THE NCS™

The National Community Survey™

Oak Park, IL
Community Livability Report

2019

NRC
National Research Center Inc.

ICMA
Leaders at the Core of Better Communities

Contents

Charter Members

AAPOR
Transparency
Initiative
AMERICAN ASSOCIATION FOR
PUBLIC OPINION RESEARCH

About

The National Community Survey™ (The NCS™) report is about the "livability" of Oak Park. The phrase "livable community" is used here to evoke a place that is not simply habitable, but that is desirable. It is not only where people do live, but where they want to live.

Great communities are partnerships of the government, private sector, community-based organizations and residents, all geographically connected. 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).

The Community Livability Report provides the opinions of a representative sample of 696 residents of the Village of Oak Park. The margin of error around any reported percentage is 4% for all respondents. The full description of methods used to garner these opinions can be found in the *Technical Appendices* provided under separate cover.

Residents

Communities are partnerships among…

Private sector

Community-based organizations

Government

Quality of Life in Oak Park

About 9 in 10 residents rated the quality of life in Oak Park as excellent or good. This rating was similar to the national benchmark (see Appendix B of the *Technical Appendices* provided under separate cover).

Overall Quality of Life

Excellent 33%

Poor 1%

Fair 12%

Good 53%

Shown below are the eight facets of community. The color of each community facet summarizes how residents rated it across the three sections of the survey that represent the pillars of a community – Community Characteristics, Governance and Participation. When most ratings across the three pillars were higher than the benchmark, the color for that facet is the darkest shade; when most ratings were lower than the benchmark, the color is the lightest shade. A mix of ratings (higher and lower than the benchmark) results in a color between the extremes.

In addition to a summary of ratings, the image below includes one or more stars to indicate which community facets were the most important focus areas for the community. Residents identified Safety and Economy as priorities for the Oak Park community in the coming two years. Ratings within the facet of Education and Enrichment tended to be higher than the national averages, while evaluations for the remaining facets were on par with national comparison communities. This overview of the key aspects of community quality provides a quick summary of where residents see exceptionally strong performance and where performance offers the greatest opportunity for improvement. Linking quality to importance offers community members and leaders a view into the characteristics of the community that matter most and that seem to be working best.

Details that support these findings are contained in the remainder of this Livability Report, starting with the ratings for Community Characteristics, Governance and Participation and ending with results for Oak Park's unique questions.

Legend

■ Higher than national benchmark
■ Similar to national benchmark
■ Lower than national benchmark

✷ Most important

Safety

Built Environment

Education and Enrichment

Natural Environment

Recreation and Wellness

Mobility

Economy

Community Engagement

Community Characteristics

What makes a community livable, attractive and a place where people want to be?

Overall quality of community life represents the natural ambience, services and amenities that make for an attractive community. How residents rate their overall quality of life is an indicator of the overall health of a community. In the case of Oak Park, 92% rated the village as an excellent or good place to live. Respondents' ratings of Oak Park as a place to live were similar to ratings in other communities across the nation.

In addition to rating the village as a place to live, respondents rated several aspects of community quality. About 9 in 10 residents favorably assessed Oak Park as a place to raise children, the overall image or reputation of the village, and its overall appearance; these ratings were strong and higher than the national benchmarks. Similar to comparison communities, about 9 in 10 respondents gave high marks to their neighborhood as a place to live. Evaluations of Oak Park as a place to retire were lower than average, with less than half rating this as excellent or good.

Delving deeper into Community Characteristics, survey respondents rated over 40 features of the community within the eight facets of Community Livability. Overall, at least half of respondents reviewed most aspects of Community Characteristics positively and ratings tended to be similar to or higher than other benchmark communities.

Place to Live

Excellent
44%

Poor
1%

Fair
7%

Good
48%

Assessments for the majority of aspects within the facets of Education and Enrichment (such as overall education and enrichment opportunities) and Community Engagement (such as opportunities to participate in community matters) were outstanding and higher than the national benchmarks. Scores also were above average for ease of travel by walking and by bicycle, vibrancy of the downtown/commercial area, Oak Park as a place to visit, and availability of affordable quality health care, among others.

However, survey participants' ratings for ease of travel by car, public parking, and cost of living were lower than observed in other municipalities across the country.

Respondents' evaluations of availability of paths and walking trails, overall built environment, Oak Park as a place to work, fitness and recreational opportunities, and adult educational opportunities improved from 2017 to 2019 (see the *Trends over Time* report provided under separate cover for more details). Additionally, positive reviews of employment opportunities improved in 2019, with a total increase of 21% since 2008.

Percent rating positively (e.g., excellent/good)

Comparison to national benchmark
■ Higher　■ Similar　■ Lower

Overall image	Neighborhood	Place to raise children	Place to retire	Overall appearance
89%	88%	92%	45%	91%

Figure 1: Aspects of Community Characteristics

Percent rating positively (e.g., excellent/good, very/somewhat safe)

Comparison to national benchmark

■ Higher
■ Similar
■ Lower

SAFETY
- Overall feeling of safety: 77%
- Safe in neighborhood: 96%
- Safe downtown/commercial area: 95%

MOBILITY
- Overall ease of travel: 75%
- Paths and walking trails: 68%
- Ease of walking: 93%
- Travel by bicycle: 68%
- Travel by car: 45%
- Public parking: 32%
- Traffic flow: 31%

NATURAL ENVIRONMENT
- Overall natural environment: 89%
- Cleanliness: 85%
- Air quality: 78%

BUILT ENVIRONMENT
- Overall built environment: 79%
- New development in Oak Park: 58%
- Affordable quality housing: 28%
- Housing options: 57%
- Public places: 87%

ECONOMY
- Overall economic health: 68%
- Vibrant downtown/commercial area: 76%
- Business and services: 69%
- Cost of living: 19%
- Shopping opportunities: 65%
- Employment opportunities: 46%
- Place to visit: 89%
- Place to work: 69%

RECREATION AND WELLNESS
- Health and wellness: 82%
- Mental health care: 60%
- Preventive health services: 79%
- Health care: 77%
- Food: 80%
- Recreational opportunities: 82%
- Fitness opportunities: 75%

EDUCATION AND ENRICHMENT
- Education and enrichment opportunities: 89%
- Religious or spiritual events and activities: 92%
- Cultural/arts/music activities: 79%
- Adult education: 74%
- Child care/preschool: 57%

COMMUNITY ENGAGEMENT
- Social events and activities: 80%
- Neighborliness: 73%
- Openness and acceptance: 75%
- Opportunities to participate in community matters: 78%
- Opportunities to volunteer: 83%

Governance

How well does the government of Oak Park meet the needs and expectations of its residents?

The overall quality of the services provided by Oak Park as well as the manner in which these services are provided is a key component of how residents rate their quality of life. About 8 in 10 residents gave favorable evaluations to the overall quality of services provided by the Village, while 3 in 10 gave high marks to services provided by the Federal Government. Both ratings were similar to national averages.

Survey respondents also rated various aspects of Oak Park's leadership and governance. In general, at least 4 in 10 residents rated each aspect positively. About 8 in 10 residents favorably assessed the customer service provided by Oak Park employees, an improvement from scores in 2017; while 6 in 10 gave high marks to the Village welcoming resident involvement. All ratings were similar to those given in other communities.

Respondents evaluated over 30 individual services and amenities available in Oak Park. Broadly, at least 6 in 10 respondents reviewed most government services positively and ratings tended to be similar to those observed in other communities nationwide. The highest-rated services included police, fire, ambulance or emergency medical services, Village parks, recreation centers, and public libraries, with about 9 in 10 residents assigning positive scores. Additionally, Village parks, recreation centers, and libraries were assigned ratings that exceeded the national benchmark, and libraries receiving the second highest rating among comparison communities nationwide.

Overall Quality of Village Services

Excellent 22%
Poor 3%
Good 57%
Fair 19%

Reviews for animal control, bus or transit services, health services, and public information also were strong and higher than the national benchmarks. Evaluations for all other aspects of Governance were on par with the national averages.

Respondents' evaluations of 12 aspects of Governance improved from 2017 to 2019, with most increases occurring within the facets of Natural Environment, Built Environment, and Community Engagement. Some of the largest increases in 2019 compared to 2017 were for emergency preparedness, natural areas preservation, and open space (with increases of 13%, 12%, and 10%, respectively).

Percent rating positively (e.g., excellent/good)

Comparison to national benchmark

■ Higher   ■ Similar   ■ Lower

Value of services for taxes paid	Overall direction	Welcoming resident involvement	Confidence in Village government	Acting in the best interest of Oak Park	Being honest	Treating all residents fairly	Customer service	Services provided by the Federal Government
46%	48%	60%	45%	52%	53%	53%	79%	34%

Figure 2: Aspects of Governance

*Percent rating positively
(e.g., excellent/good)*

Comparison to national
benchmark

- ■ Higher
- ■ Similar
- ■ Lower

SAFETY
- Police — 89%
- Fire — 98%
- Ambulance/EMS — 97%
- Crime prevention — 71%
- Fire prevention — 87%
- Animal control — 76%
- Emergency preparedness — 72%

MOBILITY
- Traffic enforcement — 54%
- Street repair — 51%
- Street cleaning — 72%
- Street lighting — 68%
- Snow removal — 71%
- Sidewalk maintenance — 65%
- Traffic signal timing — 57%
- Bus or transit services — 78%

NATURAL ENVIRONMENT
- Garbage collection — 86%
- Recycling — 83%
- Yard waste pick-up — 84%
- Drinking water — 81%
- Natural areas preservation — 65%
- Open space — 70%

BUILT ENVIRONMENT
- Storm drainage — 63%
- Sewer services — 79%
- Power utility — 84%
- Utility billing — 76%
- Land use, planning and zoning — 53%
- Code enforcement — 61%
- Cable television — 64%

ECONOMY
- Economic development — 56%

RECREATION AND WELLNESS
- Village parks — 94%
- Recreation centers — 89%
- Health services — 84%

EDUCATION AND ENRICHMENT
- Public libraries — 97%
- Special events — 79%

COMMUNITY ENGAGEMENT
- Public information — 86%

Participation

Are the residents of Oak Park connected to the community and each other?

An engaged community harnesses its most valuable resource, its residents. The connections and trust among residents, government, businesses and other organizations help to create a sense of community, a shared sense of membership, belonging and history. About three-quarters of respondents gave excellent or good scores to the sense of community in Oak Park; this rating was higher than the national benchmark.

About 9 in 10 survey respondents indicated they would recommend living in Oak Park to someone who asked and 8 in 10 planned to remain in the community for the next five years, both of which were on par with national averages. More Oak Park residents (67%) reported contacting Village employees than residents in other comparison communities.

The survey included over 30 activities and behaviors for which respondents indicated how often they participated in or performed each, if at all. Levels of Participation varied widely across the different facets, making the benchmark comparisons, as well as comparisons to Oak Park over time, useful for interpreting the results. About 9 in 10 respondents had recycled at home, purchased goods or services in Oak Park, visited a Village park, talked to or visited with neighbors, or voted in local elections. Fewer than 2 in 10 had contacted Oak Park elected officials or watched a local public meeting. Each of these ratings were all on par with communities nationwide.

Sense of Community

Excellent 30%
Poor 3%
Fair 19%
Good 47%

Compared to municipalities across the country, more Oak Park residents had used Oak Park public libraries, walked or biked instead of driving, and used public transportation instead of driving. Fewer residents in Oak Park had stocked supplies in preparation for an emergency, worked in Oak Park, or believed the economy would have a positive impact on their income than in comparison communities.

In 2019, fewer respondents had reported a crime in the 12 months prior to the survey than in 2017. Additionally, in 2019, fewer residents reported volunteering or doing a favor for a neighbor than in 2017.

Percent rating positively (e.g., very/ somewhat likely, yes)

Comparison to national benchmark

■ Higher ■ Similar ■ Lower

| Recommend Oak Park | Remain in Oak Park | Contacted Oak Park employees |
| 90% | 80% | 67% |

7

Figure 3: Aspects of Participation

Percent rating positively (e.g., yes, more than once a month, always/sometimes)

Comparison to national benchmark

- ■ Higher
- ■ Similar
- ■ Lower

SAFETY
- Stocked supplies for an emergency — 18%
- Did NOT report a crime — 78%
- Was NOT the victim of a crime — 86%

MOBILITY
- Used public transportation instead of driving — 84%
- Carpooled instead of driving alone — 46%
- Walked or biked instead of driving — 86%

NATURAL ENVIRONMENT
- Conserved water — 77%
- Made home more energy efficient — 73%
- Recycled at home — 95%

BUILT ENVIRONMENT
- Did NOT observe a code violation — 61%
- NOT under housing cost stress — 67%

ECONOMY
- Purchased goods or services in Oak Park — 98%
- Economy will have positive impact on income — 21%
- Work in Oak Park — 30%

RECREATION AND WELLNESS
- Used Oak Park recreation centers — 60%
- Visited a Village park — 91%
- Ate 5 portions of fruits and vegetables — 88%
- Participated in moderate or vigorous physical activity — 89%
- In very good to excellent health — 69%

EDUCATION AND ENRICHMENT
- Used Oak Park public libraries — 79%
- Participated in religious or spiritual activities — 38%
- Attended a Village-sponsored event — 64%

COMMUNITY ENGAGEMENT
- Campaigned for an issue, cause or candidate — 32%
- Contacted Oak Park elected officials — 19%
- Volunteered — 39%
- Participated in a club — 25%
- Talked to or visited with neighbors — 91%
- Done a favor for a neighbor — 76%
- Attended a local public meeting — 24%
- Watched a local public meeting — 15%
- Read or watched local news — 81%
- Voted in local elections — 90%

Special Topics

The Village of Oak Park included four questions of special interest on The NCS, with topics related to the importance of Village services, problems in Oak Park, sources of Village information, and the value of services for taxes paid.

The Village asked residents to rate how important it was for Oak Park to maintain various services at least at current levels. Almost all residents indicated it was essential or very important to maintain fire and emergency medical services (95%), maintenance of the public way, street cleaning, and snow plowing (95%), and police protection (94%). At least half of residents indicated that it was essential or very important to maintain the remaining services at least at current levels, but about 4 in 10 residents said it was somewhat important or not at all important to maintain partner agencies that promote or support tourism, housing, and the arts in Oak Park.

Figure 4: Importance of Maintaining Village Services
Please rate how important, if at all, it is for the Village of Oak Park to maintain each of the following services at least at current levels (as compared with cutting the levels of service):

	Essential	Very important	Somewhat important	Not at all important
Fire and emergency medical assistance	62%	33%	5%	
Maintenance of the public way, street cleaning, snow plowing	47%	48%	5%	
Police protection	62%	32%	5%	1%
Business retention, development, and attraction	44%	43%	12%	2%
Care of trees and landscaping in the parkways	33%	49%	17%	1%
Public health services	38%	43%	18%	2%
Environmental sustainability programs and events	39%	37%	19%	5%
Housing programs	35%	36%	22%	6%
Operation and administration of parking services	26%	40%	28%	6%
Partner agencies that promote or support tourism, housing and the arts in Oak Park	17%	42%	33%	8%

At least half of community members indicated that traffic and crime were a moderate or major problem in Oak Park. Conversely, at least one-third of residents thought disorderly youth, noise, run-down buildings and houses, and graffiti were not a problem in Oak Park.

Figure 5: Problems in Oak Park
*To what degree, if at all, is each of the following a problem in Oak Park?*

	Major problem	Moderate problem	Minor problem	Not a problem
Traffic	22%	37%	29%	11%
Crime	9%	42%	37%	12%
Homelessness	13%	31%	40%	15%
Panhandling	15%	26%	38%	21%
Drugs	7%	25%	41%	27%
Disorderly youth	3%	19%	44%	34%
Noise	4%	15%	38%	43%
Run-down buildings and houses	3%	14%	41%	42%
Graffiti	2%	10%	41%	48%

When asked about sources utilized for obtaining information about the Village, about three-quarters of residents said they get a lot or some information from the Village of Oak Park OP/FYI newsletter and other Village mailings, friends and neighbors, the Village Park website, and local newspapers (print and online). About half of residents indicated they get a lot or some information from local social media pages/groups and the Village of Oak Park email news. About 3 in 10 residents indicated they get information about Oak Park from the Village of Oak Park Facebook and Twitter pages, and about 1 in 10 get information from the Village's cable TV channel (VOP-TV).

Figure 6: Sources of Village Information
How much information about Oak Park, if any, do you get from each of the following sources?

Oak Park residents rated the value of services for taxes paid to various community entities. The highest-rated entities included Oak Park Public Library and the Park District of Oak Park, with about 8 in 10 respondents rating these as excellent or good value for the taxes paid. Of those who had an opinion, about 7 in 10 respondents gave high marks to Elementary School District 97, Oak Park Fire & Police Pensions, and OPRF High School District 200. Fewer respondents felt that they got an excellent or good value for the taxes they paid to Cook County.

Figure 7: Value of Taxes Paid
Please rate the value of services for the taxes paid to each of the following (percent of your property tax bill):

Legend: ■ Excellent ■ Good ■ Fair ■ Poor

Entity	Excellent	Good	Fair	Poor
Oak Park Public Library (4.80%)	53%	31%	13%	3%
Park District of Oak Park (4.76%)	41%	42%	13%	3%
Elementary School District 97 (38.32%)	32%	40%	19%	9%
Oak Park Fire & Police Pensions (5.80%)	27%	44%	22%	7%
OPRF High School District 200 (22.69%)	30%	38%	20%	12%
Mosquito Abatement District (0.12%)	25%	40%	26%	9%
Village of Oak Park (11.05%)	17%	47%	28%	8%
Metropolitan Water Reclamation District (3.12%)	22%	40%	31%	7%
Oak Park Township (2.46%)	23%	38%	28%	10%
Triton Community College District 504 (2.55%)	17%	39%	29%	16%
Cook County (4.33%)	10%	29%	37%	24%

Conclusions

Sense of community is strong in Oak Park and residents remain loyal.

Residents' assessments of the sense of community in the village were above the national average, with about three-quarters rating this as excellent or good. About 9 in 10 respondents were likely to recommend living in Oak Park to someone who asked and about 8 in 10 planned to remain in Oak Park for the next five years. Most community members also gave high marks to the overall quality of life in Oak Park (87% excellent or good), along with the village (92%) and their neighborhoods (88%) as places to live. Ratings for Oak Park as a place to raise children, the village's overall image or reputation, and its overall appearance were exceptional and higher than average, with positive reviews from about 9 in 10 residents.

Although residents feel safe, safety remains a community priority.

About three-quarters of residents gave positive scores to the overall feeling of safety in Oak Park. Additionally, almost all residents felt safe in their neighborhoods (96%) and in the downtown/commercial area (95%). Residents indicated that Safety was an important focus for the Village to address in the coming two years; about 9 in 10 respondents said that the overall feeling of safety was an essential area of focus for the village. Additionally, about half of respondents felt that crime was a major or moderate problem in Oak Park.

Out of all Village services, police, fire, and ambulance/emergency medical services were given some of the most positive reviews. In 2019, more residents gave high marks to fire prevention and emergency preparedness than in 2017, and fewer residents had reported a crime. About 9 in 10 community members felt that it was essential or very important for the Village to maintain fire and emergency medical assistance and police protection services at least at current levels. About 7 in 10 residents positively rated the value of services for taxes paid to Oak Park Fire and Police Pensions.

Residents praise the local economy, but are concerned about cost of living.

Assessments of Oak Park as a place to visit and the vibrancy of the downtown/commercial area were strong and higher than the national benchmarks. Similar to other comparison communities, about two-thirds of residents positively rated the overall economic health of Oak Park, shopping opportunities, Oak Park as a place to work, and the overall quality of business and service establishments. Furthermore, ratings of employment opportunities and Oak Park as a place to work improved from 2017 to 2019.

Survey participants highlighted the Economy as a priority for the Village in the next two years. About 9 in 10 respondents indicated that it was essential or very important for the Village to maintain services related to business retention, development, and attraction at least at current levels. However, evaluations of cost of living in Oak Park were lower than the national benchmarks. Compared to other municipalities, fewer Oak Park residents believed the economy would have a positive impact on their income.

Education and Enrichment opportunities in Oak Park are an asset that residents appreciate.

Residents applauded aspects and services related to Education and Environment, with overall evaluations that tended to be higher than the national benchmarks. These include above-average ratings for the overall education and enrichment opportunities of Oak Park, along with opportunities to attend religious or spiritual events and activities. Respondents' assessments of public libraries were outstanding, with 97% assigning excellent or good scores, ranking second among national comparison communities. Additionally, more residents in Oak Park reported using Oak Park public libraries compared to other jurisdictions nationwide. Reviews of opportunities to participate in cultural/arts/music activities and adult educational opportunities were also higher than the national average; the latter rating improved from 2017 to 2019. Of those who had an opinion, a majority of residents gave positive ratings to the value of services for taxes paid to Oak Park Public Library (84%), Elementary School District 97 (72%), OPRF High School District 200 (68%), and Triton Community College District 504 (56%).

THE NCS™
The National Community Survey™

Oak Park, IL
Dashboard Summary of Findings

2019

NRC
National Research Center Inc.

ICMA
Leaders at the Core of Better Communities

Summary

The National Community 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 summarizes Oak Park's performance in the eight facets of community livability with the "General" rating as a summary of results from the overarching questions not shown within any of the eight facets. The "Overall" represents the community pillar in its entirety (the eight facets and general).

By summarizing resident ratings across the eight facets and three pillars of a livable community, a picture of Oak Park's community livability emerges. Below, the color of each community facet summarizes how residents rated each of the pillars that support it – Community Characteristics, Governance and Participation. When most ratings were higher than the benchmark, the color is the darkest shade; when most ratings were lower than the benchmark, the color is the lightest shade. A mix of ratings (higher and lower than the benchmark) results in a color between the extremes.

Broadly, ratings within most facets tended to be positive and similar to the national benchmarks. Within the pillar of Community Characteristics, assessments of Education and Enrichment and Community Engagement tended to be higher than the national averages. In Governance, ratings within the facets of Recreation and Wellness and Education and Enrichment were strong and higher than those observed in other communities. Levels of Participation within the facet of Mobility were higher than the national benchmarks, while levels within the facet of Economy were lower than the national benchmarks. This information can be helpful in identifying the areas that merit more attention.

Figure 1: Dashboard Summary

	Community Characteristics			Governance			Participation		
	Higher	Similar	Lower	Higher	Similar	Lower	Higher	Similar	Lower
Overall	20	26	4	7	38	0	5	28	3
General	3	3	1	0	3	0	1	2	0
Safety	0	3	0	1	6	0	0	2	1
Mobility	2	3	2	1	7	0	2	1	0
Natural Environment	0	3	0	0	6	0	0	3	0
Built Environment	2	3	0	0	7	0	0	2	0
Economy	2	5	1	0	1	0	0	1	2
Recreation and Wellness	3	4	0	3	0	0	0	5	0
Education and Enrichment	4	1	0	1	1	0	1	2	0
Community Engagement	4	1	0	1	7	0	1	10	0

National Benchmark	
	Higher
	Similar
	Lower

Figure 2: Detailed Dashboard

	Community Characteristics	Trend	Benchmark	Percent positive	Governance	Trend	Benchmark	Percent positive	Participation	Trend	Benchmark	Percent positive
General	Overall appearance	↔	↑	91%	Customer service	↑	↔	79%	Recommend Oak Park	↔	↔	90%
General	Overall quality of life	↔	↔	87%	Services provided by Oak Park	↔	↔	78%	Remain in Oak Park	↔	↔	80%
General	Place to retire	↔	↓	45%	Services provided by the Federal Government	↔	↔	34%	Contacted Oak Park employees	↔	↑↑	67%
General	Place to raise children	↔	↑	92%								
General	Place to live	↔	↔	92%								
General	Neighborhood	↔	↔	88%								
General	Overall image	↔	↑	89%								
Safety	Overall feeling of safety	↔	↔	77%	Police	↔	↔	89%	Was NOT the victim of a crime	↔	↔	86%
Safety	Safe in neighborhood	↔	↔	96%	Crime prevention	↔	↔	71%	Did NOT report a crime	↑	↔	78%
Safety	Safe downtown/commercial area	↔	↔	95%	Fire	↔	↔	98%	Stocked supplies for an emergency	↔	↓	18%
Safety					Fire prevention	↑	↔	87%				
Safety					Ambulance/EMS	↔	↔	97%				
Safety					Emergency preparedness	↑	↔	72%				
Safety					Animal control	↔	↑	76%				
Mobility	Traffic flow	↔	↔	31%	Traffic enforcement	↔	↔	54%	Carpooled instead of driving alone	↔	↔	46%
Mobility	Travel by car	↔	↓	45%	Street repair	↔	↔	51%	Walked or biked instead of driving	↔	↑↑	86%
Mobility	Travel by bicycle	↔	↑	68%	Street cleaning	↔	↔	72%	Used public transportation instead of driving	↔	↑↑	84%
Mobility	Ease of walking	↔	↑↑	93%	Street lighting	↔	↔	68%				
Mobility	Overall ease travel	↔	↔	75%	Snow removal	↔	↔	71%				
Mobility	Public parking	↔	↓	32%	Sidewalk maintenance	↔	↔	65%				
Mobility	Paths and walking trails	↑	↔	68%	Traffic signal timing	↔	↔	57%				
Mobility					Bus or transit services	↔	↑↑	78%				
Natural Environment	Overall natural environment	↔	↔	89%	Garbage collection	↔	↔	86%	Recycled at home	↔	↔	95%
Natural Environment	Air quality	↔	↔	78%	Recycling	↔	↔	83%	Conserved water	↔	↔	77%
Natural Environment	Cleanliness	↔	↔	85%	Yard waste pick-up	↑	↔	84%	Made home more energy efficient	↔	↔	73%
Natural Environment					Drinking water	↔	↔	81%				
Natural Environment					Open space	↑	↔	70%				
Natural Environment					Natural areas preservation	↑	↔	65%				
Built Environment	New development in Oak Park	↔	↔	58%	Sewer services	↑	↔	79%	NOT experiencing housing cost stress	↔	↔	67%
Built Environment	Affordable quality housing	↔	↔	28%	Storm drainage	↑	↔	63%	Did NOT observe a code violation	↔	↔	61%
Built Environment	Housing options	↔	↔	57%	Power utility	↔	↔	84%				
Built Environment	Overall built environment	↑	↑	79%	Utility billing	↔	↔	76%				
Built Environment	Public places	↔	↑	87%	Land use, planning and zoning	↑	↔	53%				
Built Environment					Code enforcement	↔	↔	61%				
Built Environment					Cable television	↔	↔	64%				

Legend

↑↑ Much higher ↑ Higher ↔ Similar ↓ Lower ↓↓ Much lower * Not available

	Community Characteristics	Trend	Benchmark	Percent positive	Governance	Trend	Benchmark	Percent positive	Participation	Trend	Benchmark	Percent positive
Economy	Overall economic health	↔	↔	68%	Economic development	↔	↔	56%	Economy will have positive impact on income	↔	↓	21%
	Shopping opportunities	↔	↔	65%					Purchased goods or services in Oak Park	↔	↔	98%
	Employment opportunities	↑	↔	46%					Work in Oak Park	↔	↓	30%
	Place to visit	↔	↑	89%								
	Cost of living	↔	↓	19%								
	Vibrant downtown/commercial area	↔	↑	76%								
	Place to work	↑	↔	69%								
	Business and services	↔	↔	69%								
Recreation and Wellness	Fitness opportunities	↑	↔	75%	Village parks	↔	↑	94%	In very good to excellent health	↔	↔	69%
	Recreational opportunities	↑	↔	82%	Recreation centers	↔	↑	89%	Used Oak Park recreation centers	↔	↔	60%
	Health care	↔	↑	77%	Health services	↔	↑	84%	Visited a Village park	↔	↔	91%
	Food	↔	↔	80%					Ate 5 portions of fruits and vegetables	↔	↔	88%
	Mental health care	↔	↑	60%					Participated in moderate or vigorous physical activity	↔	↔	89%
	Health and wellness	↔	↔	82%								
	Preventive health services	↔	↑	79%								
Education and Enrichment	Cultural/arts/music activities	↔	↑	79%	Public libraries	↔	↑	97%	Used Oak Park public libraries	↔	↑	79%
	Child care/preschool	↔	↔	57%	Special events	↔	↔	79%	Participated in religious or spiritual activities	↔	↔	38%
	Religious or spiritual events and activities	↔	↑	92%					Attended a Village-sponsored event	↔	↔	64%
	Adult education	↑	↑	74%								
	Overall education and enrichment	↔	↑	89%								
Community Engagement	Opportunities to participate in community matters	↔	↑	78%	Public information	↑	↑	86%	Sense of community	↔	↑	77%
	Opportunities to volunteer	↔	↑	83%	Overall direction	↔	↔	48%	Voted in local elections	↔	↔	90%
	Openness and acceptance	↔	↑	75%	Value of services for taxes paid	↔	↔	46%	Talked to or visited with neighbors	↔	↔	91%
	Social events and activities	↔	↑	80%	Welcoming resident involvement	↑	↔	60%	Attended a local public meeting	↔	↔	24%
	Neighborliness	↔	↔	73%	Confidence in Village government	↔	↔	45%	Watched a local public meeting	↔	↔	15%
					Acting in the best interest of Oak Park	↔	↔	52%	Volunteered	↓	↔	39%
					Being honest	↑	↔	53%	Participated in a club	↔	↔	25%
					Treating all residents fairly	↔	↔	53%	Campaigned for an issue, cause or candidate	↔	↔	32%
									Contacted Oak Park elected officials	↔	↔	19%
									Read or watched local news	↔	↔	81%
									Done a favor for a neighbor	↓	↔	76%

Legend

↑↑ Much higher ↑ Higher ↔ Similar ↓ Lower ↓↓ Much lower * Not available

Oak Park, IL

Comparisons by Demographic Subgroups

2019

About

The National Community 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. Communities conducting The NCS can choose from a number of optional services to customize the reporting of survey results. Oak Park's Comparisons by Demographic Subgroups is part of a larger project for the Village and additional reports are available under separate cover. This report discusses differences in opinion of survey respondents by length of residency in Oak Park, housing tenure, annual household income, presence of an adult 65 years or older in the household, race, age and sex of respondent.

Understanding the Tables

For most of the questions, one number appears for each question. Responses have been summarized to show only the proportion of respondents giving a certain answer; for example, the percent of respondents who rated the quality of life as "excellent" or "good," or the percent of respondents who participated in an activity at least once. It should be noted that when a table that does include all responses (not a single number) for a question that only permitted a single response does not total to exactly 100%, it is due to the common practice of percentages being rounded to the nearest whole number.

The subgroup comparison tables contain the crosstabulations of survey questions by selected respondent characteristics. Chi-square or ANOVA tests of significance were applied to these breakdowns of survey questions. A "p-value" of 0.05 or less indicates that there is less than a 5% probability that differences observed between groups are due to chance; or in other words, a greater than 95% probability that the differences observed in the selected categories of the sample represent "real" differences among those populations. As subgroups vary in size and each group (and each comparison to another group) has a unique margin of error, statistical testing is used to determine whether differences between subgroups are statistically significant. Statistical testing was not performed on multiple response questions.

Each column in the following tables is labeled with a letter for each subgroup being compared. The "Overall" column, which shows the ratings for all respondents, also has a column designation of "(A)", but no statistical tests were done for the overall rating.

For each pair of subgroups ratings within a row (a single question item) that has a statistically significant difference, an upper case letter denoting significance is shown in the cell with the larger column proportion. The letter denotes the subgroup with the smaller column proportion from which it is statistically different. Subgroups that have no upper case letter denotation in their column and that are also not referred to in any other column were not statistically different.

For example, in Figure 1 below, respondents age 55 and over (C) gave significantly higher rating to the overall quality of life than those age 18 to 34 (A) and 35 to 54 (B), as denoted by the "A B" listed in the cell of the ratings for those 55+. This was also true of women (A) over men (B); people who were White (A) over those who were Hispanic and/or other race (B); homeowners (B) over renters (A); and those living in detached housing (A) over those living in attached housing (B).

Figure 1: Community Characteristics – General (Example Only)

Percent rating positively (e.g., excellent/good)	Age			Sex		Race/ethnicity		Housing tenure		Housing unit type		Overall
	18-34	35-54	55+	Female	Male	White alone, not Hispanic	Hispanic and/or other race	Rent	Own	Detached	Attached	
	(A)	(B)	(C)	(A)	(B)	(A)	(B)	(A)	(B)	(A)	(B)	(A)
The overall quality of life in ABC	76%	78% A	82% A B	79% B	77%	81% B	71%	73%	81% A	79% B	76%	78%
Overall image or reputation of ABC	69%	69%	73% A B	71% B	69%	72% B	64%	68%	71% A	69%	71% A	70%
ABC as a place to live	81%	84% A	87% A B	85% B	83%	86% B	78%	79%	86% A	85% B	82%	84%

Findings

Notable differences between demographic subgroups included the following:

- Residents who lived in Oak Park for five years or less tended to give higher marks to aspects related to Economy and government performance than residents who lived in Oak Park for more than five years. These residents were also more likely to recommend living in Oak Park to someone who asked than residents who had lived in Oak Park for longer. Respondents who lived in Oak Park for more than five years tended to be more engaged with the community, reporting higher rates of volunteering, attending or watching a local public meeting, and voting in local elections, among others.
- Community members who rented their homes assigned more positive ratings to many of the community characteristics within the facets of Mobility and Economy than those who owned their homes. Renters also gave higher scores to government performance. However, homeowners reviewed garbage collection, recycling, and drinking water more favorably than renters, and were more likely to participate in most activities related to Recreation and Wellness, Education and Enrichment, and Community Engagement.
- Respondents who had an annual household income of $150,000 or more tended to more positively evaluate the variety of housing options and were less likely to be under housing cost stress than residents who had an annual income of less than $150,000. Additionally, respondents who had an annual household income of $150,000 or more were more likely to give favorable ratings to opportunities to participate in social events and activities, opportunities to volunteer, neighborliness of residents in Oak Park, and the sense of community.
- When differences were noted, households with members aged 65 or older were much less likely to report using alternative modes of transportation and participate in Recreation and Wellness activities compared to households without members aged 65 or older.
- Community members who were not white assessed several Mobility-related characteristics and government performance more positively than community members who were white. Conversely, respondents who were white tended to give higher ratings to characteristics related to Education and Enrichment and Community Engagement.
- Residents aged 18-34 were more likely to feel safe in their neighborhood and in the downtown/commercial area than residents aged 35 or older. Residents aged 18-34 also gave higher ratings to Economy, such overall economic health and overall quality of business and services establishments, compared to residents who were older. Conversely, residents aged 35 or older were more likely to indicate that the overall economic health of Oak Park was an essential or very important focus for the community.
- Female residents, compared to males, tended to assign more positive reviews to general Community Characteristics, including overall quality of life, Oak Park as a place to raise children, the village's overall image or reputation, and its appearance.

Table 1: Community Characteristics - General

Percent rating positively (e.g., excellent/good)	Length of Residency			Housing Tenure		Annual Household Income			Overall
	5 years or less	6 to 20 years	More than 20 years	Rent	Own	Less than $49,999	$50,000 to $149,999	$150,000 or more	
	(A)	(B)	(C)	(A)	(B)	(A)	(B)	(C)	(A)
The overall quality of life in Oak Park	87%	88%	84%	86%	87%	81%	87%	92% A	87%
Overall image or reputation of Oak Park	89%	91%	85%	88%	89%	80%	92% A	90% A	89%
Oak Park as a place to live	93%	92%	91%	92%	92%	89%	92%	94%	92%
Your neighborhood as a place to live	88%	85%	89%	87%	88%	84%	89%	90%	88%
Oak Park as a place to raise children	92%	94%	90%	90%	93%	82%	95% A	94% A	92%
Oak Park as a place to retire	60% B C	31%	44% B	64% B	35%	68% B C	41%	37%	45%
Overall appearance of Oak Park	90%	93%	88%	89%	92%	87%	91%	93% A	91%

Table 2: Community Characteristics - General

Percent rating positively (e.g., excellent/good)	Household Members Aged 65 or Older		Race		Age			Sex		Overall
	No	Yes	White	Not white	18-34	35-54	55+	Female	Male	
	(A)	(B)	(A)	(B)	(A)	(B)	(C)	(A)	(B)	(A)
The overall quality of life in Oak Park	86%	89%	87%	88%	84%	88%	87%	90% B	83%	87%
Overall image or reputation of Oak Park	88%	90%	90%	88%	91%	89%	86%	92% B	84%	89%
Oak Park as a place to live	91%	94%	92%	94%	91%	93%	91%	94%	90%	92%
Your neighborhood as a place to live	87%	91%	91% B	84%	85%	90%	89%	89%	86%	88%
Oak Park as a place to raise children	91%	93%	91%	94%	90%	93%	91%	95% B	88%	92%
Oak Park as a place to retire	39%	57% A	40%	56% A	57% B	32%	52% B	45%	46%	45%
Overall appearance of Oak Park	91%	89%	90%	93%	90%	92%	88%	93% B	88%	91%

Table 3: Community Characteristics - Safety

Percent rating positively (e.g., excellent/good, very/somewhat safe)	Length of Residency			Housing Tenure		Annual Household Income			Overall
	5 years or less	6 to 20 years	More than 20 years	Rent	Own	Less than $49,999	$50,000 to $149,999	$150,000 or more	
	(A)	(B)	(C)	(A)	(B)	(A)	(B)	(C)	(A)
Overall feeling of safety in Oak Park	81% C	76%	72%	83% B	73%	86% B C	74%	76%	77%
In your neighborhood during the day	96%	97%	94%	97%	95%	96%	94%	99% B	96%
In Oak Park's downtown/commercial area during the day	96%	96%	92%	95%	95%	92%	95%	98% A	95%

Table 4: Community Characteristics - Safety

Percent rating positively (e.g., excellent/good, very/somewhat safe)	Household Members Aged 65 or Older		Race		Age			Sex		Overall
	No	Yes	White	Not white	18-34	35-54	55+	Female	Male	
	(A)	(B)	(A)	(B)	(A)	(B)	(C)	(A)	(B)	(A)
Overall feeling of safety in Oak Park	76%	79%	74%	85% A	81%	76%	75%	76%	78%	77%
In your neighborhood during the day	96%	94%	96%	97%	100% B C	95%	93%	96%	96%	96%
In Oak Park's downtown/commercial area during the day	95%	95%	94%	97%	100% B C	95%	91%	95%	95%	95%

Table 5: Community Characteristics - Mobility

Percent rating positively (e.g., excellent/good, very/somewhat safe)	Length of Residency			Housing Tenure		Annual Household Income			Overall
	5 years or less	6 to 20 years	More than 20 years	Rent	Own	Less than $49,999	$50,000 to $149,999	$150,000 or more	
	(A)	(B)	(C)	(A)	(B)	(A)	(B)	(C)	(A)
Overall ease of getting to the places you usually have to visit	76%	76%	71%	75%	75%	65%	76% A	77% A	75%
Traffic flow on major streets	32%	27%	32%	36% B	28%	39% C	32%	25%	31%
Ease of public parking	35% C	35% C	23%	29%	34%	15%	32% A	42% A B	32%
Ease of travel by car in Oak Park	46%	45%	43%	45%	45%	41%	43%	49%	45%
Ease of travel by bicycle in Oak Park	68%	70%	64%	75% B	64%	77% C	67%	63%	68%
Ease of walking in Oak Park	91%	95%	92%	93%	92%	89%	92%	95% A	93%
Availability of paths and walking trails	75% B C	66%	59%	79% B	60%	72% C	71% C	61%	68%

Table 6: Community Characteristics - Mobility

Percent rating positively (e.g., excellent/good, very/somewhat safe)	Household Members Aged 65 or Older		Race		Age			Sex		Overall
	No	Yes	White	Not white	18-34	35-54	55+	Female	Male	
	(A)	(B)	(A)	(B)	(A)	(B)	(C)	(A)	(B)	(A)
Overall ease of getting to the places you usually have to visit	74%	76%	70%	84% A	76%	73%	75%	75%	74%	75%
Traffic flow on major streets	28%	39% A	26%	43% A	29%	29%	35%	35% B	26%	31%
Ease of public parking	33%	27%	32%	30%	28%	38% A C	27%	31%	34%	32%
Ease of travel by car in Oak Park	44%	48%	40%	57% A	43%	47%	44%	51% B	38%	45%
Ease of travel by bicycle in Oak Park	68%	65%	62%	80% A	75%	67%	63%	65%	71%	68%
Ease of walking in Oak Park	93%	90%	92%	93%	92%	94%	90%	94%	91%	93%
Availability of paths and walking trails	69%	63%	64%	78% A	82% B C	63%	63%	69%	67%	68%

Table 7: Community Characteristics - Natural Environment

Percent rating positively (e.g., excellent/good, very/somewhat safe)	Length of Residency			Housing Tenure		Annual Household Income			Overall
	5 years or less	6 to 20 years	More than 20 years	Rent	Own	Less than $49,999	$50,000 to $149,999	$150,000 or more	
	(A)	(B)	(C)	(A)	(B)	(A)	(B)	(C)	(A)
Quality of overall natural environment in Oak Park	95% B C	89% C	81%	95% B	85%	90%	90%	89%	89%
Air quality	81% C	82% C	70%	81%	76%	71%	80% A	81% A	78%
Cleanliness of Oak Park	84%	87%	82%	83%	86%	81%	85%	88%	85%

Table 8: Community Characteristics - Natural Environment

Percent rating positively (e.g., excellent/good, very/somewhat safe)	Household Members Aged 65 or Older		Race		Age			Sex		Overall
	No	Yes	White	Not white	18-34	35-54	55+	Female	Male	
	(A)	(B)	(A)	(B)	(A)	(B)	(C)	(A)	(B)	(A)
Quality of overall natural environment in Oak Park	90%	86%	88%	93%	98% B C	86%	86%	90%	87%	89%
Air quality	80%	73%	75%	86% A	82% C	80% C	72%	77%	80%	78%
Cleanliness of Oak Park	85%	83%	84%	86%	84%	87%	82%	85%	84%	85%

Table 9: Community Characteristics - Built Environment

Percent rating positively (e.g., excellent/good, very/somewhat safe)	Length of Residency			Housing Tenure		Annual Household Income			Overall
	5 years or less	6 to 20 years	More than 20 years	Rent	Own	Less than $49,999	$50,000 to $149,999	$150,000 or more	
	(A)	(B)	(C)	(A)	(B)	(A)	(B)	(C)	(A)
Overall "built environment" of Oak Park (including overall design, buildings, parks and transportation systems)	88% B C	77% C	69%	86% B	75%	72%	82% A	83% A	79%
Public places where people want to spend time	87%	92% C	81%	85%	89%	78%	88% A	92% A	87%
Variety of housing options	56%	59%	54%	49%	61% A	45%	54%	69% A B	57%
Availability of affordable quality housing	33%	24%	26%	32%	25%	33%	26%	30%	28%
Overall quality of new development in Oak Park	73% B C	55% C	43%	71% B	51%	67% B	55%	60%	58%

Table 10: Community Characteristics - Built Environment

Percent rating positively (e.g., excellent/good, very/somewhat safe)	Household Members Aged 65 or Older		Race		Age			Sex		Overall
	No	Yes	White	Not white	18-34	35-54	55+	Female	Male	
	(A)	(B)	(A)	(B)	(A)	(B)	(C)	(A)	(B)	(A)
Overall "built environment" of Oak Park (including overall design, buildings, parks and transportation systems)	81% B	73%	78%	83%	86% C	82% C	71%	81%	78%	79%
Public places where people want to spend time	88%	83%	88%	86%	83%	93% A C	83%	89%	85%	87%
Variety of housing options	55%	60%	60% B	49%	55%	57%	57%	56%	58%	57%
Availability of affordable quality housing	28%	30%	28%	30%	34% B	23%	29%	26%	31%	28%
Overall quality of new development in Oak Park	61% B	48%	53%	73% A	70% B C	60% C	48%	58%	60%	58%

Table 11: Community Characteristics - Economy

Percent rating positively (e.g., excellent/good, very/somewhat safe)	Length of Residency			Housing Tenure		Annual Household Income			Overall
	5 years or less	6 to 20 years	More than 20 years	Rent	Own	Less than $49,999	$50,000 to $149,999	$150,000 or more	
	(A)	(B)	(C)	(A)	(B)	(A)	(B)	(C)	(A)
Overall economic health of Oak Park	83% B C	58%	60%	82% B	61%	81% B C	66%	62%	68%
Oak Park as a place to work	70%	68%	66%	72%	66%	66%	71%	67%	69%
Oak Park as a place to visit	90%	87%	89%	91%	87%	92%	87%	89%	89%
Employment opportunities	57% B	35%	45%	54% B	41%	50%	47%	44%	46%
Shopping opportunities	76% B C	62% C	52%	71% B	61%	67%	64%	67%	65%
Cost of living in Oak Park	24% B	12%	18%	24% B	16%	26% B	15%	21%	19%
Overall quality of business and service establishments in Oak Park	78% B C	66%	61%	74% B	66%	65%	71%	70%	69%
Vibrant downtown/commercial area	87% B C	76% C	59%	84% B	71%	73%	80%	74%	76%

Table 12: Community Characteristics - Economy

Percent rating positively (e.g., excellent/good, very/somewhat safe)	Household Members Aged 65 or Older		Race		Age			Sex		Overall
	No	Yes	White	Not white	18-34	35-54	55+	Female	Male	
	(A)	(B)	(A)	(B)	(A)	(B)	(C)	(A)	(B)	(A)
Overall economic health of Oak Park	67%	68%	64%	78% A	85% B C	62%	66%	69%	67%	68%
Oak Park as a place to work	65%	78% A	69%	70%	65%	68%	73%	72%	64%	69%
Oak Park as a place to visit	89%	89%	89%	89%	90%	87%	90%	89%	89%	89%
Employment opportunities	48%	40%	46%	47%	65% B C	40%	43%	48%	44%	46%
Shopping opportunities	67% B	57%	65%	65%	77% B C	66% C	54%	66%	64%	65%
Cost of living in Oak Park	18%	20%	18%	21%	25% B	14%	21%	19%	19%	19%
Overall quality of business and service establishments in Oak Park	70%	67%	69%	72%	80% B C	67%	66%	71%	68%	69%
Vibrant downtown/commercial area	79% B	64%	75%	78%	88% B C	79% C	63%	77%	76%	76%

Table 13: Community Characteristics - Recreation and Wellness

Percent rating positively (e.g., excellent/good, very/somewhat safe)	Length of Residency			Housing Tenure		Annual Household Income			Overall
	5 years or less	6 to 20 years	More than 20 years	Rent	Own	Less than $49,999	$50,000 to $149,999	$150,000 or more	
	(A)	(B)	(C)	(A)	(B)	(A)	(B)	(C)	(A)
Health and wellness opportunities in Oak Park	81%	80%	84%	78%	84%	81%	80%	86%	82%
Fitness opportunities (including exercise classes and paths or trails, etc.)	73%	76%	75%	72%	76%	71%	73%	79%	75%
Recreational opportunities	86%	81%	79%	86%	80%	83%	82%	83%	82%
Availability of affordable quality food	83%	76%	79%	83%	78%	78%	80%	81%	80%
Availability of affordable quality health care	77%	73%	81%	80%	75%	70%	79%	79%	77%
Availability of preventive health services	81%	73%	82%	79%	79%	80%	76%	83%	79%
Availability of affordable quality mental health care	60%	59%	62%	59%	61%	61%	57%	66%	60%

Table 14: Community Characteristics - Recreation and Wellness

Percent rating positively (e.g., excellent/good, very/somewhat safe)	Household Members Aged 65 or Older		Race		Age			Sex		Overall
	No	Yes	White	Not white	18-34	35-54	55+	Female	Male	
	(A)	(B)	(A)	(B)	(A)	(B)	(C)	(A)	(B)	(A)
Health and wellness opportunities in Oak Park	81%	83%	83%	80%	80%	83%	82%	84%	78%	82%
Fitness opportunities (including exercise classes and paths or trails, etc.)	74%	74%	73%	78%	69%	78% A	75%	77%	72%	75%
Recreational opportunities	82%	82%	83%	81%	85%	83%	79%	86% B	78%	82%
Availability of affordable quality food	80%	79%	80%	80%	79%	81%	79%	81%	78%	80%
Availability of affordable quality health care	76%	78%	80%	74%	78%	76%	79%	80%	74%	77%
Availability of preventive health services	78%	80%	81%	76%	78%	78%	80%	80%	77%	79%
Availability of affordable quality mental health care	60%	61%	64%	54%	55%	61%	63%	60%	61%	60%

Table 15: Community Characteristics - Education and Enrichment

Percent rating positively (e.g., excellent/good, very/somewhat safe)	Length of Residency			Housing Tenure		Annual Household Income			Overall
	5 years or less	6 to 20 years	More than 20 years	Rent	Own	Less than $49,999	$50,000 to $149,999	$150,000 or more	
	(A)	(B)	(C)	(A)	(B)	(A)	(B)	(C)	(A)
Overall opportunities for education and enrichment	91%	86%	89%	87%	89%	86%	88%	91%	89%
Availability of affordable quality child care/preschool	63%	57%	52%	56%	57%	59%	56%	57%	57%
Adult educational opportunities	75%	76%	70%	69%	76%	63%	74%	79% A	74%
Opportunities to attend cultural/arts/music activities	78%	80%	80%	75%	82%	77%	77%	84%	79%
Opportunities to participate in religious or spiritual events and activities	97% C	92%	88%	91%	93%	88%	92%	96% A	92%

Table 16: Community Characteristics - Education and Enrichment

Percent rating positively (e.g., excellent/good, very/somewhat safe)	Household Members Aged 65 or Older		Race		Age			Sex		Overall
	No	Yes	White	Not white	18-34	35-54	55+	Female	Male	
	(A)	(B)	(A)	(B)	(A)	(B)	(C)	(A)	(B)	(A)
Overall opportunities for education and enrichment	89%	85%	90%	86%	91%	90%	85%	91% B	85%	89%
Availability of affordable quality child care/preschool	56%	59%	61% B	47%	58%	53%	63%	58%	54%	57%
Adult educational opportunities	75%	69%	79% B	61%	75%	76%	71%	77%	70%	74%
Opportunities to attend cultural/arts/music activities	79%	79%	81%	76%	81%	82%	76%	82%	76%	79%
Opportunities to participate in religious or spiritual events and activities	93%	90%	95% B	87%	98% C	93%	89%	91%	94%	92%

Table 17: Community Characteristics - Community Engagement

Percent rating positively (e.g., excellent/good, very/somewhat safe)	Length of Residency			Housing Tenure		Annual Household Income			Overall
	5 years or less	6 to 20 years	More than 20 years	Rent	Own	Less than $49,999	$50,000 to $149,999	$150,000 or more	
	(A)	(B)	(C)	(A)	(B)	(A)	(B)	(C)	(A)
Opportunities to participate in social events and activities	79%	85% C	75%	76%	83% A	73%	77%	87% A B	80%
Opportunities to volunteer	84%	85%	82%	80%	85%	77%	81%	90% A B	83%
Opportunities to participate in community matters	81% C	80%	72%	77%	78%	75%	76%	82%	78%
Openness and acceptance of the community toward people of diverse backgrounds	76%	74%	76%	74%	76%	79%	72%	80% B	75%
Neighborliness of residents in Oak Park	72%	75%	72%	67%	77% A	66%	68%	86% A B	73%

Table 18: Community Characteristics - Community Engagement

Percent rating positively (e.g., excellent/good, very/somewhat safe)	Household Members Aged 65 or Older		Race		Age			Sex		Overall
	No	Yes	White	Not white	18-34	35-54	55+	Female	Male	
	(A)	(B)	(A)	(B)	(A)	(B)	(C)	(A)	(B)	(A)
Opportunities to participate in social events and activities	81% B	73%	85% B	68%	81%	84% C	73%	82%	77%	80%
Opportunities to volunteer	84%	83%	87% B	77%	82%	85%	83%	82%	86%	83%
Opportunities to participate in community matters	78%	77%	80%	75%	78%	80%	75%	79%	77%	78%
Openness and acceptance of the community toward people of diverse backgrounds	75%	76%	84% B	59%	77%	75%	75%	75%	76%	75%
Neighborliness of residents in Oak Park	73%	75%	76% B	67%	71%	76%	72%	73%	75%	73%

Table 19: Governance - General

Percent rating positively (e.g., excellent/good)	Length of Residency			Housing Tenure		Annual Household Income			Overall
	5 years or less	6 to 20 years	More than 20 years	Rent	Own	Less than $49,999	$50,000 to $149,999	$150,000 or more	
	(A)	(B)	(C)	(A)	(B)	(A)	(B)	(C)	(A)
The Village of Oak Park	79%	82% C	73%	77%	79%	74%	77%	83% A	78%
The value of services for the taxes paid to Oak Park	55% B C	39%	45%	59% B	41%	58% B C	46%	43%	46%
The overall direction that Oak Park is taking	61% B C	38%	43%	62% B	41%	56%	48%	48%	48%
The job Oak Park government does at welcoming resident involvement	67% C	62% C	51%	70% B	56%	73% B	57%	61%	60%
Overall confidence in Oak Park government	52% B C	40%	41%	56% B	39%	52%	45%	42%	45%
Generally acting in the best interest of the community	61% B C	48%	44%	58% B	49%	61% B	47%	55%	52%
Being honest	57%	51%	50%	56%	52%	56%	50%	58%	53%
Treating all residents fairly	61% B C	51%	46%	60% B	50%	62%	50%	53%	53%
Overall customer service by Oak Park employees (police, receptionists, planners, etc.)	78%	80%	79%	78%	79%	78%	76%	84% B	79%
The Federal Government	33%	30%	40%	35%	34%	44% B C	31%	33%	34%

Table 20: Governance - General

Percent rating positively (e.g., excellent/good)	Household Members Aged 65 or Older		Race		Age			Sex		Overall
	No	Yes	White	Not white	18-34	35-54	55+	Female	Male	
	(A)	(B)	(A)	(B)	(A)	(B)	(C)	(A)	(B)	(A)
The Village of Oak Park	78%	79%	80%	77%	72%	81% A	79%	79%	77%	78%
The value of services for the taxes paid to Oak Park	44%	52%	43%	56% A	54%	43%	47%	50%	42%	46%
The overall direction that Oak Park is taking	49%	44%	44%	61% A	64% B C	45%	42%	52%	45%	48%
The job Oak Park government does at welcoming resident involvement	63% B	52%	59%	66%	67% C	64% C	52%	63%	60%	60%
Overall confidence in Oak Park government	45%	44%	41%	56% A	53%	43%	43%	48%	42%	45%

Percent rating positively (e.g., excellent/good)	Household Members Aged 65 or Older		Race		Age			Sex		Overall
	No	Yes	White	Not white	18-34	35-54	55+	Female	Male	
	(A)	(B)	(A)	(B)	(A)	(B)	(C)	(A)	(B)	(A)
Generally acting in the best interest of the community	52%	49%	48%	63% A	58% C	53%	46%	53%	50%	52%
Being honest	53%	52%	51%	57%	54%	53%	53%	53%	53%	53%
Treating all residents fairly	52%	54%	53%	55%	60%	51%	50%	48%	60% A	53%
Overall customer service by Oak Park employees (police, receptionists, planners, etc.)	77%	83%	79%	79%	83%	77%	78%	77%	81%	79%
The Federal Government	32%	43% A	33%	37%	28%	31%	44% A B	34%	34%	34%

Table 21: Governance - Safety

Percent rating positively (e.g., excellent/good)	Length of Residency			Housing Tenure		Annual Household Income			Overall
	5 years or less	6 to 20 years	More than 20 years	Rent	Own	Less than $49,999	$50,000 to $149,999	$150,000 or more	
	(A)	(B)	(C)	(A)	(B)	(A)	(B)	(C)	(A)
Police services	86%	89%	92%	83%	92% A	87%	85%	95% A B	89%
Fire services	100%	97%	97%	96%	98%	95%	98%	99% A	98%
Ambulance or emergency medical services	100% B	95%	96%	97%	96%	95%	97%	97%	97%
Crime prevention	71%	73%	69%	79% B	67%	79%	69%	72%	71%
Fire prevention and education	89%	87%	86%	89%	86%	87%	85%	91%	87%
Animal control	83%	73%	73%	80%	74%	82%	72%	77%	76%
Emergency preparedness (services that prepare the community for natural disasters or other emergency situations)	75%	73%	67%	83% B	65%	79%	72%	69%	72%

Table 22: Governance - Safety

Percent rating positively (e.g., excellent/good)	Household Members Aged 65 or Older		Race		Age			Sex		Overall
	No	Yes	White	Not white	18-34	35-54	55+	Female	Male	
	(A)	(B)	(A)	(B)	(A)	(B)	(C)	(A)	(B)	(A)
Police services	87%	95% A	91% B	84%	73%	92% A	93% A	90%	87%	89%
Fire services	97%	99%	98%	97%	97%	98%	98%	97%	99%	98%

Percent rating positively (e.g., excellent/good)	Household Members Aged 65 or Older		Race		Age			Sex		Overall
	No	Yes	White	Not white	18-34	35-54	55+	Female	Male	
	(A)	(B)	(A)	(B)	(A)	(B)	(C)	(A)	(B)	(A)
Ambulance or emergency medical services	96%	98%	97%	95%	97%	97%	96%	96%	97%	97%
Crime prevention	68%	78% A	71%	73%	69%	70%	74%	72%	71%	71%
Fire prevention and education	87%	87%	90%	83%	86%	88%	87%	87%	87%	87%
Animal control	76%	76%	76%	76%	83%	75%	74%	74%	78%	76%
Emergency preparedness (services that prepare the community for natural disasters or other emergency situations)	73%	67%	71%	73%	80%	72%	67%	66%	80% A	72%

Table 23: Governance - Mobility

Percent rating positively (e.g., excellent/good)	Length of Residency			Housing Tenure		Annual Household Income			Overall
	5 years or less	6 to 20 years	More than 20 years	Rent	Own	Less than $49,999	$50,000 to $149,999	$150,000 or more	
	(A)	(B)	(C)	(A)	(B)	(A)	(B)	(C)	(A)
Traffic enforcement	51%	54%	57%	55%	53%	57%	50%	59%	54%
Street repair	51%	52%	49%	55%	49%	54%	51%	49%	51%
Street cleaning	70%	74%	73%	70%	73%	72%	74%	72%	72%
Street lighting	61%	73% A	72% A	67%	69%	66%	69%	69%	68%
Snow removal	64%	77% A	72%	65%	74% A	61%	71%	73% A	71%
Sidewalk maintenance	69%	62%	61%	68%	62%	62%	66%	64%	65%
Traffic signal timing	59%	58%	53%	58%	57%	63%	54%	56%	57%
Bus or transit services	75%	82%	75%	78%	77%	72%	78%	78%	78%

Table 24: Governance - Mobility

Percent rating positively (e.g., excellent/good)	Household Members Aged 65 or Older		Race		Age			Sex		Overall
	No	Yes	White	Not white	18-34	35-54	55+	Female	Male	
	(A)	(B)	(A)	(B)	(A)	(B)	(C)	(A)	(B)	(A)
Traffic enforcement	51%	62% A	52%	58%	43%	56% A	58% A	56%	50%	54%
Street repair	51%	50%	49%	58% A	44%	57% A	49%	51%	53%	51%
Street cleaning	71%	74%	72%	74%	68%	74%	71%	72%	71%	72%
Street lighting	66%	74%	71% B	62%	58%	70% A	73% A	69%	67%	68%

Percent rating positively (e.g., excellent/good)	Household Members Aged 65 or Older		Race		Age			Sex		Overall
	No	Yes	White	Not white	18-34	35-54	55+	Female	Male	
	(A)	(B)	(A)	(B)	(A)	(B)	(C)	(A)	(B)	(A)
Snow removal	69%	76%	71%	71%	58%	74% A	73% A	67%	76% A	71%
Sidewalk maintenance	64%	64%	64%	67%	64%	66%	63%	63%	66%	65%
Traffic signal timing	56%	58%	52%	66% A	52%	61%	55%	63% B	50%	57%
Bus or transit services	78%	75%	79%	75%	76%	77%	78%	74%	81%	78%

Table 25: Governance - Natural Environment

Percent rating positively (e.g., excellent/good)	Length of Residency			Housing Tenure		Annual Household Income			Overall
	5 years or less	6 to 20 years	More than 20 years	Rent	Own	Less than $49,999	$50,000 to $149,999	$150,000 or more	
	(A)	(B)	(C)	(A)	(B)	(A)	(B)	(C)	(A)
Garbage collection	83%	88%	88%	81%	89% A	82%	85%	90%	86%
Recycling	80%	85%	84%	74%	88% A	86%	78%	89% B	83%
Yard waste pick-up	81%	84%	86%	79%	85%	83%	81%	88% B	84%
Drinking water	77%	84%	86% A	75%	86% A	74%	79%	89% A B	81%
Preservation of natural areas such as open space, farmlands and greenbelts	71% C	64%	59%	74% B	61%	66%	65%	65%	65%
Oak Park open space	81% B C	67%	58%	80% B	63%	74%	70%	67%	70%

Table 26: Governance - Natural Environment

Percent rating positively (e.g., excellent/good)	Household Members Aged 65 or Older		Race		Age			Sex		Overall
	No	Yes	White	Not white	18-34	35-54	55+	Female	Male	
	(A)	(B)	(A)	(B)	(A)	(B)	(C)	(A)	(B)	(A)
Garbage collection	85%	89%	89% B	80%	80%	86%	90% A	83%	89% A	86%
Recycling	81%	87%	84%	79%	77%	83%	86% A	78%	89% A	83%
Yard waste pick-up	83%	85%	87% B	76%	68%	85% A	87% A	81%	86%	84%
Drinking water	79%	88% A	85% B	75%	75%	83% A	84% A	76%	88% A	81%

Percent rating positively (e.g., excellent/good)	Household Members Aged 65 or Older		Race		Age			Sex		Overall
	No	Yes	White	Not white	18-34	35-54	55+	Female	Male	
	(A)	(B)	(A)	(B)	(A)	(B)	(C)	(A)	(B)	(A)
Preservation of natural areas such as open space, farmlands and greenbelts	68% B	54%	64%	67%	76% C	66% C	54%	65%	66%	65%
Oak Park open space	73% B	54%	68%	76%	84% B C	70% C	56%	71%	68%	70%

Table 27: Governance - Built Environment

Percent rating positively (e.g., excellent/good)	Length of Residency			Housing Tenure		Annual Household Income			Overall
	5 years or less	6 to 20 years	More than 20 years	Rent	Own	Less than $49,999	$50,000 to $149,999	$150,000 or more	
	(A)	(B)	(C)	(A)	(B)	(A)	(B)	(C)	(A)
Storm drainage	62%	65%	62%	61%	64%	64%	61%	65%	63%
Sewer services	78%	81%	79%	77%	80%	79%	79%	82%	79%
Power (electric and/or gas) utility	85%	82%	85%	86%	83%	82%	86%	84%	84%
Utility billing	79%	72%	77%	75%	77%	80%	77%	77%	76%
Land use, planning and zoning	62% C	53%	45%	61% B	50%	64% B	46%	60% B	53%
Code enforcement (weeds, abandoned buildings, etc.)	66%	62%	55%	73% B	56%	58%	67% C	57%	61%
Cable television	67%	61%	63%	64%	64%	61%	64%	67%	64%

Table 28: Governance - Built Environment

Percent rating positively (e.g., excellent/good)	Household Members Aged 65 or Older		Race		Age			Sex		Overall
	No	Yes	White	Not white	18-34	35-54	55+	Female	Male	
	(A)	(B)	(A)	(B)	(A)	(B)	(C)	(A)	(B)	(A)
Storm drainage	61%	69%	63%	63%	55%	63%	69% A	59%	69% A	63%
Sewer services	79%	80%	83% B	74%	77%	79%	81%	76%	83% A	79%
Power (electric and/or gas) utility	83%	86%	86%	81%	83%	84%	85%	84%	84%	84%
Utility billing	75%	78%	79% B	69%	73%	77%	77%	75%	77%	76%
Land use, planning and zoning	56% B	44%	52%	58%	61% C	57% C	45%	57%	51%	53%
Code enforcement (weeds, abandoned buildings, etc.)	61%	60%	59%	69%	65%	62%	57%	63%	60%	61%
Cable television	65%	60%	67%	59%	61%	69%	60%	63%	64%	64%

Table 29: Governance - Economy

Percent rating positively (e.g., excellent/good)	Length of Residency			Housing Tenure		Annual Household Income			Overall
	5 years or less	6 to 20 years	More than 20 years	Rent	Own	Less than $49,999	$50,000 to $149,999	$150,000 or more	
	(A)	(B)	(C)	(A)	(B)	(A)	(B)	(C)	(A)
Economic development	68% B C	51%	50%	71% B	49%	67%	55%	55%	56%

Table 30: Governance - Economy

Percent rating positively (e.g., excellent/good)	Household Members Aged 65 or Older		Race		Age			Sex		Overall
	No	Yes	White	Not white	18-34	35-54	55+	Female	Male	
	(A)	(B)	(A)	(B)	(A)	(B)	(C)	(A)	(B)	(A)
Economic development	56%	57%	56%	59%	67% B C	53%	54%	55%	58%	56%

Table 31: Governance - Recreation and Wellness

Percent rating positively (e.g., excellent/good)	Length of Residency			Housing Tenure		Annual Household Income			Overall
	5 years or less	6 to 20 years	More than 20 years	Rent	Own	Less than $49,999	$50,000 to $149,999	$150,000 or more	
	(A)	(B)	(C)	(A)	(B)	(A)	(B)	(C)	(A)
Village parks	96%	93%	92%	92%	95%	93%	93%	97%	94%
Recreation centers or facilities	93% C	90% C	83%	88%	89%	86%	90%	90%	89%
Health services	89% B	79%	82%	92% B	79%	88%	82%	84%	84%

Table 32: Governance - Recreation and Wellness

Percent rating positively (e.g., excellent/good)	Household Members Aged 65 or Older		Race		Age			Sex		Overall
	No	Yes	White	Not white	18-34	35-54	55+	Female	Male	
	(A)	(B)	(A)	(B)	(A)	(B)	(C)	(A)	(B)	(A)
Village parks	94%	93%	96% B	91%	96%	95%	91%	92%	97% A	94%
Recreation centers or facilities	90%	86%	90%	87%	91%	90%	86%	89%	89%	89%
Health services	83%	86%	85%	82%	89%	81%	83%	83%	83%	84%

Table 33: Governance - Education and Enrichment

Percent rating positively (e.g., excellent/good)	Length of Residency			Housing Tenure		Annual Household Income			Overall
	5 years or less	6 to 20 years	More than 20 years	Rent	Own	Less than $49,999	$50,000 to $149,999	$150,000 or more	
	(A)	(B)	(C)	(A)	(B)	(A)	(B)	(C)	(A)
Public library services	97%	98%	96%	95%	98%	92%	99% A	98% A	97%
Village-sponsored special events	86% C	79%	72%	84%	77%	81%	77%	84%	79%

Table 34: Governance - Education and Enrichment

Percent rating positively (e.g., excellent/good)	Household Members Aged 65 or Older		Race		Age			Sex		Overall
	No	Yes	White	Not white	18-34	35-54	55+	Female	Male	
	(A)	(B)	(A)	(B)	(A)	(B)	(C)	(A)	(B)	(A)
Public library services	97%	98%	97%	97%	94%	99% A	97%	97%	96%	97%
Village-sponsored special events	81%	74%	79%	83%	87% C	82% C	71%	81%	78%	79%

Table 35: Governance - Community Engagement

Percent rating positively (e.g., excellent/good)	Length of Residency			Housing Tenure		Annual Household Income			Overall
	5 years or less	6 to 20 years	More than 20 years	Rent	Own	Less than $49,999	$50,000 to $149,999	$150,000 or more	
	(A)	(B)	(C)	(A)	(B)	(A)	(B)	(C)	(A)
Public information services	87%	88%	84%	87%	86%	78%	90% A	89% A	86%

Table 36: Governance - Community Engagement

Percent rating positively (e.g., excellent/good)	Household Members Aged 65 or Older		Race		Age			Sex		Overall
	No	Yes	White	Not white	18-34	35-54	55+	Female	Male	
	(A)	(B)	(A)	(B)	(A)	(B)	(C)	(A)	(B)	(A)
Public information services	88%	82%	86%	89%	90%	88%	83%	87%	86%	86%

Table 37: Participation General

Percent rating positively (e.g., always/sometimes, more than once a month, yes)	Length of Residency			Housing Tenure		Annual Household Income			Overall
	5 years or less	6 to 20 years	More than 20 years	Rent	Own	Less than $49,999	$50,000 to $149,999	$150,000 or more	
	(A)	(B)	(C)	(A)	(B)	(A)	(B)	(C)	(A)
Sense of community	72%	83% A	77%	72%	80% A	73%	74%	86% A B	77%
Recommend living in Oak Park to someone who asks	96% B C	86%	85%	93% B	87%	92%	89%	90%	90%
Remain in Oak Park for the next five years	79%	81%	78%	77%	81%	79%	76%	88% A B	80%
Contacted the Village of Oak Park (in-person, phone, email or web) for help or information	61%	74% A	68%	59%	72% A	59%	66%	76% A B	67%

Table 38: Participation General

Percent rating positively (e.g., always/sometimes, more than once a month, yes)	Household Members Aged 65 or Older		Race		Age			Sex		Overall
	No	Yes	White	Not white	18-34	35-54	55+	Female	Male	
	(A)	(B)	(A)	(B)	(A)	(B)	(C)	(A)	(B)	(A)
Sense of community	77%	78%	79%	74%	74%	80%	77%	78%	77%	77%
Recommend living in Oak Park to someone who asks	90%	89%	89%	91%	95% B C	89%	87%	90%	90%	90%
Remain in Oak Park for the next five years	79%	83%	80%	81%	70%	86% A	80% A	81%	79%	80%
Contacted the Village of Oak Park (in-person, phone, email or web) for help or information	67%	67%	71% B	59%	62%	69%	69%	68%	66%	67%

Table 39: Participation - Safety

Percent rating positively (e.g., always/sometimes, more than once a month, yes)	Length of Residency			Housing Tenure		Annual Household Income			Overall
	5 years or less	6 to 20 years	More than 20 years	Rent	Own	Less than $49,999	$50,000 to $149,999	$150,000 or more	
	(A)	(B)	(C)	(A)	(B)	(A)	(B)	(C)	(A)
Was NOT the victim of a crime	90% B C	82%	83%	89% B	84%	87%	86%	85%	86%
Did NOT report a crime	82%	75%	76%	82% B	76%	79%	80%	76%	78%
Stocked supplies in preparation for an emergency	15%	24% A C	16%	20%	16%	20%	20% C	13%	18%

Table 40: Participation - Safety

Percent rating positively (e.g., always/sometimes, more than once a month, yes)	Household Members Aged 65 or Older		Race		Age			Sex		Overall
	No	Yes	White	Not white	18-34	35-54	55+	Female	Male	
	(A)	(B)	(A)	(B)	(A)	(B)	(C)	(A)	(B)	(A)
Was NOT the victim of a crime	86%	87%	84%	89%	87%	85%	86%	86%	86%	86%
Did NOT report a crime	78%	79%	79%	77%	82%	75%	78%	81%	75%	78%
Stocked supplies in preparation for an emergency	17%	21%	16%	21%	18%	14%	22% B	19%	15%	18%

Table 41: Participation - Mobility

Percent rating positively (e.g., always/sometimes, more than once a month, yes)	Length of Residency			Housing Tenure		Annual Household Income			Overall
	5 years or less	6 to 20 years	More than 20 years	Rent	Own	Less than $49,999	$50,000 to $149,999	$150,000 or more	
	(A)	(B)	(C)	(A)	(B)	(A)	(B)	(C)	(A)
Walked or biked instead of driving	89% C	92% C	77%	85%	86%	73%	89% A	93% A	86%
Carpooled with other adults or children instead of driving alone	44%	53%	44%	35%	54% A	33%	44% A	63% A B	46%
Used bus, rail, subway or other public transportation instead of driving	90% C	89% C	70%	83%	84%	70%	86% A	90% A	84%

Table 42: Participation - Mobility

Percent rating positively (e.g., always/sometimes, more than once a month, yes)	Household Members Aged 65 or Older		Race		Age			Sex		Overall
	No	Yes	White	Not white	18-34	35-54	55+	Female	Male	
	(A)	(B)	(A)	(B)	(A)	(B)	(C)	(A)	(B)	(A)
Walked or biked instead of driving	92% B	67%	88% B	82%	94% C	91% C	74%	88%	84%	86%
Carpooled with other adults or children instead of driving alone	51% B	31%	52% B	34%	50% C	53% C	34%	47%	45%	46%
Used bus, rail, subway or other public transportation instead of driving	89% B	67%	85%	80%	93% C	88% C	71%	84%	84%	84%

Table 43: Participation - Natural Environment

Percent rating positively (e.g., always/sometimes, more than once a month, yes)	Length of Residency			Housing Tenure		Annual Household Income			Overall
	5 years or less	6 to 20 years	More than 20 years	Rent	Own	Less than $49,999	$50,000 to $149,999	$150,000 or more	
	(A)	(B)	(C)	(A)	(B)	(A)	(B)	(C)	(A)
Recycle at home	93%	97% A	95%	92%	97% A	89%	97% A	97% A	95%
Made efforts to make your home more energy efficient	71%	77%	73%	69%	75%	70%	74%	74%	73%
Made efforts to conserve water	73%	82% A	78%	77%	77%	68%	81% A	78% A	77%

Table 44: Participation - Natural Environment

Percent rating positively (e.g., always/sometimes, more than once a month, yes)	Household Members Aged 65 or Older		Race		Age			Sex		Overall
	No	Yes	White	Not white	18-34	35-54	55+	Female	Male	
	(A)	(B)	(A)	(B)	(A)	(B)	(C)	(A)	(B)	(A)
Recycle at home	96%	93%	98% B	88%	94%	96%	95%	94%	96%	95%
Made efforts to make your home more energy efficient	74%	70%	69%	81% A	71%	75%	71%	71%	76%	73%
Made efforts to conserve water	76%	82%	77%	78%	70%	76%	85% A B	78%	75%	77%

Table 45: Participation - Built Environment

Percent rating positively (e.g., always/sometimes, more than once a month, yes)	Length of Residency			Housing Tenure		Annual Household Income			Overall
	5 years or less	6 to 20 years	More than 20 years	Rent	Own	Less than $49,999	$50,000 to $149,999	$150,000 or more	
	(A)	(B)	(C)	(A)	(B)	(A)	(B)	(C)	(A)
NOT under housing cost stress	66%	73%	64%	58%	74% A	28%	64% A	100% A B	67%
Did NOT observe a code violation	71% B C	55%	56%	76% B	52%	65% C	66% C	50%	61%

Table 46: Participation - Built Environment

Percent rating positively (e.g., always/sometimes, more than once a month, yes)	Household Members Aged 65 or Older		Race		Age			Sex		Overall
	No	Yes	White	Not white	18-34	35-54	55+	Female	Male	
	(A)	(B)	(A)	(B)	(A)	(B)	(C)	(A)	(B)	(A)
NOT under housing cost stress	71% B	58%	71% B	59%	63%	77% A C	58%	67%	68%	67%
Did NOT observe a code violation	62%	61%	58%	70% A	71% B C	58%	58%	63%	60%	61%

Table 47: Participation - Economy

Percent rating positively (e.g., always/sometimes, more than once a month, yes)	Length of Residency			Housing Tenure		Annual Household Income			Overall
	5 years or less	6 to 20 years	More than 20 years	Rent	Own	Less than $49,999	$50,000 to $149,999	$150,000 or more	
	(A)	(B)	(C)	(A)	(B)	(A)	(B)	(C)	(A)
Purchase goods or services from a business located in Oak Park	99% C	98% C	95%	99%	97%	97%	98%	99%	98%
Economy will have positive impact on income	23%	19%	18%	20%	21%	18%	20%	24%	21%
Work in Oak Park	27%	38% A C	25%	25%	33% A	25%	31%	31%	30%

Table 48: Participation - Economy

Percent rating positively (e.g., always/sometimes, more than once a month, yes)	Household Members Aged 65 or Older		Race		Age			Sex		Overall
	No	Yes	White	Not white	18-34	35-54	55+	Female	Male	
	(A)	(B)	(A)	(B)	(A)	(B)	(C)	(A)	(B)	(A)
Purchase goods or services from a business located in Oak Park	99% B	94%	97%	98%	100% C	98% C	95%	98%	98%	98%
Economy will have positive impact on income	21%	19%	20%	21%	18%	23%	19%	16%	26% A	21%
Work in Oak Park	34% B	18%	30%	29%	30%	35% C	23%	29%	30%	30%

Table 49: Participation - Recreation and Wellness

Percent rating positively (e.g., always/sometimes, more than once a month, yes)	Length of Residency			Housing Tenure		Annual Household Income			Overall
	5 years or less	6 to 20 years	More than 20 years	Rent	Own	Less than $49,999	$50,000 to $149,999	$150,000 or more	
	(A)	(B)	(C)	(A)	(B)	(A)	(B)	(C)	(A)
Used Oak Park recreation centers or their services	59% C	71% A C	49%	51%	66% A	45%	58% A	74% A B	60%
Visited a neighborhood park or Village park	91% C	96% A C	84%	86%	93% A	78%	92% A	97% A	91%
Eat at least 5 portions of fruits and vegetables a day	88%	92% C	84%	86%	88%	82%	88%	92% A	88%
Participate in moderate or vigorous physical activity	88%	93% C	86%	86%	91%	82%	90% A	92% A	89%
Reported being in "very good" or "excellent" health	72% C	71%	62%	61%	74% A	49%	69% A	84% A B	69%

Table 50: Participation - Recreation and Wellness

Percent rating positively (e.g., always/sometimes, more than once a month, yes)	Household Members Aged 65 or Older		Race		Age			Sex		Overall
	No	Yes	White	Not white	18-34	35-54	55+	Female	Male	
	(A)	(B)	(A)	(B)	(A)	(B)	(C)	(A)	(B)	(A)
Used Oak Park recreation centers or their services	65% B	43%	60%	58%	55% C	74% A C	45%	60%	60%	60%
Visited a neighborhood park or Village park	94% B	80%	92% B	86%	96% C	92% C	84%	91%	90%	91%
Eat at least 5 portions of fruits and vegetables a day	90% B	80%	88%	87%	86%	92% C	83%	90% B	84%	88%

Percent rating positively (e.g., always/sometimes, more than once a month, yes)	Household Members Aged 65 or Older		Race		Age			Sex		Overall
	No	Yes	White	Not white	18-34	35-54	55+	Female	Male	
	(A)	(B)	(A)	(B)	(A)	(B)	(C)	(A)	(B)	(A)
Participate in moderate or vigorous physical activity	92% B	80%	90%	88%	90%	92% C	84%	89%	89%	89%
Reported being in "very good" or "excellent" health	73% B	56%	72% B	62%	75% C	73% C	57%	65%	72%	69%

Table 51: Participation - Education and Enrichment

Percent rating positively (e.g., always/sometimes, more than once a month, yes)	Length of Residency			Housing Tenure		Annual Household Income			Overall
	5 years or less	6 to 20 years	More than 20 years	Rent	Own	Less than $49,999	$50,000 to $149,999	$150,000 or more	
	(A)	(B)	(C)	(A)	(B)	(A)	(B)	(C)	(A)
Used Oak Park public libraries or their services	72%	92% A C	77%	67%	87% A	64%	81% A	87% A	79%
Participated in religious or spiritual activities in Oak Park	30%	40% A	45% A	28%	44% A	27%	37%	47% A B	38%
Attended a Village-sponsored event	58%	81% A C	56%	53%	72% A	40%	68% A	76% A B	64%

Table 52: Participation - Education and Enrichment

Percent rating positively (e.g., always/sometimes, more than once a month, yes)	Household Members Aged 65 or Older		Race		Age			Sex		Overall
	No	Yes	White	Not white	18-34	35-54	55+	Female	Male	
	(A)	(B)	(A)	(B)	(A)	(B)	(C)	(A)	(B)	(A)
Used Oak Park public libraries or their services	80%	77%	82% B	72%	70%	86% A C	77%	84% B	73%	79%
Participated in religious or spiritual activities in Oak Park	35%	45% A	40% B	31%	21%	42% A	45% A	37%	37%	38%
Attended a Village-sponsored event	68% B	51%	69% B	54%	58%	74% A C	56%	67%	61%	64%

Table 53: Participation - Community Engagement

Percent rating positively (e.g., always/sometimes, more than once a month, yes)	Length of Residency			Housing Tenure		Annual Household Income			Overall
	5 years or less	6 to 20 years	More than 20 years	Rent	Own	Less than $49,999	$50,000 to $149,999	$150,000 or more	
	(A)	(B)	(C)	(A)	(B)	(A)	(B)	(C)	(A)
Campaigned or advocated for an issue, cause or candidate	16%	45% A	41% A	20%	40% A	20%	31% A	43% A B	32%
Contacted Oak Park elected officials (in-person, phone, email or web) to express your opinion	9%	22% A	28% A	12%	23% A	13%	19%	22% A	19%
Volunteered your time to some group/activity in Oak Park	23%	51% A	50% A	23%	50% A	22%	37% A	58% A B	39%
Participated in a club	18%	31% A	29% A	18%	30% A	14%	21%	38% A B	25%
Talked to or visited with your immediate neighbors	85%	95% A	96% A	81%	98% A	80%	92% A	97% A	91%
Done a favor for a neighbor	59%	86% A	88% A	56%	88% A	61%	74% A	88% A B	76%
Attended a local public meeting	12%	30% A	35% A	10%	32% A	10%	24% A	33% A B	24%
Watched (online or on television) a local public meeting	6%	20% A	20% A	8%	19% A	9%	13%	21% A B	15%
Read or watch local news (via television, paper, computer, etc.)	71%	84% A	93% A B	73%	86% A	81%	78%	87% B	81%
Vote in local elections	83%	94% A	96% A	82%	95% A	82%	89% A	97% A B	90%

Table 54: Participation - Community Engagement

Percent rating positively (e.g., always/sometimes, more than once a month, yes)	Household Members Aged 65 or Older		Race		Age			Sex		Overall
	No	Yes	White	Not white	18-34	35-54	55+	Female	Male	
	(A)	(B)	(A)	(B)	(A)	(B)	(C)	(A)	(B)	(A)
Campaigned or advocated for an issue, cause or candidate	31%	34%	33%	29%	14%	38% A	38% A	33%	29%	32%
Contacted Oak Park elected officials (in-person, phone, email or web) to express your opinion	17%	23%	18%	18%	6%	22% A	25% A	18%	19%	19%
Volunteered your time to some group/activity in Oak Park	40%	37%	45% B	28%	19%	50% A	42% A	44% B	33%	39%
Participated in a club	25%	25%	28% B	17%	11%	30% A	28% A	26%	23%	25%
Talked to or visited with your immediate neighbors	91%	92%	94% B	85%	82%	94% A	94% A	90%	93%	91%

Percent rating positively (e.g., always/sometimes, more than once a month, yes)	Household Members Aged 65 or Older		Race		Age			Sex		Overall
	No	Yes	White	Not white	18-34	35-54	55+	Female	Male	
	(A)	(B)	(A)	(B)	(A)	(B)	(C)	(A)	(B)	(A)
Done a favor for a neighbor	73%	84% A	79% B	67%	50%	86% A	83% A	77%	74%	76%
Attended a local public meeting	22%	30% A	25%	20%	11%	26% A	31% A	23%	24%	24%
Watched (online or on television) a local public meeting	15%	15%	14%	16%	7%	18% A	17% A	14%	15%	15%
Read or watch local news (via television, paper, computer, etc.)	79%	89% A	80%	83%	65%	85% A	90% A	82%	80%	81%
Vote in local elections	90%	91%	91%	87%	81%	94% A	92% A	93% B	86%	90%

Table 55: Community Focus Areas

Percent rating positively (e.g., essential/very important)	Length of Residency			Housing Tenure		Annual Household Income			Overall
	5 years or less	6 to 20 years	More than 20 years	Rent	Own	Less than $49,999	$50,000 to $149,999	$150,000 or more	
	(A)	(B)	(C)	(A)	(B)	(A)	(B)	(C)	(A)
Overall feeling of safety in Oak Park	95%	92%	95%	95%	94%	93%	94%	94%	94%
Overall ease of getting to the places you usually have to visit	84%	77%	78%	88% B	76%	86% C	84% C	71%	81%
Quality of overall natural environment in Oak Park	80%	79%	78%	81%	79%	84% C	81%	74%	79%
Overall "built environment" of Oak Park (including overall design, buildings, parks and transportation systems)	70%	80% A	77%	70%	78% A	74%	72%	81% B	75%
Health and wellness opportunities in Oak Park	70%	64%	67%	77% B	62%	80% B C	68% C	58%	67%
Overall opportunities for education and enrichment	73%	74%	74%	75%	74%	73%	73%	75%	74%
Overall economic health of Oak Park	82%	95% A	93% A	82%	94% A	81%	87%	97% A B	89%
Sense of community	76%	84% A	82%	75%	83% A	78%	79%	83%	80%

Table 56: Community Focus Areas

Percent rating positively (e.g., essential/very important)	Household Members Aged 65 or Older		Race		Age			Sex		Overall
	No	Yes	White	Not white	18-34	35-54	55+	Female	Male	
	(A)	(B)	(A)	(B)	(A)	(B)	(C)	(A)	(B)	(A)
Overall feeling of safety in Oak Park	94%	94%	94%	94%	94%	94%	94%	94%	93%	94%
Overall ease of getting to the places you usually have to visit	81%	80%	78%	87% A	86% B	77%	80%	79%	82%	81%
Quality of overall natural environment in Oak Park	80%	77%	78%	80%	79%	80%	78%	81%	77%	79%
Overall "built environment" of Oak Park (including overall design, buildings, parks and transportation systems)	74%	79%	74%	76%	64%	78% A	79% A	77%	72%	75%
Health and wellness opportunities in Oak Park	66%	72%	61%	81% A	68%	65%	70%	71% B	63%	67%
Overall opportunities for education and enrichment	74%	73%	67%	88% A	69%	77%	73%	74%	73%	74%
Overall economic health of Oak Park	88%	91%	89%	88%	75%	95% A	92% A	89%	88%	89%
Sense of community	78%	84%	76%	88% A	66%	85% A	83% A	82%	77%	80%

Table 57: Importance of Maintaining City Services

Please rate how important, if at all, it is for the Village of Oak Park to maintain each of the following services at least at current levels (as compared with cutting the levels of service): (Percent rating as "Essential" or "Very important").	Length of Residency			Housing Tenure		Annual Household Income			Overall
	5 years or less	6 to 20 years	More than 20 years	Rent	Own	Less than $49,999	$50,000 to $149,999	$150,000 or more	
	(A)	(B)	(C)	(A)	(B)	(A)	(B)	(C)	(A)
Business retention, development, and attraction	86%	87%	86%	86%	86%	82%	86%	89%	86%
Care of trees and landscaping in the parkways	82%	77%	85% B	84%	80%	90% B C	80%	80%	82%
Maintenance of the public way, street cleaning, snow plowing	97%	93%	93%	95%	94%	96%	95%	92%	94%
Fire and emergency medical assistance	93%	96%	97% A	94%	96%	95%	95%	95%	95%
Housing programs	79% B C	66%	67%	84% B	63%	82% B C	73% C	62%	72%
Operation and administration of parking services	67%	65%	67%	76% B	60%	85% B C	66% C	54%	66%
Partner agencies that promote or support tourism, housing and the arts in Oak Park	57%	62%	58%	67% B	54%	71% B C	59% C	50%	59%
Police protection	89%	96% A	98% A	90%	96% A	93%	92%	97% B	94%

Please rate how important, if at all, it is for the Village of Oak Park to maintain each of the following services at least at current levels (as compared with cutting the levels of service): (Percent rating as "Essential" or "Very important").	Length of Residency			Housing Tenure		Annual Household Income			Overall
	5 years or less	6 to 20 years	More than 20 years	Rent	Own	Less than $49,999	$50,000 to $149,999	$150,000 or more	
	(A)	(B)	(C)	(A)	(B)	(A)	(B)	(C)	(A)
Public health services	83%	77%	81%	87% B	77%	92% B C	82% C	73%	81%
Environmental sustainability programs and events	83% B C	73%	70%	82% B	72%	83% C	79% C	69%	76%

Table 58: Importance of Maintaining City Services

Please rate how important, if at all, it is for the Village of Oak Park to maintain each of the following services at least at current levels (as compared with cutting the levels of service): (Percent rating as "Essential" or "Very important").	Household Members Aged 65 or Older		Race		Age			Sex		Overall
	No	Yes	White	Not white	18-34	35-54	55+	Female	Male	
	(A)	(B)	(A)	(B)	(A)	(B)	(C)	(A)	(B)	(A)
Business retention, development, and attraction	86%	87%	84%	90% A	82%	87%	88%	86%	86%	86%
Care of trees and landscaping in the parkways	81%	85%	80%	85%	80%	80%	85%	82%	81%	82%
Maintenance of the public way, street cleaning, snow plowing	94%	96%	94%	96%	96%	93%	95%	94%	95%	94%
Fire and emergency medical assistance	95%	97%	96%	94%	91%	96% A	96% A	95%	95%	95%
Housing programs	72%	69%	64%	87% A	83% B C	67%	69%	79% B	62%	72%
Operation and administration of parking services	64%	72%	62%	75% A	68%	65%	68%	69%	63%	66%
Partner agencies that promote or support tourism, housing and the arts in Oak Park	58%	62%	52%	74% A	58%	58%	60%	63% B	54%	59%
Police protection	93%	96%	93%	95%	85%	96% A	97% A	93%	94%	94%
Public health services	80%	83%	77%	89% A	83%	78%	82%	85% B	76%	81%
Environmental sustainability programs and events	77%	73%	72%	85% A	85% B C	75%	71%	82% B	69%	76%

Table 59: Problems in Oak Park

To what degree, if at all, is each of the following a problem in Oak Park? (Percent rating as "Major problem" or "Moderate problem").	Length of Residency			Housing Tenure		Annual Household Income			Overall
	5 years or less	6 to 20 years	More than 20 years	Rent	Own	Less than $49,999	$50,000 to $149,999	$150,000 or more	
	(A)	(B)	(C)	(A)	(B)	(A)	(B)	(C)	(A)
Crime	35%	58% A	65% A	34%	61% A	44%	47%	60% A B	51%
Disorderly youth	17%	22%	29% A	23%	22%	27% C	20%	17%	22%
Drugs	17%	39% A	46% A	27%	36% A	28%	32%	32%	32%
Graffiti	6%	11%	21% A B	9%	13%	15% C	10%	8%	12%
Homelessness	39%	42%	54% A B	46%	43%	47%	44%	38%	45%
Noise	13%	20% A	25% A	18%	19%	23%	17%	15%	18%
Panhandling	35%	43%	49% A	39%	43%	42%	40%	39%	42%
Run-down buildings and houses	16%	16%	18%	18%	16%	27% B C	10%	18% B	17%
Traffic	53%	60%	67% A	50%	65% A	50%	60% A	63% A	59%

Table 60: Problems in Oak Park

To what degree, if at all, is each of the following a problem in Oak Park? (Percent rating as "Major problem" or "Moderate problem").	Household Members Aged 65 or Older		Race		Age			Sex		Overall
	No	Yes	White	Not white	18-34	35-54	55+	Female	Male	
	(A)	(B)	(A)	(B)	(A)	(B)	(C)	(A)	(B)	(A)
Crime	49%	56%	57% B	36%	29%	57% A	60% A	48%	53%	51%
Disorderly youth	19%	31% A	21%	21%	12%	21% A	31% A B	23%	22%	22%
Drugs	28%	45% A	32%	31%	11%	34% A	47% A B	36% B	27%	32%
Graffiti	9%	22% A	11%	12%	2%	10% A	22% A B	10%	13%	12%
Homelessness	43%	49%	46%	39%	41%	40%	52% A B	48% B	39%	45%
Noise	16%	27% A	20%	14%	11%	17%	26% A B	15%	22% A	18%

To what degree, if at all, is each of the following a problem in Oak Park? (Percent rating as "Major problem" or "Moderate problem").	Household Members Aged 65 or Older		Race		Age			Sex		Overall
	No	Yes	White	Not white	18-34	35-54	55+	Female	Male	
	(A)	(B)	(A)	(B)	(A)	(B)	(C)	(A)	(B)	(A)
Panhandling	41%	44%	44% B	35%	35%	41%	47% A	42%	40%	42%
Run-down buildings and houses	16%	19%	18%	13%	13%	17%	20% A	16%	18%	17%
Traffic	58%	64%	63% B	50%	53%	59%	64% A	54%	65% A	59%

Table 61: Sources of Information

How much information about Oak Park, if any, do you get from each of the following sources? (Percent rating as "A lot" or "Some").	Length of Residency			Housing Tenure		Annual Household Income			Overall
	5 years or less	6 to 20 years	More than 20 years	Rent	Own	Less than $49,999	$50,000 to $149,999	$150,000 or more	
	(A)	(B)	(C)	(A)	(B)	(A)	(B)	(C)	(A)
Village of Oak Park website	82% C	88% C	69%	78%	81%	77%	78%	87% A B	80%
Village of Oak Park Facebook & Twitter pages	31% C	36% C	21%	30%	29%	35%	29%	31%	30%
Friends and neighbors	78%	93% A	88% A	73%	93% A	72%	85% A	95% A B	85%
Local newspapers (print and online)	61%	81% A	89% A B	62%	84% A	68%	72%	84% A B	75%
Village of Oak Park email news	32%	61% A	59% A	40%	54% A	51%	47%	52%	49%
Village of Oak Park OP/FYI newsletter and other Village mailings	76%	93% A	93% A	77%	92% A	84%	85%	89%	86%
VOP-TV, the Village's cable TV channel	7%	16% A	19% A	14%	12%	16% C	14% C	7%	13%
Local social media pages/groups	48%	60% A C	42%	45%	52%	42%	53% A	51%	50%

Table 62: Sources of Information

How much information about Oak Park, if any, do you get from each of the following sources? (Percent rating as "A lot" or "Some").	Household Members Aged 65 or Older		Race		Age			Sex		Overall
	No	Yes	White	Not white	18-34	35-54	55+	Female	Male	
	(A)	(B)	(A)	(B)	(A)	(B)	(C)	(A)	(B)	(A)
Village of Oak Park website	86% B	62%	81%	78%	79% C	91% A C	66%	85% B	74%	80%
Village of Oak Park Facebook & Twitter pages	34% B	15%	27%	38% A	28% C	40% A C	18%	35% B	23%	30%
Friends and neighbors	85%	86%	89% B	78%	75%	90% A	88% A	87%	84%	85%
Local newspapers (print and online)	73%	82% A	77%	71%	58%	78% A	83% A	75%	74%	75%
Village of Oak Park email news	47%	54%	46%	55% A	30%	55% A	55% A	51%	46%	49%
Village of Oak Park OP/FYI newsletter and other Village mailings	85%	89%	86%	86%	74%	90% A	91% A	90% B	81%	86%
VOP-TV, the Village's cable TV channel	11%	19% A	8%	22% A	6%	12%	20% A B	14%	11%	13%
Local social media pages/groups	54% B	34%	51%	48%	49% C	60% A C	38%	56% B	42%	50%

Table 63: Value of Taxes Paid

Please rate the value of services for the taxes paid to each of the following (percent of your property tax bill): (Percent rating as "Excellent" or "Good").	Length of Residency			Housing Tenure		Annual Household Income			Overall
	5 years or less	6 to 20 years	More than 20 years	Rent	Own	Less than $49,999	$50,000 to $149,999	$150,000 or more	
	(A)	(B)	(C)	(A)	(B)	(A)	(B)	(C)	(A)
Elementary School District 97 (38.32%)	86% B C	67%	68%	84% B	69%	80%	68%	74%	72%
OPRF High School District 200 (22.69%)	75%	66%	65%	75%	66%	60%	69%	70%	68%
Village of Oak Park (11.05%)	71% B	58%	65%	67%	64%	58%	65%	68%	65%
Oak Park Fire & Police Pensions (5.80%)	70%	68%	76%	72%	70%	63%	72%	71%	71%
Oak Park Public Library (4.80%)	84%	84%	84%	81%	85%	76%	87% A	86% A	84%
Park District of Oak Park (4.76%)	83%	85%	84%	85%	84%	78%	84%	86%	84%
Cook County (4.33%)	44% B	31%	42%	55% B	33%	58% B C	38%	31%	39%
Metropolitan Water Reclamation District (3.12%)	71% B	56%	59%	74% B	57%	69%	61%	59%	62%

Please rate the value of services for the taxes paid to each of the following (percent of your property tax bill): (Percent rating as "Excellent" or "Good").	Length of Residency			Housing Tenure		Annual Household Income			Overall
	5 years or less	6 to 20 years	More than 20 years	Rent	Own	Less than $49,999	$50,000 to $149,999	$150,000 or more	
	(A)	(B)	(C)	(A)	(B)	(A)	(B)	(C)	(A)
Oak Park Township (2.46%)	67% B	53%	64% B	65%	60%	64%	63%	58%	62%
Triton Community College District 504 (2.55%)	68% B C	48%	54%	69% B	50%	62%	58%	49%	56%
Mosquito Abatement District (0.12%)	69%	68%	60%	82% B	59%	72%	68%	59%	65%

Table 64: Value of Taxes Paid

Please rate the value of services for the taxes paid to each of the following (percent of your property tax bill): (Percent rating as "Excellent" or "Good").	Household Members Aged 65 or Older		Race		Age			Sex		Overall
	No	Yes	White	Not white	18-34	35-54	55+	Female	Male	
	(A)	(B)	(A)	(B)	(A)	(B)	(C)	(A)	(B)	(A)
Elementary School District 97 (38.32%)	72%	70%	70%	78%	79%	75% C	65%	75%	68%	72%
OPRF High School District 200 (22.69%)	68%	66%	68%	70%	68%	73% C	62%	73% B	62%	68%
Village of Oak Park (11.05%)	62%	71%	63%	70%	69%	62%	65%	67%	61%	65%
Oak Park Fire & Police Pensions (5.80%)	69%	77%	72%	68%	65%	71%	75%	75% B	66%	71%
Oak Park Public Library (4.80%)	83%	87%	87% B	77%	80%	85%	84%	86%	81%	84%
Park District of Oak Park (4.76%)	84%	83%	84%	83%	85%	85%	81%	84%	83%	84%
Cook County (4.33%)	37%	43%	34%	51% A	49% B	33%	40%	46% B	32%	39%
Metropolitan Water Reclamation District (3.12%)	61%	64%	59%	69%	70%	61%	58%	67% B	56%	62%
Oak Park Township (2.46%)	58%	72% A	59%	67%	60%	57%	68% B	66%	57%	62%
Triton Community College District 504 (2.55%)	53%	63%	51%	67% A	66% B	49%	58%	61% B	48%	56%
Mosquito Abatement District (0.12%)	65%	65%	63%	71%	77% C	63%	62%	67%	63%	65%

Table 65: Line Item Additions to Question 4

Please rate how safe or unsafe you feel: (Percent rating as "Very safe" or "Somewhat safe").	Length of Residency			Housing Tenure		Annual Household Income			Overall
	5 years or less	6 to 20 years	More than 20 years	Rent	Own	Less than $49,999	$50,000 to $149,999	$150,000 or more	
	(A)	(B)	(C)	(A)	(B)	(A)	(B)	(C)	(A)
In your neighborhood after dark	71%	78%	70%	74%	72%	72%	70%	80% B	73%
In Oak Park's downtown/commercial area after dark	74%	82% A C	72%	77%	76%	76%	74%	81%	76%

Table 66: Line Item Additions to Question 4

Please rate how safe or unsafe you feel: (Percent rating as "Very safe" or "Somewhat safe").	Household Members Aged 65 or Older		Race		Age			Sex		Overall
	No	Yes	White	Not white	18-34	35-54	55+	Female	Male	
	(A)	(B)	(A)	(B)	(A)	(B)	(C)	(A)	(B)	(A)
In your neighborhood after dark	72%	74%	70%	80% A	72%	75%	71%	71%	75%	73%
In Oak Park's downtown/commercial area after dark	76%	77%	72%	86% A	80%	77%	72%	75%	77%	76%

Table 67: Line Item Additions to Question 5

Please rate each of the following characteristics as they relate to Oak Park as a whole: (Percent rating as "Excellent" or "Good").	Length of Residency			Housing Tenure		Annual Household Income			Overall
	5 years or less	6 to 20 years	More than 20 years	Rent	Own	Less than $49,999	$50,000 to $149,999	$150,000 or more	
	(A)	(B)	(C)	(A)	(B)	(A)	(B)	(C)	(A)
Ease of travel by bus in Oak Park	58%	63%	62%	69% B	56%	60%	62%	59%	61%
Ease of travel by rail in Oak Park	91% C	91%	85%	92%	87%	79%	91% A	92% A	89%

Table 68: Line Item Additions to Question 5

Please rate each of the following characteristics as they relate to Oak Park as a whole: (Percent rating as "Excellent" or "Good").	Household Members Aged 65 or Older		Race		Age			Sex		Overall
	No	Yes	White	Not white	18-34	35-54	55+	Female	Male	
	(A)	(B)	(A)	(B)	(A)	(B)	(C)	(A)	(B)	(A)
Ease of travel by bus in Oak Park	61%	60%	57%	69% A	59%	63%	60%	60%	62%	61%
Ease of travel by rail in Oak Park	92% B	80%	91% B	84%	94% C	90% C	84%	90%	88%	89%

Table 69: Line Item Additions to Question 7

Please indicate whether or not you have done each of the following in the last 12 months. (Percent rating as "Yes").	Length of Residency			Housing Tenure		Annual Household Income			Overall
	5 years or less	6 to 20 years	More than 20 years	Rent	Own	Less than $49,999	$50,000 to $149,999	$150,000 or more	
	(A)	(B)	(C)	(A)	(B)	(A)	(B)	(C)	(A)
Called for police service in Oak Park	27%	33%	35%	28%	32%	33%	27%	37% B	31%
Called for Oak Park fire/emergency medical services	6%	14% A	17% A	9%	13%	13%	11%	11%	12%

Table 70: Line Item Additions to Question 7

Please indicate whether or not you have done each of the following in the last 12 months. (Percent rating as "Yes").	Household Members Aged 65 or Older		Race		Age			Sex		Overall
	No	Yes	White	Not white	18-34	35-54	55+	Female	Male	
	(A)	(B)	(A)	(B)	(A)	(B)	(C)	(A)	(B)	(A)
Called for police service in Oak Park	31%	31%	32%	28%	20%	38% A	31% A	31%	31%	31%
Called for Oak Park fire/emergency medical services	9%	19% A	10%	14%	7%	10%	17% A B	10%	13%	12%

Table 71: Line Item Additions to Question 10

Please rate the quality of each of the following services in Oak Park: (Percent rating as "Excellent" or "Good").	Length of Residency			Housing Tenure		Annual Household Income			Overall
	5 years or less	6 to 20 years	More than 20 years	Rent	Own	Less than $49,999	$50,000 to $149,999	$150,000 or more	
	(A)	(B)	(C)	(A)	(B)	(A)	(B)	(C)	(A)
Services to low-income people	56%	65% C	46%	56%	53%	51%	57%	57%	55%
Leaf pick-up	68%	78%	76%	66%	78% A	65%	72%	80% A	74%
Care of trees along the parkway	84% C	83% C	74%	80%	81%	72%	84% A	83% A	80%
Alley maintenance	69% B C	55%	48%	69% B	52%	60%	62%	52%	58%
Parking services	42%	37%	35%	33%	41%	30%	35%	50% A B	38%
Online Village services	60%	72% A	64%	61%	67%	63%	59%	73% B	65%
Building permit review	62%	50%	47%	63%	48%	68% B	47%	51%	51%
Oak Park adjudication court	68% C	53%	46%	55%	55%	69%	52%	51%	54%

Table 72: Line Item Additions to Question 10

Please rate the quality of each of the following services in Oak Park: (Percent rating as "Excellent" or "Good").	Household Members Aged 65 or Older		Race		Age			Sex		Overall
	No	Yes	White	Not white	18-34	35-54	55+	Female	Male	
	(A)	(B)	(A)	(B)	(A)	(B)	(C)	(A)	(B)	(A)
Services to low-income people	57%	49%	58%	51%	50%	60%	52%	48%	64% A	55%
Leaf pick-up	73%	77%	74%	75%	60%	79% A	75% A	71%	78%	74%
Care of trees along the parkway	82%	76%	81%	81%	83%	83% C	75%	81%	80%	80%
Alley maintenance	59%	54%	54%	65% A	61%	60%	52%	55%	61%	58%
Parking services	39%	35%	43% B	30%	31%	45% A C	34%	38%	39%	38%
Online Village services	66%	63%	66%	64%	53%	71% A	64%	59%	72% A	65%
Building permit review	52%	48%	55%	46%	55%	55%	45%	51%	52%	51%
Oak Park adjudication court	59% B	37%	57%	54%	69% C	57%	43%	54%	55%	54%

Oak Park, IL

Comparisons by Geographic Subgroups

2019

NRC
National Research Center Inc

ICMA
Leaders at the Core of Better Communities

Summary

The National Community 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. Communities conducting The NCS can choose from a number of optional services to customize the reporting of survey results. Oak Park's Comparisons by Geographic Subgroups is part of a larger project for the Village and additional reports are available under separate cover. This report discusses differences in opinion of survey respondents by quadrant in Oak Park.

Understanding the Tables

For most of the questions, one number appears for each question. Responses have been summarized to show only the proportion of respondents giving a certain answer; for example, the percent of respondents who rated the quality of life as "excellent" or "good," or the percent of respondents who participated in an activity at least once. It should be noted that when a table that does include all responses (not a single number) for a question that only permitted a single response does not total to exactly 100%, it is due to the common practice of percentages being rounded to the nearest whole number.

The subgroup comparison tables contain the crosstabulations of survey questions by quadrant. Chi-square or ANOVA tests of significance were applied to these breakdowns of survey questions. A "p-value" of 0.05 or less indicates that there is less than a 5% probability that differences observed between groups are due to chance; or in other words, a greater than 95% probability that the differences observed in the selected categories of the sample represent "real" differences among those populations. As subgroups vary in size and each group (and each comparison to another group) has a unique margin of error, statistical testing is used to determine whether differences between subgroups are statistically significant. Statistical testing was not performed on multiple response questions.

Each column in the following tables is labeled with a letter for each subgroup being compared. The "Overall" column, which shows the ratings for all respondents, also has a column designation of "(A)", but no statistical tests were done for the overall rating.

For each pair of subgroup ratings within a row (a single question item) that has a statistically significant difference, an upper case letter denoting significance is shown in the cell with the larger column proportion. The letter denotes the subgroup with the smaller column proportion from which it is statistically different. Subgroups that have no upper case letter denotation in their column and that are also not referred to in any other column were not statistically different.

For example, in Figure 1 below, respondents in Districts 1 (A) and 2 (B) gave significantly lower ratings to overall quality of life than respondents in Districts 3 (C) and 4 (D), as denoted by the "A B" listed in the cell of the ratings for Districts 3 and 4. The overall quality of life rating in District 4 (D) also was significantly lower than that of District 3 (C) (as indicated by the "D" in the rating for District 3).

Figure 1: Community Characteristics – General (Example Only)

Percent rating positively (e.g., excellent/good)	District				Overall
	District 1	District 2	District 3	District 4	
	(A)	(B)	(C)	(D)	(A)
The overall quality of life in ABC	73%	74%	79% A B D	76% A B	78%
Overall image or reputation of ABC	65%	66%	69% A B	71% A B C	70%
ABC as a place to live	80%	81%	85% A B D	82% A B	84%

Four quadrants were tracked for comparison and the number of completed surveys for each are in the figure below.

Figure 2: Geographic Areas

Quadrant	Number of Completed Surveys
Northwest	176
Northeast	195
Southwest	167
Southeast	157

Findings

Notable differences between quadrants included the following:

- Residents who lived in the Southeast quadrant were more likely to use the Village of Oak Park Facebook & Twitter pages and the Village of Oak Park email news to get information about the Village compared to those living in the other quadrants. However, Southeast respondents assigned lower marks to the neighborliness of residents in Oak Park and bus or transit services compared to those living in other areas of the village.
- Residents who lived in the Northwest and Southwest were more likely to positively rate their neighborhood as a place to live. However, residents who lived in the Northeast or Southeast gave higher ratings to traffic flow on major streets and ease of travel by car in Oak Park, and were more likely to indicate that overall opportunities for education and enrichment were an essential or very important focus for Oak Park in the coming two years.
- When differences were noted, respondents who lived in the Southwest were less likely to indicate that the overall economic health of Oak Park was an essential or very important focus for the community compared to their counterparts.
- Community members who lived in the Southwest were more likely to rate homelessness, noise, and panhandling as a problem compared to those living in the Northeast and Southeast quadrants.

Table 1: Community Characteristics - General

Percent rating positively (e.g., excellent/good)	Quadrant				Overall
	Northwest	Northeast	Southwest	Southeast	
	(A)	(B)	(C)	(D)	(A)
The overall quality of life in Oak Park	85%	87%	89%	86%	87%
Overall image or reputation of Oak Park	82%	87%	91% A	91% A	89%
Oak Park as a place to live	90%	95%	92%	91%	92%
Your neighborhood as a place to live	92% B D	84%	94% B D	84%	88%
Oak Park as a place to raise children	91%	91%	88%	97% C	92%
Oak Park as a place to retire	47%	47%	35%	50% C	45%
Overall appearance of Oak Park	87%	95% A	89%	90%	91%

Table 2: Community Characteristics - Safety

Percent rating positively (e.g., excellent/good, very/somewhat safe)	Quadrant				Overall
	Northwest	Northeast	Southwest	Southeast	
	(A)	(B)	(C)	(D)	(A)
Overall feeling of safety in Oak Park	72%	78%	74%	81%	77%
In your neighborhood during the day	96%	96%	96%	96%	96%
In Oak Park's downtown/commercial area during the day	95%	96%	94%	95%	95%

Table 3: Community Characteristics - Mobility

Percent rating positively (e.g., excellent/good, very/somewhat safe)	Quadrant				Overall
	Northwest	Northeast	Southwest	Southeast	
	(A)	(B)	(C)	(D)	(A)
Overall ease of getting to the places you usually have to visit	78%	70%	75%	77%	75%
Traffic flow on major streets	22%	36% A C	24%	37% A C	31%
Ease of public parking	28%	33%	28%	37%	32%
Ease of travel by car in Oak Park	38%	51% A C	38%	51% A C	45%
Ease of travel by bicycle in Oak Park	64%	72%	63%	69%	68%
Ease of walking in Oak Park	92%	93%	92%	93%	93%
Availability of paths and walking trails	69%	68%	64%	71%	68%

Table 4: Community Characteristics - Natural Environment

Percent rating positively (e.g., excellent/good, very/somewhat safe)	Quadrant				Overall
	Northwest	Northeast	Southwest	Southeast	
	(A)	(B)	(C)	(D)	(A)
Quality of overall natural environment in Oak Park	87%	91%	85%	92% C	89%
Air quality	81%	84%	75%	75%	78%
Cleanliness of Oak Park	84%	90% C	80%	85%	85%

Table 5: Community Characteristics - Built Environment

Percent rating positively (e.g., excellent/good, very/somewhat safe)	Quadrant				Overall
	Northwest	Northeast	Southwest	Southeast	
	(A)	(B)	(C)	(D)	(A)
Overall "built environment" of Oak Park (including overall design, buildings, parks and transportation systems)	78%	78%	79%	81%	79%
Public places where people want to spend time	80%	88%	90% A	89% A	87%
Variety of housing options	66% B	54%	54%	55%	57%
Availability of affordable quality housing	30%	26%	25%	31%	28%
Overall quality of new development in Oak Park	64% C	57%	49%	65% C	58%

Table 6: Community Characteristics - Economy

Percent rating positively (e.g., excellent/good, very/somewhat safe)	Quadrant				Overall
	Northwest	Northeast	Southwest	Southeast	
	(A)	(B)	(C)	(D)	(A)
Overall economic health of Oak Park	64%	71%	66%	71%	68%
Oak Park as a place to work	68%	71%	74%	64%	69%
Oak Park as a place to visit	92%	88%	91%	86%	89%
Employment opportunities	45%	43%	51%	45%	46%
Shopping opportunities	64%	58%	70% B	66%	65%
Cost of living in Oak Park	18%	22%	15%	21%	19%
Overall quality of business and service establishments in Oak Park	69%	65%	72%	72%	69%
Vibrant downtown/commercial area	71%	69%	77%	84% A B	76%

Table 7: Community Characteristics - Recreation and Wellness

Percent rating positively (e.g., excellent/good, very/somewhat safe)	Quadrant				Overall
	Northwest	Northeast	Southwest	Southeast	
	(A)	(B)	(C)	(D)	(A)
Health and wellness opportunities in Oak Park	76%	84%	78%	86% A	82%
Fitness opportunities (including exercise classes and paths or trails, etc.)	77%	74%	69%	78% C	75%
Recreational opportunities	85%	80%	81%	84%	82%
Availability of affordable quality food	83%	74%	82%	82% B	80%
Availability of affordable quality health care	79%	71%	79%	80%	77%
Availability of preventive health services	79%	74%	80%	82%	79%
Availability of affordable quality mental health care	71% B	50%	60%	65% B	60%

Table 8: Community Characteristics - Education and Enrichment

Percent rating positively (e.g., excellent/good, very/somewhat safe)	Quadrant				Overall
	Northwest	Northeast	Southwest	Southeast	
	(A)	(B)	(C)	(D)	(A)
Overall opportunities for education and enrichment	83%	87%	89%	92% A	89%
Availability of affordable quality child care/preschool	58%	68% D	60% D	44%	57%
Adult educational opportunities	61%	73%	81% A	76% A	74%
Opportunities to attend cultural/arts/music activities	82%	77%	82%	76%	79%
Opportunities to participate in religious or spiritual events and activities	95%	91%	89%	93%	92%

Table 9: Community Characteristics - Community Engagement

Percent rating positively (e.g., excellent/good, very/somewhat safe)	Quadrant				Overall
	Northwest	Northeast	Southwest	Southeast	
	(A)	(B)	(C)	(D)	(A)
Opportunities to participate in social events and activities	80%	79%	83%	77%	80%
Opportunities to volunteer	84%	82%	85%	83%	83%
Opportunities to participate in community matters	72%	81%	74%	81%	78%
Openness and acceptance of the community toward people of diverse backgrounds	80%	78%	73%	73%	75%
Neighborliness of residents in Oak Park	81% D	78% D	74% D	65%	73%

Table 10: Governance - General

Percent rating positively (e.g., excellent/good)	Quadrant				Overall
	Northwest	Northeast	Southwest	Southeast	
	(A)	(B)	(C)	(D)	(A)
The Village of Oak Park	78%	81%	75%	79%	78%
The value of services for the taxes paid to Oak Park	45%	44%	42%	53% C	46%
The overall direction that Oak Park is taking	49%	47%	47%	50%	48%
The job Oak Park government does at welcoming resident involvement	57%	65%	59%	60%	60%
Overall confidence in Oak Park government	43%	50%	42%	44%	45%
Generally acting in the best interest of the community	50%	53%	51%	51%	52%
Being honest	52%	53%	56%	49%	53%
Treating all residents fairly	57%	49%	56%	51%	53%
Overall customer service by Oak Park employees (police, receptionists, planners, etc.)	78%	82%	80%	76%	79%
The Federal Government	32%	38%	36%	32%	34%

Table 11: Governance - Safety

Percent rating positively (e.g., excellent/good)	Quadrant				Overall
	Northwest	Northeast	Southwest	Southeast	
	(A)	(B)	(C)	(D)	(A)
Police services	88%	91%	87%	90%	89%
Fire services	93%	100% A	100% A	97%	98%
Ambulance or emergency medical services	95%	98%	97%	96%	97%
Crime prevention	76% C	77% C	63%	70%	71%
Fire prevention and education	84%	92%	86%	86%	87%
Animal control	70%	80%	79%	73%	76%
Emergency preparedness (services that prepare the community for natural disasters or other emergency situations)	65%	72%	79%	69%	72%

Table 12: Governance - Mobility

Percent rating positively (e.g., excellent/good)	Quadrant				Overall
	Northwest	Northeast	Southwest	Southeast	
	(A)	(B)	(C)	(D)	(A)
Traffic enforcement	59%	54%	49%	54%	54%
Street repair	47%	53%	51%	52%	51%
Street cleaning	70%	74%	65%	76% C	72%
Street lighting	74%	63%	69%	68%	68%
Snow removal	72%	71%	69%	70%	71%
Sidewalk maintenance	64%	61%	64%	68%	65%

Percent rating positively (e.g., excellent/good)	Quadrant				Overall
	Northwest	Northeast	Southwest	Southeast	
	(A)	(B)	(C)	(D)	(A)
Traffic signal timing	49%	62% A	61%	54%	57%
Bus or transit services	84% D	77% D	88% B D	65%	78%

Table 13: Governance - Natural Environment

Percent rating positively (e.g., excellent/good)	Quadrant				Overall
	Northwest	Northeast	Southwest	Southeast	
	(A)	(B)	(C)	(D)	(A)
Garbage collection	84%	89%	88%	82%	86%
Recycling	79%	87% D	84%	79%	83%
Yard waste pick-up	76%	88% A	84%	83%	84%
Drinking water	80%	84%	77%	84%	81%
Preservation of natural areas such as open space, farmlands and greenbelts	61%	72%	61%	64%	65%
Oak Park open space	64%	74%	70%	69%	70%

Table 14: Governance - Built Environment

Percent rating positively (e.g., excellent/good)	Quadrant				Overall
	Northwest	Northeast	Southwest	Southeast	
	(A)	(B)	(C)	(D)	(A)
Storm drainage	58%	62%	66%	64%	63%
Sewer services	80%	77%	81%	79%	79%
Power (electric and/or gas) utility	84%	88% D	86% D	78%	84%
Utility billing	72%	80%	81% D	72%	76%
Land use, planning and zoning	52%	58%	47%	57%	53%
Code enforcement (weeds, abandoned buildings, etc.)	67%	56%	64%	59%	61%
Cable television	58%	63%	69%	64%	64%

Table 15: Governance - Economy

Percent rating positively (e.g., excellent/good)	Quadrant				Overall
	Northwest	Northeast	Southwest	Southeast	
	(A)	(B)	(C)	(D)	(A)
Economic development	53%	54%	58%	59%	56%

Table 16: Governance - Recreation and Wellness

	Quadrant				Overall
	Northwest	Northeast	Southwest	Southeast	
Percent rating positively (e.g., excellent/good)	(A)	(B)	(C)	(D)	(A)
Village parks	94%	95%	97% D	91%	94%
Recreation centers or facilities	85%	88%	91%	90%	89%
Health services	84%	80%	88%	83%	84%

Table 17: Governance - Education and Enrichment

	Quadrant				Overall
	Northwest	Northeast	Southwest	Southeast	
Percent rating positively (e.g., excellent/good)	(A)	(B)	(C)	(D)	(A)
Public library services	94%	99% A	98%	96%	97%
Village-sponsored special events	77%	87% D	86% D	70%	79%

Table 18: Governance - Community Engagement

	Quadrant				Overall
	Northwest	Northeast	Southwest	Southeast	
Percent rating positively (e.g., excellent/good)	(A)	(B)	(C)	(D)	(A)
Public information services	85%	87%	88%	85%	86%

Table 19: Participation General

	Quadrant				Overall
	Northwest	Northeast	Southwest	Southeast	
Percent rating positively (e.g., always/sometimes, more than once a month, yes)	(A)	(B)	(C)	(D)	(A)
Sense of community	80%	76%	79%	75%	77%
Recommend living in Oak Park to someone who asks	88%	88%	91%	91%	90%
Remain in Oak Park for the next five years	73%	79%	78%	85% A	80%
Contacted the Village of Oak Park (in-person, phone, email or web) for help or information	61%	68%	68%	70%	67%

Table 20: Participation - Safety

	Quadrant				Overall
	Northwest	Northeast	Southwest	Southeast	
Percent rating positively (e.g., always/sometimes, more than once a month, yes)	(A)	(B)	(C)	(D)	(A)
Was NOT the victim of a crime	90%	87%	84%	84%	86%
Did NOT report a crime	85% C	79%	74%	77%	78%
Stocked supplies in preparation for an emergency	16%	19%	16%	19%	18%

Table 21: Participation - Mobility

	Quadrant				Overall
	Northwest	Northeast	Southwest	Southeast	
Percent rating positively (e.g., always/sometimes, more than once a month, yes)	(A)	(B)	(C)	(D)	(A)
Walked or biked instead of driving	88%	84%	87%	85%	86%
Carpooled with other adults or children instead of driving alone	40%	47%	51%	45%	46%
Used bus, rail, subway or other public transportation instead of driving	87%	80%	88%	81%	84%

Table 22: Participation - Natural Environment

	Quadrant				Overall
	Northwest	Northeast	Southwest	Southeast	
Percent rating positively (e.g., always/sometimes, more than once a month, yes)	(A)	(B)	(C)	(D)	(A)
Recycle at home	96%	96%	98% D	92%	95%
Made efforts to make your home more energy efficient	76%	77% C	66%	73%	73%
Made efforts to conserve water	82% C	76%	71%	80% C	77%

Table 23: Participation - Built Environment

	Quadrant				Overall
	Northwest	Northeast	Southwest	Southeast	
Percent rating positively (e.g., always/sometimes, more than once a month, yes)	(A)	(B)	(C)	(D)	(A)
NOT under housing cost stress	66%	66%	70%	67%	67%
Did NOT observe a code violation	71% B C	58%	57%	61%	61%

Table 24: Participation - Economy

Percent rating positively (e.g., always/sometimes, more than once a month, yes)	Quadrant				Overall
	Northwest	Northeast	Southwest	Southeast	
	(A)	(B)	(C)	(D)	(A)
Purchase goods or services from a business located in Oak Park	97%	95%	99% B	99% B	98%
Economy will have positive impact on income	25%	18%	19%	22%	21%
Work in Oak Park	29%	36% C	26%	29%	30%

Table 25: Participation - Recreation and Wellness

Percent rating positively (e.g., always/sometimes, more than once a month, yes)	Quadrant				Overall
	Northwest	Northeast	Southwest	Southeast	
	(A)	(B)	(C)	(D)	(A)
Used Oak Park recreation centers or their services	53%	61%	57%	65% A	60%
Visited a neighborhood park or Village park	93% D	91%	93% D	87%	91%
Eat at least 5 portions of fruits and vegetables a day	93% B C	84%	81%	93% B C	88%
Participate in moderate or vigorous physical activity	93% B	85%	87%	92% B	89%
Reported being in "very good" or "excellent" health	77% C D	73%	64%	65%	69%

Table 26: Participation - Education and Enrichment

Percent rating positively (e.g., always/sometimes, more than once a month, yes)	Quadrant				Overall
	Northwest	Northeast	Southwest	Southeast	
	(A)	(B)	(C)	(D)	(A)
Used Oak Park public libraries or their services	81%	78%	81%	78%	79%
Participated in religious or spiritual activities in Oak Park	46% D	36%	38%	34%	38%
Attended a Village-sponsored event	62%	62%	70%	63%	64%

Table 27: Participation - Community Engagement

Percent rating positively (e.g., always/sometimes, more than once a month, yes)	Quadrant				Overall
	Northwest	Northeast	Southwest	Southeast	
	(A)	(B)	(C)	(D)	(A)
Campaigned or advocated for an issue, cause or candidate	32%	38%	28%	31%	32%
Contacted Oak Park elected officials (in-person, phone, email or web) to express your opinion	17%	24% D	19%	15%	19%

Percent rating positively (e.g., always/sometimes, more than once a month, yes)	Quadrant				Overall
	Northwest	Northeast	Southwest	Southeast	
	(A)	(B)	(C)	(D)	(A)
Volunteered your time to some group/activity in Oak Park	39%	46% D	38%	35%	39%
Participated in a club	26%	31% D	25%	20%	25%
Talked to or visited with your immediate neighbors	84%	92% A	91% A	94% A	91%
Done a favor for a neighbor	67%	69%	80% A B	83% A B	76%
Attended a local public meeting	25%	24%	23%	23%	24%
Watched (online or on television) a local public meeting	14%	13%	17%	15%	15%
Read or watch local news (via television, paper, computer, etc.)	83%	81%	79%	83%	81%
Vote in local elections	91%	91%	89%	91%	90%

Table 28: Community Focus Areas

Percent rating positively (e.g., essential/very important)	Quadrant				Overall
	Northwest	Northeast	Southwest	Southeast	
	(A)	(B)	(C)	(D)	(A)
Overall feeling of safety in Oak Park	95%	93%	95%	94%	94%
Overall ease of getting to the places you usually have to visit	84%	76%	84%	79%	81%
Quality of overall natural environment in Oak Park	81%	82%	77%	79%	79%
Overall "built environment" of Oak Park (including overall design, buildings, parks and transportation systems)	82% C	74%	66%	79% C	75%
Health and wellness opportunities in Oak Park	58%	71% A	63%	74% A C	67%
Overall opportunities for education and enrichment	66%	80% A C	68%	78% A C	74%
Overall economic health of Oak Park	96% C	90% C	82%	90% C	89%
Sense of community	76%	85% C	70%	86% A C	80%

Table 29: Importance of Maintaining City Services

Please rate how important, if at all, it is for the Village of Oak Park to maintain each of the following services at least at current levels (as compared with cutting the levels of service): (Percent rating as "Essential" or "Very important").	Quadrant				Overall
	Northwest	Northeast	Southwest	Southeast	
	(A)	(B)	(C)	(D)	(A)
Business retention, development, and attraction	80%	91% A C	84%	88%	86%
Care of trees and landscaping in the parkways	87% B	77%	78%	86% B C	82%
Maintenance of the public way, street cleaning, snow plowing	98%	94%	93%	94%	94%
Fire and emergency medical assistance	95%	92%	97% B	97% B	95%
Housing programs	63%	72%	66%	80% A C	72%
Operation and administration of parking services	59%	62%	71% A	70% A	66%
Partner agencies that promote or support tourism, housing and the arts in Oak Park	54%	58%	57%	64%	59%
Police protection	96%	93%	92%	94%	94%
Public health services	77%	80%	75%	88% A C	81%
Environmental sustainability programs and events	74%	75%	72%	82% C	76%

Table 30: Problems in Oak Park

To what degree, if at all, is each of the following a problem in Oak Park? (Percent rating as "Major problem" or "Moderate problem").	Quadrant				Overall
	Northwest	Northeast	Southwest	Southeast	
	(A)	(B)	(C)	(D)	(A)
Crime	50%	45%	55%	52%	51%
Disorderly youth	25%	24% D	26% D	16%	22%
Drugs	32%	31%	36%	31%	32%
Graffiti	14%	9%	14%	10%	12%
Homelessness	55% B D	36%	55% B D	37%	45%
Noise	21%	13%	26% B D	15%	18%
Panhandling	46% B	33%	50% B D	39%	42%
Run-down buildings and houses	16%	14%	22% B	16%	17%
Traffic	68% B D	56%	63% D	53%	59%

Table 31: Sources of Information

How much information about Oak Park, if any, do you get from each of the following sources? (Percent rating as "A lot" or "Some").	Quadrant				Overall
	Northwest	Northeast	Southwest	Southeast	
	(A)	(B)	(C)	(D)	(A)
Village of Oak Park website	73%	82%	85% A	78%	80%
Village of Oak Park Facebook & Twitter pages	27%	28%	25%	38% A B C	30%
Friends and neighbors	85%	84%	91% D	82%	85%
Local newspapers (print and online)	79%	73%	70%	79% C	75%
Village of Oak Park email news	44%	46%	45%	57% A B C	49%
Village of Oak Park OP/FYI newsletter and other Village mailings	82%	82%	87%	90% A B	86%
VOP-TV, the Village's cable TV channel	12%	9%	15%	16%	13%
Local social media pages/groups	40%	51%	52%	53% A	50%

Table 32: Value of Taxes Paid

Please rate the value of services for the taxes paid to each of the following (percent of your property tax bill): (Percent rating as "Excellent" or "Good").	Quadrant				Overall
	Northwest	Northeast	Southwest	Southeast	
	(A)	(B)	(C)	(D)	(A)
Elementary School District 97 (38.32%)	63%	71%	70%	79% A	72%
OPRF High School District 200 (22.69%)	60%	67%	63%	76% A	68%
Village of Oak Park (11.05%)	69%	68% C	56%	66%	65%
Oak Park Fire & Police Pensions (5.80%)	65%	74%	69%	75%	71%
Oak Park Public Library (4.80%)	83%	83%	84%	86%	84%
Park District of Oak Park (4.76%)	80%	86%	85%	84%	84%
Cook County (4.33%)	37%	50% C D	30%	37%	39%
Metropolitan Water Reclamation District (3.12%)	56%	66%	61%	62%	62%
Oak Park Township (2.46%)	54%	69% A C	56%	63%	62%
Triton Community College District 504 (2.55%)	56%	65% C	49%	52%	56%
Mosquito Abatement District (0.12%)	61%	71%	59%	67%	65%

Table 33: Line Item Additions to Question 4

	Quadrant				Overall
	Northwest	Northeast	Southwest	Southeast	
Please rate how safe or unsafe you feel: (Percent rating as "Very safe" or "Somewhat safe").	(A)	(B)	(C)	(D)	(A)
In your neighborhood after dark	78%	69%	76%	71%	73%
In Oak Park's downtown/commercial area after dark	73%	80%	78%	75%	76%

Table 34: Line Item Additions to Question 5

	Quadrant				Overall
	Northwest	Northeast	Southwest	Southeast	
Please rate each of the following characteristics as they relate to Oak Park as a whole: (Percent rating as "Excellent" or "Good").	(A)	(B)	(C)	(D)	(A)
Ease of travel by bus in Oak Park	69%	56%	68%	56%	61%
Ease of travel by rail in Oak Park	93% B	84%	92% B	87%	89%

Table 35: Line Item Additions to Question 7

	Quadrant				Overall
	Northwest	Northeast	Southwest	Southeast	
Please indicate whether or not you have done each of the following in the last 12 months. (Percent rating as "Yes").	(A)	(B)	(C)	(D)	(A)
Called for police service in Oak Park	23%	37% A	34%	29%	31%
Called for Oak Park fire/emergency medical services	13%	10%	11%	12%	12%

Table 36: Line Item Additions to Question 10

	Quadrant				Overall
	Northwest	Northeast	Southwest	Southeast	
Please rate the quality of each of the following services in Oak Park: (Percent rating as "Excellent" or "Good").	(A)	(B)	(C)	(D)	(A)
Services to low-income people	50%	53%	57%	56%	55%
Leaf pick-up	72%	76%	71%	75%	74%
Care of trees along the parkway	82%	85% D	82% D	74%	80%
Alley maintenance	68% D	57%	56%	55%	58%
Parking services	38%	38%	38%	38%	38%
Online Village services	64%	59%	69%	66%	65%
Building permit review	47%	51%	52%	52%	51%
Oak Park adjudication court	49%	49%	58%	56%	54%

Oak Park, IL

Trends over Time

2019

Summary

The National Community 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 2019 ratings for the Village of Oak Park to its previous survey results in 2000, 2004, 2008, 2011, 2013, 2015 and 2017. Additional reports and technical appendices are available under separate cover.

Trend data for Oak Park 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 six percentage points between the 2017 and 2019 surveys, otherwise the comparisons between 2017 and 2019 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 Oak Park for 2019 generally remained stable. Of the 131 items for which comparisons were available, 109 items were rated similarly in 2017 and 2019, two items showed a decrease in ratings and 20 showed an increase in ratings. Notable trends over time included the following:

- Within the pillar of Community Characteristics, ratings for seven aspects increased from 2017 to 2019, including availability of paths and walking trails, overall built environment, employment opportunities, and Oak Park as a place to work. Other improvements in 2019 included fitness and recreational opportunities and adult educational opportunities. Assessments of shopping opportunities, employment opportunities, and availability of affordable health care have been on the rise since 2008 (with increases of 26%, 21%, and 18%, respectively, over the last decade).
- More than half of the 20 items that saw rating improvements were within Governance. Evaluations for fire prevention, emergency preparedness, yard waste pick-up, open space, and natural areas preservation increased from 2017 to 2019. Residents gave higher marks to three items related to government performance (overall customer service of Oak Park employees, welcoming resident involvement and being honest). Additionally, reviews for public information, sewer services, storm drain, and land use, planning and zoning increased from 2017 to 2019. While ratings for economic development remained stable from 2017 to 2019, assessments have increased from 33% assigning ratings of excellent or good in 2011 to 56% in 2019.
- From 2017 to 2019, levels of Participation for most items remained stable in Oak Park. Fewer community members reported a crime in 2019. However, residents reported lower levels of volunteering and doing a favor for a neighbor in 2019 compared to 2017.

Table 1: Community Characteristics General

	Percent rating positively (e.g., excellent/good)								2019 rating compared to 2017	Comparison to benchmark							
	2000	2004	2008	2011	2013	2015	2017	2019		2000	2004	2008	2011	2013	2015	2017	2019
Overall quality of life	80%	93%	89%	90%	89%	90%	84%	87%	Similar	NA	Much higher	Much higher	Much higher	Much higher	Similar	Similar	Similar
Overall image	NA	NA	87%	89%	89%	89%	85%	89%	Similar	NA	NA	Much higher	Much higher	Much higher	Higher	Higher	Higher
Place to live	NA	NA	93%	91%	93%	94%	90%	92%	Similar	NA	NA	Much higher	Much higher	Much higher	Similar	Similar	Similar
Neighborhood	NA	93%	86%	88%	88%	88%	87%	88%	Similar	NA	Much higher	Much higher	Much higher	Higher	Similar	Similar	Similar
Place to raise children	81%	96%	85%	93%	92%	91%	90%	92%	Similar	NA	Much higher	Much higher	Much higher	Much higher	Higher	Higher	Higher
Place to retire	58%	NA	55%	55%	57%	58%	47%	45%	Similar	NA	NA	Lower	Lower	Lower	Similar	Lower	Lower
Overall appearance	81%	94%	89%	92%	89%	94%	87%	91%	Similar	NA	Much higher	Much higher	Much higher	Much higher	Higher	Similar	Higher

Table 2: Community Characteristics by Facet

		Percent rating positively (e.g., excellent/good, very/somewhat safe)								2019 rating compared to 2017	Comparison to benchmark							
		2000	2004	2008	2011	2013	2015	2017	2019		2000	2004	2008	2011	2013	2015	2017	2019
Safety	Overall feeling of safety	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	76%	77%	77%	Similar	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	Similar	Similar	Similar
	Safe in neighborhood	NA	NA	91%	92%	94%	94%	91%	96%	Similar	NA	NA	Similar	Similar	Similar	Similar	Similar	Similar
	Safe downtown/commercial area	NA	NA	94%	93%	95%	97%	93%	95%	Similar	NA	NA	Much higher	Much higher	Much higher	Similar	Similar	Similar
	Overall ease of travel	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	84%	71%	75%	Similar	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	Similar	Similar	Similar
	Paths and walking trails	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	61%	56%	68%	Higher	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	Similar	Similar	Similar
	Ease of walking	NA	94%	88%	89%	92%	89%	87%	93%	Similar	NA	Much higher	Much higher	Much higher	Much higher	Much higher	Higher	Much higher
	Travel by bicycle	55%	67%	64%	71%	74%	67%	66%	68%	Similar	NA	Much higher	Much higher	Much higher	Much higher	Higher	Similar	Higher
	Travel by car	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	52%	45%	45%	Similar	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	Similar	Lower	Lower
	Public parking	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	27%	26%	32%	Similar	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	Lower	Lower	Lower
Mobility	Traffic flow	NA	NA	41%	42%	46%	43%	32%	31%	Similar	NA	NA	Similar	Similar	Similar	Similar	Similar	Similar
	Overall natural environment	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	86%	85%	89%	Similar	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	Similar	Similar	Similar
Natural Environment	Cleanliness	NA	NA	87%	89%	87%	86%	81%	85%	Similar	NA	NA	Much higher	Much higher	Much higher	Similar	Similar	Similar

		Percent rating positively (e.g., excellent/good, very/somewhat safe)								2019 rating compared to 2017	Comparison to benchmark							
		2000	2004	2008	2011	2013	2015	2017	2019		2000	2004	2008	2011	2013	2015	2017	2019
	Air quality	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	78%	73%	78%	Similar	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	Similar	Similar	Similar
Built Environment	Overall built environment	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	81%	72%	79%	Higher	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	Higher	Similar	Higher
	New development in Oak Park	NA	NA	47%	51%	53%	56%	52%	58%	Similar	NA	NA	Much lower	Similar	Similar	Similar	Similar	Similar
	Affordable quality housing	NA	NA	33%	35%	37%	38%	23%	28%	Similar	NA	NA	Similar	Similar	Lower	Similar	Lower	Similar
	Housing options	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	64%	54%	57%	Similar	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	Similar	Similar	Similar
	Public places	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	86%	83%	87%	Similar	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	Higher	Similar	Higher
	Overall economic health	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	67%	68%	68%	Similar	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	Similar	Similar	Similar
	Vibrant downtown/commercial area	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	69%	71%	76%	Similar	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	Higher	Higher	Higher
	Business and services	NA	NA	55%	67%	65%	64%	67%	69%	Similar	NA	NA	Similar	Higher	Similar	Similar	Similar	Similar
	Cost of living	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	24%	16%	19%	Similar	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	Lower	Lower	Lower
	Shopping opportunities	48%	71%	39%	51%	51%	61%	67%	65%	Similar	NA	Much higher	Lower	Similar	Similar	Similar	Similar	Similar
	Employment opportunities	NA	NA	25%	28%	33%	41%	33%	46%	Higher	NA	NA	Similar	Similar	Similar	Similar	Similar	Similar
	Place to visit	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	84%	83%	89%	Similar	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	Higher	Higher	Higher
Economy	Place to work	NA	NA	56%	58%	68%	68%	57%	69%	Higher	NA	NA	Similar	Higher	Much higher	Similar	Similar	Similar
	Health and wellness	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	78%	83%	82%	Similar	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	Similar	Similar	Similar
	Mental health care	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	68%	60%	60%	Similar	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	Higher	Similar	Higher
	Preventive health services	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	76%	76%	79%	Similar	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	Similar	Similar	Higher
	Health care	NA	NA	59%	68%	62%	74%	73%	77%	Similar	NA	NA	Much higher	Much higher	Much higher	Similar	Similar	Higher
	Food	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	75%	75%	80%	Similar	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	Similar	Similar	Similar
Recreation and Wellness	Recreational opportunities	NA	NA	75%	75%	79%	72%	71%	82%	Higher	NA	NA	Much higher	Much higher	Much higher	Similar	Similar	Similar
	Fitness opportunities	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	69%	66%	75%	Higher	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	Similar	Similar	Similar
Education and Enrichment	Education and enrichment opportunities	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	84%	83%	89%	Similar	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	Higher	Higher	Higher
	Religious or spiritual events and activities	NA	NA	85%	86%	87%	89%	88%	92%	Similar	NA	NA	Much higher	Much higher	Much higher	Higher	Similar	Higher

		Percent rating positively (e.g., excellent/good, very/somewhat safe)								2019 rating compared to 2017	Comparison to benchmark							
		2000	2004	2008	2011	2013	2015	2017	2019		2000	2004	2008	2011	2013	2015	2017	2019
	Cultural/arts/music activities	NA	86%	75%	72%	75%	83%	78%	79%	Similar	NA	Much higher	Much higher	Much higher	Much higher	Higher	Higher	Higher
	Adult education	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	76%	65%	74%	Higher	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	Similar	Similar	Higher
	Child care/preschool	NA	NA	40%	49%	40%	68%	54%	57%	Similar	NA	NA	Higher	Much higher	Similar	Higher	Similar	Similar
	Social events and activities	NA	NA	77%	77%	80%	78%	82%	80%	Similar	NA	NA	Much higher	Much higher	Much higher	Higher	Higher	Higher
	Neighborliness	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	78%	72%	73%	Similar	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	Higher	Similar	Similar
	Openness and acceptance	76%	89%	88%	86%	87%	77%	75%	75%	Similar	NA	Much higher	Much higher	Much higher	Much higher	Higher	Higher	Higher
	Opportunities to participate in community matters	NA	NA	77%	76%	82%	77%	79%	78%	Similar	NA	NA	Much higher	Much higher	Much higher	Higher	Higher	Higher
Community Engagement	Opportunities to volunteer	NA	NA	83%	80%	85%	81%	82%	83%	Similar	NA	NA	Much higher	Much higher	Much higher	Similar	Similar	Higher

Table 3: Governance General

	Percent rating positively (e.g., excellent/good)								2019 rating compared to 2017	Comparison to benchmark							
	2000	2004	2008	2011	2013	2015	2017	2019		2000	2004	2008	2011	2013	2015	2017	2019
Services provided by Oak Park	77%	92%	72%	74%	82%	80%	76%	78%	Similar	NA	Much higher	Similar	Higher	Higher	Similar	Similar	Similar
Customer service	64%	81%	70%	74%	81%	74%	72%	79%	Higher	NA	Similar	Similar	Similar	Higher	Similar	Similar	Similar
Value of services for taxes paid	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	47%	43%	46%	Similar	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	Similar	Similar	Similar
Overall direction	65%	71%	53%	60%	66%	59%	45%	48%	Similar	NA	Much higher	Lower	Higher	Higher	Similar	Similar	Similar
Welcoming resident involvement	64%	73%	61%	65%	63%	65%	54%	60%	Higher	NA	Much higher	Lower	Much higher	Much higher	Similar	Similar	Similar
Confidence in Village government	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	54%	46%	45%	Similar	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	Similar	Similar	Similar
Acting in the best interest of Oak Park	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	60%	50%	52%	Similar	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	Similar	Similar	Similar
Being honest	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	63%	46%	53%	Higher	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	Similar	Similar	Similar
Treating all residents fairly	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	61%	56%	53%	Similar	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	Similar	Similar	Similar
Services provided by the Federal Government	NA	NA	31%	40%	38%	45%	29%	34%	Similar	NA	NA	Lower	Similar	Similar	Similar	Similar	Similar

Table 4: Governance by Facet

		Percent rating positively (e.g., excellent/good)								2019 rating compared to 2017	Comparison to benchmark							
		2000	2004	2008	2011	2013	2015	2017	2019		2000	2004	2008	2011	2013	2015	2017	2019
Safety	Police	76%	90%	87%	86%	92%	88%	87%	89%	Similar	NA	Much higher	Much higher	Much higher	Much higher	Similar	Similar	Similar
	Fire	85%	98%	96%	96%	98%	95%	94%	98%	Similar	NA	Much higher	Much higher	Much higher	Much higher	Similar	Similar	Similar
	Ambulance/EMS	82%	97%	92%	93%	95%	93%	93%	97%	Similar	NA	Much higher	Much higher	Much higher	Much higher	Similar	Similar	Similar
	Crime prevention	67%	80%	58%	67%	74%	77%	68%	71%	Similar	NA	Much higher	Similar	Similar	Higher	Similar	Similar	Similar
	Fire prevention	NA	NA	80%	84%	85%	85%	80%	87%	Higher	NA	NA	Higher	Much higher	Higher	Similar	Similar	Similar
	Animal control	66%	83%	76%	75%	76%	74%	72%	76%	Similar	NA	Much higher	Much higher	Much higher	Much higher	Similar	Similar	Higher
	Emergency preparedness	NA	NA	72%	69%	61%	74%	58%	72%	Higher	NA	NA	Higher	Similar	Similar	Similar	Similar	Similar
Mobility	Traffic enforcement	62%	76%	56%	54%	57%	61%	52%	54%	Similar	NA	Much higher	Lower	Lower	Lower	Similar	Similar	Similar
	Street repair	56%	59%	35%	36%	48%	40%	50%	51%	Similar	NA	Higher	Much lower	Lower	Similar	Similar	Similar	Similar
	Street cleaning	75%	89%	74%	70%	77%	63%	71%	72%	Similar	NA	Much higher	Much higher	Much higher	Much higher	Similar	Similar	Similar
	Street lighting	68%	83%	70%	71%	72%	66%	69%	68%	Similar	NA	Much higher	Much higher	Much higher	Much higher	Similar	Similar	Similar
	Snow removal	58%	77%	58%	64%	77%	59%	67%	71%	Similar	NA	Much higher	Similar	Higher	Much higher	Similar	Similar	Similar
	Sidewalk maintenance	48%	70%	54%	58%	65%	63%	61%	65%	Similar	NA	Much higher	Higher	Higher	Much higher	Similar	Similar	Similar
	Traffic signal timing	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	56%	54%	57%	Similar	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	Similar	Similar	Similar
	Bus or transit services	NA	81%	69%	76%	69%	78%	73%	78%	Similar	NA	Much higher	Much higher	Much higher	Much higher	Higher	Higher	Much higher
Natural Environment	Garbage collection	73%	89%	80%	86%	89%	88%	83%	86%	Similar	NA	Higher	Similar	Similar	Similar	Similar	Similar	Similar
	Recycling	72%	87%	81%	83%	88%	89%	81%	83%	Similar	NA	Much higher	Much higher	Much higher	Much higher	Similar	Similar	Similar
	Yard waste pick-up	NA	85%	75%	78%	77%	79%	77%	84%	Higher	NA	Much higher	Higher	Higher	Higher	Similar	Similar	Similar
	Drinking water	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	81%	81%	81%	Similar	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	Similar	Similar	Similar
	Natural areas preservation	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	63%	53%	65%	Higher	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	Similar	Similar	Similar

		Percent rating positively (e.g., excellent/good)								2019 rating compared to 2017	Comparison to benchmark							
		2000	2004	2008	2011	2013	2015	2017	2019		2000	2004	2008	2011	2013	2015	2017	2019
	Open space	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	70%	60%	70%	Higher	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	Similar	Similar	Similar
	Storm drainage	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	61%	54%	63%	Higher	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	Similar	Similar	Similar
	Sewer services	NA	NA	70%	64%	75%	75%	71%	79%	Higher	NA	NA	Similar	Lower	Similar	Similar	Similar	Similar
	Power utility	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	82%	81%	84%	Similar	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	Similar	Similar	Similar
	Utility billing	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	72%	74%	76%	Similar	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	Similar	Similar	Similar
	Land use, planning and zoning	NA	NA	38%	43%	54%	61%	46%	53%	Higher	NA	NA	Similar	Similar	Similar	Similar	Similar	Similar
	Code enforcement	NA	NA	57%	48%	67%	64%	56%	61%	Similar	NA	NA	Much higher	Higher	Much higher	Similar	Similar	Similar
Built Environment	Cable television	46%	69%	62%	59%	62%	55%	64%	64%	Similar	NA	Much higher	Much higher	Similar	Higher	Similar	Similar	Similar
Economy	Economic development	NA	77%	36%	33%	35%	51%	53%	56%	Similar	NA	Much higher	Much lower	Lower	Much lower	Similar	Similar	Similar
	Village parks	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	90%	89%	94%	Similar	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	Higher	Similar	Higher
Recreation and Wellness	Recreation centers	NA	NA	76%	NA	NA	90%	87%	89%	Similar	NA	NA	Higher	NA	NA	Higher	Higher	Higher
	Health services	74%	89%	72%	68%	69%	77%	80%	84%	Similar	NA	Much higher	Much higher	Higher	Similar	Similar	Similar	Higher
Education and Enrichment	Special events	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	81%	77%	79%	Similar	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	Higher	Similar	Similar
	Public libraries	81%	NA	92%	96%	95%	93%	93%	97%	Similar	NA	NA	Much higher	Much higher	Much higher	Higher	Higher	Higher
Community Engagement	Public information	NA	NA	80%	80%	83%	81%	78%	86%	Higher	NA	NA	Much higher	Much higher	Much higher	Similar	Similar	Higher

Table 5: Participation General

	Percent rating positively (e.g., always/sometimes, more than once a month, yes)								2019 rating compared to 2017	Comparison to benchmark							
	2000	2004	2008	2011	2013	2015	2017	2019	2017	2000	2004	2008	2011	2013	2015	2017	2019
Sense of community	73%	88%	85%	82%	84%	79%	76%	77%	Similar	NA	Much higher	Much higher	Much higher	Much higher	Higher	Higher	Higher
Recommend Oak Park	NA	NA	89%	88%	91%	92%	87%	90%	Similar	NA	NA	Higher	Higher	Higher	Similar	Similar	Similar
Remain in Oak Park	NA	NA	79%	82%	85%	83%	80%	80%	Similar	NA	NA	Lower	Similar	Similar	Similar	Similar	Similar
Contacted Oak Park employees	71%	NA	74%	76%	69%	70%	67%	67%	Similar	NA	NA	Much higher	Much higher	Much higher	Much higher	Much higher	Much higher

Table 6: Participation by Facet

		Percent rating positively (e.g., always/sometimes, more than once a month, yes)								2019 rating compared to 2017	Comparison to benchmark							
		2000	2004	2008	2011	2013	2015	2017	2019		2000	2004	2008	2011	2013	2015	2017	2019
Safety	Stocked supplies for an emergency	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	24%	21%	18%	Similar	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	Lower	Lower	Lower
	Did NOT report a crime	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	76%	72%	78%	Higher	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	Similar	Similar	Similar
	Was NOT the victim of a crime	NA	NA	77%	87%	86%	88%	89%	86%	Similar	NA	NA	Much lower	Similar	Similar	Similar	Similar	Similar
Mobility	Used public transportation instead of driving	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	81%	79%	84%	Similar	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	Much higher	Much higher	Much higher
	Carpooled instead of driving alone	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	44%	48%	46%	Similar	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	Similar	Similar	Similar
	Walked or biked instead of driving	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	88%	87%	86%	Similar	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	Much higher	Much higher	Much higher
Natural Environment	Conserved water	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	78%	78%	77%	Similar	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	Similar	Similar	Similar
	Made home more energy efficient	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	74%	77%	73%	Similar	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	Similar	Similar	Similar
	Recycled at home	NA	NA	90%	92%	90%	89%	91%	95%	Similar	NA	NA	Much higher	Much higher	Much higher	Similar	Similar	Similar
Built Environment	Did NOT observe a code violation	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	56%	67%	61%	Similar	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	Similar	Higher	Similar
	NOT under housing cost stress	NA	NA	NA	64%	66%	67%	65%	67%	Similar	NA	NA	NA	Similar	Similar	Similar	Similar	Similar
Economy	Purchased goods or services in Oak Park	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	91%	94%	98%	Similar	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	Similar	Similar	Similar
	Economy will have positive impact on income	NA	NA	7%	11%	24%	29%	22%	21%	Similar	NA	NA	Much lower	Much lower	Higher	Similar	Similar	Lower

		Percent rating positively (e.g., always/sometimes, more than once a month, yes)								2019 rating compared to 2017	Comparison to benchmark							
		2000	2004	2008	2011	2013	2015	2017	2019		2000	2004	2008	2011	2013	2015	2017	2019
	Work in Oak Park	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	28%	28%	30%	Similar	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	Lower	Lower	Lower
Recreation and Wellness	Used Oak Park recreation centers	NA	NA	66%	NA	NA	62%	59%	60%	Similar	NA	NA	Much higher	NA	NA	Similar	Similar	Similar
	Visited a Village park	NA	NA	94%	NA	NA	89%	88%	91%	Similar	NA	NA	Much higher	NA	NA	Similar	Similar	Similar
	Ate 5 portions of fruits and vegetables	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	86%	86%	88%	Similar	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	Similar	Similar	Similar
	Participated in moderate or vigorous physical activity	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	87%	86%	89%	Similar	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	Similar	Similar	Similar
	In very good to excellent health	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	71%	70%	69%	Similar	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	Similar	Similar	Similar
Education and Enrichment	Used Oak Park public libraries	73%	NA	83%	86%	85%	80%	84%	79%	Similar	NA	NA	Much higher	Much higher	Much higher	Higher	Much higher	Higher
	Participated in religious or spiritual activities	NA	NA	53%	46%	48%	43%	43%	38%	Similar	NA	NA	Similar	Much lower	Lower	Similar	Similar	Similar
	Attended a Village-sponsored event	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	68%	62%	64%	Similar	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	Higher	Similar	Similar
Community Engagement	Campaigned for an issue, cause or candidate	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	23%	33%	32%	Similar	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	Similar	Similar	Similar
	Contacted Oak Park elected officials	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	18%	24%	19%	Similar	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	Similar	Similar	Similar
	Volunteered	NA	NA	45%	44%	50%	41%	45%	39%	Lower	NA	NA	Higher	Similar	Higher	Similar	Similar	Similar
	Participated in a club	NA	NA	31%	30%	29%	24%	28%	25%	Similar	NA	NA	Similar	Similar	Similar	Similar	Similar	Similar
	Talked to or visited with neighbors	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	92%	89%	91%	Similar	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	Similar	Similar	Similar
	Done a favor for a neighbor	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	79%	84%	76%	Lower	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	Similar	Similar	Similar

	Percent rating positively (e.g., always/sometimes, more than once a month, yes)								2019 rating compared to 2017	Comparison to benchmark							
	2000	2004	2008	2011	2013	2015	2017	2019		2000	2004	2008	2011	2013	2015	2017	2019
Attended a local public meeting	NA	NA	30%	28%	27%	23%	27%	24%	Similar	NA	NA	Similar	Similar	Similar	Similar	Similar	Similar
Watched a local public meeting	25%	NA	36%	34%	27%	20%	21%	15%	Similar	NA	NA	Much lower	Much lower	Much lower	Similar	Similar	Similar
Read or watched local news	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	84%	87%	81%	Similar	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	Similar	Similar	Similar
Voted in local elections	NA	NA	NA	82%	79%	88%	88%	90%	Similar	NA	NA	NA	Much higher	Higher	Similar	Similar	Similar

THE NCS™
The National Community Survey™

Oak Park, IL
Technical Appendices

2019

NRC
National Research Center Inc.

ICMA
Leaders at the Core of Better Communities

Contents

Appendix A: Complete Survey Responses

Responses excluding "don't know"

The following pages contain a complete set of responses to each question on the survey, excluding the "don't know" responses. The percent of respondents giving a particular response is shown followed by the number of respondents (denoted with "N=").

Table 1: Question 1

Please rate each of the following aspects of quality of life in Oak Park:	Excellent		Good		Fair		Poor		Total	
Oak Park as a place to live	44%	N=306	48%	N=328	7%	N=45	1%	N=9	100%	N=688
Your neighborhood as a place to live	44%	N=303	44%	N=299	10%	N=69	2%	N=14	100%	N=685
Oak Park as a place to raise children	52%	N=300	40%	N=226	7%	N=40	1%	N=6	100%	N=572
Oak Park as a place to work	26%	N=95	42%	N=152	24%	N=87	7%	N=25	100%	N=360
Oak Park as a place to visit	39%	N=253	50%	N=324	10%	N=67	1%	N=5	100%	N=649
Oak Park as a place to retire	19%	N=90	27%	N=130	26%	N=128	28%	N=138	100%	N=486
The overall quality of life in Oak Park	33%	N=224	53%	N=359	12%	N=80	1%	N=8	100%	N=672

Table 2: Question 2

Please rate each of the following characteristics as they relate to Oak Park as a whole:	Excellent		Good		Fair		Poor		Total	
Overall feeling of safety in Oak Park	22%	N=149	55%	N=378	20%	N=135	3%	N=23	100%	N=685
Overall ease of getting to the places you usually have to visit	32%	N=217	43%	N=291	20%	N=134	5%	N=36	100%	N=678
Quality of overall natural environment in Oak Park	35%	N=240	54%	N=365	10%	N=68	1%	N=7	100%	N=679
Overall "built environment" of Oak Park (including overall design, buildings, parks and transportation systems)	27%	N=186	52%	N=352	17%	N=112	4%	N=29	100%	N=678
Health and wellness opportunities in Oak Park	29%	N=176	53%	N=324	15%	N=90	3%	N=21	100%	N=611
Overall opportunities for education and enrichment	40%	N=237	49%	N=290	9%	N=53	3%	N=15	100%	N=595
Overall economic health of Oak Park	14%	N=82	54%	N=312	25%	N=148	7%	N=38	100%	N=580
Sense of community	30%	N=200	47%	N=316	19%	N=129	3%	N=22	100%	N=666
Overall image or reputation of Oak Park	34%	N=231	55%	N=373	9%	N=65	2%	N=14	100%	N=682

Table 3: Question 3

Please indicate how likely or unlikely you are to do each of the following:	Very likely		Somewhat likely		Somewhat unlikely		Very unlikely		Total	
Recommend living in Oak Park to someone who asks	56%	N=383	34%	N=231	7%	N=46	3%	N=24	100%	N=683
Remain in Oak Park for the next five years	52%	N=343	28%	N=184	12%	N=77	9%	N=56	100%	N=660

Table 4: Question 4

Please rate how safe or unsafe you feel:	Very safe		Somewhat safe		Neither safe nor unsafe		Somewhat unsafe		Very unsafe		Total	
In your neighborhood during the day	66%	N=455	29%	N=202	3%	N=21	1%	N=8	0%	N=1	100%	N=687
In Oak Park's downtown/commercial area during the day	70%	N=475	25%	N=170	4%	N=24	1%	N=7	0%	N=3	100%	N=680
In your neighborhood after dark	26%	N=178	47%	N=319	12%	N=82	13%	N=88	2%	N=14	100%	N=681
In Oak Park's downtown/commercial area after dark	37%	N=245	40%	N=267	14%	N=92	8%	N=56	2%	N=11	100%	N=671

Table 5: Question 5

Please rate each of the following characteristics as they relate to Oak Park as a whole:	Excellent		Good		Fair		Poor		Total	
Traffic flow on major streets	3%	N=22	28%	N=186	42%	N=285	27%	N=182	100%	N=675
Ease of public parking	7%	N=44	25%	N=170	34%	N=223	34%	N=229	100%	N=667
Ease of travel by car in Oak Park	8%	N=54	37%	N=245	38%	N=255	17%	N=110	100%	N=665
Ease of travel by bicycle in Oak Park	27%	N=129	40%	N=189	23%	N=106	10%	N=46	100%	N=469
Ease of walking in Oak Park	50%	N=339	42%	N=286	7%	N=45	1%	N=6	100%	N=675
Availability of paths and walking trails	28%	N=163	40%	N=235	21%	N=123	11%	N=65	100%	N=585
Air quality	23%	N=151	55%	N=353	19%	N=122	3%	N=18	100%	N=645
Cleanliness of Oak Park	33%	N=224	52%	N=351	13%	N=90	2%	N=14	100%	N=679
Overall appearance of Oak Park	39%	N=263	52%	N=354	9%	N=61	0%	N=3	100%	N=682
Public places where people want to spend time	41%	N=278	46%	N=307	11%	N=75	2%	N=11	100%	N=671
Variety of housing options	17%	N=105	39%	N=240	35%	N=213	9%	N=53	100%	N=610
Availability of affordable quality housing	8%	N=43	20%	N=116	36%	N=203	36%	N=204	100%	N=566
Fitness opportunities (including exercise classes and paths or trails, etc.)	25%	N=160	49%	N=315	21%	N=136	4%	N=27	100%	N=637
Recreational opportunities	30%	N=187	53%	N=332	16%	N=101	2%	N=10	100%	N=630
Availability of affordable quality food	29%	N=194	51%	N=348	16%	N=107	4%	N=30	100%	N=678
Availability of affordable quality health care	27%	N=141	50%	N=257	19%	N=100	4%	N=18	100%	N=516
Availability of preventive health services	27%	N=129	52%	N=249	17%	N=82	4%	N=20	100%	N=480
Availability of affordable quality mental health care	22%	N=71	38%	N=122	30%	N=97	10%	N=31	100%	N=320
Ease of travel by bus in Oak Park	20%	N=75	42%	N=161	30%	N=115	9%	N=33	100%	N=385
Ease of travel by rail in Oak Park	45%	N=290	43%	N=277	10%	N=61	2%	N=10	100%	N=638

Table 6: Question 6

Please rate each of the following characteristics as they relate to Oak Park as a whole:	Excellent		Good		Fair		Poor		Total	
Availability of affordable quality child care/preschool	18%	N=55	38%	N=113	32%	N=95	12%	N=34	100%	N=297
Adult educational opportunities	23%	N=92	51%	N=208	22%	N=91	4%	N=16	100%	N=407
Opportunities to attend cultural/arts/music activities	30%	N=190	49%	N=306	18%	N=116	2%	N=16	100%	N=627
Opportunities to participate in religious or spiritual events and activities	44%	N=215	48%	N=237	7%	N=35	1%	N=4	100%	N=490
Employment opportunities	8%	N=24	38%	N=108	36%	N=102	18%	N=51	100%	N=284
Shopping opportunities	15%	N=98	50%	N=331	29%	N=195	6%	N=40	100%	N=664
Cost of living in Oak Park	2%	N=17	17%	N=111	45%	N=300	36%	N=241	100%	N=669
Overall quality of business and service establishments in Oak Park	16%	N=106	54%	N=358	27%	N=178	4%	N=26	100%	N=668

Please rate each of the following characteristics as they relate to Oak Park as a whole:	Excellent		Good		Fair		Poor		Total	
Vibrant downtown/commercial area	26%	N=171	50%	N=333	19%	N=127	5%	N=32	100%	N=663
Overall quality of new development in Oak Park	16%	N=100	42%	N=262	24%	N=150	17%	N=108	100%	N=619
Opportunities to participate in social events and activities	28%	N=172	52%	N=320	18%	N=111	3%	N=16	100%	N=619
Opportunities to volunteer	36%	N=179	47%	N=232	15%	N=75	1%	N=7	100%	N=494
Opportunities to participate in community matters	31%	N=167	47%	N=255	20%	N=107	3%	N=14	100%	N=543
Openness and acceptance of the community toward people of diverse backgrounds	27%	N=176	48%	N=308	20%	N=126	5%	N=31	100%	N=641
Neighborliness of residents in Oak Park	25%	N=166	49%	N=327	23%	N=152	4%	N=27	100%	N=672

Table 7: Question 7

Please indicate whether or not you have done each of the following in the last 12 months.	No		Yes		Total	
Made efforts to conserve water	23%	N=157	77%	N=527	100%	N=685
Made efforts to make your home more energy efficient	27%	N=184	73%	N=493	100%	N=677
Observed a code violation or other hazard in Oak Park (weeds, abandoned buildings, etc.)	61%	N=416	39%	N=262	100%	N=677
Household member was a victim of a crime in Oak Park	86%	N=585	14%	N=95	100%	N=680
Reported a crime to the police in Oak Park	78%	N=533	22%	N=149	100%	N=682
Stocked supplies in preparation for an emergency	82%	N=559	18%	N=121	100%	N=680
Campaigned or advocated for an issue, cause or candidate	68%	N=461	32%	N=217	100%	N=678
Contacted the Village of Oak Park (in-person, phone, email or web) for help or information	33%	N=223	67%	N=455	100%	N=678
Contacted Oak Park elected officials (in-person, phone, email or web) to express your opinion	81%	N=555	19%	N=126	100%	N=681
Called for police service in Oak Park	69%	N=472	31%	N=212	100%	N=684
Called for Oak Park fire/emergency medical services	88%	N=598	12%	N=78	100%	N=676

Table 8: Question 8

In the last 12 months, about how many times, if at all, have you or other household members done each of the following in Oak Park?	2 times a week or more		2-4 times a month		Once a month or less		Not at all		Total	
Used Oak Park recreation centers or their services	13%	N=86	18%	N=123	29%	N=194	40%	N=269	100%	N=672
Visited a neighborhood park or Village park	30%	N=203	32%	N=219	28%	N=191	9%	N=63	100%	N=676
Used Oak Park public libraries or their services	19%	N=130	34%	N=233	26%	N=174	21%	N=140	100%	N=677
Participated in religious or spiritual activities in Oak Park	9%	N=59	15%	N=102	14%	N=94	62%	N=420	100%	N=675
Attended a Village-sponsored event	1%	N=9	10%	N=65	53%	N=357	36%	N=240	100%	N=672
Used bus, rail, subway or other public transportation instead of driving	41%	N=279	18%	N=123	25%	N=168	16%	N=110	100%	N=680
Carpooled with other adults or children instead of driving alone	14%	N=94	15%	N=101	17%	N=118	54%	N=365	100%	N=678
Walked or biked instead of driving	48%	N=325	24%	N=164	14%	N=96	14%	N=95	100%	N=680
Volunteered your time to some group/activity in Oak Park	6%	N=38	14%	N=96	19%	N=132	61%	N=412	100%	N=677
Participated in a club	4%	N=28	9%	N=59	12%	N=83	75%	N=511	100%	N=681
Talked to or visited with your immediate neighbors	38%	N=259	32%	N=217	21%	N=144	9%	N=60	100%	N=680
Done a favor for a neighbor	16%	N=107	23%	N=157	37%	N=249	24%	N=164	100%	N=677

Table 9: Question 9

Thinking about local public meetings (of local elected officials like Village Council or County Commissioners, advisory boards, town halls, HOA, neighborhood watch, etc.), in the last 12 months, about how many times, if at all, have you or other household members attended or watched a local public meeting?	2 times a week or more		2-4 times a month		Once a month or less		Not at all		Total	
Attended a local public meeting	0%	N=1	1%	N=9	22%	N=150	76%	N=516	100%	N=676
Watched (online or on television) a local public meeting	0%	N=2	3%	N=17	12%	N=80	85%	N=574	100%	N=672

Table 10: Question 10

Please rate the quality of each of the following services in Oak Park:	Excellent		Good		Fair		Poor		Total	
Police services	45%	N=244	44%	N=243	10%	N=54	1%	N=6	100%	N=548
Fire services	57%	N=247	41%	N=177	2%	N=10	0%	N=0	100%	N=434
Ambulance or emergency medical services	55%	N=206	42%	N=158	3%	N=13	0%	N=0	100%	N=377
Crime prevention	22%	N=104	49%	N=231	24%	N=114	5%	N=23	100%	N=472
Fire prevention and education	39%	N=136	49%	N=171	12%	N=42	1%	N=4	100%	N=352
Traffic enforcement	15%	N=80	39%	N=207	29%	N=158	17%	N=91	100%	N=536
Street repair	13%	N=80	38%	N=244	33%	N=213	16%	N=99	100%	N=637
Street cleaning	24%	N=154	48%	N=310	21%	N=138	7%	N=43	100%	N=645
Street lighting	18%	N=120	50%	N=327	26%	N=168	7%	N=43	100%	N=657
Snow removal	20%	N=125	50%	N=309	20%	N=122	9%	N=58	100%	N=614
Sidewalk maintenance	16%	N=103	48%	N=312	28%	N=182	7%	N=46	100%	N=644
Traffic signal timing	12%	N=77	45%	N=286	28%	N=182	15%	N=94	100%	N=638
Bus or transit services	30%	N=146	48%	N=231	19%	N=93	3%	N=17	100%	N=487
Garbage collection	35%	N=216	51%	N=321	12%	N=72	3%	N=16	100%	N=625
Recycling	34%	N=206	48%	N=294	14%	N=84	4%	N=22	100%	N=606
Yard waste pick-up	35%	N=155	49%	N=215	11%	N=51	5%	N=22	100%	N=443
Storm drainage	18%	N=97	45%	N=247	28%	N=152	9%	N=49	100%	N=545
Drinking water	37%	N=228	45%	N=278	15%	N=92	4%	N=23	100%	N=621
Sewer services	29%	N=152	50%	N=266	18%	N=97	2%	N=13	100%	N=527
Power (electric and/or gas) utility	30%	N=192	54%	N=342	14%	N=88	2%	N=15	100%	N=637
Utility billing	21%	N=126	56%	N=341	21%	N=128	3%	N=19	100%	N=615
Village parks	51%	N=321	43%	N=273	5%	N=33	1%	N=4	100%	N=632
Recreation centers or facilities	43%	N=224	46%	N=242	8%	N=39	4%	N=18	100%	N=525
Land use, planning and zoning	16%	N=76	37%	N=175	31%	N=144	16%	N=75	100%	N=469
Code enforcement (weeds, abandoned buildings, etc.)	18%	N=77	43%	N=186	26%	N=111	13%	N=57	100%	N=430
Animal control	29%	N=108	47%	N=174	19%	N=72	5%	N=18	100%	N=371
Economic development	16%	N=79	40%	N=198	29%	N=142	15%	N=73	100%	N=491
Health services	28%	N=117	56%	N=230	15%	N=63	1%	N=4	100%	N=413
Public library services	68%	N=403	29%	N=170	3%	N=17	0%	N=1	100%	N=591
Public information services	31%	N=158	55%	N=277	12%	N=61	1%	N=7	100%	N=503

Please rate the quality of each of the following services in Oak Park:	Excellent		Good		Fair		Poor		Total	
Cable television	18%	N=63	46%	N=162	25%	N=88	11%	N=39	100%	N=353
Emergency preparedness (services that prepare the community for natural disasters or other emergency situations)	25%	N=68	47%	N=127	23%	N=62	6%	N=15	100%	N=272
Preservation of natural areas such as open space, farmlands and greenbelts	23%	N=109	42%	N=203	26%	N=123	9%	N=45	100%	N=479
Oak Park open space	24%	N=134	46%	N=259	25%	N=140	6%	N=33	100%	N=565
Village-sponsored special events	28%	N=147	51%	N=264	19%	N=100	1%	N=6	100%	N=518
Overall customer service by Oak Park employees (police, receptionists, planners, etc.)	28%	N=163	51%	N=295	17%	N=99	4%	N=24	100%	N=582
Services to low-income people	19%	N=45	36%	N=85	27%	N=64	19%	N=44	100%	N=238
Leaf pick-up	26%	N=128	48%	N=241	20%	N=101	6%	N=29	100%	N=498
Care of trees along the parkway	27%	N=166	53%	N=328	16%	N=98	4%	N=23	100%	N=615
Alley maintenance	17%	N=99	41%	N=233	26%	N=148	16%	N=93	100%	N=572
Parking services	9%	N=56	29%	N=177	34%	N=208	28%	N=171	100%	N=612
Online Village services	25%	N=134	40%	N=212	30%	N=161	5%	N=26	100%	N=533
Building permit review	17%	N=37	34%	N=74	35%	N=76	14%	N=31	100%	N=218
Oak Park adjudication court	22%	N=33	32%	N=47	28%	N=41	18%	N=26	100%	N=147

Table 11: Question 11

Overall, how would you rate the quality of the services provided by each of the following?	Excellent		Good		Fair		Poor		Total	
The Village of Oak Park	22%	N=138	57%	N=361	19%	N=123	3%	N=16	100%	N=638
The Federal Government	5%	N=29	29%	N=160	43%	N=237	23%	N=124	100%	N=551

Table 12: Question 12

Please rate the following categories of Oak Park government performance:	Excellent		Good		Fair		Poor		Total	
The value of services for the taxes paid to Oak Park	9%	N=53	37%	N=207	36%	N=200	18%	N=102	100%	N=562
The overall direction that Oak Park is taking	11%	N=63	38%	N=225	37%	N=219	15%	N=89	100%	N=596
The job Oak Park government does at welcoming resident involvement	16%	N=78	45%	N=224	27%	N=133	13%	N=65	100%	N=499
Overall confidence in Oak Park government	9%	N=53	36%	N=213	39%	N=229	17%	N=98	100%	N=593
Generally acting in the best interest of the community	12%	N=71	39%	N=233	32%	N=191	16%	N=95	100%	N=591
Being honest	15%	N=78	38%	N=199	32%	N=170	15%	N=79	100%	N=526
Treating all residents fairly	14%	N=72	39%	N=200	32%	N=162	16%	N=80	100%	N=515

Table 13: Question 13

Please rate how important, if at all, you think it is for the Oak Park community to focus on each of the following in the coming two years:	Essential		Very important		Somewhat important		Not at all important		Total	
Overall feeling of safety in Oak Park	61%	N=416	33%	N=225	6%	N=41	0%	N=0	100%	N=681
Overall ease of getting to the places you usually have to visit	31%	N=210	50%	N=336	17%	N=115	3%	N=17	100%	N=678
Quality of overall natural environment in Oak Park	33%	N=226	46%	N=313	19%	N=131	1%	N=9	100%	N=678
Overall "built environment" of Oak Park (including overall design, buildings, parks and transportation systems)	33%	N=220	42%	N=288	23%	N=155	2%	N=14	100%	N=677
Health and wellness opportunities in Oak Park	24%	N=160	44%	N=296	29%	N=195	4%	N=25	100%	N=676

Please rate how important, if at all, you think it is for the Oak Park community to focus on each of the following in the coming two years:	Essential		Very important		Somewhat important		Not at all important		Total	
Overall opportunities for education and enrichment	36%	N=243	38%	N=255	23%	N=152	3%	N=24	100%	N=674
Overall economic health of Oak Park	47%	N=322	42%	N=282	10%	N=69	1%	N=6	100%	N=678
Sense of community	35%	N=236	45%	N=305	19%	N=129	1%	N=7	100%	N=678

Table 14: Question 14

Please rate how important, if at all, it is for the Village of Oak Park to maintain each of the following services at least at current levels (as compared with cutting the levels of service):	Essential		Very important		Somewhat important		Not at all important		Total	
Business retention, development, and attraction	44%	N=293	43%	N=285	12%	N=81	2%	N=12	100%	N=670
Care of trees and landscaping in the parkways	33%	N=222	49%	N=330	17%	N=117	1%	N=6	100%	N=674
Maintenance of the public way, street cleaning, snow plowing	47%	N=313	48%	N=323	5%	N=36	0%	N=1	100%	N=674
Fire and emergency medical assistance	62%	N=418	33%	N=223	5%	N=32	0%	N=0	100%	N=673
Housing programs	35%	N=236	36%	N=242	22%	N=149	6%	N=41	100%	N=668
Operation and administration of parking services	26%	N=176	40%	N=268	28%	N=187	6%	N=38	100%	N=669
Partner agencies that promote or support tourism, housing and the arts in Oak Park	17%	N=113	42%	N=282	33%	N=222	8%	N=54	100%	N=670
Police protection	62%	N=413	32%	N=214	5%	N=34	1%	N=8	100%	N=670
Public health services	38%	N=254	43%	N=286	18%	N=119	2%	N=11	100%	N=669
Environmental sustainability programs and events	39%	N=262	37%	N=249	19%	N=128	5%	N=31	100%	N=671

Table 15: Question 15

To what degree, if at all, is each of the following a problem in Oak Park?	Not a problem		Minor problem		Moderate problem		Major problem		Total	
Crime	12%	N=84	37%	N=247	42%	N=280	9%	N=61	100%	N=671
Disorderly youth	34%	N=228	44%	N=294	19%	N=126	3%	N=24	100%	N=672
Drugs	27%	N=177	41%	N=271	25%	N=166	7%	N=47	100%	N=660
Graffiti	48%	N=317	41%	N=271	10%	N=66	2%	N=12	100%	N=665
Homelessness	15%	N=99	40%	N=269	31%	N=208	13%	N=89	100%	N=664
Noise	43%	N=290	38%	N=258	15%	N=99	4%	N=25	100%	N=673
Panhandling	21%	N=140	38%	N=251	26%	N=174	15%	N=103	100%	N=668
Run-down buildings and houses	42%	N=282	41%	N=276	14%	N=93	3%	N=19	100%	N=671
Traffic	11%	N=76	29%	N=199	37%	N=252	22%	N=148	100%	N=676

Table 16: Question 16

How much information about Oak Park, if any, do you get from each of the following sources?	A lot		Some		None		Total	
Village of Oak Park website	23%	N=156	57%	N=383	20%	N=135	100%	N=674
Village of Oak Park Facebook & Twitter pages	7%	N=50	22%	N=151	70%	N=471	100%	N=671
Friends and neighbors	29%	N=192	57%	N=378	15%	N=99	100%	N=669
Local newspapers (print and online)	31%	N=207	44%	N=293	25%	N=166	100%	N=666
Village of Oak Park email news	14%	N=92	35%	N=236	51%	N=342	100%	N=670
Village of Oak Park OP/FYI newsletter and other Village mailings	39%	N=264	47%	N=315	14%	N=94	100%	N=673
VOP-TV, the Village's cable TV channel	1%	N=7	12%	N=79	87%	N=580	100%	N=667
Local social media pages/groups	16%	N=106	34%	N=228	50%	N=337	100%	N=671

Table 17: Question 17

Please rate the value of services for the taxes paid to each of the following (percent of your property tax bill):	Excellent		Good		Fair		Poor		Total	
Elementary School District 97 (38.32%)	32%	N=138	40%	N=170	19%	N=80	9%	N=39	100%	N=426
OPRF High School District 200 (22.69%)	30%	N=118	38%	N=148	20%	N=80	12%	N=47	100%	N=392
Village of Oak Park (11.05%)	17%	N=94	47%	N=252	28%	N=148	8%	N=42	100%	N=536
Oak Park Fire & Police Pensions (5.80%)	27%	N=123	44%	N=204	22%	N=101	7%	N=31	100%	N=459
Oak Park Public Library (4.80%)	53%	N=293	31%	N=170	13%	N=70	3%	N=18	100%	N=552
Park District of Oak Park (4.76%)	41%	N=230	42%	N=235	13%	N=73	3%	N=16	100%	N=555
Cook County (4.33%)	10%	N=41	29%	N=125	37%	N=160	24%	N=102	100%	N=428
Metropolitan Water Reclamation District (3.12%)	22%	N=90	40%	N=162	31%	N=127	7%	N=29	100%	N=408
Oak Park Township (2.46%)	23%	N=104	38%	N=172	28%	N=125	10%	N=47	100%	N=450
Triton Community College District 504 (2.55%)	17%	N=57	39%	N=131	29%	N=97	16%	N=53	100%	N=339
Mosquito Abatement District (0.12%)	25%	N=93	40%	N=149	26%	N=98	9%	N=32	100%	N=372

Table 18: Question D1

How often, if at all, do you do each of the following, considering all of the times you could?	Never		Rarely		Sometimes		Usually		Always		Total	
Recycle at home	3%	N=22	2%	N=12	7%	N=50	18%	N=127	69%	N=474	100%	N=684
Purchase goods or services from a business located in Oak Park	1%	N=4	2%	N=12	28%	N=192	50%	N=339	20%	N=136	100%	N=682
Eat at least 5 portions of fruits and vegetables a day	1%	N=7	11%	N=76	35%	N=238	32%	N=220	20%	N=139	100%	N=681
Participate in moderate or vigorous physical activity	2%	N=12	9%	N=63	30%	N=199	31%	N=212	28%	N=188	100%	N=673
Read or watch local news (via television, paper, computer, etc.)	4%	N=29	14%	N=98	25%	N=167	25%	N=169	32%	N=217	100%	N=679
Vote in local elections	5%	N=35	5%	N=32	8%	N=52	19%	N=127	64%	N=431	100%	N=677

Table 19: Question D2

Would you say that in general your health is:	Percent	Number
Excellent	26%	N=178
Very good	43%	N=292
Good	25%	N=173
Fair	5%	N=35
Poor	1%	N=7
Total	100%	N=684

Table 20: Question D3

What impact, if any, do you think the economy will have on your family income in the next 6 months? Do you think the impact will be:	Percent	Number
Very positive	6%	N=38
Somewhat positive	15%	N=102
Neutral	55%	N=372
Somewhat negative	23%	N=154
Very negative	2%	N=14
Total	100%	N=680

Table 21: Question D4

What is your employment status?	Percent	Number
Working full time for pay	64%	N=439
Working part time for pay	11%	N=75
Unemployed, looking for paid work	2%	N=14
Unemployed, not looking for paid work	4%	N=31
Fully retired	18%	N=126
Total	100%	N=685

Table 22: Question D5

Do you work inside the boundaries of Oak Park?	Percent	Number
Yes, outside the home	20%	N=135
Yes, from home	10%	N=67
No	70%	N=474
Total	100%	N=675

Table 23: Question D6

How many years have you lived in Oak Park?	Percent	Number
Less than 2 years	19%	N=130
2 to 5 years	22%	N=151
6 to 10 years	14%	N=95
11 to 20 years	16%	N=107
More than 20 years	29%	N=202
Total	100%	N=686

Table 24: Question D7

Which best describes the building you live in?	Percent	Number
One family house detached from any other houses	44%	N=304
Building with two or more homes (duplex, townhome, apartment or condominium)	53%	N=367
Other	3%	N=18
Total	100%	N=690

Table 25: Question D8

Is this house, apartment or mobile home...	Percent	Number
Rented	40%	N=279
Owned	60%	N=411
Total	100%	N=689

Table 26: Question D9

About how much is your monthly housing cost for the place you live (including rent, mortgage payment, property tax, property insurance and homeowners' association (HOA) fees)?	Percent	Number
Less than $300 per month	3%	N=21
$300 to $599 per month	3%	N=21
$600 to $999 per month	9%	N=59
$1,000 to $1,499 per month	26%	N=175
$1,500 to $2,499 per month	31%	N=205
$2,500 or more per month	28%	N=185
Total	100%	N=667

Table 27: Question D10

Do any children 17 or under live in your household?	Percent	Number
No	67%	N=460
Yes	33%	N=225
Total	100%	N=685

Table 28: Question D11

Are you or any other members of your household aged 65 or older?	Percent	Number
No	76%	N=518
Yes	24%	N=167
Total	100%	N=685

Table 29: Question D12

How much do you anticipate your household's total income before taxes will be for the current year? (Please include in your total income money from all sources for all persons living in your household.)	Percent	Number
Less than $25,000	9%	N=61
$25,000 to $49,999	12%	N=77
$50,000 to $99,999	30%	N=194
$100,000 to $149,999	19%	N=125
$150,000 or more	30%	N=198
Total	100%	N=655

Table 30: Question D13

Are you Spanish, Hispanic or Latino?	Percent	Number
No, not Spanish, Hispanic or Latino	95%	N=641
Yes, I consider myself to be Spanish, Hispanic or Latino	5%	N=34
Total	100%	N=675

Table 31: Question D14

What is your race? (Mark one or more races to indicate what race(s) you consider yourself to be.)	Percent	Number
American Indian or Alaskan Native	0%	N=3
Asian, Asian Indian or Pacific Islander	6%	N=42
Black or African American	19%	N=129
White	72%	N=484
Other	8%	N=53

Total may exceed 100% as respondents could select more than one option.

Table 32: Question D15

In which category is your age?	Percent	Number
18 to 24 years	3%	N=23
25 to 34 years	21%	N=147
35 to 44 years	20%	N=141
45 to 54 years	22%	N=155
55 to 64 years	12%	N=80
65 to 74 years	13%	N=91
75 years or older	8%	N=52
Total	100%	N=689

Table 33: Question D16

What is your sex?	Percent	Number
Female	56%	N=382
Male	44%	N=302
Total	100%	N=684

Table 34: Question D17

Do you consider a cell phone or landline your primary telephone number?	Percent	Number
Cell	80%	N=546
Land line	9%	N=59
Both	12%	N=81
Total	100%	N=686

Responses including "don't know"

The following pages contain a complete set of responses to each question on the survey, including the "don't know" responses. The percent of respondents giving a particular response is shown followed by the number of respondents (denoted with "N=").

Table 35: Question 1

Please rate each of the following aspects of quality of life in Oak Park:	Excellent		Good		Fair		Poor		Don't know		Total	
Oak Park as a place to live	44%	N=306	48%	N=328	7%	N=45	1%	N=9	0%	N=3	100%	N=690
Your neighborhood as a place to live	44%	N=303	44%	N=299	10%	N=69	2%	N=14	0%	N=1	100%	N=686
Oak Park as a place to raise children	44%	N=300	33%	N=226	6%	N=40	1%	N=6	17%	N=114	100%	N=686
Oak Park as a place to work	14%	N=95	22%	N=152	13%	N=87	4%	N=25	47%	N=323	100%	N=683
Oak Park as a place to visit	37%	N=253	48%	N=324	10%	N=67	1%	N=5	4%	N=29	100%	N=678
Oak Park as a place to retire	13%	N=90	19%	N=130	19%	N=128	20%	N=138	28%	N=191	100%	N=677
The overall quality of life in Oak Park	33%	N=224	53%	N=359	12%	N=80	1%	N=8	1%	N=6	100%	N=678

Table 36: Question 2

Please rate each of the following characteristics as they relate to Oak Park as a whole:	Excellent		Good		Fair		Poor		Don't know		Total	
Overall feeling of safety in Oak Park	22%	N=149	55%	N=378	20%	N=135	3%	N=23	0%	N=1	100%	N=685
Overall ease of getting to the places you usually have to visit	32%	N=217	43%	N=291	20%	N=134	5%	N=36	0%	N=2	100%	N=680
Quality of overall natural environment in Oak Park	35%	N=240	54%	N=365	10%	N=68	1%	N=7	0%	N=2	100%	N=682
Overall "built environment" of Oak Park (including overall design, buildings, parks and transportation systems)	27%	N=186	52%	N=352	16%	N=112	4%	N=29	0%	N=3	100%	N=681
Health and wellness opportunities in Oak Park	26%	N=176	47%	N=324	13%	N=90	3%	N=21	11%	N=75	100%	N=685
Overall opportunities for education and enrichment	35%	N=237	43%	N=290	8%	N=53	2%	N=15	13%	N=87	100%	N=682
Overall economic health of Oak Park	12%	N=82	46%	N=312	22%	N=148	6%	N=38	15%	N=100	100%	N=680
Sense of community	29%	N=200	46%	N=316	19%	N=129	3%	N=22	2%	N=16	100%	N=682
Overall image or reputation of Oak Park	34%	N=231	54%	N=373	9%	N=65	2%	N=14	0%	N=2	100%	N=685

Table 37: Question 3

Please indicate how likely or unlikely you are to do each of the following:	Very likely		Somewhat likely		Somewhat unlikely		Very unlikely		Don't know		Total	
Recommend living in Oak Park to someone who asks	56%	N=383	34%	N=231	7%	N=46	3%	N=24	0%	N=3	100%	N=686
Remain in Oak Park for the next five years	50%	N=343	27%	N=184	11%	N=77	8%	N=56	3%	N=20	100%	N=680

Table 38: Question 4

Please rate how safe or unsafe you feel:	Very safe		Somewhat safe		Neither safe nor unsafe		Somewhat unsafe		Very unsafe		Don't know		Total	
In your neighborhood during the day	66%	N=455	29%	N=202	3%	N=21	1%	N=8	0%	N=1	0%	N=1	100%	N=688
In Oak Park's downtown/commercial area during the day	69%	N=475	25%	N=170	4%	N=24	1%	N=7	0%	N=3	1%	N=5	100%	N=686
In your neighborhood after dark	26%	N=178	47%	N=319	12%	N=82	13%	N=88	2%	N=14	1%	N=4	100%	N=685
In Oak Park's downtown/commercial area after dark	36%	N=245	39%	N=267	13%	N=92	8%	N=56	2%	N=11	2%	N=15	100%	N=686

Table 39: Question 5

Please rate each of the following characteristics as they relate to Oak Park as a whole:	Excellent		Good		Fair		Poor		Don't know		Total	
Traffic flow on major streets	3%	N=22	27%	N=186	42%	N=285	27%	N=182	1%	N=9	100%	N=684
Ease of public parking	7%	N=44	25%	N=170	33%	N=223	34%	N=229	2%	N=13	100%	N=680
Ease of travel by car in Oak Park	8%	N=54	36%	N=245	38%	N=255	16%	N=110	2%	N=14	100%	N=679
Ease of travel by bicycle in Oak Park	19%	N=129	28%	N=189	16%	N=106	7%	N=46	31%	N=207	100%	N=676
Ease of walking in Oak Park	50%	N=339	42%	N=286	7%	N=45	1%	N=6	1%	N=4	100%	N=680
Availability of paths and walking trails	24%	N=163	34%	N=235	18%	N=123	9%	N=65	14%	N=95	100%	N=680
Air quality	22%	N=151	52%	N=353	18%	N=122	3%	N=18	6%	N=38	100%	N=683
Cleanliness of Oak Park	33%	N=224	51%	N=351	13%	N=90	2%	N=14	1%	N=4	100%	N=683
Overall appearance of Oak Park	38%	N=263	52%	N=354	9%	N=61	0%	N=3	0%	N=2	100%	N=684
Public places where people want to spend time	41%	N=278	45%	N=307	11%	N=75	2%	N=11	2%	N=11	100%	N=682
Variety of housing options	15%	N=105	35%	N=240	31%	N=213	8%	N=53	10%	N=70	100%	N=680
Availability of affordable quality housing	6%	N=43	17%	N=116	30%	N=203	30%	N=204	17%	N=113	100%	N=678
Fitness opportunities (including exercise classes and paths or trails, etc.)	23%	N=160	46%	N=315	20%	N=136	4%	N=27	7%	N=46	100%	N=683
Recreational opportunities	27%	N=187	49%	N=332	15%	N=101	1%	N=10	8%	N=51	100%	N=681
Availability of affordable quality food	28%	N=194	51%	N=348	16%	N=107	4%	N=30	1%	N=8	100%	N=686
Availability of affordable quality health care	21%	N=141	38%	N=257	15%	N=100	3%	N=18	24%	N=165	100%	N=682
Availability of preventive health services	19%	N=129	37%	N=249	12%	N=82	3%	N=20	30%	N=201	100%	N=681
Availability of affordable quality mental health care	10%	N=71	18%	N=122	14%	N=97	5%	N=31	52%	N=354	100%	N=675
Ease of travel by bus in Oak Park	11%	N=75	24%	N=161	17%	N=115	5%	N=33	43%	N=296	100%	N=681
Ease of travel by rail in Oak Park	42%	N=290	40%	N=277	9%	N=61	2%	N=10	7%	N=48	100%	N=686

Table 40: Question 6

Please rate each of the following characteristics as they relate to Oak Park as a whole:	Excellent		Good		Fair		Poor		Don't know		Total	
Availability of affordable quality child care/preschool	8%	N=55	17%	N=113	14%	N=95	5%	N=34	56%	N=381	100%	N=678
Adult educational opportunities	14%	N=92	31%	N=208	13%	N=91	2%	N=16	40%	N=270	100%	N=677
Opportunities to attend cultural/arts/music activities	28%	N=190	45%	N=306	17%	N=116	2%	N=16	7%	N=49	100%	N=676
Opportunities to participate in religious or spiritual events and activities	32%	N=215	35%	N=237	5%	N=35	1%	N=4	27%	N=185	100%	N=676
Employment opportunities	4%	N=24	16%	N=108	15%	N=102	7%	N=51	58%	N=395	100%	N=679

Please rate each of the following characteristics as they relate to Oak Park as a whole:	Excellent		Good		Fair		Poor		Don't know		Total	
Shopping opportunities	15%	N=98	49%	N=331	29%	N=195	6%	N=40	1%	N=9	100%	N=673
Cost of living in Oak Park	2%	N=17	16%	N=111	45%	N=300	36%	N=241	0%	N=3	100%	N=672
Overall quality of business and service establishments in Oak Park	16%	N=106	53%	N=358	26%	N=178	4%	N=26	1%	N=8	100%	N=676
Vibrant downtown/commercial area	26%	N=171	50%	N=333	19%	N=127	5%	N=32	1%	N=7	100%	N=670
Overall quality of new development in Oak Park	15%	N=100	39%	N=262	22%	N=150	16%	N=108	8%	N=57	100%	N=676
Opportunities to participate in social events and activities	26%	N=172	47%	N=320	16%	N=111	2%	N=16	8%	N=55	100%	N=674
Opportunities to volunteer	27%	N=179	35%	N=232	11%	N=75	1%	N=7	27%	N=178	100%	N=672
Opportunities to participate in community matters	25%	N=167	38%	N=255	16%	N=107	2%	N=14	20%	N=137	100%	N=680
Openness and acceptance of the community toward people of diverse backgrounds	26%	N=176	46%	N=308	19%	N=126	5%	N=31	5%	N=35	100%	N=676
Neighborliness of residents in Oak Park	24%	N=166	48%	N=327	22%	N=152	4%	N=27	1%	N=8	100%	N=681

Table 41: Question 7

Please indicate whether or not you have done each of the following in the last 12 months.	No		Yes		Total	
Made efforts to conserve water	23%	N=157	77%	N=527	100%	N=685
Made efforts to make your home more energy efficient	27%	N=184	73%	N=493	100%	N=677
Observed a code violation or other hazard in Oak Park (weeds, abandoned buildings, etc.)	61%	N=416	39%	N=262	100%	N=677
Household member was a victim of a crime in Oak Park	86%	N=585	14%	N=95	100%	N=680
Reported a crime to the police in Oak Park	78%	N=533	22%	N=149	100%	N=682
Stocked supplies in preparation for an emergency	82%	N=559	18%	N=121	100%	N=680
Campaigned or advocated for an issue, cause or candidate	68%	N=461	32%	N=217	100%	N=678
Contacted the Village of Oak Park (in-person, phone, email or web) for help or information	33%	N=223	67%	N=455	100%	N=678
Contacted Oak Park elected officials (in-person, phone, email or web) to express your opinion	81%	N=555	19%	N=126	100%	N=681
Called for police service in Oak Park	69%	N=472	31%	N=212	100%	N=684
Called for Oak Park fire/emergency medical services	88%	N=598	12%	N=78	100%	N=676

Table 42: Question 8

In the last 12 months, about how many times, if at all, have you or other household members done each of the following in Oak Park?	2 times a week or more		2-4 times a month		Once a month or less		Not at all		Total	
Used Oak Park recreation centers or their services	13%	N=86	18%	N=123	29%	N=194	40%	N=269	100%	N=672
Visited a neighborhood park or Village park	30%	N=203	32%	N=219	28%	N=191	9%	N=63	100%	N=676
Used Oak Park public libraries or their services	19%	N=130	34%	N=233	26%	N=174	21%	N=140	100%	N=677
Participated in religious or spiritual activities in Oak Park	9%	N=59	15%	N=102	14%	N=94	62%	N=420	100%	N=675
Attended a Village-sponsored event	1%	N=9	10%	N=65	53%	N=357	36%	N=240	100%	N=672
Used bus, rail, subway or other public transportation instead of driving	41%	N=279	18%	N=123	25%	N=168	16%	N=110	100%	N=680
Carpooled with other adults or children instead of driving alone	14%	N=94	15%	N=101	17%	N=118	54%	N=365	100%	N=678
Walked or biked instead of driving	48%	N=325	24%	N=164	14%	N=96	14%	N=95	100%	N=680
Volunteered your time to some group/activity in Oak Park	6%	N=38	14%	N=96	19%	N=132	61%	N=412	100%	N=677
Participated in a club	4%	N=28	9%	N=59	12%	N=83	75%	N=511	100%	N=681

In the last 12 months, about how many times, if at all, have you or other household members done each of the following in Oak Park?	2 times a week or more		2-4 times a month		Once a month or less		Not at all		Total	
Talked to or visited with your immediate neighbors	38%	N=259	32%	N=217	21%	N=144	9%	N=60	100%	N=680
Done a favor for a neighbor	16%	N=107	23%	N=157	37%	N=249	24%	N=164	100%	N=677

Table 43: Question 9

Thinking about local public meetings (of local elected officials like Village Council or County Commissioners, advisory boards, town halls, HOA, neighborhood watch, etc.), in the last 12 months, about how many times, if at all, have you or other household members attended or watched a local public meeting?	2 times a week or more		2-4 times a month		Once a month or less		Not at all		Total	
Attended a local public meeting	0%	N=1	1%	N=9	22%	N=150	76%	N=516	100%	N=676
Watched (online or on television) a local public meeting	0%	N=2	3%	N=17	12%	N=80	85%	N=574	100%	N=672

Table 44: Question 10

Please rate the quality of each of the following services in Oak Park:	Excellent		Good		Fair		Poor		Don't know		Total	
Police services	36%	N=244	36%	N=243	8%	N=54	1%	N=6	19%	N=127	100%	N=674
Fire services	37%	N=247	26%	N=177	1%	N=10	0%	N=0	35%	N=237	100%	N=671
Ambulance or emergency medical services	31%	N=206	23%	N=158	2%	N=13	0%	N=0	44%	N=297	100%	N=674
Crime prevention	16%	N=104	35%	N=231	17%	N=114	3%	N=23	29%	N=192	100%	N=664
Fire prevention and education	20%	N=136	26%	N=171	6%	N=42	1%	N=4	47%	N=318	100%	N=670
Traffic enforcement	12%	N=80	31%	N=207	24%	N=158	14%	N=91	19%	N=122	100%	N=658
Street repair	12%	N=80	37%	N=244	32%	N=213	15%	N=99	4%	N=29	100%	N=666
Street cleaning	23%	N=154	46%	N=310	21%	N=138	6%	N=43	4%	N=27	100%	N=672
Street lighting	18%	N=120	49%	N=327	25%	N=168	6%	N=43	2%	N=13	100%	N=670
Snow removal	19%	N=125	46%	N=309	18%	N=122	9%	N=58	9%	N=59	100%	N=673
Sidewalk maintenance	15%	N=103	47%	N=312	27%	N=182	7%	N=46	4%	N=27	100%	N=671
Traffic signal timing	11%	N=77	43%	N=286	27%	N=182	14%	N=94	5%	N=33	100%	N=671
Bus or transit services	22%	N=146	35%	N=231	14%	N=93	3%	N=17	27%	N=180	100%	N=666
Garbage collection	32%	N=216	48%	N=321	11%	N=72	2%	N=16	7%	N=49	100%	N=674
Recycling	31%	N=206	44%	N=294	13%	N=84	3%	N=22	10%	N=64	100%	N=670
Yard waste pick-up	23%	N=155	32%	N=215	8%	N=51	3%	N=22	34%	N=225	100%	N=668
Storm drainage	15%	N=97	37%	N=247	23%	N=152	7%	N=49	18%	N=123	100%	N=668
Drinking water	34%	N=228	42%	N=278	14%	N=92	3%	N=23	7%	N=47	100%	N=668
Sewer services	23%	N=152	40%	N=266	14%	N=97	2%	N=13	21%	N=140	100%	N=667
Power (electric and/or gas) utility	29%	N=192	51%	N=342	13%	N=88	2%	N=15	5%	N=34	100%	N=671
Utility billing	19%	N=126	51%	N=341	19%	N=128	3%	N=19	8%	N=53	100%	N=667
Village parks	48%	N=321	41%	N=273	5%	N=33	1%	N=4	5%	N=33	100%	N=666
Recreation centers or facilities	34%	N=224	36%	N=242	6%	N=39	3%	N=18	21%	N=141	100%	N=666
Land use, planning and zoning	11%	N=76	26%	N=175	22%	N=144	11%	N=75	30%	N=199	100%	N=669
Code enforcement (weeds, abandoned buildings, etc.)	11%	N=77	28%	N=186	17%	N=111	8%	N=57	35%	N=236	100%	N=666
Animal control	16%	N=108	26%	N=174	11%	N=72	3%	N=18	44%	N=295	100%	N=666

Please rate the quality of each of the following services in Oak Park:	Excellent		Good		Fair		Poor		Don't know		Total	
Economic development	12%	N=79	30%	N=198	21%	N=142	11%	N=73	26%	N=174	100%	N=666
Health services	18%	N=117	35%	N=230	10%	N=63	1%	N=4	37%	N=248	100%	N=661
Public library services	60%	N=403	25%	N=170	3%	N=17	0%	N=1	12%	N=80	100%	N=671
Public information services	24%	N=158	41%	N=277	9%	N=61	1%	N=7	25%	N=168	100%	N=671
Cable television	9%	N=63	24%	N=162	13%	N=88	6%	N=39	47%	N=314	100%	N=666
Emergency preparedness (services that prepare the community for natural disasters or other emergency situations)	10%	N=68	19%	N=127	9%	N=62	2%	N=15	59%	N=394	100%	N=665
Preservation of natural areas such as open space, farmlands and greenbelts	17%	N=109	31%	N=203	19%	N=123	7%	N=45	27%	N=179	100%	N=658
Oak Park open space	20%	N=134	39%	N=259	21%	N=140	5%	N=33	15%	N=97	100%	N=662
Village-sponsored special events	22%	N=147	40%	N=264	15%	N=100	1%	N=6	22%	N=144	100%	N=661
Overall customer service by Oak Park employees (police, receptionists, planners, etc.)	24%	N=163	44%	N=295	15%	N=99	4%	N=24	13%	N=90	100%	N=672
Services to low-income people	7%	N=45	13%	N=85	10%	N=64	7%	N=44	64%	N=431	100%	N=670
Leaf pick-up	19%	N=128	36%	N=241	15%	N=101	4%	N=29	25%	N=167	100%	N=666
Care of trees along the parkway	25%	N=166	49%	N=328	15%	N=98	4%	N=23	7%	N=47	100%	N=663
Alley maintenance	15%	N=99	35%	N=233	22%	N=148	14%	N=93	14%	N=93	100%	N=665
Parking services	8%	N=56	26%	N=177	31%	N=208	25%	N=171	9%	N=58	100%	N=671
Online Village services	20%	N=134	32%	N=212	24%	N=161	4%	N=26	20%	N=136	100%	N=669
Building permit review	6%	N=37	11%	N=74	11%	N=76	5%	N=31	67%	N=451	100%	N=669
Oak Park adjudication court	5%	N=33	7%	N=47	6%	N=41	4%	N=26	78%	N=522	100%	N=669

Table 45: Question 11

Overall, how would you rate the quality of the services provided by each of the following?	Excellent		Good		Fair		Poor		Don't know		Total	
The Village of Oak Park	21%	N=138	54%	N=361	18%	N=123	2%	N=16	5%	N=33	100%	N=671
The Federal Government	4%	N=29	24%	N=160	36%	N=237	19%	N=124	17%	N=112	100%	N=663

Table 46: Question 12

Please rate the following categories of Oak Park government performance:	Excellent		Good		Fair		Poor		Don't know		Total	
The value of services for the taxes paid to Oak Park	8%	N=53	31%	N=207	30%	N=200	15%	N=102	17%	N=111	100%	N=673
The overall direction that Oak Park is taking	9%	N=63	33%	N=225	33%	N=219	13%	N=89	11%	N=77	100%	N=673
The job Oak Park government does at welcoming resident involvement	12%	N=78	33%	N=224	20%	N=133	10%	N=65	26%	N=173	100%	N=673
Overall confidence in Oak Park government	8%	N=53	32%	N=213	34%	N=229	15%	N=98	12%	N=80	100%	N=672
Generally acting in the best interest of the community	11%	N=71	35%	N=233	29%	N=191	14%	N=95	12%	N=80	100%	N=671
Being honest	12%	N=78	30%	N=199	25%	N=170	12%	N=79	22%	N=146	100%	N=672
Treating all residents fairly	11%	N=72	30%	N=200	24%	N=162	12%	N=80	24%	N=160	100%	N=674

Table 47: Question 13

Please rate how important, if at all, you think it is for the Oak Park community to focus on each of the following in the coming two years:	Essential		Very important		Somewhat important		Not at all important		Total	
Overall feeling of safety in Oak Park	61%	N=416	33%	N=225	6%	N=41	0%	N=0	100%	N=681
Overall ease of getting to the places you usually have to visit	31%	N=210	50%	N=336	17%	N=115	3%	N=17	100%	N=678
Quality of overall natural environment in Oak Park	33%	N=226	46%	N=313	19%	N=131	1%	N=9	100%	N=678
Overall "built environment" of Oak Park (including overall design, buildings, parks and transportation systems)	33%	N=220	42%	N=288	23%	N=155	2%	N=14	100%	N=677
Health and wellness opportunities in Oak Park	24%	N=160	44%	N=296	29%	N=195	4%	N=25	100%	N=676
Overall opportunities for education and enrichment	36%	N=243	38%	N=255	23%	N=152	3%	N=24	100%	N=674
Overall economic health of Oak Park	47%	N=322	42%	N=282	10%	N=69	1%	N=6	100%	N=678
Sense of community	35%	N=236	45%	N=305	19%	N=129	1%	N=7	100%	N=678

Table 48: Question 14

Please rate how important, if at all, it is for the Village of Oak Park to maintain each of the following services at least at current levels (as compared with cutting the levels of service):	Essential		Very important		Somewhat important		Not at all important		Total	
Business retention, development, and attraction	44%	N=293	43%	N=285	12%	N=81	2%	N=12	100%	N=670
Care of trees and landscaping in the parkways	33%	N=222	49%	N=330	17%	N=117	1%	N=6	100%	N=674
Maintenance of the public way, street cleaning, snow plowing	47%	N=313	48%	N=323	5%	N=36	0%	N=1	100%	N=674
Fire and emergency medical assistance	62%	N=418	33%	N=223	5%	N=32	0%	N=0	100%	N=673
Housing programs	35%	N=236	36%	N=242	22%	N=149	6%	N=41	100%	N=668
Operation and administration of parking services	26%	N=176	40%	N=268	28%	N=187	6%	N=38	100%	N=669
Partner agencies that promote or support tourism, housing and the arts in Oak Park	17%	N=113	42%	N=282	33%	N=222	8%	N=54	100%	N=670
Police protection	62%	N=413	32%	N=214	5%	N=34	1%	N=8	100%	N=670
Public health services	38%	N=254	43%	N=286	18%	N=119	2%	N=11	100%	N=669
Environmental sustainability programs and events	39%	N=262	37%	N=249	19%	N=128	5%	N=31	100%	N=671

Table 49: Question 15

To what degree, if at all, is each of the following a problem in Oak Park?	Not a problem		Minor problem		Moderate problem		Major problem		Total	
Crime	12%	N=84	37%	N=247	42%	N=280	9%	N=61	100%	N=671
Disorderly youth	34%	N=228	44%	N=294	19%	N=126	3%	N=24	100%	N=672
Drugs	27%	N=177	41%	N=271	25%	N=166	7%	N=47	100%	N=660
Graffiti	48%	N=317	41%	N=271	10%	N=66	2%	N=12	100%	N=665
Homelessness	15%	N=99	40%	N=269	31%	N=208	13%	N=89	100%	N=664
Noise	43%	N=290	38%	N=258	15%	N=99	4%	N=25	100%	N=673
Panhandling	21%	N=140	38%	N=251	26%	N=174	15%	N=103	100%	N=668
Run-down buildings and houses	42%	N=282	41%	N=276	14%	N=93	3%	N=19	100%	N=671
Traffic	11%	N=76	29%	N=199	37%	N=252	22%	N=148	100%	N=676

Table 50: Question 16

How much information about Oak Park, if any, do you get from each of the following sources?	A lot		Some		None		Total	
Village of Oak Park website	23%	N=156	57%	N=383	20%	N=135	100%	N=674
Village of Oak Park Facebook & Twitter pages	7%	N=50	22%	N=151	70%	N=471	100%	N=671
Friends and neighbors	29%	N=192	57%	N=378	15%	N=99	100%	N=669
Local newspapers (print and online)	31%	N=207	44%	N=293	25%	N=166	100%	N=666
Village of Oak Park email news	14%	N=92	35%	N=236	51%	N=342	100%	N=670
Village of Oak Park OP/FYI newsletter and other Village mailings	39%	N=264	47%	N=315	14%	N=94	100%	N=673
VOP-TV, the Village's cable TV channel	1%	N=7	12%	N=79	87%	N=580	100%	N=667
Local social media pages/groups	16%	N=106	34%	N=228	50%	N=337	100%	N=671

Table 51: Question 17

Please rate the value of services for the taxes paid to each of the following (percent of your property tax bill):	Excellent		Good		Fair		Poor		Don't know		Total	
Elementary School District 97 (38.32%)	20%	N=138	25%	N=170	12%	N=80	6%	N=39	37%	N=251	100%	N=677
OPRF High School District 200 (22.69%)	18%	N=118	22%	N=148	12%	N=80	7%	N=47	42%	N=280	100%	N=672
Village of Oak Park (11.05%)	14%	N=94	38%	N=252	22%	N=148	6%	N=42	20%	N=133	100%	N=669
Oak Park Fire & Police Pensions (5.80%)	18%	N=123	30%	N=204	15%	N=101	5%	N=31	32%	N=214	100%	N=673
Oak Park Public Library (4.80%)	44%	N=293	25%	N=170	10%	N=70	3%	N=18	18%	N=120	100%	N=672
Park District of Oak Park (4.76%)	34%	N=230	35%	N=235	11%	N=73	2%	N=16	17%	N=116	100%	N=671
Cook County (4.33%)	6%	N=41	19%	N=125	24%	N=160	15%	N=102	36%	N=241	100%	N=669
Metropolitan Water Reclamation District (3.12%)	13%	N=90	24%	N=162	19%	N=127	4%	N=29	39%	N=264	100%	N=672
Oak Park Township (2.46%)	16%	N=104	26%	N=172	19%	N=125	7%	N=47	33%	N=221	100%	N=671
Triton Community College District 504 (2.55%)	9%	N=57	20%	N=131	14%	N=97	8%	N=53	50%	N=332	100%	N=671
Mosquito Abatement District (0.12%)	14%	N=93	22%	N=149	15%	N=98	5%	N=32	45%	N=300	100%	N=672

Table 52: Question D1

How often, if at all, do you do each of the following, considering all of the times you could?	Never		Rarely		Sometimes		Usually		Always		Total	
Recycle at home	3%	N=22	2%	N=12	7%	N=50	18%	N=127	69%	N=474	100%	N=684
Purchase goods or services from a business located in Oak Park	1%	N=4	2%	N=12	28%	N=192	50%	N=339	20%	N=136	100%	N=682
Eat at least 5 portions of fruits and vegetables a day	1%	N=7	11%	N=76	35%	N=238	32%	N=220	20%	N=139	100%	N=681
Participate in moderate or vigorous physical activity	2%	N=12	9%	N=63	30%	N=199	31%	N=212	28%	N=188	100%	N=673
Read or watch local news (via television, paper, computer, etc.)	4%	N=29	14%	N=98	25%	N=167	25%	N=169	32%	N=217	100%	N=679
Vote in local elections	5%	N=35	5%	N=32	8%	N=52	19%	N=127	64%	N=431	100%	N=677

Table 53: Question D2

Would you say that in general your health is:	Percent	Number
Excellent	26%	N=178
Very good	43%	N=292
Good	25%	N=173
Fair	5%	N=35
Poor	1%	N=7
Total	100%	N=684

Table 54: Question D3

What impact, if any, do you think the economy will have on your family income in the next 6 months? Do you think the impact will be:	Percent	Number
Very positive	6%	N=38
Somewhat positive	15%	N=102
Neutral	55%	N=372
Somewhat negative	23%	N=154
Very negative	2%	N=14
Total	100%	N=680

Table 55: Question D4

What is your employment status?	Percent	Number
Working full time for pay	64%	N=439
Working part time for pay	11%	N=75
Unemployed, looking for paid work	2%	N=14
Unemployed, not looking for paid work	4%	N=31
Fully retired	18%	N=126
Total	100%	N=685

Table 56: Question D5

Do you work inside the boundaries of Oak Park?	Percent	Number
Yes, outside the home	20%	N=135
Yes, from home	10%	N=67
No	70%	N=474
Total	100%	N=675

Table 57: Question D6

How many years have you lived in Oak Park?	Percent	Number
Less than 2 years	19%	N=130
2 to 5 years	22%	N=151
6 to 10 years	14%	N=95
11 to 20 years	16%	N=107
More than 20 years	29%	N=202
Total	100%	N=686

Table 58: Question D7

Which best describes the building you live in?	Percent	Number
One family house detached from any other houses	44%	N=304
Building with two or more homes (duplex, townhome, apartment or condominium)	53%	N=367
Other	3%	N=18
Total	100%	N=690

Table 59: Question D8

Is this house, apartment or mobile home…	Percent	Number
Rented	40%	N=279
Owned	60%	N=411
Total	100%	N=689

Table 60: Question D9

About how much is your monthly housing cost for the place you live (including rent, mortgage payment, property tax, property insurance and homeowners' association (HOA) fees)?	Percent	Number
Less than $300 per month	3%	N=21
$300 to $599 per month	3%	N=21
$600 to $999 per month	9%	N=59
$1,000 to $1,499 per month	26%	N=175
$1,500 to $2,499 per month	31%	N=205
$2,500 or more per month	28%	N=185
Total	100%	N=667

Table 61: Question D10

Do any children 17 or under live in your household?	Percent	Number
No	67%	N=460
Yes	33%	N=225
Total	100%	N=685

Table 62: Question D11

Are you or any other members of your household aged 65 or older?	Percent	Number
No	76%	N=518
Yes	24%	N=167
Total	100%	N=685

Table 63: Question D12

How much do you anticipate your household's total income before taxes will be for the current year? (Please include in your total income money from all sources for all persons living in your household.)	Percent	Number
Less than $25,000	9%	N=61
$25,000 to $49,999	12%	N=77
$50,000 to $99,999	30%	N=194
$100,000 to $149,999	19%	N=125
$150,000 or more	30%	N=198
Total	100%	N=655

Table 64: Question D13

Are you Spanish, Hispanic or Latino?	Percent	Number
No, not Spanish, Hispanic or Latino	95%	N=641
Yes, I consider myself to be Spanish, Hispanic or Latino	5%	N=34
Total	100%	N=675

Table 65: Question D14

What is your race? (Mark one or more races to indicate what race(s) you consider yourself to be.)	Percent	Number
American Indian or Alaskan Native	0%	N=3
Asian, Asian Indian or Pacific Islander	6%	N=42
Black or African American	19%	N=129
White	72%	N=484
Other	8%	N=53

Total may exceed 100% as respondents could select more than one option.

Table 66: Question D15

In which category is your age?	Percent	Number
18 to 24 years	3%	N=23
25 to 34 years	21%	N=147
35 to 44 years	20%	N=141
45 to 54 years	22%	N=155
55 to 64 years	12%	N=80
65 to 74 years	13%	N=91
75 years or older	8%	N=52
Total	100%	N=689

Table 67: Question D16

What is your sex?	Percent	Number
Female	56%	N=382
Male	44%	N=302
Total	100%	N=684

Table 68: Question D17

Do you consider a cell phone or landline your primary telephone number?	Percent	Number
Cell	80%	N=546
Land line	9%	N=59
Both	12%	N=81
Total	100%	N=686

Appendix B: Benchmark Comparisons

Comparison Data

NRC's database of comparative resident opinion is comprised of resident perspectives gathered in surveys from over 600 communities whose residents evaluated the same kinds of topics on The National Community Survey. The comparison evaluations are from the most recent survey completed in each community; most communities conduct surveys every year or in alternating years. NRC adds the latest results quickly upon survey completion, keeping the benchmark data fresh and relevant. The communities in the database represent a wide geographic and population range. The Village of Oak Park chose to have comparisons made to the entire database.

Interpreting the Results

Ratings are compared when there are at least five communities in which a similar question was asked. Where comparisons are available, four columns are provided in the table. The first column is Oak Park's "percent positive." The percent positive is the combination of the top two most positive response options (i.e., "excellent" and "good," "very safe" and "somewhat safe," etc.), or, in the case of resident behaviors/participation, the percent positive represents the proportion of respondents indicating "yes" or participating in an activity at least once a month. The second column is the rank assigned to Oak Park's rating among communities where a similar question was asked. The third column is the number of communities that asked a similar question. The final column shows the comparison of Oak Park's rating to the benchmark.

Benchmark Database Characteristics	
Region	Percent
New England	3%
Middle Atlantic	5%
East North Central	15%
West North Central	13%
South Atlantic	22%
East South Central	3%
West South Central	7%
Mountain	16%
Pacific	16%
Population	Percent
Less than 10,000	10%
10,000 to 24,999	22%
25,000 to 49,999	23%
50,000 to 99,999	22%
100,000 or more	23%

In that final column, Oak Park's results are noted as being "higher" than the benchmark, "lower" than the benchmark or "similar" to the benchmark, meaning that the average rating given by Oak Park residents is statistically similar to or different (greater or lesser) than the benchmark. Being rated as "higher" or "lower" than the benchmark means that Oak Park's average rating for a particular item was more than 10 points different than the benchmark. If a rating was "much higher" or "much lower," then Oak Park's average rating was more than 20 points different when compared to the benchmark.

National Benchmark Comparisons

Table 69: Community Characteristics General

	Percent positive	Rank	Number of communities in comparison	Comparison to benchmark
The overall quality of life in Oak Park	87%	144	431	Similar
Overall image or reputation of Oak Park	89%	65	339	Higher
Oak Park as a place to live	92%	126	376	Similar
Your neighborhood as a place to live	88%	103	307	Similar
Oak Park as a place to raise children	92%	82	367	Higher
Oak Park as a place to retire	45%	304	347	Lower
Overall appearance of Oak Park	91%	48	338	Higher

Table 70: Community Characteristics by Facet

		Percent positive	Rank	Number of communities in comparison	Comparison to benchmark
Safety	Overall feeling of safety in Oak Park	77%	233	348	Similar
	In your neighborhood during the day	96%	176	345	Similar
	In Oak Park's downtown/commercial area during the day	95%	97	313	Similar
Mobility	Overall ease of getting to the places you usually have to visit	75%	119	272	Similar
	Availability of paths and walking trails	68%	129	308	Similar
	Ease of walking in Oak Park	93%	7	302	Much higher
	Ease of travel by bicycle in Oak Park	68%	52	301	Higher
	Ease of travel by car in Oak Park	45%	263	300	Lower
	Ease of public parking	32%	202	231	Lower
	Traffic flow on major streets	31%	263	328	Similar
Natural Environment	Quality of overall natural environment in Oak Park	89%	74	274	Similar
	Cleanliness of Oak Park	85%	93	281	Similar
	Air quality	78%	138	244	Similar
Built Environment	Overall "built environment" of Oak Park (including overall design, buildings, parks and transportation systems)	79%	32	263	Higher
	Overall quality of new development in Oak Park	58%	136	288	Similar
	Availability of affordable quality housing	28%	217	297	Similar
	Variety of housing options	57%	100	276	Similar
	Public places where people want to spend time	87%	15	257	Higher
Economy	Overall economic health of Oak Park	68%	133	269	Similar
	Vibrant downtown/commercial area	76%	35	246	Higher
	Overall quality of business and service establishments in Oak Park	69%	94	271	Similar
	Cost of living in Oak Park	19%	234	265	Lower
	Shopping opportunities	65%	118	289	Similar
	Employment opportunities	46%	138	306	Similar
	Oak Park as a place to visit	89%	45	283	Higher
	Oak Park as a place to work	69%	121	351	Similar
Recreation and Wellness	Health and wellness opportunities in Oak Park	82%	65	264	Similar
	Availability of affordable quality mental health care	60%	25	234	Higher
	Availability of preventive health services	79%	38	238	Higher
	Availability of affordable quality health care	77%	40	257	Higher
	Availability of affordable quality food	80%	30	244	Similar
	Recreational opportunities	82%	60	289	Similar
	Fitness opportunities (including exercise classes and paths or trails, etc.)	75%	103	255	Similar
Education and	Overall opportunities for education and enrichment	89%	39	266	Higher

		Percent positive	Rank	Number of communities in comparison	Comparison to benchmark
Enrichment	Opportunities to participate in religious or spiritual events and activities	92%	8	204	Higher
	Opportunities to attend cultural/arts/music activities	79%	35	286	Higher
	Adult educational opportunities	74%	44	243	Higher
	Availability of affordable quality child care/preschool	57%	96	257	Similar
	Opportunities to participate in social events and activities	80%	30	262	Higher
	Neighborliness of Oak Park	73%	33	258	Similar
	Openness and acceptance of the community toward people of diverse backgrounds	75%	29	289	Higher
Community Engagement	Opportunities to participate in community matters	78%	18	272	Higher
	Opportunities to volunteer	83%	24	263	Higher

Table 71: Governance General

	Percent positive	Rank	Number of communities in comparison	Comparison to benchmark
Services provided by the Village of Oak Park	78%	165	401	Similar
Overall customer service by Oak Park employees (police, receptionists, planners, etc.)	79%	131	367	Similar
Value of services for the taxes paid to Oak Park	46%	255	385	Similar
Overall direction that Oak Park is taking	48%	218	310	Similar
Job Oak Park government does at welcoming resident involvement	60%	88	313	Similar
Overall confidence in Oak Park government	45%	179	270	Similar
Generally acting in the best interest of the community	52%	175	270	Similar
Being honest	53%	160	261	Similar
Treating all residents fairly	53%	159	267	Similar
Services provided by the Federal Government	34%	189	250	Similar

Table 72: Governance by Facet

		Percent positive	Rank	Number of communities in comparison	Comparison to benchmark
	Police services	89%	76	426	Similar
	Fire services	98%	56	364	Similar
	Ambulance or emergency medical services	97%	48	327	Similar
	Crime prevention	71%	161	349	Similar
	Fire prevention and education	87%	49	281	Similar
	Animal control	76%	25	317	Higher
Safety	Emergency preparedness (services that prepare the community for natural disasters or other emergency situations)	72%	63	275	Similar
	Traffic enforcement	54%	281	353	Similar
	Street repair	51%	139	358	Similar
	Street cleaning	72%	84	313	Similar
	Street lighting	68%	91	315	Similar
	Snow removal	71%	116	265	Similar
	Sidewalk maintenance	65%	80	306	Similar
	Traffic signal timing	57%	100	260	Similar
Mobility	Bus or transit services	78%	13	228	Much higher
	Garbage collection	86%	144	333	Similar
	Recycling	83%	119	340	Similar
Natural Environment	Yard waste pick-up	84%	85	265	Similar
	Drinking water	81%	57	296	Similar

		Percent positive	Rank	Number of communities in comparison	Comparison to benchmark
	Preservation of natural areas such as open space, farmlands and greenbelts	65%	79	252	Similar
	Oak Park open space	70%	50	240	Similar
	Storm drainage	63%	177	331	Similar
	Sewer services	79%	111	302	Similar
	Power (electric and/or gas) utility	84%	49	186	Similar
	Utility billing	76%	74	232	Similar
	Land use, planning and zoning	53%	90	294	Similar
Built Environment	Code enforcement (weeds, abandoned buildings, etc.)	61%	91	372	Similar
	Cable television	64%	31	200	Similar
Economy	Economic development	56%	130	280	Similar
Recreation and Wellness	Village parks	94%	25	309	Higher
	Recreation centers or facilities	89%	16	273	Higher
	Health services	84%	30	220	Higher
Education and Enrichment	Village-sponsored special events	79%	44	280	Similar
	Public library services	97%	2	320	Higher
Community Engagement	Public information services	86%	9	283	Higher

Table 73: Participation General

	Percent positive	Rank	Number of communities in comparison	Comparison to benchmark
Sense of community	77%	35	301	Higher
Recommend living in Oak Park to someone who asks	90%	109	280	Similar
Remain in Oak Park for the next five years	80%	207	275	Similar
Contacted Oak Park (in-person, phone, email or web) for help or information	67%	4	318	Much higher

Table 74: Participation by Facet

		Percent positive	Rank	Number of communities in comparison	Comparison to benchmark
Safety	Stocked supplies in preparation for an emergency	18%	228	235	Lower
	Did NOT report a crime to the police	78%	169	261	Similar
	Household member was NOT a victim of a crime	86%	203	270	Similar
Mobility	Used bus, rail, subway or other public transportation instead of driving	84%	5	214	Much higher
	Carpooled with other adults or children instead of driving alone	46%	82	249	Similar
	Walked or biked instead of driving	86%	9	258	Much higher
Natural Environment	Made efforts to conserve water	77%	171	243	Similar
	Made efforts to make your home more energy efficient	73%	177	245	Similar
	Recycle at home	95%	84	257	Similar
Built Environment	Did NOT observe a code violation or other hazard in Oak Park	61%	72	252	Similar
	NOT experiencing housing costs stress	67%	153	256	Similar
Economy	Purchase goods or services from a business located in Oak Park	98%	93	255	Similar
	Economy will have positive impact on income	21%	251	257	Lower
	Work inside boundaries of Oak Park	30%	185	256	Lower

	Percent positive	Rank	Number of communities in comparison	Comparison to benchmark
Recreation and Wellness				
Used Oak Park recreation centers or their services	60%	89	238	Similar
Visited a neighborhood park or Village park	91%	38	265	Similar
Eat at least 5 portions of fruits and vegetables a day	88%	34	246	Similar
Participate in moderate or vigorous physical activity	89%	51	251	Similar
In very good to excellent health	69%	64	251	Similar
Education and Enrichment				
Used Oak Park public libraries or their services	79%	9	246	Higher
Participated in religious or spiritual activities in Oak Park	38%	152	204	Similar
Attended Village-sponsored event	64%	55	260	Similar
Community Engagement				
Campaigned or advocated for an issue, cause or candidate	32%	29	239	Similar
Contacted Oak Park elected officials (in-person, phone, email or web) to express your opinion	19%	95	253	Similar
Volunteered your time to some group/activity in Oak Park	39%	119	263	Similar
Participated in a club	25%	123	244	Similar
Talked to or visited with your immediate neighbors	91%	124	253	Similar
Done a favor for a neighbor	76%	201	248	Similar
Attended a local public meeting	24%	75	262	Similar
Watched (online or on television) a local public meeting	15%	190	232	Similar
Read or watch local news (via television, paper, computer, etc.)	81%	174	256	Similar
Vote in local elections	90%	37	258	Similar

Communities included in national comparisons

The communities included in Oak Park's comparisons are listed on the following pages along with their population according to the American Community Survey (ACS) 2017 5-year estimates.

Brighton city, CO	38,016
Brookline CDP, MA	59,246
Brooklyn Center city, MN	30,885
Brooklyn city, OH	10,891
Broomfield city, CO	64,283
Brownsburg town, IN	24,625
Buffalo Grove village, IL	41,551
Burlingame city, CA	30,401
Cabarrus County, NC	196,716
Cambridge city, MA	110,893
Canandaigua city, NY	10,402
Cannon Beach city, OR	1,517
Cañon City city, CO	16,298
Canton city, SD	3,352
Cape Coral city, FL	173,679
Carlsbad city, CA	113,147
Carroll city, IA	9,937
Cartersville city, GA	20,235
Cary town, NC	159,715
Castle Rock town, CO	57,274
Cedar Hill city, TX	48,149
Cedar Park city, TX	70,010
Cedar Rapids city, IA	130,330
Celina city, TX	7,910
Centennial city, CO	108,448
Chandler city, AZ	245,160
Chandler city, TX	2,896
Chanhassen city, MN	25,108
Chapel Hill town, NC	59,234
Chardon city, OH	5,166
Charles County, MD	156,021
Charlotte County, FL	173,236
Charlottesville city, VA	46,487
Chattanooga city, TN	176,291
Chautauqua town, NY	4,362
Chesterfield County, VA	335,594
Clackamas County, OR	399,962
Clayton city, MO	16,214
Clearwater city, FL	112,794
Cleveland Heights city, OH	45,024
Clinton city, SC	8,538
Clive city, IA	17,134
Clovis city, CA	104,411
College Park city, MD	32,186
College Station city, TX	107,445
Colleyville city, TX	25,557
Collinsville city, IL	24,767
Columbia city, MO	118,620
Columbia city, SC	132,236
Columbia Falls city, MT	5,054
Commerce City city, CO	52,905
Concord city, CA	128,160
Concord town, MA	19,357
Conshohocken borough, PA	7,985
Coolidge city, AZ	12,221
Coon Rapids city, MN	62,342
Coral Springs city, FL	130,110
Coronado city, CA	24,053
Corvallis city, OR	56,224
Cottonwood Heights city, UT	34,214
Coventry Lake CDP, CT	2,932
Creve Coeur city, MO	18,259
Cupertino city, CA	60,687
Dacono city, CO	4,929
Dakota County, MN	414,655
Dallas city, OR	15,413
Dallas city, TX	1,300,122
Danville city, KY	16,657
Darien city, IL	22,206
Davenport city, FL	3,665
Davidson town, NC	12,325
Dayton city, OH	140,939
Dayton town, WY	815
Dearborn city, MI	95,295
Decatur city, GA	22,022
Del Mar city, CA	4,338
DeLand city, FL	30,315
Delaware city, OH	38,193
Denison city, TX	23,342
Denton city, TX	131,097
Denver city, CO	678,467
Des Moines city, IA	214,778
Des Peres city, MO	8,536
Destin city, FL	13,421
Dover city, NH	30,901
Dublin city, CA	57,022
Dublin city, OH	44,442
Duluth city, MN	86,066
Durham city, NC	257,232
Durham County, NC	300,865
Dyer town, IN	16,077
Eagan city, MN	66,102
Eagle Mountain city, UT	27,773
Eau Claire city, WI	67,945
Eden Prairie city, MN	63,660
Eden town, VT	1,254
Edgewater city, CO	5,299
Edina city, MN	50,603
Edmond city, OK	89,769
Edmonds city, WA	41,309
El Cerrito city, CA	24,982
El Paso de Robles (Paso Robles) city, CA	31,409
Elk Grove city, CA	166,228
Elmhurst city, IL	46,139
Englewood city, CO	33,155
Erie town, CO	22,019
Estes Park town, CO	6,248
Euclid city, OH	47,698
Fairview town, TX	8,473
Farmers Branch city, TX	33,808
Farmersville city, TX	3,440
Farmington Hills city, MI	81,235
Farmington town, CT	25,596
Fate city, TX	10,339
Fayetteville city, GA	17,069
Fayetteville city, NC	210,324
Ferguson township, PA	18,837
Fernandina Beach city, FL	11,957
Flower Mound town, TX	71,575
Forest Grove city, OR	23,554
Fort Collins city, CO	159,150
Franklin city, TN	72,990
Frederick town, CO	11,397
Fremont city, CA	230,964
Fruita city, CO	13,039
Gahanna city, OH	34,691
Gaithersburg city, MD	67,417
Galveston city, TX	49,706
Gardner city, KS	21,059
Germantown city, TN	39,230
Gilbert town, AZ	232,176
Gillette city, WY	31,783
Glen Ellyn village, IL	27,983
Glendora city, CA	51,891
Glenview village, IL	47,066
Golden city, CO	20,365
Golden Valley city, MN	21,208
Goodyear city, AZ	74,953
Grafton village, WI	11,576
Grand Blanc city, MI	7,964

Grants Pass city, OR	36,687
Grass Valley city, CA	12,893
Greeley city, CO	100,760
Greenville city, NC	90,347
Greenwich town, CT	62,782
Greenwood Village city, CO	15,397
Greer city, SC	28,587
Gunnison County, CO	16,215
Haltom City city, TX	44,059
Hamilton city, OH	62,216
Hamilton town, MA	7,991
Hampton city, VA	136,255
Hanover County, VA	103,218
Harrisburg city, SD	5,429
Harrisonburg city, VA	53,064
Harrisonville city, MO	10,025
Hastings city, MN	22,620
Henderson city, NV	284,817
Herndon town, VA	24,545
High Point city, NC	109,849
Highland Park city, IL	29,796
Highlands Ranch CDP, CO	105,264
Homer Glen village, IL	24,403
Honolulu County, HI	990,060
Hoquiam city, WA	8,416
Horry County, SC	310,186
Hudson town, CO	1,709
Huntley village, IL	26,265
Huntsville city, TX	40,727
Hutchinson city, MN	13,836
Hutto city, TX	22,644
Independence city, MO	117,369
Indio city, CA	86,867
Iowa City city, IA	73,415
Irving city, TX	235,648
Issaquah city, WA	35,629
Jackson city, MO	14,690
Jackson County, MI	158,989
James City County, VA	73,028
Jefferson County, NY	116,567
Jefferson Parish, LA	437,038
Jerome city, ID	11,306
Johnson City city, TN	65,598
Johnston city, IA	20,172
Jupiter town, FL	62,373
Kalamazoo city, MI	75,833
Kansas City city, KS	151,042
Kansas City city, MO	476,974
Keizer city, OR	37,910
Kent city, WA	126,561
Kerrville city, TX	22,931
Key West city, FL	25,316
King City city, CA	13,721
Kingman city, AZ	28,855
Kirkland city, WA	86,772
Kirkwood city, MO	27,659
Knoxville city, IA	7,202
La Plata town, MD	9,160
La Vista city, NE	17,062
Laguna Niguel city, CA	65,429
Lake Forest city, IL	18,931
Lake in the Hills village, IL	28,908
Lake Zurich village, IL	19,983
Lakeville city, MN	61,056
Lakewood city, CO	151,411
Lakewood city, WA	59,102
Lancaster County, SC	86,544
Lansing city, MI	115,222
Laramie city, WY	32,104
Larimer County, CO	330,976
Las Cruces city, NM	101,014
Las Vegas city, NM	13,445
Lawrence city, KS	93,954
Lawrenceville city, GA	29,287
Lehi city, UT	58,351
Lenexa city, KS	52,030
Lewisville city, TX	103,638
Lewisville town, NC	13,516
Libertyville village, IL	20,504
Lincolnwood village, IL	12,637
Lindsborg city, KS	3,313
Little Chute village, WI	11,006
Littleton city, CO	45,848
Livermore city, CA	88,232
Lombard village, IL	43,776
Lone Tree city, CO	13,430
Long Grove village, IL	7,980
Longmont city, CO	91,730
Lonsdale city, MN	3,850
Los Alamos County, NM	18,031
Los Altos Hills town, CA	8,490
Loudoun County, VA	374,558
Louisville city, CO	20,319
Lower Merion township, PA	58,500
Lynchburg city, VA	79,237
Lynnwood city, WA	37,242
Manassas city, VA	41,379
Manhattan Beach city, CA	35,698
Manhattan city, KS	55,427
Mankato city, MN	41,241
Maple Grove city, MN	68,362
Maplewood city, MN	40,127
Maricopa County, AZ	4,155,501
Marin County, CA	260,814
Marion city, IA	38,014
Mariposa County, CA	17,658
Marshfield city, WI	18,326
Martinez city, CA	37,902
Marysville city, WA	66,178
Maui County, HI	164,094
McKinney city, TX	164,760
McMinnville city, OR	33,211
Mecklenburg County, NC	1,034,290
Menlo Park city, CA	33,661
Menomonee Falls village, WI	36,411
Mercer Island city, WA	24,768
Meridian charter township, MI	41,903
Meridian city, ID	91,917
Merriam city, KS	11,259
Mesa city, AZ	479,317
Miami Beach city, FL	92,187
Miami city, FL	443,007
Middleton city, WI	18,951
Middletown town, RI	16,100
Midland city, MI	41,958
Milford city, DE	10,645
Milton city, GA	37,556
Minneapolis city, MN	411,452
Minnetrista city, MN	7,187
Missouri City city, TX	72,688
Moline city, IL	42,644
Monroe city, MI	20,128
Montgomery city, MN	2,921
Montgomery County, MD	1,039,198
Monticello city, UT	2,599
Montrose city, CO	18,918
Moraga town, CA	17,231
Morristown city, TN	29,446
Morrisville town, NC	23,873
Morro Bay city, CA	10,568

Mountlake Terrace city, WA	20,922	Powhatan County, VA	28,364
Murphy city, TX	20,361	Prince William County, VA	450,763
Naperville city, IL	146,431	Prior Lake city, MN	25,452
Napoleon city, OH	8,646	Pueblo city, CO	109,122
Nederland city, TX	17,284	Purcellville town, VA	9,217
Needham CDP, MA	30,429	Queen Creek town, AZ	33,298
Nevada City city, CA	3,112	Raleigh city, NC	449,477
Nevada County, CA	98,838	Ramsey city, MN	25,853
New Braunfels city, TX	70,317	Raymond town, ME	4,497
New Brighton city, MN	22,440	Raymore city, MO	20,358
New Concord village, OH	2,561	Redmond city, OR	28,492
New Hope city, MN	20,909	Redmond city, WA	60,712
New Orleans city, LA	388,182	Redwood City city, CA	84,368
New Ulm city, MN	13,249	Reno city, NV	239,732
Newport city, RI	24,745	Richland city, WA	53,991
Newport News city, VA	180,775	Richmond city, CA	108,853
Newton city, IA	15,085	Richmond Heights city, MO	8,466
Niles village, IL	29,823	Rio Rancho city, NM	93,317
Noblesville city, IN	59,807	River Falls city, WI	15,256
Norcross city, GA	16,474	Riverside city, CA	321,570
Norfolk city, NE	24,352	Roanoke city, VA	99,572
Norfolk city, VA	245,752	Roanoke County, VA	93,419
North Mankato city, MN	13,583	Rochester city, NY	209,463
North Port city, FL	62,542	Rock Hill city, SC	70,764
North Yarmouth town, ME	3,714	Rockville city, MD	66,420
Northglenn city, CO	38,473	Roeland Park city, KS	6,810
Novato city, CA	55,378	Rohnert Park city, CA	42,305
Novi city, MI	58,835	Rolla city, MO	20,013
O'Fallon city, IL	29,095	Rosemount city, MN	23,474
Oak Park village, IL	52,229	Rosenberg city, TX	35,867
Oakley city, CA	39,950	Roseville city, MN	35,624
Oklahoma City city, OK	629,191	Round Rock city, TX	116,369
Olmsted County, MN	151,685	Royal Palm Beach village, FL	37,665
Olympia city, WA	49,928	Sacramento city, CA	489,650
Orange village, OH	3,280	Sahuarita town, AZ	28,257
Orland Park village, IL	59,161	Sammamish city, WA	62,877
Orleans Parish, LA	388,182	San Diego city, CA	1,390,966
Oshkosh city, WI	66,649	San Jose city, CA	1,023,031
Oswego village, IL	33,759	San Marcos city, CA	93,493
Ottawa County, MI	280,243	San Marcos city, TX	59,935
Overland Park city, KS	186,147	Sangamon County, IL	198,134
Paducah city, KY	24,879	Santa Fe city, NM	82,980
Palm Beach Gardens city, FL	53,119	Santa Fe County, NM	147,514
Palm Coast city, FL	82,356	Sarasota County, FL	404,839
Palo Alto city, CA	67,082	Savage city, MN	30,011
Palos Verdes Estates city, CA	13,591	Schaumburg village, IL	74,427
Papillion city, NE	19,478	Schertz city, TX	38,199
Paradise Valley town, AZ	13,961	Scott County, MN	141,463
Park City city, UT	8,167	Scottsdale city, AZ	239,283
Parker town, CO	51,125	Sedona city, AZ	10,246
Parkland city, FL	28,901	Sevierville city, TN	16,387
Pasco city, WA	70,607	Shakopee city, MN	40,024
Pasco County, FL	498,136	Sharonville city, OH	13,974
Payette city, ID	7,366	Shawnee city, KS	64,840
Pearland city, TX	113,693	Shawnee city, OK	30,974
Peoria city, IL	115,424	Sherborn town, MA	4,302
Pflugerville city, TX	58,013	Shoreline city, WA	55,431
Pinehurst village, NC	15,580	Shoreview city, MN	26,432
Piqua city, OH	20,793	Shorewood village, IL	16,809
Pitkin County, CO	17,747	Sierra Vista city, AZ	43,585
Plano city, TX	281,566	Silverton city, OR	9,757
Platte City city, MO	4,867	Sioux Falls city, SD	170,401
Pleasant Hill city, IA	9,608	Skokie village, IL	64,773
Pleasanton city, CA	79,341	Snoqualmie city, WA	12,944
Polk County, IA	467,235	Snowmass Village town, CO	2,827
Pompano Beach city, FL	107,542	Somerset town, MA	18,257
Port Orange city, FL	60,315	South Jordan city, UT	65,523
Port St. Lucie city, FL	178,778	Southlake city, TX	30,090
Portland city, OR	630,331	Spearfish city, SD	11,300
Powell city, OH	12,658	Springfield city, MO	165,785

Springville city, UT 32,319
St. Augustine city, FL 13,952
St. Charles city, IL.. 32,730
St. Joseph city, MO 76,819
St. Louis County, MN...200,294
St. Lucie County, FL..298,763
State College borough, PA 42,224
Steamboat Springs city, CO 12,520
Sugar Land city, TX 86,886
Suisun City city, CA 29,280
Summit County, UT 39,731
Sunnyvale city, CA 151,565
Surprise city, AZ..129,534
Suwanee city, GA 18,655
Tacoma city, WA...207,280
Takoma Park city, MD 17,643
Temecula city, CA 110,722
Tempe city, AZ 178,339
Temple city, TX 71,795
Texarkana city, TX 37,222
The Woodlands CDP, TX.......................................109,608
Tigard city, OR.. 51,355
Tinley Park village, IL 57,107
Tracy city, CA 87,613
Trinidad CCD, CO.. 10,819
Tualatin city, OR 27,135
Tulsa city, OK 401,352
Tustin city, CA 80,007
Twin Falls city, ID 47,340
Unalaska city, AK 4,809
University Heights city, OH 13,201
University Park city, TX... 24,692
Urbandale city, IA 42,222
Vail town, CO.. 5,425
Ventura CCD, CA..115,218
Vernon Hills village, IL... 26,084
Vestavia Hills city, AL 34,003

Victoria city, MN... 8,679
Vienna town, VA 16,474
Virginia Beach city, VA...450,057
Walnut Creek city, CA.. 68,516
Warrensburg city, MO 19,890
Washington County, MN 250,979
Washoe County, NV 445,551
Washougal city, WA 15,241
Wauwatosa city, WI 47,687
Wentzville city, MO.. 35,768
West Carrollton city, OH 12,963
West Chester township, OH 62,804
Western Springs village, IL 13,187
Westerville city, OH... 38,604
Westlake town, TX 1,006
Westminster city, CO...111,895
Westminster city, MD 18,557
Wheat Ridge city, CO 31,162
White House city, TN.. 11,107
Wichita city, KS..389,054
Williamsburg city, VA 14,817
Willowbrook village, IL 8,598
Wilmington city, NC...115,261
Wilsonville city, OR.. 22,789
Windsor town, CO.. 23,386
Windsor town, CT 29,037
Winnetka village, IL.. 12,504
Winter Garden city, FL.. 40,799
Woodbury city, MN... 67,648
Woodinville city, WA... 11,675
Wyandotte County, KS 163,227
Yakima city, WA... 93,182
York County, VA... 67,196
Yorktown town, IN 11,200
Yorkville city, IL 18,691
Yountville city, CA 2,978

Appendix C: Detailed Survey Methods

The National Community Survey™ (The NCS™), conducted by National Research Center, Inc., was developed to provide communities an accurate, affordable and easy way to assess and interpret resident opinion about important local topics. Standardization of common questions and survey methods provide the rigor to assure valid results, and each community has enough flexibility to construct a customized version of The NCS.

Results offer insight into residents' perspectives about the community as a whole, including local amenities, services, public trust, resident participation and other aspects of the community in order to support budgeting, land use and strategic planning and communication with residents. Resident demographic characteristics permit comparison to the Census as well as comparison of results for different subgroups of residents. The Village of Oak Park funded this research. Please contact Oak Park Communications Director David Powers at dpowers@oak-park.us if you have any questions about the survey.

Survey Validity

The question of survey validity has two parts: 1) how can a community be confident that the results from those who completed the questionnaire are representative of the results that would have been obtained had the survey been administered to the entire population? and 2) how closely do the perspectives recorded on the survey reflect what residents really believe or do?

To answer the first question, the best survey research practices were used for the resources spent to ensure that the results from the survey respondents reflect the opinions of residents in the entire community. These practices include:

- Using a mail-out/mail-back methodology, which typically gets a higher response rate than phone for the same dollars spent. A higher response rate lessens the worry that those who did not respond are different than those who did respond.
- Selecting households at random within the community to receive the survey to ensure that the households selected to receive the survey are representative of the larger community.
- Over-sampling multi-family housing units to improve response from hard-to-reach, lower income or younger apartment dwellers.
- Selecting the respondent within the household using an unbiased sampling procedure; in this case, the "birthday method." The cover letter included an instruction requesting that the respondent in the household be the adult (18 years old or older) who most recently had a birthday, irrespective of year of birth.
- Contacting potential respondents three times to encourage response from people who may have different opinions or habits than those who would respond with only a single prompt.
- Inviting response in a compelling manner (using appropriate letterhead/logos and a signature of a visible leader) to appeal to recipients' sense of civic responsibility.
- Providing a pre-addressed, postage-paid return envelope.
- Offering the survey in Spanish or other language when requested by a given community.
- Weighting the results to reflect the demographics of the population.

The answer to the second question about how closely the perspectives recorded on the survey reflect what residents really believe or do is more complex. Resident responses to surveys are influenced by a variety of factors. For questions about service quality, residents' expectations for service quality play a role as well as the "objective" quality of the service provided, the way the resident perceives the entire community (that is, the context in which the service is provided), the scale on which the resident is asked to record his or her opinion and, of course, the opinion, itself, that a resident holds about the service. Similarly a resident's report of certain behaviors is colored by what he or she believes is the socially desirable response (e.g., reporting tolerant behaviors toward "oppressed groups," likelihood of voting for a tax increase for services to poor people, use of alternative modes of travel to work besides the single occupancy vehicle), his or her memory of the actual behavior (if it is not a question speculating about future actions, like a vote), his or her confidence that he or she can be honest without suffering any negative consequences (thus the need for anonymity) as well as the actual behavior itself.

How closely survey results come to recording the way a person really feels or behaves often is measured by the coincidence of reported behavior with observed current behavior (e.g., driving habits), reported intentions to behave with observed future behavior (e.g., voting choices) or reported opinions about current community quality

with objective characteristics of the community (e.g., feelings of safety correlated with rates of crime). There is a body of scientific literature that has investigated the relationship between reported behaviors and actual behaviors. Well-conducted surveys, by and large, do capture true respondent behaviors or intentions to act with great accuracy. Predictions of voting outcomes tend to be quite accurate using survey research, as do reported behaviors that are not about highly sensitive issues (e.g., family abuse or other illegal or morally sanctioned activities). For self-reports about highly sensitive issues, statistical adjustments can be made to correct for the respondents' tendency to report what they think the "correct" response should be.

Research on the correlation of resident opinion about service quality and "objective" ratings of service quality vary, with some showing stronger relationships than others. NRC's own research has demonstrated that residents who report the lowest ratings of street repair live in communities with objectively worse street conditions than those who report high ratings of street repair (based on road quality, delay in street repair, number of road repair employees). Similarly, the lowest rated fire services appear to be "objectively" worse than the highest rated fire services (expenditures per capita, response time, "professional" status of firefighters, breadth of services and training provided). Resident opinion commonly reflects objective performance data but is an important measure on its own. NRC principals have written, "If you collect trash three times a day but residents think that your trash haul is lousy, you still have a problem."

Selecting Survey Recipients

"Sampling" refers to the method by which households were chosen to receive the survey. All households within the Village of Oak Park were eligible to participate in the survey. A list of all households within the zip codes serving Oak Park was purchased from Go-Dog Direct based on updated listings from the United States Postal Service. Since some of the zip codes that serve the Village of Oak Park households may also serve addresses that lie outside of the community, the exact geographic location of each housing unit was compared to community boundaries using the most current municipal boundary file (updated on a quarterly basis) and addresses located outside of the Village of Oak Park boundaries were removed from consideration. Each address identified as being within Village boundaries was further identified as being within one of four quadrants (Northwest, Northeast, Southwest and Southeast).

To choose the 2,400 survey recipients, a systematic sampling method was applied to the list of households previously screened for geographic location. Systematic sampling is a procedure whereby a complete list of all possible households is culled, selecting every *Nth* one, giving each eligible household a known probability of selection, until the appropriate number of households is selected. Multi-family housing units were selected at a higher rate as residents of this type of housing typically respond at lower rates to surveys than do those in single-family housing units. Figure 1 displays a map of the households selected to receive the survey. In general, because of the random sampling techniques used, the displayed sampling density will closely mirror the overall housing unit density (which may be different from the population density). While the theory of probability assumes no bias in selection, there may be some minor variations in practice (meaning, an area with only 15% of the housing units might be selected at an actual rate that is slightly above or below that).

An individual within each household was selected using the birthday method. The birthday method selects a person within the household by asking the "person whose birthday has most recently passed" to complete the questionnaire. The underlying assumption in this method is that day of birth has no relationship to the way people respond to surveys. This instruction was contained in the cover letter accompanying the questionnaire.

Figure 1: Location of Survey Recipients

Survey Recipients in Oak Park, IL

- In NE Oak Park
- In NW Oak Park
- In SE Oak Park
- In SW Oak Park
- NE
- NW
- SE
- SW

Survey Administration and Response

Selected households received three mailings, one week apart, beginning on September 25, 2019. The first mailing was a prenotification postcard announcing the upcoming survey. The next mailing contained a letter from the Village President/Mayor inviting the household to participate, a questionnaire and a postage-paid return envelope. The final mailing contained a reminder letter, another survey and a postage-paid return envelope. The second cover letter asked those who had not completed the survey to do so and those who had already done so to refrain from turning in another survey. The survey was available in English. Both cover letters included a URL through which the residents selected for the mail survey could choose respond online rather than by mail, as well as unique identifiers to ensure duplicate responses could be tracked and removed from the dataset, if necessary. The Village of Oak Park chose to augment their administration of The NCS with several additional services, including demographic subgroup comparisons and geographic subgroup comparison. The results of these additional services have been provided under separate cover. Completed surveys were collected over the following seven weeks.

About 3% of the 2,400 surveys mailed were returned because the housing unit was vacant or the postal service was unable to deliver the survey as addressed. Of the remaining 2,335 eligible households that received the survey, 696 completed the survey, providing an overall response rate of 30%. Of the 696 completed surveys, 210 were completed online. Additionally, responses were tracked by subarea; response rates by quadrant ranged from 27% to 34%. The response rates were calculated using AAPOR's response rate #2[1] for mailed surveys of unnamed persons.

Table 75: Survey Response Rates by Quadrant

	Northwest	Northeast	Southwest	Southeast	Overall
Total sample used	600	600	600	600	2,400
I=Complete Interviews	173	192	164	155	684
P=Partial Interviews	3	3	3	2	11
R=Refusal and break off	0	0	0	0	0
NC=Non Contact	0	0	0	0	0
O=Other	0	0	0	0	0
UH=Unknown household	0	0	0	0	0
UO=Unknown other	417	387	405	431	1,640
NE=Not eligible	7	18	28	12	65
Response rate: (I+P)/(I+P) + (R+NC+O) + (UH+UO)	30%	34%	29%	27%	30%

Confidence Intervals

It is customary to describe the precision of estimates made from surveys by a "level of confidence" and accompanying "confidence interval" (or margin of error). A traditional level of confidence, and the one used here, is 95%. The 95% confidence interval can be any size and quantifies the sampling error or imprecision of the survey results because some residents' opinions are relied on to estimate all residents' opinions.[2]

The margin of error for the Village of Oak Park survey is no greater than plus or minus four percentage points around any given percent reported for all respondents (696 completed surveys).

For subgroups of responses, the margin of error increases because the number of respondents for the subgroup is smaller.

Survey Processing (Data Entry)

Upon receipt, completed surveys were assigned a unique identification number. Additionally, each survey was reviewed and "cleaned" as necessary. For example, a question may have asked a respondent to pick two items out

---

[1] See AAPOR's Standard Definitions here: http://www.aapor.org/Standards-Ethics/Standard-Definitions-(1).aspx for more information

[2] A 95% confidence interval indicates that for every 100 random samples of this many residents, 95 of the confidence intervals created will include the "true" population response. This theory is applied in practice to mean that the "true" perspective of the target population lies within the confidence interval created for a single survey. For example, if 75% of residents rate a service as "excellent" or "good," then the 4% margin of error (for the 95% confidence interval) indicates that the range of likely responses for the entire community is between 71% and 79%. This source of uncertainty is called sampling error. In addition to sampling error, other sources of error may affect any survey, including the non-response of residents with opinions different from survey responders. Though standardized on The NCS, on other surveys, differences in question wording, order, translation and data entry, as examples, can lead to somewhat varying results.

of a list of five, but the respondent checked three; in this case, NRC would use protocols to randomly choose two of the three selected items for inclusion in the dataset.

All surveys then were entered twice into an electronic dataset; any discrepancies were resolved in comparison to the original survey form. Range checks as well as other forms of quality control were also performed.

NRC used SurveyGizmo, a web-based survey and analytics platform, to collect the online survey data. Use of an online system means all collected data are entered into the dataset when the respondents submit the surveys. Skip patterns are programmed into system so respondents are automatically "skipped" to the appropriate question based on the individual responses being given. Online programming also allows for more rigid control of the data format, making extensive data cleaning unnecessary.

A series of quality control checks were also performed in order to ensure the integrity of the web data. Steps may include and not be limited to reviewing the data for clusters of repeat IP addresses and time stamps (indicating duplicate responses) and removing empty submissions (questionnaires submitted with no questions answered).

Survey Data Weighting

The demographic characteristics of the survey respondents were compared to those found in the 2010 Census and American Community Survey estimates for adults in the Village of Oak Park. The primary objective of weighting survey data is to make the survey respondents reflective of the larger population of the community. The characteristics used for weighting were housing tenure (rent or own), housing unit type (attached or detached), race/ethnicity, sex, age, and area. No adjustments were made for design effects. The results of the weighting scheme are presented in the following table.

Table 76: Oak Park, IL 2019 Weighting Table

Characteristic	Population Norm	Unweighted Data	Weighted Data
Housing			
Rent home	42%	20%	40%
Own home	58%	80%	60%
Detached unit*	43%	61%	44%
Attached unit*	57%	39%	56%
Race and Ethnicity			
White	69%	77%	68%
Not white	31%	23%	32%
Not Hispanic	94%	96%	95%
Hispanic	6%	4%	5%
Sex and Age			
Female	55%	59%	56%
Male	45%	41%	44%
18-34 years of age	27%	11%	25%
35-54 years of age	42%	36%	43%
55+ years of age	32%	54%	32%
Females 18-34	14%	7%	14%
Females 35-54	23%	20%	24%
Females 55+	18%	31%	18%
Males 18-34	12%	3%	11%
Males 35-54	19%	15%	19%
Males 55+	14%	23%	14%
Quadrant			
Northwest	17%	25%	18%
Northeast	25%	28%	25%
Southwest	25%	24%	25%
Southeast	32%	23%	31%

* U.S. Census Bureau ACS 2017 5-year estimates

Survey Data Analysis and Reporting

The survey dataset was analyzed using the Statistical Package for the Social Sciences (SPSS). For the most part, the percentages presented in the reports represent the "percent positive." The percent positive is the combination of the top two most positive response options (i.e., "excellent" and "good," "very safe" and "somewhat safe," "essential" and "very important," etc.), or, in the case of resident behaviors/participation, the percent positive represents the proportion of respondents indicating "yes" or participating in an activity at least once a month.

On many of the questions in the survey respondents may answer "don't know." The proportion of respondents giving this reply is shown in the full set of responses included in Appendix A. However, these responses have been removed from the analyses presented in the reports. In other words, the tables and graphs display the responses from respondents who had an opinion about a specific item. When a table for a question that only permitted a single response does not total to exactly 100%, it is due to the common practice of percentages being rounded to the nearest whole number.

Appendix D: Survey Materials

Dear Oak Park Resident,

It won't take much of your time to make a big difference!

Your household has been randomly selected to participate in a survey about your community. Your survey will arrive in a few days.

Thank you for helping create a better Village!

Sincerely,

Anan Abu·Taleb
Village President/Mayor
Village of Oak Park

Oak Park

Village of Oak Park
123 Madison St.
Oak Park, IL 60302

Oak Park

Village of Oak Park
123 Madison St.
Oak Park, IL 60302

Oak Park

Village of Oak Park
123 Madison St.
Oak Park, IL 60302

Oak Park

Village of Oak Park
123 Madison St.
Oak Park, IL 60302

October 2019

Dear Village of Oak Park Resident:

Please help us shape the future of Oak Park! You have been selected at random to participate in the 2019 Oak Park Community Survey.

Please take a few minutes to fill out the enclosed survey. Your participation in this survey is very important – especially since your household is one of only a small number being surveyed. Your feedback will help Oak Park make decisions that affect our Village.

A few things to remember:
- **Your responses are completely confidential.**
- In order to hear from a diverse group of residents, the adult 18 years or older in your household who most recently had a birthday should complete this survey.
- **You may return the survey by mail in the enclosed postage-paid envelope, or you can complete the survey online using the following link and access code:**

  xx.webplaceholder.xx

  Access Code: XXXXX

If you have any questions about the survey please call 708-358-5770.

Thank you for your time and participation!

Anan Abu-Taleb
Village President/Mayor

October 2019

Dear Village of Oak Park Resident:

Here's a second chance if you haven't already responded to the 2019 Oak Park Community Survey! **(If you completed it and sent it back, we thank you for your time and ask you to recycle this survey. Please do not respond twice.)**

Please help us shape the future of Oak Park! You have been selected at random to participate in the 2019 Oak Park Community Survey.

Please take a few minutes to fill out the enclosed survey. Your participation in this survey is very important – especially since your household is one of only a small number of households being surveyed. Your feedback will help Oak Park make decisions that affect our Village.

A few things to remember:
- **Your responses are completely confidential.**
- In order to hear from a diverse group of residents, the adult 18 years or older in your household who most recently had a birthday should complete this survey.
- **You may return the survey by mail in the enclosed postage-paid envelope, or you can complete the survey online using the following link and access code:**

  xx.webplaceholder.xx

  Access Code: XXXXX

If you have any questions about the survey please call 708-358-5770.

Thank you for your time and participation!

Anan Abu-Taleb
Village President/Mayor

The Village of Oak Park 2019 Community Survey

Please complete this questionnaire if you are the adult (age 18 or older) in the household who most recently had a birthday. The adult's year of birth does not matter. Please select the response (by circling the number or checking the box) that most closely represents your opinion for each question. Your responses are anonymous and will be reported in group form only.

1. Please rate each of the following aspects of quality of life in Oak Park:

	Excellent	Good	Fair	Poor	Don't know
Oak Park as a place to live	1	2	3	4	5
Your neighborhood as a place to live	1	2	3	4	5
Oak Park as a place to raise children	1	2	3	4	5
Oak Park as a place to work	1	2	3	4	5
Oak Park as a place to visit	1	2	3	4	5
Oak Park as a place to retire	1	2	3	4	5
The overall quality of life in Oak Park	1	2	3	4	5

2. Please rate each of the following characteristics as they relate to Oak Park as a whole:

	Excellent	Good	Fair	Poor	Don't know
Overall feeling of safety in Oak Park	1	2	3	4	5
Overall ease of getting to the places you usually have to visit	1	2	3	4	5
Quality of overall natural environment in Oak Park	1	2	3	4	5
Overall "built environment" of Oak Park (including overall design, buildings, parks and transportation systems)	1	2	3	4	5
Health and wellness opportunities in Oak Park	1	2	3	4	5
Overall opportunities for education and enrichment	1	2	3	4	5
Overall economic health of Oak Park	1	2	3	4	5
Sense of community	1	2	3	4	5
Overall image or reputation of Oak Park	1	2	3	4	5

3. Please indicate how likely or unlikely you are to do each of the following:

	Very likely	Somewhat likely	Somewhat unlikely	Very unlikely	Don't know
Recommend living in Oak Park to someone who asks	1	2	3	4	5
Remain in Oak Park for the next five years	1	2	3	4	5

4. Please rate how safe or unsafe you feel:

	Very safe	Somewhat safe	Neither safe nor unsafe	Somewhat unsafe	Very unsafe	Don't know
In your neighborhood during the day	1	2	3	4	5	6
In Oak Park's downtown/commercial area during the day	1	2	3	4	5	6
In your neighborhood after dark	1	2	3	4	5	6
In Oak Park's downtown/commercial area after dark	1	2	3	4	5	6

5. Please rate each of the following characteristics as they relate to Oak Park as a whole:

	Excellent	Good	Fair	Poor	Don't know
Traffic flow on major streets	1	2	3	4	5
Ease of public parking	1	2	3	4	5
Ease of travel by car in Oak Park	1	2	3	4	5
Ease of travel by bicycle in Oak Park	1	2	3	4	5
Ease of walking in Oak Park	1	2	3	4	5
Availability of paths and walking trails	1	2	3	4	5
Air quality	1	2	3	4	5
Cleanliness of Oak Park	1	2	3	4	5
Overall appearance of Oak Park	1	2	3	4	5
Public places where people want to spend time	1	2	3	4	5
Variety of housing options	1	2	3	4	5
Availability of affordable quality housing	1	2	3	4	5
Fitness opportunities (including exercise classes and paths or trails, etc.)	1	2	3	4	5
Recreational opportunities	1	2	3	4	5
Availability of affordable quality food	1	2	3	4	5
Availability of affordable quality health care	1	2	3	4	5
Availability of preventive health services	1	2	3	4	5
Availability of affordable quality mental health care	1	2	3	4	5
Ease of travel by bus in Oak Park	1	2	3	4	5
Ease of travel by rail in Oak Park	1	2	3	4	5

6. Please rate each of the following characteristics as they relate to Oak Park as a whole:

	Excellent	Good	Fair	Poor	Don't know
Availability of affordable quality child care/preschool	1	2	3	4	5
Adult educational opportunities	1	2	3	4	5
Opportunities to attend cultural/arts/music activities	1	2	3	4	5
Opportunities to participate in religious or spiritual events and activities	1	2	3	4	5
Employment opportunities	1	2	3	4	5
Shopping opportunities	1	2	3	4	5
Cost of living in Oak Park	1	2	3	4	5
Overall quality of business and service establishments in Oak Park	1	2	3	4	5
Vibrant downtown/commercial area	1	2	3	4	5
Overall quality of new development in Oak Park	1	2	3	4	5
Opportunities to participate in social events and activities	1	2	3	4	5
Opportunities to volunteer	1	2	3	4	5
Opportunities to participate in community matters	1	2	3	4	5
Openness and acceptance of the community toward people of diverse backgrounds	1	2	3	4	5
Neighborliness of residents in Oak Park	1	2	3	4	5

7. Please indicate whether or not you have done each of the following in the last 12 months.

	No	Yes
Made efforts to conserve water	1	2
Made efforts to make your home more energy efficient	1	2
Observed a code violation or other hazard in Oak Park (weeds, abandoned buildings, etc.)	1	2
Household member was a victim of a crime in Oak Park	1	2
Reported a crime to the police in Oak Park	1	2
Stocked supplies in preparation for an emergency	1	2
Campaigned or advocated for an issue, cause or candidate	1	2
Contacted the Village of Oak Park (in-person, phone, email or web) for help or information	1	2
Contacted Oak Park elected officials (in-person, phone, email or web) to express your opinion	1	2
Called for police service in Oak Park	1	2
Called for Oak Park fire/emergency medical services	1	2

8. In the last 12 months, about how many times, if at all, have you or other household members done each of the following in Oak Park?

	2 times a week or more	2-4 times a month	Once a month or less	Not at all
Used Oak Park recreation centers or their services	1	2	3	4
Visited a neighborhood park or Village park	1	2	3	4
Used Oak Park public libraries or their services	1	2	3	4
Participated in religious or spiritual activities in Oak Park	1	2	3	4
Attended a Village-sponsored event	1	2	3	4
Used bus, rail, subway or other public transportation instead of driving	1	2	3	4
Carpooled with other adults or children instead of driving alone	1	2	3	4
Walked or biked instead of driving	1	2	3	4
Volunteered your time to some group/activity in Oak Park	1	2	3	4
Participated in a club	1	2	3	4
Talked to or visited with your immediate neighbors	1	2	3	4
Done a favor for a neighbor	1	2	3	4

9. Thinking about local public meetings (of local elected officials like City Council or County Commissioners, advisory boards, town halls, HOA, neighborhood watch, etc.), in the last 12 months, about how many times, if at all, have you or other household members attended or watched a local public meeting?

	2 times a week or more	2-4 times a month	Once a month or less	Not at all
<u>Attended</u> a local public meeting	1	2	3	4
<u>Watched</u> (online or on television) a local public meeting	1	2	3	4

The Village of Oak Park 2019 Community Survey

10. Please rate the quality of each of the following services in Oak Park:

	Excellent	Good	Fair	Poor	Don't know
Police services	1	2	3	4	5
Fire services	1	2	3	4	5
Ambulance or emergency medical services	1	2	3	4	5
Crime prevention	1	2	3	4	5
Fire prevention and education	1	2	3	4	5
Traffic enforcement	1	2	3	4	5
Street repair	1	2	3	4	5
Street cleaning	1	2	3	4	5
Street lighting	1	2	3	4	5
Snow removal	1	2	3	4	5
Sidewalk maintenance	1	2	3	4	5
Traffic signal timing	1	2	3	4	5
Bus or transit services	1	2	3	4	5
Garbage collection	1	2	3	4	5
Recycling	1	2	3	4	5
Yard waste pick-up	1	2	3	4	5
Storm drainage	1	2	3	4	5
Drinking water	1	2	3	4	5
Sewer services	1	2	3	4	5
Power (electric and/or gas) utility	1	2	3	4	5
Utility billing	1	2	3	4	5
Village parks	1	2	3	4	5
Recreation centers or facilities	1	2	3	4	5
Land use, planning and zoning	1	2	3	4	5
Code enforcement (weeds, abandoned buildings, etc.)	1	2	3	4	5
Animal control	1	2	3	4	5
Economic development	1	2	3	4	5
Health services	1	2	3	4	5
Public library services	1	2	3	4	5
Public information services	1	2	3	4	5
Cable television	1	2	3	4	5
Emergency preparedness (services that prepare the community for natural disasters or other emergency situations)	1	2	3	4	5
Preservation of natural areas such as open space, farmlands and greenbelts	1	2	3	4	5
Oak Park open space	1	2	3	4	5
Village-sponsored special events	1	2	3	4	5
Overall customer service by Oak Park employees (police, receptionists, planners, etc.)	1	2	3	4	5
Services to low-income people	1	2	3	4	5
Leaf pick-up	1	2	3	4	5
Care of trees along the parkway	1	2	3	4	5
Alley maintenance	1	2	3	4	5
Parking services	1	2	3	4	5
Online Village services	1	2	3	4	5
Building permit review	1	2	3	4	5
Oak Park adjudication court	1	2	3	4	5

11. Overall, how would you rate the quality of the services provided by each of the following?

	Excellent	Good	Fair	Poor	Don't know
The Village of Oak Park	1	2	3	4	5
The Federal Government	1	2	3	4	5

12. Please rate the following categories of Oak Park government performance:

	Excellent	Good	Fair	Poor	Don't know
The value of services for the taxes paid to Oak Park	1	2	3	4	5
The overall direction that Oak Park is taking	1	2	3	4	5
The job Oak Park government does at welcoming resident involvement	1	2	3	4	5
Overall confidence in Oak Park government	1	2	3	4	5
Generally acting in the best interest of the community	1	2	3	4	5
Being honest	1	2	3	4	5
Treating all residents fairly	1	2	3	4	5

13. Please rate how important, if at all, you think it is for the Oak Park community to focus on each of the following in the coming two years:

	Essential	Very important	Somewhat important	Not at all important
Overall feeling of safety in Oak Park	1	2	3	4
Overall ease of getting to the places you usually have to visit	1	2	3	4
Quality of overall natural environment in Oak Park	1	2	3	4
Overall "built environment" of Oak Park (including overall design, buildings, parks and transportation systems)	1	2	3	4
Health and wellness opportunities in Oak Park	1	2	3	4
Overall opportunities for education and enrichment	1	2	3	4
Overall economic health of Oak Park	1	2	3	4
Sense of community	1	2	3	4

14. Please rate how important, if at all, it is for the Village of Oak Park to maintain each of the following services at least at current levels (as compared with cutting the levels of service):

	Essential	Very important	Somewhat important	Not at all important
Business retention, development, and attraction	1	2	3	4
Care of trees and landscaping in the parkways	1	2	3	4
Maintenance of the public way, street cleaning, snow plowing	1	2	3	4
Fire and emergency medical assistance	1	2	3	4
Housing programs	1	2	3	4
Operation and administration of parking services	1	2	3	4
Partner agencies that promote or support tourism, housing and the arts in Oak Park	1	2	3	4
Police protection	1	2	3	4
Public health services	1	2	3	4
Environmental sustainability programs and events	1	2	3	4

15. To what degree, if at all, is each of the following a problem in Oak Park?

	Not a problem	Minor problem	Moderate problem	Major problem
Crime	1	2	3	4
Disorderly youth	1	2	3	4
Drugs	1	2	3	4
Graffiti	1	2	3	4
Homelessness	1	2	3	4
Noise	1	2	3	4
Panhandling	1	2	3	4
Run-down buildings and houses	1	2	3	4
Traffic	1	2	3	4

16. How much information about Oak Park, if any, do you get from each of the following sources?

	A lot	Some	None
Village of Oak Park website	1	2	3
Village of Oak Park Facebook & Twitter pages	1	2	3
Friends and neighbors	1	2	3
Local newspapers (print and online)	1	2	3
Village of Oak Park email news	1	2	3
Village of Oak Park OP/FYI newsletter and other Village mailings	1	2	3
VOP-TV, the Village's cable TV channel	1	2	3
Local social media pages/groups	1	2	3

17. Please rate the value of services for the taxes paid to each of the following (percent of your property tax bill):

	Excellent	Good	Fair	Poor	Don't know
Elementary School District 97 (38.32%)	1	2	3	4	5
OPRF High School District 200 (22.69%)	1	2	3	4	5
Village of Oak Park (11.05%)	1	2	3	4	5
Oak Park Fire & Police Pensions (5.80%)	1	2	3	4	5
Oak Park Public Library (4.80%)	1	2	3	4	5
Park District of Oak Park (4.76%)	1	2	3	4	5
Cook County (4.33%)	1	2	3	4	5
Metropolitan Water Reclamation District (3.12%)	1	2	3	4	5
Oak Park Township (2.46%)	1	2	3	4	5
Triton Community College District 504 (2.55%)	1	2	3	4	5
Mosquito Abatement District (0.12%)	1	2	3	4	5

The Village of Oak Park 2019 Community Survey

Our last questions are about you and your household. Again, all of your responses to this survey are completely anonymous and will be reported in group form only.

D1. How often, if at all, do you do each of the following, considering all of the times you could?

	Never	Rarely	Sometimes	Usually	Always
Recycle at home	1	2	3	4	5
Purchase goods or services from a business located in Oak Park	1	2	3	4	5
Eat at least 5 portions of fruits and vegetables a day	1	2	3	4	5
Participate in moderate or vigorous physical activity	1	2	3	4	5
Read or watch local news (via television, paper, computer, etc.)	1	2	3	4	5
Vote in local elections	1	2	3	4	5

D2. Would you say that in general your health is:
❍ Excellent ❍ Very good ❍ Good ❍ Fair ❍ Poor

D3. What impact, if any, do you think the economy will have on your family income in the next 6 months? Do you think the impact will be:
❍ Very positive ❍ Somewhat positive ❍ Neutral ❍ Somewhat negative ❍ Very negative

D4. What is your employment status?
❍ Working full time for pay
❍ Working part time for pay
❍ Unemployed, looking for paid work
❍ Unemployed, not looking for paid work
❍ Fully retired

D5. Do you work inside the boundaries of Oak Park?
❍ Yes, outside the home
❍ Yes, from home
❍ No

D6. How many years have you lived in Oak Park?
❍ Less than 2 years ❍ 11-20 years
❍ 2-5 years ❍ More than 20 years
❍ 6-10 years

D7. Which best describes the building you live in?
❍ One family house detached from any other houses
❍ Building with two or more homes (duplex, townhome, apartment or condominium)
❍ Other

D8. Is this house, apartment or mobile home…
❍ Rented
❍ Owned

D9. About how much is your monthly housing cost for the place you live (including rent, mortgage payment, property tax, property insurance and homeowners' association (HOA) fees)?
❍ Less than $300 per month
❍ $300 to $599 per month
❍ $600 to $999 per month
❍ $1,000 to $1,499 per month
❍ $1,500 to $2,499 per month
❍ $2,500 or more per month

D10. Do any children 17 or under live in your household?
❍ No ❍ Yes

D11. Are you or any other members of your household aged 65 or older?
❍ No ❍ Yes

D12. How much do you anticipate your household's total income before taxes will be for the current year? (**Please include in your total income money from all sources for all persons living in your household.**)
❍ Less than $25,000
❍ $25,000 to $49,999
❍ $50,000 to $99,999
❍ $100,000 to $149,999
❍ $150,000 or more

Please respond to both questions D13 and D14:

D13. Are you Spanish, Hispanic or Latino?
❍ No, not Spanish, Hispanic or Latino
❍ Yes, I consider myself to be Spanish, Hispanic or Latino

D14. What is your race? (**Mark one or more races to indicate what race you consider yourself to be.**)
❍ American Indian or Alaskan Native
❍ Asian, Asian Indian or Pacific Islander
❍ Black or African American
❍ White
❍ Other

D15. In which category is your age?
❍ 18-24 years ❍ 55-64 years
❍ 25-34 years ❍ 65-74 years
❍ 35-44 years ❍ 75 years or older
❍ 45-54 years

D16. What is your sex?
❍ Female ❍ Male

D17. Do you consider a cell phone or land line your primary telephone number?
❍ Cell ❍ Land line ❍ Both

Thank you for completing this survey. Please return the completed survey in the postage-paid envelope to: National Research Center, Inc., PO Box 549, Belle Mead, NJ 08502