

City of Auburn 2015 Community Survey

...helping organizations make better decisions since 1982

Findings
Report

Submitted to Auburn, California by:

ETC Institute
725 W. Frontier Lane,
Olathe, Kansas
66061

February 2015





Contents

Executive Summary	i
Section 1: Charts and Graphs.....	1
Section 2: Benchmarking Analysis	23
Section 3: Importance-Satisfaction Analysis	31
Section 4: GIS Maps	49
Section 5: Tabular Data.....	172
Section 6: Survey Instrument.....	220


City of Auburn 2015 Community Survey Executive Summary Report

Overview and Methodology

Overview. During January and February of 2015, ETC Institute administered a community survey for the City of Auburn, California. The purpose of the survey was to assess satisfaction with the delivery of major City services to help set community priorities so that tax dollars are spent wisely.

Methodology. A seven-page survey was mailed to a random sample of 2,000 households throughout the City of Auburn. The mailed survey included a postage paid return envelope and a cover letter. The cover letter explained the purpose of the survey and encouraged residents to return their surveys in the mail. Approximately seven days after the surveys were mailed, residents who received the survey were contacted by phone. Those who indicated that they had not returned the survey by mail or completed it online were given the option of completing it by phone.

The goal was to receive at least 400 completed surveys. This goal was exceeded, with a total of 431 households completing a survey. The results for the random sample of 431 households have a 95% level of confidence with a precision of at least +/- 4.7%. There were no statistically significant differences in the results of the survey based on the method of administration (mail vs. phone). In order to better understand how well services are being delivered by the City, ETC Institute geocoded the home address of respondents to the survey. The map to the right shows the physical distribution of survey respondents based on the locations of their homes.



Interpretation of “Don’t Know” Responses. The percentage of “don’t know” responses has been excluded from many of the graphs in this report to assess satisfaction with residents who had used City services and to facilitate valid comparisons with other communities in the benchmarking analysis. Since the number of “don’t know” responses often reflects the utilization and awareness of city services, the percentage of “don’t know” responses has been included in the tabular data in Section 4 of this report. When the “don’t know” responses have been excluded, the text of this report will indicate that the responses have been excluded with the phrase “who had an opinion.”

This report contains the following:

- a summary of the methodology for administering the survey and major findings
- charts showing the overall results for the survey (Section 1)
- benchmarking data that shows how the results for the City of Auburn compare to other U.S. cities (Section 2)
- importance-satisfaction analysis that identifies priorities for investment (Section 3)
- tabular data showing the overall results for all questions on the survey (Section 4)
- a copy of the cover letter and survey instrument (Section 5)

Major Findings

Major Categories of City Services

- The major categories of city services that had the highest levels of satisfaction, based upon the combined percentage of “very satisfied” and “satisfied” responses among residents, who had an opinion, were: fire services (85%), parks and recreation services (81%), police services (77%), and ambulance services (77%).
- Based on the sum of their top three choices, the areas that residents feel should receive the most emphasis from City leaders over the next two years were: (1) the maintenance of city streets and infrastructure, (2) the quality of police services, and (3) the flow of traffic and congestion management.

Perceptions of the City

- Most residents have a positive perception of the City of Auburn. Eighty-two percent (82%) of residents surveyed, who had an opinion, were satisfied (rating of 4 or 5 on a 5-point scale) with the overall quality of life in the City; 13% were neutral, and only 5% were dissatisfied. Seventy-two percent (72%) of residents surveyed, who had an opinion, were satisfied with the image of the City and 67% were satisfied with the appearance of the City.

Ratings of the City

- Nearly all (94%) residents surveyed, who had an opinion, rated the City of Auburn as an excellent or good place to live; 5% were neutral, and only 1% rated the City as below average. Eighty-nine percent (89%) of residents surveyed, who had an opinion, rated the City as an excellent or good place to raise children, and 83% rated the City as an excellent or good place to retire.

City Leadership

- Forty-six percent (46%) of residents surveyed, who had an opinion, were satisfied (rating of 4 or 5 on a 5-point scale) with the leadership provided by elected officials; 36% were neutral, and 18% were dissatisfied. Forty-four percent (44%) of residents surveyed, who had an opinion, were satisfied (rating of 4 or 5 on a 5-point scale) with the overall effectiveness of City management; 40% were neutral, and 16% were dissatisfied.

Police Services

- The police services that had the highest levels of satisfaction, based upon the combined percentage of “very satisfied” and “satisfied” responses among residents, who had an opinion, were: the appearance and quality of police vehicles/equipment (84%), the overall quality of police services (73%), and the overall support to local businesses and residents (65%).
- Based on the sum of their top three choices, the police services that residents feel should receive the most emphasis from City leaders over the next two years were: (1) efforts to prevent crime, (2) visibility of police in neighborhoods, and (3) police response time.

Fire and Emergency Medical Services

- The fire and emergency medical services that had the highest levels of satisfaction, based upon the combined percentage of “very satisfied” and “satisfied” responses among residents, who had an opinion, were: the appearance and quality of fire apparatus and equipment (85%), the overall quality of fire protection (83%), and fire personnel emergency response time (79%).
- Based on the sum of their top three choices, the fire and emergency medical services that residents feel should receive the most emphasis from City leaders over the next two years were: (1) quality of community fire fuel reduction programs, (2) fire personnel emergency response time, and (3) the overall quality of fire protection.

Code Enforcement

- The code enforcement areas that had the highest levels of satisfaction, based upon the combined percentage of “very satisfied” and “satisfied” responses among residents,

who had an opinion, were: clean-up of debris/litter (72%), cleanup of large junk/abandoned vehicles (69%) and animal control (61%).

- Based on the sum of their top two choices, the code enforcement areas that residents feel should receive the most emphasis from City leaders over the next two years were: (1) cleanup of overgrown and weedy lots and (2) cleanup of debris/litter.

Utility Services

- The utility services that had the highest levels of satisfaction, based upon the combined percentage of “very satisfied” and “satisfied” responses among residents, who had an opinion, were: residential garbage collection service (90%), water service (76%) and recycling at city’s drop-off recycling center (76%).
- Based on the sum of their top two choices, the water services that residents feel should receive the most emphasis from City leaders over the next two years were: (1) water service and (2) sewer service.

Maintenance Services

- The maintenance services that had the highest levels of satisfaction, based upon the combined percentage of “very satisfied” and “satisfied” responses among residents, who had an opinion, were: the maintenance of city-owned buildings (71%), maintenance of traffic signals (67%), and maintenance of street signs (66%).
- Based on the sum of their top three choices, the maintenance services that residents feel should receive the most emphasis from City leaders over the next two years were: (1) maintenance of streets, (2) maintenance of sidewalks, and (3) adequacy of city street lighting.

Traffic Flow and Transportation

- Sixty-eight percent (68%) of residents surveyed, who had an opinion, were “very satisfied” or “satisfied” with the ease of travel by car in Auburn; 55% were “very satisfied” or “satisfied” with the ease of pedestrian travel, and 38% were “very satisfied” or “satisfied” with the ease of travel by bicycle.

Parks and Recreation Services

- The parks and recreation services that had the highest levels of satisfaction, based upon the combined percentage of “very satisfied” and “satisfied” responses among residents, who had an opinion, were: maintenance of parks (84%) and the maintenance of walking trails (75%).

Communication

- The aspects of communications that had the highest levels of satisfaction, based upon the combined percentage of “very satisfied” and “satisfied” responses among residents, who had an opinion, were: the quality of the city’s website (42%) and the availability of information on city services and programs (41%).

Development and Redevelopment

- The development and redevelopment items that had the highest levels of satisfaction, based upon the combined percentage of “very satisfied” and “satisfied” responses among residents, who had an opinion, were: the overall appearance of Old Town Auburn (78%), the overall appearance of Downtown Auburn (73%), and the appearance of Lincoln Highway & High Street (62%).
- Based on the sum of their top three choices, the development and redevelopment items that residents feel should receive the most emphasis from City leaders over the next two years were: (1) the City’s planning for future growth, (2) the overall appearance of Highway 49 North, and (3) the redevelopment of abandoned or under-utilized properties.

Auburn Transit

- 48% of residents surveyed, who had an opinion, were “very satisfied” or “satisfied” with the overall value of the Auburn transit program; 41% were neutral, and 11% were dissatisfied; 46% of residents surveyed, who had an opinion, were “very satisfied” or “satisfied” with the overall friendliness and service of drivers; 50% were neutral, and 4% were dissatisfied.

Community Development

- The aspects of community development that received the highest levels of priority, based upon the combined percentage of “very high” and “high” responses among residents, who had an opinion, were: protecting residents and businesses from crime (92%), maintaining a balanced City budget (87%), improving City streets and sidewalks (78%), and preserving green space to ensure some areas of the City are not developed (77%).
- Based on the sum of their top three choices, the community development items that residents feel should receive the most emphasis from City leaders over the next two years were: (1) improving City streets and sidewalks, (2) protecting residents and businesses from crime, and (3) maintaining a balanced City budget.

Other Findings

- 93% of residents surveyed, who had an opinion, feel “very safe” or “safe” in their neighborhood during the day, and 92% overall feel “very safe” or “safe” in the Auburn.
- The top two sources were residents get information about city issues, services, and events are the local newspaper (75%) and word of mouth (74%).
- 38% of residents have called or visited the city with a question, problem or complaint during the past year; of the 38% that have contacted the city, 78% felt it was “very easy” or “easy” to contact the person they needed to reach, and 76% felt the department they contacted was responsive to their issue.
- 42% of residents feel the City should expand its geographic boundaries into unincorporated North Auburn; 32% are not sure, and 26% do not feel the City should expand into unincorporated North Auburn.
- 38% of residents would consider additional fees, assessments or taxes to support public infrastructure programs, and 30% would consider additional fees, assessments or taxes to support fire and life safety programs and activities.
- 41% of residents feel that short-term rentals would be a good alternative for tourism in Auburn; 35% are not sure, and 24% do not feel short-term rentals would be a good alternative for tourism in Auburn.
- 36% of residents feel that short-term rentals should be allowed in residential districts; 35% are not sure, and 29% do not feel that short-term rentals should be allowed in residential districts.

How Auburn Compares to Other Communities

Auburn **rated above the California average** in 37 of the 54 areas that were assessed. Auburn rated significantly higher than the California average (5% or more above) in 23 of these areas. The areas in which Auburn rated at least 10% above the California average are listed below:

- Auburn as a place to live (+23%)
- Feeling of safety in your neighborhood at night (+22%)
- Auburn as a place to raise children (+19%)
- Clean-up of junk/debris (+19%)
- Overall quality of city’s customer service (+18%)
- Auburn as a place to retire (+18%)

- Overall quality of City services provided (+17%)
- Feeling of safety in your neighborhood during the day (+15%)
- Overall image of the community (+14%)
- Overall feeling of safety in the community (+14%)
- Maintenance of walking trails (+14%)
- Overall quality of parks and recreation services (+13%)
- Overall quality of life in the City (+13%)
- Auburn as a place to work (+13%)
- Maintenance of parks (+13%)
- Crime prevention (+11%)
- Overall quality of fire services (+10%)

Auburn **rated below the California average** in 17 of the 54 areas that were assessed. Auburn rated significantly lower than the California average (5% or more below) in 10 of these areas. The areas in which Auburn rated at least 10% below the California average are listed below

- Adequacy of street lighting (-14%)
- Police safety education programs (-14%)
- Maintenance of sidewalks (-13%)
- Inspection programs provided by the Fire Dept. (-13%)
- Flow of traffic and congestion management (-13%)
- Visibility of police in neighborhoods (-11%)

Investment Priorities

Recommended Priorities for the Next Two Years. In order to help the City identify investment priorities for the next two years, ETC Institute conducted an Importance-Satisfaction (I-S) analysis. This analysis examined the importance that residents placed on each City service and the level of satisfaction with each service.

By identifying services of high importance and low satisfaction, the analysis identified which services will have the most impact on overall satisfaction with City services over the next two years. If the City wants to improve its overall satisfaction rating, the City should prioritize investments in services with the highest Importance Satisfaction (I-S) ratings. Details regarding the methodology for the analysis are provided in the Section 3 of this report.

Based on the results of the Importance-Satisfaction (I-S) Analysis, ETC Institute recommends the following:


- **Overall Priorities for the City by Major Category.** The first level of analysis reviewed the importance of and satisfaction with major categories of City services. This analysis was conducted to help set the overall priorities for the City. Based on the results of this analysis, the major services that are recommended as the top three priorities for investment over the next two years in order to raise the City's overall satisfaction rating are listed below in descending order of the Importance-Satisfaction rating:
 - Maintenance of City streets and infrastructure (IS Rating= 0.3717)
 - Flow of traffic and congestion management (IS Rating=0. 2072)
 - Quality of community development programs (IS Rating= 0.1140)

- **Priorities within Departments/Specific Areas:** The second level of analysis reviewed the importance of and satisfaction of services within departments and specific service areas. This analysis was conducted to help departmental managers set priorities for their department. Based on the results of this analysis, the services that are recommended as the top priorities within each department/area over the next two years are listed below:
 - **Police Services:** visibility of police in neighborhoods and efforts to prevent crime
 - **Fire and Emergency Medical Services:** quality of community fire fuel reduction programs
 - **Code Enforcement:** cleanup of overgrown and weedy lots and efforts to remove dilapidated structures
 - **Utility Services:** water service
 - **Maintenance:** maintenance of streets and maintenance of sidewalks
 - **Development and Redevelopment:** city's planning for future growth and redevelopment of abandoned or under-utilized properties

Section 1:
Charts and Graphs

Q1. Overall Satisfaction with City Services by Major Category


by percentage of respondents who rated the item as a 1 to 5 on a 5-point scale (excluding don't knows)



Source: ETC Institute (2015)

Q2. City Services That Should Receive the Most Emphasis Over the Next Two Years by Major Category


by percentage of respondents who selected the item as one of their top three choices



Source: ETC Institute (2015)

Q3. Satisfaction with Items That Influence Perceptions Residents Have of the City


by percentage of respondents who rated the item as a 1 to 5 on a 5-point scale (excluding don't knows)





Source: ETC Institute (2015)

Q4. How Respondents Rate Auburn as a Place to Live, Work, and Raise Children

by percentage of respondents who rated the item as a 1 to 5 on a 5-point scale (excluding don't knows)




Source: ETC Institute (2015)



Q7. Police Services That Should Receive the Most Emphasis Over the Next Two Years


by percentage of respondents who selected the item as one of their top three choices



Source: ETC Institute (2015)

Q8. Satisfaction with Various Aspects of Fire and Emergency Medical Services


by percentage of respondents who rated the item as a 1 to 5 on a 5-point scale (excluding don't knows)



Source: ETC Institute (2015)

Q9. Fire and Emergency Medical Services That Should Receive the Most Emphasis Over the Next Two Years


by percentage of respondents who selected the item as one of their top three choices



Source: ETC Institute (2015)

Q10. How Safe Residents Feel in Various Situations


by percentage of respondents who rated the item as a 1 to 5 on a 5-point scale (excluding don't knows)



Source: ETC Institute (2015)

Q11. Satisfaction with Various Aspects of Code Enforcement


by percentage of respondents who rated the item as a 1 to 5 on a 5-point scale (excluding don't knows)



Source: ETC Institute (2015)

Q12. Code Enforcement Items That Should Receive the Most Emphasis Over the Next Two Years


by percentage of respondents who selected the item as one of their top two choices



Source: ETC Institute (2015)

Q13. Satisfaction with Various Aspects of Utility Services


by percentage of respondents who rated the item as a 1 to 5 on a 5-point scale (excluding don't knows)



Source: ETC Institute (2015)

Q14. Utility Services That Should Receive the Most Emphasis Over the Next Two Years


by percentage of respondents who selected the item as one of their top two choices



Source: ETC Institute (2015)

Q15. Satisfaction with Various Aspects of Maintenance Services


by percentage of respondents who rated the item as a 1 to 5 on a 5-point scale (excluding don't knows)



Source: ETC Institute (2015)

Q16. Maintenance Services That Should Receive the Most Emphasis Over the Next Two Years


by percentage of respondents who selected the item as one of their top three choices



Source: ETC Institute (2015)

Q17. Satisfaction with Various Aspects of Traffic Flow and Transportation


by percentage of respondents who rated the item as a 1 to 5 on a 5-point scale (excluding don't knows)



Source: ETC Institute (2015)

Q18. Satisfaction with Various Aspects of Parks and Recreation Services


by percentage of respondents who rated the item as a 1 to 5 on a 5-point scale (excluding don't knows)



Source: ETC Institute (2015)

Q19. Satisfaction with Various Aspects of Communication


by percentage of respondents who rated the item as a 1 to 5 on a 5-point scale (excluding don't knows)



Source: ETC Institute (2015)

Q20. Which of the following are your primary sources of information about city issues, services, and events?


by percentage of respondents (multiple choices could be made)



Source: ETC Institute (2015)

Q21. Have you called or visited the city with a question, problem, or complaint during the past year?

by percentage of respondents




Source: ETC Institute (2015)

Q21. Have you called or visited the city with a question, problem, or complaint during the past year?

by percentage of respondents


Q21a. How easy was it to contact the person you needed to reach?




Source: ETC Institute (2015)

Q21. Have you called or visited the city with a question, problem, or complaint during the past year?

by percentage of respondents




Q21b. What department did you contact?




Source: ETC Institute (2015)

Q21. Have you called or visited the city with a question, problem, or complaint during the past year?

by percentage of respondents




Q21c. Was the department you contacted responsive to your issue?



Source: ETC Institute (2015)

Q22. Satisfaction with Various Aspects of Development and Redevelopment in Auburn


by percentage of respondents who rated the item as a 1 to 5 on a 5-point scale (excluding don't knows)



Source: ETC Institute (2015)

Q23. Development and Redevelopment Items That Should Receive the Most Emphasis Over the Next Two Years


by percentage of respondents who selected the item as one of their top three choices



Source: ETC Institute (2015)

Q24. Satisfaction with Various Aspects of Auburn Transit


by percentage of respondents who rated the item as a 1 to 5 on a 5-point scale (excluding don't knows)



Source: ETC Institute (2015)

Q25. Do you currently ride Auburn Transit buses?


by percentage of respondents




Source: ETC Institute (2015)

Q25. Do you currently ride Auburn Transit buses?

by percentage of respondents




Q25a. What are the primary purposes of your trip?



Source: ETC Institute (2015)

Q25. Do you currently ride Auburn Transit buses?

by percentage of respondents




Q25b. Do you own your own vehicle?

Source: ETC Institute (2015)

Q26. Level of Priority of Various Aspects of Community Development


by percentage of respondents who rated the item as a 1 to 5 on a 5-point scale (excluding don't knows)



Source: ETC Institute (2015)

Q27. Community Development Items That Should Receive the Most Emphasis Over the Next Two Years


by percentage of respondents who selected the item as one of their top three choices



Source: ETC Institute (2015)

Q28. Do you believe the City of Auburn should expand its geographical boundaries into unincorporated North Auburn?


by percentage of respondents



Source: ETC Institute (2015)

Q29. Would you consider additional fees, assessments or taxes to support any of the following?


by percentage of respondents (multiple choices could be made)



Source: ETC Institute (2015)

Q30. Do you feel that short term rentals (such as AirBNB) would be a good alternative for tourism in Auburn?


by percentage of respondents



Source: ETC Institute (2015)

Q31. Do you believe short term rentals (such as AirBNB) should be allowed in residential districts, such as R-1, R-2 and R-3?


by percentage of respondents



Source: ETC Institute (2015)

Q32. Demographics: How many years have you lived in the City of Auburn?


by percentage of respondents



Source: ETC Institute (2015)

Q33. Demographics: What is your age?


by percentage of respondents



Source: ETC Institute (2015)

Q34. Demographics: Are you or other members of your household of Hispanic or Latino ancestry?


by percentage of respondents



Source: ETC Institute (2015)

Q35. Demographics: Which of the following best describes your race/ethnicity?


by percentage of respondents (multiple choices could be made)



Source: ETC Institute (2015)

Q36. Demographics: Annual Household Income


by percentage of respondents



Source: ETC Institute (2015)

Q37. Demographics: Gender

by percentage of respondents



Source: ETC Institute (2015)

Section 2:
Benchmarking Analysis

Benchmarking Summary Report Auburn, California

Overview

ETC Institute's *DirectionFinder* program was originally developed in 1999 to help community leaders across the United States use statistically valid community survey data as a tool for making better decisions. Since November of 1999, the survey has been administered in more than 230 cities in 43 states. Most participating cities conduct the survey on an annual or biennial basis.

This report contains benchmarking data from two sources: (1) a national survey that was administered by ETC Institute during the summer of 2014 to a random sample of 4,088 residents across the United States and (2) a regional survey administered to 405 residents living in communities throughout the State of California.

Interpreting the Charts


The charts on the following pages show how the overall results for Auburn compare to the a U.S. national and regional averages based on the results of the 2014 survey that was administered by ETC Institute to a random sample of 4,088 residents across the United States, and the regional survey administered to 405 residents living in communities throughout California. The City of Auburn's results are shown in blue, the California averages are shown in red and the National averages are shown in yellow in the charts on the following pages.

National Benchmarks



Note: The benchmarking data contained in this report is protected intellectual property. Any reproduction of the benchmarking information in this report by persons or organizations not directly affiliated with the City of Auburn, California is not authorized without written consent from ETC Institute.



Overall Satisfaction with Various City Services Auburn vs. California vs. the U.S

by percentage of respondents who rated the item 4 or 5 on a 5-point scale where 5 was "very satisfied" and 1 was "very dissatisfied" (excluding don't knows)




Source: 2015 ETC Institute





Overall Satisfaction with Fire and Ambulance Services Auburn vs. California vs. the U.S


by percentage of respondents who rated the item 4 or 5 on a 5-point scale where 5 was "very satisfied" and 1 was "very dissatisfied" (excluding don't knows)



Source: 2015 ETC Institute

How Safe Residents Feel in Their Community Auburn vs. California vs. the U.S


by percentage of respondents who rated the item 4 or 5 on a 5-point scale where 5 was "very safe" and 1 was "very unsafe" (excluding don't knows)



Source: 2015 ETC Institute

Overall Satisfaction with Code Enforcement Auburn vs. California vs. the U.S


by percentage of respondents who rated the item 4 or 5 on a 5-point scale where 5 was "very satisfied" and 1 was "very dissatisfied" (excluding don't knows)





Source: 2015 ETC Institute

Overall Satisfaction with Utility Services Auburn vs. California vs. the U.S

by percentage of respondents who rated the item 4 or 5 on a 5-point scale where 5 was "very satisfied" and 1 was "very dissatisfied" (excluding don't knows)



Source: 2015 ETC Institute



Section 3:
Importance-Satisfaction
Analysis

Importance-Satisfaction Analysis

Auburn, California

Overview

Today, city officials have limited resources which need to be targeted to activities that are of the most benefit to their citizens. Two of the most important criteria for decision making are (1) to target resources toward services of the highest importance to citizens; and (2) to target resources toward those services where citizens are the least satisfied.

The Importance-Satisfaction (IS) rating is a unique tool that allows public officials to better understand both of these highly important decision making criteria for each of the services they are providing. The Importance-Satisfaction rating is based on the concept that cities will maximize overall citizen satisfaction by emphasizing improvements in those service categories where the level of satisfaction is relatively low and the perceived importance of the service is relatively high.

Methodology

The rating is calculated by summing the percentage of responses for items selected as the first, second, third and fourth most important services for the City to provide. This sum is then multiplied by 1 minus the percentage of respondents that indicated they were positively satisfied with the City's performance in the related area (the sum of the ratings of 4 and 5 on a 5-point scale excluding "don't knows"). "Don't know" responses are excluded from the calculation to ensure that the satisfaction ratings among service categories are comparable. [IS=Importance x (1-Satisfaction)].

Example of the Calculation. Respondents were asked to identify the major categories of city services they thought should receive the most emphasis over the next two years. Thirty-seven percent (37%) selected *the flow of traffic and congestion management* as one of the most important services for the City to provide.

With regard to satisfaction, 44% of the residents surveyed rated the city's overall performance in *the flow of traffic and congestion management* as a "4" or a "5" on a 5-point scale (where "5" means "very satisfied) excluding "Don't know" responses. The I-S rating for *the flow of traffic and congestion management* was calculated by multiplying the sum of the most important percentages by 1 minus the sum of the satisfaction percentages. In this example, 37% was multiplied by 56% (1-0.44). This calculation yielded an I-S rating of 0.2072, which was ranked second out of ten major service categories.



The maximum rating is 1.00 and would be achieved when 100% of the respondents select an item as one of their top three choices to emphasize over the next two years and 0% indicate that they are positively satisfied with the delivery of the service.

The lowest rating is 0.00 and could be achieved under either one of the following two situations:

- if 100% of the respondents were positively satisfied with the delivery of the service
- if none (0%) of the respondents selected the service as one of the three most important areas for the City to emphasize over the next two years.

Interpreting the Ratings

Ratings that are greater than or equal to 0.20 identify areas that should receive significantly more emphasis over the next two years. Ratings from .10 to .20 identify service areas that should receive increased emphasis. Ratings less than .10 should continue to receive the current level of emphasis.

- *Definitely Increase Emphasis ($IS \geq 0.20$)*
- *Increase Current Emphasis ($0.10 \leq IS < 0.20$)*
- *Maintain Current Emphasis ($IS < 0.10$)*

The results for Auburn are provided on the following pages.

Importance-Satisfaction Rating City of Auburn, California Major Categories of City Services

Category of Service	Most Important %	Most Important Rank	Satisfaction %	Satisfaction Rank	Importance-Satisfaction Rating	I-S Rating Rank
Very High Priority (IS >.20)						
Maintenance of city streets and infrastructure	63%	1	41%	10	0.3717	1
Flow of traffic & congestion management	37%	3	44%	9	0.2072	2
High Priority (IS .10 - .20)						
Quality of community development programs	19%	7	40%	11	0.1140	3
Medium Priority (IS <.10)						
Effectiveness of city's communication with public	19%	6	49%	7	0.0969	4
Quality of police services	39%	2	77%	3	0.0897	5
Enforcement of city codes and ordinances	15%	8	47%	8	0.0795	6
Quality of parks & recreation services	25%	5	81%	2	0.0475	7
Quality of fire services	27%	4	85%	1	0.0405	8
Management of stormwater	10%	9	60%	6	0.0400	9
Quality of the city's customer service	7%	10	66%	5	0.0238	10
Quality of ambulance services	6%	11	77%	4	0.0138	11

Note: The I-S Rating is calculated by multiplying the "Most Important" % by (1-'Satisfaction' %)

Most Important %:

The "Most Important" percentage represents the sum of the first, second, third and fourth most important responses for each item. Respondents were asked to identify the items they thought should receive the most emphasis over the next two years.

Satisfaction %:

The "Satisfaction" percentage represents the sum of the ratings "4" and "5" excluding 'don't knows.' Respondents ranked their level of satisfaction with the each of the items on a scale of 1 to 5 with "5" being very satisfied and "1" being very dissatisfied.

Importance-Satisfaction Rating

City of Auburn, California

Police Services

Category of Service	Most Important %	Most Important Rank	Satisfaction %	Satisfaction Rank	Importance-Satisfaction Rating	I-S Rating Rank
<u>Very High Priority (IS >.20)</u>						
Visibility of police in neighborhoods	49%	2	51%	9	0.2401	1
Efforts to prevent crime	55%	1	63%	4	0.2035	2
<u>High Priority (IS .10 - .20)</u>						
Visibility of police in retail areas	31%	4	51%	8	0.1519	3
Police response time	31%	3	62%	5	0.1178	4
<u>Medium Priority (IS <.10)</u>						
Police safety education programs	19%	7	52%	7	0.0912	5
Overall support to local businesses and resident	24%	5	65%	3	0.0840	6
Enforcement of traffic laws	18%	8	62%	6	0.0684	7
Overall quality of police services	23%	6	73%	2	0.0621	8
Appearance & quality of police vehicles/quipment	4%	9	84%	1	0.0064	9

Note: The I-S Rating is calculated by multiplying the "Most Important" % by (1-'Satisfaction' %)

Most Important %:

The "Most Important" percentage represents the sum of the first, second, third and fourth most important responses for each item. Respondents were asked to identify the items they thought should receive the most emphasis over the next two years.

Satisfaction %:

The "Satisfaction" percentage represents the sum of the ratings "4" and "5" excluding 'don't knows.' Respondents ranked their level of satisfaction with the each of the items on a scale of 1 to 5 with "5" being very satisfied and "1" being very dissatisfied.

Importance-Satisfaction Rating

City of Auburn, California

Fire and Emergency Medical Services

Category of Service	Most Important %	Most Important Rank	Satisfaction %	Satisfaction Rank	Importance-Satisfaction Rating	I-S Rating Rank
Very High Priority (IS >.20)						
Quality of community fire fuel reduction programs	44%	1	54%	8	0.2024	1
Medium Priority (IS <.10)						
Overall support to local businesses and residents	25%	5	61%	5	0.0975	2
Quality of local ambulance service	28%	4	68%	4	0.0896	3
Fire personnel emergency response time	42%	2	79%	3	0.0882	4
Quality of fire safety education programs	22%	6	60%	6	0.0880	5
Inspection programs provided by Fire Dept.	19%	7	54%	7	0.0874	6
Overall quality of fire protection	37%	3	83%	2	0.0629	7
Appearance & quality of fire apparatus & equipment	7%	8	85%	1	0.0105	8

Note: The I-S Rating is calculated by multiplying the "Most Important" % by (1-'Satisfaction' %)

Most Important %:

The "Most Important" percentage represents the sum of the first, second, third and fourth most important responses for each item. Respondents were asked to identify the items they thought should receive the most emphasis over the next two years.

Satisfaction %:

The "Satisfaction" percentage represents the sum of the ratings "4" and "5" excluding 'don't knows.' Respondents ranked their level of satisfaction with the each of the items on a scale of 1 to 5 with "5" being very satisfied and "1" being very dissatisfied.

Importance-Satisfaction Rating

City of Auburn, California

Code Enforcement

Category of Service	Most Important %	Most Important Rank	Satisfaction %	Satisfaction Rank	Importance-Satisfaction Rating	I-S Rating Rank
<u>Very High Priority (IS >.20)</u>						
Cleanup of overgrown and weedy lots	46%	1	48%	6	0.2392	1
<u>High Priority (IS .10 - .20)</u>						
Efforts to remove dilapidated structures	24%	4	49%	5	0.1224	2
Cleanup of debris/litter	41%	2	72%	1	0.1148	3
<u>Medium Priority (IS <.10)</u>						
Animal control	21%	5	61%	3	0.0819	4
Cleanup of large junk/abandoned vehicles	26%	3	69%	2	0.0806	5
Enforcement of loud music	9%	6	58%	4	0.0378	6

Note: The I-S Rating is calculated by multiplying the "Most Important" % by (1-'Satisfaction' %)

Most Important %:

The "Most Important" percentage represents the sum of the first, second, third and fourth most important responses for each item. Respondents were asked to identify the items they thought should receive the most emphasis over the next two years.

Satisfaction %:

The "Satisfaction" percentage represents the sum of the ratings "4" and "5" excluding 'don't knows.' Respondents ranked their level of satisfaction with the each of the items on a scale of 1 to 5 with "5" being very satisfied and "1" being very dissatisfied.

Importance-Satisfaction Rating

City of Auburn, California

Utility Services

Category of Service	Most Important %	Most Important Rank	Satisfaction %	Satisfaction Rank	Importance-Satisfaction Rating	I-S Rating Rank
<u>Very High Priority (IS >.20)</u>						
Water service (PCWA)	43%	1	76%	2	0.1032	1
<u>Medium Priority (IS <.10)</u>						
Sewer service	36%	2	73%	4	0.0972	2
City's drop-off recycling center (Recology)	30%	3	76%	3	0.0720	3
Business license process	7%	6	60%	6	0.0280	4
Utility billing customer service	8%	5	68%	5	0.0256	5
Residential garbage collection service (Recology)	20%	4	90%	1	0.0200	6

Note: The I-S Rating is calculated by multiplying the "Most Important" % by (1-'Satisfaction' %)

Most Important %:

The "Most Important" percentage represents the sum of the first, second, third and fourth most important responses for each item. Respondents were asked to identify the items they thought should receive the most emphasis over the next two years.

Satisfaction %:

The "Satisfaction" percentage represents the sum of the ratings "4" and "5" excluding 'don't knows.' Respondents ranked their level of satisfaction with the each of the items on a scale of 1 to 5 with "5" being very satisfied and "1" being very dissatisfied.

Importance-Satisfaction Rating

City of Auburn, California

Maintenance Services

Category of Service	Most Important %	Most Important Rank	Satisfaction %	Satisfaction Rank	Importance-Satisfaction Rating	I-S Rating Rank
<u>Very High Priority (IS >.20)</u>						
Maintenance of streets	60%	1	43%	9	0.3420	1
Maintenance of sidewalks	46%	2	36%	10	0.2944	2
<u>High Priority (IS .10 - .20)</u>						
Adequacy of city street lighting	37%	3	51%	8	0.1813	3
Cleanup of debris/litter in and near roadways	30%	4	53%	7	0.1410	4
<u>Medium Priority (IS <.10)</u>						
Overall cleanliness of streets and public areas	20%	5	64%	4	0.0720	5
Mowing/trimming along streets and public areas	13%	8	63%	6	0.0481	6
Maintenance of the City's retail areas	13%	6	64%	5	0.0468	7
Maintenance of traffic signals	13%	7	67%	2	0.0429	8
Maintenance of street signs	4%	9	66%	3	0.0136	9
Maintenance of city-owned buildings	4%	10	71%	1	0.0116	10

Note: The I-S Rating is calculated by multiplying the "Most Important" % by (1-'Satisfaction' %)

Most Important %:

The "Most Important" percentage represents the sum of the first, second, third and fourth most important responses for each item. Respondents were asked to identify the items they thought should receive the most emphasis over the next two years.

Satisfaction %:

The "Satisfaction" percentage represents the sum of the ratings "4" and "5" excluding 'don't knows.' Respondents ranked their level of satisfaction with the each of the items on a scale of 1 to 5 with "5" being very satisfied and "1" being very dissatisfied.

Importance-Satisfaction Rating City of Auburn, California Development and Redevelopment

Category of Service	Most Important %	Most Important Rank	Satisfaction %	Satisfaction Rank	Importance-Satisfaction Rating	I-S Rating Rank
Very High Priority (IS >.20)						
City's planning for future growth	41%	1	20%	11	0.3280	1
Redevelop abandoned/under-utilized properties	35%	3	20%	10	0.2800	2
Overall appearance of Highway 49 North	38%	2	27%	9	0.2774	3
High Priority (IS .10 - .20)						
Overall quality of new retail development	26%	4	41%	6	0.1534	4
Medium Priority (IS <.10)						
Overall quality of new business development	16%	6	40%	7	0.0960	5
Appearance of Lincoln Highway & High Street	16%	7	62%	3	0.0608	6
City's building permit/review process	9%	10	36%	8	0.0576	7
Overall quality of new residential development	10%	9	44%	4	0.0560	8
Overall appearance of Downtown Auburn	19%	5	73%	2	0.0513	9
Quality of new airport industrial development	6%	11	44%	5	0.0336	10
Overall appearance of Old Town Auburn	15%	8	78%	1	0.0330	11

Note: The I-S Rating is calculated by multiplying the "Most Important" % by (1-'Satisfaction' %)

Most Important %:

The "Most Important" percentage represents the sum of the first, second, third and fourth most important responses for each item. Respondents were asked to identify the items they thought should receive the most emphasis over the next two years.

Satisfaction %:

The "Satisfaction" percentage represents the sum of the ratings "4" and "5" excluding 'don't knows.' Respondents ranked their level of satisfaction with the each of the items on a scale of 1 to 5 with "5" being very satisfied and "1" being very dissatisfied.

Importance-Satisfaction Matrix Analysis.

The Importance-Satisfaction rating is based on the concept that public agencies will maximize overall customer satisfaction by emphasizing improvements in those areas where the level of satisfaction is relatively low and the perceived importance of the service is relatively high. ETC Institute developed an Importance-Satisfaction Matrix to display the perceived importance of major services that were assessed on the survey against the perceived quality of service delivery. The two axes on the matrix represent Satisfaction (vertical) and relative Importance (horizontal).

The I-S (Importance-Satisfaction) matrix should be interpreted as follows.


- **Continued Emphasis (above average importance and above average satisfaction).** This area shows where the City is meeting customer expectations. Items in this area have a significant impact on the customer's overall level of satisfaction. The City should maintain (or slightly increase) emphasis on items in this area.
- **Exceeding Expectations (below average importance and above average satisfaction).** This area shows where the City is performing significantly better than customers expect the City to perform. Items in this area do not significantly affect the overall level of satisfaction that residents have with City services. The City should maintain (or slightly decrease) emphasis on items in this area.
- **Opportunities for Improvement (above average importance and below average satisfaction).** This area shows where the City is not performing as well as residents expect the City to perform. This area has a significant impact on customer satisfaction, and the City should DEFINITELY increase emphasis on items in this area.
- **Less Important (below average importance and below average satisfaction).** This area shows where the City is not performing well relative to the City's performance in other areas; however, this area is generally considered to be less important to residents. This area does not significantly affect overall satisfaction with City services because the items are less important to residents. The agency should maintain current levels of emphasis on items in this area.

Matrices showing the results for Auburn are provided on the following pages.

City of Auburn 2015 DirectionFinder Survey Importance-Satisfaction Assessment Matrix

-Overall-


(points on the graph show deviations from the mean importance and satisfaction ratings given by respondents to the survey)



City of Auburn 2015 DirectionFinder Survey Importance-Satisfaction Assessment Matrix


-Police Services-

(points on the graph show deviations from the mean importance and satisfaction ratings given by respondents to the survey)



City of Auburn 2015 DirectionFinder Survey Importance-Satisfaction Assessment Matrix -Fire and Emergency Medical Services-


(points on the graph show deviations from the mean importance and satisfaction ratings given by respondents to the survey)



City of Auburn 2015 DirectionFinder Survey Importance-Satisfaction Assessment Matrix

-Code Enforcement-


(points on the graph show deviations from the mean importance and satisfaction ratings given by respondents to the survey)



City of Auburn 2015 DirectionFinder Survey Importance-Satisfaction Assessment Matrix

-Utilities-


(points on the graph show deviations from the mean importance and satisfaction ratings given by respondents to the survey)



City of Auburn 2015 DirectionFinder Survey Importance-Satisfaction Assessment Matrix

-Maintenance-


(points on the graph show deviations from the mean importance and satisfaction ratings given by respondents to the survey)



City of Auburn 2015 DirectionFinder Survey Importance-Satisfaction Assessment Matrix

-Development and Redevelopment-

(points on the graph show deviations from the mean importance and satisfaction ratings given by respondents to the survey)



Section 4:
GIS Maps

Interpreting the Maps


The maps on the following pages show the mean ratings for several questions by Census Block Group in the City of Auburn.

If all areas on a map are the same color, then residents generally feel the same about that issue regardless of the location of their home.

When reading the maps, please use the following color scheme as a guide:


- **DARK/LIGHT BLUE** shades indicate POSITIVE ratings. Shades of blue generally indicate higher levels of “very satisfied” or “satisfied” responses, higher levels of “very safe” or “safe” responses or higher levels of agreement depending upon the type of question.
- **YELLOW** shades indicate NEUTRAL ratings. Shades of yellow generally indicate that residents thought the quality of service delivery is adequate or that residents were neutral about the issue in question.
- **RED/ORANGE** shades indicate NEGATIVE ratings. Shades of red generally indicate higher levels of “dissatisfied” or “very dissatisfied” responses, higher levels of “unsafe” or “very unsafe” responses and higher levels of disagreement depending on the question.

Location of Survey Respondents




2015 Auburn Citizen Survey

Q1a. Quality of fire services



Q1b. Quality of police services



LEGEND

Mean rating
on a 5-point scale, where:


- 1.0-1.8 Very Dissatisfied
- 1.8-2.6 Dissatisfied
- 2.6-3.4 Neutral
- 3.4-4.2 Satisfied
- 4.2-5.0 Very Satisfied
- Other (no responses)



2015 Auburn Citizen Survey

Shading reflects the mean rating for all respondents
by Census Block Group (merged as needed)

Q1c. Quality of ambulance services



LEGEND

Mean rating
on a 5-point scale, where:


- 1.0-1.8 Very Dissatisfied
- 1.8-2.6 Dissatisfied
- 2.6-3.4 Neutral
- 3.4-4.2 Satisfied
- 4.2-5.0 Very Satisfied
- Other (no responses)



2015 Auburn Citizen Survey

Shading reflects the mean rating for all respondents
by Census Block Group (merged as needed)

Q1d. Quality of parks & recreation services



LEGEND

Mean rating on a 5-point scale, where:


-  1.0-1.8 Very Dissatisfied
-  1.8-2.6 Dissatisfied
-  2.6-3.4 Neutral
-  3.4-4.2 Satisfied
-  4.2-5.0 Very Satisfied
-  Other (no responses)



2015 Auburn Citizen Survey

Shading reflects the mean rating for all respondents by Census Block Group (merged as needed)

Q1e. Quality of City's customer service



LEGEND

Mean rating
on a 5-point scale, where:


- 1.0-1.8 Very Dissatisfied
- 1.8-2.6 Dissatisfied
- 2.6-3.4 Neutral
- 3.4-4.2 Satisfied
- 4.2-5.0 Very Satisfied
- Other (no responses)



2015 Auburn Citizen Survey

Shading reflects the mean rating for all respondents
by Census Block Group (merged as needed)

Q1f. Maintenance of City streets and infrastructure



LEGEND


Mean rating on a 5-point scale, where:

- 1.0-1.8 Very Dissatisfied
- 1.8-2.6 Dissatisfied
- 2.6-3.4 Neutral
- 3.4-4.2 Satisfied
- 4.2-5.0 Very Satisfied
- Other (no responses)

2015 Auburn Citizen Survey

Shading reflects the mean rating for all respondents by Census Block Group (merged as needed)

Q1g. Enforcement of City codes & ordinances



LEGEND

Mean rating on a 5-point scale, where:


- 1.0-1.8 Very Dissatisfied
- 1.8-2.6 Dissatisfied
- 2.6-3.4 Neutral
- 3.4-4.2 Satisfied
- 4.2-5.0 Very Satisfied
- Other (no responses)



2015 Auburn Citizen Survey

Shading reflects the mean rating for all respondents by Census Block Group (merged as needed)

Q1h. Flow of traffic & congestion management



LEGEND

Mean rating
on a 5-point scale, where:


- 1.0-1.8 Very Dissatisfied
- 1.8-2.6 Dissatisfied
- 2.6-3.4 Neutral
- 3.4-4.2 Satisfied
- 4.2-5.0 Very Satisfied
- Other (no responses)



2015 Auburn Citizen Survey

Shading reflects the mean rating for all respondents
by Census Block Group (merged as needed)

Q1i. Management of stormwater



LEGEND


Mean rating
on a 5-point scale, where:

- 1.0-1.8 Very Dissatisfied
- 1.8-2.6 Dissatisfied
- 2.6-3.4 Neutral
- 3.4-4.2 Satisfied
- 4.2-5.0 Very Satisfied
- Other (no responses)

2015 Auburn Citizen Survey

Shading reflects the mean rating for all respondents
by Census Block Group (merged as needed)

Q1j. Effectiveness of City's communication with the public



LEGEND


Mean rating on a 5-point scale, where:

- 1.0-1.8 Very Dissatisfied
- 1.8-2.6 Dissatisfied
- 2.6-3.4 Neutral
- 3.4-4.2 Satisfied
- 4.2-5.0 Very Satisfied
- Other (no responses)

2015 Auburn Citizen Survey

Shading reflects the mean rating for all respondents by Census Block Group (merged as needed)

Q1k. Quality of community development programs



LEGEND

Mean rating on a 5-point scale, where:


- 1.0-1.8 Very Dissatisfied
- 1.8-2.6 Dissatisfied
- 2.6-3.4 Neutral
- 3.4-4.2 Satisfied
- 4.2-5.0 Very Satisfied
- Other (no responses)



2015 Auburn Citizen Survey

Shading reflects the mean rating for all respondents by Census Block Group (merged as needed)

Q3a. Value received for City tax dollars & fees



LEGEND


Mean rating on a 5-point scale, where:

- 1.0-1.8 Very Dissatisfied
- 1.8-2.6 Dissatisfied
- 2.6-3.4 Neutral
- 3.4-4.2 Satisfied
- 4.2-5.0 Very Satisfied
- Other (no responses)

2015 Auburn Citizen Survey

Shading reflects the mean rating for all respondents by Census Block Group (merged as needed)

Q3b. Image of the City



LEGEND


Mean rating
on a 5-point scale, where:

- 1.0-1.8 Very Dissatisfied
- 1.8-2.6 Dissatisfied
- 2.6-3.4 Neutral
- 3.4-4.2 Satisfied
- 4.2-5.0 Very Satisfied
- Other (no responses)

2015 Auburn Citizen Survey

Shading reflects the mean rating for all respondents
by Census Block Group (merged as needed)

Q3c. Quality of life in the City



LEGEND

Mean rating on a 5-point scale, where:


- 1.0-1.8 Very Dissatisfied
- 1.8-2.6 Dissatisfied
- 2.6-3.4 Neutral
- 3.4-4.2 Satisfied
- 4.2-5.0 Very Satisfied
- Other (no responses)



2015 Auburn Citizen Survey

Shading reflects the mean rating for all respondents by Census Block Group (merged as needed)

Q3d. Appearance of the City



LEGEND

Mean rating on a 5-point scale, where:


- 1.0-1.8 Very Dissatisfied
- 1.8-2.6 Dissatisfied
- 2.6-3.4 Neutral
- 3.4-4.2 Satisfied
- 4.2-5.0 Very Satisfied
- Other (no responses)



2015 Auburn Citizen Survey

Shading reflects the mean rating for all respondents by Census Block Group (merged as needed)

Q3e. Overall quality of City services



LEGEND


Mean rating on a 5-point scale, where:

- 1.0-1.8 Very Dissatisfied
- 1.8-2.6 Dissatisfied
- 2.6-3.4 Neutral
- 3.4-4.2 Satisfied
- 4.2-5.0 Very Satisfied
- Other (no responses)

2015 Auburn Citizen Survey

Shading reflects the mean rating for all respondents by Census Block Group (merged as needed)

Q3f. Public schools in Auburn



LEGEND


Mean rating on a 5-point scale, where:

- 1.0-1.8 Very Dissatisfied
- 1.8-2.6 Dissatisfied
- 2.6-3.4 Neutral
- 3.4-4.2 Satisfied
- 4.2-5.0 Very Satisfied
- Other (no responses)

2015 Auburn Citizen Survey

Shading reflects the mean rating for all respondents by Census Block Group (merged as needed)

Q3g. Hospitals and medical services in Auburn



LEGEND

Mean rating on a 5-point scale, where:


- 1.0-1.8 Very Dissatisfied
- 1.8-2.6 Dissatisfied
- 2.6-3.4 Neutral
- 3.4-4.2 Satisfied
- 4.2-5.0 Very Satisfied
- Other (no responses)



2015 Auburn Citizen Survey

Shading reflects the mean rating for all respondents by Census Block Group (merged as needed)

Q4a Auburn as a place to live



LEGEND

Mean rating on a 5-point scale, where:


- 1.0-1.8 Poor
- 1.8-2.6 Below Average
- 2.6-3.4 Neutral
- 3.4-4.2 Good
- 4.2-5.0 Excellent
- Other (no responses)



2015 Auburn Citizen Survey

Shading reflects the mean rating for all respondents by Census Block Group (merged as needed)

Q4b. Auburn as a place to raise children



LEGEND

Mean rating on a 5-point scale, where:


- 1.0-1.8 Poor
- 1.8-2.6 Below Average
- 2.6-3.4 Neutral
- 3.4-4.2 Good
- 4.2-5.0 Excellent
- Other (no responses)



2015 Auburn Citizen Survey

Shading reflects the mean rating for all respondents by Census Block Group (merged as needed)

Q4c. Auburn as a place to work



LEGEND

Mean rating on a 5-point scale, where:


- 1.0-1.8 Poor
- 1.8-2.6 Below Average
- 2.6-3.4 Neutral
- 3.4-4.2 Good
- 4.2-5.0 Excellent
- Other (no responses)



2015 Auburn Citizen Survey

Shading reflects the mean rating for all respondents by Census Block Group (merged as needed)

Q4d. Auburn as a place to retire



LEGEND

Mean rating on a 5-point scale, where:


- 1.0-1.8 Poor
- 1.8-2.6 Below Average
- 2.6-3.4 Neutral
- 3.4-4.2 Good
- 4.2-5.0 Excellent
- Other (no responses)



2015 Auburn Citizen Survey

Shading reflects the mean rating for all respondents by Census Block Group (merged as needed)

Q5a. Quality of leadership provided by the city's elected officials



LEGEND

Mean rating on a 5-point scale, where:


- 1.0-1.8 Very Dissatisfied
- 1.8-2.6 Dissatisfied
- 2.6-3.4 Neutral
- 3.4-4.2 Satisfied
- 4.2-5.0 Very Satisfied
- Other (no responses)



2015 Auburn Citizen Survey

Shading reflects the mean rating for all respondents by Census Block Group (merged as needed)

Q5. Effectiveness of appointed boards & commission



LEGEND

Mean rating
on a 5-point scale, where:


- 1.0-1.8 Very Dissatisfied
- 1.8-2.6 Dissatisfied
- 2.6-3.4 Neutral
- 3.4-4.2 Satisfied
- 4.2-5.0 Very Satisfied
- Other (no responses)



2015 Auburn Citizen Survey

Shading reflects the mean rating for all respondents
by Census Block Group (merged as needed)

Q5c. Effectiveness of City management



LEGEND

Mean rating on a 5-point scale, where:


- 1.0-1.8 Very Dissatisfied
- 1.8-2.6 Dissatisfied
- 2.6-3.4 Neutral
- 3.4-4.2 Satisfied
- 4.2-5.0 Very Satisfied
- Other (no responses)



2015 Auburn Citizen Survey

Shading reflects the mean rating for all respondents by Census Block Group (merged as needed)

Q6a. Overall quality of police services



LEGEND

Mean rating
on a 5-point scale, where:


- 1.0-1.8 Very Dissatisfied
- 1.8-2.6 Dissatisfied
- 2.6-3.4 Neutral
- 3.4-4.2 Satisfied
- 4.2-5.0 Very Satisfied
- Other (no responses)



2015 Auburn Citizen Survey

Shading reflects the mean rating for all respondents
by Census Block Group (merged as needed)

Q6b. Visibility of police in neighborhoods



LEGEND

Mean rating
on a 5-point scale, where:


- 1.0-1.8 Very Dissatisfied
- 1.8-2.6 Dissatisfied
- 2.6-3.4 Neutral
- 3.4-4.2 Satisfied
- 4.2-5.0 Very Satisfied
- Other (no responses)



2015 Auburn Citizen Survey

Shading reflects the mean rating for all respondents
by Census Block Group (merged as needed)

Q6c. Visibility of police in retail areas



LEGEND

Mean rating on a 5-point scale, where:


- 1.0-1.8 Very Dissatisfied
- 1.8-2.6 Dissatisfied
- 2.6-3.4 Neutral
- 3.4-4.2 Satisfied
- 4.2-5.0 Very Satisfied
- Other (no responses)



2015 Auburn Citizen Survey

Shading reflects the mean rating for all respondents by Census Block Group (merged as needed)

Q6d. Police response time



LEGEND

Mean rating on a 5-point scale, where:


- 1.0-1.8 Very Dissatisfied
- 1.8-2.6 Dissatisfied
- 2.6-3.4 Neutral
- 3.4-4.2 Satisfied
- 4.2-5.0 Very Satisfied
- Other (no responses)



2015 Auburn Citizen Survey

Shading reflects the mean rating for all respondents by Census Block Group (merged as needed)

Q6e. Appearance & quality of police vehicles & equipment



LEGEND


Mean rating on a 5-point scale, where:

- 1.0-1.8 Very Dissatisfied
- 1.8-2.6 Dissatisfied
- 2.6-3.4 Neutral
- 3.4-4.2 Satisfied
- 4.2-5.0 Very Satisfied
- Other (no responses)

2015 Auburn Citizen Survey

Shading reflects the mean rating for all respondents by Census Block Group (merged as needed)

Q6f. Efforts to prevent crime



LEGEND

Mean rating on a 5-point scale, where:


- 1.0-1.8 Very Dissatisfied
- 1.8-2.6 Dissatisfied
- 2.6-3.4 Neutral
- 3.4-4.2 Satisfied
- 4.2-5.0 Very Satisfied
- Other (no responses)



2015 Auburn Citizen Survey

Shading reflects the mean rating for all respondents by Census Block Group (merged as needed)

Q6g. Police safety education programs



LEGEND


Mean rating
on a 5-point scale, where:

- 1.0-1.8 Very Dissatisfied
- 1.8-2.6 Dissatisfied
- 2.6-3.4 Neutral
- 3.4-4.2 Satisfied
- 4.2-5.0 Very Satisfied
- Other (no responses)

2015 Auburn Citizen Survey

Shading reflects the mean rating for all respondents
by Census Block Group (merged as needed)

Q6h. Enforcement of traffic laws



LEGEND

Mean rating on a 5-point scale, where:


- 1.0-1.8 Very Dissatisfied
- 1.8-2.6 Dissatisfied
- 2.6-3.4 Neutral
- 3.4-4.2 Satisfied
- 4.2-5.0 Very Satisfied
- Other (no responses)



2015 Auburn Citizen Survey

Shading reflects the mean rating for all respondents by Census Block Group (merged as needed)

Q6i. Support to local businesses and residents



LEGEND

Mean rating on a 5-point scale, where:


- 1.0-1.8 Very Dissatisfied
- 1.8-2.6 Dissatisfied
- 2.6-3.4 Neutral
- 3.4-4.2 Satisfied
- 4.2-5.0 Very Satisfied
- Other (no responses)



2015 Auburn Citizen Survey

Shading reflects the mean rating for all respondents by Census Block Group (merged as needed)

Q8a. Overall quality of fire protection



LEGEND

Mean rating
on a 5-point scale, where:


-  1.0-1.8 Very Dissatisfied
-  1.8-2.6 Dissatisfied
-  2.6-3.4 Neutral
-  3.4-4.2 Satisfied
-  4.2-5.0 Very Satisfied
-  Other (no responses)



2015 Auburn Citizen Survey

Shading reflects the mean rating for all respondents
by Census Block Group (merged as needed)

Q8b. Fire personnel emergency response time



LEGEND

Mean rating
on a 5-point scale, where:


- 1.0-1.8 Very Dissatisfied
- 1.8-2.6 Dissatisfied
- 2.6-3.4 Neutral
- 3.4-4.2 Satisfied
- 4.2-5.0 Very Satisfied
- Other (no responses)



2015 Auburn Citizen Survey

Shading reflects the mean rating for all respondents
by Census Block Group (merged as needed)

Q8c. Quality of fire safety education programs



LEGEND

Mean rating
on a 5-point scale, where:


- 1.0-1.8 Very Dissatisfied
- 1.8-2.6 Dissatisfied
- 2.6-3.4 Neutral
- 3.4-4.2 Satisfied
- 4.2-5.0 Very Satisfied
- Other (no responses)



2015 Auburn Citizen Survey

Shading reflects the mean rating for all respondents
by Census Block Group (merged as needed)

Q8d. Appearance & quality of fire apparatus & equipment



LEGEND


Mean rating on a 5-point scale, where:

- 1.0-1.8 Very Dissatisfied
- 1.8-2.6 Dissatisfied
- 2.6-3.4 Neutral
- 3.4-4.2 Satisfied
- 4.2-5.0 Very Satisfied
- Other (no responses)

2015 Auburn Citizen Survey

Shading reflects the mean rating for all respondents by Census Block Group (merged as needed)

Q8e. Quality of local ambulance service



LEGEND

Mean rating on a 5-point scale, where:


-  1.0-1.8 Very Dissatisfied
-  1.8-2.6 Dissatisfied
-  2.6-3.4 Neutral
-  3.4-4.2 Satisfied
-  4.2-5.0 Very Satisfied
-  Other (no responses)



2015 Auburn Citizen Survey

Shading reflects the mean rating for all respondents by Census Block Group (merged as needed)

Q8f. Inspection programs provided by the Fire Department



LEGEND

Mean rating on a 5-point scale, where:


- 1.0-1.8 Very Dissatisfied
- 1.8-2.6 Dissatisfied
- 2.6-3.4 Neutral
- 3.4-4.2 Satisfied
- 4.2-5.0 Very Satisfied
- Other (no responses)



2015 Auburn Citizen Survey

Shading reflects the mean rating for all respondents by Census Block Group (merged as needed)

Q8g. Quality of community fire fuel reduction programs



LEGEND

Mean rating on a 5-point scale, where:


- 1.0-1.8 Very Dissatisfied
- 1.8-2.6 Dissatisfied
- 2.6-3.4 Neutral
- 3.4-4.2 Satisfied
- 4.2-5.0 Very Satisfied
- Other (no responses)



2015 Auburn Citizen Survey

Shading reflects the mean rating for all respondents by Census Block Group (merged as needed)

Q8h. Overall support to local businesses & residents



LEGEND

Mean rating
on a 5-point scale, where:


- 1.0-1.8 Very Dissatisfied
- 1.8-2.6 Dissatisfied
- 2.6-3.4 Neutral
- 3.4-4.2 Satisfied
- 4.2-5.0 Very Satisfied
- Other (no responses)



2015 Auburn Citizen Survey

Shading reflects the mean rating for all respondents
by Census Block Group (merged as needed)

Q10a. Feeling of safety in your neighborhood during the day




LEGEND

Mean rating on a 5-point scale, where:

- 1.0-1.8 Very Unsafe
- 1.8-2.6 Unsafe
- 2.6-3.4 Neutral
- 3.4-4.2 Safe
- 4.2-5.0 Very Safe
- Other (no responses)

2015 Auburn Citizen Survey
Shading reflects the mean rating for all respondents by Census Block Group (merged as needed)

Q10b. Feeling of safety in your neighborhood at night



LEGEND

Mean rating on a 5-point scale, where:


- 1.0-1.8 Very Unsafe
- 1.8-2.6 Unsafe
- 2.6-3.4 Neutral
- 3.4-4.2 Safe
- 4.2-5.0 Very Safe
- Other (no responses)



2015 Auburn Citizen Survey

Shading reflects the mean rating for all respondents by Census Block Group (merged as needed)

Q10c. Feeling of safety in the City's parks



LEGEND

Mean rating on a 5-point scale, where:


- 1.0-1.8 Very Unsafe
- 1.8-2.6 Unsafe
- 2.6-3.4 Neutral
- 3.4-4.2 Safe
- 4.2-5.0 Very Safe
- Other (no responses)



2015 Auburn Citizen Survey

Shading reflects the mean rating for all respondents by Census Block Group (merged as needed)

Q10d. Feeling of safety traveling by bicycle in Auburn



LEGEND

Mean rating on a 5-point scale, where:


- 1.0-1.8 Very Unsafe
- 1.8-2.6 Unsafe
- 2.6-3.4 Neutral
- 3.4-4.2 Safe
- 4.2-5.0 Very Safe
- Other (no responses)



2015 Auburn Citizen Survey

Shading reflects the mean rating for all respondents by Census Block Group (merged as needed)

Q10e. Feeling of safety traveling as a pedestrian in Auburn




LEGEND
Mean rating on a 5-point scale, where:

- 1.0-1.8 Very Unsafe
- 1.8-2.6 Unsafe
- 2.6-3.4 Neutral
- 3.4-4.2 Safe
- 4.2-5.0 Very Safe
- Other (no responses)

2015 Auburn Citizen Survey
Shading reflects the mean rating for all respondents by Census Block Group (merged as needed)

Q10f. Overall feeling of safety in Auburn



LEGEND

Mean rating on a 5-point scale, where:


- 1.0-1.8 Very Unsafe
- 1.8-2.6 Unsafe
- 2.6-3.4 Neutral
- 3.4-4.2 Safe
- 4.2-5.0 Very Safe
- Other (no responses)



2015 Auburn Citizen Survey

Shading reflects the mean rating for all respondents by Census Block Group (merged as needed)

Q10g. Feeling of safety from large to small scale wildfire



LEGEND

Mean rating on a 5-point scale, where:


- 1.0-1.8 Very Unsafe
- 1.8-2.6 Unsafe
- 2.6-3.4 Neutral
- 3.4-4.2 Safe
- 4.2-5.0 Very Safe
- Other (no responses)



2015 Auburn Citizen Survey

Shading reflects the mean rating for all respondents by Census Block Group (merged as needed)

Q11a. Cleanup of debris/litter



LEGEND

Mean rating
on a 5-point scale, where:


- 1.0-1.8 Very Dissatisfied
- 1.8-2.6 Dissatisfied
- 2.6-3.4 Neutral
- 3.4-4.2 Satisfied
- 4.2-5.0 Very Satisfied
- Other (no responses)



2015 Auburn Citizen Survey

Shading reflects the mean rating for all respondents
by Census Block Group (merged as needed)

Q11b. Cleanup of large junk/abandoned vehicles



LEGEND

Mean rating
on a 5-point scale, where:


- 1.0-1.8 Very Dissatisfied
- 1.8-2.6 Dissatisfied
- 2.6-3.4 Neutral
- 3.4-4.2 Satisfied
- 4.2-5.0 Very Satisfied
- Other (no responses)



2015 Auburn Citizen Survey

Shading reflects the mean rating for all respondents
by Census Block Group (merged as needed)

Q11c. Cleanup of overgrown & weedy lots



LEGEND

Mean rating
on a 5-point scale, where:


- 1.0-1.8 Very Dissatisfied
- 1.8-2.6 Dissatisfied
- 2.6-3.4 Neutral
- 3.4-4.2 Satisfied
- 4.2-5.0 Very Satisfied
- Other (no responses)




2015 Auburn Citizen Survey

Shading reflects the mean rating for all respondents
by Census Block Group (merged as needed)

Q11d. Efforts to remove dilapidated structures



Q11e. Enforcement of loud music



LEGEND


Mean rating
on a 5-point scale, where:

-  1.0-1.8 Very Dissatisfied
-  1.8-2.6 Dissatisfied
-  2.6-3.4 Neutral
-  3.4-4.2 Satisfied
-  4.2-5.0 Very Satisfied
-  Other (no responses)

2015 Auburn Citizen Survey

Shading reflects the mean rating for all respondents
by Census Block Group (merged as needed)

Q11f. Animal control



LEGEND

Mean rating on a 5-point scale, where:


- 1.0-1.8 Very Dissatisfied
- 1.8-2.6 Dissatisfied
- 2.6-3.4 Neutral
- 3.4-4.2 Satisfied
- 4.2-5.0 Very Satisfied
- Other (no responses)



2015 Auburn Citizen Survey

Shading reflects the mean rating for all respondents by Census Block Group (merged as needed)

Q13a. Residential garbage collection services (Recology)



LEGEND

Mean rating on a 5-point scale, where:


-  1.0-1.8 Very Dissatisfied
-  1.8-2.6 Dissatisfied
-  2.6-3.4 Neutral
-  3.4-4.2 Satisfied
-  4.2-5.0 Very Satisfied
-  Other (no responses)



2015 Auburn Citizen Survey

Shading reflects the mean rating for all respondents by Census Block Group (merged as needed)

Q13b. Recycling at city's drop-off recycling center (Recology)



LEGEND


Mean rating on a 5-point scale, where:

- 1.0-1.8 Very Dissatisfied
- 1.8-2.6 Dissatisfied
- 2.6-3.4 Neutral
- 3.4-4.2 Satisfied
- 4.2-5.0 Very Satisfied
- Other (no responses)

2015 Auburn Citizen Survey

Shading reflects the mean rating for all respondents by Census Block Group (merged as needed)

Q13c. Sewer service



LEGEND

Mean rating on a 5-point scale, where:


- 1.0-1.8 Very Dissatisfied
- 1.8-2.6 Dissatisfied
- 2.6-3.4 Neutral
- 3.4-4.2 Satisfied
- 4.2-5.0 Very Satisfied
- Other (no responses)



2015 Auburn Citizen Survey

Shading reflects the mean rating for all respondents by Census Block Group (merged as needed)

Q13d. Water service (PCWA)



LEGEND


Mean rating on a 5-point scale, where:

- 1.0-1.8 Very Dissatisfied
- 1.8-2.6 Dissatisfied
- 2.6-3.4 Neutral
- 3.4-4.2 Satisfied
- 4.2-5.0 Very Satisfied
- Other (no responses)

2015 Auburn Citizen Survey

Shading reflects the mean rating for all respondents by Census Block Group (merged as needed)

Q13e. Business license process



LEGEND


Mean rating
on a 5-point scale, where:

- 1.0-1.8 Very Dissatisfied
- 1.8-2.6 Dissatisfied
- 2.6-3.4 Neutral
- 3.4-4.2 Satisfied
- 4.2-5.0 Very Satisfied
- Other (no responses)

2015 Auburn Citizen Survey

Shading reflects the mean rating for all respondents
by Census Block Group (merged as needed)

Q13f. Utility billing customer service



LEGEND

Mean rating
on a 5-point scale, where:


- 1.0-1.8 Very Dissatisfied
- 1.8-2.6 Dissatisfied
- 2.6-3.4 Neutral
- 3.4-4.2 Satisfied
- 4.2-5.0 Very Satisfied
- Other (no responses)



2015 Auburn Citizen Survey

Shading reflects the mean rating for all respondents
by Census Block Group (merged as needed)

Q15a. Maintenance of streets



LEGEND


Mean rating on a 5-point scale, where:

- 1.0-1.8 Very Dissatisfied
- 1.8-2.6 Dissatisfied
- 2.6-3.4 Neutral
- 3.4-4.2 Satisfied
- 4.2-5.0 Very Satisfied
- Other (no responses)

2015 Auburn Citizen Survey

Shading reflects the mean rating for all respondents by Census Block Group (merged as needed)

Q15b. Maintenance of sidewalks



LEGEND

Mean rating
on a 5-point scale, where:


- 1.0-1.8 Very Dissatisfied
- 1.8-2.6 Dissatisfied
- 2.6-3.4 Neutral
- 3.4-4.2 Satisfied
- 4.2-5.0 Very Satisfied
- Other (no responses)



2015 Auburn Citizen Survey

Shading reflects the mean rating for all respondents
by Census Block Group (merged as needed)

Q15c. Maintenance of streets signs



LEGEND

Mean rating
on a 5-point scale, where:


- 1.0-1.8 Very Dissatisfied
- 1.8-2.6 Dissatisfied
- 2.6-3.4 Neutral
- 3.4-4.2 Satisfied
- 4.2-5.0 Very Satisfied
- Other (no responses)



2015 Auburn Citizen Survey

Shading reflects the mean rating for all respondents
by Census Block Group (merged as needed)

Q15d. Maintenance of traffic signals



LEGEND


Mean rating
on a 5-point scale, where:

-  1.0-1.8 Very Dissatisfied
-  1.8-2.6 Dissatisfied
-  2.6-3.4 Neutral
-  3.4-4.2 Satisfied
-  4.2-5.0 Very Satisfied
-  Other (no responses)

2015 Auburn Citizen Survey

Shading reflects the mean rating for all respondents
by Census Block Group (merged as needed)

Q15. Maintenance of the City's retail areas



LEGEND

Mean rating on a 5-point scale, where:


-  1.0-1.8 Very Dissatisfied
-  1.8-2.6 Dissatisfied
-  2.6-3.4 Neutral
-  3.4-4.2 Satisfied
-  4.2-5.0 Very Satisfied
-  Other (no responses)



2015 Auburn Citizen Survey

Shading reflects the mean rating for all respondents by Census Block Group (merged as needed)

Q15f. Cleanup of debris/litter in and near roadways



LEGEND

Mean rating
on a 5-point scale, where:


- 1.0-1.8 Very Dissatisfied
- 1.8-2.6 Dissatisfied
- 2.6-3.4 Neutral
- 3.4-4.2 Satisfied
- 4.2-5.0 Very Satisfied
- Other (no responses)



2015 Auburn Citizen Survey

Shading reflects the mean rating for all respondents
by Census Block Group (merged as needed)

Q15g. Maintenance of City-owned buildings



LEGEND

Mean rating
on a 5-point scale, where:


- 1.0-1.8 Very Dissatisfied
- 1.8-2.6 Dissatisfied
- 2.6-3.4 Neutral
- 3.4-4.2 Satisfied
- 4.2-5.0 Very Satisfied
- Other (no responses)



2015 Auburn Citizen Survey

Shading reflects the mean rating for all respondents
by Census Block Group (merged as needed)

Q15h. Mowing/trimming along streets and public areas



LEGEND

Mean rating on a 5-point scale, where:


- 1.0-1.8 Very Dissatisfied
- 1.8-2.6 Dissatisfied
- 2.6-3.4 Neutral
- 3.4-4.2 Satisfied
- 4.2-5.0 Very Satisfied
- Other (no responses)



2015 Auburn Citizen Survey

Shading reflects the mean rating for all respondents by Census Block Group (merged as needed)

Q15i. Overall cleanliness of streets and public areas



LEGEND

Mean rating
on a 5-point scale, where:


- 1.0-1.8 Very Dissatisfied
- 1.8-2.6 Dissatisfied
- 2.6-3.4 Neutral
- 3.4-4.2 Satisfied
- 4.2-5.0 Very Satisfied
- Other (no responses)



2015 Auburn Citizen Survey

Shading reflects the mean rating for all respondents
by Census Block Group (merged as needed)

Q15j. Adequacy of City street lighting



LEGEND

Mean rating
on a 5-point scale, where:


- 1.0-1.8 Very Dissatisfied
- 1.8-2.6 Dissatisfied
- 2.6-3.4 Neutral
- 3.4-4.2 Satisfied
- 4.2-5.0 Very Satisfied
- Other (no responses)



2015 Auburn Citizen Survey

Shading reflects the mean rating for all respondents
by Census Block Group (merged as needed)

Q17a. Ease of travel by car in Auburn



LEGEND


Mean rating
on a 5-point scale, where:

- 1.0-1.8 Very Dissatisfied
- 1.8-2.6 Dissatisfied
- 2.6-3.4 Neutral
- 3.4-4.2 Satisfied
- 4.2-5.0 Very Satisfied
- Other (no responses)

2015 Auburn Citizen Survey

Shading reflects the mean rating for all respondents
by Census Block Group (merged as needed)

Q17b. Ease of travel by bicycle in Auburn



LEGEND


Mean rating
on a 5-point scale, where:

- 1.0-1.8 Very Dissatisfied
- 1.8-2.6 Dissatisfied
- 2.6-3.4 Neutral
- 3.4-4.2 Satisfied
- 4.2-5.0 Very Satisfied
- Other (no responses)

2015 Auburn Citizen Survey

Shading reflects the mean rating for all respondents
by Census Block Group (merged as needed)

Q17c. Ease of pedestrian travel in Auburn



LEGEND


Mean rating
on a 5-point scale, where:

-  1.0-1.8 Very Dissatisfied
-  1.8-2.6 Dissatisfied
-  2.6-3.4 Neutral
-  3.4-4.2 Satisfied
-  4.2-5.0 Very Satisfied
-  Other (no responses)

2015 Auburn Citizen Survey

Shading reflects the mean rating for all respondents
by Census Block Group (merged as needed)

Q18a. Maintenance of parks



LEGEND

Mean rating on a 5-point scale, where:


- 1.0-1.8 Very Dissatisfied
- 1.8-2.6 Dissatisfied
- 2.6-3.4 Neutral
- 3.4-4.2 Satisfied
- 4.2-5.0 Very Satisfied
- Other (no responses)



2015 Auburn Citizen Survey

Shading reflects the mean rating for all respondents by Census Block Group (merged as needed)

Q18b. Maintenance of walking trails



LEGEND


Mean rating
on a 5-point scale, where:

- 1.0-1.8 Very Dissatisfied
- 1.8-2.6 Dissatisfied
- 2.6-3.4 Neutral
- 3.4-4.2 Satisfied
- 4.2-5.0 Very Satisfied
- Other (no responses)

2015 Auburn Citizen Survey

Shading reflects the mean rating for all respondents
by Census Block Group (merged as needed)

Q18c. Maintenance of biking paths and lanes



LEGEND


Mean rating on a 5-point scale, where:

- 1.0-1.8 Very Dissatisfied
- 1.8-2.6 Dissatisfied
- 2.6-3.4 Neutral
- 3.4-4.2 Satisfied
- 4.2-5.0 Very Satisfied
- Other (no responses)

2015 Auburn Citizen Survey

Shading reflects the mean rating for all respondents by Census Block Group (merged as needed)

Q18d. Quality of special events offered by the City



LEGEND


Mean rating
on a 5-point scale, where:

- 1.0-1.8 Very Dissatisfied
- 1.8-2.6 Dissatisfied
- 2.6-3.4 Neutral
- 3.4-4.2 Satisfied
- 4.2-5.0 Very Satisfied
- Other (no responses)

2015 Auburn Citizen Survey

Shading reflects the mean rating for all respondents
by Census Block Group (merged as needed)

Q19a. Quality of the City's website



LEGEND


Mean rating
on a 5-point scale, where:

- 1.0-1.8 Very Dissatisfied
- 1.8-2.6 Dissatisfied
- 2.6-3.4 Neutral
- 3.4-4.2 Satisfied
- 4.2-5.0 Very Satisfied
- Other (no responses)

2015 Auburn Citizen Survey

Shading reflects the mean rating for all respondents
by Census Block Group (merged as needed)

Q19b. Quality of the City's social media



LEGEND

Mean rating
on a 5-point scale, where:


- 1.0-1.8 Very Dissatisfied
- 1.8-2.6 Dissatisfied
- 2.6-3.4 Neutral
- 3.4-4.2 Satisfied
- 4.2-5.0 Very Satisfied
- Other (no responses)



2015 Auburn Citizen Survey

Shading reflects the mean rating for all respondents
by Census Block Group (merged as needed)

Q19c. Availability of information on City services & programs



LEGEND


Mean rating on a 5-point scale, where:

- 1.0-1.8 Very Dissatisfied
- 1.8-2.6 Dissatisfied
- 2.6-3.4 Neutral
- 3.4-4.2 Satisfied
- 4.2-5.0 Very Satisfied
- Other (no responses)

2015 Auburn Citizen Survey

Shading reflects the mean rating for all respondents by Census Block Group (merged as needed)

Q19d. City's efforts to keep you informed



LEGEND


Mean rating
on a 5-point scale, where:

- 1.0-1.8 Very Dissatisfied
- 1.8-2.6 Dissatisfied
- 2.6-3.4 Neutral
- 3.4-4.2 Satisfied
- 4.2-5.0 Very Satisfied
- Other (no responses)

2015 Auburn Citizen Survey

Shading reflects the mean rating for all respondents
by Census Block Group (merged as needed)

Q19e. Level of public involvement in local decision-making



LEGEND


Mean rating on a 5-point scale, where:

- 1.0-1.8 Very Dissatisfied
- 1.8-2.6 Dissatisfied
- 2.6-3.4 Neutral
- 3.4-4.2 Satisfied
- 4.2-5.0 Very Satisfied
- Other (no responses)

2015 Auburn Citizen Survey

Shading reflects the mean rating for all respondents by Census Block Group (merged as needed)

Q19f. Transparency of City government



LEGEND


Mean rating
on a 5-point scale, where:

- 1.0-1.8 Very Dissatisfied
- 1.8-2.6 Dissatisfied
- 2.6-3.4 Neutral
- 3.4-4.2 Satisfied
- 4.2-5.0 Very Satisfied
- Other (no responses)

2015 Auburn Citizen Survey

Shading reflects the mean rating for all respondents
by Census Block Group (merged as needed)

Q19g. Quality of City's phone system



LEGEND

Mean rating
on a 5-point scale, where:


- 1.0-1.8 Very Dissatisfied
- 1.8-2.6 Dissatisfied
- 2.6-3.4 Neutral
- 3.4-4.2 Satisfied
- 4.2-5.0 Very Satisfied
- Other (no responses)



2015 Auburn Citizen Survey

Shading reflects the mean rating for all respondents
by Census Block Group (merged as needed)

Q22a. Quality of new residential development



LEGEND

Mean rating
on a 5-point scale, where:


- 1.0-1.8 Very Dissatisfied
- 1.8-2.6 Dissatisfied
- 2.6-3.4 Neutral
- 3.4-4.2 Satisfied
- 4.2-5.0 Very Satisfied
- Other (no responses)



2015 Auburn Citizen Survey

Shading reflects the mean rating for all respondents
by Census Block Group (merged as needed)

Q22b. City's building permit/renew process



LEGEND


Mean rating
on a 5-point scale, where:

- 1.0-1.8 Very Dissatisfied
- 1.8-2.6 Dissatisfied
- 2.6-3.4 Neutral
- 3.4-4.2 Satisfied
- 4.2-5.0 Very Satisfied
- Other (no responses)

2015 Auburn Citizen Survey

Shading reflects the mean rating for all respondents
by Census Block Group (merged as needed)

Q22c. Overall quality of new retail development



LEGEND


Mean rating
on a 5-point scale, where:

- 1.0-1.8 Very Dissatisfied
- 1.8-2.6 Dissatisfied
- 2.6-3.4 Neutral
- 3.4-4.2 Satisfied
- 4.2-5.0 Very Satisfied
- Other (no responses)

2015 Auburn Citizen Survey

Shading reflects the mean rating for all respondents
by Census Block Group (merged as needed)

Q22d. Overall quality of new business development



LEGEND


Mean rating
on a 5-point scale, where:

- 1.0-1.8 Very Dissatisfied
- 1.8-2.6 Dissatisfied
- 2.6-3.4 Neutral
- 3.4-4.2 Satisfied
- 4.2-5.0 Very Satisfied
- Other (no responses)

2015 Auburn Citizen Survey

Shading reflects the mean rating for all respondents
by Census Block Group (merged as needed)

Q22e. Quality of new airport industrial development



LEGEND


Mean rating
on a 5-point scale, where:

- 1.0-1.8 Very Dissatisfied
- 1.8-2.6 Dissatisfied
- 2.6-3.4 Neutral
- 3.4-4.2 Satisfied
- 4.2-5.0 Very Satisfied
- Other (no responses)

2015 Auburn Citizen Survey

Shading reflects the mean rating for all respondents
by Census Block Group (merged as needed)

Q22f. Redevelopment of abandoned/under-utilized properties



LEGEND


Mean rating on a 5-point scale, where:

- 1.0-1.8 Very Dissatisfied
- 1.8-2.6 Dissatisfied
- 2.6-3.4 Neutral
- 3.4-4.2 Satisfied
- 4.2-5.0 Very Satisfied
- Other (no responses)

2015 Auburn Citizen Survey

Shading reflects the mean rating for all respondents by Census Block Group (merged as needed)

Q22g. Appearance of Lincoln Highway & High Street



LEGEND

Mean rating
on a 5-point scale, where:


- 1.0-1.8 Very Dissatisfied
- 1.8-2.6 Dissatisfied
- 2.6-3.4 Neutral
- 3.4-4.2 Satisfied
- 4.2-5.0 Very Satisfied
- Other (no responses)



2015 Auburn Citizen Survey

Shading reflects the mean rating for all respondents
by Census Block Group (merged as needed)

Q22h. Appearance of Downtown Auburn



LEGEND


Mean rating
on a 5-point scale, where:

-  1.0-1.8 Very Dissatisfied
-  1.8-2.6 Dissatisfied
-  2.6-3.4 Neutral
-  3.4-4.2 Satisfied
-  4.2-5.0 Very Satisfied
-  Other (no responses)

2015 Auburn Citizen Survey

Shading reflects the mean rating for all respondents
by Census Block Group (merged as needed)

Q22i. Appearance of Old Town Auburn



LEGEND

Mean rating
on a 5-point scale, where:


- 1.0-1.8 Very Dissatisfied
- 1.8-2.6 Dissatisfied
- 2.6-3.4 Neutral
- 3.4-4.2 Satisfied
- 4.2-5.0 Very Satisfied
- Other (no responses)



2015 Auburn Citizen Survey

Shading reflects the mean rating for all respondents
by Census Block Group (merged as needed)

Q22j. Appearance of Highway 49 North



LEGEND

Mean rating
on a 5-point scale, where:


- 1.0-1.8 Very Dissatisfied
- 1.8-2.6 Dissatisfied
- 2.6-3.4 Neutral
- 3.4-4.2 Satisfied
- 4.2-5.0 Very Satisfied
- Other (no responses)



2015 Auburn Citizen Survey

Shading reflects the mean rating for all respondents
by Census Block Group (merged as needed)

Q22k. City planning for future growth



LEGEND


Mean rating
on a 5-point scale, where:

- 1.0-1.8 Very Dissatisfied
- 1.8-2.6 Dissatisfied
- 2.6-3.4 Neutral
- 3.4-4.2 Satisfied
- 4.2-5.0 Very Satisfied
- Other (no responses)

2015 Auburn Citizen Survey

Shading reflects the mean rating for all respondents
by Census Block Group (merged as needed)

Q24a. Bus stop locations & their convenience



LEGEND


Mean rating
on a 5-point scale, where:

- 1.0-1.8 Very Dissatisfied
- 1.8-2.6 Dissatisfied
- 2.6-3.4 Neutral
- 3.4-4.2 Satisfied
- 4.2-5.0 Very Satisfied
- Other (no responses)

2015 Auburn Citizen Survey

Shading reflects the mean rating for all respondents
by Census Block Group (merged as needed)

Q24b. Hours of operation



LEGEND


Mean rating
on a 5-point scale, where:

- 1.0-1.8 Very Dissatisfied
- 1.8-2.6 Dissatisfied
- 2.6-3.4 Neutral
- 3.4-4.2 Satisfied
- 4.2-5.0 Very Satisfied
- Other (no responses)

2015 Auburn Citizen Survey

Shading reflects the mean rating for all respondents
by Census Block Group (merged as needed)

Q24c. Overall friendliness & service of drivers



LEGEND

Mean rating on a 5-point scale, where:


- 1.0-1.8 Very Dissatisfied
- 1.8-2.6 Dissatisfied
- 2.6-3.4 Neutral
- 3.4-4.2 Satisfied
- 4.2-5.0 Very Satisfied
- Other (no responses)



2015 Auburn Citizen Survey

Shading reflects the mean rating for all respondents by Census Block Group (merged as needed)

Q24d. Cleanliness & comfort of vehicles



LEGEND


Mean rating
on a 5-point scale, where:

- 1.0-1.8 Very Dissatisfied
- 1.8-2.6 Dissatisfied
- 2.6-3.4 Neutral
- 3.4-4.2 Satisfied
- 4.2-5.0 Very Satisfied
- Other (no responses)

2015 Auburn Citizen Survey

Shading reflects the mean rating for all respondents
by Census Block Group (merged as needed)

Q24e. Overall value of the program



LEGEND

Mean rating
on a 5-point scale, where:


- 1.0-1.8 Very Dissatisfied
- 1.8-2.6 Dissatisfied
- 2.6-3.4 Neutral
- 3.4-4.2 Satisfied
- 4.2-5.0 Very Satisfied
- Other (no responses)



2015 Auburn Citizen Survey

Shading reflects the mean rating for all respondents
by Census Block Group (merged as needed)

Q24f. Transit fees for services



LEGEND


Mean rating
on a 5-point scale, where:

- 1.0-1.8 Very Dissatisfied
- 1.8-2.6 Dissatisfied
- 2.6-3.4 Neutral
- 3.4-4.2 Satisfied
- 4.2-5.0 Very Satisfied
- Other (no responses)

2015 Auburn Citizen Survey

Shading reflects the mean rating for all respondents
by Census Block Group (merged as needed)

Q26a. Ensuring that affordable housing is available



LEGEND

Mean rating on a 5-point scale, where:


-  1.0-1.8 Very Low Priority
-  1.8-2.6 Low Priority
-  2.6-3.4 Medium Priority
-  3.4-4.2 High Priority
-  4.2-5.0 Very High Priority
-  Other (no responses)



2015 Auburn Citizen Survey

Shading reflects the mean rating for all respondents by Census Block Group (merged as needed)

Q26b. Improving City streets & sidewalks



LEGEND

Mean rating on a 5-point scale, where:


- 1.0-1.8 Very Low Priority
- 1.8-2.6 Low Priority
- 2.6-3.4 Medium Priority
- 3.4-4.2 High Priority
- 4.2-5.0 Very High Priority
- Other (no responses)



2015 Auburn Citizen Survey

Shading reflects the mean rating for all respondents by Census Block Group (merged as needed)

Q26c. Adding biking lanes & trails



LEGEND

Mean rating on a 5-point scale, where:


- 1.0-1.8 Very Low Priority
- 1.8-2.6 Low Priority
- 2.6-3.4 Medium Priority
- 3.4-4.2 High Priority
- 4.2-5.0 Very High Priority
- Other (no responses)



2015 Auburn Citizen Survey

Shading reflects the mean rating for all respondents by Census Block Group (merged as needed)

Q26d. Managing stormwater runoff



LEGEND

Mean rating on a 5-point scale, where:


- 1.0-1.8 Very Low Priority
- 1.8-2.6 Low Priority
- 2.6-3.4 Medium Priority
- 3.4-4.2 High Priority
- 4.2-5.0 Very High Priority
- Other (no responses)



2015 Auburn Citizen Survey

Shading reflects the mean rating for all respondents by Census Block Group (merged as needed)

Q26e. Promoting economic development/job creation



LEGEND

Mean rating on a 5-point scale, where:


- 1.0-1.8 Very Low Priority
- 1.8-2.6 Low Priority
- 2.6-3.4 Medium Priority
- 3.4-4.2 High Priority
- 4.2-5.0 Very High Priority
- Other (no responses)



2015 Auburn Citizen Survey

Shading reflects the mean rating for all respondents by Census Block Group (merged as needed)

Q26f. Preserving green space to ensure some areas of the City are not developed



LEGEND

Mean rating on a 5-point scale, where:


- 1.0-1.8 Very Low Priority
- 1.8-2.6 Low Priority
- 2.6-3.4 Medium Priority
- 3.4-4.2 High Priority
- 4.2-5.0 Very High Priority
- Other (no responses)



2015 Auburn Citizen Survey

Shading reflects the mean rating for all respondents by Census Block Group (merged as needed)

Q26g. Protecting residents & businesses from crime



LEGEND

Mean rating on a 5-point scale, where:


-  1.0-1.8 Very Low Priority
-  1.8-2.6 Low Priority
-  2.6-3.4 Medium Priority
-  3.4-4.2 High Priority
-  4.2-5.0 Very High Priority
-  Other (no responses)



2015 Auburn Citizen Survey

Shading reflects the mean rating for all respondents by Census Block Group (merged as needed)

Q26h. Preserving/protecting the environment



LEGEND

Mean rating on a 5-point scale, where:


- 1.0-1.8 Very Low Priority
- 1.8-2.6 Low Priority
- 2.6-3.4 Medium Priority
- 3.4-4.2 High Priority
- 4.2-5.0 Very High Priority
- Other (no responses)



2015 Auburn Citizen Survey

Shading reflects the mean rating for all respondents by Census Block Group (merged as needed)

Q26i. Expanding public transportation (bus) services



LEGEND

Mean rating on a 5-point scale, where:


- 1.0-1.8 Very Low Priority
- 1.8-2.6 Low Priority
- 2.6-3.4 Medium Priority
- 3.4-4.2 High Priority
- 4.2-5.0 Very High Priority
- Other (no responses)



2015 Auburn Citizen Survey

Shading reflects the mean rating for all respondents by Census Block Group (merged as needed)

Q26j. Historic preservation efforts



LEGEND


Mean rating on a 5-point scale, where:

-  1.0-1.8 Very Low Priority
-  1.8-2.6 Low Priority
-  2.6-3.4 Medium Priority
-  3.4-4.2 High Priority
-  4.2-5.0 Very High Priority
-  Other (no responses)

2015 Auburn Citizen Survey

Shading reflects the mean rating for all respondents by Census Block Group (merged as needed)

Q26k. Maintaining a balanced City budget



LEGEND

Mean rating on a 5-point scale, where:


- 1.0-1.8 Very Low Priority
- 1.8-2.6 Low Priority
- 2.6-3.4 Medium Priority
- 3.4-4.2 High Priority
- 4.2-5.0 Very High Priority
- Other (no responses)



2015 Auburn Citizen Survey

Shading reflects the mean rating for all respondents by Census Block Group (merged as needed)

Q26l. Efforts to address homelessness



LEGEND

Mean rating on a 5-point scale, where:


- 1.0-1.8 Very Low Priority
- 1.8-2.6 Low Priority
- 2.6-3.4 Medium Priority
- 3.4-4.2 High Priority
- 4.2-5.0 Very High Priority
- Other (no responses)



2015 Auburn Citizen Survey

Shading reflects the mean rating for all respondents by Census Block Group (merged as needed)

Q26m. Hiring and retaining qualified City employees



LEGEND

Mean rating on a 5-point scale, where:


- 1.0-1.8 Very Low Priority
- 1.8-2.6 Low Priority
- 2.6-3.4 Medium Priority
- 3.4-4.2 High Priority
- 4.2-5.0 Very High Priority
- Other (no responses)



2015 Auburn Citizen Survey

Shading reflects the mean rating for all respondents by Census Block Group (merged as needed)

Q26n. Improving the overall quality of City services



LEGEND

Mean rating on a 5-point scale, where:


- 1.0-1.8 Very Low Priority
- 1.8-2.6 Low Priority
- 2.6-3.4 Medium Priority
- 3.4-4.2 High Priority
- 4.2-5.0 Very High Priority
- Other (no responses)



2015 Auburn Citizen Survey

Shading reflects the mean rating for all respondents by Census Block Group (merged as needed)

Q260. Improving how the City plans for growth



LEGEND

Mean rating on a 5-point scale, where:


- 1.0-1.8 Very Low Priority
- 1.8-2.6 Low Priority
- 2.6-3.4 Medium Priority
- 3.4-4.2 High Priority
- 4.2-5.0 Very High Priority
- Other (no responses)



2015 Auburn Citizen Survey

Shading reflects the mean rating for all respondents by Census Block Group (merged as needed)

Q26p. Improving the City's overall quality of life



LEGEND

Mean rating on a 5-point scale, where:


- 1.0-1.8 Very Low Priority
- 1.8-2.6 Low Priority
- 2.6-3.4 Medium Priority
- 3.4-4.2 High Priority
- 4.2-5.0 Very High Priority
- Other (no responses)



2015 Auburn Citizen Survey

Shading reflects the mean rating for all respondents by Census Block Group (merged as needed)

Q26q. Promotion of arts & culture in Auburn



LEGEND

Mean rating on a 5-point scale, where:


- 1.0-1.8 Very Low Priority
- 1.8-2.6 Low Priority
- 2.6-3.4 Medium Priority
- 3.4-4.2 High Priority
- 4.2-5.0 Very High Priority
- Other (no responses)



2015 Auburn Citizen Survey

Shading reflects the mean rating for all respondents by Census Block Group (merged as needed)

Q26r. Promotion of tourism in Auburn



LEGEND

Mean rating on a 5-point scale, where:

- 1.0-1.8 Very Low Priority
- 1.8-2.6 Low Priority
- 2.6-3.4 Medium Priority
- 3.4-4.2 High Priority
- 4.2-5.0 Very High Priority
- Other (no responses)



2015 Auburn Citizen Survey

Shading reflects the mean rating for all respondents by Census Block Group (merged as needed)

Section 5:
Tabular Data

Q1. MAJOR CATEGORIES OF CITY SERVICES. Please rate your overall satisfaction with major categories of services on a scale of 1 to 5 where 5 means "Very Satisfied" and 1 means "Very Dissatisfied."

(N=431)

	Very Satisfied	Satisfied	Neutral	Dissatisfied	Very Dissatisfied	Don't Know
A. Quality of fire services	34.3%	34.3%	9.5%	1.6%	1.4%	18.8%
B. Quality of police services	31.1%	38.1%	13.0%	5.3%	1.9%	10.7%
C. Quality of ambulance services	22.5%	27.8%	13.2%	1.6%	0.5%	34.3%
D. Quality of parks & recreation services	26.2%	49.2%	13.7%	3.5%	0.7%	6.7%
E. Quality of the city's customer service	15.8%	33.4%	16.9%	6.7%	1.6%	25.5%
F. Maintenance of city streets and infrastructure	7.4%	31.3%	22.3%	21.8%	12.1%	5.1%
G. Enforcement of city codes and ordinances	9.7%	25.3%	26.5%	7.9%	4.6%	26.0%
H. Flow of traffic & congestion management	8.8%	33.2%	29.7%	16.7%	7.4%	4.2%
I. Management of stormwater	11.6%	40.4%	27.6%	4.6%	2.3%	13.5%
J. Effectiveness of city's communication with public	9.5%	33.9%	30.2%	10.2%	4.9%	11.4%
K. Quality of community development programs	6.0%	24.6%	35.5%	6.7%	3.2%	23.9%

WITHOUT DON'T KNOWS

Q1. MAJOR CATEGORIES OF CITY SERVICES. Please rate your overall satisfaction with major categories of services on a scale of 1 to 5 where 5 means "Very Satisfied" and 1 means "Very Dissatisfied." (Without "Don't Know")

(N=431)

	Very Satisfied	Satisfied	Neutral	Dissatisfied	Very Dissatisfied
A. Quality of fire services	42.3%	42.3%	11.7%	2.0%	1.7%
B. Quality of police services	34.8%	42.6%	14.5%	6.0%	2.1%
C. Quality of ambulance services	34.3%	42.4%	20.1%	2.5%	0.7%
D. Quality of parks & recreation services	28.1%	52.7%	14.7%	3.7%	0.7%
E. Quality of the city's customer service	21.2%	44.9%	22.7%	9.0%	2.2%
F. Maintenance of city streets and infrastructure	7.8%	33.0%	23.5%	23.0%	12.7%
G. Enforcement of city codes and ordinances	13.2%	34.2%	35.7%	10.7%	6.3%
H. Flow of traffic & congestion management	9.2%	34.6%	31.0%	17.4%	7.7%
I. Management of stormwater	13.4%	46.6%	31.9%	5.4%	2.7%
J. Effectiveness of city's communication with public	10.7%	38.2%	34.0%	11.5%	5.5%
K. Quality of community development programs	7.9%	32.3%	46.6%	8.8%	4.3%

Q2. Which THREE of the MAJOR CATEGORIES OF CITY SERVICES do you think should receive the most emphasis from city leaders over the next TWO Years?

Q2. Most Emphasis	Number	Percent
Quality of fire services	56	13.0 %
Quality of police services	78	18.1 %
Quality of ambulance services	4	0.9 %
Quality of parks & recreation services	20	4.6 %
Quality of the city's customer service	5	1.2 %
Maintenance of city streets and infrastructure	143	33.2 %
Enforcement of city codes and ordinances	13	3.0 %
Flow of traffic & congestion management	50	11.6 %
Management of stormwater	4	0.9 %
Effectiveness of city's communication with public	14	3.2 %
Quality of community development programs	13	3.0 %
None chosen	31	7.2 %
Total	431	100.0 %

Q2. Which THREE of the MAJOR CATEGORIES OF CITY SERVICES do you think should receive the most emphasis from city leaders over the next TWO Years?

Q2. 2nd Emphasis	Number	Percent
Quality of fire services	40	9.3 %
Quality of police services	62	14.4 %
Quality of ambulance services	4	0.9 %
Quality of parks & recreation services	41	9.5 %
Quality of the city's customer service	8	1.9 %
Maintenance of city streets and infrastructure	78	18.1 %
Enforcement of city codes and ordinances	24	5.6 %
Flow of traffic & congestion management	64	14.8 %
Management of stormwater	20	4.6 %
Effectiveness of city's communication with public	18	4.2 %
Quality of community development programs	25	5.8 %
None chosen	47	10.9 %
Total	431	100.0 %

Q2. Which THREE of the MAJOR CATEGORIES OF CITY SERVICES do you think should receive the most emphasis from city leaders over the next TWO Years?

Q2. 3rd Emphasis	Number	Percent
Quality of fire services	22	5.1 %
Quality of police services	26	6.0 %
Quality of ambulance services	19	4.4 %
Quality of parks & recreation services	48	11.1 %
Quality of the city's customer service	16	3.7 %
Maintenance of city streets and infrastructure	51	11.8 %
Enforcement of city codes and ordinances	26	6.0 %
Flow of traffic & congestion management	46	10.7 %
Management of stormwater	18	4.2 %
Effectiveness of city's communication with public	49	11.4 %
Quality of community development programs	43	10.0 %
None chosen	67	15.5 %
Total	431	100.0 %

Q2. Sum of the top THREE MAJOR CATEGORIES OF CITY SERVICES you think should receive the most emphasis from city leaders over the next TWO Years

Q2. Sum of Top 3 Choices	Number	Percent
Maintenance of city streets and infrastructure	272	63.1 %
Quality of police services	166	38.5 %
Flow of traffic & congestion management	160	37.1 %
Quality of fire services	118	27.4 %
Quality of parks & recreation services	109	25.3 %
Effectiveness of city's communication with public	81	18.8 %
Quality of community development programs	81	18.8 %
Enforcement of city codes and ordinances	63	14.6 %
Management of stormwater	42	9.7 %
Quality of the city's customer service	29	6.7 %
Quality of ambulance services	27	6.3 %
None chosen	31	7.2 %
Total	1179	

Q3. PERCEPTIONS OF THE CITY. Several items that may influence your perception of the City of Auburn are listed below. Please rate your satisfaction with each item on a scale of 1 to 5, where 5 means "Very Satisfied" and 1 means "Very Dissatisfied."

(N=431)

	Very Satisfied	Satisfied	Neutral	Dissatisfied	Very Dissatisfied	Don't Know
A. The value that you receive for your city tax dollars and fees	7.0%	34.3%	34.6%	12.3%	4.9%	7.0%
B. Image of the city	22.5%	48.5%	17.9%	8.4%	1.4%	1.4%
C. Quality of life in the city	33.2%	47.6%	12.3%	5.1%	0.2%	1.6%
D. Appearance of the city	20.0%	46.2%	20.4%	9.3%	2.3%	1.9%
E. Overall quality of city services	13.0%	44.1%	28.5%	6.7%	0.7%	7.0%
F. Public schools in Auburn	13.2%	33.6%	22.5%	6.7%	2.3%	21.6%
G. Hospitals and medical services in Auburn	17.6%	37.8%	24.1%	6.7%	2.8%	10.9%

WITHOUT DON'T KNOWS

Q3. PERCEPTIONS OF THE CITY. Several items that may influence your perception of the City of Auburn are listed below. Please rate your satisfaction with each item on a scale of 1 to 5, where 5 means "Very Satisfied" and 1 means "Very Dissatisfied."(Without "Don't Know")

(N=431)

	Very Satisfied	Satisfied	Neutral	Dissatisfied	Very Dissatisfied
A. The value that you receive for your city tax dollars and fees	7.5%	36.9%	37.2%	13.2%	5.2%
B. Image of the city	22.8%	49.2%	18.1%	8.5%	1.4%
C. Quality of life in the city	33.7%	48.3%	12.5%	5.2%	0.2%
D. Appearance of the city	20.3%	47.0%	20.8%	9.5%	2.4%
E. Overall quality of city services	14.0%	47.4%	30.7%	7.2%	0.7%
F. Public schools in Auburn	16.9%	42.9%	28.7%	8.6%	3.0%
G. Hospitals and medical services in Auburn	19.8%	42.4%	27.1%	7.6%	3.1%

Q4. Please rate Auburn on a scale of 1 to 5, where 5 means "Excellent" and 1 means "Poor" with regard to each of the following:

(N=431)

	Excellent	Good	Neutral	Below Average	Poor	Don't Know
A. As a place to live	52.9%	40.6%	4.9%	0.9%	0.2%	0.5%
B. As a place to raise children	40.4%	40.1%	7.9%	2.1%	0.5%	9.0%
C. As a place to work	23.7%	28.8%	20.9%	9.5%	3.2%	13.9%
D. As a place to retire	37.4%	39.2%	11.4%	4.2%	0.7%	7.2%

WITHOUT DON'T KNOWS

Q4. Please rate Auburn on a scale of 1 to 5, where 5 means "Excellent" and 1 means "Poor" with regard to each of the following:(Without "Don't Know")

(N=431)

	Excellent	Good	Neutral	Below Average	Poor
A. As a place to live	53.1%	40.8%	4.9%	0.9%	0.2%
B. As a place to raise children	44.4%	44.1%	8.7%	2.3%	0.5%
C. As a place to work	27.5%	33.4%	24.3%	11.1%	3.8%
D. As a place to retire	40.3%	42.3%	12.3%	4.5%	0.8%

Q5. CITY LEADERSHIP. Please rate your satisfaction on a scale of 1 to 5, where 5 means "Very Satisfied" and 1 means "Very Dissatisfied," with the following:

(N=431)

	Very Satisfied	Satisfied	Neutral	Dissatisfied	Very Dissatisfied	Don't Know
A. Overall quality of leadership provided by the city's elected officials	4.9%	33.4%	30.4%	11.1%	4.4%	15.8%
B. Overall effectiveness of appointed boards and commissions	3.5%	26.5%	35.0%	9.5%	3.9%	21.6%
C. Overall effectiveness of City Management	4.4%	31.8%	32.7%	9.7%	3.5%	17.9%

WITHOUT DON'T KNOWS

Q5. CITY LEADERSHIP. Please rate your satisfaction on a scale of 1 to 5, where 5 means "Very Satisfied" and 1 means "Very Dissatisfied," with the following:(Without "Don't Know")

(N=431)

	Very Satisfied	Satisfied	Neutral	Dissatisfied	Very Dissatisfied
A. Overall quality of leadership provided by the city's elected officials	5.8%	39.7%	36.1%	13.2%	5.2%
B. Overall effectiveness of appointed boards and commissions	4.4%	33.7%	44.7%	12.1%	5.0%
C. Overall effectiveness of City Management	5.4%	38.7%	39.8%	11.9%	4.2%

Q6. POLICE SERVICES. Please rate your satisfaction on a scale of 1 to 5, where 5 means "Very Satisfied" and 1 means "Very Dissatisfied," with the following police services provided by the City of Auburn:

(N=431)

	Very Satisfied	Satisfied	Neutral	Dissatisfied	Very Dissatisfied	Don't Know
A. Overall quality of police services	23.7%	44.5%	17.2%	5.1%	3.0%	6.5%
B. Visibility of police in neighborhoods	12.8%	36.0%	28.3%	14.8%	3.9%	4.2%
C. Visibility of police in retail areas	12.1%	36.2%	30.2%	13.5%	2.8%	5.3%
D. Police response time	15.5%	29.0%	21.8%	3.5%	1.9%	28.3%
E. Overall appearance and quality of police vehicles and equipment	32.7%	46.6%	12.5%	2.1%	0.9%	5.1%
F. Efforts to prevent crime	15.8%	39.0%	23.7%	6.3%	1.9%	13.5%
G. Police safety education programs	10.0%	24.4%	28.1%	3.0%	0.9%	33.6%
H. Enforcement of traffic laws	13.5%	41.3%	26.0%	4.9%	3.2%	11.1%
I. Overall support to local businesses and residents (education, support, information)	15.1%	36.0%	22.5%	3.7%	0.7%	22.0%

WITHOUT DON'T KNOWS

Q6. POLICE SERVICES. Please rate your satisfaction on a scale of 1 to 5, where 5 means "Very Satisfied" and 1 means "Very Dissatisfied," with the following police services provided by the City of Auburn:(Without "Don't Know")

(N=431)

	Very Satisfied	Satisfied	Neutral	Dissatisfied	Very Dissatisfied
A. Overall quality of police services	25.3%	47.6%	18.4%	5.5%	3.2%
B. Visibility of police in neighborhoods	13.3%	37.5%	29.5%	15.5%	4.1%
C. Visibility of police in retail areas	12.7%	38.2%	31.9%	14.2%	2.9%
D. Police response time	21.7%	40.5%	30.4%	4.9%	2.6%
E. Overall appearance and quality of police vehicles and equipment	34.5%	49.1%	13.2%	2.2%	1.0%
F. Efforts to prevent crime	18.2%	45.0%	27.3%	7.2%	2.1%
G. Police safety education programs	15.0%	36.7%	42.3%	4.5%	1.4%
H. Enforcement of traffic laws	15.1%	46.5%	29.2%	5.5%	3.7%
I. Overall support to local businesses and residents (education, support, information)	19.3%	46.1%	28.9%	4.8%	0.9%

Q7. Which THREE of the POLICE SERVICES items listed above do you think should receive the most emphasis from city leaders over the next TWO Years?

<u>Q7. Most Emphasis</u>	<u>Number</u>	<u>Percent</u>
Overall quality of police services	50	11.6 %
Visibility of police in neighborhoods	98	22.7 %
Visibility of police in retail areas	29	6.7 %
Police response time	41	9.5 %
Overall appearance and quality of police vehicles and equipment	7	1.6 %
Efforts to prevent crime	78	18.1 %
Police safety education programs	21	4.9 %
Enforcement of traffic laws	22	5.1 %
Overall support to local businesses and residents (education, support, information)	34	7.9 %
<u>None chosen</u>	<u>51</u>	<u>11.8 %</u>
Total	431	100.0 %

Q7. Which THREE of the POLICE SERVICES items listed above do you think should receive the most emphasis from city leaders over the next TWO Years?

<u>Q7. 2nd Emphasis</u>	<u>Number</u>	<u>Percent</u>
Overall quality of police services	26	6.0 %
Visibility of police in neighborhoods	68	15.8 %
Visibility of police in retail areas	59	13.7 %
Police response time	49	11.4 %
Overall appearance and quality of police vehicles and equipment	4	0.9 %
Efforts to prevent crime	86	20.0 %
Police safety education programs	26	6.0 %
Enforcement of traffic laws	23	5.3 %
Overall support to local businesses and residents (education, support, information)	23	5.3 %
<u>None chosen</u>	<u>67</u>	<u>15.5 %</u>
Total	431	100.0 %

Q7. Which THREE of the POLICE SERVICES items listed above do you think should receive the most emphasis from city leaders over the next TWO Years?

<u>Q7. 3rd Emphasis</u>	<u>Number</u>	<u>Percent</u>
Overall quality of police services	25	5.8 %
Visibility of police in neighborhoods	46	10.7 %
Visibility of police in retail areas	45	10.4 %
Police response time	44	10.2 %
Overall appearance and quality of police vehicles and equipment	7	1.6 %
Efforts to prevent crime	73	16.9 %
Police safety education programs	33	7.7 %
Enforcement of traffic laws	33	7.7 %
Overall support to local businesses and residents (education, support, information)	45	10.4 %
<u>None chosen</u>	<u>80</u>	<u>18.6 %</u>
Total	431	100.0 %

Q7. Sum of the top THREE POLICE SERVICES you think should receive the most emphasis from city leaders over the next TWO Years.

<u>Q7. Sum of Top 3 Choices</u>	<u>Number</u>	<u>Percent</u>
Efforts to prevent crime	237	55.0 %
Visibility of police in neighborhoods	212	49.2 %
Police response time	134	31.1 %
Visibility of police in retail areas	133	30.9 %
Overall support to local businesses and residents (education, support, information)	102	23.7 %
Overall quality of police services	101	23.4 %
Police safety education programs	80	18.6 %
Enforcement of traffic laws	78	18.1 %
Overall appearance and quality of police vehicles and equipment	18	4.2 %
<u>None chosen</u>	<u>51</u>	<u>11.8 %</u>
Total	1146	

Q8. FIRE AND EMERGENCY MEDICAL SERVICES. Please rate your satisfaction on a scale of 1 to 5, where 5 means "Very Satisfied" and 1 means "Very Dissatisfied," with the following fire and emergency medical services provided by the City of Auburn:

(N=431)

	Very Satisfied	Satisfied	Neutral	Dissatisfied	Very Dissatisfied	Don't Know
A. Overall quality of fire protection	30.4%	39.4%	12.5%	1.2%	1.2%	15.3%
B. Fire personnel emergency response time	23.9%	31.1%	12.3%	1.2%	1.6%	29.9%
C. Quality of fire safety education programs	14.6%	23.7%	23.4%	1.6%	0.5%	36.2%
D. Overall appearance and quality of fire apparatus and equipment	32.9%	42.2%	10.9%	1.4%	0.9%	11.6%
E. Quality of local ambulance service	18.8%	25.1%	19.0%	1.4%	0.5%	35.3%
F. Quality of inspection programs provided by the Fire Department	9.7%	18.6%	21.8%	1.2%	0.9%	47.8%
G. Quality of community fire fuel reduction programs	11.1%	23.7%	22.3%	5.6%	2.1%	35.3%
H. Overall support to local businesses and residents (education, support, information)	14.8%	26.7%	23.2%	2.8%	0.7%	31.8%

WITHOUT DON'T KNOWS

Q8. FIRE AND EMERGENCY MEDICAL SERVICES. Please rate your satisfaction on a scale of 1 to 5, where 5 means "Very Satisfied" and 1 means "Very Dissatisfied," with the following fire and emergency medical services provided by the City of Auburn: (Without "Don't Know")

(N=431)

	Very Satisfied	Satisfied	Neutral	Dissatisfied	Very Dissatisfied
A. Overall quality of fire protection	35.9%	46.6%	14.8%	1.4%	1.4%
B. Fire personnel emergency response time	34.1%	44.4%	17.5%	1.7%	2.3%
C. Quality of fire safety education programs	22.9%	37.1%	36.7%	2.5%	0.7%
D. Overall appearance and quality of fire apparatus and equipment	37.3%	47.8%	12.3%	1.6%	1.0%
E. Quality of local ambulance service	29.0%	38.7%	29.4%	2.2%	0.7%
F. Quality of inspection programs provided by the Fire Department	18.7%	35.6%	41.8%	2.2%	1.8%
G. Quality of community fire fuel reduction programs	17.2%	36.6%	34.4%	8.6%	3.2%
H. Overall support to local businesses and residents (education, support, information)	21.8%	39.1%	34.0%	4.1%	1.0%

Q9. Which THREE of the FIRE AND EMERGENCY MEDICAL SERVICES items listed above do you think should receive the most emphasis from city leaders over the next TWO Years?

<u>Q9. Most Emphasis</u>	<u>Number</u>	<u>Percent</u>
Overall quality of fire protection	90	20.9 %
Fire personnel emergency response time	89	20.6 %
Quality of fire safety education programs	28	6.5 %
Overall appearance and quality of fire apparatus and equipment	6	1.4 %
Quality of local ambulance service	8	1.9 %
Quality of inspection programs provided by the Fire Department	17	3.9 %
Quality of community fire fuel reduction programs	89	20.6 %
Overall support to local businesses and residents (education, support, information)	20	4.6 %
<u>None chosen</u>	<u>84</u>	<u>19.5 %</u>
Total	431	100.0 %

Q9. Which THREE of the FIRE AND EMERGENCY MEDICAL SERVICES items listed above do you think should receive the most emphasis from city leaders over the next TWO Years?

<u>Q9. 2nd Emphasis</u>	<u>Number</u>	<u>Percent</u>
Overall quality of fire protection	38	8.8 %
Fire personnel emergency response time	73	16.9 %
Quality of fire safety education programs	36	8.4 %
Overall appearance and quality of fire apparatus and equipment	12	2.8 %
Quality of local ambulance service	53	12.3 %
Quality of inspection programs provided by the Fire Department	24	5.6 %
Quality of community fire fuel reduction programs	51	11.8 %
Overall support to local businesses and residents (education, support, information)	29	6.7 %
<u>None chosen</u>	<u>115</u>	<u>26.7 %</u>
Total	431	100.0 %

Q9. Which THREE of the FIRE AND EMERGENCY MEDICAL SERVICES items listed above do you think should receive the most emphasis from city leaders over the next TWO Years?

<u>Q9. 3rd Emphasis</u>	<u>Number</u>	<u>Percent</u>
Overall quality of fire protection	32	7.4 %
Fire personnel emergency response time	20	4.6 %
Quality of fire safety education programs	30	7.0 %
Overall appearance and quality of fire apparatus and equipment	10	2.3 %
Quality of local ambulance service	58	13.5 %
Quality of inspection programs provided by the Fire Department	40	9.3 %
Quality of community fire fuel reduction programs	48	11.1 %
Overall support to local businesses and residents (education, support, information)	57	13.2 %
<u>None chosen</u>	<u>136</u>	<u>31.6 %</u>
Total	431	100.0 %

Q9. Sum of the top THREE FIRE AND EMERGENCY MEDICAL SERVICES items you think should receive the most emphasis from city leaders over the next TWO Years.

<u>Q9. Sum of Top 3 Choices</u>	<u>Number</u>	<u>Percent</u>
Quality of community fire fuel reduction programs	188	43.6 %
Fire personnel emergency response time	182	42.2 %
Overall quality of fire protection	160	37.1 %
Quality of local ambulance service	119	27.6 %
Overall support to local businesses and residents (education, support, information)	106	24.6 %
Quality of fire safety education programs	94	21.8 %
Quality of inspection programs provided by the Fire Department	81	18.8 %
Overall appearance and quality of fire apparatus and equipment	28	6.5 %
<u>None chosen</u>	<u>84</u>	<u>19.5 %</u>
Total	1042	

Q10. FEELING OF SAFETY. Please rate your feeling of safety in the following areas using a scale of 1 to 5, where 5 means "Very Safe" and 1 means "Very Unsafe.":

(N=431)

	Very Safe	Safe	Neutral	Unsafe	Very Unsafe	Don't Know
A. In your neighborhood during the day	51.6%	40.5%	4.7%	1.9%	0.5%	0.9%
B. In your neighborhood at night	26.5%	47.3%	15.1%	9.3%	0.9%	0.9%
C. In the city's parks	10.7%	39.9%	27.4%	12.5%	0.7%	8.8%
D. Traveling by bicycle in Auburn	7.2%	27.1%	24.4%	13.5%	4.4%	23.4%
E. Traveling as a pedestrian in Auburn	13.7%	45.9%	19.3%	12.5%	3.2%	5.3%
F. Overall feeling of safety in Auburn	24.8%	56.6%	14.4%	2.3%	0.5%	1.4%
G. From large or small scale wildfire	8.6%	37.4%	29.9%	15.1%	4.9%	4.2%

WITHOUT DON'T KNOWS

Q10. FEELING OF SAFETY. Please rate your feeling of safety in the following areas using a scale of 1 to 5, where 5 means "Very Safe" and 1 means "Very Unsafe.":(Without "Don't Know")

(N=431)

	Very Safe	Safe	Neutral	Unsafe	Very Unsafe
A. In your neighborhood during the day	52.1%	40.8%	4.7%	1.9%	0.5%
B. In your neighborhood at night	26.7%	47.8%	15.2%	9.4%	0.9%
C. In the city's parks	11.7%	43.8%	30.0%	13.7%	0.8%
D. Traveling by bicycle in Auburn	9.4%	35.5%	31.8%	17.6%	5.8%
E. Traveling as a pedestrian in Auburn	14.5%	48.5%	20.3%	13.2%	3.4%
F. Overall feeling of safety in Auburn	25.2%	57.4%	14.6%	2.4%	0.5%
G. From large or small scale wildfire	9.0%	39.0%	31.2%	15.7%	5.1%

Q11. CODE ENFORCEMENT. IN YOUR NEIGHBORHOOD ONLY, please rate your satisfaction on a scale of 1 to 5, where 5 means "Very Satisfied" and 1 means "Very Dissatisfied," with the following:

(N=431)

	Very Satisfied	Satisfied	Neutral	Dissatisfied	Very Dissatisfied	Don't Know
A. Cleanup of debris/litter	25.1%	43.6%	13.5%	11.4%	2.3%	4.2%
B. Cleanup of large junk/abandoned vehicles	22.5%	39.7%	18.6%	7.9%	2.1%	9.3%
C. Cleanup of overgrown and weedy lots	15.3%	29.9%	25.5%	16.9%	6.0%	6.3%
D. Efforts to remove dilapidated structures	13.3%	27.0%	28.4%	9.8%	3.3%	18.4%
E. Enforcement of loud music	15.3%	29.7%	25.3%	5.8%	2.1%	21.8%
F. Animal control	14.8%	39.4%	23.7%	7.0%	3.7%	11.4%

WITHOUT DON'T KNOWS

Q11. CODE ENFORCEMENT. IN YOUR NEIGHBORHOOD ONLY, please rate your satisfaction on a scale of 1 to 5, where 5 means "Very Satisfied" and 1 means "Very Dissatisfied," with the following:(Without "Don't Know")

(N=431)

	Very Satisfied	Satisfied	Neutral	Dissatisfied	Very Dissatisfied
A. Cleanup of debris/litter	26.2%	45.5%	14.0%	11.9%	2.4%
B. Cleanup of large junk/abandoned vehicles	24.8%	43.7%	20.5%	8.7%	2.3%
C. Cleanup of overgrown and weedy lots	16.3%	31.9%	27.2%	18.1%	6.4%
D. Efforts to remove dilapidated structures	16.2%	33.0%	34.8%	12.0%	4.0%
E. Enforcement of loud music	19.6%	38.0%	32.3%	7.4%	2.7%
F. Animal control	16.8%	44.5%	26.7%	7.9%	4.2%

Q12. Which TWO of the CODE ENFORCEMENT items listed above do you think should receive the most emphasis from city leaders over the next TWO Years?

Q12. Most Emphasis	Number	Percent
Cleanup of debris/litter	122	28.3 %
Cleanup of large junk/abandoned vehicles	41	9.5 %
Cleanup of overgrown and weedy lots	103	23.9 %
Efforts to remove dilapidated structures	43	10.0 %
Enforcement of loud music	22	5.1 %
Animal control	39	9.0 %
None chosen	61	14.2 %
Total	431	100.0 %

Q12. Which TWO of the CODE ENFORCEMENT items listed above do you think should receive the most emphasis from city leaders over the next TWO Years?

Q12. 2nd Emphasis	Number	Percent
Cleanup of debris/litter	56	13.0 %
Cleanup of large junk/abandoned vehicles	69	16.0 %
Cleanup of overgrown and weedy lots	96	22.3 %
Efforts to remove dilapidated structures	58	13.5 %
Enforcement of loud music	18	4.2 %
Animal control	51	11.8 %
None chosen	83	19.3 %
Total	431	100.0 %

Q12. Sum of the top TWO CODE ENFORCEMENT items you think should receive the most emphasis from city leaders over the next TWO Years

Q12. Sum of Top 2 Choices	Number	Percent
Cleanup of overgrown and weedy lots	199	46.2 %
Cleanup of debris/litter	178	41.3 %
Cleanup of large junk/abandoned vehicles	110	25.5 %
Efforts to remove dilapidated structures	101	23.4 %
Animal control	90	20.9 %
Enforcement of loud music	40	9.3 %
None chosen	84	19.5 %
Total	779	

Q13. UTILITY SERVICES. Please rate your satisfaction on a scale of 1 to 5, where 5 means "Very Satisfied" and 1 means "Very Dissatisfied," with the following:

(N=431)

	Very Satisfied	Satisfied	Neutral	Dissatisfied	Very Dissatisfied	Don't Know
A. Residential garbage collection service (Recology)	50.6%	37.1%	6.5%	2.3%	1.2%	2.3%
B. Recycling at city's drop-off recycling center (Recology)	28.5%	34.6%	14.6%	4.6%	1.2%	16.5%
C. Sewer service	25.3%	42.7%	18.1%	4.4%	2.1%	7.4%
D. Water service (PCWA)	29.5%	43.6%	15.1%	6.5%	1.9%	3.5%
E. Business license process	10.0%	18.8%	14.6%	3.2%	1.6%	51.7%
F. Utility billing customer service	15.3%	41.5%	22.7%	3.2%	0.5%	16.7%

WITHOUT DON'T KNOWS

Q13. UTILITY SERVICES. Please rate your satisfaction on a scale of 1 to 5, where 5 means "Very Satisfied" and 1 means "Very Dissatisfied," with the following:(Without "Don't Know")

(N=431)

	Very Satisfied	Satisfied	Neutral	Dissatisfied	Very Dissatisfied
A. Residential garbage collection service (Recology)	51.8%	38.0%	6.7%	2.4%	1.2%
B. Recycling at city's drop-off recycling center (Recology)	34.2%	41.4%	17.5%	5.6%	1.4%
C. Sewer service	27.3%	46.1%	19.5%	4.8%	2.3%
D. Water service (PCWA)	30.5%	45.2%	15.6%	6.7%	1.9%
E. Business license process	20.7%	38.9%	30.3%	6.7%	3.4%
F. Utility billing customer service	18.4%	49.9%	27.3%	3.9%	0.6%

Q14. Which TWO of the UTILITY SERVICES listed above do you think should receive the most emphasis from city leaders over the next TWO Years?

Q14. Most Emphasis	Number	Percent
Residential garbage collection service (Recology)	49	11.4 %
Recycling at city's drop-off recycling center (Recology)	70	16.2 %
Sewer service	85	19.7 %
Water service (PCWA)	102	23.7 %
Business license process	15	3.5 %
Utility billing customer service	17	3.9 %
None chosen	93	21.6 %
Total	431	100.0 %

Q14. Which TWO of the UTILITY SERVICES listed above do you think should receive the most emphasis from city leaders over the next TWO Years?

Q14. 2nd Emphasis	Number	Percent
Residential garbage collection service (Recology)	38	8.8 %
Recycling at city's drop-off recycling center (Recology)	60	13.9 %
Sewer service	70	16.2 %
Water service (PCWA)	84	19.5 %
Business license process	17	3.9 %
Utility billing customer service	18	4.2 %
None chosen	144	33.4 %
Total	431	100.0 %

Q14. Sum of the top TWO UTILITY SERVICES you think should receive the most emphasis from city leaders over the next TWO Years

Q14. Sum of Top 2 Choices	Number	Percent
Water service (PCWA)	186	43.2 %
Sewer service	155	36.0 %
Recycling at city's drop-off recycling center (Recology)	130	30.2 %
Residential garbage collection service (Recology)	87	20.2 %
Utility billing customer service	35	8.1 %
Business license process	32	7.4 %
None chosen	93	21.6 %
Total	718	

Q15. MAINTENANCE. Excluding areas maintained by the City of Auburn, please rate your satisfaction on a scale of 1 to 5, where 5 means "Very Satisfied" and 1 means "Very Dissatisfied," with the following:

(N=431)

	Very Satisfied	Satisfied	Neutral	Dissatisfied	Very Dissatisfied	Don't Know
A. Maintenance of streets	7.2%	34.6%	17.9%	24.1%	12.8%	3.5%
B. Maintenance of sidewalks	7.7%	26.7%	24.1%	24.1%	12.8%	4.6%
C. Maintenance of street signs	12.3%	50.3%	24.8%	6.7%	1.2%	4.6%
D. Maintenance of traffic signals	13.9%	50.3%	20.9%	8.1%	2.3%	4.4%
E. Maintenance of the City's retail areas	12.3%	48.3%	25.1%	7.9%	1.4%	5.1%
F. Cleanup of debris/litter in and near roadways	9.5%	41.1%	26.9%	14.8%	2.6%	5.1%
G. Maintenance of city-owned buildings	11.8%	51.3%	22.3%	3.2%	0.9%	10.4%
H. Mowing/trimming along streets and public areas	13.2%	46.9%	23.4%	10.2%	1.4%	4.9%
I. Overall cleanliness of streets and public areas	12.8%	49.0%	23.4%	9.7%	1.4%	3.7%
J. Adequacy of city street lighting	7.2%	42.0%	25.3%	16.9%	4.6%	3.9%

WITHOUT DON'T KNOWS

Q15. MAINTENANCE. Excluding areas maintained by the City of Auburn, please rate your satisfaction on a scale of 1 to 5, where 5 means "Very Satisfied" and 1 means "Very Dissatisfied," with the following:(Without "Don't Know")

(N=431)

	Very Satisfied	Satisfied	Neutral	Dissatisfied	Very Dissatisfied
A. Maintenance of streets	7.5%	35.8%	18.5%	25.0%	13.2%
B. Maintenance of sidewalks	8.0%	28.0%	25.3%	25.3%	13.4%
C. Maintenance of street signs	12.9%	52.8%	26.0%	7.1%	1.2%
D. Maintenance of traffic signals	14.6%	52.7%	21.8%	8.5%	2.4%
E. Maintenance of the City's retail areas	13.0%	50.9%	26.4%	8.3%	1.5%
F. Cleanup of debris/litter in and near roadways	10.0%	43.3%	28.4%	15.6%	2.7%
G. Maintenance of city-owned buildings	13.2%	57.3%	24.9%	3.6%	1.0%
H. Mowing/trimming along streets and public areas	13.9%	49.3%	24.6%	10.7%	1.5%
I. Overall cleanliness of streets and public areas	13.3%	50.8%	24.3%	10.1%	1.4%
J. Adequacy of city street lighting	7.5%	43.7%	26.3%	17.6%	4.8%

Q16. Which THREE of the areas of MAINTENANCE listed above do you think should receive the most emphasis from city leaders over the next TWO Years?

<u>Q16. Most Emphasis</u>	<u>Number</u>	<u>Percent</u>
Maintenance of streets	182	42.2 %
Maintenance of sidewalks	46	10.7 %
Maintenance of street signs	3	0.7 %
Maintenance of traffic signals	17	3.9 %
Maintenance of the City's retail areas	12	2.8 %
Cleanup of debris/litter in and near roadways	26	6.0 %
Maintenance of city-owned buildings	2	0.5 %
Mowing/trimming along streets and public areas	8	1.9 %
Overall cleanliness of streets and public areas	13	3.0 %
Adequacy of city street lighting	60	13.9 %
<u>None chosen</u>	<u>62</u>	<u>14.4 %</u>
Total	431	100.0 %

Q16. Which THREE of the areas of MAINTENANCE listed above do you think should receive the most emphasis from city leaders over the next TWO Years?

<u>Q16. 2nd Emphasis</u>	<u>Number</u>	<u>Percent</u>
Maintenance of streets	58	13.5 %
Maintenance of sidewalks	107	24.8 %
Maintenance of street signs	6	1.4 %
Maintenance of traffic signals	19	4.4 %
Maintenance of the City's retail areas	20	4.6 %
Cleanup of debris/litter in and near roadways	42	9.7 %
Maintenance of city-owned buildings	8	1.9 %
Mowing/trimming along streets and public areas	19	4.4 %
Overall cleanliness of streets and public areas	32	7.4 %
Adequacy of city street lighting	36	8.4 %
<u>None chosen</u>	<u>84</u>	<u>19.5 %</u>
Total	431	100.0 %

Q16. Which THREE of the areas of MAINTENANCE listed above do you think should receive the most emphasis from city leaders over the next TWO Years?

<u>Q16. 3rd Emphasis</u>	<u>Number</u>	<u>Percent</u>
Maintenance of streets	17	3.9 %
Maintenance of sidewalks	46	10.7 %
Maintenance of street signs	10	2.3 %
Maintenance of traffic signals	21	4.9 %
Maintenance of the City's retail areas	26	6.0 %
Cleanup of debris/litter in and near roadways	60	13.9 %
Maintenance of city-owned buildings	6	1.4 %
Mowing/trimming along streets and public areas	27	6.3 %
Overall cleanliness of streets and public areas	42	9.7 %
Adequacy of city street lighting	61	14.2 %
<u>None chosen</u>	<u>115</u>	<u>26.7 %</u>
Total	431	100.0 %

Q16. Sum of the top THREE areas of MAINTENANCE you think should receive the most emphasis from city leaders over the next TWO Years

<u>Q16. Sum of Top 3 Choices</u>	<u>Number</u>	<u>Percent</u>
Maintenance of streets	257	59.6 %
Maintenance of sidewalks	199	46.2 %
Adequacy of city street lighting	157	36.4 %
Cleanup of debris/litter in and near roadways	128	29.7 %
Overall cleanliness of streets and public areas	87	20.2 %
Maintenance of the City's retail areas	58	13.5 %
Maintenance of traffic signals	57	13.2 %
Mowing/trimming along streets and public areas	54	12.5 %
Maintenance of street signs	19	4.4 %
Maintenance of city-owned buildings	16	3.7 %
<u>None chosen</u>	<u>62</u>	<u>14.4 %</u>
Total	1094	

Q17. TRAFFIC FLOW & TRANSPORTATION. For each of the following, please rate your satisfaction on a scale of 1 to 5, where 5 means "Very Satisfied" and 1 means "Very Dissatisfied."

(N=431)

	Very Satisfied	Satisfied	Neutral	Dissatisfied	Very Dissatisfied	Don't Know
A. Ease of travel by car in Auburn	16.5%	50.1%	18.1%	12.5%	2.1%	0.7%
B. Ease of travel by bicycle in Auburn	7.0%	20.2%	22.5%	15.5%	6.0%	28.8%
C. Ease of pedestrian travel in Auburn	13.7%	37.8%	23.9%	15.3%	3.9%	5.3%

WITHOUT DON'T KNOWS

Q17. TRAFFIC FLOW & TRANSPORTATION. For each of the following, please rate your satisfaction on a scale of 1 to 5, where 5 means "Very Satisfied" and 1 means "Very Dissatisfied." (Without "Don't Know")

(N=431)

	Very Satisfied	Satisfied	Neutral	Dissatisfied	Very Dissatisfied
A. Ease of travel by car in Auburn	16.6%	50.5%	18.2%	12.6%	2.1%
B. Ease of travel by bicycle in Auburn	9.8%	28.3%	31.6%	21.8%	8.5%
C. Ease of pedestrian travel in Auburn	14.5%	40.0%	25.2%	16.2%	4.2%

Q18. PARKS AND RECREATION. Please rate your satisfaction on a scale of 1 to 5, where 5 means "Very Satisfied" and 1 means "Very Dissatisfied," with the following:

(N=431)

	Very Satisfied	Satisfied	Neutral	Dissatisfied	Very Dissatisfied	Don't Know
A. Maintenance of parks	23.9%	55.0%	12.1%	3.0%	0.5%	5.6%
B. Maintenance of walking trails	18.8%	45.7%	16.7%	4.9%	0.5%	13.5%
C. Maintenance of biking paths and lanes	12.8%	32.5%	20.9%	10.2%	3.2%	20.4%
D. Quality of special events offered by the City	24.4%	39.4%	18.6%	5.8%	0.7%	11.1%

WITHOUT DON'T KNOWS

Q18. PARKS AND RECREATION. Please rate your satisfaction on a scale of 1 to 5, where 5 means "Very Satisfied" and 1 means "Very Dissatisfied," with the following:(Without "Don't Know")

(N=431)

	Very Satisfied	Satisfied	Neutral	Dissatisfied	Very Dissatisfied
A. Maintenance of parks	25.3%	58.2%	12.8%	3.2%	0.5%
B. Maintenance of walking trails	21.7%	52.8%	19.3%	5.6%	0.5%
C. Maintenance of biking paths and lanes	16.0%	40.8%	26.2%	12.8%	4.1%
D. Quality of special events offered by the City	27.4%	44.4%	20.9%	6.5%	0.8%

Q19. CITY COMMUNICATION. Please rate your satisfaction on a scale of 1 to 5, where 5 means "Very Satisfied" and 1 means "Very Dissatisfied," with the following:

(N=431)

	Very Satisfied	Satisfied	Neutral	Dissatisfied	Very Dissatisfied	Don't Know
A. Quality of the city's website	2.6%	19.7%	22.3%	6.7%	1.6%	47.1%
B. Quality of the city's social media (Twitter, Facebook, etc.)	2.6%	7.4%	20.9%	2.3%	1.4%	65.4%
C. Availability of information on city services and programs	3.7%	25.8%	31.8%	9.0%	2.1%	27.6%
D. City's efforts to keep you informed	4.2%	23.9%	38.1%	14.4%	1.9%	17.6%
E. Level of public involvement in local decision-making	3.7%	18.8%	33.4%	15.3%	5.6%	23.2%
F. Transparency of City government	2.8%	15.5%	34.3%	14.4%	7.4%	25.5%
G. Quality of City's phone system	3.0%	18.6%	28.5%	6.7%	2.8%	40.4%

WITHOUT DON'T KNOWS

Q19. CITY COMMUNICATION. Please rate your satisfaction on a scale of 1 to 5, where 5 means "Very Satisfied" and 1 means "Very Dissatisfied," with the following:(Without "Don't Know")

(N=431)

	Very Satisfied	Satisfied	Neutral	Dissatisfied	Very Dissatisfied
A. Quality of the city's website	4.8%	37.3%	42.1%	12.7%	3.1%
B. Quality of the city's social media (Twitter, Facebook, etc.)	7.4%	21.5%	60.4%	6.7%	4.0%
C. Availability of information on city services and programs	5.1%	35.6%	43.9%	12.5%	2.9%
D. City's efforts to keep you informed	5.1%	29.0%	46.2%	17.5%	2.3%
E. Level of public involvement in local decision-making	4.8%	24.5%	43.5%	19.9%	7.3%
F. Transparency of City government	3.7%	20.9%	46.1%	19.3%	10.0%
G. Quality of City's phone system	5.1%	31.1%	47.9%	11.3%	4.7%

Q20. Which of the following are your primary sources of information about city issues, services, and events?

<u>Q20. Primary sources of information</u>	<u>Number</u>	<u>Percent</u>
Local newspaper	322	74.7 %
Word of mouth (friends/neighbors)	317	73.5 %
Television news programs	129	29.9 %
City website	102	23.7 %
Radio news programs	87	20.2 %
Public meetings	65	15.1 %
Social networking site (Facebook, Twitter, YouTube)	61	14.2 %
City emails/press releases (e-Notifier)	43	10.0 %
Other	23	5.3 %
City cable channel	14	3.2 %
None chosen	12	2.8 %
Total	1175	

Q21. Have you called or visited the city with a question, problem, or complaint during the past year?

<u>Q21. Have you called or visited the city?</u>	<u>Number</u>	<u>Percent</u>
Yes	164	38.1 %
No	267	61.9 %
Total	431	100.0 %

Q21a. How easy was it to contact the person you needed to reach?

<u>Q21a. How easy was it to contact the person ?</u>	<u>Number</u>	<u>Percent</u>
Very easy	76	46.3 %
Somewhat easy	49	29.9 %
Difficult	24	14.6 %
Very difficult	11	6.7 %
Not provided	4	2.4 %
Total	164	100.0 %

Q21b. What department did you contact? (Check all that apply)

<u>Q21b. What department did you contact?</u>	<u>Number</u>	<u>Percent</u>
Police	56	34.1 %
Public Works	56	34.1 %
Codes Enforcement	42	25.6 %
Planning	39	23.8 %
Building Permits	28	17.1 %
City Manager's Office	21	12.8 %
Fire	14	8.5 %
Finance (city licenses and taxes)	14	8.5 %
Municipal Airport	1	0.6 %
Not provided	3	1.8 %
Total	274	

Q21c. Was the department you contacted responsive to your issue?

<u>Q21c. Was the department you contacted responsive to your issue?</u>	<u>Number</u>	<u>Percent</u>
Yes	119	72.6 %
No	37	22.6 %
Not provided	8	4.9 %
Total	164	100.0 %

Q22. DEVELOPMENT. Please rate your satisfaction on a scale of 1 to 5, where 5 means "Very Satisfied" and 1 means "Very Dissatisfied," with the following areas of development and redevelopment in Auburn:

(N=431)

	Very Satisfied	Satisfied	Neutral	Dissatisfied	Very Dissatisfied	Don't Know
A. Overall quality of new residential development	4.9%	28.3%	33.2%	6.5%	2.3%	24.8%
B. City's building permit/review process	3.2%	16.0%	24.6%	7.0%	2.6%	46.6%
C. Overall quality of new retail development (stores, restaurants, etc.)	6.3%	30.6%	31.1%	17.4%	5.6%	9.0%
D. Overall quality of new business development (offices, medical facilities, banks, etc.)	4.4%	29.5%	35.0%	10.7%	4.6%	15.8%
E. Overall quality of new airport industrial development	4.6%	20.4%	26.2%	3.9%	2.3%	42.5%
F. Redevelopment of abandoned or under-utilized properties	2.3%	12.3%	31.1%	21.8%	4.6%	27.8%
G. Overall appearance of Lincoln Highway & High Street	13.0%	46.4%	20.4%	10.4%	5.1%	4.6%
H. Overall appearance of Downtown Auburn	20.9%	50.8%	18.1%	6.5%	2.3%	1.4%
I. Overall appearance of Old Town Auburn	23.4%	52.4%	16.7%	3.7%	1.6%	2.1%
J. Overall appearance of Highway 49 North	3.9%	22.5%	29.2%	26.5%	15.3%	2.6%
K. City's planning for future growth	3.2%	10.0%	25.1%	17.6%	9.7%	34.3%

WITHOUT DON'T KNOWS

Q22. DEVELOPMENT. Please rate your satisfaction on a scale of 1 to 5, where 5 means "Very Satisfied" and 1 means "Very Dissatisfied," with the following areas of development and redevelopment in Auburn:(Without "Don't Know")

(N=431)

	Very Satisfied	Satisfied	Neutral	Dissatisfied	Very Dissatisfied
A. Overall quality of new residential development	6.5%	37.7%	44.1%	8.6%	3.1%
B. City's building permit/review process	6.1%	30.0%	46.1%	13.0%	4.8%
C. Overall quality of new retail development (stores, restaurants, etc.)	6.9%	33.7%	34.2%	19.1%	6.1%
D. Overall quality of new business development (offices, medical facilities, banks, etc.)	5.2%	35.0%	41.6%	12.7%	5.5%
E. Overall quality of new airport industrial development	8.1%	35.5%	45.6%	6.9%	4.0%
F. Redevelopment of abandoned or under-utilized properties	3.2%	17.0%	43.1%	30.2%	6.4%
G. Overall appearance of Lincoln Highway & High Street	13.6%	48.7%	21.4%	10.9%	5.4%
H. Overall appearance of Downtown Auburn	21.2%	51.5%	18.4%	6.6%	2.4%
I. Overall appearance of Old Town Auburn	23.9%	53.6%	17.1%	3.8%	1.7%
J. Overall appearance of Highway 49 North	4.0%	23.1%	30.0%	27.1%	15.7%
K. City's planning for future growth	4.9%	15.2%	38.2%	26.9%	14.8%

Q23. Which THREE of the areas of DEVELOPMENT listed above do you think should receive the most emphasis from city leaders over the next TWO Years?

<u>Q23. Most Emphasis</u>	<u>Number</u>	<u>Percent</u>
Overall quality of new residential development	17	3.9 %
City's building permit/review process	15	3.5 %
Overall quality of new retail development (stores, restaurants, etc.)	29	6.7 %
Overall quality of new business development (offices, medical facilities, banks, etc.)	14	3.2 %
Overall quality of new airport industrial development	7	1.6 %
Redevelopment of abandoned or under-utilized properties	51	11.8 %
Overall appearance of Lincoln Highway & High Street	17	3.9 %
Overall appearance of Downtown Auburn	30	7.0 %
Overall appearance of Old Town Auburn	12	2.8 %
Overall appearance of Highway 49 North	71	16.5 %
City's planning for future growth	89	20.6 %
None chosen	79	18.3 %
Total	431	100.0 %

Q23. Which THREE of the areas of DEVELOPMENT listed above do you think should receive the most emphasis from city leaders over the next TWO Years?

<u>Q23. 2nd Emphasis</u>	<u>Number</u>	<u>Percent</u>
Overall quality of new residential development	17	3.9 %
City's building permit/review process	13	3.0 %
Overall quality of new retail development (stores, restaurants, etc.)	38	8.8 %
Overall quality of new business development (offices, medical facilities, banks, etc.)	28	6.5 %
Overall quality of new airport industrial development	6	1.4 %
Redevelopment of abandoned or under-utilized properties	53	12.3 %
Overall appearance of Lincoln Highway & High Street	27	6.3 %
Overall appearance of Downtown Auburn	26	6.0 %
Overall appearance of Old Town Auburn	26	6.0 %
Overall appearance of Highway 49 North	58	13.5 %
City's planning for future growth	42	9.7 %
None chosen	97	22.5 %
Total	431	100.0 %

Q23. Which THREE of the areas of DEVELOPMENT listed above do you think should receive the most emphasis from city leaders over the next TWO Years?

<u>Q23. 3rd Emphasis</u>	<u>Number</u>	<u>Percent</u>
Overall quality of new residential development	10	2.3 %
City's building permit/review process	11	2.6 %
Overall quality of new retail development (stores, restaurants, etc.)	44	10.2 %
Overall quality of new business development (offices, medical facilities, banks, etc.)	27	6.3 %
Overall quality of new airport industrial development	12	2.8 %
Redevelopment of abandoned or under-utilized properties	48	11.1 %
Overall appearance of Lincoln Highway & High Street	23	5.3 %
Overall appearance of Downtown Auburn	26	6.0 %
Overall appearance of Old Town Auburn	25	5.8 %
Overall appearance of Highway 49 North	33	7.7 %
City's planning for future growth	47	10.9 %
None chosen	125	29.0 %
Total	431	100.0 %

Q23. Sum of the top THREE areas of DEVELOPMENT you think should receive the most emphasis from city leaders over the next TWO Years

<u>Q23. Sum of Top 3 Choices</u>	<u>Number</u>	<u>Percent</u>
City's planning for future growth	178	41.3 %
Overall appearance of Highway 49 North	162	37.6 %
Redevelopment of abandoned or under-utilized properties	152	35.3 %
Overall quality of new retail development (stores, restaurants, etc.)	111	25.8 %
Overall appearance of Downtown Auburn	82	19.0 %
Overall quality of new business development (offices, medical facilities, banks, etc.)	69	16.0 %
Overall appearance of Lincoln Highway & High Street	67	15.5 %
Overall appearance of Old Town Auburn	63	14.6 %
Overall quality of new residential development	44	10.2 %
City's building permit/review process	39	9.0 %
Overall quality of new airport industrial development	25	5.8 %
None chosen	79	18.3 %
Total	1071	

Q24. AUBURN TRANSIT PROGRAM. Please rate your satisfaction on a scale of 1 to 5, where 5 means "Very Satisfied" and 1 means "Very Dissatisfied," with the following areas of local transit in Auburn:

(N=431)

	Very Satisfied	Satisfied	Neutral	Dissatisfied	Very Dissatisfied	Don't Know
A. Bus stop locations and their convenience	2.8%	15.3%	16.7%	3.2%	3.0%	58.9%
B. Hours of operation	2.1%	12.8%	15.8%	5.1%	1.6%	62.6%
C. Overall friendliness and service of drivers	4.2%	11.1%	16.7%	0.7%	0.5%	66.8%
D. Cleanliness and comfort of vehicles	2.1%	12.1%	17.2%	1.2%	0.5%	67.1%
E. Overall value of the program	4.4%	13.2%	15.1%	2.8%	1.4%	63.1%
F. Transit Fees for Services	3.0%	12.8%	15.1%	1.9%	1.4%	65.9%

WITHOUT DON'T KNOWS

Q24. AUBURN TRANSIT PROGRAM. Please rate your satisfaction on a scale of 1 to 5, where 5 means "Very Satisfied" and 1 means "Very Dissatisfied," with the following areas of local transit in Auburn:(Without "Don't Know")

(N=431)

	Very Satisfied	Satisfied	Neutral	Dissatisfied	Very Dissatisfied
A. Bus stop locations and their convenience	6.8%	37.3%	40.7%	7.9%	7.3%
B. Hours of operation	5.6%	34.2%	42.2%	13.7%	4.3%
C. Overall friendliness and service of drivers	12.6%	33.6%	50.3%	2.1%	1.4%
D. Cleanliness and comfort of vehicles	6.3%	36.6%	52.1%	3.5%	1.4%
E. Overall value of the program	11.9%	35.8%	40.9%	7.5%	3.8%
F. Transit Fees for Services	8.8%	37.4%	44.2%	5.4%	4.1%

Q25. Do you currently ride Auburn Transit buses?

Q25. Do you currently ride Auburn Transit buses?	Number	Percent
Yes	28	6.5 %
No	403	93.5 %
Total	431	100.0 %

Q25a. What are the primary purposes of your trips? (Check all that apply)

Q25a. What are the primary purposes of your trips?	Number	Percent
Personal business	12	42.9 %
Shopping	10	35.7 %
Home	9	32.1 %
Other	8	28.6 %
Recreation	7	25.0 %
Work	7	25.0 %
Visiting friends/relatives	6	21.4 %
Medical appointment	5	17.9 %
Total	64	

Q25b. Do you own your own vehicle?

Q25b. Do you own your own vehicle?	Number	Percent
Yes	25	89.3 %
No	3	10.7 %
Total	28	100.0 %

City of Auburn 2015 Community Survey: Findings Report

Q26. COMMUNITY DEVELOPMENT. Using a scale of 1 to 5, where 5 means "Very High Priority" and 1 means "Very Low Priority," rank the importance of the following issues:

(N=431)

	Very High Priority	High priority	Medium priority	Low priority	Very low priority	Don't know
A. Ensuring that affordable housing is available	13.7%	20.2%	31.6%	15.3%	12.8%	6.5%
B. Improving City streets and sidewalks	38.3%	38.1%	18.1%	1.9%	1.2%	2.6%
C. Adding biking lanes and trails	21.3%	21.8%	32.9%	12.1%	9.7%	2.1%
D. Managing stormwater runoff to prevent floods and minimize water pollution	24.1%	37.1%	26.9%	6.7%	1.9%	3.2%
E. Promoting economic development/job creation	31.1%	35.7%	23.7%	3.9%	1.9%	3.7%
F. Preserving green space to ensure some areas of the city are not developed	46.9%	27.6%	14.2%	5.6%	2.6%	3.2%
G. Protecting residents and businesses from crime	64.7%	25.5%	6.7%	0.7%	0.7%	1.6%
H. Preserving/protecting the environment	38.5%	28.8%	21.1%	7.7%	1.9%	2.1%
I. Expanding public transportation (bus) services	12.1%	13.9%	39.9%	14.6%	9.3%	10.2%
J. Historic preservation efforts	30.9%	28.8%	26.2%	6.7%	3.9%	3.5%
K. Maintaining a balanced City budget	50.8%	33.2%	10.0%	1.2%	1.2%	3.7%
L. Efforts to address homelessness	33.4%	28.5%	22.0%	5.3%	7.9%	2.8%
M. Hiring and retaining qualified City employees	23.9%	38.7%	25.3%	5.1%	1.9%	5.1%
N. Improving the overall quality of services provided by the City	18.6%	38.3%	33.4%	4.9%	0.5%	4.4%
O. Improving how the City plans for growth	1.6%	34.1%	23.7%	3.5%	2.1%	5.1%
P. Improving the City's overall quality of life	28.3%	39.7%	22.5%	6.0%	0.7%	2.8%
Q. Promotion of arts & culture in Auburn	23.0%	28.3%	27.8%	13.5%	4.9%	2.6%
R. Promotion of tourism in Auburn	21.3%	26.9%	28.1%	15.8%	4.9%	3.0%

WITHOUT DON'T KNOWS

Q26. COMMUNITY DEVELOPMENT. Using a scale of 1 to 5, where 5 means "Very High Priority" and 1 means "Very Low Priority," rank the importance of the following issues:(Without "Don't Know")

(N=431)

	Very High Priority	High priority	Medium priority	Low priority	Very low priority
A. Ensuring that affordable housing is available	14.6%	21.6%	33.7%	16.4%	13.6%
B. Improving City streets and sidewalks	39.3%	39.0%	18.6%	1.9%	1.2%
C. Adding biking lanes and trails	21.8%	22.3%	33.6%	12.3%	10.0%
D. Managing stormwater runoff to prevent floods and minimize water pollution	24.9%	38.4%	27.8%	7.0%	1.9%
E. Promoting economic development/job creation	32.3%	37.1%	24.6%	4.1%	1.9%
F. Preserving green space to ensure some areas of the city are not developed	48.4%	28.5%	14.6%	5.8%	2.6%
G. Protecting residents and businesses from crime	65.8%	25.9%	6.8%	0.7%	0.7%
H. Preserving/protecting the environment	39.3%	29.4%	21.6%	7.8%	1.9%
I. Expanding public transportation (bus) services	13.4%	15.5%	44.4%	16.3%	10.3%
J. Historic preservation efforts	32.0%	29.8%	27.2%	7.0%	4.1%
K. Maintaining a balanced City budget	52.8%	34.5%	10.4%	1.2%	1.2%
L. Efforts to address homelessness	34.4%	29.4%	22.7%	5.5%	8.1%
M. Hiring and retaining qualified City employees	25.2%	40.8%	26.7%	5.4%	2.0%
N. Improving the overall quality of services provided by the City	19.4%	40.0%	35.0%	5.1%	0.5%
O. Improving how the City plans for growth	33.3%	35.9%	24.9%	3.7%	2.2%
P. Improving the City's overall quality of life	29.1%	40.8%	23.2%	6.2%	0.7%
Q. Promotion of arts & culture in Auburn	23.6%	29.0%	28.6%	13.8%	5.0%
R. Promotion of tourism in Auburn	22.0%	27.8%	28.9%	16.3%	5.0%

Q27. Which THREE of the areas of COMMUNITY DEVELOPMENT listed above do you think should receive the most emphasis from city leaders over the next TWO Years?

<u>Q27. Most Emphasis</u>	<u>Number</u>	<u>Percent</u>
Ensuring that affordable housing is available	24	5.6 %
Improving City streets and sidewalks	94	21.8 %
Adding biking lanes and trails	25	5.8 %
Managing stormwater runoff to prevent floods and minimize water pollution	11	2.6 %
Promoting economic development/job creation	27	6.3 %
Preserving green space to ensure some areas of the city are not developed	27	6.3 %
Protecting residents and businesses from crime	47	10.9 %
Preserving/protecting the environment	10	2.3 %
Expanding public transportation (bus) services	6	1.4 %
Historic preservation efforts	4	0.9 %
Maintaining a balanced City budget	31	7.2 %
Efforts to address homelessness	35	8.1 %
Hiring and retaining qualified City employees	9	2.1 %
Improving the overall quality of services provided by the City	2	0.5 %
Improving how the City plans for growth	17	3.9 %
Improving the City's overall quality of life	8	1.9 %
Promotion of arts & culture in Auburn	5	1.2 %
Promotion of tourism in Auburn	7	1.6 %
None chosen	42	9.7 %
Total	431	100.0 %

Q27. Which THREE of the areas of COMMUNITY DEVELOPMENT listed above do you think should receive the most emphasis from city leaders over the next TWO Years?

<u>Q27. 2nd Emphasis</u>	<u>Number</u>	<u>Percent</u>
Ensuring that affordable housing is available	17	3.9 %
Improving City streets and sidewalks	41	9.5 %
Adding biking lanes and trails	19	4.4 %
Managing stormwater runoff to prevent floods and minimize water pollution	20	4.6 %
Promoting economic development/job creation	42	9.7 %
Preserving green space to ensure some areas of the city are not developed	30	7.0 %
Protecting residents and businesses from crime	65	15.1 %
Preserving/protecting the environment	22	5.1 %
Expanding public transportation (bus) services	3	0.7 %
Historic preservation efforts	11	2.6 %
Maintaining a balanced City budget	34	7.9 %
Efforts to address homelessness	24	5.6 %
Hiring and retaining qualified City employees	7	1.6 %
Improving the overall quality of services provided by the City	10	2.3 %
Improving how the City plans for growth	9	2.1 %
Improving the City's overall quality of life	7	1.6 %
Promotion of arts & culture in Auburn	10	2.3 %
Promotion of tourism in Auburn	8	1.9 %
None chosen	52	12.1 %
Total	431	100.0 %

Q27. Which THREE of the areas of COMMUNITY DEVELOPMENT listed above do you think should receive the most emphasis from city leaders over the next TWO Years?

<u>Q27. 3rd Emphasis</u>	<u>Number</u>	<u>Percent</u>
Ensuring that affordable housing is available	8	1.9 %
Improving City streets and sidewalks	24	5.6 %
Adding biking lanes and trails	15	3.5 %
Managing stormwater runoff to prevent floods and minimize water pollution	14	3.2 %
Promoting economic development/job creation	22	5.1 %
Preserving green space to ensure some areas of the city are not developed	34	7.9 %
Protecting residents and businesses from crime	46	10.7 %
Preserving/protecting the environment	18	4.2 %
Expanding public transportation (bus) services	12	2.8 %
Historic preservation efforts	18	4.2 %
Maintaining a balanced City budget	45	10.4 %
Efforts to address homelessness	33	7.7 %
Hiring and retaining qualified City employees	7	1.6 %
Improving the overall quality of services provided by the City	5	1.2 %
Improving how the City plans for growth	25	5.8 %
Improving the City's overall quality of life	16	3.7 %
Promotion of arts & culture in Auburn	10	2.3 %
Promotion of tourism in Auburn	18	4.2 %
None chosen	61	14.2 %
Total	431	100.0 %

Q27. Sum of the top THREE areas of COMMUNITY DEVELOPMENT you think should receive the most emphasis from city leaders over the next TWO Years

<u>Q27. Sum of Top 3 Choices</u>	<u>Number</u>	<u>Percent</u>
Improving City streets and sidewalks	159	36.9 %
Protecting residents and businesses from crime	158	36.7 %
Maintaining a balanced City budget	110	25.5 %
Efforts to address homelessness	92	21.3 %
Preserving green space to ensure some areas of the city are not developed	91	21.1 %
Promoting economic development/job creation	91	21.1 %
Adding biking lanes and trails	59	13.7 %
Improving how the City plans for growth	51	11.8 %
Preserving/protecting the environment	50	11.6 %
Ensuring that affordable housing is available	49	11.4 %
Managing stormwater runoff to prevent floods and minimize water pollution	45	10.4 %
Promotion of tourism in Auburn	33	7.7 %
Historic preservation efforts	33	7.7 %
Improving the City's overall quality of life	31	7.2 %
Promotion of arts & culture in Auburn	25	5.8 %
Hiring and retaining qualified City employees	23	5.3 %
Expanding public transportation (bus) services	21	4.9 %
Improving the overall quality of services provided by the City	17	3.9 %
<u>None chosen</u>	<u>42</u>	<u>9.7 %</u>
Total	1180	

Q28. Do you believe the City of Auburn should expand its geographical boundaries into unincorporated North Auburn?

Q28. Do you believe the City of Auburn should expand?	Number	Percent
Yes	181	42.0 %
No	114	26.5 %
Not sure	136	31.6 %
Total	431	100.0 %

Q29. Would you consider additional fees, assessments or taxes to support any of the following? (check any that apply)

Q29. Would you consider additional fees, assessments or taxes to support any of the following?	Number	Percent
Public infrastructure programs including streets and sidewalks	162	37.6 %
Fire and life safety programs and activities	127	29.5 %
Public infrastructure including streetscape, landscaping and beautification	122	28.3 %
Law enforcement programs and activities	118	27.4 %
Other	57	13.2 %
Not provided	157	36.4 %
Total	743	

Q30. Do you feel that short term rentals (such as AirBNB) would be a good alternative for tourism in Auburn?

Q30. Do you feel that short term rentals would be a good?	Number	Percent
Yes	175	40.6 %
No	103	23.9 %
Not sure	153	35.5 %
Total	431	100.0 %

Q31. Do you believe short term rentals (such as AirBNB) should be allowed in residential districts, such as R-1, R-2 and R-3?

Q31. Do you believe short term rentals should be allowed?	Number	Percent
Yes	156	36.2 %
No	124	28.8 %
Not sure	151	35.0 %
Total	431	100.0 %

Q32. Approximately how many years have you lived in the City of Auburn?

Q32. Approximately how many years have you lived?	Number	Percent
5 or less	83	19.3 %
6 to 14	111	25.8 %
15 to 24	79	18.3 %
25 to 34	53	12.3 %
35+	76	17.6 %
Not Provided	29	6.7 %
Total	431	100.0 %

Q33. What is your age?

Q33. What is your age?	Number	Percent
18 to 34 years	46	10.7 %
35 to 44 years	65	15.1 %
45 to 54 years	108	25.1 %
55 to 64 years	93	21.6 %
65+ years	99	23.0 %
Not provided	20	4.6 %
Total	431	100.0 %

Q34. Are you or other members of your household of Hispanic or Latino ancestry?

Q34. Are you Hispanic or Latino ancestry?	Number	Percent
Yes	42	9.8 %
No	365	85.5 %
Not provided	20	4.7 %
Total	427	100.0 %

Q35. Which of the following best describes your race/ethnicity? (check all that apply)

Q35. Which of the following best describes your race/ethnicity?	Number	Percent
Asian/Pacific Islander	14	3.2 %
Black/African American	8	1.9 %
White/Caucasian	375	87.0 %
American Indian/Eskimo	7	1.6 %
Other	8	1.9 %
Not provided	38	8.8 %
Total	450	

Q36. Would you say your total annual household income is:

Q36. Would you say your total annual household income is:	Number	Percent
Under \$50,000	71	16.5 %
\$50,000 - \$99,999	144	33.4 %
\$100,000 - \$149,999	103	23.9 %
\$150,000 or more	74	17.2 %
Not provided	39	9.0 %
Total	431	100.0 %

Q37. Your gender:

Q37. Your gender:	Number	Percent
Male	228	52.9 %
Female	203	47.1 %
Total	431	100.0 %

Section 6:
Survey Instrument



January 2015

Dear Citizen of Auburn,

Your City Council values citizen input and applies resources to key areas that you deem most important. Citizen input is crucial to guide our decision making process. At the City of Auburn, we know that our revenue belongs to our taxpayers so we are listening to you about where your money should be responsibly invested. To this cause, we are conducting the 1st Auburn Community Survey.

Your input on the Auburn Community Survey is extremely important. During the next few months, City Council will be developing strategies and policies that affect a wide range of City services including police, fire, public works, community development and others. To ensure that the City's priorities are aligned with the needs of our residents, **we need to know what YOU think.**

We appreciate your time. We realize this survey takes some time to complete but every question is important. The time you invest in this survey will influence decisions that will be made about the City's future. Your responses will also allow City leaders to identify and address the many opportunities and challenges facing our great community.

Please return your survey sometime during the next week.

- All information collected for this study is strictly confidential.
- Please return your survey in the enclosed, postage-paid envelope addressed to ETC Institute, 725 W. Frontier Circle, Olathe, KS 66061.

If you have any questions about the purpose of the survey, please call Dylan Feik, Administrative Services Director, at (530) 823-4211. Thank you again for taking the time to better our community.

Sincerely,

Keith Nesbitt
Mayor

Tim Rundel
City Manager



2015 City of Auburn Community Survey

Welcome to the City of Auburn's Community Survey for 2015. Your input is an important part of the city's ongoing effort to involve citizens in long-range planning and budget decisions. Please take a few minutes to complete this survey. If you have questions about this survey, please contact Dylan Feik at the City of Auburn at 530-823-4211, ext. 110.

1. MAJOR CATEGORIES OF CITY SERVICES. Please rate your overall satisfaction with major categories of services on a scale of 1 to 5 where 5 means "Very Satisfied" and 1 means "Very Dissatisfied."

How satisfied are you with the...	Very Satisfied	Satisfied	Neutral	Dissatisfied	Very Dissatisfied	Don't Know
A. Quality of fire services	5	4	3	2	1	9
B. Quality of police services	5	4	3	2	1	9
C. Quality of ambulance services	5	4	3	2	1	9
D. Quality of parks & recreation services	5	4	3	2	1	9
E. Quality of the city's customer service	5	4	3	2	1	9
F. Maintenance of city streets and infrastructure	5	4	3	2	1	9
G. Enforcement of city codes and ordinances	5	4	3	2	1	9
H. Flow of traffic & congestion management	5	4	3	2	1	9
I. Management of stormwater	5	4	3	2	1	9
J. Effectiveness of city's communication with public	5	4	3	2	1	9
K. Quality of community development programs	5	4	3	2	1	9

2. Which THREE of the MAJOR CATEGORIES OF CITY SERVICES do you think should receive the most emphasis from city leaders over the next TWO Years? [Write in the letters below using the letters from the list in Q1 above].

1st _____ 2nd _____ 3rd _____

3. PERCEPTIONS OF THE CITY. Several items that may influence your perception of the City of Auburn are listed below. Please rate your satisfaction with each item on a scale of 1 to 5 where 5 means "Very Satisfied" and 1 means "Very Dissatisfied."

How satisfied are you with the...	Very Satisfied	Satisfied	Neutral	Dissatisfied	Very Dissatisfied	Don't Know
A. The value that you receive for your city tax dollars and fees	5	4	3	2	1	9
B. Image of the city	5	4	3	2	1	9
C. Quality of life in the city	5	4	3	2	1	9
D. Appearance of the city	5	4	3	2	1	9
E. Overall quality of city services	5	4	3	2	1	9
F. Public schools in Auburn	5	4	3	2	1	9
G. Hospitals and medical services in Auburn	5	4	3	2	1	9

4. Please rate Auburn on a scale of 1 to 5 where 5 means "Excellent" and 1 means "Poor" with regard to each of the following:

Please rate the City of Auburn...	Excellent	Good	Neutral	Below Average	Poor	Don't Know
A. As a place to live	5	4	3	2	1	9
B. As a place to raise children	5	4	3	2	1	9
C. As a place to work	5	4	3	2	1	9
D. As a place to retire	5	4	3	2	1	9

5. CITY LEADERSHIP. Please rate your satisfaction on a scale of 1 to 5, where 5 means “Very Satisfied” and 1 means “Very Dissatisfied,” with the following:

How satisfied are you with the...	Very Satisfied	Satisfied	Neutral	Dissatisfied	Very Dissatisfied	Don't Know
A. Overall quality of leadership provided by the city's elected officials	5	4	3	2	1	9
B. Overall effectiveness of appointed boards and commissions	5	4	3	2	1	9
C. Overall effectiveness of City Management	5	4	3	2	1	9

6. POLICE SERVICES. Please rate your satisfaction on a scale of 1 to 5, where 5 means “Very Satisfied” and 1 means “Very Dissatisfied,” with the following police services provided by the City of Auburn:

How satisfied are you with the...	Very Satisfied	Satisfied	Neutral	Dissatisfied	Very Dissatisfied	Don't Know
A. Overall quality of police services	5	4	3	2	1	9
B. Visibility of police in neighborhoods	5	4	3	2	1	9
C. Visibility of police in retail areas	5	4	3	2	1	9
D. Police response time	5	4	3	2	1	9
E. Overall appearance and quality of police vehicles and equipment	5	4	3	2	1	9
F. Efforts to prevent crime	5	4	3	2	1	9
G. Police safety education programs	5	4	3	2	1	9
H. Enforcement of traffic laws	5	4	3	2	1	9
I. Overall support to local businesses and residents (education, support, information)	5	4	3	2	1	9

7. Which THREE of the POLICE SERVICES items listed above do you think should receive the most emphasis from city leaders over the next TWO Years? [Write in the letters below using the letters from Q6 above].

1st ____ 2nd ____ 3rd ____

8. FIRE AND EMERGENCY MEDICAL SERVICES. Please rate your satisfaction on a scale of 1 to 5, where 5 means “Very Satisfied” and 1 means “Very Dissatisfied,” with the following fire and emergency medical services provided by the City of Auburn:

How satisfied are you with the...	Very Satisfied	Satisfied	Neutral	Dissatisfied	Very Dissatisfied	Don't Know
A. Overall quality of fire protection	5	4	3	2	1	9
B. Fire personnel emergency response time	5	4	3	2	1	9
C. Quality of fire safety education programs	5	4	3	2	1	9
D. Overall appearance and quality of fire apparatus and equipment	5	4	3	2	1	9
E. Quality of local ambulance service	5	4	3	2	1	9
F. Quality of inspection programs provided by the Fire Department	5	4	3	2	1	9
G. Quality of community fire fuel reduction programs	5	4	3	2	1	9
H. Overall support to local businesses and residents (education, support, information)	5	4	3	2	1	9

9. Which THREE of the FIRE AND EMERGENCY MEDICAL SERVICES items listed above do you think should receive the most emphasis from city leaders over the next TWO Years? [Write in the letters below using the letters from Q8 above].

1st ____ 2nd ____ 3rd ____

10. FEELING OF SAFETY. Please rate your feeling of safety in the following areas using a scale of 1 to 5 where 5 means “very safe” and 1 means “Very Unsafe.”:

How safe do you feel...	Very Safe	Safe	Neutral	Unsafe	Very Unsafe	Don't Know
A. In your neighborhood during the day	5	4	3	2	1	9
B. In your neighborhood at night	5	4	3	2	1	9
C. In the city’s parks	5	4	3	2	1	9
D. Traveling by bicycle in Auburn	5	4	3	2	1	9
E. Traveling as a pedestrian in Auburn	5	4	3	2	1	9
F. Overall feeling of safety in Auburn	5	4	3	2	1	9
G. From large or small scale wildfire	5	4	3	2	1	9

11. CODE ENFORCEMENT. IN YOUR NEIGHBORHOOD ONLY, please rate your satisfaction on a scale of 1 to 5, where 5 means “Very Satisfied” and 1 means “Very Dissatisfied,” with the following:

In your neighborhood, how satisfied are you with the...	Very Satisfied	Satisfied	Neutral	Dissatisfied	Very Dissatisfied	Don't Know
A. Cleanup of debris/litter	5	4	3	2	1	9
B. Cleanup of large junk/abandoned vehicles	5	4	3	2	1	9
C. Cleanup of overgrown and weedy lots	5	4	3	2	1	9
D. Efforts to remove dilapidated structures	5	4	3	2	1	9
E. Enforcement of loud music	5	4	3	2	1	9
F. Animal control	5	4	3	2	1	9

12. Which TWO of the CODE ENFORCEMENT items listed above do you think should receive the most emphasis from city leaders over the next TWO Years? [Write in the letters below using the letters from Q11 above].

1st _____ 2nd _____

13. UTILITY SERVICES. Please rate your satisfaction on a scale of 1 to 5, where 5 means “Very Satisfied” and 1 means “Very Dissatisfied,” with the following:

How satisfied are you with the...	Very Satisfied	Satisfied	Neutral	Dissatisfied	Very Dissatisfied	Don't Know
A. Residential garbage collection service	5	4	3	2	1	9
B. Recycling at city’s drop-off recycling center	5	4	3	2	1	9
C. Sewer service	5	4	3	2	1	9
D. Water service (PCWA)	5	4	3	2	1	9
E. Business license process	5	4	3	2	1	9
F. Utility billing customer service	5	4	3	2	1	9

14. Which TWO of the UTILITY SERVICES listed above do you think should receive the most emphasis from city leaders over the next TWO Years? [Write in the letters below using the letters from Q13 above].

1st _____ 2nd _____

15. MAINTENANCE. Excluding areas maintained by the City of Auburn, please rate your satisfaction on a scale of 1 to 5, where 5 means “Very Satisfied” and 1 means “Very Dissatisfied,” with the following:

How satisfied are you with the...	Very Satisfied	Satisfied	Neutral	Dissatisfied	Very Dissatisfied	Don't Know
A. Maintenance of streets	5	4	3	2	1	9
B. Maintenance of sidewalks	5	4	3	2	1	9
C. Maintenance of street signs	5	4	3	2	1	9
D. Maintenance of traffic signals	5	4	3	2	1	9
E. Maintenance of the City's retail areas	5	4	3	2	1	9
F. Cleanup of debris/litter in and near roadways	5	4	3	2	1	9
G. Maintenance of city-owned buildings	5	4	3	2	1	9
H. Mowing/trimming along streets and public areas	5	4	3	2	1	9
I. Overall cleanliness of streets and public areas	5	4	3	2	1	9
J. Adequacy of city street lighting	5	4	3	2	1	9

16. Which THREE of the areas of MAINTENANCE listed above do you think should receive the most emphasis from city leaders over the next TWO Years? [Write in the letters below using the letters from Q15 above].

1st ____ 2nd ____ 3rd ____

17. TRAFFIC FLOW & TRANSPORTATION. For each of the following, please rate your satisfaction on a scale of 1 to 5 where 5 means “Very Satisfied” and 1 means “Very Dissatisfied.”

How satisfied are you with the...	Very Satisfied	Satisfied	Neutral	Dissatisfied	Very Dissatisfied	Don't Know
A. Ease of travel by car in Auburn	5	4	3	2	1	9
B. Ease of travel by bicycle in Auburn	5	4	3	2	1	9
C. Ease of pedestrian travel in Auburn	5	4	3	2	1	9

18. PARKS AND RECREATION. Please rate your satisfaction on a scale of 1 to 5, where 5 means “Very Satisfied” and 1 means “Very Dissatisfied,” with the following:

How satisfied are you with the...	Very Satisfied	Satisfied	Neutral	Dissatisfied	Very Dissatisfied	Don't Know
A. Maintenance of parks	5	4	3	2	1	9
B. Maintenance of walking trails	5	4	3	2	1	9
C. Maintenance of biking paths and lanes	5	4	3	2	1	9
D. Quality of special events offered by the City	5	4	3	2	1	9

19. CITY COMMUNICATION. Please rate your satisfaction on a scale of 1 to 5, where 5 means “Very Satisfied” and 1 means “Very Dissatisfied,” with the following:

How satisfied are you with the...	Very Satisfied	Satisfied	Neutral	Dissatisfied	Very Dissatisfied	Don't Know
A. Quality of the city's website	5	4	3	2	1	9
B. Quality of the city's social media (<i>Twitter, Facebook, etc.</i>)	5	4	3	2	1	9
C. Availability of information on city services and programs	5	4	3	2	1	9
D. City's efforts to keep you informed	5	4	3	2	1	9
E. Level of public involvement in local decision-making	5	4	3	2	1	9
F. Transparency of City government	5	4	3	2	1	9
G. Quality of City's phone system	5	4	3	2	1	9

20. Which of the following are your primary sources of information about city issues, services, and events?

(check all that apply)

- (01) City website
- (02) Local newspaper
- (03) City cable channel
- (04) Radio news programs
- (05) Television news programs
- (06) Social networking site (*Facebook, Twitter, YouTube*)
- (07) Word of mouth (friends/neighbors)
- (08) City emails/press releases (*e-Notifier*)
- (09) Public meetings
- (10) Other _____

21. Have you called or visited the city with a question, problem, or complaint during the past year?

- (1) Yes [answer Q#21a-c]
- (2) No [go to Q#22]

21a. [Only if YES to Q#21] How easy was it to contact the person you needed to reach?

- (1) Very easy
- (2) Somewhat easy
- (3) Difficult
- (4) Very difficult

21b. [Only if YES to Q#21] What department did you contact? (Check all that apply)

- (1) Police
- (2) Fire
- (3) Planning
- (4) Codes Enforcement
- (5) Public Works
- (6) City Manager's Office
- (7) Municipal Airport
- (8) Finance (city licenses and taxes)
- (9) Building Permits

21c. [Only if YES to Q#21] Was the department you contacted responsive to your issue?

- (1) Yes
- (2) No

22. DEVELOPMENT. Please rate your satisfaction on a scale of 1 to 5, where 5 means "Very Satisfied" and 1 means "Very Dissatisfied," with the following areas of development and redevelopment in Auburn:

How satisfied are you with the...	Very Satisfied	Satisfied	Neutral	Dissatisfied	Very Dissatisfied	Don't Know
A. Overall quality of new residential development	5	4	3	2	1	9
B. City's building permit/review process	5	4	3	2	1	9
C. Overall quality of new retail development (stores, restaurants, etc.)	5	4	3	2	1	9
D. Overall quality of new business development (offices, medical facilities, banks, etc.)	5	4	3	2	1	9
E. Overall quality of new airport industrial development	5	4	3	2	1	9
F. Redevelopment of abandoned or under-utilized properties	5	4	3	2	1	9
G. Overall appearance of Lincoln Highway & High Street	5	4	3	2	1	9
H. Overall appearance of Downtown Auburn	5	4	3	2	1	9
I. Overall appearance of Old Town Auburn	5	4	3	2	1	9
J. Overall appearance of Highway 49 North	5	4	3	2	1	9
K. City's planning for future growth	5	4	3	2	1	9

23. Which THREE of the areas of DEVELOPMENT listed above do you think should receive the most emphasis from city leaders over the next TWO Years? [Write in the letters below using the letters from Q22 above].

1st _____ 2nd _____ 3rd _____

24. AUBURN TRANSIT PROGRAM. Please rate your satisfaction on a scale of 1 to 5, where 5 means "Very Satisfied" and 1 means "Very Dissatisfied," with the following areas of local transit in Auburn:

How satisfied are you with the...	Very Satisfied	Satisfied	Neutral	Dissatisfied	Very Dissatisfied	Don't Know
A. Bus stop locations and their convenience	5	4	3	2	1	9
B. Hours of operation	5	4	3	2	1	9
C. Overall friendliness and service of drivers	5	4	3	2	1	9
D. Cleanliness and comfort of vehicles	5	4	3	2	1	9
E. Overall value of the program	5	4	3	2	1	9
F. Transit Fees for Services	5	4	3	2	1	9

25. Do you currently ride Auburn Transit buses?

___(1) Yes [answer Q#25a-b] ___(2) No [go to Q#26]

25a. [Only if YES to Q#25] **What are the primary purposes of your trips? (Check all that apply)**

- | | |
|-----------------------------------|----------------------------|
| ___(1) Home | ___(5) Shopping |
| ___(2) Visiting friends/relatives | ___(6) Personal business |
| ___(3) Recreation | ___(7) Medical appointment |
| ___(4) Work | ___(8) Other: _____ |

25b. [Only if YES to Q#25] **Do you own your own vehicle?**

___(1) Yes ___(2) No

26. COMMUNITY DEVELOPMENT. Using a scale of 1 to 5, where 5 means "Very High Priority" and 1 means "Very Low Priority," rank the importance of the following issues:

How high of a priority do you place on...	Very High Priority	High Priority	Medium Priority	Low Priority	Very Low Priority	Don't Know
A. Ensuring that affordable housing is available	5	4	3	2	1	9
B. Improving City streets and sidewalks	5	4	3	2	1	9
C. Adding biking lanes and trails	5	4	3	2	1	9
D. Managing stormwater runoff to prevent floods and minimize water pollution	5	4	3	2	1	9
E. Promoting economic development/job creation	5	4	3	2	1	9
F. Preserving green space to ensure some areas of the city are not developed	5	4	3	2	1	9
G. Protecting residents and businesses from crime	5	4	3	2	1	9
H. Preserving/protecting the environment	5	4	3	2	1	9
I. Expanding public transportation (bus) services	5	4	3	2	1	9
J. Historic preservation efforts	5	4	3	2	1	9
K. Maintaining a balanced City budget	5	4	3	2	1	9
L. Efforts to address homelessness	5	4	3	2	1	9
M. Hiring and retaining qualified City employees	5	4	3	2	1	9
N. Improving the overall quality of services provided by the City	5	4	3	2	1	9
O. Improving how the City plans for growth	5	4	3	2	1	9
P. Improving the City's overall quality of life	5	4	3	2	1	9
Q. Promotion of arts & culture in Auburn	5	4	3	2	1	9
R. Promotion of tourism in Auburn	5	4	3	2	1	9

27. Which THREE of the areas of COMMUNITY DEVELOPMENT listed above do you think should receive the most emphasis from city leaders over the next TWO Years? [Write in the letters below using the letters from Q26 above].

1st ___ 2nd ___ 3rd ___

28. Do you believe the City of Auburn should expand its geographical boundaries into unincorporated North Auburn?

(1) Yes (2) No (3) Not sure

29. Would you consider additional fees, assessments or taxes to support any of the following? (check any that apply)

- (1) Fire and life safety programs and activities
- (2) Law enforcement programs and activities
- (3) Public infrastructure programs including streets and sidewalks
- (4) Public infrastructure including streetscape, landscaping and beautification
- (5) Other: _____

30. Do you feel that short term rentals (such as AirBNB) would be a good alternative for tourism in Auburn?

(1) Yes (2) No (3) Not sure

31. Do you believe short term rentals (such as AirBNB) should be allowed in residential districts, such as R-1, R-2 and R-3?

(1) Yes (2) No (3) Not sure

32. Approximately how many years have you lived in the City of Auburn? _____ years

33. What is your age?

- (1) under 25 years
- (2) 25 to 34 years
- (3) 35 to 44 years
- (4) 45 to 54 year
- (5) 55 to 64 years
- (6) 65+ years

34. Are you or other members of your household of Hispanic or Latino ancestry?

(1) Yes (2) No

35. Which of the following best describes your race/ethnicity? (check all that apply)

- (1) Asian/Pacific Islander
- (2) Black/African American
- (3) White/Caucasian
- (4) American Indian/Eskimo
- (5) Other: _____

36. Would you say your total annual household income is:

- (1) under \$50,000
- (2) \$50,000 to \$99,999
- (3) \$100,000 to \$149,999
- (4) \$150,000 or more

37. Your gender: (1) Male (2) Female

This concludes the survey for 2015. Thank you for your time!

Please Return Your Completed Survey in the Enclosed Postage Paid Envelope Addressed to:
ETC Institute, 725 W. Frontier Circle, Olathe, KS 66061

Your responses will remain Completely Confidential. The information printed to the right will ONLY be used to help identify which areas of the City are having problems with city services. If your address is not correct, please provide the correct information.