University of Texas at El Paso
DigitalCommons@UTEP

IPED Technical Reports | Institute for Policy and Economic Development

6-1-2004

Vision 2004 El Paso Citizen Survey for City of El Paso

Dennis L. Soden
University of Texas at El Paso, desoden@utep.edu

America Tirado
University of Texas at El Paso, atirado@utep.edu

Follow this and additional works at: http://digitalcommons.utep.edu/iped_techrep

Part of the Business Commons, and the Economics Commons

Comments:
IPED Technical Report: 2004-7

Recommended Citation
Soden, Dennis L. and Tirado, America, "Vision 2004 El Paso Citizen Survey for City of El Paso" (2004). *IPED Technical Reports.* Paper 35.
http://digitalcommons.utep.edu/iped_techrep/35

This Article is brought to you for free and open access by the Institute for Policy and Economic Development at DigitalCommons@UTEP. It has been accepted for inclusion in IPED Technical Reports by an authorized administrator of DigitalCommons@UTEP. For more information, please contact lweber@utep.edu.

Vision 2004
El Paso Citizen Survey

for
City of El Paso

Dennis L. Soden
and
America Tirado

Technical Report 2004-7
June 2004

Institute for Policy and Economic Development
University of Texas at El Paso
El Paso, TX 79968-0703
915.747.7974 Fax 915.747.7948
iped.utep.edu

Introduction

In the spring of 2004, the Institute for Policy and Economic Development (IPED) at the University of Texas at El Paso was contracted by the City of El Paso to conduct a survey of citizen attitudes and perceptions pertaining to city services and general quality of life issues in El Paso. Specific to the goals of the survey was to determine areas of focus for targeting improvements in city provided goods and services.

The results reported here indicate that the city has great consensus among its residents, with little variation between residents of different areas of the city. The city does have a variety of issues which will warrant greater attention. The data reported places a large palette of issues in front of the elected officials and residents of the City of El Paso, as well as a set of opportunities to collectively move forward to address solutions.

Methodology

The survey project began with a series of interviews and contacts with community members to determine the set of issues to be addressed by this survey. Over 30 comments were received from a broad spectrum of community stakeholders and were appropriately incorporated into the survey. In addition, comparisons to surveys conducted in other cities were made to develop a broad issue base.

The survey was conducted from April 26th through May 17th, 2004, using a Random Digit Dialing (RDD) sample of El Paso County phone numbers that was pre-tested for disconnects and fax machines. With random digit dialing, every household with a working phone within a selected area has an equal probability of being chosen for participation. This occurs because phone numbers are generated *at random* based only on the working prefixes (first three numbers) for a selected area.

In total, 1273 surveys were completed. All interviewers were bilingual in English and Spanish, and calls were made from 12:00 p.m. to 8:00 p.m. each day, Monday through Friday. Potential participants were informed of the purpose of the study, that participation was voluntary, and that all responses would remain confidential and reported only in the aggregate.

A stratified sample was used in order to determine how to equally acquire 1250 surveys from the five areas of El Paso. The five areas are composed of contiguous zip codes and are referenced in the findings as: Westside, Central, Eastside, Lower Valley, and Northeast. As shown below in Table 1,

Population from each zip code was acquired and calculated as a percent of the total acquired population from the 2000 U.S. Census, which was weighted based on a total response or sample size of 1250. The total population that was used to make these calculations is 625,853. Zip codes 79906 and 79908 were excluded from the sample because they are considered part of Fort Bliss. The final column of Table 1 reports the actual percentage of respondents by area of El Paso. A more detailed demographic breakdown is provided in Tables 28 through 40 at the end of the findings.

Table 1
Targeted and Final Response Distribution

Area of Town	Zip Codes	Population	Percentage of Population	Target	Number of Surveys Completed	Percent of Total Collected
Westside	79912	64,791			132	
	79922	8,871			11	
	79932	16,606			28	
Westside Total		90,268	14.4%	180	171	13.4%
Central	79901	22,941			18	
	79902	19,262			43	
	79903	28,680			37	
	79905	28,305			59	
	79930	14,012			54	
Central Total		113,200	18.1%	226	211	16.6%
Eastside	79925	41,008			65	
	79935	19,452			22	
	79936	92,089			228	
Eastside Total		152,549	24.4%	305	315	24.7%
Lower Valley	79907	55,127			127	
	79915	42,133			82	
	79927	53,573			99	
	79938	18,628			62	
Lower Valley Total		169,461	27.1%	338	370	29.1%
Northeast	79904	33,248			58	
	79924	57,046			122	
	79934	10,081			26	
Northeast Total		100,375	16.0%	200	206	16.2%
TOTAL		625,853			1273	100%

FINDINGS

Identification with Landmarks and City Attributes

Table 2
When you think of El Paso, what is your favorite landmark?
Top 10 Responses

Rank for Top 10 Response Categories*		Frequency	Percent
1	Franklin Mountains	511	39.4
2	Scenic Drive/Rim Road	104	8.0
3	Star on the Mountain	65	5.0
4	Downtown and San Jacinto Plaza	55	4.2
5	Desert	43	3.3
6	Rio Grande	37	2.9
7	Overall Community Quality	38	2.9
8	International Boundary and Bridges	32	2.5
9	Tranquility/Peacefulness/Security	31	2.4
10	Parks	30	2.3

- ***The Franklin Mountains were the dominant landmark among all respondents, indicative of its prominent geographic role in the City.***

- A total of 43 response categories were created using a constant comparative method. All remaining categories reported less than 2 percent among total responses.

Table 3
What positive image first comes to mind when you think of El Paso?*
Top Ten Responses

Rank	Image	Frequency	Percent
1	Tranquility/Peacefulness/ Security	220	17.0
2	Climate/Weather	216	16.7
3	Individuals/People	137	10.6
4	Diversity and Multi-culturalism	97	7.5
5	Friendliness and Lack of Racial Tensions	53	4.1
6	Franklin Mountains	45	3.5
7	Schools	36	2.8
8	Overall Quality of Community	35	2.7
9	International Boundary and Bridges	34	2.6
10	Family	29	2.2

- ***El Pasoans indicate the positive nature of the city's safety and security leads in creating the community image, as seen by 17 percent of respondents and its first place rank.***

- ***The City's climate is also viewed positively by 16.7 percent of those surveyed, a geographic factor that prevails in southwestern cities.***

- ***Individual people and the diversity of the region are also seen positively, as evidenced by 10.6 and 7.5 percent of respondents, respectively.***

- A total of 32 response categories were created using a constant comparative method. All remaining categories reported less than 2 percent among total responses.

Table 4
What negative image first comes to mind when you think of El Paso?
Top 10 Responses

Rank	Image	Frequency	Percent
1	Lack of Jobs and Good Salaries	182	14.0
2	Trashy and Dirty Looking	114	8.8
3	Poor climate/hot and dusty	110	8.5
4	Violence/Gangs	71	5.5
5	Nothing to Do/Boring	65	5.0
6	Pollution	50	3.9
6	International Boundary and Bridges	50	3.9
8	General Economic Conditions	41	3.2
9	Low income and Poverty	38	2.9
10	Traffic	33	2.5

- ***Lack of jobs and good salaries recorded the highest negative image at 14 percent.***
- ***The image of a city that is dirty in appearance and has lots of trash obtained 8.8 percent of responses, followed closely by the climatic conditions.***
- A total of 462 response categories were created using a constant comparative method. All remaining categories reported 2 percent or less among total responses.

Table 5
Community Strengths
Top 5 Responses

What would you say are El Paso' two biggest strengths that can be better utilized to promote the city?

Rank	Strength
1	Weather and Climate
2	Border Location
3	Hispanic Culture/Mexican Culture History/Historical Places
4	Friendly, Nice, Good, Helpful People
5	UTEP/EPCC/Education System/Schools

- ***Five topics dominated responses to city strengths that can promote El Paso.***
- ***The weather and climate that have been a factor in the growth of all southwestern cities clearly ranked number one.***
- ***Location on an international border combines with the culture and history of the region as a second force.***
- ***The region's people and their ability to work together has been an under-utilized strength in promoting the region, as is the school system from pre-K through college.***

Strategic Planning and Consolidation

Table 6
How important do you think it is for the City to have a strategic plan?

Area of City		Very Important	Important	Neutral	Not that Important	Not Important	Total in Area
Westside	% within Area of City	83.4%	5.9%	8.9%	1.2%	.6%	100.0%
	% of Total	11.2%	.8%	1.2%	.2%	.1%	13.4%
Central	% within Area of City	82.5%	5.7%	7.6%	3.3%	.9%	100.0%
	% of Total	13.8%	1.0%	1.3%	.6%	.2%	16.7%
Eastside	% within Area of City	83.2%	6.8%	5.8%	3.5%	.6%	100.0%
	% of Total	20.4%	1.7%	1.4%	.9%	.2%	24.6%
Lower Valley	% within Area of City	82.2%	8.5%	6.3%	1.6%	1.4%	100.0%
	% of Total	23.9%	2.5%	1.8%	.5%	.4%	29.0%
Northeast	% within Area of City	80.1%	4.4%	10.7%	3.9%	1.0%	100.0%
	% of Total	13.1%	.7%	1.7%	.6%	.2%	16.3%
City-wide	% of Total	**82.3%**	**6.6%**	**7.4%**	**2.7%**	**1.0%**	**100.0%**

- ***City-wide and in each area of the city there is strong belief that it is very important that the City have a strategic plan.***

Table 7
In years, how often do you feel a city should develop a strategic plan?

		Number of Years						
Area of City		**1 year**	**2 years**	**3 years**	**4 years**	**5 years**	**6 years or more**	**Total in Area**
Westside	% within Area of City	40.7%	21.6%	12.3%	3.7%	17.9%	3.7%	100.0%
	% of Total	5.5%	2.9%	1.7%	.5%	2.4%	.5%	13.6%
Central	% within Area of City	60.2%	12.9%	7.5%	3.0%	11.4%	5.0%	100.0%
	% of Total	10.2%	2.2%	1.3%	.5%	1.9%	.8%	16.9%
Eastside	% within Area of City	50.8%	16.8%	11.1%	3.7%	14.8%	2.7%	100.0%
	% of Total	12.7%	4.2%	2.8%	.9%	3.7%	.7%	25.0%
Lower Valley	% within Area of City	58.1%	17.7%	9.4%	2.4%	10.6%	1.8%	100.0%
	% of Total	16.6%	5.0%	2.7%	.7%	3.0%	.5%	28.5%
Northeast	% within Area of City	53.4%	16.8%	13.6%	4.7%	9.9%	1.6%	100.0%
	% of Total	8.6%	2.7%	2.2%	.8%	1.6%	.3%	16.1%
City-wide	**% of Total**	**53.5%**	**17.1%**	**10.6%**	**3.4%**	**12.7%**	**2.8%**	**100%**

- ***City-wide mean support for a strategic plan is every 2.22 years, with Westside residents most likely to favor a longer period of time between strategic plans with Central residents most supportive of shorter time frames.***

Table 8
Knowledge of City Planning Documents – Consolidated Plan

At this point in time, do you know if the city has the following planning document?

Consolidated Plan		Area of City: Westside	Central	Eastside	Lower Valley	Northeast	City-wide
Yes	% within Area of City	15.3%	5.8%	8.7%	6.9%	10.2%	**8.8%**
	% of Total	2.1%	1.0%	2.2%	2.0%	1.7%	**8.8%**
Not Sure	% within Area of City	50.6%	56.0%	52.7%	46.0%	57.8%	**51.9%**
	% of Total	6.9%	9.2%	13.1%	13.2%	9.5%	**51.9%**
No	% within Area of City	34.1%	38.2%	38.6%	47.1%	32.0%	**39.2%**
	% of Total	4.6%	6.3%	9.6%	13.5%	5.3%	**39.2%**
Total	% within Area of City	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	**100.0%**
	% of Total	13.5%	16.5%	24.8%	28.8%	16.4%	**100.0%**

Table 9
Knowledge of City Planning Documents – Masterplan

At this point in time, do you know if the city has the following planning document?

Masterplan		Area of City: Westside	Central	Eastside	Lower Valley	Northeast	City-wide
Yes	% within Area of City	15.3%	8.2%	10.9%	8.4%	14.1%	**10.8%**
Not Sure	% within Area of City	49.4%	52.9%	52.7%	47.1%	54.4%	**51.0%**
No	% within Area of City	35.3%	38.9%	36.3%	44.6%	31.6%	**38.2%**
Total	% within Area of City	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	**100.0%**
	% of Total	13.6%	16.6%	24.8%	28.6%	16.4%	**100.0%**

Table 10
Knowledge of City Planning Documents – Strategic Plan

At this point in time, do you know if the city has the following planning document?

Strategic Plan		Area of City: Westside	Central	Eastside	Lower Valley	Northeast	City-wide
Yes	% within Area of City	22.4%	10.5%	10.9%	13.1%	19.9%	**14.5%**
Not Sure	% within Area of City	46.5%	52.2%	53.4%	45.3%	51.9%	**49.7%**
No	% within Area of City	31.2%	37.3%	35.7%	41.7%	28.2%	**35.8%**
Total	% within Area of City	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	**100.0%**
	% of Total	13.5%	16.6%	24.8%	28.7%	16.4%	**100.0%**

- ***Resident knowledge of city planning documents is extremely low, with half or more having no idea of the existence of planning documents.***

Table 11
Support for City-County Consolidation

Would you favor a consolidation of the City of El Paso and the County of El Paso?

Response		Area of City: Westside	Central	Eastside	Lower Valley	Northeast	City-wide
Yes	% within Area of City	50.9%	56.8%	52.5%	51.0%	47.6%	**51.7%**
Not Sure	% within Area of City	37.9%	34.5%	34.1%	34.4%	37.9%	**35.4%**
No	% within Area of City	11.2%	8.7%	13.4%	14.6%	14.6%	**12.9%**
Total	% within Area of City	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	**100.0%**
	% of Total	13.4%	16.4%	25.0%	28.9%	16.4%	**100.0%**

- ***Over one-half of city residents are in support of city-consolidation, while one-third reports they are unsure.***

Knowledge of City Operations and Perceptions of City Collaboration

Table 12
How knowledgeable would you say you are with the City of El Paso operations, programs and policies?

Level of Knowledge

Area of City		Very Knowledgeable	Knowledgeable	Neutral	Somewhat Knowledgeable	Not Very Knowledgeable	Total in Area
Westside	% within Area of City	11.8%	18.9%	26.6%	14.2%	28.4%	100.0%
	% of Total	1.6%	2.5%	3.6%	1.9%	3.8%	13.4%
Central	% within Area of City	4.8%	15.3%	29.7%	17.7%	32.5%	100.0%
	% of Total	.8%	2.5%	4.9%	2.9%	5.4%	16.5%
Eastside	% within Area of City	6.3%	14.6%	28.6%	20.0%	30.5%	100.0%
	% of Total	1.6%	3.6%	7.1%	5.0%	7.6%	24.9%
Lower Valley	% within Area of City	7.7%	11.5%	30.1%	19.4%	31.4%	100.0%
	% of Total	2.2%	3.3%	8.7%	5.6%	9.1%	28.9%
Northeast	% within Area of City	13.1%	15.5%	31.6%	17.5%	22.3%	100.0%
	% of Total	2.1%	2.5%	5.1%	2.8%	3.6%	16.3%
City-wide	**% of Total**	**8.3%**	**14.5%**	**29.4%**	**18.3%**	**29.5%**	**100.0%**

- ***Overall, respondents reported that they were between neutral and somewhat knowledgeable about city operations, programs and policies based on a mean score of 3.47.***
- ***Within areas of the city, Northeast and Westside residents are more likely to report they feel very knowledgeable.***
- ***However, within each area of the city, over one-fifth report they are not very knowledgeable, resulting in 29.5 percent of residents self-reporting low knowledge of city operations, programs and policies.***

Table 13
Mean Scores for City Collaboration
On a scale of 1 to 5 with 1 being excellent, 3 being neutral and 5 poor how would you rate city collaboration with the following agencies and organizations?

Excellent Neutral Poor
1----------2----------3----------4----------5

Agency or Organization	Area of City					City-wide
	Westside	Central	Eastside	Lower Valley	Northeast	
El Paso County Government	3.0	2.76	2.95	2.85	3.05	**2.91**
Texas State Government	3.12	2.82	2.99	2.88	3.06	**2.96**
U.S. Federal Government	2.86	2.75	3.04	2.87	2.93	**2.90**
Cd. Juárez Government	3.39	3.40	3.46	3.39	3.42	**3.40**
State of Chihuahua Government	3.49	3.33	3.55	3.49	3.43	**3.46**
Mexico Federal Government	3.45	3.37	3.53	3.51	3.39	**3.46**
Las Cruces Government	2.98	2.71	2.85	2.88	2.77	**2.84**
New Mexico Government	3.02	2.67	2.91	2.84	2.84	**2.85**
El Paso Community College	2.22	2.00	2.14	2.21	2.18	**2.15**
Fort Bliss	2.08	1.92	2.10	2.07	1.92	**2.03**
Thomason Hospital	2.09	2.14	2.24	2.08	2.20	**2.15**
UTEP	1.92	1.80	2.06	1.96	1.95	**1.94**
Chambers of Commerce	2.42	2.39	2.51	2.48	2.48	**2.46**
Local School Districts	2.47	2.30	2.48	2.34	2.48	**2.41**
Texas Tech Health Science Center	2.28	2.17	2.35	2.33	2.29	**2.30**
Empowerment Zone	2.59	2.44	2.69	2.55	2.74	**2.60**
Non-Profits	2.63	2.47	2.74	2.58	2.64	**2.61**
Religious Community	2.59	2.43	2.67	2.56	2.71	**2.60**
Overall Mean Collaboration Score	**2.70**	**2.55**	**2.74**	**2.66**	**2.69**	**2.67**

- ***An examination of resident perceptions of how well the city collaborates with a variety of other government agencies and local organizations suggests that collaboration outside the region, such as state and federal government bodies, is viewed as being worse than local agencies, especially with Mexican governments.***

- ***UTEP, Fort Bliss, Thomason Hospital, and El Paso Community College were viewed as enjoying the best collaboration with the city.***

- ***The collaboration index suggests that residents of Central El Paso are more likely to give high marks to the city for collaboration generally (Mean Collaboration Score = 2.55), while Eastside residents perceive the least level of collaboration overall (Mean Collaboration Score = 2.74).***

- ***Overall, the City receives a mean collaboration score of 2.67 placing it just slightly above neutral.***

Table 14
Citizen's Issue Definition
Top 20 Responses of Three Responses Combined -- City-wide

If you had to pick only three issues that you would want your elected officials to work on, what would they be?

Rank	Combined Responses
1	Jobs and Employment Opportunities
2	Better Education and More Schools
3	More Parks and Recreation Opportunities
4	Better Salaries
5	Lower Taxes (Property and Sales Taxes)
6	Improve/Beautify and Clean Streets, Lights, Crosswalks
7	General Economy/Business Environment
8	Clean up City/Appearance
9	Water Supply
10	Roads/Infrastructure
11	Social Aid (Migrants/Low Income/Poor/Food Stamps)
11	Healthcare Costs and Delivery
12	Problems of Police/Law Enforcement
13	Tourism Growth
14	Provide More Youth Programs
15	Safety and Security Issues
16	International Bridges/Location
17	Entertainment, Especially Family
18	Improved and More Public Transportation
19	Sports Events
20	Programs for Elderly (Services and Healthcare)

- ***Citizens remained consistent in voicing their opinions about what elected officials should work on in relationship to their positive and negative images of the city.***

- ***Jobs and employment opportunities dominated the responses followed by better education..***

- ***More parks and better salaries are more distinctly defined as key issues, as is lower taxes.***

- A total of 3891 responses were categorized using a constant comparative method. All remaining categories reported less than 2 percent among total responses.

Business Environment

Table 15
Mean Scores for El Paso as a Place to Do Business

Thinking of all aspects of the local business environment, how would you rate El Paso as a place to do business on a scale of one being excellent, 3 being neutral and 5 being poor?

Excellent Neutral Poor
1----------2----------3----------4----------5

Area of City					
Westside	**Central**	**Eastside**	**Lower Valley**	**Northeast**	**City-wide**
3.00	2.88	2.94	3.01	3.15	**2.99**

- ***Overall, the city is neutral for being a good place to do business (mean = 2.99) with the Northeast reporting the least favorable score (mean = 3.15) and the Central area reporting the most favorable (mean = 2.88).***

Table 16
Mean Scores for Change in Business Conditions

On a scale from 1 to 3 with 1 being better, 2 being the same and 3 being worse, compared to two years ago, do you think El Paso has become a better place to do business, stayed the same, or is worse?

Better — Stayed the Same — Worse
1----------2----------3

Area of City					
Westside	**Central**	**Eastside**	**Lower Valley**	**Northeast**	**City-wide**
1.92	2.08	1.82	1.99	1.95	**1.95**

- ***City-wide the perception is that El Paso is marginally better for doing business than two years ago (mean = 1.95)***
- ***Only Central El Paso records a mean score suggesting a worse business environment.***

Table 17
Mean Scores for Working with City of El Paso

Overall, how easy do you think it is to work with the City of El Paso, based on a scale of 1 being very easy, 3 being neutral and 5 being very difficult?

Very Easy — Neutral — Very Difficult
1----------2----------3----------4----------5

Area of City					
Westside	**Central**	**Eastside**	**Lower Valley**	**Northeast**	**City-wide**
3.25	3.26	3.39	3.34	3.49	**3.36**

- **Overall, the city is not viewed as easy to work with.**
- **Westside and Central residents view the city more favorably than Northeast and Eastside residents.**

Satisfaction with Taxes and Expenditures

Table 18
Mean Score for Use of Tax Dollars

How satisfied are you with the city's use of your tax dollars, based on a scale from 1 being very satisfied, 3 being neutral and 5 being unsatisfied?

Very Satisfied — Neutral — Very Unsatisfied
1----------2----------3----------4----------5

Area of City					
Westside	**Central**	**Eastside**	**Lower Valley**	**Northeast**	**City-wide**
3.28	3.08	3.18	3.13	3.18	**3.16**

- ***In general, citizens are not satisfied with the city's use of tax dollars with highest unsatisfactory scores emerging from the Westside.***

Table 19
Mean Scores Regarding City Contracting with Private Companies

When city government contracts private companies for services how important do you feel the following are based on a scale of 1 to 5 with 1 being very important, 3 being neutral and 5 being not important.

Very Important — Neutral — Not Very Important
1----------2----------3----------4----------5

	Area of City					
Issue	**Westside**	**Central**	**Eastside**	**Lower Valley**	**Northeast**	**City-wide**
Quality	1.26	1.44	1.26	1.19	1.28	**1.27**
Open Bidding	1.48	1.53	1.50	1.30	1.44	**1.44**
Contracts to Local Businesses	1.43	1.46	1.42	1.25	1.38	**1.37**

- ***City residents consider all factors related to contracting private businesses of considerable importance and have greatest interest in quality of services provided.***

Table 20
Support for Strategies to Spend Tax Dollars
Would you say current strategies are properly spending your tax dollars?

		Area of City					
Response		**Westside**	**Central**	**Eastside**	**Lower Valley**	**Northeast**	**City-wide**
Yes	% within Area of City	24.7%	33.3%	25.2%	27.9%	27.7%	**27.7%**
Not sure	% within Area of City	32.9%	35.7%	38.9%	40.6%	34.0%	**37.2%**
No	% within Area of City	42.4%	31.0%	36.0%	31.5%	38.3%	**35.1%**
Total	% within Area of City	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	**100.0%**
	% of Total	13.5%	16.6%	24.9%	28.7%	16.3%	**100.0%**

- ***City-wide over one-third are not sure how their tax dollars are being spent; over 25 percent believe current spending strategies are proper.***
- ***Over-one-third does not support current spending strategies with the largest opposition originating on the Westside.***

Table 21
Support for Tax Rate
Would you say taxes are too low, just right or too high?

		Area of City					
Response		**Westside**	**Central**	**Eastside**	**Lower Valley**	**Northeast**	**City-wide**
Too Low	% within Area of City	4.1%	2.4%	2.6%	1.9%	2.4%	2.5%
Just Right	% within Area of City	34.1%	47.4%	36.7%	33.2%	38.3%	37.4%
Too High	% within Area of City	61.8%	50.2%	60.8%	64.8%	59.2%	60.1%
Total	% within Area of City	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%
	% of Total	13.5%	16.6%	24.7%	28.9%	16.3%	100.0%

- ***El Pasoans across the city strongly affirm that taxes are too high.***
- ***Residents in Central El Paso are most likely to view taxes as just right while a pocket of Westside residents take a view that taxes may be too low.***

Satisfaction with City Services

A variety of public services were considered in this survey. Among these, some are not delivered by the City of El Paso, such as 911 or utilities. Yet, the city is viewed as provider of all services by most people and citizen satisfaction with the community on a whole requires consideration of the broadest set of services as done in this study.

Table 22
Mean Scores for Satisfaction with City Services

On a scale of 1 to 5 with 1 being very satisfied, 3 being neutral and 5 being very dissatisfied how satisfied are you with the city's ability to provide each of the following:

Very Satisfied — Neutral — Very Dissatisfied
1----------2----------3----------4----------5

Service	Westside	Central	Eastside	Lower Valley	Northeast	City-wide
Adequate Signage on Streets and Highways	2.46	2.19	2.34	2.18	2.43	**2.29**
Affordable Housing	2.53	2.58	2.62	2.64	2.70	**2.64**
Affordable Public Transportation	2.39	2.43	2.62	2.58	2.53	**2.53**
Airport Services	2.06	2.12	2.23	2.14	2.05	**2.14**
Bi-national Needs	2.82	2.74	2.96	2.73	2.78	**2.81**
Building Permit Services	2.59	2.63	2.72	2.57	2.71	**2.64**
Business Retention	3.12	2.98	3.32	3.03	3.10	**3.12**
Cultural Events	2.64	2.50	2.95	2.85	2.61	**2.75**
City Marketing and Advertising	2.87	2.58	3.04	2.72	2.79	**2.81**
Domestic Violence Prevention and Support	2.60	2.53	2.62	2.51	2.48	**2.55**
Downtown Parking	3.65	3.47	3.90	3.67	3.64	**3.69**

Table 22 - Continued
Mean Scores for Satisfaction with City Services

Very Satisfied 1----------2----------3----------4----------5 Very Dissatisfied

Service	Westside	Central	Eastside	Lower Valley	Northeast	City-wide
Downtown Redevelopment	3.07	2.71	3.25	3.00	2.98	**3.02**
Economic Development Strategies	3.19	2.90	3.33	3.20	3.00	**3.14**
Electric Service	2.06	2.05	2.45	2.10	2.18	**2.19**
Emergency Medical Services/ Ambulance	2.02	1.79	2.10	2.04	1.99	**2.01**
Environmental Protection	2.94	2.72	3.06	2.84	2,90	**2.90**
Fire protection	1.64	1.59	1.70	1.66	1.61	**1.65**
Floodwater Protection	2.37	2.48	2.78	2.45	2.56	**2.55**
Gang Violence	2.99	2.76	3.01	2.85	2.93	**2.91**
Garbage Pick Up	1.85	1.87	2.01	1.83	1.89	**1.89**
Gas Service	2.15	2.10	2.37	2.19	2.16	**2.21**
Graffiti Clean Up/Elimination	2.55	2.47	2.73	2.64	2.73	**2.64**
Growth Strategy	3.26	3.00	3.38	3.25	3.06	**3.21**
Incentive and Abatement Strategies	2.77	2.76	2.91	2.92	2.90	**2.87**
Industry Recruitment	3.25	2.96	3.28	3.19	3.09	**3.17**
Infrastructure Planning and Development	2.71	2.38	2.77	2.48	2.65	**2.59**
Libraries	2.26	2.25	2.42	2.18	2.27	**2.27**
Litter Clean Up	2.72	2.51	2.88	2.50	2.73	**2.66**

Table 22 - Continued
Mean Scores for Satisfaction with City Services

Very Satisfied 1----------2----------3----------4----------5 Very Dissatisfied

Service	Westside	Central	Eastside	Lower Valley	Northeast	City-wide
NAFTA	3.05	3.06	3.39	3.15	3.20	**3.20**
Neighborhood Strategies	2.94	2.74	3.03	2.85	2.96	**2.91**
911 Service	1.73	1.73	1.85	1.81	1.74	**1.79**
Notice to Stakeholders about Programs/Policies	2.80	2.67	2.96	2.78	2.82	**2.82**
Parks	2.96	2.40	3.11	2.91	2.60	**2.83**
Phone Services	2.39	2.13	2.47	2.35	2.33	**2.35**
Police Protection	2.18	2.12	2.32	2.16	2.17	**2.21**
Pre-school Programs	2.57	2.35	2.64	2.43	2.55	**2.51**
Recreation	2.94	2.57	3.10	2.93	2.70	**2.88**
Recreation Sport Leagues	2.80	2.82	3.06	2.83	2.72	**2.86**
Recycling	3.06	2.60	3.13	2.82	2.96	**2.91**
Relationships with Non-Profit Organizations	2.75	2.51	2.81	2.65	2.65	**2.69**
Relationships with Faith-Based Organizations	2.74	2.47	2.85	2.65	2.70	**2.70**
Streets and Highways Maintenance	2.60	2.42	2.81	2.69	2.75	**2.68**
Sporting Events	2.86	2.56	3.00	2.86	2.70	**2.82**
Transportation Related to Border Crossings	3.23	3.09	3.47	3.26	3.15	**3.26**
Tourism Development	3.10	2.82	3.37	3.15	2.97	**3.11**

Table 22 - Continued
Mean Scores for Satisfaction with City Services

Very Satisfied 1----------2----------3----------4----------5 Very Dissatisfied

Service	Westside	Central	Eastside	Lower Valley	Northeast	City-wide
Vandalism Elimination	2.72	2.68	3.07	2.81	2.90	**2.86**
Water Service	2.25	2.10	2.65	2.31	2.25	**2.35**
Workforce Growth	3.29	3.33	3.63	3.39	3.24	**3.40**
Youth Programs	3.01	2.79	3.14	2.92	2.94	**2.97**
Zoning	2.76	2.62	2.80	2.73	2.72	**2.73**
Zoo	2.46	2.20	2.52	2.36	2.30	**2.38**

- ***Across a variety of service areas, residents reported very consistent responses regardless of the area of the city in which they resided.***
- ***911 Service, which technically does not fall under the city's domain, was the most satisfactorily viewed service, followed by emergency medical services/ambulance.***
- ***Citizens also report satisfaction with all utility services, which the city does not directly supply, but does represent citizens in developing these services.***
- ***El Paso Airport also scored very high and as one of the few city-owned airports in the nation bodes well for this activity.***
- ***Consistent with other findings, downtown parking was viewed poorly as are the city's industrial recruitment, workforce and growth strategies, and transportation related to border crossing.***

Experience and Contact with City and City Employees

Table 23
Contact Using City Website

Have you ever visited the City's website?

		Area of City					
Response		**Westside**	**Central**	**Eastside**	**Lower Valley**	**Northeast**	**City-wide**
Yes	% within Area of City	35.9%	22.6%	26.8%	19.1%	40.0%	**27.3%**
No	% within Area of City	64.1%	77.4%	73.2%	80.9%	60.0%	**72.7%**
Total	% within Area of City	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	**100.0%**
	% of Total	13.5%	16.5%	25.0%	28.7%	16.3%	**100.0%**

- ***Across the city, Northeast and Westside residents report great use of the city's website.***
- ***Lowest use of the city's website is reported in the Lower Valley and Central areas of the city.***
- ***Given the explosive growth in the use of websites for dissemination of information by public agencies, the city-wide visits to the city website may be lower than expected.***

Table 24
Contact with City Officials

How many times each year would you say you contact city officials?

		Area of City					
Number of Contacts		**Westside**	**Central**	**Eastside**	**Lower Valley**	**Northeast**	**City-wide**
Never	% within Area of City	51.5%	58.9%	60.8%	61.5%	47.1%	**57.2%**
1	% within Area of City	17.0%	18.7%	15.6%	15.8%	20.6%	**17.2%**
2	% within Area of City	9.4%	9.6%	13.1%	10.7%	12.3%	**11.2%**
3	% within Area of City	7.0%	6.2%	4.8%	6.0%	5.9%	**5.9%**
4	% within Area of City	4.7%	2.4%	2.2%	2.2%	2.5%	**2.6%**
5 to 10	% within Area of City	6.3%	1.9%	1.3%	1.9%	6.9%	**3.1%**
11 to 15	% within Area of City	2.9%	1.0%	1.0%	.8%	2.0%	**1.3%**
16 or more	% within Area of City	1.2%	1.4%	1.3%	1.1%	2.9%	**1.5%**
Total	% within Area of City	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	**100.0%**
	% of Total	13.5%	16.5%	24.8%	29.0%	16.1%	**100.0%**

- ***City-wide well over half of respondents (57.2 percent) indicate that they never contact city officials.***
- ***Northeast and Westside residents are more likely to contact city officials, while Eastside and Lower Valley residents are the least likely.***

Table 25
Method of Contact with City

How is your contact most often made?

Method of Contact		Area of City					
		Westside	**Central**	**Eastside**	**Lower Valley**	**Northeast**	**City-wide**
Phone	% within Area of City	31.0%	24.6%	23.3%	17.9%	34.6%	**24.7%**
In-Person	% within Area of City	9.4%	12.1%	10.6%	17.1%	14.1%	**13.1%**
E-mail	% within Area of City	5.8%	2.9%	5.6%	3.3%	5.2%	**4.5%**
Writing	% within Area of City	1.8%	1.0%	1.0%	1.1%	4.2%	**1.6%**
Never Make Contact	% within Area of City	52.0%	59.4%	59.5%	60.6%	41.9%	**56.0%**
Total	% within Area of City	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	**100.0%**
	% of Total	13.9%	16.8%	24.4%	29.4%	15.5%	**100.0%**

- ***While over one-half of city residents report no contact with city officials (56.0 percent), when contact is made, phone contact is the most common method.***
- ***In-person contact is made in over 10 percent of all cases city wide, with Lower Valley residents most likely to choose the in-person method.***
- ***Northeast, Eastside and Westside residents appear to be making a shift to more email contact.***

Table 26
Mean Scores Related to Experience with City Employees

How would you rate your experience with city employees in the following areas using a scale from 1 to 5 with 1 being very satisfied, 3 being neutral and 5 being very dissatisfied?

Very Satisfied 1----------2----------3----------4----------5 Very Dissatisfied (Neutral = 3)

Experience	Area of City: Westside	Central	Eastside	Lower Valley	Northeast	City-wide
Respectful Personal Treatment	4.14	4.37	4.44	4.38	3.56	**4.22**
Helpfulness	4.20	4.38	4.55	4.40	3.64	**4.28**
Knowledgeable	4.16	4.34	4.49	4.39	3.66	**4.25**
Resolving Issues in a Timely Manner	4.29	4.49	4.70	4.50	3.85	**4.41**
Your Overall Experience	4.27	4.44	4.60	4.46	3.72	**4.34**

- ***In general, city residents indicate they have not had good experience in their dealings with city employees reporting dissatisfaction across all areas.***
- ***Northeast residents indicate they have the least dissatisfaction, yet they also are on the dissatisfaction side of the scale in all instances.***

Table 27
Mean Scores Related City Communication with Citizens

How successful do you think the city communicates with its citizens about the following issues using a scale from 1 to 5 with 1 being very successful, 3 being neutral and 5 being very unsuccessful

Very Successful 1----------2----------3----------4----------5 Very Unsuccessful (Neutral = 3)

Issue	Area of City: Westside	Central	Eastside	Lower Valley	Northeast	City-wide
Public Works Projects	2.86	2.87	2.97	2.95	2.64	**2.88**
City Sponsored Programs	2.80	2.77	2.91	2.96	2.59	**2.84**
Changes in Regulations	2.95	2.80	2.95	2.94	2.74	**2.89**
Changes in Utility Rates	2.74	2.75	2.83	2.92	2.76	**2.82**
Overall City Policies	2.91	2.80	2.93	2.94	2.66	**2.87**

- ***The city is viewed as being close to neutral in its communications with citizens.***
- ***Northeast residents reflect the most successful experiences while the Lower Valley, Central, and Westside are closely aligned in their opinions and are more critical of the city's communication experiences.***

City-wide Demographic and Social Profile of Respondents

City-wide data on the demographic and social makeup of the respondents are reported below. Individual areas of the community reflect 2000 census data, and the sample provides an excellent representation of the city and its residents.

Political and Social Orientation

Many perspectives about a community and its future are linked to political and social orientation. Tables 28 and 29 show that El Paso citizens are inclined to be moderate overall with a conservative leaning on both social and economic orientations, suggesting an active role for government but with restrictions and budget limitations.

Table 28
What is your orientation on social issues?

Orientation	Frequency	Percent
Very Liberal	51	3.9
Liberal	265	20.4
Moderate	541	41.7
Conservative	382	29.5
Very Conservative	34	2.6
Missing or No Response	24	1.9
Total	1297	100.0

Table 29
What is your orientation on economic issues?

Orientation	Frequency	Percent
Very Liberal	44	3.4
Liberal	246	19.0
Moderate	576	44.4
Conservative	362	27.9
Very Conservative	46	3.5
Missing or No Response	23	1.8
Total	1297	100.0

The following characterizes the demographic makeup of the respondents on a city-wide basis. The make-up of the participants mirrors the city's demographics, providing an excellent basis for determining the Vision of El Paso citizens using a statistically valid response group.

Table 30
Ethnic Group

Ethnic Group	Frequency	Percent
Caucasian	212	16.3
Latino(a)/Hispanic	999	77.0
African-American	23	1.8
Asian-American	3	.2
Alaskan or Pacific Islander	3	.2
Other	39	3.0
Missing	18	1.4
Total	1297	100.0

Table 31
Completion Status

Over one-half (52.1 percent) completed the survey in English with over 40 percent choosing Spanish for their participation. With a Hispanic population exceeding three-quarters of the community these ratios reflect nativism in language and bi-lingual capabilities consistent with the city population.

Language of Participation	Frequency	Percent
Completed Survey in English	676	52.1
Completed Survey in Spanish	560	43.2
Incomplete Survey in English	37	2.9
Incomplete Survey in Spanish	24	1.9
Total	1297	100.0

Table 32
Gender

Gender	Frequency	Percent
Female	854	65.8
Male	386	29.8
Missing/No Response	66	4.4
Total	1297	100.0

Table 33
What is your total household income before taxes?

Income	Frequency	Percent
Less than $20K	391	30.1
$20K or more, but less than $40K	349	26.9
$40K or more, but less than $60K	201	15.5
$60K or more, but less than $80K	101	7.8
$80K or more, but less than $120K	64	4.9
$120K or more	28	2.2
Refuse to Answer/Do Not Know	163	12.6
Total	1297	100.0

Table 34
Age Group

Respondents to the survey were spread across all age groupings in El Paso and represent a sample that is reflective of the community and statistically valid for analysis.

Age Group	Frequency	Percent
18 to 25 years	231	17.8
26 to 30 years	143	11.0
31 to 35 years	115	8.9
36 to 40 years	129	9.9
41 to 45 years	123	9.5
46 to 50 years	142	10.9
51 to 55 years	98	7.6
56 to 60 years	77	5.9
61 to 65 years	72	5.6
66 or older	160	12.3
Total	1290	99.5
Missing/No Response	7	.5
Total	1297	100.0

Table 35
Number in Household

Number	Frequency	Percent
1	132	10.2
2	282	21.7
3	287	22.1
4	298	23.0
5	180	13.9
6	72	5.6
7	18	1.4
8	8	.6
9	2	.2
Missing or No Response	18	1.4
Total	1297	100.0

Table 36
Number of Children 18 years of age or younger in Household

Number	Frequency	Percent
None or No response	570	43.9
1	288	22.2
2	247	19.0
3	144	11.1
4	35	2.7
5	9	.7
7	3	.2
8	1	.1
Total	1297	100.0

Table 37
Education Level

Level of Education	Frequency	Percent
Did Not Complete High School	288	22.2
High School Graduate	327	25.2
Some College	368	28.4
College Graduate	192	14.8
Graduate Degree	63	4.9
Trade School	22	1.7
Missing or No Response	37	2.9
Total	1297	100.0

Table 38
Years in El Paso

Number of Years	Frequency	Percent
1	96	7.4
2	73	5.6
3	146	11.3
4	154	11.9
5	153	11.8
6	254	19.6
7	151	11.6
8	134	10.3
9 or more9	111	8.6
Missing or No Response	25	1.9
Total	1297	100.0

Table 39
Home Description

Home Type	Frequency	Percent
Rent or Lease a Single Family Home	169	13.0
Rent or Lease a Condominium or Townhouse	6	.5
Rent or Lease an Apartment	181	14.0
Rent or Lease a Mobile Home	29	2.2
Own or Buying a Single Family Home	848	65.4
Own or Buying a Condominium or Townhouse	11	.8
Own or Buying a Mobile Home	25	1.9
Missing or No Response	28	2.2
Total	1297	100.0

Table 40
Occupation

Occupation	Frequency	Percent
Scientific/Technical	21	1.6
Agriculture/Forestry/Fishing	7	.5
Professional/Managerial	177	13.6
Manufacturing/Processing	23	1.8
Sales	68	5.2
Construction	21	1.6
Clerical/Bookkeeping	30	2.3
Transportation	10	.8
Service	59	4.5
Military	15	1.2
Homemaker	332	25.6
Retired	188	14.5
Student	153	11.8
Unemployed	43	3.3
Other	126	9.7
Missing or No Response	24	1.9
Total	1297	100.0