington	19	1.5	4.6	46.7
	11 Alexandria	30	2.4	7.4	54.1
	12 Richmond City or Area	3	.2	.7	54.8
	13 Elsewhere in VA	9	.7	2.3	57.0
	14 Washington D.C	3	.3	.8	57.8
	15 Maryland	15	1.2	3.7	61.5
	16 Another location	149	11.6	36.3	97.8
17 Lived all over	9	.7	2.2	100.0	
Total	410	31.9	100.0		
Missing	99 Don't know/No answer	4	.3		
	System	873	67.8		
	Total	877	68.1		
Total		1287	100.0		

kundr597

		Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Valid	1 Yes	173	13.4	34.5	34.5
	2 No	328	25.5	65.5	100.0
	Total	501	38.9	100.0	
Missing	9 Refused	1	.1		
	System	786	61.0		
	Total	786	61.1		
Total		1287	100.0		

k5to1297

		Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Valid	1 Yes	279	21.7	63.0	63.0
	2 No	164	12.7	37.0	100.0
	Total	443	34.4	100.0	
Missing	9 Refused	3	.2		
	System	842	65.4		
	Total	844	65.6		
Total		1287	100.0		

kovr1297

		Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Valid	1 Yes	219	17.1	62.8	62.8
	2 No	130	10.1	37.2	100.0
	Total	349	27.1	100.0	
Missing	9 Refused	1	.1		
	System	937	72.8		
	Total	938	72.9		
Total		1287	100.0		

sch11 R Has Children in PWC Schools

		Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Valid	1 Yes	132	10.3	86.1	86.1
	2 No	21	1.7	13.9	100.0
	Total	154	12.0	100.0	
Missing	System	1133	88.0		
Total		1287	100.0		

under18

		Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Valid	0	752	58.4	60.0	60.0
	1	201	15.6	16.0	76.0
	2	195	15.2	15.6	91.6
	3	76	5.9	6.1	97.7
	4	18	1.4	1.4	99.1
	5	6	.5	.5	99.5
	6	3	.3	.3	99.8
	7	2	.1	.1	99.9
	21	1	.1	.1	100.0
	Total	1253	97.4	100.0	
Missing	99 Don't know/Refused	4	.3		
	System	30	2.3		
	Total	34	2.6		
Total		1287	100.0		

under18_rec

		Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Valid	1 No children under 18	752	58.4	60.0	60.0
	2 Children under 18	501	39.0	40.0	100.0
	Total	1253	97.4	100.0	
Missing	System	34	2.6		
Total		1287	100.0		

older18

		Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Valid	1	4	.3	5.4	5.4
	2	57	4.4	68.0	73.4
	3	12	.9	14.7	88.0
	4	9	.7	11.2	99.2
	5	1	.1	.8	100.0
	Total	83	6.5	100.0	
Missing	99 Don't know/Refused	3	.2		
	System	1201	93.3		
	Total	1204	93.5		
Total		1287	100.0		

agecat5

		Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Valid	1 18-25	50	3.9	4.1	4.1
	2 26-37	180	14.0	14.9	19.0
	3 38-49	382	29.7	31.6	50.6
	4 50-64	398	30.9	32.9	83.5
	5 Over 64	200	15.5	16.5	100.0
	Total	1209	94.0	100.0	
Missing	System	78	6.0		
Total		1287	100.0		

work

		Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Valid	1 Working full time	773	60.0	61.6	61.6
	2 Working part time	82	6.4	6.6	68.2
	3 Looking for work	27	2.1	2.1	70.3
	4 Homemaker	100	7.8	8.0	78.3
	5 Retired	232	18.0	18.5	96.8
	6 Student	26	2.0	2.1	98.9
	7 Other	14	1.1	1.1	100.0
	Total	1254	97.4	100.0	
Missing	9 Don't know/Refused	3	.2		
	System	30	2.4		
	Total	33	2.6		
Total		1287	100.0		

income4

		Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Valid	1 Up to \$35k	108	8.4	10.5	10.5
	2 \$35k to \$50k	100	7.8	9.8	20.3
	3 \$50k ti \$75k	194	15.1	19.0	39.3
	4 Over \$75k	620	48.1	60.7	100.0
	Total	1021	79.3	100.0	
Missing	System	266	20.7		
Total		1287	100.0		

educ6

		Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Valid	1 Less than HS	49	3.8	3.9	3.9
	2 High School grad	226	17.6	18.2	22.2
	3 Some college	305	23.7	24.6	46.8
	4 4 year degree	358	27.8	28.9	75.7
	5 Grad work	266	20.6	21.4	97.1
	6 Adv Grad/PhD	36	2.8	2.9	100.0
	Total	1239	96.3	100.0	
Missing	System	48	3.7		
Total		1287	100.0		

jobcity

		Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Valid	1 Prince William County	261	20.3	30.7	30.7
	2 Manassas	27	2.1	3.1	33.8
	3 Manassas Park	2	.1	.2	34.0
	4 Stafford County	7	.5	.8	34.8
	5				
	Fredericksburg/ Spotsylvania	4	.3	.5	35.3
	6 Fauquier County/Warrenton	6	.5	.7	36.1
	7 Loudon County	28	2.2	3.3	39.4
	8 Fairfax County	209	16.3	24.6	63.9
	9 Fairfax City	20	1.5	2.3	66.2
	10 Falls Church	12	.9	1.4	67.6
	11 Arlington	49	3.8	5.7	73.4
	12 Alexandria	39	3.0	4.6	77.9
	13 Richmond City or area	2	.2	.2	78.2
	14 Elsewhere in VA	11	.9	1.3	79.5
	15 Washington, DC	114	8.9	13.4	92.9
	16 Maryland	17	1.3	2.0	94.8
	17 Another location (specify)	28	2.2	3.3	98.2
18 Works all over (vol)	15	1.2	1.8	100.0	
Total	851	66.1	100.0		
Missing	99 Don't know/No answer	4	.3		
	System	432	33.6		
	Total	436	33.9		
Total		1287	100.0		

marital

		Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Valid	1 Married	803	62.4	65.8	65.8
	2 Separated	35	2.8	2.9	68.7
	3 Divorced	158	12.3	12.9	81.6
	4 Widowed	91	7.1	7.5	89.1
	5 Never married	133	10.3	10.9	100.0
	Total	1221	94.9	100.0	
Missing	9 Refused	34	2.6		
	System	32	2.5		
	Total	66	5.1		
Total		1287	100.0		

race4

		Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Valid	1 White	900	69.9	74.6	74.6
	2 Black	192	14.9	15.9	90.5
	3 Asian	37	2.9	3.1	93.6
	4 Other	77	6.0	6.4	100.0
	Total	1206	93.7	100.0	
Missing	9	48	3.7		
	System	33	2.6		
	Total	81	6.3		
Total		1287	100.0		

hispanic

		Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Valid	1 Yes	101	7.8	8.2	8.2
	2 No	1134	88.1	91.8	100.0
	Total	1235	95.9	100.0	
Missing	9 Don't know/Refused	19	1.5		
	System	33	2.6		
	Total	52	4.1		
Total		1287	100.0		

miltry2

		Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Valid	1 Served	285	22.2	22.9	22.9
	2 Not served	962	74.7	77.1	100.0
	Total	1247	96.9	100.0	
Missing	8 Don't know/No answer	8	.6		
	System	32	2.5		
	Total	40	3.1		
Total		1287	100.0		

rgender

		Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Valid	3 Male	544	42.3	43.4	43.4
	4 Female	710	55.1	56.6	100.0
	Total	1254	97.4	100.0	
Missing	8 Don't know/Can't tell	1	.1		
	System	32	2.5		
	Total	33	2.6		
Total		1287	100.0		

Appendix D: Survey Results

newarea

		Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Valid	1 Battlefield	300	23.3	23.3	23.3
	2 Broad Run	166	12.9	12.9	36.2
	3 Hoadly	77	6.0	6.0	42.2
	4 Old Bridge	184	14.3	14.3	56.5
	5 Dale	244	19.0	19.0	75.5
	6 Potomac	191	14.8	14.8	90.3
	7 Forest Park	124	9.7	9.7	100.0
	Total	1287	100.0	100.0	

Statistics

qol10 Overall Impression of PWC

N	Valid	1280
	Missing	7
Mean		7.18

qol10 Overall Impression of PWC

		Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Valid	1	7	.6	.6	.6
	2	7	.5	.5	1.1
	3	19	1.5	1.5	2.6
	4	27	2.1	2.1	4.6
	5	127	9.8	9.9	14.5
	6	153	11.9	12.0	26.5
	7	346	26.9	27.1	53.6
	8	399	31.0	31.2	84.7
	9	114	8.9	8.9	93.7
	10	81	6.3	6.3	100.0
	Total	1280	99.4	100.0	
Missing	98 Don't know	7	.5		
	99 Refused	0	.0		
	Total	7	.6		
Total		1287	100.0		

goals_1 Goal: Homeless Services

		Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Valid	1 Very important	295	22.9	48.1	48.1
	2 Somewhat important	238	18.5	38.8	86.9
	3 Not that important	80	6.2	13.1	100.0
	Total	613	47.7	100.0	
Missing	4 Unable to rate or don't know	26	2.0		
	System	648	50.3		
	Total	674	52.3		
Total		1287	100.0		

goals_2 Goal: Affordable Housing

		Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Valid	1 Very important	373	29.0	59.1	59.1
	2 Somewhat important	197	15.3	31.3	90.4
	3 Not that important	61	4.7	9.6	100.0
	Total	631	49.0	100.0	
Missing	4 Unable to rate or don't know	8	.6		
	System	648	50.3		
	Total	656	51.0		
Total		1287	100.0		

goals_3 Goal: Safe from Crime

		Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Valid	1 Very important	570	44.3	90.9	90.9
	2 Somewhat important	55	4.3	8.7	99.7
	3 Not that important	2	.2	.3	100.0
	Total	627	48.7	100.0	
Missing	4 Unable to rate or don't know	3	.2		
	System	657	51.1		
	Total	660	51.3		
Total		1287	100.0		

goals_4 Goal: Regional Cooperation

		Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Valid	1 Very important	327	25.4	52.1	52.1
	2 Somewhat important	254	19.7	40.5	92.6
	3 Not that important	46	3.6	7.4	100.0
	Total	626	48.7	100.0	
Missing	4 Unable to rate or don't know	16	1.2		
	System	644	50.1		
	Total	661	51.3		
Total		1287	100.0		

goals_5 Goal: Environmental quality

		Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Valid	1 Very important	462	35.9	72.8	72.8
	2 Somewhat important	155	12.0	24.4	97.2
	3 Not that important	18	1.4	2.8	100.0
	Total	635	49.3	100.0	
Missing	4 Unable to rate or don't know	5	.4		
	System	647	50.3		
	Total	652	50.7		
Total		1287	100.0		

goals_6 Goal: Better Public Transportation

		Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Valid	1 Very important	398	31.0	64.0	64.0
	2 Somewhat important	178	13.8	28.6	92.6
	3 Not that important	46	3.6	7.4	100.0
	Total	622	48.3	100.0	
Missing	4 Unable to rate or don't know	17	1.3		
	System	648	50.4		
	Total	665	51.7		
Total		1287	100.0		

goals_7 Goal: Job training

		Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Valid	1 Very important	308	23.9	48.5	48.5
	2 Somewhat important	248	19.3	39.2	87.6
	3 Not that important	78	6.1	12.4	100.0
	Total	635	49.3	100.0	
Missing	4 Unable to rate or don't know	22	1.7		
	System	631	49.0		
	Total	652	50.7		
Total		1287	100.0		

goals_8 Goal: Diversity

		Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Valid	1 Very important	336	26.1	51.3	51.3
	2 Somewhat important	204	15.9	31.2	82.5
	3 Not that important	114	8.9	17.5	100.0
	Total	655	50.9	100.0	
Missing	4 Unable to rate or don't know	18	1.4		
	System	614	47.7		
	Total	632	49.1		
Total		1287	100.0		

goals_9 Goal: Treatment Programs for Drugs

		Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Valid	1 Very important	259	20.1	41.5	41.5
	2 Somewhat important	280	21.8	44.8	86.3
	3 Not that important	86	6.6	13.7	100.0
	Total	625	48.6	100.0	
Missing	4 Unable to rate or don't know	29	2.3		
	System	633	49.2		
	Total	662	51.4		
Total		1287	100.0		

goals_10 Goal: Economic Development

		Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Valid	1 Very important	335	26.0	55.0	55.0
	2 Somewhat important	185	14.3	30.3	85.3
	3 Not that important	89	6.9	14.7	100.0
	Total	609	47.3	100.0	
Missing	4 Unable to rate or don't know	8	.7		
	System	669	52.0		
	Total	678	52.7		
Total		1287	100.0		

goals_11 Goal: Higher-paying jobs

		Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Valid	1 Very important	452	35.1	72.6	72.6
	2 Somewhat important	138	10.8	22.2	94.8
	3 Not that important	32	2.5	5.2	100.0
	Total	622	48.4	100.0	
Missing	4 Unable to rate or don't know	11	.8		
	System	654	50.8		
	Total	665	51.6		
Total		1287	100.0		

goals_12 Goal: Public Education

		Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Valid	1 Very important	538	41.8	83.6	83.6
	2 Somewhat important	81	6.3	12.6	96.2
	3 Not that important	25	1.9	3.8	100.0
	Total	644	50.0	100.0	
Missing	4 Unable to rate or don't know	12	.9		
	System	631	49.0		
	Total	643	50.0		
Total		1287	100.0		

goals_13 Goal: Residential Development

		Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Valid	1 Very important	314	24.4	52.6	52.6
	2 Somewhat important	173	13.4	28.9	81.5
	3 Not that important	111	8.6	18.5	100.0
	Total	598	46.5	100.0	
Missing	4 Unable to rate or don't know	28	2.2		
	System	661	51.4		
	Total	689	53.5		
Total		1287	100.0		

goals_14 Goal: Self Sufficiency in Service programs

		Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Valid	1 Very important	311	24.1	52.9	52.9
	2 Somewhat important	244	18.9	41.6	94.5
	3 Not that important	32	2.5	5.5	100.0
	Total	587	45.6	100.0	
Missing	4 Unable to rate or don't know	38	3.0		
	System	662	51.4		
	Total	700	54.4		
Total		1287	100.0		

goals_15 Goal: Road network

		Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Valid	1 Very important	550	42.7	84.0	84.0
	2 Somewhat important	93	7.3	14.3	98.3
	3 Not that important	11	.9	1.7	100.0
	Total	654	50.8	100.0	
Missing	4 Unable to rate or don't know	4	.3		
	System	629	48.8		
	Total	633	49.2		
Total		1287	100.0		

goals_16 Goal: Fees to pay for Services

		Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Valid	1 Very important	201	15.6	35.0	35.0
	2 Somewhat important	291	22.6	50.7	85.7
	3 Not that important	82	6.4	14.3	100.0
	Total	574	44.6	100.0	
Missing	4 Unable to rate or don't know	33	2.6		
	System	679	52.8		
	Total	713	55.4		
Total		1287	100.0		

goals_17 Goal: Same Tax Rates

		Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Valid	1 Very important	410	31.8	65.9	65.9
	2 Somewhat important	171	13.3	27.6	93.5
	3 Not that important	40	3.1	6.5	100.0
	Total	621	48.3	100.0	
Missing	4 Unable to rate or don't know	7	.5		
	System	659	51.2		
	Total	666	51.7		
Total		1287	100.0		

goals_18 Goal: Basic needs

		Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Valid	1 Very important	342	26.5	55.9	55.9
	2 Somewhat important	231	17.9	37.8	93.6
	3 Not that important	39	3.0	6.4	100.0
	Total	612	47.5	100.0	
Missing	4 Unable to rate or don't know	12	.9		
	System	663	51.5		
	Total	675	52.5		
Total		1287	100.0		

goals_19 Goal: Parks and Recreation

		Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Valid	1 Very important	280	21.8	46.7	46.7
	2 Somewhat important	267	20.7	44.5	91.2
	3 Not that important	53	4.1	8.8	100.0
	Total	600	46.6	100.0	
Missing	4 Unable to rate or don't know	11	.8		
	System	676	52.5		
	Total	687	53.4		
Total		1287	100.0		

goals_20 Goal: Child Services

		Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Valid	1 Very important	259	20.1	43.4	43.4
	2 Somewhat important	242	18.8	40.6	84.1
	3 Not that important	95	7.4	15.9	100.0
	Total	596	46.3	100.0	
Missing	4 Unable to rate or don't know	30	2.4		
	System	661	51.3		
	Total	691	53.7		
Total		1287	100.0		

goals_21 Goal: Increase Technology

		Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Valid	1 Very important	328	25.5	51.5	51.5
	2 Somewhat important	242	18.8	38.0	89.5
	3 Not that important	67	5.2	10.5	100.0
	Total	637	49.5	100.0	
Missing	4 Unable to rate or don't know	13	1.0		
	System	637	49.5		
	Total	650	50.5		
Total		1287	100.0		

goals_22 Goal: Prevent Emergencies

		Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Valid	1 Very important	527	41.0	81.8	81.8
	2 Somewhat important	102	7.9	15.8	97.5
	3 Not that important	16	1.3	2.5	100.0
	Total	645	50.1	100.0	
Missing	4 Unable to rate or don't know	11	.9		
	System	631	49.0		
	Total	642	49.9		
Total		1287	100.0		

goals_23 Goal: Revenue

		Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Valid	1 Very important	322	25.0	50.9	50.9
	2 Somewhat important	224	17.4	35.5	86.4
	3 Not that important	86	6.7	13.6	100.0
	Total	632	49.1	100.0	
Missing	4 Unable to rate or don't know	19	1.5		
	System	636	49.4		
	Total	655	50.9		
Total		1287	100.0		

goals_24 Goal: Senior Services

		Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Valid	1 Very important	450	35.0	67.3	67.3
	2 Somewhat important	192	14.9	28.7	96.1
	3 Not that important	26	2.0	3.9	100.0
	Total	668	51.9	100.0	
Missing	4 Unable to rate or don't know	18	1.4		
	System	600	46.7		
	Total	619	48.1		
Total		1287	100.0		

ctysat97 Gen Sat

		Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Valid	1 Very satisfied	373	29.0	30.4	30.4
	2 Somewhat satisfied	723	56.2	59.1	89.5
	3 Somewhat dissatisfied	106	8.2	8.7	98.1
	4 Very dissatisfied	23	1.8	1.9	100.0
	Total	1225	95.2	100.0	
Missing	8 Unable to rate/don't know	53	4.1		
	9 Refused	2	.2		
	System	7	.5		
	Total	62	4.8		
Total		1287	100.0		

vote Sat w/ Convenient Ways to Register to Vote

		Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Valid	1 Very satisfied	444	34.5	54.6	54.6
	2 Somewhat satisfied	328	25.4	40.3	94.9
	3 Somewhat dissatisfied	32	2.5	3.9	98.8
	4 Very dissatisfied	10	.8	1.2	100.0
	Total	814	63.2	100.0	
Missing	8 Unable to rate/don't know	162	12.6		
	System	312	24.2		
	Total	473	36.8		
Total		1287	100.0		

govtserv Sat w/ Informing Citizens about Government

		Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Valid	1 Very satisfied	204	15.9	23.3	23.3
	2 Somewhat satisfied	489	38.0	55.6	78.8
	3 Somewhat dissatisfied	147	11.4	16.7	95.5
	4 Very dissatisfied	39	3.1	4.5	100.0
	Total	879	68.3	100.0	
Missing	8 Unable to rate/don't know	65	5.0		
	System	343	26.7		
	Total	408	31.7		
Total		1287	100.0		

infosor1 Info: County website

		Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Valid	0 Not selected	602	46.7	68.9	68.9
	1 Selected	271	21.1	31.1	100.0
	Total	873	67.8	100.0	
Missing	System	414	32.2		
Total		1287	100.0		

infosor2 Info: PWC officials and staff

		Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Valid	0 Not selected	826	64.2	94.6	94.6
	1 Selected	47	3.6	5.4	100.0
	Total	873	67.8	100.0	
Missing	System	414	32.2		
Total		1287	100.0		

infosor3 Info: Potomac news

		Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Valid	0 Not selected	580	45.1	66.5	66.5
	1 Selected	292	22.7	33.5	100.0
	Total	873	67.8	100.0	
Missing	System	414	32.2		
Total		1287	100.0		

infosor4 Info: Washington Post

		Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Valid	0 Not selected	577	44.8	66.1	66.1
	1 Selected	295	23.0	33.9	100.0
	Total	873	67.8	100.0	
Missing	System	414	32.2		
Total		1287	100.0		

infosor5 Info: TV news

		Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Valid	0 Not selected	584	45.3	66.9	66.9
	1 Selected	289	22.5	33.1	100.0
	Total	873	67.8	100.0	
Missing	System	414	32.2		
Total		1287	100.0		

infosor6 Info: Radio news

		Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Valid	0 Not selected	760	59.0	87.1	87.1
	1 Selected	113	8.8	12.9	100.0
	Total	873	67.8	100.0	
Missing	System	414	32.2		
Total		1287	100.0		

infosor7 Info: Automated telephone system

		Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Valid	0 Not selected	867	67.4	99.4	99.4
	1 Selected	5	.4	.6	100.0
	Total	873	67.8	100.0	
Missing	System	414	32.2		
Total		1287	100.0		

infosor8 Info: Newsletter

		Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Valid	0 Not selected	736	57.2	84.3	84.3
	1 Selected	137	10.6	15.7	100.0
	Total	873	67.8	100.0	
Missing	System	414	32.2		
Total		1287	100.0		

infosor9 Info: Cable Channel 23

		Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Valid	0 Not selected	763	59.3	87.5	87.5
	1 Selected	109	8.5	12.5	100.0
	Total	873	67.8	100.0	
Missing	System	414	32.2		
Total		1287	100.0		

infoso10 Info: Other

		Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Valid	0 Not selected	656	51.0	75.2	75.2
	1 Selected	217	16.8	24.8	100.0
	Total	873	67.8	100.0	
Missing	System	414	32.2		
Total		1287	100.0		

Multiple Responses

Case Summary^b

	Cases					
	Valid		Missing		Total	
	N	Percent	N	Percent	N	Percent
\$infosource ^a	861	66.9%	426	33.1%	1287	100.0%

a. Dichotomy group tabulated at value 1.

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

\$infosource Frequencies

		Responses		Percent of Cases
		N	Percent	
Source of Information ^a	Info: County website	271	15.3%	31.5%
	Info: PWC officials and staff	47	2.6%	5.5%
	Info: Potomac news	292	16.5%	33.9%
	Info: Washington Post	295	16.6%	34.3%
	Info: TV news	289	16.3%	33.6%
	Info: Radio news	113	6.4%	13.1%
	Info: Automated telephone system	5	.3%	.6%
	Info: Newsletter	137	7.7%	15.9%
	Info: Cable Channel 23	109	6.2%	12.7%
	Info: Other	217	12.2%	25.2%
Total		1775	100.0%	206.2%

a. Dichotomy group tabulated at value 1.

animala Satisfaction with Animal Control

		Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Valid	1 Very satisfied	225	17.5	39.2	39.2
	2 Somewhat satisfied	259	20.1	45.3	84.5
	3 Somewhat dissatisfied	48	3.7	8.4	92.9
	4 Very dissatisfied	41	3.2	7.1	100.0
	Total	572	44.5	100.0	
Missing	8 Unable to rate/don't know	298	23.1		
	9 Refused	0	.0		
	System	416	32.4		
Total	715	55.5			
Total		1287	100.0		

strlta Satisfaction with Street Lighting

		Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Valid	1 Very satisfied	215	16.7	28.3	28.3
	2 Somewhat satisfied	346	26.9	45.5	73.8
	3 Somewhat dissatisfied	132	10.2	17.3	91.1
	4 Very dissatisfied	68	5.3	8.9	100.0
	Total	760	59.1	100.0	
Missing	8 Unable to rate/don't know	101	7.9		
	System	426	33.1		
	Total	527	40.9		
Total		1287	100.0		

fire Sat w/ Fire Fighting in R's Area

		Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Valid	1 Very satisfied	882	68.5	75.7	75.7
	2 Somewhat satisfied	264	20.5	22.6	98.4
	3 Somewhat dissatisfied	15	1.1	1.3	99.6
	4 Very dissatisfied	5	.4	.4	100.0
	Total	1165	90.5	100.0	
Missing	8 Unable to rate/don't know	112	8.7		
	System	11	.8		
	Total	122	9.5		
Total		1287	100.0		

rescue Sat w/ Emergency Medical Rescue Services

		Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Valid	1 Very satisfied	584	45.4	73.8	73.8
	2 Somewhat satisfied	196	15.2	24.7	98.5
	3 Somewhat dissatisfied	10	.8	1.3	99.8
	4 Very dissatisfied	2	.1	.2	100.0
	Total	792	61.5	100.0	
Missing	8 Unable to rate/don't know	160	12.4		
	System	335	26.0		
	Total	495	38.5		
Total		1287	100.0		

moscont Satisfaction with Mosquito Control

		Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Valid	1 Very satisfied	433	33.7	38.9	38.9
	2 Somewhat satisfied	503	39.1	45.2	84.1
	3 Somewhat dissatisfied	118	9.2	10.6	94.7
	4 Very dissatisfied	58	4.5	5.3	100.0
	Total	1113	86.5	100.0	
Missing	8 Unable to rate/don't know	163	12.6		
	9 Refused	1	.1		
	System	11	.8		
	Total	174	13.5		
Total		1287	100.0		

amcrime Sat w/ Safety in Neighborhood in Daytime

		Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Valid	1 Very satisfied	754	58.5	60.8	60.8
	2 Somewhat satisfied	414	32.2	33.4	94.3
	3 Somewhat dissatisfied	46	3.6	3.7	98.0
	4 Very dissatisfied	25	1.9	2.0	100.0
	Total	1238	96.2	100.0	
Missing	8 Unable to rate/don't know	33	2.6		
	9 Refused	2	.2		
	System	14	1.1		
Total		49	3.8		
Total		1287	100.0		

pmcrime Sat w/ Safety in Neighborhood at Night

		Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Valid	1 Very satisfied	571	44.3	46.5	46.5
	2 Somewhat satisfied	493	38.3	40.2	86.7
	3 Somewhat dissatisfied	93	7.2	7.6	94.3
	4 Very dissatisfied	70	5.4	5.7	100.0
	Total	1227	95.4	100.0	
Missing	8 Unable to rate/don't know	44	3.4		
	9 Refused	2	.2		
	System	14	1.1		
	Total	60	4.6		
Total		1287	100.0		

attitude Sat w/ Police Dept. Attitudes Towards Citizens

		Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Valid	1 Very satisfied	457	35.5	56.3	56.3
	2 Somewhat satisfied	256	19.9	31.5	87.9
	3 Somewhat dissatisfied	61	4.8	7.5	95.4
	4 Very dissatisfied	37	2.9	4.6	100.0
	Total	811	63.0	100.0	
Missing	8 Unable to rate/don't know	169	13.1		
	9 Refused	2	.2		
	System	305	23.7		
	Total	476	37.0		
Total		1287	100.0		

drugs Sat w/ Reduce the Use of Illegal Drugs

		Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Valid	1 Very satisfied	238	18.5	38.0	38.0
	2 Somewhat satisfied	282	21.9	45.2	83.2
	3 Somewhat dissatisfied	65	5.1	10.5	93.7
	4 Very dissatisfied	39	3.1	6.3	100.0
	Total	625	48.6	100.0	
Missing	8 Unable to rate/don't know	335	26.0		
	9 Refused	2	.2		
	System	325	25.3		
	Total	662	51.4		
Total		1287	100.0		

police Sat w/ Overall Performance of Police Dept.

		Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Valid	1 Very satisfied	435	33.8	49.1	49.1
	2 Somewhat satisfied	383	29.7	43.2	92.3
	3 Somewhat dissatisfied	46	3.6	5.2	97.6
	4 Very dissatisfied	22	1.7	2.4	100.0
	Total	886	68.9	100.0	
Missing	8 Unable to rate/don't know	65	5.1		
	9 Refused	2	.2		
	System	333	25.9		
	Total	401	31.1		
Total		1287	100.0		

ctysherf Familiarity w Sheriff's Office

		Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Valid	1 Yes – familiar enough to rate	288	22.4	23.9	23.9
	2 Not sure	919	71.4	76.1	100.0
	Total	1207	93.8	100.0	
Missing	8 Don't know/not sure	65	5.1		
	9 Refused	1	.1		
	System	14	1.1		
Total		80	6.2		
Total		1287	100.0		

attitut "Sat w Sheriff's office Attitudes"

		Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Valid	1 Very satisfied	139	10.8	51.4	51.4
	2 Somewhat satisfied	109	8.5	40.5	91.9
	3 Somewhat dissatisfied	13	1.0	4.7	96.7
	4 Very dissatisfied	9	.7	3.3	100.0
	Total	270	21.0	100.0	
Missing	8 Unable to rate/don't know	17	1.3		
	System	1000	77.7		
	Total	1017	79.0		
Total		1287	100.0		

sheriffa "Sat w Sheriff's office"

		Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Valid	1 Very satisfied	149	11.6	54.2	54.2
	2 Somewhat satisfied	111	8.6	40.3	94.5
	3 Somewhat dissatisfied	9	.7	3.3	97.8
	4 Very dissatisfied	6	.5	2.2	100.0
	Total	275	21.3	100.0	
Missing	8 Unable to rate/don't know	14	1.1		
	System	999	77.6		
	Total	1012	78.7		
Total		1287	100.0		

court Visited Judicial Center in past year

		Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Valid	1 Yes, visited in last 12 months	369	28.7	29.1	29.1
	2 No, has not visited	900	69.9	70.9	100.0
	Total	1269	98.6	100.0	
Missing	8 Can't recall/Don't know	3	.3		
	9 Refused"	1	.1		
	System	14	1.1		
Total		18	1.4		
Total		1287	100.0		

courtsat Sat w/ Security in Courthouse

		Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Valid	1 Very satisfied	270	21.0	74.7	74.7
	2 Somewhat satisfied	82	6.3	22.6	97.3
	3 Somewhat dissatisfied	6	.5	1.7	99.0
	4 Very dissatisfied	4	.3	1.0	100.0
	Total	361	28.0	100.0	
Missing	8 Unable to rate/don't know	8	.6		
	System	918	71.3		
	Total	926	72.0		
Total		1287	100.0		

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

		Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Valid	1 Yes, has contacted in last 12 months	257	20.0	20.3	20.3
	2 No, has not contacted	1012	78.6	79.7	100.0
	Total	1269	98.6	100.0	
Missing	8 Can't recall/Don't know	3	.3		
	9 Refused	1	.1		
	System	14	1.1		
	Total	18	1.4		
Total		1287	100.0		

emservb1 911: Police

		Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Valid	0 Not selected	147	11.4	57.0	57.0
	1 Selected	111	8.6	43.0	100.0
	Total	257	20.0	100.0	
Missing	System	1030	80.0		
Total		1287	100.0		

emservb2 911: Fire

		Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Valid	0 Not selected	222	17.3	86.3	86.3
	1 Selected	35	2.7	13.7	100.0
	Total	257	20.0	100.0	
Missing	System	1030	80.0		
Total		1287	100.0		

emservb3 911: Ambulance/rescue squad

		Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Valid	0 Not selected	139	10.8	54.1	54.1
	1 Selected	118	9.2	45.9	100.0
	Total	257	20.0	100.0	
Missing	System	1030	80.0		
Total		1287	100.0		

emservb4 911: Something else

		Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Valid	0 Not selected	239	18.6	92.9	92.9
	1 Selected	18	1.4	7.1	100.0
	Total	257	20.0	100.0	
Missing	System	1030	80.0		
Total		1287	100.0		

emservb5 EMSERVB5

		Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Valid	0 Not selected	257	20.0	100.0	100.0
Missing	System	1030	80.0		
Total		1287	100.0		

emservb6 EMSERVB6

		Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Valid	0 Not selected	257	20.0	100.0	100.0
Missing	System	1030	80.0		
Total		1287	100.0		

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

		Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Valid	0 Not selected	257	20.0	100.0	100.0
Missing	System	1030	80.0		
Total		1287	100.0		

emservb8 911: Refused

		Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Valid	0 Not selected	257	20.0	100.0	100.0
Missing	System	1030	80.0		
Total		1287	100.0		

Multiple Responses

Case Summary^b

	Cases					
	Valid		Missing		Total	
	N	Percent	N	Percent	N	Percent
\$emergency ^a	257	20.0%	1030	80.0%	1287	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 services contacted ^a	911: Police	111	39.2%	43.0%
	911: Fire	35	12.5%	13.7%
	911: Ambulance/rescue squad	118	41.8%	45.9%
	911: Something else	18	6.5%	7.1%
Total		282	100.0%	109.7%

a. Dichotomy group tabulated at value 1.

emergsb Nature of 911 Call (emerg or other)

		Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Valid	1 Emergency	64	5.0	59.7	59.7
	2 Some other reason	44	3.4	40.3	100.0
	Total	108	8.4	100.0	
Missing	3 Can't remember/Don't know	3	.2		
	System	1176	91.4		
	Total	1179	91.6		
Total		1287	100.0		

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

		Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Valid	1 Very satisfied	213	16.6	84.7	84.7
	2 Somewhat satisfied	25	1.9	9.9	94.6
	3 Somewhat dissatisfied	8	.6	3.1	97.7
	4 Very dissatisfied	6	.4	2.3	100.0
	Total	252	19.6	100.0	
Missing	7	2	.1		
	8 Unable to rate/don't know	4	.3		
	System	1030	80.0		
Total	Total	1035	80.4		
Total		1287	100.0		

emtimeb Satisfaction with Time for Help to Arrive

		Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Valid	1 Very satisfied	181	14.1	75.9	75.9
	2 Somewhat satisfied	32	2.5	13.5	89.3
	3 Somewhat dissatisfied	9	.7	3.6	92.9
	4 Very dissatisfied	17	1.3	7.1	100.0
	Total	239	18.6	100.0	
Missing	7	12	1.0		
	8 Unable to rate/don't know	6	.5		
	System	1030	80.0		
Total	Total	1048	81.4		
Total		1287	100.0		

emasstb Sat w/ Assistance on the Scene

		Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Valid	1 Very satisfied	178	13.8	80.0	80.0
	2 Somewhat satisfied	28	2.2	12.6	92.6
	3 Somewhat dissatisfied	9	.7	3.9	96.5
	4 Very dissatisfied	8	.6	3.5	100.0
	Total	222	17.3	100.0	
Missing	7	5	.4		
	8 Unable to rate/don't know	18	1.4		
	System	1042	81.0		
Total	Total	1065	82.7		
Total		1287	100.0		

Statistics

cpr97 Number of People in HH with CPR

N	Valid	778
	Missing	509
Mean		.95

cpr97 Number of People in HH with CPR

		Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Valid	0	278	21.6	35.8	35.8
	1	304	23.6	39.1	74.9
	2	159	12.3	20.4	95.3
	3	28	2.2	3.6	98.9
	4	8	.6	1.0	99.9
	5	1	.1	.1	100.0
	Total	778	60.4	100.0	
Missing	System	509	39.6		
Total		1287	100.0		

shelter1 "Shelter w Power"

		Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Valid	1 No capability for sheltering"	4	.3	.6	.6
	2 One day	7	.5	1.1	1.7
	3 2 to 3 days	83	6.5	14.2	16.0
	4 4 daus tp 1 week	239	18.6	40.8	56.8
	5 8 days to 2 weeks	124	9.6	21.2	77.9
	6 2 weels tp 1 month	101	7.9	17.3	95.3
	7 More than 1 month	28	2.2	4.7	100.0
	Total	585	45.5	100.0	
Missing	8 "Don't know"	10	.8		
	System	692	53.8		
	Total	702	54.5		
Total		1287	100.0		

shelter2 "Shelter wo Power"

		Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Valid	1 No capability for sheltering"	8	.6	1.1	1.1
	2 One day	25	1.9	3.7	4.9
	3 2 to 3 days	190	14.8	28.5	33.3
	4 4 daus tp 1 week	291	22.6	43.6	76.9
	5 8 days to 2 weeks	77	6.0	11.6	88.5
	6 2 weels tp 1 month	52	4.0	7.8	96.2
	7 More than 1 month	25	1.9	3.8	100.0
	Total	667	51.8	100.0	
Missing	8 "Don't know"	9	.7		
	System	612	47.5		
	Total	620	48.2		
Total		1287	100.0		

library Sat. with Providing Library Services

		Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Valid	1 Very satisfied	481	37.4	70.3	70.3
	2 Somewhat satisfied	165	12.8	24.1	94.4
	3 Somewhat dissatisfied	27	2.1	4.0	98.4
	4 Very dissatisfied	11	.9	1.6	100.0
	Total	684	53.1	100.0	
Missing	8 Unable to rate/don't know	115	9.0		
	System	488	37.9		
	Total	603	46.9		
Total		1287	100.0		

park Sat. with Providing Park and Recreation Programs

		Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Valid	1 Very satisfied	327	25.4	48.0	48.0
	2 Somewhat satisfied	283	22.0	41.6	89.6
	3 Somewhat dissatisfied	43	3.4	6.4	95.9
	4 Very dissatisfied	28	2.1	4.1	100.0
	Total	681	52.9	100.0	
Missing	8 Unable to rate/don't know	117	9.1		
	System	489	38.0		
	Total	606	47.1		
Total		1287	100.0		

elderly Sat w/ Programs for Elderly Population

		Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Valid	1 Very satisfied	146	11.3	27.1	27.1
	2 Somewhat satisfied	302	23.5	56.2	83.2
	3 Somewhat dissatisfied	64	5.0	11.9	95.1
	4 Very dissatisfied	26	2.0	4.9	100.0
	Total	538	41.8	100.0	
Missing	8 Unable to rate/don't know	731	56.8		
	System	18	1.4		
	Total	749	58.2		
Total		1287	100.0		

problem Sat w/ Help to Emotional Problems

		Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Valid	1 Very satisfied	65	5.1	21.0	21.0
	2 Somewhat satisfied	165	12.8	53.0	73.9
	3 Somewhat dissatisfied	45	3.5	14.6	88.5
	4 Very dissatisfied	36	2.8	11.5	100.0
	Total	311	24.1	100.0	
Missing	8 Unable to rate/don't know	610	47.4		
	9 Refused	2	.2		
	System	364	28.3		
Total		976	75.9		
Total		1287	100.0		

libry12 Has R Used Library Services

		Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Valid	1 Yes	877	68.1	69.8	69.8
	2 No	379	29.5	30.2	100.0
	Total	1256	97.6	100.0	
Missing	8 Can't recall/Don't know	11	.8		
	System	20	1.6		
Total		31	2.4		
Total		1287	100.0		

librysat Sat w/ Service from Library Staff

		Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Valid	1 Very satisfied	769	59.7	88.8	88.8
	2 Somewhat satisfied	88	6.8	10.1	98.9
	3 Somewhat dissatisfied	7	.5	.8	99.7
	4 Very dissatisfied	3	.2	.3	100.0
	Total	866	67.3	100.0	
Missing	7	6	.5		
	8 Unable to rate/don't know	5	.4		
	System	410	31.9		
	Total	421	32.7		
	Total	1287	100.0		

deptss Familiar with Dept. of Soc. Services

		Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Valid	1 Yes--familiar	247	19.2	19.5	19.5
	2 Not sure	137	10.6	10.8	30.3
	3 No--not familiar	883	68.6	69.7	100.0
	Total	1267	98.4	100.0	
Missing	System	20	1.6		
	Total	1287	100.0		

dsssat Sat. with Dept. of Soc. Services

		Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Valid	1 Very satisfied	81	6.3	33.6	33.6
	2 Somewhat satisfied	97	7.5	40.2	73.8
	3 Somewhat dissatisfied	22	1.7	9.3	83.1
	4 Very dissatisfied	41	3.2	16.9	100.0
	Total	241	18.7	100.0	
Missing	8 Unable to rate/don't know	5	.4		
	9 Refused	1	.1		
	System	1040	80.8		
	Total	1046	81.3		
	Total	1287	100.0		

hlthdept Familiar with Health Department

		Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Valid	1 Yes--familiar	256	19.9	20.2	20.2
	2 Not sure	97	7.6	7.7	27.9
	3 No--not familiar	913	71.0	72.1	100.0
	Total	1266	98.4	100.0	
Missing	System	21	1.6		
Total		1287	100.0		

hlthsat Sat. with Health Department

		Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Valid	1 Very satisfied	90	7.0	35.4	35.4
	2 Somewhat satisfied	123	9.6	48.5	83.9
	3 Somewhat dissatisfied	24	1.9	9.5	93.5
	4 Very dissatisfied	17	1.3	6.5	100.0
	Total	254	19.7	100.0	
Missing	8 Unable to rate/don't know	2	.2		
System		1031	80.1		
Total		1033	80.3		
Total		1287	100.0		

mental Familiar with Mental Health Services

		Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Valid	1 Yes--familiar	144	11.2	11.4	11.4
	2 Not sure	104	8.1	8.2	19.6
	3 No--not familiar	1018	79.1	80.4	100.0
	Total	1266	98.4	100.0	
Missing	System	21	1.6		
Total		1287	100.0		

mentret Sat. with Services to Mental Retardation

		Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Valid	1 Very satisfied	32	2.5	26.9	26.9
	2 Somewhat satisfied	56	4.3	46.4	73.3
	3 Somewhat dissatisfied	17	1.3	13.8	87.1
	4 Very dissatisfied	15	1.2	12.9	100.0
	Total	120	9.3	100.0	
Missing	8 Unable to rate/don't know	23	1.8		
	9 Refused	1	.1		
	System	1143	88.8		
Total		1167	90.7		
Total		1287	100.0		

menteis Sat w/ Early Intervention Services

		Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Valid	1 Very satisfied	21	1.6	22.9	22.9
	2 Somewhat satisfied	47	3.6	50.7	73.7
	3 Somewhat dissatisfied	10	.8	11.2	84.8
	4 Very dissatisfied	14	1.1	15.2	100.0
	Total	92	7.1	100.0	
Missing	8 Unable to rate/don't know	52	4.0		
	9 Refused	1	.1		
	System	1143	88.8		
Total		1195	92.9		
Total		1287	100.0		

mentsub Sat w/ Services to Substance Abuse

		Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Valid	1 Very satisfied	20	1.6	23.3	23.3
	2 Somewhat satisfied	35	2.7	40.5	63.7
	3 Somewhat dissatisfied	16	1.2	18.4	82.1
	4 Very dissatisfied	15	1.2	17.9	100.0
	Total	86	6.7	100.0	
Missing	8 Unable to rate/don't know	57	4.4		
	9 Refused	1	.1		
	System	1143	88.8		
Total		1201	93.3		
Total		1287	100.0		

mentall Sat w/ Mental Health Services Overall

		Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Valid	1 Very satisfied	32	2.5	23.6	23.6
	2 Somewhat satisfied	68	5.2	50.2	73.9
	3 Somewhat dissatisfied	22	1.7	16.7	90.6
	4 Very dissatisfied	13	1.0	9.4	100.0
	Total	134	10.4	100.0	
Missing	8 Unable to rate/don't know	10	.8		
	System	1143	88.8		
	Total	1153	89.6		
Total	1287	100.0			

anybody Has R Contacted County Govt.

		Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Valid	1 Yes	540	42.0	43.1	43.1
	2 No	713	55.4	56.9	100.0
	Total	1253	97.3	100.0	
Missing	9 Can't recall/Don't know/Refused	14	1.1		
	System	21	1.6		
	Total	34	2.7		
Total	1287	100.0			

helpful2 Helpfulness of County Employees

		Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Valid	1 Very satisfied	296	23.0	55.1	55.1
	2 Somewhat satisfied	133	10.3	24.7	79.8
	3 Somewhat dissatisfied	52	4.1	9.8	89.5
	4 Very dissatisfied	56	4.4	10.5	100.0
	Total	537	41.7	100.0	
Missing	8 Unable to rate/don't know	3	.2		
	System	747	58.0		
	Total	750	58.3		
Total	1287	100.0			

taxesa Contact County about taxes

		Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Valid	1 Yes	206	16.0	35.9	35.9
	2 No	368	28.6	64.1	100.0
	Total	574	44.6	100.0	
Missing	9 Don't know/Refused/Not applicable	2	.1		
	System	711	55.2		
	Total	713	55.4		
Total		1287	100.0		

howcona1 Contact taxes: Person

		Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Valid	0 Not selected	144	11.2	70.1	70.1
	1 Selected	62	4.8	29.9	100.0
	Total	206	16.0	100.0	
Missing	System	1081	84.0		
Total		1287	100.0		

howcona2 Contact taxes: Phone

		Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Valid	0 Not selected	61	4.7	29.4	29.4
	1 Selected	145	11.3	70.6	100.0
	Total	206	16.0	100.0	
Missing	System	1081	84.0		
Total		1287	100.0		

howcona3 Contact taxes: Mail

		Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Valid	0 Not selected	182	14.1	88.2	88.2
	1 Selected	24	1.9	11.8	100.0
	Total	206	16.0	100.0	
Missing	System	1081	84.0		
Total		1287	100.0		

Multiple Responses

Case Summary^b

	Cases					
	Valid		Missing		Total	
	N	Percent	N	Percent	N	Percent
\$ccounty ^a	202	15.7%	1085	84.3%	1287	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	
Contacting the County	Contact taxes: Person	62	26.6%	30.4%
	Contact taxes: Phone	145	62.9%	71.9%
	Contact taxes: Mail	24	10.5%	12.0%
Total		231	100.0%	114.2%

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	126	9.8	62.2	62.2
	2 Somewhat satisfied	47	3.6	23.1	85.2
	3 Somewhat dissatisfied	12	.9	5.7	90.9
	4 Very dissatisfied	18	1.4	9.1	100.0
	Total	203	15.8	100.0	
Missing	8 Unable to rate/don't know	3	.2		
	System	1081	84.0		
Total	Total	1084	84.2		
Total		1287	100.0		

timesata Sat w/ timeliness of tax request

		Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Valid	1 Very satisfied	129	10.1	63.2	63.2
	2 Somewhat satisfied	41	3.2	20.0	83.2
	3 Somewhat dissatisfied	15	1.1	7.2	90.4
	4 Very dissatisfied	20	1.5	9.6	100.0
	Total	205	15.9	100.0	
Missing	8 Unable to rate/don't know	1	.1		
	System	1081	84.0		
Total		1082	84.1		
Total		1287	100.0		

net1 Used the PWC Government Web Site

		Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Valid	1 Yes	788	61.2	62.4	62.4
	2 No	474	36.8	37.6	100.0
	Total	1262	98.0	100.0	
Missing	8 Don't know	4	.3		
	System	21	1.6		
Total		25	2.0		
Total		1287	100.0		

net2 Sat. with PWC Government Web Site

		Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Valid	1 Very satisfied	425	33.0	54.3	54.3
	2 Somewhat satisfied	310	24.1	39.6	93.9
	3 Somewhat dissatisfied	34	2.6	4.3	98.2
	4 Very dissatisfied	14	1.1	1.8	100.0
	Total	783	60.8	100.0	
Missing	8 Unable to rate/don't know	5	.4		
	System	499	38.8		
Total		504	39.2		
Total		1287	100.0		

land1 Sat w/ Planning of Land Level-prejob

		Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Valid	1 Very satisfied	39	3.0	6.9	6.9
	2 Somewhat satisfied	228	17.7	40.2	47.1
	3 Somewhat dissatisfied	163	12.7	28.7	75.8
	4 Very dissatisfied	138	10.7	24.2	100.0
	Total	568	44.1	100.0	
Missing	8 Unable to rate/don't know	75	5.8		
	System	645	50.1		
	Total	719	55.9		
Total		1287	100.0		

ratejobs Familiar w/ Attracting New Jobs

		Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Valid	1 Yes	353	27.5	29.4	29.4
	2 No	849	66.0	70.6	100.0
	Total	1203	93.4	100.0	
Missing	8 Don't know	61	4.7		
	9 Refused	1	.1		
	System	23	1.8		
Total		84	6.6		
Total		1287	100.0		

newjobs Sat w/ Attracting New Jobs to PWC

		Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Valid	1 Very satisfied	108	8.4	31.4	31.4
	2 Somewhat satisfied	163	12.7	47.6	79.0
	3 Somewhat dissatisfied	44	3.4	12.8	91.9
	4 Very dissatisfied	28	2.2	8.1	100.0
	Total	343	26.6	100.0	
Missing	8 Unable to rate/don't know	11	.8		
	System	934	72.5		
	Total	944	73.4		
Total		1287	100.0		

land2 Sat w/ Planning of Land Devel-postjob

		Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Valid	1 Very satisfied	21	1.6	15.0	15.0
	2 Somewhat satisfied	48	3.7	34.0	49.0
	3 Somewhat dissatisfied	36	2.8	25.1	74.1
	4 Very dissatisfied	37	2.8	25.9	100.0
	Total	141	11.0	100.0	
Missing	8 Unable to rate/don't know	6	.5		
	System	1140	88.5		
	Total	1146	89.0		
Total		1287	100.0		

neighbor Sat w/ Preventing Neighborhood Deterioration

		Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Valid	1 Very satisfied	203	15.7	20.3	20.3
	2 Somewhat satisfied	464	36.0	46.6	66.9
	3 Somewhat dissatisfied	179	13.9	17.9	84.8
	4 Very dissatisfied	151	11.7	15.2	100.0
	Total	996	77.4	100.0	
Missing	8 Unable to rate/don't know	267	20.7		
	9 Refused	1	.1		
	System	23	1.8		
	Total	291	22.6		
Total		1287	100.0		

recyclec Sat w/ recycling services

		Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Valid	1 Very satisfied	418	32.5	50.6	50.6
	2 Somewhat satisfied	312	24.3	37.7	88.3
	3 Somewhat dissatisfied	49	3.8	5.9	94.2
	4 Very dissatisfied	48	3.8	5.8	100.0
	Total	827	64.3	100.0	
Missing	8 Unable to rate/don't know	108	8.4		
	System	352	27.3		
	Total	460	35.7		
Total		1287	100.0		

landfill Has R Taken Trash to Landfill

		Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Valid	1 Yes	442	34.3	47.5	47.5
	2 No	488	37.9	52.5	100.0
	Total	929	72.2	100.0	
Missing	8 Can't recall/Don't know	11	.9		
	System	347	26.9		
	Total	358	27.8		
Total		1287	100.0		

fillsat Sat. with Landfill

		Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Valid	1 Very satisfied	344	26.7	78.9	78.9
	2 Somewhat satisfied	74	5.8	17.1	96.0
	3 Somewhat dissatisfied	12	.9	2.8	98.7
	4 Very dissatisfied	5	.4	1.3	100.0
	Total	436	33.9	100.0	
Missing	8 Unable to rate/don't know	6	.4		
	System	845	65.7		
	Total	851	66.1		
Total		1287	100.0		

travel97 Sat w/ Ease of Travel in PWC

		Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Valid	1 Very satisfied	155	12.0	12.4	12.4
	2 Somewhat satisfied	431	33.5	34.5	46.9
	3 Somewhat dissatisfied	331	25.8	26.5	73.4
	4 Very dissatisfied	333	25.9	26.6	100.0
	Total	1250	97.2	100.0	
Missing	8 Unable to rate/don't know	12	1.0		
	9 Refused	1	.1		
	System	23	1.8		
Total		37	2.8		
Total		1287	100.0		

outsidec Sat w/ Ease of Travel around NoVA outside PWC

		Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Valid	1 Very satisfied	59	4.6	5.2	5.2
	2 Somewhat satisfied	257	20.0	22.5	27.7
	3 Somewhat dissatisfied	325	25.3	28.5	56.1
	4 Very dissatisfied	501	38.9	43.9	100.0
	Total	1142	88.8	100.0	
Missing	8 Unable to rate/don't know	49	3.8		
	System	96	7.4		
	Total	145	11.2		
Total		1287	100.0		

transc2 Sat w/ Public Transportation in PWC

		Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Valid	1 Very satisfied	93	7.2	15.1	15.1
	2 Somewhat satisfied	257	19.9	41.9	57.0
	3 Somewhat dissatisfied	143	11.1	23.4	80.4
	4 Very dissatisfied	120	9.3	19.6	100.0
	Total	613	47.6	100.0	
Missing	8 Unable to rate/don't know	642	49.9		
	System	33	2.5		
	Total	674	52.4		
Total		1287	100.0		

moresat1 Trans: Service to other locations

		Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Valid	0 Not selected	110	8.6	41.9	41.9
	1 Selected	153	11.9	58.1	100.0
	Total	263	20.5	100.0	
Missing	System	1024	79.5		
Total		1287	100.0		

moresat2 Trans: Longer hours/service on weekends

		Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Valid	0 Not selected	208	16.2	79.2	79.2
	1 Selected	55	4.3	20.8	100.0
	Total	263	20.5	100.0	
Missing	System	1024	79.5		
Total		1287	100.0		

moresat3 Trans: More frequent service

		Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Valid	0 Not selected	153	11.9	58.0	58.0
	1 Selected	111	8.6	42.0	100.0
	Total	263	20.5	100.0	
Missing	System	1024	79.5		
Total		1287	100.0		

moresat4 Trans: Other

		Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Valid	0 Not selected	147	11.4	55.8	55.8
	1 Selected	116	9.0	44.2	100.0
	Total	263	20.5	100.0	
Missing	System	1024	79.5		
Total		1287	100.0		

Multiple Responses

Case Summary^b

	Cases					
	Valid		Missing		Total	
	N	Percent	N	Percent	N	Percent
\$trans ^a	261	20.2%	1026	79.8%	1287	100.0%

a. Dichotomy group tabulated at value 1.

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

\$trans Frequencies

		Responses		Percent of Cases
		N	Percent	
More satisfaction with public trans	Trans: Service to other locations	153	35.2%	58.7%
	Trans: Longer hours/service on weekends	55	12.6%	21.1%
	Trans: More frequent service	111	25.4%	42.5%
	Trans: Other	116	26.8%	44.7%
Total		435	100.0%	166.9%

a. Dichotomy group tabulated at value 1.

novatrc2 Sat w/ Public Transportation in NoVA outside PWC

		Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Valid	1 Very satisfied	163	12.6	22.0	22.0
	2 Somewhat satisfied	319	24.8	43.0	65.0
	3 Somewhat dissatisfied	131	10.2	17.6	82.6
	4 Very dissatisfied	128	10.0	17.4	100.0
	Total	740	57.5	100.0	
Missing	8 Unable to rate/don't know	513	39.9		
	9 Refused	1	.1		
	System	33	2.5		
	Total	547	42.5		
Total	1287	100.0			

growthc Sat w/ Rate of PWC Growth

		Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Valid	1 Very satisfied	88	6.8	7.5	7.5
	2 Somewhat satisfied	431	33.5	36.5	44.0
	3 Somewhat dissatisfied	368	28.6	31.2	75.2
	4 Very dissatisfied	293	22.8	24.8	100.0
	Total	1180	91.7	100.0	
Missing	8 Unable to rate/don't know	79	6.2		
	System	28	2.2		
	Total	107	8.3		
Total	1287	100.0			

roaddeva Sat w/ Coordination of Development with Road Systems

		Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Valid	1 Very satisfied	46	3.6	6.1	6.1
	2 Somewhat satisfied	225	17.5	29.4	35.5
	3 Somewhat dissatisfied	220	17.1	28.8	64.3
	4 Very dissatisfied	273	21.2	35.7	100.0
	Total	764	59.4	100.0	
Missing	8 Unable to rate/don't know	125	9.7		
	System	398	31.0		
	Total	523	40.6		
Total	1287	100.0			

svedeva Sat w/ Coordination of Development with Community Facilities

		Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Valid	1 Very satisfied	238	18.5	22.0	22.0
	2 Somewhat satisfied	559	43.4	51.7	73.7
	3 Somewhat dissatisfied	189	14.7	17.5	91.2
	4 Very dissatisfied	95	7.4	8.8	100.0
	Total	1081	84.0	100.0	
Missing	8 Unable to rate/don't know	180	14.0		
	9 Refused	1	.1		
	System	24	1.9		
	Total	206	16.0		
Total		1287	100.0		

envrdeva Sat w/ County's Efforts to Protect Environment

		Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Valid	1 Very satisfied	108	8.4	18.1	18.1
	2 Somewhat satisfied	333	25.9	55.5	73.6
	3 Somewhat dissatisfied	86	6.7	14.4	88.0
	4 Very dissatisfied	72	5.6	12.0	100.0
	Total	600	46.6	100.0	
Missing	8 Unable to rate/don't know	230	17.9		
	System	457	35.5		
	Total	687	53.4		
Total		1287	100.0		

spcedeva Sat w/ County's Efforts to Preserve Open Space

		Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Valid	1 Very satisfied	89	6.9	12.6	12.6
	2 Somewhat satisfied	273	21.2	38.9	51.5
	3 Somewhat dissatisfied	171	13.3	24.4	75.9
	4 Very dissatisfied	169	13.2	24.1	100.0
	Total	702	54.6	100.0	
Missing	8 Unable to rate/don't know	123	9.5		
	9 Refused	1	.1		
	System	460	35.8		
	Total	585	45.4		
Total		1287	100.0		

historic Sat w/ County's Efforts in Historic Preservation

		Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Valid	1 Very satisfied	193	15.0	33.7	33.7
	2 Somewhat satisfied	314	24.4	54.8	88.4
	3 Somewhat dissatisfied	43	3.3	7.5	95.9
	4 Very dissatisfied	23	1.8	4.1	100.0
	Total	572	44.5	100.0	
Missing	8 Unable to rate/don't know	224	17.4		
	9 Refused	1	.1		
	System	489	38.0		
	Total	715	55.5		
Total		1287	100.0		

inputdev Sat w/ Opportunities for Citizen Input

		Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Valid	1 Very satisfied	107	8.3	17.8	17.8
	2 Somewhat satisfied	292	22.7	48.8	66.6
	3 Somewhat dissatisfied	110	8.6	18.5	85.1
	4 Very dissatisfied	89	6.9	14.9	100.0
	Total	598	46.5	100.0	
Missing	8 Unable to rate/don't know	380	29.5		
	9 Refused	2	.1		
	System	308	23.9		
	Total	689	53.5		
Total		1287	100.0		

visdev Sat w/ Visual Appearance of New Development

		Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Valid	1 Very satisfied	226	17.5	25.1	25.1
	2 Somewhat satisfied	479	37.2	53.4	78.5
	3 Somewhat dissatisfied	123	9.5	13.6	92.1
	4 Very dissatisfied	71	5.5	7.9	100.0
	Total	898	69.8	100.0	
Missing	8 Unable to rate/don't know	42	3.2		
	System	347	27.0		
	Total	389	30.2		
Total		1287	100.0		

trashc Sat w/ Appearance of Trash along Roadways & in Neighborhoods

		Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Valid	1 Very satisfied	300	23.3	28.5	28.5
	2 Somewhat satisfied	521	40.5	49.6	78.1
	3 Somewhat dissatisfied	157	12.2	14.9	93.0
	4 Very dissatisfied	73	5.7	7.0	100.0
	Total	1052	81.7	100.0	
Missing	8 Unable to rate/don't know	15	1.1		
	System	221	17.2		
	Total	235	18.3		
Total		1287	100.0		

signsc Sat w/ Appearance of Illegal Signs along Major Roads

		Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Valid	1 Very satisfied	105	8.1	10.3	10.3
	2 Somewhat satisfied	395	30.7	38.8	49.2
	3 Somewhat dissatisfied	307	23.8	30.2	79.3
	4 Very dissatisfied	210	16.3	20.7	100.0
	Total	1016	79.0	100.0	
Missing	8 Unable to rate/don't know	50	3.9		
	System	221	17.2		
	Total	271	21.0		
Total		1287	100.0		

buildingc Sat w/ Appearance of Deteriorated Buildings

		Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Valid	1 Very satisfied	190	14.8	19.5	19.5
	2 Somewhat satisfied	532	41.4	54.6	74.1
	3 Somewhat dissatisfied	187	14.5	19.1	93.2
	4 Very dissatisfied	66	5.1	6.8	100.0
	Total	975	75.8	100.0	
Missing	8 Unable to rate/don't know	90	7.0		
	System	221	17.2		
	Total	312	24.2		
Total		1287	100.0		

junkc Sat w/ Appearance of Junk Cars

		Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Valid	1 Very satisfied	304	23.7	30.7	30.7
	2 Somewhat satisfied	470	36.5	47.4	78.1
	3 Somewhat dissatisfied	129	10.0	13.0	91.1
	4 Very dissatisfied	88	6.9	8.9	100.0
	Total	992	77.1	100.0	
Missing	8 Unable to rate/don't know	72	5.6		
	9 Refused	1	.1		
	System	222	17.2		
	Total	295	22.9		
Total		1287	100.0		

view View of Services and Taxes

		Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Valid	1 Decrease services & taxes	118	9.2	9.6	9.6
	2 Keep services & taxes same	776	60.3	63.3	73.0
	3 Increase services & taxes	174	13.5	14.2	87.2
	4 Increase services, keep taxes same (vol)	72	5.6	5.9	93.0
	5 Increase services, decrease taxes (vol)	37	2.9	3.0	96.1
	6 Keep services same, decrease taxes (vol)	28	2.2	2.3	98.4
	7 Some other change (vol)	20	1.6	1.6	100.0
	Total	1225	95.2	100.0	
Missing	8 Don't know/No opinion	34	2.6		
	System	28	2.2		
	Total	62	4.8		
Total		1287	100.0		

value Sat w/ Value for Tax Dollar

		Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Valid	1 Very satisfied	213	16.5	18.5	18.5
	2 Somewhat satisfied	709	55.1	61.7	80.2
	3 Somewhat dissatisfied	146	11.4	12.7	92.9
	4 Very dissatisfied	81	6.3	7.1	100.0
	Total	1149	89.3	100.0	
Missing	8 Unable to rate/don't know	59	4.6		
	System	79	6.1		
	Total	138	10.7		
Total		1287	100.0		

effneff Sat w/ Efficient and Effective Service

		Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Valid	1 Very satisfied	235	18.3	21.8	21.8
	2 Somewhat satisfied	690	53.6	63.8	85.6
	3 Somewhat dissatisfied	111	8.6	10.3	95.8
	4 Very dissatisfied	45	3.5	4.2	100.0
	Total	1081	84.0	100.0	
Missing	8 Unable to rate/don't know	107	8.3		
	9 Refused	3	.2		
	System	97	7.5		
	Total	206	16.0		
Total		1287	100.0		

trstgov1 Trust of Government to do What is Right

		Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Valid	1 Just about always	154	12.0	12.7	12.7
	2 Most of the time	624	48.5	51.4	64.0
	3 Only some of the time	419	32.5	34.5	98.5
	4 Never/almost never (vol)	18	1.4	1.5	100.0
	Total	1215	94.4	100.0	
Missing	8 Don't know/No answer	42	3.3		
	System	30	2.3		
	Total	72	5.6		
Total		1287	100.0		

schl4 Sat that School System Provides Efficient Service

		Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Valid	1 Very satisfied	99	7.7	41.4	41.4
	2 Somewhat satisfied	103	8.0	42.9	84.4
	3 Somewhat dissatisfied	19	1.4	7.8	92.1
	4 Very dissatisfied	19	1.5	7.9	100.0
	Total	239	18.6	100.0	
Missing	8 Unable to rate/don't know	54	4.2		
	System	994	77.3		
Total		1048	81.4		
Total		1287	100.0		

park12 Has R Used Park Authority's Parks

		Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Valid	1 Yes--has used	700	54.4	57.0	57.0
	2 No--has not	529	41.1	43.0	100.0
	Total	1229	95.5	100.0	
Missing	8 Can't recall/Don't know	28	2.2		
	System	30	2.3		
Total		58	4.5		
Total		1287	100.0		

park1 Familiar with Park Authority

		Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Valid	1 Yes--familiar	612	47.6	48.7	48.7
	2 Not sure	89	6.9	7.1	55.8
	3 No--not familiar	556	43.2	44.2	100.0
	Total	1257	97.7	100.0	
Missing	System	30	2.3		
Total		1287	100.0		

park2 Sat. with Park Authority

		Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Valid	1 Very satisfied	341	26.5	56.2	56.2
	2 Somewhat satisfied	228	17.7	37.5	93.7
	3 Somewhat dissatisfied	26	2.0	4.3	97.9
	4 Very dissatisfied	13	1.0	2.1	100.0
	Total	607	47.2	100.0	
Missing	8 Unable to rate/don't know	5	.4		
	System	675	52.4		
Total		680	52.8		
Total		1287	100.0		

ctyserv1 Familiar with Service Authority

		Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Valid	1 Yes--familiar	719	55.9	57.2	57.2
	2 Not sure	46	3.6	3.6	60.9
	3 No--not familiar	492	38.2	39.1	100.0
	Total	1257	97.6	100.0	
Missing	System	30	2.4		
Total		1287	100.0		

ctyserv2 Sat. with Service Authority

		Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Valid	1 Very satisfied	395	30.7	55.1	55.1
	2 Somewhat satisfied	274	21.3	38.2	93.3
	3 Somewhat dissatisfied	22	1.7	3.1	96.4
	4 Very dissatisfied	26	2.0	3.6	100.0
	Total	717	55.7	100.0	
Missing	8 Unable to rate/don't know	2	.2		
	System	568	44.1		
Total		570	44.3		
Total		1287	100.0		

jobcity City Where R Works

		Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Valid	1 Prince William County	261	20.3	30.7	30.7
	2 Manassas	27	2.1	3.1	33.8
	3 Manassas Park	2	.1	.2	34.0
	4 Stafford County	7	.5	.8	34.8
	5				
	Fredericksburg/ Spotsylvania	4	.3	.5	35.3
	6 Fauquier County/Warrenton	6	.5	.7	36.1
	7 Loudon County	28	2.2	3.3	39.4
	8 Fairfax County	209	16.3	24.6	63.9
	9 Fairfax City	20	1.5	2.3	66.2
	10 Falls Church	12	.9	1.4	67.6
	11 Arlington	49	3.8	5.7	73.4
	12 Alexandria	39	3.0	4.6	77.9
	13 Richmond City or area	2	.2	.2	78.2
	14 Elsewhere in VA	11	.9	1.3	79.5
	15 Washington, DC	114	8.9	13.4	92.9
	16 Maryland	17	1.3	2.0	94.8
	17 Another location (specify)	28	2.2	3.3	98.2
	18 Works all over (vol)	15	1.2	1.8	100.0
	Total	851	66.1	100.0	
Missing	99 Don't know/No answer	4	.3		
	System	432	33.6		
	Total	436	33.9		
Total		1287	100.0		

samehome Live in Same House as 1 Year Ago

		Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Valid	1 Yes	843	65.5	94.7	94.7
	2 No	47	3.7	5.3	100.0
	Total	891	69.2	100.0	
Missing	9 Refused	0	.0		
	System	396	30.8		
	Total	396	30.8		
Total		1287	100.0		

samework Same Workplace as 1 Year Ago

		Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Valid	1 Yes	712	55.3	84.3	84.3
	2 No	132	10.3	15.7	100.0
	Total	844	65.6	100.0	
Missing	3 Not working a year ago (vol)	6	.4		
	9 Refused	5	.4		
	System	432	33.6		
	Total	443	34.4		
Total		1287	100.0		

Statistics

comm98 Commute Time to Work

N	Valid	839
	Missing	448
Mean		42.27

commtime Commute Time Difference From 1 Year Ago

		Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Valid	1 Gotten longer	319	24.8	37.9	37.9
	2 Gotten shorter	91	7.1	10.9	48.8
	3 Stayed about the same	427	33.2	50.8	99.5
	4 Not working 1 year ago (vol)	4	.3	.5	100.0
	Total	841	65.3	100.0	
Missing	8 Don't know	10	.8		
	9 Refused	3	.3		
	System	432	33.6		
Total		446	34.7		
Total		1287	100.0		

telecom Does R Telecommute

		Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Valid	1 Yes	180	14.0	21.2	21.2
	2 No	649	50.4	76.5	97.6
	3 Home is main place of work	20	1.6	2.4	100.0
	Total	849	65.9	100.0	
Missing	8 Don't know	4	.3		
	9 Refused	2	.2		
	System	432	33.6		
	Total	438	34.1		
Total		1287	100.0		

teltime How Often R Telecommutes

		Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Valid	1 All the time	18	1.4	10.3	10.3
	2 Several times a week	45	3.5	25.0	35.2
	3 Several times a month	41	3.2	22.9	58.2
	4 Once or twice a month	47	3.6	26.2	84.3
	5 Several times a year	28	2.2	15.7	100.0
	Total	178	13.8	100.0	
Missing	8 Don't know	0	.0		
	System	1108	86.1		
	Total	1109	86.2		
Total		1287	100.0		

phone1 Is Phone Number Listed

		Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Valid	1 Yes	967	75.1	81.0	81.0
	2 No	227	17.6	19.0	100.0
	Total	1194	92.8	100.0	
Missing	9 Don't know/Refused	44	3.4		
	System	49	3.8		
	Total	93	7.2		
Total		1287	100.0		

phone2 R Chose Unlisted Number or Not Yet in Phone Book

		Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Valid	1 Unlisted/Unpublished	207	16.1	91.6	91.6
	2 Got number after phone book came out	12	.9	5.3	96.9
	3 Other	7	.5	3.1	100.0
	Total	226	17.5	100.0	
Missing	9 Don't know/Refused System	1	.1		
	Total	1060	82.4		
	Total	1061	82.5		
Total		1287	100.0		

Multiple Responses

Case Summary

	Cases					
	Valid		Missing		Total	
	N	Percent	N	Percent	N	Percent
\$hope1 ^a	623	99.5%	3	.5%	626	100.0%

a. Dichotomy group tabulated at value 1.

\$hope1 Frequencies

	Responses	Responses		Percent of Cases
		N	Percent	
What is the one thing about Prince William County you hope is different in 20 to 25 ^a years?	Reduction of traffic, congestion	261	36.0%	41.9%
	Improve roads, public transportation	165	22.7%	26.5%
	Reduction in development, housing, growth control	104	14.3%	16.7%
	Maintain green spaces (parks, trees, ruraleness etc.)	15	2.1%	2.4%
	Community feeling, maintain standards of living, way of life	8	1.1%	1.3%
	Control of illegal immigration	20	2.8%	3.2%
	Improve schools, education system	21	2.9%	3.4%
	Reduce taxes, costs of living	23	3.2%	3.7%
	Increase/Access to Grocery stores, shopping malls, restaurants	20	2.8%	3.2%
	More businesses/Job opportunities/Development	11	1.5%	1.8%
	Improve safety and security (police, Fire, EMT)	29	4.0%	4.7%
	Improve other county services (health services, etc.)	24	3.3%	3.9%
	Others	25	3.4%	4.0%
Total		726	100.0%	116.5%

a. Dichotomy group tabulated at value 1.

Multiple Responses

Case Summary

	Cases					
	Valid		Missing		Total	
	N	Percent	N	Percent	N	Percent
\$hope2 ^a	510	99.2%	4	.8%	514	100.0%

a. Dichotomy group tabulated at value 1.

\$hope2 Frequencies

	Responses	Responses		Percent of Cases
		N	Percent	
What is the one thing you hope stays the same in Prince William County in 20 to 25 ^a years?	Reduction of traffic, congestion	11	2.0%	2.2%
	Improve roads, public transportation	11	2.0%	2.2%
	Reduction in development, housing, growth control	85	15.7%	16.7%
	Maintain green spaces (parks, trees, ruraleness etc.)	147	27.2%	28.8%
	Community feeling, maintain standards of living, way of life	100	18.5%	19.6%
	Control of illegal immigration	7	1.3%	1.4%
	Improve schools, education system	41	7.6%	8.0%
	Reduce taxes, costs of living	20	3.7%	3.9%
	Increase/Access to Grocery stores, shopping malls, restaurants	20	3.7%	3.9%
	More businesses/Job opportunities/ Development	8	1.5%	1.6%
	Improve safety and security (police, Fire, EMT)	22	4.1%	4.3%
	Improve other county services (health services, etc.)	35	6.5%	6.9%
	Others	34	6.3%	6.7%
Total	541	100.0%	106.1%	

a. Dichotomy group tabulated at value 1.

**Appendix E:
Question Revisions and Rotation Plan**

Question	Prior Designator	Question Name	Core Question	Not Core Incl. 2006	Not Core Incl. 2007
Between 1 and 10 how would you rate PWC as a place to live?	OVERALL	QOL10	1		
On the same scale where would you say PWC stood 5 yrs ago?	Q22	5YRAGOB		1	
On the same scale where would you say PWC will stand 5 yrs from now?	Future	FUTUREB		1	
Would you like to be living in PWC 5 yrs from now or someplace else?	Q23	HPELIVEB		1	
How satisfied are you in general with services the County provides?		CTYSAT97	1		
Since last year is satisfaction with services increased/decreased/same?	satchg			1	
How satisfied are you with:					
The job the county is doing in providing convenient ways to register to vote?	Q51	VOTE	1		
The job the county is doing keeping citizens informed about programs?	Q54	GOVTSERV	1		
Where do you get information on the PWC government?		INFOSORC			1
How satisfied are you with:					
The job the County is doing in animal control services?	Q39	ANIMALA			1
The job the County is doing in providing street lighting?	Q40	STRLTA	1		
The job the County is doing in fire fighting in your area?	Q33	FIRE	1		
The job the County is doing in providing emergency medical rescue?	Q34	RESCUE	1		
The job the County is doing in controlling mosquitoes?		MOSCONT			1
How satisfied are you with:					
Safety from crime in your neighborhood during daylight?	Q36a	AMCRIME	1		
Safety from crime in your neighborhood after dark?	Q36b	PMCRIME	1		
Safety from crime in commercial areas during daylight?	Q36c	DYCRIMEB		1	
Safety from crime in commercial areas after dark?	Q36d	NTCRIMEB		1	
Crime prevention programs and information provided by police?	Q37	PREVENTB		1	
Police department attitudes and behaviors towards citizens?	Q37a	ATTITUDE	1		
Police department efforts to reduce the use of illegal drugs?	Q38	DRUGS	1		
Police department's efforts to combat gang activity?		GANGS		1	
The overall performance of the police department?	Q35	POLICE	1		
In the past year, have you had occasion to visit the Judicial Center (the courthouse in downtown Manassas)?		COURT			1
How satisfied are you with the level of security in the courthouse?		COURTSAT			1
New Satisfaction Sheriff's Office attitudes and behaviors toward citizens		ATTITUT	1		
New Satisfaction with the overall performance of the Sheriff's Office		SHERIFFA	1		
Have you dialed 911 over the past 12 months?	Q184	EMERG911	1		
When you dialed 911 which services did you call for?	Q187	EMSERVB	1		
Was your call because of an emergency?	Q187a	EMERGSB	1		
How satisfied were you with:					
The assistance you received from the person who took your 911 call?	Q191	EMSATIS	1		
The time it took for help to arrive on scene?	Q192	EMTIMEB	1		
The assistance provided on the scene?	Q193	EMASSTB	1		
How many people in your household have been trained in CPR?		CPR97	1		
Why dissatisfied with the assistance received from person taking 911 call?		EMSATRES		1	
How much time did it take for help to arrive on the scene?		EMTIMEST		1	

Question

Question	Prior Designator	Question Name	Core Question	Not Core Incl. 2006	Not Core Incl. 2007
What is a reasonable amount of time to receive help?		EMTIMRES		1	
Why dissatisfied with the assistance provided on the scene?		EMASSRES		1	
NEW In the event of an emergency, how long could you shelter in your home with electricity?		SHELTER1			1
NEW In the event of an emergency, how long could you shelter in your home without electricity?		SHELTER2			1
Providing library services?	Q50	LIBRARY	1		
Providing park and recreation facilities and programs?	Q46	PARK	1		
Providing programs to help the County's elderly population?	Q58	ELDERLY	1		
Providing help to people in financial need?	Q59	FINNEEDB		1	
Providing help to people with emotional, mental, or alcohol and drug problems?		PROBLEMB			1
Have you used the county libraries in the past 12 months?	Q81	LIBRY12	1		
If so, how satisfied were you with service from library staff?	Q82	LIBRYSAT	1		
Are you familiar enough to rate the Department of Social Services?	Q87	DEPTSS	1		
If so, how satisfied are you with DSS services?	Q88	DSSSAT	1		
Are you familiar enough with Health Department to rate their services?	Q89	HLTHDEPT	1		
If so, how satisfied are you with Health Department services?	Q90	HLTHSAT	1		
Are you familiar with the services of the Community Service Board?	Q93	MENTAL	1		
How satisfied are you with their:					
NEW Services to people with mental retardation?		MENTRET	1		
NEW Early Intervention Services?		MENTEIS	1		
NEW Services to people with substance abuse problems?		MENSUB	1		
NEW Services overall?		MENTALL	1		
NEW Services to people with mental health problems		MENTHPB*	1		
* This question was omitted in the 2007 survey					
Over the past 12 months have you contacted anybody in the County government about anything?	Q65	ANYBODY	1		
If so, how satisfied were you with the helpfulness of employees?	Q68	HELPFUL2	1		
Have you contacted the County about your taxes over last 12 months?	Q64a	TAXESA	1		
What was the specific reason you contacted the County?	Q64a1	CONTACTA	1		
How did you contact the county (telephone, walk in, etc).	Q64b	HOWCONA	1		
How satisfied were you with the helpfulness of employees?	Q64c1	HELPFULA	1		
How satisfied were you with time it took for your request to be answered?	Q64c3	TIMESATA	1		
Have you ever used the PWC government website?		NET1	1		
If so, how satisfied were you with the site?		NET2	1		
How satisfied are you with the job the County is doing planning how land will be used and developed?	Q52	LAND	1		
Are you familiar enough with County's effort to attract new jobs and business to rate those efforts?		RATEBJOBS	1		
How satisfied are you with the job the County is doing trying to attract new jobs and businesses?	Q56	NEWJOBS	1		
What caused you to be dissatisfied with the job the County is doing to attract new jobs and businesses?		JOBSDIS		1	
What types of jobs do you think the county should be trying to attract?		JOBSDISN		1	
What are some reasons you are very satisfied with the job the County is doing to attract new jobs and businesses?		JOBSSAT		1	

Question	Prior Designator	Question Name	Core Question	Not Core Incl. 2006	Not Core Incl. 2007
How satisfied are you with:					
The job the County is doing in preventing neighborhoods from deteriorating and making sure the community is well kept up?	Q53	NEIGHBOR	1		
The recycling services in the County?		RECYCLEC			1
Have you used the County landfill in the last 12 months?	Q83	LANDFILL	1		
If so, how satisfied were you with landfill services?	Q86	LFILLSAT	1		
NEW In the past twelve months, have a member of your family used the Balls Ford Road Compost		COMPOST		1	
NEW How satisfied were you with the Balls Ford Road compost facility		COMPSAT		1	
How satisfied are you with:					
The ease of travel or getting around within PWC?		TRAVEL97	1		
The ease of getting around Northern VA outside of PWC?		OUTSIDEDEC	1*		
*Client asked that OUTSIDEDEC be moved to the core questions.					
REVISED Public transportation provided to PWC residents for destinations within PWC?	TRANSC	TRANSC2			1
What would make you more satisfied with public transportation?	pubtra	MORESAT			1
What aspects of PWC's public transportation contribute to your satisfaction?		WHYSAT			1
REVISED How satisfied are you with public transportation provided to PWC residents for destinations elsewhere in NOVA and DC?	NOVATRC	NOVATRC2			1
How satisfied are you with:					
The rate of growth in the County?		GROWTHC	1		
The coordination of development with transportation and road systems?	roadeva	ROADDEVA			1
The coordination of development with locations of community facilities?	svcdev	SVEDEVA			1
The County's efforts to protect the environment?	envirdev	ENVRDEVA			1
The County's efforts to preserve open space?	spacedev	SPCEDEVA			1
NEW The County's efforts in historic preservation?		HISTORIC			1
Opportunities for citizen input on the planning process?		INPUTDEV	1		
The visual appearance of new development in the County?		VISDEV	1		
NEW Familiarity with the County's effort to preserve and improve the water quality of the streams?		QSSCREEN		1	
NEW Satisfaction with the County's effort to preserve and improve the water quality of the streams		QSTREAMS		1	
How satisfied are you with the visual appearance of the County in regards to:					
The amount of trash / debris, litter along roadways and in neighborhoods?		TRASHC			1
The number of illegal signs along major roads?		SIGNSC			1
Deteriorated buildings and other structures?		BUILDNGC			1
The number of junk cars along roadways and in neighborhoods?		JUNKC			1
Should services and taxes increase, decrease, or stay the same?	Q129	VIEW	1		
How satisfied are you with the County in giving you value for your tax dollar?	Q96	VALUE	1		
How satisfied are you that the County provides efficient and effective service?		EFFNEFF	1		
How much of the time can you trust the County government to do right?		TRSTGOV1	1		

Question	Prior Designator	Question Name	Core Question	Not Core Incl. 2006	Not Core Incl. 2007
How many persons under 18 live in your household?	Q132	UNDER18	1		
Are any of those children less than 5?		KUNDR597	1		
Are any of those children ages 5 to 12?		K5TO1297	1		
Are any of those children ages 13 to 17?		KOVR1297	1		
Do you currently have any children attending PWC Schools?		SCHLO1	1		
How satisfied are you:					
That the school system provides efficient/effective service?		SCHL4	1		
With adult learning opportunities in the County?		ADULTC		1	
With life-long learning opportunities in the County?		LEARNC		1	
Have you used park and recreation facilities in the past 12 months?	Q75	PARK12	1		
Are you familiar enough with Park Authority services to rate?		PARK1	1		
How satisfied are you that the Park Authority provides efficient/effective service?		PARK2	1		
Are you familiar enough with Service Authority to rate?		CTYSERV1	1		
How satisfied are you that Service Authority provides efficient/effective service?		CTYSERV2	1		
How many persons in your household are 18 or older?	Q131	OLDER18	1		
In what year were you born?	Q134	YRBORN	1		
Are you working full time, part time, looking for work?	Q135	WORK	1		
Do you have any specialized work related license?	cred98	CRED98B		1	
What kind of work do you do at your job?	job1	JOB1B		1	
What is the main business or industry of your organization?	job2	JOB2B		1	
So you are employed in?	job3	JOB3B		1	
What is the place where you work primarily concerned with?	job5	JOB5B		1	
In what county or city is your job located?	Q136	JOBCITY	1		
NEW And where in Fairfax is your job located		FAIRFAX		1	
Are you living today in the same house as you were a year ago?		SAMEHOME	1		
Are you commuting to the same workplace as you were a year ago?		SAMEWORK	1		
How long on average does it take you to get to work?		COMM98	1		
During the past year has your commuting time gotten longer/shorter/same?		COMMTIME	1		
Do you telecommute or telework?		TELECOM	1		
In past 12 months, how often have you telecommuted or teleworked?		TELTIME	1		
Is the number I dialed listed in the current telephone book?		PHONE1	1		
If not, is it because you chose to have an unlisted number or because you got this number after the current phone book came out?		PHONE2	1		
What is your marital status?	Q137	MARITAL	1		
What is the highest level of education you completed?	Q138	EDUC	1		
Are you currently serving or have you served in the U.S. military?	Qmiltry	MILTRY	1		
What is your income range?	Q151	INCOME	1		
Do you consider yourself to be of Hispanic origin?		HISPANIC	1		
What is your race?	Q152	RACE	1		
Total Questions			88	28	22

SATISFACTION ITEM INDEX

Item Number	Satisfaction Item	Frequency Page Number	Questionnaire Page Number	Report Page Number
<i>General Satisfaction with Services and Taxes</i>				
CTYSAT97	Gen Satisfaction with County Services	D-10	A-8	12
VOTE	Convenient Ways to Register to Vote	D-10	A-9	13
GOVTSERV	Informing Citizens about Government	D-10	A-9	13
ANIMALA	Satisfaction with Animal Control	D-14	A-10	17
STRLTA	Street Lighting	D-14	A-10	16
MOSCONT	Satisfaction with Efforts to Control Mosquitoes	D-15	A-11	17
TIMESATA	Timeliness of Tax Request	D-32	A-22	24
HELPFULA	Helpfulness of County Tax Employees	D-31	A-21	23
NOVATRC2	Public Transportation in NoVA outside PWC	D-38	A-25	31
TRANSC2	Public Transportation in PWC	D-36	A-25	31
VALUE	Value for Tax Dollar	D-43	A-29	34
<i>Public Safety</i>				
FIRE	Fire Fighting in Respondent's Area	D-14	A-10	14
RESCUE	Emergency Medical Rescue Services	D-15	A-10	14
AMCRIME	Safety in Neighborhood in Daytime	D-15	A-11	16
PMCRIME	Safety in Neighborhood at Night	D-16	A-11	16
ATTITUDE	Police Attitudes and Behaviors Towards Citizens	D-16	A-11	14
DRUGS	Reduce the Use of Illegal Drugs	D-16	A-12	14
ATTITUT	Sheriff's office Attitudes and Behaviors Toward Citizens	D-17	A-12	14
POLICE	Overall Performance of Police Dept.	D-17	A-12	14
SHERIFFA	Sheriff's office Performance	D-18	A-13	14
COURTSAT	Security in Courthouse	D-18	A-13	14
EMSATIS	Assistance from 9-1-1 Operator	D-22	A-14	15
EMTIMEB	Time for Help to Arrive	D-22	A-15	15
EMASSTB	Assistance on the Scene	D-22	A-15	15
<i>Public Services</i>				
PARK	Providing Park and Recreation Programs and Facilities	D-24	A-17	19
PROBLEMB	Providing Help to People with Emotional, Mental or Alcohol and Drug Problems	D-25	A-17	20
LIBRARY	Satisfaction with Providing Library Services	D-24	A-17	19
ELDERLY	Programs for Elderly Population	D-25	A-17	20
DSSSAT	Satisfaction with Department of Social Services	D-26	A-18	20
LIBRYSAT	Service from Library Staff	D-26	A-18	19
HLTHSAT	Satisfaction with Health Department	D-27	A-19	20
MENTALL	Mental Health Services Overall	D-29	A-20	20
MENTRET	Services to Mental Retardation	D-28	A-19	20
MENTEIS	Early Intervention Services	D-28	A-19	20
MENTSUB	Services to Substance Abuse	D-28	A-20	20
EFFNEFF	County Provides Efficient and Effective Service in General	D-43	A-29	12
SCHL4	School System Provides Efficient Service	D-44	A-30	19
PARK1	Familiarity with Park Authority	D-44	A-31	19
PARK2	Park Authority	D-45	A-31	23
CTYSERV2	Service Authority	D-45	A-32	24

Item Number	Satisfaction Item	Frequency Page Number	Questionnaire Page Number	Report Page Number
	<i>Planning and Development Issues</i>			
VISDEV	Visual Appearance of New Development	D-40	A-27	29
TRASHC	Appearance of Trash along Roadways & in Neighborhoods	D-41	A-27	29
JUNKC	Appearance of Junk Cars	D-42	A-28	29
BUILDNGC	Appearance of Deteriorated Buildings	D-41	A-28	29
GROWTHC	Growth in County	D-38	A-25	26
LAND1	Land Use Planning and Development - prejob	D-33	A-22	26
LAND2	Land Use Planning and Development - postjob	D-34	A-22	26
RECYCLEC	Recycling Services	D-34	A-23	30
LFILLSAT	Landfill	D-35	A-24	30
NEWJOBS	Attracting New Jobs to PWC	D-33	A-23	30
NEIGHBOR	Preventing Neighborhood Deterioration	D-34	A-23	29
TRAVEL97	Ease of Travel in PWC	D-35	A-24	30
SPCEDEVA	County's Efforts to Preserve Open Space	D-39	A-26	28
ENVRDEVA	County's Efforts to Protect Environment	D-39	A-26	28
INPUTDEV	Opportunities for Citizen Input	D-40	A-27	27
HISTORIC	County's Efforts in Historic Preservation	D-40	A-27	28
SIGNSC	Appearance of Illegal Signs along Major Roads	D-41	A-28	29
SVEDEVA	Coordination of Development with Community Facilities	D-39	A-26	26
ROADDEVA	Coordination of Development with Road Systems	D-38	A-26	30
OUTSIDEC	Ease of Travel around NoVa outside PWC	D-36	A-24	30
	<i>Communication with the County</i>			
NET2	Satisfaction with PWC Government Web Site	D-32	A-22	23
HELPFUL2	Satisfaction with County Employees at County Gov.	D-29	A-20	22