

## Garden City Services Survey 2000

### Executive Summary

Garden City contracted with the Center for Survey Research at the Docking Institute of Public Affairs to conduct a telephone survey of 500 residents of Garden City. The specific objectives of the survey included:

- Assessing residents' satisfaction with city services
- Determining satisfaction with the city police and government
- Assessing opinions about renovation of the Big Pool
- Determining residents' satisfaction with park and recreation facilities

From analysis of the survey results, we find that:

- Most respondents (56%) report that they feel safe or very safe walking around Garden City alone at night, though the percentage is much higher for men than for women.
- Respondents generally rate city services as "good" or "fair". The greatest source of dissatisfaction is with snow removal, which 26% of respondents rate as "poor."
- The highest satisfaction ratings, based on the percent of respondents calling them "good," are for the zoo (88%), fire protection (80%), and electricity (78%).
- A majority of respondents (53% in each case) rates both neighborhood streets and major streets as "good."
- Fifty-seven percent of respondents state that the city government is either doing "well" or "very well" overall.
- Respondents think that the police are doing a good job of controlling most kinds of illegal activity. The highest positive rating of police activity is in controlling traffic, with 67% rating control as good. However, only 37% of respondents rate the police department as "good" at controlling illegal drugs.

- ÿ Voters who supported the sales tax increase for the Big Pool outnumbered those who opposed the sales tax increase. The main reasons for opposition are general opposition to a sales tax increase and high renovation costs.
- ÿ Among those who voted against the sales tax increase, the most commonly cited reasons are opposition to increasing the sales tax (73%) and the high cost of renovating the Big Pool (70%).
- ÿ Fifty-nine percent of respondents indicate that they are getting their money's worth from city property taxes.
- ÿ Among recreation facilities, the Big Pool is what respondents most often say needs "some improvement" (47%) or "much improvement" (10%). Shelter and picnic areas are most often seen as needing "much improvement" (14%).

## **Section I**

### **Methods**

Between March 16, 2000 and March 28, 2000 the Docking Institute's Center for Survey Research conducted a survey of 500 households in Garden City. A random sampling technique was used to generate the telephone numbers. The survey was conducted using a Computer Aided Telephone Interviewing (CATI) system. The CATI system allows interviewers to enter the information into a computer database as the interviewers administer the questionnaire. A total of 633 households were reached after a maximum of six call attempts. This represents a response rate of 79%.

Using a 95% confidence interval, the results from the survey of households have a margin of error of +/- 4.5%. In other words, given 100 different random samples of 500 Garden City residents, only 5% of the time will the total results obtained from the sample population differ by more than +/- 4.5% from the results that would be obtained in a survey of the whole population, assuming no response bias. Importantly, the margin of error for subgroups is higher. Any statistics for subgroups with fewer than 40 to 50 respondents are primarily suggestive.

### **Survey Instrument**

The Docking Institute and the Garden City Manager agreed on the survey items to be used. It was the responsibility of Garden City to formulate study objectives. The Docking Institute was responsible for developing survey items that were technically correct and without bias. Question wording and the survey design are property of the Docking Institute and may not be used for additional surveys without written permission from the Director of the Docking Institute of Public Affairs. Frequency distributions for each survey item and a copy of the survey instrument are included in appendices.

## **Format of the Report**

The analysis is divided into five sections. The first section describes demographic characteristics of the respondents. Section II describes respondents' perceptions of city services in Garden City. Section III describes perceptions of city government and of police services. Section IV focuses on opinions about renovation of the Big Pool. Section V addresses respondents' opinions of park and recreation facilities. Appendix I contains a copy of the survey instrument. Appendix II contains frequency distribution tables for the survey questions. The Valid Percent column in these tables contains the percentages cited in the text of the report.

**Section I**  
**Sample Demographics**

**Table 1** below gives summary statistics for some characteristics of the people contacted. Twenty-five percent of respondents report that they have completed some college and high school. Most respondents (73%) own their home, and a majority (51%) are registered to vote. The mean age of the sample is 46 years and the mean length of residence in Garden City is 24 years. The respondents are 45% male and 55% female. Most respondents are white (79%) or “some other race” (12%). Most respondents (52%) have

ily  
omes  
less  
n  
0,000  
year;  
most  
mmon  
ome  
egory  
\$20,00  
\$30,000 a year.

fam  
inc  
of  
tha  
\$4  
per  
the  
co  
inc  
cat  
is  
0 to

**Q19 Highest Level of Education Completed**

		Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Valid	8th Grade or Less	30	6.0	6.2	6.2
	Some High School	45	9.0	9.2	15.4
	High School Graduate	122	24.4	25.1	40.5
	Vocational School	26	5.2	5.3	45.8
	Some College	122	24.4	25.1	70.8
	College Graduate	97	19.4	19.9	90.8
	Post College Graduate	39	7.8	8.0	98.8
	RA-DK	6	1.2	1.2	100.0
	Total	487	97.4	100.0	
Missing	System	13	2.6		
Total		500	100.0		

**Table 1**  
Demographic Profile of Garden City Residents

Q21 Tenure		
N	Valid	486
	Missing	14
Mean		24.32
Median		20.00

AGE		
N	Valid	476
	Missing	24
Mean		46.2374
Median		43.0000

**Q17 Registered to Vote**

		Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Valid	Yes	134	26.8	50.6	50.6
	No	125	25.0	47.2	97.7
	RA-DK	6	1.2	2.3	100.0
	Total	265	53.0	100.0	
Missing	System	235	47.0		

**Q24 Family Income**

		Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Valid	Less than \$10,000	35	7.0	7.4	7.4
	\$10,000-\$20,000	47	9.4	10.0	17.4
	\$20,000-\$30,000	91	18.2	19.3	36.7
	\$30,000-\$40,000	73	14.6	15.5	52.2
	\$40,000-\$50,000	56	11.2	11.9	64.1
	\$50,000-\$60,000	36	7.2	7.6	71.8
	\$60,000-\$70,000	29	5.8	6.2	77.9
	\$70,000 or more	50	10.0	10.6	88.5
	RA-DK	54	10.8	11.5	100.0
Total	471	94.2	100.0		
Missing	System	29	5.8		
Total		500	100.0		

**Table 1**  
Sample  
ography  
(Contin

Dem  
cs  
ued)

**Q20 Own or Rent**

		Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Valid	Own Home	353	70.6	72.6	72.6
	Rent	123	24.6	25.3	97.9
	RA-DK	10	2.0	2.1	100.0
	Total	486	97.2	100.0	
Missing	System	14	2.8		
Total		500	100.0		

**Q22 Race**

		Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Valid	White	379	75.8	78.6	78.6
	Black or African American	5	1.0	1.0	79.7
	American Indian or Alaskan Native	2	.4	.4	80.1
	Asian	3	.6	.6	80.7
	Some Other Race	59	11.8	12.2	92.9
	RA-DK	34	6.8	7.1	100.0
	Total	482	96.4	100.0	
Missing	System	18	3.6		
Total		500	100.0		

**Table 1**

Sample Demographics (Continued)

**Q16 Area of City Living In**

		Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Valid	Northwest	111	22.2	22.8	22.8
	Northeast	195	39.0	40.1	63.0
	Southwest	74	14.8	15.2	78.2
	Southeast	73	14.6	15.0	93.2
	RA-DK	33	6.6	6.8	100.0
	Total	486	97.2	100.0	
Missing	System	14	2.8		
Total		500	100.0		

**Q23 Mexican or Hispanic Origin**

		Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Valid	Yes	102	20.4	21.6	21.6
	No	367	73.4	77.6	99.2
	3	1	.2	.2	99.4
	RA-DK	3	.6	.6	100.0
	Total	473	94.6	100.0	
Missing	System	27	5.4		
Total		500	100.0		

**Table 1**

Sample  
phics

d)

**Q25 Gender**

		Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Valid	Male	216	43.2	44.7	44.7
	Female	267	53.4	55.3	100.0
	Total	483	96.6	100.0	
Missing	System	17	3.4		
Total		500	100.0		

Demogra  
(Continue



While 79% of respondents describe themselves as white, 22% say they are of Mexican or Hispanic origin. This is possible because Hispanics can be of any race, and many are, in fact, Caucasian.

We asked respondents to identify the section of Garden City where they live. Most respondents (63%) live north of Kansas Avenue, with 23% living northwest and 40% living northeast. The rest live southeast (15%) or southwest (15%) of Kansas Avenue.

## **Section II**

### **City Service Provision**

We asked respondents to rate a number of city services as “Good”, “Fair”, or “Poor”. The results are reported and interpreted in this section. For clearer illustration, the 19 services we asked about are divided into three categories: public health and safety, other basic services, and amenities. After focusing on each of these service categories in turn this section describes respondents’ opinions of road surface conditions.


**General Safety** Respondents were first asked how safe they would feel walking alone in the city at night. **Table 2** gives the percent of males and females in each answer category. Men report feeling safer than women, with 77% of men and 39% of women reporting that they would feel safe or very safe walking alone at night.

**Table 2**  
Feelings of Safety, by Gender

	Male	Female
Very Safe	18%	6%
Safe	59%	33%
Unsafe	13%	32%
Very Unsafe	6%	5%
Don't Know	5%	5%

**Public Health and Safety** Street lighting, trash collection, sewer services, fire protection, and law enforcement are classified, for analytical purposes, as public health and safety services. Satisfaction with most of these services is high, as **Figure 1** on the following page indicates. Seventy percent or more of respondents rate trash collection, sewer services, and fire protection as “Good.” The other public health and safety services - law enforcement, and street lighting are rated as “Good” by over 50% of respondents. The only service to receive a “Poor” rating from significant numbers is law enforcement, which is rated as “Poor” by 11% of the respondents.

**Figure 1**  
Satisfaction with Public Health and Safety Services




maintenance, animal control, water services, snow removal, storm water drainage, electricity, and the cemetery are all categorized as basic services. Respondents' have less favorable perceptions of these services than of the public health and safety services.

**Figure 2** below shows respondents' perceptions of each basic service.

**Figure 2**

Satisfaction with Other Basic Services




Four of the seven basic services have favorable ratings from respondents. A majority of respondents rate animal control, water service, electricity service, and the cemetery as “Good.” Road maintenance, snow removal, and storm water drainage are rated as “Fair” more often than “Good.”

Some services are more commonly perceived as being poor than others. Snow removal is most often rated as “Poor”, with 26% of respondents giving this rating. Using the proportion of “Poor” ratings as a criterion, snow removal is the least satisfactory of these basic services. None of the services is rated as “Poor” by the largest group of respondents.

**Amenities** The city parks, the airport, recreation facilities, the zoo, the municipal golf course, and the swimming pool are all classified as amenities. These services are generally rated as “Good” as indicated in **Figure 3**.


**Figure 3**



Only the airport and swimming pool are rated as “Good” by less than half of respondents. The airport is rated “Good” by the largest group of respondents (46%). More respondents (28%) do not know how to rate the airport than give it a rating of “Fair” (40%).

The percentage rating the swimming pool as “Good” is higher than the percentage rating it as “Fair” or “Poor”, but of all amenities it is the amenity most often rated as poor by respondents. The zoo (88%), parks (74%), recreation facilities (57%), and golf course (52%) are rated as “Good” by a majority of respondents.

**Street Surfaces** Respondents were asked their opinion of the condition both of major streets and neighborhood streets in Garden City. Respondents’ perceptions of the condition both of neighborhood streets and major streets are summarized in **Figure 4** below. A majority of respondents rate both kinds of streets as “good.” Major streets are more often rated as “fair” (40%) and less often rated as poor (7%), compared to neighborhood streets.




**Figure 4**  
Satisfaction with Street Surfaces

### Section III

#### City Government and the Police Department

This section reports on several questions asked about the quality of Garden City government and law enforcement. Respondents were first asked their overall impression of how well the city government is run. Respondents were also asked to rate the police as “Good”, “Fair”, or “Poor” on four aspects of law enforcement and on the department’s general ability to control crime.

As indicated in **Figure 5** below, a majority (57%) of respondents say the government is run “Very Well” or “Well”. Only 10% of respondents felt that the government is “Poorly” or “Very Poorly”.




indicated below, a (57%) of say the run “Very “Well”. responden city run ‘Very

**Figure 5**

Satisfaction

with City

Government, Percentages



Respondents were asked to rate the police department on

their ability to control gang activity, illegal drugs, violent crimes, traffic, and crime in general. The results are summarized in **Figure 6** on the following page. Control of illegal drugs is where the police department is most often rated as “poor” with 22% of respondents giving this rating. The highest level of satisfaction is with police control of traffic with 67% of respondents rating the police as “good” in this area.

**Figure 6**

Satisfaction with Law Enforcement

We also asked respondents if they feel that they are getting their money's worth for their property taxes. A majority (59%) thinks so. Twenty-seven percent feel they are not getting their money's worth, and 7% feel they are getting more than their money's worth (7%).

## **Section IV**

### **Opinions About Renovation of the Big Pool**

We asked respondents several questions about the Big Pool and about a sales tax increase intended to fund renovations of the Big Pool. Respondents who voted on the proposed sales tax increase were asked how they vote and were asked what should be done with the Big Pool. Respondents feelings about the Big Pool are described at the end of this section.

A proposal to fund renovations of the Big Pool with a ½ cent increase in the sales tax was voted upon by Garden City residents in 1999. Respondents were asked if they voted, and if so, how they voted on the sales tax increase. Forty-six percent of respondents did vote on the tax increase, and of those 46% voted in favor of the pool renovation.

Those who voted against the pool renovation plan were asked which of six reasons



were important to their decision. The percentages answering “Yes” , “No” and “Don’t Know” to each reason are given in **Table 3** below. The two most commonly cited reasons for voted against the sales tax increase are opposition to an increased sales tax (72%) and excessive cost of the pool renovations (70%). The location (18%) and the reduced size of the pool (18%) were important to the fewest respondents.

**Table 3**


Opposition to the Sales Tax Increase

Reason for Opposition	Yes	No	Don't Know
Reduced size of pool	18%	77%	5%
Location of pool	18%	78%	4%
No admission fee charged	30%	65%	5%
Renovation cost too high	70%	26%	4%
Prefer neighborhood pools	34%	62%	4%
Opposed to sales tax increase	73%	25%	2%

Respondents were asked three other questions regarding the proposed Big Pool renovation project. They were first asked how much improvement the Big Pool needs. **Figure 7** summarizes the responses to this question. The largest group of respondents (42%) think that some improvement is needed. Another 34% of respondents think that much improvement is needed.

**Figure 7**


Improvements to the Big Pool



**Figure 8** on the following page

gives the amount of improvement needed in the Big Pool according to those who voted for the tax increase and against it. The main conclusion to be drawn from this chart is that those who voted for the tax increase tend to feel that the Big Pool needs more improvement than those who voted against the tax increase. A narrow majority (52%) of those who voted for the sales tax increase feel the Big Pool needs “Much Improvement” compared to fewer than 40% of those who voted against the sales tax increase. Eighteen percent of those who voted against the tax increase indicate that the Big Pool needs no improvement, while only one percent of those who voted for the tax increase state that no improvements are needed.

**Figure 8**




Respondents were also asked about several options for the Big Pool project. Their responses are presented in **Figure 9** below. The most popular option, selected by 29% of respondents, is to reduce the size of the project. Doing only minimal repairs as necessary (26%) and attempting to pass the original plan again (24%) are also popular options. Only 3% think the Big Pool should be closed without being replaced, while 10% think the Big Pool should be replaced by other pool facilities.

**Figure 9**


Options for the Big Pool, Percent Supporting

Respondents were asked what they would like the City to do, if the Big Pool is closed. **Figure 10** summarizes the results. The most popular option (30%) to keeping the Big Pool open is to build two or three neighborhood pools. Building a waterpark with a swimming pool (27%) was the next most popular option. Respondents were also given the opportunity to offer an option not included in the list of responses. Thirteen percent of respondents took this option, with the most common suggestions being to keep the Big Pool open, doing renovations or repairs as necessary. Sixty percent of respondents favor charging a small fee for admission to municipal pool facilities.

**Figure 10**  
Options if the Big  
Closed



Pool is



**Section VI  
Parks and  
n Facilities**

**Recreatio**


Responden

ts were asked several questions about the condition of Garden City recreation facilities. They were asked if much improvement is needed, some improvement is needed, or no improvement is needed. Based on the low percentage of respondents giving “much improvement” as a response, satisfaction with recreation facilities is rather high. For clearer illustration the eight items asked about are divided into two categories: Sports

Facilities and Other Facilities.

**Sports Facilities** Respondents were asked about their satisfaction with the quality of basketball courts, baseball and softball fields, soccer fields, and tennis courts. Their answers are summarized in **Figure 11** below. The largest group of respondents, who answered each question, indicated that no improvement is needed in these facilities. Most respondents (55%) did not know if the baseball and softball fields needed any improvement. As indicated in Figure 9, answers of “Don’t Know” are common for all four questions.

**Figure 11**  
Condition of Sports Facilities




**Other Facilities**

Respondents were asked about the amount of improvement

needed in several other amenities at Garden City parks. Their responses are summarized in **Figure 12**. Of these other amenities, the shelter and picnic areas (14%) are most widely seen as needing much improvement. However, a majority of respondents thinks that the

playground equipment (57%) and shelter and picnic areas (56%) need much improvement or some improvement. Only 45% of respondents could give an opinion about needed improvements to the skateboard park.

**Figure 12**  
Condition of Other Facilities



## Conclusions

Public safety is considered satisfactory by most residents. Most people feel safe walking alone at night in Garden City, though more men than women feel this way. Satisfaction with police handling of five different law enforcement issues is high. Public opinion of police department handling of criminal activity is generally high.

Satisfaction with most city services is reasonably high based on the dominance of “Good” or “Fair” ratings. The recreational and park facilities are also satisfactory to most people who expressed an opinion. Most felt that the sports facilities and other park facilities need little if any improvement. Both neighborhood and major streets are satisfactory to a plurality of Garden City residents.

Garden City residents are generally satisfied with city services, with government, and with the police. There is considerable controversy over the Big Pool improvement project regarding what should be done. The most popular options are to do only minimal repairs as necessary and to reduce the size of the project. More respondents voted for the sales tax increase than against it.



**Appendix I**  
**Garden City Services Survey 2000**

Hello, my name is (YOUR FIRST NAME). I'm calling from Fort Hays State University. I'm taking a 5-minute survey on behalf of the City of Garden City to ask some questions about services and facilities.

May I speak with the male (or female) head of the household?

[WHEN THE INITIAL CONTACT IS NOT THE TARGETED RESPONDENT,  
REPEAT THE INTRODUCTION ONCE THE TARGETED RESPONDENT IS  
ON THE PHONE]

Your answers will remain completely confidential. May I ask you a few questions?

How safe would you feel walking alone at night in Garden City? [Q1]

[READ RESPONSES]

- [1 Very safe,
- 2 safe,
- 3 unsafe or
- 4 very unsafe
- 9 DK/RA]

I am interested in what you think of the services provided by the City of Garden City. For each of the following, indicate whether you think the services provided are good, fair, or poor. [Q2]

- [1 GOOD

2 FAIR  
3 POOR  
9 DK/RA]

Street lighting [Q2a]  
Road maintenance [Q2b]  
Trash pickup [Q2c]  
Parks [Q2d]  
Animal control [Q2e]  
Water services [Q2f]  
Sewer services [Q2g]  
Airport [Q2h]  
Snow removal [Q2i]  
Fire protection [Q2j]  
Law enforcement [Q2k]  
Storm water drainage [Q2l]  
Electricity [Q2m]  
Cemetery [Q2n]  
Recreation facilities [Q2o]  
Zoo[Q2p]  
Municipal golf course [Q2q]  
Swimming pool [Q2r]

How would you rate the condition of street surfaces in your neighborhood?

Are they good, fair or poor? [Q3]

[1 GOOD  
2 FAIR  
3 POOR  
9 DK/RA]

How would you rate the overall condition of the major streets in Garden City?

Are they in good, fair, or poor condition? [Q4]

[1 GOOD

2 FAIR

3 POOR

9 DK/RA]

In general, how well does the City government operate? [Q5]

[READ RESPONSES]

[1] Very well,

[2] well,

[3] neither well nor poorly,

[4] poorly or

[5] very poorly.

[9 DK/RA]

Would you say the performance of the Garden City police department is good, fair, or poor in the following areas: [Q6]

[1 GOOD    2 FAIR    3 POOR]

Reducing gang activity [Q6a]

Reducing illegal drug activity [Q6b]

Reducing violent crimes [Q6c]

Controlling traffic [Q6d]

Preventing crime in general [Q6e]

The present city property tax for a \$80,000 home is about \$24 per month. The revenue from this tax funds the police and fire departments, park and street maintenance, building inspection services, recreation, the zoo, the swimming

pool, and the cemetery. Given the taxes you pay for city services, do you feel you are: [Q7] [READ RESPONSES]

- [1] Getting more than your money's worth,
- [2] getting your money's worth, or
- [3] not getting your money's worth?
- [9 DK/RA]

Of the Garden City parks you are familiar with, think about the conditions of the recreation facilities. For each of the following facilities, please indicate whether there is much improvement needed, some improvement needed, or no improvement needed. [Q8]

- [1 MUCH IMPROVEMENT NEEDED
- 2 SOME IMPROVEMENT NEEDED
- 3 NO IMPROVEMENT NEEDED
- 9 DK/RA]

Playground equipment [Q8a]

Shelter and picnic areas [Q8b]

Basketball courts [Q8c]

Baseball/softball fields [Q8d]

Soccer fields [Q8e]

Tennis courts [Q8f]

Skateboard Park [Q8g]

Vegetation in the parks [Q8h]

[IF ASKED TO EXPLAIN: "like trees, shrubs, and grass"]

Thinking of the Big Pool, is there much improvement needed, some improvement needed, or no improvement needed? [Q9]

- [1 MUCH IMPROVEMENT NEEDED
- 2 SOME IMPROVEMENT NEEDED
- 3 NO IMPROVEMENT NEEDED
- 9 DK/RA]

Okay, I would like to read a brief description of a proposed renovation to Garden City's Big Pool that was voted down last year. The project would have been funded by a ½ cent increase in sales tax to completely rebuild the Big Pool. Several facilities would have been added, including a water slide, interactive water amusements, additional sundeck and shade areas, zero-depth entry for disabled accessibility, a competition swimming area, a new bathhouse, and a new concession facility. The size of the pool would have been reduced somewhat. Even though that proposal was voted down, the issue of what to do about the future of the Big Pool remains. The Big Pool is currently operated by the City.

Now I would like to ask you some questions about the Big Pool.

First, there are several options for dealing with the Big Pool. I will read five, and please tell me which option you think is best. [Q10]

- [1 Make another attempt to pass the renovation plan that was previously defeated,
- 2 Reduce the size of the renovation project so that it costs less,
- 3 Do only minimal repairs necessary to keep the pool operating for the next 2 to 5 years,
- 5 Close the Big Pool, and develop a plan for constructing other pool facilities.
- 4 Close the Big Pool, and build no other swimming facilities.
- 9 DK/RA]

If the Big Pool is closed, would you like for the City to: [Q11]

- [1 Build a waterpark that includes a swimming pool,
- 2 Build a standard municipal swimming pool,
- 3 Build two or three neighborhood swimming pools,
- 4 Build no new swimming facility, or
- 5 Pursue some other option

What would you like to see \_\_\_\_\_? [q11a]

9 DK/RA]

Should the admission to municipal pool facilities in Garden City continue to be free or should a small fee be required? [Q12]

[1 Free of charge

2 Small fee

9 DK/RA]

Did you vote in the last election when the ½ cent sales tax increase for pool renovations was on the ballot? [Q13]

[1 YES

2 NO

9 DK/RA

Did you vote in favor of the ½ cent sales tax increase? [Q14]

[1 YES

2 NO

3 DID NOT VOTE ON THIS ISSUE

9 DK/RA]

Which of the following reasons were important in your decision not to vote for the ½ cent sales tax increase for pool renovations? [Q15]

[1 YES 2 NO 9 DK/RA]

The size of the pool would be somewhat reduced after the renovation [Q15a]

The Location of the pool [Q15b]

Because no admission fee to the pool would be charged [Q15c]

The Cost of the renovation was too high [Q15d]

You would prefer neighborhood pools [Q15e]

You were opposed to an increase in the sales tax [Q15f]

In which general area of the city do you live? [Q16]

[READ RESPONSE CATEGORIES]

1 Northwest, north of Kansas Avenue and west of 3<sup>rd</sup> St

2 Northeast, north of Kansas Avenue and east of 3<sup>rd</sup> St.

3 Southwest, south of Kansas Avenue and west of 3<sup>rd</sup> St.

4 Southeast, south of Kansas Avenue and east of 3<sup>rd</sup> St.

9 DK/RA]

Are you registered to vote? [Q17]

[1 YES

2 NO

9 DK/RA]

[FOR ALL RESPONDENTS]

Finally, I would like to ask a few questions about yourself

In what year were you born? [Q18]

What is the highest level of education you completed? [Q19]

[READ RESPONSES]

- [1] eighth grade or less
- [2] some high school
- [3] high school graduate
- [4] vocational school
- [5] some college
- [6] college graduate
- [7] or post college graduate
- [9 REFUSED TO ANSWER]

Do you own your home, or do you rent? [Q20]

- [1] own home
- [2] rent
- [9 DK/RA]

About how many years have you lived in the Garden City area?

[Code 999 if DK/RA] [Q21]

Do you consider yourself: [Q22]

- [1 White
- 2 Black or African American
- 3 American Indian or Alaskan Native
- 4 Asian
- 5 Native Hawaiian or Other Pacific Islander
- 6 Some other race
- 9 DK/RA]

Are you of Mexican or some other Hispanic origin? [Q23]



- [1 YES
- 2 NO
- 9 DK/RA]

Was your total family income for the last year above or below \$30,000? [Q24]

[IF BELOW \$30,000, READ THE FOLLOWING RESPONSES]

- [1] Was it less than \$10,000,
- [2] Between \$10,000 and \$20,000,
- [3] or between \$20,000 and \$30,000?

[IF ABOVE \$30,000, READ THE FOLLOWING RESPONSES]

- [4] Was it between \$30,000 and \$40,000,
- [5] Between \$40,000 and \$50,000,
- [6] Between \$50,000 and \$60,000,
- [7] Between \$60,000 and \$70,000,
- [8] or was it over \$70,000?
- [9 REFUSED ANSWER]

Okay, that's all the questions I have. Thank you very much for your participation. [HANG UP]

Was the respondent [Q25]

- [1] male
- [2] female

Was the survey conducted in English or Spanish? [Q26]

- [1] English
- [2] Spanish

**Q1 Safe**

	Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Valid Very Safe	56	11.2	11.2	11.2
Safe	222	44.4	44.4	55.6
Unsafe	116	23.2	23.2	78.8
Very Unsafe	80	16.0	16.0	94.8
RA-DK	26	5.2	5.2	100.0
Total	500	100.0	100.0	

Respondent's prefix

[Q27]

suffix

[Q28]

Survey station

number [Q29]

Day survey completed. [Q30]

Interviewer # [Q31]

**Appendix II**  
**Frequency Distributions**

**Q2a Street Lighting**

		Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Valid	Good	262	52.4	52.4	52.4
	Fair	187	37.4	37.4	89.8
	Poor	47	9.4	9.4	99.2
	RA-DK	4	.8	.8	100.0
	Total	500	100.0	100.0	

**Q2b Road Maintenance**

		Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Valid	Good	190	38.0	38.0	38.0
	Fair	223	44.6	44.6	82.6
	Poor	85	17.0	17.0	99.6
	RA-DK	2	.4	.4	100.0
	Total	500	100.0	100.0	

**Q2c Trash Pickup**

		Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Valid	Good	353	70.6	70.6	70.6
	Fair	99	19.8	19.8	90.4
	Poor	26	5.2	5.2	95.6
	RA-DK	22	4.4	4.4	100.0
	Total	500	100.0	100.0	

**Q2d Parks**

		Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Valid	Good	368	73.6	73.6	73.6
	Fair	91	18.2	18.2	91.8
	Poor	18	3.6	3.6	95.4
	RA-DK	23	4.6	4.6	100.0
	Total	500	100.0	100.0	

**Q2e Animal Control**

		Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Valid	Good	273	54.6	54.6	54.6
	Fair	140	28.0	28.0	82.6
	Poor	53	10.6	10.6	93.2
	RA-DK	34	6.8	6.8	100.0
	Total	500	100.0	100.0	

**Q2f Water Services**

		Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Valid	Good	347	69.4	69.5	69.5
	Fair	100	20.0	20.0	89.6
	Poor	30	6.0	6.0	95.6
	RA-DK	22	4.4	4.4	100.0
	Total	499	99.8	100.0	
Missing	System	1	.2		
Total		500	100.0		

**Q2g Sewer Services**

		Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Valid	Good	351	70.2	70.3	70.3
	Fair	91	18.2	18.2	88.6
	Poor	20	4.0	4.0	92.6
	RA-DK	37	7.4	7.4	100.0
	Total	499	99.8	100.0	
Missing	System	1	.2		
Total		500	100.0		

**Q2h Airport**

		Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Valid	Good	230	46.0	46.1	46.1
	Fair	102	20.4	20.4	66.5
	Poor	29	5.8	5.8	72.3
	RA-DK	138	27.6	27.7	100.0
	Total	499	99.8	100.0	
Missing	System	1	.2		
Total		500	100.0		

**Q2i Snow Removal**

		Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Valid	Good	176	35.2	35.3	35.3
	Fair	180	36.0	36.1	71.3
	Poor	125	25.0	25.1	96.4
	RA-DK	18	3.6	3.6	100.0
	Total	499	99.8	100.0	
Missing	System	1	.2		
Total		500	100.0		

**Q2j Fire Protection**

		Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Valid	Good	396	79.2	79.5	79.5
	Fair	61	12.2	12.2	91.8
	Poor	7	1.4	1.4	93.2
	RA-DK	34	6.8	6.8	100.0
	Total	498	99.6	100.0	
Missing	System	2	.4		
Total		500	100.0		

**Q2k Law Enforcement**

		Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Valid	Good	291	58.2	58.4	58.4
	Fair	131	26.2	26.3	84.7
	Poor	55	11.0	11.0	95.8
	RA-DK	21	4.2	4.2	100.0
	Total	498	99.6	100.0	
Missing	System	2	.4		
Total		500	100.0		

**Q2l Storm Water Drainage**

		Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Valid	Good	172	34.4	34.5	34.5
	Fair	208	41.6	41.8	76.3
	Poor	101	20.2	20.3	96.6
	RA-DK	17	3.4	3.4	100.0
	Total	498	99.6	100.0	
Missing	System	2	.4		
Total		500	100.0		

**Q2m Electricity**

		Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Valid	Good	385	77.0	77.3	77.3
	Fair	92	18.4	18.5	95.8
	Poor	14	2.8	2.8	98.6
	RA-DK	7	1.4	1.4	100.0
	Total	498	99.6	100.0	
Missing	System	2	.4		
Total		500	100.0		

**Q2n Cemetery**

		Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Valid	Good	354	70.8	71.1	71.1
	Fair	51	10.2	10.2	81.3
	Poor	3	.6	.6	81.9
	RA-DK	90	18.0	18.1	100.0
	Total	498	99.6	100.0	
Missing	System	2	.4		
Total		500	100.0		

**Q2o Recreation Facilities**

		Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Valid	Good	282	56.4	56.7	56.7
	Fair	122	24.4	24.5	81.3
	Poor	43	8.6	8.7	89.9
	RA-DK	50	10.0	10.1	100.0
	Total	497	99.4	100.0	
Missing	System	3	.6		
Total		500	100.0		

**Q2p Zoo**

		Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Valid	Good	434	86.8	87.5	87.5
	Fair	46	9.2	9.3	96.8
	Poor	4	.8	.8	97.6
	RA-DK	12	2.4	2.4	100.0
	Total	496	99.2	100.0	
Missing	System	4	.8		
Total		500	100.0		

**Q2q Municipal Golf Course**

		Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Valid	Good	259	51.8	52.2	52.2
	Fair	39	7.8	7.9	60.1
	Poor	2	.4	.4	60.5
	RA-DK	196	39.2	39.5	100.0
	Total	496	99.2	100.0	
Missing	System	4	.8		
Total		500	100.0		

**Q2r Swimming Pool**

		Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Valid	Good	223	44.6	45.1	45.1
	Fair	142	28.4	28.7	73.7
	Poor	56	11.2	11.3	85.1
	RA-DK	74	14.8	14.9	100.0
	Total	495	99.0	100.0	
Missing	System	5	1.0		
Total		500	100.0		



**Q4 Major Streets Condition**

		Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Valid	Good	260	52.0	52.6	52.6
	Fair	196	39.2	39.7	92.3
	Poor	34	6.8	6.9	99.2
	RA-DK	4	.8	.8	100.0
	Total	494	98.8	100.0	
Missing	System	6	1.2		
Total		500	100.0		

**Q5 City Government Operation**

		Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Valid	Very Well	37	7.4	7.5	7.5
	Well	244	48.8	49.3	56.8
	Neither Well Nor Poorly	136	27.2	27.5	84.2
	Poorly	34	6.8	6.9	91.1
	Very Poorly	13	2.6	2.6	93.7
	RA-DK	31	6.2	6.3	100.0
Total		495	99.0	100.0	
Missing	System	5	1.0		
Total		500	100.0		

**Q3 Neighborhood Street Surfaces**

		Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Valid	Good	260	52.0	52.5	52.5
	Fair	175	35.0	35.4	87.9
	Poor	51	10.2	10.3	98.2
	RA-DK	9	1.8	1.8	100.0
	Total	495	99.0	100.0	
Missing	System	5	1.0		
Total		500	100.0		

**Q6b Police - Illegal Drugs**

		Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Valid	Good	181	36.2	37.6	37.6
	Fair	176	35.2	36.5	74.1
	Poor	106	21.2	22.0	96.1
	RA-DK	19	3.8	3.9	100.0
	Total	482	96.4	100.0	
Missing	System	18	3.6		
Total		500	100.0		

**Q6c Police - Violent Crimes**

		Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Valid	Good	226	45.2	46.5	46.5
	Fair	183	36.6	37.7	84.2
	Poor	58	11.6	11.9	96.1
	RA-DK	19	3.8	3.9	100.0
	Total	486	97.2	100.0	
Missing	System	14	2.8		
Total		500	100.0		

**Q6 Police - Gang Activity**

		Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Valid	Good	204	40.8	41.9	41.9
	Fair	190	38.0	39.0	80.9
	Poor	74	14.8	15.2	96.1
	RA-DK	19	3.8	3.9	100.0
	Total	487	97.4	100.0	
Missing	System	13	2.6		
Total		500	100.0		

**Q6e Police - Crime in General**

		Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Valid	Good	228	45.6	46.7	46.7
	Fair	192	38.4	39.3	86.1
	Poor	59	11.8	12.1	98.2
	RA-DK	9	1.8	1.8	100.0
	Total	488	97.6	100.0	
Missing	System	12	2.4		
Total		500	100.0		

**Q6d Police - Traffic**

		Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Valid	Good	327	65.4	66.7	66.7
	Fair	131	26.2	26.7	93.5
	Poor	25	5.0	5.1	98.6
	RA-DK	7	1.4	1.4	100.0
	Total	490	98.0	100.0	
Missing	System	10	2.0		
Total		500	100.0		

**Q8b Shelter and Picnic Areas**

		Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Valid	Much Improvement Needed	69	13.8	14.1	14.1
	Some Improvement Needed	207	41.4	42.2	56.3
	No Improvement Needed	146	29.2	29.8	86.1
	RA-DK	68	13.6	13.9	100.0
	Total	490	98.0	100.0	
Missing	System	10	2.0		
Total		500	100.0		

Q8 TAKES

		Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Valid	Getting More than Your Moneys Worth	35	7.0	7.1	7.1
	Getting Your Moneys Worth	289	57.8	58.9	66.0
	Not Getting Your Moneys Worth	131	26.2	26.7	92.7
	RA-DK	36	7.2	7.3	100.0
	Total	491	98.2	100.0	
Missing	System	9	1.8		
Total		500	100.0		

**Q8a Playground Equipment**

		Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Valid	Much Improvement Needed	51	10.2	10.4	10.4
	Some Improvement Needed	229	45.8	46.7	57.1
	No Improvement Needed	125	25.0	25.5	82.7
	RA-DK	85	17.0	17.3	100.0
	Total	490	98.0	100.0	
Missing	System	10	2.0		
Total		500	100.0		

**Q8e Soccer Fields**

		Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Valid	Much Improvement Needed	51	10.2	10.4	10.4
	Some Improvement Needed	103	20.6	21.0	31.4
	No Improvement Needed	178	35.6	36.3	67.8
	RA-DK	158	31.6	32.2	100.0
	Total	490	98.0	100.0	
Missing	System	10	2.0		
Total		500	100.0		

**Basketball Courts**

		Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Valid	Much Improvement Needed	63	12.6	12.9	12.9
	Some Improvement Needed	146	29.2	29.8	42.7
	No Improvement Needed	129	25.8	26.3	69.0
	RA-DK	152	30.4	31.0	100.0
	Total	490	98.0	100.0	
Missing	System	10	2.0		
Total		500	100.0		

**Baseball and Softball Fields**

		Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Valid	Much Improvement Needed	42	8.4	8.6	8.6
	Some Improvement Needed	98	19.6	20.0	28.6
	No Improvement Needed	269	53.8	54.9	83.5
	RA-DK	81	16.2	16.5	100.0
	Total	490	98.0	100.0	
Missing	System	10	2.0		
Total		500	100.0		

**Q8f Tennis Courts**

		Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Valid	Much Improvement Needed	53	10.6	10.8	10.8
	Some Improvement Needed	125	25.0	25.5	36.3
	No Improvement Needed	174	34.8	35.5	71.8
	RA-DK	138	27.6	28.2	100.0
	Total	490	98.0	100.0	
Missing	System	10	2.0		
Total		500	100.0		

**Q8g Skateboard Park**

		Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Valid	Much Improvement Needed	41	8.2	8.4	8.4
	Some Improvement Needed	61	12.2	12.5	20.9
	No Improvement Needed	119	23.8	24.3	45.2
	RA-DK	268	53.6	54.8	100.0
	Total	489	97.8	100.0	
Missing	System	11	2.2		
Total		500	100.0		

**Q8h Vegetation in the Parks**

		Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Valid	Much Improvement Needed	52	10.4	10.6	10.6
	Some Improvement Needed	101	20.2	20.7	31.3
	No Improvement Needed	293	58.6	59.9	91.2
	RA-DK	43	8.6	8.8	100.0
	Total	489	97.8	100.0	
Missing	System	11	2.2		
Total		500	100.0		

**Q9 Big Pool Need Improvement**

		Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Valid	Much Improvement Needed	165	33.0	34.2	34.2
	Some Improvement Needed	201	40.2	41.6	75.8
	No Improvement Needed	60	12.0	12.4	88.2
	RA-DK	57	11.4	11.8	100.0
	Total	483	96.6	100.0	
Missing	System	17	3.4		
Total		500	100.0		

**Q10 Big Pool Options**

		Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Valid	Attempt to Pass Same Plan	118	23.6	24.3	24.3
	Reduce Size of Project to Lower Cost	139	27.8	28.6	52.9
	Do Only Minimal Repairs as Necessary	128	25.6	26.3	79.2
	Close Big Pool Without Replacing	16	3.2	3.3	82.5
	Close Big Pool, Construct Other Facilities	35	7.0	7.2	89.7
	RA-DK	50	10.0	10.3	100.0
	Total	486	97.2	100.0	
Missing	System	14	2.8		
Total		500	100.0		

**Q11 If Big Pool is Closed**

		Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Valid	Waterpark with Swimming Pool	129	25.8	26.7	26.7
	Standard Municipal Pool	52	10.4	10.7	37.4
	2 or 3 Neighborhood Pools	145	29.0	30.0	67.4
	No New Swimming Pools	27	5.4	5.6	72.9
	Other Option	63	12.6	13.0	86.0
	RA-DK	68	13.6	14.0	100.0
	Total	484	96.8	100.0	
Missing	System	16	3.2		
Total		500	100.0		

**Q12 Admission to Pools**

		Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Valid	Free of Charge	183	36.6	37.9	37.9
	Small Fee	277	55.4	57.3	95.2
	RA-DK	23	4.6	4.8	100.0
	Total	483	96.6	100.0	
Missing	System	17	3.4		
Total		500	100.0		

**Q13 Participated in Pool Vote**

		Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Valid	Yes	223	44.6	46.0	46.0
	No	232	46.4	47.8	93.8
	RA-DK	30	6.0	6.2	100.0
	Total	485	97.0	100.0	
Missing	System	15	3.0		
Total		500	100.0		



**Q14 Vote in Favor of Tax**

		Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Valid	Yes	104	20.8	45.6	45.6
	No	100	20.0	43.9	89.5
	Did Not Vote On This Issue	4	.8	1.8	91.2
	RA-DK	20	4.0	8.8	100.0
	Total	228	45.6	100.0	
Missing	System	272	54.4		
Total		500	100.0		

**Q15a Reduced Size**

		Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Valid	Yes	17	3.4	17.5	17.5
	No	75	15.0	77.3	94.8
	RA-DK	5	1.0	5.2	100.0
	Total	97	19.4	100.0	
Missing	System	403	80.6		
Total		500	100.0		

**Q15b Location**

		Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Valid	Yes	17	3.4	17.5	17.5
	No	76	15.2	78.4	95.9
	RA-DK	4	.8	4.1	100.0
	Total	97	19.4	100.0	
Missing	System	403	80.6		
Total		500	100.0		

**Q15d Cost Too High**

		Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Valid	Yes	68	13.6	70.1	70.1
	No	25	5.0	25.8	95.9
	RA-DK	4	.8	4.1	100.0
	Total	97	19.4	100.0	
Missing	System	403	80.6		
Total		500	100.0		

**Prefer Neighborhood Pools**

		Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Valid	Yes	33	6.6	33.7	33.7
	No	61	12.2	62.2	95.9
	RA-DK	4	.8	4.1	100.0
	Total	98	19.6	100.0	
Missing	System	402	80.4		
Total		500	100.0		

**Opposed to Increase in Sales Tax**

		Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Valid	Yes	70	14.0	72.9	72.9
	No	24	4.8	25.0	97.9
	RA-DK	2	.4	2.1	100.0
	Total	96	19.2	100.0	
Missing	System	404	80.8		
Total		500	100.0		

**Q15c No Admission Fee**

		Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Valid	Yes	29	5.8	29.9	29.9
	No	63	12.6	64.9	94.8
	RA-DK	5	1.0	5.2	100.0
	Total	97	19.4	100.0	
Missing	System	403	80.6		
Total		500	100.0		

**Statistics**

		Q18 Year Born	Q19 Highest Level of Education Completed	Q21 Tenure	Q22 Race	Q24 Family Income	AGE
N	Valid	476	487	486	482	471	476
	Missing	24	13	14	18	29	24
Mean		1953.76	4.33	24.32	2.21	4.84	46.2374
Median		1957.00	5.00	20.00	1.00	4.00	43.0000
Mode		1961	3 <sup>a</sup>	1	1	3	39.00
Minimum		1899	1	0	1	1	16.00
Maximum		1984	9	99	9	9	101.00

a. Multiple modes exist. The smallest value is shown

**Q17 Registered to Vote**

		Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Valid	Yes	134	26.8	50.6	50.6
	No	125	25.0	47.2	97.7
	RA-DK	6	1.2	2.3	100.0
	Total	265	53.0	100.0	
Missing	System	235	47.0		
Total		500	100.0		

**Q16 Area of City Living In**

		Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Valid	Northwest	111	22.2	22.8	22.8
	Northeast	195	39.0	40.1	63.0
	Southwest	74	14.8	15.2	78.2
	Southeast	73	14.6	15.0	93.2
	RA-DK	33	6.6	6.8	100.0
	Total	486	97.2	100.0	
Missing	System	14	2.8		
Total		500	100.0		

**Q20 Own or Rent**

		Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Valid	Own Home	353	70.6	72.6	72.6
	Rent	123	24.6	25.3	97.9
	RA-DK	10	2.0	2.1	100.0
	Total	486	97.2	100.0	
Missing	System	14	2.8		
Total		500	100.0		

**Q22 Race**

		Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Valid	White	379	75.8	78.6	78.6
	Black or African American	5	1.0	1.0	79.7
	American Indian or Alaskan Native	2	.4	.4	80.1
	Asian	3	.6	.6	80.7
	Some Other Race	59	11.8	12.2	92.9
	RA-DK	34	6.8	7.1	100.0
	Total	482	96.4	100.0	
Missing	System	18	3.6		
Total		500	100.0		

**Q19 Highest Level of Education Completed**

		Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Valid	8th Grade or Less	30	6.0	6.2	6.2
	Some High School	45	9.0	9.2	15.4
	High School Graduate	122	24.4	25.1	40.5
	Vocational School	26	5.2	5.3	45.8
	Some College	122	24.4	25.1	70.8
	College Graduate	97	19.4	19.9	90.8
	Post College Graduate	39	7.8	8.0	98.8
	RA-DK	6	1.2	1.2	100.0
Total	487	97.4	100.0		
Missing	System	13	2.6		
Total		500	100.0		

**Q23 Mexican or Hispanic Origin**

		Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Valid	Yes	102	20.4	21.6	21.6
	No	367	73.4	77.8	99.4
	RA-DK	3	.6	.6	100.0
	Total	472	94.4	100.0	
Missing	System	28	5.6		
Total		500	100.0		

**Q24 Family Income**

		Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Valid	Less than \$10,000	35	7.0	7.4	7.4
	\$10,000-\$20,000	47	9.4	10.0	17.4
	\$20,000-\$30,000	91	18.2	19.3	36.7
	\$30,000-\$40,000	73	14.6	15.5	52.2
	\$40,000-\$50,000	56	11.2	11.9	64.1
	\$50,000-\$60,000	36	7.2	7.6	71.8
	\$60,000-\$70,000	29	5.8	6.2	77.9
	\$70,000 or more	50	10.0	10.6	88.5
	RA-DK	54	10.8	11.5	100.0
	Total	471	94.2	100.0	
Missing	System	29	5.8		
	Total	500	100.0		

**Q24 Family Income**

		Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Valid	Less than \$10,000	35	7.0	7.4	7.4
	\$10,000-\$20,000	47	9.4	10.0	17.4
	\$20,000-\$30,000	91	18.2	19.3	36.7
	\$30,000-\$40,000	73	14.6	15.5	52.2
	\$40,000-\$50,000	56	11.2	11.9	64.1
	\$50,000-\$60,000	36	7.2	7.6	71.8
	\$60,000-\$70,000	29	5.8	6.2	77.9
	\$70,000 or more	50	10.0	10.6	88.5
	RA-DK	54	10.8	11.5	100.0
Total	471	94.2	100.0		
Missing	System	29	5.8		
Total		500	100.0		

**Q25 Gender**

		Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Valid	Male	216	43.2	44.7	44.7
	Female	267	53.4	55.3	100.0
	Total	483	96.6	100.0	
Missing	System	17	3.4		
Total		500	100.0		