CITIZEN SURVEY

2016/2018 Trend Comparison
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Highlights

- Place to Live: Excellent/Good 81% (+2%)
- 3/4 residents gave positive reviews to their neighborhood as a place to live
- 3/4 residents gave positive reviews as a place to raise children
- 8 in 10 plan to remain in the City for the next 5 years
- 62% favorably rated Cedar Rapids’ overall image and appearances (similar to other communities)
ASPECTS OF COMMUNITY CHARACTERISTICS

Higher comparison
- Employment opportunities
- Adult education

Improved comparison
Lower to Similar
- Public parking

Lower comparison
- Overall feeling of safety
- Overall natural environment
- Cleanliness
- Air quality
- Place to visit

Higher
- Safe downtown/commercial area
- Travel by bicycle
- Travel by public transportation
- Travel by car
- Public parking
- Traffic flow
- Overall natural environment
- Overall built environment
- Affordable quality housing
- Housing options
- Public places
- ECONOMY
- Overall economic health
- Vibrant downtown/commercial area
- Business and services
- Cost of living
- Shopping opportunities
- Employment opportunities
- Place to visit
- Place to work
- RECREATION AND WELLNESS
- Health and wellness
- Mental health care
- Preventative health services
- Health care
- Food
- Recreational opportunities
- Fitness opportunities
- EDUCATION AND ENRICHMENT
- Education and enrichment opportunities
- Cultural/arts/music activities
- Adult education
- Child care/preschool
- COMMUNITY ENGAGEMENT
- Social events and activities
- Neighorliness
- Openness and acceptance
- Opportunities to participate in community matters
- Opportunities to volunteer

Lower
- Cleanliness
- Air quality
- Overall feeling of safety
- Overall natural environment
- Overall built environment
- Affordable quality housing
- Housing options
- Public places
- ECONOMY
- Overall economic health
- Vibrant downtown/commercial area
- Business and services
- Cost of living
- Shopping opportunities
- Employment opportunities
- Place to visit
- Place to work
- RECREATION AND WELLNESS
- Health and wellness
- Mental health care
- Preventative health services
- Health care
- Food
- Recreational opportunities
- Fitness opportunities
- EDUCATION AND ENRICHMENT
- Education and enrichment opportunities
- Cultural/arts/music activities
- Adult education
- Child care/preschool
- COMMUNITY ENGAGEMENT
- Social events and activities
- Neighorliness
- Openness and acceptance
- Opportunities to participate in community matters
- Opportunities to volunteer

Similar
- Overall economic health
- Vibrant downtown/commercial area
- Business and services
- Cost of living
- Shopping opportunities
- Employment opportunities
- Place to visit
- Place to work
- RECREATION AND WELLNESS
- Health and wellness
- Mental health care
- Preventative health services
- Health care
- Food
- Recreational opportunities
- Fitness opportunities
- EDUCATION AND ENRICHMENT
- Education and enrichment opportunities
- Cultural/arts/music activities
- Adult education
- Child care/preschool
- COMMUNITY ENGAGEMENT
- Social events and activities
- Neighorliness
- Openness and acceptance
- Opportunities to participate in community matters
- Opportunities to volunteer
GOVERNANCE GENERAL TREND COMPARISONS

Highlights

- Overall Quality of City Services: Excellent/Good 74% (+10%)
- 3/4 residents gave a positive evaluation to the overall quality of City Services
- 3/4 residents gave a positive rating to the overall customer service provided by the City
- 8 in 10 residents gave a positive rating to garbage collection, recycling, yard waste pick-up and drinking water
- 8 in 10 residents gave a positive rating to fire, ambulance/EMS, sewer services, City parks and public libraries
### Higher comparison
- Drinking water

### Improved comparison
- Sidewalk maintenance
- Code enforcement

### Lower comparison
- Crime prevention
- Street repair
- Street cleaning

---

**ASPECTS OF GOVERNANCE**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Aspect</th>
<th>2016</th>
<th>2018</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>SAFETY</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Police</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fire</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ambulance/EMS</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Crime prevention</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fire prevention</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Animal control</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Emergency preparedness</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MOBILITY</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Traffic enforcement</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Street repair</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Street cleaning</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Street lighting</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Snow removal</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sidewalk maintenance</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Traffic signal timing</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bus or transit services</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NATURAL ENVIRONMENT</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Garbage collection</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Recycling</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Yard waste pick-up</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Drinking water</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Natural areas preservation</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Open space</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BUILT ENVIRONMENT</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Storm drainage</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sewer services</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Utility billing</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Land use, planning and zoning</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Code enforcement</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cable television</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ECONOMY</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Economic development</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>RECREATION AND WELLNESS</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>City parks</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Recreation programs</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Recreation centers</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Health services</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>EDUCATION AND ENRICHMENT</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Public libraries</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Special events</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>COMMUNITY ENGAGEMENT</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Public information</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Comparison to National Benchmark**

- **Higher**: 93% Higher, 90% Similar, 92% Lower
- **Improved**: 81% Higher, 80% Similar, 84% Lower
- **Lower**: Drinking water 85% Lower, Sidewalk maintenance 79% Lower, Code enforcement 82% Lower
PARTICIPATION GENERAL TREND COMPARISONS

### PARTICIPATION

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Sense of Community</th>
<th>Recommend Cedar Rapids</th>
<th>Remain in Cedar Rapids</th>
<th>Contacted Cedar Rapids employees</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2016</td>
<td>49%</td>
<td>80%</td>
<td>82%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2018</td>
<td>55%</td>
<td>82%</td>
<td>83%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2018</td>
<td>42%</td>
<td>40%</td>
<td>42%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Highlights
- Sense of Community: Excellent/Good 55% (+6%) (similar to other communities)
- 8 in 10 residents recommend living in the City of Cedar Rapids
- 8 in 10 residents plan to remain in the City for the next 5 years
- 8 in 10 residents reported not being under housing cost stress
- 2/3 residents work in Cedar Rapids
ASPECTS OF PARTICIPATION

SAFETY
- Stocked supplies for an emergency: 78% in 2016 vs. 89% in 2018, Higher
- Did NOT report a crime: 76% in 2016 vs. 87% in 2018, Higher
- Was NOT the victim of a crime: 89% in 2016 vs. 91% in 2018, Higher

MOBILITY
- Used public transportation instead of driving: 13% in 2016 vs. 11% in 2018, Lower
- Carpoled instead of driving alone: 44% in 2016 vs. 40% in 2018, Lower
- Walked or biked instead of driving: 46% in 2016 vs. 49% in 2018, Lower

NATURAL ENVIRONMENT
- Conserved water: 71% in 2016 vs. 76% in 2018, Higher
- Made home more energy efficient: 76% in 2016 vs. 76% in 2018, Lower
- Recycled at home: 91% in 2016 vs. 90% in 2018, Lower

BUILT ENVIRONMENT
- Did NOT observe a code violation: 50% in 2016 vs. 55% in 2018, Higher
- NOT under housing cost stress: 74% in 2016 vs. 83% in 2018, Higher

ECONOMY
- Purchased goods or services in Cedar Rapids: 23% in 2016 vs. 35% in 2018, Improved
- Economy will have positive impact on income: 68% in 2016 vs. 64% in 2018, Improved

RECREATION AND WELLNESS
- Work in Cedar Rapids: 50% in 2016 vs. 51% in 2018, Higher
- Visited a City park: 82% in 2016 vs. 85% in 2018, Improved
- Ate 5 portions of fruits and vegetables: 77% in 2016 vs. 80% in 2018, Improved
- Participated in moderate or vigorous physical activity: 78% in 2016 vs. 80% in 2018, Improved
- In very good to excellent health: 78% in 2016 vs. 77% in 2018, Improved

EDUCATION AND ENRICHMENT
- Used Cedar Rapids recreation centers: 51% in 2016 vs. 51% in 2018, Lower
- Used Cedar Rapids public libraries: 51% in 2016 vs. 51% in 2018, Lower
- Attended a City-sponsored event: 55% in 2016 vs. 55% in 2018, Lower

COMMUNITY ENGAGEMENT
- Campaigned for an issue, cause or candidate: 20% in 2016 vs. 26% in 2018, Improved
- Contacted Cedar Rapids elected officials: 13% in 2016 vs. 18% in 2018, Improved
- Volunteered: 45% in 2016 vs. 46% in 2018, Improved
- Participated in a club: 33% in 2016 vs. 32% in 2018, Lower
- Talked to or visited with neighbors: 32% in 2016 vs. 32% in 2018, Lower
- Done a favor for a neighbor: 82% in 2016 vs. 80% in 2018, Lower
- Attended a local public meeting: 11% in 2016 vs. 17% in 2018, Improved
- Watched a local public meeting: 24% in 2016 vs. 30% in 2018, Improved
- Read or watched local news: 85% in 2016 vs. 85% in 2018, Similar
- Voted in local elections: 85% in 2016 vs. 83% in 2018, Lower

Higher comparison
- NOT under housing cost stress
- Work in Cedar Rapids

Improved comparison
- Walked or biked instead of driving
- Conserved water

Lower comparison
- Used public transportation instead of driving

Higher comparison
- NOT under housing cost stress
- Work in Cedar Rapids

Improved comparison
- Walked or biked instead of driving
- Conserved water

Lower comparison
- Used public transportation instead of driving
### SINGLE MOST IMPORTANT ISSUE FACING CEDAR RAPIDS

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Issue</th>
<th>2016</th>
<th>2018</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Street repairs</td>
<td>31%</td>
<td>28%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Public safety</td>
<td>22%</td>
<td>20%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Flood control</td>
<td>9%</td>
<td>17%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Job creation</td>
<td>21%</td>
<td>16%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Taxes</td>
<td>12%</td>
<td>11%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other</td>
<td>5%</td>
<td>8%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### CITY'S PROGRESS ON STREET IMPROVEMENT

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Condition</th>
<th>2016</th>
<th>2018</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Excellent/Good</td>
<td>30%</td>
<td>36%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fair</td>
<td>35%</td>
<td>36%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Poor</td>
<td>32%</td>
<td>27%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Undecided</td>
<td>3%</td>
<td>0%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
WHAT WOULD IMPROVE CEDAR RAPIDS' QUALITY OF LIFE?

### Top 5 commonly-cited areas of focus

**2016**

1. Road repair 16%
2. Safety 15%
3. Mobility 13%
4. New development/entertainment 12%
5. Parks/recreation/wellness 9%

**2018**

1. Mobility 14% (+1%)
2. Road repair 13% (-3%)
3. Entertainment/events/restaurant 12% (-)
4. Safety 11% (-4%)
5. Economic development/planning/jobs 10% (+6%)