

**APPENDIX 2**  
**RANDOM HOUSEHOLD SURVEY | ALL COMPARISONS | IN-DEPTH ANALYSIS**

## **Section Table of Contents**

County Comparisons.....	133
Gender Comparisons.....	143
Age Comparisons .....	151
Education Comparisons .....	159
Income Comparisons.....	167
Race Comparisons.....	175

## COUNTY COMPARISONS

OVERALL RATING OF COMMUNITY AS A PLACE TO LIVE	La Crosse 435 (55.4%)	Monroe 124 (15.8%)	Trempealeau 69 (8.8%)	Vernon 90 (11.5%)	Houston 67 (8.5%)	Difference in rating by county
Poor/fair	7.4%	20.8%	25.4%	8.0%	9.2%	<b>&lt;0.0001</b>
Good	50.0%	63.3%	53.7%	61.4%	49.2%	
Excellent	42.6%	15.8%	20.9%	30.7%	41.5%	
<b>Mean Score</b>	<b>3.35</b>	<b>2.93</b>	<b>2.88</b>	<b>3.22</b>	<b>3.32</b>	<b>&lt;0.0001</b>
Trempealeau County respondents rated their community as a place to live lower than the other communities. 25% indicated their community rated fair or poor on this.						

ASPECTS OF HEALTH	La Crosse 435 (55.4%)	Monroe 124 (15.8%)	Trempealeau 69 (8.8%)	Vernon 90 (11.5%)	Houston 67 (8.5%)	Difference in rating by county
Overall health						
Poor/fair	10.9%	12.1%	19.1%	10.0%	17.9%	<b>0.0008</b>
Good	60.1%	76.6%	58.8%	71.1%	53.7%	
Excellent	29.0%	11.3%	22.1%	18.9%	28.4%	
<b>Mean Score</b>	<b>3.18</b>	<b>2.98</b>	<b>2.99</b>	<b>3.09</b>	<b>3.09</b>	<b>0.0084</b>
Overall mental health						
Poor/fair	6.7%	6.4%	10.1%	5.6%	9.0%	0.8221
Good	54.0%	58.9%	52.2%	57.8%	52.2%	
Excellent	39.3%	34.7%	37.7%	36.7%	38.8%	
<b>Mean Score</b>	<b>3.14</b>	<b>3.27</b>	<b>3.28</b>	<b>3.31</b>	<b>3.30</b>	0.9271
Overall dental health						
Poor/fair	13.7%	18.6%	23.2%	22.2%	16.4%	0.3751
Good	52.7%	52.4%	52.2%	47.8%	53.7%	
Excellent	33.6%	29.0%	24.6%	30.0%	29.9%	
<b>Mean Score</b>	<b>3.17</b>	<b>3.06</b>	<b>2.91</b>	<b>3.00</b>	<b>3.07</b>	0.0545
Access to health care						
Poor/fair	5.1%	11.4%	27.5%	9.0%	7.5%	<b>&lt;0.0001</b>
Good	30.6%	45.5%	31.9%	41.6%	37.3%	
Excellent	64.4%	43.1%	40.6%	49.4%	55.2%	
<b>Mean Score</b>	<b>3.58</b>	<b>3.28</b>	<b>3.10</b>	<b>3.39</b>	<b>3.43</b>	<b>&lt;0.0001</b>
Access to mental health care						
Poor/fair	11.2%	16.0%	29.5%	16.0%	17.2%	<b>&lt;0.0001</b>
Good	35.3%	53.6%	32.8%	53.1%	37.5%	
Excellent	53.5%	30.4%	37.7%	30.9%	45.3%	
<b>Mean Score</b>	<b>3.43</b>	<b>3.10</b>	<b>3.07</b>	<b>3.09</b>	<b>3.22</b>	<b>&lt;0.0001</b>

Access to dental care						
Poor/fair	6.7%	12.9%	28.9%	14.4%	6.0%	<b>&lt;0.0001</b>
Good	31.6%	45.2%	30.4%	42.2%	38.8%	
Excellent	61.7%	41.9%	40.6%	43.3%	55.2%	
<b>Mean Score</b>	<b>3.52</b>	<b>3.23</b>	<b>3.01</b>	<b>3.24</b>	<b>3.46</b>	<b>&lt;0.0001</b>
Access to healthy food choices						
Poor/fair	21.2%	19.4%	26.1%	15.7%	9.0%	<b>&lt;0.0001</b>
Good	37.4%	47.6%	39.1%	37.1%	44.8%	
Excellent	55.9%	33.1%	34.8%	47.2%	46.3%	
<b>Mean Score</b>	<b>3.48</b>	<b>3.11</b>	<b>3.03</b>	<b>3.29</b>	<b>3.34</b>	<b>&lt;0.0001</b>
Ability to pay for health care						
Poor/fair	34.1%	45.2%	33.9%	32.6%	34.3%	0.6008
Good	43.2%	38.7%	45.6%	50.6%	46.3%	
Excellent	22.7%	16.1%	20.6%	16.9%	19.4%	
<b>Mean Score</b>	<b>2.80</b>	<b>2.60</b>	<b>2.75</b>	<b>2.74</b>	<b>2.73</b>	0.2936
Ability to pay for mental health care						
Poor/fair	37.0%	45.8%	37.5%	39.5%	37.9%	0.4437
Good	42.9%	41.7%	37.5%	46.5%	45.5%	
Excellent	20.1%	12.5%	25.0%	14.0%	16.7%	
<b>Mean Score</b>	<b>2.74</b>	<b>2.51</b>	<b>2.75</b>	<b>2.60</b>	<b>2.65</b>	0.1209
Ability to pay for dental care						
Poor/fair	33.7%	40.3%	41.2%	37.8%	32.8%	0.6738
Good	44.9%	44.4%	38.2%	47.8%	47.8%	
Excellent	21.4%	15.3%	20.6%	14.4%	19.4%	
<b>Mean Score</b>	<b>2.77</b>	<b>2.60</b>	<b>2.62</b>	<b>2.62</b>	<b>2.70</b>	0.3154
Ability to pay for healthy food choices						
Poor/fair	23.1%	32.3%	29.4%	23.6%	25.8%	0.3397
Good	50.6%	50.8%	47.1%	52.8%	45.5%	
Excellent	26.3%	16.9%	23.5%	23.6%	28.8%	
<b>Mean Score</b>	<b>3.00</b>	<b>2.77</b>	<b>2.84</b>	<b>2.93</b>	<b>2.97</b>	0.0652
Quality of water in the rivers and lakes in your community						
Poor/fair	34.9%	31.7%	40.3%	27.8%	47.8%	<b>0.0397</b>
Good	51.5%	60.2%	44.8%	51.1%	43.3%	
Excellent	13.6%	8.1%	14.9%	21.1%	9.0%	
<b>Mean Score</b>	<b>2.73</b>	<b>2.74</b>	<b>2.70</b>	<b>2.90</b>	<b>2.49</b>	<b>0.0231</b>
Everyone have insurance (% yes)	93.9%	92.7%	92.8%	87.6%	93.4%	0.2751
Avoid seeing a doctor in past 12 months because of cost (% yes)	26.6%	29.0%	24.6%	29.2%	27.3%	0.4461

- Access to health care, dental care, mental health care, and access to healthy food choices varied by county of residence, but ability to pay and overall mental health and dental health did not vary by county.
- La Crosse County residents rated access to health care, dental care, mental health, and healthy food choices all higher than residents from the other four counties.
- Houston County residents also rated access highly.
- Nearly 28% of Trempealeau County residents rated access to health care as fair or poor, and 12% of Monroe County residents indicated this.
- Nearly 30% of Trempealeau County residents rated access to dental care or access to mental health care as fair or poor.
- About one-in-five respondents from Trempealeau County reported their overall health was fair or poor. This was nearly double the rate in the other counties. About 30% of respondents from Houston and La Crosse Counties indicated their health was excellent.

<b>ASPECTS OF PUBLIC SAFETY</b>	<b>La Crosse 435 (55.4%)</b>	<b>Monroe 124 (15.8%)</b>	<b>Trempealeau 69 (8.8%)</b>	<b>Vernon 90 (11.5%)</b>	<b>Houston 67 (8.5%)</b>	<b>Difference in rating by county</b>
<b>Quality of law enforcement</b>						
Poor/fair	14.2%	22.4%	33.8%	14.4%	28.4%	<b>0.0028</b>
Good	64.5%	64.5%	55.9%	61.1%	55.2%	
Excellent	21.4%	12.1%	10.3%	24.4%	16.4%	
<b>Mean Score</b>	<b>3.05</b>	<b>2.85</b>	<b>2.72</b>	<b>3.08</b>	<b>2.82</b>	<b>&lt;0.0001</b>
<b>Efforts to prevent crime</b>						
Poor/fair	22.3%	27.6%	32.8%	17.8%	28.4%	<b>0.0002</b>
Good	60.1%	61.8%	61.2%	61.1%	58.2%	
Excellent	17.6%	10.6%	6.0%	21.1%	13.4%	
<b>Mean Score</b>	<b>2.64</b>	<b>2.78</b>	<b>2.69</b>	<b>3.02</b>	<b>2.72</b>	<b>0.0013</b>
<b>Quality of emergency services</b>						
Poor/fair	6.0%	12.1%	14.7%	11.1%	13.6%	<b>0.0451</b>
Good	50.8%	53.2%	52.9%	53.3%	54.6%	
Excellent	43.2%	34.7%	32.4%	35.6%	31.8%	
<b>Mean Score</b>	<b>3.37</b>	<b>3.22</b>	<b>3.18</b>	<b>3.22</b>	<b>3.18</b>	<b>0.0103</b>
<b>Safety of neighborhood</b>						
Poor/fair	9.7%	12.2%	17.4%	7.8%	7.6%	<b>0.2129</b>
Good	58.2%	59.4%	55.1%	57.8%	59.1%	
Excellent	32.0%	28.5%	27.5%	34.4%	33.3%	
<b>Mean Score</b>	<b>3.21</b>	<b>3.15</b>	<b>3.10</b>	<b>3.26</b>	<b>3.21</b>	<b>0.5412</b>
<b>Safety of schools</b>						
Poor/fair	7.5%	11.4%	13.2%	8.0%	9.1%	<b>0.9041</b>
Good	63.2%	62.6%	58.8%	65.9%	59.1%	
Excellent	29.3%	26.0%	27.9%	26.1%	31.8%	
<b>Mean Score</b>	<b>3.21</b>	<b>3.14</b>	<b>3.13</b>	<b>3.18</b>	<b>3.21</b>	<b>0.6809</b>

Ability to respond to major safety threats						
Poor/fair	19.5%	33.1%	37.3%	33.0%	26.9%	0.0223
Good	64.1%	57.3%	52.2%	54.5%	61.2%	
Excellent	16.4%	9.7%	10.5%	12.5%	11.9%	
<b>Mean Score</b>	<b>2.95</b>	<b>2.73</b>	<b>2.69</b>	<b>2.74</b>	<b>2.79</b>	<b>0.0011</b>
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Rating of quality of law enforcement varied by county. <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Respondents from Vernon and La Crosse County were more likely to rate this as excellent, and respondents from Trempealeau were more likely to rate it as fair or poor.</li> </ul> </li> <li>Ratings of efforts to prevent crime varied by county. <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Respondents from Vernon County rate this the highest, while respondents from Trempealeau, Houston and Monroe Counties rated this lower.</li> </ul> </li> <li>Rating of quality of emergency services varied by county. <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Respondents from La Crosse County were more likely to rate this as excellent.</li> </ul> </li> <li>Rating of ability to respond to major safety threats varied by county. <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Respondents from La Crosse County were more likely to rate this as excellent, and respondents from Trempealeau were more likely to rate it as fair or poor.</li> </ul> </li> </ul>						

ASPECTS OF EDUCATION	La Crosse 435 (55.4%)	Monroe 124 (15.8%)	Trempealeau 69 (8.8%)	Vernon 90 (11.5%)	Houston 67 (8.5%)	Difference in rating by county
A place that meets your family's educational needs						
Poor/fair	6.9%	21.9%	23.2%	17.1%	19.7%	<.0001
Good	41.4%	56.3%	55.4%	55.7%	42.9%	
Excellent	51.7%	21.9%	21.4%	27.1%	37.5%	
<b>Mean Score</b>	<b>3.43</b>	<b>2.98</b>	<b>2.93</b>	<b>3.10</b>	<b>3.16</b>	<b>&lt;.0001</b>
Birth-to-three education						
Poor/fair	13.1%	24.4%	52.8%	37.3%	15.4%	<.0001
Good	52.7%	57.0%	34.0%	40.3%	59.6%	
Excellent	34.2%	18.6%	13.2%	22.4%	25.0%	
<b>Mean Score</b>	<b>3.18</b>	<b>2.91</b>	<b>2.40</b>	<b>2.73</b>	<b>3.06</b>	<b>&lt;.0001</b>
Early education opportunities						
Poor/fair	7.4%	10.4%	27.3%	25.0%	7.4%	<.0001
Good	48.7%	54.0%	52.7%	47.1%	57.4%	
Excellent	44.0%	35.6%	20.0%	27.9%	35.2%	
<b>Mean Score</b>	<b>3.36</b>	<b>3.23</b>	<b>2.86</b>	<b>3.00</b>	<b>3.26</b>	<b>&lt;.0001</b>
Quality of schools - 4K-12						
Poor/fair	6.2%	14.6%	18.0%	14.9%	8.8%	<.0001
Good	44.5%	60.4%	59.0%	52.7%	54.4%	
Excellent	49.3%	25.0%	23.0%	32.4%	36.8%	
<b>Mean Score</b>	<b>3.41</b>	<b>3.10</b>	<b>2.98</b>	<b>3.15</b>	<b>3.28</b>	<b>&lt;.0001</b>

Quality of higher education						
Poor/fair	2.3%	24.5%	18.3%	24.3%	14.0%	<b>&lt;.0001</b>
Good	32.7%	47.2%	50.0%	43.2%	40.4%	
Excellent	65.0%	28.3%	31.7%	32.4%	45.6%	
<b>Mean Score</b>	<b>3.62</b>	<b>2.99</b>	<b>3.05</b>	<b>3.03</b>	<b>3.23</b>	<b>&lt;.0001</b>
Opportunities in your job to gain knowledge or skills						
Poor/fair	30.1%	50.6%	42.9%	49.2%	36.2%	<b>0.0003</b>
Good	39.8%	34.5%	40.8%	39.3%	38.3%	
Excellent	30.1%	14.9%	16.3%	11.5%	25.5%	
<b>Mean Score</b>	<b>2.90</b>	<b>2.44</b>	<b>2.71</b>	<b>2.43</b>	<b>2.74</b>	<b>&lt;.0001</b>
Community resources to learn new skills						
Poor/fair	21.8%	52.6%	64.1%	49.4%	24.2%	<b>&lt;.0001</b>
Good	48.6%	34.2%	23.4%	36.7%	46.8%	
Excellent	29.5%	13.2%	12.5%	13.9%	29.0%	
<b>Mean Score</b>	<b>3.03</b>	<b>2.47</b>	<b>2.20</b>	<b>2.48</b>	<b>2.95</b>	<b>&lt;.0001</b>
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>All aspects of education varied by county of residence. Most aspects were rated higher by La Crosse and Houston County respondents and rated lower by Monroe, Trempealeau or Vernon County respondents.</li> </ul>						

ASPECTS OF QUALITY OF LIFE	La Crosse 435 (55.4%)	Monroe 124 (15.8%)	Trempealeau 69 (8.8%)	Vernon 90 (11.5%)	Houston 67 (8.5%)	Difference in rating by county
Leisure time opportunities						
Poor/fair	19.2%	39.8%	51.5%	35.6%	25.8%	<b>&lt;.0001</b>
Good	51.5%	49.6%	36.8%	48.9%	48.5%	
Excellent	29.3%	10.6%	11.8%	15.5%	28.7%	
<b>Mean Score</b>	<b>3.08</b>	<b>2.65</b>	<b>2.44</b>	<b>2.70</b>	<b>2.95</b>	<b>&lt;.0001</b>
Opportunities for youth to explore interests and participate in positive activities						
Poor/fair	21.1%	44.3%	52.9%	44.3%	45.5%	<b>&lt;.0001</b>
Good	57.3%	45.9%	36.8%	44.3%	42.4%	
Excellent	21.6%	9.8%	10.3%	11.4%	12.1%	
<b>Mean Score</b>	<b>2.99</b>	<b>2.57</b>	<b>2.32</b>	<b>2.61</b>	<b>2.61</b>	<b>&lt;.0001</b>
Opportunities to enjoy fine arts and cultural experiences						
Poor/fair	19.0%	62.1%	69.1%	57.8%	31.8%	<b>&lt;.0001</b>
Good	48.2%	34.7%	20.6%	30.0%	43.9%	
Excellent	32.9%	3.2%	10.3%	12.2%	24.2%	
<b>Mean Score</b>	<b>3.11</b>	<b>2.22</b>	<b>2.06</b>	<b>2.37</b>	<b>2.83</b>	<b>&lt;.0001</b>
Physical recreation for adults						
Poor/fair	11.8%	34.2%	52.9%	34.4%	26.2%	<b>&lt;.0001</b>
Good	47.2%	51.2%	32.4%	45.6%	44.6%	
Excellent	41.0%	14.6%	14.7%	20.0%	29.2%	
<b>Mean Score</b>	<b>3.27</b>	<b>2.76</b>	<b>2.51</b>	<b>2.74</b>	<b>2.95</b>	<b>&lt;.0001</b>

Safe bike routes to school or work						
Poor/fair	37.8%	50.4%	73.5%	54.5%	47.7%	<b>&lt;.0001</b>
Good	44.1%	38.8%	20.6%	34.1%	44.6%	
Excellent	18.2%	10.7%	5.9%	11.4%	7.7%	
<b>Mean Score</b>	<b>2.71</b>	<b>2.46</b>	<b>1.97</b>	<b>2.35</b>	<b>2.43</b>	<b>&lt;.0001</b>
Library services in your community						
Poor/fair	11.4%	17.9%	30.9%	18.9%	15.2%	<b>&lt;.0001</b>
Good	47.4%	62.6%	42.7%	53.3%	60.6%	
Excellent	41.1%	19.5%	26.5%	27.8%	24.2%	
<b>Mean Score</b>	<b>3.29</b>	<b>3.01</b>	<b>2.87</b>	<b>3.04</b>	<b>3.06</b>	<b>&lt;.0001</b>
Efforts to protect the natural environment						
Poor/fair	27.1%	44.7%	63.2%	32.6%	40.9%	<b>&lt;.0001</b>
Good	55.3%	49.6%	27.9%	52.8%	53.0%	
Excellent	17.6%	5.7%	8.8%	14.6%	6.1%	
<b>Mean Score</b>	<b>2.86</b>	<b>2.52</b>	<b>2.18</b>	<b>2.73</b>	<b>2.55</b>	<b>&lt;.0001</b>
Opportunities to volunteer						
Poor/fair	7.7%	20.5%	38.8%	36.7%	13.9%	<b>&lt;.0001</b>
Good	53.1%	60.7%	49.3%	41.1%	55.4%	
Excellent	39.2%	18.9%	11.9%	22.2%	30.8%	
<b>Mean Score</b>	<b>3.31</b>	<b>2.97</b>	<b>2.70</b>	<b>2.78</b>	<b>3.12</b>	<b>&lt;.0001</b>
A place where people are treated respectfully						
Poor/fair	27.5%	37.1%	39.7%	31.5%	35.4%	<b>0.004</b>
Good	57.9%	50.0%	54.4%	56.2%	58.5%	
Excellent	14.6%	12.9%	5.9%	12.4%	6.2%	
<b>Mean Score</b>	<b>2.83</b>	<b>2.69</b>	<b>2.49</b>	<b>2.75</b>	<b>2.65</b>	<b>0.0027</b>
A place where people of different cultural/racial/ethnic backgrounds are included in decision-making						
Poor/fair	38.2%	43.8%	55.2%	47.7%	63.5%	<b>0.0078</b>
Good	50.4%	47.9%	40.3%	45.4%	31.8%	
Excellent	11.5%	8.3%	4.5%	7.0%	4.7%	
<b>Mean Score</b>	<b>2.66</b>	<b>2.57</b>	<b>2.34</b>	<b>2.44</b>	<b>2.29</b>	<b>0.0002</b>
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>All aspects of quality of life varied by county of residence. Most aspects were rated higher by La Crosse and Houston County respondents and rated lower by Monroe, Trempealeau or Vernon County respondents.</li> </ul>						

ASPECTS OF CAREGIVING	La Crosse 435 (55.4%)	Monroe 124 (15.8%)	Trempealeau 69 (8.8%)	Vernon 90 (11.5%)	Houston 67 (8.5%)	Difference in rating by county
Availability of quality child care						
Poor/fair	23.4%	27.1%	66.7%	51.0%	23.8%	<b>&lt;.00001</b>
Good	54.7%	50.0%	25.6%	34.7%	57.1%	
Excellent	21.9%	22.9%	7.7%	14.3%	19.1%	
<b>Mean Score</b>	<b>2.96</b>	<b>2.90</b>	<b>2.23</b>	<b>2.53</b>	<b>2.90</b>	<b>&lt;.00001</b>

Ability to pay for child care						
Poor/fair	51.4%	49.0%	58.6%	44.2%	32.4%	<b>0.0465</b>
Good	32.6%	46.9%	27.6%	51.2%	55.9%	
Excellent	16.0%	4.1%	13.8%	4.7%	11.8%	
<b>Mean Score</b>	<b>2.53</b>	<b>2.41</b>	<b>2.34</b>	<b>2.42</b>	<b>2.71</b>	<b>0.4140</b>
A place that meets the needs of the elderly						
Poor/fair	23.8%	35.7%	48.4%	40.8%	35.5%	<b>&lt;0.0001</b>
Good	55.2%	45.5%	35.5%	40.7%	53.2%	
Excellent	21.0%	18.8%	16.1%	18.5%	11.3%	
<b>Mean Score</b>	<b>2.94</b>	<b>2.73</b>	<b>2.45</b>	<b>2.67</b>	<b>2.63</b>	<b>&lt;0.0001</b>
Access to help to stay in the home						
Poor/fair	31.9%	36.0%	48.3%	42.5%	45.6%	<b>0.0074</b>
Good	47.9%	45.4%	44.8%	43.9%	38.6%	
Excellent	20.2%	18.6%	6.9%	13.6%	15.8%	
<b>Mean Score</b>	<b>2.85</b>	<b>2.74</b>	<b>2.41</b>	<b>2.56</b>	<b>2.63</b>	<b>0.0014</b>
A place that meets the needs of persons with disabilities						
Poor/fair	27.1%	40.9%	58.0%	43.2%	44.2%	<b>0.0002</b>
Good	54.6%	43.6%	33.9%	46.0%	44.3%	
Excellent	18.3%	15.5%	8.1%	10.8%	11.5%	
<b>Mean Score</b>	<b>2.89</b>	<b>2.69</b>	<b>2.37</b>	<b>2.58</b>	<b>2.61</b>	<b>&lt;0.0001</b>
Efforts to prevent abuse or neglect						
Poor/fair	26.2%	38.3%	59.3%	43.6%	32.2%	<b>0.0001</b>
Good	55.8%	47.7%	25.4%	43.7%	58.1%	
Excellent	18.0%	14.0%	15.3%	12.7%	9.7%	
<b>Mean Score</b>	<b>2.88</b>	<b>2.68</b>	<b>2.42</b>	<b>2.62</b>	<b>2.68</b>	<b>&lt;0.0001</b>
Availability of services that meet the needs of abused						
Poor/fair	26.0%	45.6%	64.9%	48.5%	38.6%	<b>&lt;0.0001</b>
Good	55.5%	46.5%	28.1%	42.9%	50.9%	
Excellent	18.5%	7.9%	7.0%	8.6%	10.5%	
<b>Mean Score</b>	<b>2.89</b>	<b>2.51</b>	<b>2.26</b>	<b>2.46</b>	<b>2.61</b>	<b>&lt;0.0001</b>
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Respondents from Trempealeau and Vernon Counties rated availability of quality child care significantly poorer than respondents from the other counties. Two-thirds of residents from Trempealeau rate this as fair or poor. Half of residents from Vernon County reported this. Of La Crosse and Monroe County respondents, 22-23% reported this was excellent.</li> <li>• Ability to pay for child care was rated higher by La Crosse and Houston County residents. More La Crosse County residents rated it as excellent (16%); however, over half of residents also rated it as fair or poor. Over 58% of respondents from Trempealeau rated ability to pay for child care as fair or poor.</li> <li>• La Crosse County respondents rated their community higher as a place that meets the needs of the elderly, access to help to stay in the home, a place that meets the needs of persons with disabilities, efforts to prevent abuse or neglect, and availability of services that meet the needs of abused, than respondents from other counties.</li> <li>• Over half of Trempealeau County respondents rated access to help to stay in the home, a place that meets the needs of persons with disabilities, efforts to prevent abuse or neglect, and availability of services that meet the needs of abused as fair or poor.</li> </ul>						

<b>ECONOMIC ASPECTS</b>	<b>La Crosse 435 (55.4%)</b>	<b>Monroe 124 (15.8%)</b>	<b>Trempealeau 69 (8.8%)</b>	<b>Vernon 90 (11.5%)</b>	<b>Houston 67 (8.5%)</b>	<b>Difference in rating by county</b>
<b>Availability of jobs with wages that offer a good standard of living</b>						
Poor/fair	51.8%	66.0%	51.6%	75.9%	69.5%	<b>0.0013</b>
Good	40.4%	27.4%	35.9%	20.5%	25.4%	
Excellent	7.8%	6.6%	12.5%	3.6%	5.1%	
<b>Mean Score</b>	<b>2.43</b>	<b>2.19</b>	<b>2.42</b>	<b>1.99</b>	<b>2.15</b>	<b>&lt;0.0001</b>
<b>Ability to meet basic needs</b>						
Poor/fair	22.5%	32.8%	31.8%	29.2%	21.5%	<b>0.0289</b>
Good	47.1%	48.7%	45.5%	51.7%	53.9%	
Excellent	30.4%	18.5%	22.7%	19.1%	24.6%	
<b>Mean Score</b>	<b>3.05</b>	<b>2.77</b>	<b>2.80</b>	<b>2.83</b>	<b>2.94</b>	<b>0.0040</b>
<b>Ability to pay for housing</b>						
Poor/fair	21.8%	31.1%	28.6%	28.7%	23.4%	0.1768
Good	48.9%	49.1%	47.6%	48.3%	43.8%	
Excellent	29.3%	19.8%	23.8%	23.0%	32.8%	
<b>Mean Score</b>	<b>3.04</b>	<b>2.82</b>	<b>2.89</b>	<b>2.89</b>	<b>2.98</b>	0.0704
<b>Availability of resources to help budget</b>						
Poor/fair	30.6%	39.6%	57.7%	40.0%	29.0%	<b>0.0017</b>
Good	54.4%	51.5%	36.5%	50.0%	58.1%	
Excellent	15.0%	8.9%	5.8%	10.0%	12.9%	
<b>Mean Score</b>	<b>2.79</b>	<b>2.61</b>	<b>2.29</b>	<b>2.57</b>	<b>2.69</b>	<b>0.0002</b>
<b>Ability to pay for education</b>						
Poor/fair	50.8%	59.8%	60.9%	67.2%	61.2%	0.123
Good	33.4%	32.9%	23.9%	26.2%	28.6%	
Excellent	15.8%	7.3%	15.2%	6.6%	10.2%	
<b>Mean Score</b>	<b>2.49</b>	<b>2.18</b>	<b>2.33</b>	<b>2.13</b>	<b>2.20</b>	<b>0.0100</b>
<b>Availability of services for people needing extra help</b>						
Poor/fair	33.3%	46.7%	48.2%	42.0%	40.7%	<b>0.0269</b>
Good	51.3%	44.6%	46.4%	52.2%	52.5%	
Excellent	15.4%	8.7%	5.4%	5.8%	6.8%	
<b>Mean Score</b>	<b>2.77</b>	<b>2.50</b>	<b>2.43</b>	<b>2.51</b>	<b>2.58</b>	<b>0.0008</b>
<b>Accessibility of convenient public transportation</b>						
Poor/fair	34.3%	72.4%	84.6%	72.4%	61.9%	<b>&lt;0.0001</b>
Good	50.8%	21.9%	11.5%	17.1%	34.9%	
Excellent	14.9%	5.7%	3.9%	10.5%	3.2%	
<b>Mean Score</b>	<b>2.71</b>	<b>1.89</b>	<b>1.52</b>	<b>1.93</b>	<b>2.13</b>	<b>&lt;0.0001</b>

Ability to pay for own vehicle						
Poor/fair	22.8%	28.9%	39.1%	27.4%	23.1%	0.083
Good	46.4%	47.1%	37.5%	50.0%	52.3%	
Excellent	30.8%	24.0%	23.4%	22.6%	24.6%	
<b>Mean Score</b>	<b>3.07</b>	<b>2.85</b>	<b>2.72</b>	<b>2.87</b>	<b>2.95</b>	<b>0.0047</b>
Efforts to reduce poverty						
Poor/fair	49.8%	65.0%	78.7%	65.0%	57.4%	0.0015
Good	43.1%	29.9%	19.7%	30.0%	39.3%	
Excellent	7.1%	5.1%	1.6%	5.0%	3.3%	
<b>Mean Score</b>	<b>2.45</b>	<b>2.16</b>	<b>2.00</b>	<b>2.15</b>	<b>2.30</b>	<b>&lt;0.0001</b>
Efforts to reduce hunger						
Poor/fair	30.2%	36.6%	54.6%	37.6%	32.8%	0.0256
Good	51.7%	51.7%	39.1%	50.6%	53.1%	
Excellent	18.1%	11.7%	6.3%	11.8%	14.1%	
<b>Mean Score</b>	<b>2.83</b>	<b>2.66</b>	<b>2.38</b>	<b>2.62</b>	<b>2.75</b>	<b>0.0003</b>
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Trempealeau County residents were more likely to rate availability of jobs with wages that offer a good standard of living as excellent compared to respondents from other counties.</li> <li>• Trempealeau County residents were more likely to rate fair or poor: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Ability to meet basic needs</li> <li>• Availability of resources to help budget</li> <li>• Availability of services for people needing extra help</li> <li>• Accessibility of convenient public transportation</li> <li>• Efforts to reduce poverty</li> <li>• Efforts to reduce hunger</li> </ul> </li> <li>• Monroe County residents rated fair or poor: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Availability of jobs with wages that offer a good standard of living</li> <li>• Ability to meet basic needs</li> <li>• Availability of services for people needing extra help</li> <li>• Accessibility of convenient public transportation</li> <li>• Efforts to reduce poverty</li> </ul> </li> <li>• Vernon County residents rated fair or poor: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Availability of jobs with wages that offer a good standard of living</li> <li>• Availability of resources to help budget</li> <li>• Availability of services for people needing extra help</li> <li>• Accessibility of convenient public transportation</li> <li>• Efforts to reduce poverty</li> </ul> </li> <li>• La Crosse County respondents were more likely to rate excellent: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Ability to meet basic needs</li> <li>• Availability of services for people needing extra help</li> <li>• Efforts to reduce hunger</li> </ul> </li> </ul>						

ISSUES IN THE COMMUNITY	La Crosse 435 (55.4%)	Monroe 124 (15.8%)	Trempealeau 69 (8.8%)	Vernon 90 (11.5%)	Houston 67 (8.5%)	Difference in rating by county
	Mean (rank)	Mean (rank)	Mean (rank)	Mean (rank)	Mean (rank)	
Hunger	2.71 (10)	2.55 (13)	2.48 (14)	2.54 (12)	2.45 (12)	0.0537
Obesity	2.81 (8)	2.88 (8)	2.72 (5)	2.86 (3)	2.75 (6)	0.7825
Tobacco Use	2.59 (13)	2.75 (11)	2.63 (9)	2.69 (8)	2.49 (10)	0.4143
Alcohol Use	3.00 (2)	2.98 (3)	2.71 (6)	2.88 (2)	2.78 (5)	0.2038
Over-the-Counter Drug Misuse	2.85 (6)	2.96 (6)	2.51 (12)	2.67 (10)	2.52 (9)	<b>0.0019</b>
Prescription Drug Misuse	2.93 (4)	3.05 (2)	2.59 (10)	2.68 (9)	2.46 (11)	<b>&lt;.0001</b>
Illegal drug use	3.36 (1)	3.34 (1)	3.07 (1)	3.02 (1)	3.03 (1)	<b>0.0005</b>
Gambling	2.06 (15)	2.26 (15)	2.07 (15)	2.15 (15)	1.83 (16)	0.0514
Risk of Losing Your Job	2.02 (16)	1.83 (17)	1.94 (16)	2.07 (17)	1.67 (17)	0.0505
Risk of Foreclosure and Bankruptcy	1.79 (18)	1.73 (18)	1.65 (19)	1.87 (18)	1.58 (18)	0.2971
Excessive Personal Debt	1.98 (17)	2.00 (16)	1.92 (17)	2.10 (16)	1.95 (15)	0.8396
Financial Problems Experienced by Local Governments	2.54 (14)	2.73 (12)	2.53 (11)	2.48 (13)	2.39 (13)	0.1583
Funding for Schools	2.73 (9)	2.79 (9)	2.76 (4)	2.74 (5)	2.82 (4)	0.9426
Identity Theft	2.92 (3)	2.98 (3)	2.94 (2)	2.79 (4)	2.86 (3)	0.6292
Sexual Abuse and Sexual Violence	2.68 (11)	2.76 (10)	2.49 (13)	2.61 (11)	2.34 (14)	<b>0.0297</b>
Bullying	2.88 (5)	2.97 (5)	2.94 (2)	2.74 (5)	3.00 (2)	0.3957
Domestic Abuse, Child Abuse, Elder Abuse	2.84 (7)	2.93 (7)	2.68 (7)	2.74 (5)	2.68 (7)	0.2349
Suicide	2.60 (12)	2.44 (14)	2.66 (8)	2.35 (14)	2.55(8)	0.1212
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Respondents from Houston County rated over the counter drug misuse, prescription drug misuse, illegal drug use and sexual abuse and violence as less of a community issue than respondents from other counties.</li> <li>• La Crosse County residents rated illegal drug use, alcohol use and identity theft as the top three issues in the community.</li> <li>• Monroe County residents rated illegal drug use, prescription drug misuse, alcohol use and identity theft as the top three issues in the community.</li> <li>• Trempealeau County residents rated illegal drug use, identity theft, bullying, and funding for schools as the top three issues in the community.</li> <li>• Vernon County residents rated illegal drug use, alcohol use, and obesity as the top three issues in the community.</li> <li>• Houston County residents rated illegal drug use, bullying, and identity theft as the top three issues in the community.</li> </ul>						

## GENDER COMPARISONS

ASPECTS OF HEALTH	Male 251 (33.6%)	Female 497 (66.4%)	Difference in rating by gender
<b>Overall health</b>			
Poor/fair	15.9%	10.1%	0.1276
Good	62.0%	64.8%	
Excellent	22.1%	25.1%	
<b>Overall mental health</b>			
Poor/fair	6.6%	6.5%	0.0094
Good	47.7%	59.1%	
Excellent	45.7%	34.4%	
<b>Overall dental health</b>			
Poor/fair	20.6%	14.0%	0.0885
Good	49.0%	54.5%	
Excellent	30.4%	31.5%	
<b>Access to health care</b>			
Poor/fair	9.3%	8.1%	0.6108
Good	33.9%	35.7%	
Excellent	56.8%	56.2%	
<b>Access to mental health care</b>			
Poor/fair	12.5%	12.1%	0.8696
Good	40.4%	43.3%	
Excellent	47.1%	44.6%	
<b>Access to dental care</b>			
Poor/fair	10.1%	10.4%	0.3647
Good	37.8%	34.9%	
Excellent	52.1%	54.7%	
<b>Access to healthy food choices</b>			
Poor/fair	8.9%	12.9%	0.6897
Good	39.1%	40.1%	
Excellent	52.0%	47.0%	
<b>Ability to pay for health care</b>			
Poor/fair	32.8%	37.1%	0.0991
Good	41.4%	44.8%	
Excellent	25.8%	18.1%	
<b>Ability to pay for mental health care</b>			
Poor/fair	38.1%	38.8%	0.0573
Good	39.3%	45.1%	
Excellent	22.6%	16.1%	

Ability to pay for dental care			
Poor/fair	36.5%	35.1%	<b>0.0341</b>
Good	40.0%	47.6%	
Excellent	23.5%	17.3%	
Ability to pay for healthy food choices			
Poor/fair	20.2%	27.2%	<b>0.0164</b>
Good	48.8%	51.5%	
Excellent	31.0%	21.3%	
Everyone have insurance (% yes)	92.6%	93.2%	0.7618
Avoid seeing a doctor in past 12 months because of cost (% yes)	18.6%	31.4%	<b>0.0002</b>
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Females rated their overall mental health lower than males. <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Males were more likely to rate their overall mental health as excellent (46%), whereas females were more likely to rate their mental health as good (59%).</li> <li>A similar number of males and females rated their overall mental health as fair/poor (6.5%).</li> </ul> </li> <li>Females rate their ability to pay for healthy food choices lower than males. <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Males were more likely to say their ability to pay for healthy food was excellent (31%) compared to 21% of females.</li> <li>Females were more likely to indicate this was good or fair/poor.</li> </ul> </li> <li>Females rated their ability to pay for dental care lower than males. <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Males were more likely to say their ability to pay for dental care was excellent (24%) compared to 17% of females that indicated this.</li> <li>Females were more likely to indicate their ability to pay for dental care was good.</li> <li>A similar number of males and females indicated their ability to pay for dental care was fair/poor (35-36%).</li> </ul> </li> <li>Females were more likely than males to report that in the past month they avoided seeing a doctor because of cost (31% reporting this, compared to 19% of males).</li> </ul>			

ASPECTS OF PUBLIC SAFETY	Male 251 (33.6%)	Female 497 (66.4%)	Difference in rating by gender
Quality of law enforcement			
Poor/fair	20.4%	16.6%	0.0876
Good	56.8%	66.1%	
Excellent	22.8%	17.3%	
Efforts to prevent crime			
Poor/fair	26.0%	22.3%	0.6782
Good	58.5%	62.1%	
Excellent	15.5%	15.6%	
Quality of emergency services			
Poor/fair	11.2%	7.4%	0.3609
Good	50.2%	52.7%	
Excellent	38.6%	39.9%	
Safety of neighborhood			
Poor/fair	12.8%	8.7%	0.1477
Good	55.3%	59.6%	
Excellent	31.9%	31.7%	

Safety of schools			
Poor/fair	10.2%	8.2%	0.3228
Good	58.2%	64.2%	
Excellent	31.6%	27.6%	
Ability to respond to major safety threats			
Poor/fair	24.1%	25.1%	<b>0.0345</b>
Good	57.6%	63.1%	
Excellent	18.3%	11.8%	
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>There were no significant differences in respondents' ratings of safety except for their community's ability to respond to safety threats.</li> <li>Females rated their community's ability to respond to safety threats lower than males. Only 12% of female respondents said this was excellent, compared to 18% of males.</li> </ul>			

ASPECTS OF EDUCATION	Male 251 (33.6%)	Female 497 (66.4%)	Difference in rating by gender
A place that meets your family's educational needs			
Poor/fair	11.8%	12.4%	0.3517
Good	48.1%	46.2%	
Excellent	40.1%	41.4%	
Birth-to-three education			
Poor/fair	23.6%	19.9%	0.6696
Good	47.9%	53.1%	
Excellent	28.5%	27.0%	
Early education opportunities			
Poor/fair	14.0%	6.8%	0.2752
Good	46.1%	56.7%	
Excellent	39.9%	36.5%	
Quality of schools - 4K-12			
Poor/fair	10.9%	8.5%	0.3318
Good	45.5%	53.1%	
Excellent	43.6%	38.4%	
Quality of higher education			
Poor/fair	9.8%	10.2%	0.4555
Good	37.3%	38.7%	
Excellent	52.9%	51.1%	
Opportunities in your job to gain knowledge or skills			
Poor/fair	35.0%	37.0%	0.8895
Good	39.7%	39.0%	
Excellent	25.3%	24.0%	

Community resources to learn new skills			
Poor/fair	32.3%	33.6%	0.5888
Good	44.0%	42.0%	
Excellent	23.7%	24.4%	
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>There were no differences in respondents' ratings of aspects of education by gender.</li> </ul>			

ASPECTS OF QUALITY OF LIFE	Male 251 (33.6%)	Female 497 (66.4%)	Difference in rating by gender
<b>Leisure time opportunities</b>			
Poor/fair	26.7%	27.6%	0.5847
Good	47.7%	51.2%	
Excellent	25.6%	21.2%	
<b>Opportunities for youth to explore interests and participate in positive activities</b>			
Poor/fair	30.5%	32.9%	0.6564
Good	52.3%	50.8%	
Excellent	17.2%	16.3%	
<b>Opportunities to enjoy fine arts and cultural experiences</b>			
Poor/fair	35.2%	35.5%	0.5133
Good	41.9%	40.9%	
Excellent	22.9%	23.6%	
<b>Physical recreation for adults</b>			
Poor/fair	21.0%	22.5%	0.806
Good	46.3%	47.7%	
Excellent	32.7%	29.8%	
<b>Safe bike routes to school or work</b>			
Poor/fair	46.1%	45.7%	0.8647
Good	38.3%	40.4%	
Excellent	15.6%	13.9%	
<b>Library services in your community</b>			
Poor/fair	15.1%	15.3%	0.4634
Good	54.7%	49.8%	
Excellent	30.2%	34.9%	
<b>Efforts to protect the natural environment</b>			
Poor/fair	34.2%	34.6%	0.4587
Good	50.2%	52.7%	
Excellent	15.6%	12.7%	
<b>Opportunities to volunteer</b>			
Poor/fair	16.4%	16.0%	0.9299
Good	51.6%	53.5%	
Excellent	32.0%	30.5%	

A place where people are treated respectfully			
Poor/fair	25.8%	33.4%	<b>0.0049</b>
Good	57.4%	56.1%	
Excellent	16.8%	10.5%	
A place where people of different cultural/racial/ethnic backgrounds are included in decision-making			
Poor/fair	37.4%	46.4%	<b>0.0085</b>
Good	49.2%	46.3%	
Excellent	13.4%	7.3%	
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Most aspects of quality of life were rated similarly between male and female respondents.</li> <li>• Female respondents rated their community lower as a place where people are treated respectfully. <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• One-third of females rated their community as fair or poor, compared to 25% of males.</li> </ul> </li> <li>• Females also rated their community lower as a place where people of different cultural/racial/ethnic backgrounds are included in decision-making. <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Of females, 46% rated their community as fair or poor, 46% rated it as good.</li> </ul> </li> </ul>			

ASPECTS OF CAREGIVING	Male 251 (33.6%)	Female 497 (66.4%)	Difference in rating by gender
Availability of quality child care			
Poor/fair	26.0%	34.0%	0.282
Good	51.2%	47.9%	
Excellent	22.8%	18.1%	
Ability to pay for child care			
Poor/fair	46.3%	60.7%	0.4472
Good	38.0%	29.4%	
Excellent	15.7%	9.9%	
A place that meets the needs of the elderly			
Poor/fair	27.7%	32.7%	<b>0.0308</b>
Good	47.2%	51.6%	
Excellent	25.1%	15.7%	
Access to help to stay in the home			
Poor/fair	34.5%	38.1%	0.1409
Good	43.8%	46.5%	
Excellent	21.7%	15.4%	
A place that meets the needs of persons with disabilities			
Poor/fair	35.8%	35.6%	0.1691
Good	44.7%	51.1%	
Excellent	19.5%	13.3%	
Efforts to prevent abuse or neglect			
Poor/fair	29.4%	36.0%	0.2273
Good	51.6%	49.8%	
Excellent	19.0%	14.2%	

Availability of services that meet the needs of abused			
Poor/fair	30.3%	39.6%	0.0858
Good	52.9%	47.9%	
Excellent	16.8%	12.5%	
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Aspects of caregiving were rated similarly by male and female respondents except the community as a place that meets the needs of the elderly.</li> <li>More males rated this as excellent (25%) compared to females (16%).</li> </ul>			

ECONOMIC ASPECTS	Male 251 (33.6%)	Female 497 (66.4%)	Difference in rating by gender
Availability of jobs with wages that offer a good standard of living			
Poor/fair	55.6%	60.0%	0.7097
Good	36.7%	33.0%	
Excellent	7.7%	7.0%	
Ability to meet basic needs			
Poor/fair	23.3%	26.1%	0.2294
Good	46.2%	50.4%	
Excellent	30.5%	23.5%	
Ability to pay for housing			
Poor/fair	21.7%	25.7%	0.4664
Good	48.3%	49.1%	
Excellent	30.0%	25.2%	
Availability of resources to help budget			
Poor/fair	30.2%	37.1%	0.0077
Good	50.7%	53.3%	
Excellent	19.1%	9.6%	
Ability to pay for education			
Poor/fair	47.3%	59.8%	0.0078
Good	34.6%	29.5%	
Excellent	18.1%	10.7%	
Availability of services for people needing extra help			
Poor/fair	34.0%	39.6%	0.3632
Good	51.6%	49.9%	
Excellent	14.4%	10.5%	
Accessibility of convenient public transportation			
Poor/fair	48.3%	51.2%	0.0293
Good	35.8%	39.7%	
Excellent	15.9%	9.1%	

Ability to pay for own vehicle			
Poor/fair	22.9%	24.5%	0.2307
Good	45.8%	49.7%	
Excellent	31.3%	25.8%	
Efforts to reduce poverty			
Poor/fair	56.4%	57.1%	0.7866
Good	36.8%	37.5%	
Excellent	6.8%	5.4%	
Efforts to reduce hunger			
Poor/fair	33.7%	34.6%	0.682
Good	53.1%	49.2%	
Excellent	13.2%	16.2%	
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• There were few differences in ratings of economic issues by gender. <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Females rated the availability of resources to help budget lower than males; 9% reported this as excellent, compared to 19% of males.</li> <li>• Females also rated the ability to pay for education lower than males; 60% rated this as fair or poor compared to 47% of males.</li> <li>• Females also rated access to convenient public transportation as lower than males; 9% rated this as excellent and 51% as fair or poor, compared to 16% of males rating it as excellent, and 48% saying it was fair or poor.</li> </ul> </li> </ul>			

ISSUES IN THE COMMUNITY	Male	Female	Difference in rating by gender
	251 (33.6%)	497 (66.4%)	
	Mean (rank)	Mean (rank)	
Hunger	2.57 (12)	2.68 (10)	0.1238
Obesity	2.70 (9)	2.87 (4)	<b>0.0185</b>
Tobacco Use	2.57 (12)	2.66 (11)	0.2039
Alcohol Use	2.82 (4)	3.00 (2)	<b>0.0316</b>
Over-the-Counter Drug Misuse	2.81 (6)	2.79 (8)	0.7710
Prescription Drug Misuse	2.86 (3)	2.86 (5)	0.9337
Illegal drug use	3.31 (1)	3.25 (1)	0.3696
Gambling	2.16 (15)	2.06 (14)	0.1713
Risk of Losing Your Job	1.94 (17)	1.97 (16)	0.7222
Risk of Foreclosure and Bankruptcy	1.73 (18)	1.77 (17)	0.6431
Excessive Personal Debt	1.95 (16)	2.01 (15)	0.4275
Financial Problems Experienced by Local Governments	2.64 (11)	2.51 (13)	0.0798
Funding for Schools	2.80 (7)	2.72 (9)	0.2746
Identity Theft	3.02 (2)	2.85 (6)	<b>0.0242</b>
Sexual Abuse and Sexual Violence	2.69 (10)	2.62 (11)	0.3443
Bullying	2.80 (7)	2.95 (3)	<b>0.0400</b>
Domestic Abuse, Child Abuse, Elder Abuse	2.82 (4)	2.82 (7)	0.9564
Suicide	2.50 (14)	2.57 (12)	0.3735
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Females rated obesity, alcohol use, and bullying as a bigger issue in the community compared to males.</li> <li>Males rated identity theft as a bigger issue in the community.</li> <li>Ranking of community issues varied between males and females. <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Males rated illegal drug use, identity theft, and prescription drug misuse as the top three issues facing the community.</li> <li>Females rated illegal drug use, alcohol use, and bullying as the top three issues facing the community.</li> </ul> </li> </ul>			

## AGE COMPARISONS

ASPECTS OF HEALTH	21-50 years 338 (45.6%)	51-64 years 192 (25.9%)	65+ years 211 (28.5%)	Difference in rating by age
<b>Overall health</b>				
Poor/fair	9.6%	12.1%	17.6%	<b>0.0014</b>
Good	61.7%	63.3%	66.2%	
Excellent	28.7%	24.6%	16.2%	
<b>Overall mental health</b>				
Poor/fair	8.9%	5.0%	4.3%	0.0549
Good	56.8%	57.8%	52.1%	
Excellent	34.3%	37.2%	43.6%	
<b>Overall dental health</b>				
Poor/fair	15.6%	18.1%	16.5%	0.8540
Good	53.8%	54.8%	49.8%	
Excellent	30.6%	27.1%	33.7%	
<b>Access to health care</b>				
Poor/fair	11.3%	8.5%	1.9%	<b>0.0006</b>
Good	39.0%	30.2%	34.1%	
Excellent	49.7%	61.3%	64.0%	
<b>Access to mental health care</b>				
Poor/fair	15.0%	14.1%	6.7%	<b>0.0254</b>
Good	44.4%	36.2%	45.4%	
Excellent	40.6%	49.7%	47.9%	
<b>Access to dental care</b>				
Poor/fair	13.3%	10.0%	5.1%	0.0573
Good	37.0%	32.2%	37.3%	
Excellent	49.7%	57.8%	57.6%	
<b>Access to healthy food choices</b>				
Poor/fair	15.8%	10.6%	6.2%	<b>0.0119</b>
Good	40.4%	35.4%	42.1%	
Excellent	43.8%	54.0%	51.7%	
<b>Ability to pay for health care</b>				
Poor/fair	40.8%	42.1%	20.4%	<b>&lt;.0001</b>
Good	43.9%	36.6%	51.0%	
Excellent	15.3%	21.3%	28.6%	
<b>Ability to pay for mental health care</b>				
Poor/fair	41.0%	42.2%	31.2%	<b>0.0167</b>
Good	44.5%	37.5%	46.2%	
Excellent	14.5%	20.3%	22.6%	

Ability to pay for dental care				
Poor/fair	38.0%	40.4%	25.9%	<b>0.0039</b>
Good	44.4%	38.9%	52.9%	
Excellent	17.6%	20.7%	21.2%	
Ability to pay for healthy food choices				
Poor/fair	31.4%	30.3%	10.0%	<b>&lt;.0001</b>
Good	49.9%	44.4%	56.5%	
Excellent	18.7%	25.3%	33.5%	
Everyone have insurance (% yes)	91.0%	94.4%	95.7%	0.0744
Avoid seeing a doctor in past 12 months because of cost (% yes)	38.6%	28.1%	7.6%	<b>&lt;.0001</b>
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Older adult respondents were more likely to rate their overall health as fair or poor than those under age 65, although they did not differ from the younger respondents on their rating of their overall dental or mental health care.</li> <li>Older adult respondents were more likely to rate most aspects of health more positively.</li> <li>Access to health care was rated higher among those 65+ and lowest among those 21-50 years.</li> <li>Access to mental health care was rated higher by those over age 65 (93% said it was good or excellent); 15% of those under age 65 rate their access to mental health care as fair or poor.</li> <li>Access to healthy food choices was rated highest among those ages 51-64 years and lowest among those 21-50 years.</li> <li>Those respondents over age 65 were more likely to say their ability to pay for healthy food choices was good or excellent. Nearly one-third of adults under age 65 stated that their ability to pay for healthy food choices was fair or poor. Only 10% of respondents over age 65 indicated this.</li> <li>Younger respondents (under age 65) all rated their ability to pay for health care, dental care and mental health care lower than those over age 65.</li> <li>Younger respondents were more likely to report avoiding care due to cost (37% reported this) compared to 8% of adults over age 65.</li> </ul>				

ASPECTS OF PUBLIC SAFETY	21-50 years 338 (45.6%)	51-64 years 192 (25.9%)	65+ years 211 (28.5%)	Difference in rating by age
Quality of law enforcement				
Poor/fair	21.2%	19.2%	11.3%	<b>0.0037</b>
Good	60.8%	67.2%	62.3%	
Excellent	18.0%	13.6%	26.4%	
Efforts to prevent crime				
Poor/fair	26.8%	25.2%	15.7%	<b>0.001</b>
Good	58.9%	65.2%	61.1%	
Excellent	14.3%	9.6%	23.2%	
Quality of emergency services				
Poor/fair	8.8%	10.1%	6.2%	<b>0.0046</b>
Good	57.4%	53.0%	42.9%	
Excellent	33.8%	36.9%	50.9%	

Safety of neighborhood				
Poor/fair	11.9%	12.7%	5.2%	0.0605
Good	59.4%	53.5%	60.5%	
Excellent	28.7%	33.8%	34.3%	
Safety of schools				
Poor/fair	12.2%	9.3%	2.4%	0.0035
Good	59.7%	59.8%	69.6%	
Excellent	28.1%	30.9%	28.0%	
Ability to respond to major safety threats				
Poor/fair	27.0%	29.2%	16.9%	0.0999
Good	58.9%	58.5%	67.6%	
Excellent	14.1%	12.3%	15.5%	
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Respondents over the age of 65 rated most quality of public safety aspects higher than younger respondents.</li> <li>• Of respondents over age 65, 26% rated quality of law enforcement as excellent compared to 13 to 18% of those younger than 65.</li> <li>• Of older adults, 23% rated efforts to prevent crime as excellent compared to 9 to 14% of younger adults.</li> <li>• Over half of adults over age 65 rated the quality of emergency services as excellent compared to one third of younger adults.</li> <li>• Respondents 21 to 50 years of age were more likely to rate safety of schools as fair or poor (12%) than older adults.</li> </ul>				

ASPECTS OF EDUCATION	21-50 years 338 (45.6%)	51-64 years 192 (25.9%)	65+ years 211 (28.5%)	Difference in rating by age
A place that meets your family's educational needs				
Poor/fair	13.0%	12.7%	9.6%	0.463
Good	43.5%	51.6%	50.7%	
Excellent	43.5%	35.7%	39.7%	
Birth-to-three education				
Poor/fair	23.1%	26.7%	15.1%	0.1788
Good	49.8%	45.8%	57.6%	
Excellent	27.1%	27.5%	27.3%	
Early education opportunities				
Poor/fair	13.8%	13.0%	7.3%	0.3384
Good	46.7%	50.4%	57.4%	
Excellent	39.5%	36.6%	35.3%	
Quality of schools - 4K-12				
Poor/fair	13.1%	8.4%	4.4%	0.0404
Good	46.0%	53.9%	53.9%	
Excellent	40.9%	37.7%	41.7%	
Quality of higher education				
Poor/fair	12.3%	9.0%	7.8%	0.2936
Good	39.2%	40.1%	33.5%	
Excellent	48.5%	50.9%	58.7%	

Opportunities in your job to gain knowledge or skills				
Poor/fair	37.1%	40.5%	31.1%	0.7738
Good	37.4%	37.8%	44.6%	
Excellent	25.5%	21.7%	24.3%	
Community resources to learn new skills				
Poor/fair	36.4%	37.2%	25.3%	0.0026
Good	45.5%	37.8%	40.8%	
Excellent	18.1%	25.0%	33.9%	
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>There were only minor differences in how respondents of different ages rated educational aspects.</li> <li>Respondents 21 to 50 years rated the quality of schools (4K-12) lower than older adults; 13% rated it as fair or poor compared to 8% of adults 51 to 64 years, and 4% of adults of 65 years. Although those 21 to 50 years old were more likely to rate it as fair or poor, they were equally as likely to say it was excellent as other respondents.</li> <li>Respondents under age 65 were more likely to rate community resources to learn new skills as fair or poor, over 35% indicating this. One-third of adults over age 65 said this was excellent. This might be reflective of who is more likely to use these resources.</li> </ul>				

ASPECTS OF QUALITY OF LIFE	21-50 years 338 (45.6%)	51-64 years 192 (25.9%)	65+ years 211 (28.5%)	Difference in rating by age
Leisure time opportunities				
Poor/fair	31.4%	28.3%	21.4%	0.0730
Good	49.3%	44.4%	54.0%	
Excellent	19.3%	27.3%	24.6%	
Opportunities for youth to explore interests and participate in positive activities				
Poor/fair	34.6%	36.4%	24.5%	0.0486
Good	49.3%	44.1%	60.3%	
Excellent	16.1%	19.5%	15.2%	
Opportunities to enjoy fine arts and cultural experiences				
Poor/fair	42.4%	39.1%	21.8%	<0.0001
Good	38.3%	39.1%	47.4%	
Excellent	19.3%	21.8%	30.8%	
Physical recreation for adults				
Poor/fair	21.9%	24.4%	21.9%	0.4211
Good	49.9%	42.6%	44.3%	
Excellent	28.2%	33.0%	33.8%	
Safe bike routes to school or work				
Poor/fair	46.7%	51.8%	36.7%	0.0133
Good	40.0%	31.8%	48.8%	
Excellent	13.3%	16.4%	14.5%	
Library services in your community				
Poor/fair	19.0%	15.5%	9.1%	0.008
Good	50.6%	54.6%	48.8%	
Excellent	30.4%	29.9%	42.1%	

Efforts to protect the natural environment				
Poor/fair	38.0%	38.4%	25.9%	<b>0.0484</b>
Good	49.6%	48.0%	58.7%	
Excellent	12.4%	13.6%	15.4%	
Opportunities to volunteer				
Poor/fair	16.8%	17.8%	14.4%	0.4342
Good	56.2%	49.0%	50.2%	
Excellent	27.0%	33.2%	35.4%	
A place where people are treated respectfully				
Poor/fair	36.9%	33.6%	19.0%	<b>0.0004</b>
Good	53.9%	53.1%	64.8%	
Excellent	9.2%	13.3%	16.2%	
A place where people of different cultural/racial/ethnic backgrounds are included in decision-making				
Poor/fair	45.9%	48.7%	34.1%	<b>0.0012</b>
Good	46.2%	43.0%	54.2%	
Excellent	7.9%	8.3%	11.7%	
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• There were many significant differences by age in ratings of aspects of quality of life in the community. <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Respondents over age 65 rated opportunities for youth to explore interests and participate in positive activities higher than younger adults.</li> <li>• Respondents over age 65 rated opportunities to enjoy fine arts and cultural experiences higher than younger adults; 42% of adults under age 50 indicated this was fair or poor.</li> <li>• Respondents over age 65 rated safe bike routes to school or work higher than younger adults; 52% of adults ages 51 to 64 indicated this was fair or poor, and 47% of adults under age 50 indicated this.</li> <li>• Older adults rated the library services in their community higher than younger adults.</li> <li>• Older adults rated the efforts to protect the natural environment higher than younger adults.</li> <li>• Adults over age 65 rated the community higher as a place where people are treated respectfully compared to younger adult respondents; 19% of adults over age 65 indicated this was fair or poor compared to 33-36% of younger adults.</li> <li>• Similarly, older adults rated their community higher as a place where people of different cultural/racial/ethnic backgrounds are included in decision-making than younger adults.</li> </ul> </li> </ul>				

ASPECTS OF CAREGIVING	21-50 years 338 (45.6%)	51-64 years 192 (25.9%)	65+ years 211 (28.5%)	Difference in rating by age
Availability of quality child care				
Poor/fair	31.8%	33.7%	24.3%	0.7366
Good	46.6%	47.7%	58.6%	
Excellent	21.6%	18.6%	17.1%	
Ability to pay for child care				
Poor/fair	44.6%	56.5%	52.3%	0.4233
Good	41.7%	31.9%	40.9%	
Excellent	13.7%	11.6%	6.8%	

A place that meets the needs of the elderly				
Poor/fair	31.3%	34.4%	25.8%	0.3288
Good	50.9%	48.6%	50.8%	
Excellent	17.8%	17	23.4%	
Access to help to stay in the home				
Poor/fair	38.2%	38.4%	31.9%	0.122
Good	48.9%	42.7%	45.2%	
Excellent	12.9%	18.9%	22.9%	
A place that meets the needs of persons with disabilities				
Poor/fair	35.1%	38.9%	32.1%	0.1541
Good	53.0%	45.5%	48.4%	
Excellent	11.9%	15.6%	19.5%	
Efforts to prevent abuse or neglect				
Poor/fair	32.2%	36.4%	31.3%	0.4915
Good	53.7%	47.7%	50.6%	
Excellent	14.1%	15.9%	18.1%	
Availability of services that meet the needs of abused				
Poor/fair	34.5%	39.2%	33.9%	0.723
Good	50.8%	49.1%	51.2%	
Excellent	14.7%	11.7%	14.9%	
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>There were no differences in ratings of aspects of caregiving in the community by age.</li> </ul>				

ECONOMIC ASPECTS	21-50 years 338 (45.6%)	51-64 years 192 (25.9%)	65+ years 211 (28.5%)	Difference in rating by age
Availability of jobs with wages that offer a good standard of living				
Poor/fair	52.9%	63.2%	64.9%	0.0525
Good	39.5%	28.4%	31.3%	
Excellent	7.6%	8.4%	3.8%	
Ability to meet basic needs				
Poor/fair	27.8%	31.0%	14.9%	0.0056
Good	48.6%	41.6%	56.7%	
Excellent	23.6%	27.4%	28.4%	
Ability to pay for housing				
Poor/fair	26.6%	28.9%	15.9%	0.0066
Good	49.3%	43.2%	54.3%	
Excellent	24.1%	27.9%	29.8%	

Availability of resources to help budget				
Poor/fair	38.8%	41.5%	20.8%	<b>0.0015</b>
Good	50.6%	45.1%	62.4%	
Excellent	10.6%	13.4%	16.8%	
Ability to pay for education				
Poor/fair	56.6%	58.2%	47.6%	0.1200
Good	32.9%	26.0%	36.9%	
Excellent	10.5%	15.8%	15.5%	
Availability of services for people needing extra help				
Poor/fair	40.1%	42.3%	29.3%	0.0853
Good	50.2%	47.0%	54.5%	
Excellent	9.7%	10.7%	16.2%	
Accessibility of convenient public transportation				
Poor/fair	51.8%	58.7%	40.9%	<b>0.0055</b>
Good	38.9%	33.7%	41.4%	
Excellent	9.3%	7.6%	17.7%	
Ability to pay for own vehicle				
Poor/fair	26.3%	30.1%	13.2%	<b>0.0023</b>
Good	49.4%	43.4%	52.5%	
Excellent	24.3%	26.5%	34.3%	
Efforts to reduce poverty				
Poor/fair	59.5%	67.2%	43.1%	<b>0.0002</b>
Good	34.0%	29.6%	50.8%	
Excellent	6.5%	3.2%	6.1%	
Efforts to reduce hunger				
Poor/fair	34.8%	38.7%	28.7%	0.3563
Good	49.3%	48.2%	56.9%	
Excellent	15.9%	13.1%	14.4%	
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Younger respondents rated several economic aspects poorer than older respondents. <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Younger adults rated the ability to meet basic needs lower than older adults.</li> <li>• Younger adults were more likely to indicate ability to pay for housing was fair or poor compared to older adults.</li> <li>• Younger adults were more likely to rate as fair or poor the availability of resources to help budget.</li> <li>• Younger adults were more likely to rate the accessibility of convenient public transportation as fair or poor (52% to 59%) compared to adults over age 65 (41%).</li> <li>• Younger adults rated lower their ability to pay for their own vehicle than older adults.</li> <li>• Younger adults rated lower efforts to reduce poverty, compared to older adults; 67% of adults age 51 to 64 indicated this was fair or poor compared to 60% of adults age 21 to 50, and 43% of adults over age 65.</li> </ul> </li> </ul>				

<b>ISSUES IN THE COMMUNITY</b>	<b>21-50 years 338 (45.6%)</b>	<b>51-64 years 192 (25.9%)</b>	<b>65+ years 211 (28.5%)</b>	<b>Difference in rating by age</b>
	<b>Mean (rank)</b>	<b>Mean (rank)</b>	<b>Mean (rank)</b>	
Hunger	2.50 (10)	2.70 (10)	2.74 (12)	<b>0.0039</b>
Obesity	2.81 (3)	2.74 (9)	2.88 (8)	0.3416
Tobacco Use	2.46 (12)	2.64 (12)	2.87 (9)	<b>&lt;.0001</b>
Alcohol Use	2.80 (4)	2.93 (3)	3.11 (3)	<b>0.0015</b>
Over-the-Counter Drug Misuse	2.64 (7)	2.86 (7)	2.96 (5)	<b>0.0004</b>
Prescription Drug Misuse	2.76 (5)	2.93 (3)	2.93 (7)	0.0558
Illegal drug use	3.14 (1)	3.34 (1)	3.36 (1)	<b>0.007</b>
Gambling	1.87 (17)	2.12 (15)	2.41 (15)	<b>&lt;.0001</b>
Risk of Losing Your Job	2.04 (16)	2.11 (16)	1.66 (17)	<b>&lt;.0001</b>
Risk of Foreclosure and Bankruptcy	1.87 (17)	1.74 (18)	1.60 (18)	<b>0.0046</b>
Excessive Personal Debt	2.17 (15)	2.00 (17)	1.68 (16)	<b>&lt;.0001</b>
Financial Problems Experienced by Local Governments	2.46 (12)	2.56 (14)	2.67 (14)	0.0503
Funding for Schools	2.63 (8)	2.83 (8)	2.86 (10)	<b>0.0096</b>
Identity Theft	2.62 (9)	3.13 (2)	3.15 (2)	<b>&lt;.0001</b>
Sexual Abuse and Sexual Violence	2.47 (11)	2.69 (11)	2.83 (11)	<b>&lt;.0001</b>
Bullying	2.82 (2)	2.87 (6)	2.99 (4)	0.1533
Domestic Abuse, Child Abuse, Elder Abuse	2.65 (6)	2.92 (5)	2.96 (5)	<b>&lt;.0001</b>
Suicide	2.41 (14)	2.58 (13)	2.70 (13)	<b>0.0030</b>
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Adults over age 65 rated hunger, tobacco use, alcohol use, over-the-counter drug misuse, illegal drug use, gambling, funding for schools, identity theft, sexual abuse and violence, domestic, child, and elder abuse, and suicide as greater community issues than younger adults.</li> <li>• Adults less than 65 rated risk of losing your job, risk of foreclosure and bankruptcy, and excessive personal debt as greater community issues than older adults.</li> <li>• Ranking of community issues varied by age. <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Respondents age 21 to 50 rated illegal drug use, bullying, and obesity as the top three issues facing the community.</li> <li>• Respondents age 51 to 64 rated illegal drug use, identity theft, and prescription drug misuse as the top three issues facing the community.</li> <li>• Respondents over the age of 65 rated illegal drug use, identity theft, and alcohol use as the top three issues facing the community.</li> </ul> </li> </ul>				

## EDUCATION COMPARISONS

ASPECTS OF HEALTH	High School grad or less 199 (25.6%)	Some college/voc. 230 (29.5%)	College or adv. degree 350 (44.9%)	Difference in rating by education
<b>Overall health</b>				
Poor/fair	15.6%	17.3%	7.7%	<b>&lt;0.0001</b>
Good	68.8%	68.5%	56.5%	
Excellent	15.6%	14.2%	35.8%	
<b>Overall mental health</b>				
Poor/fair	7.5%	7.7%	6.6%	<b>0.0035</b>
Good	60.0%	62.7%	47.4%	
Excellent	32.5%	29.6%	46.0%	
<b>Overall dental health</b>				
Poor/fair	26.1%	21.5%	7.4%	<b>&lt;0.0001</b>
Good	54.3%	56.9%	48.6%	
Excellent	19.6%	21.6%	44.0%	
<b>Access to health care</b>				
Poor/fair	10.6%	10.7%	6.3%	<b>&lt;0.0001</b>
Good	45.2%	34.8%	29.6%	
Excellent	44.2%	54.5%	64.1%	
<b>Access to mental health care</b>				
Poor/fair	15.1%	14.6%	12.2%	<b>0.0002</b>
Good	49.7%	45.0%	35.4%	
Excellent	35.2%	40.4%	52.4%	
<b>Access to dental care</b>				
Poor/fair	13.1%	12.0%	8.0%	<b>&lt;0.0001</b>
Good	43.2%	39.9%	28.6%	
Excellent	43.7%	48.1%	63.4%	
<b>Access to healthy food choices</b>				
Poor/fair	14.6%	14.3%	8.0%	<b>0.0002</b>
Good	47.7%	42.4%	34.2%	
Excellent	37.7%	43.3%	57.8%	
<b>Ability to pay for health care</b>				
Poor/fair	41.4%	47.4%	25.2%	<b>&lt;0.0001</b>
Good	47.0%	36.6%	46.1%	
Excellent	11.6%	16.0%	28.7%	
<b>Ability to pay for mental health care</b>				
Poor/fair	47.1%	50.2%	27.0%	<b>&lt;0.0001</b>
Good	42.0%	37.1%	46.9%	
Excellent	10.9%	12.7%	26.1%	

Ability to pay for dental care				
Poor/fair	46.4%	44.8%	24.6%	<b>&lt;0.0001</b>
Good	45.0%	41.7%	46.3%	
Excellent	8.6%	13.5%	29.1%	
Ability to pay for healthy food choices				
Poor/fair	29.4%	36.4%	16.0%	<b>&lt;0.0001</b>
Good	53.3%	46.4%	50.6%	
Excellent	17.3%	17.2%	33.4%	
Everyone have insurance (% yes)	91.4%	90.5%	95.7%	<b>0.0304</b>
Avoid seeing a doctor in past 12 months because of cost (% yes)	24.6%	37.0%	22.0%	<b>0.0008</b>
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>In general, respondents with lower educational attainment rated all aspects of health lower than those with some post-secondary education.</li> <li>Those with some college or vocational training rated all aspects of health lower than those with a college or advanced degree. <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Those with some college/vocational training rated the overall mental health about the same as those with less education. Only 30% rated their mental health as excellent compared to 33% of those with less education, and 46% of those with more education.</li> <li>Those with some college/vocational training rated their overall health similarly to those with less education.</li> </ul> </li> <li>Those respondents with less education (less than a college degree) were less likely to report that everyone in the household has health insurance.</li> <li>Those with some college or vocational training were more likely to report avoiding care in the past 12 months due to cost; 37% reported this versus those with less education (25%) or those with more education (22%).</li> </ul>				

ASPECTS OF PUBLIC SAFETY	High School grad or less 199 (25.6%)	Some college/voc. 230 (29.5%)	College or adv. degree 350 (44.9%)	Difference in rating by education
Quality of law enforcement				
Poor/fair	21.7%	21.8%	14.6%	0.0555
Good	57.6%	63.7%	64.4%	
Excellent	20.7%	14.5%	21.0%	
Efforts to prevent crime				
Poor/fair	23.2%	25.7%	23.3%	0.4918
Good	61.6%	61.4%	59.4%	
Excellent	15.2%	12.9%	17.3%	
Quality of emergency services				
Poor/fair	7.6%	11.2%	8.0%	0.5940
Good	49.0%	53.2%	52.9%	
Excellent	43.4%	35.6%	39.1%	

Safety of neighborhood				
Poor/fair	10.6%	13.3%	8.1%	<b>0.0009</b>
Good	64.0%	62.2%	52.0%	
Excellent	25.4%	24.5%	39.9%	
Safety of schools				
Poor/fair	5.1%	13.0%	8.1%	<b>0.0073</b>
Good	71.3%	62.3%	58.1%	
Excellent	23.6%	24.7%	33.8%	
Ability to respond to major safety threats				
Poor/fair	20.6%	29.7%	25.0%	0.2840
Good	64.4%	56.3%	61.6%	
Excellent	15.0%	14.0%	13.4%	
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Respondents with college or advanced degree rated the safety of the neighborhood higher than those with less than a college degree.</li> <li>• Of respondents with a college degree, 40% rated the safety of their neighborhood as excellent compared to 25% of those with less education.</li> <li>• Those respondents with a college degree were also more likely to rate the safety of the schools as excellent compared to only 24% of those with less education.</li> </ul>				

ASPECTS OF EDUCATION	High School grad or less 199 (25.6%)	Some college/voc. 230 (29.5%)	College or adv. degree 350 (44.9%)	Difference in rating by education
A place that meets your family's educational needs				
Poor/fair	16.1%	14.6%	10.0%	<b>0.0005</b>
Good	55.2%	51.9%	40.0%	
Excellent	28.7%	33.5%	50.0%	
Birth-to-three education				
Poor/fair	22.6%	27.2%	18.1%	0.093
Good	54.0%	49.4%	50.0%	
Excellent	23.4%	23.4%	31.9%	
Early education opportunities				
Poor/fair	10.7%	12.3%	12.3%	<b>0.0149</b>
Good	55.3%	59.5%	42.5%	
Excellent	34.0%	28.2%	45.2%	
Quality of schools - 4K-12				
Poor/fair	12.3%	11.5%	7.2%	0.0681
Good	51.3%	55.5%	46.9%	
Excellent	36.4%	33.0%	45.9%	
Quality of higher education				
Poor/fair	13.0%	11.6%	8.0%	<b>&lt;.0001</b>
Good	45.6%	43.2%	31.3%	
Excellent	41.4%	45.2%	60.7%	

Opportunities in your job to gain knowledge or skills				
Poor/fair	41.2%	40.9%	33.1%	0.2004
Good	41.9%	34.4%	40.1%	
Excellent	16.9%	24.7%	26.8%	
Community resources to learn new skills				
Poor/fair	32.3%	38.7%	31.5%	0.0495
Good	45.5%	38.2%	43.4%	
Excellent	22.2%	23.1%	25.1%	
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Those with a higher level of education were more likely to rate aspects of education higher.</li> <li>50% rated a place that meets your family's educational needs as excellent (compared to 29-34% of less educated)</li> <li>45% rated early education opportunities as excellent (compared to 28-34% of less educated)</li> <li>61% rated quality of higher education as excellent (compared to 41-45% of less educated)</li> <li>25% rated community resources to learn new skills as excellent (compared to 22-23% of less educated)</li> </ul>				

ASPECTS OF QUALITY OF LIFE	High School grad or less 199 (25.6%)	Some college/voc. 230 (29.5%)	College or adv. degree 350 (44.9%)	Difference in rating by education
Leisure time opportunities				
Poor/fair	31.0%	33.2%	22.5%	<.0001
Good	48.7%	50.0%	49.9%	
Excellent	20.3%	16.8%	27.6%	
Opportunities for youth to explore interests and participate in positive activities				
Poor/fair	33.8%	38.9%	27.5%	0.0157
Good	51.8%	48.5%	51.9%	
Excellent	14.4%	12.6%	20.6%	
Opportunities to enjoy fine arts and cultural experiences				
Poor/fair	42.6%	38.2%	30.5%	<.0001
Good	43.2%	44.2%	38.2%	
Excellent	14.2%	17.6%	31.3%	
Physical recreation for adults				
Poor/fair	31.3%	28.7%	14.3%	<.0001
Good	47.2%	48.5%	44.4%	
Excellent	21.5%	22.8%	41.3%	
Safe bike routes to school or work				
Poor/fair	41.5%	47.7%	47.4%	0.735
Good	44.0%	38.6%	37.9%	
Excellent	14.5%	13.7%	14.7%	
Library services in your community				
Poor/fair	12.3%	17.3%	15.5%	0.0039
Good	56.1%	58.0%	44.3%	
Excellent	31.6%	24.7%	40.2%	

Efforts to protect the natural environment				
Poor/fair	32.0%	35.6%	36.4%	0.2572
Good	52.8%	52.4%	50.4%	
Excellent	15.2%	12.0%	13.2%	
Opportunities to volunteer				
Poor/fair	16.8%	19.1%	13.7%	0.0069
Good	55.8%	55.7%	49.6%	
Excellent	27.4%	25.2%	36.7%	
A place where people are treated respectfully				
Poor/fair	29.1%	32.5%	31.6%	0.0364
Good	54.1%	59.7%	55.6%	
Excellent	16.8%	7.8%	12.8%	
A place where people of different cultural/racial/ethnic backgrounds are included in decision-making				
Poor/fair	37.9%	43.2%	46.9%	0.0304
Good	52.1%	48.9%	43.6%	
Excellent	10.0%	7.9%	9.5%	
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Those with a higher level of education were more likely to rate aspects of quality of life higher than those with less education. Those with a college or advanced degree: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>28% indicated leisure time opportunities were excellent (compared to 17-20% with less education).</li> <li>20% indicated opportunities for youth to explore interests and participate in positive activities as excellent (compared to 13-14% with less education).</li> <li>31% rated excellent opportunities to enjoy fine arts and cultural experiences (compared to 14-17% with less education stating this).</li> <li>41% indicated physical recreation for adults was excellent (compared to 22% of those with less education).</li> <li>40% indicated the library services were excellent compare to 25-30% of those with less education.</li> <li>37% rated opportunities to volunteer as excellent (compared to 25-27% of those with less education).</li> </ul> </li> <li>Those with a high school degree or less were more likely to rate their community as a place where people were treated respectfully as excellent (17%) and rated higher the community as a place where people of different cultural/racial/ethnic backgrounds are included in decision-making.</li> </ul>				

ASPECTS OF CAREGIVING	High School grad or less 199 (25.6%)	Some college/voc. 230 (29.5%)	College or adv. degree 350 (44.9%)	Difference in rating by education
Availability of quality child care				
Poor/fair	27.7%	36.1%	30.8%	0.4824
Good	53.5%	43.7%	50.0%	
Excellent	18.8%	20.2%	19.2%	
Ability to pay for child care				
Poor/fair	52.0%	58.6%	41.0%	0.0513
Good	37.3%	33.3%	43.6%	
Excellent	10.7%	8.1%	15.4%	

A place that meets the needs of the elderly				
Poor/fair	28.7%	34.8%	30.2%	<b>0.0037</b>
Good	46.3%	46.6%	54.7%	
Excellent	25.0%	18.6%	15.1%	
Access to help to stay in the home				
Poor/fair	38.5%	41.7%	32.4%	<b>0.0323</b>
Good	39.1%	42.3%	52.7%	
Excellent	22.4%	16.0%	14.9%	
A place that meets the needs of persons with disabilities				
Poor/fair	38.4%	41.5%	30.1%	<b>0.0073</b>
Good	41.8%	43.5%	57.4%	
Excellent	19.8%	15.0%	12.5%	
Efforts to prevent abuse or neglect				
Poor/fair	34.0%	39.9%	29.3%	<b>0.0463</b>
Good	45.3%	46.0%	57.1%	
Excellent	20.7%	14.1%	13.6%	
Availability of services that meet the needs of abused				
Poor/fair	37.4%	38.3%	34.5%	0.1704
Good	46.2%	46.8%	53.8%	
Excellent	16.4%	14.9%	11.7%	
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Those with a high school diploma or less were more likely to rate as excellent their community as a place that meets the needs of the elderly; 25% indicated this compared to 15-18% of recipients of higher education.</li> <li>Those with less education were also more likely to rate as excellent help to stay in the home; 22% indicated this compared to 15-16% of recipients of higher education.</li> <li>Those with less education were more likely to rate as excellent their community as a place that meets the needs of persons with disabilities; 20% rated this as excellent compared to 13-15% of recipients of higher education</li> <li>Those with a high school diploma or less education were more likely to rate as excellent efforts to prevent abuse or neglect. They were, however, also more likely to say this was fair or poor.</li> </ul>				

ECONOMIC ASPECTS	High School grad or less 199 (25.6%)	Some college/voc. 230 (29.5%)	College or adv. degree 350 (44.9%)	Difference in rating by education
Availability of jobs with wages that offer a good standard of living				
Poor/fair	66.3%	61.9%	52.6%	<b>0.0007</b>
Good	28.8%	33.7%	37.0%	
Excellent	4.9%	4.4%	10.4%	
Ability to meet basic needs				
Poor/fair	31.3%	33.9%	17.5%	<b>&lt;.0001</b>
Good	56.8%	48.0%	43.7%	
Excellent	11.9%	18.1%	38.8%	

Ability to pay for housing				
Poor/fair	29.0%	35.9%	15.2%	<b>&lt;.0001</b>
Good	58.7%	43.6%	45.8%	
Excellent	12.3%	20.5%	39.0%	
Availability of resources to help budget				
Poor/fair	37.4%	38.9%	41.2%	<b>0.0002</b>
Good	56.0%	51.5%	40.2%	
Excellent	6.6%	9.6%	18.6%	
Ability to pay for education				
Poor/fair	68.1%	66.7%	43.5%	<b>&lt;.0001</b>
Good	27.6%	26.2%	36.2%	
Excellent	4.3%	7.1%	20.3%	
Availability of services for people needing extra help				
Poor/fair	43.9%	46.5%	29.4%	<b>0.0006</b>
Good	44.6%	45.0%	56.6%	
Excellent	11.5%	8.5%	14.0%	
Accessibility of convenient public transportation				
Poor/fair	51.4%	49.0%	51.5%	0.7097
Good	34.9%	41.3%	37.8%	
Excellent	13.7%	9.7%	10.7%	
Ability to pay for own vehicle				
Poor/fair	29.2%	35.0%	14.9%	<b>&lt;.0001</b>
Good	56.0%	41.7%	48.3%	
Excellent	14.8%	23.3%	36.8%	
Efforts to reduce poverty				
Poor/fair	57.4%	62.2%	53.7%	<b>0.0359</b>
Good	38.6%	32.7%	39.4%	
Excellent	4.0%	5.1%	6.9%	
Efforts to reduce hunger				
Poor/fair	37.3%	40.1%	29.1%	<b>0.0216</b>
Good	51.7%	47.8%	52.1%	
Excellent	11.0%	12.1%	18.8%	
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Those with a higher level of education rate most economic aspects in the community higher than those with less education. They rated higher: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Availability of jobs with wages that offer a good standard of living</li> <li>• Ability to meet basic needs</li> <li>• Ability to pay for housing</li> <li>• Availability of resources to help budget</li> <li>• Ability to pay for education</li> <li>• Availability of services for people needing extra help</li> <li>• Ability to pay for own vehicle</li> <li>• Efforts to reduce poverty, and efforts to reduce hunger.</li> </ul> </li> <li>• There was no difference by education in rating of accessibility of convenient public transportation.</li> </ul>				

<b>ISSUES IN THE COMMUNITY</b>	<b>High School grad or less 199 (25.6%)</b>	<b>Some college/voc. 230 (29.5%)</b>	<b>College or adv. degree 350 (44.9%)</b>	<b>Difference in rating by education</b>
	<b>Mean (rank)</b>	<b>Mean (rank)</b>	<b>Mean (rank)</b>	
Hunger	2.74 (12)	2.59 (11)	2.59 (10)	0.1413
Obesity	2.78 (9)	2.68 (8)	2.93 (3)	<b>0.0068</b>
Tobacco Use	2.85 (8)	2.51 (14)	2.58 (11)	<b>0.001</b>
Alcohol Use	3.02 (5)	2.79 (4)	2.97 (2)	<b>0.0337</b>
Over-the-Counter Drug Misuse	3.04 (4)	2.66 (10)	2.74 (8)	<b>0.0002</b>
Prescription Drug Misuse	3.05 (3)	2.74 (6)	2.83 (4)	<b>0.0044</b>
Illegal drug use	3.32 (1)	3.24 (1)	3.25 (1)	0.664
Gambling	2.30 (15)	2.03 (17)	2.00 (15)	<b>0.0012</b>
Risk of Losing Your Job	2.05 (16)	2.07 (16)	1.83 (17)	<b>0.0072</b>
Risk of Foreclosure and Bankruptcy	1.88 (18)	1.89 (18)	1.61 (18)	<b>0.0002</b>
Excessive Personal Debt	2.03 (17)	2.14 (15)	1.86 (16)	<b>0.0047</b>
Financial Problems Experienced by Local Governments	2.68 (14)	2.57 (12)	2.47 (13)	0.0551
Funding for Schools	2.75 (11)	2.69 (7)	2.79 (6)	0.463
Identity Theft	3.10 (2)	3.00 (2)	2.74 (7)	<b>&lt;.0001</b>
Sexual Abuse and Sexual Violence	2.78 (9)	2.67 (9)	2.55 (12)	<b>0.0272</b>
Bullying	3.01 (6)	2.91 (3)	2.82 (5)	0.0825
Domestic Abuse, Child Abuse, Elder Abuse	3.01 (6)	2.78 (5)	2.74 (8)	<b>0.0055</b>
Suicide	2.73 (13)	2.54 (13)	2.45 (14)	<b>.0053</b>
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Those with a college or advanced degree rated the following as a bigger problem in the community than those with less education: obesity.</li> <li>• Those with a high school diploma or less rate the following as a bigger problem in the community than those with more education: tobacco use, alcohol use, over-the-counter and prescription drug misuse, gambling, risk of losing your job, risk of foreclosure, identity theft, sexual abuse and violence, domestic, child and elder abuse, and suicide.</li> <li>• Those with some college or vocational training were more like than those with higher education to rate as a significant issue: risk of losing your job, risk of foreclosure, and excessive personal debt.</li> <li>• Those with a high school diploma or less rate illegal drug use, identity theft, and prescription drug misuse as the top three issues.</li> <li>• Those with some college or vocational training rated as the top three issues in the community: illegal drug use, identity theft, and bullying.</li> <li>• Those with a college or advanced degree ranked as the top three issues: illegal drug use, alcohol use, and obesity.</li> </ul>				

## INCOME COMPARISONS

ASPECTS OF HEALTH	<\$25,000 109 (15.1%)	\$25,000-\$75,000 341 (47.3%)	\$75,000+ 271 (37.6%)	Difference in rating by income
<b>Overall health</b>				
Poor/fair	28.2%	13.1%	4.8%	<b>&lt;0.0001</b>
Good	62.7%	65.7%	60.1%	
Excellent	9.1%	21.2%	35.1%	
<b>Overall mental health</b>				
Poor/fair	14.4%	8.8%	2.6%	<b>&lt;0.0001</b>
Good	64.0%	58.1%	47.0%	
Excellent	21.6%	33.1%	50.4%	
<b>Overall dental health</b>				
Poor/fair	38.1%	19.2%	5.9%	<b>&lt;0.0001</b>
Good	44.6%	55.1%	50.0%	
Excellent	17.3%	25.7%	44.1%	
<b>Access to health care</b>				
Poor/fair	18.0%	7.6%	6.0%	<b>&lt;0.0001</b>
Good	45.1%	36.4%	28.6%	
Excellent	36.9%	56.0%	65.4%	
<b>Access to mental health care</b>				
Poor/fair	25.3%	12.8%	8.3%	<b>&lt;0.0001</b>
Good	41.1%	45.3%	36.7%	
Excellent	33.6%	41.9%	55.0%	
<b>Access to dental care</b>				
Poor/fair	26.3%	9.9%	4.8%	<b>&lt;0.0001</b>
Good	36.4%	39.5%	28.2%	
Excellent	37.3%	50.6%	67.0%	
<b>Access to healthy food choices</b>				
Poor/fair	22.9%	10.0%	7.8%	<b>&lt;0.0001</b>
Good	50.5%	42.1%	33.2%	
Excellent	26.6%	47.9%	59.0%	
<b>Ability to pay for health care</b>				
Poor/fair	57.2%	43.9%	18.6%	<b>&lt;0.0001</b>
Good	37.3%	39.8%	48.3%	
Excellent	5.5%	16.3%	33.1%	
<b>Ability to pay for mental health care</b>				
Poor/fair	62.7%	48.7%	18.5%	<b>&lt;0.0001</b>
Good	32.7%	36.7%	52.1%	
Excellent	4.6%	14.6%	29.4%	

Ability to pay for dental care				
Poor/fair	65.8%	44.0%	15.5%	<b>&lt;0.0001</b>
Good	28.8%	42.2%	51.5%	
Excellent	5.4%	13.8%	33.0%	
Ability to pay for healthy food choices				
Poor/fair	47.3%	32.3%	9.6%	<b>&lt;0.0001</b>
Good	43.6%	48.7%	52.2%	
Excellent	9.1%	19.0%	38.2%	
Everyone have insurance (% yes)	83.3%	91.8%	97.8%	<b>&lt;0.0001</b>
Avoid seeing a doctor in past 12 months because of cost (% yes)	32.4%	32.2%	20.2%	<b>0.0004</b>
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Respondents earning less than \$25,000 were more likely to rate all aspects of health lower than those earning over \$25,000.</li> <li>• Those earning between \$25,000 and \$75,000 rated all aspects of health lower than those earning more than \$75,000.</li> <li>• Those earning less than \$25,000 were more likely to report someone in the household is without health insurance (17%) compared to those earning \$25,000-75,000 (8%) and those earning more than \$75,000 (2%).</li> <li>• Those earning less than \$75,000 were more likely to report avoiding care in the past year because of cost.</li> </ul>				

ASPECTS OF PUBLIC SAFETY	<\$25,000 109 (15.1%)	\$25,000-\$75,000 341 (47.3%)	\$75,000+ 271 (37.6%)	Difference in rating by income
Quality of law enforcement				
Poor/fair	27.2%	20.7%	10.0%	<b>0.0004</b>
Good	55.5%	59.2%	70.3%	
Excellent	17.3%	20.1%	19.7%	
Efforts to prevent crime				
Poor/fair	20.9%	26.7%	20.8%	0.3341
Good	61.8%	59.2%	62.5%	
Excellent	17.3%	14.1%	16.7%	
Quality of emergency services				
Poor/fair	13.6%	8.4%	7.0%	0.2874
Good	44.6%	53.4%	52.8%	
Excellent	41.8%	38.2%	40.2%	
Safety of neighborhood				
Poor/fair	16.5%	10.0%	7.7%	<b>0.0029</b>
Good	56.0%	60.9%	53.9%	
Excellent	27.5%	29.1%	38.4%	

Safety of schools				
Poor/fair	10.1%	8.5%	7.9%	0.042
Good	66.7%	65.6%	56.3%	
Excellent	23.2%	25.9%	35.8%	
Ability to respond to major safety threats				
Poor/fair	25.5%	27.5%	21.4%	0.686
Good	58.5%	58.5%	64.4%	
Excellent	16.0%	14.0%	14.2%	
Quality of law enforcement				
Poor/fair	27.2%	20.7%	10.0%	0.0004
Good	55.5%	59.2%	70.3%	
Excellent	17.3%	20.1%	19.7%	
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Respondents with lower income rated quality of law enforcement, safety of their neighborhood, and safety of schools as poorer than those with higher education.</li> </ul>				

ASPECTS OF EDUCATION	<\$25,000 109 (15.1%)	\$25,000-\$75,000 341 (47.3%)	\$75,000+ 271 (37.6%)	Difference in rating by income
A place that meets your family's educational needs				
Poor/fair	22.8%	11.4%	9.8%	0.0006
Good	44.3%	51.9%	40.2%	
Excellent	32.9%	36.7%	50.0%	
Birth-to-three education				
Poor/fair	23.3%	20.4%	21.7%	0.5546
Good	50.7%	54.6%	46.3%	
Excellent	26.0%	25.0%	32.0%	
Early education opportunities				
Poor/fair	10.9%	11.6%	13.4%	0.2782
Good	52.1%	54.4%	43.5%	
Excellent	37.0%	34.0%	43.1%	
Quality of schools - 4K-12				
Poor/fair	15.4%	9.5%	8.9%	0.1843
Good	56.4%	48.7%	48.3%	
Excellent	28.2%	41.8%	42.8%	
Quality of higher education				
Poor/fair	15.3%	10.1%	8.6%	0.0060
Good	38.5%	40.1%	32.3%	
Excellent	46.2%	49.8%	59.1%	

Opportunities in your job to gain knowledge or skills				
Poor/fair	51.7%	41.0%	30.6%	0.0003
Good	36.2%	36.4%	40.6%	
Excellent	12.1%	22.6%	28.8%	
Community resources to learn new skills				
Poor/fair	35.7%	34.7%	30.9%	0.0853
Good	39.0%	42.3%	43.2%	
Excellent	25.3%	23.0%	25.9%	
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Respondents with lower income rated their community as a place that meets the family's educational needs lower than those with higher education.</li> <li>• Respondents with lower education also rated the quality of higher education poorer than those with higher education.</li> <li>• Finally, 52% of respondents with income less than \$25,000 rated opportunities in your job to gain knowledge or skills as fair or poor; 41% of individuals earning \$25,000-75,000 indicated this, whereas 31% of respondents indicated this.</li> </ul>				

ASPECTS OF QUALITY OF LIFE	<\$25,000 109 (15.1%)	\$25,000-\$75,000 341 (47.3%)	\$75,000+ 271 (37.6%)	Difference in rating by income
Leisure time opportunities				
Poor/fair	39.9%	30.7%	20.6%	0.0039
Good	40.7%	48.5%	52.6%	
Excellent	19.4%	20.8%	26.8%	
Opportunities for youth to explore interests and participate in positive activities				
Poor/fair	29.9%	34.2%	30.1%	0.9498
Good	53.3%	49.6%	52.4%	
Excellent	16.8%	16.2%	17.5%	
Opportunities to enjoy fine arts and cultural experiences				
Poor/fair	39.1%	36.1%	34.2%	0.1368
Good	40.9%	43.1%	37.9%	
Excellent	20.0%	20.8%	27.9%	
Physical recreation for adults				
Poor/fair	33.9%	22.0%	18.1%	0.0001
Good	45.0%	51.0%	41.3%	
Excellent	21.1%	27.0%	40.6%	
Safe bike routes to school or work				
Poor/fair	43.4%	45.0%	45.9%	0.8218
Good	41.5%	40.6%	40.4%	
Excellent	15.1%	14.4%	13.7%	

Library services in your community				
Poor/fair	16.5%	14.4%	16.6%	0.4332
Good	46.8%	54.3%	47.8%	
Excellent	36.7%	31.3%	35.6%	
Efforts to protect the natural environment				
Poor/fair	36.6%	33.2%	34.9%	0.1074
Good	45.0%	55.7%	49.3%	
Excellent	18.4%	11.1%	15.8%	
Opportunities to volunteer				
Poor/fair	25.7%	13.9%	15.1%	<.0001
Good	47.7%	58.4%	47.6%	
Excellent	26.6%	27.7%	37.3%	
A place where people are treated respectfully				
Poor/fair	40.4%	29.5%	29.8%	0.1225
Good	44.0%	59.3%	57.0%	
Excellent	15.6%	11.2%	13.2%	
A place where people of different cultural/racial/ethnic backgrounds are included in decision-making				
Poor/fair	43.0%	43.8%	44.1%	0.8882
Good	46.7%	47.2%	45.9%	
Excellent	10.3%	9.0%	10.0%	
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Respondents with a household income &lt;\$25,000 were more likely to report leisure time opportunities were fair or poor.</li> <li>• Respondents with a household income &lt;\$25,000 were more likely to rate physical recreation for adults as fair or poor.</li> <li>• Respondents earning &lt;\$25,000 were also more likely to report opportunities to volunteer was fair or poor.</li> </ul>				

ASPECTS OF CAREGIVING	<\$25,000 109 (15.1%)	\$25,000-\$75,000 341 (47.3%)	\$75,000+ 271 (37.6%)	Difference in rating by income
Availability of quality child care				
Poor/fair	33.4%	28.9%	32.5%	0.0476
Good	43.1%	54.3%	45.0%	
Excellent	23.5%	16.8%	22.5%	
Ability to pay for child care				
Poor/fair	67.5%	60.6%	29.7%	<.0001
Good	20.9%	31.4%	52.3%	
Excellent	11.6%	8.0%	18.0%	
A place that meets the needs of the elderly				
Poor/fair	34.3%	30.2%	29.7%	0.0242
Good	36.3%	51.9%	55.3%	
Excellent	29.4%	17.9%	15.0%	

Access to help to stay in the home				
Poor/fair	40.9%	38.8%	34.2%	0.0056
Good	33.3%	45.9%	51.1%	
Excellent	25.8%	15.3%	14.7%	
A place that meets the needs of persons with disabilities				
Poor/fair	45.0%	34.8%	31.9%	0.0011
Good	31.0%	52.1%	53.9%	
Excellent	24.0%	13.1%	14.2%	
Efforts to prevent abuse or neglect				
Poor/fair	35.7%	34.2%	31.5%	0.0408
Good	43.9%	50.9%	54.5%	
Excellent	20.4%	14.9%	14.0%	
Availability of services that meet the needs of abused				
Poor/fair	43.5%	36.9%	31.7%	0.2674
Good	40.2%	49.8%	54.7%	
Excellent	16.3%	13.3%	13.6%	
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Aspects of caregiving varied significantly by household income.</li> <li>Those earning less than \$25,000 were more likely to rate fair or poor: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Ability to pay for child care</li> <li>A place that meets the needs of the elderly</li> <li>Access to help to stay in the home</li> <li>A place that meets the needs of persons with disabilities</li> </ul> </li> <li>Those earning \$25,000-75,000 were more likely to rate fair or poor: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Availability of quality child care</li> <li>Ability to pay for child care</li> </ul> </li> </ul>				

ECONOMIC ASPECTS	<\$25,000 109 (15.1%)	\$25,000-\$75,000 341 (47.3%)	\$75,000+ 271 (37.6%)	Difference in rating by income
Availability of jobs with wages that offer a good standard of living				
Poor/fair	77.1%	65.3%	46.1%	<0.0001
Good	15.7%	30.1%	42.5%	
Excellent	7.2%	4.6%	11.4%	
Ability to meet basic needs				
Poor/fair	51.0%	34.1%	8.9%	<0.0001
Good	37.0%	49.2%	48.0%	
Excellent	12.0%	16.7%	43.1%	
Ability to pay for housing				
Poor/fair	49.5%	34.2%	7.2%	<0.0001
Good	38.6%	47.7%	48.9%	
Excellent	11.9%	18.1%	43.9%	

Availability of resources to help budget				
Poor/fair	50.5%	36.8%	28.4%	<b>&lt;0.0001</b>
Good	40.0%	55.3%	50.7%	
Excellent	9.5%	7.9%	20.9%	
Ability to pay for education				
Poor/fair	78.0%	65.8%	37.6%	<b>&lt;0.0001</b>
Good	19.1%	27.9%	38.1%	
Excellent	2.9%	6.3%	24.3%	
Availability of services for people needing extra help				
Poor/fair	50.0%	43.3%	28.6%	<b>&lt;0.0001</b>
Good	39.4%	45.9%	57.9%	
Excellent	10.6%	10.8%	13.5%	
Accessibility of convenient public transportation				
Poor/fair	50.5%	50.0%	52.4%	0.1546
Good	31.6%	40.3%	36.9%	
Excellent	17.9%	9.7%	10.7%	
Ability to pay for own vehicle				
Poor/fair	53.1%	28.2%	11.4%	<b>&lt;.0001</b>
Good	34.4%	50.6%	47.7%	
Excellent	12.5%	21.2%	40.9%	
Efforts to reduce poverty				
Poor/fair	66.7%	59.0%	53.7%	<b>0.0002</b>
Good	26.0%	36.6%	39.0%	
Excellent	7.3%	4.4%	7.3%	
Efforts to reduce hunger				
Poor/fair	42.8%	34.6%	30.1%	<b>0.0027</b>
Good	42.9%	53.6%	49.0%	
Excellent	14.3%	11.8%	20.9%	
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Economic aspects varied significantly by household income.</li> <li>• Those earning &lt;\$25,000 were more likely to rate fair or poor: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Availability of jobs that offer a good standard of living (77%)</li> <li>• Ability to meet the basic needs (51%)</li> <li>• Ability to pay for housing (50%)</li> <li>• Availability of resources to help budget (51%)</li> <li>• Ability to pay for education (78%)</li> <li>• Availability of services for people needing extra help (50%)</li> <li>• Ability to pay for own vehicle (53%)</li> <li>• Efforts to reduce poverty (67%)</li> <li>• Efforts to reduce hunger (43%)</li> </ul> </li> </ul>				

<b>ISSUES IN THE COMMUNITY</b>	<b>&lt;\$25,000 109 (15.1%) Mean (rank)</b>	<b>\$25,000-\$75,000 341 (47.3%) Mean (rank)</b>	<b>\$75,000+ 271 (37.6%) Mean (rank)</b>	<b>Difference in rating by income</b>
Hunger	2.83 (12)	2.65 (10)	2.56 (10)	<b>0.0362</b>
Obesity	2.91 (9)	2.80 (7)	2.82 (4)	0.5321
Tobacco Use	2.85 (11)	2.63 (12)	2.56 (10)	<b>0.0398</b>
Alcohol Use	3.21 (2)	2.93 (2)	2.84 (2)	<b>0.0047</b>
Over-the-Counter Drug Misuse	3.04 (7)	2.82 (6)	2.68 (9)	<b>0.0063</b>
Prescription Drug Misuse	3.07 (5)	2.85 (5)	2.78 (6)	<b>0.0381</b>
Illegal drug use	3.37 (1)	3.26 (1)	3.25 (1)	0.4561
Gambling	2.42 (16)	2.13 (15)	1.88 (15)	<b>&lt;.0001</b>
Risk of Losing Your Job	2.34 (17)	2.06 (16)	1.73 (17)	<b>&lt;.0001</b>
Risk of Foreclosure and Bankruptcy	2.25 (18)	1.82 (18)	1.53 (18)	<b>&lt;.0001</b>
Excessive Personal Debt	2.52 (15)	2.06 (16)	1.74 (16)	<b>&lt;.0001</b>
Financial Problems Experienced by Local Governments	2.71 (13)	2.58 (13)	2.43 (14)	<b>0.0194</b>
Funding for Schools	2.68 (14)	2.74 (9)	2.76 (7)	0.7234
Identity Theft	3.06 (6)	2.89 (3)	2.84 (3)	0.1281
Sexual Abuse and Sexual Violence	2.97 (8)	2.63 (11)	2.53 (12)	<b>0.0005</b>
Bullying	3.18 (3)	2.86 (4)	2.82 (4)	<b>0.0026</b>
Domestic Abuse, Child Abuse, Elder Abuse	3.18 (3)	2.79 (8)	2.73 (8)	<b>&lt;.0001</b>
Suicide	2.87 (10)	2.56 (14)	2.45 (13)	0.0013
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Those earning less than \$25,000 ranked most all the issues as more significant issues than other income groups: hunger, tobacco use, alcohol use, over the counter drug misuse, prescription drug misuse, gambling, risk of losing your job, risk of foreclosure and bankruptcy, excessive personal debt, financial problems experienced by local governments, sexual abuse and violence, bullying, domestic, child and elder abuse, and suicide were all rated as higher concerns.</li> <li>• Respondents earning less than \$25,000 rated illegal drug use, alcohol use, and domestic, child, and elder abuse as the top three community issues.</li> <li>• Respondents earning over \$25,000 rated illegal drug use, alcohol use, and identity theft as the top three community issues</li> </ul>				

## RACIAL COMPARISONS

ASPECTS OF HEALTH		White 740 (97.2%)	Non-White 21 (2.8%)	Difference in rating by race
<b>Overall health</b>				
	Poor/fair	12.5%	9.1%	0.2978
	Good	63.2%	68.2%	
	Excellent	24.3%	22.7%	
<b>Overall mental health</b>				
	Poor/fair	6.9%	9.1%	0.1297
	Good	55.2%	59.1%	
	Excellent	37.9%	31.8%	
<b>Overall dental health</b>				
	Poor/fair	16.5%	9.5%	0.063
	Good	52.0%	81.0%	
	Excellent	31.5%	9.5%	
<b>Access to health care</b>				
	Poor/fair	8.6%	4.5%	0.4889
	Good	35.0%	50.0%	
	Excellent	56.4%	45.5%	
<b>Access to mental health care</b>				
	Poor/fair	12.2%	25.5%	0.0190
	Good	42.8%	28.6%	
	Excellent	45.0%	45.9%	
<b>Access to dental care</b>				
	Poor/fair	10.5%	9.1%	0.6644
	Good	35.8%	31.8%	
	Excellent	53.7%	59.1%	
<b>Access to healthy food choices</b>				
	Poor/fair	11.2%	13.6%	0.5303
	Good	40.5%	27.3%	
	Excellent	48.3%	59.1%	
<b>Ability to pay for health care</b>				
	Poor/fair	35.6%	45.4%	0.5614
	Good	43.6%	45.5%	
	Excellent	20.8%	9.1%	
<b>Ability to pay for mental health care</b>				
	Poor/fair	38.7%	49.9%	0.3688
	Good	42.5%	45.5%	
	Excellent	18.8%	4.6%	

Ability to pay for dental care			
Poor/fair	35.8%	45.4%	0.1909
Good	44.5%	50.0%	
Excellent	19.7%	4.6%	
Ability to pay for healthy food choices			
Poor/fair	25.4%	31.8%	0.6562
Good	49.8%	54.6%	
Excellent	24.8%	13.6%	
Everyone have insurance (% yes)	93.0%	95.5%	0.6531
Avoid seeing a doctor in past 12 months because of cost (% yes)	27.1%	22.7%	0.8041
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>There were no differences in rating of aspects of health by race except for access to mental health care.</li> <li>Over 25% of non-white respondents rated their access to mental health care as fair or poor, compared to 12% of white respondents. Only 29% of non-white respondents indicated the access to mental health care was good compared to 43% of with respondents indicating this.</li> <li>Caution should be taken when examining these results due to the small number of non-white compared to white respondents.</li> </ul>			

ASPECTS OF PUBLIC SAFETY	White 740 (97.2%)	Non-White 21 (2.8%)	Difference in rating by race
Quality of law enforcement			
Poor/fair	18.3%	31.9%	0.2341
Good	62.7%	54.5%	
Excellent	19.0%	13.6%	
Efforts to prevent crime			
Poor/fair	23.4%	40.9%	0.2064
Good	61.2%	50.0%	
Excellent	15.4%	9.1%	
Quality of emergency services			
Poor/fair	8.8%	9.0%	0.0496
Good	52.6%	45.5%	
Excellent	38.6%	45.5%	
Safety of neighborhood			
Poor/fair	10.2%	13.7%	0.2295
Good	58.0%	72.7%	
Excellent	31.8%	13.6%	
Safety of schools			
Poor/fair	8.6%	13.6%	0.1061
Good	62.8%	68.2%	
Excellent	28.6%	18.2%	

Ability to respond to major safety threats			
Poor/fair	25.2%	30.0%	<b>0.0292</b>
Good	60.9%	55.0%	
Excellent	13.9%	15.0%	
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Slightly more non-white respondents rated the quality of emergency services as excellent compared to white respondents.</li> <li>Non-white respondents were more “polar,” Meaning more likely to rate the ability to respond to major safety threats as either fair/poor or excellent.</li> <li>Caution should be taken when examining these results due to the small number of non-white compared to white respondents.</li> </ul>			

ASPECTS OF EDUCATION	White 740 (97.2%)	Non-White 21 (2.8%)	Difference in rating by race
A place that meets your family’s educational needs			
Poor/fair	12.1%	26.3%	0.3138
Good	47.4%	42.1%	
Excellent	40.5%	31.6%	
Birth-to-three education			
Poor/fair	21.9%	11.1%	0.519
Good	51.0%	66.7%	
Excellent	27.1%	22.2%	
Early education opportunities			
Poor/fair	12.1%	0.0%	0.3814
Good	50.9%	66.7%	
Excellent	37.0%	33.3%	
Quality of schools - 4K-12			
Poor/fair	9.6%	11.1%	<b>0.0154</b>
Good	50.3%	61.1%	
Excellent	40.1%	27.8%	
Quality of higher education			
Poor/fair	10.4%	4.7%	0.6004
Good	37.8%	42.9%	
Excellent	51.8%	52.4%	
Opportunities in your job to gain knowledge or skills			
Poor/fair	37.0%	44.5%	0.6194
Good	38.5%	44.4%	
Excellent	24.5%	11.1%	
Community resources to learn new skills			
Poor/fair	34.1%	33.3%	0.9422
Good	41.8%	47.6%	
Excellent	24.1%	19.1%	

Non-white respondents were more likely to rate the quality of schools 4K-12 as good, fair or poor, than white respondents.

Caution should be taken when examining these results due to the small number of non-white compared to white respondents.

ASPECTS OF QUALITY OF LIFE	White 740 (97.2%)	Non-White 21 (2.8%)	Difference in rating by race
<b>Leisure time opportunities</b>			
Poor/fair	27.7%	31.8%	0.2403
Good	49.1%	59.1%	
Excellent	23.2%	9.1%	
<b>Opportunities for youth to explore interests and participate in positive activities</b>			
Poor/fair	32.7%	22.7%	0.3287
Good	50.5%	68.2%	
Excellent	16.8%	9.1%	
<b>Opportunities to enjoy fine arts and cultural experiences</b>			
Poor/fair	35.8%	36.3%	0.9432
Good	41.2%	45.5%	
Excellent	23.0%	18.2%	
<b>Physical recreation for adults</b>			
Poor/fair	23.6%	4.5%	0.2157
Good	46.0%	59.1%	
Excellent	30.4%	36.4%	
<b>Safe bike routes to school or work</b>			
Poor/fair	45.8%	40.9%	0.9605
Good	39.8%	45.5%	
Excellent	14.4%	13.6%	
<b>Library services in your community</b>			
Poor/fair	15.5%	9.1%	0.2458
Good	51.3%	40.9%	
Excellent	33.2%	50.0%	
<b>Efforts to protect the natural environment</b>			
Poor/fair	35.4%	27.2%	0.5057
Good	51.4%	54.6%	
Excellent	13.2%	18.2%	
<b>Opportunities to volunteer</b>			
Poor/fair	16.1%	9.1%	0.8007
Good	53.3%	59.1%	
Excellent	30.6%	31.8%	

A place where people are treated respectfully			
Poor/fair	30.8%	27.4%	0.3297
Good	57.2%	49.9%	
Excellent	12.0%	22.7%	
A place where people of different cultural/racial/ethnic backgrounds are included in decision-making			
Poor/fair	43.5%	45.5%	0.6965
Good	47.6%	40.9%	
Excellent	8.9%	13.6%	
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• There were no differences between white and non-white ratings for any of the aspects of quality of life.</li> <li>• Caution should be taken when examining these results due to the small number of non-white compared to white respondents.</li> </ul>			

ASPECTS OF CAREGIVING	White 740 (97.2%)	Non-White 21 (2.8%)	Difference in rating by race
Availability of quality child care			
Poor/fair	31.3%	30.7%	0.9779
Good	49.0%	46.2%	
Excellent	19.7%	23.1%	
Ability to pay for child care			
Poor/fair	47.9%	66.7%	0.0791
Good	40.5%	8.3%	
Excellent	11.6%	25.0%	
A place that meets the needs of the elderly			
Poor/fair	30.9%	33.4%	0.6241
Good	49.8%	57.1%	
Excellent	19.3%	9.5%	
Access to help to stay in the home			
Poor/fair	36.7%	46.7%	0.8487
Good	45.8%	40.0%	
Excellent	17.5%	13.3%	
A place that meets the needs of persons with disabilities			
Poor/fair	35.4%	50.0%	0.6338
Good	49.2%	38.9%	
Excellent	15.4%	11.1%	
Efforts to prevent abuse or neglect			
Poor/fair	33.6%	40.0%	0.4041
Good	50.6%	45.0%	
Excellent	15.8%	15.0%	

Availability of services that meet the needs of abused			
Poor/fair	36.6%	35.0%	0.8306
Good	49.7%	45.0%	
Excellent	13.7%	20.0%	
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>There were no differences between white and non-white ratings for any of the aspects of caregiving.</li> <li>Caution should be taken when examining these results due to the small number of non-white compared to white respondents.</li> </ul>			

ECONOMIC ASPECTS	White 740 (97.2%)	Non-White 21 (2.8%)	Difference in rating by race
Availability of jobs with wages that offer a good standard of living			
Poor/fair	58.8%	52.6%	0.2415
Good	34.0%	47.4%	
Excellent	7.2%	0.0%	
Ability to meet basic needs			
Poor/fair	25.4%	30.0%	0.1904
Good	48.1%	60.0%	
Excellent	26.5%	10.0%	
Ability to pay for housing			
Poor/fair	24.7%	26.3%	0.0866
Good	47.5%	68.4%	
Excellent	27.8%	5.3%	
Availability of resources to help budget			
Poor/fair	34.8%	31.5%	0.6616
Good	52.0%	63.2%	
Excellent	13.2%	5.3%	
Ability to pay for education			
Poor/fair	54.3%	83.3%	0.0685
Good	32.1%	11.1%	
Excellent	13.6%	5.6%	
Availability of services for people needing extra help			
Poor/fair	37.4%	64.7%	0.0120
Good	50.9%	35.3%	
Excellent	11.7%	0.0%	
Accessibility of convenient public transportation			
Poor/fair	51.8%	23.5%	0.0947
Good	37.1%	64.7%	
Excellent	11.1%	11.8%	

Ability to pay for own vehicle			
Poor/fair	24.5%	22.2%	0.4143
Good	47.7%	61.1%	
Excellent	27.8%	16.7%	
Efforts to reduce poverty			
Poor/fair	57.2%	65.4%	0.5344
Good	37.2%	34.6%	
Excellent	5.6%	0.0%	
Efforts to reduce hunger			
Poor/fair	34.2%	47.4%	0.5237
Good	51.0%	42.1%	
Excellent	14.8%	10.5%	
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Non-white respondents were more likely to rate the availability of services for people needing extra help as fair or poor compared to white respondents; 65% of non-white respondents indicated this compared to white respondents</li> <li>• There were no other differences between white and non-white ratings for any of the economic aspects.</li> <li>• Caution should be taken when examining these results due to the small number of non-white compared to white respondents.</li> </ul>			

ISSUES IN THE COMMUNITY	White 740 (97.2%)	Non-White 21 (2.8%)	Difference in rating by race
	Mean (rank)	Mean (rank)	
Hunger	2.62 (12)	2.73 (11)	0.5761
Obesity	2.82 (6)	2.81 (9)	0.9444
Tobacco Use	2.64 (10)	2.71 (12)	0.7194
Alcohol Use	2.92 (2)	3.41 (2)	<b>0.0204</b>
Over-the-Counter Drug Misuse	2.78 (8)	3.14 (5)	0.0947
Prescription Drug Misuse	2.85 (5)	3.18 (4)	0.1119
Illegal drug use	3.26 (1)	3.50 (1)	0.2207
Gambling	2.09 (15)	1.95 (17)	0.5177
Risk of Losing Your Job	1.94 (17)	2.43 (15)	<b>0.0306</b>
Risk of Foreclosure and Bankruptcy	1.75 (18)	1.86 (18)	0.6163
Excessive Personal Debt	1.98 (16)	2.14 (16)	0.4871
Financial Problems Experienced by Local Governments	2.55 (13)	2.77 (10)	0.2797
Funding for Schools	2.76 (9)	2.68 (13)	0.7236
Identity Theft	2.91 (3)	2.91 (7)	0.9834
Sexual Abuse and Sexual Violence	2.64 (11)	2.82 (8)	0.3904
Bullying	2.88 (4)	3.23 (3)	0.0958
Domestic Abuse, Child Abuse, Elder Abuse	2.81 (7)	3.05 (6)	0.2546
Suicide	2.54 (14)	2.68 (13)	0.4963
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Non-white respondents rated alcohol use and risk of losing your job as bigger issues in the community.</li> <li>• White respondents rated illegal drug use, alcohol use, and identity theft as the top three issues in the community.</li> <li>• Non-white respondents rated illegal drug use, alcohol use, and bullying as the top three issues in the community</li> <li>• Caution should be taken when examining these results due to the small number of non-white compared to white respondents.</li> </ul>			