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Bottom Line Upfront
Major Findings
Summary
Questions
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
- Fourth Community Survey conducted for the City by ETC Institute
- Included many of the same questions that were asked in previous years

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:** 867 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>White</td>
<td>80.1%</td>
<td>80.6%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hispanic/Latino</td>
<td>6.8%</td>
<td>6.6%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>African American/Black</td>
<td>4.7%</td>
<td>5.9%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Asian/Pacific Islander</td>
<td>6.3%</td>
<td>5.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>American Indian/Native American/Aleutian/Eskimo</td>
<td>2.7%</td>
<td>3.5%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Census results are based on population estimates as of July 1, 2018*
Location of Survey Respondents

Good distribution of responses from throughout the City
Residents Have a Positive Perception of the City
- 84% of respondents indicated they are satisfied with the City as a place to live, only 5% were not
- 77% indicated they are satisfied with the quality of services provided by the City

Lawrence Is Setting the Standard for the Delivery of City Services
- The City rated above the U.S. Average in 43 of the 54 areas that were compared and above the KC Metro Average in 32 of the 54 areas
- The City rated 29% above the U.S. average and 7% above the KC Metro average for the overall quality of services provided by the City

Trends Analysis
- The City saw an increase in positive ratings in 47 of the 99 areas that were assessed in 2015 and 2019 (47%) and 51 of the 84 areas assessed in 2011 and 2019 (61%)

Priorities for Improvement
- Maintenance of City streets and utilities
- Flow of motor vehicle traffic and congestion management
- Quality of planning and code enforcement
- Effectiveness of City communication with the public
Perceptions

RESIDENTS HAVE A VERY POSITIVE PERCEPTION OF THE CITY
Q3. Perceptions of the City
by percentage of respondents (excluding don't knows)

Source: ETC Institute (2020)

Livability of your neighborhood
- Very Satisfied: 38%
- Satisfied: 48%
- Neutral: 10%
- Dissatisfied: 5%

The City as a place to live
- Very Satisfied: 35%
- Satisfied: 49%
- Neutral: 10%
- Dissatisfied: 5%

Overall quality of life in the City
- Very Satisfied: 29%
- Satisfied: 53%
- Neutral: 14%
- Dissatisfied: 4%

The City as a place where I feel welcome
- Very Satisfied: 35%
- Satisfied: 46%
- Neutral: 15%
- Dissatisfied: 5%

The City as a place to raise children
- Very Satisfied: 34%
- Satisfied: 45%
- Neutral: 16%
- Dissatisfied: 5%

Overall quality of City services
- Very Satisfied: 18%
- Satisfied: 59%
- Neutral: 18%
- Dissatisfied: 6%

Overall image of the City
- Very Satisfied: 23%
- Satisfied: 50%
- Neutral: 18%
- Dissatisfied: 9%

Upkeep of your neighborhood
- Very Satisfied: 27%
- Satisfied: 44%
- Neutral: 17%
- Dissatisfied: 13%

The City as a place to retire
- Very Satisfied: 28%
- Satisfied: 40%
- Neutral: 20%
- Dissatisfied: 13%

The City as a place to work
- Very Satisfied: 21%
- Satisfied: 38%
- Neutral: 21%
- Dissatisfied: 20%

City efforts to promote diversity in the community
- Very Satisfied: 17%
- Satisfied: 36%
- Neutral: 35%
- Dissatisfied: 13%

Overall value that you receive for your City tax dollars and fees
- Very Satisfied: 10%
- Satisfied: 38%
- Neutral: 26%
- Dissatisfied: 26%

Enforcement of City codes and ordinances
- Very Satisfied: 8%
- Satisfied: 36%
- Neutral: 37%
- Dissatisfied: 19%

Source: ETC Institute (2020)

Over 50% of Respondents Were Satisfied with 11 of the 13 Items Rated
Overall, Residents Have a Positive Perception of Downtown Lawrence

**Q2. Perceptions of Downtown by percentage of respondents (excluding don’t knows)**

Source: ETC Institute (2020)

- **Beautification of Downtown Lawrence**: 46% Very Satisfied, 42% Satisfied, 9% Neutral, 3% Dissatisfied
- **How safe you feel in Downtown Lawrence during the day**: 46% Very Satisfied, 41% Satisfied, 8% Neutral, 5% Dissatisfied
- **The appearance and cleanliness of Downtown Lawrence**: 26% Very Satisfied, 53% Satisfied, 13% Neutral, 8% Dissatisfied
- **Downtown Lawrence special events and parades**: 34% Very Satisfied, 43% Satisfied, 20% Neutral, 3% Dissatisfied
- **How safe you feel in Downtown Lawrence after dark**: 17% Very Satisfied, 37% Satisfied, 22% Neutral, 23% Dissatisfied
- **The availability of bicycle parking**: 15% Very Satisfied, 34% Satisfied, 43% Neutral, 8% Dissatisfied
- **The availability of vehicle parking**: 11% Very Satisfied, 38% Satisfied, 23% Neutral, 29% Dissatisfied
- **The types of retail and entertainment establishments available**: 11% Very Satisfied, 37% Satisfied, 28% Neutral, 24% Dissatisfied
Nearly 70% of Residents Were Satisfied with 6 of the 12 Services Rated

<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>Overall quality of fire and emergency medical services</td>
<td>48%</td>
<td>44%</td>
<td>8%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Overall quality of City trash and yardwaste services</td>
<td>47%</td>
<td>41%</td>
<td>7%</td>
<td>5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Overall quality of the City’s parks and recreation system</td>
<td>37%</td>
<td>47%</td>
<td>13%</td>
<td>4%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Overall quality of police services</td>
<td>33%</td>
<td>48%</td>
<td>14%</td>
<td>6%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Overall quality of City water and wastewater utility services</td>
<td>27%</td>
<td>52%</td>
<td>12%</td>
<td>9%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Overall quality of customer service by City staff</td>
<td>27%</td>
<td>41%</td>
<td>25%</td>
<td>7%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Overall quality of the City’s stormwater runoff/stormwater management system</td>
<td>16%</td>
<td>42%</td>
<td>27%</td>
<td>15%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Overall quality of the City’s public transportation</td>
<td>16%</td>
<td>35%</td>
<td>37%</td>
<td>13%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Overall effectiveness of City communication with the public</td>
<td>11%</td>
<td>36%</td>
<td>37%</td>
<td>16%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Overall flow of motor vehicle traffic and congestion management on streets in the City</td>
<td>8%</td>
<td>33%</td>
<td>28%</td>
<td>31%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Overall maintenance of City streets and utilities</td>
<td>8%</td>
<td>29%</td>
<td>24%</td>
<td>39%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Overall quality of planning and code enforcement</td>
<td>8%</td>
<td>28%</td>
<td>38%</td>
<td>26%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Overall Quality of City Services

All areas of the map are in blue

The City is equitably providing services to all residents regardless of the location.
Livability of Your Neighborhood

All areas of the map are in blue.

The City is equitably providing services to all residents regardless of the location.
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.
Overall Quality of Planning and Code Enforcement

This item was determined to be the third 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.
Overall Effectiveness of City Communication

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

Areas in yellow 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 RATES SIGNIFICANTLY HIGHER THAN NATIONAL AND REGIONAL AVERAGES
Q3. 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

Source: ETC Institute (2020)
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

Overall quality of police services

Overall quality of the City’s parks and recreation system

Overall quality of the City’s stormwater runoff/stormwater management system

Overall quality of fire and emergency medical services

Overall quality of City trash and yardwaste services

Overall quality of customer service by City staff

Overall quality of City water and wastewater utility services

Overall quality of the City’s public transportation

Overall effectiveness of City communication with the public

Overall flow of motor vehicle traffic and congestion management on streets in the City

Overall maintenance of City streets and utilities

Source: ETC Institute (2020)
Q9. Parks and Recreation
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

Source: ETC Institute (2020)
Q10. City Maintenance
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

Source: ETC Institute (2020)
Q17b. Behavior of City Employees

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

City employees were courteous and polite
- 16% Above National Average
- 11% Above National Average
- 18% Above National Average

City employees were responsive to my concerns
- 16% Above National Average
- 11% Above National Average
- 18% Above National Average

I was satisfied with the overall quality of service provided
- 16% Above National Average
- 11% Above National Average
- 18% Above National Average

Source: ETC Institute (2020)
Trends

SHORT-AND LONG-TERM TREND ANALYSIS
Short-Term Trends

**Notable Short-Term Increases Since 2015**
- City efforts to promote diversity in the community
- Enforcement of City codes and ordinances
- Availability of bicycle parking Downtown
- Connectivity of bicycle lanes
- Ease of east/west travel in Lawrence
- Availability of pedestrian (walking) paths in Lawrence

**Notable Short-Term Decreases Since 2015**
- The types of retail and entertainment establishments available Downtown
- Timeliness of street maintenance repairs
- Condition of streets in neighborhoods
Long-Term Trends

Notable *Long-Term Increases Since 2011*

- City indoor recreation facilities
- City efforts to promote diversity in the community
- Overall quality of the City’s drop-off recycling sites
- Ease of east/west travel in Lawrence
- Snow removal on neighborhood streets
- Availability of gym space
- Downtown Lawrence special events and parades
- Snow remove on major City streets

Notable *Long-Term Decreases Since 2011*

- City employees were responsive to my concerns when contacted
- I was satisfied with the overall quality of services provided
Priorities for Investment

IMPORTANCE-SATISFACTION ANALYSIS
Q1a. 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
- 1st Choice: 70%
- 2nd Choice: 45%
- 3rd Choice: 23%

Overall flow of motor vehicle traffic and congestion management on streets in the City
- 1st Choice: 23%
- 2nd Choice: 45%
- 3rd Choice: 23%

Overall quality of police services
- 1st Choice: 23%
- 2nd Choice: 45%
- 3rd Choice: 23%

Overall quality of planning and code enforcement
- 1st Choice: 23%
- 2nd Choice: 45%
- 3rd Choice: 23%

Overall quality of the City's stormwater runoff/stormwater management system
- 1st Choice: 19%
- 2nd Choice: 45%
- 3rd Choice: 19%

Overall quality of the City's parks and recreation system
- 1st Choice: 18%
- 2nd Choice: 45%
- 3rd Choice: 18%

Overall quality of City water and wastewater utility services
- 1st Choice: 16%
- 2nd Choice: 45%
- 3rd Choice: 16%

Overall quality of the City's public transportation
- 1st Choice: 14%
- 2nd Choice: 45%
- 3rd Choice: 14%

Overall quality of fire and emergency medical services
- 1st Choice: 13%
- 2nd Choice: 45%
- 3rd Choice: 13%

Overall effectiveness of City communication with the public
- 1st Choice: 11%
- 2nd Choice: 45%
- 3rd Choice: 11%

Overall quality of City trash and yardwaste services
- 1st Choice: 6%
- 2nd Choice: 45%
- 3rd Choice: 6%

Overall quality of customer service by City staff
- 1st Choice: 4%
- 2nd Choice: 45%
- 3rd Choice: 4%

Source: ETC Institute (2020)
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Category of Service</th>
<th>Most Important %</th>
<th>Most Important Rank</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>70%</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td>37%</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>0.4404</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Overall flow of motor vehicle traffic and congestion management on streets in the City</td>
<td>45%</td>
<td>2</td>
<td></td>
<td>41%</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>0.2692</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Overall quality of planning and code enforcement</td>
<td>23%</td>
<td>4</td>
<td></td>
<td>36%</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>0.1476</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Overall effectiveness of City communication with the public</td>
<td>19%</td>
<td>5</td>
<td></td>
<td>47%</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>0.1014</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Overall quality of the City’s public transportation</td>
<td>16%</td>
<td>7</td>
<td></td>
<td>51%</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>0.0797</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Overall quality of the City’s stormwater runoff/stormwater management system</td>
<td>18%</td>
<td>6</td>
<td></td>
<td>58%</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>0.0737</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Overall quality of police services</td>
<td>23%</td>
<td>3</td>
<td></td>
<td>80%</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>0.0459</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Overall quality of City water and wastewater utility services</td>
<td>14%</td>
<td>8</td>
<td></td>
<td>79%</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>0.0284</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Overall quality of the City’s parks and recreation system</td>
<td>13%</td>
<td>9</td>
<td></td>
<td>84%</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>0.0201</td>
<td>9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Overall quality of customer service by City staff</td>
<td>4%</td>
<td>12</td>
<td></td>
<td>67%</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>0.0138</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Overall quality of fire and emergency medical services</td>
<td>11%</td>
<td>10</td>
<td></td>
<td>92%</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0.0085</td>
<td>11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Overall quality of City trash and yardwaste services</td>
<td>6%</td>
<td>11</td>
<td></td>
<td>88%</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0.0079</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
City of Lawrence Community Survey
Importance-Satisfaction Assessment Matrix

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

**Exceeded Expectations**
lower importance/higher satisfaction

- Overall quality of fire and emergency medical services
- Overall quality of City trash and yardwaste services
- Overall quality of the City’s parks and rec system
- Overall quality of water and wastewater utility services
- Overall quality of customer service from City staff

**Continued Emphasis**
higher importance/higher satisfaction

- Overall quality of police services

**Less Important**
lower importance/lower satisfaction

- Overall quality of the City’s stormwater runoff/stormwater management system
- Overall quality of the City’s public transportation
- Overall effectiveness of City communication with the public

**Opportunities for Improvement**
higher importance/lower satisfaction

- Overall flow of motor vehicle traffic and congestion management on streets in the City
- Overall maintenance of City streets and utilities
- Overall quality of planning and code enforcement

Source: ETC Institute (2020)
<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 value that you receive for your City tax dollars and fees</td>
<td>48%</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>48%</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>0.2506</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Enforcement of City codes and ordinances</td>
<td>25%</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>44%</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>0.1408</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The City as a place to work</td>
<td>28%</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>60%</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>0.1114</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>City efforts to promote diversity in the community</td>
<td>23%</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>52%</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>0.1083</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Upkeep of your neighborhood</td>
<td>21%</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>71%</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>0.0605</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Overall quality of City services</td>
<td>24%</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>77%</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>0.0547</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The City as a place to retire</td>
<td>16%</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>68%</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>0.0517</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Overall image of the City</td>
<td>14%</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>73%</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>0.0363</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The City as a place to raise children</td>
<td>12%</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>79%</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>0.0257</td>
<td>9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Overall quality of life in the City</td>
<td>14%</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>82%</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>0.0247</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The City as a place to live</td>
<td>13%</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>84%</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0.0203</td>
<td>11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The City as a place where I feel welcome</td>
<td>7%</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>80%</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>0.0141</td>
<td>12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Livability of your neighborhood</td>
<td>9%</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>86%</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0.0125</td>
<td>13</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

I-S Ratings .1000 or Greater Are Considered a High Priority for Investment Over the Next Two Years
<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>Availability of affordable housing for low/moderate income families</td>
<td>77%</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>14%</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>0.6633</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>How well the City is planning growth</td>
<td>79%</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>22%</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>0.6162</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>City efforts to promote economic development</td>
<td>69%</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>28%</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>0.4975</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Overall quality of new development in Lawrence</td>
<td>52%</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>31%</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>0.3581</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Access to quality housing you can afford</td>
<td>51%</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>43%</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>0.2890</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Access to quality mental healthcare you can afford</td>
<td>35%</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>32%</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>0.2384</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Access to quality healthcare you can afford</td>
<td>38%</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>52%</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0.1849</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Access to quality childcare you can afford</td>
<td>21%</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>21%</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>0.1655</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Access to healthy food you can afford</td>
<td>20%</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>68%</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0.0642</td>
<td>9</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

I-S Ratings .1000 or Greater Are Considered a High Priority for Investment Over the Next Two Years
## 2020 Importance-Satisfaction Rating

Lawrence, Kansas
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>Cost of parks/recreation programs and services offered by the City</td>
<td>25%</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>69%</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>0.0779</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Number of walking and biking trails</td>
<td>29%</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>74%</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>0.0742</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Condition of equipment</td>
<td>23%</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>79%</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>0.0482</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Availability of gym space</td>
<td>13%</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>67%</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>0.0446</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Appearance/cleanliness of City parks</td>
<td>25%</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>87%</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0.0321</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Quality of recreation programs offered by the City</td>
<td>14%</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>79%</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>0.0305</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>City outdoor recreation facilities</td>
<td>12%</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>76%</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>0.0280</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The City’s outdoor aquatic facilities</td>
<td>10%</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>71%</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>0.0279</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>City indoor recreation facilities</td>
<td>12%</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>78%</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>0.0259</td>
<td>9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Number of City parks</td>
<td>12%</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>79%</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>0.0239</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Availability of sports fields in Lawrence</td>
<td>8%</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>71%</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>0.0234</td>
<td>11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Availability of information about parks and recreation programs</td>
<td>11%</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>80%</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>0.0232</td>
<td>12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>City’s landscaping efforts</td>
<td>13%</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>83%</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0.0228</td>
<td>13</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The City’s indoor aquatic facilities</td>
<td>8%</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>73%</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>0.0204</td>
<td>14</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

I-S Ratings .1000 or Greater Are Considered a High Priority for Investment Over the Next Two Years
# 2020 Importance-Satisfaction Rating

**Lawrence, Kansas**

**City Maintenance**

<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>Timeliness of street maintenance repairs</td>
<td>50%</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>22%</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>0.3908</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Condition of major City streets</td>
<td>45%</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>46%</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>0.2464</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Condition of streets in your neighborhood</td>
<td>40%</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>41%</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>0.2330</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Maintenance of curbs and gutters on city streets</td>
<td>29%</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>39%</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>0.1760</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Condition of sidewalks in your neighborhood</td>
<td>22%</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>49%</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>0.1151</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Maintenance of pavement markings</td>
<td>17%</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>36%</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>0.1110</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Adequacy of city street lighting</td>
<td>23%</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>53%</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>0.1083</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Snow removal on neighborhood streets</td>
<td>14%</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>62%</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0.0527</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Streetsweeping services provided by the City</td>
<td>7%</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>59%</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>0.0269</td>
<td>9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Snow removal on major City streets</td>
<td>4%</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>86%</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0.0062</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

I-S Ratings .1000 or Greater Are Considered a High Priority for Investment Over the Next Two Years
## 2020 Importance-Satisfaction Rating

**Lawrence, Kansas**

**Water/Wastewater Utilities**

<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 value that you receive for water and wastewater utility rates</td>
<td>45%</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>54%</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>0.2043</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Quality of your drinking water</td>
<td>49%</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>76%</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>0.1166</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Taste of your drinking water</td>
<td>30%</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>76%</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>0.0720</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The accuracy of your water bill</td>
<td>24%</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>71%</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>0.0707</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>How well the City keeps you informed about planned disruptions to your water service</td>
<td>14%</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>71%</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>0.0418</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Smell of your drinking water</td>
<td>17%</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>76%</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>0.0403</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Water pressure in your home</td>
<td>15%</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>85%</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0.0231</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The reliability of your water service</td>
<td>17%</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>91%</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0.0149</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**I-S Ratings .1000 or Greater Are Considered a High Priority for Investment Over the Next Two Years**
## 2020 Importance-Satisfaction Rating

**Lawrence, Kansas**  
**Transportation**  

<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>Traffic signal coordination on major city streets</td>
<td>32%</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>42%</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>0.1873</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ease of east/west travel in Lawrence</td>
<td>29%</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>50%</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>0.1444</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Availability of safe routes for children to walk or bicycle to school</td>
<td>21%</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>40%</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>0.1295</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Connectivity of bicycle lanes</td>
<td>13%</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>32%</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>0.0887</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ease of north/south travel in Lawrence</td>
<td>21%</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>61%</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0.0814</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The frequency of Lawrence Transit service</td>
<td>9%</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>42%</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>0.0507</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The number of destinations served by Lawrence Transit</td>
<td>9%</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>43%</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>0.0500</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Connectivity of sidewalks and paths</td>
<td>11%</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>54%</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>0.0498</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Availability of pedestrian (walking) paths in Lawrence</td>
<td>12%</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>59%</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0.0477</td>
<td>9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Parking enforcement services</td>
<td>6%</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>56%</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>0.0270</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

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.

**Q14. Communication**

*by percentage of respondents (excluding don't knows)*

<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>Availability of and timeliness of info about services and activities</td>
<td>13%</td>
<td>48%</td>
<td>31%</td>
<td>8%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Responsiveness of City social media accounts</td>
<td>15%</td>
<td>43%</td>
<td>33%</td>
<td>9%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>City’s efforts to keep you informed about city-related issues</td>
<td>13%</td>
<td>44%</td>
<td>29%</td>
<td>15%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>City’s efforts to be transparent</td>
<td>8%</td>
<td>29%</td>
<td>36%</td>
<td>27%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The level of public involvement in local decision-making</td>
<td>9%</td>
<td>27%</td>
<td>33%</td>
<td>31%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: ETC Institute (2020)
Q15. City Communication [Part 1]

How Often Respondents Use Each Item
by percentage of respondents (excluding not provided responses)

Source: ETC Institute (2020)

Social Media is not the Most Used Source of Information

- Parks and Recreation guide
  - Often: 14%
  - 4: 23%
  - 3: 27%
  - 2: 19%
  - Never: 18%

- Local media outlets (newspaper)
  - Often: 27%
  - 4: 20%
  - 3: 15%
  - 2: 14%
  - Never: 24%

- Direct Mail
  - Often: 11%
  - 4: 16%
  - 3: 23%
  - 2: 17%
  - Never: 33%

- The City website, www.lawrenceks.org
  - Often: 6%
  - 4: 15%
  - 3: 28%
  - 2: 29%
  - Never: 22%

- City newsletter, The Flame
  - Often: 12%
  - 4: 12%
  - 3: 13%
  - 2: 15%
  - Never: 49%

- Email subscription notifications
  - Often: 8%
  - 4: 10%
  - 3: 12%
  - 2: 10%
  - Never: 61%

- Facebook
  - Often: 7%
  - 4: 9%
  - 3: 12%
  - 2: 8%
  - Never: 65%

- NextDoor
  - Often: 6%
  - 4: 6%
  - 3: 12%
  - 2: 7%
  - Never: 69%

- Solid Waste App
  - Often: 6%
  - 4: 6%
  - 3: 6%
  - 2: 7%
  - Never: 75%

- Twitter
  - Often: 4%
  - 4: 5%
  - 3: 6%
  - 2: 5%
  - Never: 81%

Sources of Information Maintained by the City Should Receive More Attention
### Q15. City Communication [Part 2]
**Effectiveness of Each Item**

by percentage of respondents

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Source</th>
<th>Effective</th>
<th>4</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>Ineffective</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Parks and Recreation guide</td>
<td>32%</td>
<td>33%</td>
<td>23%</td>
<td>6%</td>
<td>7%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The City website, <a href="http://www.lawrenceks.org">www.lawrenceks.org</a></td>
<td>15%</td>
<td>31%</td>
<td>33%</td>
<td>10%</td>
<td>12%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Local media outlets (newspaper)</td>
<td>24%</td>
<td>28%</td>
<td>25%</td>
<td>9%</td>
<td>15%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Direct Mail</td>
<td>19%</td>
<td>27%</td>
<td>28%</td>
<td>9%</td>
<td>17%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>City newsletter, The Flame</td>
<td>18%</td>
<td>22%</td>
<td>24%</td>
<td>10%</td>
<td>26%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Email subscription notifications</td>
<td>15%</td>
<td>20%</td>
<td>28%</td>
<td>8%</td>
<td>29%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Facebook</td>
<td>13%</td>
<td>16%</td>
<td>27%</td>
<td>7%</td>
<td>37%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NextDoor</td>
<td>12%</td>
<td>12%</td>
<td>26%</td>
<td>11%</td>
<td>40%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Solid Waste App</td>
<td>14%</td>
<td>11%</td>
<td>23%</td>
<td>8%</td>
<td>44%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Twitter</td>
<td>8%</td>
<td>11%</td>
<td>23%</td>
<td>6%</td>
<td>52%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: ETC Institute (2020)
Summary

Residents Have a Positive Perception of the City

Lawrence Rated Significantly Higher than the National Average in 80% of the Areas Assessed

Lawrence Saw an Increase in Positive Ratings in 47% of the Areas Assessed Between 2015 and 2019

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)
- Quality of planning and code enforcement
- Effectiveness of City communication with the public (increasing the utilization of sources maintained by City)
- Economic growth and affordability issues (affordable housing and how well the City is planning growth)
Questions?

THANK YOU!