



2013 RICHMOND SUPPLEMENTAL WEB SURVEY RESULTS

OVERVIEW

As part of its participation in The National Citizen Survey™ (The NCS), the City of Richmond conducted a mailed survey of 3,000 residents. Surveys were mailed to randomly selected households in April 2013 and data was collected through early June 2013. After the official data collection period was over and the data were reported, the City made available the web-based survey to its residents through a link on the City's web site. Visitors to the site were able to complete the survey from June 2013 through December 2013, and 282 surveys were received. The results from the non-scientific survey are included in the 2013 Supplemental Web Survey Report.

In 2007, the City of Richmond enrolled in the National Research Center's (NRC) National Citizen Survey (NCS) program in order to conduct a resident survey to help the City Council set spending priorities and to set a benchmark of city service delivery. Since 2007, the City has conducted a scientific survey biennially. The NCS is a collaborative effort between the NRC (a public research firm focused on public sector information needs) and the International City/County Management Association (ICMA). In 2011 and 2013, Richmond also opened up the survey for all Richmond residents to complete (non-scientific survey).

As part of its participation in The National Citizen Survey™ (The NCS), the City of Richmond conducted a mailed survey of 3,000 residents. Surveys were mailed to randomly selected households in April 2013 and data was collected through early June 2013. 408 survey responses were collected.

After the official data collection period was over and the data were reported, the City made available the web-based survey to its residents through a link on the City's web site. Visitors to the site were able to complete the survey from June through December 2013 and 282 surveys were received.

Elected officials and city staff can use the survey results as a tool to:

- Assess the quality of community life and services provided to residents;
- Track residents' perceptions of service quality, community amenities, and public safety;

- Help make informed decisions about how to allocate resources;
- Assess support for local policies;
- Gather information on residents' use of services; and
- Compare results from previous years to measure changes over time.

2013 Non-Scientific Supplemental Web Survey Results and Comparison to 2013 Scientific Survey Results

The non-scientific web survey received a total of 282 responses, which is in comparison to a total of 408 completed surveys obtained through the scientific survey which went out to 3,000 randomly selected Richmond households.

Overall, the web-based, non-scientific survey results are, on average, higher (i.e., more favorable) than those that were obtained through the random sample, scientific survey. The results comparing ratings between those from the non-scientific and non-scientific surveys are listed below. The full report, 2013 Supplemental Web Survey Report, is located in Attachment A.

Demographics for Non-Scientific Survey Respondents

- The majority of residents lived in Richmond for more than 20 years at 38% with 23% living in Richmond between 11-20 years
- 54% were employed full-time
- 84% owned their home and 76% lived in a one family detached house
- 77% did not have any children under 17 years old living in their household
- 38% had members of their household aged 65 or older
- 93% described themselves as not Spanish, Hispanic or Latino
- 73% of respondents were White, 14% were African American, 9% were Asian, Asian Indian or Pacific Islander, 9% were other, and %% were American Indian or Alaskan native
- 36% had an annual household income of over \$100,000, 35% had an annual income between \$50,000 and \$99,999, and 29% had an annual income of less than \$49,999
- 66% were female and 34% were male
- 8% were under 34 years old, 33% were between 35 and 54 years old, and 61% were over 55 years old

Quality of Life and Community Characteristics

Respondents were asked to rate each of the following aspects of quality of life in Richmond. The following responses are from respondents providing ratings of “excellent” or “good”.

Quality of Life (rating service as either “good” or “excellent”)	Scientific Results 2013	Non-scientific Results 2013
Richmond as a place to retire	27%	52%
Your neighborhood as a place to live	53%	76%
Richmond as a place to raise children	14%	21%
Richmond as a place to work	22%	54%

Richmond as a place to retire	27%	39%
The overall quality of life in Richmond	30%	46%

Community Characteristics (rating service as either “good” or “excellent”)	Scientific Results 2013	Non-scientific Results 2013
Overall appearance of Richmond	18%	15%
Recreational opportunities	27%	49%
Employment opportunities	9%	14%
Educational opportunities	13%	19%
Opportunities to participate in community matters	43%	72%
Opportunities to volunteer	54%	78%

Public Safety & Code Enforcement

Residents were asked to rate how safe or unsafe they felt in the various situations. The responses below represent the percentage of residents that felt “very safe” or “somewhat safe”.

Community and Personal Public Safety (felt “very safe” or “somewhat safe”)	Scientific Results 2013	Non-scientific Results 2013
Safety in your neighborhood during the day	70%	82%
Safety in your neighborhood after dark	43%	66%
Safety in Richmond’s downtown area during the day	37%	45%
Safety in Richmond’s downtown area after dark	10%	10%
Safety from violent crime (e.g. rape, assault, robbery)	20%	30%
Safety from property crimes (e.g., burglary, theft)	14%	17%
Safety from environmental hazards	16%	14%

Residents were also asked to rate seven (7) public safety related services.

Public Safety Services (rating service as either “good” or “excellent”)	Scientific Results 2013	Non-scientific Results 2013
Police services	57%	79%
Fire services	69%	87%
Crime prevention	27%	53%
Fire prevention and education	46%	63%
Traffic enforcement	38%	50%
Code enforcement (weeds, abandoned buildings, etc.)	15%	26%

Recreation, Parks and Library Services

The survey contained questions seeking residents’ perspectives about opportunities and services related to the community’s parks, libraries and recreation services. The table below reveals the percentage of residents that stated the service listed below as either “good” or “excellent”.

Park and Recreation Opportunities (rating service as either “good” or “excellent”)	Scientific Results	Non-scientific Results
--	---------------------------	-------------------------------

	2013	2013
Recreational opportunities	28%	%
City parks	46%	72%
Recreation programs or classes	44%	66%
Recreation centers or facilities	42%	69%
Public library services	52%	65%

Health

The City decided to include two general health-related questions to the survey. This was in response to the development and implementation of the Health & Wellness Element in the General Plan and the City's focus on Health in All Policies which allows the City to view its services and policies through a prism of health. Although the City of Richmond is not directly responsible for the provision of health services, the City does have a relationship with Contra Costa Health Services and other health care providers and it is important to have an understanding of resident perception of the services provided. Responses to these questions will allow the city to track changes in self-reported health trends over time.

Self-Reported Health Questions	Scientific Results 2013	Non-scientific Results 2013
When asked "How would you rate your health?", residents responded as follows:		
Excellent	25%	21%
Very good	23%	43%
Good	38%	27%
Fair	12%	8%
Poor	2%	1%
When asked to compare their health in general now to a year ago, residents responded as follows:		
Much better now than a year ago	15%	6%
Somewhat better now than one year ago	15%	11%
About the same	59%	71%
Somewhat worse now than one year ago	9%	12%
Much worse now than one year ago	2%	0%

Residents were asked to rate the community's health services, as well as the availability of health care, high quality affordable food and preventive health care services. The availability of affordable quality food was rated more positively, while the availability of affordable quality health care was rated less favorably by residents.

Health and Wellness Access (rating service as either "good" or "excellent")	Scientific Results 2013	Non-scientific Results 2013
Availability of preventative health services	34%	48%
Availability of affordable quality food	36%	32%
Availability of affordable quality health care	27%	45%

Housing and Development

The survey asked respondents to reflect on the availability of affordable housing as well as the variety of housing options. The survey asked residents to evaluate the quality of new development.

Housing Options (rating service as either “good” or “excellent”)	Scientific Results 2013	Non-scientific Results 2013
Availability of affordable housing	34%	39%
Variety of housing options	28%	48%
Overall quality of new development in Richmond	23%	45%

Contact with and impressions of City of Richmond

Respondents were also asked to rate their experience with the City of Richmond’s government. Below are the scientific and non-scientific survey results.

Government (rating service as either “good” or “excellent”)	Scientific Results 2013	Non-scientific Results 2013
Job Richmond government does at welcoming citizen involvement	31%	54%
The value of services for the taxes paid to Richmond	35%	41%
The overall direction that Richmond is taking	36%	59%
Overall image or reputation of Richmond	6%	8%
Services provided by City of Richmond	34%	53%

Focus Areas for the Next 2 Years

In a policy question created by City staff, residents were asked how important specific issues are for the city to address within the next two (2) years. The list below lists the shows the top six (6) areas that residents stated was either essential or very important for the city to address. The results are very similar for this question.

Focus Areas	Scientific Results 2013	Non-scientific Results 2013
Developing job training opportunities –	88%	83%
Improving street paving conditions	86%	80%
Improving environmental quality –	84%	83%
Increasing street and pedestrian lighting –	80%	77%
Reducing crime	96%	96%
Addressing blighted properties	87%	85%

Support for Tax Increase

When asked to what extent residents would support or oppose a tax increase for the specific items, residents responded as “strongly supporting” or “somewhat supporting” the following items:

Support for Tax Increases	Scientific Results 2013	Non-scientific Results 2013
Street and road repairs and construction	76%	71%
Recreation and park development	74%	75%
Library services	70%	68%
Paramedics	69%	72%
Enhanced street lighting and landscaping	69%	71%
Storm water facilities to restore creeks and prevent flooding	54%	67%

The ratings for this question are also similar when comparing the scientific and non-scientific results.

Concluding Thoughts

Although on average the non-scientific survey responses were higher than the responses found in the scientific survey, results from both surveys showed that residents were concerned about issues such as crime, lack of opportunities for youth, the overall appearance and reputation of the City including the need for street paving and code enforcement, economic development, and the quality of public school education.

The survey results allow the City of Richmond to establish city service benchmarks and help identify resident priorities and concerns with the goal of increasing the overall reputation of Richmond and overall quality of life for Richmond residents.

DOCUMENTS ATTACHED:

Attachment 1 – 2013 Supplemental Web Survey Results