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Purpose, Methodology, and Demographics

Summary of Major Findings

Summary

Questions
Purpose

To gather objective feedback from a statistically representative sample of residents about a wide range of issues related to the delivery of city and county government services

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

To objectively assess service performance over time
Methodology

Survey Description
- A core set of questions, including district specific questions

Method of Administration
- By mail and online to a random sample of households
- Sample was stratified to ensure the completion of at least 300 surveys in each of the County’s 8 Districts and at least 30 surveys from each neighborhood area

Sample Size
- **Goal:** 2,400 surveys
- **Actual:** 4,313 surveys

Margin of Error
- +/- 1.5% at the 95% level of confidence
Overall Results Were Weighted By District to Ensure that Input from Each District Was Equally Valued
MAJOR FINDINGS
Neighborhood and Community Services

MAJOR FINDINGS
Q1. Satisfaction With Neighborhood/Community Services

By percentage of respondents (excluding don’t knows)

<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>13%</td>
<td>3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ambulance services</td>
<td>41%</td>
<td>39%</td>
<td>17%</td>
<td>4%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Police services</td>
<td>28%</td>
<td>43%</td>
<td>18%</td>
<td>11%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Trash collection and recycling</td>
<td>21%</td>
<td>39%</td>
<td>19%</td>
<td>21%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Parks and recreation facilities</td>
<td>15%</td>
<td>38%</td>
<td>28%</td>
<td>19%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sewer utility system</td>
<td>13%</td>
<td>35%</td>
<td>36%</td>
<td>16%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Parks and recreation programs</td>
<td>13%</td>
<td>30%</td>
<td>38%</td>
<td>20%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Storm water runoff/management system</td>
<td>11%</td>
<td>31%</td>
<td>34%</td>
<td>25%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Public transportation</td>
<td>11%</td>
<td>28%</td>
<td>41%</td>
<td>20%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Municipal court</td>
<td>11%</td>
<td>28%</td>
<td>46%</td>
<td>15%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Communication with the public</td>
<td>9%</td>
<td>27%</td>
<td>36%</td>
<td>28%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Code enforcement</td>
<td>9%</td>
<td>24%</td>
<td>36%</td>
<td>32%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Planning and zoning</td>
<td>9%</td>
<td>24%</td>
<td>46%</td>
<td>22%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Maintenance of city streets</td>
<td>8%</td>
<td>25%</td>
<td>26%</td>
<td>41%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: ETC Institute (2020)

Fire & Ambulance Services Were the Best Rated Services; Maintenance of Streets Was Lowest
Satisfaction With Neighborhood/Community Services


by percentage of respondents who rated the item as a 4 or 5 on a 5-point scale (excluding don't knows)

Significant Increase Since 2018

Significant Decrease Since 2018

Ratings for 13 of 14 Services Have Increased Since 2016
Q2. **Neighborhood and Community Services That Should Receive the Most Emphasis For Improvement Over the Next 2 Years**

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

- **Maintenance of city streets**
- **Police services**
- **Communication with the public**
- **Code enforcement**
- **Trash collection and recycling**
- **Storm water runoff/management system**
- **Parks and recreation facilities**
- **Public transportation**
- **Fire services**
- **Planning and zoning**
- **Parks and recreation programs**
- **Sewer utility system**
- **Ambulance services**
- **Municipal court**

Source: FTC Institute (2020)
### Priorities for Improving Neighborhood/Community Services by District

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Rank</th>
<th>Overall Priorities</th>
<th># of Districts 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>Police services</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>Communication with the public</td>
<td>Police services</td>
<td>Police services</td>
<td>Police services</td>
<td>Police services</td>
<td>Police services</td>
<td>Police services</td>
<td>Police services</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3rd</td>
<td>Communication with the public</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>Police services</td>
<td>Communication with the public</td>
<td>Storm water runoff/mgmt system</td>
<td>Code enforcement</td>
<td>Trash collection &amp; recycling</td>
<td>Code enforcement</td>
<td>Communication with the public</td>
<td>Code enforcement</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4th</td>
<td>Code enforcement</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>Code enforcement</td>
<td>Code enforcement</td>
<td>Code enforcement</td>
<td>Trash collection &amp; recycling</td>
<td>Parks &amp; recreation facilities</td>
<td>Communication with the public</td>
<td>Code enforcement</td>
<td>Communication with the public</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5th</td>
<td>Trash collection &amp; recycling</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>Trash collection &amp; recycling</td>
<td>Trash collection &amp; recycling</td>
<td>Communication with the public</td>
<td>Communication with the public</td>
<td>Communication with the public</td>
<td>Storm water runoff/mgmt system</td>
<td>Parks &amp; recreation facilities</td>
<td>Trash collection &amp; recycling</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Maintenance of City Streets Is the Top Priority in All 8 Districts
## 2020 Importance-Satisfaction Rating

**Kansas City, Kansas & Wyandotte County Community Survey**

**Neighborhood/Community Services**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Category of Service</th>
<th>Most Important %</th>
<th>Most Important Rank</th>
<th>Most Important Satisfaction %</th>
<th>Satisfaction Rank</th>
<th>Importance-Satisfaction Rating</th>
<th>I-S Rating Rank</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Maintenance of city streets</td>
<td>63%</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>33%</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>0.4232</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Code enforcement</td>
<td>29%</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>33%</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>0.1910</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Communication with the public</td>
<td>29%</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>36%</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>0.1855</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Storm water runoff/management system</td>
<td>22%</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>42%</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>0.1291</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Public transportation</td>
<td>19%</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>39%</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>0.1167</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Trash collection and recycling</td>
<td>27%</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>60%</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>0.1072</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Police services</td>
<td>36%</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>71%</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>0.1048</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Planning and zoning</td>
<td>15%</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>33%</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>0.1036</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Parks and recreation facilities</td>
<td>21%</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>53%</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>0.0979</td>
<td>9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Parks and recreation programs</td>
<td>14%</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>43%</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>0.0798</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sewer utility system</td>
<td>14%</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>48%</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>0.0709</td>
<td>11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Municipal court</td>
<td>8%</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>39%</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>0.0490</td>
<td>12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fire services</td>
<td>17%</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>85%</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0.0249</td>
<td>13</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ambulance services</td>
<td>11%</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>80%</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0.0215</td>
<td>14</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Greatest Opportunities for Improvement: I-S Rating Above 0.15**
2020 Unified Government Community Survey
Importance-Satisfaction Assessment Matrix
-Neighborhood and Community Services
(points on the graph show deviations from the mean importance and satisfaction ratings given by respondents to the survey)

Source: ETC Institute (2020)
Maintenance of City Streets

This item was determined to be the top priority for improvement based on the Importance-Satisfaction Analysis.

Areas in yellow show lower levels of satisfaction and can help the UG target resources to those areas with the most need for improvement.
Code Enforcement

This item was determined to be the second highest priority for improvement based on the Importance-Satisfaction Analysis.

Areas in yellow show lower levels of satisfaction and can help the UG target resources to those areas with the most need for improvement.
Communication with the Public

This item was determined to be the third highest priority for improvement based on the Importance-Satisfaction Analysis.

Areas in blue indicate higher levels of satisfaction.
Stormwater Runoff

This item was determined to be the fourth highest priority for improvement based on the Importance-Satisfaction Analysis.

Areas in yellow show lower levels of satisfaction and can help the UG target resources to those areas with the most need for improvement.

Areas in blue indicate higher levels of satisfaction.
Public Transportation

This item was determined to be the fifth highest priority for improvement based on the Importance-Satisfaction Analysis.

Areas in yellow show lower levels of satisfaction and can help the UG target resources to those areas with the most need for improvement.

Areas in blue indicate higher levels of satisfaction.
County Level Services

MAJOR FINDINGS
### Q3. Satisfaction With County Level Services

*by percentage of respondents (excluding don’t knows)*

<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>Local Election Process</td>
<td>15%</td>
<td>40%</td>
<td>34%</td>
<td>11%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>County parks</td>
<td>15%</td>
<td>40%</td>
<td>32%</td>
<td>14%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3-1-1 Call Center</td>
<td>13%</td>
<td>30%</td>
<td>45%</td>
<td>12%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Customer service by Unified Govt. employees</td>
<td>11%</td>
<td>32%</td>
<td>38%</td>
<td>20%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Treasurer’s Office</td>
<td>10%</td>
<td>32%</td>
<td>41%</td>
<td>17%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Motor Vehicle Registration</td>
<td>11%</td>
<td>31%</td>
<td>26%</td>
<td>33%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Public Health Department services</td>
<td>10%</td>
<td>28%</td>
<td>50%</td>
<td>12%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Area Agency on Aging services</td>
<td>8%</td>
<td>25%</td>
<td>50%</td>
<td>18%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Services for developmental disabilities</td>
<td>8%</td>
<td>23%</td>
<td>52%</td>
<td>18%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>County Appraiser’s Office services</td>
<td>8%</td>
<td>23%</td>
<td>40%</td>
<td>30%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The District Attorneys’ Office</td>
<td>9%</td>
<td>21%</td>
<td>40%</td>
<td>30%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Senior transportation</td>
<td>8%</td>
<td>22%</td>
<td>53%</td>
<td>18%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: ETC Institute (2020)

*Local Elections Has the Most Satisfaction; Motor Vehicles Has the Most Dissatisfaction*
Significant Increase Since 2018
Ratings for 9 of 11 Services Have Increased Since 2016

Satisfaction With County Level Services
by percentage of respondents who rated the item as a 4 or 5 on a 5-point scale (excluding don't knows)

- Local Election Process
  Previously: The Election Office
- County parks
- Customer service by Unified Govt. employees
- Treasurer's Office
- Motor Vehicle Registration
- Public Health Department services
- Area Agency on Aging services
- Services for developmental disabilities
- County Appraiser’s Office services
- The District Attorneys’ Office
- Senior transportation

Significant Increase Since 2018
Significant Decrease Since 2018

Ratings for 9 of 11 Services Have Increased Since 2016
Q4. County Level Services That Should Receive the Most Emphasis For Improvement Over the Next 2 Years

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

Motor Vehicle Registration: 44%
Customer service by Unified Govt. employees: 28%
County parks: 27%
Area Agency on Aging services: 27%
County Appraiser’s Office services: 25%
Services for developmental disabilities: 24%
Senior transportation: 22%
Public Health Department services: 21%
The District Attorneys’ Office: 21%
Treasurer’s Office: 16%
Local Election Process: 13%
3-1-1 Call Center: 12%

Source: ETC Institute (2020)

Motor Vehicle Registration Is the Top County Level Service Priority for Improvement
## Priorities for Improving County Services by District

| Rank | Overall Priorities                        | # of Districts in Top 5 | District 1                                      | District 2                                      | District 3                                      | District 4                                      | District 5                                      | District 6                                      | District 7                                      | District 8                                      |
|------|-------------------------------------------|-------------------------|------------------------------------------------|------------------------------------------------|------------------------------------------------|------------------------------------------------|------------------------------------------------|------------------------------------------------|------------------------------------------------|------------------------------------------------|------------------------------------------------|
| 2nd  | Customer Service                          | 8                       | Area Agency on aging services                  | Customer Service                                | Area Agency on aging services                  | Customer Service                                | District Attorneys' Office                       | County parks                                   | Area Agency on aging services                  | Customer Service                                |
| 3rd  | County parks                              | 6                       | Services for developmental disabilities        | Public Health Department services               | Customer Service                                | Services for developmental disabilities        | County Appraiser's Office services              | County Appraiser's Office services              | County Appraiser's Office services              | Area Agency on aging services                  |
| 4th  | Area Agency on aging services             | 6                       | Customer Service                                | Area Agency on aging services                  | County parks                                   | County parks                                   | Customer Service                                | Customer Service                                | Customer Service                                | County parks                                   |
| 5th  | County Appraiser's Office services        | 3                       | Senior transportation                           | Services for developmental disabilities        | Services for developmental disabilities        | Public Health Department services               | Customer Service                                | Area Agency on aging services                  | County parks                                   | Services for developmental disabilities        |
## 2020 Importance-Satisfaction Rating
### Kansas City, Kansas & Wyandotte County Community Survey
#### County Level Services

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Category of Service</th>
<th>Most Important %</th>
<th>Most Important Rank</th>
<th>Most Satisfaction %</th>
<th>Satisfaction Rank</th>
<th>Importance-Satisfaction Rating</th>
<th>I-S Rating Rank</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Motor Vehicle Registration</td>
<td>44%</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>41%</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>0.2609</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Area Agency on Aging services</td>
<td>27%</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>33%</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>0.1797</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>County Appraiser's Office services</td>
<td>25%</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>30%</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>0.1748</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Services for developmental disabilities</td>
<td>24%</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>31%</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>0.1661</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Customer service by Unified Govt. employees</td>
<td>28%</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>43%</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>0.1593</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Senior transportation</td>
<td>22%</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>30%</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>0.1535</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The District Attorneys' Office</td>
<td>21%</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>30%</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>0.1482</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Public Health Department services</td>
<td>21%</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>38%</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>0.1323</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>County parks</td>
<td>27%</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>54%</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0.1232</td>
<td>9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Treasurer's Office</td>
<td>16%</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>42%</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>0.0902</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3-1-1 Call Center</td>
<td>12%</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>43%</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>0.0680</td>
<td>11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Local Election Process</td>
<td>13%</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>55%</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0.0600</td>
<td>12</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Greatest Opportunities for Improvement:** I-S Rating Above 0.15
Motor Vehicle Registration

This item was determined to be the top priority for improvement based on the Importance-Satisfaction Analysis.

Areas in yellow show lower levels of satisfaction and can help the UG target resources to those areas with the most need for improvement.
Area Agency on Aging Services

This item was determined to be the second highest priority for improvement based on the Importance-Satisfaction Analysis.

Areas in yellow show lower levels of satisfaction and can help the UG target resources to those areas with the most need for improvement.
County Appraiser’s Office Services

This item was determined to be the third highest priority for improvement based on the Importance-Satisfaction Analysis.

Areas in yellow show lower levels of satisfaction and can help the UG target resources to those areas with the most need for improvement.
Services for Developmental Disabilities

This item was determined to be the fourth highest priority for improvement based on the Importance-Satisfaction Analysis.

Areas in yellow show lower levels of satisfaction and can help the UG target resources to those areas with the most need for improvement.
Customer Service by UG Employees

This item was determined to be the fifth highest priority for improvement based on the Importance-Satisfaction Analysis.

Areas in yellow show lower levels of satisfaction and can help the UG target resources to those areas with the most need for improvement.
Senior Transportation

This item was determined to be the sixth highest priority for improvement based on the Importance-Satisfaction Analysis.

Areas in yellow show lower levels of satisfaction and can help the UG target resources to those areas with the most need for improvement.
Public Safety Ratings and Priorities

MAJOR FINDINGS
Satisfaction With Public Safety
by percentage of respondents who rated the item as a 4 or 5 on a 5-point scale (excluding don’t knows)

- How quickly fire department responds to medical emergency calls: 80% (2020), 79% (2018), 77% (2016)
- How quickly fire department responds to fires: 77% (2020), 77% (2018), 76% (2016)
- How quickly police department personnel respond to emergencies: 54% (2020), 58% (2018), 55% (2016)
- Visibility of police in neighborhoods: 51% (2020), 53% (2018), 52% (2016)
- Visibility of police in neighborhood retail areas: 49% (2020), 48% (2018), 48% (2016)
- Enforcement of traffic laws: 45% (2020), 45% (2018), 46% (2016)
- City's overall efforts to prevent crime: 37% (2020), 35% (2018), 39% (2016)
- Quality of animal control in neighborhoods: 36% (2020), 35% (2018), 33% (2016)

Satisfaction Has Increased in 5 of 9 Areas Since 2016

Significant Increase Since 2018
Significant Decrease Since 2018
Q7. **Public Safety 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

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Service</th>
<th>1st Choice</th>
<th>2nd Choice</th>
<th>3rd Choice</th>
<th>Percentage</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>City's overall efforts to prevent crime</td>
<td>46%</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Visibility of police in neighborhoods</td>
<td>45%</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Visibility of police in neighborhood retail areas</td>
<td>29%</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Quality of animal control in neighborhoods</td>
<td>28%</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Visibility of Code Enforcement in neighborhoods</td>
<td>27%</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>How quickly police department personnel respond to emergencies</td>
<td>22%</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Enforcement of traffic laws</td>
<td>20%</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>How quickly fire department responds to medical emergency calls</td>
<td>8%</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>How quickly fire department responds to fires</td>
<td>8%</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: ETC Institute (2020)
### 2020 Importance-Satisfaction Rating
#### Kansas City, Kansas & Wyandotte County Community Survey
#### Public Safety 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>City's overall efforts to prevent crime</td>
<td>46%</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>37%</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>0.2897</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Visibility of police in neighborhoods</td>
<td>45%</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>51%</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>0.2187</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Visibility of code enforcement in neighborhoods</td>
<td>27%</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>31%</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>0.1818</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Quality of animal control in neighborhoods</td>
<td>28%</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>36%</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>0.1786</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Visibility of police in neighborhood retail areas</td>
<td>29%</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>49%</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>0.1470</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Enforcement of traffic laws</td>
<td>20%</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>45%</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>0.1093</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>How quickly police department personnel respond to emergencies</td>
<td>22%</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>54%</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>0.0998</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>How quickly fire department responds to fires</td>
<td>8%</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>77%</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0.0180</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>How quickly fire department responds to medical emergency calls</td>
<td>8%</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>80%</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0.0166</td>
<td>9</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Greatest Opportunities for Improvement: I-S Rating Above 0.15**
City’s Overall Efforts to Prevent Crime

This item was determined to be the top priority for improvement based on the Importance-Satisfaction Analysis.

Areas in yellow show lower levels of satisfaction and can help the UG target resources to those areas with the most need for improvement.
Visibility of Police in Neighborhoods

This item was determined to be the second highest priority for improvement based on the Importance-Satisfaction Analysis.

Areas in yellow show lower levels of satisfaction and can help the UG target resources to those areas with the most need for improvement.

Areas in blue indicate higher levels of satisfaction.
Visibility of Code Enforcement in Neighborhoods

This item was determined to be the third highest priority for improvement based on the Importance-Satisfaction Analysis.

Areas in yellow show lower levels of satisfaction and can help the UG target resources to those areas with the most need for improvement.
Quality of Animal Control in Neighborhoods

This item was determined to be the fourth highest priority for improvement based on the Importance-Satisfaction Analysis.

Areas in yellow show lower levels of satisfaction and can help the UG target resources to those areas with the most need for improvement.
Maintenance Ratings and Priorities

MAJOR FINDINGS
Satisfaction With City Maintenance

by percentage of respondents who rated the item as a 4 or 5 on a 5-point scale (excluding don't knows)

- Snow removal on major city streets
- Maintenance of street signs/traffic signals
- Maintenance of major city streets
- Maintenance of city buildings
- Snow removal on streets in your neighborhood
- Overall appearance of downtown
- Maintenance of stormwater drainage system
- Overall cleanliness of streets/other public areas
- Maintenance of streets in your neighborhood
- Maintenance of downtown parking lots
- Maintenance of curbs in your neighborhood
- Maintenance of sidewalks in your neighborhood
- Maintenance of alleys in your neighborhood

Satisfaction Has Increased in 11 of 13 Areas Since 2016
Q9. City Maintenance 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 streets in your neighborhood 44%
Snow removal on streets in your neighborhood 34%
Maintenance of major city streets 31%
Overall cleanliness of streets/other public areas 23%
Maintenance of sidewalks in your neighborhood 23%
Maintenance of curbs in your neighborhood 15%
Maintenance of stormwater drainage system 14%
Snow removal on major city streets 14%
Overall appearance of downtown 11%
Maintenance of alleys in your neighborhood 10%
Maintenance of city buildings 8%
Maintenance of street signs/traffic signals 7%
Maintenance of downtown parking lots 6%

Source: ETC Institute (2020)
### 2020 Importance-Satisfaction Rating

**Kansas City, Kansas & Wyandotte County Community Survey**

**Maintenance 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>Maintenance of streets in your neighborhood</td>
<td>44%</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>31%</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>0.2988</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Snow removal on streets in your neighborhood</td>
<td>34%</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>38%</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>0.2079</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Maintenance of sidewalks in your neighborhood</td>
<td>23%</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>23%</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>0.1783</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Maintenance of major city streets</td>
<td>31%</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>42%</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>0.1766</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Overall cleanliness of streets/other public areas</td>
<td>23%</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>33%</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>0.1565</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Maintenance of curbs in your neighborhood</td>
<td>15%</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>26%</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>0.1106</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Maintenance of stormwater drainage system</td>
<td>14%</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>37%</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>0.0910</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Maintenance of alleys in your neighborhood</td>
<td>10%</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>18%</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>0.0829</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Overall appearance of downtown</td>
<td>11%</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>37%</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>0.0691</td>
<td>9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Snow removal on major city streets</td>
<td>14%</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>60%</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0.0553</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Maintenance of city buildings</td>
<td>8%</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>40%</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>0.0500</td>
<td>11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Maintenance of downtown parking lots</td>
<td>6%</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>31%</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>0.0423</td>
<td>12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Maintenance of street signs/traffic signals</td>
<td>7%</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>54%</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0.0305</td>
<td>13</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Greatest Opportunities for Improvement: I-S Rating Above 0.15**
Maintenance of Streets in Neighborhoods

This item was determined to be the top priority for improvement based on the Importance-Satisfaction Analysis.

Areas in yellow show lower levels of satisfaction and can help the UG target resources to those areas with the most need for improvement.

Areas in blue indicate higher levels of satisfaction.
Snow Removal on Streets in Neighborhoods

This item was determined to be the second highest priority for improvement based on the Importance-Satisfaction Analysis.

Areas in yellow show lower levels of satisfaction and can help the UG target resources to those areas with the most need for improvement.
Maintenance of Sidewalks in Neighborhoods

This item was determined to be the third highest priority for improvement based on the Importance-Satisfaction Analysis.

Areas in yellow show lower levels of satisfaction and can help the UG target resources to those areas with the most need for improvement.
Maintenance of Major City Streets

This item was determined to be the fourth highest priority for improvement based on the Importance-Satisfaction Analysis.

Areas in yellow show lower levels of satisfaction and can help the UG target resources to those areas with the most need for improvement.
Overall Cleanliness of Streets/Other Public Areas

This item was determined to be the fifth highest priority for improvement based on the Importance-Satisfaction Analysis.

Areas in yellow show lower levels of satisfaction and can help the UG target resources to those areas with the most need for improvement.
Parks and Recreation Ratings and Priorities

MAJOR FINDINGS
Satisfaction With Parks and Recreation


by percentage of respondents who rated the item as a 4 or 5 on a 5-point scale (excluding don't knows)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Service</th>
<th>2020</th>
<th>2018</th>
<th>2016</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Maintenance of parks and equipment</td>
<td>47%</td>
<td>49%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The number of parks</td>
<td>44%</td>
<td>41%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sunflower Hills Golf Course</td>
<td>39%</td>
<td>37%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Number of outdoor athletic fields</td>
<td>30%</td>
<td>28%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Number of walking and biking trails</td>
<td>30%</td>
<td>28%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ease of registering for recreation programs</td>
<td>26%</td>
<td>29%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fees charged for recreation programs</td>
<td>29%</td>
<td>24%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Skateboard parks</td>
<td>24%</td>
<td>25%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Youth recreation programs</td>
<td>26%</td>
<td>24%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Programs for seniors</td>
<td>22%</td>
<td>23%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Adult recreation programs</td>
<td>23%</td>
<td>21%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Swimming pool and spray parks</td>
<td>24%</td>
<td>22%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Significant Increase Since 2018
Significant Decrease Since 2018

Satisfaction Has Increased or Stayed the Same in 10 of 12 Areas Since 2016
Q11. Parks and Recreation Facilities and 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

Source: ETC Institute (2020)

Walking/Biking Trails and Maintenance of Parks Are the Top Parks and Recreation Priorities
## 2020 Importance-Satisfaction Rating
### Kansas City, Kansas & Wyandotte County Community Survey
#### 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 Rank</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Number of walking and biking trails</td>
<td>30%</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>32%</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>0.2036</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Swimming pool and spray parks</td>
<td>25%</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>22%</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>0.1940</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Youth recreation programs</td>
<td>20%</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>25%</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>0.1536</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Maintenance of parks and equipment</td>
<td>30%</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>49%</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0.1535</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Community centers</td>
<td>20%</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>35%</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>0.1334</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Programs for seniors</td>
<td>16%</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>23%</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>0.1229</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Adult recreation programs</td>
<td>15%</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>23%</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>0.1137</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The number of parks</td>
<td>16%</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>44%</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0.0869</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fees charged for recreation programs</td>
<td>10%</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>29%</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>0.0679</td>
<td>9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Number of outdoor athletic fields</td>
<td>7%</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>37%</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>0.0447</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ease of registering for recreation programs</td>
<td>5%</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>29%</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>0.0369</td>
<td>11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tennis courts</td>
<td>3%</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>23%</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>0.0240</td>
<td>12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Skateboard parks</td>
<td>3%</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>25%</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>0.0209</td>
<td>13</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sunflower Hills Golf Course</td>
<td>3%</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>43%</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>0.0153</td>
<td>14</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Futsal courts</td>
<td>1%</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>24%</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>0.0083</td>
<td>15</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Greatest Opportunities for Improvement:** I-S Rating Above 0.15
Number of Walking and Biking Trails

This item was determined to be the top priority for improvement based on the Importance-Satisfaction Analysis.

Areas in yellow show lower levels of satisfaction and can help the UG target resources to those areas with the most need for improvement.
Swimming Pool and Spray Parks

This item was determined to be the second highest priority for improvement based on the Importance-Satisfaction Analysis.

Areas in yellow show lower levels of satisfaction and can help the UG target resources to those areas with the most need for improvement.
Youth Recreation Programs

This item was determined to be the third highest priority for improvement based on the Importance-Satisfaction Analysis.

Areas in yellow show lower levels of satisfaction and can help the UG target resources to those areas with the most need for improvement.
Maintenance of Parks and Equipment

This item was determined to be the fourth highest priority for improvement based on the Importance-Satisfaction Analysis.

Areas in yellow show lower levels of satisfaction and can help the UG target resources to those areas with the most need for improvement.

Areas in blue indicate higher levels of satisfaction.
Code Enforcement Ratings and Priorities
Satisfaction With Enforcement of Codes and Ordinances
by percentage of respondents who rated the item as a 4 or 5 on a 5-point scale (excluding don’t knows)

- Clean-up of junk/trash/debris in neighborhoods: 42% in 2020, 38% in 2018, 31% in 2016
- Maintenance of residential property in neighborhoods: 42% in 2020, 39% in 2018, 33% in 2016
- Removal of inoperable/junk cars in neighborhoods: 41% in 2020, 39% in 2018, 35% in 2016
- Mowing/trimming of weeds on private/vacant property in neighborhoods: 40% in 2020, 38% in 2018, 28% in 2016
- Maintenance of commercial/business property: 38% in 2020, 37% in 2018, 33% in 2016
- Mowing/trimming of weeds on private/vacant property city-wide: 33% in 2020, 30% in 2018, 24% in 2016
- Clean-up of junk/trash/debris city-wide: 32% in 2020, 28% in 2018, 26% in 2016

Significant Increase Since 2018
Significant Decrease Since 2018

Satisfaction Has Increased or Stayed the Same in ALL 7 Areas Since 2016
Clean-up of Junk/Trash/Debris Is the Top Code Enforcement Priority
<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>Clean-up of junk/trash/debris city-wide</td>
<td>49%</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>32%</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>0.3312</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mowing/trimming of weeds on private/vacant property city-wide</td>
<td>38%</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>33%</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>0.2523</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Clean-up of junk/trash/debris in neighborhoods</td>
<td>32%</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>42%</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0.1835</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Maintenance of residential property in neighborhoods</td>
<td>24%</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>42%</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0.1400</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Maintenance of commercial/business property</td>
<td>22%</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>38%</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>0.1394</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mowing/trimming of weeds on private/vacant property in neighborhoods</td>
<td>23%</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>40%</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>0.1379</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Removal of inoperable/junk cars in neighborhoods</td>
<td>21%</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>41%</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>0.1228</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Greatest Opportunities for Improvement: I-S Rating Above 0.15**
Clean-up of Junk/Trash/Debris City-Wide

This item was determined to be the top priority for improvement based on the Importance-Satisfaction Analysis.

Areas in yellow show lower levels of satisfaction and can help the UG target resources to those areas with the most need for improvement.
Mowing/Trimming of Weeds on Private/Vacant Property City-Wide

This item was determined to be the second highest priority for improvement based on the Importance-Satisfaction Analysis.

Areas in yellow show lower levels of satisfaction and can help the UG target resources to those areas with the most need for improvement.
Clean-up of Junk/Trash/Debris in Neighborhoods

This item was determined to be the third highest priority for improvement based on the Importance-Satisfaction Analysis.

Areas in yellow show lower levels of satisfaction and can help the UG target resources to those areas with the most need for improvement.
Other Issues
The Top 5 Most Used Sources Were Also The Top 5 Most Preferred Sources

Social Media Has Become One of the Most Influential Sources of Information About County Government

Q12. How Residents Get Information About the Unified Government

by percentage of respondents (multiple selections could be made)

- Local television: 53%
- The Citizen newsletter: 42%
- Social media - Facebook, Twitter, YouTube: 39%
- UG Website: 29%
- Nextdoor: 25%
- Local newspapers: 19%
- UGTV (Google Ch 41, Spectrum Ch 2): 18%
- Neighborhood meetings: 12%
- ENews Source: 10%
- UG public meetings: 8%
- Other: 6%

Source: ETC Institute (2020)
1 in 6 Residents Reported that Homelessness is a Problem In their Neighborhood
Q21. How important do you think it is for the Unified Government to manage stormwater runoff to help protect the quality of water in lakes and streams?

by percentage of respondents (excluding not provided)

83% Thought This Issue Was Very Important or Important in 2018

Source: ETC Institute (2020)
Q22. Which of the following BEST reflects the way you think stormwater fees should be paid?

by percentage of respondents (excluding not provided)

- 57%: Property owners who generate more should pay more
- 30%: All property owners should pay the same rate
- 13%: Don’t know

Source: ETC Institute (2020)

52% Thought Property Owners Who Generate More Should Pay More in 2018
A Majority of Residents Were Either “Not Sure” or “Not Supportive”
Q25. Support for Residency Policy for All Wyandotte County Employees
by percentage of respondents (excluding not provided)

- Very supportive: 51%
- Somewhat supportive: 15%
- Not sure: 25%
- Not supportive: 10%

Source: ETC Institute (2020)

A Majority of Residents Were “Very Supportive”
Q28a. Support for Unified Government Policy of Property Owners Maintaining Their Right-of-Way
by percentage of respondents (excluding not provided)

A Majority of Residents Were “Very Supportive”

Source: ETC Institute (2020)
Summary of Trends

Among 66 Areas Assessed Since 2016, Satisfaction Rating Have INCREASED in 53 Areas

Since 2018, There Have Been Notable Increases in Satisfaction With:
- Satisfaction with Code Enforcement
- Satisfaction with Communication with the Public
- Satisfaction with Fire services
- Satisfaction with Parks and Recreation Facilities
- Satisfaction with Parks and Recreation Programs
- Satisfaction with Planning and Zoning
- Satisfaction with Services for Developmental Disabilities
- Satisfaction with Storm Water Runoff/Management System
- Satisfaction with the Customer Service Provided by UG Employees
- Satisfaction with the Sewer Utility System

The Only Areas That Have Decreased By More the 4% Since 2018 Are:
- Snow Removal on Major and Neighborhood Streets
- City Attorney’s Office
- Motor Vehicle Registration
Opportunities for Improvement

**Neighborhood/Community Level Services**
- Maintenance of city streets - *#1 in All 8 Districts*
- Code enforcement
- Communication with the public
- Storm water runoff/management system
- Public transportation

**County Level Services**
- Motor Vehicle Registration - *#1 in ALL 8 Districts*
- Area Agency on Aging services
- County Appraiser's Office services
- Services for developmental disabilities
- Customer service by Unified Govt. employees
- Senior transportation
Questions?

THANK YOU