The 2015 Civic Services Public Opinion Survey was conducted on the Edmonton Insight Community online panel in early 2015. The results of the survey were shared with Branch Managers and Directors across the City in the summer of 2015 to assist in business planning.

This survey was previously conducted annually in 2006-2011 through a telephone survey to 800 residents of Edmonton, when it was called the Citizen Satisfaction Survey. The survey was replaced by a focused survey on the Corporate Performance Measures of the Way Ahead Strategic Plan. The results of that survey and other Corporate Performance Measures were presented to City Council on September 22, 2015, in the report The Way Ahead Progress Report 2014.

With the advent of the Edmonton Insight Community, the annual survey of satisfaction and opinions about civic services and programs can be conducted with minimal cost. While the previous telephone survey cost over $25,000 to conduct, this survey delivered to ongoing participants in the Insight Community has no cost above the staff time and annual subscription to an online survey tool. Many business areas requested the return of this survey in order to track opinions about operations and to assist in continuous improvements and annual business planning.

For more information about this survey, contact the Office of Public Engagement, City of Edmonton, at 780-495-0395 or PublicEngagement@edmonton.ca.
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Summary Results

Summary Results – Overall Satisfaction
• Overall, 83% of respondents are satisfied with services and programs offered throughout the year by the City of Edmonton.
• A large majority of respondents agree that they receive fair to very good or fair value for taxes (81%).

Summary Results – Service Priorities
• Transportation tops areas to improve with public transit (52%), summer (40%) and winter (31%) road maintenance, and rush hour traffic (29%) highlighted.
• Of those who felt the City could decrease service levels to reduce costs, 49% felt bike lanes were an area that could be decreased.
• Fire rescue, curbside waste collection, parks, playgrounds, sports fields and public libraries all rate high in importance and satisfaction.
• Summer road maintenance, public transit, rush hour traffic, permit and inspection services, and bike lanes/routes are all services with less than 50% satisfaction, with but which are rated high importance.

Summary Results – Service Experience
• A significant number of respondents reported they believed that transportation and permits and inspection services were most likely to have worsened in the last 12 months.
  o Notably, 50% state that rush hour traffic has worsened in the last 12 months.
  o The quality of service in other areas largely remained the same or slightly improved.
• Half of respondents (49%) reported a recent customer service experience or interaction with the City of Edmonton, with a majority of these agreeing that City staff understood the inquiry (79%), took time to deliver the service or resolve the inquiry (71%) and were helpful (70%).
• One-quarter, disagreed that City staff were able to resolve their inquiry (24%) and were not satisfied with their interaction (25%).

Summary Results – Reputation of Edmonton
• A large majority of respondents agree that Edmonton is culturally diverse (91%), is a great place to live (86%), has a great network of multi-use trails (83%) and is great for entertainment, events & fun (79%).
• A majority of respondents said they would speak highly of Edmonton (64%), while very few said they would be critical of Edmonton if asked (10%) or without being asked (4%).
• A large majority of respondents agree that they have access to city services and amenities (88%).
Methodology and Population Sample

The survey was conducted online in the Edmonton Insight Community from April 17 to May 4, 2015.

The Edmonton Insight Community is an online panel of Edmontonians who have signed up to provide regular feedback to City surveys throughout the year. The Insight Community has more than 3,800 members (October 2015), who complete monthly mixed-topic surveys and one or two dedicated surveys per month on a single topic. All City departments are involved in supplying questions. Members of the Insight Community provide demographic information when they join. This demographic information can be used for specifically targeted surveys, such as by neighbourhood or gender or age group. The demographic data helps in recruitment efforts to ensure the Insight Community reflects Edmonton’s population, as recorded in Census data.

The Civic Services Public Opinion Survey was sent to Edmonton Insight Community members on April 17 through email invitation. An open survey was also promoted through the City’s Twitter and Facebook channels as a method of recruiting more citizens to the Insight Community. Only the responses from registered Insight Community members are used in this report.

The survey was a combination of multiple-choice and open-ended questions with 13 topic areas.

The full survey was completed by 1,162 respondents.

The average Study Completion Time was 29 minutes and 16 seconds. The median Study Completion Time was 14 minutes and 15 seconds. Therefore, the survey would be roughly equivalent to input provided through presentations over almost 567 hours.

As a non-random online survey, a margin of error is not reported for these results. However, if a probability sample had been used results for a random sample of 1,062, it would be accurate ± 2.99 percentage points, 19 times out of 20.
## Profile of Survey Respondents

### Gender
- Male: 43%
- Female: 53%
- Other: 0%
- I prefer not to answer: 4%

### Length of Time Lived in Edmonton
- Less than 1 year: 1%
- Between 1 to 2 years: 2%
- Between 3 to 5 years: 4%
- Greater than 5 years: 92%

### Employment Status
- Employed full-time (30+ hours a week): 67%
- Employed part-time (0-30 hours a week): 8%
- Homemaker: 3%
- Post-secondary student: 3%
- High School Student: 0%
- Unemployed: 2%
- Permanently unable to Work: 1%
- Retired: 13%
- Other (Specify): 3%

### Have Children under 18 at Home
- Yes: 26%
- No: 74%

### Age
- "18-24": 2%
- "25-29": 9%
- "30-34": 16%
- "35-39": 12%
- "40-44": 9%
- "45-49": 10%
- "50-54": 10%
- "55-59": 12%
- "60-64": 8%
- "65-69": 7%
- "70-74": 4%
- "75-79": 1%

### Homeownership
- Own: 80%
- Rent: 20%
### Household Income

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Income Range</th>
<th>Percentage</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Under $20,000</td>
<td>3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$20,000 to $29,999</td>
<td>3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$30,000 to $39,999</td>
<td>3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$40,000 to $49,999</td>
<td>4%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$50,000 to $59,999</td>
<td>6%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$60,000 to $79,999</td>
<td>12%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$80,000 to $99,999</td>
<td>14%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$100,000 to $149,000</td>
<td>23%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$150,000 and over</td>
<td>19%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Prefer not to answer</td>
<td>14%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Highest Level of Education

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Education Level</th>
<th>Percentage</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Elementary/grade school graduate</td>
<td>1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>High school graduate</td>
<td>11%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>College / technical school graduate</td>
<td>25%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>University undergraduate degree</td>
<td>36%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Post-graduate degree</td>
<td>23%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Professional school graduate (e.g. medicine, dentistry, veterinary medicine, optometry)</td>
<td>3%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Ward

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Ward</th>
<th>Percentage</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>6%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>4%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>6%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>6%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>18%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>6%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td>16%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9</td>
<td>9%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10</td>
<td>10%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11</td>
<td>7%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12</td>
<td>5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>WARD UNKNOWN</td>
<td>3%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Survey Topics

- Satisfaction, importance and change in quality of City services
- Areas for improvement
- Areas to decrease service levels
- Value for taxes
- Reputation
- Customer service experience
- Access to services and role in quality of life
- Aspects of living in Edmonton
Full Survey Results

Satisfaction, Importance and Change in Service

Service areas

The City of Edmonton has more than 30 branches in five main departments. The branches support more than 300 programs. All City services were grouped into 23 categories to be more manageable to review and assess. The groupings reflect previous citizen satisfaction surveys and publications or material on the City budget and taxation. Final categories were developed with project managers for the respective areas. In alphabetical order, the service categories are:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Service Category</th>
<th>Description</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Adequate and affordable housing</td>
<td>Efforts to increase the supply of affordable housing e.g. Cornerstones, Safe Housing, Landlord and Tenant Advisory Board</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bicycle lanes or bicycle routes</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>City arenas and shells</td>
<td>(covered structures over ice rinks, without air heating)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>City of Edmonton attractions such as the Valley Zoo, John Janzen Nature Centre, Muttart Conservatory, or Fort Edmonton</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>City recreation &amp; leisure programs (dropin/registered)</td>
<td>at a City-run facility, playground, or community centre? (eg. swim lessons, art classes, summer camps)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>City recreation or fitness facilities, including outdoor pools</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fire rescue services</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Litter and environmental programs like Capital City Clean Up and graffiti clean up teams</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Maps on <a href="http://www.Edmonton.ca">www.Edmonton.ca</a></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Multi-use trails</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Neighbourhood Renewal Program (part of Building Great Neighbourhoods)</td>
<td>to reconstruct your community’s roads, curbs, sidewalks and streetlights</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Open Data Catalogue</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Parks, playground, sports fields and open spaces, including the river valley parks</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Permit and inspection services for new buildings and building improvements</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Police services</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Public libraries</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Public transit (bus services and LRT)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rush hour traffic flow</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sewer services, including home wastewater, stormwater and land drainage</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Summer road maintenance, including paving, street sweeping, pothole repair and sidewalk repair</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
2015 Civic Services Public Opinion Survey

- Waste and reuse collection sites (Eco Stations, Community Recycling Depots, Reuse Centre)
- Waste collection services at curbside (garbage, recycling)
- Winter road maintenance, including snow clearing, sanding and community sandbox service

Results overview: Service Satisfaction and Importance

- Overall, 83% are satisfied with services and programs offered by the City.
- Summer road maintenance; public transit; rush hour flow; permit and inspection services; and bike lanes/routes are services that less than 50% of respondents are satisfied with but which they rate as important.
- Fire rescue; curbside waste collection; parks, playgrounds, sports fields; and public libraries all rate high in importance and satisfaction.
- Transportation and permit & inspection services were most likely to have worsened in the last 12 months.
- Regression analysis suggests the services that have the greatest impact on overall satisfaction with the City are: winter roads maintenance; litter management; summer roads maintenance; recreation and leisure programs.
- The Open Data Catalogue and maps on www.edmonton.ca have high satisfaction by users of the services but also rate lower in importance.
- 50% of respondents believe that rush hour traffic has worsened in the last 12 months.

*note: those who answered ‘did not use or don’t know’ to each service were removed in the satisfaction, importance and quality of service charts
# Overall Service Importance

Question:

Please rate how important you feel each of the following services are to citizens of Edmonton.

Note: Results for each service area are provided further in this document. The graph above is for quick comparison only.

## Overall Service Importance

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Service Area</th>
<th>1 Not at all important</th>
<th>2 Somewhat unimportant</th>
<th>3 Neither important nor not important</th>
<th>4 Somewhat important</th>
<th>5 Very important</th>
<th>Don't Know</th>
<th>Did not use</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Public libraries</td>
<td>14%</td>
<td>22%</td>
<td>57%</td>
<td>1%</td>
<td>19%</td>
<td>1%</td>
<td>0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Police services</td>
<td>13%</td>
<td>15%</td>
<td>61%</td>
<td>74%</td>
<td>18%</td>
<td>1%</td>
<td>0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Public transit</td>
<td>25%</td>
<td>8%</td>
<td>44%</td>
<td>28%</td>
<td>74%</td>
<td>4%</td>
<td>1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Curbside waste collection services</td>
<td>23%</td>
<td>29%</td>
<td>48%</td>
<td>74%</td>
<td>18%</td>
<td>5%</td>
<td>3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Waste and reuse collection sites</td>
<td>69%</td>
<td>40%</td>
<td>58%</td>
<td>55%</td>
<td>4%</td>
<td>5%</td>
<td>2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Parks, playgrounds, sports fields</td>
<td>4%</td>
<td>4%</td>
<td>55%</td>
<td>56%</td>
<td>4%</td>
<td>5%</td>
<td>2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>City recreation &amp; fitness facilities</td>
<td>21%</td>
<td>44%</td>
<td>46%</td>
<td>17%</td>
<td>6%</td>
<td>9%</td>
<td>2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>City arenas and shells</td>
<td>23%</td>
<td>45%</td>
<td>46%</td>
<td>17%</td>
<td>8%</td>
<td>5%</td>
<td>2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>City recreation &amp; leisure programs</td>
<td>30%</td>
<td>43%</td>
<td>38%</td>
<td>17%</td>
<td>6%</td>
<td>9%</td>
<td>2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sewer services</td>
<td>23%</td>
<td>72%</td>
<td>46%</td>
<td>17%</td>
<td>8%</td>
<td>5%</td>
<td>2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fire rescue services</td>
<td>8%</td>
<td>17%</td>
<td>34%</td>
<td>33%</td>
<td>6%</td>
<td>9%</td>
<td>2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>City of Edmonton attractions</td>
<td>16%</td>
<td>50%</td>
<td>34%</td>
<td>33%</td>
<td>6%</td>
<td>9%</td>
<td>2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Permit and inspection services</td>
<td>14%</td>
<td>41%</td>
<td>41%</td>
<td>33%</td>
<td>6%</td>
<td>9%</td>
<td>2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The Neighbourhood Renewal Program</td>
<td>16%</td>
<td>43%</td>
<td>43%</td>
<td>34%</td>
<td>6%</td>
<td>9%</td>
<td>2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bicycle lanes &amp; routes</td>
<td>16%</td>
<td>43%</td>
<td>43%</td>
<td>34%</td>
<td>6%</td>
<td>9%</td>
<td>2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Multi-use trails</td>
<td>16%</td>
<td>43%</td>
<td>43%</td>
<td>34%</td>
<td>6%</td>
<td>9%</td>
<td>2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Open Data Catalogue</td>
<td>16%</td>
<td>43%</td>
<td>43%</td>
<td>34%</td>
<td>6%</td>
<td>9%</td>
<td>2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Map on <a href="http://www.Edmonton.ca">www.Edmonton.ca</a></td>
<td>9%</td>
<td>53%</td>
<td>43%</td>
<td>30%</td>
<td>6%</td>
<td>9%</td>
<td>2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Winter road maintenance</td>
<td>20%</td>
<td>50%</td>
<td>30%</td>
<td>25%</td>
<td>6%</td>
<td>9%</td>
<td>2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Summer road maintenance</td>
<td>23%</td>
<td>43%</td>
<td>43%</td>
<td>34%</td>
<td>6%</td>
<td>9%</td>
<td>2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rush hour traffic</td>
<td>39%</td>
<td>43%</td>
<td>43%</td>
<td>34%</td>
<td>6%</td>
<td>9%</td>
<td>2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Adequate and affordable housing</td>
<td>30%</td>
<td>43%</td>
<td>43%</td>
<td>34%</td>
<td>6%</td>
<td>9%</td>
<td>2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Litter and environmental programs</td>
<td>15%</td>
<td>43%</td>
<td>43%</td>
<td>34%</td>
<td>6%</td>
<td>9%</td>
<td>2%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Base: Edmontonians (n=1,069)
Overall Service Satisfaction

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Service Area</th>
<th>1 very dissatisfied</th>
<th>2 somewhat satisfied</th>
<th>3 Neither satisfied nor dissatisfied</th>
<th>4 somewhat satisfied</th>
<th>5 very satisfied</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Public libraries</td>
<td>10%</td>
<td>16%</td>
<td>53%</td>
<td>18%</td>
<td>3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Police services</td>
<td>10%</td>
<td>14%</td>
<td>42%</td>
<td>20%</td>
<td>6%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Public transit</td>
<td>10%</td>
<td>13%</td>
<td>37%</td>
<td>28%</td>
<td>6%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Curbside waste collection services</td>
<td>10%</td>
<td>13%</td>
<td>42%</td>
<td>35%</td>
<td>6%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Waste and reuse collection sites</td>
<td>10%</td>
<td>11%</td>
<td>35%</td>
<td>36%</td>
<td>6%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Parks, playground, sports fields</td>
<td>10%</td>
<td>11%</td>
<td>34%</td>
<td>32%</td>
<td>6%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>City recreation of fitness facilities</td>
<td>10%</td>
<td>13%</td>
<td>37%</td>
<td>30%</td>
<td>6%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>City arenas and sheds</td>
<td>10%</td>
<td>11%</td>
<td>34%</td>
<td>30%</td>
<td>6%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>City recreation &amp; leisure programs</td>
<td>10%</td>
<td>11%</td>
<td>34%</td>
<td>31%</td>
<td>6%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sewer services</td>
<td>10%</td>
<td>11%</td>
<td>34%</td>
<td>31%</td>
<td>6%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fire rescue services</td>
<td>10%</td>
<td>11%</td>
<td>34%</td>
<td>31%</td>
<td>6%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>City of Edmonton attractions</td>
<td>10%</td>
<td>11%</td>
<td>34%</td>
<td>31%</td>
<td>6%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Permit and inspection services</td>
<td>10%</td>
<td>11%</td>
<td>34%</td>
<td>31%</td>
<td>6%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The Neighbourhood Renewal Program</td>
<td>10%</td>
<td>11%</td>
<td>34%</td>
<td>31%</td>
<td>6%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bicycle lanes or routes</td>
<td>10%</td>
<td>11%</td>
<td>34%</td>
<td>31%</td>
<td>6%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Multimodal trails</td>
<td>10%</td>
<td>11%</td>
<td>34%</td>
<td>31%</td>
<td>6%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Open Data Catalogue</td>
<td>10%</td>
<td>11%</td>
<td>34%</td>
<td>31%</td>
<td>6%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Maps on <a href="http://www.Edmonton.ca">www.Edmonton.ca</a></td>
<td>10%</td>
<td>11%</td>
<td>34%</td>
<td>31%</td>
<td>6%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Winter road maintenance</td>
<td>10%</td>
<td>11%</td>
<td>34%</td>
<td>31%</td>
<td>6%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Summer road maintenance</td>
<td>10%</td>
<td>11%</td>
<td>34%</td>
<td>31%</td>
<td>6%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rush hour traffic flow</td>
<td>10%</td>
<td>11%</td>
<td>34%</td>
<td>31%</td>
<td>6%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Adequate and affordable housing</td>
<td>10%</td>
<td>11%</td>
<td>34%</td>
<td>31%</td>
<td>6%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Litter and environmental programs</td>
<td>10%</td>
<td>11%</td>
<td>34%</td>
<td>31%</td>
<td>6%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Base: Edmontonians (n=1,069)

Question:

Thinking about the specific services provided by the City of Edmonton, how satisfied are you with each of the different services?

Note: Results for each service area are provided further in this document. The graph above is for quick comparison only.
## Importance and Satisfaction

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>High Importance/Low Satisfaction</th>
<th>High Importance/High Satisfaction</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Winter road maintenance</td>
<td>Fire rescue</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sewer services</td>
<td>Curbside waste collection</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Police services</td>
<td>Parks, playgrounds, sports fields</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Waste and reuse collection sites</td>
<td>Rec/leisure facilities</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Neighbourhood renewal</td>
<td>Rec/leisure programs</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Arena/ Ice rinks</td>
<td>Attractions (Zoo, Conservatory)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Affordable housing</td>
<td>Litter/enviro programs</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bike Lanes/Routes</td>
<td>Maps on edmonton.ca</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Question:

Thinking about the specific services provided by the City of Edmonton, how satisfied are you with each of the different services?

Please rate how important you feel each of the following services are to citizens of Edmonton.
Change in Quality of Service

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Service Area</th>
<th>Don't Know</th>
<th>1 Got Worse</th>
<th>2 Remained Same</th>
<th>3 Improved</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Public libraries</td>
<td>12%</td>
<td>2%</td>
<td>49%</td>
<td>37%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Police services</td>
<td>10%</td>
<td>9%</td>
<td>66%</td>
<td>7%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Public transit</td>
<td>12%</td>
<td>15%</td>
<td>61%</td>
<td>12%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Curbside waste collection services</td>
<td>10%</td>
<td>2%</td>
<td>71%</td>
<td>17%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Waste and reuse collection sites</td>
<td>13%</td>
<td>1%</td>
<td>63%</td>
<td>23%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Parks, playground, sports fields</td>
<td>13%</td>
<td>5%</td>
<td>74%</td>
<td>6%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>City recreation &amp; fitness facilities</td>
<td>20%</td>
<td>2%</td>
<td>54%</td>
<td>24%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>City arenas and shells</td>
<td>12%</td>
<td>47%</td>
<td>1%</td>
<td>48%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>City recreation &amp; leisure programs</td>
<td>28%</td>
<td>4%</td>
<td>56%</td>
<td>13%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sewer services</td>
<td>23%</td>
<td>4%</td>
<td>68%</td>
<td>7%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fire rescue services</td>
<td>24%</td>
<td>1%</td>
<td>60%</td>
<td>6%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>City of Edmonton attractions</td>
<td>22%</td>
<td>3%</td>
<td>58%</td>
<td>18%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Permit and inspection services</td>
<td>28%</td>
<td>5%</td>
<td>52%</td>
<td>15%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The Neighbourhood Renewal Program</td>
<td>13%</td>
<td>17%</td>
<td>42%</td>
<td>22%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bicycle lanes or routes</td>
<td>20%</td>
<td>4%</td>
<td>69%</td>
<td>13%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Multi-use trails</td>
<td>23%</td>
<td>4%</td>
<td>69%</td>
<td>13%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Open Data Catalogue</td>
<td>28%</td>
<td>5%</td>
<td>52%</td>
<td>15%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Maps on <a href="http://www.Edmonton.ca">www.Edmonton.ca</a></td>
<td>29%</td>
<td>14%</td>
<td>49%</td>
<td>1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Winter road maintenance</td>
<td>26%</td>
<td>21%</td>
<td>49%</td>
<td>13%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Summer road maintenance</td>
<td>10%</td>
<td>42%</td>
<td>45%</td>
<td>13%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rush hour traffic flow</td>
<td>18%</td>
<td>7%</td>
<td>64%</td>
<td>11%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Base: Edmontonians (n=1,069)

Question:

Thinking back over the last 12 months, would you say that the quality of services provided by the City of Edmonton has improved, remained about the same, or got worse in the following services and programs?

Note: Results for each service area are provided further in this document. The graph above is for quick comparison only.
Overall Satisfaction with all Civic Services

Question:
Now, taking into consideration all the services and programs offered throughout the year by the City of Edmonton, how satisfied are you, overall, with the civic services provided to Edmontonians?

83% of respondents said they were very or somewhat satisfied with civic services provided to Edmontonians.
A regression analysis reviewed the response to all 23 service areas, in relation to ratings of overall satisfaction with City services. The analysis suggests perception of these services were found to have greatest impact on overall satisfaction with the City. In other words, if satisfaction with these areas were to increase, the overall satisfaction with the City would be expected to increase.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Category</th>
<th>R</th>
<th>R Square</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Winter Roads</td>
<td>0.478</td>
<td>0.23</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Litter</td>
<td>0.435</td>
<td>0.19</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Summer Roads</td>
<td>0.425</td>
<td>0.18</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Transit</td>
<td>0.42</td>
<td>0.18</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rec and Leisure - program</td>
<td>0.415</td>
<td>0.17</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Determine predictive power of all 23 service areas on overall satisfaction:
R = .75 (interpretation: strong)  R Square = .563 (interpretation: 56.3% of variation in overall satisfaction can be predicted by service-area satisfaction)
R = .642  R square = .412
Respondents were asked which areas they would recommend increasing funding to improve the services, and which areas should have funding decreased.

Services Recommended to Improve

Transportation tops areas to improve with public transit (52%), summer (40%) and winter (31%) road maintenance and rush hour traffic (29%) highlighted.

Question:

In your opinion, what would you say are 3 service areas you would like to see the City of Edmonton improve?
Question:

In your opinion, are there any areas or services where you feel the City could decrease service levels to reduce costs?

Of those who felt the City could decrease service levels to reduce costs, 49% felt bike lanes were an area in which service could be decreased. No other area has significant consensus. Next level may be listed due to lack of awareness for service rather than actual recommendation for decrease.
Value for Taxes

Question:

We would like to know your opinion about the value for taxes. On average, the homeowners in a typical house (valued at $401,000) pay about $6 per day in property taxes to the City to pay for all the civic services in Edmonton. People who don’t own property contribute to property taxes through their rent.

Would you say you receive...
- Very good value
- Good value
- Fair value
- Poor value
- Very poor value
- Don’t know

Overall, 45% of participants said they receive good to very good value for taxes; 36% fair value; 14% said they receive poor or very poor value.
Perception of satisfaction, importance and change in quality of service are provided for each of the following civic service areas:

- Adequate and affordable housing (Efforts to increase the supply of affordable housing e.g. Cornerstones, Safe Housing, Landlord and Tenant Advisory Board)
- Bicycle lanes or bicycle routes
- City arenas and shells (covered structures over ice rinks, without air heating)
- City of Edmonton attractions such as the Valley Zoo, John Janzen Nature Centre, Muttart Conservatory, or Fort Edmonton
- City recreation & leisure programs (dropin/registered) at a City-run facility, playground, or community centre? (e.g. swim lessons, art classes, summer camps)
- City recreation or fitness facilities, including outdoor pools
- Fire rescue services
- Litter and environmental programs like Capital City Clean Up and graffiti clean up teams
- Maps on www.Edmonton.ca
- Multi-use trails
- Neighbourhood Renewal Program (part of Building Great Neighbourhoods) to reconstruct your community’s roads, curbs, sidewalks and streetlights
- Open Data Catalogue
- Parks, playground, sports fields and open spaces, including the river valley parks
- Permit and inspection services for new buildings and building improvements
- Police services
- Public libraries
- Public transit (bus services and LRT)
- Rush hour traffic flow
- Sewer services, including home wastewater, stormwater and land drainage
- Summer road maintenance, including paving, street sweeping, pothole repair and sidewalk repair
- Waste and reuse collection sites (Eco Stations, Community Recycling Depots, Reuse Centre)
- Waste collection services at curbside (garbage, recycling)
- Winter road maintenance, including snow clearing, sanding and community sandbox service
Adequate & Affordable Housing

(Efforts to increase the supply of affordable housing e.g. Cornerstones, Safe Housing, Landlord and Tenant Advisory Board)

Total Satisfied

- 1 Very Dissatisfied
- 2 Somewhat Dissatisfied
- 3 Neither Satisfied nor Dissatisfied
- 4 Somewhat Satisfied
- 5 Very Satisfied

Satisfaction

- Total Satisfied: 44%

Total Importance

- 1 Not at all important
- 2 Somewhat important
- 3 Neither important nor unimportant
- 4 Somewhat important
- 5 Very important

Importance

- Total Importance: 77%

Quality of Service

- 1 Got worse
- 2 Remained about the same
- 3 Improved

Quality

- Total Quality: 84%

"Have Affordable Housing available more quickly, try to get some form of rent control"

Base in chart: (n=624)  Base Overall: Edmontonians (n=1,069) Don't know 42%
Bicycle Lanes or Routes

Total Satisfied

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Satisfaction</th>
<th>1 Very Dissatisfied</th>
<th>2 Somewhat Dissatisfied</th>
<th>3 Neither Satisfied nor Dissatisfied</th>
<th>4 Somewhat Satisfied</th>
<th>5 Very Satisfied</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>19%</td>
<td>32%</td>
<td>25%</td>
<td>18%</td>
<td>5%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Satisfaction 23%

Total Importance

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Importance</th>
<th>1 Not at all important</th>
<th>2 Somewhat important</th>
<th>3 Neither important nor unimportant</th>
<th>4 Somewhat important</th>
<th>5 Very important</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>16%</td>
<td>12%</td>
<td>15%</td>
<td>31%</td>
<td>26%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Importance 57%

Quality of Service

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Quality</th>
<th>1 Got worse</th>
<th>2 Remained about the same</th>
<th>3 Improved</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>20%</td>
<td>53%</td>
<td>27%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Stayed same or improved 80%

“No more bike lanes, dollars lost, roadways more congested, lots of bike trails exist in river valley.”

Base in chart: (n=864)  Base overall: Edmontonians (n=1,069) Don’t know 19%
City arenas and shells

(Shells are covered structures over ice rinks, without air heating)

Total Satisfied

- 5% Very Dissatisfied
- 29% Somewhat Dissatisfied
- 46% Neither Satisfied nor Dissatisfied
- 18% Somewhat Satisfied
- 1% Very Satisfied

Satisfaction: 64%

Total Importance

- 3% Not at all Important
- 8% Somewhat Important
- 21% Neither Important nor unimportant
- 49% Somewhat important
- 18% Very important

Importance: 67%

City Arenas and Shells Importance Total n=989
Did not use 5% Don’t know 3%

Quality of Service

- 3% Got worse
- 90% Remained about the same
- 7% Improved

Stayed same or improved: 97%

Base in chart: (n=568) Base overall: Edmontonians (n=1,069) Don’t know 47%
City of Edmonton attractions
(such as the Valley Zoo, John Janzen Nature Centre, Muttart Conservatory, or Fort Edmonton)

Base in chart: (n=840)  Base overall: Edmontonians (n=1,069) Don't know 22%
City recreation & leisure programs
(drop-in/registered programs at a City-run facility, playground, or community centre eg. swim lessons, art classes, summer camps)

Total Satisfied

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Satisfaction</th>
<th>1 Very Dissatisfied</th>
<th>2 Somewhat Dissatisfied</th>
<th>3 Neither Satisfied nor Dissatisfied</th>
<th>4 Somewhat Satisfied</th>
<th>5 Very Satisfied</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>15%</td>
<td>14%</td>
<td>47%</td>
<td>33%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Satisfaction 80%

Total Importance

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Importance</th>
<th>1 Not at all important</th>
<th>2 Somewhat important</th>
<th>3 Neither important nor unimportant</th>
<th>4 Somewhat important</th>
<th>5 Very important</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>11%</td>
<td>46%</td>
<td>39%</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Importance 85%

City Recreation & Leisure Programs Importance Total n=1,039
Did not use 2% Don’t know 1%

Quality of Service

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Quality</th>
<th>1 Got worse</th>
<th>2 Remained about the same</th>
<th>3 Improved</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>4%</td>
<td>78%</td>
<td>18%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Stayed same or improved 96%

Base in chart: (n=771)  Base overall: Edmontonians (n=1,069) Don’t know 28%
City recreation or fitness facilities, including outdoor pools

Total Satisfied

- 1 Very Dissatisfied: 14%
- 2 Somewhat Dissatisfied: 16%
- 3 Neither Satisfied nor Dissatisfied: 48%
- 4 Somewhat Satisfied: 34%
- 5 Very Satisfied: 3%

Total Importance

- 1 Not at all important: 19%
- 2 Somewhat important: 43%
- 3 Neither important nor unimportant: 17%
- 4 Somewhat important: 10%
- 5 Very important: 10%

Quality of Service

- 1 Got worse: 2%
- 2 Remained about the same: 68%
- 3 Improved: 30%

Base in chart: (n=854) Base overall: Edmontonians (n=1,069) Don’t know 20%

“Thank you for The Meadows Rec Centre and library! We use it at least once a week, and it has drastically improved our family’s quality of life.”
Fire Rescue Services

Total Satisfied

- 1 Very Dissatisfied: 0%
- 2 Somewhat Dissatisfied: 10%
- 3 Neither Satisfied nor Dissatisfied: 38%
- 4 Somewhat Satisfied: 51%
- 5 Very Satisfied: 89%

Total Importance

- 1 Not at all important: 0%
- 2 Somewhat important: 12%
- 3 Neither important nor unimportant: 38%
- 4 Somewhat important: 86%

Fire Rescue Services Importance Total n=(1,056)
Did not use 1% Don’t know 1%

Quality of Service

- 1 Got worse: 2%
- 2 Remained about the same: 90%
- 3 Improved: 8%

Stayed same or improved 98%

"Fire Services are excellent in my opinion and other departments could learn a lot from their efficiency and response times."

Base in chart: (n=710) Base overall: Edmontonians (n=1,069) Don’t know 34%
Litter and environmental programs

(includes Capital City Clean Up and graffiti clean up teams)

Total Satisfied

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Satisfaction</th>
<th>1 Very Dissatisfied</th>
<th>2 Somewhat Dissatisfied</th>
<th>3 Neither Satisfied nor Dissatisfied</th>
<th>4 Somewhat Satisfied</th>
<th>5 Very Satisfied</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1 Very Dissatisfied</td>
<td>3%</td>
<td>10%</td>
<td>21%</td>
<td>45%</td>
<td>21%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Litter & Environmental Programs Satisfaction Total n=551
Did not use 6% Don't know 5%

Total Importance

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Importance</th>
<th>1 Not at all important</th>
<th>2 Somewhat Important</th>
<th>3 Neither Important nor unimportant</th>
<th>4 Somewhat Important</th>
<th>5 Very Important</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1 Not at all important</td>
<td>6%</td>
<td>13%</td>
<td>47%</td>
<td>37%</td>
<td>6%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Litter & Environmental Programs Importance Total n=1,045
Did not use 6% Don't know 2%

Quality of Service

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Quality</th>
<th>1 Got worse</th>
<th>2 Remained about the same</th>
<th>3 Improved</th>
<th>Stayed same or improved 91%</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>9%</td>
<td>78%</td>
<td>13%</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

"Improvements that would improve my day-to-day life include improving beauty / cleanliness"

Base in chart: (n=874) Base Overall: Edmontonians (n=1,069) Don't know 18%
2015 Civic Services Public Opinion Survey

Maps on www.edmonton.ca

Total Satisfied

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Rating</th>
<th>Percentage</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Very Dissatisfied</td>
<td>2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Somewhat Dissatisfied</td>
<td>9%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Neither Satisfied nor Dissatisfied</td>
<td>24%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Somewhat Satisfied</td>
<td>43%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Very Satisfied</td>
<td>22%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Satisfaction

Total Importance

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Rating</th>
<th>Percentage</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Not at all important</td>
<td>6%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Somewhat important</td>
<td>13%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Neither important nor unimportant</td>
<td>33%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Somewhat important</td>
<td>37%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Very important</td>
<td>12%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Importance

Maps on Edmonton.ca Importance Total n=886
Did not use 8% Don't know 10%

Quality of Service

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Rating</th>
<th>Percentage</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Got worse</td>
<td>3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Remained about the same</td>
<td>77%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Improved</td>
<td>20%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Quality

Base in chart: (n=446)  Base overall: Edmontonians (n=1,069) Don't know 58%
Multi-use trails

Total Satisfied

- Very Dissatisfied: 18%
- Somewhat Dissatisfied: 11%
- Neither Satisfied nor Dissatisfied: 49%
- Somewhat Satisfied: 36%
- Very Satisfied: 85%

Total Importance

- Not at all Important: 11%
- Somewhat Important: 43%
- Neither Important nor Unimportant: 43%
- Very Important: 86%

Quality of Service

- Got worse: 4%
- Remained about the same: 87%
- Improved: 8%

Base in chart: (n=861)  Base overall: Edmontonians (n=1,069) Don't know 20%
Neighbourhood Renewal Program

(part of Building Great Neighbourhoods to reconstruct your community’s roads, curbs, sidewalks and streetlights)

**Total Satisfied**
- 1 Very Dissatisfied: 6%
- 2 Somewhat Dissatisfied: 13%
- 3 Neither Satisfied nor Dissatisfied: 22%
- 4 Somewhat Satisfied: 43%
- 5 Very Satisfied: 15%

Satisfaction: 58%

**Total Importance**
- 1 Not at all important: 14%
- 2 Somewhat important: 45%
- 3 Neither important nor unimportant: 22%
- 4 Somewhat important: 45%

Importance: 90%

Neighbourhood Renewal Program Importance Total n=(1,025)
Did not use 1% Don't know 3%

**Quality of Service**
- 1 Got worse: 7%
- 2 Remained about the same: 72%
- 3 Improved: 21%

Quality: 99%

Base in chart: (n=774)  Base overall: Edmontonians (n=1,069) Don't know 28%
Open Data Catalogue

Total Satisfied

1 Very Dissatisfied
2 Somewhat Dissatisfied
3 Neither Satisfied nor Dissatisfied
4 Somewhat Satisfied
5 Very Satisfied

Satisfaction

Total Importance

1 Not at all important
2 Somewhat important
3 Neither important nor unimportant
4 Somewhat important
5 Very important

Importance

Open Data Catalogue Importance Total n=(566)
Did not use 14% Don’t know 33%

Quality of Service

1 Got worse
2 Remained about the same
3 Improved

Quality

Stayed same or improved 98%

"The Open Data is Awesome keep up the good work."

Base in chart: (n=332) Base overall: Edmontonians (n=1,069) Don’t know 69%
Parks, playground, sports fields

(also open spaces, including the river valley parks)

2015 Civic Services Public Opinion Survey
Permit and inspection services
(for new buildings and building improvements)

Total Satisfied
- 1 Very Dissatisfied: 11%
- 2 Somewhat Dissatisfied: 21%
- 3 Neither Satisfied nor Dissatisfied: 34%
- 4 Somewhat Satisfied: 28%
- 5 Very Satisfied: 6%

Total Importance
- 1 Not at all important: 19.3%
- 2 Somewhat Important: 13%
- 3 Neither Important nor unimportant: 46%
- 4 Somewhat Important: 37%
- 5 Very Important: 5%

Quality of Service
- 1 Got worse: 16.6%
- 2 Remained about the same: 73.9%
- 3 Improved: 9.5%

Base in chart: (n=482) Base overall: Edmontonians (n=1,069) Don't know 55%
Police services

Total Satisfied

Satisfaction

1 Very Dissatisfied 2 Somewhat Dissatisfied 3 Neither Satisfied nor Dissatisfied 4 Somewhat Satisfied 5 Very Satisfied

Satisfaction 70%

Base in chart: (n=873)

Total Importance

Importance

1 Not at all Important 2 Somewhat Important 3 Neither Important nor unimportant 4 Somewhat Important 5 Very Important

Importance 97%

Police Services Importance Total n=(1,065)
Did not use 0% Don’t know 0%

Quality of Service

Quality

1 Got worse 2 Remained about the same 3 Improved

Stayed same or improved 89%

“Edmonton Police Services need more resources. Stretched far too thin.”

Base in chart: (n=873)  Base overall: Edmontonians (n=1,069) Don’t know 19%
Public libraries

Total Satisfied

- 1 Very Dissatisfied: 2%
- 2 Somewhat Dissatisfied: 6%
- 3 Neither Satisfied nor Dissatisfied: 32%
- 4 Somewhat Satisfied: 59%
- 5 Very Satisfied: 1%

Satisfaction

Total Importance

- 1 Not at all Important: 1%
- 2 Somewhat Important: 7%
- 3 Neither Important nor unimportant: 32%
- 4 Somewhat Important: 58%
- 5 Very Important: 9%

Importance

Quality of Service

- 1 Got worse: 3%
- 2 Remained about the same: 56%
- 3 Improved: 41%

Quality

"I cannot possibly praise EPL enough. I visit the library 2 or 3 times per week, participating in programs and utilizing resources. I love our libraries."

Base in chart: (n=945) Base overall: Edmontonians (n=1,069) Don't know 12%
Public transit (bus services and LRT)

**Total Satisfied**
- 1 Very Dissatisfied: 10%
- 2 Somewhat Dissatisfied: 23%
- 3 Neither Satisfied nor Dissatisfied: 20%
- 4 Somewhat Satisfied: 40%
- 5 Very Satisfied: 7%

Satisfaction

**Total Importance**
- 1 Not at all Important: 1%
- 2 Somewhat Important: 20%
- 3 Neither Important nor unimportant: 75%
- 4 Somewhat Important: 0%
- 5 Very Important: 0%

Importance

**Quality of Service**
- 1 Got worse: 17%
- 2 Remained about the same: 70%
- 3 Improved: 13%

Quality

Base in chart: (n=947)  Base overall: Edmontonians (n=1,069) Don’t know 12%
Rush hour traffic flow

Total Satisfied

- 1 Very Dissatisfied: 16%
- 2 Somewhat Dissatisfied: 30%
- 3 Neither satisfied nor dissatisfied: 25%
- 4 Somewhat satisfied: 25%
- 5 Very satisfied: 4%

Satisfaction 29%

Total Importance

- 1 Not at all important: 1%
- 2 Somewhat important: 4%
- 3 Neither important nor unimportant: 39%
- 4 Somewhat important: 48%
- 5 Very important: 87%

Overall importance 87%

Quality of Service

- 1 Got worse: 50%
- 2 Remained about the same: 47%
- 3 Improved: 3%

Stayed same or improved 50%

“Traffic flow can be improved by having synchronized green lights instead of red.”

Base in chart: (n=965)  Base overall: Edmontonians (n=1,069) Don’t know 10%
Sewer services, including home wastewater, stormwater and land drainage

Total Satisfied

- Very Dissatisfied: 3%
- Somewhat Dissatisfied: 8%
- Neither Satified nor Dissatisfied: 19%
- Somewhat Satisfied: 48%
- Very Satisfied: 22%

Total Importance

- Not at all Important: 3%
- Somewhat Important: 24%
- Neither Important nor Unimportant: 73%
- Somewhat Important: 4%
- Very Important: 5%

Sewer Services Importance Total n=1,055
Did not use 0% Don't know 1%

Quality of Service

- Got worse: 5%
- Remained about the same: 87%
- Improved: 8%

Stayed same or improved 95%

Base in chart: (n=837) Base overall: Edmontonians (n=1,069) Don't know 22%
Summer road maintenance
(including paving, street sweeping, pothole repair and sidewalk repair)

Total Satisfied

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Satisfaction</th>
<th>1 Very Dissatisfied</th>
<th>2 Somewhat Dissatisfied</th>
<th>3 Neither Satisfied nor Dissatisfied</th>
<th>4 Somewhat Satisfied</th>
<th>5 Very Satisfied</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Percentage</td>
<td>14%</td>
<td>28%</td>
<td>19%</td>
<td>34%</td>
<td>5%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Total Importance

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Importance</th>
<th>1 Not at all Important</th>
<th>2 Somewhat Important</th>
<th>3 Neither Important nor unimportant</th>
<th>4 Somewhat Important</th>
<th>5 Very Important</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Percentage</td>
<td>3%</td>
<td>28%</td>
<td>69%</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>0%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Quality of Service

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Quality</th>
<th>1 Got worse</th>
<th>2 Remained about the same</th>
<th>3 Improved</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Percentage</td>
<td>23%</td>
<td>64%</td>
<td>14%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Base in chart: (n=1,008)  Base overall: Edmontonians (n=1,069) Don't know 6%
Waste and reuse collection facilities
(Eco Stations, Community Recycling Depots, Reuse Centre)

Total Satisfied

- 1 Very Dissatisfied: 13%
- 2 Somewhat Dissatisfied: 9%
- 3 Neither Satisfied nor Dissatisfied: 39%
- 4 Somewhat Satisfied: 48%
- 5 Very Satisfied: 87%

Total Importance

- 1 Not at all Important: 3%
- 2 Somewhat Important: 8%
- 3 Neither Important nor Unimportant: 37%
- 4 Somewhat Important: 58%
- 5 Very Important: 95%

Waste & Reuse Collection Sites Importance Total n=1,065
Did not use 9% Don’t know 6%

Quality of Service

- 1 Got worse: 2%
- 2 Remained about the same: 72%
- 3 Improved: 26%

Stayed same or improved 98%

"Waste Services do a great job of engaging people in recycling, using eco-stations and composting."

Base in chart: (n=937)  Base overall: Edmontonians (n=1,069) Don’t know 13%
Waste collection services at curbside – garbage and recycling

**Total Satisfied**

- 1 Very Dissatisfied: 16%
- 2 Somewhat Dissatisfied: 7%
- 3 Neither Satisfied nor Dissatisfied: 36%
- 4 Somewhat Satisfied: 52%
- 5 Very Satisfied: 8%

**Total Importance**

- 1 Not at all important: 14%
- 2 Somewhat important: 26%
- 3 Neither important nor unimportant: 26%
- 4 Somewhat important: 70%
- 5 Very important: 96%

Curbside Waste Collection Importance Total: n=1,057
Did not use 1% Don’t know 0%

**Quality of Service**

- 1 Got worse: 2%
- 2 Remained about the same: 72%
- 3 Improved: 26%

Stayed same or improved: 98%

“Waste Services do a great job of engaging people in recycling, using eco-stations and composting”

Base in chart: (n=960)  Base overall: Edmontonians (n=1,069) Don’t know: 10%
Winter road maintenance

(including snow clearing, sanding and community sandbox service)

Total Satisfied

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Satisfaction</th>
<th>1 Very Dissatisfied</th>
<th>2 Somewhat Dissatisfied</th>
<th>3 Neither Satisfied nor Dissatisfied</th>
<th>4 Somewhat Satisfied</th>
<th>5 Very Satisfied</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>10%</td>
<td>19%</td>
<td>12%</td>
<td>42%</td>
<td>17%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Satisfaction 59%

Total Importance

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Importance</th>
<th>1 Not at all important</th>
<th>2 Somewhat important</th>
<th>3 Neither important nor unimportant</th>
<th>4 Somewhat important</th>
<th>5 Very important</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Winter Road Maintenance Importance Total n=1,070</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>10%</td>
<td>20%</td>
<td>78%</td>
<td>0%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Importance 98%

Quality of Service

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Quality</th>
<th>1 Got worse</th>
<th>2 Remained about the same</th>
<th>3 Improved</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>14%</td>
<td>50%</td>
<td>36%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Stayed same or improved 86%

Base in chart: (n=1,046) Base Overall: Edmontonians (n=1,069) Don't know 2%
Customer Service Experience

Participants in the survey were asked if they believed they could recall a recent customer service experience with the City of Edmonton. Participants who said “yes” were asked to identify the service, and were asked:

Thinking of your most recent customer service experience with the City, please tell us whether you agree or disagree with the following statements:

- City staff took the time to deliver the service or resolve the inquiry
- City staff were helpful
- City staff understood the inquiry
- City staff were able to resolve my inquiry
- Overall, I was satisfied with the interaction

Participants who said they had a previous customer service experience were asked:

Please tell us what we could have done differently to improve our service?

Summary results

- 49% of respondents reported they had a recent customer service experience or interaction with the City of Edmonton
- 66% were satisfied with the interaction
- 79% agreed that City staff understood the inquiry, 71% agreed staff took time to deliver service or resolve inquiry, and 70% said staff were helpful
- One-quarter disagreed that City staff were able to resolve their inquiry (24%) and were not satisfied overall with their interaction (25%)
Overall Customer Service Experience

City staff took the time to deliver the service or resolve the inquiry

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Strongly Disagree</th>
<th>Somewhat Disagree</th>
<th>Neither Agree nor Disagree</th>
<th>Agree</th>
<th>Strongly Agree</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>10%</td>
<td>9%</td>
<td>9%</td>
<td>39%</td>
<td>32%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Agreement: 71%

City staff were helpful

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Strongly Disagree</th>
<th>Somewhat Disagree</th>
<th>Neither Agree nor Disagree</th>
<th>Agree</th>
<th>Strongly Agree</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>8%</td>
<td>9%</td>
<td>11%</td>
<td>36%</td>
<td>34%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Agreement: 70%

Question:

Thinking of your most recent customer service experience with the City, please tell us whether you agree or disagree with these following statements.

"Staff at leisure and recreation centres have always been friendly and helpful when I have gone there - it seems like there is good morale!"
Overall Customer Service Experience

Question:

Thinking of your most recent customer service experience with the City, please tell us whether you agree or disagree with these following statements.

City staff took understood the inquiry

- 1 Strongly Disagree: 5%
- 2 Somewhat Disagree: 7%
- 3 Neither Agree nor Disagree: 8%
- 4 Agree: 43%
- 5 Strongly Agree: 36%

Agreement: 79%

City staff were able to resolve my inquiry

- 1 Strongly Disagree: 14%
- 2 Somewhat Disagree: 10%
- 3 Neither Agree nor Disagree: 10%
- 4 Agree: 33%
- 5 Strongly Agree: 30%

Agreement: 63%

Base: Edmontonians (n=529)
Overall Customer Service Experience

Overall, I was satisfied with the interaction

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>1 Strongly Disagree</th>
<th>2 Somewhat Disagree</th>
<th>3 Neither Agree nor Disagree</th>
<th>4 Agree</th>
<th>5 Strongly Agree</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>14%</td>
<td>11%</td>
<td>9%</td>
<td>32%</td>
<td>34%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Agreement 66%

Base: Edmontonians (n=529)

Question:

Thinking of your most recent customer service experience with the City, please tell us whether you agree or disagree with these following statements.
Access to Services and Role of Civic Services in Quality of Life

Participants were asked for their level of agreement with the following statements:

- I feel I have access to City services and amenities.
- City services and programs play a role in the quality of life for Edmontonians.

“| I feel I have access to City services and amenities |

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>1 Strongly Disagree</th>
<th>2 Somewhat Disagree</th>
<th>3 Neither Agree nor Disagree</th>
<th>4 Agree</th>
<th>5 Strongly Agree</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1%</td>
<td>4%</td>
<td>7%</td>
<td>49%</td>
<td>39%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Agreement 88%

“City services and programs play a role in the quality of life for Edmontonians”

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>1 Strongly Disagree</th>
<th>2 Somewhat Disagree</th>
<th>3 Neither Agree nor Disagree</th>
<th>4 Agree</th>
<th>5 Strongly Agree</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>18%</td>
<td>4%</td>
<td>31%</td>
<td>64%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Agreement 95%

Total n=(1,069)
Pride in Edmonton and community reputation

Of the survey respondents, 64% said they would speak highly of Edmonton. Very few stated they would be critical of Edmonton if asked (10%) or without being asked (4%).

Question:

Which of these phrases best describes the way you would speak about the City of Edmonton to your friends, family or colleagues?

"Being a born and raised Edmontonian, I am very proud of our city and the services it provides its citizens. As well, our mayor is fantastic!"
2015 Civic Services Public Opinion Survey

Reputation of the community

- Several attributes were identified by program managers to evaluate perception and change over time.
- A majority of respondents agree that Edmonton is culturally diverse (91%), is a great place to live (86%), has a great network of multi-use trails (83%) and is great for entertainment, events & fun (79%)
- Agreement is much lower among respondents when it comes to Edmonton having a great bicycle-lane network (16%) and having a great public transit system (29%)

Question:

To what extent do you Agree or Disagree with each of the following statements about the City of Edmonton:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Statement</th>
<th>1 Strongly Disagree</th>
<th>2 Somewhat Disagree</th>
<th>3 Neither Agree nor Disagree</th>
<th>4 Agree</th>
<th>5 Strongly Agree</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>In general, Edmonton is a great place to live</td>
<td>8%</td>
<td>52%</td>
<td>34%</td>
<td>7%</td>
<td>86%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Great place for entertainment, events &amp; fun</td>
<td>15%</td>
<td>56%</td>
<td>23%</td>
<td>9%</td>
<td>79%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Great place for sports</td>
<td>19%</td>
<td>52%</td>
<td>18%</td>
<td>6%</td>
<td>69%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Open and welcoming to newcomers</td>
<td>22%</td>
<td>49%</td>
<td>15%</td>
<td>5%</td>
<td>64%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Environmentally responsible city</td>
<td>19%</td>
<td>49%</td>
<td>34%</td>
<td>9%</td>
<td>63%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Clean city</td>
<td>27%</td>
<td>22%</td>
<td>38%</td>
<td>3%</td>
<td>43%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Culturally diverse</td>
<td>27%</td>
<td>53%</td>
<td>38%</td>
<td>4%</td>
<td>91%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Diverse economy</td>
<td>17%</td>
<td>27%</td>
<td>42%</td>
<td>7%</td>
<td>49%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Great public transit system</td>
<td>13%</td>
<td>30%</td>
<td>25%</td>
<td>27%</td>
<td>29%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Great network of multi-use trails</td>
<td>19%</td>
<td>49%</td>
<td>25%</td>
<td>27%</td>
<td>16%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Great bicycle-lane network</td>
<td>15%</td>
<td>26%</td>
<td>29%</td>
<td>12%</td>
<td>16%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Becoming a sustainable city</td>
<td>8%</td>
<td>41%</td>
<td>41%</td>
<td>7%</td>
<td>48%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
2015 Civic Services Public Opinion Survey

Trending on questions about reputation

Questions about whether people agree with the statements that Edmonton is a great place to live, work, and visit have been asked in various surveys over the past few years. In addition, a number of questions related to the goals of the City have been asked in subsequent surveys.

When looking at the trends over time using the following data, it is important to remember that different methodologies were used. Therefore, this information must be considered with limited reliability and can be used for rough analysis that compares methods (telephone vs online polling) as much as changes over time.

Levels of agreement have increased from Winter 2015 to Spring 2015 for:
- Edmonton is a great place to live (75% to 86%)
- Edmonton is a great place for entertainment & fun (65% to 79%)
- Edmonton is culturally diverse has increased compared to the Winter 2015 (91% vs. 79%)

Open and welcoming:
- Although lower in Winter 2015 compared to historic telephone data (58%), agreement that Edmonton is open & welcoming to newcomers has increased to 64% in the Spring 2015.

Diverse economy:
- Agreement was much lower in Winter 2015 (40%) compared to 2014 telephone data (65%) that Edmonton has a diverse economy, with a slight increase in Spring 2015 (49%).

Clean city:
- Agreement that Edmonton is a clean city remains low (43% vs 44%).

Environmental Responsibility:
- Agreement that Edmonton is environmentally responsible increased slightly (63% vs 59%).

Public Transit:
- Compared to telephone survey data, Edmonton Insight Community members are less like to agree (29% vs 37%) that Edmonton has a great public transit system.
2015 Civic Services Public Opinion Survey

Trend over time – Place to live, place for entertainment, place for sports

A broken red line indicates division between methodologies, with data above the line from the Edmonton Insight Community online panel and data below the line from historic telephone data.

![Chart showing trend over time for place to live, place for entertainment, and place for sports.]

**Total Agree (4,5 ratings)**

- Great place to live: 86% (Spring 2015 - Insight Community), 75% (Winter 2015 - Insight Community), 79% (December 2014 - Telephone), 76% (2014), 76% (2013).
- Great place for entertainment & fun: 65% (Spring 2015 - Insight Community), 63% (Winter 2015 - Insight Community), 69% (December 2014 - Telephone), 63% (2014), 63% (2013).
- Great place for sports: 60% (Spring 2015 - Insight Community), 60% (Winter 2015 - Insight Community), 60% (December 2014 - Telephone), 60% (2014), 60% (2013).

**Base:** Edmontonians (n=1,069)

**Question:**

To what extent do you agree or disagree with each of the following statements about the City of Edmonton? Edmonton is/has ...

*Note: Spring/Winter 2015 were completed through Edmonton Insight Community, while Trending 2012–2014 by telephone survey.*
2015 Civic Services Public Opinion Survey

Trend over time – Culturally Diverse, open to newcomers

A broken red line indicates division between methodologies, with data above the line from the Edmonton Insight Community online panel and data below the line from historic telephone data.

![Bar chart showing trends over time for culturally diverse and open & welcoming to newcomers]

**Question:**

To what extent do you agree or disagree with each of the following statements about the City of Edmonton? Edmonton is/has ...

*Note: Spring/Winter 2015 were completed through Edmonton Insight Community, while Trending 2012–2014 by telephone survey.*
2015 Civic Services Public Opinion Survey

Trend over time – Diverse economy

A broken red line indicates division between methodologies, with data above the line from the Edmonton Insight Community online panel and data below the line from historic telephone data.

Base: Edmontonians (n=1,069)

Question:

To what extent do you agree or disagree with each of the following statements about the City of Edmonton? Edmonton is/has ...

*Note: Spring/Winter 2015 were completed through Edmonton Insight Community, while Trending 2012–2014 by telephone survey.
2015 Civic Services Public Opinion Survey

Trend over time – Clean and environmentally responsible city

A broken red line indicates division between methodologies, with data above the line from the Edmonton Insight Community online panel and data below the line from historic telephone data.

Base: Edmontonians (n=1,069)

Question:

To what extent do you agree or disagree with each of the following statements about the City of Edmonton? Edmonton is/has ...

*Note: Spring/Winter 2015 were completed through Edmonton Insight Community, while Trending 2012–2014 by telephone survey.
2015 Civic Services Public Opinion Survey

Trend over time – Public Transit

A broken red line indicates division between methodologies, with data above the line from the Edmonton Insight Community online panel and data below the line from historic telephone data.

**Total Agree (4,5 rating)**

Base: Edmontonians (n=1,069)

**Question:**

To what extent do you agree or disagree with each of the following statements about the City of Edmonton? Edmonton is/has ...

*Note: Spring/Winter 2015 were completed through Edmonton Insight Community, while Trending 2012–2014 by telephone survey.*
JOIN THE
Edmonton
INSIGHT COMMUNITY

It’s the quick and easy way to help make your City better.

OPEN CITY

edmonton.ca/insightcommunity