

**CITY OF HACKENSACK,
NEW JERSEY
CLIMATE STUDY**

Conducted for:

Hackensack Economic Development Commission
Hackensack, New Jersey

Conducted by:

Center for Public Interest Polling
Eagleton Institute of Politics

R

March 1997

**CITY OF HACKENSACK,
NEW JERSEY
CLIMATE STUDY**

TABLE OF CONTENTS

	PAGE
EXECUTIVE SUMMARY	i
CHAPTER 1: INTRODUCTION.....	1
A. Background and Purpose	1
B. Research Objectives	1
C. Research Methodology.....	2
D. Profile of Study Participants	3
E. Organization of the Report	6
F. Acknowledgments	7
CHAPTER 2: CLIMATE OF HACKENSACK	12
A. Introduction.....	12
B. Hackensack Ratings	12
C. Impressions of Hackensack.....	13
D. Areas for Improvement	16
CHAPTER 3: DOWNTOWN ECONOMIC ACTIVITY	24
A. Introduction.....	24
B. Downtown Shopping Patterns.....	24
C. Suggested Improvements for Downtown Area	26
CHAPTER 4: OTHER DEVELOPMENT ISSUES	33
A. Introduction.....	33
B. Impact of Potential Sunday Shopping Hours for Residents.....	33
C. Impact of Public Transit Options for Workforce	34
D. Opinion of Hackensack Economic Development Commission.....	35
APPENDIX A: Annotated Survey Instruments	
APPENDIX B: Overview of Research Methodology	

**CITY OF HACKENSACK,
NEW JERSEY
CLIMATE STUDY**

EXECUTIVE SUMMARY

A. INTRODUCTION

The Hackensack Economic Development Commission contracted with the Eagleton Institute's Center for Public Interest Polling at Rutgers University to conduct a climate study of the City of Hackensack. The main objective of the study is to provide a baseline of information on the attitudes and economic activity of (1) residents of Hackensack, (2) residents of towns surrounding Hackensack, and (3) employees who work for companies/organizations in Hackensack.

Research methodology included a general adult population survey which was conducted by telephone with 508 residents of Hackensack and 256 residents of municipalities which border Hackensack, and a survey of the Hackensack workforce which was conducted with 932 workers at selected sites in the city, using self-administered questionnaires.

--Profile of Survey Participants--

Hackensack Residents

About half the city's population is white (56%), 21 percent is African-American, 13 percent Latino, and 3 percent is Asian.

1-in-10 city residents report that they or another member of their household owns a business in Hackensack.

Overall, 25 percent of city residents report annual household incomes below \$30,000, 23 percent earn between \$30,000 and \$50,000 a year, 16 percent earn between \$50,000 and \$75,000, 17 percent earn over \$75,000, and 20 percent give no answer.

Surrounding Area Residents

Racially, these towns have more white (69%) and Asian residents (9%) than Hackensack does, about the same proportion of Latino residents (14%), and fewer African-American residents (4%).

One-in-five employed area residents work in the City of Hackensack, with those from towns south and west of Hackensack (27%) more likely than those who live north (19%) or east (13%) to work in the city.

City Workforce

Two-thirds of workforce survey participants are employed by the Hackensack University Medical Center (“HUMC”), 12 percent from *The Record*, 11 percent from Bergen County offices, 5 percent from Court Plaza, 4 percent from Sears, and 1 percent from Independence Bank.¹ The reader should keep the large proportion of HUMC employees in mind when reviewing the workforce survey findings, since this segment of the population contributes a sizable weight to the total results.

The reader should also note that the different locations of these workplaces may also affect the responses of their particular workforce. Also, whereas about half of the resident survey and area survey participants were female, the workforce at all sites except for *The Record* have majority female staffs.

1-in-3 Hackensack workers reside either in the city (13%) or in towns bordering the city (19%). However, Sears staff (60%) are most likely to reside in the immediate Hackensack area.

B. CLIMATE OF HACKENSACK

--Hackensack Ratings--

Three-in-four Hackensack residents give the city positive ratings of excellent (17%) or good (58%) as a place to live.

Seven-in-ten residents of surrounding towns give the Hackensack area ratings of excellent (15%) or good (56%) as a place to live.

More than 4-in-5 Hackensack workers give the city positive ratings of excellent (14%) or good (69%) as a place to work. (Figure 1)

--Impressions of Hackensack--

When asked what they like most about Hackensack, the top three mentions of city residents are easy access (34%), the sense of community and diversity (31%), and the city's central location (27%). (Figure 2)

18 to 29 year olds (44%), non-white residents (44%), and those in the Hudson/Hillers neighborhood (43%) are most likely to mention the sense of

¹ The responses of the 11 participants from Independence Bank are included in the workforce total but are not presented separately due to the small sample size.

community and diversity. Access and location are more likely to be mentioned by white residents (40 percent access and 32 percent location) than non-white residents (26% access and 19% location).

The top three mentions of area residents are easy access (27%), the shopping opportunities (23%), and the sense of community and diversity (22%).

The top three mentions of the city workforce are easy access (24%), the shopping opportunities (24%), and the city's central location (23%).

The city's shopping opportunities are mentioned most often by staff at *The Record* (37%), whereas employees of both Sears (10%) and HUMC (8%) are less likely than other city workers to say that the restaurants are something they like about Hackensack. "Main Street" is mentioned by 20 percent of Court Plaza personnel, 14 percent of those at *The Record*, 10 percent of Bergen County employees, and 7 percent each from those at Sears and HUMC.

In contrast to certain issues mentioned as positive aspects of Hackensack, there are no issues which stand out as especially negative regarding the city in the minds of study participants. When asked what they like least about Hackensack, about 1-in-10 city residents mention crime and safety (14%), traffic (12%), appearance (12%), and drug activity (11%). One-in-ten or more area residents mention traffic (18%), being overcrowded (11%), crime and safety (10%), appearance (10%) and parking (10%). In comparison, parking (4%) and crowding (3%) issues were less likely to be mentioned by city residents.

For city residents, crime and safety is more of an issue for residents of the Anderson/Upper Main area (23%) and for residents who own or run a business in the city (29%) than it is for other residents. Business owners in the city (20%) are also more likely than non-business owners (11%) to mention the city's appearance as something they like least about Hackensack.

Among area residents, shopping is more likely to be mentioned as something liked least by those living south and west of the city (13%) compared with those living either north (7%) or east (6%) of Hackensack. Crime receives more mentions from those north (14%) and east (13%) than from those south and west (5%).

Overall, 36 percent of the city's workforce mention traffic and 25 percent mention parking as something they like least about Hackensack. More than 1-in-10 also mention crime and safety (18%), "Main Street" (16%), the city's appearance (13%), and snow removal (13%).

Mentions of "Main Street" come from 3-in-10 workers at Court Plaza, *The Record*, and Bergen County, and 2-in-10 employees of Sears. Court Plaza personnel (24%) are also

most likely to mention restaurants as something they like least. Parking is more of a concern for staff at Court Plaza (31%), Bergen County (29%), and HUMC (25%) than it is for those at either Sears (17%) or *The Record* (16%). Mentions of traffic are highest among *The Record* (49%) and HUMC (40%) employees, followed by 26 percent of Court Plaza staff, 24 percent of Bergen County workers, and 7 percent of those at Sears.

--Areas for Improvement--

Survey participants were asked to rate the need for improvement in 11 different areas of city life. These areas include:

- parking (68% city residents, 65% area residents, 80% city workforce),
- controlling drug use (66% city residents, 69% area residents, 79% city workforce),
- traffic (63% city residents, 70% area residents, 74% city workforce),
- housing (61% city residents, 65% area residents, 67% city workforce),
- property maintenance (61% city residents, 68% area residents, 66% city workforce),
- the homeless situation (56% city residents, 52% area residents, 67% city workforce),
- public schools (53% city residents, 57% area residents, 51% city workforce),
- abandoned properties (52% city residents, 52% area residents, 64% city workforce),
- trash and litter (50% city residents, 58% area residents, 65% city workforce),
- police protection (41% city residents, 41% area residents, 57% city workforce), and
- public transportation (36% city residents, 42% area residents, 46% city workforce).

City residents of Hudson/Hillers are among the Hackensack residents most likely to feel that parking (75%), property maintenance (74%), public schools (70%), and abandoned properties (57%) need to be improved. Residents of the Anderson/Upper Main area are more likely than others to feel that improvements are needed in trash and litter (64%) and police protection (52%) but less likely to feel the same about traffic (53%) and public schools (48%). Residents of Fairmount are more likely than others to feel that public transportation in the city needs to be improved (41%).

Among the Hackensack workforce, issues for which the need for improvement varies include trash and litter, which ranges from 78 percent among Bergen County employees and 74 percent among those at Court Plaza to 63 percent at HUMC, 61 percent at *The Record*, and 57 percent at Sears; and public transportation, which ranges from 53 percent among Bergen County employees and 50 percent among Sears staff, to 47 percent at HUMC, 38 percent at *The Record*, and 31 percent at Court Plaza. Also of note, those in the Hackensack workforce who own or run a business in the city (67%) are more likely than other workers (49%) to feel that the city's public schools need to be improved.

C. DOWNTOWN ECONOMIC ACTIVITY

--Downtown Shopping Patterns--

Three-in-four city and area residents report that they have gone to the downtown area of Hackensack within the past year.

The most frequent type of activity for those who have gone downtown is shopping (63% city residents, 67% area residents, 64% city workforce).

More than 2-in-5 city residents also go downtown to use the Johnson Public Library (53%), get business services such as copying papers (42%), and eating dinner in a restaurant (41%). Fewer area residents are likely to get these goods or services while downtown (35% library, 26% business services, 33% eat dinner out).

Other resident activities include eating lunch in a restaurant (38% city residents, 31% area residents), going to the Court House (30% city residents, 31% area residents), visiting a doctor (26% city residents, 25% area residents), using professional services such as from a lawyer or accountant (24% city residents, 30% area residents), and receiving services from County agencies (22% city residents, 26% area residents).

In addition to going shopping downtown (64%), more than 2-in-5 members of the city workforce eat lunch out (54%), visit a doctor (45%), and eat dinner out (42%) in downtown Hackensack. Other workforce activities include going to the Court House (32%), getting business services (31%), using the library (28%), using professional services (23%), and receiving County services (20%).

Generally these activities are higher for employees at worksites other than HUMC. These include shopping downtown -- which is 54 percent for HUMC staff but ranges from 70 percent to 83 percent among other workers; eating lunch out -- which is 43 percent for HUMC but ranges from 75 percent to 84 percent among other workers; getting business services -- which is 25 percent for HUMC but ranges from 38 to 48 percent for other workers; and using the Johnson library -- which is 20 percent for HUMC and 24 percent for Court Plaza but ranges from 41 to 47 percent for other workers.

--Suggested Improvements for Downtown Area--

Two-in-five city and area residents and 1-in-3 city workforce members feel that shopping opportunities need to be improved (Figure 3). This includes have more shops with a wider variety of goods (27% city residents, 25% area residents, 21% city workforce) and having better quality or more upscale shops in the area (12% city residents, 15% area residents, 11% city workforce).

Other suggestions include:

having more and better quality restaurants (17% city residents, 10% area residents, 19% city workforce),
a movie theater (17% city residents, 10% area residents, 17% city workforce),
more recreational opportunities such as a health club (15% city residents, 16% area residents, 12% city workforce),
improved parking (13% city residents, 6% area residents, 9% city workforce),
improved appearance (10% city residents, 12% area residents, 3% city workforce),
more nightlife and cultural activities (7% city residents, 7% area residents, 9% city workforce), and
improved safety (2% city residents, 2% area residents, 2% city workforce).

Among city residents, women (46%) are more likely than men (34%) to say that shopping needs to be improved. Residents of Fairmount (55%) are also more likely than other neighborhood residents to feel the same.

Among the city workforce, the need for more and better restaurants is expressed by 47 percent of Court Plaza personnel, and the need for better shopping opportunities is expressed by 54 percent of Bergen County employees.

Six-in-ten city residents and over half of area residents and the city workforce say they would be very likely to go downtown more often than they do now if their suggestions for improving the area were implemented.

In addition to suggestions for improvements, survey participants were asked what types of things should not be included in the development of the downtown area. Suggestions include:

“adult” or pornographic stores (14% city residents, 15% area residents, 6% city workforce),
bars or liquor stores (14% city residents, 13% area residents, 9% city workforce),
housing projects or shelters (7% city residents, 8% area residents, 3% city workforce),
offices or commercial buildings (7% city residents, 8% area residents, 4% city workforce),
thrift/discount stores or malls (6% city residents, 6% area residents, 6% city workforce),
cheap restaurants or fast food (5% city residents, 4% area residents, 4% city workforce),
and video arcades or teen hang-outs (4% city residents, 4% area residents, 3% city workforce).

D. OTHER DEVELOPMENT ISSUES

--Impact of Potential Sunday Shopping Hours for Residents--

City and area residents were asked whether they would be more or less likely to go to downtown Hackensack if Sunday shopping hours were allowed. Half of city residents say they would be a lot more (37%) or a little more (13%) likely to shop in downtown Hackensack on Sundays, while 36 percent say this availability would make no difference to them and 12 percent say it would make them less likely.

Almost half of area residents say that the availability of Sunday shopping hours would make them a lot more (36%) or a little more (10%) likely to go to downtown Hackensack to shop, while 39 percent say that Sunday opening would make no difference to them and 12 percent say it would make them less likely.

--Impact of Public Transit Options for Workforce--

Survey participants from the city workforce were asked their opinion of a possible bus or trolley service which would run during the day to and from major work locations and parking sites in Hackensack. Overall, 44 percent of the workforce strongly approve and 36 percent mildly approve of such a plan, while 10 percent disapprove mildly (6%) or strongly (4%) and 9 percent have no opinion.

Four-in-ten city workers say that having a free public transportation service in Hackensack would make them more likely to use downtown stores and services, 3 percent say this would make them less likely, and 52 percent say this would make no difference to them.

--Opinion of Hackensack Economic Development Commission--

At this early stage of the Commission's activity, 3-in-10 ten city residents and 2-in-10 area residents have heard of the Hackensack Economic Development Commission.

Sixty-six percent of city residents who have heard of the Commission approve of what it is trying to do, while 3 percent disapprove and 31 percent have no opinion at this time.

Forty-three percent of area residents who have heard of the Commission approve of what it is trying to do, 13 percent disapprove, and 44 percent have no opinion at this time.

Among the city workforce, 44 percent approve of the Commission's efforts, 1 percent disapprove, and 56 percent have no opinion at this time.

E. SUMMARY AND OBSERVATIONS

Before initiating efforts to revitalize Hackensack, the Hackensack Economic Development Commission first felt it was important to gather the input of members of the Hackensack community in a scientific and systematic way. The result was “The City of Hackensack Climate Study,” which utilized a unique three-pronged survey approach to assess the attitudes and behaviors of the Hackensack community, defined as: city residents, residents of surrounding towns, and people who work for businesses and agencies located in the city.

The survey results indicate a widespread general positive regard toward the City of Hackensack, with large majorities of both residents and the workforce saying that Hackensack is an excellent or good place to live and work. These members of the Hackensack community refer to a number of areas in the city which they would like to see improved, including parking and traffic, housing and property maintenance, and controlling drug use. They would also like to see a revitalization of the downtown “Main Street” area with new and better quality shops and restaurants.

Additionally, the survey results indicate that the City has a strong foundation of resources to build upon, ranging from obvious assets such as transportation and infrastructure, to less tangible advantages such as a strong sense of community among city residents. City residents were particularly engaged in the issues discussed in the survey, with a high proportion (92%) indicating they would be willing to talk further about the revitalization of Hackensack. Furthermore, 117 of the 932 employees who participated in the city workforce survey said they would be interested in volunteering their time to help with the revitalization of Hackensack. (Over 60 percent of these potential volunteers reside outside of the city.)

In the first few months of the Hackensack Economic Development Commission's existence, those community members who have heard of its efforts are overwhelmingly supportive. Overall, the results of the City of Hackensack Climate Study indicate that the community is very interested in seeing Hackensack successfully revitalized.

**CITY OF HACKENSACK,
NEW JERSEY
CLIMATE STUDY**

CHAPTER 1

INTRODUCTION

A. Background and Purpose

One of the initial tasks of the Hackensack Economic Development Commission (“Commission”) was to further its understanding of the overall climate affecting economic activity in the City of Hackensack, particularly with regard to the downtown area around Main Street. The Commission contracted with the Eagleton Institute’s Center for Public Interest Polling at Rutgers University to conduct a climate study of the City of Hackensack. The main objective of the study is to provide a baseline of information on the attitudes and economic activity of (1) residents of Hackensack, (2) residents of towns surrounding Hackensack, and (3) employees who work for companies/organizations in Hackensack.

Research methodology included a general adult population survey which was conducted by telephone with 508 residents of Hackensack and 256 residents of municipalities which border Hackensack, and a survey of the Hackensack workforce which was conducted with 932 workers at selected sites in the city, using self-administered questionnaires.

B. Research Objectives

As stated above, the main research objectives of the study are to provide a baseline of information on the attitudes and economic activity of residents of Hackensack and surrounding towns, and employees who work in the city. Specific objectives include:

- * what residents and workers like and dislike about Hackensack;
- * evaluation of possible areas for improvement;
- * downtown shopping behaviors;
- * and other development issues.

C. Research Methodology

Eagleton researchers developed the resident and workforce questionnaires in accordance with the priorities of the Commission. The initial questionnaires were pre-tested and modified. The questionnaires used for the resident survey and the workforce survey are almost identical, modified to each group's particular experiences. The final annotated versions of the survey instruments can be found in Appendix A of this report.

For the workforce survey, a total of 932 employees filled out the questionnaire during September and October of 1996. The telephone interviews were conducted with a stratified random probability sample of 508 adult Hackensack residents and 256 adult residents of towns surrounding Hackensack from November 18 to 26, 1996.

Percentages presented for the workforce sample have a $\pm 3.3\%$ margin of sampling error. Percentages presented for the Hackensack resident sample have a $\pm 4.5\%$ margin of sampling error. Percentages presented for the area resident sample have a $\pm 6.5\%$ margin of sampling error. It is important to note that sampling error does not take into account other sources of error inherent in any study of public opinion, including question wording, question order, length of interview, and social desirability of responses. A more comprehensive description of the research methodology is included in Appendix B.

D. Profile of Study Participants

In order to better understand the study findings, readers should keep in mind the general distribution of demographic characteristics of the sampled populations. Table 1-1 presents a profile of city residents with their self-identified neighborhood area: Fairmount to the north, Prospect Avenue and Maple Hill to the west, Hillers and Hudson Street to the south, and Anderson Street/Upper Main Street/First Street to the east. Residents of Prospect/Maple Hill are most likely to have lived in the city for 5 years or less (46%), while residents of the Hillers/Hudson area are most likely to have been Hackensack residents for over 20 years (44%). Also, home ownership, which is 40 percent citywide, is highest in the Fairmount section (63%) and lowest in the Anderson/Upper Main area (27%).

About half the city's population is white (56%), 21 percent is African-American, 13 percent Latino, and 3 percent is Asian. White residents are more concentrated in the Fairmount section (73%), while African-Americans make up 37 percent of the Anderson/Upper Main neighborhood. Latinos are more populous in Anderson/Upper Main (19%) and Hillers/Hudson (18%) than in other city neighborhoods.

Over one-third of city residents have a high school diploma (29%) or less education (7%), with this more likely to be the case among residents of Hillers/Hudson (43%) and Anderson/Upper Main (40%). About 6-in-10 city residents are employed full time and 1-in-6 are retired. Of those city residents who are employed at least part-time, 32 percent work in Hackensack. Also, 1-in-10 city residents report that they or another member of their household owns a business in Hackensack.

Overall, 25 percent of city residents report annual household incomes below \$30,000, 23 percent earn between \$30,000 and \$50,000 a year, 16 percent earn between \$50,000 and \$75,000, 17 percent earn over \$75,000, and 20 percent give no answer. Residents of Fairmount (23%) and Prospect/Maple Hill (22%) are more likely than other city residents to have incomes over \$75,000 a year, while those in the Anderson/Upper Main area (34%) are more likely to earn less than \$30,000 annually.

For the results regarding residents of area towns surrounding Hackensack (Table 1-2), the municipalities were divided into three areas: towns east of the city (Bogota and Teaneck), towns south and west of the city (Hasbrouck Heights, Little Ferry, Lodi, Maywood, Moonachie, Ridgefield Park, South Hackensack, and Wood-Ridge), and towns north of the city (Bergenfield, New Milford, Paramus, and River Edge).

Racially, these towns have more white (69%) and Asian residents (9%) than Hackensack does, about the same proportion of Latino residents (14%), and fewer African-American residents (4%). Latino residents (25%) are more concentrated in towns south and west of the city, while Asian residents (16%) are more populous in towns north of Hackensack.

Compared to city residents, home ownership is higher among those who live in towns east (69%) and north (52%) of the city, and about the same for those who live south and west (42%) of Hackensack. One-in-five employed area residents work in the City of Hackensack, with those from towns south and west of Hackensack (27%) more likely than those who live north (19%) or east (13%) to work in the city.

Turning to the city workforce survey, results are presented for the entire workforce and for 5 of the worksites sampled (the sample size from Independence Bank is too small to be

presented separately). Two-thirds of workforce survey participants are employed by the Hackensack University Medical Center (“HUMC”), 12 percent from *The Record*, 11 percent from Bergen County offices, 5 percent from Court Plaza, 4 percent from Sears, and 1 percent from Independence Bank (Table 1-3).² The reader should keep the large proportion of HUMC employees in mind when reviewing the workforce survey findings, since this segment of the population contributes a sizable weight to the total results. The reader should also note that the different locations of these sites in Hackensack may also have an affect on the responses of their particular workforce.

With the exception of Sears employees (48%), between 8-in-10 and 9-in-10 workforce survey participants are employed in full-time positions. Furthermore, 16 percent of Court Plaza participants own or run a business in Hackensack. More than half of the total Hackensack workforce has a college degree (52%), ranging from 15 percent of Sears employees to 65 percent of those at *The Record*.

Whereas about half of the resident survey and area survey participants were female, the workforce at all sites except for *The Record* have majority female staffs. This ranges from 86 percent of HUMC workers, to 70 percent of Bergen County employees, 63 percent at Court Plaza, 57 percent at Sears, and 40 percent at *The Record*.

²

The responses of the 11 participants from Independence Bank are included in the workforce total but are not presented separately due to the small sample size.

Three-in-ten Hackensack workers earn between \$30,000 and \$50,000 (17%) or less (14%), while 24 percent make \$50,000 to \$75,000 and 30 percent make over \$75,000 a year. Fifteen percent give no answer. Court Plaza participants (53%) are most likely to earn over \$75,000 and staff at *The Record* (71%) are most likely to earn over \$50,000. On the other hand, Sears workers (25%) are least likely to earn over \$50,000 a year.

It is also important to note that 1-in-3 Hackensack workers reside in the city (13%) or in towns bordering the city (19%). However, Sears staff (60%) are most likely to reside in the immediate Hackensack area.

E. Organization of the Report

This report is designed to provide an overview of the key findings from the surveys. Since it is impossible to provide details for every sub-group and every question within the scope of this summary report, a full set of tables and cross-tabulations is included in separate statistical volumes which accompany this report.

Beside this introductory chapter, this report is divided into three additional chapters. Chapter 2 discusses the overall climate of Hackensack as seen through the eyes of the three sampled groups. Chapter 3 examines workers' and residents' shopping behaviors and suggestions for improving the downtown Main Street area. Chapter 4 presents results for some development issues presented to the different groups of survey participants. For residents, this includes the potential impact of having Sunday shopping hours, and for the workforce this includes an evaluation of the impact of having more intra-city transit options.

The narrative text of each chapter is followed by a set of tables. The title of the table summarizes the question which the percentages represent and is followed by a “[Q.]” designation so readers can locate the exact question wording in Appendix A. The first “[Q.]” refers to the location on resident survey instrument and the second “[Q.]” (in italics) refers to the location on the workforce survey instrument.

The tables include the distribution of responses (percentages) among all those who were asked the question (indicated by the “n” size), along with a breakdown of sub-group responses. In some cases, it was not possible to provide sub-group breakdowns due to small sample sizes. In most cases, the percentages should be read from left to right for each sub-group, and add up to 100 percent. Cases where they add up to 99 or 101 percent are due to statistical rounding. Other tables may not have a total presented if the question allowed for multiple responses.

Readers should note that all references to “Hackensack residents” or “City residents” refer to those telephone survey participants who live in the City of Hackensack itself and all references to “area residents” refer to those telephone survey participants who reside in towns surrounding Hackensack. “Workforce,” “workers,” or “employees” refer to those participants who completed the self-administered workforce survey.

In addition to the text of the report, there are two appendices. Appendix A contains annotated versions of the final survey instruments. Readers are encouraged to refer to this for exact question wording. Appendix B provides additional information about survey methodology. Separate statistical volumes with a full set of data tabulations also accompany this report.

F. Acknowledgments

At Eagleton, the study was conducted by Janice Ballou, Director, with Patrick Murray, Senior Research Analyst. Peter Tucci, Chairman of the Hackensack Economic Development Commission, and Eugene Duffy, Director of the Hackensack Department of Community Affairs and City Council Liaison for the Commission, led the project for the Commission. However, this report and the interpretation of all survey findings herein are the sole responsibility of the Center for Public Interest Polling, the Eagleton Institute of Politics at Rutgers, the State University of New Jersey.

TABLE 1-1
Profile of Survey Participants: City Residents

	<u>TOTAL</u> (n=508)	<u>Fairmount</u> (n=106)	<i>Neighborhood:</i> <u>Prospect Ave/ Maple Hill</u> (n=195)	<u>Hillers/ Hudson St</u> (n=50)	<u>Upper Main St/ Anderson St/1st St</u> (n=85)
<u>Education</u>					
--Less than High School	7%	6%	4%	8%	10%
--High School Grad	29	26	27	35	30
--Some College	23	27	20	32	26
--College Grad	25	24	34	19	17
--Post-Grad	12	17	14	4	11
<u>Employment</u>					
--Full-time	60	65	61	60	61
--Part-time	8	8	9	6	6
--Laid-off	2	1	2	2	1
--Retired	17	17	18	14	14
--Not employed	10	8	9	12	12
Works in Hackensack	32	38	25	34	34
Household member owns city business	10	11	6	18	18
<u>Own or rent home</u>					
--Own	40	63	38	37	27
--Rent	56	34	58	61	67
<u>Marital Status</u>					
Married	43	47	43	47	40
Widowed	8	9	11	4	3
Divorced/separated	15	18	15	12	13
Single	33	27	31	36	37
Has children under 18	29	29	24	34	34
<u>Age</u>					
--18 to 29	20	18	21	19	23
--30 to 39	25	20	24	36	29
--40 to 49	19	26	17	22	17
--50 to 64	14	20	12	10	13
--65 and older	17	15	21	10	13
<u>Race</u>					
--White	56	73	65	62	26
--African-American	21	11	18	17	37
--Latino	13	11	7	18	19
--Asian	3	1	4	1	2
--Other/NA	7	5	6	2	15
<u>Income</u>					
--Under \$30,000	25	17	22	26	34
--\$30,000 to \$50,000	23	26	22	32	23
--\$50,000 to \$75,000	16	19	16	18	9
--Over \$75,000	17	23	22	10	11
--NA	20	16	18	14	22
<u>Years Lived in City</u>					
--1 to 5	35	27	46	15	30
--6 to 10	20	22	19	20	19
--11 to 20	15	16	9	21	16
--Over 20	31	36	26	44	35

TABLE 1-2
Profile of Survey Participants: Area Residents

	<u>TOTAL</u> (n=256)	<u>East of City</u> (n=136)	<i>Area:</i> <u>South and</u> <u>West of City</u> (n=64)	<u>North of City</u> (n=56)
<u>Education</u>				
--Less than High School	2%	3%	2%	2%
--High School Grad	32	32	41	21
--Some College	30	28	27	34
--College Grad	25	32	20	25
--Post-Grad	10	4	9	16
<u>Employment</u>				
--Full-time	64	69	66	57
--Part-time	12	10	17	9
--Laid-off	--	1	--	--
--Retired	13	10	9	21
--Not employed	8	10	4	11
Works in Hackensack	21	13	27	19
Household member owns city business	6	5	8	4
<u>Own or rent home</u>				
--Own	52	69	42	52
--Rent	43	24	58	41
<u>Marital Status</u>				
Married	52	58	48	52
Widowed	8	9	4	12
Divorced/separated	11	9	13	11
Single	27	24	34	20
Has children under 18	36	41	32	38
<u>Age</u>				
--18 to 29	22	20	25	18
--30 to 39	27	26	36	16
--40 to 49	17	23	13	18
--50 to 64	15	18	14	15
--65 and older	15	11	9	25
<u>Race</u>				
--White	69	85	59	70
--African-American	4	1	9	2
--Latino	14	7	25	5
--Asian	9	4	5	16
--Other/NA	4	2	2	7
<u>Income</u>				
--Under \$30,000	18	18	20	15
--\$30,000 to \$50,000	25	21	30	21
--\$50,000 to \$75,000	21	26	26	12
--Over \$75,000	12	15	5	20
--NA	24	21	20	32
<u>Years Lived in Area</u>				
--1 to 5	22	21	21	23
--6 to 10	18	10	25	16
--11 to 20	16	24	14	13
--Over 20	45	46	41	48

TABLE 1-3
Profile of Survey Participants: City Workforce

	<u>TOTAL</u> (n=932)	<u>Court Plaza</u> (n=51)	<u>The Record</u> (n=116)	<i>Worksite:</i> <u>Sears</u> (n=42)	<u>Bergen County</u> (n=104)	<u>HUMC</u> (n=608)
<u>Education</u>						
--High School Grad	16%	12%	15%	42%	15%	15%
--Some College	27	35	20	35	28	28
--College Grad	33	22	52	10	20	34
--Post-Grad	19	24	13	5	30	19
<u>Employment</u>						
--Self-employed	1	8	--	--	--	--
--Full-time	85	82	88	48	88	86
--Part-time	12	8	12	48	5	11
--Other	2	2	--	4	7	2
Owens or runs business in city	2	16	3	--	1	1
<u>Days per week in City</u>						
--1 to 4	16	14	9	7	6	17
--5	78	80	89	76	89	75
--6 to 7	4	6	2	15	4	4
--Depends	2	--	--	2	1	3
<u>Gender</u>						
--Male	23	33	60	40	29	12
--Female	75	63	40	57	70	86
<u>Age</u>						
--18 to 29	13	12	8	29	10	13
--30 to 39	28	28	23	12	19	31
--40 to 49	30	30	39	12	29	31
--50 and older	26	26	29	42	40	21
<u>Race</u>						
--White	78	82	87	55	81	76
--African-American	9	4	5	24	9	10
--Latino	5	4	3	12	1	6
--Asian	3	2	3	--	3	3
--Other/NA	5	8	2	9	7	5
<u>Income</u>						
--Under \$30,000	14	6	7	38	24	12
--\$30,000 to \$50,000	17	18	18	14	18	18
--\$50,000 to \$75,000	24	8	34	15	23	25
--Over \$75,000	30	53	37	10	24	29
--NA	15	16	5	24	13	17
<u>Years Worked in City</u>						
--1 to 5	35	41	22	45	36	36
--6 to 10	25	33	24	17	28	25
--11 to 20	26	14	34	10	25	26
--Over 20	12	10	21	21	12	10
<u>Town of Residence</u>						
--Hackensack	13	8	8	38	16	11
--Town bordering Hackensack	19	14	20	22	18	20
--Within 5 miles of city	22	37	14	15	27	21
--Over 5 miles from city	47	41	58	25	39	48

CHAPTER 2

CLIMATE OF HACKENSACK

A. Introduction

This chapter discusses the climate of Hackensack as seen through the eyes of the three groups of survey participants. This includes ratings of the City of Hackensack as a place to live, the Hackensack area as a place to live, and the city as a place to work. Survey participants also listed the things they like most and least about the city, and evaluated the need for improvement in 11 different areas.

B. Hackensack Ratings

Three-in-four Hackensack residents give the city positive ratings of excellent (17%) or good (58%) as a place to live, while 19 percent say it is only fair and 4 percent say it is poor (Table 2-1). More non-white residents (82%) than white residents (71%) give the city positive ratings as a place to live. Positive ratings by neighborhood range from 80 percent in Prospect/Maple Hill, to 75 percent in Fairmount, 73 percent in Anderson/Upper Main, and 69 percent in Hudson/Hillers.

Seven-in-ten residents of surrounding towns give the Hackensack area ratings of excellent (15%) or good (56%), ranging from 82 percent in towns north of the city to 72 percent east of the city and 64 percent south and west of the city. More white (76%) than non-white (61%) area residents give the Hackensack area positive marks as a place to live.

More than 4-in-5 Hackensack workers give the city positive ratings of excellent (14%) or good (69%) as a place to work. This finding is fairly consistent regardless of worksite.

However, those who own or run a business in Hackensack (32%) are more likely than others in the workforce (12%) to give the city a rating of excellent as a place to work.

C. Impressions of Hackensack

When asked what they like most about Hackensack, the top three mentions of city residents are easy access (34%), the sense of community and diversity (31%), and the city's central location (27%) (Table 2-2). The top three mentions of area residents are easy access (27%), the shopping opportunities (23%), and the sense of community and diversity (22%). The top three mentions of the city workforce are easy access (24%), the shopping opportunities (24%), and the city's central location (23%). City residents (13%) were less likely than area residents or the city workforce to mention shopping opportunities, while the workforce (10%) is less likely to mention sense of community.

Other mentions include appearance (10% city residents, 5% area residents, 16% city workforce), public schools (10% city residents, 6% area residents, 0% city workforce), local services (8% city residents, 8% area residents, 9% city workforce), safety and security (5% city residents, 4% area residents, 8% city workforce), health care (3% city residents, 5% area residents, 11% city workforce), the restaurants (2% city residents, 1% area residents, 11% city workforce), the county seat (2% city residents, 6% area residents, 7% city workforce), and "Main Street" (2% city residents, 4% area residents, 9% city workforce).

Among city residents, 18 to 29 year olds (44%), non-white residents (44%), and those in the Hudson/Hillers neighborhood (43%) are most likely to mention the sense of community and diversity. Access and location are more likely to be mentioned by white residents (40 percent access and 32 percent location) than non-white residents (26% access and 19% location).

Among area residents, shopping is more likely to be mentioned by white (29%) than non-white (5%) residents as something they like about Hackensack. Shopping is also mentioned more by those who live north of the city (41%) when compared with those who live either east (23%) or south and west (9%) of Hackensack.

Among the city workforce, the city's shopping opportunities are mentioned most often by staff at *The Record* (37%), whereas employees of both Sears (10%) and HUMC (8%) are less likely than other city workers to say that the restaurants are something they like about Hackensack. Also, Bergen County employees are more likely than others to mention the city's location (38%) and HUMC staff are more likely than others to mention health care (15%). "Main Street" is mentioned by 20 percent of Court Plaza personnel, 14 percent of those at *The Record*, 10 percent of Bergen County employees, and 7 percent each from those at Sears and HUMC.

When asked what they like least about Hackensack, one-quarter of city and area residents and 15 percent of the city workforce gave no answer (Table 2-3). More than 1-in-10 city residents mention crime and safety (14%), traffic (12%), appearance (12%), and drug activity (11%). One-in-ten or more area residents mention traffic (18%), being overcrowded (11%), crime and safety (10%), appearance (10%) and parking (10%). In comparison, parking (4%) and crowding (3%) issues were less likely to be mentioned by city residents.

Other issues mentioned by residents as things they like least about Hackensack include local services (9% city residents, 3% area residents), the shopping opportunities (8% city residents, 9% area residents), “Main Street” (6% city residents, 4% area residents), public schools (5% city residents, 1% area residents), restaurants and entertainment opportunities (3% city residents, 2% area residents), homelessness (2% city residents, 2% area residents), snow removal (2% city residents, 0% area residents), and flooding (1% city residents, 2% area residents).

For city residents, crime and safety is more of an issue for residents of the Anderson/Upper Main area (23%) and for residents who own or run a business in the city (29%) than it is for other residents. Business owners in the city (20%) are also more likely than non-business owners (11%) to mention the city’s appearance as something they like least about Hackensack. White residents are more likely than non-white residents to be concerned with drugs (13% white, 8% non-white), the city’s appearance (16% white, 7% non-white), traffic (15% white, 7% non-white), and “Main Street” (9% white and 1% non-white).

Among area residents, shopping is more likely to be mentioned as something liked least by those living south and west of the city (13%) compared with those living either north (7%) or east (6%) of Hackensack. Crime receives more mentions from those north (14%) and east (13%) than from those south and west (5%). Parking is mentioned by more residents south and west (15%) and north (11%) of the city than it is by those who live east (2%) of Hackensack.

For city and area residents there is no strong consensus on what they like least about Hackensack. The same is not true for the city’s workforce. Overall, 36 percent of the workforce mention traffic and 25 percent mention parking as something they like least about Hackensack.

More than 1-in-10 also mention crime and safety (18%), “Main Street” (16%), the city’s appearance (13%), and snow removal (13%). Other mentions of things liked least about the city include restaurants and entertainment opportunities (7%), homelessness (7%), flooding (7%), shopping (6%), drug activity (4%), local services (4%), and schools (1%).

Staff at HUMC are less likely to mention either “Main Street” (10%) or restaurants (3%) as something they like least about Hackensack. Mentions of “Main Street” come from 3-in-10 workers at Court Plaza, *The Record*, and Bergen County, and 2-in-10 employees of Sears. Court Plaza personnel (24%) are also most likely to mention restaurants as something they like least. Parking is more of a concern for staff at Court Plaza (31%), Bergen County (29%), and HUMC (25%) than it is for those at either Sears (17%) or *The Record* (16%). Mentions of traffic are highest among *The Record* (49%) and HUMC (40%) employees, followed by 26 percent of Court Plaza staff, 24 percent of Bergen County workers, and 7 percent of those at Sears. Staff at *The Record* are also more likely than other city workers to mention flooding (28%) as something they like least about the city.

D. Areas for Improvement

Survey participants were asked to rate the need for improvement in 11 different areas of city life. Table 2-4 presents the results for those who say that a particular area needs a great deal or some improvement. These areas include parking (68% city residents, 65% area residents, 80% city workforce), controlling drug use (66% city residents, 69% area residents, 79% city workforce), traffic (63% city residents, 70% area residents, 74% city workforce), housing (61% city residents, 65% area residents, 67% city workforce), property maintenance (61% city

residents, 68% area residents, 66% city workforce), the homeless situation (56% city residents, 52% area residents, 67% city workforce), public schools (53% city residents, 57% area residents, 51% city workforce), abandoned properties (52% city residents, 52% area residents, 64% city workforce), trash and litter (50% city residents, 58% area residents, 65% city workforce), police protection (41% city residents, 41% area residents, 57% city workforce), and public transportation (36% city residents, 42% area residents, 46% city workforce).

Among city residents, white residents (74%) are more likely to feel traffic needs to be improved, while non-white residents are more likely to see controlling drug use (72%), housing (68%), public schools (62%), trash and litter (55%), police protection (49%), and public transportation (42%) as areas for improvement. Residents of Hudson/Hillers are among the Hackensack residents most likely to feel that parking (75%), property maintenance (74%), public schools (70%), and abandoned properties (57%) need to be improved. Residents of the Anderson/Upper Main area are more likely than others to feel that improvements are needed in trash and litter (64%) and police protection (52%) but less likely to feel the same about traffic (53%) and public schools (48%). Residents of Fairmount are more likely than others to feel that public transportation in the city needs to be improved (41%). Also, 66 percent of renters feel that housing needs to be improved (compared to 56 percent of home-owners), and more parents than non-parents feel that controlling drug use (75% parents, 62% non-parents) and the public schools (66% parents and 47% non-parents) need to be improved.

Among area residents, those living in towns south and west of the city are more likely to feel that traffic (75%), trash and litter (64%) and the public schools (62%) need to be improved. Those living north of the city are more likely than other area residents to say the same about

parking (73%), but less likely to feel that property maintenance (59%), controlling drug use (56%), abandoned properties (46%), and the homeless situation (43%) in Hackensack need to be improved.

Among the Hackensack workforce, those at *The Record* are less concerned than others with the homeless situation (60%) and housing (58%), while those at Sears are less concerned with traffic (59%), abandoned properties (55%), and property maintenance (53%). Other issues for which the need for improvement varies include trash and litter, which ranges from 78 percent among Bergen County employees and 74 percent among those at Court Plaza to 63 percent at HUMC, 61 percent at *The Record*, and 57 percent at Sears; and public transportation, which ranges from 53 percent among Bergen County employees and 50 percent among Sears staff, to 47 percent at HUMC, 38 percent at *The Record*, and 31 percent at Court Plaza. Also of note, those in the Hackensack workforce who own or run a business in the city (67%) are more likely than other workers (49%) to feel that the city's public schools need to be improved.

TABLE 2-1

Hackensack Rating [Q.2/Q.2]

	<u>Excellent</u>	<u>Good</u>	<u>Only Fair</u>	<u>Poor</u>	<u>Don't Know</u>	<u>Total</u>	<u>(n)</u>
<i>Rate City as a place to live:</i>							
CITY RESIDENTS	17%	58%	19%	4%	2%	100%	(508)
<u>Neighborhood</u>							
--Fairmount	11	64	21	3	1	100	(106)
--Prospect/Maple Hill	18	62	17	2	1	100	(195)
--Hudson/Hillers	17	52	19	12	--	100	(50)
--Anderson/Main/1st	19	54	21	2	4	100	(85)
<u>Race</u>							
--White	13	58	22	5	2	100	(277)
--Non-white	24	58	17	2	--	101	(206)
<u>Age</u>							
--18 to 29	19	60	20	1	1	101	(104)
--30 to 49	17	59	18	5	1	100	(226)
--50 and older	17	56	21	3	3	100	(156)
<i>Rate Area as a place to live:</i>							
AREA RESIDENTS	15%	56%	21%	5%	3%	100%	(256)
<u>Area</u>							
--East	6	66	21	4	2	99	(136)
--South & West	14	50	27	7	3	101	(64)
--North	25	57	12	2	4	100	(56)
<i>Rate City as a place to work:</i>							
CITY WORKFORCE	14%	69%	14%	1%	3%	101%	(932)
<u>Worksite</u>							
--Court Plaza	4	80	14	--	2	100	(51)
--The Record	10	71	18	--	1	100	(116)
--Sears	12	69	19	--	--	100	(42)
--Bergen County	12	65	20	1	2	100	(104)
--HUMC	16	68	11	--	4	99	(608)
<u>Own/run business in City</u>							
--Yes	32	54	10	1	3	100	(97)
--No	12	71	14	--	3	100	(829)

TABLE 2-2

Things Like Most about Hackensack [Q.3/Q.3]

	<u>City Residents</u> (n=508)	<u>Area Residents</u> (n=256)	<u>City Workforce</u> (n=932)
Easy Access	34%	27%	24%
Sense of Community/Diversity	31	22	10
Convenient Location	27	15	23
Shopping	13	23	24
Appearance	10	5	16
Public Schools	10	6	--
Local Services	8	8	9
Safety/Security	5	4	8
Health Care	3	5	11
Restaurants	2	1	11
County Seat	2	6	7
"Main Street"	2	4	9
Other	4	4	15
Don't Know/No Answer	10	23	18

TABLE 2-3

Things Like Least about Hackensack [Q.4/Q.4]

	<u>City Residents</u> (n=508)	<u>Area Residents</u> (n=256)	<u>City Workforce</u> (n=932)
Crime/Lack of Safety	14%	10%	18%
Traffic	12	18	36
Appearance	12	10	13
Drug activity	11	9	4
Local services	9	3	4
Shopping	8	9	6
“Main Street”	6	4	16
Public Schools	5	1	1
Parking	4	10	25
Overcrowded	3	11	--
Restaurants/Entertainment	3	2	7
Homelessness	2	2	7
Snow Removal	2	--	13
Flooding	1	2	7
Other	12	9	22
Don't Know/No Answer	27	26	15

TABLE 2-4

Improvement of City Services [Q.5/Q.5]

Needs to be improved a "great deal" or "some":

	<u>Parking</u>	<u>Control Drug Use</u>	<u>Traffic</u>	<u>Housing</u>	<u>Property Maintenance</u>	<u>Homeless Situation</u>	<u>Public Schools</u>	<u>Abandoned Properties</u>	<u>Trash & Litter</u>	<u>Police Protection</u>	<u>Public Transit</u>	<u>(n)</u>
CITY RESIDENTS	68%	66%	63%	61%	61%	56%	53%	52%	50%	41%	36%	(508)
<u>Neighborhood</u>												
--Fairmount	65	71	63	56	57	62	61	51	46	31	41	(106)
--Prospect/Maple Hill	68	61	67	60	59	46	47	47	44	41	31	(195)
--Hudson/Hillers	75	71	68	67	74	66	70	58	52	42	29	(50)
--Anderson/Main/1st	66	66	53	68	64	59	48	53	64	52	35	(85)
<u>Race</u>												
--White	69	62	74	57	60	55	46	52	44	35	32	(277)
--Non-white	70	72	47	68	67	59	62	54	55	49	42	(206)
<u>Gender</u>												
--Male	66	62	64	63	59	52	54	47	46	38	38	(257)
--Female	70	70	62	59	65	61	51	56	54	45	35	(251)

continued...

TABLE 2-4 (Continued)

Improvement of City Services [Q.5/Q.5]

Needs to be improved a "great deal" or "some":

	<u>Parking</u>	<u>Control Drug Use</u>	<u>Traffic</u>	<u>Housing</u>	<u>Property Maintenance</u>	<u>Homeless Situation</u>	<u>Public Schools</u>	<u>Abandoned Properties</u>	<u>Trash & Litter</u>	<u>Police Protection</u>	<u>Public Transit</u>	<u>(n)</u>
AREA RESIDENTS	65%	69%	70%	65%	68%	52%	57%	52%	58%	41%	42%	(256)
<u>Area</u>												
--East	58	75	66	61	70	55	54	56	54	41	39	(136)
--South & West	63	77	75	69	74	57	62	53	64	44	41	(64)
--North	73	56	64	64	59	43	52	46	55	39	47	(56)
<u>Gender</u>												
--Male	67	76	66	69	71	53	61	55	63	40	42	(130)
--Female	62	62	72	62	65	51	52	48	54	43	43	(126)
CITY WORKFORCE	80%	79%	74%	67%	66%	67%	51%	64%	65%	57%	46%	(932)
<u>Worksite</u>												
--Court Plaza	88	80	68	72	65	71	49	68	74	55	31	(51)
--The Record	76	74	71	58	69	60	45	62	61	49	38	(116)
--Sears	79	86	59	67	53	71	52	55	57	58	50	(42)
--Bergen County	85	76	72	76	72	74	48	71	78	52	53	(104)
--HUMC	80	79	77	67	65	66	52	62	63	58	47	(608)
<u>Gender</u>												
--Male	78	79	72	67	69	62	53	65	63	48	45	(219)
--Female	82	79	74	68	65	69	50	64	67	59	47	(700)

CHAPTER 3

DOWNTOWN ECONOMIC ACTIVITY

A. Introduction

This chapter discusses the downtown Main Street shopping activity of city and area residents and the city workforce. In addition to tabulating the types of goods and services acquired downtown, suggestions for how to increase consumer activity along Main Street are discussed. For the purposes of this study “downtown” is defined as the area around Main Street from the Court House to Sears.

B. Downtown Shopping Patterns

Three-in-four city and area residents report that they have gone to the downtown area of Hackensack within the past year (Table 3-1). Hackensack residents most likely to have done this include those who live in neighborhoods nearest Main Street -- Hudson/Hillers (88%) and Anderson/Upper Main (85%). Area resident from towns south and west (82%) and east (81%) of the city are more likely than those who live north (70%) of Hackensack to have gone downtown in the past year. Parents in Hackensack (80%) and the surrounding area (86%) are more likely to have gone downtown when compared to non-parents (73%).

The most frequent type of activity for those who have gone downtown is shopping (63% city residents, 67% area residents, 64% city workforce) (Table 3-2). More than 2-in-5 city residents also go downtown to use the Johnson Public Library (53%), get business services such as copying papers (42%), and eating dinner in a restaurant (41%). Fewer area residents are

likely to get these goods or services while downtown (35% library, 26% business services, 33% eat dinner out).

Other resident activities include eating lunch in a restaurant (38% city residents, 31% area residents), going to the Court House (30% city residents, 31% area residents), visiting a doctor (26% city residents, 25% area residents), using professional services such as from a lawyer or accountant (24% city residents, 30% area residents), and receiving services from County agencies (22% city residents, 26% area residents).

In addition to going shopping downtown (64%), more than 2-in-5 members of the city workforce eat lunch out (54%), visit a doctor (45%), and eat dinner out (42%) in downtown Hackensack. Other workforce activities include going to the Court House (32%), getting business services (31%), using the library (28%), using professional services (23%), and receiving County services (20%).

Generally these activities are higher for employees at worksites other than HUMC. These include shopping downtown -- which is 54 percent for HUMC staff but ranges from 70 percent to 83 percent among other workers; eating lunch out -- which is 43 percent for HUMC but ranges from 75 percent to 84 percent among other workers; getting business services -- which is 25 percent for HUMC but ranges from 38 to 48 percent for other workers; and using the Johnson library -- which is 20 percent for HUMC and 24 percent for Court Plaza but ranges from 41 to 47 percent for other workers. On the other hand, HUMC staff (52%) are more likely than other city workers (29% to 38%) to visit a doctor in the downtown area. Other worksites with staff more likely to do certain downtown activities include 54 percent of Sears employees who eat dinner out downtown, 63 percent of Court Plaza personnel and 55 percent of Bergen County

employees who go to the Court House, and 51 percent of Bergen County employees who receive County services.

C. Suggested Improvements for Downtown Area

Survey participants were asked to provide suggestions on how to improve the downtown area around Main Street in order to attract more people. Two-in-five city and area residents and 1-in-3 city workforce members feel that shopping opportunities need to be improved (Table 3-3). This includes have more shops with a wider variety of goods (27% city residents, 25% area residents, 21% city workforce) and having better quality or more upscale shops in the area (12% city residents, 15% area residents, 11% city workforce).

Other suggestions include having more and better quality restaurants (17% city residents, 10% area residents, 19% city workforce), a movie theater (17% city residents, 10% area residents, 17% city workforce), more recreational opportunities such as a health club (15% city residents, 16% area residents, 12% city workforce), improved parking (13% city residents, 6% area residents, 9% city workforce), improved appearance (10% city residents, 12% area residents, 3% city workforce), more nightlife and cultural activities (7% city residents, 7% area residents, 9% city workforce), and improved safety (2% city residents, 2% area residents, 2% city workforce).

Among city residents, women (46%) are more likely than men (34%) to say that shopping needs to be improved. Residents of Fairmount (55%) are also more likely than other neighborhood residents to feel the same. Among area residents, those who live south and west of the city are more likely to suggest more recreational opportunities (24%) and improved

appearance (18%) as ways to increase consumer activity downtown. Among the city workforce, the need for more and better restaurants is expressed by 47 percent of Court Plaza personnel, and the need for better shopping opportunities is expressed by 54 percent of Bergen County employees.

Those survey participants who made a suggestion on how to improve the downtown area were asked whether the implementation of their suggestions would make them likely to go downtown more often than they do now. Six-in-ten city residents and over half of area residents and the city workforce say they would be very likely to go downtown more often than they do now if their suggestions for improving the area were implemented (Table 3-4).

In addition to suggestions for improvements, survey participants were asked what types of things should not be included in the development of the downtown area. About half of city and area residents and one-third of the city workforce gave responses to this question (Table 3-5). Suggestions for what should not be included in downtown Hackensack are “adult” or pornographic stores (14% city residents, 15% area residents, 6% city workforce), bars or liquor stores (14% city residents, 13% area residents, 9% city workforce), housing projects or shelters (7% city residents, 8% area residents, 3% city workforce), offices or commercial buildings (7% city residents, 8% area residents, 4% city workforce), thrift/discount stores or malls (6% city residents, 6% area residents, 6% city workforce), cheap restaurants or fast food (5% city residents, 4% area residents, 4% city workforce), and video arcades or teen hang-outs (4% city residents, 4% area residents, 3% city workforce).

TABLE 3-1

Gone to Downtown Hackensack in Past Year [Q.6/NA]

	<u>Yes</u>	<u>No</u>	<u>Don't Know</u>	<u>Total</u>	<u>(n)</u>
CITY RESIDENTS	75%	24%	1%	100%	(508)
<u>Neighborhood</u>					
--Fairmount	76	23	1	100	(106)
--Prospect/Maple Hill	72	27	1	100	(195)
--Hudson/Hillers	88	12	--	100	(50)
--Anderson/Main/1st	85	15	--	100	(85)
<u>Race</u>					
--White	76	23	1	100	(277)
--Non-white	74	25	1	100	(206)
<u>Works in City</u>					
--Yes	78	22	--	100	(109)
--No	73	26	1	100	(238)
<u>Age</u>					
--18 to 29	71	29	--	100	(104)
--30 to 49	80	19	1	100	(226)
--50 and older	72	27	1	100	(156)
<u>Household Income</u>					
--Under \$30,000	71	29	--	100	(124)
--\$30,000-50,000	83	17	1	101	(117)
--Over \$50,000	78	22	--	100	(168)
AREA RESIDENTS	77%	22%	1%	100%	(256)
<u>Area</u>					
--East	81	17	2	100	(136)
--South & West	82	18	--	100	(64)
--North	70	30	--	100	(56)
<u>Household Income</u>					
--Under \$30,000	66	33	1	100	(47)
--\$30,000-50,000	85	15	1	101	(57)
--Over \$50,000	82	17	1	100	(96)

TABLE 3-2
Services/Purchases Made in Downtown Hackensack [Q.7/Q.8]

	<u>Shopping</u>	<u>Johnson Library</u>	<u>Business Services</u>	<u>Eat Dinner Out</u>	<u>Eat Lunch Out</u>	<u>Go to Court House</u>	<u>Visit Doctor</u>	<u>Professional Services</u>	<u>County Services</u>	<u>(n)</u>
CITY RESIDENTS	63%	53%	42%	41%	38%	30%	26%	24%	22%	(508)
<u>Neighborhood</u>										
--Fairmount	58	55	45	39	35	38	22	32	27	(106)
--Prospect/Maple Hill	61	49	35	41	35	28	24	19	21	(195)
--Hudson/Hillers	69	57	46	55	49	27	48	37	28	(50)
--Anderson/Main/1st	78	57	56	47	48	36	29	27	24	(85)
<u>Race</u>										
--White	62	53	37	43	36	29	25	26	24	(277)
--Non-white	64	53	51	40	43	30	28	20	22	(206)
AREA RESIDENTS	67%	35%	26%	33%	31%	31%	25%	30%	26%	(256)
<u>Area</u>										
--East	74	39	27	29	33	31	25	26	22	(136)
--South & West	73	41	28	32	37	24	25	34	33	(64)
--North	57	22	23	36	23	38	24	29	20	(56)
CITY WORKFORCE	64%	28%	31%	42%	54%	32%	45%	23%	20%	(932)
<u>Worksite</u>										
--Court Plaza	70	24	48	38	84	63	33	34	30	(51)
--The Record	81	45	40	42	76	32	29	21	17	(116)
--Sears	83	41	38	54	78	23	38	21	18	(42)
--Bergen County	83	47	44	40	75	55	31	25	51	(104)
--HUMC	54	20	25	41	43	25	52	21	14	(608)

TABLE 3-3
Suggested Improvements
for Downtown Hackensack [Q.8/Q.11]

	<u>City Residents</u> (n=508)	<u>Area Residents</u> (n=256)	<u>City Workforce</u> (n=932)
More Shops	27%	25%	21%
Better Quality/Upscale Shops	12	15	11
More Restaurants	9	4	13
Better Quality/Variety of Restaurants	8	6	6
Movie Theater	17	10	17
More Recreational Opportunities	15	16	12
Improve Parking	13	6	9
Improve Appearance	10	12	3
More Nightlife/Cultural Activities	7	7	9
Improve Safety/Security	2	2	2
Other	9	4	19
Don't Know/No Answer	25	31	36

TABLE 3-4

**Likelihood of Going Downtown More Often
if Suggested Improvements were Made [Q.8A/Q.12]**

	<u>Very Likely</u>	<u>Somewhat Likely</u>	<u>Not very Likely</u>	<u>Not at all Likely</u>	<u>Don't Know</u>	<u>Total</u>	<u>(n)</u>
CITY RESIDENTS	62%	30%	2%	3%	2%	99%	(383)
<u>Neighborhood</u>							
--Fairmount	61	27	1	7	4	100	(85)
--Prospect/Maple Hill	64	32	2	2	1	101	(142)
--Hudson/Hillers	52	38	5	3	2	100	(42)
--Anderson/Main/1st	66	24	5	2	3	100	(67)
<u>Race</u>							
--White	58	33	3	3	2	99	(206)
--Non-white	65	28	2	3	2	100	(159)
AREA RESIDENTS	54%	35%	5%	4%	2%	100%	(172)
<u>Area</u>							
--East	52	43	3	2	--	100	(93)
--South & West	58	31	6	5	--	100	(49)
--North	47	37	7	3	7	101	(30)
CITY WORKFORCE	52%	37%	5%	3%	4%	101%	(601)
<u>Worksite</u>							
--Court Plaza	46	41	3	3	8	101	(39)
--The Record	51	39	6	1	2	99	(79)
--Sears	68	32	--	--	--	100	(31)
--Bergen County	65	30	2	--	2	99	(79)
--HUMC	48	38	6	5	4	101	(363)

TABLE 3-5

**What Should Not be Included
in Downtown Development [Q.9/Q.13]**

	<u>City Residents</u> (n=508)	<u>Area Residents</u> (n=256)	<u>City Workforce</u> (n=932)
“Adult” Stores/Pornography	14%	15%	6%
Bars/Liquor Stores	14	13	9
Housing Projects/Shelters	7	8	3
Offices/Commercial Buildings	7	8	4
Thrift Stores/Discount Stores/Malls	6	6	6
Cheap Restaurants/Fast Food	5	4	4
Video Arcades	4	4	3
Other	9	7	12
Don't Know/No Answer	53	53	67

CHAPTER 4

OTHER DEVELOPMENT ISSUES

A. Introduction

This chapter presents results for other development issues presented to the different groups of survey participants. For city and area residents, this includes the potential impact of having Sunday shopping hours. For the workforce, this includes an evaluation of the impact of having more intra-city transit options. Also, early evaluations of the Commission's efforts are discussed.

B. Impact of Potential Sunday Shopping Hours for Residents

City and area residents were asked whether they would be more or less likely to go to downtown Hackensack if Sunday shopping hours were allowed. Half of city residents say they would be a lot more (37%) or a little more (13%) likely to shop in downtown Hackensack on Sundays, while 36 percent say this availability would make no difference to them and 12 percent say it would make them less likely (Table 4-1).

Almost half of area residents say that the availability of Sunday shopping hours would make them a lot more (36%) or a little more (10%) likely to go to downtown Hackensack to shop, while 39 percent say that Sunday opening would make no difference to them and 12 percent say it would make them less likely. More residents who live south and west (53%) and east (51%) of the city say that Sunday shopping hours would increase their likelihood of going to downtown Hackensack, compared to those who live north (32%) of the city.

If Sunday shopping were available, three-quarters of those residents who say they would be more likely to shop in downtown stores report that they would buy clothing (73% city residents, 78% area residents) (Table 4-2). Other intended purchases would be groceries or food (21% city residents, 11% area residents), household appliances (19% city residents, 27% area residents), books and music (9% city residents, 7% area residents), hardware and building supplies (8% city residents, 6% area residents), and eating out at restaurants (7% city residents, 3% area residents), among others.

C. Impact of Public Transit Options for Workforce

Survey participants from the city workforce were asked their opinion of a possible bus or trolley service which would run during the day to and from major work locations and parking sites in Hackensack. Overall, 44 percent of the workforce strongly approve and 36 percent mildly approve of such a plan, while 10 percent disapprove mildly (6%) or strongly (4%) and 9 percent have no opinion (Table 4-3).

Four-in-ten city workers say that having a free public transportation service in Hackensack would make them more likely to use downtown stores and services (Table 4-4). Three percent say this would make them less likely and 52 percent say this would make no difference to them. Staff at Sears (62%) and Bergen County employees (50%) are most likely to say that they would use downtown stores and services more if free public transportation were provided.

D. Opinion of Hackensack Economic Development Commission

At this early stage of the Commission's activity, 3-in-10 ten city residents and 2-in-10 area residents have heard of the Hackensack Economic Development Commission (Table 4-5). Workforce survey participants were not asked this question.

Overall, 66 percent of city residents who have heard of the Commission approve of what it is trying to do, while 3 percent disapprove and 31 percent have no opinion at this time. Forty-three percent of area residents who have heard of the Commission approve of what it is trying to do, 13 percent disapprove, and 44 percent have no opinion at this time. Among the city workforce, 44 percent approve of the Commission's efforts, 1 percent disapprove, and 56 percent have no opinion at this time.

TABLE 4-1

**Impact of Possible Sunday Shopping Hours
on Going to Downtown Hackensack [Q.10/NA]**

	<u>Lot more Likely</u>	<u>Little more Likely</u>	<u>No Difference</u>	<u>Less Likely</u>	<u>Depends/ Don't Know</u>	<u>Total</u>	<u>(n)</u>
CITY RESIDENTS	37%	13%	36%	12%	3%	101%	(508)
<u>Neighborhood</u>							
--Fairmount	33	14	35	16	2	100	(106)
--Prospect/Maple Hill	33	16	36	13	2	100	(195)
--Hudson/Hillers	34	11	43	12	--	100	(50)
--Anderson/Main/1st	40	8	43	8	1	100	(85)
<u>Race</u>							
--White	33	10	40	14	2	99	(277)
--Non-white	45	17	29	8	1	100	(206)
AREA RESIDENTS	36%	10%	39%	12%	4%	101%	(256)
<u>Area</u>							
--East	38	13	35	13	2	101	(136)
--South & West	46	7	33	7	6	99	(64)
--North	21	11	48	18	2	100	(56)

TABLE 4-2

**Purchases Would Make Downtown if
Sunday Shopping Were Available [Q.10A/NA]**

	<u>City Residents</u> (n=253)	<u>Area Residents</u> (n=118)
Clothes	73%	78%
Groceries/Food	21	11
Household Appliances	19	27
Books/Music	9	7
Hardware	8	6
Eat at Restaurants	7	3
Health & Beauty Aids	5	3
Sporting Goods/Toys	3	2
Gifts	3	2
Automotive Supplies	2	6
Stationery	2	--
Jewelry	1	3
Business Services	1	--
Furniture	1	3
Other	4	2

TABLE 4-3

**Opinion of Possible
Downtown Trolley Service [NA/Q.15]**

	<u>Strongly Approve</u>	<u>Mildly Approve</u>	<u>Mildly Disapprove</u>	<u>Strongly Disapprove</u>	<u>Don't Know</u>	<u>Total</u>	<u>(n)</u>
CITY WORKFORCE	44%	36%	6%	4%	9%	99%	(932)
<u>Worksite</u>							
--Court Plaza	45	31	10	8	6	100	(51)
--The Record	41	39	9	3	9	101	(116)
--Sears	62	24	7	--	7	100	(42)
--Bergen County	44	33	10	7	7	101	(104)
--HUMC	44	38	4	3	11	100	(608)
<u>Lives in Hackensack</u>	51	32	11	4	3	101	(111)

TABLE 4-4

**Impact of Having Free Public Transit
on Shopping Downtown [NA/Q.16]**

	<u>More Likely</u>	<u>Less Likely</u>	<u>No Difference</u>	<u>Don't Know</u>	<u>Total</u>	<u>(n)</u>
CITY WORKFORCE	41%	3%	52%	4%	100%	(932)
<u>Worksite</u>						
--Court Plaza	37	--	59	4	100	(51)
--The Record	39	3	53	6	101	(116)
--Sears	62	--	33	5	100	(42)
--Bergen County	50	2	46	2	100	(104)
--HUMC	38	3	54	4	99	(608)
<u>Lives in Hackensack</u>	48	2	50	--	100	(111)

TABLE 4-5

**Image of Hackensack Economic
Development Commission [Q.21/Q.30]**

	<i>Heard of HEDC:</i>		<i>Opinion of HEDC Efforts:</i>		
	<u>Yes</u>	<u>(n)</u>	<u>Approve</u>	<u>Disapprove</u>	<u>Can't Judge</u> <u>(n)</u>
CITY RESIDENTS	29%	(508)	66%	3%	31% (144)
AREA RESIDENTS	20%	(256)	43%	13%	44% (47)
CITY WORKFORCE	NA	NA	44%	1%	56% (932)

APPENDIX A:

Telephone Survey Instrument

**[CATI: NOTE for following questions: Punch 1 FROM S.2 is HACKENSACK.
ALL OTHER Punches are "the Hackensack Area" for Q.1 and Q.2]**

1. First of all, about how many years long have you lived in (Hackensack/the Hackensack area)?

01. LESS THAN ONE

02. 1 - 2

03. 3 - 5

04. 6 - 10

05. 11 - 14

06. 15 - 20

07. 21 - 30

08. MORE THAN 30

(VOL) 09. MY ENTIRE LIFE

10. DON'T KNOW

[IF RESPONDENT LIVES IN HACKENSACK (PUNCH 1 TO S.1), ASK:]

1A. What section of Hackensack do you live in --[READ LIST]?

[IF NOT SURE, PROBE: Which of these areas do you live nearest?]

1. FAIRMOUNT

2. PROSPECT AVENUE

3. HUDSON STREET

4. ANDERSON STREET

5. SUMMIT AVENUE/MAPLE HILL

6. HILLERS

7. UPPER MAIN STREET, OR

8. FIRST STREET

9. OTHER

[ASK EVERYONE:]

2. Overall, how would you rate (Hackensack/the Hackensack area) as a place to live--excellent, good, only fair, or poor?

1. EXCELLENT

2. GOOD

3. ONLY FAIR

4. POOR

9. DON'T KNOW

3. What are the one or two things you like most about the City of Hackensack? [**ACCEPT UP TO THREE RESPONSES**]

- | | |
|-------------------------------------|---|
| 1. LOCATION/CENTRAL LOCATION | 17. NIGHTLIFE/ENTERTAINMENT OPPORTUNITIES |
| 2. ACCESS: GENERAL | 18. DIVERSE COMMUNITY |
| 3. EASY TO GET TO BY MAJOR ROADS | 19. FRIENDLINESS/NEIGHBORLINESS |
| 4. PUBLIC TRANSPORTATION | 20. HEALTH CARE |
| 5. TRAFFIC/CONGESTION | 21. SCHOOLS/EDUCATION |
| 6. PARKING | 22. COUNTY SERVICES |
| 7. QUALITY OF ROADS | 23. LOCAL SERVICES/POLICE/FIRE |
| 8. CLEANLINESS | 24. SNOW REMOVAL |
| /APPEARANCE OF NEIGHBORHOODS | 25. FLOODING |
| 9. PARKS AND TREES | 26. TAXES |
| 10. "MAIN STREET" | 27. SAFETY/CRIME/DRUG USE ISSUES |
| 11. SHOPPING: GENERAL | 28. HOMELESS/VAGRANTS |
| 12. SHOPPING: RIVERSIDE SQUARE MALL | |
| 13. SHOPPING: MAIN STREET | |
| 14. SHOPPING: CONVENIENCE | 97. OTHER (specify: _____) |
| 15. SHOPPING: VARIETY | 98. DK |
| 16. RESTAURANTS | 99. NOTHING |

4. And, what are the one or two things you like least about the City of Hackensack? [**ACCEPT UP TO THREE RESPONSES**]

- | | |
|-------------------------------------|--|
| 1. LOCATION/BAD LOCATION | 17. LACK NIGHTLIFE/ENTERTAINMENT OPPORTUNITIES |
| 2. ACCESS: GENERAL | 18. DIVERSE COMMUNITY |
| 3. HARD TO GET TO BY MAJOR ROADS | 19. LACK FRIENDLINESS/NEIGHBORLINESS |
| 4. PUBLIC TRANSPORTATION | 20. HEALTH CARE |
| 5. TRAFFIC/CONGESTION | 21. SCHOOLS/EDUCATION |
| 6. PARKING | 22. COUNTY SERVICES |
| 7. QUALITY OF ROADS | 23. LOCAL SERVICES/POLICE/FIRE |
| 8. CLEANLINESS | 24. SNOW REMOVAL |
| /APPEARANCE OF NEIGHBORHOODS | 25. FLOODING |
| 9. LACK OF PARKS AND TREES | 26. TAXES |
| 10. "MAIN STREET" | 27. SAFETY/CRIME/DRUG USE ISSUES |
| 11. SHOPPING: GENERAL | 28. HOMELESS/VAGRANTS |
| 12. SHOPPING: RIVERSIDE SQUARE MALL | |
| 13. SHOPPING: MAIN STREET | |
| 14. SHOPPING: NOT CONVENIENT | 97. OTHER (specify: _____) |
| 15. SHOPPING: LACK OF VARIETY | 98. DK |
| 16. RESTAURANTS (LACK OF/QUALITY) | 99. NOTHING |

5. I am going to read a list of some possible things that could be improved in the City of Hackensack. For each, please tell me how much you think it needs to be improved. Does **[READ ITEM]** need to be improved a great deal, some, not much, or not at all?

	<u>A Great Deal</u>	<u>Some</u>	<u>Not Much</u>	<u>Not At All</u>	<u>Don't Know</u>
[ROTATE]					
a. Police protection	1	2	3	4	9
b. Housing	1	2	3	4	9
c. Controlling drug use	1	2	3	4	9
d. Keeping homeless people off the streets	1	2	3	4	9
e. Property maintenance	1	2	3	4	9
f. Abandoned properties	1	2	3	4	9
g. Trash and litter problems	1	2	3	4	9
h. Traffic	1	2	3	4	9
I. Public school education	1	2	3	4	9
j. Public Transportation	1	2	3	4	9
k. Parking	1	2	3	4	9

6. Now I'm going to ask you a few questions about downtown Hackensack. For the purposes of this survey, downtown Hackensack is the area around Main Street from the Court House to Sears. **[IF NEEDED: from Essex Street to Temple Street]**

Have you gone to downtown Hackensack in the past year to shop or get professional or County services?

1. YES --> **CONTINUE WITH Q.7 SERIES**

2. NO --> **SKIP TO Q.8**

9. DK --> **SKIP TO Q.8**

[IF HAVE BEEN DOWNTOWN IN PAST YEAR ("YES" TO Q.6), ASK:]

7. How often do you go to downtown Hackensack to **(READ ITEM)**--a few times a week, a few times a month, once a month or less, or not all?

	<u>A Few Times A Week</u>	<u>A Few Times A Month</u>	<u>Once A Month or Less</u>	<u>Not At All</u>	<u>Don't Know</u>
[ROTATE]					
a. go shopping	1	2	3	4	9
c. eat lunch in a restaurant	1	2	3	4	9
d. eat dinner out at a restaurant	1	2	3	4	9
e. Visit a doctor or other health care provider	1	2	3	4	9
f. use business services such as copying papers and mailing	1	2	3	4	9
g. use professional services such as a lawyer or accountant	1	2	3	4	9
h. go to the Court House	1	2	3	4	9
I. get services from County agencies	1	2	3	4	9
j. use the Johnson Public Library	1	2	3	4	9

[ASK EVERYONE:]

8. Thinking about the future development of downtown Hackensack, what would you like to have there that is not now available? For example, what types of businesses, services, and recreational activities or other types of improvements do you think would be the most likely to attract people to the downtown area? **[ACCEPT UP TO THREE RESPONSES]**

1. IMPROVE APPEARANCE
2. BETTER PARKING
3. FREE PARKING
4. MORE/BETTER PUBLIC TRANSPORTATION
5. MORE/WIDER VARIETY OF SHOPS
6. BETTER QUALITY/UPSCALE SHOPS
7. MORE CLOTHING/APPAREL STORES
8. MORE/WIDER VARIETY OF RESTAURANTS
9. BETTER QUALITY RESTAURANTS
10. SUPERMARKET
11. MOVIE THEATER/CINEMA
12. NIGHT CLUBS/LIVE THEATER/CONCERTS
13. OTHER ENTERTAINMENT (E.G. GALLERIES, FAIRS, PARADES)
14. RECREATION/SPORTS/HEALTH CLUB
15. YOUTH ACTIVITIES
16. PARKS AND TREES
17. OTHER (specify: _____)
18. DK --> **SKIP TO Q.9**
19. NOTHING --> **SKIP TO Q.9**

[IF ANYTHING IS MENTIONED IN Q.8, ASK:]

8A. If Hackensack had the type of things that you've just suggested, how likely would you be to go downtown more often than you do now -- very likely, somewhat likely, not very likely, or not at all likely?

1. VERY LIKELY
2. SOMEWHAT LIKELY
3. NOT VERY LIKELY
4. NOT AT ALL LIKELY
9. DON'T KNOW

[ASK EVERYONE:]

9. And what kinds of things do you think should not be included in the development of downtown Hackensack?
[ACCEPT UP TO THREE RESPONSES]

1. BARS/LIQUOR STORES
2. PORN/"ADULT" STORES/GO-GO BARS
3. VIDEO ARCADES/TEEN HANG-OUTS
4. FAST FOOD/CHEAP EATERIES
5. THRIFT/SECOND-HAND STORES
6. DISCOUNT/DOLLAR STORES
7. SHOPPING MALLS
8. OFFICE/COMMERCIAL BUILDINGS
9. LOW-INCOME HOUSING
10. HOMELESS SHELTERS/REHAB CENTERS

17. OTHER (specify: _____)
18. DK
19. NOTHING

10. If Sunday shopping were made available in downtown Hackensack, would you be more likely or less likely to shop in downtown Hackensack, or wouldn't it make much of a difference? **[IF "MORE" OR "LESS" LIKELY, PROBE:** Would that be a lot (more/less) likely or just a little (more/less) likely?]

1. LOT MORE LIKELY --> **ASK Q.10A**
2. LITTLE MORE LIKELY --> **ASK Q.10A**

3. NO DIFFERENCE
4. LITTLE LESS LIKELY --> **GO TO Q.11**
5. LOT LESS LIKELY
- (VOL) 8. DEPENDS
9. DK

[IF "MORE LIKELY" TO Q.10, ASK:]

10A. What types of goods and services would you be most likely to buy if Sunday shopping were available in downtown Hackensack? **[ACCEPT UP TO THREE RESPONSES]**

1. BUSINESS SERVICES (COPYING, ETC.)
2. STATIONERY/CARDS
3. GIFTS
4. CLOTHES
5. JEWELRY
6. BOOKS AND RECORDS/CDS
7. HEALTH AND BEAUTY AIDS
8. GROCERIES/FOOD
9. EAT AT RESTAURANTS
10. HOUSEHOLD APPLIANCES
11. FURNITURE
12. HARDWARE/BUILDING MATERIALS
13. GARDEN SUPPLIES
14. AUTOMOTIVE SUPPLIES

17. OTHER (specify: _____)
18. DK
19. NOTHING

[ASK EVERYONE:]

Now just a few questions so that we can classify your answers.

11. What was the last grade in school you completed?

1. 8TH GRADE OR LESS
2. HIGH SCHOOL INCOMPLETE (GRADES 9, 10 AND 11)
3. HIGH SCHOOL COMPLETE (GRADE 12)
4. VOCATIONAL/TECHNICAL SCHOOL
5. SOME COLLEGE OR ASSOCIATES DEGREE
6. COLLEGE GRADUATE OR BACHELORS DEGREE
7. GRADUATE WORK (MASTERS, LAW SCHOOL, MEDICAL SCHOOL)
8. OTHER (specify: _____)
9. NOT DETERMINED

12. Are you currently employed full-time, employed part-time, laid off, retired or not employed?

1. EMPLOYED FULL-TIME ----> ASK Q.13
2. EMPLOYED PART-TIME

3. TEMPORARILY LAID OFF
4. RETIRED
5. NOT EMPLOYED GO TO Q.14
8. OTHER
9. DK/REFUSED

[IF EMPLOYED IN Q.12, ASK:]

13. Is your place of employment located in Hackensack or in some other town?

1. HACKENSACK
2. SOME OTHER TOWN
- (VOL) 3. MUST TRAVEL FOR JOB
9. DON'T KNOW

[ASK EVERYONE:]

14. Does anyone in your household own or run any type of business in the City of Hackensack? [**IF 'YES', PROBE:** Is this you or someone else?]

1. YES, RESPONDENT/RESPONDENT AND SOMEONE ELSE
2. YES, SOMEONE ELSE IN HOUSEHOLD
3. NO, NO ONE IN HOUSEHOLD OWNS/RUNS A HACKENSACK BUSINESS
9. DON'T KNOW

15. Do you own or rent your home?

1. OWN
2. RENT
- (VOL) 3. LIVE RENT FREE WITH PARENTS/RELATIVES
9. DON'T KNOW/REFUSED

16. Are you married, widowed, divorced, separated, or have you never been married?

1. MARRIED
2. WIDOWED
3. DIVORCED
4. SEPARATED
5. NEVER MARRIED
9. DON'T KNOW

17. Are there any children under 18 now living in your household?

1. YES
2. NO
9. DK

18. What was your age on your last birthday?

___/___/___ (CODE # OF YEARS, 99=REFUSED AND CODE)

18A. [IF REFUSED AGE ASK: Is it between ...?]

1. 18-20
2. 21-24
3. 25-29
4. THIRTIES (30-39)
5. FORTIES (40-49)
6. FIFTIES (50-59)
7. 60 - 64
8. 65 OR OLDER
9. NO ANSWER/REFUSED

19. Are you white, black, or of Hispanic or Asian origin?

1. WHITE
2. BLACK
3. HISPANIC
4. ASIAN
8. OTHER (SPECIFY: _____)
9. NOT DETERMINED

20. So that we can group all answers, what is your total annual family income before taxes -- **[READ LIST 1-7]**?

1. LESS THAN \$10,000,
2. \$10,000 to \$20,000,
3. \$20,000 to \$30,000,
4. \$30,000 to \$50,000,
5. \$50,000 to \$75,000,
6. \$75,000 to \$100,000, OR
7. MORE THAN \$100,000
9. REFUSED/DON'T KNOW

21. Have you heard of the Hackensack Economic Development Commission?

1. YES ---> **ASK Q.21A**

2. NO

9. DON'T KNOW > SKIP TO THANK YOU

[IF "YES" TO Q.21, ASK:]

21A. Do you approve or disapprove of what the Hackensack Economic Development Commission is trying to do?

1. APPROVE

2. DISAPPROVE

9. DON'T KNOW

Thank you for your time. You've been very helpful.

APPENDIX B:

Overview of Research Methodology

CITY OF HACKENSACK, NEW JERSEY CLIMATE STUDY

OVERVIEW OF RESEARCH METHODOLOGY

I. INTRODUCTION

The Hackensack Economic Development Commission contracted with the Eagleton Institute's Center for Public Interest Polling at Rutgers University to conduct a climate study of the City of Hackensack. The main objective of the study is to provide a baseline of information on the attitudes and economic activity of (1) residents of Hackensack, (2) residents of towns surrounding Hackensack, and (3) employees who work for companies/organizations in Hackensack.

Research methodology included a general adult population survey which was conducted by telephone with 508 residents of Hackensack and 256 residents of municipalities which border Hackensack, and a survey of the Hackensack workforce which was conducted with 932 workers at selected sites in the city, using self-administered questionnaires.

II. QUESTIONNAIRE DEVELOPMENT

Eagleton researchers developed the questionnaires in accordance with the priorities of the Commission. The original questionnaire was pre-tested by telephone with a random group of Hackensack residents. This was then modified after consultation with the Commission and administered to the Hackensack workforce. After the workforce survey was conducted and the preliminary results were reviewed, the questionnaire was modified for the resident survey. This final questionnaire was then pretested with a random group of area residents. Modifications were made to the survey instrument in order to increase the understandability and accuracy of questions asked. The questionnaire was further refined in order to meet budget and time constraints. The final annotated versions of the survey instruments can be found in Appendix A of the study report.

Besides basic demographic information, the questionnaire asks about overall image of Hackensack, evaluation of possible areas for improvements, downtown shopping behaviors, and other development issues.

The final version of the telephone questionnaire was programmed into a CATI (Computer Assisted Telephone Interviewing) system. The CATI system is invaluable in a survey such as this where different information is to be obtained for various groups of people. It enables the interviewer to accurately skip over certain questions which may be irrelevant to a particular study participant (e.g. Hackensack residents versus residents of other area towns), while retaining the flow and integrity of the interview process.

III. SAMPLE SELECTION AND WEIGHTING

For the workforce survey, approximately 4,000 questionnaires were distributed to employees at 6 Hackensack worksites selected by the Commission. These sites include Hackensack University Medical Center, Court Plaza, *The Record*, Sears, Independence Bank, and Bergen County offices. These questionnaires included a cover letter from the Commission. A receptacle for returning the questionnaires was provided at each site. All employees were encouraged to complete the questionnaire, but since survey participants in this portion of the study were self-selected, the results should be seen as a reflection of the attitudes and behaviors of employees at these work sites.

For the telephone survey, a random proportional probability sample was used to select the 508 Hackensack residents and 256 residents of towns bordering Hackensack age 18 and older who participated in the survey. Telephone exchanges and working blocks were chosen to reflect the distribution of the population. The final two digits of the telephone number were randomly generated. This procedure ensures that those with unlisted or new telephone numbers are included in the sample. Each working phone number was called a minimum of three times, at different times of the week, in an effort to reach people who are infrequently home, before being replaced with a back-up number.

Because of the overlap of phone exchanges across municipal boundaries, study participants were asked to name their home municipality (and neighborhood, if they reside in Hackensack). Finally, responses from Hackensack were weighted to match the gender and race distribution of the population. Responses from other municipalities were grouped according to direction in relation to Hackensack (i.e. north, east, south, and west) and weighted according to their share of the actual population of the towns which border Hackensack.

IV. SAMPLING ERROR

The percentages obtained in a random probability sample survey are estimates of what the distribution of responses would be if the entire population had been surveyed. "Margin of sampling error" is a statistical term which describes the probable difference between interviewing everyone in a given population and a sample drawn from that population. For example, the margin of sampling error associated with a sample of 508 Hackensack residents is ± 4.5 percent at a 95 percent confidence interval. Thus, if 47 percent of those in a sample of 508 are found to agree with a particular statement, the percentage of agreement for other samples would be between 42.5 percent and 51.5 percent 19 times out of 20.

Sampling error increases as the sample size is reduced. This must be kept in mind when comparing the responses of different groups within a sample (e.g. men compared with women). Estimates for other subgroups are: 400-- $\pm 5\%$, 300-- $\pm 6\%$, 200-- $\pm 7\%$, and 100-- $\pm 10\%$. For

example, percentages presented for residents of towns surrounding Hackensack (n=256) have a margin of sampling error of $\pm 6.5\%$.

Readers should note that sampling error does not take into account other possible sources of error inherent in any study of public opinion, including question wording, question order, length of interview, and social desirability of responses.

V. DATA COLLECTION

The workforce survey involved self-administered interviews completed by employees at 6 sites in Hackensack. Data collection took place during September and October, 1996. Of the approximately 4,000 questionnaires distributed, 932 were returned for a response rate of 20 to 25 percent.

The telephone survey involved CATI interviews with a random probability sample of 764 adults. The CATI interviews were conducted from November 18 to 26, 1996 by experienced professional interviewers who were trained and monitored by the Eagleton research staff. Overall, the telephone survey yielded a completion rate of 74 percent of the eligible households that were contacted.

VI. DATA PROCESSING AND ANALYSIS

The workforce questionnaires were edited by Eagleton staff. All open-end response items were coded to allow for quantitative analysis. All questionnaires were then data-entered into a standard computer readable ASCII format file. For the telephone interviews, the CATI system directly generated a computer readable data file (ASCII format), which reduces the amount of error inherent in the coding and entry of data recorded on paper questionnaires. An SPSS (Statistical Package for the Social Sciences) computer file was developed to process the raw ASCII information. The SPSS system enabled the Eagleton research staff to integrate the data so that it could be accessed and analyzed in aggregate form.