

THE NCSTM
The National Citizen SurveyTM

Park City, UT

Trends over Time

2015



NRC

National Research Center Inc

2955 Valmont Road Suite 300
Boulder, Colorado 80301
n-r-c.com • 303-444-7863

ICMA

Leaders at the Core of Better Communities

777 North Capitol Street NE Suite 500
Washington, DC 20002
icma.org • 800-745-8780

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 NCS communities. The NCS captures residents' opinions within the three pillars of a community (Community Characteristics, Governance and Participation) across eight central facets of community (Safety, Mobility, Natural Environment, Built Environment, Economy, Recreation and Wellness, Education and Enrichment and Community Engagement). This report discusses trends over time, comparing the 2015 ratings for Park City to its previous survey results in 2011 and 2013. 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 between the 2013 and 2015 surveys, otherwise the comparison between 2013 and 2015 are noted as being “similar.” Additionally, benchmark comparisons 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 2015 generally remained stable. Of the 128 items for which comparisons were available, 101 items were rated similarly in 2013 and 2015, nine items showed a decrease in ratings and 18 showed an increase in ratings. Notable trends over time included the following:

- Overall, most aspects of Community Characteristics remained stable from 2013 to 2015. Ratings increased for employment opportunities, K-12 education and Park City as a place to raise children. Ratings decreased from 2013 to 2015 for traffic flow, ease of travel by car, public parking, housing opportunities and Park City as a place to work.
- Within the pillar of Governance, ratings decreased for traffic enforcement, cable television and the overall direction of Park City. Ratings increased from 2013 to 2015 for street repair, street cleaning, sidewalk maintenance and drinking water.
- Several rates of Participation increased from 2013 to 2015. More Park City residents reported that they had carpooled, conserved water, made their homes more energy efficient, worked in Park City, used Park City recreation centers, listened/watched a local public meeting, volunteered, participated in a club or read or watched local news. Further, fewer Park City residents reported observing a code violation and more Park City residents had a positive economic outlook. However, more Park City residents were under housing cost stress in 2015 compared to 2013.

The National Citizen Survey™

Table 1: Community Characteristics General

	Percent rating positively (e.g., excellent/good)			2015 rating compared to 2013	Comparison to benchmark		
	2011	2013	2015		2011	2013	2015
Overall quality of life	98%	96%	96%	Similar	Much higher	Higher	Higher
Overall image	96%	92%	92%	Similar	Much higher	Higher	Higher
Place to live	99%	94%	97%	Similar	Much higher	Higher	Higher
Neighborhood	91%	92%	91%	Similar	Much higher	Higher	Higher
Place to raise children	90%	85%	93%	Higher	Much higher	Higher	Higher
Place to retire	79%	77%	78%	Similar	Much higher	Higher	Higher
Overall appearance	97%	91%	94%	Similar	Much higher	Higher	Higher

Table 2: Community Characteristics by Facet

		Percent rating positively (e.g., excellent/good, very/somewhat safe)			2015 rating compared to 2013	Comparison to benchmark			
		2011	2013	2015		2011	2013	2015	
Safety	Overall feeling of safety	NA	96%	99%	Similar	NA	Higher	Higher	
	Safe in neighborhood	98%	97%	100%	Similar	Much higher	Similar	Similar	
	Safe downtown area	98%	97%	98%	Similar	Much higher	Higher	Higher	
Mobility	Overall ease of travel	NA	85%	81%	Similar	NA	NA	Similar	
	Paths and walking trails	94%	91%	94%	Similar	Much higher	Much higher	Much higher	
	Ease of walking	92%	88%	90%	Similar	Much higher	Much higher	Higher	
	Travel by bicycle	94%	84%	85%	Similar	Much higher	Much higher	Much higher	
	Travel by public transportation	NA	89%	84%	Similar	NA	Much higher	Much higher	
	Travel by car	75%	66%	53%	Lower	Much higher	Similar	Similar	
	Public parking	NA	50%	35%	Lower	NA	NA	Lower	
	Traffic flow	68%	61%	41%	Lower	Much higher	Similar	Similar	
	Natural Environment	Overall natural environment	94%	93%	94%	Similar	Much higher	Much higher	Higher
		Cleanliness	93%	91%	95%	Similar	Much higher	Higher	Higher
Air quality		92%	90%	91%	Similar	Much higher	Higher	Higher	
Overall built environment		NA	77%	75%	Similar	NA	NA	Similar	
New development in Park City		60%	62%	56%	Similar	Similar	Similar	Similar	
Built Environment	Affordable quality housing	26%	23%	22%	Similar	Much lower	Lower	Much lower	
	Housing options	40%	42%	30%	Lower	Much lower	Lower	Much lower	
	Public places	NA	91%	90%	Similar	NA	NA	Much higher	
	Overall economic health	NA	81%	81%	Similar	NA	NA	Higher	
	Vibrant downtown/commercial area	NA	77%	79%	Similar	NA	NA	Much higher	
Economy	Business and services	72%	71%	74%	Similar	Higher	Similar	Similar	
	Cost of living	NA	26%	19%	Similar	NA	NA	Lower	
	Shopping opportunities	63%	72%	76%	Similar	Much higher	Higher	Higher	
	Employment opportunities	43%	41%	49%	Higher	Much higher	Similar	Higher	

The National Citizen Survey™

		Percent rating positively (e.g., excellent/good, very/somewhat safe)			2015 rating compared to 2013	Comparison to benchmark		
		2011	2013	2015		2011	2013	2015
	Place to visit	NA	96%	98%	Similar	NA	Much higher	Much higher
	Place to work	72%	75%	64%	Lower	Much higher	Higher	Similar
Recreation and Wellness	Health and wellness	NA	94%	93%	Similar	NA	NA	Much higher
	Preventive health services	75%	72%	79%	Similar	Much higher	Similar	Higher
	Health care	69%	67%	71%	Similar	Much higher	Higher	Similar
	Recreational opportunities	98%	96%	97%	Similar	Much higher	Much higher	Much higher
	Fitness opportunities	NA	95%	97%	Similar	NA	NA	Much higher
	Religious or spiritual events and activities	86%	88%	84%	Similar	Higher	Similar	Similar
Education and Enrichment	Cultural/arts/music activities	75%	93%	88%	Similar	Much higher	Much higher	Much higher
	Adult education	NA	62%	60%	Similar	NA	NA	Similar
	K-12 education	84%	78%	87%	Higher	Much higher	Similar	Similar
	Child care/preschool	31%	51%	51%	Similar	Much lower	Similar	Similar
Community Engagement	Social events and activities	89%	91%	92%	Similar	Much higher	Much higher	Much higher
	Neighborliness	NA	69%	67%	Similar	NA	NA	Similar
	Openness and acceptance	68%	68%	65%	Similar	Higher	Similar	Similar
	Opportunities to participate in community matters	84%	84%	85%	Similar	Much higher	Higher	Higher
	Opportunities to volunteer	90%	91%	92%	Similar	Much higher	Higher	Higher

Table 3: Governance General

	Percent rating positively (e.g., excellent/good)			2015 rating compared to 2013	Comparison to benchmark		
	2011	2013	2015		2011	2013	2015
Services provided by the Park City Municipal Government	83%	80%	80%	Similar	Higher	Similar	Similar
Customer service	78%	83%	82%	Similar	Higher	Similar	Similar
Value of services for taxes paid	70%	66%	71%	Similar	Much higher	Similar	Similar
Overall direction	70%	64%	50%	Lower	Much higher	Similar	Similar
Welcoming citizen involvement	80%	73%	66%	Similar	Much higher	Higher	Similar
Confidence in City government	NA	66%	58%	Similar	NA	NA	Similar
Acting in the best interest of Park City	NA	66%	63%	Similar	NA	NA	Similar
Being honest	NA	66%	72%	Similar	NA	NA	Similar
Treating all residents fairly	NA	56%	61%	Similar	NA	NA	Similar
Services provided by the Federal Government	44%	43%	49%	Similar	Similar	Similar	Similar

Table 4: Governance by Facet

	Percent rating positively (e.g., excellent/good)			2015 rating compared to 2013	Comparison to benchmark			
	2011	2013	2015		2011	2013	2015	
Safety	Police	81%	77%	83%	Similar	Similar	Similar	Similar
	Fire	94%	95%	97%	Similar	Similar	Similar	Similar
	Ambulance/EMS	93%	95%	96%	Similar	Similar	Similar	Similar
	Crime prevention	82%	82%	85%	Similar	Much higher	Higher	Higher

The National Citizen Survey™

		Percent rating positively (e.g., excellent/good)			2015 rating compared to 2013	Comparison to benchmark		
		2011	2013	2015		2011	2013	2015
	Fire prevention	83%	81%	86%	Similar	Higher	Similar	Similar
	Animal control	69%	58%	58%	Similar	Higher	Similar	Similar
	Emergency preparedness	65%	61%	69%	Similar	Similar	Similar	Similar
Mobility	Traffic enforcement	62%	73%	60%	Lower	Similar	Similar	Similar
	Street repair	37%	47%	63%	Higher	Similar	Similar	Similar
	Street cleaning	70%	74%	85%	Higher	Higher	Similar	Higher
	Street lighting	69%	79%	77%	Similar	Higher	Higher	Similar
	Snow removal	77%	83%	89%	Similar	Much higher	Higher	Higher
	Sidewalk maintenance	67%	68%	77%	Higher	Much higher	Similar	Higher
	Traffic signal timing	56%	62%	60%	Similar	Similar	Similar	Similar
	Bus or transit services	97%	94%	91%	Similar	Much higher	Much higher	Much higher
	Garbage collection	88%	82%	87%	Similar	Higher	Similar	Similar
	Natural Environment	Recycling	80%	68%	70%	Similar	Much higher	Similar
Drinking water		43%	49%	62%	Higher	Much lower	Lower	Similar
Natural areas preservation		75%	79%	75%	Similar	Much higher	Higher	Higher
Open space		NA	82%	78%	Similar	NA	Similar	Higher
Built Environment		Storm drainage	82%	77%	80%	Similar	Much higher	Similar
	Sewer services	79%	85%	84%	Similar	Higher	Similar	Similar
	Power utility	86%	82%	83%	Similar	Higher	Similar	Similar
	Utility billing	NA	78%	78%	Similar	NA	Similar	Similar
	Land use, planning and zoning	57%	56%	52%	Similar	Much higher	Similar	Similar
	Code enforcement	58%	61%	60%	Similar	Much higher	Similar	Similar
	Cable television	NA	64%	50%	Lower	NA	Similar	Similar
	Economy	Economic development	58%	57%	62%	Similar	Much higher	Similar
Recreation and Wellness	City parks	98%	97%	96%	Similar	Much higher	Higher	Higher
	Recreation programs	94%	92%	92%	Similar	Much higher	Higher	Higher
	Recreation centers	91%	96%	95%	Similar	Much higher	Much higher	Much higher
	Health services	84%	82%	81%	Similar	Much higher	Higher	Higher
Education and Enrichment	Special events	NA	86%	85%	Similar	NA	Higher	Higher
	Public libraries	92%	95%	95%	Similar	Much higher	Similar	Higher
Community Engagement	Public information	83%	82%	78%	Similar	Much higher	Similar	Similar

Table 5: Participation General

	Percent rating positively (e.g., always/sometimes, more than once a month, yes)			2015 rating compared to 2013	Comparison to benchmark		
	2011	2013	2015		2011	2013	2015
Sense of community	87%	74%	74%	Similar	Much higher	Higher	Similar
Recommend Park City	96%	94%	92%	Similar	Much higher	Similar	Similar

The National Citizen Survey™

	Percent rating positively (e.g., always/sometimes, more than once a month, yes)			2015 rating compared to 2013	Comparison to benchmark		
	2011	2013	2015		2011	2013	2015
Remain in Park City	89%	87%	88%	Similar	Much higher	Similar	Similar
Contacted Park City employees	57%	47%	50%	Similar	Similar	Similar	Similar

Table 6: Participation by Facet

		Percent rating positively (e.g., always/sometimes, more than once a month, yes)			2015 rating compared to 2013	Comparison to benchmark		
		2011	2013	2015		2011	2013	2015
Safety	Stocked supplies for an emergency	NA	20%	16%	Similar	NA	NA	Much lower
	Did NOT report a crime	NA	83%	75%	Similar	NA	NA	Similar
	Was NOT the victim of a crime	90%	87%	91%	Similar	Higher	Similar	Similar
Mobility	Used public transportation instead of driving	NA	NA	76%	NA	NA	NA	Much higher
	Carpooled instead of driving alone	NA	61%	71%	Higher	NA	NA	Much higher
	Walked or biked instead of driving	NA	87%	91%	Similar	NA	NA	Much higher
Natural Environment	Conserved water	NA	87%	96%	Higher	NA	NA	Higher
	Made home more energy efficient	NA	74%	83%	Higher	NA	NA	Similar
Built Environment	Recycled at home	89%	89%	96%	Similar	Much higher	Similar	Higher
	Did NOT observe a code violation	NA	43%	53%	Higher	NA	NA	Similar
Economy	NOT under housing cost stress	60%	79%	67%	Lower	Lower	Higher	Similar
	Purchased goods or services in Park City	NA	98%	98%	Similar	NA	NA	Similar
	Economy will have positive impact on income	24%	34%	42%	Higher	Much higher	Higher	Higher
Recreation and Wellness	Work in Park City	NA	63%	72%	Higher	NA	NA	Much higher
	Used Park City recreation centers	83%	77%	91%	Higher	Much higher	Much higher	Much higher
	Visited a City park	96%	92%	96%	Similar	Much higher	Similar	Higher
	Ate 5 portions of fruits and vegetables	NA	90%	93%	Similar	NA	NA	Similar
	Participated in moderate or vigorous physical activity	NA	93%	99%	Similar	NA	NA	Higher
Education and Enrichment	In very good to excellent health	NA	87%	87%	Similar	NA	NA	Higher
	Used Park City public libraries	82%	80%	79%	Similar	Much higher	Similar	Higher
	Participated in religious or spiritual activities	36%	36%	32%	Similar	Much lower	Lower	Lower
Community Engagement	Attended a City-sponsored event	NA	85%	88%	Similar	NA	NA	Much higher
	Campaigned for an issue, cause or candidate	NA	31%	33%	Similar	NA	NA	Higher
	Contacted Park City elected officials	NA	28%	25%	Similar	NA	NA	Similar
	Volunteered	70%	52%	66%	Higher	Much higher	Similar	Much higher
	Participated in a club	51%	36%	51%	Higher	Much higher	Similar	Much higher
	Talked to or visited with neighbors	NA	NA	96%	NA	NA	NA	Similar
Done a favor for a neighbor	NA	NA	94%	NA	NA	NA	Higher	

The National Citizen Survey™

	Percent rating positively (e.g., always/sometimes, more than once a month, yes)			2015 rating compared to 2013	Comparison to benchmark		
	2011	2013	2015		2011	2013	2015
Attended a local public meeting	44%	37%	44%	Similar	Much higher	Higher	Much higher
Listened/Watched a local public meeting	NA	13%	32%	Higher	NA	Much lower	Similar
Read or watched local news	NA	83%	91%	Higher	NA	NA	Similar
Voted in local elections	72%	79%	81%	Similar	Similar	Similar	Similar