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Investment Priorities

Recommended Priorities for the Next Two Years. In order to help the Unified Government identify investment priorities for the next two years, ETC Institute conducted an Importance-Satisfaction (I-S) analysis. This analysis examined the importance that residents placed on each service and the level of satisfaction with each service.

By identifying services of high importance and low satisfaction, the analysis identified which services will have the most impact on overall satisfaction with City and County services over the next two years. If the Unified Government wants to improve its overall satisfaction rating, they should prioritize investments in services with the highest Importance Satisfaction (I-S) ratings. Details regarding the methodology for the analysis are provided in the Section 3 of this report.

Based on the results of the Importance-Satisfaction (I-S) Analysis, ETC Institute recommends the following:

- **Overall Priorities for the City by Major Category.** The first level of analysis reviewed the importance of and satisfaction with major categories of City services. This analysis was conducted to help set the overall priorities for the City. Based on the results of this analysis, the major services that are recommended as the top three priorities for investment over the next two years in order to raise the City’s overall satisfaction rating are listed below in descending order of the Importance-Satisfaction rating:

  - Quality of maintenance of City streets
  - Quality of communication with the public
  - Quality of City Code Enforcement

- **Overall Priorities for the County by Major Category.** The second level of analysis reviewed the importance of and satisfaction with major categories of County services. This analysis was conducted to help set the overall priorities for the County. Based on the results of this analysis, the major services that are recommended as the top priorities for investment over the next two years in order to raise the County’s overall satisfaction rating are listed below in descending order of the Importance-Satisfaction rating:

  - Quality of motor vehicle registration
  - Quality services for development disabilities
  - Customer service received from County employees
  - Quality of the Area Agency on Aging Services
  - Quality of senior transportation
• Priorities Within Departments/Specific Areas: The third level of analysis reviewed the importance of and satisfaction of services within departments and specific service areas. This analysis was conducted to help departmental managers set priorities for their department. Based on the results of this analysis, the services that are recommended as the top priorities within each department over the next two years are listed below:

  o Public Safety: City’s overall efforts to prevent crime, the visibility of police in neighborhoods, the quality of animal control in neighborhoods, and the visibility of Code Enforcement in neighborhoods.

  o City Codes and Ordinances: Enforcing the clean-up of litter and debris (blight) city-wide, enforcement of mowing and trimming of weeds on private and/or vacant property city-wide, enforcing the clean-up of junk, trash and debris (blight) in neighborhoods, and enforcing mowing and trimming of weeds on private and/or vacant property in neighborhoods.

  o City Maintenance Services: Maintenance of streets in neighborhoods, snow removal on neighborhood streets, maintenance of major City streets, maintenance of sidewalks in neighborhoods, and the overall cleanliness of streets and other public areas.

  o Parks and Recreation: Number of walking and biking trails, youth recreation programs, and swimming pool and spray parks.
Section 1: Importance-Satisfaction Analysis
Overview

Today, city and county officials have limited resources which need to be targeted to activities that are of the most benefit to their citizens. Two of the most important criteria for decision making are (1) to target resources toward services of the highest importance to citizens; and (2) to target resources toward those services where citizens are the least satisfied.

The Importance-Satisfaction (IS) rating is a unique tool that allows public officials to better understand both of these highly important decision making criteria for each of the services they are providing. The Importance-Satisfaction rating is based on the concept that cities will maximize overall citizen satisfaction by emphasizing improvements in those service categories where the level of satisfaction is relatively low and the perceived importance of the service is relatively high.

Methodology

The rating is calculated by summing the percentage of responses for items selected as the first, second and third most important services for the City or County to emphasize over the next two years. This sum is then multiplied by 1 minus the percentage of respondents that indicated they were positively satisfied with the City or County’s performance in the related area (the sum of the ratings of 4 and 5 on a 5-point scale excluding “don’t know” responses). “Don't know” responses are excluded from the calculation to ensure that the satisfaction ratings among service categories are comparable. [IS=Importance x (1-Satisfaction)].

Example of the Calculation. Respondents were asked to identify the overall Kansas City, KS services they thought were the most important for the City to provide. Approximately sixty-four percent (64.1%) of residents selected the “quality of maintenance of City streets” as one of the most important major services to provide.

With regard to satisfaction, twenty-seven percent (28.6%) of the residents surveyed rated their overall satisfaction with the “quality of maintenance of City streets” as a “4” or a “5” on a 5-point scale (where “5” means “very satisfied”). The I-S rating for “quality of maintenance of
City streets’ was calculated by multiplying the sum of the most important percentages by 1 minus the sum of the satisfaction percentages. In this example, 64.1% was multiplied by 28.6% (1-0.714). This calculation yielded an I-S rating of 0.4577, which ranked first out of fifteen major City services.

The maximum rating is 1.00 and would be achieved when 100% of the respondents select an item as one of their top three choices to emphasize over the next two years and 0% indicates that they are positively satisfied with the delivery of the service.

The lowest rating is 0.00 and could be achieved under either one of the following two situations:

- if 100% of the respondents were positively satisfied with the delivery of the service
- if none (0%) of the respondents selected the service as one of the three most important areas for the City to emphasize over the next two years.

**Interpreting the Ratings**

Ratings that are greater than or equal to 0.20 identify areas that should receive significantly more emphasis over the next two years. Ratings from .10 to .20 identify service areas that should receive increased emphasis. Ratings less than .10 should continue to receive the current level of emphasis.

- Definitely Increase Emphasis (I-S>=0.20)
- Increase Current Emphasis (0.10<=I-S<0.20)
- Maintain Current Emphasis (I-S<0.10)

The results for District 8 are provided on the following page.
## Importance-Satisfaction Rating

### Kansas City, KS/Wyandotte County

#### City Services

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Category of Service</th>
<th>Most Important %</th>
<th>Most Important Rank</th>
<th>Satisfaction %</th>
<th>Satisfaction Rank</th>
<th>Importance-Satisfaction Rating</th>
<th>I-S Rating Rank</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Very High Priority (IS &gt; .20)</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Maintenance of City streets</td>
<td>64%</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>29%</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>0.4577</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Communication with the public</td>
<td>33%</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>29%</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>0.2315</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>High Priority (IS .10-.20)</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Code enforcement</td>
<td>27%</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>30%</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>0.1874</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Storm water runoff/management system</td>
<td>21%</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>39%</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>0.1267</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Public transportation</td>
<td>21%</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>42%</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>0.1201</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Parks &amp; recreation programs</td>
<td>18%</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>40%</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>0.1070</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Planning &amp; zoning</td>
<td>14%</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>28%</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>0.1021</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Medium Priority (IS &lt; .10)</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Parks &amp; recreation facilities</td>
<td>20%</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>52%</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>0.0946</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Police services</td>
<td>31%</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>69%</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>0.0942</td>
<td>9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sewer utility system</td>
<td>17%</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>45%</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>0.0919</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Recycling</td>
<td>15%</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>49%</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>0.0741</td>
<td>11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Municipal court</td>
<td>10%</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>35%</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>0.0634</td>
<td>12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Trash collection system</td>
<td>16%</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>60%</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>0.0546</td>
<td>13</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fire services</td>
<td>16%</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>83%</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0.0280</td>
<td>14</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ambulance services</td>
<td>12%</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>76%</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0.0268</td>
<td>15</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Note:** The I-S Rating is calculated by multiplying the "Most Important\%" by (1-'Satisfaction\%').

**Most Important %:**

- The "Most Important\%" percentage represents the sum of the first, second and third most important responses for each item. Respondents were asked to identify the items they thought should receive the most emphasis over the next two years.

**Satisfaction %:**

- The "Satisfaction\%" percentage represents the sum of the ratings "4" and "5" excluding 'don't knows.'

  Respondents ranked their level of satisfaction with the each of the items on a scale of 1 to 5 with "5" being very satisfied and "1" being very dissatisfied.
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## Importance-Satisfaction Rating

### Kansas City, KS/Wyandotte County

### Wyandotte County Services

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Category of Service</th>
<th>Most Important %</th>
<th>Most Important Rank</th>
<th>Satisfaction %</th>
<th>Satisfaction Rank</th>
<th>Importance-Satisfaction Rating</th>
<th>I-S Rating Rank</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Very High Priority (IS &gt; .20)</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Motor Vehicle Registration</td>
<td>48%</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>35%</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>0.3125</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>High Priority (IS .10-.20)</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Services for developmental disabilities</td>
<td>26%</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>29%</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>0.1856</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Customer service provided by Unified Government employees</td>
<td>26%</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>35%</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>0.1785</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Area Agency on Aging Services</td>
<td>27%</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>37%</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>0.1682</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Senior transportation</td>
<td>21%</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>30%</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>0.1455</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Public Health Department services</td>
<td>22%</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>34%</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>0.1443</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>County parks</td>
<td>29%</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>53%</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0.1368</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>County Appraiser's Office services</td>
<td>19%</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>35%</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>0.1243</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Adult Jail/Juvenile Detention Center</td>
<td>15%</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>35%</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>0.1002</td>
<td>9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Medium Priority (IS &lt; .10)</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>District Courts</td>
<td>13%</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>36%</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>0.0804</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Treasurer's Office</td>
<td>13%</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>38%</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>0.0789</td>
<td>11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>County Sheriff's office</td>
<td>12%</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>53%</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0.0544</td>
<td>12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Community elections</td>
<td>9%</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>40%</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>0.0522</td>
<td>13</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The District Attorneys' Office</td>
<td>8%</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>35%</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>0.0494</td>
<td>14</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The Election Office</td>
<td>6%</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>44%</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>0.0316</td>
<td>15</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Note:** The I-S Rating is calculated by multiplying the "Most Important" % by (1-'Satisfaction' %)

### Most Important %:

The "Most Important" percentage represents the sum of the first, second and third most important responses for each item. Respondents were asked to identify the items they thought should receive the most emphasis over the next two years.

### Satisfaction %:

The "Satisfaction" percentage represents the sum of the ratings '4' and '5' excluding 'don't knows.' Respondents ranked their level of satisfaction with each of the items on a scale of 1 to 5 with '5' being very satisfied and '1' being very dissatisfied.
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## Importance-Satisfaction Rating

### Kansas City, KS/Wyandotte County

**Public Safety**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Category of Service</th>
<th>Most Important %</th>
<th>Most Important Rank</th>
<th>Satisfaction %</th>
<th>Satisfaction Rank</th>
<th>Importance-Satisfaction Rating</th>
<th>I-S Rating Rank</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Very High Priority (IS &gt; .20)</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The City's overall efforts to prevent crime</td>
<td>39%</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>39%</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>0.2388</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The visibility of police in neighborhoods</td>
<td>40%</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>49%</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>0.2031</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>High Priority (IS .10-.20)</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Quality of animal control in your neighborhood</td>
<td>28%</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>32%</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>0.1859</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The visibility of Code Enforcement in your neighborhood</td>
<td>26%</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>30%</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>0.1810</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The visibility of police in neighborhood retail areas</td>
<td>27%</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>48%</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>0.1409</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The visibility of Building Inspection in your neighborhood</td>
<td>14%</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>26%</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>0.1006</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Medium Priority (IS &lt;.10)</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>How quickly police department personnel respond to emergencies</td>
<td>17%</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>56%</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>0.0766</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Enforcement of traffic laws</td>
<td>13%</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>46%</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>0.0699</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>How quickly fire department responded to fires</td>
<td>6%</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>73%</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0.0161</td>
<td>9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>How quickly fire department responds to medical emergency calls</td>
<td>5%</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>78%</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0.0118</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Note: The I-S Rating is calculated by multiplying the "Most Important" % by (1- ’Satisfaction’ %)

**Most Important %:** The "Most Important" percentage represents the sum of the first, second and third most important responses for each item. Respondents were asked to identify the items they thought should receive the most emphasis over the next two years.

**Satisfaction %:** The "Satisfaction" percentage represents the sum of the ratings “4” and “5” excluding ‘don’t knows.’ Respondents ranked their level of satisfaction with the each of the items on a scale of 1 to 5 with "5" being very satisfied and "1" being very dissatisfied.
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# Importance-Satisfaction Rating

**Kansas City, KS/Wyandotte County**

## City Maintenance

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Category of Service</th>
<th>Most Important %</th>
<th>Most Important Rank</th>
<th>Most Important Rating</th>
<th>I-S Rating Rank</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Very High Priority (IS &gt; .20)</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Maintenance of streets in your neighborhood</td>
<td>40%</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>32%</td>
<td>0.2733</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Snow removal on neighborhood streets</td>
<td>37%</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>34%</td>
<td>0.2468</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>High Priority (IS .10-.20)</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Maintenance of major City streets</td>
<td>33%</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>41%</td>
<td>0.1958</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Maintenance of sidewalks in your neighborhood</td>
<td>24%</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>20%</td>
<td>0.1896</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Overall cleanliness of streets &amp; other public areas</td>
<td>24%</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>30%</td>
<td>0.1663</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Maintenance of curbs in your neighborhood</td>
<td>16%</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>24%</td>
<td>0.1184</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Maintenance of stormwater drainage system in your neighborhood</td>
<td>16%</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>34%</td>
<td>0.1076</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Medium Priority (IS &lt;.10)</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Snow removal on major City streets</td>
<td>16%</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>59%</td>
<td>0.0658</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Overall appearance of Downtown</td>
<td>10%</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>38%</td>
<td>0.0632</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Maintenance of Downtown parking lots</td>
<td>6%</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>28%</td>
<td>0.0425</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Maintenance of alleys in your neighborhood</td>
<td>5%</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>22%</td>
<td>0.0413</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Maintenance of street signs/ traffic signals</td>
<td>6%</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>48%</td>
<td>0.0320</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Maintenance of City buildings</td>
<td>4%</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>41%</td>
<td>0.0255</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Note:** The I-S Rating is calculated by multiplying the "Most Important" % by (1-'Satisfaction' %)

**Most Important %:**

The "Most Important" percentage represents the sum of the first, second and third most important responses for each item. Respondents were asked to identify the items they thought should receive the most emphasis over the next two years.

**Satisfaction %:**

The "Satisfaction" percentage represents the sum of the ratings "4" and "5" excluding 'don't knows.' Respondents ranked their level of satisfaction with the each of the items on a scale of 1 to 5 with "5" being very satisfied and "1" being very dissatisfied.
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# Importance-Satisfaction Rating

## Kansas City, KS/Wyandotte County

### City Codes and Ordinances

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Category of Service</th>
<th>Most Important %</th>
<th>Most Important Rank</th>
<th>Satisfaction %</th>
<th>Satisfaction Rank</th>
<th>Importance-Satisfaction Rating</th>
<th>I-S Rating Rank</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Very High Priority (IS &gt; .20)</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Enforcing clean-up of junk, trash &amp; debris (blight), city-wide</td>
<td>48%</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>24%</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>0.3675</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Enforcing mowing &amp; trimming of weeds on private and/or vacant property, city-wide</td>
<td>42%</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>25%</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>0.3158</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Enforcing clean-up of junk, trash &amp; debris (blight), in your neighborhood</td>
<td>37%</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>29%</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>0.2641</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>High Priority (IS .10-.20)</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Enforcing mowing &amp; trimming of weeds on private and/or vacant property, in your neighborhood</td>
<td>27%</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>30%</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>0.1915</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Enforcing removal of inoperable or junk cars in your neighborhood</td>
<td>21%</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>35%</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0.1367</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Enforcing maintenance of residential property (houses) in your neighborhood</td>
<td>20%</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>35%</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0.1324</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Enforcing maintenance of business property</td>
<td>17%</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>34%</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>0.1084</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Note:** The I-S Rating is calculated by multiplying the "Most Important" % by (1-'Satisfaction' %)

**Most Important %:**

The "Most Important" percentage represents the sum of the first, second and third most important responses for each item. Respondents were asked to identify the items they thought should receive the most emphasis over the next two years.

**Satisfaction %:**

The "Satisfaction" percentage represents the sum of the ratings '4' and '5' excluding 'don't knows.' Respondents ranked their level of satisfaction with the each of the items on a scale of 1 to 5 with '5' being very satisfied and '1' being very dissatisfied.
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## Importance-Satisfaction Rating

**Kansas City, KS/Wyandotte County**

**Parks and Recreation**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Category of Service</th>
<th>Most Important %</th>
<th>Most Important Rank</th>
<th>Satisfaction %</th>
<th>Satisfaction Rank</th>
<th>Importance-Satisfaction Rating</th>
<th>I-S Rating Rank</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Very High Priority (IS &gt; .20)</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Youth recreation programs</td>
<td>32%</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>23%</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>0.2458</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Number of walking &amp; biking trails</td>
<td>32%</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>31%</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>0.2184</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>High Priority (IS .10-.20)</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Swimming pool &amp; spray parks</td>
<td>24%</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>25%</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>0.1795</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Programs for seniors</td>
<td>21%</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>22%</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>0.1673</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Adult recreation programs</td>
<td>20%</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>22%</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>0.1521</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Maintenance of parks &amp; equipment</td>
<td>28%</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>52%</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0.1334</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fees charged for recreation programs</td>
<td>16%</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>22%</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>0.1231</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The number of parks</td>
<td>19%</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>42%</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0.1083</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Medium Priority (IS &lt; .10)</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Number of outdoor athletic fields</td>
<td>12%</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>29%</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>0.0870</td>
<td>9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ease of registering for programs</td>
<td>7%</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>26%</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>0.0551</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Skate board parks</td>
<td>5%</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>17%</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>0.0396</td>
<td>11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sunflower Hills Golf Course</td>
<td>2%</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>42%</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>0.0086</td>
<td>12</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Note:** The I-S Rating is calculated by multiplying the "Most Important" % by (1-'Satisfaction' %)

**Most Important %:**

The "Most Important" percentage represents the sum of the first, second and third most important responses for each item. Respondents were asked to identify the items they thought should receive the most emphasis over the next two years.

**Satisfaction %:**

The "Satisfaction" percentage represents the sum of the ratings "4" and "5" excluding 'don't knows.' Respondents ranked their level of satisfaction with the each of the items on a scale of 1 to 5 with "5" being very satisfied and "1" being very dissatisfied.
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Section 2: GIS Maps
Location of Survey Respondents

2016 Unified Government Community Survey

Satisfaction with Neighborhood and Community Services
Q1 01 Quality of Police Services

2016 Unified Government Community Survey
Shading reflects the mean rating for all respondents by Neighborhood

Citizen Satisfaction
Mean rating on a 5-point scale

- 1.0-1.8 Very Dissatisfied
- 1.8-2.6 Dissatisfied
- 2.6-3.4 Neutral
- 3.4-4.2 Satisfied
- 4.2-5.0 Very Satisfied
- No Response

Q1 02 Quality of Fire Services

2016 Unified Government Community Survey
Shading reflects the mean rating for all respondents by Neighborhood

Citizen Satisfaction
Mean rating on a 5-point scale

- 1.0-1.8 Very Dissatisfied
- 1.8-2.6 Dissatisfied
- 2.6-3.4 Neutral
- 3.4-4.2 Satisfied
- 4.2-5.0 Very Satisfied
- No Response
Q1 03 Quality of Ambulance Services

Citizen Satisfaction
Mean rating on a 5-point scale

1.0-1.8 Very Dissatisfied
1.8-2.6 Dissatisfied
2.6-3.4 Neutral
3.4-4.2 Satisfied
4.2-5.0 Very Satisfied

No Response

2016 Unified Government Community Survey
Shading reflects the mean rating for all respondents by Neighborhood

ETC INSTITUTE

Q1 04 Quality of Maintenance of City Streets

Citizen Satisfaction
Mean rating on a 5-point scale

1.0-1.8 Very Dissatisfied
1.8-2.6 Dissatisfied
2.6-3.4 Neutral
3.4-4.2 Satisfied
4.2-5.0 Very Satisfied

No Response

2016 Unified Government Community Survey
Shading reflects the mean rating for all respondents by Neighborhood

ETC INSTITUTE
Q1 05 Quality of Storm Water Run-off Management System

2016 Unified Government Community Survey
Shading reflects the mean rating for all respondents by Neighborhood

Citizen Satisfaction
Mean rating on a 5-point scale

- 1.0-1.8 Very Dissatisfied
- 1.8-2.6 Dissatisfied
- 2.6-3.4 Neutral
- 3.4-4.2 Satisfied
- 4.2-5.0 Very Satisfied
- No Response

2016 Unified Government Community Survey
Shading reflects the mean rating for all respondents by Neighborhood

Citizen Satisfaction
Mean rating on a 5-point scale

- 1.0-1.8 Very Dissatisfied
- 1.8-2.6 Dissatisfied
- 2.6-3.4 Neutral
- 3.4-4.2 Satisfied
- 4.2-5.0 Very Satisfied
- No Response
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Q1 07 Quality of Trash Collection System

Citizen Satisfaction
Mean rating on a 5-point scale

ETC Institute (2016)

2016 Unified Government Community Survey
Shading reflects the mean rating for all respondents by Neighborhood

Q1 08 Quality of Parks and Recreation Facilities

Citizen Satisfaction
Mean rating on a 5-point scale

ETC Institute (2016)
Q1 11 Quality of Planning and Zoning

2016 Unified Government Community Survey
Shading reflects the mean rating for all respondents by Neighborhood

Q1 12 Communication with the Public

2016 Unified Government Community Survey
Shading reflects the mean rating for all respondents by Neighborhood
Q1 13 Quality of Municipal Court

2016 Unified Government Community Survey
Shading reflects the mean rating for all respondents by Neighborhood

Citizen Satisfaction
Mean rating on a 5-point scale

- 1.0-1.8 Very Dissatisfied
- 1.8-2.6 Dissatisfied
- 2.6-3.4 Neutral
- 3.4-4.2 Satisfied
- 4.2-5.0 Very Satisfied
- No Response

Q1 14 Quality of Recycling

2016 Unified Government Community Survey
Shading reflects the mean rating for all respondents by Neighborhood

Citizen Satisfaction
Mean rating on a 5-point scale

- 1.0-1.8 Very Dissatisfied
- 1.8-2.6 Dissatisfied
- 2.6-3.4 Neutral
- 3.4-4.2 Satisfied
- 4.2-5.0 Very Satisfied
- No Response
Q1 15 Quality of Public Transportation

Citizen Satisfaction
Mean rating on a 5-point scale

1.0-1.8 Very Dissatisfied
1.8-2.6 Dissatisfied
2.6-3.4 Neutral
3.4-4.2 Satisfied
4.2-5.0 Very Satisfied
No Response

2016 Unified Government Community Survey
Shading reflects the mean rating for all respondents by Neighborhood

Satisfaction with County Level Services
Q3 16 Quality of County Sheriff's Office

2016 Unified Government Community Survey

Shading reflects the mean rating for all respondents by Neighborhood

Citizen Satisfaction
Mean rating on a 5-point scale
- 1.0-1.8 Very Dissatisfied
- 1.8-2.6 Dissatisfied
- 2.6-3.4 Neutral
- 3.4-4.2 Satisfied
- 4.2-5.0 Very Satisfied
- No Response

Q3 17 Quality of Adult Jail Juvenile Detention Center

2016 Unified Government Community Survey

Shading reflects the mean rating for all respondents by Neighborhood

Citizen Satisfaction
Mean rating on a 5-point scale
- 1.0-1.8 Very Dissatisfied
- 1.8-2.6 Dissatisfied
- 2.6-3.4 Neutral
- 3.4-4.2 Satisfied
- 4.2-5.0 Very Satisfied
- No Response
Q3 18 Quality of Services for Developmental Disabilities

2016 Unified Government Community Survey
Shading reflects the mean rating for all respondents by Neighborhood

Q3 19 Quality of Area Agency on Aging Services

2016 Unified Government Community Survey
Shading reflects the mean rating for all respondents by Neighborhood
Q3 20 Quality of Senior Transportation

2016 Unified Government Community Survey
Shading reflects the mean rating for all respondents by Neighborhood

ETC INSTITUTE

1.0-1.8 Very Dissatisfied
1.8-2.6 Dissatisfied
2.6-3.4 Neutral
3.4-4.2 Satisfied
4.2-5.0 Very Satisfied
No Response

Q3 21 Quality of District Courts

2016 Unified Government Community Survey
Shading reflects the mean rating for all respondents by Neighborhood

ETC INSTITUTE
Q3 22 Quality of Treasurer's Office

Citizen Satisfaction
Mean rating on a 5-point scale

- 1.0-1.8 Very Dissatisfied
- 1.8-2.6 Dissatisfied
- 2.6-3.4 Neutral
- 3.4-4.2 Satisfied
- 4.2-5.0 Very Satisfied
- No Response

2016 Unified Government Community Survey
Shading reflects the mean rating for all respondents by Neighborhood

Q3 23 Quality of Motor Vehicle Registration

Citizen Satisfaction
Mean rating on a 5-point scale

- 1.0-1.8 Very Dissatisfied
- 1.8-2.6 Dissatisfied
- 2.6-3.4 Neutral
- 3.4-4.2 Satisfied
- 4.2-5.0 Very Satisfied
- No Response

2016 Unified Government Community Survey
Shading reflects the mean rating for all respondents by Neighborhood
Q3 24 Quality of County Appraiser’s Office services

2016 Unified Government Community Survey
Shading reflects the mean rating for all respondents by Neighborhood

Q3 25 County Parks Wyandotte County Park

2016 Unified Government Community Survey
Shading reflects the mean rating for all respondents by Neighborhood
Q3 26 Quality of The District Attorneys Office

Citizen Satisfaction
Mean rating on a 5-point scale

- 1.0-1.8 Very Dissatisfied
- 1.8-2.6 Dissatisfied
- 2.6-3.4 Neutral
- 3.4-4.2 Satisfied
- 4.2-5.0 Very Satisfied
- No Response

2016 Unified Government Community Survey
Shading reflects the mean rating for all respondents by Neighborhood

Q3 27 Quality of The Election Office

Citizen Satisfaction
Mean rating on a 5-point scale

- 1.0-1.8 Very Dissatisfied
- 1.8-2.6 Dissatisfied
- 2.6-3.4 Neutral
- 3.4-4.2 Satisfied
- 4.2-5.0 Very Satisfied
- No Response

2016 Unified Government Community Survey
Shading reflects the mean rating for all respondents by Neighborhood
Q3 28 Quality of Community Elections

2016 Unified Government Community Survey

Shading reflects the mean rating for all respondents by Neighborhood

Citizen Satisfaction
Mean rating on a 5-point scale

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Rating</th>
<th>Description</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1.0-1.8</td>
<td>Very Dissatisfied</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1.8-2.6</td>
<td>Dissatisfied</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.6-3.4</td>
<td>Neutral</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3.4-4.2</td>
<td>Satisfied</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4.2-5.0</td>
<td>Very Satisfied</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>N</td>
<td>No Response</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Q3 29 Quality of Customer Service Provided by Unified Government Employees

2016 Unified Government Community Survey

Shading reflects the mean rating for all respondents by Neighborhood

Citizen Satisfaction
Mean rating on a 5-point scale

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Rating</th>
<th>Description</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1.0-1.8</td>
<td>Very Dissatisfied</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1.8-2.6</td>
<td>Dissatisfied</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.6-3.4</td>
<td>Neutral</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3.4-4.2</td>
<td>Satisfied</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4.2-5.0</td>
<td>Very Satisfied</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>N</td>
<td>No Response</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Q3 30 Quality of Public Health Department Services

2016 Unified Government Community Survey
Shading reflects the mean rating for all respondents by Neighborhood

Citizen Satisfaction
Mean rating on a 5-point scale
- 1.0-1.8 Very Dissatisfied
- 1.8-2.6 Dissatisfied
- 2.6-3.4 Neutral
- 3.4-4.2 Satisfied
- 4.2-5.0 Very Satisfied
- No Response

Satisfaction with Public Safety Services
Q6 01 Satisfaction with The Visibility of Police in Neighborhoods

2016 Unified Government Community Survey

Shading reflects the mean rating for all respondents by Neighborhood

Citizen Satisfaction
Mean rating on a 5-point scale

1.0-1.8 Very Dissatisfied
1.8-2.6 Dissatisfied
2.6-3.4 Neutral
3.4-4.2 Satisfied
4.2-5.0 Very Satisfied
No Response

Q6 02 Satisfaction with The Visibility of Police in Neighborhood Retail Areas

2016 Unified Government Community Survey

Shading reflects the mean rating for all respondents by Neighborhood

Citizen Satisfaction
Mean rating on a 5-point scale

1.0-1.8 Very Dissatisfied
1.8-2.6 Dissatisfied
2.6-3.4 Neutral
3.4-4.2 Satisfied
4.2-5.0 Very Satisfied
No Response

Q6 03 Satisfaction with The Visibility of Code Enforcement in Your Neighborhood

Shading reflects the mean rating for all respondents by Neighborhood.

Q6 04 Satisfaction with The visibility of Building Inspections in Your Neighborhood

Shading reflects the mean rating for all respondents by Neighborhood.
Q6 05 Satisfaction with The City’s Overall Efforts to Prevent Crime

Citizen Satisfaction
Mean rating on a 5-point scale

1.0-1.8 Very Dissatisfied
1.8-2.6 Dissatisfied
2.6-3.4 Neutral
3.4-4.2 Satisfied
4.2-5.0 Very Satisfied
No Response

2016 Unified Government Community Survey
Shading reflects the mean rating for all respondents by Neighborhood

Q6 06 Satisfaction with Enforcement of Traffic Laws

Citizen Satisfaction
Mean rating on a 5-point scale

1.0-1.8 Very Dissatisfied
1.8-2.6 Dissatisfied
2.6-3.4 Neutral
3.4-4.2 Satisfied
4.2-5.0 Very Satisfied
No Response

2016 Unified Government Community Survey
Shading reflects the mean rating for all respondents by Neighborhood
Q6 07 Satisfaction with How Quickly Police Department Personnel Respond to Emergencies

Citizen Satisfaction
Mean rating on a 5-point scale

- 1.0-1.8 Very Dissatisfied
- 1.8-2.6 Dissatisfied
- 2.6-3.4 Neutral
- 3.4-4.2 Satisfied
- 4.2-5.0 Very Satisfied
- No Response

2016 Unified Government Community Survey
Shading reflects the mean rating for all respondents by Neighborhood

---

Q6 08 Satisfaction with How Quickly Fire Department Responded to Fires

Citizen Satisfaction
Mean rating on a 5-point scale

- 1.0-1.8 Very Dissatisfied
- 1.8-2.6 Dissatisfied
- 2.6-3.4 Neutral
- 3.4-4.2 Satisfied
- 4.2-5.0 Very Satisfied
- No Response

2016 Unified Government Community Survey
Shading reflects the mean rating for all respondents by Neighborhood
Q6 09 Satisfaction with How Quickly Fire Department Responds to Medical Emergencies

Citizen Satisfaction
Mean rating on a 5-point scale

ETC INSTITUTE

1.0-1.8 Very Dissatisfied
1.8-2.6 Dissatisfied
2.6-3.4 Neutral
3.4-4.2 Satisfied
4.2-5.0 Very Satisfied
No Response

2016 Unified Government Community Survey
Shading reflects the mean rating for all respondents by Neighborhood

Q6 10 Quality of Animal Control in Your Neighborhood

Citizen Satisfaction
Mean rating on a 5-point scale

ETC INSTITUTE
Satisfaction with City Maintenance Services

Q8 01 Satisfaction with Maintenance of Major City Streets

Mean rating on a 5-point scale

1.0-1.8 Very Dissatisfied
1.8-2.6 Dissatisfied
2.6-3.4 Neutral
3.4-4.2 Satisfied
4.2-5.0 Very Satisfied
No Response

2016 Unified Government Community Survey
Shading reflects the mean rating for all respondents by Neighborhood

ETC Institute (2016)
Q8 02 Satisfaction with Quality of Maintenance of Streets in Your Neighborhood

Citizen Satisfaction
Mean rating on a 5-point scale

- 1.0-1.8 Very Dissatisfied
- 1.8-2.6 Dissatisfied
- 2.6-3.4 Neutral
- 3.4-4.2 Satisfied
- 4.2-5.0 Very Satisfied
- No Response

2016 Unified Government Community Survey
Shading reflects the mean rating for all respondents by Neighborhood

Q8 03 Satisfaction with Maintenance of Alleys in Your Neighborhood

Citizen Satisfaction
Mean rating on a 5-point scale

- 1.0-1.8 Very Dissatisfied
- 1.8-2.6 Dissatisfied
- 2.6-3.4 Neutral
- 3.4-4.2 Satisfied
- 4.2-5.0 Very Satisfied
- No Response

2016 Unified Government Community Survey
Shading reflects the mean rating for all respondents by Neighborhood
Q8 04 Satisfaction with Maintenance of Sidewalks in Your Neighborhood

Shading reflects the mean rating for all respondents by Neighborhood

Citizen Satisfaction
Mean rating on a 5-point scale

1.0-1.8 Very Dissatisfied
1.8-2.6 Dissatisfied
2.6-3.4 Neutral
3.4-4.2 Satisfied
4.2-5.0 Very Satisfied
No Response

2016 Unified Government Community Survey

Q8 05 Satisfaction with Maintenance of Curbs in Your Neighborhood

Shading reflects the mean rating for all respondents by Neighborhood

Citizen Satisfaction
Mean rating on a 5-point scale

1.0-1.8 Very Dissatisfied
1.8-2.6 Dissatisfied
2.6-3.4 Neutral
3.4-4.2 Satisfied
4.2-5.0 Very Satisfied
No Response

2016 Unified Government Community Survey
Q8 06 Satisfaction with Maintenance of Street Signs and Traffic Signals

Citizen Satisfaction
Mean rating on a 5-point scale

1.0-1.8 Very Dissatisfied
1.8-2.6 Dissatisfied
2.6-3.4 Neutral
3.4-4.2 Satisfied
4.2-5.0 Very Satisfied
No Response

2016 Unified Government Community Survey
Shading reflects the mean rating for all respondents by Neighborhood

Q8 07 Satisfaction with Maintenance of Downtown Parking Lots

Citizen Satisfaction
Mean rating on a 5-point scale

1.0-1.8 Very Dissatisfied
1.8-2.6 Dissatisfied
2.6-3.4 Neutral
3.4-4.2 Satisfied
4.2-5.0 Very Satisfied
No Response

2016 Unified Government Community Survey
Shading reflects the mean rating for all respondents by Neighborhood
Q8 08 Satisfaction with Overall Appearance of Downtown Including Lighting, Landscaping, and Planter Boxes

2016 Unified Government Community Survey
Shading reflects the mean rating for all respondents by Neighborhood

Citizen Satisfaction
Mean rating on a 5-point scale

- 1.0-1.8 Very Dissatisfied
- 1.8-2.6 Dissatisfied
- 2.6-3.4 Neutral
- 3.4-4.2 Satisfied
- 4.2-5.0 Very Satisfied
- No Response
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Q8 10 Satisfaction with Quality of Snow Removal on Major City Streets

2016 Unified Government Community Survey
Shading reflects the mean rating for all respondents by Neighborhood

Q8 11 Satisfaction with Snow Removal on Neighborhood Streets

2016 Unified Government Community Survey
Shading reflects the mean rating for all respondents by Neighborhood
Q8 12 Satisfaction with Overall Cleanliness of Streets and Other Public Areas

2016 Unified Government Community Survey
Shading reflects the mean rating for all respondents by Neighborhood

Q8 13 Satisfaction with Maintenance of Storm Water Drainage System in Your Neighborhood

2016 Unified Government Community Survey
Shading reflects the mean rating for all respondents by Neighborhood
Satisfaction with Enforcement of Codes

Q10 01 Satisfaction with Enforcing the Clean-up of Junk, Trash, and Debris city-wide

Shading reflects the mean rating for all respondents by Neighborhood

2016 Unified Government Community Survey

2016 Kansas City, KS/Wyandotte County Community Survey Final Report: District 8

ETC INSTITUTE
Q10 02 Satisfaction with Enforcing the Clean-up of Junk, Trash, and Debris in Your Neighborhood

Citizen Satisfaction
Mean rating on a 5-point scale

1.0-1.8 Very Dissatisfied
1.8-2.6 Dissatisfied
2.6-3.4 Neutral
3.4-4.2 Satisfied
4.2-5.0 Very Satisfied
No Response

2016 Unified Government Community Survey
Shading reflects the mean rating for all respondents by Neighborhood

Q10 03 Satisfaction with Enforcing the Mowing and Trimming of Weeds on Private and/or Vacant Property, city-wide

Citizen Satisfaction
Mean rating on a 5-point scale

1.0-1.8 Very Dissatisfied
1.8-2.6 Dissatisfied
2.6-3.4 Neutral
3.4-4.2 Satisfied
4.2-5.0 Very Satisfied
No Response

2016 Unified Government Community Survey
Shading reflects the mean rating for all respondents by Neighborhood
Q10 04 Satisfaction with Enforcing the Mowing and Trimming of Weeds on Private and/or Vacant Property in Your Neighborhood

2016 Unified Government Community Survey
Shading reflects the mean rating for all respondents by Neighborhood

Q10 05 Satisfaction with Enforcing the Maintenance of Residential Property in Your Neighborhood

2016 Unified Government Community Survey
Shading reflects the mean rating for all respondents by Neighborhood
Q10 06 Satisfaction with Enforcing the Maintenance of Business Property

2016 Unified Government Community Survey

Shading reflects the mean rating for all respondents by Neighborhood

Q10 07 Satisfaction with Enforcing the Removal of Inoperable or Junk Care in Your Neighborhood

2016 Unified Government Community Survey

Shading reflects the mean rating for all respondents by Neighborhood
Satisfaction with Parks and Recreation Services

Q12 01 Satisfaction with Maintenance of Parks & Equipment

Shading reflects the mean rating for all respondents by Neighborhood

2016 Unified Government Community Survey

ETC Institute (2016)
Q12 02 Satisfaction with Number of Walking and Biking Trails

2016 Unified Government Community Survey
Shading reflects the mean rating for all respondents by Neighborhood

Citizen Satisfaction
Mean rating on a 5-point scale
1.0-1.8 Very Dissatisfied
1.8-2.6 Dissatisfied
2.6-3.4 Neutral
3.4-4.2 Satisfied
4.2-5.0 Very Satisfied
No Response

Q12 03 Satisfaction with The Number of Parks

2016 Unified Government Community Survey
Shading reflects the mean rating for all respondents by Neighborhood

Citizen Satisfaction
Mean rating on a 5-point scale
1.0-1.8 Very Dissatisfied
1.8-2.6 Dissatisfied
2.6-3.4 Neutral
3.4-4.2 Satisfied
4.2-5.0 Very Satisfied
No Response
Q12 04 Satisfaction with Number of Outdoor Athletic Fields

2016 Unified Government Community Survey
Shading reflects the mean rating for all respondents by Neighborhood

Citizen Satisfaction
Mean rating on a 5-point scale
- 1.0-1.8 Very Dissatisfied
- 1.8-2.6 Dissatisfied
- 2.6-3.4 Neutral
- 3.4-4.2 Satisfied
- 4.2-5.0 Very Satisfied
- No Response

Q12 05 Satisfaction with Sunflower Hills Golf Course

2016 Unified Government Community Survey
Shading reflects the mean rating for all respondents by Neighborhood

Citizen Satisfaction
Mean rating on a 5-point scale
- 1.0-1.8 Very Dissatisfied
- 1.8-2.6 Dissatisfied
- 2.6-3.4 Neutral
- 3.4-4.2 Satisfied
- 4.2-5.0 Very Satisfied
- No Response
Q12 06 Satisfaction with Swimming Pool & Spray Parks

2016 Unified Government Community Survey
Shading reflects the mean rating for all respondents by Neighborhood

Q12 07 Satisfaction with Youth Recreation Programs

2016 Unified Government Community Survey
Shading reflects the mean rating for all respondents by Neighborhood
Q12 08 Satisfaction with Adult Recreation Programs

Shading reflects the mean rating for all respondents by Neighborhood.

Q12 09 Satisfaction with Programs for Seniors

Shading reflects the mean rating for all respondents by Neighborhood.
Q12 10 Satisfaction with Ease of Registering for Programs

2016 Unified Government Community Survey
Shading reflects the mean rating for all respondents by Neighborhood

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Citizen Satisfaction</th>
<th>Mean rating on a 5-point scale</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1.0-1.8</td>
<td>Very Dissatisfied</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1.8-2.6</td>
<td>Dissatisfied</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.6-3.4</td>
<td>Neutral</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3.4-4.2</td>
<td>Satisfied</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4.2-5.0</td>
<td>Very Satisfied</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No Response</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

2016 Kansas City, KS/Wyandotte County Community Survey Final Report: District 8
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Q12 12 Satisfaction with Fees charged for Recreation Programs

2016 Unified Government Community Survey
Shading reflects the mean rating for all respondents by Neighborhood

Citizen Satisfaction
Mean rating on a 5-point scale

1.0-1.8 Very Dissatisfied
1.8-2.6 Dissatisfied
2.6-3.4 Neutral
3.4-4.2 Satisfied
4.2-5.0 Very Satisfied
No Response

Satisfaction with Perception of Wyandotte County
Q17 01 Satisfaction with Overall image of Wyandotte County

2016 Unified Government Community Survey

Shading reflects the mean rating for all respondents by Neighborhood

Citizen Satisfaction
Mean rating on a 5-point scale

1.0-1.8 Very Dissatisfied
1.8-2.6 Dissatisfied
2.6-3.4 Neutral
3.4-4.2 Satisfied
4.2-5.0 Very Satisfied
No Response

Q17 02 Satisfaction with How well Wyandotte County is Planning Growth and Development

2016 Unified Government Community Survey

Shading reflects the mean rating for all respondents by Neighborhood

Citizen Satisfaction
Mean rating on a 5-point scale

1.0-1.8 Very Dissatisfied
1.8-2.6 Dissatisfied
2.6-3.4 Neutral
3.4-4.2 Satisfied
4.2-5.0 Very Satisfied
No Response
Q17 03 Satisfaction with Overall Quality of Life in Wyandotte County

Mean rating on a 5-point scale

1.0-1.8 Very Dissatisfied
1.8-2.6 Dissatisfied
2.6-3.4 Neutral
3.4-4.2 Satisfied
4.2-5.0 Very Satisfied
No Response

2016 Unified Government Community Survey

Shading reflects the mean rating for all respondents by Neighborhood

Q17 04 Satisfaction with Overall appearance of Wyandotte County

Mean rating on a 5-point scale

1.0-1.8 Very Dissatisfied
1.8-2.6 Dissatisfied
2.6-3.4 Neutral
3.4-4.2 Satisfied
4.2-5.0 Very Satisfied
No Response

2016 Unified Government Community Survey

Shading reflects the mean rating for all respondents by Neighborhood
Q17 05 Satisfaction with Overall Feeling of Safety in Wyandotte County

2016 Unified Government Community Survey
Shading reflects the mean rating for all respondents by Neighborhood

Q17 06 Satisfaction with Overall quality of City and County

2016 Unified Government Community Survey
Shading reflects the mean rating for all respondents by Neighborhood
Q17.07 Satisfaction with Your Monthly Trash Service Fee

Q17.08 Satisfaction with Your Monthly Sewer Fee
Q17 09 Satisfaction with The Overall Value You Receive for City and County Taxes and Fees You Pay

Citizen Satisfaction
Mean rating on a 5-point scale
- 1.0-1.8 Very Dissatisfied
- 1.8-2.6 Dissatisfied
- 2.6-3.4 Neutral
- 3.4-4.2 Satisfied
- 4.2-5.0 Very Satisfied
- No Response

2016 Unified Government Community Survey
Shading reflects the mean rating for all respondents by Neighborhood
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Section 3: Tabular Analysis
Commission District 8

Q18. The Unified Government has a dangerous dog ordinance to make the community safe for people and pets in the most comprehensive way possible. The Unified Government's current dangerous dog ordinance currently bans "pit bulls". The Unified Government could amend the current dangerous dog ordinance to hold owners accountable for the behavior of their dogs regardless of the dog's breed. Would you support this change?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Q18. Would you support this change</th>
<th>Number</th>
<th>Percent</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Yes (Law should be expanded to hold owners responsible for the behavior of all dog breeds)</td>
<td>419</td>
<td>85.2 %</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No (Law should continue to apply to pit bulls only)</td>
<td>55</td>
<td>11.2 %</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Not provided</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>3.7 %</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>492</td>
<td>100.0 %</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

EXCLUDING NOT PROVIDED

Q18. The Unified Government has a dangerous dog ordinance to make the community safe for people and pets in the most comprehensive way possible. The Unified Government's current dangerous dog ordinance currently bans "pit bulls". The Unified Government could amend the current dangerous dog ordinance to hold owners accountable for the behavior of their dogs regardless of the dog's breed. Would you support this change? (without "not provided")

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Q18. Would you support this change</th>
<th>Number</th>
<th>Percent</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Yes (Law should be expanded to hold owners responsible for the behavior of all dog breeds)</td>
<td>419</td>
<td>88.4 %</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No (Law should continue to apply to pit bulls only)</td>
<td>55</td>
<td>11.6 %</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>474</td>
<td>100.0 %</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Q19. Should female/hen chickens (no males/roosters) be allowed in backyards not zoned for agricultural purposes?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Q19. Should female/hen chickens (no males/roosters) be allowed in backyards not zoned for agricultural purposes</th>
<th>Number</th>
<th>Percent</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>247</td>
<td>50.2 %</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No</td>
<td>224</td>
<td>45.5 %</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Not provided</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>4.3 %</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>492</td>
<td>100.0 %</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
**Commission District 8**

**EXCLUDING NOT PROVIDED**

**Q19. Should female/hen chickens (no males/roosters) be allowed in backyards not zoned for agricultural purposes?** (without "not provided")

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Purposes</th>
<th>Number</th>
<th>Percent</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>247</td>
<td>52.4 %</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No</td>
<td>224</td>
<td>47.6 %</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>471</td>
<td>100.0 %</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Q19a. (If YES to Question 19) How many female chickens should be allowed in backyards?**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Q19a. How many female chickens should be allowed</th>
<th>Number</th>
<th>Percent</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1 to 6</td>
<td>131</td>
<td>53.0 %</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7 to 12</td>
<td>48</td>
<td>19.4 %</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13 to 20</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>8.9 %</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>21+</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>4.9 %</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Don't know</td>
<td>34</td>
<td>13.8 %</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>247</td>
<td>100.0 %</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**EXCLUDING DON’T KNOW**

**Q19a. (If YES to Question 19) How many female chickens should be allowed in backyards? (without "don't know")**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Q19a. How many female chickens should be allowed</th>
<th>Number</th>
<th>Percent</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1 to 6</td>
<td>131</td>
<td>61.5 %</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7 to 12</td>
<td>48</td>
<td>22.5 %</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13 to 20</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>10.3 %</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>21+</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>5.6 %</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>213</td>
<td>100.0 %</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Section 4:
Survey Instrument
18. The Unified Government has a dangerous dog ordinance to make the community safe for people and pets in the most comprehensive way possible. The Unified Government’s current dangerous dog ordinance currently bans “pit bulls”. The Unified Government could amend the current dangerous dog ordinance to hold owners accountable for the behavior of their dogs regardless of the dog’s breed. Would you support this change?

   (1) Yes (The law should be expanded to hold owners responsible for the behavior of all dog breeds.)
   (2) No (The law should continue to apply to pit bulls only.)

19. Should female/hen chickens (no males/roosters) be allowed in backyards not zoned for agricultural purposes?

   (1) Yes  (2) No

19-2. [IF YES to #19] How many female chickens should be allowed in backyards?

   (1) 1 to 6  (2) 7 to 12  (3) 13 to 20  (4) 21 or more chickens  (9) Don’t know

20. Do you have any suggestions to improve the quality of services in your neighborhood? [If yes, please write your suggestions in the space provided below.]

   __________________________________________________________
   __________________________________________________________
   __________________________________________________________
   __________________________________________________________