City of Lewisville – 2016 Resident Satisfaction Survey

A resident satisfaction survey was conducted online from July 15 through August 5 of this 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 and again in July-August 2015. Previously, the city performed the Lewisville 2025 Input Survey online in April-July 2013. The online surveys were conducted using the SurveyMonkey website and were promoted through media releases, website and social media postings, and electronic newsletters. A total of 1,257 responses were received for the 2016 Resident Satisfaction Survey, a slight reduction from the two previous years but still enough to lend validity to the aggregated results.

There were 33 potential questions in the survey, but the use of screening questions meant most respondents only saw about 30 questions. The first question received 1,251 responses and the last question drew 1,100 responses, an attrition rate of 12.07 percent that is better than the industry norm and better than was seen in the two previous years' satisfaction surveys.

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 2016 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 2016 survey focusing on Police Operations and City Appearance 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 2016 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 2016 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 2016 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.

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 follows the industry standard and includes "no opinion" responses in the Resident Satisfaction Survey, but filters out those responses when analyzing results. Therefore, the survey results included in this report 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.

The 2016 survey marked the third straight year for the online Resident Satisfaction Survey, using many of the same questions each time. This creates the opportunity to compare results from all three years and develop some trending information, which points out areas where scores are changing (up or down) over time and helps identify areas where follow-up action might be warranted. Trending data is included in the analysis below for all questions that have three years of data available.

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 2016 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	2016 Responses	2016 Percentage	2015 Percentage	2014 Percentage
Very Satisfied	315	25.18 %	22.23 %	24.62 %
Satisfied	824	65.87 %	67.02 %	63.62 %
Dissatisfied	103	8.23 %	8.74 %	10.23 %
Very Dissatisfied	9	0.72 %	2.00 %	1.54 %
SATISFACTION RATING		**91.05 %**	**89.25 %**	**88.24 %**
SATISFACTION RATIO		10.2	8.3	7.5

This question has been included in all of our past satisfaction surveys. In the random-sample surveys conducted through 2004, our goal was to attain a 90 percent or higher overall satisfaction rating. This is determined by adding the two positive responses ("very satisfied" and "satisfied"). In addition, the goal was to have at least 25 percent positive intensity and a 9:1 or better ratio between positive and negative ratings. Because of expected differences due to survey methodology as described previously, staff did not initially set a goal for this question; based on the three-year results shown above, staff has determined that the same goals remain valid.

The actual satisfaction rating received is 91.05 percent, a very strong result for an opt-in online survey and a slight increase over the 2015 rating (which itself was a slight increase over the 2014 rating). The total increase of less than 3 percentage points is within the expected margin, so the three results are statistically indistinguishable. However, the positive trend is encouraging. Results also showed a high degree of positive intensity, with 25.18 percent of respondents describing themselves as "very satisfied" (315 people out of 1,251 respondents). In addition, only 9 people (0.72 percent) described themselves as "very unsatisfied" with the quality of life in Lewisville. The positive response ratio was 10.2:1 (which means there were 10.2 positive responses for every one negative response).

These are strong results and compare favorably to other cities in North Texas that conduct surveys. The results show that a large majority of Lewisville residents are satisfied with the quality of life they experience here. It is important that the city organization continue providing high levels of service in order to maintain that satisfaction, but there is little doubt that most Lewisville residents have a positive view of their community.

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	2016 Responses	2016 Percentage	2015 Percentage	2014 Percentage
Improved	587	46.81 %	41.66 %	43.07 %
Stayed the Same	421	33.57 %	37.25 %	35.29 %
Gotten Worse	227	18.10 %	17.76 %	19.26 %
No Opinion	19	1.52 %	3.34 %	2.39 %
SATIS. RATIO		2.6	2.3	2.2

This question was new in the 2014 survey, and results have been very consistent during the three survey periods with changes within the expected margin. Responses to "improved" increased 3.74 percentage points from 2014 to 2016, and responses to "gotten worse" decreased 1.16 percentage points during that same time. The positive ratio was 2.6 in the 2016 survey, a notable improvement over the two previous surveys.

As additional projects related to the Lewisville 2025 vision plan and the 2015 bond election are completed, staff would hope to see this result continue to improve, perhaps even surpassing the 50 percent mark. It is important, therefore, that those projects be promoted to residents and that their connection to Lewisville 2025 or the bond election is made clear.

Cross-tabulation of these results with the length of residency results in Q32 once again showed that respondents who have lived in Lewisville longer were more likely to report a change, either positive or negative, while newer residents were more likely to report no change.

Q33. 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	2016 Responses	2016 Percentage	2015 Percentage	2014 Percentage
Very Likely	433	41.04 %	34.79 %	40.63 %
Likely	440	41.71 %	47.26 %	40.63 %
Unlikely	138	13.08 %	11.96 %	13.10 %
Very Unlikely	44	4.17 %	5.98 %	5.64 %
SATISFACTION RATING		**82.75 %**	**82.06 %**	**81.26 %**
SATISFACTION RATIO		4.8	4.6	4.3

This question was first asked in the 2014 survey. It mirrors a question used for many years in on-site 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. Staff wanted to know if Lewisville has earned consumer endorsements from its residents.

Results are strongly positive. Adjusted to remove the “no opinion” responses, 82.75 percent of respondents said they would recommend Lewisville to a family member or friend moving to North Texas (41.04 percent with intensity). That compares to 17.25 percent who would not (4.17 percent with intensity) for a positive ratio of 4.8:1.

Looking at results from all three annual surveys, there is a slight positive trend that is within the expected margin. The percentage of respondents who would recommend Lewisville has increased by 1.49 percentage points and the positive intensity has increased by 0.41 percentage points. Neither of those changes would be considered statistically significant and represent overall stable results for this survey question.

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	16.88 %	211
Satisfied	62.48 %	781
Dissatisfied	18.80 %	235
Very Dissatisfied	1.84 %	23
SATIS. RATING	**79.36 %**	

Another question first asked in the 2014 survey, this was intended to determine whether residents see value for their property taxes. In the 2016 survey, 79.36 percent said they do, with a positive ratio of 3.8:1. This represents a statistically significant increase from 62.90 percent satisfaction in 2014 and 75.38 percent satisfaction in 2015, although it should be noted that the question in the 2014 survey only presented two answer options (satisfied or dissatisfied) rather than the standard four-point scale.

Perhaps even more encouraging was that only 1.84 percent of respondents (23 out of 1,250 people) said they are “very dissatisfied” with the level of city services received in return for city property taxes paid.

Although not reflected in the survey, staff has anecdotal experience that indicates a portion of Lewisville residents do not realize the breakdown of property tax bills among taxing agencies. In addition, in some cases residents are unclear as to which level of government provides specific services (e.g. vehicle registration, driver's licenses, and public health clinic). Improved awareness of those items might impact the responses to this question, although as an attitudinal question it is assumed that some respondents will be uninformed about the topic being surveyed.

A cross-tabulation of results between responses to Q3 (satisfaction for services for taxes) and Q1 (overall satisfaction) 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, 949 gave a positive answer to both questions (76.16 percent) and 70 gave negative responses to both questions (5.62 percent) for a plus ratio of 13.6:1. The remaining 227 people gave mixed responses, the majority of those (169 people) saying "satisfied" to Q1 and "dissatisfied" to Q3, indicating that they are generally happy with quality of life in Lewisville but do not equate that to the relative value of municipal services.

As a comparison, results of the 2015 survey showed 71.83 percent giving positive responses to both questions and 7.31 percent giving two negative responses for a plus ratio of 9.8:1.

There were 144 survey respondents (11.56 percent) who could be called enthusiastic fans of Lewisville, with intense positive responses to both questions; and 5 (0.40 percent) who could be called strong critics who gave intense negative responses to both questions. The unusual outliers are the two 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.

The full cross-tabulation between Q1 and Q3 is shown on the following page.

Q3. How satisfied or dissatisfied are you with tht 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	144	45.71%	62	7.56%	3	2.94%	1	11.11%	210	16.85%
	68.57%		29.52%		1.43%		0.48%			
Satisfied	159	50.48%	584	71.22%	35	34.31%	2	22.22%	780	62.60%
	20.38%		74.87%		4.49%		0.26%			
Dissatisfied	10	3.17%	169	20.61%	53	51.96%	1	11.11%	233	18.70%
	4.29%		72.53%		22.75%		0.43%			
Very Dissatisfied	2	0.63%	5	0.61%	11	10.78%	5	55.56%	23	1.85%
	8.70%		21.74%		47.83%		21.74%			
TOTAL	315		820		102		9		1246	
	25.28%		65.81%		8.19%		0.72%			

CHART KEY -->

RAW NUMBER OF RESPONDENTS	% of the Q1 responses that fit this Q3 group
% of the Q3 group that gave this Q1 response	

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."

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."

Purple = 8 percentage points or more above the norm   Red = 8 percentage points or more below the norm

Satisfaction with specific city services

Q4. Rate the following City Services

Answer Options	2016 Rating	2015 Rating	2014 Rating
Ambulance Services	94.93 %	95.16 %	94.17 %
Code Enforcement	54.26 %	50.51 %	50.05 %
Curbside Recycling	85.66 %	83.30 %	82.38 %
Fire Services	99.24 %	97.46 %	97.74 %
Library Services	93.23 %	90.65 %	92.64 %
Park Facilities	80.02 %	75.93 %	81.08 %
Police Services	89.82 %	86.33 %	86.73 %
Recreational Programming	75.99 %	68.88 %	72.95 %
Sewer Service	83.90 %	79.56 %	79.12 %
Sidewalks	56.63 %	53.93 %	54.70 %
Special Events Organized by City	80.20 %	74.74 %	75.56 %
Storm Water Drainage	74.95 %	72.44 %	77.16 %
Street Lighting in Neighborhoods	45.11 %	46.57 %	42.72 %
Street Maintenance	52.91 %	48.81 %	54.74 %
Trash Collection	81.52 %	76.08 %	73.62 %
Water Service	88.26 %	86.95 %	83.51 %

Respondents were asked to rate each listed service as excellent, good, fair or poor. The adjusted Satisfaction Rating is determined by removing the “no opinion” responses and adding the two positive responses.

Compared to survey results from 2015, ratings in the 2016 survey were higher for 14 of the 16 listed services. This year’s ratings are very similar to results from the 2014 survey in most cases, and most changes are within the expect margin so do not represent significant improvement. One notable exception is Trash Collection, which increased nearly eight percentage points from 2014 (73.62 percent) to 2016 (81.52 percent) as residents became more accustomed to the collection schedule change that took place shortly before the 2014 survey was conducted.

Ratings in this question are topped by Fire Services (99.24 percent) and Ambulance Services (94.93 percent). The only other city service receiving a positive rating of better than 90 percent is Library Services (93.23). Seven others received satisfaction ratings above 80 percent, compared to 2015 results when there were only three services rated in the 80s.

The complete list of evaluated services in order of Satisfaction Rating:

1.	Fire Services	99.24
2.	Ambulance Services	94.93
3.	Library Services	93.23
4.	Police Services	89.82
5.	Water Service	88.26
6.	Curbside Recycling	85.66
7.	Sewer Service	83.90
8.	Trash Collection	81.52
9.	Special Events	80.20
10.	Park Facilities	80.02
11.	Recreation Programs	75.99
12.	Storm Water Drainage	74.95
13.	Sidewalks	56.63
14.	Code Enforcement	54.26
15.	Street Maintenance	52.91
16.	Street Lighting	45.11

The four service categories receiving the highest satisfaction ratings – Fire Services, Ambulance Services, Police Services, and Library Services – all received positive intensity (“excellent” ratings) better than 50 percent.

The “no opinion” filter came heavily into play on this question, as four service categories (Ambulance Services, Fire Services, Recreational Programming, and Library Services) received no rating from 20 percent or more of respondents. For example, 54.91 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 42.81 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 information is collected in other questions later in the survey for some services (Park Facilities, Library, Recreation Programs, and Street Maintenance). 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.

Several of the listed services were addressed in more detail in the 2016 Police Operations and City Appearance/Property Maintenance Survey conducted earlier this year. Recommendations were made at the conclusion of that survey for Police Services, Code Enforcement, Sidewalks, and Residential Street Lighting. Note that this includes three of the four service areas receiving the lowest satisfaction ratings in this survey.

These numbers, while positive overall, do contain some points of concern. For example, the low rating for Residential Street Lighting was expected based on past survey results; but that item also received 24.59 percent intense negative responses, marking it as an area of extreme dissatisfaction among residents. No other service area received as much as 15 percent intense negative responses.

There also are some "soft" positive numbers, especially those received for Park Facilities and Recreational Programming. While both of those service areas received higher satisfaction ratings than in the 2015 survey, the rating for Park Facilities was down compared to 2014 results (still within the expected margin). In addition, both of these service areas received lower positive intensity than other service areas – 29.17 percent for Park Facilities and 24.01 percent for Recreational Programming. These results are analyzed in greater detail later in this report (Q10 and Q11). Storm Water Drainage also raises some concern, with a 74.95 percent satisfaction rating that is down from 2014; staff believes the flooding experienced during 2015 contributed to the lower rating.

Q5. Rate the overall condition of the following types of roadways in Lewisville.

Answer Options	Excellent	Good	Fair	Poor	No Opinion	Adj. Satisfaction
Alleys	68	378	321	145	225	48.90
Federal highways (35E)	35	246	350	490	41	25.07
Main thoroughfares	175	676	271	52	10	72.49
In your neighborhood	222	626	234	98	3	71.86
In other neighborhoods	101	623	293	83	83	65.82
State highways	166	679	259	74	6	71.73
Traffic intersections	122	653	309	86	5	66.24

This question was included in the 2014 survey and will be used in alternate years, so there is not the same three-year data trend available with these results. However, the results in hand do provide some useful insight into public perception of roadway conditions in Lewisville.

Overall, streets in Lewisville are viewed as being in "good" condition, but leaning more toward "fair" then "excellent" for each roadway type. Streets controlled by the city (main thoroughfares and residential streets) received satisfaction ratings between 65.82 and 72.49 percent with low positive intensity (from 9.18 to 18.81 percent). That indicates a general satisfaction with city streets, but also some concern about streets potentially deteriorating with age.

Main thoroughfares received the highest satisfaction rating (72.49 percent) followed by residential streets within the respondents' own neighborhoods (71.86 percent), however respondents gave their highest positive intensity to their own residential streets (18.81 percent). Comparing that to the statistically significant lower ratings for residential streets in other neighborhoods (65.82 percent overall, 9.18 percent positive intensity) could be a product of Familiarity Bias as described in past surveys – people are more familiar with the streets in their own neighborhood, and are more likely to have a negative view of streets in unfamiliar neighborhoods.

A breakdown of results by ZIP code shows higher overall satisfaction with residential streets within their own neighborhood residents among residents in 75067 (77.30 percent) and 75077 (72.81 percent). Residents living in the 75056 ZIP code were almost evenly split, with 53.27 percent satisfaction among the 107 respondents.

The lowest rating by far was received by Federal Highways at just 25.07 percent satisfaction. This almost certainly is a reflection of the ongoing construction project on Interstate 35E. Further evidence of that impact is found in the tremendous drop from a 40.73 percent satisfaction rating received in the 2014 survey.

Q6. In the past 12 months, what contacts have you had with the Animal Shelter and Adoption Center or an Animal Services employee?

Answer Options	**Response Percent**	**Response Count**
Reporting a stray animal or encroaching wildlife	12.70%	150
Looking to adopt a new pet	6.18%	73
Donating to the Animal Adoption Center	5.00%	59
Reporting a dead animal in a public roadway	4.49%	53
Looking for a lost or missing pet	3.30%	39
Volunteering at the Animal Adoption Center	1.52%	18
No contact	75.61%	893

This question is new to the 2016 survey and primarily was used as a qualifier for the following question that asked respondents to rate aspects of the Animal Services operation. The list of contacts did not include every possible interaction, but included the most frequent items. One notable omission that will be added in future years is "Voluntary dropoff of a pet" because staff at the shelter reports that this contact is on the rise.

Results for this question show what staff already knew to be true – most Lewisville residents do not have direct contact with Animal Services (75.61 percent of survey respondents). Among those who do, the most frequent contact is reporting a stray animal or encroaching wildlife (12.70 percent) followed by those visitors looking to adopt a new pet (6.18%).

Q7. Regarding the Lewisville Animal Shelter and Adoption Center and Animal Services staff, how satisfied or dissatisfied are you with the following?

Answer Options	Satisfaction Rating
Response to reports of stray animals	88.14%
Response to reports of wildlife	82.26%
Response to reports of dead animals in public roadways	86.21%
Assistance with finding a lost or missing pet	88.76%
Ease of adopting a new pet	92.78%
Cost of adopting a new pet	82.73%
Physical appearance of the Animal Shelter	94.82%
Facilities at the Animal Shelter and Adoption Center	94.54%
Professionalism of staff at the Animal Shelter	92.31%
Friendliness of staff at the Animal Shelter	94.20%
Volunteer programs at the Animal Shelter	88.89%

As with the qualifying question Q6 above, this question is new to the 2016 survey. Only 292 respondents saw this question, and because of "No Opinion" responses some of the categories were rated by fewer than 100 people. However, these results still help assess the rating categories against one another and five of the criteria received more than 150 responses each to create some statistically validity to those ratings.

Overall, ratings ranged from a low of 82.26 percent to a high of 94.82 percent, presenting a very positive set of scores for Animal Services operations. The five categories with more than 150 responses ranged from 88.14 percent to 94.54 percent.

The center itself received the highest satisfaction ratings, with 94.82 percent satisfaction for the physical appearance of the building and 94.54 percent satisfaction for facilities within the building. Significantly more than 70 percent of respondents marked "Very Satisfied" for those categories, demonstrating an intense positive perception of the shelter building.

Respondents gave their lowest satisfaction rating to "Response to reports of wildlife" at 82.26 percent. This could result from the fact that Animal Services staff generally is not able to trap and remove wildlife in residential areas, although that is the response some residents are seeking when they make a report. Nevertheless, a satisfaction rating above 80 must be considered a positive mark.

Because this question has not been asked previously, there is no trending data for comparison. This question likely will be asked in alternate years in order to track changes over time.

Satisfaction with recreation and events

Q8. 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	41.28 %	485
1 -3 times	24.94%	293
4 -6 times	11.23%	132
7 -10 times	7.40%	87
More than 10 times	13.87%	163
Decline to answer	1.28%	15

This also was used as a qualifier question. Only people who indicated they had visited the library were asked to evaluate the facility in Q9.

This question shows that awareness and use of the library is high, with 58.72 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). However, the percentage of respondents who say they had not visited the library at all during the previous 12 months has increased each survey year, from 33.39 percent in 2014 to 41.28 percent in 2016. In addition, the percentages of people visiting 1-3 times, 3-6 times, or more than 10 times within the preceding 12 months have all decreased slightly each survey year.

The Library's usage statistics do not reflect a decrease in the number of visitors that we might expect from the increase in survey participants stating that none of their family members have visited the Library in the past year. The number of library visits, new cards, and total circulation has held steady or gone up during the past three years.

Results for this question might be a case where the demographics of the survey respondents had a measurable impact on the data, specifically the fact (as detailed in Q30 below) that survey respondents tended to be older overall than the city's census figures show. The highest use rate of the library is among residents with children living at home, according to these results; older respondents are less likely to fit into that group. As shown in the chart below, more than three-fourths (76.24 percent) of the people who said they had not visited the library at all during the preceding 12 months also indicated on Q31 that they had no children under the age of 18 living in their home. The same cross-tabulation shows that 37.24 percent of people with children age 6 or younger in their home and 45.45 percent of people with children ages 7-12 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 potential growth opportunity.

Q8. In the past 12 months, how many times have you or a member of your household visited the Lewisville Public Library?	Q31. 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?								TOTAL	
	No children		Under age 6		Ages 7-12		Ages 13-18			
None	353	47.64%	46	31.72%	30	20.69%	34	23.61%	463	39.40%
	76.24%		9.94%		6.48%		7.34%			
1-3 times	197	26.59%	26	17.93%	27	18.62%	37	25.69%	287	24.43%
	68.64%		9.06%		9.41%		12.89%			
4-6 times	67	9.04%	19	13.10%	21	14.48%	20	13.89%	127	10.81%
	52.76%		14.96%		16.54%		15.75%			
7-10 times	42	5.67%	9	6.21%	22	15.17%	26	18.06%	99	8.43%
	42.42%		9.09%		22.22%		26.26%			
More than 10 times	71	9.58%	45	31.03%	43	29.66%	25	17.36%	184	15.66%
	38.59%		24.46%		23.37%		13.59%			
Decline to answer	11	1.48%	0	0.00%	2	1.38%	2	1.39%	15	1.28%
	73.33%		0.00%		13.33%		13.33%			
TOTAL	741		145		145		144		1175	
	63.06%		12.34%		12.34%		12.26%			

CHART KEY -->

RAW NUMBER OF RESPONDENTS	% of the Q8 responses that fit this Q31 group
% of the Q31 group that gave this Q8 response	

This percentage compares to the total results on the right of the chart; it can be read as "This percentage of people with Q34 children living at home gave Q12 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 Q12 response have Q34 children living at home."

Purple = 8 percentage points or more above the norm

Red = 8 percentage points or more below the norm

Q9. Regarding the Library, how satisfied or dissatisfied are you with the following?

Answer Options	**Satisfaction Rating**
Classes & Events for Children	94.75%
Classes & Events for Teens	87.36%
Classes & Events for Adults	84.08%
Courtesy of Library staff	96.10%
Hours of Operation	92.82%
Public-use computers	91.59%
Selection of books and materials	91.32%
Technology classes and services	82.83%

This question was asked only of 672 survey respondents who indicated on the preceding Q8 that they had visited the library during the preceding 12 months.

All eight program groups listed received a satisfaction ranking of higher than 82 percent, with five landing in the 90s. These are very consistent with the overall satisfaction rating of 93.23 that Library Services received in Q4. The order of service ratings was unchanged from the 2015 survey. Library programs listed in order of positive ratings (combines "very satisfied" and "somewhat satisfied") and adjusted to remove "no opinion" responses:

1. Courtesy of Library Staff (96.10)
2. Classes & Events for Children (94.75)
3. Hours of Operation (92.82)
4. Public-use Computers (91.59)
5. Selection of Books and Materials (91.32)
6. Classes & Events for Teens (87.36)
7. Classes & Events for Adults (84.08)
8. Technology Classes and Services (82.83)

The highest positive intensity was for Courtesy of Library Staff (67.01 percent very satisfied; 73.01 percent adjusted to remove "no opinion" responses); and Classes/Events for Children (55.41 percent adjusted). Two other categories – Public-Use Computers and Hours of Operation – received positive intensity of greater than 50 percent. The greatest negative intensity was for Classes/Events for Adults at 4.50 percent, representing 13 people out of 289.

These results show a potential demand for expanded adult classes, especially in the area of technology. Alternately, current classes might need to be better promoted in order to increase awareness and participation. Either of these steps could have budget and staffing impacts, but would address the areas of greatest perceived weakness in current Library service offerings.

Below are ratings for each of the eight categories for all three survey years.

	2014	2015	2016
Classes and events for children	95.42%	94.00%	94.75%
Classes and events for teens	89.95%	86.13%	87.36%
Classes and events for adults	88.05%	85.00%	84.08%
Courtesy of library staff	95.18%	94.90%	96.10%
Hours of operation	92.26%	91.70%	92.82%
Public-use computers	91.94%	90.48%	91.59%
Selection of books and materials	92.11%	90.30%	91.32%
Technology classes and services	89.23%	84.84%	82.93%

Most rating categories have remained consistent within the expected statistical margin of 4 percentage points. Ratings for Technology Classes/Services have declined by a significant 6.3 percentage points since 2014, a trend that should be reversed with the new computer equipment and technology packages approved for the library in the 2016-17 budget. Classes/Events for Adults also has declined overall by 3.97 percentage points, which is within the expected statistical margin but bears watching.

Q10. 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	19.83%	230
1 - 3 times	26.98%	313
4 -6 times	14.91%	173
7 - 10 times	9.74%	113
More than 10 times	28.10%	326
Decline to answer	0.43%	5

Results for this question have remained consistent during the three survey years, with about 80 percent of 2016 respondents saying they had visited a Lewisville park or recreation facility within the previous 12 months. More than 35 percent have visited frequently (7-10 times or more). Comparing to the 2014 survey results, all responses this year were within two percentage points of the earlier numbers.

As with results for Q8 about library visits, results for this question showed lower frequency of visitation by respondents with no children under age 18 living in their home. 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.

Q11. Regarding Parks and Recreation in Lewisville, how satisfied or dissatisfied are you with the following?

Answer Options	**Satisfaction Rating**
Athletic fields	91.65%
Availability of open space	89.62%
City aquatic parks	83.47%
Hike and bike trails	80.43%
Playgrounds	88.17%
Recreation centers	79.43%
Recreation programs and classes	77.01%
Senior Activity Center	85.05%
The location of city parks	90.79%
The appearance of city parks	88.62%

This question was asked only of the 926 survey respondents who indicated on the preceding Q10 that they had visited a park facility during the preceding 12 months.

All 10 elements of city park and recreation facilities received satisfaction ratings above 77 percent (compared to a low of 73 percent in 2015), with two in the 90s and six more in the 80s. 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 will be used to identify specific areas of interest during the public input phase of planning and design for the new Multi-Generational Recreation Center.

Parks and Recreation categories listed in order of positive ratings (combines “very satisfied” and “somewhat satisfied”) and adjusted to remove “no opinion” responses:

1. Athletic Fields (91.65)
2. Location of City Parks (90.79)
3. Availability of Open Space (89.62)
4. Appearance of City Parks (88.62)
5. Playgrounds (88.17)
6. Senior Activity Center (85.05)
7. City Aquatic Parks (83.47)
8. Hike and Bike Trails (80.43)
9. Recreation Centers (79.43)
10. Recreation Programs and Classes (77.01)

The two lowest-rated categories should receive a significant boost in 2018 when the new Multi-Generational Recreation Center opens, offering larger facilities and the opportunity for expanded recreation programs and classes. It is important to note that Recreational Programming received a soft positive score in Q4, which asked respondents to rate overall satisfaction with a variety of city service areas. In order to improve that rating and the public perception it represents, it will be important to give significant attention to recreation programs and classes when the new facility opens. This rating also could be impacted by the online registration system for recreation classes, which has drawn some criticism from the public in the past.

The 80.43 percent satisfaction rating for “hike and bike trails” showed noticeable improvement from last year’s 74.43 rating. This likely is a result of new trails that have started or completed construction during the past year, including the DCTA trail, trails at Lake Park, and a lakeside trail at Copperas Branch Park East. This rating should continue to improve as additional trails come on line, along with the regional connector trail along Garden Ridge and Valley Parkway. At that point, a marketing piece dedicated to city trails could further increase public awareness and use of the system.

Because of a software glitch in the 2014 survey, there are only two years’ worth of data for this question so no reliable trending information is available. Satisfaction ratings were generally higher in the 2016 survey than in 2015, but until a third year of results can be compiled that should be considered inconclusive.

Q12. Parks and Leisure Services Department offers multiple special events for the community each year. During the past 12 months, which of the following events have you attended?

This question is a one-time addition to the 2016 survey and is largely educational in nature, making survey respondents aware of the variety of events PALS offers during the year. It also was used to prepare survey respondents for the subsequent question in which they were asked to rate the importance of various event elements.

The results of this question show attendance ranging from 5.18 percent (Spooktacular Trails) down to 0.98 percent (Daddy-Daughter Dance), and largely reflect the actual attendance counts or estimates for each event. A total of seven events were listed: Daddy-Daughter Dance, Funny Bunny Festival, Teddy Bear Picnic, Ducky Derby, Doggie Dive-in, Spooktacular Trails, and Family Fun Pumpkin Walk.

Q13. Regarding the Parks and Leisure Services Department special events, how important are the following factors in your attendance and enjoyment?

Answer Options	Very Imp.	Somewhat Imp.	Somewhat Unimp.	Very Unimp.	No opinion	Importance Rating
Location of Event	427	373	46	28	245	91.53%
Day/Time of Event	601	257	15	19	227	96.19%
Games for Children	250	209	73	157	423	66.62%
Crafts for Children	204	233	89	162	428	63.52%
Door Prizes/Giveaways	114	229	236	174	357	45.55%
Pet-Friendly Event	166	272	147	199	334	55.87%
Cost of Event Admission	399	379	76	31	228	87.91%
Cost of Event Activities	394	387	76	28	233	88.25%
Food/Beverage for Sale	346	432	74	35	230	87.71%
Vendor Booths	285	428	110	45	249	82.14%
Information Booths	226	415	151	55	264	75.68%

This question also is a one-time addition in the 2016 survey and was used to assess the relative importance of various event elements in attracting potential attendees. The question was asked of all survey respondents, not just those who indicated in Q12 that they had attended a PALS event, because staff wanted to capture results from people who had not attended but might attend in the future.

Below are all 11 categories listed in order of Importance Rating:

1. Day/Time of Event (96.19)
2. Location of Event (91.53)
3. Cost of Event Activities (88.25)
4. Cost of Event Admission (87.91)
5. Food/Beverage for Sale (87.71)
6. Vendor Booths (82.14)
7. Information Booths (75.68)
8. Games for Children (66.62)
9. Crafts for Children (63.52)
10. Pet-Friendly Events (55.87)
11. Door Prizes/Giveaways (45.55)

At first glance, the relatively low ratings for children's games and crafts (both less than 70 percent) might be surprising, but a cross-tabulation of these results with the results of Q31 (children in the home) gives a great deal of perspective. For example, while Games for Children only received a 66.62 percent importance rating overall, it received a 97.79 rating from respondents with children ages 6 and younger – 133 of the 136 people who gave an opinion. That includes a positive intensity of 75.00 percent (102 out of 136 rating children's games as "Very Important"). Importance of children's games becomes lower as the ages of the children increase. Parents of children ages 7-12 gave a 93.89 percent overall rating, with 61.83 intensely positive; and parents of children ages 13-18 gave a 72.82 percent overall rating, with 33.98 percent intensely positive. Meanwhile, nearly half (350 out of 721) of respondents with no children at home gave no opinion to this rating category.

Similar, although slightly lower, numbers are seen when analyzing the results for children's crafts. What these results tell us is that people with no children don't care all that much about having children's activities at a PALS event, but those activities are extremely important to parents with young children and should be considered a primary motivator for their attendance. In other words, despite the relatively low importance given to those categories in the overall survey results, reducing or eliminating those activities almost certainly would negatively impact event attendance while retaining them has no negative impact.

The survey does not ask respondents whether they own pets, but a similar correlation is likely between pet owners and respondents who give high importance to Pet-Friendly Events. In this case, however, it is possible that some potential attendees choose not to attend events where there could be multiple animals, so event staff should remain sensitive to that possibility and continue taking responsible steps to ensure animals remain under owner control when they are allowed at an event.

The one element that could be eliminated with virtually no negative impact on attendance is Door Prizes and Giveaways. This can be a useful tool for increasing the exposure received by event sponsors, and should continue being used for that purpose. However, these survey results indicate that there should be minimal monetary investment made by the city in obtaining additional door prizes and giveaways.

Q14. In August 2015, the city assumed gate operations at the 2,000-acre LLELA nature area (Lewisville Lake Environmental Learning Area). During the past 12 months, how many times have you or a member of you household visited LLELA?

Answer Options	Response Percent	Response Count
None	60.07%	683
None (did not know it existed)	20.67%	235
1 - 3 times	14.51%	165
4 -6 times	2.29%	26
7 - 10 times	0.53%	6
More than 10 times	1.32%	15
Decline to answer	0.62%	7

This first-time question served two purposes – to educate survey respondents about the city's relatively new involvement with LLELA, and to assess public awareness of the preserve. In future surveys, this will be the first question in a couplet, with the following question used to measure interest and satisfaction in various LLELA programs and amenities. The follow-up question was not used in the 2016 survey because LLELA had been closed due to flooding for much of the 12 months preceding the survey window, so accurate assessments would have been highly unlikely.

Results for this question indicate a public awareness of nearly 80 percent for LLELA. However, it is possible that the order of responses influenced those results – some people who do not know about LLELA might have marked "none" and moved on without seeing the second option. As a result, staff is not comfortable with an 80 percent awareness rating. Those two responses will be switched for the 2017 survey. These results also show a low rate of frequent visitors to LLELA. It is very possible this was influenced in part by the flood-induced closings at the preserve.

These results will serve as a baseline for future trending data, but should not be considered fully reliable due to the circumstances explained above.

Satisfaction with getting information from the city

Q15. In regard to specific communications, please tell me:

Answer Options	Yes	No	% Yes
Have you read the Horizon e-newsletter?	841	280	75.02%
Do you have Spectrum or Frontier television service at home?	792	329	70.65%
Have you accessed the City's website (www.cityoflewisville.com) in the past 12 months?	988	137	87.82%
Have you signed up to receive the electronic Horizon e-newsletter delivered to your email every other week?	695	426	62.00%
Have you interacted with the City of Lewisville Facebook during the past 6 months?	282	840	25.13%
Have you downloaded the city’s free mobile app?	145	972	12.98%
Do you remember receiving the printed Horizon newsletter in the mail within the past 3 months?	477	643	42.59%

A third answer option of “Don’t Remember” was included with this question; for analysis purposes, those responses were combined here with the “No” answers. In most cases, the statistical impact was minimal.

This question is repeated from past surveys, but the last two categories are new to the 2016 survey. The intent of this question is to measure use rather than effectiveness. The website is used by 87.82 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, while possibly inflated somewhat by the nature of the surveying tool, is nevertheless an encouraging figure.

The result here showing 62.00 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 September 15, 2016, the subscriber list for the electronic Horizon newsletter contained 14,885 email address, which would be about 40 percent of the adult population (but nearly double the number of subscribers as of Jan. 5, 2015). There also is one contradiction within the survey results, which show 62.00 percent of respondents have signed up to receive the electronic newsletter while 75.02 percent have read it. The electronic newsletter also is posted to the city’s Facebook page, but it is unlikely that 13 percent of survey respondents accessed the electronic newsletter through Facebook. However, as seen in the three-year trend data below, this anomaly has existed every year.

The percentage of respondents who said they subscribe to cable is 75.02 percent, which is statistically comparable to the actual household penetration rate of just over 70 percent reported by Spectrum (formerly Time Warner Cable) and Frontier (formerly Verizon FIOS). The 12.98 percent of respondents who have downloaded the city's mobile application roughly corresponds with the current total of 1,049 downloads, but should increase next year after the new website and expanded mobile app launch later this year.

The percentage of respondents who remembered receiving the printed Horizon newsletter (42.59 percent) might seem low since the newsletter is mailed to every residential address in Lewisville, including Castle Hills, but is actually encouraging since the June issue of the Horizon was the first printed newsletter distributed by the city in nearly a decade. In past surveys, the printed newsletter was the highest-rated source for city information, and staff expects this percentage to increase significantly in the 2017 survey.

The three-year data trend for this question:

	2014	**2015**	**2016**
Have you read the Horizon e-newsletter?	84.08%	78.17%	75.02%
Do you have Spectrum (Time Warner) or Frontier (Verizon Fios) television service?	75.11%	75.33%	70.65%
Have you accessed the City's website (www.cityoflewisville.com) in the past 12 months?	89.38%	90.23%	87.82%
Have you signed up to receive the electronic Horizon e-newsletter delivered to your email every other week?	66.30%	66.82%	62.00%
Have you interacted with the City of Lewisville on Facebook during the past 6 months?	25.39%	26.48%	25.13%
Have you downloaded the city's free mobile app to your phone or mobile device?			12.98%
Do you remember receiving the printed Horizon newsletter in the mail within the past three months?			42.59%

These results show a steady decline in the public use of all the city's major communication tools. This supports national survey findings by Pew Research Center that show the public continues to use a wider range of communication sources than in the past, with individual tools becoming less prevalent over time. This is a difficult trend to overcome, although restoration of the printed Horizon newsletter might be successful in creating a single trusted information source.

Q16. The City maintains an active presence on the following social media outlets. How aware or unaware are you of these outlets?

Answer Options	Very Aware	Somewhat Aware	Somewhat Unaware	Very Unaware	No opinion	Awareness
Facebook	306	226	124	316	148	47.50%
Twitter	102	141	115	444	315	21.75%
YouTube	75	111	135	534	257	16.73%
NextDoor	458	145	69	287	155	54.13%
Instagram	36	91	144	546	297	11.40%

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. This does result in Awareness Ratings that are about 8 percentage points lower than would be obtained by discarding the "no opinion" responses, but gives a more accurate picture.

NextDoor and Instagram had not been included in previous surveys. NextDoor received the highest level of awareness (54.13 percent) among respondents to this question and the highest positive intensity (41.11 percent), demonstrating the rapid popularity of this relatively new social media outlet. This also was the first year staff posted the survey link on NextDoor. The survey link was posted to NextDoor a few hours before the electronic Horizon newsletter was sent out with the survey link; this appears to have contributed to the fact that 39.86 percent of all survey responses came through the NextDoor link. The largest source of survey responses still was the electronic Horizon at 49.01 percent. Overall sources of 2016 survey responses are detailed below.

Outlet	Count	Percentage
Twitter	20	1.59%
Facebook	37	2.94%
NextDoor	501	39.86%
Horizon	616	49.01%
Website	83	6.60%

This question first was asked in the 2014 survey but has been revised each year, so full three-year tending data is not available for all responses. Trending for the city's three most-used outlets does show a steady increase in public awareness for all three. The addition of an Electronic Communications Specialist position in 2014 is the likely cause of the increased use and awareness of all three social media outlets.

	2014	**2015**	**2016**
Facebook	39.83%	42.55%	47.50%
Twitter	15.36%	20.57%	21.75%
YouTube	12.33%	15.13%	16.73%

These numbers show that Facebook continues to be a strong communication outlet for the city, with NextDoor helping to expand the online audience despite some challenges in the user interface. Twitter and YouTube are still building a reliable audience, while Instagram is the city's newest social media outlet and is not likely to become a viable communication tool for at least another year or two. In addition, this question also could have an education effect on survey respondents, prompting them to investigate outlets of which they were unaware.

Q17. 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	17.08%	192
Effective	40.08%	450
Ineffective	8.54%	96
Very ineffective	4.80%	54
No opinion	29.54%	332

This question differs from the preceding Q16 in that it asks respondents to evaluate the city's social media presence rather than simply stating their awareness of it. Results show a satisfaction rating of 81.06 percent and a plus ratio of 4.3:1 when "no opinion" responses are filtered out. About three out of 10 respondents had no opinion on effectiveness of the city's social media efforts, which would seem to be tied to the awareness ratings described above in Q16.

The three-year trend for this question shows some improvement over 2014 and significant improvement over 2015, when there was a noticeable dip in the results.

	2014	**2015**	**2016**
Very effective	24.79%	20.11%	24.24%
Effective	53.03%	54.16%	56.82%
Ineffective	15.15%	17.19%	12.12%
Very ineffective	7.02%	8.54%	6.82%
OVERALL SATISFACTION RATING	**77.82%**	**74.27%**	**81.06%**
SATISFACTION RATIO	3.5	2.9	4.3

Q28. How familiar are you with the Lewisville 2025 vision plan?

Answer Options	**Response Percent**	**Response Count**
I do not know anything about the Lewisville 2025 vision plan	38.05%	398
I have heard about the Lewisville 2025 plan but do not know what it contains	28.39%	297
I have heard about the nine “Big Moves” in the plan but do not know any specific action steps	7.74%	81
I am familiar with the contents of the Lewisville 2025 plan but do not know what progress has been made on action steps	17.97%	188
I am keeping up with website postings and other information about progress and accomplishments related to the Lewisville 2025 vision plan	7.84%	82

These results show that more than one-third of respondents (33.55%) have some degree of awareness not only about the existence of the Lewisville 2025 vision plan but about some of its contents. Because the overwhelming majority of survey respondents live in single-family homes (detailed in Q26 below), this percentage likely is not true of apartment residents. However, it is a remarkably high level of awareness for a government planning document and shows that the plan has gotten the attention of a large segment of residents.

Nearly two-fifths (38.05 percent) still report no knowledge of the Lewisville 2025 plan. Reducing that number will require repeated references to the Lewisville 2025 plan in all the city’s communications outlets, especially the printed Horizon newsletter that is the city’s only regular communications tool that reaches every household in the city. Linking major projects to Lewisville 2025 recommendations will spark increased awareness of the plan, even among residents who have not yet expressed any interest in the plan.

While two-year trending is often unreliable, a comparison of 2016 survey results to those from the 2015 survey is very encouraging.

	2015	**2016**
I do not know anything about the Lewisville 2025 vision plan	49.76%	38.05%
I have heard about the Lewisville 2025 plan but do not know what it contains	28.25%	28.39%
I have heard about the nine "Big Moves" in the plan but do not know any specific action steps	6.66%	7.74%
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%	17.97%
I am keeping up with website postings and other information about progress and accomplishments related to the Lewisville 2025 vision plan	5.94%	7.84%

As these numbers show, the level of public awareness about the Lewisville 2025 vision plan increased significantly from 2015 to 2016, especially among respondents who reported some knowledge about the Big Moves and related action steps. An annual report on the vision plan that was mailed to all Lewisville and Castle Hills residential addresses in February 2016 probably contributed greatly to this increased awareness, but other factors include signage at Lewisville 2025 project sites, social media posts connecting various projects to Lewisville 2025 recommendations, and public attention given to the bond election and early design discussions related to the Multi-Generational Recreation Center.

Regardless of the cause, these numbers appear to show that the public is paying attention to Lewisville 2025 and has a growing interest in following progress toward plan goals. This creates a demand for the city to actively talk about Lewisville 2025 as often as is reasonable.

Q25. During the past six months, have you accessed the City website to conduct any of the following activities?

Answer Options	Yes	No	User %
Contact City Council or staff	92	996	8.46%
Review City job opportunities or apply for a job	206	883	18.92%
Search for special events or activities sponsored by the City	663	425	60.94%
Search for special events or activities not sponsored by the City	293	794	26.95%
Review commercial or residential development information	282	803	25.99%
Review Agendas or Minutes	148	933	13.69%
Pay a Lewisville water bill	554	534	50.92%
Pay a Lewisville municipal court fine	26	1054	2.41%
Look up or create a map of Lewisville	212	873	19.54%
Look up information about holding a garage sale	103	979	9.52%
Find information about the Neighbors Leading Neighbors program	112	970	10.35%
Look at updates on the Lewisville 2025 vision plan	269	815	24.82%

This question is a repeat from past surveys, again with some adjustments to reflect changes in website tools and strategies. The intent of this question is to measure how many people used various tools on the city website, a figure that is used in conjunction with usefulness and satisfaction ratings determined in other questions. Results of this question also can be combined with actual traffic counts from the website when making decisions about site navigation and content prioritization.

Because there was no screening question used to limit these responses, these results include people who have not visited the city website within the previous 12 months (12.18 percent of respondents according to results of Q15 above). Presumably, those respondents should be included in the “no” responses for each answer option listed with this question.

The top website functions used by respondents were searching for special events or activities sponsored by the city (60.94 percent) and paying a water bill (50.92 percent). The least-used function, according to respondents, was paying a municipal court fine (2.41 percent). Historic use patterns do show that most people paying tickets online live outside the area, while Lewisville residents are more likely to appear in person.

Listed in order of “yes” responses, the 12 website services presented in the survey are:

1. Search for special events or activities sponsored by the city 60.94
2. Pay a Lewisville water bill 50.92
3. Search for special events or activities not sponsored by the city 26.95
4. Review commercial or residential development information 25.99
5. Look at updates on the Lewisville 2025 vision plan 24.82
6. Look up or create a map of Lewisville 19.54
7. Review city job opportunities or apply for a job 18.92
8. Review agendas or minutes 13.69
9. Find information about Neighbors Leading Neighbors program 10.35
10. Look up information about holding a garage sale 9.52
11. Contact City Council or staff 8.46
12. Pay a Lewisville municipal court fine 2.41

Since this question was not included in the 2015 survey, there is only two years’ worth of data and trending is unreliable. However, results changed very little from 2014 to 2016, dropping slightly in most cases. Three response options – garage sales, Neighbors Leading Neighbors, and Lewisville 2025 – are new to the 2016 survey.

The relatively high percentage of respondents who reported visiting the website to look for updates to the Lewisville 2025 plan (24.82 percent, fifth overall) underscores the analysis included with Q28 and shows that expanded, timely updates on Lewisville 2025 projects need to be given more priority on the city website.

Satisfaction with providing input to the city

Q18. 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	12.75%	142
Telephone	27.56%	307
Mailed a letter	1.35%	15
Email to City Council	3.50%	39
Email to city staff	14.00%	156
Website comments	9.16%	102
Social Media	15.08%	168
Online Survey	42.46%	473
None	35.19%	392

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 repeated in the 2015 and 2016 surveys.

This question asked respondents to mark all feedback tools they had used within the previous 12 months to provide input to the city. In past years, the top response was “none,” given by more than half of respondents in 2014 and 2015 even though responding to the online survey was in itself a form of providing feedback. Staff addressed that in the 2016 survey document by adding “online survey” as a response option. That option was selected by 42.46 percent of respondents (which technically should have been 100 percent since this survey was conducted exclusively online), and “none” dropped to 35.19 percent.

Percentages for the other seven listed choices total 83.40, which means a significant number of respondents (as many as 25.86 percent) had used more than one feedback tool during the previous year. This underscores the need to provide multiple feedback options to residents.

The next highest number for a specific feedback tool was telephone, used by 27.56 percent of respondents. This percentage has increased each of the past two years. 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 (Q21 and Q22) provide additional information on telephone contact with the public.

These results also show that residents are far more likely to email city staff (14.00 percent) than they are to email a council member (3.50 percent), and are least likely to provide feedback with a mailed letter (1.35 percent).

Three-year trending results for this question show little change, other than changes caused by adding the “online survey” response option in 2016.

	2014	**2015**	**2016**
In-person visit	9.30%	12.60%	12.75%
Telephone	23.40%	24.32%	27.56%
Mailed a letter	1.50%	1.47%	1.35%
Email to City Council	5.50%	5.64%	3.50%
Email to city staff	12.20%	14.51%	14.00%
Website comments	11.90%	14.07%	9.16%
Social media	12.60%	16.70%	15.08%
Online Survey	-	-	42.46%
None	53.60%	50.11%	35.19%

Other than the response change already discussed, the only category close to a statistically significant change over time is “telephone,” which increased 4.16 percentage points from 2014 to 2016. Overall, responses to this question have remained extremely stable. This question might be shifted to an alternate-year pattern going forward, since there are such small changes over time.

Q19. How easy is it for you to give feedback or input to the City?

Answer Options	Response Percent	Response Count
Very easy	26.62%	296
Somewhat easy	34.17%	380
Somewhat difficult	6.92%	77
Very difficult	3.42%	38
No opinion	28.87%	321

This question was included 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 85.46 percent approval rating (combining "very easy" with "somewhat easy" and filtering out the "no opinion" responses) with an intensity score that represents 27.72 percent of all respondents (37.42 percent adjusted). In contrast, only 3.42 percent of total respondents (4.80 percent adjusted) gave an intensely negative response of "very difficult," representing 38 people out of 958. The overall response ratio was a strong 5.9:1 positive. No opinion was given by 28.87 percent of respondents, which largely reflects the 35.18 percent who said in Q18 above that they had not attempted to give feedback to the city during the previous 12 months. (Of the people who said "no opinion" here, 243 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. The three-year trend for this question shows slight slippage in the "very easy" responses, but no significant change in the "very difficult" responses.

	2014	**2015**	**2016**
Very easy	41.02%	37.39%	37.42%
Somewhat easy	43.78%	43.09%	48.04%
Somewhat difficult	11.19%	14.58%	9.73%
Very difficult	4.01%	4.93%	4.80%
OVERALL SATISFACTION RATING	**84.81%**	**80.48%**	**85.46%**
SATISFACTION RATIO	5.6	4.1	5.9

The overall results are trending in a positive direction, as shown by the Satisfaction Ratio, but increasing the "very easy" responses should be a goal. The city already offers a range of feedback opportunities; increased visibility and easier access to those feedback tools could improve the numbers associated with this question. The new Mobile City Hall project could boost these survey results. Emerging technologies also should be reviewed periodically to watch for new feedback tools to offer Lewisville residents.

Q20. How responsive do you think the City is to public feedback or input?

Answer Options	**Response Percent**	**Response Count**
Very responsive	27.72%	196
Somewhat responsive	46.68%	330
Somewhat unresponsive	16.41%	116
Very unresponsive	9.91%	65

This question in included as a way to measure public perception of how well the city responds to feedback received. Results show a Satisfaction Rating of 74.40, which means three-fourths of respondents have a positive view of how the city responds to public feedback. The three-year trend detailed below shows some slight erosion of those numbers from 2014 to 2016. It is possible that the timing of the 2014 survey, coming immediately after the Lewisville 2025 planning process, had a positive bump in that year's survey results.

	2014	**2015**	**2016**
Very responsive	30.18%	25.94%	27.72%
Somewhat responsive	48.12%	47.37%	46.68%
Somewhat unresponsive	11.82%	17.04%	16.41%
Very unresponsive	9.87%	9.68%	9.19%
OVERALL SATISFACTION RATING	**78.30%**	**73.28%**	**74.40%**
SATISFACTION RATIO	3.6	2.7	2.9

Q21. 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	37.95%	422
No	55.49%	617
Don't remember	6.56%	73

In Q18 (above), we saw that 27.56 percent of total respondents had used the telephone to provide feedback to the city during the preceding 12 months. We see a similar result here, with 37.95 percent of respondents saying 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 422 people is higher than the 307 people who selected "telephone" on Q18. That difference could be a result of the "or any member of your household" language used in this question.

This result emphasizes the importance of telephone contacts for the city, as nearly two out of five resident households can be expected to call the city during the course of a year. The question also was used to screen respondents, with only those who answered "yes" being given the subsequent Q22 to evaluate the service they received by phone.

Q22. 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 417 respondents were directed to this question.

Eight of the nine items rated by survey respondents received a Satisfaction Rating better than 75 percent, topped by "Courtesy of the Person Answering the Phone" at 92.25 percent. 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 92.25
2. Was Asked Adequate Questions 85.60
3. Directed to the Correct Department 85.58
4. Represented City in a Positive Manner 83.70
5. Employee Seemed Concerned 83.33
6. Showed Pride and Concern for Quality 78.12
7. Call Returned in a Reasonable Time 77.97
8. Problem Adequately Dealt With 76.82
9. Follow-up from the City 56.64

The three-year data trend:

	2014	**2015**	**2016**
The courtesy of the person answering the telephone	89.92%	92.46%	92.25%
Directed to the correct department	87.84%	91.02%	85.58%
Employee seemed concerned about my problem	75.68%	80.35%	83.33%
Asked adequate questions to determine the nature of the problem	80.16%	80.47%	85.60%
If not available, the correct employee returned my call in a reasonable time	70.14%	75.95%	77.97%
The problem was adequately dealt with by the employee responding	67.49%	70.00%	76.82%
Follow up from City to ensure my concerns were addressed	46.59%	52.26%	56.64%
The people I worked with showed pride and concern for quality of the work	70.13%	74.72%	78.12%
Through his/her actions, the primary employee I worked with represented the City in a positive manner	76.64%	78.54%	83.70%

Trend data is generally positive with eight of the nine categories receiving a higher Satisfaction Rating in 2016 than they did in 2014, including five that improved by 7 percentage points or more. Only one (Directed to the Correct Department) declined over time, by a statistically minimal 2.26 percentage points. Even with the slippage, that category received the third-highest Satisfaction Rating for this question in the 2016 survey at a solid 85.58 percent. Nevertheless, it is worth verifying that all employees have easy access to a staff telephone directory and a basic understand of department responsibilities, as it is possible some of the organizational changes made since 2014 have contributed to an increase in misdirected calls.

Q23. Have you or a member of your household used the online Customer Support Center to submit a complaint, a request for service or for other information in the past 12 months?

Answer Options	Response Percent	Response Count
Yes	11.89%	131
No	80.59%	888
Don't remember	7.53%	83

The results for this question indicate a higher level of use for the online reporting system than is actually experienced. If 11.89 percent of households each used the system just once, that would produce more than 4,000 submissions. The actual total number of requests created between July 1, 2015, and June 30, 2016, was 3,123 (excluding Public Records Requests). This higher-than-expected result likely is a result of the survey being conducted exclusively online, with online users more likely to use an online reporting system.

However, staff would prefer even greater actual and perceived use of the online system, and is looking into ways to direct more residents to the online system and to make the system easier to use.

This also was used as a qualifier question. Only people who indicated they had used the Customer Support Center were asked to evaluate the system in Q24.

Q24. When the Customer Service Management system was used, did you track your request and was it done in a timely manner?

Answer Options	Response Percent	Response Count
Yes	61.94%	83
No	29.10%	39
Don't remember	8.96%	12

Staff's preference would be for a higher rating on this question (61.94 percent overall, 68.03 percent adjusted to filter out the non-responses). However, since the definition of "timely" can vary wildly, this number might have an artificial ceiling. Some people are content if they receive an answer within three months, while some are discontent if they do not receive an answer the same business day.

We are looking into the possibility of removing this question couplet from future citywide surveys and replacing it with a spot email survey for residents who submit Customer Service Management requests. Staff believes this will be a more accurate indicator of satisfaction since it can be delivered immediately after a request is received and processed.

Who took the satisfaction survey?

Q29. Gender

Answer Options	Response Percent	Response Count
Male	37.93%	410
Female	62.07%	671

Q30. Which of these age groups includes your age?

Answer Options	Response Percent	Response Count
18 - 24 years	0.91%	10
25 - 34 years	11.69%	128
35 - 44 years	19.63%	215
45 - 54 years	23.65%	259
55 - 64 years	23.56%	258
65 and Older	20.55%	225

Q31. 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	68.36%	741
Under age 6	13.38%	145
Ages 7 - 12	13.38%	145
Ages 13 - 18	13.28%	144

Q32. How long have you lived in the City of Lewisville?

Answer Options	Response Percent	Response Count
Less than one year	2.56%	28
1 - 3 years	16.62%	182
4 - 6 years	10.41%	114
7 - 9 years	9.41%	103
10 - 20 years	29.68%	325
More than 20 years	31.32%	343

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	88.52%	972
I rent a house, duplex, townhome or mobile home in Lewisville	7.38%	81
I rent an apartment in Lewisville	3.55%	39
I live in a retirement center or similar facility in Lewisville	0.09%	1
I do not live in Lewisville	0.46%	5

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

Answer Options	Response Percent	Response Count
75057	9.84%	108
75067	58.74%	645
75077	29.78%	327
75056	1.64%	18

The four demographic questions above show that survey respondents skewed heavily toward female participants, two-thirds are age 45 or older, two-thirds have no children in the home, and more than 60 percent have lived in Lewisville at least 10 years. These demographic breakdowns are generally consistent with U.S. Census data but do not represent a true demographic sampling. In addition, we continue to have low representation among renters, apartment residents, and in the 75057 ZIP code overall.