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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 assess perceptions about the quality of life and other issues in the community
Methodology

- **Survey Description**
  - 7 page survey

- **Method of Administration**
  - Conducted by mail, phone and the Internet to a stratified random sample of households
  - Sample was stratified to ensure the completion of at least 150 surveys in each of the 8 Council Districts
  - Each survey took approximately 15-20 minutes to complete

- **Conducted During February 2014**

- **Total Number of Completed Surveys:** 1,249

- **Margin of error:** +/- 2.8% at the 95% confidence level

- **Distribution of sample compares well to the most recent Census estimates**
Q35. What is your age?
by percentage of respondents

35 to 44: 22%
18 to 34: 17%
45 to 54: 23%
55 to 64: 22%
65+: 16%

Source: ETC Institute DirectionFinder (2014 - Kansas City, KS/Wyandotte County)
Q39. Which of the following best describes your race?

by percentage of respondents (multiple selections could be made)

- White: 65%
- African American/Black: 25%
- American Indian or Alaska Native: 3%
- Asian, Hawaiian or Other Pacific Islander: 3%
- Other: 7%

Source: ETC Institute DirectionFinder (2014 - Kansas City, KS/Wyandotte County)
Q38. Are you or other members of your household of Hispanic or Latino ancestry?

by percentage of respondents

Yes 24%
No 76%

Source: ETC Institute DirectionFinder (2014 - Kansas City, KS/Wyandotte County)
Q41. Demographics: Gender
by percentage of respondents

Male 50%
Female 51%

Source: ETC Institute DirectionFinder (2014 - Kansas City, KS/Wyandotte County)
Q40. Total Annual Household Income
by percentage of respondents

- Under $30,000: 27%
- $30,000-$59,999: 30%
- Not provided: 11%
- $60,000-$99,999: 21%
- $100,000+: 11%

Source: ETC Institute DirectionFinder (2014 - Kansas City, KS/Wyandotte County)
Council District of Respondents
by percentage of respondents

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

Source: ETC Institute DirectionFinder (2014 - Kansas City, KS/Wyandotte County)
The Unified Government is moving in the right direction, but there are opportunities to do better.

Top Priorities for Improving City Services
- Maintenance of City streets
- Code Enforcement
- Communication with the public
- Public Transit
- Police

Top Priorities for Improving County Services
- Aging Services
- Motor Vehicle Registration Services
- Parks

Community Issues that Are Most Important to Residents
- Safe Neighborhoods, Schools, and Jobs

Strong Support for Having the Unified Government Do More to Promote Economic Development
Major Findings #1

The Unified Government Is Moving in the Right Direction
Q1. Overall Satisfaction with Services Provided by the City of Kansas City, KS

*Trends: 2000 vs. 2014*

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: 81% (2000), 85% (2014)
- Quality of City police services: 63% (2000), 66% (2014)
- Quality of City’s parks & recreation facilities: 38% (2000), 55% (2014)
- Customer service received from City employees: 47% (2000), 47% (2014)
- City’s storm water runoff/management system: 34% (2000), 46% (2014)
- Quality of City’s parks & recreation programs: 38% (2000), 44% (2014)
- Quality of communication with public: 29% (2000), 40% (2014)
- Quality of maintenance of City streets: 19% (2000), 36% (2014)
- Quality of City Code Enforcement: 30% (2000), 33% (2014)

*Source: ETC Institute DirectionFinder (2014 - Kansas City, KS/Wyandotte County)*
Q3. Satisfaction with Items that Influence Perceptions of Kansas City, KS

Trends: 2000 vs. 2014

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

Overall quality of life in Kansas City
- 2000: 30%
- 2014: 47%

Overall image of Kansas City
- 2000: 19%
- 2014: 44%

The Image of the Community Has Improved Dramatically

Source: ETC Institute DirectionFinder (2014 - Kansas City, KS/Wyandotte County)
Major Findings #2

But There Are Opportunities to Do Better
Q3. Satisfaction with Items that Influence Perceptions of Kansas City, KS

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

- **Overall quality of life in Kansas City**: 10% Very Satisfied (5), 37% Satisfied (4), 33% Neutral (3), 21% Dissatisfied (1/2)
- **City is planning/managing growth/development well**: 11% Very Satisfied (5), 35% Satisfied (4), 31% Neutral (3), 23% Dissatisfied (1/2)
- **Overall image of Kansas City**: 8% Very Satisfied (5), 36% Satisfied (4), 31% Neutral (3), 25% Dissatisfied (1/2)
- **Overall feeling of safety in Kansas City**: 7% Very Satisfied (5), 29% Satisfied (4), 32% Neutral (3), 32% Dissatisfied (1/2)
- **Overall appearance of Kansas City**: 5% Very Satisfied (5), 29% Satisfied (4), 33% Neutral (3), 34% Dissatisfied (1/2)

*Source: ETC Institute DirectionFinder (2014 - Kansas City, KS/Wyandotte County)*
Satisfaction with Items that Influence Perceptions of the City
Wyandotte County/Kansas City, KS vs. Kansas City Metro vs. the U.S.

by percentage of respondents who rated the item 4 or 5 on a 5-point scale where 5 was "very satisfied" and 1 was "very dissatisfied" (excluding don't knows)

Overall quality of life in Kansas City
- WyCO/KCK: 47%
- Kansas City Metro: 77%
- U.S. Avg: 75%

City is planning/managing growth/development well
- WyCO/KCK: 46%
- Kansas City Metro: 49%
- U.S. Avg: 42%

Overall image of Kansas City
- WyCO/KCK: 44%
- Kansas City Metro: 72%
- U.S. Avg: 60%

Overall feeling of safety in Kansas City
- WyCO/KCK: 36%
- Kansas City Metro: 82%
- U.S. Avg: 71%

Overall appearance of Kansas City
- WyCO/KCK: 34%
- Kansas City Metro: 70%
- U.S. Avg: 66%

Source: 2014 ETC Institute
Q22. Quality of Life Ratings in Wyandotte County

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

- As a place to live: 13% Excellent, 46% Good, 21% Neutral, 20% Below Average/Poor
- As a place to work: 11% Excellent, 36% Good, 27% Neutral, 26% Below Average/Poor
- As a place to raise children: 10% Excellent, 33% Good, 26% Neutral, 32% Below Average/Poor
- As a place where you would buy your next home: 13% Excellent, 29% Good, 23% Neutral, 35% Below Average/Poor
- As a place to retire: 13% Excellent, 27% Good, 22% Neutral, 39% Below Average/Poor

Source: ETC Institute DirectionFinder (2014 - Kansas City, KS/Wyandotte County)
Overall Ratings of the Community
Wyandotte County/Kansas City, KS vs. Kansas City Metro vs. the U.S.

by percentage of respondents who rated the item 4 or 5 on a 5-point scale
where 5 was "excellent" and 1 was "poor" (excluding don't knows)

As a place to live
- WYCO/KCK: 59%
- Kansas City Metro: 85%
- U.S. Avg (cities with 100,000+ residents): 82%

As a place to work
- WYCO/KCK: 47%
- Kansas City Metro: 60%
- U.S. Avg (cities with 100,000+ residents): 67%

As a place to raise children
- WYCO/KCK: 43%
- Kansas City Metro: 82%
- U.S. Avg (cities with 100,000+ residents): 76%

As a place to retire
- WYCO/KCK: 40%
- Kansas City Metro: 69%
- U.S. Avg (cities with 100,000+ residents): 64%

Source: 2014 ETC Institute
Q26. Are your needs being met in Wyandotte County?

by percentage of respondents who answered "yes"

- Family & friends are nearby: 79%
- Types of housing: 67%
- Affordability of housing: 67%
- Affordable shopping/merchandise: 64%
- Sense of community: 62%
- Access to quality shopping: 61%
- Proximity to jobs/employment: 57%
- Quality of public schools: 49%
- Employment opportunities: 42%

A Majority of Residents Do Not Think Their Needs for Public Schools or Employment Are Being Met

Source: ETC Institute DirectionFinder (2014 - Kansas City, KS/Wyandotte County)
Major Findings #3

Priorities for Improving CITY Services
Q1. Overall Satisfaction with Services Provided by the City of Kansas City, KS

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 City fire services</td>
<td>40%</td>
<td>45%</td>
<td>13%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Quality of ambulance services</td>
<td>38%</td>
<td>42%</td>
<td>17%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Quality of trash collection system</td>
<td>32%</td>
<td>47%</td>
<td>13%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Quality of City police services</td>
<td>23%</td>
<td>43%</td>
<td>23%</td>
<td>11%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Quality of recycling</td>
<td>20%</td>
<td>40%</td>
<td>25%</td>
<td>15%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Quality of City’s parks &amp; recreation facilities</td>
<td>17%</td>
<td>38%</td>
<td>20%</td>
<td>17%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Quality of City’s sewer utility</td>
<td>14%</td>
<td>38%</td>
<td>31%</td>
<td>17%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Customer service received from City employees</td>
<td>14%</td>
<td>33%</td>
<td>35%</td>
<td>18%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>City’s storm water runoff/management system</td>
<td>11%</td>
<td>35%</td>
<td>32%</td>
<td>22%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Quality of Municipal Court</td>
<td>13%</td>
<td>32%</td>
<td>39%</td>
<td>17%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Quality of City’s parks &amp; recreation programs</td>
<td>14%</td>
<td>30%</td>
<td>37%</td>
<td>19%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Quality of public transportation</td>
<td>15%</td>
<td>28%</td>
<td>35%</td>
<td>22%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Quality of communication with public</td>
<td>10%</td>
<td>30%</td>
<td>37%</td>
<td>23%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Quality of maintenance of City streets</td>
<td>9%</td>
<td>27%</td>
<td>26%</td>
<td>38%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Quality of City Planning &amp; Zoning</td>
<td>9%</td>
<td>26%</td>
<td>41%</td>
<td>23%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Quality of City Code Enforcement</td>
<td>9%</td>
<td>24%</td>
<td>37%</td>
<td>30%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: ETC Institute DirectionFinder (2014 - Kansas City, KS/Wyandotte County)
Q1a. Quality of City police services

Mean rating on a 5-point scale, where:
- 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

Other (no responses)
Q1b. Quality of City fire services

Mean rating for all respondents by District:

- 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
- Other (no responses)
Q1c. Quality of ambulance services

Mean rating on a 5-point scale, where:

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
Other (no responses)
Q1g. Quality of trash collection system

Mean rating on a 5-point scale, where:

- 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

Other (no responses)
Q1e. Quality of City storm water runoff and management system

Mean rating for all respondents by District

Mean rating on a 5-point scale, where:

- 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

Other (no responses)
Q1h. Quality of City parks and recreation facilities

Mean rating on a 5-point scale, where:

- 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
- Other (no responses)

2014 Kansas City, KS/Wyandotte County Community Survey
Mean rating for all respondents by District
Q11. Quality of customer service you receive from City employees

LEGEND
Mean rating on a 5-point scale, where:
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
Other (no responses)
Q1p. Quality of public transportation

2014 Kansas City, KS/Wyandotte County Community Survey
Mean rating for all respondents by District

LEGEND
Mean rating on a 5-point scale, where:
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
Other (no responses)
Q1d. Quality of City street maintenance

2014 Kansas City, KS/Wyandotte County Community Survey

Mean rating for all respondents by District

**LEGEND**

Mean rating on a 5-point scale, where:
- 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
- Other (no responses)
Q1j. Quality of City code enforcement

LEGEND
Mean rating on a 5-point scale, where:

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
Other (no responses)

2014 Kansas City, KS/Wyandotte County Community Survey
Mean rating for all respondents by District
Q1m. Quality of communication with the public

Mean rating on a 5-point scale, where:

- 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

Other (no responses)
Q2. City 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 maintenance of City streets: 43%
- Quality of City police services: 28%
- Quality of City Code Enforcement: 21%
- Quality of communication with public: 20%
- Quality of public transportation: 17%
- Quality of City’s parks & recreation facilities: 16%
- Customer service received from City employees: 13%
- City’s storm water runoff/management system: 12%
- Quality of City Planning & Zoning: 12%
- Quality of City’s parks & recreation programs: 11%
- Quality of City fire services: 10%
- Quality of City’s sewer utility: 9%
- Quality of recycling: 8%
- Quality of ambulance services: 7%
- Quality of Municipal Court: 6%
- Quality of trash collection system: 4%

Source: ETC Institute DirectionFinder (2014 - Kansas City, KS/Wyandotte County)
# Priorities for Improving City Services by District

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Rank</th>
<th>Overall County Priorities</th>
<th># Districts in Which the Issue Was 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 Streets</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>Maintenance of Streets</td>
<td>Maintenance of Streets</td>
<td>Maintenance of Streets</td>
<td>Maintenance of Streets</td>
<td>Maintenance of Streets</td>
<td>Maintenance of Streets</td>
<td>Maintenance of Streets</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2nd</td>
<td>Police Services</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>Police Services</td>
<td>Police Services</td>
<td>Police Services</td>
<td>Code Enforcement</td>
<td>Police Services</td>
<td>Police Services</td>
<td>Police Services</td>
<td>Police Services</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3rd</td>
<td>Code Enforcement</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>Communication</td>
<td>Code Enforcement</td>
<td>Code Enforcement</td>
<td>Police Services</td>
<td>Parks &amp; Recreation</td>
<td>Code Enforcement</td>
<td>Communication</td>
<td>Communication</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4th</td>
<td>Communication</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>Public Transit</td>
<td>Communication</td>
<td>Public Transit</td>
<td>Communication</td>
<td>Code Enforcement</td>
<td>Communication</td>
<td>Planning &amp; Zoning</td>
<td>Code Enforcement</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5th</td>
<td>Public Transit</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>Parks &amp; Recreation</td>
<td>Public Transit</td>
<td>Communication</td>
<td>Public Transit</td>
<td>Communication</td>
<td>Stormwater Management</td>
<td>Customer Service</td>
<td>Public Transit</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
## Importance-Satisfaction Rating

**Kansas City, KS/Wyandotte County**

**City of Kansas City, KS 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>43%</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>36%</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>0.2760</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 of City Code Enforcement</td>
<td>21%</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>33%</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>0.1394</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Quality of communication with public</td>
<td>20%</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>40%</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>0.1192</td>
<td>3</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 public transportation</td>
<td>17%</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>43%</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>0.0951</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Quality of City police services</td>
<td>28%</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>66%</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>0.0945</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Quality of City Planning &amp; Zoning</td>
<td>12%</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>35%</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>0.0774</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Quality of City's parks &amp; recreation facilities</td>
<td>16%</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>55%</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>0.0704</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Customer service received from City employees</td>
<td>13%</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>47%</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>0.0665</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>City's storm water runoff/management system</td>
<td>12%</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>46%</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>0.0656</td>
<td>9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Quality of City's parks &amp; recreation programs</td>
<td>11%</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>44%</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>0.0642</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Quality of City's sewer utility</td>
<td>9%</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>52%</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>0.0431</td>
<td>11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Quality of Municipal Court</td>
<td>6%</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>45%</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>0.0341</td>
<td>12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Quality of recycling</td>
<td>8%</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>60%</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>0.0314</td>
<td>13</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Quality of City fire services</td>
<td>10%</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>85%</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0.0155</td>
<td>14</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Quality of ambulance services</td>
<td>7%</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>80%</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0.0131</td>
<td>15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Quality of trash collection system</td>
<td>4%</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>79%</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>0.0079</td>
<td>16</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Top 5 Opportunities for Improvement:

- Quality of maintenance of City streets
- Quality of City Code Enforcement
- Quality of communication with public
- Quality of public transportation
- Quality of City police services
Major Findings #4

Priorities for Improving COUNTY Services
### Q4. 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>42%</td>
<td>30%</td>
<td>15%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Quality of Election Office</td>
<td>13%</td>
<td>38%</td>
<td>37%</td>
<td>12%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Quality of Community Elections</td>
<td>11%</td>
<td>39%</td>
<td>36%</td>
<td>14%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Quality of County Sheriff’s Office</td>
<td>15%</td>
<td>35%</td>
<td>39%</td>
<td>11%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Customer service received from County employees</td>
<td>10%</td>
<td>37%</td>
<td>35%</td>
<td>18%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Quality of Motor Vehicle Registration</td>
<td>12%</td>
<td>33%</td>
<td>25%</td>
<td>31%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Quality of District Courts</td>
<td>10%</td>
<td>33%</td>
<td>43%</td>
<td>14%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Quality of Treasurers Office</td>
<td>9%</td>
<td>34%</td>
<td>40%</td>
<td>17%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Quality of District Attorneys’ Office</td>
<td>11%</td>
<td>30%</td>
<td>46%</td>
<td>13%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Quality of County Appraiser’s Office services</td>
<td>7%</td>
<td>29%</td>
<td>40%</td>
<td>24%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Quality Aging Services</td>
<td>10%</td>
<td>24%</td>
<td>43%</td>
<td>24%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Quality services for developmental disabilities</td>
<td>10%</td>
<td>23%</td>
<td>45%</td>
<td>22%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: ETC Institute DirectionFinder (2014 - Kansas City, KS/Wyandotte County)
Q4j. Quality of the Election Office

Mean rating for all respondents by District:

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
Other (no responses)
Q4a. Quality of County Sheriff's office

**Mean rating on a 5-point scale, where:**
- 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
- Other (no responses)
Q4h. Quality of parks

Mean rating for all respondents by District

**LEGEND**

Mean rating on a 5-point scale, where:

- **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**
- **Other (no responses)**
Q41. Quality of Customer service you receive from County employees

Mean rating on a 5-point scale, where:
- 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
- Other (no responses)

2014 Kansas City, KS/Wyandotte County Community Survey
Mean rating for all respondents by District
Q4b. Quality Services for developmental disabilities

2014 Kansas City, KS/Wyandotte County Community Survey

Mean rating for all respondents by District

**LEGEND**

Mean rating on a 5-point scale, where:

- 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
- Other (no responses)
Q4c. Quality Aging Services

Mean rating on a 5-point scale, where:
- 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
- Other (no responses)

2014 Kansas City, KS/Wyandotte County Community Survey
Mean rating for all respondents by District
Q4f. Quality of Motor Vehicle Registration

**Legend**

Mean rating on a 5-point scale, where:

- **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
- **Other (no responses)**
Q4g. Quality of County Appraiser's Office services
Q5. 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: 36%
- Quality Aging Services: 31%
- Quality of Parks: 28%
- Customer service received from County employees: 24%
- Quality services for developmental disabilities: 24%
- Quality of County Appraiser’s Office services: 19%
- Quality of County Sheriff’s Office: 13%
- Quality of Treasurers Office: 13%
- Quality of District Courts: 10%
- Quality of Community Elections: 10%
- Quality of District Attorneys’ Office: 7%
- Quality of Election Office: 6%

Source: ETC Institute DirectionFinder (2014 - Kansas City, KS/Wyandotte County)
# Priorities for Improving County Services by District

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Rank</th>
<th>Overall County Priorities</th>
<th># Districts in Which the Issue Was 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>Motor Vehicle Registration</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>Aging Services</td>
<td>Aging Services</td>
<td>Aging Services</td>
<td>Aging Services</td>
<td>Motor Vehicle Registration</td>
<td>Motor Vehicle Registration</td>
<td>Motor Vehicle Registration</td>
<td>Motor Vehicle Registration</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2nd</td>
<td>Aging Services</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>Motor Vehicle Registration</td>
<td>Services for developmental disabilities</td>
<td>Motor Vehicle Registration</td>
<td>Parks</td>
<td>Aging Services</td>
<td>Aging Services</td>
<td>Customer service</td>
<td>Aging Services</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3rd</td>
<td>Parks</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>Parks</td>
<td>Motor Vehicle Registration</td>
<td>Parks</td>
<td>Services for developmental disabilities</td>
<td>Parks</td>
<td>Parks</td>
<td>Parks</td>
<td>Parks</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4th</td>
<td>Customer service</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>Services for developmental disabilities</td>
<td>Parks</td>
<td>Customer service</td>
<td>Customer service</td>
<td>County Appraiser's Office services</td>
<td>County Appraiser's Office services</td>
<td>Customer service</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5th</td>
<td>Services for developmental disabilities</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>Customer service</td>
<td>Customer service</td>
<td>Services for developmental disabilities</td>
<td>Motor Vehicle Registration</td>
<td>Services for developmental disabilities</td>
<td>Services for developmental disabilities</td>
<td>Aging Services</td>
<td>Services for developmental disabilities</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
# 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>Quality Aging Services</td>
<td>31%</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>34%</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>0.2072</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Quality of Motor Vehicle Registration</td>
<td>36%</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>45%</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>0.2002</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 services for developmental disabilities</td>
<td>24%</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>33%</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>0.1021</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Customer service received from County employees</td>
<td>24%</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>47%</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>0.1296</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Quality of Parks</td>
<td>28%</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>55%</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0.1271</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Quality of County Appraiser’s Office services</td>
<td>19%</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>36%</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>0.1189</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>Quality of Treasurers Office</td>
<td>13%</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>43%</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>0.0715</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Quality of County Sheriff’s Office</td>
<td>13%</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>50%</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>0.0672</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Quality of District Courts</td>
<td>10%</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>43%</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>0.0592</td>
<td>9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Quality of Community Elections</td>
<td>10%</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>50%</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>0.0478</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Quality of District Attorneys’ Office</td>
<td>7%</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>41%</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>0.0423</td>
<td>11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Quality of Election Office</td>
<td>6%</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>51%</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0.0307</td>
<td>12</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Top 5 Opportunities for Improvement:**
2014 Kansas City, KS/Wyandotte County Community Survey
Importance-Satisfaction Assessment Matrix
- Wyandotte County Services -
(points on the graph show deviations from the mean importance and satisfaction ratings given by respondents to the survey)

Source: ETC Institute (2014)
Major Findings #5

Economic Development Issues
Q17. In general, how do you think the efforts to promote economic development in the community should change over the next 5 years?

by percentage of respondents

71% Thought It Should Be Greater

- Should be much greater: 39%
- Should be somewhat greater: 32%
- Stay about same: 15%
- Should be reduced: 3%
- Don’t know: 11%

Source: ETC Institute DirectionFinder (2014 - Kansas City, KS/Wyandotte County)
Q18. In general, how supportive are you of having the City and/or County use incentives to attract new business or expand existing business in Kansas City and Wyandotte County?

by percentage of respondents

- Very supportive: 39%
- Somewhat supportive: 34%
- Not supportive: 10%
- Not sure: 17%

73% Were Supportive

Source: ETC Institute DirectionFinder (2014 - Kansas City, KS/Wyandotte County)
Q19. Where should the retail economic development efforts focus?

by percentage of respondents

- Indian Springs: 29%
- Downtown/Minnesota Ave: 18%
- State Ave Corridor: 16%
- Leavenworth Rd Corridor: 9%
- Quindaro Boulevard: 8%
- Strong Ave/Metropolitan Ave Corridor: 8%
- Highway 7 Corridor: 7%
- Central Ave Corridor: 6%
- Merriam Lane Corridor: 5%

Source: ETC Institute DirectionFinder (2014 - Kansas City, KS/Wyandotte County)
Q20. Where should the industrial economic efforts focus?

by percentage of respondents

- Fairfax: 33%
- Kansas Ave/Turner Diagonal: 18%
- K-32 Corridor: 17%
- Quindaro Boulevard: 13%
- Armourdale: 9%
- James St/Central Industrial District: 6%

Source: ETC Institute DirectionFinder (2014 - Kansas City, KS/Wyandotte County)
Q21. Agreement With Statements Related to Economic Development in Wyandotte County

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

- County needs more higher paying, value added employment opportunities: 54% Strongly Agree (5), 39% Agree (4), 6% Neutral (3), 0% Disagree (2,1)
- I want to be able to live & work in WYCO: 54% Strongly Agree (5), 30% Agree (4), 12% Neutral (3), 4% Disagree (2,1)
- County should attract more retail stores: 38% Strongly Agree (5), 43% Agree (4), 13% Neutral (3), 6% Disagree (2,1)
- County needs more industrial development: 34% Strongly Agree (5), 44% Agree (4), 17% Neutral (3), 5% Disagree (2,1)
- County should encourage development of office centers: 36% Strongly Agree (5), 40% Agree (4), 20% Neutral (3), 5% Disagree (2,1)
- New/revitalized commercial areas should have higher quality design/appearance than existing areas: 34% Strongly Agree (5), 38% Agree (4), 23% Neutral (3), 5% Disagree (2,1)
- Wyandotte County needs more dining options: 33% Strongly Agree (5), 32% Agree (4), 25% Neutral (3), 10% Disagree (2,1)
- Wyandotte County needs more hotels: 23% Strongly Agree (5), 33% Agree (4), 33% Neutral (3), 12% Disagree (2,1)

A Majority of Residents Agreed With All 8 Statements

Source: ETC Institute DirectionFinder (2014 - Kansas City, KS/Wyandotte County)
Q21c. Wyandotte County needs more higher paying, value added employment opportunities
Q21a. Wyandotte County should attract more retail stores

2014 Kansas City, KS/Wyandotte County Community Survey
Mean rating for all respondents by District

LEGEND
Mean rating on a 5-point scale, where:
1.0-1.8 Strongly Disagree
1.8-2.6 Disagree
2.6-3.4 Neutral
3.4-4.2 Agree
4.2-5.0 Strongly Agree
Other (no responses)
Q21b. Wyandotte County needs more industrial development

Mean rating on a 5-point scale, where:

- 1.0-1.8 Strongly Disagree
- 1.8-2.6 Disagree
- 2.6-3.4 Neutral
- 3.4-4.2 Agree
- 4.2-5.0 Strongly Agree

Other (no responses)
Support for Various Initiatives
Q28. Do you support the sale and use of fireworks in Wyandotte County?

by percentage of respondents

Yes 56%
No 34%
Don't know 10%

Ratio of Support to Opposition is 5 to 3

Source: ETC Institute DirectionFinder (2014 - Kansas City, KS/Wyandotte County)
Q29. How supportive are you of the move to prevent the concealed carry of handguns in all public buildings in Wyandotte County?

by percentage of respondents (excluding “not provided”)

Ratio of Support to Opposition is Almost 2 to 1

Very supportive
42%

Supportive
11%

Not supportive
28%

Not sure
19%

Source: ETC Institute DirectionFinder (2014 - Kansas City, KS/Wyandotte County)
Q30. How supportive would you be of the Unified Government exploring the possibility of building a new jail or expanding the existing jail? by percentage of respondents

Ratio of Support to Opposition is 5 to 1

- Very supportive: 27%
- Supportive: 33%
- Not sure: 28%
- Not supportive: 12%

Source: ETC Institute DirectionFinder (2014 - Kansas City, KS/Wyandotte County)
Major Findings #7

Community Issues that Are Most Important to Residents
Q25. 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

- Low crime rate/safe neighborhoods: 54%
- Good schools: 40%
- Good jobs/strong economy: 29%
- Access to grocery stores/healthy foods: 19%
- Affordable housing: 18%
- Good place to raise children: 16%
- Low level of child abuse: 15%
- Clean environment: 11%
- Access to health care: 10%
- Parks & recreation: 8%
- Good race/ethnic relations: 8%
- Healthy behaviors & lifestyles: 6%
- Strong family life: 6%
- Arts & cultural events: 5%

Top Three Community Issues
1. Safe Neighborhoods
2. Education
3. Jobs

Source: ETC Institute DirectionFinder (2014 - Kansas City, KS/Wyandotte County)
Q24a. Low crime rate/safe neighborhoods

Mean rating on a 5-point scale, where:

- 1.0-1.8 Not Important at all
- 1.8-2.6 Unimportant
- 2.6-3.4 Neither
- 3.4-4.2 Important
- 4.2-5.0 Very Important

Other (no responses)
Q24c. Good schools

**LEGEND**
Mean rating on a 5-point scale, where:

- 1.0-1.8 Not Important at all
- 1.8-2.6 Unimportant
- 2.6-3.4 Neither
- 3.4-4.2 Important
- 4.2-5.0 Very Important
- Other (no responses)
Q24j. Good jobs/strong economy

LEGEND

Mean rating on a 5-point scale, where:

- 1.0-1.8 Not Important at all
- 1.8-2.6 Unimportant
- 2.6-3.4 Neither
- 3.4-4.2 Important
- 4.2-5.0 Very Important
- Other (no responses)

2014 Kansas City, KS/Wyandotte County Community Survey

Mean rating for all respondents by District
Conclusions

- The Unified Government is moving in the right direction, but there are opportunities to do better

- Top Priorities for Improving City Services
  - Maintenance of City streets
  - Code Enforcement
  - Communication with the public
  - Public Transit
  - Police

- Top Priorities for Improving County Services
  - Aging Services
  - Motor Vehicle Registration Services
  - Parks

- Community Issues that Are Most Important to Residents
  - Safe Neighborhoods, Schools, and Jobs

- Strong Support for Having the Unified Government Do More to Promote Economic Development
Questions?

THANK YOU