

Executive Summary

Survey Background

The National Citizen Survey™ (The NCS™) is a collaborative effort between National Research Center, Inc. (NRC) and the International City/County Management Association (ICMA). Three thousand surveys were mailed to Chandler households, completed surveys were returned by 730 residents (26% of the sample).

It is customary to describe the precision of estimates made from surveys by a “level of confidence” (or margin of error). The 95 percent confidence level for this survey of 730 residents is generally no greater than plus or minus 3 percentage points around any given percent reported for the entire sample.

Survey results were weighted to reflect the demographic profile of all residents in the City of Chandler. (For more information on the survey methodology, see Appendix B in the Report of Results. A copy of the survey materials can be found in Appendix C of the Report of Results.)

Summary of Normative Comparisons

Participation in the ICMA Citizen Survey allows cities to compare their survey results against those compiled by other cities. Jurisdictions are compared against the average rating from all comparison jurisdictions in which a similar question was asked and categorized as either “above”, “below” or “similar to” (within 2 points of) the average (norm).

Evaluated against these normative comparisons for jurisdictions with populations of 150,000 or more, the following items were:

Above the Norm:

- ❖ Chandler as a place to live.
- ❖ Neighborhood as a place to live.
- ❖ Chandler as a place to raise children.
- ❖ Chandler as a place to work.
- ❖ Chandler as a place to retire.
- ❖ Openness and acceptance of people with diverse backgrounds.
- ❖ Overall appearance.
- ❖ Shopping opportunities.
- ❖ Job opportunities.
- ❖ Overall image/reputation.
- ❖ Overall quality of new development.
- ❖ Access to affordable quality health care.
- ❖ Ease of car travel.
- ❖ Safety from fire.
- ❖ Safety in neighborhood during the day.
- ❖ Safety in neighborhood after dark.
- ❖ Safety in parks after dark.
- ❖ Police services.
- ❖ Fire services.
- ❖ Emergency medical services.
- ❖ Crime prevention.
- ❖ Fire prevention and education.

- ❖ Traffic enforcement.
- ❖ Street repair.
- ❖ Street cleaning.
- ❖ Street lighting.
- ❖ Sidewalk maintenance.
- ❖ Traffic signal timing.
- ❖ Amount of public parking.
- ❖ Quality of City parks.
- ❖ Quality of recreation programs or classes.
- ❖ Range/variety of recreation programs and classes.
- ❖ Quality of recreation centers/facilities.
- ❖ Accessibility of parks.
- ❖ Appearance/maintenance of parks.
- ❖ Appearance of recreation centers/facilities.
- ❖ Public library services.
- ❖ Variety of Library Materials.
- ❖ Quality of garbage collection.
- ❖ Quality of recycling.
- ❖ Quality of storm drainage.
- ❖ Quality of sewer services.
- ❖ Quality of land use, planning and zoning.
- ❖ Quality of code enforcement.
- ❖ Quality of animal control.
- ❖ Quality of economic development.
- ❖ Quality of services to seniors.
- ❖ Quality of services to youth.
- ❖ Quality of services to low-income people.
- ❖ Quality of public information services.
- ❖ Quality of municipal courts.
- ❖ Quality of cable television.
- ❖ Overall quality of services provided by the City.
- ❖ Overall quality of services provided by the federal government.
- ❖ Overall quality of services provided by the state.
- ❖ Knowledge of City employees.
- ❖ Responsiveness of City employees.
- ❖ Courtesy of City employees.
- ❖ Overall impression of City employees.
- ❖ Value received for City taxes paid.
- ❖ Pleased with direction City is taking.
- ❖ City government welcomes citizen involvement.
- ❖ City government listens to citizens.

Similar to the Norm:

- ❖ Sense of community.
- ❖ Opportunity to attend cultural activities.
- ❖ Educational opportunities.
- ❖ Access to affordable quality housing.
- ❖ Ease of walking.
- ❖ Safety from violent crime.
- ❖ Safety from property crimes.
- ❖ Safety in downtown area during the day.
- ❖ Safety in parks during the day.
- ❖ Accessibility of recreation centers/facilities.

Below the Norm:

- ❖ Air quality.
- ❖ Recreational opportunities.
- ❖ Access to affordable quality childcare.
- ❖ Ease of bus travel.
- ❖ Ease of bicycle travel.
- ❖ Safety in downtown area after dark.
- ❖ Bus/transit services.
- ❖ Quality of drinking water.

In several cases, Chandler not only ranked as “above the norm” in a particular category, but was also one of the top three out of all similarly sized jurisdictions reporting.

Categories in which Chandler was ranked 1st out of all reporting jurisdictions with populations of 150,000 or more were:

- ❖ Value received for City taxes paid.
- ❖ Pleased with direction City is taking.
- ❖ Quality of municipal courts.
- ❖ Sidewalk maintenance.

Categories in which Chandler was ranked 2nd out of all reporting jurisdictions with populations of 150,000 or more were:

- ❖ City government welcomes citizen involvement.
- ❖ City government listens to citizens.
- ❖ Courtesy of City employees.
- ❖ Openness and acceptance of people with diverse backgrounds.
- ❖ Quality of cable television.
- ❖ Overall quality of new development.
- ❖ Quality of sewer services.

Categories in which Chandler was ranked 3rd out of all reporting jurisdictions with populations of 150,000 or more were:

- ❖ Chandler as a place to work.
- ❖ Overall impression of City employees.
- ❖ Quality of economic development.
- ❖ Quality of public information services.
- ❖ Range/variety of recreation programs and classes.
- ❖ Accessibility of recreation centers/facilities.
- ❖ Amount of public parking.

Quality of Community Life

An additional set of questions asks respondents about the quality of life in their community. Respondents are asked to record their opinions on a scale of “Excellent”, “Fair”, “Good”, or “Poor”. Average responses are translated into a 100-point scale. In comparing to other jurisdictions, scores over 67 on this scale are considered to be above average.

Given the 67-point standard, Chandler rated fairly high in a number of important areas. Overall, Chandler as a place to live received a ranking of 74. Residents rated their feelings of safety in their neighborhoods during the day at 92 out of 100, and safety in parks during the day received a rating of 80.

This portion of the survey also showed that residents are using City services in large numbers. Over 70% of respondents had used public libraries or library services within the past year. Eighty four percent had visited a Chandler Park and 79% read the CityScope citizen newsletter included in their utility bill.

Chandler also scored highly in ratings of public trust, with respondents indicating they receive good value for the taxes they pay, that they are pleased with the overall direction the City is taking and that Chandler welcomes citizen involvement. Overall, the quality of services provided by the City of Chandler received a rating of 67 out of 100, far higher than the service ratings of either the federal or state level governments. Ratings of contact with City employees were also high, ranging from 71 (for Responsiveness and Overall Impression) to 74 (for Courtesy).

Quality of public safety services is another area in which residents felt Chandler provides above average service. Police services were rated at 68 and Fire services were rated at 78, well above the 67-point average. While residents noted that traffic enforcement and crime prevention efforts were not quite where they could be, no category ranked lower than 55 on the 100 point scale.

Other areas where results were consistently somewhat below the 67-point mark included “Quality of Transportation Services”, “Quality of Planning and Code Enforcement Services” and “Quality of Services to Special Populations” (youth, seniors, etc.).

Overall, 94% of residents responded that they were “very” or “somewhat” satisfied living in Chandler.

Results for all quality of community of life questions are included in the complete report.

Geographic and Demographic Subgroup Comparisons

Certain survey data response sets were also broken down by geographic and demographic subgroups to facilitate comparisons of resident perceptions as they pertain to certain locations in the city or to certain demographic profiles.

For geographic comparisons, responses were grouped by the three following areas:

- ❖ West of Price Road/101
- ❖ East of Price Road/101 and north of Pecos
- ❖ East of Price Road/101 and south of Pecos

Those respondents located West of Price Road/101 or East of Price Road/101 and south of Pecos tended to rate quality of life in and overall characteristics of Chandler more highly than did their counterparts residing East of Price Road/101 and north of Pecos. These residents were also more likely than their neighbors to view issues such as run down buildings, illegal dumping in vacant lots and alleys, drugs, crime etc. as problems in Chandler. Despite these concerns, residents in this area did not appear to feel significantly less safe in their communities, did not report more frequent instances of crime, and they did not rate overall service quality provided by the City of Chandler any lower than did neighboring areas. In fact, residents in this area tended to rate the quality of contact with City employees and the level of public trust more highly than did residents in either of the other two geographic areas. Results for additional geographic comparisons are included with the complete report.

In terms of demographic responses, those residing in Chandler for two to 20 years tended to give out the highest ratings in terms of quality of life, as did those with pre-tax income of \$100,000 or more and those between the ages of 35 and 44. Quality of life ratings were lower among respondents from the Spanish/Hispanic/Latino population than those among the non-Spanish/Hispanic/Latino demographic.

Additional comparisons based on demographic categories are included in the complete report.