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Purpose

• To objectively assess resident satisfaction with the delivery of City services

• To measure trends from 2010 to 2016

• To gather input from residents to help set budget priorities

• To compare Austin’s performance with other large cities
Methodology

• **Survey Description**
  – included most of the questions that were asked on surveys administered between 2010 and 2015

• **Method of Administration**
  – by mail, phone and Internet to a randomly selected sample of households (in English, Spanish, Vietnamese and Mandarin); follow-up by email
  – sample included households with traditional land lines and cell phones
  – each survey took approximately 15 minutes to complete

• **Sample size:**
  – 2,099 completed surveys
  – a minimum of 200 surveys completed in each of the City’s 10 Council Districts

• **Confidence level:** 95%

• **Margin of error:** +/- 2.1% overall
Q24. Demographics: Total Annual Household Income
by percentage of respondents

- Not provided: 7%
- $150K+: 15%
- $80K-$149,999: 24%
- $60K-$79,999: 14%
- $40K-$59,999: 17%
- $20K-$39,999: 14%
- Less than $20K: 9%

Good representation by INCOME. In 2016, Austin’s median family income was $77,800
(Source: U.S. Dept. of Housing and Urban Development)

Source: ETC Institute DirectionFinder (2016 - Austin, TX)
Q22. Demographics: Which of the following best describes your race?

by percentage of persons in households (multiple selections could be made)

- Caucasian/White: 63% (Austin Survey Data), 68% (2010 U.S. Census Data)
- African American/Black: 9% (Austin Survey Data), 8% (2010 U.S. Census Data)
- Asian/Pacific Islander: 6% (Austin Survey Data), 6% (2010 U.S. Census Data)
- American Indian: 2% (Austin Survey Data), 1% (2010 U.S. Census Data)
- Other: 23% (Austin Survey Data), 17% (2010 U.S. Census Data)

Race demographic calculation greater than 100% due to ETC methodology.

Source: ETC Institute DirectionFinder (2016 - Austin, TX)
**Q23. Demographics: Are you Hispanic, Latino, or of other Spanish ancestry?**

by percentage of respondents

---

**Austin Survey Data**

- No: 64%
- Yes: 36%
- Not provided: 0%

---

**2010 U.S. Census Data**

- No: 65%
- Yes: 35%

---

Good Representation By HISPANIC ANCESTRY

---

Source: ETC Institute DirectionFinder (2016 - Austin, TX)
Q20. Demographics: Age of Respondents

by percentage of respondents

- 35-44 years: 21%
- 18-34 years: 20%
- 45-54 years: 22%
- 55-64 years: 19%
- 65+ years: 18%
- Not provided: 1%

Source: ETC Institute DirectionFinder (2016 - Austin, TX)
Q25. Demographics: Gender

by percentage of respondents

**Austin Survey Data**
- Male: 49%
- Female: 51%

**2010 U.S. Census Data**
- Male: 51%
- Female: 49%

Good Representation By GENDER

Source: ETC Institute DirectionFinder (2016 - Austin, TX)
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Population Density and Survey Responses Density
Austin continues to get great ratings as a place to live and work. However, overall satisfaction with City services has declined. This is a nationwide trend, as concerns about the economy, public safety, and issues related to the recent Presidential election may have contributed to decreases in satisfaction with government during the past year. Although most ratings have decreased, Austin continues to set the standard for customer service and other areas compared to other large U.S. cities.

- Customer service rated 22% above the national average for cities with populations greater than 250,000.

Opportunities for improvement that will have the most positive impact on overall satisfaction over the next year:
- Traffic flow on major highways and major City streets
- Maintenance of major City streets
- Quality of planning & zoning services
- Quality of public safety services
Major Finding #1

Residents Generally Have a Positive Perception of the City
Most Residents Feel Good About Living in Austin, but There Are Concerns About Growth
Residents were generally satisfied with the airport, parks and recreation, utility services, libraries and public safety, but were less satisfied with city infrastructure and traffic flow.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Category</th>
<th>Very Satisfied (5)</th>
<th>Satisfied (4)</th>
<th>Neutral (3)</th>
<th>Dissatisfied (1/2)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Austin-Bergstrom International Airport</td>
<td>28%</td>
<td>51%</td>
<td>15%</td>
<td>6%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Quality of parks and rec programs/facilities</td>
<td>23%</td>
<td>51%</td>
<td>17%</td>
<td>8%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Quality of drinking water services</td>
<td>26%</td>
<td>46%</td>
<td>18%</td>
<td>10%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Quality of public safety services</td>
<td>21%</td>
<td>51%</td>
<td>19%</td>
<td>9%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Quality of City libraries</td>
<td>23%</td>
<td>48%</td>
<td>23%</td>
<td>7%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Quality of wastewater services</td>
<td>17%</td>
<td>48%</td>
<td>24%</td>
<td>12%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Animal services</td>
<td>15%</td>
<td>44%</td>
<td>32%</td>
<td>9%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Quality of electric services</td>
<td>17%</td>
<td>42%</td>
<td>22%</td>
<td>19%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Quality of health &amp; human services</td>
<td>8%</td>
<td>33%</td>
<td>41%</td>
<td>18%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Quality of municipal court services</td>
<td>8%</td>
<td>33%</td>
<td>41%</td>
<td>18%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Overall management of stormwater runoff</td>
<td>6%</td>
<td>34%</td>
<td>34%</td>
<td>26%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Effectiveness of city communication</td>
<td>5%</td>
<td>29%</td>
<td>41%</td>
<td>26%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Overall maintenance of City sidewalks</td>
<td>4%</td>
<td>27%</td>
<td>32%</td>
<td>37%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Overall maintenance of major City streets</td>
<td>4%</td>
<td>25%</td>
<td>27%</td>
<td>45%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Quality of planning &amp; zoning services</td>
<td>3%</td>
<td>17%</td>
<td>35%</td>
<td>45%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Overall quality of development review, permitting and inspection services</td>
<td>3%</td>
<td>13%</td>
<td>32%</td>
<td>52%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Traffic flow on major City streets</td>
<td>1%</td>
<td>9%</td>
<td>18%</td>
<td>72%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Traffic flow on major highways</td>
<td>1%</td>
<td></td>
<td>9%</td>
<td>86%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Q18. Level of Agreement with the statement: “Employees of the City of Austin are ethical in the way they conduct City business”

by percentage of respondents

- AGREE 43%
- Strongly AGREE 13%
- Strongly DISAGREE 6%
- DISAGREE 9%
- Neutral 28%

Only 15% of the Residents Surveyed Disagreed
Major Finding #2
Overall Satisfaction with City Services Is Generally the Same Throughout the City
While There Are Some Differences for Specific Services, Overall Satisfaction With City Services Is the Same Throughout the City.

Citizen Satisfaction
Mean rating on a 5-point scale

- 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
- No Response

2016 City of Austin Community Survey
Shading reflects the mean rating for all respondents by Council District
**Major Finding #3**

Satisfaction Levels in the City of Austin Are Higher than the National Average
Benchmarking Communities With Populations Greater Than 250,000

- Arlington County, VA
- Arlington, TX
- Austin, TX
- Dallas, TX
- Denver, CO
- Des Moines, IA
- Durham, NC
- Fort Lauderdale, FL
- Fort Worth, TX
- Houston, TX
- Indianapolis, IN
- Johnson County, KS
- Kansas City, MO
- Las Vegas, NV
- Mecklenburg County, NC
- Miami-Dade County, FL
- Minneapolis, MN
- Oklahoma City, OK
- Plano, TX
- Providence, RI
- San Antonio, TX
- San Diego, CA
- San Francisco, CA
- Seattle, WA
- St. Louis, MO
- Tempe, AZ
- Tulsa, OK
- Tucson, AZ
- Wichita, KS
- Yuma County, AZ
Perceptions of the City
Austin vs. Large U.S. Cities
by percentage of respondents who rated the item as a 4 or 5 on a 5-point scale where 5 was "very satisfied"

National Comparisons

The City as a place to live: 71% (Austin) vs. 80% (National avg)
The City as a place to work: 71% (Austin) vs. 76% (National avg)
Overall quality of life in the city: 63% (Austin) vs. 70% (National avg)
The City as a place to raise children: 66% (Austin) vs. 68% (National avg)
Overall quality of services provided by the City: 45% (Austin) vs. 47% (National avg)
Overall value that you receive for your city taxes: 31% (Austin) vs. 34% (National avg)
How well the City is planning growth: 13% (Austin) vs. 33% (National avg)

Significantly Higher:  
Significantly Lower:  
National avg for cities with pop. >250,000  
Austin
Satisfaction with Major Categories of City Services

Austin vs. Large U.S. Cities

by percentage of respondents who rated the item as a 4 or 5 on a 5-point scale where 5 was "very satisfied"

National Comparisons

Overall quality of parks/recreation
- 11% above national average
  - National avg for cities with pop. >250,000: 63%
  - Austin: 74%

Overall quality of public safety services
- 67%
  - National avg: 72%
  - Austin: 72%

Overall quality of drinking water
- 68%
  - National avg: 72%
  - Austin: 71%

Overall quality of city libraries
- 69%
  - National avg: 71%
  - Austin: 71%

Overall quality of wastewater services
- 64%
  - National avg: 65%
  - Austin: 65%

Animal services
- 55%
  - National avg: 59%
  - Austin: 59%

Overall management of stormwater runoff
- 16% below national avg.
  - National avg: 40%
  - Austin: 56%

Overall effectiveness of communication by the City
- 34%
  - National avg: 38%
  - Austin: 38%

Traffic flow on major city streets
- 10%
  - National avg: 30%
  - Austin: 30%
Feeling of Safety in the City

Austin vs. Large U.S. Cities

by percentage of respondents who rated the item as a 4 or 5 on a 5-point scale where 5 was "strongly agree"

National Comparisons

I feel safe in my neighborhood during the day

National avg for cities with pop. >250,000: 91%
Austin: 91%

21% above national average

I feel safe in my neighborhood at night

National avg for cities with pop. >250,000: 49%
Austin: 70%

Significantly Higher: ↑
Significantly Lower: ↓
Satisfaction with Public Safety Services
Austin vs. Large U.S. Cities
by percentage of respondents who rated the item as a 4 or 5 on a 5-point scale
where 5 was "very satisfied"

**National Comparisons**

- **Overall quality of fire services**: 81% Austin, 83% national average
- **Timeliness of Fire response to emergencies**: 84% Austin, 82% national average
- **Medical assistance provided by EMS**: 69% Austin, 81% national average (12% above national average)
- **Overall quality of police services**: 59% Austin, 71% national average (12% above national average)
- **Speed of emergency police response**: 54% Austin, 67% national average (13% above national average)
- **Enforcement of local traffic laws**: 48% Austin, 52% national average

Significantly Higher: ➤
Significantly Lower: ➡️
Significantly Higher: Significantly Lower:

Satisfaction with Transportation Infrastructure
Austin vs. Large U.S. Cities

by percentage of respondents who rated the item as a 4 or 5 on a 5-point scale where 5 was "very satisfied"

National Comparisons

Condition of streets in neighborhoods:
- National average: 36%
- Austin: 58%
- 22% above national average

Condition of sidewalks in neighborhoods:
- National average: 46%
- Austin: 50%

Condition of major city streets:
- National average: 43%
- Austin: 40%
Satisfaction with Residential & Neighborhood Services
Austin vs. Large U.S. Cities
by percentage of respondents who rated the item as a 4 or 5 on a 5-point scale
where 5 was "very satisfied"

National Comparisons

- Quality of residential garbage collection: Significantly Higher
  - Austin: 82%
  - National avg: 76%
  - 12% above national average

- Quality of residential curbside recycling services
  - Austin: 80%
  - National avg: 76%
  - 12% above national average

- Cleanliness of city streets and public areas
  - Austin: 62%
  - National avg: 54%

- Household hazardous waste disposal service
  - Austin: 49%
  - National avg: 48%

- Enforcement of local codes & ordinances
  - Austin: 40%
  - National avg: 40%

Significantly Higher: ▲
Significantly Lower: ▼

National avg for cities with pop. >250,000

25
Satisfaction with Recreation and Cultural Services

Austin vs. Large U.S. Cities
by percentage of respondents who rated the item as a 4 or 5 on a 5-point scale where 5 was "very satisfied"

National Comparisons

- Number of city parks: 74% (Austin) vs. 71% (National)
- Appearance of park grounds: 73% (Austin) vs. 68% (National)
- Number of walking/biking trails: 70% (Austin) vs. 64% (National)
- Quality of outdoor athletic fields: 56% (Austin) vs. 60% (National)
- Quality of park facilities: 56% (Austin) vs. 56% (National)
- Overall satisfaction with city swimming pools: 54% (Austin) vs. 40% (National), 14% above national average
- Quality of youth athletic programs offered by City: 46% (Austin) vs. 50% (National)
- Quality of adult athletic programs offered by City: 45% (Austin) vs. 46% (National)

Significantly Higher: ➡ Significantly Lower: ⬅
Significantly Higher: Significantly Lower:

Satisfaction with Customer Service
Austin vs. Large U.S. Cities
by percentage of respondents who rated the item as a 4 or 5 on a 5-point scale where 5 was "strongly agree"

National Comparisons

Overall quality of customer service

22% above national average

National avg for cities with pop. >250,000  Austin
Benchmarking Communities With Populations Greater Than 500,000

- Austin, TX
- Dallas, TX
- Fort Worth, TX
- Houston, TX
- Kansas City, MO

- Las Vegas, NV
- Oklahoma City, OK
- San Antonio, TX
- San Diego, CA
# Satisfaction with City Services

**Austin vs. Large U.S. Cities With Populations of 500,000+**

by percentage of respondents who rated the item as a 4 or 5 on a 5-point scale

where 5 was "very satisfied" and 4 was "satisfied"

## National Comparisons

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Service</th>
<th>Austin</th>
<th>National Avg for cities with pop. &gt;500,000</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Fire services</td>
<td>70%</td>
<td>83%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Emergency medical services</td>
<td>65%</td>
<td>81%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Parks and recreation</td>
<td>61%</td>
<td>74%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Police services</td>
<td>61%</td>
<td>71%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Library services</td>
<td>52%</td>
<td>71%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Maintenance/condition of neighborhood streets</td>
<td>42%</td>
<td>58%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Overall quality of customer service</td>
<td>35%</td>
<td>58%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Maintenance/condition of neighborhood sidewalks</td>
<td>50%</td>
<td>55%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Overall quality of City services</td>
<td>44%</td>
<td>47%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Code enforcement</td>
<td>19%</td>
<td>40%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>City communications</td>
<td>27%</td>
<td>34%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Maintenance/condition of major City streets</td>
<td>28%</td>
<td>42%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Traffic flow on major City streets</td>
<td>10%</td>
<td>25%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

14% below national average

15% below national average
Major Finding #4
Satisfaction with City Services Has Decreased From 2010 to 2016
The Most Significant Change from 2010 to 2016 Involved How Well Austin is Planning Growth
The Most Significant Changes in Major Services from 2010 to 2016 Included Management of Stormwater Runoff, Effectiveness of Communication, and Quality of Municipal Court Services.
There Were NO Significant Changes from 2010 to 2016
Major Finding #5
Opportunities for Improvement
## 2016 Importance-Satisfaction Rating

**City of Austin**

**Major Categories of City Services**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Category of Service</th>
<th>Most Important %</th>
<th>Most Important Rank</th>
<th>Satisfaction %</th>
<th>Satisfaction Rank</th>
<th>Importance-Satisfaction Rating</th>
<th>I-S Rating Rank</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Very High Priority (I-S &gt; .20)</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Traffic flow on major highways</td>
<td>62%</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>5%</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>0.5921</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Traffic flow on major City streets</td>
<td>47%</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>10%</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>0.4235</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>High Priority (I-S .10-20)</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Overall maintenance of major City streets</td>
<td>25%</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>28%</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>0.1800</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Quality of planning &amp; zoning services</td>
<td>22%</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>20%</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>0.1732</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Quality of public safety services</td>
<td>43%</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>72%</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>0.1187</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Medium Priority (I-S &lt;.10)</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Development review, permitting and inspection services</td>
<td>12%</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>16%</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>0.0967</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Quality of health &amp; human services</td>
<td>16%</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>41%</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>0.0945</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Quality of drinking water services</td>
<td>33%</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>73%</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>0.0913</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Quality of electric services</td>
<td>18%</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>58%</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>0.0732</td>
<td>9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Overall maintenance of City sidewalks</td>
<td>9%</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>31%</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>0.0693</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Overall management of stormwater runoff</td>
<td>7%</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>40%</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>0.0433</td>
<td>11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Quality of parks and rec programs/facilities</td>
<td>17%</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>74%</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0.0424</td>
<td>12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Effectiveness of city communication</td>
<td>6%</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>34%</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>0.0369</td>
<td>13</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Quality of wastewater services</td>
<td>7%</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>65%</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>0.0249</td>
<td>14</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Animal services</td>
<td>6%</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>59%</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>0.0242</td>
<td>15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Quality of municipal court services</td>
<td>4%</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>41%</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>0.0241</td>
<td>16</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Quality of City libraries</td>
<td>7%</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>71%</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>0.0214</td>
<td>17</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Austin-Bergstrom International Airport</td>
<td>6%</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>79%</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0.0131</td>
<td>18</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Highest Priorities:**
## 2016 Importance-Satisfaction Rating
City of Austin
Transportation Infrastructure

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Category of Service</th>
<th>Most Important %</th>
<th>Most Important Rank</th>
<th>Satisfaction %</th>
<th>Satisfaction Rank</th>
<th>Importance-Satisfaction Rating</th>
<th>I-S Rating Rank</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Very High Priority (IS &gt; .20)</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Condition of major City streets</td>
<td>65%</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>40%</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>0.3911</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Timing of traffic signals on City streets</td>
<td>44%</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>35%</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>0.2856</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>High Priority (IS .10-.20)</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Condition of streets in your neighborhood</td>
<td>39%</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>58%</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0.1634</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pedestrian accessibility</td>
<td>29%</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>46%</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>0.1585</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Adequacy of street lighting in your community</td>
<td>29%</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>50%</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>0.1479</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mowing &amp; trimming along City streets</td>
<td>21%</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>38%</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>0.1327</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>On-street bicycle accessibility</td>
<td>18%</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>40%</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>0.1052</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Medium Priority (IS &lt; .10)</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Condition of sidewalks in your neighborhood</td>
<td>16%</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>50%</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>0.0825</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Off-street bicycle accessibility</td>
<td>6%</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>50%</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0.0315</td>
<td>9</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
# 2016 Importance-Satisfaction Rating
## City of Austin
### Public Safety Services

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Category of Service</th>
<th>Most Important %</th>
<th>Most Important Rank</th>
<th>Satisfaction %</th>
<th>Satisfaction Rank</th>
<th>Importance-Satisfaction Rating</th>
<th>I-S Rating Rank</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>High Priority (IS .10-.20)</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Overall quality of police services</td>
<td>48%</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>71%</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>0.1374</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Speed of emergency police response</td>
<td>36%</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>67%</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>0.1182</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Medium Priority (IS &lt;.10)</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Enforcement of local traffic laws</td>
<td>13%</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>48%</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>0.0673</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Timeliness of EMS response</td>
<td>21%</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>81%</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>0.0401</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Timeliness of Fire response</td>
<td>21%</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>82%</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0.0396</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Overall quality of fire services</td>
<td>23%</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>83%</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0.0394</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Medical assistance provided by EMS</td>
<td>16%</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>81%</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>0.0312</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Public Safety Priorities:
# 2016 Importance-Satisfaction Rating

City of Austin

Environmental Services

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Category of Service</th>
<th>Most Important %</th>
<th>Most Important Rank</th>
<th>Satisfaction %</th>
<th>Satisfaction Rank</th>
<th>Importance-Satisfaction Rating</th>
<th>I-S Rating Rank</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Very High Priority (IS &gt; .20)</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Flood control efforts</td>
<td>46%</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>43%</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>0.2603</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>High Priority (IS .10-.20)</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Water quality of lakes &amp; streams</td>
<td>37%</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>56%</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0.1649</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Water conservation programs</td>
<td>34%</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>54%</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0.1555</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Water &amp; wastewater utility response time</td>
<td>31%</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>51%</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>0.1536</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Energy conservation program</td>
<td>25%</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>51%</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>0.1220</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Environmental Services Priorities:
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Category of Service</th>
<th>Most Important %</th>
<th>Most Important Rank</th>
<th>Satisfaction %</th>
<th>Satisfaction Rank</th>
<th>Importance-Satisfaction Rating</th>
<th>I-S Rating Rank</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Very High Priority (IS &gt; 20)</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Safety in City parks &amp; park facilities</td>
<td>47%</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>57%</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>0.2008</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>High Priority (IS 10-20)</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>None</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Medium Priority (IS &lt; 10)</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Overall quality of parks &amp; recreation programs</td>
<td>32%</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>72%</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>0.0895</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Quality of youth athletic programs</td>
<td>15%</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>46%</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>0.0829</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Number of walking/biking trails</td>
<td>26%</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>70%</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>0.0776</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Quality of facilities</td>
<td>17%</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>56%</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>0.0759</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Number of City parks</td>
<td>25%</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>74%</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0.0668</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Appearance of park grounds in Austin</td>
<td>22%</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>73%</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>0.0606</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Overall satisfaction with City swimming pools</td>
<td>11%</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>54%</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>0.0523</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Materials at libraries</td>
<td>16%</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>68%</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>0.0506</td>
<td>9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Library programs</td>
<td>14%</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>69%</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>0.0432</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Quality of adult athletic programs</td>
<td>6%</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>45%</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>0.0329</td>
<td>11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Library hours</td>
<td>8%</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>62%</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>0.0297</td>
<td>12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Quality of outdoor athletic fields</td>
<td>5%</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>56%</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>0.0227</td>
<td>13</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cleanliness of library facilities</td>
<td>5%</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>73%</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0.0122</td>
<td>14</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Satisfaction with aquatic programs</td>
<td>2%</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>46%</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>0.0119</td>
<td>15</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
## 2016 Importance-Satisfaction Rating
### City of Austin
### Residential and Neighborhood Services

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Category of Service</th>
<th>Most Important %</th>
<th>Most Important Rank</th>
<th>Satisfaction %</th>
<th>Satisfaction Rank</th>
<th>Importance-Satisfaction Rating</th>
<th>I-S Rating Rank</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>High Priority (IS .10-.20)</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Code enforcement of weed lots, abandoned vehicles,</td>
<td>22%</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>37%</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>0.1416</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>graffiti and dilapidated buildings</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Safety of your drinking water</td>
<td>58%</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>76%</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>0.1393</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cleanliness of City streets &amp; public areas</td>
<td>27%</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>62%</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>0.1029</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Enforcement of local codes &amp; ordinances</td>
<td>17%</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>40%</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>0.1029</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Medium Priority (IS &lt;.10)</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Reliability of your electric service</td>
<td>40%</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>82%</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0.0712</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Quality of residential garbage collection</td>
<td>36%</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>82%</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0.0662</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cleanliness of your neighborhood</td>
<td>17%</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>69%</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>0.0518</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Household hazardous waste disposal service</td>
<td>8%</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>49%</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>0.0427</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Quality of residential curbside recycling services</td>
<td>17%</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>80%</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>0.0349</td>
<td>9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bulky item pick-up/removal services</td>
<td>9%</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>68%</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>0.0293</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Quality of residential yard waste collection</td>
<td>7%</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>76%</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>0.0167</td>
<td>11</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Residential and Neighborhood Services Priorities:
Summary and Conclusions

• Austin continues to get great ratings as a place to live and work
• However, overall satisfaction with City services has declined. This is a nationwide trend, as concerns about the economy, public safety, and issues related to the recent Presidential election may have contributed to decreases in satisfaction with government during the past year
• Although most ratings have decreased, Austin continues to set the standard for customer service and other areas compared to other large U.S. cities
  - Customer service rated 22% above the national average for cities with populations greater than 250,000
• Opportunities for improvement that will have the most positive impact on overall satisfaction over the next year:
  - Traffic flow on major highways and major City streets
  - Maintenance of major City streets
  - Quality of planning & zoning services
  - Quality of public safety services
How will the City use this data to improve services to Austinites?
Continuous Learning and Improvement

- The City of Austin is dedicated to continuous learning and improvement throughout the organization.
- Through the Office of Performance Management (OPM), the City of Austin will:
  - Analyze results with regard to recently discussed strategic outcomes.
  - Implement mechanisms to more frequently use this and additional data points for organizational improvement.
  - Work one-on-one with departments to further analyze the citizens survey results and determine ways the data can be used to make adjustments in services/processes.
Transportation Projects

- Traffic continues to be a major challenge
  - Symptom of Austin’s growing economic activity
  - Large regional projects impact traffic flow
- Traffic flow on major highways and major City streets were identified as the most important priorities to our residents
  - City of Austin is committed to addressing regional mobility issues in partnership with surrounding entities
  - Recently approved a $720 million transportation bond will target various areas throughout the City
  - Transportation Department is exploring opportunities to use Smart Cities and Smart Technologies to help prioritize areas for improvement
- ATD will work with OPM to further analyze areas experiencing unique traffic issues
Communications

- Resident perceptions of overall effectiveness of communication by the City of Austin declined this year
  - Decline not reflected in CPIO annual survey administered four months prior (48% positive vs. 34% positive)
  - May be reflective of general tone/attitude toward government leading to November election
- CPIO will work with the OPM to evaluate findings and possible corrective actions
  - Aggregate and analyze narrative responses to identify gaps and opportunities.
  - Analyze satisfaction relative to geographic distribution and other factors (concentration of capital projects, zoning cases, etc.).
  - Explore possibility of focus group discussions among those providing contact information, combined with CityWorks graduates.
Service with PRIDE Initiative

- Compared to other large cities, City of Austin had high levels of customer service satisfaction
- Service with PRIDE customer experience training
  - Purpose of training:
    - Understand the customer journey from start to finish
    - Help employees understand roles and responsibilities when interacting with customers and coworkers
    - Provide employees with the tools necessary to identify and address breaks in customer service delivery
    - Strive to make each interaction a defining moment for our customers and to engender empathy in each customer interaction
- Department Status
  - Completed training - 20
  - Training in Progress - 8
  - Scheduling underway – 7
Questions?

THANK YOU!!