

MAHONING COUNTY CITIZENS' ATTITUDES TOWARD DEVELOPMENT:
AN AID TO DECISION-MAKING AND PLANNING

Prepared for
The Mahoning County Planning Commission

Prepared by
The Center for Urban Studies
Youngstown State University
Youngstown, Ohio 44555
(216) 742-3355

January 1987

MAHONING COUNTY PLANNING COMMISSION MEMBERS

Don P. Cook, Chairman

Robert J. Lidle, 1st Vice Chairman

Raymond A. Garea, 2nd Vice Chairman

Dominic A. Bitonte, D.D.S.

Ruth H. Mobley

Russell J. Saadey

Daniel J. O'Horo

Charles A. Corroto

Thomas J. Carney, County Commissioner

John A. Palermo, County Commissioner

Leonard G. Yurcho, County Commissioner

Ex Officio Members

Michael Fitas, County Engineer

Betty L. Sekula, Executive Secretary/Director

CENTER FOR URBAN STUDIES STAFF

Terry F. Buss, Director

George R. Garchar, Project Manager

Cynthia Cook Hall, Word Processing

LIST OF TABLES

- | | |
|----------|---|
| Table 1 | Length of Time Non-lifetime Residents Have Lived in Mahoning County |
| Table 2 | Importance of Selected Factors on Decision to Move to Mahoning County |
| Table 3 | Importance of Selected Factors on Decision to Move to Mahoning County By Age |
| Table 4 | Importance of Selected Factors on Decision to Move to Mahoning County By Education Level |
| Table 5 | Importance of Selected Factors on Decision to Move to Mahoning County Compared to Nation |
| Table 6 | Perceived Severity of Selected Community Problems in Mahoning County |
| Table 7 | Perceived Severity of Selected Community Problems in Mahoning County and Nation |
| Table 8 | Rating of Selected Public Services in Mahoning County |
| Table 9 | Ratings of Selected Public Services in Mahoning County and Nation |
| Table 10 | Number and Percentage of Mahoning County Residents Who Do Most of Their Non-Food Shopping at Selected Locations |
| Table 11 | Importance of Selected Factors on Decision of Where to Shop |
| Table 12 | Extent to Which Selected Types of Development Would be Welcome in Respondents' Community and Neighborhood |

INTRODUCTION

In the summer of 1986, the Center for Urban Studies at Youngstown State University conducted an attitudinal survey for the Mahoning County Planning Commission. Approximately 2500 telephone interviews were completed within the jurisdiction of the Planning Commission-Poland Village, Sebring, Beloit, and all unincorporated areas of Mahoning County. In addition, approximately 200 surveys were conducted within the City of Youngstown.

The purpose of the survey was to gather a wide range of information which could be used to help make planning and development decisions. The survey covered topics such as choice of residence, preferences concerning shopping and recreation, satisfaction with public services, attitudes about development, and perceptions concerning community problems.

The survey was designed to provide useable information at the census tract level. Such information is often preferable to county wide data when a decision concerning a specific area has to be made. Some questions were derived from local (EDATA, 1977) and national (HUD, 1978) surveys conducted at an earlier date; this allows for temporal and geographic comparison of results. The data from Youngstown allows for direct comparison between the City and County.

It should be noted that the data derived from the Youngstown surveys were not incorporated into the overall results but used strictly for comparative purposes. Unless otherwise stated, data

presented in this report represents the results of the telephone interviews completed within the jurisdiction of the Planning Commission. It should also be noted that, to optimize comparability, national data utilized in this report were based on jurisdictions within Standard Metropolitan Statistical Areas, but outside the central city.

The information developed from this survey is expected to be of use in two ways. It can be used directly by the Planning Commission as an aid to decision making and planning. As such, the results of the survey represent a comprehensive base of citizen input. The Planning Commission can also make results available to other community leaders, private developers, and interested citizens in need of such information.

This report constitutes a general summary of the overall survey results and should be thought of as a preliminary product of this research effort. Information at the census tract level will be made available through the Mahoning County Planning Commission Office. Also, the Center for Urban Studies will work with the Planning Commission to develop policy recommendations based on the research findings.

MAJOR FINDINGS

The population of Mahoning County is expected to continue its decline throughout this decade and into the next. Recent population loss, and the anticipated future drop, is due more to lack of immigration than to massive outmigration. Mahoning County's level of outmigration is similar to other more stable regions, such as Akron and Canton, which have a less negative immigrant to outmigrant ratio. Of special concern is the net loss of educated young people who, in many ways, represent the future of the Valley.

If Mahoning County is to stabilize its population, it must be able to attract people from outside the region to offset inevitable losses through outmigration. Accomplishing this necessitates an understanding of what people feel is important in a region.

Job and housing related factors have the greatest influence in most people's locational decisions concerning place of residence. Characteristics of neighborhoods such as perceived safety and neatness, and availability of good schools are also important factors. These latter factors, however, probably have more influence over choice of neighborhood within an area than over choice of the area itself.

In general, most Mahoning County residents are satisfied with their quality of life. Among potential community problems, only unemployment is thought to be severe by a substantial proportion. Potential problems such as crime, lack of medical care, and

inadequate housing are not believed to be severe. Among public services, only road and street maintenance was rated as unsatisfactory by as much as one-third of the population, and this service does not typically receive high marks anywhere in the nation. Other services such as police protection, fire protection, and schools were rated satisfactorily.

Mahoning County has progressively become more suburbanized, and will probably continue to do so. Few residents outside Youngstown expressed a desire to live in the city. Very few people anywhere in the county do much shopping downtown.

One thing that could limit certain types of development in the suburbs is negative citizen reaction. Heavy industry, subsidized housing, and to a lesser degree, large scale retail development is unwelcome.

MIGRATION PATTERNS AND TRENDS

Most people move to Mahoning County for job related reasons. In planning for community development, it is helpful to know what attracted people to an area. Factors important enough to influence choice of residence should be given strong consideration both when planning for current residents and when attempting to attract people to the community.

In many cases, individuals do not move to a community; instead, they are born in a community and remain there. Nearly two-thirds of those surveyed were lifelong residents of Mahoning County. Of those who were not lifelong residents, the majority had lived here more than fifteen years (see Table 1). Thus, the county has a strong core population that is apparently committed to the area.

Most people who had not lived in Mahoning County all their life reported that they moved here for reasons related to work. Over 68 percent of the respondents rated convenience to work as either very important or important. Another 56 percent indicated that a job change played an important role in their decision to move here. Other reasons rated as either important or very important to choice of residence by a majority of respondents included: affordable housing, housing of desired quality, safe neighborhood, good schools, and a well kept neighborhood. The least important reasons, those which less than one-third rated as either very important or important included: recreation, good

mass transit, and ethnic background of residents (see Table 2). It should be noted that with the exception of job related factors and to a lesser degree housing related factors, the above reasons probably affect the selection of a neighborhood within a given community more strongly than the decision to move to the community itself.

The young attached stronger importance to most of the housing and neighborhood related factors than did older individuals. Housing quality, a safe and well kept neighborhood, and good schools were all rated as significantly more important to young people's choice of residence (see Table 3). Some factors--quality of housing, good schools, convenience to work, and job change--were rated as more important by those with a relatively high level of education (see Table 4).

Some significant differences exist between local residents and others across the country in the importance they place on various reasons for moving to an area. It is ironic that one of Mahoning County's most positive attributes--inexpensive quality housing--was rated as substantially less important locally than nationally, while reasons related to work--a commodity in short supply locally--were rated much higher in importance locally than nationally (see Table 5). Perhaps this is a case where the importance of a resource is not fully appreciated until it is in short supply. Another possible explanation is that in a region where jobs are plentiful, people have the luxury of placing more importance on other attributes when choosing their place of residence.

Due mainly to limited immigration, the population of Mahoning County is expected to continue its decline into the near future. Only about 8 percent of the respondents planned to move in the next 12 months. Another 10 percent stated that they would definitely move (1%) or probably move (9%) in the next 2 or 3 years. However, over one-third of all those who had any plans to move planned to stay in the area. All told, then, about 11 percent of the respondents planned to leave the area within the next three years.

It is important to note that an outmigration percentage of 11 percent is not unusual for a community. Other communities in Ohio, such as Akron and Canton, have had higher rates of outmigration in the recent past than has the Youngstown area. This may reflect the strong family ties and ethnic tradition which exists in the local area or it may mean that the most mobile of the local population left long ago, leaving a relatively immobile population behind.

Lack of immigration rather than a massive outmigration is, therefore, at the heart of Mahoning County's expected population decline. While the number of immigrants nearly equals the number of outmigrants in Akron and Canton, outmigrants exceed immigrants nearly 2 to 1 in the Youngstown area (see Monroe). Census data reveals that only about 9 percent of the population living in Mahoning County in 1980 had moved there during the previous 5 years. This compares with more than 12 percent in Summit County (Akron) and Hamilton County (Cincinnati), and approximately 19

percent in Franklin County (Columbus). The presence of corporate headquarters, research and development facilities, and government activities in these latter cities are probably responsible for much of the immigration occurring there.

Highly educated young adults are leaving the area in greater proportions than are their less educated, older counterparts. A common concern among many older industrialized communities is the exodus of educated young adults. This phenomenon, sometimes referred to as the brain drain, is no stranger to Mahoning County. Between 1975 and 1980, nearly 20 percent of those aged 20-29 and more than 20 percent of those with a college education, left the Youngstown-Warren MSA. The number of people in these same population categories who moved into the area was about half the number who moved out. As was the case with the overall population, it is not that the number of outmigrants is extraordinarily high--the young and educated are normally mobile--but that the number of immigrants is comparatively low (Monroe).

The rate of outmigration from Mahoning County among the young and educated is not expected to slow in the near future. Over 24 percent of those aged 30 or under plan to leave the area within the next 2 or 3 years. This compares with about 13 percent of those aged 31 to 64 and just 6 percent of those 65 or over.

Approximately 20 percent of the college graduates plan to leave compared to only about 5 percent of those who had not finished high school. Over 34 percent of the college graduates

aged 30 or younger plan to leave within the next 3 years.

There are important implications in these findings for Mahoning County. The County can expect to continue to lose much of its educated young population. This is natural and inevitable. The question yet to be answered is whether the County will attract other young educated individuals to replace those who leave.*

Most of those who plan to leave Mahoning County do so for job related reasons. If people move to an area for job related reasons, it stands to reason that people leave an area for these same reasons. Such is the case in Mahoning County where the economic woes have been greatly publicized--in some cases, perhaps, exaggerated--both locally and nationally.

The actual and perceived sluggishness of the local economy has had an impact on residential plans of many Mahoning County residents. Of those likely to move out of the Youngstown-Warren area, nearly 60 percent planned to leave for job related reasons. Among the young, plans to leave for job related reasons were even more common.

* For a more detailed discussion of this issue see, Garchar, George R. "Breaking the Downward Spiral: The Local Brain Drain and Economic Development" (Youngstown: Center for Urban Studies, Youngstown State University, 1986, mimeographed).

COMMUNITY PROBLEMS AND PUBLIC SERVICES

With the exception of unemployment, most residents feel that Mahoning County does not have severe problems; very few people believe problems such as crime, lack of medical care or inadequate housing are severe. Previous research conducted by the Center for Urban Studies suggests that job related reasons and quality of life related reasons generally have the most impact on decisions to migrate (Garchar). In Mahoning County, job related reasons are accounting for the majority of decisions to move out of the area. On the other hand, except for the economy, most people are satisfied with the quality of life in the area. Out of 15 potential community problems presented to respondents, only unemployment was felt to be a severe one. Other problems--such as fear of crime, lack of good medical care, and inadequate housing--were rated as either a small problem or no problem at all by the vast majority of residents (see Table 6).

As might be expected, respondents in their prime working years saw unemployment as a more severe problem than did either the young or the elderly. More surprising was that individuals with an eighth grade education or less viewed unemployment as a less severe problem than did more highly educated respondents. This might be partly due to lower expectations among the less educated, but it is largely because most (73%) of those who never attended high school are elderly with less concern about employment problems.

Residents of Youngstown viewed their situation more negatively than did other Mahoning County residents, rating 13 of the 15 community problems as more severe. For example, 62 percent of the Youngstown residents viewed unemployment as a severe problem compared to 39 percent of the county residents; 29 percent compared to 10 percent saw crime as a severe problem. These figures illustrate the divergence in quality of life between inner city residents, on the one hand, and suburban and rural residents on the other.

Mahoning County residents generally perceived community problems to be less severe, than was the case nationally. Of the seven potential community problems, which were generally comparable to those included in the 1978 HUD study, only unemployment was felt to be more severe in Mahoning County. Lack of medical care, fear of crime, dirty streets and sidewalks, fires, pollution, drug addicts, and noise were all rated as less severe problems here compared to the Nation (see Table 7).*

* Although the national data is felt to be generally comparable to that for Mahoning County, it is important to recognize that the two surveys were conducted at different times and used slightly different wording in some cases.

Like people nationwide, Mahoning County residents want better road and street maintenance; but they rate other public services such as schools and safety forces satisfactorily. One of the public sector's major roles, in providing for the quality of life and in setting the stage for economic development, is to provide necessary services not usually provided by the private sector. For the most part, county residents rate the public services which are provided to them -- including police, fire protection, and schools -- satisfactorily. One exception to this is road and street maintenance which was rated as excellent by only 8 percent and good by just 36 percent of those responding.* Parks and playgrounds, and public health services, were rated substantially higher than roads but lower than most other services (see Table 8).

In most cases, Youngstown residents rated their public services less positively than did County residents. Only 6 percent of those from Youngstown, compared to 25 percent of those from elsewhere in the County rated police protection as excellent. An even larger difference was evident in the ratings of public schools, 7 percent to 36 percent. These findings again point out how quality of life differs by location of residence within the region.

* The State, as well as the County, townships, and municipalities maintain various roads in or near the study area. The survey did not distinguish among these maintenance responsibilities.

Mahoning County residents' ratings of their public services generally parallel those of people across the country. For instance, citizens nationwide do not appear satisfied with road and street maintenance; only 9 percent rated it as excellent and 44 percent as good. These ratings are only slightly better than those received by Mahoning County. Ratings for police protection, garbage collection, public schools, parks and playgrounds, and public health services were slightly better in Mahoning County than nationwide. Street lighting and public transit are difficult to compare because of the large percentage of people who do not receive these services, especially in Mahoning County (see Table 9).

SUBURBANIZATION, SHOPPING BEHAVIOR, AND NEW DEVELOPMENT

The suburbs continue to be the focus of Mahoning County residents. During the 1950's and 60's, a strong trend towards suburbanization was evident both locally and nationally. In Mahoning County, for example, the population in Boardman and Austintown more than doubled between 1950 and 1970. Many factors contributed to this trend: increased accessibility allowed by the interstate highway system; the availability of large tracts of relatively inexpensive land; the desire to escape the negative qualities associated with the city such as noise, pollution, and congestion; and the perception that better services were to be had for less tax dollars in the suburbs. These and other factors contributed to a kind of suburban spiral with businesses and consumers, employers and employees, successively following each

other to the suburbs, leaving behind a greater concentration of the poor, elderly, and minority population.

In the 1970's, some planners and urban scholars began to envision a strong "back-to-the-city-movement," partly brought about by shrinking supplies and soaring costs of oil. An inner city revitalization was envisioned where the white middle class would return to the cosmopolitan atmosphere and convenience of the downtown. This movement did not materialize to the degree some expected (Baldassare p.10). In some communities, such as the greater Youngstown area, it did not materialize at all. This is evident in both residential and retail patterns.

There are many probable reasons for the continued focus on the suburbs. Several reasons, which are documented in the Mahoning County survey, are discussed below.

A change in the energy situation is one possible reason development has continued to spread outward rather than turn inward. The EDATA survey revealed that, in the mid-1970's, the energy shortage was still a fairly high priority, ranking ahead of problems such as lack of good medical care, lack of recreation for adults, and lack of transportation. In 1986, Mahoning County residents ranked the energy shortage last in importance among fifteen problems they responded to, including the three problems mentioned above.

Another possible reason is that, unlike many large cities, an individual may live in the suburbs of Youngstown and have a relatively short and quick commute to the city or to other work

locations. More than half of the county residents surveyed live within 15 minutes of their workplace. Less than 20 percent live more than 20 miles from work.

Finally, Mahoning County residents simply believe that the advantages of suburban living outnumber the disadvantages. Among the county residents surveyed, less than 6 percent stated that they would prefer to live in the city. The majority (51%) preferred the suburbs; the remainder preferred either a small town (18%), a rural area (23%), or had no preference (2%).

Youngstown residents were much more likely to prefer city living; half preferred this option while less than one-quarter preferred the suburbs.

The effects of suburbanization have all but eliminated downtown retailing. Before suburbanization took hold in the 1950's, Downtown Youngstown was the major retail center in Mahoning County. As late as 1977, the EDATA survey of Mahoning and Trumbull County residents revealed that approximately 16 percent did most of their non-food shopping in Downtown Youngstown. Today, Downtown Youngstown is simply not a factor on the local retail scene. When asked: For most of your shopping needs, other than for food, where do you usually shop?, just one-third of one percent of the respondents (8 of approximately 2500) mentioned downtown. This contrasts sharply with nearly 80 percent who mentioned a shopping location in either Boardman or Austintown. Nearly half of those surveyed mentioned the Southern Park Mall by name (see Table 10).

The shopping behavior of Youngstown residents did not differ substantially from that of other county residents. Only about 3 percent of the people in Youngstown did most of their non-food shopping downtown. However, an estimated 10 percent volunteered that they would like to shop downtown but that, in essence, this was no longer possible because of store closings, especially Strouss.

"Deals" are more important than "Frills" to the average consumer. The decline of downtown Youngstown as a retail center has been the topic of much discussion. While most planners and community leaders probably agree that downtown will never be the retail center it once was, there is still considerable hope that some shopping activity can be preserved.

Much of the planning activity concerning the downtown, to date, has focused on improving the appearance and environment. However, the survey indicates that if the average shopper is to be attracted downtown, aesthetics alone won't do it. Selection of goods, lower prices, parking, and convenient location are all more important to the typical consumer than is appearance (see Table 11).

Despite problems with the local economy, many people in Mahoning County do not welcome heavy industry. Given the relatively high rate of unemployment in the Mahoning Valley, one might expect that the creation of jobs is of paramount importance to residents. Apparently, however, if more jobs means heavy industry with its associated negative externalities such as noise

and pollution, many people are not willing to make the tradeoff. Only about half of those surveyed answered yes when asked if they would welcome heavy industry in their community; only 10 percent would welcome it in their neighborhood. Among the ten types of development mentioned, heavy industry was ranked 9th, only slightly higher than subsidized housing, in terms of how welcome it was in the community. It ranked last in desirability as an activity in the neighborhood (see Table 12).

All types of development were generally more acceptable to the young and middle-aged than to the elderly. For example, over 80 percent of those aged 30 or under welcomed apartments and light industry in their community compared to less than 70 percent of the elderly. The level of acceptance also varied with level of education. Those with higher levels of education tended to accept apartments, condominiums, and offices to a greater degree than those with less formal education. On the other hand, those with less education were more likely to welcome low income housing, large scale retail, and heavy industry.

BIBLIOGRAPHY

Baldassare, Mark. Trouble in Paradise: The Suburban Transformation in America. (New York: Columbia University Press, 1986).

Garchar, George R. "Breaking the Downward Spiral: The Local Brain Drain and Economic Development," (Youngstown: Center for Urban Studies, Youngstown State University, 1986, mimeographed).

Monroe, Charles B. "Akron, Canton, and Youngstown: Migration Patterns from 1975 to 1980," (unpublished report for Northeast Ohio Urban Institutional Grant Program, 1985).

Table 1 Length of Time Non-lifetime Residents Have Lived in Mahoning County

5 years or less	151	16.7%
6 to 10 years	112	12.4%
11 to 15 years	124	13.7%
16 to 20 years	115	12.7%
21 to 30 years	139	15.4%
More than 30 years	<u>264</u>	<u>29.1%</u>
	905	100.0

Table 2 Importance of Selected Factors on Decision to Move to Mahoning County

	<u>Very Important</u>	<u>Important</u>	<u>Not too Important</u>	<u>Didn't Affect Decision</u>
(1) Location was convenient to work	52.5%(347)	15.9%(105)	6.7%(44)	24.9%(164)
(2) Housing was in the range you could afford.	22.5%(148)	40.6%(266)	10.4%(69)	26.4%(174)
(3) Housing was of the quality, type or size you wanted.	20.0%(130)	43.3%(281)	9.6%(63)	27.0%(175)
(4) Wanted to be near relatives or friends.	24.7%(162)	21.8%(143)	12.8%(84)	40.8%(268)
(5) Looking for green open spaces.	10.3%(66)	27.6%(177)	16.0%(103)	46.1%(296)
(6) Looking for convenient shopping.	5.3%(34)	33.7%(216)	13.9%(89)	47.1%(302)
(7) Looking for recreation, entertainment, or cultural activities.	3.9%(25)	27.4%(177)	19.0%(123)	49.6%(321)
(8) Looking for a safe neighborhood.	29.6%(189)	36.8%(236)	7.6%(49)	26.1%(167)
(9) Looking for good schools.	29.0%(187)	29.8%(192)	9.3%(60)	31.9%(206)
(10) Looking for good mass transportation (i.e., buses, subways, trains).	2.0%(13)	16.8%(108)	16.6%(107)	64.7%(417)
(11) Taxes were reasonable here compared to other places you considered.	8.1%(52)	29.5%(189)	16.7%(107)	45.6%(293)
(12) Because of ethnic and racial backgrounds of the people who lived here.	2.9%(19)	18.0%(115)	18.4%(118)	60.7%(389)
(13) Neighborhood was well kept.	19.6%(124)	45.1%(285)	9.9%(62)	25.4%(161)
(14) Made a job change.	48.4%(316)	7.6%(49)	3.1%(20)	41.0%(268)

Table 3 Importance of Selected Factors on Decision to Move to Mahoning County By Age

	VERY IMPORTANT			IMPORANT			NOT TOO IMPORTANT			DIDN'T AFFECT DECISION		
	30 or UNDER	31-64	65 +	30 or UNDER	31-64	65 +	30 or UNDER	31-64	65 +	30 or UNDER	31-64	65 +
Location convenient to work	55.8	53.5	48.6	11.2	17.2	14.5	9.8	5.9	8.0	23.3	23.4	28.8
Housing within affordable range	28.5	24.5	15.6	47.9	40.0	39.5	8.4	8.8	15.1	15.2	26.7	29.8
Housing of desirable quality, type, and size	21.1	22.1	14.3	54.0	41.2	44.7	6.0	9.2	12.0	18.9	27.4	28.9
Looking for safe neighborhood	38.1	31.7	20.7	38.6	38.0	33.5	5.6	5.3	14.2	17.7	25.1	31.7
Looking for good schools	42.9	33.0	13.1	24.0	30.9	29.9	5.6	7.2	15.8	27.4	28.9	41.1
Well kept neighborhood	24.7	21.2	13.5	52.7	45.4	41.8	7.7	7.1	17.6	14.8	26.3	27.2
Made a job change	43.9	50.8	43.9	4.0	7.4	9.2	4.3	2.6	4.2	47.8	39.2	42.7

Table 4 Importance of Selected Factors on Decision to Move to Mahoning County By Education Level

	VERY IMPORTANT			IMPORTANT			NOT TOO IMPORTANT			DIDN'T AFFECT DECISION		
	NON HS GRAD	HS GRAD	COLLEGE	NON HS GRAD	HS GRAD	COLLEGE	NON HS GRAD	HS GRAD	COLLEGE	NON HS GRAD	HS GRAD	COLLEGE
Location convenient to work	46.7	49.0	58.2	13.4	19.1	13.4	8.2	7.2	5.3	31.7	24.3	23.1
Housing within affordable range	14.0	27.5	20.9	32.7	41.8	41.9	12.5	7.5	12.3	40.8	23.2	24.8
Housing of desirable quality, type, and size	14.3	21.2	21.1	32.8	44.6	44.8	14.7	9.2	8.5	38.2	25.0	25.5
Looking for safe neighborhood	27.5	29.0	30.9	36.0	39.3	34.5	11.7	6.7	7.5	24.8	25.0	27.2
Looking for good schools	18.5	29.5	31.7	29.0	28.0	31.8	11.6	9.9	7.7	41.0	32.6	28.9
Well kept neighborhood	21.0	18.6	20.1	36.9	47.1	46.0	10.3	10.5	9.2	31.8	23.8	24.8
Made a job change	39.0	44.0	55.5	6.7	7.8	7.1	5.0	2.5	3.4	49.3	45.7	34.0

Table 5 Importance of Selected Factors on Decision to Move to Mahoning County Compared to Nation

	VERY IMPORTANT		IMPORTANT		NOT TOO IMPORTANT		DIDN'T AFFECT DECISION	
	MAHONING	NATIONAL	MAHONING	NATIONAL	MAHONING	NATIONAL	MAHONING	NATIONAL
Location was convenient to work	52.5%	29.5%	15.9%	22.8%	6.7%	14.6%	24.9%	39.2%
Housing was in the range you could afford	22.5%	40.1%	40.6%	38.2%	10.4%	8.4%	26.4%	13.2%
Housing was of the quality, type or size you wanted	20.0%	34.3%	43.3%	41.6%	9.6%	9.6%	27.0%	14.3%
Looking for a safe neighborhood	29.6%	33.8%	36.8%	40.8%	7.6%	7.3%	26.1%	17.7%
Looking for good schools	29.0%	32.0%	29.8%	25.9%	9.3%	9.4%	31.9%	32.0%
Neighborhood was well kept	19.6%	22.1%	45.1%	48.7%	9.9%	10.0%	25.4%	18.8%
Made a job change	48.4%	16.6%	7.6%	9.9%	3.1%	8.1%	41.0%	64.1%

Table 6 Perceived Severity of Selected Community Problems in Mahoning County

	Severe Problem	Small Problem	No Problem	No Answer
fear of crime	10.1%(259)	54.7%(1394)	34.1%(869)	1.1%(29)
lack of good medical care	3.8%(96)	21.2%(541)	73.7%(1879)	1.3%(35)
inadequate housing for all persons	4.8%(122)	18.7%(477)	72.3%(1844)	4.2%(108)
dirty streets and side- walks	3.4%(88)	15.6%(397)	79.6%(2031)	1.3%(35)
lack of garbage collec- tion	2.5%(64)	6.7%(171)	89.3%(2278)	1.4%(37)
unemployment	39.0%(994)	30.4%(775)	25.4%(647)	5.3%(135)
lack of recreation for adults	11.3%(289)	26.6%(678)	58.6%(1495)	3.5%(88)
fires in the neighbor- hood	1.3%(33)	13.1%(333)	83.9%(2140)	1.8%(45)
low pay, not enough to live on	20.2%(515)	23.4%(596)	51.8%(1323)	4.6%(117)
lack of transportation	13.2%(338)	19.8%(506)	64.5%(1646)	2.4%(62)
dirty air and water	5.1%(130)	16.3%(416)	76.8%(1959)	1.8%(46)
shortage of fuels	0.5%(14)	9.5%(241)	88.4%(2256)	1.6%(40)
drug addicts in the neighborhood	4.5%(114)	17.2%(439)	73.6%(1878)	4.7%(119)
noise in the neighbor- hood	4.0%(101)	22.0%(562)	72.7%(1855)	1.3%(32)
cheating or overcharg- ing by stores	5.2%(133)	16.9%(432)	75.5%(1925)	2.4%(60)

Table 7 Perceived Severity of Selected Community Problems in Mahoning County and Nation*

	Severe		Small		Not a Problem		Not Sure	
	Mahoning	National	Mahoning	National	Mahoning	National	Mahoning	National
(Fear of) Crime	10.1	20.3	54.7	55.8	34.1	21.4	1.1	2.6
Lack of (Good) Medical Care	3.8	12.3	21.2	27.4	73.7	55.0	1.3	5.3
Dirty Streets and Sidewalks	3.4	8.2	15.6	27.8	79.6	62.8	1.3	1.2
Unemployment	39.0	18.7	30.4	30.1	25.4	33.0	5.3	18.1
Fires (in Neighborhood)	1.3	4.0	13.1	20.4	83.9	69.9	1.8	5.6
Air Pollution (Dirty Air and Water)	5.1	13.6	16.3	26.0	76.8	58.1	1.8	2.3
Noise (in Neighborhood)	4.0	8.7	22.0	27.2	72.7	63.2	1.3	1.0

* words in parentheses represent differences between Mahoning County survey and National survey

Table 8 Rating of Selected Public Services in Mahoning County

	<u>Excellent</u>	<u>Good</u>	<u>Fair</u>	<u>Poor</u>	<u>Not Provided</u>	<u>No Answer</u>
(1) Police protection	25.3(646)	52.4(1337)	15.7(402)	3.8(98)	0.6(16)	2.1(53)
(2) Garbage collection	28.9(737)	58.7(1498)	6.1(154)	1.1(28)	3.6(91)	1.6(41)
(3) Street lighting	8.8(225)	27.7(706)	11.4(292)	6.7(170)	44.8(1143)	0.6(15)
(4) Fire protection	28.0(714)	60.9(1554)	6.7(172)	1.0(27)	0.2(5)	3.1(79)
(5) Public schools	35.6(909)	46.9(1196)	6.6(169)	2.1(53)	0.2(4)	8.6(219)
(6) Parks and playgrounds	16.0(408)	42.4(1082)	16.7(427)	5.5(139)	10.1(259)	9.2(235)
(7) Roads and street maintenance	7.5(192)	36.2(923)	32.5(828)	22.5(573)	0.6(16)	0.7(18)
(8) Public transportation	1.7(44)	12.7(324)	11.6(297)	8.4(213)	52.2(1331)	13.4(341)
(9) Public health services in hospitals and clinics	16.3(415)	50.3(1283)	10.1(257)	2.7(68)	13.4(341)	7.3(187)

Table 9 Ratings of Selected Public Services in Mahoning County and Nation

	Police Protection		Garbage Collection		Street Lighting	
	Mahoning	National	Mahoning	National	Mahoning	National
Excellent	25.3	23.6	28.9	29.4	8.8	16.7
Good	52.4	48.3	58.7	48.6	27.7	45.5
Fair	15.7	17.1	6.1	9.1	11.4	17.2
Poor	3.8	6.7	1.1	4.6	6.7	9.4
Not Sure	2.1	3.0	1.6	1.1	0.6	.3
Not Provided	0.6	1.4	3.6	7.2	44.8	10.9

	Fire Protection		Public Schools		Parks & Playgrounds	
	Mahoning	National	Mahoning	National	Mahoning	National
Excellent	28.0	34.4	35.6	23.6	16.0	14.8
Good	60.9	49.5	46.9	43.2	42.4	37.8
Fair	6.7	7.4	6.6	13.5	16.7	20.3
Poor	1.0	2.8	2.1	8.1	5.5	10.4
Not Sure	3.1	5.0	8.6	10.7	9.2	6.4
Not Provided	0.2	.9	0.2	.8	10.1	10.4

	Road and Street Maintenance		Public Transportation		Public Health Service	
	Mahoning	National	Mahoning	National	Mahoning	National
Excellent	7.5	9.5	1.7	6.7	16.3	14.5
Good	36.2	43.8	12.7	22.3	50.3	40.1
Fair	32.5	25.5	11.6	14.2	10.1	13.9
Poor	22.5	19.7	8.4	18/3	2.7	8.1
Not Sure	0.7	.8	13.4	6.5	7.3	9.6
Not Provided	0.6	.7	52.2	33.0	13.4	13.8

Table 10 Number and Percentage of Mahoning County Residents Who Do Most of Their Non-Food Shopping at Selected Locations*

Southern Park Mall	1225	48.9%
Boardman Plaza	228	9.1%
Elsewhere in Boardman	111	4.4%
Austintown Plaza	249	9.9%
Elsewhere in Austintown	173	6.9%
Downtown Youngstown	8	0.3%

*If respondent mentioned more than one of the above locations, the table reflects each location mentioned. Because some respondents mentioned a multiple location store without giving a specific location (e.g. Sears, K-Mart), the above figures may be slightly higher in actuality.

Table 11 Importance of Selected Factors on Decision of Where to Shop

	<u>Very Important</u>	<u>Somewhat Important</u>	<u>Not at All Important</u>	<u>No Answer</u>
(A) convenient location	58.2%(1484)	30.6%(782)	8.2%(209)	3.0%(76)
(B) parking facilities	60.9%(1554)	26.9%(685)	9.3%(236)	3.0%(76)
(C) selection of goods	74.9%(1910)	19.5%(498)	2.5%(63)	3.2%(81)
(D) lower prices	62.4%(1591)	30.2%(770)	4.4%(111)	3.1%(79)
(E) class of people who shop there	10.8%(275)	28.5%(727)	57.5%(1467)	3.2%(81)
(F) adequate public transportation	7.7%(195)	12.9%(329)	74.6%(1902)	4.9%(125)
(G) variety of stores	43.3%(1104)	41.4%(1057)	11.5%(293)	3.8%(96)
(H) general overall appearance	39.6%(1011)	47.4%(1210)	9.3%(238)	3.6%(92)
(I) good entrances and exits onto streets	42.4%(1081)	37.7%(962)	15.7%(401)	4.2%(107)

Table 12 Extent to Which Selected Types of Development Would be Welcome in Respondents' Community and Neighborhood

	COMMUNITY			NEIGHBORHOOD		
	Yes	No	No Answer	Yes	No	No Answer
single family housing	91.3(2330)	6.8(175)	1.8(46)	79.7(2033)	18.0(459)	2.3(59)
apartments	71.0(1810)	27.1(690)	2.0(50)	44.1(1124)	53.5(1364)	2.4(62)
condominiums	69.1(1763)	28.4(725)	2.4(62)	43.8(1117)	53.1(1356)	3.1(78)
subsidized housing (low income)	47.5(1213)	49.1(1254)	3.3(84)	25.7(656)	70.2(1790)	4.1(104)
small scale retail	81.9(2089)	16.3(416)	1.8(46)	49.8(1272)	47.5(1211)	2.7(68)
large scale retail	65.8(1679)	32.1(818)	2.1(53)	24.6(628)	72.5(1848)	2.9(75)
offices	78.9(2014)	19.0(484)	2.1(53)	35.7(911)	61.2(1561)	3.1(79)
light industry	75.8(1933)	21.9(559)	2.3(58)	27.1(692)	70.1(1789)	2.8(70)
heavy industry	49.7(1268)	48.1(1226)	2.2(57)	9.5(242)	88.1(2247)	2.4(63)
institutional uses (e.g., hospitals, nursing homes)	80.8(2061)	15.2(387)	4.0(103)	40.9(1044)	54.1(1379)	5.0(128)