

# San José, CA

Trends over Time

2017



2955 Valmont Road Suite 300 Boulder, Colorado 80301 n-r-c.com • 303-444-7863



777 North Capitol Street NE Suite 500 Washington, DC 20002 icma.org • 800-745-8780

## **Summary**

The National Citizen Survey™ (The NCS™) is a collaborative effort between National Research Center, Inc. (NRC) and the International City/County Management Association (ICMA). The survey and its administration are standardized to assure high quality research methods and directly comparable results across The NCS communities. The NCS captures residents' opinions within the three pillars of a community (Community Characteristics, Governance and Participation) across eight central facets of community (Safety, Mobility, Natural Environment, Built Environment, Economy, Recreation and Wellness, Education and Enrichment and Community Engagement). This report discusses trends over time, comparing the 2017 ratings for the City of San José to its previous survey results (every year between 2011 and 2016). Additional reports and technical appendices are available under separate cover.

Trend data for San José represent important comparison data and should be examined for improvements or declines. Deviations from stable trends over time, especially, represent opportunities for understanding how local policies, programs or public information may have affected residents' opinions.

Meaningful differences between survey years have been noted within the following tables as being "higher" or "lower" if the differences are greater than three percentage points between the 2016 and 2017 surveys, otherwise the comparison between 2016 and 2017 are noted as being "similar." Additionally, benchmark comparisons for all survey years are presented for reference. Changes in the benchmark comparison over time can be impacted by various trends, including varying survey cycles for the individual communities that comprise the benchmarks, regional and national economic or other events, as well as emerging survey methodologies.

Overall, ratings in San José for 2017 generally remained stable. Of the 129 items for which comparisons were available, 95 items were rated similarly in 2016 and 2017, 17 items showed a decrease in ratings and 17 showed an increase in ratings. Notable trends over time included the following:

- Ratings that increased were spread across the three pillars but the facets of Safety and Community Engagement housed 14 of the 17 increases from 2016 to 2017. Aspects of Safety that increased included overall feelings of safety and crime prevention, among others, and more residents indicated that they did not report a crime. Within Community Engagement, ratings increased for San José welcoming resident involvement and acting in the best interest of the community among others. Further, more residents indicated they had talked to or visited with neighbors, watched a local public meeting and contacted San José elected officials.
- Within Community Characteristics, the quality of four aspects of Mobility declined over the one-year period (traffic flow, travel by public transportation, overall ease of travel and public parking) and have been steadily decreasing since 2014. Each of these ratings in 2017 was lower than the national average.
- Fewer residents in 2017 compared to 2016 indicated they would be likely to recommend living in San José
  (which has been decreasing since 2013) and fewer gave positive ratings to the quality of their neighborhood
  and the overall appearance of the community.
- Built Environment saw a decline in the quality of San José's overall built environment and the level of observing code violations increased (fewer residents indicated they did NOT observe a violation).

Table 1: Community Characteristics General

	Pe	rcent rat	ting posi	tively (e.	g., exce	llent/goo	od)	2017 rating compared to			Compa	rison to ben	chmark		
	2011	2012	2013	2014	2015	2016	2017	2016	2011	2012	2013	2014	2015	2016	2017
									Much	Much	Much			Much	Much
Overall quality of life	62%	60%	57%	59%	51%	44%	43%	Similar	lower	lower	lower	Lower	Lower	lower	lower
									Much	Much	Much			Much	Much
Overall image	51%	46%	43%	51%	41%	33%	33%	Similar	lower	lower	lower	Lower	Lower	lower	lower
									Much	Much	Much			Much	Much
Place to live	73%	64%	65%	71%	67%	56%	56%	Similar	lower	lower	lower	Lower	Lower	lower	lower
									Much	Much	Much				
Neighborhood	67%	64%	61%	67%	63%	63%	58%	Lower	lower	lower	lower	Lower	Lower	Lower	Lower
Place to raise									Much	Much	Much			Much	Much
children	53%	63%	63%	53%	54%	45%	43%	Similar	lower	lower	lower	Lower	Lower	lower	lower
									Much	Much	Much	Much	Much	Much	Much
Place to retire	26%	28%	28%	28%	20%	14%	13%	Similar	lower	lower	lower	lower	lower	lower	lower
									Much	Much	Much		Much	Much	Much
Overall appearance	54%	48%	43%	45%	34%	30%	25%	Lower	lower	lower	lower	Lower	lower	lower	lower

Table 2: Community Characteristics by Facet

		Pe	ercent ra		tively (e. omewha		llent/goo	d,	2017 rating compared			Compar	ison to ber	chmark		
		2011	2012	2013	2014	2015	2016	2017	to 2016	2011	2012	2013	2014	2015	2016	2017
	Overall feeling of safety	NA	NA	NA	46%	40%	33%	36%	Higher	NA	NA	NA	Much lower	Much lower	Much lower	Much lower
	Safe in neighborhood	87%	84%	82%	83%	78%	76%	76%	Similar	Lower	Much lower	Much lower	Similar	Lower	Lower	Lower
Safety	Safe downtown/commercial area	71%	62%	58%	64%	57%	57%	55%	Similar	Much lower	Much lower	Much lower	Lower	Much lower	Much lower	Much lower
	Overall ease of travel	NA	NA	NA	53%	48%	38%	34%	Lower	NA	NA	NA	Lower	Lower	Much lower	Much lower
	Paths and walking trails	45%	45%	50%	56%	44%	43%	43%	Similar	Much lower	Much lower	Much lower	Similar	Lower	Lower	Lower
	Ease of walking	46%	53%	43%	52%	47%	40%	41%	Similar	Much lower	Much lower	Much lower	Similar	Lower	Lower	Lower
	Travel by bicycle	37%	40%	34%	44%	39%	31%	31%	Similar	Lower	Lower	Much lower	Similar	Similar	Lower	Lower
	Travel by public transportation	48%	41%	42%	38%	34%	23%	19%	Lower	Similar	Lower	Lower	Similar	Similar	Lower	Lower
Mobility	Travel by car	40%	50%	40%	48%	40%	30%	29%	Similar	Much lower	Lower	Much lower	Similar	Lower	Much lower	Much lower

		Po	ercent ra		itively (e somewha		llent/goo	d,	2017 rating compared			Compar	rison to ber	nchmark		
		2011	2012	2013	2014	2015	2016	2017	to 2016	2011	2012	2013	2014	2015	2016	2017
	Public parking	NA	NA	NA	38%	27%	26%	22%	Lower	NA	NA	NA	Lower	Lower	Lower	Much lower
	Traffic flow	23%	26%	23%	32%	23%	17%	14%	Lower	Much lower	Much lower	Much lower	Lower	Lower	Much lower	Much lower
	Overall natural environment	43%	48%	44%	50%	43%	41%	36%	Lower	Much lower	Much lower	Much lower	Lower	Much lower	Much lower	Much lower
	Cleanliness	52%	41%	40%	34%	25%	22%	20%	Similar	Much lower	Much lower	Much lower	Much lower	Much lower	Much lower	Much lower
Natural Environment	Air quality	43%	48%	42%	41%	37%	43%	38%	Lower	Much lower	Much lower	Much lower	Lower	Much lower	Much lower	Much lower
	Overall built environment	NA	NA	NA	46%	41%	32%	27%	Lower	NA	NA	NA	Similar	Lower	Lower	Much lower
	New development in San José	58%	53%	49%	46%	44%	37%	38%	Similar	Similar	Lower	Lower	Similar	Similar	Lower	Lower
	Affordable quality housing	20%	21%	22%	15%	10%	5%	6%	Similar	Much lower	Much lower	Much lower	Much lower	Much lower	Much lower	Much lower
	Housing options	50%	39%	37%	34%	19%	19%	18%	Similar	Lower	Much lower	Much lower	Lower	Much lower	Much lower	Much lower
Built Environment	Public places	NA	NA	NA	50%	40%	32%	32%	Similar	NA	NA	NA	Similar	Lower	Much lower	Much lower
	Overall economic health	NA	NA	NA	54%	52%	47%	50%	Similar	NA	NA	NA	Similar	Similar	Similar	Similar
	Vibrant downtown/commercial area	NA	NA	NA	40%	33%	31%	29%	Similar	NA	NA	NA	Similar	Similar	Lower	Lower
	Business and services	59%	66%	57%	58%	43%	51%	49%	Similar	Similar	Similar	Similar	Similar	Similar	Similar	Similar
	Cost of living	NA	NA	NA	11%	10%	5%	5%	Similar	NA	NA	NA	Much lower	Much lower	Much lower	Much lower
	Shopping opportunities	76%	77%	75%	75%	70%	76%	75%	Similar	Much higher	Much higher	Much higher	Higher	Similar	Higher	Higher
	Employment opportunities	46%	51%	45%	61%	53%	56%	58%	Similar	Much higher	Much higher	Higher	Higher	Higher	Higher	Higher
	Place to visit	NA	NA	NA	49%	43%	34%	34%	Similar	NA	NA	NA	Lower	Lower	Much lower	Much lower
Economy	Place to work	66%	74%	68%	73%	71%	65%	63%	Similar	Higher	Much higher	Similar	Similar	Similar	Similar	Similar
	Health and wellness	NA	NA	NA	61%	56%	53%	52%	Similar	NA	NA	NA	Similar	Lower	Lower	Lower
	Mental health care	NA	NA	NA	42%	35%	28%	28%	Similar	NA	NA	NA	Similar	Similar	Lower	Lower
	Preventive health services	NA	NA	NA	55%	47%	52%	49%	Similar	NA	NA	NA	Similar	Similar	Similar	Similar
Recreation and Wellness	Health care	28%	44%	32%	49%	42%	48%	47%	Similar	Much lower	Lower	Much lower	Similar	Lower	Similar	Similar

## The National Citizen Survey $^{\scriptscriptstyle\mathsf{TM}}$

		Po	ercent ra	٥.	tively (e omewha	<b>J</b> ,	llent/goo	d,	2017 rating compared			Compar	ison to ber	nchmark		
		2011	2012	2013	2014	2015	2016	2017	to 2016	2011	2012	2013	2014	2015	2016	2017
	Food	52%	57%	50%	60%	49%	57%	54%	Similar	Lower	Similar	Much lower	Similar	Lower	Similar	Similar
	Recreational opportunities	53%	55%	57%	54%	39%	49%	53%	Higher	Lower	Lower	Lower	Similar	Lower	Lower	Similar
	Fitness opportunities	NA	NA	NA	57%	47%	52%	54%	Similar	NA	NA	NA	Similar	Lower	Lower	Lower
	Education and enrichment opportunities	NA	NA	NA	58%	57%	56%	61%	Higher	NA	NA	NA	Similar	Similar	Similar	Similar
	Religious or spiritual events and activities	68%	60%	60%	69%	64%	66%	67%	Similar	Lower	Much lower	Much lower	Similar	Lower	Similar	Similar
	Cultural/arts/music activities	64%	60%	53%	60%	52%	56%	56%	Similar	Much higher	Higher	Similar	Similar	Similar	Similar	Similar
	Adult education	NA	NA	NA	53%	54%	50%	50%	Similar	NA	NA	NA	Similar	Similar	Similar	Similar
	K-12 education	NA	NA	NA	48%	39%	41%	42%	Similar	NA	NA	NA	Lower	Lower	Much lower	Much lower
Education and Enrichment	Child care/preschool	16%	27%	20%	45%	37%	25%	26%	Similar	Much lower	Much lower	Much lower	Similar	Lower	Much lower	Lower
	Social events and activities	57%	46%	50%	56%	45%	50%	50%	Similar	Similar	Much lower	Lower	Similar	Similar	Similar	Similar
	Neighborliness	NA	NA	NA	41%	36%	36%	37%	Similar	NA	NA	NA	Lower	Lower	Lower	Lower
	Openness and acceptance	67%	71%	60%	65%	60%	65%	63%	Similar	Similar	Higher	Similar	Similar	Similar	Similar	Similar
	Opportunities to participate in community matters	55%	53%	42%	53%	47%	60%	55%	Lower	Lower	Lower	Much lower	Similar	Similar	Similar	Similar
Community Engagement	Opportunities to volunteer	70%	61%	57%	62%	59%	71%	71%	Similar	Similar	Lower	Much lower	Similar	Similar	Similar	Similar

Table 3: Governance General

	Pe	rcent rat	ting posi	tively (e.	g., exce	llent/god	od)	2017 rating			Compar	ison to ber	nchmark		
	2011	2012	2013	2014	2015	2016	2017	compared to 2016	2011	2012	2013	2014	2015	2016	2017
Services provided by San José	46%	42%	45%	54%	48%	38%	41%	Similar	Much lower	Much lower	Much lower	Lower	Lower	Much lower	Much lower
Customer service	57%	53%	64%	46%	39%	38%	40%	Similar	Much lower	Much lower	Lower	Lower	Much lower	Much lower	Much lower
Value of services for taxes paid	26%	28%	32%	29%	25%	18%	20%	Similar	Much lower	Much lower	Much lower	Lower	Lower	Much lower	Much lower
Overall direction	31%	35%	37%	41%	37%	25%	30%	Higher	Much lower	Much lower	Much lower	Lower	Lower	Much lower	Much lower
Welcoming resident involvement	38%	37%	26%	37%	31%	29%	33%	Higher	Lower	Much lower	Much lower	Similar	Lower	Lower	Lower
Confidence in City government	NA	NA	NA	32%	30%	23%	28%	Higher	NA	NA	NA	Lower	Lower	Lower	Lower

	Pe	rcent rat	ting posi	tively (e.	g., exce	llent/goo	od)	2017 rating			Compar	ison to ber	nchmark		
	2011	2012	2013	2014	2015	2016	2017	compared to 2016	2011	2012	2013	2014	2015	2016	2017
Acting in the best interest of															
San José	NA	NA	NA	40%	31%	26%	30%	Higher	NA	NA	NA	Similar	Lower	Lower	Lower
Being honest	NA	NA	NA	38%	30%	28%	29%	Similar	NA	NA	NA	Lower	Lower	Lower	Lower
															Much
Treating all residents fairly	NA	NA	NA	38%	31%	29%	27%	Similar	NA	NA	NA	Similar	Lower	Lower	lower
Services provided by the															
Federal Government	33%	32%	34%	40%	34%	32%	25%	Lower	Similar	Similar	Lower	Similar	Similar	Similar	Lower

Table 4: Governance by Facet

	ciriance by race	Pe	rcent rat	ting posi	tively (e	.g., exce	llent/goo	od)	2017 rating		1	Compa	rison to ben	chmark	1	I
		2011	2012	2013	2014	2015	2016	2017	compared to 2016	2011	2012	2013	2014	2015	2016	2017
	Police	61%	54%	51%	46%	44%	29%	37%	Higher	Much lower						
	Fire	84%	80%	81%	75%	74%	75%	78%	Similar	Lower	Much lower	Much lower	Lower	Lower	Lower	Lower
	Ambulance/EMS	83%	73%	73%	68%	76%	71%	75%	Higher	Lower	Much lower	Much lower	Lower	Lower	Lower	Lower
	Crime prevention	38%	28%	33%	31%	25%	14%	20%	Higher	Much lower						
	Fire prevention	58%	56%	52%	54%	46%	46%	48%	Similar	Much lower	Much lower	Much lower	Lower	Lower	Much lower	Much lower
	Animal control	46%	45%	46%	49%	44%	43%	43%	Similar	Lower	Much lower	Much lower	Similar	Similar	Lower	Lower
Safety	Emergency preparedness	37%	37%	29%	46%	37%	39%	32%	Lower	Much lower	Much lower	Much lower	Lower	Lower	Lower	Much lower
	Traffic enforcement	57%	37%	43%	40%	29%	24%	23%	Similar	Much lower	Much lower	Much lower	Lower	Much lower	Much lower	Much lower
	Street repair	21%	15%	29%	28%	24%	12%	14%	Similar	Much lower	Much lower	Much lower	Lower	Lower	Much lower	Much lower
	Street cleaning	42%	32%	45%	34%	35%	31%	30%	Similar	Much lower	Much lower	Much lower	Lower	Lower	Much lower	Much lower
	Street lighting	42%	35%	46%	40%	45%	42%	41%	Similar	Much lower	Much lower	Much lower	Lower	Similar	Lower	Lower
	Sidewalk maintenance	35%	30%	43%	35%	30%	28%	28%	Similar	Much lower	Much lower	Much lower	Lower	Lower	Lower	Lower
	Traffic signal timing	34%	37%	42%	43%	37%	32%	31%	Similar	Lower	Lower	Lower	Similar	Similar	Lower	Lower
Mobility	Bus or transit services	50%	43%	55%	46%	52%	36%	35%	Similar	Similar	Lower	Similar	Similar	Similar	Lower	Lower
Natural	Garbage collection	74%	77%	77%	71%	72%	72%	71%	Similar	Lower	Lower	Lower	Similar	Similar	Similar	Similar
Environment	Recycling	74%	78%	79%	71%	72%	71%	70%	Similar	Similar	Similar	Similar	Similar	Similar	Similar	Similar

		Pe	rcent rat	ting posi	tively (e	g., exce	llent/goo	od)	2017 rating		1	Compa	rison to ben	chmark	1	I
		2011	2012	2013	2014	2015	2016	2017	compared to 2016	2011	2012	2013	2014	2015	2016	2017
	Yard waste pick-up	76%	72%	68%	70%	66%	71%	69%	Similar	Similar	Similar	Lower	Similar	Similar	Similar	Similar
	Drinking water	51%	53%	53%	52%	52%	47%	47%	Similar	Much lower	Much lower	Much lower	Lower	Lower	Lower	Lower
	Natural areas preservation	38%	35%	41%	40%	38%	41%	41%	Similar	Much lower	Much lower	Much lower	Lower	Lower	Lower	Lower
	Storm drainage	55%	54%	59%	53%	48%	53%	50%	Similar	Similar	Lower	Similar	Similar	Similar	Similar	Similar
	Sewer services	58%	59%	65%	59%	59%	63%	63%	Similar	Much lower	Much lower	Much lower	Similar	Similar	Similar	Similar
	Utility billing	NA	NA	NA	50%	53%	48%	45%	Similar	NA	NA	NA	Similar	Similar	Lower	Lower
	Land use, planning and zoning	32%	34%	34%	34%	34%	24%	21%	Similar	Lower	Lower	Much lower	Similar	Similar	Lower	Lower
Built	Code enforcement	28%	25%	37%	32%	22%	15%	15%	Similar	Much lower	Much lower	Lower	Lower	Lower	Much lower	Much lower
Environment	Cable television	NA	NA	NA	41%	42%	42%	41%	Similar	NA	NA	NA	Similar	Similar	Similar	Similar
Economy	Economic development	32%	34%	28%	48%	42%	36%	40%	Higher	Lower	Lower	Much lower	Similar	Similar	Similar	Similar
	City parks	68%	55%	64%	61%	56%	55%	56%	Similar	Much lower	Much lower	Much lower	Lower	Lower	Lower	Lower
	Recreation programs	52%	43%	44%	56%	50%	54%	53%	Similar	Much lower	Much lower	Much lower	Lower	Lower	Lower	Lower
Recreation and Wellness	Recreation centers	54%	43%	48%	55%	48%	57%	50%	Lower	Much lower	Much lower	Much lower	Lower	Lower	Similar	Lower
Education and Enrichment	Public libraries	68%	62%	62%	66%	69%	74%	75%	Similar	Much lower	Much lower	Much lower	Lower	Lower	Similar	Similar
Community Engagement	Public information	43%	44%	40%	51%	47%	52%	49%	Lower	Much lower	Much lower	Much lower	Similar	Lower	Similar	Lower

Table 5: Participation General

Table 3. Farticipa	tion dei	iciai													
	Perce	nt rating p	oositively (	e.g., alwa	• • .	mes, more	e than	2017			Compa	rison to bei	nchmark		
			Office	a mondi,	ycsy			2017 rating			Сотпра	13011 10 1001	icilitark		
	2011	2012	2013	2014	2015	2016	2017	compared to 2016	2011	2012	2013	2014	2015	2016	2017
Sense of community	36%	42%	37%	36%	32%	27%	27%	Similar	Much lower	Much lower	Much lower	Lower	Much lower	Much lower	Much lower
Recommend San José	80%	75%	78%	71%	66%	51%	45%	Lower	Much lower	Much lower	Much lower	Lower	Lower	Much lower	Much lower
Remain in San José	83%	81%	80%	82%	77%	69%	66%	Similar	Similar	Lower	Similar	Similar	Similar	Lower	Lower
Contacted San José employees	32%	30%	45%	44%	40%	52%	52%	Similar	Much lower	Much lower	Lower	Similar	Similar	Similar	Similar

Table 6: Participation by Facet

		Perce	ent rating	•	y (e.g., a ce a mor		metimes,	more	2017 rating compared to			Compari	son to ben	chmark		
		2011	2012	2013	2014	2015	2016	2017	2016	2011	2012	2013	2014	2015	2016	2017
	Stocked supplies for an emergency	NA	NA	NA	49%	51%	44%	50%	Higher	NA	NA	NA	Higher	Higher	Similar	Higher
	Did NOT report a crime	NA	NA	NA	69%	65%	59%	63%	Higher	NA	NA	NA	Similar	Lower	Lower	Lower
Safety	Was NOT the victim of a crime	88%	88%	73%	81%	79%	76%	74%	Similar	Similar	Similar	Much lower	Similar	Similar	Lower	Lower
	Used public transportation instead of driving	NA	NA	NA	48%	48%	45%	43%	Similar	NA	NA	NA	Higher	Much higher	Higher	Higher
	Carpooled instead of driving alone	NA	NA	NA	60%	63%	56%	57%	Similar	NA	NA	NA	Higher	Higher	Higher	Higher
Mobility	Walked or biked instead of driving	NA	NA	NA	65%	57%	56%	56%	Similar	NA	NA	NA	Similar	Similar	Similar	Similar
	Conserved water	NA	NA	NA	97%	98%	97%	95%	Similar	NA	NA	NA	Higher	Higher	Higher	Higher
	Made home more energy efficient	NA	NA	NA	85%	81%	82%	80%	Similar	NA	NA	NA	Similar	Similar	Similar	Similar
Natural Environment	Recycled at home	96%	93%	95%	96%	95%	98%	97%	Similar	Much higher	Much higher	Much higher	Higher	Similar	Higher	Higher
	Did NOT observe a code violation	NA	NA	NA	45%	43%	37%	32%	Lower	NA	NA	NA	Similar	Lower	Lower	Much lower
Built Environment	NOT under housing cost stress	41%	48%	37%	49%	51%	51%	50%	Similar	Much lower	Much lower	Much lower	Lower	Lower	Lower	Lower
	Purchased goods or services in San José	NA	NA	NA	98%	96%	97%	97%	Similar	NA	NA	NA	Similar	Similar	Similar	Similar
	Economy will have positive impact on income	16%	26%	29%	37%	37%	28%	28%	Similar	Similar	Much higher	Much higher	Higher	Similar	Similar	Similar
Economy	Work in San José	NA	NA	NA	55%	52%	48%	51%	Similar	NA	NA	NA	Higher	Similar	Similar	Similar
·	Used San José recreation centers	49%	42%	44%	51%	51%	43%	41%	Similar	Much lower	Much lower	Much lower	Similar	Similar	Lower	Lower
	Visited a City park	86%	89%	92%	87%	87%	88%	85%	Similar	Similar	Similar	Higher	Similar	Similar	Similar	Similar
	Ate 5 portions of fruits and vegetables	NA	NA	NA	88%	84%	85%	83%	Similar	NA	NA	NA	Similar	Similar	Similar	Similar
	Participated in moderate or vigorous physical activity	NA	NA	NA	89%	87%	86%	84%	Similar	NA	NA	NA	Similar	Similar	Similar	Similar
Recreation and Wellness	In very good to excellent health	NA	NA	NA	64%	56%	61%	63%	Similar	NA	NA	NA	Similar	Similar	Similar	Similar

		Perce	ent rating	•	y (e.g., a ce a mor		metimes,	more	2017 rating compared to			Compari	son to ben	chmark		
		2011	2012	2013	2014	2015	2016	2017	2016	2011	2012	2013	2014	2015	2016	2017
	Used San José public libraries	74%	70%	68%	63%	64%	62%	58%	Lower	Similar	Similar	Similar	Similar	Similar	Similar	Similar
	Participated in religious or spiritual activities	49%	50%	48%	50%	48%	39%	38%	Similar	Similar	Similar	Similar	Similar	Similar	Similar	Similar
Education and Enrichment	Attended a City- sponsored event	NA	NA	NA	40%	39%	48%	49%	Similar	NA	NA	NA	Lower	Lower	Similar	Similar
	Campaigned for an issue, cause or candidate	NA	NA	NA	27%	22%	29%	36%	Higher	NA	NA	NA	Similar	Similar	Similar	Higher
	Contacted San José elected officials	NA	NA	NA	19%	18%	27%	33%	Higher	NA	NA	NA	Similar	Similar	Similar	Higher
	Volunteered	37%	43%	43%	46%	39%	43%	43%	Similar	Much lower	Similar	Similar	Similar	Similar	Similar	Similar
	Participated in a club	27%	26%	28%	29%	33%	26%	27%	Similar	Similar	Lower	Similar	Similar	Similar	Similar	Similar
	Talked to or visited with neighbors	NA	NA	NA	84%	82%	87%	91%	Higher	NA	NA	NA	Similar	Similar	Similar	Similar
	Done a favor for a neighbor	NA	NA	NA	71%	75%	74%	76%	Similar	NA	NA	NA	Lower	Similar	Similar	Similar
	Attended a local public meeting	18%	15%	19%	19%	18%	28%	31%	Similar	Much lower	Much lower	Lower	Similar	Similar	Similar	Similar
	Watched a local public meeting	27%	25%	28%	20%	19%	20%	27%	Higher	Much lower	Much lower	Much lower	Lower	Lower	Similar	Similar
	Read or watched local news	NA	NA	NA	87%	86%	89%	87%	Similar	NA	NA	NA	Similar	Similar	Similar	Similar
Community Engagement	Voted in local elections	66%	66%	66%	82%	74%	85%	87%	Similar	Much lower	Lower	Much lower	Similar	Similar	Similar	Similar