



WEDNESDAY, OCT. 28, 2026

CONTACT:

Ashley Koning, Director
Office: 848-932-8940
akoning@rutgers.edu

All news releases are available at https://eagletonpoll.rutgers.edu/press_releases/. Follow the Rutgers-Eagleton Poll on [Facebook](#), [Bluesky](#), and [LinkedIn](#).

New Jerseyans Are Divided on Use of Automated License Plate Readers by Local Law Enforcement

While most are supportive of monthly audits, warrants and reduced data storage time, views are mixed on barring police from sharing data with other states

NEW BRUNSWICK, N.J. (Oct. 28, 2026) – New Jerseyans are divided on the overall use of automated license plate readers for local law enforcement purposes in their community, according to the latest Rutgers-Eagleton Poll.

While majorities support requiring monthly audits, warrants and a shorter window for storing the data, residents are mixed on prohibiting New Jersey police from sharing data with law enforcement in other states.

The Poll defined automated license plate readers as, “...motion-activated cameras, often mounted on utility poles, that photograph passing cars and people, recording the time and location. The images are often processed to extract license plates and are stored in a database that law enforcement can search later.”

Residents are divided on the use of the cameras for law enforcement purposes in their community. Half are opposed (30% “strongly,” 20% “somewhat”), while 44% are supportive (15% “strongly,” 29% “somewhat”).

Slightly less than 8 in 10 (78%) New Jerseyans support requiring police departments to audit license plate reader searches monthly instead of once a year, to make sure searches are lawful (15% are opposed).

Nearly 7 in 10 (69%) support requiring police to get a warrant before searching license plate reader data. Nearly a quarter (24%) are opposed.

Automated License Plate Readers Rutgers-Eagleton Poll

About two-thirds (66%) support requiring that license plate reader data be deleted after six months instead of the three years currently allowed, while slightly less than a quarter (23%) are opposed.

Residents are more mixed when it comes to barring New Jersey police from sharing the data with law enforcement in other states: Forty-eight percent are supportive of this measure, while 42% are opposed.

“New Jerseyans don’t agree on whether they want these cameras in their communities, but they largely agree on how they should be governed if they are there,” said [Ashley Koning](#), an assistant research professor and director of the [Eagleton Center for Public Interest Polling](#) at Rutgers University-New Brunswick. “Requiring a warrant, requiring monthly audits and shortening how long the data is kept each draw majority support across the board, including from the residents most enthusiastic about the technology itself. Sharing the data across state lines is the exception.”

Political party affiliation is the widest divide on license plate readers overall, and is the only demographic with significant differences on every question. Republicans are the most supportive partisan of the technology (67%) and the least supportive of limits on it. They are less likely than both Democrats and independents to support requiring a warrant before searching the data (52%, compared with 74% among both) and barring New Jersey police from sharing data with law enforcement in other states (33%, compared with 52% among both). Independents are the more supportive of requiring monthly audits (85%) than either Democrats (75%) or Republicans (72%).

Republican resistance to the out-of-state sharing ban is the strongest opposition any group registers to any of the four proposed rules: Sixty-two percent are opposed, 39% of them “strongly.”

The state’s youngest residents are the least supportive age cohort of license plate readers in local law enforcement: Twenty-eight percent of those 18 to 34 support the use of the technology, sharply below every older cohort (45% among those 35 to 49, 48% among those 50 to 64 and 55% among those 65 and older).

Support for warrant requirements decreases somewhat with age, from 75% among those 18 to 34 to 60% among those 65 and older. Residents ages 50 and older are more likely than their younger counterparts to oppose barring New Jersey police from sharing data with law enforcement in other states (47% among those 50 to 64 and 52% among those 65 and older versus 31% of those 18 to 34 and 36% of those 35 to 49).

“Party and age cut through almost every question here, and they run in the same direction: The residents most comfortable with the cameras are the least interested in limits on them,” said Koning.

Automated License Plate Readers Rutgers-Eagleton Poll

When it comes to race and ethnicity, Black residents are the least supportive of license plate readers at 25%, compared with 49% of white residents, 45% of Hispanic residents and 42% of residents of other races. They are also more supportive than white residents of barring out-of-state data sharing (56% versus 42%), yet are less supportive of requiring monthly audits (66% vs. 80% among white residents)

Men and women are statistically indistinguishable on whether they support license plate readers at all (43% and 46%). But men are more supportive of three of the four proposed limits: Monthly audits (84% versus 72%), a warrant requirement (73% versus 65%) and deleting data after six months (71% versus 61%).

Income and region matter more narrowly. Residents earning less than \$50,000 are less likely than those earning more to support license plate readers (33%) and less likely to support monthly audits (68%, compared with 79% to 84% across the higher income brackets). By region, residents in South Jersey near Philadelphia and those living in the state's urban areas (79% and 73%) are more supportive than suburban and exurban residents (59% and 55%) of deleting data after six months, while urban and exurban residents are more supportive of monthly audits (87% and 86%) than suburban and Philadelphia-area residents (73% each).

Results are from a statewide poll of 1,004 adults contacted through the probability-based Rutgers-Eagleton/SSRS Garden State Panel from Sept. 24 to Sept. 27. The full sample has a margin of error of +/- 4.1 percentage points.

###

ABOUT THE EAGLETON CENTER FOR PUBLIC INTEREST POLLING

Home of the Rutgers-Eagleton Poll, the Eagleton Center for Public Interest Polling (ECPIP) was established in 1971 and is the oldest and one of the most respected university-based statewide polling operations in the United States. Now in its 55th year and with the publication of over 200 polls, ECPIP's mission is to provide scientifically sound, nonpartisan information about public opinion. To read more about ECPIP and view all of our press releases, published research and data archive, please visit our website: eagletonpoll.rutgers.edu. You can also visit our [Facebook](#) and [Bluesky](#).

ABOUT THE EAGLETON INSTITUTE OF POLITICS

The Eagleton Center for Public Interest Polling is a unit of the Eagleton Institute of Politics at Rutgers University–New Brunswick. The Eagleton Institute studies how American politics and government work and change, analyzes how the democracy might improve and promotes political participation and civic engagement. The Institute explores state and national politics through research, education and public service, linking the study of politics with its day-to-day practice. To learn more about Eagleton programs and expertise, visit eagleton.rutgers.edu.

ABOUT RUTGERS UNIVERSITY-NEW BRUNSWICK

**Automated License Plate Readers
Rutgers-Eagleton Poll**

Rutgers University-New Brunswick is where Rutgers, The State University of New Jersey, began more than 250 years ago. Ranked among the world's top 60 universities, Rutgers's flagship university is a leading public research institution and a member of the prestigious Association of American Universities. It is home to internationally acclaimed faculty and has 12 degree-granting schools and a Division I Athletics program. It is the Big Ten Conference's most diverse university. Through its community of teachers, scholars, artists, scientists and healers, Rutgers is equipped as never before to transform lives.

ABOUT THE RUTGERS-EAGLETON/SSRS GARDEN STATE PANEL

The [Rutgers-Eagleton/SSRS Garden State Panel](#) is a probability-based panel of New Jersey adults age 18 or older. The panel is managed and maintained by [SSRS](#), a full-service research firm based in Glen Mills, PA. Panelists are recruited randomly based on statewide representative ABS (Address Based Sample) design. The ABS sample is drawn from the Delivery Sequence File (DSF) maintained by the U.S. Postal Service, which provide population coverage in the 98%-99% range. The Rutgers-Eagleton/SSRS Garden State Panel is a multi-mode panel. Internet households participate via web while all non-internet households (including those who have internet but are unwilling to take surveys online) participate via phone. Panelists also have the option of taking surveys in their preferred language (English or Spanish).

QUESTIONS AND TABLES START ON THE FOLLOWING PAGE

Questions and Tables

The questions covered in this release are listed below. Column percentages may not add to 100% due to rounding. Respondents are New Jersey adults 18+ unless otherwise noted; all percentages are of weighted results. Interpret groups with samples sizes under 100 with extreme caution. Crosstabs may be suppressed or condensed in order to maintain statistical rigor.

- F1. Automated License Plate Readers (ALPR) are motion-activated cameras, often mounted on utility poles, that photograph passing cars and people, recording the time and location. The images are often processed to extract license plates and are stored in a database that law enforcement can search later. To what extent would you support or oppose the use of ALPR technology for law enforcement purposes in your community?**

Strongly support	15%
Somewhat support	29%
Somewhat oppose	20%
Strongly oppose	30%
Don't know	5%
Unweighted N=	1004

	Party ID			Gender		Race or Ethnicity				Age			
	Dem	Ind	Rep	Man	Woman	Wht	Blk	Hisp	Other	18-34	35-49	50-64	65+
Strongly supp	8%	14%	30%	18%	13%	18%	8%	13%	12%	5%	16%	18%	20%
Smwht supp	28%	26%	37%	25%	33%	31%	17%	32%	30%	23%	29%	30%	35%
Smwht opp	21%	25%	11%	22%	19%	17%	28%	21%	26%	27%	19%	17%	19%
Strongly opp	38%	29%	19%	32%	28%	29%	36%	31%	29%	39%	29%	30%	23%
Don't know	6%	6%	3%	3%	7%	5%	12%	3%	3%	6%	8%	4%	4%
Unwt N=	437	376	190	417	580	577	124	180	121	228	272	263	241

**Automated License Plate Readers
Rutgers-Eagleton Poll**

	Income				Region					Education			
	<\$50K	\$50K- <\$100K	\$100K- <\$150K	\$150K+	Urban	Suburb	Exurban	Phil/ South	Shore	HS or less	Some college	College grad	Grad work
Strongly supp	6%	15%	23%	17%	17%	14%	21%	9%	17%	14%	17%	14%	16%
Smwht supp	27%	35%	25%	29%	34%	25%	25%	35%	31%	34%	28%	24%	30%
Smwht opp	18%	23%	18%	21%	14%	27%	15%	16%	22%	18%	21%	25%	18%
Strongly opp	40%	24%	28%	30%	31%	28%	34%	34%	26%	29%	27%	33%	32%
Don't know	10%	4%	5%	3%	5%	6%	6%	6%	3%	6%	7%	5%	4%
Unwt N=	246	311	182	261	125	319	163	240	156	241	206	255	302

**Automated License Plate Readers
Rutgers-Eagleton Poll**

F2. To what extent would you support or oppose each of the following rules for how police in New Jersey use automated license plate readers (ALPR)?

Requiring police to get a warrant before searching license plate reader data

Strongly support	42%
Somewhat support	27%
Somewhat oppose	15%
Strongly oppose	9%
Don't know	8%
Unweighted N=	1004

	Party ID			Gender		Race or Ethnicity				Age			
	Dem	Ind	Rep	Man	Woman	Wht	Blk	Hisp	Other	18-34	35-49	50-64	65+
Strongly supp	51%	42%	29%	45%	39%	36%	59%	54%	43%	53%	46%	42%	30%
Smwht supp	23%	32%	23%	28%	26%	29%	16%	26%	26%	22%	27%	27%	30%
Smwht opp	14%	11%	22%	13%	16%	15%	14%	12%	16%	11%	12%	15%	20%
Strongly opp	4%	7%	20%	9%	9%	11%	3%	6%	8%	5%	10%	9%	11%
Don't know	7%	8%	6%	4%	10%	9%	9%	2%	6%	9%	6%	6%	9%
Unwt N=	437	376	190	417	580	577	124	180	121	228	272	263	241

	Income				Region					Education			
	<\$50K	\$50K- <\$100K	\$100K- <\$150K	\$150K+	Urban	Suburb	Exurban	Phil/ South	Shore	HS or less	Some college	College grad	Grad work
Strongly supp	49%	38%	42%	42%	45%	42%	47%	43%	36%	38%	42%	43%	47%
Smwht supp	20%	34%	22%	28%	29%	24%	23%	27%	32%	28%	32%	27%	21%
Smwht opp	14%	13%	18%	13%	16%	14%	12%	16%	16%	16%	13%	12%	17%
Strongly opp	6%	9%	11%	9%	5%	12%	10%	6%	8%	9%	9%	10%	8%
Don't know	10%	5%	7%	8%	5%	8%	9%	8%	8%	9%	4%	8%	8%
Unwt N=	246	311	182	261	125	319	163	240	156	241	206	255	302

**Automated License Plate Readers
Rutgers-Eagleton Poll**

F2. To what extent would you support or oppose each of the following rules for how police in New Jersey use automated license plate readers (ALPR)?

Requiring that the data be deleted after six months instead of the three years currently allowed

Strongly support	39%
Somewhat support	27%
Somewhat oppose	14%
Strongly oppose	9%
Don't know	11%
Unweighted N=	1004

	Party ID			Gender		Race or Ethnicity				Age			
	Dem	Ind	Rep	Man	Woman	Wht	Blk	Hisp	Other	18-34	35-49	50-64	65+
Strongly supp	40%	44%	26%	44%	33%	36%	47%	47%	34%	46%	45%	37%	28%
Smwht supp	27%	26%	30%	27%	28%	28%	23%	24%	32%	24%	29%	23%	32%
Smwht opp	14%	12%	19%	14%	15%	17%	14%	9%	10%	14%	8%	16%	18%
Strongly opp	7%	7%	17%	8%	11%	8%	5%	12%	16%	8%	9%	11%	10%
Don't know	12%	11%	8%	7%	14%	12%	12%	8%	9%	9%	10%	13%	12%
Unwt N=	437	376	190	417	580	577	124	180	121	228	272	263	241

	Income				Region					Education			
	<\$50K	\$50K- <\$100K	\$100K- <\$150K	\$150K+	Urban	Suburb	Exurban	Phil/ South	Shore	HS or less	Some college	College grad	Grad work
Strongly supp	42%	39%	36%	37%	41%	35%	35%	50%	36%	37%	37%	41%	40%
Smwht supp	27%	26%	30%	27%	32%	24%	20%	29%	32%	32%	29%	21%	25%
Smwht opp	11%	16%	12%	16%	14%	15%	18%	9%	14%	12%	17%	15%	13%
Strongly opp	8%	11%	10%	9%	8%	11%	13%	5%	8%	8%	7%	12%	10%
Don't know	12%	9%	13%	11%	5%	15%	14%	7%	9%	10%	10%	11%	12%
Unwt N=	246	311	182	261	125	319	163	240	156	241	206	255	302

**Automated License Plate Readers
Rutgers-Eagleton Poll**

F2. To what extent would you support or oppose each of the following rules for how police in New Jersey use automated license plate readers (ALPR)?

Requiring police departments to audit license plate reader searches monthly instead of once a year, to make sure searches are lawful

Strongly support	48%
Somewhat support	30%
Somewhat oppose	8%
Strongly oppose	7%
Don't know	7%
Unweighted N=	1004

	Party ID			Gender		Race or Ethnicity				Age			
	Dem	Ind	Rep	Man	Woman	Wht	Blk	Hisp	Other	18-34	35-49	50-64	65+
Strongly supp	48%	52%	42%	55%	41%	48%	44%	51%	50%	54%	51%	50%	39%
Smwht supp	27%	33%	30%	29%	31%	32%	22%	29%	27%	24%	31%	28%	36%
Smwht opp	10%	5%	10%	7%	9%	6%	18%	7%	8%	9%	6%	8%	9%
Strongly opp	5%	5%	13%	7%	7%	7%	4%	7%	9%	6%	5%	8%	8%
Don't know	10%	6%	6%	2%	12%	7%	12%	5%	7%	7%	7%	6%	9%
Unwt N=	437	376	190	417	580	577	124	180	121	228	272	263	241

**Automated License Plate Readers
Rutgers-Eagleton Poll**

	Income				Region					Education			
	<\$50K	\$50K- <\$100K	\$100K- <\$150K	\$150K+	Urban	Suburb	Exurban	Phil/ South	Shore	HS or less	Some college	College grad	Grad work
Strongly supp	42%	46%	52%	53%	43%	46%	56%	47%	52%	44%	50%	50%	50%
Smwht supp	26%	33%	28%	31%	44%	27%	30%	26%	27%	30%	32%	28%	31%
Smwht opp	10%	10%	9%	3%	8%	12%	2%	7%	6%	10%	9%	10%	3%
Strongly opp	10%	4%	6%	7%	3%	7%	7%	9%	8%	7%	6%	6%	7%
Don't know	11%	7%	5%	6%	2%	9%	4%	12%	7%	10%	3%	6%	8%
Unwt N=	246	311	182	261	125	319	163	240	156	241	206	255	302

**Automated License Plate Readers
Rutgers-Eagleton Poll**

F2. To what extent would you support or oppose each of the following rules for how police in New Jersey use automated license plate readers (ALPR)?

Barring New Jersey police from sharing the data with law enforcement in other states

Strongly support	25%
Somewhat support	23%
Somewhat oppose	24%
Strongly oppose	18%
Don't know	11%
Unweighted N=	1004

	Party ID			Gender		Race or Ethnicity				Age			
	Dem	Ind	Rep	Man	Woman	Wht	Blk	Hisp	Other	18-34	35-49	50-64	65+
Strongly supp	30%	23%	19%	27%	22%	21%	31%	36%	21%	34%	28%	21%	18%
Smwht supp	22%	29%	14%	23%	22%	21%	25%	18%	33%	22%	27%	23%	19%
Smwht opp	25%	23%	23%	23%	24%	26%	19%	23%	20%	22%	22%	21%	29%
Strongly opp	11%	14%	39%	21%	17%	22%	7%	15%	20%	9%	14%	26%	23%
Don't know	13%	11%	6%	7%	14%	11%	18%	8%	7%	13%	10%	9%	11%
Unwt N=	437	376	190	417	580	577	124	180	121	228	272	263	241

	Income				Region					Education			
	<\$50K	\$50K- <\$100K	\$100K- <\$150K	\$150K+	Urban	Suburb	Exurban	Phil/ South	Shore	HS or less	Some college	College grad	Grad work
Strongly supp	34%	20%	21%	24%	19%	23%	24%	27%	31%	27%	22%	24%	24%
Smwht supp	17%	29%	22%	21%	24%	22%	23%	25%	20%	24%	21%	22%	23%
Smwht opp	20%	25%	25%	24%	29%	23%	20%	24%	23%	22%	26%	26%	22%
Strongly opp	12%	18%	23%	21%	18%	19%	24%	13%	18%	15%	22%	16%	22%
Don't know	17%	8%	9%	10%	10%	13%	9%	11%	7%	12%	9%	12%	9%
Unwt N=	246	311	182	261	125	319	163	240	156	241	206	255	302

Methodology

This Rutgers-Eagleton Poll was conducted using the [Rutgers-Eagleton/Garden State Panel](#) Omnibus platform. The Garden State Panel Omnibus is a quarterly, New Jersey statewide, probability-based survey. Data collection was conducted from September 24 to 27, 2026, with a scientifically selected random sample of 1,004 New Jersey adults, 18 or older. The survey was conducted via web and administered in English and Spanish.

The Garden State Panel Omnibus is conducted on the Rutgers-Eagleton/SSRS Garden State Panel. The Rutgers-Eagleton/SSRS Garden State Panel is a joint research venture between the Eagleton Center for Public Interest Polling (ECPIP) at Rutgers University-New Brunswick and SSRS. It is a probability-based panel of New Jersey adults ages 18 or older. Members are recruited randomly based on statewide representative ABS (Address Based Sample) design. ABS sample is drawn from the Delivery Sequence File (DSF) maintained by the U.S. Postal Service. Population coverage of the DSF is in the 98%-99% range. During the recruitment process, full demographic information on panelists is collected.

The Rutgers/SSRS Garden State Panel is a multi-mode panel. For this poll, only Internet households were invited to participate via web; non-internet households were not included. Sample was drawn using a probability proportional to size (PPS) methodology to ensure adequate representation of each demographic group while minimizing the variability of the final weights. The sample was additionally stratified by preferred survey language to meet the sample size targets for each group.

Data were weighted to represent the residential adult population of New Jersey. The data were weighted by first applying a base weight then balancing the demographic profile of the sample to target population parameters.

With the base weight applied, the data were weighted to balance the demographic profile of the sample to the target population parameters.

Data were weighted to distributions of age, race/ethnicity by nativity, gender/sex by age, gender/sex by education, age by education, NJ region, home tenure, number of household adults, civic engagement, frequency of Internet use, and 2024 presidential recalled vote.

The following table shows the data sources used for calibration totals.

Table 1. Calibration Variable Sources

Calibration Variables	Sources
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Gender • Age • Education • Race • Ethnicity • Hispanic nativity • Number of adults in household • Home tenure 	2025 Current Population Survey ¹
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • NJ Region 	ACS 2024 1-Year Estimates ²
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Internet frequency 	SSRS Opinion Panel
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Civic engagement 	September 2023 CPS Volunteering and Civic Life Supplement ³
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • 2024 Presidential recalled vote⁴ 	National Election Pool

Final calibrated weights are trimmed at the 5th and 95th percentiles to prevent individual interviews from having too much influence on survey-derived estimates.

Post-data collection statistical adjustments require analysis procedures that reflect departures from simple random sampling. We calculate the effects of these design features so that an appropriate adjustment can be incorporated into tests of statistical significance when using these data. The so-called "design effect" or *deff* represents the loss in statistical efficiency that results from a disproportionate sample design and systematic non-response. The total sample design effect for this survey is 1.75.

All surveys are subject to sampling error, which is the expected probable difference between interviewing everyone in a population versus a scientific sampling drawn from that population. Sampling error should be adjusted to recognize the effect of weighting the data to better match the population. In this poll, the simple sampling error for 1,004 New Jersey adults is +/-3.1 percentage points at a 95% confidence interval. The design effect is 1.75, making the adjusted margin of error +/- 4.1 percentage points. Thus, if 50% of New Jersey adults in this sample favor a particular position, we would be 95% sure that the true figure is between 45.9 and 54.1% (50 +/- 4.1) if all New Jersey adults had been interviewed, rather than just a sample.

¹ Steven Ruggles, Sarah Flood, Matthew Sobek, Daniel Backman, Grace Cooper, Julia A. Rivera Drew, Stephanie Richards, Renae Rodgers, Jonathan Schroeder, and Kari C.W. Williams. IPUMS USA: Version 16.0 [dataset]. Minneapolis, MN: IPUMS, 2025. <https://doi.org/10.18128/D010.V16.0>

² U.S. Census Bureau. "Age and Sex." American Community Survey, ACS 1-Year Estimates Subject Tables, Table S0101, 2024

³ Sarah Flood, Miriam King, Renae Rodgers, Steven Ruggles, J. Robert Warren, Daniel Backman, Annie Chen, Grace Cooper, Stephanie Richards, Megan Schouweiler, and Michael Westberry (2024). Integrated Public Use Microdata Series, Current Population Survey: Version 12.0 [dataset]. Minneapolis, MN: IPUMS, 2024. <https://doi.org/10.18128/D030.V12.0>

⁴ Recalled vote in the 2024 presidential election is defined as the chosen candidate of panelists who are currently registered to vote, specifically among the following listed candidates: Kamala Harris, Donald Trump, Jill Stein, Chase Oliver, and Robert F. Kennedy, Jr. Panelists who are not currently registered to vote or voted for a non-listed candidate are counted along with those who did not vote in the election.

Automated License Plate Readers Rutgers-Eagleton Poll

Sampling error is only one possible source of error in a survey estimate. Sampling error does not consider other sources of variation inherent in public opinion studies, such as selection bias, non-response bias, question wording, context effects, or reporting accuracy, which may contribute additional error.

This Rutgers-Eagleton Poll was fielded by SSRS through the Rutgers-Eagleton/SSRS Garden State Panel. The questionnaire was developed and all data analyses were completed in house by the Eagleton Center for Public Interest Polling (ECPIP). Ashley Koning and Jessica Roman led analysis and preparation of this release. The Rutgers-Eagleton Poll is paid for and sponsored by the Eagleton Institute of Politics at Rutgers, The State University of New Jersey, a non-partisan academic center for the study of politics and the political process. Full questionnaires are available on request and can also be accessed through our archives at eagletonpoll.rutgers.edu. For more information, please contact poll@eagleton.rutgers.edu.

**Automated License Plate Readers
Rutgers-Eagleton Poll**

**Weighted Demographics
1,004 New Jersey Adults 18+
Overall Margin of Error = +/- 4.1 percentage points**

Please note: Totals may equal slightly more or less than 100% due to rounding.

		deff	MOE
Democrat	38%	1.83	+/- 6.3%
Independent	39%	1.76	+/- 6.7%
Republican	23%	1.54	+/- 8.8%
 Man	46%	1.68	+/- 6.2%
Woman	54%	1.79	+/- 5.5%
 White	58%	1.56	+/- 5.1%
Black	13%	1.89	+/- 12.1%
Hispanic	15%	2.42	+/- 11.4%
Other	14%	1.73	+/- 11.7%
 18-34	24%	1.93	+/- 9.0%
35-49	25%	1.87	+/- 8.1%
50-64	25%	1.70	+/- 7.9%
65+	27%	1.50	+/- 7.7%
 <50K	23%	2.05	+/- 8.9%
50K-<100K	30%	1.86	+/- 7.6%
100K-<150K	20%	1.60	+/- 9.2%
150K+	26%	1.49	+/- 7.4%
 Urban	16%	1.54	+/- 10.9%
Suburb	35%	1.64	+/- 7.0%
Exurban	14%	1.67	+/- 9.9%
Phil/South	17%	2.17	+/- 9.3%
Shore	17%	1.61	+/- 10.0%
 HS or less	30%	1.79	+/- 8.4%
Some college	20%	1.76	+/- 9.0%
4-yr college grad	24%	1.73	+/- 8.1%
Grad work	26%	1.55	+/- 7.0%