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# City of Auburn 2016 DirectionFinder ${ }^{\circledR}$ Survey Executive Summary 

## Purpose and Methodology

ETC Institute administered the DirectionFinder® survey for the City of Auburn during the spring of 2016. The survey was administered as part of the City's on-going effort to assess citizen satisfaction with the quality of city services. The City of Auburn has been administering an annual citizen survey since 1985.

Resident Survey. A seven-page survey was mailed to a random sample of households in the City of Auburn. Approximately seven days after the surveys were mailed residents who received the survey were contacted by phone. Those who indicated that they had not returned the survey were given the option of completing it by phone. Of the households that received a survey, a total of 735 completed surveys. The results for the random sample of 735 households have a $95 \%$ level of confidence with a precision of at least +/-3.6\%. In order to better understand how well services are being delivered by the City, ETC Institute geocoded the home address of respondents to the survey (see map below).

The percentage of "don't know" responses has been excluded from many of the graphs shown in this report to facilitate valid comparisons of the results from Auburn with the results from other communities in the DirectionFinder ${ }^{\circledR}$ database. Since the number of "don't know" responses often reflects the utilization and awareness of city services, the percentage of "don't know" responses has been provided in the tabular data section of this report. When the "don't know" responses have been excluded, the text of this report will indicate that the responses have been excluded with the phrase "who had an opinion."


This report contains:
$>$ a summary of the methodology for administering the survey and major findings
$>$ charts showing the overall results for most questions on the survey
$>$ benchmarking data that shows how the results for Auburn compare to other communities
$>$ importance-satisfaction analysis
> tables that show the results for each question on the survey
$>$ a copy of the survey instrument

## Major Findings

$>$ Overall Satisfaction with City Services. The overall City services that residents, who had an opinion, were most satisfied (rating of 4 or 5 on a 5-point scale) with were: police, fire, and ambulance services ( $93 \%$ ), the quality of the City's school system ( $90 \%$ ), and the quality of City library services ( $88 \%$ ). There were no City services that showed significant increases in positive ratings from 2015, and there were four significant decreases: the flow of traffic and congestion management (-11\%), the quality of parks \& recreation services ($6 \%$ ), maintenance of city infrastructure ( $-4 \%$ ), and effectiveness of the city's communication with the public.
*Note: changes of $4 \%$ or more were statistically significant
$>$ Overall Priorities. The overall areas that residents thought should receive the most emphasis from the City of Auburn over the next two years were: 1) flow of traffic and congestion management, 2) the maintenance of city infrastructure and 3) the quality of the City's school system.
$>$ Perceptions of the City. Most ( $91 \%$ ) of the residents surveyed, who had an opinion, were very satisfied with the quality of life in the City; only $2 \%$ were dissatisfied and the remaining $7 \%$ gave a neutral rating. Most ( $87 \%$ ) of the residents surveyed, who had an opinion, were also satisfied with the overall image of the City; only $5 \%$ were dissatisfied and the remaining $8 \%$ gave a neutral rating. None of the items related to perceptions of the City showed a significant increase or decrease from 2015.
$>$ Public Safety. The public safety services that residents, who had an opinion, were most satisfied with (rating of 4 or 5 on a 5-point scale) were: the quality of local fire protection $(92 \%)$, the response time of fire personnel $(91 \%)$, and the quality of local police protection $(90 \%)$. The public safety services that residents felt should receive the most emphasis from City leaders over the next two years were: 1) efforts to prevent crime, 2) the visibility of police in neighborhoods and 3) the overall quality of police protection. There were three public safety services that showed significant increases in positive ratings from 2015: police response time $(+5 \%)$, visibility of police in retail areas $(+5 \%)$, and efforts to prevent crime ( $+4 \%$ ). There was one significant decrease: enforcement of traffic laws ( $-4 \%$ ).
$>$ Feeling of Safety in the City. Most (92\%) of the residents surveyed, who had an opinion, generally felt safe (rating of 4 or 5 on a 5-point scale) in Auburn. In addition, ninety-six percent $(96 \%)$ of residents felt safe in their neighborhood during the day and $92 \%$ felt safe in downtown Auburn. There were no safety issues that showed significant increases or decreases in positive ratings from 2015.
$>$ Code Enforcement. The code enforcement services that residents, who had an opinion, were most satisfied with (rating of 4 or 5 on a 5-point scale) were: the clean-up of debris and litter ( $83 \%$ ) and the cleanup of large junk and abandoned vehicles ( $80 \%$ ). The code enforcement services that residents felt should receive the most emphasis from City leaders over the next two years were: 1) the cleanup of debris/litter and 2) the cleanup of overgrown and weedy lots. There were two significant increases in positive ratings for code enforcement services from 2015: control of nuisance animals ( $+5 \%$ ) and cleanup of overgrown and weedy lots $(+4 \%)$. There were no significant decreases.
$>$ Garbage and Water Services. The garage and water services that residents, who had an opinion, were most satisfied with (rating of 4 or 5 on a 5 -point scale) were: residential garbage collection services ( $92 \%$ ), yard waste removal service ( $85 \%$ ) and water service $(85 \%)$. The garbage and water services that residents felt should receive the most emphasis from City leaders over the next two years were: 1) the material types accepted for recycling and 2) overall curbside recycling service. There were no significant increases and one significant decrease in garbage and water services rated from 2015: overall curbside recycling service (-4\%).
$>$ Development and Redevelopment in the City. The development and redevelopment services that residents, who had an opinion, were most satisfied with (rating of 4 or 5 on a 5point scale) were: the overall appearance of Downtown Auburn (79\%) and the quality of new industrial development ( $67 \%$ ). There were four significant increases in positive ratings from 2015 with regard to development and redevelopment in the City: overall appearance of Opelika Road $(+20 \%)$, redevelopment of abandoned/under-utilized properties $(+12 \%)$, the quality of new residential development $(+5 \%)$, and the quality of new retail development $(+4 \%)$. There was one significant decrease: the City's planning for future growth (-6\%).
$>$ Parks and Recreation. The parks and recreation services that residents, who had an opinion, were most satisfied with (rating of 4 or 5 on a 5 -point scale) were: the maintenance of City parks ( $84 \%$ ), the maintenance of walking trails ( $83 \%$ ), the maintenance of cemeteries $(82 \%)$, the maintenance of outdoor athletic fields ( $80 \%$ ), and the quality of outdoor athletic fields ( $79 \%$ ), and the quality of community recreation centers ( $79 \%$ ). The parks and recreation service that residents felt should receive the most emphasis from City leaders over the next two years were: 1) maintenance of parks, 2) quality of special events, and 3) maintenance of biking paths and lanes. There were three parks and recreation services that showed significant increases in positive ratings from 2015: quality of swimming pools $(+7 \%)$, quality of community recreation centers $(+4 \%)$, and maintenance of swimming pools $(+4 \%)$. There were three significant decreases in positive ratings for parks and recreation
services: quality of senior programs (-9\%), special needs/therapeutics programs ( $-7 \%$ ), and ease of registering for programs (-4\%).
$>$ City Maintenance. The maintenance services that residents, who had an opinion, were most satisfied with (rating of 4 or 5 on a 5-point scale) were: the maintenance of downtown Auburn ( $89 \%$ ), the maintenance of traffic signals ( $89 \%$ ), and the maintenance of street signs $(88 \%)$. The maintenance service that residents felt should receive the most emphasis from City leaders over the next two years were: 1) the maintenance of streets, and 2) the adequacy of city street lighting. There were two significant increases in positive ratings in maintenance services from 2015: adequacy of city street lighting (+6\%) and cleanup of debris/litter in/near roadways (+4\%). There were no significant decreases.
$>$ Downtown Auburn. The aspects of Downtown Auburn that residents, who had an opinion, were most satisfied with (rating of 4 or 5 on a 5-point scale) were: the cleanliness of downtown areas ( $93 \%$ ), signage and wayfinding ( $85 \%$ ), feeling of safety of downtown at night ( $84 \%$ ), and pedestrian accessibility ( $84 \%$ ). The aspects of Downtown that residents felt should receive the most emphasis from City leaders over the next two years were: 1) availability of parking and 2) the feeling of safety at night. There were four significant increases in positive ratings from 2015 with regard to downtown Auburn: signage and wayfinding $(+8 \%)$, landscaping and green space $(+7 \%)$, availability of outdoor dining venues $(+6 \%)$, and availability of public event space $(+4 \%)$. There was one significant decrease: quality of public events held downtown (-6\%).
$>$ City Communication. Seventy-six percent (76\%) of the residents surveyed, who had an opinion, were satisfied (rating of 4 or 5 on a 5 -point scale) with the quality of the City's OPEN LINE newsletter and $67 \%$ were satisfied with the availability of information on parks and recreation programs and services. There were no increases in positive ratings in any of the communication areas rated from 2015, and there was one significant decrease: quality of OPEN LINE newsletter (-4\%).

## Other Findings

$>$ Ninety-seven percent $(97 \%)$ of the residents surveyed, who had an opinion, rated the City as an excellent or good place to live; only $1 \%$ felt it was a below average place to live.
$>$ Ninety-seven percent $(97 \%)$ of the residents surveyed, who had an opinion, rated the City as an excellent or good place to raise children; only $1 \%$ felt it was a below average place to raise children.
$>$ Two-thirds (66\%) of residents surveyed, who had an opinion, were satisfied (rating of 4 or 5 on a 5-point scale) with ease of travel by car in Auburn; $13 \%$ were neutral and $21 \%$ were dissatisfied.
$>$ Fifty-eight percent (58\%) of the residents surveyed reported they did not use the city's bicycle lanes and facilities; 23\% occasionally used the bicycle lanes and facilities, $5 \%$ used them monthly, and $10 \%$ used them weekly or daily.
$>$ The primary sources that residents received information about city issues, services and events were: word of mouth (64\%), the local newspaper (61\%), and the Open Line newsletter (58\%).
$>$ Eighty-seven percent ( $87 \%$ ) of residents who had contacted the City during the past year felt it was very easy or somewhat easy to contact the person they needed to reach.

## Trends

A summary of the long-term trends (2006 to 2016) is provided on the following page.

Long-Term Trends. Positive ratings for the City of Auburn improved or stayed the same in 64 of the 68 areas that were assessed in both 2006 and 2016; 50 of these improvements were statistically significant (increases of $4 \%$ or more were significant). There were decreases in positive ratings in only 4 of the 68 areas that were rated in both 2006 and 2016, and two of these decreases were statistically significant (decreases of $4 \%$ or more were significant). The significant changes from 2006 to 2016 are shown in the table below.

| Category by percentage of respondents who rated the item as a 4 or 5 on a 5 -point scale (excluding don't knows) | 2016 | 2006 | Change <br> From 2006 | Category |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| SIGNIFICANT INCREASES |  |  |  |  |
| Quality of community recreation centers | 79\% | 52\% | 27\% | Parks and Recreation |
| Maintenance of walking trails | 83\% | 58\% | 25\% | Parks and Recreation |
| Community recreation centers | 77\% | 52\% | 25\% | Parks and Recreation |
| Maintenance of swimming pools | 70\% | 48\% | 22\% | Parks and Recreation |
| Visibility of police in retail areas | 80\% | 60\% | 20\% | Public Safety |
| Visibility of police in neighborhoods | 79\% | 61\% | 18\% | Public Safety |
| Ease of pedestrian travel in Auburn | 65\% | 47\% | 18\% | Traffic Flow and Transportation |
| Maintenance of streets | 74\% | 57\% | 17\% | Maintenance |
| Quality of swimming pools | 65\% | 48\% | 17\% | Parks and Recreation |
| Police safety education programs | 70\% | 54\% | 16\% | Public Safety |
| Maintenance of biking paths/lanes | 73\% | 58\% | 15\% | Parks and Recreation |
| Fire personnel emergency response time | 91\% | 76\% | 15\% | Public Safety |
| Quality of fire safety education programs | 76\% | 62\% | 14\% | Public Safety |
| Maintenance of street signs | 88\% | 75\% | 13\% | Maintenance |
| In City parks | 78\% | 66\% | 12\% | Feeling of Safety |
| Enforcement of traffic laws | 70\% | 58\% | 12\% | Public Safety |
| Quality of local ambulance service | 82\% | 70\% | 12\% | Public Safety |
| Maintenance of sidewalks | 76\% | 65\% | 11\% | Maintenance |
| Police response time | 84\% | 73\% | 11\% | Public Safety |
| Utility Billing Office customer service | 81\% | 71\% | 10\% | Garbage \& Water |
| Overall cleanliness of streets/public areas | 84\% | 74\% | 10\% | Maintenance |
| Adequacy of city street lighting | 71\% | 61\% | 10\% | Maintenance |
| Maintenance of downtown Auburn | 89\% | 80\% | 9\% | Maintenance |
| Maintenance of traffic signals | 89\% | 80\% | 9\% | Maintenance |
| Mowing/trimming along streets and public areas | 83\% | 74\% | 9\% | Maintenance |
| Maintenance of cemeteries | 82\% | 73\% | 9\% | Parks and Recreation |
| Overall quality of City services | 86\% | 77\% | 9\% | Perceptions |
| Overall quality of fire protection | 92\% | 83\% | 9\% | Public Safety |
| Residential garbage collection | 92\% | 84\% | 8\% | Garbage \& Water |
| Maintenance of city infrastructure | 68\% | 60\% | 8\% | Overall Satisfaction |
| Enforcement of city codes \& ordinances | 64\% | 56\% | 8\% | Overall Satisfaction |
| Quality of police, fire, \& ambulance services | 93\% | 85\% | 8\% | Overall Satisfaction |
| Fees charged for recreation programs | 68\% | 60\% | 8\% | Parks and Recreation |
| Overall quality of police protection | 90\% | 82\% | 8\% | Public Safety |
| Efforts to prevent crime | 77\% | 69\% | 8\% | Public Safety |
| Control of nuisance animals | 68\% | 60\% | 8\% | Codes and Ordinances |
| In commercial and retail areas | 84\% | 77\% | 7\% | Feeling of Safety |
| Yard waste removal service | 85\% | 78\% | 7\% | Garbage \& Water |
| Water service | 85\% | 78\% | 7\% | Garbage \& Water |
| Value received for your city tax dollars and fees | 75\% | 68\% | 7\% | Perceptions |
| Cleanup of overgrown and weedy lots | 65\% | 58\% | 7\% | Codes and Ordinances |
| Efforts to remove dilapidated structures | 64\% | 57\% | 7\% | Codes and Ordinances |
| Quality of the city's website | 67\% | 61\% | 6\% | City Communication |
| Overall image of the City | 87\% | 81\% | 6\% | Perceptions |
| Overall feeling of safety in Auburn | 92\% | 87\% | 5\% | Feeling of Safety |
| Quality of adult athletic programs | 64\% | 59\% | 5\% | Parks and Recreation |
| Overall appearance of the City | 76\% | 71\% | 5\% | Perceptions |
| Overall quality of life in the City | 91\% | 86\% | 5\% | Perceptions |
| Enforcement of loud music | 62\% | 57\% | 5\% | Codes and Ordinances |
| Ease of registering for programs | 69\% | 65\% | 4\% | Parks and Recreation |
| SIGNIFICANT DECREASES |  |  |  |  |
| Quality of parks \& recreation services | 78\% | 83\% | 5\% | Overall Satisfaction |
| Curbside recycling service | 70\% | 74\% | 4\% | Garbage \& Water |

## How Auburn Compares to Other Communities

The City of Auburn is setting the standard for the delivery of city services compared to other U.S. communities. Auburn rated above the national average for other U.S. communities in 61 of the 62 the areas that were assessed; 53 of which were significantly above the national average ( $5 \%$ or more above the national average). Auburn rated below the national average in only 1 area, which was significantly below the national average. The areas where Auburn rated significantly above or below the national average are shown in the table below.
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Charts and Graphs


Source: ETC Institute (2016)

TRENDS: Overall Satisfaction With City Services by Major Category (2006, 2015, \& 2016)
by percentage of respondents who rated the item as a 4 or 5 on a 5 -point scale (excluding don't knows)


## Q2. Major Categories of City Services That Should Receive the Most Emphasis Over the Next Two Years

by percentage of residents surveyed who selected the item as one of their top three choices


Source: ETC Institute (2016)


Source: ETC Institute (2016)

TRENDS: Overall Perceptions of the City of Auburn (2006, 2015, \& 2016)
by percentage of respondents who rated the item as a 4 or 5 on a 5-point scale (excluding don't knows)


Q4. Quality of Life in the City of Auburn
by percentage of residents surveyed who rated the item as a 1 to 5 on a 5 -point scale (excluding don't knows)


Source: ETC Institute (2016)

TRENDS: Ratings of the Quality of Life in the City of Auburn (2006, 2015, \& 2016)


## CITY LEADERSHIP



Source: ETC Institute (2016)

TRENDS: Overall Satisfaction with City Leadership (2006, 2015, \& 2016)
by percentage of respondents who rated the item as a 4 or 5 on a 5 -point scale (excluding don't knows)


## PUBLIC SAFETY



Source: ETC Institute (2016)



Source: ETC Institute (2016)

## FEELING OF SAFETY

Q8. Feelings of Safety in Auburn
by percentage of residents surveyed who rated the item as a 1 to 5 on a 5 -point scale (excluding don't knows)


Source: ETC Institute (2016)


## CODE ENFORCEMENT



Source: ETC Institute (2016)

TRENDS: Overall Satisfaction with Enforcement of Codes and Ordinances $(2013,2015 \& 2016)$
by percentage of respondents who rated the item as a 4 or 5 on a 5 -point scale (excluding don't knows)



## GARBAGE and WATER SERVICES

## Q11. Satisfaction with Garbage and Water Services



Source: ETC Institute (2016)

TRENDS: Satisfaction with Garbage and Water Services (2006, 2015, \& 2016)


## Q12. Garbage and Water Services That Should Be Emphasized Most Over the Next Two Years

by percentage of residents surveyed who selected the item as one of their top two choices


## DEVELOPMENT AND REDEVELOPMENT IN THE CITY



Source: ETC Institute (2016)

TRENDS: Overall Satisfaction with Development and Redevelopment in the City (2013, 2015, \& 2016)
by percentage of respondents who rated the item as a 4 or 5 on a 5 -point scale (excluding don't knows)


## PARKS \& RECREATION




## Q15. Parks and Recreation Services That Should Be Emphasized Most Over the Next Two Years

by percentage of residents surveyed who selected the item as one of their top two choices


Source: ETC Institute (2016)

## TRAFFIC FLOW and TRANSPORTATION



Source: ETC Institute (2016)


## Q17. How often do you use the city's bicycle lanes and facilities?

by percentage of residents surveyed


Source: ETC Institute (2016)

## CITY MAINTENANCE

## Q18. Satisfaction with Various Aspects of City Maintenance

by percentage of residents surveyed who rated the item as a 1 to 5 on a 5 -point scale (excluding don't knows)


Source: ETC Institute (2016)

# TRENDS: Overall Satisfaction with City Maintenance (2006, 2015, \& 2016) 




## DOWNTOWN AUBURN

## Q20. Satisfaction with Various Aspects of

 Downtown Auburn

Source: ETC Institute (2016)

## TRENDS: Overall Satisfaction with Downtown Auburn (2013, 2015, \& 2016)

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


## Q21. Areas of Downtown Auburn That Should Receive

 the Most Emphasis Over the Next Two Yearsby percentage of residents surveyed who selected the item as one of their top three choices


Source: ETC Institute (2016)

## Project or Initiative Priorities



## CITY COMMUNICATION



Source: ETC Institute (2016)

## TRENDS: Overall Satisfaction with City Communication

 (2006, 2015, \& 2016)by percentage of respondents who rated the item as a 4 or 5 on a 5-point scale (excluding don't knows)


Source: ETC Institute (2016)
TRENDS

Q24. Which of the following are your primary sources of information about city issues, services, and events?


Source: ETC Institute (2016)

## CUSTOMER SERVICE

Q25. Have you called or visited the City with a question, problem, or complaint during the past year?
by percentage of residents surveyed


TRENDS: Have you called or visited the City with a question, problem, or complaint during the past year? 2015-2016
by percentage of residents surveyed


Source: ETC Institute (2016)

Q25a. How easy was it to contact the person you needed to reach?
by percentage of respondents who contacted the City in the past year



Q25b. What City department did you contact?
by percentage of respondents who contacted the City in the past year


Source: ETC Institute (2016)

## Q25c. Was the Department You Contacted Responsive to Your Issue?

by percentage of respondents who contacted the City in the past year


## TRENDS: Was the Department You Contacted

 Responsive to Your Issue? (2015-2016)by percentage of respondents who contacted the City in the past year


Source: ETC Institute (2016)

## DEMOGRAPHICS

Q27. Demographics: Ages of people in the household
by percentage of residents surveyed


Source: ETC Institute (2016)

Q28. Demographics: How Many Years Have You Lived in the City of Auburn?


Q29. Demographics: How many people in your household work within the Auburn City Limits?
by percentage of residents surveyed


Source: ETC Institute (2016)

Q30. Demographics: Are you a full time Auburn University student?
by percentage of residents surveyed


Q31. Demographics: Do you own or rent your current residence?
by percentage of residents surveyed


Q32. Demographics: What is Your Age?



Q34. Demographics: Total Annual Household Income
by percentage of residents surveyed


Q35. Demographics: Gender of the Respondents
by percentage of residents surveyed


Male 49\%

Section 2:
Benchmarking Analysis

## DirectionFinder Survey

Year 2016 Benchmarking Summary Report

## Overview

ETC Institute's DirectionFinder ${ }^{\circledR}$ program was originally developed in 1999 to help community leaders across the United States use statistically valid community survey data as a tool for making better decisions. Since November 1999, the survey has been administered in more than 230 cities and counties in 43 states.

This report contains benchmarking data from two sources. The first source is from a national survey that was administered by ETC Institute during the summer of 2015 to a random sample of more than 4,000 residents in the continental United States. The second source is from individual community surveys that were administered in 40 medium-sized cities (population of 20,000 to 199,999 ) between January 2012 and December 2015. The "U.S. Average" shown in this report reflects the overall results of ETC Institute's national survey. The results from individual cities were used as the basis for developing the ranges of performance that are shown in this report for specific types of services. The 40 cities included in the performance ranges that are shown in this report are listed below:

- Abilene, Texas
- Auburn, Alabama
- Baytown, Texas
- Blue Springs, Missouri
- Bryan, Texas
- Chapel Hill, North Carolina
- Columbia, Missouri
- Coral Springs, Florida
- Davenport, lowa
- Dothan, Alabama
- Fort Lauderdale, Florida
- Garden City, Kansas
- Grandview, Missouri
- Hallandale Beach, Florida
- High Point, North Carolina
- Independence, Missouri
- Junction City, Kansas
- Lawrence, Kansas
- Lenexa, Kansas
- Naperville, Illinois
- Newport Beach, California
- Newport News, Virginia
- Olathe, Kansas
- Overland Park, Kansas
- Pflugerville, Texas
- Pueblo, Colorado
- Round Rock, Texas
- Saint Joseph, Missouri
- San Marcos, Texas
- Shawnee, Kansas
- Shoreline, Washington
- Springfield, Missouri
- Tamarac, Florida
- Tempe Arizona
- Vancouver, Washington
- Vestavia Hills, Alabama
- Wentzville, Missouri
- Wilmington, North Carolina
- Winchester, Virginia
- Yuma, Arizona


## Interpreting the Performance Range Charts

The charts on the following pages provide comparisons for several items that were rated on the survey. The horizontal bars show the range of satisfaction among residents in communities that have participated in the DirectionFinder ${ }^{\circledR}$ Survey during the past two years. The lowest and highest satisfaction ratings are listed to the left and right of each bar. The orange dot on each bar shows how the results for Auburn compare to the national average, which is shown as a vertical dash in the middle of each horizontal bar. If the orange dot is located to the right of the vertical dash, the City of Auburn rated above the national average. If the orange dot is located to the left of the vertical dash, the City of Auburn rated below the national average.

## National Benchmarks

Note: The benchmarking data contained in this report is protected intellectual property. Any reproduction of the benchmarking information in this report by persons or organizations not directly affiliated with the City of Auburn, Alabama is not authorized without written consent from ETC Institute.

Overall Satisfaction with Major Categories of City Services Auburn vs. the U.S.
by percentage of respondents who rated the item 4 or 5 on a 5 -point scale





## Overall Ratings of the Community Auburn vs. the U.S.



## Overall Satisfaction with Public Safety Services Auburn vs. the U.S.



Satisfaction with Various Public Safety Services
Provided by Cities - 2016
by percentage of respondents who rated the item 4 or 5 on a 5 -point scale where 5 was "Strongly Agree" and 1 was "Strongly Disagree" (excluding don't knows)


## How Safe Residents Feel in Their Community Auburn vs. the U.S.



Source: 2016 ETC Institute




Overall Satisfaction with City Maintenance Auburn vs. the U.S.
by percentage of respondents who rated the item 4 or 5 on a 5 -point scale where 5 was "very satisfied" and 1 was "very dissatisfied" (excluding don't knows)




Overall Satisfaction with Parks and Recreation Auburn vs. the U.S.
by percentage of respondents who rated the item 4 or 5 on a 5 -point scale where 5 was "very satisfied" and 1 was "very dissatisfied" (excluding don't knows)


## Overall Satisfaction with Code Enforcement Auburn vs. the U.S.





Satisfaction with Various Aspects of City Communications - 2016
by percentage of respondents who rated the item 4 or 5 on a 5-point scale where 5 was "very satisfied" and 1 was "very dissatisfied" (excluding don't knows)

Auburn, $A L$


Overall Satisfaction with Utility/Environmental Services Auburn vs. the U.S.


Source: 2016 ETC Institute


# Importance-Satisfaction Analysis Auburn, Alabama 

## Overview

Today, city officials have limited resources which need to be targeted to activities that are of the most benefit to their citizens. Two of the most important criteria for decision making are (1) to target resources toward services of the highest importance to citizens; and (2) to target resources toward those services where citizens are the least satisfied.

The Importance-Satisfaction (IS) rating is a unique tool that allows public officials to better understand both of these highly important decision making criteria for each of the services they are providing. The Importance-Satisfaction rating is based on the concept that cities will maximize overall citizen satisfaction by emphasizing improvements in those service categories where the level of satisfaction is relatively low and the perceived importance of the service is relatively high.

## Methodology

The rating is calculated by summing the percentage of responses for items selected as the first, second, third and fourth most important services for the City to provide. This sum is then multiplied by 1 minus the percentage of respondents that indicated they were positively satisfied with the City's performance in the related area (the sum of the ratings of 4 and 5 on a 5-point scale excluding "don't knows"). "Don't know" responses are excluded from the calculation to ensure that the satisfaction ratings among service categories are comparable. [IS=Importance $x$ (1-Satisfaction)].

Example of the Calculation. Respondents were asked to identify the major categories of city services they thought should receive the most emphasis over the next two years. Sixty percent ( $60 \%$ ) selected flow of traffic \& congestion management as the most important service for the City to provide.

With regard to satisfaction, $46 \%$ of the residents surveyed rated the city's overall performance with flow of traffic \& congestion management as a " 4 " or a " 5 " on a 5 -point scale (where " 5 " means "very satisfied) excluding "Don't know" responses. The I-S rating for flow of traffic \& congestion management was calculated by multiplying the sum of the most important percentages by 1 minus the sum of the satisfaction percentages. In this example, $60 \%$ was multiplied by $54 \%$ (1-0.46). This calculation yielded an I-S rating of 0.3240 , which was ranked first out of ten major service categories.

The maximum rating is 1.00 and would be achieved when $100 \%$ of the respondents select an item as one of their top three choices to emphasize over the next two years and $0 \%$ indicate that they are positively satisfied with the delivery of the service.

The lowest rating is 0.00 and could be achieved under either one of the following two situations:

- if $100 \%$ of the respondents were positively satisfied with the delivery of the service
- if none $(0 \%)$ of the respondents selected the service as one of the three most important areas for the City to emphasize over the next two years.


## Interpreting the Ratings

Ratings that are greater than or equal to 0.20 identify areas that should receive significantly more emphasis over the next two years. Ratings from .10 to .20 identify service areas that should receive increased emphasis. Ratings less than .10 should continue to receive the current level of emphasis.

- Definitely Increase Emphasis (IS>=0.20)
- Increase Current Emphasis (0.10<=IS<0.20)
- Maintain Current Emphasis (IS<0.10)

The results for Auburn are provided on the following pages.

## Importance-Satisfaction Rating City of Auburn <br> OVERALL

| Category of Service | Most Important $\%$ | Most Important Rank | $\begin{gathered} \text { Satisfaction } \\ \% \end{gathered}$ | Satisfaction Rank | ImportanceSatisfaction Rating | I-S Rating Rank |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Very High Priority (IS >.20) |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Flow of traffic \& congestion management | 60\% | 1 | 46\% | 10 | 0.3240 | 1 |
| High Priority (IS .10-20) |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Maintenance of city infrastructure | 46\% | 2 | 69\% | 7 | 0.1426 | 2 |
| Medium Priority (IS <.10) |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Effectiveness of city's communication w/ public | 25\% | 6 | 63\% | 9 | 0.0920 | 3 |
| Enforcement of city codes and ordinances | 20\% | 7 | 64\% | 8 | 0.0724 | 4 |
| Quality of parks \& recreation services | 27\% | 5 | 78\% | 5 | 0.0597 | 5 |
| Quality of the city's school system | 44\% | 3 | 90\% | 2 | 0.0444 | 6 |
| Collection of garbage, recycling \& yard waste | 13\% | 8 | 82\% | 4 | 0.0239 | 7 |
| Quality of police, fire, \& ambulance services | 28\% | 4 | 93\% | 1 | 0.0207 | 8 |
| Quality of the city's customer service | 7\% | 7 | 73\% | 6 | 0.0188 | 9 |
| Quality of city library services | 5\% | 10 | 88\% | 3 | 0.0060 | 10 |

Note: The I-S Rating is calculated by multiplying the "Most Important" \% by (1-'Satisfaction' \%)

Most Important \%:

Satisfaction \%.

The "Most Important" percentage represents the sum of the first, second, and third
most important responses for each item. Respondents were asked to identify
the items they thought should receive the most emphasis over the next two years.

The "Satisfaction" percentage represents the sum of the ratings "4" and "5" excluding 'don't knows.' Respondents ranked their level of satisfaction with the each of the items on a scale
of 1 to 5 with " 5 " being very satisfied and "1" being very dissatisfied.
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## Importance-Satisfaction Rating <br> City of Auburn <br> PUBLIC SAFETY

| Category of Service | Most Important \% | Most Important Rank Rank | $\begin{gathered} \text { Satisfaction } \\ \% \end{gathered}$ | Satisfaction Rank | ImportanceSatisfaction Rating | I-S Rating Rank |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| High Priority (IS .10-20) |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Efforts to prevent crime | 47\% | 1 | 78\% | 8 | 0.1034 | 1 |
| Medium Priority (IS <.10) |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Visibility of police in neighborhoods | 42\% | 2 | 79\% | 7 | 0.0886 | 2 |
| Enforcement of traffic laws | 22\% | 4 | 70\% | 11 | 0.0662 | 3 |
| Visibility of police in retail areas | 21\% | 5 | 80\% | 6 | 0.0416 | 4 |
| Police safety education programs | 14\% | 8 | 71\% | 10 | 0.0406 | 5 |
| Overall quality of police protection | 37\% | 3 | 90\% | 3 | 0.0370 | 6 |
| Quality of local ambulance service | 20\% | 6 | 82\% | 5 | 0.0354 | 7 |
| Quality of fire safety education programs | 10\% | 10 | 76\% | 9 | 0.0242 | 8 |
| Police response time | 13\% | 9 | 84\% | 4 | 0.0215 | 9 |
| Overall quality of fire protection | 17\% | 7 | 92\% | 1 | 0.0133 | 10 |
| Fire personnel emergency response time | 7\% | 11 | 91\% | 2 | 0.0066 | 11 |

Note: The I-S Rating is calculated by multiplying the "Most Important" \% by (1-'Satisfaction' \%)

Most Important \%

Satisfaction \%: Respondents ranked their level of satisfaction with the each of the items on a scale of 1 to 5 with " 5 " being very satisfied and "1" being very dissatisfied.
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## Importance-Satisfaction Rating <br> City of Auburn <br> CODE ENFORCEMENT

| Category of Service | Most Important \% | Most Important Rank | $\begin{aligned} & \text { Satisfaction } \\ & \% \end{aligned}$ | Satisfaction Rank | ImportanceSatisfaction Rating | I-S Rating Rank |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| High Priority (IS .10-.20) |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Cleanup of overgrown and weedy lots | 38\% | 2 | 65\% | 4 | 0.1349 | 1 |
| Medium Priority (IS $<.10$ ) |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Efforts to remove dilapidated structures | 27\% | 3 | 64\% | 5 | 0.0969 | 2 |
| Control of nuisance animals | 24\% | 4 | 67\% | 3 | 0.0792 | 3 |
| Enforcement of loud music | 19\% | 5 | 62\% | 6 | 0.0728 | 4 |
| Cleanup of debris/litter | 40\% | 1 | 83\% | 1 | 0.0670 | 5 |
| Cleanup of large junk/abandoned vehicles | 16\% | 6 | 79\% | 2 | 0.0336 | 6 |

Note: The I-S Rating is calculated by multiplying the "Most Important" \% by (1-'Satisfaction' \%)

| Most Important \%: | The "Most Important" percentage represents the sum of the first and second <br> most important responses for each item. Respondents were asked to identify <br> the items they thought should receive the most emphasis over the next two years. |
| :--- | :--- |
| Satisfaction \%: | The "Satisfaction" percentage represents the sum of the ratings "4" and " 5 " excluding 'don't knows.' <br> Respondents ranked their level of satisfaction with the each of the items on a scale <br> of 1 to 5 with " $5 " ~ b e i n g ~ v e r y ~ s a t i s f i e d ~ a n d ~ " 1 " ~ b e i n g ~ v e r y ~ d i s s a t i s f i e d . ~$ |

[^0]
## Importance-Satisfaction Rating <br> City of Auburn <br> GARBAGE AND WATER SERVICES

|  | Most <br> Important <br> $\%$ | Most <br> Important <br> Rank | Satisfaction <br> $\%$ | Satisfaction <br> Rank | Importance- <br> Satisfaction <br> Rating | I-S Rating <br> Rank |
| :--- | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Category of Service |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| High Priority (IS .10-.20) | $37 \%$ | 1 | $62 \%$ | 7 | 0.1425 | 1 |
| Material types accepted for recycling |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Medium Priority (IS <.10) | $31 \%$ | 2 | $70 \%$ | 6 | 0.0942 | 2 |
| Curbside recycling service overall | $23 \%$ | 4 | $86 \%$ | 2 | 0.0322 | 3 |
| Water service | $21 \%$ | 5 | $85 \%$ | 3 | 0.0313 | 4 |
| Yard waste removal service | $10 \%$ | 6 | $78 \%$ | 5 | 0.0223 | 5 |
| Recycling at city's drop-off recycling center | $25 \%$ | 3 | $92 \%$ | 1 | 0.0213 | 6 |
| Residential garbage collection service | $9 \%$ | 7 | $81 \%$ | 4 | 0.0170 | 7 |
| Utility Billing Office customer service |  |  |  |  |  |  |

Note: The I-S Rating is calculated by multiplying the "Most Important" \% by (1-'Satisfaction' \%)

| Most Important \%: | The "Most Important" percentage represents the sum of the first and second <br> most important responses for each item. Respondents were asked to identify <br> the items they thought should receive the most emphasis over the next two years. |
| :--- | :--- |
| Satisfaction \%: | The "Satisfaction" percentage represents the sum of the ratings "4" and " 5 " excluding 'don't knows.' <br> Respondents ranked their level of satisfaction with the each of the items on a scale <br> of 1 to 5 with " 5 " being very satisfied and "1" being very dissatisfied. |
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## Importance-Satisfaction Rating <br> City of Auburn <br> PARKS AND RECREATION

|  | Most <br> Important <br> $\%$ | Most <br> Important <br> Rank | Satisfaction <br> $\%$ | Satisfaction <br> Rank | Importance- <br> Satisfaction <br> Rating | I-S Rating <br> Rank |  |
| :--- | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Category of Service |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Medium Priority (IS <.10) | $17 \%$ | 6 | $60 \%$ | 17 | 0.0678 | 1 |  |
| Quality of senior programs | $22 \%$ | 3 | $73 \%$ | 10 | 0.0587 | 2 |  |
| Maintenance of biking paths and lanes | $25 \%$ | 2 | $77 \%$ | 8 | 0.0570 | 3 |  |
| Quality of special events | $35 \%$ | 1 | $84 \%$ | 1 | 0.0550 | 4 |  |
| Maintenance of parks | $12 \%$ | 10 | $55 \%$ | 18 | 0.0540 | 5 |  |
| Quality of special needs/therapeutics programs | $15 \%$ | 7 | $69 \%$ | 12 | 0.0464 | 6 |  |
| Quality of cultural arts programs | $19 \%$ | 5 | $78 \%$ | 7 | 0.0426 | 7 |  |
| Quality of youth athletic programs | $12 \%$ | 11 | $68 \%$ | 14 | 0.0389 | 8 |  |
| Fees charged for recreation programs | $10 \%$ | 15 | $64 \%$ | 16 | 0.0360 | 9 |  |
| Quality of adult athletic programs | $20 \%$ | 4 | $83 \%$ | 2 | 0.0342 | 10 |  |
| Maintenance of walking trails | $14 \%$ | 8 | $77 \%$ | 9 | 0.0329 | 11 |  |
| Quality of community recreation centers | $9 \%$ | 16 | $65 \%$ | 15 | 0.0320 | 12 |  |
| Quality of swimming pools | $10 \%$ | 13 | $69 \%$ | 13 | 0.0312 | 13 |  |
| Ease of registering for programs | $14 \%$ | 9 | $79 \%$ | 6 | 0.0295 | 14 |  |
| Maintenance of community recreation centers | $10 \%$ | 12 | $80 \%$ | 4 | 0.0202 | 15 |  |
| Maintenance of outdoor athletic fields | $10 \%$ | 14 | $81 \%$ | 3 | 0.0190 | 16 |  |
| Maintenance of cemeteries | $9 \%$ | 17 | $79 \%$ | 5 | 0.0189 | 17 |  |
| Quality of outdoor athletic fields | $6 \%$ | 18 | $70 \%$ | 11 | 0.0180 | 18 |  |
| Maintenance of swimming pools |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |

Note: The I-S Rating is calculated by multiplying the "Most Important" \% by (1-'Satisfaction' \%)

Most Important \%:

Satisfaction \%:
The "Satisfaction" percentage represents the sum of the ratings "4" and " 5 " excluding 'don't knows.
Respondents ranked their level of satisfaction with the each of the items on a scale
of 1 to 5 with " 5 " being very satisfied and " 1 " being very dissatisfied.

## Importance-Satisfaction Rating <br> City of Auburn <br> MAINTENANCE

| Category of Service | $\begin{gathered} \text { Most } \\ \text { Important } \\ \% \end{gathered}$ | Most Important Rank | $\begin{gathered} \text { Satisfaction } \\ \% \end{gathered}$ | Satisfaction Rank | ImportanceSatisfaction Rating | I-S Rating Rank |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| High Priority (IS .10-.20) |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Maintenance of streets | 43\% | 1 | 75\% | 9 | 0.1075 | 1 |
| Adequacy of city street lighting | 37\% | 2 | 71\% | 10 | 0.1084 | 2 |
| Medium Priority (IS < .10) |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Cleanup of debris/litter in and near roadways | 26\% | 4 | 76\% | 8 | 0.0629 | 3 |
| Maintenance of sidewalks | 26\% | 3 | 76\% | 7 | 0.0616 | 4 |
| Overall cleanliness of streets and public areas | 25\% | 5 | 84\% | 5 | 0.0393 | 5 |
| Mowing/trimming along streets and public areas | 15\% | 7 | 84\% | 6 | 0.0240 | 6 |
| Maintenance of downtown Auburn | 18\% | 6 | 89\% | 1 | 0.0193 | 7 |
| Maintenance of traffic signals | 11\% | 8 | 89\% | 2 | 0.0125 | 8 |
| Maintenance of street signs | 8\% | 9 | 88\% | 3 | 0.0096 | 9 |
| Maintenance of city-owned buildings | 5\% | 10 | 84\% | 4 | 0.0079 | 10 |

Note: The I-S Rating is calculated by multiplying the "Most Important" \% by (1-'Satisfaction' \%)

Most Important \%:

Satisfaction \%:
The "Most Important" percentage represents the sum of the first, second, and third most important responses for each item. Respondents were asked to identify the items they thought should receive the most emphasis over the next two years. The "Satisfaction" percentage represents the sum of the ratings "4" and " 5 " excluding 'don't knows.' Respondents ranked their level of satisfaction with the each of the items on a scale of 1 to 5 with " 5 " being very satisfied and "1" being very dissatisfied.
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## Importance-Satisfaction Rating <br> City of Auburn <br> DOWNTOWN AUBURN

|  | Most <br> Important <br> $\%$ | Most <br> Important <br> Rank | Satisfaction <br> $\%$ | Satisfaction <br> Rank | Importance- <br> Satisfaction <br> Rating | I-S Rating <br> Rank |
| :--- | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Category of Service |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Very High Priority (IS >.20) | $58 \%$ | 1 | $33 \%$ | 12 | 0.3903 | 1 |
| Availability of parking |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Medium Priority (IS <.10) | $19 \%$ | 4 | $61 \%$ | 8 | 0.0741 | 2 |
| Availability of retail shopping | $16 \%$ | 7 | $57 \%$ | 11 | 0.0688 | 3 |
| Availability of outdoor dining venues | $19 \%$ | 5 | $72 \%$ | 7 | 0.0536 | 4 |
| Quality of public events held downtown | $13 \%$ | 9 | $61 \%$ | 9 | 0.0512 | 5 |
| Availability of public event space | $17 \%$ | 6 | $73 \%$ | 6 | 0.0466 | 6 |
| Availability of dining opportunities | $26 \%$ | 2 | $85 \%$ | 3 | 0.0390 | 7 |
| Feeling of safety of downtown at night | $14 \%$ | 8 | $80 \%$ | 5 | 0.0281 | 8 |
| Landscaping and green space | $7 \%$ | 11 | $60 \%$ | 10 | 0.0281 | 9 |
| Enforcement of parking violations \& meter times | $12 \%$ | 10 | $84 \%$ | 4 | 0.0198 | 10 |
| Pedestrian accessibility | $20 \%$ | 3 | $93 \%$ | 1 | 0.0148 | 11 |
| Cleanliness of downtown areas | $6 \%$ | 12 | $86 \%$ | 2 | 0.0084 | 12 |
| Signage and wayfinding |  |  |  |  |  |  |

Note: The I-S Rating is calculated by multiplying the "Most Important" \% by (1-'Satisfaction' \%)

| Most Important \%: | The "Most Important" percentage represents the sum of the first, second, and third <br> most important responses for each item. Respondents were asked to identify <br> the items they thought should receive the most emphasis over the next two years. |
| :--- | :--- |
| Satisfaction \%: | The "Satisfaction" percentage represents the sum of the ratings "4" and " 5 " excluding 'don't knows.' <br> Respondents ranked their level of satisfaction with the each of the items on a scale <br> of 1 to 5 with "5" being very satisfied and "1" being very dissatisfied. |
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## Importance-Satisfaction Matrix Analysis

The Importance-Satisfaction rating is based on the concept that public agencies will maximize overall customer satisfaction by emphasizing improvements in those areas where the level of satisfaction is relatively low and the perceived importance of the service is relatively high. ETC Institute developed an Importance-Satisfaction Matrix to display the perceived importance of major services that were assessed on the survey against the perceived quality of service delivery. The two axes on the matrix represent Satisfaction (vertical) and relative Importance (horizontal).

The I-S (Importance-Satisfaction) matrix should be interpreted as follows.

- Continued Emphasis (above average importance and above average satisfaction). This area shows where the City is meeting customer expectations. Items in this area have a significant impact on the customer's overall level of satisfaction. The City should maintain (or slightly increase) emphasis on items in this area.
- Exceeding Expectations (below average importance and above average satisfaction). This area shows where the City is performing significantly better than customers expect the City to perform. Items in this area do not significantly affect the overall level of satisfaction that residents have with City services. The City should maintain (or slightly decrease) emphasis on items in this area.
- Opportunities for Improvement (above average importance and below average satisfaction). This area shows where the City is not performing as well as residents expect the City to perform. This area has a significant impact on customer satisfaction, and the City should DEFINITELY increase emphasis on items in this area.
- Less Important (below average importance and below average satisfaction). This area shows where the City is not performing well relative to the City's performance in other areas; however, this area is generally considered to be less important to residents. This area does not significantly affect overall satisfaction with City services because the items are less important to residents. The agency should maintain current levels of emphasis on items in this area.

Matrices showing the results for Auburn are provided on the following pages.

## 2016 City of Auburn DirectionFinder Survey Importance-Satisfaction Assessment Matrix -Major Categories of City Services-

(points on the graph show deviations from the mean importance and satisfaction ratings given by respondents to the survey)


Source: ETC Institute (2016)

## 2016 City of Auburn DirectionFinder Survey Importance-Satisfaction Assessment Matrix -Public Safety-

(points on the graph show deviations from the mean importance and satisfaction ratings given by respondents to the survey)


Source: ETC Institute (2016)

## 2016 City of Auburn DirectionFinder Survey Importance-Satisfaction Assessment Matrix -Code Enforcemnt-

(points on the graph show deviations from the mean importance and satisfaction ratings given by respondents to the survey)
mean importance


## 2016 City of Auburn DirectionFinder Survey Importance-Satisfaction Assessment Matrix -Garbage and Water Services-

(points on the graph show deviations from the mean importance and satisfaction ratings given by respondents to the survey)


## 2016 City of Auburn DirectionFinder Survey Importance-Satisfaction Assessment Matrix -Parks and Recreation-

(points on the graph show deviations from the mean importance and satisfaction ratings given by respondents to the survey)
mean importance


## 2016 City of Auburn DirectionFinder Survey Importance-Satisfaction Assessment Matrix -Maintenance-

(points on the graph show deviations from the mean importance and satisfaction ratings given by respondents to the survey)
mean importance


## 2016 City of Auburn DirectionFinder Survey Importance-Satisfaction Assessment Matrix -Downtown-

(points on the graph show deviations from the mean importance and satisfaction ratings given by respondents to the survey)
mean importance


Source: ETC Institute (2016)

## Section 4: Tabular Data

## Q1. MAJOR CATEGORIES OF CITY SERVICES. Please rate your overall satisfaction with major categories of services on a scale of 1 to 5, where 5 means "Very Satisfied" and 1 means "Very Dissatisfied."

$(\mathrm{N}=735)$

|  | Very <br> Satisfied | Satisfied | Neutral | Dissatisfied Dissatisfied Don't know |  |  |
| :--- | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Q1 01. Quality of the city s school <br> system | $43.1 \%$ | $33.5 \%$ | $6.1 \%$ | $2.0 \%$ | $0.4 \%$ | $14.8 \%$ |
|  <br> ambulance services |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Q1 03. Quality of parks \& recreation |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| services |  |  |  |  |  |  |

Q1. MAJOR CATEGORIES OF CITY SERVICES. Please rate your overall satisfaction with major categories of services on a scale of 1 to 5, where 5 means "Very Satisfied" and 1 means "Very
Dissatisfied." (Without "Don't Know")
( $\mathrm{N}=735$ )

|  | Very <br> Satisfied | Satisfied | Neutral | Vissatisfied | Vissatisfied |
| :--- | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Q1 01. Quality of the city s school system | $50.6 \%$ | $39.3 \%$ | $7.2 \%$ | $2.4 \%$ | $0.5 \%$ |

Q2. Which THREE of the MAJOR CATEGORIES OF CITY SERVICES do you think should receive the most emphasis from city leaders over the next TWO Years?

| Q2 1st Choice | Number | Percent |
| :--- | ---: | ---: |
| Quality of the city's school system | 189 | $25.7 \%$ |
| Quality of police, fire, \& ambulance services | 68 | $9.3 \%$ |
| Quality of parks \& recreation services | 31 | $4.2 \%$ |
| Quality of city library services | 6 | $0.8 \%$ |
| Quality of the city's customer service | 11 | $1.5 \%$ |
| Maintenance of city infrastructure | 97 | $13.2 \%$ |
| Enforcement of city codes and ordinances | 34 | $4.6 \%$ |
| Flow of traffic \& congestion management | 198 | $26.9 \%$ |
| Collection of garbage, recycling \& yard waste | 24 | $3.3 \%$ |
| Effectiveness of city's communication with public | 41 | $5.6 \%$ |
| None selected | 36 | $4.9 \%$ |
| Total | 735 | $100.0 \%$ |

## Q2. Which THREE of the MAJOR CATEGORIES OF CITY SERVICES do you think should receive the most emphasis from city leaders over the next TWO Years?

| Q2 2nd Choice | Number | Percent |
| :--- | ---: | ---: |
| Quality of the city's school system | 84 | $11.4 \%$ |
| Quality of police, fire, \& ambulance services | 86 | $11.7 \%$ |
| Quality of parks \& recreation services | 91 | $12.4 \%$ |
| Quality of city library services | 13 | $1.8 \%$ |
| Quality of the city's customer service | 13 | $1.8 \%$ |
| Maintenance of city infrastructure | 112 | $15.2 \%$ |
| Enforcement of city codes and ordinances | 55 | $7.5 \%$ |
| Flow of traffic \& congestion management | 144 | $19.6 \%$ |
| Collection of garbage, recycling \& yard waste | 26 | $3.5 \%$ |
| Effectiveness of city's communication with public | 55 | $7.5 \%$ |
| None selected | 56 | $7.6 \%$ |
| Total | 735 | $100.0 \%$ |

Q2. Which THREE of the MAJOR CATEGORIES OF CITY SERVICES do you think should receive the most emphasis from city leaders over the next TWO Years?

| Q2 3rd Choice | Number | Percent |
| :--- | ---: | ---: |
| Quality of the city's school system | 52 | $7.1 \%$ |
| Quality of police, fire, \& ambulance services | 49 | $6.7 \%$ |
| Quality of parks \& recreation services | 79 | $10.7 \%$ |
| Quality of city library services | 18 | $2.4 \%$ |
| Quality of the city's customer service | 26 | $3.5 \%$ |
| Maintenance of city infrastructure | 126 | $17.1 \%$ |
| Enforcement of city codes and ordinances | 57 | $7.8 \%$ |
| Flow of traffic \& congestion management | 100 | $13.6 \%$ |
| Collection of garbage, recycling \& yard waste | 47 | $6.4 \%$ |
| Effectiveness of city's communication with public | 85 | $11.6 \%$ |
| None selected | 96 | $13.1 \%$ |
| Total | 735 | $100.0 \%$ |

## SUM OF THE TOP CHOICES

## Q2. Sum of the Top THREE MAJOR CATEGORIES OF CITY SERVICES you think should receive the most emphasis from city leaders over the next TWO Years

| Q2 1st Choice | Number | Percent |
| :--- | ---: | ---: |
| Flow of traffic \& congestion management | 442 | $60.1 \%$ |
| Maintenance of city infrastructure | 335 | $45.6 \%$ |
| Quality of the city's school system | 325 | $44.2 \%$ |
| Quality of police, fire, \& ambulance services | 203 | $27.6 \%$ |
| Quality of parks \& recreation services | 201 | $27.3 \%$ |
| Effectiveness of city's communication with public | 181 | $24.6 \%$ |
| Enforcement of city codes and ordinances | 146 | $19.9 \%$ |
| Collection of garbage, recycling \& yard waste | 97 | $13.2 \%$ |
| Quality of the city's customer service | 50 | $6.8 \%$ |
| Quality of city library services | 37 | $5.0 \%$ |
| None selected | 36 | $4.9 \%$ |
| Total | 2053 |  |

Q3. PERCEPTIONS OF THE CITY. Several items that may influence your perception of the City of Auburn are listed below. Please rate your satisfaction with each item on a scale of 1 to 5 , where 5 means "Very Satisfied" and 1 means "Very Dissatisfied."
( $\mathrm{N}=735$ )

|  | Very <br> Satisfied | Satisfied | Neutral | Dissatisfied Dissatisfied Don't know |  |  |
| :--- | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Q3 1. Overall value that you receive for | $20.7 \%$ | $51.7 \%$ | $17.0 \%$ | $5.4 \%$ | $1.4 \%$ | $3.8 \%$ |
| your city tax dollars and fees | $34.7 \%$ | $51.0 \%$ | $8.3 \%$ | $4.2 \%$ | $0.8 \%$ | $1.0 \%$ |
| Q3 2 Overall image of the city | $41.1 \%$ | $48.8 \%$ | $6.7 \%$ | $1.9 \%$ | $0.5 \%$ | $1.0 \%$ |
| Q3 3. Overall quality of life in the city | $26.7 \%$ | $48.4 \%$ | $15.1 \%$ | $7.6 \%$ | $1.2 \%$ | $1.0 \%$ |
| Q3 4 Overall appearance of the city | $25.6 \%$ | $59.3 \%$ | $10.2 \%$ | $2.4 \%$ | $0.7 \%$ | $1.8 \%$ |

## EXCLUDING DON'T KNOW

Q3. PERCEPTIONS OF THE CITY. Several items that may influence your perception of the City of Auburn are listed below. Please rate your satisfaction with each item on a scale of 1 to 5 , where 5 means "Very Satisfied" and 1 means "Very Dissatisfied." (Without "Don't Know")
( $\mathrm{N}=735$ )

|  | Very <br> Satisfied | Satisfied | Neutral | Dissatisfied | Very <br> Dissatisfied |
| :--- | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Q3 1. Overall value that you receive for your <br> city tax dollars and fees | $21.5 \%$ | $53.7 \%$ | $17.7 \%$ | $5.7 \%$ | $1.4 \%$ |
| Q3 2 Overall image of the city | $35.0 \%$ | $51.5 \%$ | $8.4 \%$ | $4.3 \%$ | $0.8 \%$ |
| Q3 3. Overall quality of life in the city | $41.5 \%$ | $49.3 \%$ | $6.7 \%$ | $1.9 \%$ | $0.5 \%$ |
| Q3 4 Overall appearance of the city | $26.9 \%$ | $48.9 \%$ | $15.2 \%$ | $7.7 \%$ | $1.2 \%$ |
| Q3 5 Overall quality of city services | $26.0 \%$ | $60.4 \%$ | $10.4 \%$ | $2.5 \%$ | $0.7 \%$ |

Q4. Please rate Auburn on a scale of 1 to 5, where 5 means "Excellent" and 1 means "Poor" with regard to each of the following:
( $\mathrm{N}=735$ )

|  | Excellent | Good | Neutral | Below <br> Average | Poor | Don't know |
| :--- | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Q4 1 As a place to live | $61.6 \%$ | $34.4 \%$ | $3.3 \%$ | $0.3 \%$ | $0.3 \%$ | $0.1 \%$ |
| Q4 2 As a place to raise children | $62.9 \%$ | $27.6 \%$ | $2.7 \%$ | $0.4 \%$ | $0.1 \%$ | $6.3 \%$ |
| Q4 3 As a place to work | $43.0 \%$ | $36.7 \%$ | $9.8 \%$ | $3.8 \%$ | $0.8 \%$ | $5.9 \%$ |

## EXCLUDING DON'T KNOW

Q4. Please rate Auburn on a scale of 1 to 5, where 5 means "Excellent" and 1 means "Poor" with regard to each of the following:(Without "Don't Know")
( $\mathrm{N}=735$ )

|  | Excellent | Good | Neutral | Below <br> Average | Poor |
| :--- | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Q4 1 As a place to live | $61.7 \%$ | $34.5 \%$ | $3.3 \%$ | $0.3 \%$ | $0.3 \%$ |
| Q4 2 As a place to raise children | $67.1 \%$ | $29.5 \%$ | $2.9 \%$ | $0.4 \%$ | $0.1 \%$ |
| Q4 3 As a place to work | $45.7 \%$ | $39.0 \%$ | $10.4 \%$ | $4.0 \%$ | $0.9 \%$ |

Q5. CITY LEADERSHIP. Please rate your satisfaction on a scale of 1 to 5 , where 5 means "Very Satisfied" and 1 means "Very Dissatisfied," with the following:
$(\mathrm{N}=735)$

|  | Very <br> Satisfied | Satisfied | Neutral | Very <br> Dissatisfied |  |  |  |
| :--- | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Q5 1. Overall quality of leadership <br> provided by the city's elected officials | $12.7 \%$ | $41.2 \%$ | $22.0 \%$ | $10.3 \%$ | $3.5 \%$ | $10.2 \%$ |  |
| Q5 2. Overall effectiveness of appointed <br> boards and commissions | $10.7 \%$ | $35.4 \%$ | $27.1 \%$ | $10.5 \%$ | $3.1 \%$ | $13.2 \%$ |  |
| Q5 3. Overall effectiveness of the City | $15.4 \%$ | $37.8 \%$ | $23.5 \%$ | $7.3 \%$ | $2.9 \%$ | $13.1 \%$ |  |
| Manager |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |

## EXCLUDING DON'T KNOW

Q5. CITY LEADERSHIP. Please rate your satisfaction on a scale of 1 to 5 , where 5 means "Very Satisfied" and 1 means "Very Dissatisfied," with the following:(Without "Don't Know")
( $\mathrm{N}=735$ )

|  | Very <br> Satisfied | Satisfied | Neutral | Dissatisfied | Very <br> Dissatisfied |
| :--- | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Q5 1. Overall quality of leadership provided by <br> the city's elected officials | $14.1 \%$ | $45.9 \%$ | $24.5 \%$ | $11.5 \%$ | $3.9 \%$ |
| Q5 2. Overall effectiveness of appointed <br> boards and commissions | $12.4 \%$ | $40.8 \%$ | $31.2 \%$ | $12.1 \%$ | $3.6 \%$ |
| Q5 3. Overall effectiveness of the City <br> Manager | $17.7 \%$ | $43.5 \%$ | $27.1 \%$ | $8.5 \%$ | $3.3 \%$ |
| Q5 4. Level of public involvement in local <br> decision-making | $10.3 \%$ | $33.5 \%$ | $28.3 \%$ | $19.7 \%$ | $8.2 \%$ |
| Q5 5 Transparency of city government | $10.9 \%$ | $29.6 \%$ | $35.0 \%$ | $15.2 \%$ | $9.2 \%$ |

Q6. PUBLIC SAFETY SERVICES. Please rate your satisfaction on a scale of 1 to 5 , where 5 means "Very Satisfied" and 1 means "Very Dissatisfied," with the following public safety services provided by the City of Auburn.
( $\mathrm{N}=735$ )

|  | Very <br> Satisfied | Satisfied | Neutral | DissatisfiedDissatisfied |  |  |
| :--- | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Q6 01. Overall quality of police <br> protection | $41.5 \%$ | $46.9 \%$ | $7.2 \%$ | $2.0 \%$ | $0.5 \%$ | $1.8 \%$ |
| Q6 02. Visibility of police in <br> neighborhoods | $31.8 \%$ | $45.7 \%$ | $15.9 \%$ | $3.8 \%$ | $1.0 \%$ | $1.8 \%$ |
| Q6 03. Visibility of police in retail areas | $26.9 \%$ | $50.5 \%$ | $15.8 \%$ | $3.3 \%$ | $0.0 \%$ | $3.5 \%$ |
| Q6 04 Police response time | $29.4 \%$ | $33.9 \%$ | $11.0 \%$ | $1.4 \%$ | $0.1 \%$ | $24.2 \%$ |
| Q6 05 Efforts to prevent crime | $26.5 \%$ | $42.7 \%$ | $15.9 \%$ | $3.4 \%$ | $1.2 \%$ | $10.2 \%$ |
| Q6 06 Police safety education programs | $22.4 \%$ | $29.4 \%$ | $19.3 \%$ | $1.9 \%$ | $0.5 \%$ | $26.4 \%$ |
| Q6 07 Enforcement of traffic laws | $24.5 \%$ | $43.1 \%$ | $18.6 \%$ | $7.8 \%$ | $2.7 \%$ | $3.3 \%$ |
| Q6 08. Overall quality of fire protection | $38.5 \%$ | $40.7 \%$ | $6.0 \%$ | $0.5 \%$ | $0.1 \%$ | $14.1 \%$ |
| Q6 09. Fire personnel emergency |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| response time |  |  |  |  |  |  |

## EXCLUDING DON'T KNOW

Q6. PUBLIC SAFETY SERVICES. Please rate your satisfaction on a scale of 1 to 5 , where 5 means "Very Satisfied" and 1 means "Very Dissatisfied," with the following public safety services provided by the City of Auburn. (Without "Don't Know")
( $\mathrm{N}=735$ )

|  | Very <br> Satisfied | Satisfied | Neutral | Dissatisfied | Very <br> Dissatisfied |
| :--- | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Q6 01. Overall quality of police protection | $42.2 \%$ | $47.8 \%$ | $7.3 \%$ | $2.1 \%$ | $0.6 \%$ |
| Q6 02. Visibility of police in neighborhoods | $32.4 \%$ | $46.5 \%$ | $16.2 \%$ | $3.9 \%$ | $1.0 \%$ |
| Q6 03. Visibility of police in retail areas | $27.9 \%$ | $52.3 \%$ | $16.4 \%$ | $3.4 \%$ | $0.0 \%$ |
| Q6 04 Police response time | $38.8 \%$ | $44.7 \%$ | $14.5 \%$ | $1.8 \%$ | $0.2 \%$ |
| Q6 05 Efforts to prevent crime | $29.5 \%$ | $47.6 \%$ | $17.7 \%$ | $3.8 \%$ | $1.4 \%$ |
| Q6 06 Police safety education programs | $30.5 \%$ | $39.9 \%$ | $26.2 \%$ | $2.6 \%$ | $0.7 \%$ |
| Q6 07 Enforcement of traffic laws | $25.3 \%$ | $44.6 \%$ | $19.3 \%$ | $8.0 \%$ | $2.8 \%$ |
| Q6 08. Overall quality of fire protection | $44.8 \%$ | $47.4 \%$ | $7.0 \%$ | $0.6 \%$ | $0.2 \%$ |
| Q6 09. Fire personnel emergency response time | $51.9 \%$ | $38.7 \%$ | $7.8 \%$ | $1.2 \%$ | $0.4 \%$ |
| Q6 10. Quality of fire safety education |  |  |  |  |  |
| programs | $34.1 \%$ | $41.7 \%$ | $22.3 \%$ | $1.8 \%$ | $0.2 \%$ |
| Q6 11. Quality of local ambulance service | $38.9 \%$ | $43.4 \%$ | $14.3 \%$ | $2.8 \%$ | $0.6 \%$ |

Q7. Which THREE of the PUBLIC SAFETY SERVICES items listed above do you think should receive the most emphasis from city leaders over the next TWO Years?

| Q7 1st Choice | Number | Percent |
| :--- | ---: | ---: |
| Overall quality of police protection | 171 | $23.3 \%$ |
| Visibility of police in neighborhoods | 125 | $17.0 \%$ |
| Visibility of police in retail areas | 33 | $4.5 \%$ |
| Police response time | 18 | $2.4 \%$ |
| Efforts to prevent crime | 140 | $19.0 \%$ |
| Police safety education programs | 32 | $4.4 \%$ |
| Enforcement of traffic laws | 74 | $10.1 \%$ |
| Overall quality of fire protection | 10 | $1.4 \%$ |
| Fire personnel emergency response time | 13 | $1.8 \%$ |
| Quality of fire safety education programs | 5 | $0.7 \%$ |
| Quality of local ambulance service | 28 | $3.8 \%$ |
| None selected | 86 | $11.7 \%$ |
| Total | 735 | $100.0 \%$ |

Q7. Which THREE of the PUBLIC SAFETY SERVICES items listed above do you think should receive the most emphasis from city leaders over the next TWO Years?

| Q7 2nd Choice | Number | Percent |
| :--- | ---: | ---: |
| Overall quality of police protection | 53 | $7.2 \%$ |
| Visibility of police in neighborhoods | 122 | $16.6 \%$ |
| Visibility of police in retail areas | 55 | $7.5 \%$ |
| Police response time | 49 | $6.7 \%$ |
| Efforts to prevent crime | 124 | $16.9 \%$ |
| Police safety education programs | 38 | $5.2 \%$ |
| Enforcement of traffic laws | 38 | $5.2 \%$ |
| Overall quality of fire protection | 63 | $8.6 \%$ |
| Fire personnel emergency response time | 16 | $2.2 \%$ |
| Quality of fire safety education programs | 29 | $3.9 \%$ |
| Quality of local ambulance service | 33 | $4.5 \%$ |
| None selected | 115 | $15.6 \%$ |
| Total | 735 | $100.0 \%$ |

Q7. Which THREE of the PUBLIC SAFETY SERVICES items listed above do you think should receive the most emphasis from city leaders over the next TWO Years?

| Q7 3rd Choice | Number | Percent |
| :--- | ---: | ---: |
| Overall quality of police protection | 47 | $6.4 \%$ |
| Visibility of police in neighborhoods | 62 | $8.4 \%$ |
| Visibility of police in retail areas | 68 | $9.3 \%$ |
| Police response time | 29 | $3.9 \%$ |
| Efforts to prevent crime | 80 | $10.9 \%$ |
| Police safety education programs | 33 | $4.5 \%$ |
| Enforcement of traffic laws | 50 | $6.8 \%$ |
| Overall quality of fire protection | 52 | $7.1 \%$ |
| Fire personnel emergency response time | 25 | $3.4 \%$ |
| Quality of fire safety education programs | 37 | $5.0 \%$ |
| Quality of local ambulance service | 82 | $11.2 \%$ |
| None selected | 170 | $23.1 \%$ |
| Total | 735 | $100.0 \%$ |

## SUM OF THE TOP CHOICES

Q7. Sum of the Top THREE PUBLIC SAFETY SERVICES items you think should receive the most emphasis from city leaders over the next TWO Years

| Q7 1st Choice | Number | Percent |
| :--- | ---: | ---: |
| Efforts to prevent crime | 344 | $46.8 \%$ |
| Visibility of police in neighborhoods | 309 | $42.0 \%$ |
| Overall quality of police protection | 271 | $36.9 \%$ |
| Enforcement of traffic laws | 162 | $22.0 \%$ |
| Visibility of police in retail areas | 156 | $21.2 \%$ |
| Quality of local ambulance service | 143 | $19.5 \%$ |
| Overall quality of fire protection | 125 | $17.0 \%$ |
| Police safety education programs | 103 | $14.0 \%$ |
| Police response time | 96 | $13.1 \%$ |
| Quality of fire safety education programs | 71 | $9.7 \%$ |
| Fire personnel emergency response time | 54 | $7.3 \%$ |
| None selected | 86 | $11.7 \%$ |
| Total | 1920 |  |

Q8. FEELING OF SAFETY. Please rate your feeling of safety in the following areas using a scale of 1 to 5, where 5 means "Very Safe" and 1 means "Very Unsafe.":
( $\mathrm{N}=735$ )

|  | Very Safe | Safe | Neutral | Unsafe | Unsafe <br> Uns | Don't know |
| :--- | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Q8 1. In your neighborhood during the | $59.9 \%$ | $35.4 \%$ | $3.3 \%$ | $1.1 \%$ | $0.0 \%$ | $0.4 \%$ |
| day | $37.0 \%$ | $47.3 \%$ | $11.8 \%$ | $2.6 \%$ | $0.8 \%$ | $0.4 \%$ |
| Q8 2 In your neighborhood at night | $21.2 \%$ | $48.3 \%$ | $17.6 \%$ | $2.3 \%$ | $0.3 \%$ | $10.3 \%$ |
| Q8 3 In the city s parks | $28.0 \%$ | $55.0 \%$ | $14.7 \%$ | $1.0 \%$ | $0.4 \%$ | $1.0 \%$ |
| Q8 4 In commercial and retail areas | $39.6 \%$ | $50.7 \%$ | $6.8 \%$ | $1.6 \%$ | $0.0 \%$ | $1.2 \%$ |
| Q8 5 In downtown Auburn | $7.5 \%$ | $20.7 \%$ | $19.9 \%$ | $14.1 \%$ | $4.4 \%$ | $33.5 \%$ |
| Q8 6 Traveling by bicycle in Auburn |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Q8 7. Traveling as a pedestrian in | $16.2 \%$ | $48.2 \%$ | $17.8 \%$ | $9.0 \%$ | $2.4 \%$ | $6.4 \%$ |
| Auburn | $32.9 \%$ | $58.5 \%$ | $6.9 \%$ | $0.5 \%$ | $0.3 \%$ | $0.8 \%$ |

## EXCLUDING DON'T KNOW

Q8. FEELING OF SAFETY. Please rate your feeling of safety in the following areas using a scale of 1 to 5, where 5 means "Very Safe" and 1 means "Very Unsafe.":(Without "Don't Know")
( $\mathrm{N}=735$ )

|  | Very Safe | Safe | Neutral | Unsafe | Uery <br> Unsafe |
| :--- | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Q8 1. In your neighborhood during the day | $60.1 \%$ | $35.5 \%$ | $3.3 \%$ | $1.1 \%$ | $0.0 \%$ |
| Q8 2 In your neighborhood at night | $37.2 \%$ | $47.5 \%$ | $11.9 \%$ | $2.6 \%$ | $0.8 \%$ |
| Q8 3 In the city s parks | $23.7 \%$ | $53.9 \%$ | $19.6 \%$ | $2.6 \%$ | $0.3 \%$ |
| Q8 4 In commercial and retail areas | $28.3 \%$ | $55.5 \%$ | $14.8 \%$ | $1.0 \%$ | $0.4 \%$ |
| Q8 5 In downtown Auburn | $40.1 \%$ | $51.4 \%$ | $6.9 \%$ | $1.7 \%$ | $0.0 \%$ |
| Q8 6 Traveling by bicycle in Auburn | $11.2 \%$ | $31.1 \%$ | $29.9 \%$ | $21.3 \%$ | $6.5 \%$ |
| Q8 7. Traveling as a pedestrian in Auburn | $17.3 \%$ | $51.5 \%$ | $19.0 \%$ | $9.6 \%$ | $2.6 \%$ |
| Q8 8. Overall feeling of safety in Auburn | $33.2 \%$ | $59.0 \%$ | $7.0 \%$ | $0.5 \%$ | $0.3 \%$ |

Q9. CODE ENFORCEMENT. IN YOUR NEIGHBORHOOD ONLY, please rate your satisfaction on a scale of 1 to 5, where 5 means "Very Satisfied" and 1 means "Very Dissatisfied," with the following:
( $\mathrm{N}=735$ )

|  | Very <br> Satisfied | Satisfied | Neutral | Dissatisfied | Dissatisfied |  |
| :--- | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Q9 1 Cleanup of debris/litter | $33.1 \%$ | $48.3 \%$ | $8.6 \%$ | $6.1 \%$ | $1.6 \%$ | $2.3 \%$ |
| Q9 2. Cleanup of large junk/abandoned <br> vehicles |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Q9 3. Cleanup of overgrown and weedy <br> lots | $30.9 \%$ | $38.5 \%$ | $12.8 \%$ | $4.4 \%$ | $0.8 \%$ | $12.7 \%$ |
| Q9 4. Efforts to remove dilapidated <br> structures | $22.4 \%$ | $36.3 \%$ | $17.4 \%$ | $12.1 \%$ | $2.9 \%$ | $8.8 \%$ |
| Q9 5 Enforcement of loud music | $20.1 \%$ | $29.5 \%$ | $18.8 \%$ | $7.1 \%$ | $1.9 \%$ | $22.6 \%$ |
| Q9 6 Control of nuisance animals | $19.9 \%$ | $31.7 \%$ | $20.0 \%$ | $7.5 \%$ | $4.5 \%$ | $16.5 \%$ |
|  | $22.0 \%$ | $36.9 \%$ | $18.1 \%$ | $7.6 \%$ | $2.3 \%$ | $13.1 \%$ |

## EXCLUDING DON'T KNOW

Q9. CODE ENFORCEMENT. IN YOUR NEIGHBORHOOD ONLY, please rate your satisfaction on a scale of 1 to 5, where 5 means "Very Satisfied" and 1 means "Very Dissatisfied," with the following:(Without "Don't Know")
( $\mathrm{N}=735$ )

|  | Very <br> Satisfied | Satisfied | Neutral | Dissatisfied | Very <br> Dissatisfied |
| :--- | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Q9 1 Cleanup of debris/litter | $33.8 \%$ | $49.4 \%$ | $8.8 \%$ | $6.3 \%$ | $1.7 \%$ |
| Q9 2. Cleanup of large junk/abandoned vehicles | $35.4 \%$ | $44.1 \%$ | $14.6 \%$ | $5.0 \%$ | $0.9 \%$ |
| Q9 3. Cleanup of overgrown and weedy lots | $24.6 \%$ | $39.9 \%$ | $19.1 \%$ | $13.3 \%$ | $3.1 \%$ |
| Q9 4. Efforts to remove dilapidated structures | $26.0 \%$ | $38.1 \%$ | $24.3 \%$ | $9.1 \%$ | $2.5 \%$ |
| Q9 5 Enforcement of loud music | $23.8 \%$ | $37.9 \%$ | $23.9 \%$ | $9.0 \%$ | $5.4 \%$ |
| Q9 6 Control of nuisance animals | $25.4 \%$ | $42.4 \%$ | $20.8 \%$ | $8.8 \%$ | $2.7 \%$ |

Q10. Which TWO of the CODE ENFORCEMENT items listed above do you think should receive the most emphasis from city leaders over the next TWO Years?

| Q10 1st Choice | Number | Percent |
| :--- | ---: | ---: |
| Cleanup of debris/litter | 184 | $25.0 \%$ |
| Cleanup of large junk/abandoned vehicles | 42 | $5.7 \%$ |
| Cleanup of overgrown and weedy lots | 134 | $18.2 \%$ |
| Efforts to remove dilapidated structures | 111 | $15.1 \%$ |
| Enforcement of loud music | 65 | $8.8 \%$ |
| Control of nuisance animals | 84 | $11.4 \%$ |
| None selected | 115 | $15.6 \%$ |
| Total | 735 | $100.0 \%$ |

Q10. Which TWO of the CODE ENFORCEMENT items listed above do you think should receive the most emphasis from city leaders over the next TWO Years?

| Q10 2nd Choice | Number | Percent |
| :--- | ---: | ---: |
| Cleanup of debris/litter | 107 | $14.6 \%$ |
| Cleanup of large junk/abandoned vehicles | 75 | $10.2 \%$ |
| Cleanup of overgrown and weedy lots | 145 | $19.7 \%$ |
| Efforts to remove dilapidated structures | 90 | $12.2 \%$ |
| Enforcement of loud music | 72 | $9.8 \%$ |
| Control of nuisance animals | 89 | $12.1 \%$ |
| None selected | 157 | $21.4 \%$ |
| Total | 735 | $100.0 \%$ |

## SUM OF THE TOP CHOICES

Q10. Sum of the Top TWO CODE ENFORCEMENT items listed above you think should receive the most emphasis from city leaders over the next TWO Years

| Q10 1st Choice | Number | Percent |
| :--- | ---: | ---: |
| Cleanup of debris/litter | 291 | $39.6 \%$ |
| Cleanup of overgrown and weedy lots | 279 | $38.0 \%$ |
| Efforts to remove dilapidated structures | 201 | $27.3 \%$ |
| Control of nuisance animals | 173 | $23.5 \%$ |
| Enforcement of loud music | 137 | $18.6 \%$ |
| Cleanup of large junk/abandoned vehicles | 117 | $15.9 \%$ |
| None selected | 115 | $15.6 \%$ |
| Total | 1313 |  |

Q11. GARBAGE AND WATER SERVICES. Please rate your satisfaction on a scale of 1 to 5, where 5 means "Very Satisfied" and 1 means "Very Dissatisfied," with the following:
( $\mathrm{N}=735$ )

|  | Very <br> Satisfied | Satisfied | Neutral | Very <br> Dissatisfied <br> Dissatisfied |  |  |  |
| :--- | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Q11 1. Residential garbage collection <br> service | $51.8 \%$ | $38.0 \%$ | $4.1 \%$ | $3.1 \%$ | $1.1 \%$ | $1.9 \%$ |  |
| Q11 2. Curbside recycling service overall | $32.2 \%$ | $28.7 \%$ | $12.1 \%$ | $9.8 \%$ | $4.8 \%$ | $12.4 \%$ |  |
| Q11 3. Material types accepted for <br> recycling | $22.4 \%$ | $31.4 \%$ | $14.6 \%$ | $14.4 \%$ | $4.8 \%$ | $12.4 \%$ |  |
| Q11 4. Recycling at city s drop-off <br> recycling center | $28.4 \%$ | $32.8 \%$ | $13.6 \%$ | $2.7 \%$ | $1.2 \%$ | $21.2 \%$ |  |
| Q115 Yard waste removal service | $40.7 \%$ | $37.3 \%$ | $7.9 \%$ | $4.8 \%$ | $1.1 \%$ | $8.3 \%$ |  |
| Q116 Water service | $38.5 \%$ | $44.1 \%$ | $7.2 \%$ | $4.6 \%$ | $2.3 \%$ | $3.3 \%$ |  |
| Q11 7. Utility Billing Office customer |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| service |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |

## EXCLUDING DON'T KNOW

Q11. GARBAGE AND WATER SERVICES. Please rate your satisfaction on a scale of 1 to 5, where 5 means "Very Satisfied" and 1 means "Very Dissatisfied," with the following:(Without "Don't Know")
( $\mathrm{N}=735$ )

|  | Very <br> Satisfied | Satisfied | Neutral | Dissatisfied | Very <br> Dissatisfied |
| :--- | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Q11 1. Residential garbage collection service | $52.8 \%$ | $38.7 \%$ | $4.2 \%$ | $3.2 \%$ | $1.1 \%$ |
| Q11 2. Curbside recycling service overall | $36.8 \%$ | $32.8 \%$ | $13.8 \%$ | $11.2 \%$ | $5.4 \%$ |
| Q11 3. Material types accepted for recycling | $25.6 \%$ | $35.9 \%$ | $16.6 \%$ | $16.5 \%$ | $5.4 \%$ |
| Q11 4. Recycling at city s drop-off recycling |  |  |  |  |  |
| center | $36.1 \%$ | $41.6 \%$ | $17.3 \%$ | $3.5 \%$ | $1.6 \%$ |
| Q11 5 Yard waste removal service | $44.4 \%$ | $40.7 \%$ | $8.6 \%$ | $5.2 \%$ | $1.2 \%$ |
| Q11 6 Water service | $39.8 \%$ | $45.6 \%$ | $7.5 \%$ | $4.8 \%$ | $2.4 \%$ |
| Q11 7. Utility Billing Office customer service | $38.0 \%$ | $43.1 \%$ | $13.3 \%$ | $4.3 \%$ | $1.4 \%$ |

Q12. Which TWO of the GARBAGE AND WATER SERVICES listed above do you think should receive the most emphasis from city leaders over the next TWO Years?

| Q12 1st Choice | Number | Percent |
| :--- | ---: | ---: |
| Residential garbage collection service | 118 | $16.1 \%$ |
| Curbside recycling service overall | 122 | $16.6 \%$ |
| Material types accepted for recycling | 165 | $22.4 \%$ |
| Recycling at city's drop-off recycling center | 20 | $2.7 \%$ |
| Yard waste removal service | 61 | $8.3 \%$ |
| Water service | 85 | $11.6 \%$ |
| Utility Billing Office customer service | 36 | $4.9 \%$ |
| None selected | 128 | $17.4 \%$ |
| Total | 735 | $100.0 \%$ |

Q12. Which TWO of the GARBAGE AND WATER SERVICES listed above do you think should receive the most emphasis from city leaders over the next TWO Years?

| Q12 2nd Choice | Number | Percent |
| :--- | ---: | ---: |
| Residential garbage collection service | 65 | $8.8 \%$ |
| Curbside recycling service overall | 109 | $14.8 \%$ |
| Material types accepted for recycling | 107 | $14.6 \%$ |
| Recycling at city's drop-off recycling center | 51 | $6.9 \%$ |
| Yard waste removal service | 91 | $12.4 \%$ |
| Water service | 85 | $11.6 \%$ |
| Utility Billing Office customer service | 33 | $4.5 \%$ |
| None selected | 194 | $26.4 \%$ |
| Total | 735 | $100.0 \%$ |

## SUM OF THE TOP CHOICES

Q12. Sum of the Top TWO GARBAGE AND WATER SERVICES listed above you think should receive the most emphasis from city leaders over the next TWO Years

| Q12 1st Choice | Number | Percent |
| :--- | ---: | ---: |
| Material types accepted for recycling | 272 | $37.0 \%$ |
| Curbside recycling service overall | 231 | $31.4 \%$ |
| Residential garbage collection service | 183 | $24.9 \%$ |
| Water service | 170 | $23.1 \%$ |
| Yard waste removal service | 152 | $20.7 \%$ |
| Recycling at city's drop-off recycling center | 71 | $9.7 \%$ |
| Utility Billing Office customer service | 69 | $9.4 \%$ |
| None selected | 128 | $17.4 \%$ |
| Total | 1276 |  |

Q13. DEVELOPMENT AND REDEVELOPMENT. For each of the following, please rate your satisfaction on a scale of 1 to 5, where 5 means "Very Satisfied" and 1 means "Very Dissatisfied."
( $\mathrm{N}=735$ )

|  | Very Satisfied | Satisfied | Neutral | Dissatisfied | Very Dissatisfied | Don't know |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Q13 1. Overall quality of new residential development | 15.8\% | 42.7\% | 16.3\% | 14.6\% | 5.7\% | 4.9\% |
| Q13 2. Overall quality of new retail development (stores, restaurants, etc.) | 15.5\% | 46.1\% | 17.7\% | 15.0\% | 3.1\% | 2.6\% |
| Q13 3. Overall quality of new business development (offices, medical facilities, banks, etc.) | 14.1\% | 45.9\% | 22.2\% | 11.3\% | 2.2\% | 4.4\% |
| Q13 4. Overall quality of new industrial development (warehouses, plants, etc.) | 15.1\% | 40.0\% | 21.6\% | 4.8\% | 1.2\% | 17.3\% |
| Q13 5. Redevelopment of abandoned or under-utilized properties | 7.2\% | 29.7\% | 26.0\% | 18.1\% | 6.7\% | 12.4\% |
| Q13 6. Overall appearance of Opelika Road | 6.3\% | 28.6\% | 28.2\% | 25.6\% | 8.8\% | 2.6\% |
| Q13 7. Overall appearance of Downtown Auburn | 28.0\% | 49.9\% | 12.8\% | 6.1\% | 1.6\% | 1.5\% |
| Q13 8. The City s planning for future growth | 12.5\% | 26.3\% | 21.1\% | 15.9\% | 13.9\% | 10.3\% |

## EXCLUDING NOT PROVIDED

Q13. DEVELOPMENT AND REDEVELOPMENT. For each of the following, please rate your satisfaction on a scale of 1 to 5 , where 5 means "Very Satisfied" and 1 means "Very Dissatisfied." (Without "Don't Know")
( $\mathrm{N}=735$ )

|  | Very <br> Satisfied | Satisfied | Neutral | Dissatisfied | Very <br> Dissatisfied |
| :--- | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Q13 1. Overall quality of new residential <br> development | $16.6 \%$ | $44.9 \%$ | $17.2 \%$ | $15.3 \%$ | $6.0 \%$ |
| Q13 2. Overall quality of new retail <br> development (stores, restaurants, etc.) | $15.9 \%$ | $47.3 \%$ | $18.2 \%$ | $15.4 \%$ | $3.2 \%$ |
| Q13 3. Overall quality of new business <br> development (offices, medical facilities, banks, <br> etc.) | $14.8 \%$ | $47.9 \%$ | $23.2 \%$ | $11.8 \%$ | $2.3 \%$ |
| Q13 4. Overall quality of new industrial <br> development (warehouses, plants, etc.) | $18.3 \%$ | $48.4 \%$ | $26.2 \%$ | $5.8 \%$ | $1.5 \%$ |
| Q13 5. Redevelopment of abandoned or under- <br> utilized properties | $8.2 \%$ | $33.9 \%$ | $29.7 \%$ | $20.7 \%$ | $7.6 \%$ |
| Q13 6. Overall appearance of Opelika Road | $6.4 \%$ | $29.3 \%$ | $28.9 \%$ | $26.3 \%$ | $9.1 \%$ |
| Q13 7. Overall appearance of Downtown | $28.5 \%$ | $50.7 \%$ | $13.0 \%$ | $6.2 \%$ | $1.7 \%$ |

Q14. PARKS AND RECREATION. Please rate your satisfaction on a scale of 1 to 5 , where 5 means "Very Satisfied" and 1 means "Very Dissatisfied," with the following:
( $\mathrm{N}=735$ )

|  | Very <br> Satisfied | Satisfied | Neutral | Dissatisfied | Dissatisfied |
| :--- | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | Don't know

Q14. PARKS AND RECREATION. Please rate your satisfaction on a scale of 1 to 5 , where 5 means
"Very Satisfied" and 1 means "Very Dissatisfied," with the following:

|  | Very <br> Satisfied | Satisfied | Neutral | Dissatisfied Dissatisfied Don't know |  |  |
| :--- | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Q14 18. Quality of special events |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| (CityFest, Downtown Trick or Treat, etc. | $23.3 \%$ | $45.0 \%$ | $15.6 \%$ | $3.7 \%$ | $0.8 \%$ | $11.6 \%$ |

## EXCLUDING DON'T KNOW

Q14. PARKS AND RECREATION. Please rate your satisfaction on a scale of 1 to 5, where 5 means "Very Satisfied" and 1 means "Very Dissatisfied," with the following:(Without "Don't Know")
( $\mathrm{N}=735$ )

|  | Very Satisfied | Satisfied | Neutral | Dissatisfied | Very Dissatisfied |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Q14 01 Maintenance of parks | 28.3\% | 56.0\% | 11.5\% | 3.9\% | 0.3\% |
| Q1402 Maintenance of cemeteries | 29.4\% | 52.1\% | 16.2\% | 1.4\% | 0.9\% |
| Q14 03 Maintenance of walking trails | 25.6\% | 57.3\% | 12.7\% | 4.0\% | 0.5\% |
| Q14 04. Maintenance of biking paths and lanes | 21.4\% | 51.9\% | 17.5\% | 6.1\% | 3.1\% |
| Q14 05. Maintenance of swimming pools | 22.2\% | 47.8\% | 26.3\% | 2.5\% | 1.2\% |
| Q14 06. Quality of swimming pools | 19.9\% | 44.6\% | 27.0\% | 7.3\% | 1.1\% |
| Q14 07. Maintenance of community recreation centers | 24.8\% | 54.1\% | 18.7\% | 2.0\% | 0.4\% |
| Q14 08. Quality of community recreation centers | 25.9\% | 50.6\% | 18.8\% | 3.9\% | 0.7\% |
| Q14 09. Maintenance of outdoor athletic fields | 26.3\% | 53.5\% | 14.6\% | 4.4\% | 1.2\% |
| Q14 10. Quality of outdoor athletic fields | 26.9\% | 52.1\% | 13.8\% | 6.0\% | 1.2\% |
| Q14 11. Quality of youth athletic programs | 29.7\% | 47.9\% | 16.8\% | 4.7\% | 1.0\% |
| Q14 12. Quality of adult athletic programs | 22.9\% | 41.1\% | 28.9\% | 6.0\% | 1.2\% |
| Q14 13. Quality of cultural arts programs | 24.1\% | 45.0\% | 24.1\% | 5.6\% | 1.1\% |
| Q14 14. Quality of senior programs | 20.9\% | 39.2\% | 34.2\% | 5.2\% | 0.5\% |
| Q14 15. Quality of special needs/therapeutics programs | 20.3\% | 35.4\% | 37.0\% | 5.8\% | 1.4\% |
| Q14 16. Ease of registering for programs | 21.7\% | 47.1\% | 25.4\% | 4.5\% | 1.4\% |
| Q14 17. Fees charged for recreation programs | 19.8\% | 47.8\% | 24.9\% | 6.0\% | 1.5\% |
| Q14 18. Quality of special events (CityFest, Downtown Trick or Treat, etc.) | 26.3\% | 50.9\% | 17.7\% | 4.2\% | 0.9\% |

Q15. Which FOUR of the areas of PARKS AND RECREATION listed above do you think should receive the most emphasis from city leaders over the next TWO Years?

| Q15 1st Choice | Number | Percent |
| :--- | ---: | ---: |
| Maintenance of parks | 121 | $16.5 \%$ |
| Maintenance of cemeteries | 15 | $2.0 \%$ |
| Maintenance of walking trails | 26 | $3.5 \%$ |
| Maintenance of biking paths and lanes | 54 | $7.3 \%$ |
| Maintenance of swimming pools | 13 | $1.8 \%$ |
| Quality of swimming pools | 18 | $2.4 \%$ |
| Maintenance of community recreation centers | 15 | $2.0 \%$ |
| Quality of community recreation centers | 25 | $3.4 \%$ |
| Maintenance of outdoor athletic fields | 20 | $2.7 \%$ |
| Quality of outdoor athletic fields | 17 | $2.3 \%$ |
| Quality of youth athletic programs | 41 | $5.6 \%$ |
| Quality of adult athletic programs | 14 | $1.9 \%$ |
| Quality of cultural arts programs | 25 | $3.4 \%$ |
| Quality of senior programs | 38 | $5.2 \%$ |
| Quality of special needs/therapeutics programs | 19 | $2.6 \%$ |
| Ease of registering for programs | 18 | $2.4 \%$ |
| Fees charged for recreation programs | 14 | $1.9 \%$ |
| Quality of special events (CityFest, Downtown Trick or |  |  |
| Treat, etc.) | 56 | $7.6 \%$ |
| None selected | 186 | $25.3 \%$ |
| Total | 735 | $100.0 \%$ |

Q15. Which FOUR of the areas of PARKS AND RECREATION listed above do you think should receive the most emphasis from city leaders over the next TWO Years?

| Q15 2nd Choice | Number | Percent |
| :--- | ---: | ---: |
| Maintenance of parks | 52 | $7.1 \%$ |
| Maintenance of cemeteries | 32 | $4.4 \%$ |
| Maintenance of walking trails | 60 | $8.2 \%$ |
| Maintenance of biking paths and lanes | 37 | $5.0 \%$ |
| Maintenance of swimming pools | 12 | $1.6 \%$ |
| Quality of swimming pools | 21 | $2.9 \%$ |
| Maintenance of community recreation centers | 20 | $2.7 \%$ |
| Quality of community recreation centers | 18 | $2.4 \%$ |
| Maintenance of outdoor athletic fields | 20 | $2.7 \%$ |
| Quality of outdoor athletic fields | 26 | $3.5 \%$ |
| Quality of youth athletic programs | 32 | $4.4 \%$ |
| Quality of adult athletic programs | 25 | $3.4 \%$ |
| Quality of cultural arts programs | 35 | $4.8 \%$ |
| Quality of senior programs | 34 | $4.6 \%$ |
| Quality of special needs/therapeutics programs | 22 | $3.0 \%$ |
| Ease of registering for programs | 10 | $1.4 \%$ |
| Fees charged for recreation programs | 16 | $2.2 \%$ |
| Quality of special events (CityFest, Downtown Trick or |  |  |
| Treat, etc.) | 38 | $5.2 \%$ |
| None selected | 225 | $30.6 \%$ |
| Total | 735 | $100.0 \%$ |

Q15. Which FOUR of the areas of PARKS AND RECREATION listed above do you think should receive the most emphasis from city leaders over the next TWO Years?

| Q15 3rd Choice | Number | Percent |
| :--- | ---: | ---: |
| Maintenance of parks | 43 | $5.9 \%$ |
| Maintenance of cemeteries | 10 | $1.4 \%$ |
| Maintenance of walking trails | 39 | $5.3 \%$ |
| Maintenance of biking paths and lanes | 37 | $5.0 \%$ |
| Maintenance of swimming pools | 14 | $1.9 \%$ |
| Quality of swimming pools | 15 | $2.0 \%$ |
| Maintenance of community recreation centers | 34 | $4.6 \%$ |
| Quality of community recreation centers | 34 | $4.6 \%$ |
| Maintenance of outdoor athletic fields | 24 | $3.3 \%$ |
| Quality of outdoor athletic fields | 11 | $1.5 \%$ |
| Quality of youth athletic programs | 30 | $4.1 \%$ |
| Quality of adult athletic programs | 16 | $2.2 \%$ |
| Quality of cultural arts programs | 27 | $3.7 \%$ |
| Quality of senior programs | 33 | $4.5 \%$ |
| Quality of special needs/therapeutics programs | 18 | $2.4 \%$ |
| Ease of registering for programs | 30 | $4.1 \%$ |
| Fees charged for recreation programs | 27 | $3.7 \%$ |
| Quality of special events (CityFest, Downtown Trick or |  |  |
| Treat, etc.) | 33 | $4.5 \%$ |
| None selected | 260 | $35.4 \%$ |
| Total | 735 | $100.0 \%$ |

Q15. Which FOUR of the areas of PARKS AND RECREATION listed above do you think should receive the most emphasis from city leaders over the next TWO Years?

| Q15 4th Choice | Number | Percent |
| :--- | ---: | ---: |
| Maintenance of parks | 39 | $5.3 \%$ |
| Maintenance of cemeteries | 14 | $1.9 \%$ |
| Maintenance of walking trails | 25 | $3.4 \%$ |
| Maintenance of biking paths and lanes | 35 | $4.8 \%$ |
| Maintenance of swimming pools | 7 | $1.0 \%$ |
| Quality of swimming pools | 14 | $1.9 \%$ |
| Maintenance of community recreation centers | 32 | $4.4 \%$ |
| Quality of community recreation centers | 25 | $3.4 \%$ |
| Maintenance of outdoor athletic fields | 11 | $1.5 \%$ |
| Quality of outdoor athletic fields | 13 | $1.8 \%$ |
| Quality of youth athletic programs | 32 | $4.4 \%$ |
| Quality of adult athletic programs | 16 | $2.2 \%$ |
| Quality of cultural arts programs | 25 | $3.4 \%$ |
| Quality of senior programs | 23 | $3.1 \%$ |
| Quality of special needs/therapeutics programs | 30 | $4.1 \%$ |
| Ease of registering for programs | 16 | $2.2 \%$ |
| Fees charged for recreation programs | 27 | $3.7 \%$ |
| Quality of special events (CityFest, Downtown Trick or |  |  |
| Treat, etc.) | 54 | $7.3 \%$ |
| None selected | 297 | $40.4 \%$ |
| Total | 735 | $100.0 \%$ |

Q15. Which FOUR of the areas of PARKS AND RECREATION listed above do you think should receive the most emphasis from city leaders over the next TWO Years?

| Q15 1st Choice | Number | Percent |
| :--- | ---: | ---: |
| Maintenance of parks | 255 | $34.7 \%$ |
| Quality of special events (CityFest, Downtown Trick or |  |  |
| Treat, etc.) | 181 | $24.6 \%$ |
| Maintenance of biking paths and lanes | 163 | $22.2 \%$ |
| Maintenance of walking trails | 150 | $20.4 \%$ |
| Quality of youth athletic programs | 135 | $18.4 \%$ |
| Quality of senior programs | 128 | $17.4 \%$ |
| Quality of cultural arts programs | 112 | $15.2 \%$ |
| Quality of community recreation centers | 102 | $13.9 \%$ |
| Maintenance of community recreation centers | 101 | $13.7 \%$ |
| Quality of special needs/therapeutics programs | 89 | $12.1 \%$ |
| Fees charged for recreation programs | 84 | $11.4 \%$ |
| Maintenance of outdoor athletic fields | 75 | $10.2 \%$ |
| Ease of registering for programs | 74 | $10.1 \%$ |
| Maintenance of cemeteries | 71 | $9.7 \%$ |
| Quality of adult athletic programs | 71 | $9.7 \%$ |
| Quality of swimming pools | 68 | $9.3 \%$ |
| Quality of outdoor athletic fields | 67 | $9.1 \%$ |
| Maintenance of swimming pools | 46 | $6.3 \%$ |
| None selected | 186 | $25.3 \%$ |
| Total | 2158 |  |

Q16. TRAFFIC FLOW \& TRANSPORTATION. For each of the following, please rate your satisfaction on a scale of 1 to 5, where 5 means "Very Satisfied" and 1 means "Very Dissatisfied."
( $\mathrm{N}=735$ )

|  | Very Satisfied | Satisfied | Neutral | Dissatisfied | Very <br> Dissatisfied | Don't know |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Q16 A Ease of travel by car in Auburn | 15.6\% | 49.1\% | 12.9\% | 17.7\% | 3.4\% | 1.2\% |
| Q16 B. Ease of travel by bicycle in Auburn | 5.3\% | 15.6\% | 22.4\% | 11.8\% | 5.0\% | 39.7\% |
| Q16 C. Ease of pedestrian travel in Auburn | 12.9\% | 45.6\% | 19.2\% | 10.3\% | 2.4\% | 9.5\% |

## EXCLUDING DON'T KNOW

Q16. TRAFFIC FLOW \& TRANSPORTATION. For each of the following, please rate your satisfaction on a scale of 1 to 5, where 5 means "Very Satisfied" and 1 means "Very Dissatisfied." (Without "Don't Know")
( $\mathrm{N}=735$ )

|  | Very <br> Satisfied | Satisfied | Neutral | Dissatisfied | Very <br> Dissatisfied |
| :--- | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Q16 A Ease of travel by car in Auburn | $15.8 \%$ | $49.7 \%$ | $13.1 \%$ | $17.9 \%$ | $3.4 \%$ |
| Q16 B. Ease of travel by bicycle in Auburn | $8.8 \%$ | $26.0 \%$ | $37.2 \%$ | $19.6 \%$ | $8.4 \%$ |
| Q16 C. Ease of pedestrian travel in Auburn | $14.3 \%$ | $50.4 \%$ | $21.2 \%$ | $11.4 \%$ | $2.7 \%$ |

## Q17. How often do you use the city's bicycle lanes and facilities?

| 17. How often do you use the city s bicycle lanes |  |  |
| :--- | ---: | ---: |
| and facilities? | Number | Percent |
| Daily | 19 | $2.6 \%$ |
| Weekly | 49 | $6.7 \%$ |
| Monthly | 40 | $5.4 \%$ |
| Occasionally | 170 | $23.1 \%$ |
| Never | 423 | $57.6 \%$ |
| Don't know | 34 | $4.6 \%$ |
| Total | 735 | $100.0 \%$ |

Q18. MAINTENANCE. Excluding areas maintained by Auburn University, please rate your satisfaction on a scale of 1 to 5 , where 5 means "Very Satisfied" and 1 means "Very Dissatisfied," with the following:
( $\mathrm{N}=735$ )

|  | Very <br> Satisfied | Satisfied | Neutral | Dissatisfied | Dissatisfied |
| :--- | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | Don't know

## EXCLUDING DON'T KNOW

Q18. MAINTENANCE. Excluding areas maintained by Auburn University, please rate your satisfaction on a scale of 1 to 5, where 5 means "Very Satisfied" and 1 means "Very Dissatisfied," with the following:(Without "Don't Know")
( $\mathrm{N}=735$ )

|  | Very <br> Satisfied | Satisfied | Neutral | Dissatisfied | Dissatisfied |
| :--- | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Q18 01 Maintenance of streets | $16.6 \%$ | $57.7 \%$ | $13.8 \%$ | $10.7 \%$ | $1.2 \%$ |
| Q18 02 Maintenance of sidewalks | $17.3 \%$ | $59.0 \%$ | $12.2 \%$ | $9.9 \%$ | $1.5 \%$ |
| Q18 03 Maintenance of street signs | $23.8 \%$ | $64.2 \%$ | $9.1 \%$ | $2.2 \%$ | $0.7 \%$ |
| Q18 04 Maintenance of traffic signals | $26.5 \%$ | $62.1 \%$ | $8.6 \%$ | $2.6 \%$ | $0.3 \%$ |
| Q18 05 Maintenance of downtown Auburn | $31.4 \%$ | $57.9 \%$ | $7.9 \%$ | $2.6 \%$ | $0.1 \%$ |
| Q18 06. Cleanup of debris/litter in and near |  |  |  |  |  |
| roadways | $17.9 \%$ | $57.9 \%$ | $14.8 \%$ | $7.6 \%$ | $1.8 \%$ |
| Q18 07. Maintenance of city-owned buildings | $22.0 \%$ | $62.3 \%$ | $13.8 \%$ | $1.6 \%$ | $0.3 \%$ |
| Q18 08. Mowing/trimming along streets and |  |  |  |  |  |
| public areas | $20.6 \%$ | $62.8 \%$ | $11.0 \%$ | $4.7 \%$ | $0.8 \%$ |
| Q18 09. Overall cleanliness of streets and |  |  |  |  |  |
| public areas | $23.0 \%$ | $61.3 \%$ | $11.3 \%$ | $3.6 \%$ | $0.8 \%$ |
| Q18 10 Adequacy of city street lighting | $17.1 \%$ | $53.6 \%$ | $16.7 \%$ | $9.9 \%$ | $2.6 \%$ |

Q19. Which THREE of the areas of MAINTENANCE listed above do you think should receive the most emphasis from city leaders over the next TWO Years?

| Q19 1st Choice | Number | Percent |
| :--- | ---: | ---: |
| Maintenance of streets | 198 | $26.9 \%$ |
| Maintenance of sidewalks | 56 | $7.6 \%$ |
| Maintenance of street signs | 14 | $1.9 \%$ |
| Maintenance of traffic signals | 18 | $2.4 \%$ |
| Maintenance of downtown Auburn | 54 | $7.3 \%$ |
| Cleanup of debris/litter in and near roadways | 57 | $7.8 \%$ |
| Maintenance of city-owned buildings | 6 | $0.8 \%$ |
| Mowing/trimming along streets and public areas | 22 | $3.0 \%$ |
| Overall cleanliness of streets and public areas | 22 | $3.0 \%$ |
| Adequacy of city street lighting | 114 | $15.5 \%$ |
| None selected | 174 | $23.7 \%$ |
| Total | 735 | $100.0 \%$ |

Q19. Which THREE of the areas of MAINTENANCE listed above do you think should receive the most emphasis from city leaders over the next TWO Years?

| Q19 2nd Choice | Number | Percent |
| :--- | ---: | ---: |
| Maintenance of streets | 73 | $9.9 \%$ |
| Maintenance of sidewalks | 81 | $11.0 \%$ |
| Maintenance of street signs | 25 | $3.4 \%$ |
| Maintenance of traffic signals | 32 | $4.4 \%$ |
| Maintenance of downtown Auburn | 36 | $4.9 \%$ |
| Cleanup of debris/litter in and near roadways | 67 | $9.1 \%$ |
| Maintenance of city-owned buildings | 16 | $2.2 \%$ |
| Mowing/trimming along streets and public areas | 44 | $6.0 \%$ |
| Overall cleanliness of streets and public areas | 79 | $10.7 \%$ |
| Adequacy of city street lighting | 77 | $10.5 \%$ |
| None selected | 205 | $27.9 \%$ |
| Total | 735 | $100.0 \%$ |

Q19. Which THREE of the areas of MAINTENANCE listed above do you think should receive the most emphasis from city leaders over the next TWO Years?

| Q19 3rd Choice | Number | Percent |
| :--- | ---: | ---: |
| Maintenance of streets | 45 | $6.1 \%$ |
| Maintenance of sidewalks | 54 | $7.3 \%$ |
| Maintenance of street signs | 20 | $2.7 \%$ |
| Maintenance of traffic signals | 27 | $3.7 \%$ |
| Maintenance of downtown Auburn | 42 | $5.7 \%$ |
| Cleanup of debris/litter in and near roadways | 63 | $8.6 \%$ |
| Maintenance of city-owned buildings | 18 | $2.4 \%$ |
| Mowing/trimming along streets and public areas | 46 | $6.3 \%$ |
| Overall cleanliness of streets and public areas | 80 | $10.9 \%$ |
| Adequacy of city street lighting | 83 | $11.3 \%$ |
| None selected | 257 | $35.0 \%$ |
| Total | 735 | $100.0 \%$ |

## SUM OF THE TOP CHOICES

## Q19. The sum of the THREE areas of MAINTENANCE listed above you think should receive the most emphasis from city leaders over the next TWO Years

| Q19 1st Choice | Number | Percent |
| :--- | ---: | ---: |
| Maintenance of streets | 316 | $43.0 \%$ |
| Adequacy of city street lighting | 274 | $37.3 \%$ |
| Maintenance of sidewalks | 191 | $26.0 \%$ |
| Cleanup of debris/litter in and near roadways | 187 | $25.4 \%$ |
| Overall cleanliness of streets and public areas | 181 | $24.6 \%$ |
| Maintenance of downtown Auburn | 132 | $18.0 \%$ |
| Mowing/trimming along streets and public areas | 112 | $15.2 \%$ |
| Maintenance of traffic signals | 77 | $10.5 \%$ |
| Maintenance of street signs | 59 | $8.0 \%$ |
| Maintenance of city-owned buildings | 40 | $5.4 \%$ |
| None selected | 174 | $23.7 \%$ |
| Total | 1743 |  |

Q20. DOWNTOWN AUBURN. For each of the following issues in DOWNTOWN AUBURN, please rate your satisfaction on a scale of 1 to 5 , where 5 means "Very Satisfied" and 1 means "Very Dissatisfied."
( $\mathrm{N}=735$ )

|  | Very <br> Satisfied | Satisfied | Neutral | DissatisfiedDissatisfied |  |  |
| :--- | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Q20 01 Cleanliness of downtown areas know |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Q20 02. Feeling of safety of downtown | $34.0 \%$ | $56.2 \%$ | $4.8 \%$ | $2.0 \%$ | $0.4 \%$ | $2.6 \%$ |
| at night | $29.5 \%$ | $49.4 \%$ | $10.9 \%$ | $3.0 \%$ | $0.8 \%$ | $6.4 \%$ |
| Q20 03 Pedestrian accessibility | $27.8 \%$ | $52.9 \%$ | $11.6 \%$ | $3.5 \%$ | $0.8 \%$ | $3.4 \%$ |
| Q20 04. Quality of public events held <br> downtown | $21.5 \%$ | $43.7 \%$ | $17.3 \%$ | $6.9 \%$ | $1.4 \%$ | $9.3 \%$ |
| Q20 05 Landscaping and green space | $24.6 \%$ | $52.7 \%$ | $13.5 \%$ | $4.6 \%$ | $1.4 \%$ | $3.3 \%$ |
| Q20 06 Signage and wayfinding | $26.3 \%$ | $55.1 \%$ | $11.4 \%$ | $2.3 \%$ | $0.4 \%$ | $4.5 \%$ |
| Q20 07. Availability of public event <br> space | $15.4 \%$ | $36.3 \%$ | $22.3 \%$ | $8.8 \%$ | $2.4 \%$ | $14.7 \%$ |
| Q20 08. Availability of dining <br> opportunities | $24.8 \%$ | $45.9 \%$ | $16.2 \%$ | $8.8 \%$ | $1.6 \%$ | $2.7 \%$ |
| Q20 09. Availability of outdoor dining |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| venues |  |  |  |  |  |  |

## EXCLUDING DON'T KNOW

Q20. DOWNTOWN AUBURN. For each of the following issues in DOWNTOWN AUBURN, please rate your satisfaction on a scale of 1 to 5 , where 5 means "Very Satisfied" and 1 means "Very Dissatisfied." (Without "Don't Know")
( $\mathrm{N}=735$ )

|  | Very <br> Satisfied | Satisfied | Neutral | Dissatisfied | Very <br> Dissatisfied |
| :--- | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Q20 01 Cleanliness of downtown areas | $34.9 \%$ | $57.7 \%$ | $4.9 \%$ | $2.1 \%$ | $0.4 \%$ |
| Q20 02. Feeling of safety of downtown at night | $31.5 \%$ | $52.8 \%$ | $11.6 \%$ | $3.2 \%$ | $0.9 \%$ |
| Q20 03 Pedestrian accessibility | $28.7 \%$ | $54.8 \%$ | $12.0 \%$ | $3.7 \%$ | $0.8 \%$ |
| Q20 04. Quality of public events held downtown | $23.7 \%$ | $48.1 \%$ | $19.0 \%$ | $7.6 \%$ | $1.5 \%$ |
| Q20 05 Landscaping and green space | $25.5 \%$ | $54.4 \%$ | $13.9 \%$ | $4.8 \%$ | $1.4 \%$ |
| Q20 06 Signage and wayfinding | $27.5 \%$ | $57.7 \%$ | $12.0 \%$ | $2.4 \%$ | $0.4 \%$ |
| Q20 07. Availability of public event space | $18.0 \%$ | $42.6 \%$ | $26.2 \%$ | $10.4 \%$ | $2.9 \%$ |
| Q20 08. Availability of dining opportunities | $25.5 \%$ | $47.1 \%$ | $16.6 \%$ | $9.1 \%$ | $1.7 \%$ |
| Q20 09. Availability of outdoor dining venues | $15.7 \%$ | $40.5 \%$ | $24.7 \%$ | $16.7 \%$ | $2.4 \%$ |
| Q20 10 Availability of retail shopping | $18.4 \%$ | $43.2 \%$ | $24.7 \%$ | $11.7 \%$ | $2.0 \%$ |
| Q20 11 Availability of parking | $7.7 \%$ | $25.0 \%$ | $18.8 \%$ | $31.6 \%$ | $16.7 \%$ |
| Q20 12. Enforcement of parking violations \& |  |  |  |  |  |
| meter times | $16.1 \%$ | $43.8 \%$ | $30.5 \%$ | $5.5 \%$ | $4.2 \%$ |

Q21. Which THREE areas of DOWNTOWN AUBURN listed above do you think should receive the most emphasis from city leaders over the next TWO Years?

| Q21 1st Choice | Number | Percent |
| :--- | ---: | ---: |
| Cleanliness of downtown areas | 57 | $7.8 \%$ |
| Feeling of safety of downtown at night | 72 | $9.8 \%$ |
| Pedestrian accessibility | 24 | $3.3 \%$ |
| Quality of public events held downtown | 34 | $4.6 \%$ |
| Landscaping and green space | 21 | $2.9 \%$ |
| Signage and wayfinding | 4 | $0.5 \%$ |
| Availability of public event space | 18 | $2.4 \%$ |
| Availability of dining opportunities | 25 | $3.4 \%$ |
| Availability of outdoor dining venues | 29 | $3.9 \%$ |
| Availability of retail shopping | 41 | $5.6 \%$ |
| Availability of parking | 266 | $36.2 \%$ |
| Enforcement of parking violations \& meter times | 14 | $1.9 \%$ |
| None selected | 130 | $17.7 \%$ |
| Total | 735 | $100.0 \%$ |

## Q21. Which THREE areas of DOWNTOWN AUBURN listed above do you think should receive the most emphasis from city leaders over the next TWO Years?

| Q21 2nd Choice | Number | Percent |
| :--- | ---: | ---: |
| Cleanliness of downtown areas | 44 | $6.0 \%$ |
| Feeling of safety of downtown at night | 69 | $9.4 \%$ |
| Pedestrian accessibility | 35 | $4.8 \%$ |
| Quality of public events held downtown | 53 | $7.2 \%$ |
| Landscaping and green space | 34 | $4.6 \%$ |
| Signage and wayfinding | 17 | $2.3 \%$ |
| Availability of public event space | 42 | $5.7 \%$ |
| Availability of dining opportunities | 47 | $6.4 \%$ |
| Availability of outdoor dining venues | 55 | $7.5 \%$ |
| Availability of retail shopping | 53 | $7.2 \%$ |
| Availability of parking | 78 | $10.6 \%$ |
| Enforcement of parking violations \& meter times | 19 | $2.6 \%$ |
| None selected | 189 | $25.7 \%$ |
| Total | 735 | $100.0 \%$ |

Q21. Which THREE areas of DOWNTOWN AUBURN listed above do you think should receive the most emphasis from city leaders over the next TWO Years?

| Q21 3rd Choice | Number | Percent |
| :--- | ---: | ---: |
| Cleanliness of downtown areas | 48 | $6.5 \%$ |
| Feeling of safety of downtown at night | 48 | $6.5 \%$ |
| Pedestrian accessibility | 30 | $4.1 \%$ |
| Quality of public events held downtown | 49 | $6.7 \%$ |
| Landscaping and green space | 46 | $6.3 \%$ |
| Signage and wayfinding | 23 | $3.1 \%$ |
| Availability of public event space | 32 | $4.4 \%$ |
| Availability of dining opportunities | 50 | $6.8 \%$ |
| Availability of outdoor dining venues | 34 | $4.6 \%$ |
| Availability of retail shopping | 47 | $6.4 \%$ |
| Availability of parking | 81 | $11.0 \%$ |
| Enforcement of parking violations \& meter times | 20 | $2.7 \%$ |
| None selected | 227 | $30.9 \%$ |
| Total | 735 | $100.0 \%$ |

## SUM OF THE TOP CHOICES

Q21. Sum of the Top THREE areas of DOWNTOWN AUBURN listed above you think should receive the most emphasis from city leaders over the next TWO Years

| Q21 1st Choice | Number | Percent |
| :--- | ---: | ---: |
| Availability of parking | 425 | $57.8 \%$ |
| Feeling of safety of downtown at night | 189 | $25.7 \%$ |
| Cleanliness of downtown areas | 149 | $20.3 \%$ |
| Availability of retail shopping | 141 | $19.2 \%$ |
| Quality of public events held downtown | 136 | $18.5 \%$ |
| Availability of dining opportunities | 122 | $16.6 \%$ |
| Availability of outdoor dining venues | 118 | $16.1 \%$ |
| Landscaping and green space | 101 | $13.7 \%$ |
| Availability of public event space | 92 | $12.5 \%$ |
| Pedestrian accessibility | 89 | $12.1 \%$ |
| Enforcement of parking violations \& meter times | 53 | $7.2 \%$ |
| Signage and wayfinding | 44 | $6.0 \%$ |
| None selected | 130 | $17.7 \%$ |
| Total | 1789 |  |

Q22. What major projects or initiatives do you feel are most important for the City to pursue over the next 1-3 years? Please indicate the importance of the following by ranking them 1 through 7 , with 1 being the HIGHEST priority and 7 being the LOWEST.
( $\mathrm{N}=735$ )

|  | Highest | High | Above Average | Average | Below Average | Low | Lowest |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Q22 Downtown Improvements (projects like |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Toomer s Corner, Gay Street Parking Lot, College/Mag. Alley Projects, etc.) - | 20.7\% | 21.8\% | 20.9\% | 12.3\% | 6.6\% | 7.5\% | 10.3\% |
| Q22 Opelika Road Improvements (such as those made between Ross St. and Gay St., continuing to the City limits) - | 24.9\% | 26.4\% | 20.2\% | 11.9\% | 6.6\% | 4.9\% | 4.9\% |
| Q22 Downtown Parking Improvements (new parking deck, expanded on-street parking etc.) - | 32.9\% | 22.9\% | 17.4\% | 8.6\% | 9.2\% | 3.9\% | 5.1\% |
| Q22 Greenways \& Pedestrian/Biking Trails (Saugahatchee Greenway, expanded pedestrian connectivity in town) - | 12.5\% | 10.2\% | 12.8\% | 21.1\% | 17.9\% | 13.4\% | 12.1\% |
| Q22 New Athletic Fields (Land acquisition \& development for soccer, football, lacrosse \& baseball fields) - | 6.0\% | 7.0\% | 8.4\% | 13.9\% | 24.1\% | 22.7\% | 17.8\% |
| Q22 New Lake Wilmore Community Recreation Center and Pool - | 4.5\% | 5.3\% | 7.8\% | 11.3\% | 14.8\% | 21.0\% | 35.2\% |
| Q22 Town Creek Park Expansion (open space, pavilions, larger playground, etc.) - | 4.5\% | 10.6\% | 14.0\% | 19.7\% | 18.2\% | 22.1\% | 10.8\% |

Q23. CITY COMMUNICATION. Please rate your satisfaction on a scale of 1 to 5, where 5 means "Very Satisfied" and 1 means "Very Dissatisfied," with the following:
( $\mathrm{N}=735$ )

|  | Very <br> Satisfied | Satisfied | Neutral | Dissatisfied | Dissatisfied |  |  |
| :--- | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Q23 1 Quality of Open Line newsletter | $21.2 \%$ | $41.0 \%$ | $16.2 \%$ | $2.9 \%$ | $0.5 \%$ | $18.2 \%$ |  |
| Q23 2 Quality of the city s website | $16.5 \%$ | $40.7 \%$ | $19.0 \%$ | $8.2 \%$ | $1.5 \%$ | $14.1 \%$ |  |
| Q23 3. Quality of the city s social media <br> (Twitter, Facebook, etc.) | $7.9 \%$ | $23.8 \%$ | $21.6 \%$ | $4.2 \%$ | $1.1 \%$ | $41.4 \%$ |  |
| Q23 4. Availability of information on city <br> services and programs | $13.2 \%$ | $41.5 \%$ | $24.1 \%$ | $8.4 \%$ | $1.5 \%$ | $11.3 \%$ |  |
| Q23 5. Availability of information about <br> Parks \& Recreation services and programs | $15.5 \%$ | $43.7 \%$ | $20.7 \%$ | $6.7 \%$ | $1.5 \%$ | $12.0 \%$ |  |
| Q23 6. Availability of information on <br> Auburn Public Library services and <br> programs |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |

## EXCLUDING DON'T KNOW

Q23. CITY COMMUNICATION. Please rate your satisfaction on a scale of 1 to 5, where 5 means "Very Satisfied" and 1 means "Very Dissatisfied," with the following:(Without "Don't Know")
( $\mathrm{N}=735$ )

|  | Very <br> Satisfied | Satisfied | Neutral | Dissatisfied | Very <br> Dissatisfied |
| :--- | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Q23 1 Quality of Open Line newsletter | $26.0 \%$ | $50.1 \%$ | $19.8 \%$ | $3.5 \%$ | $0.7 \%$ |
| Q23 2 Quality of the city s website | $19.2 \%$ | $47.4 \%$ | $22.2 \%$ | $9.5 \%$ | $1.7 \%$ |
| Q23 3. Quality of the city s social media <br> (Twitter, Facebook, etc.) | $13.5 \%$ | $40.6 \%$ | $36.9 \%$ | $7.2 \%$ | $1.9 \%$ |
| Q23 4. Availability of information on city <br> services and programs | $14.9 \%$ | $46.8 \%$ | $27.1 \%$ | $9.5 \%$ | $1.7 \%$ |
|  <br> Recreation services and programs | $17.6 \%$ | $49.6 \%$ | $23.5 \%$ | $7.6 \%$ | $1.7 \%$ |
| Q23 6. Availability of information on Auburn <br> Public Library services and programs | $22.1 \%$ | $49.0 \%$ | $22.8 \%$ | $4.9 \%$ | $1.1 \%$ |

Q24. Which of the following are your primary sources of information about city issues, services, and events?

| Q24 Primary sources of information (multiple selections allowed) | Percent |  |
| :--- | ---: | ---: |
| Word of mouth (friends/neighbors) | 167 | $63.5 \%$ |
| Local newspaper (Villager, OA News) | 161 | $61.2 \%$ |
| Open Line newsletter | 153 | $58.2 \%$ |
| City website via home computer (desktop, laptop) | 104 | $39.5 \%$ |
| Radio news programs | 81 | $30.8 \%$ |
| Television news programs | 72 | $27.4 \%$ |
| City website via mobile device (phone, tablet) | 62 | $23.6 \%$ |
| City social media sites (Facebook, Twitter, YouTube) | 51 | $19.4 \%$ |
| Calling a city department on the telephone | 47 | $17.9 \%$ |
| Public meetings | 30 | $11.4 \%$ |
| City emails/texts/press releases (e-Notifier) | 24 | $9.1 \%$ |
| City cable channel (Charter Ch. 16, WOW Ch. 13) | 18 | $6.8 \%$ |
| Other social media sites (private, non-city sites) | 17 | $6.5 \%$ |
| Other | 3 | $1.1 \%$ |
| Total | 990 |  |

Q25. Have you called or visited the city with a question, problem, or complaint during the past year?
Q25. Have you called or visited the city with a
question, problem, or complaint during the past

| year? | Number | Percent |
| :--- | ---: | ---: |
| Yes | 299 | $40.7 \%$ |
| No | 436 | $59.3 \%$ |
| Total | 735 | $100.0 \%$ |

Q25-2. How easy was it to contact the person you needed to reach?
Q25-2. How easy was it to contact the person you

| needed to reach? | Number | Percent |
| :--- | ---: | ---: |
| Very easy | 140 | $46.8 \%$ |
| Somewhat easy | 120 | $40.1 \%$ |
| Difficult | 29 | $9.7 \%$ |
| Very difficult | 10 | $3.3 \%$ |
| Total | 299 | $100.0 \%$ |

Q25-3. What department did you contact?

| Q25-3 (01) Police | Number | Percent |
| :--- | ---: | ---: |
| Yes | 50 | $16.7 \%$ |
| No | 249 | $83.3 \%$ |
| Total | 299 | $100.0 \%$ |

## Q25-3. What department did you contact?

| Q25-3 (02) Fire | Number | Percent |
| :--- | ---: | ---: |
| Yes | 3 | $1.0 \%$ |
| No | 296 | $99.0 \%$ |
| Total | 299 | $100.0 \%$ |

## Q25-3. What department did you contact?

| Q25-3 (03) Planning | Number | Percent |
| :--- | ---: | ---: |
| Yes | 27 | $9.0 \%$ |
| No | 272 | $91.0 \%$ |
| Total | 299 | $100.0 \%$ |

Q25-3. What department did you contact?

| Q25-3 (04) Parks and Recreation | Number | Percent |
| :--- | ---: | ---: |
| Yes | 29 | $9.7 \%$ |
| No | 270 | $90.3 \%$ |
| Total | 299 | $100.0 \%$ |

Q25-3. What department did you contact?

| Q25-3 (05) Codes Enforcement | Number | Percent |
| :--- | ---: | ---: |
| Yes | 31 | $10.4 \%$ |
| No | 268 | $89.6 \%$ |
| Total | 299 | $100.0 \%$ |

Q25-3. What department did you contact?

| Q25-3 (06) Public Works | Number | Percent |
| :--- | ---: | ---: |
| Yes | 28 | $9.4 \%$ |
| No | 271 | $90.6 \%$ |
| Total | 299 | $100.0 \%$ |

Q25-3. What department did you contact?

| Q25-3 (07) City Manager's Office | Number | Percent |
| :--- | ---: | ---: |
| Yes | 20 | $6.7 \%$ |
| No | 279 | $93.3 \%$ |
| Total | 299 | $100.0 \%$ |

## Q25-3. What department did you contact?

| Q25-3 (08) Utility Billing Office | Number | Percent |
| :--- | ---: | ---: |
| Yes | 25 | $8.4 \%$ |
| No | 274 | $91.6 \%$ |
| Total | 299 | $100.0 \%$ |

## Q25-3. What department did you contact?

| Q25-3 (09) Municipal Court | Number | Percent |
| :--- | ---: | ---: |
| Yes | 7 | $2.3 \%$ |
| No | 292 | $97.7 \%$ |
| Total | 299 | $100.0 \%$ |

## Q25-3. What department did you contact?

| Q25-3 (10) Environmental Services (garbage, |  |  |
| :--- | ---: | ---: |
| trash, recycling, animal control) | Number | Percent |
| Yes | 61 | $20.4 \%$ |
| No | 238 | $79.6 \%$ |
| Total | 299 | $100.0 \%$ |

Q25-3. What department did you contact?

| Q25-3 (11) Water Resource Management (water, |  |  |
| :--- | ---: | ---: |
| sewer and watershed management) | Number | Percent |
| Yes | 29 | $9.7 \%$ |
| No | 270 | $90.3 \%$ |
| Total | 299 | $100.0 \%$ |

Q25-3. What department did you contact?

| Q25-3 (12) Finance (city licenses and taxes) | Number | Percent |
| :--- | ---: | ---: |
| Yes | 7 | $2.3 \%$ |
| No | 292 | $97.7 \%$ |
| Total | 299 | $100.0 \%$ |

Q25-3. What department did you contact?

| Q25-3 (13) Other | Number | Percent |
| :--- | ---: | ---: |
| Yes | 4 | $1.3 \%$ |
| No | 295 | $98.7 \%$ |
| Total | 299 | $100.0 \%$ |

## Q25-3. Other

| Q25-3 Other (please specify) | Number | Percent |
| :--- | ---: | ---: |
| City council | 2 | $50.0 \%$ |
| Title Office | 1 | $25.0 \%$ |
| voter registration | 1 | $25.0 \%$ |
| Total | 4 | $100.0 \%$ |

Q25-4. Was the department you contacted responsive to your issue?

| Q25-4. Was the department you contacted |  |  |
| :--- | ---: | ---: |
| responsive to your issue? | Number | Percent |
| Yes | 239 | $79.9 \%$ |
| No | 49 | $16.4 \%$ |
| Don't remember | 11 | $3.7 \%$ |
| Total | 299 | $100.0 \%$ |

Q27. How many (counting yourself) people in your household are?

|  | Mean | Sum |
| :--- | :---: | ---: |
| number | 2.79 | 2041 |
| Q27 Under age 5 | 0.17 | 121 |
| Q27 Ages 5-9 | 0.21 | 150 |
| Q27 Ages 10-14 | 0.21 | 156 |
| Q27 Ages 15-19 | 0.20 | 147 |
| Q27 Ages 20-24 | 0.14 | 105 |
| Q27 Ages 25-34 | 0.35 | 253 |
| Q27 Ages 35-44 | 0.39 | 286 |
| Q27 Ages 45-54 | 0.39 | 286 |
| Q27 Ages 55-64 | 0.39 | 283 |
| Q27 Ages 65-74 | 0.29 | 213 |
| Q27 Ages 75+ | 0.06 | 41 |

## Q28. Approximately how many years have you lived in the City of Auburn?

| Q28. Approximately how many years have you |  |  |
| :--- | ---: | ---: |
| $\underline{\text { lived in the City of Auburn? }}$ | Number | Percent |
| 5 years or less | 158 | $21.5 \%$ |
| 6 to 10 years | 142 | $19.3 \%$ |
| 11 to 15 years | 100 | $13.6 \%$ |
| 16 to 20 years | 65 | $8.8 \%$ |
| 21 to 30 years | 115 | $15.6 \%$ |
| $31+$ years | 155 | $21.1 \%$ |
| Total | 735 | $100.0 \%$ |

Q29. How many people in your household work within the Auburn city limits?

| 29. How many people in your household work |  |  |
| :--- | ---: | ---: |
| within the Auburn city limits? | Number | Percent |
| None | 241 | $32.8 \%$ |
| One | 266 | $36.2 \%$ |
| Two | 171 | $23.3 \%$ |
| Three | 20 | $2.7 \%$ |
| Four | 7 | $1.0 \%$ |
| Five or more | 1 | $0.1 \%$ |
| Not provided | 29 | $3.9 \%$ |
| Total | 735 | $100.0 \%$ |

Q30. Are you a full time Auburn University student?

| 30. Are you a full time Auburn University student? | Number | Percent |
| :--- | ---: | ---: |
| Yes | 54 | $7.3 \%$ |
| No | 670 | $91.2 \%$ |
| Not provided | 11 | $1.5 \%$ |
| Total | 735 | $100.0 \%$ |

Q31. Do you own or rent your current residence?

| 31. Do you own or rent your current residence? | Number | Percent |
| :--- | ---: | ---: |
| Own | 544 | $74.0 \%$ |
| Rent | 179 | $24.4 \%$ |
| Not provided | 12 | $1.6 \%$ |
| Total | 735 | $100.0 \%$ |

## Q32. What is your age?

| Q32 What is your age? | Number | Percent |
| :--- | ---: | ---: |
| $18-34$ years | 159 | $21.6 \%$ |
| 35-44 years | 146 | $19.9 \%$ |
| 45-54 years | 151 | $20.5 \%$ |
| 55-64 years | 141 | $19.2 \%$ |
| 65+ years | 132 | $18.0 \%$ |
| Not provided | 6 | $0.8 \%$ |
| Total | 735 | $100.0 \%$ |

Q33. Which of the following best describes your race/ethnicity

| Q33 Race (1) Asian/Pacific Islander | Number | Percent |
| :--- | ---: | ---: |
| No | 703 | $95.6 \%$ |
| Yes | 32 | $4.4 \%$ |
| Total | 735 | $100.0 \%$ |

Q33. Which of the following best describes your race/ethnicity

| Q33 Race (2) Black/African American | Number | Percent |
| :--- | ---: | ---: |
| No | 641 | $87.2 \%$ |
| Black/African American | 94 | $12.8 \%$ |
| Total | 735 | $100.0 \%$ |

## Q33. Which of the following best describes your race/ethnicity

| Q33 Race (3) Hispanic | Number | Percent |
| :--- | ---: | ---: |
| No | 717 | $97.6 \%$ |
| Hispanic | 18 | $2.4 \%$ |
| Total | 735 | $100.0 \%$ |

## Q33. Which of the following best describes your race/ethnicity

| Q33 Race (4) White/Caucasian | Number | Percent |
| :--- | ---: | ---: |
| No | 153 | $20.8 \%$ |
| White | 582 | $79.2 \%$ |
| Total | 735 | $100.0 \%$ |

## Q33. Which of the following best describes your race/ethnicity

| Q33 Race (5) American Indian/Eskimo | Number | Percent |
| :--- | ---: | ---: |
| No | 727 | $98.9 \%$ |
| American Indian/Eskimo | 8 | $1.1 \%$ |
| Total | 735 | $100.0 \%$ |

Q33. Which of the following best describes your race/ethnicity

| Q33 Race (6) Other (please specify) | Number | Percent |
| :--- | ---: | ---: |
| No | 729 | $99.2 \%$ |
| Other | 6 | $0.8 \%$ |
| Total | 735 | $100.0 \%$ |

Q33. Which of the following best describes your race/ethnicity

| Q33 Race (7) Not Provided | Number | Percent |
| :--- | ---: | ---: |
| No | 715 | $97.3 \%$ |
| Not provided | 20 | $2.7 \%$ |
| Total | 735 | $100.0 \%$ |

## Q33. Other

| Q33 (06). Please define 'Other': | Number | Percent |
| :--- | ---: | ---: |
| Bi-racial | 1 | $25.0 \%$ |
| Human | 1 | $25.0 \%$ |
| Mixed | 1 | $25.0 \%$ |
| Mixed race | 1 | $25.0 \%$ |
| Total | 4 | $100.0 \%$ |

## Q34. Would you say your total annual household income is:

| Q34. Would you say your total annual household <br> income is: |  |  |
| :--- | ---: | ---: |
| Under $\$ 30,000$ | 77 | $10.5 \%$ |
| $\$ 30,000$ to $\$ 59,999$ | 143 | $19.5 \%$ |
| $\$ 60,000$ to $\$ 99,999$ | 210 | $28.6 \%$ |
| $\$ 100,000$ or more | 251 | $34.1 \%$ |
| Not provided | 54 | $7.3 \%$ |
| Total | 735 | $100.0 \%$ |

## Q35. Your gender:

| Q35 Your gender | Number | Percent |
| :--- | ---: | ---: |
| Male | 358 | $48.7 \%$ |
| Female | 365 | $49.7 \%$ |
| Not provided | 12 | $1.6 \%$ |
| Total | 735 | $100.0 \%$ |

## Section 5:

## Survey Instrument

City of Auburn

- Home of Auburn University

February 2016

## Dear Auburn Resident,

I am writing to ask for your assistance with the 2016 Citizen Survey. This survey has been administered annually by the City of Auburn for the past 27 years. The feedback we receive from the results of the survey helps us gauge how successful we have been in providing quality services to the residents of Auburn and also helps us identify areas where we can improve. The Citizen Survey is a vital instrument in establishing budget priorities and forming policy decisions. Auburn is known for its active and involved citizenry and your participation in this survey is another important way to get involved in helping guide our community.

This year we have again partnered with ETC Institute to administer the survey. Please take a few minutes to complete and return this survey in the next few days. If you are not a resident of the City of Auburn, please disregard this survey. A postage-paid return envelope addressed to ETC Institute has been provided for your convenience. You may also complete the survey on-line by going to www.AuburnCitySurvey.org.

Your responses to the questions in the survey are anonymous. The information printed on the back of the survey serves only to identify broad geographic areas and helps us identify areas in the City where we might improve our service delivery.

The results of the survey will be presented to the City Council and the public in April. Additionally, a comprehensive report analyzing the survey results will be available at City Hall and posted on the City's website, with a summary included in a future issue of Auburn's monthly newsletter, Open Line. If you have any questions about the survey, please call me at (334) 501-7260. Thank you for helping guide the direction of our community by completing the enclosed survey. Your participation will help to ensure that "the Loveliest Village on the Plains" remains a very special place in which to live, work and raise our children.

Sincerely,


Charles M. Duggan, Jr.
City Manager
Enclosure

## 2016 City of Auburn Citizen Survey

Welcome to the City of Auburn's Citizen Survey for 2016. Your input is an important part of the city's ongoing effort to involve citizens in long-range planning and budget decisions. Please take a few minutes to complete this survey. If you have questions about this survey, please call the City Manager, Charles M. Duggan, Jr., at 501-7260. You may also complete the survey on-line by going to www.AuburnCitySurvev.org.

1. MAJOR CATEGORIES OF CITY SERVICES. Please rate your overall satisfaction with major categories of services on a scale of 1 to 5 , where 5 means "Very Satisfied" and 1 means "Very Dissatisfied":

| How satisfied are you with the... |  | $\begin{aligned} & \text { Very } \\ & \text { Satisfied } \end{aligned}$ | Satisfied | Neutral | Dissatisfied | Very Dissatisfied | Don't Know |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| 01. | Quality of the city's school system | 5 | 4 | 3 | 2 | 1 | 9 |
| 02. | Quality of police, fire, \& ambulance services | 5 | 4 | 3 | 2 | 1 | 9 |
| 03. | Quality of parks \& recreation services | 5 | 4 | 3 | 2 | 1 | 9 |
| 04. | Quality of city library services | 5 | 4 | 3 | 2 | 1 | 9 |
| 05. | Quality of the city's customer service | 5 | 4 | 3 | 2 | 1 | 9 |
| 06. | Maintenance of city infrastructure | 5 | 4 | 3 | 2 | 1 | 9 |
| 07. | Enforcement of city codes and ordinances | 5 | 4 | 3 | 2 | 1 | 9 |
| 08. | Flow of traffic \& congestion management | 5 | 4 | 3 | 2 | 1 | 9 |
| 09. | Collection of garbage, recycling \& yard waste | 5 | 4 | 3 | 2 | 1 | 9 |
| 10. | Effectiveness of city's communication with public | 5 | 4 | 3 | 2 | 1 | 9 |

2. Which THREE of the MAJOR CATEGORIES OF CITY SERVICES do you think should receive the most emphasis from city leaders over the next two years? [Write in the numbers below using the numbers from the list in Q1 above.]

1st: $\qquad$ $2^{\text {nd: }}$ $\qquad$ $3{ }^{\text {rd }}$ $\qquad$
3. PERCEPTIONS OF THE CITY. Several items that may influence your perception of the City of Auburn are listed below. Please rate your satisfaction with each item on a scale of 1 to 5 , where 5 means "Very Satisfied" and 1 means "Very Dissatisfied":

| How satisfied are you with the... |  | Very Satisfied | Satisfied | Neutral | Dissatisfied | Very Dissatisfied | Don't <br> Know |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| 1. | Overall value that you receive for your city tax dollars and fees | 5 | 4 | 3 | 2 | 1 | 9 |
| 2. | Overall image of the city | 5 | 4 | 3 | 2 | 1 | 9 |
| 3. | Overall quality of life in the city | 5 | 4 | 3 | 2 | 1 | 9 |
| 4. | Overall appearance of the city | 5 | 4 | 3 | 2 | 1 | 9 |
| 5. | Overall quality of city services | 5 | 4 | 3 | 2 | 1 | 9 |

4. Please rate Auburn on a scale of 1 to 5, where 5 means "Excellent" and 1 means "Poor," with regard to each of the following:

| Please rate the City of Auburn... |  | Excellent | Good | Neutral | Below <br> Average | Poor | Don't Know |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| 1. | As a place to live | 5 | 4 | 3 | 2 | 1 | 9 |
| 2. | As a place to raise children | 5 | 4 | 3 | 2 | 1 | 9 |
| 3. | As a place to work | 5 | 4 | 3 | 2 | 1 | 9 |

5. CITY LEADERSHIP. Please rate your satisfaction on a scale of 1 to 5 , where 5 means "Very Satisfied" and 1 means "Very Dissatisfied," with each of the following:

| How satisfied are you with the... |  | Very Satisfied | Satisfied | Neutral | Dissatisfied | Very <br> Dissatisfied | Don't <br> Know |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| 1. | Overall quality of leadership provided by the city's elected officials | 5 | 4 | 3 | 2 | 1 | 9 |
| 2. | Overall effectiveness of appointed boards and commissions | 5 | 4 | 3 | 2 | 1 | 9 |
| 3. | Overall effectiveness of the City Manager | 5 | 4 | 3 | 2 | 1 | 9 |
| 4. | Level of public involvement in local decision-making | 5 | 4 | 3 | 2 | 1 | 9 |
| 5. | Transparency of city government | 5 | 4 | 3 | 2 | 1 | 9 |

6. PUBLIC SAFETY SERVICES. Please rate your satisfaction on a scale of 1 to 5 , where 5 means "Very Satisfied" and 1 means "Very Dissatisfied," with the following public safety services provided by the City of Auburn:

| How satisfied are you with the... | Very <br> Satisfied |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| :---: | :--- | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Satisfied |  | Neutral |  | Dissatisfied <br> Dissatisfied |  | Verr <br> Know |  |
| 01. | Overall quality of police protection | 5 | 4 | 3 | 2 | 1 | 9 |
| 02. | Visibility of police in neighborhoods | 5 | 4 | 3 | 2 | 1 | 9 |
| 03. | Visibility of police in retail areas | 5 | 4 | 3 | 2 | 1 | 9 |
| 04. | Police response time | 5 | 4 | 3 | 2 | 1 | 9 |
| 05. | Efforts to prevent crime | 5 | 4 | 3 | 2 | 1 | 9 |
| 06. | Police safety education programs | 5 | 4 | 3 | 2 | 1 | 9 |
| 07. | Enforcement of traffic laws | 5 | 4 | 3 | 2 | 1 | 9 |
| 08. | Overall quality of fire protection | 5 | 4 | 3 | 2 | 1 | 9 |
| 09. | Fire personnel emergency response time | 5 | 4 | 3 | 2 | 1 | 9 |
| 10. | Quality of fire safety education programs | 5 | 4 | 3 | 2 | 1 | 9 |
| 11. | Quality of local ambulance service | 5 | 4 | 3 | 2 | 1 | 9 |

7. Which THREE of the PUBLIC SAFETY SERVICES items listed above do you think should receive the most emphasis from city leaders over the next two years? [Write in the numbers below using the numbers from Q6 above.]
1 st: $\qquad$ $2^{\text {nd: }}$ $\qquad$ -
$3^{\text {rd }}$ : $\qquad$
8. FEELING OF SAFETY. Please rate your feeling of safety in the following areas using a scale of 1 to 5 where 5 means "Very Safe" and 1 means "Very Unsafe":

| How safe do you feel... |  | Very Safe | Safe | Neutral | Unsafe | Very Unsafe | Don't Know |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| 1. | In your neighborhood during the day | 5 | 4 | 3 | 2 | 1 | 9 |
| 2. | In your neighborhood at night | 5 | 4 | 3 | 2 | 1 | 9 |
| 3. | In the city's parks | 5 | 4 | 3 | 2 | 1 | 9 |
| 4. | In commercial and retail areas | 5 | 4 | 3 | 2 | 1 | 9 |
| 5. | In downtown Auburn | 5 | 4 | 3 | 2 | 1 | 9 |
| 6. | Traveling by bicycle in Auburn | 5 | 4 | 3 | 2 | 1 | 9 |
| 7. | Traveling as a pedestrian in Auburn | 5 | 4 | 3 | 2 | 1 | 9 |
| 8. | Overall feeling of safety in Auburn | 5 | 4 | 3 | 2 | 1 | 9 |

9. CODE ENFORCEMENT. IN YOUR NEIGHBORHOOD ONLY, please rate your satisfaction on a scale of 1 to 5 , where 5 means "Very Satisfied" and 1 means "Very Dissatisfied," with the following:

| In your neighborhood, how satisfied are you with the... |  | Very Satisfied | Satisfied | Neutral | Dissatisfied | Very Dissatisfied | Don't Know |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| 1. | Cleanup of debris/litter | 5 | 4 | 3 | 2 | 1 | 9 |
| 2. | Cleanup of large junk/abandoned vehicles | 5 | 4 | 3 | 2 | 1 | 9 |
| 3. | Cleanup of overgrown and weedy lots | 5 | 4 | 3 | 2 | 1 | 9 |
| 4. | Efforts to remove dilapidated structures | 5 | 4 | 3 | 2 | 1 | 9 |
| 5. | Enforcement of loud music | 5 | 4 | 3 | 2 | 1 | 9 |
| 6. | Control of nuisance animals | 5 | 4 | 3 | 2 | 1 | 9 |

10. Which TWO of the CODE ENFORCEMENT items listed above do you think should receive the most emphasis from city leaders over the next two years? [Write in the numbers below using the numbers from Q9 above.]
$\qquad$ $2^{\text {nd }}:$ $\qquad$
11. GARBAGE AND WATER SERVICES. Please rate your satisfaction on a scale of 1 to 5 , where 5 means "Very Satisfied" and 1 means "Very Dissatisfied," with the following:

| How satisfied are you with the... |  | Very Satisfied | Satisfied | Neutral | Dissatisfied | Very Dissatisfied | Don't Know |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| 1. | Residential garbage collection service | 5 | 4 | 3 | 2 | 1 | 9 |
| 2. | Curbside recycling service overall | 5 | 4 | 3 | 2 | 1 | 9 |
| 3. | Material types accepted for recycling | 5 | 4 | 3 | 2 | 1 | 9 |
| 4. | Recycling at city's drop-off recycling center | 5 | 4 | 3 | 2 | 1 | 9 |
| 5. | Yard waste removal service | 5 | 4 | 3 | 2 | 1 | 9 |
| 6. | Water service | 5 | 4 | 3 | 2 | 1 | 9 |
| 7. | Utility Billing Office customer service | 5 | 4 | 3 | 2 | 1 | 9 |

12. Which TWO of the GARBAGE AND WATER SERVICES listed above do you think should receive the most emphasis from city leaders over the next two years? [Write in the numbers below using the numbers from Q11 above.]

1 st: $\qquad$ $2^{\text {nd }}$ : $\qquad$
13. DEVELOPMENT AND REDEVELOPMENT. Please rate your satisfaction on a scale of 1 to 5 , where 5 means "Very Satisfied" and 1 means "Very Dissatisfied," with each of the following areas of development and redevelopment in Auburn:

| How | satisfied are you with the... | Very Satisfied | Satisfied | Neutral | Dissatisfied | Very Dissatisfied | Don't Know |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| 1. | Overall quality of new residential development | 5 | 4 | 3 | 2 | 1 | 9 |
| 2. | Overall quality of new retail development (stores, restaurants, etc.) | 5 | 4 | 3 | 2 | 1 | 9 |
| 3. | Overall quality of new business development (offices, medical facilities, banks, etc.) | 5 | 4 | 3 | 2 | 1 | 9 |
| 4. | Overall quality of new industrial development (warehouses, plants, etc.) | 5 | 4 | 3 | 2 | 1 | 9 |
| 5. | Redevelopment of abandoned or under-utilized properties | 5 | 4 | 3 | 2 | 1 | 9 |
| 6. | Overall appearance of Opelika Road | 5 | 4 | 3 | 2 | 1 | 9 |
| 7. | Overall appearance of Downtown Auburn | 5 | 4 | 3 | 2 | 1 | 9 |
| 8. | The City's planning for future growth | 5 | 4 | 3 | 2 | 1 | 9 |

14. PARKS AND RECREATION. Please rate your satisfaction on a scale of 1 to 5 , where 5 means "Very Satisfied" and 1 means "Very Dissatisfied," with the following:

| How satisfied are you with the... | Very <br> Satisfied |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | Satisfied |  | Neutral |  | DissatisfiedVery <br> Dissatisfied |  | Don't <br> Know |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| 01. | Maintenance of parks | 5 | 4 | 3 | 2 | 1 | 9 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| 02. | Maintenance of cemeteries | 5 | 4 | 3 | 2 | 1 | 9 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| 03. | Maintenance of walking trails | 5 | 4 | 3 | 2 | 1 | 9 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| 04. | Maintenance of biking paths and lanes | 5 | 4 | 3 | 2 | 1 | 9 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| 05. | Maintenance of swimming pools | 5 | 4 | 3 | 2 | 1 | 9 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| 06. | Quality of swimming pools | 5 | 4 | 3 | 2 | 1 | 9 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| 07. | Maintenance of community recreation centers | 5 | 4 | 3 | 2 | 1 | 9 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| 08. | Quality of community recreation centers | 5 | 4 | 3 | 2 | 1 | 9 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| 09. | Maintenance of outdoor athletic fields | 5 | 4 | 3 | 2 | 1 | 9 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| 10. | Quality of outdoor athletic fields | 5 | 4 | 3 | 2 | 1 | 9 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| 11. | Quality of youth athletic programs | 5 | 4 | 3 | 2 | 1 | 9 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| 12. | Quality of adult athletic programs | 5 | 4 | 3 | 2 | 1 | 9 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| 13. | Quality of cultural arts programs | 5 | 4 | 3 | 2 | 1 | 9 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| 14. | Quality of senior programs | 5 | 4 | 3 | 2 | 1 | 9 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| 15. | Quality of special needs/therapeutics programs | 5 | 4 | 3 | 2 | 1 | 9 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| 16. | Ease of registering for programs | 5 | 4 | 3 | 2 | 1 | 9 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| 17. | Fees charged for recreation programs | 5 | 4 | 3 | 2 | 1 | 9 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| 18. | Quality of special events (CityFest, Downtown Trick or <br> Treat, etc.) | 5 | 4 | 3 | 2 | 1 | 9 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |

15. Which FOUR of the areas of PARKS AND RECREATION listed above do you think should receive the most emphasis from city leaders over the next two years? [Write in the numbers below using the numbers from Q14 above.]
1 st : $\qquad$ $2^{\text {nd }}$ $\qquad$ 3 rd: $\qquad$ $4^{\text {th }}$ : $\qquad$
16. TRAFFIC FLOW \& TRANSPORTATION. For each of the following, please rate your satisfaction on a scale of 1 to 5 , where 5 means "Very Satisfied" and 1 means "Very Dissatisfied":

| How satisfied are you with the... |  | Very Satisfied | Satisfied | Neutral | Dissatisfied | Very Dissatisfied | Don't Know |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| 1. | Ease of travel by car in Auburn | 5 | 4 | 3 | 2 | 1 | 9 |
| 2. | Ease of travel by bicycle in Auburn | 5 | 4 | 3 | 2 | 1 | 9 |
| 3. | Ease of pedestrian travel in Auburn | 5 | 4 | 3 | 2 | 1 | 9 |

17. How often do you use the city's bicycle lanes and facilities?
_(1) Daily
(2) Weekly
(3) Monthly
(4) Occasionally
(5) Never
18. MAINTENANCE. Excluding areas maintained by Auburn University, please rate your satisfaction on a scale of 1 to 5, where 5 means "Very Satisfied" and 1 means "Very Dissatisfied," with the following:

| How satisfied are you with the... |  | Very Satisfied | Satisfied | Neutral | Dissatisfied | Very Dissatisfied | Don't Know |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| 01. | Maintenance of streets | 5 | 4 | 3 | 2 | 1 | 9 |
| 02. | Maintenance of sidewalks | 5 | 4 | 3 | 2 | 1 | 9 |
| 03. | Maintenance of street signs | 5 | 4 | 3 | 2 | 1 | 9 |
| 04. | Maintenance of traffic signals | 5 | 4 | 3 | 2 | 1 | 9 |
| 05. | Maintenance of downtown Auburn | 5 | 4 | 3 | 2 | 1 | 9 |
| 06. | Cleanup of debris/litter in and near roadways | 5 | 4 | 3 | 2 | 1 | 9 |
| 07. | Maintenance of city-owned buildings | 5 | 4 | 3 | 2 | 1 | 9 |
| 08. | Mowing/trimming along streets and public areas | 5 | 4 | 3 | 2 | 1 | 9 |
| 09. | Overall cleanliness of streets and public areas | 5 | 4 | 3 | 2 | 1 | 9 |
| 10. | Adequacy of city street lighting | 5 | 4 | 3 | 2 | 1 | 9 |

19. Which THREE of the areas of MAINTENANCE listed above do you think should receive the most emphasis from city leaders over the next two years? [Write in the numbers below using the numbers from Q18 above.]

1 st: $\qquad$ $2^{\text {nd }}:$ $\qquad$ $3^{\text {rd }}$ : $\qquad$
20. DOWNTOWN AUBURN. For each of the following issues in DOWNTOWN AUBURN, please rate your satisfaction on a scale of 1 to 5 , where 5 means "Very Satisfied" and 1 means "Very Dissatisfied":

| How satisfied are you with the... |  | Very Satisfied | Satisfied | Neutral | Dissatisfied | Very Dissatisfied | Don't Know |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| 01. | Cleanliness of downtown areas | 5 | 4 | 3 | 2 | 1 | 9 |
| 02. | Feeling of safety of downtown at night | 5 | 4 | 3 | 2 | 1 | 9 |
| 03. | Pedestrian accessibility | 5 | 4 | 3 | 2 | 1 | 9 |
| 04. | Quality of public events held downtown | 5 | 4 | 3 | 2 | 1 | 9 |
| 05. | Landscaping and green space | 5 | 4 | 3 | 2 | 1 | 9 |
| 06. | Signage and wayfinding | 5 | 4 | 3 | 2 | 1 | 9 |
| 07. | Availability of public event space | 5 | 4 | 3 | 2 | 1 | 9 |
| 08. | Availability of dining opportunities | 5 | 4 | 3 | 2 | 1 | 9 |
| 09. | Availability of outdoor dining venues | 5 | 4 | 3 | 2 | 1 | 9 |
| 10. | Availability of retail shopping | 5 | 4 | 3 | 2 | 1 | 9 |
| 11. | Availability of parking | 5 | 4 | 3 | 2 | 1 | 9 |
| 12. | Enforcement of parking violations \& meter times | 5 | 4 | 3 | 2 | 1 | 9 |

21. Which THREE areas of DOWNTOWN AUBURN listed above do you think should receive the most emphasis from city leaders over the next two years? [Write in the numbers below using the numbers from Q20 above.]
$\qquad$ $2^{\text {nd: }}$ $\qquad$ 3 rd: $\qquad$
22. What major projects or initiatives do you feel are most important for the City to pursue over the next 1-3 years? Please indicate the importance of the following by ranking them 1 through 7 , with 1 being the HIGHEST priority and 7 being the LOWEST. (Use each number ONLY ONCE.)
__ Downtown Improvements (projects like Toomer's Corner, Gay Street Parking Lot, College/Mag. Alley Projects, etc.)Opelika Road Improvements (such as those made between Ross St. and Gay St., continuing to the City limits) Downtown Parking Improvements (new parking deck, expanded on-street parking etc.) Greenways \& Pedestrian/Biking Trails (Saugahatchee Greenway, expanded pedestrian connectivity in town) New Athletic Fields (Land acquisition \& development for soccer, football, lacrosse \& baseball fields) New Lake Wilmore Community Recreation Center and Pool Town Creek Park Expansion (open space, pavilions, larger playground, etc.)
23. CITY COMMUNICATION. Please rate your satisfaction on a scale of 1 to 5 , where 5 means "Very Satisfied" and 1 means "Very Dissatisfied," with the following:

| How satisfied are you with the... |  | Very Satisfied | Satisfied | Neutral | Dissatisfied | Very Dissatisfied | Don't Know |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| 1. | Quality of Open Line newsletter | 5 | 4 | 3 | 2 | 1 | 9 |
| 2. | Quality of the city's website | 5 | 4 | 3 | 2 | 1 | 9 |
| 3. | Quality of the city's social media (Twitter, Facebook, etc.) | 5 | 4 | 3 | 2 | 1 | 9 |
| 4. | Availability of information on city services and programs | 5 | 4 | 3 | 2 | 1 | 9 |
| 5. | Availability of information about Parks \& Recreation services and programs | 5 | 4 | 3 | 2 | 1 | 9 |
| 6. | Availability of information on Auburn Public Library services and programs | 5 | 4 | 3 | 2 | 1 | 9 |

24. Which of the following are your primary sources of information about city issues, services, and events? (Check all that apply.)
__(01) Open Line newsletter
(02) City website via home computer (desktop, laptop)
(03) City website via mobile device (phone, tablet)
(04) City emails/texts/press releases (e-Notifier)
(05) Calling a city department on the telephone
(06) City cable channel (Charter Ch. 16, WOW Ch. 13)
(07) City social media sites (Facebook, Twitter, YouTube)
(08) Other social media sites (private, non-city sites)
(09) Local newspaper (Villager, OA News)
(10) Radio news programs
(11) Television news programs
(12) Word of mouth (friends/neighbors)
(13) Public meetings
_(14) Other: $\qquad$
25. Have you called or visited the city with a question, problem, or complaint during the past year?
__(1) Yes [Answer Q25-2 to Q25-4.] _(2) No [Skip to Q26.]

25-2. How easy was it to contact the person you needed to reach?
___(1) Very easy
___(
(2) Somewhat easy $\qquad$ (3) Difficult
___(4) Very difficult

25-3. What department did you contact? (Check all that apply.)
__(01) Police
(02) Fire
(03) Planning
(04) Parks and Recreation
(05) Codes Enforcement
(06) Public Works
(07) City Manager's Office
(08) Utility Billing Office
__(09) Municipal Court
__(10) Environmental Services (garbage, trash, recycling, animal control)
_ (11) Water Resource Management (water, sewer and watershed management)
(12) Finance (city licenses and taxes)
__(13) Other: $\qquad$

25-4. Was the department you contacted responsive to your issue?
__(1) Yes
__(2) No
26. If you could improve ONE thing about the City of Auburn, what would it be?

## DEMOGRAPHICS

27. How many people in your household (counting yourself) are:

| Under age 5 | Ages 15-19 | Ages 35-44 | Ages 65-74 |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| __ Ages 5-9 | Ages 20-24 | Ages 45-54 | Ages 75+ |
| Ages 10-14 | Ages 25-34 | Ages 55-64 |  |

28. Approximately how many years have you lived in the City of Auburn? $\qquad$ years
29. How many people in your household work within the Auburn city limits? $\qquad$ people
30. Are you a full time Auburn University student?
___(1) Yes
(2) No
31. Do you own or rent your current residence?
__(1) Own (2) Rent
32. What is your age?
__(1)
(1) Under 25 years
(3) 35 to 44 years
(5) 55 to 64 years
___(2) 25 to 34 years
(4) 45 to 54 year
(6) $65+$ years
33. Which of the following best describes your race/ethnicity? (Check all that apply.)
___(1) Asian/Pacific Islander
(3) Hispanic
(5) American Indian/Eskimo
__(2) Black/African American
(4) White/Caucasian
(6) Other: $\qquad$
34. Would you say your total annual household income is:
(1) Under \$30,000 $\qquad$ (2) $\$ 30,000$ to $\$ 59,999$
(3) $\$ 60,000$ to $\$ 99,999$
(4) $\$ 100,000$ or more
35. Your gender:
___(1) Male___(2) Female

This concludes the survey for 2016. If you would like to suggest a question for consideration to be included in next year's survey, please visit our website at www.auburnalabama.org/survey and click on the "Submit Survey Question" menu button. Thank you for your time!

Please Return Your Completed Survey in the Enclosed Postage Paid Envelope Addressed to:
ETC Institute, 725 W. Frontier Circle, Olathe, KS 66061

Your responses will remain Completely Confidential. The information printed to the right will ONLY be used to help identify which areas of the City are having problems with city services. If your address is not correct, please provide the correct information. Thank you!

## APPENDIXA: GIS MAPS <br> 2016 Citizen Survey
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## Interpreting the Maps

The maps on the following pages show the mean ratings for several questions on the survey by Census Block Group. If all areas on a map are the same color, then residents generally feel the same about that issue regardless of the location of their home.

When reading the maps, please use the following color scheme as a guide:

- DARK/LIGHT BLUE shades indicate POSITIVE ratings. Shades of blue generally indicate satisfaction with a service, ratings of "excellent" or "good" and ratings of "very safe" or "safe."
- OFF-WHITE shades indicate NEUTRAL ratings. Shades of neutral generally indicate that residents thought the quality of service delivery is adequate.
- ORANGE/RED shades indicate NEGATIVE ratings. Shades of orange/red generally indicate dissatisfaction with a service, ratings of "below average" or "poor" and ratings of "unsafe" or "very unsafe."


Q1-1 Satisfaction with quality of the city's school system


## Q1-2 Satisfaction with quality of police, fire, \& ambulance services



Q1-3 Satisfaction with the quality of parks \& recreation services


Q1-4 Satisfaction with quality of city library services


Q1-5 Satisfaction with quality of the city's customer service


Q1-6 Satisfaction with maintenance of city infrastructure


Q1-7 Satisfaction with enforcement of city codes and ordinances


## Q1-8 Satisfaction with flow of traffic \& congestion management



Q1-9 Satisfaction with the collection of garbage, recycling \& yard waste


Q1-10 Satisfaction with effectiveness of city's communication with public


Q3-1 Satisfaction with overall value received for city tax dollars and fees


## Q3-2 Satisfaction with overall image of the city



Q3-3 Satisfaction with overall quality of life in the city



Q3-5 Satisfaction with overall quality of city services



Q4-2 Ratings of the city as a place to raise children



Q5-1 Satisfaction with overall quality of leadership provided by the city's elected officials


## Q5-2 Satisfaction with overall effectiveness of appointed boards and commissions



Q5-3 Satisfaction with overall effectiveness of the City Manager


Q5-4 Satisfaction with level of public involvement in local decision-making


Q5-5 Satisfaction with transparency of city government


Q6-1 Satisfaction with overall quality of police protection


Q6-2 Satisfaction with visibility of police in neighborhoods


Q6-3 Satisfaction with visibility of police in retail areas


Q6-4 Satisfaction with police response time



Q6-6 Satisfaction with police safety education programs



Q6-8 Satisfaction with overall quality of fire protection


Q6-9 Satisfaction with fire personnel emergency response time


Q6-10 Satisfaction with quality of fire safety education programs


Q6-11 Satisfaction with quality of local ambulance service


Q8-1 Feeling of safety in neighborhoods during the day


## Q8-2 Feeling of safety in neighborhoods at night



Q8-3 Feeling of safety in the city's parks


Q8-4 Feeling of safety in commercial and retail areas


## Q8-5 Feeling of safety in downtown Auburn




Q8-7 Feeling of safety traveling as a pedestrian in Auburn



Q9-1 Satisfaction with cleanup of debris/litter


Q9-2 Satisfaction with cleanup of large junk/abandoned vehicles


Q9-3 Satisfaction with cleanup of overgrown and weedy lots


## Q9-4 Satisfaction with efforts to remove dilapidated structures



Q9-5 Satisfaction with enforcement of loud music



Q11-1 Satisfaction with residential garbage collection service


Q11-2 Satisfaction with curbside recycling service overall


Q11-3 Satisfaction with material types accepted for recycling


## Q11-4 Satisfaction with recycling at city's drop-off recycling center



Q11-5 Satisfaction with yard waste removal service



Q11-7 Satisfaction with Utility Billing Office customer service


## Q13-1 Satisfaction with overall quality of new residential development



Q13-2 Satisfaction with overall quality of new retail development


Q13-3 Satisfaction with overall quality of new business development


Q13-4 Satisfaction with overall quality of new industrial development


## Q13-5 Satisfaction with redevelopment of abandoned or under-utilized properties



Q13-6 Satisfaction with overall appearance of Opelika Road


## Q13-7 Satisfaction with overall appearance of Downtown Auburn



Q13-8 Satisfaction with the City's planning for future growth



Q14-2 Satisfaction with maintenance of cemeteries


Q14-3 Satisfaction with maintenance of walking trails


Q14-4 Satisfaction with maintenance of biking paths and lanes


## Q14-5 Satisfaction with maintenance of swimming pools



Q14-6 Satisfaction with quality of swimming pools


Q14-7 Satisfaction with maintenance of community recreation centers


Q14-8 Satisfaction with quality of community recreation centers


Q14-9 Satisfaction with maintenance of outdoor athletic fields


Q14-10 Satisfaction with quality of outdoor athletic fields


Q14-11 Satisfaction with quality of youth athletic programs


Q14-12 Satisfaction with quality of adult athletic programs


## Q14-13 Satisfaction with quality of cultural arts programs



Q14-14 Satisfaction with quality of senior programs


Q14-15 Satisfaction with quality of special needs/therapeutics programs


Q14-16 Satisfaction with ease of registering for programs


Q14-17 Satisfaction with fees charged for recreation programs


## Q14-18 Satisfaction with quality of special events




Q16-2 Satisfaction with ease of travel by bicycle in Auburn


Q16-3 Satisfaction with ease of pedestrian travel in Auburn


## Q18-1 Satisfaction with maintenance of streets




Q18-3 Satisfaction with maintenance of street signs


Q18-4 Satisfaction with maintenance of traffic signals


Q18-5 Satisfaction with maintenance of downtown Auburn


Q18-6 Satisfaction with cleanup of debris/litter in and near roadways


Q18-7 Satisfaction with maintenance of city-owned buildings


Q18-8 Satisfaction with mowing/trimming along streets and public areas


Q18-9 Satisfaction with overall cleanliness of streets and public areas


Q18-10 Satisfaction with adequacy of city street lighting


Q20-1 Satisfaction with cleanliness of downtown areas


## Q20-2 Satisfaction with feeling of safety of downtown at night



Q20-3 Satisfaction with pedestrian accessibility


Q20-4 Satisfaction with quality of public events held downtown


Q20-5 Satisfaction with landscaping and green space



Q20-7 Satisfaction with availability of public event space


Q20-8 Satisfaction with availability of dining opportunities


Q20-9 Satisfaction with availability of outdoor dining venues


Q20-10 Satisfaction with availability of retail shopping


## Q20-11 Satisfaction with availability of parking



Q20-12 Satisfaction with enforcement of parking violations \& meter times


Q23-1 Satisfaction with quality of Open Line newsletter


Q23-2 Satisfaction with quality of the city's website


Q23-3 Satisfaction with quality of the city's social media


Q23-4 Satisfaction with availability of information on city services and programs




## APPENDIX B:-QUESTION 26 OPEN-ENDED RESPONSES <br> 2016 Citizen Survey Auburn, Alabama
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INETITUTE

## Overview

On survey Question 26, residents of Auburn were given the opportunity to provide open-ended comments. While the results in this Appendix are not statistically valid, they provide useful insights for interpreting the reasons behind citizens' survey responses. The results were recorded verbatim, so spelling and grammatical errors have not been corrected.

- Take a look at down town Opelika. Leave Auburn ALONE, invest in what's here instead of destroying it one building at a time.
- Better City Council
- Downtown parking
- There needs to be more emphasis on the quality of new residential development. Standards for multifamily are good but single family needs work. More parks, sidewalks and other features developers pay for as they bring in new residents.
- Maintain character of downtown area-once gone it is gone forever.
- Better biking lanes out side of downtown!
- better balance between development and preservation
- Traffic
- Stricter animal control laws.
- traffic and parking
- Being more forward thinking about what residential developments we encourage in the downtown/near downtown area. I strongly feel that the city officials are looking out for their own financial bottom line, and not at what's best for the city for the next decade.
- traffic lights
- I worry that the city government is not responsive to the concerns of citizens about development, design and proliferation of student housing,
- Not sure
- As far as new residency, new homes need more land, better builders, and affordable
- Get control
- Downtown is growing too much ,it is losing the family feeling
- Traffic flow around the Moore's Mill area and on East University at the traffic light at the AU credit union.
- Better Planning for Growth as it relates to the School System.
- Stop building more student housing
- Get rid of all billboards and use small signage like ft. Collins Colorado does
- Parks and Rec fields- I would like to have a centralized SportPlex like Opelika. As it is now, I run three kids all over town because there is not one location suitable to meet the needs of all the kids
- Stop increasing lease prices for buildings downtown that create real estate monopolies for developers that run off local downtown businesses. This brings in generic chains and ruins the atmosphere of downtown Auburn and Toomer's Corner.
- Care of the streets/roadways--fix potholes and paving
- level south college street beyond Donahue \& Start over
- Stop the construction of mass-housing projects
- walking and biking trails
- Passing of information on to the citizens.
- purchase more land around downtown to control development style/types
- Opelika Road
- parking and traffic flow
- Advertising of community events
- Try to clean up Opelika Highway and utilize or demolish old buildings
- zoning
- Urban space planning. No more apartments.
- emphasis on high quality education
- Customer service
- city council communications with the public more often
- have someone review driver's views and trim accordingly. 2-focus on more public viewing of police across Auburn. 3- control growth so Auburn retains it's "village" atmosphere
- organized sports for retirees
- I would like a city ordinance that prohibits utility trailers from being parked on a residential street for more than 24-48 hours without moving. The street is not a storage or parking area for these.
- bike lanes in more places
- I would make sure that everyone can afford to live in Auburn. The cost to live in Auburn is way to high.
- Community recreation centers and pools!!!
- Get rid of the politics involved in the athletic programs within Parks and Rec.
- Better enforcement of rental property codes i.e. multiple families in single family dwelling, rental property grounds/upkeep
- Ensuring that we capitalize on any opportunities for retail development such as TigerTown that could increase our tax base while also decreasing our focus on building new apartment structures.
- parkiing downtown
- More pedestrian accessibility and more sidewalks
- Traffic congestion on Moores Mill Road
- Parking
- no improvement needed
- Traffic lights and pedestrian lights remain functioning
- I'm not sure if the city has a leash law and how well it's enforced.
- cooperation
- Constant new apartment complex that force older ones to start offering section 8
- improve traffic flow
- Stop building so many apartments and banks.
- Slow down development of large apartment structures. Do not exceed the existing infrastructure. There are only so many student apartment complexes we need.
- stop all the condos downtown, Leave parking deck alone
- do not agree with approval of rental apts space development
- parking downtown
- Downtown parking \& shopping
- limit high rise buildings
- For the city council to not vote yes when the citizens are saying no to changing downtown, it can be tabled until next meeting instead of steamrolling the citizens and doing what you want anyway. We do need to make improvements to downtown, but not at the cost of the look and feel. Maybe these new developers should look to Opelika Road to make their improvements and leave the downtown alone.
- Build Pickleball courts
- Donahue road
- Parking
- To slow down with the building of apartments. One day those beautiful new apartments are going to be tired, run-down, hell-holes. The shine only lasts so long before the tenants move on to the NEWER ones.
- They need to preserve the historical aspect of Auburn. Tearing down historic buildings and putting up new gaudy buildings take away from what Auburn has always been. Auburn's look and feel is very different and is turning into the opposite of what I moved here for. I love Auburn but there is too much commercial greed going on right now. I do not see myself living in Auburn forever because so much has changed.
- Intrusive commercial building too close to residential areas. (the new dollar general)
- Police supervisors should be available to the public anytime. I was told by dispatch I had to come to the department in the middle of the night to speak with a police supervisor.
- Enforce music code for vehicles and also enforce speed limit for schools
- quit building more apartments! leave some of the older structures instead of tearing everything down! Have police check on neighborhoods!
- slow development
- Preserver what we have
- Create more sidewalks .
- stop all the apartment buildings, so big and ugly.
- The city of Auburn could learn MUCH from Opelika!!!! Downtown Auburn looks pathetic compared to what Opelika has done and it's quite sad. Auburn should have taken pride in all of the old historical homes they tore down for CVS and other stores and now we can't get those landmarks back.
- Need more entertainment for children 2 to 10
- Not to have so many boxed stores ie Dollar general, Family dollar just put anyway. It is making our city and neighborhoods look very trashy, low income
- Provide more police on sites.
- Build a bike path to go around/through the city. The small bike lanes are not safe
- Quit tearing it up for the sake of transient residents. Some people have lived here their entire life and all the 'so called improvements' are for the sake of the transient population and not the people who make this 'home.'
- More responsive to the public regarding development; less kowtowing to the developers.
- Stop parking of cars on sidewalks and on wrong side of street
- More homes for low income family instead of apartments
- Implement a building code to blend existing and new buildings into a more attractive design and environmentally friendly. This would help us truly become the loveliest village. In other words, we don't need businesses looking junky.
- The equal use of the softball complex for youth athletics!
- Get residents to deal with their trash properly. For example, not leaving trash cans at the curb for days and weeks in a row. And also overflowing at the road because they forget to put their can out each week. Happens all the time. It may not be a city issue but our postal carrier is completely incompetent. And yes I have complained about getting my neighbors mail and my mail going missing regularly due to it being put in someone else's mailbox. Mishandled mail ha even included packages with prescription medication.
- Traffic light maintence
- Dont be afraid to progress. DO NOT fall behind Opelika. They have a nice downtown. Our is better but please do not let them move ahead of us.
- Better code enforcement in residential areas
- openess of city government
- The trucks hauling debris to the landfill on US 29 College St.) have lately been leaving large chunks of construction materials on the roadway. I hit one last week, causing damage. Make them CLEAN UP AFTER THEMSELVES. They drive right back past it. They can see it. They know it was once on their truck.
- Parking Down town
- Add/improve bike lanes.
- A red light on Martin Luther King (Highway 14), where it intersects with that ramp off of Shug Jordan Parkway. PLEASE!!!! Petition ALDoT, the Governor, or whoever else can get this accomplished!!! I have asked for this before.
- Open a YMCA.
- It's the best place to live \& raise a family - by far
- Curb off campus residential apartment boom
- more activities for children
- Parking
- I hate having so much construction during the summer. It is harder to travel across town in the summer because of all the road work then when the students are in town! I understand it is necessary, but having multiple major projects at the same time is hectic.
- more recreational facilities in low income neighborhoods
- cable and internet like Opelika
- The High School - I would love to get rid of block scheduling.
- Improved community involvement in city development and less behind the scenes planning by the counsel, planners, and developers. Some aspects of development should be decided by vote, not unilaterally by elected officials.
- Downtown parking
- Reconsider the plans for the hotel that would take over the municipal parking deck downtown. That location will add a heavy traffic burden to Gay Street (which is already a main traffic lane).
- Parking down town and recycling
- I think at some point, we need to stop building new structures and reimagine what already exists. I feel that the new marketplace Walmart on East University was a waste of money and had a negative impact on the housing around the area. If there's a Publix right down the street, there is no need for another poorly serviced Walmart. It seems as if the city of Auburn develops without thinking. Another example is the housing for students around Auburn. Because we keep building new complexes, rent is going up and the students who want to be here cannot afford it. I shouldn't have to give someone an arm and a leg for a plywood box room and 4 roommates. Development needs to be thoroughly thought out, from an environmental, economic and citizen impact perspective.
- more bicycle lanes and enforcement
- Don't want to see any more huge apartment complexes.
- fewer tall apartment buildings
- STOP BUILDING APARTMENTS! You are ruining the small town charm that brought us to Auburn. We will move as soon as our children are out of school.
- Fix the traffic problems that happen every day and night all along Samford. There's got to be a way to move the junior high traffic to the back of the building so it doesn't conflict with the students/staff going to work at Auburn University. OR the start time for the junior high could be changed so as NOT TO CONFLICT with the start time of the university. Research shows that the junior high age student needs the extra sleep. Move the start time to a little later in the morning and route the traffic to the back of the junior high and you've got a winning strategy that costs very little dollars and alleviates a huge traffic nightmare every day.
- Open communication about the city planning before the decisions have been made.
- I would like for people to accept and understand the growth of the city
- End Auburn Aprtheid-person of color have no say in city goverment
- Parking
- Parking
- Clean up your water, it needs to be tested for human pathogens! It molds black mold in toilets, showers and drinking cups in the bathroom that are not washed every day. The water even smells bad in the warm months. My number 1 reason to move from Auburn is the water, the second reason is it is no fun for Adults without children at home. It also is a town that does not have a fair University in it.
- Protect downtown from becoming overbuilt/populated/etc.
- More funds and emphasis on the poor and low income neighborhoods public transportation routes, taxi or bus service for other than students, affordable and reasonable apartment home communities which are not priced and tailored just for students, addition of an indoor heated pool at Frank Brown rec, more and easier access to either the public library or university library, family fun oriented businesses.
- police issuing too many citations for speeding, yet lots of murders. no visibility on campus, police are hateful, not helpful
- The city of Auburn needs to focus more on the public housing kids needs and well being, The projects have no playground areas or basketball courts for the young kids to play on, the facilities for public housing are taken over by parks and recreation during the year, Boys \& Girls club is a positive place for the kids in this part of the community and they cant utilize the facility to its full
potential and every time the subject of building a new facility for Boys \& Girls club is brought up the response is THE CITY DOES NOT HAVE ANY MONEY! We must find a way to work together to give our kids a fair chance at having a opportunity to succeed in life. City officials pay more attention to one side of town than the other and its clearly becoming obvious that public housing is last on the list of concerns to be addressed, a lot of issues that has been addressed are being patched up and not really being fixed and this patching problems has been going on for years. Please show more attention to public housing and programs that benefit public housing.
- Public safety equipment for the officers! Your support for the our police is s priority at all times!
- traffic, building
- City leaders and elected officials listen to the citizens instead of cow-towing to developers and business interests. Some of the elected officials would benefit by the development being proposed so of course they support.
- More family activities, though Auburn does a good job with this.
- Synchronize the traffic lights
- For Alabamians (no only Auburn Residents) to give space to bicyclists. I often fear for my life on my 2-mile bike ride to the AU campus everyday. I can't ride my bike in the street without feeling I'll be hit by a car. There's even a bike lane but often people ride on the line as if to taunt me. I realize this isn't a city problem, but I also cannot ride on the sidewalks because they are in such disrepair on North Donahue that their are too many broken piece or cracked and upended sidewalks that riding a bike is difficult form the corner of Shugg to the AU Campus. This is a problem I have noticed all around town.
- moritorium on the massive student massive projects
- Keep it clean and green! SUSTAINABILITY, and that doesn't just mean recycling. Auburn needs to think more about the environment and how the city affects it. Keep improving, because I've definitely noticed changes in this area that have been great for the city!
- Give tax write offs to those businesses who will use and upgrade existing buildings. Ask the question ' why do we need another bank?" Before you issue another permit to build one.
- Downtown parking. I'm sure there are great dining options and retail stores downtown, but I rarely go because there is never any parking. So I usually end up at Tiger Town and Auburn misses out on that tax.
- STOP BUILDING STUDENT HOUSING DOWNTOWN! DOWNTOWN IS ALREADY BECOMING INCREASINGLY DIFFICULT TO PARK, SHOP, AND EAT AS IS. PUTTING MORE PEOPLE LIVING IN THAT AREA WILL JUST CREATE MORE OF AN ISSUE. DOWNTOWN IS LOSING IT'S SMALL TOWN FEEL AND BECOMING SOME NEW SLICK URBAN CITY WITH NO PERSONALITY. RESTAURANT CHAINS AND SHOPS ARE INFILTRATING AS OPPOSED TO SMALL BUSINESS OWNERS/STORES - WHO ARE THE BACKBONE OF OUR COMMUNITY AND MAKE THE TOWN SPECIAL. EVERY TIME A 'LUXURY" CONDO IS BUILT DOWNTOWN, ANOTHER OLDER CONDO BECOMES A DUMP/POOR MAINTENANCE IN THE SURROUNDING AREAS. FEEL FREE TO BUILD STUDENT HOUSING ON OLDER, LESS DESIRABLE EXISTING HOUSING. CITY PLANNING HAS DONE A GREAT JOB WITH PUBLIC TRANSPORTATION FOR THOSE AREAS. I GRADUATED FROM AUBURN IN THE EARLY 90'S AND DECIDED TO COME BACK, TO RAISE MY FAMILY. I LOVE KNOWING SHOP OWNERS AND STANDING RIGHT IN FRONT FOR THE CHRISTMAS

PARADE. IT FEELS LIKE HOME. THE LAST THING I WANT TO SEE IS A CONTINUED DEVELOPMENT OF UNNECESSARY "STUDENT" HOUSING DOWNTOWN - WITH THE EXCUSE OF "EASILY CONVERTED TO MULTIFAMILY, WORK FORCE, YOUNG PROFESSIONAL HOUSING". WHILE GROWTH IS INEVITABLE, LETS PLEASE DO IT RESPONSIBILITY, ACCOUNTING FOR OUR GREEN SPACE, ABILITY TO TO CONTINUE OUR GREAT PUBLIC EDUCATION SYSTEM WITHOUT OVERCROWDING, AND PREVENTING CRIME. THANK YOU FOR OUR GREAT CITY AND WONDERFUL DOWNTOWN EVENTS AND ART ACTIVITIES. I AM PROUD TO CALL AUBURN MY HOME! WDE!

- We desperately need more parks. Not necessarily bigger parks, but just more outdoor spaces. In the Midwest cities and communities have parks everywhere. They aren't huge, but provide a great place for families to get outside. I miss being able to walk/bike to a park to play with my kids. A big problem here is the full sun over children's playgrounds. There is no shade at a lot of them parks where the play grounds are. Makes it very hot in the summertime to enjoy being outside at the park.
- visibility of police in sketchy neighborhoods
- Knowledgable on different activities that are coming up and on kids sports activity program applications. Be more friendly and not let the people wait by the window while she finished her social conversation with the other employee!!
- night time visibility
- Have the police focus on the drug problem and crime. Every time you turn a corner they are hiding running radar. There are bigger issues in town than speeders.
- Food type choices ... really would love to have a Carrabas and a good Mediterranean restaurant. Too many banks ... overall satisfied and love this town.
- Campus parking availability
- Parking
- Extra lane for turning into Shell Station on SHug Jordan 147 South.
- The City of Auburn is doing a wonderful job for our citizens. You ask the ONE thing to improve...I am concerned about how safe it is for citizens who live in annexed areas so far away from police, fire, and ambulance services. We all know seconds count. Perhaps we should make building more substations, hiring more police, firemen, and EMTs a priority before some other things. Thank you for all that you do for us!!
- Entertainment intended for young professionals
- Cost of water
- safe biking trails safe as separate from roadways
- Put a center left turn lane on University / Shug Jordan parkway.
- Traffic congestion
- Parks
- sports fields for kids with lights and graded for drainage
- Street lighting on University/Shug Jordan in addition to reflectors or reflective paint for lines.
- Downtown parking.
- Traffic on Moore's Mill in Mornings
- Cut the sales tax!!! 2) Cut property taxes. 3) Stop wasting public money on parking structures!!! 4) Explain to me a structural engineer how a parking structure in the southern USA wears out in less than 30 years so we have to waste more money to build a new one.
- Pick up the excessive amount of garbage EVERYWHERE on the sides of the roads--and ticket people who litter. It's embarrassing! The Loveliest Village??? I think not!
- Traffic
- Parking
- sidewalks and parking
- More family friendly downtown
- Improve traffic flow on highway 14 , so that it doesn't take 20 minutes to get across town. The traffic light at Donahue and Loachapoka road ties traffic into town for 3 light changes at times.
- Put slow signs in residential areas.
- Parking
- do something about all the empty commercial buildings
- Traffic congestion
- listen to citizens
- do away with auto recycling on US 280 next to exit to College street
- Get true public transportation.
- City enforcement (police) has to do a better job than they are now. I got a ticket which was not a fair judge by the police and the judge. I feel that they treated me unfair. I am a good citizen, obey the law including traffic law but I got the ticket because I cannot argue with the police. Please make sure the police are well trained so they do not give tickets to a wrong person. I saw a lot of people breaking the traffic law and do not get a ticket. While I am the one always very careful obeying the law and still got a ticket?????? Unbelievable.....
- Road maintenance on Opelika Rd
- Develop stricter development standards
- Street signs, expand, easy to read , especially at night
- Internet service at edge of city limits. $\$ 300-\$ 400 \mathrm{~K}$ houses with terrible internet options in a college town !!!!!!!!
- repave roads around schools, Sanford is the worst!
- Better customer service from all city employees.
- Stop growing, or at least stop looking like a big town.
- please do not mess up the cozy small town feel of the downtown area!
- Traffic transition from Opelika Road to College Street
- Police Dept is undermanned and needs to increase staffing in relation to increase in population
- Stop the building of apartment complexes and parking decks. Too much construction. Too much tear down of old buildings.
- excessive speeding on Wrights Mill Road and Moores Mill Road - both South of freeway - never seen a ticket issued in years...except at stop sign. go figure.
- bike lanes more accessible, continuous throughout the city
- Better pedestrian and bicycling infrastructure. The bike lanes don't connect and in many places outside of downtown there are no sidewalks
- education about cycling for cyclists and drivers
- Stop building apartments. Rennovate what we have, make more retail. Downtown looks great and Opelika Rd is looking amazing
- More name brand shopping stores.
- Members of planning commission
- Transparency of city leaders and city manager
- Fix up older buildings front and back, add more retail, retaurants and bars for older couples
- Parking downtown and better recycling program. (Example - Columbus, Georgia uses full size recycling cans similar to our trash cans). Auburn goes through way too many aluminum cans to be this poor at dealing with recycling.
- clean up vacant properties.
- Less apartment building development.
- retail, keep tax dollars in Auburn
- Roads
- More police and fire accessibility in our area. Belle tara
- Improve traffic flow.
- Make sure we save the small town feeling downtown. It is very unique!
- building department
- park and rec facility
- Parking
- Expand Moore's Mill Road and relieve the congestion going to town and campus in the morning.
- streets
- Need more post offices
- Stop catering to the college students
- Controlling people on bicycles
- bike/pedestrian friendly travel
- Maintain auburn as the 'loveliest village" by stopping all large (tall) building construction, demolish old "eyesore" buildings (Guthries old building and old Texaco on Opelike Road), and enforce laws which require residences to be maintained (houses and lawns).
- try to keep the developers from running over everthing as they seem to be doing
- Increased safety for bicycle lanes.
- Simplified and reduced tax and regulation structure allowing small businesses to thrive.
- Don't be so hesitant to grow and expand. There is a reason people want to move here. Don't be stuck in the past and have the 'village" mind set. People want to live in a city where there are things to do, restaurants/bars to eat, retail to shop. Auburn is losing lots of money to Opelika for that very reason. I want to spend my money in Auburn, but I dont, because Opelika has all the restaurants and retail. It's ok to grow in population and in size. The fact that people have been arguing about a height restriction is a complete joke! 75 ft ? c'mon. It's not that big of a deal.
- less student housing , more retail
- Go back to the small town feel, not big city
- CAREFUL consideration to the idea that 'we must increase sales tax revenue" at the expense of maintaining a quaint downtown "village" atmosphere. Also tighter control on MUD's - many empty beds already, why do we need more?
- Better selection of restaurants and keeping rental properties clean.
- Parking and remove all reserved parking after 6 pm . I will go to Opelika downtown and spend money rather than deal with parking and all the rules downtown Auburn
- better parks,bicycle paths, walks
- Preservation and Protection of core. Streets like Gay, Wrights Mill, Samford, Payne St, Thach, Magnolia have homes that need renovating - not tearing down. Tax Incentives for home/property owners to invest in their properties in these areas. Involving Historic committees as a voting member of the planning department and BZA.
- Keep the school system with only one high school.
- cost of city services
- Elected leaders who listened to the constituency and did what the public wanted.
- restriction of high rise bldgs, better parking
- More emphasis on parks, hiking and walking
- As long as architecture is appropriate and matches, New development downtown is positive. Build the new hotel. War Eagle.
- new mayor
- Diversity
- deer control-- both as a safety issue and property destruction issue that are greatly increasing
- Program offered for working parents- city after school limited to teacher type hours; summer programs for kids
- Pedestrian crossings that match the traffic lights so people stop crossing at the wrong time
- Increase in size of police dept, pay of officers, and promotions of respect for our police officers.
- Bicycle lanes! More and more residents and students are riding bikes. Because of traffic, it's sometimes easier to get around on a bike. At times I don't feel as safe because the bicycle lanes run out or just aren't there. I'm in my 50's. I travel a great deal and have seen what other cities have done to make their area safer for bike riders. There will be more bike traffic in downtown when the grocery store goes in. My wife rides her bike to work everyday. Bike lanes means less cars in downtown.
- Moores Mill Rd/ University intersection! What happened to the Moores Mill Rd bridge/ widening project? It started last year and nothing has been done for months.The backed up traffic every weekday morning is ridiculous!
- Stop building so many apartments.
- More downtown parks.
- Stop expanding the city limits so that existing property values within the city limits can have the opportunity to appreciate for the mere fact that they are part of the city and have access to the city schools, services, etc.
- Pedestrian connectivity and access (sidewalks, crosswalks) outside of downtown. Slower speed limit on Glenn to University (keep at 35 MPH ).
- recycling
- Add sidewalks to all residential and get more people to recycle
- Would like city to build more affordable homes for senior citizen
- More consideration for historic preservation.
- Need to improve the Environmental Services Department. Need to have them NOT put the garbage cans on the grass. It kills it!!
- Stop building apartments
- The streets from College all the way down past Auburn Junior High are HORRIBLE!!! Please repave.
- I want the development of this town to STOP. The schools can't keep up. The superintendent has said we'll need a new elementary school in 2 years! Traffic and pedestrian safety are problematic due to this fast growth, especially near the university. The character of downtown is under threat from complicity between developers, the City Council and the Mayor. I am seriously unhappy!
- I'm watching Opelika really become a city focused on young professionals, and middle-age adults. Seems like they try harder. Auburn still seems a bit too reliant on the University. Look at the entertainment area growth in Opelika. Nothing like it in Auburn.
- more green space for walking and biking trails, native plants, passive rainwater harvesting in public spaces
- On the day of the 'Big Event", the City would allow bigger trash piles by the road.
- Bring in more diverse jobs, not just manufacturing and education. A lot of people live here but work in another area.
- add more street lights on bypass, and turn lanes
- Transportation for disabled people!!!
- Traffic flow at peak times.
- Police enforcement of drivers texting while driving
- More/better bike lanes. The ones we have do not make me feel safe when I use them
- Recycling curbside
- I would insist on transparency in government. I have attended public hearings on zoning issues and building projects. I not only find our local government unresponsive, but openly contemptuous in response to thoughtful and reasonable questions from the citizens of the city. We do not elect our officials to represent the developers from out of state (or from in state). We elect them to listen and thoughtfully represent and respond to our concerns and to act in the long term interests of us and of our children. I am not against progress, but there are a huge number of very thoughtful people who are part of our community and who, if they were listened to, could provide ideas for beautiful expansion of our city rather than the monstrously ugly apartment complexes like the one across from the police station and the new projects that the city council recently approved in down town Auburn. Take a look at cities like Fairhope. There are examples of progress without uglificaiton and the immense traffic problems that Auburn's thoughtless zoning board has allowed, even encouraged. I understand that business should be supported, but out of town developers do not represent business in the sense of community building. They do not care about the city of Auburn and whether or not their projects leave it better off and more beautiful--they only care about profit. That is not enough. Our officials should insist that each project make this community better and the landscape more beautiful--that each project represents a step forward--rather than a quick profit. I am an optimistic person but the behavior of our mayor, the entire zoning board, and most of the city council clearly indicate that their priorities are their rich friends, not the everyday citizens of auburn. I used to be proud of this city, but in the last few years, I have grown increasingly appalled at contempt that our elected officials show
toward the honest, hard working everyday people of our city. Of course you can choose to dismiss this, and I know that you probably will, which is a pity because I am actually trying to help. I am letting you know not only my feelings, but the sentiments that I have heard expressed by friends and in some cases life long residents. There is a growing level of frustration. It can be addressed. It can be addressed by listening and acting on the feedback that you are receiving. When people speak out it is not because they 'don't know enough to know what's going on," or because they are "trouble makers." They speak out because they are concerned. If it is a complicated issue and you feel it is misunderstood, Explain it. People are not stupid and they don't speak out to be trouble makers. They speak out of concern and their concerns should be met with an open mind and an honest hearing. Ignoring people is quicker, but listening is a more certain way forward. You would be surprised. We are a town full of really smart people.
- Storm water runoff
- Traffic
- avoid overbuilding tall buildings and multipurpose buildings within 3 miles of the Downtown area while providing incentives for buying up and improving aging real estate for improvement.
- Larger library
- There needs to be more focus on maintaining the small town atmosphere and less focus on building so many new apartment buildings. We have several older apartment complexes that should be remodeled instead of adding these new buildings to our community.
- Planned growth
- Traffic patterns downtown
- police involvement, more handicap parking
- Traffic
- Parking downtown is terrible. I cannot even go Five Guys on a non-football Saturday anymore without having to circle the block repeatedly to find a place to park. We've pretty much given up on dining or shopping downtown these days.
- Retail shopping!
- INCREASE IN SENIOR HOUSING.
- Flow of traffic down town
- Make traffic easier to navigate.
- traffic congestion
- would love more walking trails
- Fewer massive student housing complexes off campus
- Change of city leadership.
- water improvements
- To convence the City Council and City Officials that Downtown Auburn is just fine as it is. It is what I am most proud of, the college town atmosphere. Add housing and retail to the outskirts, not to the Gay Street parking, which WAS JUST BUILT. Who in the City is getting the payoff for this construction?
- Jobs
- flow of traffic
- Make the neighborhood more safe day and night. Have the police watch the neighborhood.
- traffic back up when trains come through
- Reduce price for sewerage
- more openness in decision making process, more citizen involvement
- The cost of living is disproportionately high given the city's size and services.
- Have more bike paths and widen the existing ones and create a rail trail for off road biking. Create a safe environment for cycling in the city.
- parking downtown
- conservation of history
- Development please, no more Wal-Mart. Can we go back to focusing on the good, local businesses who are run by people who care about this community and are interested in Auburn? I've seen great improvements since I came here in the late 90 's, but we've lost something too. It's just not as good as it once was.
- Stop changing downtown landscape. Try to preserve some heritage.
- Stop building apartments
- Downtown travel \& parking
- Over-building of apartment complexes and limited parking downtown. Would spend more time and $\$$ if parking was adequate.
- The quality of special needs education.
- increased streetlighting in neighborhoods. i live on Cherry Street, and my street, as well as parts of Annalue, are not as well lit as they could be.
- More careful, cautious development. Please think carefully about the monster buildings being thrown up everywhere. It's horrible letting anyone deface the city in such an egregious manner, but it's even worse when we let out-of-town developers with no connection to or care for the city come in and mangle our beautiful little town. I've lived elsewhere on and off, and have seen some wonderfully well thought out and implemented planned developments, but this seems to be something lacking in our general region. Please don't let old houses get torn down and shoddy cookie cutter places be built up, two or three houses to a lot that use to be only one nice house. This is something I've seen while moving around, too. More and more houses on smaller and smaller lots pressed in against each other. Better inform the citizenry of Auburn of plans. (See link below.) http://1.bp.blogspot.com/-
KOJaOWdZ19U/UZ46GuG7NOI/AAAAAAAABJE/tVvacN7ameE/s1600/rowhouse+sign.jpg If I could change one more thing, it would be transparency of hiring decisions for top management. A full rundown of top level positions and final applicants, posted in the monthly news letter so everyone could see what was going on and who their potential new city heads would be, so that the citizens can, if not have any say, at least be aware of what decisions were being made and their impact.
- More sidewalks, everywhere.
- Stop the building of any NEW apartment complexes. We have more housing than students and the only benefit of new housing is for the investors who build it, rent it for a couple of years and then sell it for a profit. Over the years the rent goes down, the maintenance decreases and it detracts from our city image. We have countless examples of this throughout the city. If there were no more new apartments built it would create an incentive for the same investors to renovate and improve the existing buildings. This would improve the city image, adequately serve the student population and decrease the number of neglected properties.
- more green space, runoff from construction
- Make the new companies hire a certain percentage of degrees people from the area. The business hire auburn people but, only as laborers. Not many managers, engineers and techs from our area. They must move away after graduating college. Auburn must make space for those people.
- fix traffic flow
- Manage traffic increase, make biking safer
- Over building and expansion that has been too rapid.
- add more traffic lights; still several areas that are dangerous - feel unsafe trying to get into traffic. some areas are accident prone
- Pickup my pile of leaves/stick piles without tearing my sod. Quit sending me threats to fine me when I'm keeping my yard clean by putting stuff on the road for pickup!
- I live in Harper Ave., right in front of Kroger at Dean Rd. and I see people up and down the road, carrying groceries and there is no sidewalk in Harper Ave. It is extremely dangerous, our street is busy and families, strollers, pedestrians have no safety to walk in the street. We DESPERATELY need a sidewalk on Harper Ave.
- That city services be provided in older established neighborhoods before continuing to build new neighborhoods. We are in city on septic tank with no gas or city water service which lowers our property value.
- ENFORCE handicapped parking. We want to be a city that is attractive to young people and that is good...But what about us older handicapped people who have lived here and paid taxes for years? Have we been forgotten? And if handicapped parking rules are not enforceable as I have been told, why are there fines posted on handicapped parking spots? The city is emphasizing youth, and that is good, but forgotten about us older folks who have been toting the load for years? Auburn's enforcement of handicapped parking is a sham. We serve the young and forget about or ignore our handicapped citizens. Auburn could and should do better, Just do it!
- curbside recycling
- More runner/jogger friendly
- bigger mall
- Parking
- The Mall needs a new department store in place of Sears.
- Racism
- sidewalk on Moores Mill inside university
- baseball park, walking track, more benches, volleyball, more basketball goals
- Old buildings downtown.
- public transportation
- parking downtown
- More friendly for young professionals, not just retirees
- I would like to see downtown Auburn going more in the direction of a downtown Opelika as far as nicer restaurants and upscale establishments instead of the college bar scene. I was born and raised here, then moved away and can honestly say this still haven't changed. We have a beautiful downtown that could thrive at night with adults instead of students if we put an initiaitive in place to bring businesses there. Similar to a downtown Roswell, Ga as there main st. area is a lot like ours!
- better communication with parks and rec.
- Stop building 7 story apartment buildings, while the older apartment complexes turn into section 8 housing.
- LIGHTING, OPELIKA ROAD, ABANDONED STRUCTURES/OLD LOOKING RUN DOWN STRUCTURES
- Provide a clear assessment of the impacts of new developments on the existing infrastructure and detailed plans on when and how these impacts will be addressed.
- I would stop the harassment of the college students by the police. You literally cannot drive on the road after 11 pm without being stopped for a bogus reason. I would also issue traffic citations fairly and equally amongst the residents. There has been a racial component affecting the outcome of a traffic stop. I don't think that should be okay in a wonderfully diverse city such as Auburn.
- More community events that are easy to attend(parking)
- The stretch of Moores mill between Hamilton/Ogletree and east University is beyond ridiculous in the morning.
- Don't have automated messages on city office \#s - have them answered by a person
- Future Development
- Improve the traffic light signals
- stop racism
- Too much emphasis on traffic tickets, not enough on crime prevention. Seems to be a revenue issue, not for public safety. Need more available self defense and gun safety classes, public shooting range.
- more greenspace
- Traffic
- Parks and Rec
- more affordable housing for families especially families with children. Kid friendly communities and more activities for children
- Indoor aquatics facility
- I know that development in Auburn is inevitable--we are a fast growing city. And while this may be economically naive, I would love to see an emphasis on small and locally owned business. I fear an influx of chain restaurants and businesses downtown. I want to go downtown to celebrate the places and people that make Auburn special--not visit a Disneyland for students.
- downtown parking
- Improve city's bikeability.
- Keep the small town village atmosphere.
- Transparency in government decisions
- better bike access
- Stronger controls over new development. Not caving in to every developer's wishes. Try to maintain the village atmosphere in future development. Listen to resident ideas on development, rather than yielding to any tax producing development idea.
- more nicer dining options
- STOP BUILDING AND EXPANDING
- Road conditions, especially near construction
- More culurally diverse recreational activities
- we have a hard time finding a place to ride bikes with our young children. also- wish some of the playgrounds had more shading features for young children (slides get too hot)
- Slow down on putting a tall apartment or condo on every corner. Leave some of the old Auburn for citizen enjoyment. Think of citizens rather than developers and lining their pockets. In fact, from what we have heard for years, the city leaders are in the back pocket of developers.
- night time safety
- More transparency between city leaders, developers, and voters
- More things for kids to do. Auburn cater more to the students then the families that live here. Also more affordable housing other than the projects
- The residents of areas that are being developed do NOT get the information about development until it has already been approved.
- better planning of multifamily developments
- Develop creative events that involve ALL the Auburn family....a chili cook off...a disability awareness day.....an Auburn History event....to celebrate our heritage
- Downtown parjubg
- Better traffic light response early in the mornings. 12am to 5 am
- Someone is going to get killed by speeding in our neighborhood. Dozens of us have contacted police and still nothing is done about it... zero police presence to deter speeding.
- traffic jam during games season
- traffic flow
- Parking issues
- Stop letting Opelika get all the new shopping center, businesses, restaurants.
- Downtown parking/accessibility, especially on the weekends.
- Recreation Center closer to the Moores Mill Rd/ Ogletree Rd area.
- Fewer apartment buildings.
- Traffic
- Keep downtown quaint and village-like which is why so many alums love to come back and spend time in auburn. We love to remember how it was when we were here. My mom who is an alum from 1964 still loves coming and being in downtown Auburn for all the lovely memories she has from her days here as a student. I feel that newer more modern buildings and facilities should be kept out of a certain radius of the downtown corner in order to preserve what is left of our lovely village.
- Slow the growth. This city is developing and growing too quickly and as a result, the quality of life is deteriorating steadily
- strengthen police protection
- elect new officials and appoint new positions at all levels except for fire dept
- More benches and more handicap parking
- Stop wasting money on sidewalks that are not used
- Trash collection. There doesnt seem to be a dump,nearby where i can take extra debris, nor can i put it at the street. When i called the city, i was told to just store it on my property. It is very frustrating.
- Improve parking and the quality of development
- Leadership
- I want Auburn to continue to be a place that I am proud to raise my children. I want it to be safe and provide opportunities for community events we can attend as a family. I wish the downtown area were more family friendly and did not feel as if it centered around students as much as it does currently.
- Honest representation from all City Officials.
- downtown parking and traffic
- congestion
- Stop building so many tall condos and banks.
- less huge apartment complexes, more thought long term put into those kinds of developments
- expand recycling program
- fix timing on stop lights to be smarter...
- Opelika Road
- Parking
- Don't build ugly things downtown. Keep the small town look and feel
- improved bike lanes/new bike trails, current are dangerous
- better traffic flow on South College and Opelika Road
- resurfacing streets, E universty dr.
- reduction of criminal activity along S College and around N Auburn
- safer and more extensive biking paths
- Slow down the apartment building downtown.
- loud noise
- Be more open as to where the money is spent.
- better traffic enforcement. Promote local business
- clean drain and remove dead tree on Tucker Ave
- Develop stronger laws regarding commercial development to improve their looks and actually enforce the rules instead of allowing developers to ignore them at will. For example setbacks and signs on South College.
- More infrastructure for access and expansion
- I would like to see an architectural review committee work collaboratively with our planning and development team to develop a vision for Auburn downtown that will capitalize on our small town feel while still fostering economic development and growth.
- More recreation fields for athletic events. Access to fields for practice.
- To think in broader terms of downtown development, instead of tearing down history, spread out a few streets from downtown and expand, not tear down and replace....expand. Auburn should take a good look at what happened to Irving, TX, a place where professional athletes, movie stars and big business owners wanted to live. But then Irving got full of itself when corp. wanted to build high end apartments, which later were sold to second tier owners and then the quality of life deeply decreased because those apartments have now become houses with low income non taxpaying residents and crime has gone up. The apartment building of Auburn has become embarrassing to think big corporations can take advantage of our small downtown history to make money. They don't live here. There is just so much space and if you tear down the things
that people are moving here for, then in 10-15 years it will become high crime low income families right in the heart of Auburn.
- I would ask our City Council to be open and honest to its citizens. The disingeniousness of pushing tax hikes on the community under the disquise of 'Education" and selling it because of community growth is absolutely wrong. The city plans for everything and has long range growth strategies. To sell tax hikes under the disquise of education pitted this cities neighbor vs neighbor. Those who new the city council and mayor, along with superintendant were being less than ethical regarding the planned growth., and those who trusted every word said. It is the responsiblity of the city to include in their growth plans, school plans to accommodate that growth and not threaten its community members with cuts and doomsday solutions. THe city is now bragging that it came through for everybody. I am disgusted with the politics that went on behind this school issue. We knew you all had the money, and are tired of your scare tactics and misinformation programs. Thank goodness the citizens of the town were smart enough to see through all the mess. We knew the city could afford a new high school without tax increase, and hopefully it will insure that our money is spent wisely.
- Increase in parking downtown
- enforcement of noise ordinances in neighborhoods
- Jo ANn Fabric Store. Make Aubrn mall open like Tiger Town
- bring in more retail
- more progressive like Tiger Town
- Better teachers and administrators
- I would create a workplace diversity program (improve Human Resource Mngt - HRM)) in the attempt to diversify, structure and progressively balance city employment opportunities (and equal employment).
- use debit/credit payments for rec centers
- Fix the traffic backup on Moores mill road. Keep the small town charm by creating building codes that keep downtown building an architecture designs that preserve the charm of a small southern downtown while increasing dinning and shopping options
- Police dept
- To make ALL bike riders use only locations with bike lanes. The city of auburn and the State of Alabama have spent Millions on bike lanes, yet there are bicycles riding in the middle of shug early and late at night.
- place more value on small business
- Stop building so many tall apartments
- We need to have better biking lanes that are respected by motor vehicles. On several occasions I have almost been hit by motor vehicles not respecting the bike lanes. More Education for drivers needs to be offered. I believe more people would bike if they felt safe on the roads.
- Do not develop new apartments on College Street from Thach Ave to Glenn Ave and do not develop new apartments on Magnolia Ave from Gay Street to Skybar. Add all the apartments you want west of College Street between Magnolia Ave and Glenn Ave.
- Get rid of old looking buildings and replace with clean lot or another business of some kind.
- Protect some of the historic areas.
- Keeping Auburn a lovely village, nor a sprawling city with little downtown.
- schools
- allow annexation
- The planning committee. They allowed for new businesses to be built like the nursing home near Moores Mill, despite the fact that it is a large commercial institution in the middle of residential neighborhoods. They also gave no proactive thought on solutions for the increase of traffic which is already abhorrent, due to having such a large facility in that area. The idea was 'oh well we will take care of it later" which I feel is the antithesis of planning.
- better parking
- Communication about recycling - I've lived here 17 years and asked several times and still don't know for sure what plastics are recycled! (and the yard trash trucks tear up the grass)
- Expedite the process for removal and/or renovation of dilapidated houses/buildings in residential areas. This is an eye sore in the community, and lowers the value of updated property/homes in the area.
- The recycling program
- Something similar to Opelika sportsplex added to soccer complex with a traffic signal and concessions.
- bicycle lanes an dparks
- Eliminate parking in yards, on grass in residential areas
- Downtown parking
- The heavy traffic problem in the downtown area.
- The traffic congestion and safer. Most days I feel safe but then a shooting or crime reminds me that we are not as safe as I would like to be.
- slow down building
- better living conditions for senior citizen and low income housing
- Parks and Recreation. I have lived in the west coast, in the midwest, and now here in Auburn. Compared to the other places I've lived, Auburn has fewer parks, the parks are not properly maintained/updated, and the programs offered are priced very high. I should not expect to pay the same price for parks and recs programs that I pay for private programs.
- Parking and traffic
- more shopping
- Recycle more plastics, and bring recycling opportunities to apartment complexes.
- A more forward-thinking Planning Board who don't want to put up more student housing in every corner. Enough.
- Recycle program
- Traffic flow and to see more cops patrolling at night
- Quality of Books at Library. Pre-K through 5th grade is good, but Juvenile section is filled with Witchcraft, Love interest and Gossip novels.
- Keep places open for those who care less about football games
- There needs to be some common sense when giving tickets. There is not enough parking in town and consideration should be give for the tax dollars spent when in town and not tickets issued when there is no harm
- imcompentent police department
- The current city plan seems to be catering exclusively to students. I'm concerned that the developments downtown are going to create too many empty rentals and apartments that may attract undesirable elements. At the same time I fear that Auburn will lose any sort of character its downtown has in an effort to generate revenue for certain investors. As other downtowns stress the small Southern charm ours seems to be filling up with generic chains that offer no sense of quality or uniqueness. I'm also sick of the high-rises downtown.
- More activities for young adults, those just out of college.
- traffic flow/congestion
- Police department - less ego and focus on quotas, more focus on serving people.
- Adaptive reuse of older buildings could be improved
- decrease business rent so business will stay
- South college
- parking downtown
- water and sewer
- traffic/parking
- More parks for my small children. I live on the North side of town.
- Better quality retail and dining.
- More music concerts and performaning opportunitites
- Consisitent enforcement of ordianances
- Maintenance of the downtown 'small town" look; limit the high rise apartments.
- stop tearing down historic structures to build apartments
- garbage collection
- The city needs to remember that not all of it's tax paying citizens are students nor wealthy residents. Many of us who have lived here and worked here all of our lives are having trouble finding safe, affordable housing for our families. We choose to live in Auburn because we love it but many of us cannot afford a safe home even though both parents work full time. We need more rental properties that are available for families that are safe and not beholden to the same timetables that the student rentals are. It would be wonderful if a community were built of small bungalows/cottages that were aimed specifically at families that are in lower tax brackets.
- more family style affordable housing
- traffic flow
- control the rampant commercialism that is destroying the village on the plains
- Larger playground at Town Creek park
- park and rec activities, adult sports,parking
- Better communication on city events, more maintenance on student housing
- If we gave people jay walking tickets in downtown the city could make lots of money and the road ways would be safer for everyone.
- The recycling department needs complete revamp. You cannot be that strict on what you take and expect people to follow. I have been to several other cities in other states too and every recycling piece all goes in one bin and is sorted by city workers not only would it give jobs out but it would make a lot of us a lot happier to save the environment
- Parking downtown
- operation of Jon Dempsey Center and Harris Center
- NO high rise buildings in the downtown core
- Flow of traffic. Lighting on major roads...Shug Jordan. More traffic lights on Shug especially on the bends near the fire department. I have a personal dilemma with Alabama power....they are planning on upgrading the power lines to run from the junction box on wire to the junction box on w. FarmVille and they have plans to run the transmission lines down Richland Rd and have told us our property is prime land to run across to get to FarmVille. We contacted our city counsel rep, and they knew nothing of this planned improvement.
- Bike riders taking more than 3 feet of the lane
- downtown parking expansion
- Parking
- I'd like to see better decisions made regarding how to spend our tax dollars. Lighted street signs would be at the bottom of my list. I'd also like to see more transparency in the bid process for infrastructure. Contracts are always awarded to the same companies, and all projects take far longer to complete than necessary. Lastly, spend some time promoting both adult and family friendly businesses and less time on student oriented ones.
- Keep the historic part, historic and reuse existing building before tearing down old ones!
- Traffic
- crossing streets in downtown is very dangerous. Need better crossings
- The communication to the public concerning parking downtown and retail businesses open!! Being a small business owner in downtown Auburn is very difficult due to rent costs and taxation. It makes it very hard to succced
- widen N College St
- Quality of public pools
- Slow down the apartment building.
- More daycare and prescool options
- add more high end retail
- new planning board
- Stop allowing the building of apartments!! If AU doesnt have enough housing then THEY should be building more dorms!!!!!!!
- traffic, need traffic light at S College and Sandhill Rd, need traffic cameras around Auburn U.
- downtown parking
- Y'all need 2-3 high schools!!! I know it's not popular politically but the quality of education is going down... and the opportunities for athletes is diminishing because there's only 1 team for each sport. We don't have our kids in the public schools because of the numbers...too many kids in each grade. Attention to the curriculum is needed...Auburn is a conservative city but the curricula being used in the public schools from what I hear doesn't reflect the values of the people of Auburn.
- Improve appearance along Opelika Rd
- safety
- Traffic flow on College. I avoid traveling on College whenever possible. Mostly because of aggressive driving of young drivers.
- Stop the construction of the tall buildings and apartment complexes. Complete transparency from the mayor and city council members about building. It appears that the mayor and city council
members care more about money than preserving the beauty and uniqueness of our small town. Very disappointed. Did not listen to the citizens who were concerned about what was happening or going to happen to our city.
- Information could be improved
- Traffic
- Traffic
- Traffic flow
- The planning and future project of Auburn Building and Events.
- Youth football soccer fields parking lot is in bad shape!!
- Flow of traffic
- clean up trash and trim weeds in areas outside of downtown
- retail and restaurants
- bike paths and safetyh
- Improved availability of safe non-student housing for single person
- Stop building student housing
- maintain historical character of town
- The way richer neighbor hoods get codes enforced compared to how they aren't enforced in poorer neighborhoods.
- recycling
- Switch water of Timberwood residents
- Greenways and improve traffic flow
- Traffic
- Traffic flow
- More transparency on the city projects, moratoriums, etc...
- All retail and restaurants are in Opelika. This is a disgrace!
- Not having sports on Wed Nights due to conflicts with church services
- traffic flow
- I realize that bigger and more comes with congestion and problems. However, congestion on the roads has become an issue. I avoid shopping in town due to congestion and Snug Jordan is becoming the same way. When I sit thru multiple light changes, I will start looking for different arrangements. I find myself going to Tiger Town more now than before and utilizing US 280 more to get there. The roads aren't big enough nor the parking close enough to handle what you appear to be trying to accomplish. These items are coming a day late and a dollar short. Taxing isn't an option any longer. Best just find a better mouse trap. A better long range plan is in need. Good luck.
- places for seniors
- stop allowing high rises around dowtown
- Better information or debates on additional private dormitories being built.
- fix the zoning downtown to make buildings fit the image and clean up Opelika Hwy
- Put a complete stoppage of all building within the city limits, especially all multi-use \& multifamily uses. Auburn is becoming too congested \& looks like crap. Auburn has lost Auburn \& greed \& crap have won. Stop issuing zoning exemptions for everything. Why have laws if they are always going to be exempted?
- More places to work.
- I would treat all Auburn citizens equally and not allow certain people because of who they are to destroy a neighbor's driveway that's been in used since the purchase of their home to cover it with hills and mounds with no outlet in case of an emergency. This is a major improvement that's needed for Auburn to be a greater place to live.
- downtown parking
- Easier way to register concerns i.e. Water leakages
- need more parks like Hickory Dickory, it get crowed and adults leave baby diapers on the benches
- Traffic
- Better Internet options. It needs to be upgraded city wide.
- Opelika Highway Corridor is outdated an ugly! Power lines everywhere, they need to be buried. The whole corridor from the Post Office to nearly the mall needs to be cleaned up. Quality businesses will never be interested in relocating to this area with this eye sore of a business district.
- Widen the road, especially Magnolia Rd. Downtown, the side parking always blocks traffic
- Attention to aesthetic beauty of the town. If you look at South College and Opelika Road with fresh eyes, they are a huge hodgepodge with no flow or master plan behind development. Wish our town could concentrate on greenspaces, outdoor dining downtown, pedestrian accessibility to venues. Look at Roswell and Decatur communities in Georgia. Both are huge retirement communities like ours but have a feeling that all development is planned out carefully.
- The out of control development of apartments! It is putting pressure on the school system and the city. People are moving in to low cost housing since we have excess housing and they are not all working in Auburn to have money that goes towards paying for schools. we need the city to think more about the citizens than the developers.
- We need more railroad overpasses, especially because school bus cross those tracks!
- Put all power lines and cables underground. It is a pity, e.g., that the considerable improvements made on Opelika Road near the post office are offset by the circus tent atmosphere created by all the power poles and power lines plus other cables.
- More importance placed on concerns from permanent residents as opposed to college students. Downtown is not inviting to permanent residents anymore.
- Remove all yard waste each week. A small pile is always left.
- Get council to vote according to constituent input. Don't destroy downtown with high rises
- Stop allowing non-Auburn based property owners to price local business owners out of downtown Auburn to have local businesses replaced by corporate chains. It is completely out of control and downtown Auburn is losing its local flavor and is quickly just becoming Anytown, USA. Also. ENOUGH with the new apartment construction for students. It has reached the point of absurdity and is creating dangerous areas in older areas like Longleaf.
- i like the city of Auburn.
- Sweep streets of debris much more often and edge the grass growing at curbs.
- More retail and non fast food restaurants. Too much is in Opelika instead of Auburn.
- More food places on Opelika Road and that don't cater to college students. Every time something new comes its down town Auburn or on College Street.
- Traffic
- Appearance of downtown shopping area.
- I would change the manner in which city council members respond to the citizens of Auburn who do not agree with the agenda of most of the council. For the most part, I am referring to the controversy regarding city growth and development.
- Clear weed growth from easements
- limit student housing. enforce heighth of new structures
- Parking
- To shift the focus of the police to patrol and check retail and residential areas for crimes and major vehicle violations and less time on minor vehicle violations.
- Overall appeal.
- Bike and pedestrian access, should be easy an dossible for this to be a primary means of transportation here
- More family restaurants near the mall area.
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