

H O U R G L A S S



F O U N D A T I O N

2002 Lancaster County
Quality of Life
Survey Results

*Conducted by
The Polk-Lepson Research Group
York, Pennsylvania*

October 2002

Hourglass Foundation
2002 Lancaster County Quality of Life Survey

Survey Findings

Background

As part of its mission to provide information, facilitate discussion and champion the intelligent management of county resources, the Hourglass Foundation has conducted its third bi-annual Lancaster County Quality of Life Survey. It is our hope to make local citizens, organizations and governments more aware, better informed and to help them make better decisions affecting our quality of life in Lancaster County.

The Sampling Process

With any sampling process, it is imperative that the sample collected represents the population under study. There is strong evidence to support that the sample utilized for the Quality of Life in Lancaster County 2002 Study is representative of Lancaster County's over 18 year-old populations. Defining factors include:

1. Sample size
2. Stratified quota
3. Data collection methodology

Sample Size

Understanding the importance of sample size in reducing sampling error, the Hourglass Foundation authorized that 1,200 households in Lancaster County be queried. The actual sample was 1,224 households. A sample of this large size yields a very small margin of error of +/- 2.8 percent at the 95 percent of confidence.

Stratified Quota

Besides a sufficient sample size, it is important to sample the right people. This is achieved by assigning specific sampling quotas. Based on the 2000 Census, quotas were set for gender and age. The actual sample collected corresponds to the quota. As might be expected, other demographic and geographic characteristics collected correspond to the 2000 Census.

Gender	Sample (1,224) 2002	2000 Census
Male	47.5%	47.8%
Female	52.4%	52.2%
Age 18 and Over		
18 to 24	12.5%	12.5%
25 to 34	17.1%	17.1%
35 to 44	21.4%	21.5%
45 to 54	17.8%	18.1%
55 to 64	11.4%	11.7%
65 and over	19.8%	19.1%

Data Collection Methodology

The research was conducted, tabulated and reported by Polk-Lepson Research Group of York, Pennsylvania. The surveys were performed on weekdays, weekday evenings and weekends to ensure the randomness of the sample. Where required, callbacks were made. Each survey was edited for accuracy and completeness of information.

Quality of Life Overview

Like best about Lancaster County	
Farmland/Countryside/Open spaces	45.3%
Nice place to live/Raise a family	20.8%
Like least about Lancaster County	
Traffic/Congestion/Road conditions	35.2%
Over development of housing and malls	28.8%
Crime	3.0%

Biggest threats to quality of life

Over development	42.0%
Drugs	14.4%
Crime	13.3%
Loss of Farmland	10.4%
Violence	10.0%
Traffic	8.9%
Sprawl	6.9%

Quality of life compared to 5 years ago

Better	17.0%
About the same	48.1%
Worse	31.2%

Safety living in Lancaster County

Very safe	50.0%
Somewhat safe	42.8%
Somewhat unsafe	4.6%
Not at all safe	1.7%

Elected officials doing enough

Yes	34.6%
No	42.3%
Unsure	23.0%

Media providing sufficient information

Yes	70.8%
No	18.7%
Unsure	10.5%

Farmland

Loss of Farmland	
A serious problem	75.4%
A minor problem	18.7%
Not a problem	3.0%

Stop or slow down loss of farmland

Yes	89.8%
No	9.2%

Paying landowners to keep land undeveloped

Very supportive	41.4%
Somewhat supportive	41.4%
Not supportive	10.3%
Unsure	6.9%

Traffic

Traffic congestion	
Serious problem	56.4%
Minor problem	36.8%
Not a problem	5.6%

Daily driving traffic	
Rarely a problem	14.5%
Occasionally a problem	39.8%
Frequently a problem	34.8%
Always a problem	9.9%

Time traveling to work	
10 minutes or less	38.2%
11-20 minutes	36.4%
21-30 minutes	13.5%
over 30 minutes	11.8%

Time traveling to work a problem	
Yes	12.3%
No	86.2%

Community Preference

Diversity vs. similar	
Diversity of income, age and race	62.5%
Similar income, age and race	34.0%
Unsure	3.5%

Basic services within walking distance	
Yes	46.7%
No	46.7%
Unsure	6.7%

Environment

Household illnesses caused by environment	
Yes	11.4%
No	88.6%

Quality of air	
Our health is greatly at risk	5.6%
Our health is slightly at risk	45.7%
Our health is not at risk	44.4%

Quality of water	
Our health is greatly at risk	8.9%
Our health is slightly at risk	41.6%
Our health is not at risk	45.3%

Availability of water	
Serious problem	32.4%
Minor problem	40.1%
Not a problem	22.3%

Availability of water in 5 years	
Serious problem	37.3%
Minor problem	36.6%
Not a problem	17.3%
Unsure	8.8%

Future Growth/Sprawl

Restrictions on future growth	
Restrictions to limit and manage growth	85.2%
No limits placed on growth	7.6%
Restrictions should allow no growth	6.2%

Effectiveness of county in managing growth	
Excellent	1.6%
Good	23.5%
Fair	48.0%
Poor	19.4%
Unsure	7.5%

Mandated growth boundaries	
Yes	53.8%
No	23.5%
Unsure	22.7%

Government involvement in regulating growth	
Strongly increase	14.5%
Moderately increase	33.9%
Maintain current	39.5%
Moderately decrease	6.7%
Strongly decrease	3.3%

Local government should cooperate more to manage growth	
Yes	86.4%
No	7.7%
Unsure	5.9%

Public Education

Your school district's performance		<i>Range by District</i>
Superior	24.3%	(53.0% - 9.1%)
Adequate	45.3%	(68.6% - 32.3%)
Inadequate	10.2%	(25.6% - 2.8%)
Unsure	20.3%	(10.2% - -34.3%)

Children in public schools		<i>Performance Rating</i>
Yes	33.2%	(39.0% - Superior)
No	66.8%	(16.9% - Superior)

Involvement with your local schools	
Very active	14.4%
Somewhat active	23.8%
Not very active	17.8%
Not active	43.9%

Knowledge of school funding		<i>Children in public school</i>
Very knowledgeable	13.6%	(16.3%)
Somewhat knowledgeable	45.2%	(58.5%)
Not very knowledgeable	40.8%	(24.9%)
Not sure	0.3%	(0.2%)

Fairness of education funding	
Yes	29.7%
No	37.4%
Unsure	32.8%

Lancaster City

Frequency visiting Lancaster City			The fate of Lancaster City impacts the county	
Frequently	34.4%		Agree	64.6%
Occasionally	27.6%		Disagree	14.6%
Seldom	32.4%		Unsure	20.9%
Never	5.6%		Importance of downtown revitalization	
Like best about downtown Lancaster			Very important	53.3%
Central Market	16.5%		Somewhat important	36.8%
Shopping	13.7%		Not important	8.4%
Restaurants/Pubs	7.5%		Satisfaction with revitalization progress	
History	6.7%		Very satisfied	6.0%
Buildings	4.0%		Somewhat satisfied	49.8%
Fulton Opera House	2.5%		Somewhat dissatisfied	27.2%
Diversity	2.4%		Very dissatisfied	10.5%
City quality of life compared to 5 years ago		<i>City Residents</i>	Most critical to successful downtown revitalization	
Better	14.0%	(18.8%)	Drug and crime-free neighborhoods	13.6%
About the same	34.1%	(30.6%)	More stores	7.8%
Worse	40.3%	(44.3%)	Successful businesses	7.7%
Unsure	11.6%	(6.0%)	Draw to get people downtown	6.9%
Biggest threats to quality of life			Clean up	5.6%
Crime	34.5%		Convention Center	5.0%
Drugs	32.3%		Safer streets	4.2%
Violence	24.5%		Fix up old buildings	4.2%
Gangs	10.7%		Willingness to pay more taxes for downtown revitalization	
Guns	10.3%		Yes	25.7%
Over development	9.2%		No	60.8%
City safety		<i>City Residents</i>	Unsure	13.5%
Very safe	10.9%	(19.8%)		
Somewhat safe	42.5%	(48.6%)		
Somewhat unsafe	26.9%	(18.1%)		
Not at all safe	16.3%	(10.7%)		

**For your copy of the graphics
 that accompany these findings, please visit
 our website <http://www.hourglass.foundation.org>
 or contact our office by calling (717) 295-0755 or
 write via E-mail hourglass.foundation@verizon.net**

