THE NCS™

The National Community Survey™

Oak Park, IL

Trends over Time

2019

NRC
National Research Center Inc

2955 Valmont Road Suite 300
Boulder, Colorado 80301
n-r-c.com • 303-444-7863

ICMA
Leaders at the Core of Better Communities

777 North Capitol Street NE Suite 500
Washington, DC 20002
icma.org • 800-745-8780

Summary

The National Community Survey™ (The NCS™) is a collaborative effort between National Research Center, Inc. (NRC) and the International City/County Management Association (ICMA). The survey and its administration are standardized to assure high quality research methods and directly comparable results across The NCS communities. The NCS captures residents' opinions within the three pillars of a community (Community Characteristics, Governance and Participation) across eight central facets of community (Safety, Mobility, Natural Environment, Built Environment, Economy, Recreation and Wellness, Education and Enrichment and Community Engagement). This report discusses trends over time, comparing the 2019 ratings for the Village of Oak Park to its previous survey results in 2000, 2004, 2008, 2011, 2013, 2015 and 2017. Additional reports and technical appendices are available under separate cover.

Trend data for Oak Park represent important comparison data and should be examined for improvements or declines. Deviations from stable trends over time, especially, represent opportunities for understanding how local policies, programs or public information may have affected residents' opinions.

Meaningful differences between survey years have been noted within the following tables as being "higher" or "lower" if the differences are greater than six percentage points between the 2017 and 2019 surveys, otherwise the comparisons between 2017 and 2019 are noted as being "similar." Additionally, benchmark comparisons for all survey years are presented for reference. Changes in the benchmark comparison over time can be impacted by various trends, including varying survey cycles for the individual communities that comprise the benchmarks, regional and national economic or other events, as well as emerging survey methodologies.

Overall, ratings in Oak Park for 2019 generally remained stable. Of the 131 items for which comparisons were available, 109 items were rated similarly in 2017 and 2019, two items showed a decrease in ratings and 20 showed an increase in ratings. Notable trends over time included the following:

- Within the pillar of Community Characteristics, ratings for seven aspects increased from 2017 to 2019, including availability of paths and walking trails, overall built environment, employment opportunities, and Oak Park as a place to work. Other improvements in 2019 included fitness and recreational opportunities and adult educational opportunities. Assessments of shopping opportunities, employment opportunities, and availability of affordable health care have been on the rise since 2008 (with increases of 26%, 21%, and 18%, respectively, over the last decade).
- More than half of the 20 items that saw rating improvements were within Governance. Evaluations for fire prevention, emergency preparedness, yard waste pick-up, open space, and natural areas preservation increased from 2017 to 2019. Residents gave higher marks to three items related to government performance (overall customer service of Oak Park employees, welcoming resident involvement and being honest). Additionally, reviews for public information, sewer services, storm drain, and land use, planning and zoning increased from 2017 to 2019. While ratings for economic development remained stable from 2017 to 2019, assessments have increased from 33% assigning ratings of excellent or good in 2011 to 56% in 2019.
- From 2017 to 2019, levels of Participation for most items remained stable in Oak Park. Fewer community members reported a crime in 2019. However, residents reported lower levels of volunteering and doing a favor for a neighbor in 2019 compared to 2017.

Table 1: Community Characteristics General

	Percent rating positively (e.g., excellent/good)								2019 rating compared to 2017	Comparison to benchmark							
	2000	2004	2008	2011	2013	2015	2017	2019		2000	2004	2008	2011	2013	2015	2017	2019
Overall quality of life	80%	93%	89%	90%	89%	90%	84%	87%	Similar	NA	Much higher	Much higher	Much higher	Much higher	Similar	Similar	Similar
Overall image	NA	NA	87%	89%	89%	89%	85%	89%	Similar	NA	NA	Much higher	Much higher	Much higher	Higher	Higher	Higher
Place to live	NA	NA	93%	91%	93%	94%	90%	92%	Similar	NA	NA	Much higher	Much higher	Much higher	Similar	Similar	Similar
Neighborhood	NA	93%	86%	88%	88%	88%	87%	88%	Similar	NA	Much higher	Much higher	Much higher	Higher	Similar	Similar	Similar
Place to raise children	81%	96%	85%	93%	92%	91%	90%	92%	Similar	NA	Much higher	Much higher	Much higher	Much higher	Higher	Higher	Higher
Place to retire	58%	NA	55%	55%	57%	58%	47%	45%	Similar	NA	NA	Lower	Lower	Lower	Similar	Lower	Lower
Overall appearance	81%	94%	89%	92%	89%	94%	87%	91%	Similar	NA	Much higher	Much higher	Much higher	Much higher	Higher	Similar	Higher

Table 2: Community Characteristics by Facet

		Percent rating positively (e.g., excellent/good, very/somewhat safe)								2019 rating compared to 2017	Comparison to benchmark							
		2000	2004	2008	2011	2013	2015	2017	2019		2000	2004	2008	2011	2013	2015	2017	2019
Safety	Overall feeling of safety	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	76%	77%	77%	Similar	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	Similar	Similar	Similar
	Safe in neighborhood	NA	NA	91%	92%	94%	94%	91%	96%	Similar	NA	NA	Similar	Similar	Similar	Similar	Similar	Similar
	Safe downtown/commercial area	NA	NA	94%	93%	95%	97%	93%	95%	Similar	NA	NA	Much higher	Much higher	Much higher	Similar	Similar	Similar
Mobility	Overall ease of travel	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	84%	71%	75%	Similar	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	Similar	Similar	Similar
	Paths and walking trails	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	61%	56%	68%	Higher	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	Similar	Similar	Similar
	Ease of walking	NA	94%	88%	89%	92%	89%	87%	93%	Similar	NA	Much higher	Much higher	Much higher	Much higher	Much higher	Higher	Much higher
	Travel by bicycle	55%	67%	64%	71%	74%	67%	66%	68%	Similar	NA	Much higher	Much higher	Much higher	Much higher	Higher	Similar	Higher
	Travel by car	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	52%	45%	45%	Similar	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	Similar	Lower	Lower
	Public parking	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	27%	26%	32%	Similar	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	Lower	Lower	Lower
	Traffic flow	NA	NA	41%	42%	46%	43%	32%	31%	Similar	NA	NA	Similar	Similar	Similar	Similar	Similar	Similar
Natural Environment	Overall natural environment	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	86%	85%	89%	Similar	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	Similar	Similar	Similar
	Cleanliness	NA	NA	87%	89%	87%	86%	81%	85%	Similar	NA	NA	Much higher	Much higher	Much higher	Similar	Similar	Similar

		Percent rating positively (e.g., excellent/good, very/somewhat safe)								2019 rating compared to 2017	Comparison to benchmark							
		2000	2004	2008	2011	2013	2015	2017	2019		2000	2004	2008	2011	2013	2015	2017	2019
	Air quality	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	78%	73%	78%	Similar	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	Similar	Similar	Similar
Built Environment	Overall built environment	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	81%	72%	79%	Higher	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	Higher	Similar	Higher
	New development in Oak Park	NA	NA	47%	51%	53%	56%	52%	58%	Similar	NA	NA	Much lower	Similar	Similar	Similar	Similar	Similar
	Affordable quality housing	NA	NA	33%	35%	37%	38%	23%	28%	Similar	NA	NA	Similar	Similar	Lower	Similar	Lower	Similar
	Housing options	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	64%	54%	57%	Similar	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	Similar	Similar	Similar
	Public places	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	86%	83%	87%	Similar	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	Higher	Similar	Higher
Economy	Overall economic health	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	67%	68%	68%	Similar	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	Similar	Similar	Similar
	Vibrant downtown/commercial area	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	69%	71%	76%	Similar	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	Higher	Higher	Higher
	Business and services	NA	NA	55%	67%	65%	64%	67%	69%	Similar	NA	NA	Similar	Higher	Similar	Similar	Similar	Similar
	Cost of living	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	24%	16%	19%	Similar	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	Lower	Lower	Lower
	Shopping opportunities	48%	71%	39%	51%	51%	61%	67%	65%	Similar	NA	Much higher	Lower	Similar	Similar	Similar	Similar	Similar
	Employment opportunities	NA	NA	25%	28%	33%	41%	33%	46%	Higher	NA	NA	Similar	Similar	Similar	Similar	Similar	Similar
	Place to visit	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	84%	83%	89%	Similar	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	Higher	Higher	Higher
	Place to work	NA	NA	56%	58%	68%	68%	57%	69%	Higher	NA	NA	Similar	Higher	Much higher	Similar	Similar	Similar
Recreation and Wellness	Health and wellness	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	78%	83%	82%	Similar	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	Similar	Similar	Similar
	Mental health care	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	68%	60%	60%	Similar	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	Higher	Similar	Higher
	Preventive health services	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	76%	76%	79%	Similar	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	Similar	Similar	Higher
	Health care	NA	NA	59%	68%	62%	74%	73%	77%	Similar	NA	NA	Much higher	Much higher	Much higher	Similar	Similar	Higher
	Food	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	75%	75%	80%	Similar	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	Similar	Similar	Similar
	Recreational opportunities	NA	NA	75%	75%	79%	72%	71%	82%	Higher	NA	NA	Much higher	Much higher	Much higher	Similar	Similar	Similar
	Fitness opportunities	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	69%	66%	75%	Higher	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	Similar	Similar	Similar
Education and Enrichment	Education and enrichment opportunities	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	84%	83%	89%	Similar	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	Higher	Higher	Higher
	Religious or spiritual events and activities	NA	NA	85%	86%	87%	89%	88%	92%	Similar	NA	NA	Much higher	Much higher	Much higher	Higher	Similar	Higher

		Percent rating positively (e.g., excellent/good, very/somewhat safe)								2019 rating compared to 2017	Comparison to benchmark							
		2000	2004	2008	2011	2013	2015	2017	2019		2000	2004	2008	2011	2013	2015	2017	2019
	Cultural/arts/music activities	NA	86%	75%	72%	75%	83%	78%	79%	Similar	NA	Much higher	Much higher	Much higher	Much higher	Higher	Higher	Higher
	Adult education	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	76%	65%	74%	Higher	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	Similar	Similar	Higher
	Child care/preschool	NA	NA	40%	49%	40%	68%	54%	57%	Similar	NA	NA	Higher	Much higher	Similar	Higher	Similar	Similar
	Social events and activities	NA	NA	77%	77%	80%	78%	82%	80%	Similar	NA	NA	Much higher	Much higher	Much higher	Higher	Higher	Higher
	Neighborliness	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	78%	72%	73%	Similar	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	Higher	Similar	Similar
	Openness and acceptance	76%	89%	88%	86%	87%	77%	75%	75%	Similar	NA	Much higher	Much higher	Much higher	Much higher	Higher	Higher	Higher
	Opportunities to participate in community matters	NA	NA	77%	76%	82%	77%	79%	78%	Similar	NA	NA	Much higher	Much higher	Much higher	Higher	Higher	Higher
Community Engagement	Opportunities to volunteer	NA	NA	83%	80%	85%	81%	82%	83%	Similar	NA	NA	Much higher	Much higher	Much higher	Similar	Similar	Higher

Table 3: Governance General

	Percent rating positively (e.g., excellent/good)								2019 rating compared to 2017	Comparison to benchmark							
	2000	2004	2008	2011	2013	2015	2017	2019		2000	2004	2008	2011	2013	2015	2017	2019
Services provided by Oak Park	77%	92%	72%	74%	82%	80%	76%	78%	Similar	NA	Much higher	Similar	Higher	Higher	Similar	Similar	Similar
Customer service	64%	81%	70%	74%	81%	74%	72%	79%	Higher	NA	Similar	Similar	Similar	Higher	Similar	Similar	Similar
Value of services for taxes paid	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	47%	43%	46%	Similar	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	Similar	Similar	Similar
Overall direction	65%	71%	53%	60%	66%	59%	45%	48%	Similar	NA	Much higher	Lower	Higher	Higher	Similar	Similar	Similar
Welcoming resident involvement	64%	73%	61%	65%	63%	65%	54%	60%	Higher	NA	Much higher	Lower	Much higher	Much higher	Similar	Similar	Similar
Confidence in Village government	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	54%	46%	45%	Similar	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	Similar	Similar	Similar
Acting in the best interest of Oak Park	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	60%	50%	52%	Similar	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	Similar	Similar	Similar
Being honest	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	63%	46%	53%	Higher	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	Similar	Similar	Similar
Treating all residents fairly	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	61%	56%	53%	Similar	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	Similar	Similar	Similar
Services provided by the Federal Government	NA	NA	31%	40%	38%	45%	29%	34%	Similar	NA	NA	Lower	Similar	Similar	Similar	Similar	Similar

Table 4: Governance by Facet

		Percent rating positively (e.g., excellent/good)								2019 rating compared to 2017	Comparison to benchmark							
		2000	2004	2008	2011	2013	2015	2017	2019		2000	2004	2008	2011	2013	2015	2017	2019
Safety	Police	76%	90%	87%	86%	92%	88%	87%	89%	Similar	NA	Much higher	Much higher	Much higher	Much higher	Similar	Similar	Similar
	Fire	85%	98%	96%	96%	98%	95%	94%	98%	Similar	NA	Much higher	Much higher	Much higher	Much higher	Similar	Similar	Similar
	Ambulance/EMS	82%	97%	92%	93%	95%	93%	93%	97%	Similar	NA	Much higher	Much higher	Much higher	Much higher	Similar	Similar	Similar
	Crime prevention	67%	80%	58%	67%	74%	77%	68%	71%	Similar	NA	Much higher	Similar	Similar	Higher	Similar	Similar	Similar
	Fire prevention	NA	NA	80%	84%	85%	85%	80%	87%	Higher	NA	NA	Higher	Much higher	Higher	Similar	Similar	Similar
	Animal control	66%	83%	76%	75%	76%	74%	72%	76%	Similar	NA	Much higher	Much higher	Much higher	Much higher	Similar	Similar	Higher
	Emergency preparedness	NA	NA	72%	69%	61%	74%	58%	72%	Higher	NA	NA	Higher	Similar	Similar	Similar	Similar	Similar
Mobility	Traffic enforcement	62%	76%	56%	54%	57%	61%	52%	54%	Similar	NA	Much higher	Lower	Lower	Lower	Similar	Similar	Similar
	Street repair	56%	59%	35%	36%	48%	40%	50%	51%	Similar	NA	Higher	Much lower	Lower	Similar	Similar	Similar	Similar
	Street cleaning	75%	89%	74%	70%	77%	63%	71%	72%	Similar	NA	Much higher	Much higher	Much higher	Much higher	Similar	Similar	Similar
	Street lighting	68%	83%	70%	71%	72%	66%	69%	68%	Similar	NA	Much higher	Much higher	Much higher	Much higher	Similar	Similar	Similar
	Snow removal	58%	77%	58%	64%	77%	59%	67%	71%	Similar	NA	Much higher	Similar	Higher	Much higher	Similar	Similar	Similar
	Sidewalk maintenance	48%	70%	54%	58%	65%	63%	61%	65%	Similar	NA	Much higher	Higher	Higher	Much higher	Similar	Similar	Similar
	Traffic signal timing	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	56%	54%	57%	Similar	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	Similar	Similar	Similar
	Bus or transit services	NA	81%	69%	76%	69%	78%	73%	78%	Similar	NA	Much higher	Much higher	Much higher	Much higher	Higher	Higher	Much higher
Natural Environment	Garbage collection	73%	89%	80%	86%	89%	88%	83%	86%	Similar	NA	Higher	Similar	Similar	Similar	Similar	Similar	Similar
	Recycling	72%	87%	81%	83%	88%	89%	81%	83%	Similar	NA	Much higher	Much higher	Much higher	Much higher	Similar	Similar	Similar
	Yard waste pick-up	NA	85%	75%	78%	77%	79%	77%	84%	Higher	NA	Much higher	Higher	Higher	Higher	Similar	Similar	Similar
	Drinking water	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	81%	81%	81%	Similar	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	Similar	Similar	Similar
	Natural areas preservation	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	63%	53%	65%	Higher	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	Similar	Similar	Similar

		Percent rating positively (e.g., excellent/good)								2019 rating compared to 2017	Comparison to benchmark							
		2000	2004	2008	2011	2013	2015	2017	2019		2000	2004	2008	2011	2013	2015	2017	2019
	Open space	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	70%	60%	70%	Higher	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	Similar	Similar	Similar
Built Environment	Storm drainage	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	61%	54%	63%	Higher	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	Similar	Similar	Similar
	Sewer services	NA	NA	70%	64%	75%	75%	71%	79%	Higher	NA	NA	Similar	Lower	Similar	Similar	Similar	Similar
	Power utility	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	82%	81%	84%	Similar	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	Similar	Similar	Similar
	Utility billing	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	72%	74%	76%	Similar	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	Similar	Similar	Similar
	Land use, planning and zoning	NA	NA	38%	43%	54%	61%	46%	53%	Higher	NA	NA	Similar	Similar	Similar	Similar	Similar	Similar
	Code enforcement	NA	NA	57%	48%	67%	64%	56%	61%	Similar	NA	NA	Much higher	Higher	Much higher	Similar	Similar	Similar
	Cable television	46%	69%	62%	59%	62%	55%	64%	64%	Similar	NA	Much higher	Much higher	Similar	Higher	Similar	Similar	Similar
Economy	Economic development	NA	77%	36%	33%	35%	51%	53%	56%	Similar	NA	Much higher	Much lower	Lower	Much lower	Similar	Similar	Similar
Recreation and Wellness	Village parks	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	90%	89%	94%	Similar	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	Higher	Similar	Higher
	Recreation centers	NA	NA	76%	NA	NA	90%	87%	89%	Similar	NA	NA	Higher	NA	NA	Higher	Higher	Higher
	Health services	74%	89%	72%	68%	69%	77%	80%	84%	Similar	NA	Much higher	Much higher	Higher	Similar	Similar	Similar	Higher
Education and Enrichment	Special events	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	81%	77%	79%	Similar	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	Higher	Similar	Similar
	Public libraries	81%	NA	92%	96%	95%	93%	93%	97%	Similar	NA	NA	Much higher	Much higher	Much higher	Higher	Higher	Higher
Community Engagement	Public information	NA	NA	80%	80%	83%	81%	78%	86%	Higher	NA	NA	Much higher	Much higher	Much higher	Similar	Similar	Higher

Table 5: Participation General

	Percent rating positively (e.g., always/sometimes, more than once a month, yes)								2019 rating compared to 2017	Comparison to benchmark							
	2000	2004	2008	2011	2013	2015	2017	2019		2000	2004	2008	2011	2013	2015	2017	2019
Sense of community	73%	88%	85%	82%	84%	79%	76%	77%	Similar	NA	Much higher	Much higher	Much higher	Much higher	Higher	Higher	Higher
Recommend Oak Park	NA	NA	89%	88%	91%	92%	87%	90%	Similar	NA	NA	Higher	Higher	Higher	Similar	Similar	Similar
Remain in Oak Park	NA	NA	79%	82%	85%	83%	80%	80%	Similar	NA	NA	Lower	Similar	Similar	Similar	Similar	Similar
Contacted Oak Park employees	71%	NA	74%	76%	69%	70%	67%	67%	Similar	NA	NA	Much higher	Much higher	Much higher	Much higher	Much higher	Much higher

Table 6: Participation by Facet

		Percent rating positively (e.g., always/sometimes, more than once a month, yes)								2019 rating compared to 2017	Comparison to benchmark							
		2000	2004	2008	2011	2013	2015	2017	2019		2000	2004	2008	2011	2013	2015	2017	2019
	Stocked supplies for an emergency	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	24%	21%	18%	Similar	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	Lower	Lower	Lower
	Did NOT report a crime	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	76%	72%	78%	Higher	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	Similar	Similar	Similar
Safety	Was NOT the victim of a crime	NA	NA	77%	87%	86%	88%	89%	86%	Similar	NA	NA	Much lower	Similar	Similar	Similar	Similar	Similar
	Used public transportation instead of driving	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	81%	79%	84%	Similar	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	Much higher	Much higher	Much higher
	Carpooled instead of driving alone	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	44%	48%	46%	Similar	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	Similar	Similar	Similar
Mobility	Walked or biked instead of driving	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	88%	87%	86%	Similar	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	Much higher	Much higher	Much higher
	Conserved water	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	78%	78%	77%	Similar	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	Similar	Similar	Similar
	Made home more energy efficient	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	74%	77%	73%	Similar	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	Similar	Similar	Similar
Natural Environment	Recycled at home	NA	NA	90%	92%	90%	89%	91%	95%	Similar	NA	NA	Much higher	Much higher	Much higher	Similar	Similar	Similar
	Did NOT observe a code violation	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	56%	67%	61%	Similar	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	Similar	Higher	Similar
Built Environment	NOT under housing cost stress	NA	NA	NA	64%	66%	67%	65%	67%	Similar	NA	NA	NA	Similar	Similar	Similar	Similar	Similar
	Purchased goods or services in Oak Park	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	91%	94%	98%	Similar	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	Similar	Similar	Similar
Economy	Economy will have positive impact on income	NA	NA	7%	11%	24%	29%	22%	21%	Similar	NA	NA	Much lower	Much lower	Higher	Similar	Similar	Lower

		Percent rating positively (e.g., always/sometimes, more than once a month, yes)								2019 rating compared to 2017	Comparison to benchmark							
		2000	2004	2008	2011	2013	2015	2017	2019		2000	2004	2008	2011	2013	2015	2017	2019
	Work in Oak Park	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	28%	28%	30%	Similar	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	Lower	Lower	Lower
Recreation and Wellness	Used Oak Park recreation centers	NA	NA	66%	NA	NA	62%	59%	60%	Similar	NA	NA	Much higher	NA	NA	Similar	Similar	Similar
	Visited a Village park	NA	NA	94%	NA	NA	89%	88%	91%	Similar	NA	NA	Much higher	NA	NA	Similar	Similar	Similar
	Ate 5 portions of fruits and vegetables	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	86%	86%	88%	Similar	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	Similar	Similar	Similar
	Participated in moderate or vigorous physical activity	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	87%	86%	89%	Similar	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	Similar	Similar	Similar
	In very good to excellent health	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	71%	70%	69%	Similar	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	Similar	Similar	Similar
Education and Enrichment	Used Oak Park public libraries	73%	NA	83%	86%	85%	80%	84%	79%	Similar	NA	NA	Much higher	Much higher	Much higher	Higher	Much higher	Higher
	Participated in religious or spiritual activities	NA	NA	53%	46%	48%	43%	43%	38%	Similar	NA	NA	Similar	Much lower	Lower	Similar	Similar	Similar
	Attended a Village-sponsored event	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	68%	62%	64%	Similar	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	Higher	Similar	Similar
Community Engagement	Campaigned for an issue, cause or candidate	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	23%	33%	32%	Similar	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	Similar	Similar	Similar
	Contacted Oak Park elected officials	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	18%	24%	19%	Similar	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	Similar	Similar	Similar
	Volunteered	NA	NA	45%	44%	50%	41%	45%	39%	Lower	NA	NA	Higher	Similar	Higher	Similar	Similar	Similar
	Participated in a club	NA	NA	31%	30%	29%	24%	28%	25%	Similar	NA	NA	Similar	Similar	Similar	Similar	Similar	Similar
	Talked to or visited with neighbors	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	92%	89%	91%	Similar	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	Similar	Similar	Similar
	Done a favor for a neighbor	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	79%	84%	76%	Lower	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	Similar	Similar	Similar

	Percent rating positively (e.g., always/sometimes, more than once a month, yes)								2019 rating compared to 2017	Comparison to benchmark							
	2000	2004	2008	2011	2013	2015	2017	2019		2000	2004	2008	2011	2013	2015	2017	2019
Attended a local public meeting	NA	NA	30%	28%	27%	23%	27%	24%	Similar	NA	NA	Similar	Similar	Similar	Similar	Similar	Similar
Watched a local public meeting	25%	NA	36%	34%	27%	20%	21%	15%	Similar	NA	NA	Much lower	Much lower	Much lower	Similar	Similar	Similar
Read or watched local news	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	84%	87%	81%	Similar	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	Similar	Similar	Similar
Voted in local elections	NA	NA	NA	82%	79%	88%	88%	90%	Similar	NA	NA	NA	Much higher	Higher	Similar	Similar	Similar