

2016 QUALITY OF LIFE SURVEY
ORLEANS AND JEFFERSON PARISHES



March 2016

UNO Survey Research Center

Dr. Edward E. Chervenak, Director
echerven@uno.edu

Elizabeth Juhasz, Research Assistant
emjuhasz@uno.edu

Anthony Licciardi, Research Assistant
alicia2@uno.edu

(504) 280-3217

You can view SRC surveys on:
poli.uno.edu/unopoll/index.cfm

Special thanks to the students in Dr. Chervenak's POLI 4600 and POLI 4650 classes, Dr. Shomade's POLI 2151 class, Mr. Battista's POLI 2151 class, Mr. Nolan's POLI 2450 class, Ms. Tana Hamiltons's POLI 2700 class, Mr. Jacob's POLI 4770 class and Mr. Worth's POLI 2900 Research Methods class

SUMMARY


- 1) There are lower levels of life satisfaction in Orleans than three years ago while Jefferson remains stable.
 - a) New Orleans residents are less likely to say the city has become a better place to live in the past five years and more likely to say it has become a worse place to live.
 - b) New Orleans residents are less positive that the parish will become a better place to live in the next five years while Jefferson residents are more positive that the parish will become a better place to live.
- 2) Crime is the biggest problem facing both parishes according to citizens.
 - a) Residents in Orleans parishes are more likely to say that crime is increasing than 3 years ago while Jefferson residents are less likely to say that crime is increasing.
 - b) The percentage of Orleans residents who say they or a member of their family was a crime victim was higher than in 2013.
 - c) Just over one-third of New Orleans voters do not feel safe around their home during the night.
 - d) One-quarter of residents in the city hear gunfire at least a few times a month.
- 3) A majority of New Orleans residents approve of the job the Police Superintendent and the District Attorney are doing.
- 4) More people disapprove than approve of the job the Civil Sheriff is doing.
- 5) A majority of New Orleans residents disapprove of the job the Criminal Courts are doing.
- 6) Perceptions of the likelihood of new jobs and industry coming into Orleans parish are more negative than positive.
- 7) Orleans Parish voters' rating of most government services has become more negative.
- 8) New Orleans Mayor Mitch Landrieu's level of approval has declined slightly, but is still at a healthy 60%.
 - a) More residents favor the removal of the Confederate monuments than oppose it, but opinion on the issue is racially polarized.
 - b) A majority of residents in the city oppose changing the city charter to allow Mitch Landrieu to run for a third term.
- 9) About half of New Orleans residents approve of the job the City Council is doing.
- 10) Jefferson residents rate Sheriff Newell Normand, Parish President Mike Yenni and the Parish Council very positively.

THE QUALITY OF LIFE SERIES

The UNO Survey Research Center began its Quality of Life series in 1986. Since then the quality of life and government services in Jefferson and Orleans parishes has been assessed approximately every other year. The current 2016 survey is the eighteenth in the series. These surveys are designed to provide an ongoing picture of how voters view local government services and the general quality of life. They highlight the problems that are of greatest concern to the voters, as well as areas of satisfaction in their parish. The thirty-year time series can be used to assess the effects of events, programs, and policies. The series can also inform the public and officials about specific areas of perceived deterioration or improvement.

The results of the Quality of Life surveys represent the **perceptions and opinions** of the registered voters of the two parishes. The results are not objective measures of the quality of life or the quality of government services.


GENERAL QUALITY OF LIFE (Tables 1 - 3)



As has been the case in all of the surveys since 1986, Jefferson voters are quite satisfied with life in their parish. The high level of satisfaction in Jefferson (94%) contrasts with New Orleans where voters are less satisfied (66%). This difference is what we would expect when comparing a lower income city with a more middle income suburb.

While the level of satisfaction in Jefferson has remained high and fairly stable, Orleans has experienced an eight percentage point drop in satisfaction from

three years ago. Despite that decline, the graph illustrates how in recent surveys a more positive perception of life in Orleans has reduced the life satisfaction gap between the two parishes. From 1986 to 2004 an average of 60% of respondents reported that they were satisfied with life in Orleans. That average fell to 55% from 2006 to 2009. In the four surveys conducted since then, the average is 70%. Although the level of life satisfaction in Orleans is down from 2013, it appears that people are relatively optimistic about life in the city.




In another general measure of the quality of life, we asked voters if they thought their parish has become a better or worse place to live, or whether there has been no change over the past five years. **In New Orleans voters are considerably less positive about the direction of the city than they were in 2013. Today, about one-third of registered voters in Orleans, 32%, report the city has become a better place to live, a 15 percentage point drop from three years ago.** One quarter of respondents say that things have gotten worse in New Orleans, compared to 20% in 2013. The percentage of Jefferson residents are more stable. Forty two percent

rate their parish as a better place to live over the last five years. One-in-five believe it has become a worse place to live while 35% reply there has been no change.

Orleans respondents also express lower levels of optimism about the future of the city than three years ago.

In 2013, 54% of residents believed that the city will become a better place to live in the next five years. That number is down to 46% in our latest survey, the lowest percentage since 2004 when 44% said the city will become a better place to live. One third report that they think there will be no change in the next five years and 9% say New Orleans will become a worse place to live. Jefferson residents are more positive about the future with the percentage of respondents saying the parish will become a better place rising from 46% in 2013 to 50% today.




While crime is mentioned most often as the biggest problem in both parishes, with the exception of 2006, it is cited more often in Orleans than in Jefferson. When asked what they think is the biggest problem facing the parish, 49% of the city’s voters tell us it is crime. **That is a significant drop from what it was three years ago when 62% told interviewers that crime was the biggest problem.**


The reduction in the mention of crime as the biggest problem in Orleans is quite a significant departure from the upward trend observed after Katrina. After falling to a low of 31% in 2006, the percentage declaring crime as the biggest problem in

the parish doubled to 62% by 2013. **Despite the recent reduction in citing crime as the city’s biggest problem, it continues to be the dominant issue in the city.**

In Jefferson Parish, there is a slight uptick from 2013 with 28% of respondents stating that crime is their top concern. In the past Orleans and Jefferson generally tracked each other regarding the crime issue, it appears there is now a divergence between the two parishes.

Because the concern about crime is so dominant in Orleans, other problems tend to get crowded out. Education is the second most often cited problem in New Orleans. The concern about education is the same as it was in 2013. Concern about unemployment is expressed by 4% of respondents, which is what was found in 2013. Eight percent of New Orleanians tell us the city's politics is the biggest problem, whether it is a concern about political corruption, comments about the mayor, or problems with government in general. In addition, streets and infrastructure are mentioned by 5% of respondents and 4% are concerned about budget cuts and public financing issues.





Just as in Orleans, education is the second most often cited problem in Jefferson. Politics is the third most important problem. A combination of leadership, corruption, or government in general is cited by 7%. One indication of satisfaction in Jefferson Parish is that 22% of registered voters responded “they were happy or there were no problems” or “don’t know” when asked what they think the biggest problem is in the parish.


Biggest Problems Facing the Parish: 2013 & 2016

	2013	2016
Orleans		
Crime	62%	49%
Economic Problems*	6%	8%
Education	7%	7%
Jefferson		
Crime	26%	28%
Education	7%	10%
Politics	7%	7%

*Note: Economic Problems include any mention of finances, unemployment, lack of business, or just "economy."

FOCUS ON CRIME AND THE CRIMINAL JUSTICE SYSTEM
(Tables 4 through 8)

Today voters in New Orleans are slightly more negative about the trend in crime than they were three years ago. In Orleans the number saying that crime is increasing rose from 50% in 2013 to 53% this year. Another 35% report there has been no change. In the pre-Katrina era from 1986 to 2004, on average, 61% reported that crime was increasing in the city. The average for the six surveys conducted since Katrina is 57%.



Jefferson Parish saw a decline in the percentage of respondents who perceive crime increasing. While the table shows a great deal of variation in the perception levels of Jefferson voters, the mean is 51%



for all the years 1986 up to and including 2016. The percentage of Jefferson residents this year who perceive that crime is increasing is 5 percentage points below that average.

The more negative perceptions about crime in Orleans may reflect the reporting of more high profile crimes. Overall crime was down in the first three quarters of 2015 according to statistics released by the NOPD.¹ However, the psychological impact of hearing about high-profile crimes reported on TV and the longer response times by the NOPD to calls for help may be having negative effects on perceptions about crime. **Regardless of the trend, residents in both parishes are at least 5 times more likely to say that crime in their parish has increased than has decreased.**

Attitudes on crime are not based only on perceptions, but on individual experience. We asked registered voters whether they or anyone in their family had been a victim of crime in the past three years. Thirty percent of Orleans respondents report that they or a family member have been a victim of crime compared to 25% in 2013. There is a slight racial disparity as 32% of whites and 28% of African-Americans revealed they or a family member were a crime victim. The numbers for whites are similar to what was found in the 2013 survey. For African-Americans, however, being a crime victim is up 6 percentage points from what was reported three years ago. As for Jefferson Parish residents, 23% report they or a family member had been victimized by crime compared to 21% three years ago.


¹ Emily Lane. Nov. 24, 2015. "New Orleans' 2015 overall crime down 6% through September, but murders and rapes up: NOPD http://www.nola.com/crime/index.ssf/2015/11/overall_crime_down_6_percent_i.html

Crime has affected New Orleans voters' sense of security in their homes. **Although the majority say they feel safe around their homes during the night, those who do not feel safe has risen slightly to 36%.** The safety levels felt in New Orleans are, naturally, lower than those in Jefferson. An overwhelming majority (87%) of voters in Jefferson feel safe at night, compared to 63% in New Orleans. And although the percentage of Jefferson residents who report not feeling safe around their home at night has decreased from the last time we asked them, those numbers are double that from 2010 (6% to 13%).



A tangible indicator of lack of safety is hearing gunfire in your neighborhood. In 2013, 24% of blacks, compared to 14% of whites, said they heard gunfire in their neighborhood at least a few times a month or more. The current survey indicates that percentage has held steady for whites, but a higher percentage of blacks, nearly 30%, report hearing gunfire at a consistent rate. **In fact, the percentage of blacks who say they hear gunfire on a regular basis is twice that for the city's white residents.**


Consistent with the perceptions about crime and safety, evaluations of the New Orleans police are relatively unchanged from three years ago. Police in Jefferson continue to enjoy a high level of confidence from the voters in that parish although public support has dropped a few percentage points. **Nonetheless, Jefferson residents are approximately 3 times more likely to positively rate police protection than are Orleans residents.**



Given that crime is the top concern expressed by New Orleans' residents, this study examined public perceptions of the various elements of the city's criminal justice system. We asked respondents to evaluate Police

Superintendent Michael Harrison, District Attorney Leon Cannizzaro, Orleans Sheriff Marlin Gusman, and the Orleans Parish Criminal Courts.

Overall, 62% of voters approve of the job that Superintendent Harris is doing. He has a disapproval rating of 22%, resulting in a net positive rating of 40 points. Sixteen percent did not offer an opinion when asked about his job performance. There is some racial divergence in the evaluation of Harrison; 57% of whites approve of him compared to 71% of African-Americans. Also, whites are twice as likely as African-American not to express an opinion about Harrison.



District Attorney Leon Cannizzaro has a 55% job approval rating, which equals the approval rating he received in 2013. Approximately one-quarter of respondents rate his job performance negatively and 19% did not provide an opinion. Fifty-three percent of blacks approve of his job performance compared to 60% of whites. Compared to 2013, he is down 9 percentage points among white respondents and he gained 3 percentage points from African-American respondents.

Orleans Parish Sheriff Marlin Gusman’s job performance ratings have improved from three years ago. At that time only 33% of New Orleans residents approved of the job he was doing as sheriff. That number is up to 40% in this survey. African-Americans fueled the boost in his ratings as 50% evaluate him positively in this survey, compared to 37% in 2013. He also saw a 4 percentage point increase in approval from white residents. Despite the improvement in his ratings, Sheriff Gusman still finds himself underwater in how the city’s residents evaluate him. Forty-five percent disapprove of his job performance and twice as many people strongly disapprove of him than strongly approve.

The fourth element in the criminal justice system we inquired about was the Orleans’ Parish Criminal Courts. **Only 31% approve of the Courts’ performance, which is lower than what was observed in 2013.** Fifty-four percent of Orleans’ residents disapprove of the Criminal Courts, which is slightly lower than from the last survey. The percentage who did not offer an opinion doubled from 7% to 15%. Nearly one third of blacks and one-quarter of whites are strongly disapproving of the criminal court’s performance.

EVALUATION OF GOVERNMENT SERVICES (Table 9)

In another measure of quality of life we asked Orleans and Jefferson residents to rate local government services. Throughout the Quality of Life surveys, Jefferson residents have expressed a much higher level of satisfaction than Orleans residents with their local government services. Perhaps this is because those services are indeed better or perhaps Jefferson residents, with higher incomes, expect and need less from local government.

Public opinion on many government services in New Orleans has changed in a more negative direction over the last several years. The negative shift was noted in the evaluation of the overall level of government services category from 2013 to 2016. Negative ratings of overall government services rose from 31% to 36% over the last three years. More specifically, appraisals of the quality of housing in Orleans and the availability of public transportation are also rated more negative than three years ago. Services to the poor and recreation programs are also more likely to be evaluated negatively compared to 2013. Negative evaluations of flood control and drainage are also 3 percentage points higher than found in the 2013 survey. Police protection realized the largest increase in negative evaluations. Three years ago 32% of Orleans residents evaluated police protection as poor. The current survey reveals that 43% of respondents rate police protection as poor or very poor.

Conditions of streets and roads is the most poorly rated service in New Orleans. The number rating the streets as “poor/very poor” was at 70% in 2013. Today that figure stands at 79%. Although there have been numerous street construction projects either completed or underway in the city, the vast majority remains negative in their evaluation of the city’s streets. Linked to all the road construction is traffic congestion. When asked to rate the control of traffic congestion in the city, respondents are more critical in their evaluations. In 2013, 30% rated it as good/very good and 30% regarded it as poor/very poor. Now 23% grade control of traffic congestion positively while 40% evaluate it negatively.


One area of improvement noted by Orleans respondents was control of abandoned houses. With tens of thousands of blighted properties in the city, control of abandoned housing is a major issue for residents. In 2013, only 7% believed the city was adequately addressing the situation while nearly 3 of 4 people thought the city was doing a poor job dealing with the problem. This survey finds that 12% of respondents are optimistic in how the city is tackling blighted housing and negative evaluations are down to 63%.


Trash pickup was the highest rated service (73%) in Orleans in 2013 with fire protection close behind (70%). However, that ranking has changed as trash pickup now has a 64% positive rating while the fire protection comes in at 71%. When it came to access to health services, respondents rate it slightly less negatively in this survey.

Jefferson residents are generally more positive about their government services. Fire protection is the highest rated service (83%) with trash pickup close behind (74%). Drainage and flooding appear to be less of a concern than it was several years ago and traffic congestion is less of a problem. However, Jefferson residents have become more negative in their opinions about several services. They are increasingly unhappy with the parish’s performance on the condition of the streets and on services for the poor.

BEST AND WORST SERVICES

Orleans	Best (%Good/Very Good)		Worst (%Poor/Very Poor)	
	Fire Protection	71%	Condition of Streets	79%
	Trash Pickup	64%	Abandoned Housing	63%
	Public Transportation	39%	Services for Poor	51%
	Access to Health Services	31%	Police Protection	43%
Jefferson				
	Fire Protection	83%	Condition of Streets	19%
	Trash Pickup	74%	Traffic Congestion	18%
	Police Protection	68%	Services for the Poor	18%
	Health Services	62%	Abandoned Housing	15%





ECONOMIC OUTLOOK
(Table 10)


Residents in Orleans Parish have become somewhat more negative about economic prospects over the past three years, while evaluations by residents in Jefferson Parish are higher than they were in the last survey.

Jefferson voters continue to be more positive about employment opportunities in their parish. A third of them rated their job prospects as good or very good in 2013. They are even more optimistic in this survey as 41% believe that jobs will be available in the parish. The outlook for residents in Orleans, however, was unchanged from 2013. One-quarter of them say they are confident of increased employment opportunities in the parish.

In 2013, Orleanians were more bullish than Jefferson residents on the likelihood of new jobs and industry coming to the parish. That is not the case today. In fact, the results show an almost complete reversal from what was observed in the 2013 survey. At that time 41% of Orleans residents, compared to 30% of Jefferson residents, thought that the likelihood of new jobs and industry were good or very good. This survey, however, found that 38% of Jefferson residents, compared to 31% of Orleans residents hold that perspective.

Residents in both parishes are relatively positive about future earnings with 38% of voters in New Orleans and 42% in Jefferson saying the likelihood of their family increasing its income in the next several years is good or very good. The results for Orleans are unchanged from 2013 while they are

up for Jefferson Parish. In the last survey, 32% of Jefferson Parish residents reported that the likelihood of increasing their income was good or very good. In addition, 32% of Jefferson respondents said their income prospects were poor or very poor in 2013 while 23% say that is the case today.



EDUCATION
(Table 11)

Residents in Orleans continue to negatively evaluate public education with 45% rating it as poor or very poor and 15% rating it as good or very good. Those evaluations are less positive than 2013. Nonetheless, this is a distinct improvement when compared to evaluations prior to Katrina. In 2004, 61% of the voters in the city gave public elementary schools a “poor” rating. Ratings for junior and senior high schools were even worse. During that time we had publicity focusing on “failing” schools, major fiscal mismanagement and corruption.



The trend in evaluations of the schools illustrates the reform effort that has taken hold in recent years. New Orleans has become a test city for the charter school movement and data from the Louisiana Department of Education indicate a slight improvement in schools over the past several years. Publicity on the reform effort and state takeover of public education has put it in a better light with voters.

Public education is rated better in Jefferson than in Orleans. Thirty-one percent rate the public schools as good or very good, but another 24% respond that the schools are poor or very poor. Another 33% say the quality of the parish’s public schools is fair.

ELECTED OFFICIALS JOB APPROVAL
(Table 12)

New Orleans Mayor Mitch Landrieu continues to enjoy a relatively high level of support. His overall approval has declined slightly in the past three years from 65% to 60%. We would expect a decrease in approval, especially with a mayor who is serving in his second term, but Landrieu continues to be rated positively by the public for his performance as the city’s chief executive.


The decline in Landrieu’s approval rating has occurred because of a loss of approval among white voters. His approval rating among African-Americans is 8 percentage points higher than what was observed in 2013. However, the mayor’s approval rating among whites dropped drastically from 78% to 49%. In fact, a sizeable percentage of whites, 43%, now disapprove of the mayor.



Not long ago the mayor pushed for the removal of four confederate monuments in the city. That decision generated a heated debate in the community about whether to keep or remove the monuments. Because of all the controversy surrounding this issue we decided to ask respondents if they favor or oppose the removal of the monuments. Overall, 50% say they favor the removal, with 31% opposing the move, and 19% not expressing an opinion. **The response to this question, however, is racially polarized. African-Americans are heavily in favor of removing the monuments while a majority of whites are opposed to their removal.**

We wanted to learn if attitudes on the confederate monuments are related to perceptions of Landrieu’s job performance. We found that 67% of those who favor the removal of the monuments approve of Landrieu’s job performance. Among those who oppose the removal, 53% give the mayor positive marks. **When we controlled for the race of the respondent we found a strong relationship between opinion on the monuments and Landrieu approval among whites. In other words, among whites, approval of the mayor is largely a function of their opinions on the monument removal.** For instance, among whites who support removing the monuments 67% approve of the mayor while 23% disapprove of him. Conversely, of those

whites who oppose the removal 36% express approval of the mayor while 57% say they disapprove of him. There is no relationship between opinion on the monuments and Landrieu approval among African-American respondents. Regardless of where they stand on the monument controversy, approximately 70% say they approve of the mayor.




We also asked registered voters in the city what they thought about a possible change to the city charter to allow Mitch Landrieu to run for a third term. Popular sentiment ran against changing the charter for that purpose, but there is a substantial difference between whites and African-Americans on this question. A majority of all registered voters, 56%, are against changing the charter. **African-Americans, however, are more likely to say they favor than oppose the change to allow Landrieu to run for a third time. Whites, on the other hand, are strongly against changing the charter by a nearly 4 to 1 margin.**

The New Orleans City Council has seen its approval rating decline after 2010 but it has stabilized since then. Six years ago 58% approved of the job the council was doing. Today, their approval rating stands at 46%. In 2013, 40% of residents disapproved of the Council’s performance. Their disapproval rate remains the same today.



There is some racial polarization in approval of the city council with African-Americans more approving than whites. **Blacks were 3 times more likely to strongly approve of the council (15% to 5%).** Forty-nine percent of African-Americans approve of the council while 38% do not. Whites are evenly divided in their evaluation of the council (42% approval to 44% disapproval).



Jefferson Parish Sheriff Newell Normand continues to be one of the more highly regarded elected officials in the two parishes. His already sky-high approval is almost unchanged from 2013. Normand has averaged an approval rating of 80% since 2010.

Despite the fact that nearly half of Jefferson residents perceive crime as increasing and that crime is mentioned most often as the biggest problem; Sheriff Normand and his police force enjoy high approval ratings.

Although Parish President Mike Yenni was elected to his position only 5 months ago he has a 71% job approval rating, with 32% reporting they strongly approve of the job he is doing as parish president. Only 9% rate him negatively while 20% did not express an opinion when asked about his performance in office.

Jefferson residents are also very positive about their Parish Council with 72% of Jefferson voters saying they approve of its performance. That number has not changed from 2013.




TABLE 1: LIFE SATISFACTION

“How satisfied are you with life in Orleans/Jefferson Parish?”

	Orleans																	
	1986	1988	1990	1992	1994	1996	1998	2000	2002	2004	2006	2007	2008	2009	2010	2012	2013	2016
Very Satisfied	10%	12%	10%	6%	6%	6%	10%	12%	8%	8%	7%	5%	11%	11%	11%	15%	10%	12%
Satisfied	54%	55	50	52	39	47	53	55	59	51	46	44	47	48	64	51	64	54
Dissatisfied	26%	24	29	32	33	31	26	23	24	28	33	31	28	29	15	23	19	24
Very Dissatisfied	8%	8	9	9	21	16	10	9	8	13	14	17	12	10	9	10	6	9
DK	2%	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	3	2	1	1	1	1	1
<i>N</i>	<i>573</i>	<i>416</i>	<i>468</i>	<i>498</i>	<i>596</i>	<i>409</i>	<i>442</i>	<i>425</i>	<i>403</i>	<i>400</i>	<i>200</i>	<i>302</i>	<i>109</i>	<i>248</i>	<i>300</i>	<i>301</i>	<i>302</i>	<i>403</i>

	Jefferson																	
	1986	1988	1990	1992	1994	1996	1998	2000	2002	2004	2006	2007	2008	2009	2010	2012	2013	2016
Very Satisfied	26%	28%	28%	32%	25%	24%	30%	28%	36%	30%	21%	21%	28%	37%	25%	27%	27%	28%
Satisfied	63%	65	62	60	66	67	63	64	55	59	66	58	62	56	67	66	63	65
Dissatisfied	9%	5	7	7	6	6	5	5	7	7	8	10	8	5	6	3	7	4
Very Dissatisfied	1%	1	2	1	2	2	2	2	2	3	5	10	2	1	2	4	2	2
DK	1%	1	1		1	1	0	1	0	1	0		1	1	1	0	1	1
<i>N</i>	<i>484</i>	<i>297</i>	<i>339</i>	<i>353</i>	<i>402</i>	<i>360</i>	<i>360</i>	<i>347</i>	<i>383</i>	<i>358</i>	<i>200</i>	<i>419</i>	<i>191</i>	<i>354</i>	<i>300</i>	<i>304</i>	<i>301</i>	<i>403</i>

TABLE 2: PAST AND FUTURE

"Thinking back over the last 5 years, would you say that Orleans/Jefferson Parish has become a better or worse place to live, or hasn't there been any change?"

	Orleans														
	1986	1988	1990	1992	1993	1994	1996	1997	1998	2000	2002	2004	2012	2013	2016
Better	23%	17%	9%	6%	4%	5%	13%	30%	47%	49%	40%	22%	39%	48%	32%
No Change	26%	25	30	18	15	15	23	31	27	31	36	39	30	28	38
Worse	45%	56	57	73	80	78	61	37	22	16	20	36	24	20	25
DK	6%	2	4	3	1	2	3	2	4	4	4	3	7	4	5
<i>N</i>	<i>573</i>	<i>416</i>	<i>468</i>	<i>498</i>	<i>781</i>	<i>596</i>	<i>360</i>	<i>582</i>	<i>442</i>	<i>425</i>	<i>403</i>	<i>400</i>	<i>301</i>	<i>302</i>	<i>403</i>

	Jefferson														
	1986	1988	1990	1992	1993	1994	1996	1997	1998	2000	2002	2004	2012	2013	2016
Better	55%	54%	44%	32%		25%	34%		45%	50%	53%	50%	39%	42%	42%
No Change	28%	30	32	43		41	35		32	34	29	32	34	30	35
Worse	14%	13	22	22		29	28		16	13	10	14	21	25	20
DK	3%	3	2	3		5	3		7	3	8	3	6	3	3
<i>N</i>	<i>567</i>	<i>297</i>	<i>341</i>	<i>353</i>		<i>402</i>	<i>360</i>		<i>417</i>	<i>347</i>	<i>383</i>	<i>358</i>	<i>304</i>	<i>301</i>	<i>403</i>

TABLE 2: PAST AND FUTURE *(continued)*

"And thinking ahead over the next five years, do you think Orleans/Jefferson Parish will become a better or worse place to live, or won't there be much of a change?"

	Orleans																	
	1986	1988	1990	1992	1994	1996	1998	2000	2002	2004	2006	2007	2008	2009	2010	2012	2013	2016
Better	44%	49%	43%	33%	54%	36%	48%	49%	58%	44%	49%	54%	56%	49%	55%	59%	54%	46%
No Change	26%	24	28	22	16	28	27	28	22	32	30	26	26	35	31	24	29	34
Worse	19%	19	20	35	19	26	16	15	5	16	12	11	14	8	7	8	9	9
DK	11%	8	9	10	11	9	9	8	15	8	8	9	4	8	7	9	8	11
N	573	416	470	498	596	409	442	425	403	400	200	302	109	248	300	301	302	403

	Jefferson																	
	1986	1988	1990	1992	1994	1996	1998	2000	2002	2004	2006	2007	2008	2009	2010	2012	2013	2016
Better	51%	56%	55%	49%	35%	45%	48%	48%	52%	49%	52%	48%	54%	50%	51%	55%	46%	50%
No Change	30%	30	24	26	28	30	28	28	29	30	24	32	26	34	37	29	33	31
Worse	12%	7	13	17	23	17	16	16	10	15	18	15	15	9	8	9	11	12
DK	7%	7	7	8	14	8	8	8	9	7	6	5	5	7	5	8	10	7
N	567	297	341	353	402	360	417	347	383	358	200	419	191	354	300	304	301	403

TABLE 3: CRIME AS BIGGEST PROBLEM

	1986	1988	1990	1992	1994	1996	1998	2000	2002	2004	2006	2007	2008	2009	2010	2012	2013	2016
Orleans	17%	27%	29%	44%	78%	70%	44%	26%	20%	46%	31%	29%	34%	33%	46%	62%	62%	49%
Jefferson	6%	8	11	29	44	48	30	18	17	24	45	46	36	38	30	30	26	28

TABLE 4: PERCEPTION OF CRIME

"Would you say that the amount of crime in New Orleans/Jefferson Parish has increased, decreased or remained about the same over the last several years?"

	Orleans																	
	1986	1988	1990	1992	1994	1996	1998	2000	2002	2004	2006	2007	2008	2009	2010	2012	2013	2016
Increased	68%	71%	87%	88%	94%	72%	20%	15%	30%	63%	73%	70%	61%	61%	38%	64%	50%	53%
Decreased	21%	20	10	8	5	18	28	26	32	26	23	28	31	32	51	29	10	8
Same	7%	7	2	3	1	8	50	57	36	10	3	1	8	6	9	5	39	35
DK	4%	2	1	1	-	2	2	2	2	1	1	1	1	1	2	2	1	4
N	573	416	470	498	596	409	442	425	403	400	200	302	109	248	300	301	302	403

	Jefferson																	
	1986	1988	1990	1992	1994	1996	1998	2000	2002	2004	2006	2007	2008	2009	2010	2012	2013	2016
Increased	44%	39%	66%	73%	56%	59%	30%	25%	28%	44%	87%	84%	66%	55%	46%	53%	50%	46%
Decreased	38%	41	24	21	30	29	38	47	42	42	11	12	27	35	39	34	9	9
Same	9%	14	5	5	11	10	24	25	27	10	1	3	6	8	12	10	36	40
DK	9%	6	5	1	3	2	8	3	3	3	1	1	1	3	2	3	5	5
N	567	297	341	353	402	360	417	347	383	358	200	419	191	354	300	304	301	403

TABLE 5: CRIME VICTIM

“Have you or anyone in your family been a victim of crime in the past three years?”

	Orleans					
	2000	2002	2004	2012	2013	2016
Yes	29%	29%	35%	26%	25%	30%
No/DK/Ref	71%	71	65	74	75	70

	Jefferson					
	2000	2002	2004	2012	2013	2016
Yes	-	23%	24%	21%	21%	23%
No/DK/Ref	-	77%	76	79	79	77

TABLE 6: HEARING GUNFIRE (ORLEANS)

	Spring 1997	Fall 1997	Fall 1998	Spring 2000	Spring 2002	Spring 2004	Spring 2012	Fall 2013	Spring 2016
Blacks Only									
Never	40%	53%	60%	56%	54%	46%	57%	59%	46%
Few times a year	20%	16	15	21	20	21	18	15	21
Few times a month or more often	40%	30	24	20	25	33	22	24	29
DK	0%	1	1	3	1	0	1	2	3
N	(452)	(358)	(268)	(265)	(249)	(250)	(176)	(175)	(233)
All Orleans									
Never		58%	65%	61%	59%	54%	58%	49%	50%
Few times a year		18	16	20	18	21	20	32	23
Few times a month or more often		24	18	16	22	25	21	18	24
DK		0	1	3	0	0	1	1	3
N		(584)	(442)	(425)	(403)	(400)	(301)	(302)	(403)

TABLE 7: SAFETY

"How safe do you feel around your home during the day?"

ORLEANS	1986	1988	1990	1992	1994	1996	1998	2000	2002	2004	2012	2013	2016
Very Safe	28%	20%	17%	18%	19%	19%	33%	42%	32%	25%	26%	29%	26%
Safe	52%	56	54	50	52	49	51	44	54	54	58	55	55
Not Very Safe	15%	19	20	24	17	21	10	10	10	13	13	11	12
Not at All Safe	3%	5	8	8	11	11	4	4	3	6	4	4	6
DK	1%	-	1		1	-	2	-	1	2	-	1	1
<i>N</i>	<i>573</i>	<i>416</i>	<i>468</i>	<i>498</i>	<i>596</i>	<i>409</i>	<i>442</i>	<i>425</i>	<i>403</i>	<i>400</i>	<i>301</i>	<i>302</i>	<i>403</i>
JEFFERSON	1986	1988	1990	1992	1994	1996	1998	2000	2002	2004	2012	2013	2016
Very Safe	45%	45%	37%	34%	42%	44%	44%	54%	52%	52%	51%	43%	50%
Safe	48%	49	51	52	47	47	48	40	42	43	45	47	45
Not Very Safe	6%	4	11	9	8	7	6	3	3	4	3	7	4
Not at All Safe	1%	2	1	4	3	2	1	2	2	1	1	2	1
DK	1%	1	1	1	-	-	1	1	1	-		1	-
<i>N</i>	<i>567</i>	<i>297</i>	<i>339</i>	<i>353</i>	<i>402</i>	<i>360</i>	<i>417</i>	<i>347</i>	<i>383</i>	<i>358</i>	<i>304</i>	<i>301</i>	<i>403</i>

TABLE 7: SAFETY

"How safe do you feel around your home during the night?"

Orleans	1986	1988	1990	1992	1994	1996	1998	2000	2002	2004	2006	2007	2008	2009	2010	2012	2013	2016
Very Safe	20%	15%	10%	13%	10%	13%	22%	29%	24%	18%	20%	18%	26%	22%	32%	17%	18%	17%
Safe	45%	50	43	39	44	43	48	44	51	47	52	55	44	55	48	46	48	46
Not Very Safe	25%	25	29	29	25	24	20	20	17	22	17	20	21	16	12	29	24	24
Not at All Safe	8%	10	16	19	21	19	10	7	7	11	11	7	8	7	7	7	9	12
DK	1%	1	1		-	-	2	-	1	2		1	1	-	1	1	1	1
N	573	416	468	498	596	409	442	425	403	400	200	302	109	248	300	301	302	403
Jefferson	1986	1988	1990	1992	1994	1996	1998	2000	2002	2004	2006	2007	2008	2009	2010	2012	2013	2016
Very Safe	34%	30%	24%	25%	28%	27%	31%	38%	39%	38%	27%	31%	47%	41%	40%	34%	28%	35%
Safe	53%	55	53	55	53	53	53	46	45	49	56	50	43	47	54	53	54	52
Not Very Safe	10%	11	18	15	13	13	12	12	11	9	12	14	8	10	5	10	15	12
Not at All Safe	2%	3	5	5	5	7	3	4	4	4	4	5	2		1	2	2	1
DK	1%	1	1		1	-	1	-	1	1	1	1	1	1		1	1	-
N	567	297	339	353	402	360	417	347	383	358	200	419	191	354	300	304	301	403

TABLE 8: EVALUATION OF ORLEANS CRIMINAL JUSTICE SYSTEM

	2013			2016		
	Overall	Black	White	Overall	Black	White
N.O. Police Superintendent Michael Harrison						
Strongly Approve				24%	34%	10%
Approve				38	37	47
Disapprove				14	13	10
Strongly Disapprove				8	5	12
Don't Know				16	10	21
(N)				(403)	(231)	(135)
District Attorney Leon Cannizzaro						
Strongly Approve	16%	12%	22%	21%	20%	23%
Approve	39	38	48	34	33	37
Disapprove	14	19	8	14	16	12
Strongly Disapprove	17	20	10	13	15	9
Don't Know	14	11	12	18	16	20
(N)	(302)	(175)	(100)	(403)	(232)	(136)
New Orleans Criminal Courts						
Strongly Approve	10%	13%	6%	9%	13%	5%
Approve	24	20	28	22	24	23
Disapprove	30	30	30	23	19	28
Strongly Disapprove	29	30	30	31	32	26
Don't Know	7	7	6	15	13	18
(N)	(302)	(175)	(100)	(403)	(232)	(135)
Sheriff Marlin Gusman						
Strongly Approve	10%	13%	5%	12%	17%	5%
Approve	23%	25	20	28	31	24
Disapprove	27%	31	24	22	22	24
Strongly Disapprove	29%	23	38	23	20	27
Don't Know	11%	8	13	14	10	20
(N)	(302)	(176)	(100)	(403)	(233)	(135)

TABLE 9: QUALITY OF GOVERNMENT SERVICES

Overall Govt. Services	ORLEANS					JEFFERSON				
	VERY GOOD (Excellent pre-2006)	GOOD	FAIR	POOR	VERY POOR (No category pre-2006)	VERY GOOD (Excellent pre-2006)	GOOD	FAIR	POOR	VERY POOR (No category pre-2006)
1986	1%	24%	50%	19%	n/a	3%	40%	43%	10%	n/a
1988	2%	16	54	24	n/a	2	44	42	6	n/a
1990	3%	20	52	22	n/a	2	42	46	7	n/a
1992	1%	13	49	34	n/a	2	42	40	11	n/a
1994	2%	13	44	35	n/a	2	42	43	9	n/a
1996	2%	18	48	30	n/a	2	46	39	7	n/a
1998	2%	24	53	18	n/a	5	46	39	6	n/a
2000	3%	18	48	27	n/a	6	45	36	9	n/a
2002	1%	15	51	29	n/a	6	47	36	7	n/a
2004	2%	18	47	31	n/a	4	47	38	8	n/a
2006	2%	13	30	37	16	10	42	32	9	4
2007	1%	10	34	36	16	10	41	34	9	3
2008	2%	11	31	32	20	14	42	32	7	2
2012	3%	19	43	23	8	4	52	32	6	2
2013	3%	20	45	24	8	7	48	31	7	2
2016	2%	18	40	30	6	9	46	30	9	2

TABLE 9: QUALITY OF GOVERNMENT SERVICES (continued)

Police Protection	ORLEANS					JEFFERSON				
	VERY GOOD (Excellent pre-2006)	GOOD	FAIR	POOR	VERY POOR (No category pre-2006)	VERY GOOD (Excellent pre-2006)	GOOD	FAIR	POOR	VERY POOR (No category pre-2006)
1986	4%	41%	40%	11%	n/a	9%	51%	31%	7%	n/a
1988	3%	27	46	22	n/a	8	54	29	7	n/a
1990	5%	32	44	16	n/a	15	50	29	6	n/a
1992	2%	30	42	24	n/a	10	57	27	5	n/a
1994	2%	17	38	41	n/a	15	53	24	6	n/a
1996	2%	21	41	33	n/a	20	47	23	9	n/a
1998	7%	43	38	10	n/a	20	49	20	8	n/a
2000	6%	42	36	15	n/a	17	53	21	7	n/a
2002	4%	37	40	18	n/a	20	53	20	6	n/a
2004	3%	27	40	29	n/a	21	52	19	7	n/a
2006	0%	21	32	26	14	18	45	23	9	3
2007	3%	20	38	29	8	23	45	23	6	3
2008	7%	23	39	21	9	27	49	19	2	1
2012	3%	20	43	23	8	28	48	16	5	2
2013	3%	21	42	25	7	19	53	13	9	4
2016	3%	20	31	31	12	23	45	23	5	2

TABLE 9: QUALITY OF GOVERNMENT SERVICES (continued)

Fire Protection	ORLEANS					JEFFERSON				
	VERY GOOD (Excellent pre-2006)	GOOD	FAIR	POOR	VERY POOR (No category pre-2006)	VERY GOOD (Excellent pre-2006)	GOOD	FAIR	POOR	VERY POOR (No category pre-2006)
1986	14%	61%	17%	1%	n/a	19%	55%	18%	2%	n/a
1988	14%	55	25	3	n/a	16	63	16	0	n/a
1990	15%	50	26	3	n/a	20	61	14	1	n/a
1992	12%	57	24	2	n/a	21	63	9	1	n/a
1994	15%	54	24	1	n/a	19	60	13	1	n/a
1996	11%	53	27	6	n/a	25	57	13	1	n/a
1998	17%	57	16	1	n/a	24	56	10	1	n/a
2000	14%	60	18	3	n/a	24	57	13	2	n/a
2002	19%	56	16	2	n/a	25	59	9	1	n/a
2004	17%	58	18	2	n/a	26	59	9	1	n/a
2012	15%	49	24	1	1	35	50	8	1	6
2013	10%	60	21	2	1	25	57	11	1	-
2016	19%	52	19	1	-	31	52	10	1	-

TABLE 9: QUALITY OF GOVERNMENT SERVICES (continued)

Water Pollution	ORLEANS					JEFFERSON				
	VERY GOOD (Excellent pre-2006)	GOOD	FAIR	POOR	VERY POOR (No category pre-2006)	VERY GOOD (Excellent pre-2006)	GOOD	FAIR	POOR	VERY POOR (No category pre-2006)
1986	2%	13%	30%	46%	n/a	2%	18%	30%	41%	n/a
1988	2%	12	31	46	n/a	2	19	29	40	n/a
1990	1%	10	30	47	n/a	2	17	34	38	n/a
1992	1%	11	32	45	n/a	1	23	37	30	n/a
1994	1%	12	32	44	n/a	2	31	34	24	n/a
1996	2%	16	35	39	n/a	4	29	36	21	n/a
1998	2%	21	32	32	n/a	2	27	39	21	n/a
2000	2%	17	37	36	n/a	3	30	36	21	n/a
2002	3%	24	36	28	n/a	8	34	33	13	n/a
2004	3%	29	34	21	n/a	4	35	33	14	n/a
2012	4%	23	33	17	10	9	42	25	6	2
2013	3%	23	32	24	9	14	44	25	3	3

TABLE 9: QUALITY OF GOVERNMENT SERVICES (continued)

Zoning and Controlling Growth	ORLEANS					JEFFERSON				
	VERY GOOD (Excellent pre-2006)	GOOD	FAIR	POOR	VERY POOR (No category pre-2006)	VERY GOOD (Excellent pre-2006)	GOOD	FAIR	POOR	VERY POOR (No category pre-2006)
1986	2%	20%	41%	20%	n/a	1%	25%	32%	31%	n/a
1988	1%	18	46	19	n/a	2	23	39	25	n/a
1990	2%	18	37	21	n/a	1	28	35	24	n/a
1992	1%	13	41	26	n/a	1	29	40	16	n/a
1994	1%	17	34	32	n/a	1	28	35	20	n/a
1996	1%	16	42	27	n/a	4	28	37	16	n/a
1998	1%	21	41	23	n/a	2	26	43	18	n/a
2000	2%	19	37	28	n/a	3	28	39	19	n/a
2002	1%	17	35	35	n/a	4	33	34	16	n/a
2004	1%	21	36	25	n/a	5	34	34	14	n/a
2012	4%	24	35	17	7	5	42	29	10	3
2013	2%	27	39	16	4	8	35	30	11	2
2016	1%	23	29	20	4	8	36	27	10	2

TABLE 9: QUALITY OF GOVERNMENT SERVICES (continued)

Drainage/ Flood Control	ORLEANS					JEFFERSON				
	VERY GOOD (Excellent pre-2006)	GOOD	FAIR	POOR	VERY POOR (No category pre-2006)	VERY GOOD (Excellent pre-2006)	GOOD	FAIR	POOR	VERY POOR (No category pre-2006)
1986	5%	23%	33%	36%	n/a	4%	28%	34%	33%	n/a
1988	5%	29	27	36	n/a	3	31	31	35	n/a
1990	5%	30	33	29	n/a	4	21	30	45	n/a
1992	2%	24	31	42	n/a	2	27	39	30	n/a
1994	4%	21	26	46	n/a	4	32	33	30	n/a
1996	3%	26	31	38	n/a	7	30	27	34	n/a
1998	2%	21	27	47	n/a	2	21	36	39	n/a
2000	2%	23	28	46	n/a	6	27	34	30	n/a
2002	1%	23	30	44	n/a	8	41	28	22	n/a
2004	4%	28	28	38	n/a	9	40	30	21	n/a
2006	4%	16	28	29	18	5	28	27	25	9
2007	2%	14	23	38	18	9	29	32	20	6
2008	1%	11	27	39	21	6	24	29	29	12
2012	2%	23	29	32	11	8	38	29	16	6
2013	3%	19	40	26	9	16	36	30	14	3
2016	4%	25	30	28	10	11	43	28	12	2

TABLE 9: QUALITY OF GOVERNMENT SERVICES (continued)

Services for the Poor	ORLEANS					JEFFERSON				
	VERY GOOD (Excellent pre-2006)	GOOD	FAIR	POOR	VERY POOR (No category pre-2006)	VERY GOOD (Excellent pre-2006)	GOOD	FAIR	POOR	VERY POOR (No category pre-2006)
1986	2%	18%	37%	32%	n/a	2%	19%	34%	14%	n/a
1988	3%	17	34	36	n/a	3	16	33	15	n/a
1990	2%	13	38	39	n/a	2	21	30	24	n/a
1992	1%	14	28	45	n/a	2	19	34	16	n/a
1994	2%	12	32	45	n/a	3	19	33	19	n/a
1996	2%	16	36	40	n/a	2	24	33	19	n/a
1998	1%	18	34	36	n/a	2	21	36	16	n/a
2000	3%	13	34	40	n/a	4	22	30	21	n/a
2002	2%	15	30	42	n/a	4	25	30	20	n/a
2004	1%	14	30	47	n/a	2	23	26	21	n/a
2012	3%	17	30	25	12	5	26	26	9	3
2013	4%	12	30	32	11	5	30	24	8	6
2016	3%	13	23	31	18	4	27	23	14	4

TABLE 9: QUALITY OF GOVERNMENT SERVICES (continued)

Parks and Recreation	ORLEANS					JEFFERSON				
	VERY GOOD (Excellent pre-2006)	GOOD	FAIR	POOR	VERY POOR (No category pre-2006)	VERY GOOD (Excellent pre-2006)	GOOD	FAIR	POOR	VERY POOR (No category pre-2006)
1986	7%	27%	39%	21%	n/a	12%	42%	32%	9%	n/a
1988	8%	27	35	26	n/a	8	48	27	11	n/a
1990	5%	28	37	26	n/a	11	49	25	13	n/a
1992	3%	26	33	33	n/a	14	53	20	9	n/a
1994	3%	18	32	44	n/a	11	50	24	9	n/a
1996	4%	26	36	30	n/a	14	53	22	8	n/a
1998	5%	30	35	26	n/a	12	53	23	8	n/a
2000	5%	27	37	26	n/a	19	44	25	8	n/a
2002	2%	30	37	28	n/a	18	56	17	5	n/a
2004	4%	31	37	24	n/a	18	54	18	8	n/a
2012	6%	28	32	24	7	22	51	15	7	1
2013*	6%	21	28	28	10	19	42	20	6	3
2016*	4%	26	26	26	9	15	41	24	7	1

*Asked for evaluation of recreation programs

TABLE 9: QUALITY OF GOVERNMENT SERVICES (continued)

Control of Abandoned Houses	ORLEANS					JEFFERSON				
	VERY GOOD (Excellent pre-2006)	GOOD	FAIR	POOR	VERY POOR (No category pre-2006)	VERY GOOD (Excellent pre-2006)	GOOD	FAIR	POOR	VERY POOR (No category pre-2006)
1994	1%	3%	9%	85%	n/a	5%	31%	22%	24%	n/a
1996	2%	2	13	79	n/a	7	34	20	23	n/a
1998	1%	7	18	71	n/a	6	35	23	18	n/a
2000	1%	9	14	71	n/a	7	33	24	21	n/a
2002	0%	4	16	77	n/a	6	37	23	18	n/a
2004	0%	5	19	72	n/a	11	38	22	16	n/a
2006	3%	6	13	39	33	5	30	24	21	4
2007	0%	3	17	43	32	8	32	25	14	6
2008	0%	3	7	39	41	10	32	22	15	4
2012	2%	8	15	43	30	10	43	19	12	3
2013	1%	6	19	43	30	10	35	20	16	4
2016	2%	10	20	38	25	11	37	22	12	3

Housing Availability/ Quality of Housing*	ORLEANS					JEFFERSON				
	VERY GOOD	GOOD	FAIR	POOR	VERY POOR	VERY GOOD	GOOD	FAIR	POOR	VERY POOR
2006	3%	9%	12%	42%	29%	8%	23%	21%	23%	12%
2007	3%	8	21	38	24	10	29	18	20	12
2008	8%	22	31	21	11	13	37	24	8	7
2012*	4%	24	35	26	7	10	52	26	4	3
2013*	3%	31	37	21	6	11	46	27	9	2
2016*	3%	25	37	22	9	13	45	25	8	3

TABLE 9: QUALITY OF GOVERNMENT SERVICES (continued)

Access to Health Services	ORLEANS					JEFFERSON				
	VERY GOOD	GOOD	FAIR	POOR	VERY POOR	VERY GOOD	GOOD	FAIR	POOR	VERY POOR
2006	4%	17%	24%	31%	20%	18%	31%	27%	15%	7%
2007	2%	10	24	41	19	13	39	24	14	5
2008	8%	18	32	24	14	24	42	21	9	1
2012	3%	24	32	27	10	16	53	19	5	1
2013	3%	22	39	23	7	12	49	20	11	2
2016	6%	26	35	22	7	18	44	22	7	1

Control of Trash and Litter/ Trash pickup*	ORLEANS					JEFFERSON				
	VERY GOOD	GOOD	FAIR	POOR	VERY POOR	VERY GOOD	GOOD	FAIR	POOR	VERY POOR
2006	3%	14%	18%	37%	28%	12%	35%	28%	19%	6%
2007	6%	25	34	25	10	13	41	26	14	4
2008	8%	27	22	22	18	18	41	27	12	2
2012*	14%	49	26	9	2	24	62	11	2	0
2013*	11%	62	18	7	2	21	61	15	1	-
2016*	15%	49	28	7	1	22	53	19	5	1

TABLE 9: QUALITY OF GOVERNMENT SERVICES (continued)

Condition of Streets	ORLEANS					JEFFERSON				
	VERY GOOD (Excellent pre-2006)	GOOD	FAIR	POOR	VERY POOR (No category pre-2006)	VERY GOOD (Excellent pre-2006)	GOOD	FAIR	POOR	VERY POOR (No category pre-2006)
1986	4%	16%	37%	40%	n/a	6%	40%	37%	16%	n/a
1988	2%	17	29	51	n/a	2	40	40	18	n/a
1990	1%	12	30	56	n/a	4	37	37	22	n/a
1992	1%	9	29	60	n/a	4	34	36	26	n/a
1994	1%	10	26	63	n/a	2	36	39	22	n/a
1996	2%	7	20	71	n/a	7	33	38	21	n/a
1998	1%	9	24	65	n/a	5	36	35	23	n/a
2000	1%	10	17	70	n/a	5	31	36	27	n/a
2002	1%	5	12	81	n/a	6	38	32	22	n/a
2004	1%	9	22	67	n/a	7	33	39	21	n/a
2006	2%	10	14	35	39	11	37	32	16	4
2007	2%	7	21	35	35	11	39	27	15	7
2008	1%	5	17	39	38	11	45	27	13	4
2012	3%	10	14	35	37	13	44	28	11	4
2013	2%	9	18	37	33	9	44	30	12	4
2016	2%	5	12	34	45	14	37	29	13	6

TABLE 9: QUALITY OF GOVERNMENT SERVICES (continued)

Availability of Public Transportation	ORLEANS					JEFFERSON				
	VERY GOOD (Excellent pre-2006)	GOOD	FAIR	POOR	VERY POOR (No category pre-2006)	VERY GOOD (Excellent pre-2006)	GOOD	FAIR	POOR	VERY POOR (No category pre-2006)
1986	15%	45%	21%	6%	n/a	3%	18%	28%	29%	n/a
1988	13%	47	24	8	n/a	2	25	26	22	n/a
1990	10%	49	26	6	n/a	5	24	27	25	n/a
1992	4%	37	29	17	n/a	5	26	23	24	n/a
1994	5%	40	30	13	n/a	3	30	23	24	n/a
1996	3%	38	32	17	n/a	6	28	24	22	n/a
1998	10%	40	27	10	n/a	4	30	23	18	n/a
2000	5%	30	32	27	n/a	4	27	24	23	n/a
2002	6%	37	27	17	n/a	7	32	22	20	n/a
2004	8%	39	28	12	n/a	8	28	25	15	n/a
2006	2%	13	34	21	12	7	25	16	16	6
2007	4%	9	25	27	11	3	21	15	13	7
2008	1%	22	33	20	8	4	22	18	19	5
2012	11%	36	27	10	6	5	33	22	10	4
2013	7%	35	30	14	5	11	28	20	11	3
2016	9%	30	28	13	10	7	33	22	9	4

TABLE 9: QUALITY OF GOVERNMENT SERVICES *(continued)*

Control of Traffic Congestion	ORLEANS					JEFFERSON				
	VERY GOOD (Excellent pre-2006)	GOOD	FAIR	POOR	VERY POOR (No category pre-2006)	VERY GOOD (Excellent pre-2006)	GOOD	FAIR	POOR	VERY POOR (No category pre-2006)
1986	4%	23%	37%	29%	n/a	2%	21%	34%	39%	n/a
1988	3%	21	41	31	n/a	1	23	39	35	n/a
1990	2%	29	39	25	n/a	2	27	40	29	n/a
1992	0%	23	41	31	n/a	4	24	40	30	n/a
1994	1%	23	40	34	n/a	1	35	35	28	n/a
1996	2%	19	40	36	n/a	3	27	36	31	n/a
1998	2%	21	40	34	n/a	2	23	37	35	n/a
2000	1%	18	38	37	n/a	1	24	37	37	n/a
2002	1%	21	39	37	n/a	4	25	35	34	n/a
2004	1%	22	36	38	n/a	4	25	37	33	n/a
2006	4%	24	41	17	13	3	20	33	29	13
2007	0%	21	37	26	12	4	23	33	26	13
2008	2%	20	42	14	15	5	34	28	24	6
2012	4%	32	31	23	7	6	32	33	19	7
2013	2%	28	39	19	11	7	31	37	16	6
2016	3%	20	33	26	14	10	39	32	14	4

TABLE 10: ECONOMIC OUTLOOK: ORLEANS

“Opportunities for employment?”

	1986	1988	1992	1994	1996	1997	1998	2000	2002	2004	2006	2007	2008	2009	2010	2012	2013	2016
Very Good (Excellent pre-2006)	0%	1%	0%	1%	1%	3%	4%	5%	1%	0%	17%	11%	5%	3%	1%	2%	3%	3%
Good	4%	5	5	9	12	23	20	22	9	7	28	25	26	17	11	17	22	21
Fair	22%	27	27	38	35	46	37	40	39	33	25	32	25	35	31	32	33	32
Poor	68%	63	61	46	47	23	31	29	47	55	18	21	27	22	31	31	27	27
Very Poor (No category pre-2006)	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	8	6	8	14	21	13	10	11
DK	6%	4	7	6	5	5	8	4	4	4	4	5	10	8	4	5	5	6
N	573	416	498	596	409	582	442	425	403	400	200	302	104	248	300	301	302	403

“Likelihood of new jobs and industry coming into the parish?”

	1986	1988	1992	1994	1996	1997	1998	2000	2002	2004	2006	2007	2008	2009	2010	2012	2013	2016
Very Good (Excellent pre-2006)	1%	1%	1%	2%	2%	3%	3%	3%	1%	1%	13%	9%	6%	8%	12%	6%	9%	6%
Good	8%	10	6	18	10	21	17	20	17	14	18	23	20	12	16	23	33	25
Fair	27%	29	29	33	33	36	32	26	32	25	30	23	25	29	27	29	28	26
Poor	54%	52	55	41	51	35	40	43	43	56	25	27	33	30	26	25	19	29
Very Poor (No category pre-2006)	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	9	10	11	14	13	11	7	9
DK	9%	7	9	6	5	5	8	8	7	5	5	8	6	6	5	7	4	6
N	573	416	498	596	409	582	442	425	403	400	200	302	104	248	300	301	302	403

TABLE 10: ECONOMIC OUTLOOK: ORLEANS

“Likelihood of your family increasing its income in the next several years?”

	1986	1988	1992	1994	1996	1997	1998	2000	2002	2004	2012	2013	2016
Very Good (Excellent pre-2006)	3%	7%	6%	11%	9%	11%	10%	7%	3%	7%	9%	13%	10%
Good	21%	30	29	31	34	33	32	30	21	30	30	26	28
Fair	30%	28	25	32	26	27	28	27	30	28	24	26	26
Poor	34%	26	31	20	23	22	22	30	34	26	19	20	20
Very Poor (No category pre-2006)	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	9	8	9
DK	12%	9	9	5	8	7	8	7	12	9	9	7	7
<i>N</i>	<i>573</i>	<i>416</i>	<i>498</i>	<i>596</i>	<i>409</i>	<i>582</i>	<i>442</i>	<i>425</i>	<i>403</i>	<i>400</i>	<i>301</i>	<i>302</i>	<i>403</i>

TABLE 10: ECONOMIC OUTLOOK: JEFFERSON

“Opportunities for employment?”

	1986	1988	1992	1994	1996	1998	2000	2002	2004	2006	2007	2008	2009	2010	2012	2013	2016
Very Good (Excellent pre-2006)	1%	1%	1%	1%	6%	9%	8%	7%	3%	24%	19%	12%	11%	5%	6%	2%	6%
Good	13%	20	16	26	33	38	44	36	33	33	35	35	27	21	28	32	35
Fair	36%	34	40	39	35	28	29	32	35	20	24	32	31	34	31	34	32
Poor	43%	38	32	24	17	12	11	17	22	10	9	11	14	21	20	16	14
Very Poor (No category pre-2006)	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	4	4	2	3	7	4	5	2
DK	7%	8	10	10	10	13	8	8	8	9	9	8	14	12	11	11	11
<i>N</i>	<i>567</i>	<i>416</i>	<i>353</i>	<i>402</i>	<i>360</i>	<i>415</i>	<i>347</i>	<i>383</i>	<i>358</i>	<i>200</i>	<i>419</i>	<i>196</i>	<i>354</i>	<i>300</i>	<i>304</i>	<i>301</i>	<i>403</i>

“Likelihood of new jobs and industry coming into the parish?”

	1986	1988	1992	1994	1996	1998	2000	2002	2004	2006	2007	2008	2009	2010	2012	2013	2016
Very Good (Excellent pre-2006)	2%	1%	1%	3%	5%	9%	5%	5%	4%	14%	8%	10%	9%	5%	5%	6%	8%
Good	16%	14	16	26	23	38	29	25	20	32	28	27	28	22	27	24	30
Fair	27%	35	37	29	37	28	33	38	36	22	31	34	31	36	33	39	30
Poor	44%	40	34	31	26	12	22	24	30	16	16	13	18	22	17	19	18
Very Poor (No category pre-2006)	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	5	5	5	3	6	5	1	4
DK	10%	11	13	11	9	13	11	8	10	11	11	11	11	10	13	11	10
<i>N</i>	<i>567</i>	<i>416</i>	<i>353</i>	<i>402</i>	<i>360</i>	<i>415</i>	<i>347</i>	<i>383</i>	<i>358</i>	<i>200</i>	<i>419</i>	<i>196</i>	<i>354</i>	<i>300</i>	<i>304</i>	<i>301</i>	<i>403</i>

TABLE 10: ECONOMIC OUTLOOK: JEFFERSON

“Likelihood of your family increasing its income in the next several years?”

	1986	1988	1994	1996	1998	2000	2002	2004	2012	2013	2016
Very Good (Excellent pre-2006)	8%	4%	5%	9%	9%	14%	10%	10%	13%	8%	11%
Good	26%	31	32	31	38	35	30	32	31	24	30
Fair	29%	29	23	30	28	27	31	27	22	28	27
Poor	30%	29	30	22	12	19	19	24	18	25	16
Very Poor (No category pre-2006)	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	8	7	7
DK	10%	7	10	8	13	5	10	7	8	8	8
<i>N</i>	<i>567</i>	<i>416</i>	<i>402</i>	<i>360</i>	<i>415</i>	<i>347</i>	<i>383</i>	<i>358</i>	<i>304</i>	<i>301</i>	<i>403</i>

TABLE 11: PUBLIC EDUCATION

Quality of Public Schools	ORLEANS					JEFFERSON				
	VERY GOOD	GOOD	FAIR	POOR	VERY POOR	VERY GOOD	GOOD	FAIR	POOR	VERY POOR
2012	3%	15%	36%	22%	17%	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a
2013	4%	14	32	23	19	6%	24%	28%	22%	7%
2016	4%	12	32	25	20	9%	22	33	15	9

TABLE 12: EVALUATION OF ORLEANS PARISH ELECTED OFFICIALS

	2012			2013			2016		
	Overall	Black	White	Overall	Black	White	Overall	Black	White
Mayor Mitch Landrieu									
Strongly Approve	39%	35%	46%	28%	23%	40%	25%	33%	13%
Approve	29%	23	38	37	37	38	35	35	36
Disapprove	9%	12	6	13	15	9	15	11	19
Strongly Disapprove	12%	17	5	13	17	8	15	11	24
Don't Know	10%	13	5	9	8	5	9	11	8
(N)	(301)	(176)	(120)	(302)	(174)	(100)	(403)	(233)	(135)

	2012			2013			2016		
	Overall	Black	White	Overall	Black	White	Overall	Black	White
Orleans City Council									
Strongly Approve	17%	14%	20%	10%	8%	15%	12%	15%	5
Approve	32%	20	48	37	30	47	34	34	37
Disapprove	23%	27	16	21	27	11	22	22	25
Strongly Disapprove	18%	26	8	20	23	16	18	17	19
Don't Know	11%	13	8	12	12	11	13	12	14
(N)	(301)	(176)	(120)	(302)	(175)	(101)	(403)	(232)	(136)

TABLE 13: SAMPLE INFORMATION, 2016

	ORLEANS	JEFFERSON
White	34%	65%
Black	59%	25%
Other	7%	10%
Male	44%	44%
Female	56%	56%
18 to 24	10%	7%
25 to 34	22%	18%
35 to 44	17%	15%
45 to 54	16%	18%
55 to 64	17%	19%
65 and over	18%	23%
<i>Number of Respondents, N</i>	403	403
Sampling Error	+/-4.9 %	+/-4.9 %
Dates of Interviewing	March 5 - 17, 2016	