

NEW JERSEY LAND USE PLANNING

A Survey of Public Opinion

Analytical Report

VOLUME I

Conducted For: New Jersey
State Planning Commission

Conducted By:

THE GALLUP ORGANIZATION, INC.' -

53 Bank **Street**

Princeton, New Jersey 08542 .

GO 86283

January 1987

TABLE OF CONTENTS

Introduction	1
Methodology	
Summary of Findings	
Detailed Findings	3
Satisfaction with New Jersey Development	4
Opinions Of What is Good and Bad About New Jersey	10
Importance of Characteristics in Community Evaluation	13
Perceived Impact of Development	19
Desirable Impact	
Adverse impact	
Differences By Community Growth Rate	
Impact of Development and Importance of Community Characteristics	25
Impact of Development	'
Concern for the Environment	27
Preservation of Natural Areas	
Preferred Location for Development	30
Awareness of the Level of Government in Control of Development	32
Opinion of The Level of Government That Should Control Development	33
Opinion on the Amount of Government Regulation of Development	36
In Conclusion	40

INTRODUCTION

This report summarizes the survey results to a study commissioned by the New Jersey State Planning Commission and conducted by The Gallup Organization, Inc. As part of its charter The Commission sought to better understand the attitudes of New Jersey residents on issues related to growth and development in the state.

More specifically, the primary objectives of this research were:

To determine New Jerseyans satisfaction with the way their communities are developing;

To identify those community characteristics that residents value most and those that they feel need to be improved;

To determine opinion on the way growth is being managed and public confidence in different levels of government to control growth;

To measure New Jerseyans opinions of where growth should be concentrated and the importance of preserving natural and other resources;

To' measure public opinion on revitalization of the state's urban areas - its feasibility and desirability.

Methodology

For this study a representative sample of 1501 adult New Jersey residents, age 18 and older, was interviewed by telephone between December 5-14, 1986. A copy of the questionnaire and tables of recommended sampling tolerances can be found in the technical appendix to this report.

Two measures were constructed to analyze the results to the survey: growth rate and stringency of government control of development. Residents were placed into one of three groups based on the rate of growth in their zip code area. The categories were determined by the percent of increase in households (not the absolute number of households) from 1980 projected through 1991 within zip codes. Consequently, a high growth xais, community could also be a low density community, and vice versa.

Low growth rate * less than 1% increase in households.

Medium growth rate * 1-1.9% increase in households.

High growth rate * 2% or greater increase in households.

To measure residents* satisfaction with the stringency of government control of development, a stringency measure was constructed by subtracting the rating for current level of government control from the rating for the desired level of government control. The construction of this measure is discussed more fully in the body of the report.

summary OF FINDINGS

Following is a summary of the results to the study:

New Jerseyans are generally satisfied with their communities and are optimistic about the future of their local area and the state;

The community characteristics that New Jerseyans value most are low crime rates, a clean environment, quality schools and physical appearance;

New Jerseyans are most satisfied with their community's access to shopping, physical appearance, environment and schools; those areas that the largest proportion feel need improvement are local taxes, traffic congestion, employment opportunities, the cost of housing, access to cultural and social activities and to recreational areas;

On balance New Jersey residents believe development has made the state a better place to live, but this is a plurality opinion, not a majority opinion;

The overwhelming majority of residents think development will have a major impact on the state and their community, some good and some bad;

On the positive side, most residents expect increased development to bring increased employment opportunities, better access to shopping, to public transportation and to cultural activities; the largest percentage see a negative impact of development in the areas of traffic congestion, increased local taxes, higher crime rate and less clean environment;

When we compare attitudes on the impact of development with attitudes on the relative importance of community characteristics, we find that the characteristics residents' value most (low crime rate and clean environment) are the very same issues on which most New Jerseyans fear development will have a negative impact. On the other hand, for those community characteristics that are less important (access to cultural activities, to recreational areas, to public transportation, employment opportunities), a plurality expect development to have a desirable impact;

The environment is an important concern for New Jerseyans: 91% say it is very or somewhat important to preserve the state's natural areas and 88% believe the state's natural resources are very or somewhat threatened by development;

New Jerseyans are most supportive of development in the more urbanized areas of the state and least supportive of development in rural areas; support concentration of development along the state's major highways; and are generally confident that the state's major urban areas can be revitalized;

New Jerseyans are not highly "home rule" oriented. A large proportion of residents (40%) support a regional approach to planning, compared with 52% who feel local communities should control growth; and when asked what level of government they feel can best manage growth, 35% choose local towns, 23% select the county, and 30% the state;

On balance state residents believe current government control of development is not very strict but that it should be very strict.

DETAILED FINDINGS

SATISFACTION WITH THE WAY NEW JERSEY COMMUNITIES ARE DEVELOPING

How would you rate New Jersey as a place to live? Overall, would you say it is excellent, good, only fair or poor?

How about your town or city, overall would you say it is excellent, good, only fair or poor as a place to live?

Looking ahead to the next 5 to 10 years, do you expect that New Jersey will become a more attractive place to live, a less attractive place to live, or don't you expect it to change very much?

How about your own town or city? In the next 5 to 10 years, will it become a more attractive place to live, a less attractive place to live, or don't you expect it to change very much?

What about the way in which development is taking place in your town or city? Is it happening in a way that makes your community a better place to live, a worse place to live, or doesn't it make a difference?

Most New Jersey residents feel the state (76%) and their town or city (71%) are good or excellent places to live, and very few give their residence a rating of poor.

Rating	New Jersey As Place To Live	Town or City As Place To Live
	%	%
Excellent	28	24
Good	48	47
Only Fair	19	23
Poor	4	6
Don't Know	1	*
	----	----
Total	100	100
No. of Interviews	(1501)	(1501)

* indicates less than one half of one percent

New Jerseyans evaluations of the state today are not related to the rate of growth in their local area, but their evaluations of their town and city are related to growth rates. Those in low, medium and high growth areas give almost identical ratings to New Jersey. On the other hand, those living in high growth areas are very slightly more likely to give an excellent rating to their community than those living in lower growth areas. This may be caused by the fact that a larger proportion of residents in high growth communities are recent arrivals to their town or city and selected their community for its desirable characteristics.

New Jersey As A Place To Live	Total Sample	Rate of Growth		
		Low	Medium	High
-----	-----	-----	-----	-----
	%	%	%	%
Excellent	28	29	27	28
Good	48	46	49	50
Only Fair	19	20	19	18
Poor	4	4	4	4
Don't Know	1	1	1	*
	-----	-----	-----	-----
Total	100	100	100	100
No. of Int	(1501)	(623)	(430)	(363)
Town or City As a Place To Live	Total Sample	Rate of Growth		
		Low	Medium	High
-----	-----	-----	-----	-----
	%	%	%	%
Excellent	24	24	20	29
Good	47	44	51	46
Only Fair	23	24	22	20
Poor	6	7	7	4
Don't Know	*	1	0	1
	-----	-----	-----	-----
Total	100	100	100	100
No. of Int	(1501)	(623)	(430)	(363)

* indicates less than one half of one percent

On balance, New Jerseyans expect the state and their town or city to become a more attractive place to live in the next five to ten years, although optimism regarding the state is higher than it is for the local area. Even though more residents believe the state and their local area will become more attractive than think it will become less attractive, ID neither case does a majority say it is likely to become more attractive. In addition, subsequent analysis will show that this optimism is tempered by concerns about the cost of housing, traffic congestion and local taxes (voiced by roughly one in three) and about the potential problems that could result from increased development in the state.

Evaluation	New Jersey In 5-10 Years	Town or City In 5-10 Years
-----	-----	-----
	%	%
More Attractive	42	34
Less Attractive	22	20
Not Much Change	31	41
Don't Know	6	5
	----	----
Total	100	100
No. of Interviews	(1501)	(1501)

There is a positive relationship between residents' current evaluation of the state and their community and their expectations for the future. In general, those who currently give positive ratings to the state or their local area today are optimistic about the future and those who give more negative evaluations today are more pessimistic about the future. For example, among those who give an excellent or good rating to New Jersey as a place to live, 47% believe the state will become more attractive in the next 5-10 years. By comparison, among those who rate the state as a fair or poor place to live, only 25% believe it will improve. Similarly, 37 % of those who give their town or city an excellent or good rating believe it will improve, compared with 26% among those who give their community a fair or poor rating.

It is also interesting to note that residents' expectations about the future of their community are related to the rate of growth in the local area; the higher the growth rate the more likely residents are to anticipate change. Specifically, those in high growth areas are more likely than those living in lower growth areas to say that their community and New Jersey will change in the next 5-10 years. For example, 34% in low growth areas expect no change in New Jersey compared with 29% in high growth areas who do not anticipate change.

New Jersey Attractiveness in The Next 5-10 Years

	More ----- %	Less ----- %	No Change ----- %	Don't Know ----- %	Total ----- %	No. of Int. -----
Total	42	22	31	5	100	(1501)
State Rating						
Ex/Good	47	17	30	6	100	(1168)
Fair/Poor	25	35	35	5	100	(318)
Rate of Growth						
Low	42	18	34	6	100	(623)
Medium	41	24	31	4	100	(430)
High	39	27	29	5	100	(363)

Town/City Attractiveness In The Next 5-10 Years

	<u>More</u>	<u>Less</u>	<u>No Change</u>	<u>Don't Know</u>	<u>Total</u>	<u>No. of Int.</u>
Total	34	20	41	5	100	(1501)
Town Rating						
Ex/Good	37	17	41	5	100	(1092)
Fair/Poor	26	26	42	6	100	(402)
Rate of Growth						
Low	31	18	46	5	100	(623)
Medium	35	21	39	5	100	(430)
High	36	24	33	7	100	(363)

Not only do New Jerseyans tend to give their communities high marks, on balance they feel development has benefited their communities. That is, more residents believe development has made their community a better place to live than think development has made it worse - 38% vs. 22%.

However, while the proportion who think development has improved their communities represents a plurality of residents, it is a plurality and not a majority, with a large number (35%) believing that growth has no impact. And this "no impact" group is drawn disproportionately from residents in areas that are experiencing the least growth. Whether this "no impact" group will remain on the sidelines during debates over development, or whether they will be drawn into the debate as they begin to witness the consequences of development will have an important impact on the level of public support or opposition to future development. One rough measure of the likely future position of this "no difference" group is to compare the opinions of those in communities with a low growth rate with those that have a higher growth rate.

In communities experiencing a high rate of growth, the percent who believe development has made their community a worse place to live is higher than in communities that have experienced low levels of development - 30% vs. 19%. At the same time residents of high growth communities are less likely to say that development has no impact than residents of low growth communities - 26% vs. 39%. But even in those communities with high rates of growth, the plurality, although it is a smaller plurality, continue to view development positively. 39% say development has improved their community whereas 30% say it has worsened their community. While we cannot conclude that increased growth causes more negative opinions of development, if the relationship between the character of the community and the perceived consequences of development for the community holds up as communities continue to grow we may find an increasingly negative opinion of development.

In sum, as previous results demonstrated, residents today see both positive and negative consequences of growth. But when asked overall whether they feel development has made their community a better or a worse place to live, a plurality of 38% say it has become a better place to live as a result of growth and development.

Impact of Development on Your Community
As A Place To Live

	<u>Better</u>	<u>Worse</u>	<u>No Diff</u>	<u>DK</u>	<u>Total</u>	<u>* Int.</u>
	%	%	%	%	%	
Total	38	22	35	5	100	(1501)
Growth Rate						
Low	38	19	39	4	100	(623)
Medium	38	22	36	4	100	(430)
High	39	30	26	5	100	(363)

OPINIONS OF WHAT IS GOOD AND BAD ABOUT NEW JERSEY

What are the things you like best about living in your community?

What are the things you like least about living in your community?

In what ways do you expect your town or city to become a more attractive/less attractive place to live?

When asked in a free response format the things they like best about living in their community and the things they like least, no single response was offered by more than one in four. The most frequently mentioned positive response was a general answer of, "It's a pleasant area" (mentioned by 25%) and the most frequently given negative response was traffic congestion (mentioned by 13%).

There are no differences between people in high, medium and low growth areas in the percent who mention different characteristics, with one exception; residents of high growth areas are more likely than residents of lower growth areas to say that the thing they like best about their community is the country or suburban atmosphere.

The Best Things About Living In Your Community

<u>Community Characteristic</u>	<u>Total</u> %	<u>Rate of Growth</u>		
		<u>Low</u> %	<u>Medium</u> %	<u>High</u> %
Pleasant Area	25	24	26	26
Friendly/Nice People	19	20	17	20
Location	15	16	14	13
Country/Suburban Atmosphere	13	7	14	21
Close To Stores	12	12	10	13
School System	9	8	8	11
Close To Metro Areas	8	10	9	5
Nothing	7	9	8	5
Small Town	6	6	6	6
Cultural Activities	5	6	4	6
Public Services	4	6	4	3
Public Transportation	4	5	4	3
Close To Work	3	3	3	2
Safe/Less Crime	3	3	4	2
Miscellaneous	12	9	15	12
Don't Know	4	5	3	2
Number of Interviews	(1501)	(623)	(430)	(363)

<u>Community Characteristic</u>	<u>Total</u> %	<u>Rate of Growth</u>		<u>High</u> %
		<u>Low</u> %	<u>Medium</u> %	
Traffic Problems	13	12	12	17
Overcrowded	8	7	9	10
High Taxes	8	8	8	9
Environment/Pollution	5	5	6	5
The People	5	6	4	4
Crime Rate	5	7	6	1
Rapid Development	4	3	6	6
Politics/Politicians	3	4	2	2
Public Transportation	3	2	2	5
Lack of Public Services	3	4	3	5
Everything Too Far Away	3	1	3	8
Not Much To Do/Too Quiet	3	4	4	4
Low Income/Welfare Recipients	1	2	1	1
Miscellaneous	15	15	15	12
Nothing	28	30	29	25
Don't Know	5	5	5	4
Number of Interviews	(1501)	(623)	(430)	(363)

Residents who reported that they expected their communities to become less attractive in the next 5-10 years were asked to specify the ways in which they felt the communities would become less attractive. Similarly, those who expected their communities to become more attractive were asked to elaborate on the ways they expected the community to improve. Again, no single response stands out. The largest percentages expect new and better housing (29%) and increased building (28%) on the positive side. On the negative side the most frequent mentions were overcrowding (42%) and too much growth (30%) on the negative side. No other specific response was offered by more than one in ten.

It should be pointed out that respondents were asked these questions prior to being asked their opinions of development. In other words, their framework was not changes that might result from development, but rather changes that could result from any factors: development, their own earning power, crime rates, etc. Yet despite this, the most frequently mentioned responses deal with development related issues: new housing, increased building, more population. In other words, we can conclude that development issues are very much a part of the public's general consciousness.

Expectations for More Attractive/Less Attractive Community

<u>Community Characteristic</u>	<u>Total</u>
	%
*** More Attractive ***	
New/Better Housing	29
Increased Building	28
Gen'l Improvement/Maintenance	15
More Business Opportunities	12
Building New Shopping Centers	11
Job Opportunities	11
Better Roads	7
Cultural opportunities	7
*** Less Attractive ***	
Overpopulated/Overcrowded	16
Too Much Development	11
Traffic Congestion	6
Number of Interviews	(803)

IMPORTANCE OF CHARACTERISTICS IN COMMUNITY EVALUATION

Now I am going to read you a list of things that can affect one's satisfaction with living in a community. Without referring to any particular community, please tell me how important each of these things is to you on a scale from 2 to 5. where 1 means not at all important and 5 means very important. First, how about:

*the amount of local crime
the local tax rates
the quality of local schools
the amount of traffic
the availability of outdoor recreational areas
the availability of employment opportunities
access to cultural and social activities
the cost of housing
access to stores for day to day shopping
reasonably clean natural environment
access to public transportation
the physical appearance of the community*

Next, using the same scale of 1 to 5, how would you rate your community on each of the previously mentioned characteristics? This time a 5 represents an excellent rating and a 1 represents a poor rating.

The two most important characteristics to New Jerseyans in evaluating the quality of life in their community are the crime rate and the environment, rated as very important by 72% and 67%, respectively. Also* important are the schools (61% rate very important) and the physical appearance of the community (58% rate very important), although among those with school aged children quality of the schools ranks first.

Roughly half say local taxes, the cost of housing and access to stores are very important, and almost as many place a similar. level of importance on traffic or employment opportunities. By comparison, relatively few (fewer than one in three) say that access to public transportation, access to recreational areas, and access to cultural and social activities are important community characteristics .

What the results to this question indicate is that New Jerseyans primary concerns with regard to their local communities are the crime rate, the environment, the schools and the physical appearance. And those community characteristics of least concern are access to public transportation, recreational areas* and cultural and social activities.

Importance In Satisfaction **With** Community

Rank	Characteristic	Very Important					Not at all Important	
		5	4	3	2	1	DK	Total
		---	---	---	---	---	---	---
		%	%	%	%	%	%	
1.	Crime rate	72	11	9	3	4	1	100
2.	Environment	67	19	9	2	3	*	100
3.	Schools	61	15	12	3	5	4	100
4.	Physical Appearance	58	26	12	2	2	*	100
5.	Local Taxes	53	17	18	5	4	3	100
6.	Cost of housing	51	23	15	4	5	2	100
7.	Access to stores	47	27	18	5	3	*	100
8.	Traffic	45	20	23	6	6	*	100
9.	Employment opportunities	40	19	19	9	10	3	100
10.	Access to Publ. Transp.	35	20	20	12	11	2	100
11.	Recreational areas	34	24	24	9	8	1	100
12.	Cultural/Social activities	31	26	27	8	7	1	100

lan tbaon on« half of on* p*re*nt

Table percentafM baMd on total tamptc of 1501 int«rvi*w>

When asked to rate their community from excellent to poor on the same twelve characteristics, New Jersey residents give the most positive ratings to access to shopping, the physical appearance of their town or city, the environment and the quality of the schools. On the other hand they give the most negative ratings to the high local taxes, traffic congestion, and employment opportunities.

More specifically, the largest percentage give a positive rating of 4 or 5 to their communities* access to shopping (69%) and its physical appearance (69%). Slightly fewer, but still a majority, give similarly high ratings to their communities* clean environment (63%), the quality of local schools (59%), the level of crime (51%) and access to public transportation (50%).

Less than half give a positive evaluation to the availability of local recreational areas (44%), access to cultural and social activities (43%), the availability of employment opportunities (39%), the cost of housing (38%), traffic (36%) and local taxes (34%). If we focus on the other hand on negative ratings of 1 or 2, between a third and a fourth of all New Jerseyans give a negative rating to their community on these six characteristics.

Rating of Respondent's Community

Rank	Characteristic	Excellent				Poor		DK	Total
		5	4	3	2	1			
----	-----	---	---	---	---	---	---	-----	
		%	%	%	%	%	%		
1.	Shopping	41	28	19	6	6	*	100	
2.	Physical Appearance	35	34	21	6	3	1	100	
3.	Schools	32	27	22	7	5	7	100	
4.	Environment	32	31	24	7	6	*	100	
5.	Crime	29	22	25	11	11	2	100	
6.	Public Transportation	28	22	22	12	14	2	100	
7.	Recreational areas	21	23	28	13	12	3	100	
8.	Cost of housing	20	18	26	15	18	3	100	
9.	Cultural/social activities	19	24	30	14	11	2	100	
10.	Employment opportunities	18	21	30	14	11	6	100	
11.	Traffic	17	19	32	14	17	1	100	
12.	Taxes	15	19	30	15	16	2	100	

* indicates less than one-half of total percent Table

percentages based on total sample of 1801 interviews

When we compare community ratings given by residents in high and low growth areas we find some differences. Those living in high growth communities are less likely than those in lower growth areas to give an excellent rating to their community for its employment opportunities, access to cultural and social activities, to shopping and to public transportation, but they are more likely to give an excellent rating to their town or city's environment. On the remaining six community characteristics residents of high growth areas do not differ significantly from those in other parts of the state. This same relationship holds if we focus instead on the percent who give poor ratings of 1 to their community.

Percent Who *Give* Excellent Community Rating

<u>Community Characteristic</u>	<u>Rate of Growth</u>		
	<u>Low</u>	<u>Med</u>	<u>High</u>
	%	%	%
Crime Rate	29	28	27
Local Taxes	16	14	16
Schools	32	31	34
Traffic Congestion	17	18	18
Recreational Areas	20	22	22
Employment Opportunities	17	20	13
Cultural/Social Activities	21	19	13
Housing Costs	20	20	19
Access To Shopping	44	43	34
Environment	28	29	38
Public Transportation	35	24	15
Physical Appearance	35	33	33

There are two helpful ways of analyzing opinion on community characteristics: 1) the percent who say an issue is very important to them, and 2) the percent who say the issue is both important and who give their community a poor rating on the characteristic. In the first instance we are measuring the potential for a community to mobilize around an issue, in the second we are measuring the existence of a issue.

Previously we noted that the community characteristics most important to New Jerseyans are crime, environment, schools and physical appearance. We next noted that most New Jerseyans give their community a positive rating on each of these characteristics. In sum, we would expect these to be non-issues as a result of community satisfaction.

If on the other hand we focus on those issues that are both important to New Jerseyans and for which residents give a negative rating to their community, we can identify the current community concerns. This analysis shows that among those issues studied, the key concerns today are traffic (ranked number 1), affordable housing (ranked second) and local taxes. In other words, traffic is the characteristic that the largest percentage say is both very important in their evaluation of their community and is rated poorly in their community. Other less pressing concerns are access to recreational facilities and employment opportunities, the crime rate, access to public transportation and to cultural and social activities.

Issues of low immediate concern include the environment, quality of the schools, access to shopping and the physical appearance of the community. While both physical appearance of the community and the environment are very important to a majority, the large majority also give their communities a high rating for each, hence these do not represent current issues of concern.

In summary, the final column on the right side in the table on the following page shows the percent of New Jersey residents for whom each community characteristic is an issue of current concern; that is, it is important and rated poorly.

Community Characteristic	% Who Say Characteristic Very Important	% Who Give Character. Positive Rating	% Who Give Character. Neg Rating	% Who Say Very Important AND Give Neg Rating
	%	%	%	%
Traffic	45	36	31	39
Housing Costs	51	38	33	36
Taxes	53	34	31	32
Recreational areas	34	44	25	23
Employment	40	39	25	23
Crime	72	51	22	20
Transportation	35	50	26	19
Cultural/Social	31	43	25	17
Environment	67	86	5	13
Schools	61	76	8	10
Shopping	47	69	12	9
Appearance	58	69	9	8

Table percentages based on total sample of 1801 interviews

PERCEIVED IMPACT OF DEVELOPMENT ON COMMUNITY CHARACTERISTICS

Next we'd like to know how you think growth and development affect different aspects of community life. Do you think growth and development will have an important effect on; RESPONDENTS WERE READ THE LIST OF 12 COMMUNITY CHARACTERISTICS.

FOR EACH CHARACTERISTIC THAT THE RESPONDENT FELT WOULD BE AFFECTED BY DEVELOPMENT, THE RESPONDENT WAS ASKED WHETHER THE IMPACT WOULD BE POSITIVE OR NEGATIVE.

A substantial majority of New Jerseyans believe growth and development will have a major impact on their communities. Of the twelve community characteristics studied, a majority believes development will have an important impact on each characteristic. This includes substantial majorities who believe development will affect their communities' cost of housing (85%), traffic congestion (84%), tax rate (81%), crime rate (76%), environment (73%), physical appearance (72%) and employment opportunities (71%).

**Percent Who Believe Development Will Have An Impact
on Each Characteristic**

Housing	85%	Employment	71%
Traffic	84%	Schools	64%
Taxes	81%	Shopping	63%
Crime	76%	Transportation	58%
Environment	73%	Rec. Areas	53%
Appearance	72%	Cultural Activ	50%

When we compare responses to this question among residents of low, medium and high growth areas we find that those living in the higher growth communities are more likely to expect development to have an impact on their town or city than those in lower growth areas. For each of the twelve community characteristics studied, the percent who anticipate change as a result of development is higher among those in high growth areas than it is among those in low or medium growth areas. For example, 83% of the residents in high growth areas believe development will have an impact on the local crime rate, whereas 71% in low growth communities hold the same opinion.

Percent Who Think Development Will
Have An Impact On Their Community

<u>Community Characteristic</u>	<u>Rate of Growth</u>		
	<u>Low</u> %	<u>Med</u> %	<u>High</u> %
1. Crime Rate	71	77	83
2. Local Taxes	80	80	85
3. Schools	60	65	68
4. Traffic Congestion	79	87	91
5. Recreational Areas	50	53	60
6. Employment Opportunities	71	72	73
7. Cultural/Social Activities	47	53	55
8. Housing Costs	82	87	90
9. Access To Shopping	58	62	71
10. Environment	73	70	79
11. Public Transportation	54	56	66
12. Physical Appearance	72	70	76

Based on total sample of 1501 interviews

When probed further on the direction of the impact development would have on each characteristic, New Jerseyans anticipated a desirable impact in six areas, an adverse impact in four areas, and are divided on the final two areas.

On the positive side, most residents expect that increased development will bring increased employment opportunities (57%) and better access to shopping (56%). Less than half, but still a plurality, also believe that more development will mean better access to public transportation (49%), to cultural and social activities (42%), and to local, outdoor recreation (34%). Among those with children in the household, 42% think increased development will improve the quality of the local schools while 23% are concerned that the quality of schools will decline with increased development.

Desirable Impact

Development will	
- increase employment opportunities	57%
- decrease employment opportunities	13%
- have no impact	29%
- don't know	1%

Total	100%

Development will	
- increase access to shopping	56%
- decrease access to shopping	6%
- have no impact on shopping	37%
- don't know	1%

Total	100%

Development will	
- Increase access to public transportation	49%
- decrease access to public transportation	8%
- have no impact on public transportation	37%
- don't know	6%

Total	100%

Development will	
- increase access to cultural activities	42%
- decrease access to cultural activities	7%
- no impact on access to cult activities	50%
- don't know	1%

Total	100%

Development will	
- improve quality of schools	39%
- lower quality of schools	21%
- have no impact on schools	36%
- don't know	4%

Total	100%

Development will	
- increase availability of recreational areas	34%
- decrease availability of recreational areas	17%
- have no impact on recreational areas	47%
- don't know	2%

Total	100%

The largest percentage see a negative impact of development in the area of traffic congestion; 78% are concerned that increased development will lead to increased traffic congestion. The next most frequently mentioned problems associated with development are the expectation of an increase in the local tax rate (mentioned by 63%) and an increase in the local crime rate (mentioned by 59%). A plurality of just under half (49%) fear increased development will result in a less clean environment.

Adverse impact

Development will	
- increase traffic congestion	78%
- decrease traffic congestion	5%
- have no impact on traffic congestion	16%
- don't know	1%

Total	100%

Development will	
- increase the local tax rate	63%
- decrease the local tax rate	16%
- have no impact on the local tax rate	19%
- don't know	2%

Total	100%

Development will	
- increase the local crime rate	59%
- decrease the local crime rate	15%
- have no impact on the local crime rate	24%
- don't know	2%

Total	100%

Development will	
- result in a less clean environment	49%
- result in a more clean environment	22%
- have no impact on the environment	27%
- don't know	2%

Total	100%

There is no clear cut opinion on whether development will have a desirable or an adverse impact on the cost of housing or the physical appearance of communities. Although a majority of 77% indicate that development will increase the cost of housing in their community, we cannot conclude that this is necessarily a positive or negative impact.

On the other hand, when asked what impact they believe development will have on the physical appearance of their communities, almost equal numbers say that it will make them more attractive as say it will make their communities less attractive - 33% and 36% respectively.

Development will	
- increase the cost of housing	77%
- decrease the cost of housing	7%
- have no impact on the cost of housing	15%
- don't know	1%

Total	100%

Development will	
- make the community more attractive	33%
- make the community less attractive	36%
- make no impact on the attractiveness	28%
- don't know	3%

Total	100%

The analysis of responses to this question by growth rate shows that residents' of high growth communities differ from residents of low growth communities in a number of respects. They are more likely than those living in lower growth areas to believe that development will have an adverse impact in five areas: crime rate, local taxes, traffic congestion, environment, and physical appearance.' But at the same time, they are more likely than their counterparts in the rest of the state to believe that development will have a positive impact in four areas: access to recreational areas, to shopping, to cultural activities, and to public transportation. Those in high growth communities are also more likely than others to predict increased housing costs as a consequence of development.

Percent Who Believe Development Will
Have a Positive Impact

<u>Community Characteristic</u>	<u>Rate of Growth</u>		
	<u>Low</u> %	<u>Med</u> %	<u>High</u> %
Crime Rate	17	16	8
Local Taxes	19	13	15
Schools	38	40	41
Traffic Congestion	6	5	4
Recreational Areas	32	33	41
Employment Opportunities	57	58	57
Cultural/Social Activities	38	46	48
Housing Costs (increase)	73	78	84
Access To Shopping	51	56	66
Environment	24	20	19
Public Transportation	47	48	55
Physical Appearance	34	33	30

Percent Who Believe Development Will
Have a Negative Impact

<u>Community Characteristic</u>	<u>Rate of Growth</u>		
	<u>Low</u> %	<u>Med</u> %	<u>High</u> %
Crime Rate	53	57	71
Local Taxes	59	65	68
Schools	19	21	23
Traffic Congestion	72	81	87
Recreational Areas	15	19	19
Employment Opportunities	12	13	16
Cultural/Social Activities	7	7	7
Housing Costs (decrease)	8	7	4
Access To Shopping	7	6	5
Environment	46	49	57
Public Transportation	7	8	11
Physical Appearance	35	35	43

Based on total sample of 1801 interviews

IMPACT OF DEVELOPMENT AND IMPORTANCE OF COMMUNITY CHARACTERISTICS

When we consider New Jerseyans' opinions of the likely impact of development on their community in light of the importance of these characteristics to them, we can identify those issues most likely to play a role in the debate over development. For example, a majority of residents may feel development will have a negative impact on certain characteristics of their community, but if those characteristics are not important to them, they will be relatively unconcerned about this potential change. On the other hand, if they anticipate a negative impact on characteristics that are very important we can anticipate increased public opposition to growth and development.

When analyzed in this way the study provides evidence that a large number of New Jerseyans are going to be opposed to increased development in their community. The characteristics that most strongly determine residents' satisfaction with their community (crime, environment) are the very same issues on which most New Jerseyans fear development will have a negative impact. On the other hand for those community characteristics that are less important (cultural activities, recreational areas, public transportation, employment opportunities), a plurality foresees that development will have a desired impact.

In sum, the four most likely arguments against development are that it will lead to an increase in traffic congestion, an increase in the local crime rate, a less clean environment and increased local taxes. On the other hand, proponents of development are most likely to focus on increased employment opportunities, better schools and improved access to shopping. These are the three areas about which the largest percentage feel that the characteristic is both important to the quality of life in their community and is likely to improve with development. While the balance of state residents believe development will be beneficial for access to public transportation, to recreational areas and to cultural and social activities, these are not sufficiently important in residents' evaluations of their communities to become key issues in supporting development.

As previously discussed, it is unclear what role housing prices and physical appearance of the community will play in discussions of development. A large majority (77%) believe the cost of housing will increase as a result of growth and development, and the cost of housing is also very important to a majority of residents. But increased housing prices, while desirable to many, will be a disadvantage to those hoping to purchase their first home and to those concerned about the affordable housing issue. Similarly, while physical appearance of a community is the fourth most important characteristic in community satisfaction, the public is equally divided on the impact of development in this area; 33% believe their community would become more attractive with development and 36% believe it would become less attractive.

Impact of Development

	<u>Important and Positive Impact</u> %	<u>Important and Negative Impact</u> %
Traffic	2	36
Crime	11	43
Environment (1)	15	34
Environment (2)	7	65
Taxes	7	36
Employment	25	4
Schools	25	13
Shopping	24	10
Transportation	17	3
Recreation	13	6
Cultural Activities	14	2
Housing	18	2
Physical Appearance	20	20

Based on total sample of 1501 interviews

(1) Those who say the environment is very important in their rating of the community and who feel that development will have a positive or negative impact on the environment in their local community, in question* 10j and 15j.

(3) Those who say preservation of the state's natural areas such as the pine barrens is very important and that the state's natural areas are threatened a great deal or somewhat by increasing growth and development, in questions 17 and 18.

CONCERN FOR THE ENVIRONMENT

How important to you personally are the natural areas of New Jersey such as the shore, the pine barrens, and the hills in the northwestern part of the state. Are these places very important, somewhat important, not too important, or not at all important to you?

To what extent do you think the state's natural areas are threatened by increasing growth and development? A great deal, somewhat or not at all?

In a number of ways the survey results confirm that the environment is a key issue to New Jerseyans, and that it contributes to peoples* opinions of development. As previously shown, on a list of 12 community characteristics, a clean environment ranks second in importance, after rate of crime, in evaluating satisfaction with ones community. It is more important than schools, taxes, the cost of housing or traffic congestion.

A substantial majority (73%) also believe that development will have an impact on the environment, and among those in high growth areas 79% say growth will affect the local environment. Finally, the environment ranks fourth as the community characteristic that the largest number believe will be adversely affected by development. It is not surprising, then, to find that preservation of the state's natural areas is very important to a large majority (71%) of New Jersey residents, and that it is somewhat important to an additional 20%.

Consequently, it is important to take note of the importance of the fact that a majority (56%) believe the state's natural areas are threatened "a great deal" by increased growth and development, and that an additional 32% believe natural resources are threatened somewhat by development. In other words, we would expect the environment, both the state's natural areas and the local community environment, to be important issues in the debate over development.

Question	Total Sample	Reside In High Growth Area
	%	%
Environment important to community	86	90
Environment will be affected by devt	73	79
Envirn will be negatively affected by devt	49	57
Preservation of environment is important	91	94
Natural resources are threatened by devt	88	90
Number of interviews	(1503)	(363)

The analysis of opinion on the importance of preserving natural areas shows that residents of high growth areas are more likely than those living in low growth areas to say that preservation is very important to them: 77% vs. 68%. On the other hand, rate of growth is not related to opinion on the degree to which residents think natural areas are threatened by development.

Those who favor stricter control of development are more likely than those who would like to have less strict controls to both believe that preservation of the state's natural areas is very important (75% vs. 61%) and that natural areas are threatened by development (63% vs. 39%).

Importance of Preservation of Natural Areas

	Very Important	Somewhat Important	Not too Important	Not at all Important	DK	Total	# Int
	----- %	----- %	----- %	----- %	----- %	----- %	-----
Total	71	20	6	2	1	100	(1501)
Growth Rate							
Low	68	21	7	3	1	100	(623)
Medium	74	18	4	2	2	100	(430)
High	77	17	4	2	0	199	(363)
Government Control Should be							
More strict	75	18	4	2	1	100	(1134)
Less strict	61	25	10	2	2	100	(264)

Extent Natural Areas are Threatened by Development

	Great Deal	Somewhat	Not at all	DK	Total	# Int
	----- %	----- %	----- %	----- %	----- %	-----
Total	56	32	6	6	100	(1501)
Growth Rate						
Low	56	31	7	6	100	(623)
Medium	58	33	5	4	100	(430)
High	56	34	5	5	100	(363)
Government Control Should be						
More strict	63	29	5	3	100	(1139)
Less strict	39	48	8	5	100	(264)

Earlier in this report we identified the most salient issues in debates over development by identifying the proportion of residents who felt that each of twelve community characteristics was both very important and would be negatively affected by development. This analysis showed that environment is one of four community characteristics most likely to form the basis of anti-development sentiment. (The other three issues are traffic, crime and local taxes.)

A second way of measuring the importance of concern for the environment as an issue in discussions about development is to cross-tabulate responses to the two questions analyzed in this section. This analysis shows that there is a positive relationship between importance of natural areas and perception of the degree of threat that development poses to natural areas; the more important the areas are to the individual the more likely the individual is to believe that they are severely threatened by development. For example, among those who feel the natural areas are very important, 63% also believe that development is a great threat to the state's natural areas. By comparison, among those who feel the natural areas are only somewhat important, only 39% believe they are greatly threatened by development.

Are NJ Natural Areas Threatened By
Increasing Growth And Development?

<u>Threatened</u>	<u>Importance of Natural Areas in New Jersey</u>				
	<u>Total</u>	<u>Very Important</u>	<u>Somewhat Important</u>	<u>Not Important</u>	<u>Unsure And DK</u>
	<u>%</u>	<u>%</u>	<u>%</u>	<u>%</u>	<u>%</u>
A Great Deal	56	63	39	77	54
Somewhat	32	27	51	57	50
Not At All	6	4	8	44	57
Don't Know	6	6	3	22	39
* Interviews	(1501)	(1117)	(263)	(102)	(19)

PREFERRED LOCATION FOR DEVELOPMENT

Future development in New Jersey is likely to occur in suburban and in rural parts of the state as well as in the older cities. If you had the power to decide, would you like to see development occur more in the cities, more in suburban areas, or more in rural areas?

Some people feel that the cities are deteriorating and cannot be improved regardless of how much might be spent. Others think the cities can be revitalized. Do you think it is or is not possible to make a major improvement in the Quality of New Jersey's main cities?

Development is also occurring in corridors along many major highways in New Jersey. How do you feel about the concentration of growth and development in these corridors? Do you think it is a good thing or a bad thing?

In general, New Jerseyans are most supportive of development in the more urbanized areas of the state and least supportive of development in rural areas. When asked where they would like future development to be concentrated, the largest percentage mentioned cities, the second largest number selected suburban areas and the smallest number chose rural areas.

It should be noted that residents of urban areas are particularly supportive of concentrated development in the cities. Among those who live in an urban area, 55% would like to see development occur mostly in the cities; among those who live in rural areas only 44% share this opinion.

Future Growth Should Be in:

	<u>Cities</u> %	<u>Suburbs</u> %	<u>Rural</u> %	<u>DK</u> %	<u>Total</u> %	<u>#Int</u>
Total	52	23	19	6	100	(1501)
Residence						
Urban	55	21	18	6	100	(401)
Suburban	52	24	18	6	100	(629)
Rural	44	27	22	7	100	(471)

Not only would a majority like to see development concentrated in urban areas, but an overwhelming majority are optimistic that the state's major cities can be revitalized; 87% say it is possible to revitalize the cities and only 7% say it is not possible to revitalize urban centers. Virtually all of those who would like to see development concentrated in urban areas believe the cities can be revitalized - 93%.

Possible to Revitalize Cities?

	<u>%</u>	<u>%</u>	<u>%</u>	<u>Total</u> <u>%</u>	<u>* Int</u>
Total	87	7	6	100	(1501)
Future Growth Should be in:					
Cities	93	4	3	100	(790)
Suburbs	83	11	6	100	(332)
Rural	78	11	11	100	(285)

Finally, a majority (54%) also believe that concentrating development along New Jersey's major highways is a good thing. This response may seem inconsistent with that given to the preceding question regarding concentration of development in urban areas. We believe, however, that they are consistent, and suggest that this is a positive acknowledgement of the abstract concept of corridor development as a concentrated development and an alternative to sprawl that is unrelated to transportation arteries.

Growth Along Corridors

	<u>Good</u> <u>%</u>	<u>Bad</u> <u>%</u>	<u>Neither</u> <u>%</u>	<u>DK</u> <u>%</u>	<u>Total</u> <u>%</u>	<u># Int</u>
Total	54	28	9	9	100	(1501)

AWARENESS OF THE LEVEL OF GOVERNMENT IN CONTROL OF DEVELOPMENT

Which level of government do you think is currently most responsible for managing growth and development in New Jersey? The governments of individual towns or cities, county governments, or state government?

New Jerseyans are not well informed about the level of government that is responsible for regulating growth and development. When asked which level of government is responsible for managing growth in the state, only 28% responded that control rests primarily with the individual towns and cities. Among the remainder, 24% said the county governments and 36% said state government is primarily responsible.

	<u>Who Is Responsible</u>
Towns/Cities	28
County	24
State	36
DK	12
Total	100
* Int	(1501)

OPINION OF THE LEVEL OF GOVERNMENT THAT SHOULD CONTROL DEVELOPMENT

Some people feel that growth and development should be controlled at the local level because towns and cities ought to have the right to encourage or discourage growth and development within their borders; other people feel that because growth and development in one community often has an effect on neighboring communities, growth and development ought to be controlled at the regional level. Which view comes closer to your own?

Which level of government can do the best job of planning for and managing future growth and development in New Jersey? Local town or city government, county government or state government?

Somewhat surprising is the survey finding that a large percentage of New Jersey residents (40%) favor a regional approach to planning. While this is less than the 52% who prefer to give the local towns and cities primary control over development, it nonetheless shows that a substantial number of New Jerseyans appreciate the need for regional approaches to local issues.

It is also interesting to note that residents of high growth areas are more likely to favor local control than residents of low growth areas. Among those in the high growth communities, 57% think growth and development should be controlled at the local level; among those in low growth areas, 48% share this opinion.

Who Should Control Growth

	<u>Towns/ Cities</u>	<u>Regional Level</u>	<u>DK</u>	<u>TOTAL</u>	<u># Int</u>
	<u>%</u>	<u>%</u>	<u>%</u>	<u>%</u>	
Total	52	40	8	100	(1501)
Growth Rate					
Low	48	44	8	100	(623)
Medium	53	41	6	100	(430)
High	57	36	7	100	(363)

A second indication that New Jerseyans are not highly "home rule" oriented when it comes to regulating growth and development is found in responses to a subsequent question that asked whether residents felt local, county or state government could do the best job of planning for and managing future growth in the state. Almost as many selected the state (30%) and the county (23%) as selected their town or city (35%.) And if we combine those who selected the state and the county, many more chose non-local government than chose local government.

Again we find those in high growth communities to be somewhat more "home rule" oriented than those in lower growth communities. Among those in the high growth areas, 41% believe local government is best able to manage development; this compares with 33% in low growth communities who share this opinion.

Level of Government Best Able to Manage Development

	<u>Towns/ Cities</u>	<u>County</u>	<u>State</u>	<u>DK</u>	<u>Total</u>	<u># Int</u>
	%	%	%	%	%	
Total	35	23	30	12	100	(1501)
Growth Rate						
Low	33	21	33	13	100	(623)
Medium	34	24	31	11	100	(430)
High	41	25	23	11	100	(363)

While the survey results do not indicate any endorsement for home rule management of development, neither do they show a clear choice of county or state control as an alternative. The lack of a clear majority response in this regard parallels the uncertainty about the level of government currently most responsible for controlling growth.

Softness of opinion on the level of government that should control development is further demonstrated by the inconsistency in responses to these two questions. Among those who favor local control, 48% say the county or state would be most effective in managing development. On the other hand, among those who favor a regional approach to growth, 27% feel local towns and cities would be most effective in managing development.

Who Should Control Growth?

Level of Gov't Best suited to Manage Growth -----	<u>Who Should Control Growth?</u>	
	Local ----- %	Regional ----- %
Town	46	24
County	19	28
State	24	39
DK	11	9
	----	----
Total	100	100
* Interviews	(776)	(606)

OPINION ON THE AMOUNT OF GOVERNMENT REGULATION or DEVELOPMENT

How strict do you think the current controls and standards for growth and development are in New Jersey using a scale from one to five, where 1 is not very strict and 5 is extremely strict?

•How strict do you think the controls and standards for growth and development should be in New Jersey, using the same scale from one to five where 1 means not very strict and 5 means extremely strict?

New Jersey residents are not in agreement in their assessment of the stringency of current government controls over development in the state, but there is consensus that there should be stringent control of development.

When asked to rate on a scale of 1 to 5 how strict they believe current government control of development is, almost half (48%) gave a midpoint score of 3 or a "Don't Know" response. (A midpoint score on a scale is often viewed as a means of giving a don't know response.) Among those selecting a rating less than or higher than 3, slightly more said current controls are lax (30% gave a low rating of 1 or 2) than said they are strict (22% gave a high rating of 4 or 5.)

On the other hand, when asked to rate on the same scale how strict they feel government control of development should be, almost half (47%) said "extremely strict" (a rating of 5), and 75% gave a "strict" rating of four or five. Only 5% said they feel government control of development should be "Not Very Strict" (a rating of 1 or 2.)

	----- 100	----- 100
	(1501)	(1501)
Rating	Controls Are %	Controls Should Be %
5 - Very Strict	8	47
4	14	28
3	40	13
2 14	3	
1 - Not Strict 16	2 • -	

Those who currently reside in areas where the rate of growth is high are more likely to favor stricter controls on development than is the case among respondents from lower growth areas.

How Strict Should Government Control of
Development Be?

	Not Strict <i>n of 2></i>	Moderate _ £21	Strict *4 or &	DK	Total	» Int
Total	5	13	75	7	100	(1501)
Growth Rate						
Low	5	13	75	7	100	(623)
Medium	5	12	77	6	100	(430)
High	3	17	83	6	100	(363)

When we compare individuals* scores on the two ratings, we can construct a measure of satisfaction with the level of government control of development. Statistically we accomplish this by subtracting the rating for current level of government control from the rating for the desired level of government control.

$$\begin{aligned} & \text{Desired level of government control} - \text{Current} \\ & \text{level of government control} \cdot \text{Satisfaction with} \\ & \text{level of government control} \end{aligned}$$

The amount of difference between the two scores tells us the degree of dissatisfaction with current levels of control; the higher the number the greater the level of dissatisfaction. The sign of the number (positive or negative) tells us whether people want more control (a positive number) or less control (a negative number.) Scores of zero indicate satisfaction with the current level of control.

Viewed this way, the study results show that only 18% of New Jerseyans are satisfied with the current level of government control of development (a score of 0), and 74% are dissatisfied with current levels of control (an integer score.) This dissatisfied group includes 6% who want less government control of development and 68% who want stricter government control of development. However, among those who support an increased government role, most want a moderate increase (53% with a score of +1 or +2), while less than half as many want a large increase (21% with a score of +3 or +4.)

Satisfaction With Government Control of Development	Total
Rating	%
+4	10
+3	9
+2	26
+1	23
0	18
-1	4
-2	1
-3	*
-4	1
Don't know	g
Total	200

Based on total sample* of 1501 interview!

While there are significant differences between some groups in the proportion who support stricter government control of growth, a majority of every group analyzed supports increased stringency: those in low and high growth areas; those satisfied and dissatisfied with their community; even those who feel development has made their town or city a better place to live.

In general, those who are less optimistic about the future of the state and their city or town, and those who feel development has hurt their community are more likely to support stricter government control of development than those who are more optimistic and those who feel development has a positive impact. For example, among residents who believe development has made their town or city a worse place to live, 78% favor stricter control (score of +1-44) compared with 63% among those who believe growth has had a positive impact on their community.

Stringency Score: Satisfaction With
Government Control of Development

	<u>0 or less</u>	<u>+1. +2</u>	<u>+3. +4</u>	<u>DK</u>	<u>Total</u>	<u># Int</u>
	%	%	%	%	%	
Total	24	48	18	10	100	(1501)
<u>Town Rating</u>						
Exc/Good	23	49	18	10	100	(1092)
Fair/Poor	24	46	20	10	100	(402)
<u>Effect of Dev't On Your Town</u>						
Positive	28	50	13	9	100	(560)
None	24	45	18	13	100	(540)
Negative	17	50	28	5	100	(341)
<u>Gov't Best Able To Manage Growth</u>						
Local	26	48	18	8	100	(532)
County	23	51	17	9	100	(369)
State	24	50	19	7	100	(433)
<u>Growth Rate</u>						
Low	22	49	18	11	100	(623)
Medium	24	49	19	18	100	(430)
High	25	47	17	11	100	(363)
<u>NJ In 10 Years</u>						
Better	26	49	15	10	100	(627)
Worse	21	45	29	5	100	(324)
<u>Town/City In 10 Years</u>						
Better	28	50	14	8	100	(502)
Worse	16	51	28	5	100	(300)

In conclusion, the study results viewed as a whole indicate the following:

- New Jerseyans tend to enjoy their communities and the state as a place to live and are generally optimistic about the future of the state;
- New Jerseyans see a number of positive and negative consequences of growth and development, but on balance tend to be positively predisposed toward development;
- The greatest concerns associated with development are increased traffic, increased crime rate, damage to the environment, and higher local taxes;
- The greatest benefits associated with development are increased employment opportunities, better schools and improved access to shopping;
- State residents favor increased development in urban areas over suburban or rural areas, and are optimistic about the ability to revitalize the states major cities;
- Residents of communities that have experienced high growth rates are more concerned about future development than those living in areas with a lower growth rate;
- New Jerseyans are not highly "home rule" oriented; 40% favor a regional approach to planning while 52% believe local towns and cities can best manage growth;
- The majority support stringent control of development, although there is no consensus on the level of government that should have primary responsibility.

Banner Definitions The following definitions apply to

banner points displayed in the tabular analysis

Rate of Growth

This is the percentage annual increase in households from 1980 projected through 1991 within zip codes.

Low. * Under 1% annual increase
Medium = 1% - 1.9% High = 2% or
more

Stringency of Control on State Growth and Development

This consists of two measures of the respondents' assessment of the stringency of development controls as rated on a 5 point scale where 1 is "not very strict" and 5 is "extremely strict". The first measure is for current controls and the second-is for the preferred strictness of control.

The stringency score is a composite of the two measures derived by subtracting each respondent's rating for current controls from the rating given regarding preferred controls. Thus, the higher the score the greater the difference between the assessment of the status quo and the preferred level of control. For example, a "1" or "not very strict" for current controls subtracted from a "5" or "extremely strict" as the desired level of control would result in a score of "4".

The columns marked "not strict" or "less strict" are based on ratings of 1,2, or 3 for the corresponding question. Those marked "very strict" or "more strict" are based on a rating of 4 or 5

Areas

Respondents have been categorized according to their residence zip code into nine areas of the state. These areas are defined primarily by counties or portions of counties as described below:

North Newark

Bergen

Hudson

Essex

Union

Passaic (Pompton Lakes and South)

Middlesex (North of the Raritan River)

Route 80

Morris

Passaic (North of Pompton Lakes)

Sussex

Warren (White, Oxford, and Mansfield and north)

Route 78

Warren (South of White, Oxford and Mansfield)

Hunterdon (except -the-Amwells and Lambertville)

Somerset (North of Hillsborough)

Central Route 1

Somerset (Hillsborough and South)

Hunterdon (Am wells and Lambertville)

Mercer

Middlesex (South of the Raritan River and west of South River and Old Bridge-)

Monmouth (Roosevelt and west)

Burlington (Bordentown area)

North Coast

Middlesex (Old Bridge, South River, South Amboy, Sayreville)

Monmouth (except Roosevelt and west)

Toms River

Ocean (except Tuckerton area)

Areas (cont'd)

South Camden Gloucester Burlington
(except Bordentown area)

Atlantic City

Atlantic

Ocean (Tuckerton area)

Cape May (Ocean City area)

Cape May

Cape May (except Ocean City area)

Cumberland

Salem

SAMPLING TOLERANCES

In interpreting survey results, it should be borne in mind that all sample surveys are subject to sampling error, that is, the extent to which the results may differ from what would be obtained if the whole population surveyed had been interviewed. The size of such sampling errors depends largely on the number of interviews conducted.

The following tables may be used in estimating the sampling error of any percentage in this report. The computed allowances have taken into account the effect of the sample design upon sampling error. They may be interpreted as indicating the range (plus or minus the figures shown) within which the results of repeated samplings in the same time period could be expected to vary, 95 percent of the time, assuming the same sampling procedure, the same interviewers, and the same questionnaire.

The first table shows how much allowance should be made for the sampling error of a percentage:

		<u>Recommended Allowance for Sampling Error</u> <u>of a Percentage</u>										
		In Percentage Points (at 95 in 100 confidence level)*										
		----- Sample Size -----										
		1500	1200	1000	750	650	550	500	400	300	250	100
Percentages near	10	2	2	2	3	3	3	3	3	4	4	7
Percentages near	20	2	3	3	3	4	4	4	5	5	6	9
Percentages near	30	3	3	3	4	4	4	5	5	6	7	11
Percentages near	40	3	3	4	4	4	5	5	6	6	7	11
Percentages near	50	3	3	4	4	4	5	5	6	7	7	11
Percentages near	60	3	3	4	4	4	5	5	6	6	7	11
Percentages near	70	3	3	3	4	4	4	5	5	6	7	11
Percentages near	80	2	3	3	3	4	4	4	5	5	6	9
Percentages near	90	2	2	2	3	3	3	3	3	4	4	7

* The chances are 95 in 100 that the sampling error is not larger than the figures shown.

The table would be used in the following manner: Let us say a reported percentage is 33 for a group which includes 1500 respondents. Then we go to row "percentages near 30" in the table and go across to the column headed "1500". The number at this point is 3, which means that the 33 percent obtained in the sample is subject to a sampling error of plus or minus 3 points. Another way of saying it is that very probably (95 chances out of 100) the true figure would be somewhere between 30 and 36, with the most Likely figure the 33 obtained.

In comparing survey results in two samples, such as, for example, men and women, the question arises as to how large a difference between them must be before one can be reasonably sure that it reflects a real difference existing in the population under study. In the tables below, the number of points which must be allowed for in such comparisons is indicated.

Two tables are provided. One is for percentages near 25 or 75; the other for percentages near 50. For percentages in between, the error to be allowed for is between those shown in the two tables:

Recommended Allowance for Sampling Error
Error of the Difference-Between-Two Samples

In Percentage Points.
(at 95 in 100 confidence level)*
TABLE A

	<u>Percentages near 25 or percentages near 75</u>					
Size of Sample	<u>750</u>	<u>650</u>	<u>550</u>	<u>400</u>	<u>300</u>	<u>100</u>
750	5					
650	5	6				
550	6	6	6			
400	6	6	7	7		
300	7	7	7	8	8	
100	11	11	11	11	11	14

* The chances are 95 in 100 that the sampling error is not larger than the figures shown.

Recommended Allowance for Sampling Error
of the Difference Between Two Samples

In Percentage Points (at 95 in
100 confidence level)*

TABLE B

	Percentages near 50					
Size of Sample	<u>750</u>	<u>650</u>	<u>550</u>	<u>400</u>	<u>300</u>	<u>100</u>
750 650	6					
550 400 300 100	6	6				
	6	7	7			
	7	7	8	8		
	8	8	8	9	9	
	12	12	12	13	13	16

Here is an example of how the tables would be used: Let us say that 50 percent of men respond a certain way and 40 percent of women respond that way also. for a difference of 10 percentage points between them. Can we say with any assurance that the 10-point difference reflects a real difference between men and women on the question? Let us consider a sample which contains approximately 750 men and 750 women.

Since the percentages are near 50, we consult Table B, and since the two samples are about 750 persons each, we look for the number in the column headed "750" which is also in the row designated "750". We find the number 6 here. This means that the allowance for error should be 6 points, and that in concluding that the percentage among men is somewhere between 4 and 16 points higher than the percentage among women we should be wrong only about 5 percent of the time. In other words, we can conclude with considerable confidence that a difference exists in the direction observed and that it amounts to at least 4 percentage points.

If, **in** another case, men's responses amount to 22 percent, say, and women's 24 percent, we consult Table A because these percentages are near 25. We look in the column headed "750" and see that the number is 5. Obviously, then, the two-point difference is inconclusive.

* The chances are 95 in 100 that the sampling error is not larger than the

New Jersey State Planning Commission

GO 86283
December 4, 1986

FINAL
QUESTIONNAIRE

4- 1[] Male 2[] Female

INTERVIEWER'S NAME

TIME STARTED: _____

STRATUM:
Urban 12- 1[]

INTERVIEWER'S I.D. 13-
14-

TIME ENDED: _____

Suburban 2[]

REP: _____ 15-

LENGTH: _____ 16-

Rural 3[]

FIPS CODE:

PAGE # _____ 18-
19-
20-

<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
7-	8-	9-	10-	11-

INTRODUCTION: Hello, I'm _____ calling from The Gallup Organization in Princeton. May I please talk to the youngest male 18 years of age or older who is at home? IF NO MALE, ASK: May I speak to the oldest female 18 years of age or older who is at home?

We are conducting a survey of New Jersey residents and would like to include your views.

- To begin with, how many years have you lived in New Jersey?
- How many years have you lived in your town or city?

	%	Q.1 NJ	%	Q.2 Town/City
Less than 1	1	1[]	6	1[]
1 or 2	3	2[]	9	2[]
3-4	2	3[]	6	3[]
5-9	5	4[]	12	4[]
10-19	14	5[]	22	5[]
20 or more	39	6[]	33	6[]
All of life	36	7[]	12	7[]
Don't know	*	y[]	*	y[]

3. How would you rate New Jersey as a place to live? Overall, would you say it is excellent, good, only fair, or poor?
4. How about your town or city, overall would you say it is excellent, good, only fair or poor as a place to live?

	<u>%</u>	<u>Q.3 NJ</u>	<u>%</u>	<u>Q.4 Town/City</u>
Excellent	28	1[]	24	1[]
Good	48	2[]	47	2[]
Only fair	19	3[]	23	3[]
Poor	4	4[]	6	4[]
Don't Know	1	y[]	--	y[]

5. Looking ahead to the next 5 to 10 years do you expect that New Jersey will become a more attractive place to live, a less attractive place to live, or don't you expect it to change very much?
6. How about your own town or city? In the next 5 to 10 years, will it become a more attractive place to live, a less attractive place to live, or don't you expect it to change very much?

	<u>%</u>	<u>Q.5 NJ</u>	<u>%</u>	<u>Q.6 Town/City</u>	
More attractive	42	1[]	34	1[]	} SKIP TO Q.8
Less attractive	22	2[]	20	2[]	
Not much change	31	3[]	41	3[]	
Don't Know	5	y[]	5	y[]	

CARD 1

IF MORE OR LESS ATTRACTIVE ('1 OR 2') IN Q.6, ASK Q.7, OTHERS GO TO Q.8

7. In what ways do you expect your town or city to become a more attractive/less attractive place to live?

y[]Don't know

ASK EVERYONE:

8. What are the things you like best about living in your community?

9. What are the things you like least about living in your community?

10. Now I am going to read you a list of things that can affect one's satisfaction with living in a community. Without referring to any particular community, please tell me how important each of these things is to you on a scale from 1 to 5, where 1 means not at all important and 5 means very important. First how about(READ LIST. START AT "X").

11. Next, using the same scale of 1 to 5, how would you rate your community on each of the previously mentioned characteristics? This time a 5 represents an excellent rating and a 1 represents a poor rating. First how would you rate.. (READ LIST. START AT "X")

		Q.10						Q.11						
		Not At All Important				Very Important	Don't know	Poor				Excellent	Don't know	
MEAN		1 %	2 %	3 %	4 %	5 %	y %	MEAN	1 %	2 %	3 %	4 %	5 %	y %
X 3.5	A. The amount of local crime	4	3	9	11	72	1	3.5 X	11	11	25	22	25	2
3.1	B. The local tax rates	4	5	18	17	53	3	3.0	16	15	30	19	18	5
4.3	C. The quality of local schools	5	3	12	15	61	4	3.8	5	7	22	27	32	7
3.9	D. The amount of traffic	6	6	23	20	45	*	3.0	17	14	32	19	17	1
3.7	E. Availability of local outdoor recreational areas	8	9	24	24	34	1	3.3	12	13	28	23	21	3
3.7	F. Availability of employment opportunities	10	9	19	19	40	3	3.2	11	14	30	21	18	6
3.7	G. Access to cultural and social activities	7	8	27	26	31	1	3.3	11	14	30	24	19	2
3.1	H. Cost of housing	5	4	15	23	51	2	3.1	18	15	26	18	20	3
4.1	I. Access to stores for day to day shopping	3	5	18	27	47	*	3.9	6	6	19	28	41	*

		Q.10					Q.11							
		Not At All Important				Very Important	Don't know	Poor					Ex-cel-lent	Don't know
MEAN		1 %	2 %	3 %	4 %	5 %	y %	MEAN	1 %	2 %	3 %	4 %	5 %	y %
4.5	J. Reasonably clean natural environment	3	2	9	19	67	*	3.8	6	7	24	31	32	*
3.6	K. Access to public transportation	11	12	20	20	35	2	3.4	14	12	22	22	22	2
4.1	L. The physical appearance of the community	2	2	12	26	58	*	3.9	3	6	21	34	35	1

12. Next we'd like to know how you think growth and development affect different aspects of community life. Do you think growth and development will have an important effect on: (READ X'ed ITEM. IF "YES", THEN ASK FOLLOW-UP QUESTION) Does growth and development have an important effect on: (READ NEXT ITEM. REPEAT FOR REST OF LIST.)

IF "YES", ASK:

X

A. The amount of local crime?

- 76 1[] Yes
- 77 2[] No
- 6 y[] Don't know

Will it increase or decrease the amount of local crime?

- 59 1[] Increase
- 16 2[] Decrease
- 2 y[] Don't know

B. The local tax rates?

- 81 1[] Yes
- 12 2[] No
- 6 y[] Don't know

Will it increase or decrease the local tax rate?

- 63 1[] Increase
- 16 2[] Decrease
- 2 y[] Don't know

67-74 = Blank
75-78 = RESP #
79-80 = '01'

C. The quality of local schools?

64 1[]Yes
 27 2[]No
 9 y[]Don't know

D. Traffic congestion?

84 1[]Yes
 15 2[]No
 1 y[]Don't know

E. Availability of local outdoor recreation?

53 1[]Yes
 39 2[]No
 8 y[]Don't know

F. Availability of employment opportunities?

71 1[]Yes
 22 2[]No
 7 y[]Don't know

G. Access to cultural and social activities?

50 1[]Yes
 43 2[]No
 7 y[]Don't know

IF "YES", ASK:

Will it result in higher quality schools or lower quality schools?

39 1[]Higher quality
 21 2[]Lower quality
 4 y[]Don't know

Will it result in increased or decreased traffic congestion?

78 1[]Increase
 5 2[]Decrease
 1 y[]Don't know

Will it increase or decrease the availability of local outdoor recreation?

34 1[]Increase
 17 2[]Decrease
 2 y[]Don't know

Will it increase or decrease the availability of employment opportunities?

57 1[]Increase
 13 2[]Decrease
 2 y[]Don't know

Will it increase or decrease access to cultural and social activities?

42 1[]Increase
 7 2[]Decrease
 1 y[]Don't know

IF "YES", ASK:

H. The cost of housing?

%
 85 1[]Yes
 11 2[]No
 4 y[]Don't know

Will it increase or decrease
the cost of housing?

%
 77 1[]Increase
 7 2[]Decrease
 1 y[]Don't know

I. Access to day-to-day shopping?

63 1[]Yes
 34 2[]No
 3 y[]Don't know

Will it increase or decrease
access to day-to-day shopping?

56 1[]Increase
 6 2[]Decrease
 1 y[]Don't know

J. The cleanliness of the
environment

73 1[]Yes
 23 2[]No
 4 y[]Don't know

Will it result in an environ-
ment that is more clean or less
clean?

22 1[]More clean
 49 2[]Less clean
 2 y[]Don't know

K. Access to public
transportation?

58 1[]Yes
 37 2[]No
 5 y[]Don't know

Will it increase or decrease
access to public transportation?

49 1[]Increase
 8 2[]Decrease
 1 y[]Don't know

L. The physical appearance of
the community?

72 1[]Yes
 24 2[]No
 4 y[]Don't know

Will it make the physical
appearance of the community
more attractive or less
attractive?

33 1[]More attractive
 36 2[]Less attractive
 3 y[]Don't know

CARD 2

13. What about the way in which development is taking place in your town or city? Is it happening in a way that makes your community a better place to live, a worse place to live, or doesn't it make a difference?
- $\frac{\%}{38}$ 1[] Better place to live
- 22 2[] Worse place to live
- 36 3[] No difference
- 4 y[] Don't know
14. Future development in New Jersey is likely to occur in suburban and in rural parts of the state as well as in the older cities. If you had the power to decide, would you like to see development occur more in the cities, more in suburban areas, or more in rural areas?
- $\frac{\%}{52}$ 1[] Cities
- 23 2[] Suburban areas
- 19 3[] Rural areas
- 6 y[] Don't know
15. Some people feel that the cities are deteriorating and cannot be improved regardless of how much might be spent. Others think the cities can be revitalized. Do you think it is or is not possible to make a major improvement in the quality of New Jersey's main cities?
- $\frac{\%}{86}$ 1[] Is
- 7 2[] Is not
- 4 3[] Maybe/Depends (VOLUNTEERED)
- 3 y[] Don't know
16. Development is also occurring in corridors along many major highways in New Jersey. How do you feel about the concentration of growth and development in these corridors? Do you think it is a good thing or a bad thing?
- $\frac{\%}{54}$ 1[] A good thing
- 28 2[] A bad thing
- 9 3[] Neither good nor bad (VOLUNTEERED)
- 3 4[] Haven't thought about it (VOLUNTEERED)
- 6 y[] Don't know

17. How important to you personally are the natural areas of New Jersey such as the shore, the pine barrens, and the hills in the northwestern part of the state. Are these places very important, somewhat important, not too important, or not at all important to you?

- $\frac{\%}{71}$ 1[] Very important
 20 2[] Somewhat important
 6 3[] Not too important
 2 4[] Not at all important
 * 5[] Some important, others not important (VOLUNTEERED)
 1 y[] Don't know

18. To what extent do you think the state's natural areas are threatened by increasing growth and development?

- $\frac{\%}{56}$ 1[] A great deal
 32 2[] Somewhat
 6 3[] Not at all
 6 y[] Don't know

19. How strict do you think the current controls and standards for growth and development are in New Jersey using a scale from one to five, where 1 is not very strict and 5 is extremely strict?

<u>Not Very</u> <u>Strict</u>		<u>Extremely</u> <u>Strict</u>		<u>Don't</u> <u>Know</u>		<u>MEAN</u>						
1[]	16	2[]	14	3[]	40	4[]	14	5[]	8	[]	8	2.5

20. How strict do you think the controls and standards for growth and development should be in New Jersey, using the same scale from one to five where 1 means not very strict and 5 means extremely strict?

<u>Not Very</u> <u>Strict</u>		<u>Extremely</u> <u>Strict</u>		<u>Don't</u> <u>Know</u>		<u>MEAN</u>						
1[]	2	2[]	3	3[]	13	4[]	28	5[]	47	[]	7	4.2

21. Some people feel that growth and development should be controlled at the local level because towns and cities ought to have the right to encourage or discourage growth and development within their borders;

Other people feel that because growth and development in one community often has an effect on neighboring communities, growth and development ought to be controlled at the regional level. Which view comes closer to your own? (READ)

- $\frac{\%}{52}$ 1[] Towns and cities should have control of growth and development, or
 40 2[] Control of growth and development should be at the regional level
 8 y[] Don't know

22. Which level of government do you think is currently most responsible for managing growth and development in New Jersey? (READ. PROBE: JUST YOUR BEST GUESS, IF NECESSARY)

- $\frac{\%}{28}$ 1[] The governments of individual towns or cities
 24 2[] County governments
 36 3[] State government
 3 4[] Depends (VOLUNTEERED)
 9 y[] Don't know

23. Which level of government can do the best job of planning for and managing future growth and development in New Jersey? (READ)

- $\frac{\%}{35}$ 1[] Local town or city government
 23 2[] County government
 30 3[] State government
 5 4[] Depends (VOLUNTEERED)
 7 y[] Don't know

Now just a few questions for statistical purposes only.

24. Do you own or rent your own apartment or house?

- 1[] Own
 2[] Rent
 3[] Live rent free with parents/relatives
 y[] Not determined

25. Are you now employed full-time, part-time or are you presently unemployed?

1[] Full-time

2[] Part-time

3[] Unemployed

y[] Don't know (DO NOT READ)

} SKIP TO Q.29

26. Approximately how many miles do you live from your place of employment?

miles: _____

yy y[] Don't know (DO NOT READ)

27. When you travel to work, do you usually travel by car, by bus, by train, or do you travel to work in some other way? (ALLOW MORE THAN ONE RESPONSE)

1[] Car

2[] Bus

3[] Train

4[] Other

y[] Don't know (DO NOT READ)

28. How long does it usually take to get to work?

minutes: _____

yy y[] Don't know (DO NOT READ)

29. Are there any children under 18 years of age now living in this household?

1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 x[] None

30. What was the last grade or class you completed in school?

- 1[] None, or grades 1-4
- 2[] Grades 5, 6, 7
- 3[] Grade 8
- 4[] High school, incomplete
- 5[] High school graduate, grade 12
- 6[] Technical, trade or business
- 7[] College, University, Incomplete
- 8[] College, University, complete

31. Is your annual household income before taxes:

- 1[] Under \$10,000 (under \$192 per week)
- 2[] \$10,000 to \$14,999 (\$192 to \$228 per week)
- 3[] \$15,000 to \$19,999 (\$289 to \$348 per week)
- 4[] \$20,000 to \$24,999 (\$385 to \$480 per week)
- 5[] \$25,000 to \$29,999 (\$481 to \$576 per week)
- 6[] \$30,000 to \$34,999 (\$577 to \$673 per week)
- 7[] \$35,000 to \$39,999 (\$674 to \$769 per week)
- 8[] \$40,000 and over (\$770 and over)
- 9[] Refused
- y[] Don't know/No answer

32. And what is your age?

<u>First Digit</u>	<u>Second Digit</u>
1	1
2	2
3	3
4	4
5	5
6	6
7	7
8	8
9	9
	0

Ages exceeding 99 are coded "99"

33. What is your race?

1[] White

2[] Black

x[] Other

34. Are you, yourself, of Hispanic origin or descent, such as Puerto Rican, Cuban, Mexican or other Spanish background?

1[] Yes

2[] No

y[] Don't know (DO NOT READ)

35. May I please have your zip code?

--	--	--	--	--

36. So that my office could check my work if it wanted, may I have your name?

37. Verify and record telephone number

--	--	--

--	--	--

--	--	--	--

END OF INTERVIEW. THANK RESPONDENT.

I HEREBY ATTEST THAT THIS IS A TRUE AND HONEST INTERVIEW.

(Respondent's Signature)

(Date)