

2015 Resident Satisfaction Survey

- Survey History
- 2015 Methodology
- Key Survey Results

Resident Satisfaction Survey History

- ❖ 2000 random-sample telephone survey (UNT)
 - ❖ 2002 random-sample telephone survey (UNT)
 - ❖ 2003 random-sample telephone survey (Turco & Assoc.)
 - ❖ 2004 random-sample telephone survey (Turco & Assoc.)
 - ❖ 2014 opt-in online survey (City staff)
 - ❖ 2015 opt-in online survey (City staff)
-
- ❖ Attitudinal surveys are a snapshot of perceptions at a particular moment in time; their best value is when multiple surveys are conducted during a compact window of time
 - ❖ Trending is not reliable here because of the 10-year gap before the 2014 survey and the change in methodology

Survey Methodology

- ❖ Random-sample telephone surveys give the highest degree of accuracy and remain the industry standard (\$15,000+)
- ❖ Opt-in online surveys can draw higher levels of participation but sacrifice scientific validity (SurveyMonkey is \$300/year)
- ❖ 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 (had 1,498 respondents in the 2015 survey)
- ❖ Online surveys tend to produce positive ratings 5 to 8 points lower than ratings from a random-sample telephone survey

Survey Respondents

- ❖ Comparable to Census data, but not a true sampling
- ❖ Skewed toward female participants (58 percent)
- ❖ Majority are age 45 or older (62 percent)
- ❖ Two-thirds have no children in the home (67 percent)
- ❖ Most have lived in Lewisville at least 10 years (56 percent)
- ❖ Most own their residence (86 percent)
- ❖ ZIP codes:
 - 75057 = 12 percent
 - 75067 = 56 percent
 - 75077 = 28 percent
 - 75056 = 4 percent
- ❖ 42 percent north of Main / 55 percent south of Main

Key Findings - Overall Satisfaction

Answer Choices	Responses	
Very satisfied	22.23%	333
Satisfied	67.02%	1,004
Dissatisfied	8.74%	131
Very dissatisfied	2.00%	30
Total		1,498

- ❖ Overall satisfaction rating of 89.25 percent (22.23 percent intensely positive) and an overall plus ratio of 8.3-to-1
- ❖ Staff goal for an opt-in online survey is 90 percent satisfaction with 25 percent intensely positive
- ❖ Past results:
 - 2000 - 94.3 percent
 - 2002 - 93.3 percent
 - 2003 - 94.26 percent
 - 2004 - 96 percent
 - 2014 - 88.24 percent

Key Findings - Overall Satisfaction

Answer Choices	Responses	
Improved	41.66%	624
Stayed the same	37.25%	558
Gotten worse	17.76%	266
No opinion	3.34%	50
Total		1,498

- ❖ “During the time you have lived here, do you think that as a community Lewisville has improved, stayed the same or gotten worse?”
- ❖ Tenure of residency directly impacted perceived change (positive or negative). “Improved” responses ranged 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.

Key Findings - Overall Satisfaction

Answer Choices	Responses	
Very likely	33.25%	413
Likely	45.17%	561
Unlikely	11.43%	142
Very unlikely	5.72%	71
No opinion	4.43%	55
Total		1,242

- ❖ “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?”
- ❖ Adjusted to remove the “no opinion” responses, 82.06 percent would recommend Lewisville and 17.94 percent would not (a plus ratio of 4.6:1)

Key Findings - Overall Satisfaction

Answer Choices	Responses	
Very satisfied	13.90%	192
Satisfied	61.48%	849
Dissatisfied	20.78%	287
Very dissatisfied	3.84%	53
Total		1,381

- ❖ “How satisfied or dissatisfied are you with the level of City Services you receive in return for the City Property taxes you pay?”
- ❖ Satisfaction rating of 75.38 percent, but low intensity
- ❖ Interesting correlation with the “overall satisfaction” results - 72 percent gave positive answers to both questions, and 7 percent gave negative answers to both questions.

Key Findings - City Services

- ❖ Respondents were asked to rate 16 city (or perceived to be city) services as excellent, good, fair or poor
- ❖ Eleven of the 16 services received “passing” marks of 70+
- ❖ All three public safety services ranked among the top five
- ❖ Trash Collection moved up from 11th to 8th in the list
- ❖ This question did not ask respondents why they assigned a specific rating; follow-up surveys in specific topics would be needed to gather that information if desired

Fire Services	97.46	Park Facilities	75.93
Ambulance Services	95.16	Special Events	74.74
Library Services	90.65	Storm Water Drainage	72.44
Water Service	86.95	Recreation Programs	68.88
Police Services	86.33	Sidewalks	53.94
Curbside Recycling	83.30	Code Enforcement	50.51
Sewer Service	79.56	Street Maintenance	48.81
Trash Collection	76.08	Street Lighting	46.57

Key Findings - City Services

	Very safe	Safe	Somewhat unsafe	Very unsafe	No opinion	Total
Within your own neighborhood	37.80% 522	47.57% 657	12.89% 178	1.74% 24	0.00% 0	1,381
Other residential areas outside your neighborhood	13.18% 182	49.60% 685	29.91% 413	4.27% 59	3.04% 42	1,381
Commercial areas	12.60% 174	54.31% 750	27.01% 373	3.84% 53	2.24% 31	1,381

- ❖ “How safe or unsafe do you feel in the following locations?”
- ❖ People consistently feel safer in their own neighborhood than any place else, possibly a product of familiarity
- ❖ Fewer than 60 respondents (less than 5 percent) said they feel “very unsafe” in any area of Lewisville
- ❖ Perhaps more than any other survey question, responses to this one are driven by individual perceptions and timing

Key Findings - City Services

- ❖ Respondents who said they had visited the library, a park, the senior center, or MCL Grand within the preceding 12 months were asked to rate various aspects at those facilities
- ❖ Library: All eight program groups received a satisfaction ranking higher than 84 percent, with five in the 90s
- ❖ Parks: All 10 elements received satisfaction ratings above 73 percent, with two in the 90s and five more in the 80s
- ❖ Senior Center: All 10 elements received a satisfaction rating of 75 percent or higher
- ❖ MCL Grand: Eight of the 12 service categories received marks higher than 80 percent; the three areas rated below 70 percent related to dining options and close-in parking

Key Findings - Getting Information

- ❖ Respondents were asked to rate the usefulness of 14 tools in terms of getting information about Lewisville
- ❖ Top ratings showed a continuing demand for electronic communication with highest marks for the city website (91.25), Horizon e-newsletter (90.56), City emails (87.98) Electronic signs/billboards (75.07) and social media (74.27)
- ❖ Lowest ratings went to radio/television news (57.71), newspapers (56.98) and to video programming online or on City Cable LTV
- ❖ Conducting the survey exclusively online probably skewed results in favor of online outlets

Key Findings - Getting Information

Answer Choices	Responses
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
Total	1,246

- ❖ More than 15 percent of respondents showed a significant level of awareness about the plan and its contents
- ❖ Awareness should increase after a printed Annual Report is mailed to all Lewisville addresses this week

Key Findings - Providing Feedback

- ❖ Much discussion about city communication efforts during the Lewisville 2025 process focused on receiving input from residents, rather than delivering information to residents
- ❖ When asked to mark all feedback tools they had used within the previous 12 months to provide input to the city, the top answer (50.11 percent of respondents) was “none”
- ❖ The highest number for a specific feedback tool was telephone, used by 24.32 percent of respondents
- ❖ Many respondents marked more than one feedback tool
- ❖ The rest of the list shows a preference for online tools:

Social Media	16.70 percent
Email to city staff	14.51 percent
Website comments	14.07 percent
In-person visit	12.60 percent
Email to City Council	5.64 percent
Mailed a letter	1.47 percent

Key Findings - Providing Feedback

Answer Choices	Responses	
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
Total		1,365

- ❖ “How easy is it for you to give feedback or input to the City?”
- ❖ No opinion was given by 33.19 percent of respondents, reflecting the 50.11 percent who said they had not attempted to give feedback during the previous 12 months
- ❖ Adjusted for the high “no opinion” response, the approval rating is 80.48 percent with 37.39 percent positive intensity

Key Findings - Providing Feedback

Answer Choices	Responses	
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
Total		1,365

- ❖ “How responsive do you think the City is to public feedback or input?”
- ❖ This question is a way to measure public perception of how well the city responds to feedback received
- ❖ Produced a 73.28 percent approval rating and a positive intensity score that represents 25.94 percent of respondents

Key Findings - Neighborhoods

Answer Choices	Responses	
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 neighbor	2.97%	37
Total		1,246

- ❖ “How well do you know your neighbors / how often do you interact with your neighbors?”
- ❖ Added in 2015 at the request of Neighborhood Services
- ❖ Nearly 40 percent of respondents reported regular interaction with their neighbors and only 8.51 percent reported no interaction

2015 Resident Satisfaction Survey

- ❖ Selected survey results are among performance measures used by departments as part of the budget process
- ❖ Completion of the 2016 survey (planned for July/August) will create three consecutive years of data using the same questions and methodology; that will allow reliable trending
- ❖ Detailed analysis and executive summary (with recommendations) has been provided to City Council
- ❖ While overall results are positive, there always is room for improvement in service delivery and public perception

Questions?