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Purpose

• To gather objectively assess resident satisfaction with the delivery of city and county government services

• To gather input from resident to help set budget priorities for the Unified Government

• To objectively assess service performance and understand short and long term trends
Methodology

- **Survey Description**
  - A 6 page survey including 1 page of District specific questions

- **Method of Administration**
  - Conducted by mail, phone and the internet
  - Sample was stratified to ensure the completion of at least 300 surveys in each of the County’s 8 Districts

- Conducted late March/early April 2016

- Total number of completed surveys as of the time this report was prepared: 2,435

- More than 2,900 have now been completed, but the final results will not change much at this point in time

- Margin of error: +/- 2% at the 95% confidence level

- Distribution of sample compares well to Census estimates
Demographics

QD-2. What is your age?
by percentage of respondents

- 35 to 44: 18%
- 45 to 54: 22%
- 55 to 64: 21%
- 65+: 17%
- 18 to 34: 21%
- Not provided: 1%

Source: ETC Institute DirectionFinder (2016 - Kansas City, KS/Wyandotte County)
Demographics

QD-5. Are you or other members of your household of Hispanic or Latino ancestry?

by percentage of respondents

Source: ETC Institute DirectionFinder (2016 - Kansas City, KS/Wyandotte County)
Demographics

QD-6. Which of the following best describes your race?

by percentage of respondents (multiple selections could be made)

- White: 64%
- African American/Black: 25%
- American Indian or Alaska Native: 1%
- Asian, Hawaiian or Other Pacific Islander: 2%
- Other: 8%

Source: ETC Institute DirectionFinder (2016 - Kansas City, KS/Wyandotte County)
Demographics

Council District of Respondents
by percentage of respondents

- Council District 3: 13%
- Council District 2: 12%
- Council District 4: 13%
- Council District 1: 12%
- Council District 5: 13%
- Council District 8: 13%
- Council District 6: 12%
- Council District 7: 13%

Source: ETC Institute DirectionFinder (2016 - Kansas City, KS/Wyandotte County)
Topic #1: Neighborhood and Community Services
## Q1. Overall Satisfaction with Services in Neighborhood and Community

by percentage of respondents who rated the item as a 1 to 5 on a 5-point scale (excluding "don't know")

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Service</th>
<th>Very Satisfied (5)</th>
<th>Satisfied (4)</th>
<th>Neutral (3)</th>
<th>Dissatisfied (1/2)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Fire services</td>
<td>42%</td>
<td>43%</td>
<td>14%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ambulance services</td>
<td>41%</td>
<td>39%</td>
<td>17%</td>
<td>3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Trash collection system</td>
<td>25%</td>
<td>47%</td>
<td>17%</td>
<td>11%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Police services</td>
<td>28%</td>
<td>43%</td>
<td>21%</td>
<td>9%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Recycling</td>
<td>13%</td>
<td>38%</td>
<td>29%</td>
<td>20%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Parks &amp; recreation facilities</td>
<td>13%</td>
<td>36%</td>
<td>28%</td>
<td>23%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sewer utility system</td>
<td>12%</td>
<td>36%</td>
<td>33%</td>
<td>19%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Parks &amp; recreation programs</td>
<td>11%</td>
<td>30%</td>
<td>34%</td>
<td>25%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Storm water runoff/management system</td>
<td>10%</td>
<td>31%</td>
<td>34%</td>
<td>25%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Public transportation</td>
<td>10%</td>
<td>29%</td>
<td>38%</td>
<td>23%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Municipal court</td>
<td>10%</td>
<td>26%</td>
<td>46%</td>
<td>19%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Code enforcement</td>
<td>9%</td>
<td>25%</td>
<td>36%</td>
<td>30%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Communication with the public</td>
<td>8%</td>
<td>25%</td>
<td>37%</td>
<td>31%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Planning &amp; zoning</td>
<td>9%</td>
<td>24%</td>
<td>47%</td>
<td>20%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Maintenance of City streets</td>
<td>7%</td>
<td>23%</td>
<td>29%</td>
<td>42%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: ETC Institute DirectionFinder (2016 - Kansas City, KS/Wyandotte County)
Q1. Overall Satisfaction with Services in Neighborhood and Community


By percentage of respondents who rated the item as a 4 or 5 on a 5-point scale (excluding “don't know”)

- Quality of City fire services
- Quality of City police services
- Quality of City’s parks & recreation facilities
- Quality of City’s parks & recreation programs
- City’s storm water runoff/management system
- Quality of City Code Enforcement
- Quality of communication with public
- Quality of maintenance of City streets

Source: ETC Institute DirectionFinder (2016 - Kansas City, KS/Wyandotte County)
Q2. Neighborhood Priorities That Should Receive the Most Emphasis Over the Next 2 Years

by percentage of respondents who selected the item as one of their top three choices

- Quality of maintenance of City streets: 53%
- Quality of City police services: 25%
- Quality of City’s parks & recreation facilities: 21%
- Quality of City Code Enforcement: 20%
- Quality of communication with public: 20%
- City’s storm water runoff/management system: 19%
- Quality of public transportation: 15%
- Quality of City’s parks & recreation programs: 15%
- Quality of City fire services: 11%
- Quality of City’s sewer utility: 11%
- Quality of recycling: 11%
- Quality of City Planning & Zoning: 10%
- Quality of trash collection system: 9%
- Quality of ambulance services: 8%
- Quality of Municipal Court: 6%

Source: ETC Institute DirectionFinder (2016 - Kansas City, KS/Wyandotte County)
## Priorities for Improving Neighborhood/Community Services by District

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Rank</th>
<th>Overall City Priorities</th>
<th># of Districts ranked in top 5</th>
<th>District 1</th>
<th>District 2</th>
<th>District 3</th>
<th>District 4</th>
<th>District 5</th>
<th>District 6</th>
<th>District 7</th>
<th>District 8</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1st</td>
<td>Maintenance of City streets</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>Maintenance of City streets</td>
<td>Maintenance of City streets</td>
<td>Maintenance of City streets</td>
<td>Maintenance of City streets</td>
<td>Maintenance of City streets</td>
<td>Maintenance of City streets</td>
<td>Maintenance of City streets</td>
<td>Maintenance of City streets</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2nd</td>
<td>Communication</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>Communication</td>
<td>City police services</td>
<td>Storm water runoff &amp; mgmnt system</td>
<td>Communication</td>
<td>Parks &amp; Rec facilities</td>
<td>City police services</td>
<td>Communication</td>
<td>Communication</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3rd</td>
<td>City police services</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>Parks &amp; Rec facilities</td>
<td>Parks &amp; Rec facilities</td>
<td>Parks &amp; Rec facilities</td>
<td>City Code Enforcement</td>
<td>Communication</td>
<td>Storm water runoff &amp; mgmnt system</td>
<td>City police services</td>
<td>City Code Enforcement</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4th</td>
<td>Parks &amp; Rec facilities</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>City police services</td>
<td>Communication</td>
<td>City police services</td>
<td>City police services</td>
<td>Communication</td>
<td>Public transportation</td>
<td>City police services</td>
<td>City police services</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5th</td>
<td>City Code Enforcement</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>Parks &amp; Rec programs</td>
<td>City Code Enforcement</td>
<td>Communication</td>
<td>Parks &amp; Rec programs</td>
<td>City Code Enforcement</td>
<td>City Code Enforcement</td>
<td>Storm water runoff &amp; mgmnt system</td>
<td>Parks &amp; Rec facilities</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Quality of Maintenance of City Streets

1st Priority

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 Council District
Communication with the Public

2016 Unified Government Community Survey
Shading reflects the mean rating for all respondents by Council District
3rd Priority

Quality of Police Services

2016 Unified Government Community Survey
Shading reflects the mean rating for all respondents by Council District
Quality of Parks and Recreation Facilities

4th Priority

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

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

ETC INSTITUTE
5th Priority

Quality of Code Enforcement

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

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
# Importance-Satisfaction Rating

## Neighborhood/Community 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>Quality of maintenance of City streets</td>
<td>60%</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>29%</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>0.4201</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Quality of communication with public</td>
<td>31%</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>32%</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>0.2102</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 City Code Enforcement</td>
<td>26%</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>34%</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>0.1719</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Quality of public transportation</td>
<td>23%</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>39%</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>0.1400</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Quality of City's parks &amp; recreation facilities</td>
<td>27%</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>49%</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>0.1364</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>City's storm water runoff/management system</td>
<td>23%</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>41%</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>0.1336</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Quality of City's parks &amp; recreation programs</td>
<td>21%</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>41%</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>0.1225</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Quality of City Planning &amp; Zoning</td>
<td>16%</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>32%</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>0.1061</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>Quality of City police services</td>
<td>29%</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>71%</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>0.0856</td>
<td>9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Quality of City's sewer utility</td>
<td>15%</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>48%</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>0.0764</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Quality of recycling</td>
<td>15%</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>51%</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>0.0748</td>
<td>11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Customer service received from City employees</td>
<td>13%</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>47%</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>0.0665</td>
<td>12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Quality of trash collection system</td>
<td>13%</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>72%</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>0.0359</td>
<td>13</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Quality of Municipal Court</td>
<td>6%</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>45%</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>0.0341</td>
<td>14</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Quality of ambulance services</td>
<td>11%</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>80%</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0.0226</td>
<td>15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Quality of City fire services</td>
<td>13%</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>84%</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0.0206</td>
<td>16</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Greatest Opportunities for Improvement:**  
(I-S Rating Above 0.15)
2016 Kansas City, KS/Wyandotte County Community Survey
Importance-Satisfaction Assessment Matrix

Neighborhood/Community Services
(points on the graph show deviations from the mean importance and satisfaction ratings given by respondents to the survey)

Mean Importance

Exceeded Expectations
lower importance/higher satisfaction
- Fire services
- Ambulance services
- Trash collection system

Continued Emphasis
higher importance/higher satisfaction
- Police services

Satisfaction Rating

Source: ETC Institute (2016)
Topic #2: County Level Services
### Q3. Satisfaction with County Services

By percentage of respondents who rated the item as a 1 to 5 on a 5-point scale (excluding “don't know”)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Service</th>
<th>Very Satisfied (5)</th>
<th>Satisfied (4)</th>
<th>Neutral (3)</th>
<th>Dissatisfied (1/2)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Quality of Parks</td>
<td>13%</td>
<td>41%</td>
<td>29%</td>
<td>17%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Quality of County Sheriff’s Office</td>
<td>15%</td>
<td>37%</td>
<td>39%</td>
<td>9%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Quality of Community Elections</td>
<td>12%</td>
<td>35%</td>
<td>41%</td>
<td>13%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Quality of Election Office</td>
<td>14%</td>
<td>33%</td>
<td>44%</td>
<td>10%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Quality of Treasurers Office</td>
<td>9%</td>
<td>33%</td>
<td>39%</td>
<td>19%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Quality of District Attorney’s Office</td>
<td>12%</td>
<td>30%</td>
<td>47%</td>
<td>11%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Quality of District Courts</td>
<td>10%</td>
<td>32%</td>
<td>46%</td>
<td>13%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Quality of Motor Vehicle Registration</td>
<td>10%</td>
<td>31%</td>
<td>22%</td>
<td>37%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Customer serviced received from County employees</td>
<td>11%</td>
<td>29%</td>
<td>37%</td>
<td>23%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Quality of Public Health Department Services</td>
<td>9%</td>
<td>31%</td>
<td>46%</td>
<td>14%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Quality of Adult Jail/Juvenile Detention Center</td>
<td>9%</td>
<td>29%</td>
<td>52%</td>
<td>11%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Quality of County Appraiser’s Office services</td>
<td>8%</td>
<td>27%</td>
<td>40%</td>
<td>24%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Quality of Aging Services</td>
<td>9%</td>
<td>26%</td>
<td>45%</td>
<td>20%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Quality of Senior transportation services</td>
<td>9%</td>
<td>23%</td>
<td>48%</td>
<td>20%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Quality of services for developmental disabilities</td>
<td>9%</td>
<td>23%</td>
<td>45%</td>
<td>23%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: ETC Institute DirectionFinder (2016 - Kansas City, KS/Wyandotte County)
Q3. Satisfaction with County Services


by percentage of respondents who rated the item as a 1 to 5 on a 5-point scale (excluding “don’t know”)

- Quality of Parks: 55% (2016), 54% (2014)
- Quality of County Sheriff’s Office: 52% (2016), 50% (2014)
- Quality of Community Elections: 47% (2016), 50% (2014)
- Quality of Election Office: 46% (2016), 51% (2014)
- Quality of Treasurers Office: 42% (2016), 43% (2014)
- Quality of District Attorney’s Office: 42% (2016), 41% (2014)
- Quality of District Courts: 42% (2016), 43% (2014)
- Quality of Motor Vehicle Registration: 41% (2016), 45% (2014)
- Customer serviced received from County employees: 40% (2016), 47% (2014)
- Quality of County Appraiser’s Office services: 36% (2016), 38% (2014)
- Quality of Aging Services: 35% (2016), 34% (2014)
- Quality of services for developmental disabilities: 32% (2016), 33% (2014)

*Source: ETC Institute DirectionFinder (2016 - Kansas City, KS/Wyandotte County)*
Q4. County Services That Should Receive the Most Emphasis Over the Next 2 Years

by percentage of respondents who selected the item as one of their top three choices

- Quality of Motor Vehicle Registration: 39%
- Quality of County parks: 24%
- Quality of services for developmental disabilities: 21%
- Quality of Area Agency on Aging Services: 20%
- Customer service provided by county employees: 20%
- Quality of senior transportation: 18%
- Quality of Public Health Department services: 17%
- Quality of County Appraiser’s Office services: 13%
- Quality of Treasurer’s Office: 11%
- Quality of Adult Jail/Juvenile Detention Center: 11%
- Quality of County Sheriff’s office: 9%
- Quality of community elections: 8%
- Quality of District Courts: 7%
- Quality of the Election Office: 6%
- Quality of The District Attorneys’ Office: 5%

Source: ETC Institute DirectionFinder (2016 - Kansas City, KS/Wyandotte County)
# Priorities for Improving County Services by District

| Rank | Overall City Priorities                                      | # of Districts ranked in top 5 | District 1                                      | District 2                                      | District 3                                      | District 4                                      | District 5                                      | District 6                                      | District 7                                      | District 8                                      |
|------|--------------------------------------------------------------|-------------------------------|------------------------------------------------|------------------------------------------------|------------------------------------------------|------------------------------------------------|------------------------------------------------|------------------------------------------------|------------------------------------------------|------------------------------------------------|------------------------------------------------|
| 2nd  | County Parks                                               | 7                             | Senior Transportation                          | Public Health Services                          | County Parks                                   | Customer Service                               | County Parks                                   | County Parks                                   | County Parks                                   | County Parks                                   |
| 3rd  | Customer Service                                           | 6                             | Area Agency on Aging Services                  | County Parks                                   | Customer Service                               | Public Health Services                          | Area Agency on Aging Services                  | Area Agency on Aging Services                  | Customer Service                               | Customer Service                               |
| 4th  | Public Health Services                                     | 6                             | Services for Developmental Disabilities        | Area Agency on Aging Services                  | Services for Developmental Disabilities        | County Parks                                   | County Appraisors Office                        | Customer Service                               | Area Agency on Aging Services                  | Public Health Services                          |
| 5th  | Area Agency on Aging Services                              | 6                             | Public Health Services                          | Customer Service                               | Public Health Services                          | Services for Developmental Disabilities        | Customer Service                               | Services for Developmental Disabilities        | Public Health Services                          | Area Agency on Aging Services                  |
Motor Vehicle Registration

1st Priority

Citizen Satisfaction

Shading reflects the mean rating for all respondents by Council District.

2016 Unified Government Community Survey

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
2nd Priority

County Parks

2016 Unified Government Community Survey

Shading reflects the mean rating for all respondents by Council District

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
Customer Service Provided by Unified Government Employees

3rd Priority

2016 Unified Government Community Survey
Shading reflects the mean rating for all respondents by Council District
Public Health Department Services

4th Priority

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

Citizen Satisfaction
Mean rating on a 5-point scale

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Rating Range</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>No Response</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
5th Priority

2016 Unified Government Community Survey

Shading reflects the mean rating for all respondents by Council District

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
### Importance-Satisfaction Rating

**County Level Services**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Category of Service</th>
<th>Most Important %</th>
<th>Most Important Rank</th>
<th>Most Satisfied %</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>Quality of Motor Vehicle Registration</td>
<td>44%</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>41%</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>0.2620</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>Quality services for developmental disabilities</td>
<td>25%</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>32%</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>0.1683</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Customer service received from County employees</td>
<td>29%</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>40%</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>0.1713</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Quality Aging Services</td>
<td>26%</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>35%</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>0.1699</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Public Health Department Services</td>
<td>26%</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>40%</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>0.1582</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Senior Transportation</td>
<td>22%</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>32%</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>0.1478</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Quality of Parks</td>
<td>30%</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>54%</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0.1408</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Quality of County Appraiser's Office services</td>
<td>16%</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>36%</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>0.1037</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>Adult Jail/Juvenile Detention Center</td>
<td>15%</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>37%</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>0.0958</td>
<td>9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Quality of Treasurers Office</td>
<td>14%</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>42%</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>0.0818</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Quality of County Sheriff's Office</td>
<td>12%</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>52%</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0.0574</td>
<td>11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Quality of Community Elections</td>
<td>11%</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>47%</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>0.0572</td>
<td>12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Quality of District Courts</td>
<td>8%</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>42%</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>0.0480</td>
<td>13</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Quality of Election Office</td>
<td>8%</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>46%</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>0.0440</td>
<td>14</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Quality of District Attorneys' Office</td>
<td>6%</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>42%</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>0.0373</td>
<td>15</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Greatest Opportunities for Improvement:**

*(I-S Rating Above 0.15)*
2016 Kansas City, KS/Wyandotte County Community Survey
Importance-Satisfaction Assessment Matrix

County Level Services
(points on the graph show deviations from the mean importance and satisfaction ratings given by respondents to the survey)

Exceeded Expectations
lower importance/higher satisfaction

- County Sheriff's office
- The District Attorneys' Office
- The Election Office
- Community elections
- District Courts
- Treasurer's Office

Continued Emphasis
higher importance/higher satisfaction

- County parks

Less Important
lower importance/lower satisfaction

- Adult Jail/Juvenile Detention Center
- County Appraiser's Office services

Opportunities for Improvement
higher importance/lower satisfaction

- Customer service
- Public Health Department services
- Area Agency on Aging Services
- Services for developmental disabilities
- Senior transportation

Source: ETC Institute (2016)
Topic #3: Overall Priorities
Q5. Overall Services That Should Receive the Most Emphasis Over the Next 2 Years

by percentage of respondents who selected the item as one of their top three choices

- Maintenance of City streets: 33%
- Motor Vehicle Registration: 20%
- Police services: 18%
- Code enforcement: 12%
- Parks & recreation facilities: 11%
- Area Agency on Aging Services: 10%
- Services for developmental disabilities: 10%
- Storm water runoff/management system: 9%
- County parks (Wyandotte County Park, Wyandotte County): 9%
- Communication with the public: 8%
- Fire services: 8%
- Public transportation: 8%
- Public Health Department services: 7%
- Customer service provided by Unified Government: 7%
- Senior transportation: 7%

Source: ETC Institute DirectionFinder (2016 - Kansas City, KS/Wyandotte County)
Topic #4:
Public Safety Ratings and Priorities
Satisfaction has increased in 5 of 6 areas since 2014.
Public Safety Services that Should Be Emphasized Most Over the Next Two Years

by percentage of respondents who selected the item as one of their top three choices

- The City's overall efforts to prevent crime: 38%
- The visibility of police in neighborhoods: 37%
- Quality of animal control in your neighborhood: 31%
- The visibility of Code Enforcement in your neighborhood: 25%
- The visibility of police in neighborhood retail areas: 25%
- How quickly police department personnel respond to: 19%
- The visibility of Building Inspection in your neighborhood: 15%
- Enforcement of traffic laws: 15%
- How quickly fire department responds to medical emergencies: 8%
- How quickly fire department responded to fires: 7%

Source: ETC Institute DirectionFinder (2016 - Kansas City, KS/Wyandotte County)
## Importance-Satisfaction Rating

### 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>Quality of animal control in City</td>
<td>32%</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>34%</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>0.2079</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>City's overall efforts to prevent crime</td>
<td>38%</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>40%</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>0.2250</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>25%</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>32%</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>0.1720</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Visibility of police in neighborhoods</td>
<td>37%</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>55%</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>0.1646</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Visibility of police in retail areas</td>
<td>25%</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>51%</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>0.1228</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Visibility of Building Inspections</td>
<td>15%</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>28%</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>0.1103</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>Police department personnel response to emergencies</td>
<td>19%</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>58%</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>0.0781</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Enforcement of City traffic laws</td>
<td>15%</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>50%</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>0.0747</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fire department response to medical emergency calls</td>
<td>8%</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>81%</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0.0149</td>
<td>9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fire department response to fires</td>
<td>7%</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>81%</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0.0125</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Greatest Opportunities for Improvement:**

(I-S Rating Above 0.15)
Topic #5: Maintenance Ratings and Priorities
Satisfaction has decreased in 5 of 7 areas since 2014.

Source: ETC Institute DirectionFinder (2016 - Kansas City, KS/Wyandotte County)
Maintenance Services that Should Be Emphasized Most Over the Next Two Years

by percentage of respondents who selected the item as one of their top three choices

- Maintenance of streets in your neighborhood: 42%
- Maintenance of major City streets: 31%
- Snow removal on neighborhood streets: 28%
- Maintenance of sidewalks in your neighborhood: 27%
- Overall cleanliness of streets & public areas: 25%
- Maintenance of stormwater drainage system: 19%
- Maintenance of curbs in your neighborhood: 16%
- Maintenance of alleys in your neighborhood: 15%
- Snow removal on major City streets: 12%
- Overall appearance of Downtown: 11%
- Maintenance of Downtown parking lots: 7%
- Maintenance of street signs/traffic signals: 7%
- Maintenance of City buildings: 6%

Source: ETC Institute DirectionFinder (2016 - Kansas City, KS/Wyandotte County)
### Importance-Satisfaction Rating

#### Maintenance

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Category of Service</th>
<th>Most Important</th>
<th>Most Important Rank</th>
<th>Satisfaction</th>
<th>Satisfaction Rank</th>
<th>Importance-Satisfaction Rating</th>
<th>I-S Rating Rank</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><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 streets in your neighborhood</td>
<td>39%</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>37%</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>0.2457</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Maintenance of sidewalks</td>
<td>27%</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>22%</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>0.2088</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>Snow removal on neighborhood streets</td>
<td>28%</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>38%</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>0.1757</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Overall cleanliness of streets &amp; other public areas</td>
<td>25%</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>34%</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>0.1624</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Maintenance of major City streets</td>
<td>26%</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>51%</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>0.1250</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Maintenance of alleys</td>
<td>15%</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>18%</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>0.1243</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Maintenance of stormwater drainage system</td>
<td>19%</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>36%</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>0.1226</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Maintenance of curbs in your neighborhood</td>
<td>16%</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>26%</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>0.1185</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>Appearance of Downtown</td>
<td>11%</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>40%</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>0.0679</td>
<td>9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Maintenance of Downtown parking lots</td>
<td>7%</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>28%</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>0.0489</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Snow removal on major City streets</td>
<td>12%</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>60%</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0.0466</td>
<td>11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Maintenance of City buildings</td>
<td>6%</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>43%</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>0.0337</td>
<td>12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Maintenance of street signs/traffic signals</td>
<td>7%</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>53%</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0.0313</td>
<td>13</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Greatest Opportunities for Improvement:**

(I-S Rating Above 0.15)
Topic #6: Code Enforcement Ratings and Priorities
Satisfaction with the Enforcement of Codes and Ordinances From 2000-2016

by percentage of respondents who rated the item as a 4 or 5 on a 5-point scale (excluding “don’t know”)

- Enforcing maintenance of business property:
  - 2000: 39%
  - 2014: 31%
  - 2016: 35%

- Maintenance of neighborhood residential property:
  - 2000: 33%
  - 2014: 33%
  - 2016: 33%

- Enforcing clean up of litter & debris:
  - 2000: 29%
  - 2014: 27%
  - 2016: 26%

- Mowing/trimming on private and/or vacant property:
  - 2000: 29%
  - 2014: 24%
  - 2016: 24%

Satisfaction has increased/stayed the same in 3 of 4 areas since 2014

Source: ETC Institute DirectionFinder (2016 - Kansas City, KS/Wyandotte County)
Q11. Codes and Ordinances That Should Receive the Most Emphasis Over the Next 2 Years
by percentage of respondents who selected the item as one of their top three choices

- Enforcing clean-up of trash city-wide: 48%
- Enforcing clean-up of trash in your neighborhood: 40%
- Mowing & trimming in your neighborhood: 29%
- Maintenance of neighborhood residential property: 28%
- Enforcing removal of inoperable or junk cars: 23%
- Enforcing maintenance of business property: 16%

Source: ETC Institute DirectionFinder (2016 - Kansas City, KS/Wyandotte County)
## Importance-Satisfaction Rating

### 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 the clean up of litter and debris city-wide</td>
<td>48%</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>26%</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>0.3547</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mowing/Trimming on private and/or vacant property city-wide</td>
<td>41%</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>24%</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>0.3085</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Enforcing the clean up of litter and debris in neighborhood</td>
<td>40%</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>32%</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>0.2700</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mowing/trimming on private and/or vacant property in neighborhood</td>
<td>29%</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>29%</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>0.2066</td>
<td>4</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>Maintenance of neighborhood residential property</td>
<td>28%</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>33%</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>0.1832</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Enforcing removal of inoperable or junk cars</td>
<td>22%</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>35%</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0.1447</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Enforcing maintenance of business property</td>
<td>16%</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>35%</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0.1064</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>None</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Greatest Opportunities for Improvement:**

- Enforcing the clean up of litter and debris city-wide
- Mowing/Trimming on private and/or vacant property city-wide
- Enforcing the clean up of litter and debris in neighborhood
- Mowing/trimming on private and/or vacant property in neighborhood
- Maintenance of neighborhood residential property
- Enforcing removal of inoperable or junk cars
- Enforcing maintenance of business property
Topic #7:
Parks & Recreation Ratings and Priorities
Satisfaction With Parks and Recreation Facilities and Services


by percentage of respondents who rated the item as a 4 or 5 on a 5-point scale (excluding “don’t know”)

- **Maintenance of parks & equipment**: 51% (2016), 50% (2014), 57% (2000)
- **Number of parks**: 40% (2016), 42% (2014), 55% (2000)
- **Number of outdoor athletic fields**: 35% (2016), 32% (2014), 42% (2000)
- **Number of walking & biking trails**: 32% (2016), 17% (2014), 26% (2000)
- **Ease of registering for programs**: 25% (2016), 28% (2014), 38% (2000)
- **Swimming pool & spray parks**: 22% (2016), 20% (2014), 25% (2000)
- **Fees that are charged for recreation programs**: 24% (2016), 26% (2014), 40% (2000)

*Satisfaction has increased in 4 of 7 areas since 2014*

*Source: ETC Institute DirectionFinder (2016 - Kansas City, KS/Wyandotte County)*
Q13. Parks and Recreation Issues that Should Receive the Most Emphasis Over the Next 2 Years

by percentage of respondents who selected the item as one of their top three choices

- Number of walking & biking trails: 35%
- Maintenance of parks & equipment: 31%
- Youth recreation programs: 28%
- Swimming pool & spray parks: 26%
- The number of parks: 20%
- Programs for seniors: 19%
- Adult recreation programs: 19%
- Fees charged for recreation programs: 16%
- Number of outdoor athletic fields: 14%
- Ease of registering for programs: 7%
- Skate board parks: 6%
- Sunflower Hills Golf Course: 3%

Source: ETC Institute DirectionFinder (2016 - Kansas City, KS/Wyandotte County)
# Importance-Satisfaction Rating

## 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 (I-S &gt; .20)</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Number of walking &amp; biking trails</td>
<td>35%</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>32%</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>0.2380</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>High Priority (I-S .10-.20)</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Youth recreation programs</td>
<td>28%</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>29%</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>0.1984</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Swimming pool &amp; spray parks</td>
<td>26%</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>25%</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>0.1955</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Programs for seniors</td>
<td>19%</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>23%</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>0.1452</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Maintenance of parks &amp; equipment</td>
<td>31%</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>51%</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0.1498</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Adult recreation programs</td>
<td>19%</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>26%</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>0.1408</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fees that are charged for recreation programs</td>
<td>16%</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>24%</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>0.1216</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Number of parks</td>
<td>20%</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>40%</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>0.1204</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Medium Priority (I-S &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>14%</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>35%</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>0.0922</td>
<td>9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ease of registering for programs</td>
<td>7%</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>28%</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>0.0482</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Skate board parks</td>
<td>6%</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>26%</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>0.0432</td>
<td>11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sunflower Hills Golf Course</td>
<td>3%</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>44%</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0.0156</td>
<td>12</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Greatest Opportunities for Improvement:**

(I-S Rating Above 0.15)
Topic #9: Other Findings
How Residents Would Like to See Sales Tax Revenue From Village West Spent Beginning in 2017

By percentage of respondents

- Property Tax Relief: 50%
- Street Resurfacing: 38%
- Police Services: 33%
- Park Improvements: 25%
- Aging Services: 24%
- Demolitions of Residential/Commercial Properties: 23%
- Personal Property (Auto) Registration at Courthouse: 21%
- Snow Removal Plowing & Treatment: 18%
- Mowing Vacant Lots: 14%
- Code Enforcement: 13%
- Fire Services: 13%
- Other: 11%

Source: ETC Institute DirectionFinder (2016 - Kansas City, KS/Wyandotte County)
Percentage of Residents Who Have Needs for Various Services in Their Neighborhood
By percentage of respondents

Source: ETC Institute DirectionFinder (2016 - Kansas City, KS/Wyandotte County)
How Residents Would Like to See the Availability of Various Types of Businesses Change in Their Neighborhood
By percentage of respondents who had a need for the business

- Senior day care: Increase (3) - 82%, Stay About the Same (2) - 18%
- Health & fitness center: Increase (3) - 81%, Stay About the Same (2) - 19%
- Children's day care: Increase (3) - 79%, Stay About the Same (2) - 21%
- Fine dining restaurant: Increase (3) - 70%, Stay About the Same (2) - 30%
- Fast casual restaurant: Increase (3) - 68%, Stay About the Same (2) - 32%
- Casual dining restaurant: Increase (3) - 68%, Stay About the Same (2) - 32%
- Urgent medical care facility: Increase (3) - 64%, Stay About the Same (2) - 36%
- Clothing & home goods: Increase (3) - 62%, Stay About the Same (2) - 37%
- Grocery store: Increase (3) - 60%, Stay About the Same (2) - 40%
- Dry cleaners: Increase (3) - 56%, Stay About the Same (2) - 43%
- Laundromat: Increase (3) - 51%, Stay About the Same (2) - 49%
- Hardware store: Increase (3) - 50%, Stay About the Same (2) - 50%
- Convenience/gas station: Increase (3) - 48%, Stay About the Same (2) - 50%
- Fast food restaurant: Increase (3) - 39%, Stay About the Same (2) - 57%
- Drug store/pharmacy: Increase (3) - 37%, Stay About the Same (2) - 62%

Source: ETC Institute DirectionFinder (2016 - Kansas City, KS/Wyandotte County)
Support for an Amendment to the Current Dangerous Dog Ordinance to Include All Breeds

By percentage who responded YES by District

Source: ETC Institute DirectionFinder (2016 - Kansas City, KS/Wyandotte County)
Support for Allowing Residents to Have Female Chickens in Backyards Not Zoned for Agriculture

By percentage who responded YES by District

![Graph showing support percentages by district](source.png)

Source: ETC Institute DirectionFinder (2016 - Kansas City, KS/Wyandotte County)
Summary
Summary of Trends

- Since 2000, Overall Satisfaction Has Improved in Most Areas
- Since 2014, the Results Have Been Mixed.

**Notable Increases from 2014**
- Satisfaction with the overall quality of police services
- Satisfaction with the visibility of police in neighborhoods
- Satisfaction with police response time to emergencies
- Satisfaction with the number of walking and biking trails

**Notable Decreases from 2014**
- Satisfaction with overall quality of parks and recreation facilities
- Satisfaction with maintenance of major city streets
- Satisfaction with maintenance of street signs and traffic signals
- Satisfaction with the overall image of Kansas City
Summary of Priorities

- Opportunities for Improving Neighborhood/Community Services
  - Quality of maintenance of City streets #1
  - Quality of communication with the public
  - Quality of City Code Enforcement
  - Quality of public transit
  - Quality of City parks and recreation facilities

- Opportunities for Improving County Services
  - Quality of motor vehicle registration - #1
  - Quality services for developmental disabilities
  - Customer service received from County employees
  - Quality aging services
  - Public health department services
Next Steps

- Although the overall results for the County and each District will not change significantly at this point, ETC Institute will continue to accept survey until April 20th
  - At the current pace, we may end up with completed surveys from more than 3,000 households
- ETC Institute will then finalize the county-level report and prepare district level reports for each commissioner.
  - The district level reports will include the importance-satisfaction analysis and maps for each district
  - The maps will be shaded by neighborhood areas
  - The county-level and district level reports will be delivered by April 30th
Questions?

THANK YOU