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Purpose

To objectively assess resident satisfaction with the delivery of City services
To measure trends from previous surveys
To compare the City’s performance with residents in other communities both regionally and nationally
To help determine priorities for the community
Methodology

Survey Description
- Seven-page survey
- Fifth Community Survey conducted for the City by ETC Institute – most recently conducted in 2019
- Included many of the same questions that were asked in previous years
- Including oversampling of minority populations for comparisons and crosstabulations

Method of Administration
- By mail and online to random sample of households in the City
- Each survey took approximately 15-20 minutes to complete

Sample Size
- **Goal:** 800 surveys
- **Actual:** 857 surveys

Margin of Error
- +/- 3.3% at the 95% level of confidence
### Demographics

Demographics of Final Sample Closely Mirror Census Estimates

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Race or Ethnic Background</th>
<th>Census</th>
<th>Survey</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Asian or Asian Indian</td>
<td>6.5%</td>
<td>6.5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Black or African American</td>
<td>5.1%</td>
<td>5.1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>American Indian or Alaska Native</td>
<td>2.4%</td>
<td>2.5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>White</td>
<td>78.7%</td>
<td>78.9%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Native Hawaiian or other Pacific Islander</td>
<td>0.0%</td>
<td>0.5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hispanic/Latino</td>
<td>6.7%</td>
<td>6.8%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Census results are based on population estimates as of July 1, 2021*
Location of Survey Respondents

Good distribution of responses from throughout the City

City of Lawrence Community Survey
Resident Continue to Have a Positive Perception of the City

- 88% of respondents indicated they are satisfied with the City as a place to live, only 4% were not.
- 73% indicated they are satisfied with the quality of services provided by the City.

Lawrence Is Setting the Standard for the Delivery of City Services in Key Areas

- The City rated above the U.S. Average in 44 of the 53 areas that were compared and above the KC Metro Average in 24 of the 53 areas.
- The City rated 22 points above the U.S. average for the overall quality of services provided by the City.
- The City was aligned with the Metro average which is extremely competitive.
Bottom Line Up Front

Trends (2019 – 2022)

- The City saw an increase in positive ratings in 31 of the 107 areas that were assessed in 2019 and 2022 – increases of 5 points or more in 8 areas - 23 items saw significant decreases in satisfaction

Priorities for Improvement

- Maintenance of City streets and utilities – *same as 2019/2020*
- Flow of motor vehicle traffic and congestion management – *same as 2019/2020*
- Quality of planning and code enforcement – *same as 2019/2020*
- Effectiveness of City communication with the public – *same as 2019/2020*
Perceptions

Residents have a very positive perception of the city.
### Q4. Perceptions of the City
by percentage of respondents (excluding don’t knows)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Item</th>
<th>Very Satisfied (5)</th>
<th>Satisfied (4)</th>
<th>Neutral (3)</th>
<th>Dissatisfied (1/2)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Livability of your neighborhood</td>
<td>37%</td>
<td>48%</td>
<td>9%</td>
<td>6%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Overall quality of life in the City</td>
<td>21%</td>
<td>59%</td>
<td>14%</td>
<td>6%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Overall quality of City services</td>
<td>14%</td>
<td>59%</td>
<td>23%</td>
<td>5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Upkeep of your neighborhood</td>
<td>26%</td>
<td>45%</td>
<td>15%</td>
<td>14%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Overall image of the City</td>
<td>18%</td>
<td>52%</td>
<td>19%</td>
<td>11%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The City as a culturally welcoming place where all enjoy life and feel at home</td>
<td>25%</td>
<td>45%</td>
<td>23%</td>
<td>7%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Overall quality of the City's equitable delivery of service</td>
<td>10%</td>
<td>43%</td>
<td>32%</td>
<td>15%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Overall value that you receive for your City tax dollars and fees</td>
<td>7%</td>
<td>38%</td>
<td>27%</td>
<td>28%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Enforcement of City codes and ordinances</td>
<td>8%</td>
<td>34%</td>
<td>38%</td>
<td>21%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Over 50% of Respondents Were Satisfied with 7 of the 9 Items Rated
While satisfaction remains high – some areas received elevated levels of dissatisfied responses.
The top priorities for improvement received the highest levels of dissatisfied responses.
Overall Maintenance of City Streets and Utilities

This item was determined to be the top priority for improvement based on the Importance-Satisfaction Analysis.

Areas in yellow and orange show lower levels of satisfaction and can help the City target resources to those areas with the most need for improvement.

Areas in blue indicate higher levels of satisfaction.
Overall Flow of Motor Vehicle Traffic and Congestion

This item was determined to be the second highest priority for improvement based on the Importance-Satisfaction Analysis.

Areas in yellow and orange show lower levels of satisfaction and can help the City target resources to those areas with the most need for improvement.

Areas in blue indicate higher levels of satisfaction.
Benchmarks

LAWRENCE COMPARES FAVORABLY TO MOST U.S. AND REGIONAL AVERAGES
Q1. Major Categories of Services
Lawrence vs. U.S. vs. KC Metro

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

- Quality of City trash and yard waste services: Lawrence 89%, U.S. 57%, KC Metro 73%
- Quality of the Public Library: Lawrence 88%, U.S. 66%, KC Metro 90%
- Quality of the City’s parks and recreation system: Lawrence 81%, U.S. 51%, KC Metro 76%
- Quality of City water & wastewater utility service: Lawrence 77%, U.S. 54%, KC Metro 69%
- Quality of police services: Lawrence 71%, U.S. 55%, KC Metro 71%
- Quality of customer service by City staff: Lawrence 66%, U.S. 41%, KC Metro 78%
- Quality of the City’s public transportation: Lawrence 74%, U.S. 51%, KC Metro 38%
- Flow of motor vehicle traffic & congestion management: Lawrence 64%, U.S. 45%, KC Metro 47%
- Effectiveness of City communication with public: Lawrence 63%, U.S. 44%, KC Metro 38%
- Quality of planning and code enforcement: Lawrence 53%, U.S. 42%, KC Metro 34%
- Maintenance of City streets and utilities: Lawrence 54%, U.S. 41%, KC Metro 30%

Significantly Higher Than National Average: 👆
Significantly Lower Than National Average: ↓
Q4. Perceptions of the City
Lawrence vs. U.S. vs. KC Metro

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

Overall quality of City services
- Lawrence: 73%
- U.S.: 51%
- KC Metro: 73%

Overall image of the City
- Lawrence: 71%
- U.S.: 55%
- KC Metro: 67%

Value received for City tax dollars & fees
- Lawrence: 45%
- U.S.: 34%
- KC Metro: 56%
Trends
SHORT-AND LONG-TERM TREND ANALYSIS
Short-Term Trends

**Notable Short-Term Increases Since 2019**
- Responsiveness of City social media accounts
- Access to quality mental healthcare you can afford
- The types of retail and entertainment establishments available
- City efforts to promote economic development
- Connectivity of sidewalks and paths
- Connectivity of bicycle lanes and shared use paths
- Availability of pedestrian (walking) paths in Lawrence
- Traffic signal coordination on major city streets
- The availability of vehicle parking
- Overall flow of motor vehicle traffic and congestion management on streets in the City

**Notable Short-Term Decreases Since 2019**
- Overall quality of police services
- The appearance and cleanliness of Downtown Lawrence
- Police Department engagement within the community
Long-Term Trends

**Notable Long-Term Increases Since 2011**
- Ease of east/west travel in Lawrence
- City indoor recreation facilities
- Overall quality of the City’s drop-off recycling sites
- The availability of vehicle parking
- Availability of pedestrian (walking) paths in Lawrence
- Number of walking and biking trails
- Downtown Lawrence special events and parades

**Notable Long-Term Decreases Since 2011**
- The City’s outdoor aquatic facilities
- How effectively the City enforces traffic offenses
- The City’s indoor aquatic facilities
- Parking enforcement services
- Police related education programs
Priorities for Investment

IMPORTANCE-SATISFACTION ANALYSIS
Q2. Major City Services That Should Receive the Most Emphasis From City Leaders Over the Next Two Years

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

- Overall maintenance of City streets and utilities: 72%
- Overall flow of motor vehicle traffic and congestion management on streets in the City: 43%
- Overall quality of police services: 29%
- Overall quality of planning and code enforcement: 24%
- Overall effectiveness of City communication with the public: 20%
- Overall quality of the City’s parks and recreation system: 20%
- Overall quality of City water and wastewater utility services: 15%
- Overall quality of the City’s public transportation: 12%
- Overall quality of fire and emergency medical services: 10%
- Overall quality of the Lawrence Public Library: 6%
- Overall quality of customer service by City staff: 6%
- Overall quality of City trash and yard waste services: 4%
# 2022 Importance-Satisfaction Rating

## Lawrence, Kansas

### Major Categories of 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>Overall maintenance of City streets and utilities</td>
<td>72%</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>30%</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>0.5090</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Overall flow of motor vehicle traffic &amp; congestion management</td>
<td>43%</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>45%</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>0.2394</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Overall quality of planning and code enforcement</td>
<td>24%</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>34%</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>0.1599</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Overall effectiveness of City communication with the public</td>
<td>20%</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>44%</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>0.1129</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Overall quality of police services</td>
<td>29%</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>71%</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>0.0853</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Overall quality of the City’s public transportation</td>
<td>12%</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>51%</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>0.0604</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Overall quality of the City’s parks and recreation system</td>
<td>20%</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>81%</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>0.0382</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Overall quality of City water and wastewater utility services</td>
<td>15%</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>77%</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>0.0343</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Overall quality of customer service by City staff</td>
<td>6%</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>66%</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>0.0197</td>
<td>9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Overall quality of fire &amp; emergency medical services</td>
<td>10%</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>89%</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0.0104</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Overall quality of the Lawrence Public Library</td>
<td>6%</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>88%</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>0.0069</td>
<td>11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Overall quality of City trash and yardwaste services</td>
<td>4%</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>89%</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0.0048</td>
<td>12</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

I-S Ratings .1000 or Greater Are Considered a High Priority for Investment Over the Next Two Years
2022 City of Lawrence Community Survey
Importance-Satisfaction Assessment Matrix

- Major Categories of Services -
(point scores on the graph show deviations from the mean importance and satisfaction ratings given by respondents to the survey)

**Exceeded Expectations**
- Overall quality of fire and emergency medical services
- Overall quality of City trash & yard waste services
- Overall quality of the Lawrence Public Library
- Overall quality of the City’s parks and rec system
- Overall quality of City water & wastewater utility services
- Overall quality of customer service by City staff

**Continued Emphasis**
- Higher importance/higher satisfaction
- Overall quality of police services

**Less Important**
- Lower importance/lower satisfaction

**Opportunities for Improvement**
- Higher importance/lower satisfaction
- Overall flow of motor vehicle traffic & congestion management
- Overall quality of planning and code enforcement
- Overall maintenance of City streets and utilities

I-S Ratings .1000 or Greater Are Considered a High Priority for Investment Over the Next Two Years
Communication

The city is the primary source of information for most residents.
Overall, Satisfaction with City Communication is Relatively High When Compared to the National Average

- Responsiveness of City social media: 26 pts. Above National Average
- Availability of and timeliness of info about services and activities: 12 pts. Above National Average
- City’s efforts to keep you informed about city-related issues: 12 pts. Above National Average
- Ease in communication with City departments and staff: 4 pts. Above National Average
Q21[1]. How Often Respondents Use Each of the Following Communication Services
by percentage of respondents (excluding not provided)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Service</th>
<th>Often</th>
<th>4</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>Never</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Local media outlets (newspaper)</td>
<td>27%</td>
<td>18%</td>
<td>17%</td>
<td>13%</td>
<td>26%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The City website, <a href="http://www.lawrenceks.org">www.lawrenceks.org</a></td>
<td>11%</td>
<td>15%</td>
<td>32%</td>
<td>22%</td>
<td>21%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Parks and Recreation guide</td>
<td>12%</td>
<td>20%</td>
<td>24%</td>
<td>20%</td>
<td>25%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Direct Mail</td>
<td>14%</td>
<td>16%</td>
<td>24%</td>
<td>17%</td>
<td>29%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Calling the City by phone</td>
<td>8%</td>
<td>12%</td>
<td>21%</td>
<td>26%</td>
<td>33%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>City newsletter, The Flame</td>
<td>9%</td>
<td>11%</td>
<td>13%</td>
<td>13%</td>
<td>55%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Facebook</td>
<td>10%</td>
<td>8%</td>
<td>11%</td>
<td>9%</td>
<td>62%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Email subscription notifications</td>
<td>11%</td>
<td>8%</td>
<td>10%</td>
<td>9%</td>
<td>63%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NextDoor</td>
<td>6%</td>
<td>8%</td>
<td>10%</td>
<td>8%</td>
<td>69%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Solid Waste App</td>
<td>7%</td>
<td>6%</td>
<td>8%</td>
<td>7%</td>
<td>72%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Twitter</td>
<td>4%</td>
<td>5%</td>
<td>5%</td>
<td>5%</td>
<td>82%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Social Media is not the Most Used Source of Information

Sources of Information Maintained by the City Should Receive More Attention
Residents Still Find the City to be the Most Effective Source of Communication
Summary

Residents Continue Have a Positive Perception of the City

Lawrence Rated Significantly Higher than the U.S. Average in 83% of the Areas Assessed

Lawrence Saw an Increase in Positive Ratings in 29% of the Areas Assessed Between 2019 and 2022

Priorities for Improvement

◦ Maintenance of City streets and utilities (*timeliness of repairs and condition of streets*)
◦ Flow of motor vehicle traffic and congestion management (*traffic signal coordination + walking/biking connectivity*)
◦ Quality of planning and code enforcement
◦ Effectiveness of City communication with the public (*increasing the utilization of sources maintained by City*)
Questions?

THANK YOU!