HEALTH CARE
Significant Findings:
1. The perception of the need to improve health care system in Albuquerque seems greater than the problem of personal or family health care access. 63% of the respondents indicating that access was not a personal or family problem ranked improving the health care system as a high community priority.
2. Problems with health care access seem related to household income and employment status.
3. Residents of the North Valley and Southwest Mesa/South Valley indicate greater problems with health care access than other areas.

Improving the health care system.- Community Priority						
Extremely High	High	Middle	Low	Extremely Low	Totals	Mean
38.2%	34.8%	21.1%	4.4%	1.5%	100.0%	4.04

Health care access for you and your family.- Problem for You or Family				
Big Problem	Somewhat of a Problem	Not a Problem	Totals	Mean
14.6%	28.2%	57.1%	100.0%	1.57

	Improving the health care system.- Community Priority																
	Extremely High		High		Middle		Low		Extremely Low		Totals		Mean	ChiSq Significance
Health care access for you and your family.- Problem for You or Family														
Big Problem	75.0%	66	14.8%	13	6.8%	6	2.3%	2	1.1%	1	100.0%	88	4.60	Yes at 99.0%
Somewhat of a Problem	44.0%	74	40.5%	68	13.7%	23	1.8%	3	0.0%	0	100.0%	168	4.27	
Not a Problem	25.5%	86	37.4%	126	28.5%	96	6.2%	21	2.4%	8	100.0%	337	3.77	

	total yearly household income before taxes													
	Less than $10,000		$10,000 to $20,000		$20,001 to $35,000		$ 35,001 to $50,000		$50,001 to $75,000		$75,001 to $100,000		Over $100,000	
Health care access for you and your family.- Problem for You or Family														
Big Problem	41.7%	5	23.8%	10	23.2%	22	13.3%	12	11.7%	15	11.1%	11	10.1%	11
Somewhat of a Problem	16.7%	2	31.0%	13	28.4%	27	33.3%	30	28.9%	37	23.2%	23	26.6%	29
Not a Problem	41.7%	5	45.2%	19	48.4%	46	53.3%	48	59.4%	76	65.7%	65	63.3%	69
Totals	100.0%	12	100.0%	42	100.0%	95	100.0%	90	100.0%	128	100.0%	99	100.0%	109
Mean	2.00		1.79		1.75		1.60		1.52		1.45		1.47	
ChiSq Significance	Yes at 90.0%													

	Employment Status													
	Employed full time		Employed part time		Retired		Unemployed, looking for work		full time homemaker		full time student		disabled	
Health care access for you and your family.- Problem for You or Family														
Big Problem	15.4%	54	28.8%	15	7.0%	11	22.2%	2	10.0%	2	25.0%	2	28.6%	4
Somewhat of a Problem	29.6%	104	19.2%	10	23.6%	37	44.4%	4	35.0%	7	25.0%	2	50.0%	7
Not a Problem	55.0%	193	51.9%	27	69.4%	109	33.3%	3	55.0%	11	50.0%	4	21.4%	3
Totals	100.0%	351	100.0%	52	100.0%	157	100.0%	9	100.0%	20	100.0%	8	100.0%	14
Mean	1.60		1.77		1.38		1.89		1.55		1.75		2.07	
ChiSq Significance	Yes at 99.0%*													

* Note: ChiSq has over 20% low count cells.

	Community Planning Area																	
	a Central Albuquerque		b East Gateway		c Foothills		d Mid Heights		e Near Heights		f North Albuquerque		g North Valley		h SW Mesa/South Valley		i Westside	
Health care access for you and your family.- Problem for You or Family																		
Big Problem	20.0%	8	5.8%	4	6.3%	4	12.9%	12	21.4%	18	7.8%	4	25.4%	16	22.2%	12	12.2%	12
Somewhat of a Problem	25.0%	10	36.2%	25	17.2%	11	30.1%	28	32.1%	27	21.6%	11	28.6%	18	33.3%	18	26.5%	26
Not a Problem	55.0%	22	58.0%	40	76.6%	49	57.0%	53	46.4%	39	70.6%	36	46.0%	29	44.4%	24	61.2%	60
Totals	100.0%	40	100.0%	69	100.0%	64	100.0%	93	100.0%	84	100.0%	51	100.0%	63	100.0%	54	100.0%	98
Mean	1.65		1.48		1.30		1.56		1.75		1.37		1.79		1.78		1.51	
ChiSq Significance	Yes at 95.0%																	

Crosstabs on Community Priority - Improving the health care system

	Reporting On	Male	Female	Hispanic	Caucasian	Central ABQ	E. Gateway	Foothills	Mid Hgts	Near Hgts	N. ABQ	N. Valley	SW Mesa S Valley
Improving the health care system.- Community Priority													
Extremely High	38.2%	27.2%	47.9%	44.7%	33.5%	56.8%	36.8%	35.5%	43.3%	39.5%	31.4%	39.7%	37.7%
High	34.8%	36.8%	32.5%	33.5%	37.1%	27.0%	41.2%	43.5%	32.2%	35.8%	35.3%	32.8%	24.5%
Middle	21.1%	26.8%	16.4%	17.6%	23.1%	16.2%	16.2%	17.7%	15.6%	19.8%	31.4%	17.2%	32.1%
Low	4.4%	7.4%	1.9%	3.7%	4.7%	0.0%	5.9%	0.0%	6.7%	4.9%	2.0%	6.9%	3.8%
Extremely Low	1.5%	1.8%	1.3%	0.5%	1.6%	0.0%	0.0%	3.2%	2.2%	0.0%	0.0%	3.4%	1.9%
Totals	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%
Mean	4.04	3.80	4.24	4.18	3.96	4.41	4.09	4.08	4.08	4.10	3.96	3.98	3.92

	Westside	Staying in ABQ	Probably Not Staying	College Degree or More	HS grad or less	Household 2 or less	Household 3 or more	Income 50 to 100k	Income < 20k	Income 20 - 50k	Income > 100k	Age 18 - 34	Age 35 - 49
Improving the health care system.- Community Priority													
Extremely High	30.9%	37.3%	43.1%	32.7%	48.3%	36.1%	42.0%	35.7%	52.0%	41.9%	33.0%	41.6%	43.8%
High	36.1%	36.0%	24.6%	38.3%	24.1%	36.1%	32.1%	32.1%	24.0%	36.3%	38.5%	27.3%	32.0%
Middle	25.8%	21.3%	23.1%	21.6%	21.8%	22.0%	19.8%	27.1%	22.0%	17.3%	16.5%	28.6%	17.2%
Low	5.2%	4.0%	6.2%	5.3%	4.6%	4.5%	4.2%	4.5%	2.0%	2.2%	8.3%	1.3%	5.9%
Extremely Low	2.1%	1.3%	3.1%	2.0%	1.1%	1.3%	1.9%	0.5%	0.0%	2.2%	3.7%	1.3%	1.2%
Totals	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%
Mean	3.89	4.04	3.98	3.94	4.14	4.01	4.08	3.98	4.26	4.13	3.89	4.06	4.11

	Age 50 - 64	Age 65 +	FTE	Not Full Time	No minors	one or more minors
Improving the health care system.- Community Priority						
Extremely High	39.6%	26.7%	37.9%	41.5%	34.2%	44.5%
High	34.1%	43.5%	34.1%	39.6%	37.9%	29.4%
Middle	19.8%	24.4%	20.4%	15.1%	22.6%	19.0%
Low	4.1%	4.6%	6.1%	1.9%	3.9%	5.2%
Extremely Low	2.3%	0.8%	1.5%	1.9%	1.3%	1.9%
Totals	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%
Mean	4.05	3.91	4.01	4.17	4.00	4.09

Crosstabs on Personal or Family Problem - Health Care Access

	Reporting On	Male	Female	Hispanic	Caucasian	Central ABQ	E. Gateway	Foothills	Mid Hgts	Near Hgts	N. ABQ	N. Valley	SW Mesa S Valley
Health care access for you and your family.- Problem for You or Family													
Big Problem	14.6%	12.5%	16.2%	21.4%	10.9%	20.0%	5.8%	6.3%	12.9%	21.4%	7.8%	25.4%	22.2%
Somewhat of a Problem	28.2%	27.5%	29.3%	32.7%	24.3%	25.0%	36.2%	17.2%	30.1%	32.1%	21.6%	28.6%	33.3%
Not a Problem	57.1%	60.0%	54.5%	45.9%	64.8%	55.0%	58.0%	76.6%	57.0%	46.4%	70.6%	46.0%	44.4%
Totals	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%
Mean	1.57	1.52	1.62	1.76	1.46	1.65	1.48	1.30	1.56	1.75	1.37	1.79	1.78

	Westside	Staying in ABQ	Probably Not Staying	College Degree or More	HS grad or less	Household 2 or less	Household 3 or more	Income 50 to 100k	Income < 20k	Income 20 - 50k	Income > 100k	Age 18 - 34	Age 35 - 49
Health care access for you and your family.- Problem for You or Family													
Big Problem	12.2%	14.3%	20.6%	12.5%	21.6%	12.2%	18.6%	11.5%	27.8%	18.4%	10.1%	18.2%	16.6%
Somewhat of a Problem	26.5%	28.9%	23.5%	25.6%	29.5%	26.3%	31.7%	26.4%	27.8%	30.8%	26.6%	22.1%	30.3%
Not a Problem	61.2%	56.8%	55.9%	61.8%	48.9%	61.5%	49.8%	62.1%	44.4%	50.8%	63.3%	59.7%	53.1%
Totals	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%
Mean	1.51	1.57	1.65	1.51	1.73	1.51	1.69	1.49	1.83	1.68	1.47	1.58	1.63

	Age 50 - 64	Age 65 +	FTE	Not Full Time	No minors	one or more minors
Health care access for you and your family.- Problem for You or Family						
Big Problem	16.2%	8.0%	15.4%	28.8%	14.0%	15.8%
Somewhat of a Problem	32.4%	22.5%	29.6%	19.2%	27.6%	29.0%
Not a Problem	51.4%	69.6%	55.0%	51.9%	58.4%	55.2%
Totals	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%
Mean	1.65	1.38	1.60	1.77	1.56	1.61

PUBLIC EDUCATION

Significant Findings:

1. **Improving public education in Albuquerque is seen as the greatest community priority of all listed.**
2. **Survey respondents are not satisfied with the quality of public education in Albuquerque.**
3. **Households with children under 18 don't have significantly different perceptions than those without children under 18.**
4. **Hispanics evaluate the need for improving public education slightly higher than others, but seem somewhat more satisfied with the quality of public education.**
5. **Less educated respondents are more satisfied with the quality of public education.**
6. **While all areas of the City ranked improving public education very highly, Mid Heights and Westside residents ranked it slightly higher.**
7. **Mid Heights residents are more satisfied than any other area with the quality of public education; the Westside residents are the least satisfied.**

Improving public education.- Community Priority						
Extremely High	High	Middle	Low	Extremely Low	Totals	Mean
54.6%	30.7%	12.1%	1.5%	1.1%	100.0%	4.36

Quality of public education in Albuquerque.- Level of Satisfaction					
Very Satisfied	Somewhat Satisfied	Somewhat Dissatisfied	Very Dissatisfied	Totals	Mean
5.2%	28.5%	37.8%	28.5%	100.0%	2.10

	18 years of age or less in household							
	0		1		2 - 3		4 or more	
Improving public education.- Community Priority								
Extremely High	50.7%	194	63.4%	52	60.0%	78	71.4%	5
High	32.4%	124	24.4%	20	28.5%	37	28.6%	2
Middle	14.4%	55	11.0%	9	7.7%	10	0.0%	0
Low	1.6%	6	0.0%	0	2.3%	3	0.0%	0
Extremely Low	1.0%	4	1.2%	1	1.5%	2	0.0%	0
Totals	100.0%	383	100.0%	82	100.0%	130	100.0%	7
Mean	4.30		4.49		4.43		4.71	
ChiSq Significance	Under 50%*							

* Note: ChiSq has over 20% low count cells.

	18 years of age or less in household							
	0		1		2 - 3		4 or more	
Quality of public education in Albuquerque.- Level of Satisfaction								
Very Satisfied	5.7%	21	6.3%	5	3.9%	5	0.0%	0
Somewhat Satisfied	29.5%	109	25.0%	20	27.1%	35	28.6%	2
Somewhat Dissatisfied	37.4%	138	41.3%	33	39.5%	51	0.0%	0
Very Dissatisfied	27.4%	101	27.5%	22	29.5%	38	71.4%	5
Totals	100.0%	369	100.0%	80	100.0%	129	100.0%	7
Mean		2.14		2.10		2.05		1.57
ChiSq Significance	Under 50%*							

* Note: ChiSq has over 20% low count cells.

	Cultural/Ethnic on Q53:Your ethnic/cultural background					
	Hispanic		Caucasian not Hispanic		Other Ethnicities	
Improving public education.- Community Priority						
Extremely High	60.1%	116	52.2%	194	51.4%	19
High	25.4%	49	33.1%	123	32.4%	12
Middle	12.4%	24	12.6%	47	8.1%	3
Low	1.0%	2	1.3%	5	5.4%	2
Extremely Low	1.0%	2	0.8%	3	2.7%	1
Totals	100.0%	193	100.0%	372	100.0%	37
Mean		4.42		4.34		4.24
ChiSq Significance	Under 50%*					

* Note: ChiSq has over 20% low count cells.

	Cultural/Ethnic on Q53:Your ethnic/cultural background					
	Hispanic		Caucasian not Hispanic		Other Ethnicities	
Quality of public education in Albuquerque.- Level of Satisfaction						
Very Satisfied	5.8%	11	4.4%	16	11.8%	4
Somewhat Satisfied	33.3%	63	27.1%	98	14.7%	5
Somewhat Dissatisfied	39.7%	75	37.6%	136	38.2%	13
Very Dissatisfied	21.2%	40	30.9%	112	35.3%	12
Totals	100.0%	189	100.0%	362	100.0%	34
Mean		2.24		2.05		2.03
ChiSq Significance	Yes at 50.0%					

	highest level of education attained											
	Less than high school		high school graduate		Some College		Trade School		Bachelor's Degree		Graduate Degree	
Improving public education.- Community Priority												
Extremely High	41.2%	7	55.6%	40	53.7%	73	66.7%	22	53.7%	88	54.6%	100
High	17.6%	3	29.2%	21	31.6%	43	27.3%	9	31.7%	52	31.1%	57
Middle	35.3%	6	11.1%	8	12.5%	17	6.1%	2	12.2%	20	11.5%	21
Low	5.9%	1	1.4%	1	1.5%	2	0.0%	0	1.2%	2	1.6%	3
Extremely Low	0.0%	0	2.8%	2	0.7%	1	0.0%	0	1.2%	2	1.1%	2
Totals	100.0%	17	100.0%	72	100.0%	136	100.0%	33	100.0%	164	100.0%	183
Mean	3.94		4.33		4.36		4.61		4.35		4.37	
ChiSq Significance	Under 50%*											

* Note: ChiSq has over 20% low count cells.

	highest level of education attained											
	Less than high school		high school graduate		Some College		Trade School		Bachelor's Degree		Graduate Degree	
Quality of public education in Albuquerque.- Level of Satisfaction												
Very Satisfied	0.0%	0	7.1%	5	6.0%	8	0.0%	0	4.9%	8	5.7%	10
Somewhat Satisfied	57.1%	8	30.0%	21	37.6%	50	26.5%	9	21.6%	35	24.6%	43
Somewhat Dissatisfied	14.3%	2	47.1%	33	32.3%	43	41.2%	14	37.0%	60	41.1%	72
Very Dissatisfied	28.6%	4	15.7%	11	24.1%	32	32.4%	11	36.4%	59	28.6%	50
Totals	100.0%	14	100.0%	70	100.0%	133	100.0%	34	100.0%	162	100.0%	175
Mean	2.29		2.29		2.26		1.94		1.95		2.07	
ChiSq Significance	Yes at 90.0%*											

* Note: ChiSq has over 20% low count cells.

	total yearly household income before taxes													
	Less than $10,000		$10,000 to $20,000		$20,001 to $35,000		$ 35,001 to $50,000		$50,001 to $75,000		$75,001 to $100,000		Over $100,000	
Improving public education.- Community Priority														
Extremely High	46.2%	6	55.0%	22	50.5%	47	53.3%	48	57.8%	74	59.8%	58	53.2%	58
High	30.8%	4	27.5%	11	38.7%	36	28.9%	26	25.8%	33	29.9%	29	31.2%	34
Middle	23.1%	3	17.5%	7	8.6%	8	14.4%	13	14.1%	18	6.2%	6	13.8%	15
Low	0.0%	0	0.0%	0	1.1%	1	1.1%	1	1.6%	2	3.1%	3	0.9%	1
Extremely Low	0.0%	0	0.0%	0	1.1%	1	2.2%	2	0.8%	1	1.0%	1	0.9%	1
Totals	100.0%	13	100.0%	40	100.0%	93	100.0%	90	100.0%	128	100.0%	97	100.0%	109
Mean	4.23		4.38		4.37		4.30		4.38		4.44		4.35	
ChiSq Significance	Under 50%*													

* Note: ChiSq has over 20% low count cells.

	total yearly household income before taxes													
	Less than $10,000		$10,000 to $20,000		$20,001 to $35,000		$ 35,001 to $50,000		$50,001 to $75,000		$75,001 to $100,000		Over $100,000	
Quality of public education in Albuquerque.- Level of Satisfaction														
Very Satisfied	8.3%	1	10.0%	4	3.3%	3	3.5%	3	5.8%	7	5.2%	5	5.6%	6
Somewhat Satisfied	16.7%	2	37.5%	15	35.9%	33	28.2%	24	32.5%	39	22.7%	22	23.1%	25
Somewhat Dissatisfied	58.3%	7	25.0%	10	30.4%	28	42.4%	36	34.2%	41	40.2%	39	42.6%	46
Very Dissatisfied	16.7%	2	27.5%	11	30.4%	28	25.9%	22	27.5%	33	32.0%	31	28.7%	31
Totals	100.0%	12	100.0%	40	100.0%	92	100.0%	85	100.0%	120	100.0%	97	100.0%	108
Mean	2.17		2.30		2.12		2.09		2.17		2.01		2.06	
ChiSq Significance	Under 50%*													

* Note: ChiSq has over 20% low count cells.

	Community Planning Area																	
	a Central Albuquerque		b East Gateway		c Foothills		d Mid Heights		e Near Heights		f North Albuquerque		g North Valley		h SW Mesa/South Valley		i Westside	
Improving public education.- Community Priority																		
Extremely High	50.0%	19	47.1%	32	46.0%	29	62.4%	58	54.8%	46	52.0%	26	55.7%	34	56.4%	31	59.2%	58
High	39.5%	15	36.8%	25	39.7%	25	25.8%	24	33.3%	28	32.0%	16	21.3%	13	25.5%	14	27.6%	27
Middle	7.9%	3	14.7%	10	12.7%	8	6.5%	6	9.5%	8	14.0%	7	21.3%	13	14.5%	8	11.2%	11
Low	2.6%	1	1.5%	1	1.6%	1	3.2%	3	0.0%	0	2.0%	1	1.6%	1	1.8%	1	0.0%	0
Extremely Low	0.0%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	0	2.2%	2	2.4%	2	0.0%	0	0.0%	0	1.8%	1	2.0%	2
Totals	100.0%	38	100.0%	68	100.0%	63	100.0%	93	100.0%	84	100.0%	50	100.0%	61	100.0%	55	100.0%	98
Mean	4.37		4.29		4.30		4.43		4.38		4.34		4.31		4.33		4.42	
ChiSq Significance	Under 50%*																	

* Note: ChiSq has over 20% low count cells.

	Community Planning Area																	
	a Central Albuquerque		b East Gateway		c Foothills		d Mid Heights		e Near Heights		f North Albuquerque		g North Valley		h SW Mesa/South Valley		i Westside	
Quality of public education in Albuquerque.- Level of Satisfaction																		
Very Satisfied	5.3%	2	6.2%	4	4.9%	3	8.8%	8	0.0%	0	8.2%	4	4.9%	3	1.9%	1	6.3%	6
Somewhat Satisfied	26.3%	10	35.4%	23	31.1%	19	39.6%	36	26.3%	21	26.5%	13	21.3%	13	32.1%	17	17.9%	17
Somewhat Dissatisfied	36.8%	14	27.7%	18	42.6%	26	28.6%	26	47.5%	38	36.7%	18	42.6%	26	41.5%	22	37.9%	36
Very Dissatisfied	31.6%	12	30.8%	20	21.3%	13	23.1%	21	26.3%	21	28.6%	14	31.1%	19	24.5%	13	37.9%	36
Totals	100.0%	38	100.0%	65	100.0%	61	100.0%	91	100.0%	80	100.0%	49	100.0%	61	100.0%	53	100.0%	95
Mean	2.05		2.17		2.20		2.34		2.00		2.14		2.00		2.11		1.93	
ChiSq Significance	Yes at 50.0%*																	

* Note: ChiSq has over 20% low count cells.

Crosstabs on Community Priority - Improving public education

	Reporting On	Male	Female	Hispanic	Caucasian	Central ABQ	E. Gateway	Foothills	Mid Hgts	Near Hgts	N. ABQ	N. Valley	SW Mesa S Valley
Improving public education.- Community Priority													
Extremely High	54.6%	48.4%	59.4%	60.1%	52.2%	50.0%	47.1%	46.0%	62.4%	54.8%	52.0%	55.7%	56.4%
High	30.7%	35.0%	27.4%	25.4%	33.1%	39.5%	36.8%	39.7%	25.8%	33.3%	32.0%	21.3%	25.5%
Middle	12.1%	12.3%	11.9%	12.4%	12.6%	7.9%	14.7%	12.7%	6.5%	9.5%	14.0%	21.3%	14.5%
Low	1.5%	2.5%	0.6%	1.0%	1.3%	2.6%	1.5%	1.6%	3.2%	0.0%	2.0%	1.6%	1.8%
Extremely Low	1.1%	1.8%	0.6%	1.0%	0.8%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	2.2%	2.4%	0.0%	0.0%	1.8%
Totals	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%
Mean	4.36	4.26	4.44	4.42	4.34	4.37	4.29	4.30	4.43	4.38	4.34	4.31	4.33

	Westside	Staying in ABQ	Probably Not Staying	College Degree or More	HS grad or less	Household 2 or less	Household 3 or more	Income 50 to 100k	Income < 20k	Income 20 - 50k	Income > 100k	Age 18 - 34	Age 35 - 49
Improving public education.- Community Priority													
Extremely High	59.2%	53.3%	60.6%	54.2%	52.8%	49.4%	64.1%	58.7%	52.8%	51.9%	53.2%	70.1%	59.1%
High	27.6%	31.4%	25.8%	31.4%	27.0%	32.6%	26.8%	27.6%	28.3%	33.9%	31.2%	18.2%	30.7%
Middle	11.2%	12.9%	9.1%	11.8%	15.7%	15.0%	7.3%	10.7%	18.9%	11.5%	13.8%	10.4%	8.0%
Low	0.0%	1.5%	1.5%	1.4%	2.2%	1.8%	0.9%	2.2%	0.0%	1.1%	0.9%	0.0%	1.7%
Extremely Low	2.0%	0.9%	3.0%	1.2%	2.2%	1.3%	0.9%	0.9%	0.0%	1.6%	0.9%	1.3%	0.6%
Totals	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%
Mean	4.42	4.35	4.39	4.36	4.26	4.27	4.52	4.41	4.34	4.33	4.35	4.56	4.46

	Age 50 - 64	Age 65 +	FTE	Not Full Time	No minors	one or more minors
Improving public education.- Community Priority						
Extremely High	50.0%	46.6%	58.7%	39.6%	50.7%	61.6%
High	31.4%	36.8%	26.2%	49.1%	32.4%	26.9%
Middle	15.0%	14.3%	11.4%	9.4%	14.4%	8.7%
Low	1.8%	1.5%	2.0%	1.9%	1.6%	1.4%
Extremely Low	1.8%	0.8%	1.7%	0.0%	1.0%	1.4%
Totals	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%
Mean	4.26	4.27	4.38	4.26	4.30	4.46

Crosstabs on Level of Satisfaction - Quality of public education in Albuquerque

	Reporting On	Male	Female	Hispanic	Caucasian	Central ABQ	E. Gateway	Foothills	Mid Hgts	Near Hgts	N. ABQ	N. Valley	SW Mesa S Valley
Quality of public education in Albuquerque.- Level of Satisfaction													
Very Satisfied	5.2%	4.8%	5.6%	5.8%	4.4%	5.3%	6.2%	4.9%	8.8%	0.0%	8.2%	4.9%	1.9%
Somewhat Satisfied	28.5%	33.1%	24.8%	33.3%	27.1%	26.3%	35.4%	31.1%	39.6%	26.3%	26.5%	21.3%	32.1%
Somewhat Dissatisfied	37.8%	34.6%	40.5%	39.7%	37.6%	36.8%	27.7%	42.6%	28.6%	47.5%	36.7%	42.6%	41.5%
Very Dissatisfied	28.5%	27.6%	29.1%	21.2%	30.9%	31.6%	30.8%	21.3%	23.1%	26.3%	28.6%	31.1%	24.5%
Totals	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%
Mean	2.10	2.15	2.07	2.24	2.05	2.05	2.17	2.20	2.34	2.00	2.14	2.00	2.11

	Westside	Staying in ABQ	Probably Not Staying	College Degree or More	HS grad or less	Household 2 or less	Household 3 or more	Income 50 to 100k	Income < 20k	Income 20 - 50k	Income > 100k	Age 18 - 34	Age 35 - 49
Quality of public education in Albuquerque.- Level of Satisfaction													
Very Satisfied	6.3%	5.5%	4.5%	5.3%	6.0%	5.6%	4.6%	5.5%	9.6%	3.4%	5.6%	5.4%	1.7%
Somewhat Satisfied	17.9%	30.5%	16.4%	23.1%	34.5%	30.0%	25.3%	28.1%	32.7%	32.2%	23.1%	17.6%	27.9%
Somewhat Dissatisfied	37.9%	36.9%	38.8%	39.2%	41.7%	36.7%	40.1%	36.9%	32.7%	36.2%	42.6%	40.5%	40.1%
Very Dissatisfied	37.9%	27.1%	40.3%	32.3%	17.9%	27.6%	30.0%	29.5%	25.0%	28.2%	28.7%	36.5%	30.2%
Totals	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%
Mean	1.93	2.14	1.85	2.01	2.29	2.14	2.05	2.10	2.27	2.11	2.06	1.92	2.01

	Age 50 - 64	Age 65 +	FTE	Not Full Time	No minors	one or more minors
Quality of public education in Albuquerque.- Level of Satisfaction						
Very Satisfied	7.8%	5.6%	4.1%	11.5%	5.7%	4.6%
Somewhat Satisfied	28.4%	35.2%	26.6%	23.1%	29.5%	26.4%
Somewhat Dissatisfied	37.6%	34.4%	39.2%	36.5%	37.4%	38.9%
Very Dissatisfied	26.1%	24.8%	30.1%	28.8%	27.4%	30.1%
Totals	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%
Mean	2.18	2.22	2.05	2.17	2.14	2.06

ECONOMIC VITALITY AND DEVELOPMENT

Significant Findings:

1. **"Attracting businesses and creating jobs" was ranked 6th out of 11 community priorities.**
2. **"Shortage of opportunities for well paying jobs" was rated as the 4th highest problem out of 11 personal or family problems.**
3. **Shortge of job opportunities is inversely related to educational achievement.**
4. **The Southwest Mesa area residents consider lack of job opportunities to be much more significant than any other area of the City.**
5. **Hispanics are more likely to consider the lack of job opportunities to be a personal or family problem than other ethnicities and cultures.**

Attracting businesses and creating jobs.- Community Priority						
Extremely High	High	Middle	Low	Extremely Low	Totals	Mean
32.2%	36.8%	25.4%	4.1%	1.5%	100.0%	3.94

Shortage of opportunities for well-paying jobs for you.- Problem for You or Family				
Big Problem	Somewhat of a Problem	Not a Problem	Totals	Mean
23.0%	30.2%	46.8%	100.0%	1.76

	highest level of education attained											
	Less than high school		high school graduate		Some College		Trade School		Bachelor's Degree		Graduate Degree	
Shortage of opportunities for well-paying jobs for you.- Problem for You or Family												
Big Problem	18.8%	3	37.0%	27	26.5%	35	32.4%	11	24.8%	39	11.7%	21
Somewhat of a Problem	56.3%	9	24.7%	18	30.3%	40	41.2%	14	30.6%	48	26.8%	48
Not a Problem	25.0%	4	38.4%	28	43.2%	57	26.5%	9	44.6%	70	61.5%	110
Totals	100.0%	16	100.0%	73	100.0%	132	100.0%	34	100.0%	157	100.0%	179
Mean	1.94		1.99		1.83		2.06		1.80		1.50	
ChiSq Significance	Yes at 99.0%											

	Community Planning Area																	
	a Central Albuquerque		b East Gateway		c Foothills		d Mid Heights		e Near Heights		f North Albuquerque		g North Valley		h SW Mesa/South Valley		i Westside	
Shortage of opportunities for well-paying jobs for you.- Problem for You or Family																		
Big Problem	25.0%	9	29.9%	20	9.7%	6	15.9%	14	26.5%	22	15.7%	8	19.7%	12	40.0%	22	25.8%	24
Somewhat of a Problem	30.6%	11	25.4%	17	27.4%	17	27.3%	24	31.3%	26	29.4%	15	26.2%	16	36.4%	20	36.6%	34
Not a Problem	44.4%	16	44.8%	30	62.9%	39	56.8%	50	42.2%	35	54.9%	28	54.1%	33	23.6%	13	37.6%	35
Totals	100.0%	36	100.0%	67	100.0%	62	100.0%	88	100.0%	83	100.0%	51	100.0%	61	100.0%	55	100.0%	93
Mean	1.81		1.85		1.47		1.59		1.84		1.61		1.66		2.16		1.88	
ChiSq Significance	Yes at 95.0%																	

	Cultural/Ethnic on Q53:Your ethnic/cultural background					
	Hispanic		Caucasian not Hispanic		Other Ethnicities	
Shortage of opportunities for well-paying jobs for you.- Problem for You or Family						
Big Problem	31.6%	60	18.7%	68	20.6%	7
Somewhat of a Problem	34.7%	66	26.9%	98	38.2%	13
Not a Problem	33.7%	64	54.4%	198	41.2%	14
Totals	100.0%	190	100.0%	364	100.0%	34
Mean		1.98		1.64		1.79
ChiSq Significance	Yes at 99.0%					

Crosstabs on Community Priority - Attracting businesses and creating jobs

	Reporting On	Male	Female	Hispanic	Caucasian	Central ABQ	E. Gateway	Foothills	Mid Hgts	Near Hgts	N. ABQ	N. Valley	SW Mesa S Valley
Attracting businesses and creating jobs.- Community Priority													
Extremely High	32.2%	29.5%	35.0%	37.7%	28.4%	34.2%	27.7%	26.7%	33.0%	26.5%	26.0%	33.9%	31.5%
High	36.8%	40.4%	33.4%	36.6%	37.3%	34.2%	38.5%	41.7%	34.0%	38.6%	38.0%	38.7%	31.5%
Middle	25.4%	23.3%	27.1%	19.4%	29.2%	28.9%	32.3%	23.3%	29.8%	25.3%	30.0%	22.6%	31.5%
Low	4.1%	5.1%	3.5%	4.2%	4.3%	2.6%	1.5%	6.7%	1.1%	7.2%	4.0%	3.2%	3.7%
Extremely Low	1.5%	1.8%	0.9%	2.1%	0.8%	0.0%	0.0%	1.7%	2.1%	2.4%	2.0%	1.6%	1.9%
Totals	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%
Mean	3.94	3.91	3.98	4.04	3.88	4.00	3.92	3.85	3.95	3.80	3.82	4.00	3.87

	Westside	Staying in ABQ	Probably Not Staying	College Degree or More	HS grad or less	Household 2 or less	Household 3 or more	Income 50 to 100k	Income < 20k	Income 20 - 50k	Income > 100k	Age 18 - 34	Age 35 - 49
Attracting businesses and creating jobs.- Community Priority													
Extremely High	44.0%	31.5%	35.8%	30.0%	37.8%	30.2%	35.8%	32.4%	29.1%	34.1%	27.5%	36.8%	35.8%
High	36.0%	36.6%	40.3%	37.6%	27.8%	37.9%	34.4%	39.2%	25.5%	32.4%	46.8%	39.5%	37.0%
Middle	13.0%	26.5%	16.4%	26.8%	30.0%	26.3%	24.2%	23.0%	40.0%	28.0%	20.2%	21.1%	23.1%
Low	6.0%	4.0%	6.0%	4.4%	2.2%	4.4%	3.7%	3.6%	3.6%	4.4%	4.6%	2.6%	2.9%
Extremely Low	1.0%	1.3%	1.5%	1.2%	2.2%	1.3%	1.9%	1.8%	1.8%	1.1%	0.9%	0.0%	1.2%
Totals	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%
Mean	4.16	3.93	4.03	3.91	3.97	3.91	3.99	3.97	3.76	3.94	3.95	4.11	4.03

	Age 50 - 64	Age 65 +	FTE	Not Full Time	No minors	one or more minors
Attracting businesses and creating jobs.- Community Priority						
Extremely High	32.4%	24.1%	33.4%	34.6%	30.2%	35.5%
High	36.6%	35.8%	36.9%	38.5%	37.5%	35.0%
Middle	25.9%	30.7%	25.6%	23.1%	26.6%	24.3%
Low	3.7%	7.3%	2.6%	3.8%	4.7%	3.3%
Extremely Low	1.4%	2.2%	1.5%	0.0%	1.0%	1.9%
Totals	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%
Mean	3.95	3.72	3.98	4.04	3.91	3.99

Crosstabs on Personal or Family Problem - Shortage of opportunities for well paying jobs

	Reporting On	Male	Female	Hispanic	Caucasian	Central ABQ	E. Gateway	Foothills	Mid Hgts	Near Hgts	N. ABQ	N. Valley	SW Mesa S Valley
Shortage of opportunities for well-paying jobs for you.- Problem for You or Family													
Big Problem	23.0%	23.3%	22.8%	31.6%	18.7%	25.0%	29.9%	9.7%	15.9%	26.5%	15.7%	19.7%	40.0%
Somewhat of a Problem	30.2%	25.6%	34.3%	34.7%	26.9%	30.6%	25.4%	27.4%	27.3%	31.3%	29.4%	26.2%	36.4%
Not a Problem	46.8%	51.1%	42.9%	33.7%	54.4%	44.4%	44.8%	62.9%	56.8%	42.2%	54.9%	54.1%	23.6%
Totals	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%
Mean	1.76	1.72	1.80	1.98	1.64	1.81	1.85	1.47	1.59	1.84	1.61	1.66	2.16

	Westside	Staying in ABQ	Probably Not Staying	College Degree or More	HS grad or less	Household 2 or less	Household 3 or more	Income 50 to 100k	Income < 20k	Income 20 - 50k	Income > 100k	Age 18 - 34	Age 35 - 49
Shortage of opportunities for well-paying jobs for you.- Problem for You or Family													
Big Problem	25.8%	22.0%	30.6%	17.9%	33.7%	18.3%	31.0%	17.6%	38.9%	32.9%	9.3%	30.6%	29.1%
Somewhat of a Problem	36.6%	28.7%	38.7%	28.6%	30.3%	27.1%	35.2%	31.7%	29.6%	31.2%	25.2%	36.1%	33.1%
Not a Problem	37.6%	49.3%	30.6%	53.6%	36.0%	54.6%	33.8%	50.7%	31.5%	35.8%	65.4%	33.3%	37.7%
Totals	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%
Mean	1.88	1.73	2.00	1.64	1.98	1.64	1.97	1.67	2.07	1.97	1.44	1.97	1.91

	Age 50 - 64	Age 65 +	FTE	Not Full Time	No minors	one or more minors
Shortage of opportunities for well-paying jobs for you.- Problem for You or Family						
Big Problem	22.0%	13.0%	22.2%	33.3%	20.1%	27.8%
Somewhat of a Problem	32.2%	18.3%	34.5%	27.5%	27.6%	34.3%
Not a Problem	45.8%	68.7%	43.3%	39.2%	52.3%	38.0%
Totals	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%
Mean	1.76	1.44	1.79	1.94	1.68	1.90

ENVIRONMENTAL PROTECTION AND ENHANCEMENT

Significant Findings:

1. Increasing water conservation is still strongly supported as a community priority by Albuquerque residents.
2. Improving regional air quality is also supported with almost 65% ranking it at least high.
3. Over 40% of the respondents consider the lack of recycling opportunities at least somewhat of a problem with younger respondents more likely to feel this way. Central Albuquerque, SW Mesa, and the Near Heights are more likely to view lack of recycling opportunities as a personal problem.
4. Over 60% are impacted by the rate of open space being consumed by development. This is inversely related to household income. Residents of Central Albuquerque, Near Heights, SW Mesa, and Near Heights feel more impacted by this.
5. Over 57% are satisfied with the protection of Albuquerque's environment; satisfaction tracks with age with the oldest residents being most satisfied. Westside, North Albuquerque, and Mid Heights residents are more satisfied than other area residents.

Increasing water conservation.- Community Priority						
Extremely High	High	Middle	Low	Extremely Low	Totals	Mean
34.4%	34.8%	25.3%	4.0%	1.5%	100.0%	3.97

Improving regional air quality.- Community Priority						
Extremely High	High	Middle	Low	Extremely Low	Totals	Mean
26.7%	38.1%	25.4%	8.0%	1.8%	100.0%	3.80

Lack of recycling opportunities.- Problem for You or Family				
Big Problem	Somewhat of a Problem	Not a Problem	Totals	Mean
11.1%	30.3%	58.6%	100.0%	1.52

Rate at which natural areas and farms are being consumed for development.- Problem for You or Family				
Big Problem	Somewhat of a Problem	Not a Problem	Totals	Mean
28.4%	32.3%	39.2%	100.0%	1.89

Protection of Albuquerque's environment (air, land, water).- Level of Satisfaction					
Very Satisfied	Somewhat Satisfied	Somewhat Dissatisfied	Very Dissatisfied	Totals	Mean
7.8%	49.7%	33.2%	9.3%	100.0%	2.56

	Age Range of Respondent											
	18 - 24		25 - 34		35 - 49		50 - 64		65 - 79		80 or over	
Lack of recycling opportunities.- Problem for You or Family												
Big Problem	33.3%	4	16.9%	11	9.7%	17	12.6%	28	6.7%	7	3.2%	1
Somewhat of a Problem	25.0%	3	27.7%	18	34.7%	61	35.1%	78	20.2%	21	16.1%	5
Not a Problem	41.7%	5	55.4%	36	55.7%	98	52.3%	116	73.1%	76	80.6%	25
Totals	100.0%	12	100.0%	65	100.0%	176	100.0%	222	100.0%	104	100.0%	31
Mean	1.92		1.62		1.54		1.60		1.34		1.23	
ChiSq Significance	Yes at 95.0%											

	Community Planning Area																	
	a Central Albuquerque		b East Gateway		c Foothills		d Mid Heights		e Near Heights		f North Albuquerque		g North Valley		h SW Mesa/South Valley		i Westside	
Lack of recycling opportunities.- Problem for You or Family																		
Big Problem	21.1%	8	7.4%	5	4.8%	3	8.6%	8	10.8%	9	15.7%	8	9.5%	6	14.5%	8	13.0%	13
Somewhat of a Problem	26.3%	10	39.7%	27	20.6%	13	24.7%	23	42.2%	35	27.5%	14	30.2%	19	40.0%	22	23.0%	23
Not a Problem	52.6%	20	52.9%	36	74.6%	47	66.7%	62	47.0%	39	56.9%	29	60.3%	38	45.5%	25	64.0%	64
Totals	100.0%	38	100.0%	68	100.0%	63	100.0%	93	100.0%	83	100.0%	51	100.0%	63	100.0%	55	100.0%	100
Mean	1.68		1.54		1.30		1.42		1.64		1.59		1.49		1.69		1.49	
ChiSq Significance	Yes at 90.0%																	

	Age Range of Respondent											
	18 - 24		25 - 34		35 - 49		50 - 64		65 - 79		80 or over	
Protection of Albuquerque's environment (air, land, water).- Level of Satisfaction												
Very Satisfied	0.0%	0	9.2%	6	5.1%	9	8.2%	18	8.6%	9	18.8%	6
Somewhat Satisfied	25.0%	3	44.6%	29	50.8%	90	46.1%	101	59.0%	62	59.4%	19
Somewhat Dissatisfied	66.7%	8	41.5%	27	34.5%	61	33.8%	74	23.8%	25	18.8%	6
Very Dissatisfied	8.3%	1	4.6%	3	9.6%	17	11.9%	26	8.6%	9	3.1%	1
Totals	100.0%	12	100.0%	65	100.0%	177	100.0%	219	100.0%	105	100.0%	32
Mean	2.17		2.58		2.51		2.51		2.68		2.94	
ChiSq Significance	Yes at 75.0%*											

* Note: ChiSq has over 20% low count cells.

	Community Planning Area																	
	a Central Albuquerque		b East Gateway		c Foothills		d Mid Heights		e Near Heights		f North Albuquerque		g North Valley		h SW Mesa/South Valley		i Westside	
Protection of Albuquerque's environment (air, land, water).- Level of Satisfaction																		
Very Satisfied	0.0%	0	13.0%	9	4.8%	3	7.5%	7	7.2%	6	7.8%	4	6.5%	4	5.6%	3	12.0%	12
Somewhat Satisfied	35.9%	14	40.6%	28	58.7%	37	53.8%	50	39.8%	33	58.8%	30	48.4%	30	53.7%	29	54.0%	54
Somewhat Dissatisfied	46.2%	18	42.0%	29	22.2%	14	33.3%	31	37.3%	31	27.5%	14	32.3%	20	31.5%	17	30.0%	30
Very Dissatisfied	17.9%	7	4.3%	3	14.3%	9	5.4%	5	15.7%	13	5.9%	3	12.9%	8	9.3%	5	4.0%	4
Totals	100.0%	39	100.0%	69	100.0%	63	100.0%	93	100.0%	83	100.0%	51	100.0%	62	100.0%	54	100.0%	100
Mean	2.18		2.62		2.54		2.63		2.39		2.69		2.48		2.56		2.74	
ChiSq Significance	Yes at 75.0%																	

	total yearly household income before taxes													
	Less than $10,000		$10,000 to $20,000		$20,001 to $35,000		$ 35,001 to $50,000		$50,001 to $75,000		$75,001 to $100,000		Over $100,000	
Rate at which natural areas and farms are being consumed for development.- Problem for You or Family														
Big Problem	41.7%	5	51.3%	20	36.6%	34	32.2%	29	27.6%	35	17.3%	17	14.7%	16
Somewhat of a Problem	25.0%	3	25.6%	10	26.9%	25	37.8%	34	34.6%	44	38.8%	38	31.2%	34
Not a Problem	33.3%	4	23.1%	9	36.6%	34	30.0%	27	37.8%	48	43.9%	43	54.1%	59
Totals	100.0%	12	100.0%	39	100.0%	93	100.0%	90	100.0%	127	100.0%	98	100.0%	109
Mean	2.08		2.28		2.00		2.02		1.90		1.73		1.61	
ChiSq Significance	Yes at 99.0%													

	Community Planning Area																	
	a Central Albuquerque		b East Gateway		c Foothills		d Mid Heights		e Near Heights		f North Albuquerque		g North Valley		h SW Mesa/South Valley		i Westside	
Rate at which natural areas and farms are being consumed for development.- Problem for You or Family																		
Big Problem	50.0%	20	28.4%	19	22.6%	14	27.8%	25	38.6%	32	13.7%	7	30.2%	19	34.0%	18	19.0%	19
Somewhat of a Problem	22.5%	9	31.3%	21	30.6%	19	27.8%	25	26.5%	22	31.4%	16	41.3%	26	35.8%	19	40.0%	40
Not a Problem	27.5%	11	40.3%	27	46.8%	29	44.4%	40	34.9%	29	54.9%	28	28.6%	18	30.2%	16	41.0%	41
Totals	100.0%	40	100.0%	67	100.0%	62	100.0%	90	100.0%	83	100.0%	51	100.0%	63	100.0%	53	100.0%	100
Mean	2.22		1.88		1.76		1.83		2.04		1.59		2.02		2.04		1.78	
ChiSq Significance	Yes at 95.0%																	

Crosstabs on Level of Satisfaction - Protection of Albuquerque's environment (air, land, water)

	Reporting On	Male	Female	Hispanic	Caucasian	Central ABQ	E. Gateway	Foothills	Mid Hgts	Near Hgts	N. ABQ	N. Valley	SW Mesa S Valley
Protection of Albuquerque's environment (air, land, water).- Level of Satisfaction													
Very Satisfied	7.8%	10.0%	6.0%	6.2%	7.4%	0.0%	13.0%	4.8%	7.5%	7.2%	7.8%	6.5%	5.6%
Somewhat Satisfied	49.7%	52.7%	47.2%	55.4%	47.2%	35.9%	40.6%	58.7%	53.8%	39.8%	58.8%	48.4%	53.7%
Somewhat Dissatisfied	33.2%	30.6%	34.9%	30.6%	36.3%	46.2%	42.0%	22.2%	33.3%	37.3%	27.5%	32.3%	31.5%
Very Dissatisfied	9.3%	6.8%	11.9%	7.8%	9.0%	17.9%	4.3%	14.3%	5.4%	15.7%	5.9%	12.9%	9.3%
Totals	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%
Mean	2.56	2.66	2.47	2.60	2.53	2.18	2.62	2.54	2.63	2.39	2.69	2.48	2.56

	Westside	Staying in ABQ	Probably Not Staying	College Degree or More	HS grad or less	Household 2 or less	Household 3 or more	Income 50 to 100k	Income < 20k	Income 20 - 50k	Income > 100k	Age 18 - 34	Age 35 - 49
Protection of Albuquerque's environment (air, land, water).- Level of Satisfaction													
Very Satisfied	12.0%	7.9%	7.5%	6.9%	10.2%	8.0%	7.2%	9.3%	14.8%	4.9%	6.4%	7.8%	5.1%
Somewhat Satisfied	54.0%	51.3%	40.3%	47.9%	58.0%	48.8%	51.4%	50.4%	42.6%	48.1%	53.2%	41.6%	50.8%
Somewhat Dissatisfied	30.0%	32.5%	37.3%	34.7%	25.0%	32.4%	34.7%	31.4%	31.5%	36.8%	32.1%	45.5%	34.5%
Very Dissatisfied	4.0%	8.3%	14.9%	10.6%	6.8%	10.8%	6.8%	8.8%	11.1%	10.3%	8.3%	5.2%	9.6%
Totals	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%
Mean	2.74	2.59	2.40	2.51	2.72	2.54	2.59	2.60	2.61	2.48	2.58	2.52	2.51

	Age 50 - 64	Age 65 +	FTE	Not Full Time	No minors	one or more minors
Protection of Albuquerque's environment (air, land, water).- Level of Satisfaction						
Very Satisfied	8.2%	10.9%	6.6%	7.4%	7.5%	8.2%
Somewhat Satisfied	46.1%	59.1%	49.6%	42.6%	48.4%	52.3%
Somewhat Dissatisfied	33.8%	22.6%	35.8%	40.7%	32.4%	34.1%
Very Dissatisfied	11.9%	7.3%	8.0%	9.3%	11.7%	5.5%
Totals	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%
Mean	2.51	2.74	2.55	2.48	2.52	2.63

Crosstabs on Community Priority - Increasing water conservation

	Reporting On	Male	Female	Hispanic	Caucasian	Central ABQ	E. Gateway	Foothills	Mid Hgts	Near Hgts	N. ABQ	N. Valley	SW Mesa S Valley
Increasing water conservation.- Community Priority													
Extremely High	34.4%	28.8%	39.4%	30.0%	36.5%	47.2%	28.8%	33.9%	42.2%	52.4%	12.0%	30.0%	33.3%
High	34.8%	35.0%	34.5%	36.8%	32.4%	25.0%	34.8%	41.9%	27.8%	29.3%	50.0%	35.0%	33.3%
Middle	25.3%	28.5%	22.3%	27.9%	25.8%	19.4%	31.8%	16.1%	25.6%	12.2%	36.0%	28.3%	24.1%
Low	4.0%	5.5%	2.9%	3.7%	4.4%	5.6%	3.0%	6.5%	3.3%	3.7%	2.0%	3.3%	7.4%
Extremely Low	1.5%	2.2%	1.0%	1.6%	0.8%	2.8%	1.5%	1.6%	1.1%	2.4%	0.0%	3.3%	1.9%
Totals	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%
Mean	3.97	3.83	4.08	3.90	3.99	4.08	3.86	4.00	4.07	4.26	3.72	3.85	3.89

	Westside	Staying in ABQ	Probably Not Staying	College Degree or More	HS grad or less	Household 2 or less	Household 3 or more	Income 50 to 100k	Income < 20k	Income 20 - 50k	Income > 100k	Age 18 - 34	Age 35 - 49
Increasing water conservation.- Community Priority													
Extremely High	26.5%	33.5%	35.4%	38.3%	25.3%	39.8%	25.5%	32.6%	36.2%	39.4%	28.2%	29.9%	30.6%
High	37.8%	36.2%	24.6%	31.9%	29.9%	31.1%	40.3%	34.4%	34.0%	33.9%	36.4%	35.1%	37.1%
Middle	32.7%	25.0%	30.8%	24.6%	34.5%	23.7%	28.2%	28.5%	23.4%	20.6%	30.0%	31.2%	27.1%
Low	3.1%	3.5%	9.2%	4.1%	8.0%	4.0%	4.2%	3.6%	2.1%	5.0%	3.6%	3.9%	3.5%
Extremely Low	0.0%	1.7%	0.0%	1.2%	2.3%	1.3%	1.9%	0.9%	4.3%	1.1%	1.8%	0.0%	1.8%
Totals	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%
Mean	3.88	3.96	3.86	4.02	3.68	4.04	3.83	3.94	3.96	4.06	3.85	3.91	3.91

	Age 50 - 64	Age 65 +	FTE	Not Full Time	No minors	one or more minors
Increasing water conservation.- Community Priority						
Extremely High	40.3%	32.6%	32.8%	50.0%	39.9%	24.7%
High	31.5%	36.4%	34.8%	22.9%	32.7%	37.7%
Middle	23.6%	22.7%	27.4%	25.0%	22.3%	31.2%
Low	3.2%	6.1%	3.7%	2.1%	3.7%	4.7%
Extremely Low	1.4%	2.3%	1.4%	0.0%	1.3%	1.9%
Totals	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%
Mean	4.06	3.91	3.94	4.21	4.06	3.79

Crosstabs on Community Priority - Improving regional air quality

	Reporting On	Male	Female	Hispanic	Caucasian	Central ABQ	E. Gateway	Foothills	Mid Hgts	Near Hgts	N. ABQ	N. Valley	SW Mesa S Valley
Improving regional air quality.- Community Priority													
Extremely High	26.7%	21.8%	31.3%	25.6%	27.2%	28.2%	26.1%	28.6%	28.7%	34.9%	21.6%	27.9%	25.5%
High	38.1%	37.1%	38.2%	37.9%	38.1%	43.6%	39.1%	39.7%	37.2%	34.9%	41.2%	36.1%	30.9%
Middle	25.4%	30.4%	21.6%	27.2%	25.1%	25.6%	23.2%	20.6%	28.7%	20.5%	31.4%	26.2%	25.5%
Low	8.0%	8.9%	6.9%	8.7%	7.7%	2.6%	10.1%	11.1%	3.2%	3.6%	5.9%	8.2%	18.2%
Extremely Low	1.8%	1.8%	1.9%	0.5%	1.9%	0.0%	1.4%	0.0%	2.1%	6.0%	0.0%	1.6%	0.0%
Totals	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%
Mean	3.80	3.68	3.90	3.79	3.81	3.97	3.78	3.86	3.87	3.89	3.78	3.80	3.64

	Westside	Staying in ABQ	Probably Not Staying	College Degree or More	HS grad or less	Household 2 or less	Household 3 or more	Income 50 to 100k	Income < 20k	Income 20 - 50k	Income > 100k	Age 18 - 34	Age 35 - 49
Improving regional air quality.- Community Priority													
Extremely High	19.2%	24.6%	32.8%	26.1%	26.7%	29.6%	21.5%	24.7%	25.9%	33.0%	19.1%	23.4%	23.3%
High	41.4%	39.7%	29.9%	38.4%	38.9%	36.0%	41.6%	39.6%	33.3%	35.2%	40.0%	35.1%	42.0%
Middle	27.3%	26.5%	20.9%	25.5%	21.1%	24.2%	27.9%	25.1%	27.8%	23.6%	30.0%	22.1%	27.8%
Low	10.1%	8.1%	9.0%	8.0%	12.2%	8.2%	7.8%	10.1%	9.3%	4.9%	9.1%	13.0%	5.7%
Extremely Low	2.0%	1.1%	7.5%	2.0%	1.1%	2.0%	1.4%	0.4%	3.7%	3.3%	1.8%	6.5%	1.1%
Totals	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%
Mean	3.66	3.79	3.72	3.79	3.78	3.83	3.74	3.78	3.69	3.90	3.65	3.56	3.81

	Age 50 - 64	Age 65 +	FTE	Not Full Time	No minors	one or more minors
Improving regional air quality.- Community Priority						
Extremely High	29.3%	28.9%	25.3%	26.9%	29.5%	21.5%
High	36.0%	37.0%	39.8%	32.7%	34.1%	44.3%
Middle	26.1%	23.7%	27.0%	28.8%	26.9%	23.7%
Low	7.2%	9.6%	5.7%	9.6%	7.5%	9.1%
Extremely Low	1.4%	0.7%	2.3%	1.9%	2.1%	1.4%
Totals	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%
Mean	3.85	3.84	3.80	3.73	3.81	3.75

PUBLIC SAFETY

Significant Findings:

1. Lowering the crime rate is a high community priority, ranking 2nd of 11 issues. While only 13.7% consider crime in their neighborhood to be a big problem, almost 53% consider it to be somewhat of a problem. The mean for neighborhood crime is the 3rd highest of the 11 personal or family problems.

2. Reducing substance abuse is recognized as an important community health and safety priority, ranked highly by over 70% of the respondents.

3. Higher educated respondents tend to rank "lowering the crime rate" somewhat lower as a community priority.

4. SW Mesa and Central Albuquerque residents rank crime in their neighborhood as much more of a problem than other areas.

Lowering the crime rate throughout the City.- Community Priority						
Extremely High	High	Middle	Low	Extremely Low	Totals	Mean
53.6%	29.5%	13.5%	2.5%	0.8%	100.0%	4.33

Crime in your neighborhood.- Problem for You or Family				
Big Problem	Somewhat of a Problem	Not a Problem	Totals	Mean
13.8%	52.9%	33.3%	100.0%	1.80

Reducing substance abuse.- Community Priority						
Extremely High	High	Middle	Low	Extremely Low	Totals	Mean
36.2%	34.4%	20.5%	6.4%	2.5%	100.0%	3.95

	highest level of education attained											
	Less than high school		high school graduate		Some College		Trade School		Bachelor's Degree		Graduate Degree	
Lowering the crime rate throughout the City.- Community Priority												
Extremely High	47.1%	8	66.7%	48	60.7%	82	60.6%	20	53.4%	86	41.5%	76
High	23.5%	4	22.2%	16	25.9%	35	33.3%	11	31.7%	51	33.9%	62
Middle	11.8%	2	6.9%	5	11.1%	15	3.0%	1	11.8%	19	21.9%	40
Low	17.6%	3	2.8%	2	2.2%	3	3.0%	1	1.9%	3	1.6%	3
Extremely Low	0.0%	0	1.4%	1	0.0%	0	0.0%	0	1.2%	2	1.1%	2
Totals	100.0%	17	100.0%	72	100.0%	135	100.0%	33	100.0%	161	100.0%	183
Mean	4.00		4.50		4.45		4.52		4.34		4.13	
ChiSq Significance	Yes at 95.0%*											

* Note: ChiSq has over 20% low count cells.

	total yearly household income before taxes													
	Less than $10,000		$10,000 to $20,000		$20,001 to $35,000		$ 35,001 to $50,000		$50,001 to $75,000		$75,001 to $100,000		Over $100,000	
Lowering the crime rate throughout the City.- Community Priority														
Extremely High	46.2%	6	59.0%	23	58.1%	54	49.4%	44	51.2%	64	51.0%	49	50.0%	55
High	46.2%	6	17.9%	7	25.8%	24	37.1%	33	28.8%	36	33.3%	32	30.0%	33
Middle	7.7%	1	17.9%	7	9.7%	9	10.1%	9	15.2%	19	14.6%	14	18.2%	20
Low	0.0%	0	5.1%	2	5.4%	5	2.2%	2	4.0%	5	0.0%	0	0.9%	1
Extremely Low	0.0%	0	0.0%	0	1.1%	1	1.1%	1	0.8%	1	1.0%	1	0.9%	1
Totals	100.0%	13	100.0%	39	100.0%	93	100.0%	89	100.0%	125	100.0%	96	100.0%	110
Mean	4.38		4.31		4.34		4.31		4.26		4.33		4.27	
ChiSq Significance	Under 50%*													

* Note: ChiSq has over 20% low count cells.

	Community Planning Area																	
	i Westside		d Mid Heights		e Near Heights		b East Gateway		c Foothills		g North Valley		h SW Mesa/South Valley		f North Albuquerque		a Central Albuquerque	
Lowering the crime rate throughout the City.- Community Priority																		
Extremely High	55.7%	54	50.0%	46	50.0%	41	55.9%	38	54.0%	34	40.3%	25	63.6%	35	62.7%	32	55.6%	20
High	29.9%	29	39.1%	36	25.6%	21	33.8%	23	34.9%	22	25.8%	16	23.6%	13	23.5%	12	19.4%	7
Middle	13.4%	13	9.8%	9	22.0%	18	7.4%	5	9.5%	6	29.0%	18	5.5%	3	7.8%	4	16.7%	6
Low	0.0%	0	1.1%	1	2.4%	2	1.5%	1	1.6%	1	3.2%	2	5.5%	3	5.9%	3	5.6%	2
Extremely Low	1.0%	1	0.0%	0	0.0%	0	1.5%	1	0.0%	0	1.6%	1	1.8%	1	0.0%	0	2.8%	1
Totals	100.0%	97	100.0%	92	100.0%	82	100.0%	68	100.0%	63	100.0%	62	100.0%	55	100.0%	51	100.0%	36
Mean	4.39		4.38		4.23		4.41		4.41		4.00		4.42		4.43		4.19	
ChiSq Significance	Under 50%*																	

* Note: ChiSq has over 20% low count cells.

	Community Planning Area																	
	i Westside		d Mid Heights		e Near Heights		b East Gateway		c Foothills		g North Valley		h SW Mesa/South Valley		f North Albuquerque		a Central Albuquerque	
Crime in your neighborhood.- Problem for You or Family																		
Big Problem	5.1%	5	13.8%	13	20.2%	17	13.0%	9	3.1%	2	12.7%	8	33.3%	18	2.0%	1	30.0%	12
Somewhat of a Problem	48.5%	48	56.4%	53	48.8%	41	53.6%	37	54.7%	35	54.0%	34	61.1%	33	45.1%	23	57.5%	23
Not a Problem	46.5%	46	29.8%	28	31.0%	26	33.3%	23	42.2%	27	33.3%	21	5.6%	3	52.9%	27	12.5%	5
Totals	100.0%	99	100.0%	94	100.0%	84	100.0%	69	100.0%	64	100.0%	63	100.0%	54	100.0%	51	100.0%	40
Mean	1.59		1.84		1.89		1.80		1.61		1.79		2.28		1.49		2.17	
ChiSq Significance	Yes at 99.0%																	

Crosstabs on Community Priority - Lowering the crime rate throughout the City

	Reporting On	Male	Female	Hispanic	Caucasian	Central ABQ	E. Gateway	Foothills	Mid Hgts	Near Hgts	N. ABQ	N. Valley	SW Mesa S Valley
Lowering the crime rate throughout the City.- Community Priority													
Extremely High	53.6%	50.0%	55.7%	54.9%	53.1%	55.6%	55.9%	54.0%	50.0%	50.0%	62.7%	40.3%	63.6%
High	29.5%	31.7%	28.3%	25.9%	32.2%	19.4%	33.8%	34.9%	39.1%	25.6%	23.5%	25.8%	23.6%
Middle	13.5%	14.4%	13.4%	16.1%	12.5%	16.7%	7.4%	9.5%	9.8%	22.0%	7.8%	29.0%	5.5%
Low	2.5%	2.5%	2.2%	3.1%	1.4%	5.6%	1.5%	1.6%	1.1%	2.4%	5.9%	3.2%	5.5%
Extremely Low	0.8%	1.4%	0.3%	0.0%	0.8%	2.8%	1.5%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	1.6%	1.8%
Totals	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%
Mean	4.33	4.26	4.37	4.33	4.36	4.19	4.41	4.41	4.38	4.23	4.43	4.00	4.42

	Westside	Staying in ABQ	Probably Not Staying	College Degree or More	HS grad or less	Household 2 or less	Household 3 or more	Income 50 to 100k	Income < 20k	Income 20 - 50k	Income > 100k	Age 18 - 34	Age 35 - 49
Lowering the crime rate throughout the City.- Community Priority													
Extremely High	55.7%	51.7%	67.2%	47.1%	62.9%	55.1%	50.5%	51.1%	55.8%	53.8%	50.0%	48.1%	50.0%
High	29.9%	31.4%	17.2%	32.8%	22.5%	29.0%	30.9%	30.8%	25.0%	31.3%	30.0%	26.0%	32.8%
Middle	13.4%	13.8%	10.9%	17.2%	7.9%	12.5%	15.5%	14.9%	15.4%	9.9%	18.2%	18.2%	13.8%
Low	0.0%	2.5%	1.6%	1.7%	5.6%	2.3%	2.7%	2.3%	3.8%	3.8%	0.9%	5.2%	2.3%
Extremely Low	1.0%	0.6%	3.1%	1.2%	1.1%	1.0%	0.5%	0.9%	0.0%	1.1%	0.9%	2.6%	1.1%
Totals	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%
Mean	4.39	4.31	4.44	4.23	4.40	4.35	4.28	4.29	4.33	4.33	4.27	4.12	4.28

	Age 50 - 64	Age 65 +	FTE	Not Full Time	No minors	one or more minors
Lowering the crime rate throughout the City.- Community Priority						
Extremely High	50.9%	64.4%	48.6%	50.9%	53.9%	51.4%
High	30.1%	27.4%	32.5%	30.2%	31.1%	28.0%
Middle	16.2%	6.7%	15.8%	18.9%	12.1%	16.5%
Low	2.3%	1.5%	2.0%	0.0%	1.8%	3.7%
Extremely Low	0.5%	0.0%	1.1%	0.0%	1.1%	0.5%
Totals	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%
Mean	4.29	4.55	4.25	4.32	4.35	4.26

Crosstabs on Personal or Family Problem - Crime in your neighborhood

	Reporting On	Male	Female	Hispanic	Caucasian	Central ABQ	E. Gateway	Foothills	Mid Hgts	Near Hgts	N. ABQ	N. Valley	SW Mesa S Valley
Crime in your neighborhood.- Problem for You or Family													
Big Problem	13.8%	14.6%	13.0%	14.3%	13.0%	30.0%	13.0%	3.1%	13.8%	20.2%	2.0%	12.7%	33.3%
Somewhat of a Problem	52.9%	52.5%	53.6%	54.6%	51.7%	57.5%	53.6%	54.7%	56.4%	48.8%	45.1%	54.0%	61.1%
Not a Problem	33.3%	32.9%	33.4%	31.1%	35.3%	12.5%	33.3%	42.2%	29.8%	31.0%	52.9%	33.3%	5.6%
Totals	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%
Mean	1.80	1.82	1.80	1.83	1.78	2.17	1.80	1.61	1.84	1.89	1.49	1.79	2.28

	Westside	Staying in ABQ	Probably Not Staying	College Degree or More	HS grad or less	Household 2 or less	Household 3 or more	Income 50 to 100k	Income < 20k	Income 20 - 50k	Income > 100k	Age 18 - 34	Age 35 - 49
Crime in your neighborhood.- Problem for You or Family													
Big Problem	5.1%	12.7%	23.5%	10.0%	17.8%	16.8%	8.1%	11.0%	24.1%	16.8%	9.1%	15.6%	13.0%
Somewhat of a Problem	48.5%	54.0%	47.1%	53.3%	54.4%	51.7%	55.4%	52.6%	51.9%	54.3%	52.7%	44.2%	51.4%
Not a Problem	46.5%	33.3%	29.4%	36.8%	27.8%	31.6%	36.5%	36.4%	24.1%	28.8%	38.2%	40.3%	35.6%
Totals	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%
Mean	1.59	1.79	1.94	1.73	1.90	1.85	1.72	1.75	2.00	1.88	1.71	1.75	1.77

	Age 50 - 64	Age 65 +	FTE	Not Full Time	No minors	one or more minors
Crime in your neighborhood.- Problem for You or Family						
Big Problem	13.6%	14.4%	13.1%	11.5%	16.2%	9.5%
Somewhat of a Problem	59.3%	49.6%	53.1%	50.0%	54.0%	50.7%
Not a Problem	27.1%	36.0%	33.8%	38.5%	29.8%	39.8%
Totals	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%
Mean	1.86	1.78	1.79	1.73	1.86	1.70

Crosstabs on Community Priority - Reducing substance abuse

	Reporting On	Male	Female	Hispanic	Caucasian	Central ABQ	E. Gateway	Foothills	Mid Hgts	Near Hgts	N. ABQ	N. Valley	SW Mesa S Valley
Reducing substance abuse.- Community Priority													
Extremely High	36.2%	32.0%	39.4%	39.1%	35.1%	28.2%	35.8%	44.3%	40.9%	31.7%	28.0%	36.1%	47.2%
High	34.4%	33.1%	36.5%	32.3%	35.9%	35.9%	43.3%	26.2%	37.6%	31.7%	40.0%	32.8%	24.5%
Middle	20.5%	22.5%	18.1%	18.2%	21.7%	23.1%	13.4%	23.0%	14.0%	28.0%	26.0%	24.6%	17.0%
Low	6.4%	8.7%	4.4%	8.3%	5.2%	7.7%	6.0%	4.9%	5.4%	6.1%	4.0%	3.3%	9.4%
Extremely Low	2.5%	3.6%	1.6%	2.1%	2.2%	5.1%	1.5%	1.6%	2.2%	2.4%	2.0%	3.3%	1.9%
Totals	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%
Mean	3.95	3.81	4.08	3.98	3.96	3.74	4.06	4.07	4.10	3.84	3.88	3.95	4.06

	Westside	Staying in ABQ	Probably Not Staying	College Degree or More	HS grad or less	Household 2 or less	Household 3 or more	Income 50 to 100k	Income < 20k	Income 20 - 50k	Income > 100k	Age 18 - 34	Age 35 - 49
Reducing substance abuse.- Community Priority													
Extremely High	32.3%	35.5%	44.8%	30.0%	47.8%	38.6%	31.9%	34.2%	46.2%	40.2%	23.6%	29.9%	30.8%
High	35.4%	34.7%	29.9%	36.2%	24.4%	33.2%	37.0%	35.1%	28.8%	32.4%	40.9%	31.2%	37.2%
Middle	19.2%	21.2%	13.4%	23.9%	15.6%	19.7%	21.3%	21.3%	21.2%	16.8%	25.5%	24.7%	19.2%
Low	10.1%	6.9%	4.5%	7.0%	8.9%	6.0%	7.4%	8.0%	1.9%	7.3%	6.4%	7.8%	9.9%
Extremely Low	3.0%	1.7%	7.5%	2.9%	3.3%	2.6%	2.3%	1.3%	1.9%	3.4%	3.6%	6.5%	2.9%
Totals	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%
Mean	3.84	3.95	4.00	3.83	4.04	3.99	3.89	3.93	4.15	3.99	3.75	3.70	3.83

	Age 50 - 64	Age 65 +	FTE	Not Full Time	No minors	one or more minors
Reducing substance abuse.- Community Priority						
Extremely High	36.7%	45.5%	32.2%	28.8%	38.3%	31.9%
High	32.1%	37.3%	35.3%	44.2%	34.1%	35.2%
Middle	23.9%	13.4%	21.6%	25.0%	19.7%	21.8%
Low	5.5%	3.0%	8.0%	0.0%	5.5%	8.3%
Extremely Low	1.8%	0.7%	2.9%	1.9%	2.4%	2.8%
Totals	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%
Mean	3.96	4.24	3.86	3.98	4.01	3.85

INFRASTRUCTURE INCLUDING ALTERNATIVE MODES OF TRANSPORTATION

Significant Findings:

1. Albuquerque residents appear conflicted about public transit. Only one community priority was ranked lower. However, when asked about the best long term solution to reducing traffic problems, improving public transportation was ranked above the other two solutions.

2. Traffic congestion was ranked as the highest personal or family problems of the 11 listed. Yet, paradoxally, over 70% of the respondents expressed satisfaction with their daily commute.

3. When considering neighborhood and housing characteristics, ease of commute and access to major highways ranked 3rd and 4th most highly out of 14 characteristics.

4. Westside residents are significantly more dissatisfied with their commute than other areas, fopllowed by SW Mesa residents. Near Heights, Foothills, and Central Albuquerque are very satisfied with their commute.

5. Westside, SW MEsa, and Mid Heights residents indicate the greatest problems with traffic congesttion, with North Albuquerque and Near Heights indicating the least problems.

Improving the quality of the City transit system.- Community Priority						
Extremely High	High	Middle	Low	Extremely Low	Totals	Mean
19.0%	29.4%	35.3%	12.4%	3.9%	100.0%	3.47

best long term solution to reducing traffic problems in Albuquerque and the surrounding areas				
Building New Roads	Developing communities where people do not have to drive long distances to work or shop.	Improving public transportation such as light rail, buses, and trains.	Don't know.	Totals
30.0%	23.8%	34.6%	11.5%	100.0%

Remedying unequal provision of infrastructure (water, sewer, roads, parks, police stations, school - Community Priority						
Extremely High	High	Middle	Low	Extremely Low	Totals	Mean
20.1%	36.5%	31.0%	9.9%	2.5%	100.0%	3.62

Traffic congestion on major roads.- Problem for You or Family				
Big Problem	Somewhat of a Problem	Not a Problem	Totals	Mean
43.0%	38.6%	18.5%	100.0%	2.25

Typical daily commute you make to work or school.- Level of Satisfaction					
Very Satisfied	Somewhat Satisfied	Somewhat Dissatisfied	Very Dissatisfied	Totals	Mean
30.0%	41.6%	17.3%	11.1%	100.0%	2.91

Being within a 30 minute commute to work.					
Mandatory - Wouldn't live without this	Important	Don't care one way or another	Would NOT live in a home with this characteris	Totals	Mean
30.8%	50.4%	17.3%	1.5%	100.0%	3.10

Easy access to the Interstate or major highway.					
Mandatory - Wouldn't live without this	Important	Don't care one way or another	Would NOT live in a home with this characteris	Totals	Mean
14.2%	62.3%	22.1%	1.5%	100.0%	2.89

	Improving the quality of the City transit system.- Community Priority														
	Extremely High		High		Middle		Low		Extremely Low		Totals		Mean	ChiSq Significance
Being within walking distance of public transportation.														
Mandatory - Wouldn't live without this	47.2%	17	22.2%	8	25.0%	9	5.6%	2	0.0%	0	100.0%	36	4.11	Yes at 99.0%*
Important	31.7%	71	41.1%	92	21.0%	47	5.4%	12	0.9%	2	100.0%	224	3.97	
Don't care one way or another	7.6%	25	23.0%	76	46.2%	153	17.8%	59	5.4%	18	100.0%	331	3.09	
Would NOT live in a home with this characteris	0.0%	0	16.7%	2	41.7%	5	25.0%	3	16.7%	2	100.0%	12	2.58	

* Note: ChiSq has over 20% low count cells.

	Traffic congestion on major roads.- Problem for You or Family										
	Big Problem		Somewhat of a Problem		Not a Problem		Totals		Mean	ChiSq Significance
Being within walking distance to stores and restaurants.										
Mandatory - Wouldn't live without this	37.1%	13	28.6%	10	34.3%	12	100.0%	35	2.03	Yes at 75.0%
Important	40.7%	99	41.2%	100	18.1%	44	100.0%	243	2.23	
Don't care one way or another	43.2%	127	39.1%	115	17.7%	52	100.0%	294	2.26	
Would NOT live in a home with this characteris	68.4%	13	21.1%	4	10.5%	2	100.0%	19	2.58	

	Community Planning Area																	
	i Westside		d Mid Heights		e Near Heights		b East Gateway		c Foothills		g North Valley		h SW Mesa/South Valley		f North Albuquerque		a Central Albuquerque	
Typical daily commute you make to work or school.- Level of Satisfaction																		
Very Satisfied	10.5%	10	33.7%	29	46.2%	36	37.7%	23	37.7%	20	27.6%	16	15.4%	8	31.0%	13	37.1%	13
Somewhat Satisfied	25.3%	24	40.7%	35	38.5%	30	50.8%	31	47.2%	25	51.7%	30	48.1%	25	35.7%	15	51.4%	18
Somewhat Dissatisfied	30.5%	29	16.3%	14	11.5%	9	6.6%	4	15.1%	8	10.3%	6	23.1%	12	28.6%	12	8.6%	3
Very Dissatisfied	33.7%	32	9.3%	8	3.8%	3	4.9%	3	0.0%	0	10.3%	6	13.5%	7	4.8%	2	2.9%	1
Totals	100.0%	95	100.0%	86	100.0%	78	100.0%	61	100.0%	53	100.0%	58	100.0%	52	100.0%	42	100.0%	35
Mean	2.13		2.99		3.27		3.21		3.23		2.97		2.65		2.93		3.23	
ChiSq Significance	Yes at 99.0%																	

	Community Planning Area																	
	i Westside		d Mid Heights		e Near Heights		b East Gateway		c Foothills		g North Valley		h SW Mesa/South Valley		f North Albuquerque		a Central Albuquerque	
Traffic congestion on major roads.- Problem for You or Family																		
Big Problem	76.8%	76	39.1%	36	30.1%	25	36.2%	25	25.0%	16	41.9%	26	58.2%	32	31.4%	16	29.7%	11
Somewhat of a Problem	19.2%	19	46.7%	43	38.6%	32	43.5%	30	54.7%	35	45.2%	28	29.1%	16	33.3%	17	43.2%	16
Not a Problem	4.0%	4	14.1%	13	31.3%	26	20.3%	14	20.3%	13	12.9%	8	12.7%	7	35.3%	18	27.0%	10
Totals	100.0%	99	100.0%	92	100.0%	83	100.0%	69	100.0%	64	100.0%	62	100.0%	55	100.0%	51	100.0%	37
Mean	2.73		2.25		1.99		2.16		2.05		2.29		2.45		1.96		2.03	
ChiSq Significance	Yes at 99.0%																	

Crosstabs on Community Priority - Improving the quality of the City transit system

	Reporting On	Male	Female	Hispanic	Caucasian	Central ABQ	E. Gateway	Foothills	Mid Hgts	Near Hgts	N. ABQ	N. Valley	SW Mesa S Valley
Improving the quality of the City transit system.- Community Priority													
Extremely High	19.0%	15.5%	21.9%	17.5%	18.2%	28.2%	13.0%	9.7%	16.0%	34.9%	3.9%	20.0%	21.8%
High	29.4%	27.8%	30.6%	24.7%	32.2%	46.2%	18.8%	33.9%	35.1%	32.5%	37.3%	25.0%	25.5%
Middle	35.3%	35.4%	35.3%	39.7%	34.3%	17.9%	52.2%	32.3%	37.2%	22.9%	39.2%	36.7%	32.7%
Low	12.4%	15.9%	9.7%	13.9%	11.0%	7.7%	13.0%	14.5%	8.5%	8.4%	17.6%	15.0%	16.4%
Extremely Low	3.9%	5.4%	2.5%	4.1%	4.3%	0.0%	2.9%	9.7%	3.2%	1.2%	2.0%	3.3%	3.6%
Totals	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%
Mean	3.47	3.32	3.60	3.38	3.49	3.95	3.26	3.19	3.52	3.92	3.24	3.43	3.45

	Westside	Staying in ABQ	Probably Not Staying	College Degree or More	HS grad or less	Household 2 or less	Household 3 or more	Income 50 to 100k	Income < 20k	Income 20 - 50k	Income > 100k	Age 18 - 34	Age 35 - 49
Improving the quality of the City transit system.- Community Priority													
Extremely High	20.2%	17.5%	25.4%	21.0%	16.7%	19.2%	18.8%	19.7%	23.6%	21.9%	9.1%	26.0%	18.9%
High	20.2%	29.6%	25.4%	31.3%	26.7%	32.7%	22.9%	28.7%	30.9%	30.6%	29.1%	23.4%	22.3%
Middle	39.4%	36.6%	29.9%	32.8%	40.0%	33.8%	38.1%	35.0%	36.4%	31.1%	42.7%	39.0%	36.6%
Low	13.1%	12.6%	11.9%	10.6%	12.2%	11.3%	14.7%	13.9%	9.1%	13.1%	11.8%	9.1%	17.1%
Extremely Low	7.1%	3.6%	7.5%	4.3%	4.4%	3.1%	5.5%	2.7%	0.0%	3.3%	7.3%	2.6%	5.1%
Totals	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%
Mean	3.33	3.45	3.49	3.54	3.39	3.54	3.35	3.49	3.69	3.55	3.21	3.61	3.33

	Age 50 - 64	Age 65 +	FTE	Not Full Time	No minors	one or more minors
Improving the quality of the City transit system.- Community Priority						
Extremely High	18.2%	16.9%	18.6%	30.2%	19.6%	18.0%
High	35.0%	32.4%	28.0%	34.0%	30.7%	25.8%
Middle	32.3%	36.0%	34.9%	28.3%	34.9%	36.4%
Low	10.5%	11.8%	14.0%	7.5%	11.1%	15.2%
Extremely Low	4.1%	2.9%	4.6%	0.0%	3.6%	4.6%
Totals	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%
Mean	3.53	3.49	3.42	3.87	3.52	3.37

In deciding where to live how Important is: Being within walking distance of public transportation

	Reporting On	Male	Female	Hispanic	Caucasian	Central ABQ	E. Gateway	Foothills	Mid Hgts	Near Hgts	N. ABQ	N. Valley	SW Mesa S Valley
Being within walking distance of public transportation.													
Mandatory - Wouldn't live without this	6.0%	4.3%	7.5%	3.6%	6.4%	12.5%	2.9%	3.2%	3.3%	14.6%	0.0%	9.7%	1.9%
Important	36.9%	31.7%	41.4%	39.2%	34.0%	62.5%	29.0%	28.6%	39.6%	43.9%	35.3%	40.3%	40.7%
Don't care one way or another	55.1%	61.9%	49.5%	54.6%	57.6%	25.0%	65.2%	66.7%	57.1%	41.5%	64.7%	48.4%	48.1%
Would NOT live in a home with this characteris	2.0%	2.2%	1.6%	2.6%	1.9%	0.0%	2.9%	1.6%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	1.6%	9.3%
Totals	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%
Mean	2.47	2.38	2.55	2.44	2.45	2.88	2.32	2.33	2.46	2.73	2.35	2.58	2.35

	Westside	Staying in ABQ	Probably Not Staying	College Degree or More	HS grad or less	Household 2 or less	Household 3 or more	Income 50 to 100k	Income < 20k	Income 20 - 50k	Income > 100k	Age 18 - 34	Age 35 - 49
Being within walking distance of public transportation.													
Mandatory - Wouldn't live without this	6.0%	5.8%	7.5%	6.9%	4.4%	6.7%	5.0%	5.8%	9.1%	7.1%	2.8%	6.5%	2.9%
Important	26.0%	37.1%	31.3%	36.1%	47.3%	34.4%	40.9%	31.7%	38.2%	44.6%	35.2%	31.2%	36.0%
Don't care one way or another	65.0%	55.7%	55.2%	55.5%	44.0%	57.1%	51.8%	60.7%	47.3%	46.7%	61.1%	59.7%	58.9%
Would NOT live in a home with this characteris	3.0%	1.3%	6.0%	1.4%	4.4%	1.8%	2.3%	1.8%	5.5%	1.6%	0.9%	2.6%	2.3%
Totals	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%
Mean	2.35	2.47	2.40	2.49	2.52	2.46	2.49	2.42	2.51	2.57	2.40	2.42	2.39

	Age 50 - 64	Age 65 +	FTE	Not Full Time	No minors	one or more minors
Being within walking distance of public transportation.						
Mandatory - Wouldn't live without this	8.2%	6.6%	5.8%	9.4%	6.0%	6.4%
Important	40.0%	36.0%	35.2%	45.3%	35.4%	38.6%
Don't care one way or another	49.1%	57.4%	56.5%	43.4%	56.5%	53.2%
Would NOT live in a home with this characteris	2.7%	0.0%	2.6%	1.9%	2.1%	1.8%
Totals	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%
Mean	2.54	2.49	2.44	2.62	2.45	2.50

Crosstabs on Personal or Family Problem - Traffic Congestion on Major Roads

	Reporting On	Male	Female	Hispanic	Caucasian	Central ABQ	E. Gateway	Foothills	Mid Hgts	Near Hgts	N. ABQ	N. Valley	SW Mesa S Valley
Traffic congestion on major roads.- Problem for You or Family													
Big Problem	43.0%	42.4%	41.9%	46.9%	39.1%	29.7%	36.2%	25.0%	39.1%	30.1%	31.4%	41.9%	58.2%
Somewhat of a Problem	38.6%	38.5%	39.7%	35.6%	42.1%	43.2%	43.5%	54.7%	46.7%	38.6%	33.3%	45.2%	29.1%
Not a Problem	18.5%	19.1%	18.4%	17.5%	18.8%	27.0%	20.3%	20.3%	14.1%	31.3%	35.3%	12.9%	12.7%
Totals	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%
Mean	2.25	2.23	2.23	2.29	2.20	2.03	2.16	2.05	2.25	1.99	1.96	2.29	2.45

	Westside	Staying in ABQ	Probably Not Staying	College Degree or More	HS grad or less	Household 2 or less	Household 3 or more	Income 50 to 100k	Income < 20k	Income 20 - 50k	Income > 100k	Age 18 - 34	Age 35 - 49
Traffic congestion on major roads.- Problem for You or Family													
Big Problem	76.8%	39.8%	67.2%	36.2%	48.4%	43.7%	40.9%	41.0%	56.4%	48.0%	27.5%	50.0%	42.4%
Somewhat of a Problem	19.2%	40.9%	17.9%	41.7%	38.5%	40.1%	36.4%	37.4%	29.1%	35.8%	52.3%	36.8%	33.9%
Not a Problem	4.0%	19.2%	14.9%	22.1%	13.2%	16.2%	22.7%	21.6%	14.5%	16.2%	20.2%	13.2%	23.7%
Totals	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%
Mean	2.73	2.21	2.52	2.14	2.35	2.28	2.18	2.19	2.42	2.32	2.07	2.37	2.19

	Age 50 - 64	Age 65 +	FTE	Not Full Time	No minors	one or more minors
Traffic congestion on major roads.- Problem for You or Family						
Big Problem	37.3%	47.1%	40.8%	42.6%	43.0%	41.8%
Somewhat of a Problem	41.9%	41.3%	39.9%	37.0%	41.4%	34.1%
Not a Problem	20.7%	11.6%	19.3%	20.4%	15.6%	24.1%
Totals	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%
Mean	2.17	2.36	2.22	2.22	2.27	2.18

Crosstabs on Level of Satisfaction - Typical Daily Commute to Work or School

	Reporting On	Male	Female	Hispanic	Caucasian	Central ABQ	E. Gateway	Foothills	Mid Hgts	Near Hgts	N. ABQ	N. Valley	SW Mesa S Valley
Typical daily commute you make to work or school.- Level of Satisfaction													
Very Satisfied	30.0%	28.4%	31.4%	23.0%	33.7%	37.1%	37.7%	37.7%	33.7%	46.2%	31.0%	27.6%	15.4%
Somewhat Satisfied	41.6%	44.8%	39.4%	48.3%	39.6%	51.4%	50.8%	47.2%	40.7%	38.5%	35.7%	51.7%	48.1%
Somewhat Dissatisfied	17.3%	15.3%	18.5%	18.5%	16.0%	8.6%	6.6%	15.1%	16.3%	11.5%	28.6%	10.3%	23.1%
Very Dissatisfied	11.1%	11.5%	10.8%	10.1%	10.7%	2.9%	4.9%	0.0%	9.3%	3.8%	4.8%	10.3%	13.5%
Totals	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%
Mean	2.91	2.90	2.91	2.84	2.96	3.23	3.21	3.23	2.99	3.27	2.93	2.97	2.65

	Westside	Staying in ABQ	Probably Not Staying	College Degree or More	HS grad or less	Household 2 or less	Household 3 or more	Income 50 to 100k	Income < 20k	Income 20 - 50k	Income > 100k	Age 18 - 34	Age 35 - 49
Typical daily commute you make to work or school.- Level of Satisfaction													
Very Satisfied	10.5%	30.6%	22.2%	32.8%	19.2%	29.7%	30.5%	33.0%	22.0%	28.7%	28.7%	20.8%	35.6%
Somewhat Satisfied	25.3%	42.4%	34.9%	41.3%	48.7%	42.1%	40.9%	36.4%	50.0%	42.1%	49.1%	44.2%	36.2%
Somewhat Dissatisfied	30.5%	17.0%	22.2%	15.0%	19.2%	17.2%	17.3%	17.5%	16.0%	18.9%	16.7%	16.9%	19.5%
Very Dissatisfied	33.7%	9.9%	20.6%	10.9%	12.8%	11.0%	11.4%	13.1%	12.0%	10.4%	5.6%	18.2%	8.6%
Totals	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%
Mean	2.13	2.94	2.59	2.96	2.74	2.91	2.90	2.89	2.82	2.89	3.01	2.68	2.99

	Age 50 - 64	Age 65 +	FTE	Not Full Time	No minors	one or more minors
Typical daily commute you make to work or school.- Level of Satisfaction						
Very Satisfied	27.3%	33.0%	30.5%	27.8%	27.4%	34.3%
Somewhat Satisfied	45.9%	40.2%	39.8%	51.9%	43.1%	38.9%
Somewhat Dissatisfied	17.2%	13.4%	17.6%	16.7%	19.2%	14.4%
Very Dissatisfied	9.6%	13.4%	12.1%	3.7%	10.3%	12.5%
Totals	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%
Mean	2.91	2.93	2.89	3.04	2.88	2.95

Choice Small Home, Small Backyard, Short Commute vs Large Home, Large Backyard, Long Commute

	Reporting On	Male	Female	Hispanic	Caucasian	Central ABQ	E. Gateway	Foothills	Mid Hgts	Near Hgts	N. ABQ	N. Valley	SW Mesa S Valley
Choice small yard & home with short commute vs large yard & home with long commute													
Option A	54.7%	48.5%	59.5%	53.8%	57.1%	77.8%	46.0%	45.6%	58.6%	81.5%	50.0%	56.7%	49.0%
Option B	45.3%	51.5%	40.5%	46.2%	42.9%	22.2%	54.0%	54.4%	41.4%	18.5%	50.0%	43.3%	51.0%
Totals	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%
Mean	1.45	1.51	1.40	1.46	1.43	1.22	1.54	1.54	1.41	1.19	1.50	1.43	1.51

	Westside	Staying in ABQ	Probably Not Staying	College Degree or More	HS grad or less	Household 2 or less	Household 3 or more	Income 50 to 100k	Income < 20k	Income 20 - 50k	Income > 100k	Age 18 - 34	Age 35 - 49
Choice small yard & home with short commute vs large yard & home with long commute													
Option A	35.1%	55.4%	47.7%	57.1%	51.3%	60.9%	44.7%	53.0%	63.5%	62.4%	45.8%	45.5%	52.3%
Option B	64.9%	44.6%	52.3%	42.9%	48.8%	39.1%	55.3%	47.0%	36.5%	37.6%	54.2%	54.5%	47.7%
Totals	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%
Mean	1.65	1.45	1.52	1.43	1.49	1.39	1.55	1.47	1.37	1.38	1.54	1.55	1.48

	Age 50 - 64	Age 65 +	FTE	Not Full Time	No minors	one or more minors
Choice small yard & home with short commute vs large yard & home with long commute						
Option A	56.6%	61.4%	52.8%	71.7%	60.4%	45.3%
Option B	43.4%	38.6%	47.2%	28.3%	39.6%	54.7%
Totals	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%
Mean	1.43	1.39	1.47	1.28	1.40	1.55

High density convenient local public transit vs low density local travel by car

	Reporting On	Male	Female	Hispanic	Caucasian	Central ABQ	E. Gateway	Foothills	Mid Hgts	Near Hgts	N. ABQ	N. Valley	SW Mesa S Valley
Choice high density with transit vs low density driving for local travel													
Option A	35.3%	32.4%	38.0%	35.8%	33.9%	71.1%	26.1%	17.7%	29.7%	66.3%	22.9%	44.3%	36.5%
Option B	64.7%	67.6%	62.0%	64.2%	66.1%	28.9%	73.9%	82.3%	70.3%	33.7%	77.1%	55.7%	63.5%
Totals	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%
Mean	1.65	1.68	1.62	1.64	1.66	1.29	1.74	1.82	1.70	1.34	1.77	1.56	1.63

	Westside	Staying in ABQ	Probably Not Staying	College Degree or More	HS grad or less	Household 2 or less	Household 3 or more	Income 50 to 100k	Income < 20k	Income 20 - 50k	Income > 100k	Age 18 - 34	Age 35 - 49
Choice high density with transit vs low density driving for local travel													
Option A	18.2%	35.7%	32.8%	37.4%	34.1%	34.3%	37.2%	28.3%	56.6%	39.3%	34.6%	33.8%	33.3%
Option B	81.8%	64.3%	67.2%	62.6%	65.9%	65.7%	62.8%	71.7%	43.4%	60.7%	65.4%	66.2%	66.7%
Totals	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%
Mean	1.82	1.64	1.67	1.63	1.66	1.66	1.63	1.72	1.43	1.61	1.65	1.66	1.67

	Age 50 - 64	Age 65 +	FTE	Not Full Time	No minors	one or more minors
Choice high density with transit vs low density driving for local travel						
Option A	39.4%	33.3%	35.7%	56.6%	34.2%	37.5%
Option B	60.6%	66.7%	64.3%	43.4%	65.8%	62.5%
Totals	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%
Mean	1.61	1.67	1.64	1.43	1.66	1.63

Crosstabs on Community Priority - Remedying unequal provision of infrastructure

	Reporting On	Male	Female	Hispanic	Caucasian	Central ABQ	E. Gateway	Foothills	Mid Hgts	Near Hgts	N. ABQ	N. Valley	SW Mesa S Valley
Remedying unequal provision of infrastructure (water, sewer, roads, parks, police stations, school - Community Priority													
Extremely High	20.1%	18.5%	21.9%	25.0%	17.8%	20.5%	10.4%	16.1%	14.1%	21.7%	14.0%	16.7%	38.2%
High	36.5%	33.0%	39.7%	39.1%	34.9%	38.5%	41.8%	29.0%	41.3%	34.9%	34.0%	40.0%	25.5%
Middle	31.0%	30.8%	30.8%	26.0%	33.5%	20.5%	35.8%	30.6%	33.7%	34.9%	40.0%	30.0%	27.3%
Low	9.9%	14.1%	6.0%	8.9%	10.8%	17.9%	7.5%	21.0%	6.5%	7.2%	12.0%	11.7%	9.1%
Extremely Low	2.5%	3.6%	1.6%	1.0%	3.0%	2.6%	4.5%	3.2%	4.3%	1.2%	0.0%	1.7%	0.0%
Totals	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%
Mean	3.62	3.49	3.74	3.78	3.54	3.56	3.46	3.34	3.54	3.69	3.50	3.58	3.93

	Westside	Staying in ABQ	Probably Not Staying	College Degree or More	HS grad or less	Household 2 or less	Household 3 or more	Income 50 to 100k	Income < 20k	Income 20 - 50k	Income > 100k	Age 18 - 34	Age 35 - 49
Remedying unequal provision of infrastructure (water, sewer, roads, parks, police stations, school - Community Priority													
Extremely High	28.6%	19.6%	25.8%	18.3%	24.4%	20.3%	20.2%	19.9%	25.9%	23.1%	13.6%	22.7%	18.0%
High	38.8%	36.5%	34.8%	33.0%	41.1%	38.2%	32.6%	33.5%	27.8%	42.9%	28.2%	33.3%	35.5%
Middle	24.5%	31.9%	24.2%	33.0%	26.7%	29.1%	34.9%	32.1%	38.9%	25.8%	38.2%	32.0%	32.0%
Low	5.1%	10.3%	7.6%	11.6%	7.8%	10.1%	9.6%	10.9%	7.4%	7.7%	16.4%	8.0%	11.6%
Extremely Low	3.1%	1.7%	7.6%	4.1%	0.0%	2.3%	2.8%	3.6%	0.0%	0.5%	3.6%	4.0%	2.9%
Totals	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%
Mean	3.85	3.62	3.64	3.50	3.82	3.64	3.58	3.55	3.72	3.80	3.32	3.63	3.54

	Age 50 - 64	Age 65 +	FTE	Not Full Time	No minors	one or more minors
Remedying unequal provision of infrastructure (water, sewer, roads, parks, police stations, school - Community Priority						
Extremely High	20.5%	20.7%	18.4%	17.3%	22.0%	17.6%
High	35.0%	41.5%	35.6%	30.8%	35.9%	36.1%
Middle	32.3%	27.4%	32.8%	46.2%	29.6%	33.8%
Low	10.0%	8.9%	9.8%	5.8%	10.5%	9.3%
Extremely Low	2.3%	1.5%	3.4%	0.0%	2.1%	3.2%
Totals	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%
Mean	3.61	3.71	3.56	3.60	3.65	3.56

SUSTAINABLE COMMUNITY DEVELOPMENT

Significant Findings:

1. While over 42% of Albuquerque residents rated revitalizing older neighborhoods as a high community priority, it ranked last of the 11 priorities measured.

2. Over 12% of the respondents rated the shortage of available affordable housing a big problem. 25.7% rated it somewhat of a problem. Almost 95% of the respondents indicated satisfaction with the residence in which they lived.

3. Lack of nearby parks was ranked the second lowest personal or family problem of the 11 measured with only 7.7% indicating that this is a big problem.

4. Walkable neighborhoods are highly valued by Albuquerque residents. Over 38% indicated this was a problem. This characteristic was also one of the highest valued as a neighborhood characteristic with over 93% rating sidewalks and places to take walks as mandatory or important.

5. Neighborhoods with people at all stages of life was valued higher than communities with various income levels and mixed types of housing.

6. The SW Mesa indicated the lack of walkable neighborhoods was a big problem, followed by Central Albuquerque and the Near Heights.

7. While all areas indicated satisfaction with the neighborhoods in which they live, Foothills , North Valley, and the Westside residents indicated greatest satisfaction, SW Mesa the least.

Revitalizing older neighborhoods.- Community Priority						
Extremely High	High	Middle	Low	Extremely Low	Totals	Mean
15.4%	26.8%	43.9%	11.2%	2.7%	100.0%	3.41

Shortage of availability of housing you can afford.- Problem for You or Family				
Big Problem	Somewhat of a Problem	Not a Problem	Totals	Mean
12.4%	25.7%	61.9%	100.0%	1.50

House or apartment in which you live.- Level of Satisfaction					
Very Satisfied	Somewhat Satisfied	Somewhat Dissatisfied	Very Dissatisfied	Totals	Mean
68.2%	26.3%	4.2%	1.3%	100.0%	3.61

Lack of parks near your home.- Problem for You or Family				
Big Problem	Somewhat of a Problem	Not a Problem	Totals	Mean
7.8%	21.2%	71.0%	100.0%	1.37

Lack of walkable neighborhoods.- Problem for You or Family				
Big Problem	Somewhat of a Problem	Not a Problem	Totals	Mean
14.6%	23.8%	61.6%	100.0%	1.53

Neighborhood in which you live.- Level of Satisfaction					
Very Satisfied	Somewhat Satisfied	Somewhat Dissatisfied	Very Dissatisfied	Totals	Mean
57.6%	32.7%	7.6%	2.1%	100.0%	3.46

Sidewalks and places to take walks.					
Mandatory - Wouldn't live without this	Important	Don't care one way or another	Would NOT live in a home with this characteris	Totals	Mean
32.4%	60.6%	6.5%	0.5%	100.0%	3.25

Living in a community of people with various income levels.					
Mandatory - Wouldn't live without this	Important	Don't care one way or another	Would NOT live in a home with this characteris	Totals	Mean
3.9%	32.3%	52.2%	11.5%	100.0%	2.29

Living in a community with mixed types of housing.					
Mandatory - Wouldn't live without this	Important	Don't care one way or another	Would NOT live in a home with this characteris	Totals	Mean
5.4%	35.0%	42.4%	17.2%	100.0%	2.29

Living in a community with people at all stages of life.					
Mandatory - Wouldn't live without this	Important	Don't care one way or another	Would NOT live in a home with this characteris	Totals	Mean
9.0%	43.1%	44.7%	3.3%	100.0%	2.58

	Community Planning Area																	
	i Westside		d Mid Heights		e Near Heights		b East Gateway		c Foothills		g North Valley		h SW Mesa/South Valley		f North Albuquerque		a Central Albuquerque	
Lack of walkable neighborhoods.- Problem for You or Family																		
Big Problem	12.9%	13	9.7%	9	20.2%	17	7.5%	5	3.1%	2	15.9%	10	37.0%	20	11.8%	6	20.0%	8
Somewhat of a Problem	13.9%	14	26.9%	25	27.4%	23	28.4%	19	7.8%	5	33.3%	21	37.0%	20	13.7%	7	32.5%	13
Not a Problem	73.3%	74	63.4%	59	52.4%	44	64.2%	43	89.1%	57	50.8%	32	25.9%	14	74.5%	38	47.5%	19
Totals	100.0%	101	100.0%	93	100.0%	84	100.0%	67	100.0%	64	100.0%	63	100.0%	54	100.0%	51	100.0%	40
Mean	1.40		1.46		1.68		1.43		1.14		1.65		2.11		1.37		1.73	
ChiSq Significance	Yes at 99.0%																	

	Community Planning Area																	
	i Westside		d Mid Heights		e Near Heights		b East Gateway		c Foothills		g North Valley		h SW Mesa/South Valley		f North Albuquerque		a Central Albuquerque	
Neighborhood in which you live.- Level of Satisfaction																		
Very Satisfied	61.4%	62	56.4%	53	54.8%	46	50.7%	35	79.7%	51	61.9%	39	30.9%	17	72.5%	37	45.0%	18
Somewhat Satisfied	31.7%	32	35.1%	33	33.3%	28	40.6%	28	18.8%	12	30.2%	19	41.8%	23	19.6%	10	45.0%	18
Somewhat Dissatisfied	5.0%	5	6.4%	6	9.5%	8	5.8%	4	1.6%	1	7.9%	5	18.2%	10	7.8%	4	10.0%	4
Very Dissatisfied	2.0%	2	2.1%	2	2.4%	2	2.9%	2	0.0%	0	0.0%	0	9.1%	5	0.0%	0	0.0%	0
Totals	100.0%	101	100.0%	94	100.0%	84	100.0%	69	100.0%	64	100.0%	63	100.0%	55	100.0%	51	100.0%	40
Mean	3.52		3.46		3.40		3.39		3.78		3.54		2.95		3.65		3.35	
ChiSq Significance	Yes at 99.0%*																	

* Note: ChiSq has over 20% low count cells.

Crosstabs on Community Priority - Revitalizing older neighborhoods

	Reporting On	Male	Female	Hispanic	Caucasian	Central ABQ	E. Gateway	Foothills	Mid Hgts	Near Hgts	N. ABQ	N. Valley	SW Mesa S Valley
Revitalizing older neighborhoods.- Community Priority													
Extremely High	15.4%	14.9%	16.0%	20.0%	12.2%	44.4%	12.7%	4.9%	11.4%	24.4%	2.0%	20.3%	22.2%
High	26.8%	29.9%	25.4%	28.6%	26.3%	25.0%	20.6%	29.5%	22.7%	28.0%	26.5%	37.3%	35.2%
Middle	43.9%	39.6%	46.9%	40.0%	46.5%	30.6%	52.4%	55.7%	53.4%	36.6%	51.0%	32.2%	33.3%
Low	11.2%	13.1%	9.1%	8.6%	12.5%	0.0%	14.3%	6.6%	8.0%	8.5%	18.4%	8.5%	5.6%
Extremely Low	2.7%	2.6%	2.6%	2.7%	2.5%	0.0%	0.0%	3.3%	4.5%	2.4%	2.0%	1.7%	3.7%
Totals	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%
Mean	3.41	3.41	3.43	3.55	3.33	4.14	3.32	3.26	3.28	3.63	3.08	3.66	3.67

	Westside	Staying in ABQ	Probably Not Staying	College Degree or More	HS grad or less	Household 2 or less	Household 3 or more	Income 50 to 100k	Income < 20k	Income 20 - 50k	Income > 100k	Age 18 - 34	Age 35 - 49
Revitalizing older neighborhoods.- Community Priority													
Extremely High	9.2%	14.6%	20.6%	13.4%	21.8%	13.9%	18.4%	14.1%	19.6%	16.7%	9.5%	16.9%	16.7%
High	21.4%	28.5%	14.3%	27.2%	29.9%	26.1%	27.8%	27.7%	19.6%	27.0%	31.4%	24.7%	25.0%
Middle	42.9%	45.0%	31.7%	43.9%	36.8%	45.9%	40.6%	42.7%	52.9%	40.8%	46.7%	36.4%	44.0%
Low	22.4%	9.7%	25.4%	12.5%	6.9%	11.5%	10.4%	13.2%	5.9%	12.1%	9.5%	19.5%	11.3%
Extremely Low	4.1%	2.1%	7.9%	3.0%	4.6%	2.7%	2.8%	2.3%	2.0%	3.4%	2.9%	2.6%	3.0%
Totals	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%
Mean	3.09	3.44	3.14	3.36	3.57	3.37	3.49	3.38	3.49	3.41	3.35	3.34	3.41

	Age 50 - 64	Age 65 +	FTE	Not Full Time	No minors	one or more minors
Revitalizing older neighborhoods.- Community Priority						
Extremely High	15.2%	13.0%	14.8%	21.6%	15.8%	14.4%
High	31.0%	24.4%	28.7%	23.5%	25.7%	28.7%
Middle	41.9%	51.1%	40.8%	49.0%	43.2%	45.5%
Low	9.0%	9.2%	12.4%	3.9%	12.9%	8.1%
Extremely Low	2.9%	2.3%	3.3%	2.0%	2.4%	3.3%
Totals	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%
Mean	3.47	3.37	3.39	3.59	3.40	3.43

WALKABILITY

Significant Findings:

1. Walkable neighborhoods are highly valued by Albuquerque residents. Over 38% indicated that the lack of walkable neighborhoods was a problem. This characteristic was also one of the highest valued as a neighborhood characteristic with over 93% rating sidewalks and places to take walks as mandatory or important.

2. The SW Mesa indicated the lack of walkable neighborhoods was a big problem, followed by Central Albuquerque and the Near Heights.

3. While walkable neighborhoods are clearly desired by Albuquerque residents, walking to public transportation, schools, stores, or places of worship is not valued nearly as highly.

	Sidewalks and places to take walks.							
	Mandatory - Wouldn't live without this		Important		Don't care one way or another		Would NOT live in a home with this characteris	
Lack of walkable neighborhoods.- Problem for You or Family								
Big Problem	19.8%	39	12.9%	48	5.0%	2	0.0%	0
Somewhat of a Problem	23.4%	46	24.9%	93	20.0%	8	0.0%	0
Not a Problem	56.9%	112	62.2%	232	75.0%	30	100.0%	3
Totals	100.0%	197	100.0%	373	100.0%	40	100.0%	3
Mean	1.63		1.51		1.30		1.00	
ChiSq Significance	Yes at 75.0%*							

* Note: ChiSq has over 20% low count cells.

Sidewalks and places to take walks.					
Mandatory - Wouldn't live without this	Important	Don't care one way or another	Would NOT live in a home with this characteris	Totals	Mean
32.4%	60.6%	6.5%	0.5%	100.0%	3.25

Being within walking distance to stores and restaurants.					
Mandatory - Wouldn't live without this	Important	Don't care one way or another	Would NOT live in a home with this characteris	Totals	Mean
6.0%	41.3%	49.5%	3.2%	100.0%	2.50

Being within walking distance to schools.					
Mandatory - Wouldn't live without this	Important	Don't care one way or another	Would NOT live in a home with this characteris	Totals	Mean
6.6%	38.8%	51.5%	3.1%	100.0%	2.49

Being within walking distance of public transportation.					
Mandatory - Wouldn't live without this	Important	Don't care one way or another	Would NOT live in a home with this characteris	Totals	Mean
6.0%	36.9%	55.1%	2.0%	100.0%	2.47

Being within walking distance of your Church, Synagogue or religious place of worship.					
Mandatory - Wouldn't live without this	Important	Don't care one way or another	Would NOT live in a home with this characteris	Totals	Mean
4.1%	19.3%	73.5%	3.1%	100.0%	2.24

	How do you usually commute to work?																	
	Drive alone		Work at home		Carpool		Public Transit		Bicycle		retired		Walk		disabled		do not work	
Being within walking distance of public transportation.																		
Mandatory - Wouldn't live without this	4.7%	19.0	6.7%	3.0	6.3%	1.0	38.5%	5.0	10.0%	1.0	0.0%	0.0	42.9%	3.0	0.0%	0.0	0.0%	0.0
Important	32.8%	132.0	42.2%	19.0	75.0%	12.0	46.2%	6.0	60.0%	6.0	44.4%	4.0	57.1%	4.0	100.0%	1.0	100.0%	1.0
Don't care one way or another	60.4%	243.0	48.9%	22.0	18.8%	3.0	7.7%	1.0	30.0%	3.0	55.6%	5.0	0.0%	0.0	0.0%	0.0	0.0%	0.0
Would NOT live in a home with this characteris	2.0%	8.0	2.2%	1.0	0.0%	0.0	7.7%	1.0	0.0%	0.0	0.0%	0.0	0.0%	0.0	0.0%	0.0	0.0%	0.0
Totals	100.0%	402.0	100.0%	45.0	100.0%	16.0	100.0%	13.0	100.0%	10.0	100.0%	9.0	100.0%	7.0	100.0%	1.0	100.0%	1.0
Mean		2.40		2.53		2.88		3.15		2.80		2.44		3.43		3.00		3.00
ChiSq Significance									Yes at 99.0%*									
Being within walking distance to schools.																		
Mandatory - Wouldn't live without this	6.0%	24.0	8.9%	4.0	12.5%	2.0	33.3%	4.0	10.0%	1.0	0.0%	0.0	14.3%	1.0	0.0%	0.0	0.0%	0.0
Important	37.5%	151.0	44.4%	20.0	50.0%	8.0	25.0%	3.0	70.0%	7.0	33.3%	3.0	85.7%	6.0	100.0%	1.0	0.0%	0.0
Don't care one way or another	53.6%	216.0	46.7%	21.0	37.5%	6.0	33.3%	4.0	20.0%	2.0	66.7%	6.0	0.0%	0.0	0.0%	0.0	100.0%	1.0
Would NOT live in a home with this characteris	3.0%	12.0	0.0%	0.0	0.0%	0.0	8.3%	1.0	0.0%	0.0	0.0%	0.0	0.0%	0.0	0.0%	0.0	0.0%	0.0
Totals	100.0%	403.0	100.0%	45.0	100.0%	16.0	100.0%	12.0	100.0%	10.0	100.0%	9.0	100.0%	7.0	100.0%	1.0	100.0%	1.0
Mean		2.46		2.62		2.75		2.83		2.90		2.33		3.14		3.00		2.00
ChiSq Significance									Under 50%*									
Being within walking distance to stores and restaurants.																		
Mandatory - Wouldn't live without this	3.8%	15.0	15.9%	7.0	6.7%	1.0	25.0%	3.0	20.0%	2.0	0.0%	0.0	28.6%	2.0	0.0%	0.0	0.0%	0.0
Important	40.8%	161.0	31.8%	14.0	60.0%	9.0	58.3%	7.0	30.0%	3.0	44.4%	4.0	71.4%	5.0	100.0%	1.0	0.0%	0.0
Don't care one way or another	51.6%	204.0	52.3%	23.0	33.3%	5.0	16.7%	2.0	40.0%	4.0	55.6%	5.0	0.0%	0.0	0.0%	0.0	100.0%	1.0
Would NOT live in a home with this characteris	3.8%	15.0	0.0%	0.0	0.0%	0.0	0.0%	0.0	10.0%	1.0	0.0%	0.0	0.0%	0.0	0.0%	0.0	0.0%	0.0
Totals	100.0%	395.0	100.0%	44.0	100.0%	15.0	100.0%	12.0	100.0%	10.0	100.0%	9.0	100.0%	7.0	100.0%	1.0	100.0%	1.0
Mean		2.45		2.64		2.73		3.08		2.60		2.44		3.29		3.00		2.00
ChiSq Significance									Yes at 50.0%*									

	How do you usually commute to work?																	
	Drive alone		Work at home		Carpool		Public Transit		Bicycle		retired		Walk		disabled		do not work	
Sidewalks and places to take walks.																		
Mandatory - Wouldn't live without this	31.5%	128.0	28.9%	13.0	43.8%	7.0	41.7%	5.0	50.0%	5.0	22.2%	2.0	42.9%	3.0	0.0%	0.0	0.0%	0.0
Important	61.1%	248.0	64.4%	29.0	56.3%	9.0	58.3%	7.0	50.0%	5.0	77.8%	7.0	57.1%	4.0	100.0%	1.0	100.0%	1.0
Don't care one way or another	6.9%	28.0	6.7%	3.0	0.0%	0.0	0.0%	0.0	0.0%	0.0	0.0%	0.0	0.0%	0.0	0.0%	0.0	0.0%	0.0
Would NOT live in a home with this characteris	0.5%	2.0	0.0%	0.0	0.0%	0.0	0.0%	0.0	0.0%	0.0	0.0%	0.0	0.0%	0.0	0.0%	0.0	0.0%	0.0
Totals	100.0%	406.0	100.0%	45.0	100.0%	16.0	100.0%	12.0	100.0%	10.0	100.0%	9.0	100.0%	7.0	100.0%	1.0	100.0%	1.0
Mean		3.24		3.22		3.44		3.42		3.50		3.22		3.43		3.00		3.00
ChiSq Significance									Under 50%*									
Being within a 30 minute commute to work.																		
Mandatory - Wouldn't live without this	33.4%	135.0	36.4%	16.0	25.0%	4.0	41.7%	5.0	70.0%	7.0	0.0%	0.0	42.9%	3.0	0.0%	0.0	0.0%	0.0
Important	55.2%	223.0	45.5%	20.0	62.5%	10.0	41.7%	5.0	20.0%	2.0	33.3%	3.0	42.9%	3.0	0.0%	0.0	0.0%	0.0
Don't care one way or another	9.9%	40.0	15.9%	7.0	12.5%	2.0	16.7%	2.0	10.0%	1.0	66.7%	6.0	0.0%	0.0	100.0%	1.0	100.0%	1.0
Would NOT live in a home with this characteris	1.5%	6.0	2.3%	1.0	0.0%	0.0	0.0%	0.0	0.0%	0.0	0.0%	0.0	14.3%	1.0	0.0%	0.0	0.0%	0.0
Totals	100.0%	404.0	100.0%	44.0	100.0%	16.0	100.0%	12.0	100.0%	10.0	100.0%	9.0	100.0%	7.0	100.0%	1.0	100.0%	1.0
Mean		3.21		3.16		3.13		3.25		3.60		2.33		3.14		2.00		2.00
ChiSq Significance									Yes at 99.0%*									
Easy access to the Interstate or major highway.																		
Mandatory - Wouldn't live without this	15.6%	63.0	18.6%	8.0	6.3%	1.0	8.3%	1.0	11.1%	1.0	0.0%	0.0	28.6%	2.0	0.0%	0.0	0.0%	0.0
Important	63.3%	255.0	53.5%	23.0	75.0%	12.0	41.7%	5.0	66.7%	6.0	55.6%	5.0	57.1%	4.0	100.0%	1.0	0.0%	0.0
Don't care one way or another	20.1%	81.0	27.9%	12.0	18.8%	3.0	41.7%	5.0	22.2%	2.0	44.4%	4.0	14.3%	1.0	0.0%	0.0	100.0%	1.0
Would NOT live in a home with this characteris	1.0%	4.0	0.0%	0.0	0.0%	0.0	8.3%	1.0	0.0%	0.0	0.0%	0.0	0.0%	0.0	0.0%	0.0	0.0%	0.0
Totals	100.0%	403.0	100.0%	43.0	100.0%	16.0	100.0%	12.0	100.0%	9.0	100.0%	9.0	100.0%	7.0	100.0%	1.0	100.0%	1.0
Mean		2.94		2.91		2.88		2.50		2.89		2.56		3.14		3.00		2.00
ChiSq Significance									Under 50%*									
Living in a community with people at all stages of life.																		
Mandatory - Wouldn't live without this	7.7%	31.0	13.6%	6.0	6.3%	1.0	16.7%	2.0	0.0%	0.0	11.1%	1.0	28.6%	2.0	0.0%	0.0	0.0%	0.0
Important	40.6%	164.0	45.5%	20.0	62.5%	10.0	66.7%	8.0	60.0%	6.0	33.3%	3.0	57.1%	4.0	100.0%	1.0	0.0%	0.0
Don't care one way or another	49.0%	198.0	36.4%	16.0	31.3%	5.0	8.3%	1.0	40.0%	4.0	55.6%	5.0	0.0%	0.0	0.0%	0.0	100.0%	1.0
Would NOT live in a home with this characteris	2.7%	11.0	4.5%	2.0	0.0%	0.0	8.3%	1.0	0.0%	0.0	0.0%	0.0	14.3%	1.0	0.0%	0.0	0.0%	0.0
Totals	100.0%	404.0	100.0%	44.0	100.0%	16.0	100.0%	12.0	100.0%	10.0	100.0%	9.0	100.0%	7.0	100.0%	1.0	100.0%	1.0
Mean		2.53		2.68		2.75		2.92		2.60		2.56		3.00		3.00		2.00
ChiSq Significance									Under 50%*									

	How do you usually commute to work?									
	drive to work volunteer work		none		service business		wife		Other	
Being within walking distance of public transportation.										
Mandatory - Wouldn't live without this	0.0%	0.0	0.0%	0.0	0.0%	0.0	100.0%	1.0	28.6%	2.0
Important	0.0%	0.0	0.0%	0.0	0.0%	0.0	0.0%	0.0	28.6%	2.0
Don't care one way or another	100.0%	1.0	100.0%	1.0	0.0%	0.0	0.0%	0.0	42.9%	3.0
Would NOT live in a home with this characteris	0.0%	0.0	0.0%	0.0	100.0%	1.0	0.0%	0.0	0.0%	0.0
Totals	100.0%	1.0	100.0%	1.0	100.0%	1.0	100.0%	1.0	100.0%	7.0
Mean		2.00		2.00		1.00		4.00		2.86
ChiSq Significance					Yes at 99.0%*					
Being within walking distance to schools.										
Mandatory - Wouldn't live without this	0.0%	0.0	0.0%	0.0	0.0%	0.0	0.0%	0.0	25.0%	2.0
Important	0.0%	0.0	100.0%	1.0	0.0%	0.0	100.0%	1.0	50.0%	4.0
Don't care one way or another	100.0%	1.0	0.0%	0.0	100.0%	1.0	0.0%	0.0	25.0%	2.0
Would NOT live in a home with this characteris	0.0%	0.0	0.0%	0.0	0.0%	0.0	0.0%	0.0	0.0%	0.0
Totals	100.0%	1.0	100.0%	1.0	100.0%	1.0	100.0%	1.0	100.0%	8.0
Mean		2.00		3.00		2.00		3.00		3.00
ChiSq Significance					Under 50%*					
Being within walking distance to stores and restaurants.										
Mandatory - Wouldn't live without this	0.0%	0.0	0.0%	0.0	0.0%	0.0	100.0%	1.0	12.5%	1.0
Important	0.0%	0.0	0.0%	0.0	0.0%	0.0	0.0%	0.0	62.5%	5.0
Don't care one way or another	100.0%	1.0	100.0%	1.0	100.0%	1.0	0.0%	0.0	25.0%	2.0
Would NOT live in a home with this characteris	0.0%	0.0	0.0%	0.0	0.0%	0.0	0.0%	0.0	0.0%	0.0
Totals	100.0%	1.0	100.0%	1.0	100.0%	1.0	100.0%	1.0	100.0%	8.0
Mean		2.00		2.00		2.00		4.00		2.88
ChiSq Significance					Yes at 50.0%*					
Sidewalks and places to take walks.										
Mandatory - Wouldn't live without this	0.0%	0.0	100.0%	1.0	0.0%	0.0	100.0%	1.0	62.5%	5.0
Important	0.0%	0.0	0.0%	0.0	100.0%	1.0	0.0%	0.0	25.0%	2.0
Don't care one way or another	100.0%	1.0	0.0%	0.0	0.0%	0.0	0.0%	0.0	12.5%	1.0
Would NOT live in a home with this characteris	0.0%	0.0	0.0%	0.0	0.0%	0.0	0.0%	0.0	0.0%	0.0
Totals	100.0%	1.0	100.0%	1.0	100.0%	1.0	100.0%	1.0	100.0%	8.0
Mean		2.00		4.00		3.00		4.00		3.50
ChiSq Significance					Under 50%*					
Being within a 30 minute commute to work.										
Mandatory - Wouldn't live without this	0.0%	0.0	0.0%	0.0	0.0%	0.0	0.0%	0.0	37.5%	3.0
Important	100.0%	1.0	0.0%	0.0	0.0%	0.0	100.0%	1.0	12.5%	1.0

	How do you usually commute to work?									
	drive to work volunteer work		none		service business		wife		Other	
Don't care one way or another	0.0%	0.0	100.0%	1.0	0.0%	0.0	0.0%	0.0	50.0%	4.0
Would NOT live in a home with this characteris	0.0%	0.0	0.0%	0.0	100.0%	1.0	0.0%	0.0	0.0%	0.0
Totals	100.0%	1.0	100.0%	1.0	100.0%	1.0	100.0%	1.0	100.0%	8.0
Mean		3.00		2.00		1.00		3.00		2.88
ChiSq Significance					Yes at 99.0%*					
Easy access to the Interstate or major highway.										
Mandatory - Wouldn't live without this	0.0%	0.0	0.0%	0.0	0.0%	0.0	0.0%	0.0	25.0%	2.0
Important	100.0%	1.0	100.0%	1.0	100.0%	1.0	100.0%	1.0	50.0%	4.0
Don't care one way or another	0.0%	0.0	0.0%	0.0	0.0%	0.0	0.0%	0.0	25.0%	2.0
Would NOT live in a home with this characteris	0.0%	0.0	0.0%	0.0	0.0%	0.0	0.0%	0.0	0.0%	0.0
Totals	100.0%	1.0	100.0%	1.0	100.0%	1.0	100.0%	1.0	100.0%	8.0
Mean		3.00		3.00		3.00		3.00		3.00
ChiSq Significance					Under 50%*					
Living in a community with people at all stages of life.										
Mandatory - Wouldn't live without this	0.0%	0.0	0.0%	0.0	0.0%	0.0	0.0%	0.0	25.0%	2.0
Important	100.0%	1.0	0.0%	0.0	0.0%	0.0	0.0%	0.0	50.0%	4.0
Don't care one way or another	0.0%	0.0	100.0%	1.0	100.0%	1.0	100.0%	1.0	25.0%	2.0
Would NOT live in a home with this characteris	0.0%	0.0	0.0%	0.0	0.0%	0.0	0.0%	0.0	0.0%	0.0
Totals	100.0%	1.0	100.0%	1.0	100.0%	1.0	100.0%	1.0	100.0%	8.0
Mean		3.00		2.00		2.00		2.00		3.00
ChiSq Significance					Under 50%*					

* Note: ChiSq has over 20% low count cells.

Personal Problem for Your - Lack of Walkable Neighborhoods

	Reporting On	Male	Female	Hispanic	Caucasian	Central ABQ	E. Gateway	Foothills	Mid Hgts	Near Hgts	N. ABQ	N. Valley	SW Mesa S Valley
Lack of walkable neighborhoods.- Problem for You or Family													
Big Problem	14.6%	11.1%	17.7%	17.3%	12.8%	20.0%	7.5%	3.1%	9.7%	20.2%	11.8%	15.9%	37.0%
Somewhat of a Problem	23.8%	26.8%	21.4%	32.1%	18.1%	32.5%	28.4%	7.8%	26.9%	27.4%	13.7%	33.3%	37.0%
Not a Problem	61.6%	62.1%	60.9%	50.5%	69.1%	47.5%	64.2%	89.1%	63.4%	52.4%	74.5%	50.8%	25.9%
Totals	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%
Mean	1.53	1.49	1.57	1.67	1.44	1.73	1.43	1.14	1.46	1.68	1.37	1.65	2.11

	Westside	Staying in ABQ	Probably Not Staying	College Degree or More	HS grad or less	Household 2 or less	Household 3 or more	Income 50 to 100k	Income < 20k	Income 20 - 50k	Income > 100k	Age 18 - 34	Age 35 - 49
Lack of walkable neighborhoods.- Problem for You or Family													
Big Problem	12.9%	13.9%	20.6%	11.1%	19.8%	14.2%	15.4%	11.4%	24.1%	21.1%	6.4%	15.6%	14.8%
Somewhat of a Problem	13.9%	24.3%	22.1%	23.4%	27.5%	22.9%	25.3%	23.2%	35.2%	22.2%	22.7%	31.2%	22.2%
Not a Problem	73.3%	61.8%	57.4%	65.5%	52.7%	62.8%	59.3%	65.4%	40.7%	56.8%	70.9%	53.2%	63.1%
Totals	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%
Mean	1.40	1.52	1.63	1.46	1.67	1.51	1.56	1.46	1.83	1.64	1.35	1.62	1.52

	Age 50 - 64	Age 65 +	FTE	Not Full Time	No minors	one or more minors
Lack of walkable neighborhoods.- Problem for You or Family						
Big Problem	15.4%	12.9%	15.7%	9.4%	14.4%	15.0%
Somewhat of a Problem	24.4%	20.9%	24.8%	32.1%	22.6%	25.5%
Not a Problem	60.2%	66.2%	59.5%	58.5%	63.0%	59.5%
Totals	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%
Mean	1.55	1.47	1.56	1.51	1.51	1.55

In deciding where to live how Important is: Being within walking distance of stores, restaurants

	Reporting On	Male	Female	Hispanic	Caucasian	Central ABQ	E. Gateway	Foothills	Mid Hgts	Near Hgts	N. ABQ	N. Valley	SW Mesa S Valley
Being within walking distance to stores and restaurants.													
Mandatory - Wouldn't live without this	6.0%	4.0%	8.0%	4.7%	6.1%	17.5%	3.0%	1.6%	5.6%	13.4%	0.0%	8.3%	5.8%
Important	41.3%	39.3%	44.7%	38.9%	41.6%	62.5%	23.9%	31.1%	48.9%	61.0%	36.0%	33.3%	40.4%
Don't care one way or another	49.5%	53.7%	44.1%	50.3%	50.4%	17.5%	68.7%	63.9%	45.6%	25.6%	60.0%	55.0%	44.2%
Would NOT live in a home with this characteris	3.2%	2.9%	3.2%	6.2%	1.9%	2.5%	4.5%	3.3%	0.0%	0.0%	4.0%	3.3%	9.6%
Totals	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%
Mean	2.50	2.44	2.58	2.42	2.52	2.95	2.25	2.31	2.60	2.88	2.32	2.47	2.42

	Westside	Staying in ABQ	Probably Not Staying	College Degree or More	HS grad or less	Household 2 or less	Household 3 or more	Income 50 to 100k	Income < 20k	Income 20 - 50k	Income > 100k	Age 18 - 34	Age 35 - 49
Being within walking distance to stores and restaurants.													
Mandatory - Wouldn't live without this	2.0%	6.2%	6.1%	5.3%	11.2%	6.6%	5.0%	5.9%	9.4%	6.7%	4.7%	5.2%	4.6%
Important	35.7%	42.3%	30.3%	42.2%	38.2%	39.8%	44.1%	36.7%	49.1%	46.1%	35.5%	36.4%	40.8%
Don't care one way or another	58.2%	48.8%	57.6%	49.9%	47.2%	51.7%	45.5%	54.3%	35.8%	45.6%	54.2%	51.9%	51.7%
Would NOT live in a home with this characteris	4.1%	2.7%	6.1%	2.6%	3.4%	1.9%	5.5%	3.2%	5.7%	1.7%	5.6%	6.5%	2.9%
Totals	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%
Mean	2.36	2.52	2.36	2.50	2.57	2.51	2.49	2.45	2.62	2.58	2.39	2.40	2.47

	Age 50 - 64	Age 65 +	FTE	Not Full Time	No minors	one or more minors
Being within walking distance to stores and restaurants.						
Mandatory - Wouldn't live without this	7.6%	5.9%	6.1%	5.9%	5.9%	6.4%
Important	44.3%	41.5%	40.9%	49.0%	42.6%	39.3%
Don't care one way or another	45.2%	50.4%	49.4%	41.2%	48.3%	51.1%
Would NOT live in a home with this characteris	2.9%	2.2%	3.5%	3.9%	3.2%	3.2%
Totals	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%
Mean	2.57	2.51	2.50	2.57	2.51	2.49

In deciding where to live how Important is: Being within walking distance of schools

	Reporting On	Male	Female	Hispanic	Caucasian	Central ABQ	E. Gateway	Foothills	Mid Hgts	Near Hgts	N. ABQ	N. Valley	SW Mesa S Valley
Being within walking distance to schools.													
Mandatory - Wouldn't live without this	6.6%	4.3%	8.8%	7.8%	5.7%	7.5%	1.5%	4.8%	6.6%	12.2%	3.9%	9.7%	9.6%
Important	38.8%	37.3%	40.1%	42.5%	35.7%	52.5%	36.8%	30.6%	41.8%	45.1%	49.0%	24.2%	36.5%
Don't care one way or another	51.5%	56.9%	47.0%	47.2%	55.4%	40.0%	55.9%	62.9%	50.5%	41.5%	45.1%	64.5%	44.2%
Would NOT live in a home with this characteris	3.1%	1.4%	4.1%	2.6%	3.2%	0.0%	5.9%	1.6%	1.1%	1.2%	2.0%	1.6%	9.6%
Totals	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%
Mean	2.49	2.45	2.54	2.55	2.44	2.67	2.34	2.39	2.54	2.68	2.55	2.42	2.46

	Westside	Staying in ABQ	Probably Not Staying	College Degree or More	HS grad or less	Household 2 or less	Household 3 or more	Income 50 to 100k	Income < 20k	Income 20 - 50k	Income > 100k	Age 18 - 34	Age 35 - 49
Being within walking distance to schools.													
Mandatory - Wouldn't live without this	4.0%	6.8%	4.5%	7.0%	7.8%	5.5%	8.6%	6.8%	9.3%	7.6%	3.7%	13.0%	5.1%
Important	37.0%	38.3%	38.8%	36.0%	37.8%	30.6%	52.7%	36.5%	44.4%	41.8%	33.9%	45.5%	46.0%
Don't care one way or another	54.0%	51.8%	52.2%	54.9%	47.8%	60.0%	36.8%	55.0%	40.7%	46.2%	59.6%	39.0%	47.7%
Would NOT live in a home with this characteris	5.0%	3.0%	4.5%	2.0%	6.7%	3.9%	1.8%	1.8%	5.6%	4.3%	2.8%	2.6%	1.1%
Totals	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%
Mean	2.40	2.49	2.43	2.48	2.47	2.38	2.68	2.48	2.57	2.53	2.39	2.69	2.55

	Age 50 - 64	Age 65 +	FTE	Not Full Time	No minors	one or more minors
Being within walking distance to schools.						
Mandatory - Wouldn't live without this	6.5%	5.2%	6.4%	7.5%	5.7%	8.3%
Important	35.6%	30.4%	38.7%	37.7%	30.3%	53.0%
Don't care one way or another	53.7%	60.0%	52.3%	52.8%	59.8%	37.3%
Would NOT live in a home with this characteris	4.2%	4.4%	2.6%	1.9%	4.2%	1.4%
Totals	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%
Mean	2.44	2.36	2.49	2.51	2.38	2.68

In deciding where to live how Important is: Being within walking distance of schools

	Reporting On	Male	Female	Hispanic	Caucasian	Central ABQ	E. Gateway	Foothills	Mid Hgts	Near Hgts	N. ABQ	N. Valley	SW Mesa S Valley
Being within walking distance to schools.													
Mandatory - Wouldn't live without this	6.6%	4.3%	8.8%	7.8%	5.7%	7.5%	1.5%	4.8%	6.6%	12.2%	3.9%	9.7%	9.6%
Important	38.8%	37.3%	40.1%	42.5%	35.7%	52.5%	36.8%	30.6%	41.8%	45.1%	49.0%	24.2%	36.5%
Don't care one way or another	51.5%	56.9%	47.0%	47.2%	55.4%	40.0%	55.9%	62.9%	50.5%	41.5%	45.1%	64.5%	44.2%
Would NOT live in a home with this characteris	3.1%	1.4%	4.1%	2.6%	3.2%	0.0%	5.9%	1.6%	1.1%	1.2%	2.0%	1.6%	9.6%
Totals	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%
Mean	2.49	2.45	2.54	2.55	2.44	2.67	2.34	2.39	2.54	2.68	2.55	2.42	2.46

	Westside	Staying in ABQ	Probably Not Staying	College Degree or More	HS grad or less	Household 2 or less	Household 3 or more	Income 50 to 100k	Income < 20k	Income 20 - 50k	Income > 100k	Age 18 - 34	Age 35 - 49
Being within walking distance to schools.													
Mandatory - Wouldn't live without this	4.0%	6.8%	4.5%	7.0%	7.8%	5.5%	8.6%	6.8%	9.3%	7.6%	3.7%	13.0%	5.1%
Important	37.0%	38.3%	38.8%	36.0%	37.8%	30.6%	52.7%	36.5%	44.4%	41.8%	33.9%	45.5%	46.0%
Don't care one way or another	54.0%	51.8%	52.2%	54.9%	47.8%	60.0%	36.8%	55.0%	40.7%	46.2%	59.6%	39.0%	47.7%
Would NOT live in a home with this characteris	5.0%	3.0%	4.5%	2.0%	6.7%	3.9%	1.8%	1.8%	5.6%	4.3%	2.8%	2.6%	1.1%
Totals	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%
Mean	2.40	2.49	2.43	2.48	2.47	2.38	2.68	2.48	2.57	2.53	2.39	2.69	2.55

	Age 50 - 64	Age 65 +	FTE	Not Full Time	No minors	one or more minors
Being within walking distance to schools.						
Mandatory - Wouldn't live without this	6.5%	5.2%	6.4%	7.5%	5.7%	8.3%
Important	35.6%	30.4%	38.7%	37.7%	30.3%	53.0%
Don't care one way or another	53.7%	60.0%	52.3%	52.8%	59.8%	37.3%
Would NOT live in a home with this characteris	4.2%	4.4%	2.6%	1.9%	4.2%	1.4%
Totals	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%
Mean	2.44	2.36	2.49	2.51	2.38	2.68

Mixed Use Neighborhood walk to stores, schools, services vs Residential only drive to stores...

	Reporting On	Male	Female	Hispanic	Caucasian	Central ABQ	E. Gateway	Foothills	Mid Hgts	Near Hgts	N. ABQ	N. Valley	SW Mesa S Valley
Choice mixed use neighborhood w/i walking distance vs residential, driving to stores, schools, services													
Option A	54.8%	52.9%	57.7%	57.4%	53.9%	83.8%	37.3%	38.1%	58.1%	80.7%	44.9%	61.3%	55.8%
Option B	45.2%	47.1%	42.3%	42.6%	46.1%	16.2%	62.7%	61.9%	41.9%	19.3%	55.1%	38.7%	44.2%
Totals	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%
Mean	1.45	1.47	1.42	1.43	1.46	1.16	1.63	1.62	1.42	1.19	1.55	1.39	1.44

	Westside	Staying in ABQ	Probably Not Staying	College Degree or More	HS grad or less	Household 2 or less	Household 3 or more	Income 50 to 100k	Income < 20k	Income 20 - 50k	Income > 100k	Age 18 - 34	Age 35 - 49
Choice mixed use neighborhood w/i walking distance vs residential, driving to stores, schools, services													
Option A	42.0%	55.4%	50.0%	56.2%	50.6%	54.2%	55.7%	50.4%	76.9%	57.9%	47.7%	57.1%	56.8%
Option B	58.0%	44.6%	50.0%	43.8%	49.4%	45.8%	44.3%	49.6%	23.1%	42.1%	52.3%	42.9%	43.2%
Totals	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%
Mean	1.58	1.45	1.50	1.44	1.49	1.46	1.44	1.50	1.23	1.42	1.52	1.43	1.43

	Age 50 - 64	Age 65 +	FTE	Not Full Time	No minors	one or more minors
Choice mixed use neighborhood w/i walking distance vs residential, driving to stores, schools, services						
Option A	58.0%	45.4%	55.9%	72.2%	55.2%	54.4%
Option B	42.0%	54.6%	44.1%	27.8%	44.8%	45.6%
Totals	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%
Mean	1.42	1.55	1.44	1.28	1.45	1.46

CULTURAL DIVERSITY AND ENGAGEMENT

Significant Findings:

1. Almost 40% of the respondents indicated that the lack of available cultural and entertainment attractions was a problem, which ranked this 8th of 11 problems. Over 68% expressed satisfaction with the availability of entertainment opportunities in Albuquerque.

2. Racial or cultural discrimination was rated the lowest personal or family problem of the 11 measured. Looking at this result by ethnic or cultural background shows that Minorities see this as a greater problem than Caucasians (not Hispanics).

3. SW Mesa and Central Albuquerque indicate greater concern for this problem than other areas of Albuquerque.

Please note that the response levels for African Americans, Asian Americans, and Native Americans were too low to generalize about their respective groups. Therefore, respondents indicating these backgrounds were grouped together as Other Ethnicities. Caution is urged in the use of this data.

Lack of availability of cultural and entertainment attractions.- Problem for You or Family				
Big Problem	Somewhat of a Problem	Not a Problem	Totals	Mean
10.1%	29.7%	60.2%	100.0%	1.50

Availability of entertainment opportunities.- Level of Satisfaction					
Very Satisfied	Somewhat Satisfied	Somewhat Dissatisfied	Very Dissatisfied	Totals	Mean
26.3%	41.9%	24.2%	7.6%	100.0%	2.87

Racial or cultural discrimination.- Problem for You or Family				
Big Problem	Somewhat of a Problem	Not a Problem	Totals	Mean
6.2%	22.4%	71.4%	100.0%	1.35

	Cultural/Ethnic on Q53:Your ethnic/cultural background					
	Caucasian not Hispanic		Hispanic		Other Ethnicities	
Racial or cultural discrimination.- Problem for You or Family						
Big Problem	3.5%	13	8.7%	17	20.0%	7
Somewhat of a Problem	18.2%	68	27.6%	54	40.0%	14
Not a Problem	78.3%	292	63.8%	125	40.0%	14
Totals	100.0%	373	100.0%	196	100.0%	35
Mean	1.25		1.45		1.80	
ChiSq Significance	Yes at 99.0%					

	Community Planning Area																	
	i Westside		d Mid Heights		e Near Heights		b East Gateway		c Foothills		g North Valley		h SW Mesa/South Valley		f North Albuquerque		a Central Albuquerque	
Racial or cultural discrimination.- Problem for You or Family																		
Big Problem	9.0%	9	4.3%	4	7.2%	6	5.9%	4	1.6%	1	6.5%	4	16.7%	9	2.0%	1	0.0%	0
Somewhat of a Problem	16.0%	16	23.9%	22	24.1%	20	14.7%	10	12.5%	8	32.3%	20	25.9%	14	11.8%	6	55.3%	21
Not a Problem	75.0%	75	71.7%	66	68.7%	57	79.4%	54	85.9%	55	61.3%	38	57.4%	31	86.3%	44	44.7%	17
Totals	100.0%	100	100.0%	92	100.0%	83	100.0%	68	100.0%	64	100.0%	62	100.0%	54	100.0%	51	100.0%	38
Mean	1.34		1.33		1.39		1.26		1.16		1.45		1.59		1.16		1.55	
ChiSq Significance	Yes at 99.0%*																	

* Note: ChiSq has over 20% low count cells.

Racial or cultural discrimination - Problem for You or Your Family

	Reporting On	Male	Female	Hispanic	Caucasian	Central ABQ	E. Gateway	Foothills	Mid Hgts	Near Hgts	N. ABQ	N. Valley	SW Mesa S Valley
Racial or cultural discrimination.- Problem for You or Family													
Big Problem	6.2%	4.7%	7.2%	8.7%	3.5%	0.0%	5.9%	1.6%	4.3%	7.2%	2.0%	6.5%	16.7%
Somewhat of a Problem	22.4%	20.9%	23.8%	27.6%	18.2%	55.3%	14.7%	12.5%	23.9%	24.1%	11.8%	32.3%	25.9%
Not a Problem	71.4%	74.5%	69.0%	63.8%	78.3%	44.7%	79.4%	85.9%	71.7%	68.7%	86.3%	61.3%	57.4%
Totals	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%
Mean	1.35	1.30	1.38	1.45	1.25	1.55	1.26	1.16	1.33	1.39	1.16	1.45	1.59

	Westside	Staying in ABQ	Probably Not Staying	College Degree or More	HS grad or less	Household 2 or less	Household 3 or more	Income 50 to 100k	Income < 20k	Income 20 - 50k	Income > 100k	Age 18 - 34	Age 35 - 49
Racial or cultural discrimination.- Problem for You or Family													
Big Problem	9.0%	4.5%	20.6%	5.7%	7.8%	5.1%	8.2%	5.8%	11.8%	7.6%	1.8%	7.8%	6.9%
Somewhat of a Problem	16.0%	22.3%	20.6%	22.7%	27.8%	20.3%	26.0%	21.7%	29.4%	23.4%	21.1%	19.5%	26.6%
Not a Problem	75.0%	73.2%	58.8%	71.6%	64.4%	74.6%	65.8%	72.6%	58.8%	69.0%	77.1%	72.7%	66.5%
Totals	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%
Mean	1.34	1.31	1.62	1.34	1.43	1.31	1.42	1.33	1.53	1.39	1.25	1.35	1.40

	Age 50 - 64	Age 65 +	FTE	Not Full Time	No minors	one or more minors
Racial or cultural discrimination.- Problem for You or Family						
Big Problem	6.3%	4.4%	6.6%	5.8%	5.7%	7.3%
Somewhat of a Problem	22.6%	19.0%	22.6%	28.8%	22.5%	22.0%
Not a Problem	71.0%	76.6%	70.9%	65.4%	71.8%	70.6%
Totals	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%
Mean	1.35	1.28	1.36	1.40	1.34	1.37

GOVERNMENTAL EFFECTIVENESS AND EFFICIENCY

Significant Findings:

1. While only 5.1% of respondents indicated high levels of satisfaction wtih the City's ability to solve problems, almost 47% indicated they were somewhat satisfied. Those indicating that they are not likely to be living in Albuquerque in 5 years had much lower satisfaction levels with this question.

2. Almost 65% of respondents were not satisfied with the ability of local governments to work together.

3. Cultural or racial background does not seem to influence this response extensively.

4. The Westide and Central Albuquerque respondents expressed the least satisfaction with the City's ability to solve problems with North Albuquerque, Mid Heights, and Foothills respondents expressing the greatest satisfaction.

City of Albuquerque's ability to solve problems.-Level of Satisfaction					
Very Satisfied	Somewhat Satisfied	Somewhat Dissatisfied	Very Dissatisfied	Totals	Mean
5.0%	46.4%	33.7%	14.8%	100.0%	2.42

Ability of area local governments to work together.- Level of Satisfaction					
Very Satisfied	Somewhat Satisfied	Somewhat Dissatisfied	Very Dissatisfied	Totals	Mean
3.5%	31.8%	43.0%	21.7%	100.0%	2.17

	City of Albuquerque's ability to solve problems.-Level of Satisfaction						
	Very Satisfied	Somewhat Satisfied	Somewhat Dissatisfied	Very Dissatisfied	Totals	Mean	ChiSq Significance
Do you think you will still be living in Albuquerque 5 years from now?							
Yes	5.1%	48.6%	33.5%	12.8%	100.0%	2.46	Yes at 99.0%
No	4.4%	26.5%	36.8%	32.4%	100.0%	2.03	

	Cultural/Ethnic on Q53:Your ethnic/cultural background					
	Caucasian not Hispanic		Hispanic		Other Ethnicities	
City of Albuquerque's ability to solve problems.-Level of Satisfaction						
Very Satisfied	4.3%	16	5.7%	11	11.1%	4
Somewhat Satisfied	47.1%	177	46.4%	90	41.7%	15
Somewhat Dissatisfied	35.9%	135	29.9%	58	27.8%	10
Very Dissatisfied	12.8%	48	18.0%	35	19.4%	7
Totals	100.0%	376	100.0%	194	100.0%	36
Mean	2.43		2.40		2.44	
ChiSq Significance	Under 50%					

Satisfaction with the City's Ability to Solve Problems - Crosstabs

	Reporting On		Male		Female		Hispanic		Caucasian		Central ABQ		E. Gateway		Foothills		Mid Hgts		Near Hgts	
City of Albuquerque's ability to solve problems.-Level of Satisfaction																				
Very Satisfied	5.0%	31	5.4%	15	4.3%	14	5.7%	11	4.3%	16	0.0%	0	4.3%	3	9.5%	6	6.4%	6	4.8%	4
Somewhat Satisfied	46.4%	285	47.3%	131	46.9%	151	46.4%	90	47.1%	177	46.2%	18	49.3%	34	47.6%	30	58.5%	55	41.0%	34
Somewhat Dissatisfied	33.7%	207	33.6%	93	32.9%	106	29.9%	58	35.9%	135	33.3%	13	29.0%	20	34.9%	22	25.5%	24	37.3%	31
Very Dissatisfied	14.8%	91	13.7%	38	15.8%	51	18.0%	35	12.8%	48	20.5%	8	17.4%	12	7.9%	5	9.6%	9	16.9%	14
Totals	100.0%	614	100.0%	277	100.0%	322	100.0%	194	100.0%	376	100.0%	39	100.0%	69	100.0%	63	100.0%	94	100.0%	83
Mean		2.42		2.44		2.40		2.40		2.43		2.26		2.41		2.59		2.62		2.34

	N. ABQ		N. Valley		SW Mesa S Valley		Westside		Staying in ABQ		Probably Not Staying		College Degree or More		HS grad or less		Household 2 or less		Household 3 or more	
City of Albuquerque's ability to solve problems.-Level of Satisfaction																				
Very Satisfied	7.8%	4	4.8%	3	3.7%	2	3.0%	3	5.1%	27	4.4%	3	5.2%	18	8.8%	8	6.2%	24	3.2%	7
Somewhat Satisfied	58.8%	30	43.5%	27	42.6%	23	34.3%	34	48.6%	258	26.5%	18	48.0%	167	46.2%	42	47.9%	187	43.4%	96
Somewhat Dissatisfied	25.5%	13	40.3%	25	31.5%	17	42.4%	42	33.5%	178	36.8%	25	35.3%	123	33.0%	30	32.3%	126	36.2%	80
Very Dissatisfied	7.8%	4	11.3%	7	22.2%	12	20.2%	20	12.8%	68	32.4%	22	11.5%	40	12.1%	11	13.6%	53	17.2%	38
Totals	100.0%	51	100.0%	62	100.0%	54	100.0%	99	100.0%	531	100.0%	68	100.0%	348	100.0%	91	100.0%	390	100.0%	221
Mean		2.67		2.42		2.28		2.20		2.46		2.03		2.47		2.52		2.47		2.33

	Income 50 to 100k		Income < 20k		Income 20 - 50k		Income > 100k		Age 18 - 34		Age 35 - 49		Age 50 - 64		Age 65 +		FTE		Not Full Time	
City of Albuquerque's ability to solve problems.-Level of Satisfaction																				
Very Satisfied	5.3%	12	7.4%	4	6.5%	12	2.8%	3	3.9%	3	2.3%	4	5.9%	13	8.0%	11	2.5%	9	11.5%	6
Somewhat Satisfied	45.6%	103	37.0%	20	41.3%	76	63.3%	69	33.8%	26	48.9%	86	46.6%	102	50.7%	70	48.2%	170	36.5%	19
Somewhat Dissatisfied	34.1%	77	27.8%	15	35.9%	66	26.6%	29	41.6%	32	33.0%	58	32.0%	70	31.9%	44	34.8%	123	40.4%	21
Very Dissatisfied	15.0%	34	27.8%	15	16.3%	30	7.3%	8	20.8%	16	15.9%	28	15.5%	34	9.4%	13	14.4%	51	11.5%	6
Totals	100.0%	226	100.0%	54	100.0%	184	100.0%	109	100.0%	77	100.0%	176	100.0%	219	100.0%	138	100.0%	353	100.0%	52
Mean		2.41		2.24		2.38		2.61		2.21		2.38		2.43		2.57		2.39		2.48

	No minors		one or more minors	
City of Albuquerque's ability to solve problems.-Level of Satisfaction				
Very Satisfied	5.9%	23	3.7%	8
Somewhat Satisfied	46.5%	180	45.2%	99
Somewhat Dissatisfied	34.1%	132	33.3%	73
Very Dissatisfied	13.4%	52	17.8%	39
Totals	100.0%	387	100.0%	219
Mean		2.45		2.35

VALUES EXPRESSED AS TRADE OFFS

Significant Findings:

1. Shorter commutes (55%) seem to be slightly more valued than larger yards. Near Heights (82%) and Central Albuquerque (78%) strongly support this and the Westside supports larger yards with longer commutes (65%).

2. Mixed use within walking distance (55%) is slightly more valued than residential only that requires driving. These CPAs support mixed use and walking over residential only and driving: Central ABQ (84%), Near Heights (81%), North Valley (61%), Mid Heights (58%), and SW Mesa (56%)

3. Lower density that requires local driving (65%) is valued more than high density with transit. Only Central Albuquerque and the Near Heights respondents expressed more support for high density with transit.

4. Local governments should collaborate to create a common regional land use plan (89%) rather than maintain independent local plans. All CPAs strongly supported this choice.

5. Infill (57%) is supported more than growth in undeveloped areas. Only the Westside solidly supported the opposite choice. North ABQ almost split evenly with 49 - 51% in favor of growth in undeveloped areas over infill.

6. More than any other characteristic, respondents desire living in a quiet neighborhood.

	Choice small yard & home with short commute vs large yard & home with long commute			
	Option A	Option B	Totals	Mean
	54.7%	45.3%	100.0%	1.45

	Choice mixed use neighborhood w/i walking distance vs residential, driving to stores, schools, services			
	Option A	Option B	Totals	Mean
	54.8%	45.2%	100.0%	1.45

	Choice high density with transit vs low density driving for local travel			
	Option A	Option B	Totals	Mean
	35.3%	64.7%	100.0%	1.65

	Choice local governments independently work on local land use vs together with common plan			
	Option A	Option B	Totals	Mean
	11.0%	89.0%	100.0%	1.89

	Choice Infill vs growth in undeveloped areas avoiding density, congestion			
	Option A	Option B	Totals	Mean
	56.9%	43.1%	100.0%	1.43

Choices and Trade Offs by CPA

	Choice small yard & home with short commute vs large yard & home with long commute									Choice mixed use neighborhood w/i walking distance vs residential, driving to stores, schools, services									
	Option A		Option B		Totals		Mean	ChiSq Significance		Option A		Option B		Totals		Mean	ChiSq Significance		
Community Planning Area																			
i Westside	35.1%	34.0	64.9%	63.0	100.0%	97.0	1.65	Yes at 99.0%		42.0%	42.0	58.0%	58.0	100.0%	100.0	1.58	Yes at 99.0%		
d Mid Heights	58.6%	51.0	41.4%	36.0	100.0%	87.0	1.41			58.1%	54.0	41.9%	39.0	100.0%	93.0	1.42			
e Near Heights	81.5%	66.0	18.5%	15.0	100.0%	81.0	1.19			80.7%	67.0	19.3%	16.0	100.0%	83.0	1.19			
b East Gateway	46.0%	29.0	54.0%	34.0	100.0%	63.0	1.54			37.3%	25.0	62.7%	42.0	100.0%	67.0	1.63			
c Foothills	45.6%	26.0	54.4%	31.0	100.0%	57.0	1.54			38.1%	24.0	61.9%	39.0	100.0%	63.0	1.62			
g North Valley	56.7%	34.0	43.3%	26.0	100.0%	60.0	1.43			61.3%	38.0	38.7%	24.0	100.0%	62.0	1.39			
h SW Mesa/South Valley	49.0%	25.0	51.0%	26.0	100.0%	51.0	1.51			55.8%	29.0	44.2%	23.0	100.0%	52.0	1.44			
f North Albuquerque	50.0%	24.0	50.0%	24.0	100.0%	48.0	1.50			44.9%	22.0	55.1%	27.0	100.0%	49.0	1.55			
a Central Albuquerque	77.8%	28.0	22.2%	8.0	100.0%	36.0	1.22			83.8%	31.0	16.2%	6.0	100.0%	37.0	1.16			

	Choice high density with transit vs low density driving for local travel									Choice local governments independently work on local land use vs together with common plan									
	Option A		Option B		Totals		Mean	ChiSq Significance		Option A		Option B		Totals		Mean	ChiSq Significance		
Community Planning Area																			
i Westside	18.2%	18.0	81.8%	81.0	100.0%	99.0	1.82	Yes at 99.0%		16.3%	16.0	83.7%	82.0	100.0%	98.0	1.84	Under 50%		
d Mid Heights	29.7%	27.0	70.3%	64.0	100.0%	91.0	1.70			13.2%	12.0	86.8%	79.0	100.0%	91.0	1.87			
e Near Heights	66.3%	55.0	33.7%	28.0	100.0%	83.0	1.34			9.9%	8.0	90.1%	73.0	100.0%	81.0	1.90			
b East Gateway	26.1%	18.0	73.9%	51.0	100.0%	69.0	1.74			10.6%	7.0	89.4%	59.0	100.0%	66.0	1.89			
c Foothills	17.7%	11.0	82.3%	51.0	100.0%	62.0	1.82			6.3%	4.0	93.8%	60.0	100.0%	64.0	1.94			
g North Valley	44.3%	27.0	55.7%	34.0	100.0%	61.0	1.56			8.2%	5.0	91.8%	56.0	100.0%	61.0	1.92			
h SW Mesa/South Valley	36.5%	19.0	63.5%	33.0	100.0%	52.0	1.63			11.5%	6.0	88.5%	46.0	100.0%	52.0	1.88			
f North Albuquerque	22.9%	11.0	77.1%	37.0	100.0%	48.0	1.77			8.0%	4.0	92.0%	46.0	100.0%	50.0	1.92			
a Central Albuquerque	71.1%	27.0	28.9%	11.0	100.0%	38.0	1.29			10.5%	4.0	89.5%	34.0	100.0%	38.0	1.89			

	Choice Infill vs growth in undeveloped areas avoiding density, congestion							
	Option A		Option B		Totals		Mean	ChiSq Significance
Community Planning Area								
i Westside	37.9%	36.0	62.1%	59.0	100.0%	95.0	1.62	Yes at 99.0%
d Mid Heights	57.5%	50.0	42.5%	37.0	100.0%	87.0	1.43	
e Near Heights	78.8%	63.0	21.3%	17.0	100.0%	80.0	1.21	
b East Gateway	55.6%	35.0	44.4%	28.0	100.0%	63.0	1.44	
c Foothills	51.6%	32.0	48.4%	30.0	100.0%	62.0	1.48	
g North Valley	58.3%	35.0	41.7%	25.0	100.0%	60.0	1.42	
h SW Mesa/South Valley	51.0%	26.0	49.0%	25.0	100.0%	51.0	1.49	
f North Albuquerque	49.0%	24.0	51.0%	25.0	100.0%	49.0	1.51	
a Central Albuquerque	84.2%	32.0	15.8%	6.0	100.0%	38.0	1.16	

Having a large house on at least 1/3 (one third) acre lot.					
Mandatory - Wouldn't live without this	Important	Don't care one way or another	Would NOT live in a home with this characteris	Totals	Mean
7.0%	34.1%	45.1%	13.8%	100.0%	2.34

Living in a place that's away from it all.					
Mandatory - Wouldn't live without this	Important	Don't care one way or another	Would NOT live in a home with this characteris	Totals	Mean
2.3%	20.9%	49.8%	27.1%	100.0%	1.98

Living in a place that's at the center of it all.					
Mandatory - Wouldn't live without this	Important	Don't care one way or another	Would NOT live in a home with this characteris	Totals	Mean
3.8%	19.5%	54.8%	21.9%	100.0%	2.05

	Community Planning Area																	
	i Westside		d Mid Heights		e Near Heights		b East Gateway		c Foothills		g North Valley		h SW Mesa/South Valley		f North Albuquerque		a Central Albuquerque	
Living in a quiet neighborhood.																		
Mandatory - Wouldn't live without this	42.6%	43	17.2%	16	23.2%	19	44.9%	31	30.2%	19	19.0%	12	35.2%	19	43.1%	22	27.5%	11
Important	53.5%	54	78.5%	73	64.6%	53	46.4%	32	63.5%	40	65.1%	41	53.7%	29	51.0%	26	65.0%	26
Don't care one way or another	4.0%	4	4.3%	4	12.2%	10	8.7%	6	6.3%	4	14.3%	9	11.1%	6	5.9%	3	7.5%	3
Would NOT live in a home with this characteris	0.0%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	0	1.6%	1	0.0%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	0
Totals	100.0%	101	100.0%	93	100.0%	82	100.0%	69	100.0%	63	100.0%	63	100.0%	54	100.0%	51	100.0%	40
Mean	3.39		3.13		3.11		3.36		3.24		3.02		3.24		3.37		3.20	
ChiSq Significance	Yes at 95.0%*																	

* Note: ChiSq has over 20% low count cells.

Choices and Trade Offs by Crosstabs

	Choice small yard & home with short commute vs large yard & home with long commute							Choice mixed use neighborhood w/i walking distance vs residential, driving to stores, schools, services							Choice high density with transit vs low density driving for local travel			
	Option A		Option B		Totals		Mean	Option A		Option B		Totals		Mean	Option A		Option B	
Reporting On	54.7%	317.0	45.3%	263.0	100.0%	580.0	1.45	54.8%	332.0	45.2%	274.0	100.0%	606.0	1.45	35.3%	213.0	64.7%	390.0
Male	48.5%	130.0	51.5%	138.0	100.0%	268.0	1.51	52.9%	145.0	47.1%	129.0	100.0%	274.0	1.47	32.4%	89.0	67.6%	186.0
Female	59.5%	178.0	40.5%	121.0	100.0%	299.0	1.40	57.7%	183.0	42.3%	134.0	100.0%	317.0	1.42	38.0%	119.0	62.0%	194.0
Hispanic	53.8%	99.0	46.2%	85.0	100.0%	184.0	1.46	57.4%	108.0	42.6%	80.0	100.0%	188.0	1.43	35.8%	68.0	64.2%	122.0
Caucasian	57.1%	202.0	42.9%	152.0	100.0%	354.0	1.43	53.9%	201.0	46.1%	172.0	100.0%	373.0	1.46	33.9%	125.0	66.1%	244.0
Central ABQ	77.8%	28.0	22.2%	8.0	100.0%	36.0	1.22	83.8%	31.0	16.2%	6.0	100.0%	37.0	1.16	71.1%	27.0	28.9%	11.0
E. Gateway	46.0%	29.0	54.0%	34.0	100.0%	63.0	1.54	37.3%	25.0	62.7%	42.0	100.0%	67.0	1.63	26.1%	18.0	73.9%	51.0
Foothills	45.6%	26.0	54.4%	31.0	100.0%	57.0	1.54	38.1%	24.0	61.9%	39.0	100.0%	63.0	1.62	17.7%	11.0	82.3%	51.0
Mid Hgts	58.6%	51.0	41.4%	36.0	100.0%	87.0	1.41	58.1%	54.0	41.9%	39.0	100.0%	93.0	1.42	29.7%	27.0	70.3%	64.0
Near Hgts	81.5%	66.0	18.5%	15.0	100.0%	81.0	1.19	80.7%	67.0	19.3%	16.0	100.0%	83.0	1.19	66.3%	55.0	33.7%	28.0
N. ABQ	50.0%	24.0	50.0%	24.0	100.0%	48.0	1.50	44.9%	22.0	55.1%	27.0	100.0%	49.0	1.55	22.9%	11.0	77.1%	37.0
N. Valley	56.7%	34.0	43.3%	26.0	100.0%	60.0	1.43	61.3%	38.0	38.7%	24.0	100.0%	62.0	1.39	44.3%	27.0	55.7%	34.0
SW Mesa S Valley	49.0%	25.0	51.0%	26.0	100.0%	51.0	1.51	55.8%	29.0	44.2%	23.0	100.0%	52.0	1.44	36.5%	19.0	63.5%	33.0
Westside	35.1%	34.0	64.9%	63.0	100.0%	97.0	1.65	42.0%	42.0	58.0%	58.0	100.0%	100.0	1.58	18.2%	18.0	81.8%	81.0
Staying in ABQ	55.4%	278.0	44.6%	224.0	100.0%	502.0	1.45	55.4%	290.0	44.6%	233.0	100.0%	523.0	1.45	35.7%	186.0	64.3%	335.0
Probably Not Staying	47.7%	31.0	52.3%	34.0	100.0%	65.0	1.52	50.0%	34.0	50.0%	34.0	100.0%	68.0	1.50	32.8%	22.0	67.2%	45.0
College Degree or More	57.1%	192.0	42.9%	144.0	100.0%	336.0	1.43	56.2%	194.0	43.8%	151.0	100.0%	345.0	1.44	37.4%	128.0	62.6%	214.0
HS grad or less	51.3%	41.0	48.8%	39.0	100.0%	80.0	1.49	50.6%	44.0	49.4%	43.0	100.0%	87.0	1.49	34.1%	30.0	65.9%	58.0
Household 2 or less	60.9%	220.0	39.1%	141.0	100.0%	361.0	1.39	54.2%	208.0	45.8%	176.0	100.0%	384.0	1.46	34.3%	131.0	65.7%	251.0
Household 3 or more	44.7%	97.0	55.3%	120.0	100.0%	217.0	1.55	55.7%	122.0	44.3%	97.0	100.0%	219.0	1.44	37.2%	81.0	62.8%	137.0
Income 50 to 100k	53.0%	116.0	47.0%	103.0	100.0%	219.0	1.47	50.4%	114.0	49.6%	112.0	100.0%	226.0	1.50	28.3%	63.0	71.7%	160.0
Income < 20k	63.5%	33.0	36.5%	19.0	100.0%	52.0	1.37	76.9%	40.0	23.1%	12.0	100.0%	52.0	1.23	56.6%	30.0	43.4%	23.0
Income 20 - 50k	62.4%	108.0	37.6%	65.0	100.0%	173.0	1.38	57.9%	106.0	42.1%	77.0	100.0%	183.0	1.42	39.3%	72.0	60.7%	111.0
Income > 100k	45.8%	49.0	54.2%	58.0	100.0%	107.0	1.54	47.7%	52.0	52.3%	57.0	100.0%	109.0	1.52	34.6%	37.0	65.4%	70.0
Age 18 - 34	45.5%	35.0	54.5%	42.0	100.0%	77.0	1.55	57.1%	44.0	42.9%	33.0	100.0%	77.0	1.43	33.8%	26.0	66.2%	51.0
Age 35 - 49	52.3%	91.0	47.7%	83.0	100.0%	174.0	1.48	56.8%	100.0	43.2%	76.0	100.0%	176.0	1.43	33.3%	58.0	66.7%	116.0
Age 50 - 64	56.6%	120.0	43.4%	92.0	100.0%	212.0	1.43	58.0%	127.0	42.0%	92.0	100.0%	219.0	1.42	39.4%	85.0	60.6%	131.0
Age 65 +	61.4%	70.0	38.6%	44.0	100.0%	114.0	1.39	45.4%	59.0	54.6%	71.0	100.0%	130.0	1.55	33.3%	44.0	66.7%	88.0
FTE	52.8%	180.0	47.2%	161.0	100.0%	341.0	1.47	55.9%	195.0	44.1%	154.0	100.0%	349.0	1.44	35.7%	123.0	64.3%	222.0
Not Full Time	71.7%	38.0	28.3%	15.0	100.0%	53.0	1.28	72.2%	39.0	27.8%	15.0	100.0%	54.0	1.28	56.6%	30.0	43.4%	23.0
No minors	60.4%	218.0	39.6%	143.0	100.0%	361.0	1.40	55.2%	211.0	44.8%	171.0	100.0%	382.0	1.45	34.2%	130.0	65.8%	250.0
one or more minors	45.3%	97.0	54.7%	117.0	100.0%	214.0	1.55	54.4%	118.0	45.6%	99.0	100.0%	217.0	1.46	37.5%	81.0	62.5%	135.0

	Totals		Mean	Choice local governments independently work on local land use vs together with common plan							Choice Infill vs growth in undeveloped areas avoiding density, congestion							
				Option A		Option B		Totals		Mean	Option A		Option B		Totals		Mean	
Reporting On	100.0%	603.0	1.65	11.0%	66.0	89.0%	535.0	100.0%	601.0	1.89	56.9%	333.0	43.1%	252.0	100.0%	585.0	1.43	
Male	100.0%	275.0	1.68	9.3%	26.0	90.7%	253.0	100.0%	279.0	1.91	55.2%	149.0	44.8%	121.0	100.0%	270.0	1.45	
Female	100.0%	313.0	1.62	13.0%	40.0	87.0%	267.0	100.0%	307.0	1.87	58.5%	176.0	41.5%	125.0	100.0%	301.0	1.42	
Hispanic	100.0%	190.0	1.64	10.8%	20.0	89.2%	166.0	100.0%	186.0	1.89	52.2%	96.0	47.8%	88.0	100.0%	184.0	1.48	
Caucasian	100.0%	369.0	1.66	11.1%	41.0	88.9%	330.0	100.0%	371.0	1.89	59.1%	211.0	40.9%	146.0	100.0%	357.0	1.41	
Central ABQ	100.0%	38.0	1.29	10.5%	4.0	89.5%	34.0	100.0%	38.0	1.89	84.2%	32.0	15.8%	6.0	100.0%	38.0	1.16	
E. Gateway	100.0%	69.0	1.74	10.6%	7.0	89.4%	59.0	100.0%	66.0	1.89	55.6%	35.0	44.4%	28.0	100.0%	63.0	1.44	
Foothills	100.0%	62.0	1.82	6.3%	4.0	93.8%	60.0	100.0%	64.0	1.94	51.6%	32.0	48.4%	30.0	100.0%	62.0	1.48	
Mid Hgts	100.0%	91.0	1.70	13.2%	12.0	86.8%	79.0	100.0%	91.0	1.87	57.5%	50.0	42.5%	37.0	100.0%	87.0	1.43	
Near Hgts	100.0%	83.0	1.34	9.9%	8.0	90.1%	73.0	100.0%	81.0	1.90	78.8%	63.0	21.3%	17.0	100.0%	80.0	1.21	
N. ABQ	100.0%	48.0	1.77	8.0%	4.0	92.0%	46.0	100.0%	50.0	1.92	49.0%	24.0	51.0%	25.0	100.0%	49.0	1.51	
N. Valley	100.0%	61.0	1.56	8.2%	5.0	91.8%	56.0	100.0%	61.0	1.92	58.3%	35.0	41.7%	25.0	100.0%	60.0	1.42	
SW Mesa S Valley	100.0%	52.0	1.63	11.5%	6.0	88.5%	46.0	100.0%	52.0	1.88	51.0%	26.0	49.0%	25.0	100.0%	51.0	1.49	
Westside	100.0%	99.0	1.82	16.3%	16.0	83.7%	82.0	100.0%	98.0	1.84	37.9%	36.0	62.1%	59.0	100.0%	95.0	1.62	
Staying in ABQ	100.0%	521.0	1.64	10.1%	53.0	89.9%	470.0	100.0%	523.0	1.90	57.2%	290.0	42.8%	217.0	100.0%	507.0	1.43	
Probably Not Staying	100.0%	67.0	1.67	15.6%	10.0	84.4%	54.0	100.0%	64.0	1.84	56.1%	37.0	43.9%	29.0	100.0%	66.0	1.44	
College Degree or More	100.0%	342.0	1.63	9.1%	31.0	90.9%	311.0	100.0%	342.0	1.91	65.4%	219.0	34.6%	116.0	100.0%	335.0	1.35	
HS grad or less	100.0%	88.0	1.66	10.3%	9.0	89.7%	78.0	100.0%	87.0	1.90	42.9%	36.0	57.1%	48.0	100.0%	84.0	1.57	
Household 2 or less	100.0%	382.0	1.66	8.9%	34.0	91.1%	347.0	100.0%	381.0	1.91	58.7%	216.0	41.3%	152.0	100.0%	368.0	1.41	
Household 3 or more	100.0%	218.0	1.63	14.7%	32.0	85.3%	185.0	100.0%	217.0	1.85	54.2%	116.0	45.8%	98.0	100.0%	214.0	1.46	
Income 50 to 100k	100.0%	223.0	1.72	8.9%	20.0	91.1%	204.0	100.0%	224.0	1.91	57.3%	126.0	42.7%	94.0	100.0%	220.0	1.43	
Income < 20k	100.0%	53.0	1.43	19.2%	10.0	80.8%	42.0	100.0%	52.0	1.81	59.6%	31.0	40.4%	21.0	100.0%	52.0	1.40	
Income 20 - 50k	100.0%	183.0	1.61	11.5%	21.0	88.5%	162.0	100.0%	183.0	1.89	55.7%	98.0	44.3%	78.0	100.0%	176.0	1.44	
Income > 100k	100.0%	107.0	1.65	9.3%	10.0	90.7%	98.0	100.0%	108.0	1.91	57.5%	61.0	42.5%	45.0	100.0%	106.0	1.42	
Age 18 - 34	100.0%	77.0	1.66	18.2%	14.0	81.8%	63.0	100.0%	77.0	1.82	55.3%	42.0	44.7%	34.0	100.0%	76.0	1.45	
Age 35 - 49	100.0%	174.0	1.67	14.0%	24.0	86.0%	148.0	100.0%	172.0	1.86	54.2%	91.0	45.8%	77.0	100.0%	168.0	1.46	
Age 50 - 64	100.0%	216.0	1.61	6.5%	14.0	93.5%	201.0	100.0%	215.0	1.93	63.3%	133.0	36.7%	77.0	100.0%	210.0	1.37	
Age 65 +	100.0%	132.0	1.67	9.8%	13.0	90.2%	120.0	100.0%	133.0	1.90	51.6%	66.0	48.4%	62.0	100.0%	128.0	1.48	
FTE	100.0%	345.0	1.64	11.1%	38.0	88.9%	305.0	100.0%	343.0	1.89	57.7%	194.0	42.3%	142.0	100.0%	336.0	1.42	
Not Full Time	100.0%	53.0	1.43	20.4%	11.0	79.6%	43.0	100.0%	54.0	1.80	59.6%	31.0	40.4%	21.0	100.0%	52.0	1.40	
No minors	100.0%	380.0	1.66	9.2%	35.0	90.8%	345.0	100.0%	380.0	1.91	58.6%	217.0	41.4%	153.0	100.0%	370.0	1.41	
one or more minors	100.0%	216.0	1.63	14.0%	30.0	86.0%	184.0	100.0%	214.0	1.86	54.1%	113.0	45.9%	96.0	100.0%	209.0	1.46	

LONG TERM SOLUTION TO TRAFFIC PROBLEMS

Significant Findings:

1. Respondents divided among the 3 choices on how to reduce traffic problems over the long term with improving public transportation receiving the most (35%), follwed by building new roads (30%) and developing communities not dependent on driving (24%).

2. The Westside (62%) and SW Mesa (46%) strongly support building more roads.

3. Central Albuquerque (58%), Near Heights (47%), Foothilss (44%), North ABQ (36%), and the North Valley (33%) respondents support improving public transportation.

4. The Near Heights (37%), Mid Heights (29%), and North Valley (27%) had the highest support for developing communities where people do not have to drive long distances to work or shop. Educational achievement tracks support for this concept - the higher the educational achievement the higher the support for developing communities not dependent on driving.

best long term solution to reducing traffic problems in Albuquerque and the surrounding areas				
Building New Roads	Developing communities where people do not have to drive long distances to work or shop.	Improving public transportation such as light rail, buses, and trains.	Don't know.	Totals
30.0% 183	23.8% 145	34.6% 211	11.5% 70	100.0% 609

Long Solution to Traffic by Crosstabs

	Reporting On		Male		Female		Hispanic		Caucasian		Central ABQ		E. Gateway		Foothills		Mid Hgts		Near Hgts	
best long term solution to reducing traffic problems in Albuquerque and the surrounding areas																				
Building New Roads	30.0%	183	35.8%	98	24.7%	79	38.4%	73	26.7%	100	5.0%	2	28.4%	19	18.8%	12	25.0%	23	11.1%	9
Developing communities where people do not have to drive long distances to work or shop.	23.8%	145	22.3%	61	25.3%	81	21.6%	41	24.1%	90	27.5%	11	19.4%	13	21.9%	14	29.3%	27	37.0%	30
Improving public transportation such as light rail, buses, and trains.	34.6%	211	31.8%	87	37.8%	121	30.0%	57	36.1%	135	57.5%	23	32.8%	22	43.8%	28	29.3%	27	46.9%	38
Don't know.	11.5%	70	10.2%	28	12.2%	39	10.0%	19	13.1%	49	10.0%	4	19.4%	13	15.6%	10	16.3%	15	4.9%	4
Totals	100.0%	609	100.0%	274	100.0%	320	100.0%	190	100.0%	374	100.0%	40	100.0%	67	100.0%	64	100.0%	92	100.0%	81
ChiSq Significance	NA		NA		NA		NA		NA		NA		NA		NA		NA		NA	

	N. ABQ		N. Valley		SW Mesa S Valley		Westside		Staying in ABQ		Probably Not Staying		College Degree or More		HS grad or less		Household 2 or less		Household 3 or more	
best long term solution to reducing traffic problems in Albuquerque and the surrounding areas																				
Building New Roads	30.0%	15	27.0%	17	46.2%	24	62.0%	62	29.4%	155	35.8%	24	26.9%	93	31.9%	29	26.5%	103	35.9%	78
Developing communities where people do not have to drive long distances to work or shop.	20.0%	10	27.0%	17	19.2%	10	13.0%	13	24.2%	128	22.4%	15	25.7%	89	19.8%	18	23.9%	93	24.0%	52
Improving public transportation such as light rail, buses, and trains.	36.0%	18	33.3%	21	25.0%	13	21.0%	21	34.3%	181	34.3%	23	37.3%	129	28.6%	26	36.5%	142	31.3%	68
Don't know.	14.0%	7	12.7%	8	9.6%	5	4.0%	4	12.1%	64	7.5%	5	10.1%	35	19.8%	18	13.1%	51	8.8%	19
Totals	100.0%	50	100.0%	63	100.0%	52	100.0%	100	100.0%	528	100.0%	67	100.0%	346	100.0%	91	100.0%	389	100.0%	217
ChiSq Significance	NA		NA		NA		NA		NA		NA		NA		NA		NA		NA	

	Income 50 to 100k		Income < 20k		Income 20 - 50k		Income > 100k		Age 18 - 34		Age 35 - 49		Age 50 - 64		Age 65 +		FTE		Not Full Time	
best long term solution to reducing traffic problems in Albuquerque and the surrounding areas																				
Building New Roads	38.8%	87	18.2%	10	21.5%	39	33.9%	37	38.2%	29	38.6%	66	22.9%	50	25.0%	35	34.1%	117	30.2%	16
Developing communities where people do not have to drive long distances to work or shop.	19.6%	44	20.0%	11	26.5%	48	29.4%	32	19.7%	15	22.8%	39	25.7%	56	25.0%	35	23.0%	79	28.3%	15
Improving public transportation such as light rail, buses, and trains.	33.0%	74	50.9%	28	37.6%	68	25.7%	28	36.8%	28	30.4%	52	38.5%	84	33.6%	47	33.2%	114	37.7%	20
Don't know.	8.5%	19	10.9%	6	14.4%	26	11.0%	12	5.3%	4	8.2%	14	12.8%	28	16.4%	23	9.6%	33	3.8%	2
Totals	100.0%	224	100.0%	55	100.0%	181	100.0%	109	100.0%	76	100.0%	171	100.0%	218	100.0%	140	100.0%	343	100.0%	53
ChiSq Significance	NA		NA		NA		NA		NA		NA		NA		NA		NA		NA	

	No minors		one or more minors	
best long term solution to reducing traffic problems in Albuquerque and the surrounding areas				
Building New Roads	27.5%	106	33.8%	73
Developing communities where people do not have to drive long distances to work or shop.	24.2%	93	24.1%	52
Improving public transportation such as light rail, buses, and trains.	36.1%	139	32.4%	70
Don't know.	12.2%	47	9.7%	21
Totals	100.0%	385	100.0%	216
ChiSq Significance	NA		NA	

	highest level of education attained					
	Less than high school	high school graduate	Some College	Trade School	Bachelor's Degree	Graduate Degree
best long term solution to reducing traffic problems in Albuquerque and the surrounding areas						
Building New Roads	29.4%	32.4%	32.3%	47.1%	30.5%	23.6%
Developing communities where people do not have to drive long distances to work or shop.	11.8%	21.6%	22.6%	23.5%	24.4%	26.9%
Improving public transportation such as light rail, buses, and trains.	29.4%	28.4%	34.6%	23.5%	34.1%	40.1%
Don't know.	29.4%	17.6%	10.5%	5.9%	11.0%	9.3%
Totals	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%
ChiSq Significance	Yes at 50.0%					

Long Term Solution by CPA

	Community Planning Area								
	a Central Albuquerque	b East Gateway	c Foothills	d Mid Heights	e Near Heights	f North Albuquerque	g North Valley	h SW Mesa/South Valley	i Westside
best long term solution to reducing traffic problems in Albuquerque and the surrounding areas									
Building New Roads	5.0%	28.4%	18.8%	25.0%	11.1%	30.0%	27.0%	46.2%	62.0%
Developing communities where people do not have to drive long distances to work or shop.	27.5%	19.4%	21.9%	29.3%	37.0%	20.0%	27.0%	19.2%	13.0%
Improving public transportation such as light rail, buses, and trains.	57.5%	32.8%	43.8%	29.3%	46.9%	36.0%	33.3%	25.0%	21.0%
Don't know.	10.0%	19.4%	15.6%	16.3%	4.9%	14.0%	12.7%	9.6%	4.0%
Totals	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%
ChiSq Significance	Yes at 99.0%								

	Employment Status						
	Employed full time	Retired	Employed part time	full time homemaker	disabled	Unemployed, looking for work	full time student
best long term solution to reducing traffic problems in Albuquerque and the surrounding areas							
Building New Roads	34.1%	22.3%	30.2%	36.8%	26.7%	0.0%	0.0%
Developing communities where people do not have to drive long distances to work or shop.	23.0%	23.6%	28.3%	26.3%	6.7%	55.6%	37.5%
Improving public transportation such as light rail, buses, and trains.	33.2%	36.3%	37.7%	31.6%	53.3%	22.2%	50.0%
Don't know.	9.6%	17.8%	3.8%	5.3%	13.3%	22.2%	12.5%
Totals	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%
ChiSq Significance	Yes at 50.0%*						

* Note: ChiSq has over 20% low count cells.

	total yearly household income before taxes						
	Less than $10,000	$10,000 to $20,000	$20,001 to $35,000	$ 35,001 to $50,000	$50,001 to $75,000	$75,001 to $100,000	Over $100,000
best long term solution to reducing traffic problems in Albuquerque and the surrounding areas							
Building New Roads	23.1%	16.7%	23.2%	19.8%	34.9%	43.9%	33.9%
Developing communities where people do not have to drive long distances to work or shop.	30.8%	16.7%	29.5%	23.3%	19.8%	19.4%	29.4%
Improving public transportation such as light rail, buses, and trains.	38.5%	54.8%	35.8%	39.5%	34.9%	30.6%	25.7%
Don't know.	7.7%	11.9%	11.6%	17.4%	10.3%	6.1%	11.0%
Totals	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%
ChiSq Significance	Yes at 50.0%						

	Length of Albuquerque Residency				
	Less than 2 years	2-5 years	6-9 years	10-19 years	20 or more years
best long term solution to reducing traffic problems in Albuquerque and the surrounding areas					
Building New Roads	33.3%	34.1%	34.0%	26.0%	30.1%
Developing communities where people do not have to drive long distances to work or shop.	7.4%	14.6%	26.0%	30.1%	23.8%
Improving public transportation such as light rail, buses, and trains.	44.4%	46.3%	32.0%	35.0%	32.8%
Don't know.	14.8%	4.9%	8.0%	8.9%	13.4%
Totals	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%
ChiSq Significance	Yes at 50.0%				

Personal Traffic Congestion Problem by Satisfaction with Commute

	Typical daily commute you make to work or school.- Level of Satisfaction							
	Very Satisfied 30.0%, 168		Somewhat Satisfied 41.6%, 233		Somewhat Dissatisfied 17.3%, 97		Very Dissatisfied 11.1%, 62	
Traffic congestion on major roads.- Problem for You or Family								
Big Problem	26.3%	44	34.2%	79	66.0%	62	85.2%	52
Somewhat of a Problem	40.1%	67	49.8%	115	28.7%	27	8.2%	5
Not a Problem	33.5%	56	16.0%	37	5.3%	5	6.6%	4
Totals	100.0%	167	100.0%	231	100.0%	94	100.0%	61
Mean	1.93		2.18		2.61		2.79	
ChiSq Significance	Yes at 99.0%							

Personal or Family Problems by Hispanic and Caucasian not Hispanic Groups



Personal Problems by Nat Am, African Am and Asian Am Group and Caucasian not Hispanic Group



Community Priorities by Young Adults vs Old Adults



Community Priorities by Near Heights vs Westside



Community Priorities by Central ABQ and North ABQ



Personal Problems by Westside vs Foothills

Personal Problems by East Gateway vs SW ABQ



Personal Problems and Likelihood of Staying in Albuquerque

	Shortage of opportunities for well-paying jobs for you.- Problem for You or Family						Traffic congestion on major roads.- Problem for You or Family			
	Big Problem	Somewhat of a Problem	Not a Problem	Totals	Mean	ChiSq Significance	Big Problem	Somewhat of a Problem	Not a Problem	Totals
Do you think you will still be living in Albuquerque 5 years from now?										
Yes	22.0% 114	28.7% 149	49.3% 256	100.0% 519	1.73	Yes at 75.0%	39.8% 211	40.9% 217	19.2% 102	100.0% 530
No	30.6% 19	38.7% 24	30.6% 19	100.0% 62	2.00		67.2% 45	17.9% 12	14.9% 10	100.0% 67

	Mean	ChiSq Significance	Shortage of availability of housing you can afford.- Problem for You or Family						Lack of parks near your home.- Problem for You or Family	
			Big Problem	Somewhat of a Problem	Not a Problem	Totals	Mean	ChiSq Significance	Big Problem	Somewhat of a Problem
Do you think you will still be living in Albuquerque 5 years from now?										
Yes	2.21	Yes at 99.0%	11.9% 63	25.1% 133	62.9% 333	100.0% 529	1.49	Under 50%	7.0% 37	22.2% 118
No	2.52		16.2% 11	29.4% 20	54.4% 37	100.0% 68	1.62		10.3% 7	16.2% 11

	Lack of parks near your home.- Problem for You or Family				Lack of availability of cultural and entertainment attractions.- Problem for You or Family					
	Not a Problem	Totals	Mean	ChiSq Significance	Big Problem	Somewhat of a Problem	Not a Problem	Totals	Mean	ChiSq Significance
Do you think you will still be living in Albuquerque 5 years from now?										
Yes	70.8% 376	100.0% 531	1.36	Under 50%	7.9% 41	30.5% 159	61.6% 321	100.0% 521	1.46	Yes at 99.0%
No	73.5% 50	100.0% 68	1.37		23.9% 16	23.9% 16	52.2% 35	100.0% 67	1.72	

	Crime in your neighborhood.- Problem for You or Family						Lack of recycling opportunities.- Problem for You or Family			
	Big Problem	Somewhat of a Problem	Not a Problem	Totals	Mean	ChiSq Significance	Big Problem	Somewhat of a Problem	Not a Problem	Totals
Do you think you will still be living in Albuquerque 5 years from now?										
Yes	12.7% 68	54.0% 289	33.3% 178	100.0% 535	1.79	Yes at 75.0%	10.4% 55	29.8% 158	59.9% 318	100.0% 531
No	23.5% 16	47.1% 32	29.4% 20	100.0% 68	1.94		17.6% 12	32.4% 22	50.0% 34	100.0% 68

	Mean	ChiSq Significance	Lack of walkable neighborhoods.- Problem for You or Family						Racial or cultural discrimination.- Problem for You or Family	
			Big Problem	Somewhat of a Problem	Not a Problem	Totals	Mean	ChiSq Significance	Big Problem	Somewhat of a Problem
Do you think you will still be living in Albuquerque 5 years from now?										
Yes	1.50	Yes at 50.0%	13.9% 74	24.3% 130	61.8% 330	100.0% 534	1.52	Under 50%	4.5% 24	22.3% 118
No	1.68		20.6% 14	22.1% 15	57.4% 39	100.0% 68	1.63		20.6% 14	20.6% 14

	Racial or cultural discrimination.- Problem for You or Family						Health care access for you and your family.- Problem for You or Family							
	Not a Problem		Totals		Mean	ChiSq Significance	Big Problem		Somewhat of a Problem		Not a Problem		Totals		Mean	ChiSq Significance
Do you think you will still be living in Albuquerque 5 years from now?																
Yes	73.2%	387	100.0%	529	1.31	Yes at 99.0%	14.3%	76	28.9%	154	56.8%	303	100.0%	533	1.57	Under 50%
No	58.8%	40	100.0%	68	1.62		20.6%	14	23.5%	16	55.9%	38	100.0%	68	1.65	

	Rate at which natural areas and farms are being consumed for development.- Problem for You or Family											
	Big Problem		Somewhat of a Problem		Not a Problem		Totals		Mean	ChiSq Significance
Do you think you will still be living in Albuquerque 5 years from now?										
Yes	27.0%	142	33.3%	175	39.7%	209	100.0%	526	1.87	Under 50%
No	35.3%	24	30.9%	21	33.8%	23	100.0%	68	2.01	

Crosstabs on Likelyhood of Staying in Albuquerque

	Reporting On	Male	Female	Hispanic	Caucasian	Central ABQ	E. Gateway	Foothills	Mid Hgts	Near Hgts	N. ABQ	N. Valley	SW Mesa S Valley
Do you think you will still be living in Albuquerque 5 years from now?													
Yes	88.8%	90.2%	87.7%	90.3%	88.6%	97.4%	85.3%	93.4%	91.2%	81.5%	96.1%	90.3%	94.4%
No	11.2%	9.8%	12.3%	9.7%	11.4%	2.6%	14.7%	6.6%	8.8%	18.5%	3.9%	9.7%	5.6%
Totals	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%

	Westside	Staying in ABQ	Probably Not Staying	College Degree or More	HS grad or less	Household 2 or less	Household 3 or more	Income 50 to 100k	Income < 20k	Income 20 - 50k	Income > 100k	Age 18 - 34	Age 35 - 49
Do you think you will still be living in Albuquerque 5 years from now?													
Yes	80.8%	100.0%	0.0%	88.3%	95.6%	87.8%	90.4%	88.4%	84.9%	89.0%	92.7%	70.8%	90.2%
No	19.2%	0.0%	100.0%	11.7%	4.4%	12.2%	9.6%	11.6%	15.1%	11.0%	7.3%	29.2%	9.8%
Totals	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%

	Age 50 - 64	Age 65 +	FTE	Not Full Time	No minors	one or more minors
Do you think you will still be living in Albuquerque 5 years from now?						
Yes	88.6%	96.4%	87.8%	90.4%	87.5%	91.2%
No	11.4%	3.6%	12.2%	9.6%	12.5%	8.8%
Totals	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%

Crosstabs on Satisfaction with House or Apartment (residence)

	Reporting On	Male	Female	Hispanic	Caucasian	Central ABQ	E. Gateway	Foothills	Mid Hgts	Near Hgts	N. ABQ	N. Valley	SW Mesa S Valley
House or apartment in which you live.- Level of Satisfaction													
Very Satisfied	68.2%	71.4%	65.4%	63.5%	71.4%	53.8%	59.4%	84.4%	69.1%	64.3%	74.5%	77.4%	54.5%
Somewhat Satisfied	26.3%	22.1%	29.6%	30.5%	23.9%	46.2%	31.9%	15.6%	28.7%	27.4%	23.5%	16.1%	32.7%
Somewhat Dissatisfied	4.2%	5.4%	3.4%	4.1%	4.0%	0.0%	7.2%	0.0%	1.1%	4.8%	2.0%	6.5%	7.3%
Very Dissatisfied	1.3%	1.1%	1.5%	2.0%	0.8%	0.0%	1.4%	0.0%	1.1%	3.6%	0.0%	0.0%	5.5%
Totals	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%
Mean	3.61	3.64	3.59	3.55	3.66	3.54	3.49	3.84	3.66	3.52	3.73	3.71	3.36

	Westside	Staying in ABQ	Probably Not Staying	College Degree or More	HS grad or less	Household 2 or less	Household 3 or more	Income 50 to 100k	Income < 20k	Income 20 - 50k	Income > 100k	Age 18 - 34	Age 35 - 49
House or apartment in which you live.- Level of Satisfaction													
Very Satisfied	70.3%	70.9%	48.5%	71.9%	63.7%	70.6%	63.8%	74.1%	52.7%	53.8%	83.6%	51.9%	66.1%
Somewhat Satisfied	22.8%	24.4%	39.7%	24.1%	28.6%	24.3%	29.9%	23.2%	34.5%	37.0%	13.6%	37.7%	27.1%
Somewhat Dissatisfied	6.9%	4.1%	5.9%	3.7%	6.6%	4.3%	4.1%	2.6%	7.3%	6.5%	2.7%	6.5%	4.5%
Very Dissatisfied	0.0%	0.6%	5.9%	0.3%	1.1%	0.8%	2.3%	0.0%	5.5%	2.7%	0.0%	3.9%	2.3%
Totals	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%
Mean	3.63	3.66	3.31	3.68	3.55	3.65	3.55	3.71	3.35	3.42	3.81	3.38	3.57

	Age 50 - 64	Age 65 +	FTE	Not Full Time	No minors	one or more minors
House or apartment in which you live.- Level of Satisfaction						
Very Satisfied	68.6%	79.7%	65.2%	75.9%	70.8%	64.1%
Somewhat Satisfied	28.3%	15.2%	28.9%	20.4%	24.3%	29.1%
Somewhat Dissatisfied	2.7%	5.1%	4.2%	3.7%	3.8%	5.0%
Very Dissatisfied	0.4%	0.0%	1.7%	0.0%	1.0%	1.8%
Totals	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%
Mean	3.65	3.75	3.58	3.72	3.65	3.55

Crosstabs on Neighborhood in which living

	Reporting On	Male	Female	Hispanic	Caucasian	Central ABQ	E. Gateway	Foothills	Mid Hgts	Near Hgts	N. ABQ	N. Valley	SW Mesa S Valley
Neighborhood in which you live.- Level of Satisfaction													
Very Satisfied	57.6%	60.5%	54.5%	49.7%	62.2%	45.0%	50.7%	79.7%	56.4%	54.8%	72.5%	61.9%	30.9%
Somewhat Satisfied	32.7%	30.2%	35.4%	36.5%	30.4%	45.0%	40.6%	18.8%	35.1%	33.3%	19.6%	30.2%	41.8%
Somewhat Dissatisfied	7.6%	7.1%	8.0%	10.2%	6.3%	10.0%	5.8%	1.6%	6.4%	9.5%	7.8%	7.9%	18.2%
Very Dissatisfied	2.1%	2.1%	2.2%	3.6%	1.1%	0.0%	2.9%	0.0%	2.1%	2.4%	0.0%	0.0%	9.1%
Totals	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%
Mean	3.46	3.49	3.42	3.32	3.54	3.35	3.39	3.78	3.46	3.40	3.65	3.54	2.95

	Westside	Staying in ABQ	Probably Not Staying	College Degree or More	HS grad or less	Household 2 or less	Household 3 or more	Income 50 to 100k	Income < 20k	Income 20 - 50k	Income > 100k	Age 18 - 34	Age 35 - 49
Neighborhood in which you live.- Level of Satisfaction													
Very Satisfied	61.4%	59.7%	41.2%	61.1%	45.7%	58.8%	55.0%	60.1%	41.8%	46.8%	73.6%	40.3%	55.9%
Somewhat Satisfied	31.7%	32.2%	38.2%	32.4%	41.3%	31.8%	34.7%	34.2%	40.0%	37.1%	23.6%	40.3%	33.3%
Somewhat Dissatisfied	5.0%	6.5%	14.7%	6.0%	8.7%	7.8%	7.2%	4.8%	12.7%	12.4%	2.7%	14.3%	7.9%
Very Dissatisfied	2.0%	1.7%	5.9%	0.6%	4.3%	1.5%	3.2%	0.9%	5.5%	3.8%	0.0%	5.2%	2.8%
Totals	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%
Mean	3.52	3.50	3.15	3.54	3.28	3.48	3.41	3.54	3.18	3.27	3.71	3.16	3.42

	Age 50 - 64	Age 65 +	FTE	Not Full Time	No minors	one or more minors
Neighborhood in which you live.- Level of Satisfaction						
Very Satisfied	58.3%	67.9%	56.1%	53.7%	58.7%	55.7%
Somewhat Satisfied	33.2%	27.1%	32.3%	44.4%	32.1%	33.5%
Somewhat Dissatisfied	7.2%	4.3%	9.3%	1.9%	7.4%	8.1%
Very Dissatisfied	1.3%	0.7%	2.3%	0.0%	1.8%	2.7%
Totals	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%
Mean	3.48	3.62	3.42	3.52	3.48	3.42

	Reporting On	Male	Female	Hispanic	Caucasian	Central ABQ	E. Gateway	Foothills	Mid Hgts	Near Hgts	N. ABQ	N. Valley	SW Mesa S Valley
Sidewalks and places to take walks.													
Mandatory - Wouldn't live without this	32.4%	26.0%	36.8%	28.7%	34.6%	42.5%	33.3%	32.8%	28.0%	36.1%	27.5%	33.3%	26.4%
Important	60.6%	64.8%	58.3%	62.6%	59.0%	52.5%	62.3%	65.6%	62.4%	60.2%	66.7%	58.7%	58.5%
Don't care one way or another	6.5%	9.3%	4.0%	8.2%	5.9%	5.0%	4.3%	1.6%	9.7%	3.6%	5.9%	7.9%	13.2%
Would NOT live in a home with this characteris	0.5%	0.0%	0.9%	0.5%	0.5%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	1.9%
Totals	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%
Mean	3.25	3.17	3.31	3.19	3.28	3.38	3.29	3.31	3.18	3.33	3.22	3.25	3.09

	Westside	Staying in ABQ	Probably Not Staying	College Degree or More	HS grad or less	Household 2 or less	Household 3 or more	Income 50 to 100k	Income < 20k	Income 20 - 50k	Income > 100k	Age 18 - 34	Age 35 - 49
Sidewalks and places to take walks.													
Mandatory - Wouldn't live without this	33.7%	31.7%	34.3%	35.4%	23.1%	32.4%	32.0%	31.6%	40.0%	31.7%	34.5%	40.3%	31.8%
Important	57.4%	60.8%	62.7%	59.7%	63.7%	60.2%	61.7%	60.4%	49.1%	61.8%	60.0%	50.6%	64.2%
Don't care one way or another	6.9%	6.9%	3.0%	4.3%	13.2%	7.1%	5.4%	7.6%	10.9%	6.5%	4.5%	9.1%	4.0%
Would NOT live in a home with this characteris	2.0%	0.6%	0.0%	0.6%	0.0%	0.3%	0.9%	0.4%	0.0%	0.0%	0.9%	0.0%	0.0%
Totals	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%
Mean	3.23	3.24	3.31	3.30	3.10	3.25	3.25	3.23	3.29	3.25	3.28	3.31	3.28

	Age 50 - 64	Age 65 +	FTE	Not Full Time	No minors	one or more minors
Sidewalks and places to take walks.						
Mandatory - Wouldn't live without this	32.7%	27.9%	33.2%	25.9%	30.9%	35.3%
Important	60.9%	62.1%	60.5%	66.7%	62.9%	56.1%
Don't care one way or another	5.5%	9.3%	5.7%	7.4%	5.4%	8.6%
Would NOT live in a home with this characteris	0.9%	0.7%	0.6%	0.0%	0.8%	0.0%
Totals	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%
Mean	3.25	3.17	3.26	3.19	3.24	3.27