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Agenda

) Review Methodology
) Review Major Findings
) Questions
Methodology

- Random sample of 613 households
- Administered by mail/phone
- Confidence Interval: 95%
- Precision: +/- 4%
- Conducted during April/May 2003
- Benchmarking data
- GIS Mapping
Benchmarking Cities

- Blue Springs, Missouri
- Bridgeport, Connecticut
- Burbank, California
- Casper, Wyoming
- Columbia, Missouri*
- Independence, Missouri
- Kansas City, Kansas
- Lawrence, Kansas*
- Lee's Summit, Missouri
- Lenexa, Kansas
- Manhattan, Kansas*
- Naperville, Illinois
- Olathe, Kansas
- Overland Park, Kansas
- Peoria, Arizona
- Prairie Village, Kansas
- Palm Desert, California
- Shoreline, Washington
- San Bernardino, California
- West Des Moines, Iowa

* Cities with a major university
Location of Respondents to the 2005 Community Survey
By Census Block Group

2005 Columbia Community Survey

More than 600 Residents Participated in the Survey. The Map Shows the Location of Those Who Provided Their Home Street Address.
Demographic Data
Demographics: Age of Residence

by percentage of respondents

- 11-20 years: 24%
- 21-30 years: 11%
- 31-50 years: 25%
- 5-10 years: 18%
- More than 50 years: 11%
- Less than 5 years: 10%
- Not provided: 1%

Source: ETC Institute DirectionFinder (2005 - Columbia, MO)
Demographics: Ages of Household Occupants
by percentage of all persons in the households surveyed

- Under age 5: 9%
- Ages 5-9: 5%
- Ages 10-14: 6%
- Ages 15-19: 6%
- Ages 20-24: 13%
- Ages 25-34: 16%
- Ages 35-44: 11%
- Ages 45-54: 14%
- Ages 55-64: 10%
- Ages 65-74: 6%
- Ages 75+: 4%
Demographics: Number of Years Residents Have Lived in the City of Columbia

by percentage of respondents

- Under 3: 10%
- 3 to 5: 19%
- 6 to 10: 18%
- 11 to 15: 14%
- 16 to 20: 9%
- 21 to 30: 13%
- 31+: 18%
Demographics: Do You Own Or Rent Your Current Residence?

by percentage of respondents

- Own: 66%
- Rent: 32%
- Not provided: 1%
Demographics: Race/Ethnicity
by percentage of respondents

- White: 85%
- Black/African American: 9%
- Asian/Pacific Islander: 3%
- Other: 3%
- Black/African American: 9%
Demographics: Total Annual Household Income

by percentage of respondents

- Under $30,000: 20%
- $30,000-59,999: 30%
- $60,000-$99,999: 28%
- $100,000 or more: 15%
- Not provided: 7%
Demographics: Gender of the Respondents

by percentage of respondents

Female 54%
Male 46%
Perceptions of the City
## Satisfaction With Items That Influence the Perception Residents Have of the City

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

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Item</th>
<th>0%</th>
<th>20%</th>
<th>40%</th>
<th>60%</th>
<th>80%</th>
<th>100%</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Overall quality of life in the City</td>
<td>13%</td>
<td>17%</td>
<td>25%</td>
<td>59%</td>
<td>25%</td>
<td>13%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Quality of services provided by the City</td>
<td>17%</td>
<td>66%</td>
<td>15%</td>
<td>22%</td>
<td>13%</td>
<td>6%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Overall image of the City</td>
<td>16%</td>
<td>57%</td>
<td>22%</td>
<td>59%</td>
<td>25%</td>
<td>5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Overall feeling of safety in the City</td>
<td>11%</td>
<td>54%</td>
<td>13%</td>
<td>57%</td>
<td>22%</td>
<td>5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Overall appearance of the City</td>
<td>11%</td>
<td>23%</td>
<td>11%</td>
<td>55%</td>
<td>31%</td>
<td>6%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Overall value received for tax dollars</td>
<td>17%</td>
<td>29%</td>
<td>10%</td>
<td>44%</td>
<td>30%</td>
<td>6%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Quality of new development in the City</td>
<td>20%</td>
<td>34%</td>
<td>7%</td>
<td>39%</td>
<td>30%</td>
<td>6%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>How well the City is planning growth</td>
<td>39%</td>
<td>25%</td>
<td>6%</td>
<td>30%</td>
<td>25%</td>
<td>6%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>How well the City is managing growth</td>
<td>45%</td>
<td>25%</td>
<td>6%</td>
<td>25%</td>
<td>25%</td>
<td>6%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Overall Satisfaction with the City  
Columbia vs. 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

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Category</th>
<th>Columbia</th>
<th>U.S.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Value received for your tax dollar</td>
<td>54%</td>
<td>47%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Overall image of your community</td>
<td>79%</td>
<td>70%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Quality of life in the community</td>
<td>84%</td>
<td>77%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Quality of city services</td>
<td>81%</td>
<td>62%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: ETC Institute Survey (May 2005)

National Benchmarking Data - All Communities
Overall Satisfaction with the Quality of City Services (Q3a)

2005 Columbia Community Survey

Potential Areas of Concern

Mean Rating
1=very unsatisfied
5=very satisfied

LEGEND:
- 1.00 to 1.80
- 1.80 to 2.60
- 2.60 to 3.40
- 3.40 to 4.20
- 4.20 to 5.00
Overall Feeling of safety in the City (Q3g)

2005 Columbia Community Survey

Potential Areas of Concern

Mean Rating
1=very unsatisfied
5=very satisfied

LEGEND:
- 1.00 to 1.80
- 1.80 to 2.60
- 2.60 to 3.40
- 3.40 to 4.20
- 4.20 to 5.00
Overall Quality of New Development in the City (Q3h)

2005 Columbia Community Survey

Potential Areas of Concern

Mean Rating
1=very unsatisfied
5=very satisfied

LEGEND:
- 1.00 to 1.80
- 1.80 to 2.60
- 2.60 to 3.40
- 3.40 to 4.20
- 4.20 to 5.00
How Residents Rated the City's Current Pace of Development in Various Areas

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

Source: ETC Institute DirectionFinder (2005 - Columbia, MO)
Overall Satisfaction with Major City Services
## Overall Satisfaction With City Services by Major Category

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

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Service</th>
<th>Very Satisfied (5)</th>
<th>Satisfied (4)</th>
<th>Neutral (3)</th>
<th>Dissatisfied (1/2)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Quality of public safety services</td>
<td>25%</td>
<td>62%</td>
<td>9%</td>
<td>4%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Quality of parks/recreation programs/facilities</td>
<td>38%</td>
<td>48%</td>
<td>11%</td>
<td>3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Quality of customer service from City employees</td>
<td>16%</td>
<td>54%</td>
<td>24%</td>
<td>6%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Quality of public health services</td>
<td>14%</td>
<td>55%</td>
<td>27%</td>
<td>4%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Maintenance of City buildings &amp; facilities</td>
<td>12%</td>
<td>55%</td>
<td>31%</td>
<td>3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Effectiveness of City communication with public</td>
<td>12%</td>
<td>51%</td>
<td>28%</td>
<td>10%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Quality of City's stormwater management</td>
<td>9%</td>
<td>45%</td>
<td>31%</td>
<td>16%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Enforcement of city codes/ordinances</td>
<td>7%</td>
<td>44%</td>
<td>35%</td>
<td>15%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Maintenance of City streets</td>
<td>5%</td>
<td>30%</td>
<td>28%</td>
<td>36%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Flow of traffic/congestion management</td>
<td>4%</td>
<td>23%</td>
<td>24%</td>
<td>49%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Legend:
- **Very Satisfied (5)**
- **Satisfied (4)**
- **Neutral (3)**
- **Dissatisfied (1/2)**
Overall Satisfaction With City Services

2005

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

Columbia, MO

Quality of public safety services
62% 95% 95% 87%

Parks and recreation programs and facilities
37% 90% 86%

Overall quality of customer service
42% 87% 70%

Effectiveness of communication with the public
25% 80% 63%

Maintenance of buildings
19% 82% 66%

Enforcement of City Codes
29% 76% 50%

City stormwater runoff system
32% 76% 53%

Source: ETC Institute Survey (May 2005)
Community Priorities
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

Flow of traffic/congestion management 74%
Maintenance of City streets 68%
Quality of public safety services 33%
Quality of City's stormwater management 23%
Quality of public health services 20%
Enforcement of city codes/ordinances 17%
Quality of parks/recreation programs/facilities 13%
Effectiveness of City communication with public 12%
Quality of customer service from City employees 7%
Maintenance of City buildings & facilities 6%
## Importance-Satisfaction Rating

### City of Columbia

**OVERALL**

<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>Flow of traffic/congestion management</td>
<td>74%</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>27%</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>0.5402</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Maintenance of City streets</td>
<td>68%</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>36%</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>0.4352</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>Stormwater runoff/management</td>
<td>23%</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>53%</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>0.1081</td>
<td>3</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>City codes and ordinances</td>
<td>17%</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>50%</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>0.0850</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Quality of public health services</td>
<td>20%</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>69%</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>0.0620</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>City communication</td>
<td>12%</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>63%</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>0.0444</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Quality public safety services</td>
<td>33%</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>87%</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0.0429</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Customer service</td>
<td>7%</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>70%</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>0.0210</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Maintenance of City buildings</td>
<td>6%</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>66%</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>0.0204</td>
<td>9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Parks and recreation</td>
<td>13%</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>86%</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0.0182</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Public Safety
## Satisfaction with Various Aspects of Public Safety

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

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Aspect</th>
<th>0%</th>
<th>20%</th>
<th>40%</th>
<th>60%</th>
<th>80%</th>
<th>100%</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Quality of City fire protection</td>
<td>25%</td>
<td>62%</td>
<td>13%</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>How quickly fire department personnel respond</td>
<td>28%</td>
<td>54%</td>
<td>17%</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Quality of City's fire prevention program</td>
<td>20%</td>
<td>61%</td>
<td>17%</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Overall quality of local police protection</td>
<td>19%</td>
<td>62%</td>
<td>14%</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Efforts to enhance fire protection</td>
<td>19%</td>
<td>56%</td>
<td>23%</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Visibility of fire department personnel</td>
<td>19%</td>
<td>55%</td>
<td>24%</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>How quickly police respond to emergencies</td>
<td>19%</td>
<td>49%</td>
<td>24%</td>
<td>8%</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>City's efforts to prevent crime</td>
<td>11%</td>
<td>52%</td>
<td>27%</td>
<td>11%</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Visibility of police in retail areas</td>
<td>10%</td>
<td>48%</td>
<td>34%</td>
<td>9%</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Visibility of police in neighborhoods</td>
<td>12%</td>
<td>45%</td>
<td>30%</td>
<td>13%</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Quality of animal control</td>
<td>11%</td>
<td>46%</td>
<td>30%</td>
<td>13%</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Enforcement of local traffic laws</td>
<td>10%</td>
<td>44%</td>
<td>24%</td>
<td>22%</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>City's municipal court</td>
<td>7%</td>
<td>42%</td>
<td>43%</td>
<td>8%</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Legend:
- **Very Satisfied (5)**
- **Satisfied (4)**
- **Neutral (3)**
- **Dissatisfied (1/2)**
Satisfaction with Public Safety
2005

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

Overall quality of local fire protection
- 79%
- 97%
- 86%

Overall quality of local police protection
- 61%
- 93%
- 81%

The City’s overall efforts to prevent crime
- 50%
- 84%
- 62%

Visibility of police in neighborhoods
- 48%
- 82%
- 57%

Enforcement of local traffic laws
- 50%
- 80%
- 54%

Quality of animal control
- 42%
- 83%
- 57%

Visibility of police in retail areas
- 40%
- 74%
- 57%

Source: ETC Institute Survey (May 2005)
Satisfaction with the Visibility of Police in Neighborhoods (Q4b)

2005 Columbia Community Survey

Potential Areas of Concern

Mean Rating
1=very unsatisfied
5=very satisfied

LEGEND:
- 1.00 to 1.80
- 1.80 to 2.60
- 2.60 to 3.40
- 3.40 to 4.20
- 4.20 to 5.00
Satisfaction with the Enforcement of Local Traffic Laws (Q4f)

2005 Columbia Community Survey

Potential Areas of Concern

Mean Rating
1=very unsatisfied
5=very satisfied

LEGEND:
- 1.00 to 1.80
- 1.80 to 2.60
- 2.60 to 3.40
- 3.40 to 4.20
- 4.20 to 5.00
Satisfaction with the Quality of Fire Protection (Q4j)

2005 Columbia Community Survey

Potential Areas of Concern

Mean Rating
1=very unsatisfied
5=very satisfied

LEGEND:
- 1.00 to 1.80
- 1.80 to 2.60
- 2.60 to 3.40
- 3.40 to 4.20
- 4.20 to 5.00
Public Safety Services That Residents Thought 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

City's efforts to prevent crime: 49%
Visibility of police in neighborhoods: 38%
Enforcement of local traffic laws: 36%
Overall quality of local police protection: 30%
Visibility of police in retail areas: 20%
How quickly police respond to emergencies: 19%
Quality of animal control: 15%
How quickly fire department personnel respond: 11%
Quality of City's fire protection: 10%
Efforts to enhance fire protection: 9%
City's municipal court: 9%
Quality of City's fire prevention program: 6%
Visibility of fire department personnel: 3%

Source: ETC Institute DirectionFinder (2005 - Columbia, MO)
### Importance-Satisfaction Rating

**City of Columbia**

**PUBLIC SAFETY**

<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 efforts to prevent crime</td>
<td>49%</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>62%</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>0.1862</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Enforcement of local traffic laws</td>
<td>36%</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>54%</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>0.1656</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Visibility of police in neighborhoods</td>
<td>38%</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>57%</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>0.1634</td>
<td>3</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>Visibility of police in retail areas</td>
<td>20%</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>57%</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>0.0860</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Quality of animal control</td>
<td>15%</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>57%</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>0.0645</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>How quickly police respond</td>
<td>19%</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>68%</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>0.0608</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Quality of local police protection</td>
<td>30%</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>81%</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>0.0570</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>City's municipal court</td>
<td>9%</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>49%</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>0.0459</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Visibility of fire department personal</td>
<td>3%</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>74%</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>0.0286</td>
<td>9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Efforts to enhance fire protection</td>
<td>9%</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>75%</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>0.0225</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>How quickly fire fighters respond</td>
<td>11%</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>82%</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0.0198</td>
<td>11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Overall quality of City fire protection</td>
<td>10%</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>86%</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0.0140</td>
<td>12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Quality of City's fire prevention program</td>
<td>6%</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>81%</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>0.0114</td>
<td>13</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Parks and Recreation
## Satisfaction with Various Aspects of Parks and Recreation

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

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Aspect</th>
<th>Very Satisfied (5)</th>
<th>Satisfied (4)</th>
<th>Neutral (3)</th>
<th>Dissatisfied (1/2)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Maintenance of City parks</td>
<td>29%</td>
<td>59%</td>
<td>9%</td>
<td>3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Number of walking and biking trails in the City</td>
<td>37%</td>
<td>47%</td>
<td>11%</td>
<td>5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>How close neighborhood parks are to homes</td>
<td>32%</td>
<td>49%</td>
<td>12%</td>
<td>6%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Quality of outdoor athletic fields</td>
<td>28%</td>
<td>50%</td>
<td>19%</td>
<td>3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>City special events and festivals</td>
<td>30%</td>
<td>46%</td>
<td>20%</td>
<td>4%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Number of outdoor athletic fields</td>
<td>26%</td>
<td>49%</td>
<td>18%</td>
<td>8%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Availability of info about parks/rec programs</td>
<td>27%</td>
<td>47%</td>
<td>19%</td>
<td>7%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The City's youth athletic programs</td>
<td>23%</td>
<td>47%</td>
<td>27%</td>
<td>3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>City community recreation center (ARC)</td>
<td>27%</td>
<td>37%</td>
<td>24%</td>
<td>13%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The City's adult athletic programs</td>
<td>19%</td>
<td>44%</td>
<td>31%</td>
<td>6%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Outdoor city swimming pools</td>
<td>11%</td>
<td>37%</td>
<td>35%</td>
<td>17%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Satisfaction with Parks and Recreation

2005

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

- Maintenance of City parks: 57% (93%)
- Outdoor athletic fields: 41% (84%)
- City swimming pools: 19% (86%)
- Walking/biking trails in the City: 16% (84%)

Source: ETC Institute Survey (May 2005)
Satisfaction with the Maintenance of City Parks (Q6a)

2005 Columbia Community Survey

Potential Areas of Concern

Mean Rating
1=very unsatisfied
5=very satisfied

LEGEND:
- 1.00 to 1.80
- 1.80 to 2.60
- 2.60 to 3.40
- 3.40 to 4.20
- 4.20 to 5.00
Satisfaction with How Close Neighborhood Parks Are to Resident’s Homes (Q6b)

2005 Columbia Community Survey

Potential Areas of Concern

Mean Rating
1=very unsatisfied
5=very satisfied

LEGEND:
- 1.00 to 1.80
- 1.80 to 2.60
- 2.60 to 3.40
- 3.40 to 4.20
- 4.20 to 5.00
Satisfaction with the Number of Walking and Biking Trails in the City (Q6c)

2005 Columbia Community Survey

Potential Areas of Concern

Mean Rating
1=very unsatisfied
5=very satisfied

LEGEND:
- 1.00 to 1.80
- 1.80 to 2.60
- 2.60 to 3.40
- 3.40 to 4.20
- 4.20 to 5.00
Satisfaction with the City’s Outdoor Swimming Pools (Q6j)

2005 Columbia Community Survey

Potential Areas of Concern

Mean Rating
1=very unsatisfied
5=very satisfied

LEGEND:
- 1.00 to 1.80
- 1.80 to 2.60
- 2.60 to 3.40
- 3.40 to 4.20
- 4.20 to 5.00
Parks and Recreation Services That Residents Thought 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

- Maintenance of City parks: 42%
- City special events and festivals: 31%
- The City's youth athletic programs: 25%
- Number of walking and biking trails in the City: 24%
- Outdoor city swimming pools: 24%
- City community recreation center (ARC): 22%
- Availability of info about parks/rec programs: 19%
- The City's adult athletic programs: 14%
- How close neighborhood parks are to home: 13%
- Number of outdoor athletic fields: 12%
- Quality of outdoor athletic fields: 9%

Source: ETC Institute DirectionFinder (2005 - Columbia, MO)
## Importance-Satisfaction Rating

**City of Columbia**  
**PARKS and RECREATION**

<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>Outdoor City Swimming pools</td>
<td>24%</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>48%</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>0.1248</td>
<td>1</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>City Community Centers (ARC)</td>
<td>22%</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>64%</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>0.0792</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The City’s youth athletic programs</td>
<td>25%</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>70%</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>0.0750</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>City special events and festivals</td>
<td>31%</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>76%</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>0.0744</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The City’s adult athletic programs</td>
<td>14%</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>63%</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>0.0518</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Maintenance of City parks</td>
<td>42%</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>88%</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0.0504</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Availability of info about parks/rec programs</td>
<td>19%</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>74%</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>0.0494</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Number of walking/biking trails</td>
<td>24%</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>84%</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0.0384</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The number of outdoor athletic fields</td>
<td>12%</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>74%</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>0.0312</td>
<td>9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>How close neighborhood parks are to home</td>
<td>13%</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>81%</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>0.0247</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Quality of outdoor athletic fields</td>
<td>9%</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>78%</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>0.0198</td>
<td>11</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Maintenance
# Satisfaction with Various Aspects of City Maintenance/Public Works

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

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Aspect</th>
<th>Very Satisfied (5)</th>
<th>Satisfied (4)</th>
<th>Neutral (3)</th>
<th>Dissatisfied (1/2)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Landscaping/appearance of public areas</td>
<td>13%</td>
<td>58%</td>
<td>20%</td>
<td>9%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Maintenance of city buildings</td>
<td>8%</td>
<td>59%</td>
<td>30%</td>
<td>2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Maintenance and preservation of downtown Columbia</td>
<td>12%</td>
<td>54%</td>
<td>27%</td>
<td>8%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Maintenance of street signs and traffic signals</td>
<td>9%</td>
<td>56%</td>
<td>21%</td>
<td>14%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Snow removal on major city streets</td>
<td>11%</td>
<td>53%</td>
<td>19%</td>
<td>17%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Adequacy of city street lighting</td>
<td>8%</td>
<td>50%</td>
<td>26%</td>
<td>16%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cleanliness of city streets/other public areas</td>
<td>8%</td>
<td>50%</td>
<td>29%</td>
<td>13%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Maintenance of streets in neighborhoods</td>
<td>8%</td>
<td>42%</td>
<td>22%</td>
<td>28%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Availability of sidewalks in the city</td>
<td>6%</td>
<td>43%</td>
<td>27%</td>
<td>24%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Condition of City sidewalks</td>
<td>4%</td>
<td>44%</td>
<td>30%</td>
<td>22%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Maintenance of major city streets</td>
<td>3%</td>
<td>38%</td>
<td>21%</td>
<td>37%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Snow removal on neighborhood streets</td>
<td>3%</td>
<td>33%</td>
<td>23%</td>
<td>39%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Satisfaction with Maintenance Services
2005

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

- Maintenance of City buildings: 98% (67%)
- Maintenance of traffic signals: 92% (65%)
- Snow removal/major City streets: 92% (64%)
- Overall cleanliness of City streets/public areas: 89% (58%)
- Landscaping/appearance of public areas: 82% (70%)
- Adequacy of street lighting: 80% (59%)
- Maintenance of City Streets: 77% (42%)
- Condition of City sidewalks: 73% (48%)

Source: ETC Institute Survey (May 2005)
Mean Rating
1=very unsatisfied
5=very satisfied

LEGEND:
- 1.00 to 1.80
- 1.80 to 2.60
- 2.60 to 3.40
- 3.40 to 4.20
- 4.20 to 5.00

2005 Columbia Community Survey

Satisfaction with the Maintenance of Neighborhood Streets (Q8b)
Mean Rating
1=very unsatisfied
5=very satisfied

LEGEN D:
- 1.00 to 1.80
- 1.80 to 2.60
- 2.60 to 3.40
- 3.40 to 4.20
- 4.20 to 5.00

Satisfaction with Snow Removal on Neighborhood Streets (Q8g)

2005 Columbia Community Survey

Potential Areas of Concern: Much of the City
Satisfaction with City Street Lighting (Q8i)

2005 Columbia Community Survey

Potential Areas of Concern

Mean Rating
1=very unsatisfied
5=very satisfied

LEGEND:
- 1.00 to 1.80
- 1.80 to 2.60
- 2.60 to 3.40
- 3.40 to 4.20
- 4.20 to 5.00
Satisfaction with the Condition of Sidewalks (Q8j)

2005 Columbia Community Survey

Potential Areas of Concern: Much of the City

Mean Rating
1=very unsatisfied
5=very satisfied

LEGEND:
- 1.00 to 1.80
- 1.80 to 2.60
- 2.60 to 3.40
- 3.40 to 4.20
- 4.20 to 5.00
Satisfaction with the Availability of Sidewalks (Q8k)

2005 Columbia Community Survey

Potential Areas of Concern: Much of the City

Mean Rating
1=very unsatisfied
5=very satisfied

LEGEND:
- 1.00 to 1.80
- 1.80 to 2.60
- 2.60 to 3.40
- 3.40 to 4.20
- 4.20 to 5.00
City Maintenance/Public Works Services That Residents Thought 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

- Maintenance of major city streets: 58%
- Snow removal on neighborhood streets: 33%
- Maintenance of streets in neighborhoods: 28%
- Availability of sidewalks in the city: 21%
- Cleanliness of city streets/other public areas: 21%
- Adequacy of city street lighting: 21%
- Condition of City sidewalks: 20%
- Snow removal on major city streets: 20%
- Maintenance and preservation of downtown Columbia: 16%
- Maintenance of street signs and traffic signals: 16%
- Landscaping/appearance of public areas: 13%
- Maintenance of city buildings: 2%

Source: ETC Institute DirectionFinder (2005 - Columbia, MO)
## Importance-Satisfaction Rating

City of Columbia

**CITY MAINTENANCE/PUBLIC WORKS**

<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>Maintenance of major City streets</td>
<td>58%</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>42%</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>0.3364</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Snow removal on neighborhood streets</td>
<td>33%</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>38%</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>0.2046</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>Maintenance of neighborhood streets</td>
<td>28%</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>50%</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>0.1400</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Availability of sidewalks in the City</td>
<td>21%</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>49%</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>0.1071</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Condition of sidewalks</td>
<td>20%</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>48%</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>0.1040</td>
<td>5</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>Cleanliness of public areas</td>
<td>21%</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>58%</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>0.0882</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Adequacy of City street lighting</td>
<td>21%</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>59%</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>0.0861</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Snow removal on major city streets</td>
<td>20%</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>64%</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>0.0720</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Maintenance of street signs/signals</td>
<td>16%</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>65%</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>0.0560</td>
<td>9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Maintenance/preservation of downtown</td>
<td>16%</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>65%</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>0.0560</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Landscaping of public areas</td>
<td>13%</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>70%</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0.0390</td>
<td>11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Maintenance of City buildings</td>
<td>2%</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>67%</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0.0066</td>
<td>12</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Communications
How Residents Get Information About City Issues

by percentage of respondents
multiple choices could be made

Local newspaper: 75%
Television News: 75%
City newsletter included w/utility bills: 56%
Radio: 56%
Friends/neighbors: 42%
City cable channel: 18%
City website: 13%
Other: 5%

Source: ETC Institute DirectionFinder (2005 - Columbia, MO)
Satisfaction with Various Aspects of City Communications

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

- Availability of info about City programs/services: 16% Very Satisfied, 53% Satisfied, 21% Neutral, 10% Dissatisfied
- Content of City's newsletter: 14% Very Satisfied, 51% Satisfied, 31% Neutral, 5% Dissatisfied
- City efforts to keep residents informed: 16% Very Satisfied, 48% Satisfied, 23% Neutral, 13% Dissatisfied
- Quality of the City's web page: 10% Very Satisfied, 43% Satisfied, 40% Neutral, 7% Dissatisfied
- How open the City is to public involvement: 13% Very Satisfied, 40% Satisfied, 30% Neutral, 18% Dissatisfied
- Quality of programming on City's cable tv channel: 8% Very Satisfied, 40% Satisfied, 40% Neutral, 13% Dissatisfied
Satisfaction with City Communications 2005

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

Availiability of information about City programs/services

Efforts to keep residents informed

Level of public involvement in local decisions

Columbia, MO

Source: ETC Institute Survey (May 2005)
Satisfaction with City’s Public Involvement Efforts (Q12c)

2005 Columbia Community Survey

Potential Areas of Concern

Mean Rating
1=very unsatisfied
5=very satisfied

LEGEND:
- 1.00 to 1.80
- 1.80 to 2.60
- 2.60 to 3.40
- 3.40 to 4.20
- 4.20 to 5.00
Municipal Services and Utilities
Percentage of Columbia Households that Use Various Services Provided by the City

by percentage of respondents who responded "yes" to use of the service

- Use city water service: 95%
- Use residential trash collection service: 93%
- Use sanitary sewer/wastewater service: 91%
- Use city electric service: 88%
- Use curbside recycling (blue bags): 81%
- Use yard waste service (clear bags): 73%
- Use drop-off recycling: 45%
- City airport: 31%
- Public transportation (bus) service: 16%
# Overall Satisfaction with Services Provided by the City of Columbia

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

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Service</th>
<th>Very Satisfied (5)</th>
<th>Satisfied (4)</th>
<th>Neutral (3)</th>
<th>Dissatisfied (1/2)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Use curbside recycling (blue bags)</td>
<td>48%</td>
<td>44%</td>
<td>5%</td>
<td>3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Use residential trash collection service</td>
<td>42%</td>
<td>49%</td>
<td>4%</td>
<td>3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Use city electric service</td>
<td>36%</td>
<td>52%</td>
<td>9%</td>
<td>3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Use sanitary sewer/wastewater service</td>
<td>33%</td>
<td>54%</td>
<td>10%</td>
<td>3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Use city water service</td>
<td>36%</td>
<td>52%</td>
<td>8%</td>
<td>4%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Use yard waste service (clear bags)</td>
<td>39%</td>
<td>46%</td>
<td>7%</td>
<td>8%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Use drop-off recycling</td>
<td>32%</td>
<td>48%</td>
<td>15%</td>
<td>6%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>City airport</td>
<td>9%</td>
<td>38%</td>
<td>29%</td>
<td>25%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Public transportation (bus) service</td>
<td>8%</td>
<td>27%</td>
<td>42%</td>
<td>22%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Legend:
- Very Satisfied (5)
- Satisfied (4)
- Neutral (3)
- Dissatisfied (1/2)
Satisfaction with Residential Trash Collection Services (Q10a)

2005 Columbia Community Survey

Potential Areas of Concern

Mean Rating
1 = very unsatisfied
5 = very satisfied

LEGEND:
- 1.00 to 1.80
- 1.80 to 2.60
- 2.60 to 3.40
- 3.40 to 4.20
- 4.20 to 5.00
Mean Rating
1=very unsatisfied
5=very satisfied

LEGEND:
- 1.00 to 1.80
- 1.80 to 2.60
- 2.60 to 3.40
- 3.40 to 4.20
- 4.20 to 5.00

Satisfaction with Electrical Utility Services (Q10e)

2005 Columbia Community Survey

Potential Areas of Concern
Satisfaction with Water Utility Services (Q10f)

2005 Columbia Community Survey

Potential Areas of Concern

Mean Rating
1 = very unsatisfied
5 = very satisfied

LEGEND:
- 1.00 to 1.80
- 1.80 to 2.60
- 2.60 to 3.40
- 3.40 to 4.20
- 4.20 to 5.00
Percentage of Residents Who Have Called or Visited the City with a Question, Problem, or Complaint During the Past Year

by percentage of respondents

Source: ETC Institute DirectionFinder (2005 - Columbia, MO)
Factors that Influence the Perception Residents Have of the Quality of Customer Service They Receive from City Employees

by percentage of respondents who had contacted the city during the last year excluding don't knows

How courteously they were treated: 43% Very satisfied, 39% Satisfied, 10% Neutral, 8% Dissatisfied/Very dissatisfied

How easy the department was to contact: 34% Very satisfied, 45% Satisfied, 7% Neutral, 14% Dissatisfied/Very dissatisfied

Technical competence/knowledge of employee: 38% Very satisfied, 36% Satisfied, 13% Neutral, 13% Dissatisfied/Very dissatisfied

Overall responsiveness of City employees: 38% Very satisfied, 30% Satisfied, 11% Neutral, 22% Dissatisfied/Very dissatisfied

Source: ETC Institute DirectionFinder (2005 - Columbia, MO)
Did You Know that You Can Register for Parks and Recreation Programs and Pay City Utility Bills Over the Internet?

by percentage of respondents

Have you ever registered or paid over the Internet?

- Yes: 75%
- No: 23%
- Don't know: 2%

Source: ETC Institute DirectionFinder (2005 - Columbia, MO)
Percentage of Households the Would Be Interested in Registering and Paying for Various City Services Over the Internet

by percentage of respondents

- Pay municipal court fees/traffic violations: 33%
- Pay for/download topographic maps: 25%
- Purchase parking permits: 24%
- Apply and pay for business license: 20%
- Purchase bus tickets: 13%

Source: ETC Institute DirectionFinder (2005 - Columbia, MO)
Parks and Recreation
Investment Priorities
and Funding Issues
### How Supportive Residents Would Be of Continuing the 1/8 Cent Parks and Recreation Sales Tax to Fund Various Projects

by percentage of respondents

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Project</th>
<th>Very Supportive</th>
<th>Somewhat Supportive</th>
<th>Don't Know</th>
<th>Not Supportive</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Develop permanent facility for Farmer's Market</td>
<td>44%</td>
<td>30%</td>
<td>4%</td>
<td>22%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Acquire land for development of neighborhood parks</td>
<td>34%</td>
<td>32%</td>
<td>5%</td>
<td>29%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Acquire/develop new walking/biking trails</td>
<td>36%</td>
<td>28%</td>
<td>3%</td>
<td>33%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Develop City owned properties as community parks</td>
<td>29%</td>
<td>34%</td>
<td>11%</td>
<td>26%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Indoor ice skating facility</td>
<td>30%</td>
<td>27%</td>
<td>6%</td>
<td>37%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Acquire land for new regional park in SE Columbia</td>
<td>29%</td>
<td>27%</td>
<td>7%</td>
<td>37%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Develop an outdoor sports facility</td>
<td>25%</td>
<td>31%</td>
<td>6%</td>
<td>38%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Add gym/exercise space to Recreation Center (ARC)</td>
<td>23%</td>
<td>28%</td>
<td>12%</td>
<td>37%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Develop an indoor sports facility</td>
<td>22%</td>
<td>28%</td>
<td>6%</td>
<td>44%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Convert Twin Lakes swimming pool to aquatic cent</td>
<td>21%</td>
<td>27%</td>
<td>10%</td>
<td>42%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Develop second recreation center in the City</td>
<td>20%</td>
<td>22%</td>
<td>7%</td>
<td>51%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Source: ETC Institute DirectionFinder (2005 - Columbia, MO)*
Parks Improvements that Residents Thought Were Most Important to Fund with a Renewal of the City's 1/8th Cent Sales Tax for Parks & Recreation

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

Develop permanent facility for Farmer's Market: 37%
Indoor ice skating facility: 27%
Acquire/develop new walking/biking trails: 25%
Acquire land for development of neighborhood parks: 23%
Develop City owned properties as community parks: 17%
Acquire land for new regional park in SE Columbia: 17%
Develop outdoor sports facility: 16%
Add gym/exercise space to Recreation Center (ARC): 15%
Convert Twin Lakes swimming pool to aquatic centre: 14%
Develop of indoor sports facility: 12%
Develop second recreation center in the City: 12%

Source: ETC Institute DirectionFinder (2005 - Columbia, MO)
If the Projects You Thought Were Most Important Were Funded, How Likely Would You Be to Vote In Favor of Continuing the 1/8th Cent Parks Sales Tax?

by percentage of respondents

- Very likely: 52%
- Somewhat likely: 21%
- Not sure: 9%
- Not likely: 17%
- No response: 1%

Source: ETC Institute DirectionFinder (2005 - Columbia, MO)
Other Capital Improvement Investment Priorities and Funding Issues
How Supportive Residents Would Be of Having the City Invest in Various Capital Improvements

by percentage of respondents

- Improving traffic flow on major City streets: 77% Very supportive, 17% Somewhat supportive, 4% Don't Know, 4% Not Supportive
- Replacing fire trucks as scheduled: 51% Very supportive, 40% Somewhat supportive, 5% Don't Know, 4% Not Supportive
- Upgrading major City streets: 58% Very supportive, 29% Somewhat supportive, 4% Don't Know, 9% Not Supportive
- Building new fire stations: 37% Very supportive, 45% Somewhat supportive, 9% Don't Know, 9% Not Supportive
- Upgrading/adding sidewalks: 46% Very supportive, 38% Somewhat supportive, 5% Don't Know, 11% Not Supportive
- Adding bike lanes/pedways to City streets: 38% Very supportive, 33% Somewhat supportive, 25% Not Supportive

Source: ETC Institute DirectionFinder (2005 - Columbia, MO)
How Likely Residents Would Be to Vote for Funding of Various Capital Improvements
by percentage of respondents

- Continuing the existing 1/4th cent sales tax:
  - Very likely: 53%
  - Somewhat likely: 32%
  - Don't know: 6%
  - Not likely: 9%

- Continuing 1/4th cent tax & adding 1/8th cent tax:
  - Very likely: 33%
  - Somewhat likely: 29%
  - Don't know: 5%
  - Not likely: 33%

- Slightly increasing property taxes:
  - Very likely: 20%
  - Somewhat likely: 22%
  - Don't know: 11%
  - Not likely: 47%

Source: ETC Institute DirectionFinder (2005 - Columbia, MO)
Maximum Increase in Development Fees that Residents Would Support

by percentage of respondents

- 10 cents sq ft: 59%
- 25 cents sq ft: 31%
- 35 cents sq ft: 21%
- 50 cents sq ft: 15%
- 75 cents sq ft: 9%
- $1.00 sq ft: 8%
- Don't know: 20%
- Nothing: 21%

Source: ETC Institute DirectionFinder (2005 - Columbia, MO)
How Likely Residents Would Be to Vote in Favor of a Comprehensive Capital Improvement Plan Funded by Sales Tax Increase, Bond Issue, and an Increase in Development Fees

by percentage of respondents

- Very likely: 23%
- Somewhat likely: 31%
- Not sure: 25%
- Not likely: 21%

Source: ETC Institute DirectionFinder (2005 - Columbia, MO)
Other Issues
Support for Having the City Use Incentives to Attract and Expand Life Science, Research and Development, Manufacturing and Regional Office Companies

by percentage of respondents

Source: ETC Institute DirectionFinder (2005 - Columbia, MO)
Conclusions/Recommendations

• The City is generally do a very good job providing city services:
  – Satisfaction with the value for city taxes was 7% above the national average
  – Satisfaction with the overall quality of city services was 19% above the national average
  – The City’s park system rated 16% above the national average
    • walking and biking trails received the highest overall rating
  – Communication ratings are significantly BETTER than other communities

• Areas to emphasize:
  – Improvements to traffic flow
  – Street maintenance
  – Enforcement of local traffic laws
  – Outdoor swimming pools
  – Snow removal on neighborhood streets

• Support for Future Funding:
  – Relatively strong support for continuing the 1/8th cent sales tax for parks and recreation
  – Relatively strong support for continuing the 1/4th cent sales tax for capital improvements
  – Residents generally do not support increases in property taxes
  – Residents willing to consider some increase in development fees
Questions ???