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Purpose

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

• To measure trends from 2011 to 2017

• 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 2011 and 2016

• **Method of Administration**
  – conducted Summer of 2017 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:**
  – 2,215 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
Q26. Demographics: Total Annual Household Income
by percentage of respondents

2017 Austin Survey Data

- Not provided: 7%
- Less than $20K: 8%
- $20K-$39,999: 14%
- $40K-$59,999: 17%
- $50K-$74,999: 15%
- $60K-$79,999: 11%
- $75K-$99,999: 16%
- $25K-$34,999: 24%
- $90K-$149,999: 27%
- $150K+: 15%

Austin 2016 ACS Data

- Less than $25K: 27%
- $25K-$34,999: 11%
- $35K-$49,999: 16%
- $50K-$74,999: 20%
- $75K-$99,999: 11%
- $100K-$149,999: 10%
- $150K+: 6%

Source: ETC Institute DirectionFinder (2017 - Austin, TX)

2010 median income in Austin=$50,132*
2016 median income in Austin=$60,939*

*Source: American Community Survey
Q25. Demographics: Which of the following best describes your race?

by percentage of persons in households

- Caucasian/White only: 46.0% (Austin Survey Data), 48.9% (Austin 2016 ACS Data)
- Hispanic: 36.7% (Austin Survey Data), 34.5% (Austin 2016 ACS Data)
- African American/Black only: 7.9% (Austin Survey Data), 7.2% (Austin 2016 ACS Data)
- Asian/Pacific Islander only: 4.1% (Austin Survey Data), 6.8% (Austin 2016 ACS Data)
- American Indian only: 0.3% (Austin Survey Data), 0.2% (Austin 2016 ACS Data)
- Other: 5.1% (Austin Survey Data), 2.3% (Austin 2016 ACS Data)

Source: ETC Institute DirectionFinder (2017 - Austin, TX)
Q24. Demographics: Are you Hispanic, Latino, or of other Spanish ancestry?

by percentage of respondents (excluding don't knows)

**Austin Survey Data**
- Yes: 37%
- No: 63%

**Austin 2016 ACS Data**
- Yes: 35%
- No: 65%

Source: ETC Institute DirectionFinder (2017 - Austin, TX)
Q21. Demographics: Age of Respondents

by percentage of respondents

**Austin Survey Data**
- 35-44 years: 20%
- 45-54 years: 20%
- 55-64 years: 20%
- 65+ years: 19%
- Not provided: 1%

**Austin 2016 ACS Data**
- 18-34 years: 42%
- 35-44 years: 20%
- 45-54 years: 15%
- 55-64 years: 12%
- 65+ years: 11%

*Source: EIC Institute DirectionFinder (2017 - Austin, TX)*
Q27. Demographics: Gender
by percentage of respondents (excluding don't knows)

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

Austin 2016 ACS Data
- Male: 50%
- Female: 50%

“Other” category is roughly 0.4%

Good Representation By GENDER

Source: ETC Institute DirectionFinder (2017 - Austin, TX)
2017 City of Austin Community Survey

Location of Respondents
COA Full Purpose Population Density

Data sources: 2017 Community Survey, ETC Institute
2016 American Community Survey 5-year estimates
Table B01003, US Census Bureau

2017 Community Survey Respondents

Survey conducted in City of Austin full-purpose jurisdiction

Map produced by: Office of Performance Management, February 2018
Bottom Line Up Front

• Austin continues to get great ratings as a place to live and work
• Satisfaction with City services has increased in most areas since 2016
• Austin continues to set the standard for customer service and other areas compared to other large U.S. cities
  - Customer service rated 25% 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
  - Quality of health & human 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, Public Safety and Libraries, but Were Less Satisfied With City Infrastructure and Traffic Flow
Q19. 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 46%
- Strongly AGREE 15%
- Strongly DISAGREE 6%
- DISAGREE 7%
- Neutral 26%

Only 13% of the Residents Surveyed Disagreed
Major Finding #2

Overall Satisfaction with City Services Is Mixed Throughout the City
Overall Satisfaction With City Services Is Mixed

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

2017 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
  - National avg for cities with pop. >250,000: 71%
  - Austin: 78%

- The City as a place to work
  - National avg: 71%
  - Austin: 75%

- Overall quality of life in the city
  - National avg: 63%
  - Austin: 69%

- The City as a place to raise children
  - National avg: 66%
  - Austin: 67%

- Overall quality of services provided by the City
  - National avg: 45%
  - Austin: 50%

- Overall value that you receive for your city taxes
  - National avg: 31%
  - Austin: 34%

- How well the City is planning growth
  - National avg: 17% below natl avg
  - Austin: 16%

Significantly Higher: ↑  Significantly Lower: ↓
## 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

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Category</th>
<th>Austin</th>
<th>National Avg.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Overall quality of parks/recognition</td>
<td>76%</td>
<td>63%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Overall quality of drinking water</td>
<td>75%</td>
<td>68%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Overall quality of public safety services</td>
<td>74%</td>
<td>67%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Overall quality of city libraries</td>
<td>72%</td>
<td>69%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Overall quality of wastewater services</td>
<td>66%</td>
<td>64%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Animal services</td>
<td>66%</td>
<td>55%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Overall management of stormwater runoff</td>
<td>56%</td>
<td>42%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Overall effectiveness of communication by the City</td>
<td>35%</td>
<td>38%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Traffic flow on major city streets</td>
<td>30%</td>
<td>11%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

- **Significantly Higher:**
  - Overall quality of parks/recognition
  - Overall quality of drinking water
  - Overall quality of public safety services
  - Overall quality of city libraries
  - Overall quality of wastewater services
  - Animal services

- **Significantly Lower:**
  - Overall management of stormwater runoff
  - Traffic flow on major city streets

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>National avg for cities with pop. &gt;250,000</th>
<th>Austin</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>13% above national average</td>
<td>14% below national average</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>19% below national average</td>
<td>19% below national average</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

22
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**: 91% (90% Austin)
- **I feel safe in my neighborhood at night**: 49% (73% Austin, 24% above national average)
- **I feel safe in City parks**: 56% (66% Austin, 10% above national average)
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**: 84% in Austin, 81% nationally
- **Medical assistance provided by EMS**: 83% in Austin, 69% nationally (14% above national average)
- **Timeliness of Fire response to emergencies**: 82% in Austin, 84% nationally
- **Overall quality of police services**: 69% in Austin, 59% nationally (10% above national average)
- **Speed of emergency police response**: 63% in Austin, 54% nationally
- **Enforcement of local traffic laws**: 50% in Austin, 52% nationally

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
23% above national average

Condition of sidewalks in neighborhoods

Condition of major city streets

National avg for cities with pop. >250,000  Austin
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: 76% Austin, 85% national average
- Quality of residential curbside recycling services: 68% Austin, 68% national average
- Cleanliness of city streets and public areas: 54% Austin, 64% national average
- Household hazardous waste disposal service: 48% Austin, 50% national average
- Enforcement of local codes & ordinances: 40% Austin, 40% national average

Significantly Higher: ↑
Significantly Lower: ↓
Significantly Higher: 

- Appearance of park grounds: 73% vs. 68%
- Number of city parks: 73% vs. 71%
- Number of walking/biking trails: 72% vs. 64%
- Quality of park facilities: 64% vs. 56%
- Quality of outdoor athletic fields: 57% vs. 60%
- Overall satisfaction with city swimming pools: 54% vs. 40% (14% above national average)
- Quality of youth athletic programs offered by City: 50% vs. 46%
- Quality of adult athletic programs offered by City: 45% vs. 46%

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

- 25% above national average
- 36% above national average
- 61% above national average

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

Significantly Higher: ▲
Significantly Lower: ▼
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
Significantly Higher: Significantly Lower:

National Comparisons

- Fire services
- Emergency medical services
- Parks and recreation
- Library services
- Police services
- Overall quality of customer service
- Maintenance/condition of neighborhood streets
- Maintenance/condition of neighborhood sidewalks
- Overall quality of City services
- Code enforcement
- City communications
- Maintenance/condition of major City streets
- Traffic flow on major City streets

Percentage above national average:
- Fire services: 14% above national average
- Emergency medical services: 17% above national average
- Parks and recreation: 15% above national average
- Library services: 20% above national average
- Police services: 21% above national average
- Overall quality of customer service: 26% above national average
- Maintenance/condition of neighborhood streets: 17% above national average
- Maintenance/condition of neighborhood sidewalks: 19% above national average
- Overall quality of City services: 19% above national average
- Code enforcement: 21% above national average
- City communications: 27% above national average
- Maintenance/condition of major City streets: 27% above national average
- Traffic flow on major City streets: 11% above national average

National avg for cities with pop. >500,000: Austin
Major Finding #4
Satisfaction with City Services Increased in Most Areas this year
Overall Satisfaction With Various Aspects of City Services by Major Category - 2011 to 2017

by percentage of respondents who rated the item as a 4 or 5 on a 5-point scale (excluding don't knows)

- Austin-Bergstrom International Airport
- Quality of parks and rec programs/facilities
- Quality of drinking water services
- Quality of public safety services
- Quality of City libraries
- Quality of wastewater services
- Animal Services
- Quality of electric services
- Quality of municipal court services
- Overall management of stormwater runoff
- Austin's overall effectiveness of communication
- Traffic flow on major City streets
- Traffic flow on major highways

Trends

Source: ETC Institute DirectionFinder (2017 - Austin, TX)

Significant Increase from 2016: ▲
Significant Decrease from 2016: ▼
Overall Perception Residents Have of the City
2011 to 2017

by percentage of respondents who rated the item as a 4 or 5 on a 5-point scale (excluding don’t knows)

- Austin as a place to live: 78% in 2011-2015, 78% in 2016, 80% in 2017
- Austin as a place to work: 76% in 2011-2015, 76% in 2016, 78% in 2017
- Overall quality of life in the city: 76% in 2011-2015, 70% in 2016, 75% in 2017
- Austin as a place to raise children: 68% in 2011-2015, 77% in 2016, 69% in 2017
- Overall quality of services provided by the City: 51% in 2011-2015, 47% in 2016, 62% in 2017
- Austin as a place to retire: 42% in 2011-2015, 34% in 2016, 56% in 2017
- Overall value for city tax dollars and fees: 34% in 2011-2015, 34% in 2016, 38% in 2017
- How well Austin is planning growth: 16% in 2011-2015, 13% in 2016, 31% in 2017

Trends:
Significant Increase from 2016: ▲
Significant Decrease from 2016: ▼

Source: ETC Institute DirectionFinder (2017 - Austin, TX)
Perceptions of Public Safety and Security
2011 to 2017
by percentage of respondents who rated the item as a 4 or 5 on a 5-point scale (excluding don't knows)

I feel safe in my neighborhood during the day: 90% (2017) vs. 91% (2016)
I feel safe walking alone downtown during the day: 79% (2017) vs. 78% (2016)
I feel safe in my neighborhood at night: 73% (2017) vs. 70% (2016)
I feel safe in city parks: 64% (2017) vs. 63% (2016)
I feel safe walking alone downtown at night: 31% (2017) vs. 28% (2016)

Source: ETC Institute DirectionFinder (2017 - Austin, TX)

Trends

Significant Increase from 2016: ↑
Significant Decrease from 2016: ↓
Major Finding #5
Opportunities for Improvement
# 2017 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 (IS &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>60%</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>4%</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>0.5770</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Traffic flow on major City streets</td>
<td>42%</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>11%</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>0.3769</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>Quality of planning &amp; zoning services</td>
<td>23%</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>21%</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>0.1778</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Overall maintenance of major City streets</td>
<td>23%</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>27%</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>0.1691</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Quality of public safety services</td>
<td>45%</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>74%</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>0.1181</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Quality of health &amp; human services</td>
<td>19%</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>45%</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>0.1043</td>
<td>6</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 development review, permitting and inspection services</td>
<td>11%</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>17%</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>0.0893</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Quality of drinking water services</td>
<td>35%</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>75%</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>0.0886</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Quality of electric services</td>
<td>17%</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>65%</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>0.0616</td>
<td>9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Quality of parks and rec programs/facilities</td>
<td>20%</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>76%</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0.0479</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Overall maintenance of City sidewalks</td>
<td>7%</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>32%</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>0.0465</td>
<td>11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Effectiveness of city communication</td>
<td>6%</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>36%</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>0.0393</td>
<td>12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Quality of wastewater services</td>
<td>9%</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>66%</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>0.0290</td>
<td>13</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Quality of municipal court services</td>
<td>5%</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>45%</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>0.0257</td>
<td>14</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Overall management of stormwater runoff</td>
<td>4%</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>43%</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>0.0242</td>
<td>15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Animal services</td>
<td>6%</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>66%</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>0.0217</td>
<td>16</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Quality of City libraries</td>
<td>7%</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>72%</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>0.0200</td>
<td>17</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Austin-Bergstrom International Airport</td>
<td>6%</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>81%</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0.0114</td>
<td>18</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Overall Priorities:**
### 2017 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>72%</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>40%</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>0.4276</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Timing of traffic signals on City streets</td>
<td>44%</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>38%</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>0.2716</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>42%</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>59%</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0.1693</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pedestrian accessibility</td>
<td>29%</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>47%</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>0.1542</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Adequacy of street lighting in your community</td>
<td>28%</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>52%</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>0.1362</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>On-street bicycle accessibility</td>
<td>20%</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>42%</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>0.1142</td>
<td>6</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>18%</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>54%</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0.0832</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mowing &amp; trimming along City streets</td>
<td>15%</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>46%</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>0.0820</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Off-street bicycle accessibility</td>
<td>7%</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>51%</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>0.0339</td>
<td>9</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
## 2017 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 (I-S 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>50%</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>69%</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>0.1524</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Speed of emergency police response</td>
<td>34%</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>63%</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>0.1244</td>
<td>2</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>Enforcement of local traffic laws</td>
<td>10%</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>50%</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>0.0488</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Timeliness of Fire response</td>
<td>24%</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>82%</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>0.0442</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Overall quality of fire services</td>
<td>26%</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>84%</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0.0402</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Timeliness of EMS response</td>
<td>21%</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>82%</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>0.0373</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Medical assistance provided by EMS</td>
<td>15%</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>82%</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0.0257</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Public Safety Priorities:
Summary and Conclusions

- Austin continues to get great ratings as a place to live and work
- Satisfaction with City services has increased in most areas since 2016
- Austin continues to set the standard for customer service and other areas compared to other large U.S. cities
  - Customer service rated 25% 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
  - Quality of health & human services
Next Steps

- Application of dashboard and GIS analytics
  - Improves ability to assess trends, demographic breakdowns, and satisfaction/dissatisfaction response location in relation to facility/road/service locations

- Commencing discussions regarding logistics for focus groups around certain service areas

- Survey redesign to ensure complete alignment with the strategic outcomes and incorporation of proposed new survey questions (related to outcome metrics)
Questions?

THANK YOU!!