2015 Resident Satisfaction Survey

LEWISVILLE
Deep Roots. Broad Wings. Bright Future.

City of Lewisville – 2015 Resident Satisfaction Survey

A resident satisfaction survey was conducted online from July 1 through August 15 of last year as a way to measure public perception of city services and quality of life in Lewisville. This report contains the results of that survey and an analysis of those results.

The city previously conducted resident satisfaction surveys in 2000 and 2002 through the University of North Texas, and in 2003 and 2004 through a private firm Turco & Associates. We also have conducted a variety of surveys focused on specific service areas or topics, including Code Enforcement (2006) and MCL Grand (2012). All of these surveys were random-sample telephone surveys.

The Resident Satisfaction Survey was first conducted entirely online in August-October 2014. Previously, the city performed the Lewisville 2025 Input Survey online in April-July 2013. All three of the online surveys were conducted using the SurveyMonkey website and were promoted through media releases, website and social media postings, and electronic newsletters. Nearly 1,500 responses were received for the 2015 Resident Satisfaction Survey, an increase of about 25 percent over the 1,200 participants in the 2014 survey.

There were 36 potential questions in the survey, but the use of screening questions meant most respondents only saw about 30 questions. The first question received 1,498 responses and the last question drew 1,242 responses, an attrition rate of 17.09 percent that is slightly better than the industry norm.

Differences in survey types

There are many different types of surveys, but cities typically use one of four types based on the target audience and the intended uses for survey data. Lewisville has, at various times, used elements of all four of these survey types.

- Attitudinal – This is the most common survey type used by cities (the 2015 Resident Satisfaction Survey falls into this category). The intent of an attitudinal survey is to take a snapshot of public impressions related to a topic or series of topics. Respondents are asked to share their views on importance or quality. However, these surveys usually do not ask respondents to explain the reasons behind those opinions. Results of an attitudinal survey can point out areas of perceived strength or weakness, and when conducted several times over a period of months or years, can identify positive and negative trends in public perception.
- Analytic – This type of survey is used more often in academic circles and is designed to find out how people perform certain behaviors or why they hold specific opinions. In most cases, the behavior or opinion itself already has been established through an attitudinal survey or respondent screening process, or is an accepted societal norm. The city's 2006 survey focusing on Code Enforcement was largely analytic in nature.
- Marketing – Retailers and service providers often use this type of survey to find out from customers and potential customers how best to influence behaviors. An example is a survey asking what laundry detergent you purchase, why you purchase it, and what you look for in a laundry detergent. Results of a marketing survey are used to develop advertising campaigns, product packaging, and product placement. Cities sometimes use marketing surveys in connection with tourism, business development, or promotion of paid services. The 2012 MCL Grand survey was primarily a marketing survey.

- Educational – This type of survey uses the content of the questions themselves to impart information to respondents. For example, a question might list three or four little-known facts, then ask the respondent to rate those facts. The primary intent of the question is to deliver those facts, not necessarily to gather input. Educational surveys often start and end with the same question as a means to measure whether respondents gained knowledge or awareness while taking the survey.

Most surveys incorporate elements of multiple survey types, although the core purpose and content falls into a single category. While the 2015 Resident Satisfaction Survey is primarily an attitudinal survey, we did include some elements of the other three survey types where it was possible to do so without distracting respondents from the main topic or making the survey so long people would quit before finishing.

Differences in survey methodology

Random-sample telephone surveys are the preferred method for conducting a public opinion survey. Telephone numbers can be sorted geographically, and respondents can be screened with the first couple of questions to ensure a demographic mix that closely mirrors known demographics of the survey area. Randomly selecting respondents removes personal bias in participant selection. All of these factors combine to give random-sample telephone surveys a high degree of scientific validity and a relatively low margin of error (about 4.5 percent for the city's surveys in 2003 and 2004).

Because the surveys rely on telephone connections, and usually do not reach mobile numbers, there is ongoing debate as to the continued validity of telephone survey results. However, telephone surveys have so far retained demography consistency and are still the industry standard for gathering public opinion.

Opt-in surveys tend to be more anecdotal because there is no demographic sampling. An opt-in survey might produce a demographic spread that closely resembles the population of the survey area, but it is not certain to happen. Opt-in surveys can provide useful data with a high response rate. Mail and online are common ways to conduct an opt-in survey. Researchers have found little difference between responses to mail surveys versus online, except mail respondents tend to trend slightly older and female (still within the statistical margin).

In-person surveys are another option, one that the city uses at Western Days and other special events to learn about attendees and their behavior patterns. In-person surveys are designed to have the same demographic accuracy as random-sample surveys; questioners are given a list of demographic "types" to include in specific ratios. These surveys can be very accurate if conducted properly, but selection bias can be a concern. For example, some research firms avoid using college-aged men to conduct on-site surveys because "secret shopper" observation studies have shown they sometimes favor attractive respondents.

The 2015 Resident Satisfaction Survey was an opt-in survey conducted exclusively online. This choice was largely an economic one. Past random-sample telephone surveys have cost about $15,000 and have not been included in the operating budget since 2006. This choice does have an impact on the survey results.

Results variations based on survey methodology

Multiple studies have found that phone survey responses are more toward the positive end of the rating scale than are online survey responses. The evidence suggests that responses to "straight answer" type questions are less likely to differ significantly between the survey types than are responses to subjective questions, particularly those questions with a greater range of response options. One such study, released in November 2011 by the University of California at Davis, suggested that random-sample telephone surveys and online surveys have the potential to produce significantly different results when respondents are asked to select from a list of answers or to assign a rating to a list of items.

While researchers have not offered a uniform explanation of that difference, there are several theories. One is that online users are interacting only with their computer while telephone respondents are interacting with a human being, and people have a natural inclination to want to please the person on the other end of the telephone line and thus are less critical.

Another theory that applies to opt-in online surveys is that people with stronger opinions, and especially people with stronger negative opinions, are more highly motivated to share their views and thus are more likely to take and complete an opt-in survey than people with less intense opinions.

Regardless of the reasons behind this behavioral trend, online surveys produce a higher percentage of "intense" ratings at both end of the scale, and positive ratings tend to be 5 to 8 percent lower than ratings collected from a random-sample telephone survey. This makes it highly deceiving to compare results of an online survey with past results from a random-sample telephone survey.

As a result, staff has not included direct comparisons between the 2015 survey results and the results of random-sample telephone surveys conducted in 2000-2004. While past results are mentioned in passing a few times in the ensuing analysis, those references are contextual in nature and should not be viewed as a valid baseline for benchmarking or trending. In addition, while 2014 online survey results are presented in some areas of this report, two results are not enough to project true trending and therefore those comparisons should be viewed as strictly anecdotal in nature.

Use and filtering of "no opinion" responses

Another documented variation found when comparing results of telephone and online surveys is the frequency of "no opinion" responses. This option typically is included in a survey as a way to give respondents with no strong view a chance to respond without significant impact on the overall results. However, people answering online surveys are four to five times more likely to select "no opinion" than people answering a telephone survey.

There are several theories that attempt to explain this behavior, but the most frequently cited is that respondents do not want to appear uninformed or apathetic when interacting with a live person over the telephone, whereas they have no such reluctance when interacting only with their computer screen. The inherent desire to "please" the questioner is another potential factor, but the self-interest of wanting to appear aware and knowledgeable is generally considered to be the most significant factor causing this statistical trend.

Regardless of the reason for the behavior, it is documented fact that “no opinion” responses are much more common with online surveys, frequently to the point of having a dramatic impact on the final results. As a quick example: If 100 people answer a survey and only 20 provide a positive answer, that would generate a 20 percent satisfaction rating. However, if 60 respondents offered no opinion, then the satisfaction rating among people who did voice an opinion is 50 percent.

While some online surveys account for this by removing the “no opinion” answer option, the industry standard is to include “no opinion” as an option (specific wording can vary) but to filter out those responses when calculating results of the survey. The problem with removing the “no opinion” option entirely is that people are forced to provide some sort of answer, even though they truly do not have an impression of the topic. Several recent studies have shown that forced responses tend to mirror the answer given to the previous question, which means survey results could be manipulated by the order in which questions are listed.

Staff opted to follow the industry standard and include “no opinion” responses in the 2014 and 2015 Resident Satisfaction Surveys, but to filter out those responses when analyzing results. Therefore, the survey results included in this report show the raw figures but have been adjusted in the analysis portion to remove the “no opinion” responses unless otherwise indicated. We believe this provides a more accurate snapshot of public perception related to city services and quality of life.

Benchmarking and competitive market comparisons

Attitudinal surveys work best when the same survey questions are asked of random audiences over a period of months or years. This allows trends to be identified by tracking how results of a question change over time. That is why the city conducted four attitudinal surveys in 2000-2004 using largely the same questions and the same methodology. Trends identified through those three surveys were useful in seeing where residents had concerns.

The most recent attitudinal survey prior to 2014 was conducted 10 years earlier. That is considered too long of a gap between surveys to develop accurate trends because of resident turnover and changes within the community (including some changes that were made partly in response to those earlier survey results). Also, changing survey methodology from random-sample telephone to opt-in online prevents accurate trending.

Most of the same questions were used so we can establish new benchmarks moving forward, and staff does plan to conduct the satisfaction survey every year or two years. While it is interesting to compare 2015 results with 2014 results, no true trend can be established and analyzed until at least one more comparable survey is conducted. For example, while the top-level satisfaction ratings improved slightly from 2014 to 2015, most of the service-specific satisfaction ratings decreased from 2014 to 2015. Until at least one more year’s worth of data is available, it is not possible to determine whether those changes are a result of increased survey participation or other factors.

Another way survey results can be assessed is by comparing results among similar communities within the competitive market. For that to be effective, each community must ask essentially the same question using the same survey methodology. Our comparison cities either have not conducted a recent satisfaction survey at all, or have not used the same questions and methodology. This mean comparisons between Lewisville’s survey results and those gathered in other communities might be entertaining, but would not be particularly useful.

Analysis of survey results

Following is an analysis of results from the 2015 Resident Satisfaction Survey. Questions are presented in a different order than the original survey document in order to draw comparisons between related results. Each question is labeled with its numerical position in the original survey. Data shown are the raw results for each question, but the analysis beneath the raw numbers is based on results with “no opinion” responses filtered out unless otherwise noted.

Overall levels of satisfaction

Q1. In general, how satisfied or dissatisfied are you with the quality of life in the community?

Answer Options	Response Percent	Response Count
Very Satisfied	22.23 %	333
Satisfied	67.02 %	1004
Dissatisfied	8.74 %	131
Very Dissatisfied	2.00 %	30

This question is identical to a question included in all of our past satisfaction surveys. In past surveys, our goal has been to attain a 90 percent or higher overall satisfaction rating. This is determined by adding the two higher responses ("very satisfied" and "satisfied"). In addition, the goal is a 9:1 ratio between positive and negative ratings. However, because of expected differences due to survey methodology as described previously, staff did not set a goal for this question.

The actual satisfaction rating received is 89.25 percent, slightly less than in past years but still a very strong result for an opt-in online survey and virtually unchanged from the 2014 satisfaction rating of 88.24 percent. Results also showed a high degree of positive intensity, with 22.23 percent of respondents describing themselves as "very satisfied" (333 people out of 1,498 respondents). In addition, only 30 people (2.00 percent) described themselves as "very unsatisfied" with the quality of life in Lewisville. The positive response ratio was 8.3:1.

The consistent results for this question in the 2014 and 2015 seems to show that a goal of 90 percent satisfaction and 25 percent intense satisfaction is reasonable and attainable, but specific benchmarks will not be established until at least one more comparable survey is completed.

Q2. During the time you have lived here, do you think that as a community Lewisville has improved, stayed the same or gotten worse?

Answer Options	Response Percent	Response Count
Improved	41.66 %	624
Stayed the same	37.25 %	558
Gotten worse	17.76 %	266
No Opinion	3.34 %	50

This question was new in the 2014 survey, so staff had no benchmark on which to predict results. Ideally, we were hoping that "improved" would receive the highest rating and "gotten worse" the lowest. Those are the exact results received for this question in both years completed to date, with the 2015 results showing 41.66 percent saying "improved" and 17.76 percent saying "gotten worse" for a comparison ratio of 2.3:1 positive. Those results are similar to (but slightly less positive) than in the 2014 survey.

Staff expected that people who have lived in Lewisville the longest would be the most likely to report seeing changes (good or bad). A cross-tabulation of these results with the length of residency results in Q35 largely supports that expectation. While 41.66 percent of all respondents said Lewisville has "improved" during the time they have lived here, that rating increased with each length-of-residency tier from a low of 23.81 percent for "less than 1 year" residents to a high of 53.17 percent for "more than 20 years" residents. Results for "gotten worse" showed a similar pattern, ranging from a low of 2.38 percent among "less than 1 year" residents to a high of 23.56 percent for "more than 20 years" residents. Results for "stayed the same" showed a reverse pattern, with newer residents far more likely to make that selection than were longer-tenured residents.

Percentages in the chart below to not precisely match the full survey results because 1,498 people answered Q2 and only 1,236 answered Q35. This cross-tabulation only shows survey respondents who answered both questions.

		Q2. During the time you have lived here, do you think that as a community Lewisville has improved, stayed the same or gotten worse?									
		Improved		Stayed the Same		Gotten Worse		No Opinion		TOTAL	
Q35. How long have you lived in the City of Lewisville?	Less than 1 year	10	1.86%	25	5.63%	1	0.45%	6	17.65%	42	3.40%
		23.81%		59.52%		2.38%		14.29%			
	1-3 years	57	10.61%	145	32.66%	15	6.79%	14	41.18%	231	18.69%
		24.68%		62.77%		6.49%		6.06%			
	4-6 years	55	10.24%	54	12.16%	18	8.14%	5	14.71%	132	10.68%
		41.67%		40.91%		13.64%		3.79%			
	7-9 years	61	11.36%	45	10.14%	32	14.48%	1	2.94%	139	11.25%
		43.88%		32.37%		23.02%		0.72%			
	10-20 years	178	33.15%	103	23.20%	77	34.84%	3	8.82%	361	29.21%
		49.31%		28.53%		21.33%		0.83%			
	More than 20 years	176	32.77%	72	16.22%	78	35.29%	5	14.71%	331	26.78%
		53.17%		21.75%		23.56%		1.51%			
	TOTAL	537		444		221		34		1236	
		43.45%		35.92%		17.88%		2.75%			

Q36. If a friend or relative were considering a move to the North Texas area, how likely would you be to encourage them to consider Lewisville?

Answer Options	Response Percent	Response Count
Very likely	33.25 %	413
Likely	45.17 %	561
Unlikely	11.43 %	142
Very unlikely	5.72 %	71
No opinion	4.43 %	55

This was another new question for the 2014 survey. It mirrors a question we have used for several years on surveys for Western Days and other special events. The idea is that just because a resident is generally satisfied with life in Lewisville does not mean they are willing to endorse Lewisville to their friends and family. Commercial marketers will tell you that a product endorsement by consumers is tough to get, but is the most valuable sales tool they can have. So staff wanted to know if Lewisville has earned consumer endorsements from its residents.

The results were very strong. Adjusted to remove the "no opinion" responses, 82.06 percent of respondents said they would recommend Lewisville to a family member or friend moving to North Texas (34.79 with intensity). That compares to 17.94 percent who would not (5.98 with intensity) for a plus ratio of 4.6:1.

Since we cannot find another North Texas city that has asked this question in a public survey, we are not able to benchmark this result against other communities. It is somewhat speculative to say this is a good result, although it is closer to the general satisfaction rating than one typically sees in commercial marketing. We choose to see this as a positive result with room for improvement, and plan to continue asking this question and tracking results in future satisfaction surveys.

Q3. How satisfied or dissatisfied are you with the level of City Services you receive in return for the City Property taxes you pay?

Answer Options	Response Percent	Response Count
Very Satisfied	13.90 %	192
Satisfied	61.48 %	849
Dissatisfied	20.78 %	287
Very Dissatisfied	3.84 %	53

Another new question for the 2014 survey, this was intended to determine whether residents see value for their property taxes. The result in 2015 showed 75.38 percent of respondents describing themselves as "satisfied" and 24.62 percent as "dissatisfied" – a plus ratio of 3.1:1. The plus ratio among intense responses was slightly better at 3.6:1 (192 very satisfied, 53 very unsatisfied).

Staff expectation was that there would be a strong correlation between responses to Q3 (satisfaction for services for taxes) and Q1 (overall satisfaction). A cross-tabulation of results for those two questions shows a very strong correlation, especially for the intense responses on each end of the rating scale.

Of the 1,381 people who answered both questions, 992 gave a positive answer to both questions (71.83 percent) and 101 gave negative responses to both questions (7.31 percent) for a plus ratio of 9.8:1. The remaining 288 people gave mixed responses, the majority of those (192 people) saying “satisfied” to Q1 and “dissatisfied” to Q3 – a result that seems to reflect the anti-tax sentiment common in contemporary politics.

There were 129 survey respondents (9.34 percent) who could be called enthusiastic fans of Lewisville, with intense positive responses to both questions; and 10 (0.72 percent) who could be called strong critics who gave intense negative responses to both questions. The unusual outliers are the three people who said they were “very satisfied” overall but “very dissatisfied” with services received for taxes paid; and the one survey respondent who was “very dissatisfied” overall but “very satisfied” with services received for taxes paid.

Q3. How satisfied or dissatisfied are you with the level of City Services you receive in return for the City property taxes you pay?	Q1. In general, how satisfied or dissatisfied are you with the quality of life in the community?									
	Very Satisfied		Satisfied		Dissatisfied		Very Dissatisfied		TOTAL	
Very Satisfied	129	41.35%	58	6.31%	4	3.31%	1	3.45%	192	13.90%
	67.19%		30.21%		2.08%		0.52%			
Satisfied	163	52.24%	642	69.86%	37	30.58%	7	24.14%	849	61.48%
	19.20%		75.62%		4.36%		0.82%			
Dissatisfied	17	5.45%	192	20.89%	67	55.37%	11	37.93%	287	20.78%
	5.92%		66.90%		23.34%		3.83%			
Very Dissatisfied	3	0.96%	27	2.94%	13	10.74%	10	34.48%	53	3.84%
	5.66%		50.94%		24.53%		18.87%			
TOTAL	312		919		121		29		1381	
	22.59%		66.55%		8.76%		2.10%			

CHART KEY -->

RAW NUMBER OF RESPONDENTS	% of the Q1 responses that fit this Q3 group	This percentage compares to the total results on the right of the chart; it can be read as "This percentage of people giving this Q1 response also gave this Q3 response."
% of the Q3 group that gave this Q1 response		This percentage compares to the total results on the bottom of the chart; it can be read as "This percentage of people giving this Q3 response also gave this Q1 response."

Satisfaction with specific city services

Q4. Rate the following City Services

Answer Options	Excellent	Good	Fair	Poor	No Opinion
Ambulance Services	344	206	26	2	803
Code Enforcement	130	415	361	173	302
Curbside Recycling	574	533	154	68	52
Fire Services	604	277	20	3	477
Library Services	498	433	69	27	354
Park Facilities	326	617	214	85	139
Police Services	569	448	106	55	203
Recreational Programming	212	452	218	82	417
Sewer Service	329	570	177	54	251
Sidewalks	172	535	418	186	70
Special Events Organized by City	343	518	228	63	229
Storm Water Drainage	284	607	248	91	151
Street Lighting in Neighborhoods	143	481	408	308	41
Street Maintenance	141	514	473	214	39
Trash Collection	476	561	211	115	18
Water Service	497	656	138	35	55

When adjusted to remove “no opinion” responses, ratings in this question were topped by Fire Services (97.46 percent) and Ambulance Services (95.16 percent). These results closely mirror numbers from the 2000-2004 and 2014 satisfaction surveys. The only other city service receiving a positive rating of better than 90 percent was Library Services (92.64). Three others – Water Service, Police Services and Curbside Recycling – received satisfaction ratings above 80 percent.

The complete list:

1. Fire Services 97.46
2. Ambulance Services 95.16
3. Library Services 90.65
4. Water Service 86.95
5. Police Services 86.33
6. Curbside Recycling 83.30
7. Sewer Service 79.56
8. Trash Collection 76.08
9. Park Facilities 75.93
10. Special Events 74.74
11. Storm Water Drainage 72.44
12. Recreation Programs 68.88
13. Sidewalks 53.94
14. Code Enforcement 50.51
15. Street Maintenance 48.81
16. Street Lighting 46.57

The four service categories receiving the highest intensity of satisfaction ("excellent" ratings) were Fire Services, Ambulance Services, Library Services and Police Services.

The "no opinion" filter came heavily into play on this question, as five service categories (Ambulance Services, Fire Services, Recreational Programming, Library Services and Code Enforcement) received no rating from 20 percent or more of respondents. For example, 58.15 percent of respondents did not rate Ambulance Services. If the "no opinion" responses are not filtered out, Ambulance Services would receive a satisfaction rating of just 24.91 percent, far below the ratings received in any previous random-sample surveys. The high "no opinion" response in certain areas could reflect a lack of direct experience with those specific services by large segments of the population.

It is important to understand that this question only asks respondents for their overall impression of each service category, but does not ask for reasoning behind each rating. That work is done in other questions later in the survey for some services (Police, Park Facilities, Library, Recreation, Special Events). For most city services, however, those questions are not asked in this survey. If that information is desired for a particular service or set of services, a follow-up survey would be needed.

For example, Sidewalks ranked 13th out of 16 services with a satisfaction rating of 53.93 percent. But without additional questioning, it is impossible to say whether the concern is with lack of sidewalks in some areas, a need for sidewalk maintenance, or whether the deficiency is perceived mostly in residential or commercial areas. A lower-than-desired satisfaction rating should be interpreted as a need for more information rather than as a blanket indictment of that service category.

The service area showing the most improvement from 2014 was Trash Collection, which moved up from 11th to 8th. While this result remains strictly anecdotal until another year's worth of data can be collected, the lower rating in 2014 came during the transition to weekly residential collection when a large number of complaints were being received by city calltakers and on social media. One could surmise that the improved rating in 2015 shows residents have become accustomed to and accepting of the new collection frequency, or that Waste Management has gotten better at completing its collection schedule since the rocky transition period.

Results of this question also provide an excellent example of why achieving a 100 percent satisfaction rating for any city service is not a reasonable goal, and why city staff generally sets goals in the range of 85-95 percent. Among the 1,381 people who responded to this question, just three rated Fire Services as "poor." However, looking at the complete survey responses for those three people showed that two of them provided negative answers to nearly every question on the survey; one of them, in fact, marked the most negative answer possible to every single survey question. There always will be some people whose opinion of city services cannot be reliably measured.

Q5. How would you rate the Lewisville Police Department in each of the following areas?

Answer Options	Excellent	Good	Fair	Poor	No Opinion	Satisfaction
Speed in responding to calls	410	351	90	46	484	84.84
Courtesy	458	400	91	51	208	86.45
Professionalism	470	404	78	43	211	88.01
Customer Service	395	391	101	43	273	85.49

Police services typically receive some of the highest positive ratings in city surveys, and that is again the case with the 2015 Resident Satisfaction Survey. All four service qualities listed in this question received satisfaction ratings between 84 and 89 percent when filtered to remove "no opinion" responses. The ratings are so close to one another that a ranking order is not particularly useful, with less than four rating points between the highest item (Professionalism) and the lowest one (Customer Service). The highest "no opinion" response was for Speed Responding to Calls, likely because most residents have never placed an urgent call for police service.

Q6. How safe or unsafe do you feel in the following locations?

Answer Options	Very Safe	Safe	Somewhat Unsafe	Very Unsafe	No opinion	Satisfaction
Within your own neighborhood	522	657	178	24	0	85.37
Other residential areas outside your neighborhood	182	685	413	59	42	64.75
Commercial areas	174	750	373	53	31	68.44

This question was included in the 2003, 2004 and 2014 satisfaction surveys, with similar results. Overall, respondents do feel safe in all areas of Lewisville – fewer than 60 people in the survey said they feel "very unsafe" in any particular area. They feel safest in their own neighborhoods, with an 85.37 positive rating that includes an intensity rating of 37.80 percent and a 5.8:1 positive ratio.

One interesting outcome of this question is that people feel much safer in their own neighborhood than in other residential areas, but also feel safer in commercial districts than in unfamiliar residential neighborhoods. This response has been consistent in all Lewisville surveys and is likely a product of familiarity. One potential cause of this result is that several high-profile violent crimes took place just as the survey was starting, so while respondents not living near those incidents felt safe at home, they felt less safe when leaving their own neighborhood. This also helps explain the large difference in intensity ratings (both positive and negative) when comparing "your own neighborhood" with the other two categories.

Perhaps more than any other survey question, responses to this one are driven by individual perceptions. Residents who have not been crime victims, have not witnessed a crime, and have recently seen a police presence feel safe. People who have been crime victims often do not, and they are more likely to report a lack of police presence even if patrol logs show frequent visits by officers to that area. This result is found in all communities that compile survey data.

Satisfaction with recreation and events

Q12. In the past 12 months, how many times have you or a member of your household visited the Lewisville Public Library?

Answer Options	Response Percent	Response Count
None	38.5 %	518
1 -3 times	26.3 %	354
4 -6 times	11.4 %	154
7 -10 times	6.6 %	89
More than 10 times	16.6 %	223
Decline to answer	0.7 %	9

This question shows that awareness and use of the library is high, with 60.87 percent of respondents indicating that they had visited Lewisville Public Library within the previous year and nearly one-fourth visiting frequently (7-10 times or more). Awareness of specific programs and activities would be expected to lag behind these numbers. The primary inference is that general library awareness is accomplished, so marketing efforts should place added emphasis on individual programs or program categories.

More than three-fourths (76.45 percent) of the people who said they had not visited the library at all during the preceding 12 months also indicated on Q34 that they had no children under the age of 18 living in their home. The same cross-tabulation shows that 37.95 percent of people with children age 6 or younger in their home had visited the library 7 or more times during the preceding 12 months. Overall, households with no children living at home were far less likely to visit the library than households with children at home, especially children ages 12 or younger. These numbers show the library's strong appeal to families with young children. Boosting visitation by households with older children or no children at home is a ripe opportunity.

This also was used as a qualifier question. Only people who indicated they had visited the library were asked to evaluate the facility in Q13.

Q13. Regarding the Library, how satisfied or dissatisfied are you with the following?

Answer Options	Very Satisfied	Somewhat Satisfied	Somewhat Dissatisfied	Very Dissatisfied	No opinion
Classes & Events for Children	207	122	15	6	464
Classes & Events for Teens	115	90	24	9	576
Classes & Events for Adults	149	157	39	15	454
Courtesy of Library staff	525	182	31	7	69
Hours of Operation	411	274	47	15	67
Public-use computers	247	171	30	14	352
Selection of books and materials	340	321	62	9	82
Technology classes and services	144	147	39	13	471

This question was asked only of survey respondents who indicated on the preceding Q12 that they had visited the library during the previous 12 months.

All eight program groups listed received a satisfaction ranking of higher than 84 percent, with five landing in the 90s. Put into simple terms, that means our lowest grade for library programs was a B. These are very consistent with the 90.65 percent overall satisfaction rating Library Services received in Q4. Library programs ranked in order of positive ratings (combines “very satisfied” and “somewhat satisfied”) and adjusted to remove “no opinion” responses:

1. Courtesy of Library Staff (94.90)
2. Classes & Events for Children (94.00)
3. Hours of Operation (91.70)
4. Public-use Computers (90.48)
5. Selection of Books and Materials (90.30)
6. Classes & Events for Teens (86.13)
7. Classes & Events for Adults (85.00)
8. Technology Classes and Services (84.84)

The highest positive intensity was for Courtesy of Library Staff (64.50 percent very satisfied; 70.47 percent adjusted to remove “no opinion” responses); and Hours of Operation (55.02 percent adjusted). This would indicate that, despite occasional complaints from individual residents, more than half of library users are “very satisfied” with the library’s current operating hours. The greatest negative intensity was for Technology Class and Services at 3.79 percent, representing 13 people out of 343.

“No opinion” responses were a significant factor with this question, as five categories received no rating from more than 40 percent of respondents. The impact can most clearly be seen in the Satisfaction Rating for “Classes and Events for Teens” which received a raw rating of 25.19 percent but an adjusted rating of 86.13 percent once staff removed the 576 people (70.76 percent) who did not rate that service.

Q16. In the past 12 months, how many times have you or a member of your household visited a Lewisville Parks and Recreation facility, such as a recreation center or public park?

Answer Options	Response Percent	Response Count
None	22.49 %	298
1 - 3 times	25.28 %	335
4 -6 times	14.11 %	187
7 - 10 times	8.91 %	118
More than 10 times	28.75 %	381
Decline to answer	0.45 %	6

Results for this question were comparable in some ways to those for library visitors in Q12. Overall, more than three-fourths of respondents said they had visited a Lewisville park or recreation facility within the previous 12 months and more than one-third have visited frequently (7-10 times or more). This result adds credence to the very strong support for additional park and recreation facilities seen in the Lewisville 2025 input survey, and could have been a factor in the bond election results in November 2015.

As with results for Q12 about library visits, results for this question showed lower frequency of visitation by respondents with no children under age 18 living in their home. More than half of those respondents (56.04 percent) either had not visited a park or recreation facility during the preceding 12 months, or had visited just 1-3 times. In contrast, 50.26 percent of respondents with children ages 6 and younger and 51.95 percent of respondents with children ages 7-12 said they had visited a park or recreation facility more than 10 times during the preceding 12 months. Boosting visitation by childless households would have the most immediate impact on overall visitation of the city's parks and recreation facilities.

This response was used to screen respondents for the following question seeking ratings for specific aspects of city parks.

Q17. Regarding Parks and Recreation in Lewisville, how satisfied or dissatisfied are you with the following?

Answer Options	Very Satisfied	Somewhat Satisfied	Somewhat Dissatisfied	Very Dissatisfied	No opinion
Athletic fields	240	276	39	18	441
Availability of open space	385	370	67	24	168
City aquatic parks	198	243	74	37	462
Hike and bike trails	224	335	138	54	263
Playgrounds	264	329	85	23	313
Recreation centers	188	317	86	40	383
Recreation programs and classes	141	226	93	41	513
Senior Activity Center	124	139	39	15	697
The location of city parks	405	435	57	33	84
The appearance of city parks	357	446	126	42	43

This question was asked only of survey respondents who indicated on the preceding Q16 that they had visited a park facility during the previous 12 months. A similar question was included in the public survey used during development of the Park and Open Space Master Plan.

All 10 elements of city park and recreation facilities received satisfaction ratings above 73 percent, with two in the 90s and five more in the 80s. One way of looking at the ratings is that parks and rec facilities received a report card with all passing marks, but still leaving room for improvement in some areas. As previously stated, the satisfaction ratings only give overall impressions and do not explain why each area received the rating that it did. A more detailed survey could be used to identify specific areas of satisfaction or desired improvement, and such a survey should be considered prior to final planning and design of the new Multi-Generational Recreation Center.

The 74.43 percent satisfaction rating for “hike and bike trails” should improve significantly in the next two years as new trails come on line that already are in construction or design, including the DCTA trail, trails at Lake Park and Copperas Branch Park East, and the regional connector trail along Garden Ridge and Valley Parkway.

The Senior Activity Center was left in this question, despite the addition of two specific survey questions about that facility, because this question is answered by a larger field of respondents that could include some who have formed an opinion about the senior center but do not use that facility. By contrast, Q19 below was asked only of survey respondents who indicated they had visited the Senior Activity Center at least once during the preceding 12 months.

The complete list of rated aspects:

1. Location of parks 90.32
2. Athletic fields 90.05
3. Available open space 89.24
4. Playgrounds 84.59
5. Senior Activity Center 82.97
6. Appearance of parks 82.70
7. Recreation centers 80.03
8. City aquatic parks 79.89
9. Hike and bike trails 74.43
10. Rec programs/classes 73.25

Q18. In the past 12 months, how many times have you or a member of your household visited the Lewisville Senior Activity Center?

Answer Options	Response Percent	Response Count
None	81.20 %	1067
Did not know about it	4.49%	59
1 - 3 times	8.68 %	114
4 -6 times	1.22 %	16
7 - 10 times	0.91 %	12
More than 10 times	2.82 %	37
Decline to answer	0.68 %	9

This was a new question for the 2015 survey and primarily was intended to screen respondents for the subsequent question seeking ratings for specific aspects of the Senior Activity Center.

Results here show that 13.63 of respondents (or a member of their household) had visited the center within the past 12 months. Staff would have liked a higher percentage since results for Q33 showed that 38.04 percent of survey respondents listed their age as 55 or older. However, the fact that only 4.49 percent of people answering this question had no awareness of the center indicates that residents not visiting do so by choice. Marketing efforts in this area should be focused on specific programs rather than on the center as a whole, because there already is very high awareness (about 95 percent based on this survey result) that the Senior Activity Center exists.

Q19. Regarding the Lewisville Senior Activity Center, how satisfied or dissatisfied are you with the following?

This question was asked only of survey respondents who indicated on the preceding Q18 that they had visited the Senior Activity Center during the previous 12 months. As a result, only 176 respondents saw this question. When “no opinion” responses are factored out, some aspects of the Senior Activity Center were rated by fewer than 100 people, meaning the results of this question have anecdotal value but cannot be considered statistically accurate. To get a clearer picture of how

Senior Activity Center users evaluate the facility and its programming, a targeted on-site survey (most recently performed in May 2006) would be needed. Feedback of this nature, either through surveys or other collection methods, is recommended prior to final planning and design of the new Multi-Generational Recreation Center.

All 10 elements of the Senior Activity Center received "passing" marks in the survey. The complete list:

1. Courtesy of center staff 95.33
2. Games and socialization 87.63
3. Hours of operation 86.67
4. Monthly dances 86.21
5. Arts and crafts classes 85.53
6. Technology classes 85.14
7. Variety of special activities 81.20
8. Cost of special activities 80.67
9. Day trips 78.21
10. Communication 75.00

Q14. In the past 12 months, how many times have you or a member of your household visited the Medical Center of Lewisville Grand Theater (MCL Grand)?

Answer Options	Response Percent	Response Count
None	65.37 %	872
1 -3 times	25.26 %	337
4 -6 times	4.27 %	57
7 -10 times	2.02 %	27
More than 10 times	2.47 %	33
Decline to answer	0.6 %	8

Responses to this survey question show that about one-third of people answering said they had attended at least one activity at MCL Grand during the previous 12 months, and two-thirds had not. In contrast with the library visitation numbers discussed earlier, the bulk of those people had attended infrequently (1-3 times) and only 2.27 percent had attended more than 10 events.

The 2012 MCL Grand awareness survey did not ask this specific question, instead breaking it down into various types of events and performances. For example, at that time 12 percent said they had visited the art gallery and 14 percent "just to see it," while only 5 percent had attended a symphony and 6 percent any other concert. Those results also showed relatively low familiarity with MCL Grand among respondents. For example, 28 percent of respondents in 2012 said they thought the building was a medical facility. Those 2012 results did show a high level of satisfaction among people who had visited MCL Grand during its first year of operation.

So while a direct comparison of results cannot be made, the data do appear to show increased awareness of and use of MCL Grand by Lewisville residents since the first survey was conducted. The 2015 results also support information gathered through ZIP Code tracking of attendees at public performances and exhibits,

that the majority of arts patrons visiting MCL Grand come from outside Lewisville. This means the facility is doing a good job on the tourism side, bringing out-of-town visitors, but still has a potential untapped audience among Lewisville and Castle Hills residents.

This also was used as a qualifier question. Only people who indicated they had visited MCL Grand were asked to evaluate the facility in Q15.

Q15. Regarding the MCL Grand, how satisfied or dissatisfied are you with the following?

Answer Options	Very Satisfied	Somewhat Satisfied	Somewhat Dissatisfied	Very Dissatisfied	No opinion	Response Count
Classes for children, teens, or adults	51	46	6	4	280	387
Close-in parking	116	118	59	25	71	389
Cost of the tickets	127	123	22	3	112	387
Courtesy of MCL Grand staff	201	92	9	0	84	386
Ease in getting to the venue	198	115	20	6	46	385
Hours of Operation	159	120	7	2	98	386
Number of dining options nearby	42	109	104	57	73	385
Proximity to my home	219	120	6	0	40	385
Safety of area	192	135	18	2	37	384
Selection of shows and events	121	148	29	8	78	384
Quality of dining options nearby	61	109	93	44	77	384
Quality of venue	218	116	8	1	42	385

This question was asked of 450 people, all of whom indicated in the preceding Q14 that they had visited MCL Grand at least once during the previous 12 months. Factoring out the “no opinion” responses still left more than 300 responses for all but one rating factor (Classes for Children, Teens or Adults) so there is some degree of statistical validity to the results.

The top eight service categories ranked by satisfaction rating (combining “very satisfied” with “somewhat satisfied” and filtering out the “no opinion” responses) all received marks higher than 80 percent. The order of the rated categories was almost identical to the 2014 survey results, with only the top two categories trading places. All 12 categories listed in order of satisfaction rating:

1. Courtesy of staff 97.02
2. Proximity to my home 96.80
3. Quality of venue 93.09
4. Hours of operation 91.77
5. Safety of the area 90.51
6. Ease getting to the venue 89.50
7. Cost of tickets 83.72
8. Classes offered 80.17
9. Selection of shows/events 79.95
10. Close-in parking 67.87
11. Quality of nearby dining 47.24
12. Number of dining options 42.12

There is a noticeable gap between the first nine categories and the final three, but the good news is that the restaurant development across Church Street from MCL Grand will improve all three of the lowest-rated areas and should produce higher marks in future surveys. It also is important to note that MCL Grand visitors do feel safe when coming to Old Town (90.51 percent) and that the availability of close-in parking is more positive than public perception makes it out to be (67.87 percent satisfaction rating).

Satisfaction with getting information from the city

Q20. Now let's talk about getting information about Lewisville. Please tell me how useful or not useful each of the following are to you in gathering news about Lewisville.

This question has been asked in past satisfaction surveys, although there have been changes made to the list of communication tools as the city added or eliminated methods. For example, the printed Horizon newsletter was the top-rated outlet in 2004 but was cut from the budget in 2007 (it will return in 2016); the electronic Horizon newsletter did not exist when the 2004 survey was conducted, only being added in 2013. The mobile application was launched just a few weeks before the 2015 survey was conducted, so is addressed elsewhere in this survey but will be added to the general ratings question in future years.

Adjusted to remove the “no opinion” response that was very significant for some listed tools, the most-useful communication outlets according to this survey question were the city website (91.25 percent), the electronic newsletter (90.56 percent), and city emails (87.98 percent). No other outlet received a rating above 75 percent. Those same three outlets received the highest level of intense positives. It is important to note, however, that the satisfaction survey was conducted exclusively online and was promoted heavily through the website and electronic newsletter, so those results probably are artificially high based on the respondent pool. Regardless, the shift toward electronic communication that was strongly indicated in results of the Lewisville 2025 input survey is again reinforced here.

Listed in order of usefulness rating (combining “very useful” with “somewhat useful” and filtering out the “no opinion” responses), the 14 communication tools are:

1.	City website	91.25	6.	City employees	73.34	11.	Radio/television news	57.71
2.	Horizon e-newsletter	90.56	7.	Postcards or mailed fliers	72.32	12.	Newspapers	56.98
3.	City emails	87.98	8.	WOW recreation catalog	71.00	13.	Online videos	41.44
4.	Electronic signs/billboards	75.07	9.	Neighbors	67.26	14.	City Cable LVTV	31.82
5.	Social media	74.27	10.	Water bill inserts	66.18			

Social media continues to increase in use and effectiveness, improving from eighth in the 2014 survey to fifth in the 2015 results. Outside media continue to rank poorly with survey respondents, as both radio/television news and newspapers were among the lowest-rated outlets. That could change somewhat in future years because a new Lewisville-only newspaper launched in late 2015, but staff expects city-managed outlets to continue receiving higher ratings than third parties such as news media or neighbors.

The low rating for City Cable LVTV is a continuation of ratings seen in past surveys. Those ratings showed a downward trend that caused staff to re-evaluate its use of video programming, shifting toward online video and reducing the video staff from two full-time editors to one full-time editor and one position that does some video work in addition to other duties at MCL Grand. It is important to note that Q21 showed 75.33 percent of respondents have either Time Warner or Verizon FIOS cable service in their home, which means there still is a potential audience for LVTV programming if staff can boost awareness and interest. In this survey, online videos received a higher usefulness rating than cable, which indicates the shift in focus from cable to online video has been a good choice. It also shows that increased awareness of online video is needed to take better advantage of this tool. A new "video spotlight" section is being added to the redesigned city website that will launch in early 2016.

Q26. In regards to specific communications, please tell me:

Answer Options	Yes	No	% Yes
Have you read the Horizon e-newsletter?	992	277	78.17 %
Do you have Time Warner or Verizon Fios television service?	956	313	75.33 %
Have you accessed the City's website (www.cityoflewisville.com) in the past 12 months?	1145	124	90.23 %
Have you signed up to receive the electronic Horizon e-newsletter delivered to your email every other week?	848	421	66.82 %
Have you interacted with the City of Lewisville Facebook during the past 6 months?	336	933	26.48 %

This question is repeated from past surveys, but all five listed categories were either new or altered starting in 2014 to reflect changing communication tools and strategies. Here, the intent is to measure use rather than effectiveness. The website is used by more than 90 percent of respondents and has been our highest-rated communication tool in every survey since the printed Horizon newsletter was discontinued. According to the most recent data compiled by Pew Research Center, 82 percent of internet users (representing 61 percent of U.S. adults) had looked for information or conducted a transaction on a government website within the past 12 months; Lewisville's website user rate of 90.23 percent, while possibly inflated somewhat by the nature of the surveying tool, is nevertheless an encouraging figure.

The result here showing 66.82 percent of respondents have signed up to receive the electronic newsletter is likely inflated due to the online-only nature of the survey. As of Jan. 5, 2016, the subscriber list for the electronic Horizon newsletter contained 15,415 email address, which would be about 40 percent of the adult population (but double the number of subscribers as of Jan. 5, 2015)

The percentage of respondents who said they subscribe to cable is 75.33 percent, which is statistically comparable to the actual household penetration rate of just over 70 percent reported by Time Warner Cable and Verizon FIOS.

Q22. The City maintains an active presence on the following social media outlets. How aware or unaware are you of these outlets?

Answer Options	Aware	Somewhat Aware	Somewhat Unaware	Unaware	No opinion	Awareness
Websites	633	387	106	101	42	80.38 %
Facebook	359	181	129	391	209	42.55 %
Twitter	124	137	134	507	367	20.57 %
YouTube	82	110	166	603	308	15.13 %

This was a new question to the 2014 survey, and the range of choices was adjusted for the 2015 survey to reflect our standard four-point scale. Since having no opinion to an awareness question essentially is the same as answering "unaware," we have combined "no opinion" with the unaware counts for the purpose of analysis.

The highest level of awareness is for the city websites, at 80.38 percent. This makes sense because the websites have been around a lot longer, and people tend to assume their city will have a website presence. However, it is an odd number considering the 90.23 use rate generated in the preceding Q21 results. Awareness of the city's Facebook presence ranked second at 42.55 percent. Awareness of Twitter (20.57 percent) and YouTube (15.13 percent) trailed, indicating under-utilized tools with the potential for increased use and exposure. The low awareness for YouTube probably held down the 41.11 usefulness rating for online videos in Q20. It is encouraging to note that the awareness rate for both Twitter and YouTube improved from 2014 to 2015. The addition of an Electronic Communications Specialist position is the likely cause of the increased use and awareness of all three social media outlets.

Q23. How effective or ineffective do you feel the City's social media presence is when communicating information about the City to residents?

Answer Options	Response Percent	Response Count
Very effective	14.11 %	179
Effective	37.98 %	482
Ineffective	12.06 %	153
Very ineffective	5.99 %	76
No opinion	29.87 %	379

This question resulted in a satisfaction rating of 74.27 percent and a plus ratio of 2.9:1 when "no opinion" responses are filtered out. About three out of 10 respondents had no opinion on effectiveness of the social media, which would seem to be tied to the awareness ratings described above in Q22.

Q24. The city launched a new mobile application ("Lewisville TX") in May 2015 for smart phones and tablets. Which of the following statements best describes your awareness of the new mobile application?

Answer Options	Response Percent	Response Count
I don't want or need a city mobile application	19.64 %	248
I was not aware of the new mobile application but might check it out	51.15 %	646
I was not aware of the new mobile application and definitely plan to download it	14.09 %	178
I have downloaded the new mobile application but have not used it much or at all	6.25 %	79
I have downloaded and used the new mobile application	5.62 %	71
Prefer not to answer	3.25 %	41

This was a new question for the 2015 survey, asked just a few weeks after the new mobile application was launched. The primary intent of this question was to create awareness for the mobile app (a form of Educational Survey). It also was used to identify the potential audience share. With only 20.29 percent (adjusted) of respondents showing no interest and 67.43 percent (adjusted) showing no awareness but some level of interest, there clearly is an opportunity to expand use of the mobile application, especially when the application features are expanded in 2016 after completion of the website redesign.

Q25. How useful to you are each of these current mobile applications?
Q26. How interested are you in each of these potential additions to the mobile application?

These two questions were given only to the 150 people who indicated in Q24 that they had downloaded the mobile application. When "no opinion" responses were removed, many of the categories were rated by fewer than 100 people (especially when asked about current features). Even had all 150 participants rated every category, the number of responses would not provide statistically validity.

However, the results do give some anecdotal support for current and future plans related to the mobile application. All of the current features received a "passing" grade of better than 70 percent satisfaction, with two receiving ratings above 90 percent. Staff had hoped to see a higher rating for "Submitting a work request to the city" and shortly after this survey was completed there were changes made to the mobile work-request interface to make it more user-friendly. Staff was pleased to see a strong rating (79.45 percent) for "Calling City Hall" since there was some question during development whether that feature would be used by the public.

Among potential features, there was a generally high level of interest in all but the tourism-driven option to search for local hotels (not unexpected with an all-Lewisville respondent base). These survey results will be used in prioritizing new mobile app features to be added in 2016. The mobile application is partly funded with Hotel Occupancy Tax, which means tourism-related features have to be included in the mobile app expansion. Based on survey results and other factors (such as currently available software and data), the first new features are expected to be restaurants, hotels and adoptable animals.

Since all of the mobile application features tie back to the city website, increased use of the mobile app also will generate increased use of the website. As of 2014, more than half of all internet use in the United States is performed using mobile devices, according to data from Pew Research Center.

Satisfaction ratings (combines "very useful" with "useful" and removes "no opinion") for 10 current mobile app features:

1. City/community calendar 91.82
2. Latest city news 91.30
3. Activities at LLELA 85.19
4. Finding a city park 84.54
5. Submitting a work request 84.52
6. Trash/recycling info 84.26
7. Activities at MCL Grand 80.90
8. Lewisville Lake activities 80.46
9. Calling City Hall 79.45
10. Paying a water bill 72.62

Internet ratings (combines "very useful" with "useful" and removes "no opinion") for seven potential mobile app features:

1. Signing up for rec classes 83.59
2. Look up local restaurants 80.88
3. Taking online city surveys 79.86
4. Adoptable cats/dogs 74.38
5. Pay municipal court fines 70.91
6. Watch Council meetings 70.16
7. Look up local hotels 40.17

Q31. How familiar are you with the Lewisville 2025 vision plan that was adopted last summer?

Answer Options	Response Percent	Response Count
I do not know anything about the Lewisville 2025 vision plan	49.76 %	620
I have heard about the Lewisville 2025 plan but do not know what it contains	28.25 %	352
I have heard about the nine "Big Moves" in the plan but do not know any specific action steps	6.66 %	83
I am familiar with the contents of the Lewisville 2025 plan but do not know what progress has been made on action steps	9.39 %	117
I am keeping up with website postings and other information about progress and accomplishments related to the Lewisville 2025 vision plan	5.94 %	74

It is encouraging to see that more than 15 percent of respondents showed a significant level of awareness about the plan and its contents. It is not surprising to find overall low awareness about the contents of the Lewisville 2025 plan since the general public rarely reads and remembers large government documents. However, it is somewhat surprising that nearly half of respondents expressed no knowledge of the plan at all since there were two citywide mailings along with extensive media coverage and other communication efforts. This represents a great opportunity to educate the public about the Lewisville 2025 plan and its objectives. The first major step in that direction will come at the end of January 2016 when the first Lewisville 2025 annual report to the public will be mailed to all addresses in Lewisville and Castle Hills.

Satisfaction with providing input to the city

Q7. Which of the following tools have you used to give feedback or input to the city during the past 12 months? (check all that apply)

Answer Options	Response Percent	Response Count
In-person visit	12.60 %	172
Telephone	24.32 %	332
Mailed a letter	1.47 %	20
Email to City Council	5.64 %	77
Email to city staff	14.51 %	198
Website comments	14.07 %	192
Social Media	16.70 %	228
None	50.11 %	684

Much discussion about city communication efforts during the Lewisville 2025 process focused on receiving input from residents, rather than delivering information to residents. To get a better understanding for what that might entail, five questions were included in the 2014 Resident Satisfaction Survey. Two had been used on previous surveys, but three were new. All five feedback-related questions were retained in the 2015 Resident Satisfaction Survey.

This question asked respondents to mark all feedback tools they had used within the previous 12 months to provide input to the city. The top answer, given by 50.11 percent of respondents, was “none” (although it is interesting to note that completing this survey was, in itself, a form of providing feedback to the city). Percentages for the other seven listed choices total 89.31, which means a significant number of respondents (as many as 39.20 percent) had used more than one feedback tool during the previous year.

The highest number for a specific feedback tool was telephone, used by 24.32 percent of respondents. That might seem unexpected in a digital age, but it is the same result seen in nearly every other similar survey conducted by government agencies nationwide at the local, state or national levels. The most recent Government Interaction Study performed by Pew Research as part of its Internet & American Life Project asked people to name their preferred method of contacting government officials. Among people who had contacted the government, the largest group (35 percent) said telephone and only 28 percent said web or email. Those numbers do change when filtered to include only Internet users (37 percent online, 33 percent phone) and broadband users (39 percent online, 32 percent phone). But in all cases, about one-third of respondents listed telephone as their preferred method for interacting with the government.

The clear lesson for Lewisville is that telephone interaction is not going away any time soon, so continued emphasis needs to be placed on telephone procedures and front-line call-takers need to continue being included in the public information cycle. Two more items below (Q10 and Q11) provide additional information on telephone contact with the public.

Q8. How easy is it for you to give feedback or input to the City?

Answer Options	Response Percent	Response Count
Very easy	24.98 %	341
Somewhat easy	28.79 %	393
Somewhat difficult	9.74 %	133
Very difficult	3.30 %	45
No opinion	33.19 %	453

This question was added in an effort to measure public perception of accessibility for municipal employees and officials. Similar surveys in other areas have shown that local government scores considerably higher on this question than state and federal government, supporting Lewisville's long-standing position that local government is the most connected with the people it serves.

Here, we received an 80.48 approval rating (combining "very easy" with "somewhat easy" and filtering out the "no opinion" responses) with an intensity score that represents 37.39 percent of respondents. In contrast, only 3.30 percent of total respondents (4.93 percent adjusted) gave an intensely negative response of "very difficult," representing 45 people. The overall response ratio was a strong 4.1:1 positive. No opinion was given by 33.19 percent of respondents, which largely reflects the 50.11 percent who said in Q7 above that they had not attempted to give feedback to the city during the previous 12 months. (Of the 453 people who said "no opinion" here, 420 selected "none" for Q7.)

There always is room for improvement. In this case, the two areas most likely to see significant positive movement is taking people from "somewhat easy" to "very easy" or increasing awareness among the large "no opinion" group.

Q9. How responsive do you think the City is to public feedback or input?

Answer Options	Response Percent	Response Count
Very responsive	16.26 %	222
Somewhat responsive	29.74 %	406
Somewhat unresponsive	10.70 %	146
Very unresponsive	6.08 %	83
No opinion	37.22 %	508

This question was added as a way to measure public perception of how well the city responds to feedback received. The expectation was that scores here would be lower than on Q8 above, but the hope was to see ratings fairly close to one another. That is what we received from respondents, with a 73.28 percent approval

rating (combining “very responsive” with “somewhat responsive” and filtering out the “no opinion” responses) and a positive intensity score that represents 25.94 percent of respondents. A slightly higher number of people gave negative responses, with 6.08 percent of total respondents (9.68 percent filtered) giving an intensely negative answer of “very unresponsive.” The overall ratio was 2.7:1 positive.

Q10. Have you or any member of your household contacted the City of Lewisville by phone with a complaint, a request for service or other information during the past 12 months?

Answer Options	Response Percent	Response Count
Yes	40.37 %	551
No	52.16 %	712
Don't remember	7.47 %	102

In Q7 (above), we saw that 24.32 percent of total respondents and 50.38 percent of respondents who had contacted the city within the previous 12 months had used the telephone to make that contact. Here we see a similar result to a question that was expanded to include the respondent and members of his or her household. On this question, 40.37 percent of respondents said they or a member of their household had called the city with a complaint, question or service request within the preceding 12 months. The raw number of 551 people is higher than the 332 people who answered positively on Q7. These differences could be a result of the “or any member of your household” language used in this question.

This result does lend additional credibility to the earlier analysis about the importance of telephone contacts. The question also was used to screen respondents, with only those who answered “yes” being given the subsequent Q11 to evaluate the service they received by phone.

Q11. When you or any member of your household contacted the City of Lewisville by telephone how satisfied or dissatisfied were you with the following customer service activities?

This question, and the preceding qualifier, were used in past satisfaction surveys and are repeated here with minimal changes. The intent is to evaluate how well city staff handles telephone calls from the public and identify areas of possible improvement. Because a screening question was used, only 551 respondents were directed to this question.

The top-ranked items, both receiving satisfaction ratings of better than 90 percent, were courtesy and being directed to the correct department. This speaks very highly of our front-line call-takers and the training they receive, while leaving some room for improvement even in these areas of strength. The lowest satisfaction rating was for follow-up, which receives the lowest ratings on this question every time it is asked. Overall, the order of the satisfaction ratings received for the nine categories evaluated in this question remained nearly unchanged from 2014, with the only change being a switch of positions between “employee seemed concerned” and “represented city in a positive manner.”

In order of satisfaction rating (combining “very satisfied” with “somewhat satisfied” and filtering out the “no opinion” responses), the nine service categories are:

1. Courtesy of the Person Answering 92.46
2. Directed to the Correct Department 91.02
3. Was Asked Adequate Questions 80.47
4. Employee Seemed Concerned 80.35
5. Represented City in a Positive Manner 78.54
6. Call Returned in a Reasonable Time 75.95
7. Showed Pride and Concern for Quality 74.72
8. Problem Adequately Dealt With 70.00
9. Follow-up from the City 52.26

Who took the satisfaction survey?

Q32. Gender

Answer Options	Response Percent	Response Count
Male	41.84 %	513
Female	58.16 %	713

Q33. Which of these age groups includes your age?

Answer Options	Response Percent	Response Count
18 - 24 years	1.51 %	19
25 - 34 years	15.43 %	191
35 - 44 years	20.68 %	256
45 - 54 years	24.31 %	301
55 - 64 years	20.03 %	248
65 and Older	18.01 %	223

Q34. Do you have any children under the age of 18 living in your home? If yes, in which of the following age categories would your children be classified?

Answer Options	Response Percent	Response Count
No children	67.32 %	828
Under age 6	15.85 %	195
Ages 7 - 12	12.52 %	154
Ages 13 - 18	14.31 %	176

Q35. How long have you lived in the City of Lewisville?

Answer Options	Response Percent	Response Count
Less than one year	3.40 %	42
1 - 3 years	18.69 %	231
4 - 6 years	10.68 %	132
7 - 9 years	11.25 %	139
10 - 20 years	29.21 %	361
More than 20 years	26.78 %	331

The four demographic questions above show that survey respondents skewed more toward female participants, more than half were age 45 or older (although participation by the youngest age ranges increased this year), two-thirds have no children in the home, and more than half have lived in Lewisville at least 10 years. These demographic breakdowns are largely consistent with U.S. Census data but do not represent a true demographic sampling.

Q27. Which of the following best describes your primary residence?

Answer Options	Response Percent	Response Count
I own a house, duplex, townhome or mobile home in Lewisville	86.28 %	1075
I rent a house, duplex, townhome or mobile home in Lewisville	8.67 %	108
I rent an apartment in Lewisville	4.17 %	52
I live in a retirement center or similar facility in Lewisville	0.08 %	1
I do not live in Lewisville	0.80 %	10

Q28. What is the ZIP Code for the street address of your primary residence?

Answer Options	Response Percent	Response Count
75057	12.04 %	150
75067	56.42 %	703
75077	27.53 %	343
75056	4.01 %	50

Q29. Is your primary residence north or south of Main Street / FM 1171?

Answer Options	Response Percent	Response Count
North of Main Street / FM 1171	41.73%	520
South of Main Street / FM 1171	54.98 %	685
Castle Hills / East Lewisville (east of the Trinity River)	3.29 %	41

The three geographic locator questions above show that the overwhelming majority of survey respondents said they own their residence even though about half of Lewisville households are renters. In addition, there was more participation in the survey from the 75077 ZIP Code that staff would have expected, although the north-south split shown in Q29 is fairly typical to past surveys.

Q30. How well do you know your neighbors / how often do you interact with your neighbors?

Answer Options	Response Percent	Response Count
I do not know or interact with any of my neighbors	8.51 %	106
I interact with my neighbors only if we happen to be outside together	52.09 %	649
I regularly talk to and interact with at least some of my neighbors	36.44 %	454
I regularly attend or host activities that bring me together with my neighbors	2.97 %	37

This question was added to the 2015 survey at the request of Neighborhood Services, and is intended to give a better picture of how Lewisville residents interact with one another within their own neighborhoods. Since this is a new question, no trending is available. However, it is worth nothing that nearly 40 percent of respondents reported regular interaction with their neighbors and only 8.51 percent reported no interaction. This is the type of self-reflective question that could draw responses intended to make the respondent “look better” so the results should be viewed somewhat skeptically. However, it also could be verification of the “neighborly” atmosphere frequently associated with Lewisville by longtime residents and frequent visitors.