

Appendix A:
Questionnaire



Weldon Cooper Center
for Public Service
Center for Survey Research



James City County Citizen Survey 2019

James City County has contracted with the Center for Survey Research at the University of Virginia to conduct this survey. Thank you for taking the next 10-15 minutes to complete this questionnaire that will help your County make decisions in the future. Your opinions are very important to your County leaders and we appreciate your time.

The survey's purpose: We want to understand the opinions of residents of James City County about issues of importance to them and to the County government, as the County begins to update its Comprehensive Plan.

Your responses will be completely confidential.

- Your responses are completely confidential and will never be identified with you individually.
- Your name or contact information will not be linked to your survey responses and will only be used to contact you for this survey.

General instructions

- Circle the number of your response to the question or check the boxes that apply.
- You can decline to take part in the survey or skip any questions you do not wish to answer.
- When you finish answering the questions, put your survey in the envelope provided and drop it in any mailbox. **No postage is required.**

Who can participate?

- A resident of James City County who is at least 18 years old.

How long will it take?

- The survey should take about 10 to 15 minutes to complete.

For more information

- Center for Survey Research: surveys3@virginia.edu, 434-243-5232
- James City County: Alex Baruch, planning@jamestowncountyva.gov, 757-253-6685

This survey has been approved by the University of Virginia's Institutional Review Board for the Social and Behavioral Sciences (Project #2364). To obtain more information about the study, ask questions about the research procedures, express concerns about your participation, please contact: Tonya R. Moon, Ph.D., Chair, IRB-SBS, at (434) 924-5999, or irbsbshelp@virginia.edu.

Your participation in this survey is voluntary. There are no known risks or direct benefits associated with your participation. You will not be paid for completing the questionnaire. However, your individual cooperation is very important to the success of this study and is greatly appreciated! We thank you for your time.

First, we have some questions about you.

Do you live in James City County?

- Yes
- No

IF NO: *If you do not live in James City County, please simply stop here and return the survey in the enclosed envelope.*

- Don't know
- Prefer not to answer

How many years have you lived in James City County?

- Less than one year
- 1-5 years
- 6-10 years
- 11-20 years
- More than 20 years
- Don't know
- Prefer not to answer

Have you lived in James City County all your life?

- Yes
- No
- Prefer not to answer

IF NO: *Where did you live before you moved to James City County? (Skip if you have lived here all your life.)*

TOWN/CITY/COUNTY_____

Please tell us your opinion about County services.

IMPORTANCE OF SERVICES: Below is a list of items your local government works on or might work on in the future, to make the County a better place to live. For each one, please circle the number that corresponds to how important you think it is for the County to devote resources to that item.

	Very Important	Somewhat Important	Somewhat unimportant	Not important at all	Don't know/ Prefer not to answer
James City County's parks and recreation facilities, programs, and services, overall.	1	2	3	4	9
James City County's parks.	1	2	3	4	9
The recreation centers.	1	2	3	4	9
The recreation programs.	1	2	3	4	9
The Williamsburg Regional Library services provided at the Williamsburg and James City County public libraries.	1	2	3	4	9
Williamsburg-James City County's public schools.	1	2	3	4	9
The roads and highways in James City County.	1	2	3	4	9
The availability of bike lanes and sidewalks.	1	2	3	4	9
Housing opportunities for citizens, generally.	1	2	3	4	9
Housing opportunities that are affordable to our workforce.	1	2	3	4	9
Efforts to protect and improve the natural environment including water quality, air quality, and environmentally sensitive areas.	1	2	3	4	9
Public access to waterways for swimming and boating.	1	2	3	4	9
Efforts to protect and preserve the County's rural character.	1	2	3	4	9
Visual appearance of buildings within new developments in the County.	1	2	3	4	9
Efforts to attract jobs and new businesses.	1	2	3	4	9
Limiting irrigation with public water to conserve the County's water supply.	1	2	3	4	9
Development of a field house or multi-use indoor sports facility for community recreation and competitive sporting events.	1	2	3	4	9

SATISFACTION WITH SERVICES: Now please tell us how *satisfied* you are with the County's efforts in each of these areas.

	Very Satisfied	Somewhat Satisfied	Somewhat Unsatisfied	Very Unsatisfied	Don't know/ Prefer not to answer
James City County's parks and recreation facilities, programs, and services, overall.	1	2	3	4	9
James City County's parks.	1	2	3	4	9
The recreation centers.	1	2	3	4	9
The recreation programs.	1	2	3	4	9
The Williamsburg Regional Library services provided at the Williamsburg and James City County public libraries.	1	2	3	4	9
Williamsburg-James City County's public schools.	1	2	3	4	9
The roads and highways in James City County.	1	2	3	4	9
The availability of bike lanes and sidewalks.	1	2	3	4	9
Housing opportunities for citizens, generally.	1	2	3	4	9
Housing opportunities that are affordable to our workforce.	1	2	3	4	9
Efforts to protect and improve the natural environment including water quality, air quality, and environmentally sensitive areas.	1	2	3	4	9
Public access to waterways for swimming and boating.	1	2	3	4	9
Efforts to protect and preserve the County's rural character.	1	2	3	4	9
Visual appearance of buildings within new developments in the County.	1	2	3	4	9
Efforts to attract jobs and new businesses.	1	2	3	4	9
Limiting irrigation with public water to conserve the County's water supply.	1	2	3	4	9
Development of a field house or multi-use indoor sports facility for community recreation and competitive sporting events.	1	2	3	4	9

OVERALL, how satisfied are you with the services provided by James City County?

- Very satisfied
- Somewhat satisfied
- Somewhat unsatisfied
- Very unsatisfied
- Don't know/prefer not to answer

How would you rate the value of County services provided in relation to the taxes paid?

- Excellent
- Good
- Fair
- Poor
- Don't know/prefer not to answer

Now, please tell us about your feelings of safety in James City County, by circling the number that corresponds to how safe you feel.

	Very safe	Somewhat safe	Somewhat unsafe	Very unsafe	Don't know/ Prefer not to answer
How safe do you feel in James City County during daylight hours?	1	2	3	4	9
How safe do you feel in James City County during the evening?	1	2	3	4	9

How would you rate the public school buildings and facilities?

- Excellent
- Good
- Fair
- Poor
- Don't know/prefer not to answer

Now we have some questions about development and land use in the County.

The list below includes some different kinds of development. For each one, please tell us whether you think the amount of development in James City County is too low, about right, or too high, by circling the number that corresponds to your opinion.

	Too low	About right	Too high	Don't know/Prefer not to answer
Residential development (either built or approved).	1	2	3	9
Office development (either built or approved).	1	2	3	9
Retail development (either built or approved).	1	2	3	9
Industrial development (either built or approved).	1	2	3	9

People have many opinions on development in James City County. For each item below, please tell us whether you agree or disagree with the statement, by circling the number that corresponds with your opinion.

	Strongly agree	Somewhat agree	Somewhat disagree	Strongly disagree	Don't know/Prefer not to answer
Residential development of the land in James City County is happening too quickly.	1	2	3	4	9
It is more important to preserve farmland in the County than it is to have more development.	1	2	3	4	9
It is important to have less development in the County even if it means you may pay more in taxes.	1	2	3	4	9
It is better to have more homes on smaller lots and set aside areas for open space in order to permanently preserve land and maintain the character of the community.	1	2	3	4	9
It is better to have neighborhoods in which there is a mix of low-, middle-, and high-income housing options.	1	2	3	4	9
It is better to have neighborhoods in which there is a mix of housing options and small-scale retail and office development.	1	2	3	4	9
Developers who wish to build businesses or residences should always be required to pay a fee to the County to offset public costs even if it means increases in the price of their services and new housing.	1	2	3	4	9

How important is it to have places in the County where people can live, work and play in close proximity?

- Very important
- Somewhat important
- Somewhat unimportant
- Not at all important
- Don't know/Prefer not to answer

Over the next twenty years, what are the most important land uses and activities that should occur in rural lands in James City County?

Thank you for answering those questions. We now want to ask more about your opinion on how the County should be growing.

What is your opinion of the County’s rate of growth over the past few years?

- Much too fast
- A little too fast
- About right
- A little too slow
- Much too slow
- Don’t know/Prefer not to answer

While the County cannot stop growth, it can take measures to manage it. For each of the following measures that the County is doing or could do, please tell us whether you favor it or oppose it, by circling the number that corresponds with your opinion.

	Strongly favor	Somewhat favor	Somewhat oppose	Strongly oppose	No opinion
Having developers and builders provide public amenities such as sidewalks, bikeways, streetlights, parks and open spaces, and street trees in the County’s development area.	1	2	3	4	9
Encouraging a greater mix of offices, stores, restaurants and other urban services with residential areas in the County’s development area.	1	2	3	4	9
Encouraging a greater variety and mix of housing types and price levels in the County’s development area.	1	2	3	4	9
Development of a more interconnected street system in the County’s development area to provide more alternative routes for traffic.	1	2	3	4	9
For rural property, reducing the number of lots a person can divide a large parcel of property into.	1	2	3	4	9
Purchasing property development rights in rural or sensitive areas, to keep the property from developing. This can include the County purchasing easements on properties while the property owner retains ownership, or the County purchasing properties in full from willing sellers.	1	2	3	4	9
Taxing agricultural and forested land at a lower rate than market value in order to defer development of rural land.	1	2	3	4	9
Allowing localized rural services, such as country stores, post offices, etc., in traditionally rural communities.	1	2	3	4	9

Now, we have just a few questions about communication and government information in James City County.

How satisfied are you with the level of communication you receive from the County government regarding services and other community issues?

- Very satisfied
- Somewhat satisfied
- Somewhat dissatisfied
- Very dissatisfied
- Don't know/Prefer not to answer

How do you find out about County information? (Check all that apply.)

- The County website
- TV48
- Social media
- Local newspaper
- An online local news source
- Other (specify: _____)
- Don't know/Prefer not to answer

How would you rate the usability and quality of information on the County's Website (www.jamescitycountyva.gov)?

- Excellent
- Good
- Fair
- Poor
- Don't know/Prefer not to answer

Please share your own thoughts about James City County:

What do you like best about living in the County?

What would you most like to see change in the County in the future?

Demographics

Reminder: All of your responses are completely confidential.

In what year were you born? _____

Counting yourself, how many adults, age 18 or older, are currently living in your home? Do not count any college students living away at school.

Don't know/Prefer not to answer

How many individuals *under* the age of 18 are currently living in your home?

Don't know/Prefer not to answer

Do any of those individuals under age 18 attend Williamsburg-James City County public schools?

Yes
No

Do you own or do you rent your current home?

Own or buying
Rent
Other
Don't know/Prefer not to answer

Which of the following best describes you?

Employed full time (35 hours/week or more)
Employed part time
Looking for work
Stay-at-home parent/homemaker
Retired
Student
Other (specify) _____

IF EMPLOYED FULL TIME OR PART TIME: Where is your primary place of employment?

- 1 James City County
- Williamsburg
- York County
- Newport News
- Other (specify) _____
- All over
- Prefer not to answer

Do you spend 30% or more of your income each month on rent (plus utilities) or mortgage payments (including taxes and insurance)?

- Yes
- No
- Don't know
- Prefer not to answer

Which of the following income categories most closely describes your total household income in 2018 before taxes, including wages and all other income?

- Less than \$10,000
- \$10,000 - \$24,999
- \$25,000 - \$49,999
- \$50,000 - \$74,999
- \$75,000 - \$99,999
- \$100,000-\$149,999
- \$150,000-\$199,999
- \$200,000 or more
- Prefer not to answer

Are you of Hispanic, Latino, or Spanish origin?

- Yes
- No
- Prefer not to answer

With which race(s) do you identify? (Check all that apply.)

- American Indian or Alaska Native
- Asian
- Black or African American
- Native Hawaiian or other Pacific Islander
- White or Caucasian
- Other (*Please write your answer:* _____)
- Prefer not to answer

Are you...

- Male
- Female
- I wish to provide my own description: _____

What is the highest level of education you have completed?

Less than high school diploma

High school graduate/GED

Some college but no degree

Associates Degree (for example: AA, AS) or certificate in career or technical education program for job training

Bachelor's Degree (for example: BA, BS)

Some graduate work

Master's, Professional or Doctoral degree (for example: MA, MSW, MD, PhD)

Prefer not to answer

James City County may plan for further citizen input into the planning process in the near future. They would try to contact residents who have already participated in this survey. If you are willing to be contacted, please visit <https://jamescitycountyva.gov/489/2035-Comprehensive-Plan> to sign up!

Thank you for your help and taking the time to complete this questionnaire.

No postage is required to mail back this questionnaire.

Please use the envelope provided.

Lost your envelope?

Please return the questionnaire to us at:

Center for Survey Research

University of Virginia

P.O. Box 400767

Charlottesville, VA 22904-4767

Appendix B:
Frequency Tables

Census Tract

		Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Valid	801	142	13.4	13.6	13.6
	802	365	34.4	34.8	48.4
	803	328	30.9	31.3	79.7
	804	213	20.1	20.3	100.0
	Total	1048	98.9	100.0	
Missing	.00	12	1.1		
Total		1060	100.0		

Primary Service Area (PSA)

		Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Valid	.00 Outside of PSA	123	11.6	11.7	11.7
	1.00 Inside of PSA	925	87.2	88.3	100.0
	Total	1048	98.9	100.0	
Missing	System	12	1.1		
Total		1060	100.0		

Do you live in James City County?

		Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Valid	1.00 Yes	1032	97.3	99.3	99.3
	2.00 No	7	0.7	0.7	100.0
	Total	1039	98.0	100.0	
Missing	4.00 Prefer not to answer	1	0.1		
	System	21	1.9		
Total	Total	21	2.0		
Total		1060	100.0		

How many years have you lived in James City County?

		Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Valid	1 Less than a year	56	5.3	5.4	5.4
	2 1-5 years	216	20.3	20.9	26.3
	3 6-10 years	134	12.6	12.9	39.2
	4 11-20 years	315	29.7	30.5	69.8
	5 More than 20 years	312	29.4	30.2	100
	Total	1032	97.4	100	
Missing	-99.00	28	2.6		
Total		1060	100.0		

Have you lived in James City County all your life?

		Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Valid	1.00 Yes	53	5.0	5.2	5.2
	2.00 No	978	92.2	94.8	100.0
	Total	1031	97.3	100.0	
Missing	4.00 Prefer not to answer	1	0.1		
	System	28	2.6		
	Total	29	2.7		
Total		1060	100.0		

Did you previously live in VA?

		Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Valid	1 Yes	468	44.2	52.9	52.9
	2 No	418	39.4	47.1	100.0
	Total	886	83.5	100.0	
Missing	-99.00	175	16.5		
Total		1060	100.0		

Region Census

		Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Valid	1.00 Northeast	158	14.9	18.0	18.0
	2.00 Midwest	45	4.3	5.2	23.1
	3.00 South	619	58.4	70.6	93.7
	4.00 West	41	3.9	4.7	98.4
	5.00 Outside US	14	1.3	1.6	100
	Total	877	82.7	100	
Missing	.00	184	17.3		
Total		1060	100.0		

Where did you previously live in VA?

		Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Valid	Albemarle County	2	0.2	0.4	0.4
	Alexandria	9	0.9	2.0	2.4
	Alleghany County	1	0.1	0.2	2.5
	Arlington	5	0.5	1.1	3.6
	Bedford County	2	0.1	0.3	4.0
	Centreville	2	0.2	0.3	4.3
	Chantilly	1	0.1	0.2	4.5
	Charles City	5	0.4	1.0	5.6
	Charlottesville	6	0.5	1.2	6.8
	Chesapeake	3	0.2	0.5	7.3
	Cologne	3	0.3	0.7	8.0
	Essex	1	0.1	0.2	8.2
	Fairfax	39	3.6	8.3	16.6
	Falls Church	2	0.2	0.4	16.9
	Farmville	1	0.1	0.2	17.2
	Fiarfax	1	0.1	0.2	17.4
	Fluvanna	1	0.1	0.2	17.5
	Fort Lee	3	0.3	0.6	18.1
	Fredericksburg	5	0.5	1.2	19.3
	FT Story	1	0.1	0.2	19.5
	Gainesville	3	0.3	0.6	20.1
	Gloucester	17	1.6	3.6	23.8
	Greene	1	0.1	0.2	24.0
	Hampton	21	2.0	4.6	28.6
	Hanover	2	0.1	0.3	28.9
	Harrisonburg	4	0.3	0.8	29.7
	Henrico	10	1.0	2.2	31.9
	Herndon	1	0.1	0.1	32.0
	Isle of Wight Co.	1	0.1	0.2	32.2
	James City County	1	0.1	0.2	32.3
	King and Queen County	1	0.1	0.1	32.5
	King George	1	0.1	0.2	32.6
	Lancaster	1	0.1	0.2	32.8
Loudoun	5	0.5	1.2	34.0	
Lynchburg	1	0.1	0.2	34.2	
Manakin Sabot	1	0.1	0.2	34.3	
Manassas	4	0.4	0.9	35.2	

Many places in VA	4	0.4	0.9	36.1
Matthews County	3	0.3	0.8	36.9
McLean	2	0.1	0.3	37.2
Mechanicsville	1	0.1	0.2	37.4
Middlesex	4	0.4	0.9	38.3
Midlothian	2	0.2	0.5	38.8
New Kent	6	0.5	1.2	40.0
Newport News	71	6.7	15.2	55.2
Norfolk	18	1.7	3.8	59.0
North Chesterfield	1	0.1	0.1	59.1
Northampton County	2	0.2	0.4	59.5
Oakton	2	0.2	0.4	59.9
Orange	1	0.1	0.2	60.1
Page	1	0.1	0.2	60.3
Petersburg	1	0.1	0.3	60.5
Poquoson	2	0.2	0.5	61.1
Portsmouth	5	0.5	1.0	62.1
Prince George	2	0.2	0.5	62.6
Prince William	9	0.8	1.9	64.5
Providence Forge	1	0.1	0.2	64.7
Quantico	1	0.1	0.2	64.8
Radford	1	0.1	0.2	65.1
Richmond	8	0.8	1.8	66.9
Roanoke	6	0.6	1.3	68.2
Shackelfords	1	0.1	0.2	68.3
Smithfield	7	0.6	1.4	69.8
Southampton	1	0.1	0.2	69.9
Spotsylvania	2	0.2	0.5	70.4
Springfield	3	0.3	0.6	71.0
Stafford	3	0.3	0.6	71.7
Staunton	3	0.3	0.6	72.3
Suffolk	6	0.5	1.2	73.5
Surry	1	0.1	0.3	73.8
Ventura County	1	0.1	0.2	74.0
Virginia Beach	21	2.0	4.5	78.5
Warrenton	2	0.1	0.3	78.8
West Point	2	0.2	0.5	79.3
Westmoreland County	3	0.3	0.7	80.0
Williamsburg	28	2.6	5.9	86.0
Williamsburg, York County	6	0.6	1.3	87.2
Winchester	2	0.2	0.5	87.7

JAMES CITY COUNTY COMPREHENSIVE PLAN SURVEY 2019

Woodbridge	1	0.1	0.2	87.9
York County	43	4.1	9.4	97.3
Yorktown	12	1.1	2.6	99.9
Zion Crossroads	1	0.1	0.1	100.0
Total	464	43.8	100.0	
Missing .00	596	56.2		
Total	1060	100.0		

Importance of James City County's parks and recreation facilities, programs, and services, overall

		Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Valid	4 Very important	594	56.0	58.6	58.6
	3 Somewhat important	358	33.7	35.3	93.9
	2 Somewhat unimportant	45	4.2	4.4	98.3
	1 Not important at all	17	1.6	1.7	100.0
	Total	1013	95.6	100.0	
Missing -99		47	4.4		
Total		1060	100.0		

Importance of James City County's parks

		Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Valid	4 Very important	594	56.0	58.9	58.9
	3 Somewhat important	350	33.0	34.6	93.5
	2 Somewhat unimportant	45	4.3	4.5	98.0
	1 Not important at all	20	1.9	2.0	100.0
	Total	1009	95.2	100.0	
Missing -99		51	4.8		
Total		1060	100.0		

Importance of the recreation centers

		Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Valid	4 Very important	468	44.1	46.5	46.5
	3 Somewhat important	394	37.2	39.2	85.7
	2 Somewhat unimportant	109	10.3	10.8	96.6
	1 Not important at all	34	3.2	3.4	100.0
	Total	1006	94.8	100.0	
Missing -99		55	5.2		
Total		1060	100.0		

Importance of the recreation programs

		Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Valid	4 Very important	404	38.1	40.9	40.9
	3 Somewhat important	416	39.2	42.0	82.9
	2 Somewhat unimportant	130	12.3	13.2	96.1
	1 Not important at all	39	3.6	3.9	100.0
	Total	989	93.2	100.0	
Missing	-99	72	6.8		
Total		1060	100.0		

Importance of the Williamsburg Regional Library services provided at the Williamsburg and James City County public libraries

		Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Valid	4 Very important	690	65.1	67.6	67.6
	3 Somewhat important	263	24.8	25.8	93.4
	2 Somewhat unimportant	47	4.4	4.6	98.0
	1 Not important at all	21	2.0	2.0	100.0
	Total	1022	96.3	100.0	
Missing	-99	39	3.7		
Total		1060	100.0		

Importance of Williamsburg-James City County's public schools

		Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Valid	4 Very important	777	73.3	77.1	77.1
	3 Somewhat important	167	15.7	16.5	93.6
	2 Somewhat unimportant	33	3.1	3.3	96.9
	1 Not important at all	32	3.0	3.1	100.0
	Total	1008	95.1	100.0	
Missing	-99	52	4.9		
Total		1060	100.0		

Importance of the roads and highways in James City County

		Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Valid	4 Very important	791	74.6	77.2	77.2
	3 Somewhat important	208	19.6	20.3	97.5
	2 Somewhat unimportant	22	2.1	2.1	99.6
	1 Not important at all	4	0.4	0.4	100.0
	Total	1025	96.7	100.0	
Missing	-99	35	3.3		
Total		1060	100.0		

Importance of the availability of bike lanes and sidewalks

		Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Valid	4 Very important	382	36.0	37.3	37.3
	3 Somewhat important	411	38.7	40.1	77.5
	2 Somewhat unimportant	173	16.3	16.9	94.3
	1 Not important at all	58	5.5	5.7	100.0
	Total	1024	96.5	100.0	
Missing	-99	37	3.5		
Total		1060	100.0		

Importance of housing opportunities for citizens, generally

		Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Valid	4 Very important	423	39.8	41.9	41.9
	3 Somewhat important	366	34.5	36.3	78.1
	2 Somewhat unimportant	172	16.2	17.0	95.2
	1 Not important at all	49	4.6	4.8	100.0
	Total	1009	95.1	100.0	
Missing	-99	52	4.9		
Total		1060	100.0		

Importance of housing opportunities that are affordable to our workforce

		Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Valid	4 Very important	512	48.3	50.5	50.5
	3 Somewhat important	328	31.0	32.4	82.9
	2 Somewhat unimportant	127	12.0	12.6	95.5
	1 Not important at all	45	4.3	4.5	100.0
	Total	1013	95.5	100.0	
Missing	-99	48	4.5		
Total		1060	100.0		

Importance of efforts to protect and improve the natural environment including water quality, air quality, and environmentally sensitive areas

		Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Valid	4 Very important	730	68.8	70.8	70.8
	3 Somewhat important	252	23.7	24.4	95.2
	2 Somewhat unimportant	40	3.8	3.9	99.1
	1 Not important at all	9	0.8	0.9	100.0
	Total	1030	97.2	100.0	
Missing	-99	30	2.8		
Total		1060	100.0		

Importance of public access to waterways for swimming and boating

		Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Valid	4 Very important	334	31.5	32.7	32.7
	3 Somewhat important	444	41.9	43.4	76.1
	2 Somewhat unimportant	185	17.4	18.1	94.2
	1 Not important at all	60	5.6	5.8	100.0
	Total	1022	96.4	100.0	
Missing	-99	38	3.6		
Total		1060	100.0		

Importance of efforts to protect and preserve the County's rural character

		Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Valid	4 Very important	512	48.3	50.1	50.1
	3 Somewhat important	360	33.9	35.2	85.2
	2 Somewhat unimportant	112	10.5	10.9	96.2
	1 Not important at all	39	3.7	3.8	100.0
	Total	1023	96.5	100.0	
Missing	-99	37	3.5		
Total		1060	100.0		

Importance of visual appearance of buildings within new developments in the County

		Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Valid	4 Very important	424	40.0	41.5	41.5
	3 Somewhat important	439	41.4	43.0	84.4
	2 Somewhat unimportant	129	12.1	12.6	97.0
	1 Not important at all	31	2.9	3.0	100.0
	Total	1023	96.5	100.0	
Missing	-99	37	3.5		
Total		1060	100.0		

Importance of efforts to attract jobs and new businesses

		Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Valid	4 Very important	537	50.7	52.5	52.5
	3 Somewhat important	364	34.3	35.6	88.1
	2 Somewhat unimportant	98	9.3	9.6	97.7
	1 Not important at all	23	2.2	2.3	100.0
	Total	1023	96.5	100.0	
Missing	-99	38	3.5		
Total		1060	100.0		

Importance of limiting irrigation with public water to conserve the County's water supply

		Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Valid	4 Very important	374	35.3	37.3	37.3
	3 Somewhat important	430	40.5	42.9	80.2
	2 Somewhat unimportant	161	15.2	16.1	96.3
	1 Not important at all	37	3.5	3.7	100.0
	Total	1003	94.6	100.0	
Missing	-99	58	5.4		
Total		1060	100.0		

Importance of development of a field house or multi-use indoor sports facility for community recreation and competitive sporting events

		Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Valid	4 Very important	165	15.5	16.4	16.4
	3 Somewhat important	359	33.8	35.8	52.2
	2 Somewhat unimportant	309	29.1	30.8	83.0
	1 Not important at all	171	16.1	17.0	100.0
	Total	1003	94.6	100.0	
Missing	-99	57	5.4		
Total		1060	100.0		

Importance of County services				
	Very important	Somewhat important	Somewhat unimportant	Not important at all
James City County's parks and recreation facilities, programs, and services, overall	58.6%	35.3%	4.4%	1.7%
James City County's parks	58.9%	34.6%	4.5%	2.0%
The recreation centers	46.5%	39.2%	10.8%	3.4%
The recreation programs	40.9%	42.0%	13.2%	3.9%
The Williamsburg Regional Library services provided at the Williamsburg and James City County public libraries	67.6%	25.8%	4.6%	2.0%
Williamsburg-James City County's public schools	77.1%	16.5%	3.3%	3.1%
Roads and highways in James City County	77.2%	20.3%	2.1%	0.4%
Availability of bike lanes and sidewalks	37.3%	40.1%	16.9%	5.7%
Housing opportunities for citizens, generally	41.9%	36.3%	17.0%	4.8%
Housing opportunities that are affordable to our workforce	50.5%	32.4%	12.6%	4.5%
Efforts to protect and improve the natural environment including water quality, air quality, and environmentally sensitive areas	70.8%	24.4%	3.9%	0.9%
Public access to waterways for swimming and boating	32.7%	43.4%	18.1%	5.8%
Efforts to protect and preserve the County's rural character	50.1%	35.2%	10.9%	3.8%
Visual appearance of buildings within new developments in the County	41.5%	43.0%	12.6%	3.0%
Efforts to attract jobs and new businesses	52.5%	35.6%	9.6%	2.3%
Limiting irrigation with public water to conserve the County's water supply	37.3%	42.9%	16.1%	3.7%
Development of a field house or multi-use indoor sports facility for community recreation and competitive sporting events	16.4%	35.8%	30.8%	17.0%

Satisfaction with James City County's parks and recreation facilities, programs, and services, overall

		Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Valid	4 Very satisfied	473	44.6	50.2	50.2
	3 Somewhat satisfied	419	39.5	44.4	94.6
	2 Somewhat unsatisfied	44	4.1	4.6	99.2
	1 Very unsatisfied	8	0.7	0.8	100.0
	Total	943	88.9	100.0	
Missing	-99	118	11.1		
Total		1060	100.0		

Satisfaction with James City County's parks

		Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Valid	4 Very satisfied	484	45.6	50.8	50.8
	3 Somewhat satisfied	419	39.6	44.1	94.9
	2 Somewhat unsatisfied	37	3.5	3.9	98.8
	1 Very unsatisfied	12	1.1	1.2	100.0
	Total	952	89.7	100.0	
Missing	-99	109	10.3		
Total		1060	100.0		

Satisfaction with the recreation centers

		Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Valid	4 Very satisfied	366	34.6	43.8	43.8
	3 Somewhat satisfied	410	38.7	49.0	92.7
	2 Somewhat unsatisfied	54	5.1	6.4	99.2
	1 Very unsatisfied	7	0.6	0.8	100.0
	Total	838	79.0	100.0	
Missing	-99	223	21.0		
Total		1060	100.0		

Satisfaction with the recreation programs

		Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Valid	4 Very satisfied	288	27.1	38.0	38.0
	3 Somewhat satisfied	389	36.7	51.3	89.2
	2 Somewhat unsatisfied	73	6.9	9.7	98.9
	1 Very unsatisfied	8	0.8	1.1	100.0
	Total	758	71.5	100.0	
Missing	-99	302	28.5		
Total		1060	100.0		

Satisfaction with the Williamsburg Regional Library services provided at Williamsburg and James City County public libraries

		Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Valid	4 Very satisfied	645	60.9	67.0	67.0
	3 Somewhat satisfied	259	24.4	26.9	93.9
	2 Somewhat unsatisfied	53	5.0	5.5	99.4
	1 Very unsatisfied	6	0.5	0.6	100.0
	Total	963	90.8	100.0	
Missing	-99	98	9.2		
Total		1060	100.0		

Satisfaction with Williamsburg-James City County's public schools

		Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Valid	4 Very satisfied	269	25.4	36.7	36.7
	3 Somewhat satisfied	336	31.7	45.9	82.7
	2 Somewhat unsatisfied	102	9.7	14.0	96.7
	1 Very unsatisfied	24	2.3	3.3	100.0
	Total	732	69.0	100.0	
Missing	-99	329	31.0		
Total		1060	100.0		

Satisfaction with the roads and highways in James City County

		Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Valid	4 Very satisfied	223	21.1	21.9	21.9
	3 Somewhat satisfied	524	49.4	51.3	73.2
	2 Somewhat unsatisfied	234	22.1	23.0	96.2
	1 Very unsatisfied	39	3.7	3.8	100.0
	Total	1021	96.3	100.0	
Missing	-99	40	3.7		
Total		1060	100.0		

Satisfaction with the availability of bike lanes and sidewalks

		Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Valid	4 Very satisfied	202	19.0	21.9	21.9
	3 Somewhat satisfied	457	43.1	49.5	71.4
	2 Somewhat unsatisfied	191	18.0	20.7	92.1
	1 Very unsatisfied	73	6.9	7.9	100.0
	Total	923	87.0	100.0	
Missing	-99	138	13.0		
Total		1060	100.0		

Satisfaction with housing opportunities for citizens, generally

		Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Valid	4 Very satisfied	188	17.8	22.2	22.2
	3 Somewhat satisfied	431	40.6	50.7	72.8
	2 Somewhat unsatisfied	189	17.8	22.2	95.1
	1 Very unsatisfied	42	3.9	4.9	100.0
	Total	850	80.2	100.0	
Missing	-99	210	19.8		
Total		1060	100.0		

Satisfaction with housing opportunities that are affordable to our workforce

		Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Valid	4 Very satisfied	114	10.8	13.8	13.8
	3 Somewhat satisfied	301	28.4	36.5	50.3
	2 Somewhat unsatisfied	283	26.7	34.3	84.6
	1 Very unsatisfied	127	12.0	15.4	100.0
	Total	826	77.9	100.0	
Missing	-99	235	22.1		
Total		1060	100.0		

Satisfaction with efforts to protect and improve the natural environment including water quality, air quality, and environmentally sensitive areas

		Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Valid	4 Very satisfied	215	20.3	24.2	24.2
	3 Somewhat satisfied	496	46.8	55.8	80.0
	2 Somewhat unsatisfied	143	13.5	16.1	96.1
	1 Very unsatisfied	35	3.3	3.9	100.0
	Total	889	83.8	100.0	
Missing	-99	171	16.2		
Total		1060	100.0		

Satisfaction with public access to waterways for swimming and boating

		Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Valid	4 Very satisfied	221	20.8	27.1	27.1
	3 Somewhat satisfied	454	42.8	55.7	82.8
	2 Somewhat unsatisfied	123	11.6	15.1	97.9
	1 Very unsatisfied	17	1.6	2.1	100.0
	Total	815	76.9	100.0	
Missing	-99	245	23.1		
Total		1060	100.0		

Satisfaction with efforts to protect and preserve the County's rural character

		Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Valid	4 Very satisfied	198	18.6	21.9	21.9
	3 Somewhat satisfied	431	40.7	47.7	69.5
	2 Somewhat unsatisfied	205	19.4	22.7	92.3
	1 Very unsatisfied	70	6.6	7.7	100.0
	Total	904	85.3	100.0	
Missing	-99	156	14.7		
Total		1060	100.0		

Satisfaction with visual appearance of buildings within new developments in the County

		Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Valid	4 Very satisfied	237	22.3	24.6	24.6
	3 Somewhat satisfied	555	52.3	57.5	82.1
	2 Somewhat unsatisfied	146	13.8	15.1	97.2
	1 Very unsatisfied	27	2.5	2.8	100.0
	Total	964	91.0	100.0	
Missing	-99	96	9.0		
Total		1060	100.0		

Satisfaction with efforts to attract jobs and new businesses

		Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Valid	4 Very satisfied	150	14.1	18.0	18.0
	3 Somewhat satisfied	417	39.3	50.3	68.3
	2 Somewhat unsatisfied	198	18.7	23.9	92.2
	1 Very unsatisfied	65	6.1	7.8	100.0
	Total	829	78.2	100.0	
Missing	-99	231	21.8		
Total		1060	100.0		

Satisfaction with limiting irrigation with public water to conserve the County's water supply

		Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Valid	4 Very satisfied	149	14.1	20.1	20.1
	3 Somewhat satisfied	400	37.7	53.9	73.9
	2 Somewhat unsatisfied	165	15.5	22.2	96.1
	1 Very unsatisfied	29	2.7	3.9	100.0
	Total	742	70.0	100.0	
Missing	-99	318	30.0		
Total		1060	100.0		

Satisfaction with development of a field house or multi-use indoor sports facility for community recreation and competitive sporting events

		Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Valid	4 Very satisfied	140	13.2	23.1	23.1
	3 Somewhat satisfied	314	29.6	52.0	75.1
	2 Somewhat unsatisfied	112	10.5	18.5	93.7
	1 Very unsatisfied	38	3.6	6.3	100.0
	Total	604	56.9	100.0	
Missing	-99	457	43.1		
Total		1060	100.0		

Satisfaction with County services				
	Very Satisfied	Somewhat Satisfied	Somewhat Unsatisfied	Very Unsatisfied
James City County's parks and recreation facilities, programs, and services, overall	50.2%	44.4%	4.6%	0.8%
James City County's parks	50.8%	44.1%	3.9%	1.2%
The recreation centers	43.8%	49.0%	6.4%	0.8%
The recreation programs	38.0%	51.3%	9.7%	1.1%
The Williamsburg Regional Library services provided at the Williamsburg and James City County public libraries	67.0%	26.9%	5.5%	0.6%
Williamsburg-James City County's public schools	36.7%	45.9%	14.0%	3.3%
Roads and highways in James City County	21.9%	51.3%	23.0%	3.8%
Availability of bike lanes and sidewalks	21.9%	49.5%	20.7%	7.9%
Housing opportunities for citizens, generally	22.2%	50.7%	22.2%	4.9%
Housing opportunities that are affordable to our workforce	13.8%	36.5%	34.3%	15.4%
Efforts to protect and improve the natural environment including water quality, air quality, and environmentally sensitive areas	24.2%	55.8%	16.1%	3.9%
Public access to waterways for swimming and boating	27.1%	55.7%	15.1%	2.1%
Efforts to protect and preserve the County's rural character	21.9%	47.7%	22.7%	7.7%
Visual appearance of buildings within new developments in the County	24.6%	57.5%	15.1%	2.8%
Efforts to attract jobs and new businesses	18.0%	50.3%	23.9%	7.8%
Limiting irrigation with public water to conserve the County's water supply	20.1%	53.9%	22.2%	3.9%
Development of a field house or multi-use indoor sports facility for community recreation and competitive sporting events	23.1%	52.0%	18.5%	6.3%

Overall, how satisfied are you with the services provided by James City County?

		Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Valid	4 Very satisfied	369	34.8	36.4	36.4
	3 Somewhat satisfied	576	54.3	56.9	93.3
	2 Somewhat unsatisfied	62	5.8	6.1	99.4
	1 Very unsatisfied	6	0.6	0.6	100.0
	Total	1012	95.5	100.0	
Missing	-99	48	4.5		
Total		1060	100.0		

How would you rate the value of County services provided in relation to the taxes paid?

		Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Valid	4 Very satisfied	169	16.0	17.4	17.4
	3 Somewhat satisfied	522	49.3	53.6	71.0
	2 Somewhat unsatisfied	232	21.8	23.8	94.7
	1 Very unsatisfied	52	4.9	5.3	100.0
	Total	975	92.0	100.0	
Missing	-99	85	8.0		
Total		1060	100.0		

How safe do you feel in James City County during daylight hours?

		Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Valid	1.00 Very Safe	797	75.1	77.2	77.2
	2.00 Somewhat safe	222	20.9	21.5	98.7
	3.00 Somewhat unsafe	13	1.3	1.3	100.0
	Total	1032	97.3	100.0	
Missing	9.00 Don't know/Prefer not to answer	1	0.1		
	System	27	2.6		
	Total	29	2.7		
Total		1060	100.0		

How safe do you feel in James City County during the evening?

		Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Valid	1.00 Very Safe	472	44.5	46.0	46.0
	2.00 Somewhat safe	453	42.7	44.2	90.2
	3.00 Somewhat unsafe	95	8.9	9.2	99.5
	4.00 Very unsafe	6	0.5	0.5	100.0
	Total	1025	96.7	100.0	
Missing	9.00 Don't know/Prefer not to answer	6	0.6		
	System	29	2.8		
	Total	35	3.3		
	Total	1060	100.0		

How would you rate the public school buildings and facilities?

		Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Valid	1.00 Excellent	193	18.2	27.4	27.4
	2.00 Good	407	38.4	57.8	85.3
	3.00 Fair	91	8.6	13.0	98.3
	4.00 Poor	12	1.2	1.7	100.0
	Total	704	66.3	100.0	
Missing	5.00 Don't know/Prefer not to answer	322	30.3		
	System	35	3.3		
	Total	357	33.7		
	Total	1060	100.0		

Amount of residential development is:

		Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Valid	1.00 Too low	62	5.8	6.4	6.4
	2.00 About right	566	53.4	58.7	65.1
	3.00 Too high	337	31.8	34.9	100.0
	Total	965	91.0	100.0	
Missing	9.00 Don't know/Prefer not to answer	58	5.5		
	System	38	3.6		
	Total	96	9.0		
	Total	1060	100.0		

JAMES CITY COUNTY COMPREHENSIVE PLAN SURVEY 2019

Amount of office development is:

		Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Valid	1.00 Too low	49	4.6	5.6	5.6
	2.00 About right	580	54.7	66.5	72.1
	3.00 Too high	244	23.0	27.9	100.0
	Total	873	82.3	100.0	
Missing	9.00 Don't know/Prefer not to answer	147	13.9		
	System	40	3.8		
	Total	188	17.7		
Total		1060	100.0		

Amount of retail development is:

		Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Valid	1.00 Too low	53	5.0	5.6	5.6
	2.00 About right	431	40.6	45.0	50.6
	3.00 Too high	472	44.5	49.4	100.0
	Total	956	90.2	100.0	
Missing	9.00 Don't know/Prefer not to answer	67	6.3		
	System	37	3.5		
	Total	104	9.8		
Total		1060	100.0		

Amount of industrial development is:

		Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Valid	1.00 Too low	154	14.5	20.0	20.0
	2.00 About right	480	45.3	62.3	82.3
	3.00 Too high	136	12.8	17.7	100.0
	Total	771	72.7	100.0	
Missing	9.00 Don't know/Prefer not to answer	244	23.1		
	System	45	4.3		
	Total	290	27.3		
Total		1060	100.0		

Agreement that residential development of the land in James City County is happening too quickly

		Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Valid	4 Strongly agree	295	27.9	31.2	31.2
	3 Somewhat agree	409	38.5	43.2	74.5
	2 Somewhat disagree	210	19.8	22.2	96.6
	1 Strongly disagree	32	3.0	3.4	100.0
	Total	946	89.2	100.0	
Missing	-99	115	10.8		
Total		1060	100.0		

Agreement that it is more important to preserve farmland in the County than it is to have more development

		Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Valid	4 Strongly agree	367	34.6	37.9	37.9
	3 Somewhat agree	394	37.1	40.6	78.5
	2 Somewhat disagree	167	15.8	17.3	95.8
	1 Strongly disagree	41	3.8	4.2	100.0
	Total	969	91.3	100.0	
Missing	-99	92	8.7		
Total		1060	100.0		

Agreement that it is more important to have less development in the County even if it means you may pay more in taxes

		Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Valid	4 Strongly agree	152	14.3	15.6	15.6
	3 Somewhat agree	376	35.5	38.8	54.4
	2 Somewhat disagree	305	28.7	31.4	85.8
	1 Strongly disagree	137	12.9	14.2	100.0
	Total	970	91.5	100.0	
Missing	-99	90	8.5		
Total		1060	100.0		

Agreement that it is better to have more homes on smaller lots and set aside areas for open space in order to permanently preserve land and maintain the character of the community

		Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Valid	4 Strongly agree	184	17.4	19.0	19.0
	3 Somewhat agree	385	36.3	39.7	58.7
	2 Somewhat disagree	265	25.0	27.4	86.0
	1 Strongly disagree	135	12.8	14.0	100.0
	Total	969	91.4	100.0	
Missing	-99	91	8.6		
Total		1060	100.0		

Agreement that it is better to have neighborhoods in which there is a mix of low-, middle-, and high-income housing options

		Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Valid	4 Strongly agree	185	17.5	19.0	19.0
	3 Somewhat agree	329	31.0	33.7	52.7
	2 Somewhat disagree	299	28.2	30.6	83.3
	1 Strongly disagree	163	15.4	16.7	100.0
	Total	977	92.1	100.0	
Missing	-99	84	7.9		
Total		1060	100.0		

Agreement that it is better to have neighborhoods in which there is a mix of housing options and small-scale retail and office development

		Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Valid	4 Strongly agree	127	12.0	13.1	13.1
	3 Somewhat agree	443	41.8	45.7	58.8
	2 Somewhat disagree	283	26.6	29.1	87.9
	1 Strongly disagree	117	11.1	12.1	100.0
	Total	971	91.5	100.0	
Missing	-99	90	8.5		
Total		1060	100.0		

Agreement that developers who wish to build businesses or residences should always be required to pay a fee to the County to offset public costs even if it means increases in the price of their services and new housing

		Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Valid	4 Strongly agree	385	36.3	41.3	41.3
	3 Somewhat agree	354	33.4	38.0	79.3
	2 Somewhat disagree	143	13.4	15.3	94.6
	1 Strongly disagree	51	4.8	5.4	100.0
	Total	933	88.0	100.0	
Missing	-99	128	12.0		
Total		1060	100.0		

How important is it to have places in the County where people can live, work and play in close proximity?

		Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Valid	1.00 Very important	443	41.7	43.9	43.9
	2.00 Somewhat important	421	39.7	41.7	85.6
	3.00 Somewhat unimportant	112	10.6	11.1	96.7
	4.00 Not at all important	34	3.2	3.3	100.0
	Total	1009	95.2	100.0	
Missing	5.00 Don't know/Prefer not to answer	19	1.8		
	System	33	3.1		
	Total	51	4.8		
Total		1060	100.0		

What is your opinion of the County's rate of growth over the past few years?

		Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Valid	1.00 Much too fast	243	22.9	25.5	25.5
	2.00 A little too fast	346	32.6	36.3	61.9
	3.00 About right	309	29.1	32.4	94.3
	4.00 A little too slow	50	4.8	5.3	99.6
	5.00 Much too slow	4	0.4	0.4	100.0
	Total	952	89.7	100.0	
Missing	6.00 Don't know/Prefer not to answer	70	6.6		
	System	39	3.6		
	Total	109	10.3		
Total		1060	100.0		

Favor or oppose having developers and builders provide public amenities such as sidewalks, bikeways, streetlights, parks and open spaces, and street trees in the County's development area

		Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Valid	4 Strongly favor	776	73.2	76.9	76.9
	3 Somewhat favor	211	19.9	20.9	97.9
	2 Somewhat oppose	16	1.5	1.6	99.5
	1 Strongly oppose	5	0.5	0.5	100.0
	Total	1009	95.1	100	
Missing	-99	52	4.9		
Total		1060	100.0		

Favor or oppose encouraging a greater mix of offices, stores, restaurants and other urban services with residential areas in the county's development area

		Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Valid	4 Strongly favor	219	20.7	22.2	22.2
	3 Somewhat favor	471	44.4	47.7	70.0
	2 Somewhat oppose	228	21.5	23.1	93.1
	1 Strongly oppose	68	6.4	6.9	100.0
	Total	987	93.0	100	
Missing	-99	74	7.0		
Total		1060	100.0		

Favor or oppose encouraging a greater variety and mix of housing types and price levels in the County's development area

		Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Valid	4 Strongly favor	325	30.7	33.3	33.3
	3 Somewhat favor	444	41.9	45.5	78.8
	2 Somewhat oppose	155	14.6	15.8	94.6
	1 Strongly oppose	52	4.9	5.4	100.0
	Total	976	92.1	100	
Missing	-99	84	7.9		
Total		1060	100.0		

**Favor or oppose the development of a more interconnected street system in the County's
development area to provide more alternative routes for traffic**

		Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Valid	4 Strongly favor	393	37.1	40.8	40.8
	3 Somewhat favor	422	39.8	43.8	84.6
	2 Somewhat oppose	108	10.2	11.2	95.8
	1 Strongly oppose	40	3.8	4.2	100.0
	Total	963	90.8	100	
Missing	-99	97	9.2		
Total		1060	100.0		

**Favor or oppose reducing the number of lots a person can divide a large parcel of property into, for
rural property**

		Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Valid	4 Strongly favor	393	37.1	43.9	43.9
	3 Somewhat favor	334	31.5	37.3	81.2
	2 Somewhat oppose	119	11.2	13.3	94.5
	1 Strongly oppose	49	4.6	5.5	100.0
	Total	895	84.4	100	
Missing	-99	166	15.6		
Total		1060	100.0		

**Favor or oppose purchasing property development rights in rural or sensitive areas, to keep the property
from developing**

		Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Valid	4 Strongly favor	337	31.7	36.9	36.9
	3 Somewhat favor	364	34.3	39.9	76.8
	2 Somewhat oppose	151	14.3	16.6	93.4
	1 Strongly oppose	60	5.7	6.6	100.0
	Total	913	86.1	100	
Missing	-99	148	13.9		
Total		1060	100.0		

Favor or oppose taxing agricultural and forested land at a lower rate than market value in order to defer development of rural land

		Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Valid	4 Strongly favor	424	40.0	45.5	45.5
	3 Somewhat favor	354	33.3	37.9	83.4
	2 Somewhat oppose	109	10.3	11.7	95.1
	1 Strongly oppose	46	4.3	4.9	100.0
	Total	933	87.9	100	
Missing	-99	128	12.1		
Total		1060	100.0		

Favor or oppose allowing localized rural services, such as country stores, post offices, etc., in traditionally rural communities

		Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Valid	4 Strongly favor	479	45.2	49.7	49.7
	3 Somewhat favor	426	40.2	44.2	93.9
	2 Somewhat oppose	48	4.5	4.9	98.8
	1 Strongly oppose	11	1.1	1.2	100.0
	Total	964	90.9	100	
Missing	-99	97	9.1		
Total		1060	100.0		

Favor/Opposition for Measures for Controlling Growth				
	Strongly favor	Somewhat favor	Somewhat oppose	Strongly oppose
Having developers and builders provide public amenities such as sidewalks, bikeways, streetlights, parks and open spaces, and street trees in the County's development area	76.9%	20.9%	1.6%	0.5%
Encouraging a greater mix of offices, stores, restaurants and other urban services with residential areas in the county's development area	22.2%	47.7%	23.1%	6.9%
Encouraging a greater variety and mix of housing types and price levels in the County's development area	33.3%	45.5%	15.8%	5.4%
The development of a more interconnected street system in the County's development area to provide more alternative routes for traffic	40.8%	43.8%	11.2%	4.2%
Reducing the number of lots a person can divide a large parcel of property into, for rural property	43.9%	37.3%	13.3%	5.5%
Purchasing property development rights in rural or sensitive areas, to keep the property from developing	36.9%	39.9%	16.6%	6.6%
Taxing agricultural and forested land at a lower rate than market value in order to defer development of rural land	45.5%	37.9%	11.7%	4.9%
Allowing localized rural services, such as country stores, post offices, etc., in traditionally rural communities	49.7%	44.2%	4.9%	1.2%

How satisfied are you with the level of communication you receive from the County government regarding services and other community issues?

		Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Valid	1.00 Very satisfied	207	19.5	21.6	21.6
	2.00 Somewhat satisfied	495	46.7	51.7	73.3
	3.00 Somewhat unsatisfied	198	18.7	20.7	94.0
	4.00 Very dissatisfied	57	5.4	6.0	100.0
	Total	957	90.3	100.0	
Missing	5.00 Don't know/Prefer not to answer	64	6.0		
	System	39	3.7		
	Total	103	9.7		
	Total	1060	100.0		

How do you find out about County information? (Check all that apply)

	N	Percent	
E2_1 The County website	326	19.9%	34.0%
E2_2 TV48	86	5.3%	9.0%
E2_3 Social media	285	17.3%	29.7%
E2_4 Local newspaper	579	35.3%	60.4%
E2_5 An online local news source	250	15.2%	26.1%
E2_6 Other	116	7.1%	12.1%
Total	1642	100.0%	171.3%

How do you find out about County information (Check all that apply)-Other, please specify: - Text

		Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Valid	accident	1	0.1	0.6	0.6
	COLONIAL HERITAGE	1	0.1	0.7	1.3
	Community activists	1	0.1	0.8	2.1
	County email	3	0.3	2.6	4.7
	Daily radio and community action board/website	1	0.1	0.6	5.3
	E - RC L	1	0.1	0.9	6.3
	Email alerts	1	0.1	1.2	7.5
	Facebook	5	0.4	4.0	11.5
	Family	1	0.1	0.6	12.1
	Family, friends, neighbors	1	0.1	0.8	12.9
	Fliers	1	0.1	0.6	13.5
	Friends	9	0.8	7.6	21.1
	Gazette	3	0.3	2.4	23.5
	GOOGLE	1	0.1	1.0	24.4
	HOA	3	0.3	2.7	27.2
	I don't receive county info	3	0.3	2.7	29.9
	I've signed up for email alerts from JCC	1	0.1	0.7	30.6
	information sessions at Windsor Reache	1	0.1	0.8	31.4
	Library	1	0.1	0.8	32.1
	Local church	1	0.1	0.7	32.9
	Local news	1	0.1	1.2	34.1
	Local TV news	5	0.5	4.6	38.7
	Mail	8	0.8	6.9	45.7
	Mail, Williamsburg, Nextdoor Magazine	3	0.3	3.0	48.6
	MAIL/WORD OF MOUTH; WGDAILY (?).COM	3	0.3	2.5	51.1
	Neighborhood emails	1	0.1	0.6	51.7
	Neighborhood monthly news letter	1	0.1	0.6	52.3
	Neighbors	8	0.7	6.6	58.9
	News Letter	1	0.1	0.6	59.5
	Nextdoor. (Online site)	1	0.1	0.7	60.3
	None	1	0.1	0.8	61.1
	online sources	1	0.1	0.8	61.8
	Phone around	1	0.1	1.0	62.8
	phone calls for alerts	1	0.1	0.8	63.6
	pick up information at library	1	0.1	1.0	64.5

JAMES CITY COUNTY COMPREHENSIVE PLAN SURVEY 2019

PUBLIC SCHOOL EMAILS "ANNOUNCEMENTS"	1	0.1	0.8	65.3
PUBLIC SERVICE ANNOUNCEMENTS	1	0.1	0.7	66.0
Radio	2	0.1	1.3	67.4
search the web	1	0.1	0.6	68.0
serve on Board of LEDA	1	0.1	0.7	68.7
SOCIAL EVENTS	1	0.1	0.9	69.7
speakers attending our FCCC Forums etc.	1	0.1	0.6	70.3
Strictly by chance	1	0.1	0.7	71.0
Telephone advisory- strong storms, tornado, etc.	1	0.1	0.6	71.6
Temporary street signs like @ Fido Fest	1	0.1	0.6	72.2
text	3	0.3	2.9	75.2
The only news I receive is from VA Gazette	1	0.1	0.6	75.8
Town/community meetings	1	0.1	0.9	76.6
Visiting offices at Mount's Bay Complex	1	0.1	0.6	77.3
WHEN I GET OVERDUE TAX NOTICES AND I NEVER GOT THE FIRST NOTICE	1	0.1	0.7	78.0
Williamsburg, [ineligible] Flyer also	1	0.1	0.8	78.7
Williamsburgfamilies.com, texts/emails you can opt into	1	0.1	0.8	79.5
Word of mouth	22	2.1	19.5	99.0
Word of mouth/mailings	1	0.1	1.0	100.0
Total	115	10.9	100.0	
Missing	.00	945	89.1	
Total		1060	100.0	

How would you rate the usability and quality of information on the County's Website (www.jamescitycountyva.gov)?					
		Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Valid	1.00 Excellent	80	7.5	11.8	11.8
	2.00 Good	385	36.4	56.9	68.7
	3.00 Fair	186	17.6	27.5	96.2
	4.00 Poor	26	2.4	3.8	100.0
	Total	678	63.9	100.0	
Missing	5.00 Don't know/Prefer not to answer	344	32.5		
	System	39	3.6		
	Total	383	36.1		
Total		1060	100.0		

		Age category			
		Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Valid	1.00 Under 50	204	19.2	21.3	21.3
	2.00 50 to 64	245	23.1	25.6	46.9
	3.00 65 to 79	365	34.4	38.1	85.0
	4.00 80 and over	144	13.6	15.0	100.0
	Total	958	90.3	100.0	
Missing	.00	103	9.7		
Total		1060	100.0		

		Number of adults in the household			
		Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Valid	1	254	24.0	26.1	26.1
	2	622	58.7	63.8	89.9
	3	67	6.3	6.9	96.7
	4	22	2.1	2.2	99.0
	5	7	0.6	0.7	99.7
	6 6 or more	3	0.3	0.3	100.0
	Total	975	92.0	100.0	
Missing	System	85	8.0		
Total		1060	100.0		

		Number of children in the household			
		Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Valid	0	763	72.0	78.5	78.5
	1	94	8.8	9.6	88.2
	2	83	7.8	8.6	96.7
	3	19	1.8	2.0	98.7
	4	8	0.8	0.9	99.5
	5	4	0.4	0.4	99.9
	6 6 or more	1	0.1	0.1	100.0
	Total	972	91.7	100.0	
Missing	System	88	8.3		
Total		1060	100.0		

Among those with children, households who have children attend Williamsburg-James City County public schools

		Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Valid	1.00 Yes	204	19.2	21.3	21.3
	2.00 No	245	23.1	25.6	46.9
	Total	958	90.3	100.0	
Missing	.00	103	9.7		
Total		1060	100.0		

Do you own or rent your current home?

		Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Valid	1.00 Own or buying	745	70.2	74.2	74.2
	2.00 Rent	236	22.3	23.5	97.7
	3.00 Other	23	2.2	2.3	100.0
	Total	1004	94.7	100.0	
Missing	4.00 Don't know/Prefer not to answer	8	0.7		
	System	49	4.6		
	Total	57	5.3		
Total		1060	100.0		

Do you own or do you rent your current home?-Other: Text

		Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Valid		1054	99.4	99.4	99.4
	Live in a retirement community but also own rental property in the county.	1	0.1	0.1	99.5
	Live in Retirement Community	1	0.1	0.1	99.6
	PART OWNER	1	0.1	0.1	99.7
	Retirement Community	1	0.1	0.1	99.8
	We sort of own but only sort of rent from Windsor Meade.	1	0.1	0.1	99.9
	Williamsburg Landing	1	0.1	0.1	100.0
	Total	1060	100.0	100.0	

		Employment status			
		Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Valid	ACTIVE	1	0.1	4.0	4.0
	consultant approx 30 hours/week	1	0.1	3.2	7.2
	Dept of Defense	1	0.1	3.9	11.1
	Disabled	9	0.8	38.3	49.4
	FREE LANCE ONLINE	1	0.1	4.7	54.1
	GRANDMOTHER/CAREGIVER	1	0.1	4.0	58.0
	Independent Contractor	1	0.1	3.8	61.9
	Retired	1	0.1	3.1	65.0
	Self-employed	2	0.2	10.5	75.5
	Semi-retired	2	0.2	10.1	85.6
	visiting	3	0.3	14.4	100.0
	Total	23	2.1	100.0	
Missing		1038	97.9		
Total		1060	100.0		

		Where is your primary place of employment?			
		Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Valid	1.00 James City County	138	13.0	33.8	33.8
	2.00 Williamsburg	76	7.2	18.7	52.5
	3.00 York County	31	2.9	7.7	60.2
	4.00 Newport News	49	4.7	12.1	72.3
	5.00 Other, please specify:	92	8.7	22.5	94.8
	6.00 All over	21	2.0	5.2	100.0
	Total	408	38.5	100.0	
Missing	7.00 Don't know/Prefer not to answer	5	0.5		
	System	647	61.0		
	Total	652	61.5		
Total		1060	100.0		

Where is your primary place of employment? -Other, please specify: Text

		Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Valid	Albemarle Co.	1	0.1	0.9	0.9
	Alexandria	1	0.1	0.9	1.8
	Blackstone, VA	1	0.1	0.9	2.6
	Busch Gardens, Williamsburg	1	0.1	0.8	3.4
	Charles City County	1	0.1	0.9	4.3
	Charlottesville	1	0.1	1.1	5.4
	Chesapeake	5	0.4	5.5	10.9
	Fairfax	1	0.1	1.3	12.2
	Fort Eustis	1	0.1	1.7	13.9
	Fort Lee	2	0.1	1.9	15.8
	Gloucester County, VA	3	0.3	3.3	19.1
	Hampton	18	1.7	21.6	40.8
	Henrico	3	0.3	3.8	44.5
	International	3	0.2	3.0	47.6
	Lanexa, VA	3	0.3	3.9	51.5
	Multiple locations	4	0.3	4.3	55.7
	New Kent	3	0.3	4.1	59.8
	Norfolk	2	0.2	2.4	62.2
	Norfolk, but work from home most day	3	0.3	4.1	66.3
	Ports Mouth	1	0.1	1.0	67.3
	Research Triangle Park, North Carolina	1	0.1	1.1	68.4
	Richmond	16	1.5	19.6	88.0
	Suffolk, VA	1	0.1	1.7	89.7
	Surry-Surry Power Station	1	0.1	0.8	90.5
	Virginia Beach	1	0.1	0.9	91.4
	Washington D.C.	3	0.3	3.6	95.0
	Work remotely from home	3	0.3	4.2	99.2
	Yorktown	1	0.1	0.8	100.0
	Total	83	7.8	100.0	
Missing	.00	977	92.2		
Total		1060	100.0		

Do you spend 30% or more of your income each month on rent (plus utilities) or mortgage payments (including taxes and insurance)?

		Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Valid	1.00 Yes	402	37.9	44.1	44.1
	2.00 No	466	44.0	51.1	95.3
	3.00 Don't know	43	4.1	4.7	100.0
	Total	912	86.0	100.0	
Missing	4.00 Prefer not to answer	86	8.1		
	System	63	5.9		
	Total	149	14.0		
Total		1060	100.0		

Total household income in 2018 before taxes

		Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Valid	1.00 Less than \$10,000	23	2.1	2.8	2.8
	2.00 \$10,000 - \$24,999	29	2.7	3.6	6.3
	3.00 \$25,000 - \$49,999	118	11.1	14.5	20.8
	4.00 \$50,000 - \$74,999	136	12.8	16.7	37.6
	5.00 \$75,000 - \$99,999	137	12.9	16.9	54.4
	6.00 \$100,000-\$149,999	192	18.1	23.6	78.0
	7.00 \$150,000-\$199,999	96	9.1	11.9	89.9
	8.00 \$200,000 or more	82	7.7	10.1	100.0
	Total	811	76.5	100.0	
Missing	9.00 Prefer not to answer	187	17.6		
	System	62	5.9		
	Total	249	23.5		
Total		1060	100.0		

Are you Hispanic, Latino, or Spanish origin?

		Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Valid	1.00 Yes	21	2.0	2.3	2.3
	2.00 No	902	85.1	97.7	100.0
	Total	923	87.1	100.0	
Missing	3.00 Prefer not to answer	71	6.7		
	System	66	6.2		
	Total	137	12.9		
Total		1060	100.0		

Race: Multiple Response

	Responses		Percent of Cases
	N	Percent	
G10_1 American Indian or Alaska Native	15	1.6%	1.6%
G10_2 Asian	29	3.0%	3.1%
G10_3 Black or African American	74	7.6%	7.8%
G10_4 Native Hawaiian or other Pacific Islander	8	0.8%	0.9%
G10_5 White or Caucasian	818	84.4%	86.9%
G10_6 Other, please specify:	25	2.6%	2.7%
Total	969	100.0%	103.0%

Race Single Category

	Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Valid				
American Indian or Alaska Native alone	6	0.6	0.7	0.7
Asian alone	21	2.0	2.3	2.9
Black or African American alone	71	6.7	7.5	10.5
Native Hawaiian or other Pacific Islander alone	2	0.2	0.3	10.7
White or Caucasian alone	794	74.9	84.4	95.1
Other/Two or more races	46	4.3	4.9	100.0
Total	941	88.8	100.0	
Missing -99.00	119	11.2		
Total	1060	100.0		

With which race(s) do you identify? (Check all that apply)- Other, please specify: Text

	Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Valid	1036	97.7	97.7	97.7
African Morocco	1	0.1	0.1	97.8
American	2	0.2	0.2	98.0
Celtic	2	0.2	0.2	98.1
English	1	0.1	0	98.2
Euro-American	1	0.1	0	98.3
Hispanic	1	0.1	0	98.4
Human	9	0.9	1	99.3
Irish American	1	0.1	0	99.3
MELTING POT AMERICAN - ITALIAN/AMERICAN INDIAN/ENGLISH/SCOTTISH/FRENCH, ETC	1	0.1	0	99.4
Mexican-American	1	0.1	0	99.5
Mixed	1	0.1	0	99.6
NORWEGIAN	1	0.1	0	99.7
Scotch/Irish	1	0.1	0	99.8
WHITE AMERICAN	1	0.1	0	99.8
Wife is Filipino	1	0.1	0	99.9
WIFE IS HISPANIC	1	0.1	0	100.0
Total	1060	100.0	100	

Gender

	Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Valid				
1.00 Male	488	46.0	48.1	48.1
2.00 Female	522	49.2	51.5	99.6
3.00 I wish to provide my own description:	4	0.4	0.4	100.0
Total	1014	95.6	100.0	
Missing System	47	4.4		
Total	1060	100.0		

		Highest level of education completed			
		Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Valid	1.00 Less than high school diploma	9	0.9	1.0	1.0
	2.00 High school graduate/GED	59	5.5	6.1	7.0
	3.00 Some college but no degree	134	12.7	13.8	20.8
	4.00 Associates Degree (for example: AA, AS) or certificate in career or technical education program for job training	94	8.9	9.7	30.6
	5.00 Bachelor's Degree (for example: BA, BS)	237	22.4	24.4	55.0
	6.00 Some graduate work	86	8.2	8.9	63.9
	7.00 Master's, Professional or Doctoral degree (for example: MA, MSW, MD, PhD)	351	33.1	36.1	100.0
	Total	972	91.6	100.0	
Missing	8.00 Prefer not to answer	27	2.5		
	System	62	5.8		
	Total	89	8.4		
Total		1060	100.0		

Appendix C:
Crosstabs

JAMES CITY COUNTY COMPREHENSIVE PLAN SURVEY 2019

		Primary Service Area (PSA)					
		Outside of PSA		Inside of PSA		Total	
		wN	w%	wN	w%	wN	w%
Overall, how satisfied are you with the services provided by James City County?	Very unsatisfied	2	1.71%	5	0.6%	7	0.7%
	Somewhat unsatisfied	12	10.3%	48	5.4%	60	6.0%
	Somewhat satisfied	72	61.5%	496	56.1%	568	56.7%
	Very satisfied	31	26.5%	335	37.9%	366	36.6%
Total		117	100.0%	884	100.0%	1001	100.0%

*Differences are statistically significant (p<.05).

		Census Tract									
		801.00		802.00		803.00		804.00		Total	
		wN	w%	wN	w%	wN	w%	wN	w%	wN	w%
Overall, how satisfied are you with the services provided by James City County	Very unsatisfied	1	0.7%	1	0.3%	2	0.6%	2	1.0%	6	0.6%
	Somewhat unsatisfied	17	12.3%	12	3.5%	12	3.8%	19	9.1%	60	6.0%
	Somewhat satisfied	74	53.6%	184	54.1%	187	59.6%	124	59.3%	569	56.8%
	Very satisfied	46	33.3%	143	42.1%	113	36.0%	64	30.6%	366	36.6%
Total		138	100.0%	340	100.0%	314	100.0%	209	100.0%	1001	100.0%

*Differences are statistically significant (p<.05).

		Number of adults in the household													
		1		2		3		4		5		6 or more		Total	
		wN	w%	wN	w%	wN	w%	wN	w%	wN	w%	wN	w%	wN	w%
Overall, how satisfied are you with the services provided by James City County?	Very unsatisfied	1	0.4%	3	0.5%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	4	0.4%
	Somewhat unsatisfied	16	6.6%	33	5.5%	4	6.0%	2	9.1%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	55	5.8%
	Somewhat satisfied	131	54.4%	345	57.2%	41	61.2%	14	63.6%	5	71.4%	1	33.3%	537	56.9%
	Very satisfied	93	38.6%	222	36.8%	22	32.8%	6	27.3%	2	28.6%	2	66.7%	347	36.8%
Total		241	100.0%	603	100.0%	67	100.0%	22	100.0%	7	100.0%	3	100.0%	943	100.0%

		Number of children in the household														Total	
		0		1		2		3		4		5		6 or more			
		wN	w%	wN	w%	wN	w%	wN	w%	wN	w%	wN	w%	wN	w%		
Overall, how satisfied are you with the services provided by James City County?	Very unsatisfied	2	0.3%	1	1.2%	1	1.2%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	4	0.4%
	Somewhat unsatisfied	51	6.9%	2	2.3%	0	0.0%	1	5.3%	1	11.1%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	55	5.9%
	Somewhat satisfied	416	56.4%	55	64.0%	39	47.0%	13	68.4%	8	88.9%	3	75.0%	1	100.0%	535	57.0%
	Very satisfied	268	36.4%	28	32.6%	43	51.8%	5	26.3%	0	0.0%	1	25.0%	0	0.0%	345	36.7%
Total		737	100.0%	86	100.0%	83	100.0%	19	100.0%	9	100.0%	4	100.0%	1	100.0%	939	100.0%

		Households with children that have attended Williamsburg-James City County public schools					
		Yes		No		Total	
		wN	w%	wN	w%	wN	w%
Overall, how satisfied are you with the services provided by James City County?	Very unsatisfied	1	0.6%	3	0.7%	4	0.7%
	Somewhat unsatisfied	2	1.2%	36	8.9%	38	6.6%
	Somewhat satisfied	100	58.5%	221	54.6%	321	55.7%
	Very satisfied	68	39.8%	145	35.8%	213	37.0%
Total		171	100.0%	405	100.0%	576	100.0%

		Home ownership							
		Own or buying		Rent		Other		Total	
		wN	w%	wN	w%	wN	w%	wN	w%
Overall, how satisfied are you with the services provided by James City County?	Very unsatisfied	4	0.6%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	4	0.4%
	Somewhat unsatisfied	37	5.1%	21	9.2%	0	0.0%	58	6.0%
	Somewhat satisfied	429	59.5%	113	49.3%	13	65.0%	555	57.2%
	Very satisfied	251	34.8%	95	41.5%	7	35.0%	353	36.4%
Total		721	100.0%	229	100.0%	20	100.0%	970	100.0%

JAMES CITY COUNTY COMPREHENSIVE PLAN SURVEY 2019

		Employment status															
		Employed full time		Employed part time		Looking for work		Stay-at-home parent/homemaker		Retired		Student		Other		Total	
		wN	w%	wN	w%	wN	w%	wN	w%	wN	w%	wN	w%	wN	w%	wN	w%
Overall, how satisfied are you with the services provided by James City County?	Very unsatisfied	1	0.3%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	1	2.9%	2	0.4%	0	0.0%	1	2.6%	5	0.5%
	Somewhat unsatisfied	23	6.7%	2	3.6%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	32	6.6%	1	12.5%	2	5.3%	60	6.1%
	Somewhat satisfied	188	55.0%	34	61.8%	8	72.7%	29	82.9%	275	56.4%	0	0.0%	25	65.8%	559	57.2%
	Very satisfied	130	38.0%	19	34.5%	3	27.3%	5	14.3%	179	36.7%	7	87.5%	10	26.3%	353	36.1%
Total		342	100.0%	55	100.0%	11	100.0%	35	100.0%	488	100.0%	8	100.0%	38	100.0%	977	100.0%

		Primary place of employment													
		James City County		Williamsburg		York County		Newport News		Other		All over		Total	
		wN	w%	wN	w%	wN	w%	wN	w%	wN	w%	wN	w%	wN	w%
Overall, how satisfied are you with the services provided by James City County?	Very unsatisfied	1	0.8%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	1	0.3%
	Somewhat unsatisfied	8	6.0%	5	6.8%	5	15.6%	6	12.2%	3	3.4%	0	0.0%	27	6.8%
	Somewhat satisfied	74	55.6%	45	60.8%	14	43.8%	22	44.9%	50	57.5%	17	77.3%	222	55.9%
	Very satisfied	50	37.6%	24	32.4%	13	40.6%	21	42.9%	34	39.1%	5	22.7%	147	37.0%
Total		133	100.0%	74	100.0%	32	100.0%	49	100.0%	87	100.0%	22	100.0%	397	100.0%

		Do you spend 30% or more of your income each month on housing?							
		Yes		No		Don't know		Total	
		wN	w%	wN	w%	wN	w%	wN	w%
Overall, how satisfied are you with the services provided by James City County?	Very unsatisfied	3	0.8%	1	0.2%	1	2.4%	5	0.6%
	Somewhat unsatisfied	32	8.1%	19	4.2%	0	0.0%	51	5.7%
	Somewhat satisfied	214	54.0%	257	57.0%	32	76.2%	503	56.6%
	Very satisfied	147	37.1%	174	38.6%	9	21.4%	330	37.1%
Total		396	100.0%	451	100.0%	42	100.0%	889	100.0%

*Differences are statistically significant (p<.05).

		Total household income in 2018 before taxes																	
		Less than \$10,000		\$10,000 - \$24,999		\$25,000 - \$49,999		\$50,000 - \$74,999		\$75,000 - \$99,999		\$100,000- \$149,999		\$150,000- \$199,999		\$200,000 or more		Total	
		wN	w%	wN	w%	wN	w%	wN	w%	wN	w%	wN	w%	wN	w%	wN	w%	wN	w%
Overall, how satisfied are you with the services provided by James City County?	Very unsatisfied	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	1	0.8%	1	0.7%	1	0.5%	1	1.1%	1	1.2%	5	0.6%
	Somewhat unsatisfied	1	4.3%	6	20.7%	12	10.5%	9	7.0%	7	5.2%	9	4.9%	1	1.1%	4	4.9%	49	6.2%
	Somewhat satisfied	18	78.3%	16	55.2%	53	46.5%	67	52.3%	84	62.7%	100	54.1%	47	49.5%	43	53.1%	428	54.2%
	Very satisfied	4	17.4%	7	24.1%	49	43.0%	51	39.8%	42	31.3%	75	40.5%	46	48.4%	33	40.7%	307	38.9%
Total		23	100.0%	29	100.0%	114	100.0%	128	100.0%	134	100.0%	185	100.0%	95	100.0%	81	100.0%	789	100.0%

		Hispanic, Latino, or Spanish Origin					
		Yes		No		Total	
		wN	w%	wN	w%	wN	w%
Overall, how satisfied are you with the services provided by James City County?	Very unsatisfied	0	0.0%	3	0.3%	3	0.3%
	Somewhat unsatisfied	1	4.5%	49	5.7%	50	5.6%
	Somewhat satisfied	13	59.1%	487	56.2%	500	56.3%
	Very satisfied	8	36.4%	327	37.8%	335	37.7%
Total		22	100.0%	866	100.0%	888	100.0%

		Race category							
		White or Caucasian		Black or African American		All remaining categories		Total	
		wN	w%	wN	w%	wN	w%	wN	w%
Overall, how satisfied are you with the services provided by James City County?	Very unsatisfied	2	0.3%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	2	0.2%
	Somewhat unsatisfied	36	4.7%	7	9.9%	4	7.4%	47	5.3%
	Somewhat satisfied	428	56.2%	43	60.6%	30	55.6%	501	56.5%
	Very satisfied	295	38.8%	21	29.6%	20	37.0%	336	37.9%
Total		761	100.0%	71	100.0%	54	100.0%	886	100.0%

JAMES CITY COUNTY COMPREHENSIVE PLAN SURVEY 2019

		Gender							
		Male		Female		Other		Total	
		wN	w%	wN	w%	wN	w%	wN	w%
Overall, how satisfied are you with the services provided by James City County?	Very unsatisfied	2	0.4%	2	0.4%	1	25.0%	5	0.5%
	Somewhat unsatisfied	36	7.5%	23	4.6%	0	0.0%	59	6.0%
	Somewhat satisfied	256	53.4%	302	61.0%	2	50.0%	560	57.3%
	Very satisfied	185	38.6%	168	33.9%	1	25.0%	354	36.2%
Total		479	100.0%	495	100.0%	4	100.0%	978	100.0%

*Differences are statistically significant (p<.05).

		Highest level of education completed															
		Less than H.S. diploma		H.S. graduate/GED		Some college but no degree		Associates degree or certificate in career or technical education program for job training		Bachelor's degree		Some graduate work		Master's, professional or doctoral degree		Total	
		wN	w%	wN	w%	wN	w%	wN	w%	wN	w%	wN	w%	wN	w%	wN	w%
Overall, how satisfied are you with the services provided by James City County?	Very unsatisfied	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	3	1.3%	1	1.2%	2	0.6%	6	0.6%
	Somewhat unsatisfied	1	11.1%	8	13.8%	10	1000.0%	5	5.6%	11	4.8%	3	3.5%	15	4.5%	53	5.6%
	Somewhat satisfied	6	66.7%	35	60.3%	72	54.1%	63	70.0%	131	57.5%	49	57.0%	179	53.1%	535	56.9%
	Very satisfied	2	22.2%	15	25.9%	51	38.3%	22	24.4%	83	36.4%	33	38.4%	141	41.8%	347	36.9%
Total		9	100.0%	58	100.0%	133	100.0%	90	100.0%	228	100.0%	86	100.0%	337	100.0%	941	100.0%

		Primary Service Area (PSA)					
		Outside of PSA		Inside of PSA		Total	
		wN	w%	wN	w%	wN	w%
How would you rate the value of County services provided in relation to the taxes paid?	Poor	13	11.5%	39	4.6%	52	5.4%
	Fair	35	31.0%	191	22.4%	226	23.4%
	Good	49	43.4%	469	55.0%	518	53.7%
	Excellent	16	14.2%	153	18.0%	169	17.5%
Total		113	100.0%	852	100.0%	965	100.0%

*Differences are statistically significant (p<.05).

APPENDIX C

		Census Tract									
		801.00		802.00		803.00		804.00		Total	
		wN	w%	wN	w%	wN	w%	wN	w%	wN	w%
How would you rate the value of County services provided in relation to the taxes paid?	Poor	13	10.0%	10	3.0%	10	3.2%	19	9.6%	52	5.4%
	Fair	38	29.2%	62	18.8%	78	25.3%	47	23.9%	225	23.3%
	Good	63	48.5%	193	58.7%	162	52.6%	101	51.3%	519	53.8%
	Excellent	16	12.3%	64	19.5%	58	18.8%	30	15.2%	168	17.4%
Total		130	100.0%	329	100.0%	308	100.0%	197	100.0%	964	100.0%

*Differences are statistically significant (p<.05).

		Number of adults in the household													
		1		2		3		4		5		6 or more		Total	
		wN	w%	wN	w%	wN	w%	wN	w%	wN	w%	wN	w%	wN	w%
How would you rate the value of County services provided in relation to the taxes paid?	Poor	9	3.8%	31	5.4%	5	7.6%	2	10.0%	0	0.0%	1	33.3%	48	5.3%
	Fair	54	23.0%	136	23.5%	16	24.2%	4	20.0%	3	50.0%	0	0.0%	213	23.5%
	Good	125	53.2%	309	53.5%	37	56.1%	11	55.0%	3	50.0%	2	66.7%	487	53.6%
	Excellent	47	20.0%	102	17.6%	8	12.1%	3	15.0%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	160	17.6%
Total		235	100.0%	578	100.0%	66	100.0%	20	100.0%	6	100.0%	3	100.0%	908	100.0%

		Number of children in the household															
		0		1		2		3		4		5		6 or more		Total	
		wN	w%	wN	w%	wN	w%	wN	w%	wN	w%	wN	w%	wN	w%	wN	w%
How would you rate the value of County services provided in relation to the taxes paid?	Poor	31	4.4%	9	10.3%	5	6.3%	1	5.9%	1	11.1%	0	0.0%	1	100.0%	48	5.3%
	Fair	161	22.7%	19	21.8%	21	26.6%	7	41.2%	6	66.7%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	214	23.6%
	Good	394	55.6%	44	50.6%	36	45.6%	6	35.3%	2	22.2%	4	100.0%	0	0.0%	486	53.6%
	Excellent	123	17.3%	15	17.2%	17	21.5%	3	17.6%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	158	17.4%
Total		709	100.0%	87	100.0%	79	100.0%	17	100.0%	9	100.0%	4	100.0%	1	100.0%	906	100.0%

*Differences are statistically significant (p<.05).

Households with children that have attended Williamsburg-James City County public schools

		Yes		No		Total	
		wN	w%	wN	w%	wN	w%
How would you rate the value of County services provided in relation to the taxes paid?	Poor	10	6.0%	21	5.4%	31	5.6%
	Fair	48	28.7%	91	23.3%	139	25.0%
	Good	77	46.1%	221	56.7%	298	53.5%
	Excellent	32	19.2%	57	14.6%	89	16.0%
Total		167	100.0%	390	100.0%	557	100.0%

*Differences are statistically significant (p<.05).

Home ownership

		Own or buying		Rent		Other		Total	
		wN	w%	wN	w%	wN	w%	wN	w%
How would you rate the value of County services provided in relation to the taxes paid?	Poor	40	5.7%	10	4.7%	0	0.0%	50	5.3%
	Fair	171	24.2%	49	23.2%	3	15.0%	223	23.8%
	Good	371	52.5%	118	55.9%	12	60.0%	501	53.5%
	Excellent	124	17.6%	34	16.1%	5	25.0%	163	17.4%
Total		706	100.0%	211	100.0%	20	100.0%	937	100.0%

Employment status

		Employed full time		Employed part time		Looking for work		Stay-at-home parent/homemaker		Retired		Student		Other		Total	
		wN	w%	wN	w%	wN	w%	wN	w%	wN	w%	wN	w%	wN	w%	wN	w%
How would you rate the value of County services provided in relation to the taxes paid?	Poor	23	6.8%	4	7.8%	0	0.0%	3	9.4%	18	3.8%	0	0.0%	3	7.9%	51	5.4%
	Fair	87	25.9%	14	27.5%	0	0.0%	13	40.6%	103	21.7%	0	0.0%	10	26.3%	227	24.0%
	Good	160	47.6%	28	54.9%	7	70.0%	12	37.5%	272	57.4%	3	100.0%	19	50.0%	501	53.1%
	Excellent	66	19.6%	5	9.8%	3	30.0%	4	12.5%	81	17.1%	0	0.0%	6	15.8%	165	17.5%
Total		336	100.0%	51	100.0%	10	100.0%	32	100.0%	474	100.0%	3	100.0%	38	100.0%	944	100.0%

APPENDIX C

		Primary place of employment													
		James City County		Williamsburg		York County		Newport News		Other		All over		Total	
		wN	w%	wN	w%	wN	w%	wN	w%	wN	w%	wN	w%	wN	w%
How would you rate the value of County services provided in relation to the taxes paid?	Poor	8	6.3%	5	7.0%	3	9.7%	6	12.2%	2	2.4%	1	4.8%	25	6.5%
	Fair	35	27.6%	15	21.1%	7	22.6%	10	20.4%	24	28.9%	9	42.9%	100	26.2%
	Good	59	46.5%	37	52.1%	18	58.1%	23	46.9%	43	51.8%	9	42.9%	189	49.5%
	Excellent	25	19.7%	14	19.7%	3	9.7%	10	20.4%	14	16.9%	2	9.5%	68	17.8%
Total		127	100.0%	71	100.0%	31	100.0%	49	100.0%	83	100.0%	21	100.0%	382	100.0%

		Do you spend 30% or more of your income each month on housing?									
		Yes		No		Don't know		Total			
		wN	w%	wN	w%	wN	w%	wN	w%		
How would you rate the value of County services provided in relation to the taxes paid?	Poor	33	8.7%	12	2.7%	2	5.3%	47	5.4%		
	Fair	97	25.6%	98	21.9%	9	23.7%	204	23.6%		
	Good	186	49.1%	252	56.4%	24	63.2%	462	53.5%		
	Excellent	63	16.6%	85	19.0%	3	7.9%	151	17.5%		
Total		379	100.0%	447	100.0%	38	100.0%	864	100.0%		

		Total household income in 2018 before taxes																	
		Less than \$10,000		\$10,000 - \$24,999		\$25,000 - \$49,999		\$50,000 - \$74,999		\$75,000 - \$99,999		\$100,000- \$149,999		\$150,000- \$199,999		\$200,000 or more		Total	
		wN	w%	wN	w%	wN	w%	wN	w%	wN	w%	wN	w%	wN	w%	wN	w%	wN	w%
How would you rate the value of County services provided in relation to the taxes paid?	Poor	1	4.3%	4	16.0%	6	5.4%	8	6.4%	6	4.6%	10	5.5%	2	2.1%	6	7.6%	43	5.6%
	Fair	2	8.7%	8	32.0%	28	25.2%	33	26.4%	37	28.2%	32	17.5%	16	16.7%	10	12.7%	166	21.5%
	Good	20	87.0%	13	52.0%	59	53.2%	60	48.0%	64	48.9%	99	54.1%	60	62.5%	47	59.5%	422	54.6%
	Excellent	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	18	16.2%	24	19.2%	24	18.3%	42	23.0%	18	18.8%	16	20.3%	142	18.4%
Total		23	100.0%	25	100.0%	111	100.0%	125	100.0%	131	100.0%	183	100.0%	96	100.0%	79	100.0%	773	100.0%

		Hispanic, Latino, or Spanish Origin					
		Yes		No		Total	
		wN	w%	wN	w%	wN	w%
How would you rate the value of County services provided in relation to the taxes paid?	Poor	1	5.0%	41	4.9%	42	4.9%
	Fair	9	45.0%	186	22.1%	195	22.6%
	Good	7	35.0%	465	55.2%	472	54.7%
	Excellent	3	15.0%	151	17.9%	154	17.8%
Total		20	100.0%	843	100.0%	863	100.0%

		Highest level of education completed															
		Less than H.S. diploma		H.S. graduate/GED		Some college but no degree		Associates Degree or certificate in career or technical education program for job training		Bachelor's Degree		Some graduate work		Master's, Professional or Doctoral degree		Total	
		wN	w%	wN	w%	wN	w%	wN	w%	wN	w%	wN	w%	wN	w%	wN	w%
How would you rate the value of County services provided in relation to the taxes paid?	Poor	1	12.5%	6	10.7%	8	6.6%	8	8.8%	7	3.3%	2	2.4%	16	4.8%	48	5.3%
	Fair	0	0.0%	23	41.1%	24	19.8%	25	27.5%	60	28.3%	15	18.1%	60	18.1%	207	22.9%
	Good	6	75.0%	24	42.9%	76	62.8%	46	50.5%	10	50.5%	48	57.8%	18	55.1%	490	54.3%
	Excellent	1	12.5%	3	5.4%	13	10.7%	12	13.2%	38	17.9%	18	21.7%	73	22.0%	158	17.5%
Total		8	100.0%	56	100.0%	121	100.0%	91	100.0%	21	100.0%	83	100.0%	32	100.0%	903	100.0%

*Differences are statistically significant (p<.05).

		Primary Service Area (PSA)							
		Outside of PSA			Inside of PSA			Total	
		wN	w%	wN	w%	wN	w%	wN	w%
How safe do you feel in James City County during daylight hours?	Very safe	85	71.4%	702	78.0%	787	77.2%		
	Somewhat safe	29	24.4%	190	21.1%	219	21.5%		
	Somewhat unsafe	5	4.2%	8	0.9%	13	1.3%		
Total		119	100.0%	900	100.0%	1019	100.0%		

*Differences are statistically significant (p<.05).

APPENDIX C

		Census Tract									
		801.00		802.00		803.00		804.00		Total	
		wN	w%	wN	w%	wN	w%	wN	w%	wN	w%
How safe do you feel in James City County during daylight hours?	Very safe	94	66.7%	294	84.0%	250	78.1%	150	71.8%	788	77.3%
	Somewhat safe	42	29.8%	54	15.4%	68	21.3%	54	25.8%	218	21.4%
	Somewhat unsafe	5	3.5%	2	0.6%	2	0.6%	5	2.4%	14	1.4%
Total		141	100.0%	350	100.0%	320	100.0%	209	100.0%	1020	100.0%

*Differences are statistically significant (p<.05).

		Primary Service Area (PSA)					
		Outside of PSA		Inside of PSA		Total	
		wN	w%	wN	w%	wN	w%
How safe do you feel in James City County during the evening?	Very safe	52	43.7%	415	46.3%	467	46.0%
	Somewhat safe	58	48.7%	390	43.5%	448	44.1%
	Somewhat unsafe	9	7.6%	85	9.5%	94	9.3%
Total		119	100.0%	896	100.0%	1015	100.0%

		Census Tract									
		801.00		802.00		803.00		804.00		Total	
		wN	w%	wN	w%	wN	w%	wN	w%	wN	w%
How safe do you feel in James City County during the evening?	Very safe	55	39.3%	164	47.3%	150	47.2%	97	46.4%	466	46.0%
	Somewhat safe	60	42.9%	151	43.5%	148	46.5%	89	42.6%	448	44.2%
	Somewhat unsafe	24	17.1%	30	8.6%	19	6.0%	22	10.5%	95	9.4%
	Very unsafe	1	0.7%	2	0.6%	1	0.3%	1	0.5%	5	0.5%
Total		140	100.0%	347	100.0%	318	100.0%	209	100.0%	1014	100.0%

		Primary Service Area (PSA)					
		Outside of PSA		Inside of PSA		Total	
		wN	w%	wN	w%	wN	w%
How would you rate the public school buildings and facilities?	Excellent	29	29.6%	162	27.0%	191	27.4%
	Good	48	49.0%	356	59.4%	404	58.0%
	Fair	19	19.4%	71	11.9%	90	12.9%
	Poor	2	2.0%	10	1.7%	12	1.7%
Total		98	100.0%	599	100.0%	697	100.0%

JAMES CITY COUNTY COMPREHENSIVE PLAN SURVEY 2019

		Census Tract									
		801.00		802.00		803.00		804.00		Total	
		wN	w%	wN	w%	wN	w%	wN	w%	wN	w%
How would you rate the public school buildings and facilities?	Excellent	22	24.2%	66	29.9%	70	28.8%	33	23.2%	191	27.4%
	Good	57	62.6%	119	53.8%	138	56.8%	89	62.7%	403	57.8%
	Fair	10	11.0%	31	14.0%	31	12.8%	18	12.7%	90	12.9%
	Poor	2	2.2%	5	2.3%	4	1.6%	2	1.4%	13	1.9%
Total		91	100.0%	221	100.0%	243	100.0%	142	100.0%	697	100.0%

		Primary Service Area (PSA)					
		Outside of PSA		Inside of PSA		Total	
		wN	w%	wN	w%	wN	w%
Amount of residential development is:	Too low	4	3.4%	55	6.6%	59	6.2%
	About right	64	55.2%	496	59.3%	560	58.8%
	Too high	48	41.4%	285	34.1%	333	35.0%
Total		116	100.0%	836	100.0%	952	100.0%

		Census Tract									
		801.00		802.00		803.00		804.00		Total	
		wN	w%	wN	w%	wN	w%	wN	w%	wN	w%
Amount of residential development is:	Too low	13	10.0%	13	4.2%	20	6.5%	15	7.4%	61	6.4%
	About right	78	60.0%	186	59.4%	188	61.2%	108	52.9%	560	58.7%
	Too high	39	30.0%	114	36.4%	99	32.2%	81	39.7%	333	34.9%
Total		130	100.0%	313	100.0%	307	100.0%	204	100.0%	954	100.0%

		Primary Service Area (PSA)					
		Outside of PSA		Inside of PSA		Total	
		wN	w%	wN	w%	wN	w%
Amount of office development is:	Too low	5	4.5%	42	5.6%	47	5.4%
	About right	68	61.8%	506	67.2%	574	66.5%
	Too high	37	33.6%	205	27.2%	242	28.0%
Total		110	100.0%	753	100.0%	863	100.0%

		Census Tract									
		801.00		802.00		803.00		804.00		Total	
		wN	w%	wN	w%	wN	w%	wN	w%	wN	w%
Amount of office development is:	Too low	5	4.2%	17	6.0%	12	4.4%	13	7.0%	47	5.4%
	About right	86	71.7%	187	66.1%	182	66.4%	119	64.0%	574	66.5%
	Too high	29	24.2%	79	27.9%	80	29.2%	54	29.0%	242	28.0%
Total		120	100.0%	283	100.0%	274	100.0%	186	100.0%	863	100.0%

		Primary Service Area (PSA)					
		Outside of PSA		Inside of PSA		Total	
		wN	w%	wN	w%	wN	w%
Amount of retail development is:	Too low	10	8.6%	43	5.2%	53	5.6%
	About right	48	41.4%	381	45.9%	429	45.3%
	Too high	58	50.0%	406	48.9%	464	49.0%
Total		116	100.0%	830	100.0%	946	100.0%

		Census Tract									
		801.00		802.00		803.00		804.00		Total	
		wN	w%	wN	w%	wN	w%	wN	w%	wN	w%
Amount of retail development is:	Too low	7	5.5%	12	3.9%	22	7.1%	11	5.6%	52	5.5%
	About right	73	57.5%	133	43.2%	134	43.1%	88	44.7%	428	45.4%
	Too high	47	37.0%	163	52.9%	155	49.8%	98	49.7%	463	49.1%
Total		127	100.0%	308	100.0%	311	100.0%	197	100.0%	943	100.0%

		Primary Service Area (PSA)					
		Outside of PSA		Inside of PSA		Total	
		wN	w%	wN	w%	wN	w%
Amount of industrial development is:	Too low	22	21.8%	129	19.5%	151	19.8%
	About right	59	58.4%	416	63.0%	475	62.4%
	Too high	20	19.8%	115	17.4%	135	17.7%
Total		101	100.0%	660	100.0%	761	100.0%

JAMES CITY COUNTY COMPREHENSIVE PLAN SURVEY 2019

		Census Tract									
		801.00		802.00		803.00		804.00		Total	
		wN	w%	wN	w%	wN	w%	wN	w%	wN	w%
Amount of industrial development is:	Too low	20	18.7%	54	22.4%	49	20.2%	28	16.3%	151	19.8%
	About right	62	57.9%	145	60.2%	156	64.5%	112	65.1%	475	62.3%
	Too high	25	23.4%	42	17.4%	37	15.3%	32	18.6%	136	17.8%
Total		107	100.0%	241	100.0%	242	100.0%	172	100.0%	762	100.0%

		Primary Service Area (PSA)					
		Outside of PSA		Inside of PSA		Total	
		wN	w%	wN	w%	wN	w%
How important is it to have places in the County where people can live, work and play in close proximity?	Very important	36	30.3%	401	45.6%	437	43.8%
	Somewhat important	52	43.7%	366	41.6%	418	41.9%
	Somewhat unimportant	24	20.2%	86	9.8%	110	11.0%
	Not at all important	7	5.9%	26	3.0%	33	3.3%
Total		119	100.0%	879	100.0%	998	100.0%

*Differences are statistically significant (p<.05).

		Census Tract									
		801.00		802.00		803.00		804.00		Total	
		wN	w%	wN	w%	wN	w%	wN	w%	wN	w%
How important is it to have places in the County where people can live, work and play in close proximity?	Very important	79	57.7%	158	46.2%	127	41.1%	73	35.1%	437	43.9%
	Somewhat important	42	30.7%	146	42.7%	132	42.7%	97	46.6%	417	41.9%
	Somewhat unimportant	13	9.5%	28	8.2%	42	13.6%	27	13.0%	110	11.0%
	Not at all important	3	2.2%	10	2.9%	8	2.6%	11	5.3%	32	3.2%
Total		137	100.0%	342	100.0%	309	100.0%	208	100.0%	996	100.0%

*Differences are statistically significant (p<.05).

		Primary Service Area (PSA)					
		Outside of PSA		Inside of PSA		Total	
		wN	w%	wN	w%	wN	w%
What is your opinion of the County's rate of growth over the past few years?	Much too fast	38	34.2%	204	24.6%	242	25.7%
	A little too fast	36	32.4%	306	36.9%	342	36.4%
	About right	32	28.8%	270	32.6%	302	32.1%
	A little too slow	4	3.6%	46	5.5%	50	5.3%
	Much too slow	1	0.9%	3	0.4%	4	0.4%
Total		111	100.0%	829	100.0%	940	100.0%

		Census Tract									
		801.00		802.00		803.00		804.00		Total	
		wN	w%	wN	w%	wN	w%	wN	w%	wN	w%
What is your opinion of the County's rate of growth over the past few years?	Much too fast	30	22.1%	88	27.9%	72	24.7%	52	26.3%	242	25.7%
	A little too fast	49	36.0%	114	36.2%	106	36.3%	73	36.9%	342	36.3%
	About right	37	27.2%	98	31.1%	105	36.0%	62	31.3%	302	32.1%
	A little too slow	19	14.0%	14	4.4%	7	2.4%	11	5.6%	51	5.4%
	Much too slow	1	0.7%	1	0.3%	2	0.7%	0	0.0%	4	0.4%
Total		136	100.0%	315	100.0%	292	100.0%	198	100.0%	941	100.0%

*Differences are statistically significant (p<.05).

Households who have children attend Williamsburg-James City County public school

		Yes		No		Total	
		wN	w%	wN	w%	wN	w%
		Satisfaction with Williamsburg-James City County's public schools	Very unsatisfied	87	51.2%	78	27.7%
	Somewhat unsatisfied	51	30.0%	156	55.3%	207	45.8%
	Somewhat satisfied	25	14.7%	38	13.5%	63	13.9%
	Very satisfied	7	4.1%	10	3.5%	17	3.8%
Total		170	100.0%	282	100.0%	452	100.0%

Households who have children attend Williamsburg-James City County public school

		Yes		No		Total	
		wN	w%	wN	w%	wN	w%
		How would you rate the public school buildings and facilities?	Excellent	62	36.7%	61	22.2%
	Good	77	45.6%	172	62.5%	249	56.1%
	Fair	26	15.4%	36	13.1%	62	14.0%
	Poor	4	2.4%	6	2.2%	10	2.3%
Total		169	100.0%	275	100.0%	444	100.0%

Appendix D:
T-Tables

	Primary Service Area (PSA)				P value
	Outside of PSA		Inside of PSA		
	w Mean	wN	w Mean	wN	
Importance of James City County's parks and recreation facilities, programs, and services, overall	3.36*	120	3.53*	882	0.023
Importance of James City County's parks	3.36*	120	3.53*	878	0.020
Importance of the recreation centers	3.13*	119	3.31*	876	0.035
Importance of the recreation programs	3.09	118	3.22	861	0.145
Importance of the Williamsburg Regional Library services provided at the Williamsburg and James City County public libraries	3.49	119	3.60	891	0.107
Importance of Williamsburg-James City County's public schools	3.71	118	3.67	880	0.475
Importance of the roads and highways in James City County	3.69	120	3.75	894	0.285
Importance of the availability of bike lanes and sidewalks	2.80*	119	3.13*	894	0.002
Importance of housing opportunities for citizens, generally	3.04	120	3.17	880	0.175
Importance of housing opportunities that are affordable to our workforce	3.21	121	3.30	882	0.268
Importance of efforts to protect and improve the natural environment including water quality, air quality, and environmentally sensitive areas	3.55	121	3.66	898	0.062
Importance of public access to waterways for swimming and boating	2.98	121	3.04	890	0.535
Importance of efforts to protect and preserve the County's rural character	3.35	119	3.31	894	0.602
Importance of visual appearance of buildings within new developments in the County	3.11	119	3.24	893	0.113
Importance of efforts to attract jobs and new businesses	3.32	121	3.39	891	0.421
Importance of limiting irrigation with public water to conserve the County's water supply	3.01	116	3.15	876	0.108
Importance of development of a field house or multi-use indoor sports facility for community recreation and competitive sporting events	2.39	116	2.54	876	0.112

*Mean differences are statistically significant (p<.05).

	Primary Service Area (PSA)				P value
	Outside of PSA		Inside of PSA		
	w Mean	wN	w Mean	wN	
Satisfaction with James City County's parks and recreation facilities, programs, and services, overall	3.29*	106	3.46*	826	0.017
Satisfaction with James City County's parks	3.26*	112	3.47*	830	0.005
Satisfaction with the recreation centers	3.24	92	3.37	735	0.099
Satisfaction with the recreation programs	3.19	88	3.27	663	0.310
Satisfaction with the Williamsburg Regional Library services provided at the Williamsburg and James City County public libraries	3.53	107	3.61	846	0.228
Satisfaction with Williamsburg-James City County's public schools	3.14	97	3.17	628	0.792
Satisfaction with the roads and highways in James City County	2.87	117	2.92	893	0.543
Satisfaction with the availability of bike lanes and sidewalks	2.83	102	2.86	811	0.771
Satisfaction with housing opportunities for citizens, generally	2.92	95	2.90	749	0.817
Satisfaction with housing opportunities that are affordable to our workforce	2.58	93	2.48	726	0.367
Satisfaction with efforts to protect and improve the natural environment including water quality, air quality, and environmentally sensitive areas	2.85*	101	3.02*	779	0.030
Satisfaction with public access to waterways for swimming and boating	2.99	103	3.09	705	0.217
Satisfaction with efforts to protect and preserve the County's rural character	2.53*	106	2.88*	787	0.000
Satisfaction with visual appearance of buildings within new developments in the County	2.92	109	3.05	846	0.079
Satisfaction with efforts to attract jobs and new businesses	2.59*	98	2.81*	724	0.008
Satisfaction with limiting irrigation with public water to conserve the County's water supply	2.75*	81	2.92*	654	0.032
Satisfaction with development of a field house or multi-use indoor sports facility for community recreation and competitive sporting events	2.96	67	2.92	531	0.694

*Mean differences are statistically significant ($p < .05$).

	Primary Service Area (PSA)				P value
	Outside of PSA		Inside of PSA		
	wN	w Mean	wN	w Mean	
Agreement that residential development of the land in James City County is happening too quickly	117	3.09	817	3.02	0.414
Agreement that it is more important to preserve farmland in the County than it is to have more development	117	3.16	841	3.12	0.642
Agreement that it is important to have less development in the County even if it means you may pay more in taxes	115	2.56	843	2.56	1.000
Agreement that it is better to have more homes on smaller lots and set aside areas for open space in order to permanently preserve land and maintain the character of the community	112	2.47	847	2.66	0.061
Agreement that it is better to have neighborhoods in which there is a mix of low-, middle-, and high-income housing options	112	2.40	854	2.57	0.130
Agreement that it is better to have neighborhoods in which there is a mix of housing options and small-scale retail and office development	111	2.52	848	2.61	0.341
Agreement that developers who wish to build businesses or residences should always be required to pay a fee to the County to offset public costs even if it means increases in the price of their services and new housing	113	3.14	809	3.15	0.925

	Primary Service Area (PSA)				P value
	Outside of PSA		Inside of PSA		
	wN	w Mean	wN	w Mean	
Favor or oppose having developers and builders provide public amenities such as sidewalks, bikeways, streetlights, parks and open spaces, and street trees in the County's development area	116	3.66	880	3.75	0.106
Favor or oppose encouraging a greater mix of offices, stores, restaurants and other urban services with residential areas in the county's development area	114	2.71	861	2.88	0.060
Favor or oppose encouraging a greater variety and mix of housing types and price levels in the County's development area	108	2.97	856	3.08	0.217
Favor or oppose the development of a more interconnected street system in the County's development area to provide more alternative routes for traffic	110	3.11	841	3.23	0.158
Favor or oppose reducing the number of lots a person can divide a large parcel of property into, for rural property	110	3.07	774	3.22	0.108
Favor or oppose purchasing property development rights in rural or sensitive areas, to keep the property from developing	109	2.94	795	3.09	0.128
Favor or oppose taxing agricultural and forested land at a lower rate than market value in order to defer development of rural land	115	3.32	807	3.24	0.319
Favor or oppose allowing localized rural services, such as country stores, post offices, etc., in traditionally rural communities	112	3.43	840	3.43	0.994

Appendix F:
2014 Comparison

JAMES CITY COUNTY COMPREHENSIVE PLAN SURVEY 2019

How many years have you lived in James City County?

Survey Year			Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
2014	Valid	Less than one year	19	3.1	3.1	3.1
		1-5 years	80	13.2	13.2	16.3
		6-10 years	154	25.4	25.4	41.7
		11-20 years	155	25.6	25.6	67.3
		More than 20 years/ Entire life	197	32.5	32.5	99.8
		DK/RF	1	0.2	0.2	100
		Total	606	100	100	
2019	Valid	Less than one year	56	5.3	5.4	5.4
		1-5 years	216	20.3	20.9	26.3
		6-10 years	134	12.6	12.9	39.2
		11-20 years	315	29.7	30.5	69.8
		More than 20 years	312	29.4	30.2	100
		DK/RF				
		Total	1032	97.4	100	

Would you say that the current amount of residential development in James City County is too low, about right, or too high?

Survey Year			Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
2014	Valid	Too low	25	4.1	4.1	4.1
		About right	309	51	51	55.1
		Too high	252	41.6	41.6	96.7
		DK/RF	20	3.3	3.3	100
		Total	606	100	100	
2019	Valid	Too low	62	5.8	6.4	6.4
		About right	566	53.4	58.7	65.1
		Too high	337	31.8	34.9	100
		Total	965	91	100	

Difference between years is statistically significant (p<.05).

Would you say that the current amount of industrial development in James City County is too low, about right, or too high?

Survey Year			Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
2014	Valid	Too low	144	23.8	23.8	23.8
		About right	297	49	49	72.8
		Too high	50	8.3	8.3	81
		DK/RF	115	19	19	100
		Total	606	100	100	
2019	Valid	Too low	154	14.5	20	20
		About right	480	45.3	62.3	82.3
		Too high	136	12.8	17.7	100
		Total	771	72.7	100	

Difference between years is statistically significant (p<.05).

Would you say that residential development of the land in James City County is happening too quickly?

Survey Year	Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent	
2014 Valid	Strongly agree	201	33.2	33.2	33.2
	Somewhat agree	239	39.4	39.4	72.6
	Somewhat disagree	113	18.6	18.6	91.3
	Strongly disagree	35	5.8	5.8	97
	DK/RF	18	3	3	100
	Total	606	100	100	
2019 Valid	Strongly agree	295	27.9	31.2	31.2
	Somewhat agree	409	38.5	43.2	74.5
	Somewhat disagree	210	19.8	22.2	96.6
	Strongly disagree	32	3	3.4	100
	Total	946	89.2	100	

Difference between years is statistically significant (p<.05).

Would you say that it is more important to preserve farmland in the County than it is to have more development?

Survey Year	Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent	
2014 Valid	Strongly agree	277	45.7	45.7	45.7
	Somewhat agree	193	31.8	31.8	77.6
	Somewhat disagree	79	13	13	90.6
	Strongly disagree	31	5.1	5.1	95.7
	DK/RF	26	4.3	4.3	100
	Total	606	100	100	
2019 Valid	Strongly agree	367	34.6	37.9	37.9
	Somewhat agree	394	37.1	40.6	78.5
	Somewhat disagree	167	15.8	17.3	95.8
	Strongly disagree	41	3.8	4.2	100
	Total	969	91.3	100	

Difference between years is statistically significant (p<.05).

Would you say that it is important to have less development in the County even if it means you may pay more in taxes ?

Survey Year	Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent	
2014 Valid	Strongly agree	162	26.7	26.7	26.7
	Somewhat agree	196	32.3	32.3	59.1
	Somewhat disagree	133	21.9	21.9	81
	Strongly disagree	84	13.9	13.9	94.9
	DK/RF	31	5.1	5.1	100
	Total	606	100	100	
2019 Valid	Strongly agree	152	14.3	15.6	15.6
	Somewhat agree	376	35.5	38.8	54.4
	Somewhat disagree	305	28.7	31.4	85.8
	Strongly disagree	137	12.9	14.2	100
	Total	970	91.5	100	

Difference between years is statistically significant (p<.05).

Would you say that it is better to have more homes on smaller lots and set aside areas for open space in order to permanently preserve land and maintain the character of the community?

Survey Year	Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
2014 Valid	Strongly agree	180	29.7	29.7
	Somewhat agree	157	25.9	55.6
	Somewhat disagree	131	21.6	77.2
	Strongly disagree	100	16.5	93.7
	DK/RF	38	6.3	100
	Total	606	100	100
2019 Valid	Strongly agree	184	17.4	19
	Somewhat agree	385	36.3	58.7
	Somewhat disagree	265	25	86
	Strongly disagree	135	12.8	100
	Total	969	91.4	100

Difference between years is statistically significant (p<.05).

Would you say that it is better to have neighborhoods in which there is a mix of low, middle, and high income housing options ?

Survey Year	Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
2014 Valid	Strongly agree	174	28.7	28.7
	Somewhat agree	208	34.3	63
	Somewhat disagree	105	17.3	80.4
	Strongly disagree	89	14.7	95
	DK/RF	30	5	100
	Total	606	100	100
2019 Valid	Strongly agree	185	17.5	19
	Somewhat agree	329	31	52.7
	Somewhat disagree	299	28.2	83.3
	Strongly disagree	163	15.4	100
	Total	977	92.1	100

Difference between years is statistically significant (p<.05).

Would you say that it is better to have neighborhoods in which there is a mix of housing options and consumer services ?

Survey Year	Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
2014 Valid	Strongly agree	193	31.8	31.8
	Somewhat agree	261	43.1	74.9
	Somewhat disagree	68	11.2	86.1
	Strongly disagree	43	7.1	93.2
	DK/RF	41	6.8	100
	Total	606	100	100
2019 Valid	Strongly agree	127	12	13.1
	Somewhat agree	443	41.8	58.8
	Somewhat disagree	283	26.6	87.9
	Strongly disagree	117	11.1	100
	Total	971	91.5	100

Difference between years is statistically significant (p<.05)

Would you say that developers who wish to build businesses or residences should always be required to pay a fee to the County to offset public costs even if it means increases in the price of services and new housing?

Survey Year			Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
2014	Valid	Strongly agree	244	40.3	40.3	40.3
		Somewhat agree	182	30	30	70.3
		Somewhat disagree	80	13.2	13.2	83.5
		Strongly disagree	54	8.9	8.9	92.4
		DK/RF	46	7.6	7.6	100
		Total	606	100	100	
2019	Valid	Strongly agree	385	36.3	41.3	41.3
		Somewhat agree	354	33.4	38	79.3
		Somewhat disagree	143	13.4	15.3	94.6
		Strongly disagree	51	4.8	5.4	100
		Total	933	88	100	

Difference between years is statistically significant (p<.05).

How safe do you feel in James City County during daylight hours ?

Survey Year			Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
2014	Valid	Very Safe	517	85.3	85.3	85.3
		Somewhat safe	81	13.4	13.4	98.7
		Somewhat unsafe	3	0.5	0.5	99.2
		Very unsafe	3	0.5	0.5	99.7
		DK/RF	2	0.3	0.3	100
		Total	606	100	100	
2019	Valid	Very Safe	797	75.1	77.2	77.2
		Somewhat safe	222	20.9	21.5	98.7
		Somewhat unsafe	13	1.3	1.3	100
		Total	1032	97.3	100	

Difference between years is statistically significant (p<.05).

How safe do you feel in James City County during the evening?

Survey Year			Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
2014	Valid	Very Safe	403	66.5	66.5	66.5
		Somewhat safe	173	28.5	28.5	95
		Somewhat unsafe	18	3	3	98
		Very unsafe	7	1.2	1.2	99.2
		DK/RF	5	0.8	0.8	100
		Total	606	100	100	
2019	Valid	Very Safe	472	44.5	46	46
		Somewhat safe	453	42.7	44.2	90.2
		Somewhat unsafe	95	8.9	9.2	99.5
		Very unsafe	6	0.5	0.5	100
		Total	1025	96.7	100	

Difference between years is statistically significant (p<.05).

JAMES CITY COUNTY COMPREHENSIVE PLAN SURVEY 2019

How would you rate the public school buildings or facilities ?

Survey Year			Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
2014	Valid	Excellent	200	33	33	33
		Good	239	39.4	39.4	72.4
		Fair	57	9.4	9.4	81.8
		Poor	13	2.1	2.1	84
		DK/RF	97	16	16	100
		Total	606	100	100	
2019	Valid	Excellent	193	18.2	27.4	27.4
		Good	407	38.4	57.8	85.3
		Fair	91	8.6	13	98.3
		Poor	12	1.2	1.7	100
		DK/RF				
		Total	704	66.3	100	

Difference between years is statistically significant (p<.05).

How would you rate the value of County services provided in relation to the taxes paid?

Survey Year			Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
2014	Valid	Excellent	102	16.8	16.8	16.8
		Good	332	54.8	54.8	71.6
		Fair	136	22.4	22.4	94.1
		Poor	21	3.5	3.5	97.5
		DK/RF	15	2.5	2.5	100
		Total	606	100	100	
2019	Valid	Excellent	169	16	17.4	17.4
		Good	522	49.3	53.6	71
		Fair	232	21.8	23.8	94.7
		Poor	52	4.9	5.3	100
		DK/RF				
		Total	975	92	100	

How satisfied are you with the level of communication you receive from the County government regarding services and other community issues ?

Survey Year			Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
2014	Valid	Very satisfied	124	20.5	20.5	20.5
		Somewhat satisfied	323	53.3	53.3	73.8
		Somewhat dissatisfied	101	16.7	16.7	90.4
		Very dissatisfied	49	8.1	8.1	98.5
		DK/RF	9	1.5	1.5	100
		Total	606	100	100	
2019	Valid	Very satisfied	207	19.5	21.6	21.6
		Somewhat satisfied	495	46.7	51.7	73.3
		Somewhat dissatisfied	198	18.7	20.7	94
		Very dissatisfied	57	5.4	6	100
		DK/RF				
		Total	957	90.3	100	

How would you rate the usability and quality of information on the County's Internet site?

Survey Year	Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
2014 Valid	Excellent	55	9.1	9.1
	Good	228	37.6	46.7
	Fair	77	12.7	59.4
	Poor	14	2.3	61.7
	DK/RF	232	38.3	100
	Total	606	100	100
2019 Valid	Excellent	80	7.5	11.8
	Good	385	36.4	56.9
	Fair	186	17.6	74.5
	Poor	26	2.4	76.9
	DK/RF	232	21.9	100
	Total	678	63.9	100

How important is it to have places in the County where people can live , work and play in close proximity?

Survey Year	Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
2014 Valid	Very important	295	48.7	48.7
	Somewhat important	224	37	85.6
	Somewhat unimportant	32	5.3	90.9
	Not at all important	24	4	94.9
	DK/RF	31	5.1	100
	Total	606	100	100
2019 Valid	Very important	443	41.7	43.9
	Somewhat important	421	39.7	83.6
	Somewhat unimportant	112	10.6	94.2
	Not at all important	34	3.2	97.4
	DK/RF	20	1.9	100
	Total	1009	95.2	100

Difference between years is statistically significant (p<.05).

Counting yourself, how many adults , age 18 or older, are currently living in your home?

Survey Year	Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
2014 Valid	1	136	22.4	22.4
	2	372	61.4	83.8
	3	64	10.6	94.4
	4	24	4	98.3
	5	2	0.3	98.7
	DK/RF	8	1.3	100
	Total	606	100	100
2019 Valid	1	254	24	26.1
	2	622	58.7	84.8
	3	67	6.3	91.1
	4	22	2.1	93.2
	5	7	0.6	93.8
	6 or more	3	0.3	94.1
	Total	975	92	100

JAMES CITY COUNTY COMPREHENSIVE PLAN SURVEY 2019

How many individuals under the age of 18 are currently living in your home?

Survey Year	Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
2014 Valid	0	414	68.3	68.3
	1	74	12.2	80.5
	2	70	11.6	92.1
	3	30	5	97
	4	9	1.5	98.5
	5	1	0.2	98.7
	7	1	0.2	98.8
	DK/RF	7	1.2	100
Total	606	100	100	
2019 Valid	0	763	72	78.5
	1	94	8.8	88.2
	2	83	7.8	96.7
	3	19	1.8	98.7
	4	8	0.8	99.5
	5	4	0.4	99.9
	6 or more	1	0.1	100
	Total	972	91.7	100

Do you own or do you rent your current home?

Survey Year	Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
2014 Valid	Own or buying	517	85.3	85.3
	Rent	72	11.9	97.2
	Other	11	1.8	99
	DK/RF	6	1	100
	Total	606	100	100
2019 Valid	Own or buying	745	70.2	74.2
	Rent	236	22.3	97.7
	Other	23	2.2	100
	Total	1004	94.7	100

Gender

Survey Year	Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
2014 Valid	Male	269	44.4	44.4
	Female	337	55.6	100
	Total	606	100	100
2019 Valid	Male	488	46	48.1
	Female	522	49.2	99.6
	Total	1014	95.2	99.6

APPENDIX F

Your best estimate of your total household income before taxes last year?

Survey Year			Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
2014	Valid	Less than \$25,000?	27	4.5	4.5	4.5
		\$25,000 - \$39,999?	44	7.3	7.3	11.7
		\$40,000 - \$59,999?	72	11.9	11.9	23.6
		\$60,000 - \$99,999?	122	20.1	20.1	43.7
		\$100,000 - \$124,999?	87	14.4	14.4	58.1
		\$125,000 - \$149,999?	45	7.4	7.4	65.5
		\$150,000 or more?	70	11.6	11.6	77.1
		DK/RF	139	22.9	22.9	100
		Total	606	100	100	
2019	Valid	Less than \$10,000	23	2.1	2.8	2.8
		\$10,000 - \$24,999	29	2.7	3.6	6.3
		\$25,000 - \$49,999	118	11.1	14.5	20.8
		\$50,000 - \$74,999	136	12.8	16.7	37.6
		\$75,000 - \$99,999	137	12.9	16.9	54.4
		\$100,000-\$149,999	192	18.1	23.6	78
		\$150,000-\$199,999	96	9.1	11.9	89.9
		\$200,000 or more	82	7.7	10.1	100
		Total	811	76.5	100	

Age Category

Survey Year			Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
2014	Valid	18-25	18	3	3.1	3.1
		26-35	37	6.1	6.4	9.5
		36-45	75	12.4	12.9	22.3
		46-55	99	16.3	17	39.3
		56-65	131	21.6	22.5	61.9
		>65	222	36.6	38.1	100
		Total	582	96	100	
		2019	Valid	Under 50	204	19.2
50 to 64	245			23.1	25.6	46.9
65 to 79	365			34.4	38.1	85
80 and over	144			13.6	15	100
Total	958			90.3	100	

Appendix G:
Survey Methodology

REPORT OF SURVEY METHODOLOGY

Overview

The 2019 James City County Citizen Survey was conducted by the Center for Survey Research (CSR) at the University of Virginia on behalf of the County government. The survey and analysis were supported by James City County (JCC). This study consisted of a dual-mode (paper and web-based) survey sent to James City County residents that aimed to understand the opinions of County residents about issues of importance to them and to the County government, as the County begins to update its Comprehensive Plan.

All James City County residents over 18 were eligible to participate. This survey was mailed out to a randomly selected stratified sample, and data from returned paper questionnaires were entered into an electronic version of the questionnaire on Qualtrics. A second, online version of the questionnaire was programmed into Qualtrics and offered midway through data collection for respondents to complete themselves, as an alternative to paper. Sample respondents were mailed an advance letter, an initial questionnaire packet, a reminder postcard, and a second packet with a letter that included a link to an online version of the survey instrument.

Questionnaire Development

Beginning in December 2018, the staff at the Center for Survey Research and James City County discussed the aims of the survey, based on previous iterations of a similar survey conducted by the County in 2014 and several prior occasions. The prior surveys were conducted by telephone. On recommendation of CSR, the County agreed that the 2019 survey should be conducted by mail, with a web option for response. The primary reason for the change in survey mode is that overall response rates to telephone surveys have declined to the point where the cost of random-digit-dialing as a sampling method has become prohibitively expensive. In addition, a mailed survey using an Address-Based Sample (ABS) offers far superior coverage of all households in the County than can be achieved using telephone sampling, even if landline and cell phone households are included in the phone number sample. Moreover, response rates in general population surveys are usually higher for mailed surveys than they currently are for telephone surveys.

A preliminary questionnaire was developed in February 2019 and was sent to James City County staff for review. CSR and JCC staff made multiple revisions to the questionnaire, keeping in mind the need to maintain comparability with previous surveys for some of the questions. The questionnaire was finalized in late March 2019.

In the questionnaire, respondents were initially asked about how long they'd lived in James City County. Next, respondents were asked about both importance of and satisfaction with a variety of County services, as well as opinions about development, land use, and country growth. Respondents were then asked about communication and government information, as well as their general likes and dislikes about living in the County. Lastly, the questionnaire concluded with demographic questions that included information such as age, income, race, gender, etc. The 16-

page questionnaire was made available in English language only. The questionnaire is shown in Appendix A of this report.

Sampling

CSR purchased an address-based sample of 3,000 residential addresses in James City County from Dynata, Inc. (formerly known as SSI or Survey Sampling International), a nationally recognized vendor for scientific survey samples. The sample is based on the address lists compiled and maintained by the U.S. Postal Service. The sample excluded addresses listed by the post office as businesses, vacant or seasonal homes, and P.O. Box addresses. The sampling vendor appended names of household occupants to the addresses where those were known, using data from white pages telephone directories and other sources. The County planning staff checked the sample list to ensure that each sampled address was actually located within the County boundaries. In addition, the County planning staff appended to each address a variable to indicate whether or not the address was located within the County's Primary Service Area. The sample was not stratified; all areas of the county were sampled with uniform probability. All correspondence was addressed using the name (where known); for example, "Michael Smith Household or current resident." If no name was known, letters were simply addressed to "Current resident." Out of the 3,000 addresses to which mail was sent, 207 addresses (about 7%) were identified as bad addresses and returned to CSR by the post office. However, since it is not known whether these addresses were actually unoccupied or non-residential units, we do not exclude these cases from the denominator when computing response rates.

Data Collection

Data collection was open from April 10th through May 20th, 2019. An advance letter (over the signature of County Administrator Scott A. Stevens) was mailed about April 10th, 2019, followed shortly thereafter by the first paper packet, mailed out on April 12th and 16th, 2019. Midway through data collection, CSR sent a reminder postcard to all sampled households with valid addresses. A second paper packet with a Qualtrics link was mailed out to non-respondents on May 6th and 7th, 2019, with data collection officially concluding on May 20th, 2019. Copies of the mailing materials are included at the end of this report.

In addition, the County posted information about the survey on its social media sites at the time of the advance letter mailing and the reminder postcard mailing. The paper questionnaire was printed professionally and distributed via USPS mail. The first survey packet included a cover letter from CSR, a questionnaire booklet, and a postage-paid return envelope. For the second packet, replacement paper questionnaires were mailed out along with a more urgently worded cover letter including a link to an online version of the instrument. The online instrument was programed into Qualtrics. The online instrument was tested and debugged by both CSR staff and James City County staff. No financial incentives were offered to respondents in this survey. Copies of the mailing pieces used in the survey are attached to this Appendix.

CSR personnel tracked all returned mail in a tracking data base. After receipt of a completed paper questionnaire was recorded, CSR staff entered responses from each one into a Qualtrics version of the survey that was optimized for efficient data entry on tablet devices. (Use of the tablet allows data entry personnel to input each survey response with a single touch of the screen, speeding the

process.) A random sample of 15 percent of the paper responses was entered a second time, with the second set of entries compared to the first to detect any errors or discrepancies. Errors were rare and appeared to be random, and all discrepancies were corrected. The corrected data from the paper questionnaires was then merged with the self-administered Qualtrics data from respondents who completed the survey online. The two data sets were checked for duplicates, to eliminate any cases in which a household completed the survey in both modes.

Data Preparation

CSR carried out the data preparation for analysis, which required labeling and cleaning of paper and online data. All data preparation was carried out using SPSS¹. Additionally, preparation of the online data was performed to clean out partial responses—instances in which the respondent opened the online questionnaire but did not answer any questions—in which case those respondents were dropped from the dataset.

Response rate

CSR received a total of 1,060 completed surveys before data collection was closed to further data entry on May 24th, 2019. Of these, only 26 were received via the online version in Qualtrics. An additional 54 valid, non-duplicate paper questionnaires were received after that date (these are not included in the data in this report, nor in the calculation of response rates). Since the study population was all households in James City County, and our purchased mailing list excluded households known by the post office to be vacant or seasonal homes, there is no basis for excluding from the eligible sample any of the households which we mailed to. (Another reason not to exclude them is that household names (where known) were included in the household addresses, so in many cases the returned mail indicated that the addressed person was not known at that address. In many such cases, the dwelling might have been occupied by new tenants not listed in the address and would thus remain eligible for the survey.) Therefore, a conservative estimate of the response rate is simply the number of completed surveys divided by the number attempted in the sample: $1060 / 3000 = 35.3$ percent. That said, if the 207 known bad addresses are excluded and we add in the questionnaires received after the survey close, the rate of return is $1112 / 2793 = 39.8$ percent of those that were not returned unopened by the post office. These days, that constitutes a remarkably high rate of return for a survey of the general public without financial incentives to the respondents. The response rate is considerably higher than what likely might have been achieved with a telephone survey.

Weighting

When surveying the general population, the demographic profile of the survey respondents rarely matches the profile of the population under study. Random sampling error, systematic differences in rates of refusal between different groups, and differences among households regarding the availability of someone being in the home to do the survey often result in datasets that somewhat over-represent certain demographic categories. Accordingly, statistical weighting of the survey results was designed to adjust some demographic characteristics in the sample so as to more accurately represent the population of interest: occupied households in James City County.

¹ IBM Corp. Released 2016. IBM SPSS Statistics for Windows, Version 25.0. Armonk, NY: IBM Corp.

CSR weighted the sample data by three variables. The first weighting variable was census tract group, based on grouping the County’s 13 census tracts into 4 geographically contiguous groups: those beginning with numbers 801, 802, 803, and 804, respectively. The second weighting variable was gender (using two categories of gender as in U.S. Census statistics). The third weighting factor combined information on housing tenure (homeowners vs. renters) and the race of the “householder” (i.e., the first person listed on a census roster), resulting in four categories: white homeowners, homeowners of any other race, white renters, and renters of any other race. A statistical method called ‘rim weighting’ or ‘raking’ was used to adjust the sample proportions on each weighting factor to closely approximate the population proportions for each of these variables, as can be seen in Table 1.

Table 1. Unweighted and weighted frequencies of variables used in weighting

Item	Unweighted JCC Survey	Weighted JCC Survey	ACS
Race by Homeownership^a			
White owner	82.6%	65.3%	65.3%
White renter	5.8%	19.0%	19.0%
Non-white owner	9.5%	9.1%	9.1%
Non-white renter	2.1%	6.7%	6.7%
Gender^a			
Female	42.9%	51.5%	51.7%
Male	56.7%	48.1%	48.3%
Own description	0.4%	0.4%	NA
Census Tract Group^a			
801	11.0%	13.6%	13.6%
802	33.2%	34.8%	34.8%
803	32.5%	31.3%	31.3%
804	23.3%	20.3%	20.3%

a - American Community Survey 5-year estimates (2012-2017)

One unusual result in this survey was that men were overrepresented in the unweighted sample. It is rare for males to constitute a majority of survey respondents, as females are generally more willing to participate in surveys. This pattern of response resulted from the use of personal names on the address labels. In households with multiple adults of different genders, it is still more common for the man’s name to be listed in the directory than the woman’s. Therefore, more of the personalized letters were addressed to males than to females. By weighting, we restored women to the majority, as they are within the adult population of the County.

For other demographic variables, weighting somewhat reduced the disparity between the weighted sample and the study population. However, as seen in Table 2, it remains the case that the respondents to the 2019 survey are older on average and more highly educated than the adult population as a whole. This pattern is partly attributable to the subject matter of the survey, the fact that no attempt was made to randomize the selection of a respondent within a household, and

the addressing of the correspondence to a listed householder (not usually the youngest member of the household). In addition, any self-administered survey (mail or web-based) entails a degree of “literacy bias,” as those with higher levels of education experience less burden in reading and answering a survey that is several pages in length.

Table 2. Unweighted and weighted demographic frequencies

Item	Unweighted JCC Survey	Weighted JCC Survey	ACS
Age^a			
Under 50	15.9%	21.3%	43.9%
50 to 64	28.8%	25.6%	26.4%
65 to 79	41.8%	38.1%	22.1%
80 and over	13.4%	15.0%	7.7%
Hispanic origin^{ad}	1.8%	2.30%	4.3%
Household Income^b			
Less than \$10,000	1.1%	2.8%	3.3%
\$10,000 - \$24,999	2.4%	3.6%	9.8%
\$25,000 - \$49,999	11.0%	14.5%	16.6%
\$50,000 - \$74,999	16.1%	16.7%	16.5%
\$75,000 - \$99,999	17.5%	16.9%	13.8%
\$100,000 - \$149,999	26.3%	23.6%	21.1%
\$150,000 - \$199,999	13.4%	11.9%	8.7%
\$200,000 or more	12.3%	10.1%	10.2%
Education^c			
Less than high school diploma	0.8%	1.0%	5.70%
High school graduate/GED	6.3%	6.1%	19.40%
Some college but no degree	12.9%	13.8%	19.50%
Associates Degree or certificate in career or technical education program for job training	8.9%	9.7%	7.50%
Bachelor's Degree	24.6%	24.4%	26.10%
Some graduate work	8.9%	8.9%	NA
Master's Professional or Doctoral degree	37.6%	36.1%	21.80%

a - Adults only, age 18+, American Community Survey 5-year estimates (2012-2017)

b - American Community Survey 5-year estimates (2012-2017)

c - Adults only, age 25+, American Community Survey 5-year estimates (2012-2017)

d - Although the American Community Survey (ACS) produces population, demographic and housing unit estimates, it is the Census Bureau's Population Estimates Program that produces and disseminates the official estimates of the population for the nation, states, counties, cities, and towns and estimates of housing units for states and counties.

Margin of Error

The margin of error due to sampling for the survey is approximately +/- 3.6 percent at the 95 percent level of confidence. This means that if the survey were to be repeated with 100 different random samples, the results of this survey would be within 3.6 percentage points of the population

mean in 95 out of those 100 iterations of the survey. If there were no other sources of error in the survey besides sampling error, it would also mean that this survey has a 95% chance of being within 3.6 percentage points of the results that would have been obtained if all households in James City County had been surveyed and all had responded. Note that there are other sources of error in surveys besides sampling error that can be difficult or impossible to measure; these include measurement error (problems with question wording) and non-response bias (differences between those who respond and those who do not).

The margin of error is affected by the weighting of the dataset. The estimate of +/- 3.6 percent takes that factor into account. Note that every question on the survey has its own margin of error. The overall calculation presented here is for a question answered by all respondents with a 50-50 response distribution. Margins of error would be larger for questions answered by smaller numbers of respondents or for subgroups in the data. On the other hand, questions with a lopsided response pattern (e.g. an 80-20 response pattern) and answered by all respondents will have a smaller margin of error.

Survey Mailing Materials

Advance letter:



County Administration
101-D Mounts Bay Road
P.O. Box 8784
Williamsburg, VA 23187-8784
P: 757-253-6728
jamescitycountyva.gov

DATE

NAME AND ADDRESS

DEAR NAME:

We want to hear from you! As you may have heard, your James City County government is preparing to update its Comprehensive Plan in the coming months. The Comprehensive Plan is intended to represent the community interest and to let developers know where we want future types of development to occur. To start that process, the James City County Board of Supervisors has contracted with the Center for Survey Research at the University of Virginia to conduct a scientific survey of County residents. I am writing to let you know that your household has been randomly selected to participate in this important project.

In about a week, you will receive a questionnaire by mail from the Center for Survey Research. Your opinions will help James City County as it reviews and updates the Comprehensive Plan. It will take about 10-15 minutes to complete. All you need to do is fill out the questionnaire and send it back in the envelope that will come with it. No postage is needed. All of your answers will be completely confidential, and your responses will never be identified with you personally.

In order for the survey to provide meaningful results, we need participation from as many of those selected as possible. We know you are busy, but we hope you will take the time to participate. If you have questions about the survey, you can contact Alex Baruch, Senior Planner at the James City County Planning Division, at (757) 253-6685, or Kate Wood, Ph.D., Senior Project Director at the Center for Survey Research, at (434) 243-1088. Mr. Baruch can be reached by email at alex.baruch@jamescitycountyva.gov, and Dr. Wood can be reached at kwood@virginia.edu.

Thank you in advance for completing and returning the questionnaire. We value your opinion and want to hear from you. Please watch your mailbox for the James City County 2019 Citizen Survey.

Sincerely,

Scott A. Stevens
County Administrator

UVA IRB-SBS #2364

First Packet Cover letter:



2400 Old Ivy Road
P.O. Box 400767
Charlottesville, VA 22904-4767
Tel: (434) 243-5222
Fax: (434) 243-5233
www.virginia.edu/surveys
surveys@virginia.edu

A Unit of the Weldon Cooper Center for Public Service
April 2019

ID: «SAMPLEID»

«LOWERSURNAME» Household
or Current Resident
«LOWERPRIMARYADD»
«LOWERSECONDARY»
«LOWERCITY», «STATE» «ZIPCODE»-«ZIP4»

Dear James City County Resident,

As you may have heard, your James City County government is preparing to update its Comprehensive Plan in the coming months. The Comprehensive Plan is intended to represent the community interest and to let developers know where we want future types of development to occur. To start that process, the James City County Board of Supervisors has contracted with the Center for Survey Research at the University of Virginia to conduct a scientific survey of County residents. Your household has been randomly selected from all households in James City County to take part in the survey. We hope you will take the time to fill out the questionnaire. Your opinions are very important to County leaders as they make decisions about the future.

The survey questionnaire is enclosed in this packet. It will take only 10 to 15 minutes to complete. Your answers are completely confidential, and results will never be reported in any way that would allow an individual to be identified. The survey is also voluntary. If there is a question that you do not wish to answer, you may simply skip it.

Once you have completed the survey, please mail it back in the enclosed, postage-paid envelope. If you have questions about the survey, you can contact Alex Baruch, Senior Planner at the James City County Planning Division, at (757) 253-6685, or Kate Wood, Ph.D., Senior Project Director at the Center for Survey Research, at (434) 243-1088. Mr. Baruch can be reached by email at alex.baruch@jamescitycountyva.gov, and Dr. Wood can be reached at kwood@virginia.edu.

Thank you very much for helping with this important study.

Cordially,

A handwritten signature in black ink that reads "Thomas M. Guterbock".

Thomas M. Guterbock, Ph.D.
Director
Center for Survey Research

IRB-SBS #2364

Reminder postcard:

Dear James City County resident:

About a week ago, the Center for Survey Research (CSR) sent you a survey packet on behalf of the James City County Board of Supervisors. Your household was selected as part of a random sample of residents in James City County to learn about residents' opinion as the County begins to update its Comprehensive Plan.

If you have already completed the questionnaire, please accept our sincere appreciation. If you have not, please do so today. It is extremely important that your responses are included in the study if the results are to accurately represent all James City County residents.

If by some chance you did not receive the questionnaire, or if it has been misplaced, please call (434) 243-5232 or send an e-mail to surveys1@virginia.edu.

Thank you for your time and effort.



Thomas M. Guterbock, Director
Center for Survey Research
University of Virginia

IRB-SBS #2364

Second packet cover letter:



2400 Old Ivy Road
P.O. Box 400767
Charlottesville, VA 22904-4767
Tel: (434) 243-5222
Fax: (434) 243-5233
www.virginia.edu/surveys
surveys@virginia.edu

A Unit of the Weldon Cooper Center for Public Service

April 2019

ID: «SAMPLEID»

«LOWERSURNAME» Household
or Current Resident
«LOWERPRIMARYADD»
«LOWERSECONDARY»
«LOWERCITY», «STATE» «ZIPCODE»-«ZIP4»

Dear James City County Resident,

Recently we sent you a questionnaire on behalf of the James City County Board of Supervisors. Although many people have already returned completed questionnaires, as of this week we have not yet received a completed questionnaire from your household. Because your opinions are important to your County leaders as they begin to update the Comprehensive Plan, we are mailing you a second questionnaire and ask you to complete it if you haven't done so already, and return it to CSR in the envelope provided. This survey is completely voluntary, and all of your answers will be completely confidential. We hope you will participate.

If you would prefer to complete this survey online instead of the paper version, you can access the survey by clicking here. [LINK TO SURVEY IN QUALTRICS](#)

If you have questions about the survey, you can contact Alex Baruch, Senior Planner at the James City County Planning Division, at (757) 253-6685, or Kate Wood, Ph.D., Senior Project Director at the Center for Survey Research, at (434) 243-1088. Mr. Baruch can be reached by email at alex.baruch@jamescitycountyva.gov, and Dr. Wood can be reached at kwood@virginia.edu. Thank you very much for helping with this important study.

Cordially,

A handwritten signature in black ink that reads "Thomas M. Guterbock".

Thomas M. Guterbock, Ph.D.
Director
Center for Survey Research

IRB-SBS #2364