

Institute for Policy and Economic Development

IPED Technical Reports

University of Texas at El Paso

Year 2006

Vision 2006 El Paso Citizen Survey

America Tirado*

Dennis L. Soden†

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

†University of Texas at El Paso, desoden@utep.edu

This paper is posted at DigitalCommons@UTEP.

http://digitalcommons.utep.edu/iped_techrep/28

Vision 2006 El Paso Citizen Survey

For: The City of El Paso

America Tirado
and
Dennis L. Soden

Technical Report 2006-02
March, 2006

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

Early in 2006, 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 and to replicate the findings of a previous 2004 City Survey.

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 set of issues in front of the elected officials and residents of the City of El Paso. As a result, these findings also provide a set of opportunities to collectively move forward to address solutions.

Methodology

The survey project began with a series of meetings with city officials to finalize the survey instrument using the 2004 survey as a basis for 2006. In comparison to the 2004 City Survey, the 2006 City Survey eliminated five questions, changed the scales for several questions, and added four new questions. These changes are referenced in this report where the data is presented. In reading this report, the reader will notice that the findings from the 2004 City Survey are placed before the findings from the 2006 City Survey which are in a **bold** font. The data are presented side by side, when applicable, to reveal trends or changes in the attitudes and perceptions of city services between 2004 and 2006.

The survey was conducted from January 9th through January 27th, 2006, 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, 1,301 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 Sunday for the first ten days and from 3:30 p.m. to 8 p.m. Monday through Friday and from 12 p.m. to 8 p.m. on Saturdays and Sunday for the remaining eight days. Potential participants were informed of the purpose of the study, that their participation was voluntary, and that all responses would remain confidential and reported only in the aggregate. The sample was designed to reflect the demographic composition of El Paso.

A stratified sample was used in order to determine how to equally acquire 1,125 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 1,125. 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	2000 Census Population	% of Population	Targeted and Final Response Distribution 2004			Targeted and Final Response Distribution 2006		
				Target	# of Surveys Completed	% of Total Collected	Target	# of Surveys Completed	% of Total Collected
Westside	79912	64,791			132			144	
	79922	8,871			11			23	
	79932	16,606			28			35	
Westside Total		90,268	14.40%	180	171	13.40%	162	202	15.53%
Central	79901	22,941			18			18	
	79902	19,262			43			41	
	79903	28,680			37			41	
	79905	28,305			59			63	
	79930	14,012			54			55	
Central Total		113,200	18.10%	226	211	16.60%	204	218	16.76%
Eastside	79925	41,008			65			89	
	79935	19,452			22			50	
	79936	92,089			228			195	
Eastside Total		152,549	24.40%	305	315	24.70%	275	334	25.67%
Lower Valley	79907	55,127			127			123	
	79915	42,133			82			93	
	79927	53,573			99			62	
	79938	18,628			62			38	
Lower Valley Total		169,461	27.10%	338	370	29.10%	305	316	24.29%
Northeast	79904	33,248			58			67	
	79924	57,046			122			140	
	79934	10,081			26			24	
Northeast Total		100,375	16.00%	200	206	16.20%	180	231	17.76%
TOTAL		625,853			1273	100%	1126	1301	100.0%

FINDINGS

Identification with City Attributes

Table 2
Top Ten Responses that Identified the Most Positive City Images

What positive image first comes to mind when you think of El Paso?¹

		2004			2006		
Frequency	Percent	Image	Rank	Image	Frequency	Percent	
328	23.8%	Tranquility/Peacefulness/Security	1	Tranquility/Peacefulness/Security	314	24.1%	
315	22.9%	Climate/Weather	2	Climate/Weather	294	22.6%	
111	8.1%	Individuals/People	3	Individuals/People	102	7.8%	
99	7.2%	Schools	4	Schools	97	7.5%	
98	7.1%	Franklin Mountains	5	Franklin Mountains	96	7.4%	
70	5.1%	Friendliness and Lack of Racial Tensions	6	Friendliness and Lack of Racial Tensions	65	5.0%	
58	4.2%	Diversity and Multi-culturalism	7	Diversity and Multi-culturalism	56	4.3%	
41	3.0%	UTEP/Sun Bowl/Miners	8	UTEP/Miners/Sun Bowl	39	3.0%	
37 and 37	2.7%; and 2.7%	International Boundary and Bridges; and Family	9	International Boundary and Bridges	35	2.7%	
30	2.2%	Overall Quality of Community	10	Family	32	2.5%	

- *The trend continues from the 2004 survey where El Pasoans ranked Tranquility, Peacefulness, and Security of the city as the first positive image with 24 percent of the response rate.*
- *Climate and Weather ranked second in both surveys with a response rate of approximately 23 percent in both survey periods.*
- *Individuals and People were ranked as the third most positive image of El Paso dropping slightly from 2004.*

¹ A total of 33 response categories were created using a constant comparative method. All remaining categories reported less than 2 percent among total responses.

Table 3
Top 10 Responses that Identified the Most Negative City Images
What negative image first comes to mind when you think of El Paso?²

		2004	Rank			2006		
Frequency	Percent	Image		Image	Frequency	Percent		
182	14.0%	Lack of Jobs and Good Salaries	1	Lack of Jobs and Good Salaries	307	23.6%		
114	8.8%	Trashy and Dirty Looking	2	Poor Climate/Hot and Dusty	112	5.4%		
110	8.5%	Poor climate/hot and dusty	3	Violence/Gangs	104	8.6%		
71	5.5%	Violence/Gangs	4	Pollution	76	8.0%		
65	5.0%	Nothing to Do/Boring	5	International Boundary and Bridges	72	5.1%		
50	3.9%	Pollution	6	Trashy and Dirty Looking	70	5.8%		
50	3.9%	International Boundary and Bridges	7	Nothing to Do/Boring	67	5.5%		
41	3.2%	General Economic Conditions	8	Low Income and Poverty	63	1.8%		
38	2.9%	Low income and Poverty	9	Traffic	41	3.2%		
33	2.5%	Traffic	10	General Economic Conditions	23	3.5%		

- *Lack of Jobs and Good Salaries recorded the highest negative image at 24 percent replicating the same results as the 2004 survey but with almost 10 percent more of the response rate choosing this image.*
- *The Poor, Hot, and Dusty Climate ranked second and obtained 5.4 percent of the responses. It was followed by Violence and Gangs which received slightly over eight percent of the response rate moving from fourth to third ranking since 2004.*

² A total of 49 response categories were created using a constant comparative method. All remaining categories reported 2 percent or less among total responses.

**Table 4
Top 5 Responses that Identified the Community's Strengths**

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

2004 Image	Rank	2006 Image
Weather and Climate	1	Weather and Climate
Border Location	2	Friendly, Nice, Good, Helpful People
Hispanic Culture/Mexican Culture History/Historical Places	3	UTEP/EPCC/Education System/Schools
Friendly, Nice, Good, Helpful People	4	Border Location
UTEP/EPCC/Education System/Schools	5	Hispanic Culture/Mexican Culture History/Historical Places

- *Much like the previous survey, the Weather and Climate were ranked first showing how they are important factors contributing to the growth of all southwestern cities.*
- *The 2004 survey placed Location on an International Border at second place. For this year, border location was in fourth place. This year's survey ranked the People's Friendliness at second place.*
- *UTEP, EPCC, and the Education System were ranked third, also moving up from 2004.*

Strategic Planning and Consolidation

Table 5
Response Rates Illustrating Citizens' Importance of a Strategic Plan

How important do you think it is for the city to have a strategic plan?

		2004					
Area of City		Not Important	Not that Important	Neutral	Important	Very Important	Total in Area
Westside	% within Area of City	0.60%	1.20%	8.90%	5.90%	83.40%	100.00%
	% of Total	0.10%	0.20%	1.20%	0.80%	11.20%	13.40%
Central	% within Area of City	0.90%	3.30%	7.60%	5.70%	82.50%	100.00%
	% of Total	0.20%	0.60%	1.30%	1.00%	13.80%	16.70%
Eastside	% within Area of City	0.60%	3.50%	5.80%	6.80%	83.20%	100.00%
	% of Total	0.20%	0.90%	1.40%	1.70%	20.40%	24.60%
Lower Valley	% within Area of City	1.40%	1.60%	6.30%	8.50%	82.20%	100.00%
	% of Total	0.40%	0.50%	1.80%	2.50%	23.90%	29.00%
Northeast	% within Area of City	1.00%	3.90%	10.70%	4.40%	80.10%	100.00%
	% of Total	0.20%	0.60%	1.70%	0.70%	13.10%	16.30%
City-wide	% of Total	1.00%	2.70%	7.40%	6.60%	82.30%	100.00%

		2006					
Area of City		Not Important	Not that Important	Neutral	Important	Very Important	Total in Area
Westside	% within Area of City	0.00%	0.52%	10.36%	10.36%	78.76%	100.00%
	% of Total	0.00%	0.08%	1.63%	1.63%	12.36%	15.69%
Central	% within Area of City	1.46%	0.97%	7.77%	10.19%	79.61%	100.00%
	% of Total	0.24%	0.16%	1.30%	1.71%	13.33%	16.75%
Eastside	% within Area of City	1.61%	0.97%	9.03%	10.00%	78.39%	100.00%
	% of Total	0.41%	0.24%	2.28%	2.52%	19.76%	25.20%
Lower Valley	% within Area of City	1.66%	0.00%	9.27%	8.94%	80.13%	100.00%
	% of Total	0.41%	0.00%	2.28%	2.20%	19.67%	24.55%
Northeast	% within Area of City	0.46%	0.46%	7.31%	10.50%	81.28%	100.00%
	% of Total	0.08%	0.08%	1.30%	1.87%	14.47%	17.80%
City-wide	% of Total	1.14%	0.57%	8.78%	9.92%	79.59%	100.00%

➤ *Following the same trend as the 2004 survey, residents feel that it is very important for the city to have a strategic plan; however, overall, there was a slight decline in the response rate from 82 percent in 2004 to almost 80 percent in 2006.*

Knowledge of City Planning Documents³

Table 6
Response Rates Reflecting Knowledge of the City Masterplan

At this point in time, do you know if the city has a Masterplan?

2004

		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%

2006

		Westside	Central	Eastside	Lower Valley	Northeast	City-wide
Yes	% within Area of City	9.28%	10.14%	8.39%	9.30%	9.13%	9.18%
Not Sure	% within Area of City	18.04%	22.22%	23.55%	22.59%	27.40%	22.91%
No	% within Area of City	72.68%	67.63%	68.06%	68.11%	63.47%	67.91%
Total	% within Area of City	100.00%	100.00%	100.00%	100.00%	100.00%	100.00%
	% of Total	15.76%	16.82%	25.18%	24.45%	17.79%	100.00%

³ Asking about resident's knowledge of the City's Consolidated Plan was removed from the 2006 survey.

**Table 7
Response Rates Reflecting Knowledge of the City Strategic Plan**

At this point in time, do you know if the city has a Strategic Plan?

2004

		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%

2006

		Westside	Central	Eastside	Lower Valley	Northeast	City-wide
Yes	% within Area of City	7.73%	10.14%	9.68%	9.27%	10.50%	9.50%
Not Sure	% within Area of City	19.59%	22.22%	22.26%	24.17%	27.40%	23.21%
No	% within Area of City	72.68%	67.63%	68.06%	66.56%	62.10%	67.29%
Total	% within Area of City	100.00%	100.00%	100.00%	100.00%	100.00%	100.00%
	% of Total	15.75%	16.80%	25.16%	24.51%	17.78%	100.00%

➤ *Much like the trend in the 2004 survey, residents are unaware of the city's planning documents, in particular the Masterplan and Strategic plan.*

Knowledge of City Operations and Perceptions of City Collaboration

Table 8
Response Rates Showing Citizens' Familiarity with City Operations

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

2004

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

2006

Area of City		Level of Knowledge					Total in Area
		Not Very Knowledgeable	Somewhat Knowledgeable	Neutral	Knowledgeable	Very Knowledgeable	
Westside	% within Area of City	37.57%	15.34%	27.51%	11.11%	8.47%	100.00%
	% of Total	5.82%	2.38%	4.27%	1.72%	1.31%	15.50%
Central	% within Area of City	36.41%	10.19%	31.07%	15.05%	7.28%	100.00%
	% of Total	6.15%	1.72%	5.25%	2.54%	1.23%	16.90%
Eastside	% within Area of City	37.34%	11.69%	31.49%	12.34%	7.14%	100.00%
	% of Total	9.43%	2.95%	7.96%	3.12%	1.80%	25.27%
Lower Valley	% within Area of City	39.33%	13.67%	26.33%	14.00%	6.67%	100.00%
	% of Total	9.68%	3.36%	6.48%	3.45%	1.64%	24.61%
Northeast	% within Area of City	38.43%	11.57%	29.17%	13.89%	6.94%	100.00%
	% of Total	6.81%	2.05%	5.17%	2.46%	1.23%	17.72%
City-wide	% of Total	37.90%	12.47%	29.12%	13.29%	7.22%	100.00%

- *Compared to the 2004 survey, residents similarly responded to being neutral and somewhat knowledgeable about city operations, programs, and policies.*
- *Within each area of the city, over 30 percent report they are not very knowledgeable, resulting in 37.9 percent compared to 29.5 percent in 2004.*
- *Slightly over eight percent of Westside residents and slightly over seven percent of Central and Eastside residents say they feel very knowledgeable about the city's operations and perceptions of city collaboration, whereas for the 2004 survey, Westside and Northeast residents reported to be more knowledgeable.*

Citizens' Issue Definition of Main Concerns

Table 9
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?⁴

2004	Rank	2006
Combined Responses		Combined Responses
Jobs and Employment Opportunities	1	Jobs and Employment Opportunities
Better Education and More Schools	2	Better Education and More Schools
More Parks and Recreation Opportunities	3	Better Salaries
Better Salaries	4	Lower Taxes (Property and Sales Taxes)
Lower Taxes (Property and Sales Taxes)	5	Roads/Infrastructure
Improve/Beautify and Clean Streets, Lights, Crosswalks	6	More Parks and Recreation Opportunities
General Economy/Business Environment	7	Programs for Elderly (Services and Healthcare)
Clean up City/Appearance	8	General Economy/Business Environment
Water Supply	9	Tourism Growth
Roads/Infrastructure	10	Safety and Security Issues
Social Aid (Migrants/Low Income/Poor/Food Stamps); and Healthcare Costs and Delivery	11	Clean Up City/Appearance
Problems of Police/Law Enforcement	12	Improve/Beautify and Clean Streets, Lights, and Crosswalks
Tourism Growth	13	Healthcare Costs and Delivery
Provide More Youth Programs	14	Entertainment, Especially Family
Safety and Security Issues	15	Problems of Police/Law Enforcement
International Bridges/Location	16	Social Aid (Migrants/Low Income/Poor/Food Stamps)
Entertainment, Especially Family	17	Provide more Youth Programs
Improved and More Public Transportation	18	Water Supply
Sports Events	19	International Bridges/Location
Programs for Elderly (Services and Healthcare)	20	Improved and More Public Transportation

- *Jobs and Education remained in first and second place, respectively, for the 2004 and 2006 surveys.*
- *In 2006, the top five categories, in order of importance, were Jobs and Employment Opportunities, Better Education and More Schools, Better Salaries, Lower Taxes, and Roads/Infrastructure, with Better Salaries and Lower Taxes moving up in rank.*
- *Safety and Security issues moved up to 10th place this year in comparison to its 2004 15th place ranking.*

⁴ A total of 3,416 responses were categorized using a constant comparative method. All remaining categories reported less than 2 percent among total responses.

Business Environment

Table 10
Mean Scores for El Paso as a Place to Do Business

The question's scale was changed from its 2004 version.

Thinking of all aspects of the local business environment, how would you rate El Paso as a place to do business?

2004					
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

2006					
Excellent	Neutral				Poor
5-----4-----3-----2-----1					
Westside	Central	Eastside	Lower Valley	Northeast	City-wide
3.52	3.53	3.53	3.49	3.47	3.51

- *In 2006, El Paso rating slightly improved and was rated above neutral (with a mean of 3.51) as a place to do business.*

Table 11
Mean Scores for Change in Business Conditions

This question's scale was changed from its 2004 version.

Compared to two years ago, do you think El Paso has become a better place to do business, stayed the same, or is worse?

2004					
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

2006					
Better	Stayed the Same				Worse
5-----4-----3-----2-----1					
Westside	Central	Eastside	Lower Valley	Northeast	City-wide
3.37	3.48	3.55	3.44	3.41	3.46

- *In comparison to the 2004 survey, El Paso was viewed as a better place for doing business. The mean city-wide score was 3.46.*
- *The Westside (mean=3.37), Northeast (mean=3.41), and Lower Valley (mean=3.55) reported lower means when compared to the entire city response.*

Table 13
Mean Score for Use of Tax Dollars

This question's scale was changed from 2004.

How satisfied are you with the city's use of your tax dollars?

2004

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

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

2006

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

Areas of City					
Westside	Central	Eastside	Lower Valley	Northeast	City-wide
2.66	2.62	2.84	2.75	2.71	2.73

- *The 2006 survey shows that citizens are unsatisfied with the city's use of tax dollars with an overall mean of 2.73.*
- *Unlike in 2004, this year Central residents reported the highest level of dissatisfaction.*

Table 14
Mean Scores Regarding City Contracting with Private Companies

This question's scale was changed from 2004.

When city government contracts private companies for services, how important do you feel the following are: ?

2004

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

Issue	Areas of City					City-wide
	Westside	Central	Eastside	Lower Valley	Northeast	
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

2006

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

Issue	Areas of City					City-wide
	Westside	Central	Eastside	Lower Valley	Northeast	
Quality	4.42	4.42	4.37	4.36	4.42	4.39
Open Bidding	4.39	4.28	4.27	4.27	4.28	4.29
Contracts to Local Businesses	4.42	4.37	4.36	4.33	4.35	4.36

- *When the city contracts private companies for services, the 2006 survey reports that City residents consider Quality, Open Bidding, and Contracts to Local Businesses as relatively important with a mean scores of 4.39, 4.29, and 4.36, respectively.*

Table 15
Percentages Indicating Support Level for Strategies to Spend Tax Dollars

This question has been changed from the 2004 survey. It currently has a different scale and five core areas, which are Public Safety, Quality of Life Services, Building and Planning Services, Transportation Services, and Economic Development.

Would you say current strategies are properly spending your tax dollars?

2004

		Areas of the City					
		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%

2006

Table16

Overall, would you say that current strategies are properly spending your tax dollars? How would you rate:?

Public Safety

		Westside	Central	Eastside	Lower Valley	Northeast	City-wide
Least Critical	% within Area of City	4.69%	5.34%	6.82%	7.72%	5.09%	6.15%
Not Critical	% within Area of City	8.33%	6.80%	9.74%	9.73%	7.41%	8.61%
Neutral	% within Area of City	33.85%	36.89%	33.77%	27.18%	36.11%	33.11%
Critical	% within Area of City	23.96%	23.30%	25.65%	26.17%	26.85%	25.33%
Most Critical	% within Area of City	29.17%	27.67%	24.03%	29.19%	24.54%	26.80%
Total	% within Area of City	100.00%	100.00%	100.00%	100.00%	100.00%	100.00%
	% of Total	15.74%	16.89%	25.25%	24.43%	17.70%	100.00%

Quality of Life Services

		Westside	Central	Eastside	Lower Valley	Northeast	City-wide
Least Critical	% within Area of City	3.13%	6.31%	6.49%	7.38%	6.51%	6.15%
Not Critical	% within Area of City	12.50%	9.71%	9.74%	11.41%	13.49%	11.24%
Neutral	% within Area of City	37.50%	39.32%	38.96%	34.56%	34.88%	37.00%
Critical	% within Area of City	20.31%	25.24%	26.30%	24.16%	23.72%	24.20%
Most Critical	% within Area of City	26.56%	19.42%	18.51%	22.48%	21.40%	21.41%
Total	% within Area of City	100.00%	100.00%	100.00%	100.00%	100.00%	100.00%
	% of Total	15.75%	16.90%	25.27%	24.45%	17.64%	100.00%

Building and Planning Services

		Westside	Central	Eastside	Lower Valley	Northeast	City-wide
Least Critical	% within Area of City	3.13%	5.34%	6.51%	4.36%	5.12%	5.01%
Not Critical	% within Area of City	15.10%	13.11%	8.47%	12.08%	13.49%	12.07%
Neutral	% within Area of City	41.67%	43.20%	45.93%	37.92%	42.79%	42.28%
Critical	% within Area of City	22.40%	21.36%	23.78%	23.15%	23.26%	22.91%
Most Critical	% within Area of City	17.71%	16.99%	15.31%	22.48%	15.35%	17.73%
Total	% within Area of City	100.00%	100.00%	100.00%	100.00%	100.00%	100.00%
	% of Total	15.76%	16.91%	25.21%	24.47%	17.65%	100.00%

Transportation Services

		Westside	Central	Eastside	Lower Valley	Northeast	City-wide
Least Critical	% within Area of City	7.29%	6.31%	6.21%	5.05%	6.05%	6.09%
Not Critical	% within Area of City	10.94%	10.19%	10.13%	11.45%	13.02%	11.10%
Neutral	% within Area of City	35.94%	44.66%	36.93%	34.68%	40.00%	38.08%
Critical	% within Area of City	21.88%	22.33%	25.82%	25.93%	21.86%	23.93%
Most Critical	% within Area of City	23.96%	16.50%	20.92%	22.90%	19.07%	20.81%
Total	% within Area of City	100.00%	100.00%	100.00%	100.00%	100.00%	100.00%
	% of Total	15.79%	16.94%	25.16%	24.42%	17.68%	100.00%

Economic Development

		Westside	Central	Eastside	Lower Valley	Northeast	City-wide
Least Critical	% within Area of City	7.81%	6.83%	9.77%	6.71%	7.48%	7.81%
Not Critical	% within Area of City	10.94%	11.71%	9.45%	10.07%	14.02%	11.02%
Neutral	% within Area of City	38.54%	40.49%	35.50%	34.56%	35.51%	36.60%
Critical	% within Area of City	14.58%	16.59%	20.85%	18.79%	20.09%	18.50%
Most Critical	% within Area of City	28.13%	24.39%	24.43%	29.87%	22.90%	26.07%
Total	% within Area of City	100.00%	100.00%	100.00%	100.00%	100.00%	100.00%
	% of Total	15.79%	16.86%	25.25%	24.51%	17.60%	100.00%

- *Residents feel that spending in all five areas is most critical with a response rate of over 20 percent except for Building and Planning Services.*
- *For Building and Planning Services overall, the response was slightly lower at 17.7 for most critical but higher for critical (22.91 %).*

**Table 17
Response Rates for Knowledge of Composition of Tax Bill**

This is a new question.

Did you know that the city only comprises 22 percent for the tax bill?

		Areas of City					
		Westside	Central	Eastside	Lower Valley	Northeast	City-Wide
Yes	% within Area of City	16.75%	19.63%	16.92%	15.96%	20.09%	17.67%
Not Sure	% within Area of City	8.63%	11.21%	12.08%	10.42%	11.16%	10.84%
No	% within Area of City	74.62%	69.16%	71.00%	73.62%	68.75%	71.48%
Total	% within Area of City	100.00%	100.00%	100.00%	100.00%	100.00%	100.00%
	% of Total	15.48%	16.81%	26.00%	24.12%	17.60%	100.00%

- *Over 70 percent of surveyed residents do not know that the city comprises 22 percent of the tax bill.*
- *Out of all five areas of the, close to 20 percent of residents in Central and Northeast are aware of the city's portion of the tax bill.*

Table 18
Percentages Indicating the Support Level for Taxes

The following question has been restructured from the 2004 survey. It includes how citizens perceive spending in the five following areas: Public Safety, Quality of Life Services, Building and Planning Services, Transportation Services, and Economic Development.

Would you say taxes are too low, just right or too high?

2004

		Areas of the City					
		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%

2006

Would you say city spending is too low, just right, or too high for the following areas: ?

Public Safety

		Westside	Central	Eastside	Lower Valley	Northeast	City-wide
Too Low	% within Area of City	20.11%	21.36%	19.08%	21.09%	21.33%	20.51%
Low	% within Area of City	7.94%	5.83%	6.91%	8.16%	6.64%	7.14%
Just Right	% within Area of City	53.44%	46.60%	53.29%	48.98%	52.61%	51.00%
High	% within Area of City	7.41%	13.59%	11.18%	8.84%	12.32%	10.63%
Too High	% within Area of City	11.11%	12.62%	9.54%	12.93%	7.11%	10.71%
Total	% within Area of City	100.00%	100.00%	100.00%	100.00%	100.00%	100.00%
	% of Total	15.70%	17.11%	25.25%	24.42%	17.52%	100.00%

Quality of Life Services

		Westside	Central	Eastside	Lower Valley	Northeast	City-wide
Too Low	% within Area of City	20.11%	28.78%	23.61%	28.57%	21.43%	24.77%
Low	% within Area of City	15.34%	12.68%	11.80%	11.90%	16.19%	13.30%
Just Right	% within Area of City	49.21%	42.93%	46.23%	43.88%	46.67%	45.64%
High	% within Area of City	5.82%	9.27%	10.82%	9.52%	9.05%	9.14%
Too High	% within Area of City	9.52%	6.34%	7.54%	6.12%	6.67%	7.15%
Total	% within Area of City	100.00%	100.00%	100.00%	100.00%	100.00%	100.00%
	% of Total	15.71%	17.04%	25.35%	24.44%	17.46%	100.00%

Building and Planning Services

		Westside	Central	Eastside	Lower Valley	Northeast	City-wide
Too Low	% within Area of City	16.93%	24.39%	14.19%	23.13%	15.57%	18.79%
Low	% within Area of City	12.17%	10.73%	8.58%	10.54%	14.15%	10.97%
Just Right	% within Area of City	59.26%	50.24%	54.13%	49.66%	50.94%	52.62%
High	% within Area of City	4.76%	8.78%	14.19%	9.52%	11.32%	10.14%
Too High	% within Area of City	6.88%	5.85%	8.91%	7.14%	8.02%	7.48%
Total	% within Area of City	100.00%	100.00%	100.00%	100.00%	100.00%	100.00%
	% of Total	15.71%	17.04%	25.19%	24.44%	17.62%	100.00%

Transportation Services

		Westside	Central	Eastside	Lower Valley	Northeast	City-wide
Too Low	% within Area of City	19.15%	20.49%	21.45%	23.73%	17.92%	20.86%
Low	% within Area of City	12.77%	7.32%	10.89%	11.86%	16.04%	11.72%
Just Right	% within Area of City	56.91%	58.54%	48.18%	50.51%	51.89%	52.54%
High	% within Area of City	4.79%	10.24%	12.54%	6.78%	8.49%	8.81%
Too High	% within Area of City	6.38%	3.41%	6.93%	7.12%	5.66%	6.07%
Total	% within Area of City	100.00%	100.00%	100.00%	100.00%	100.00%	100.00%
	% of Total	15.63%	17.04%	25.19%	24.52%	17.62%	100.00%

Economic Development

		Westside	Central	Eastside	Lower Valley	Northeast	City-wide
Too Low	% within Area of City	29.10%	32.68%	26.91%	30.27%	30.99%	29.78%
Low	% within Area of City	10.58%	11.22%	11.63%	12.24%	14.08%	11.98%
Just Right	% within Area of City	47.62%	45.85%	45.85%	46.94%	43.66%	46.01%
High	% within Area of City	5.29%	6.83%	10.63%	6.80%	8.45%	7.82%
Too High	% within Area of City	7.41%	3.41%	4.98%	3.74%	2.82%	4.41%
Total	% within Area of City	100.00%	100.00%	100.00%	100.00%	100.00%	100.00%
	% of Total	15.72%	17.05%	25.04%	24.46%	17.72%	100.00%

- *El Pasoans across the city strongly affirm that taxes are just right in the areas of Public Safety, Building and Planning Services, Transportation Services, and Economic Development, all of which have a response rate of 50 percent.*
- *The response rate for Quality of Life Service was the lowest at 45.6 percent.*

Experience and Contact with City and City Employees

**Table 20
Contact Using City Website**

Have you ever visited the city's website?

2004

		Areas of the City					
		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%

2006

		Westside	Central	Eastside	Lower Valley	Northeast	City-wide
Yes	% within Area of City	29.69%	26.83%	24.51%	26.94%	24.41%	26.30%
No	% within Area of City	70.31%	73.17%	75.49%	73.06%	75.59%	73.70%
Total	% within Area of City	100.00%	100.00%	100.00%	100.00%	100.00%	100.00%
	% of Total	15.83%	16.90%	25.23%	24.48%	17.56%	100.00%

- **Overall, the same trends as reported by the 2004 survey persist. Close to 75 percent of residents have not visited the city's website while about 25 percent have visited it.**
- **In 2004, Westside and Northeast Eastside residents reported the greatest use of the city's website. The 2006 survey revealed that Westside (29.7 %) and Lower Valley (26.9 %) residents visited the city's website more when compared to residents from the other areas of the city.**
- **Lowest use is reported by the Eastside and the Northeast residents.**

**Table 21
Percentages Demonstrating Contact with City Officials**

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

2004

Number of Contacts		Areas of the City					City-wide
		Westside	Central	Eastside	Lower Valley	Northeast	
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%

2006

Number of Contacts		Westside	Central	Eastside	Lower Valley	Northeast	City-wide
Never	% within Area of City	61.67%	65.95%	59.71%	61.45%	58.85%	61.35%
1	% within Area of City	8.33%	11.35%	15.47%	14.50%	13.54%	13.04%
2	% within Area of City	15.56%	8.11%	9.35%	9.16%	14.06%	10.94%
3	% within Area of City	6.11%	3.78%	4.68%	3.05%	5.73%	4.56%
4	% within Area of City	2.22%	4.86%	2.16%	4.20%	1.56%	3.01%
5 to 10	% within Area of City	5.00%	2.16%	4.32%	3.82%	2.60%	3.65%
11 to 15	% within Area of City	0.56%	2.16%	2.16%	2.29%	1.56%	1.82%
16 or more	% within Area of City	0.56%	1.62%	2.16%	1.53%	2.08%	1.64%
Total	% within Area of City	100.00%	100.00%	100.00%	100.00%	100.00%	100.00%
	% of Total	16.41%	16.86%	25.34%	23.88%	17.50%	100.00%

- *Approximately 60 percent of all residents have never made contact with city officials. The response rate is almost five percent higher this year than the 2004 survey.*
- *The 2004 and 2006 surveys both revealed that Eastside and Lower Valley residents were more likely to have contacted city officials once.*

**Table 22
Method of Contact with City**

How is your contact most often made?

2004

		Areas of the City					
Method of Contact		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%

2006

Method of Contact		Westside	Central	Eastside	Lower Valley	Northeast	City-wide
Phone	% within Area of City	63.77%	60.00%	55.56%	61.22%	64.94%	60.68%
In-Person	% within Area of City	17.39%	18.33%	29.63%	24.49%	25.97%	24.03%
E-mail	% within Area of City	14.49%	13.33%	12.96%	12.24%	7.79%	12.14%
Writing	% within Area of City	4.35%	8.33%	1.85%	2.04%	1.30%	3.16%
Total	% within Area of City	100.00%	100.00%	100.00%	100.00%	100.00%	100.00%
	% of Total	16.75%	14.56%	26.21%	23.79%	18.69%	100.00%

- *While over one-half of city residents report no contact with city officials (61.4 %), when contact is made, phone contact is the most common method.*
- *In-person contact is made with close to 25 percent of all cases city-wide, with Eastside and Lower Valley residents most likely to choose the in-person method.*
- *Using e-mail to contact city officials has risen from 2004 results. More Westside, Eastside, and Central residents are using e-mail to contact city officials. Overall, e-mail usage has increased by 8 percentage points, from 4.5 percent in 2004 to 12.14 percent in 2006.*

Table 23
Mean Scores Related to Customer Service with City Employees

This is a new question.

How would you rate customer service?

	Very Dissatisfied		Neutral		Very Satisfied	
	1-----	2-----	3-----	4-----	5	
			Areas of City			
	Westside	Central	Eastside	Lower Valley	Northeast	City-wide
	3.61	3.19	3.29	3.40	3.53	3.40

- Overall, El Paso residents are satisfied with the customer service provided by the City of El Paso
- Westside residents along with Northeast and Lower Valley residents are the most satisfied residents.

Table 24
Percentages Related to Contact with City Employees in the Last Year

This is a new question.

Have you had contact with the city in the Last Year?

			Areas of City				
		Westside	Central	Eastside	Lower Valley	Northeast	City-wide
Yes	% within Area of City	23.91%	25.00%	29.59%	30.86%	33.01%	28.82%
No	% within Area of City	76.09%	75.00%	70.41%	69.14%	66.99%	71.18%
Total	% within Area of City	100.00%	100.00%	100.00%	100.00%	100.00%	100.00%
	% of Total	15.97%	17.01%	25.52%	23.35%	18.14%	100.00%

- Over 70 percent of residents did not have contact with the city this past year.

Table 25
Percentages Indicating Contact with City Employees in the Last Year by City Department

This is a new question.

Have you had contact with the city in the last year?
 If yes, then which department did you have contact with: ?

Service	Area of City					Total	Rank
	Westside	Central	Eastside	Lower Valley	Northeast		
Police	31.82%	34.69%	42.53%	46.99%	42.03%	40.96%	1
Consolidated Tax Office	25.00%	24.49%	22.99%	30.12%	23.19%	25.30%	2
Building Permits and Inspections	22.73%	12.24%	9.20%	12.05%	13.04%	12.95%	3
Planning and Development	11.36%	10.20%	9.20%	13.25%	11.59%	11.14%	4
Fire	6.82%	8.16%	11.49%	12.05%	14.49%	11.14%	5
Solid Waste Management	18.18%	10.20%	6.90%	10.84%	11.59%	10.84%	6
Streets	9.09%	6.12%	12.64%	4.82%	13.04%	9.34%	7
Community Development	9.09%	12.24%	10.34%	8.43%	5.80%	9.04%	8
Parks and Recreation	9.09%	4.08%	10.34%	4.82%	10.14%	7.83%	9
Human Resources	4.55%	8.16%	8.05%	8.43%	7.25%	7.53%	10
Libraries	4.55%	6.12%	6.90%	7.23%	11.59%	7.53%	11
Museums and Cultural Affairs	0.00%	6.12%	9.20%	4.82%	13.04%	7.23%	12
Sun Metro	9.09%	6.12%	8.05%	6.02%	4.35%	6.63%	13
Code Enforcement	6.82%	4.08%	4.60%	6.02%	10.14%	6.33%	14
Zoo	4.55%	6.12%	6.90%	2.41%	11.59%	6.33%	15
Engineering	2.27%	2.04%	4.60%	8.43%	8.70%	5.72%	16
Airport	6.82%	4.08%	3.45%	3.61%	10.14%	5.42%	17
Economic Development	2.27%	2.04%	3.45%	9.64%	5.80%	5.12%	18
Purchasing	2.27%	8.33%	3.45%	3.61%	4.35%	4.23%	19

➤ **Most residents who had contact with the city did so through the Police (41 %), the Consolidated Tax Office (25.3 %), and the Building and Permits Departments (13 %).**

Table 27
Mean Scores Related City Communication with Citizens

The scale was changed for this question.

How successful do you think the city communicates with its citizens about the following: ?

2004

Very Successful ----- Neutral ----- Very Unsuccessful
 1-----2-----3-----4-----5

Issue	Areas of City					City-wide
	Westside	Central	Eastside	Lower Valley	Northeast	
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

2006

Very Unsuccessful ----- Neutral ----- Very Successful
 1-----2-----3-----4-----5

Issue	Areas of City					City-wide
	Westside	Central	Eastside	Lower Valley	Northeast	
Capital Improvement Projects	2.36	2.50	2.45	2.56	2.41	2.36
City Sponsored Programs	2.40	2.48	2.34	2.50	2.51	2.40
Changes in Regulations	2.49	2.67	2.57	2.65	2.65	2.49
Changes in Utility Rates	2.43	2.61	2.55	2.56	2.61	2.43
Overall City Policies	2.35	2.53	2.51	2.52	2.69	2.35

➤ Overall, in 2006 residents feel that the city unsuccessfully communicates with its residents about city issues.

City-wide Demographic and Social Profile of Respondents

City-wide data on the demographic and social makeup of the respondents are reported below. The include: respondents' age, occupation, years lived in El Paso, rent or ownership of home, individuals in household, number of children in household, education level, racial group, Hispanic origin, income, and gender. Individual areas of the community reflect 2000 census data, and the sample provides an excellent representation of the city and its residents.

Table 28
Racial Group

Racial 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 29 (2006)
Racial Group

This question was reworded from the 2004 survey.

Racial Group	Frequency	Percent
White	1176	90.39%
African-American	37	2.84%
Alaskan or Pacific Islander	4	0.31%
Other	31	2.38%
Asian-American	8	0.61%
Don't Know/Refuse	3	0.23%
Native-American	4	0.31%
Missing or No Response	38	2.92%
Total	1301	100.00%

Table 30
Ethnic Group

This is a new question.

Are you of Hispanic or Latino descent?

	Frequency	Percent
Hispanic or Latino Descent	1018	78.25%
Not Hispanic or Latino	183	14.07%
Missing or No Response	100	7.69%
Total	1301	100.00%

Table 31
Completion Status

Over one-half (52.1 %) 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	2004		2006	
	Frequency	Percent	Frequency	Percent
Completed Survey in English	676	52.1%	700	53.8%
Completed Survey in Spanish	560	43.2%	583	44.8%
Incomplete Survey in English	37	2.9%	13	1.0%
Incomplete Survey in Spanish	24	1.9%	5	0.4%
Total	1297	100.0%	1301	100.0%

**Table 32
Gender**

Gender	2004		2006	
	Frequency	Percent	Frequency	Percent
Female	854	65.8	648	49.8%
Male	386	29.8	626	48.1%
Missing/No Response	66	4.4	27	97.9%
Total	1297	100	1301	2.1%

**Table 33
Income**

Income	2004		2006	
	Frequency	Percent	Frequency	Percent
Less than \$20K	391	30.10%	439	31.98%
\$20K or more, but less than \$40K	349	26.90%	291	21.37%
\$40K or more, but less than \$60K	201	15.50%	162	11.68%
\$60K or more, but less than \$80K	101	7.80%	101	7.61%
\$80K or more, but less than \$120K	64	4.90%	77	5.76%
\$120K or more	28	2.20%	40	2.69%
Refuse to Answer/Do Not Know	163	12.60%	119	18.91%
Total	1297	100.00%	1229	100.00%

**Table 34
Age Group (2004)**

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	2004		2006	
	Frequency	Percent	Frequency	Percent
18 to 25 years	231	17.8%	193	14.9%
26 to 30 years	143	11.0%	90	6.9%
31 to 35 years	115	8.9%	101	7.8%
36 to 40 years	129	9.9%	137	10.6%
41 to 45 years	123	9.5%	106	8.2%
46 to 50 years	142	10.9%	143	11.0%
51 to 55 years	98	7.6%	121	9.3%
56 to 60 years	77	5.9%	101	7.8%
61 to 65 years	72	5.6%	78	6.0%
66 or older	160	12.3%	177	13.6%
Total	1290	99.5%	1247	96.1%
Missing/No Response	7	5.0%	46	3.5%
Total	1297	100.0%	1297	100.0%

Table 35
Number in Household

Number in Household	2004		2006	
	Frequency	Percent	Frequency	Percent
1	132	10.2	152	11.68%
2	282	21.7	317	24.37%
3	287	22.1	237	18.22%
4	298	23	282	21.68%
5	180	13.9	161	12.38%
6	72	5.6	71	5.46%
7	18	1.4	14	1.08%
8	8	0.6	6	0.46%
9	2	0.2	3	0.23%
Missing or No Response	18	1.4	58	4.46%
Total	1297	100	1301	100.00%

Table 37
Education Level

	2004		2006	
	Frequency	Percent	Frequency	Percent
Did Not Complete High School	288	22.2	286	21.98%
High School Graduate	327	25.2	248	19.06%
Some College	368	28.4	309	23.75%
College Graduate	192	14.8	257	19.75%
Graduate Degree	63	4.9	89	6.84%
Trade School	22	1.7	39	3.00%
Missing or No Response	37	2.9	73	5.61%
Total	1297	100	1301	100.00%

Table 38
Years in El Paso Table 73

Number of Years	2004		2006	
	Frequency	Percent	Frequency	Percent
1	96	7.4	22	1.68%
2	73	5.6	31	2.37%
3	146	11.3	26	1.98%
4	154	11.9	25	1.91%
5	153	11.8	32	2.44%
6	254	19.6	27	2.06%
7	151	11.6	17	1.30%
8	134	10.3	23	1.76%
9 or more	111	8.6	1043	80.31%
Missing or No Response	25	1.9	55	4.20%
Total	1297	100	1301	100.00%

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

Number	2004		2006	
	Frequency	Percent	Frequency	Percent
None or No response	570	43.9	667	51.27%
1	288	22.2	226	17.37%
2	247	19.0	238	18.29%
3	144	11.1	122	9.38%
4	35	2.7	36	2.77%
5	9	.7	5	0.38%
7	3	.2	3	0.23%
8	1	.1	3	0.23%
Total	1297	100.0	1301	100.00%

Table 39
Home Description

Home Type	2004		2006	
	Frequency	Percent	Frequency	Percent
Rent or Lease a Single Family Home	169	13	95	7.30%
Rent or Lease a Condominium or Townhouse	6	0.5	8	0.61%
Rent or Lease an Apartment	181	14	168	12.91%
Rent or Lease a Mobile Home	29	2.2	18	1.38%
Own or Buying a Single Family Home	848	65.4	913	70.18%
Own or Buying a Condominium or Townhouse	11	0.8	6	0.46%
Own or Buying a Mobile Home	25	1.9	9	0.69%
Missing or No Response	28	2.2	84	6.46%
Total	1297	100	1301	100.00%

Table 40
Occupation

Occupation	2004		2006	
	Frequency	Percent	Frequency	Percent
Scientific/Technical	21	1.6	22	1.69%
Agriculture/Forestry/Fishing	7	0.5	1	0.08%
Professional/Managerial	177	13.6	228	17.52%
Manufacturing/Processing	23	1.8	34	2.61%
Sales	68	5.2	54	4.15%
Construction	21	1.6	44	3.38%
Clerical/Bookkeeping	30	2.3	41	3.15%
Transportation	10	0.8	26	2.00%
Service	59	4.5	101	7.76%
Military	15	1.2	19	1.46%
Homemaker	332	25.6	221	16.99%
Retired	188	14.5	214	16.45%
Student	188	14.5	155	11.91%
Unemployed	43	3.3	26	2.00%
Other	126	9.7	80	6.15%
Missing or No Response	24	1.9	35	2.69%
Total	1297	100	1301	100.00%