INTRODUCTION

BACKGROUND

On three occasions in the past, the Village of Glen Ellyn has conducted a Community Attitude Survey seeking citizen opinions on a variety of services and issues. Past surveys were conducted in 1983, 1990 and 2000. Results from the surveys assisted the Village with long-range planning and prioritization of goals. Information from past surveys has been used for planning everything from Roosevelt Road shopping district improvements to roadway upgrades.

PURPOSE

The purpose of the survey was to obtain statistically valid opinions from a random sample of Village residents to assist the Village Board and staff in the evaluation and improvement of Village services and long-range plans. This year, for the first time, the survey included questions about the Village's residential solid waste program. Responses were expected to be helpful in planning for the next solid waste collection contract.

METHOD

Respondents were recruited by telephone and asked to accept "placement" of a questionnaire that would be filled out by a head-of-household. Up to 3 attempts were made to reach someone at each phone number selected for inclusion in the sample.

Questionnaires were then mailed out to those respondents who accepted placement of the questionnaire. Respondents were asked to either complete the questionnaire on-line via the Internet, or complete the hard-copy questionnaire and return it to the Civic Center.

A copy of the questionnaire is in Appendix D of this report. A copy of the 2000 questionnaire is also included in the same Appendix. The 2004 questionnaire followed this outline:

1. Satisfaction with current Village services
2. Future Village Service Level Adjustments
3. Dealings with Village of Glen Ellyn employees
4. Village communication program
5. Special events and activities
6. Downtown business area
7. Roosevelt Road corridor
8. Housing
9. Glen Ellyn Public Library
10. Other important issues
11. Solid waste collection
12. Traffic
13. Recreation and entertainment
14. General comments about Glen Ellyn
15. Classification

About a week and a half after questionnaires were mailed out, a reminder call was made to each household to remind them to complete the questionnaire and drop it off at the Civic Center or complete it online. A second series of reminder calls were made to people who had not yet returned the questionnaire after they had received the first reminder call.

DATES AND LOCATION OF INTERVIEWING

Placement Interviews for the current wave were conducted between Monday, September 13 and Saturday, September 18, 2004. First reminder calls were conducted between Thursday, September 23 and Tuesday, October 5, 2004. Second reminder calls were conducted between Monday, October 4 and Wednesday, October 20, 2004. Members of the Dimension Research Field Staff working at the company's Peoria, Illinois office conducted all interviews. All respondents who had not been contacted from the first recall at the time of the second recall were sent a post card reminder of the survey. At the end of the second recall all respondents who said they would complete and turn in a survey or said they had already turned one in and we had yet to receive it were send an additional survey.

Questionnaire returns were collected through Monday, November 8, 2004.

SAMPLE

The sampling frame chosen for this study was the 60137 zip code and the following telephone exchanges within the 630 telephone area code: 469, 858, 790, 545, 942, 534, and 446. There are residential phone numbers from 38 different telephone exchanges that lie within the 60137 zip code. However, only 19% of those residential phone numbers are within the zip code. To include all of the telephone exchanges in the sample drawn for this study would have made the research prohibitively expensive, because such a low percentage of phone numbers dialed would have fallen within the geography of interest to this study. By including only those telephone exchanges which have 67% or more of their residential numbers in the 60137 zip code, we can effectively increase the qualifying incidence for the study dramatically, thus keeping research costs manageably low. The seven telephone exchanges selected for the sampling frame, cover 90% of the residential phones in the 60137 zip code. Furthermore, 83% of the residential phone listings in those exchanges lie within the 60137 zip code. Therefore, the selection of these exchanges for the sampling frame produces the best trade-off in terms of coverage and potential study qualifying incidence.

Because of the relatively high rate (45.1%) of unlisted phone numbers in DuPage County (and, therefore, probably in Glen Ellyn), it was decided to use randomly generated phone numbers for the study. This allows us to potentially reach a much greater percentage of community residents than if only "listed" phone numbers were attempted. To the extent that people with unlisted numbers might have different views than those with listed phone numbers, we were thus able to include both types of respondents.

An additional sampling frame was established in order to include residents of the Braeside area of Glen Ellyn. That sampling frame was established based on residence address street name. The following street names were included: Briar St., Brighton St., Cheltenham Dr., Heather Ln., Londonberry Ln., Royal Glen Dr., St. James Pl., Surrey Dr., and Windemere Dr. Listed telephone numbers were used for this portion of the sample.

Qualified respondents were male or female heads-of-household who claimed to reside within the Village limits of Glen Ellyn.

A total of 641 placement interviews were completed for this study.

A total of 480 completed questionnaires were either dropped in the Village collection box outside the Civic Center or completed via the internet. There were 43 respondents who chose to complete the questionnaire using the online option.

INTERPRETATION OF DATA

A dash in the body of a table means no respondent gave that particular response.

An asterisk in the body of a table means that less than one-half of one percent of respondents gave that particular response.

Some banner points may add to more than total because the answers are not mutually exclusive.

Some banner points may add to less than total because all possible answers are not included.

Residence locations are defined as follows:

- ***Area 1 – Northwest –*** West of Main Street, north of the commuter railroad tracks.
- ***Area 2 – Northeast –*** East of Main Street, north of the commuter railroad tracks.
- ***Area 3 – Braeside*** – North of Roosevelt Road, east of I-355, west of Finley Road.
- ***Area 4 – Southwest –*** North of Roosevelt Road, west of Main Street, south of the commuter railroad tracks.
- ***Area 5 – Southeast –*** North of Roosevelt Road, east of Main Street, south of the commuter railroad tracks.
- ***Area 6 – Far South –*** South of Roosevelt Road.

2004 COMMUNITY ATTITUDE SURVEY
HIGHLIGHTS

Glen Ellyn survey respondents have many positive views about the community

- Like the great atmosphere [55% of respondents]
  - "small town/ homey" [18%]
  - "people/ friends/ neighbors" [12%]
  - "community pride/ spirit/ concern" [12%]
- Like the community appearance [43% of respondents]
  - Like the trees/ greenery/ park-like setting [20%]
  - Like the diverse housing styles/ sizes [11%]
  - Like how attractive/ pretty/ beautiful it is [11%]
- Like the convenience of Glen Ellyn [30% of respondents]
  - Like the convenience of the train to Chicago [12%]
  - Like that it's close to schools/ shopping/ etc. [11%]
- Like the business district/ shopping [28% of respondents]
  - Like the central business district/ downtown shopping [14%]
- Like the parks/ Park District programs [25% of respondents]
- Like the school system [25% of respondents]
- Like that it's a safe place to live/ has a low crime rate [18% of respondents]
- Police protection
  - Highly satisfied [30% of respondents]
  - Highly/ very satisfied [80% of respondents]
- Public library
  - Highly satisfied [43% of respondents]
  - Highly/ very satisfied [79% of respondents]
  - Over one-half of adults [53%] use it once a month or more often
  - At least two-thirds of children in middle school and grade school use it at least once a month
- Fire protection
  - Highly satisfied [37% of respondents]
  - Highly/ very satisfied [78% of respondents]
  - 70% of respondents are willing to have the Village collect money for the volunteer fire company each month on their water bill.
- Water quality [76% of respondents highly/ very satisfied]
- Glen Ellyn Newsletter and Special Reports
  - Used regularly to find out about Village events, activities and services [89% of respondents]
  - Extremely/ very useful [79% of respondents]

Some negative views, trends, and desired improvements were noted

- Taxes
  - One of the 3 most important issues facing Glen Ellyn in next 5 years [35% of respondents]
  - Dislike the taxes in Glen Ellyn [26% of respondents]
- School issues
  - One of the 3 most important issues facing Glen Ellyn in next 5 years [35% of respondents]
    - Improving/ maintaining quality of schools [16%]
    - School overcrowding [11%]
    - School funding/ referendum/ maintain quality without raising taxes [9%]

- Quality of life issues
  - One of the 3 most important issues facing Glen Ellyn in next 5 years [33% of respondents]
    - Keeping Glen Ellyn affordable [10%]
    - Maintaining Village character [8%]
    - Public safety [6%]
- Tear downs/ Limit house size/ Control and/ or restrict new construction
  - One of the 3 most important issues facing Glen Ellyn in next 5 years [33% of respondents]
  - Dislike the trend to tear down and rebuild larger homes [22% of respondents]
  - Agree strongly/ moderately that building houses much higher than neighbor adversely affects Village character [72% of respondents]
  - Agree strongly/ moderately that removal of smaller houses adversely affects Village character [61% of respondents]
  - Agree strongly/ moderately that building larger replacement houses adversely affects Village character [57% of respondents]
- Maintain a viable central business district
  - One of the 3 most important issues facing Glen Ellyn in next 5 years [20% of respondents]
- Traffic/ transportation issues
  - One of the 3 most important issues facing Glen Ellyn in next 5 years [19% of respondents]
    - Car traffic/ noise [11%]
    - Train traffic/ noise [4%]
  - Dislike something about traffic/ transportation in Glen Ellyn [24% of respondents]
    - Dislike car traffic/ noise [8%]
    - Dislike train traffic/ noise [8%]
    - Dislike construction traffic/ trucks [5%]
- Street repairs
  - One of the 3 most important issues facing Glen Ellyn in next 5 years [12% of respondents]
- Dissatisfied with quality of side streets [38% of respondents]
  - Satisfaction with street in front of your house [24% dissatisfied; 56% highly/ very satisfied]
  - Satisfaction with water drainage on your street [21% dissatisfied; 60% highly/ very satisfied]
- Street lighting
  - Dissatisfied [28% of respondents]
  - Increase future service level for street lighting [28% of respondents]
- Completeness of sidewalk network
  - Dissatisfied [21% of respondents]
  - Increase future service level for filling in sidewalk network gaps [27% of respondents]
- Placement of utility wires underground
  - Increase future service level for placing utility wires underground [43% of respondents]
  - Over one-half [53%] of respondents are willing to pay extra on Com Ed bill for this
- Attendance at special events and activities by residents appears to be declining, but they are well-liked by those who do attend
- Next solid waste collection contract – encourage recycling; make those who throw out more, pay more; and establish a low base rate

2004 COMMUNITY ATTITUDE SURVEY

RESEARCH FINDINGS

It is important to note at the outset that respondents provided two types of responses in completing this survey. For some questions, they chose their response from a list that was supplied for them. That is called a closed-end question. For other questions, they were asked to provide their answer in their own words. That is called an open-end question. It is often desirable to accumulate open-end answers across all respondents in order to know to what extent certain ideas are mentioned by the group, as a whole. To do that, one must "code" those answers. That is, one must try and assign one particular "code" to the particular ideas that are expressed. This task is complicated by the fact that not all respondents express ideas exactly the same way, nor are all respondents equally able to always express their ideas in the most clear and concise manner. Once the "codes" are assigned, it is necessary to find wording that captures the idea. That wording appears in the data tables of this report and is quoted throughout the written findings.

It is no surprise that respondents gave many more positive answers than negative ones. In virtually every study of this type, respondents give far more "positive" answers than "negative" answers. If it were the other way around, it would be a sign of extreme dissatisfaction to the point one might expect to see angry crowds gather on a daily basis outside the Village offices.

Therefore, in analyzing the data from this study, the goal is to point out those "positives" and those "negatives" that stand out from the others either in terms of relative magnitude or in terms of trends. One expects some variability in the data due to sample size, so it would be a mistake to focus on very small differences.

LIKES ABOUT LIVING IN GLEN ELLYN [Table 147]

Near the end of the questionnaire, after having completed many questions about aspects of living in Glen Ellyn where they selected their answers from those provided, respondents were asked to provide, in their own words, what they liked and what they disliked about living in Glen Ellyn.

Just as in 2000, 1990 and 1983, the most frequently volunteered comments cited by respondents as something they liked about living in Glen Ellyn concerned the "atmosphere." This year, that idea was mostly expressed as "small town/ homey atmosphere" (18%), people/ friends/ neighbors" (12%), "community pride/ spirit/ concern" (12%), "friendly" (10%), "character/ charm" (6%), and "peaceful/ quiet" (6%).

The second most mentioned category of likes was "Services & facilities." Within this, mention of "Parks/ Park District services/ facilities" was one of the two leading categories at 25%. Mention of "good school system" was the other leading idea also at 25%. Notably, this level has declined from 2000 when it stood at 30% and from 1990 (41%) and 1983 (38%). Among those with children in the schools, mentions of "good school system" stand at between 30% and 38%. Appreciation of the "good school system" is somewhat lower among those with no children at home under 18 years of age. Only 17% of those people mentioned the "good school system" as something they particularly like about living in Glen Ellyn. Those without children presumably should value the schools in terms of how their property value is affected.

Comments related to "community appearance" were the third most mentioned category at 43%. This is back up at levels seen in 1990 and 1983. The biggest difference in this category as compared to 2000 is the increased mentions related to "trees/ greenery/ park-like setting" (20% vs. 14% in 2000).

Positive comments about the "business district/ shopping" continue to grow over time.

TABLE A Likes About Living in Glen Ellyn

	2004	2000	1990	1983
Atmosphere (Net)	55%	68%	57%	52%
Services & facilities (Net)	50	51	55	50
Parks/ Park District services/ facilities	25	19	18	21
Good school system	25	30	41	38
Village services/facilities	15	17	15	17
Other services/ facilities	13	20	13	NA
Community appearance (Net)	43	39	45	46
Convenience (Net)	30	31	28	20
Business district/ shopping (Net)	28	23	19	21
Safe place to live/ low crime rate	18	22	11	NA

Sample sizes: 480 in 2004; 532 in 2000 and 1990; NA in 1983.

DISLIKES ABOUT LIVING IN GLEN ELLYN [Table 148]

"Taxes" have regained first place in the minds of respondents as the most frequently mentioned dislike of living in Glen Ellyn.

Dislikes concerning "traffic/ transportation" continue to grow, from 6% in 1983 to 10% in 1990 to 16% in 2000 to where now, at 24%, it is the second most disliked aspect of living in Glen Ellyn. The increase over 2000 can largely be attributed to "construction traffic and trucks" as well as to increased "noise from cars and trucks" as well as from "trains."

Another growing trend in terms of dislikes concerns the tear-down issue. Dislikes regarding the "trend to tear down and build larger homes/ new homes too large" is now mentioned as a dislike by 22% of respondents. This has grown from 3% in 1990 and 11% in 2000.

On a more positive note, dislikes regarding "Village services" continued to fall in 2004. Nearly one-fourth (23%) still mention something related to "Village services" as a dislike, but this is down from 29% in 2000 and 42% in 1990. The most notable aspect of this decline is related to dislikes of "Village government" which declined from 16% in 2000 to 10% in 2004. This category includes fewer mentions of "problems with building/ zoning regulations," fewer comments about "Village Board unresponsive/ not work for good of community."

TABLE B Dislikes About Living in Glen Ellyn

	2004	2000	1990	1983
Taxes (Net)	26%	21%	45%	19%
Traffic/ transportation (Net)	24	16	10	6
Village services (Net)	23	29	42	43
Village government	10	16	NA	NA
Infrastructure	7	6	NA	NA
Water/ sewer	1	3	17	18
Police	2	1	5	NA
Other Village services	7	8	NA	NA
Trend to tear down and build larger home	22	11	3	NA
Business district/ shopping (Net)	14	13	9	7
No particular dislikes/ nothing answered	18	25	17	NA

Sample sizes: 480 in 2004 and 532 in 2000 and 1990; NA in 1983.

THREE MOST IMPORTANT ISSUES FACING GLEN ELLYN IN NEXT 5 YEARS [Table 149-150]

After expressing in their own words what they liked and disliked about living in Glen Ellyn, respondents were asked to express in their own words the three most important issues facing the Village in the coming five years. These answers were compiled two ways. First they were compiled in terms of the first mention, which is presumed to be each person's single most important issue facing the Village. Second, they were compiled in total, without consideration as to which was first.

"Taxes" have moved to the top of the list as the most important issue facing Glen Ellyn in the next five years. They were mentioned first by about one-fifth of respondents and were mentioned in total by a little over one-third of respondents. It is the "rising taxes" aspect that gets mentioned most frequently followed by comments concerning "high property taxes." The "rising taxes" aspect appeared as a future important issue among nearly twice as many people in 2004 as in 2000.

Close behind "taxes" as an important issue facing Glen Ellyn in the future are "school issues." This was the first mention by the second greatest number of people and, again, was mentioned in total by a little over one-third of respondents. First mentions of "school issues" are about triple what they were in 2000, while total mentions are nearly double. In fact, the "school issues" component that is driving this increase is "school funding/ referendum/ maintain quality of schools without raising taxes," that is another aspect of "taxes." There is also increased concern for "school overcrowding" as well as a concern about "improving/ maintaining quality of schools," and doing so "without raising taxes."

"Quality of life" issues were at the top of the list in 2000, but have fallen a bit in 2004. They are still a concern of one-third of all respondents and were the first concern mentioned by nearly one out of every six people. The "quality of life" issue mentioned by most people was "keeping Glen Ellyn affordable." The next two most mentioned issues were "maintaining Village character" and "public safety."

The fourth category that was a first mention of 15% of respondents, and it was a category that was mentioned by one-third of respondents in total, is "building issues." It is a concern mentioned only a little more often than in 2000. "Building issues" are dominated by "tear downs." "Tear-downs" were the first mentioned issue by 11% and the issue was mentioned by 22% of the respondents in total. It is interesting that so many more people mention "tear-downs" as an important issue facing Glen Ellyn in the next five years, but they are less likely than in 2000 to specifically express concerns about "limiting house size," or "limit multi-family/ high-density/ high-rise building."

"Maintaining viable central business district" is considered to be an important future issue by 20% of respondents.

TABLE C Three Most Important Issues Facing Glen Ellyn in the Next Five Years

	2004		2000	
	First Mention	Total Mentions	First Mention	Total Mentions
Taxes	21%	35%	14%	32%
School issues	19	35	6	19
Quality of life issues	15	33	19	42
Building issues	15	33	13	29
Business areas	8	28	8	26
Repairs to infrastructure	6	19	16	35
Transportation issues	7	19	4	13
Parks & recreation	*	5	3	10

Sample sizes: 480 in 2004 and 532 in 2000
* Less than one-half of one percent

SATISFACTION WITH CURRENT VILLAGE SERVICES [Tables 1-18]

Levels of "satisfaction" with Village services were more than double the levels of "dissatisfaction" for all areas of inquiry except "quality of side streets." The highest levels of "satisfaction" were given to "Village Links," "water quality," "public library," "communication/ information flow to citizens," "police protection" and "street cleaning." Only a little over one-half of respondents offered an opinion on the Village Links, but those that did were extremely satisfied.

"Dissatisfaction" levels were highest this year for "quality of side streets," "street lighting," "the street in front of your house," "completeness of the sidewalk network" and "water drainage on your street."

TABLE D Satisfaction With Current Village Services

	Satisfied (Total)	Highly Satisfied	Very Satisfied	Dissatisfied (Total)
Village Links (among those with opinion - 44% had no opinion)	97%	46%	43%	3%
Water quality	92	28	48	6
Public library	90	43	36	5
Communication/ information flow to citizens	90	21	44	7
Police protection	89	30	50	6
Street cleaning	88	16	46	8
Snow removal	86	17	47	10
Garbage/ recycling collection	84	22	44	12
Quality of main streets	84	14	43	15
Fire protection	84	37	41	4
Quality of sidewalks	80	15	33	14
Preservation of historic houses and buildings (among those with opinion - 22% had no opinion)	80	18	38	20
Maintenance of parkway trees	79	16	37	17
Water drainage on your street	77	22	38	21
Street in front of your house	74	24	32	24
Completeness of sidewalk network	72	16	31	21
Street lighting	70	13	31	28
Quality of side streets	61	5	24	38

Sample size: 480

The biggest increases in "satisfaction" noted this year compared to 2000 were for the "public library" (+7%), "quality of sidewalks" (+5%), "water quality" (+4%), "the street in front of your house" (+4%), and "street cleaning" (+4%). "Satisfaction" with "water quality" is up 67% since the 1990 survey. Lake Michigan water became available in Glen Ellyn in 1992. Other notable increases in satisfaction compared to 1990 include "quality of sidewalks" (+20%), "street cleaning" (+12%), "communication/ information flow to citizens" (+11%), and "quality of side streets" (+9%).

Only two levels of "satisfaction" have declined since 2000 – "quality of main streets" (-5%) and "fire protection" (-4%). In fact, "satisfaction" with "fire protection" is lower by 7% than it was in 1990. Satisfaction with "fire protection" is lowest among those under 35 years of age, and those who have lived in Glen Ellyn 5 years or less. "Satisfaction" with "garbage collection/ recycling" is the only other area that is lower this year than in 1990 (-3%).

TABLE E Percent "Satisfied" (Total) with Current Village Services Compared to Previous Years

	2004	2000	1990
Village Links (among those with opinion)	97%	95%	--
Water quality	92	88	25%
Communication/ information flow to citizens	90	89	79
Public library	90	83	84
Police protection	89	91	88
Street cleaning	88	84	76
Snow removal	86	84	81
Quality of main streets	84	89	84
Fire protection	84	88	91
Garbage/ recycling collection	84	86	87
Quality of sidewalks	80	75	60
Preservation of historic houses and buildings (among those with opinion)	80	--	--
Maintenance of parkway trees	79	81	77
Water drainage on your street	77	78	--
Street in front of your house	74	70	--
Completeness of sidewalk network	72	--	--
Street lighting	70	70	75
Quality of side streets	61	61	52

Sample sizes: 480 in 2004 and 532 in 2000 and 1990

Even though "satisfaction" with "fire protection" has declined some, it is noteworthy that it is the area with the third highest level of people saying they are "highly satisfied" (37%). Only the public library (43%) and the Village Links (46% of those with an opinion) were higher on "highly satisfied."

TABLE F Percent "Highly Satisfied" with Current Village Services Compared to Previous Years

	2004	2000	1990
Village Links (among those with opinion)	46%	41%	--
Public library	43	35	19%
Fire protection	37	35	40
Police protection	30	31	18
Water quality	28	23	2
Street in front of your house	24	14	--
Garbage/ recycling collection	22	26	16
Water drainage on your street	22	16	--
Communication/ information flow to citizens	21	21	7
Preservation of historic houses and buildings (among those with opinion)	18	--	--
Snow removal	17	15	8
Maintenance of parkway trees	16	17	6
Street cleaning	16	14	5
Completeness of sidewalk network	16	--	--
Quality of sidewalks	15	10	2
Quality of main streets	14	12	6
Street lighting	13	14	8
Quality of side streets	5	5	2

Sample sizes: 480 in 2004 and 532 in 2000 and 1990

In looking for areas in which to improve, it would be natural to focus on those areas that generate that greatest amount of "dissatisfaction." Those areas would be "quality of side streets," "street in front of your house," "street lighting" and "water drainage on your street." These areas are receiving a lot of attention currently with major street reconstruction projects. "Dissatisfaction" with "quality of side streets" is highest (48%) in the northeast quadrant of the Village. "Dissatisfaction" with "the street in front of your house" is lowest (10%) in the northwest quadrant, and highest (29%) in the areas north of Roosevelt Road, but south of the Union Pacific tracks. "Dissatisfaction" with "street lighting" is fairly consistent across all areas of the Village. "Dissatisfaction" with "water drainage on your street" is highest (24%) in the areas east of Main Street and north of Roosevelt Road.

TABLE G Percent "Highly" or "Very Dissatisfied" with Current Village Services Compared to Previous Years

	2004	2000	1990
Street in front of your house	13%	16%	--
Quality of side streets	13	12	17%
Street lighting	12	13	7
Water drainage on your street	11	10	--
Preservation of historic houses and buildings	8	--	--
Completeness of sidewalk network	7	--	--
Garbage/ recycling collection	6	4	4
Maintenance of parkway trees	6	7	7
Street cleaning	4	5	5
Snow removal	4	6	7
Quality of main streets	4	4	4
Quality of sidewalks	4	7	13
Public library	3	3	4
Communication/ information flow to citizens	3	3	6
Police protection	3	2	2
Water quality	2	5	52
Fire protection	2	2	*
Village Links	1	2	--

Sample sizes: 480 in 2004 and 532 in 2000 and 1990
* Less than one-half of one percent

FUTURE SERVICE LEVEL ADJUSTMENTS [Tables 19-33]

There was no service for which more than one-half of respondents felt the level should be "increased." For nearly all services, a majority of respondents believed current service levels should be "maintained." However, in only one case did more people think the service level should be "increased" than thought it should be "maintained at present level" – "placement of utility wires underground" (43% "increase vs. 30% "maintain"). One in six respondents was even in favor of raising taxes to help put utility wires under ground.

One of the most polarized views is with respect to "preservation of historical houses and buildings," where 22% think levels should be "increased" and 24% think levels should be "cut back." This was the only area where more people thought the future service level should be "cut back" than thought it should be "increased." The other area showing polarized views is with respect to "enhancing the appearance of the Roosevelt Road corridor," where 27% think levels should be "increased" and 26% think levels should be "cut back." The biggest difference noted in comparing 2004 results to 2000 results is that a lot more people in 2004 feel that various future service levels should be "cut back." In addition to the aforementioned areas, other areas where significant number of respondents called for "cutbacks" include "enhancing the appearance of the downtown business area" (19%), "placement of utility wire underground" (19%), "fill in gaps in sidewalk network" (18%), and "maintenance of parkway trees" (17%).

TABLE H Future Village Service Level Adjustments

	Increase Service & Raise Taxes if Necessary	Increase Service but Don't Raise Taxes	Maintain Present Service Level	Cutback Service Level
Placement of utility wires underground	17	26	29	19
Street lighting	5	23	61	7
Fill in gaps in sidewalk network	5	22	48	18
Enhancing appearance of Roosevelt Rd. corridor	7	20	44	26
Enhancing appearance of downtown business area	6	21	50	19
Snow plowing – side streets	3	21	63	9
Street improvement in front of your house	4	18	64	8
Preservation of historical houses & buildings	5	17	45	24
Sidewalk repairs	2	19	62	11
Water drainage on your street	3	17	66	7
Fire protection service	8	10	76	2
Maintenance of parkway trees	3	14	62	17
Police service	6	10	74	6
Snow plowing – main streets	2	13	78	4
Communication/ flow of information to citizens	*	12	73	12

Sample size: 480
* Less than one-half of one percent

DEALINGS WITH VILLAGE OF GLEN ELLYN EMPLOYEES [Tables 34-41, Appendix]

About two in five respondents (41%) in this study claim to have had a problem or concern that they brought to the attention of someone working for the Village of Glen Ellyn in the preceding 12 months. This does not necessarily mean they had a complaint. It only means that some matter was brought to the attention of a Village employee. This is a little higher than the 37% level reported in 2000 which was up a little from the 33% level reported in the 1990 study. The people in the current study who brought a problem or concern to the attention of a Village employee did so an average of 2.1 times in the past 12 months. Forty percent of them did so only once in 12 months, while 58% brought up problems or concerns more than once. These figures are close to those of 2000.

Respondent comments describing their problem or concern are in the Appendix of this report. An examination of those comments discloses that the three most mentioned concerns dealt with "parkway trees," "nearby home construction issues," and "street condition" or "street construction" issues. In the 2000 survey, the three most mentioned concerns dealt with "water meters," "trees," or "non-emergency police assistance" matters.

The people were asked about the most recent instance in which they brought a concern or problem to the attention of a Village employee. Nearly all (93%) said they were "treated with courtesy" that last time, while 7% said they were "not treated courteously." Nearly nine in ten (86%) said they were "treated in a friendly manner," but 13% said they were not. Over one-fourth (27%) said it "took a long time to get the help or information they wanted," while 71% said it did not. More than two in five (43%) considered the matter to be a "major" issue, while 56% considered it "minor." Nearly one-third (30%) were "dissatisfied" with the response to their problem or concern.

Looking at this information in combination, it turns out that 9% of all respondents had a problem or concern they considered "major" and they were "dissatisfied" with the response to their problem or concern. Four years ago this figure was 7%. One can speculate that a resident's lack of satisfaction with regard to a matter and/ or how long it took for a response contributes to their view of whether the matter is a major or minor issue.

TABLE I Satisfaction With Response From Village Government and Whether or Not It Took a Long Time to Get the Help or Information Wanted

	2004 Total	2004 Major Issue	2004 Minor Issue	2000 Total	2000 Major Issue	2000 Minor Issue
Completely satisfied	23%	12%	32%	26%	15%	33%
Very satisfied	25	16	30	24	15	29
Somewhat satisfied	16	16	16	13	17	11
Neither satisfied nor dissatisfied	6	4	7	5	3	6
Somewhat dissatisfied	14	25	6	11	14	8
Very dissatisfied	9	12	6	11	18	6
Completely dissatisfied	7	13	3	10	17	6
Took a long time to get help/ information	27%	38%	19%	24%	38%	18%
Did not take a long time	71	60	80	72	61	80

Sample sizes: 85 to 199.

In summary, there appears to be some increased willingness of respondents to bring problems or concerns to the attention of Village employees. Those problems or concerns are increasingly judged to be "major." It would seem that the level of response to these problems or concerns is quite similar to what it was 4 years ago.

VILLAGE COMMUNICATIONS PROGRAM [Tables 42-57]

The information sources "used regularly" by most respondents to find out about events and activities in the Village are the Glen Ellyn Newsletter and Special Reports, newspapers, word of mouth, the downtown business area message board, and the annual Village calendar. A growing percentage utilizes the Glen Ellyn web site, the downtown message board, newspapers, and cable television. A declining percentage utilizes the annual Village calendar, word of mouth, posters displayed in businesses, and radio.

TABLE J Information Sources "Used Regularly" to Find Out About Events and Activities In, or Services Offered by, the Village

	2004	2000
Glen Ellyn Newsletter and Special Reports	89%	90%
Newspapers	76	71
Word of mouth	53	59
Downtown business area message board	47	40
Annual Village calendar	45	52
Posters displayed in Glen Ellyn businesses	26	32
Cable television	20	18
Glen Ellyn web site	18	8
Radio	--	5

Sample sizes: 480 in 2004 and 532 in 2000.

The Glen Ellyn newsletter and Special Reports were claimed to be received by 95% of respondents. Eighty-six percent (86%) say they got the Village calendar. Subscription to cable TV, as claimed by study respondents, stands at 78%. Subscription to satellite TV is currently at 7%. Dial-up Internet access is claimed by 34% while 56% say they have high-speed Internet access. The Village message board is read by 61%.

The Glen Ellyn Newsletter and Special Reports are viewed as the most useful source of information about Glen Ellyn, followed by daily/ weekly newspapers and the Annual Village calendar.

TABLE K Usefulness of Village Communication Program Elements

	2004			2000		
	Extremely/ Very Useful	Somewhat/ Slightly Useful	Not at All useful	Extremely/ Very Useful	Somewhat/ Slightly Useful	Not at All useful
Glen Ellyn Newsletter and Special Reports	79%	15%	1%	74%	19%	1%
Daily or weekly newspapers	59	30	2	57	29	2
Annual Village Calendar	35	41	11	39	40	8
Message Board in downtown business area	34	38	13	26	36	14
Glen Ellyn Internet web site	14	27	20	7	17	24
Live cable TV Village Board meeting telecasts	10	30	28	8	26	27
Village information channel on cable TV	7	39	25	NA	NA	NA
Cable TV Village Board meeting re-broadcasts	8	26	31	NA	NA	NA

Sample sizes: 480 in 2004 and 532 in 2000.

HOUSING ISSUES [Tables 94-97]

About three out of every five respondents (61%) feel that removal of smaller houses adversely affects Village character. Not quite as many (57%) believe that building larger replacement houses adversely affects Village character. Nearly three-fourths (72%) agree that the building of houses that tower over the nearby homes adversely affects the character of the Village. There is less agreement that construction of multi-story housing near the downtown business area adversely affects the character of the Village. But more people agree (47%) that it does than disagree (33%).

TABLE L Agreement That Situation Adversely Affects Village Character

	Removal of Smaller Houses		Building of Larger Replacement Houses		Building Houses Much Higher than Neighboring Houses		Building 3-5 Story Multi-Family Buildings In or Near Downtown	
	2004	2000	2004	2000	2004	2000	2004	2000
Agree strongly	37%	31%	33%	30%	48%	47%	27%	30%
Agree moderately	24	28	24	25	24	29	20	21
Neither agree nor disagree	10	13	14	12	9	6	17	16
Disagree moderately	16	16	18	20	10	11	19	21
Disagree strongly	9	9	8	9	7	5	13	9

Sample sizes: 480 in 2004 and 532 in 2000.

The biggest change from four years ago is the increase in those who “agree strongly” that removal of smaller houses adversely affects Village character. The other notable change compared to 4 years ago is the decline in agreement with two statements – “Building houses much higher than neighboring houses adversely affects Village character,” and “Constructing 3-5 story multi-family buildings in or near downtown” adversely affects Village character.

VILLAGE TRAFFIC ISSUES [Tables 133-136]

Traffic in the Village of Glen Ellyn is thought to be a “frequent” (20%) or “occasional” (54%) problem by about three-fourths of respondents. This is up a lot from the 51% level in 2000 and the 60% level reported in 1990. A little over one-third (36%) either agree “strongly” (11%) or “moderately” (26%) that the “speed of traffic in the Village” is a problem. This is up from 30% in 2000 and about the same as the 37% in 1990. Interest in “having traffic speed enforced more closely” is a little higher (46% “interested”) than in 2000 (42%) and about the same as 1990 (45%). Forty-six percent are “interested” in having it more closely enforced, while 32% are “not interested.” Over one-half (55%) of respondents “agree” with the statement that “waiting for trains to pass in order to cross the Union Pacific tracks is a major inconvenience.” Twenty-four percent (24%) “disagree” with that statement.

TABLE M Village of Glen Ellyn Traffic Issues

	2004	2000	1990
Traffic in Glen Ellyn is … frequently a problem	20%	10%	11%
… occasionally a problem	54	42	49
… seldom a problem	18	33	27
… not a problem	6	14	10
Speed of traffic in Glen Ellyn is a problem … agree strongly	11%	9%	10%
… agree moderately	26	20	27
… neither agree nor disagree	27	25	NA
… disagree moderately	21	28	38
… disagree strongly	13	13	16
Enforce speed of traffic more closely … definitely interested	21%	17%	22%
… probably interested	25	24	23
… not sure if interested	18	20	17
… probably not interested	23	23	20
… definitely not interested	9	11	14
Waiting for trains to clear intersection is a major inconvenience … agree strongly	23%	NA	NA
… agree moderately	32	NA	NA
… neither agree nor disagree	15	NA	NA
… disagree moderately	15	NA	NA
… disagree strongly	9	NA	NA

Sample sizes: 480 in 2004 and 532 in 2000 and 1990.

SOLID WASTE COLLECTION [Tables 116-132]

In anticipation of the expiration of the Village's residential solid waste collection contract in 2005, residents' attitudes with respect to solid waste collection were explored in some depth in 2004.

There is very low agreement that a system that allows each household to put out an unlimited amount of refuse and waste for the same flat fee is better. On the other hand, the majority of respondents have high agreement that the Village's appearance is enhanced by having all refuse picked up on a single day throughout the Village, that using pre-paid stickers for extra waste encourages recycling, and that a system requiring pre-paid stickers for extra waste is a better system.

TABLE N Extent of Agreement with Certain Solid Waste Collection Philosophies

	Complete Agreement (10)	High Agreement (8-10)	Moderate Agreement (4-7)	Low Agreement (1-3)	Not Agree at All (1)	Mean
A system requiring residents who put out more refuse to pay through the use of pre-paid stickers is a better system	42%	63%	20%	18%	10%	7.41
The appearance of the Village is enhanced by having all refuse and recycling picked up on the same day throughout the Village	39	59	23	18	10	7.20
The use of pre-paid stickers for extra waste collection encourages residents to recycle	31	58	26	16	8	7.16
A system where everyone pays the same monthly fee and may put out as much refuse and yard waste as they want each week is a better system	7	14	17	69	49	3.15

Sample sizes: 468 to 475.
A 10-point end-anchored scale was used where 1 = "Do not agree at all," and 10 = "Agree completely."

Sixty percent (60%) of respondents consider the encouragement of recycling throughout the Village to "extremely important." Only 1% considers it "not important at all." The average importance rating, using a 10-point scale where 10 = extremely important and 1 = not important at all, was 8.80.

If refuse and recycling were to be picked up on just one day, a huge proportion (75%) would prefer that day be Monday. Tuesday was the second most popular day selected by only 12% of respondents.

A series of questions sought to learn how much value people might place on certain options that might be considered as part of the next residential solid waste collection contract. It turns out that no more than one-fourth of respondents were willing to pay for any of the options except one. Nearly half (44%) were willing to pay for having an unlimited trash pickup day each spring. It is interesting to note that while respondents think that a one-day collection throughout the Village enhances the appearance of the Village, they are not very willing to pay extra for that feature. Similarly, while Monday is the preferred day for collection, they are not very willing to pay extra to maintain Monday as the day of collection.

TABLE O Value of Certain Solid Waste Collection Options

	Would Pay Nothing More	Would Pay 1-10% More	Would Pay 11% + More	Mean Among All	Mean Among the Willing
Unlimited trash pickup day each spring	56%	40%	4%	3.3%	7.4%
To be allowed to put out 65 gal. of refuse per week	75	20	5	2.7	10.7
To eliminate the use of stickers for extra waste collection	78	17	5	2.4	10.8
To be allowed to put out 95 gal. of refuse per week	87	8	5	1.8	14.0
To have refuse and recycling picked up on Monday throughout Village	88	11	1	0.8	6.9
To have solid waste picked up on just one day throughout Village	87	12	*	0.8	6.2

Sample sizes: 445 to 452.

Finally, to allow for the possible interaction of a combination of effects, respondents were presented with four different possible future residential solid waste collection contracts. They were asked to put them in order of preference.

There was one clearly preferred option and it was the preference of every sub-group shown in the column headings of the detailed support Table 128 that is included in the full report for this study. It is the option most similar to the current contract. That option was the one where residents could put out one 35-gallon container each week for a monthly charge of $10, and then affix a $2 pre-paid sticker to every additional 35-gallon put out in a week. An unlimited spring pickup would occur with this plan every other year.

TABLE P Ranking of Possible Future Residential Solid Waste Collection Contracts

	Ranked First	Ranked 1st or 2nd	Ranked 3rd or 4th	Ranked Last
$10 per month; one 35-gallon container per week; $2 pre-paid sticker for each additional 35-gallon container per week; unlimited spring pickup every other year	49%	78%	22%	2%
$14 per month; one 65-gallon container per week; $2 pre-paid sticker for each additional 35-gallon container per week; unlimited spring pickup every other year	17	47	52	9
No monthly fee; $2.50 pre-paid sticker for each 35-gallon container per week; unlimited spring pickup every other year	17	44	56	36
$18 per month; unlimited refuse each week; no unlimited spring pickup every other year	15	25	75	46

Sample size: 454

SPECIAL EVENTS AND ACTIVITIES [Tables 58-64]

The most widely attended public event or activity in the past 12 months was the summer farmers' market in downtown. This event was held on Fridays from late spring through early fall, so residents had many opportunities to visit. It was followed closely by the 4th of July activities, as well as the Taste of Glen Ellyn and Village Fair. Attendance at the special events and activities of interest seems to be on the decline over the years. The one exception to that trend is the Cardboard Regatta.

The events most enjoyed by those who attended were the 4th of July activities including the Cardboard Regatta.

TABLE Q Attendance at and Enjoyment of Special Events and Activities

	2004		2000		1990	
	Attended	Enjoyed It Very Much	Attended	Enjoyed It Very Much	Attended	Enjoyed It Very Much
Summer farmers' market in downtown area	58%	51%	NA	NA	NA	NA
4th of July parade	53	77	60	74	71	69
Taste of Glen Ellyn/ Village fair	52	50	67	47	69	44
4th of July fireworks	51	89	59	83	69	83
Cardboard regatta at Lake Ellyn	36	85	35	87	NA	NA
Fine arts festival at Lake Ellyn	32	53	44	55	40	55
Day-after-Thanksgiving Holiday walk	31	60	34	54	52	64

Sample sizes: 480 in 2004 and 532 in 2000 and 1990.

GLEN ELLYN PUBLIC LIBRARY [Tables 98-100]

Usage of the Glen Ellyn Public Library appears to be up very slightly as compared to four years ago. Thirteen percent (13%) of adult family members report using the library once a week or more often. Four years ago that figure was 11%. Fifty-three percent (53%) report using it once a month or more often vs. 51% in 2000. Usage of the library is at even higher levels among children where it is used at least once a month by 52% of high schoolers, 66% of junior high schoolers, 82% of grade schoolers, and 67% of children younger than grade school age.

More than three-fourths (78%) of respondents said the library reading & reference materials meet the needs of their family. This level was at 72% in 2000 and 67% in 1990. Agreement is stronger among those with children in middle school or lower.

TABLE R Glen Ellyn Public Library Issues

	2004		2000		1990	
	Adults	Children < 18	Adults	Children < 18	Adults	Children < 18
How often use Glen Ellyn Public Library … once a week or more	13%	17%	11%	12%	9%	13%
… several times a month	25	31	23	28	20	33
… once a month	16	16	17	18	16	17
… once every few months	22	21	20	16	25	15
… once or twice a year	15	6	14	6	13	2
… never	8	10	13	18	12	16
Reading/reference materials meet needs of family … agree strongly	44%		35%		30%	
… agree moderately	35		37		37	
… disagree moderately	5		6		7	
… disagree strongly	2		2		4	

Sample sizes: 231 – 532.

FREQUENCY OF USING RECREATIONAL FACILITIES [Tables 137-146]

In terms of ever being used, the facilities used by the greatest number of people are Lake Ellyn and Park (90%), the Glen movie theater (74%), and the Glen Ellyn Civic Center (60%).

The most frequently used facilities are Sunset Pool and park (in season), the Village Links (in season), and Lake Ellyn and Park.

TABLE S Frequency of Using Recreational/ Entertainment Facilities

	2004		2000	
	Ever Use	Use once a month or More Often	Ever Use	Use once a month or More Often
Lake Ellyn and Park	90%	33%	87%	33%
Glen movie theater	74	16	71	10
Glen Ellyn Civic Center	60	12	64	14
Village Links (in season)	54	29	53	33
Main Street Recreation Center	53	21	55	23
Sunset Park and Pool (in season)	46	27	50	30
Holes & Knolls miniature golf course	41	8	NA	NA
Spring Avenue Recreation Center	36	15	NA	NA
Panfish Park	32	7	32	7
BR Ryall YMCA	28	14	24	13

Sample sizes: 480 in 2004 and 532 in 2000.

DOWNTOWN BUSINESS AREA [Tables 65-80]

Respondents are generally satisfied with the downtown business area. They are most satisfied with the friendliness of service at the businesses. They are least satisfied with the availability of parking, with traffic, and with the variety of stores. As compared to results in 2000, the biggest improvements in terms of people saying they are completely or very satisfied were for overall appearance (+11%), landscaping (+11%), condition of sidewalks (+9%), snow removal from sidewalks (+4%) and parking lots (+4%), and friendliness of service (+4%). The only declines were for amount of traffic (-5%) and variety of stores (-7%).

TABLE T Satisfaction With Downtown Business Area

	Completely Satisfied	Very Satisfied	Fairly Satisfied	Not at All Satisfied
Friendliness of service at the businesses	25%	56%	14%	1%
Landscaping	22	54	20	1
Condition of sidewalks	21	56	17	1
Snow removal from streets	19	51	19	1
Overall appearance	17	57	22	1
Variety of restaurants	17	40	29	8
Snow removal from sidewalks	16	45	19	3
Snow removal from parking lots	16	41	19	1
Number of benches for sitting	16	38	26	5
Special events and activities	14	49	21	2
Business hours	10	44	34	7
Availability of parking on weekdays	9	29	34	15
Availability of parking on Saturdays	8	26	36	17
Variety of stores	6	28	42	18
Amount of traffic	6	30	43	11

Sample size: 480

Two-thirds respondents claim to visit the downtown business area at least once a week. This is down from 75% in 2000. In fact, about one-third (32%) visit 3 times a week or more often. The central business area is visited at least once a month by 91% of respondents.

ROOSEVELT ROAD CORRIDOR [Tables 81-93]

Respondents are generally less satisfied with the Roosevelt Road corridor than with the central business area. They are most satisfied with the street lighting, followed by business hours, the friendliness of service at the businesses and with the variety of stores. They are least satisfied with the amount of traffic, and the ease of entering and leaving parking lots. Satisfaction for all factors is up in 2004 as compared to 2000 in terms of people saying they are completely or very satisfied. The largest increases were for street lighting (+23%), overall appearance (+21%), and landscaping (+14%).

TABLE U Satisfaction With Roosevelt Road Corridor

	Completely Satisfied	Very Satisfied	Fairly Satisfied	Not at All Satisfied
Street lighting	18%	52%	24%	1%
Business hours	12	50	29	2
Friendliness of service at the businesses	11	45	37	1
Variety of stores	10	45	33	7
Size of business signs	8	33	39	11
Number of business signs	8	28	40	15
Variety of restaurants	8	33	41	13
Landscaping	8	33	41	13
Overall appearance	7	28	46	15
Special events and activities	6	16	22	9
Ease of entering and leaving parking lots	5	23	45	24
Amount of traffic	3	11	41	38

Sample size: 480

Eighty-seven percent (87%) of respondents claim to visit the Roosevelt Road corridor at least once a week. In fact, over half (55%) visits 3 times a week or more often. The Roosevelt Road corridor is visited at least once a month by 96% of respondents.

OTHER IMPORTANT ISSUES [Tables 101-115]

Open Space: About one-half (53%) of respondents feel Glen Ellyn has just the right amount of open space. This up somewhat from 2000 when only 45% said Glen Ellyn had just the right amount. In a 1999 Glen Ellyn Park District Survey, 50% of respondents thought there was just the right amount of open space in Glen Ellyn. At no time has more than 2% said there was too much open space. It turns out that women are a little more inclined than men to say there is too little open space.

Village Vehicle Stickers: A lot more people (55%) oppose raising property taxes enough to replace the $25 Village vehicle sticker fee than favor the idea (32%). The margin of opposition in 2000 was 46% to 39%, when the Village vehicle sticker fee was $15.

Safety: People feel safer in daylight than at night. They feel safer in the downtown business area than in the Roosevelt Road corridor, but they feel safer yet in their own neighborhood. People feel their children are safer in schools the younger they are. The attitudes expressed in 2004 are quite similar to 2000. There is just a slightly greater tendency in 2004 than in 2000 to feel a little less safe at night, both in the downtown business area as well as their own neighborhood.

TABLE V Feelings of Safety for Self and for Children in Schools

	2004			2000		
	Completely Extremely Safe	Very Somewhat Safe	Not Very Not at All Safe	Completely Extremely Safe	Very Somewhat Safe	Not Very Not at All Safe
In your neighborhood during daylight hours	68%	31%	1%	67%	33%	*%
In your neighborhood at night	46	52	2	40	56	4
In downtown business area during daylight hours	67	33	*	65	34	--
In downtown business area at night	38	60	1	33	62	3
In Roosevelt Rd. corridor during daylight hours	41	57	2	38	58	2
In Roosevelt Rd. corridor at night	15	71	13	13	70	16
Children in elementary schools	41	52	1	41	50	1
Children in junior high or middle schools	33	57	1	31	55	2
Children in high schools	23	65	3	21	63	*

Sample sizes: 480 in 2004 and 532 in 2000.
* Less than one-half of one percent

Overhead Utility Wires: A little over one-half (53%) of respondents are willing to pay a little extra on their Com Ed electrical bill each month for the purpose of removing overhead utility wires and having them buried underground. Forty-seven percent (47%) are opposed to paying anything at all. Including all respondents, people are willing to pay an average of $2.45 extra per month for such a purpose. That works out to an average of $4.73 per month extra among only those who are willing to pay something extra for that purpose. Opposition is strongest among those who live south of Roosevelt Road. In 2000, for a different question on the same topic, 68%* of respondents said they would allocate some of the Village's budget to relocate utility wires from above ground to underground. On average, for all respondents, they said they would allocate $5,294* per $100,000 of budget.

Volunteer Fire Department: Seven out of ten respondents (70%) said they were willing to have the Village collect money for the Glen Ellyn Volunteer Fire Department each month on their Village water bill. Twenty-nine percent (29%) were opposed. Opposition was strongest among those age 55 and above (36%), as well as those living south of Roosevelt Road (35%) and those living in the southwest sector of the Village, but north of Roosevelt Road (35%). On average, all respondents were willing to have the Village collect $3.57 per month for the volunteer fire department. That works out to $5.14 per month among the willing.

Train Station Use: A high proportion (82%) of respondents uses the Glen Ellyn METRA train station at least once a year. One in seven (14%) use it 3 or more times per week. Nearly three in ten (29%) use it at least once a month. Fully seven in ten (70%) use it at least 2 or 3 times a year. Heaviest usage is by those with children younger than grade school (68 times per year), those who have lived in Glen Ellyn 5 years or less (66 times per year), those under 35 years of age (60 times per year), and those with grade school children (59 times per year).

* Table 57 from 2000 Community Attitude Survey

Train Station Appearance: Satisfaction with the appearance of the Glen Ellyn Train Station and its surrounding grounds is fairly high, but there is room for improvement. In total, 78% of respondents say they are satisfied with the station and grounds' appearance. That includes 21% who are completely satisfied, 39% who are very satisfied, and 18% who are somewhat satisfied. Six percent were neither satisfied nor dissatisfied, and another 6% were dissatisfied with the appearance of the station and its surrounding grounds. With the 10% who expressed no opinion, that leaves 69% who are less than completely satisfied with the appearance. Perhaps not surprisingly, satisfaction with appearance is lower among people who use the train station the most. Among two groups that use the train station the most – those with children younger than grade school, and those who have lived in Glen Ellyn 5 years or less - eighty-five percent (85%) are less than completely satisfied with the appearance of the train station and its surrounding grounds.

DEMOGRAPHIC CHARACTERISTICS [Tables 151-168]

Fifty-four percent of the questionnaires were filled out by women, and 44% by men. Two percent did not identify their gender. Four years ago, slightly more men (49%) than women (47%) completed the survey, and in 1990 slightly more women (51%) than men (49%) completed the survey.

This year's respondent group continues to suggest that Glen Ellyn residents are tending to stay put in the Village. The average length of residence has increased from 13.9 years (1990) to 17.5 years (2000) to 18.8 years (2004). Forty-two percent have been residents of the Village for more than 20 years. This figure is higher than what was seen in 2000 (39%), 1990 (31%) or 1983 (28%). This year's group of respondents also has the lowest level (18%) of respondents who have lived in the Village for less than six years. The four previous waves of the study all had higher levels of Under-6-year residents – 2000 (20%), 1990 (29%), and 1983 (26%).

Nearly all respondents (94%) own their residence, and the great majority (82%) lives in a single-family residence.

There is an average of 3.0 people living in each household. Twelve percent of respondents live in single-person households compared to 16% in 2000 and 9% in 1990. There is a slight increase in the number households with four, or more, members – 39% this year vs. 36% in 2000 and 1990.

The percent of respondents who have at least one child living in their household who is 18 years old, or younger, is about what it was in 2000. The mix is a little different however. Fewer households now have high school, junior high school, or middle school children. More households have children younger than grade school.

TABLE W Presence of Children in Household

	2004	2000
Have at least one child in household (Net)	49%	48%
College students	10	10
High school students	18	15
Junior high school/ Middle school students	16	10
Grade school students	20	20
Pre-school age children	9	10
Younger than pre-school age children	10	14

Sample sizes: 480 (2004) and 532 (2000).

The average age of respondents has gone up a little compared to past years – 53.8 this year as compared to 52.2 in 2000 and 47.0 in 1990. One-fourth of this year's respondents are age 65, or older. That is higher than in 2000 (22%), 1990 (14%), and 1983 (10%). Only 29% of this year's group is under 45 vs. 33% in 2000, 49% in 1990, and 53% in 1983.

Employment of male respondents has dropped from 82% in 1990 to 77% in 2000 to 70% in 2004. Employment of female respondents has also declined. It was 65% in 1990, 58% in 2000 and 56% in 2004. The vast majority (84%) of male respondents works outside Glen Ellyn. This is nearly identical (83%) to 2000. Among women, however, 50% of those employed work in Glen Ellyn as compared to 39% in 2000. The percent who work in their home has gone up from 16% in 2000 to 23% in 2004.