

Scottsdale, AZ

Trends over Time

2016



2955 Valmont Road Suite 300 Boulder, Colorado 80301 n-r-c.com • 303-444-7863



777 North Capitol Street NE Suite 500 Washington, DC 20002 icma.org • 800-745-8780

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 2016 ratings for the City of Scottsdale to its previous survey results in 2003, 2004, 2006, 2010, 2013 and 2016. 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 2013 and 2016 surveys, otherwise the comparison between 2013 and 2016 are noted as being "similar." Additionally, benchmark comparisons 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 2016 generally remained stable. Of the 131 items for which comparisons were available, 124 items were rated similarly in 2013 and 2016; three items showed a decrease in ratings and four showed an increase in ratings. Notable trends over time included the following:

- Ratings for almost all aspects of Community Characteristics remained stable over time; the only item that saw a change in ratings from 2013 to 2016 was the overall ease of travel, which declined.
- The vast majority of Governance ratings remained stable from 2013 to 2016. The proportion of respondents who positively rated street cleaning, the job Scottsdale government does at welcoming citizen involvement, and customer service provided by Scottsdale employees increased from 2013 to 2016. However, ratings for utility billing and land use, planning and zoning declined over time.
- Most Participation rates remained similar from 2013 to 2016; the only item to change over time was the proportion of residents who had contacted Scottsdale employees, which increased.

Table 1: Community Characteristics by Facet

		Perc			y (e.g., e what safe		good,	2016 rating compared to		C	Comparison	to benchma	rk	
		2003	2004	2006	2010	2013	2016	2013	2003	2004	2006	2010	2013	2016
	Overall feeling of safety	NA	NA	NA	NA	94%	92%	Similar	NA	NA	NA	NA	Higher	Similar
	Safe in neighborhood	95%	95%	96%	98%	97%	97%	Similar	Higher	Higher	Higher	Much higher	Similar	Similar
Safety	Safe downtown/commercial area	92%	93%	91%	91%	97%	94%	Similar	Much lower	Much higher	Higher	Higher	Similar	Similar
	Overall ease of travel	NA	NA	NA	NA	87%	76%	Lower	NA	NA	NA	NA	Similar	Similar
	Paths and walking trails	NA	NA	NA	82%	89%	84%	Similar	NA	NA	NA	Much higher	Much higher	Higher
	Ease of walking	NA	NA	68%	73%	85%	78%	Similar	NA	NA	Much higher	Much higher	Higher	Similar
	Travel by bicycle	54%	59%	55%	68%	69%	65%	Similar	Similar	Higher	Higher	Much higher	Higher	Similar
	Travel by public transportation	NA	NA	12%	NA	40%	39%	Similar	NA	NA	Much lower	NA	Similar	Similar
	Travel by car	52%	51%	40%	69%	76%	70%	Similar	Similar	Similar	Much lower	Much higher	Similar	Similar
	Public parking	NA	NA	NA	NA	65%	65%	Similar	NA	NA	NA	NA	Similar	Similar
Mobility	Traffic flow	29%	22%	19%	57%	62%	55%	Similar	NA	NA	NA	Much higher	Similar	Similar
	Overall natural environment	NA	NA	NA	82%	89%	88%	Similar	NA	NA	NA	Higher	Higher	Similar
Natural	Cleanliness	NA	NA	NA	93%	91%	92%	Similar	NA	NA	NA	Much higher	Higher	Higher
Environment	Air quality	NA	NA	NA	60%	63%	69%	Similar	NA	NA	NA	Lower	Similar	Similar
	Overall built environment	NA	NA	NA	NA	81%	81%	Similar	NA	NA	NA	NA	Higher	Higher
	New development in Scottsdale	NA	NA	NA	76%	78%	71%	Similar	NA	NA	NA	Much higher	Higher	Higher
	Affordable quality housing	NA	NA	NA	NA	49%	45%	Similar	NA	NA	NA	NA	Similar	Similar
Built	Housing options	NA	NA	NA	70%	71%	72%	Similar	NA	NA	NA	Much higher	Higher	Higher
Environment	Public places	NA	NA	NA	NA	88%	88%	Similar	NA	NA	NA	NA	Higher	Higher
	Overall economic health	NA	NA	NA	NA	82%	85%	Similar	NA	NA	NA	NA	Higher	Higher
	Vibrant downtown/commercial area	NA	NA	NA	NA	85%	86%	Similar	NA	NA	NA	NA	Much higher	Much higher
	Business and services	NA	NA	NA	89%	89%	88%	Similar	NA	NA	NA	Much higher	Higher	Higher
	Cost of living	NA	NA	NA	NA	52%	48%	Similar	NA	NA	NA	NA	Similar	Similar
Economy	Shopping opportunities	94%	95%	95%	93%	96%	94%	Similar	Much higher	Much higher	Much higher	Much higher	Much higher	Much higher

		Perc		g positivel ery/some			good,	2016 rating compared to		C	Comparison	to benchma	rk	
		2003	2004	2006	2010	2013	2016	2013	2003	2004	2006	2010	2013	2016
	Employment opportunities	47%	53%	62%	51%	67%	66%	Similar	Higher	Much higher	Much higher	Much higher	Much higher	Higher
	Place to visit	NA	NA	NA	NA	94%	95%	Similar	NA	NA	NA	NA	Much higher	Much higher
	Place to work	NA	NA	84%	88%	86%	92%	Similar	NA	NA	Much higher	Much higher	Much higher	Much higher
	Health and wellness	NA	NA	NA	NA	92%	92%	Similar	NA	NA	NA	NA	Higher	Higher
	Mental health care	NA	NA	NA	NA	61%	68%	Similar	NA	NA	NA	NA	Higher	Higher
	Preventive health services	NA	NA	NA	NA	83%	85%	Similar	NA	NA	NA	NA	Higher	Higher
	Health care	NA	NA	NA	NA	78%	80%	Similar	NA	NA	NA	NA	Higher	Higher
	Food	NA	NA	NA	NA	81%	84%	Similar	NA	NA	NA	NA	Higher	Higher
Recreation and	Recreational opportunities	81%	83%	85%	86%	89%	89%	Similar	Much higher	Much higher	Much higher	Much higher	Higher	Higher
Wellness	Fitness opportunities	NA	NA	NA	NA	89%	90%	Similar	NA	NA	NA	NA	Higher	Higher
	Religious or spiritual events and activities	NA	NA	NA	88%	92%	90%	Similar	NA	NA	NA	Higher	Higher	Similar
	Cultural/arts/music activities	79%	77%	77%	80%	88%	85%	Similar	Much higher	Much higher	Much higher	Much higher	Much higher	Higher
	Adult education	NA	NA	NA	NA	76%	77%	Similar	NA	NA	NA	NA	Higher	Similar
Education and	K-12 education	NA	NA	NA	78%	77%	81%	Similar	NA	NA	NA	Higher	Similar	Similar
Enrichment	Child care/preschool	NA	NA	NA	NA	63%	65%	Similar	NA	NA	NA	NA	Higher	Similar
	Social events and activities	NA	NA	NA	79%	81%	76%	Similar	NA	NA	NA	Much higher	Higher	Similar
	Neighborliness	NA	NA	NA	NA	58%	57%	Similar	NA	NA	NA	NA	Similar	Similar
	Openness and acceptance	NA	NA	NA	55%	58%	58%	Similar	NA	NA	NA	Lower	Similar	Similar
Community	Opportunities to participate in community matters	NA	NA	NA	67%	66%	66%	Similar	NA	NA	NA	Similar	Similar	Similar
Engagement	Opportunities to volunteer	NA	NA	NA	77%	79%	77%	Similar	NA	NA	NA	Higher	Similar	Similar

Table 2: Governance General

		Percer	nt rating exceller	positivel nt/good)	, , , ,		2016 rating compared to		(Comparison to	benchmark		
	2003						2013	2003	2004	2006	2010	2013	2016
Services provided by Scottsdale	83%	88%	81%	88%	87%	89%	Similar	Higher	Much higher	Much higher	Much higher	Similar	Higher
Customer service	80%	80%	76%	83%	80%	90%	Higher	Higher	Similar	Similar	Much higher	Similar	Higher
Value of services for taxes paid	NA	NA	69%	74%	70%	71%	Similar	NA	NA	Much higher	Much higher	Higher	Higher

		Percen	nt rating exceller				2016 rating compared to	Comparison to benchmark							
	2003					2016	2013	2003	2004	2006	2010	2013	2016		
									Much						
Overall direction	51%	67%	57%	64%	72%	70%	Similar	Similar	higher	Similar	Higher	Similar	Similar		
Welcoming citizen involvement	54%	63%	51%	55%	52%	61%	Higher	Similar	Higher	Similar	Similar	Similar	Similar		
Confidence in City government	NA	NA	NA	NA	59%	63%	Similar	NA	NA	NA	NA	Similar	Similar		
Acting in the best interest of Scottsdale	NA	NA	NA	NA	60%	64%	Similar	NA	NA	NA	NA	Similar	Similar		
Being honest	NA	NA	NA	NA	53%	59%	Similar	NA	NA	NA	NA	Similar	Similar		
Treating all residents fairly	NA	NA	NA	NA	57%	63%	Similar	NA	NA	NA	NA	Similar	Similar		
Services provided by the Federal Government	41%	47%	37%	43%	34%	40%	Similar	Similar	Similar	Similar	Similar	Similar	Similar		

Table 3: Governance by Facet

			Percen		positivel nt/good)	y (e.g.,		2016 rating			Comparison t	to benchmarl	<	
		2003	2004	2006	2010	2013	2016	compared to 2013	2003	2004	2006	2010	2013	2016
	Police	83%	87%	82%	90%	90%	91%	Similar	Similar	Higher	Much higher	Much higher	Similar	Higher
	Fire	91%	94%	96%	96%	97%	98%	Similar	Similar	Similar	Much higher	Higher	Similar	Similar
	Ambulance/EMS	91%	93%	92%	95%	97%	98%	Similar	Similar	Similar	Higher	Much higher	Similar	Similar
	Crime prevention	NA	NA	NA	84%	87%	85%	Similar	NA	NA	NA	Much higher	Higher	Higher
	Fire prevention	NA	NA	NA	88%	88%	87%	Similar	NA	NA	NA	Much higher	Similar	Similar
	Animal control	70%	73%	73%	72%	79%	80%	Similar	Similar	Higher	Much higher	Much higher	Similar	Higher
Safety	Emergency preparedness	NA	NA	NA	60%	71%	71%	Similar	NA	NA	NA	Similar	Similar	Similar
	Traffic enforcement	61%	63%	58%	71%	76%	73%	Similar	Similar	Similar	Similar	Higher	Similar	Similar
	Street repair	63%	63%	60%	67%	66%	69%	Similar	Much higher	Much higher	Much higher	Much higher	Higher	Higher
	Street cleaning	75%	76%	70%	82%	76%	85%	Higher	Much higher	Much higher	Much higher	Much higher	Higher	Higher
	Street lighting	NA	NA	NA	75%	77%	77%	Similar	NA	NA	NA	Much higher	Higher	Higher
	Sidewalk maintenance	70%	74%	66%	78%	75%	80%	Similar	Much higher	Much higher	Much higher	Much higher	Higher	Higher
	Traffic signal timing	53%	54%	48%	57%	60%	62%	Similar	Higher	Similar	Similar	Higher	Similar	Similar
Mobility	Bus or transit services	38%	35%	37%	57%	56%	64%	Similar	Much lower	Much lower	Much lower	Similar	Similar	Similar

			Percen	t rating exceller	positivel nt/good)	y (e.g.,		2016 rating			Comparison t	to benchmar	k	
		2003	2004	2006	2010	2013	2016	compared to 2013	2003	2004	2006	2010	2013	2016
	Garbage collection	91%	89%	88%	92%	89%	95%	Similar	Much higher	Much higher	Much higher	Much higher	Similar	Higher
	Recycling	80%	82%	77%	87%	81%	87%	Similar	Similar	Higher	Higher	Much higher	Similar	Similar
	Yard waste pick-up	76%	78%	75%	86%	76%	76%	Similar	Much lower	Higher	Much higher	Much higher	Similar	Similar
	Drinking water	40%	39%	42%	52%	59%	56%	Similar	Much lower	Much lower	Much lower	Much lower	Similar	Lower
	Natural areas preservation	NA	NA	NA	78%	78%	77%	Similar	NA	NA	NA	Much higher	Higher	Higher
Natural Environment	Open space	NA	NA	NA	NA	95%	89%	Similar	NA	NA	NA	NA	Much higher	Much higher
	Storm drainage	53%	51%	48%	70%	69%	69%	Similar	Similar	Similar	Similar	Much higher	Similar	Similar
	Sewer services	NA	NA	NA	83%	84%	83%	Similar	NA	NA	NA	Much higher	Similar	Similar
	Utility billing	NA	NA	NA	NA	79%	70%	Lower	NA	NA	NA	NA	Similar	Similar
	Land use, planning and zoning	40%	52%	48%	60%	70%	61%	Lower	Lower	Higher	Higher	Much higher	Higher	Similar
	Code enforcement	57%	59%	59%	72%	74%	68%	Similar	Higher	Higher	Much higher	Much higher	Higher	Higher
Built Environment	Cable television	NA	NA	NA	68%	64%	58%	Similar	NA	NA	NA	Much higher	Similar	Similar
Economy	Economic development	57%	65%	72%	60%	72%	79%	Similar	Higher	Much higher	Much higher	Much higher	Higher	Higher
	City parks	90%	89%	84%	93%	95%	90%	Similar	Much higher	Much higher	Much higher	Much higher	Higher	Similar
	Recreation programs	88%	84%	80%	85%	91%	89%	Similar	Much higher	Much higher	Much higher	Much higher	Higher	Higher
Recreation and Wellness	Recreation centers	NA	NA	NA	86%	93%	87%	Similar	NA	NA	NA	Much higher	Higher	Higher
	Special events	NA	NA	NA	NA	81%	80%	Similar	NA	NA	NA	NA	Similar	Similar
Education and Enrichment	Public libraries	90%	91%	88%	93%	94%	95%	Similar	Higher	Much higher	Much higher	Much higher	Similar	Higher
Community Engagement	Public information	74%	77%	73%	77%	82%	80%	Similar	Much lower	Much higher	Much higher	Much higher	Similar	Higher

Table 4: Participation General

	Percent r	ating positiv		ays/sometim	nes, more th	an once a	2016			`omnarico	n to benchma	ırk	
	2003	2004	2006	2010	2013	2016	2016 rating compared to 2013	2003	2004	2006	2010	2013	2016
Sense of community	53%	57%	54%	59%	54%	62%	Similar	Similar	Similar	Lower	Similar	Similar	Similar
Recommend Scottsdale	NA	NA	NA	96%	96%	94%	Similar	NA	NA	NA	Much higher	Higher	Similar
Remain in Scottsdale	NA	NA	NA	92%	94%	94%	Similar	NA	NA	NA	Much higher	Higher	Higher
Contacted Scottsdale employees	54%	53%	54%	50%	39%	54%	Higher	NA	NA	NA	Lower	Lower	Similar

Table 5: Participation by Facet

		Percent i	rating posit		, always/so nonth, yes)	metimes, n	nore than	2016 rating		C	Comparis	on to bench	nmark	
		2003	2004	2006	2010	2013	2016	compared to 2013	2003	2004	2006	2010	2013	2016
	Stocked supplies for an emergency	NA	NA	NA	NA	18%	26%	Similar	NA	NA	NA	NA	Lower	Lower
	Did NOT report a crime	NA	NA	NA	NA	85%	85%	Similar	NA	NA	NA	NA	Similar	Similar
Safety	Was NOT the victim of a crime	88%	87%	12%	89%	90%	86%	Similar	NA	NA	NA	Similar	Similar	Similar
	Used public transportation instead of driving	NA	NA	NA	NA	18%	13%	Similar	NA	NA	NA	NA	Lower	Lower
	Carpooled instead of driving alone	NA	NA	NA	NA	45%	50%	Similar	NA	NA	NA	NA	Similar	Similar
Mobility	Walked or biked instead of driving	NA	NA	NA	NA	55%	59%	Similar	NA	NA	NA	NA	Similar	Similar
	Conserved water	NA	NA	NA	NA	85%	83%	Similar	NA	NA	NA	NA	Similar	Similar
Natural	Made home more energy efficient	NA	NA	NA	NA	79%	78%	Similar	NA	NA	NA	NA	Similar	Similar
Environment	Recycled at home	80%	79%	84%	86%	89%	94%	Similar	NA	NA	NA	Higher	Similar	Similar
	Did NOT observe a code violation	NA	NA	NA	NA	58%	67%	Similar	NA	NA	NA	NA	Similar	Higher
Built Environment	NOT under housing cost stress	NA	NA	NA	67%	74%	71%	Similar	NA	NA	NA	Similar	Similar	Similar
	Purchased goods or services in Scottsdale	NA	NA	NA	NA	100%	97%	Similar	NA	NA	NA	NA	Similar	Similar
	Economy will have positive impact on income	29%	38%	39%	15%	34%	38%	Similar	NA	NA	NA	Similar	Higher	Higher
Economy	Work in Scottsdale	NA	NA	NA	NA	41%	36%	Similar	NA	NA	NA	NA	Similar	Similar
Recreation and	Used Scottsdale recreation centers	56%	61%	59%	58%	66%	63%	Similar	NA	NA	NA	Similar	Similar	Similar
Wellness	Visited a City park	84%	86%	82%	83%	82%	86%	Similar	NA	NA	NA	Similar	Similar	Similar

		Percent	rating posi		, always/so nonth, yes)	metimes, r	nore than	2016 rating		(Comparis	on to bench	nmark	
		2003	2004	2006	2010	2013	2016	compared to 2013	2003	2004	2006	2010	2013	2016
	Ate 5 portions of fruits and vegetables	NA	NA	NA	NA	86%	87%	Similar	NA	NA	NA	NA	Similar	Similar
	Participated in moderate or vigorous physical activity	NA	NA	NA	NA	90%	89%	Similar	NA	NA	NA	NA	Similar	Similar
	In very good to excellent health	NA	NA	NA	NA	72%	78%	Similar	NA	NA	NA	NA	Similar	Similar
	Used Scottsdale public libraries	73%	73%	76%	73%	60%	62%	Similar	NA	NA	NA	Similar	Lower	Similar
	Participated in religious or spiritual activities	NA	NA	NA	52%	42%	44%	Similar	NA	NA	NA	Similar	Similar	Similar
Education and Enrichment	Attended a City-sponsored event	NA	NA	NA	NA	46%	46%	Similar	NA	NA	NA	NA	Similar	Similar
	Campaigned for an issue, cause or candidate	NA	NA	NA	NA	21%	29%	Similar	NA	NA	NA	NA	Similar	Similar
	Contacted Scottsdale elected officials	NA	NA	NA	NA	11%	19%	Similar	NA	NA	NA	NA	Similar	Similar
	Volunteered	39%	40%	41%	47%	37%	36%	Similar	NA	NA	NA	Similar	Similar	Similar
	Participated in a club	NA	NA	NA	35%	31%	30%	Similar	NA	NA	NA	Higher	Similar	Similar
	Talked to or visited with neighbors	NA	NA	NA	NA	88%	93%	Similar	NA	NA	NA	NA	Similar	Similar
	Done a favor for a neighbor	NA	NA	NA	NA	76%	82%	Similar	NA	NA	NA	NA	Similar	Similar
	Attended a local public meeting	22%	23%	25%	20%	15%	17%	Similar	NA	NA	NA	Much lower	Lower	Similar
	Watched a local public meeting	48%	47%	54%	42%	20%	21%	Similar	NA	NA	NA	Similar	Lower	Similar
Community	Read or watched local news	NA	NA	NA	NA	82%	86%	Similar	NA	NA	NA	NA	Similar	Similar
Engagement	Voted in local elections	66%	79%	76%	76%	84%	89%	Similar	NA	NA	NA	Similar	Similar	Similar