Park City, UT

Trends over Time

Contents

C		1
Summary	 	 1 I

The National Citizen Survey™
© 2012-2013 National Research Center, Inc.
2955 Valmont Road, Suite 300
Boulder, CO 80301
303-444-7863
ncs@n-r-c.com
www.n-r-c.com

Summary

The National Citizen Survey™ (The NCS) is a collaborative effort between National Research Center, Inc. (NRC) and the International City/County Management Association (ICMA). The survey and its administration are standardized to assure high quality research methods and directly comparable results across The National Citizen Survey communities. This report discusses trends over time, comparing the 2013 ratings for Park City to its previous survey results in 2011. Additional reports and technical appendices are available under separate cover.

Trend data for Park City represent important comparison data and should be examined for improvements or declines. Deviations from stable trends over time, especially, represent opportunities for understanding how local policies, programs or public information may have affected residents' opinions.

Meaningful differences between survey years have been noted within the following tables as being "higher" or "lower" if the differences are greater than eight percentage points, otherwise the comparison between 2011 and 2013 are noted as being "similar." Additionally benchmark comparison for all survey years are presented for reference. Changes in the benchmark comparison over time can be impacted by various trends, including varying survey cycles for the individual communities that comprise the benchmarks; regional and national economic or other events; as well as emerging survey methodologies.

Overall, ratings in Park City for 2013 generally remained stable. Of the 91 items for which comparisons were available, 72 items were rated similarly in 2011 and 2013, 12 items showed a decrease in ratings and seven showed an increase in ratings. Notable trends over time included the following:

- Overall, most aspects of Community Quality remained stable between 2011 and 2013. Increases
 in ratings included shopping opportunities, cultural/arts/music activities and child
 care/preschool. Within the area of Mobility, ease of travel by bicycle and ease of travel by car
 experienced declines in their ratings.
- Aspects of Governance saw increases in several services related to Mobility (i.e., traffic enforcement, street repair and in street lighting). Decreases were seen in animal control and recycling services.
- Overall, levels of Engagement and Participation in various activities available in Park City in 2013 were similar to or lower than 2011. Fewer respondents reported having contacted Park City Municipal employees, volunteering, participating in a club or watching a public meeting in 2013 than in 2011.

Table 1: Community Quality Overall

	Percent rating positively (e.g., excellent/good)		2013 compared to	· · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · ·	Comparison to benchmark	
	2011	2013	2011	2011	2013	
Overall quality of life	98%	96%	Similar	Much higher	Higher	
Overall image	96%	92%	Similar	Much higher	Higher	
Place to live	99%	94%	Similar	Much higher	Higher	
Neighborhood	91%	92%	Similar	Much higher	Higher	
Place to raise children	90%	85%	Similar	Much higher	Higher	
Place to retire	79%	77%	Similar	Much higher	Higher	
Overall appearance	97%	91%	Similar	Much higher	Higher	

Table 2: Community Quality by Domain

	Percent rating positively (e.g., excellent/good, very/somewhat safe) 2		2013 compared to	Comparison to benchmark	
Safety	2011	2013	2011	2011	2013
Overall feeling of safety	NA	96%	NA	NA	Higher
Safe in neighborhood	98%	97%	Similar	Much higher	Similar
Safe downtown	98%	97%	Similar	Much higher	Higher

		positively (e.g., ry/somewhat safe)	2013 compared	Comparison to benchmark	
Mobility	2011	2013	to 2011	2011	2013
Overall ease travel	NA	85%	NA	NA	NA
Paths and walking trails	94%	91%	Similar	Much higher	Much higher
Ease of walking	92%	88%	Similar	Much higher	Much higher
Travel by bicycle	94%	84%	Lower	Much higher	Much higher
Travel by public transportation	NA	89%	NA	NA	Much higher
Travel by car	75%	66%	Lower	Much higher	Similar
Public parking	NA	50%	NA	NA	NA
Traffic flow	68%	61%	Similar	Much higher	Similar

	Percent rating positively (e.g., excellent/good, very/somewhat safe)		2013 compared	Comparison to benchmark	
Natural Environment	2011	2013	to 2011	2011	2013
Overall natural environment	94%	93%	Similar	Much higher	Much higher
Cleanliness	93%	91%	Similar	Much higher	Higher
Air quality	92%	90%	Similar	Much higher	Higher

	Percent rating positively (e.g., excellent/good, very/somewhat safe)		2013 compared	Comparison to benchmark	
Built Environment	2011	2013	to 2011	2011	2013
Overall built environment	NA	77%	NA	NA	NA
New development in Park City	60%	62%	Similar	Similar	Similar
Affordable quality housing	26%	23%	Similar	Much lower	Lower
Housing options	40%	42%	Similar	Much lower	Lower
Public places	NA	91%	NA	NA	NA

	Percent rating positively (e.g., excellent/good, very/somewhat safe)		2013 compared	Comparison to benchmark	
Economy	2011	2013	to 2011	2011	2013
Overall economic health	NA	81%	NA	NA	NA
Vibrant downtown	NA	77%	NA	NA	NA
Business and services	72%	71%	Similar	Higher	Similar
Cost of living	NA	26%	NA	NA	NA
Shopping opportunities	63%	72%	Higher	Much higher	Higher
Employment opportunities	43%	41%	Similar	Much higher	Similar
Place to visit	NA	96%	NA	NA	Much higher
Place to work	72%	75%	Similar	Much higher	Higher

Recreation and	Percent rating positively (e.g., excellent/good, very/somewhat safe)		2013 compared	Comparison to benchmark	
Wellness	2011	2013	to 2011	2011	2013
Health and wellness	NA	94%	NA	NA	NA
Preventive health services	75%	72%	Similar	Much higher	Similar
Health care	69%	67%	Similar	Much higher	Higher
Recreational opportunities	98%	96%	Similar	Much higher	Much higher
Fitness opportunities	NA	95%	NA	NA	NA

	Percent rating positively (e.g., excellent/good, very/somewhat safe)		2013 compared		rison to nmark
Education and Enrichment	2011	2013	to 2011	2011	2013
Education and enrichment	NA	79%	NA	NA	NA
Religious or spiritual events and activities	86%	88%	Similar	Higher	Similar
Cultural/arts/music activities	75%	93%	Higher	Much higher	Much higher
Adult education	NA	62%	NA	NA	NA

	Percent rating positively (e.g., excellent/good, very/somewhat safe)		2013 compared	•	rison to nmark
Education and Enrichment	2011	2013	to 2011	2011	2013
K-12 education	84%	78%	Similar	Much higher	Similar
Child care/preschool	31%	51%	Higher	Much lower	Similar

	Percent rating positively (e.g., excellent/good, very/somewhat safe)		2013 compared	Comparison to benchmark	
Community Engagement	2011	2013	to 2011	2011	2013
Social events and activities	89%	91%	Similar	Much higher	Much higher
Neighborliness	NA	69%	NA	NA	NA
Openness and acceptance	68%	68%	Similar	Higher	Similar
Opportunities to participate in community matters	84%	84%	Similar	Much higher	Higher
Opportunities to volunteer	90%	91%	Similar	Much higher	Higher

Table 3: Governance Overall

	Percent rating positively (e.g., excellent/good)		2013 compared to	Comparison to benchmark	
	2011	2013	2011	2011	2013
Services provided by Park City	83%	80%	Similar	Higher	Similar
Customer service	78%	83%	Similar	Higher	Similar
Value of services	70%	66%	Similar	Much higher	Similar
Overall direction	70%	64%	Similar	Much higher	Similar
Welcoming citizen involvement	80%	73%	Similar	Much higher	Higher
Confidence in Park City	NA	66%	NA	NA	NA
Acting in the best interest of Park City	NA	66%	NA	NA	NA
Being honest	NA	66%	NA	NA	NA
Treating all residents fairly	NA	56%	NA	NA	NA
Services provided by the federal government	44%	43%	Similar	Similar	Similar

Table 4: Governance by Domain

		Percent rating positively (e.g., excellent/good)		Comparison to benchmark	
Safety	2011	2013	2013 compared to 2011	2011	2013
Police	81%	77%	Similar	Similar	Similar
Fire	94%	95%	Similar	Similar	Similar
Ambulance/EMS	93%	95%	Similar	Similar	Similar
Crime prevention	82%	82%	Similar	Much higher	Higher
Fire prevention	83%	81%	Similar	Higher	Similar
Animal control	69%	58%	Lower	Higher	Similar
Emergency preparedness	65%	61%	Similar	Similar	Similar

	Percent rating positively (e.g., excellent/good)		2013 compared to	Comparison to benchmark	
Mobility	2011	2013	2011	2011	2013
Traffic enforcement	62%	73%	Higher	Similar	Similar
Street repair	37%	47%	Higher	Similar	Similar
Street cleaning	70%	74%	Similar	Higher	Similar
Street lighting	69%	79%	Higher	Higher	Higher
Snow removal	77%	83%	Similar	Much higher	Higher
Sidewalk maintenance	67%	68%	Similar	Much higher	Similar
Traffic signal timing	56%	62%	Similar	Similar	Similar
Bus or transit services	97%	94%	Similar	Much higher	Much higher

	Percent rating positively (e.g., excellent/good)		2013 compared to	Comparison to benchmark	
Natural Environment	2011	2013	2011	2011	2013
Garbage collection	88%	82%	Similar	Higher	Similar
Recycling	80%	68%	Lower	Much higher	Similar
Drinking water	43%	49%	Similar	Much lower	Lower
Natural areas preservation	75%	79%	Similar	Much higher	Higher
Open space	NA	82%	NA	NA	Similar

	Percent rating positively (e.g., excellent/good)		2013 compared to	Comparison to benchmark	
Built Environment	2011	2013	2011	2011	2013
Storm drainage	82%	77%	Similar	Much higher	Similar
Sewer services	79%	85%	Similar	Higher	Similar
Power utility	86%	82%	Similar	Higher	Similar
Utility billing	NA	78%	NA	NA	Similar
Land use, planning and zoning	57%	56%	Similar	Much higher	Similar
Code enforcement	58%	61%	Similar	Much higher	Similar

	Percent rating positively (e.g., excellent/good)		2013 compared to	Comparison to benchmark	
Economy	2011	2013	2011	2011	2013
Economic development	58%	57%	Similar	Much higher	Similar

Recreation and		Percent rating positively (e.g., excellent/good)		Comparison to benchmark	
Wellness	2011	2013	2013 compared to 2011	2011	2013
City parks	98%	97%	Similar	Much higher	Higher
Recreation programs	94%	92%	Similar	Much higher	Higher
Recreation centers	91%	96%	Similar	Much higher	Much higher
Health services	84%	82%	Similar	Much higher	Higher

Education and		Percent rating positively (e.g., excellent/good)		Comparis benchm	
Enrichment	2011	2013	2011	2011	2013
Special events	NA	86%	NA	NA	Higher
Public libraries	92%	95%	Similar	Much higher	Similar

Community	Percent rating positively (e.g., excellent/good)		2013 compared to	Comparison to benchmark	
Engagement	2011	2013	2011	2011	2013
Public information	83%	82%	Similar	Much higher	Similar

Table 5: Engagement and Participation Overall

	Percent rating positively (e.g., always/sometimes, more than once a month, yes)		2013 compared	Compari benchi	
	2011	2013	to 2011	2011	2013
Sense of community	87%	74%	Lower	Much higher	Higher
Recommend Park City	96%	94%	Similar	Much higher	Similar
Remain in Park City	89%	87%	Similar	Much higher	Similar
Contacted Park City employees	57%	47%	Lower	Similar	Similar

Table 6: Engagement and Participation by Domain

	Percent rating positively (e.g., always/sometimes, more than once a month, yes)		2013 compared		rison to hmark
Safety	2011	2013	to 2011	2011	2013
Stocked supplies for an emergency	NA	20%	NA	NA	NA
Reported a crime	84%	NA	NA	Higher	NA
Was the victim of a crime	10%	13%	Similar	Lower	Similar

	Percent rating positively (e.g., always/sometimes, more than once a month, yes)		2013 compared		rison to nmark
Mobility	2011	2013	to 2011	2011	2013
Used public transportation instead of driving	NA	74%	NA	NA	NA
Carpooled instead of driving alone	NA	61%	NA	NA	NA
Walked or biked instead of driving	NA	87%	NA	NA	NA

	Percent rating positively (e.g., always/sometimes, more than once a month, yes)		2013 compared	Compar bench	
Natural Environment	2011	2013	to 2011	2011	2013
Conserved water	NA	87%	NA	NA	NA
Made home more energy efficient	NA	74%	NA	NA	NA
Recycled at home	89%	89%	Similar	Much higher	Similar

	Percent rating positively (e.g., always/sometimes, more than once a month, yes)		2013 compared	Compar bench	
Built Environment	2011	2013	to 2011	2011	2013
Observed a code violation	NA	43%	NA	NA	NA
Housing costs 30% or more of income	40%	21%	Lower	Higher	Lower

	Percent rating positively (e.g., always/sometimes, more than once a month, yes)		2013 compared	Compari benchr	
Economy	2011	2013	to 2011	2011	2013
Purchased goods or services in Park City	NA	98%	NA	NA	NA
Economy will have positive impact on income	24%	34%	Higher	Much higher	Higher
Work in Park City	NA	63%	NA	NA	NA

	Percent rating positively (e.g., always/sometimes, more than once a month, yes)		2013 compared to	Comparison to benchmark	
Recreation and Wellness	2011	2013	2011	2011	2013
Used Park City recreation centers	83%	77%	Similar	Much higher	Much higher
Visited a City park	96%	92%	Similar	Much higher	Similar
Used Park City public libraries	82%	80%	Similar	Much higher	Similar
Ate 5 portions of fruits and vegetables	NA	90%	NA	NA	NA
Participated in moderate or vigorous physical activity	NA	93%	NA	NA	NA
In good to excellent health	NA	99%	NA	NA	NA

Education and	Percent rating positively (e.g., always/sometimes, more than once a month, yes)		2013 compared	Comparison to benchmark	
Enrichment	2011	2013	to 2011	2011	2013
Participated in religious or spiritual activities	36%	36%	Similar	Much lower	Lower
Attended a City- sponsored event	NA	85%	NA	NA	NA

	Percent rating positively (e.g., always/sometimes, more than once a month, yes)		2013 compared to	Comparison to benchmark	
Community Engagement	2011	2013	2011	2011	2013
Campaigned for an issue, cause or candidate	NA	31%	NA	NA	NA
Contacted Park City elected officials	NA	28%	NA	NA	NA
Volunteered	70%	52%	Lower	Much higher	Similar
Participated in a club	51%	36%	Lower	Much higher	Similar
Talked to or visited with neighbors	53%	45%	Lower	Higher	Similar
Done a favor for a neighbor	96%	83%	Lower	Similar	Lower
Attended a local public meeting	44%	37%	Similar	Much higher	Higher
Watched a local public meeting	NA	13%	NA	NA	Much lower
Read or watched local news	NA	83%	NA	NA	NA
Voted in local elections	72%	79%	Similar	Similar	Similar