

1999 CITIZEN SURVEY of CITY GOVERNMENT FY 1999-2000

City of Urbandale, Iowa

Presented to the Urbandale City Council
on January 31, 2000

Mayor Brad Zaun

City Council Members:

Dave Bluder
Don Brush
John Forst
Phil Noah
Susann Siebke

TABLE of CONTENTS

1999 Citizen Survey of City Government

1	Executive Summary
3	Survey Instrument - Description of Changes
5	Demographics
9	Future Bond Projects
12	Community Development
14	City Hall
16	Fire and Rescue
19	Library
25	Parks and Recreation
27	Parks
29	Recreation
33	Swimming Pool
35	Senior Citizens Center
38	Police
41	Public Works
43	Solid Waste Collection
47	Street Maintenance
52	Water
Appendix	1999 Survey Instrument
		1999 Quick Summary of Survey Results
		1999 Written Comments from Survey Respondents
		1996 Survey Instrument
		1992 Survey Instrument

Executive Summary

1999 Citizen Survey of City Government

This report presents the results of the 1999 Citizen Survey, which is the third joint survey conducted by the City of Urbandale and the Urbandale Community School District. The first survey was conducted in 1992, and the second survey was conducted in 1996. The surveys have provided invaluable information regarding citizens' perspectives on City services, ideas for new programs, and opinions regarding City bond issues. One advantage of conducting three surveys over the past 8 years is the trend information it provides. It is hoped that this report will allow the City Council and the operating departments to continually improve service delivery to citizens and customers.

The Urbandale Community School District mailed 500 surveys in April and May, 1999. The second section of the survey pertained only to the City. As shown in the following table, 116 surveys were returned for the City, for a return rate of 23%. While 23% is a respectable rate, it should be noted that the 1999 Citizen Survey had the lowest number of respondents when compared to the previous surveys. The relatively low number of responses for some questions made it more difficult to interpret the survey results. The responses were:

1999			1996			1992		
FY 1998-99			FY 1995-96			FY 1991-92		
# Distrib	# Return	Rate	# Distrib	# Return	Rate	# Distrib	# Return	Rate
500	116	23%	800	226	28%	375	168	45%

The 1999 survey instrument was based on the previous survey instruments, with some changes and additions. As in previous surveys, the respondents were asked to rate a variety of City services based on their experiences or observations during the 12 months preceding the survey. The only department to receive a combined rating of 90% or more for excellent or good services for all three surveys is the Fire Department (which includes Rescue). The Police Department also received an excellent or good service rating in 1999, as well as in 1992.

During the next six months, the following six divisions will review their operating procedures and suggest ways to enhance their City services. These services received combined 1999 ratings of excellent and good below 75%: Building Inspection (72%), Street Maintenance (69%), Street Sweeping (69%), Animal Control (62%), Planning and Zoning (46%), and Mosquito Control (35%).

As the City continues to grow and develop north and west of Interstate 35/80, additional services are anticipated to meet the needs of current and future residents. The 1999 survey included five possible bond issues that may be considered over the next ten years. In order for a bond referendum to pass, 60% or more of those voting in the referendum must approve it. Based on the 1999 survey, none of the five projects would receive a “yes” rating of 60% or more. It should be noted that support for the Community/Recreation Center, which is one of the four goals (Community Center) resulting from the 1998 “Imagine Urbandale-Vision Plan”, rated 47% for support in the 1999 survey, in comparison to 62% for support in the 1996 survey.

It should also be noted that the percentage results for the bond referendum projects included the “don’t know” responses. Efforts by interested civic groups to increase awareness regarding bond referendum issues could reduce the uncertainty either way. State law prohibits the City from expending bond funds to campaign on behalf of a bond referendum. The City will continue to reevaluate all of the projects on a continual basis to meet the needs of a changing community, and to present the projects in the annual Capital Improvements Program.

The attached report provides a summary regarding all 1999 survey questions, and provides a comparison to the 1996 and 1992 survey results, where appropriate.

Survey Instrument – Description of Changes

The 1999 survey instrument was based on 1996 and 1992 survey instruments. The 1999 survey consisted of 47 questions, with the inclusion of a new section for the Fire Department; in comparison to the previous surveys which had 43 questions. A summary of the consistency and minor changes between the surveys is shown below. Any reference to a specific question number is based on the 1999 survey instrument. Please see the Appendix for a copy of the survey instruments for each year.

General Administration: This section was basically the same. Question 1, regarding quality of service for 19 activities, included all the services from the 1996 survey and added “Collection—Recycle Curb It!” and “Street Sweeping” as activities. Question 2, regarding future bond referendums, included four of the previous projects and added “Fire Department Training Facility” as a project. The following projects were not carried over to the 1999 survey since they have been addressed since the 1996 survey--“Enhancement of Existing Parks”, “New Library”, “New Regional Park”, and “Senior Citizen Center”. Questions 3 to 11, regarding treatment and resolution of concerns or service requests for a respondent who called a department, remained the same, except the Building division was separated out from Community Development, and Fire and Rescue was added.

Library Services: This section was changed to address the services for the new Library. Question 12, regarding the library hours and use, was the same. Questions 13 to 15, addressed the new Library, and asked the respondent to identify new services, new adult programming opportunities, and the use or features in the public meeting rooms.

Parks and Recreation: This section was basically the same. Questions 16, 17, 19, 20 and 22 were the same. Question 18 revised a previous question regarding use of the pool or water playground. Question 21 asked if the respondent knew about the Wellness/Fitness center at the High School. Please see the Appendix for open-ended responses to Question 22.

Police Department: This section was the same, and consisted of Questions 23 to 28. Please see the Appendix for open-ended responses to Question 28.

Fire Department: This was a new section, since the City has hired a full-time Fire Chief since the last survey. The questions were modeled on some of the questions used for the Police Department, such as Question 29 regarding a request for service and Question 30 regarding response time. Question 31 pertained to the volunteer status of the department.

Public Works: This section had several changes, and did not focus on collection and recycling, as in the previous survey. Question 32 pertained to City growth and the street network to keep pace with the growth. Questions 33 and 34, regarding the conditions of streets, and ice and snow removal, remained the same. Question 35 was the same and asked for additional items to be included in curbside recycling. Please see the Appendix for open-ended responses to Question 35.

Water Department: This section was basically the same, and consisted of Questions 36 to 42. Questions 36 and 37 revised “service” to mean customer service or quality of water, respectively. Question 38 was new and asked the respondent to rate their water pressure. Please see the Appendix for open-ended responses to Question 39.

Demographics: This section was the same, and consisted of Questions 43 to 47. Question 47 was adjusted from 4 geographic boundaries to 6 geographic boundaries to identify the area of the respondent.

Demographics

The 1992 survey established that the results did not reflect the percentage distribution of the 1990 U.S. Census, although some general trends were slightly comparable. In general, the citizen survey did not divide the City into the same sections as the U.S. Census; and there were differences in age categories and dwelling categories. Based on the differences from the 1990 U.S. Census, no attempt was made to compare the 1999 survey results to the 1996 Special U.S. Census. It should be noted that the 116 respondents to the 1999 survey represent less than one-half of one percent of the City's population of 27,565.

Location of Survey Respondents: In order to determine where the 1999 survey respondents lived, the City was divided into six sections along both sides of Douglas Avenue. In anticipation of further growth to the west, the sections were from the western corporate limits to 142nd Street; in the central area, between 142nd Street and 86th Street; and to the east from 86th Street to the eastern corporate limits. It should be noted that in the previous surveys, the City was divided into four sections along 86th Street and Douglas Avenue. The results are fairly consistent with the previous surveys, but more importantly, represent dispersed locations to provide an overall review of City services. A future survey may want to review which areas of Urbandale are identified by the School District to receive a survey.

By location, the responses to question 47, for the 1999 survey were distributed fairly evenly on either side of 86th Street—54% (59) lived east of 86th Street, and 46% (51) lived west of 86th Street. These percentages reversed the 1996 survey, but are very comparable to the 1992 survey.

1999	1996		1992		Location--86th Street
31% 34	27% 59	37% 60	North of Douglas Ave, bet. East limits & 86th (A)		
23% 25	18% 39	18% 30	South of Douglas Ave, bet. East limits & 86th Street (D)		
54% 59	45% 98	55% 90	East of 86th Street		
	37% 80	25% 41	North of Douglas Ave, West of 86th Street		
38% 42			North of Douglas Ave, bet. 86th & 142nd Street (B)		
1% 1			North of Douglas Ave, bet. 142nd & West limits (C)		
	18% 39	20% 32	South of Douglas Ave, West of 86th Street		
7% 8			South of Douglas Ave, bet. 86th & 142nd Street (E)		
0% 0			South of Douglas Ave, bet. 142nd & West limits (F)		
46% 51	55% 119	45% 73	West of 86th Street		
100% 110	100% 217	100% 163			

Along either side of Douglas Avenue, 70% (77) lived north of Douglas Avenue, and 30% (33) lived south of Douglas Avenue; these percentages were fairly consistent with the previous surveys. The area south of Douglas Avenue supports a 160 acre regional City park west of 86th Street, and a non-profit 600 acre agricultural museum west of 109th Street to approximately 128th Street, neither of which can be developed for residential housing. Industrial parks and retail shopping are located on both sides of Douglas Avenue.

1999	1996	1992	Location--Douglas Avenue
31% 34	27% 59	37% 60	North of Douglas Ave, bet. East limits & 86th (A)
	37% 80	25% 41	North of Douglas Ave, West of 86th Street
38% 42			North of Douglas Ave, bet. 86th & 142nd Street (B)
1% 1			North of Douglas Ave, bet. 142nd & West limits (C)
70% 77	64% 139	62% 101	North of Douglas Avenue
23% 25	18% 39	18% 30	South of Douglas Ave, bet. East limits & 86th (D)
	18% 39	20% 32	South of Douglas Ave, West of 86th Street
7% 8			South of Douglas Ave, bet. 86th & 142nd Street (E)
0% 0			South of Douglas Ave, bet. 142nd & West limits (F)
30% 33	36% 78	38% 62	South of Douglas Avenue
100% 110	100% 217	100% 163	

Age of Respondents: The 1999 respondents were asked to identify which one of five ranges best described their age. The respondents were fairly comparable to the previous surveys, regarding the top three age groups that have participated in the surveys.

By age category, the responses to question 45 were:

1999	1996	1992	Age of Respondents
31% 34	29% 63	30% 50	Age 40 to 50 years old
25% 28	23% 50	18% 30	Age 62 years old and older
25% 27	27% 59	34% 55	Age 29 to 39 years old
17% 19	18% 40	14% 23	Age 51 to 61 years old
2% 2	2% 5	4% 6	Age 18 to 28 years old
100% 110	100% 217	100% 164	

Gender of Respondents: The 1999 respondents were asked to identify their gender. Again, there was consistency between the surveys. By gender category, the responses to question 43 were:

1999	1996	1992	Gender
58% 66	65% 143	58% 93	Female
42% 47	35% 77	42% 66	Male
100% 113	100% 220	100% 159	

Type of Dwelling of the Respondents: The majority or 96% (107) of the 1999 respondents lived in single-family housing; a finding that was consistent with the previous surveys. Again, no one indicated an apartment or a mobile home as their primary type of dwelling. A future survey may want to consider the source for the random pool from which the respondents are drawn to participate in the survey. The current random pool is based on residents who receive a water bill, which eliminates residents in apartments and mobile homes.

By type of dwelling, the responses to question 44 were:

1999	1996	1992	Type of Dwelling
96% 107	97% 216	93% 153	Single-family housing
4% 4	0% 1	3% 5	Condo
1% 1	2% 4	2% 4	Duplex
0% 0	0% 0	0% 0	Apartment
0% 0	0% 0	0% 0	Mobile Home
0% 0	0% 1	1% 2	Other-Dwelling other than those listed
100% 112	100% 222	100% 164	

Income of the Respondents: The 1999 respondents were asked to identify which one of four ranges best described their income. Again, there was consistency between the surveys. By income category, the responses to question 46 were:

1999	1996	1992	Income
58% 61	50% 102	40% 60	\$60,000 and up
25% 27	27% 56	31% 46	\$59,999 to \$40,000
12% 13	17% 35	25% 37	\$39,999 to \$20,000
5% 5	6% 12	5% 7	\$19,999 and below
100% 106	100% 205	100% 150	

The preceding discussion on the 1999 demographic responses has established a strong consistency with the respondents who participated in the previous surveys.

Future Bond Projects

In anticipation of the City's continued growth to the west and north, the 1999 survey included a question regarding five possible bond issues that may be considered in the next ten years. The respondents were asked, based on their feelings at the time of the survey, how they might vote on a bond referendum to pay for the additional projects. It should be noted that while four of the five projects would probably be planned west of Interstate 35/80, the possible development of those projects should not be misinterpreted that the west is favored over the east. Instead, the City Council through its Comprehensive Planning process has attempted to develop unique features on both sides of the Interstate to encourage citizen participation in those features. While the Interstate bisects the City on the west and on the north, there has been and will continue to be a concerted effort by the City Council and City departments to perceive of Urbandale as a single City rather than as a divided City. The City will reevaluate all of these projects and future projects on a continual basis to meet the needs of a growing and changing community.

In 1995, the City froze the Debt Service tax levy at \$1.70 until the year 2011—which exceeds the 10 year time frame of the survey question. The City's pledge to freeze the levy at \$1.70 was a major factor in the 1995 bond referendum to construct a second Fire Station, and was made possible by the retirement of the debt for the Police Station. Any future debt incurred for other capital improvement projects, when combined with the Fire Station, would not exceed the \$1.70 debt levy limit unless another bond referendum was approved by the voters. The \$1.70 debt levy remained constant from FY1994-95 to FY1997-98, and decreased to \$1.67 in FY1998-1999. In September, 1998, voters approved bond referendums to construct a new Library and to provide various Park improvement projects, resulting in a \$1.92 debt levy in FY1999-2000, when the 1999 survey was conducted. In FY2000-01, the proposed debt levy will be between \$2.00 and \$2.15, and will be finalized before March, 2000.

In order for a bond referendum to pass, 60% or more of those voting in the referendum must approve it. Based on the 1999 survey, none of the five projects could meet the 60% test. It should be noted that support for the Community/Recreation Center, which is one of the four goals (Community Center) resulting from the 1998 "Imagine Urbandale-Vision Plan", rated 47% for support in the 1999 survey, in comparison to 62% for support in the 1996 survey.

A critical factor to consider in a bond referendum is the undecided voter. Efforts by interested civic groups to increase awareness regarding a bond referendum issue could reduce the uncertainty either way. State Law prohibits the City from expending bond funds to campaign on behalf of a

bond referendum. In reference to the new Library bond referendum, the 1996 survey indicated that 17% did not know how they would vote, while 46% were in favor of the proposed project. When it was put to a public vote, the 1998 Library bond was approved by 76% of those voting. Similarly, in reference to the acquisition of land for a Regional Park west of the Interstate and Park improvements, the 1996 survey indicated that 32% did not know how they would vote, while 22% were in favor of the proposed project. When it was put to a public vote, the 1998 Park bond was approved by 73% of those voting. Finally, in reference to the Fire Station bond referendum, the 1992 survey indicated that 46% did not know how they would vote, while 40% were in favor of the proposed project. When it was put to a public vote, the 1995 Fire Station bond was approved by 89% of those voting.

The following table shows the 1999 rankings based on a “yes” response favoring a bonded project. It should be noted that four of the five projects have been on all surveys. The 1999 results showed a decrease in support for the “Public Golf Course” and the “Community/Recreation Center” (previously the “Recreation/Youth Center”). Support for the “Community/Recreation Center”, which is one of the four goals (Community Center) resulting from the 1998 “Imagine Urbandale-Vision Plan”, rated 47% in the 1999 survey, in comparison to 62% in the 1996 survey. There was only a modest increase for the “Outdoor Swimming Pool”, while the perennial last place finisher—“City Hall”, showed a significant increase from 18% to 31%. The new project added in 1999 was the “Fire Department Training Facility”, which tied for a second place finish. By 1999 project ranking, the responses to question 2a-2e were:

Future Bond Projects <i>CIP = proposed 1999-2004</i>	1999				1996				1992			
	Rank	Yes	No	Unk	Rank	Yes	No	Unk	Rank	Yes	No	Unk
Outdoor Swimming Pool <i>CIP # of Respondents</i>	1	49%	30%	21%	3	48%	35%	17%	2	30%	31%	39%
		54	33	23		102	75	35		67	70	88
Community/Recreation Center (Recreation/Youth <i>CIP # of Respondents</i>	2 Tie	47%	24%	29%	1	62%	23%	15%	3	29%	24%	47%
		52	26	32		133	48	32		65	53	107
Fire Dept Training Facility <i>CIP # of Respondents</i>	2 Tie	47%	19%	34%	2	New--N/A			0	New--N/A		
		52	21	38								
City Hall Building <i>CIP # of Respondents</i>	3	31%	33%	36%	8	18%	48%	34%	6	11%	35%	54%
		34	37	40		39	102	73	Tie	25	79	121
Public Golf Course <i>CIP # of Respondents</i>	4	19%	58%	23%	6	27%	57%	16%	5	22%	43%	35%
		21	63	25		57	123	34		50	96	79
Enhance Existing Parks <i># of Respondents</i>	N/A	To be Implemented			2	56%	26%	18%	0	New--N/A		
		Fund: GOB				118	55	38				
Library Building <i>CIP # of Respondents</i>	N/A	Under Construction			4	46%	37%	17%	4	24%	32%	44%
		Fund: GOB				98	79	35		54	71	100
Senior Citizen Center <i>CIP # of Respondents</i>	N/A	Use Old Library			5	40%	28%	32%	0	New--N/A		
						84	59	67				
Regional Park <i>CIP # of Respondents</i>	N/A	Fund: GOB			7	22%	46%	32%	0	New--N/A		
		Fund: REAP				47	97	68				
Fire Station No. 2 <i># of Respondents</i>	N/A	N/A			N/A	Completed			1	40%	14%	46%
						Fund: GOB				90	31	104
Public Works Garage <i># of Respondents</i>	N/A	N/A			N/A	Completed			6	11%	22%	67%
						Fund: Oper. Budget			Tie	25	49	151

Community Development – Planning/Zoning and Building

The Community Development Department consists of two divisions— Building Inspection and Planning/Zoning. Both divisions interact with the public on a daily basis to ensure that construction and development are consistent with City ordinances. The Community Development Department is currently located in City Hall, but will move to a new facility in 2000 and co-locate with the Engineering Division of the Department of Engineering and Public Works.

Service Quality

The survey asked two questions (1.f,g) regarding the respondent's interaction with Community Development during the past 12 months. In general, the 1999 respondents indicated they received excellent and good service from Building Inspection (72%). This percentage is very comparable to the previous surveys. The Planning and Zoning Division did not score as well, with 46% of the respondents rating the service as excellent and good. This satisfaction rating is similar to previous surveys. It should be noted that both of these divisions rated lower than most other City services. It was unknown if the rating levels reflected the department's enforcement activities, policy issues, direct contact, and/or low survey response (25 and 37 total responses).

	1999			1996			1992		
	Excl Good	Fair Poor	Total # Resp	Excl Good	Fair Poor	Total # Resp	Excl Good	Fair Poor	Total # Resp
Service quality									
1.f-Building and Inspection	72%	28%	25	70%	30%	81	70%	30%	71
1.g-Planning and Zoning	46%	54%	37	54%	46%	101	52%	48%	79

The survey also asked if the respondents thought they were treated courteously and if their concern was resolved based on calling either department in the past 12 months. In general, the answers provided by the 1999 respondents reversed the results of the preceding table. It should be noted that the preceding table is based on experience with or observation of the service, whereas the following table is based on call contact. The number of respondents for the following table is significantly lower.

Service quality	1999		1996		1992	
Treated Courteously?	Yes Courteous	Total # Y-N Rsp	Yes Courteous	Total # Y-N Rsp	Yes Courteous	Total # Y-N Rsp
9. Comm Dev (Plan-Zone, Bldg)			56%	48	86%	29
9. Plan-Zone/Comm Dev	55%	11				
10. Building	38%	8				
Concern Resolved?	Yes Resolved	Total # Y-N Rsp	Yes Resolved	Total # Y-N Rsp	Yes Resolved	Total # Y-N Rsp
9. Comm Dev (Plan-Zone, Bldg)			65%	17	80%	20
9. Plan-Zone/Comm Dev	75%	4				
10. Building	50%	2				

The Community Development Department will evaluate its operations for both divisions to determine how service quality could be improved for the customer in the office and in the field.

FY Budget and Staffing

The following information is not part of the Citizen Survey instrument, but is provided to give a better understanding of the financial and personnel resources used to provide the services. The FY budget is based on the adopted budget. Additional statistical information is also provided regarding the operations.

Department	F-T Staff	FY98-99 Budget	F-T Staff	FY95-96 Budget	F-T Staff	FY91-92 Budget
Planning/Zoning	4	267,412	4	272,916	3.5	168,515
Building	4	292,690	4	239,349	3.5	169,422
# Build Permits Issued		771		602		835
# Square Miles		21.17		17.65		14.32

City Hall

The City Hall administrative office consists of two divisions—City Manager, and Finance and Records. Both divisions interact with the public and City employees on a daily basis. These offices are often contacted by citizens to follow-up on service requests and to request information about City policies, ordinances, and City Council actions. It should be noted that the office of the City Manager administers the City’s website (www.urbandale.org), although each City department updates its website information; and administers the City’s informational radio station (1210AM). The 1999 survey, which was prepared in November and December, 1998, did not ask any questions about the website or radio station since these services started in early January, 1999. A future survey may want to include a question about these City services.

Service Quality

The survey asked one question (1.b) regarding the respondent’s interaction with City Hall during the past 12 months. In general, the 1999 respondents indicated they received excellent and good service from City Hall (85%), which is comparable to the original survey.

Service quality	1999			1996			1992		
	Excl Good	Fair Poor	Total # Resp	Excl Good	Fair Poor	Total # Resp	Excl Good	Fair Poor	Total # Resp
1.b-City Hall/Administration	85%	15%	59	78%	22%	148	86%	14%	97

In another question (3), the 1999 respondents thought they were treated courteously (89%) and that their concerns were resolved (93%), which is an increase from the 1996 survey.

Service quality	1999			1996			1992		
	Yes Courteous	Total # Y-N Rsp	Total #	Yes Courteous	Total # Y-N Rsp	Total #	Yes Courteous	Total # Y-N Rsp	Total #
3. City Hall/Administration	89%	36		77%	83		92%	50	
Concern Resolved?	Yes Resolved	Total # Y-N Rsp	Total #	Yes Resolved	Total # Y-N Rsp	Total #	Yes Resolved	Total # Y-N Rsp	Total #
	93%	27		86%	42		88%	43	

The City Hall administrative staff will continue to evaluate its operations to determine how service quality can be improved for the customer at the service counter or when calling City Hall. Whenever possible, the employees will attempt to provide additional assistance and follow-up.

Future Bond Issue

Again, in response to the question (2.d) regarding support of a bond issue to build a new City Hall, the 1999 survey respondents indicated 33% were supportive of a future bond issue, and 36% did not know—these figures were based on 111 total answers. Support for a future bond issue is significantly above the 1996 survey results of 18%, and triples the supports of 11% from the original 1992 survey. However, since Community Development will vacate City Hall in 2000, and the City Council Chambers may be relocated to either the new Library or the vacated Library (which will become a Community Center), there will be sufficient area for the City’s administrative offices, thereby eliminating the need to construct a new City Hall in the short-term. It is also anticipated that the current City Hall could be renovated for less than constructing a new facility, even with the addition of an elevator to meet ADA (Americans with Disabilities Act) requirements. It is also anticipated that computer technology and the City’s planned WAN (Wide Area Network) will enable the City’s administrative offices to conduct business electronically with customers and other City departments. The results were:

	1999			1996			1992		
	Yes	No	Don't Know	Yes	No	Don't Know	Yes	No	Don't Know
Future Bond Issue									
2.d-City Hall/Administratio	34 31%	37 33%	40 36%	39 18%	102 48%	73 34%	25 11%	79 35%	121 54%

FY Budget and Staffing

The following information is not part of the Citizen Survey instrument, but is provided to give a better understanding of the financial and personnel resources used to provide the services. The FY budget is based on the adopted budget.

Department	F-T Staff	FY98-99 Budget	F-T Staff	FY95-96 Budget	F-T Staff	FY91-92 Budget
City Manager	3	272,301	2	181,389	2	126,761
Finance/Records	2	204,101	2	215,808	2	146,405

Fire and Rescue

The Urbandale Volunteer Fire Department consists of two divisions—Fire and Rescue. Both divisions interact with the public on an emergency basis, and through fire prevention education and public relations activities. Since the 1996 survey, a second Fire Station was constructed in 1997 west of Interstate 35/80, and a full-time Fire Chief/Paramedic was hired in 1998. Currently, there are approximately 55 to 60 volunteers and the majority are dual trained in both fire fighting and emergency medical services. The Police Dispatcher is the first point of contact for a 911 Fire or EMS call.

Service Quality

The survey asked one question (1.h) regarding the respondent's interaction with Fire and Rescue during the past 12 months. In general, the 1999 respondents indicated they received excellent and good service from Fire and Rescue (93%), which is a slight decrease from the 1996 survey. Fire and Rescue has received a rating of 90% or more for all three surveys.

	1999			1996			1992		
	Excl	Fair	Total #	Excl	Fair	Total #	Excl	Fair	Total #
	Good	Poor	Resp	Good	Poor	Resp	Good	Poor	Resp
1.h - Fire and Rescue	93%	7%	72	95%	5%	168	91%	9%	122

The 1999 survey asked a new question (11) to determine the service rating. The 1999 respondents thought they were treated courteously (83%) and their concerns were resolved (80%). The Fire Department will evaluate its service delivery to improve in these areas. The results were:

Service quality	1999		1996	1992
	Total #			
	Yes	Y-N		
Treated Courteously?	Courteous	Resp	Courteous	Courteous
11. Fire and Rescue	83%	18	--- N/A ---	--- N/A ---
	Total			
	Yes	Total		
Concern Resolved?	Resolved	# Resp	Resolved	Resolved
11. Fire and Rescue	80%	10	--- N/A ---	--- N/A ---

The 1999 survey asked two new questions (29 and 30) to determine if the respondents had requested service and if they were satisfied with the response time. Of the respondents who requested service, they were satisfied with the response time. The results were:

	1999			1996	1992
Fire Department (Fire/Rescue)	Yes	No	Total # Y-N Resp		
29-Requested service?	7%	93%	109	N/A	N/A
30-Satisfied w/ Response time?	86%	14%	7	N/A	N/A

The 1999 survey asked a new question (31) to determine if the respondents knew that Urbandale is served by a volunteer department. In addition, the Fire Department's phone number was provided to enable a respondent to follow-up (i.e., to receive information or to volunteer). There was very little response to this question, since a response of "No" to question 29 directed the respondent to skip questions 30 and 31, and proceed to question 32. Therefore, many respondents skipped this question per the instructions. However, of those who responded, the majority knew that Urbandale had a volunteer department. The results were:

31. Did you know that Urbandale is served by a volunteer Fire Department?	1999		1996	1992
	Total # Resp	%		
Yes	14	88%	--N/A--	--N/A--
No	2	13%	--N/A--	--N/A--
Total	16	100%	0	0

The 1999 survey asked a new question (2.a.) regarding support of a bond issue to build a Fire Department Training Center. The respondents indicated marginal support (47%). The City has not prepared any plans for a training facility, although the proposed Capital Improvements Program for 1999 to 2004+ and beyond, proposes a training center (year 2004+). The on-site training facilities would possibly reduce firefighter certification from 18-24 months to 6 months. The facility could include a burn room, tower, training props, and confined spaces. The results were:

Future Bond Issue	1999			1996	1992
	Yes	No	Don't Know		
2.a-Fire Dept Training Facility	52 47%	21 19%	38 34%	--N/A--	--N/A--

FY Budget and Staffing

The following information is not part of the Citizen Survey instrument, but is provided to give a better understanding of the financial and personnel resources used to provide the services. The FY budget is based on the adopted budget. Additional statistical information is also provided regarding the operations.

Department	F-T Staff	FY98-99 Budget	F-T Staff	FY95-96 Budget	F-T Staff	FY91-92 Budget
Fire	0	227,153	0	249,511	0	248,618
Rescue	1	319,160	0	196,048	0	128,110
# Fire Calls		504		385		251
# Rescue Calls		1,095		890		698

Library

The Library provides a wide variety of services and materials to children and adult users on a daily basis. The Library also offers visual and auditory items, special monthly programs and a dial-a-story program. Since the 1992 survey, the Library has computerized the circulation process, installed computers to replace the card cataloging system, and provided computers for users to access a variety of CD-Rom programs. In September, 1998, voters approved a bond referendum to construct a new Library in the vicinity of 86th Street, south of Douglas Avenue, in the Walker Johnston Park municipal complex. The new Library will open in mid-2000.

Service Quality

The survey asked one question (1.i) regarding the respondent's interaction with the Library during the past 12 months. In general, the 1999 respondents indicated they received excellent and good service from the Library (85%), which was a decrease from the 1996 (95%) and 1992 (90%) surveys.

	1999			1996			1992		
	Excl	Fair	Total #	Excl	Fair	Total #	Excl	Fair	Total #
Service quality	Good	Poor	Resp	Good	Poor	Resp	Good	Poor	Resp
1.i-Library	85%	15%	101	95%	5%	202	90%	10%	144

In another question (4), the 1999 respondents thought they were treated courteously (94%), which represents an increase in perceived courteousness from the 1996 survey (89%). The 1999 respondents also thought their concerns were resolved (98%), which is comparable to the previous two surveys.

	1999		1996		1992	
	Yes	Total #	Yes	Total #	Yes	Total #
Treated Courteously?	Courteous	Resp	Courteous	Resp	Courteous	Resp
4. Library	94%	54	89%	116	97%	88
Concern Resolved?	Yes	Total	Yes	Total	Yes	Total
	Resolved #	Resp	Resolved #	Resp	Resolved #	Resp
4. Library	98%	45	99%	73	100%	69

The survey respondents were also asked if the Library was open when the respondent wanted to use it (12). The 1999 survey indicated the Library

was usually open (89%) when the respondents wanted to use it, as shown below:

12. When you want to use Library, is it open?	1999		1996		1992
	Total #	%	Total #	%	
	Y-N Resp		Y-N Resp		
Yes	91	89%	186	94%	N/A--not a question in 1992
No	11	11%	12	6%	
Total	102	100%	198	100%	

Respondents answering “No” to the above question (12) were asked, “If No, what hours would you suggest?” Basically, in comparison to the current hours, the following respondents would like the Library to open earlier, and to close later, and to be open on Sunday (possibly year round). The answers were:

Other hours suggested:	1999 Total # Resp	1996 Total # Resp
Sunday	1	1
Sunday, open earlier	1	
Sunday, 12:00pm-5:00pm	1	
Sunday, 12:00pm-6:00pm		1
Sunday evening	1	1
7 days/week = 7:00am-10:00pm	1	
7 days/week = 8:00am-9:00pm	1	
7 days/week = 9:00am-9:00pm	1	
7:00am to 10:00pm	1	
Saturday, 8:30am to ?	1	
8:00am to ? pm	1	
8:30am to 9:00pm		1
9:00am to 9:00pm		3
9:00am to 9:30pm		1
Friday & Sunday, until 7:00pm	1	
Summer, Friday & Sunday evenings	1	
Summer, later evenings		1
	12	9

It should be noted that the new Library will change its hours of operation when it relocates to the new facility, and the new hours will address many of the concerns expressed by the respondents for longer hours and year round operation, including Sundays. The hours of operation will be:

Days	Old Library	New Library
Monday to Thursday	9:30am-9:00pm	9:00am-9:00pm
Friday to Saturday	9:30am-5:30pm	9:00am-6:00pm
Sunday (Sept to May)	2:00pm-5:00pm	See Below
Sunday (June to August)	Closed	See Below
Sunday (Year Round)	Not Applicable	1:00-5:00pm

The 1999 survey also asked a if there were any new services the respondents would like the new Library to provide (13). The respondents could check as many items as they wanted. The results are shown below.

13. What new services would you like the new Library to offer?	1999		1996		1992
	Total # Resp	%	Total # Resp	%	
Digital camera	15	17%		0%	N/A--no responses received in 1992
Laptop computer	14	16%		0%	
DVD movies and player	13	15%		0%	
Foreign language	13	15%		0%	
Other (in 1999)	12	13%		0%	
LCD (overhead computer display)	11	12%		0%	
Web TV take home kit (plug into TV)	11	12%		0%	
Computer software		0%	70	29%	
Internet service		0%	64	26%	
Multimedia CD-Rom software		0%	56	23%	
Adult programming		0%	32	13%	
Music on audio cassette		0%	15	6%	
Other (in 1996)		0%	5	2%	
Total	89	100%	242	100%	

The foreign languages indicated in question (13) consisted of the following areas of interest. This list may also be applicable as program ideas for the Parks and Recreation continuing education program, which currently offers foreign language instruction in Spanish and German (Winter/Spring 2000) for youths. An adult foreign language program through the Parks and Recreation may be an option to consider.

13. Foreign language component (13.f)	1999 Total # Resp
Spanish	5
French	3
German	2
Japanese	2
Asian	1
Irish	1
Italian	1
Latin	1
Phonics game	1
Russian	1
Total	18

The comments generated from question (13) for “other” pertained to book acquisition, programs for individuals with disabilities, and amenities in the new Library, as shown below:

13. Other (13.g)	1999 Total # Resp
Books (more selection)	4
Books on tape (more)	1
Disabilities/programming	1
2nd copy machine	1
User friendly setting	1
Larger Library	1
No need for coffee shop	1
Tax \$ better spent	1

The 1999 survey asked a new question (14) regarding adult program opportunities at the new Library. The Parks and Recreation continuing education program currently offers computer instruction in some of the identified areas—Internet use and beginning computer (Winter/Spring 2000). Perhaps some of the other areas would be viable for the Parks and Recreation continuing education program to consider—travelogues and crafts. The remaining topics would be applicable to the Library. The responses were:

14. What adult programming opportunities would you participate in if offered at the new library?	1999	
	Total #	% Resp
General computer classes	40	26%
Library's online catalog	28	18%
Internet searching	27	18%
Travelogue	27	18%
Book discussion groups	15	10%
Crafts	12	8%
Other	3	2%
Total	152	100%

The 1999 survey asked a new question (15) regarding the services that should be provided in the public meeting rooms at the new Library. The following table shows the responses and the current status as proposed in the architectural plans. The responses were:

15. What services should be provided in the public meeting rooms at the new library?	1999		2000
	Total #	% Resp	Current Status
Use for business meetings	58	24%	Yes in plans
Use for social events	48	20%	Board is discussing (January 2000)
Sound system	35	14%	Yes in plans
Video/data projection	35	14%	Yes in plans
Kitchen facilities	33	14%	Yes in plans
Satellite down-link	19	8%	Wired for future use
Cable TV reception/origination	10	4%	Wired for future use
Other	5	2%	
Total	243	100%	

The responses of "other" for this question (15) included a desire not to have live music or a coffee bar in the Library. Other uses were for City Hall spaces/Council Chamber, private use, and to teach young women how to cook (note, the kitchen facilities will not be of a sufficient size for this last activity).

FY Budget and Staffing

The following information is not part of the Citizen Survey instrument, but is provided to give a better understanding of the financial and personnel resources used to provide the services. The FY budget is based on the adopted budget. Additional statistical information is also provided regarding the operations.

Department	F-T Staff	FY98-99 Budget	F-T Staff	FY95-96 Budget	F-T Staff	FY91-92 Budget
Library	8	910,104	7	741,702	7	805,591
# Part-Time Staff		22		17		19
# of Book Circulated		90,573		78,556		70,168
# Books+Video Circul.		378,004		377,929		290,004

Parks and Recreation

The Parks and Recreation Department provides a wide array of leisure time services to the public on a daily basis. Some of the programs offered by the department include the Swimming Pool, Senior Citizen Center, Mosquito Control, and Grounds Maintenance services. Beginning in 1995, the City started providing the Urbandale School District with turf maintenance at seven school properties. The general public interacts with the department on a daily basis through its year round Recreation program, continuing education program, Senior Citizen program, and use of the parks and trails.

Service Quality

The survey asked two questions (1.k, j) regarding the respondent's interaction with Parks and Recreation during the past 12 months. In general, the 1999 respondents indicated they received excellent and good service from Parks and Recreation (87%), which is a decrease from 1996. The Mosquito Control division had a lower rating (35%) than in the previous two surveys, and the lowest rating of all services. Typically, Mosquito Control is done in the evening, and past experience has indicated that while approximately half of the calls are supportive of the treatment, the other half opposes the operation. The Parks and Recreation Department will continue to evaluate the Mosquito Control operations to determine ways the program can be improved.

Service quality	1999			1996			1992		
	Excl	Fair	Total #	Excl	Fair	Total #	Excl	Fair	Total #
	Good	Poor	Resp	Good	Poor	Resp	Good	Poor	Resp
1.k-Parks & Recreation	87%	13%	103	93%	7%	203	86%	14%	155
1.j-Mosquito Control	35%	65%	74	56%	44%	155	41%	59%	94

In another question (5), the 1999 respondents thought they were treated courteously by the Parks and Recreation Department (92%), which represents an increase in perceived courteousness from the 1996 survey (80%). The 1999 respondents also thought their concerns were usually resolved by the Parks and Recreation Department (87%), which is a decrease from the previous surveys.

Service Quality	1999		1996		1992	
Treated Courteously?	Yes Courteous	Total # Y-N Resp	Yes Courteous	Total # Y-N Resp	Yes Courteous	Total # Y-N Resp

5. Parks & Rec.	92%	39	80%	86	95%	60
Concern Resolved?	Yes Resolved	Total # Resp	Yes Resolved	Total # Resp	Yes Resolved	Total # Resp
5. Parks & Rec.	87%	31	100%	45	92%	48

Parks

The survey respondents were asked to identify how often they or their family members used the Urbandale park system (17). Monthly use and weekly use rated 65% or more for all surveys, although this use rate is lower than in previous years. The responses for the 1999 are shown below:

17. How often the Parks system is used.	1999		1996		1992	
	Total	%	Total	%	Total	%
	# Resp		# Resp		# Resp	
Monthly	38	36%	101	47%	84	54%
Weekly	31	29%	68	32%	47	30%
Daily	20	19%	10	5%	5	3%
Never	17	16%	36	17%	21	13%
Total	106	100%	215	100%	157	100%

In addition to the frequency of Park use, the respondents were asked to identify the type of park they used most often (20). There is popular use of both the off-street trails and the small neighborhood parks within 10 minutes of home, which have consistently rated as the top two uses in all three surveys. The results are shown below:

20. Type of park most often used.	1999		1996		1992	
	Total	%	Total	%	Total	%
	# Resp		# Resp		# Resp	
Off-street trails-bike, walk, jog	54	47%	91	35%	64	46%
Small, w/i 10 minutes of home	28	25%	97	37%	50	36%
Natural, undeveloped state	11	10%	7	3%	9	6%
Large w/ many activities/options	4	4%	38	14%	14	10%
Other (describe)	2	2%	5	2%	2	1%
Seldom use parks because...	15	13%	25	10%	0	0%
Total	114	100%	263	100%	139	100%

Several of the respondents for the 1999 survey provided additional comments for, "Seldom use parks because..."

- no time /too busy (5), age (2), too small and over crowded—seem too much like sports facilities, live too far away, use other recreational facility, no use for a park, parks are an entity better left to state/national jurisdiction, etc.

Comments under “Other” were:

- walk dog and watch softball, use all the parks but it depends on mood, weather, time frame.

In response to the question (2.c) regarding support of a bond issue for a public golf course, there was minimal support (19%), which is the lowest support for this issue since the first survey. The department will continue to reevaluate the potential for recreational opportunities as the City develops to the west and north. The results were:

Future Bond Issue	1999			1996			1992		
	Yes	No	Don't Know	Yes	No	Don't Know	Yes	No	Don't Know
Enhance Existing Parks	N/A = not a question in 1999			118	55	38	N/A = not a question in 1992		
2.c-Public Golf Course	21	63	25	57	123	34	50	96	79
	19%	58%	23%	27%	57%	16%	22%	43%	35%
New Regional Park	N/A = not a question in 1999			47	97	68	N/A = not a question in 1992		
				22%	46%	32%			

FY Budget and Staffing

The following information is not part of the Citizen Survey instrument, but is provided to give a better understanding of the financial and personnel resources used to provide the services. The FY budget is based on the adopted budget. Additional statistical information is also provided regarding the operations.

Department	F-T Staff	FY98-99 Budget	F-T Staff	FY95-96 Budget	F-T Staff	FY91-92 Budget
Parks	7	1,293,014	7	957,035	7	828,209
# Acres		423		423		273
# Miles off-street trails		12		12		11.5

Recreation

Each year, Recreation aggressively promotes its recreational activities and programs. In 1998, the City and School entered into a joint agreement to hire a full-time employee in the Department of Parks and Recreation to coordinate the community education program for the City and School. This arrangement has resulted in better program coordination, increased course offerings and revenue, and improved public relations and program awareness.

In 1998, the department started to publish a comprehensive (40 pages) Seasonal Program Guide of course offerings, which is also available for viewing on the City's website. Announcements are also published in local newspapers, and flyers and brochures are distributed to various user groups. To determine the effectiveness of these promotional efforts, respondents were asked to identify the "top 3" sources they used most to learn about recreational activities (16).

In the 1999 survey (question 16), the Seasonal Program Guide was the primary source for learning about the programs, followed by the Press Citizen and the Des Moines Register, which were comparable. It should be noted that "word of mouth" is a viable source in all surveys. In addition, although not identified below, some respondents in the 1996 survey indicated that the Library was a source for learning about recreational activities—and may be a viable place for the department to place announcements. The responses are shown below:

16. Sources used most to learn about Parks and Recreation services?	1999		1996		1992	
	Total #	% Resp	Total #	% Resp	Total #	% Resp
Seasonal Program Guide	75	30%	N/A		N/A	
Press Citizen	59	23%	N/A		N/A	
Des Moines Register	51	20%	124	26%	67	19%
Word of mouth	42	17%	92	19%	68	20%
School Flyers	23	9%	45	9%	29	8%
Stand-up Billboard Signs	3	1%	N/A		N/A	
Other	0	0%	9	2%	2	1%
Urbandale News	0	0%	119	25%	118	34%
Television	0	0%	36	8%	12	3%
Shoppers News	0	0%	34	7%	32	9%
Radio	0	0%	20	4%	16	5%
Total	253	100%	479	100%	344	100%

The 1999 survey asked a new question (21) regarding the Wellness/Fitness center located in the balcony of the Urbandale High School gym. The center opened in Fall, 1998, and is opened to residents

to join at a nominal cost per individual or family. The center is open Monday through Thursday from 3:30pm to 7:00pm, and on Friday from 3:30pm to 6:00pm. There are approximately 35 fitness machines available for use. Since the center was a relatively new program, the department wanted to know if the public was aware of its existence. In addition, the Parks Department's phone number was provided to enable a respondent to follow-up (i.e., to receive information). The responses were:

21. Are you aware that Urbandale offers a Wellness/Fitness center located at the High School?	1999	
	Total #	% Resp
Yes	45	41%
No	64	59%
Total	109	100%

Based on the results to this question (21), it appears that additional promotion of this program would be warranted (paper promotion, website, City's 1210AM radio station, announcements at school games, etc.).

The Recreation program is always looking for new ideas to develop programs and activities of interest to the public. In another question (22), the 1999 respondents were asked for their ideas. The responses were:

- Adults: computer classes, stained glass, landscape design, Spanish language classes
- Childcare: baby sitting class or service (i.e., baby sitting pals), childcare before and after summer camp program, Police protection at park sites—perhaps shuttle busing available to the sites
- Children: craft and cooking classes for kids
- Disabilities: set up more programs for people with disabilities of all ages
- Pool: need an outdoor pool (the indoor pool is crowded in the summer)
- Trails: measured mile walk, trails open to mountain bikes in western areas, enforce the dog scooper program
- Final note: Eliminate it to cut taxes

As noted in the Library section for question (13), the foreign language list may also be applicable as program ideas for the Parks and Recreation continuing education program, which currently offers foreign language

instruction in Spanish and German (Winter/Spring 2000) for youths. A foreign language program for adults may be an option for Parks and Recreation to consider.

As noted in the Library section for question (14) regarding adult program opportunities at the new Library, perhaps travelogues and crafts would be viable for the Parks and Recreation continuing education program to consider. As noted for this question in the Library section, the Library was identified as a source for computer training. Perhaps the continuing education program could expand or incorporate its training efforts, which currently include Internet use and beginning computer (Winter/Spring 2000).

In response to the question (2.b) regarding support of a bond issue to build a community/recreation center, there was marginal support (47%) which is a decrease from the 1996 survey. The results were:

	1999			1996			1992		
	Yes	No	Don't Know	Yes	No	Don't Know	Yes	No	Don't Know
Future Bond Issue									
2.b-Comm/Rec Ctr	52 47%	26 24%	32 29%	133 62%	48 23%	32 15%	65 29%	53 24%	107 48%

The construction of a “Community Center” was identified by the “Imagine Urbandale-Vision Plan” as one of its four primary goals for the future. The vision plan was a collaborative effort between the City, Urbandale Community School District, Urbandale Chamber of Commerce, and citizens at large. The vision plan was launched at the Urbandale Business Expo in June, 1998; and three community forums were held in September and October, 1998, which resulted in over one hundred ideas. The City Council, at its meeting of February 9, 1999, endorsed the final report prepared for the vision plan.

FY Budget and Staffing

The following information is not part of the Citizen Survey instrument, but is provided to give a better understanding of the financial and personnel resources used to provide the services. The FY budget is based on the adopted budget.

Department	F-T Staff	FY98-99 Budget	F-T Staff	FY95-96 Budget	F-T Staff	FY91-92 Budget
Recreation	2	175,367	2	139,349	2	102,090
# Classes Held		266	Not Available		Not Available	
# Participants		5,127	Not Available		Not Available	

Swimming Pool

The City's indoor Swimming Pool is opened year round for public use. The pool is also used by the Urbandale Community School District for its events.

Service Quality

The survey asked one question (7) regarding the respondent's use of the Swimming Pool during the past 12 months. The 1999 respondents thought that they were treated courteously at the Swimming Pool (63%), however, this represents a decrease in perceived courteousness from the 1996 survey. The 1999 respondents also thought their concerns were resolved at the Swimming Pool (55%), which is a decrease from the 1996 survey. It was unknown if the rating levels reflected the low survey response (16 and 11 total responses).

Service quality	1999		1996		1992	
	Yes	Total #	Yes	Total #	Yes	Total #
	Y-N		Y-N		Y-N	
Treated Courteously?	Courteous	Resp	Courteous	Resp	Courteous	Resp
7. Swimming Pool	63%	16	71%	63	85%	41
	Yes	Total	Yes	Total	Yes	Total
Concern Resolved?	Resolved	# Resp	Resolved	# Resp	Resolved	# Resp
7. Swimming Pool	55%	11	90%	29	89%	27

The 1999 survey asked a new question (18) to identify the primary uses of the pool. Based on these responses, additional programs may be developed or highlighted to address the uses. In reality, those who "do not use (49%)" the pool may never use the pool regardless of the programs that may be developed. The responses were:

18. Which of the following describes why you and/or your family use the Pool or water playground?	1999	
	Total #	% Resp
Leisure	34	25%
Lessons	15	11%
School Activities	12	9%
Fitness	8	6%
Do Not Use	65	49%
Total	134	100%

In response to the question (2.e) regarding support of a bond issue to build an outdoor swimming pool, there was marginal support (49%), consistent with the 1996 survey. The City has not prepared any plans for

an outdoor swimming pool, although the proposed Capital Improvements Program for 1999 to 2004+ and beyond, anticipates a full scale outdoor water park (year 2004+). Facilities could include a swimming pool, play equipment, and other water features, and could be located in the regional park proposed for the western part of the City. The following table summarizes the results:

Future Bond Issue	1999			1996			1992		
	Yes	No	Don't Know	Yes	No	Don't Know	Yes	No	Don't Know
2.e-Outdoor Swimming Pool	54 49%	33 30%	23 21%	102 48%	75 35%	35 17%	67 30%	70 31%	88 39%

FY Budget and Staffing

The following information is not part of the Citizen Survey instrument, but is provided to give a better understanding of the financial and personnel resources used to provide the services. The FY budget is based on the adopted budget.

Department	F-T Staff	FY98-99 Budget	F-T Staff	FY95-96 Budget	F-T Staff	FY91-92 Budget
Pool	1	451,332	1	268,323	1	207,269
# Walk-in users		20,507	Not Available		Not Available	
# Pass/Punch cards		7,046	Not Available		Not Available	

Senior Citizen Center

The Senior Citizen Center is currently located in the Ralph Whitten Shelter House at Lions Park. The center offers a variety of programs, arts and crafts, personal growth activities, exercise classes, recreational activities, attendance at cultural and athletic events, monthly mini-trips, and two charter bus trips each year. The center is open Monday through Thursday, and serves a noon meal on Tuesday and Thursday.

After the current Library is vacated in mid-2000, the facility will be renovated for use as a community center that would also accommodate the Senior Citizen Center activities. The current Lions Park facility would continue to be utilized as a shelter house available for public rental.

Service Quality

The survey asked one question (1.n) regarding the respondent's interaction with the Senior Citizen Center during the past 12 months. In general, the 1999 respondents indicated that they received excellent and good service from the Senior Citizen Center (80%), which is comparable to the 1996 survey and is a significant increase from the 1992 survey, which had approximately the same number of respondents. The results were:

	1999			1996			1992		
	Excl	Fair	Total #	Excl	Fair	Total #	Excl	Fair	Total #
	Good	Poor	Resp	Good	Poor	Resp	Good	Poor	Resp
1.n-Senior Citizen Center	80%	20%	30	82%	18%	59	68%	32%	37

The respondents were also asked if adequate leisure-time facilities were offered to senior citizens (60 years and older). The 1999 survey results were comparable to the 1996 survey results, as shown below:

19. Are there adequate leisure activities for Senior Citizens?	1999		1996		1992	
	Total #	% Resp	Total #	% Resp	Total #	% Resp
Yes	18	16%	38	17%	17	11%
Somewhat (Need More)	12	11%	17	8%	8	5%
No	6	5%	11	5%	10	6%
Don't Know	76	68%	158	71%	126	78%
Total	112	100%	224	100%	161	100%

In reference to the availability of leisure-time facilities for senior citizens, the results of the preceding question (19) and the demographics question (45) regarding the respondent's age, were combined for a better understanding of the respondents' perspective. Based on the number of "Don't Know" for the age categories exceeding 40 years (65%), it appears that those likely to access the services for their parents or themselves do not know of the Senior Citizen services. Further, of those 62+ years, there is a comparable number of those who think the services are adequate and those that do not know of the services. Finally, the highest number to indicate there is a need for additional services are in the category of 62+ years. The results were:

19. Adequate leisure activities Senior Citizens	1999				
	Yes	No	Need More	Don't Know	
45. Age					
18-28	0	0	0	2	} 35%
29-39	2	0	1	23	
40-50	3	1	2	28	} 65%
51-61	2	4	2	10	
62+	10	1	7	9	
	107	17	6	12	72
	100%	16%	6%	11%	67%

The consistently high percentage of "Don't Know" for all survey years—over 65%, may reflect that the services go unrecognized until the services are needed for someone in the respondent's life or by the respondent, or may never be known to those in need. The department has previously reviewed and explored alternatives to increase public awareness of the Senior Citizen Program with a special emphasis placed on recruiting additional participants and future program users. Since the percentage of "Don't Know" responses remains high, efforts to increase the public's awareness of the program should continue—website, City's radio station 1210AM, quarterly Citizen's Brief newsletter, Seasonal Program Guide, etc. On the website the information is currently available as a download rather than as a direct click on. It is suggested that a direct click on be evaluated since it would be easier to use.

FY Budget and Staffing

The following information is not part of the Citizen Survey instrument, but is provided to give a better understanding of the financial and personnel resources used to provide the services. The FY budget is based on the adopted budget.

Department	F-T Staff	FY98-99 Budget	F-T Staff	FY95-96 Budget	F-T Staff	FY91-92 Budget
Senior Citizens	0	54,260	0	41,600	0	35,677
# Part-Time		2		2		2
# of Participants		9,658		8,074		7,589

Police

The Police Department operates 24 hours a day, 7 days a week. The department is responsible for enforcing all applicable laws and ordinances. Officers interact with or are observed by the public on a daily basis. The department also participates in a drug education program with the Urbandale schools, sponsors a Reserve Police Officers program, and provides animal control services. The Police Dispatcher is the first point of contact for a 911 call.

Service Quality

The survey asked two questions (1.a, l) regarding the respondent's interaction with the Police Department during the past 12 months. In general, the 1999 respondents indicated they received excellent and good service from the Police (90%), which is comparable to the 1996 results. The Animal Control rating of excellent and good service (62%) was a decrease over the previous surveys. The results were:

Service quality	1999			1996			1992		
	Excl	Fair	Total #	Excl	Fair	Total #	Excl	Fair	Total #
	Good	Poor	Resp	Good	Poor	Resp	Good	Poor	Resp
1.l-Police	90%	10%	97	86%	14%	206	96%	4%	145
1.a-Animal Control	62%	38%	61	70%	30%	144	71%	29%	106

In another question (6), the 1999 respondents thought they were treated courteously (91%), which is a considerable improvement from the 1996 survey. The 1999 respondents also thought that their concerns were resolved 85% of the time, which is a decrease from the 1996 survey. These results are reinforced by the 1999 respondents who requested service (to be presented on the next page).

Service quality	1999			1996			1992			
	Yes	Y-N	Total #	Yes	Y-N	Total #	Yes	Y-N	Total #	
	Courteous	Resp	Courteous	Resp	Courteous	Resp	Courteous	Resp	Courteous	Resp
6. Police	91%		44	79%		96	91%		75	
Concern Resolved?	Yes	Y-N	Total #	Yes	Y-N	Total #	Yes	Y-N	Total #	
	Resolved	Resp	Resolved	Resp	Resolved	Resp	Resolved	Resp	Resolved	Resp
	Resolved	Resp	Resolved	Resp	Resolved	Resp	Resolved	Resp	Resolved	Resp
6. Police	85%		33	89%		54	94%		66	

The 1999 survey respondents were also asked if they had requested service from the Police Department in the past 12 months, and if so, were the respondents satisfied with the response time, officers' conduct, and

resolution. Based on the results, 29% of the 1999 respondents had requested service, and 90% of these respondents indicated they were satisfied with the response time. In addition, 97% of the 1999 respondents thought that the Police officers acted in a professional manner, and 87% of the respondents thought that their concerns were resolved.

The following results would suggest that direct contact has been very positive between the public and the officers. The results for professional conduct remain consistently high for all surveys. The results were:

	1999			1996			1992		
Police Department	Yes	No	Total #	Yes	No	Total #	Yes	No	Total #
	Y-N Resp			Y-N Resp			Y-N Resp		
23-Requested service?	29%	71%	110	33%	67%	202	34%	65%	149
24-Good response time?	90%	10%	30	96%	4%	67	92%	8%	51
25-Professional conduct?	97%	3%	30	96%	4%	69	94%	6%	52
26-Resolved concern?	87%	13%	30	94%	6%	68	87%	13%	52

In response to the question (27) regarding the provision of adequate follow-up information or service, 87% (adjusted) of the 1999 respondents indicated follow-up was provided for those who desired follow-up services. The number of respondents receiving partial follow-up has consistently improved each survey. The results were:

27. Officer(s) provided adequate follow-up information or services?	1999		1996		1992	
	Total #	% Resp	Total #	% Resp	Total #	% Resp
Yes	13	45%	34	52%	14	28%
Somewhat	1	3%	4	6%	5	10%
No, still waiting	1	3%	6	9%	2	4%
Not Applicable	14	48%	21	32%	29	58%
Total	29	100%	65	100%	50	100%
If "Not Applicable" deleted:	(14)		(21)		(29)	
Total	15		44		21	
Then "Yes" would be:	13	87%	34	77%	14	67%

The Police Department is interested in ways to improve its services to the public. In another question (28), the 1999 respondents were asked for their ideas. The responses were:

- Needs: to see them cruise the neighborhood, when calling on a cell phone it takes time to be transferred to the proper dispatch, enforce Urbandale laws, get out in the crowd with people

- Special Needs – Kids/Teens: need to be more friendly (seem too punky, stuck up, don't wave or smile at kids, facial expression "tough attitude" or "grouchy"), need to be a bit more courteous to teens, crack down on teenage drinking parties and drivers
- Negative comments regarding current services: less "good old boy" make up of department—have more than their share of trouble for size, treat people equally regardless of make and year of car and race of driver, stop getting sued
- Positive comments regarding current services: do an excellent job, do a great job, pleased with their patrol of our neighborhood, do a commendable job, excellent service, publicity about the good things they do, satisfied

FY Budget and Staffing

The following information is not part of the Citizen Survey instrument, but is provided to give a better understanding of the financial and personnel resources used to provide the services. The FY budget is based on the adopted budget.

Department	F-T Staff	FY98-99 Budget	F-T Staff	FY95-96 Budget	F-T Staff	FY91-92 Budget
Police		3,013,827		2,277,690		1,702,188
# Officers	40		36		31.5	
# Dispatchers	0		4		4	
# Clerical	3		3		3	

Public Works

The Department of Public Works consists of seven divisions: Street (Roadway) Maintenance, Sanitary Sewers, Solid Waste Collection, Storm Sewers, Street Cleaning, Street Lighting, and Traffic Safety. The divisions interact with or are observed by the public on a daily basis throughout the year.

Service Quality

The survey asked three questions (1. m, p, s) regarding the respondent's interaction with several divisions of the Public Works Department during the past 12 months. Street Lighting: The department is responsible for the design, location and coordination of street lights and traffic signals to keep pace with City development. Sewer: The department annually televises one-fourth of the City's sewer system to inspect and maintain the sewer lines. Traffic Signals/Signs: The department annually repaints all street markings, and inspects one-fourth of the City's traffic signs. In general, the 1999 respondents indicated that they received good and excellent service from Street Lighting (87%), Sanitary and Storm Sewers (79%), and Traffic Signals and Signs (77%), each of which is a slight decrease from the 1996 survey. The results were:

	1999			1996			1992		
	Excl	Fair	Total #	Excl	Fair	Total #	Excl	Fair	Total #
Service quality	Good	Poor	Resp	Good	Poor	Resp	Good	Poor	Resp
1.p-Street Lighting	87%	13%	109	91%	9%	218	85%	15%	150
1.m-Sanitary & Storm Sewers	79%	21%	77	80%	20%	151	79%	21%	116
1.s-Traffic Signals & Signs	77%	23%	112	80%	20%	219	75%	25%	158

It should be noted, that while the department annually inspects one-fourth of all sidewalks on public and private property in the City, the property owner is responsible for maintaining and repairing any sidewalk cited during the annual inspection.

In another question (8), the 1999 respondents thought they were treated courteously (91%), which is a substantial increase from the 1996 survey. The 1999 respondents also thought that their concerns were resolved (65%), which is a decrease from the 1996. The results were:

Service quality	1999		1996		1992	
	Yes	Total #	Yes	Total #	Yes	Total #
Treated Courteously?	Courteous	Y-N Resp	Courteous	Y-N Resp	Courteous	Y-N Resp
8. Public Works/Engineering	91%	35	73%	75	84%	44
	Yes	Total	Yes	Total	Yes	Total
Concern Resolved?	Resolved	# Resp	Resolved	# Resp	Resolved	# Resp
8. Public Works/Engineering	65%	26	72%	47	79%	34

FY Budget and Staffing

The following information is not part of the Citizen Survey instrument, but is provided to give a better understanding of the financial and personnel resources used to provide the services. The FY budget is based on the adopted budget. Additional statistical information is also provided regarding the operations.

Department	F-T Staff	FY98-99 Budget	F-T Staff	FY95-96 Budget	F-T Staff	FY91-92 Budget
Street Lighting	0	356,000	0	332,000	0	285,000
Traffic Safety	0.5	91,016	0.5	76,943	0.5	76,640
Sanitary Sewer	2	282,771	2	140,581	2	161,337
Storm Sewer	0.5	67,184	0.5	29,198	0.5	28,890
# Street Lights		3,093		2,536		2,349
# Miles Paved Roads		127.46		118.76		104.37
# Miles Sanitary Swr		135.75		127.44		115.98
# Miles Storm Swr		110.68		101.30		93.43

Solid Waste Collection

Solid Waste Collection is a division of the Department of Public Works. This division provides household collection four days a week, Monday through Thursday, ten hours a day.

Household Collection: The division collects household waste year round from approximately 8,900 houses a week. Residents do not pay a separate user fee for the collection of household waste, which is provided by the City as part of the property taxes collected through the General Fund. In November, 1998, the City participated in a study using a semi-automated and a fully-automated collection system with specialized collection containers that were distributed to selected residents. Based on the positive responses from the residents, the City will convert to a fully automated collection system in Summer, 2000, and will provide a special collection container for each household receiving this service. The 1999 Citizen Survey occurred prior to the changes in the collection method.

Yardwaste Collection: The Solid Waste division also collects yardwaste for approximately seven months a year. In May, 1999, a “pay as you throw” cost was implemented for the yardwaste program to partially recover the cost of the program. The 1999 Citizen Survey occurred prior to the changes in the yardwaste program.

Spring Cleanup: The Solid Waste division also conducts an annual Spring Cleanup program for bulk items, at no additional cost to the resident. It is anticipated that a fee for the collection of bulk items outside of the annual Spring Cleanup program will be implemented in Summer, 2000. The 1999 Citizen Survey occurred prior to the changes in the bulk item program.

Tires: This program is sponsored by the Metro Waste Authority for one week in May. Residents may drop off their old tires—maximum of 10, at the City’s Public Works complex, at no cost to the resident.

Recycling: The “Curb It!” recycling program started in FY1995-96. It is operated by the Metro Waste Authority and is not a City program. Residents, however, participate in the recycling “Curb It!” at no cost to the user. The program is operated by the Metro Waste Authority, which contracts with a private hauler to collect the recyclable items. Residents place their recyclable items in a bin provided by the contractor, and it is collected by the private hauler on the same day the City collects the household garbage. Recyclable items include magazines, catalogs, clean paper, cereal and tissue boxes, clear glass, brown paper sacks, tin/aluminum cans, number 1 and 2 plastics, newspaper, and flattened cardboard. In March, 1999, the City renewed its agreement with the Metro

Waste Authority to provide the recycling “Curb It!” program through June, 2004.

Service Quality

The survey asked three questions (1. c, d, e) regarding the respondent’s interaction with the Solid Waste Collection division during the past 12 months. In general, the 1999 respondents indicated they received excellent and good service related to Solid Waste Collection for garbage (84%), yardwaste (77%), and recycling (80%), each of which represents a decrease to the 1996 survey. The survey results were:

Service quality	1999			1996			1992		
	Excl Good	Fair Poor	Total # Resp	Excl Good	Fair Poor	Total # Resp	Excl Good	Fair Poor	Total # Resp
1.c-Collect-Garbage	84%	16%	115	87%	13%	222	76%	24%	159
1.d-Collect-Yard Waste	77%	23%	110	83%	17%	217	76%	24%	155
1.e-Recycle Curb It	80%	20%	113	95%	5%	215	---	N/A	---

The 1999 survey asked respondents to list any additional items they wanted the curbside recycling program to collect (35). This open ended question generated the following responses:

35. Additional items residents wanted curbside recycling to collect	1999		1996	
	Total	%	Total	%
	# Resp		# Resp	
Antifreeze containers		0%	1	2%
Appliances (6 or 4 x year)		0%	1	2%
Boxes (unfolded)	1	7%		
Cardboard	1	7%		
Colored glass	3	20%	4	8%
Concrete		0%	3	6%
Dirt		0%	2	4%
Furnance filters		0%	1	2%
Furniture (once a month)		0%	1	2%
Longer branches		0%	1	2%
Oil	1	7%	7	14%
Paint	1	7%	4	8%
Phone books		0%	2	4%
Pizza boxes		0%	1	2%
Plastic bags	4	27%	10	20%
Plastic other than 1 & 2	2	13%	7	14%
Steel cans		0%	1	2%
Styrofoam		0%	3	6%
Tin cans	1	7%		
Tires	1	7%	1	2%
Total	15	100%	50	100%

The recycling question (35) also generated negative and positive comments, including:

Recycling-Negative: quit the recycling program, end the program or pay as you use, pick up what is dropped instead of leaving it on the street (2)

Recycling-Positive: happy with the current program, this program is excellent—hope it continues and we would be willing to pay more in fees if necessary, excellent program—would like to see it extended to apartments and schools

In addition, the recycling question (35) generated comments about the annual Spring Cleanup. All of the following comments express a desire to have bulk items picked up more than once a year. The proposed bulk item subscription program would address these concerns. The comments were:

Spring Cleanup: would like big items picked up at least twice a year, more frequently than once per year collection of unused household items-non-recyclable, currently there is no program to pick-up large items at curbside other than during Spring Cleanup and such a service would be a beneficial addition to current services, more than 1 time a year-junk removal (Spring

and Fall, or once a quarter), do the clean up 2 times a year (Spring and Fall).

FY Budget and Staffing

The following information is not part of the Citizen Survey instrument, but is provided to give a better understanding of the financial and personnel resources used to provide the services. The FY budget is based on the adopted budget. Additional statistical information is also provided regarding the operations.

Department	Staff	Budget	Staff	Budget	Staff	Budget
Solid Waste	7	827,813	6	758,001	6	552,469
# Households		8,672		8,148		7,693
# House Tons Coll.		6,141		5,537		6,100
# Yardwst Tons Coll.		2,670		2,282		1,820
# Spring Cleanup Tons		542		506		490
# Recycle Tons Coll.		2,318		1,997		Not Applicable

Street Maintenance

The Street (Roadway) Maintenance division repairs streets year round, weather permitting. This division is also responsible for winter plowing operations, traffic pavement marking, and street cleaning.

Service Quality

The survey asked three questions (1.o, q, r) regarding the respondent's interaction with Street Maintenance during the past 12 months. In general, the 1999 respondents indicated they received excellent and good service from Snow and Ice Removal (86%) and Street Maintenance (69%), both of which represent an increase from the 1996 survey. The 1999 survey added the new category of Street Sweeping (69%).

Service quality	1999			1996			1992		
	Excl Good	Fair Poor	Total # Resp	Excl Good	Fair Poor	Total # Resp	Excl Good	Fair Poor	Total # Resp
1.o-Snow & Ice Removal	86%	14%	111	81%	19%	220	---	N/A	---
1.q-Street Maintenance	69%	31%	113	65%	35%	216	65%	35%	158
1.r-Street Sweeping	69%	31%	103	---	N/A	---	---	N/A	---

During the winter months, the removal of snow and ice is an important concern to the City and the public. The City's snow and ice removal manual prioritizes primary roads (i.e., 86th Street, Douglas Avenue, Meredith Drive, etc.), and secondary roads (i.e., collector streets, metro bus routes, all other streets). The City does not have designated "snow routes", and clears all streets and cul-de-sacs "curb to curb". Emergencies, isolated problem areas, equipment breakdown, staff availability, and other conditions sometimes effect the allocation of materials and personnel to clear the streets of snow and ice. The 1999 survey asked respondents to rate the City's ability to keep the main roads passable during ice and snow storms (34). The combined excellent and good rating for main roads was 89%, and slightly exceeded the service rating in the above table (86%). The results were:

34. Rate City's ability to keep main roads passable during ice and snow storms?	1999		1996		1992	
	%	# Resp	%	# Resp	%	# Resp
Good	46%	51	50%	110	N/A = not a question	
Excellent	43%	47	42%	92	in 1992	
Sub Total Excell+Good	89%	98	92%	202		
Fair	8%	9	7%	15		
Poor	3%	3	1%	3		
Sub Total Fair+Poor	11%	12	8%	18		
Total	100%	110	100%	220		

In another question (33), the 1999 respondents were asked to rate the condition of the streets in their neighborhood. The respondents indicated that the streets were in good condition (53%), which is a decrease from both of the previous surveys—however, the excellent rating increased from the previous surveys. The results were:

33. Rate the condition of streets in your neighborhood?	1999		1996		1992	
	%	# Resp	%	# Resp	%	# Resp
Good	53%	59	58%	128	67%	110
Excellent	21%	23	16%	38	15%	25
Sub-Total Excell+Good	74%	82	74%	166	82%	135
Fair	21%	23	22%	48	15%	25
Poor	5%	6	4%	8	2%	4
Sub-Total Fair+Poor	26%	29	26%	56	18%	29
Total	100%	111	100%	222	100%	164

In reference to the condition of the streets in the respondents' neighborhood, the results of the preceding question (33) and the demographics question (47) regarding the area the respondent lived in Urbandale, were combined for a better understanding of the respondents' perspective by location. The majority indicated that the roads were in "excellent to good" condition (75%), and "fair to poor" condition (25%)—for north and south of Douglas Avenue, and for east and west of 86th Street. The results by location were:

33. Rate the condition of streets in your neighborhood?	1999		1996	
	Excell+Good	Fair+Poor	Excell+Good	Fair+Poor
North of Douglas	55%	16%	51%	13%
South of Douglas	20%	9%	25%	11%
Total	75%	25%	76%	24%
East of 86th	39%	16%	29%	16%
West of 86th	36%	9%	46%	9%
Total	75%	25%	75%	25%

Detail: North and South of Douglas:

33. Rate the condition of streets in your neighborhood? 47. neighborhood?	1999								Svy Total Resp
	Excel %	Total Resp	Good %	Total Resp	Fair %	Total Resp	Poor %	Total Resp	
N of Douglas, bet East & 86	3%	3	21%	22	7%	7	2%	2	34
N of Douglas, bet 86 & 142	15%	16	16%	17	6%	6	1%	1	40
N of Douglas, bet 142 & West	0%	0	0%	0	1%	1	0%	0	1
	18%	19	37%	39	13%	14	3%	3	
NORTH	Excel+Good		55%	58	Fair+Poor =		16%	17	75
S of Douglas, bet East & 86	3%	3	12%	13	6%	6	2%	2	24
S of Douglas, bet 86 & 142	0%	0	5%	5	2%	2	0%	0	7
S of Douglas, bet 142 & West	0%	0	0%	0	0%	0	0%	0	0
	3%	3	17%	18	8%	8	2%	2	
SOUTH	Excel+Good		20%	21	Fair+Poor =		9%	10	31
OVERALL TOTAL	Excel+Good		75%	79	Fair+Poor =		25%	27	106

30. Rate the condition of streets in your neighborhood? 43. neighborhood?	1996								Svy Total Resp
	Excel %	Total Resp	Good %	Total Resp	Fair %	Total Resp	Poor %	Total Resp	
N of Douglas-West of 86	11%	24	23%	50	3%	6	0%	0	80
N of Douglas-East of 86	3%	6	14%	30	10%	21	1%	2	59
	14%	30	37%	80	12%	27	1%	2	
NORTH	Excel+Good		51%	110	Fair+Poor =		13%	29	139
S of Douglas-West of 86	2%	5	10%	21	5%	11	1%	2	39
S of Douglas-East of 86	1%	3	12%	25	3%	7	2%	4	39
	4%	8	21%	46	8%	18	3%	6	
SOUTH	Excel+Good		25%	54	Fair+Poor =		11%	24	78
OVERALL TOTAL	Excel+Good		76%	164	Fair+Poor =		24%	53	217

Detail: East and West of 86th Street:

33. Rate the condition of streets in your neighborhood?	1999								Svy Total Resp
	Excel %	Total Resp	Good %	Total Resp	Fair %	Total Resp	Poor %	Total Resp	
N of Douglas, bet East & 86	3%	3	21%	22	7%	7	2%	2	34
S of Douglas, bet East & 86	3%	3	12%	13	6%	6	2%	2	24
	6%	6	33%	35	12%	13	4%	4	
EAST	Excel+Good		39% 41		Fair+Poor =		16% 17		58
N of Douglas, bet 86 & 142	15%	16	16%	17	6%	6	1%	1	40
S of Douglas, bet 86 & 142	0%	0	5%	5	2%	2	0%	0	7
N of Douglas, bet 142 & West	0%	0	0%	0	1%	1	0%	0	1
S of Douglas, bet 142 & West	0%	0	0%	0	0%	0	0%	0	0
	15%	16	21%	22	8%	9	1%	1	
WEST	Excel+Good		36% 38		Fair+Poor =		9% 10		48
OVERALL TOTAL	Excel+Good		75% 79		Fair+Poor =		25% 27		106

30. Rate the condition of streets in your neighborhood?	1996								Svy Total Resp
	Excel %	Total Resp	Good %	Total Resp	Fair %	Total Resp	Poor %	Total Resp	
S of Douglas-East of 86	1%	3	12%	25	3%	7	2%	4	39
N of Douglas-East of 86	3%	6	14%	30	10%	21	1%	2	59
	4%	9	25%	55	13%	28	3%	6	
EAST	Excel+Good		29% 64		Fair+Poor =		16% 34		98
S of Douglas-West of 86	2%	5	10%	21	5%	11	1%	2	39
N of Douglas-West of 86	11%	24	23%	50	3%	6	0%	0	80
	13%	29	33%	71	8%	17	1%	2	
WEST	Excel+Good		46% 100		Fair+Poor =		9% 19		119
OVERALL TOTAL	Excel+Good		76% 164		Fair+Poor =		24% 53		217

The Department of Engineering and Public Works coordinates a roads inspection program which identifies City roads in need of repair. The City Council annually approves an Asphalt Resurfacing Program and a Concrete Resurfacing Program to repair roads in various locations throughout the City.

The 1999 survey asked a new question (32), to determine if the respondent was satisfied with the growth of the street network to keep pace with the growth in the City. The development of the street network is a result of the planning identified in the annual Capital Improvements Projects document. The results to this question indicate that the respondents were satisfied. The results were:

32. Satisfaction with street network to keep up with growth?	1999	
	%	# Resp
Yes	88%	89
No	12%	12
Total	100%	101

FY Budget and Staffing

The following information is not part of the Citizen Survey instrument, but is provided to give a better understanding of the financial and personnel resources used to provide the services. The FY budget is based on the adopted budget. Additional statistical information is also provided regarding the operations.

Department	F-T Staff	FY98-99 Budget	F-T Staff	FY95-96 Budget	F-T Staff	FY91-92 Budget
Road Maintenance	14	1,954,669	13	1,439,466	11	1,254,944
# Miles Paved		127.46		118.76		104.37
# Miles Unpaved		2.75		10.11		7.91

Water

The Urbandale Water Department and its Board of Trustees, govern the installation of new water lines, provide 24 hour distribution and maintenance, and emergency service for the water lines. Customers are billed on a monthly basis.

Service Quality

The 1999 survey better defined the term “service” used in the previous surveys, and identified it as “customer service personnel” (question 36) and “quality of water provided” (question 37). The survey asked two questions (36 and 37) regarding the respondent’s interaction with the Water Department during the past 12 months. The 1999 respondents rated customer service excellent to good (93%) and the quality of water excellent to good (82%). The results were:

	1999			1996			1992		
	Excl	Fair	Total #	Excl	Fair	Total #	Excl	Fair	Total #
Service quality	Good	Poor	Resp	Good	Poor	Resp	Good	Poor	Resp
36. Customer Service	93%	7%	81						
37. Quality of Water	82%	18%	108						
Service provided				90%	10%	213	88%	12%	149

The 1999 survey asked a new question (38) regarding the water pressure experienced by the respondent. The majority of the respondents were satisfied (88%), although some respondents indicated the pressure was too low (11%). The results were:

38. Rate your water pressure?	1999	
	%	# Resp
Too high	1%	1
Too low	11%	12
Satisfactory	88%	98
Total	100%	111

In reference to the water pressure experienced by the respondent, the results of the preceding question (38) and the demographics question (47) regarding the area the respondent lived in Urbandale, were combined for a better understanding of the respondents’ perspective by location. Based on the total number of answers per location in 1999, the majority of the respondents were located north of Douglas Avenue, and indicated that the water pressure was satisfactory (61%). Respondents rated the water pressure too low north of Douglas Avenue between the east corporate

limits and 86th Street (5%), and south of Douglas Avenue between the east corporate limits and 86th Street (3%). The results by location were:

38. Rate the water pressure 47. neighborhood?	1999						Svy
	High %	Total Resp	Low %	Total Resp	OK %	Total Resp	Total Resp
N of Douglas, bet East & 86	1%	1	5%	5	26%	28	34
N of Douglas, bet 86 & 142	0%	0	3%	3	34%	37	40
N of Douglas, bet 142 & West	0%	0	0%	0	1%	1	1
North of Douglas	1%	1	7%	8	61%	66	75
S of Douglas, bet East & 86	0%	0	3%	3	20%	22	25
S of Douglas, bet 86 & 142	0%	0	1%	1	6%	7	8
S of Douglas, bet 142 & West	0%	0	0%	0	0%	0	0
South of Douglas	0%	0	4%	4	27%	29	33
Total	2%	2	19%	20	149%	161	108

Water customers are billed on a monthly basis. In 1995, the department implemented an automated meter read system that utilizes a phone connection to the customer's meter. Currently, approximately 1/3 of the customers are on the automated system, and the remaining 2/3 of the customers are responsible for reading their water meters.

The department also asked a question (39) to determine if the water bill was easy to understand. The 1999 survey results indicate that the majority of customers (96%) thought the water bill was easy to understand, which is comparable to the previous surveys. The results were:

39-Bill easy to understand?	1999		1996		1992	
	Yes	Total # Y-N Resp	Yes	Total # Y-N Resp	Yes	Total # Y-N Resp
Understand bill	96%	107	94%	206	96%	163

The Water Department asked the 1999 respondents to suggest changes if they thought the water bill was not easy to understand. The suggestions were:

Bill: consider past paying status of the customer and do not disconnect—the timing is unrealistic (the customer was out of the county for a month and the bill was not paid within the first week of the following month—concerned that they would be disconnected over a \$12 bill that was not paid).

Bill: the bill is okay, but the meter is too complicated.

Sewer: There was a concern expressed regarding the sewer charges that appear on the bill. The comment was, when will the sewage treatment plant be paid for so the sewer bill will be reduced?

The results of the three remaining service questions (40, 41, 42) in the past 12 months, the 1999 respondents thought the requested work was completed (71%), they were treated courteously by the Water Department (83%), and their concern was addressed (88%). These responses represent a decrease from the 1996 survey results.

Service quality	1999		1996		1992	
	Yes	Total # Y-N Resp	Yes	Total # Y-N Resp	Yes	Total # Y-N Resp
40-Work was completed?	71%	17	83%	41	77%	31
41-Treated courteously?	83%	24	96%	51	87%	52
42-Concern was addressed?	88%	16	94%	48	87%	40

FY Budget and Staffing

The following information is not part of the Citizen Survey instrument, but is provided to give a better understanding of the financial and personnel resources used to provide the services. The FY budget is based on the adopted budget.

Department	F-T Staff	FY98-99 Budget	F-T Staff	FY95-96 Budget	F-T Staff	FY91-92 Budget
Water	11	6,439,867	11	5,651,547	10	3,111,874
# Part-Time		1		1		1
# Miles of main		139.80		129.46		109.67

APPENDIX

Survey Instruments

1999 Survey Instrument

1999 Citizen Survey - City of Urbandale, Iowa

Section Two: City Services Opinionnaire

DIRECTIONS: Please read each of the statements below and choose the response that best describes your opinion. Your response will either be in the form of a check mark, a word, a phrase or sentence, or a number that corresponds to a set of response choices which are provided. Please mark your responses in the space provided for each item.

GENERAL ADMINISTRATION:

1. Please indicate your overall opinion of each service based upon your experience with or observations of each service during the past 12 months. Select one of the choices given in the scale below which best represents your feelings.

4 = Excellent, 3 = Good, 2 = Fair, 1 = Poor, 0 = Don't Know

- | | |
|---|--|
| <p>___ a. Animal Control</p> <p>___ b. City Hall - Administration</p> <p>___ c. Collection-Garbage</p> <p>___ d. Collection-Yard Waste</p> <p>___ e. Collection-Recycle Curb It!</p> <p>___ f. Building Inspection</p> <p>___ g. Planning and Zoning</p> <p>___ h. Fire and Rescue</p> <p>___ i. Library</p> <p>___ j. Mosquito Control</p> | <p>___ k. Parks and Recreation</p> <p>___ l. Police</p> <p>___ m. Sanitary and Storm Sewers</p> <p>___ n. Senior Citizens Center</p> <p>___ o. Snow and Ice Removal</p> <p>___ p. Street Lighting</p> <p>___ q. Street Maintenance</p> <p>___ r. Street Sweeping</p> <p>___ s. Traffic Signals and Signs</p> |
|---|--|

2. As the City continues to grow, additional services will be required in the next 10 years. Based upon your feelings today, indicate how you might vote for a bond referendum to pay for the following projects. Your response choices are:

2 = Yes, 1 = No, 0 = Don't Know

- | | |
|--|---|
| <p>___ a. Fire Department Training Facility</p> <p>___ b. Community/Recreation Center</p> <p>___ c. Public Golf Course</p> | <p>___ d. City Hall</p> <p>___ e. Outdoor Swimming Pool</p> |
|--|---|

In the past 12 months, if you have called any of the following City of Urbandale departments with a concern or request for service, please indicate the City's response to your call. Check responses in each of the two boxes below which apply to your situation.

	Treated Courteously?	Concern Resolved?
3. City Hall / Administration	___ a. Yes ___ b. No	___ c. Yes ___ d. No ___ e. Unknown
4. Library	___ a. Yes ___ b. No	___ c. Yes ___ d. No ___ e. Unknown
5. Parks/Recreation	___ a. Yes ___ b. No	___ c. Yes ___ d. No ___ e. Unknown
6. Police	___ a. Yes ___ b. No	___ c. Yes ___ d. No ___ e. Unknown
7. Swimming Pool	___ a. Yes ___ b. No	___ c. Yes ___ d. No ___ e. Unknown
8. Public Works/Engineering	___ a. Yes ___ b. No	___ c. Yes ___ d. No ___ e. Unknown
9. Planning-Zoning/Com Dv	___ a. Yes ___ b. No	___ c. Yes ___ d. No ___ e. Unknown
10. Building	___ a. Yes ___ b. No	___ c. Yes ___ d. No ___ e. Unknown
11. Fire and Rescue	___ a. Yes ___ b. No	___ c. Yes ___ d. No ___ e. Unknown

LIBRARY SERVICES:

12. When you want to use the Library, is it open?
_____ a. Yes
_____ b. No. If No, what hours would you suggest? _____am to _____pm
13. What new services would you like the new library to offer? **Please Check All That Apply.**
_____ a. LCD-overhead display using a computer for presentations
_____ b. Digital camera
_____ c. DVD movies and player
_____ d. Laptop computer
_____ e. Web TV take home kit-connects TV to the Internet
_____ f. Foreign language items in: _____
(language)
_____ g. Other: _____
14. What adult programming opportunities would you participate in if offered at the new library? **Please Check All That Apply**
_____ a. Library's online catalog
_____ b. Internet searching
_____ c. General computer classes
_____ d. Book discussion groups
_____ e. Travelogue
_____ f. Crafts
_____ g. Other: _____
15. What services should be provided in the public meeting rooms at the new library? **Please Check All That Apply**
_____ a. Kitchen facilities
_____ b. Satellite down- link
_____ c. Video/data projection
_____ d. Sound system
_____ e. Cable TV reception/origination
_____ f. Use for business meetings
_____ g. Use for social events
_____ h. Other: _____

PARKS and RECREATION:

16. From which of the following sources do you primarily receive information about Parks and Recreation services? **Please limit your responses to your top 3 sources or less**
_____ a. Seasonal Program Guide
_____ b. Press Citizen
_____ c. Des Moines Register
_____ d. School Flyers
_____ e. Stand-up billboard signs
_____ f. Word of Mouth
_____ g. Other _____
17. How frequently do you and / or your family members use the Urbandale park system?
_____ a. Daily
_____ b. Weekly
_____ c. Monthly
_____ d. Never
18. Which of the following describe why you and/or your family members use the Urbandale Pool and/or water playground? **Please Check All That Apply**
_____ a. Leisure
_____ b. Fitness
_____ c. Lessons
_____ d. School Activities
_____ e. Do not use
19. Do you think the City of Urbandale provides adequate leisure-time facilities for senior citizens (60+ years)?
_____ a. Yes
_____ b. No
_____ c. Somewhat (Need more)
_____ d. Don't know
20. What type of park do you most often use in Urbandale? **Please Check Only One**
_____ a. Parks left in their natural undeveloped state
_____ b. Off-street meandering trails for biking, walking and jogging
_____ c. Small neighborhood parks within 10 minutes of your home
_____ d. Large parks that offer many activities and leisure options
_____ e. Other (describe) _____
_____ f. Seldom use parks because _____

PARKS and RECREATION (Continued):

21. Are you aware that Urbandale offers a Wellness/Fitness center located at the High School?
___ a. Yes
___ b. No—(For more information, call Parks and Recreation, 278-3963)
22. Are there additional programs you would like to see offered through Parks and Recreation? Please list:

POLICE DEPARTMENT:

23. Have you requested service from the Urbandale Police in the last 12 months?
___ a. If Yes, continue with item #24 ___ b. If No, continue with item #28
24. Were you satisfied with the response time?
___ a. Yes ___ b. No
25. Did the officer(s) act in a professional manner?
___ a. Yes ___ b. No
26. Did the officer(s) resolve your problem or adequately address your questions or concerns?
___ a. Yes ___ b. No
27. Did the officer(s) provide adequate follow-up information or service?
___ a. Yes ___ c. Somewhat
___ b. No, still waiting ___ d. Not Applicable
28. What improvements would you like to see in the Urbandale Police service? Please list:

FIRE DEPARTMENT (includes Rescue):

29. Have you requested service from the Urbandale Fire Department in the last 12 months?
___ a. If Yes, continue with item #30 ___ b. If No, continue with item #32
30. Were you satisfied with the response time?
___ a. Yes ___ b. No
31. Did you know that Urbandale is served by a volunteer Fire Department?
___ a. Yes ___ b. No—(For more information, call 278-3970)

ENGINEERING and PUBLIC WORKS:

32. Our community is growing. Are you satisfied with the growth of the street network to keep up with this growth?
___ a. Yes ___ b. No
33. How would you rate the condition of streets in your neighborhood?
___ a. Excellent ___ b. Good ___ c. Fair ___ d. Poor
34. How would you rate the City of Urbandale's ability to keep the main roads passable during ice and snow storms?
___ a. Excellent ___ b. Good ___ c. Fair ___ d. Poor

ENGINEERING and PUBLIC WORKS (Continued):

35. Please list any additional items you would like the curbside recycling collection program to collect:

WATER DEPARTMENT:

The Urbandale Water Department, under the jurisdiction of the Urbandale Water Board of Trustees, is very interested in receiving feedback regarding services to you. Please, if you would, answer the following questions as best you can.

36. How would you rate your experience with customer service personnel?
___ a. Excellent ___ b. Good ___ c. Fair ___ d. Poor ___ e. Don't Know
37. How would you rate the quality of water provided by the Urbandale Water Department?
___ a. Excellent ___ b. Good ___ c. Fair ___ d. Poor ___ e. Don't Know
38. How would you rate your water pressure?
___ a. Too High ___ b. Too Low ___ c. Satisfactory
39. Is the information on your water bill presented in a manner that is easy to understand?
___ a. Yes
___ b. No, my suggested changes are: _____

In the past 12 months, if you have had contact with the Urbandale Water Department regarding a concern or request for service, please check the response that best describes your contact.

40. Work requested was completed ___ a. Yes ___ b. No
41. I was treated courteously ___ a. Yes ___ b. No
42. My concern was addressed ___ a. Yes ___ b. No ___ c. Don't Know

DEMOGRAPHICS

Please check the following information that best describes the person completing this survey. The information will be kept confidential and will not be used to identify you.

43. Your gender ___ a. Female ___ b. Male
44. Type of dwelling in which you live
___ a. Apartment ___ c. Duplex ___ e. Single-Family Housing
___ b. Condo ___ d. Mobile Home ___ f. Other _____
45. What is your age?
___ a. 18 - 28 ___ b. 29-39 ___ c. 40 - 50 ___ d. 51-61 ___ e. 62 and older
46. What is your annual household income
___ a. Below \$19,999 ___ c. \$40,000 to \$59,999
___ b. \$20,000 to \$39,999 ___ d. \$60,000 and up
47. In which area of Urbandale do you live?
___ a. North of Douglas Avenue between the East corporate limits and 86th Street
___ b. North of Douglas Avenue between 86th Street and 142nd Street
___ c. North of Douglas Avenue between 142nd Street and the West corporate limits
___ d. South of Douglas Avenue between the East corporate limits and 86th Street
___ e. South of Douglas Avenue between 86th Street and 142nd Street
___ f. South of Douglas Avenue between 142nd Street and the West corporate limits

Thank you for taking time to complete this survey.

1999 Quick Summary of Survey Results

**1999 Written Comments
from
Survey Respondents**

1996 Survey Instrument

1992 Survey Instrument