Scottsdale, AZ

Trends over Time

2014

### Contents

Cumman		1
Summary	 	 ••••• I

The National Citizen Survey™ © 2001-2014 National Research Center, Inc.

National Research Center, Inc. 2955 Valmont Road, Suite 300 Boulder, CO 80301 www.n-r-c.com • 303-444-7863 International City/County Management Association 777 North Capitol Street NE, Suite 500 Washington, DC 20002 www.icma.org • 202-289-ICMA

## Summary

The National Citizen Survey™ (The NCS) is a collaborative effort between National Research Center, Inc. (NRC) and the International City/County Management Association (ICMA). The survey and its administration are standardized to assure high quality research methods and directly comparable results across The NCS communities. The NCS captures residents' opinions within the three pillars of a community, Community Characteristics, Governance and Participation, across eight central facets of community, Safety, Mobility, Natural Environment, Built Environment, Economy, Recreation and Wellness, Education and Enrichment and Community Engagement. This report discusses trends over time, comparing the 2013 ratings for the City of Scottsdale to its previous survey results in 2003, 2004, 2006, 2007, and 2010. Additional reports and technical appendices are available under separate cover.

Trend data for Scottsdale represent important comparison data and should be examined for improvements or declines. Deviations from stable trends over time, especially, represent opportunities for understanding how local policies, programs or public information may have affected residents' opinions.

Meaningful differences between survey years have been noted within the following tables as being "higher" or "lower" if the differences are greater than nine percentage points between the 2010 and 2013 surveys, otherwise the comparison between 2010 and 2013 are noted as being "similar." Additionally, benchmark comparison for all survey years are presented for reference. Changes in the benchmark comparison over time can be impacted by various trends, including varying survey cycles for the individual communities that comprise the benchmarks, regional and national economic or other events, as well as emerging survey methodologies.

Overall, ratings in Scottsdale for 2013 generally remained stable. Of the 85 items for which comparisons were available, 71 items were rated similarly in 2010 and 2013, seven items showed a decrease in ratings and seven showed an increase in ratings. Notable trends over time included the following:

- Out of the 53 Community Characteristics measured, 33 could be compared to 2010 ratings. Of those that could be compared, three characteristics increased while none decreased. Increases in ratings were found within the facets of Mobility and Economy.
- Economy ratings increased across each of the three pillars; within Community Characteristics the rating for employment opportunities increased, within Governance the ratings for economic development increased, and within Participation more survey respondents felt the economy will have a positive impact on their income in 2013 compared to 2010.
- When available, Participation ratings within the eight community livability facets generally remained stable from 2010 to 2013; however fewer respondents used Scottsdale public libraries, participated in religious or spiritual activities, watched a local public meeting, volunteered or contacted Scottsdale employees in 2013 than in 2010.

Table 1: Community Characteristics General

	Perce	nt rating	positivel	y (e.g., e	xcellent/	good)			(	Comparison to be	enchmarl	<	
	2003	2004	2006	2007	2010	2013	2013 compared to 2010	2003	2004	2006	2007	2010	2013
Overall quality of life	91%	93%	90%	NA	94%	98%	Similar	Much higher	Much higher	Much higher	NA	Much higher	Higher
Overall image	NA	NA	NA	NA	92%	91%	Similar	NA	NA	NA	NA	Much higher	Higher
Place to live	94%	95%	94%	NA	96%	98%	Similar	Much higher	Much higher	Much higher	NA	Much higher	Higher
Neighborhood	87%	89%	90%	NA	91%	93%	Similar	Much higher	Much higher	Much higher	NA	Much higher	Higher
Place to raise children	80%	81%	78%	NA	85%	92%	Similar	Higher	Higher	Similar	NA	Much higher	Similar
Place to retire	82%	86%	81%	NA	91%	91%	Similar	Much higher	Much higher	Much higher	NA	Much higher	Much higher
Overall appearance	89%	90%	87%	NA	94%	96%	Similar	Much higher	Much higher	Much higher	NA	Much higher	Higher

Table 2: Community Characteristics by Facet

		Pero		g positivel ery/some		xcellent/g e)	ood,	2013 compared to		Со	mparison to	benchm	ark	
		2003	2004	2006	2007	2010	2013	2010	2003	2004	2006	2007	2010	2013
	Overall feeling of safety	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	94%	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	Higher
	Safe in neighborhood	95%	95%	96%	NA	98%	97%	Similar	Higher	Higher	Higher	NA	Much higher	Similar
Safety	Safe downtown/commercial area	92%	93%	91%	NA	91%	97%	Similar	Much lower	Much higher	Higher	NA	Higher	Similar
	Overall ease travel	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	87%	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	Similar
	Paths and walking trails	NA	NA	NA	NA	82%	89%	Similar	NA	NA	NA	NA	Much higher	Much higher
	Ease of walking	NA	NA	68%	NA	73%	85%	Higher	NA	NA	Much higher	NA	Much higher	Higher
	Travel by bicycle	54%	59%	55%	NA	68%	69%	Similar	Similar	Higher	Higher	NA	Much higher	Higher
	Travel by public transportation	NA	NA	12%	NA	NA	40%	Higher	NA	NA	Much lower	NA	NA	Similar
	Travel by car	52%	51%	40%	NA	69%	76%	Similar	Similar	Similar	Much lower	NA	Much higher	Similar
	Public parking	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	65%	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	Similar
Mobility	Traffic flow	29%	22%	19%	NA	57%	62%	Similar	NA	NA	NA	NA	Much higher	Similar
	Overall natural environment	NA	NA	NA	NA	82%	89%	Similar	NA	NA	NA	NA	Higher	Higher
Natural	Cleanliness	NA	NA	NA	NA	93%	91%	Similar	NA	NA	NA	NA	Much higher	Higher
Environment	Air quality	NA	NA	NA	NA	60%	63%	Similar	NA	NA	NA	NA	Lower	Similar
	Overall built environment	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	81%	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	Higher
Built	New development in Scottsdale	NA	NA	NA	NA	76%	78%	Similar	NA	NA	NA	NA	Much	Higher

		Perd	cent ratino V	g positivel very/some			jood,	2013 compared to		Со	mparison to	benchm	ark	
		2003	2004	2006	2007	2010	2013	2010	2003	2004	2006	2007	2010	2013
Environment													higher	
	Affordable quality housing	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	49%	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	Similar
	1 3 6												Much	
	Housing options	NA	NA	NA	NA	70%	71%	Similar	NA	NA	NA	NA	higher	Higher
	Public places	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	88%	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	Higher
	Overall economic health	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	82%	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	Higher
	Vibrant downtown/commercial													Much
	area	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	85%	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	higher
													Much	
	Business and services	NA	NA	NA	NA	89%	89%	Similar	NA	NA	NA	NA	higher	Higher
	Cost of living	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	52%	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	Similar
	Shopping opportunities	94%	95%	95%	NA	93%	96%	Similar	Much higher	Much higher	Much higher	NA	Much higher	Much higher
	71 3 11									Much	Much		Much	Much
	Employment opportunities	47%	53%	62%	NA	51%	67%	Higher	Higher	higher	higher	NA	higher	higher
														Much
	Place to visit	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	94%	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	higher
											Much		Much	Much
Economy	Place to work	NA	NA	84%	NA	88%	86%	Similar	NA	NA	higher	NA	higher	higher
	Health and wellness	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	92%	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	Higher
	Mental health care	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	61%	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	Higher
	Preventive health services	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	83%	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	Higher
	Health care	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	78%	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	Higher
	Food	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	81%	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	Higher
									Much	Much	Much		Much	
Recreation and	Recreational opportunities	81%	83%	85%	NA	86%	89%	Similar	higher	higher	higher	NA	higher	Higher
Wellness	Fitness opportunities	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	89%	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	Higher
	Religious or spiritual events and activities	NA	NA	NA	NA	88%	92%	Similar	NA	NA	NA	NA	Higher	Higher
									Much	Much	Much		Much	Much
	Cultural/arts/music activities	79%	77%	77%	NA	80%	88%	Similar	higher	higher	higher	NA	higher	higher
	Adult education	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	76%	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	Higher
Education and	K-12 education	NA	NA	NA	NA	78%	77%	Similar	NA	NA	NA	NA	Higher	Similar
Enrichment	Child care/preschool	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	63%	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	Higher
	Social events and activities	NA	NA	NA	NA	79%	81%	Similar	NA	NA	NA	NA	Much higher	Higher
	Neighborliness	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	58%	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	Similar
0 !!	Openness and acceptance	NA	NA	NA	NA	55%	58%	Similar	NA NA	NA NA	NA NA	NA	Lower	Similar
Community										NA NA			Similar	
Engagement	Opportunities to participate in	NA	NA	NA	NA	67%	66%	Similar	NA	IVA	NA	NA	Similal	Similar

	Pero	ent ratinç v		y (e.g., e: what safe		ood,	2013 compared to		Coi	mparison to	benchma	ark	
	2003	2004	2006	2007	2010	2013	2010	2003	2004	2006	2007	2010	2013
community matters													
 Opportunities to volunteer	NA	NA	NA	NA	77%	79%	Similar	NA	NA	NA	NA	Higher	Similar

Table 3: Governance General

	Percer	t rating	positively	y (e.g.,	excellent	/good)	2013 compared to		C	Comparison to b	enchmar	k	
	2003	2004	2006	2007	2010	2013	2010	2003	2004	2006	2007	2010	2013
Services provided by Scottsdale	83%	88%	81%	NA	88%	87%	Similar	Higher	Much higher	Much higher	NA	Much higher	Similar
Customer service	80%	80%	76%	NA	83%	80%	Similar	Higher	Similar	Similar	NA	Much higher	Similar
Value of services for taxes paid	NA	NA	69%	NA	74%	70%	Similar	NA	NA	Much higher	NA	Much higher	Higher
Overall direction	51%	67%	57%	NA	64%	72%	Similar	Similar	Much higher	Similar	NA	Higher	Similar
Welcoming citizen involvement	54%	63%	51%	NA	55%	52%	Similar	Similar	Higher	Similar	NA	Similar	Similar
Confidence in City government	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	59%	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	Similar
Acting in the best interest of Scottsdale	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	60%	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	Similar
Being honest	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	53%	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	Similar
Treating all residents fairly	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	57%	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	Similar
Services provided by the Federal Government	41%	47%	37%	NA	43%	34%	Lower	Similar	Similar	Similar	NA	Similar	Similar

Table 4: Governance by Facet

			Percer	nt rating exceller	positivel nt/good)			2013 compared		Сс	omparison to	benchma	ark	
		2003	2004	2006	2007	2010	2013	to 2010	2003	2004	2006	2007	2010	2013
	Police	83%	87%	82%	NA	90%	90%	Similar	Similar	Higher	Much higher	NA	Much higher	Similar
	Fire	91%	94%	96%	NA	96%	97%	Similar	Similar	Similar	Much higher	NA	Higher	Similar
	Ambulance/EMS	91%	93%	92%	NA	95%	97%	Similar	Similar	Similar	Higher	NA	Much higher	Similar
	Crime prevention	NA	NA	NA	NA	84%	87%	Similar	NA	NA	NA	NA	Much higher	Higher
	Fire prevention	NA	NA	NA	NA	88%	88%	Similar	NA	NA	NA	NA	Much higher	Similar
Safety	Animal control	70%	73%	73%	NA	72%	79%	Similar	Similar	Higher	Much	NA	Much	Similar

			Percer	nt rating exceller	positivel nt/good)	y (e.g.,		2013 compared		Co	omparison to	benchma	ırk	
		2003	2004	2006	2007	2010	2013	to 2010	2003	2004	2006	2007	2010	2013
											higher		higher	
	Emergency													
	preparedness	NA	NA	NA	NA	60%	71%	Higher	NA	NA	NA	NA	Similar	Similar
	Traffic enforcement	61%	63%	58%	NA	71%	76%	Similar	Similar	Similar	Similar	NA	Higher	Similar
	Street repair	63%	63%	60%	NA	67%	66%	Similar	Much higher	Much higher	Much higher	NA	Much higher	Higher
	Street cleaning	75%	76%	70%	NA	82%	76%	Similar	Much higher	Much higher	Much higher	NA	Much higher	Higher
	Street lighting	NA	NA	NA	NA	75%	77%	Similar	NA	NA	NA	NA	Much higher	Higher
	Sidewalk maintenance	70%	74%	66%	NA	78%	75%	Similar	Much higher	Much higher	Much higher	NA	Much higher	Higher
	Traffic signal timing	53%	54%	48%	NA	57%	60%	Similar	Higher	Similar	Similar	NA	Higher	Similar
Mobility	Bus or transit services	38%	35%	37%	NA	57%	56%	Similar	Much lower	Much lower	Much lower	NA	Similar	Similar
	Garbage collection	91%	89%	88%	NA	92%	89%	Similar	Much higher	Much higher	Much higher	NA	Much higher	Similar
	Recycling	80%	82%	77%	NA	87%	81%	Similar	Similar	Higher	Higher	NA	Much higher	Similar
	Yard waste pick-up	76%	78%	75%	NA	86%	76%	Lower	Much lower	Higher	Much higher	NA	Much higher	Similar
	Drinking water	40%	39%	42%	NA	52%	59%	Similar	Much lower	Much lower	Much lower	NA	Much lower	Similar
	Natural areas preservation	NA	NA	NA	NA	78%	78%	Similar	NA	NA	NA	NA	Much higher	Higher
Natural Environment	Open space	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	95%	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	Much higher
	Storm drainage	53%	51%	48%	NA	70%	69%	Similar	Similar	Similar	Similar	NA	Much higher	Similar
	Sewer services	NA	NA	NA	NA	83%	84%	Similar	NA	NA	NA	NA	Much higher	Similar
	Utility billing	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	79%	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	Similar
	Land use, planning and												Much	
	zoning	40%	52%	48%	NA	60%	70%	Higher	Lower	Higher	Higher	NA	higher	Higher
	Code enforcement	57%	59%	59%	NA	72%	74%	Similar	Higher	Higher	Much higher	NA	Much higher	Higher
Built Environment	Cable television	NA	NA	NA	NA	68%	64%	Similar	NA	NA	NA	NA	Much higher	Similar
Economy	Economic development	57%	65%	72%	NA	60%	72%	Higher	Higher	Much higher	Much higher	NA	Much higher	Higher

			Percen	t rating exceller	positivel nt/good)			2013 compared		Co	omparison to	benchma	ırk	
		2003	2004	2006	2007	2010	2013	to 2010	2003	2004	2006	2007	2010	2013
	City parks	90%	89%	84%	NA	93%	95%	Similar	Much higher	Much higher	Much higher	NA	Much higher	Higher
	Recreation programs	88%	84%	80%	NA	85%	91%	Similar	Much higher	Much higher	Much higher	NA	Much higher	Higher
Recreation and Wellness	Recreation centers	NA	NA	NA	NA	86%	93%	Similar	NA	NA	NA	NA	Much higher	Higher
	Special events	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	81%	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	Similar
Education and Enrichment	Public libraries	90%	91%	88%	NA	93%	94%	Similar	Higher	Much higher	Much higher	NA	Much higher	Similar
Community Engagement	Public information	74%	77%	73%	NA	77%	82%	Similar	Much lower	Much higher	Much higher	NA	Much higher	Similar

Table 5: Participation General

	Percent	rating positiv		/ays/sometim n, yes)	es, more tha	n once a	2013 compared to		Co	omparisor	n to benc	hmark	
	2003	2004	2006	2007	2010	2013	2010	2003	2004	2006	2007	2010	2013
Sense of community	53%	57%	54%	NA	59%	54%	Similar	Similar	Similar	Lower	NA	Similar	Similar
Recommend Scottsdale	NA	NA	NA	NA	88%	96%	Similar	NA	NA	NA	NA	Much higher	Higher
Remain in Scottsdale	NA	NA	NA	NA	87%	94%	Similar	NA	NA	NA	NA	Much higher	Higher
Contacted Scottsdale employees	54%	53%	NA	54%	50%	39%	Lower	NA	NA	NA	NA	Lower	Lower

Table 6: Participation by Facet

	· · · · · ·	Percent	rating posi	3 , 6	, always/so nonth, yes)		nore than	2013 compared		Co	ompariso	on to ber	nchmark	
		2003	2004	2006	2007	2010	2013	to 2010	2003	2004	2006	2007	2010	2013
	Stocked supplies for an emergency	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	18%	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	Lower
	Did NOT report a crime	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	85%	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	Similar
Safety	Was NOT the victim of a crime	12%	13%	NA	12%	89%	90%	Similar	NA	NA	NA	NA	Similar	Similar
	Used public transportation instead of driving	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	18%	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	Lower
	Carpooled instead of driving alone	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	45%	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	Similar
Mobility	Walked or biked instead of	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	55%	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	Similar

		Percent	rating posi			ometimes, i	more than	0010		C	omparie	on to hor	achmark	
		2003	2004	2006	nonth, yes) 2007	2010	2013	2013 compared to 2010	2003	2004	2006	on to ber 2007	2010	2013
	driving	2003	2004	2000	2007	2010	2013	10 2010	2003	2004	2000	2007	2010	2013
	Conserved water	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	85%	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	Similar
Natural	Made home more energy efficient	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	79%	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	Similar
Environment	Recycled at home	80%	79%	NA	84%	86%	89%	Similar	NA	NA	NA	NA	Higher	Similar
	Did NOT observe a code violation	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	58%	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	Similar
<b>Built Environment</b>	NOT under housing cost stress	NA	NA	NA	NA	67%	74%	Similar	NA	NA	NA	NA	Similar	Similar
	Purchased goods or services in Scottsdale	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	100%	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	Similar
	Economy will have positive impact on income	29%	38%	NA	39%	15%	34%	Higher	NA	NA	NA	NA	Similar	Higher
Economy	Work in Scottsdale	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	41%	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	Similar
	Used Scottsdale recreation centers	56%	61%	NA	59%	58%	66%	Similar	NA	NA	NA	NA	Similar	Similar
	Visited a City park	84%	86%	NA	82%	83%	82%	Similar	NA	NA	NA	NA	Similar	Similar
	Ate 5 portions of fruits and vegetables	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	86%	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	Similar
	Participated in moderate or vigorous physical activity	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	90%	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	Similar
Recreation and	In very good to excellent health	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	72%	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	Similar
Wellness	Used Scottsdale public libraries	73%	73%	NA	76%	73%	60%	Lower	NA	NA	NA	NA	Similar	Lower
Education and Enrichment	Participated in religious or spiritual activities	NA	NA	NA	NA	52%	42%	Lower	NA	NA	NA	NA	Similar	Similar
	Attended a City-sponsored event	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	46%	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	Similar
	Campaigned for an issue, cause or candidate	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	21%	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	Similar
	Contacted Scottsdale elected officials	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	11%	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	Similar
	Volunteered	39%	40%	NA	41%	47%	37%	Lower	NA	NA	NA	NA	Similar	Similar
	Participated in a club	NA	NA	NA	NA	35%	31%	Similar	NA	NA	NA	NA	Higher	Similar
	Talked to or visited with neighbors	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	88%	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	Similar
	Done a favor for a neighbor	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	76%	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	Similar
Community	Attended a local public meeting	22%	23%	NA	25%	20%	15%	Similar	NA	NA	NA	NA	Much lower	Lower
Engagement	Watched a local public meeting	48%	47%	NA	54%	42%	20%	Lower	NA	NA	NA	NA	Similar	Lower

	Percent rating positively (e.g., always/sometimes, more than													
		once a month, yes)						2013 compared	Comparison to benchmark					
		2003	2004	2006	2007	2010	2013	to 2010	2003	2004	2006	2007	2010	2013
Read or watched le	ocal news	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	82%	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	Similar
Voted in local el	ections	66%	79%	76%	NA	76%	84%	Similar	NA	NA	NA	NA	Similar	Similar